

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. Title: "AJAE appendix for Dairy Tariff-Quota Liberalization: Contrasting Bilateral and Most Favored Nation Reform Options"

Authors: Jason H. Grant, Thomas W. Hertel, and Thomas F. Rutherford

Date: December 4, 2008

"Note: The material contained herein is supplementary to the article named in the title and published in the *American Journal of Agricultural Economics (AJAE)*."

Bilateral TRQ Filling Ratios

The U.S. has *nine* different specialty cheese quotas (called TRQIDs) totaling over 136,000 metric tons (mt) (see <u>www.amad.org</u>, appendix table 2): Cheese Substitutes (TRQID11); Blue Veined (TRQID12); Cheddar (TRQID13); American (TRQID14); Edam/Gouda (TRQID15); Italian (TRQID16); Swiss (no eye) (TRQID17); Other cheese substitutes (TRQID18); and Swiss (with eye) (TRQID19). Within each TRQID, the quota allocated varies by country and variety across product lines at the *HS8-digit* level. However, each TRQID covers only a subset of HS8-digit cheese lines that do not map directly to the model's HS6-digit tariff lines (i.e. HS 040690).

We also had to confront the issue of bilateral quota allocations. The AMAD notifications report the quota level allocated to specific partners for each TRQID. However, not all countries export to the U.S. in all TRQID categories (appendix table 2). Furthermore, for some TRQIDs (but not all) Finland, Sweden and Austria received separate quota allocations from the EU15 as a group. To minimize the amount of information lost in aggregating TRQs to the model's HS6 digit commodity level and 14 country aggregation (appendix table 1), we calculated a filling ratio for each of the nine specialty cheese quotas at the most detailed level available (HS8-digit):

(1)
$${}^{ID}FR_{r,k} = \frac{{}^{ID}Quant_{r,US,k}}{{}^{ID}Quota_{r,k}}$$

where, *ID* indexes a particular TRQID (ID = 11...19), *r* indexes the source region, *k* indexes the HS8-digit specialty cheese line, *FR* denotes the filling ratio, equal to the quantity exported from *r* to the U.S. (*Quant*) divided by the *Quota* allocated to *r* in commodity (*k*). At this point we have filling ratios at the HS8 digit level that vary by *r* and TRQID (*ID*).

Next we aggregated the filling ratios under each TRQID to the sub-sector model regions (14 countries) using a trade-value weighted aggregation as:

(2)
$${}^{ID}FR1_m = \sum_m \left(\frac{{}^{ID}V_{r \in m, US, k \in g}}{\sum_m {}^{ID}V_{m, US, k \in g}} {}^{ID}FR_{r,k} \right)$$

where, *m* indexes one of the 14 model countries in a particular TRQID (*ID*). The numerator in (2), ${}^{ID}V_{r\in m,US,k\in ID}$, is the value of trade from *r* (as an element of *m*) to the U.S. in commodity *k* (as an element of TRQID (*ID*)) and the denominator is the total value of trade from *m* to the US in a particular TRQID. This yields a value share from which to weight the filling rations (*FR*_{*r*,*k*}) derived in (1).

The share weighted filling ratios (${}^{ID}FR_m$) in (2) vary by (*ID*) and exporter (*m*). As a final step we aggregated ${}^{ID}FR1_m$ across TRQIDs using the value of trade in the total value of trade across all TRQIDs as weights to arrive at the model aggregated filling ratios which vary only by exporter (*m*):

(3)
$$FR2_{m} = \sum_{m} \left(\frac{V_{m,US,g}}{\sum_{g} V_{m,US,g}} FR1_{m,g} \right)$$

The resulting filling ratios are reported in appendix table 2. The EU15 is the only country to trade in all nine TRQIDs. TRQID 11 (Cheese Substitutes) is the largest traded category with the EU15 and NZL getting the largest quota allocation in this category. The second-to-last column in appendix table 2 reports the PE/GE model filling ratios. Interestingly, six countries were out-of-quota in 2001 with Australia (AUS) exporting more than twice its quota allocation. Clearly these seven countries have a lot at stake when it comes to liberalizing US specialty cheese TRQs.

Multilateral (MFN) TRQs

To complicate matters, the MFN quota, which is available for any country, is at the forefront of the agricultural trade negotiations. The MFN quota accounts for less than five percent of total bilateral TRQs in most cases (appendix table 2). We allocate the MFN quota as an auction where the quota goes to the highest bidder and assume that exporters can shift specialty cheese costelessly from the bilateral out-of-quota market to the MFN market. This is an important point because substantial improvements in market access may not occur immediately if exporters simply redirect bilateral (out-of-quota) exports to the MFN regime in order to take advantage of the additional quota available.

Which exporter will pick up the MFN quota is a critical issue in the set up of this scenario. We incorporate detailed unit values of specialty cheese supplied by different exporters to re-establish the units of comparison. The EU15 supplies the highest valued specialty cheese (table 2) so we normalize all unit values on the (0,1) interval (EU15 = 1.0).

Imputation of Commodity Demands

Given data on international trade flows, we then need to attribute commodity imports to v intermediate and final demand segments (*d*) for each region (*r*). Dropping region (*r*) subscripts, we impute demands using a least squares procedure which minimizes deviations from target import shares ($\hat{\theta}_{r,d}$) in demand segment (*d*):

$$\min_{M_{g,d}^*:D_{g,d}^*} \Omega = \sum_d \left[(1+t_d^M) M_{g,d}^* - \hat{\theta}_{g,d} \left((1+t_d^M) M_{g,d}^* + (1+t_d^D) D_{g,d}^* \right) \right]^2$$

subject to:

$$\sum_{d} M_{g,d}^{*} = \overline{M}_{g}$$
$$\sum_{g} D_{g,d}^{*} = \overline{D}$$

$$\sum_{g} \left((1 + t_{d}^{M}) M_{g,d}^{*} + (1 + t_{d}^{D}) D_{g,d}^{*} \right) = \overline{A}_{d}$$

where, \overline{M}_{g} is aggregate imports of commodity g from the trade flow data; \overline{D} is aggregate sectoral output taken from the GTAP database; \overline{A}_{d} is aggregate sectoral demand from the GTAP database; and $t_{d}^{M}(t_{d}^{D})$ is the tax rate on imported (domestic) goods purchased in use d. We assume that target import shares ($\hat{\theta}_{g,d}$) are equivalent to the sector shares in the GTAP database. If we had external data on import demand intensity at the commodity level, this could be incorporated into the procedure.

The imputed benchmark data are $M_{g,d}^*$, which is the demand for imported commodity g in demand segment d; and $D_{g,d}^*$, which is the demand for the domestic commodity g in demand segment d. Finally, once demand has been obtained, production is calculated by summing domestic commodity demands and exports of sub-sector good (g) in region (r).

Commod	ity Aggregation (19)	Country Aggregation (14)				
PDR	Paddy Rice	ARG	Argentina			
WHT	Wheat	AUS	Australia			
GRO	Other Cereals	CAN	Canada			
V_F	Vegetables and Fruit	EU15	European Union			
OSD	Oilseeds	JPN	Japan			
C_B	Sugar Cane and Beet	LAM	Latin America and Caribbean			
PFB	Plant Based Fibers	MEX	Mexico			
OCR	Other Crops	MNA	Middle East and North Africa			
CTL	Bovine Cattle	NZL	New Zealand			
OAP	Other Animal Products	ROA	Rest of Asia			
RMK	Raw Milk	ROE	Rest of Europe			
WOL	Wool	SAM	South America			
VOL	Vegetable Oils and Fats	SAO	South Asia and Oceania			
MIL	Dairy	USA	United States			
PCR	Processed Rice					
SGR	Sugar					
OFD	Other Food Products					
B_T	Beverages and Tobacco					
OTH	All Other Goods					

Appendix Table 1. Country and Sector Information

Import Market, 2001												
		TRQID										
Country	TRQ Variable	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	Model Aggregation	MFN Unit Values
Country			12	15	14	143	4,808	17	10	19		values
ARG	Quota Trade	100 24				143 48	4,808 5,633				4,782 5,578	0.6
AKG												0.0
	Fill	0.24				0.33	1.17				1.16	
	Quota	1,133		1,617	1,000						1,249	
AUS	Trade	3,153		2,470	1,136						2,585	0.7
AUS	Fill	2.78		1.53	1,130						2,505	0.7
	ГШ	2.78		1.55	1.14						2.07	
	Quota	1,141		833						70	828	
CAN	Trade	1,222		1,083						206	1085	0.9
	Fill	1.07		1.30						2.95	1.32	
	Quota	20,756	2,529	430	271	5,348	3,499	3,675	4,000	6,117	10,000	
EU15 ^b	Trade	22,800	2,692	724	159	6,326	4,625	5,625	1,977	11,000	12,100	1.0
	Fill	1.10	1.06	1.68	0.59	1.18	1.32	1.53	0.49	1.80	1.21	
	Quota	11,322		3,950	2,000						4,040	
NZL	Trade	13,600		8,226	1,985						10,700	0.8
	Fill	1.20		2.08	0.99						1.49	
	0	1.570				1.67	1 222	1.050	175	5 40 7	4 702	
ROE ^a	Quota	1,579 1,728				167 45	1,323 1,302	1,850 857	175 20	5,487 4,780	4,783 3,555	0.9
KUE	Trade					0.27	0.98		0.11		0.88	0.9
	Fill	1.09				0.27	0.98	0.46	0.11	0.87	0.88	
	Quota	250					511			42	471	
SAM	Trade	255					1,178			110	987	0.4
	Fill	1.02					2.30			2.64	2.10	
MFN	Quota ^c	502	N/A	240	170	26	14	80	N/A	86		
	ilateral ota	1.4	N/A	3.5	5.2	0.5	0.2	1.5	N/A	0.7		

Appendix Table 2. TRQ Allocations and MFN Unit Values in the US Specialty Cheese Import Market, 2001

Note: Quota and Trade values are in metric tons (mt). Fill = Trade/Quota.

^a ROE countries exporting specialty cheese to the US with bilateral quota allocations are Switzerland, Czech

Republic, Hungary, Norway, Poland and Romania.

^b EU15 TRQ information accounts for quota that was allocated separately to Sweden, Finland and Austria for

TRQID11, TRQID15, TRQID17, TRQID18 and TRQID19 (see www.amad.org).

^c The amount of MFN quota allocated in the benchmark equilibrium of the tariff line model is zero