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Introductory Comments

• This presentation is based on a project undertaken with Peter Petri for the World Bank, *Global Economic Prospects*

• It includes both qualitative and quantitative analysis of the implications of mega-regionalism

• I would like to split the presentation into three parts:
  - I will begin with context and introduce the TPP
  - I will overview the results of the effects of the TPP from our model, which was built together with Fan Zhai starting in 2009
  - Finally, I will explore implications for Asia-Pacific Cooperation in light of the recent US elections.
Takeaways

• Mega-regional trade agreements (MRTAs) have emerged as a potential force for global economic integration.
• The TPP--the first MRTA of the 21st Century--addresses many traditional and hitherto-neglected impediments to trade and updates rules governing trade.
• We find that on the whole the TPP should be very favorable to developing member-economies:
  – Global welfare gains of $0.5 trillion, trade gains of $1 trillion
  – Percent gains are largest for less developed members
  – Modest negative effects on non-members such as China, Taiwan
• Importance of capacity building, active government policies to maximize gains in developing economies
• The fate of the TPP and deepening A-P Cooperation in light of the new Trump Administration is unclear. Still, the strong economic and strategic case for promoting integration remains. But it could be a long four years.
Trade is Good for Growth and Development

- Empirical work over the past two decades confirms that trade has a positive effect on growth and development:
  - Trade leads to growth; trade-induced growth leads to improved employment
  - Particularly relevant to developing economies with unemployment/underemployment and/or large informal sector
  - Trade has important productivity spillovers via exports, imports and links to FDI
  - Trade reduces poverty (Winters, et. al, 2004) but beware context!
  - Production networks driving trade in Asia have great potential to plug LICs into the regional and global markets, help SMEs, and reduce poverty as well
  - Macro environment and other policies that create greater stability and improve the lot of the poor need to be prioritized.
  - Still, importance of active government policies to facilitate adjustment
Why megaregionals?

• Doha challenges, strategy and politics --&gt; RTAs
• Spaghetti-bowl consequences --&gt; MRTAs
• Traditional RTA concerns are exaggerated
  – Empirical evidence suggests trade creation over trade diversion
  – Despite RTA trend, global trade and FDI are expanding
• RTAs improve over time
  – Effective RTAs typically grow
  – Competitive liberalization drives RTAs to improve
  – Diversion costs of RTAs stimulate MFN liberalization
• We define MRTAs to be RTAs that have a systemic, global impact
• These are in the A-P (TPP, RCEP, FTAAP), but also TTIP (but as between OECD, we exclude in this talk)
Regional agreements
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- FTAAP
- TTIP
- TPP
- RCEP
- NAFTA
- EU
- MERCOSUR
- SAPTA
- ASEAN
Trade Shares in GDP

- ASEAN Countries
- Latin America and Caribbean
- South Asia
- Sub-Saharan Africa
Megaregionals in the Asia Pacific

RCEP (16)
- Cambodia
- India
- Laos
- Myanmar
- China
- Indonesia
- Korea
- Philippines
- Thailand

TPP (12)
- Australia
- Brunei
- Japan
- Malaysia
- New Zealand
- Singapore
- Vietnam
- PNG
- Hong Kong
- Russia
- Taiwan
- United States

APEC (21)
- Canada
- Chile
- Mexico
- Peru
- United States

APEC (21) overlaps with RCEP (16) and TPP (12) regions.
### How did past FTAs affect trade?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Increase in Intra-trade</th>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>Special features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Bank <em>GEP 2005</em> (2005)</td>
<td>120%</td>
<td>17 research studies</td>
<td>Meta-analysis, mostly naïve models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cippolina &amp; Salvatici <em>REStat</em> (2010)</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>1460 estimates</td>
<td>Meta-analysis, cross-section and individual RTA studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head &amp; Mayer <em>Handbook</em> (2014)</td>
<td>43% - 80%</td>
<td>108 – 257 estimates</td>
<td>Meta-analysis, naïve and structural models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baier et al. <em>CESifo WP</em> (2016)</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>1965-2010, every 5 years</td>
<td>Panel, general equilibrium, endogenous, two margins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limão <em>Handbook</em> (2016)</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>5-year panel 1965-2010</td>
<td>General equilibrium, dynamic, endogenous PTA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The TPP

• 75% of nonzero tariffs zeroed immediately, 99% eventually
• ROO allow cumulation, more flexible than in past US FTAs
• Services and investment commitments on negative list basis; improvements over GATS
• Mechanisms to minimize trade impact of SPS, TBT
• Government procurement rules for 7 members not in WTO GPA
• Rules for the digital economy
  – Access to networks
  – No tariffs on digital products
  – Free data transfer, no data localization requirements (except finance)
• IP protection
  – Copyrights: 70 years beyond life of author
  – Criminal penalties for violations on commercial scale
  – Data exclusivity for biologics (5 years rather than 12 as in US)
  – Patent extension for approval delays
• New chapters
  – Trade facilitation (48 hour clearance, express delivery)
  – State-owned enterprises
  – Regulatory coherence (transparency, access), SMEs
• Binding labor and environmental commitments
The modeling approach

• Standard foundations
  – GTAP 9 data, LINKAGE model, 19 sectors/29 regions

• Modern trade theory
  – Heterogeneous firms, monopolistic competition in sectors generates productivity increases, variety benefits

• Extensive tariff, NTB, trade agreement detail
  – Benefits incremental to prior agreements
  – NTBs from Kee et. al (goods), CEPII (services)
  – Allowance for non-actionable barriers
  – ROO effects, ROO-related costs
  – Trade agreement provisions are scored for effectiveness
  – Actionable barriers reduced in proportion to agreement scores
  – 20% of barrier reductions are non-preferential ("spillovers")

• Side model for FDI barriers, effects
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## Winners/losers: factors

### % change in 2030

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Skilled wages</th>
<th>Unskilled wages</th>
<th>Capital returns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Authors
The bottom line

• The TPP is significant and beneficial
  – Welfare gains of $0.5 trillion, trade gains of $1 trillion
  – Percent gains are largest for less developed members
  – Modest negative effects on non-members

• To maximize development impact:
  – Emphasize capacity building for members
  – Increase liberalization of ROO
  – Increase liberalization of developing country products
  – Expand and converge on multilateral framework
US Leadership in the Asia-Pacific (1): The Potential

- TPP has been cast as a means to «compete with» or even «isolate» China.
- This is not the case: TPP, like RCEP, is part of process leading to the FTAAP, decided at APEC Yokohama meetings to start in 2020.
- In Beijing in 2014, major study launched on FTAAP, to be completed after this year.
- US, China only get direct big gains from megaregionalism when they join with each other in the FTAAP: We estimate (2014) that each gain more than three-fold participation in TPP and RCEP, respectively.
- The FTAAP would have the potential to reform global governance at a time of slow trade and lack of liberalization momentum at WTO.
- Just as diversity in the TPP makes it easier to embrace diversity in FTAAP (e.g., SOEs), greater diversity in FTAAP will make it easier to write rules at the global level.
- Problem: is there the political will to get there?
US Leadership in the Asia-Pacific (2): The Trump Reality?

• If President Trump is anything like Candidate Trump, he will try to discard the TPP and will likely have major conflicts with China.

• His program, often labeled «populist», has decried loss of manufacturing jobs and has blamed it on China, from currency manipulation to unfair trading practices. He claims that the TPP allows China to «come in the back door,» an odd claim as it will lose the most from TPP.

• He has even called climate change a «hoax», contrived by China to hurt US competitiveness.

• He has proposed a 45% tariff on Chinese imports; in addition to lambasting the TPP, he wants to tear up NAFTA, and has threatened to pull out of the WTO.

• In short, he is not pro-trade and certainly anti-China, suggesting that, despite great opportunities, the next 4 years will likely be filled with more conflict than cooperation.

• Of course, Pres. Trump may be different than Candidate Trump; the Congress is now all Republican, and the Republicans have tended to be pro-trade in the past.

• Throw in the importance of strategic interests, perhaps progress will be made after all. But sadly that’s not where the smart betting will be.
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