



# Measuring Costs and Benefits of Non-Tariff Measures in Agri-Food

OECD, Trade and Agriculture  
Contact: [Frank.vantongeren@oecd.org](mailto:Frank.vantongeren@oecd.org)

# Motivation

- NTMs important in international trade correction of information asymmetries, other market failures, but also possible protectionist purposes
- Existing economic studies:
  - focus mainly on (forgone) trade effects
  - presume removal of NTMs improves welfare (as for tariffs)
  - Lack conceptual foundation to analyze welfare effects of NTMs in an imperfect world

# Incidence of NTMs: Main points

- SPS issues can generate trade frictions
  - Heterogenous standards across countries
  - Importance of International based standards
- South-North and South-South trade issue

# The policy challenge

- NTMs are at interface between domestic policies and trade
- The challenge: recognize regulatory autonomy while avoiding obstacles to trade
- Objective: identify best practice/least cost solutions
  - Comparative analysis of different ways to address the same issue

# Summary of CB analysis

- Key points:
  - Distinguish actors that are concerned by given market imperfection from those that are not
  - Obtain assessment of welfare effects with and without NTM in place for those groups
- Some results
  - Trade restriction may sometimes be welfare optimal (both domestic and global) if proportion of concerned is ‘big enough’ and value of externality is ‘big enough’

# Analytical approach: costs and benefits

- A non-tariff measure has different costs and benefits for different actors:
  - Domestic :
    - Consumers, producers , government
    - (upstream, downstream, supply chain)
  - Foreign :
    - producers
    - (consumers, government)

# Analytical framework

- All consumers (unconcerned & concerned) derive utility from consuming a market good. Concerned consumers decrease their demand if they know of a negative attribute (2 demands  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  unconcerned/concerned)
- Producers maximize profit in a competitive industry ( $S_O$  and  $S_F$ )
- To simplify, the negative attribute comes only through foreign supply
- Domestic firms assumed to have incurred costs to meet regulation to eliminate the attribute (in the baseline)

# Clusters of products

	Number of cluster members	Trade coverage	NTM notifications	SPS concerns	Typical product
Cluster 1	25	High	High	High/ Very high	Cheese
Cluster 2	131	High	High	Medium/ High	Poultry
Cluster 3	195	High	High	Low	Vegetables
Cluster 4	216	High	Low	Low	Cut flowers
Cluster 5	116	Low	Low	Low	Vegetable oil
Cluster 6	94	Very low	Very low	Low	Oil cakes & other vegetable material

Six stable clusters of 777 products based on :

3 criteria: i) occurrence of NTMs (TRAINS), ii) their trade coverage (COMTRADE),

iii) the NTM-related trade frictions amongst countries (WTO SPS-STC)



# Case studies selected from cluster analysis

- Cheese:
  - unpasteurized milk, human health issue (consumption externalities)
- Shrimps:
  - antibiotics, human health, developing country issues (consumption and production externalities)
- Cut flowers:
  - invasive species, developing country issues (production externalities)

# Case Study : Impacts on gross profits of shrimp producers of OECD Food Safety regulation-(in mln euros)

	Import Ban	BMP better management practices	BMP+ resistant varieties
Vietnam	-483.8	+55.757	-170.1
Indonesia	-416.9	+47.6	-144.4
India	-211.1	+26.6	-85.3

# Case Study: Cut Flowers-change in gross profits(mln euros)

	Tighter inspect	Tighter inspect+ qlty.deprec	Production changes + reduced inspect
Kenya	-.822	-24.68	-3.83
Ecuador	-.244	-7.33	-1.14
Eu	+1.15	+1.15	.633

# Preliminary conclusions from cases

- Framework is flexible and adds economic dimension into assessment of measure, BUT:
- Data limitations are serious (no data on product varieties)
- If human life at stake, CBA is of limited use: need broader approach, risk assessment