



**Asia-Pacific  
Economic Cooperation**

**FTAAP Capacity Building Programs in  
Rules of Origin and FTA Implementation  
Summary Report**

**APEC Committee on Trade and Investment**

**December 2012**

APEC Project CTI09/2012

Produced by  
Sungwoo Choi  
Multilateral Trade Bureau  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade  
Republic of Korea

For  
Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation Secretariat  
35 Heng Mui Keng Terrace  
Singapore 119616  
Tel: (65) 68919 600  
Fax: (65) 68919 690  
Email: [info@apec.org](mailto:info@apec.org)  
Website: [www.apec.org](http://www.apec.org)

© 2013 APEC Secretariat  
Published February 2013

APEC#213-CT-04.2

## **2012 APEC Workshop on FTA Rules of Origin**

July 10-12, 2012, Seoul, Republic of Korea

### **Executive Summary**

In 2012, APEC Leaders directed Ministers to “continue to facilitate APEC’s role as an incubator of an FTAAP and to explore ways forward towards its realization by providing leadership and intellectual input into the process of its developments.” In order to identify capacity-building needs for regional economic integration (REI) in an effort to work towards an FTAAP, a survey was conducted and analyzed in 2010. Based on the survey analysis, the multiyear work plan for the REI Capacity-Building Needs Initiative (CBNI) was proposed in 2011. Consequently, the Action Plan Framework for the REI CBNI was endorsed in 2012 and this workshop was organized as a kickoff meeting of its programs that were developed under the framework.

The 2012 APEC Workshop on FTA Rules of Origin (ROOs) was successfully held in Seoul, Korea on July 10-12, 2012. The objective of the workshop was to enhance understanding of FTA ROOs and customs procedures, to share relevant experiences and best practices, to discuss policy measures for ROOs in the APEC community, and to assess the feasibility of creating APEC-wide ROOs.

In this workshop, 37 government officials in charge of ROOs from 19 APEC member economies and speakers with expertise on the related topics, including university professors and an official from World Customs Organization (WCO) attended to share their ideas and experiences. Topics of the first day of the workshop included 1) Rules of Origin and their Harmonization, 2) FTA ROOs and Regional Economic Integration in APEC, 3) Effects of ROO on Trade, and 4) Challenges presented by Rules of Origin and WCO Origin Database. On the second day, the participants discussed Origin Verification Process and Practices, Origin Management System and Cases of Origin Management System in the Private Sector. The workshop ended on the third day with a visit to the Seoul Main Customs office, where the participants were able to discuss the Korea Customs Service Electronic System, UNI-PASS and ROO-related cases and examples in Korea’s FTAs, followed by a brief tour of the customs museum.

This workshop shed light on various issues and perspectives on FTA ROOs from both academics and practitioners. The workshop benefited from active participation in discussions and expertise offered by the speakers and delegates. They shared their

comprehensive knowledge of FTA ROOs and harmonization in the context of regional economic integration in APEC, effects of ROOs on trade, challenges ahead, and the use of WCO database. The participants were also able to enrich their knowledge on the origin verification process and practices, origin management system, and the cases of origin management system in the private sector.

In Session 1(Rules of Origin and their Harmonization) presented by Professor Alan Deardorff, it was recognized that ROOs have become one of the major issues in international trade with the proliferation of FTAs. From economic standpoint, ‘No ROOs’ would be optimal due to the deadweight loss, administration and documentation cost, and input diversion. The most counterintuitive cost is related to input diversion since the cost of ROOs becomes larger as the number of FTAs increases, FTAs have more of their own ROOs, and industries are more fragmented. Hence, we need to harmonize ROOs and simplify them to have least restrictions. In reality, however, harmonizing ROOs across all FTAs is an almost impossible task. Cumulation should be as broad as possible in order to enhance the world’s economic welfare. The Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) was first planned to allow broader cumulation among the participating economies, but it seems to be a long shot to achieve this goal. The European Union has been a leader in cumulation provisions, but these provisions are not used very often in practice. In MERCOSUR, there are no rules on cumulation at all. In this regard, full cumulation seems to be a premature concept in the APEC region. Further, one of the practical challenges of cumulation using the Regional Value Content (RVC) method in the region is the possibility of manipulation in currency exchange. Nonetheless, the workshop participants agreed that it is critical to simplify ROOs and enhance transparency of ROOs.

In Session 2(FTA ROOs and Regional Economic Integration in APEC), Professor Innwon Park suggested a regime-wide ROO for the APEC region. He mentioned that APEC has put enormous efforts to mitigate negative effects caused by the complicated web of FTAs. It has also worked to harmonize and simplify ROOs in the APEC region since the mid-1990s. The regime-wide ROOs, which aim to mitigate the problems of restrictive ROOs, include de minimis, the roll-up or absorption principle, and cumulation. In terms of the flexibility of rules, de minimis is the most appropriate for final goods while roll-up is for intermediate goods. Meanwhile, the self-certification process makes it easy for customs officers to work with ROOs, and it enhances the utilization rate as well. A horizontal ROO is needed to simplify ROOs since it reduces barriers across

sectors with different rules.

In Session 3(Effect of ROOs on Trade), Professor Hansung Kim pointed out that one of the major trade impacts of the ROOs is trade diversion. The key for mitigating the damage of ROOs is how to address the trade diversion effect. ROOs determine the nationality of a product and prevent the free rider problem. Since complex ROOs deter utilization of FTAs, introducing diagonal cumulation to FTAs in the Asia-Pacific region would be a short-term solution. Diagonal cumulation can work as an intermediate step for the FTAAP and start integrating the regional production network. There are technical difficulties in achieving diagonal cumulation as this requires all participating economies to have identical ROOs and not to have duty drawback provisions in their texts. The RVC method normally works well in developed economies but not in less developed economies where the accounting system is not acceptably developed. The product specific rule (PSR) increases vertical consistency across the production line. Vertical consistency refers to the consistency within an agreement, whereas horizontal consistency refers to the consistency across FTAs. The consistency problem will only exacerbate as an economy enters into more and more FTAs. The utilization rate of Korea's FTAs varies across different agreements depending on the restrictiveness level of different ROOs. In contrast, China's FTAs have a high consistency rate of about 40% and Japan has strategically pursued a very consistent ROOs system in product-specific rules.

In Session 4(Challenges Presented by ROOs and WCO Origin Database), Ms. Mette Werdeline Azzam presented challenges linked to ROOs. It is reported that ROOs are sometimes employed for the purpose of compensating for the loss of tariffs and other conventional barriers. In some cases, the rules are different even under the same name, and it is hard to find common ground within or beyond a regional agreement or a customs union. Multi-stages of FTA increase the complexity in applying ROOs. Using only one single ROO is not feasible in practice due to fragmentation. In some sectors, RVC cannot be met and technical rules or change in tariff classification (CTC) is used instead. Most of all, simplification and harmonization of rules are needed. Because of stringent ROOs, developing economies face challenges in taking advantages of tariff preferences. In particular, SMEs in developing countries may face bigger challenges in relation to ROOs. There is a need for transparent reference to classification of change of tariff heading (CTH), which is a widely used standard. Ms. Werdeline suggested that flexibility of ROOs should be pursued in order to accommodate technological changes.

She also advocated that it is imperative to use comparative studies on different rules, to utilize tools for FTAs developed by WCO, and to make use of database on preferential trade agreements that are available on the website of WCO.

In Session 5(Origin Verification Process and Practices), speakers from Korea, the U.S. and Chinese Taipei introduced their own process and practices. The Korea Customs Service (KCS) recently established a new FTA Implementation Policy Bureau in order to effectively manage increasing demands from newly signed FTAs. In Korea, the import verification process consists of risk assessment, selection, verification, and determination. The export verification process goes through receipt of request, verification, notification of the result, and follow-up action. To minimize the administrative costs and burden caused by the complexity of verification systems, Korea needs to provide a harmonized and simplified form of verification. The origin risk intelligence system of Korea takes trade volume, complexity in ROO, and social impact into account. Verification checking procedures are composed of formality check and other substantial factors. The main challenges of ROOs include non-compliance/negligence in cooperation between partners, reluctance to provide sufficient information, lack of expertise in classification, and different interpretation/classification/guidelines between importing and exporting parties. Therefore, it is strongly recommended to establish focal points for effective communication and mutual cooperation. It is also recommended to provide a harmonized guideline or a manual for verification procedures. Meanwhile, the US CBP provides online services such as classification guidance, eligibility for preferential treatment through its online system, and the Customs Ruling Online Search System (CROSS). Verification of origin under the Korea-U.S. FTA is typically a two-step process. The first step is to request a certificate of origin from the importer and the second step is to request the supporting documentation from the importer. The verification process does not begin until the documents that go beyond the certification are requested. Importers can use any format for certification as long as it contains required data elements for certification. In Chinese Taipei, the Customs Service requests information about the origin of goods from the certifying authority of an exporting party, and then sends written questionnaires for further information. The Customs Service often conducts on-site verification to review the records and documents together with inspection on the materials and facilities used in the production of the goods in question. As the customs administration plays a critical role in implementing FTAs, capacity-building and customs cooperation on the ROOs are needed to enhance the

implementation of FTAs. As it is not easy to narrow the different views of partner economies on what is the proper verification procedure, it is a good idea to have a harmonized guideline or manual.

In Session 6(Origin Management System), Korea Institute of Origin Information introduced FTA-PASS, which is the self-origin-management system developed by KCS in order to support SMEs and exporters who lack the capacity to develop their own ROOs management system. The architecture of the FTA-PASS consists of master information, transaction information, document issues, user information, and origin calculation. The procedure of the FTA-PASS starts with data management, followed by calculation management and document management. It contains all HS codes for Korea's eight FTAs in force. It automatically completes more than 50% of the documentation and allows users to issue certificates. Korea's FTA-PASS can be considered as one of the potential solutions for the complexity problem of the self-certification process.

In Session 7(Cases of Origin Management System in the Private Sector), the presenters discussed on how global companies such as Hyundai Motor Company (HMC) and SMEs cope with FTA ROOs. For the successful implementation of FTAs, four factors were highlighted: a dedicated team with competent members, a well-equipped system, supplier training, and HS code management. HMC's origin management system has been a successful win-win strategy for both HMC and its suppliers. The origin determination system and the FTA hub system are the core sources of HMC's FTA audit package. The FTA hub works as a suppliers' portal that browses HS codes, origin determination and the internal data submitted by suppliers through their certificate of origin. Perfect compliance can be achieved through collaboration between the private sector and public sector with strong government support. In this regard, HMC's hub system can serve as an intermediary that links all the parties and help achieve the best FTA compliance environment. SMEs find it too complex to prepare FTA supporting materials since preparation requires professional knowledge. SMEs have little incentive to comply with the complex rules. They are often concerned that their confidential information may be released and at the same time they are also concerned that they may be cut from the supply chain if they do not meet the global exporters' requests. It is indispensable that government should provide a free web solution to help SMEs with quick preparation and minimize risks of incorrect origin calculation.

Harmonization of ROOs is a clear answer to the challenges posed by diverse and complex ROOs. However, it is not easy to harmonize ROOs because of the conflict among different interest groups. The first step toward harmonization of ROOs is to enhance transparency, simplicity and flexibility of rules. The use of WebTR as a network hub can be a good tool for reducing administrative costs. The next step is to build a single cumulation zone with the aid from APEC-wide capacity building efforts. We need to maximize the utilization rate through better implementation. Although public certification is still prevalent in the APEC region, self-certification is recommended for its low administrative costs and easy access to the preferential tariffs under FTAs. The integrated and harmonized procedure for the certificate of origin is an essential prerequisite for traders to fully enjoy the benefits of FTAs. The self-origin management system developed by KCS can be considered as a possible solution for overcoming the complexity problem of the self-certification process, in particular for SMEs. It is also crucial for governments to provide SMEs support for training programs, infrastructure, and advisory network. KCS plans to establish a global single window so that all the customs service agencies can share relevant data. The worldwide Unique Consignment Reference (UCR) is being discussed in WCO. In this system, an exporting economy can submit UCR to an importing economy, and the latter can save time and cost in the process by obtaining cargo information prior to the customs declaration.

According to the pre- and post-workshop surveys, the participants who attended the workshop are interested in sharing diverse technicalities and interpretations of ROOs. Most of their concerns, however, are as follows: what to feature in the new trend of FTA ROOs; how to facilitate the origin verification process and hence increase utilization of FTAs; how to design FTA ROOs; what policies to adopt for efficient ROOs implementation; and how to cooperate with various stakeholders.

In conclusion, APEC-wide efforts to enhance the transparency, simplicity and flexibility of ROOs are needed. To this end, public and private collaboration is crucial. This capacity building workshop on FTA ROOs may have served as a good starting point for this purpose. Future capacity-building programs should follow up on this workshop by focusing on the areas that were identified in the discussions and surveys, by strengthening the practical expertise and networks to reach consensus on best practices, by producing a harmonized guideline or manual, and by integrating the ROO-related procedures.

## **2012 APEC Workshop on FTA Implementation**

November 15-16, 2012, Jeju, Republic of Korea

### **Executive Summary**

Securing the implementation of FTA commitments is every economy's urgent concern. Any non-implementation is damaging the very foundation of reciprocity of FTA mechanism. How to effectively facilitate FTA implementation remains imperative particularly in such diverse political and economic environment of Asia-Pacific.

For the proper implementation of FTAs, the governments must check any possible inconsistency between treaty commitments and existing laws and regulations. Any inconsistency problem needs to be solved by revising laws and regulations and administrative guidelines. Equipping relevant regulatory organizations and agencies with required knowledge and capacities for the implementation is a critical part of preparation for the implementation. In particular, customs administrations need to be fully ready to administer preferential tariff rates and verification of origin.

Cooperative interactions between the administrative and legislative bodies are also instrumental in enhancing implementation capacities of APEC economies. For this purpose, Korea enacted the Trade Procedure Act in January 2012. This kind of legislative solution can help increase transparency in the trade policy process while institutionalizing the scope of mutually amicable interactions between the government and the parliament in a highly political environment of FTA implementation.

Moreover, the implementation of trade agreements involves activities to foster business communities' utilization of FTA benefits. Governments need to provide assistance to their enterprises, in particular, to help them deal with the difficulties they experience in meeting the requirements of preferential rules of origin (ROOs). Divergent ROOs are one of the main causes of raising business costs in the era of proliferating FTAs. Simple, consistent, and predictable ROOs are more likely to foster the growth of cross-country production networks in the world trading system. The Pan-European Cumulation System shows a good example of harmonizing ROOs on a regional basis. Therefore, APEC needs to pursue the long-term goal of harmonizing ROOs in Asia-Pacific, while making immediate efforts to converge ROOs of FTAs concluded among APEC economies.

Government assistance also needs to be targeted at the sectors affected adversely by FTAs to enhance their competitiveness or to facilitate structural adjustments. How to systematically attend to disadvantaged business groups is also related to the necessity to secure legitimacy of the trade deal at issue and it will also garner further supports for any future deal. As necessary it is, this industrial adjustment issue is always a politically sensitive task, requiring government's engagement in a two-level game.

In playing the game, the Korean government has made continuous efforts to balance economic welfare with political reality by delaying tariff elimination for sensitive products and paying substantial compensation to farmers. Such a balancing task has easily been challenged by anti-FTA groups and any surrender to such challenge has only generated more challenges and eventually moral hazard. Even the Investor-State Dispute Settlement mechanism, once an obscure topic understood only by arbitrators and law professors, has swiftly entered public consciousness, and criticisms about the mechanism were used by anti-FTA groups to pose another challenge to the legitimacy of FTA liberalization policy. .

As a way to deal with these challenges in a systemic manner, Korea adopted the Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) program. This program proved its utility in persuading opponent groups and gaining people's agreement on the FTA deal and its domestic implementation. It needs to be remembered, however, that in the process of extracting this political utility economic efficiency has largely been sacrificed in operating the program. A future task of Korea would be to make the political instrument more economically efficient.

To better pursue the two-level game, governmental authorities need to share information on controversial issues and to have enough consultations with stake-holding industries and the general public. The authorities should try to reflect as many compromised opinions of the issues into the FTA negotiation. Without such procedures of active internal consultation or engagement, any outcome of international negotiation could be vulnerable to criticism and challenges from interest groups, hindering implementation of the FTA.

Promotion of benefits and public awareness of FTAs is also a critical tool in the game. In the process of promotion of the Korea-US FTA, Korea had to pay incalculable

amount of social costs, as anti-liberalization organizations developed their organizational capabilities in a systematic manner and demonstrated powerful solidarity. The negotiation and implementation authorities need to execute intensive public relation activities to reach out to the people. The point that FTAs will bring about business opportunities even to disadvantaged sectors needs to be clearly understood by the business people in those sectors, and their productivity enhancing endeavors need to be efficiently supported by governmental domestic measures. FTA parties may work jointly to promote the benefits of FTAs. It would be a good idea to establish an FTA Promotion Mechanism at the APEC level to promote the benefits of FTAs regionally.

If FTA benefits are not utilized by users, what is the use of implementing FTAs? Another urgent task and responsibility of APEC economies is to promote SME's FTA utilization. To encourage SMEs to actively utilize FTAs, more collaboration among APEC members is needed in such areas including customs, origin determinations, harmonizing product specific rules of origin, and sharing information and experiences. It is about time to formulate common guideline for origin verification among FTA partners in Asia Pacific such as NAFTA Verification Manual. In the end, APEC enterprises need to look at FTAs through a global supply chain lens where business processes are unbundled and where sales, marketing, manufacturing and sourcing raw materials are internationalised. Business communities need to understand how to use the FTA tool to their best.

Sometimes, FTA implementation and compliance may be constrained by the central-local protectionism. An increasing level of local power due to democratization is a new trend in many economies of Asia Pacific. In this practical environment, if a local government feels that the implementation of certain provision is not conducive to its economic growth, it may be unwilling to genuinely enforce such provision in its territory. A typical example would be a local government's lax enforcement of environmental and labor commitments under FTAs. Attention should be paid among APEC economies to establishing operative and effective implementation mechanism that is based on a cooperative spirit between central and local governments.

The implementation of complex trade agreements often poses a great challenge to developing countries. How to assist developing economies in implementing FTAs is also becoming a prevailing concern as more FTAs are concluded between developed and developing economies in Asia Pacific.

Given the significance of monitoring FTA implementation, it is about time to pay attention to, and to know, any huddles and barriers in the process of FTA implementation. APEC economies in particular need to discuss this topic and raise their voices towards each other as well as towards outside. This discussion could find some useful solutions and share even painful experiences or process of trial and errors with APEC economies. This kind of effort will contribute to genuine regional integration of APEC economies including the integration that will be achieved by the FTAAP initiative.

## **2012 APEC Workshop on FTA Rules of Origin**

July 10-12, 2012, Seoul, Republic of Korea

### **Analysis of Results of the Feedback Survey**

In accordance to APEC guidelines, an evaluation sheet was included within the meeting documents in order for participants to provide important feedback regarding the workshop as well as recommendations for further projects.

In terms of the response ratio, 28 evaluations were received, representing 78% of the total participants that attended the workshop. Considering some participants from the same member economy submitted a consolidated response, this response rate is closer to 100%.

With respect to the overall workshop program, 16 (57%) respondents answered “satisfactory” and 12 (43%) responded “good” with comments that the program provided broader views of understanding ROOs, state-of-the-art and useful topics/contents/knowledge, experienced speakers, fairly well-organized arrangements, and an active exchange of views on good practices.

In regards to the sessions on the first day, 17 (61%) respondents answered “satisfactory,” followed by 11 (39%) as “good” with the explanation that it was such an eye opener to impacts and implementation of ROOs in FTAs, and the presentation made by Professor Deardorff was very interesting and other presentations contained very practical information/knowledge.

In regards to the sessions on the second day, 16 (57%) respondents replied “satisfactory,” whereas 12 (43%) answered “good” on the grounds of the very detailed and illustrative information/presentations, and different views both from governments and the private sector.

In terms of the on-site visit to Seoul Main Customs on the third day, only 9 participants completed the survey. Among them, 6 (21%) respondents answered “satisfactory” along with 2 (7%) responses for “good” and 1 (4%) for “fair” because it was informative and

helpful to understand and complement the workshop topics.

As to the question on whether the workshop met its objectives, 15 (54%) answered “satisfactory” along with 11 (39%) responses for “good” because it was very informative in providing knowledge on ROOs in FTAs. On the other hand, 1 (4%) answered “fair” due to very little new knowledge.

With respect to the question on whether the workshop was appropriate for participants, 14 (50%) responses were classified as “satisfactory” and 13 (46%) as “good” because some participants were so experienced to provide good information and their own experiences to share. A participant (4%) responded “fair” to suggest that the moderator be more active to break the ice.

As to ways in improving the workshop, the respondents suggested providing the presentation materials in advance to allow participants to study prior to attending, encouraging more active engagement of the participants involved in the discussion and reaching consensus on the best practices to implement.

In terms of the workshop benefits or changes in their work, organization and/or economy, the respondents pointed out that the broader visions, better understanding on ROO and case studies will contribute to designing and improving their public policies/provisions and their ROO negotiations. They suggested more specific capacity-building programs to follow up on the workshop.

As to the question on what changes they plan to implement when returning to their home economy, the responses included improving the quality of the capacity-building program in the internal areas of the ROO administrations, creating cooperation with the WCO or Korean government, and establishing an FTA outreach program for business people, in particular for SMEs.

In regards to what needs to be done next by APEC and how to support and build on the workshop results, their suggestions were to conduct more technical assistance on ROOs for APEC/ASEAN members, maintain the network among speakers and participants, discuss other factors such as the issue of Market Access, and simplify and improve provisions of ROO as an important element for the future FTA and FTAAP negotiations. It was also highlighted to ponder the need for more experts on ROOs especially in moving towards an FTAAP, more practical experience and trends to be provided by

APEC in different ways, and more workshops for ROO capacity-building.

Some respondents suggested that an ice-breaking session is needed before starting the workshop such as an “Introduction Session” among participants, so that participants can more actively participate in the main program with less formality.

In conclusion, given that the feedback provided by participants was overall positive and constructive, we believe that the workshop was a success and, as always, there is still room for improvement. The specific comments from participants will be taken into account in future activities.

## **Workshop on FTA Implementation**

15-16 November, 2012, Jeju, Korea

### **Analysis of the Results of Participants Feedback**

The Workshop on FTA implementation was held in Jeju, Korea on 15th-16th November, 2012. During the workshop, 18 speakers presented on various contentious issues ranging from promoting public awareness of FTAs and enhancing utilization of FTAs to addressing negatively impacted sectors in FTA implementation. 37 participants from 17 APEC economies participated in the workshop and actively shared their economies' experiences on FTA implementation. For evaluation purposes, Korea conducted a feedback survey, and 35 participants responded.

According to the survey, the majority of the respondents (97%) evaluated the entire workshop to be "satisfactory" or "good" where as the rest (3%) evaluated it to be "fair." No respondents thought the workshop was "not good" or "not satisfactory." The respondents commented that sharing Korea's experience provided participants with better understanding of FTA implementation as well as precious insights on useful tools to be applied to their economies. Also, they highly appreciated the session 7, "sharing experiences of APEC economies" where 5 speakers from Chile, China, Indonesia, New Zealand, and the U.S. briefly presented on their own FTA implementation experiences.

When asked how well the workshop met its objectives, 51% of the respondents marked "satisfactory", while 40% and 9% marked "good" and "fair," respectively. Several respondents (22%) commented that it would have been better to have more opportunities to interact with participants and speakers. They suggested that having more time for Q&A or additional break-out sessions for networking and informal discussions would improve the quality of this kind of workshops.

Regarding the appropriateness of the participants (speakers and audience) of the workshop, the majority of the respondents (85%) answered it was "satisfactory" or "good," and 11% "fair." Some participants commented that business sectors should be included.

When asked how this workshop will benefit or change their work, organization and/or economy, many of the respondents stated that they became more aware of the importance of FTA implementation and the necessities of putting more focus on the issue in their economies. They also mentioned that for this purpose, they will report the workshop results with their own recommendations to future activities within relevant ministries to improve FTA implementations, particularly on enhancing public awareness and utilization, will inform their respective parliaments of the importance of trade adjustment assistance, will refer to best practices, particularly Korea's experiences in establishing their FTA implementation mechanisms for more engaging interest groups concerned and providing FTA information services, and will consult more often with other ministries and business associations in order to take into account various points of view in implementing FTAs.

Many respondents pointed out that the workshop should have been held for a longer period of time and suggested follow-up workshops with broader topics as follows: 1) sector-based in-depth analysis (agriculture, ROO, etc.); 2) chapter-based in-depth analysis (legal, economic, administrative, and public approaches, etc.); 3) services and investment liberalization as well as tariff liberalization; 4) more comparative analysis on APEC economies' situation; 5) recommendation for the development of FTAAP and TPP; and 5) specific case studies regarding challenges that APEC economies have faced.

As for the subsequent activities to be pursued by APEC in order to build on the results of the workshop, the respondents suggested as follows: 1) hold follow-up implementation workshops; 2) consolidate and circulate members' experiences; 3) publish more materials for trade policy experts; 4) conduct further survey on the needs of members in terms of capacity building for FTA implementation; 5) cooperate to find solutions to increase utilization rate and practices in their economies; 6) continuously provide information on FTA implementation to all participants; and 7) build a network of FTA implementation and provide with participants a contact list to help participants to communicate each other.

## 2012 APEC Workshop on FTA Rules of Origin

### List of Speakers and Participants

July 10-12, 2012, Seoul, Republic of Korea

#### Speakers

**Mr. Alan Deardorff**

Professor, University of Michigan  
The United States of America  
alandear@umich.edu

**Mr. Billy Wen-Hai Shyu**

Assistant Director, Directorate General of Customs, Ministry of Finance  
Chinese Taipei  
dft6@webmail.customs.gov.tw

**Ms. Mette Azzam**

Technical Officer  
WCO  
mette.azzam@wcoomd.org

**Mr. Han Sung Kim**

Professor, Ajou University  
Republic of Korea  
hkim1@ajou.ac.kr

**Mr. Innwon Park**

Professor, Korea University  
Republic of Korea  
iwpark@korea.ac.kr

**Mr. Sang Hee Pang**

General Manager of Hyundai Motor Company  
Republic of Korea  
shpang@hyundai.com

**Mr. Mungu Park**

Partner of KPMG Korea  
Republic of Korea  
mungupark@kr.kpmg.com

**Ms. Gabby Shim**

Senior Deputy Director of Korea Customs Service  
Republic of Korea  
gyshim2000@gmail.com

**Mr. J.D. Jackson**

CBP Official of US Embassy in Seoul  
The United States of America  
jdjackson@cbp.dhs.gov

**Mr. Seong Man Park**

IT Business Team Manager, Korea Institute of Origin Information  
Republic of Korea  
smpark@origin.or.kr

**Moderators**

**Mr. Nakgyoon Choi**

Senior Research Fellow, Korea Institute for International Economic Policy  
Republic of Korea  
ngchoi@kiep.go.kr

**Ms. Mee Jin Cho**

Assistant Professor, Myongji University  
Republic of Korea  
mjcho@mju.ac.kr

**Mr. Chul Chung**

Research Fellow, Korea Institute for International Economic Policy  
Director, Korea National Center for APEC Studies  
Republic of Korea  
cchung@kiep.go.kr

**Participants**

**Mr. Mario Lavin**

Economic Advisor North America and CARICOM Department, General Directorate International  
Economic Affairs  
Chile  
mlavin@direcon.gob.cl

**Mr. Zheng Fan**

Official, Qingdao Customs of China  
People's Republic of China  
fanzheng@customs.gov.cn

**Ms. Bo Chen**

Official, Fuzhou office of rules of origin General Administration of Customs  
People's Republic of China  
chen\_bo@customs.gov.cn

**Ms. Ayuditya S. Widyatni**

Staff, Ministry of Trade  
Indonesia  
dhitya\_ayu@yahoo.com

**Ms. Armi Yuniani**

Head of Section on Investment Facilitation, Ministry of Trade  
Indonesia  
me\_1706@yahoo.com

**Ms. Siti Arfah Kamaruzaman**

Assistant Director, Ministry of International Trade and Industry  
Malaysia  
sitiarfah@miti.gov.my

**Mr. Gan Chee Koon**

Principal Assistant Director, Ministry of International Trade and Industry  
Malaysia  
ckgan@miti.gov.my

**Mr. Jorge Lopez Valdez,**

Director for Negotiation of Rules of Origin and Customs Procedures, Ministry of Economy  
Mexico  
jorge.lopez@economia.gob.mx

**Ms. Miroslava Elizabeth Perez Lopez**

Deputy Director for Negotiation of Rules of Origin and Customs Procedures, Ministry of  
Economy  
Mexico  
miroslava.perez@economia.gob.mx

**Ms. Christina Amos**

Acting Director Tariff & Trade, PNG Customs Services  
Papua New Guinea  
amosc@custom.gov.pg, amosc818@gmail.com

**Mr. Sapak William**

Project Coordinator, PNG Customs Services  
Papua New Guinea  
sapakwilliam@gmail.com

**Ms. Norma Arpafo**

Trade and Industry Development Specialist, Department of Trade and Industry  
The Republic of the Philippines  
yen.arpafo@yahoo.com

**Ms. Marie Sherylyn Aquia**

Trade and Industry Development Specialist, Department of Trade and Industry  
The Republic of the Philippines  
msdaquia\_bitr@yahoo.com

**Mr. Sergio Navarro**

Trade Officer, Ministry of Foreign Trade and Tourism  
Peru  
snavarro@mincetur.gob.pe

**Mr. Waldy Bejarano**

Trade Officer, Ministry of Foreign Trade and Tourism  
Peru  
wbejarano@mincetur.gob.pe

**Ms. Yulia Khodchenkova**

Senior inspector, Federal Customs Service  
Russia  
KhodchenkovaYuM@ca.customs.ru

**Ms. Piyawan Chantasophon**

Scientist of Customs Department  
Thailand  
106474@customs.go.th,pi.piyawan@gmail.com

**Mr. Yossatorn Wattanapituksakul**

Trade Officer, Department of Foreign Trade, Ministry of Commerce  
Thailand  
yossatornw@moc.go.th

**Mr. Phongthep Thongthep**

Trade Officer, Professional level, Department of Foreign Trade, Ministry of Commerce\_  
Thailand  
phongthept@moc.go.th

**Mr. Hong Duong Bui**

Director of APEC-ASEM Division, Ministry of Industry and Trade of Viet Nam  
Vietnam  
duongmoit@gmail.com

**Mr. Van Phuong Hoang**

Deputy Director of ASEAN Division, Ministry of Industry and Trade of Viet Nam  
Vietnam  
phuonghv@moit.gov.vn

**Ms. Ai Ching Sia**

Second Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade  
Brunei Darussalam  
aiching.sia@mfa.gov.bn

**Mr. Jean Francois Marion**

Senior Trade Policy Officer, Tariffs and Goods Market Access Division of Foreign Affairs and  
International Trade Canada  
Canada  
jean-francois.marion@international.gc.ca

**Ms. Chu-Chun Luo**

Customs Officer, Department of Customs Administration, Ministry of Finance  
Chinese Taipei  
cclo@mail.mof.gov.tw

**Mr. Yen-Shen Lin**

Customs Officer, Department of Customs Administration, Ministry of Finance  
Chinese Taipei  
007126@webmail.customs.gov.tw

**Ms. Yu Ting Hui**

Assistant Trade Officer, Trade and Industry Department  
Hong Kong, China  
irisythui@tid.gov.hk

**Mr. Koichi Okada**

Director Assistant, Ministry of Economy Trade and Industry  
Japan  
natsumi-yuna@meti.go.jp

**Ms. Seongsil Kim**

Assistant Deputy Director, Ministry of Knowledge Economy  
Republic of Korea  
sskim012@mke.go.kr

**Ms. Hyewon Han**

Assistant Deputy Director, Ministry of Knowledge Economy  
Republic of Korea  
hh222@mke.go.kr

**Mr. Jaeho Jang**

Assistant Deputy Director, Ministry of Knowledge Economy  
Republic of Korea  
bluemaru@mke.go.kr

**Ms. Kook Hee Lee**

Deputy Director, Ministry of Strategy and Finance  
Republic of Korea  
davebona@mosf.go.kr

**Ms. So Hyun Park**

Assistant Deputy Director, Ministry of Strategy and Finance  
Republic of Korea

**Ms. Yanling, Sophia Lee**

Assistant Director, Ministry of Trade and Industry  
Singapore  
Sophia\_Lee@mti.gov.sg

**Mr. Arthur Zavyalov**

Counselor, Trade in Goods Unit of the Department of Trade Policy  
Eurasian Economic Commission  
zavyalov@tsouz.ru

**Mr. Vitaliy Ponomarev**

Consultant, Trade in Goods Unit of the Department of Trade Policy  
Eurasian Economic Commission  
ponomarev\_v@list.ru

## 2012 APEC Workshop on FTA Implementation

### List of Speakers and Participants

November 15-16, 2012, Jeju, Republic of Korea

#### Speakers

**Mr. Seong-in Kim**

Director General, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade  
Republic of Korea  
sikim59@mofat.go.kr

**Mr. Seong-ho Lee**

Deputy Director General, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade  
Republic of Korea  
shlee89@mofat.go.kr

**Mr. Young-jae Kim**

Director, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade  
Republic of Korea  
yjkim70@mofat.go.kr

**Ms. Myung-hee Yoo**

Program Director, APEC Secretariat  
Republic of Korea  
ymh@apec.org

**Mr. Tae-sung Park**

Director General, Korea International Trade Association (KITA)  
Republic of Korea  
parkts1402@naver.com

**Mr. Byung-il Choi**

President, Korea Economic Research Institute (KERI)  
Republic of Korea  
byc@keri.org

**Prof. Back-hoon Song**

Sungshin Univ.  
Republic of Korea  
bsong@sungshin.ac.kr

**Prof. In-kyo Cheong**

Inha Univ.  
Republic of Korea  
inkyoo@inha.ac.kr

**Dr. Jin-kyo Suh**

Doctor, Korea Institute for International Economic Policy (KIEP)  
Republic of Korea  
jksuh@kiep.go.kr

**Prof. Won-mog Choi**

Ewha Womans Univ.  
Republic of Korea  
wmchoi@ewha.ac.kr

**Prof. Yoon Heo**

Seogang Univ.  
Republic of Korea  
hury@sogang.ac.kr

**Prof. Jiang-yu Wang**

Singapore National Univ.  
People's Republic of China  
jywang@nus.edu.sg

**Prof. Itakura Ken**

Nagoya City Univ.  
Japan  
itakura@econ.nagoya-cu.ac.jp

**Prof. Laura Henry**

Kyung Hee Univ.  
The United States of America  
lshenry@khu.ac.kr

**Mr. Bryant Trick**

Deputy Assistant USTR for Korea, Office of the United States Trade Representative (USTR)  
The United States of America  
bryant\_Trick@ustr.eop.gov

**Mr. Alejandro Buvinic**

Trade Commissioner, Embassy of Chile to the USA  
Chile  
abuvinic@minrel.gov.cl

**Mr. Astera Primanto Bhakti**

Director, Ministry of Finance  
Indonesia  
apbhakti@fiskal.depkeu.go.id

**Ms. Yan Wang**

First Secretary, Ministry of Commerce  
People's Republic of China  
wangyan@mofcom.gov.cn

**Mr. Steve McCombie**

Head of FTA Implementation Unit, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade  
New Zealand  
Steve.McCombie@mfat.govt.nz

**Participants**

**Mr. Arfian Abdul Kadir**

Acting Senior Superintendent of Customs  
Royal Customs and Excise Department, Brunei  
arfian.kadir@customs.mof.gov.bn

**Mr. Azizul Omar**

Finance Officer, Ministry of Finance  
Brunei  
azizulsabrin\_omar@mof.gov.bn

**Ms. Patricia Rodriguez**

Advisor to the Director of Bilateral Economic Affairs  
General Directorate of International Economic Affairs  
Chile  
prodriguez@direcon.gob.cl

**Mr. Alvaro de la Barra, Croquevielle**

Economic Analyst, Research Department, General Directorate of International Economic Affairs  
Chile  
adelabarra@direcon.gob.cl

**Mr. Minghua Ren**

Official, Ministry of Commerce  
People's Republic of China  
renminghua@mofcom.gov.cn

**Mr. Jinchao Qiu**

Director, Shanghai WTO Affairs Consultation Center  
People's Republic of China  
15821288898@126.com

**Mr. Widia Ariadi**

Head of Regional Section II (APEC Desk)  
Ministry of Finance, Indonesian Customs and Excise  
Indonesia  
ariadiwidia@gmail.com; i\_customs@yahoo.com

**Mr. Budi Suharto**

Head of Regional Section III, Ministry of Finance, Indonesian Customs and Excise  
Indonesia  
bud\_sht@yahoo.co.id

**Ms. Hirai Mayuko**

Assistant Director, Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (METI)  
Japan  
hirai-mayuko@meti.go.jp

**Ms. Muzalmah Mustapha Kamal**

Senior Federal Counsel, Attorney General's Chambers  
Malaysia  
muzalmah@agc.gov.my

**Ms. Nur Sarah Dina Baharudin**

Senior Federal Counsel, Attorney General's Chambers  
Malaysia  
nursarah@agc.gov.my

**Ms. Monica Edwards**

Deputy Director, Ministry of Economy, Operations for North America,  
International Trade Negotiations, Undersecretary of Foreign Trade  
Mexico  
Monica.edwards@economia.gob.mx

**Mr. Roberto Corona**

Deputy Director, Ministry of Economy, Asia and Multilateral Organizations  
Mexico  
roberto.corona@economia.gob.mx

**Mr. Boris Gomez**

Trade Officer, Ministry of Foreign Trade and Tourism  
Peru  
bgomez@mincetur.gob.pe

**Ms. Jennifer Olortegui**

Trade Officer, Ministry of Foreign Trade and Tourism  
Peru  
jolortegui@mincetur.gob.pe

**Ms. Ma. Josefina Villena**

Economic Development Specialist II, National Economic and Development Authority  
The Republic of the Philippines  
mpvillena@neda.gov.ph

**Mr. Murray Frazer**

Principal Trade Officer, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade  
Papua New Guinea  
fmurray02@gmail.com

**Mr. Kamil Benjamin**

Senior Foreign Service Officer, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade  
Papua New Guinea  
benjamin.kamil@yahoo.com

**Ms. Yulia Shestoperova**

Expert, Ministry of Economic Development of the Russian Federation  
Russia  
Shestoperova@economy.gov.ru

**Ms. Alena Bulatnikova**

Expert, Ministry of Economic Development of the Russian Federation  
Russia  
Bulatnikova@economy.gov.ru

**Ms. Deborah Lee**

Senior Assistant Director, Ministry of Trade and Industry  
Singapore  
Deborah\_lee@mti.gov.sg

**Mr. Shun Loong Chua**

Senior Assistant Director, Ministry of Trade and Industry  
Singapore  
chua\_shun\_loong@mti.gov.sg

**Mr. Chen-yu Wang**

Officer, Ministry of Economic Affairs, Office of Trade Negotiations  
Chinese Taipei  
cywang1@moea.gov.tw

**Ms. Duen-Yi (Phoebe) Shih**

Second Secretary, Ministry of Economic Affairs, Bureau of Foreign Trade  
Chinese Taipei  
fibi@trade.gov.tw

**Ms. Tung Ming-Huei**

Section chief, Ministry of Economic Affairs, Bureau of Foreign Trade  
Chinese Taipei  
minghuei@trade.gov.tw

**Mr. Yu-Chieh Wang**

Officer, Ministry of Economic Affairs, Department of International Organizations  
Chinese Taipei  
bowlesre@state.gov

**Ms. Kanonrat Luengsode**

Trade Officer, Ministry of Commerce, Department of Foreign Trade  
Thailand  
kanonrats@gmail.com

**Ms. Suchaya Prukbamroong**

Trade Officer, Professional Level, Department of Trade Negotiations, Ministry of Commerce  
Thailand  
suchaya\_pr@moc.go.th

**Dr. Sompob Teraumpon**

Trade Officer, Department of Foreign Trade, Ministry of Commerce  
Thailand  
saratathp@moc.go.th

**Ms. Quynh Mai Pham**

Deputy Director General, Ministry of Industry and Trade, Multilateral Trade Policy Department  
Vietnam  
maipq@moit.gov.vn

**Ms. Lien Huong Vu**

Deputy Director,  
Ministry of Industry and Trade, Multilateral Trade Policy Department, APEC-ASEM Division  
Vietnam  
huongvl@moit.gov.vn

**Ms. Bich Ngoc Hoang**

Deputy Director of Vietnam Integration Review  
National Committee for International Economic Cooperation Office of Vietnam  
Vietnam  
ngoc.ubqg@gmail.com

**Ms. Thai Ha Bui**

Official, Ministry of Industry and Trade of Vietnam  
Vietnam  
habthai@moit.gov.vn

**Mr. Ji Hoon Sohn**

International Trade Specialist, Department of Commerce, International Trade Administration,  
Korea Desk  
The United States of America  
Eric.Sohn@trade.gov

**Mr. Ryan Bowles**

Economic Officer, U.S. Embassy Seoul  
The United States of America  
BowlesRE@state.gov

**Mr. Arthur Zavyalov**

Deputy Head of Section for Goods, Trade Policy Department  
Eurasian economic commission (EEC)  
a.zavyalov@ecommission.org

**Mr. Sergey Melkumov**

Chief Expert, Section for Bilateral and Multilateral Cooperation, Trade Policy Department  
Eurasian economic commission (EEC)  
melkumov@ecommission.org