| **Individual Action Plan Update for United States for 2012 - April 2014** |
| --- |
| ***Highlights of recent policy developments which indicate how [economy] is progressing towards the Bogor Goals and key challenges it faces in its efforts to meet the Goals.***  |
|  |

| IAP Chapter (and Sub-Chapter and Section Heading, if any) | **Improvements made since [Year] IAP**  | **Further Improvements Planned** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Tariffs | The U.S. economy is among the most open in the world. In 2013, 70 percent of imports for consumption entered the United States duty-free. The U.S. trade-weighted applied tariff average in 2013, including preferences and FTAs, was 1.4 percent. The United States has implemented Free Trade Agreements (FTAs) with 20 countries, including six agreements with seven APEC economies. Since 2011 the United States has implemented FTAs with Korea, Colombia, and Panama. | The United States is negotiating the Trans-Pacific Partnership with eleven other APEC economies, which will include binding commitments to market access, including tariffs, across all sectors. The United States is working with other APEC economies to carry out Leaders instructions to conclude negotiations on expanding the WTO Information Technology Agreement. We have also announced our intent to enter into negotiations on a new trade agreement in the WTO aimed at eliminating tariffs on a wide range of environmental goods.  The United States has implemented WebTR, and will continue to make its tariff regime as transparent as possible, including keeping current its online tools and making them as user-friendly as possible.  |
| Website for further information:  | [*www.ustr.gov*](http://www.ustr.gov) |  |
| Contact point for further details: | *Edward\_Brzytwa@ustr.eop.gov* |  |
| ***Non-Tariff Measures*** | **No changes since 2011.**  | *Provide brief points only* |
| Website for further information:  |  |  |
| Contact point for further details:  |  |  |
| ***Services*** | *Provide brief points only* | *Provide brief points only* |
| *Website for further information:*  |  |  |
| *Contact point for further details:* |  |  |
| ***Investment*** | *Provide brief points only* | *Provide brief points only* |
| Website for further information:  |  |  |
| Contact point for further details: |  |  |
| ***Standards and Conformance*** | *Provide brief points only* | *Provide brief points only* |
| Website for further information:  |  |  |
| Contact point for further details: | Jennifer\_A\_Stradtman@ustr.eop.gov; Edward\_Brzytwa@ustr.eop.gov  |  |
| ***Customs Procedures*** | **Single Window:** The Automated Commercial Environment (ACE) is the commercial trade processing system being developed by the U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to facilitate trade while strengthening border security. The ACE Secure Data Portal, essentially a customized web page, connects CBP, the trade community, and participating government agencies by providing a single, centralized, online access point for communications and information related to cargo shipments. As of February 2014, there are more than 22,600 ACE portal accounts for trade users, including 3,700 importer accounts, 1,435 broker accounts, and 17,500 carrier accounts. More than $125 billion in duties and fees have been paid through the ACE monthly statement process since the first payment was made in July 2004.The International Trade Data System (ITDS) is a program that is ensuring inter-agency participation in ACE. Through ITDS efforts, ACE will provide a “single window” for collecting and sharing trade data with agencies that are responsible for ensuring the compliance of imported and exported cargo with U.S. laws. To date, there are 49 Participating Government Agencies (PGAs) in ITDS. An APEC Single Window, as the first milestone of its Single Window Collective Action Plan (CAP), endorsed by APEC in 2011, a regional Single Window Workshop was held in Chinese Taipei in 2011. A second regional workshop on Single Window was held in Malaysia in October 2012. However, the discussions at these workshops were preliminary, focusing on identifying the factors that led to success in single window implementation. Those factors were identified as: the economy’s situation (economic, political, etc.), strong leading agencies, political will, budget, operational-level leadership, and interoperability. **Trade Recovery:**The U.S. has been working to promote trade resumption policies and practices that will provide for a coordinated restoration of the movement of goods following a potential disruption by developing and implementing national and global guidelines, standards, policies and programs.”For Background, the Strategy on Trade Recovery was initially outlined in the 2006 Security and Accountability for Every Port (SAFE Port) Act, which required development of a Strategy to Enhance International Supply Chain Security (Section 201 of the Act) that included Trade Resumption Protocols.In parallel with, and informing efforts toward, fulfilling the SAFE Port Act requirements the U.S. engaged with the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) to create the APEC Trade Recovery Program (TRP). These efforts have been reflected on a global scale by the creation of Trade Recovery Guidelines in the World Customs Organization (WCO) SAFE Framework of Standards package.Most recently, under the Secretary’s Secure Supply Chain Initiative (SSCI), there have been efforts to enhance global trade recovery guidelines and foster the creation of operational communications mechanisms through collaboration with the WCO, APEC, UPU, and the International Maritime Organization (IMO).APEC has served as a pivot point with these efforts, with the United States successfully proposing the adoption of specific information sets for exchange by governments and the private sector to enhance operational decision making. Based on the USCG/CBP protocols and expanded to include all modes of transport through discussions with the private sector at the Secure Trade in the APEC Region (STAR) Conference in San Francisco, APEC adopted these “Essential Elements of Information” at its Sub-Committee on Customs Procedures (SCCP) meeting in September, 2011.The WCO adopted the APEC SCCP information sets at the Policy Commission meeting in December, 2011, creating global guidelines.The United States was also successful in prompting APEC to recognize the importance of an operational trade recovery communications system and setting the stage for future action. At the 19th APEC Economic Leaders’ Meeting in Honolulu, Leaders recognized the significant risks to economic prosperity posed by the succession of natural disasters in the region, and supported the Ministers statement on this effort. | Future Automated Commercial Environment (ACE) releases currently planned include: In February 2014, the Administration issued an Executive Order (EO) on 21st Century Trade Facilitation. The EO established a December 2016 deadline for completion of the U.S. International Trade Data System (ITDS), a single window data submission and processing system for government-wide import and export data requirements. In support of this EO, and in reflection of the significant policy and technical progress made by Customs and Border Protection and Partner Government Agencies on this initiative in the past year, the U.S. updated APEC partners on U.S. single window efforts during the meeting of the Sub-Committee on Customs Procedures (SCCP) on the margins of the APEC Senior Officials Meeting 1, February 15-28, Ningbo, China. At the SCCP, the U.S. is exploring convening a Single Window Workshop for late 2014 or early 2015. Such a workshop would inform U.S. single window efforts by facilitating the exchange of lessons learned and best practices between APEC economies, many of which have or are also developing single window systems. Given the significant policy and technical advances the U.S. has made in the past two years in developing its single window system, the ITDS, it is envisioned that an upcoming APEC meeting and a potential follow-on Single Window Workshop would provide a timely opportunity to ensure continued coordination between APEC economies in the development and deployment of interoperable Single Window systems and reaffirm with our trading partners that we are committed to implementing such a system and making strong progress toward doing so.**Future Work on Trade Recovery:**Collaboration with World Customs Organization (WCO) continues on operationalizing the mechanism by which the TRP will be implemented.The United States is in preliminary discussions with some of our APEC partners to develop bilateral trade recovery protocols as well as received approval for the Global Trade Recovery Information Platform (GTRIP) and the APEC concept note, which will move the operational mechanism for TRP forward for APEC economies. There has been a lot of support from the other APEC economies as well as WCO members.Following implementation and testing within APEC, use of G-TRIP would be expanded within the Asia-Pacific Region through engagement within ASEAN and then globally through the WCO.Initial efforts would center on developing economies to mitigate the disproportionate impacts of disasters on their less-developed transportation systems. |
| Website for further information:  | [www.cbp.gov](http://www.cbp.gov); [www.itds.gov](http://www.itds.gov) |  |
| Contact point for further details:  | MARGARET.V.WILLIAMSON@CBP.DHS.GOV; Edward\_Brzytwa@ustr.eop.gov |  |
| ***Intellectual Property Rights*** | * “2013 Joint Strategic Plan for Intellectual Property Enforcement” (June 2013) http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/IPEC/2013-us-ipec-joint-strategic-plan.pdf
* Release of “Administration Strategy on Mitigating the Theft of U.S. Trade Secrets” (February 2013) <http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/IPEC/admin_strategy_on_mitigating_the_theft_of_u.s._trade_secrets.pdf>
* As part of international effort, US authorities seized over 1600 websites that were illegally selling counterfeit or misbranded drugs that purported to be brand name pharmaceuticals (June 2013) http://www.fda.gov/newsevents/newsroom/pressannouncements/ucm358794.htm
 | *Provide brief points only* |
| Website for further information:  | See above |  |
| Contact point for further details:  | Michael\_Diehl@ustr.eop.gov; Edward\_Brzytwa@ustr.eop.gov |  |
| ***Competition Policy*** | In March 2014, Federal Trade Commission (FTC) staff issued a policy paper that focused on proposed state-level changes to statutes and rules governing the “scope of practice” of Advanced Practice Registered Nurses (APRNs). Scope of practice rules determine the range of health care procedures and services that various health care professionals are licensed to provide under state law. In the case of APRNs, these rules establish both the range of services APRNs may deliver and the extent to which they are permitted to practice independently, or without direct physician supervision.<http://www.ftc.gov/reports/policy-perspectives-competition-regulation-advanced-practice-nurses>The Department of Justice (DOJ), FTC and Canadian Competition Bureau, in March 2014, issued a set of “best practices” to make more transparent how they coordinate merger reviews that affect the United States and Canada. The best practices set forth how effective day-to-day cooperation works between the two U.S. agencies and the Competition Bureau, including how the agencies communicate with each other, benefit from the similarity of their respective merger review timetables, cooperate in the analysis of evidence, use waivers of confidentiality provided by the parties and address remedies and settlements. The best practices also seek to promote cooperation and coordination between the U.S. and Canadian agencies in order to enhance the likelihood of consistent outcomes when the same merger is reviewed in both countries. In addition, the best practices acknowledge the contribution that merging parties can make in facilitating cooperation, and provide guidance to firms about how to work with the agencies to coordinate and facilitate the reviews of their proposed transactions. The “best practices” do not modify existing U.S. or Canadian law, but instead build upon the framework of the 1995 antitrust cooperation agreement between the United States and Canada and the experience gained under that framework.The FTC held a public workshop, “Examining Health Care Competition,” in March 2014, to study certain activities and trends that may affect competition in the evolving health care industry. The workshop explored current developments related to: professional regulation of health care providers; innovations in health care delivery; advancements in health care technology; measuring and assessing health care quality; and price transparency of health care services.In February 2014, the FTC held a [workshop to explore competition issues involving biologic medicines and follow-on biologics](http://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/2014/02/follow-biologics-workshop-impact-recent-legislative-regulatory). Biologic medicines comprise the fastest-growing sector of pharmaceuticals and target such difficult-to-treat diseases as cancer, diabetes, and multiple sclerosis. Workshop presentations were provided by a wide range of experts in the research, development, commercialization and sale of biosimilar and interchangeable follow-on biologic medicines.In September 2013, the DOJ and the staff of the FTC issued a joint model waiver of confidentiality for individuals and companies to use in merger and civil non-merger matters involving concurrent review by the DOJ or FTC and non-U.S. competition authorities. A waiver provides the terms on which an individual or company agrees to waive statutory confidentiality protections that are otherwise available to the agency that originally received the company’s confidential information. The model waiver is designed to streamline the waiver process thereby significantly reduces the burden on individuals and companies, as well the agencies’ time and resources involved in negotiating waivers. A waiver allows for the sharing of confidential information only among the competition agencies listed in the waiver. For additional information on the joint model waiver, *see* <http://www.justice.gov/atr/public/international/index.html>; <http://www.ftc.gov/sites/default/files/attachments/international-waivers-confidentiality-ftc-antitrust-investigations/model_waiver.pdf>In 2013, the FTC issued [final changes to the premerger notification rules](http://www.ftc.gov/sites/default/files/documents/federal_register_notices/2013/11/131115premergerfrn.pdf) that require companies in the pharmaceutical industry to report certain proposed acquisitions of exclusive patent rights to the FTC and the DOJ for [antitrust review](http://www.ftc.gov/opa/reporter/competition/mergers.shtml). The revised rules clarify when a transfer of exclusive rights to a patent in the pharmaceutical industry results in a potentially reportable asset acquisition under the Hart Scott Rodino (HSR) Act. It also issued [final changes to its premerger rules](http://www.ftc.gov/os/fedreg/2013/06/130628hsrfinalrulefrn.pdf) to establish procedures for the withdrawal of a Hart Scott Rodino (HSR) premerger notification filing in certain circumstances<http://www.ftc.gov/policy/federal-register-notices/16-cfr-part-801-premerger-notification-reporting-waiting-period><http://www.ftc.gov/sites/default/files/documents/federal_register_notices/federal-register-notice-16-cfr-parts-801-802-and-803-premerger-notification-reporting-> In January 2013, the DOJ and the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office released a joint Policy Statement on Remedies for Standards-Essential Patents Subject to Voluntary F/RAND Commitments. The statement addressed how federal district courts and the U.S. International Trade Commission resolve cases involving standards-essential patents which owners have committed to licensing on fair, reasonable, and non-discriminatory (FRAND) terms.The DOJ and FTC, in December 10, 2012, hosted a public workshop on patent assertion entity (PAE) behavior. The workshop provided a forum for industry participants, academics, economists, lawyers, and other interested parties to discuss the evolution of economic and legal analyses of PAE behavior, including patent acquisition and licensing activity. The workshop consisted of a series of panels examining, among other topics, PAE behavior, the economics of IP licensing, industry experiences with PAE behavior, economic and legal theories and empirical work concerning PAE activity, and the potential efficiencies and harms to innovation and competition that this activity may generate. For additional information on this workshop, *see* <http://www.justice.gov/atr/public/workshops/pae/index.html>; <http://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events-calendar/2012/12/patent-assertion-entity-activities-workshop>In December 2012, DOJ hosted a senior official from the Japan Fair Trade Commission, as part of the Antitrust Division’s Visiting International Enforcers Program (“VIEP”). Participants in the VIEP are exposed to all aspects of the Division’s work, consistent with the Division’s confidentiality obligations, and receive training from senior Division officials regarding the Division’s civil and criminal enforcement programs. Participants also have the opportunity to participate in meetings with Division decision-makers, parties, and third parties in matters under review, and are invited to provide training to the Division on a topic of their choice related to their jurisdiction’s antitrust law.The FTC issued a staff report finding that in Fiscal Year (FY) 2012 (October 1, 2011 through September 30, 2012), the number of potentially anticompetitive patent dispute settlements between branded and generic drug companies increased significantly compared with FY 2011, jumping from 28 to 40. The figure is the highest of any year since the FTC began collecting data in 2003. In nearly half of these settlements, branded firms may have used the promise that they would not develop or market an authorized generic (AG) as a payment to stall generic drug firms from marketing a competing product. Overall, the agreements reached in the latest fiscal year involved 31 different brand-name pharmaceutical products with combined annual U.S. sales of more than $8.3 billion. <http://www.ftc.gov/sites/default/files/documents/reports/agreements-filed-federal-trade-commission-under-medicare-prescription-drug-improvement-and/130117mmareport.pdf>On September 10, 2012, the FTC and DOJ held a joint public workshop on most-favored-nation clauses (MFNs). The workshop provided a forum for discussion of the evolution of economic and legal thinking on MFNs and their implications. The workshop featured panels discussing economic theories concerning MFNs and why they are used, the legal treatment of MFNs, and industry experiences with MFNs, among other topics. See <http://www.justice.gov/atr/public/workshops/mfn/index.html> .Horizontal Merger Investigation Data: Fiscal Years 1996-2011. In January 2013, to promote transparency in merger enforcement, Federal Trade Commission staff reviewed the horizontal merger investigations that the agency conducted during fiscal years 1996through 2011 and compiled relevant data for public release may be found at: <http://www.ftc.gov/sites/default/files/documents/reports/horizontal-merger-investigation-data-fiscal-years-1996-2011/130104horizontalmergerreport.pdf>In September 2012 the DOJ and FTC signed an antitrust memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the Government of India Ministry of Corporate Affairs and the Competition Commission of India (CCI) to promote increased cooperation and communication among competition agencies in both countries. The MOU is a framework for voluntary cooperation and does not change existing law in either country. <http://www.ftc.gov/system/files/1209indiamou.pdf>; <http://www.justice.gov/atr/public/press_releases/2012/287457.htm> On July 31, 2012, the FTC withdrew the [Policy Statement on Monetary Equitable Remedies in Competition Cases](http://www.ftc.gov/policy/federal-register-notices/policy-statement-monetary-equitable-remedies-competition-cases). The Statement was issued in 2003 and outlined a framework for determining when the Commission would seek equitable monetary remedies, such as disgorgement of ill-gotten gains, in competition case. The Commission wrote that, "Although intended to clarify past Commission views on this topic, the practical effect of the Policy Statement was to create an overly restrictive view of the Commission's options for equitable remedies. Accordingly, the Commission withdraws the Policy Statement and will rely instead upon existing law, which provides sufficient guidance on the use of monetary equitable remedies."http://www.ftc.gov/policy/federal-register-notices/federal-register-notice-withdrawal-commission-policy-statement The FTC International Fellows Program continues. It permits counterparts from non-U.S. agencies to spend several months working directly with FTC staff on investigations. In the first half of FY 14, FTC hosted 5 International Fellows from Argentina, Japan, Chile, and two from the EC. In FY 13, FTC hosted 10 International Fellows from Argentina, Canada, Colombia, Egypt, Japan, Lithuania, two from South Korea, Switzerland and Nigeria.  The agency also had two outbound exchanges to foreign agencies in Canada and Mexico.On January 13, 2012, the FTC issued proposed changes to its procedures that, if adopted, would expedite its investigatory processes, and update its procedures to keep pace with electronic discovery. The proposed changes, which will be published in the Federal Register and are open for public comment until March 23, 2012, concern the procedures in Parts 2 and 4 of the FTC’s Rules of Practice. They are part of the FTC's effort to periodically review and update its rules to ensure that they are efficient and not unduly burdensome on outside parties.The proposed changes to Part 2 are designed to expedite Commission investigations and make sure the FTC's investigatory processes continue to keep pace with electronic discovery. For example, the proposed changes require parties to meet and confer with Commission staff on an accelerated basis in order to resolve electronic discovery issues relating to subpoenas and civil investigative demands (CIDs), as well as any other issues.Proposals also include changes to:* streamline the process for resolving disputes over FTC subpoenas and CIDs, as well as petitions to limit or quash FTC subpoenas and CIDs;
* expedite the FTC's pre-merger review process by giving the agency's General Counsel the authority to initiate enforcement proceedings when a party fails to comply with the Hart-Scott-Rodino second request process; and
* relieve parties of their obligations to preserve documents related to an FTC investigation after a year passes with no written communication from the Commission or staff.

Additional information is available at <http://www.ftc.gov/opa/2012/01/part2rules.shtm>.  |   |
| Website for further information:  | [www.ftc.gov](http://www.ftc.gov); [www.justice.gov](http://www.justice.gov) |  |
| Contact point for further details:  |  Edward\_Brzytwa@ustr.eop.gov |  |
| ***Government Procurement*** | U.S. FTAs with Korea, Panama, and Colombia entered into force since 2011. Each of these FTAs contains government procurement chapters. | *Provide brief points only* |
| Website for further information:  | [www.ustr.eop.gov](http://www.ustr.eop.gov) |  |
| Contact point for further details:  | Edward\_Brzytwa@ustr.eop.gov |  |
| ***Deregulation/Regulatory Review*** | On May 10, 2012, President Obama issued Executive Order 13610, “Identifying and Reducing Regulatory Burdens,” which institutionalized retrospective review in the U.S. This Executive Order also emphasized that flexibility and removal of unnecessary burdens are essential elements of the U.S. rulemaking process, as is the improvement of rules already on the books. A particular focus of this initiative is ensuring regulatory flexibility for SMEs and reducing regulatory burdens for everyone. Executive Order 13610 asks agencies to report regularly on the progress of their retrospective review activities. In response, agencies have provided updates on their initiatives, many of which are new efforts that agencies have added since their July 2013 listing of look-back plans. These efforts have already saved more than $10 billion in regulatory costs in the near term, with more savings to come. Here are three examples of recent reforms: • The Department of Transportation has proposed to rescind the requirement that truck drivers submit and retain driver-vehicle inspection reports when the driver has neither found nor been made aware of any vehicle defects or deficiencies. This change would save tens of millions of hours in red tape per year, for approximately $1.5 billion in annual red tape reduction. • In the area of export control regulations, streamlined permitting processes have now been finalized for 8 of 15 targeted categories of export controls with more in the works.• The Department of Veterans Affairs has issued a proposed rule to reorganize and rewrite its compensation and pension regulations, making it easier and less costly for claimants, beneficiaries, veterans’ representatives, and VA personnel to locate and understand those regulations. | Moving forward, the Office of Management and Budget plans to work with agencies on several ways to further institutionalize retrospective review as an essential component of U.S. regulatory policy. As part of this effort, the U.S. is considering and developing several components that will make regulatory look-back a more systematic priority for agencies. |
| Website for further information:  | [www.reginfo.gov](http://www.reginfo.gov) |  |
| Contact point for further details: | ahunt@omb.eop.gov; Edward\_Brzytwa@ustr.eop.gov  |  |
| ***Implementation of WTO Obligations/ROOs*** | **No changes since 2011.**  | *Provide brief points only* |
| Website for further information:  | [www.ustr.gov](http://www.ustr.gov)  |  |
| Contact point for further details: | Edward\_Brzytwa@ustr.eop.gov  |  |
| ***Dispute Mediation*** | **No changes since 2011.** | *Provide brief points only* |
| Website for further information:  | [www.ustr.gov](http://www.ustr.gov)  |  |
| Contact point for further details: | Edward\_Brzytwa@ustr.eop.gov  |  |
| *Mobility of Business People* | Visas. The United States has improved wait times and capacity for visa applicants, exceeding the President’s goal of 80 percent of visa applicants worldwide to be interviewed within three weeks of submitting their applications (met the goal in August 2012 and have not looked back) and increasing visa capacity by 40 percent in China and Brazil in FY 2012 and maintaining such capacity in FY 2013.**Visa Waiver Program.** The Department of Homeland Security designated Chinese Taipei to the Visa Waiver Program in 2012, and added Chile in 2014. Meanwhile, the Department of Homeland Security is working with other Federal government agencies within the National Tourism Strategy to increase the number of travellers from VWP countries.**Trusted Traveler Programs.** The United States continues to expand its trusted traveler program. These programs are voluntary and applicants undergo an extensive background check to determine their eligibility as low-risk, trusted travelers. At airports, trusted travelers have access to the Global Entry kiosks to complete their immigration processing. | **Automated Passport Control.** The Automated Passport Control program (APC) is a public/private business transformation initiative that dramatically reduces inspection time while allowing the officer to focus on performing core law enforcement responsibilities, with the added benefit of serving as a force multiplier and reducing wait times.  The traveler performs the administrative function of providing passport information and biometrics (for applicable travelers) as part of the queuing process, prior to presenting themselves for inspection by an officer. Since the launch of the APC program in August 2013, the program has expanded to a total of 12 sites. For Fiscal Year 2014, CBP anticipates adding 10 additional sites. **Visas**. The United States is examining the concept of a paperless visa process that will enhance security and ease of application/travel for business travelers and tourists.  |
| *Website for further information:*  | [www.uscis.gov](http://www.uscis.gov); [www.cpb.gov](http://www.cpb.gov); [www.travel.state.gov](http://www.travel.state.gov)  |  |
| *Contact point for further details:* | STEPHANIE.A.WOOD@CBP.DHS.GOV; BednarzJA@state.gov; Edward\_Brzytwa@ustr.eop.gov; Jai\_Motwane@ustr.eop.gov  |  |
| *Official websites that gather economies’ information* | *No changes since 2011 update.*  | *Provide brief points only* |
| Website for further information:  |  |  |
| Contact point for further details: |  |  |
| ***Transparency*** | *No changes since 2011 update.* | *Provide brief points only* |
| Website for further information:  |  |  |
| Contact point for further details: |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **RTAs/FTAs**  |
| ***-*** ***Description of current agreements*** | *Please use Part 1 of the RTA/FTA reporting template to provide a short description or hyperlinks to any new agreements and to report improvements to existing agreements.* **United States – Korea Free Trade Agreement*** Date of entry into force: 15 March 2012
* Notification to the WTO: 15 March 2012
* For more information: <http://www.ustr.gov/trade-agreements/free-trade-agreements/korus-fta>

**United States – Colombia Free Trade Agreement*** Date of entry into force: 15 May 2012
* Notification to the WTO: 8 May 2012
* For more information: <http://www.ustr.gov/uscolombiatpa>

**United States – Panama Free Trade Agreement*** Date of entry into force: 31 October 2012
* Notification to the WTO: 29 October 2012
* For more information: <http://www.ustr.gov/trade-agreements/free-trade-agreements/panama-tpa>
 |
| ***- Agreements under negotiation*** | *Please provide information on agreements that are currently under negotiation eg issues being covered in the negotiation and the status of the negotiation.* **Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) Negotiations**On November 12, 2011, the Leaders of the nine Trans-Pacific Partnership countries – Australia, Brunei Darussalam, Chile, Malaysia, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore, Vietnam, and the United States – announced the achievement of the broad outlines of an ambitious, 21st-century Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) agreement that will enhance trade and investment among the TPP partner countries, promote innovation, economic growth and development, and support the creation and retention of jobs.President Obama announced in November 2009 the United States’ intention to participate in the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) negotiations to conclude an ambitious, next-generation, Asia-Pacific trade agreement that reflects U.S. economic priorities and values. Through this agreement, the Obama Administration is seeking to boost U.S. economic growth and support the creation and retention of high-quality American jobs by increasing exports in a region that includes some of the world’s most robust economies and that represents more than 40 percent of global trade. The Obama Administration, working in close partnership with Congress and with a wide range of stakeholders, is seeking to conclude a strong agreement that addresses the issues that U.S. businesses and workers are facing in the 21st century.The United States is currently negotiating the TPP with eleven other like-minded countries (Australia, Brunei Darussalam, Canada, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore, and Vietnam) that share a commitment to concluding a high-standard, ambitious agreement and to expanding the initial group to include additional countries throughout the Asia-Pacific region. On April 24, 2013, the United States Trade Representative notified Congress of its intent to include Japan, the world’s third largest economy, in the TPP negotiations, pending the successful conclusion of the domestic procedures of each of the current members. Japan’s entry further distinguishes TPP as the most credible pathway to broader Asia-Pacific regional economic integration.For more information: <http://www.ustr.gov/tpp>**Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (T-TIP) Negotiations**On June 17, 2013, President Obama, together with European Council President Van Rompuy, European Commission President Barroso, and Prime Minister Cameron, announced that the United States and the European Union (EU) will launch negotiations on a Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (T-TIP) agreement. T-TIP will be an ambitious, comprehensive, and high-standard trade and investment agreement that offers significant benefits in terms of promoting U.S. international competitiveness, jobs, and growth. This ambitious trade and investment agreement will aim to boost economic growth in the United States and the EU and add to the more than 13 million American and EU jobs already supported by transatlantic trade and investment. For more information: <http://www.ustr.gov/ttip>  |
|  | ***Agreement #1*** |  |
| ***Agreement #2*** |  |
| ***Agreement #3*** |  |
| ***Agreement #4*** |  |
| ***Agreement #5*** |  |
| ***Agreement #6*** |  |
| ***Agreement #7*** |  |
| ***Agreement #8*** |  |
| ***Agreement #9*** |  |
| ***Agreement #10*** |  |
| ***Agreement #11*** |  |
| ***Agreement #12*** |  |
| ***Agreement #13*** |  |
| ***Agreement #14*** |  |
| ***Agreement #15*** |  |
| ***Agreement #16*** |  |
| ***Agreement #17*** |  |
| ***Agreement #18*** |  |
| ***Agreement #19*** |  |
| ***Agreement #20*** |  |
| ***-*** ***Future plans*** |  |
| Website for further information:  |  |
| Contact point for further details: |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Other voluntary reporting areas*** | *Provide brief points only* | *Provide brief points only* |
| Website for further information:  |  |  |
| Contact point for further details: |  |  |