The impacts of the Doha Round on Egypt

Minh Thu To Silvia Sorescu Kayenat Kabir Simon Tsao Jeff Okun-Kozlowicki Gregory Whitten Lurong Chen Verena Mecklenbrauck

WTO Doha Round

- Cut agricultural and non-agricultural tariffs worldwide
- Special treatment of developing countries
- Ongoing negotiations
- Our simulations based on a paper by Peter J. Minor (2006): The Doha Development Round and Projected Impacts on Egyptian Trade and Production: A Global CGE Analysis

Minor (2006) – Impact on Egypt

- GTAP 2001 database
- Modification made using ALTERTAX: MFA quotas were eliminated, EU enlargement, Egypt-US Qualified Industrial Scheme
- Looked at two different scenarios:
 - Without Sensitive Agriculture
 - With 2% Sensitive Agriculture
- Closure:
 - National savings adjust to maintain the current balance of trade for some regions
 - Real wage fixed for unskilled labor in developing countries (unemployment)

Extensions

- Group 1: Consider bilateral trade agreements in addition or instead of the Doha Round
- Group 2: Consider non-tariff measures and agricultural subsidies
- Group 3: Consider changes due to the Arab Spring
- Group 4: Updating of the baseline data to reflect current economic situation and compare potential effects of implementation of Doha today

Group 1 - Introduction and scenarios

- Consider bilateral trade agreements in addition or instead of the Doha Round
- Doha + Egypt-EU FTA (with and without unemployment)
- No Doha + Egypt-EU FTA (with and without unemployment)
- Doha + EU-USA FTA
- No Doha + EU-USA FTA

• Compared to effects of the Doha round on Egypt (Peter Minor paper)

Welfare impacts – with unemployment



Welfare impacts – full employment



Terms of trade effect – Doha + Egypt-EU FTA Price transmission

• Export prices (pfob) decrease in all sectors:

pfob(i,r,s) = pm(i,r) - tx(i,r) - txs(i,r,s);

- pm(i,r) = sum(k,PROD_COMM, REVSHR(i,k,r) * pmes(i,k,r));
- pfe(i,j,r) = tf(i,j,r) + pmes(i,j,r);
- pfd(i,j,r) = tfd(i,j,r) + pm(i,r);
- pf(i,j,r) = FMSHR(i,j,r) * pfm(i,j,r) + [1 FMSHR(i,j,r)] * pfd(i,j,r);
- ps(j,r) + ao(j,r)
 - = sum(i,ENDW_COMM, STC(i,j,r) * [pfe(i,j,r) afe(i,j,r) ava(j,r)])
 - + sum(i,TRAD_COMM, STC(i,j,r) * [pf(i,j,r) af(i,j,r)])
 - + profitslack(j,r);
- Producer prices decrease as well in all sectors
- Factor depreciation: pfactor(Egypt) = -1.14
- Inputs cheaper → decrease in export prices → terms of trade effect driven by lower export prices

Trade effects

	Exports				Imports			
	Baseline 2001 (\$ millions)	Doha	No Doha but Eg-EU FTA	Doha and Eg-EU FTA	Baseline 2001 (\$ millions)	Doha	No Doha but Eg-EU FTA	Doha and Eg-EU FTA
Agricultural	1092	-0.20%	36.35%	17.65%	-3359	0.66%	-2.92%	-0.25%
Non- agricultural	3125	0.07%	3.42%	3.55%	-13373	-0.13%	-0.48%	-0.62%
Service	8307	0.14%	0.29%	0.46%	-3995	0.11%	0.17%	0.29%
Energy & Mining	1999	0.10%	0.24%	0.38%	-1117	0.15%	-1.15%	-0.96%
Total	14524	0.09%	3.67%	2.41%	-21845	0.05%	-0.77%	-0.41%

Trade results – Doha-Egypt-EU with unemployment

- Imports increase especially in the apparel, processed food and beverage sectors
- Imports decrease especially in some agricultural sectors, i.e. livestock, wheat
- There are decreases in exports in some sectors in the original simulation (Doha round) but in our simulations exports increase in every sector across scenarios

Output effects

	total output (\$ million)	percentage change	Expansion	Substitution
Agricultural	30226	-1.14		
Processed Food and Beverage	10261	-6.10	-6.334	0.238
Live Stock and Diary	5801	1.30	-0.068	1.366
Non-agricultural	30727	-0.91		
Apparel	7136	-3.56	-4.242	0.683
Textile	6744	-1.70	-1.913	0.216
Services	73366	1.64		
Other services	23745	1.08	0.435	0.643
Trade and finance	20753	1.07	0.475	0.594
Transportation and communication	14920	3.21	n.a.	n.a.
Construction	10243	2.25	2.145	0.11
Electric distribution	3705	0.33	0.325	0
Total	146634	0.44		

Group 2: Non-Tariff Measures and Agricultural Subsidies

Silvia Sorescu Minh Thu To

Motivation

Projected Impacts of the Doha Development Round on Egypt's Trade and Production (Peter Minor, 2006) \rightarrow Focus on tariff rates reductions in agriculture and manufacturing

... missing out on other types of distortions and barriers affecting production and trade

- agricultural producer subsidies
- barriers to services trade
- non-tariff measures

Database and scenarios

Updated database to include AVE of services (based on CEPII estimations) using Altertax \rightarrow updated tms for services sectors (construction, trade and finance, transport, electricity distribution)

- Scenario 1: Peter Minor (2006) tariff reductions agr and mnfcs + reduction in tms for services (20%)
- Scenario 2: Scenario 1 + reduction in agriculture producer subsidies (60% for developed countries and 40% for developing countries) → shock to in: cereals, fibers, paddy rice, processed rice, wheat
- Scenario 3: Scenario 2 + NTM reductions in agr and mnfcs







Production impacts - agriculture

	20% reduction NTM Services		Reduction of Agri Subsidies		Reduction of NTM Agri and Manf	
	% change	mil USD	% change	mil USD	% change	mil USD
Cereal	1.0	14.4	1.5	20.8	1.3	19.1
Livestock	1.5	85.9	1.5	83.4	1.5	85.1
Fibers	-0.2	-2.7	1.4	16.0	1.3	15.4
Other Agriculture	0.5	6.0	0.3	3.6	0.4	4.7
Processed foods and Beverages	0.5	48.5	0.4	43.6	0.6	61.1
Paddy Rice	1.2	16.2	1.5	19.3	1.7	22.7
Processed Rice	0.1	1.9	0.3	5.7	0.6	10.0
Vegetable, Fruits, Nuts	0.7	33.7	0.7	31.1	0.8	35.9
Vegetable oils and fats	0.2	1.6	0.0	0.2	-0.5	-4.7
Wheat	1.3	20.5	2.0	30.3	1.1	17.1

Trade effects

- Scenario 1: 20% reduction NTM Services
- \rightarrow exports expand significantly across all services sectors
- Scenario 2: Sc 1+Reduction of Agri Subsidies
 >exports increasing in fibers and paddy rice sectors due to reduction of producer subsidies in major importing countries
- Scenario 3: Sc 2+Reduction of NTM Agri and Manf
- \rightarrow services trade expansion higher than in Scenario 2
- \rightarrow exports increase in all manufacturing sectors except for textiles

Group 3: DOHA Round-EGPYT-Arab Spring: effects of Negative capital shock

Simon Tsao & Kayenat kabir GTAP Short Course, 2016, west lafayette

Outline

- Motivation
- Experiments
- Results
 - Welfare decomposition
 - Exchange rate
 - Sectoral impacts
- Learning

During the Arab Spring in egypt • Annual **GDP** growth rate: 5.14% (2010), 2.11% (2013), 2.23% (2014)

- Tourism, textile and construction industries hit hard
- Capital investment went down
- Investments shifted to energy intensive industry
- 20% of Egypt's budget spent on energy subsidy
- **Unemployment** rate :8.9 % (2010), 13.4% (2014)







Experiment

- Estimate the marginal impact of decreased capital investment during Arab Spring to impacts of Doha round in Egypt
- Projected impacts of Doha Round in Egypt (Peter Minor, 2006)
- Extension: Shocked industrywide capital input by 5%
 qo("Capital", "Egypt")= -5
 - Unemployment for both skilled and unskilled labor made endogenous

Welfare Decomposition

Region	Allocative Efficiency	Endowment Effect	Terms of Trade Effect	Investment-Savings Effect	Total Welfare Effect
1 CENTAM	302	554	311	-78	1,089
2 China	2,163	5,735	3,353	-413	10,838
3 Egypt	70	74	-101	-33	<mark>11</mark>
4 EU	6,602	0	-3,510	154	3,246
5 India	1,127	1,072	-289	13	1,922
6 Japan	8,875	0	1,020	-163	9,732
7 LDC	-190	-165	-185	-40	-580
8 MERCOSUR	513	373	1,399	-18	2,266
9 MEXICO	46	-343	-713	73	-937
10 ROW	15,496	11,666	-242	497	27,417
11 USA	-254	. 0	-943	-20	-1,217
12 XME	48	0	-131	32	-51

Doha Round (Minor 2006 results)

Arab Spring + Doha Round vs. Doha Round

Region	Allocative Efficiency	Endowment Effect	Terms of Trade Effect	Investment-Savings Effect	Total Welfare Effect
1 CENTAM	302	554	312	-78	1,090
2 China	2,163	5,736	3,348	-424	10,823
<mark>3 Egypt</mark>	-219	-2,622	54	57	<mark>-2,729</mark>
4 EU	6,615	0	-3,558	134	3,190
5 India	1,127	1,075	-289	11	1,924
6 Japan	8,878	0	1,021	-177	9,722
7 LDC	-190	-166	-187	-41	-584
8 MERCOSUR	512	372	1,394	-20	2,257
9 MEXICO	47	-343	-714	72	-938
10 ROW	15,495	11,668	-278	483	27,368
11 USA	-257	0	-987	-45	-1,289
12 XME	45	0	-147	31	-71
Total	34,518	16,273	-31	. 2	50,762

(all values in millions of 2001 dollars)

Terms of Trade (ToT)

- In the Doha Round experiment, the most significant welfare cost to Egypt is ToT
 - Import prices rose more than export prices

• Equation TOT2eq

trade terms for region r, computed from components
(all,r,REG)

 $tot2(r) = c1_r(r) + c2_r(r) - c3_r(r)$.

	Doha	Doha + Arab Spring
TempCoeff		
1 c1_r (world prices)	-0.0	2 -0.02
2 c2_r (export prices)	-0.4	2 0.53
3 c3_r (import prices)	-0.1	4 -0.06
тот	-0.5	9 0.46

Change in Export Prices

• Change in Egypt's export prices driven by change

in the price of factor endowment (i.e., Capital)

computes % change in price index of primary factors, by region
(all,r,REG)

VENDWREG(r) * pfactor(r) = sum(i,ENDW_COMM, VOM(i,r) * pm(i,r));



% change in market price

	pm(i, Egypt)
1 Land	-9.44
2 UnSkLab	0.48
3 SkLab	0.48
4 Capital	2.07
5 NatRes	-6.2

Employment and Industry Outputs^{ndustry Outputs}

			qo[*Egypt]	Doha	Doha + Arab Spring	Differ	ence
·••			16 MacElct		-0.04	-5.63	-5.59
nt			18 Mtl		0.66	-4.78	-5.44
			19 oMnfcs		-2.39	-7.69	-5.3
			25 Textile		-1.79	-7.05	-5.26
s4s9sub	arabsp2	Difference	9 Chemical		-0.02	-4.86	-4.84
0.00	2.22	2.6	6 AppLeat		-4.09	-8.76	-4.67
0.28	-3.32	-3.6	20 OSR		0.43	-4.23	<mark>-4.66</mark>
0	2 1 1	2 11	11 Elec		0.04	-4.61	-4.65
0	-5.44	-5.44	26 TrdFinsvc		0.06	-4.55	-4.61
			27 Trncomsvc		0.73	-3.87	-4.6
			30 Wdpap		-0.14	-4.39	-4.25
			14 Lmf		0.21	-3.96	-4.17
			15 LVS		1.4	-2.6	-4
			17 Min		0.17	-3.78	-3.95
			7 cartrn		-0.32	-4.26	-3.94
			13 Fibers		-0.07	-3.95	-3.88
			22 pfbev		0.2	-3.57	-3.77
			8 Cereal		0.94	-2.6	-3.54
			31 Wheat		1.66	-1.86	-3.52
			29 VegOilFat		0.48	-3.03	-3.51
			21 OthAg		0.58	-2.73	-3.31
			28 Vegftnt		0.61	-2.39	-3
			10 Con		-0.07	-2.94	-2.87
			24 Rice_Pro		0.01	-2.77	-2.78
			23 Rice_Pad		1.12	-1.49	-2.61
			32 CGDS		-0.11	-2.68	-2.57
			12 Energy		0.11	-2.44	-2.55
	nt s4s9sub 0.28 0	nt \$4\$9\$ub arab\$p2 0.28 -3.32 0 -3.44	nt s4s9sub arabsp2 Difference 0.28 -3.32 -3.6 0 -3.44 -3.44	nt S4S9sub arabsp2 Difference 9 Chemical 0.28 -3.32 -3.6 20 OSR 0 -3.44 -3.44 -3.44 11 Elec 0 -3.44 -3.44 26 TrdFinsvc 27 Trncomsvc 30 Wdpap 14 Lmf 15 LVS 17 Min 7 cartm 13 Fibers 22 pfbev 8 Cereal 31 Wheat 29 VegOilFat 21 OthAg 28 Vegftnt 10 Con 24 Rice_Pro 23 Rice_Pad 32 CGDS	nt s4s9sub arabsp2 Difference 0.28 -3.32 -3.6 20 SR 0 -3.44 -3.44 -3.44 26 TrdFinsvc 27 Trncomsvc 30 Wdpap 11 Elec 20 TrdFinsvc 27 Trncomsvc 30 Wdpap 14 Lmf 15 LVS 17 Min 7 cartrn 13 Fibers 22 pfbev 8 Cereal 31 Wheat 29 VegOilFat 21 OthAg 28 Vegftnt 10 Con 24 Rice_Pro 28 Vegftnt 10 Con 24 Rice_Pro 21 CethAg 28 Vegftnt 10 Con 24 Rice_Pro 21 CethAg 28 Vegftnt 10 Con 24 Rice_Pro 21 CethAg 28 Vegftnt 10 Con 24 Rice_Pro 21 CethAg 22 Cefos 12 Energy	nt s4s9sub arabsp2 Difference 90.000 0.28 -3.32 -3.6 90.000 0.28 -3.44 -3.4	$ \begin{array}{ c c c } \mbody flex flex flex flex flex flex flex flex$

Learning Experience!

Originally tried to run the experiment for sector wide capital reduction AND capital outflow specifically from Textile and Construction to Energy sector

Problems:

Qfe (sector specific endowment) could not be shocked in the condensed model. Uncondensed model would not run with the given license When it finally ran- there was bad data problem

SWITCH GEAR IF THE HARDEST PATH DOES'T WORK OUT

Group 4: Updating the database

Jeff Okun-Kozlowicki Gregory Whitten

Methodology – update the data

- Incorporate shocks to:
 - GDP;
 - Capital stock;
 - Labor force;
 - Population

to target 2015 levels (as indicated by World Bank's WDI).

- Use PWT results as a substitute for selected countries.
- Endogenize afereg in the closure to match observed GDP growth.

Methodology – update the data: closure

- Minor (2006) fixes the trade balance and endogenizes the price of saving (dpsave).
- We choose to change the endogenize the trade balance.
- Capital stocks have generally grown over time.
- For open economies, FDI may be an important contributor to domestic
 K.
- For intellectual consistency with shocking capital, we fix dpsave.
- Unlike Minor (2006), we make labor exogenous in order to update the data to 2015.

Change in EV owing to Doha as a share of post-Doha GDP.

1 CENTAM	0.47%
2 China	0.12%
3 Egypt	-0.29%
4 EU	-0.04%
5 India	-0.11%
6 Japan	-0.03%
7 LDC	-0.21%
8 MERCOSUR	0.24%
9 MEXICO	-0.11%
10 ROW	0.03%
11 USA	0.01%
12 XME	-0.09%

Sectors of Doha's effects in Egypt



Contribution to growth in Egyptian disaggregated output



100

-40

Contributors to differences between the simulations in Doha's effects

- Terms of Trade for CENTAM (smaller worsening under Doha)
 - Wheat: export prices rise more.
 - Textiles: export prices rise more.
 - Processed rice: import prices fall more.
- Terms of Trade for Mercosur (improvement under Doha)
 - Livestock & dairy: import prices fall more.
 - Processed food & beverage: export prices rise more.
- Allocative efficiency for Japan (better under Doha: prodtax)
 - Construction output rises.
 - Trade in Financial Services rises.

TFP %age Changes

afereg	Implied by the model (2001-2015)	Greg's work (2001-2010) following Caselli (2005)
1 CENTAM	22.267	
2 China	82.3	37
3 Egypt	8.075	-1
4 EU	8.954	
5 India	71.743	18
6 Japan	17.443	1
7 LDC	21.967	
8 MERCOSUR	10.161	
9 MEXICO	-5.178	-9
10 ROW	8.462	
11 USA	14.139	-8
12 XME	10.329	

Limitations

- Capital stocks are not PPP-adjusted.
- Problems with simulation-implied TFP.
- We assume equal growth rates for skilled and unskilled labor (data limitations).
- Fitting a 15-year update into a comparative static framework is problematic.
- No reduction in our experiment of service barriers.