From: **9(2)(a)** (WSH)
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2016 05:48 AM
To: .... **9(2)(a)** (Inet); **9(2)(a)** (TND); **9(2)(a)** (WSH); **9(2)(a)** (WSH); **9(2)(a)** (TND); **9(2)(a)** (AMER); **9(2)(a)** (TND); **9(2)(a)** (TND); **9(2)(a)** ; **9(2)(a)** (WSH); **9(2)(a)** (TND); **9(2)(a)** ; **(2)(a)**; **9(2)(a)**; GROSER, Tim (WSH); (NAD); **9(2)(a)** ; **9(2)(a)** ; **9(2)(a)** (AMER); **9(2)(a)** (AMER); **9(2)(a)** (AMER); **9(2)(a)** **9(2)(a)** ; **9(2)(a)** (WSH); ; WALKER, David (DS TEG); (WSH)
Subject: US ratification: Weekly summary 11 February 2016

Hi all

. OUT OF SCOPE

OUT OF SCOPE

OUT OF SCOPE

OUT OF SCOPE

OUT OF SCOPE

OUT OF SCOPE

Reports/studies

We're collecting the various think-tank reports/economic analyses but I thought it worth mentioning **s6(a)** meeting there was a lot of talk about the "Tufts" study. It turns out that the "Tufts" study has not much to do with Tufts – i.e. for an econometric study, it has no connection with the economics faculty at Tufts. Happy to dig into the precise details if that would be useful for you, but **s6(a)** calling it the "Tufts study" as it gives too much credibility to what is, in effect, a hit piece. [I see it concludes that every single country loses jobs out of TPP; the Peterson Institute has debunked it online, noting that if everyone's economy shrinks by removing trade barriers, then the logical conclusion is that we should all wall ourselves off, i.e. it fails an obvious first principles test.]

REMAINING PAGES OUT OF SCOPE