FACILITATING TRADE IN GOODS WITHIN ASEAN: A LEGAL ANALYSIS OF DOCTRINE AND TREATIES

BILOTSKY Sergiy - Doctor in Law, Professor, Educational and Scientific Institute of International Relations, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv
ORCID: 0000-0001-5904-9069
УДК 341:33
DOI: https://doi.org/10.32782/ep.2024.2.35

This article aims to analyze the multifaceted issues arising from ASEAN's economic cooperation efforts, with a particular focus on trade facilitation within the region. By examining the challenges and opportunities presented by ASEAN's free trade agreements with other nations, as well as its initiatives in infrastructure development, industry collaboration, and economic integration, this study provides a comprehensive understanding of ASEAN's economic landscape. The research also identifies key obstacles hindering deeper economic integration and proposes potential solutions to address these challenges. Through a thorough examination of existing literature and empirical evidence, this study offers valuable insights to policymakers, economists, and stakeholders involved in ASEAN's economic development and regional integration efforts. ASEAN has established several FTAs with nations like Australia, New Zealand, China, Japan, and South Korea, enhancing commerce and investment and spurring economic growth. Additionally, initiatives in infrastructure development and industry collaboration further promote economic integration within the region. However, challenges such as varying levels of economic development among member states, external pressures like protectionism and geopolitical tensions, and issues with FTAs and non-tariff measures persist. Research on ASEAN's economic initiatives, such as the ASEAN Economic Community and the ASEAN Free Trade Area, has highlighted the benefits and challenges of these integrations. Addressing these obstacles requires coordinated efforts to streamline regulations, improve standards, and enhance regulatory practices.

Keywords: ASEAN, international trade, international economic agreement, trade in goods, economic cooperation, international economic law, regional international law.

Introduction

The Association of Southeast Asian Nations, or ASEAN, is a regional intergovernmental body that encourages social, political, and economic cooperation among its constituent nations. The 10 member countries of the organization, which was founded in 1967, are Brunei, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, and Vietnam.

Promoting economic cooperation and integration among its member states is one of ASEAN's main goals. This is made possible by a number of programs and agreements that lower trade barriers, encourage investment, and strengthen regional economic cooperation. In this context, the ASEAN Economic Community (AEC), which was founded in 2015, is among the most important projects [1]. To enable the free flow of skilled labor, capital, goods, and services throughout the region, the AEC seeks to unite ASEAN into a single market and manufacturing base. The promotion of economic integration among ASEAN member states has been greatly advanced by the AEC. Non-tariff barriers have been lowered and tariffs on the majority of goods traded within ASEAN have been abolished. As a result, there are now more investments and trade within the region.

Issues and purpose of the research

The purpose of this study is to analyze the multifaceted issues arising from ASEAN's economic cooperation efforts, particularly focusing on the facilitation of trade in goods within the region. By examining the various challenges and opportunities presented by ASEAN's free trade agreements (FTAs) with other nations, as well as its initiatives in infrastructure development, industry collaboration, and economic integration, this study aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the current state of ASEAN's economic landscape. Additionally, the study seeks to identify key obstacles hindering deeper economic integration and propose potential solutions to address these challenges. Through a thorough examination of existing literature and empirical evidence, this study endeavors to contribute valuable insights to policymakers, economists, and stakeholders involved in ASEAN's economic development and regional integration efforts.

Analysis and results

ASEAN has inked a number of free trade agreements (FTAs) with other nations, such as Australia, New Zealand, China, Japan, South Korea, and South Korea. These free trade agreements (FTAs) have made commerce and investment between ASEAN and these nations even easier, opening up new business opportunities and spurring economic expansion. Apart from commerce and investment, ASEAN prioritizes various other domains of economic collaboration. For instance, the organization has launched programs like the ASEAN Infrastructure Fund and the Master Plan on ASEAN Connectivity to encourage connectivity and infrastructure development in the area. In addition, ASEAN fosters collaboration in other industries like banking, energy, tourism, and agriculture. To encourage discussion and cooperation in these areas and to produce collaborative projects and initiatives, the organization has formed working groups and committees.

Even with these successes, ASEAN's economic cooperation still faces obstacles and needs development. For instance, the economic development of the member states varies, with some having more developed economies than others. This can make it difficult to address problems with poverty and income inequality as well as to harmonize laws and standards. ASEAN also has to contend with external issues including escalating protectionism and tense geopolitical relations. These elements may have an effect on regional economic cooperation and impede the development of deeper integration.

Numerous studies were conducted on the limitation of modified bounded integrations and the relationship between bounded bread-and-butter affiliation (REI) and the growth of chip economies. The European Union (EU), the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), the Bay of Bengal Initiative for Multi-Sectoral Technical and Bread-and-Butter Cooperation (BIMSTEC), the South Asian Association for Bounded Cooperation (SAARC), and the African Union (AU) are all covered in these studies. Furthermore, a sufficient number of research have been conducted on the topics covered in the ASEAN Blueprint-2025.

The fundamental scope of many earlier studies on REI was trade distortion and barter notion [2, p. 13]. Te Velde gave advice on how constrained association acts as a catalyst for development and aggregation in underdeveloped nations [3, p. 4]. He became familiar with console abstractions covering 100 nations between 1990 and 2004. He claimed that limited affiliation has complete access to emerging trends since it promotes barter and foreign direct investment, two things that lead to expansion. Nevertheless, this abstraction was unable to approve the capable forward application of limited integration. Shah recommended that limited bread-and-butter affiliation play a part in advancement from the perspective of South Asia and that bread-and-butter affiliation gained persuasive bread-and-butter advancement in the recommended region [4, p. 39]. He was accustomed to being an agent of animal capital, labor, and democracy as means of subsistence. The effects of European Bread-and-Butter Affiliation on Foreign Direct Investment were discussed by Simionescu [5, p. 97]. He adjusted Romania's 2005–16 abstracts for the effect assessment and demonstrated that Romania was attracting more FDI during this time due to its EU partners. Pangestu and Armstrong emerged in response to the Asian countries' success, recognizing that trade was the

driving force behind it [6, p. 15]. They identified the primary disciplinarian of this development as being bread-and-butter affiliation. Mexico's rise to prominence as a major producer and exporter of motor agents was examined by Klier & Rubenstein [7]. They said that Mexico opened up its market with the completion of NAFTA (the North American Free Trade Area), which paved the way for the dispatch of advancement consistent with all-encompassing advancement in that industry.

Discussions over ASEAN's fundamental affiliation were not very important because politics was the organization's main goal. A few studies on the ASEAN Bread-and-Butter Community (AEC) and ASEAN Free Barter Area (AFTA) have been conducted. These research made an effort to describe the advantages and disadvantages of these routine integrations. AEC was described in an abstract by Cappannelli as a first step in advancing ASEAN Bread-and-Butter Integration [8]. However, there aren't enough abandoned footfalls for this arena to succeed globally. In order to fulfill its goal of achieving bread-and-butter development, this abstraction is appropriate that ASEAN charge apparatus an additional feasible action above AEC. Chia correctly points out that in order for ASEAN to meet all of the goals outlined in the ASEAN Blueprint, it must guarantee authority attentiveness and allocation flexibility [9]. Additionally, she stated that "in order to seize the opportunities and properly address the day-to-day challenges of the 21st century, ASEAN must begin on additional liberalization, rationalization, and affiliation." In the midst of the ASEAN countries' bribery and bread-and-butter advancement, Haw and Ling suggested the pact. Their claim implied that the nations were susceptible to fluctuations since it took a while for them to adjust to long-term equilibriums, particularly with regard to inflation, trade openness, and bread-and-butter growth [10]. Petri et al. made an effort to evaluate AEC's effects in a thorough manner. A few opportunities were inherent in them, such as the development of advance altitude, the ease of bartering, the removal of tariffs, and the elimination of non-assessment measures. They start out by saying that the AEC will symbolize structural arrest and acclimation in various ASEAN nations [11, p. 95]. The results of AEC's use of an activating accountable accepted equilibrium were examined by Lee and Plummer [12]. This abstraction appropriately highlights the importance of the AEC's allowances, well-organized community policies, and the removal of political and authoritative hurdles.

Kawai et al. investigated the ASEAN governments' long-term restrictions on FDI and barter. Their econometric analysis appropriates a different accumulation between trade and FDI, indicating the entry of FDI through the acceleration of trade breeze and vice versa [13].

Two ways in which abridgement, healthcare arrangements, and health are related were examined by Ruger et al. through their analysis of the interchange between bloom and abridgement. The native class was brought up as the connection between prosperity and the distribution of wealth and advances. Additionally, the lesson covered the relationship between healthcare commitment organizations, bloom accounts techniques, and economic outcomes [14, p. 763].

The ASEAN Community is intended to be outward-looking and possess the following interconnected and mutually reinforcing key characteristics: (i) a single market and production base; (ii) a highly competitive economic region; (iii) a region of equitable development; and (iv) a region that is fully integrated into the global economy. These initiatives are part of the AEC Blueprint 2009-2015. The AEC, which consists of three fundamental components, is the ultimate aim of regional economic integration for the ASEAN area.

One production and market foundation. The states have decided that an ASEAN single market and production base will consist of the following five key components: (i) free flow of products; (ii) free flow of services; (iii) free flow of investment; (iv) freer flow of capital; and (v) free flow of skilled labor, according to paragraph A, item 9. Furthermore, two crucial elements of the single market and production base are the food, agriculture, and forestry sectors as well as the priority integration sectors.

Creating a single market and industrial base is the primary objective of the push for regional economic integration toward a system of free

flow of skilled labor, capital, investment, and commodities. It is envisaged for the ASEAN area to operate mostly as a unified economy.

The ASEAN Economic Community's main goal is to unite ASEAN into a single market and industrial base. Part of this process involves allowing for free movement of labor, capital, skills, and products across five industries. Benefits and drawbacks of this kind of liberalization will differ depending on the ability of entrepreneurs in each nation. To ascertain the consequences that will occur in each area, it can be broken down as follows.

The ASEAN Free Trade Area, or AFTA, was established in 1992 and has progressively lowered customs barriers among its member countries. As of 2010, the six former members of ASEAN include Singapore, Malaysia, and Thailand. on 2015, the reciprocal customs rates of the Philippines, Indonesia, and Brunei on the Inclusive List must be reduced to 0%. Meanwhile, the four newly admitted member countries, namely Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar, and Vietnam, have to gradually cut their charges to 0% within the year. It is noteworthy that the liberalization of commerce within the region has given many Thai export items an advantage over their rivals in ASEAN. While this is happening, some products must adapt to withstand the increasing competition from the expected export product group.

Paragraph A1 of AECB states that the states have decided on follwing: (i) getting rid of non-tariff barriers and tariffs; (ii) creating origin standards with streamlined certification procedures that adapt to and facilitate a dynamic trade environment; (iii) possessing straightforward, uniform, transparent, and standardized trade and customs procedures that are integrated regionally and have an efficient ASEAN Single Window (ASW); and (iv) establishing unrestricted trade among ASEAN members.

Among the products that would profit from this liberalization in the Indonesian market are corn, rubber products, and furniture. Malaysian consumers have access to ready-made vehicles, furniture, apparel, and other goods; nevertheless, some export goods need to be modified. both agricultural and industrial goods Rubber, textiles sold in the Philippines, plastic pellets sold in Indonesia, products made from cassava, etc. A suggestion for improving agricultural products is to increase the yield per rai. Whether it's building irrigation systems or growing plants to help with planting, harvesting, and processing main raw materials to raise the value of agricultural products.

As for the suggestions for changing industrial products, business owners wish to move their emphasis from competition based on price to competition based on quality by using creativity and innovation to produce goods that meet the changing needs of consumers and society. However, it's crucial to keep in mind that many Thai export products struggle to compete, in part because of practical problems such origin regulations that limit the use of AFTA. Tariff-free trade measures (NTBs) How some countries continue to support their indigenous producers, such as Thai business owners who claim not to be aware of the terms of the AFTA agreement—a problem that has to be fixed right now if AFTA is to reach its full potential.

Even while the AEC plan policies to support a free flow of commodities have been implemented with great success, much work remains, especially in the areas of institutions and procedures. Generally speaking, the measures' implementation can be described as sluggish but significant cumulative progress—pretty much in line with the ASEAN DNA. In less than ten years of the AEC Blueprint 2009-2015, it may be unrealistic to expect the institutional foundations of the free flow of products to be effectively developed given the vast differences in the degrees of development and the various political-legal systems of the AMSs. It takes time for institutions to expand and for laws to adapt in a way that supports the free flow of goods. As part of the updated AEC Blueprint 2016–2025, the AEC 2015 efforts to support the free movement of commodities throughout ASEAN are still being implemented piecemeal.

As per A3 Item 13, it has been agreed upon by the states to eliminate non-tariff barriers. Significant progress has been made on tariff liberalization by ASEAN. The complete abolition of non tariff barriers (NTBs) will be the primary goal of ASEAN in 2015.Tariffs have been successfully removed by ASEAN, but NTMs and NTBs continue to be a key cause

for concern. In reality, ASEAN leaders and the business community are now more concerned about NTMs and NTBs because tariffs have all but vanished. A new ERIA-UNCTAD report claims that throughout the previous ten years, NTMs increased in the ASEAN region concurrently with a decline in tariffs [15].

ASEAN has been working to solve the problem of NTMs and NTBs since the late 1990s. Understanding and categorizing NTMs – which at the time were largely interchangeable with NTBs – as well as compiling data on NTMs in ASEAN in line with UNCTAD classification were the initial priorities. The AEC Blueprint 2009-2015 had a minimal impact because it used a voluntary approach to fixing or getting rid of NTBs.

The reduced import duty rates under the ASEAN Free Trade Agreement align with the principles of cooperation in international tax law. The drop in import duty rates can be attributed to an agreement among ASEAN member nations that requires cooperation in implementing consistent legislation for import duty rates. Consequently, the international tax collection of ASEAN is both equitable and efficient. The aim of using customs taxes as a tool to address social issues is furthered by the reduction of import tax rates to 0% under the ASEAN Free Trade Agreement. This is because importing less expensive consumables from ASEAN countries is made possible by lowering these tax rates.

Under the ASEAN Free Trade Agreement, the import duty rate has been lowered to 0% in order to achieve the purpose of using customs duties as a weapon to induce changes in the price level and costs of producing goods due to the non-aggregation of taxes. The expense of customs increased imports of semi-finished items, capital goods, and raw materials. helps produce more things at a cheaper cost of manufacturing for both domestic and foreign markets.

Laws governing customs taxes are also dynamic and subject to frequent changes. Customs legislation needs to be updated and changed to take into account changes in international trade and economic conditions. Always in accordance with Thailand's pledge to uphold the agreements it has made with other countries. The study contends that the ASEAN Free Trade Area Agreement's reduction of import duty rates is an upgrade to customs tax laws that keeps pace with global trade and economic trends and complies with international commitments. Because of this drop in import duty rates, Thailand's customs tax laws will thus be able to keep up with the development of world trade and economy.

The ASEAN Free Trade Agreement's lower import tariff rate mitigates the negative effects of customs tax collection, which drives up the price of imported goods. Customs charges must be paid by the buyers of imported products; however, imports from ASEAN nations are subject to zero percent duty. This mitigates the impact of rising import prices on consumers. The amount of money collected in customs fees drives up the price of imported goods, hence influencing the quantity consumed. And there will be harm if a product of that kind is needed for general consumption. However, if the import tariff rate is reduced to 0%, the cost of goods imported from ASEAN countries will go down. Both a decrease in the product's effect and an increase in its use are inevitable.

The Ing and Cadot research and views from the private business community indicate that, in spite of a few noteworthy achievements, the region's need to address NTBs or the NTB implications of NTMs remains a top priority.

NTMs are usually implemented for legitimate non-economic reasons like food safety and environmental protection, according to the Ing and Cadot study. Comparing AMSs also demonstrates that a more burdensome regime is not always the outcome of having a large number of NTMs. Put differently, the way the NTMs are implemented has a big impact on how much work they have to do. This is especially true for sanitary and phytosanitary measures, which comprise most NTMs, and trade restrictions that are technical in character. Because of this, Ing and Cadot suggest that the best way to handle NTMs is to see them from the perspective of a nation's regulatory change rather than from the perspective of trade negotiations.

ASEAN is addressing the issue of NTB repercussions of NTMs through five mechanisms. The first technique, negotiating down NTBs, has not shown much success thus far. The second is the resolution of specific cases,

which was once handled by the ASEAN Trade in Goods Agreement organization but is now expected to be reinforced by ASEAN Solutions for Trade, Investments, and Services. An online tool called ASEAN Solutions for Investments, Services, and Trade allows ASEAN-based businesses to file grievances and respond to them. When it was first founded in 2016, its primary concentration was on products commerce. There are two more important processes included in the AEC blueprint. Standards and compliance are the third, and they're an essential instrument for removing technical trade obstacles. Insofar as these procedures burden importers and exporters and have the potential to be used to discriminate against foreign goods in the domestic market, they can be seen as an additional means of reducing the trade barrier effect of NTMs (which now includes excessive administrative costs). Each endeavor is important in and of itself. The final mechanism in the AEC Blueprint 2016–2025 is the promotion of good regulatory practice.

Conclusion

From the analyzed information, several critical issues arise regarding ASEAN's economic collaboration and integration efforts.

One significant challenge is the varying levels of economic development among ASEAN member states. While some nations have highly developed economies, others are still emerging. This divergence makes it challenging to address issues such as poverty reduction, income inequality, and the harmonization of laws and standards across the region.

ASEAN faces external challenges such as escalating protectionism and geopolitical tensions, which could impede deeper economic integration and regional cooperation. The rise of protectionist measures in some countries and geopolitical conflicts may hinder the progress of free trade agreements and disrupt economic partnerships between ASEAN and other nations.

While ASEAN has signed several FTAs with countries like Australia, New Zealand, China, Japan, and South Korea, there may be challenges in fully realizing the benefits of these agreements. Issues such as differing regulatory standards, non-tariff barriers, and complexities in trade procedures could hinder smooth trade flow and limit the potential economic gains from these agreements.

Despite progress in tariff reduction, non-tariff measures and barriers remain significant obstacles to intra-regional trade within ASEAN. These measures, implemented for reasons such as food safety and environmental protection, can increase administrative burdens and compliance costs for businesses. Addressing NTMs and NTBs effectively requires coordinated efforts among ASEAN member states to streamline regulations, improve standards, and enhance regulatory practices.

Sources

1. ASEAN Economic community blueprint. *ASEAN*. URL: https://www.asean.org/wp-content/uploads/images/archive/5187-10.pdf (date of access: 21.12.2023).

2. Viner J., Oslington P. Customs Union Issue. Oxford University Press, 2014. 240 p.

3. te Velde D. W. Regional Integration, Growth and Convergence. *Journal of Economic Integration*. 2011. Vol. 26, no. 1. P. 1–28. URL: https://doi.org/10.11130/jei.2011.26.1.1 (date of access: 21.12.2023).

4. Shah M. I. Investigating the Role of Regional Economic Integration on Growth: Fresh Insights from South Asia. *Global Journal of Emerging Market Economies*. 2020. P. 35-57. URL: https://doi.org/10.1177/0974910120974800 (date of access: 21.12.2023).

5. Simionescu M. Effects of European economic integration on foreign direct investment: The case of Romania. *Economics & Sociology*. 2018. Vol. 11, no. 4. P. 96–105. URL: https://doi.org/10.14254/2071-789x.2018/11-4/6 (date of access: 21.12.2023).

6. Asian Economic Integration in an Era of Global Uncertainty / ed. by S. Armstrong, T. Westland. ANU Press, 2018. URL: https://doi.org/10.22459/aeiegu.01.2018 (date of access: 21.12.2023).

7. Klier T., Rubenstein J. Mexico's Growing Role in the Auto Industry Under NAFTA: Who Makes What and What Goes Where. *Economic Perspectives*. 2017. Vol. 41, No. 6. URL: https://www.chicagofed.org/publications/economic-perspectives/2017/6 (date of access: 21.12.2023).

8. Capannelli G. The ASEAN Economy in the Regional Context: Opportunities, Challenges, and Policy Options. *ADB Working Paper Series on Regional Economic Integration. No. 145*. URL: https://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/publication/152830/reiwp-145.pdf (date of access: 21.12.2023).

9. Chia S. Y. The ASEAN Economic Community: Progress, Challenges, and Prospects. *Asian Development Bank Working Papers. No. 140*. URL: https://www.adb.org/publications/asean-economic-community-progress-challenges-and-prospects (date of access: 21.12.2023).

10. Haw T. J., Kueh J., Ling S. W. S. Corruption and Growth in ASEAN Countries: A Non-Linear Investigation. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*. 2020. Vol. 10, no. 3. URL: https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v10-i3/7055 (date of access: 21.12.2023).

11. Petri P. A., Plummer M. G., Zhai F. ASEAN Economic Community: A General Equilibrium Analysis. Asian Economic Journal. 2012. Vol. 26, no. 2. P. 93–118. URL: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8381.2012.02079.x (date of access: 21.12.2023).

12. Lee H., Plummer M. Assessing the Impact of the ASEAN Economic Community. *OSIPP Discussion Paper: DP-2011-E-002*. 2011. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/50917497_Assessing_the_Impact_of_the_ASEAN_Economic_Community (date of access: 21.12.2023).

13. Kawai M., Naknoi K. ASEAN economic integration through trade and foreign direct investment: Long-term challenges. *Asian Development Bank Working Papers. No. 545*. 2015. URL: https://www.adb.org/publications/asean-economic-integration-through-trade-and-foreign-direct-investment-long-term (date of access: 21.12.2023).

14. Prah J., Jamison D.T., Bloom D.E., Canning D. Health and the economy. *Global Health: Diseases, Programs, Systems, and Policies*. 2011. P. 757-814.

15. Ing L. Y., Cadot O. A More Integrated ASEAN: Facilitating Trade in Goods. *ASEAN@50. The ASEAN Economic Community Into 2025 and Beyond*. URL: https://www.eria.org/5.3.ASEAN_50_Vol_5_Ing_and_Cadot.pdf (date of access: 21.12.2023).

Сергій Дмитрович Білоцький,
доктор юридичних наук, професор, професор Інституту міжнародних відносин Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка
ORCID: 0000-0001-5904-9069

СПРИЯННЯ ТОРГІВЛІ ТОВАРАМИ В МЕЖАХ АСЕАН: ЮРИДИЧНИЙ АНАЛІЗ ДОКТРИНИ ТА ДОГОВОРІВ

Ця стаття має на меті проаналізувати питання, що виникають у зв'язку із зусиллями АСЕАН щодо економічного співробітництва, з особливим акцентом на сприянні здійсненню торгівлі в регіоні. Вивчаючи виклики та можливості, пов'язані з угодами про вільну торгівлю АСЕАН з іншими країнами, а також її ініціативами щодо розвитку інфраструктури, промислової співпраці та економічної інтеграції, це дослідження забезпечує належне розуміння економічного ландшафту АСЕАН. Дослідження також визначає ключові перешкоди, що заважають глибшій економічній інтеграції, і пропонує потенційні рішення для вирішення цих проблем. АСЕАН уклала кілька угод про вільну торгівлю з такими країнами, як Австралія, Нова Зеландія, Китай, Японія та Південна Корея, що сприяло розвитку торгівлі та інвестицій і стимулювало економічне зростання. Крім того, ініціативи щодо розвитку інфраструктури та промислового співробітництва ще більше сприяють економічній інтеграції в регіоні. Проте такі проблеми, як різний рівень економічного розвитку між державами-членами, зовнішній тиск, як-от: протекціонізм і геополітична напруженість, а також проблеми з угодами про вільну торгівлю та нетарифними заходами залишаються. Визначено, що дискусії про економічне співробітництво АСЕАН часто були затьмарені політичними цілями. Дослідження економічних ініціатив АСЕАН, таких як Економічне співтовариство АСЕАН і Зона вільної торгівлі АСЕАН підкреслили переваги та проблеми цих інтеграцій. Подолання цих перешкод вимагає скоординованих зусиль для впорядкування нормативних актів, удосконалення стандартів і вдосконалення практики регулювання.

Ключові слова: АСЕАН, міжнародна торгівля, міжнародний економічний договір, торгівля товарами, економічне співробітництво, міжнародне економічне право, регіональне міжнародне право.