## CUTS Dossier on Preferential Trade Agreements January-March 2017 (Vol. XI, No. 1)

# (For all previous issues of PTA Dossiers, please visit: (http://www.cuts-citee.org/PTADossier.htm)

#### **Contents**

1.	EU, Japan determined to deliver trade deal by end of 2017	. 1
2.	South Korea tentatively signs FTA with 5 Central American countries	5
3.	Eurasian Economic Union, Singapore May Sign Free Trade Deal in 2017	8

## 1. EU, Japan determined to deliver trade deal by end of 2017

European Commission President Jean-Claude Juncker, said he was very confident of a swift agreement this year. Our negotiations with Japan are now in a decisive and hopefully final stage. This agreement is necessary, because we believe in free, fair and rules-based trade. Japan is the EU's sixth largest trading partner in the world. For Japan, the EU occupies third place. The volume of trade between the two amounted to an estimated €125 billion in 2016...The EU-Japan trade deal is comparable to the Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA), negotiated between the EU and Canada, an EU official said. But at the moment, the FTA between the EU and Japan resembles the one concluded between the EU and South Korea in 2011, and seems to be the likeliest outcome politically, experts say.

(https://www.euractiv.com/section/economy-jobs/news/eu-japan-determined-to-deliver-trade-deal-by-end-of-2017/)

#### **CUTS Comments**

Japan and the European Union (EU) are confident of agreeing to a trade agreement this year. This new trade equation between them is likely to have some impact on India's export basket. Though at present competition is moderate, the situation may change in favour of the EU as well as Japan in both short- and long-run.

Trade statistics reveal that in 2016 the total value of India's export to the EU was approximately US\$ 45.75 billion. In the same year, the value of Japan's export to the EU was approximately US\$ 73.86 billion.

As shown in Table 1.1, India and Japan are competing in five product segments (in their top 10 exports) such as pearls, precious or semi-precious stones; organic chemicals; vehicles other than railway or tramway rolling stock; machinery, mechanical appliances, nuclear reactors, etc.; and electrical machinery and equipment and parts thereof. In the competing product segments the annual growth of export of India during 2012-2016 was relatively better than that of Japan except in products of precious and semi-precious stones.

Also, there are products like articles of apparel: not knitted or crocheted; articles of apparel: knitted or crocheted; mineral fuels, mineral oils and products of their distillation; iron and steel; and pharmaceutical products, where India is likely to remain a leading player as compared to Japan.

		Tabl	le 1.1				
	lia's Export to the in 2016: US\$ 4575		Japan's Export to the EU (Export in 2016: US\$ 73865.75mn)				
Export Value in 2016 (US\$mn)	Annual Growth (2012-2016, %)	Sectors		Coctors		Export Value in 2016 (US\$mn)	Annual Growth (2012-2016, %)
3341.1	-6.3	Pearls, precious o stones		2841.8	53.3		
3188.6	1.9	Articles of appare crocheted	el: not knitted or				
3008.7	4.8	Organic chemical	S	1810.9	-23.7		
2984.9	26.2	Articles of appare crocheted	el: knitted or				
2909.8	31.7	Vehicles other that tramway rolling s	•	17838.2	12.1		
2838.4	22.1	Machinery, mech appliances, nuclea		16742.9	-18.9		
2273.4	-70.1	Mineral fuels, min products of their					
1895.9	-26.4	Electrical machin equipment and pa		9976.8	-25.7		
1802.2	12.0	Iron and steel		•••	•••		
1561.1	14.4	Pharmaceutical pr	roducts				
		Optical, photogra cinematographic, checking, precision	measuring,	5589.6	-15.6		
		Commodities not specified	elsewhere	4410.0	-13.6		
		Plastics and articl	es thereof	1652.1	-14.7		
		Rubber and article	es thereof	1314.8	-32.3		
		Ships, boats and f structures	loating	1244.3	26.7		
25803.8	37 (56%)	Top 10 P (percentage of		63421.2	(86%)		
Source: Internation	onal Trade Centre D	atabase					

At the same time, when we talk about export from India to Japan, in 2016, it was valued at approximately US\$ 3.8 billion, whereas that of the EU to Japan was approximately US\$ 62.76 billion. As a result of this FTA Japan's import from India may get affected in the short-run (see Table 1.2).

India is the 25<sup>th</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup> largest import source for the EU and Japan, respectively. As shown in Table 1.2, India and the EU are competing in four product segments (in their top 10 exports) such as organic chemicals; machinery, mechanical appliances, nuclear reactors, boilers; vehicles other than railway or tramway rolling stock; and electrical machinery and equipment and parts thereof.

It is also observed that in products like mineral fuels, mineral oils and products of their distillation; fish and crustaceans, molluscs; pearls, precious or semi-precious stones; articles of apparel: not knitted or crocheted; iron and steel; and miscellaneous chemical products, India has an edge over the EU in Japan's market. Because of this advantage, it has the potential to improve its overall position in Japan's market.

		Tab	le 1.2				
	dia's Export to Ja in 2016: US\$ 382			J's Export to Japan in 2016: US\$62764.63mn)			
Export Value in 2016 (US\$mn)	Annual Growth (2012-2016, %)	Sec	etors	Export Value in 2016 (US\$mn)	Annual Growth (2012-2016, %)		
649.9	-76.9	Mineral fuels, min products of their d					
399.0	37.0	Organic chemicals	1	2573.8	-38.4		
381.7	12.4	Fish and crustacea	ns, molluscs		•••		
296.9	-17.2	Pearls, precious or stones	semi-precious				
245.8	69.8	Machinery, mecha nuclear reactors, b		8215.8	1.1		
196.2	81.2	Vehicles other that tramway rolling st		10354.4	-0.2		
151.4	-24.8	Articles of apparel crocheted	: not knitted or				
139.7	-43.9	Iron and steel			•••		
119.3	89.9	Miscellaneous che	mical products		•••		
107.2	-0.5	Electrical machine and parts thereof	ry and equipment	3610.5	-16.3		
		Pharmaceutical pro	oducts	8861.4	-5.9		
		Optical, photograp cinematographic	ohic,	5668.4	-15.6		
		Meat and edible m	eat offal	1536.0	26.3		
		Beverages, spirits	and vinegar	1287.0	-16.0		
		Wood and articles charcoal	of wood; wood	1235.7	-4.0		
		Plastics and article	es thereof	1231.1	-14.2		
2687.2	(70%)	Top 10 Products (percentage of total export)  44			7 (71%)		
Source: Internation	onal Trade Centre I	Database					

Given this composition of trade among the three countries, a quick simulation using Degrees of Similarity in Export Structures (Finger-Kreinin Index) and Relative Export Competitive Pressure Index can give an indication of competitive strengths and weaknesses with direct competitors in respective markets.

The Finger-Kreinin Index (FKI) measures how similar two sets of countries are in respect to their trade in a destination country. It is used to compare the similarity between either the structure of a country's import or export with any two partner countries so as to see how similar a country's export pattern is to its import pattern, whether geographically or by product or to compare the structure of production in two different countries. It explains how similar the import of a given product is from two different suppliers.

It is useful to measure overall similarity of export of two countries and, therefore, their degree of competitiveness/complementarity either with respect to a particular market or with respect to trade with the rest of the world. If FK=1 then export structures would be exactly similar and if FK=0 there would be no similarity.

The Relative Export Competitive Pressure Index (RECPI) calculates the average degree of competition that country X faces in country Y's market from country Z. It takes into account both the structure and level of competing countries' trade. Country X will be interested in the value of country Z's export to country Y, and also to the extent to which country Z's export is in direct competition with country X's export. A low RECPI explains less competition between the competitors.

There was moderate similarity of export from India and the EU to Japan as well as from India and Japan to the EU. The FKI in Table 1.3A varied between 0.17 and 0.19. This means that at the aggregate level India's and Japan's exports are to some extent more similar than that of India's and EU's.

Furthermore, the RECPIs between India and the EU and that between India and Japan indicate that export competitiveness was moderate to high for India and Japan in the EU's market, but the same is not that intense in Japan's market (see Table 1.3C&D).

Table 1.3: FKI and RECPI among India-EU-Japan (2013-16)													
A. India's FKI with EU						B. India's FKI with Japan							
Competitor	2013	2014	2015	2016		Competitor	2013	2014	2015	2016			
Japan	0.17	0.17	0.18	0.19		EU	0.14	0.14	0.17	0.19			
C. Inc	dia's RE	CPI with	EU			D. Indi	a's REC	PI with J	apan				
Competitor	2013	2014	2015	2016		Competitor	2013	2014	2015	2016			
Japan	0.08	0.06	0.12	0.17		EU	0.17	0.17	0.52	0.68			
Source: CUTS cald	culation u	sing data	from UN	Comtrac	le v	ia WITS 6-Digit and	TradeSif	t softwar	e				

#### **Food for Thought**

Though the trade potential is high and untapped yet among India, the EU and Japan, a more positive approach is the need of the hour for India. As a result of this FTA, a wide range of the EU's and Japan's products will receive further preferential treatment in their respective markets. In the wake of expected changes in trade in goods, services as well as investment relationship among India, the EU and Japan, India should look at possible changes in its composition of trade with these countries. Along with reviewing the existing CEPA with Japan, India's proposed FTA with the EU may be fast tracked. Furthermore, it should undertake additional trade facilitation measures to improve its supply chain as well as trade competitiveness.

#### 2. South Korea tentatively signs FTA with 5 Central American countries

South Korea and a group of Central American countries have tentatively signed a free trade agreement. The Ministry of Trade, Industry and Energy said Sunday that the signing ceremony was held in San José, Costa Rica last Friday, with representatives from South Korea, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Honduras and Panama attending. The two sides agreed to formally sign the trade pact as soon as possible, which will go into effect following parliamentary ratification. A ministry official said that it is the first free trade deal between an Asian country and the group of Central American countries. He expected that the trade pact will allow South Korea to make its way into the Central American market with great growth potential, and get a head start over rival countries like Japan and China...

(http://wtocenter.vn/news/s-korea-tentatively-signs-fta-5-central-american-countries)

## **CUTS Comments**

The new trade deal between South Korea and this Group of Central American Countries (GCACs) is likely to have some impact on the export basket of India. Our research based on ITC database and TradeSift software shows that India and GCACs are competing in a relatively moderate numbers of products in South Korea's market.

Trade statistics reveal that in 2016 the total value of India's export to South Korea was approximately US\$ 3.5 billion. In the same year, total value of GCACs' export to South Korea was approximately US\$ 66.4 million.

As shown in Table 2.1, India and GCAC countries are competing in four product segments (among their top 10 exports to South Korea) such as aluminum and articles thereof; iron and steel; electrical machinery and equipment and parts thereof; and optical, photographic, cinematographic, measuring. Currently, India is better placed than GCAC countries in these product segments and as a result of this FTA it may not affect India's export interest in South Korea's market in the short-run.

		Tabl	e 2.1				
	s Export to South t in 2016: US\$ 346		GCAC's Export to South Korea (Export in 2016: US\$66.4mn)				
Export Value in 2016 (US\$mn)	Annual Growth (2012-2016, %)	Sec	tors	Export Value in 2016 (US\$mn)	Annual Growth (2012-2016, %)		
625.7	-46.7	Mineral fuels, min products of their d					
536.7	102.5	Aluminium and ar	rticles thereof	3.1	-72.2		
316.3	-7.8	Organic chemicals	S	•••			
272.3	-34.7	Iron and steel		6.6	-86.3		
183.9	-10.6	Cotton					
157.9	57.5	Machinery, mecha nuclear reactors, b		•••	•••		
95.7	-41.0	Pearls, precious or stones	r semi-precious				
89.4	-58.0	Residues and wast industries; prepare					
89.1	43.2	Electrical machine and parts thereof	ery and equipment	2.1	-91		
83.0	516.7	Optical, photograp		6.8	325		
		Coffee, tea, maté a	and spices	26.7	-54.9		
		Ores, slag and ash	l	7.0	NA		
		Edible fruit and nu fruit or melons	uts; peel of citrus	4.9	1951.0		
		Lead and articles t	thereof	2.8	-32.8		
		Live trees and other roots and the like; etc.		1.1	32.2		
		Copper and article	es thereof	0.8	-84.6		
2450.14	4 (71%)		Products f total export)	62.02	(93%)		

In 2016, India's export to GCAC countries was valued at approximately US\$ 653.6 million and South Korea's export to GCAC countries was approximately US\$ 2.03 billion. Following this FTA it is expected that India's export to GCAC countries may get affected in some product segments. Though South Korea's export similarity and complementarity are low to moderate (see Table 2.3), trade diversion in favour of South Korea as well as GCAC countries may not be ruled out.

In 2016, India was the 23<sup>rd</sup> largest and 16<sup>th</sup> largest importing sources for South Korea and GCAC countries, respectively. Products like vehicles other than railway or tramway rolling stock; pharmaceutical products; tanning or dyeing extracts; tannins and their derivatives; articles of apparel: knitted or crocheted; machinery, mechanical appliances, nuclear reactors, boilers; miscellaneous chemical products; man-made staple fibres; articles of apparel: not knitted or crocheted; electrical machinery and equipment and parts thereof; and rubber and articles thereof, are major export items from India to GCACs. If we compare the data shown in Table 2.2, India and Korea compete with each other in five of those product segments.

Additionally, if we look at export growth trend of these products during 2012 to 2016, it indicates that in most of them India is relatively better positioned. This situation may change after this FTA along with a distinct long-term impact. In order to strengthen its position in these markets, India requires necessary measures, such as new trade deals with GCAC countries, to maintain and increase market access of its products in these countries.

		Tabl	le 2.2				
	Export to GCAC ( ort in 2016: US\$65		South Korea's Export to GCAC Countries (Exports in 2016: US\$ 2031.64mn)				
Export Value in 2016 (US\$mn)	Annual Growth (2012-2016, %)	Sec	tors	Export Value in 2016 (US\$mn)	Annual Growth (2012-2016, %)		
231.1	152.0	Vehicles other tha tramway rolling st		462.3	-3.3		
61.9	22.8	Pharmaceutical pr	oducts	16.5	105.6		
52.0	99.3	Tanning or dyeing and their derivativ			•••		
43.0	-50.2	Articles of apparel crocheted	l: knitted or				
28.3	73.2	Machinery, mechanuclear reactors, b		74.2	-38.3		
23.9	95.2	Miscellaneous che	emical products				
21.3	38.8	Man-made staple	fibres				
21.2	-34.3	Articles of apparel crocheted	l: not knitted or				
17.4	22.2	Electrical machine and parts thereof	ery and equipment	79.9	-55.4		
15.6	-34.5	Rubber and article	es thereof	31.0	-35.4		
		Ships, boats and fl	loating structures	1094.1	-67.8		
		Iron and steel		68.3	-47.5		
		Knitted or crochet	ed fabrics	55.1	-44.0		
		Plastics and article	es thereof	33.1	6.6		
		Articles of iron or	steel	14.9	-66.0		
515.5	(79%)	Top 10 Products (percentage of total export)		1929.3	3(95%)		

The FKIs in Table 2.3B varies between 0.10 and 0.15 and shows some increasing tendency that indicate some similarity of export of India and South Korea to GCAC countries. This means that at the aggregate level and to some extent India and South Korea were competing in the market of GCAC countries. At the same time, the level of export similarity between India and GCAC countries in South Korea's market was also low and stable (Table 2.3A). This means that the competition between India and GCAC countries in South Korea's market was less than that of India and South Korea in the market of GCAC countries.

Similar to the results of the Finger-Kreinin Index, Table 2.3C shows that during 2013 to 2016 the RECPIs of India with South Korea were low (negligible), indicating very low competition between India and GCAC countries in South Korea's market. On the other hand, India's RECPI with GCAC countries is moderate and increasing, indicating that the level of competition is increasing between India and South Korea in the market of GCAC countries (Table 2.3D).

	Table 2.3: FKI and RECPI among India-South Korea-GCACs (2013-16)												
A. India'	s FKI wi	th Soutl	1 Korea			B. India's FKI with GCACs							
Competitor	2013	2014	2015	2016		Competitor	2013	2014	2015	2016			
GCACs	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02		South Korea	0.10	0.11	0.15	NA			
C. India's	RECPI	with Sou	th Korea	ı		D. India	s RECP	I with Go	CACs				
Competitor	2013	2014	2015	2016		Competitor	2013	2014	2015	2016			
GCACs	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		South Korea	0.97	0.79	1.14	NA			
Source: C	UTS calc	ulation u	sing data	from UN	Ca	omtrade via WITS 6-D	igit and	TradeSift	software				

# Food for Thought

As a result of this FTA, a wide range of South Korean and GCAC countries' products will receive reciprocal preferential treatment in their respective market. India is connected with South Korea under the India-South Korea Comprehensive Economic Partnership Agreement (CEPA). In the wake of expected changes in trade in goods, services as well as investment relationship among India, South Korea and GCAC countries, India should put more emphasis in strengthening its trade and investment relations with GCAC countries and at the same time strengthen its supply chains to gain more in the markets of South Korea as well as GCAC countries.

## 3. Eurasian Economic Union, Singapore May Sign Free Trade Deal in 2017

The Eurasian Economic Union (EAEU) and Singapore may sign a free trade agreement by the end of 2017 and ratify it in the first half of 2018, Russian First Deputy Prime Minister Igor Shuvalov said Friday. During the ASEAN-Russia meeting in Sochi in May, certain ASEAN (Association of Southeast Asian Nations) members suggested signing a free trade agreement, and we have clear instructions from the Russian president that the agreement with Singapore is a priority. I confirm that we have all possibilities to sign this agreement by the end of 2017 in order to carry out ratification procedures in the first half of 2018.

(http://www.brics-info.org/eurasian-economic-union-singapore-may-sign-free-trade-deal-in-2017/)

## **CUTS Comments**

The new trade agreement between EAEU countries and Singapore is likely to have some impact on India's export. Trade statistics reveal that in 2016 the total value of India's export to EAEU countries was approximately US\$ 2.04 billion, whereas that of Singapore to EAEU countries was approximately US\$ 561.4 million.

As shown in Table 3.1, India and Singapore are competing in some product segments (in their top 10 exports) such as pharmaceutical products; machinery, mechanical appliances, nuclear reactors, boilers; and electrical machinery and equipment and parts thereof. In most of these competing product segments, the annual export growth of Singapore has gained momentum during 2012-2016. The new trade equation may accelerate this growth momentum in favour of Singapore and further strengthen its position in EAEU's market in these product segments.

		Tabl	e 3.1				
	Export to EAEU ( t in 2016: US\$2039		Singapore's Export to EAEU Countries (Export in 2016: US\$ 561.41mn)				
Export Value in 2016 (US\$mn)	Annual Growth (2012-2016, %)	Sec	tors	Export Value in 2016 (US\$mn)	Annual Growth (2012-2016, %)		
390.5	-30.1	Pharmaceutical pro	oducts	46.4	41.5		
209.9	154.0	Machinery, mechan nuclear reactors, bo		148.4	-4.2		
151.0	-17.8	Coffee, tea, maté a	nd spices	•••	•••		
111.7	-34.8	Aircraft, spacecraft	t, and parts thereof	•••	•••		
98.3	113.4	Organic chemicals		•••	•••		
77.7	-75.9	Electrical machine and parts thereof	ry and equipment	100.6	-32.5		
70.7	-12.6	Vehicles other than tramway rolling sto					
66.1	-22.8	Miscellaneous edib	ole preparations	•••	•••		
59.9	11.0	Tobacco and manu substitutes	factured tobacco				
59.4	103.8	Fish and crustacear	ns, molluscs	•••	•••		
		Optical, photographic, n		66.7	7.8		
		Plastics and article	s thereof	36.9	59.7		
		Commodities not e	lsewhere specified	33.6	NA		
		Articles of iron or	steel	21.4	31.2		
		Cocoa and cocoa p	reparations	19.8	635.4		
		Ships, boats and flo	oating structures	18.3	-5.6		
		Mineral fuels, mine products of their di	eral oils and	16.2	137.4		
1295.1	(64%)	Top 10 Products (percentage of total export) 508.23 (91%)			(91%)		
Source: Internation	onal Trade Centre I	Database					

In 2016, India's export to the Singapore was valued at approximately US\$ 7.4 billion, whereas that of EAEU countries to Singapore was approximately US\$ 1.9 billion. It is expected that India's export interest may get further affected as a result of EAEU-Singapore free trade agreement.

In 2016, India was the 19<sup>th</sup> largest source of import for EAEU countries and the 13<sup>th</sup> largest source of import for Singapore. Products like mineral fuels, mineral oils and products of their distillation; ships, boats and floating structures; pearls, precious or semi-precious stones; machinery, mechanical appliances, nuclear reactors; organic chemicals; copper and articles thereof; aircraft, spacecraft, and parts thereof; electrical machinery and equipment and parts thereof; optical, photographic, cinematographic; and essential oils and resinoids; perfumery are major exports from India to Singapore.

If we compare the data from Table 3.2, India and EAEU countries largely compete with each other in products such as mineral fuels, mineral oils and products of their distillation; machinery, mechanical appliances, nuclear reactors; copper and articles thereof; and commodities not elsewhere specified. In terms of annual growth of export during 2012-16, in these product segments, EAEU countries have an edge over India. Because of this advantage, it has the potential to further improve its overall position in Singapore's market.

		Tabl	e 3.2				
	a's Export to Sings t in 2016: US\$ 738		EAEU's Export to Singapore (Export in 2016: US\$1870.62mn)				
Export Value in 2016 (US\$mn)	Annual Growth (2012-2016, %)	Sec	tors	Export Value in 2016 (US\$mn)	Annual Growth (2012-2016, %)		
3482.7	-57.4	Mineral fuels, mine products of their di		1709.4	13.6		
721.5	-49.1	Ships, boats and flo	oating structures		•••		
529.1	-10.4	Pearls, precious or stones	semi-precious				
392.8	6.2	Machinery, mechanuclear reactors	nical appliances,	23.0	31.8		
323.7	-48.5	Organic chemicals		•••	•••		
288.9	3758.0	Copper and articles	s thereof	4.4	87480.0		
229.4	70.6	Aircraft, spacecrafthereof	_				
224.3	1.7	Electrical machine and parts thereof	ry and equipment				
166.5	-34.8	Optical, photograp cinematographic					
68.0	-14.0	Essential oils and r perfumery					
		Commodities not e specified	elsewhere	48.9	NA		
		Lead and articles the	hereof	20.1	NA		
		Miscellaneous che	mical products	11.2	748.2		
		Ores, slag and ash		7.5	-56.5		
		Fertilisers		6.1	1288.9		
		Nickel and articles	thereof	5.5	3287.0		
		Aluminium and art	ticles thereof	4.4	124.8		
6426.73	3 (87%)	Top 10 I (percentage of		1840.45	5 (98%)		
Source: Internation	onal Trade Centre L	Database					

The FKI in Table 3.3B varies between 0.03 and 0.52, indicating moderate similarity of exports of India and EAEU countries to Singapore. This means that at the aggregate level and to some extent there is more similarity of India's and EAEU's exports to Singapore than that of India's and Singapore's in EAEU's market (Table 3.3A&B).

Similar to the results of the Finger-Kreinin Index, Table 3.3D shows that during 2013-2016 India's RECPIs with Singapore were moderate indicate that the degree of competition between India and EAEU countries in Singapore's market was increasing. However, the competition between India and Singapore in EAEU's market is low (Table 3.3C).

Table 3.3: FKI and RECPI among India-EAEU-Singapore (2013-16)													
A. India's FKI with EAEU						B. India's FKI with Singapore							
Competitor	2013	2014	2015	2016		Competitor	2013	2014	2015	2016			
Singapore	0.09	0.09	0.07	NA		EAEU	0.34	0.52	0.36	0.03			
C. Indi	a's REC	PI with 1	EAEU			D. India'	s RECPI	with Sir	gapore				
Competitor	2013	2014	2015	2016		Competitor	2013	2014	2015	2016			
Singapore	0.00	0.01	0.01	NA		EAEU	0.08	0.75	0.55	0.00			
Source: CUTS cal	Source: CUTS calculation using data from UN Comtrade via WITS 6-Digit and TradeSift software												

#### **Food for Thought**

Though the trade potential is high and untapped yet among India, EAEU countries and Singapore, a more positive approach is the need of the hour for India. As a result of this FTA, a wide range of EAEU's and Singapore's products will receive further preferential treatment in their respective market. In the wake of expected changes in trade in goods, services as well as investment relationship among India, EAEU countries and Singapore, India should look at possible changes in its composition of trade with these countries. At the same time, India's proposed comprehensive economic cooperation agreement with EAEU countries may be fast tracked, with a particular emphasis on strategic commodities such as oil and natural gas, potash, along with a review of its existing CECA with Singapore. Furthermore, it should undertake additional trade facilitation measures to improve its supply chain as well as trade competitiveness.