COUNCIL HIGHLIGHTS

NATIONAL FOREIGN TRADE COUNCIL

"SERVING AMERICA'S GLOBAL BUSINESSES SINCE 1914"

Council Highlights is a bi-monthly summary of news and events of the National Foreign Trade Council exclusively for its members.

July 2015

Vol 16, Issue 02

View From the NFTC Chair

By Alan Wm. Wolff, NFTC Chairman

Travel is always enlightening. Last month in New Zealand on the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), I incidentally came across the history in somewhat greater depth of U.S. relations with that small pristine country, once a formal ally. That formal alliance was dissolved in the 1950s due to the habit of the United States (France and the U.K. were involved to an even greater extent) of testing nuclear weapons in the atmosphere in its neighborhood. A few days earlier in Brisbane, Australia, also TPP-connected (sugar), I visited the small but very interesting museum that houses General MacArthur's wartime headquarters. After WWII, the United States went, I believe, for nearly 70 years without having any American troop presence in Australia but is back again in the face of China's maritime claims. From my perspective, more interesting was the very large economic presence of China in the region. Over one-quarter of Australia's trade is with China, and that is growing at a rate of over 13 percent per year, while the United States accounts for less than 9 percent of Australian trade, which is growing at a rate of only 2.5 percent per year.

In May, I was in China. The news in the Pacific seen from Beijing and Hangzhou was dominated by China's global initiatives. The biggest financial story for both the Chinese and leading international papers was the founding of the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB), initially capitalized at $100 billion (for purposes of comparison, the Inter-American Development Bank started out in 1959 with the equivalent in today's dollars of $10 billion and now has total capital of $170 billion). The AIIB has 57 founding donor countries.

(*Continued on page 3)*

A Word From the President

By Bill Reinsch, NFTC President

This month's issue contains several personal reflections from National Foreign Trade Council (NFTC) staff members who have been part of the Trade Benefits America Coalition – the group that worked hard to enact Trade Promotion Authority (TPA) into law so the country can move on to complete the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) and Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) negotiations that are so important for American jobs and growth. Having been involved in the Coalition's work myself, I want to add my own thoughts to those of Dan and Richard.

For me, the biggest surprise was the vehemence of the opposition. Trade is usually controversial when it comes to the Congress because, inevitably, the gains of trade are long term and diffuse, while the losses tend to be short term and specific. Those who perceive themselves as "losing" self-identify very quickly and don't hesitate to say so to their elected officials. "Winners" may not know they have won for some time. That is even more true when the Congress is debating negotiating authority in the abstract rather than a specific agreement whose terms can be evaluated.

In the past, however, these battles have been hard-fought but not prolonged, and the pro-trade forces have generally won, albeit not always easily. This time, however, while the outcome was the same, the battle was different. It was much more ferocious, with the TPA opponents being much better organized than usual (and better organized than the pro-trade side) and threatening a variety of dire political consequences for those, primarily Democrats, who did not support them. There are some general political reasons for this, as well as some reasons specific to trade policy. I want to mention the former and then discuss the latter in greater detail.

(Continued on page 2)

1625 K Street, NW, Suite 200
Washington DC, 20006-1604
Phone: (202) 887-0278 | Fax: (202) 452-8160

A Word From the President

(Continued from page 1)

Politically, developed countries have for the past 15 or so years, and particularly after the 2007 financial crisis, seen an erosion of the political center. In Europe you see it in the growth in popularity of fringe parties on the far right and far left. In the United States, where a two-party system is firmly in place, you see it in growing intra-party battles. Most obvious, the Republicans have had to deal with the Tea Party folks who are attempting to pull the party sharply to the right. Increasingly, it is clear the Democrats have their own Tea Party – the progressive wing – trying to pull them sharply to the left. The TPA debate got caught up in those struggles in both parties, and, in the end, the vote was about whether we could hold the center against the extremes of both parties.

As I have written separately, for the progressives, the vote was also about power and whether it would remain (in their view) in the hands of big business or whether it would be transferred to the people. This made the debate more apocalyptic than it otherwise would have been because it turned it into a fight over control of people's lives rather than a fight over trade policy.

The trade policy arguments, however, also took on a new urgency. The trade debate has always been about jobs and whether trade liberalization would create more of them or make them disappear. The trade opponents are still debating that about NAFTA, more than twenty years later. A recent study by David Autor at MIT suggests that they were wrong about NAFTA but could well be right about China, although that does not cause him to oppose TPP. An old friend, Ted Alden, at the Council on Foreign Relations recently said that the biggest problem in the current debate has been the unrelenting refusal of the business community to admit that trade has costs. I told him that while I thought there was some truth to that, it was matched by the unrelenting refusal of labor to admit that trade has benefits as well.

As with many things in life, the truth lies somewhere in the middle. There is growing evidence that in certain sectors, trade, particularly Chinese imports, has led directly to job losses, but there is also another large pile of evidence that trade has led broadly to economic growth and job creation over a long period of time. The American people, in their wisdom, reflect this conundrum in public opinion polls, where they support trade in principle but have concerns about specific elements of it.

Alden is correct in arguing that if the business community will not, or cannot, address this issue head on, we risk losing these battles in the future, and with both TPP and TTIP coming down the road, there is a lot at stake. But there is a larger issue here as well. While the progressives say this is about power, not trade; I would argue it is about change. Trade accelerates change, and in a global economy things move with lightning speed compared to just a couple decades ago. Workers with limited skills and education have limited flexibility, and they find themselves victims of rapid change. The left sees this as disempowerment, but I see it as failure on our part to maintain an agile work force that can adapt to changed circumstances.

Individual workers inevitably have some responsibility to equip themselves for survival in a new economy, but it has long been U.S. policy that when the government facilitates change, as it does with trade negotiations, it has some responsibility to provide assistance, which is why we have the Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) program. As I wrote members of Congress before they voted on it, TAA has had its problems and limitations over the years, but right now it's all we've got, and we remove it at our peril.

The irony of the current debate is that the right answers to these problems do not lie in trade policy; they lie in improving our education system to produce a more agile workforce and in incentivizing our companies to invest and create jobs here at home. Blocking trade agreements will not bring back the jobs that have been lost and will not create new ones. As another friend, who shall have to remain anonymous, told me, the essence of the anti-trade argument is that things are getting worse for workers, and trade agreements will make them get worse faster. What that means, of course, is that blocking trade agreements only guarantees things will get worse slower. That's hardly a path to success for our economy, but if we don't take the steps we need to take to get growth moving again here, then, like in the movie "Groundhog Day," we are doomed to repeat the trade debate we have just had over and over.

"A Word From the President" is written by NFTC President Bill Reinsch. If you have questions or comments, please forward them to breinsch@nftc.org.

View From the NFTC Chair— *Report from Recent Days Spent Abroad*

(Continued from page 1)

The United States and Japan are abstaining at present, albeit less noisily now that so many others are including themselves. The Secretary General of the interim founding group of this newest international financial institution (and presumed new head) is Jin Liqun. Jin is an accomplished international financial leader, having been earlier in his career an Alternate Executive Director of the World Bank, a Vice President of the Asian Development Bank, China's Deputy Finance Minister, and, among other things, Chairman of the Supervisory Board of China's sovereign wealth fund. Despite the United States and Japan holding back, 14 Member States of the European Union have signed up to the AIIB, and Christine Lagarde announced last month that the International Monetary Fund would work closely with the new institution.

This is all part of China's idiosyncratically-named grand initiative "One-Belt, One Road" (the land-based "Silk Road Economic Belt" and oceanic "Maritime Silk Road"), sort of a combination of a super-sized version of John Kennedy's Alliance for Progress, but for a different geographic region, and a more expansionist version of the Monroe Doctrine. The Belt stretches from Western Europe through Russia and Asia. Although those are its enormous geographic bounds, Premier Li Keqiang that same week was signing dozens of infrastructure commitments each with Colombia and Peru.

The highlight of the week in the "Maritime Silk Road" department, as reported in the Chinese press, was China's efforts to persuade an American surveillance plane to leave China's claimed territorial airspace in the expanse of the South and East China Seas, which the United States regards as international waters and China's neighbors see as partially their territorial waters. Remembering the Hainan plane incident from 2001, one has to be concerned that incidents between our two countries are never far from happening.

Here in D.C., the Senate was disposing of a restrictive Trade Promotion Authority (TPA) amendment aimed at China and passing TPA. Max Baucus, now U.S. Ambassador to China, whom I visited with, was much cheered by the passage of TPA. During the week, I was also at a dinner between Hangzhou and Indiana officials about attracting each others' companies to invest in plants in their respective geographies. However, the primary focus of my China visit was China's policies targeting seven strategic industries in which its announced intention is to become a world leader: energy saving equipment, next-generation information technology, biotechnology, high-end equipment manufacturing, new energy, new materials and new energy vehicles. In particular, China has made a down payment amounting to many tens of billions of dollars dedicated to the creation of a leading edge integrated circuits industry.

And that was just one part of what was going on between China and the world during that one week.

Ambassador Alan Wm. Wolff is a Senior Counsel of the International Trade Practice at McKenna Long & Aldridge LLP and is the Chairman of the NFTC Board of Directors.

Reflections on the TPA Debate

By J. Dan O'Flaherty, Vice President, doflaherty@nftc.org

The sad fact is that trade skeptics have largely succeeded in defining the terms of the debate over Trade Promotion Authority (TPA). In so doing, they tapped into fears and anxieties broadly felt in a population experiencing profound and rapid structural changes in our economy. Trade policy then becomes a stand-in for the technological and organizational transformation of the means of production, to employ a useful Marxist category. The fact that those changes are the cause of justifiable anxieties, especially in the labor force, is used to assert the need for a root and branch revision of the way in which the United States manages trade policy. This is what philosophers call a "category mistake," in which things belonging in one category are mistakenly placed in another.

The obvious empirical question that arises is the extent to which trade is responsible for structural change, and secondarily, what remedies are appropriate. NFTC President Bill Reinsch ably points out that these underlying issues remain largely ignored, while TPA proponents have trouble addressing this claim because the winners of trade agreements are diffuse, while the losers are more easily identifiable.

Each side of the congressional TPA debate marshalled a blizzard of facts and factoids to support their case. While both sides have indulged in hyperbole, the opponents of TPA have resorted to a distressing degree of fear-mongering that can only be poisonous to future policy debate. Start with the willful conflation of TPA with TPP by asserting that in this vote Congress was dealing with a trade agreement rather than a procedural mechanism. That conflation opens the door to their broader claim that trade destroys jobs and poses a threat to our own environmental and labor protections. To say nothing of the misrepresentation of the consequences of NAFTA which should have been forcefully debunked.

So what is to be done? It seems to me, having met with large numbers of Democratic members and staffs, that what is most needed is reassurance, reassurance from the highest levels of political leadership that the new economy can serve the interests of the working class, that trade hugely benefits consumers, that much manufacturing is indeed returning to our shores, that the United States as a service economy has a bright future, and that government is capable of easing transition. Above all, reassurance that change in itself is not to be feared and that its opportunities need to be aggressively grasped. Trade Adjustment Assistance is surely part of that, but also a strong safety net, better education, training and community support can ease the transition we are in. One can only hope that this disappointing debate can be rescued by broadening and elevating the way it is conducted. So hope springs eternal!

SAVE THE DATE!

The NFTC Foundation's 101st World Trade Dinner will be the evening of October 15, 2015, at the Marriott Marquis, Washington, DC. This is the chic and stylish new convention center headquarters hotel, building on the glamour of the Centennial dinner last fall. As usual, the NFTC Board of Directors will meet earlier that same day. We look forward to seeing you there as we honor those who have made significant contributions throughout their careers to the expansion of global, rules-based trade. For table sponsorship packages or individual tickets, please contact NFTC Vice President James Wilkinson at jwilkinson@nftc.org.

Concerning the House Trade Defeat

*By Richard Sawaya, Vice President, USA*Engage, rsawaya@nftc.org*

Like many of readers of this publication, I did a lot of Hill visits over a year leading up to the June 12 vote on the trade package in the House.

While it is not yet time to write the story of Trade Promotion Authority (TPA) or the pending trade agreements, Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) and Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP), it is timely to assess the tactics employed to build decisive majority support on their behalf in the People's House.

This is not a matter of substance. As the current Israeli Ambassador said to me, while we both cooled our heels in the front office of one House member, "Expanding trade is Economics 101. Everybody knows that."

Everybody that is, except the American voters who, district by district, called into their House members' offices opposing passage of TPA and trade deals.

I'm not thinking of Republican members and their constituents who impugned TPA because of deeply held grievance against the incumbent President. By all accounts, their opposition is not to expanding trade, nor to negotiating trade deals, nor even to the concomitant necessity of "fast track" per se, but only to the incumbent. Their numbers, though not insignificant, are not decisive.

And I don't want to focus on the "big sort" of U.S. congressional politics and the disappearance of the pragmatic middle in both parties. Bill Reinsch has remarked on that phenomenon on both its domestic and European contexts.

My brief is about a fundamental failure to inform and persuade at the grassroots that in turn allows the populist opposition to substitute correlation for causation in their opposition to TPA and TPP.

Fear gave the opposition standing. Opponents could ignite the grassroots by equating employment disruption, the global supply chain, the financial crash and its aftermath, and stagnant or declining incomes for many Americans with trade deals.

All the Hill lobbying, all the print and TV ads, and all the fact sheets stipulating to the empirical reality that trade benefits Americans didn't matter. And that prevented the construction of a center majority in the People's House. Generic public opinion is not the same thing as member perception of voter opinion.

Until and unless the employees of every company in the United States whose jobs and job futures are export related are moved to weigh in with their member of Congress, it is hard to imagine a different climate, all other policy questions remaining unchanged. That means organizing activity and making the case work site by site throughout the country.

It's all about the grassroots.

NFTC Hosts WIPO's Director General Francis Gurry

On June 23, the NFTC hosted World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) Director General Francis Gurry for a roundtable discussion of intellectual property. The event provided a unique opportunity to discuss issues central to NFTC member companies and associations within the realm of intellectual property protection and regulation. Among them were the recent debate on the Lisbon Agreement relating to geographical indications and the role of WIPO in the transition of control of the mechanics of the interest away from the U.S. government.

GIF Partners on New DOC Startup Global Initiative

By Jake Colvin, Executive Director, Global Innovation Forum, jcolvin@nftc.org

On April 2, at 1776 in Washington, DC, the Global Innovation Forum – a project of the NFTC Foundation that connects business, startup, university and development communities to explore trade issues – participated in the first Startup Global pilot event held by the U.S. Department of Commerce to help young and emerging companies access international markets.

The Startup Global forum gathered officials from across the U.S. government – including senior international trade specialists, and officials from the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office and U.S. Small Business Administration – with entrepreneurs, corporations and experts to discuss a range of topics from federal resources to go global to protecting intellectual property and navigating international partnerships and regulations.

Entrepreneurs from the 1776 startup community – including founders of Ridescout (recently acquired by Daimler), Rebel Desk and Wireless Registry – also discussed their experiences evaluating and breaking into international markets. The discussions also featured representatives from corporations including eBay and General Electric, who the Global Innovation Forum helped convene.

This Startup Global pilot builds on the Global Innovation Forum's prior cooperation with the Commerce Department via a Startup Global Design Workshop held on May 2, 2014. That discussion was hosted by the White House Business Council and featured representatives from the Global Innovation Forum, 1776, Business Forward and Intuit – whose Chief Innovation Officer chairs the Global Innovation Forum.

NFTC Leads Business Delegation to Havana, Cuba

By Jake Colvin, NFTC Vice President, Global Trade Issues, jcolvin@nftc.org

NFTC led a U.S. business delegation to Cuba from June 24 to 27 in partnership with the Center for Democracy in the Americas, taking experts to engage in professional meetings to gain a better understanding of Cuba's priorities in the areas of trade, foreign investment, foreign relations, economic development and entrepreneurship.

The group began the visit with a session with Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores and Ministerio del Comercio Exterior y la Inversión Extranjera along with other Cuban ministries and companies responsible for various areas of trade and investment. The Cuban Government also scheduled sessions to discuss IT, healthcare, financial services and infrastructure, including meetings with Etecsa, Softel, Desoft, the Ministry of Transportation, the Ministry of Industry, Banco Financiero International S.A., and Banco Nacional De Cuba. On June 26, the delegation visited the Mariel Port and toured the massive construction site with its director.

The delegation held a private meeting hosted at the U.S. Interests Section with Senators Cardin, Heller and Leahy, who were in Havana on a separate delegation.

Participants also met with a variety of cuenta propistas, or entrepreneurs, who run businesses from jewelry shops to an autobody shop for classic cars to private residences and restaurants.

The Way Forward With Cuba

*By Richard Sawaya, Vice President, USA*Engage, rsawaya@nftc.org*

The May 20 Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing "Cuba: The Way Forward" provided a valuable, if rare, moment of clarity about U.S. hemispheric policy. In his testimony, Ambassador Thomas Shannon, one of our most able and accomplished career diplomats, quoted Hans Morgenthau: "Our purpose is not to defend or preserve a present or restore a past, it is to create the future," emphasizing that U.S. global engagement is meant to defend one kind of future against another kind of future.

All the viewpoints expressed from the dais by senators opposed to, and supportive of, President Obama's historic decision to normalize U.S. relations with Cuba and seek a congressional end to the U.S. embargo of the island nation bore out the salience of Morgenthau's strategic distinction.

Predictably, senators in opposition recited a granular litany of facts from the historical record and from the present to condemn the Cuban regime's political repression, international acts against U.S. national security and economic immiseration of the citizenry by means of state command and control. Their common refrain: We and the Cuban people got nothing for our change in policy which will only accrue to the material benefit of the regime.

Senators in favor channeled Albert Einstein, who famously defined insanity as doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results. To wit: the unilateral U.S. embargo. As Ambassador Shannon's fellow witness, Assistant Secretary for Western Hemisphere Roberta Jacobson clearly stipulated, the Administration's policy was not a matter of quid pro quo but rather ending what has not worked in order to promote the conditions for change. In this regard, it is worthwhile noting one fact about U.S. sanctions: To have any hope of working, sanctions have to be multilateral.

Senator Kaine from Virginia captured the strategic warrant for normalizing U.S. relations with Cuba when he detailed the state of North and South American hemispheric economic, political, and cultural integration, and, underscored that unlike the rest of the world, the two continents are at peace.

To which one might add:

- Geography: The Panama Canal expansion and Cuba's location augur well for the island's economic advancement in the region.

- Demographics: The bilingually fluent Latino population under 30 is the fastest growing subgroup in the United States.

- Opinion: Americans generally support normalizing U.S. relations with Cuba, including a majority of Cuban Americans. And in a groundbreaking opinion poll, ordinary Cubans overwhelmingly support the Obama Administration's opening.

- Global assessment: U.S. strategic exposures in Europe, the Middle East, Asia and Africa speak for themselves in terms of sovereign power conflicts and economic interdependence. On the other hand, the United States holds the commanding heights in North and South America, in terms of internal market, regional trade (half of U.S. exports are to Canada and Mexico), cultural affinities, security on land and at sea, and with the Administration's action, "soft power."

The strategic conclusion: End the embargo and let commerce work for the benefit of the Cuban people and their American kin, for U.S. leadership in the Western hemisphere, and for the U.S. economy in multiple sectors.

Treasury Proposals on New Model U.S. Tax Treaty

By Catherine Schultz, Vice President for Tax Policy, cschultz@nftc.org

On May 20, 2015, the U.S. Treasury Department released for public comment proposed changes to the U.S. Model Income Tax Treaty Convention. The U.S. Model Treaty has not been updated since 2006, and Treasury has been working on the current draft for many years. Treasury officials have said that the proposed changes are aimed at protecting the U.S. tax base, making treaties more dynamic in light of changes in the international tax environment, and influencing the work of the OECD in addressing base erosion and profit shifting (BEPS). Treasury officials participate in the OECD Working Party 1, and many of the proposals recently released in the Treasury draft are also included in the BEPS Action 6 revised Discussion Draft on preventing tax treaty abuse. Treasury International Tax Counsel Danielle Rolfes has also said that the proposed changes in the U.S. Model Treaty are designed to address the current use of U.S. treaties that facilitate double non-taxation and create stateless income by focusing on the core purpose of treaties which is to prevent double-taxation. The proposed changes to the U.S. Model Treaty are new provisions that are not included in the current U.S. Model Treaty. Releasing the document for public comments is an unusual step by Treasury, but they acknowledge that the new provisions were difficult to draft, and they need public input to be sure that they work as originally intended.

The new provisions would:

1) Tighten the “triangular provision” that would deny tax treaty benefits when certain income is attributable to a permanent establishment outside the beneficial owner’s country of residence.

2) Deny tax treaty benefits to certain interest and royalties if they benefit from a “special tax regime” in the beneficial owner’s country of residence.

3) Deny tax treaty benefits for dividends and certain deductible payments made by a domestic corporation that is treated as an inverted company under Section 7874, during the 10 year period following the completion of the inversion transaction.

4) Modify the limitation-on-benefit (LOB) article of the U.S. Model Treaty by adding a new “derivative benefits test” and a base erosion prong to the “subsidiary of a publicly traded company” test.

5) Enable Treasury to turn off or partially terminate a tax treaty if the treaty partner makes a domestic law change that reduces its corporate or individual tax rates.

According to Danielle Rolfes, the proposed changes to the U.S. Model Treaty are objective tests that will allow any company to determine if they qualify for treaty benefits. Treasury has been very frustrated with the action in the OECD BEPS tax treaty working group. The current OECD revised Discussion Draft will permit countries to adopt “principle purpose tests” (PPT) to determine treaty benefits. The PPT is subjective, and companies cannot be sure if they qualify for treaty benefits before they make an investment in a tax treaty country. Countries are also able to adopt a simplified LOB along with a PPT, which will also make it difficult for companies to determine whether they qualify for treaty benefits. The new U.S. Model is designed to take the subjectivity out of tax treaties.

The proposed U.S. Model Treaty changes do not work as well as Treasury assumes they do. The NFTC will be providing comments to Treasury with recommended changes that we feel must be made to the new provisions to have them work more effectively, and to be sure they do not work to deny tax treaty benefits to companies who legitimately should receive those benefits. The proposed changes to the U.S. Model Treaty have no effect on treaties currently in force and would only have effect with respect to treaties that enter into force after the new rules are negotiated with a potential treaty partner. Once the U.S. Model Treaty is finalized, it would be used by the United States as a basis for treaty negotiations in the future. As with the current U.S. Model Treaty, not every provision is included in all of our tax treaties, and flexibility in negotiation of future treaties would continue to be needed.

20th Annual International Human Resource Management Forum-New York City

By Bill Sheridan, Vice President, International Human Resources, wsheridan@nftc.org

The NFTC hosted its 20th Annual International Human Resource Management Forum at the Yale Club of New York from June 17 to 18, 2015. There were 150 participants at the forum.

In addition to subject matter experts from Aon Hewitt, Berry Appleman & Leiden Corporate Immigration (BAL), Brookfield Global Relocation Services (Brookfield), the NFTC, NetExpat, PwC and United Healthcare Global (UHG), the faculty included senior international business and resource executives from Accenture, Amil (Brasil), BNP Paribas, Boeing, CA Technologies, Citi, the Department of State, Hess, Johnson & Johnson, Linde Group, LVMH, Mars, MeadWestVaco, Phillips 66, Radix Engineering (Brasil), Spectrum Group Consulting Services, Symantec and Walmart International.

The agenda included sessions on:

- Developing Leaders for the Global Enterprise: Marc Ostfield , Deputy Director-Foreign Service Institute, U.S. Department of State; Ruth A. Moore, Senior Vice President-Global Talent Management, Citi; Peter Vermeulen, Vice President-Human Resources, Linde Corporation Americas; Alain Verstandig, President, Net Expat

- The Impact of Current Economic Times on the Management of Retirement Plans: Joseph Bulvid, Vice President, Global Benefits & Planning, Johnson & Johnson; Paul Garner, Partner-U.S. Practice Leader Pensions, Aon Hewitt

- Challenges for Mobility in Africa: Danae Bentley, Director-Global Mobility Consulting, PwC; Gilles de Vignemont, Principal & Leader African Tax Group, PwC

- Mitigating Health and Safety Risks in a Global Environment: Pascaline Wolfermann, Director-Health, Aero Medical & Logistics Intelligence, UnitedHealthcare Global

- Global Visa Adjudication: A Look from the Inside Out: James Carroll, Senior Manager-Global Mobility, MeadWestVaco; Lynden Melmed, Partner, BAL; Gina Werth, Former Consular Officer, Department of State

- Demand for a More Strategic Approach to Global Mobility Costs: Diane Douiyssi, Director-Global Consulting, Brookfield; Cecile Johnson, Director-HR Customer Service & Global Mobility, Phillips 66; Melissa Sudano, Director-Global Mobility; CA Technologies

- Mobility Matters Impacting Corporate Tax "For Non-Tax People": Joann Houlihan, Managing Director-International Assignment Services, PwC; Tiby Joseph, Tax Director-International Assignment Services; Simona Vasile, Tax Director-International Assignment Services, PwC

- Pathways to a Corporate Immigration Business Travel Program: David Berry, Founding Partner, BAL; Christopher Tice, Senior Consultant-Global Mobility, Boeing; Richard Villegas, Global Mobility, Accenture

(Continued on page 10)

20th Annual International Human Resource Management Forum-New York City

By Bill Sheridan, Vice President International Human Resources, wsheridan@nftc.org

(Continued from page 9)

- The Impact of Non-Communicable Disease on Global Healthcare: Dr. Margaret-Mary Wilson, Chief Medical Officer & Senior Vice President, UnitedHealthcare Global
- China and the United States: A Perspective from Washington: William A. Reinsch, President, National Foreign Trade Council
- Best Practices in Expatriate Partner Assistance: Veronique Goodall, Head of Global Mobility Team, BNP Paribas; Jackie Grube, Senior Director-Global Assignments, Walmart; Peggy Lee, Director-Compensation & Expatriates, LVMH; Nicte Nolasco, Senior Global Mobility Manager, Mars; Alain Verstandig, President, Net Expat
- Executive Action: How President Obama is Reshaping U.S. Business Immigration Policy: Lynden Melmed, Partner, BAL; Johnna Moran, Global Employee Mobility Manager, Symantec
- Effective Management of Retirement and Medical Benefits for a Globally Mobile Workforce: Lisa F. Burkard, Managing Director, Spectrum Group Consulting; Valerie Mercurio, Director-Consulting Services, Brookfield
- Managing Global Talent: Navigating the Changing Landscape of Global Employee Benefits: Kristin Bataille, Vice President, Aon Hewitt; Lisa Mars, Vice President-Human Resources, CA Technologies
- Brasil: The Healthcare Landscape and Emerging Trends: Dr. Norberto Birman, Director, Amil/UHG (Brasil); Luiz Eduardo Rubiao, Chief Executive Office, Radix Engineering (Brasil); Dr. Cassio Zandona, Director, Amil/UHG (Brasil)
- Technology Trends in Global Mobility: JoAnne Davidson, Director, PwC; Timothy A. Stansel, Managing Director, PwC
- What's Trending in Global Mobility: Laura Cox, Senior Manager-Global Mobility, Hess: Nicte Nolasco, Senior Global Mobility Manager, Mars; Valerie Mercurio, Director-Consulting Services, Brookfield

The forum also included a presentation by Timothy Dwyer and Mark Peyser, the co-authors of "Hissing Cousins: The Untold Story of Eleanor Roosevelt and Alice Roosevelt Longworth." Eleanor and Alice were contemporaries and first cousins who were close friends during childhood and their teenage years. As adults, they continued to have a close relationship but were opponents on many political, social and geo-political issues and at one point were "dueling columnists."

The next International Human Resource Forum will be from March 23 to 24, 2016, in Houston. Details will be announced in the early fall.

The New York City-based International Benefits (and Compensation) Committee will hold its fall meeting on October 20, and the Houston-based International Compensation and Benefits Committee will hold its fall meeting on November 12. Details will be announced for both meetings in mid-August. For more information on either committee, contact Bill Sheridan at wsheridan@nftc.org.

Marketing and Business Development

By James Wilkinson, Vice President for Strategy and Growth, jwilkinson@nftc.org

On May 15, the NFTC hosted its 2nd Annual London Forum on Trade and Investment at the London offices of Baker McKenzie LTD. Turnout was strong, with over 60 diplomats and business representatives in attendance.

Keynote remarks were given by Sir Simon Fraser, Permanent Under Secretary and Head of the Diplomatic Service, Foreign and Commercial Office, Her Majesty's Government. The panels that followed discussed regional trade agreements generally as they relate to the multilateral system and examined the novel elements within these agreements in greater detail.

Other speakers included:

- NFTC President Bill Reinsch;
- Amb. Jonathan Fried, Canadian Ambassador to the WTO;
- Amb. Hamish McCormick, Australian Ambassador to the WTO;
- Amb. Inga Ernstsone, Latvian Ambassador to the WTO;
- Dr. Simon Evenett, University of St. Gallen;
- Dr. Carlos Braga, Professor of International Political Economy and Director, Evian Group @ IMD;
- Amb. Jean-Paul Thuillier, French Ambassador to the WTO;
- Alejandro Jara, Counsel, King and Spalding, and former Deputy Director General of the WTO; and
- Rain Newton-Smith, Director of Economics, Confederation of British Industry (CBI).

Board of Directors Activity

For its annual offsite meeting, the Board met on June 5 at India House in New York City, which was the organization's home from its inception in 1914 until 1938. India House General Manager, Bruce Godfrey welcomed the NFTC back, and talked about the shared history of the two organizations. Notably, U.S. Steel President James Farrell was the Founding Chairman of both India House and the NFTC. After the meeting concluded, Mr. Godfrey gave a guided tour to the Directors, including Mr. Farrell's original office, oil paintings of Mr. Farrell and other founders, like Willard Straight, the immense collection of sailing ship models which these gentlemen amassed and donated to India House, and even a turn-of-prior-century spice display that caught Paul Nolan's eye. The Board also saw the brass plaque placed last year to commemorate the joint centennial of India House and the NFTC. It is featured prominently at the entrance to India House, and the 1914-era logo it displays is a vivid testament to the shared history, close ties and renewed connections of the two organizations.

The Board toured the Elizabeth II Garden, which Board member Bill Potter described in detail, as he is also on the Board for the charitable group that maintains that public space. The Board's walk continued down Wall Street, and the group headed to the 9/11 Memorial Museum, where they were given a guided tour of the former site of the World Trade Center. The tour brought back painful memories of that dark day in 2001, as well as the heroic activity of first responders and strangers helping one another in time of crisis.

This issue of Council Highlights brought to you by:

National Foreign Trade Council
E-mail: nftcinformation@nftc.org
www.nftc.org

Washington DC Office
1625 K Street, NW, Suite 200
Washington, DC 20006
Phone: 202-887-0278
Fax: 202-452-8160

New York Office
60 East 42nd Street, Suite 1136
New York, NY 10165
Phone: 212-399-7128
Fax: 212-399-7144

NATIONAL FOREIGN TRADE COUNCIL

"SERVING AMERICA'S GLOBAL BUSINESSES SINCE 1914"

The National Foreign Trade Council is a leading business organization advocating an open, rules-based global trading system. Founded in 1914 by a broad-based group of American companies, the NFTC now serves hundreds of member companies through its offices in Washington and New York.

For membership opportunities, please contact us at nftcinformation@nftc.org or 202-887-0278.