

---

**MIRROR ANALYSIS OF INDONESIA-CHINA TRADE 2020**

Suhud Widiyanto<sup>1</sup>, Purwanto<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Badan Pusat Statistik Republik Indonesia, Subdirektorat Statistik Impor, Jakarta, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup>Badan Pusat Statistik Republik Indonesia, Subdirektorat Statistik Impor, Jakarta, Indonesia

**Abstract**

As a super power country in Asia and even the world, China is Indonesia's main trading partner with an import value of US\$39,634.7 million in 2020. The decision of a country to conduct trade cooperation, whether bilateral or multilateral is basically to obtain or increase national income, expand the market and is also influenced by trading partners or partners with whom the country will conduct trade cooperation. The better and more promising the trading partners or cooperation partners are, the more profitable it will be for the parties involved in the trade. Foreign trade is a source of foreign exchange for the country; it is natural that if other countries want to establish trade cooperation relations with China, then there must be a standard to ensure the quality of the trade comparison data. The purpose of this analysis is to determine the quality of Indonesia-China trade by using the mirror analysis method. This analysis uses secondary data from the Central Statistics Agency (BPS) and the International Trade Center (ITC), data used for the years 2011-2020. The results of this analysis display data in 2 digits and 6 digits Harmonize System (HS). The results of the analysis conclude that overall Indonesia-China foreign trade has experienced significant and fluctuating developments for import and export commodities.

**Keywords:** Export, import, asymmetry, mirror analysis.

**1. Introduction.**

National development towards advanced Indonesia is a sustainable national development goal from Sabang to Marauke, which is stated in the 1945 Constitution. In developing countries, development is prioritized in the economic sector, on the grounds that significant economic growth will lead to development progress in other fields. Rapid economic movements will lead to economic development and will also accelerate the movement of development in the economic sector. According to Sukirno (2009: 9). Economic theory states that trade liberalization increases effectiveness, efficiency, competition, trade flows, economies of scale and productivity factors thus, will increase the movement of economic growth in a country (Barro & Sala-i-Martin, 1995; Wacziarg, 1997). Although there have been liberal trade reforms in various countries, researchers have found various specific or specific barriers in a country, which hinder the movement of world trade flows (Kalirajan, 2007). For example, Krugman & Elizondo (1995) found that trade flows are hampered when infrastructure development is only concentrated in certain locations in an economy, weak and inefficient institutions in a country (Wilson JS, Mann CL, and Otsuki T, 2004), to problems such as lobbying the interests of the stakeholders (Gawande and Krishna, 2001) all of which will contribute to restrain or hinder the flow of trade between the two countries. This obstacle causes a trade gap to occur by reducing the flow of trade growth rates and between countries from their potential level (Kalirajan, 2007). In this context, apart from multilateral efforts, bilateral and regional efforts need to be made to facilitate

countries in overcoming these various obstacles. Indonesia-China bilateral trade increased rapidly from only US\$26,212.2 million (2011) and peaked in 2018 to US\$45,537.8 million. The rapid increase in Indonesia-China trade relations cannot be separated from two main factors, namely the first due to the 1997-1998 monetary crisis and political interests, both regional, bilateral, multilateral economic cooperation through a strategic partnership agreement in 2007 in the form of the *ASEAN-China cooperation agreement. Free Trade Area (ACFTA)* and January 2010 have been running effectively and fully (*full implementation*).

Because of that, it is not surprising that the realization of the two countries' targets to improve Indonesia-China trade relations is very intense, which becomes a strategic question and of course very important is how the impact of increasing Indonesia-China trade relations for the welfare of society and the competitiveness of the import and export market Indonesian exports. In this case, to ensure the need and quality of the data, it is very important to conduct trade analysis and evaluation.

*International Merchandise Trade Statistics (IMTS)* sebagai rujukan atau referensi dari *United Nations Statistic Development (UNSD)* for its member countries in making guidelines and compiling the flow of their imports and exports. By referring to UNSD, it is hoped that these differences can be reduced. Ideally, if we import commodity "Y" from a country, then the value of our imports should be equal to the value of that country's exports. Because theoretically, imports and exports are "mirrors" of each other. However, in many cases, the value of imports and exports between the two countries often shows a large difference, this is also the case for Indonesia and China. To evaluate and examine the gap or difference, economists and statisticians have done a lot of analysis and research for it. "*Mirror Analysis*" is a method that is often used. In the mirror analysis, the causes of differences (*asymmetry*) vary (Hamanaka, Shintaro. 2011). First, the differences in concepts and definitions or methodologies of imports and exports. As recommended in *International Merchandise Trade Statistics (IMTS)*, that the export value is recorded with *Free on Board (FOB)* while the import value is recorded with *Cost Insurance and Freight (CIF)*. The import value here is greater because of the additional costs for insurance and cargo/freight, while the export value is not. The next second reason is asymmetry, which is a matter of recording or inputting data at different customs offices. For example, the level of accuracy of data recording carried out by the *Customs and Excise Service and Supervision Office (Kantor Pelayanan dan Pengawasan Bea dan Cukai - KPPBC)* in Indonesia is very different for imports and exports. The perspective and scope of commodities of business actors towards goods is also very influential in determining and entering commodity codes / *Harmonized System (HS)*, because some of the perpetrators of foreign trade between Indonesia and China still go through a third country, namely Singapore or so-called indirect imports. Indirect imports are actually the main factor causing data discrepancies (data discrepancies) in foreign trade. In general, the difference in data (data discrepancy) of foreign trade is caused by two main things (including: the problem of unrecorded data and problems related to data collection (Puskadaglu, 2012). As stated above, import-export is a measure of economic growth, very important for policy makers, both to make decisions and trade negotiations and very important as well as a source of foreign exchange for the country. Accuracy of data will result in right and right decisions, but wrong data will result in wrong decisions too. So to be useful it must meet standard quality standards,

including being consistent between countries and also consistent over time. The economic sector is more concerned with institutionalizing government cooperation with other countries than the security sector (Lipson, 1984). (Gallop, 2016) has studied the effect of alliance networks on trade patterns. between countries, he tends to use mirror studies trade between countries.

The Indonesia-China cooperation is generally the same in conducting trade cooperation with other countries, namely minimizing or even eliminating trade inhibiting factors such as non-tariff barriers and tariff barriers (Peter, 2006). The ASEAN-China free trade area has attracted a lot of attention both at the regional and international levels, one of which is Indonesia (Roberts, 2010). Free trade as a tool for driving a country's economic growth, it is not surprising that many countries seek to conduct international cooperation by conducting foreign trade, with the aim of increasing the rate of economic growth in a country (Salvatore, 2007). Mirror analysis will be carried out in this paper so that it is known whether or not the quality of Indonesian commodity import data to China is very well.

## 2. Methodology.

The research method uses mirror analysis, in order to see the comparison of Indonesia-China trade data based on the commodity code or Harmonize System (HS), weight and value. The most frequently used variable is the value variable, on the grounds that the unit of foreign trade value is relatively the same, namely in US\$, so that the data can be compared between countries. EUROSTAT has created a formula or formula if mirror analysis is used to identify possible discrepancies and asymmetry between two countries' import-export data. In this analysis, a formula that refers to EUROSTAT will be used, it is:

$$Asymmetry = mirror\ value\ (P) - value\ (R)$$

$$Discrepancy = ABS \frac{(mirror\ value\ (P) - value\ (R))}{(mirror\ value\ (P) + value\ (R))/2}$$

Where is:

P (*partner*) = The partner country for which the comparison is made.

R (*reporter*) = The pioneer country that did/initiated the comparison.

ABS = Absolute Value

Asymmetry is the difference between the mirror values, which is the difference between the values of the partner country being compared to the reporting country that made or initiated the comparison. The discrepancy describes the percentage difference between the value of the partner country where the comparison is made and the reporting country that makes or initiates the comparison, the value of the discrepancy is between  $\geq 0\% - \leq 200\%$ .

In this mirror analysis there are three levels or levels, it is:

1.  $\geq 0\%$  -  $< 15\%$  shows low discrepancy,
2.  $> 15\%$  -  $< 50\%$  shows moderate discrepancy,
3.  $> 50\%$  -  $\leq 200\%$  shows high discrepancy, represents imbalance or very serious irregularities in foreign trade.

### 3. Data Source.

The secondary data in this study is Indonesia's foreign trade data obtained from the *Central Statistics Agency of the Republic of Indonesia* (BPS-RI). In general, import data obtained by BPS comes from the results of Customs and Excise administration in all Customs and Excise Service and Supervision Offices (KPPBC) in Indonesia. Currently, the data collected is in the form of soft copy of the Goods Import Notification (PIB). PIB is a document used for import trading activities, which is filled out by the importer or Customs Service Management Company (PPJK) and has been granted an unloading permit by the Directorate General of Customs and Excise which will later be submitted to the customs office at the import unloading port. Import data collection is done on a monthly basis. As for China's foreign trade data obtained from the *International Trade Center* (ITC). The data used is based on the *Harmonized System* (HS) code for 2011-2020 while the unit value used is in thousand US\$.

*Harmonized System (HS)* is a commodity classification that can identify and compile commodity details in an internationally consistent manner from each customs, for statistical and analytical purposes, as well as for trade negotiations either bilaterally or multilaterally.

### 4. Results and Discussion

Category Comparison of Indonesia's Import Value with China's Exports

The comparison of foreign trade data between Indonesia and China is divided into five categories, as shown in table

1 below:

Tabel 1. Category Import Export Value Comparison ID-CN

Category	Import ID	Export CN	Discrepancy
I	No	Yes	High
II	Yes	No	High
III	Yes	Yes	High
IV	Yes	Yes	Medium
V	Yes	Yes	Low

Indonesia's Top 10 Imports Commodities from China and China's Top 10 Exports Commodities to Indonesia 2020 A comparison of foreign trade data for the top 10 Indonesian imports from China with the top 10 Chinese exports to Indonesia can be seen in table 2 below.

Tabel 2. Import and Export Top 10 HS2 Digits, Year 2020

Top 15 Indonesian Big Imports (US\$ 000)			Top 15 China Big Imports (US\$ 000)		
No	HS2 digit	Import Value ID	No	HS2 digit	Import Value CN
1	85	9 381 176	1	85	8 303 242
2	84	8 952 152	2	84	7 551 791
3	39	1 576 779	3	73	1 891 168
4	29	1 424 438	4	39	1 861 251
5	72	1 313 773	5	72	1 441 843
6	73	992 356	6	90	1 275 676
7	38	961 357	7	29	1 259 582
8	87	937 486	8	87	1 078 449
9	08	823 706	9	94	993 607
10	94	805 467	10	38	839 919
Others		12 466 019	Others		14 507 842
<b>Total</b>		<b>39 634 710</b>	<b>Total</b>		<b>41 004 370</b>

Source: Badan Pusat Statistik (BPS) and *International Trade Centre (ITC)*.

Based on the table above, it can be seen that, the five main commodities imported by Indonesia from China and the five export commodities from China to Indonesia are commodities that are always included in the top 10 Official Statistics News (BRS) which are released every month by the Head of the Central Statistics Agency of the Republic of Indonesia (BPS). -RI), the commodities are HS 85 (Electrical machinery and equipment), HS 84 (Mechanical machinery and equipment), HS 39 (Plastics and plastic goods), HS 29 (Organic chemicals) and HS 72 (Iron and steel) and from the table above it can also be seen that all Indonesian imported commodities from China and Chinese exports to Indonesia always come from these two countries, although their positions are not sequential or not the same, and only one commodity is different, namely for Indonesian imports from China for HS 08 (Fruits) and Chinese exports to Indonesia for HS 90 (Optical devices, photography, cinematography, medical).

#### 4.1. Foreign Trade Data Discrepancy of Indonesian (ID) - China (CN)

In table 3 below is the discrepancy of Indonesia's foreign trade data with China in 2011-2020. It can be seen that the discrepancy in foreign trade data between the two countries tends to fluctuate and decrease, in the sense of being very good. The largest discrepancy occurred in 2014 by 24.21 percent, but decreased very significantly in 2019 by 1.67 percent and in 2020 by 3.40 percent, this shows the overall process of recording or collecting data on Indonesia's imports from China and China's exports to China. Indonesia can be said to be very good, this is because it is no longer using PIB documents, but has changed by using *Soft Copy* of Notification of Imported Goods (PIB), where in *Soft Copy* of PIB everything has been recorded or recorded completely and very clearly, so that recording or input the data is very good and can reduce discrepancies. More details can be seen in table 3.

Tabel 3. Foreign Trade Data Discrepancy ID-CN 2011-2020 (US\$ 000)

Year	ID Import Value	CN Export Value	Average Value	Asymmetry	ABS (Asymmetry)	Discrepancy
2011	26 212 187	29 220 944	27 716 566	3 008 757	3 008 757	10.86%
2012	29 385 794	34 285 244	31 835 519	4 899 450	4 899 450	15.39%
2013	29 849 465	36 930 490	33 389 977	7 081 025	7 081 025	21.21%
2014	30 624 335	39 059 606	34 841 971	8 435 271	8 435 271	24.21%
2015	29 410 887	34 375 284	31 893 086	4 964 397	4 964 397	15.57%
2016	30 800 462	32 375 905	31 588 184	1 575 443	1 575 443	4.99%
2017	35 766 832	34 805 909	35 286 371	-960 923	960 923	2.72%
2018	45 537 832	43 246 345	44 392 089	-2 291 487	2 291 487	5.16%
2019	44 930 621	45 685 377	45 307 999	754 756	754 756	1.67%
2020	39 634 710	41 004 370	40 319 540	1 369 660	1 369 660	3.40%

Soruce: Badan Pusat Statistik (BPS) and *International Trade Centre (ITC)*.

Some of the reasons that can cause discrepancies in foreign trade data between the two countries are:

- Differences in the classification of commodities in the Harmonized System (HS).
- Trade not directly to partner countries, but through third countries.
- Time lag difference.
- Differences in valuation records, imports with CIF and exports with FOB.
- Validation error and
- Illegal trade.

##### 4.1.1. Comparison of ID Import Value with CN Export in 2020, Category I

Category I shows a comparison of foreign trade data between Indonesia and China, where the value of Indonesia's imports from China is of no value but the value of China's exports to Indonesia is of value. In this category, the discrepancy value is 200%. Some of the HS that fall into this category can be seen in table 4 below.

Tabel 4. Comparison of Indonesia’s Import Value with China’s Exports in 2020, Category I (US\$ 000)

HS Code	ID Import Value	CN Export Value	Average Value	Asymmetry	ABS (Asymmetry)	Discrepancy
999999	0	177 353	88 677	177 353	177 353	200.00%
870322	0	9 923	4 962	9 923	9 923	200.00%
160554	0	3 033	1 517	3 033	3 033	200.00%
271112	0	2 191	1 096	2 191	2 191	200.00%
271113	0	1 628	814	1 628	1 628	200.00%
290379	0	1 049	525	1 049	1 049	200.00%
380862	0	890	445	890	890	200.00%
470500	0	528	264	528	528	200.00%
220300	0	416	208	416	416	200.00%
852792	0	345	173	345	345	200.00%

Source: Badan Pusat Statistik (BPS) and *International Trade Centre (ITC)*.

4.1.2. Comparison of ID Import Value with CN Export in 2020, Category II

Category II shows a comparison of foreign trade data between Indonesia and China, where the value of Indonesia's imports from China has a value but the value of China's exports to Indonesia has no value. In this category, the discrepancy value is 200%. Some of the HS that fall into this category can be seen in table 5 below.

Tabel 5. Comparison of Indonesia’s Import Value with China’s Exports in 2020, Category II (US\$ 000)

HS Code	ID Import Value	CN Export Value	Average Value	Asymmetry	ABS (Asymmetry)	Discrepancy
841182	30 699	0	15 349	-30 699	30 699	200.00%
710812	14 263	0	7 131	-14 263	14 263	200.00%
280519	12 276	0	6 138	-12 276	12 276	200.00%
930690	12 260	0	6 130	-12 260	12 260	200.00%
050290	9 149	0	4 575	-9 149	9 149	200.00%
810320	7 042	0	3 521	-7 042	7 042	200.00%
380859	6 351	0	3 176	-6 351	6 351	200.00%
391310	6 308	0	3 154	-6 308	6 308	200.00%
540730	5 867	0	2 934	-5 867	5 867	200.00%
840120	5 809	0	2 904	-5 809	5 809	200.00%

Source: Badan Pusat Statistik (BPS) and *International Trade Centre (ITC)*.

4.1.3. Comparison of ID Import Value with CN Export in 2020, Category III

Category III shows a comparison of foreign trade data between Indonesia and China, where the value of Indonesia's imports from China and the value of China's exports to Indonesia has value, but the discrepancy value is high. Some of the HS that fall into this category can be seen in table 6 below.

Tabel 6. Comparison of Indonesia's Import Value with China's Exports in 2020, Category III (US\$ 000)

HS Code	ID Import Value	CN Export Value	Average Value	Asymmetry	ABS (Asymmetry)	Discrepancy
890520	10 868	242 132	126 500	231 264	231 264	182.82%
850239	271 882	23 525	147 703	-248 357	248 357	168.15%
732393	37 345	164 157	100 751	126 812	126 812	125.87%
940540	51 485	166 791	109 138	115 306	115 306	105.65%
851712	487 828	1 305 254	896 541	817 426	817 426	91.18%
847982	127 256	50 926	89 091	-76 330	76 330	85.68%
950300	128 634	289 958	209 296	161 324	161 324	77.08%
852990	658 087	317 263	487 675	-340 824	340 824	69.89%
854370	65 391	123 897	94 644	58 506	58 506	61.82%
841370	108 695	188 066	148 380	79 371	79 371	53.49%

Source: Badan Pusat Statistik (BPS) and *International Trade Centre (ITC)*.

#### 4.1.4. Comparison of ID Import Value with CN Export in 2020, Category IV

Category IV shows a comparison of foreign trade data between Indonesia and China, where the value of Indonesia's imports from China and the value of China's exports to Indonesia has value, but the value of the discrepancy is moderate. Some of the HS that fall into this category can be seen in table 7 below.

Tabel 7. Comparison of Indonesia's Import Value with China's Exports in 2020, Category IV (US\$ 000)

HS Code	ID Import Value	CN Export Value	Average Value	Asymmetry	ABS (Asymmetry)	Discrepancy
392690	151 814	251 960	201 887	100 146	100 146	49.61%
380893	80 806	132 016	106 411	51 210	51 210	48.12%
851770	2 638 337	1 658 273	2148305	-980 064	980 064	45.62%
080810	261 837	170 648	216 242	-91 189	91 189	42.17%
841710	141 027	100 780	120 903	-40 247	40 247	33.29%
850423	91 873	69 199	80 536	-22 674	22 674	28.15%
070320	585 785	459 864	522 825	-125 921	125 921	24.08%
721070	190 651	232 796	211 724	42 145	42 145	19.91%
847130	872 124	721 324	796 724	-150 800	150 800	18.93%
310221	111 145	130 825	120 985	19 680	19 680	16.27%

Source: Badan Pusat Statistik (BPS) and *International Trade Centre (ITC)*.

#### 4.1.5. Comparison of ID Import Value with CN Export in 2020, Category V

Category V shows a comparison of foreign trade data between Indonesia and China, where the value of Indonesia's imports from China and the value of China's exports to Indonesia has value, but the discrepancy value is low. Some of the HS that fall into this category can be seen in table 8 below.



Tabel 8. Comparison of Indonesia's Import Value with China's Exports in 2020, Category V (US\$ 000)

HS Code	ID Import Value	CN Export Value	Average Value	Asymmetry	ABS (Asymmetry)	Discrepancy
842139	92 818	106 849	99 834	14 031	14 031	14.05%
848180	243 810	276 850	260 330	33 040	33 040	12.69%
854449	170 591	188 847	179 719	18 256	18 256	10.16%
401120	100 956	111 023	105 990	10 067	10 067	9.50%
850440	229 581	246 736	238 158	17 155	17 155	7.20%
722790	128 612	120 048	124 330	-8 564	8 564	6.89%
630790	177 098	186 045	181 572	8 947	8 947	4.93%
271012	219 344	211 347	215 345	-7 997	7 997	3.71%
760711	119 246	121 999	120 622	2 753	2 753	2.28%
850760	239 029	236 706	237 868	-2 323	2 323	0.98%

Source: Badan Pusat Statistik (BPS) and *International Trade Centre (ITC)*.

## 5. Conclusion

1. The 10 biggest commodities, all of them are the same, only one commodity is different, namely HS 08 (Fruits) for Indonesian imports from China and China's exports to Indonesia for HS 90 (Optical devices, photography, cinematography, medical).
2. The five main commodities Indonesia imports from China are the same as Chinese exports to Indonesia although not sequentially, the commodities are HS 85 (Electrical machinery and equipment), HS 84 (Mechanical machinery and equipment), HS 39 (Plastics and plastic goods), HS 29 (Organic chemicals) and HS 72 (Iron and steel).
3. The largest discrepancy occurred in 2014 by 24.21 percent, but decreased very significantly in 2019 by 1.67 percent and in 2020 by 3.40 percent.
4. The perspective of business actors on goods that affect the determination of commodity codes or in terms of providing *Harmonized System (HS)* numbers.
5. Trade through a third country/indirect (Indirect), i.e. goods purchased by a third country and sent directly to the buyer's country.
6. The difference in time lag is the difference in sending time which causes the sending country to be different from the recipient country.
7. Differences in valuation, payment for import transactions uses CIF so that there are additional shipping costs and insurance costs, while for exports of goods using FOB.
8. Differences can occur because the inspection of import documents (import declarations) is very detailed and thorough, while for exports, the assessment of export documents (export declarations) is not as detailed and accurate as imports, except for some commodities.
9. The quality of Indonesia's import data against China's partner countries is quite good. Although there are still differences, they can still be tolerated.

## References

- Badan Pusat Statistik. Subdirektorat Statistik Impor. Publikasi Statistik Impor, 2011-2020.  
 Barro, R. & Sala-I-Martin., (1995), *Economic Growth*, New York, McGraw-Hill.

- Department of Economic and Social Affairs Statistics Division. 2011. *International Merchandise Trade Statistics: Concepts and Definitions 2010*. Statistical Papers Series M No. 52. United Nations.
- Gallop, Max B (2016). "Endogenous Networks and International Cooperation". Department of Government and Public Policy, Strathclyde. *Journal of Peace Research* 2016, Vol. 53(3), 310-324.
- Gawande, K., & P. Krishna., (2001), "The Political Economy of Trade Policy: Empirical Approaches," Working Papers, Economics Department, Brown University, Providence.
- Hamanaka, Shintaro. 2011. *Utilizing the Multiple Mirror Technique to Assess the Quality of Cambodian Trade Statistics*. ADB Working Paper Series on Regional Economic Integration, No.88.
- <https://www.bps.go.id>
- <https://www.ec.europa.eu/eurostat>
- <https://www.trademap.org>
- Kalirajan K. (2007), "Regional Cooperation and Bilateral Trade Flows: An Empirical Measurement of Resistance," *The International Trade Journal*, 21(2), hal.85-107.
- Krugman, P., Elizondo, R.L., (1995), "Trade Policy and Third World Metropolis," *Journal of Development Economics*, Vo. 49, hal.137-150, Oktober. Dapat diakses pada situs:[http://www.elsevier.com/framework\\_aboutus/pdfs/trade\\_policy.pdf](http://www.elsevier.com/framework_aboutus/pdfs/trade_policy.pdf)
- Lipson, C. (1984). *International Cooperation in Economic and Security Affairs*. *World Politics*, 37(1), pp. 1-23.
- Peraturan Menteri Keuangan, Nomor: 53/PMK/011/2007, Tentang: "Penetapan Tarif Bea Masuk Dalam Rangka ASEAN-China Free Trade Area (ACFTA)".
- Peter G. W. 2006. Comparative Advantage and Protection in Indonesia. *Journal Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies*. 28(3): h: 41-70.
- Puskadaglu (2012). "Analisis Diskrepansi Perdagangan Luar Negeri". Pusat Kebijakan Perdagangan Luar Negeri kementerian Perdagangan RI.
- Roberts, Benjamin. 2010. A Gravity Study Of The Proposed Tiongkok-Asean Free Trade Area. *The International Trade Journal*.18 (4): h: 335-353.
- Salvatore, Dominick. 2007. *Ekonomi Internasional*. Erelangga. Jakarta.
- Sukirno, Sadono. 2009. *Pengantar Teori Makro Ekonomi*. Jakarta : PT Raja Grafindo Persada.
- United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. 2019. *IMTS Bilateral Asymmetries – How to Measure, Analyze, Reduce and Way Forward*.
- Wacziarg, R., (1997), "Trade, Competition and Market Size," Harvard University, Cambridge.
- Wilson, J. S., Mann, C. L., & Otsuki, T., (2004), "The Potential Benefit of Trade Facilitation: A Global Perspective," *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper* 3224, Februari, The World Bank, Washington, DC.