



ASIAN ECONOMIC INTEGRATION REPORT 2022

ADVANCING DIGITAL SERVICES TRADE
IN ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

HIGHLIGHTS



Download the full report:
<https://aric.adb.org/aeir2022>

ASIAN ECONOMIC INTEGRATION REPORT 2022

ADVANCING DIGITAL SERVICES TRADE
IN ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

HIGHLIGHTS



Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 IGO license (CC BY 3.0 IGO)

© 2022 Asian Development Bank
6 ADB Avenue, Mandaluyong City, 1550 Metro Manila, Philippines
Tel +63 2 8632 4444; Fax +63 2 8636 2444
www.adb.org

Some rights reserved. Published in 2022.

Publication Stock No. ARM220034-2

The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views and policies of the Asian Development Bank (ADB) or its Board of Governors or the governments they represent.

ADB does not guarantee the accuracy of the data included in this publication and accepts no responsibility for any consequence of their use. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers does not imply that they are endorsed or recommended by ADB in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

By making any designation of or reference to a particular territory or geographic area, or by using the term “country” in this document, ADB does not intend to make any judgments as to the legal or other status of any territory or area.

This work is available under the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 IGO license (CC BY 3.0 IGO) <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/igo/>. By using the content of this publication, you agree to be bound by the terms of this license. For attribution, translations, adaptations, and permissions, please read the provisions and terms of use at <https://www.adb.org/terms-use#openaccess>.

This CC license does not apply to non-ADB copyright materials in this publication. If the material is attributed to another source, please contact the copyright owner or publisher of that source for permission to reproduce it. ADB cannot be held liable for any claims that arise as a result of your use of the material.

Please contact pubsmarketing@adb.org if you have questions or comments with respect to content, or if you wish to obtain copyright permission for your intended use that does not fall within these terms, or for permission to use the ADB logo.

Corrigenda to ADB publications may be found at <http://www.adb.org/publications/corrigenda>.

Note:

“\$” refers to United States dollars.

Cover design by Erickson Mercado.

HIGHLIGHTS




Fragile, Uneven Recovery amid the Pandemic

Asia and the Pacific saw fragile, uneven recovery in cross-border economic activities and movement of people in 2021, and the recovery momentum has weakened due to the Omicron variant. Merchandise trade, cross-border investment, capital flows, and international remittances have improved markedly since the latter half of 2020. But trade in services, particularly non-digital services, and movement of people are still sluggish due to the ongoing pandemic and emergence of new coronavirus disease (COVID-19) variants. Although ramped up across the region and elsewhere, the varying progress of vaccination underlies the uneven pace of recovery in cross-border transactions, investments, and movement of people. Sustained economic recovery post-COVID-19 requires stronger regional cooperation particularly through information sharing and other health control measures (such as cross-border travel requirements, and vaccinated travel lanes) to prevent flare-ups. Revamping social and economic infrastructure in such areas as health care, supply chains, and mitigation of climate change risks will be priority agendas for an inclusive and sustainable recovery.

COVID-19 vaccination and stronger regional cooperation are needed to support economic recovery

New COVID-19 variants and varying pace of vaccination impede full recovery of cross-border activities



Sustained economic recovery post-COVID-19 requires stronger regional cooperation




AUS = Australia, NZL = New Zealand.

Sources: ADB, Asian Development Outlook December 2021 Supplement, Manila; Our World in Data; and United Nations.

Regional integration trends in Asia and the Pacific remain positive

Intraregional Shares (% of total)



FDI = foreign direct investment (flows data), Equity = equity asset holdings (stock data), Debt = debt asset holdings (stock data), Migration is based on outbound data.

Note: Where 2020 data are not available, the latest year for available data is indicated in parentheses.

Sources: ADB calculations using data from ASEAN Secretariat; International Monetary Fund; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development; United Nations Conference on Trade and Development; United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs Population Division; United Nations World Tourism Organization; World Bank; and national sources.

The latest regional integration estimates suggest that regional integration trends in Asia and the Pacific remain positive.


The region reported a 7% increase from 2006 to 2019 in the Asia-Pacific Regional Cooperation and Integration Index. In the new technology and digital connectivity dimension, Asia and the Pacific displays the highest performance among all regions, reflecting wider internet penetration, increased information and communication technology (ICT) goods trade and research collaboration. Asia's performance in environmental cooperation is comparable with other developing regions, with the estimated level now close to three-quarters of the European Union (EU) and North America, the top performing regions. In 2019, people and social integration, regional value chains, and infrastructure and connectivity dimensions were the main drivers of regional cooperation and integration (RCI) progress in Asia and the Pacific. The region's performance is similar to the EU in areas of regional trade, investment, and value chain participation, while gaps remain for money and finance. RCI performance continues to vary widely across the Asian subregions, with East Asia and Southeast Asia showing the highest integration. Subregional gaps in trade and investment, infrastructure and connectivity, and people and social integration remain high, while the divide in technology and digital connectivity within the region has narrowed.

Trade and Global Value Chains

Asia's merchandise trade continued to grow rapidly in 2021, after demonstrating strong resilience amid the pandemic in 2020.

After bottoming out in mid-2020 during the first wave of the pandemic, Asia's merchandise trade recovered faster than expected in 2021. Trade growth accelerated at double-digit rates, reaching 19.7% by June before settling down to 9.7% in September 2021. The steep rebound was underpinned by the release of pent-up demand supported by

macroeconomic stimulus programs and economic recovery around the globe along with gradual progress in vaccine rollout in the region. The relatively early success of containing the pandemic in several major Asian economies also helped the region to become the supply hub of medical supplies and consumer goods and boosted its merchandise exports to the world. Yet, the uneven pace of vaccine rollout across the region and the spread of new virus variants remain a significant downside risk to continued trade recovery. Amid such persistent uncertainties, the region should intensify efforts to embrace liberal trade and investment regimes. The Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP), the largest mega trade agreement, is expected to help spur the region’s trade growth. To magnify its trade creation effect, policy makers could also consider activating the built-in work plan of the agreement. This can cultivate RCEP’s potential as a “living document” by deepening its commitment and expanding its coverage further in the future.



EU = European Union (27 members), UK = United Kingdom, y-o-y = year-on-year.
 Sources: ADB calculations using data from CEIC Data Company; CPB Netherlands Bureau for Economic Policy Analysis. World Trade Monitor; and International Monetary Fund. Direction of Trade Statistics.

The pandemic has not slowed the deepening of intraregional trade linkages and regional value chains. The region’s intraregional trade share rose to 58.5% in 2020 from 57.5% in 2019. This was driven mainly by the early recovery of the People’s

Republic of China (PRC) from the pandemic, which led to a surge in its exports and spilled over to other economies in the region with strong trade linkages with the PRC. Excluding the PRC, the region's intraregional share rather slipped to 38.2% in 2020 from 38.4% in 2019. At the subregional level, intraregional trade linkages strengthened for East Asia, South Asia, and the Pacific and Oceania, with South Asia demonstrating the largest increase in its intraregional trade share to 40.5% in 2020 from 38.9% in 2019. Asia's global value chain (GVC) participation declined in 2020 in tandem with the similar decline of the world's GVC participation. Nevertheless, its regional value chain linkages strengthened further in 2020 during the pandemic thanks to its supply chain linkages with the PRC and deepening value chain linkages in high- and medium-technology sectors.

Supply chain bottlenecks associated with partial disruptions in production capacity and logistics logjams during the pandemic continue to weigh on the global and regional trade outlook. Global shipping costs have risen sharply since mid-2020 due to excess demand for manufacturing goods, rising input costs, flawed performance of integrated logistics functions including inland trucking, and quarantine requirements for port workers. Proactive solutions such as operationalizing tracking technologies and the digitized trade and transport management system, expanding competition in port operations, and making systemwide investments throughout the logistics chain, from ports to warehouses to inland transport, can help ease the problems. While semiconductors are an essential component of electronic devices, enabling communications, computing, health care, transportation, clean energy, and countless other applications, their production capacities are highly specialized and geographically concentrated, exposing the sector to extreme vulnerabilities to potential supply chain disruptions. Further diversification of their supply chains and utilization of just-in-case inventory management are becoming increasingly popular among businesses. To meet ever growing demand for semiconductors, governments should nurture an enabling environment for the expansion of research and development (R&D) and capital investments, and skills development for materials scientists and electronic engineers.

Cross-Border Investment

Despite the pandemic's impact on global foreign direct investment (FDI), inward FDI to the region has been relatively resilient. Global FDI declined by 34.7% in 2020 based on balance of payments data—even lower than at the height of the global financial crisis. FDI into Asia and the Pacific, however, slipped by only 1.3% in 2020. The region remains an attractive investment destination, accounting for 53.6% of global FDI. East Asia and Southeast Asia were the largest recipients


in the region, attracting roughly 80% of Asia's inward FDI. Nevertheless, greenfield projects, which are typically aimed at input and labor-intensive activities such as in primary and manufacturing sectors, were hit hard by the pandemic. Greenfield FDI into Asia and the Pacific declined by 37.9% in 2020, driven by a 75.8% drop in the primary sector. In contrast, deal values for mergers and acquisitions (M&As) in Asia posted 38.7% annual growth, boosted by M&As in manufacturing and services which increased 51.0% and 31.2%, respectively. The first half (H1) of 2021 saw slow recovery in greenfield investment and a steady improvement in M&As in the region. Meanwhile, Asia's outward FDI also dipped, falling 14.2% in 2020 over the previous year. The recovery prospects for inward FDI remain uncertain as announced greenfield investments continue to decline. Supply chain disruptions due to recurrent pandemic waves and restrictive FDI measures may hamper FDI growth. As such, phasing out the restrictive investment policies enacted during the pandemic may allow the region to counter these challenges.

FDI is increasingly important for fostering digital services trade in the region.

Digitalization is fundamentally transforming how firms, in particular digitally intensive multinational enterprises, operate and invest overseas with less need for physical presence and faster speed of business transactions. Asia and the Pacific stands out as an important hub of digital services FDI, particularly for financial and insurance services; information, computer, and telecommunications; and other business services. The trend is increasingly driven by investments in fintech, digital payments, data processing and hosting, cloud computing, professional and technical services, among others. On average, 24% of FDI into the region from 2003 to 2020 went into digital services, with East Asia and South Asia the main destinations. Greenfield FDI in Asia's digital services was particularly resilient during the pandemic, contracting by 9.7% in 2020 compared with the 57.9% plunge in FDI for non-digital services and 28.6% for manufacturing FDI. Restrictions on FDI in Asia's digital services sectors, such as legal and professional services, remain stricter than for non-digital services, mostly in the form of limitations on foreign equity and ownership. This, together with differences in FDI regulations across Asia and the Pacific, may hamper foreign firms' investment decisions in the region. To encourage FDI in digital services sectors, Asian economies should embed investment policy frameworks in national digital plans and services development strategies. Relevant investor criteria, such as digital infrastructure, digital regulatory barriers, ICT skills, and investment protection in regard to intellectual property rights, should be incorporated in FDI strategies for digital services. Investment promotion agencies, digital clusters, and digital special economic zones fit this purpose.

Cross-border investment into Asia and the Pacific

Asia and the Pacific remained an attractive FDI destination in 2020



GREENFIELD:

▼ **38%**

M&As:

▲ **39%** from 2019

COVID-19 continued to weigh on greenfield FDI into Asia and the Pacific; M&As hint at recovery in the region


FDI policies in services



In Asia and the Pacific, investment policies tend to be stricter in digital services than in non-digital services

2020 Restrictiveness Index score:	Strictest in:
Digital, 0.24	Radio and TV broadcasting (0.50)
Non-digital, 0.14	Media (0.44)
	Legal (0.38)

FDI in digital services can foster Asia's trade in these sectors



- Other business services
- Financial services
- Information, computer, and telecommunications

\$128 billion in 2020

▲ **7%** in 2020

COVID-19 = coronavirus disease, FDI = foreign direct investment, ICT = information and communication technology, M&A = merger & acquisition. Sources: ADB calculations using data from ASEAN Secretariat. ASEANstats Data Portal; Bureau van Dijk. Zephyr M&A Database; CEIC Data Company; Eurostat. Balance of Payments; Financial Times. fDi Markets; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. FDI Regulatory Restrictiveness Index; and United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. World Investment Report 2021 Statistical Annex Tables.

Financial Integration

An accommodative macroeconomic policy environment and broadening vaccine rollouts buttressed the economic recovery and stable financial conditions in 2021, but considerable uncertainties remain. Financial markets were much calmer




in H1 2021 than throughout 2020. Supportive fiscal and monetary policy measures and vaccination rollout lifted growth prospects for the region and kept financial conditions favorable. However, risks loom as high inflation will prompt advanced economies including the United States (US) to normalize monetary policy earlier than expected, which could tighten global liquidity conditions and trigger capital outflows from emerging and developing economies, including those in Asia and the Pacific. A sudden large capital flow reversal and weakening of the region's currencies could instigate financial instability. The ongoing financial woes of the PRC property and housing sector add to the concern given uncertainties over the risk of domestic and cross-border financial spillovers. The emergence of the Omicron variant and its possible impact on the global economy also poses a significant risk to financial stability.

Asia's financial integration

Diverging recovery adds risks to the region's financial stability.

Asia and the Pacific continues to invest more outside the region in 2020.

Capital inflows during the pandemic remained robust despite increase in volatility.



Sources: ADB calculations using data from Bank for International Settlements, Locational Banking Statistics, International Monetary Fund (IMF), Coordinated Direct Investment Survey; and IMF, Coordinated Portfolio Investment Survey.

In 2020, Asian investors continued to invest more outside the region than inside. Around two-thirds of Asia's asset and liability holdings were placed in economies outside the region. In addition, almost half of Asia's international debt liabilities were denominated in US dollars as of the end of 2020, while 63% of the region's debt assets are denominated in US dollars. The greenback's dominance in Asia's cross-border investment holdings and liabilities could lead to several risks including the impact of US monetary policy spillover effects on global liquidity, as well as balance sheet and welfare effects of large exchange rate fluctuations between the US dollar and local currency.

Foreign capital inflows in Asia and the Pacific continued to increase in 2021.

Nonresident capital inflows in the region increased in 2020 to \$1.6 trillion from \$1.2 trillion in 2019, mainly due to increases in other accounts payable, currency and deposits, as well as debt inflows including portfolio debt and loans. In contrast, equity inflows including FDI and portfolio equity decreased by 30% in 2020, compared with 2019. Extraordinary policy support in the region and elsewhere strengthened this rebound in nonresident capital inflows in 2020, following foreign capital outflows at the onset of the pandemic. However, the volatility of capital inflows inched higher in 2020 as volatilities for loans and portfolio inflows intensified. Nonresident capital inflows continued to increase in 2021, reaching around \$372 billion for selected Asia and Pacific economies in the second quarter (Q2) of 2021, a 175% increase from Q2

2020. Nonetheless, volatility of nonresident capital inflows for selected economies in the region increased slightly in H1 2021 compared with H1 2020. Emerging trends and patterns of capital inflows and their compositions offer the key to assessing the likely impact of changes in capital flow drivers and forging policy responses.

Movement of People


The COVID-19 pandemic continues to transform international migration and the mobility of people. The pandemic did not alter the upward trajectory of the global stock of migrants, which increased to 280.6 million in 2020 from 248.0 million in 2015—migrants from Asia and the Pacific reached 93.0 million. However, the economic repercussions of the pandemic curtailed the flow of migrant workers out of the region, especially from Central Asia and South Asia. Intraregional migration, accounting for one-third of total migrant movement in Asia and the Pacific, is especially prevalent for Asian migrants in East Asia, the Pacific and Oceania, and Southeast Asia. As economies reconfigure their approach to post-pandemic cross-border mobility, it is important to accelerate the pace of vaccination rollout, scale up disaster-preparedness initiatives, and leverage regional cooperation initiatives on migration facilitation through bilateral and regional labor agreements. These could help capitalize on migrants' contribution to global and regional economic recovery.

Remittance inflows to Asia and the Pacific declined by only 2.0% in 2020 and are estimated to grow by 2.5% in 2021. Global remittance inflows reached \$705.5 billion in 2020, a 2.3% decline from \$722.2 billion in 2019—Asia and the Pacific received \$314.4 billion in 2020. Remittance inflows to all subregions declined by varying degrees in 2020, except the Pacific and South Asia which grew by 14.4% and 5.2%, respectively. Along with altruism, factors including fiscal stimulus in migrant host economies, tax- and related incentives, increased use of digital channels, and local currency depreciation in home economies encouraged migrants to remit amid the pandemic. Facilitation of the use of formal channels also enhanced the capture of remittance data. In 2020, Bangladesh, India, Pakistan, the Philippines, and the PRC were among the top remittance recipients in Asia and the Pacific, and globally, accounting for \$225.4 billion or 32.0% of global and 71.7% of total regional remittance inflows when combined. Remittances as a share of gross domestic product (GDP) is significantly high in some economies in Central Asia and the Pacific such as Georgia, the Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan, Tonga, and Samoa. The average cost of remitting to Asia and the Pacific has been declining but remains higher than the Sustainable Development Goal of less than 3% to be reached by 2030 at 5.9%. Data for H1 2021 showed continued recovery in remittance flows to the region. Remittances to all subregions except East Asia are expected to register a 2.5% growth in 2021.


The pandemic has hit tourism in Asia and the Pacific hard, and establishing recovery momentum remains challenging given the recurrent outbreaks. The last 2 years have seen the pandemic wreak havoc on global tourism. International tourism arrivals dropped by 72.6% globally in 2020 over 2019, which snowballed into a \$1.3 trillion loss in tourism revenues and over \$2 trillion decline in global GDP. In Asia and the Pacific, international arrivals dropped 82.8% and tourism revenues by 66.4%, relative to the pre-pandemic average in 2015 through 2019. Major revenue losses due to low tourist arrivals were led by the Pacific, East Asia, and Southeast Asia, though other subregions were also badly hit. Tourism indicators in 2021 suggest that arrivals remain deeply stunted, but there are signs of optimism as vaccination programs pick up and economies cautiously reopen borders at a varying pace. Government support in particular, restoring travel confidence and use of technology to facilitate travel and follow health protocols could support the recovery of tourism. In some economies, government assistance focused on jump-starting the industry as the pandemic prolonged. Priority was therefore put on the resumption of domestic tourism prior

Movement of people in Asia and the Pacific

Global remittance inflows to Asia and the Pacific are expected to rebound by 2.5% in 2021, having declined by 2% in 2020



Cautious reopening of borders determines the recovery momentum of tourism in Asia and the Pacific



* relative to 2015-2019 average.

Sources: ADB calculations using data from KNOMAD (Global Knowledge Partnership for Migration and Development); United Nations World Tourism Organization Tourism Dashboard; Maldives Monetary Authority Statistical Database; and Pacific Tourism Organization.

to opening borders to international visitors. Restoring travel confidence among domestic tourists and potential international visitors with emphasis on hygienic health-care protocols is the new norm. Use of big data to formulate tourism policy and technological innovations for contactless tourism services are becoming popular to safely manage tourism flows in an economy. Regional cooperation across all these areas is important to overcome challenges in systematic planning and implementation toward recovery and greater resilience of the tourism sector.

Theme Chapter: Advancing Digital Services Trade in Asia and the Pacific

Rapid digitalization is bringing down barriers to services trade. Globalization of the services sector in recent decades supported by the so-called third unbundling offers new opportunities for international division of labor with major implications for labor markets. Intensification of digitalization since the COVID-19 pandemic began has accelerated this phenomenon. Digital technology has also allowed access to a new range of products and services. This process may not be fully reversed post-pandemic and represents a structural shift in services transactions for the region and globally.

Digital services trade has expanded thanks to the digitization of a wide range of services with the support of ICT applications and data-driven solutions. Digitally deliverable services are gaining traction compared with trade in services based on face-to-face interactions, with the help of rapidly developing digital technologies and the growing prevalence of “untact” transactions (without face-to-face encounters) in the provision of cross-border services.


Asia and the Pacific is at the forefront of digital services trade with the highest regional growth. From \$403.4 billion worth of digitally deliverable services trade in 2005, the region has witnessed its trade more than tripled, achieving over \$1.4 trillion in 2020. The region is also a substantial and growing digital services partner with other regions. The region is also showing rapid growth in the relative share of digital services trade in total services trade. The data confirm a fast-growing share of digital services in Asia’s total services export basket from 36% to 48% and from 34% to 39% for imports between 2005 and 2019. An empirical analysis suggests digital services trade could contribute to the growth of both GDP and gross national income per capita.

The region has yet to narrow the gap with respect to the global average. Cross-economy analysis reveals the region is still far behind other advanced economies such as the EU and North America in the share of digital services exports out of total goods

and services exports, which translates into lower revealed comparative advantage for the region. While some economies in South Asia and Southeast Asia excel other regional peers for industrial competitiveness in such sectors as business process outsourcing and information technology (IT) and telecommunication services, many economies in the region are still at a nascent stage of developing financial, professional, and business services.

Digital services trade in Asia and the Pacific

Asia's total trade in digitally deliverable services




Asia and the Pacific
has seen rapid growth
in digital services trade...



Digitally deliverable services are an important part of the GVC landscape in Asia and the Pacific.

Regional shares in trade in digitally deliverable services



...but it has yet to narrow the gap with the global average.



Digital services trade benefits from trade liberalization and deregulation of the sectors.

GVC = global value chain.

Source: World Trade Organization-Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development Balanced Trade in Services Dataset (BaTIS).

In closing the gap with advanced economies in the competitiveness of digital services trade, the region needs to focus particularly on policy reforms.

Among others, (i) human capital development, (ii) digital connectivity, (iii) ICT investment, and (iv) an enabling policy and regulatory environment all underpin the competitiveness of digital services. The length of education is associated with greater trade in digital services. The importance of upskilling and reskilling the workforce cannot be overstated, especially considering the skill-contingent barriers to the uptake of digital technology. Digital technologies are also the bedrock of fostering innovation among small and medium-sized enterprises to help them become competitive providers of digital services. Developing Asia's digital services exports hinge largely on the availability, accessibility, and affordability of high-quality broadband services. The

region's rapid growth of mobile penetration bodes well on this front. Finally, supportive internet regulations could enable economies even with low digitalization to better reap the benefits of digital services trade.

Scenario (or policy) analysis points to clear positive impact on digital services trade from trade liberalization and deregulation of digital services. Lowering trade barriers and deregulation lead to gains in both backward and forward GVC participation in manufacturing and services. More importantly, both policy moves could increase real incomes in regional economies, with deregulation generating much larger gains. From a welfare perspective, this implies the importance of considering nondiscriminatory regulatory reduction measures in addition to international trade policy reforms. Efforts to liberalize the policy environment should therefore embrace reforms in the domestic market.

There are many potential synergies between digital services trade and other sectors of the economy. Growth in e-commerce for merchandise goods creates opportunities for digital services exports such as financial services and logistics. Manufacturing growth provides opportunities for embedding digital services and applications in manufacturing exports, enabling indirect exports of digital services. Given the prevalence of cross-border business-to-business (B2B) activity in digital services, access to digital services imports, including from foreign digital platforms, could still be a significant future facilitator of digital services exports, both directly and indirectly embedded in merchandise exports.

Data-related policies could also have significant impact on digital services trade. Using a unique data set that traces the development of the policy measures in 64 economies, this chapter assesses which of the restrictions on (i) data localization policies, (ii) local storage requirements, and (iii) conditional flow regimes are driving the identified negative impact of trade in digital services for Asia and the Pacific and the rest of the world. The results show that data localization and local storage requirements cause negative trade results in digital services but that the role of conditional flow regimes is more complex. While many data flow restrictions are adopted and implemented from legitimate policy perspectives such as protection of privacy and personal data, and protection against the threat to cybersecurity, economies need to weigh their positive effects against their negative impact on digital trade flows.

Assessing the social and welfare impact of digital services trade requires examining impacts on household incomes and prices. Expansion in digital services trade could help poverty reduction and welfare improvement given the overall positive

impact on wages and cost reductions. Besides the potential replacement of traditional services jobs by technological solutions, worsening income inequality among those with different skill sets as well as potentially yawning divergence between urban and rural households remain concerns. This requires policy makers' continued attention to the sector, geographic, and gender distribution effects of the benefits from digital services trade.

Global trade rules and provisions in bilateral and regional trade agreements provide an emerging international regulatory framework governing trading conditions. Although more and more digital-trade-specific trade agreements are expected to emerge, strengthened efforts are called for to come up with clearer guidelines for digital services trade and digital trade at large. World Trade Organization (WTO) negotiations also offer an opportunity for progress on digital services market access. WTO members in Asia and the Pacific should also consider joining the WTO plurilateral Joint Statement Initiative on Services Domestic Regulation as a commitment to adopt and ensure good regulatory practice that will help cut trade costs, including for digital services.

Regulatory cooperation can encourage interoperability of divergent digital regulatory approaches. By adopting common standards, economies can reduce redundant efforts, minimize technical duplication, and promote a higher level of interoperability, which could help lower trade costs. By recognizing regulatory outcomes in trading partners voluntarily or through mutual arrangement, economies can support cross-border trade in services. Mutual recognition agreements need to be designed in an open and transparent manner and should offer due process that guarantees access to any party wishing to join. Digitalization brings more convenience but could entail greater vulnerabilities in security and pursuant economic and social costs. The importance of putting in place an appropriate risk management system against cybersecurity crimes cannot be overemphasized. The interoperability of cybersecurity frameworks should be enhanced while reducing the cost of regulatory frictions.

Governments need to continue efforts to nurture the enabling environment for digital services trade.


- **The ability to tap export opportunities for digital services depends on having capacity to leverage specific strengths and conditions.** Partnership between government and industry is critical in this regard. Governments will need to keep pace with emerging needs in digital services sectors, investing in ICT infrastructure and specialized skills and updating regulatory regimes to fit the digital economy. Greater

preparedness for experimentation, the embracing of opportunities to pilot and test applications, and adoption of a regulatory approach that encourages risk-taking can help economies to develop digital services sectors.

- **Even if economies fall short in some areas of digital readiness, they can still succeed as digital services exporters.** This requires leveraging strengths, for example, first mover advantage in such services as IT-business process outsourcing, a well-established and vibrant IT services industry, and domestic demand for apps and solutions to develop digital services exports. Economies can also convert disadvantages such as remoteness, geography, and a small domestic market into opportunity by targeting niche markets and using those as experimentation ground.
- **Participation in digital services trade can be a building block for social and economic convergence within and across economies.** This is attainable by creating jobs and increasing incomes, empowering less advantaged sections of society; by supporting financial inclusion; increasing access to health and education: by improving productivity; and lowering trade costs. To ensure that digital services trade makes such benefits possible, while avoiding aggravation of inequities during the process of digital transformation, it is vital that governments' overall approach to the digital economy includes dedicated focus on digital access and inclusiveness.
- **Economy case studies highlight the scope for digital services trade to facilitate the integration of economies into global and regional markets.** Bilateral and regional agreements need to focus more on digital services in their chapters and provisions on economic and regulatory cooperation, e-commerce, R&D, investment, and mobility of people, as well as in their commitments under the General Agreement on Trade in Services (such as market access and national treatment) including in sectors such as financial and business services.
- **Governments need to weigh carefully the pros and cons of data transfer restrictions.** Greater cooperation on standards, interoperability, and dialogue with businesses and industry associations are needed to design policies to balance national security and sovereignty concerns without undermining commercial opportunities. As digital services trade has social and economic implications, restrictions on cross-border data transfers could have repercussions on the realization of development benefits, which needs to be properly gauged against other policy objectives.
- **The new agreement on international tax rules could pave the way for fair taxation on digital services.** Economies should consider the benefits and risks of digital services taxes and other unilateral measures, as they could trigger bilateral trade

frictions and prompt compensatory measures and deter investment. In the meantime, rules to ensure effective collection of indirect taxes value-added tax or goods and services tax on imported digital services have gained traction. International cooperation will be essential to adapt and design domestic legislation, ensure the exchange of information for tax purposes, and develop mechanisms for dispute prevention on taxation for the implementation of new tax frameworks.

- o **The biggest challenge ahead for digital services trade is regulation which, though evolving, lacks transparency, predictability, and appropriate scope in many economies.** Regular regulatory reviews, including in consultation with services industry stakeholders, and reforming domestic regulatory practices consistent with international benchmarks, principles, and frameworks should be undertaken.



FTA = free trade agreement.
Source: Asian Development Bank.

Asian Economic Integration Report 2022

Advancing Digital Services Trade in Asia and the Pacific—Highlights

This publication highlights key findings of the Asian Economic Integration Report 2022 and provides insights on advancing digital services trade in Asia and the Pacific. It presents an overview of changes in trade and global value chains, cross-border investment, financial integration, and the movement of people since the coronavirus disease outbreak in 2020. The highlights also include updates on the Asia-Pacific Regional Cooperation and Integration Index. The Asian Economic Integration Report involves the annual review of economic cooperation and integration covering the 49 regional members of the Asian Development Bank.

About the Asian Development Bank

ADB is committed to achieving a prosperous, inclusive, resilient, and sustainable Asia and the Pacific, while sustaining its efforts to eradicate extreme poverty. Established in 1966, it is owned by 68 members—49 from the region. Its main instruments for helping its developing member countries are policy dialogue, loans, equity investments, guarantees, grants, and technical assistance.



ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

6 ADB Avenue, Mandaluyong City

1550 Metro Manila, Philippines

www.adb.org