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Cotton sector was the first to recover after crises in 1990s

Cotton outpaced other sectors in agriculture by 7 years

Total agriculture and cotton production indices, 1993=100%
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.. and performed even better than the grain sector

- planted area under cotton is higher than in soviet times – which is not true for grains
Cotton industry used to be the only example of vertical coordination use in Kazakhstan.
Contracts

• Cotton traders introduced forward contract scheme
• To avoid market risks, price was linked to world price:

\[ \text{Price} = (\text{P}_L - 26\%) - \text{P}_P \times Q \]

- Price – price per 1 ton of raw cotton
- \text{P}_L – Liverpool Cotton Association price
- 26\% – delivery discount
- \text{P}_P – processing services price
- Q – cotton fiber conversion coefficient (quality)

Source: Formation and development of cotton market. Sh. Zhukabayeva. 2005
Traders used their market power to increase margins

Comparison of world and KZ cotton price

September Cotlook A Index, USD per ton
KZ raw cotton price, farmgate in cotton fiber equivalent, USD per ton

Source: own calculation based on Statistics Committee and National Cotton Council of America data
Traders used their market power to increase margins (continued)

Cotton price margin (Cotlook – KZ price), USD per ton

Source: own calculation based on Statistics Committee and National Cotton Council of America data
Legislation reasoning

• Following 46% price growth in 2003, producers extended area under crop
• In 2004, world price dropped by 12% and by 41% - Kazakhstan, i.e. ginneries increased their margin
• It led to farmers complaints on fairness of ginneries
• Government decided to put in order in cotton market and developed Law on Cotton sector development
• New law introduced the idea of cotton warehouse receipts, which showed good results in grain market
• Law was in line with overall political imperative to establish state-mandated industry clusters
Key features of the Law on Cotton sector development (July 21, 2007)

- Ginners were prohibited from engaging in business activities which were not related to warehouse services (*removed in 2015*);
- Ginners were prohibited from issuing guarantees and using their property as collateral under loan agreements with third parties;
- Cotton receipts were introduced;
- All ginners must participate in a guarantee scheme - cotton receipts guarantee scheme.
Distortion of supply chain
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Area has been shrinking despite positive market context

Source: own calculation based on Statistics Committee and National Cotton Council of America data
Export of cotton has been decreasing since 2007 and has become less responsive to world market signals.

Source: Committee of Statistics
by 2015, total sown area decreased by more than a half compared to 2004

Adoption of the Law

Soviet period:

90s: Growth up to 140 th. ha

2004: Record 220 th. ha

2015: Decrease by 55% compared to 2004

Source: Committee of Statistics
.. and even subsidies did not help

Source: OECD PSE database
Government intervention continued

2005  legislation on creation of SEZ Ontustik, specialized on textile industry. SEZ was expected to become a core of “textile cluster”, following M. Porters’ ideology. Plan was to attract US $1bn of investments, build 15 factories in three years,

2007  creation of KazMakhtta, subsidiary of state-owned Food Contract Corporation. Company was procuring, processing cotton and producing seeds. Intention was to intervene the market and provide “fair price” for farmers.

2011  First factory “Khlopkoprom-Tsellulosa” started operations in SEZ Ontustik

2015  Kazmakhta was sold to private investor

Change in cotton processing regulation
other factors could have influenced

- due to financial crises, interest rates have increased in 2008, that could have limited financing of producers
- but afterwards, rates dropped, which did not lead to restoration of the cotton industry
Main consequences of adoption of the Law: post-2007 trends in cotton industry

• Distortion of supply chain and financing system;
• Shrinking sown area and decreasing cotton output;
• Decreased processing capacity;
• Falling exports;
• Increase of government spending;
• Inefficiency of cotton receipts;
• Decrease of private investments in the sector.
Processing plants are operating at 33% of their total capacity - 12 out of 23 plants were operating in 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total number</th>
<th>Total capacity th. tons</th>
<th>Number of those who applied for working in 2015</th>
<th>Total capacity of those who applied for working in 2015, th. tons</th>
<th>Licensed ginners and CCC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ginners</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>274,5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton collecting centers (CCC)</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Akimat of Southern Kazakhstan oblast
Cotton receipts which should have provided cotton growers with the opportunities to obtain finance are ineffective in reality.

Source: KazAgroGarant
SEZ Ontustik performance

- Created in 2005, SEZ Ontustik was expected to become a core of “textile cluster”, following M. Porters’ ideology. Plan was to attract US $1bn of investments, build 15 factories in three years and process 100’000 tons of cotton annually.
- By 2015, 8 factories operational, worth US $144 mio investments, mostly backed by semi-government loans.
- In 2014 114 tons of local cotton was processed. SEZ management argue limitation on textile sector specialization.

Conclusions

• government pro-development regulation could be devastating for industry development
• the quality of regulatory measures turns out to be more important than the availability of massive state funding for production lines that were hand-picked by the cabinet of ministers
• liberal reform of the cotton law that relaxes the constraints on processor funding might restore the vibrancy of the cotton sector