

Leena Kerkelä

# Essays on Globalization – Policies in Trade, Development, Resources and Climate Change

HELSINKI SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

ACTA UNIVERSITATIS OECONOMICAE HELSINGIENSIS

A-342

# Table of Contents

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>1 Introduction and Summary</b>   | <b>1</b>  |
| 1.1 Applied general equilibrium models in the analysis of global policies   | 3         |
| 1.2 Description of GTAP model   | 6         |
| 1.3 Interpreting the results  | 14        |
| 1.4 Implications from the composite Armington structure in trade for welfare analysis in trade liberalization     | 16        |
| 1.5 Summaries of the essays and main findings   | 22        |
| 1.5.1 Essay 1: Trade and aid policies: Their impact on economic development in Mozambique                         | 23        |
| 1.5.2 Essay 2: Distortion costs and effects of price liberalization in the Russian energy markets: A CGE analysis | 24        |
| 1.5.3 Essay 3: Trade preferences in the EU sugar sector: Winners and losers                                       | 25        |
| 1.5.4 Essay 4: Credited forest carbon sinks: How the cost reduction is allocated among countries and sectors      | 26        |
| 1.5.5 Technical part  | 27        |
| 1.6 Conclusions   | 31        |
| References  | 31        |
| <br>  |           |
| <b>2 Trade and Aid Policies: Their Impact on Economic Development in Mozambique</b>                               | <b>37</b> |
| 2.1 Introduction  | 38        |
| 2.2 Mozambique's position in trade regimes  | 40        |
| 2.3 Aid, aid dependency, and donor behaviour  | 43        |
| 2.3.1 Aid allocation  | 43        |
| 2.3.2 Donor approaches to private sector development  | 45        |
| 2.4 Measuring trade and aid in CGE framework  | 50        |
| 2.4.1 Trade agreements and welfare in Mozambique  | 50        |
| 2.4.2 Measuring the welfare gain from aid   | 52        |
| 2.5 Structural effects of trade and aid   | 54        |
| 2.5.1 Aid, trade and development – description of simulations   | 54        |
| 2.5.2 Results of the simulations  | 56        |

|   |                |
|---|----------------|
| 2.5.3 Sensitivity of aid and trade facilitation shocks  | 60             |
| 2.5.4 Special case study – sugar exports to the EU  | 63             |
| 2.5.5 Discussion  | 68             |
| 2.6 Concluding comments   | 68             |
| References  | 70             |
| Appendices  | 75             |
| <br><b>3 Distortion Costs and Effects of Price Liberalization in the Russian Energy Markets: A CGE Analysis</b> | <br><b>77</b>  |
| 3.1 Introduction  | 78             |
| 3.2 The role of Russian energy in trade and the domestic economy  | 80             |
| 3.3 Elements of energy market reform in Russia  | 85             |
| 3.3.1 Price liberalization  | 86             |
| 3.3.2 Tax reform  | 87             |
| 3.3.3 Design of market structure  | 88             |
| 3.3.4 Global interest for Russian energy reform   | 89             |
| 3.4 Analysis of Russian energy markets with the GTAP model  | 90             |
| 3.5 The costs of distorted energy markets   | 93             |
| 3.6 The impact of price increases of domestic gas and electricity   | 100            |
| 3.7 Conclusions   | 105            |
| References  | 106            |
| Appendices  | 109            |
| <br><b>4 Trade Preferences in the EU Sugar Sector: Winners and Losers</b>                                       | <br><b>115</b> |
| 4.1 Introduction  | 116            |
| 4.2 The EU sugar sector, world sugar market and trade preferences   | 117            |
| 4.2.1 EU preferential agreement with the African, Caribbean, and Pacific countries                              | 120            |
| 4.2.2 EU preferential agreement with the Least Developed Countries (LDCs)                                       | 121            |
| 4.3 Studying the changes in the global sugar markets by using the GTAP model                                    | 122            |
| 4.3.1 Implied tariffs from the tariff quota system of the EU sugar regime                                       | 125            |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 4.3.1.1 Tariffs, quotas and tariff rate quotas   | 125 |
| 4.3.1.2 Changes made within the tariff quota system of the applied EU trade preferences                                  | 128 |
| 4.3.2 Complete liberalization of sugar imports into the EU for only a set of countries or for all countries in the world | 130 |
| 4.4 Simulation results for the unilateral liberalization of the EU sugar sector  | 132 |
| 4.4.1 The elasticity of substitution for sugar trade   | 136 |
| 4.5 Discussion and caveats   | 139 |
| References   | 140 |
| Appendices   | 143 |

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| <b>5 Credited forest carbon sinks: How the cost reduction is allocated among countries and sectors</b>         | <b>151</b> |
| 5.1 Introduction   | 152        |
| 5.2 Carbon sinks in the Kyoto Protocol and in the model simulations  | 153        |
| 5.2.1 Forest carbon sinks under Articles 3.3 and 3.4   | 153        |
| 5.2.2 Treatment of forest carbon sinks in the policy simulations   | 157        |
| 5.3 Description of the model   | 158        |
| 5.4 Scenarios  | 161        |
| 5.4.1 Baseline projections   | 161        |
| 5.4.2 Policy scenarios   | 162        |
| 5.5 Results and discussion   | 163        |
| 5.5.1 Which countries benefit from carbon sinks?   | 163        |
| 5.5.2 What is the importance of the sinks agreement compared to the US withdrawal?                             | 165        |
| 5.5.3 How are other countries and different sectors affected by the larger sinks allowed for Canada and Japan? | 166        |
| 5.5.4 Can we find any basis for allowing larger sinks for Canada and Japan?                                    | 168        |
| 5.5.5 How are benefits from carbon sinks distributed within the economy?                                       | 170        |
| 5.6 Conclusions and caveats  | 171        |
| References   | 175        |
| Appendix   | 178        |