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#### Abstract

Although average tariffs in Quad markets are very low, tariff peaks and tariff escalation have a disproportional effect on exports by least developed countries (LDCs). Tariff peak products tend to be heavily concentrated in agriculture and food products and in labor intensive sectors such as apparel and footwear. Full duty and quota free access for LDCs in the Quad for tariff peak products would result in a 11 percent increase in their total exports-on the order of $\$ 2.5$ billion. Exports to Quad countries of tariff peak products would expand by 30 to 60 percent. Given that LDC exports of tariff peak items account for only a small share of total developing country exports, granting LDCs duty free access has a negligible impact on other developing countries. For the same reason, Quad imports increase only marginally, suggesting that this should not be a factor constraining implementation of duty free access for the poorest countries.
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[^0]
## Introduction

Average most-favored-nation (MFN) tariffs in the Quad (Canada, the EU, Japan and the US) have fallen to about 5 percent. Given that the Quad grant developing countries preferential access to their markets through the General System of Preferences (GSP) and related schemes, as well as reciprocal trade agreements such as NAFTA or the EuroMediterranean Partnership Agreements, the majority of goods imported from developing countries enters into Quad markets on a duty-free basis. ${ }^{1}$ Despite the low average MFN and preferential tariff rates that apply in developed countries, tariffs for some commodities are over 100 percent. Such tariff peaks are often concentrated in products that are of export interest to developing countries. They include major agricultural staple food products, such as sugar, cereals and fish; tobacco and certain alcoholic beverages; fruits and vegetables; food industry products with a high sugar content, clothing and footwear. The Uruguay Round of multilateral trade negotiations actually increased tariff dispersion, as tariffication of non-tariff barriers (NTBs) in agriculture led to the imposition of high duties on agricultural products that had previously been quota constrained (Hoekman and Kostecki, 2001). As a result, tariffs that are more than three times higher than the average MFN duty are not uncommon in the Quad.

In many cases where there are tariff peaks, preferences tend to be limited, in that 'sensitive' products are excluded from the schemes or some type of quantitative limitation is imposed, either in terms of the amount that can be imported under the preferential rates (a tariff rate quota) or in terms of the countries that are eligible (Michalopoulos, 1999, Hallaert, 2000). Moreover, the tariff structure of developed countries shows significant tariff escalation, so that market access for more processed products (embodying greater value added) is more restricted. For example, fullyprocessed manufacturing food products face tariffs twice as large as products in the firststage of processing in the EU and Japan, with final goods confronting an average MFN tariff of 24 and 65 percent, respectively. In Canada the ratio is even higher: tariffs on fully-processed food products are 12 times higher than for $1^{\text {st }}$ stage processed products

[^1](the MFN tariff on fully processed is 42 percent). ${ }^{\text {The existence of duty-drawback }}$ systems for Quad-based exporters and the fact that GSP preferences in the Quad are more likely to be granted for products with low MFN tariffs (see below), reinforces the degree of escalation, as some imports of semi-processed products or raw materials are exempted from duties when used as inputs in export production.

This paper assesses the potential effects on the value and the pattern of trade from implementing initiatives to grant least developed countries (LDCs) duty free access for tariff peak items in Quad markets. ${ }^{3}$ The paper is motivated by recent proposals of the Commission of the European Communities to provide LDCs with free access to the EU for all products except arms. We investigate what implementation of this proposal by all Quad countries would mean for LDCs. The paper focuses on tariff peaks only-tariffs below 15 percent are ignored. We do this for a number of reasons. First, peaks affect commodities that are of relatively greater importance for LDCs than other developing countries-they account for a larger share of total LDC exports. Second, from a political economy point of view this is where the 'action' is-these are the products with the highest protection in the Quad. Third, moving beyond tariff peaks to consider elimination of all tariffs on all imports from LDCs requires the use of a computable general equilibrium model of the world economy. Although such tools are readily available, they do not allow a detailed and disaggregated analysis of the effect of liberalization at the product and country level. As we are interested in determining the likely impact of dutyfree access on the pattern and composition of trade, we use a partial equilibrium approach. By limiting our focus to tariff peaks-which account for only a small share of total trade of most countries-such an approach is unlikely to lead to misleading conclusions. ${ }^{-1}$

We do not quantify the effect of remaining NTBs-the focus is solely on tariffs and tariff preferences. NTBs are relatively unimportant in the Quad-only 1.2 percent of tariff lines are subject to NTBs in Canada, 4.2 percent in Europe, 2.6 in Japan and 2.9 in the US (OECD, 1997a). However, they do apply to a sector that is of great interest to

[^2]developing countries-clothing-which is still constrained by quotas. By ignoring these quotas and the associated rents, our analysis underestimates the potential export response by LDCs following duty-free access for tariff peak products. However, given that the WTO Agreement on Textiles and Clothing requires that remaining quotas are to be removed no later than 2005, in the medium term what matters are the tariff preferences. As any duty free access initiative will in all likelihood take some time to be implemented, ignoring textiles and clothing quotas should not have major implications for our results. In the case of agriculture, the Uruguay Round led to tariffication of all NTBs in the Quad (with the exception of rice in Japan). Although tariff rate quotas are often used, these involve two-tier tariff systems, with out of quota imports subject to higher tariffs. In this paper we use out of quota tariffs as the appropriate measure of protection, which may lead to an overestimate of the effects of duty-free access. Specific tariffs-frequently used for agricultural products in the Quad-have been converted into ad valorem equivalents using OECD data (OECD, 1997a; 2000).

The paper is structured as follows. We start with a description of the extent and importance of existing tariff peaks in the Quad (Section 1); the preferential treatment granted to developing countries for these tariff peaks products (Section 2) and the prevailing pattern of developing country exports (Section 3). ${ }^{6}$ We then assess the possible impact of granting duty free access for tariff peak items to the Quad for LDCs, using partial equilibrium simulation methods (Section 4). Section 5 concludes.

## 1 Tariff peaks and imports in Quad

Between 6 and 14 percent of Quad tariff lines at the 6-digit of the Harmonized System (HS) are above 15 percent (Table 1). ${ }^{\text {T }}$ There are 200 to 300 such lines in the US, the EU and Japan, whereas Canada has more than 700 tariff peaks. The average tariff in the Quad over all tariff peak products is 28 percent, or 4.5 times the unweighted total average tariff of 6.2 percent. The highest average tariff for peak products is found in the EU with an average of 40.3 percent (compared to an average of 7.4 percent for all products). In the

[^3]US and Canada, most of the tariff peaks are in industrial products (over 85 percent), whereas in the EU and Japan most peaks affect agricultural products ( 91 and 77 percent). The maximum tariff rate at the 6-digit level of aggregation in Canada, the EU, Japan and the US, respectively, applies to butter ( 340 percent), edible bovine offal ( 250 percent), raw cane sugar (170 percent) and ground nuts in shell (120 percent).

Total imports of products subject to tariff peaks in the Quad in 1999 was $\$ 92.8$ billion. More than 60 percent of Quad imports of these products originate in developing countries (55.2/92.8-see Table 1) and potentially face an average tariff of 28 percent. ${ }^{\square}$ This represents around 5 percent of total developing countries exports to the Quad. LDC exports are disproportionately affected by tariff peaks in the Quad-products subject to tariff peaks represent 15 to 30 percent of total exports to the US, EU and Canada. Up to $\$ 22$ billion of tariff revenue may be collected on these tariff peak items by Quad countries, half of which is contributed by developing country exporters (including those with preferential treatment); LDC exporters may pay up to $\$ 200$ million in tariff revenue, in spite of their preferences.

Tables 2a-d provide a more detailed description of Quad imports of peak products from developing countries at the HS 2 digit level. The trade values reported correspond only to imports of products with tariffs above 15 percent at the 6 digit level for each of the 2 digit categories. In the US and Canada, the largest import category subject to tariff peaks is apparel: more than 90 percent of LDC exports of tariff peak products to the US and Canada occur in HS 61 and 62 (apparel and clothing). For developing countries in general, clothing and footwear represent more than 60 percent of exports of tariff peak products to the Quad. Exports of clothing to the EU and Japan are also relatively large, but these products are not tariff peak items in either market. Most developing country exports of tariff peak products to the EU and Japan occur in agriculture, food products and footwear.

[^4]Table 1: Tariff peaks and imports by Quad, 1999

| Tariff Peak Product (at HS 6-digit Level) | USA | EU15 /a | Japan | Canada | All Quad |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. of Tariff Peak Products ( $\mathrm{mfn}>=15 \%$ ) /b | 307 | 317 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 233 \\ 178 \\ 55 \\ \\ 4.6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 732 \\ 85 \\ 647 \end{gathered}$ | 1077 /e |
| of which: Agriculture Products /b | 48 | 290 |  |  | 364 /e |
| Industrial Products $/ \mathrm{b}$ | 263 | 27 |  |  | 713 /e |
| Tariff Peak Products as \% of All Tariff Lines | 6.1 | 6.2 |  | $\begin{gathered} 647 \\ 14.3 \end{gathered}$ | 7.8 /f |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 27.8 \\ 4.3 \\ 170.5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30.5 \\ 8.3 \\ 342.7 \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Average MFN Tariff Rates (unweighted in \%): |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tariff Peak Products | 20.8 | 40.3 |  |  | 28.0 |
| All Products | 5.0 | 7.4 |  |  | 6.2 |
| Maximum Rate | 121.0 | 251.9 |  |  | 221.5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total imports of Tariff Peak Products | 41.2 | 27.1 | $\begin{gathered} 15.8 \\ 4.8 \\ 0.03 \end{gathered}$ | 8.7 | 92.8 |
| (US\$ billion) |  |  |  |  |  |
| of which: All Preferential \& GSP Countries | 26.3 | 16.5 |  | $\begin{gathered} 7.6 \\ 0.09 \end{gathered}$ | 55.2 |
| Least Developed Countries /c | 0.9 | 0.3 |  |  | 1.3 |
| ACP Developing Countries /d |  | 2.7 |  |  | 2.7 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Share of Tariff Peak products in total imports (\%) | 4.6 | 3.4 | 4.9 | 4.6 | 4.2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| of which: All Preferential \& GSP Countries (\%) | 6.6 | 4.9 | $\begin{aligned} & 2.8 \\ & 2.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.8 \\ 30.2 \end{gathered}$ | 5.2 |
| Least Developed Countries /c | 15.0 | 2.8 |  |  | 11.4 |
| ACP Developing Countries /d |  | 15.0 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Import Revenue Collection in Tariff Peak | 5.4 | 8.9 | 6.3 | 1.6 | 22.2 |
| Products from the World (in Billion of US\$) |  |  |  |  |  |
| of which: All Preferential \& GSP Dev. Countries | 4.6 | 4.3 | $\begin{gathered} 1.4 \\ 0.001 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.7 \\ 0.02 \end{gathered}$ | 11.0 |
| Least Developed Countries /c | 0.2 | 0.03 |  |  | 0.2 |
| ACP Developing Countries /d |  | 0.57 |  |  | 0.6 |

Notes: /a Excludes all EU intra trade in world totals
/b No overlapping items in the Quad aggregates
/c Based on the United Nations classification of 48 countries
/d Based on fourth Lomé Convention for 59 Africa, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) low income countries. Includes a large number of LDCs.
/e Number of non-overlapping categories.
/f This is the simple (unweighted) average across Quad countries. Note that of the 5032 tariff lines at the 6 digit level of the Harmonized System, 21 percent (1077/5032) includes a tariff peak item in at least one Quad member.

Sources: OECD for MFN tariff, WTO tariff files for preferences and UN Comtrade Statistics for trade.

Table 2a: Canadian Tariff Peak Imports by HS 2-digit (1996-98 average)

| Tariff Peak at HS 2-digit Product | DC. (non-IDC) |  | IDCs |  | World |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \$ '000 | All Peaks | \$ '000 | All Peaks | \$ '000 | All Peaks |
| 01 Live animals. | 134 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 25118 | 0.3 |
| 02 Meat and edible meat offal | 12 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 116718 | 1.3 |
| 04 Dairy prod; birds' eggs; honey | 9653 | 0.3 | 12 | 0.0 | 227028 | 2.6 |
| 06 Live tree \& other plant; bulb, cut flowers | 38432 | 1.1 | 3 | 0.0 | 50659 | 0.6 |
| 08 Edible fruit and nuts; melons | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 20 | 0.0 |
| 10 Cereals. | 2937 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 16482 | 0.2 |
| 11 Prod mill indust; malt; starches | 649 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 16511 | 0.2 |
| 12 Oil seed, oleagi fruits; misc grain | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 13 Lac; gums, resins \& other veg | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 0.0 |
| 15 Animal/veg fats \& oils \& prod | 14003 | 0.4 | 5 | 0.0 | 67360 | 0.8 |
| 16 Prep of meat, fish or mollusks | 16 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 111379 | 1.3 |
| 17 Sugars and sugar confectionery | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 76 | 0.0 |
| 18 Cocoa and cocoa preparations | 11530 | 0.3 | 12 | 0.0 | 225982 | 2.6 |
| 19 Prep of cereal, flour, starch/milk prod | 2583 | 0.1 | 1 | 0.0 | 109161 | 1.3 |
| 20 Prep of vegetable, fruit, nuts prod | 8454 | 0.2 | 4 | 0.0 | 11073 | 0.1 |
| 21 Miscellaneous edible preparations | 21007 | 0.6 | 17 | 0.0 | 333050 | 3.8 |
| 22 Beverages, spirits and vinegar | 5573 | 0.2 | 1 | 0.0 | 116947 | 1.3 |
| 23 Residues \& waste from food indust | 8333 | 0.2 | 148 | 0.2 | 141109 | 1.6 |
| 24 Tobacco and manufactured | 313 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 10187 | 0.1 |
| 33 Essential oils \& resinoids, perf. | 197 | 0.0 | 1 | 0.0 | 81149 | 0.9 |
| 35 Albuminoidal subs; modified starches | 110 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 5602 | 0.1 |
| 39 Plastics and articles thereof. | 36479 | 1.0 | 151 | 0.2 | 396692 | 4.6 |
| 40 Rubber and articles thereof. | 35795 | 1.0 | 85 | 0.1 | 100675 | 1.2 |
| 42 Articles of leather; saddlery, travel pr | 108267 | 3.0 | 45 | 0.1 | 118978 | 1.4 |
| 43 Furskins and artificial fur thereof. | 9796 | 0.3 | 7 | 0.0 | 17308 | 0.2 |
| 51 Wool, fine/coarse animal hair nes | 32530 | 0.9 | 9 | 0.0 | 87919 | 1.0 |
| 52 Cotton. | 51587 | 1.4 | 26 | 0.0 | 241263 | 2.8 |
| 53 Other vegetable textile fibres \& yarns | 2193 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 4220 | 0.0 |
| 54 Man-made filaments. | 79183 | 2.2 | 1 | 0.0 | 249164 | 2.9 |
| 55 Man-made staple fibres. | 98053 | 2.7 | 60 | 0.1 | 272819 | 3.1 |
| 56 Wadding, felt \& nonwoven, yarns etc. | 9119 | 0.3 | 15 | 0.0 | 240986 | 2.8 |
| 57 Carpets and other textile floor coverings | 7148 | 0.2 | 176 | 0.2 | 66718 | 0.8 |
| 58 Special woven fab; tufted tex fab etc | 22818 | 0.6 | 11 | 0.0 | 106245 | 1.2 |
| 59 Impregnated, coated, cover/laminated | 13128 | 0.4 | 1 | 0.0 | 164554 | 1.9 |
| 60 Knitted or crocheted fabrics | 78072 | 2.2 | 2 | 0.0 | 247784 | 2.9 |
| 61 Art of apparel \& clothing access | 756272 | 20.9 | 34576 | 38.9 | 1134671 | 13.1 |
| 62 Art of apparel \& clothing access | 1068566 | 29.6 | 50355 | 56.6 | 1502785 | 17.3 |
| 63 Other made up textile articles | 141153 | 3.9 | 1410 | 1.6 | 414617 | 4.8 |
| 64 Footwear, gaiters and articles | 606225 | 16.8 | 141 | 0.2 | 859968 | 9.9 |
| 65 Headgear and parts thereof. | 40650 | 1.1 | 1559 | 1.8 | 56996 | 0.7 |
| 67 Prepr feathers \& down; art flower nes | 2629 | 0.1 | 89 | 0.1 | 3727 | 0.0 |
| 68 Art of stone, plaster, cement, asbestos | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 177 | 0.0 |
| 70 Glass and glassware. | 1150 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 44277 | 0.5 |
| 85 Electrical mech equip parts, sound pr | 171068 | 4.7 | 2 | 0.0 | 392525 | 4.5 |
| 86 Railw/tramw locom, rolling stock etc. | 7 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 22473 | 0.3 |
| 89 Ships, boats and floating structures | 53317 | 1.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 73031 | 0.8 |
| 91 Clocks and watches and parts nes | 8740 | 0.2 | 9 | 0.0 | 13005 | 0.1 |
| 94 Furniture; bedding, mattress, cushion | 16789 | 0.5 | 1 | 0.0 | 54570 | 0.6 |
| 95 Toys, games \& sports requisites, nes | 26841 | 0.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 54440 | 0.6 |
| 96 Miscellaneous manufactured articles | 10824 | 0.3 | 4 | 0.0 | 75004 | 0.9 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All above Peak Products (50) | 3612335 | 100.0 | 88940 | 100.0 | 8683203 | 100.0 |
| All Peaks as \% of All Goods | 12.1 |  | 30.2 |  | 4.6 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All goods | 29735968 |  | 294206 |  | 189663049 |  |

Source: Computations based on UN COMTRADE Statistics.

Table 2b: European Union Tariff Peak Imports by HS 2-digit (1996-1998 average)

| Tariff Peak at HS 2-digit Products | DCs (non-LDCs) |  | LDCs \& ACP |  |  | World (excl intra EU) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Imports <br> \$ '000 | As \% of All Peaks | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LDCs } \\ & \${ }^{\prime} \mathbf{0 0 0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { ACP } \\ \$ \$^{\prime} 000 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Total as \% } \\ \text { of All } \\ \text { Peaks } \end{array}$ | Imports \$ '000 | As \% of All Peaks |
| 01 Live animals. | 196738 | 1.2 | 3 | 0 | 0.0 | 198627 | 0.4 |
| 02 Meat and edible meat offal | 1484861 | 9.0 | 2501 | 32284 | 1.2 | 2479580 | 4.7 |
| 03 Fish \& crustacean, mollusk nes | 414792 | 2.5 | 18352 | 58281 | 2.6 | 640485 | 1.2 |
| 04 Dairy prod; birds' eggs; honey | 408724 | 2.5 | 532 | 1120 | 0.1 | 1158305 | 2.2 |
| 06 Live tree \& other plant; bulb, cut flowers | 403997 | 2.5 | 24351 | 172061 | 6.6 | 616188 | 1.2 |
| 07 Edible vegetables and roots \& tubers | 748841 | 4.5 | 1893 | 6239 | 0.3 | 786957 | 1.5 |
| 08 Edible fruit and nuts; melons | 3215127 | 19.5 | 11357 | 523714 | 18.0 | 3854199 | 7.2 |
| 09 Coffee, tea, mat and spices | 5718 | 0.0 | 18 | 136 | 0.0 | 7712 | 0.0 |
| 10 Cereals. | 655581 | 4.0 | 5992 | 43400 | 1.7 | 1812641 | 3.4 |
| 11 Prod mill indust; malt; starches | 30152 | 0.2 | 72 | 930 | 0.0 | 64027 | 0.1 |
| 12 Oil seed, oleagi fruits; misc grain | 76 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 76 | 0.0 |
| 13 Lac ; gums, resins \& other veg | 4783 | 0.0 | 29 | 44 | 0.0 | 12102 | 0.0 |
| 15 Animal/veg fats \& oils \& prod | 283301 | 1.7 | 35 | 105 | 0.0 | 293660 | 0.6 |
| 16 Prep of meat, fish or mollusks | 1504943 | 9.1 | 73048 | 475351 | 18.4 | 2599617 | 4.9 |
| 17 Sugars and sugar confectionery | 290881 | 1.8 | 50961 | 872813 | 31.0 | 1305696 | 2.4 |
| 18 Cocoa and cocoa preparations | 1040 | 0.0 | 0 | 2 | 0.0 | 2284 | 0.0 |
| 19 Prep of cereal, flour, starch/milk prod | 109982 | 0.7 | 275 | 1880 | 0.1 | 337617 | 0.6 |
| 20 Prep of vegetable, fruit, nuts prod | 2788622 | 16.9 | 3115 | 128265 | 4.4 | 3360717 | 6.3 |
| 21 Miscellaneous edible preparations | 235059 | 1.4 | 1308 | 54198 | 1.9 | 745369 | 1.4 |
| 22 Beverages, spirits and vinegar | 413058 | 2.5 | 2170 | 262588 | 8.9 | 903738 | 1.7 |
| 23 Residues \& waste from food indust | 158264 | 1.0 | 179 | 1073 | 0.0 | 1278138 | 2.4 |
| 24 Tobacco and manufactured | 415206 | 2.5 | 34135 | 67035 | 3.4 | 658981 | 1.2 |
| 29 Organic chemicals. | 1452 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 6456 | 0.0 |
| 35 Albuminoidal subs; modified starches | 17148 | 0.1 | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 58026 | 0.1 |
| 38 Miscellaneous chemical products | 207 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1630 | 0.0 |
| 56 Wadding, felt \& nonwoven, yarns etc. | 4143 | 0.0 | 5084 | 79 | 0.2 | 10053 | 0.0 |
| 64 Footwear, gaiters and articles | 2117353 | 12.9 | 27649 | 10328 | 1.3 | 3032077 | 5.7 |
| 87 Vehicles o/t railw/tramw roll stock, pts | 550465 | 3.3 | 4888 | 139 | 0.2 | 873057 | 1.6 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All above Peak Products (28) | 16460512 | 100.0 | 267948 | 2712065 | 100.0 | 53322977 | 100.0 |
| All Peaks as \% of All Goods | 4.9 |  | 2.8 | 15.0 |  | 6.7 |  |
| All Goods | 336372956 |  | 9486662 | 18046842 |  | 793651939 |  |
| Memo: Non-Peak Items |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 61 Art of apparel \& clothing accessories | 12628395 | 76.7 | 1045824 | 531205 | 52.9 | 30819954 | 57.8 |
| 62 Art of apparel \& clothing accessories | 20492103 | 124.5 | 1205487 | 258471 | 49.1 | 40252929 | 75.5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Computations based on UN COMTRADE Statistics.

Table 2c: Japan's Tariff Peak Imports by HS 2-digit Product (1996-98 average)


Source: Computations based on UN COMTRADE Statistics.

Table 2d: United States Tariff Peak Imports by HS 2-digit (1996-98 average)

| Tariff Peak at HS 2-digit Product | Developing countries (non LDC) |  |  | LDCs |  | World |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Non-Mex } \\ \${ }^{\prime} 000 \end{gathered}$ | Mexico <br> \$ '000 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Total As \% } \\ \text { of All } \\ \text { Peaks } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Imports <br> \$ '000 | As \% of All Peaks | Imports <br> \$ '000 | As \% of All Peaks |
| 02 Meat and edible meat offal 04 Dairy prod; birds' eggs; honey 07 Edible vegetables and roots nes 08 Edible fruit and nuts; melons 11 Prod mill indust; malt; starches 12 Oil seed, oleagi fruits; misc etc. 15 Animal/veg fats \& oils \& prod 19 Prep of cereal, flour, milk prod 20 Prep of vegetable, fruit, nuts <br> 21 Miscellaneous edible prep <br> 24 Tobacco and manufactured <br> 28 Inorgn chem; compds of prec <br> 29 Organic chemicals. <br> 30 Pharmaceutical products. <br> 42 Articles of leather; saddlery <br> 51 Wool, fine/coarse animal hair <br> 52 Cotton. <br> 54 Man-made filaments. <br> 55 Man-made staple fibres. <br> 56 Wadding, felt \& nonwoven, yarn <br> 58 Special woven fab; tufted fabrics <br> 60 Knitted or crocheted fabrics <br> 61 Art of apparel \& clothing access <br> 62 Art of apparel \& clothing access <br> 64 Footwear, gaiters and parts etc. <br> 69 Ceramic products. <br> 70 Glass and glassware. <br> 82 Tool, implement, cutlery, spoon <br> 86 Railw/tramw locom, rolling stock <br> 87 Vehicles o/t railw/tramw roll stock <br> 96 Miscellaneous manufactures <br> All Above Peak Products (31) <br> All Peaks as \% of All Goods <br> All Goods | 63 | 0 <br> 32 <br> 163044 <br> 166620 <br> 6 <br> 3871 <br> 5862 <br> 318 <br> 66832 <br> 469 <br> 31038 <br> 218 <br> 0 <br> 99 <br> 35 <br> 12525 <br> 77 <br> 17204 <br> 7248 <br> 13 <br> 12311 <br> 1817 <br> 1716956 <br> 582678 <br> 132102 <br> 127765 <br> 32752 <br> 770 <br> 19692 <br> 3289379 <br> 26215 <br> 6417948 <br> 7.5 <br>  <br> 85767530 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 18312 <br> 704 <br> 220214 <br> 317574 <br> 33 <br> 45380 <br> 18770 <br> 8504 <br> 441239 <br> 5230 <br> 1132888 <br> 435 <br> 9034 <br> 118917 <br> 10084 <br> 185022 <br> 15085 <br> 714444 <br> 479378 <br> 8213 <br> 137878 <br> 238127 <br> 11050780 <br> 9293099 <br> 4904978 <br> 855098 <br> 327747 <br> 75849 <br> 416215 <br> 10063170 <br> 56282 <br>  <br> 41172410 <br> 4.6 <br> 86667625 | 0.0 |
|  | 147 |  | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
|  | 21946 |  | 1.0 | 17 | 0.0 |  | 0.5 |
|  | 145263 |  | 1.7 | 6 | 0.0 |  | 0.8 |
|  | 23 |  | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
|  | 41151 |  | 0.2 | 92 | 0.0 |  | 0.1 |
|  | 2959 |  | 0.0 | 1 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
|  | 2831 |  | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
|  | 309031 |  | 2.0 | 15 | 0.0 |  | 1.1 |
|  | 132 |  | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
|  | 828882 |  | 4.7 | 63707 | 6.9 |  | 2.8 |
|  | 27 |  | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
|  | 230 |  | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
|  | 9140 |  | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |  | 0.3 |
|  | 132 |  | 0.0 | 1 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
|  | 46265 |  | 0.3 | 18 | 0.0 |  | 0.4 |
|  | 1797 |  | 0.0 | 3 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
|  | 128835 |  | 0.8 | 4 | 0.0 |  | 1.7 |
|  | 177819 |  | 1.0 | 246 | 0.0 |  | 1.2 |
|  | 707 |  | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
|  | 4642 |  | 0.1 | 9 | 0.0 |  | 0.3 |
|  | 1292 |  | 0.0 | 7 | 0.0 |  | 0.6 |
|  | 4957240 |  | 36.1 | 376335 | 41.0 |  | 26.8 |
|  | 4245221 |  | 26.1 | 476601 | 51.9 |  | 22.6 |
|  | 950635 |  | 5.9 | 730 | 0.1 |  | 11.9 |
|  | 111009 |  | 1.3 | 20 | 0.0 |  | 2.1 |
|  | 67670 |  | 0.5 | 1181 | 0.1 |  | 0.8 |
|  | 5184 |  | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |  | 0.2 |
|  | 48 |  | 0.1 | 0 | 0.0 |  | 1.0 |
|  | 281 |  | 17.8 | 0 | 0.0 |  | 24.4 |
|  | 3513 |  | 0.2 | 15 | 0.0 |  | 0.1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 12064119 |  | 100.0 | 919009 | 100.0 |  | 100.0 |
|  | 8.4 |  |  | 15.0 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 143519745 |  |  | 6114833 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Computations based on UN COMTRADE Statistics.

## 2 Tariff peaks and developing country preferences

Most developing countries enjoy preferential access to Quad markets, either through unilateral schemes such as the GSP, or through free trade agreements such as NAFTA or EU Association Agreements. In the case of Canada, Japan and the EU, around 170 developing countries benefit from GSP (or better) preferences. ${ }^{8}$ In the case of the US, 29 developing countries are excluded from GSP, so that only 140 developing countries benefit from some sort of preferential access.

Preferences granted by the Quad are of a cascading nature-countries with FTAs generally get the best treatment, followed by LDCs and other developing countries. The US grants preferences to the members of the Andean Pact (ATP) and the Caribbean (CAR), and to Mexico under NAFTA. ${ }^{\square}$ For the EU, we report both Lomé preferences (ACP), and the FTA preferences granted to Eastern Europe and Mediterranean countries. Note that in the case of the EU three different groups of countries are constructed: LDCs that are not ACP members; ACP countries (broken down into LDC and non-LDC countries); and non-ACP, non-LDC developing countries that benefit from GSP treatment. Finally, in the case of Canada, developing countries are grouped into those benefiting from LDC, GSP, or Caribbean preferences, and Mexico and Chile, that benefit from FTAs.

On average these preferential schemes are quite generous. In the EU, the average tariff faced by LDCs or ACP members is below 1 percent, compared to the 7.4 percent average MFN tariff. GSP preferences in the EU are less generous, but still imply more than a 50 percent margin. Japan and the US follow with a 50 percent preference margin under their GSP regime, and an average 60 percent preference for LDCs. Canada gives a 25 percent preference to GSP countries and 45 percent to LDCs. The US data suggest that preference margins granted to developing countries are relatively small in products with tariff peaks. GSP countries only benefit on average from a 20 percent margin. LDCs have a 41 percent margin; Andean Trade Pact and Caribbean countries benefit on average from a 45 percent preference margin.

[^5]Table 3: Tariff Peaks and Preferential Duty Rates in the Quad, 1999

| Preferential Trade Agreements/GSP | Number of Countries | Average Pref. Rate (unweighted in \%) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Tariff Peak Products | All Goods at HS-6 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Canada |  | 0.6 | 0.1 |
| Mexico | 1 | 1.6 | 0.3 |
| Israel | 1 | 0.6 | 0.1 |
| ANDEAN /a | 4 | 14 | 1.7 |
| Caribbean Community /b | $22$ | 13.5 | 1.6 |
| GSP-only beneficiaries /c | $\begin{aligned} & 80 \\ & 38 \end{aligned}$ | 16 | 2.4 |
| Least developed Countries /d |  | 14.4 | $\begin{gathered} 1.8 \\ (5.0) \end{gathered}$ |
| Other Countries (MFN Rate) |  | (20.8) |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| European Union: <br> Eastern Europe and Middle East /e GSP-only beneficiaries /f Least Developed ACP Countries /g Other ACP Countries /h Other Least Developed Countries /i Other Countries (MFN Rate) /j | 15 |  |  |
|  | $30$ | 20.1 |  |
|  | $42$ | 19.8 | 1.8 3.6 |
|  | 37 | 11.9 | 0.8 |
|  | 32 11 | 12.4 | $0.9$ |
|  | 11 | 12.6 | 0.9 |
|  |  | (40.3) | (7.4) |
| Japan: |  |  |  |
| GSP-only beneficiaries /k | $127$ | 22.7 | 2.3 |
| Least Developed Countries /l | 42 | 19.0 | 1.7 |
| Other Countries (MFN Rate) |  | (27.8) | (4.3) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Canada: |  |  |  |
| United States | 1 | 7.1 | 1.6 |
| Australia | 1 | 28.2 | 7.8 |
| New Zealand | 1 | 28.2 | 7.8 |
| Mexico | 1 | 15.9 | 3.1 |
| Chile | 1 | 12.2 | 2.4 |
| Israel | 1 | 11.8 | 2.5 |
| Caribbean Countries /m | 18 | 23.3 | 4.3 |
| GSP-only beneficiaries /n | 108 | 28.2 | 6.2 |
| Least Developed Countries /o | 47 | 22.8 | $\begin{gathered} 4.4 \\ (8.3) \end{gathered}$ |
| Other Countries (MFN Rate) |  | (30.5) |  |

Notes: /a Included Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador and Peru under Andean Trade Preference Act.
/b Based on 20 Caribbean countries under Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act and Bahamas, Nicaragua.
/c Included 80 developing countries or territories under GSP scheme but excluding 29 other developing economies.
/d Based on UN 48 least developed countries but excluding 10 countries.
/e Including countries with reciprocal and non reciprocal trade agreements with the EU.
/f Most developing countries in Latin America and Asia; excludes Hong Kong, Korea and Singapore (non-GSP nations).
$/ \mathrm{g}$ Included 37 ACP and least developed countries under Lome Convention.
/h Included ACP 32 countries under Lome Convention but not under the group of least developed countries.
/i Included 11 least developed countries but not under ACP countries.
/j Included all industrial countries, Hong Kong, Korea, Singapore and 14 transition countries.
/k 127 countries; excludes Albania, Bosnia, Estonia, Latvia, Lebanon, Lithuania, Macedonia, Moldova, Vietnam, Yugoslavia. /1 Excludes 3 LDCs: Comoros, Djibouti and Tuvalu. 3 others (Congo DR, Kiribati and Zambia) are included in the GSP group.
$/ \mathrm{m}$ Included 18 Caribbean countries or territories under Commonwealth Caribbean Countries Tariff.
/n Excluded 8 developing countries: Albania, Aruba, Bosnia \& Herz, Macedonia, Mongolia, Oman, Saudi Arabia, Yugoslavia
/o Excluded Myanmar.
Source: WTO files.

Preferences are much less generous for tariff peak products. Indeed, except for the EU, the preference margins are significantly below the average across all products. Preference margins for GSP beneficiaries in Canada, Japan and the US on tariff peak items are only 8,18 and 23 percent, respectively. For LDCs the margins fall to 25 percent in Canada and 30 percent in the US and Japan. More detail on the structure of preferences for different tariff brackets in the Quad is provided in Table 4. For example, for tariffs between 50 and 100 percent, the preference margin granted to LDCs is only 17 percent in the US and 22 percent in Japan. Thus, although existing preferential schemes grant significant preferences to developing countries, preferences are concentrated in products which already enjoy low tariffs (between 0 and 10 percent) rather than on tariff peaks. In other words, preferential schemes offer little protection against tariff peaks in the Quad, except for the European Union. Data on the average MFN import duties on tariff peak products at the HS 2 digit level, and preference margins granted by the Quad to different groups of developing countries are provided in Appendix A. A value of 1 in the preference columns means that the products enter the Quad member duty-free-there is a 100 percent margin.

## 3 Tariff peaks and LDC exports

In order to simulate the possible effect of duty free access to the Quad, data are required on the total value of LDC exports to the world of products that are subject to tariff peaks in the Quad. Tariff peaks in the Quad affect LDC exports to the world because Quad tariffs lower world prices (see Appendix C). Data on global exports of LDCs of products subject to peaks in the Quad are reported in Tables 5a-d at the HS 2 digit level, where values again correspond only to those 6 -digit products within each 2 digit category that face tariff peaks in the Quad (i.e., they do not correspond to exports of all products within the 2 digit category). Total exports of LDCs to each Quad member and to the world at the 2 digit level are reported in Appendix B. They amount to $\$ 22.7$ billion, of which $\$ 17$ billion is exported to the Quad. ${ }^{10}$

[^6]Table 4: Structure of MFN and LDC Duty Rates by Quad Countries, 1999

| Tariff Rateat HS-6 digit | United States |  |  |  | European Union |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of Tar Lines | As \% of All Lines | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MFN } \\ & \text { Rate } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LDCs } \\ & \text { Rate } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | No. of Tar Lines | As \% of All Lines | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MFN } \\ & \text { Rate } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LDCs } \\ & \text { Rate } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| MFN > $=100$ | 3 | 0.1 | 115.4 | 42.8 | 22 | 0.4 | 132.5 | 46.2 |
| MFN > $=50$ | 5 | 0.1 | 86.0 | 70.9 | 49 | 1.0 | 73.8 | 26.0 |
| MFN > $=40$ | 1 | 0.0 | 44.0 | 38.9 | 25 | 0.5 | 43.6 | 12.1 |
| MFN > $=30$ | 9 | 0.2 | 33.3 | 20.5 | 46 | 0.9 | 34.5 | 13.3 |
| MFN > $=25$ | 20 | 0.4 | 26.4 | 16.8 | 26 | 0.5 | 27.0 | 9.4 |
| MFN > $=20$ | 47 | 0.9 | 22.0 | 13.0 | 60 | 1.2 | 22.2 | 5.0 |
| MFN $>=15$ | 226 | 4.4 | 16.8 | 12.5 | 89 | 1.7 | 17.2 | 1.7 |
| MFN $>=10$ | 374 | 7.3 | 12.0 | 6.8 | 715 | 14.0 | 11.9 | 0.2 |
| MFN $>=5$ | 1096 | 21.4 | 6.9 | 1.9 | 1478 | 28.9 | 6.8 | 0.0 |
| MFN > 0 | 2355 | 46.1 | 2.9 | 0.1 | 2125 | 41.6 | 3.0 | 0.0 |
| MFN $=0$ | 977 | 19.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 478 | 9.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| All Products | 5113 | 100.0 | 5.0 | 1.8 | 5113 | 100.0 | 7.4 | 0.8 |
| Tariff Peak Prod | 311 | 6.1 | 20.8 | 14.4 | 317 | 6.2 | 40.3 | 12.3 |
| (MFN >= 15) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tariff Rate | Japan |  |  |  |  | Canada |  |  |
| MFN $>=100$ | 3 | 0.1 | 139.2 | 118.0 | 38 | 0.7 | 184.9 | 141.1 |
| MFN > $=50$ | 11 | 0.2 | 67.0 | 52.3 | 22 | 0.4 | 79.4 | 42.6 |
| MFN > $=40$ | 17 | 0.3 | 45.4 | 25.6 | 2 | 0.0 | 46.0 | 24.5 |
| MFN $>=30$ | 26 | 0.5 | 33.8 | 19.4 | 1 | 0.0 | 35.3 | 35.3 |
| MFN > $=25$ | 36 | 0.7 | 27.2 | 19.9 | 6 | 0.1 | 25.0 | 1.8 |
| MFN > $=20$ | 55 | 1.1 | 22.4 | 17.5 | 305 | 6.0 | 22.8 | 20.6 |
| MFN $>=15$ | 85 | 1.7 | 17.1 | 11.2 | 358 | 7.0 | 17.7 | 11.2 |
| MFN > $=10$ | 341 | 6.7 | 12.6 | 2.8 | 572 | 11.2 | 11.4 | 3.1 |
| MFN $>=5$ | 832 | 16.3 | 7.2 | 1.7 | 1376 | 26.9 | 7.6 | 2.1 |
| MFN > 0 | 1465 | 28.7 | 3.5 | 0.4 | 1087 | 21.3 | 3.0 | 1.0 |
| MFN $=0$ | 2241 | 43.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1346 | 26.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| All Products | 5112 | 100.0 | 4.3 | 1.5 | 5113 | 100.0 | 8.3 | 4.4 |
| Tariff Peak Prod | 233 | 4.6 | 27.8 | 19.3 | 732 | 14.3 | 30.5 | 22.8 |
| (MFN >= 15) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: WTO files

More than $\$ 5.5$ billion of LDC exports to the world, or 25 percent of their total exports, are potentially affected by tariff peaks in Canada (Table 5a-column 3). Most of these affected exports are in apparel and clothing (HS 62 and 62). More interestingly, more than 99 percent of LDC exports of apparel to the world are affected by a tariff peak in Canada (total exports are reported in Appendix B). There is almost no preferential access for LDCs in these items (the preference margin is only 8 percent-see Table A1). This implies that full duty free access to Canada is likely to have a significant effect on

LDC exports. Exports of other developing countries potentially affected by a Canadian tariff peaks are also concentrated in apparel-and preference margins are even smaller (around 3 percent). However, Mexico and Chile benefit from a 66 percent preference margin in these items under their respective bilateral trade agreements with Canada which brings the tariff they face to around 10 percent.

Similarly, more than $\$ 3$ billion of LDC exports to the world, or 14 percent, are potentially affected by tariff peaks in the US (Table 5d). Most LDC exports to the world facing a tariff peak in the US are again concentrated in apparel ( $\$ 2.6$ billion dollars), and do not benefit from preferential access. Tobacco is another tariff peak item that is an important export for both LDCs and GSP beneficiaries. In the case of LDCs, more than 95 percent of their total exports of tobacco to the world potentially face a tariff peak in the US of 63 percent (the MFN rate on these products averages 73 percent, with a 14 percent preference margin for LDCs-see Appendix Table B4).

The numbers are smaller in the case of Japan and the EU (Tables 5b and 5c), with tariff peaks in each market affecting some $\$ 500$ and $\$ 800$ million of LDC exports to the world, respectively. Although these numbers are small in absolute terms, the effect of peaks in these markets on specific LDCs may be quite large. For example, currently Djibouti, Kiribati, Somalia and Tuvalu together export less than $\$ 50$ million to the world. LDC exports affected by EU tariff peaks are concentrated in meat and fish products (HS 16), fish and crustaceans (HS 03), sugar (HS 17), tobacco (HS 24) and footwear (HS 64) (Table 5b). However, as indicated in Table A2, with the exception of meat, fish or mollusk products (HS 16) and sugar (HS 17), all of these exports benefit from full duty free access into the EU. In the case of preparations of meat, the 68 percent preference margin brings the tariff faced by LDC exporters around 10 percent. In the case of sugar, however, the preference margin granted to LDCs is quite small; their exports face an average tariff of 29 percent.

LDC exports that are affected by Japanese tariff peaks include sugar (HS 17), raw hides and skins (HS 41) and footwear (HS 64) (Table 5c). Of these, sugar is the only one where no preference is granted to LDCs. Full duty free access is granted for footwear, while in the case of hides and skins, an 80 preference margin is granted to LDCs-see Appendix Table A3.

Table 5a
Canada: Tariff Peaks and developing country exports to the world (US\$ million)

| Tariff Peak at HS 2-digit Product | MFN tariff | Exp of LDC | Exp of GSP | Exp of Mex | Exp of Chl | Exp of CAR | Exp of Wld |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01 Live animals. | 198.8 | 0.0 | 195.9 | 0.0 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 746.6 |
| 02 Meat and edible meat offal | 109.9 | 0.1 | 1705.9 | 2.4 | 17.0 | 0.5 | 6463.9 |
| 04 Dairy prod; birds' eggs; honey | 197.5 | 1.4 | 1389.0 | 10.0 | 23.7 | 4.8 | 23700.0 |
| 06 Live tree \& other plant; bulb, cut flowers | 15.2 | 29.5 | 1163.3 | 19.5 | 2.8 | 0.9 | 4020.2 |
| 08 Edible fruit and nuts; melons | 16.6 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.9 |
| 10 Cereals. | 70.2 | 0.3 | 1671.3 | 35.4 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 14100.0 |
| 11 Prod mill indust; malt; starches | 85.3 | 4.6 | 411.5 | 1.1 | 9.0 | 0.3 | 2745.5 |
| 12 Oil seed, oleagi fruits; misc grain | 18.3 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 23.8 |
| 13 Lac ; gums, resins \& other veg | 74.0 | 0.0 | 41.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 54.5 |
| 15 Animal/veg fats \& oils \& prod | 28.0 | 1.8 | 3524.5 | 2.1 | 1.8 | 0.4 | 6514.0 |
| 16 Prep of meat, fish or mollusks | 68.7 | 0.2 | 610.1 | 3.3 | 8.0 | 0.3 | 2402.3 |
| 17 Sugars and sugar confectionery | 16.6 | 0.0 | 16.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 74.8 |
| 18 Cocoa and cocoa preparations | 85.5 | 0.2 | 303.6 | 18.0 | 6.0 | 0.3 | 3893.8 |
| 19 Prep of cereal, flour, starch/milk prod | 54.5 | 0.2 | 395.6 | 7.2 | 2.1 | 1.6 | 2486.0 |
| 20 Prep of vegetable, fruit, nuts prod | 19.4 | 0.0 | 502.7 | 9.4 | 7.1 | 0.0 | 918.3 |
| 21 Miscellaneous edible preparations | 48.9 | 2.2 | 880.6 | 42.4 | 66.2 | 10.6 | 9137.3 |
| 22 Beverages, spirits and vinegar | 26.7 | 2.0 | 398.1 | 74.8 | 2.2 | 7.0 | 2498.6 |
| 23 Residues \& waste from food indust | 30.3 | 4.4 | 347.7 | 2.5 | 6.4 | 0.0 | 3996.9 |
| 24 Tobacco and manufactured | 17.6 | 7.8 | 917.1 | 6.6 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 9859.3 |
| 33 Essential oils \& resinoids, perf. | 18.0 | 0.7 | 118.2 | 4.6 | 1.7 | 1.6 | 2285.8 |
| 35 Albuminoidal subs; modified starches | 18.0 | 0.0 | 240.4 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 977.3 |
| 39 Plastics and articles thereof. | 16.7 | 1.3 | 1693.8 | 39.7 | 4.0 | 0.3 | 8907.0 |
| 40 Rubber and articles thereof. | 16.8 | 0.4 | 1897.0 | 45.7 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 3412.1 |
| 42 Articles of leather; saddlery, travel pr | 16.6 | 3.2 | 4278.2 | 18.8 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 4999.2 |
| 43 Furskins and artificial fur thereof. | 19.2 | 0.1 | 420.7 | 0.1 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 777.7 |
| 51 Wool, fine/coarse animal hair nes | 16.5 | 0.1 | 309.5 | 14.8 | 4.6 | 0.1 | 2659.2 |
| 52 Cotton. | 17.3 | 11.3 | 4035.9 | 172.2 | 25.4 | 0.6 | 9109.7 |
| 53 Other vegetable textile fibres \& yarns | 16.0 | 0.0 | 208.6 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 411.4 |
| 54 Man-made filaments. | 19.0 | 2.1 | 7224.0 | 33.1 | 3.9 | 0.3 | 13400.0 |
| 55 Man-made staple fibres. | 19.0 | 3.3 | 5002.1 | 21.7 | 10.4 | 0.9 | 10600.0 |
| 56 Wadding, felt \& nonwoven, yarns etc. | 16.9 | 15.4 | 1062.2 | 82.8 | 2.8 | 1.4 | 5643.1 |
| 57 Carpets and other textile floor coverings | 18.9 | 4.4 | 501.7 | 12.7 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 2258.4 |
| 58 Special woven fab; tufted tex fab etc | 17.9 | 1.3 | 1838.0 | 60.3 | 4.9 | 1.2 | 4782.5 |
| 59 Impregnated, coated, cover/laminated | 17.8 | 0.7 | 2147.3 | 15.7 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 5756.6 |
| 60 Knitted or crocheted fabrics | 18.0 | 1.8 | 4663.7 | 36.7 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 8004.4 |
| 61 Art of apparel \& clothing access | 23.3 | 1776.5 | 45500.0 | 2233.2 | 13.9 | 452.2 | 72000.0 |
| 62 Art of apparel \& clothing access | 22.4 | 2678.1 | 63200.0 | 3185.4 | 30.4 | 144.6 | 94900.0 |
| 63 Other made up textile articles | 22.1 | 99.9 | 7835.3 | 466.0 | 3.2 | 3.9 | 13400.0 |
| 64 Footwear, gaiters and articles | 20.8 | 74.9 | 30700.0 | 391.6 | 12.5 | 5.4 | 45800.0 |
| 65 Headgear and parts thereof. | 18.7 | 136.1 | 1487.6 | 38.5 | 0.1 | 1.2 | 2071.0 |
| 67 Prepr feathers \& down; art flower nes | 21.3 | 1.7 | 391.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 433.9 |
| 68 Art of stone, plaster, cement, asbestos | 21.3 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.7 |
| 70 Glass and glassware. | 16.6 | 0.1 | 361.1 | 54.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 2224.0 |
| 85 Electrical mech equip parts, sound pr | 16.7 | 0.3 | 5098.9 | 505.9 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 12800.0 |
| 86 Railw/tramw locom, rolling stock etc. | 15.0 | 1.3 | 178.9 | 19.7 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 996.1 |
| 89 Ships, boats and floating structures | 22.5 | 621.7 | 4623.6 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 301.0 | 10500.0 |
| 91 Clocks and watches and parts nes | 18.6 | 0.0 | 689.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 2.4 | 835.2 |
| 94 Furniture; bedding, mattress, cushion | 21.0 | 1.1 | 1073.0 | 59.5 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 1818.8 |
| 95 Toys, games \& sports requisites, nes | 16.4 | 0.0 | 713.8 | 5.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1099.3 |
| 96 Miscellaneous manufactured articles | 17.5 | 0.1 | 496.7 | 54.4 | 0.1 | 1.3 | 1995.5 |
| All above Peak Products (50) | 30.5 | 5,492.8 | 212,471.1 | 7,809.9 | 285.8 | 947.0 | 438,508.4 |
| All Peaks as \% of All Goods |  | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |
| All goods | 8.3 | 22,263 |  | 102,498 |  | 5,560 |  |

Source: Computations based on UN COMTRADE Statistics.

Table 5b:

## EU Tariff Peaks and developing countries exports to the world US\$ million)

| Tariff Peak at HS 2-digit Products | MFN <br> Tariff | Exports of <br> LDC <br> (Non- <br> ACP) | Exports of GSP | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Exp of } \\ \text { ACP } \\ \text { (non LDC) } \end{array}$ | Exports of ACP+LDC | Exports of FTAs | World trade |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01 Live animals. | 38.2 | 0.7 | 747.1 | 0.7 | 1.0 | 247.2 | 6455.3 |
| 02 Meat and edible meat offal | 71.0 | 0.4 | 4053.2 | 35.7 | 9.7 | 876.6 | 35436.3 |
| 03 Fish \& crustacean, mollusk nes | 18.7 | 28.3 | 1980.6 | 235.1 | 86.5 | 175.4 | 3401.9 |
| 04 Dairy prod; birds' eggs; honey | 59.1 | 1.1 | 942.5 | 7.5 | 0.6 | 542.9 | 28565.7 |
| 06 Live tree \& other plant; bulb, cut flowers | 16.9 | 0.1 | 959.5 | 190.2 | 29.6 | 235.9 | 3552.6 |
| 07 Edible vegetables and roots \& tubers | 25.4 | 0.2 | 1490.6 | 16.9 | 2.0 | 227.3 | 2991.5 |
| 08 Edible fruit and nuts; melons | 20.2 | 0.4 | 6446.6 | 549.0 | 12.1 | 945.5 | 8832.7 |
| 09 Coffee, tea, mat and spices | 16.0 | 0.0 | 7.2 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 4.3 | 64.6 |
| 10 Cereals. | 75.6 | 9.8 | 4708.6 | 52.5 | 11.4 | 687.1 | 35831.3 |
| 11 Prod mill indust; malt; starches | 38.2 | 5.2 | 530.4 | 10.4 | 0.6 | 148.3 | 5779.8 |
| 12 Oil seed, oleagi fruits; misc grain | 74.4 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.3 | 8.4 |
| 13 Lac ; gums, resins \& other veg | 17.8 | 0.0 | 23.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 2.5 | 112.8 |
| 15 Animal/veg fats \& oils \& prod | 56.0 | 0.8 | 134.1 | 2.2 | 0.1 | 369.4 | 4623.0 |
| 16 Prep of meat, fish or mollusks | 23.5 | 24.9 | 5214.1 | 490.3 | 56.8 | 578.3 | 11229.7 |
| 17 Sugars and sugar confectionery | 37.6 | 1.4 | 3540.0 | 1155.3 | 83.1 | 514.9 | 11643.8 |
| 18 Cocoa and cocoa preparations | 24.0 | 0.0 | 8.2 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 140.1 |
| 19 Prep of cereal, flour, starch/milk prod | 34.1 | 1.6 | 938.8 | 10.0 | 0.3 | 143.1 | 9413.7 |
| 20 Prep of vegetable, fruit, nuts prod | 26.1 | 1.4 | 5222.8 | 170.3 | 3.7 | 1516.9 | 16249.0 |
| 21 Miscellaneous edible preparations | 19.2 | 2.1 | 1373.4 | 83.4 | 2.0 | 245.7 | 11612.6 |
| 22 Beverages, spirits and vinegar | 35.7 | 2.3 | 1747.4 | 365.8 | 3.4 | 392.6 | 11729.6 |
| 23 Residues \& waste from food indust | 71.4 | 5.2 | 652.4 | 14.9 | 4.8 | 153.4 | 8403.0 |
| 24 Tobacco and manufactured | 56.2 | 3.6 | 1292.4 | 384.4 | 47.1 | 731.5 | 18118.1 |
| 29 Organic chemicals. | 33.9 | 0.0 | 54.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 182.8 |
| 35 Albuminoidal subs; modified starches | 24.9 | 0.0 | 191.5 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 5.7 | 1140.6 |
| 38 Miscellaneous chemical products | 45.9 | 0.0 | 13.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 103.9 |
| 56 Wadding, felt \& nonwoven, yarns etc. | 21.1 | 0.4 | 75.6 | 0.3 | 10.2 | 1.6 | 114.8 |
| 64 Footwear, gaiters and articles | 18.2 | 31.4 | 11400.0 | 50.7 | 1.5 | 293.0 | 9117.8 |
| 87 Vehicles o/t railw/tramw roll stock, pts | 16.3 | 5.0 | 2533.0 | 3.5 | 0.5 | 170.8 | 25041.1 |
| All above Peak Products (28) | 40.3 | 1265 | 56280.5 | 3830.5 | 366.9 | 9222.2 | 269896.6 |
| All Peaks as \% of All Goods |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All Goods |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Computations based on UN COMTRADE Statistics.

Table 5c:
Japan's Tariff Peaks and world exports of developing countries (millions US\$)

| Tariff Peak at HS 2-digit products | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MFN } \\ & \text { Tariff } \end{aligned}$ | Exp. Of LDC | Exp. of GSP | Word trade |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 02 Meat and edible meat offal | 39.31 | 12.7 | 1755.5 | 12991.7 |
| 03 Fish \& crustacean, mollusk nes | 15.00 | 0.8 | 101.2 | 975.8 |
| 04 Dairy prod; birds' eggs; honey | 28.99 | 3.2 | 1514.4 | 23006.5 |
| 07 Edible vegetables and roots \& tubers | 15.80 | 0.0 | 15.9 | 31.0 |
| 08 Edible fruit and nuts; melons | 19.81 | 27.2 | 9279.3 | 16292.5 |
| 09 Coffee, tea, mat and spices | 17.81 | 6.5 | 556.5 | 1998.6 |
| 10 Cereals. | 63.38 | 16.9 | 1592.2 | 8527.1 |
| 11 Prod mill indust; malt; starches | 23.24 | 11.2 | 543.6 | 3530.4 |
| 12 Oil seed, oleagi fruits; misc grain | 19.10 | 23.8 | 66.6 | 111.1 |
| 15 Animal/veg fats \& oils \& prod | 26.99 | 0.1 | 114.3 | 1268.5 |
| 16 Prep of meat, fish or mollusks | 20.69 | 0.2 | 686.1 | 1662.8 |
| 17 Sugars and sugar confectionery | 71.25 | 175.4 | 5636.1 | 10761.1 |
| 18 Cocoa and cocoa preparations | 22.77 | 0.7 | 557.0 | 5570.7 |
| 19 Prep of cereal, flour, starch/milk prod | 21.91 | 6.4 | 1775.9 | 12640.9 |
| 20 Prep of vegetable, fruit, nuts prod | 22.69 | 4.7 | 6327.4 | 12775.8 |
| 21 Miscellaneous edible preparations | 22.35 | 7.8 | 1860.0 | 11362.8 |
| 22 Beverages, spirits and vinegar | 38.65 | 9.5 | 3314.3 | 23943.4 |
| 24 Tobacco and manufactured | 18.63 | 0.2 | 533.3 | 1578.4 |
| 29 Organic chemicals. | 20.00 | 0.0 | 196.0 | 746.5 |
| 35 Albuminoidal subs; modified starches | 23.31 | 0.1 | 206.8 | 1483.1 |
| 38 Miscellaneous chemical products | 80.83 | 0.0 | 9.6 | 74.4 |
| 41 Raw hides and skins (other than fur) | 26.08 | 370.9 | 5158.7 | 11496.8 |
| 42 Articles of leather; saddlery, travel pr | 15.52 | 12.2 | 5085.9 | 6690.7 |
| 43 Furskins and artificial fur thereof. | 16.25 | 0.7 | 827.3 | 2226.4 |
| 53 Other vegetable textile fibres \& yarns | 16.00 | 0.2 | 482.2 | 946.1 |
| 58 Special woven fab; tufted tex fab etc | 17.90 | 1.3 | 310.5 | 635.0 |
| 60 Knitted or crocheted fabrics | 15.70 | 1.7 | 245.9 | 483.6 |
| 64 Footwear, gaiters and articles | 36.24 | 95.6 | 18062.0 | 31305.7 |
| All above Peak Products (50) | 27.8 | 790.2 | 66814.5 | 205117.5 |
| All Peaks as \% of All Goods |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| All goods | 4.3 | 22263 |  |  |

Source: Computations based on UN COMTRADE Statistics.

Table 5d:
US tariff peaks and global exports of developing countries (US\$ million)

| Product Description | MFN | Export LDC | $\begin{gathered} \text { ExportG } \\ \text { SP } \end{gathered}$ | Export NGSP | Export MEX | Export ATP | Export CAR | Export WLD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 02 Meat and edible meat offal | 19.2 | 0 | 538 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1170 |
| 04 Dairy prod; birds' eggs; honey | 20.9 | 0 | 298 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 694 |
| 07 Edible vegetables and roots nes | 20.6 | 14 | 1288 | 316 | 211 | 3 | 4 | 2808 |
| 08 Edible fruit and nuts; melons | 16.7 | 2 | 1139 | 62 | 218 | 13 | 1 | 2254 |
| 11 Prod mill indust; malt; starches | 16.3 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| 12 Oil seed, oleagi fruits; misc etc. | 78.0 | 17 | 695 | 220 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 993 |
| 15 Animal/veg fats \& oils \& prod | 19.9 | 1 | 1569 | 30 | 6 | 34 | 0 | 2088 |
| 19 Prep of cereal, flour, milk prod | 16.8 | 0 | 253 | 7 | 15 | 9 | 0 | 776 |
| 20 Prep of vegetable, fruit, nuts | 28.7 | 0 | 3070 | 295 | 86 | 111 | 26 | 4981 |
| 21 Miscellaneous edible prep | 19.8 | 0 | 623 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1079 |
| 24 Tobacco and manufactured | 73.5 | 400 | 9862 | 750 | 61 | 43 | 1 | 17143 |
| 28 Inorgn chem; compds of prec | 15.1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 29 Organic chemicals. | 16.8 | 0 | 65 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 156 |
| 30 Pharmaceutical products. | 30.0 | 0 | 950 | 42 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 2169 |
| 42 Articles of leather; saddlery | 20.0 | 0 | 39 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 137 |
| 51 Wool, fine/coarse animal hair | 20.5 | 0 | 1660 | 139 | 26 | 17 | 0 | 2804 |
| 52 Cotton. | 18.3 | 0 | 122 | 51 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 230 |
| 54 Man-made filaments. | 16.4 | 2 | 3370 | 5356 | 24 | 11 | 0 | 11570 |
| 55 Man-made staple fibres. | 16.3 | 3 | 3992 | 2978 | 17 | 17 | 0 | 9283 |
| 56 Wadding, felt \& nonwoven | 15.2 | 0 | 53 | 47 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 146 |
| 58 Special woven, tufted fabrics | 18.5 | 0 | 850 | 753 | 39 | 12 | 0 | 2087 |
| 60 Knitted or crocheted fabrics | 18.6 | 0 | 377 | 663 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 1294 |
| 61 Art of apparel \& clothing | 19.5 | 1326 | 17607 | 13490 | 1765 | 293 | 335 | 40452 |
| 62 Art of apparel \& clothing | 18.9 | 1342 | 18087 | 13211 | 614 | 117 | 75 | 38129 |
| 64 Footwear, gaiters and parts etc. | 27.8 | 40 | 6432 | 10514 | 143 | 16 | 1 | 18271 |
| 69 Ceramic products. | 17.6 | 0 | 3774 | 122 | 138 | 39 | 0 | 5832 |
| 70 Glass and glassware. | 16.2 | 1 | 1266 | 266 | 47 | 7 | 0 | 2098 |
| 82 Tool, implement, cutlery | 15.2 | 0 | 74 | 152 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 313 |
| 86 Railw/tramw locom, | 17.2 | 1 | 390 | 8 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 987 |
| 87 Vehicles o/t railw/tramw | 25.0 | 0 | 11192 | 408 | 3595 | 94 | 0 | 33540 |
| 96 Miscellaneous manufactures | 20.7 | 0 | 76 | 34 | 29 | 1 | 0 | 195 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total (tariff peak products) | 20.8 | 3151 | 89724 | 50016 | 7073 | 853 | 447 | 203696 |
| Peaks as a \% of Total |  | 0.14 | 0.04 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.02 | 0.08 | 0.04 |
| Total (All goods) | 5/0 | 22263 | 2108310 | 732781 | 102498 | 41605 | 5560 | 4787750 |

## 4. Effects of Reducing tariff peaks in the Quad

The small size of LDC exports relative to total developing country exports that are potentially affected by Quad tariff peaks implies that the gains for developing countries from a reduction in tariff peaks could be much larger than the tariff revenue collected in
the Quad on their exports. Indeed, preferential access may allow for re-directing an important share of their exports to the market that grants further preferential access. This section provides estimates of the change in LDC exports if each Quad member was to grant duty free access to all LDC exports of tariff peak items. For comparison purposes, we also calculate the impact of duty free access for peak items for all developing countries (current GSP beneficiaries), and the effect of a nondiscriminatory (MFN) reduction of all tariff peaks to a level of 5 percent (the Quad average). For each Quad member, we group developing countries according to the type of preference that they receive, distinguishing between LDCs, GSP beneficiaries and FTA partners (results for the latter are not reported for space reasons). ${ }^{\square}$ In all simulations we also have groups of developed countries corresponding to the different tariff regimes in Quad members. In the case of the EU and Japan, all developed countries enter into the MFN regime category, whereas for Canada we separate Australia, New Zealand, the US and Israel. We do not report results of changes in exports for developed countries. ${ }^{[12}$ To further simplify the presentation, we report results at the 2-digit level of the HS. However, simulations pertain only to affected 6-digit tariff peak items within each 2-digit category.

The simulations use a simple partial equilibrium model of the world market for each 'product'-defined as a 6-digit tariff line item. We assume that each 6-digit item represents only a small share of the economy, so that the effects on other markets of a change in tariffs can be ignored. Import demand and export supply are iso-elastic and are calibrated for each country/group using trade value, unit prices, tariffs and preference margins at the 6 -digit tariff line level. World markets are assumed to be perfectly competitive and integrated, in the sense that there is no further scope for arbitrage across countries. Products are perfectly homogenous. The world price is determined by equating total world import demand (the sum across countries/groups) to total world export supply (the sum across countries/groups). We employ a conservative supply elasticity of 0.5 to reflect the difficulty many LDCs will have in generating a supply response to the changed incentives following duty free access for tariff peak items. Demand elasticities were

[^7]derived using the estimates reported in Shiells, Stern and Deardorff (1986) and Stern et al. (1976).

Appendix C provides a more detailed description of the methodology and data sources. As shown there, granting duty free access to a group of developing countries unambiguously reduces the world price (at the existing world price there is excess supply), which will in turn reduce other developing countries' exports. The country/group benefiting from duty free access obviously benefits (in spite of the world price decline). We report results for each Quad member in turn.

## Canada

Table 6a reports changes in the value of exports of LDCs and GSP beneficiaries, both in terms of dollar value of percentage change of tariff peak exports to Canada, following the elimination of tariff peaks in Canada. The first simulation grants duty free access to LDCs only, whereas the second simulation grants full duty free access to all developing countries for peak items-including not only LDCs, but also GSP beneficiaries. Both scenarios have implications for developing country groups. Thus, duty free access for LDCs will result in some trade diversion away from GSP beneficiaries and FTA members. Extending duty free access to all developing countries will be to the detriment of countries that currently obtain the greatest preference margins, generally countries that are members of FTAs.

LDC exports expand by $\$ 1.6$ billion if duty free access is granted exclusively to these countries. Under this scenario the loss in export revenue (associated with trade diversion) for other developing countries is small-total exports fall by $\$ 555$ million relative to the base line. This is equivalent to 0.3 percent of their total exports of peak products to the world. Note that the predicted changes in export revenue for LDCs are larger than the tariff revenue data in Table 1. The reason is that all exports to the world of products facing tariff peaks in Canada will be affected by Canada's tariff reforms.

The greatest increases for LDC exports under the preferential duty free access scenario occur in products that are both highly protected and where LDCs have en existing supply capacity (as reflected in existing exports to the world of the products
concerned). As can be seen from Table 6a, virtually all of the increase occurs in categories 61-62 of the HS: apparel. ${ }^{[13}$ Coming a far second is footwear and headgear.

Which LDCs are the major gainers? Table 7 reports the total predicted increase in exports for each LDC. In absolute terms, Bangladesh is by far the largest gainer, with a more than $\$ 1$ billion increase in exports following the grant of duty free access to LDCs (equal to some 60 percent of the total increase in LDC exports). Liberia follows with a $\$ 180$ million increase. However, in relative terms, the increase in exports of Bangladesh and Liberia is similar to those of Haiti, Lao and Cambodia-who all see their exports increase by 20 percent. Table 8 shows the top 5 products at the 2 digit level of the Harmonized System would experience the largest increase in export revenue in dollar terms and the top 5 countries that benefit from these increases. Bangladesh is the top exporter in all 5 products.

The largest gains for developing countries obviously occur when duty free access is granted to all developing countries (simulation II). Exports to Canada of peak items by non-LDCs increase by 22 percent, while those of LDCs increase by 16 percent. In absolute terms, the increase in GSP countries exports dominates, reflecting their much larger share of the total market. Total exports of tariff peak products increase by some $\$ 47$ billion, of which $\$ 46.1$ billion accrues to GSP beneficiaries (2.1 percent of their total exports to the world) and $\$ 892$ million to LDCs (4 percent of total LDC exports to the world). Most of the overall increase in exports again occurs in textiles and apparel. However, a few other sectors are also significant, including dairy and cereals.

An MFN reduction in tariff peaks to 5 percent, moving the structure of protection closer to uniformity, would generate an increase in total export revenue of slightly more than 0.1 percent for non-LDC developing countries ( $\$ 1.5$ billion). LDCs would see their exports decline slightly ( 0.5 percent of current exports to the world), as existing preferential access is eroded. The largest losses are for Mexico ( $\$ 925$ million-not reported), reflecting preference erosion in the Canadian market. However, this represents less than 1 percent of total Mexican exports to the world.

[^8]
## The European Union

Table 6 b reports changes in the value of exports of LDCs and GSP beneficiaries, both in terms of dollar value and percentage change of tariff peak exports to the EU, following elimination of tariff peaks by the EU. The effect of duty free access for LDCs are smaller than in the case of Canada, reflecting the fact the EU already provides significant preferential access to all developing countries. However, exports of LDCs could increase by some $\$ 185$ million, representing a 37 percent increase in exports of peak items to the EU. In contrast to the Canadian case, most of the increase in exports occurs in agricultural commodities, especially sugar products (accounting for 64 percent of the increase), followed by cereals, meat, and fruit. Exports of textiles and clothing are of course also important in the EU, but these are not tariff peak items.

Full duty free access for all developing countries would increase exports of tariff peak items to the EU by some 18 percent ( $\$ 11$ billion), while not detrimentally affecting LDC exports. Sugar accounts for about 15 percent of the total increase. The largest expansion occurs in meat (almost 30 percent). Cereals and footwear are other important growth areas, each accounting for about 15 percent of the total increase. A MFN reduction in peaks to 5 percent would increase non-LDC developing country exports of tariff peak items by only 1.3 percent, and reduce LDC exports of such products by some 9 percent. LDC exports of sugar would expand slightly, but most categories decline.

Table 7 reports export increases by LDC. The largest absolute increase under duty free access for LDCs only occurs in Madagascar with an expansion in exports of \$26 million, equivalent to about 4 percent of Madagascar's total exports. In relative terms, the LDC that gains the most from duty free access to the EU is the Maldives, with a 19 percent increase in exports ( $\$ 13.5$ million); followed by Kiribati with a 17 percent increase ( $\$ 1$ million) and Somalia with a 15 percent increase ( $\$ 4.4$ million). Table 8 b reports the top 5 products in terms of export value growth at the 2 digit level of the Harmonized System and the top 5 exporters in these categories. Countries that gain include Malawi, Myanmar, Sudan and Nepal.

Granting duty free access to LDCs generates an export revenue loss for those ACP countries that are not LDCs (however, ACP members as a whole experience a net gain of $\$ 135$ million, as the majority are LDCs). Our estimates suggest that the $\$ 23$
million loss in export revenue for these non-LDC ACP countries associated with granting duty free access to LDCs represents less than 0.1 percent of their total exports to the world. Finally, if tariff peaks are reduced on a MFN basis to 5 percent, then the loss for ACP countries that do not benefit from LDC preferences would be ten times larger (around 1 percent). LDCs would also see their export revenue fall by 0.2 percent as their preference margins erode.

## Japan

In the case of Japan, elimination of tariff peaks for LDCs has a significant effect on their exports of sugar and certain cereals. Increases in exports of these commodities account for almost all of the 62 percent increase in LDC exports of tariff peak items to Japan (Table 6c). Other developing countries lose market share in Japan as a result of granting duty free access to LDCs, but the decline in exports is only 0.4 percent of their total exports to the world.

One would expect to see large increases in exports of products such as rice and groundnuts, as these are highly protected, with ad valorem equivalents of the specific tariffs that apply to out of quota quantities often exceeding 100 percent-WTO (1997). Rice is currently the only quota constrained product in Japan-the domestic/world price ratio is over 5. In the simulations, LDCs do not experience a large increase in exports of these items because they are not significant exporters of these commodities. ${ }^{14}$ Those LDCs that produce rice largely consume it domestically. Total exports to the world of cereals-including rice-by LDCs was only $\$ 20$ million in the late 1990s (Appendix B). Thus, no matter how high the preference margin in Japan, the methodology used in the simulations cannot generate a large increase in exports. In the longer run, rice producers might change policies so as to export domestic production to Japan, importing their requirements from the rest of the world. There is clearly a large incentive to do this, and doing so would greatly increase the gains of preferential access to the Japanese market.

[^9]If full duty free access is extended to all developing countries, their total exports would expand by $\$ 13.6$ billion, or 20 percent of total exports to Japan. LDC exports would also increase slightly. The composition of the increased trade would be different. In addition to sugar, which would account for about 25 percent of the total increase, major growth categories include footwear (another 25 percent), alcoholic beverages, cereals, and meat.

The LDC that benefits the most from duty free access to Japan in absolute terms is Bangladesh, with a simulated export increase of $\$ 229$ million ( 47 percent of the total increase in LDC exports). However, this represents only around 5 percent of Bangladesh exports. In relative terms, the main beneficiaries are Somalia (a 43 percent increase in exports-or 12.8 million) and Cape Verde (a 23 percent increase- $\$ 4.4$ million). Sudan and Togo follow with more than 10 percent. Looking at the major growth items, countries that gain significantly include Madagascar, Myanmar and Nepal (Table 8a).

## United States

Granting duty free access to LDCs for the 307 tariff peaks in the US while keeping tariffs on other sources of supply unchanged (first column of Table 6d) generates an extra $\$ 1.1$ billion dollar of export revenue for LDCs (a 35 percent increase, or 5 percent of their total exports to the world). Other developing countries see their export revenue contract, but the aggregate reduction is less than $\$ 0.4$ billion. Total diversion losses are negligible given the small size of LDC exports. Mexico, the Andean Pact and Caribbean countries are not affected (their overall export revenue contracts by just $\$ 18$ million, compared to total exports of $\$ 150$ billion). Most of the action in the US market revolves around apparel, which accounts for two-thirds of the LDC export increase. Tobacco accounts for most of the remaining increase.

If duty free access is extended to all the developing countries that now have preferential treatment, total exports of tariff peak items to the US of both the LDC and non-LDC group would expand by about 20 percent. Total exports of LDCs to the world increases by 2.9 percent. In the case of GSP countries, the $\$ 18$ billion increase is equal to 1 percent of their exports to the world. Many more product categories would see
significant increases, but the same categories dominate. One noteworthy difference is the predicted increase in imports of automotive products (mostly parts).

The smallest gain for LDCs is obtained when tariff peaks in the US are reduced to 5 percent on a MFN basis. This generates an increase of only 4 percent in total LDC exports of tariff peak items to the US. GSP developing countries increase their export revenue by a total of almost $\$ 3$ billion, some of which occurs to the detriment of Mexico.

The LDC that benefits the most from duty free access to the US is Bangladesh, with an increase in exports of $\$ 737$ million (67 percent of the total increase in exports of LDCs). This represents a 16 percent increase in Bangladesh's exports to the world. In relative terms, the main beneficiary is Malawi with a 25 percent increase. If we focus on the major growth items, countries that expand their exports include Cambodia and Myanmar (textiles) and Malawi, Gambia and Sudan.

## Summary of the simulation results

The results suggest that the greatest impact for LDCs associated with a reduction in tariff peaks is to be expected if full duty free access is granted to them exclusively. In order to calculate the total impact on LDC exports, the gains calculated above for each LDC in each Quad market cannot simply be added. This is because in some cases tariff peaks on a 6-digit item are found in more than one Quad market. It is therefore necessary to correct for double counting. Once this is done, we arrive at an estimate of the total increase in LDC exports following duty-free access for peak products in the Quad of $\$ 2.5$ billion. This is equivalent to an 11 percent increase in their total exports of all goods to the world.

Total imports into the Quad associated with duty free access for peak products will expand by only a modest $\$ 132$ million (most of it concentrated in the US-not reported). The reason for this small effect on the import side is that the increase in LDC export revenues essentially involves diversion of trade from other sources (both developed and developing countries). The small import effect suggests there is not a compelling reason to be concerned with possible adjustment costs for domestic importcompeting industries located in the Quad. The diversion does imply losses for other developing countries. However, these losses are very small in relative terms, given the very small magnitude of LDC exports. Overall, the decline in exports of other developing
countries and OECD nations will be less than 0.1 percent of their total exports to the world.

If duty free access is also granted to other developing countries, the increase in export revenue for LDCs would be halved to 6 percent of their current exports to the world, as they now need to compete with other developing countries in Quad markets. An MFN reduction of tariff peak items to 5 percent would have little effect on LDC exports as they would not only need to compete with other developing and industrialized countries in Quad markets, but also would see the value of their current preferential access under GSP or LDC preferential schemes erode. Thus, although an MFN reduction of tariff peak items is desirable from a world welfare point of view, it provides relatively little in terms of export revenue gains for LDCs. The same is true under duty free access for all developing countries as a group. While this benefits non-LDCs significantly, LDCs do not experience major gains-indeed, they may lose. Both a unilateral MFN elimination of all tariff peaks in the Quad and duty free access for all developing countries is likely to be difficult to realize in political terms, as it will lead to substantially greater import penetration in the Quad. Attaining such outcomes is likely to require a broader negotiating context that allows for reciprocal concessions to be offered by developing countries. Such negotiations are likely to be launched in the coming years, and as a result one can expect that tariff barriers will be reduced further. As far as LDCs are concerned, the results of the simulations suggest that an immediate offer of duty free access is a low cost option for the Quad to offer, while not imposing a very large cost on other, less advanced, developing countries.

Table 6a: Estimates of Export Changes in LDCs and GSP Groups by HS-2 Product After Canadian Tariff Peak Reform

 dollar value of the export change. The second column provides the percentage change relative to current exports of tariff peak items to Canaada. Source: Authors calculations

Table 6b: Estimates of Export Changes in LDCs and GSP Groups by HS-2 Product After EU Tariff Peak Reform

|  | Simulation I: LDC=0 |  |  |  | Simulation II: LDC=GSP=0 |  |  |  | Simulation II:MFN=5\% |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HS-2 Product | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { LDC- } \\ \text { Exp } \\ \left(\mathbf{S}^{\prime} \mathbf{0 0 0}\right) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { LDC- } \\ \text { Exp } \\ \text { (\%) } \end{gathered}$ | GSP-Exp <br> (\$ '000) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { GSP- } \\ \text { Exp } \\ (\%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { LDC- } \\ \text { Exp } \\ \left(\$^{\prime} 000\right) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { LDC } \\ \text {-Exp } \\ (\%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { GSP-Exp } \\ & \text { (\$ '000) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { GSP- } \\ \text { Exp } \\ (\%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { LDC- } \\ \text { Exp } \\ \left(\$^{\prime} 000\right) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { LDC- } \\ \text { Exp } \\ (\%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { GSP- } \\ \text { Exp } \\ \left(S^{\prime} 000\right) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { GSP- } \\ \text { Exp } \\ (\%) \end{gathered}$ |
| 01 Live animals. | 1731 | 0.4 | -396 | 0.0 | 467 | 0.1 | 157654 | 0.3 | -157 | 0.0 | 13581 | 0.0 |
| 02 Meat and edible meat offal | 18392 | 3.7 | -3267 | 0.0 | 9104 | 1.8 | 3241296 | 5.4 | -641 | -0.1 | 333896 | 0.6 |
| 03 Fish \& crustacean, molluse nes | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | -13897 | -2.8 | 216244 | 0.4 | -17466 | -3.5 | 7826 | 0.0 |
| 04 Dairy prod; birds' eggs; honey | 2206 | 0.4 | -56 | 0.0 | 1784 | 0.4 | 603378 | 1.0 | 123 | 0.0 | 213247 | 0.4 |
| 06 Live tree \& plant; bulb, flowers | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | -3481 | -0.7 | 39764 | 0.1 | -2758 | -0.6 | 12247 | 0.0 |
| 07 Edible vegetables, roots \& tubers | 752 | 0.2 | -919 | 0.0 | -489 | -0.1 | -125392 | -0.2 | -392 | -0.1 | -82339 | -0.1 |
| 08 Edible fruit and nuts; melons | 2672 | 0.5 | -3356 | 0.0 | -1275 | -0.3 | -346249 | -0.6 | -647 | -0.1 | -113213 | -0.2 |
| 09 Coffee, tea, mat and spics | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | -1 | 0.0 | 168 | 0.0 | -2 | 0.0 | -127 | 0.0 |
| 10 Cereals. | 24376 | 4.9 | -17676 | 0.0 | -172 | 0.0 | 1365455 | 2.3 | -4331 | -0.9 | 18514 | 0.0 |
| 11 Prod mill indust; malt; starches | 4341 | 0.9 | -523 | 0.0 | 3189 | 0.6 | 245100 | 0.4 | 1374 | 0.3 | 98045 | 0.2 |
| 12 Oil seed, oleagi fruits; misc grain | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 17 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 12 | 0.0 |
| 13 Lac ; gums, resins \& other veg | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | -6 | 0.0 | 2594 | 0.0 | -4 | 0.0 | 1762 | 0.0 |
| 15 Animal/veg fats \& oils \& prod | 39 | 0.0 | -1 | 0.0 | -13 | 0.0 | 44006 | 0.1 | -75 | 0.0 | 18176 | 0.0 |
| 16 Prep of meat, fish or molluscs | 669 | 0.1 | -332 | 0.0 | -12701 | -2.6 | 422568 | 0.7 | -11899 | -2.4 | -6408 | 0.0 |
| 17 Sugars and sugar confectionery | 119020 | 24.1 | -67516 | -0.1 | 29576 | 6.0 | 1593922 | 2.6 | 7053 | 1.4 | 391943 | 0.7 |
| 18 Cocoa and cocoa preparations | 2 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 0.0 | 2252 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 228 | 0.0 |
| 19 Prep of cereal, flour, starch/milk | 822 | 0.2 | -150 | 0.0 | 521 | 0.1 | 337005 | 0.6 | 122 | 0.0 | 81865 | 0.1 |
| 20 Prep of vegetable, fruit, nuts prod | 131 | 0.0 | -41 | 0.0 | -571 | -0.1 | 592750 | 1.0 | -752 | -0.2 | 102750 | 0.2 |
| 21 Miscellaneous edible prep. | 233 | 0.0 | -26 | 0.0 | 80 | 0.0 | 193192 | 0.3 | -261 | -0.1 | 17860 | 0.0 |
| 22 Beverages, spirits and vinegar | 395 | 0.1 | -117 | 0.0 | -339 | -0.1 | 238450 | 0.4 | -874 | -0.2 | -45232 | -0.1 |
| 23 Residues \& waste from food | 9070 | 1.8 | -5469 | 0.0 | 1794 | 0.4 | 350258 | 0.6 | -93 | 0.0 | 12389 | 0.0 |
| 24 Tobacco and manufactured | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | -4993 | -1.0 | 382245 | 0.6 | -9381 | -1.9 | -120977 | -0.2 |
| 29 Organic chemicals. | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 19613 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 4104 | 0.0 |
| 35 Albuminoidal subs; starches | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | -5 | 0.0 | -24025 | 0.0 |
| 38 Miscellaneous chemical products | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | -1 | 0.0 | 6628 | 0.0 | -3 | 0.0 | 1919 | 0.0 |
| 56 Wadding, felt \& nonwoven, yarns | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | -1674 | -0.3 | 5241 | 0.0 | -1462 | -0.3 | 2241 | 0.0 |
| 64 Footwear, gaiters and articles | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | -1991 | -0.4 | 1271984 | 2.1 | -3885 | -0.8 | -114896 | -0.2 |
| 87 Vehicles o/t railw/tramw roll | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | -301 | -0.1 | 254541 | 0.4 | -534 | -0.1 | -28553 | 0.0 |
| Net gains from all peaks | 184,848 | 37.5 | -99,844 | -0.2 | 4612 | 0.9 | 11,114,668 | 18.5 | -46,949 | -9.5 | 796,838 | 1.3 |

Note: Total LDC exports to the world of peak items in base year: $\$ 493$ million; total GSP country exports of peak items to world in base year was $\$ 60$ billion. The first column in each group of countries and in each simulation gives the dollar value of the export change. The second column provides the percentage change relative to current exports of tariff peak items to the EU.

Source: Authors calculations

## Table 6c: Estimates of Export Changes in LDCs and GSP Groups by HS-2 Product After Japanese Tariff Peak Reform

|  | Simulation I: LDC=0 |  |  |  | Simulation II: LDC=GSP=0 |  |  | Simulation III:MFN=5\% |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HS-2 Product | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { LDC- } \\ \text { Exp } \\ \left(\$^{\prime} \mathbf{0 0 0}\right) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { LDC- } \\ \text { Exp } \\ (\%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | GSP-Exp <br> (\$ '000) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { GSP- } \\ \text { Exp } \\ (\%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { LDC- } \\ \text { Exp } \\ \left(\$^{\prime} 000\right) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { LDC } \\ \text {-Exp } \\ (\%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { GSP-Exp } \\ & \left(\$^{\prime} \mathbf{0 0 0}\right) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { GSP- } \\ \text { Exp } \\ (\%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { LDC- } \\ \text { Exp } \\ \left(\${ }^{\prime} \mathbf{0 0 0}\right) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { LDC- } \\ \text { Exp } \\ (\%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { GSP-Exp } \\ & \left(\$^{\prime} \mathbf{0 0 0}\right) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { GSP- } \\ \text { Exp } \\ (\%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 02 Meat and edible meat offal | 6971 | 0.9 | -842 | 0.0 | 5780 | 0.7 | 734494 | 1.1 | -1039 | -0.1 | -119565 | -0.2 |
| 03 Fish \& crustacean, mollusc nes | 78 | 0.0 | -1 | 0.0 | 77 | 0.0 | 3808 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 04 Dairy prod; birds' eggs; honey | 1560 | 0.2 | -234 | 0.0 | 1291 | 0.2 | 399000 | 0.6 | -56 | 0.0 | -28976 | 0.0 |
| 07 Edible vegetables and roots \& tubers | 9 | 0.0 | -6 | 0.0 | 3 | 0.0 | 1094 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | -5 | 0.0 |
| 08 Edible fruit and nuts; melons | 1306 | 0.2 | -1055 | 0.0 | -4161 | -0.5 | 323370 | 0.5 | -3010 | -0.4 | 46387 | 0.1 |
| 09 Coffee, tea, mat and spics | 513 | 0.1 | -306 | 0.0 | -87 | 0.0 | 60437 | 0.1 | -701 | -0.1 | -5701 | 0.0 |
| 10 Cereals. | 18250 | 2.3 | -5459 | 0.0 | 9285 | 1.2 | 875825 | 1.3 | -1718 | -0.2 | -162089 | -0.2 |
| 11 Prod mill indust; malt; starches | 3270 | 0.4 | -625 | 0.0 | 2507 | 0.3 | 128772 | 0.2 | 94 | 0.0 | -34714 | -0.1 |
| 12 Oil seed, oleagi fruits; misc grain | 4230 | 0.5 | -6249 | 0.0 | -1909 | -0.2 | 5347 | 0.0 | -330 | 0.0 | -924 | 0.0 |
| 15 Animal/veg fats \& oils \& prod | 40 | 0.0 | -4 | 0.0 | 34 | 0.0 | 45917 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 86 | 0.0 |
| 16 Prep of meat, fish or molluscs | 61 | 0.0 | -21 | 0.0 | 37 | 0.0 | 90851 | 0.1 | -2 | 0.0 | -12927 | 0.0 |
| 17 Sugars and sugar confectionery | 450913 | 57.1 | -277419 | -0.4 | 85637 | 10.8 | 3066181 | 4.6 | 1240 | 0.2 | 62666 | 0.1 |
| 18 Cocoa and cocoa preparations | 154 | 0.0 | -11 | 0.0 | 131 | 0.0 | 143325 | 0.2 | -53 | 0.0 | -14835 | 0.0 |
| 19 Prep of cereal, flour, starch/milk prod | 1561 | 0.2 | -226 | 0.0 | 1224 | 0.2 | 467175 | 0.7 | -413 | -0.1 | -21184 | 0.0 |
| 20 Prep of vegetable, fruit, nuts prod | 1186 | 0.2 | -438 | 0.0 | 574 | 0.1 | 989634 | 1.5 | -190 | 0.0 | -11574 | 0.0 |
| 21 Miscellaneous edible preparations | 1376 | 0.2 | -198 | 0.0 | 1025 | 0.1 | 377751 | 0.6 | -527 | -0.1 | -55139 | -0.1 |
| 22 Beverages, spirits and vinegar | 2323 | 0.3 | -714 | 0.0 | 1506 | 0.2 | 1247766 | 1.9 | -409 | -0.1 | -147708 | -0.2 |
| 24 Tobacco and manufactured | 64 | 0.0 | -10 | 0.0 | 52 | 0.0 | 89218 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 63 | 0.0 |
| 29 Organic chemicals. | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | -4 | 0.0 | -29511 | 0.0 |
| 35 Albuminoidal subs; modified starches | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | -13 | 0.0 | -38260 | -0.1 |
| 38 Miscellaneous chemical products | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | -19 | 0.0 | -5075 | 0.0 |
| 41 Raw hides and skins (other than fur) | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | -31499 | -4.0 | 358526 | 0.5 | -57933 | -7.3 | -293718 | -0.4 |
| 42 Articles of leather; saddlery, travel pr | 2517 | 0.3 | -996 | 0.0 | 1375 | 0.2 | 579281 | 0.9 | -121 | 0.0 | -11439 | 0.0 |
| 43 Furskins and artificial fur thereof. | 83 | 0.0 | -21 | 0.0 | 60 | 0.0 | 45508 | 0.1 | -38 | 0.0 | -56026 | -0.1 |
| 53 Other vegetable textile fibres \& yarns | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | , | 0.0 | -13 | 0.0 | -37357 | -0.1 |
| 58 Special woven fab; tufted tex fab etc | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | -60 | 0.0 | 23576 | 0.0 | -160 | 0.0 | -14361 | 0.0 |
| 60 Knitted or crocheted fabrics | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | -81 | 0.0 | 15822 | 0.0 | -179 | 0.0 | -10533 | 0.0 |
| 64 Footwear, gaiters and articles | 29 | 0.0 | -5 | 0.0 | -6463 | -0.8 | 3509678 | 5.3 | -27858 | -3.5 | -2776550 | -4.2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net gains from all peaks | 496,495 | 62.8 | -294,840 | -0.4 | 66337 | 8.4 | 13,582,356 | 20.3 | -93,454 | -11.8 | -3,778,969 | -5.7 |

Note: Total LDC exports to the world of peak items in base year: $\$ 790$ million; total GSP exports of peak items to world in base year was $\$ 66.8$ billion. The first column in each group of countries and in each simulation gives the dollar value of the export change. The second column provides the percentage change relative to current exports of tariff peak items to Japan.

Source: Authors calculations

# Table 6d: Estimates of Export Changes in LDCs and GSP Groups by HS-2 Product After United States Tariff Peak Reform 

|  | Simulation I: LDC=0 |  |  | Simulation II: LDC=GSP=0 |  |  |  | Simulation III:MFN=5\% |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HS-2 Product | $\begin{gathered} \text { LDC-Exp } \\ \left(\${ }^{\prime} 000\right) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { LDC- } \\ \text { Exp } \\ \text { (\% } \\ \text { change) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { GSP-Exp } \\ & (\$ \mathbf{~} 000) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { GSP- } \\ \text { Exp } \\ \text { (\% } \\ \text { change) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LDC- } \\ & \text { Exp } \\ & \left(\$^{\prime} 000\right) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { LDC- } \\ \text { Exp } \\ \text { (\% } \\ \text { change) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { GSP-Exp } \\ & \left(\${ }^{\prime} 000\right) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { GSP- } \\ \text { Exp } \\ \text { (\% } \\ \text { change) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LDC- } \\ & \text { Exp } \\ & \left(\${ }^{\prime} \mathbf{0 0 0}\right) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { LDC- } \\ \text { Exp } \\ \text { (\% } \\ \text { change) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { GSP-Exp } \\ & \left(\$^{\prime} 000\right) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { GSP- } \\ \text { Exp } \\ (\% \\ \text { change) } \end{gathered}$ |
| 02 Meat and edible meat offal | 1 | 0.0 | -1 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 79681 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 3668 | 0.0 |
| 04 Dairy prod; birds' eggs; | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 50447 | 0.1 | -1 | 0.0 | 1749 | 0.0 |
| 07 Edible vegetables, roots | 764 | 0.0 | -426 | 0.0 | -289 | 0.0 | 113713 | 0.1 | -525 | 0.0 | 40389 | 0.0 |
| 08 Edible fruit and nuts; | 26 | 0.0 | -15 | 0.0 | -110 | 0.0 | 59455 | 0.1 | -126 | 0.0 | 22148 | 0.0 |
| 11 Prod mill indust; malt; | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | -21 | 0.0 | 775 | 0.0 | -17 | 0.0 | 306 | 0.0 |
| 12 Oil seed, oleagi fruits; | 26997 | 0.9 | -28536 | 0.0 | -3273 | -0.1 | 128751 | 0.1 | 2427 | 0.1 | 104374 | 0.1 |
| 15 Animal/veg fats \& oils | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | -1 | 0.0 | 154186 | 0.2 | -53 | 0.0 | 50412 | 0.1 |
| 19 Prep of cereal, flour, starch | 16 | 0.0 | -3 | 0.0 | 3 | 0.0 | 28926 | 0.0 | -19 | 0.0 | -2335 | 0.0 |
| 20 Prep.vegetable, fruit, nuts | 79 | 0.0 | -24 | 0.0 | 38 | 0.0 | 462751 | 0.5 | 1 | 0.0 | 74933 | 0.1 |
| 21 Misce. edible prep. | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 84203 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 9436 | 0.0 |
| 24 Tobacco | 329056 | 10.4 | -198019 | -0.2 | 89662 | 2.8 | 1830789 | 2.0 | 39858 | 1.3 | 371948 | 0.4 |
| 28 Inorgn chem; | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | -82 | 0.0 |
| 29 Organic chemicals. | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | -6117 | 0.0 |
| 30 Pharmaceutical products. | 170 | 0.0 | -47 | 0.0 | 110 | 0.0 | 296017 | 0.3 | 9 | 0.0 | 24090 | 0.0 |
| 42 Articles of leather | 13 | 0.0 | -2 | 0.0 | 11 | 0.0 | 10440 | 0.0 | 2 | 0.0 | 1602 | 0.0 |
| 51 Wool, fine/coarse | 63 | 0.0 | -31 | 0.0 | 27 | 0.0 | 239031 | 0.3 | 2 | 0.0 | 13167 | 0.0 |
| 52 Cotton. | 20 | 0.0 | -9 | 0.0 | 10 | 0.0 | 18488 | 0.0 | 1 | 0.0 | 2343 | 0.0 |
| 54 Man-made filaments. | 420 | 0.0 | -84 | 0.0 | 321 | 0.0 | 625595 | 0.7 | 13 | 0.0 | 33369 | 0.0 |
| 55 Man-made staple fibres. | 810 | 0.0 | -270 | 0.0 | 502 | 0.0 | 617246 | 0.7 | 25 | 0.0 | 26676 | 0.0 |
| 56 Wadding, felt, yarns | 46 | 0.0 | -16 | 0.0 | 26 | 0.0 | 7021 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 107 | 0.0 |
| 58 Special woven fab; tufted | 67 | 0.0 | -19 | 0.0 | 43 | 0.0 | 147539 | 0.2 | 3 | 0.0 | 11402 | 0.0 |
| 60 Knitted or crocheted fab. | 10 | 0.0 | -2 | 0.0 | 7 | 0.0 | 80568 | 0.1 | 1 | 0.0 | 8307 | 0.0 |
| 61 Art of apparel \& clothing | 395761 | 12.6 | -83168 | -0.1 | 293339 | 9.3 | 3859192 | 4.3 | 48514 | 1.5 | 650588 | 0.7 |
| 62 Art of apparel \& clothing | 336286 | 10.7 | -73015 | -0.1 | 251660 | 8.0 | 3495104 | 3.9 | 37013 | 1.2 | 439221 | 0.5 |
| 64 Footwear, gaiters | 16630 | 0.5 | -2927 | 0.0 | 12851 | 0.4 | 1932681 | 2.2 | 1562 | 0.0 | 243656 | 0.3 |
| 69 Ceramic products. | 33 | 0.0 | -11 | 0.0 | 20 | 0.0 | 586311 | 0.7 | 1 | 0.0 | 38940 | 0.0 |
| 70 Glass and glassware. | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | -78 | 0.0 | 194680 | 0.2 | -168 | 0.0 | 14443 | 0.0 |
| 82 Tool, implement, cutlery | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 4713 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | -4612 | 0.0 |
| 86 Railw/tramw, rolling . | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | -92 | 0.0 | -26391 | 0.0 |
| 87 Vehicles o/t railw/tramw | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 0.0 | -29 | 0.0 | 3476051 | 3.9 | -92 | 0.0 | 803051 | 0.9 |
| 96 Miscellaneous manuf. | 60 | 0.0 | -22 | 0.0 | 11 | 0.0 | 7060 | 0.0 | -33 | 0.0 | -1696 | 0.0 |
| Net gains from all peaks | 1,107,327 | 35.1 | -386,646 | -0.4 | 644,841 | 20.5 | 18,591,414 | 20.4 | 128305 | 4.1 | 2,949,094 | 3.3 |

Note: Total LDC exports to the world of peak items in base year: $\$ 3.2$ billion; total GSP exports of peak items to world in base year was $\$ 89.8$ billion. The first column in each group of countries and in each simulation gives the dollar value of the export change. The second column provides the percentage change relative to current exports of tariff peak items to the US.

Source: Authors calculations
Table 7：Estimates of LDC Export Changes by Market After Quad Tariff Peak Reform （based on 1996－98 export averages in \＄million）

| E |  | 앙 | 8. | $\begin{aligned} & n \\ & 6 \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\bigcirc$ | 6 \％ 0 | \％ | \％ | $\left[\begin{array}{l} \infty \\ i \end{array}\right]$ | $\frac{1}{0}$ | 6 | 8 | 8. | 앙 | 앙 | 8. | $3$ | $\bigcirc$ | ç̀ | O | $8$ | $\underset{r}{2}$ | $80$ | 난 | 8 | $\stackrel{\infty}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{+}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| む̃ |  | $\bigcirc$ | 0. | $\stackrel{\downarrow}{\infty}$ | ， | 50 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | ${ }_{0}^{\infty}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | 3 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\pm$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{7}{7}$ | 0 | $\stackrel{\square}{+}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $)^{\infty}$ |
| $\stackrel{\stackrel{\pi}{\boxed{x}}}{\substack{0}}$ |  | J． | O | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \frac{1}{4} \end{aligned}$ | \％ | 3 3 | J | J | ¢ | $=$ | \％ | $\bigcirc$ | 8 | $\bigcirc$ | $\overline{0}$ | 0 | ก̌ | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | J | $\bigcirc$ | Ni | 0 | $\stackrel{m}{2}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\xrightarrow{-}$ | $\infty$ |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | ¢ 0 | $\bigcirc$ | O | $\stackrel{1}{\circ}$ | $\infty$ | 9 | － 0 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\overline{0}$ | $\bigcirc$ | \％ | 0 | $\stackrel{N}{\text { n }}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\infty}$ | $0$ | त̀ | O | 간 | $\cdots$ |
| $!$ |  | $\stackrel{7}{0}$ | ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{O}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | $0_{0}^{\infty}$ | 8 | ते | $8$ | $\stackrel{+}{\infty}$ |  | ${ }^{\circ}{ }^{\infty}$ | $8$ | $8$ | － | $\overline{7}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{0}$ | $\stackrel{7}{8}$ | $\stackrel{\substack{6 \\ i}}{ }$ | $\frac{\square}{0}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | + | $8$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\infty}$ | 8 | $8$ | $\stackrel{\square}{7}$ |
| $\frac{\tilde{y}}{\frac{2}{y}}$ |  | ò | 0 | 觡 | $0$ | $\stackrel{1}{9}$ | ${ }_{1}$ | ¢ | $\stackrel{+}{1}$ | ${ }^{\infty}$ | ¢ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | 9 | $\stackrel{7}{1}$ | 0 | $\stackrel{\square}{i}$ | べ | ¢̣ | T | $\bigcirc$ | ${ }_{7}$ | O | $\stackrel{\infty}{+}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | T 7 |
|  |  | 3. | O | － | $\checkmark$ | 5 | $\cdots$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{1}{7}$ | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\checkmark$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | － | $\checkmark$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\xrightarrow{2}$ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | O | $\bigcirc$ | － |
| $\stackrel{\tilde{\sim}}{\underset{\sim}{5}}$ |  | O） | ¢ | तें | ${ }_{1}{ }^{\circ}$ | ${ }_{0}$ | $\stackrel{+}{i}$ | \％ | $\bigcirc$ | ＋ | \％ | $\checkmark$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\cdots$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\checkmark$ | － | $\bar{\sim}$ | $\bigcirc$ | \％ | $\bigcirc$ | ご | 0 | $\stackrel{\sim}{7}$ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | $\cdots \stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ |
|  |  | ${ }_{0}^{\infty}$ | $0$ | $\underbrace{6}_{6}$ | $\hat{n}$ | $6$ | $\stackrel{2}{2}$ | $8$ | 어 | $\stackrel{m}{2}$ | ${ }^{2}{ }_{2}^{n}$ | ${ }_{0}$ | ${ }_{c}^{0}$ | － | ${ }_{0}^{\infty}$ | $\stackrel{9}{7}$ | $0$ | ત̧ | Ǹ | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\sim}$ | $\frac{\square}{0}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{4}$ |  | n | 8 | $\cdots$ | $\stackrel{N}{\sim}$ |
| シ | 者 o | 0. | O | $\stackrel{\square}{7}$ | $i$ | $60$ | $\hat{i}$ | $0$ | $\frac{0}{1}$ | $1$ | $\begin{array}{l\|l\|l} 1 \\ \\ \hline 1 \end{array}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{1}{1}$ | $9$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{+}{\square}$ | $0$ |  | $\bar{i}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{i}$ | e | $0_{9}^{6}$ | ก̧ | 0 |  | ？ |
| 荡 |  | 0. | ㅇ． | ${ }^{\circ}$ | － | － 0 | 3 | O | $\checkmark$ | O | $0 \cdot$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | ¢ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\checkmark$ | $\bigcirc$ | － | － | $\bigcirc$ | － | $\bigcirc$ | 0 |
| 9 |  | J | O |  | So | － 0 | ${ }^{\text {r }}$ | J | $\stackrel{\infty}{\infty}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | ̂． | － | $\checkmark$ | \％ | ${ }^{\circ}$ | \％ | \％ | in | $\stackrel{\square}{0}$ | N | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | ${ }_{\text {N}}$ | ヘ |
| E |  | O. | $8$ | $\stackrel{8}{6}$ | $f_{6}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 6 \\ 6 & 8 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $0$ | $8$ |  | $\stackrel{\infty}{0}$ | $\bigcirc$ | 8 | $8$ | － | $\stackrel{\square}{0}$ | 8 | $\stackrel{\square}{\circ}$ | O－ | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{\square}{0}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\circ}$ | $8$ | $\stackrel{\square}{-}$ | 8 | $\stackrel{\text { त }}{ }$ | $\stackrel{+}{+}$ |
| $\frac{\frac{2}{5}}{5}$ | 鄀 | of | $0$ | $\left[\begin{array}{l} \infty \\ \lambda \\ 1 \end{array}\right.$ | ， 0 | $0 \cdot$ | O | O | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{y} \\ & \end{aligned}$ | it | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{+}{0}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{N}{i}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{\square}{7}$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { تِ } \\ \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | $\stackrel{7}{6}$ | O－ | $\underset{i}{n}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | 앙 | $\begin{gathered} t \\ i \\ i \end{gathered}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | 3 | $\overline{0}$ | $\bigcirc$ | － | \％ | $\checkmark$ | 5 | $\bigcirc$ | त̇ | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{?}{-}$ | $\bigcirc$ | 8 | 8， |
| 巛゙ |  | તo | T | ¢ | \％ | $\bigcirc$ | On | $\bigcirc$ | 2 | $\stackrel{\infty}{\infty}$ | －${ }^{\circ}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | O | $\square$ | $\bigcirc$ | O̧ | $\bigcirc$ | $\checkmark$ | 5 | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{n}{7}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\cdots$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\infty}$ | \％ |
| ₹ |  | Si | $\begin{gathered} \text { N } \\ \text { ה } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6 \\ 6 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $2$ | $6$ |  | ¢ | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{ }$ | $\propto$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | $\cdots$ | － |  | $\stackrel{\square}{\text { m }}$ | m | $\stackrel{\sim}{\circ}$ | 0 | $\stackrel{n}{\circ}$ | \％ | त | $\bigcirc$ | N | $\stackrel{\pi}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\infty}$ | ${ }_{6}$ |
|  | E |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{7}{8} \\ & \frac{7}{6} \\ & \frac{7}{5} \\ & \frac{1}{n} \\ & \hline 1 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\dot{\theta}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 4 \\ \frac{\pi}{6} \\ \frac{6}{6} \\ 6 \end{array}$ | $\circ$ $\stackrel{0}{0}$ 0 0 0 0 |  | تِ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0.6 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | 撲 | 明 | $\begin{aligned} 6 \\ \frac{7}{4} \\ \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | E |  | $:$ | C |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 4, } \\ & \frac{0}{3} \end{aligned}$ | \％ |


Sources: Based on the simulation results and UN COMTRADE Statistics.

Table 8a: Export Changes in LDCs by Major Product After Duty Free Access in EU and Japan (Based on 1996-98 export average in \$ Million)

| HS-2 Product | EU Tariff Peak Reform |  |  |  | Japanese Tariff Peak Reform |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Beneficial <br> LDCs | Peak Exp to World | Export <br> Increase | $\begin{gathered} \text { Exp Sh } \\ \text { in \% } \end{gathered}$ | Beneficial LDCs | Peak Exp to World | Export <br> Increase | $\begin{gathered} \text { Exp Sh } \\ \text { in \% } \end{gathered}$ |
| 02 Meats \& edible meat | SDN | 5.2 | 9.5 | 51.8 | MDG | 2.1 | 2.3 | 33.2 |
|  | MDG | 2.2 | 4.1 | 22.1 | SDN | 2.0 | 2.2 | 31.1 |
|  | VUT | 1.8 | 3.3 | 18.1 | VUT | 1.8 | 2.0 | 28.4 |
|  | MYR | 0.2 | 0.3 | 1.6 | MYR | 0.1 | 0.2 | 2.3 |
|  | UGA | 0.1 | 0.2 | 1.0 | UGA | 0.1 | 0.1 | 1.6 |
|  | All LDCs | 10.1 | 18.4 | 100.0 | All LDCs | 6.4 | 7.0 | 100.0 |
| 10 Cereals | MYR | 8.9 | 9.6 | 39.3 | MYR | 3.3 | 6.8 | 37.3 |
|  | MDG | 3.1 | 3.3 | 13.7 | MOZ | 2.2 | 4.6 | 25.2 |
|  | SDN | 2.9 | 3.2 | 13.0 | MDG | 2.1 | 4.4 | 23.9 |
|  | MOZ | 2.2 | 2.4 | 9.8 | UGA | 0.5 | 1.1 | 6.0 |
|  | TZA | 1.6 | 1.7 | 7.0 | GMB | 0.2 | 0.5 | 2.6 |
|  | All LDCs | 22.6 | 24.4 | 100.0 | All LDCs | 8.7 | 18.3 | 100.0 |
| 11 Flour, malt \& starch | NPL | 3.6 | 2.6 | 60.5 | NPL | 3.5 | 1.9 | 59.5 |
|  | BGD | 0.8 | 0.6 | 13.6 | BGD | 0.8 | 0.4 | 13.7 |
|  | MYR | 0.6 | 0.4 | 9.4 | ETH | 0.5 | 0.3 | 8.0 |
|  | ETH | 0.3 | 0.2 | 5.1 | MYR | 0.4 | 0.2 | 7.3 |
|  | BTN | 0.2 | 0.2 | 3.6 | BTN | 0.2 | 0.1 | 3.6 |
|  | All LDCs | 5.9 | 4.3 | 100.0 | All LDCs | 5.9 | 3.3 | $100.0$ |
| 12 Oil seed \& misc grain |  |  |  |  | SDN | 11.0 | 3.9 | 92.3 |
|  |  |  |  |  | MYR | 0.3 | 0.1 | $2.3$ |
|  |  |  |  |  | AFG | 0.2 | 0.1 | 1.6 |
|  |  |  |  |  | NER | 0.2 | 0.1 | 1.3 |
|  |  |  |  |  | CAM | 0.1 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | All LDCs | 11.9 | 4.2 | 100.0 |
| 17 Sugars \& confectionery | MWI | 23.1 | 32.0 | 26.9 | MWI | 23.2 | 99.6 | 22.1 |
|  | ZMB | 16.6 | 23.0 | 19.3 | ZMB | 16.6 | 71.3 | 15.8 |
|  | MOZ | 13.0 | 18.0 | 15.2 | MOZ | 15.3 | 65.8 | 14.6 |
|  | MDG | 11.4 | 15.8 | 13.3 | SDN | 14.8 | 63.7 | 14.1 |
|  | TZA | 9.9 | 13.7 | 11.5 | MDG | 11.4 | 48.9 | 10.9 |
|  | All LDCs | $85.9$ | $119.0$ | $100.0$ | All LDCs | $104.9$ | $450.9$ | $100.0$ |
| 23 Residue \& waste food | MYR | 3.5 | 3.2 | 34.8 |  |  |  |  |
|  | ZAR | 1.7 | 1.6 | 17.2 |  |  |  |  |
|  | NPL | $1.6$ | $1.4$ | $15.8$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | MOZ | 0.7 | $0.6$ | $6.9$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | TGO | 0.7 | $0.6$ | $6.8$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | All LDCs | 10.1 | 9.1 | 100.0 |  |  |  |  |

Table 8b: Export Changes in LDCs by Major Product After Duty Free Access in Canada and US (Based on 1996-98 export average in \$ Million)

| HS-2 Product | Canadian Tariff Peak Reform |  |  |  | USA Tariff Peak Reform |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Beneficial LDCs | Peak Exp to World | Export <br> Increase | Exp Sh in \% | Beneficial LDCs | Peak Exp to World | Export <br> Increase | Exp Sh in \% |
| 12 Oil seed \& misc grain |  |  |  |  | GMB | 8.4 | 13.5 | 50.1 |
|  |  |  |  |  | SDN | 6.4 | 10.3 | 38.2 |
|  |  |  |  |  | MWI | 0.5 | 0.9 | 3.2 |
|  |  |  |  |  | MDG | 0.4 | 0.7 | 2.4 |
|  |  |  |  |  | NER | 0.2 | 0.4 | 1.3 |
|  |  |  |  |  | All LDCs | 16.8 | 27.0 | 100.0 |
| 24 Tobacco |  |  |  |  | MWI | 310.1 | 250.3 | 76.1 |
|  |  |  |  |  | TZA | 54.0 | 43.6 | $13.2$ |
|  |  |  |  |  | UGA | 11.0 | 8.9 | 2.7 |
|  |  |  |  |  | ZMB | 10.1 | 8.1 | 2.5 |
|  |  |  |  |  | LBR | 5.6 | 4.6 | 1.4 |
|  |  |  |  |  | All LDCs | 407.6 | 329.1 | $100.0$ |
| 61 Clothing, knitted | BGD | 1145.6 | 404.0 | 64.5 | BGD | 936.3 | 279.3 | 70.6 |
|  | CAM | 192.3 | 67.8 | 10.8 | CAM | 121.8 | 36.3 | 9.2 |
|  | HTI | 119.7 | 42.2 | 6.7 | HTI | 91.9 | 27.4 | 6.9 |
|  | MYR | 109.6 | 38.6 | 6.2 | MYR | 78.4 | 23.4 | 5.9 |
|  | MDG | 93.5 | 33.0 | 5.3 | LAO | 28.9 | 8.6 | 2.2 |
|  | All LDCs | 1776.6 | 626.5 | 100.0 | All LDCs | 1326.8 | 395.8 | 100.0 |
| 62 Clothing, not knitted | BGD | 2109.1 | 692.2 | 78.7 | BGD | 1133.3 | 283.9 | 84.4 |
|  | CAM | 133.4 | 31.2 | 5.0 | MYR | 65.2 | 16.3 | 4.9 |
|  | MYR | 99.9 | 23.4 | 3.7 | CAM | 36.7 | 9.2 | 2.7 |
|  | NPL | 95.6 | 22.4 | 3.6 | LAO | 34.8 | 8.7 | 2.6 |
|  | MDG | 90.2 | 21.1 | 3.4 | NPL | 27.0 | 6.8 | 2.0 |
|  | All LDCs | 2678.5 | 879.0 | 100.0 | All LDCs | 1342.4 | 336.3 | $100.0$ |
| 63 Other made up textiles | BGD | 80.4 | 23.5 | 80.1 |  |  |  |  |
|  | MWI | 6.9 | 2.0 | 6.8 |  |  |  |  |
|  | NPL | 6.0 | 1.7 | 6.0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | CAM | 2.0 | 0.6 | 2.0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | MDG | 1.7 | 0.5 | 1.7 |  |  |  |  |
|  | All LDCs | 100.3 | 29.3 | 100.0 |  |  |  |  |
| 64 Footwear | BGD | 41.5 | 11.0 | 55.3 | BGD | 22.1 | 9.2 | 55.2 |
|  | CAM | 11.2 | 3.0 | 14.9 | CAM | 7.9 | 3.3 | 19.6 |
|  | CPV | 7.0 | 1.9 | 9.3 | CPV | 3.5 | 1.5 | 8.8 |
|  | MYR | 6.7 | 1.8 | 9.0 | MYR | 2.4 | 1.0 | 5.9 |
|  | LAO | 3.6 | 1.0 | 4.8 | LAO | 1.5 | 0.6 | 3.8 |
|  | All LDCs | 75.1 | 19.9 | 100.0 | All LDCs | 40.1 | 16.6 | 100.0 |
| 65 Headgear \& parts | BGD | 130.8 | 18.6 | 96.1 |  |  |  |  |
|  | NPL | 3.0 | 0.4 | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |
|  | MDG | 0.8 | $0.1$ | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |
|  | CAM | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.4 |  |  |  |  |
|  | HTI | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.4 |  |  |  |  |
|  | All LDCs | 136.1 | 19.4 | 100.0 |  |  |  |  |

Sources: Based on simulation results and UN COMTRADE Statistics.

## Caveats

The estimated gains from preferential access may be too high even though we have deliberately assumed a limited supply response. ${ }^{15}$ Although expanding exports to a particular market by re-directing exports from other regions does not require an increase in total exports (and therefore in supply), it does requires the establishment of strong business relationships and a good reputation as a supplier in the new market, which may limit the gains from these preferential initiatives. However, one can also argue that the static nature of the simulations underestimates the potential export gains for LDCs. If allowance is made investment, the supply response in LDCs to large tariff preference margins in the Quad may be much higher than the one assumed in the simulations.

An important qualification to consider is that the estimates are premised on the assumption that access is truly free. In practice any type of preferences will be accompanied by rules of origin and may remain subject to the threat of contingent protection-antidumping, countervailing duties and safeguard actions. Both types of policy instruments can be used to make duty free access irrelevant in practice. Examples abound of protectionist lobbying in Quad members to tighten GSP rules of origin to restrict the ability of beneficiaries to significantly expand exports. Usually such lobbying is facilitated by the use of value added tests or local content requirements-e.g., at least 40 percent of the value added in production must originate in the country of export. The problem with such criteria is that they can be changed unilaterally and allow significant discretion for administering authorities to determine if the rule has been met.

An example from the US illustrates how rules of origin may be used to nullify the benefits of preferences. In 1983, the US adopted the Caribbean Basin Initiative, which granted Caribbean countries duty-free access to the US for many products. To determine whether a product was eligible for preferential treatment, at least 35 percent of the value of the good imported into the US must have been generated in the Caribbean. The preference scheme induced foreign investment in the Caribbean, including firms that established operations in Costa Rica and Jamaica to convert surplus European wine into ethanol, which was then exported to the US. This production process met the 35 percent

[^10]value added test. Two years later, with production and exports doing well, the exporters were hit with a rule change: a US Congressman introduced an amendment to a tax bill raising the value added requirement for ethanol to 70 percent-an impossible requirement to meet for the Caribbean producers. The US industry that had lobbied for this rule change was never threatened by the imports-which never exceeded three percent of US consumption (Bovard, 1991: 22). Rules of origin are also high cost to administer-the tariff equivalent of the associated red tape can be significant. Herin (1986) estimated the ad-valorem cost of fulfilling rules of origin in EFTA was high enough for some $25 \%$ of all trade to pay the MFN tariff rather than document origin.
The WTO includes an Agreement on Rules of Origin that aims to foster the harmonization of the rules used by members. The agreement calls for a work program to be undertaken by a Technical Committee, in conjunction with the WCO, to develop a classification system regarding the changes in tariff subheadings based on the Harmonized System that constitute a substantial transformation. In principle, such rules are to be based on the change in tariff heading methodology, not value added criteria. The former involves rules that specify that a good originates if in the production process, the good that is produced is classified in a HS category that differs from that applying to the major inputs used. The WCO harmonization program, expected to be completed by the end of 2001, provides a potential solution to the rules of origin problem, as it creates the possibility of the Quad adopting the WCO rules. The WCO rules of origin are intended to be applied for non-preferential commercial policy instruments-tariffs, import licensing, antidumping and so forth-but there is no reason why they could not be applied to preferential trade as well. Doing so would help to greatly reduce transactions costs and uncertainty.

The threat of antidumping and similar instruments of contingent protection can also make duty free access redundant if there is a probability that once exports have expanded they will be targeted by such mechanisms. It is therefore important that duty free access schemes exempt LDCs exempt from the application of antidumping and safeguard actions. While this may be politically difficult to achieve, the small trade flows concerned should make such a promise relatively painless in practice. A problem, however, is that antidumping is an 'automatic' type of instrument, whose application
cannot be blocked by the political authorities unless the relevant laws and regulations are amended. More generally, being unilateral, it must be recognized that duty free access offers by the Quad are not enforceable. This implies a need for good faith efforts to deliver on promises to open markets fully and to prevent attempts to re-impose protection through the backdoor. Monitoring of the implementation of duty free access by civil society (development-oriented NGOs) could help ensure compliance. This is an area where it is not possible to rely on WTO dispute settlement, given that preferences are unilateral.

Finally, it should be noted that the above analysis completely ignores the fact that trade barriers faced by developing countries include policies imposed by other developing countries. Almost 40 percent of developing countries exports were imported by other developing countries in 1998 (Hertel and Martin, 1999). Moreover, tariffs are higher in developing countries for products. Own liberalization is likely to be a major precondition for benefiting fully from duty free access in the Quad.

## 5 Concluding remarks

Although average tariffs confronting LDCs in Quad markets are very low, tariff peaks and tariff escalation have a disproportional effect on LDC exports. Goods that are subject to MFN tariffs of 15 percent or higher account for 11 percent of LDC exports to the Quad, although these types of products represent only 4 percent of total Quad imports ( $\$ 93$ billion). Of this small amount, LDCs account for less than 4 percent of total Quad imports of tariff peak items-they are very small players.

Products that are subject to tariff peaks, especially in Canada and the US, tend to benefit from only limited preferential access. The impact of tariff peaks is therefore disproportionately great for LDCs. Tariff peak products tend to be heavily concentrated in agriculture products (sugar, cereals, meat) and in labor intensive sectors such as apparel and footwear. LDC exports of tariff peak items to the Quad tend to be highly concentrated. In Japan, LDCs are virtually not present in the market; in the US and Canada exports are heavily concentrated in apparel. Only in the EU do LDCs have a relatively diversified presence in that they export non-negligible quantities of a number products.

Elimination of tariff peaks for LDCs in Quad markets will have a significant effect on LDC exports to these markets, ranging from 30 to 60 percent. The extra $\$ 2.5$ billion of exports by LDCs represents an 11 percent increase in their total exports to the world. This would constitute a major improvement in terms of export performance. The impact of duty free access on domestic producers and domestic consumption in the Quad would be very small, in part LDCs will displace trade from other sources. While such displacement-trade diversion-is inherently a problem associated with granting preferential access to only a subset of countries, the amounts involved are very small relative to total developing (non-LDC) country exports of tariff peak products. Moreover, LDC exports expand more than other developing countries trade contracts. In terms of other developing country total exports to the world, the decline associated with providing LDCs with free access to the Quad is quite small-less than 0.1 percent of their global exports.

The overall increase in exports of $\$ 2.5$ billion can be compared to the magnitude of the official development assistance (ODA) given by the Quad to LDCs. Total ODA to LDCs stood at $\$ 6.7$ billion in 1998, more than two-thirds of which was provided by the EU and its member states. If we divide the projected increase in LDC exports of tariff peak items following granting of duty free access in Canada, the EU, Japan and the US by the ODA provided by each of these Quad members to all LDCs, we can conclude that duty free access would generate an increase in exports that is equivalent to more than 5 times ODA granted by Canada; more than double that provided by the US, about half that granted by Japan ODA, and only 4 percent of EU ODA. ${ }^{6}$

The distribution of export increases across products and countries reflects differences in both the export bundle of LDCs and the tariff peak items in Quad countries. In terms of specific product categories and countries, the impact of duty free access for LDCs is relatively concentrated. In the US and Canada, most of the action is in apparel. In the EU and Japan, the action is primarily in sugar and related products, and cereals. In terms of which LDCs benefit most, Bangladesh would be a big beneficiary, as the largest LDC exporter of apparel, footwear and fish to the EU, US, and Canada. Other LDCs will also benefit significantly in relative terms. Cambodia, Cape Verde, Haiti, Lao,

[^11]Liberia, Malawi, the Maldives and Somalia would all see their exports increase by 20 percent or more. Given that tariff peaks across Quad countries occur in different products and that LDC export bundles are quite varied, it is important that all Quad members grant preferential access to ensure that all LDCs benefit.

It is well known that protectionist trade regimes in industrialized countries are not the most important factor constraining LDC export growth-importance as well are domestic distortions and institutional weaknesses that create high transactions costs, bias investment incentives and raise risk premia-see, e.g., Ng and Yeats (1996), World Bank (2001). Duty free access will not solve the problem of the marginalization of LDCs in global trade. However, it is something that can be offered to these countries by the Quad, and that can help offset to some extent the major domestic challenges and transactions costs that confront domestic entrepreneurs in these countries. In the process it may help alter the domestic political economy forces that constrain the adoption and implementation of better policies by mobilizing groups that will benefit from improved access to the Quad.
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## APPENDIX A:

Tariff Peaks at 2-digit HS in Quad

Table A1: Peaks and preferential access into the Canadian market

| Tariff Peak at HS 2-digit Product | \# 6 -digit lines | MFN tariff | LDC pref. | GSP pref | Mex Pref | Chl Pref | CAR Pref |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01 Live animals. | 4 | 198.8 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.25 |
| 02 Meat and edible meat offal | 10 | 109.9 | 0.60 | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.60 | 0.60 |
| 04 Dairy prod; birds' eggs; honey | 26 | 197.5 | 0.31 | 0.03 | 0.05 | 0.50 | 0.54 |
| 06 Live tree \& other plant; bulb, cut flowers | 1 | 15.2 | 0.47 | 0.47 | 0.51 | 0.60 | 1.00 |
| 08 Edible fruit and nuts; melons | 1 | 16.6 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 10 Cereals. | 3 | 70.2 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.69 | 0.53 |
| 11 Prod mill indust; malt; starches | 7 | 85.3 | 0.14 | 0.02 | 0.14 | 0.07 | 0.14 |
| 12 Oil seed, oleagi fruits; misc grain | 1 | 18.3 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 13 Lac; gums, resins \& other veg | 1 | 74.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 15 Animal/veg fats \& oils \& prod | 8 | 28.0 | 0.80 | 0.57 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 16 Prep of meat, fish or mollusks | 5 | 68.7 | 0.59 | 0.14 | 0.22 | 0.50 | 0.66 |
| 17 Sugars and sugar confectionery | 1 | 16.6 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 18 Cocoa and cocoa preparations | 2 | 85.5 | 1.00 | 0.18 | 1.00 | 0.73 | 1.00 |
| 19 Prep of cereal, flour, starch/milk prod | 3 | 54.5 | 0.96 | 0.26 | 0.87 | 0.96 | 1.00 |
| 20 Prep of vegetable, fruit, nuts prod | 2 | 19.4 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.77 | 0.48 | 1.00 |
| 21 Miscellaneous edible preparations | 4 | 48.9 | 0.97 | 0.37 | 0.77 | 0.83 | 1.00 |
| 22 Beverages, spirits and vinegar | 3 | 26.7 | 0.67 | 0.27 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 23 Residues \& waste from food indust | 2 | 30.3 | 0.29 | 0.00 | 0.40 | 0.50 | 0.50 |
| 24 Tobacco and manufactured | 1 | 17.6 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 33 Essential oils \& resinoids, perf. | 1 | 18.0 | 1.00 | 0.74 | 1.00 | 0.57 | 1.00 |
| 35 Albuminoidal subs; modified starches | 2 | 18.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.50 | 0.50 |
| 39 Plastics and articles thereof. | 5 | 16.7 | 1.00 | 0.36 | 0.70 | 0.72 | 1.00 |
| 40 Rubber and articles thereof. | 7 | 16.8 | 1.00 | 0.37 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 42 Articles of leather, saddlery, travel pr | 3 | 16.6 | 1.00 | 0.42 | 0.72 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 43 Furskins and artificial fur thereof. | 2 | 19.2 | 1.00 | 0.34 | 0.61 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 51 Wool, fine/coarse animal hair nes | 7 | 16.5 | 0.87 | 0.41 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| 52 Cotton. | 66 | 17.3 | 0.15 | 0.06 | 0.62 | 0.62 | 0.00 |
| 53 Other vegetable textile fibres \& yarns | 2 | 16.0 | 1.00 | 0.13 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| 54 Man-made filaments. | 34 | 19.0 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| 55 Man-made staple fibres. | 68 | 19.0 | 0.10 | 0.03 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| 56 Wadding, felt \& nonwoven, yarns etc. | 22 | 16.9 | 0.39 | 0.16 | 0.77 | 0.77 | 0.00 |
| 57 Carpets and other textile floor coverings | 14 | 18.9 | 1.00 | 0.47 | 0.77 | 0.77 | 0.00 |
| 58 Special woven fab; tufted tex fab etc | 31 | 17.9 | 0.34 | 0.11 | 0.65 | 0.65 | 0.00 |
| 59 Impregnated, coated, cover/laminated | 13 | 17.8 | 0.90 | 0.33 | 0.73 | 0.73 | 0.00 |
| 60 Knitted or crocheted fabrics | 16 | 18.0 | 0.38 | 0.12 | 0.65 | 0.65 | 0.00 |
| 61 Art of apparel \& clothing access | 114 | 23.3 | 0.07 | 0.02 | 0.62 | 0.62 | 0.00 |
| 62 Art of apparel \& clothing access | 116 | 22.4 | 0.09 | 0.04 | 0.66 | 0.66 | 0.00 |
| 63 Other made up textile articles | 52 | 22.1 | 0.14 | 0.06 | 0.68 | 0.68 | 0.03 |
| 64 Footwear, gaiters and articles | 23 | 20.8 | 0.12 | 0.07 | 0.70 | 0.67 | 0.00 |
| 65 Headgear and parts thereof. | 4 | 18.7 | 0.61 | 0.12 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| 67 Prepr feathers \& down; art flower nes | 4 | 21.3 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 68 Art of stone, plaster, cement, asbestos | 1 | 21.3 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 70 Glass and glassware. | 7 | 16.6 | 0.46 | 0.22 | 0.73 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 85 Electrical mech equip parts, sound pr | 3 | 16.7 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 86 Railw/tramw locom, rolling stock etc. | 7 | 15.0 | 1.00 | 0.55 | 0.92 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 89 Ships, boats and floating structures | 10 | 22.5 | 1.00 | 0.04 | 0.74 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 91 Clocks and watches and parts nes | 6 | 18.6 | 1.00 | 0.50 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 94 Furniture; bedding, mattress, cushion | 2 | 21.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.77 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 95 Toys, games \& sports requisites, nes | 1 | 16.4 | 0.13 | 0.06 | 0.84 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 96 Miscellaneous manufactured articles | 4 | 17.5 | 0.68 | 0.34 | 0.76 | 1.00 | 1.00 |

Source: OECD and WTO tariff files.

Table A2: Preferential access into the EU market in tariff peaks

| Tariff Peak at HS 2-digit Products | \# of 6 - <br> digit <br> tariff <br> lines | MFN <br> Tariff | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LDC } \\ & \text { Pref. } \end{aligned}$ | GSP <br> Pref. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ACP } \\ & \text { Pref. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { ACP } \\ + \text { LDC } \\ \text { Pref. } \end{gathered}$ | FTA <br> Pref. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01 Live animals. | 7 | 38.2 | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.30 | 0.35 | 0.00 |
| 02 Meat and edible meat offal | 41 | 71.0 | 0.08 | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.00 |
| 03 Fish \& crustacean, mollusk nes | 17 | 18.7 | 1.00 | 0.10 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| 04 Dairy prod; birds' eggs; honey | 25 | 59.1 | 0.12 | 0.01 | 0.06 | 0.12 | 0.02 |
| 06 Live tree \& other plant; bulb, cut flowers | 2 | 16.9 | 1.00 | 0.18 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.33 |
| 07 Edible vegetables and roots \& tubers | 12 | 25.4 | 0.79 | 0.15 | 0.66 | 0.79 | 0.00 |
| 08 Edible fruit and nuts; melons | 8 | 20.2 | 0.66 | 0.12 | 0.64 | 0.66 | 0.06 |
| 09 Coffee, tea, mat and spices | 2 | 16.0 | 0.50 | 0.69 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| 10 Cereals. | 14 | 75.6 | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.06 | 0.07 | 0.00 |
| 11 Prod mill indust; malt; starches | 31 | 38.2 | 0.17 | 0.02 | 0.20 | 0.21 | 0.00 |
| 12 Oil seed, oleagi fruits; misc grain | 1 | 74.4 | 0.15 | 0.00 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.00 |
| 13 Lac ; gums, resins \& other veg | 1 | 17.8 | 1.00 | 0.30 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| 15 Animal/veg fats \& oils \& prod | 8 | 56.0 | 0.60 | 0.19 | 0.51 | 0.60 | 0.03 |
| 16 Prep of meat, fish or mollusks | 22 | 23.5 | 0.68 | 0.20 | 0.67 | 0.68 | 0.01 |
| 17 Sugars and sugar confectionery | 9 | 37.6 | 0.14 | 0.03 | 0.21 | 0.25 | 0.05 |
| 18 Cocoa and cocoa preparations | 1 | 24.0 | 0.25 | 0.10 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 |
| 19 Prep of cereal, flour, starch/milk prod | 13 | 34.1 | 0.37 | 0.11 | 0.39 | 0.42 | 0.30 |
| 20 Prep of vegetable, fruit, nuts prod | 42 | 26.1 | 0.88 | 0.15 | 0.88 | 0.90 | 0.02 |
| 21 Miscellaneous edible preparations | 8 | 19.2 | 0.95 | 0.28 | 0.78 | 0.95 | 0.28 |
| 22 Beverages, spirits and vinegar | 12 | 35.7 | 0.71 | 0.33 | 0.77 | 0.78 | 0.06 |
| 23 Residues \& waste from food indust | 6 | 71.4 | 0.06 | 0.03 | 0.11 | 0.13 | 0.00 |
| 24 Tobacco and manufactured | 8 | 56.2 | 1.00 | 0.39 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| 29 Organic chemicals. | 3 | 33.9 | 1.00 | 0.33 | 0.53 | 1.00 | 0.53 |
| 35 Albuminoidal subs; modified starches | 2 | 24.9 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 38 Miscellaneous chemical products | 2 | 45.9 | 0.50 | 0.00 | 0.33 | 0.50 | 0.33 |
| 56 Wadding, felt \& nonwoven, yarns etc. | 2 | 21.1 | 1.00 | 0.15 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 64 Footwear, gaiters and articles | 13 | 18.2 | 1.00 | 0.30 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 87 Vehicles o/t railw/tramw roll stock, pts | 5 | 16.3 | 1.00 | 0.44 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |

[^12]Table A3: Preferential access into the Japanese market in tariff peaks

| Tariff Peak at HS 2-digit products | \# of 6-digit lines | MFN <br> Tariff | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { LDC } \\ \text { preferences } \end{array}$ | GSP preferences |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 02 Meat and edible meat offal | 9 | 39.31 | 0.13 | 0.13 |
| 03 Fish \& crustacean, mollusk nes | 4 | 15.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 04 Dairy prod; birds' eggs; honey | 25 | 28.99 | 0.05 | 0.05 |
| 07 Edible vegetables and roots \& tubers | 1 | 15.80 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 08 Edible fruit and nuts; melons | 11 | 19.81 | 0.15 | 0.09 |
| 09 Coffee, tea, mat and spices | 5 | 17.81 | 0.49 | 0.11 |
| 10 Cereals. | 1 | 63.38 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 11 Prod mill indust; malt; starches | 28 | 23.24 | 0.11 | 0.06 |
| 12 Oil seed, oleagi fruits; misc grain | 1 | 19.10 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 15 Animal/veg fats \& oils \& prod | 2 | 26.99 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 16 Prep of meat, fish or mollusks | 4 | 20.69 | 0.05 | 0.05 |
| 17 Sugars and sugar confectionery | 11 | 71.25 | 0.05 | 0.05 |
| 18 Cocoa and cocoa preparations | 6 | 22.77 | 0.49 | 0.18 |
| 19 Prep of cereal, flour, starch/milk prod | 13 | 21.91 | 0.15 | 0.04 |
| 20 Prep of vegetable, fruit, nuts prod | 32 | 22.69 | 0.23 | 0.06 |
| 21 Miscellaneous edible preparations | 7 | 22.35 | 0.19 | 0.11 |
| 22 Beverages, spirits and vinegar | 16 | 38.65 | 0.39 | 0.16 |
| 24 Tobacco and manufactured | 2 | 18.63 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 29 Organic chemicals. | 2 | 20.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 35 Albuminoidal subs; modified starches | 2 | 23.31 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 38 Miscellaneous chemical products | 1 | 80.83 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 41 Raw hides and skins (other than fur) | 10 | 26.08 | 1.00 | 0.57 |
| 42 Articles of leather; saddlery, travel pr | 5 | 15.52 | 0.20 | 0.10 |
| 43 Furskins and artificial fur thereof. | 8 | 16.25 | 0.47 | 0.47 |
| 53 Other vegetable textile fibres \& yarns | 4 | 16.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 58 Special woven fab; tufted tex fab etc | 4 | 17.90 | 1.00 | 0.50 |
| 60 Knitted or crocheted fabrics | 3 | 15.70 | 1.00 | 0.50 |
| 64 Footwear, gaiters and articles | 16 | 36.24 | 0.81 | 0.40 |

Source: Computations based on UN COMTRADE Statistics.

Table A4: Preferential Access into the US market in tariff peaks

| Product Description | \# lines | MFN | LDC | GSP | Mexico | ATP | Caribbean |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 02 Meat and edible meat offal | 2 | 19.20 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 04 Dairy prod; birds' eggs; honey | 2 | 20.90 | 0.38 | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.38 | 0.38 |
| 07 Edible vegetables and roots nes | 10 | 20.56 | 0.88 | 0.18 | 0.90 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 08 Edible fruit and nuts; melons | 5 | 16.66 | 0.80 | 0.18 | 0.74 | 0.80 | 0.80 |
| 11 Prod mill indust; malt; starches | 1 | 16.30 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 12 Oil seed, oleagi fruits; misc etc. | 3 | 77.95 | 0.00 | 0.33 | 0.67 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 15 Animal/veg fats \& oils \& prod | 4 | 19.92 | 0.50 | 0.25 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 |
| 19 Prep of cereal, flour, milk prod | 2 | 16.79 | 0.84 | 0.50 | 0.63 | 0.84 | 0.84 |
| 20 Prep of vegetable, fruit, nuts | 11 | 28.67 | 0.55 | 0.11 | 0.56 | 0.55 | 0.55 |
| 21 Miscellaneous edible prep | 1 | 19.80 | 0.74 | 0.00 | 0.43 | 0.74 | 0.74 |
| 24 Tobacco and manufactured | 7 | 73.48 | 0.14 | 0.09 | 0.96 | 0.14 | 0.14 |
| 28 Inorgn chem; compds of prec | 1 | 15.10 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 29 Organic chemicals. | 4 | 16.75 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 30 Pharmaceutical products. | 1 | 30.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 42 Articles of leather; saddlery | 1 | 20.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.60 | 0.13 | 0.13 |
| 51 Wool, fine/coarse animal hair | 4 | 20.45 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 52 Cotton. | 10 | 18.34 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 54 Man-made filaments. | 27 | 16.37 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 55 Man-made staple fibres. | 56 | 16.27 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.97 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 56 Wadding, felt \& nonwoven, yarn | 1 | 15.20 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 58 Special woven fab; tufted fabrics | 15 | 18.47 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.07 | 0.20 |
| 60 Knitted or crocheted fabrics | 5 | 18.58 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 61 Art of apparel \& clothing access | 58 | 19.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.85 | 0.02 | 0.05 |
| 62 Art of apparel \& clothing access | 41 | 18.85 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.83 | 0.02 | 0.14 |
| 64 Footwear, gaiters and parts etc. | 12 | 27.77 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.57 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| 69 Ceramic products. | 4 | 17.63 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.27 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 70 Glass and glassware. | 4 | 16.16 | 1.00 | 0.08 | 0.42 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 82 Tool, implement, cutlery, spoon | 1 | 15.23 | 1.00 | 0.65 | 0.65 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 86 Railw/tramw locom, rolling stock | 7 | 17.20 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 87 Vehicles o/t railw/tramw roll stock | 5 | 25.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 96 Miscellaneous manufactures | 2 | 20.66 | 0.78 | 0.57 | 1.00 | 0.78 | 0.78 |
| Soure: OECD and WTO tarf |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: OECD and WTO tariff files.

## Appendix B: Total Exports of LDC by HS-2 digit (1996-98 average, peaks and other products)

| HS-2 Product | Export Values of LDCs (\$ '000) |  |  |  |  | Export Shares of All Goods (\%) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Canada | EU | Japan | USA | World | Canada | EU | Japan | USA | World |
| 01 Live animals. | 70 | 4384 | 670 | 3523 | 12306 | 0.02 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.06 | 0.05 |
| 02 Meat and edible meat offal | 0 | 2649 | 1905 | 21 | 11298 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.14 | 0.00 | 0.05 |
| 03 Fish \& crustacean, mollusc nes | 10983 | 569991 | 400391 | 136963 | 1307056 | 3.74 | 6.06 | 29.94 | 2.25 | 5.74 |
| 04 Dairy prod; birds' eggs; honey | 12 | 535 | 71 | 102 | 1873 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.01 |
| 05 Products of animal origin | 17 | 4372 | 3248 | 943 | 11468 | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.24 | 0.02 | 0.05 |
| 06 Live tree \& other plant; bulb, cut flowers | 141 | 0 | 56 | 1550 | 34618 | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.15 |
| 07 Edible vegetables and roots \& tubers | 247 | 61539 | 8139 | 613 | 250776 | 0.08 | 0.65 | 0.61 | 0.01 | 1.10 |
| 08 Edible fruit and nuts; melons | 1510 | 68239 | 17 | 24000 | 257010 | 0.51 | 0.73 | 0.00 | 0.39 | 1.13 |
| 09 Coffee, tea, mat and spics | 18586 | 928734 | 106749 | 125653 | 1407068 | 6.32 | 9.87 | 7.98 | 2.06 | 6.18 |
| 10 Cereals. | 41 | 5995 | 484 | 128 | 19373 | 0.01 | 0.06 | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.09 |
| 11 Prod mill indust; malt; starches | 10 | 119 | 0 | 165 | 5460 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.02 |
| 12 Oil seed, oleagi fruits; misc grain | 822 | 120725 | 57273 | 23180 | 282589 | 0.28 | 1.28 | 4.28 | 0.38 | 1.24 |
| 13 Lac ; gums, resins \& other veg | 12 | 44216 | 3305 | 15826 | 70480 | 0.00 | 0.47 | 0.25 | 0.26 | 0.31 |
| 14 Vegetable plaiting materials, nes | 110 | 6088 | 113 | 1402 | 14957 | 0.04 | 0.06 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.07 |
| 15 Animal/veg fats \& oils \& prod | 22 | 54930 | 1626 | 1508 | 89950 | 0.01 | 0.58 | 0.12 | 0.02 | 0.40 |
| 16 Prep of meat, fish or molluscs | 530 | 73066 | 7935 | 438 | 83974 | 0.18 | 0.78 | 0.59 | 0.01 | 0.37 |
| 17 Sugars and sugar confectionery | 69 | 62605 | 3 | 22332 | 103055 | 0.02 | 0.67 | 0.00 | 0.37 | 0.45 |
| 18 Cocoa and cocoa preparations | 268 | 51913 | 0 | 2840 | 68535 | 0.09 | 0.55 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.30 |
| 19 Prep of cereal, flour, starch/milk prod | 19 | 310 | 2 | 177 | 3158 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 |
| 20 Prep of vegetable, fruit, nuts prod | 239 | 3209 | 15 | 372 | 5304 | 0.08 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.02 |
| 21 Miscellaneous edible preparations | 66 | 1327 | 51 | 48 | 4208 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.02 |
| 22 Beverages, spirits and vinegar | 131 | 2271 | 52 | 689 | 6122 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.03 |
| 23 Residues \& waste from food indust | 155 | 30380 | 89 | 6771 | 48190 | 0.05 | 0.32 | 0.01 | 0.11 | 0.21 |
| 24 Tobacco and manufactured | 939 | 208971 | 39075 | 63707 | 405337 | 0.32 | 2.22 | 2.92 | 1.05 | 1.78 |
| 25 Salt; sulphur; earth \& ston, lime | 39564 | 33851 | 873 | 4457 | 119327 | 13.46 | 0.36 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.52 |
| 26 Ores, slag and ash. | 34792 | 565475 | 6385 | 124427 | 757596 | 11.84 | 6.01 | 0.48 | 2.04 | 3.33 |
| 27 Mineral fuels, oils \& prod | 55357 | 664502 | 253674 | 2972303 | 5957934 | 18.84 | 7.06 | 18.97 | 48.83 | 26.16 |
| 28 Inorgn chem; compds of prec met | 7940 | 67907 | 21 | 4701 | 149466 | 2.70 | 0.72 | 0.00 | 0.08 | 0.66 |
| 29 Organic chemicals. | 137 | 1647 | 205 | 172 | 7777 | 0.05 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.03 |
| 30 Pharmaceutical products. | 12 | 1494 | 0 | 12309 | 22587 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.20 | 0.10 |
| 31 Fertilisers. | 11 | 1028 | 4 | 908 | 32335 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.14 |
| 32 Tanning/dyeing extract; tannins etc | 30 | 4229 | 22 | 735 | 8154 | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.04 |
| 33 Essential oils \& resinoids, perf. | 209 | 16215 | 244 | 2133 | 31690 | 0.07 | 0.17 | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.14 |
| 34 Soap, organic surface-active agents | 14 | 350 | 3 | 80 | 9957 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.04 |
| 35 Albuminoidal subs; modified starches | 53 | 1790 | 0 | 618 | 2755 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| 36 Explosives; pyrotechnic prod | 0 | 10 | 0 | 110 | 141 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 37 Photographic or cinematographic pr | 1 | 585 | 43 | 23 | 790 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 38 Miscellaneous chemical products | 97 | 374 | 78 | 141 | 2496 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.01 |
| 39 Plastics and articles thereof. | 221 | 3954 | 348 | 1051 | 13733 | 0.08 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.06 |
| 40 Rubber and articles thereof. | 653 | 17095 | 71 | 10700 | 106054 | 0.22 | 0.18 | 0.01 | 0.18 | 0.47 |
| 41 Raw hides and skins (other than fur) | 191 | 171564 | 14278 | 10193 | 321639 | 0.06 | 1.82 | 1.07 | 0.17 | 1.41 |
| 42 Articles of leather; saddlery, travel gds | 226 | 8063 | 1173 | 17929 | 28818 | 0.08 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.29 | 0.13 |
| 43 Furskins and artificial fur thereof. | 46 | 7997 | 3 | 385 | 8774 | 0.02 | 0.08 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.04 |
| 44 Wood and articles of wood. | 647 | 166790 | 108025 | 10358 | 621952 | 0.22 | 1.77 | 8.08 | 0.17 | 2.73 |
| 45 Cork and articles of cork | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 46 Manufactures of straw, plaiting mat etc | 65 | 4782 | 205 | 1780 | 7382 | 0.02 | 0.05 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.03 |
| 47 Pulp of wood/of other fibrous cellulosic | 3 | 90 | 1181 | 280 | 2347 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.09 | 0.00 | 0.01 |
| 48 Paper \& paperboard; art \& paper pulp | 81 | 7455 | 92 | 682 | 11724 | 0.03 | 0.08 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.05 |
| 49 Printed books, newspaper prod. | 59 | 5149 | 190 | 460 | 9137 | 0.02 | 0.05 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.04 |

50 Silk.
51 Wool, fine/coarse animal hair nes 52 Cotton.
53 Other vegetable textile fibres \& yarns
54 Man-made filaments.
55 Man-made staple fibres.
56 Wadding, felt \& nonwoven, yarns etc.
57 Carpets and other textile floor coverings
58 Special woven fab; tufted tex fab etc
59 Impregnated, coated, cover/laminated
60 Knitted or crocheted fabrics
61 Art of apparel \& clothing access
62 Art of apparel \& clothing access
63 Other made up textile articles 64 Footwear, gaiters and articles
65 Headgear and parts thereof.
66 Umbrellas, walking-stick, whips etc.
67 Prepr feathers \& down; art flower nes
68 Art of stone, plaster, cement, asbestos
69 Ceramic products.
70 Glass and glassware.
71 Natural/cultured pearls, prec stones
72 Iron and steel.
73 Articles of iron or steel.
74 Copper and articles thereof.
75 Nickel and articles thereof.
76 Aluminium and articles thereof.
78 Lead and articles thereof.
79 Zinc and articles thereof.
80 Tin and articles thereof.
81 Other base metals; cermets thereof.
82 Tool, implement, cutlery, spoon, fork
83 Miscellaneous articles of base metal
84 Nuclear reactors, boiler, mech appl.
85 Electrical mech equip parts, sound pr
86 Railw/tramw locom, rolling stock etc.
87 Vehicles o/t railw/tramw roll stock, pts
88 Aircraft, spacecraft, and parts nes
89 Ships, boats and floating structures 90 Optical, photo, cine, meas, presision
91 Clocks and watches and parts nes
92 Musical instruments; parts \& access
93 Arms and ammunition; parts \& access
94 Furniture; bedding, mattress, cushion
95 Toys, games \& sports requisites, nes
96 Miscellaneous manufactured articles
97 Works of art, collectors pieces nes

All Goods
As \% of All Exports to the World
Source: Based on partner's data from UN Comtrade statistics

## Appendix C: The empirical model

World markets are perfectly competitive and integrated, in the sense that there is no further scope for arbitrage across countries. Products traded in world markets under the same 6-digit classification of the Harmonized system (HS) are considered as perfectly homogenous. Each product of the 6-digit HS classification is a sufficiently small share of the economy, so that the effects on other product's markets of changes in a particular 6digit product market can be considered as negligible.

Because we are interested on the consequences of reductions of tariff peaks in country $i$, let us model import demand for each HS-6-digit product of country $i=U S, E U, C A N, J P N$ as given by:

$$
\begin{equation*}
M_{i}=\frac{A_{i}}{\left[P_{W}\left(1+T_{i}\right)\right]^{E}} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $E$ is the import demand elasticity (common to all countries in our simulations), ${ }^{, 17}$ $P_{W}$ is the world price; $T_{i}$ is the MFN tariff in country $i$ and $A_{i}$ is a demand parameter in country $i$. Throughout the paper we will assume that tariffs are kept constant in the rest of the world. Therefore rest-of-the-world import demand is given by:

$$
\begin{equation*}
M_{\text {ROW }}=\frac{A_{\text {ROW }}}{\left[P_{W}\right]^{E}} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Export supply of country $j$ to country $i$ is given by:

$$
\begin{equation*}
X_{j \rightarrow i}=B_{j}\left[P_{W}\left(1+T_{i} \Pi_{i \rightarrow j}\right)\right]^{\theta} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

$\Theta$ is the export supply elasticity (common to all countries); $\Pi_{i \rightarrow j}$ is the level of tariff preference granted by country $i$ to exports from $j$. Thus, if $\Pi_{i \rightarrow j}=0$ imports of $i$ from $j$
have to pay country $i$ 's MFN tariff. Similarly if $\Pi_{i \rightarrow j}=1$ exports from $j$ receive the domestic price in i. $B_{j}$ is a supply parameter.

The equilibrium world price is obtained by solving for the world price the world market clearing condition, i.e.,
$p_{W}^{E}=\underset{P_{W}}{\operatorname{argsol}}\left[\sum_{k} M_{k}-\sum_{j} X_{i}=0\right]=\left[\frac{A_{i} /\left(1+T_{i}\right)^{E}+A_{R O W}}{\sum_{j} B_{j}\left[1+T_{i} \Pi_{i \rightarrow j}\right]^{\theta}}\right]^{1 /(E+\theta)}$

All demand and supply parameters are calibrated using UN's trade data (value and quantities) at the 6-digit of the Harmonized system and MFN and preferential margins of country $i$ : ${ }^{18}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
B_{j}=\frac{X_{j}}{\left[1+T_{i} \Pi_{i \rightarrow j}\right]^{e}} \quad ; \quad A_{R O W}=M_{R O W}\left[P_{W}\right]^{E} \quad ; \quad A_{i}=M_{i}\left[P_{W}\left(1+T_{i}\right)\right]^{E} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using the calibrated parameters in (4) and replacing them into the right-hand-side of (3) we simulate in the empirical section the effect on world prices (and developing countries' export revenue) of changes in country $i$ 's tariff peaks. Before jumping into the simulation exercise, let us determine analytically what would be the predictions from the setup described above.

## Effect on world prices of a reduction in tariff peaks

To sign the effect of a reduction in tariff peaks on world prices, differentiate (3) with respect to $t_{i}$. It yields:

[^13]\[

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial p_{W}^{E}}{\partial t_{i}}= & \frac{1}{E+\Theta}\left[\frac{A_{R O W}+A_{i} /\left(1+T_{i}\right)^{E}}{\sum_{j} B_{j}\left(1+T_{i} \Pi_{i \rightarrow j}\right)^{\theta}}\right]^{1 /(\Theta+E)-1}\left(-E \frac{A_{i} /\left(1+T_{i}\right)^{E-1}}{\sum_{j} B_{j}\left(1+T_{i} \Pi_{i \rightarrow j}\right)^{\Theta}}-\right. \\
& \left.\left\{\sum_{j} B_{j} \Theta\left(1+T_{i} \Pi_{i \rightarrow j}\right)^{\Theta-1} \Pi_{i \rightarrow j}\right\} \frac{A_{R O W}+A_{i} /\left(1+T_{i}\right)^{E}}{\left[\sum_{j} B_{j}\left(1+T_{i} \Pi_{i \rightarrow j}\right)^{\Theta}\right]^{2}}\right)<0 \tag{5}
\end{align*}
$$
\]

Thus a reduction of country $i$ 's tariff peaks will necessarily lead to an increase in world prices. Does this necessarily lead to an increase of country $j$ 's export revenue? No, given that some countries benefit from preferential access and therefore their export price is partly determined by the tariff.

## Effect on export revenue of a reduction in tariff peaks

The export revenue of country $j$ is given by:

$$
\begin{equation*}
E R_{j}=P_{W}\left(1+T_{i} \Pi_{i \rightarrow j}\right) X_{j}=B_{j}\left(P_{W}\left(1+T_{i} \Pi_{i \rightarrow j}\right)\right)^{\theta+1} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

The change in export revenue following a change in country's $i$ tariff is obtained by differentiating the right-hand-side of (6) with respect to $T_{i}$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\partial E R_{j}}{\partial T_{i}}=B_{j}(\Theta+1)\left(P_{W}\left(1+T_{i} \Pi_{i \rightarrow j}\right)\right)^{\theta}\left[\frac{\partial P_{W}}{\partial T_{i}}+P_{W} \Pi_{i \rightarrow j}\right] \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus, if country $j$ has no preferential access to country $i$ 's market (i.e., $\Pi_{i \rightarrow j}=0$ ), then a tariff cut will necessarily bring an increase in export revenue of country $j .{ }^{10}$ Similarly, if

[^14]country $j$ has full preferential access into country $i$ 's market (i.e., $\Pi_{i \rightarrow j}=1$ ), then a tariff cut will necessarily bring a decline in export revenue of country $i .{ }^{20}$

More generally, the export revenue of country $j$ will increase following a tariff reduction in country $i$ if:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\frac{\partial P_{W}}{\partial T_{i}} \frac{T_{i}}{P_{W}}\right|<T_{i} \Pi_{i \rightarrow j} \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

That is, if the elasticity of the world price with respect to the tariff is smaller than the tariff faced by the exporter $j$ in country $i$.

This suggests that a crucial element of the analysis of the effects of tariff reductions in the Quad on the export revenue of developing countries is the degree of preferential access that developing countries enjoy in Quad markets.

## Effect on world price of an increase in preferential access

The derivative of the world price given in equilibrium by equation (3) with respect to the degree of preference ( $\Pi_{i \rightarrow j}$ ) is clearly negative, suggesting that any increase in the tariff preferences that country $i$ grants to country $j$ will reduce world prices.

## Annex: Data sources

All trade data is from UN Comtrade Database (value and unit prices). MFN tariff schedules for Quad members are from the OECD compendium of tariff, 2000. Tariff preferences have been calculated using Quad member tariff schedules reported in the WTO IDB database and preference data provided by the WTO's Trade Policy Review division (when data was available at the 8 or 10 digit level, simple averages were taken).

[^15]In instances where specific tariffs are applied, we use ad valorem equivalents calculated by the OECD and the TPR division. Elasticities of import demand are assumed to be equal across countries and are constructed using data reported in: C. Shiells, R. Stern and A. Deardorff (1986), "Estimates of the elasticities of substitutions between imports and home goods for the United States", Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv 122, 497-519 and R. Stern, J. Francis and B. Schumacher (1976), Price elasticities in international trade: an annotated bibliography, London (An excel file is available from the authors). Export supply elasticities are also assumed constant across countries and due to the lack of information at this level of disaggregation we set its value to 0.5 (alternatively, we provide estimates with the elasticity of export supply set equal to 0 ).
smaller than the initial tariff in absolute value (unless we are in the presence of the Metzler paradox in which an fall in tariff leads to an increase in domestic prices).


[^0]:    * The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and should not be attributed to the World Bank. We are grateful to Ataman Aksoy, Uri Dadush, Elena Ianchovichina, William Martin, Aaditya Mattoo, and participants in a trade seminar at the World Bank for helpful discussions and suggestions; to Gerard Durand, Alice Enders, Daniel Morales, and Javier Suarez for valuable advice and data on tariffs; and to Lili Tabada for excellent assistance.
    ${ }^{\dagger}$ Development Research Group, World Bank, 1818 H Street, NW, Washington, DC, USA.
    * Centre for Economic Policy Research, London, UK.

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ Both GSP and North-South FTAs give rise to trade diversion. This will benefit some developing countries, but hurt others.

[^2]:    ${ }^{2}$ Figures are from WTO Trade Policy Reviews of Quad countries.
    ${ }^{3}$ We use the United Nations definition of LDCs. This comprises the 48 countries listed in Table 7 below.
    ${ }^{4}$ See Ianchovichina, Mattoo and Olarreaga (2000) for a CGE-based estimate of the gains for Sub-Saharan Africa of unrestricted market access for all goods in the Quad.

[^3]:    ${ }^{5}$ Under preferential treatment we include both unilateral schemes such as GSP, Lomé or LDC preferences, and those granted under bilateral agreements, such as NAFTA, Canada-Chile and the Euro-Med agreements.
    ${ }^{6}$ The WTO and UNCTAD define tariff peaks as all tariff line above 15 percent (at the 6 digit of the HS).

[^4]:    7 "Potentially" because tariff preferences granted to developing countries through bilateral or unilateral schemes will bring down the tariff faced by these exporters.

[^5]:    ${ }^{8}$ The EU was the first customs territory to grant GSP preferences to developing countries in 1971. See Kenan and Stevens (1997) or Hallaert (2000) for a detailed description of the European GSP.
    ${ }^{9}$ In the simulations discussed in section 4 we also include preferences for developed countries that benefit from preferences in other Quad markets (see footnotes in Table 3 for a description).

[^6]:    ${ }^{10}$ More than 26 percent are mineral fuels exports (HS 27) for which there are no tariff peaks in the Quad. Non-oil exports of LDC amount to $\$ 17$ billion.

[^7]:    ${ }^{11}$ Stevens and Kennan (2000) have identified more than 30 tariff regimes in the EU. We follow them in working with only the major aggregate categories/groups.
    ${ }^{12}$ These are available from the authors upon request.

[^8]:    ${ }^{13}$ Most of these gains are heavily concentrated in around 10 tariff lines at the 6 digit level of the Harmonized System.

[^9]:    ${ }^{14}$ Using the out of quota ad-valorem equivalents provided in the WTO's 1997 Trade Policy Review of Japan for groundnuts and dairy products and setting an ad-valorem equivalent for rice at 150 percent provides slightly larger gains for LDCs and other developing countries. Full duty free access to LDC generates an extra $\$ 15$ million to the existing $\$ 497$ million increase in exports; whereas when GSP beneficiaries also benefit from duty free access, this generates an extra $\$ 2$ billion to the existing $\$ 14$ billion increase in GSP exports.

[^10]:    ${ }^{15}$ One can also argue that the static nature of the simulations underestimates the potential export gains for LDCs. Once we allow for investment (FDI), the supply response in LDCs to large tariff preference margins in the Quad may be much higher than the one assumed in the simulations.

[^11]:    ${ }^{16}$ Data on ODA based on OECD DAC figures.

[^12]:    Source: OECD and WTO tariff files.

[^13]:    ${ }^{17}$ The 6-digit HS import demand elasticities have been derived from Stern et al. (1976).
    ${ }^{18}$ Given that goods are perfectly substitutable exports of $j$ to the rest-of-the-world need to receive the same price as exports to country $i$.

[^14]:    ${ }^{19}$ To see this note that the term in square brackets on the right-hand-side of (7) will then have the same sign as the change in world prices (which is negative).

[^15]:    ${ }^{20}$ To see this note that the term in square brackets on the right-hand-side of (7) will then be necessarily larger than zero as the elasticity of world price with respect to the tariff change in country $i$ is necessarily

