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- Novel approach to quantitative general equilibrium modeling with focus on agriculture

- **Goal**: A more nuanced view of how global production & trade patterns shift in response to policy
  - Existing models make simplifying assumptions on intra-sector production structure
  - Assumptions deliver convenient analytical solutions for structural equations **BUT** impose strong restrictions on trade elasticities
Introduction and Motivation

- Novel approach to quantitative general equilibrium modeling with focus on agriculture

- **Goal:** A more nuanced view of how global production & trade patterns shift in response to policy

- **Needed:** A tractable model of ag trade with a more flexible production structure
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  - Endogenous specialization $\rightarrow$ trade affects the set of goods produced
  - Simplifying assumption: Set of competitive goods is randomly determined by R&D process
Introduction and Motivation

Point of Departure

- Eaton and Kortum (2002) "Probabilistic Ricardian" model
  - Endogenous specialization → trade affects the set of goods produced
  - Simplifying assumption: Set of competitive goods is randomly determined by R&D process
- Canada & Colombia are equally likely to specialize in coffee
- Imposes stiff patterns of elasticities
Price increase of Costa Rican ag goods in the US market

EK model predict equal increases in trade flows for any two exporters with the same share of the US ag market
Price increase of Costa Rican ag goods in the US market

US Ag Imports: Costa Rica

- Bananas: 40.8%
- Pineapples: 16.8%
- Coffee: 10.7%
- Melons: 7.5%
- Fruit, nes: 3.2%
- Beef: 2.8%
- Other: 9.1%
- 9.1%

Ecuador US Ag Market Share = .001%

- Bananas: 71.4%
- Cocoa: 4.7%
- Coffee: 3.7%
- Fruit, Nes: 5%
- Mangoes: 2.8%
- Plantains: 5%

The Netherlands: US Ag Market Share = .001%

- Tomatoes: 45.8%
- Green Chiles & Peppers: 44.1%
- Eggplants: 2.4%
- Other: 4.2%
Introduction and Motivation

Point of Departure


Analytical Contribution

- Allow agro-ecology to drive specialization in agriculture
  - Predicts “like” countries more sensitive to each other
- Allow product-specific trade costs
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Point of Departure

- Eaton and Kortum (2002) ”Probabilistic Ricardian” model

Analytical Contribution

- Allow agro-ecology to drive specialization in agriculture
- Allow product-specific trade costs

Empirical Contribution

- E&K estimate key parameters describing trade patterns from structural gravity model
- Specify new model equation as random coefficients logit
  - More flexible production structure
  - Little additional data
Roadmap

- Model overview
- Selected general equilibrium results
- Work in progress
- Conclusion
Model Overview
About the Model

- $I$ countries engaged in bilateral trade
  - Exporter indexed by $i$
  - Importer index by $n$
- Two tradable sectors: Agriculture and Manufacturing
- Production technology is heterogeneous across products
- All markets are perfectly competitive
- Trade occurs as buyers look for the lowest price
About the Model

- $l$ countries engaged in bilateral trade
  - Exporter indexed by $i$
  - Importer indexed by $n$

- Two tradable sectors: Agriculture and Manufacturing
  - A continuum of products in each sector indexed by $j$

- Production technology is heterogeneous across products

- All markets are perfectly competitive

- Trade occurs as buyers look for the lowest price
About the Model

- \( l \) countries engaged in bilateral trade
  - Exporter indexed by \( i \)
  - Importer index by \( n \)

- Two tradable sectors: Agriculture and Manufacturing
  - A continuum of products in each sector indexed by \( j \)

- Production technology is heterogeneous across products
  - **Agriculture:** Climate and land endowments influence which products have the best technology
  - **Manufacturing:** The set of products in which producers have the best technology is random

- All markets are perfectly competitive

- Trade occurs as buyers look for the lowest price
About the Model

- $l$ countries engaged in bilateral trade
  - Exporter indexed by $i$
  - Importer index by $n$

- Two tradable sectors: Agriculture and Manufacturing
  - A continuum of products in each sector indexed by $j$

- Production technology is heterogeneous across products
  - **Agriculture**: Climate and land endowments influence which products have the best technology
  - **Manufacturing**: The set of products in which producers have the best technology is random

- All markets are perfectly competitive

- Trade occurs as buyers look for the lowest price
Production Technology
Model Overview

Agricultural Technology Country $i$, product $j$ technology

$$q_i^A(j) = z_i^A(j) \times (N_i \beta_i^A (a_i(j) L_i)^{1-\beta_i^A})^\alpha_i^A Q_i^A 1-\alpha_i^A$$

- Input bundle is the same for all ag products
  - $N_i$ is labor
  - $L_i$ is land
  - $Q_i^k$ is an aggregate of intermediate inputs from all sectors
Model Overview

Agricultural Technology Country \( i \), product \( j \) technology

\[
q_i^A(j) = z_i^A(j) \times \left(N_i^i \beta_i^A (a_i(j)L_i)^{1-\beta_i^A}\right)^{\alpha_i^A}Q_i^A 1^{-\alpha_i^A}
\]

- \( z_i^A(j) \) Technological productivity-enhancing Frechet r.v.

\[
F_i^A(z) = \exp\{-T_i^Az^{-\theta}\}
\]

- \( T_i^A \) drives average technological productivity in country \( i \) ag
- \( \theta \) drives dispersion of technological productivity
- Independently distributed across products
Model Overview

Agricultural Technology Country $i$, product $j$ technology

$$q_i^A(j) = z_i^A(j) \times (N_i \beta_i^A (a_i(j)L_i)^{1-\beta_i^A})^{\alpha_i^A} Q_i^A 1^{1-\alpha_i^A}$$

- $a_i(j)$ is deterministic variable representing land productivity
  - Value reflects the coincidence of product requirements and country ecological characteristics
- E.g., coffee
  - Country-specific parametric density, independent of $z_i^A(j)$
Model Overview

**Comparative Advantage** Probability country $i$ has comparative advantage in product $j$ in market $n$

$$\pi_{ni}(j) \equiv Pr(p_{ni}^A(j) = \min_l \{p_{nl}^A(j)\})$$
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Comparative Advantage Probability country \( i \) has comparative advantage in product \( j \) in market \( n \)

\[
\pi_{ni}^A(j) = \frac{T_i^A(\tilde{a}_i(j)c_i^A\tau_{ni}^A(j))^{-\theta}}{N \sum_{l=1}^{N} T_l^A(\tilde{a}_l(j)c_l^A\tau_{nl}^A(j))^{-\theta}}
\]

Absolute Advantage

- \( T_i^A \) is average ag sector technological productivity
- \( c_i^A \) is cost of ag input bundle
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Comparative Advantage Probability country $i$ has comparative advantage in product $j$ in market $n$

$$\pi_{ni}(j) = \frac{T_i^A(\tilde{a}_i(j)c_i^A\tau_{ni}(j))^{-\theta}}{\sum_{l=1}^{N} T_l^A(\tilde{a}_l(j)c_l^A\tau_{nl}(j))^{-\theta}}$$

Random Source of Comparative Advantage

- Realization of $z_i^A(j)$
  - Independent across products
Model Overview

Comparative Advantage Probability country $i$ has comparative advantage in product $j$ in market $n$

$$\pi_{ni}^{A}(j) = \frac{T_i^A(\tilde{a}_i(j)c_i^A\tau_{ni}^{A}(j))^{-\theta}}{\sum_{l=1}^{N} T_l^A(\tilde{a}_l(j)c_l^A\tau_{nl}^{A}(j))^{-\theta}}$$

Non-Random Sources of Comparative Advantage

- $\tilde{a}_i(j)$ product $j$ land productivity
- $\tau_{ni}^{k}(j) \geq 1$ is exporter $i$’s cost to export products to market $n$
  - Deterministic variable with parametric density
  - Independent of $z_i^A(j)$ and $\tilde{a}_i(j)$
Model Overview

Market Share

Exporter $i$ share in country $n$ ag expenditure

$$
\pi^A_{ni} = \left( \frac{T_i^A(\tilde{a}_i c_i^A \tau^A_{ni})^{-\theta}}{\sum_{l=1}^N T_l^A(\tilde{a}_l c_l^A \tau^A_{nl})^{-\theta}} \right) dF_{\tilde{a}_n}(\tilde{a}) dF_{\tau_n}(\tau)
$$

- $F_{\tilde{a}_n}(\tilde{a})$ is the distribution of $\tilde{a}_n = [\tilde{a}_1, ..., \tilde{a}_I]$ across all products consumed in market $n$

- $F_{\tau_n}(\tau)$ is the distribution of $\tau = [\tau_{n1}, ..., \tau_{nl}]$ across all products consumed in market $n$
Model Overview

Market Share  Exporter \( i \) share in country \( n \) ag expenditure

\[
\pi_{ni}^A = \int \frac{T_i^A(\tilde{a}_i c_i^A \tau_{ni}^A)^{-\theta}}{\sum_{l=1}^N T_i^A(\tilde{a}_l c_l^A \tau_{nl}^A)^{-\theta}} \ dF_{\tilde{a}_n}(\tilde{a}) \ dF_{\tau_n}(\tau)
\]

- This is the structural equation from which productivity and trade cost distribution parameters are estimated
Trade Elasticities
Trade Elasticities

Elasticity  P.E. elasticity of market share with respect to competitor trade costs

\[
\frac{\partial \pi_{nl}^A}{\partial \tau_{ni}^A} = \frac{\theta}{\tau_{nl}^A} \left( \text{cov} \left( \pi_{ni}^A(j), \pi_{nl}^A(j) \right) + \pi_{ni}^A \times \pi_{nl}^A \right) \quad l \neq i
\]

- Ecuador’s market share is more sensitive to Costa Rican trade costs because they have high probability of comparative advantage in the same products
- Countries with similar distributions of \( \tilde{a}_i(j) \) will systematically specialize in similar products
- E&K elasticity is constant across competitors
Estimating Trade and Productivity Distribution Parameters
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Trade & Productivity Distribution Parameters

- Specify bilateral market share as random coefficients logit
  
  **Absolute Advantage:** Exporter fixed effect
  
  **Land Productivity:** Interact exporter characteristics and product requirements
  
  - Exporter characteristics: Arable land and distribution of total land across climate zones (World Bank, GTAP)
  
  - Product requirements: Constructed distribution of production across climate zones (FAO & GTAP) and normal random variable
Trade & Productivity Distribution Parameters

• Specify bilateral market share as random coefficients logit
  
  **Absolute Advantage:** Exporter fixed effect

  **Land Productivity:** Interact exporter characteristics and product requirements

  **Trade costs:** Interact gravity variables and product costs

  • Gravity variables: border, language distance, EU, NAFTA (CEPIII)
  • Product costs: Normal random variable
Trade & Productivity Distribution Parameters

- Specify bilateral market share as random coefficients logit
  
  **Absolute Advantage:** Exporter fixed effect
  
  **Land Productivity:** Interact exporter characteristics and product requirements
  
  **Trade costs:** Interact gravity variables and product costs

- Bilateral market share from FAO trade & production data
Does it Matter?
Counterfactual 1: GE Ag Elasticities

The Experiment  Simulate GE elasticities

1. Solve for global equilibrium in two models
   - New model
   - EK model
2. Simulate 1% increase in a single exporter’s trade costs
3. Calculate percent change in each competitor’s market share relative to base
Counterfactual 1: GE Ag Elasticities

Key Result: Substantially different implications for effects of policy on patterns of production and trade
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Key Result: Substantially different implications for effects of policy on patterns of production and trade

The Elasticity of US Market Share Relative to the Median Exporter
General equilibrium elasticity with respect to trade costs of ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Import Market</th>
<th>Canada Modified Model</th>
<th>Canada EK Model</th>
<th>Costa Rica Modified Model</th>
<th>Costa Rica EK Model</th>
<th>France Modified Model</th>
<th>France EK Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>39.20</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>20.85</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>11.58</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Counterfactual 1: GE Ag Elasticities

**The Elasticity of US Market Share Relative to the Median Exporter**

General equilibrium elasticity with respect to trade costs of ...  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Import Market</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canada Mod</td>
<td>EK Model</td>
<td>Costa Rica Mod</td>
<td>EK Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>5.94 1.00 0.00 1.00 5.75 1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>3.31 1.00 0.37 1.00 3.14 1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>39.20 1.00 0.24 1.00 0.16 1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>1.27 1.00 0.09 1.00 1.07 1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>8.93 1.00 0.00 1.04 5.53 1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>20.85 1.00 0.03 1.00 1.05 1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>11.58 1.00 0.01 1.13 0.99 1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>8.42 1.00 0.03 1.00 0.77 1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- EK model - US market share sensitivity = median for all three competitors' trade costs
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The Elasticity of US Market Share Relative to the Median Exporter

General equilibrium elasticity with respect to trade costs of ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Import Market</th>
<th>Canada Modified Model</th>
<th>Canada EK Model</th>
<th>Costa Rica Modified Model</th>
<th>Costa Rica EK Model</th>
<th>France Modified Model</th>
<th>France EK Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>39.20</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>20.85</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>11.58</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Modified model - US more sensitive than the median
  - Always - with respect to Canadian costs
  - Almost always - with respect to French costs
# Counterfactual 1: GE Ag Elasticities

## The Elasticity of US Market Share Relative to the Median Exporter

General equilibrium elasticity with respect to trade costs of...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Import Market</th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>Costa Rica</th>
<th>France</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modified Model</td>
<td>EK Model</td>
<td>Modified Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>39.20</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>20.85</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>11.58</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Modified model - US more sensitive than the median
  - Always - with respect to Canadian costs
  - Almost always - with respect to French costs
### Counterfactual 1: GE Ag Elasticities

**The Elasticity of US Market Share Relative to the Median Exporter**

General equilibrium elasticity with respect to trade costs of...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Import Market</th>
<th>Canada Modified Model</th>
<th>Canada EK Model</th>
<th>Costa Rica Modified Model</th>
<th>Costa Rica EK Model</th>
<th>France Modified Model</th>
<th>France EK Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>39.20</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>20.85</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>11.58</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Modified model - US more sensitive than the median
  - Always - with respect to Canadian costs
  - Almost always - with respect to French costs
  - Never - with respect to Costa Rican costs
Work in Progress

Making product-level predictions

- Use science-based estimates of product requirements
  - Climate requirements for key products available from GTAP and GAEZ

- Allow for systematic differences in plant vs. animal products
  - Minor change to interaction in land productivity distribution

- Improve precision with additional moments as in Petrin (2002)
  - Include product-specific market shares for key products
Conclusion
Conclusion

Large Potential Benefits of the Model

- Transparent approach to estimate parameters that define trade patterns
- Delivers elasticities that reflect expected cross-country substitution patterns
- Offers opportunity to evaluate how country and product characteristics affect trade