

Middle East and North Africa countries' agricultural export potentials under trade reforms

Tsakiridou, Efthimia; Somwaru, Agapi; Mattas, Konstadinos

Postprint / Postprint

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

www.peerproject.eu

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Tsakiridou, E., Somwaru, A., & Mattas, K. (2010). Middle East and North Africa countries' agricultural export potentials under trade reforms. *Applied Economics*, 42(12), 1591-1599. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00036840701721497>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter dem "PEER Licence Agreement zur Verfügung" gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zum PEER-Projekt finden Sie hier: <http://www.peerproject.eu> Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

Terms of use:

This document is made available under the "PEER Licence Agreement". For more information regarding the PEER-project see: <http://www.peerproject.eu> This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.



Middle East and North Africa Countries' Agricultural Export Potentials under Trade Reforms

Journal:	<i>Applied Economics</i>
Manuscript ID:	APE-06-0821.R1
Journal Selection:	Applied Economics
Date Submitted by the Author:	31-Jul-2007
Complete List of Authors:	TSAKIRIDOU, EFTHIMIA; ARISTOTLE UNIVERSITY OF THESSALONIKI, AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS Somwaru, Agapi; Economic Research Service, USDA MATTAS, KONSTADINOS; ARISTOTLE UNIVERSITY OF THESSALONIKI, AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS
JEL Code:	F15 - Economic Integration & F1 - Trade & F - International Economics, F19 - Other & F1 - Trade & F - International Economics, F40 - General & F4 - Macroeconomic Aspects of International Trade and Finance & F - International Economics, N55 - Asia including Middle East & N5 - Agriculture, Natural Resources, Environment, and Extractive Industries & N - Economic History, N57 - Africa Oceania & N5 - Agriculture, Natural Resources, Environment, and Extractive Industries & N - Economic History
Keywords:	TRADE REFORM, MENA COUNTRIES, MEDITERRANEAN COUNTRIES, AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS, TRADE AGREEMENTS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



For Peer Review

Middle East and North Africa Countries' Agricultural Export Potentials under Trade Reforms

1. Introduction

Middle East and North Africa (MENA)¹ countries, amid a globalized and changed world, could significantly contribute to tackle the world's upheavals of today – illegal immigration, economic stagnation, political unrest, public's uproar – providing that their own course to economic growth and stability is ensured. Since 1995, the EU has acknowledged this important universal role of MENA countries, by the so called Barcelona agreement and attempted to expand its trade and relations to this particular region. Strengthening the vital economic sectors of MENA countries via free trade safeguards a steady development course for the whole region. Agriculture, a major economic component and employment provider for all MENA countries, constitutes, perhaps, an important economic sector². At large, MENA countries concentrate on exporting agricultural products, in particular fruits-vegetables-olive oil or cotton and wheat. Though intra-MENA trade constitutes a significant part of their transactions, "extra" trade is taking place mainly between MENA countries and EU, roughly half of MENA countries exports target the EU and a significant part of their imports originates from EU too (Achy and Sekat, 2003).

Forthcoming trade reforms, either in a global, WTO, or a regional level, EU-Med Partnership (Kniper and dell' Aquila, 2004) can substantially influence MENA countries' export orientation, and subsequently, the pace of their economic growth. EU-Med Association Agreements, of great importance for MENA countries, were

1
2
3 established in 1995, summit of Barcelona³, and a new roadmap was drafted in
4
5 November 2005. According to this roadmap, a detailed evolution plan of trade
6
7 liberalization will be negotiated, started in 2006, between the EU and Mediterranean
8
9 Partner Countries.
10
11

12
13
14
15 Trade liberalization is strictly related to changes in employment and economic growth
16
17 rates and in relative prices (Martin, 2004). The effects of the liberalization on MENA
18
19 countries have attracted the interest of several scholars (Augier and Gasiorek, 2003;
20
21 Nabli and Veganzones-Varoudakis, 2004; Abu-Qarn and Abu-Bader, 2004; Siliverstovs
22
23 and Herzer, 2007), while the agricultural export performance have not considered in
24
25 particular. However, in non-MENA countries, trade liberalization and the impact on
26
27 agricultural sector have been introduced (Hertel, 1999; Hertel et al, 2000; Gohin and
28
29 Meyers, 2002; Keeney and Hertel, 2005; Valenzuela et al, 2006). The premise in this
30
31 work is that agricultural exports form the underpinnings to build up smoothly and
32
33 gradually the rest of the economic sectors, as it can refrain huge labor force and foster
34
35 regional development. Thus, a particular focus is given on agricultural exports.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43
44 The purpose of this work is to assess the likely impacts due to undergoing trade reforms,
45
46 WTO or EU-Med agreements, upon the MENA countries with a particular emphasis on
47
48 agricultural trade. Several trade reform options are studied using a global trade model. A
49
50 global analysis of this type provides insights into various agricultural trade options and
51
52 indicates what the potential effects on MENA countries would be, both positive and
53
54 negative.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 To understand the potential effects and to trace out probable directions of the expected
7
8 changes, three distinct scenarios were defined from a broader spectrum of anticipated
9
10 trade reforms. Certainly, the examined scenarios do not represent the real pace of WTO
11
12 or EU-Med partnership reforms in terms of details in application and needed time span
13
14 to be completed. Nevertheless, the scenarios can serve the goals and the focus of this
15
16 work to provide a policy supporting base. The three scenarios to be examined are the
17
18 following: first, global trade reform (scenario - 1) elimination of all tariffs on
19
20 agricultural imports and subsidies on agricultural exports throughout the world is
21
22 assumed; second, EU and MENA trade agreement (scenario - 2) removal of all trade
23
24 barriers on agricultural products is achieved; third, MENA special provisions (scenario -
25
26 3) agricultural exports of MENA countries face no trade barriers but MENA countries
27
28 maintain their barriers to agricultural imported goods (non-reciprocity), an option that
29
30 can be granted to developing countries in a WTO agreement.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 In the next section the methodology and data are briefly presented, while in section three
40
41 the results of the various trade reform scenarios are given. Finally, in the sections to
42
43 follow, the effect of bilateral trade agreements between MENA countries and EU are
44
45 explored. The paper ends up with the main conclusions and implications.
46
47
48
49

50 **2. Methodology and data**

51
52 Computable general equilibrium model (CGE)⁴, a widely followed approach in trade
53
54 analysis, and GTAP global database (1997) were used (McDougall et al, 1998;
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Tongzong, 2001) to cast the trade reform impacts. An overview of the GTAP model is
4
5 analytically described by Hertel and Tsigas (1997) The (CGE) model was developed by
6
7 Diao et al. (2001), and details are not provided here as can be easily found in the relative
8
9 literature. The CGE model is global in the sense that all regions of the world are
10
11 included, and production and consumption decisions in each region follow behavior that
12
13 is consistent with economic theory. Trade flows among regions are multilateral and
14
15 world prices are determined by world market clearing conditions or, in other words,
16
17 excess demand for each commodity in the world is zero. The general equilibrium feature
18
19 of the model means that resources can move among sectors, securing consistent changes
20
21 among all sectors (Diao and Somwaru, 2001). Thus, adjustments in the livestock sector,
22
23 for example, are consistent with adjustments in the feed grains sector.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 The assumption that labor and capital are mobile between agriculture and non-
33
34 agricultural sectors is introduced. Relaxing this assumption would slow the supply
35
36 response from countries having a comparative advantage in world agricultural markets
37
38 causing world agricultural prices to rise more than the predicted increase in this analysis.
39
40 Moreover, the assumption that labor is fully employed places upward pressure on prices,
41
42 since abundant labor is likely in MENA countries, supply response can occur at a lower
43
44 cost.
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 A “base” scenario was developed initially to represent a stylized view of agricultural
52
53 production and trade in the world under current trade policies. First, a global trade
54
55 reform scenario was simulated (scenario - 1). In this scenario, all tariffs and export
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 subsidies on agricultural imports are eliminated, while other agricultural policies remain
4 unchanged. Second, EU and MENA countries trade agreement (scenario - 2), a bilateral
5 regional trade agreement, removing all trade barriers on agricultural products is
6 established. In this scenario, the benefit/loss with global trade reform is contrasted.
7
8 Finally, MENA countries are treated specially and differentially under the provisions in
9 the Agreement on Agriculture for developing countries (scenario-3). In this scenario,
10 trade policies of MENA countries remain in place while MENA countries do not make
11 tariff concessions, given the region's economic development status. Implementation of
12 special and differential treatment would help industrial development and export
13 promotion efforts of MENA countries.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 Four indicators were used to assess the effects of agricultural liberalization on each
30 country/region. These are: (a) changes in world agricultural prices, (b) changes in the
31 volume of world agricultural trade, (c) changes in exports and imports, and (d) changes
32 in welfare and gross domestic product. The analysis is based on the 1998 levels of
33 applied agricultural tariffs, domestic support and export subsidies, and the use of tariff
34 rate quotas. Caveats need to be noted. First, tariff rates and tariff equivalent rates are
35 based on the 1998 data. Since tariff reductions have been undertaken by many countries
36 after 1998, and since the bound rates are much higher than the applied rates in many
37 cases, the analysis may overestimate the extent of tariff reduction that would take effect
38 after 2000 for some countries. In this situation, the analysis may overestimate the extent
39 of all import barriers.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

3. Global Trade Reform (Scenario - 1)

Though this is a very extreme and unrealistic scenario, assumed that all tariffs on agricultural imports and subsidies on agricultural exports worldwide are eliminated, it can provide valuable information on the direction of anticipated changes in a completely free trade for agricultural commodities.

From a theoretical point of view, restricting imports in the *import-protecting* countries causes domestic consumers to face higher food prices than world prices and to employ more resources in agriculture. Eliminating import tariffs will induce a demand rise for agricultural imported goods and a supply drop of domestic produced products, placing upward pressure on world agricultural prices. This upward pressure in turn induces agricultural exporting countries to increase production. This is in line with the results, as the level of world agricultural prices rises by 11.6 per cent relative to the level of world non-agricultural prices, the worldwide agricultural production increases by 1.15 per cent and the trade flows in value and volume increase by 40 and 23 per cent, respectively.

The well-accepted equivalent variation (often referred to as the willingness to pay) is used to measure the social welfare gains or losses due to trade liberalization. One-time welfare effects are considered. The one-time effects are measured by using the status-quo (pre-reform) prices as the base, and address the question: what income would be equivalent to the change brought about by the trade liberalization (Varian, 1984). The

1
2
3 welfare effects over time are measured by summing the discounted value of this
4
5
6 measure over time.
7

8
9
10 Welfare effects of trade reform suggest that consumers can be worse off if the country's
11
12 terms of trade deteriorate following liberalization. That is, if the prices of the goods a
13
14 country exports fall relative to the prices of goods the country imports, then consumers
15
16 can be adversely affected since their expenditures on imported goods increase while
17
18 their income from exported goods falls.
19
20

21
22
23 As table 1 shows, most countries, but MENA countries, experience an increase in
24
25 welfare measured by changes in GDP and equivalent variation that accounts for the
26
27 welfare gains or losses due to agricultural trade liberalization. The negative effect of
28
29 global trade reform on MENA welfare is mainly caused by erosion in the preferential
30
31 treatment by the EU. EU has granted special trade preferences to the MENA countries.
32
33 After worldwide reform, MENA countries may experience a welfare loss because they
34
35 suffer a decline in demand for agricultural goods that would have been exported to the
36
37 EU. In other words, MENA countries will experience deterioration in their terms of
38
39 trade as a result of global reform in the agricultural sector (namely, net importers of
40
41 agricultural products).
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 Since trade liberalization enhances trade, growth in agriculture trade is expected
52
53 worldwide. Indeed, model results indicate that world agricultural trade increases
54
55 substantially after liberalization. Removal of all agricultural trade protection worldwide
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 results in an increase in the value of world agricultural trade by almost forty per cent
4
5 (Table 1).
6
7
8
9

10 Trade flows by country/region will be substantially influenced as provided in table 2.
11
12 Australia, New Zealand, the EU, the U.S., and Japan will benefit the most from export
13
14 growth. Value changes in exports will reach almost fifty per cent for the EU and the
15
16 U.S.. MENA countries' exports will rise by 29.57 per cent. Changes in agricultural
17
18 import values depict a very different story from that of exports as the highest increase in
19
20 imports occurs in MENA countries, followed by Japan and the EU. As the paper focuses
21
22 on MENA countries, table 3 presents changes in commodity trade flow for twelve
23
24 agricultural commodity/aggregates.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 For MENA countries, vegetables, fruits, and olive oil products are of paramount
33
34 importance and changes in exports / imports in those sectors would play a significant
35
36 role in the agricultural economy of the MENA region. Under scenario - 1 exports and
37
38 imports of vegetables and fruits, in value terms, increase by 28 and 148 per cent,
39
40 respectively. Almost the same pattern is followed by olive oil products where the
41
42 increase in imports counterbalances the increase in exports.
43
44
45
46
47

48 Looking at export / import changes of agricultural products under this scenario, the
49
50 effects are devastating for the economy. The imports increase outweighs the exports
51
52 increase for all agricultural products. Thus, an abrupt liberalization of the agricultural
53
54 trade may bring the whole economy to disarray, since the agricultural sector will suffer
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the most. In this respect, pursuing a gradual liberalization in agricultural markets may
4
5 ease the negative effects.
6
7
8
9

10 **4. EU and MENA Trade Agreement (Scenario - 2)**

11
12 Under this scenario, the EU and MENA countries sign a bilateral regional agreement,
13
14 abolishing all current trade barriers on agricultural products. This scenario tries
15
16 somehow to depict the current EU-Med agreement roadmap in an abstracting way. In
17
18 accordance with the Barcelona agreement, and the follow-up agreements, this is the
19
20 ultimate goal that may come into effect in 2010 or afterwards.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 From an economic point of view, this scenario can be classified as a regional or bilateral
30
31 agreement. Two main changes in the trade are expected, the “trade creation” and the
32
33 “trade diversion”. Trade creation occurs if the agreement permits efficient producers in
34
35 one member country to sell into a previously protected neighbouring market without
36
37 affecting the exports of more efficient non-members. When trade-creation occurs,
38
39 capital and other factors of production are reallocated toward more efficient uses, raising
40
41 the returns to those factors and improving the overall economic welfare of members.
42
43 Countries outside a trade-creation agreement could benefit as well, if the efficiency and
44
45 welfare gains in member countries generate trade and growth opportunities for non-
46
47 members. Trade-diversion, on the other hand, causes importers to switch from more
48
49 efficient suppliers outside the agreement to less efficient suppliers within the agreement,
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1
2
3
4
5
6 MENA countries are expected to gain from the trade-creation effects of a regional
7
8 agreement with the EU. Factors of production would be reallocated within the MENA
9
10 countries economy towards the more competitive sectors, as producers take advantage
11
12 of the new export opportunities and as imports rise to challenge the less competitive
13
14 sectors. The less competitive sectors of the MENA countries would decline, but gains in
15
16 the competitive sectors would offset those losses.
17
18

19
20
21
22 Under this scenario world prices of agricultural products increase by 4.2 per cent while
23
24 worldwide trade in value and volume increases by 1.46 and 0.92, respectively. As
25
26 expected, welfare in EU and MENA countries, would increase minimally. Trade flows
27
28 between EU and MENA countries increase both in value and volume, that is trade
29
30 creation, while trade diversion may result in the countries outside the agreement (table
31
32 2, second column). What is worth noting is that the rate of exports increase is higher for
33
34 the MENA countries than for the EU, backing the premise that EU-Med agreements can
35
36 boost their agricultural exports.
37
38
39
40
41
42

43
44 As the results of this scenario reflect to a large extent the expected changes due to
45
46 completion of Barcelona roadmap, the results in table 3 shed light on the mix of
47
48 agricultural trade. The main agricultural production of the MENA countries, that is
49
50 fruits, vegetables and olive oil, benefit substantially from liberalizing agricultural trade.
51
52 This change is expected to have spillover effects on the whole economy of MENA
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 countries and in particular on the food processing industry, associated with the
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

countries and in particular on the food processing industry, associated with the
aforementioned commodities.

5. MENA Special Provisions (Scenario - 3)

The Uruguay Round Agreements contain special provisions for developing countries that can be granted to them, among other things, long and gradual phase-in periods for their commitments and fewer obligations in some sectors (The World Bank, 2003). As a consequence, and in order to glean the full benefits from trade openness or trade reforms, MENA countries can take advantage of the market access provisions and adopt adjustments designed to improve their supply response. The trade impact of the reductions in tariff levels on the exports of any one individual MENA country depends on the treatment granted to its products by the importing countries (Michalek, 2005).

In order to evaluate the impact of export potentials of MENA countries, under this scenario, it is allowed MENA countries' exports to face duty-free trade status. As expected, agricultural exports of MENA countries' are grown. Results (table 2) reveal that MENA countries' trade flows increase the most. MENA countries' exports (value) would increase by 35.10 per cent and imports by 25.19 per cent. In other words, special provisions treatment induces MENA countries' trade more than in case of scenario 1 or 2. It is clear from the results of this scenario, that MENA countries benefit the most as they are granted a preferential treatment in the world trade. As it could have been

1
2
3 expected, the welfare gains are minimal, though that a slight increase in the world trade
4
5 was registered (Table 1).
6
7
8
9

10 Furthermore, a glance at the results in table 3 reveals that for the most of agricultural
11 products a significant export upsurge was recorded. Having in mind that table 3 reflects
12 percentage changes, it can be deduced that increase in vegetables and fruits exports
13 will induce the expansion of the whole sector. This increase will be very conducive for
14 the whole economy of the MENA countries, as agricultural activities, in particular fruits
15 and vegetables, employ the vast majority of the population.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 **6. Concluding remarks**

28
29
30
31 Over the last years, MENA countries have attracted the focus of the EU as they present
32 a close and growing market and they maintain huge population reserves, not to mention
33 energy reserves too, that can serve to the EU's consumption and production engine.
34 Thus, EU very early (1995) engaged in negotiations with Mediterranean countries and
35 signed the EU-Med partnership agreements, aiming at strengthening the bilateral trade
36 and developing the whole Mediterranean area. In line with this agreement, enhancing the
37 EU-MENA countries trade is the larger strategic and prior perspective; but the particular
38 importance of agriculture in retaining the labor surpluses and boosting the development
39 of close related sectors, food and processing industry must not be undermined. The
40 agriculture trade between MENA countries and the EU is of a great importance, as more
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 than half of their exports are destined to the EU and a significant part of their imports
4
5 originates from EU too.
6
7
8
9

10 The trade liberalization process either through EU-Med agreement or WTO could cause
11
12 substantial changes upon MENA countries trade, growth and welfare. With particular
13
14 focus on agricultural trade, a Global CGE model was employed to trace out probable
15
16 impacts of alternative trade liberalization options on MENA countries. Since trade
17
18 relations through time can be influenced by several non-measurable and unforeseen
19
20 factors, the assessment of trade liberalization impacts, beyond being a laborious task, is
21
22 a complex process. Nevertheless, the application of this modeling process can be proven
23
24 conducive to the discussion of future policy reforms on the base of sound empirical
25
26 results.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 The modeling proceeds first by developing a “base” scenario to represent a stylized
35
36 view of agricultural production and trade in the world under the current trade policies.
37
38 Then, the modeling carries on by building up a global trade reform scenario, where all
39
40 tariffs and export subsidies on agricultural commodities are eliminated, a full
41
42 liberalization scenario. Same process is repeated by simulating a scenario that represents
43
44 somehow the EU-Med agreements. According to this scenario, all trade barriers upon
45
46 agricultural commodities between the EU and MENA countries are removed. Finally,
47
48 the last scenario roughly represents WTO agreements, where preferential provisions are
49
50 granted to developing countries, exports from MENA countries face no trade barriers
51
52 while barriers to imports remain intact.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 As expected, results reveal that trade volume, welfare and production of MENA
7
8 countries are substantially influenced by the liberalization scenarios. The direction of
9
10 ensuing changes, and changes magnitude to a certain extent, varies significantly among
11
12 the three formulated scenarios. Thus, results can signal valuable indications to EU and
13
14 MENA countries policy makers on the pursued trade and integration policies. In
15
16 particular, scenario - 3, MENA countries were granted special provisions, proved to be
17
18 the most beneficial for them, followed by scenario - 2, reflecting the EU-Med
19
20 agreements. Regarding the gains in terms of exports, both scenario - 2 and scenario - 3
21
22 could induce a substantial export growth.
23
24
25
26
27
28

29
30 Finally, export/import flows of agricultural commodities are cast by the model in each
31
32 and every assumed scenario. Again, scenario – 2 and scenario – 3 yield the most
33
34 favorable outcome for vegetables and fruits, and olive oil products, the most vital
35
36 agricultural commodities for the MENA countries. Exports increase in the
37
38 aforementioned commodities would foster the agricultural economy and could bring
39
40 about spillover effects on the local food and processing industry. Sequentially, the
41
42 drafted roadmap by the EU-Med agreements seems to be beneficial for both the EU and
43
44 MENA countries and can serve as a safe pace towards further trade liberalization.
45
46
47
48
49

50 **Notes**

51 ¹ Turkey, Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, Egypt, Lebanon, Libya, Syria, Israel, Gaza Strip
52 and West Bank, and Jordan.
53

54
55 ² The Average Agriculture's share for MENA countries in the GDP and Exports exceeds
56 the 10 per cent.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

³ The so-called Barcelona Agreement is implemented through Association Agreements with each one of the Mediterranean Partner Countries, and the aim of this Agreement is the formation of a Free Trade Area after 2010.

⁴ Model is documented in DiaO and Somwaru (2002) and short description is provided in the Appendix.

For Peer Review

References

Abu-Qarn, A.S. and S. Abu-Bader (2004) The validity of the ELG hypothesis in the MENA region: cointegration and error correction model analysis, *Applied Economics*, **36**, 1685-1695.

Achy, L. and K. Sekkat (2003) The European Single Currency and MENA's Exports to Europe, *Review of Development Economics*, **7(4)**, 563-582.

Augier, P. and M. Gasiorek (2003) The welfare implications of trade liberalization between the Southern Mediterranean and the EU, *Applied Economics*, **35**, 1171-1190.

Diao, X., T. Roe and A. Somwaru (2002) Developing Country Interests in Agricultural Reforms Under the World Trade Organization, *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, **84(August)**, 782-790.

Diao, X. and A. Somwaru (2001) A Dynamic Evaluation of the Effects of A Free trade Area of the Americas – An Intertemporal, Global General Equilibrium Model, *Journal of Regional Integration*, **16(1)**, 21-47.

Diao, X., A. Somwaru, and T. Roe (2001) A Global Analysis of Agricultural Reform in WTO Member Countries, in *Agricultural Policy Reform in the WTO: The Road Ahead*, USDA/ERS Agricultural Economic Report No. 802:25-40.

Gohin, A. and C. Meyers (2002) The phasing out of export subsidies: Impacts on EU agriculture, paper prepared for the International Conference on Policy Modelling (EcoMod 2002), Brussels, July 4-6, 2002.

1
2
3 Hertel, T.W. (1999) Applied General Equilibrium Analysis of Agricultural and
4 Resource Policies, Staff paper 99-2, Dept. of Agricultural Economics, Purdue
5 University.
6
7
8
9

10 Hertel, T.W., Anderson, K., Francois, J. F. and Martin, W. (2000) Agriculture and non-
11 agricultural liberalization in the Millenium Round, CIES discussion paper 0016.
12
13

14 Hertel, T.W. and M.E. Tsigas (1997) Structure of GTAP, published in T.W. Hertel (ed.),
15 Global Trade Analysis: Modeling and Applications, Cambridge University Press, 1997.
16
17

18 Keeney, R. and T.W. Hertel (2005) GTAP-AGR: A Framework for Assessing the
19 Implications of Multilateral Changes in Agricultural Policies, GTAP Technical Paper
20 No.24.
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 Kniper, M. and C. dell'Aquila (2004) Euro-Mediterranean Partnership: State of affairs
28 and key policy and research issues, Report 6.04.10, Agricultural Economics Research
29 Institute (LEI), The Hague.
30
31
32
33

34 Martin, I. (2004) The Social Impact of Euro-Mediterranean Free Trade Areas: A First
35 Approach with Special Reference to the Case of Morocco, *Mediterranean Politics*, **9(3)**,
36 422-458.
37
38
39
40

41 McDougall, R., A. Elbehri and T. Truong (1998) Global Trade, Assistance, and
42 Protection: The GTAP 4 Data Base, Center for Global Trade Analysis, Purdue
43 University. West Lafayette, IN.
44
45
46
47

48 Michalek, J. (2005) Comparative Analysis of Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) for
49 Central and Eastern European Countries' and Mediterranean Partner Countries' Exports
50 to the EU, FEMISE, FEM 22-03, Femise 2 network.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Nabli, M.K. and M-A. Veganzones-Varoudakis (2004) How does exchange rate policy
4 affect manufactured exports in MENA countries?, *Applied Economics*, **36(19)**, 2209-
5
6 2219.
7
8

9
10 Siliverstovs, B. and D. Herzer (2007) Manufacturing exports, mining exports and
11 growth: cointegration and causality analysis for Chile (1960-2001), *Applied Economics*,
12
13 **39(2)**, 153-167.
14
15

16
17 The World Bank (2003) MENA Development Report Better Governance for
18 Development in the Middle-East and North Africa.
19

20
21 Tongzon, J.L. (2001) China's membership in the World Trade Organization (WTO) and
22 the exports of the developing economies of East Asia: a computable general equilibrium
23 approach, *Applied Economics*, 33(15), 1943-1959.
24
25
26

27
28 Valenzuela, E., Anderson, K. and T.W. Hertel (2006) Impacts of Trade Reform:
29 Sensitivity of GTAP Results to Modeling Assumptions, paper prepared for the 9th
30 Annual Conference on Global Economic Analysis, UN Conference Centre, Addis
31 Ababa, 15-17 June
32
33
34
35
36
37

38
39 Varian, Hal R. (1984) *Microeconomic Analysis*, Second Edition, New York and
40 London: W.W. Norton & Company.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. MENA trade liberalization options: impacts on world production, GDP and welfare

	Scenario - 1 Global trade reform	Scenario - 2 Regional trade agreement	Scenario - 3 MENA: special provisions
	% change from the base year (1998)		
World trade value	39.73	1.46	3.34
World trade volume	23.32	0.92	2.12
<i>GDP (real terms)</i>			
Australia/New Zealand	0.53	0	0.02
Japan	0.09	0	0.00
United States	0.04	0	0.00
EU	0.08	0	0.00
MENA	-0.74	0	-0.01
Rest of the Americas	0.14	0	0.01
Rest of the World	-0.06	0	0.00
<i>Welfare</i>			
Australia/New Zealand	0.6783	-0.0033	0.03
Japan	0.2914	0.0005	0.00
United States	0.0429	-0.0004	0.00
EU	0.136	0.0090	0.01
MENA	-0.1514	0.1239	0.28
Rest of the Americas	0.2285	-0.0027	0.01
Rest of the World	0.1673	-0.0013	0.01

Table 2. MENA trade liberalization options: impacts on trade flows by

	Scenario - 1 Global trade reform	Scenario - 2 Regional trade agreement	Scenario - 3 MENA: special provisions
	% change from the base year (1998)		
<i>Exports in value</i>			
Australia/New Zealand	57.69	-0.21	2.26
Japan	35.65	-0.09	0.70
United States	44.78	-0.18	2.02
EU	44.00	5.10	4.32
MENA	29.57	16.26	35.10
Rest of the Americas	32.08	-0.23	1.65
Rest of the World	34.50	-0.28	1.48
<i>Exports in volume</i>			
Australia/New Zealand	35.14	-0.15	1.51
Japan	28.18	-0.06	0.47
United States	27.32	-0.12	1.29
EU	20.70	3.25	2.77
MENA	20.06	10.25	22.17
Rest of the Americas	18.97	-0.15	1.00
Rest of the World	21.34	-0.19	0.94
<i>Imports in value</i>			
Australia/New Zealand	18.69	-0.03	0.53
Japan	58.85	0.00	0.86
United States	16.66	0.00	0.40
EU	26.68	2.06	2.01
MENA	67.16	10.68	25.19
Rest of the Americas	31.84	-0.02	0.35
Rest of the World	45.95	0.01	1.16
<i>Imports in volume</i>			
Australia/New Zealand	11.72	-0.02	0.36
Japan	34.41	0.00	0.49
United States	10.23	0.00	0.24
EU	17.03	1.29	1.28
MENA	36.20	6.69	16.05
Rest of the Americas	19.70	-0.01	0.25
Rest of the World	27.01	0.01	0.75

Table 3. MENA trade liberalization options: commodity trade flows

	Scenario - 1 Global trade reform	Scenario - 2 Regional trade agreement	Scenario - 3 MENA: special provisions
	% change from the base year (1998)		
Exports value			
Food grains	92.96	39.07	137.97
Feed grains	35.71	26.67	46.38
Vegetables&Fruits	27.89	17.64	32.28
Oilseeds*	10.17	0.27	18.87
Other crops	14.89	1.95	16.81
Cattle	42.81	34.01	54.65
Other animals	15.88	8.65	17.48
Processed meat	70.40	50.85	79.79
Other processed meat	107.55	21.16	128.84
Processed oil	14.24	13.24	18.66
Other processed food	41.40	23.59	49.04
Beverages&Tobacco	16.18	5.12	22.18
Fishing	1.05	0.24	0.37
Non agricultural	1.23	0.15	0.36
Imports value			
Food grains	53.29	3.18	22.38
Feed grains	33.22	3.53	16.74
Vegetables&Fruits	148.43	9.89	46.25
Oilseeds*	30.80	0.37	14.43
Other crops	23.04	1.57	11.00
Cattle	76.18	15.55	29.80
Other animals	21.40	6.14	10.95
Processed meat	145.49	18.04	47.17
Other processed meat	117.34	19.61	37.29
Processed oil	28.30	2.09	13.03
Other processed food	63.54	17.44	26.57
Beverages&Tobacco	210.95	25.58	56.55
Fishing	-5.21	-0.45	-1.03
Non agricultural	-4.72	-0.39	-1.04

*Oilseeds includes: soybeans, olives and other oil producing crops.

Appendix:

The model developed in this study is based on the neoclassical growth theory, and is a static CGE model with a multi-regional and multi-sectoral specification.

Consumption/savings: In each region the representative household owns land, labor and all financial wealth (defined below) to seek to maximize utility. For reasons of simplicity, we assume no independent government investment. Government spends all its tax revenues on consumption or on transfers to households and, hence, fiscal deficits are ignored. The household's utility is:

$$MAX u(TC_n) \quad (1)$$

TC_n , which is the aggregate consumption generated from final goods, is as follows:

$$TC_n = \prod_i C_{ni}^{a_{ni}} \quad (2)$$

where C_{ni} is final good i in region n , and $\sum_i a_{ni} = 1$. The household in each region maximizes (1) subject to a budget constraint:

$$Ptc_n TC_n \leq [(1 - ld_n)wld_n + (1 - lbt_n)wlb_n LB_n + TI_n] \quad (3)$$

where Ptc_n is consumer price index; wld_n is the land rental rate, wlb_n is the wage rate; TI_n is the lump sum transfer of government revenues; ld_n and lbt_n are household land and labor income tax, respectively.

Households allocate their total income flows, including financial and non-financial, between consumption and savings. The current budget constraint for the household is:

$$SAV_n = (1 - ldt_n)wld_n + LD_n + (1 - lbt_n)wlb_n LB_n + TI_n + (1 - kt_n)wk_n K_n - Ptc_n TC_n \quad (4)$$

where SAV_n is n -th region's household savings; wk_n is the current capital rental price and kt_n is the capital income tax rate; and $Ptc_n TC_n$ are total consumption expenditures.

The traditional Armington functions are all specified. For consumers or investors, goods imported from abroad or produced domestically are not identical. This imperfect substitution relation is reflected with an Armingtonian constant elasticity substitution (CES) function. Furthermore, it can be assumed that the goods consumed by consumers and used for investment are different and there are different substitution elasticities for goods produced at home and imported from abroad. To simplify the analysis, we assume that the composite goods used for consumption or for investment are same goods. Composite goods are also used as intermediate inputs in each production sector.