

# Scenarios for Trade Integration in the Americas

Xinshen Diao

Eugenio Díaz-Bonilla

Sherman Robinson <sup>1</sup>

Trade and Macroeconomics Division

International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)

November 2001

**Draft. Do not quote. Comments welcome.**

---

<sup>1</sup> Paper presented at the symposium “Impacts of Trade Liberalization Agreements on Latin America and the Caribbean” organized by the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) and the Centre d’Etudes Prospectives et d’Information Internationales (CEPII), November 5-6, Inter-American Development Bank, Washington D.C. Xinshen Diao is Research Fellow, Eugenio Díaz-Bonilla is Senior Research Fellow, and Sherman Robinson is Director, in the Trade and Macroeconomics Division of the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI).

# Scenarios for Trade Integration in the Americas

Xinshen Diao, Eugenio Díaz-Bonilla, and Sherman Robinson

Draft

## I. INTRODUCTION

Trade liberalization and economic integration in the Americas has been progressing at a steady pace since the mid-1980s. There are several reasons for these developments. On the political side, the spread of democracy in the Continent opened new opportunities for dialogue and collaboration across countries, including, but going beyond, trade to include non-economic aspects. Democratic interaction replaced the segmentation and distrust that characterized much of the inter-country relationships under previous military regimes.

On the economic side, there were important changes in trade, macroeconomic, public sector, and regulatory policies. Reduction of trade barriers occurred multilaterally, as a result of GATT/WTO negotiations; regionally, as a consequence of different trade agreements in the American continent; and unilaterally, depending on specific liberalization programs in different countries. Other economic changes, including liberalization of the current and capital accounts of the balance of payments, national treatment of foreign investments, markets deregulation, and privatization of public enterprises, led to larger capital flows and foreign direct investment in the Americas. Chart 1 presents an index of policy changes for Latin America showing the clear acceleration of policy reforms in the 1990s (Morley, Machado, and Pettinato, 1999 extending work by Eduardo Lora at the IADB). All those transformations opened opportunities for the civil society in the Americas to increase the economic, political, social, and cultural exchanges in the Continent. They also increased the integration with the world economy of LAC countries (see Charts 2 and 3, for trade and financial flows).

Although the ratio of capital flows to GDP appear to be decreasing lately (and never got back to the levels of the 1970s that ended in the debt crises of the 1980s) the process of trade expansion continues, both because of additional policy changes related mainly to the multiple levels of different trade negotiations currently taking place, and

due to greater familiarity in the private sector with international trade opportunities created by previous policy changes. The latter implies that even in the absence of new trade liberalization initiatives, a greater densification of the trade flows within the region should be expected—a product of the learning process in the private sector. But, as indicated, there are different new policy negotiations and initiatives in process that would eventually facilitate further trade expansion, in the region.

There is a growing literature analyzing various integration and trade liberalization scenarios in Latin America using multi-country world models.<sup>2</sup> There are ongoing discussions of expanding NAFTA to include a Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA), of the impact of MERCOSUR

, of possible links between MERCOSUR and the European Union (EU), and of further global trade liberalization under the next round of WTO talks scheduled to start in November 2001. This paper concentrates on only two potential future trade scenarios for those negotiations: a possible FTAA and a potential agreement between MERCOSUR and the European Union. Because of the complexity of the scenarios considered, the framework of analysis is a world computable general equilibrium (CGE) model.<sup>3</sup> The rest of the paper is organized as follows. The next section reviews the main characteristics of the model and the data utilized. The following section discusses the nature of the policy experiments, and analyzes the main results. Finally some policy conclusions and issues for further analysis are presented.

## **II. MODEL AND DATA**

The framework of analysis is a general equilibrium model with a multi-region and multi-sector specification. The base year is 1995 and most of the data come from the database of the Global Trade Analysis Project (GTAP), version 5 (McDougall et al., 1998).

---

<sup>2</sup> See, for example, the survey in Robinson and Thierfelder (1999); Robinson, Burfisher, and Thierfelder (1998); Diao and Somwaru, 1999 and 2002; Hinojosa-Ojeda et al., 1995 and 1997; Burfisher and Jones, eds., 1998; Roland-Holst and van der Mensbrugge, 2001.

<sup>3</sup> There is a active literature analyzing various integration and trade liberalization scenarios in Latin America using multi-country world CGE models. See, for example, the survey in Robinson and Thierfelder (1999). Recent examples include: Diao and Somwaru, 1999 and 2002; Hinojosal-Ojeda et al., 1995 and 1997; and Burfisher and Jones, eds., 1998.

The structure of this class of static world CGE is described in greater detail elsewhere (see for instance Noland, Liu, Robinson, and Wang, 1999). It can also be run in a dynamic specification (see Diao, 1999), but then the level of disaggregation of products and countries/regions must be reduced compared to what is being presented here. There are 38 products and 29 countries and regions (see Tables 1 and 2). The disaggregation for the agricultural and agroindustrial goods and for the American Continent is the maximum possible included in the GTAPv5 database.<sup>4</sup> For the aggregation of other developing regions a cluster analysis of food security situations (Diaz-Bonilla et al, 2000) was utilized. There are 5 factors of production: skilled labor, unskilled labor, capital, land, and natural resources.

The main institutions of the model are as follows. First, there is a single private household in each country that saves a constant proportion of disposable income and buys consumption goods. The household in each country owns the firms but also works there, receiving wages, distributed profits, and lump-sum transfers (which may be negative) from the government. The government spends all its tax revenues on consumption or lump-sum transfers to households. A capital account collects savings and buys investment goods. Producers within a country/region are aggregated into one representative firm for each sector, which produces the respective good or service, buying intermediate goods and hiring factors of productions. In making production decisions, the firms choose the levels of labor and intermediate inputs to produce a single sectoral output, taking into account the price of sectoral outputs, the wage rate, the prices of intermediate inputs, and the existent stock of capital. Sectoral outputs are either sold in the domestic market or exported to foreign markets.

In a multi-region and multi-sector global model, with an Armington (1969) specification, the domestically produced and consumed good from each sector is different both from the export good generated in that same sector (with that differentiation captured through a CET function), and from the imported good corresponding to that sector (utilizing a CES function). The composite export and import goods from each sector are differentiated by country of origin/destination based on constant elasticity

---

<sup>4</sup> The model includes 13 Latin American country/regions; 8 are countries and 3 are regional aggregations.

functions acting as an aggregator. Commodity trade flows are differentiated by their geographical and sectoral origin and destination.

Domestic and world markets for goods and services equilibrate through changes in endogenously determined prices. Domestic production and consumption prices interact with world prices, the real exchange rate per country, different levels of border protection, and, if applicable, consumption, production, and export subsidies.

Factor markets also equilibrate through the interaction of demand, supply and prices. In the simulations the supply of all factors of production other than labor are kept at the base levels, and there are no changes in inter-country savings and investments flows. The labor markets can be run with full employment (with wages as the equilibrating variable) or two alternative specifications with endogenous unemployment: one with nominal wages fixed and one with real wages fixed.<sup>5</sup> Wages (and returns to other factors of production) may vary due to other imperfections in markets that are assumed not to change for the policy experiments presented here.

The model has two other specification changes from the standard world CGE framework. First, it includes a cash-in-advance technology (Clower, 1967) that can be utilized to anchor the nominal variables (see Walsh 1998, among others, for a general discussion of cash-in-advance models; and Díaz-Bonilla and Piñeiro, 1999, and Díaz Bonilla, Reza, and Piñeiro, 2000, for the inclusion of a cash-in-advance technology in a CGE model). If all nominal variables are free to move, money is a “veil” and the model behaves as in the classical dichotomy in Walrasian models between the determination of relative prices and the determination of absolute levels (Patinkin, 1965). If there is any rigidity in a monetary variable, then changes in money supply or demand will have real effects. The importance of those effects will depend on the number of variables affected by nominal resistance and the degree of such resistance. A cash-in-advance specification can be derived by assuming money in the utility function (Feenstra, 1986), linking the monetary technology to the value of consumption goods. Conceivably, money can also appear as an argument in the production function (Fisher, 1974), which would link the

---

<sup>5</sup> The model considers the real product wage, i.e. the nominal wage in each sector divided by the specific product price. Simulations can also be done with the real consumption wage fixed instead.

monetary constraint to the value of production.<sup>6</sup> Here the cash-in-advance technology combines constraints for both consumption sales and a production, equally weighted.

Second, it is assumed that trade liberalization affects country productivity through different channels: the learning-by-doing, access to new knowledge, and scale effects of increased exports; the technological spillovers due to greater availability of better capital and intermediate goods for production; and the increase in competition in previously protected domestic markets (see the discussion of the links between trade, technology and productivity in Balassa, 1989; Grossman and Helpman, 1995; and Romer, 1994; for CGE applications with productivity linked to trade see, for instance, de Melo and Robinson, 1995; Lewis, Robinson, and Wang, 1995; and Diao and Somwaru, 2000). The model includes a technology shift parameter in the production functions linked to the level of export and imports.

The US nominal exchange rate is fixed at 1, and the US dollar is the world numeraire, with all world prices expressed in dollars. Every country has its own nominal exchange rate, which may be fixed or allowed to float depending on the closure followed (see below), and also a country-specific numeraire price index (a price index of domestic goods). Changes in the nominal exchange rate in a region correspond to a change in the real exchange rate, defined as the ratio of the prices of traded goods to non-traded goods in each country/region. In this class of country models, there is a functional relationship between the real exchange rate and the trade balance in each region (Devarajan, Lewis, and Robinson, 1993).

### **III. SIMULATIONS**

#### **(a) Scenarios**

The world CGE is utilized to simulate two scenarios: a Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA), and a free trade agreement between MERCOSUR (including Chile and Bolivia) and the European Union (FTMEU). Trade restrictions are measured as *ad*

---

<sup>6</sup> In principle, both specifications are compatible with how national accounts may be set up according to the System of National Accounts 1993 (CEU, IMF, OECD, UN, and World Bank, 1993), although the production approach is more commonly applied.

*valorem* tariff equivalents. The main source of the initial levels of tariff rates for the countries and regions in the model is the same database GTAPv5. The tariff rates are weighted applied rates for each individual country and region in the database, and the weights are sectoral import shares for countries/regions in the model.

In both simulations it is assumed that full market access is allowed for all sectors across the participating countries or regions (i.e. all market access barriers are eliminated). Obviously, the model can also be run with sectors exempted in different degrees from full market access (say sugar or automobiles), including the permanence of some tariff rate quotas. The European Union has been negotiating numerous free trade agreements with important exclusions in agriculture (see the European Commission, 2001). The simulations reported here assume no exclusions from free market access. However, regarding agriculture, it is also assumed that neither the US and Canada (within the FTAA), nor the EU (within the FTMEU), will eliminate support to their producers in the regional trade agreements considered here. Those countries have already indicated that they are prepared to negotiate domestic support only within multilateral negotiations in the WTO. Therefore, the distorting effects of producer subsidies remain.

Because in the 1995 database both NAFTA and MERCOSUR are still not completely implemented, the results of the simulations reflect also the (small) effect of the completion of those agreements.

As mentioned, the European Union is negotiating numerous trade agreements, and, more importantly, it is embarked in the process of enlargement of the Union. There are 13 countries considered as potential candidates for inclusion in the EU: Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, the Slovak Republic, Slovenia and Turkey. Accession negotiations have started with all of them except Turkey.

In addition, the EU has negotiated a FTA with South Africa in October 1999; signed the Cotonou Agreement (successor to previous Lomé Conventions) with 77 African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries on June, 2000, which (among other things) establishes that Regional Economic Partnership Agreements (REPA) on trade will be negotiated and prepared between 2002-2008; and the EU approved the so-called 'Everything But Arms' (EBA) Initiative on February 26, 2001, which removes all tariffs

and quotas on all EU imports except arms (but also establishes special regimes for sugar, rice, and bananas) from the 49 Least Developed Countries (which include 40 Least Developed ACP countries) (see the discussion in Bjørnskov and Krivonos, 2001). There are also bilateral agreements with a number of countries, including some in the Americas, like Mexico. A full evaluation of a MERCOSUR-EU free trade agreement should include the different trade agreements that temporally and politically will most likely take precedence over MERCOSUR in the EU negotiating process. Here, however, we concentrate on a “pure” FTMEU, and the results should be considered an upper bound for possible impacts on MERCOSUR countries.

Similarly, the FTAA and the FTMEU can be run with or without other important trade events, such as the entry of China in the WTO, and further WTO negotiations for agriculture and other sectors. Those events are not factored in the simulations presented here.

(b) Closure

The simulations are based on a mix of regimes for labor markets. For all the countries in Latin America unemployment is allowed and the simulations are run with real wages fixed, while the United States and Canada are run on the assumption of a full employment regime (with flexible wages playing the equilibrating role). The rest of the countries and regions are also run with fixed labor supplies, and wages equilibrate their labor markets.

Countries with hard pegs such as Argentina’s Currency Board, and those that adopted a dollarization regime, are run with fixed nominal exchange rates. All the rest of the countries float against the dollar, which is the world numeraire. The real exchange rate (in fact, one for exports and another for imports) is determined endogenously in all countries, and country trade balances (and hence capital inflows) are assumed fixed exogenously (Devarajan, Lewis, and Robinson, 1993; Robinson, 1991).

Although the cash-in-advance constraint allows the determination of nominal variables by fixing the money supply, the simulations presented here follow the more traditional approach of defining a price index as the domestic numeraire to facilitate

comparison with other simulations. The index utilized corresponds to the prices of the domestic goods.

Overall foreign savings (trade balances), investment demand, and government consumption of goods and services are all kept constant at base levels.

### (c) Results

Tables 3 to 11 show different indicators of the simulated effects of the FTAA and FTMEU.

Changes in real GDP are all positive for the countries participating in the FTAA and the FTMEU (Table 3). For the bigger countries (USA and Canada, in the FTAA, and the European Union, in the FTMEU), the increases in the GDP are below 1%. Mexico, which already has access to the US and Canada, does not benefit much from the FTAA, but it is not affected negatively either. Argentina, Central America, and Colombia appear to have larger increases in real GDP from the FTAA (6.6%, 6.3% and 5.5%, respectively). Chile, already a global trader, has the smallest increase. Argentina also has the biggest increase in GDP, and Chile the smallest, for the FTMEU. Both the FTAA and the FTMEU appear to generate very small declines in GDP (about 0.1%) in some countries, mostly in Asia.

Changes in Consumption are also positive for the participating countries, and the ranking of countries is similar as before (Table 4).

The levels of the Consumer Price Index (at base year weights) decline in general, but the changes are minor (Table 5).

The impacts of the simulations on labor markets appear in Tables 6 to 9. For countries and regions with wages as the equilibrating variable in labor markets, the simulations show small increases in real wages of skilled and unskilled labor in the US and Canada (for the FTAA) and in the European Union (for the FTMEU). The FTAA produces some small negative effects on real wages of unskilled labor elsewhere in the world, mostly in Asian countries, but not as much on skilled labor real wages. The FTMEU shows far smaller negative effects on other countries, and again the greater (but still very small) changes center on unskilled labor.

In the case of the LAC countries, whose labor markets are modeled in an unemployment mode with rigid real wages, the equilibrating variable is employment. Both the occupation of skilled and unskilled labor increases across Latin America under the FTAA, with the strongest percentage increases in Argentina and Uruguay for unskilled labor, and for Central America, Argentina, and Colombia for skilled. Changes in employment in Chile, although positive, tend to be smaller than for the other LAC countries. The percentage changes of the simulations suggest an overall increase of employment of about 5.1-5.6 million jobs in the participating LAC countries.

The FTMEU also creates strong employment effects in the MERCOSUR members, with the largest increases for Argentina, Uruguay and the Rest of Mercosur, and the smallest for Chile. The increases in total employment amount to about 2.8-3.0 million jobs.

Tables 10 and 11 show changes in trade as a result of both agreements. In the FTAA, exports and imports increase significantly for most countries, except the USA and Canada (which are big diversified exporters), Mexico (which already has access to the US market), and Chile, a global trader. The FTMEU show similar patterns, with the European Union showing small increases, and strong effects for the Latin countries, with Chile appearing at the lower end (Table 10).

The FTAA creates trade (exports plus imports) at the world level, for about 65 billion US dollars, or 0.7% of total world trade. There is a very small amount of trade decrease (trade diversion) in the countries not participating in the FTAA of about 1 billion US dollars (or 0.02% of the trade of the countries not participating). The effect of the FTMEU on world trade is about half that of the FTAA: it leads to an increase of world trade of about 34 billion US dollars, or about 0.35% of the world trade, also with a very small decrease of trade in the non-participating countries (Table 11). These results that the regional trade agreements are net trade creating is consistent with empirical studies of many such agreements (Robinson and Thierfelder, 1999).

#### **IV. CONCLUSIONS**

The empirical results lead to the conclusion that these alternative regional integration scenarios—an FTAA or a potential agreement between MERCOSUR and the

European Union—are good for the participants and have little impact on the non-participants. Trade creation greatly exceeds trade diversion, so both these scenarios are net trade creating, and the trade-diversion has relatively minor effects on the affected regions. For example, real wages of unskilled workers fall very slightly in Asia, but the effect on skilled wages is negligible.

In general, the gains are larger for the Latin American participants than for their large potential partners—the US and EU. These results are consistent with earlier studies of NAFTA, which also predicted small positive gains for the US and large gains for Mexico (Burfisher, Robinson, and Thierfelder, 2001).

Many countries in Latin America are currently undergoing macroeconomic strains, and growth in the region has slowed. In this environment, external shocks and stabilization and structural adjustment programs are likely to lead to significant swings in trade balances and exchange rates. While short-term in nature, such swings cause far larger changes in the prices of tradable goods in these economies than would result from the sorts of trade liberalization and regional integration policies considered in this paper.<sup>7</sup> The lesson is that it is hard to reap the long-term benefits of trade liberalization in an environment of macroeconomic instability.

Finally, a note on methodology. The model used in this paper is in the tradition of neoclassical multi-country computable general equilibrium models that, over the past fifteen years, have provided the core empirical framework for analyzing the impact of trade liberalization scenarios. It has long been recognized that this modeling framework must be extended to incorporate advances in both macro and micro elements if it is to provide an adequate framework for analyzing: (1) the impact of international and domestic policy liberalization on poverty and income distribution; and (2) the impact of structural adjustment and macro stabilization programs. Our model incorporates some macro elements such as a cash-in-advance mechanism and rigidities such as fixed wages and fixed exchange rates. While the literature on such extensions is growing, there is much to be done. We are still from providing an empirical or theoretical framework that adequately reconciles micro and macro theory.

---

<sup>7</sup> See, for example, Robinson, Burfisher, and Thierfelder (1998) who analyze the long-term impact on Argentina and Brazil of forming a customs union under Mercosur and compare the results with the impact of Brazilian devaluations.

On the distribution and poverty side, there is also much progress and much to be done. A few models have been developed of individual countries which incorporate both a CGE model and models of individual household behavior based on empirical work with household surveys. These “microsimulation models” hold great promise and work is underway using this framework in a number of Latin American countries.

## References

- Burfisher, Mary and Elizabeth A. Jones, eds. (1998). *Regional Trade Agreements and U.S. Agriculture*. Agriculture Economic Report Number 771, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.
- Burfisher, Mary, Sherman Robinson, and Karen Thierfelder. (2001). "The Impact of NAFTA on the United States." *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 125-144.
- Clower, Robert W. (1967). "A Reconsideration of the Microfoundations of Monetary Theory." *Western Economic Journal*, Vol. 6, no. 1 (December), pp. 1-9.
- Devarajan, Shantayanan, Jeffrey D. Lewis, and Sherman Robinson. (1993). "External Shocks, Purchasing Power Parity, and the Equilibrium Real Exchange Rate." *World Bank Economic Review*, Vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 45-63
- Díaz-Bonilla, Eugenio, Marcelle Thomas, Sherman Robinson and Andrea Cattaneo (2000). "Food Security and Trade Negotiations in the World Trade Organization: a Cluster Analysis of Country Groups" Trade and Macroeconomics Division, Working Paper Number 59. IFPRI. December.
- Díaz-Bonilla, Eugenio (1999) "Integration with divergent macroeconomic policies: The case of MERCOSUR." IFPRI/Fundacion Andina. Paper presented at the Inter-American Dialogue seminar on alternative responses to Brazil's financial crisis. February 12, Washington D.C.
- Díaz-Bonilla, Eugenio, Lucio Reza, and Valeria Piñeiro. (1999). "Venezuela: Estrategias Agropecuarias Alternativas. Un Analisis Cuantitativo." Final Report, MAgC, IICA, IFPRI. Caracas and Washington, DC: October.
- Diao, Xinshen, and Agapi Somwaru. (1999). "MERCOSUR and the US: An Intertemporal General Equilibrium Evaluation of Regional Integration." *International Economic Journal*, Vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 27-43.
- Diao, Xinshen, and Agapi Somwaru (2002, forthcoming). "An Inquiry on General Equilibrium Effects of MERCOSUR—An Intertemporal World Model." *Journal of Policy Modeling*. Vol. 21(1).
- Fischer, Stanley. (1974). "Money in the Production Function." *Economic Inquiry*, Vol 12, no 4 (Nov.), pp. 518-533.
- Hinojosa-Ojeda, Raúl A., Jeffrey D. Lewis, and Sherman Robinson. (1997). *Convergence and Divergence between NAFTA, Chile, and MERCOSUR: Overcoming Dilemmas of North and South American Economic Integration*. Working Paper Series 219, Integration and Regional Programs Department, Inter-American Development Bank.
- Hinojosa-Ojeda, Raúl A., Jeffrey D. Lewis, and Sherman Robinson. (1995). "Regional Integration Options for Central America and the Caribbean after NAFTA." *The North American Journal of Economics and Finance*, Vol. 6., no. 2, pp. 121-148.

- Lewis, Jeffrey D., Sherman Robinson, and Zhi Wang. (1995). "Beyond the Uruguay Round: The Implications of an Asian Free Trade Area." *China Economic Review*, Vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 35-90.
- de Melo, Jaime and Sherman Robinson. (1992). "Productivity and Externalities: Models of Export-Led Growth." *Journal of Economic Trade and Economic Development*, Vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 41-68.
- Morley, Samuel A., Roberto Machado, and Stefano Pettinato. (1999). "Indexes of Structural Reform in Latin America." Serie Reformas Económicas 12, Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, United Nations, Santiago, Chile.
- Noland, Marcus, Li-Gang Liu, Sherman Robinson, and Zhi Wang. (1998). *Global Economic Effects of the Asian Currency Devaluations*. Washington, DC: Institute for International Economics.
- Patinkin, Don. (1965). *Money, Interest, and Prices*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. New York: Harper & Row.
- Robinson, Sherman. (1991). "Macroeconomics, Financial Variables, and Computable General Equilibrium Models." *World Development*, Vol. 19, no. 11, pp. 1509-1525.
- Robinson, Sherman, and Karen Thierfelder. (1999). "Trade Liberalization and Regional Integration: The Search for Large Numbers." TMD Discussion Paper No. 34, Trade and Macroeconomics Division, International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI).
- Robinson, Sherman, Mary Burfisher, and Karen Thierfelder. (1998). "Agricultura, comercio y tasas de cambio en el Mercosur." In Lucio G. Reca and Ruben G. Echeverría, eds., *Agricultura, medio ambiente y pobreza rural en América Latina*. Washington, DC: Inter-American Development Bank.
- Roland-Holst, David and Dominique van der Mensbrugghe. (2001). "Regionalism versus Globalization in the Americas: Empirical Evidence on Opportunities and Challenges." Draft paper presented at the international symposium "Impacts of Trade Liberalization Agreements on Latin America and the Caribbean" sponsored by the Inter-American Development Bank, Washington, DC, November 5-6.
- Walsh, Carl E. (1998). *Monetary Theory and Policy*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

CHART 1

Index of Policy Reform in LAC




CHART 2

Trade as Percentage of GDP in LAC




CHART 3




TABLE 1 Countries and Regions

USA	US
CAN	Canada
MEX	Mexico
XCM	Central America and Caribbean
COL	Colombia
PER	Peru
VEN	Venezuela
XAP	Rest of Andean Pact
ARG	Argentina
BRA	Brazil
CHL	Chile
URY	Uruguay
XSM	Rest of South America
ANZ	Australia and New Zealand
JPK	Japan and Korea
E_U	European Union
CHN	China
IDN	Indonesia
PHL	Philippines
IND	India
ASX	Asia agricultural exporting
OAS	Rest of Asia
EEU	East European and Rest of Europe
TUR	Turkey
NAF	North Africa and rest of Middle East
SFC	South Africa
AFC	Africa food insecure mainly importing from the EU
AFD	Africa food insecure diverse trading partners
ROW	Rest of the World

TABLE 2 Products

PDR	Paddy rice
WHT	Wheat
GRO	Other grains
V_F	Fruits and vegetables
OSD	Oilseeds
C_B	Sugar cane sugar beet
PFB	Plant-based fibers
OCR	Other crops
CTL	Bovine cattle, sheep and goats, horses
OAP	Other animal products
RMK	Raw milk
WOL	Wool, silk
FRE	Forestry
FSH	Fishing
CMT	Bovine cattle, sheep and goat, meat products
OMT	Other meat products
VOL	Vegetable oils and fats
MIL	Dairy products
PCR	Processed rice
SGR	Sugar
OFD	Other food products
B_T	Beverages and tobacco products
ENG	Energy
OMN	Other minerals
TEX	Textiles
WAP	Wearing apparel
LEA	Leather products
PPP	Wood, paper products, publishing
P_C	Petroleum, coal products
CRP	Chemical rubber plastic products
NMM	Other mineral products
MVH	Motor vehicles and parts
OTN	Other transport equipment
ELE	Electronic equipment
OME	Other machinery and equipment
UTL	Electricity water
CNS	Construction
OSG	Other services and Government

TABLE 3  
 Change in Real GDP  
 (% over base)

	FTAA	FTMEU
USA	0.8	0.0
CAN	0.5	0.0
MEX	0.6	0.0
XCM	6.3	0.0
COL	5.5	0.0
PER	3.1	0.0
VEN	3.8	0.0
XAP	4.1	-0.1
ARG	6.6	7.7
BRA	4.0	4.0
CHL	2.8	2.1
URY	4.8	5.5
XSM	4.9	5.3
ANZ	0.0	0.0
JPK	0.0	0.0
E_U	0.0	0.3
CHN	0.0	0.0
IDN	-0.1	0.0
PHL	0.0	0.0
IND	-0.1	0.0
ASX	0.0	0.0
OAS	-0.2	0.0
EEU	0.0	0.0
TUR	0.0	0.0
NAF	0.0	0.0
SFC	0.0	0.0
AFC	0.0	0.0
AFD	-0.1	-0.1
ROW	0.0	0.0

TABLE 4

Change in Real Consumption (% over base)	FTAA	FTMEU
USA	0.9	0.0
CAN	0.6	0.0
MEX	0.7	0.0
XCM	4.1	0.0
COL	5.6	0.0
PER	2.9	0.0
VEN	3.4	0.0
XAP	3.3	0.0
ARG	7.0	7.9
BRA	4.7	4.8
CHL	2.3	1.7
URY	3.7	4.4
XSM	1.9	3.3
ANZ	-0.1	-0.1
JPK	0.0	0.0
E_U	0.0	0.4
CHN	-0.1	0.0
IDN	-0.1	0.0
PHL	0.0	0.0
IND	-0.1	0.0
ASX	0.0	0.0
OAS	-0.2	0.0
EEU	0.0	0.0
TUR	0.0	0.0
NAF	0.1	0.1
SFC	-0.1	0.0
AFC	0.0	0.0
AFD	-0.1	-0.1
ROW	0.0	0.0

TABLE 5

Change in CPI (% over base)	FTAA	FTMEU
USA	0.0	0.0
CAN	-0.1	0.0
MEX	-0.2	0.0
XCM	-1.2	0.0
COL	-0.3	0.0
PER	-0.2	0.0
VEN	-0.7	0.0
XAP	-1.4	-0.1
ARG	0.1	0.3
BRA	0.1	0.1
CHL	-0.5	-0.4
URY	-0.9	-1.1
XSM	-1.0	-1.6
ANZ	0.0	0.0
JPK	0.0	0.0
E_U	0.0	0.0
CHN	0.0	0.0
IDN	0.0	0.0
PHL	0.0	0.0
IND	0.0	0.0
ASX	0.0	0.0
OAS	0.0	0.0
EEU	0.0	0.0
TUR	0.0	0.0
NAF	0.0	0.0
SFC	0.0	0.0
AFC	0.0	0.0
AFD	0.0	0.0
ROW	0.0	0.0

TABLE 6

Change in Real Wages (Unskilled Labor)  
 (% over base)

	FTAA	FTMEU
USA	0.7	0.0
CAN	0.4	0.0
MEX	0.0	0.0
XCM	0.0	0.0
COL	0.0	0.0
PER	0.0	0.0
VEN	0.0	0.0
XAP	0.0	0.0
ARG	0.0	0.0
BRA	0.0	0.0
CHL	0.0	0.0
URY	0.0	0.0
XSM	0.0	0.0
ANZ	0.0	0.0
JPK	0.0	0.0
E_U	0.0	0.3
CHN	0.0	0.0
IDN	-0.1	0.0
PHL	-0.1	0.0
IND	-0.1	0.0
ASX	0.0	0.0
OAS	-0.2	0.0
EEU	0.0	0.0
TUR	-0.1	0.0
NAF	0.0	0.0
SFC	0.0	0.0
AFC	-0.1	-0.1
AFD	-0.1	-0.1
ROW	0.0	0.0

TABLE 7

Change in Real Wages (Skilled Labor) (% over base)	FTAA	FTMEU
USA	0.7	0.0
CAN	0.4	0.0
MEX	0.0	0.0
XCM	0.0	0.0
COL	0.0	0.0
PER	0.0	0.0
VEN	0.0	0.0
XAP	0.0	0.0
ARG	0.0	0.0
BRA	0.0	0.0
CHL	0.0	0.0
URY	0.0	0.0
XSM	0.0	0.0
ANZ	0.0	0.0
JPK	0.0	0.0
E_U	0.0	0.3
CHN	0.0	0.0
IDN	0.0	0.0
PHL	0.0	0.0
IND	0.0	0.0
ASX	0.0	0.0
OAS	-0.2	0.0
EEU	0.0	0.0
TUR	0.0	0.0
NAF	0.0	0.0
SFC	0.0	0.0
AFC	0.0	0.0
AFD	0.0	0.0
ROW	0.0	0.0

TABLE 8

Change in Employment of Non Skilled Labor  
(% over base)

	FTAA	FTMEU
USA	0.0	0.0
CAN	0.0	0.0
MEX	0.3	0.0
XCM	3.1	0.0
COL	3.1	0.0
PER	1.3	0.0
VEN	2.0	0.0
XAP	2.2	0.1
ARG	6.1	6.8
BRA	2.0	2.0
CHL	1.4	1.0
URY	4.1	4.6
XSM	2.3	2.9
ANZ	0.0	0.0
JPK	0.0	0.0
E_U	0.0	0.0
CHN	0.0	0.0
IDN	0.0	0.0
PHL	0.0	0.0
IND	0.0	0.0
ASX	0.0	0.0
OAS	0.0	0.0
EEU	0.0	0.0
TUR	0.0	0.0
NAF	0.0	0.0
SFC	0.0	0.0
AFC	0.0	0.0
AFD	0.0	0.0
ROW	0.0	0.0

TABLE 9

Change in Employment of Skilled Labor  
(% over base)

	FTAA	FTMEU
USA	0.0	0.0
CAN	0.0	0.0
MEX	0.6	0.0
XCM	5.6	0.0
COL	5.3	0.0
PER	2.4	0.0
VEN	2.8	0.0
XAP	4.3	0.0
ARG	5.4	6.0
BRA	3.4	3.4
CHL	2.4	1.9
URY	4.5	5.2
XSM	4.7	5.8
ANZ	0.0	0.0
JPK	0.0	0.0
E_U	0.0	0.0
CHN	0.0	0.0
IDN	0.0	0.0
PHL	0.0	0.0
IND	0.0	0.0
ASX	0.0	0.0
OAS	0.0	0.0
EEU	0.0	0.0
TUR	0.0	0.0
NAF	0.0	0.0
SFC	0.0	0.0
AFC	0.0	0.0
AFD	0.0	0.0
ROW	0.0	0.0

TABLE 10

	Change in Trade (% change over base)		FTMEU	
	FTAA		Exports Imports	
	Exports	Imports	Exports	Imports
USA	1.2	1.2	0.0	0.0
CAN	0.6	0.8	0.0	0.0
MEX	1.0	1.4	0.0	0.0
XCM	12.3	7.6	0.0	0.0
COL	9.9	7.8	-0.1	-0.1
PER	9.0	6.1	-0.1	-0.1
VEN	5.1	7.0	0.0	0.1
XAP	8.1	7.5	-0.1	-0.1
ARG	11.4	11.2	13.0	12.6
BRA	10.0	6.2	10.2	6.2
CHL	4.6	4.0	3.4	3.0
URY	8.9	8.1	10.2	9.4
XSM	7.4	4.7	7.0	6.2
ANZ	0.0	-0.1	-0.1	-0.1
JPK	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
E_U	0.0	-0.1	0.5	0.6
CHN	0.0	-0.1	0.0	0.0
IDN	-0.1	-0.2	0.0	0.0
PHL	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
IND	-0.1	-0.1	0.0	0.0
ASX	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
OAS	-0.4	-0.3	0.1	0.1
EEU	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TUR	-0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0
NAF	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1
SFC	0.0	-0.1	0.0	-0.1
AFC	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
AFD	-0.3	-0.1	-0.1	-0.2
ROW	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL	0.7	0.7	0.3	0.3

TABLE 11

	Change in Aggregate Trade			Percentage change over base		
	Billion US dollars over base			Percentage change over base		
	Exports	Imports	Total Trade	Exports	Imports	Total Trade
<b>FTAA</b>						
Americas	32.8	33.3	66.1	2.27	2.08	2.2
Rest of the World	-0.4	-0.9	-1.3	-0.01	-0.03	-0.02
TOTAL	32.4	32.4	64.8	0.69	0.69	0.69
<b>FTMEU</b>						
EU-Mercosur	16.9	16.9	33.8	1.46	1.52	1.49
Rest of the World	-0.7	-0.6	-1.3	-0.02	-0.02	-0.02
TOTAL	16.2	16.2	32.5	0.35	0.35	0.35