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Larry Combest, R-Texas, US House Agriculture Committee Chairman, on China’s WTO offer:
"The uniqueness of this agreement is that the Chinese gave up everything, the United States had to give up nothing... "

CNN reports on new US Farm bill (May 13, 2002 Posted: 1346 GMT):
"President Bush on Monday signed a 10-year, $190 billion farm bill that promises to expand subsidies to growers... "

Robert B. Zoellick, United States Trade Representative, on agricultural support ( May 7, 2002):
"EU's ceiling of over $60 billion of trade-distorting subsidies is three-times the U.S. ceiling of $19.1 billion; Japan enjoys a ceiling of over $30 billion, more than one-and-a-half times... "

WTO/World Bank/IMF chiefs warn against rich-country protectionism (May 16, 2002):
"Prospects for reform of agricultural support policies...toward interventions that are less damaging to the economic opportunities of the poor, are particularly important...How can leaders in developing countries or in any capital argue for more open economies if leadership in this area is not forthcoming from wealthy nations... "
Objectives and methods

- **Issues to be addressed**
  - What is the impact on China and the world?
  - Does the impact depend on OECD ag policies?

- **Simulation exercises using GTAP model**
  - Base case with no policy changes
  - Policy scenarios against the Base
    - Implementing China’s ag commitments
    - Implementing China’s ag commitments when OECD reforms
Is this study any different?

- Previous studies
  - Data: lack of actual commitments (tariffs and TRQs)
  - Methods: unilateral actions by China

- Our study
  - the actual commitments
  - focused on agriculture
  - policy interactions between OECD countries and China
  - perspective of further agr negotiations
### Bound tariff and TRQs in the actual commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>wheat</th>
<th>grain</th>
<th>vege &amp; fruit</th>
<th>plant based-fiber</th>
<th>beef &amp; lamb</th>
<th>pork &amp; poultry</th>
<th>veg. oil</th>
<th>milk</th>
<th>rice</th>
<th>sugar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>T_{2000}</strong></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T_{2005}</strong></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T_{inquota}</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q_{2000}</strong></td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q_{2005}</strong></td>
<td>9.64</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q_{actual20}</strong></td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: T refers to tariff rates; Q refers to trade quantities in million tons.
Who is distorting the world market? a comparison of tariff rates

Note: TRQ goods for China are wheat, grain, vegetable oil, rice and sugar.
Source: GTAP database and China WTO offer
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Domestic support in EU and USA
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Policy Scenarios

Base case in 2005 (no policy changes)

S1

China’s WTO commitments in agr.

S2

China’s commitments + OECD liberalization

S3

China’s commitments + OECD market access liberalization

S4

China’s commitments + OECD domestic support liberalization
S1. China’s agricultural imports

% changes in imports from the base case
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S1. China’s agricultural exports

% changes in exports from the base case
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S1. China’s agricultural output

% changes in output from the base case
S1. Self-sufficiency in China
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S1. Impact on the world market (wheat and rice)
S1. Impact on the world market (other products)
S2. China’s agricultural imports

% changes from the base case

Scenario 1
Scenario 2
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S2. China’s agricultural exports

% changes from base case

Scenario 1
Scenario 2
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S2. China’s agricultural output

% changes from base case

Scenario 1
Scenario 2
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Decomposition scenarios (S3 and S4): imports
Decomposition scenarios (S3 and S4): export
Decomposition scenarios (S3 and S4): output
Conclusions

- Moderate loss to ag sectors in China
  - increased imports and decreased output
  - sector results differ (depending on the offer)
  - TRQ offers differential market access (depending on initial import/quota ratio)

- Marginal overall welfare implication to China
  - however, impact not negligible for Chinese farmers

- Moderate impact on the world market but China’s trade partners gain
Conclusions

- OECD reforms help Chinese agr and farmers: negative impact mitigated
  - improved market access opportunity ➔ more export and output
  - improved world market price ➔ less imports

- both market access barrier and domestic supports in OECD countries matter to China
Further efforts

- **Data improvement**
  - Initial protection structure (applied rates are preferred!)
  - Initial trade volume for TRQ goods (variations in historical trade volume)

- **Supply side responses in China**
  - Will they help the situation or worsen it?

- **Expand the analysis beyond agriculture**
  - Impact of liberalizations in other sectors (plenty of studies on this)
Outline
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Methodology

- Simulation exercises using GTAP model
  - Base case in 2005 with no policy changes
  - Policy scenarios against the Base, capturing the effects of
    - Implementing China’s ag commitments
    - Implementing China’s ag commitments when OECD reforms
Literature

- Aggregated studies
  - e.g. Lejour, Zhai and Li, Fan and Zheng
  - Hypothetical liberalization scenarios
  - agriculture as an aggregated sector

- Studies focused on Agriculture
  - e.g. Diao et al. (GE), Fuller et al. (PE), Huang et al.(PE)
  - Hypothetical liberalization scenarios except Fuller
Data problem
- TRQs, tariff levels and reductions

Typical approach of previous studies
- Unilateral actions by China, no policy changes in r.o.w.
- Not enough to address further questions such as
  - the relative impact on the world?
  - feedback effects of possible multilateral liberalizations on China?
  - perspectives of further negotiations in agriculture?
  - What can rich countries do to help the poorer ones?
## Sce. 1: China’s ag trade and production

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>imports</th>
<th>market price of imports</th>
<th>exports</th>
<th>export price index</th>
<th>output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wht</td>
<td>152.2</td>
<td>-41.5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-4.3</td>
<td>-12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gro</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>-13.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v_f</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>osd</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pfb</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ocr</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oap</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cmt</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>omt</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vol</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mil</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>-12.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pcr</td>
<td>164.7</td>
<td>-41.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgr</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>-8.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>