



AgEcon SEARCH
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search

<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>

aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

No endorsement of AgEcon Search or its fundraising activities by the author(s) of the following work or their employer(s) is intended or implied.

Agricultural Outlook Forum
U.S. Department of Agriculture

Presented: March 1-2, 2007

THE DOHA ROUND: CLOSING THE PERCEPTIONS GAP

Tim Josling
Senior Fellow, Freeman-Spogli Institute for
International Studies, Stanford University

THE DOHA ROUND: CLOSING THE PERCEPTIONS GAP

Tim Josling

Senior Fellow, Freeman-Spogli Institute for
International Studies, Stanford University

Introduction

- The Doha Round has been on the brink of failure for some months
- Much of the problem has been the difficulty of agreeing the “modalities” for agriculture
- The US has demanded large cuts in tariffs to open up markets for agricultural and other products
- The developing countries have demanded significant cuts in domestic support (farm subsidies) by the US, the EU and Japan
- The EU has offered to end export subsidies but wants disciplines on US programs that affect exports (food aid and export credits)

Introduction

- Such a deal would have considerable benefits for the US and for other countries alike
- Tariffs on agricultural goods would still be high but would cut in half
- Elimination of export subsidies (and more disciplines on state trading exporters) would make export competition fairer
- Domestic support in all countries would be drastically limited, to avoid any return to price-based support
- US policy would become less of a WTO liability

Close the perceptions gap?

- US perception is that the US proposal to cut limit on domestic support by 60 percent was a significant offer
- Others claimed that a total trade distorting support limit of \$22 billion would have allowed the US actually to increase funding for trade-distorting policies (current AMS limit is \$19 billion)
- A deal could be on the cards that establishes a limit for US trade-distorting support of around \$15-17 billion
- This would cut AMS spending to about \$11 billion

Close the perceptions gap?

- Such a deal would not impact US agricultural policy immediately: subsidy payments would stay within these limits for as long as corn prices stayed high
- USDA Farm Bill proposals go some way to making policy consistent with a DDA package, but more will have to be done
- Revenue-based CCPs consistent with new Blue Box but not with Green Box
- EU agriculture can live with big cut in trade-distorting subsidies: 2003 reforms put most payments into the Green Box

Close the perceptions gap?

- US has demanded deep cuts in agricultural tariffs in part to open up EU markets
- EU has (informally) increased its offer to 51 percent but argues that it needs flexibility for “sensitive products”
- Developing countries want to shelter over 20 percent of their tariff lines from cuts
- The US has argued that both sensitive and special products threaten to gut the market access gains expected of the DDA

Close the perceptions gap?

- EU tariffs could be cut by 54 percent with relatively modest impacts on farm income
- There would be limited exceptions for “sensitive products” and additional TRQs would be required
- Developing countries would be allowed to exempt “special products” from cuts and to use a Special Safeguard Mechanism in cases of import surges
- Developing countries would agree to improved market access in the area of manufactured product tariffs (Swiss Formula of 20) and services

Close the perceptions gap?

- US would have to agree in reduction in Dairy and Sugar tariff protection, as well as cuts in administered prices
- Ethanol tariff would be cut, to the advantage of external sugar producers who are gearing up to supply the US market
- New export markets for US goods would open up, though not so much in Europe as in emerging developing countries

Close the perceptions gap?

- Export subsidy elimination would be good for wheat and barley producers
- Curbs on Canadian Wheat Board would be welcomed in US (though Canada is in the process of changing the status of the CWB)
- Export credit guarantees would be disciplined, but compliance with the cotton panel is already doing this
- Food Aid changes to more cash grants are in any case beneficial to developing country recipients

What are the Alternatives?

- If the Doha Round does not reach an agreement in the next few weeks, it may be some years before another chance arises
- Regional agreements would be energized in Asia: China, India and Japan are negotiating agreements within the region
- Bilaterals are being expanded between Europe and Asia, as well as with developing countries and Russia
- The US, without TPA, will face more competition in overseas markets

What are the Alternatives?

- Legal challenges under existing WTO rules could emerge to dismantle parts of US farm policy
- Cotton panel has already questioned the Green Box notification of the Fruit and Vegetable exemption
- Cotton panel found CCPs and LDPs cause serious prejudice to other exporters
- Brazil will challenge again if US cotton policy is not modified (in Farm Bill or in DDA)

What are the Alternatives?

- Similar reasoning applies to other commodities
- Canada has challenged US corn programs
- Even when prices are high, markets can still be affected by subsidies
- Real possibility that corn challenge could be successful
- Rice policy is also vulnerable if arguments about specific sub-markets for rice are plausible

Bottom Line

- It is worthwhile making adjustments in domestic policy that are in any case worthwhile in domestic terms
 - More environmental stewardship links to income support expands constituency
 - Less trade-distorting policies allows the US to regain its leadership in international trade
 - Policies in conformity with WTO removes uncertainty for producers
- These advantages would be evident even without a DDA agreement

Thanks for Listening

Contact author at josling@stanford.edu