

**MEDIA AVAILABILITY**  
**Civil Society/NGO Contacts for IPEF Ministerial**  
**Brisbane, Australia**  
**December 12-15, 2022**

■ *Will be in Brisbane*

Name and Organization	Country	Topics of Expertise	Contact Details
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Kate Lappin</b> Public Services International</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Asia Pacific Region</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Labor, gender, digital</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><a href="mailto:kate.lappin@world-psi.org">kate.lappin@world-psi.org</a> +61 424 418 861</p>
<p>Previous trade agreements have guaranteed multinational corporations unregulated power to make obscene profits, drive down wages, pollute the environment, avoid taxes and grab public services, all without fear of governments regulating in the public interest. The IPEF doesn't appear to be much different.</p> <p>This time Big Tech are disguising their demands for even more corporate control with marketing spin about gender equality, "upskilling women" and democracy. It's difficult to get excited about the promises of a fairer agreement when the deal remains clouded in secrecy, none of the participating countries comply with existing international labour standards and when Big Tech and other corporations are clearly playing an influential role.</p>			
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Pat Randal</b> Australian Fair Trade and Investment Network (AFTINET)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Australia</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Secrecy, geopolitics</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><a href="mailto:campaign@aftinet.org.au">campaign@aftinet.org.au</a> +61-419 695 841</p>
<p>We welcome the Australian government 's decision to enable community stakeholders to present their views to IPEF negotiators at the Brisbane meeting. But we are disappointed that this will be a one-way street, because IPEF governments have signed <a href="#">secrecy</a> documents pledging that texts and other negotiating documents will remain secret for five years after the negotiations finish.</p> <p>IPEF agreements will impact peoples' lives in areas like labour rights, environmental standards, digital trade and consumer privacy, and we need access to text proposals to have any meaningful input . We call on IPEF governments to revoke the secrecy agreement.</p>			
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Maureen Penjueli</b> Pacific Network on Globalisation (PANG)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Fiji</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Fish, development, climate</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><a href="mailto:coordinator@pang.org.fj">coordinator@pang.org.fj</a> 679- 777 7077</p>

<p><b>Adam Wolfenden</b> Pacific Network on Globalisation (PANG)</p>	<p>Fiji</p>	<p>Fish, development, climate</p>	<p><a href="mailto:campaigner@pang.org.fj">campaigner@pang.org.fj</a> +61- 401 045 536</p>
<p>The IPEF is seeking to lock Fiji, and any other Pacific Island Countries who may be interested, into an economic environment that aims to make it easier for US companies to do business. This will make it harder for Small Island Developing States to explore development options with other developing countries.</p> <p>In addition, the approach to climate change and sustainability commitments will do little to undo the imbalance in access and affordability of the green technologies needed to adapt to a climate crisis caused by the major powers in IPEF negotiations.</p> <p>Ultimately the lack of transparency and access to the negotiations will make it next to impossible for citizens of IPEF countries to have a say in the outcome.</p>			
<p><b>Parminder Jeet Singh</b> IT for Change</p>	<p>India</p>	<p>ICTs for development, Internet governance, e-governance, digital economy</p>	<p><a href="mailto:parminder@itforchange.net">parminder@itforchange.net</a> +91 98459 49445</p>
<p>IPEF to me looks nothing other than these new age 'spheres of political influence' that replace cold war alliances. Calling it 'not a typical trade deal' is at one level just a spin with free trade agreements written all over the initiative.</p> <p>On the other hand, it is not clear if one is supposed to be happy that 'this is not a typical trade deal' knowing that it appears to be much more, and worse -- a holistic plan of economic, political, and possibly then cultural and military, spheres of influence shaping, and domination. A new form of digital age neo- neo- colonization. Locking a country or a region into ones digital system locks it in economy, society, policy, culture and even military wise... This is the reason that the digital element of IPEF is so pronounced.</p> <p>In the digital arena, it is not market access but digital access, and digital standards, and digital lock-ins, that supercede everything else. That is what the IPEF is about... At this stage, no one other than the US master strategists behind this initiative seem to recognize IPEF for what it really is.</p>			
<p><b>Rachmi Hertanti</b> Transnational Institute</p>	<p>Indonesia</p>	<p>IPR on Seeds and Medicines, digital trade, including trade-related energy and raw materials</p>	<p><a href="mailto:rachmi.hertanti@gmail.com">rachmi.hertanti@gmail.com</a></p>

On the side of the G20 forum last November, Indonesia made several commitments on industrial and infrastructure cooperation with the US to strengthen commitments in the Indo-Pacific Economic Framework, particularly under the Supply Chains pillar. Indonesia's involvement in the US IPEF Cooperation will only encourage the expansion of the extractive industry model through the development of mega infrastructure projects and the industrialization of strategic projects such as semiconductor and nickel processing related to the energy transition.

Certainly, the expansion of the investment in this development model will encourage a massive impact on evictions and the destruction of people's livelihoods, as well as low worker protection standards. This is because the Government will use the Job Creation Law as a legal basis for trade and investment cooperation within IPEF. The Job Creation Law contains rules that provide broad access to investor rights but limit people's democratic space and eliminate guarantees for the protection of people's rights, especially labour rights.

The use of the Job Creation Law as a basis for IPEF Cooperation by the Government has violated the Indonesian Constitution, considering that the Job Creation Law has been ruled unconstitutional by the Constitutional Court. Indonesian cooperation in IPEF will only repeat various violations of people's rights affected by the expansion of cooperation in international trade and investment agreements, including violations of democratic rights due to the lack of transparency in the IPEF discussion process and no consultations carried out by the government with the community, even with the Indonesian Parliament.

**Mohideen Abdul Kader**  
Consumers' Association of  
Penang

Malaysia

From the limited information available publicly, it is clear that IPEF negotiations will include problematic provisions that restrict regulatory and policy space and do not serve the interests of developing countries and their peoples such as the cross-border data flow provisions from the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP).

The lack of transparency in the IPEF negotiations hides any attempts by the USA to propose provisions demanded by its corporations in IPEF such as restricting the ability to regulate genetically modified organisms and other provisions rejected by many civil society organisations in the TPP.

We call on the newly elected Government of Malaysia to re-consider participating in IPEF.

**Prof. Emeritus Jane Kelsey**  
*Faculty of Law*  
University of Auckland  
Itsourfuture

New  
Zealand

Secrecy, TPPA  
revisited, digital,  
inclusiveness  
(esp indigenous)

[j.kelsey@auckland.ac.nz](mailto:j.kelsey@auckland.ac.nz)  
+64 -21-765-055

IPEF is a US-initiated, US-designed, US-driven negotiation, being conducted in secret, to advance US corporate interests and to neutralize the growing influence of China in the Asia Pacific.

The last time the US tried something similar was the ill-fated Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement. IPEF is a new vintage of the old TPP, with some bits dropped out and new chapters added in. The US business lobby has rebranded itself under an IPEF banner and urged the US to table the most pro-corporate provisions of the TPP and USMCA as their negotiating texts. Given the absurdly short timeframe the US is proposing to conclude the deal it is highly likely it will do that. But how will we know?

The secrecy pact our governments have signed with the US requires the negotiating documents to remain secret until five years after any outcome has entered into force - although cleared corporate advisers in the US will have ready access to the texts. Didn't our governments learn anything from the massive international backlash against the TPP?

<p><b>Melanie Foley</b> Public Citizen's Global Trade Watch</p>	<p>United States</p>	<p>US political situation, US civil society perspective, consumer issues</p>	<p><a href="mailto:mfoley@citizen.org">mfoley@citizen.org</a> +1-301-807-5304</p>
---	--------------------------	--	---

The Biden administration has repeatedly stated its goal of developing a new "worker-centered" trade model. While it is encouraging that the IPEF process, unlike past FTAs, will not include the intellectual property or investment terms that have prioritized corporate profits above human lives, it still remains to be seen whether corporate interests will dominate other elements of the IPEF framework. Big Tech corporations, for instance, are eager to use "digital trade" negotiations to cement their power and undermine domestic policy discussions related to competition, consumer privacy, and algorithmic transparency.

The process to date has left much to be desired, with Congress kept at arm's length and stakeholder engagement disorganized and insufficient. In order to really create a new trade model, the U.S. must open this secretive process, publish draft and consolidated texts after each round, and respect Congress' Constitutional authority.