



BABN | BRITISHAMERICAN
BUSINESS NETWORK



BritishAmericanBusiness

Creating a Rationale

An Analysis of the UK's MoU Initiative with US States

Francesca Lentini, Policy Manager, BritishAmerican Business

Emanuel Adam, Chief Trade and Policy Officer, BritishAmerican Business

Duncan Edwards, Chief Executive Officer, BritishAmerican Business

Executive Summary

As of March 2024, the UK has signed eight Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs) with US states. The UK government, the Department for Business and Trade, and the various US states and their leadership should be applauded for the work they have done to get these agreements signed, as they offer a real opportunity to boost trade and investment in important sectors from which all parties can benefit.

This paper offers a comprehensive analysis of all the MoUs, by delving into their structures, objectives, areas and industries of focus, implementation mechanisms and means of cooperation, and progress monitoring. The report underscores the value of these agreements in fostering economic collaboration, while emphasising the need for a clear strategic vision, coordinated implementation, and transparent communication to maximise their long-term economic value. A number of other benefits to this initiative are also explored in this paper. The paper argues that, while quantitative outcomes may take time to materialise, qualitative indicators and strategic integration underline the positive impact of MoUs on transatlantic trade and investment cooperation.

The hard part now will be making sure that the commitments made in these agreements are acted on, this year, next year and every year. This will require the right level of government resource backed up by an engaged business community, trade associations, chambers of commerce and other interested stakeholders. Recent activities initiated by the MoU process suggest that things are going in the right direction. BAB will certainly be a supporter.

Introduction

As of March 2024, the UK has signed eight Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs) with US states, namely with (in order of signing): Indiana (May 2022), North Carolina (July 2022), South Carolina (December 2022), Oklahoma (April 2023), Utah (June 2023), Washington State (September 2023), Florida (November 2023), and most recently Texas (March 2024 – although it is labelled as a Statement of Mutual Cooperation (SMC)).

The pursuit of these MoUs is part of a wider trade and investment promotion campaign, formerly known as #DITStateside, which seeks to encourage trade and investment through a closer relationship at the state level. MoUs as a tool in trade negotiations are not new, but the British Government turned to MoUs when negotiations for a US-UK Free Trade Agreement (FTA) stalled in 2020. Currently, the UK Department for Business and Trade (DBT) is leading a “twin-track” approach to trade with the US, working both at the local level with individual states, while also engaging at the federal government level¹.

A Memorandum of Understanding is a formal document that outlines the terms and understanding between two or more parties who intend to enter into an agreement or partnership, and it can be used as a starting point for negotiations and collaboration, by establishing a common understanding of objectives and responsibilities for all parties involved². More specifically, according to DBT’s own definition, these state-level MoUs are meant to establish mutual goals and activities to strengthen economic ties between a US state and the UK, as well as set out frameworks to address trade barriers, increase trade and investment, enhance business networks, and increase jobs³.

Since the UK signed its first MoU of this type (the UK previously signed an MoU with the State of Maine in 2020⁴) with the State of Indiana in May 2022, the UK’s effort to engage with individual states on trade and investment has led to some debate about the value of this approach. Some observers emphasised the merit of engaging stakeholders locally, others have questioned these efforts, noting, among other concerns, that MoUs are not legally binding and do nothing on tariffs or market access.

BritishAmerican Business (BAB) has supported the UK’s bilateral efforts with US states while maintaining the view that a full FTA would be in the best interest of both countries. As the leading transatlantic trade and business organisation, BAB has spearheaded the business view on the initiative, offering input into the approach and scope, and ultimately helping businesses, and other relevant stakeholders, to understand how best to interpret and work within the framework of these MoUs.

In 2023, in a first analysis of the MoU initiative⁵, BAB argued that a consistent state-level approach will both create trade and investment opportunities for transatlantic business, while building political support for US-UK trade and investment cooperation at the federal level. BAB also made recommendations for what needs to be done to make the initiative consistent, impactful, and lasting.

Building on direct comparison and analysis of the text of these state-level MoUs, as well as consultation with stakeholders involved in the work across several MoU states and the UK Government, this report offers a comprehensive analysis of all MoUs (including the SMC with Texas announced in March 2024) signed since 2022, with information available to date. The report includes an analysis of structure and objectives of the various MoUs, and it highlights focus areas and scope, as well as means of cooperation. This commentary assesses merits and implementation, and highlights areas that deserve attention.

Analysis

Frameworks

DBT's specific aim with these MoUs is the same across all these agreements: to address non-tariff trade barriers through frameworks, increase trade and investment, and enhance business cooperation across the UK and individual states' economies, while also creating jobs.

All of the MoUs **have similar structures but differ in length**. The lengthiest MoU, and thus the most detailed, is the one with Indiana, the first signed back in May 2022 at 2761 words (about five pages). The agreements with Oklahoma, Utah, Washington State, Florida, and Texas can be classified as mid-length, ranging between around 1520 and 1950 words. The shortest texts are the ones with North Carolina and South Carolina, respectively at 1272 and 1244 words (or about two pages).

Structure, however, is similar across all MoUs. All of these agreements include an introduction and several sections, covering: objectives/purpose/goals, priority sectors and areas of cooperation, forms of cooperation/activities, implementation, information sharing and confidentiality, intellectual property, and final provisions. The SMC with Texas, however, does not include a separate section on means of cooperation, although some of this information is included throughout the text.

All MoUs have mechanisms to implement commitments and to monitor progress. Specifically, all of the MoUs, except the one with Washington State, set out the creation of a Working Group. These Working Groups are designed to meet periodically (mostly every six months) to steer and monitor the implementation of the specific MoU they were created for.

As of March 2024, all working groups have met at least once, except Texas and Florida, which have been signed only recently. Indiana has met twice so

far, with the last meeting held in June 2023⁶; the North Carolina-UK group has met three times so far, with the most recent meeting in January 2024⁷; as for South Carolina, the working group has met once, in June 2023⁸; the Oklahoma-UK working group had its first meeting in October 2023⁹; a couple of months later, the Utah-UK working group also met, in December 2023¹⁰; the Florida-UK working group is set to have its inaugural meeting by May 2024. The Washington State MoU does not mention a working group explicitly, but it states that "the Participants will hold regular MOU implementation meetings either virtually or in person, to coordinate the implementation of the MOU"¹¹.

All these MoUs can be amended or terminated at any point in time (through appropriate procedures). These agreements have to operate within the boundaries of state level legislatures, and cannot achieve traditional trade liberalisation goals, such as tariff reductions. They therefore focus on policy alignment in different areas of common interest, cooperation on priority industries, dialogue facilitation, and other ways to create an encouraging dynamic for businesses.

A more detailed look at the text of all eight MoUs shows **some similarities and some interesting differences when it comes to sectors and areas of focus, the specific objectives of the MoU, means of cooperation and implementation, and government procurement**. BAB has compared all of these texts and collated the data in one collective table, which is part of this report.

Areas of Focus

In terms of industries and areas of focus, **all MoUs focus on relevant industry areas reflected in transatlantic trade and investment**, such as advanced manufacturing, life sciences, and FinTech. **All MoUs except the one with Florida also emphasise opportunities in energy transition**, whether that is sustainability, sustainable economy, climate change, net zero, clean energy, and/or energy transition. Specifically, the North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Washington State MoUs reference net zero directly, as well as emphasising the need for the advancement of low emissions technologies and lower carbon

intensive power sources (including hydrogen), zero emissions vehicles, and carbon capture, utilisation, and storage (CCUS).

The Indiana, South Carolina, and Utah MoUs do not refer to net zero explicitly, but the texts refer to innovation to facilitate sustainability, supporting economic growth, and clean power generation. The Texas SMC mentions sustainable economic growth, energy resilience, and emerging energy solutions.

First meeting of the UK-North Carolina MoU Working Group in Raleigh, NC



With seven out of eight MoUs referencing sustainability, Florida is an outlier – the text of this MoU does not mention anything related to net zero or climate change at all. The MoU with Florida focuses on fintech (along with Utah), another priority sector for the UK which is a global centre for this industry and the second largest destination for fintech investment, after the US¹².

The second most cited priority sector across these MoUs is life sciences, which is referenced in six of them: Indiana, South Carolina, Utah, Washington State, Florida, and Texas. The third common priority is **agriculture**, with a particular focus on innovation and sustainability. It is a shared priority for Indiana, Oklahoma, Washington State, and Florida. **Aerospace and aviation and supply chains (including supply chain resilience)** are also mentioned in 50% of the MoUs. Other notable sectors and priorities are **workforce development, innovation and regulatory cooperation**, which are common across three states.

Finally, a few additional areas and sectors of focus are included in these MoUs, but are not common across all of them. These are: **automotive, fintech (as we saw earlier), advanced manufacturing, transport, space, infrastructure, legal services and law tech, economic development and investment, digital, and chemicals**. The table in the appendix contains more detail on which MoUs focus on which of these industries.

Purpose and Objectives

All eight MoUs have one objective in common, which is to “address barriers to trade and/or investment” – this is the only objective that appears across all documents. Interestingly though, only three MoUs also cite “increasing investment” in both places as an objective of the agreement (North Carolina, Florida, and Texas) – on the other hand, in the text of the Oklahoma MoU, for instance, the word “investment” is never mentioned.

The second most common objective is to “strengthen business and create decent jobs” in the US state and the UK, “grow academic and research ties”, and support “regulators and professional bodies interested in pursuing

recognition arrangements on professional qualifications”. These objectives are shared by six MoUs, excluding the Carolinas. On the other hand, the MoUs with North Carolina and South Carolina are the only ones that mention “strengthening the long-standing bond between the people of [the two places]” as one of the objectives of their agreements.

“Addressing barriers to economic cooperation and development” is the third most common objective, shared by the most recent five MoUs: Oklahoma, Utah, Washington State, Florida, and Texas. The first three MoUs share the purpose of “increasing economic opportunity for their respective citizens”.

A shared objective among four MoUs is also “increasing trade between the US state and the UK”, shared by the MoUs with Oklahoma, Utah, Washington State, and Florida.

The SMC with Texas uses slightly different language, but with a similar inferred intent, namely: “fostering innovation, promoting and advancing trade, and increasing prosperity in both regions”.

Means of Cooperation

All MoUs except Texas, where means of cooperation fall under other sections, have dedicated chapters that specify “visits and missions” and “information sharing/best practice exchange” as means of cooperation. “Private sector partnerships” and “capital investment” are also fairly common, but they are missing in the Indiana (and Texas) MoUs.

Other shared cited instruments are “joint symposia, seminars, workshops, exhibitions, and training”, as well as “academic cooperation”. The Oklahoma MoU is the only one to introduce a “social media campaign” as means of cooperation.

Government Procurement

All MoUs signed so far put a special emphasis on public procurement. This is referenced across the eight MoUs in a few different ways, ranging from simply providing guidance to vendors seeking information on government procurement, to offering UK suppliers treatment no less favourable than that to suppliers from a State not bordering with the US State in question. Other MoUs mention prioritising and advancing opportunities in their government procurement processes, or exploring opportunities to increase participation by private companies in the procurement markets of both MoU parties. In those MoUs with US states that are party to the WTO Agreement on Government Procurement (WTO GPA), the text mentions reaffirming existing obligations under the GPA.

Signing of MoU between the UK and the state of South Carolina



Out of the eight MoUs signed so far, three are with US states that are not party to the WTO GPA – these are Indiana, North Carolina, and South Carolina¹³. These states still have to abide by any federal legislation on procurement, but are not bound by international commitments for their own procurement. As such, only the texts of the Oklahoma, Washington State, Florida, and Texas MoUs mention reaffirming “existing obligations under the Revised World Trade Organization Agreement on Government Procurement (WTO GPA)”. The same agreements also state the willingness to “explore opportunities to increase participation by private companies in the procurement markets of the US state and the UK”, as does the MoU with Utah (although this is the only mention of government procurement in that agreement).

The three US states not bound by the GPA also mention different provisions around government procurement. Indiana, for instance, states that it will work “to offer UK suppliers treatment no less favourable than that to suppliers from a state not bordering with Indiana”. North Carolina, on the other hand, is less specific, noting the two parties in the MoU will prioritise and advance “opportunities in their government procurement processes”. Finally, South Carolina commits to providing “simple guidance to vendors on applicable government procurement opportunities and processes”. The SMC with Texas mentions that “the State of Texas will endeavour to offer the United Kingdom’s suppliers treatment no less favourable than US suppliers”.

MoU Implementation

All but one MoU (North Carolina) cite specific coordinating authorities: for instance, for the MoU with South Carolina, the South Carolina Department of Commerce and the British Consulate General in Atlanta are listed. For Texas, it is the Department for Business and Trade and the British Consulate in Houston and the Texas Economic Development and Tourism Office. Furthermore, all but one MoU (Washington State) mention the creation of a specific Working Group structure to monitor progress, such as, for instance, the United Kingdom-Oklahoma Trade and Economic Promotion Board. Most of these Groups are set up to meet periodically - the North Carolina-UK MoU Working Group, for

example, has met three times since its establishment in July 2022, alternating between the UK and the US. More recent MoU partnerships have seen their first meeting take place or are due soon.

Working Group meetings, which are accompanied by official statements and report-outs, cover the focus areas listed in the respective MoUs. As part of the first Utah-UK Working Group meeting, for example, discussions covered academic collaboration and workforce development, new opportunities in life sciences and aerospace, as well as public sector procurement. Working Group meetings also generally produce a list of actions to be delivered, such as trade missions, presence at trade shows, announcements of new investments, as well as commitments to advance specific workstreams, such as around procurement and academic collaboration.

Several UK-state partnerships have led to initiatives directly linked to the MoUs, such as a trade mission from Manchester/UK to North Carolina, or a trade delegation from Indiana to the UK in 2023 although, so far, these have been fewer than we might have expected. Encouragingly, statements from Working Group meetings list upcoming initiatives and events organised as part of the MoU Working Group workstream, so there may be more activity to come.

Commentary

When the UK started to engage on signing MoUs with individual US states in 2022, some sceptics suggested that these agreements might be of limited use given that they are neither legally binding nor do they change tariffs or market access.

In our paper 'Taking Trade Local'¹⁴, published in April 2023, BAB noted that, in order to make the initiative a success, a clear strategic approach and a set of measurable outcomes would be needed to make a political and economic case for this approach. Almost two years into the strategy, our analysis supports our instinct that this kind of trade promotion activity can have real value, but that a lot hinges on the execution of the commitments that have been made by both sides.

A Long-Term Part of the UK's Approach to Economic Collaboration With the US

The most important message to take away from our analysis is that the UK Government has made these agreements a consistent part of its strategic approach and not just a one-off. There are now eight MoUs and at least two more in the works, possibly more. The UK Government has designated a special unit within DBT in London and a senior lead in Washington DC to coordinate efforts, all of which suggests that the MoU initiative is a central and long-term part of the UK government's approach to economic collaboration with the US.

A Shift Toward the 'Big' States

The second takeaway from our analysis is that with the recent signings of the MoUs with Florida and Texas, the UK Government has moved towards the 'big' states. In other words, the UK is focusing on states that meet the UK's criteria around what is sometimes described as 'talent, expertise and industries'. In our previous analysis, we argued that it was reasonable at the outset to work with states who were willing to engage, but we were also clear that focusing on the big states with greater economic value and resources would add credibility and opportunity to the overall efforts. This is now being done.

A New Generation of MoU Agreements

The third takeaway from our analysis is that there is clearly an attempt to craft a new generation of MoU agreements with the ambition to create a much more detailed, impactful and long-lasting collaboration. We know that MoUs are not new, and that these get signed on a regular basis, between countries, cities, or organisations. For example, the Northern Ireland Chamber of Commerce and Industry (NI Chamber) and the North Carolina Chamber of Commerce (NC Chamber) recently signed an MoU to promote international trade, investment, and cooperation¹⁵.

Upon consultation with local implementation stakeholders in Indiana, we discovered that, interestingly, the US State had already started to implement a new approach to MoUs even before the MoU with the UK was signed, pursuing agreements that would serve both as economic development tools, but also as frameworks to support the overall relationship with another party, whether a country or a subnational entity. As such, the UK-Indiana MoU not only reflected a mutual interest to explore MoUs, but it also set a useful benchmark for the UK.

Linking Domestic Industry Objectives and Trade and Investment Promotion

Another takeaway that only becomes visible as more MoUs are signed suggests that there is some consistency around MoU focus areas that reflect key industries relevant to both the UK and US states. Though there are differences between the states, our analysis shows that a majority of MoUs mirror industries that have traditionally been prominent in UK-US trade and investment, such as in life sciences, services, manufacturing, and automotive. We also noted with interest that some industries mentioned as key areas of focus in the MoUs mirrored commitments made in the Atlantic Declaration, for example around aerospace & defence and energy.

We were also not surprised that many MoUs signed reflected sectors identified as growth areas for the UK – digital, creative, green energy, financial services, life sciences, advanced manufacturing – as well as overarching policy objectives set out by the UK Government, such as the promotion of green industries as part of the Net Zero Strategy.

In our view, linking MoU objectives to domestic policy goals is a smart development, and perhaps the most impactful. In the UK's case, we argue that the MoUs could and should serve as an implementation tool of, and extension to, recommendations set out in the Lord Harrington Review into the UK's approach to FDI¹⁶, which called not only for a focus on growth areas, but also on an alignment of trade and investment promotion structure and staffing in key markets. In our consultation with relevant stakeholders, for instance, we learnt that UK Government staff in MoU states are being upskilled to better explain and implement MoU objectives, which in turn will potentially create an even better UK-US trade and investment promotion proposition.

Activation of Local Stakeholder Networks

Our analysis shows that the very fact that an MoU has been signed can activate local stakeholder networks to engage around UK-US specific trade and

investment collaboration efforts. This has been certainly true for networks that were already engaged and active, such as in North Carolina, where the UK has a Government Office, but also in states where coordinated engagement has not been as strong.

For example, we learnt that the MoU signed with South Carolina changed the focus and level of engagement within the South Carolina Commerce Department, with a senior staffer reporting that the MoU has led South Carolina to have its structure focus on the UK, with the State now even contemplating opening a UK office, in addition to its European office in Munich/Germany. We also learned that in Indiana the MoU is being seen as a strategic element to Indiana's trade and investment promotion efforts, thereby adding resource and energy into building this economic relationship, and the activities linked to it.

UK Government offices, in addition to the General Consulates, can play a significant role in using the potential that an MoU provides. For example, North Carolina's success in spearheading the MoU implementation can be very much attributed to the existence of a UK Government office and an Office Lead who understands how to use the engagement structure an MoU can provide. This in turn confirms the very idea behind the establishment of UK Government offices in key US states; something that BAB has long supported.

A Framework for Trade and Investment Promotion

Creating a framework in order to address trade and investment barriers is the key objective of the MoUs signed thus far¹⁷. BAB has long argued that one of the strongest benefits of the MoUs could be to create a formalised framework for existing and new initiatives. Our analysis of the texts and consultation with coordinating authorities found that this can be very much the case.

How MoUs serve as a connecting point can be seen in many of the Working Group notes published after the meetings. For example, the read-out of the third UK-North Carolina MoU Working Group meeting lists key events - such as a planned UK Motorsport trade delegation or the BABN Transatlantic

Conference scheduled for September 2024 in Charlotte - under the MoU umbrella, while also announcing a number of new initiatives and activities, such as a roundtable on improving access to government procurement or the participation of UK government officials and UK companies in the University of Carolina at Capitol Hill Clean Tech Summit in March 2024. It is fair to assume that many of these events may have taken place regardless, but even where initiatives have no immediate link to the MoU itself, placing them under the 'MoU umbrella' creates a 'recognition' factor among stakeholders, the effect of which should not be underestimated.

Stating What MoUs are and What They are Not

Since the UK started its #DITStateside campaign in 2022, there has been consistent confusion (and therefore often scepticism) around what these MoUs are and what they are not.

As shown in our analysis, all MoUs signed so far mention the objective to 'address' trade and investment barriers in one way or another. It is worth noting, however, that only the MoU with Indiana has "removing trade and investment barriers" explicitly listed under its objectives, and that only two MoUs – the first two signed with Indiana and North Carolina – talk about "removing trade and investment barriers" at all. All other MoUs use the phrase "addressing trade and investment barriers". The SMC with Texas mentions "promoting and advancing trade" in its text.

What matters is how trade and investment barriers are being addressed. All MoUs are essentially agreements on trade and investment - what exactly this means, however, requires a closer look at the texts.

Rather than through traditional market access provisions and regulation, MoUs seek to enhance trade and investment through trade missions, academic collaboration, and by linking up trade and investment cooperation capacity between parties, businesses and other stakeholders. As important as these things are, measuring their immediate economic impact will be more difficult

than, for example, measuring the impact of tariff reductions. The first MoU signed with Indiana defines this very limitation in its text. While the objective here is also to "remove trade and investment barriers", the text emphasises limits to it, as trade barriers are to be overcome within the framework of existing [US State] laws and regulations. A way of describing what MoUs are and what they are not will be important as the UK, and more US states, use MoUs to further strengthen their economic ties.

Market Access Through Access to Government Procurement

Our analysis shows that all MoUs include increased access to procurement as a desired objective and tangible outcome. In fact, there is indeed scope and interest by parties to use the MoUs as a way to open up government procurement markets on both sides of the Atlantic, with greater access than if there was no MoU in place, especially in those states not bound by the WTO GPA. For example, the agreement between the UK and Texas states that the State of Texas will endeavour to offer the United Kingdom's suppliers "treatment

Signing of MoU between the UK and the state of Texas. Source: Department for Business & Trade



no less favourable than US suppliers”. It is hard at this point to fully assess the potential merit of it; yet, as our consultation with Indiana revealed, even if the MoU simply helps to make procurement opportunities and processes more visible, that is better than where we are today. There is a big potential win here and we hope that this area is getting appropriate attention.

MoUs as Advocacy Tool for Other Policy Objectives

In previous work done on the MoUs, including work done by the Center for Strategic & International Studies (CSIS), it was argued¹⁸, among other things, that these MoUs should be used to make a local case for future trade agreements at a federal level. This may still be true, but in addition to that, our analysis and consultation revealed that there may well be scope to use these MoUs also as advocacy tools for other, industry-specific policy objectives between the UK and US states.

As our analysis shows, all but two (North Carolina and South Carolina) MoUs mention the mutual recognition of qualifications as a tangible objective flow specifically by supporting regulators and professional bodies interested in pursuing recognition arrangements.

The UK-US mutual recognition agreement (MRA) signed between the UK’s Architects Registration Board (ARB) and the US’s National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) in February 2023 provides a good example of how that can be achieved. In fact, though the ARB and the NCARB have signed the agreement, whether and where it can be implemented depends on the approval of a large number of independent local bodies, requiring additional advocacy for those bodies to sign up to the agreement.

If MoUs help to create momentum and support for such arrangements to be approved and implemented, this can only be a good thing. The success of efforts to develop a similar agreement between the US National Council of Examiners for Engineering and Surveying (NCEES) and the Engineering Council in the United Kingdom will be a good test case.

We argue that there may be even more scope for the MoUs to be used as an advocacy tool between governments. US state policymakers could seek to use the formal relationship to directly work with the UK Government on areas of interest; in turn, the UK Government and stakeholders can work directly with state legislators and governments to address issues that may have come up at federal level. Recent conversations among transatlantic stakeholders suggest interest to explore this. For example, given the overall concern among US and UK businesses around regulatory fragmentation across the US and the ambition for the UK and the US to look for alignment, using the MoU Framework to seek common ground may turn out to be an unanticipated benefit.

A Clear Strategy and Vision Will be More Important Than Ever

We have previously made the case for the UK to set out a clear strategic approach and vision for its engagement with US states. This should include clearly articulating the goals, scope, and deliverables of the campaign. As the UK has now signed its eighth agreement, such a function becomes more important than ever.

Though the implementation will take place at a local level, with an important role for designated implementation bodies, the UK will, by default, be the central coordination unit that links MoU objectives and delivery to broader industry goals and integrates specific objectives from US states into the wider strategy and development. The UK will also be able to share learning and best practice across all MoU relationships, to the benefit of all parties.

At the local level, the challenge will be to deliver on these objectives in a clear and inclusive way, so that all local stakeholders understand the objectives and mechanisms behind the MoU process and are integrated into its delivery.

Information and Coordinated Delivery Will Ensure Longevity

We have argued before that we see the MoUs between the UK and US states as a new generation of agreements. In addition to the greater substance that these MoU offer, our argument is based on a greater focus around the implementation. As such, for these agreements to last, both parties will need to focus on execution and transparency in communication.

On information, we know that DBT has been working on improving communication surrounding MoUs. The goal is to make sure businesses are not only aware of the existence of these agreements, but that they also, and most importantly, understand how they can benefit from them. So far there is not much available beyond the MoU texts and Working Group statements. In our view, this information should contain core objectives, means of delivery, how businesses can benefit from and access the various actions driven by the MoU, a list and contact information for key delivery partners and stakeholders, as well as references to current developments and opportunities such as trade missions, procurement opportunities, case studies (where available), trade shows, and other events. The same goes for the information produced by each State about the opportunities for their companies.

On execution, local processes are as important as a centralised strategic approach. The MoUs will deliver on their objectives if local stakeholders are engaged, receive guidance on how the agreement can support their audiences, and if they are resourced to support the implementation of the MoU and encouraged to do so.

Though the majority of MoUs have Working Groups and designated implementation bodies to coordinate the MoU implementation, in some cases, identifying who sits on those groups and how agendas are being set is not easily accessible. Also, the authors of this report could not get a response in time from all US MoU states, with one State not reachable at all.

Our consultation suggested that there is a risk that working group processes can lose momentum if, for example, stakeholders are not aware of their role or if there is a lack of tangible outcome.

A coordinated delivery, guided by a clear strategy and accessible information, may well turn the MoU initiative, launched in the context of a halt to negotiations for a comprehensive FTA, into a new level of transatlantic trade and investment cooperation.

The Economic Value

All MoUs that are part of the current UK efforts with US states share the objective to boost trade and investment cooperation, with the ultimate goal to grow trade and investment between the UK and US states. Evidence of this will be visible only once new trade and investment data for the period after an MoU has been signed becomes available, which will take some time.

In the meantime, qualitative data will be the most useful indicator of any success, such as a growth in leads or business activity and testimonials from companies who cite the MoUs as a contributing factor. Credible case studies that are directly linked to a MoU, however, may also not be visible for some time. We also argue that those case studies, as helpful as they are, should not be the only indicator to assess the success of an MoU. Rather, the economic value of the MoUs will derive from them being an anchor for a strategic shift and focus in the long-term, adding resource, visibility, and an increasing integration of trade and investment tools. This ought to be highlighted, as it is a strong message.

Conclusion

Since 2022, the UK has signed eight Memoranda of Understanding with US states, designed to enhance economic collaboration between the UK and specific US states. This paper offers a comprehensive analysis of all the MoUs signed so far, including the trade and investment pact signed between the UK and Texas in March 2024. The analysis and commentary conclude with an overall positive verdict on the UK government's MoU initiative.

The UK has made signing MoUs with US states an integral part of its trade and investment work with the US, and the focus has recently, rightly, been put on larger US states that are economically relevant for companies in the corridor. The analysis also revealed that the MoUs can create important frameworks for trade and investment activity, activate local networks of stakeholders to engage in the transatlantic corridor, and create opportunities for business, such as in public procurement. The paper also identified the positive impact MoUs can have as they link up trade and investment promotion goals with domestic growth sectors.

Our analysis also shows that more needs to be done to ensure the success of this approach for the long term. The more MoUs that are signed, the more important it is to have a clear strategic approach and vision in place, specifically around how the various commitments that are made in the agreements are executed and publicised to the business community at whom they are aimed. In that regard, this paper supports current efforts by the UK Government to publish a set of materials that explains the structure, objectives, and benefits of the MoUs.

The UK Department for Business and Trade and the various states and their leadership should be applauded for the work they have done to get these agreements signed. They offer real opportunity to boost trade and investment in important sectors from which all parties can benefit.

Now comes the hard part; making sure that the commitments made in these agreements are acted on, this year, next year and every year. This will require the right level of government resource backed up by an engaged business community, trade associations, chambers of commerce and other interested stakeholders. Recent activities initiated by the MoU process suggests that things are going in the right direction. BAB will certainly be a supporter.

		Indiana	North Carolina	South Carolina	Oklahoma	Utah	Washington State	Florida	Texas
Admin	Date/Entry in operation	27-May-22	20-Jul-22	07-Dec-22	18-Apr-23	22-Jun-23	25-Sep-23	14-Nov-23	13-Mar-24
	To note								It's labelled as a Statement of Mutual Cooperation (SMC), not Memorandum of Understanding (MoU)
	Can be amended	Through discussion in the Working Group, with modifications agreed in writing	At any time upon mutual consent	At any point, with mutual written consent	At any time upon mutual written consent	At any time upon mutual written consent	At any time upon mutual written consent	At any time upon mutual written consent	The Participants may amend this SMC at any time upon their mutual written consent
	Can be terminated	With 45 days' written notice	At any time upon mutual consent 90 days' written notice if no mutual consent	With 10 days' written notice	At any time upon mutual written consent	With 45 days' written notice	With 45 days' written notice	With 45 days' written notice	With 45 days' written notice
	Legally binding?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Sectors/topics/areas of focus	Sustainability/ sustainable economy/climate change/net zero/ clean energy/ energy transition (7)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Through cooperation on advanced manufacturing Accelerating the development of initiatives to advance low emissions technology Emphasis on clean power generation and innovative energy storage solutions and technologies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Achieving net zero greenhouse gas emissions as soon as possible, but no later than 2050, by accelerating the development and deployment of clean energy industry and technologies, such as photovoltaic solar, offshore wind, electric vehicles, battery storage Cooperation to achieve net-zero greenhouse gas emissions by no later than 2050, by decarbonising their economies, promoting sustainable growth, and building skilled and modern workforces 	Capitalising on innovation to facilitate sustainability and protecting the natural environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accelerate the development of secure, clean, affordable, and responsible energy solutions that support global decarbonisation while powering the world's growing energy demands. Encourage and enable the utilisation of lower carbon intensity power sources while reducing harmful emissions and waste streams Collaborate on efforts to drive down the costs of the technologies needed to lower emissions Focus on energy transition, including hydrogen, and carbon capture, utilisation, and storage (CCUS). Zero-emissions vehicles and negative carbon technologies such as Direct Air Capture (DAC) 	Support sustainable economic growth (for example, through improved infrastructure, affordable housing, optimising education and industry partnerships, and protecting the quality of the environment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support global decarbonisation and the pathway to net zero, including through meeting domestic commitments to the phase out of unabated coal power by no later than 2030 as participants in the Powering Past Coal Alliance (PPCA), as well as ensuring a just transition for workers and communities traditionally reliant on fossil fuel economies Development and efforts to drive down the cost of clean and reliable solutions to address climate change. With a particular focus on; hydrogen, wind power and other marine renewable forms of energy; zero emission transport; nature-based solutions 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote and foster sustainable economic growth Support the development of new and emerging energy solutions to ensure greater energy resilience New and emerging innovative energy solutions, including hydrogen, carbon capture, utilisation and energy storage

		<u>Indiana</u>	<u>North Carolina</u>	<u>South Carolina</u>	<u>Oklahoma</u>	<u>Utah</u>	<u>Washington State</u>	<u>Florida</u>	<u>Texas</u>
Sectors/topics/areas of focus	Life Sciences (6)	This area of cooperation works to advance company partnerships, opportunities, economic development missions, symposia, workshops, and other relevant cooperative events; market access, early-stage company investment, finance, and support; clinical research; and research partnerships		Collaborating on R&D and facilitating trade opportunities		Healthcare and life sciences including health tech	Including health-tech	Especially medtech	Health and life sciences, including rural health, telemedicine, and health technology
	Agriculture and agbioscience (4)	This area of cooperation seeks to facilitate collaboration and information sharing in the field of sustainable agriculture and agricultural technology and innovation			Agriculture, including food and fibre (including crops such as cotton and industrial hemp used for agricultural purposes) production.		Agriculture, including opportunities to explore collaboration in the field of sustainable agriculture, and agricultural technology, biotechnology, and innovation to improve farm management and productivity in a manner supportive of high animal health and welfare, and a reduced spread of antimicrobial resistance	Agricultural biotechnology	

		<u>Indiana</u>	<u>North Carolina</u>	<u>South Carolina</u>	<u>Oklahoma</u>	<u>Utah</u>	<u>Washington State</u>	<u>Florida</u>	<u>Texas</u>
Sectors/topics/areas of focus	Aerospace and aviation (4)	This area of cooperation targets the development, operation, and manufacturing of aircraft between the aerospace industries of the Participants, with the aim of enhancing aerospace manufacturing attractiveness, workforce development, foreign direct investment and market access				Aerospace	Aerospace		Aerospace
	Supply chain resilience/supply chains and logistics (4)					Through increased co-operation and support the growth of both the State of Utah and the United Kingdom's critical mineral sectors through information sharing, increased business links, and R&D partnerships	Including ports and manufacturing	Supply chains and logistics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify opportunities to improve supply chain resilience Supply chains and critical minerals
	Workforce development (3)	Sharing of best practices and policy developments to deliver accessible workforce training and opportunities, especially in light of the shift toward a low carbon economy				Workforce development including supporting the workforce to meet the needs of high demand, high-wage jobs created by innovation across all sectors, and the creation and preservation of high-quality jobs	Clusters and workforce development, utilising innovation networks to develop new high-growth, high-value industries.		
	Innovation and regulatory cooperation (3)	Enabling innovation by sharing expertise on forward-looking regulatory frameworks					As it occurs in the other identified priority areas		Support innovation

		<u>Indiana</u>	<u>North Carolina</u>	<u>South Carolina</u>	<u>Oklahoma</u>	<u>Utah</u>	<u>Washington State</u>	<u>Florida</u>	<u>Texas</u>
Sectors/topics/areas of focus	Automotive (2)	Including electric, connected and automated mobility		Collaborating on R&D and facilitating trade opportunities					
	Fintech (2)					Fintech		Including reinsurance	
	Advanced manufacturing (2)	Particularly in support of sustainability							Advanced technologies
	Transport (2)							Including aviation, maritime, intercity, light, and high-speed rail, and rail freight	Transport services including intercity light and high-speed rail, and rail freight
	Infrastructure (2)							Including water, adaptation, and resilience together with cyber security	Infrastructure, including water, adaptation and resilience, ports, rail, and aviation
	Legal services and law tech (2)							Legal services and law tech	Professional business services including financial and legal
	Space (1)							Space	
	Economic development and investment (1)	Exchange of business delegations and market information to enhance mutual trading relationship in key sector identified							
	Chemicals (1)	Chemicals							Chemicals

		<u>Indiana</u>	<u>North Carolina</u>	<u>South Carolina</u>	<u>Oklahoma</u>	<u>Utah</u>	<u>Washington State</u>	<u>Florida</u>	<u>Texas</u>
Sectors/topics/areas of focus	Digital (1)						Recognising the importance of digital technologies as a contributor to economic growth and quality of life, building a secure, open and trustworthy digital online environment, and developing cyber and digital skills, innovation and talent		
	Purpose/objectives	Address barriers to trade and/or investment (8)	e.g. through recognition of professional qualifications	Identifying, anticipating and addressing barriers to free and open trade	Identify, anticipate and where appropriate, address barriers to trade and investment, including barriers arising from innovation	Consider and pursue solutions to specific market access barriers, e.g. through supporting regulators and professional bodies interested in pursuing recognition arrangements on professional qualifications	Consider and pursue solutions to specific market access barriers, e.g. through supporting regulators and professional bodies interested in pursuing recognition arrangements on professional qualifications	Consider and pursue solutions to specific market access barriers, e.g. through supporting regulators and professional bodies interested in pursuing recognition arrangements on professional qualifications	Consider and pursue solutions to specific market access barriers, e.g. through supporting regulators and professional bodies interested in pursuing recognition arrangements on professional qualifications
	Strengthen businesses and create decent jobs in the US state and the UK (6)	To strengthen their businesses and create jobs in both Indiana and the United Kingdom	Text mentions "enhancing business networks"		Strengthen businesses and create decent jobs in both Oklahoma and the United Kingdom	Foster innovation, strengthen business links, support women's economic empowerment, and encourage investment and the creation of high-quality jobs across all regions	Foster innovation, strengthen business links, encourage the creation of decent work and support educational and skills opportunities necessary in critical industries in both places	Foster innovation, strengthen business links, and encourage the creation of decent work in both the United Kingdom and the State of Florida.	Strengthen business links, support economic development, and encourage investment and the creation of high-quality jobs across all regions of both the United Kingdom and the State of Texas

		<u>Indiana</u>	<u>North Carolina</u>	<u>South Carolina</u>	<u>Oklahoma</u>	<u>Utah</u>	<u>Washington State</u>	<u>Florida</u>	<u>Texas</u>
Purpose/objectives	Growing academic and research ties (6)	The Participants will work to promoting collaborative projects, research, information exchange and the sharing of best practice and expertise regarding innovation			The Participants will work to promoting collaborative projects, research, information exchange and the sharing of best practice and expertise regarding innovation	Grow academic and research ties through promoting collaborative projects, research and information exchange	Grow academic and research ties through promoting collaborative projects, research and information exchange	Grow academic and research ties through promoting collaborative projects, research, and information exchange	Promote industry-to-industry exchanges, including, but not limited to, our world-leading academic institutions
	Mutual recognition of professional qualifications (6)	Where appropriate, the Participants commit to considering and pursuing solutions to specific market access barriers, such as government procurement, and supporting regulators and professional bodies interested in pursuing recognition arrangements on professional qualifications			Intend to consider and, as appropriate, pursue solutions to specific market access barriers. This may include through supporting regulators and professional bodies interested in pursuing recognition arrangements on professional qualifications	Intend to consider and, as appropriate, pursue solutions to specific market access barriers to trade between the United Kingdom and the State of Utah. This may include supporting regulators and professional bodies interested in pursuing recognition arrangements for professional qualifications	Intend to consider and, as appropriate, pursue solutions to specific market access barriers. This may include supporting regulators and professional bodies interested in pursuing recognition arrangements of professional qualifications	Market access - consider and, as appropriate, pursue solutions to specific market access barriers. This may include supporting regulators and professional bodies interested in pursuing recognition arrangements on professional qualifications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage regulators and professional bodies interested in pursuing recognition arrangements of professional qualifications • “The Participants intend to consider and, as appropriate, pursue solutions to specific market access barriers. This may include supporting regulators and professional bodies interested in pursuing recognition arrangements of professional qualifications”
	Address barriers to economic cooperation and development (5)	Deepening economic development cooperation	Text mentions “promote economic development”			Create a forum to find solutions to existing and anticipated barriers economic cooperation and development.	Create a forum to identify and address existing or anticipated barriers to trade, investment and economic co-operation and development	Create a forum to identify and address existing or anticipated barriers to trade, investment and economic co-operation and development	Create a forum to identify and address existing or anticipated barriers to trade, investment and economic co-operation and development

		<u>Indiana</u>	<u>North Carolina</u>	<u>South Carolina</u>	<u>Oklahoma</u>	<u>Utah</u>	<u>Washington State</u>	<u>Florida</u>	<u>Texas</u>
Purpose/objectives	Increase trade between the US state and the UK (4)		Text mentions "enhance trade relations"		Increase trade between the United Kingdom and Oklahoma through deepening economic development co-operation and trade relations to strengthen businesses and create decent jobs in both Oklahoma and the United Kingdom	Increase trade between the United Kingdom and State of Utah through deepening economic cooperation and trade relations	Increase trade between the United Kingdom and Washington State through deepening economic development co-operation and trade relations	Increase trade between the United Kingdom and the State of Florida through deepening economic development co-operation and trade relations	
	To increase economic opportunity for their respective citizens (3)	To develop a structure framework of engagement to identify and promote opportunities for their respective citizens and businesses	Increasing economic opportunities for the Participants' citizens and residents, particularly in previously underinvested regions, by identifying, anticipating and addressing barriers to free and open trade, increasing investment and enhancing business networks	To increase economic opportunity for their respective citizens					
	Increase investment in both places (3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The text recognises "importance of two-way investment." The purpose of the Working Group is to facilitate the exchange of mutually beneficial information to increase foreign direct investment 	Increase investment in both North Carolina (NC) and the UK		The word "investment" is never mentioned in this MoU			Increase bilateral investment by facilitating mutual co-operation for companies wishing to make connections in the Priority Areas of focus	Promote bilateral investment by facilitating investor introductions and signposting available incentives, resources, financing, and support available for businesses
	Promote a relationship of generic cooperation (2)	Enhancing cooperation		Promote a relationship of cooperation, with established parameters					
	To strengthen the long-standing bond between the people of the two places (2)		Strengthening people-to-people ties between the Participants	To strengthen the long-standing bond between the people of SOUTH CAROLINA and the UNITED KINGDOM					

		Indiana	North Carolina	South Carolina	Oklahoma	Utah	Washington State	Florida	Texas
Purpose/objectives	Foster innovation (1)								Foster innovation, including through encouraging the sharing of best practice for resilient and forward-looking regulatory frameworks which support innovation
	Promote and advance trade (1)								Promote and advance trade between businesses in the United Kingdom and State of Texas through deepening economic co-operation
	Increase prosperity in both regions (1)								Goals of encouraging collaboration for increasing prosperity in both regions and contributing to the further development of favourable relations between the State of Texas and the United Kingdom
Working group/board/implementation meetings	Working group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Created 6m after signing Meets annually (has met twice so far, last meeting June 2023) First meeting took place on 12 Dec 2022: Joint Statement on UK-Indiana Memorandum of Understanding Working Group Mar 2023, Indiana Delegation went to UK: Joint Statement on UK-Indiana Memorandum of Understanding Working Group June 2023: second Working Group meeting (according to Deloitte): I'll be There for MoU? - Deloitte 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meets periodically Has met three times so far Jan 2023: UK and North Carolina State hold inaugural Working Group meeting June 2023: UK and North Carolina State hold second Working Group meeting Feb 2024: UK and State of North Carolina hold Third Working Group Meeting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting periodically Met once so far Jun 2023: UK and South Carolina State hold inaugural Working Group meeting 	United Kingdom-Oklahoma Trade and Economic Promotion Board' ("the Board") <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meets annually Inaugural meeting in Oklahoma within 6m of signing First meeting held in Oct 2023, although referred to as Working Group there: UK and Oklahoma hold inaugural Working Group meeting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting periodically First meeting Dec 2023: UK and the State of Utah Hold Inaugural Working Group Meeting 	No Working Group per se referred to in the text. The text refers to "implementation meetings"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meets annually First meeting 6m after signing (so by May 2024) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> First meeting within 6 months of signing, then annually thereafter
	MoU implementation meetings							Regular	

		<u>Indiana</u>	<u>North Carolina</u>	<u>South Carolina</u>	<u>Oklahoma</u>	<u>Utah</u>	<u>Washington State</u>	<u>Florida</u>	<u>Texas</u>
Means of cooperation and implementation	Visits and Missions (7)	The Participants commit to promoting representative and accessible trade missions with a focus on diversity and inclusion	Government missions	Foster meaningful and collaborative engagement across a variety of mediums, including through visits and missions	Trade missions	Government missions	Government and Trade missions	Trade missions	This section is not present in this MoU
	Information sharing/best practice exchange (7)	Sharing appropriate information and best practices regarding policies and programs	Share information and best practices in areas such as policy and program design and implementation; capacity-building and development of expertise to foster innovation across all sectors; data gathering and usage; supply chain development; high labour standards and workforce training; electricity system modernisation; and government lead-by-example, sustainability, equity, and environmental justice	Provide guidance on government procurement opportunities and processes; develop a closer working relationship; discuss best practices for cooperation	Promoting research information exchange opportunities	Share information and best practices in areas such as policy and programme design and implementation, capacity-building, and development of expertise to foster growth and innovation across all sectors	Best Practice Exchange - share information and best practices in areas such as policy and programme design and implementation, capacity-building, and development of expertise to foster growth, inclusive trade, and innovation across all sectors	Best practice exchange - share information and best practices in areas such as policy and program design and implementation, capacity-building, and development of expertise to foster growth and innovation across all sectors	
	Private sector partnership development (6)		Facilitate introductions and partnerships among private sector companies to strengthen clean energy markets and increase competitiveness in domestic and global markets through meetings, worker exchange programs, and regional arrangements	Facilitate introductions and explore opportunities for public and private sector institutions to invest capital in sectors, including but not limited to, clean energy, infrastructure, real estate, life sciences (including healthtech), and advanced technology	Identifying opportunities for building partnerships between companies within the jurisdiction of each Participant	Facilitate introductions and partnerships among private sector companies, including small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) and women owned businesses	Facilitate introductions and partnerships among private sector companies, including small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) and women owned businesses	Facilitate introductions and partnerships among private sector companies through meetings, worker exchange programmes, and regional arrangements, with a particular focus on small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs)	

		<u>Indiana</u>	<u>North Carolina</u>	<u>South Carolina</u>	<u>Oklahoma</u>	<u>Utah</u>	<u>Washington State</u>	<u>Florida</u>	<u>Texas</u>
Means of cooperation and implementation	Capital investment (6)		Facilitate introductions and explore opportunities for public and private sector institutions to invest capital in sectors, including but not limited to clean energy, infrastructure, affordable housing, life sciences, and advanced technology	Facilitate introductions and explore opportunities for public and private sector institutions to invest capital in sectors, including but not limited to, clean energy, infrastructure, real estate, life sciences (including healthtech), and advanced technology	Exploring opportunities for public and private sector institutions to invest capital in sectors including but not limited to energy transition	Facilitate introductions and explore opportunities for public and private sector institutions to invest capital, whether direct or via third party funds, in areas including but not limited to renewable energy, life sciences, aerospace and fintech	Facilitate introductions and explore opportunities for public and private sector institutions to deploy development capital, whether directly or via third party funds, in areas including but not limited to; real estate and regeneration, energy and infrastructure, and clean energy technology; emerging technology; life sciences	Facilitate introductions and explore opportunities for public and private sector institutions to invest capital, whether directly or via third party funds. Signpost available incentives, resources, financing, and support available for businesses seeking to invest, including facilitating introductions with regional investment promotion agencies	This section is not present in this MoU
	Joint symposia, seminars, workshops, exhibitions, and training (5)	Carrying out specific projects, including technology and infrastructure demonstration projects	Collaborate on joint events such as symposia, seminars, workshops, exhibitions, and trainings			Joint projects and events - collaborate on joint events such as symposia, seminars, workshops, exhibitions, and trainings	Joint projects and events - collaborate on joint events such as symposia, seminars, workshops, exhibitions, and trainings	Joint projects and events - collaborate on joint events such as symposia, seminars, workshops, exhibitions, and trainings	
	Academic cooperation (5)	The Participants will work to promoting collaborative projects, research, information exchange and the sharing of best practice and expertise regarding innovation, with a particular focus on priority sectors whilst simultaneously ensuring that any collaboration should conform to proportionate standards of research security and integrity			Grow academic and research ties through promoting collaborative projects, research, information exchange and the sharing of best practice and expertise regarding innovation	Connect researchers, students, and thought leaders for information sharing, collaborations, and other types of co-operation whilst simultaneously ensuring that any collaboration should conform to proportionate standards of research security and integrity	Connect researchers, students, and thought leaders for information sharing, collaborations, and other types of co-operation whilst simultaneously ensuring that any collaboration should conform to proportionate standards of research security and integrity	Connect researchers, students, and thought leaders for information sharing, collaboration, and other types of co-operation, whilst simultaneously ensuring that any collaboration should conform to proportionate standards of research, security, and integrity	

		<u>Indiana</u>	<u>North Carolina</u>	<u>South Carolina</u>	<u>Oklahoma</u>	<u>Utah</u>	<u>Washington State</u>	<u>Florida</u>	<u>Texas</u>
Means of cooperation and implementation	Higher Education partnerships (1)		Connect researchers, students, and thought leaders for information sharing, collaborations, and other types of cooperation						This section is not present in this MoU
	Social media campaign (1)				As part of each annual meeting, including the inaugural meeting, the British Consulate-General, Houston and the State of Oklahoma will develop a social media campaign to promote the tourism and commercial opportunities in Oklahoma				
Government procurement	Simple guidance to vendors on applicable government procurement opportunities and processes			Provide guidance to vendors seeking information regarding applicable government procurement opportunities and processes					
	US state will work to offer UK suppliers treatment no less favourable than that to suppliers from a state not bordering with the US state in question.	Indiana will actively work towards offering the United Kingdom's suppliers treatment no less favourable than that afforded to suppliers from a state not bordering Indiana, including state level preferences							The State of Texas will endeavour to offer the United Kingdom's suppliers treatment no less favourable than US suppliers

		<u>Indiana</u>	<u>North Carolina</u>	<u>South Carolina</u>	<u>Oklahoma</u>	<u>Utah</u>	<u>Washington State</u>	<u>Florida</u>	<u>Texas</u>
Government procurement	Prioritising and advancing opportunities in their government procurement processes	The Participants will prioritise and advance opportunities in their government procurement processes within the Working Group framework	Prioritising and advancing opportunities in their government procurement processes						
	Both parties reaffirm their existing obligations under the Revised World Trade Organization Agreement on Government Procurement (WTO GPA)	The United Kingdom reaffirms its existing obligations under the World Trade Organisation Revised Agreement on Government Procurement (WTO GPA)			Reaffirm their existing obligations under the Revised World Trade Organization Agreement on Government Procurement (WTO GPA)		Reaffirm their existing obligations under the revised World Trade Organization Agreement on Government Procurement (WTO GPA)	The Participants acknowledge the Revised World Trade Organization Agreement on Government Procurement (WTO GPA)	The Participants reaffirm their existing obligations under the World Trade Organisation Government Procurement Agreement ("WTO GPA")
	Explore opportunities to increase participation by private companies in the procurement markets of the US state and the UK				Explore opportunities to increase participation by private companies in the procurement markets of the United Kingdom and Oklahoma	The Participants will explore opportunities to increase participation by private companies in the procurement markets funded by the Government of the United Kingdom and the State of Utah	Explore opportunities to open access to markets covered in the WTO GPA and encourage private company participation in mutually acceptable government procurement markets of the United Kingdom and Washington	Encourage private company participation in mutually acceptable government procurement markets of the United Kingdom and the State of Florida	Intend to explore opportunities to open access to markets covered in the WTO GPA and encourage private company participation in mutually acceptable government procurement markets of the United Kingdom and the State of Texas

The colours in the table represent the following in relation to the text in the paper: green - information discussed in the text, yellow - information referenced in the text, white - information not discussed in the text, and red - information not discussed, but important to highlight

References

¹ Department for Business and Trade and the Rt Hon Kemi Badenoch MP , [UK and Florida sign pact to boost trade](#), November 2023

² Lawbite, [What is a Memorandum of Understanding?](#), July 2023

³ Department for Business and Trade, [UK MOUs with US states on economic cooperation and trade relations](#), December 2022

⁴ State of Maine, Office of Governor Janet T.Mills, [Maine and United Kingdom Sign Agreement to Advance Partnership on Clean Energy, Climate Change](#), December 2020

⁵ BritishAmerican Business, [Taking Trade Local - The Business Case for State-Level Trade and Investment Cooperation](#), April 2023

⁶ Deloitte, [I'll be there for MoU?](#), July 2023

⁷ Department for Business and Trade, [UK and State of North Carolina hold Third Working Group Meeting](#), February 2024

⁸ Department for Business and Trade, [UK and South Carolina State hold inaugural Working Group meeting](#), June 2023

⁹ Department for International Trade and Department for Business and Trade, [UK and Oklahoma hold inaugural Working Group meeting](#), October 2023

¹⁰ Department for Business and Trade, [UK and the State of Utah Hold Inaugural Working Group Meeting](#), December 2023

¹¹ Department for Business and Trade, [Policy paper - Memorandum of Understanding on trade co-operation, innovation and clean energy between the Washington State and the United Kingdom](#), September 2023

¹² International Trade Administration, [United Kingdom - Country Commercial Guide](#), March 2023

¹³ World Trade Organization, [Integrated Government Procurement Market Access Information \(e-GPA\) Portal](#)

¹⁴ BritishAmerican Business, [Taking Trade Local - The Business Case for State-Level Trade and Investment Cooperation](#), April 2023

¹⁵ Northern Ireland Chamber of Commerce and Industry, [NI Chamber confirms new strategic alliance in USA](#), March 2024

¹⁶ HM Treasury, [The Harrington Review of Foreign Direct Investment](#), November 2023

¹⁷ Department for Business and Trade, [UK MOUs with US states on economic cooperation and trade relations](#), December 2022

¹⁸ Center for Strategic & International Studies, [An Innovative Trade Strategy- U.S. States Strike Individual MoU's with the U.K. Government](#)

**This report has been produced as part of the
BAB Policy Trade Sub-Committee workstream.**

To learn more, contact:



Francesca Lentini
Policy Manager
BritishAmerican Business
flentini@babinc.org

GB-NON-07439.



Proudly part of



BritishAmerican Business is the leading transatlantic trade association incorporating the British-American Chamber of Commerce in the US and the American Chamber of Commerce in the UK.

We are committed to strengthening the economic corridor between the United States and the United Kingdom by supporting policies and actions that protect and enhance the environment for transatlantic trade and investment on behalf of our members.

We convene and serve a growing network of companies and business leaders through networking opportunities, bespoke programming and marketing platforms.

We actively promote trade and investment and support those who make the transatlantic corridor part of their business growth ambition.

For more information, please visit www.babinc.org

**March 2024
BritishAmerican Business
www.babinc.org**