United Nations Conference on Trade and Development

Erosion of trade preferences in the post-Hong Kong framework: From "trade is better than aid" to "aid for trade"

United Nations
New York and Geneva, 2007

Executive summary

The slow pace of the Doha Development Agenda (DDA) provides a window of opportunity for considering the possible implication of preference erosion once the DDA concludes. Trade preferences proved to be a difficult negotiating subject during the Sixth Ministerial Conference of the World Trade Organization, held in Hong Kong (China). Although there has been progress in widening the scope of trade preferences for least developed countries (LDCs), the issue of erosion of trade preferences remains to be defined and addressed to the satisfaction of a number of developing countries. A close analysis in this study concerning the measures in favour of LDCs as a result of the duty-free, quota-free initiative for at least 97 per cent of products reveals that actual preferences granted by the European Union (EU), the United States and Japan under their respective initiatives already meet requirements. This means that current product exclusion, notably textile and garments for the United States and some agricultural products for Japan, may remain unaltered, even in spite of recent improvements. Despite a proposal by LDCs , there has been no substantive progress in liberalizing the restrictive rules of origin that continue to affect the utilization of trade preferences granted to LDCs especially those granted by the EU under the Everything But Arms initiative in the textiles and clothing sectors.

This study begins with the assertion that preferential trade flows detected under the country/tariff lines approach may be relatively small, but may have significant poverty implications. It provides examples of linkages and pinpoints which country and products are benefiting most from recent preferential market access initiatives in favour of LDCs by the EU, Japan and the United States. It shows that the benefits of trade preferences are heavily concentrated on a relatively small number of product/country pairs, and highlights the possible consequences of multilateral tariff negotiations for trade preferences and preferential margins. The study underscores the significance of the value of trade preferences granted by the EU, the United States and Japan for the LDCs. This value represented in 2004 approximately $800 million for utilized preferences in terms of revenue forgone i.e. The non-collection of the duties that would otherwise be levied on imports from LDCs. To put this in context, the total value of revenue foregone over a five-year period may be equivalent to an estimated $4 billion for the European Union, the United States and Japan ($800 million * 5 years = $4 billion). As a matter of comparison, this exceeds by far the $200–400 million indicated in a World Bank/IMF paper presented in the Development Committee to finance the Enhanced Integrated Framework (EIF). Moreover, it should be noted that the $200–400 million of the EIF is to be spread over a five-year period, and that a part of that amount is expected to finance the EIF secretariat.

The study also discusses the magnitude of the erosion of preferential margins for products from LDCs that have most effectively utilized trade preferences. Some LDCs and vulnerable countries may be expected to suffer a decline in their exports to the QUAD countries (Canada, the EU, Japan and the United States) following trade liberalization at the most-favoured-nation level. Other countries that do not rely on trade preferences or are not utilizing them effectively may stand to gain from multilateral tariff liberalization. This study discusses the recent Aid for Trade Initiative and the EIF as initiatives for possible frameworks for measures that may be enacted to alleviate and mitigate the possible trade effects of the erosion of trade preferences for some LDCs' products/pairs. Given the impact that preference erosion may have on poverty and the household income of workers in the industries or sectors potentially affected, a remedial strategy could be addressed through insertion in the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper process. To this end, the study concludes by recommending that the lessons learned in the previous phases of the Integrated Framework and other trade-related technical assistance at the bilateral level should guide the international community, currently engaged in designing the operational features of the EIF and Aid for Trade. In particular, sound operational mechanisms and effective approval procedures have to be established at the country level and in the EIF secretariat to ensure a quick and effective disbursement of available funds under the EIF.

Acknowledgements

This study was carried out under the supervision of Mr. Habib Ouane, Director, Division for Africa, Least Developed Countries and Special Programmes (ALDC). It was prepared by Stefano Inama, with inputs and comments from Marcel Namfua, Interregional Adviser to ALDC, Craig Van Grasstek (especially regarding the section related to US preferences) and Simon Evenett, University of Saint Gallen.

Secretarial support was provided at different times by Mounia Atiki, Regina Ogunyinka, Veronica Rivera Cruz and Stefanie West.

The publication of this study was made possible by the contributions of the Government of Italy and the United Kingdom's Department for International Development to the UNCTAD project Mainstreaming LDCs into the Global Economy.

Contents

List of tables

Explanatory Notes

The term "dollars" ($) refers to United States dollars unless otherwise stated. The term "billion" signifies 1,000 million.

Use of a dash (–) between dates representing years, e.g. 1981–1990, signifies the full period involved, including the initial and final years.

The term "least developed country" (LDC) refers, throughout this paper, to a country included in the United Nations list of least developed countries.

Abbreviations

ACP	African, Caribbean and Pacific States
AGOA	African Growth and Opportunity Act
CBI	Caribbean Basin Initiative
CBTPA	Caribbean Trade Partnership Act
DDA	Doha Development Agenda
DFQF	duty-free, quota-free
DSU	Dispute Settlement Understanding
DTIS	Diagnostic Trade and Integration Study
EBA	Everything But Arms
EC	European communities
EIF	Enhanced Integrated Framework
EU	European Union
FDI	foreign direct investment
GATT	General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade
GSP	Generalized System of Preferences
GSTP	Global System of Trade Preferences
HS	Harmonized System
HTS	Harmonized Tariff Schedule
IF	Integrated Framework
IMF	International Monetary Fund
ITC	International Trade Centre
LDCs	least developed countries
LLDCs	landlocked developing countries
MFA	Multifibre Arrangement
MFN	most favoured nation
NTAE	non-traditional agricultural exports
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
SIDS	small island developing States
TRTA	trade-related technical assistance
WIRSPA	West Indies Rum and Spirits Producers Association
WITS	World Integrated Trade Solution
WTO	World Trade Organization

Introduction

1 Until recently, trade preferences were part of and instrumental in the paradigm that *trade is better than aid.*[1]

2 The original objectives of the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) were (a) to increase export earnings; (b) to promote industrialization; and (c) to accelerate economic growth. Trade preferences were expected to serve as a catalyst in triggering virtuous circles leading to higher exports and revenues, increased supply capacity and, ultimately, economic growth.

3 Although success stories have been recorded, mainly in South-East Asia, where successful GSP utilization has been made possible thanks to Asian beneficiary countries' increased supply capacity and export drive, trade preferences even as generous as those granted under the former Lomé Conventions and now the Cotonou Partnership Agreement have not generated the expected results in the least developed countries (LDCs), particularly those in the African region[2].

4 At the World Trade Organization's (WTO) Sixth Ministerial Conference, held in Hong Kong (China), the original paradigm — that trade is better than aid — was almost reversed under the Aid for Trade Initiative. It is now recognized that trade instruments, such as increased market access and trade liberalization, are not per se sufficient to generate supply capacity and economic growth. Amidst such changes to the paradigm, the preference-receiving countries' concern about the erosion of preferences has remained a constant preoccupation.

5 Within the framework of decisions taken by the WTO members at the Hong Kong Ministerial Conference, this study examines the following matters: (a) which products and which LDCs and most vulnerable countries benefit most from existing preferences granted by the Triad (the United States, Japan and the European Union); (b) the effects of preference erosion that may follow multilaterally agreed reductions in most favoured nation (MFN) tariff rates; (c) the relationship between preference erosion and recent proposals for Aid for Trade and the Enhanced Integrated Framework (EIF); and (d) the case for improving existing preferences and re-establishing multilateral principles for the granting of preferences to developing and least developed countries.

6 This study is organized as follows:

- Chapter I examines the issue of preference erosion in the post-Hong Kong scenario.

[1] For a discussion of this concept and the underlying rationale, see B. Hoekman and S. Prowse, "Economic policy responses to preference erosion: From trade as aid to aid for trade"; S. Tangermann, "The future of preferential trade arrangements for developing countries and the current round of WTO negotiations on agriculture", FAO, 2002; and P. McCawley, "Aid versus trade: Some considerations", *Australian Economic Review,* 39 (1), 2006.

[2] Some studies suggest that trade preferences had a sizable impact. See for instance, M. Persson and F. Wilhelmsson, "Assessing the effects of EU trade preferences for developing countries", Lund Univesity, 2006. The main findings of this study are that certain preference systems have had large effects — the largest are found for ACP countries, where the preferences increase exports by about 30 per cent, followed by Mediterranean countries.

- Chapter II provides extensive trade data and figures at the tariff-line level of the country/product pairs that have most benefited from trade preferences in 2004. This chapter is accompanied by a set of tables, contained in the Annex, with detailed information for years 2004 and 2002.
- Chapter III provides estimates utilizing a partial equilibrium model of the losses and gains that LDCs may incur following multilaterally agreed MFN reduction.
- Chapter IV examines the correlation between the EIF and Aid for Trade Initiatives with regard to preference erosion. It also provides a number of suggestions on how to improve existing trade preferences in accordance with multilaterally agreed criteria.

I. Erosion of trade preferences in the post-WTO Hong Kong Ministerial Framework

A. The issue of preference erosion and its impact: A tariff line/country approach

7 The erosion of trade preferences and MFN multilateral tariff negotiations has been at odds for quite a long time. However, regarding previous discussions on the value of trade preferences, new elements are militating in favour of revisiting the issue of preference erosion in the context of the Doha Development Agenda (DDA):

(i) The recognition that preference erosion is an issue to be addressed in the current DDA; and
(ii) The LDC duty-free, quota-free (DFQF) and Aid for Trade Initiatives launched at the Hong Kong Ministerial Conference.

8 Trade preferences provide access for goods originating in beneficiary countries at a lower level of duty or duty-free. The difference between the MFN rate of duty and the GSP or preferential rate of duty is called the preferential margin. Thus, if a MFN duty is at 10 per cent and is reduced to zero under the GSP or other preferential arrangements, there will be a 10 per cent preferential margin. However, when MFN liberalization occurs, it may result in the MFN duty of 10 per cent being reduced to 6 per cent, thus generating a preference erosion equivalent to 4 per cent.

9 The issue of preference erosion is linked to the basic question of how the GSP (like any other preferences) works. If suppliers from different countries compete in the same product market, importers will have an incentive to divert orders from a non-beneficiary country, which must pay the full MFN rate of duty, to a preference-receving country. Such an incentive to divert sourcing may be reduced by the erosion of the preference margin, which ultimately may not be sufficiently attractive or commercially meaningful for such a switch.

10 Several questions arise concerning how preferences work in practice and who is capturing the rents — the exporter, the importer, or is it shared? Field experience suggests that in the majority of cases, it is the importer who pockets the tariff revenue forgone, which arises as a result of the GSP or other trade preferences. It is precisely this incentive that causes the importer to divert the order in favour of developing countries. Some developing countries' exporters have negotiated, after establishing a

good working relationship with the importer, a share of tariff revenue forgone.

11 The different types of benefits that developing countries can draw from preference schemes can flow from (a) larger quantities of export goods sold; (b) higher prices charged for export goods; and (c) a higher total value of sales of exported goods.

12 Empirical evidence shows a preference for a higher total value of sales of exported goods. Trade preferences are supposed to generate a switch from non-preferential to preferential suppliers, with a consequent increase of sales. In the absence of a margin of preference, the buyers will source their imports from other suppliers. As the Lao Association of Textiles and Garments said, "no preferences, no textiles in Lao".[3]

13 Quantifying the value of trade preferences is difficult. The approach taken in this study is to identify country/product pairs that have most "utilized" trade preferences at tariff-line level. The term "utilized"[4] in this context means that exports of goods originating in a specific LDC classified in a specific tariff line have been recorded by the customs authorities of the preference-giving country as having requested preferential tariff treatment at the time of importation — for example, in the case of the export of garments from the Lao People's Democratic Republic, rather than paying a 10 per cent custom duty *ad valorem,* that country requested duty-free treatment under the Everything But Arms (EBA) preferences.

14 The tariff-line approach is taken in this study because, given the limited supply capacity of LDCs and the limited export diversification and destination of their exports, the analysis has to be aimed at identifying products and markets where preferences make a difference in the economy and trade performance of LDCs. The case of the Lao People's Democratic Republic may serve as example: the value of exports of garments originating there and exported to the EU in 2004, for which preferences were requested, totalled $96 million. This trade volume accounted for approximately 80 per cent of total exports concentrated in one preference-giving country. If the 10 per cent preferential margin makes a difference, for garment producers in the Lao People's Democratic Republic, between the sale and non-sale of garments to the EU importers, it is easy to draw the consequences of erosion of preferences for the whole of the economy of the Lao People's Democratic Republic. As a result of reduced sales, garment factories would close: this would impact on the balance of payments, and there would be greater unemployment and a significant reduction of income for households in the countryside that rely on remittances from garment workers.

15 It could be argued that $96 million is a relatively small trade volume in international trade. However, it could have a significant impact on the economy of an LDC such as the Lao People's Democratic Republic.

---

[3] Lao Diagnostic Trade Integration Study, May 2005, the World Bank.

[4] The sources of the trade data on utilization of trade preferences are the notifications to UNCTAD by the EU and Japan. In the case of the United States, the data are available from the International Trade Centre (ITC) website. Notifications by preference-giving countries to UNCTAD are made in order to facilitate the work of the UNCTAD secretariat in discharging its mandate on trade preferences. Notifications have been the source used for all tables and calculations contained in this publication.

16 The aim of this study is to assert that preferential trade flows identified under a country/tariff line approach may be relatively small, but could have significant poverty implications. Those implications may be partially or totally addressed under the EIF and the Aid for Trade Initiatives.

17 Perhaps other examples would help in better understanding the relative magnitude of trade flows poverty, and employment implications in LDCs. It is worth noting that the issue of cotton, one of most intractable issues at the Cancún Ministerial Conference, involved trade amounting to $311 million in 2003. Cotton products have an important place in the trade balance of Chad, Benin, Burkina Faso, Mali and Togo "with around 30 per cent of earnings from agricultural exports. Over 10 million people in the region depend directly on cotton production and several millions more are indirectly affected by the problems now encountered in the sector".[5]

18 In many cases, small flows in trade of specific products can be of great importance for the economy of a country. The social and economic repercussions of such flows have already been illustrated in the case of products such as bananas and sugar in the context of African, Caribbean and Pacific States (ACP) preferences.[6] Those repercussions are corroborated by evidence arising from the direct knowledge that beneficiary countries' trade negotiators have of the weaknesses of their economy and the relative importance of the trade preferences on those products, which represent at times the major foreign earnings of their countries.[7]

19 A number of studies have shown the existing linkage between export trade flows and small-scale farmers, including with regard to gender issues.[8]

20 Exports from Uganda to the EU total approximately $60 million for fish, $2 million for vanilla and approximately $5 million for horticultural products. Those amounts represent about 25 per cent of total non-traditional agricultural exports (NTAE). The products in question attract high preference margins and are grown mostly by smallholders in rural areas. Tobacco farming is another sector that is labour-intensive. Tobacco products represent by far the major export earning of Malawi (49 per cent of its total exports), and currently enjoy a high preferential margin. That country's tobacco trade flows amounted to $224 million in 2003.

21 The value of garment exports from Bangladesh in 2001 was about $5 billion. Ninety per cent of the 1.8 million people employed in the garment sector in Bangladesh were female workers, who made a 46 per cent contribution to family income according to recent estimates. Without their earnings, about 80 per cent of the families would fall below the poverty line. Similar situations can be found in Cambodia and Madagascar. In Cambodia, overall export flows from the garment sector are more limited: In 2001, they totalled $1 billion and accounted for almost 95 per cent of total exports. In 2003, there were more than 200 garment factories in Cambodia, concentrated around Phnom Penh and neighbouring provinces, and they

---

[5] WTO Negotiations on Agriculture, Poverty reduction: Sectoral initiative in favour of cotton. Joint proposal by Benin, Burkina Faso, Chad and Mali. WTO document TN/AG/GEN/4, 16 May 2003.
[6] In the case of bananas, see Nera Economic Consulting, *Addressing the Impact of Preference Erosion in Bananas on Caribbean Countries*, August 2004, London. See also UNCTAD, *Turning Losses into Gains,* UNCTAD/DITC/TNCD/2003/1.
[7] See comments by K.A. Brown, Representative of Saint Lucia, in the paper entitled, Agricultural trade preferences, presented by S. Tangermann at the FAO Round Tables, Geneva, 2001–2002. See also FAO papers on selected issues relating to WTO negotiations on agriculture, Rome 2002.
[8] *Trade and Gender: Opportunities and Challenges for Developing Countries*, UNCTAD/EDM, 2004.

employed an estimated 200,000 workers.[9] Cambodia has the highest female participation in the labour force in the region — 74 per cent among women over the age of 15. According to a survey by the National Institute of Statistics, about 64 per cent of workers in the manufacturing sector are employed by the garment industry, and 85–90 per cent of them are women. Many workers in that industry are single women between the ages of 18 and 24 and come from rural poor families; their level of education is generally low. The average total monthly income for those women is about $50–$80. This level of income supports at least 100,000 poor rural households, which rely on remittances from female garment workers.[10]

22 Studies in Bangladesh, which shares many similarities with Cambodia, show that the female workers in the garment industry were likely to be hit hard after the abolition of quotas in 2005. An UNCTAD study quoting projections by the Ministry of Commerce in 1996[11] indicated that the phasing out of quotas at the end of 2004 would imply the immediate retrenchment of 180,000 female workers. More recently, another paper[12] quoted a survey by the Bangladesh Garment Manufactures and Exporters Associations indicating that the slowdown in United States orders of garments after the events of September 11, 2001 had led to the closure of 1,178 factories and the loss of 35,000 jobs. Since then, however, many factories have been reopening and exports of textiles and garments from Bangladesh have continued to raise in recent years even after the end of the Multi fibre agreement in 2005. According to a recent report the readymade garment industry has become the lifeline of the Bangladesh economy. It is the source of its strength and — in a way — could be the cause of its vulnerability. With the two million workforce it employs directly, and another one million in linkage industries, it supports the livelihood of some 10 million Bangladeshis who have been lifted out of poverty[13]

23 In the case of Lesotho, an overall trade flow of garments worth about $200 million is the main source of income for approximately 50,000 workers in that sector.

24 Although not all trade flows in the above-mentioned examples are heavily dependent on tariff preferences, the figures serve to demonstrate the relationship between, and interdependence of trade flows, employment and poverty.

25 The above examples show the importance of adopting a tariff-line approach in respect of the country and product that may be affected by preference erosion. This may help the LDC preference-receiving countries to realize that not all trade preferences are equally important, and guide them in recognizing their interests and priorities in multilateral trade negotiations and the recent related initiatives, namely the EIF and Aid for Trade Initiatives.

B. The issue of preference erosion and the "LDC package" at the Hong Kong Ministerial Conference

---

[9] ILO and preliminary reports of the Asian Development Bank.
[10] ILO and preliminary reports of the Asian Development Bank.
[11] D. Bhattachrya, The post MFA challenge to the Bangladesh textile and clothing sector: Trade, sustainable development and gender. United Nations, New York and Geneva.
[12] M.K. Shefaly (Executive Director, NUK), paper presented at workshop on "Globalisation, trade liberalization and economic growth in Asia: Should labour and environmental standards be part of the equation? The case of Bangladesh. 3–4 October 2002, University of New England, Armidale, Australia.
[13] See End of the MFA quotas: Key issues and strategic options for Bangladesh ready made garments. The World Bank, 2005.

26 As expected, the issue of market access and preference erosion proved highly divisive at the Hong Kong Ministerial Conference.[14] A number of major exporters of agricultural products in developing countries strongly objected to the proposal that implementation periods for market access commitments be delayed in order to take into account long-standing preferences. Some developing countries (e.g. Pakistan and Sri Lanka) were concerned that extended market access for LDCs would adversely affect their exports. This led to language reflecting their concerns regarding the market access commitment in respect of LDCs.

27 Some argued that the LDCs package, consisting of duty- and quota-free market access on a lasting basis for all products originating from all LDCs by 2008 or no later than the start of the implementation period, combined with the EIF and Aid for Trade Initiative, was one of most tangible commitments in the Hong Kong Declaration.

28 Paragraph (a) (ii) of the Hong Kong Ministerial Decision on Measures in Favour of LDCs states as follows:

"Members facing difficulties at this time to provide market access as set out above shall provide duty-free and quota-free market access for at least 97 per cent of products originating from LDCs, defined at the tariff line level, by 2008 or no later than the start of the implementation period. Compliance with this commitment is to be achieved progressively, taking into account the impact on other developing countries at similar levels of development and as appropriate by incrementally building on the initial list of covered products. Members shall annually notify the implementation of such schemes. Developing countries providing such treatment to LDCs shall be permitted to phase in their commitments."

29 Few people before the Hong Kong Ministerial Conference believed that major WTO members would accept such an improvement in the currently available unilateral trade preferences. However, it remains to be seen how such commitments will be meaningfully implemented. A mechanism to review implementation has been incorporated in the Decision:

"The Committee on Trade and Development shall annually review the steps taken to provide duty-free and quota-free market access to the LDCs and report to the General Council for appropriate action."

30 Legally, one may argue that Ministerial Decisions once the deadline of 2008 has lapsed are justiciable. It follows therefore that the commitments in the Decisions may be an enforceable right of LDCs providing recourse to the Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU) against those members that have not faithfully fulfilled their commitments. Others may cast doubts on this possibility. Above all, the track record of LDCs participation to the DSU proceedings suggests that such dispute is unlikely.[15]

---

[14] This intense debate over market access and preferences is reflected in the Chair's Reports of the Agricultural and National Agri-Marketing Association (NAMA) Negotiating Committees contained in annexes A and B of the Ministerial Declaration.

[15] See Mavroidis, Horn and Inama, What developing countries should be asking in the context of DSU negotiations, mimeo, 2003.

31 With regard to other aspects of the package, the Aid for Trade proposal was endorsed, but its actual features remain undefined, and there is a wide divergence on the specifics, the modalities and the funds available. Developing countries expected that new funds would be offered, on a grant basis, for their national budgets, and targeted at building supply capacity and infrastructure.

32 However, the negotiations between developed and developing countries over the insertion of "concessional loans" in the Ministerial Declaration as a means of securing additional financial resources for the initiative provide a strong indication of the real nature of the debate. The text of the Ministerial Declaration does little more than set out a work plan and provide for a meeting of the WTO General Council to be held in July 2006. A series of initiatives have been proliferating since then but significant action on the ground is yet to be seen.

33 The strengthening of the Integrated Framework (IF) may also be considered part of the package. While the three pillars of the EIF have been identified as (i) providing additional funding, (ii) strengthening in-country implementation, and (iii) improving IF decision-making and its management, the final shape and size of the reform have been entrusted to a Task Force, which issued a report in June 2006.[16] The new IF was expected to enter into force in early 2007. Protracted negotiations on the structure and location of the Executive Secretariat, the designation of the new trust fund manager and the modus operandi of the EIF are causing significant delays in its implementation, which is now expected in the autumn of 2007 or at the beginning of 2008.

C. Implementing Hong Kong decisions: Some questions to be addressed

34 Many questions remain unanswered about the implementation of the LDC package and the Aid for Trade proposal.

35 The value of the market access initiative is expected to derive from further concessions to be made by the United States and Japan under their respective GSP schemes for LDCs. The EBA Initiative of the EU more than fully satisfies the 97 per cent requirement. By contrast, in the case of the United States and, before the recent improvement in April 2007, the Japanese scheme, there remains considerable scope for improvement to achieve the 97 per cent requirement. This could be done by expanding product coverage for textiles and clothing in the case of the United States. The implementation of this commitment, as well as its timing, would have to be monitored, as the definition of duty- and quota-free for 97 per cent of products at the tariff-line level provides room for considerable loopholes.

36 On a gross estimate average of 10,000 tariff lines for the United States and Japan, the 97 per cent figure allows for the exclusion of about 300 tariff lines. Given the concentration of exports from LDCs, 300 tariff lines provide ample scope to exclude the bulk of them from the commitment, if not all exports from LDCs, as shown in tables 1 and 2.

[16] At the time of writing, the IF is in transition to the EIF and extensive consultations are being held among all stakeholders.

37 According to the calculation shown in table 1, in the case of the United States market, the 300 product-specific tariff lines contained in the annexes[17] are equivalent to a trade volume of slightly more than $5 billion, almost the amount of the trade volume of products not actually covered in the GSP scheme. This means that the actual market access under the current United States GSP scheme is already complying with the commitment to achieve the 97 per cent requirement at the tariff-line level. From a cursory glance at the top 300 most exported items from LDCs, contained in table 33, it is evident that almost all products are textiles and garments.

Table 1
Trade flows currently excluded from DFQF to the United States and trade flows that might continue to be excluded under the 97 per cent commitment (2004)

Description	Total ($000)	Share of U.S. imports in world imports from LDCs	Receiving preferential treatment ($000)	World imports from LDCs ($000)
1	2	3	4	5
Trade flows of all imported products in the United States from LDCs	12 863 496	23.7	4 640 925	54 176 725
Trade flows of products currently NOT covered by the GSP	5 070 879			
Trade flows of 3 per cent of tariff lines not covered by the GSP schceme	5 068 870			
Percentage of trade flows from LDCs excluded from preferential treatment	39.4			

38 As shown in table 2, the case of Japan was similar. The amount of LDC trade not covered by the GSP scheme was equivalent to $1.4 billion mainly represented by Petroleum oils and fish. This figure was exactly the same as the first 300 tariff lines not covered in the GSP scheme. Again, in this case, the requirement to achieve 97 per cent at the tariff level was already fulfilled under the existing GSP arrangement. On April[18] 2007 Japan notified further improvements to implement the DFQF commitment. As a result of this expansion, Japan reported that 1,101 products have been added to the list of items for the DFQF to LDCs (from 7,758 to 8,859 tariff lines). According to the notification made by Japan to the WTO the coverage has increased significantly from 86 per cent to 98 per cent, defined at the tariff line level. In terms of the import value, Japan reported that the coverage of the DFQF to LDCs is well over 99 per cent.From a quick comparative glance between the notification and the table 34 in this study listing the products formely excluded it appears that rice will continue to be excluded while relevant exports of fish products from LDCs will be granted duty free treatment following the improvement. At the time of this writing it was not possible to carry out a more detailed assessment.

[17]In 2005, tariff lines for the United States were 10,502; for the European Union, 14,982; and for Japan, 9,261. Reportedly, 3 per cent in the case of the United States accounts for some 330 tariff lines, while 20–25 6-digit HS levels currently account for some two thirds of Bangladesh's total exports. See also Oxfam and Bridges reports on the Hong Kong outcome.
[18] See WT/COMTD/N/2/Add.14 of 12 April 2007.

Table 2
Trade flows currently excluded from DFQF to Japan and trade flows that might continue to be excluded under the 97 per cent commitment[19] (2004)

Description	Japan imports from LDCs: Total ($000)	Share of Japan's imports in world imports from LDCs	Receiving preferential treatment ($000)	World imports from LDCs ($000)
2	7	8	9	11
Trade flows of all imported products in Japan from LDCs	2 422 109.0	4.5	458 763.0	54 169 426.0
Trade flows of products NOT covered by the GSP scheme	1 488 756.0			
Trade flows of 3 per cent of tariff lines NOT covered by the GSP scheme	1 488 756.0			
Percentage of trade flows from LDCs excluded from preferential imports	61.5			

39 The calculation has not been made for the EU, as EBA product coverage complies more than fully with the commitment of the Hong Kong Ministerial Decision on Measures in Favour of LDCs.

40 The issue of rules of origin and their impact on the utilization of trade preferences was once again not adequately addressed in the text of the above-mentioned Decision. Paragraph (b) of the Decision provides that WTO members:

> "Ensure that preferential rules of origin applicable to imports from LDCs are transparent and simple, and contribute to facilitating market access."

41 Unless further efforts are made by the LDCs and WTO members, no action is likely to be undertaken at the multilateral level. The above-mentioned wording on the rules of origin in the Decision is not legally enforceable. It does not provide for the establishment of any working group or the specification of modalities to prevent the rules of origin from being an obstacle to the utilization of trade preferences. The LDC group recently put forward a draft that could serve as a concrete proposal for addressing this issue.[20] However, further discussions of the proposal have yet to take place.

42 Rules of origin are an important aspect of preferential market access; they are one of the main areas where much remains to be done, especially in the case of EBA. For the United States market, even hypothetical market access for textiles and clothing may be subject to rules of origin, as in the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA), which requires the utilization of US yarn or fabrics.[21] It remains to be seen

[19] This calculation does not take into account the recent improvements made to the GSP of Japan in favor to LDCs made in April 2007, nor the fact that for the most exported product from LDCs in 2005, petroleum oils (heading no. 270900090), as contained in the list of products contained in the Annex is no longer dutiable and MFN free since April 2006.
[20] See WTO document WT/CMTD/LDC/W/35.
[21] Contrary to some conventional wisdom, the normal rules of origin under AGOA are stringent, requiring the utilization of US or regional fabric. The utilization of US fabric imported by African countries to make finished garments to be re-exported is hardly commercially viable and the utilization of regional (African fabric) is also illusory, given the scarce production capacity. African garment exports from lesser developed countries benefit from AGOA preferences only by virtue of an exception to the basic rules, granted until 2007 and subject to a cap allowing the utilization of third country fabric. The category of lesser developed countries is a *sui generis* category not corresponding to the United Nations' LDC list.

whether a concession of this nature will be commercially viable for those exporters wishing to comply with such origin requirements or whether more liberal rules will be devised. The undergoing reform[22] of the EU rules of origin may provide the opportunity to revise the the EBA rules of origin.The improvements of rules of origin made recently by Canada have amply demonstrated the positive trade implications on LDCs trade flows.[23]

43 With regard to the non-trade aspects of the LDCs package, the recommendations of the task force on Aid for Trade[24] (seven months after the Hong Kong Ministerial Conference) provide little assistance in better identifying the impact and magnitude of such an initiative.

44 Supposing that preference erosion is included in the Aid for Trade Initiative, how would the amount of compensation for preference erosion be calculated? What mechanisms could be put in place to affect the transfers and what forms would these tranfers take? This is an area where there is a large gap in the literature. The number of studies reporting comparative statistical estimates of the gains from multilateral trade liberalization far exceeds the number of careful studies of trade-related adjustment processes in developing countries.[25] Until now, most economic analysis has been directed at quantifying the value of trade preferences and the possible aggregated trade effects. Little attention has been paid to addressing how to cope with adjustments and what lessons may be learned by the international community.

45 Moreover, when adjustment costs are discussed by trade economists, they tend to be reported (often dismissed) as small and are therefore easy to accommodate with complementary national measures.

46 The case of preference erosion may be a testing ground since studies diverge on the effects generated by preference erosion.

47 Generally speaking, there is no agreement in the international community on the adjustment processes that developing countries go through, both during and after multilateral trade liberalization, and the costs involved.

48 Some developing countries have asserted that even with ambitious cost reduction programmes on the part of their producers, substantial preference erosion will result in the collapse of a major industry; however, analysis based on different econometric models suggests different outcomes.

49 More research is needed in order to explore the likelihood of such a collapse and how developing countries have adjusted in the past to the elimination of industries that may employ a substantial proportion of the national labour force.

50 As previously explained, the approach taken in this study is to identify country/product pairs that have most utilized trade preferences. The analysis in the following sections is aimed at identifying products and markets where preferences may make a difference in the economy and trade performance of LDCs.

---

[22] See the Green Paper on the Future of Rules of Origin in Preferential Trade Arrangements, COM(2003)787 final, Brussels, 18 December 2003.
[23] See further below in Chaper IV, 2 (i).
[24] See the WTO document WT/AFT/1, 27 July 2006.
[25] S. Evenett, *Some Tough Love for Aid for Trade*. Forthcoming, Intereconomics.

51 The second step of such an analysis would be to establish a link between the country product/pairs and the communities or social groups, workers or small-scale rural farmers that have benefited from trade preferences and could suffer from preference erosion. The third step is to establish mechanisms at the multilateral and bilateral levels to address the possible adverse effects of the erosion of those preferences.

52 It is not the intention here to cover steps two and three. Poverty implications of preference erosion may be addressed under new initiatives, such as the EIF and Aid for Trade. The present document is a preliminary analysis to be followed by other steps at the counry level outlined above, using instruments such as the updating of the Diagnostic Trade and Integration Study (DTIS) under the EIF or the Aid Trade initiative.

D. Quantifying the value of trade preferences on a tariff line and country basis

53 This chapter will identify the country/product pairs that have most benefited from trade preferences under the preferential schemes of the EU, the United States and Japan available to LDCs.

54 In this analysis, due account has been taken of the utilization of trade preferences.[26] Traditional methodology[27] that was utilized to calculate the value of trade preferences assumed that preferences were fully utilized.[28]

55 It may be argued against that this analysis focused on the effective utilization at the country/product level that existing preferences on sectors where LDCs have not yet developed supply capacity or recorded trade may be effectively utilized in the future. However, this argument is not sufficiently corroborated by facts or empirical analysis.

56 In some cases, such as AGOA for Lesotho, trade preferences have been able to generate an incentive for foreign direct investment (FDI) by some Asian companies in garment factories to develop supply capacity[29] and exploit a substantial preferential margin. However, in the majority of cases, there is no evidence that trade preferences alone have been able to generate the expected export diversification and FDI. Most notably, trade preferences granted under the four Lomé Conventions — from 1975 to

---

[26] In this note, the term "utilization" refers to as the ratio between imports actually claiming trade preferences and the covered dutiable imports. These trade data are recorded on the basis of customs declarations made at the time of import into the preference-giving countries. Thus, we will refer to claimed/received trade preferences, since the final granting of preferences takes place only where the import declaration is liquidated.

[27] The methodology used until recently assumed that preferences were automatically granted at the time of importation. However, it was made clear that such methodology ignored the fact that granting such preferences was subject to compliance with the original requirements and presentation of the certificate of origin. See: Improving market access for LDCs. UNCTAD/DITC/TNCD/4, 2 May 2001.

[28] Underutilization of trade preferences means that the MFN rate is applied, rather than the preferential rate of duty. Thus, for the LDCs that are recording low utilization, one of the priorities may be to counter the erosion of trade preferences by arguing for a change in the rules of origin and other regulations affecting utilization.

[29] *Investment Policy Review of Lesotho* (UNCTAD/ITC/IPC/2003/4) and *The Least Developed Countries Report 2004* (UNCTAD/LDC/2004).

the current Cotonou Partnership Agreement — have improved the export diversification and supply capacity of ACP States only in a few, rather exceptional, cases.[30]

57 Another factor that has been taken into account in the analysis is the large part of LDCs' trade that already occurs on an MFN duty-free basis, mainly because of the export composition that is concentrated on commodities.

58 In this study, the trade volumes shown in the tables are the net value of trade preferences calculated on the basis of dutiable imports and of trade flows that have actually claimed trade preferences at the time of customs clearance in preference-giving countries.[31] This calculation has been made in order to deflate the preferential trade flows of "empty preferences", where, for example, products exported from LDCs already enter preference-giving country markets on an MFN basis or where the preferences are not granted because of the rules of origin or other administrative reasons.

59 On the one hand, it is quite clear that the method employed tends to reduce the overall figure of preferential trade in respect to other approaches.[32] On the other hand, given the export structure of LDCs, it permits a precise identification and quantification of the trade flows effectively benefiting from trade preferences.

60 The terms "utilized" or "received" used in the tables are for ease of reference. The exact figures of "utilized" or "received" trade preferences are accurate only when the customs obligations arising from an import declaration have been liquidated. More precisely, the amounts shown in this study refer to preferences that were "claimed" at the time of importation in the customs declaration of the importer. Since there have been indications from preference-giving countries that the amounts of claimed preferences do not differ dramatically from those effectively liquidated, it has been decided to maintain the traditional UNCTAD terminology.

---

[30] The European Union Commission Green Paper on the future of EU/ACP relations. However, see also M. Persson and F. Wilhelmsson, Assessing the effects of EU trade preferences for developing countries. Lund Univesity, 2006.

[31] These trade flows are calculated from notifications of member States to the UNCTAD secretariat.

[32] For another method,"Trade preference erosion: Potential economic impacts" OECD, Trade Policy Working Paper No. 17.

Table 3.A
Total received preferences under the EU-ACP and EBA, Japan, US-GSP for LDCs and AGOA (2004)

Reporter	Year	Agri Products	Non-Agri Products	All Products
GSP/ACP received imports of ALL LDCs	2004	439'444	5'153'191	5'592'635
EU TOTAL		439'444	5'153'191	5'592'635
GSP received imorts of ALL LDCs	2004	6'685	141'759	148'444
JAPAN TOTAL		6'685	141'759	148'444
AGOA received imports of LDCs/AGOA	2004	11'116	2'435'070	2'446'186
GSP received imports of LDCs/AGOA	2004	40'178	3'400'781	3'440'959
GSP received imports of LDCs excl. AGOA	2004	2'794	1'058'670	1'061'464
USA TOTAL		54'088	6'894'521	6'948'609
USA TOTAL excl. Petroleum		54'088	963'556	1'017'644
GRAND TOTAL		500'217	12'189'471	12'689'688

61 Table 3.A shows the value of trade preferences in terms of trade volumes that have received preferential treatment. The total amount of received trade preferences was equivalent to $12.6 billion in 2004, including oil, and $6.7 billion when oil was excluded. The EU accounted for the bulk of the preferential trade, which totalled around 4/5 of preferential trade when petroleum products are excluded. In the case of AGOA and the US–GSP preferences, petroleum oils from Angola and Equatorial Guinea were by far the most important items of the preferential trade flows.

62 With respect to the trade flows from 2002, as shown in table 5A in the Annex, there was a substantial increase in received trade preferences equivalent to roughly $3 billion in 2004, mainly in the EU market. This increase is due to textile and garment exports from the following countries: Bangladesh (equivalent to $1.2 billion), Madagascar (approximately $300 million) and Cambodia (approximately $200 million). Other countries' amount of preferential trade has substantially increased, for example Senegal ($200 million), Mauritania (approximately $100 million) and the United Republic of Tanzania ($130 million) for fishery products.

Table 3.B
Estimated forgone duty revenues for imports from LDCs granted preferential treatment (2004)

Reporter	Partners	Year	Agri products	Non-agri products	All products
EU	Imports from ALL LDCs	2004	17 689	593 802	**611 491**
	EU TOTAL		17 689	593 802	**611 491**
JAPAN	Imports from ALL LDCs	2004	358	8 067	**8 425**
	JAPAN TOTAL		358	8 067	**8 425**
USA	Imports from LDCs/AGOA	2004	4 291	173 309	**177 600**
	Imports from LDCs excl. AGOA	2004	203	10 484	**10 687**
	USA TOTAL		4 494	183 793	**188 287**
ALL	***GRAND TOTAL***		***22 541***	***785 662***	***808 203***

63 Table 3.B reports a simple calculation of the duty revenues forgone on the amount of received trade figures reported for 2004. It shows that the amount of revenue forgone was substantial and equivalent to $808 million in 2004. As in the case of preferential trade flows, the EU makes the most of the amount of revenues forgone, totalling more than $611 million.

64 In a simple calculation of compensation for preference erosion, it may be considered that the figure of about $800 million of revenue forgone for utilized preferences far exceeds the $200–400 million for the EIF indicated in the World Bank/International Monetary Fund (IMF) paper prepared for the Development Committee. Moreover, it should be noted that the $200–400 million of the EIF is to be spread over a five-year period; part of this amount is to finance the new EIF secretariat. If there is a total erosion of preferences over a five-year period, the amount of revenue forgone will be equivalent to roughly $4 billion against a disbursement of between $200 and $400 for financing the EIF. Thus, in a hypothetical LDC perspective, one can read these numbers as a substantial reduction of amounts previously allocated to LDCs trough a trade preferences mechanism.

1. Trade preferences for LDCs granted by the EU

65 Trade preferences granted by the EU to LDCs have traditionally been provided through the former Lomé Conventions, currently the Cotonou Partnership Agreement, and the GSP for LDCs. Until the introduction of the EBA Initiative in 2001, trade preferences granted under the Lomé Convention and the Cotonou Agreement were more generous than those granted under the GSP scheme for LDCs.[33] More specifically, the product coverage on agricultural products was much larger under the Lomé/Cotonou Agreements than under the EU–GSP for LDCs.

[33] In particular, entry prices for vegetables and fruit, and specific rated duty applicable to flour and sugar have been completely eliminated under the EBA, while they are still applicable, even if at a reduced rate, under the Cotonou Agreement. See *Trade Preferences for LDCs: An Early Assessment of Benefits and Possible Improvements*, UNCTAD/ITCD/TSB/2003.

66 Under the special treatment granted to least developed beneficiaries, Regulation 980/2005[34] fully incorporates the EBA Initiative (previously Regulation 416/2001, amending Regulation 2802/98[35]), which entered into force on 5 March 2001.

67 Before the EBA, and in accordance with Article 6 of the previous GSP scheme, namely Regulation (2802/98), the LDCs were granted duty-free access on a list of selected products, whereas for other products, the Common Customs Tariff continued to be reduced in accordance with the modulation mechanism.[36]

68 The EBA, as currently incorporated in the Regulation (Section 3), extends duty- and quota-free access to all products originating in LDCs, except for arms and ammunition, which fall within the Harmonized System (HS) in Chapter 93 [37] and threrice,bananas and sugar where progressive liberalization is gradually granted copled with opening of preferential tariff quotas[38]. The EBA coverage now includes all agricultural products, to which are added such sensitive products as beef and other

[34] See OJL169 of 30/6/2005.

[35] Council Regulation (EC) No. 416/2001 of 28 February 2001, amending Regulation (EC) No. 2820/98 of 21 December 1998 applying a multi-annual scheme of generalized tariff preferences for the period 1 July 1999 to 31 December 2001 so as to extend duty-free access without any quantitative restrictions to products originating in the LDCs (OJL60, 1.3.2001: 43).

[36] Although Council Regulation 602/98[36] (extending product coverage for LDCs under the GSP) aimed at granting LDCs not members to the Lomé IV Convention preferences “equivalent” to those enjoyed by signatories, market access conditions for ACP-LDCs were, most of the time, still more favourable than the ones for non-ACP LDCs under the GSP. In fact, several sensitive agricultural concessions granted under Lomé/Cotonou special protocols and quotas would apply only to a few ACPs and not to non-ACP LDCs.

[37] It should be noted that products of Chapter 93 are excluded from the European communities (EC)-GSP product coverage for all beneficiaries. See Annex IV of the Regulation reporting the list of products covered by the scheme.

[38] The following are the transitional arrangements: **Fresh bananas** (CN code 0803 0019). The EBA provides for full liberalization between 1 January 2002 and 1 January 2006 by reducing the full Community tariff by 20 per cent every year. **Rice** (HS 1006). Customs duties on rice will be phased in between 1 September 2006 and 1 September 2009 by gradually reducing the full community tariff to zero. During the interim period, in order to provide effective market access, LDC rice will be allowed to enter the EC market duty-free within the limits of a tariff quota. The initial quantities of this quota are based on best levels of LDC exports to the EC in the past years, plus 15 per cent. The quota will increase by 15 per cent every year, from 2,517 tons (husked-rice equivalent) in 2001/2002 to 6,696 tons in 2008/2009 (the marketing year starts in September and finishes in August of the following year). **Sugar** (HS 1701). Full liberalization will be phased in between 1 July 2006 and 1 July 2009 by gradually reducing the full Community tariff to zero. In the meantime, as for rice, LDC cane sugar, for refining, classified in subheading 17011110, can enter duty-free within the limits of a tariff quota, which will increase from 74,185 tons (white-sugar equivalent) in 2001/2002 to 197,355 tons in 2008/2009 (July to June marketing year). Imports of sugar under the ACP–EC Sugar Protocol will be excluded from the above calculations so as to uphold the viability of the Protocol.

Tariff quotas for rice and raw sugar from LDCs

	2001–2002	**2002–2003**	**2003–2004**	**2004–2005**	**2005–2006**	**2006–2007**	**2007–2008**	**2008–2009**
Products	**"EU import 000 tons"**	**"EU import 000 tons"**	**"EU import 000 tons"**	**"EU import 000 tons"**	**"EU import 000 tons"**	**"EU import 000 tons"**	**"EU import 000 tons"**	**"EU import 000 tons"**
Rice[1]	2 517	2 895	3 329	3 829	4 403	5 063	5 823	6 696
Sugar[2]	74 185	85 313	98 110	112 827	129 751	149 213	171 595	197 335

[1] Marketing years: September 2001 to September 2009. [2] Marketing years: July 2001 to July 2009.

meat, dairy products, fruit and vegetables, processed fruit and vegetables, maize and other cereals, starch, oils, processed sugar products, cocoa products, pasta and alcoholic beverages. For most of those products, the pre-EBA GSP used to provide a percentage reduction of MFN rates, which would apply only to the *ad valorem* duties, thus leaving the specific duties still entirely applicable. This is no longer the case. The relevant provisions, as contained in Article 12, paragraph 1 of the Regulation, state that customs tariffs on all products of Chapters 1 to 97 (except those of 93) are now entirely suspended. Thus, specific and other duties (for example, the rather complicated "entry price system" used to regulate access to the European communities (EC) market of certain fruit and vegetables, such as cucumbers and courgettes) are no longer applicable to LDCs' exports.

69 Undeniably, the introduction of the EBA, which grants better trade preferences than the present Cotonou Agreement, has introduced an enhanced uniformity in LDCs' access to EU markets.[39] However, the traditional scheme for dual access to the European market has created some confusion for analysts and trade policymakers when examining the utilization rate and preferences under the Lomé/Cotonou Agreements and former EU-GSP scheme for LDCs, now the EBA. Almost 30 years of traditional market access under the ACP countries' preferences have shaped a pattern of trade that will take time to change under the EBA. In fact, analysis of the trade data shows that the ACP-LDCs are still exporting under ACP trade preferences, rather than the EBA. This may explain the extremely poor utilization of the EBA by African LDCs in 2001, the first year of operation for the EBAs. Therefore, in this note, the utilization and value trade preferences have been analysed by separating the ACP–LDCs from the Asian LDCs in 2002 and 2004. The dual membership of ACP-LDCs during 2002 meant that in spite of the existence of the EBA, nearly all their trade took place under the Cotonou Partnership Agreement. However, the amount of trade that took place under the EBA has also been taken into account in order to provide a complete picture.[40]

70 The following tables provide a snapshot of the products that most benefited from tariff preferences in 2002 under the EBA and ACP arrangements[41].

[39] However, it has been pointed out that this uniformity is not complete. Under the Cotonou Agreement, ACP countries still enjoy the rules of origin providing for full cumulation among them. Under the EBA, there is no full cumulation — cumulation is granted only to some regional agreements.
[40] In the 2004 data, notified by the EU, previously separated data sets concerning GSP and ACP have been merged. Data of previous years were notified according to preferences claimed under GSP or ACP preferences.
[41] For an overall evaluation of EBA see Gallezot and Bureau, The trade effects of the European Union's EBA Initiative,Commission of the European Union, 2005.

Summary of countries and products that most benefited in 2002 from EU trade preferences

Product description	Tariff rates			Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Cum-ulative share	Main supplier and share (per cent)
	MFN	ACP	LDC	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports ACP-covered	Imports ACP-received		
ACP-LDCs agricultural products									
Tobacco	18.4 € MIN/ 22 € MAX 24 € /100 kg/met	0.0		69 713	69 713	69 713	68 303	17.5	MWI (84.7)
Crude ground-nut oil	6.4	0.0		74 462	74 462	74 462	67 254	34.7	SEN (78.9)
Vanilla	6.0	0.0		72 739	72 739	72 739	60 400	50.2	MDG (83.8)
TOTAL				**402 269**	**402 269**	**402 269**	**327 296**	**83.8**	
ACP-LDCs non-agricultural products									
Aluminium	6.0	0.0		404 792	404 792	404 792	397 820	28.9	MOZ (100)
Frozen shrimps and prawns	12.0	0.0		191 272	191 272	191 272	181 524	42.1	MDG (55.3)
Fresh or chilled fish fillets	9.0	0.0		142 333	142 333	142 333	103 493	49.6	TZA (64.6)
TOTAL				**1 292 093**	**1 292 093**	**1 292 093**	**1 168 374**	**84.8**	
GSP LDCs excluding ACP agricultural products									
Other vegetables, fresh or chilled	12.8		0.0	7 063	7 063	7 072	7 030	59.2	BGD (99.7)
TOTAL				**11 341**	**11 341**	**11 349**	**10 845**	**83.5**	
GSP LDCs Excluding ACP non-agricultural products									
T-shirts	12.0		0.0	549 776	549 776	549 503	495 424	22.0	BGD (95.5)
Jerseys, pullovers, etc., of man-made fibres	12.4		0.0	472 989	472 989	473 366	335 758	36.9	BGD (72.9)
Jersey, pullovers, etc., of cotton, knitted or crocheted	12.4		0.0	171 148	171 148	171 197	117 598	42.1	BGD (61.5)
Frozen shrimps and prawns	12.0		0.0	90 354	90 354	90 382	89 355	46.1	BGD (99.1)
Men's or boys' trousers, breeches, etc., of cotton	12.4		0.0	181 662	181 662	181 598	88 446	50.0	BGD (82.3)
TOTAL				**2 981 430**	**2 981 430**	**2 981 522**	**1 912 475**	**85.0**	

2. Trade preferences for LDCs granted under the Cotonou/Lomé preferences

71 In terms of the utilization rate, ACP-LDCs under the Cotonou preferences have traditionally performed better than their counterparts in the Asian context under the GSP. Looked at more closely, this may be hardly surprising since the composition of exports explains the difference: Exports of ACP-LDCs are heavily concentrated on agricultural products or raw materials, where rules of origin play a limited role, while the exports of Asian LDCs are also equally concentrated, but on the garment sector, where the rules of origin are stringent and affect utilization. This resulted in the

utilization rate for ACP–LDCs being above 70 per cent on average for the entire period from 1998 to 2004.[42]

72 The second critical factor to be noted in respect of the ACP countries is that the dutiable imports, in the case of ACP-LDCs, accounted for less than a quarter ($2.5 billion) out of an overall figure of $9.2 billion exports in 2004. Almost $6 billion exports of ACP-LDCs are already entering the EU duty-free. As shown in table 4, this ratio of dutiable to MFN-free products has been rather constant from 1998 to 2004.

Table 4
Imports of least developed ACP countries into the EU under the Lomé/Cotonou Partnership Agreement, 1998–2004

Year	Total imports	Dutiable imports	ACP imports		Percentages		
			Covered	Receiving	Coverage	Utilization	Utility
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(4)/(3)	(5)/(4)	(5)/(3)
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
1998	5 619.4	2 154.0	2 153.1	1 467.4	99.9	68.1	68.1
1999	5 676.1	1 943.8	1 932.5	1 578.7	99.4	81.6	81.2
2000	7 572.5	1 719.5	1 710.2	1 226.5	99.4	71.7	71.3
2001	8 060.7	2 063.5	2 059.8	1 570.4	99.8	76.2	76.1
2002	8 440.7	2 237.1	2 162.6	1 768.0	96.6	81.7	79.0
2003	8 112.9	2 206.4	2 096.8	1 563.6	95.0	74.6	70.9
2004	9 166.4	2 721.5	2 498.0	1 766.6	91.8	70.7	64.9

73 Table 5 reports the products and countries that most benefited from trade preferences in 2004. Three products and four tariff lines account for 58 per cent of all utilized preferences, with a utilization rate close to 100 per cent (with the exception of tobacco).

[42] See Annex for further details.

Table 5
Major agricultural products and LDC suppliers ranked by descending value of ACP received imports, 2004

Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal supplier	
	MFN appl. (per cent)	ACP (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports ACP-covered	Imports ACP-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
Fresh cut flowers and buds	*	0.0	54 496	54 496	54 495	52 047	12.3	24.8	9	UGA	47.0
Vanilla	6.0	0.0	43 633	43 633	43 633	40 418	9.6	34.4	6	MDG	86.7
Tobacco, partly or wholly stemmed/stripped	18.4 MIN 22 € MAX 24 €/ 100 kg/net	0.0	37 905	37 905	37 905	37 021	8.8	43.2	4	MWI	82.2
Crude ground-nut oil	6.4	0.0	37 664	37 664	37 664	34 372	8.1	51.3	3	SEN	68.0
Tobacco, partly or wholly stemmed/stripped	18.4 MIN 22 € MAX 24 €/ 100 kg/net	0.0	42 874	42 874	42 874	30 137	7.1	58.5	5	TZA	51.0

* 1 January – 31 May: 8.5; 1 June – 31October: 12.0; 1 November – 31 December: 8.5.

74 With respect to the data from 2002, the most important improvement was the utilization of trade preferences by Uganda on cut flowers, which jumped from a minimal utilization in 2002 to almost 100 per cent in 2004. Exports of groundout oil from Senegal in 2004 showed a sharp decrease from $67 million to $34 million.

75 Tobacco, mainly from Malawi (80 per cent)[43] and, to a lesser extent, Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania, was by far the most important product with the highest preferential margin in 2002 or 2004, since the MFN rate for tobacco was 18.4 per cent, with a minimum specific duty of €22 and maximum of €24 per 100 kg net. Tobacco products alone accounted for 33.5 per cent of ACP LDCs' claimed trade preferences in 2002, with a trade value of $102.5 million of claimed preferences.

76 Exports of groundnut oil from Senegal (78.9 per cent) and Gambia (13.4 per cent) worth $67 million of claimed trade preferences were also among the top products in 2002, with a preferential margin of 6.4 per cent and high utilization rates (92 per cent). Vanilla from Madagascar (83.8 per cent) and Comoros (13.4 per cent) was the third most important product, with a preferential margin of 6 per cent and a trade value of $60 million of claimed trade preferences in 2002. However, in 2004 the amount of claimed trade preferences dropped by about $20 million for a total of $40 million, as shown in table 5.

77 In 2002, exports of raw sugar worth approximately $60 million from Zambia (21 per cent), the United Republic of Tanzania (17 per cent), Malawi (17 per cent) and Swaziland (13 per cent) were also figured one of the most claimed trade preferences, even if utilization was surprisingly low (50 per cent). This low utilization of ACP trade preferences could have partly been explained by the fact that $19 million worth of trade has been claimed under the EBA Initiative, with the overall cumulated utilization thus totalling roughly 75 per cent of available trade preferences.

[43] The percentage figure in brackets relates to the country share of the overall amount of exports of the particular product.

78 With regard to vegetable products, among the products that most benefited from trade preferences were pumpkins from Zambia (50 per cent), Uganda (22 per cent) and the United Republic of Tanzania (8 per cent) — with a total of $11 million of claimed trade preferences — and beans from Senegal (48 per cent), Ethiopia (15 per cent) and Burkina Faso (12 per cent) — with a overall amount of $13 million of claimed trade preferences and a considerable preferential margin of 12.8 per cent for pumpkins and 10.4–13.6 per cent for beans.

79 As previously noted, in 2002, cut flowers from Zambia (21 per cent), Uganda (7.9 per cent) and the United Republic of Tanzania (15 per cent) recorded quite a high export value of $44 million, but a minimal value of utilization, since only $3 million claimed trade preferences, as a result of which the estimated utilization rate was 7 per cent. The MFN rate for roses was a seasonal rate, ranging from 8.5 to12 per cent and providing a high preferential margin.

80 Another product that has shown minimal utilization of available trade preferences is cane molasses from Swaziland, with a trade value of $11.3 million and preferential margin of €0.35/100 kg.

81 As shown in table 6, aluminium from Mozambique was by far the most important item exported by ACP-LDCs in 2004. Compared with 2002, exports doubled to $858 million, but utilization rates did not keep pace since they were about half the potential ($397 million). Compared with the data for 2002, fish products continue to maintain the lead in terms of the amount of claimed preferences and preferential margins.

Table 6
Major non-agricultural products and LDC suppliers, ranked by descending value of ACP received imports (2004)

Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal supplier	
	MFN appl. (per cent)	ACP (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports ACP-covered	Imports ACP-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
Aluminium unwrought	6.0	0.0	858 731	858 731	858 731	394 082	26.6	26.6	2	MOZ	100.0
Frozen shrimps and prawns	12.0	0.0	203 207	203 207	203 207	193 200	13.0	39.6	8	MDG	65.0
Fresh or chilled fish fillets	9.0	0.0	187 115	187 115	183 579	124 161	8.4	47.9	6	TZA	57.0
Octopus (excl. live, fresh or chilled) - frozen	8.0	0.0	89 554	89 554	89 554	86 542	5.8	53.8	9	SEN	48.1
Fresh or chilled fish (excl. livers & roes)	10.0	0.0	77 001	77 001	77 001	74 554	5.0	58.8	10	SEN	59.1
Prepared or preserve tuna, skipjack & Atlantic bonito	24.0	0.0	61 159	61 159	61 159	57 051	3.8	62.6	2	MDG	67.2

82 In 2002, as far as non-agricultural products were concerned, 32 tariff lines, mainly fishery products, aluminium and clothing, represented a cumulated share of 84.8 per cent of all trade preferences claimed under the Cotonou Partnership Agreement, equivalent to approximately $1.168 million.

83 Exports utilizing preferences continued to be highly concentrated in 2004, since six tariff lines accounted for 62 per cent of all claimed received trade preferences. In 2002, the highest preferential margin (24 per cent) was recorded on preserved tuna exports, worth around $50 million, from Madagascar (62 per cent) and Senegal (37 per cent), with a utilization rate of more than 80 per cent. With regard to the 2002 figures, these export figures were maintained. In 2002, $51 million of fresh fish from Senegal (53 per cent) and Mauritania (25 per cent) recorded a preferential margin of 15 per cent. The figures for 2004 show shrimps and prawns from Madagascar worth $193 million and octopus from Senegal worth $86 million (ranking at the top). On average, the preferential margin on fishery products was above 10 per cent and the utilization rate was 90 per cent.

3. Trade preferences for LDCs granted under EBA

84 Exports of agricultural products from the European Union LDC-GSP effective beneficiaries were quite limited in 2004 and focused on seven tariff lines with a total value of $15 million. In 2002, three tariff lines worth $9 million accounted for 82 per cent of claimed trade preferences.

85 Pumpkins from Bangladesh were by far the major product with full utilization, a recorded trade of $7 million in 2002 and $11 million 2004, and a preferential margin of 12.8 per cent. Another export is garlic from Yemen, with full utilization and a considerable preferential margin, since the MFN rate is 9.6 per cent + €120/100 kg. Rice from Cambodia recorded $1 million of claimed trade in 2002 and 2004, with an 80 per cent utilization rate. As in the case of sugar for other countries, Cambodia may have benefited from the tariff quota for rice opened under EBA.

86 As shown in table 7, the benefits from trade preferences in the case of the European Union LDC-GSP beneficiaries are highly concentred in the garment sector. Three tariff lines and one country (Bangladesh) accounted for half of all claimed trade preferences in 2002 and 2004.

Table 7
Major non-agricultural products and principal suppliers, ranked by descending value of GSP received imports, 2004

Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers ACP (per cent)	Principal supplier	
	MFN appl. (per cent)	ACP (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports ACP-covered	Imports ACP-received				Total imports	Imports dutiable
T-shirts - cotton	12	0	1 108 446	1 108 446	1 086 335	907 350	24.6	24.6	6	BGD	92.6
Jerseys - man-made fibres	12.2	0	884 618	884 618	819 449	640 067	17.3	41.9	6	BGD	68.3
Jerseys - cotton	12.2	0	382 005	382 005	355 073	280 895	7.6	49.5	6	BGD	68.6

87 As can be seen in tables 11 and 11.A in the Annex, claimed preferences exports of T-shirts almost doubled in 2004, from $495 million to $900 million, with high utilization rates. The same is valid for the second most benefiting tariff line, namely jerseys of man-made fibres.

88 As far as non-agricultural products are concerned, non-ACP LDCs' exports to the EU accounted for some $4.3 billion in 2002. Most exported products included textiles and clothing (74.5 per cent of total trade), minerals (5.8 per cent), prepared food (3.6 per cent), and hides and skins (3.2 per cent). The (non-ACP) LDC that has most benefited so far from the GSP scheme is Bangladesh, followed by Cambodia (8 per cent), with Nepal and the Lao People's Democratic Republic accounting for 4 per cent each.[44]

89 In 2004, 28 tariff lines accounted for 85 per cent of claimed/received trade preferences. Out of the 28 tariff lines, 24 related to garments and textiles articles, while the remaining tariff lines were related to shrimps, footwear and bicycles.

90 In 2002, 40 tariff lines at the 8-digit level accounted for 85 per cent of all claimed trade preferences under the EBA, equivalent to $1.9 billion of claimed/received trade preferences. Out of the 40 tariff lines, 30 were textiles and clothing products, three were frozen shrimps and prawns, and the remaining seven lines related to footwear, chinaware and leather products. This comparison indicates that between 2002 and 2004 there was a closer concentration of exports in some detailed tariff lines, with a rather substantial export increase.

91 T-shirts and jerseys of man-made fibres and cotton, with a recorded claimed trade of $1.8 billion in 2004 and $947 million in 2002 (mainly from Bangladesh), accounted for 49 per cent (2004) and 42 per cent (2002) of all claimed trade preferences. The utilization rate may vary according to the tariff lines and the HS Chapters in 2004 and 2002. In the case of Chapter 61 — garments, knitted and crocheted — the utilization was close to 90 per cent in some cases for Bangladesh,

[44] According to data for 2002.

while constantly low or close to zero for Cambodia. In the case of Chapter 62, the utilization rate was extremely low for both countries, this being an indication of difficulties in meeting the requirements of the rules of origin.[45] In 2004, men's or boys' shirts of cotton from Chapter 62 showed a utilization rate of about 50 per cent. The difference in utilization between Chapters 61 and 62 is due to origin requirements.

92 Apart from garments, the products that most benefited from trade preferences were shrimps and prawns from Bangladesh, with a preferential margin of 12 per cent and 8 per cent, respectively, and a cumulative trade value of trade preferences of $110 million (2004) and $170 million (2002), recording a varying degree of utilization of trade preferences (from a high of nearly 80 per cent in one tariff line to a low of 50 per cent in another tariff line in 2004). Bicycles and chinaware were also products exported from Bangladesh with a good utilization rate and a preferential margin above 10 per cent on average.

93 Cambodian exports of footwear were equal to $26 million of claimed trade preferences, with a utilization rate close to 100 per cent and a preferential margin of 17 per cent in 2002; in 2004, these exports dropped significantly. Carpets from Nepal, with $43 million in 2004 and $37 million in 2002 of claimed trade preferences, also showed a utilization rate of above 90 per cent and a preferential margin of 8.3 per cent.

4. Most received/claimed trade preferences, on a tariff-line basis, from SIDS under ACP preferences

94 Table 8 summarizes the products that most benefited from trade preferences for small island developing States (SIDS) in the case of agricultural products, namely Papua New Guinea and the Dominican Republic. Five products and six tariff lines accounted for 78 per cent of all claimed/trade preferences.

95 In 2004, exports from Papua New Guinea also ranked at the top of the list of products most benefiting from trade preferences, with crude and refined palm oil totalling $167 million and almost full utilization.

96 In 2002, exports from Papua New Guinea to the European Union claiming trade preferences were classified in six tariff lines (mainly crude palm oil, crude coconut and palm kernel oil), with a preferential margin of 3.8–6.4 per cent for a value of claimed trade preferences of $129 million. A notable feature of the exports from Papua New Guinea is that approximately one third of trade volume occurs under MFN-free conditions.

97 The remaining products benefiting from trade preferences are bananas and cigars for the Dominican Republic.

[45] See tables in the Annex for more details.

Table 8
Major agricultural products of ACP-SIDS suppliers, ranked by descending value of ACP-SIDS received imports (2004)

Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent) MFN appl. (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers ACP (per cent)	Principal supplier	
										1st supplier	
	MFN appl. (per cent)	ACP (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports ACP-covered	Imports ACP-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
Crude palm oil	3.8	0.0	136 120	136 120	136 120	135 311	27.5	27.5	1	PNG	100.0
Bananas - fresh or dried	680€/ 1000kg/net	0.0	150 648	150 648	150 648	118 349	24.1	51.6	7	DOM	47.3
Rum & tafia	O,6€//% Vol/hl+3.2€ hl	0.0	48 599	48 599	48 599	47 834	9.7	61.3	9	DOM	98.4
Palm oil (excl. crude) & liquid fractions	9.0	0.0	32 355	32 355	32 355	31 565	6.4	67.7	2	PNG	100.0
Cigars, cheroots & cigarillos	43.0	0.0	30 343	30 343	30 343	29 986	6.1	73.8	6	DOM	99.8
Crude coconut (copra) oil & fractions	6.4	0.0	31 865	31 865	31 865	23 077	4.7	78.5	3	PNG	97.4

98 As shown in table 9, aluminium oxide from Jamaica is at the top of the list of products that most benefited from trade preferences in 2004, its value almost doubling, compared with 2002, to $311 million of received/claimed trade preferences. This individual tariff line most benefited from ACP preferences in 2002, with a utilization rate of roughly 70 per cent and a value equal to $172 million of claimed trade preferences, with a preferential margin of 4 per cent.

Table 9
Major non-agricultural products and ACP-SIDS suppliers, ranked by descending value of ACP received imports (2004)

Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers	
										1st supplier	
	MFN appl. (er cent)	ACP (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports ACP-covered	Imports ACP-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
Aluminium oxide	4.0	0.0	323 075	323 075	323 075	311 568	20.9	20.9	1	JAM	100.0
T-shirts - cotton	12.0	0.0	296 124	296 124	296 124	276 825	18.5	39.4	13	MUS	99.6
Prepared or preserved tuna	24.0	0.0	207 886	207 886	207 886	206 469	13.8	53.2	3	SYC	63.2
Prepared or preserved tuna	24.0	0.0	79 718	79 718	79 718	77 186	5.2	58.4	3	SYC	53.5

Methanol (methyl alcohol)	6.3	0.0	59 331	59 331	59 331	58 885	3.9	62.4	2	TTO	100.0
Jerseys - cotton	12.2	0.0	51 011	51 011	51 011	48 627	3.3	65.6	4	MUS	60.8

99 The largest African exporter among SIDS is Mauritius. In the case of ACP preferences, exports from Mauritius were mainly concentrated on garments, accounting for $450 million in 2004 and approximately $370 million of claimed trade preferences in 2002. The utilization rate recorded is quite high (90 per cent), with an average preferential margin of 10 per cent in both 2002 and 2004.

100 Prepared or preserved tuna from Seychelles enjoyed the highest preferential margin, with 24 per cent for a cumulated amount of claimed/received trade preferences of $284 million in 2004 and $213 million in 2003. The utilization rate was quite high.

101 In the case of Sao Tome and Principe, fish — with a preferential margin of 15 per cent — and copra — 6.4 per cent — were the two most important products, claiming trade preferences for an aggregated amount of $642,000.

102 Comoros' exports claiming preferences were concentrated in three tariff lines — vanilla, cloves and essential oils — with an overall value of $8 million. Utilization was not very high, totalling approximately 60 per cent.

5. Most-received EU preferences, on a tariff-line basis, from landlocked countries under ACP preferences

103 As shown in table 10, there were a handful of products that benefited from trade preferences in 2004, in the case of landlocked developing countries (LLDCs). Tobacco and cut flowers from Zimbabwe and meat from Botswana accounted for 64 per cent of all claimed trade preferences.

Table 10
Major agricultural product LLDC suppliers, ranked by descending value of ACP-LLDC received imports (2004)

Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal supplier	
	MFN appl. (per cent)	ACP (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports ACP-covered	Imports ACP-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
Tobacco, partly or wholly stemmed/stripped	18.4 MIN 22 € MAX 24 €/ 100 kg/net	0.0	65 744	65 744	65 744	65 501	24.0	24.0	1	ZWE	100.0
Tobacco, partly or wholly stemmed/stripped	18.4 MIN 22 € MAX 24 €/ 100 kg/net	0.0	40 095	40 095	40 095	31 695	11.6	35.6	1	ZWE	100.0
Fresh or chilled boneless bovine meat	12,8+303,4€/ 100kg/net	0 % + 242€ /100 kg[46]	34 150	34 150	34 150	30 676	11.2	46.9	2	BWA	95.2
Fresh cut flowers & buds	*	0.0	31 873	31 873	31 873	29 840	10.9	57.8	1	ZWE	100.0
Fresh cut flowers & buds (Proteas)	**	0.0	18 600	18 600	18 600	18 393	6.7	64.6	1	ZWE	100.0

** 1 January – 31 May: 8.5; 1 June – 31 October: 12; 1 November – 31 December: 8.5.*
*** 1 January – 31 May: 8.5; 1 June – 31 October: 12; 1 November – 31 December: 8.5.*

104 The same pattern was recorded in 2002, when 10 products classified in 16 tariff lines made up 93 per cent of received/claimed trade preferences for an amount of $351 million. Zimbabwe, Swaziland and Botswana were the main beneficiaries. Tobacco from Zimbabwe accounted for about 41 per cent of received trade preferences, worth $158 million and with a substantial preferential margin since the MFN rate is equivalent to 18.4 per cent, with a minimum of €22 and maximum of €24 100kg/net. Raw cane sugar from Swaziland was the second tariff line that most benefited from ACP trade preferences, with $87.6 million of received/claimed trade preferences. The third tariff line was boneless bovine meat from Botswana, worth $26 million and with a preference margin of 12.8 + €303.4/100 kg/net. Other tariff lines concerning mainly vegetable products, such as oranges, peas and beans, showed a very high preferential margin. In all instances, the utilization rates were quite high — over 90 per cent — except for oranges from Zimbabwe, which showed a utilization rate roughly equivalent to 50 per cent.

105 Since 2002, the traditional flows of trade for non-agricultural exports from ACP-LLDCs have not shown drastic changes. Five tariff lines accounted for 84 per cent of all claimed/received trade preferences, with a corresponding amount of around $106 million.

[46] Rate granted within a preferential tariff quota. See EU regulation 2247/03,OJ L 333, 20/12/2003.

Table 11
Major non-agricultural products and LLDC suppliers, ranked by descending value of ACP-LLDC received imports (2004)

Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers – 1st supplier	
	MFN appl. (per cent)	ACP (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports ACP-covered	Imports ACP-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
Ferro-chromium	4.0	0.0	94 596	94 596	84 151	82 646	68.0	68.0	1	ZWE	100.0
Ignition wiring sets - vehicles, aircrafts etc.	3.7	0.0	8 968	8 968	8 968	8 230	6.8	74.8	1	BWA	100.0
Women's or girls' jerseys - man-made fibres	12.2	0.0	5 631	5 631	5 631	5 552	4.6	79.3	2	BWA	99.9
T-shirts - cotton	12.0	0.0	4 010	4 010	4 010	3 140	2.6	81.9	3	BWA	95.8
Men's or boys' trousers - cotton	12.0	0.0	2 958	2 958	2 958	2 888	2.4	84.3	3	ZWE	94.3

106 In 2002, 11 tariff lines accounted for 84.8 per cent of the received claimed trade preferences for an amount of $86 million. Ferro-chromium from Zimbabwe represented the first most benefiting tariff line, with an amount of almost $32 million received claimed trade preferences, a share of 31 per cent and a preferential margin of 4 per cent. As shown in table 11, this amount increased substantially in 2004 to $82 million. Ignition wiring sets from Botswana, with an amount of received/claimed trade preferences, was the second most benefiting tariff line for an amount of $20 million and a preferential margin of 3.7 per cent. In 2004, exports of this product dropped to $8 million. Other tariff lines, such as classified garments from Zimbabwe, Botswana and Swaziland, also benefited from trade preferences, with an average preferential margin of 12 per cent. In all these tariffs lines, the utilization rate was quite high, averaging over 90 per cent.

107 In 2004, the composition of trade from landlocked countries that benefited from the EU GSP schemes reported a new entry: Lamb meat and tobacco from the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

Table 12
EU major agricultural products and their principal suppliers, ranked by descending value of GSP-LLDC received imports (2004)

Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent) MFN appl. (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal supplier	
	MFN appl. (per cent)	GSP (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports ACP-covered	Imports ACP-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
Walnuts without shells, fresh or dried	5.1	1.6	21 198	21 198	21 198	17 612	18.3	18.3	3	MDA	97.6
Fresh or chilled lamb carcasses & half carcasses	12.8 % + 171.3 EUR/100 kg	0.0	15 546	15 546	15 546	15 421	16.0	34.4	1	MKD	100.0
Tobacco, not stemmed/stripped	18.4 MIN 22 € MAX 24 €/ 100 kg/net	14.9 % MAX 24 EUR/100 kg	15 531	15 531	15 531	9 518	9.9	44.3	6	MKD	97.4
Hazelnuts (without shells), fresh or dried	3.2	0.0	7 583	7 583	7 583	7 206	7.5	51.8	1	AZE	100.0

108 In 2002, GSP agricultural preferences for LLDCs — six tariff lines from four countries — represented around 85 per cent of received claimed trade preferences. Walnuts from Moldova represented 43 per cent of received claimed preferences for an amount of $14.5 million and a preferential margin of 3.5 per cent. Hazelnuts from Azerbaijan, with a preferential margin of 3.2 per cent and an amount of $7.7 million of received trade preferences, was the second tariff line that most benefited. Other products were ethyl alcohol and cereals from Bolivia and tobacco from Paraguay: all recorded a high preferential margin.

109 As shown in table 13, metals and gas were the products that most benefited from trade preferences in 2004 for non-agricultural trade preferences. Those new entries raised the amount of claimed trade preferences to around $515 million. Exports were relatively diversified among countries and tariff lines, as 15 tariff lines accounted for 53 per cent of claimed/received trade preferences. Apart from metals and gas, garments and footwear from Moldova, with a respective $26 million and $13 million of claimed/received trade preferences, were among the products that benefited from trade preferences.

Table 13
Major non-agricultural products and LLDC suppliers, ranked by descending value of GSP-LLDC received imports, 2004

Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal supplier – 1st supplier	
	MFN appl. (per cent)	GSP (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports GSP-covered	Imports GSP-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
Ferro-chromium	4.0	0.0	186 908	186 908	177 700	146 707	15.1	15.1	1	KAZ	100.0
Ferro-molybdenum	2.7	0.0	71 052	71 052	71 052	67 308	6.9	22.0	4	ARM	81.4
Ferro-silico-manganese	3.7	0.0	45 307	45 307	45 307	39 639	4.1	26.0	1	KAZ	100.0
Propane – liquefied	0.7	0.0	65 955	65 955	65 955	33 284	3.4	29.5	1	KAZ	100.0

110 In 2002, 23 tariff lines accounted for 63 per cent of received claimed trade preferences for an amount of $164 million. Cotton yarn from Uzbekistan, bed linen from the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and ferro-silico-manganese from Kazakhstan were the three products that benefited the most. In 2004, yarn from Uzbekistan did not maintain the trade flows recorded in 2002.

6. Trade preferences for LDCs granted under the GSP of Japan

111 The Japanese scheme of generalized preferences has been reviewed and extended for a decade, ending 31 March 2014. During the fiscal year 2001/2002,[47] the special treatment granted to LDC beneficiaries was improved by adding a number of tariff items for duty- and quota-free treatment for their exclusive benefit. In addition, all 49 LDCs would be able to benefit from those preferences.

112 LDCs will enjoy the following special treatment for all products covered by the scheme:

- Duty-free entry;
- Exemption from ceiling restrictions; and
- An additional list of products for which preferences are granted solely to LDC beneficiaries.

113 Japan further improved its GSP scheme in 2003. The number of LDCs' agricultural and fishery products under duty- and quota-free treatment was increased from about 300 items to 500 items: The additional 200 items included prawns and frozen fish fillets. As for the LDCs' industrial products, almost all items have been given duty- and quota-free treatment. According to the Japanese Government, this expansion brought the percentage of products under this treatment in the total import value from LDCs, including industrial products, from about 80 per cent to over 90 per cent. According to Japan, the recent improvements notified to WTO in April 2007

[47] For detailed information on the current scheme, see *The Handbook on the Scheme of Japan 2002/2003*, UNCTAD/ITCD/TSB/Misc.42/Rev.2, available on the Internet.

will bring, in terms of the import value, the coverage of the DFQF to LDCs well over 99 per cent percentage of products.

114 In the case of Japan, two products from three countries accounted for 78 per cent of all claimed trade preferences in 2004 and 2002, as shown in table 14, with an overall amount of claimed/received trade preferences of $5.1 million in 2004 and slightly more than $3 million in 2001. Macadamia nuts from Malawi, with a preferential margin of 5 per cent and $3.7 million in 2004 and $2.2 million in 2002 of claimed trade preferences, ranked first.

Table 14
Major agricultural products and LDC suppliers, ranked by descending value of GSP received imports (2004)

Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter s total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter s total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal supplier	
	MFN appl. (per cent)	ACP (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports ACP-covered	Imports ACP-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
Macadamia nuts, fresh or dried	5.0	0.0	3 767	3 767	3 767	3 767	55.9	55.9	1	MWI	100.0
Beeswax	15.0	0.0	1 484	1 484	1 484	1 484	22.0	77.9	2	TZA	59.9

115 Beeswax from both Ethiopia (51.7 per cent) and the United Republic of Tanzania (48.3 per cent) recorded a trade value of trade preferences of $1.4 million in 2004 and $799,000 in 2001, with a preferential margin of 12.8 per cent.

116 As shown in table 15, octopus from Mauritania ranked consistently at the top of the most benefeting products that benefited from trade preferences, with $111 million of received trade preferences in 2004, showing a significant increase from the $39 million recorded in 2002. Shrimps from Myanmar ranked as the second product most benefiting from trade preferences, with $86 million of received/claimed trade preferences: this is a new entry, as this product did not figure in 2002.

117 However, the most important change concerns footwear from Cambodia, which considerably increased its exports from 2002, with an exceptionally high preferential margin of 60 per cent.

Table 15
Major non-agricultural products and LDC suppliers, ranked by descending value of GSP received imports (2004)

Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $ 000)				Share in reporter s total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter s total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers	
										1st supplier	
	MFN appl. (per cent)	LDC (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports GSP-covered	Imports GSP-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
Octopus	7.0	0.0	121 129	121 129	121 129	111 467	25.5	25.5	5	MRT	89.0

Shrimps & prawns – frozen	4.0	0.0	106 271	106 271	106 271	89 465	20.5	46.0	7	MMR	59.4
Other footwear	60.0	0.0	41 044	41 044	41 044	41 044	9.4	55.4	4	MMR	44.2
Other footwear	60.0	0.0	33 281	33 281	33 281	33 281	7.6	63.0	3	KHM	82.0
Other footwear	60.0	0.0	24 671	24 671	24 671	24 614	5.6	68.7	3	KHM	88.1
Other footwear	60.0	0.0	20 756	20 756	20 756	20 756	4.8	73.4	3	KHM	79.9

118 Compared with 2002, there was a rather marked increase in 2004 in preferential trade, as the six tariff lines shown in table 15 total $328 million. In 2002, 14 tariff lines accounted for 85 per cent of claimed trade preferences under the Japan GSP scheme, with a total value of claimed trade preferences of $190 million.

119 Octopus from Mauritania in 2002 ranked first, with $40 million of claimed trade preferences. In 2004, octopus from Mauritania still ranked first, but with preferential trade worth $111 million. All other products recorded full utilization with the exception of shawl and scarves from Nepal, which recorded 80 per cent of claimed trade preferences.

120 Footwear from Cambodia, Bangladesh and Myanmar, with a cumulated amount of claimed trade preferences of over $90 million, enjoyed a very high preferential margin of 33.8 per cent and an overall amount of claimed trade preferences equal to $115 million. Leather and leather products from Bangladesh, with a cumulative value of $10 million, also benefited from such a high preferential margin.

121 In 2002, cathodes of copper from Zambia and preserved crab from Angola were the two most important products from sub-Saharan Africa, with a preferential margin of 36 per cent for the former and 9.6 per cent for the latter. In 2004, cathodes of copper were still one of the most exported products, with $8.2 million of claimed received trade preferences.

(i) Most-received trade preferences, on a tariff-line basis, from small island developing States under the GSP of Japan

122 Skipjack was the major export of the Solomon Islands, with a preferential margin of 9.6 per cent and an overall amount of $1.5 million received trade preferences. However, other exports, such as yellow fin tuna ($2.2 million) and big-eye tuna ($4.5 million) did not receive preferential treatment, even when covered by the Japan GSP scheme.

123 Significant exports of tuna from Fiji (totalling approximately $14.5 million) were not granted GSP treatment, although they were covered by a scheme with a preferential rate of 3.5 per cent. The same pattern is observed for fish exports from Mauritius worth $8 million and tuna from Papua New Guinea.

7. Trade preferences for LDCs granted under the GSP of the United States and AGOA

124 In order to calculate the degree to which the preferences of LDCs in the United States market might be eroded, it is first necessary to identify the nature and scope of the preferential treatment that those countries currently receive. The United

States' programmes do not ensure that all imports from LDCs enjoy full duty- and quota-free access. On the contrary, LDCs are subject to higher average tariffs than other US trading partners. The average US tariff imposed on imports in 2003 was almost three times as high as the average tariff (1.59 per cent) imposed on all non-preferential imports into the US market. There are several reasons for this treatment of LDCs.

125 First, the United States' trade policy is not geared to the granting of preferences to LDCs per se. While there are now some provisions in US law that offer special recognition to this subset of developing countries, the United States tends to put more emphasis on a country's geographical location than on its income level.

126 Second, it is a long-standing principle of US policy to make preferential treatment conditional upon a country's satisfying certain eligibility criteria.[48] Being an LDC is neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition for benefiting from the preferential trade programmes of the United States. Two of those programmes — the GSP scheme and AGOA — do extend better treatment to the poorest beneficiaries. The range of goods that are eligible for duty-free treatment under the GSP is much wider for the LDCs than it is for other developing countries, but the law does not specify the standards by which the LDCs are to be determined.[49]

127 Forty-one LDCs are designated for GSP-LDC treatment. Six LDCs are denied basic GSP treatment and hence are excluded from the GSP-LDC programme as well;[50] three other LDCs benefit only from the regular GSP programme.[51] In the case of AGOA, the "lesser developed beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries" are subject to less onerous rules on apparel imports. The criterion is simple: a per capita gross national product of less than $1,500 in 1998.[52] In addition to the United Nations LDCs in sub-Saharan Africa, this definition covers six countries that are not considered LDCs under the United Nations criteria.[53] The United States thus takes a more restrictive approach than the United Nations when defining LDCs for the purpose of the GSP and a less restrictive approach for the purpose of AGOA.

128 Third and perhaps most important is the commodity composition of US trade with LDCs. Apparel is one of the most prominent items in US imports from those countries, and it remains excluded under US-GSP treatment.

---

48 These criteria relate to the country's laws and policies rather than its income level. Some LDCs have not met the requirements set out in US law. One LDC is denied MFN treatment by the United States (the denial of preferential or MFN treatment to some LDCs is essentially a political issue that lies outside the scope of this paper).

49 Section 2467(5) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, may be the perfect example of a tautology in US trade law. It defines a "least-developed beneficiary developing country" as "a beneficiary developing country that is designated as a least-developed beneficiary developing country". This legal provision can be contrasted with language in the US implementing legislation for the Tokyo Round Agreement on Government Procurement. Section 308(6) of the Trade Agreements Act of 1979, as amended, provides that "the term 'least developed country' means any country on the United Nations General Assembly list of least developed countries".

50 Timor-Leste, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Maldives, Myanmar and Sudan.

51 Eritrea, Senegal and Solomon Islands.

52 Section 112(b)(3)(B)(ii) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act of 2000. This provision was later amended by section 3107(b)(3)(B) of the Trade Act of 2002 to specify that Botswana and Namibia are also to be considered lesser developed beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries.

53 The non-LDCs that are considered by the United States to be lesser developed beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries are Botswana, Cameroon, Ghana, Kenya, Namibia and Nigeria.

129 For most LDCs, either apparel or petroleum dominates their exports to the United States. Combined, these sectors made up 87.2 per cent of all US imports from LDCs in 2003. The data in the Annex show that for six countries oil and gas accounted for more than half of US imports from those countries, and for 10 countries apparel accounted for more than half. Oil and apparel represent polar extremes in the political economy of US trade policy, both in the tariffs that are applied and in the encouragement they receive from policymakers.

130 When the tariff lines most benefiting from preferences in the United States are analysed, the whole scenario under both the US-GSP and AGOA shows that 15 tariff lines cover above 80 per cent of the overall amount of trade preferences.

131 Petroleum oil from Angola, showing $2.7 billion of received trade preferences, is by far the most important item. It accounts for 93.8 per cent of all received trade preferences under the US-GSP for LDCs in 2002.

132 When oil from Angola is excluded, the overall amount of claimed trade preferences under the GSP was equivalent to about $240 million in 2002. In 2004, Angola was admitted as a beneficiary under AGOA and trade was recorded under this latter arrangement. As shown in table 16, exports of petroleum products from Equatorial Guinea replaced Angola lion's share in benefiting from the United States preferences since it totalled $935 million in 2004, equivalent to 85 per cent of all claimed/received preferential trade. Other relevant exports were plastic articles from Bangladesh, with a value of $5.4 million, and golf equipment with a value of $4.5 million.

Table 16
Major non-agricultural products and LDC suppliers, ranked by descending value of GSP received imports (2004)

Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter s total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter s total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers	
										1st supplier	
	MFN appl. (per cent)	LDC (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports GSP-covered	Imports GSP-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
Petroleum oils & oils from bituminous minerals	10.5¢bbl	0.0	1 005 885	1 005 885	1 005 885	935 009	88.3	88.3	2	GNQ	92.8
Methanol (Methyl alchl)	5.5	0.0	99 074	99 074	99 074	99 074	9.4	97.7	1	GNQ	100.0
Articles for the conveyance or packing of goods – plastics	3.0	0.0	11 706	11 706	11 706	5 482	0.5	98.2	5	BGD	62.1
Golf equip (other than footwear) & parts	4.9	0.0	4 686	4 686	4 686	4 596	0.4	98.6	1	BGD	100.0
Porcelain or china (o/than bone china), househld tabl. & kitch.ware	8.0	0.0	2 296	2 296	2 296	2 215	0.2	98.8	1	BGD	100.0
Petroleum oils & oils from bituminous minerals	10.5¢bbl	0.0	1 005 885	1 005 885	1 005 885	935 009	88.3	88.3	2	GNQ	92.8

Table 17
United States major agricultural products and LDC suppliers, marked by descending value of GSP received imports, 2004

Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter s total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter s total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers 1st supplier	
	MFN appl. (per cent)	LDC (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports GSP-covered	Imports GSP-received				Total imports	Imports dutiable
Tobacco - threshed or similarly processed	37.5¢/kg	0.0	861	861	861	861	30.8	30.8	1	BGD	100.0
Juice of any single fruit - concentrated or not	0.5¢/liter	0.0	991	991	991	417	14.9	45.7	1	WSM	100.0
Guavas, mangoes & mangosteens - fresh	6.6¢/kg	0.0	2 633	2 633	2 633	188	6.7	52.5	1	HTI	100.0

133 Table 17 shows agricultural products and countries that most benefited from the US GSP scheme in 2004. The amount of claimed preferences received is rather small, totalling slightly more than $1 million. In 2002, agricultural products receiving preferences under the US-GSP for LDCs were roots from Congo, gelatine sheets from Bangladesh, and fruits from Togo and Haiti. The total volume of claimed trade preferences was just over $1 million.

Table 18
Major agricultural products and LDC suppliers, ranked by descending value of AGOA received imports (2004)

Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter s total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter s total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers 1st supplier	
	MFN appl. (per cent)	LDC (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports GSP-covered	Imports GSP-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
Tobacco - threshed etc & not from cigar leaf	37.5¢/kg	0.0	24 584	24 584	24 584	16 624	40.8	40.8	3	MWI	93.0
Tobacco threshed etc & not from cigar leaf	37.5¢/kg	0.0	18 241	18 241	18 241	10 103	24.8	65.6	3	MWI	99.0
Cane sugar (raw) - solid form w/o added flavour/ color	1.4606¢/kg	0.0	9 818	9 818	9 818	9 818	24.1	89.6	2	MOZ	59.7

134 In the case of AGOA, tobacco from Malawi (with a trade value of $16.6 million in 2004 and $5.3 million in 2002 of claimed trade preferences) accounted for almost 70 per cent of claimed trade preferences from agricultural products; however,

the utilization rate was rather low, as shown in table 18.

135 Trade flows remained concentrated, even in the case of non-agricultural products under AGOA, where seven tariff lines classifying garment apparel from Lesotho and Madagascar accounted for 8.2 per cent of all claimed trade preferences with an aggregated trade volume of almost $200 million. As shown in table 15 in the Annex, in 2004 the main export was petroleum oil from Angola. When oil is excluded, other exports are still concentrated on garments from Lesotho and Madagascar.

(i) Most received/claimed trade preferences, on a tariff-line basis, of small island developing States under the GSP of the United States

136 The major exports for SIDS under the US-GSP came from the Pacific countries, as the Caribbean SIDS mainly exported their goods under the Caribbean Basin Initiative (CBI), and African SIDS under AGOA.

137 Fiji's exports of mineral water, sugar, molasses, bananas and other fruits benefited from the US-GSP, with a total amount of $16 million and a very high utilization rate. Another export that received GSP duty-free treatment was fresh yams from Tonga, worth $290,000.

138 Imports from African SIDS under AGOA in 2002 were mostly exports of garments of Mauritius, totalling $300 million. Out of this total amount, $285 million was dutiable. However, only $114 million actually appeared to have received preferential treatment, with a resulting utilization rate of around 40 per cent.

(ii) Most received/claimed trade preferences, on a tariff-line basis, of small island developing States under the Caribbean Basin Initiative

139 In 2004, as shown in table 19, methanol from Trinidad and Tobago ranked as a top product that most benefited from trade preferences, with an amount of $500 million. Together with three other products from the Dominican Republic, they accounted for 76 per cent of all claimed received trade preferences for non-agricultural products.

Table 19
Major non-agricultural products and SIDS suppliers, ranked by descending value of the CBI received imports, 2004

Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter s total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter s total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers	
										1st supplier	
	MFN appl. (per cent)	LDC (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports GSP-covered	Imports GSP-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
Methanol (Methyl alcohol)	5.5	0.0	504 860	504 860	504 860	500 336	47.3	47.3	1	TTO	100.0
Precious metal (other than silver), articles of jewellery etc.	5.5	0.0	197 021	197 021	197 021	177 771	16.8	64.2	5	DOM	98.5
Automatic circuit breakers for voltage not exceeding 1,000 V	2.7	0.0	111 591	111 591	111 591	95 728	9.1	73.2	1	DOM	100.0
Gold necklaces & neck chains	5.5	0.0	33 569	33 569	33 569	30 366	2.9	76.1	2	DOM	100.0

140 In 2002, methanol, steel bars and tyres made up 89 per cent of all received CBI trade preferences of Trinidad and Tobago. Methanol, by far the product most benefiting from preferences (70 per cent of CBI received trade preferences), had a preferential margin of 6 per cent.

141 The exports from the Bahamas in 2002 were concentrated on polystyrene, with a preferential margin of 6.5 per cent and a value of $65 million. However, no significant trade was recorded in 2004.

142 Barbados' preferential exports to the United States under the CBI were composed of rum ($4.8 million), ethyl alcohol ($2.2 million), and wrenches and machinery ($32 million). These exports amounted to a cumulated share of 79 per cent of all preferential imports into the CBI and showed high utilization rates.

143 In the case of Dominica, major dutiable exports to the United States under the CBI were ceramic items worth $300,000, with a preferential margin of 5.7 per cent.

144 Seven dutiable tariff lines of Jamaican exports to the United States market represented 78 per cent of all received trade preferences under the CBI. Ethyl alcohol, with a 2.5 per cent preferential margin, was the product that most benefited, with a value of received trade preferences of $35.4 million; this was followed by yams, with a preferential margin of 6.5 per cent and a value of received trade preferences of $10 million. Other products were papaya, sauces and other fruits, with a preferential margin of 6.4 per cent (6 per cent for other fruits) and a value of received trade preferences of $4 million for papaya and about $2 million for the other products.

145 Saint Kitts and Nevis' preferential exports were concentrated on three tariff lines: switches (total received trade preferences of $19 million and a preferential

margin of 2.7 per cent), television parts worth $2.5 million and other machine parts worth $2.1 million.

146 Electronics exports — namely, television antennas and transmission apparatus — were two items that most benefited from the CBI, with a value of $5.5 million and a preferential margin of 1.8 per cent.

(iii) Most-received US-GSP preferences for landlocked countries

Table 20
Major agricultural products landlocked suppliers, ranked by descending value of GSP-LLDC received imports (2004)

Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter s total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter s total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers	
										1st supplier	
	MFN appl. (per cent)	LDC (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports GSP-covered	Imports GSP-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
Cane/beet sugar & pure sucrose - solid, w/o added coloring or flavouring	3.6606¢/kg	0.0	4 406	4 406	4 406	4 406	29.8	29.8	1	PRY	100.0
Cane sugar (raw) - solid, w/o added flavouring or colouring	3.6606¢/kg	0.0	3 535	3 535	3 535	3 535	23.9	53.6	1	PRY	100.0
Animal products - unfit for human consumption	1.1	0.0	1 262	1 262	1 262	1 262	8.5	62.1	1	PRY	100.0
Cane sugar (raw) - solid (used for certain polyhydric alcohols)	-1.0	0.0	976	976	976	929	6.3	68.4	1	PRY	100.0

147 In 2004, as shown in table 20, four tariff lines classifying raw cane sugar and animal products from Paraguay accounted for 68 per cent of all claimed trade preferences, with an overall value of almost $10 million. In 2002, US agricultural preferences for LLDCs, excluding AGOA and LDC beneficiaries, four tariff lines and three products from three countries, accounted for 81.4 per cent of all trade preferences. Sugar from Paraguay, liquorice from Uzbekistan and animal products from Paraguay received claimed trade preferences totalling $9.3 million.

148 In the case of non-agricultural preferences for LLDCs, excluding AGOA and LDC beneficiaries, mineral products from Kazakhstan and Bolivia made up the bulk of benefits, both in 2004 and 2002, as shown in tables 29 and 29A in the Annex. In 2004, ferrochromium and other ferrous minerals from Kazakhstan, classified into four tariff lines, accounted for the majority of all claimed received trade preferences, with a share of 62 per cent in 2004. In 2002, 16 tariff lines made up 95 per cent of received claimed trade preferences for an amount of $245 million. Zinc and copper

cathodes from Kazakhstan accounted for almost half of the total received trade preferences, with low preferential margins of 1 and 1.5 per cent.

E. Identifying preference erosion and possible trade effects

149 MFN liberalization is expected to occur in any case, with consequent, inevitable erosion of trade preferences. Erosion will also occur following the negotiations by the main Preference Giving Countries of Free trade agreements. The real issue for preference-receiving countries is to identify the trade and economic effects that may derive from such liberalization. The preceding chapters identified those products and country pairs that have most benefited from trade preferences. This chapter will assess the potential trade effects of the erosion of preferential margins according to various negotiating scenarios utilizing the World Integrated Trade Solution (WITS).[54] The simulation has been carried out at the tariff-line level in order to match the country/product methodology of this paper. The trade data of 2002 received preferential trade flows were used in the simulation.

149 To take into account the issue of the utilization of trade preferences, such simulations have been carried out using the utilization rates at the country/product level. The issue of utilization has been discussed in section I. Where utilization is low, it means that, at the time of importation, the preferential tariff was not applied and the MFN rate of duty was levied. If MFN is applied despite the existence of the preferential rate of duty, the country may stand to gain from MFN liberalization. Generally speaking, the introduction of the utilization rate in the simulation scenario introduced the following variables:

- The lower the utilization rate, the more the MFN rate is applied and the country is supposed to record benefits from MFN liberalization; and
- The higher the utilization rates, the more the country may be exposed to trade losses since the preferences are effective.

150 For non-agricultural products, product simulation has been carried with three negotiating scenarios being assumed: Free trade, the Girard formula and a linear reduction formula.[55] The free trade scenario has been used as a benchmark, as it entails the total erosion of trade preferences — that is, for those countries attaching importance to trade preferences, it represents the "worst-case" scenario.

---

[54] WITS is a simple tool for quantification of the effects on trade flows, developed by UNCTAD and the World Bank. It uses a partial equilibrium model that is particularly useful for analysing the first-round or impact effects of trade liberalization on specific products. Some caution is advised in looking at the totals across products, as these may also be subject to intersectoral effects (general equilibrium consideration), which normally lead to even larger effects. However, given the low value of LDC trade, this may be less serious an issue than a much wider liberalization scenario, for example WTO negotiations. This simulation has been carried out using WITS and does not cover other non-tariff barriers that could be liberalized. In particular, the simulation does not take into account the trade effects that may arise from the expected end of textile and clothing restrictions under the Agreement on Textiles and Clothing. This may have a significant impact on the results of the simulations since (to be discussed below) the majority of trade effects of the simulation activity take place in the textiles and clothing area. Other models and studies are assessing the impact of trade liberalization on textiles and clothing. The present exercise is aimed at simply quantifying the "missed trade preferences" either because there is no coverage or because the utilization rates are low. The results of the simulation have to be read within this context.

[55] The Girard Formula has been applied with a coefficient of 1 and applying sectoral elimination of MFN duties on the following sectors: electronics and electrical goods, fish and fish products, footwear, leather goods, motor vehicles (parts and components), stones, gems and precious metals, and textiles and clothing. The linear reduction formula has been applied with a reduction of 40per cent.

151 In the case of agricultural products, two scenarios have been taken into account. The first scenario is free trade, while the second is a simplified version of the Harbison Proposal based on tariff bands.[56] In the following sections, the tables show only the results of the free trade scenario, while the results of the simple mix trade scenario are just summarized.

1. Preference erosion and trade effects in the EU market

152 In the case of non-agricultural products and EU-GSP LDC effective beneficiaries under the first scenario (free trade), Bangladesh shows a mixed performance as shown in table 21. Table 21 summarizes, in a table format, the important trade effects arising from the simulation scenario for the trade preferences most utilized by LDCs at the tariff-line level — for example, columns 5 and 6 show the first LDC gaining supplier in the simulation for the specific tariff line shown in column 1, and columns 7 and 8 show the the first LDC losing supplier in the simulation. In fact, it appears that for the garments in Chapter 61 of the HS, Bangladesh does not record significant trade losses following the complete erosion of trade preferences. In some tariff lines, Bangladesh appears as the first gaining supplier, displacing trade flows of other LDCs such as the Lao People's Democratic Republic and Madagascar.

153 Consistent trade gains are recorded for Bangladesh in the case of some tariff lines classifying garments, not knitted and crocheted, where the country is experiencing low utilization of trade preferences due to origin requirements. Since Bangladesh is facing MFN duties in this tariff line due to non-utilization of trade preferences, it is not surprising that the country stands to gain from MFN liberalization in these tariff lines. However, the same categories of products are experiencing trade losses for Madagascar, Nepal, the Lao People's Democratic Republic and Cambodia. Bangladesh and Mozambique appear to record trade losses on fishery products to benefit of Argentina.

[56] The simplified Harbison Proposal applies a simple average reduction for all agricultural products according to tariff bands: X >90 average reduction = 60 per cent 15 <X $\leq$90 average reduction = 50 per cent X $\leq$15 average reduction = 40 per cent The negotiating scenario has been inspired by an UNCTAD study entitled, "Development opportunities and challenges in the WTO negotiations on industrial tariffs".

Table 21
Simulation of trade effects for non-agricultural products: Free trade scenario for EU non-agricultural trade preferences under the EBA

Products		Simulation results ($000)			Principal gaining suppliers		Principal LDC losing suppliers	
		MFN base rate (per cent)	Cumulated trade effects		1st gaining suppl.		1st LDC losing suppl.	
NL code	Description		Trade creation	Trade diversion	ISO3	Total trade effect	ISO3	Total trade effect
1	2	3	4	4	5	6	7	8
6109100000	T-shirts - cotton (knitted or crocheted)	12.0	44 571	-26 618	IND	107 891	MDG	-132
6110309900	Jerseys, pullovers etc. - man-made fibres (knitted or crocheted)	12.0	93 723	-28 364	ROM	72 311	MDG	-168
6110209900	Jerseys, pullovers etc. - cotton (knitted or crocheted)	12.0	33 128	-5 973	HKG	56 792	MDG	-818
0306138000	Frozen shrimps & prawns	12.0	982	-4 966	ARG	6 995	BGD	-3 720
6203423500	Men's or boys' trousers, breeches etc. - cotton	12.0	47 005	-5 309	ROM	85 206	LAO	-329
6105100000	Men's or boys' shirts - cotton (knitted or crocheted)	12.0	8 138	-7 141	CHN	32 574	BGD	-2 836
6110309100	Jerseys, pullovers etc. - man-made fibres (knitted or crocheted)	12.0	22 937	-6 473	BGD	8 730	MDG	-47
6110209100	Jerseys, pullovers etc. - cotton (knitted or crocheted)	12.0	12 332	-3 141	HKG	28 433	MDG	-780
6205200010	Men's or boys' shirts - cotton	12.0	32 554	-1 135	BGD	28 544	LAO	-405
6205200090	Men's or boys' shirts - cotton	12.0	32 554	-1 135	BGD	28 544	LAO	-405
5701109100	Carpets & other textile floor coverings - wool	8.0	1 208	-2 509	IND	6 645	NPL	-1 331
6203423100	Men's or boys' trousers, breeches - cotton	12.0	33 769	3 463	BGD	34 065	MDG	-478
6105201000	Men's or boys' shirts - man-made fibres (knitted or crocheted)	12.0	3 911	-2 925	CHN	10 904	KHM	-947
6205300000	Men's or boys' shirts - man-made fibres	12.0	51 692	1 083	BGD	51 566	KHM	-220
0306135010	Frozen shrimps & prawns	12.0	710	-620	ARG	1 868	MOZ	-1 185
0306135020	Frozen shrimps & prawns	12.0	710	-620	ARG	1 868	MOZ	-1 185
0306135090	Frozen shrimps & prawns	12.0	710	-620	ARG	1 868	MOZ	-1 185
6203429000	Men's or boys' trousers, breeches etc. - cotton	12.0	10 357	-1 202	BGD	7 704	MDG	-423
6110119000	T-shirts	12.4	3 354	-2 421	HKG	29 301	BGD	1 199
6109903000	T-shirts, singlets etc. - other textiles (knitted or crocheted)	12.0	9 193	-523	CHN	63 129	NPL	0

154 Madagascar and Nepal recorded trade losses in their garments and carpet exports, while Hong Kong (China), China, India and Tunisia appear to gain market share.

155 Other negotiating scenarios according to the Girard Formula do not show substantially different results. This is probably due to the export structure of LDCs being heavily centred on clothing and fishery products, and the fact that the simulation assumed that free trade would take place in textiles and clothing, and fishery products following sectorial agreements.

156 The simple mix scenario appears to show different trade effects. Trade losses are less pronounced and some trade gains are recorded. In the case of Bangladesh, trade gains are shown in tariff lines such as shirts, where it ranks as the first gaining supplier. However, trade losses are still recorded, even if of a more limited nature, for Nepal (carpets), Cambodia (footwear) and Mozambique (prawns).

157 Table 22 shows the results of the simulation for agricultural products. Exports of groundnut oil from Senegal, tobacco from Malawi and Uganda, and sugar from Zambia are the biggest losers in this scenario. The figures concerning Malawi tobacco products are of particular importance, as losses of over $3 million are recorded. Zambia also appears to lose its market share in sugar to Mauritius.

Table 22
Simulation of trade effects for agricultural products: Free trade scenario for EU agricultural trade preferences under ACP preferences

Product		Simulation results ($000)			Principal gaining suppliers		Principal LDC losing suppliers	
		MFN base rate (per cent)	Cumulated trade effects		1st gaining suppl.		1st LDC losing suppl.	
NL code	Description		Trade creation	Trade diversion	ISO3	Total trade effect	ISO3	Total trade effect
1	2	17	19	20	26	27	34	35
1508109000	Crude groundnut oil	6.4	491	-1 017	ARG	1 632	SEN	-373
2401202000	Tobacco - partly or wholly stemmed or stripped	4.2	63	-4 075	USA	6 160	MWI	-3 345
0905000000	Vanilla	6.0	890	-770	USA	329	MDG	-10
2401201000	Tobacco - partly or wholly stemmed or stripped	4.9	50	-2 516	USA	11 552	UGA	-605
1701111000	Raw cane sugar in solid form	67.1	12 380	-30 757	MUS	128 689	ZMB	-4 023
2401205010	Tobacco - partly or wholly stemmed or stripped	11.2	383	-103	MEX	558	UGA	-84
2401205090	Tobacco - partly or wholly stemmed or stripped	11.2	383	-103	MEX	558	UGA	-84
1701119000	Raw cane sugar in solid form	67.6	2 387	-5 371	MUS	18 593	MWI	-2 942
0709909010	Other vegetables, fresh or chilled	12.8	5	-97	THA	312	ZMB	-61

158 As shown in table 23, for ACP-LDCs' non-agricultural products, the free trade scenario records trade losses for Senegal in fishery products, and Mozambique in aluminium and fish products. In the same tariff lines, Argentina and the Russian Federation both record positive gains.

159 More specifically, trade losses of over $8 million have been recorded for Senegal and Mozambique for prawns and fishery products. In these tariff lines, Argentina and Brazil appear to increase their market shares. Madagascar and Nepal recorded trade losses in their garments and carpet sections, while Hong Kong (China), China, India and Tunisia appear to gain market share.

160 The simple mix scenario appears to show different trade effects. Trade losses are less pronounced and some trade gains are recorded.

Table 23
Simulation of trade effects of non-agricultural products for trade scenario under ACP preferences

Products		Simulation results ($000)			Principal gaining suppliers		Principal LDC losing suppliers	
		MFN base rate (per cent)	Cumulated trade effects		1st gaining suppl.		1st LDC losing suppl.	
NL code	Description		Trade creation	Trade diversion	ISO3	Total trade effect	ISO3	Total trade effect
1	2	17	19	20	26	27	34	35
7601100000	Aluminium unwrought	6.0	1'598	-36'581	RUS	52'646	MOZ	-34'986
0307591000	Octopus	8.0	315	-5'243	MAR	8'479	SEN	-2'563
0306135010	Frozen shrimps & prawns	12.0	1'584	-2'271	ARG	1'868	MOZ	-1'185
0306135020	Frozen shrimps & prawns	12.0	1'584	-2'271	ARG	1'868	MOZ	-1'185
0306135090	Frozen shrimps & prawns	12.0	1'584	-2'271	ARG	1'868	MOZ	-1'185
0306138000	Frozen shrimps & prawns	12.0	240	-2'216	ARG	6'995	BGD	-3'720
0307491800	Cuttle fish & squid (excl. live, fresh or chilled)	8.0	164	-1'223	THA	4'318	SEN	-598
0304101920	Fresh or chilled fish fillets	9.0	710	-305	KEN	388	SEN	0
0304101930	Fresh or chilled fish fillets	9.0	710	-305	KEN	388	SEN	0
0304101940	Fresh or chilled fish fillets	9.0	710	-305	KEN	388	SEN	0
0304101990	Fresh or chilled fish fillets	9.0	710	-305	KEN	388	SEN	0
2818200000	Aluminium oxide	4.0	215	-566	USA	4'358	GIN	-352
0306134000	Frozen shrimps & prawns	12.0	1	-1'643	MAR	4'618	SEN	-772

161 The fishery exports appear to be those most affected, with negative effects for Senegal and Mauritania. Madagascar also shows trade losses in clothing.

162 As in the case of textiles and clothing, the application of sectoral reduction under the Girard Formula reproduces the same trade effects as in the free trade area scenario.

163 Under the simple mix scenario, trade gains are recorded for Madagascar (prawns) and the United Republic of Tanzania (fish fillets). Smaller trade losses are reported for Senegal and Mauritania in fishery products.

2. Preference erosion and possible trade effects in the United States

164 Under the US-GSP scheme, given the low preferential trade recorded when petroleum oil is excluded, the trade effects are relatively small. In the case of agricultural products, exports of fruits from Haiti and gelatine products from Bangladesh show trade losses. The main difference recorded between the free trade and Harbison scenario concerns the magnitude of those losses, which are significantly greater under the free trade scenario.

165 In the case of non-agricultural products under AGOA, shown in table 24, where most of the preferential imports from LDCs are concentrated, the three scenarios record trade losses for Madagascar ($1.2 million), Lesotho (almost $1 million) . The magnitude of these losses is greater under the free trade and lower under the simple mix formula.

Table 24
Simulation of trade effects of non-agricultural products: Free trade scenario for US markets under AGOA preferences

Products		Simulation results ($000)			Principal gaining suppliers		Principal LDC losing suppliers	
		MFN base rate (per cent)	Cumulated trade effects		1st gaining suppl.		1st LDC losing suppl.	
NL code	Description		Trade creation	Trade diversion	ISO3	Total trade effect	ISO3	Total trade effect
1	2	17	19	20	26	27	34	35
61102020	Sweaters, pullovers etc. - cotton (knitted or crocheted)	16.5	25'982	-16'559	HND	256'552	CAN	-22'622
62046240	Women's or girls' trousers, breeches & shorts - cotton (not knitted or crocheted)	16.6	16'512	-7'909	HKG	273'113	MEX	-103'941
62034240	Men's or boys' trousers & shorts - cotton (not bibs, knitted or crocheted)	16.6	19'097	-6'015	BGD	99'226	MEX	-116'050
61101010	Sweaters, pullovers, sweatshirts, waistcoats etc - cashmere (knitted or crocheted)	4.0	224	-1'424	HKG	12'536	MDG	-1'204
61103030	Sweaters, pullovers etc. - man-made fibers (knitted or crocheted)	32.0	3'871	-3'695	HKG	470'545	LSO	-921
61046220	Women's or girls' trousers, breeches & shorts - cotton (knitted or crocheted)	14.9	2'002	-1'629	SLV	23'552	LAO	0
62052020	Men's or boys' shirts - cotton (not knitted or crocheted)	19.7	4'261	-2'351	BGD	153'630	LSO	-20

166 The only LDC that shows some positive gain in all scenarios is Bangladesh for some tariff lines classifying garments. Given the structure of trade preferences in the United States and the lack of export diversification to the LDCs, some other calculations have been made to simulate the possible implication of erosion of tariff preferences as shown in table 25, listing the top Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) tariff lines exported from LDCs in 2003. In the case of a free trade scenario, there was no effect on the 12 products that were already duty-free on an MFN basis, but these constituted just 6.5 per cent of the value of the 50 products in our sample. Similarly, these cuts resulted in no erosion of preferences for the 11 items that were theoretically eligible for preferential treatment when imported from countries that benefited from either the full AGOA programme or the Caribbean Trade Partnership Act (CBTPA), but in actual practice are imported solely on an MFN basis. These items accounted for 9.2 per cent of the value of the top 50 products. The only effect on the existing margins of preference would be on the 27 items that enter at a rate below the MFN rate. Very few of these items were imported on an entirely duty-free basis; many of them were apparel products that came either from LDCs that are not eligible for preferential treatment in this sector or from AGOA or CBTPA beneficiaries that are theoretically eligible, but unable to meet the rules of origin for those programmes.

167 As a result, the average tariff rate imposed on the imports of the 27 products from LDCs (4.85 per cent) was not vastly lower than the average MFN tariff on these items (6.45 per cent). Alternatively, the margins of preference can be expressed according to the tariffs paid: imports from LDCs paid $430.9 million in tariffs on these 50 products, which was $142.5 million less than they would have paid on an MFN basis. Taken as a whole, the average tariff on imports of all 50 products from the LDCs was 5.54 per cent, or just 19.6 per cent below the level that would be paid on an MFN basis (i.e. 6.89 per cent). Since the existing margins of preference are so small, there is not much scope for their erosion in the Doha Round.

168 The picture is quite different if it is assumed that the United States made good on its pledge to eliminate all tariffs on all imports from the LDCs. The potential margins of preference, and hence the potential scope for their erosion, are much greater than the existing preferences. In this instance, the affected products include not only the 27 items that currently enter at something below the MFN rate, but also the 11 products that are eligible for preferences in theory but are denied them in practice. Combined, these two categories accounted for 93.5 per cent of the value of the top 50 US imports from LDCs in 2003. In this idealized scenario, the margins of preference are, by definition, equal to the MFN rates. For the average product, this was 6.89 per cent. Expressed in terms of United States tariffs forgone, this was equal to $726.0 million. Put another way, the *potential* margins of preference — and thus the potential level of preference erosion — are about five times greater than the *existing* margins of preference. That multiplier remains the same whether one focuses on the average tariff rate or the value of the forgone tariffs.

Table 25[57]
Tariff treatment of United States imports from LDCs (2003)
Top 50 HTS 4-digit items, imports for consumption, customs value, thousands of US dollars

HTS item and product description	2003 imports from LDCs	LDC tariff paid	LDC tariff rate	MFN tariff rate	Tariffs forgone: Existing prefe-rences	Tariffs forgone: Potential prefe-rences
Products that enjoy margins of preference	***8 884 208***	***430 921***	***4.85***	***6.45***	***142 504***	***573 425***
2709: Petroleum oils & oils from bituminous minerals, crude	4 882 919	259	0.01	0.28	13 413	13 672
6204: Women's or girls' suits, dresses, skirts, etc. not knit	817 437	104 862	12.83	15.22	19 552	124 414
6110: Sweaters, pullovers & similar articles, knit or crocheted	781 332	105 864	13.55	18.21	36 417	142 281
24 Other 4-digit items	2 402 520	219 936	9.15	12.20	73 122	293 058
Products that do not enjoy preferential treatment in practice	***969 735***	***152 604***	***15.74***	***15.74***	***0***	***152 604***
6205: Men's or boys' shirts, not knit or crocheted	329 837	67 170	20.36	20.36	0	67 170
6206: Women's or girls' blouses, shirts, not knit or crocheted	194 204	33 394	17.20	17.20	0	33 394
6211: Track suits, ski-suits & swimwear, not knit or crocheted	110 063	18 912	17.18	17.18	0	18 912
8 Other 4-digit items	335 631	33 128	9.87	9.87	0	33 128
Products that are duty-free on an MFN basis	***681 897***	***0***	***0.00***	***0.00***	***0***	***0***
0905: Vanilla beans	202 245	0	0.00	0.00	0	0
0306: Crustaceans, live, fresh, chilled, frozen etc.	99 477	0	0.00	0.00	0	0
7102: Diamonds, whether or not worked, but not mounted or set	66 773	0	0.00	0.00	0	0
9 Other 4-digit items	313 402	0	0	0	0	0
SUBTOTAL:	10 535 839	583 525	5.54	6.89	142 504	726 029
ALL OTHER:	229 721	3 825	1.67			
TOTAL:	**10 765 560**	**587 350**	**5.46**			

Products that enjoy margins of preference = products for which there is any difference between the LDC tariff rate and the MFN tariff rate.
Products that *do not* enjoy preferential treatment in practice = products that are subject to duty on an MFN basis, and may be eligible for preferential treatment when imported from some LDCs, but in actual practice, the observed payment of tariffs by LDCs (LDC tariff rate) is at or above the MFN tariff rate.
LDC tariff paid = the value of tariffs paid on imports from LDCs.
LDC tariff rate = the average tariff imposed on imports from LDCs (i.e. LDC tariff paid divided by 2003 imports from LDCs and expressed as a percentage).
MFN tariff rate = the average tariff for US imports in that 4-digit category during 2003 for products that entered on an MFN basis. Note that in some cases the calculated percentage for the MFN tariff rate was higher than the calculated LDC tariff rate, due to different compositions of imports among the 8-digit items that fall within a 4-digit category. In those cases the value in the MFN tariff rate column was replaced by the value in the LDC tariff rate column, on the basis of the conclusion that all of the imports from LDCs must have been entering on an MFN basis.
Current savings = the value of tariffs that are not being paid by LDCs under the status quo. This is the difference between the LDC tariff paid and the tariff that would be paid if the imports paid the MFN tariff rate (i.e. 2003 imports from LDCs multiplied by the MFN tariff rate). Potential savings = the value of tariffs that would not be paid by LDCs if all products imported from LDCs received duty-free treatment. This is the inverse of the value of

[57] Source: Calculations by Craig Van Grasstek, mimeo, 2.

the tariffs that would be paid if the imports were subject to the MFN tariff rate (i.e. 2003 imports from LDCs multiplied by the MFN tariff rate).
Note: Product descriptions are abbreviated for purposes of clarity.

3. Preference erosion and possible trade effects in Japan

169 In the case of Japan, trade losses for agricultural products were reported for macadamia nuts from Malawi, and beeswax from Ethiopia and the United Republic of Tanzania. These trade effects were minimal under the free trade and Harbison scenario.

170 For non-agricultural products, octopus from Mauritania and Senegal would be most affected, with a trade loss of $3.4 million out of a total of $37 million of recorded trade preferences in the case of the free trade scenario as shown in table 25. This loss is expected to be reduced to $1 million in the case of the simple mix scenario. Other trade losses, of about $5.6 million, were recorded by Bangladesh and Cambodia in footwear against an overall amount of received trade preferences of slightly more than $50 million.

Table 26
Simulation of trade effect for non-agricultural products: Free trade scenario for Japanese markets under GSP preferences

Products		Simulation results ($000)			Principal gaining suppliers		Principal LDC losing suppliers	
		MFN base rate (per cent)	Cumulated trade effects		1st gaining suppl.		1st LDC losing suppl.	
NL code	Description		Trade creation	Trade diversion	ISO3	Total trade effect	ISO3	Total trade effect
030759100	Octopus frozen	7.0	52	-3 573	MAR	14 052	MRT	-3 458
640399015	Other footwear	33.8	0	-2 774	ITA	3 013	BGD	-1 111
740311010	Cathodes & sections of cathodes	3.0	915	-1 077	CHL	4 024	MMR	-428
640399016	Other footwear	33.8	4	-3 692	ITA	4 769	KHM	-3 219
640391019	Other footwear	33.8	0	-1 063	ITA	954	KHM	-786
640399029	Other footwear	33.8	0	-944	DEU	781	KHM	-803
640399011	Footwear for gymnastics, athletics or similar activities	27.0	1	-3 554	CHN	55 482	BGD	-2 186
410410312	Whole bovine leather	33.8	0	-75	USA	48	BGD	-75
410620212	Goat & kid skin leather	33.8	0	-136	IND	139	BGD	-136
621420200	Shawls, scarves	7.6	191	-129	ITA	4 683	CHN	-2 565
620530010	Men's or boys' shirts - synthetic fibres	8.5	22	-655	CHN	29 162	BGD	-351
410439212	Bovine leather and equine leather	33.8	0	-703	USA	840	BGD	-703
640391029	Other footwear, covering the ankle	33.8	0	-153	USA	81	KHM	-126
160510029	Crab prepared or preserved, n.e.s.	9.6	51	-420	CHN	10 792	AGO	-369

171 Thus, in the case of total liberalization in the agricultural and non-agricultural sectors, trade losses of all LDCs were estimated at 10 per cent of the overall amount of received trade preferences. This amount was roughly equivalent to $20 million.

F. Work ahead: Addressing preference erosion within the framework of the Hong Kong Ministerial decisions

172 Revisiting preference erosion in the light of the decisions taken at the Hong Kong Ministerial Conference on market access for LDCs and Aid for Trade has been the declared objective of this study.

173 Trade data analysis in the previous sections suggests that certain countries and products may suffer considerably from preference erosion. This could have a potential impact on small-scale industries, mainly garments, certain agricultural products and fisheries. The impact may be significant for certain communities even if the trade volume is relatively small, as illustrated in section I of this study. The trade data in section II should be used to elaborate policies at the national level that make use of the existing multilateral initiatives to address the possible impact of preference erosion.

174 To that end, the concluding sections of this study discuss possible modalities regarding the following: (1) the relationship between preference erosion and recent initiatives for the EIF and Aid for Trade Initiative; (2) the case for further improving market access and rules of origin under the existing preferences; and (3) the re-establishing of multilateral principles for the granting of preferences to developing and least developed countries.

1. Addressing preference erosion through the EIF and Aid for Trade Initiative: Mainstreaming

(i) Trade liberalization and development assistance

175 Until the launching of the Aid for Trade Initiative, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and the WTO system operated on the principle of separation: trade assistance packages were handled outside the GATT and WTO per se, despite the fact that such packages were the practice in bilateral arrangements. Financing mechanisms such as the European Development Fund have been operating for decades under the former Lomé Conventions and have been incorporated into the Cotonou Partnership Agreement. In the case of the Euro-Mediterranean partnership, a mix of aid and repayable loans at concessional interest favourable rates was made available to Mediterranean partners to address the difficulties that they may face in the opening up of their economies.

176 The Aid for Trade Initiative could provide the financial instrument for an assistance package to cope with adjustments and trade reform programmes arising from trade commitments undertaken at the multilateral level.

177 A first concrete attempt to test that assumption is to link preference erosion

arising from MFN liberalization with the adjustment costs that could be addressed by the Aid for Trade Initiative. Apart from the funding and financial considerations that the international community would have to put forward to make the Aid for Trade Initiative concrete, one of the main difficulties would be to quantify preference erosion at the country level and disburse the necessary funds through tested and appropriate modalities.

178 This is an area where future analysis should be concentrated at the field level. Section I of this study identified a series of progressive steps to identify and possibly mitigate adverse effects from preference erosion. Details of a number of steps are briefly outlined below.

(ii) Mainstreaming preference erosion

179 The EIF and DTIS process conducted under the IF should serve as an instrument to clearly identify and suggest modalities for undertaking actions at the country level to mitigate the adverse effects of preference erosion and mainstream those modalities into the development plans. This process could ultimately lead to policy actions to remedy preference erosion that could be inserted in the national Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) and addressed under the Aid for Trade Initiative.

180 Trade preferences were already featured in DTIS findings and recommendations, but responses to the identified needs and trade-related technical assistance have been weak and slow to materialize. At the same time, the limited funding available under the EIF may not be sufficient or even designed to cover the structural changes that may be generated by the deterioration of an entire industrial or agricultural sector dependent on trade preferences.

181 The EIF should, however, be used as a vehicle to mainstream remedies for preference erosion within a country's PRSPs. For instance, the DTIS could analyse changes and recommend actions to move from a trade policy heavily reliant on preferences to more active participation in regional and multilateral trade negotiations to acquire market access and diversify the export base. At the same time, this may include recommendations for actions to be undertaken by donors to alleviate adverse effects arising from preference erosion.

182 This latter aspect is where a great deal of effort should also be carried out at the national level to mainstream the issue of preference erosion into the development plans of the LDCs concerned. It will require extensive coordination and mainstreaming among different government actors to make sure that the impact of preference erosion is reflected in the PRSPs. The scope and design of the EIF imply that possible infrastructural problems, such as the deterioration of a particular industrial or agricultural sector arising from the impact of preference erosion, will have to be addressed by the PRSPs and the Aid for Trade Initiative.

183 The task of mainstreaming trade issues into development plans has been recognized as one the most formidable challenges for the EIF, as noted in the report of the WTO Task Force:

> "The donor community has generally not responded adequately to the needs identified in the DTISs. The fact that the findings and recommendations of the

DTISs have not been adequately fed into the PRSP and similar processes, or into the programming frameworks of other donors, contributes to this problem. The IF is still often seen by both the donor community and the LDCs as a stand-alone process. Trade is inadequately seen, by both donors and recipients, as an integral aspect of economic development and poverty reduction, so does not feature high enough on their priorities evaluation made."[58]

184 In fact, preference erosion arises as a trade issue most commonly in the portfolio of the Ministry of Commerce. However, in most cases, it is not the latter that is involved in the drafting of the PRSPs, as the lead may be taken by other ministries, such as the planning or finance ministries. It would be necessary to hold a series of inter-ministerial coordination meetings among the ministries concerned and the private sector to make sure that the agreed priorities, including adverse effects arising from preference erosion, are included in the PRSPs and brought to the attention of the donor community.

(iii) Ensuring follow-up through effective trade-related technical assistance (TRTA)

185 The main challenge facing the international community is to define the effective rules and mechanisms governing the EIF and the Aid for Trade Initiative. The disbursement of funds and the implementation of TRTA should quickly respond and address the issues identified during the analytical phase of the DTIS. Failing to live up to the expectations generated by the IF process and the EIF initiative may rapidly generate frustration and disaffection among the recipient countries regarding the recently launched initiatives. Experience with the IF has shown that even the limited funding of $1 million available for implementing projects under Window II has often not been used owing to cumbersome procedures, red tape and modalities for disbursing funds that simply do not match the realities at the field level.[59]

186 The Aid for Trade Initiative may be an ideal candidate for actions to alleviate any shocks arising from preference erosion, since its wider scope potentially addresses infrastructure projects falling outside the immediate scope of the EIF. The modalities for execution of trade adjustment programmes are unknown, but a number of lessons may be learned from the experiences gained under bilateral programmes.

187 An interesting example of financial assistance provided at the product level, in order to address the potential repercussions of tariff liberalization, is the integrated development programme for the Caribbean rum sector, which consists of a €70 million project.

188 For 20 years, rum under the Lomé Convention was subject to restricted access to the EU market,[60] free of customs duties by means of quota. In effect, most ACP

[58] See WTO document WT/IFSC/W/15 of 18 June 2006.

[59] See, for instance, the report by the UNDP as trust fund manager of the IF at the meeting of the Integrated Framework Steering Committee held on 12 December 2006. By making a quick calculation of the financial expenditures reported, the UNDP report shows that out of a total trust fund of $30 million after five years of operation, one third (roughly $10 million) of the IFTF fund was allocated for specific projects, but no expenditures were recorded for different matters related to project implementation.

[60] The quota (which was actually never achieved) implied a yearly increase of 27 per cent (37 per cent for the United Kingdom). In 1998, the volume of ACP rum exported to the EU had tripled compared with the level of the early 1980s.

producers remained suppliers of low-priced, low-value commodity rum. On 1 January 1995, imports of ACP light rum were fully liberalized, while traditional heavy rum continued to be subject to tariff quotas increasing on a yearly basis until complete liberalization by 1 January 2000. In 1996, the EU and the United States agreed to liberalize their markets in certain spirituous beverages.

189 In connection with this zero-for-zero agreement, Caribbean countries pointed out that rum is a sugar-based, added-value, agro-industrial product with historical and economic relevance to the Caribbean and had been exported to Europe for over three centuries. The contribution of the sector to the region's economies is significant, as it employs — directly and indirectly — 50,000 people. It was the Caribbean's fourth largest traditional export earner, providing over $260 million a year in foreign exchange, according to the West Indies Rum and Spirits Producers Association (WIRSPA).

190 In response to that concern, the European Council and Commission recognized the likely impact on ACP export of rum to the EU market and confirmed that it would be considered during any future negotiations and arrangements related to the rum sector. In order to address ACP concerns that exporters would be unable to compete in the EC market, a Joint ACP–EU Declaration on rum was agreed on during the post-Lomé negotiations of the Cotonou Agreement. This declaration acknowledges "that rum is a value added agro-industrial ACP product capable, if appropriate efforts are undertaken, of competing in a global economy".

191 The aim of the project was to enhance the competitiveness of the sector by making it export-ready in the segment of branded products. It had three main components:

- Institutional capacity-building for the WIRSPA;
- Plant modernization and meeting environmental needs;
- Implementation of a distribution and marketing strategy.

192 Similar programmes are being implemented for other products, such as sugar and bananas. There is an array of lessons learned from the implementation of those programmes that could be used to devise appropriate country/product pair or regional programmes to address preference erosion.

(iv) Some steps that may be undertaken

193 On the basis of previous paragraphs the following steps may be undertaken: as summarized below.

- The examination of trade flows carried out in this study provides reasonable indications of the magnitude of received/claimed trade preferences, which although relatively limited, may have a decisive poverty impact on countries and social sectors that are exclusively dependent on those exports.
- There should be analysis of, and further evidence should be gathered about, possible market shares losses due to preference erosion, as well as the impact on productivity, unemployment and social costs; this should be done at the country level through ongoing multilateral assistance provided by the EIF and/or the Aid for Trade Initiative.

- In countries where the DTIS is still in progress or being updated, and where preference erosion may be recognized as having potential adverse effects, LDC Governments, donors and IF agencies should exploit the possibilities provided by the EIF and Aid for Trade Initiative to provide adequate responses to preference erosion.

194 In designing the new EIF procedures, the lengthy and complex approval and submission procedures for projects to be financed under Window II should be streamlined as a matter of top priority, so as to generate the desired responses by LDC Governments in mainstreaming trade into development plans.

195 As pointed out at the beginning of this study, the amount of tariff revenue forgone under the existing trade preferences is equivalent to more than $400 million annually for the EU alone (for one year). That is roughly the same amount as may be pledged for the EIF over a period of five years.

196 Projects' delivery under the EIF will have to proceed expeditiously and produce tangible outcomes to compare favourably with the trade adjustments costs that may arise from erosion of trade preferences.

2. Fixing trade preferences: Possible improvements to existing preferential schemes

(i) Extending true market access and reforming rules of origin

197 As documented in recent UNCTAD reports,[61] numerous “holes” still exist in the current preferential programmes — for example, some countries and many products are denied preferential treatment either in principle or in practice. As pointed out in section 1 of this study, the 97 per cent figure for market access commitment contained in the Hong Kong decision on measures in favour of LDCs allows preference-giving countries sufficient flexibility to maintain such holes unaltered.

198 However, the industrialized countries should fill those gaps and extend preferential treatment as soon as possible, and not wait for it to be part of the final Doha Round package. No matter when this is completed, it would also be advisable to make the pledge a legally enforceable obligation. In contrast to the ordinary GSP for developing countries, which in the WTO system is treated as a privilege that may be granted or withdrawn by the donor countries, LDCs' preferential access should be made permanent and binding.

199 Low utilization of preferences due to stringent rules of origin and burdensome documentary evidence is a topic that has featured in the debates of the UNCTAD Special Committee since the late 1970s. However, rather than the stringency of rules of origin being addressed, low utilization has been flagged as an argument for reducing the value of trade preferences and the amount of the adjustment costs arising from their erosion.[62]

[61] See UNCTAD (2003b).

[62] In the case of the EU, current rules of origin are clearly hampering the utilization of available trade preferences under EBA. Rules of origin should allow utilization of fabrics coming from all Asian

200 The GSP rules of origin have remained unchanged since the 1970s, despite the current fragmentation of production and MFN rates being lowered in a series of multilateral rounds. As pointed out in section I, despite all that has been written about the need to liberalize origin requirements, the text of the document issuing from the Hong Kong Ministerial Conference[63] provides inter alia that:

> "Developed members shall, and developing countries members in a position to do so should… (b) ensure that preferential rules of origin applicable to imports from LDCs are simple and transparent, and contribute to facilitating market access."

201 It does not require much legal or WTO experience to realize that such language is tantamount to a best-endeavour commitment that bears no obligation to be made operational. Previous attempts in the 1970s to elaborate a harmonized set of preferential rules of origin for unilateral trade preferences, such as the GSP under the auspices of UNCTAD, failed because the preference-giving OECD countries argued that those preferences were autonomous.

202 After a long time revisiting the issue of rules of origin at the multilateral level may be considered. Canada and most recently the EU have taken action to review their GSP rules of origin.[64] Efforts should be made to bring these individual initiatives at multilateral level to discuss ways and means on how simplify and liberalize rules of origin.

203 The LDC group recently made a structured proposal on rules of origin at the WTO based on an across-the-board percentage criterion that reflects the latest experience gained in this area. This initiative should be taken as a starting point by preference-giving countries to engage in a meaningful debate leading to a set of rules of origin that takes into account the industrial reality of LDCs.

(ii) Redefining objectives of unilateral trade preferences

204 The world map of trade preferences today resembles a pre-1947 situation, where preferences were allocated according to geopolitical interest or political economy considerations. The original multilaterally agreed principles of the GSP have been significantly eroded. Ironically, in an international trading system that is

---

countries, including China. Meanwhile, it is suggested that the value-added calculations should be changed to allow Cambodian, Bangladesh and other small Asian suppliers in the garment industry to utilize high-price fabrics with a view to their entering new niche markets. Recently launched by the European Union Commission too simplify rules of origin may provide the opportunity for such revisions. Until the entry into force of the amendments to the Canadian GSP scheme for LDC countries in January 2003, T&C products were excluded from the Canadian GSP. The new scheme provides for duty-free treatment for all T&C from LDCs and full cumulation among all beneficiaries of the Canadian GSP scheme. This means that textile inputs from China and India can be used. According to preliminary estimates, the trade effects of this new concession have been immediate and impressive, with garment exports to Canada increasing more than sevenfold in the first nine months of 2003. It is to be hoped that the positive steps taken by Canada will inspire the necessary changes and improvements in the United States and the European Union market access conditions for Bangladesh and Cambodian garments.

63 WTO document, WT/MIN(05)/DEC, 22 December 2005.

64 See the Green Paper on the Future of Rules of Origin in Preferential Trade Arrangements, COM(2003)787 final Brussels, 18 December 2003.

increasingly based on multilateral rules and aims at a stronger development orientation, the most concrete achievement of special and preferential treatment, namely unilateral trade preferences, is left to the discretion of preference-giving countries and to the opaque formulation of the enabling clause dating back to 1979.

205 Ideally, the Doha Development Agenda should provide the opportunity for a comprehensive review of the trade preferences granted under the GSP and other unilateral and non-reciprocal trade preferences.

206 Important aspects of the future of trade preferences and of the GSP are yet to be addressed: for example, what is the future of unilateral North–South trade preferences in relation to the issue of erosion and duty- and quota-free treatment for LDCs? What rules should govern South–South trade preferences?

207 The multilateral community should recognize that leaving trade preferences in limbo, arguing that they are not beneficial, is just as unrealistic and counterproductive as advocating their maintenance in spite of multilateral tariff liberalization.

208 Many middle-income and vulnerable countries have been substantially benefiting from trade preferences and are going to be considerably affected by the erosion of trade preferences. Improved preferential market access under an enhanced GSP could still provide significant trading opportunities for those countries. However, the current trend indicates that trade preferences in favour of those countries are likely to be granted under regional initiatives or reciprocal free trade agreements rather than under the umbrella of a multilateral instrument such as the GSP schemes.

209 Ultimately, the ruling of the Appellate Body in the India/EU GSP case opened the way for legally justifiable preferences à la carte. The new EU-GSP scheme for the period 2005–2008[65] actually exploits the present flexibilities in the multilateral trading system to implement special incentives for sustainable development and good governance "*based on an integral concept of sustainable development as recognized by a series of international conventions and instruments*".[66]

210 In principle, it may be argued that flexibility is needed to adapt trade preferences to the evolving realities of the international trading system. This argument may largely justify an approach resulting in additional trade preferences for developing countries and LDCs. The principles and objectives of the GSP may also be revisited to take into account the evolving nature of international trade.

211 The striking fact, however, is the absence of a multilateral debate and multilaterally agreed criteria and rules on how to operate and implement unilateral trade

[65] See Council Regulation 980/2005, 27 June 2004, applying a scheme of generalized tariff preferences, OJ L 169 of 30 June 2005.

[66] Such as the UN Declaration on the Right to Development of 1986, the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development of 1992, the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work of 1998, the UN Millennium Declaration of 2000 and the Johannesburg Declaration on Sustainable Development of 2002. Consequently, developing countries which, owing to a lack of diversification and insufficient integration into the international trading system, are vulnerable while assuming special burdens and responsibilities due to the ratification and effective implementation of core international conventions on human and labour rights, environmental protection and good governance should benefit from additional tariff preferences. See preambles to Council regulation 980/2005.

preferences in the present international trading system. This is even more surprising at a time when the agenda of the international community is focused on development issues.

212 Trade preferences are there to stay for a while in spite of MFN tariff liberalization. They may be controversial, perverse and suboptimal from an economic point of view. However, they are (like antidumping laws) part of the trade landscape. Since multilateral rules govern antidumping to avoid abuses, discretionary practices and "arm-twisting" practices, the same should apply to preferences.

213 From that perspective, there is room for strengthening the multilateral profile of trade preferences and imparting discipline to them so that they can better fulfil their role. The adjustments proposed may lead to a revisited multilateral GSP instrument instead of the plethora of existing trade preferences.

214 In the case of LDCs, some of the shortcomings of the GSP schemes have been addressed, and the attempts to multilateralize the EBA[67] could be a good starting point to bring GSP discussions into the multilateral scenario. However, for many other developing countries benefiting from the normal GSP arrangements, the original GSP limitations remain largely unchanged since the late 1970s.

215 Improvements to the GSP schemes may imply further graduation measures at country and product-country level since it would be hardly justifiable from a preference-giving country point of view to grant improved preferences to the more advanced developing countries.

216 This latter point is a highly controversial subject, if not *taboo*, but the price for not confronting it is unilateral practices by preference-giving countries. Most concerned developing countries should actively engage in opening a debate on these issues.

(iii) Developing countries providing improved market access to LDCs

217 The Hong Kong decision provides that developing countries "*in a position to do so*" should also provide duty- and quota-free treatment to LDCs. Annexes to a WTO secretariat report [68] on market access to LDC listed a number of developing countries as granting trade preferences to LDCs under different trade arrangements such as the GSTP and other regional South–South trade agreements. By their very nature, trade preferences granted under the Global System of Trade Preferences (GSTP) and other South–South regional initiative arrangements are available only to countries members of the GSTP or other South–South agreements. It follows that preferences granted under those initiatives are not of a unilateral nature such as that embedded in the Hong Kong Declaration.

218 In that context, it may be noted that as early as June 1999, WTO members agreed to a waiver[69] to provide an instrument for developing country members to offer preferential tariff treatment to LDCs' products. As it emerged from paragraph 2 of the waiver, trade preferences granted to LDCs by developing countries were designed to be of a non-discriminatory and non-reciprocal nature as in the GSP:

---

[67] See M. Dodini, Duty- and quota-free access to LDCs: The multilateralisation of EBA. EU Commission presentation, IFRI-AFD, 28 October 2005.
[68] WTO document WT/CMTD/LDC/W/35.
[69] WTO document WT/L/304 of 17 June 1999.

219 "Developing country Members wishing to take actions pursuant to the provisions of this Waiver shall notify to the Council on Trade in Goods the list of all products of least-developed countries for which preferential tariff treatment is to be provided on a generalized, non-reciprocal and non-discriminatory basis and the preference margins to be accorded. Subsequent modifications to the preferences shall similarly be notified."

220 However, as of January 2007, this waiver had been utilized only by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

221 It is clear from the annexes of the above-mentioned WTO report that South–South preferences have been implemented under regional initiatives or using the GSTP, rather than a non-discriminatory, non-reciprocal instrument as envisaged in the 1999 waiver. This may be a legitimate choice. However, further efforts may be devised to further improve trade preferences in accordance with the spirit and letter of the 1999 waiver.

II. Summary of main findings

222 This study has examined the issue of preference erosion on a tariff-line basis to identify the countries and product pairs most likely to be affected. It has suggested that although relatively small in absolute terms, the trade volumes affected by erosion may have a significant impact on small-scale industries and agricultural and fishery communities, with poverty implications.

223 Two main lines of action have been identified to address preference erosion:

1. Addressing preference erosion through the EIF and Aid for Trade Initiative

224 This study may help national policymakers and donors begin to consider stategies at the national level on how to utilize those instruments to address the possible adverse effects of preference erosion on specific sectors and/or communities.

225 As outlined in section I.D above, the EIF, expected to be operational in 2007, may provide instruments and initial trade-related technical assistance to address poverty implications arising from preference erosion. The ministry of trade, usually the most informed with regard to the impact of preferential erosion, could use the structure and the bodies created by the EIF, such as the National Steering Committee, to mainstream issues arising from preference erosion into the development plans of the affected LDCs.

2. Extending true market access and reform rules of origin

226 WTO members should provide meaningful and comprehensive trade preferences to LDCs, as well as the reform of existing rules of origin. More advanced developing countries should also be part of this effort. The multilateral legal framework of trade preferences needs to be revisited to impart transparency and stability to trade preferences.

III. References

Alexandraki, K. and Lankes, H.P. (2004). IMF Working Paper. Working Paper No. WP/04/169, International Monetary Fund, Washington, DC.

FAO (2003). *Improving the Value and Effective Utilization of Agricultural Trade Preferences: A Conceptual Framework for Case Studies of the Impact of Trade Preferences on Agricultural Products*. FAO, Rome.

Grynberg, R. and Silva, S. (2004). *Preference-Dependent Economies and Multilateral Liberalization: Impacts and Options*. Commonwealth Secretariat, London.

Hoekman, B. and Prowse, S. (2005). Economic policy responses to preference erosion: From trade as aid to aid for trade. Policy Research Working Paper 3721, World Bank, Washington, DC.

IMF (2004). Fund support for trade-related balance of payments adjustments. Prepared by the Policy Development and Review Department.

Limao, N. and Olarreaga, M. (2005). Trade preferences to small developing countries and the welfare costs of lost multilateral liberalization. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 3565, Washington, DC.

Lippoldt, D. and Kowalski, P. (2005). Trade preference erosion: Potential economic impacts, OECD Trade Policy Paper No. 17. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Paris.

Low, P., Piermartini, R. and Richtering, J. (2005). Multilateral solutions to preference erosion. Paper prepared for the International Symposium on Preference Erosion: Impacts and Policy Responses, 13–14 June 2005, Geneva.

Mavrodidis, P., Horn, H. and Inama, S."What developing countries should be asking in the context of DSU negotiations"Mimeo,2003

Official Journal of the European Union, vol. 47, 30 October 2004.

Onguglo, B. Binding under the WTO of duty-free, quota-free treatment (DFQFT) for LDCs.

Page, S. (2005). A preference erosion compensation fund: A new proposal to protect countries from the negative effects of trade liberalization. Overseas Development Institute, London.

Prowse, S. (2005). Additional support for trade adjustment and integration: A proposal.

UNCTAD (1985). *The history of UNCTAD 1964-1984.* United Nations publication, sales no. 85.II.D.6, New York.

UNCTAD (1998). Ways and means of enhancing the utilization of trade preferences by developing countries, in particular LDCs, as well as further ways of expanding preferences: Report by the UNCTAD secretariat. TD/B/COM.1/20, Geneva.

UNCTAD (2001a). Improving market access for least developed countries. UNCTAD/DITC/TNCD/4.

UNCTAD (2001b). The benefits associated with the least developed country status and the question of graduation. Note to the Economic and Social Council, prepared by the UNCTAD secretariat, E/2001/CRP.5.

UNCTAD (2002a). Least developed country status: Effective benefits and the perspective of graduation. TD/B/49/7.

UNCTAD (2002b). *The Least Developed Countries Report 2000.* United Nations publication, sales no. E.00.II.D.21, Geneva and New York.

UNCTAD (2003a). The African Growth and Opportunity Act: A preliminary assessment. UNCTAD/ ITCD/TSB/2003/1, New York and Geneva.

UNCTAD (2003b). Trade preferences for LDCs: An early assessment of benefits and possible improvements. UNCTAD/ITCD/TSB/2003/8, Geneva.

UNCTAD (2003c). Turning losses into gains: SIDS and multilateral trade liberalization in agriculture. UNCTAD/DITC/TNCD/2003/1, New York and Geneva.

UNCTAD and the Commonwealth Secretariat (2001). Duty- and quota-free market access for LDCs: An analysis of Quad initiatives. London and Geneva.

Van der Mensbrugghe, D. (2005). The Doha Development Agenda and preference erosion: Modeling the impacts. Paper prepared for the International Symposium on Preference Erosion: Impacts and Policy Responses, 13–14 June 2005, Geneva.

World Trade Organization (2001). Market access conditions for least developed countries, Note by the Secretariat: Revision, WT/LDC/SWG/IF/14/Rev.1, 20 April; and Explanatory Notes: Addendum, WT/LDC/SWG/IF/14/Rev.1/Add.1, 25 April.

World Trade Organization (2002). Market access: Unfinished business. Post-Uruguay Round inventory and issues. WTO Special Study, Geneva.

World Trade Organization (2003a). Communication from the international monetary fund. WT/TF/COH/14.

World Trade Organization (2003b). WTO negotiations on agriculture — Poverty reduction: Sectoral initiative in favour of cotton. Joint proposal by Benin, Burkina Faso, Chad and Mali. TN/AG/GEN/6.

World Trade Organization (2004a). Market access issues related to products of export interest originating from least-developed countries. WT/COMTD/LDC/W/35/TN/MA/S/12.

World Trade Organization (2004b). Market access issues related to products of export interest originating from least-developed countries. WT/COMTD/LDC/W/35/TN/MA/S/11.

World Trade Organization (2005). Market access for non-agricultural products: Treatment of non-reciprocal preferences for Africa. TN/MA/W/49.

Zampetti, A.B. and Fredriksson, T. (2003). The development dimension of investment negotiations in the WTO: Challenges and opportunities. *Journal of World Investment*, 4 (3): 2003.

Annex

ISO 3Code Abbreviations

Afghanistan	AFG
Albania	ALB
Algeria	DZA
Angola	AGO
Antigua and Barbuda	ATG
Argentina	ARG
Armenia	ARM
Australia	AUS
Austria	AUT
Azerbaijan	AZE
Bahamas	BHS
Bahrain	BHR
Bangladesh	BGD
Barbados	BRB
Belarus	BLR
Belgium	BEL
Belize	BLZ
Benin	BEN
Bhutan	BTN
Bolivia	BOL
Bosnia and Herzegovina	BIH
Botswana	BWA
Brazil	BRA
Bulgaria	BGR
Burkina Faso	BFA
Burundi	BDI
Cambodia	KHM
Cameroon	CMR
Canada	CAN
Cape Verde	CPV
Central African Republic	CAF
Chad	TCD
Chile	CHL
China	CHN
Colombia	COL
Comoros	COM
Congo	COG
Cook Islands	COK
Costa Rica	CRI
Croatia	HRV
Cuba	CUB
Cyprus	CYP
Czech Republic	CZE
Côte d'Ivoire	CIV
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	PRK
Democratic Republic of the Congo	COD
Denmark	DNK
Djibouti	DJI
Dominica	DMA
Dominican Republic	DOM
Ecuador	ECU
Egypt	EGY
El Salvador	SLV
Equatorial Guinea	GNQ
Eritrea	ERI
Estonia	EST
Ethiopia	ETH
Fiji	FJI
Finland	FIN

France	FRA
Gabon	GAB
Gambia	GMB
Georgia	GEO
Germany	DEU
Ghana	GHA
Greece	GRC
Grenada	GRD
Guatemala	GTM
Guinea	GIN
Guinea-Bissau	GNB
Guyana	GUY
Haiti	HTI
Honduras	HND
Hungary	HUN
Iceland	ISL
India	IND
Indonesia	IDN
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	IRN
Iraq	IRQ
Ireland	IRL
Israel	ISR
Italy	ITA
Jamaica	JAM
Japan	JPN
Jordan	JOR
Kazakhstan	KAZ
Kenya	KEN
Kiribati	KIR
Kuwait	KWT
Kyrgyzstan	KGZ
Lao People's Democratic Republic	LAO
Latvia	LVA
Lebanon	LBN
Lesotho	LSO
Liberia	LBR
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	LBY
Lithuania	LTU
Luxembourg	LUX
Madagascar	MDG
Malawi	MWI
Malaysia	MYS
Maldives	MDV
Mali	MLI
Malta	MLT
Marshall Islands	MHL
Mauritania	MRT
Mauritius	MUS
Mexico	MEX
Micronesia (Federated States of)	FSM
Monaco	MCO
Mongolia	MNG
Morocco	MAR
Mozambique	MOZ
Myanmar	MMR
Namibia	NAM
Nauru	NRU
Nepal	NPL
Netherlands	NLD
New Zealand	NZL
Nicaragua	NIC

Niger	NER
Nigeria	NGA
Niue	NIU
Norway	NOR
Oman	OMN
Pakistan	PAK
Palau	PLW
Panama	PAN
Papua New Guinea	PNG
Paraguay	PRY
Peru	PER
Philippines	PHL
Poland	POL
Portugal	PRT
Qatar	QAT
Republic of Korea	KOR
Republic of Moldova	MDA
Republic of Serbia	SRB
Romania	ROM
Russian Federation	RUS
Rwanda	RWA
Saint Kitts and Nevis	KNA
Saint Lucia	LCA
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	VCT
Samoa	WSM
San Marino	SMR
Sao Tome and Principe	STP
Saudi Arabia	SAU
Senegal	SEN
Serbia and Montenegro	YUG
Seychelles	SYC
Sierra Leone	SLE
Slovakia	SVK
Slovenia	SVN
Solomon Islands	SLB
Somalia	SOM
South Africa	ZAF
Spain	ESP
Sri Lanka	LKA
Sudan	SDN
Suriname	SUR
Swaziland	SWZ
Sweden	SWE
Switzerland	CHE
Syrian Arab Republic	SYR
Tajikistan	TJK
Thailand	THA
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	MKD
Timor-Leste	TMP
Togo	TGO
Tonga	TON
Trinidad and Tobago	TTO
Tunisia	TUN
Turkey	TUR
Turkmenistan	TKM
Tuvalu	TUV
Uganda	UGA
Ukraine	UKR
United Arab Emirates	ARE
United Kingdom	GBR
United Republic of Tanzania	TZA
United States of America	USA

Uruguay	URY
Uzbekistan	UZB
Vanuatu	VUT
Venezuela	VEN
Viet Nam	VNM
Yemen	YEM
Zambia	ZMB
Zimbabwe	ZWE

Table 1
Imports of least developed ACP countries into the European Union under the Lomé/Cotonou Partnership Agreement (1998–2002)

Year	Total imports	Dutiable imports	ACP imports		Percentages		
			Covered	Receiving	Coverage	Utilization	Utility
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(4)/(3)	(5)/(4)	(5)/(3)
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
1998	5 619.4	2 154.0	2 153.1	1 467.4	99.9	68.1	68.1
1999	5 676.1	1 943.8	1 932.5	1 578.7	99.4	81.6	81.2
2000	7 572.5	1 719.5	1 710.2	1 226.5	99.4	71.7	71.3
2001	8 060.7	2 063.5	2 059.8	1 570.4	99.8	76.2	76.1
2002	8 440.7	2 237.1	2 162.6	1 768.0	96.6	81.7	79.0
2003	8 112.9	2 206.4	2 096.8	1 563.6	95.0	74.6	70.9
2004	9 166.4	2 721.5	2 498.0	1 766.6	91.8	70.7	64.9

Source: UNCTAD secretariat calculations.

Table 2
Imports from effective LDC beneficiaries under the GSP scheme of the EU*
(1994–2005, *in US million***)**

Year	Total imports	Dutiable imports	GSP imports		Percentages		
			Covered	Receiving	Coverage	Utilization	Utility
					(5)/(4)	(6)/(5)	(6)/(4)
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
1994	2 471.2	1 823.4	1 791.7	748.1	98.3	41.8	41.0
1995	2 814.6	2 277.8	2 246.3	1 077.6	98.6	48.0	47.3
1996	3 219.0	2 580.3	2 520.1	1 196.8	97.7	47.5	46.4
1997	3 614.8	2 926.3	2 888.8	770.8	98.7	26.7	26.3
1998	3 519.4	2 932.1	2 908.0	761.8	99.2	26.2	26.0
1999	3 562.2	3 100.9	3 075.2	1 035.0	99.2	33.7	33.4
2000	4 247.1	3 671.7	3 633.6	1 499.5	99.0	41.3	40.8
2001	4 372.4	3 958.1	3 935.7	1 847.4	99.4	46.9	46.7
2002	4 408.8	3 982.4	3 982.5	2 271.2	100.0	57.0	57.0
2003	5 334.3	5 156.1	4 798.9	2 840.6	93.1	59.2	55.1
2004	6 971.0	6 720.0	6 257.5	3 849.3	93.1	61.5	57.3
2005	6 664.2	6 340.3	6 067.6	4 065.4	95.7	67.0	64.1

Source: Notifications and UNCTAD secretariat calculations.
* Figures for 1994 and 1995 exclude Austria, Finland and Sweden.

Table 3[70]
Tariff Treatment of United States Imports from LDCs, 2003
Top 50 HTS 4-Digit Items, Imports for Consumption, Customs Value, Thousands of US Dollars

					Tariffs forgone	
HTS item and product description	**2003 Imports from LDCs**	**LDC Tariff paid**	**LDC tariff rate**	**MFN tariff rate**	**Existing prefe-rences**	**Potential preferences**
Products that enjoy margins of preference	***8 884 208***	***430 921***	***4.85***	***6.45***	***142 504***	***573 425***
2709: Petroleum oils & oils from bituminous minerals, crude	4 882 919	259	0.01	0.28	13 413	13 672
6204: Women's or girls' suits, dresses, skirts, etc. not knit	817 437	104 862	12.83	15.22	19 552	124 414
6110: Sweaters, pullovers, & similar articles, knit or crocheted	781 332	105 864	13.55	18.21	36 417	142 281
24 Other 4-digit items	2 402 520	219 936	9.15	12.20	73 122	293 058
Products that do not enjoy preferential treatment in practice	***969 735***	***152 604***	***15.74***	***15.74***	***0***	***152 604***
6205: Men's or boys' shirts, not knit or crocheted	329 837	67 170	20.36	20.36	0	67 170
6206: Women's or girls' blouses, shirts, not knit or crocheted	194 204	33 394	17.20	17.20	0	33 394
6211: Track suits, ski-suits & swimwear, not knit or crocheted	110 063	18 912	17.18	17.18	0	18 912
8 Other 4-digit items	335 631	33 128	9.87	9.87	0	33 128
Products that are duty-free on an mfn basis	***681 897***	***0***	***0.00***	***0.00***	***0***	***0***
0905: Vanilla beans	202 245	0	0.00	0.00	0	0
0306: Crustaceans, live, fresh, chilled, frozen etc.	99 477	0	0.00	0.00	0	0
7102: Diamonds, whether or not worked, but not mounted or set	66 773	0	0.00	0.00	0	0
9 Other 4-digit items	313 402	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal:	10 535 839	583 525	5.54	6.89	142 504	726 029
All Other:	229 721	3 825	1.67			
Total	**10 765 560**	**587 350**	**5.46**			

Products that enjoy margins of preference = products for which there is any difference between the "LDC tariff rate" and the "MFN tariff rate."
Products that do not enjoy preferential treatment in practice = products that are subject to duty on an MFN basis, and may be eligible for preferential treatment when imported from some LDCs, but for which in actual practice the observed payment of tariffs by LDCs ("LDC tariff rate") is at or above the "MFN tariff rate."
LDC tariff paid = the value of tariffs paid on imports from LDCs.
LDC tariff rate = the average tariff imposed on imports from LDCs (i.e., "LDC tariff paid" divided by "2003 imports from LDCs" and expressed as a percentage).
MFN tariff rate = the average tariff for U.S. imports in that 4-digit category during 2003 for products that entered on an MFN basis. Note that in some cases the calculated percentage for the MFN tariff rate was higher than the calculated "LDC tariff rate," due to different compositions of imports among the 8-digit items that fall within a 4-digit category. In those cases the value in the "MFN tariff rate" column was replaced with the value in the "LDC

[70] These calculations have been carried by Van Grasstek.

tariff rate" column, based on the conclusion that all of the imports from LDCs must have been entering on an MFN basis.

Current Savings = the value of tariffs that are not being paid by LDCs under the status quo. This is the difference between the "LDC tariff paid" and the tariff that would be paid if the imports paid the "MFN tariff rate" (i.e., "2003 imports from LDCs" multiplied by the "MFN tariff rate"). Potential savings = the value of tariffs that would not be paid by LDCs if all products imported from LDCs received duty-free treatment. This is the inverse of the value of the tariffs that would be paid if the imports were subject to the "MFN tariff rate" (i.e., "2003 imports from LDCs" multiplied by the "MFN tariff rate").

Note that product descriptions are abbreviated here for purposes of clarity.

Table 4
Imports of the United States from LDC effective beneficiaries of its GSP schemes, excluding oil (1994-2004) (*in US million*)

Country	Year	Total imports	Dutiable imports	GSP imports		Percentages		
				Covered	Received	(5)/(4)	(6)/(5)	(6)/(4)
	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7.0)	(8.0)	(9.0)
United States	1994	1 583.1	1 226.2	68.1	50.4	5.6	74.0	4.1
	1995	1 713.7	1 400.5	69.7	49.4	5.0	70.9	3.5
	1996	2 495.7	1 496.1	69.7	48.3	4.7	69.3	3.2
	1997	2 686.4	1 881.9	168.8	91.5	9.0	54.2	4.9
	1998	2 725.3	2 078.3	113.6	89.4	5.5	78.7	4.3
	1999	3 417.8	2 813.9	124.4	99.3	4.4	79.8	3.5
	2000	4 191.8	3 644.0	134.6	98.9	3.7	73.5	2.7
	2001	4 376.8	3 916.1	161.0	132.2	4.1	82.1	3.4
	2002	4 607.2	4 069.0	188.1	128.7	4.6	68.5	3.2
	2003	5 155.1	4 471.2	230.0	187.7	5.1	81.6	4.2
	2004	5 876.5	4 947.2	208.7	173.7	4.2	83.2	3.5

Table 4A
Imports from effective LDC beneficiaries under the GSP scheme of Japan*
(1994-2001) (*in US million*)

Year	Total imports	Dutiable imports	GSP imports		Percentages		
			Covered	Received	Coverage	Utilization	Utility
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(5)/(4)	(6)/(5)	(6)/(4)
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
1994	1 120.5	695.5	211.2	200.5	30.4	94.9	28.8
1995	1 309.8	912.7	241.9	230.1	26.5	95.1	25.2
1996	1 504.3	939.8	388.9	269.9	41.4	69.4	28.7
1997	1 204.9	757.3	306.3	222.1	40.4	72.5	29.3
1998	1 045.4	643.8	260.9	189.9	40.5	72.8	29.5
1999	989.0	679.6	286.4	231.9	42.1	81.0	34.1
2000	1 236.5	881.3	308.7	236.0	35.0	76.4	26.8
2001	1 001.3	754.9	398.1	228.4	52.7	57.4	30.3

Source: Notifications and UNCTAD secretariat calculations. For years 1999, 2000 and 2001, UNCTAD estimates based on notification from Japan.
* Fiscal years.

Table 5
Total received preferences under the EU-ACP and EBA, Japan, US-GSP for LDCs and AGOA (2004)

Reporter	Year	Agri Products	Non-Agri Products	All Products
GSP/ACP received imports of ALL LDCs	2004	439'444	5'153'191	5'592'635
EU TOTAL		439'444	5'153'191	5'592'635
GSP received imorts of ALL LDCs	2004	6'685	141'759	148'444
JAPAN TOTAL		6'685	141'759	148'444
AGOA received imports of LDCs/AGOA	2004	11'116	2'435'070	2'446'186
GSP received imports of LDCs/AGOA	2004	40'178	3'400'781	3'440'959
GSP received imports of LDCs excl. AGOA	2004	2'794	1'058'670	1'061'464
USA TOTAL		54'088	6'894'521	6'948'609
USA TOTAL excl. Petroleum		54'088	963'556	1'017'644
GRAND TOTAL		500'217	12'189'471	12'689'688

Table 5A
Total received preferences under the EU-ACP and EBA, Japan, US-GSP for LDCs and AGOA (2001/2002)

COUNTRY	TOTAL RECEIVED IMPORTS	YEAR	AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS	NON-AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS	ALL
EU	ACP received imports of LDCs/ACP members	2002	390 695	1 341 706	1 732 401
	GSP received imports of ALL LDCs	2002	48 113	2 172 151	2 220 264
	EU TOTAL		**438 808**	**3 513 857**	**3 952 665**
JAPAN	GSP received imorts of ALL LDCs	2001	3 891	224 504	228 395
	JAPAN TOTAL		**3 891**	**224 504**	**228 395**
US	AGOA received imports of LDCs/AGOA	2001	7 690	237 466	245 156
	GSP received imports of LDCs excl. AGOA	2001	2 146	3 035 389	3 037 535
	US TOTAL		**9 836**	**3 272 855**	**3 282 691**
	GRAND TOTAL				**7 463 751**

Table 6
Current preferential treatment in QUAD countries for SIDS

SIDS countries	US-GSP-LDC	AGOA	CBI	Canada LDC	Canada GPT	Canada Commonwealth
Antigua and Barbuda			X		X	X
Bahamas			X		X	X
Barbados			X		X	X
Cape Verde	X	X		X	X	
Comoros	X			X	X	
Dominica			X		X	X
Fiji					X	
Grenada			X		X	X
Jamaica			X		X	X
Kiribati	X			X	X	
Maldives				X	X	
Marshall Islands					X	
Micronesia (Fed. States of)						
Mauritius		X			X	
Nauru					X	
Palau						
Papua New Guinea					X	
Samoa	X			Western	X	
Sao Tome and Principe	X	X		X	X	
Seychelles		X			X	
Solomon Islands				X	X	
Saint Kitts and Nevis			X		X	X
Saint Lucia			X		X	X
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines			X		X	X
Timor-Leste						
Tonga					X	
Trinidad and Tobago			X		X	X
Tuvalu	X			X	X	
Vanuatu	X			X	X	

Table 7
Current preferential treatment in QUAD countries for products originating in the landlocked developing countries (LLDCs)

No.	LLDCs by region	European Union		United States		Canada	Japan	GSTP
		GSP/EBA	Cotonou Partnership Agreement	GSP	AGOA			
	LLDCs in Americas							
1	Bolivia			X		X	X	X
2	Paraguay			X		X	X	
	LLDCs in Africa							
3	Botswana		X	X	X	X	X	
4	Burkina Faso*	X	X	X		X	X	
5	Burundi*	X	X	X		X	X	
6	Central African Republic*	X	X	X	X	X	X	
7	Chad*	X	X	X	X	X	X	
8	Ethiopia*	X	X	X	X	X	X	
9	Lesotho*	X	X	X	X	X	X	
10	Malawi*	X	X	X	X	X	X	
11	Mali*	X	X	X	X	X	X	
12	Niger*	X	X	X	X	X	X	
13	Rwanda*	X	X	X	X	X	X	
14	Swaziland		X	X	X	X	X	
15	Uganda*	X	X	X	X	X	X	
16	Zambia*	X	X	X	X	X	X	
17	Zimbabwe		X	X		X	X	X
	LLDCs in Asia							
18	Afghanistan*	X				X	X	
19	Bhutan*	X		X		X	X	
20	Lao People's Democratic Republic*	X				X	X	
21	Mongolia			X			X	
22	Nepal*	X		X		X	X	
	LLDCs in S-E Europe and CIS							
23	Armenia			X		X	X	
24	Azerbaijan					X	X	
25	Kazakhstan			X		X	X	
26	Kyrgyzstan			X		X	X	
27	FYR Macedonia			X			X	
28	Moldova			X		X	X	
29	Tajikistan					X	X	
30	Turkmenistan					X	X	
31	Uzbekistan			X		X	X	

Note: * LDC landlocked developing countries.

Table 8
EU Major agricultural products & their principal LDC suppliers, ranked by descending value of ACP received imports (2004)

Product code (hs)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group)									
											1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	ACP (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports ACP-covered	Imports ACP-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
06031010	Fresh cut flowers & buds	[71]	0.0	54 496	54 496	54 495	52 047	12.3	24.8	9	UGA	47.0	ZMB	28.7	ETH	11.7	TZA	10.6	BDI	0.7
09050000	Vanilla	6.0	0.0	43 633	43 633	43 633	40 418	9.6	34.4	6	MDG	86.7	COM	10.6	UGA	2.7	AGO	0.0	VUT	0.0
24012020	Tobacco - light air-cured	18.4 MIN 22 € MAX 24 €/ 100 kg/net	0.0	37 905	37 905	37 905	37 021	8.8	43.2	4	MWI	82.2	UGA	9.7	MOZ	7.8	ZMB	0.4		
15081090	Crude ground-nut oil -- Other	6.4	0.0	37 664	37 664	37 664	34 372	8.1	51.3	3	SEN	68.0	GMB	22.9	SDN	9.1				
24012080	Tobacco - flue-cured tobacco	11,2 MIN 22 € MAX 56 €/ 100 kg/net	0.0	42 874	42 874	42 874	30 137	7.1	58.5	5	TZA	51.0	MWI	30.4	ZMB	10.9	UGA	6.9	ZAR	0.8
24012010	Tobacco - flue-cured Virginia type	18.4 MIN 22 € MAX 24 €/ 100 kg/net	0.0	26 040	26 040	26 040	25 475	6.0	64.5	6	TZA	39.7	UGA	24.2	MWI	21.6	ZMB	7.1	ZAR	6.9
07082000	Beans - fresh or chilled	10.4	0.0	32 887	32 887	32 616	25 387	6.0	70.5	12	SEN	41.4	ETH	19.6	ZMB	13.2	TZA	12.9	BFA	6.5
06021090	Unrooted cuttings & slips	4.0	0.0	17 386	17 386	17 386	15 247	3.6	74.1	7	UGA	60.9	TZA	33.7	TGO	5.3	BDI	0.0	MDG	0.0
07099090	Other vegetables	12.8	0.0	11 141	11 141	11 141	10 001	2.4	76.5	18	UGA	39.6	ZMB	17.3	TGO	15.0	TZA	13.4	ZAR	5.9
07081000	Peas - fresh or chilled	8.0	.	9 065	9 065	9 065	9 009	2.1	78.6	7	ZMB	77.6	TZA	19.0	MDG	2.9	GMB	0.2	SEN	0.2
24011041	Tobacco	18.4 MIN 22 € MAX 24 €/ 100 kg/net	0.0	8 689	8 689	8 688	7 853	1.9	80.5	4	MOZ	31.7	TZA	30.5	UGA	26.8	MWI	11.0		
24012090	Tobacco	18.4 MIN 22 € MAX 24 €/ 100 kg/net	0.0	7 266	7 266	7 266	7 079	1.7	82.2	7	MWI	76.3	ZAR	14.4	UGA	7.0	MOZ	1.5	TZA	0.4

[71] From 1 Jan - 31 May: 8.5; from 1 June - 31 Oct: 12; and from 1 Nov - 31 Dec: 8.5

Table 8A
EU Major agricultural products & their principal LDC suppliers, ranked by descending value of ACP received imports (2002)

Product code (hs)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group)									
											1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	ACP (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports ACP-covered	Imports ACP-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
24012020	Tobacco - light air-cured	18.4 MIN 22 € MAX 24 €/ 100 kg/net	0.0	69 713	69 713	69 713	68 303	17.5	17.5	4	MWI	84.7	UGA	7.9	MOZ	7.4	ZMB	0.0		
15081090	Crude ground-nut oil – Other	6.4	0.0	74 462	74 462	74 462	67 254	17.2	34.7	5	SEN	78.9	GMB	13.4	SDN	7.6	TGO	0.0	GIN	0.0
09050000	Vanilla	6.0	0.0	72 739	72 739	72 739	60 400	15.5	50.2	4	MDG	83.8	COM	13.2	UGA	2.8	GIN	0.1		
24012010	Tobacco, partly or wholly stemmed/stripped -- Flue-cured Virginia type	18.4 MIN 22 € MAX 24 €/ 100 kg/net	0.0	39 254	39 254	39 254	38 232	9.8	59.9	4	TZA	52.3	UGA	23.6	MWI	23.0	ZMB	1.1		
17011110	Raw cane sugar, in solid form -- For refining	33,9 €/ 100 kg/net	0.0*	60 424	60 424	60 424	30 431	7.8	67.7	7	ZMB	21.8	TZA	17.5	MWI	17.2	SDN	13.2	MOZ	12.9
24012050	Tobacco, partly or wholly stemmed/stripped -- whether or not cut in regular size, having a custom value of not less than	11.2 MIN 22 € MAX 56 €/ 100 kg/net	0.0	37 212	37 212	37 212	21 553	5.5	73.2	5	MWI	72.4	MOZ	15.1	UGA	9.4	ZMB	3.0	TZA	0.0
07082000	Beans, fresh or chilled	[72]	0.0	22 655	22 655	22 655	16 101	4.1	77.4	12	SEN	48.5	ETH	15.0	BFA	12.5	ZMB	11.3	GMB	5.4
07099090	Other vegetables, fresh or chilled, nes -- Pumpkins and courges	12.8	0.0	14 421	14 421	14 421	13 633	3.5	80.9	22	ZMB	50.4	UGA	22.5	TZA	8.6	TGO	7.8	SEN	3.2

72 From 1 Jan to 30 June: 10.4 MIN 1.6€/100 kg/net; From 1 Jul to 30 Sept: 13.6 MIN 1.6 € /100/ kg/net; From 1 Oct to 31 Dec : 10.4 MIN 1.6 €/100 kg/net

Table 9
Major non-agricultural products & their principal suppliers, ranked by descending value of ACP received imports (2004)

Product code (hs)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group)									
											1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	ACP (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports ACP-covered	Imports ACP-received				ISO3 code	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
76011000	Aluminium unwrought	6.0	0.0	858 731	858 731	858 731	394 082	26.6	26.6	2	MOZ	100.0	RWA	0.0						
03061350	Frozen shrimps & prawns	12.0	0.0	203 207	203 207	203 207	193 200	13.0	39.6	8	MDG	65.0	MOZ	20.1	SEN	6.7	GIN	3.8	TZA	2.6
03041019	Fish fillets (eels) - fresh or chilled	9.0	0.0	187 115	187 115	183 579	124 161	8.4	47.9	6	TZA	57.0	UGA	43.0	GIN	0.0	MLI	0.0	MDG	0.0
03075910	Octopus - frozen	8.0	0.0	89 554	89 554	89 554	86 542	5.8	53.8	9	SEN	48.1	MRT	39.4	TZA	8.3	MDG	2.2	GNB	1.1
03026999	Fish (sturgeon) - fresh or chilled	10.0	0.0	77 001	77 001	77 001	74 554	5.0	58.8	10	SEN	59.1	MRT	29.1	GIN	8.8	MDG	1.4	MOZ	1.0
16041418	Tuna - preserved	24.0	0.0	61 159	61 159	61 159	57 051	3.8	62.6	2	MDG	67.2	SEN	32.8						
76012091	Aluminium unwrought	6.0	0.0	52 057	52 057	52 057	51 989	3.5	66.1	4	MOZ	99.6	CAF	0.3	ERI	0.1	SLE	0.1		
29051100	Methanol (methyl alcohol)	6.3	0.0	47 129	47 129	47 129	44 510	3.0	69.1	1	GNQ	100.0								
03074918	Cuttle fish & squid	8.0	0.0	36 591	36 591	36 591	35 729	2.4	71.5	7	SEN	54.1	MRT	34.0	GNB	5.0	GIN	3.6	GMB	1.6
03061380	Frozen shrimps & prawns	12.0	0.0	34 811	34 811	34 811	30 535	2.1	73.6	9	MOZ	62.9	SEN	21.3	GIN	8.3	MDG	2.3	MRT	2.2
03042094	Other	15.0	0.0	23 941	23 941	23 941	22 374	1.5	75.1	7	SEN	72.9	TZA	12.1	MRT	10.9	GMB	2.3	UGA	1.2
03042019	Fish fillets (eels) - frozen	9.0	0.0	23 826	23 826	23 826	20 958	1.4	76.5	3	TZA	75.1	UGA	24.4	SEN	0.5				
03041038	Fish fillets (haddock) - fresh	18.0	0.0	19 964	19 964	19 964	19 938	1.3	77.9	9	SEN	82.2	MRT	9.4	TZA	5.0	UGA	2.4	MDG	0.5
03061340	Shrimps & prawns - frozen	12.0	0.0	14 778	14 778	14 778	14 755	1.0	78.9	2	SEN	75.2	MRT	24.8						

Table 9A
Major non-agricultural products & their principal suppliers, ranked by descending value of ACP received imports (2002)

Product code (HS)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of supp-liers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group)									
											1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	ACP (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports ACP-covered	Imports ACP-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
76011000	Aluminium unwrought, not alloyed	6.0	0.0	404 792	404 792	404 792	397 820	28.9	28.9	1	MOZ	100.0								
03061350	Frozen shrimps & prawns	12.0	0.0	191 272	191 272	191 272	181 524	13.2	42.1	12	MDG	55.3	MOZ	24.4	SEN	7.2	TZA	4.2	GIN	2.7
03041019	Fresh or chilled fish fillets - eels	9.0	0.0	142 333	142 333	142 333	103 493	7.5	49.6	7	TZA	64.6	UGA	35.3	SOM	0.0	MWI	0.0	SEN	0.0
03075910	Octopus (excl. live, fresh or chilled) - frozen	8.0	0.0	94 977	94 977	94 977	90 638	6.6	56.2	10	SEN	53.3	MRT	39.3	TZA	3.2	AGO	1.5	MDG	1.2
03026999		15.0	0.0	59 944	59 944	59 944	59 091	4.3	60.4	13	SEN	63.6	MRT	25.7	GIN	7.8	MOZ	1.7	MDG	0.7
16041418	Prepared or preserved tuna, skipjack and Atlantic bonito - preserved	24.0	0.0	44 269	44 269	44 269	38 656	2.8	63.3	3	MDG	62.1	SEN	37.7	MRT	0.2				
03061380	Frozen shrimps & prawns -- other	12.0	0.0	38 728	38 728	38 728	37 417	2.7	66.0	13	MOZ	33.1	AGO	31.1	SEN	19.7	MDG	5.4	GIN	3.1
03074918	Cuttle fish and squid (excl. live, fresh or chilled) – other	8.0	0.0	30 618	30 618	30 618	28 799	2.1	68.1	9	SEN	44.8	MRT	36.8	AGO	7.0	GIN	5.8	GNB	3.9
03042095	Frozen fish fillets -- halibut	15.0	0.0	33 479	33 479	33 479	26 857	1.9	70.0	9	SEN	71.3	TZA	11.1	MRT	8.1	UGA	4.8	GMB	4.0
28182000	Aluminium oxide (excl. artificial corundum)	4.0	0.0	28 230	28 230	28 230	24 113	1.8	71.8	3	GIN	100.0	ZAR	0.0	MDG	0.0				
03037998		15.0	0.0	18 788	18 788	18 788	18 004	1.3	73.1	12	MRT	37.2	SEN	24.3	AGO	13.6	GIN	10.2	GNB	5.7
03041038	Fresh or chilled fish fillets - haddock	18.0	0.0	16 856	16 856	16 856	16 729	1.2	74.3	11	SEN	77.6	TZA	11.6	MRT	7.1	UGA	2.5	ERI	1.0
03061340	Frozen shrimps & prawns -- deepwater rose shrimps	12.0	0.0	16 648	16 648	16 648	16 645	1.2	75.5	5	SEN	46.9	AGO	45.3	MRT	6.0	GIN	1.3	TGO	0.4
03042019	Frozen fish fillets -- eels	9.0	0.0	22 653	22 653	22 653	13 653	1.0	76.5	2	TZA	68.9	UGA	31.1						
16041411	Prepared or preserved tuna, skipjack and Atlantic bonito - preserved	24.0	0.0	11 991	11 991	11 991	10 463	0.8	77.2	3	MDG	63.5	SEN	36.4	MRT	0.1				

Table 10
Major agricultural products & their principal suppliers, ranked by descending value of GSP received imports (2004)

Product code (hs)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group)									
											1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	LDC (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports GSP-covered	Imports GSP-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
07099090	Other vegetables - fresh or chilled	12.8	0.0	11 257	11 257	11 257	11 227	59.8	59.8	2	BGD	99.9	YEM	0.1						
07032000	Garlic - fresh or chilled	9.6 + 120 €/ 100 kg/net		1 448	1 448	1 393	1 266	6.7	66.6	2	KHM	96.2	MMR	3.8						
07108095	Vegetables - frozen	14.4	0.0	968	968	968	954	5.1	71.6	3	KHM	60.3	BGD	34.2	YEM	5.5				
07102900	Leguminous vegetables (shelled or unshelled) - frozen	14.4	0.0	802	802	802	802	4.3	75.9	1	BGD	100.0								
08062098	Dried grapes	Entry prices[73]	0.0	712	712	712	676	3.6	79.5	1	AFG	100.0								
20059080	Vegetables preserved (other than by vinegar) - not frozen	17.6	0.0	519	519	518	460	2.5	82.0	1	LAO	100.0								
19012000	Mixes & doughs for preparation of bakers' wares	7,6 +EA	-1.0	452	452	452	452	2.4	84.4	1	BGD	100.0								

[73] See EU Regulation 2658/87 last amended by 1549/06 of 31/10/2006 OJ L 301.

Table 10A
EU Major agricultural products & their principal suppliers, ranked by descending value of GSP received imports (2002)

Product code (hs)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group)									
											1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	LDC (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports GSP-covered	Imports GSP-received				ISO3 code	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
07099090	Other vegetables (fresh or chilled) - pumpkins & courges	12.8	0.0	7 063	7 063	7 072	7 030	59.2	59.2	2	BGD	99.7	YEM	0.3						
07032000	Garlic - fresh or chilled	9.6 + 120 €/ 100 kg/net	0.0	1 676	1 676	1 673	1 648	13.9	73.1	2	YEM	95.6	BGD	4.4						
10063098	Semi-milled or wholly milled rice	416 €/t	0.0[74]	1 410	1 410	1 410	1 097	9.2	82.3	2	KHM	99.5	LAO	0.5						

[74] Within the EBA preferential quota see above page 35.

Table 11
Major non-agricultural products & their principal suppliers, ranked by descending value of GSP received imports (2004)

Product code (hs)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group) 1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	LDC (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports GSP-covered	Imports GSP-received				Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
61091000	T-shirts - cotton	12	0.0	1 108 446	1 108 446	1 086 335	907 350	24.6	24.6	6	BGD	92.6	KHM	4.2	MMR	2.0	LAO	1.1	NPL	0.1
61103099	Women's or girls' jerseys - man-made fibres	12.2	0.0	884 618	884 618	819 449	640 067	17.3	41.9	6	BGD	68.3	KHM	22.9	MMR	7.4	LAO	1.4	NPL	0.0
61102099	Women's or girls' jerseys - cotton	12	0.0	382 005	382 005	355 073	280 895	7.6	49.5	6	BGD	68.6	KHM	23.0	MMR	7.1	LAO	1.1	NPL	0.2
61103091	Men's or boys' jerseys - man-made fibres	12	0.0	205 804	205 804	192 579	150 846	4.1	53.6	6	BGD	78.4	KHM	8.6	LAO	6.6	MMR	6.4	NPL	0.0
62034235	Men's or boys' trousers - cotton	12	0.0	382 153	382 153	357 713	143 961	3.9	57.5	6	BGD	83.4	KHM	6.5	MMR	6.4	LAO	3.3	NPL	0.4
61051000	Men's or boys' shirts - cotton	12	0.0	139 076	139 076	134 937	115 728	3.1	60.7	6	BGD	89.6	KHM	4.5	MMR	3.0	LAO	2.8	NPL	0.1
61102091	Men's or boys' jerseys - cotton	12	0.0	158 128	158 128	145 186	107 665	2.9	63.6	8	BGD	81.8	KHM	8.5	MMR	8.2	LAO	1.2	NPL	0.2
62052000	Men's or boys' shirts - cotton	12	0.0	298 020	298 020	263 173	93 457	2.5	66.1	7	BGD	80.1	MMR	10.5	LAO	6.6	KHM	2.5	NPL	0.2

Table 11A
Major non-agricultural products & their principle suppliers, ranked by descending value of GSP Received Imports (Year 2002)

Product code (hs)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of suppliers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group)									
											1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	LDC (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports GSP-covered	Imports GSP-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
61091000	T-shirts, singlets and other vests, of cotton	12.0	0.0	549 776	549 776	549 503	495 424	22.0	22.0	6	BGD	95.5	KHM	2.4	LAO	1.7	MDV	0.4	NPL	0.1
61103099	Jerseys, pullovers, etc, of man-made fibres	12.	0.0	472 989	472 989	473 366	335 758	14.9	36.9	5	BGD	72.9	KHM	25.0	LAO	2.0	NPL	0.0	MDV	0.0
61102099	Jerseys, pullovers, etc, of cotton, knitted or crocheted	12	0.0	171 148	171 148	171 197	117 598	5.2	42.1	5	BGD	61.5	KHM	35.3	LAO	2.8	NPL	0.3	MDV	0.0
03061380	Frozen shrimps and prawns – Other	12.	0.0	90 354	90 354	90 382	89 355	4.0	46.1	2	BGD	99.1	YEM	0.9						
62034235	Men's or boys' trousers, breeches, etc, of cotton	12.	0.0	181 662	181 662	181 598	88 446	3.9	50.0	5	BGD	82.3	KHM	9.6	LAO	7.1	MDV	0.6	NPL	0.4
61051000	Men's or boys' shirts of cotton, knitted or crocheted	120	0.0	91 990	91 990	91 989	78 983	3.5	53.6	6	BGD	87.0	KHM	7.3	LAO	4.8	MDV	0.8	NPL	0.0
61103091	Jerseys, pullovers, etc	12	0.0	107 757	107 757	107 927	72 081	3.2	56.8	5	BGD	84.6	KHM	10.9	LAO	4.5	NPL	0.0	MDV	0.0
03061350	Frozen shrimps and prawns --	12.	0.0	70 086	70 086	70 121	68 088	3.0	59.8	2	BGD	97.7	YEM	2.3						
62052000	Men's or boys' shirts of cotton	12	0.0	199 582	199 582	199 565	63 757	2.8	62.6	5	BGD	90.2	LAO	6.9	KHM	2.5	NPL	0.3	MDV	0.0
61102091	Jerseys, pullovers, etc, of cotton, knitted or crocheted	12.	0.0	66 363	66 363	66 417	46 956	2.1	64.7	5	BGD	81.5	KHM	15.3	LAO	2.1	NPL	0.8	MDV	0.3
57011091	Carpets and other textile floor coverings	8.3	0.0	43 834	43 834	43 826	37 363	1.7	66.4	2	NPL	99.5	AFG	0.5						
62034231	Men's or boys' trousers, breeches, etc, of cotton	12	0.0	104 935	104 935	104 978	33 544	1.5	67.8	5	BGD	87.2	KHM	9.9	MDV	1.5	LAO	1.4	NPL	0.1
62046239	Women's or girls' trousers, breeches, etc, of cotton	12	0.0	105 857	105 857	105 840	32 019	1.4	69.3	5	BGD	87.1	KHM	7.4	LAO	4.0	NPL	1.4	MDV	0.1
61052010	Men's or boys' shirts of man-made fibres	12	0.0	30 881	30 881	30 839	25 051	1.1	70.4	3	BGD	54.9	KHM	29.8	LAO	15.3				

Table 12
Japan major agricultural products & their LDC principal suppliers, ranked by descending value of GSP received imports (2004)

Product code (hs)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of suppliers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group)									
											1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	LDC (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports GSP-covered	Imports GSP-received				ISO3 code	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
080290200	Macadamia nuts, fresh or dried	5.0	0.0	3 767	3 767	3 767	3 767	55.9	55.9	1	MWI	100.0								
152190010	Beeswax	15.0	0.0	1 484	1 484	1 484	1 484	22.0	77.9	2	TZA	59.9	ETH	40.1						

Table 12A
Japan major agricultural products & their LDC principal suppliers, ranked by descending value of GSP received imports (2002)

Product code (hs)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group)									
											1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	LDC (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports GSP-covered	Imports GSP-received				Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
080290200	Macadamia nuts, fresh or dried	5.0	0.0	2 334	2 334	2 334	2 243	57.6	57.6	1	MWI	100.0								
152190010	Beeswax	12.8	0.0	799	799	799	799	20.5	78.2	2	ETH	51.7	TZA	48.3						

Table 13
Japan major non-agricultural products & their principal suppliers, ranked by descending value of GSP received imports (2004)

Product code (hs)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group)									
											1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	LDC (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports GSP-covered	Imports GSP-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
030759100	Octopus	10.0	0.0	121 129	121 129	121 129	111 467	25.5	25.5	5	MRT	89.0	SEN	9.1	AGO	1.1	GNB	0.4	GIN	0.4
030613000	Shrimps & prawns - frozen	4.0	0.0	106 271	106 271	106 271	89 465	20.5	46.0	7	MMR	59.4	BGD	18.2	MDG	12.7	MOZ	9.2	KHM	0.3
640399015	Other footwear	60.0	0.0	41 044	41 044	41 044	41 044	9.4	55.4	4	MMR	44.2	KHM	43.1	BGD	12.7	NPL	0.0		
640399016	Other footwear	60.0	0.0	33 281	33 281	33 281	33 281	7.6	63.0	3	KHM	82.0	BGD	12.1	MMR	5.9				
640391019	Other footwear	60.0	0.0	24 671	24 671	24 671	24 614	5.6	68.7	3	KHM	88.1	MMR	9.9	BGD	2.0				
640399029	Other footwear	60.0	0.0	20 756	20 756	20 756	20 756	4.8	73.4	3	KHM	79.9	BGD	15.0	MMR	5.2				
620311200	Men's or boys' suits - wool or fine animal hair	11.2	0.0	17 461	17 461	17 461	17 456	4.0	77.4	2	MMR	100.0	BGD	0.0						
620530010	Men's or boys' shirts - synthetic fibres	9.0	0.0	14 503	14 503	14 503	14 360	3.3	80.7	2	MMR	70.0	BGD	30.0						
640399011	Footwear for gymnastics & athletics	27.0	0.0	10 063	10 063	10 063	10 063	2.3	83.0	3	BGD	67.1	MMR	28.4	KHM	4.5				
740311010	Cathodes	3.0	0.0	11 526	11 526	11 526	8 329	1.9	84.9	1	ZMB	100.0								

Table 13A
Japan major non-agricultural products & their principal suppliers, ranked by descending value of GSP received imports (2002)

Product code (hs)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group)									
											1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	LDC (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports GSP-covered	Imports GSP-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
030759100	Octopus (Octopus spp.), frozen	7.0	0.0	41 088	41 088	41 088	39 822	17.7	17.7	3	MRT	97.3	SEN	2.6	KHM	0.0				
740311010	Cathodes and sections of cathodes	3.0	0.0	55 372	55 372	55 372	33 253	14.8	32.6	3	ZMB	67.7	MMR	24.9	ZAR	7.4				
640399015	Other footwear	33.8	0.0	28 738	28 738	28 738	28 738	12.8	45.4	3	BGD	39.7	KHM	38.1	MMR	22.2				
640399016	Other footwear	33.8	0.0	20 916	20 916	20 916	20 916	9.3	54.7	4	KHM	83.3	BGD	9.0	MMR	7.2	LAO	0.6		
640391019	Other footwear	33.8	0.0	18 078	18 078	18 078	18 078	8.1	62.7	4	KHM	71.7	MMR	22.4	BGD	5.7	LAO	0.3		
640399029	Other footwear	33.8	0.0	13 673	13 673	13 673	13 673	6.1	68.8	4	KHM	82.1	BGD	12.2	MMR	5.4	LAO	0.3		
640399011	Footwear for gymnastics, athletics or similar activities	27.0	0.0	7 773	7 773	7 773	7 773	3.5	72.3	3	BGD	61.4	MMR	31.2	KHM	7.4				
410410312	Whole bovine leather, dyed or coloured	33.8	0.0	5 636	5 636	5 636	5 636	2.5	74.8	1	BGD	100.0								
410620212	Goat and kid skin leather	33.8	0.0	4 485	4 485	4 485	4 485	2.0	76.8	1	BGD	100.0								
620530010	Men's or boys' shirts, of synthetic fibres	8.5	0.0	4 244	4 244	4 244	4 174	1.9	78.6	4	BGD	57.1	MMR	41.4	LAO	1.0	NPL	0.5		
621420200	Shawls, scarves, mufflers, mantillas, veils and the like	7.6	0.0	5 725	5 725	5 725	3 920	1.7	80.4	1	NPL	100.0								
410439212	Bovine leather and equine leather	33.8	0.0	3 496	3 496	3 496	3 496	1.6	81.9	1	BGD	100.0								
640391029	Other footwear	33.8	0.0	3 407	3 407	3 407	3 407	1.5	83.5	3	KHM	80.1	BGD	15.3	MMR	4.7				
160510029	Crab prepared or preserved, nes.	9.6	0.0	2 859	2 859	2 859	2 859	1.3	84.7	1	AGO	100.0								

Table 14
United States major agricultural products & their principal suppliers, ranked by descending value of AGOA received imports (2004)

Product code (HS)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group)									
											1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	AGOA (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports AGOA-covered	Imports AGOA-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
24012083	Tobacco - threshed or similarly processed & not from cigar leaf	37.5¢/kg	0.0	24 584	24 584	24 584	16 624	40.8	40.8	3	MWI	93.0	UGA	3.6	TZA	3.4				
24012085	Tobacco threshed or similarly processed & not from cigar leaf	37.5¢/kg	0.0	18 241	18 241	18 241	10 103	24.8	65.6	3	MWI	99.0	MOZ	0.9	UGA	0.1				
17011110	Cane sugar (raw) - solid form w/o added flavouring or colouring	1.4606¢/kg	0.0	9 818	9 818	9 818	9 818	24.1	89.6	2	MOZ	59.7	MWI	40.3						
08029080	Nuts (in shell) - fresh or dried	1.3¢/kg	0.0	1 136	1 136	1 136	1 136	2.8	92.4	1	MWI	100.0								
07133340	Dried kidney beans	1.5¢/kg	0.0	592	592	592	592	1.5	93.9	1	ETH	100.0								
29054500	Glycerol	0.5¢/kg	0.0	555	555	555	464	1.1	95.0	1	SEN	100.0								

Table 14A
United States major agricultural products & their principal suppliers, ranked by descending value of AGOA received imports (2002)

Product code (HS)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group)									
											1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	AGOA (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports AGOA-covered	Imports AGOA-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
24012085	Tobacco, partly or wholly stemmed/stripped, threshed or similarly processed, not from cigar leaf , described in addl	37.5¢/kg	0.0	22'398	22'398	22'398	5'340	69.2	69.2	2	MWI	98.2	TZA	1.8						

Table 15
United States major non-agricultural products & their principal suppliers, ranked by descending value of AGOA received imports (2004)

Product code (hs)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group)									
											1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	AGOA (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports AGOA-covered	Imports AGOA-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
27090020	Petroleum oils	10.5¢/bbl	0.0	4 473 671	4 473 671	4 473 671	1 311 164	53.8	53.8	3	AGO	97.0	TCD	2.4	GNB	0.6		.		.
27090010	Petroleum oils	5.25¢/bbl	0.0	676 660	676 660	676 660	290 876	11.9	65.8	2	TCD	81.1	AGO	18.9		.		.		.
61102020	Sweaters	16.5	0.0	234 234	234 234	234 234	230 871	9.5	75.3	7	LSO	59.0	MDG	38.0	MWI	2.2	MOZ	0.6	TZA	0.2
62046240	Women's or girls'	16.6	0.0	157 927	157 927	157 927	155 519	6.4	81.7	8	MDG	55.0	LSO	43.4	MWI	1.2	TZA	0.2	UGA	0.1
62034240	Men's or boys'	16.6	0.0	155 270	155 270	155 270	153 841	6.3	88.0	7	LSO	64.5	MDG	28.7	MWI	4.1	UGA	2.5	TZA	0.2
61103030	Sweaters	32.0	0.0	47 575	47 575	47 575	47 296	1.9	89.9	6	LSO	68.0	MDG	22.6	MWI	7.5	ETH	1.8	TZA	0.1
61046220	Women's or girls'	14.9	0.0	38 150	38 150	38 150	37 776	1.6	91.5	5	LSO	66.6	MDG	31.1	MWI	1.9	ETH	0.4	NER	0.0
61091000	T-shirts	16.5	0.0	36 533	36 533	36 533	35 706	1.5	92.9	9	LSO	66.9	MDG	29.2	MOZ	1.8	TZA	1.3	MWI	0.8
61034315	Men's or boys'	28.2	0.0	27 386	27 386	27 386	27 246	1.1	94.1	5	LSO	67.6	MDG	20.4	MWI	9.2	ETH	2.6	TZA	0.2
61046320	Women's or girls'	28.2	0.0	23 886	23 886	23 886	23 609	1.0	95.0	6	LSO	79.6	MDG	15.9	MWI	3.7	UGA	0.5	ETH	0.2
61034210	Men's or boys'	16.1	0.0	15 010	15 010	15 010	14 958	0.6	95.6	2	LSO	81.4	MDG	18.6		.		.		.
61061000	Women's or girls'	19.7	0.0	11 793	11 793	11 793	10 954	0.4	96.1	5	LSO	63.6	MDG	23.1	MWI	12.4	ETH	0.7	TZA	0.3
61051000	Men's or boys' shirts,	19.7	0.0	15 030	15 030	15 030	10 619	0.4	96.5	5	LSO	67.2	MDG	17.7	MWI	9.5	TZA	5.6	MLI	0.0
61012000	Men's or boys'	15.9	0.0	8 518	8 518	8 518	8 236	0.3	96.9	2	MDG	89.1	LSO	10.9		.		.		.
62052020	Men's or boys'	19.7	0.0	8 067	8 067	8 067	7 879	0.3	97.2	6	MDG	77.6	CPV	13.6	MWI	8.8	GIN	0.0	LSO	0.0
61142000	Garments	10.8	0.0.	7 852	7 852	7 852	7 851	0.3	97.5	6	MDG	56.9	LSO	41.1	TZA	1.5	MWI	0.5	MRT	0.0
61099010	T-shirts	32.0	0.0	4 887	4 887	4 887	4 817	0.2	97.7	5	LSO	54.2	MDG	44.6	ETH	0.7	CPV	0.5	MWI	0.0
62046335	Women's or girls'	28.6	0.0	4 557	4 557	4 557	4 525	0.2	97.9	8	MDG	37.4	MWI	26.2	LSO	16.8	CPV	14.9	ETH	4.3
61022000	Women's or girls'	15.9	0.0	4 546	4 546	4 546	4 504	0.2	98.1	3	MDG	50.9	LSO	45.4	MWI	3.7		.		.

Table 15A
United States major non-agricultural products & their principal suppliers, ranked by descending value of AGOA received imports (2002)

Product code (hs)	Product description	Tariff rates: MFN appl. (per cent)	Tariff rates: AGOA (per cent)	Values of imports from partner countries (in $000): Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports AGOA-covered	Imports AGOA-received	Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group): 1st supplier ISO3 code	1st supplier Share (per cent)	2nd supplier ISO3 code	2nd supplier Share (per cent)	3rd supplier ISO3 code	3rd supplier Share (per cent)	4th supplier ISO3 code	4th supplier Share (per cent)	5th supplier ISO3 code	5th supplier Share (per cent)
61102020	Sweaters, pullovers and similar articles, knitted or crocheted, of cotton, nes	17.8	0.0	109 146	109 146	109 108	57 760	24.3	24.3	4	LSO	59.5	MDG	39.9	MWI	0.5	ETH	0.0		
62046240	Women's or girls' trousers, breeches and shorts, not knitted or crocheted, of cotton, nes	16.9	0.0	81 989	81 989	81 103	51 224	21.6	45.9	7	LSO	66.6	MDG	32.3	MWI	1.1	SLE	0.0	SEN	0.0
62034240	Men's or boys' trousers and shorts, not bibs, not knitted or crocheted, of cotton, not containing 15 per cent or more by weight	16.9	0.0	80 602	80 602	80 369	45 022	19.0	64.9	5	LSO	59.1	MDG	37.0	MWI	3.7	ZMB	0.3	SEN	0.0
61101010	Sweaters, pullovers, sweatshirts, waistcoats (vests) and similar articles, knitted or crocheted, wholly of cashmere	5.0	0.0	21 019	21 019	20 993	19 390	8.2	73.0	2	MDG	99.9	GIN	0.1						
61103030	Sweaters, pullovers and similar articles, knitted or crocheted, of manmade fibers, nes	32.7	0.0	12 729	12 729	12 593	8 256	3.5	76.5	5	LSO	59.4	MDG	35.9	MWI	3.7	MOZ	0.6	ETH	0.4
61046220	Women's or girls' trousers, breeches and shorts, knitted or crocheted, of cotton	15.4	0.0	11 625	11 625	11 625	7 300	3.1	79.6	2	LSO	73.5	MDG	26.5						
62052020	Men's or boys' shirts, not knitted or crocheted, of cotton, nes	20.1	0.0	14 019	14 019	14 005	7 151	3.0	82.6	7	MDG	90.6	MWI	8.8	LSO	0.4	MOZ	0.1	SEN	0.0

Table 16
United States major agricultural products & their principal suppliers, marked by descending value of GSP received imports (2004)

Product code (HS)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group)									
											1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	LDC (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports GSP-covered	Imports GSP-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
24012085	Tobacco - threshed or similarly processed	37.5¢/kg	0.0	861	861	861	861	30.8	30.8	1	BGD	100.0								
20098060	Juice of any single fruit - concentrated or not concentrated	0.5¢/liter	0.0	991	991	991	417	14.9	45.7	1	WSM	100.0								
08045060	Guavas, mangoes & mangosteens - fresh	6.6¢/kg	0.0	2 633	2 633	2 633	188	6.7	52.5	1	HTI	100.0								
08045040	Guavas, mangoes & mangosteens - fresh	6.6¢/kg	0.0	4 855	4 855	4 855	167	6.0	58.4	1	HTI	100.0								
06011090	Bulbs, tubers, tuberous roots, corms, crowns & rhizomes	3.5	0.0	145	145	145	145	5.2	63.6	1	NPL	100.0								
11063040	Fruit & nut flour	9.6	0.0	127	127	127	127	4.5	68.2	1	WSM	100.0								

Table 16A
United States major agricultural products & their principal suppliers, marked by descending value of GSP received imports (2002)

Product code (HS)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No of suppliers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group)									
											1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	LDC (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports GSP-covered	Imports GSP-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
13021940	Ginseng; substances having anesthetic, prophylactic or therapeutic properties, other than poppy straw extract	1.0	0.0	517	517	517	517	28.5	28.5	1	ZAR	100.0								
35030055	Gelatin sheets and derivatives, nesoi; isinglass; other glues of animal origin, nesoi	2.8¢/kg + 3.8 per cent	0.0	286	286	286	286	15.8	44.3	1	BGD	100.0								
24022080	Cigarettes containing tobacco but not containing clove, paper-wrapped	$1.05/kg + 2.3 per cent	0.0	253	253	253	253	14.0	58.2	1	KHM	100.0								
08045040	Guavas, mangoes, and mangosteens, fresh, if entered during the period September 1 through May 31, inclusive	6.6¢/kg	0.0	1 776	1 776	1 776	148	8.1	66.4	1	HTI	100.0								
20089990	Fruit nesi, and other edible parts of plants nesi, other than pulp and excluding mixtures, otherwise prepared or pre	6.0	0.0	145	145	145	145	8.0	74.3	1	TGO	100.0								
08045060	Guavas, mangoes, and mangosteens, fresh, if entered during the period June 1 through August 31, inclusive	6.6¢/kg	0.0	1 686	1 686	1 686	123	6.8	81.1	1	HTI	100.0								

Table 17
US Major non-agricultural products & their principal suppliers, ranked by descending value of GSP received imports (2004)

Product code (HS)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's Total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group)									
											1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	LDC (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports GSP-covered	Imports GSP-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
27090020	Petroleum oils & oils from bituminous minerals	10.5¢bbl	0.0	1 005 885	1 005 885	1 005 885	935 009	88.3	88.3	2	GNQ	92.8	ZAR	7.2						
29051120	Methanol (Methyl alcohol)	5.5	0.0	99 074	99 074	99 074	99 074	9.4	97.7	1	GNQ	100.0								
39239000	Articles for the conveyance or packing of goods - plastics	3.0	0.0	11 706	11 706	11 706	5 482	0.5	98.2	5	BGD	62.1	KHM	33.3	NPL	2.5	HTI	2.1	ZAR	0.0
95063900	Golf equipment (other than golf footwear) & parts	4.9	0.0	4 686	4 686	4 686	4 596	0.4	98.6	1	BGD	100.0								
69111037	Porcelain or china (o/than bone china), househld tabl. & kitch.ware	8.0	0.0	2 296	2 296	2 296	2 215	0.2	98.8	1	BGD	100.0								

Table 17A
US Major non-agricultural products & their principal suppliers, ranked by descending value of GSP received imports (2002)

Product code (HS)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No of suppliers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group)									
											1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	LDC (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports GSP-covered	Imports GSP-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
27090020	Petroleum oils & oils from bituminous minerals - crude, testing 25 degrees A.P.I. or more	10.5¢bbl	0.0	2 919 443	2 919 443	2 919 443	2 707 022	93.8	93.8	4	AGO	85.3	YEM	8.0	ZAR	3.7	GNQ	2.9		.

Table 18
EU Major agricultural products & their principal suppliers, ranked by descending value of ACP-SIDS received imports (2004)

Product code (HS)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group)									
											1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	ACP (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports ACP-covered	Imports ACP-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
15111090	Crude palm oil	3.8	0.0	136 120	136 120	136 120	135 311	27.5	27.5	1	PNG	100.0								
08030019	Bananas - fresh or dried	680€/ 1000kg/net	0.0	150 648	150 648	150 648	118 349	24.1	51.6	7	DOM	47.3	LCA	23.0	VCT	13.0	JAM	9.3	DMA	6.6
22084039	Rum & tafia	06€/ 1000kg7net	0.0	48 599	48 599	48 599	47 834	9.7	61.3	9	DOM	98.4	BHS	0.8	JAM	0.4	TTO	0.2	DMA	0.2
15119099	Palm oil	9.0	0.0	32 355	32 355	32 355	31 565	6.4	67.7	2	PNG	100.0	TTO	0.0		.		.		.
24021000	Cigars etc.	43.0	0.0	30 343	30 343	30 343	29 986	6.1	73.8	6	DOM	99.8	DMA	0.1	BHS	0.1	JAM	0.0	SYC	0.0
15131199	Crude coconut oil	6.4	0.0	31 865	31 865	31 865	23 077	4.7	78.5	3	PNG	97.4	FJI	2.6	DOM	0.0				
22084099	Rum & tafia		0.0	17 104	17 104	17 104	16 672	3.4	81.9	6	DOM	44.6	JAM	28.4	BRB	13.7	TTO	10.4	LCA	1.6
15132190	Crude palm kernel or babassu oil	6.4	0.0.	16 814	16 814	16 814	15 291	3.1	85.0	1	PNG	100.0								
09050000	Vanilla	6.0	0.0	10 197	10 197	10 197	9 014	1.8	86.8	4	PNG	98.2	TON	0.7	MUS	0.6	JAM	0.5		.
15119019	Palm oil	10.9	0.0	8 374	8 374	8 374	8 374	1.7	88.5	1	PNG	100.0								
07099090	Other vegetables - fresh or chilled	12.8	0.0	7 440	7 440	7 440	7 088	1.4	90.0	8	DOM	56.3	JAM	22.9	LCA	13.8	DMA	2.6	MUS	1.7
22084051	Rum & tafia	06€/ 1000kg	0.0	5 871	5 871	5 871	5 871	1.2	91.1	5	BRB	39.6	BHS	38.5	JAM	17.8	TTO	3.0	DOM	1.1
22021000	Waters - added sugar	9.6	0.0	3 757	3 757	3 757	3 631	0.7	91.9	13	TTO	34.3	DOM	25.6	MUS	18.7	JAM	18.0	BRB	1.4
18040000	Cocoa butter, fat & oil	9.0	0.0	3 206	3 206	3 206	3 102	0.6	92.5	2	DOM	89.1	DMA	10.9						
07149011	Roots & tubers - fresh or dried	9.5€/ 100kg/net	0.0	2 645	2 645	2 645	2 636	0.5	93.1	4	JAM	82.6	VCT	8.9	DMA	8.5	DOM	0.0		

Table 18A
EU Major agricultural products & their principal suppliers, ranked by descending value of ACP-SIDS received imports (2002)

Product code (HS)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group)									
											1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	ACP (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports ACP-covered	Imports ACP-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
17011110	Raw cane sugar, in solid form	33.9 €/ 100 kg/net	0.0*	465 279	465 279	465 279	460 111	39.5	39.5	7	MUS	55.5	FJI	17.0	JAM	14.6	TTO	5.6	BRB	3.9
22084091	Rum and tafia	Free	0.0	319 739	319 739	319 739	319 574	27.4	66.9	6	BHS	98.8	JAM	0.7	BRB	0.4	DOM	0.1	TTO	0.0
08030019	Bananas, including plantains, fresh or dried	680 €/ 1.000 Kg/net	0.0*	152 805	152 805	152 805	139 587	12.0	78.9	6	DOM	37.8	LCA	21.7	JAM	18.4	VCT	14.3	DMA	7.6
15111090	Crude palm oil	3.8	0.0	120 620	120 620	120 620	113 470	9.7	88.6	1	PNG	100.0								
17011190	Raw cane sugar, in solid form	41.9 €/ 100 kg/net	0.0*	34 957	34 957	34 957	33 827	2.9	91.5	2	MUS	95.8	BRB	4.2						
24021000	Cigars, cheroots and cigarillos containing tobacco	26.0	0.0	28 150	28 150	28 150	20 999	1.8	93.3	4	DOM	99.7	DMA	0.3	BHS	0.0	JAM	0.0		
15132190	Crude palm kernel or babassu oil and fractions	6.4	0.0	9 497	9 497	9 497	9 393	0.8	94.1	1	PNG	100.0								
22084039	Rum and tafia	0.6 E/ per cent vol/hl + 3.2 €/hl	0.0	8 151	8 151	8 151	7 758	0.7	94.8	8	DOM	85.3	BHS	6.8	JAM	4.4	BRB	3.2	LCA	0.1
22084051	Rum and tafia	0.6 €/ per cent vol/hl	0.0	7 539	7 539	7 539	6 140	0.5	95.3	4	JAM	50.3	BHS	31.7	BRB	15.4	TTO	2.6		
22084099	Rum and tafia	0.6 €/ per cent vol/hl	0.0	6 213	6 213	6 213	5 774	0.5	95.8	6	BRB	44.5	JAM	42.9	DOM	8.3	LCA	3.8	TTO	0.5
15131199	Crude coconut (copra) oil and fractions	6.4	0.0	14 067	14 067	14 067	5 682	0.5	96.3	2	PNG	80.0	FJI	20.0						
22084031	Rum and tafia		0.0	5 225	5 225	5 225	4 029	0.3	96.6	5	BHS	60.3	DOM	35.6	JAM	2.4	TTO	1.2	ATG	0.5

Table 19
EU Major non-agricultural products & their principal suppliers, ranked by descending value of SIDS receiving imports (2004)

Product code (HS)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group)									
											1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	ACP (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports ACP-covered	Imports ACP-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
28182000	Aluminium oxide	4.0	0.0	323 075	323 075	323 075	311 568	20.9	20.9	1	JAM	100.0								
61091000	T-shirts - cotton	12	0.0	296 124	296 124	296 124	276 825	18.5	39.4	13	MUS	99.6	DOM	0.2	BHS	0.2	BRB	0.0	JAM	0.0
16041418	Prepared or preserved tuna	24.0	0.0	207 886	207 886	207 886	206 469	13.8	53.2	3	SYC	63.2	MUS	29.5	PNG	7.4				
16041411	Prepared or preserved tuna	24.0	0.0	79 718	79 718	79 718	77 186	5.2	58.4	3	SYC	53.5	MUS	25.9	PNG	20.7				
29051100	Methanol (methyl alcohol)	6.3	0.0	59 331	59 331	59 331	58 885	3.9	62.4	2	TTO	100.0	TON	0.0						
61102099	Jerseys - cotton	12.2	0.0	51 011	51 011	51 011	48 627	3.3	65.6	4	MUS	60.8	JAM	39.2	DOM	0.0	FJI			
03061110	Rock lobster etc.- frozen	12,5	0.0	36 743	36 743	36 743	36 743	2.5	68.1	1	BHS	100.0								
62052000	Men's or boys' shirts - cotton	12	0.0	43 757	43 757	40 799	36 371	2.4	70.5	7	MUS	99.6	BHS	0.3	DOM	0.0	LCA	0.0	FJI	0.0
61051000	Men's or boys' shirts - cotton	12	0.0	32 935	32 935	32 935	30 293	2.0	72.5	6	MUS	97.0	JAM	1.6	DOM	1.3	LCA	0.0	TTO	0.0
61102091	Men's or boys' jerseys - cotton	12.2	0.0	31 535	31 535	31 535	30 222	2.0	74.6	5	MUS	55.4	JAM	44.0	DOM	0.6	FJI		SYC	
03034290	Yellowfin tunas - frozen	22.0	0.0	25 392	25 392	25 392	25 379	1.7	76.3	3	SYC	99.8	MUS	0.1	FJI	0.1				
61103099	Women's or girls' jerseys - man-made fibres	12.2	0.0	17 849	17 849	17 849	16 399	1.1	77.4	3	JAM	59.3	MUS	40.4	DOM	0.3				
62121090	Brassieres	12	0.0	15 864	15 864	15 864	13 347	0.9	78.3	4	MUS	80.9	DOM	19.1	GRD	0.0	KNA	0.0		
03061350	Shrimps & prawns - frozen	12.0	0.0	11 659	11 659	11 659	11 659	0.8	79.0	2	SYC	94.0	BHS	6.0						
61061000	Women's or girls' blouses - cotton	12	0.0	13 300	13 300	13 300	11 606	0.8	79.8	5	MUS	99.2	JAM	0.5	DOM	0.2	LCA	0.0	KNA	

Table 19A
EU Major non-agricultural products & their principal suppliers, ranked by descending value of SIDS receiving imports (2002)

Product code (HS)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner CCountries (in $ 000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group)									
											1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	ACP (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports ACP-covered	Imports ACP-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
16041418	Prepared or preserved tuna, skipjack and Atlantic bonito	24.0	0.0	195 748	195 748	195 748	181 989	16.4	16.4	3	SYC	66.0	MUS	31.4	PNG	2.6				
61091000	T-shirts, singlets and other vests	12.0	0.0	186 520	186 520	186 520	175 437	15.8	32.3	8	MUS	99.4	DOM	0.5	JAM	0.1	PNG	0.0	ATG	0.0
28182000	Aluminium oxide (excl. artificial corundum)	4.0	0.0	253 413	253 413	253 413	172 562	15.6	47.8	1	JAM	100.0								
61102099	Jerseys, pullovers, etc,	12.4	0.0	50 879	50 879	50 879	41 561	3.8	51.6	4	MUS	62.5	JAM	37.2	DOM	0.2	ATG	0.0		
61051000	Men's or boys' shirts of cotton	12.0	0.0	38 892	38 892	38 892	38 294	3.5	55.0	4	MUS	99.8	JAM	0.1	TTO	0.0	LCA	0.0		
61102091	Jerseys, pullovers, etc, of cotton	12.4	0.0	38 753	38 753	38 753	36 867	3.3	58.4	4	MUS	61.8	JAM	38.1	DOM	0.1	DMA	0.0		
29051100	Methanol (methyl alcohol)	7.0	0.0	103 826	103 826	103 826	35 574	3.2	61.6	1	TTO	100.0								
62052000	Men's or boys' shirts of cotton	12.0	0.0	38 193	38 193	38 193	34 881	3.1	64.7	5	MUS	99.6	JAM	0.2	ATG	0.1	DOM	0.0	TTO	0.0
16041411	Prepared or preserved tuna, skipjack and Atlantic bonito	24.0	0.0	46 712	46 712	46 712	32 563	2.9	67.7	3	SYC	74.9	PNG	15.4	MUS	9.7				
03061110	Frozen rock lobster and other sea crawfish	12.5	0.0	31 077	31 077	31 077	29 817	2.7	70.4	1	BHS	100.0								
62034231	Men's or boys' trousers, breeches, etc	12.4	0.0	21 953	21 953	21 953	21 332	1.9	72.3	5	MUS	99.5	FJI	0.4	TTO	0.1	LCA	0.0	DOM	0.0
28141000	Anhydrous ammonia	6.6	0.0	16 832	16 832	16 832	16 827	1.5	73.8	2	TTO	100.0	MUS	0.0						
61061000	Women's or girls' blouses, etc	12.4	0.0	13 531	13 531	13 531	12 666	1.1	74.9	2	MUS	100.0	FJI	0.0						
62034235	Men's or boys' trousers, breeches, etc	12.4	0.0	14 604	14 604	14 604	12 415	1.1	76.1	4	MUS	94.2	DOM	5.8	LCA	0.0	TTO	0.0		
61103099	Jerseys, pullovers, etc	12.4	0.0	16 774	16 774	16 774	12 336	1.1	77.2	6	MUS	55.9	JAM	41.7	DOM	2.4	PLW	0.0	FJI	0.0
62046231	Women's or girls' trousers, breeches, etc	12.4	0.0	12 676	12 676	12 676	12 031	1.1	78.3	2	MUS	100.0	DOM	0.0						
62121090	Brassieres	6.5	0.0	15 123	15 123	15 123	11 223	1.0	79.3	3	MUS	86.0	DOM	13.8	TON	0.1				
16041416	Prepared or preserved tuna, skipjack and Atlantic bonito	24.0	0.0	9 441	9 441	9 441	9 441	0.9	80.1	2	SYC	96.3	MUS	3.7						

Table 20
US major agricultural products and their principal suppliers, ranked by descending value of AGOA-SIDS received imports (2004)

Product code (HS)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group)									
											1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	AGOA (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports AGOA-covered	Imports AGOA-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
22084020	Rum & tafia in containers each holding not over 4 liters	23.7¢/pf.liter	0.0	10	10	10	10	100.0	100.0	1	MUS	100.0								
17011110	Cane sugar (raw) in solid form w/o added flavouring or colouring	33.9 €/ 100 kg/net	0.0	9 888	9 888	0	0	0.0	100.0	1	MUS	100.0								
17019950	Cane/beet sugar & pure sucrose refined, solid & w/o added colour or flavouring	7.062¢	0.0	53	53	0	0	0.0	100.0	1	MUS	100.0								
17011105	Cane sugar (raw) - in solid form w/o added flavouring or colouring	1.4606¢/kg	0.0	45	45	0	0	0.0	100.0	1	MUS	100.0								

Table 20A
US major agricultural products and their principal suppliers, ranked by descending value of AGOA-SIDS received imports (2002)

Product code (HS)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group)									
											1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	AGOA (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports AGOA-covered	Imports AGOA-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
17011110	Cane or beet sugar	1.4606c/kg.	0.0	6 515	6 515	0	0		0.0	1	MUS	100.0								
17039050	Molasses nesi	0.01c/kg of total sugar	0.0	4 308	4 308	0	0		0.0	1	MUS	100.0								
17031050	Cane molasses nesi	0.01c/kg of total sugar	0.0	1 857	1 857	0	0		0.0	1	MUS	100.0								
06031070	Chrysanthemums, standard carnations, anthuriums and orchids, fresh cut	6.4	0.0	44	44	0	0		0.0	1	MUS	100.0								
17011105	Cane sugar		0.0	26	26	0	0		0.0	1	MUS	100.0								
33021040	Mixtures of/with basis of odoriferous substances	8.4 c/kg + 1.9 per cent	0.0	21	21	0	0		0.0	1	MUS	100.0								
24012033	Tobacco, partly or wholly stemmed/stripped	40.9 c/kg	0.0	15	15	15	0		0.0	1	MUS	100.0								
17019950	Cane/beet sugar & pure sucrose	35.74 c/kg	0.0	14	14	0	0		0.0	1	MUS	100.0								
33021050	Mixtures of/with basis of odoriferous substances	17 c/kg + 1.9 per cent	0.0	9	9	0	0		0.0	1	MUS	100.0								

Table 21
US Major non-agricultural products and their principal suppliers, ranked by descending value of AGOA-SIDS received imports (2004)

Product code (HS)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group)									
											1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	AGOA (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports AGOA-covered	Imports AGOA-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
64039160	Footwear w/outer soles of rubber/ plastics/composition leather	8.5	0.0	156	156	156	12	100.0	100.0	1	MUS	100.0								
62052020	Men's or boys' shirts (not knitted or crocheted) - cotton	19.7	0.0	66 468	66 468	0	0	0.0	100.0	2	MUS	100.0	SYC	0.0						
62046240	Women's or girls' trousers (not knitted or crocheted) - cotton	16.6	0.0	51 584	51 584	0	0	0.0	100.0	1	MUS	100.0								
61102020	Sweaters, pullovers etc. (knitted or crocheted) - cotton	16.5	0.0	38 122	38 122	0	0	0.0	100.0	1	MUS	100.0								
62034240	Men's or boys' trousers & shorts (not knitted or crocheted) - cotton	16.6	0.0	33 118	33 118	0	0	0.0	100.0	1	MUS	100.0								

Table 21A
US Major non-agricultural products and their principal suppliers, ranked by descending value of AGOA-SIDS received imports (2001)

Product code (HS)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $ 000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No of suppliers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group)									
											1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN Appl. (per cent)	AGOA (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports AGOA-covered	Imports AGOA-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
62034240	Men's or boys' trousers and shorts, not bibs, not knitted or crocheted, of cotton, not containing 15 per cent or more by weigh	16,9	0.0	70.963	70.963	70.963	18.828	45,1	45,1	1	MUS	100,0								
62046240	Women's or girls' trousers, breeches and shorts, not knitted or crocheted, of cotton, nesoi	16,9	0.0	61.318	61.318	61.318	12.780	30,6	75,7	1	MUS	100,0								
62052020	Men's or boys' shirts, not knitted or crocheted, of cotton, nesoi	20,1	0.0	44.740	44.740	44.740	5.147	12,3	88,0	1	MUS	100,0								
62045220	Women's or girls' skirts and divided skirts, not knitted or crocheted, of cotton, nesoi	8,4	0.0	7.778	7.778	7.778	1.716	4,1	92,1	1	MUS	100,0								
61101020	Sweaters, pullovers, waistcoats (vests) and similar articles, knitted or crocheted, of wool or fine animal hair	16,3	0.0	4.342	4.342	4.342	1.113	2,7	94,8	1	MUS	100,0								
61091000	T-shirts, singlets, tank tops and similar garments, knitted or crocheted, of cotton	17,8	0.0	5.598	5.598	5.598	969	2,3	97,1	1	MUS	100,0								
61051000	Men's or boys' shirts, knitted or crocheted, of cotton	20,1	0.0	3.912	3.912	3.912	502	1,2	98,3	1	MUS	100,0								
61102020	Sweaters, pullovers and similar articles, knitted or crocheted, of cotton, nesoi	17,8	0.0	27.400	27.400	27.400	245	0,6	98,9	1	MUS	100,0								

Table 22
US major agricultural products and their principal suppliers, ranked by descending value of CBI received imports (2004)

Product code (HS)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group)									
											1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	CBI (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports CBI-covered	Imports CBI-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
24021080	Cigars, cheroots & cigarillos containing tobacco	57¢/kg +1.2%	0.0	186 100	186 100	186 100	185 056	36.2	36.2	3	DOM	100.0	BRB	0.0	JAM	0.0				
17011110	Cane sugar (raw) - in solid form w/o added flavoring or coloring	1.4606¢/kg	0.0	83 300	83 300	83 300	83 300	16.3	52.5	2	DOM	93.6	JAM	6.4						
22071060	Undenatured ethyl alcohol of 80 per cent vol. alcohol or higher - nonbeverage purposes	2.5	0.0	56 101	56 101	56 101	56 101	11.0	63.5	1	JAM	100.0								
08044000	Avocados - fresh or dried	11.2¢/kg	0.0	17 838	17 838	17 838	17 782	3.5	67.0	1	DOM	100.0								
24021030	Cigars, cheroots & cigarillos containing tobacco	$1.89/kg + 4,7%	0.0	15 950	15 950	15 950	15 852	3.1	70.1	1	DOM	100.0								
21069099	Food preparations - not canned or frozen	6.4	0.0	17 074	17 074	17 074	15 451	3.0	73.1	5	DOM	96.6	JAM	2.5	TTO	0.6	VCT	0.2	DMA	0.1

Table 22A
US major agricultural products and their principal suppliers, ranked by descending value of CBI received imports (2001)

Product code (HS)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group)									
											1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	CBI (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports CBI-covered	Imports CBI-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
24021080	Cigars, cheroots and cigarillos containing tobacco	57c/kg + 1.4 per cent	0.0	167 968	167 968	167 968	165 769	32.8	32.8	4	DOM	99.5	JAM	0.4	BRB	0.0	DMA	0.0		
17011110	Raw sugar	1.4606c/kg.	0.0	73 724	73 724	73 724	73 724	14.6	47.4	2	DOM	95.8	TTO	4.2						
22071060	Undenatured ethyl alcohol of 80 per cent vol. alcohol or higher	2.5	0.0	39 353	39 353	39 353	39 353	7.8	55.2	1	JAM	100.0								
22030000	Beer made from malt	0.0	0.0	26 272	26 272	26 272	24 760	4.9	60.1	4	DOM	53.1	JAM	38.3	TTO	4.3	BHS	4.2		
21069099	Food preparations not elsewhere specified or included	6.4	0.0	15 857	15 857	15 857	14 586	2.9	63.0	5	DOM	90.8	JAM	7.8	TTO	0.8	BRB	0.5	BHS	0.1
24021060	Cigars, cheroots and cigarillos containing tobacco	54c/kg + 1.4 per cent	0.0	14 407	14 407	14 407	14 386	2.9	65.9	1	DOM	100.0								
07149010	Fresh or chilled dasheens	2.3	0.0	13 467	13 467	13 467	13 365	2.6	68.5	6	DOM	97.3	JAM	2.2	VCT	0.3	DMA	0.2	BRB	0.0
17039050	Molasses nesi	0.01c/kg of total sugars	0.0	13 109	13 109	13 109	13 109	2.6	71.1	1	DOM	100.0								
07149020	Fresh or chilled yams	6.4	0.0	11 191	11 191	11 191	10 773	2.1	73.3	3	JAM	98.5	DOM	1.5	VCT	0.0				
22084080	Rum and tafia	0.0	0.0	10 735	10 735	10 735	10 704	2.1	75.4	3	JAM	58.6	BRB	36.8	DOM	4.6				
08044000	Avocados, fresh or dried	11.2c/kg	0.0	9 868	9 868	9 868	9 762	1.9	77.3	3	DOM	97.5	BHS	2.4	JAM	0.1				
24021030	Cigars, cheroots and cigarillos containing tobacco	$1.89/kg + 4.7 per cent	0.0	8 837	8 837	8 837	8 829	1.7	79.1	1	DOM	100.0								
20081915	Coconuts, otherwise prepared or preserved, nes	1.0	0.0	7 493	7 493	7 493	6 903	1.4	80.4	1	DOM	100.0								

Table 23
US major non-agricultural products & their principal suppliers, ranked by descending value of CBI received imports (2004)

Product code (HS)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group)									
											1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	CBI (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports CBI-covered	Imports CBI-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
29051120	Methanol (Methyl alcohol)	5.5	0.0	504 860	504 860	504 860	500 336	47.3	47.3	1	TTO	100.0								
71131950	Precious metal (o/than silver), articles of jewelry etc.	5.5	0.0	197 021	197 021	197 021	177 771	16.8	64.2	5	DOM	98.5	VCT	1.4	JAM	0.0	TTO	0.0	LCA	0.0
85362000	Automatic circuit breakers for voltage not exceeding 1,000 V	2.7	0.0	111 591	111 591	111 591	95 728	9.1	73.2	1	DOM	100.0								
71131929	Gold neckLDCs & neck chains	5.5	0.0	33 569	33 569	33 569	30 366	2.9	76.1	2	DOM	100.0	JAM	0.0						
85119060	Parts of electrical ignition or starting equipment	2.5	0.0	32 019	32 019	32 019	30 141	2.9	78.9	2	DOM	100.0	BRB	0.0						
85364900	Relays for switching	2.7	0.0	28 099	28 099	28 099	25 903	2.5	81.4	4	DOM	80.3	TTO	19.7	LCA	0.0	KNA	0.0		
16041440	Tunas and skipjack	1.1¢/kg	0.0	18 517	18 517	18 517	18 517	1.8	83.1	1	TTO	100.0								
85365090	Switches for making connections to or in electrical circuits	2.7	0.0	22 421	22 421	22 421	18 079	1.7	84.9	5	KNA	80.7	DOM	19.2	TTO	0.1	LCA	0.0	BRB	0.0

Table 23A
US major non-agricultural products & their principal suppliers, ranked by descending value of CBI received imports (2001)

Product code (HS)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $ 000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No of suppliers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group)									
											1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	CBI (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports CBI-covered	Imports CBI-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
29051120	Methanol (Methyl alcohol), other than imported only for use in producing synthetic natural gas (SNG) or for direct	9.2	0.0	315.347	315.347	315.347	315.347	31.7	31.7	1	TTO	100.0								
71131950	Precious metal (o/than silver)	5.5	0.0	163.772	163.772	163.772	145.586	14.6	46.4	8	DOM	98.5	VCT	1.3	TTO	0.1	BHS	0.0	JAM	0.0
85362000	Automatic circuit breakers, for a voltage not exceeding 1,000 V	2.7	0.0	79.891	79.891	79.891	70.877	7.1	53.5	1	DOM	100.0								
72139130	Iron/nonalloy steel, nesoi, hot-rolled bars &	0.6	0.0	87.207	87.207	87.207	70.593	7.1	60.6	1	TTO	100.0								
39031100	Polystyrene, expandable, in primary forms	6.5	0.0	66.579	66.579	66.579	66.385	6.7	67.3	1	BHS	100.0								
85043140	Electrical transformers	6.6	0.0	39.642	39.642	39.642	37.785	3.8	71.1	2	DOM	99.8	KNA	0.2						
39269098	Other articles of plastic, nesoi	5.3	0.0	38.479	38.479	38.479	20.811	2.1	73.1	8	DOM	99.4	JAM	0.4	TTO	0.2	DMA	0.0	GRD	0.0
40119980	New pneumatic tire, of rub	3.4	0.0	17.417	17.417	17.417	17.415	1.8	74.9	1	TTO	100.0								
85365090	Switches nesoi	2.7	0.0	21.998	21.998	21.998	17.042	1.7	76.6	5	KNA	77.6	DOM	22.1	BRB	0.2	LCA	0.1	JAM	0.0
85364900	Relays for switching	2.7	0.0	18.091	18.091	18.091	15.860	1.6	78.2	3	DOM	98.4	TTO	1.5	KNA	0.1				
85119060	Parts nesi of electrical ignition or starting equipment or generators used for spark- or compression-ignition intern	2.5	0.0	15.328	15.328	15.328	15.328	1.5	79.7	1	DOM	100.0								

Table 24
EU major agricultural products & their principal suppliers, ranked by descending value of ACP-LLDC receiving imports (2004)

Product code (HS)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group)									
											1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	ACP (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports ACP-covered	Imports ACP-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
24012010	Tobacco - flue-cured Virginia type	18.4 MIN 22 € MAX 24 E/100 kg/ne	0	65 744	65 744	65 744	65 501	24	24	1	ZWE	100								
24012080	Tobacco - flue-cured tobacco	11,2.4 MIN 22 € MAX 24 E/100 kg/ne	0	40 095	40 095	40 095	31 695	11.6	35.6	1	ZWE	100								
2013000	Boneless bovine meat - fresh or chilled	12,8+303,4€/100 kg/net	0 % + 242€	34 150	34 150	34 150	30 676	11.2	46.9	2	BWA	95.2	SWZ	4.8						
6031010	Fresh cut flowers & buds	1[2]	0	31 873	31 873	31 873	29 840	10.9	57.8	1	ZWE	100								
6031080	Fresh cut flowers & buds	1[3]	0	18 600	18 600	18 600	18 393	6.7	64.6	1	ZWE	100								
8051030	Oranges - fresh or dried	Entry prices[4]	0	13 978	13 978	13 781	11 530	4.2	68.8	2	ZWE	77.7	SWZ	22.3						
24013000	Tobacco refuse	11,2 MIN 22 € MAX 24 E/100 kg/ne	0	8 488	8 488	8 488	6 871	2.5	71.3	1	ZWE	100								

Table 24A

EU major agricultural products & their principal suppliers, ranked by descending value of ACP-LLDC receiving imports (2002)

Product code (HS)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group)									
											1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	ACP (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports ACP-covered	Imports ACP-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
24012010	Tobacco, partly or wholly stemmed/stripped	18.4 MIN 22 € MAX 24 E/100 kg/net	0.0	162 004	162 004	162 004	157 976	41.9	41.9	1	ZWE	100.0								
17011110	Raw cane sugar, in solid form	33.9 €/ 100 kg/net	0.0*	94 284	94 284	94 284	87 682	23.3	65.2	2	SWZ	78.0	ZWE	22.0						
02013000	Fresh or chilled boneless bovine meat	12.8 + 141.4 €/ 100 kg/net	0 per cent + 24.2€/100 kg*	28 686	28 686	28 686	26 456	7.0	72.2	2	BWA	94.1	SWZ	5.9						
24012080	Tobacco, partly or wholly stemmed/stripped	11.2 MIN 22 € MAX 56 E/100 kg/net	0.0	30 520	30 520	30 520	26 403	7.0	79.2	1	ZWE	100.0								
24013000	Tobacco refuse	11.2 MIN 22 E MAX 56 €/100 kg/net	0.0	13 320	13 320	13 320	12 857	3.4	82.6	1	ZWE	100.0								
07099090	Other vegetables, fresh or chilled, nes	12.8	0.0	6 211	6 211	6 211	6 177	1.6	84.2	3	ZWE	92.5	SWZ	7.4	BWA	0.0				
08051030	Oranges, fresh or dried	MAX 16 + 7.1€/100 kg/net MIN 3.2	MAX 7.1€/100 kg MIN 0	11 231	11 231	11 231	5 133	1.4	85.6	2	ZWE	78.1	SWZ	21.9						
02023090	Frozen boneless bovine meat	12.8 + 304.1 €/ 100 kg/net	0 per cent + 24.3€/100 kg*	4 306	4 306	4 306	4 261	1.1	86.7	1	BWA	100.0								
02023050	Frozen boneless bovine meat	12.8 + 221.1 €/ 100 kg/net	0 per cent + 17.6€/100 kg*		3 926	3 926	3 926	1.0	87.8	1	BWA	100.0								
07081000	Peas, fresh or chilled	9.9	0.0	5 939	5 939	5 939	3 829	1.0	88.8	2	ZWE	99.5	SWZ	0.5						

Table 25
EU major non-agricultural products & their principal suppliers, ranked by descending value of ACP-LLDC receiving imports (2004)

Product code (HS)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group)									
											1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	ACP (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports ACP-covered	Imports ACP-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
72024190	Ferro-chromium	4.0	0.0	94 596	94 596	84 151	82 646	68.0	68.0	1	ZWE	100.0								
85443090	Ignition wiring sets - vehicles, aircrafts etc.	3.7	0.0	8 968	8 968	8 968	8 230	6.8	74.8	1	BWA	100.0								
61103099	Women's or girls' jerseys - man-made fibres	12.2	0.0	5 631	5 631	5 631	5 552	4.6	79.3	2	BWA	99.9	SWZ	0.1						
61091000	T-shirts - cotton	12.0	0.0	4 010	4 010	4 010	3 140	2.6	81.9	3	BWA	95.8	ZWE	4.1	SWZ	0.1				
62034235	Men's or boys' trousers - cotton	12.0	0.0	2 958	2 958	2 958	2 888	2.4	84.3	3	ZWE	94.3	BWA	5.7	SWZ					
54025200	Single yarn - polyesters	4.0	0.0	3 219	3 219	3 219	2 663	2.2	86.5	1	SWZ	100.0								
03041019	Fish fillets (eels) - fresh or chilled	9.0	0.0	2 305	2 305	2 305	2 285	1.9	88.3	1	ZWE	100.0								
62034231	Men's or boys' trousers - cotton	12.0	0.0	1 719	1 719	1 719	1 643	1.4	89.7	2	ZWE	99.0	SWZ	1.0						
62046239	Women's or girls' trousers - cotton	12.0	0.0	1 851	1 851	1 851	1 155	1.0	90.7	2	ZWE	64.9	BWA	35.1						
62034251	Men's or boys' trousers - cotton	12.0	0.0	879	879	879	842	0.7	91.3	1	ZWE	100.0								
62034211	Men's or boys' trousers - cotton	12.0	0.0	664	664	664	664	0.5	91.9	1	ZWE	100.0								
54026200	Multiple or cabled yarn - polyesters	4.0	0.0	921	921	921	523	0.4	92.3	1	SWZ	100.0								
61102099	Women's or girls' jerseys - cotton	12.2	0.0	538	538	538	517	0.4	92.7	3	BWA	85.1	ZWE	14.7	SWZ	0.2				

Table 25A
EU major non-agricultural products & their principal suppliers, ranked by descending value of ACP-LLDC receiving imports (2002)

Product code (HS)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $ 000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group)									
											1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	ACP (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports ACP-covered	Imports ACP-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
72024199	Ferro-chromium	4.0	0.0	34 321	34 321	34 321	31 963	31.4	31.4	1	ZWE	100.0								
85443090	Ignition wiring sets	3.7	0.0	20 669	20 669	20 669	20 315	20.0	51.4	1	BWA	100.0								
72024191	Ferro-chromium	4.0	0.0	10 214	10 214	10 214	9 426	9.3	60.7	1	ZWE	100.0								
54025200	Single yarn of polyesters	5.0	0.0	6 431	6 431	6 431	6 050	6.0	66.7	1	SWZ	100.0								
61103099	Jerseys, pullovers, etc	12.4	0.0	5 007	5 007	5 007	4 811	4.7	71.4	3	BWA	86.2	ZWE	13.7	SWZ	0.1				
62034231	Men's or boys' trousers, breeches, etc	12.4	0.0	4 031	4 031	4 031	3 810	3.7	75.1	3	ZWE	95.6	SWZ	3.8	BWA	0.6				
62034235	Men's or boys' trousers, breeches, etc	12.4	0.0	3 440	3 440	3 440	3 408	3.4	78.5	1	ZWE	100.0								
72025000	Ferro-silico-chromium	2.7	0.0	3 347	3 347	3 347	2 136	2.1	80.6	1	ZWE	100.0								
61091000	T-shirts, singlets and other vests	12.0	0.0	1 825	1 825	1 825	1 760	1.7	82.3	2	BWA	93.4	ZWE	6.6						
62046231	Women's or girls' trousers, breeches, etc	12.4	0.0	1 413	1 413	1 413	1 397	1.4	83.7	1	ZWE	100.0								
62046239	Women's or girls' trousers, breeches, etc	12.4	0.0	1 128	1 128	1 128	1 092	1.1	84.8	1	ZWE	100.0								

Table 26
EU major agricultural products & their principal suppliers, ranked by descending value of GSP-LLDC receiving imports (2004)

Product code (HS)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group)									
											1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	GSP (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports GSP-covered	Imports GSP-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
08023200	Walnuts w/o shells - fresh or dried	5.1	0.0	21 198	21 198	21 198	17 612	18.3	18.3	3	MDA	97.6	KGZ	1.6	UZB	0.8				
02041000	Lamb carcasses - fresh or chilled	12.8	0.0	15 546	15 546	15 546	15 421	16.0	34.4	1	MKD	100.0								
24011060	Tobacco - Prilep type	11.2	0.0	15 531	15 531	15 531	9 518	9.9	44.3	6	MKD	97.4	KAZ	1.3	KGZ	0.8	ARM	0.3	MDA	0.3
08022200	Hazlenuts w/o shells - fresh or dried	3.2	0.0	7 583	7 583	7 583	7 206	7.5	51.8	1	AZE	100.0								
10089090	Other cereal - Quinoa	37	0.0	2 861	2 861	2 788	2 712	2.8	54.6	1	BOL	100.0								
22071000	Undenatured ethyl alcohol	19.2	-1.0	3 684	3 684	3 684	2 512	2.6	57.2	2	BOL	99.2	MKD	0.8						
15121191	Crude sunflower seed & safflower oils	6.4	2.9	3 546	3 546	3 546	2 341	2.4	59.7	2	MDA	51.3	PRY	48.7						
07020000	Tomatoes - fresh or chilled	Entry prices[75]	0.0	2 117	2 117	2 117	2 106	2.2	61.8	1	MKD	100.0								
04013019	Milk & cream not concentrated or sweetened	56,6€/100kg/net	0.0	1 926	1 926	1 926	1 926	2.0	63.8	1	MKD	100.0								
07096010	Fruits (Capiscum) - fresh or chilled	7.2	0.0	1 757	1 757	1 757	1 746	1.8	65.7	1	MKD	100.0								

Table 26A
EU major agricultural products & their principal suppliers, ranked by descending value of GSP-LLDC receiving imports (2002)

Product code (HS)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's Total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's Total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group)									
											1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	GSP (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports GSP-covered	Imports GSP-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
08023200	Walnuts without shells, fresh or dried	5.1	1.6	17 390	17 390	17 386	14 599	43.8	43.8	4	MDA	96.3	UZB	2.5	KGZ	1.0	KAZ	0.2		
08022200	Hazlenuts without shells, fresh or dried	3.2	0.0	8 924	8 924	8 925	7 765	23.3	67.1	1	AZE	100.0								
22071000	Undenatured ethyl alcohol, of alcoholic strength	19.2 €/hl	0.0	3 748	3 748	3 748	2 938	8.8	75.9	1	BOL	100.0								
10089090	Other cereal, nes -- Quinoa	37 €/t	0.0 [76]	1 451	1 451	1 428	1 283	3.8	79.7	1	BOL	100.0								
24011070	Tobacco, not stemmed/stripped -- whether or not cut in regular size, having a custom value of not less than ECU|450	11.2 MIN 22 E MAX 56 €/ 100 kg/net	7.7 per cent MAX 56€/100 kg	1 415	1 415	1 415	1 083	3.2	83.0	1	PRY	100.0								
24012070	Tobacco, partly or wholly stemmed/stripped -- whether or not cut in regular size, having a custom value of not less	11.2 MIN 22 E MAX 56 €/ 100 kg/net	7.7 per cent MAX 56€/100 kg	1 290	1 290	1 290	993	3.0	85.9	1	PRY	100.0								

Table 27
EU major non-agricultural products & their principal suppliers, ranked by descending value of GSP-LLDC receiving imports (2004)

Product code (HS)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group)									
											1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	GSP (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports GSP-covered	Imports GSP-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
72024190	Ferro-chromium	4.0	0.0	186 908	186 908	177 700	146 707	15.1	15.1	1	KAZ	100.0								
72027000	Ferro-molybdenum	2.7	3.0	71 052	71 052	71 052	67 308	6.9	22.0	4	ARM	81.4	TJK	18.4	UZB	0.2	KAZ	0.0		
72023000	Ferro-silico-manganese	3.7	3.7	45 307	45 307	45 307	39 639	4.1	26.0	1	KAZ	100.0								
27111294	Propane - liquefied	0.7	0.0	65 955	65 955	65 955	33 284	3.4	29.5	1	KAZ	100.0								
72022100		5.7	0.0	35 427	35 427	35 427	32 514	3.3	32.8	2	MKD	52.6	KAZ	47.4						
62052000	Men's or boys' shirts - cotton	12.0	10.6	36 242	36 242	36 242	31 506	3.2	36.0	8	MKD	95.4	TJK	4.0	MDA	0.2	MNG	0.2	TKM	0.1
27111211	Propane - liquefied (power or heating fuel)	8.0	0.0	30 521	30 521	30 521	27 086	2.8	38.8	1	KAZ	100.0								
62064000	Women's or girls' blouses - man-made fibres	12.0	11.3	30 257	30 257	30 257	26 014	2.7	41.5	4	MKD	99.7	MDA	0.1	MNG	0.1	TKM	0.0		
28047000	Phosphorus	5.5	0.0	28 579	28 579	28 579	22 566	2.3	43.8	1	KAZ	100.0								
27111397	Butanes - liquefied	0.7	0.0	28 223	28 223	28 223	20 916	2.1	46.0	2	KAZ	100.0	MKD	0.0						
63023190	Bed linen - cotton	12	10.6	19 592	19 592	19 592	18 174	1.9	47.8	5	MDA	90.4	TKM	4.8	MKD	4.7	MNG	0.1	BOL	
79011100	Zinc not alloyed unwrought	2.5	0.0	29 717	29 717	23 327	13 568	1.4	49.2	2	MKD	78.5	KAZ	21.5						
64039996	Footwear	8.0	4.5	14 454	14 454	14 454	13 219	1.4	50.6	4	MDA	84.2	MKD	15.8	ARM	0.0	KAZ	0.0		
52051200	Uncombed single cotton yarn	4.2	0.0	19 475	19 475	19 475	13 168	1.4	51.9	3	UZB	85.2	TKM	10.3	TJK	4.6				
64061090	Uppers - hand-made	3.0	0.0	13 006	13 006	13 006	13 006	1.3	53.3	1	MKD	100.0								

Table 27A

EU major non-agricultural products & their principal suppliers, ranked by descending value of GSP-LLDC receiving imports (2002)

Product code (HS)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group)									
											1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	GSP (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports GSP-covered	Imports GSP-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
52051200	Uncombed single cotton yarn	4.4	3.5	19 655	19 655	19 653	18 650	7.2	7.2	4	UZB	85.9	TKM	13.4	TJK	0.5	KGZ	0.1		
63023190	Bed linen of cotton	12.0	9.6	13 536	13 536	13 535	13 167	5.1	12.2	3	MDA	97.8	TKM	1.5	TJK	0.7				
72023000	Ferro-silico-manganese	3.7	0.0	21 523	21 523	21 680	12 991	5.0	17.2	1	KAZ	100.0								
52053200	Uncombed multiple (folded)	4.4	3.5	12 622	12 622	12 622	10 792	4.1	21.3	3	UZB	64.9	TJK	33.2	KGZ	1.9				
52081219	Unbleached plain cotton weave	8.4	6.7	10 435	10 435	10 435	9 960	3.8	25.1	4	UZB	86.2	TKM	11.5	KAZ	2.0	AZE	0.4		
72027000	Ferro-molybdenum	2.7	0.0	9 159	9 159	9 159	8 666	3.3	28.5	2	ARM	98.2	TJK	1.8						
52051300	Uncombed single cotton yarn	4.4	3.5	8 724	8 724	8 724	8 477	3.3	31.7	2	UZB	64.7	TKM	35.3						
62034235	Men's or boys' trousers, breeches, etc	12.4	9.9	8 177	8 177	8 177	7 412	2.8	34.6	8	TJK	50.0	MDA	26.3	UZB	22.4	MNG	0.5	PRY	0.4
28047000	Phosphorus	5.5	0.0	7 028	7 028	7 028	6 983	2.7	37.2	1	KAZ	100.0								
52091200	Unbleached 3 or 4-thread twill	8.4	6.7	6 770	6 770	6 774	6 743	2.6	39.8	4	TJK	72.4	UZB	27.1	TKM	0.4	MDA	0.0		
28413000	Sodium dichromate	6.9	0.0	7 504	7 504	7 504	6 520	2.5	42.3	1	KAZ	100.0								
42021299	Trunks, suit-cases, etc	3.7	0.0	6 205	6 205	6 205	6 125	2.3	44.7	2	MDA	99.7	TJK	0.3						
42050000	Articles of leather or of composition leather, nes	2.5	0.0	5 668	5 668	5 668	5 627	2.2	46.8	3	PRY	100.0	MDA	0.0	MNG	0.0				
64039996	Footwear with rubber soles, leather uppers	8.0	4.5	6 361	6 361	6 361	5 510	2.1	49.0	2	MDA	100.0	AZE	0.0						
52052300	Combed single cotton yarn	4.4	3.5	5 412	5 412	5 413	5 183	2.0	50.9	2	UZB	89.1	TKM	10.9						
52081299	Unbleached plain cotton weave	8.4	6.7	4 912	4 912	4 912	4 752	1.8	52.8	6	MDA	31.3	TKM	25.0	UZB	23.0	KAZ	16.0	TJK	4.5
52052200	Combed single cotton yarn	4.4	3.5	4 643	4 643	4 643	4 394	1.7	54.4	2	UZB	93.8	TKM	6.2						
28199090	Chromium oxides and hydroxides	7.1	3.6	4 612	4 612	4 612	4 369	1.7	56.1	1	KAZ	100.0								
52081296	Unbleached plain cotton weave	8.4	6.7	4 121	4 121	4 117	3 924	1.5	57.6	6	UZB	82.0	KAZ	9.1	TJK	3.4	PRY	2.7	MDA	1.5
28191000	Chromium trioxide	7.1	3.6	4 748	4 748	4 743	3 801	1.5	59.1	1	KAZ	100.0								
28332500	Sulphates of copper	3.2	0.0	3 923	3 923	3 923	3 515	1.3	60.4	1	UZB	100.0								
29051200	Propan-1-ol and propan-2-ol	5.5	2.0	3 451	3 451	3 451	3 451	1.3	61.8	1	AZE	100.0								

Table 28
US major agricultural products & their principal suppliers, ranked by descending value of GSP-LLDC received imports (2004)

Product code (HS)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	77.7 SWZ 22.3 [illegible] 24013000 Tobacco refuse [illegible]	[illegible]	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group)									
											1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	CBI (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports CBI-covered	Imports CBI-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
17019910	Cane/beet sugar & pure sucrose - solid, w/o added coloring or flavoring	3.6606¢/kg	0.0	4 406	4 406	4 406	4 406	29.8	29.8	1	PRY	100.0								
17011110	Cane sugar (raw) - solid, w/o added flavoring or coloring	1.4606¢/kg	0.0	3 535	3 535	3 535	3 535	23.9	53.6	1	PRY	100.0								
05119940	Animal products - unfit for human consumption	1.1%	0.0	1 262	1 262	1 262	1 262	8.5	62.1	1	PRY	100.0								
17011120	Cane sugar (raw) - solid (used for certain polyhydric alcohols)	1.4606¢/kg	0.0	976	976	976	929	6.3	68.4	1	PRY	100.0								
08112020	Raspberries, loganberries, black currants & gooseberries - frozen	4.5	0.0	416	416	416	416	2.8	71.2	1	MKD	100.0								

Table 28A

US major agricultural products & their principal suppliers, ranked by descending value of GSP-LLDC received imports (2001)

Product code (HS)	Produc description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's Total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal Suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group) 1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	GSP (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports GSP-covered	Imports GSP-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
17011110	Raw sugar	1.4606c/kg	0.0	7 650	7 650	7 650	4 110	35.6	35.6	2	PRY	53.7	BOL	46.3						
17019910	Cane or beet sugar	3.6606c/kg	0.0	4 447	4 447	4 447	3 657	31.7	67.3	1	PRY	100.0								
13021200	Saps and extracts of licorice	3.8	0.0	1 288	1 288	1 288	1 212	10.5	77.8	1	UZB	100.0								
05119940	Animal products nes	1.1	0.0	419	419	419	419	3.6	81.4	1	PRY	100.0								

Table 29
US major non-agricultural products and their principal suppliers, ranked by descending value of GSP received imports (2004)

Product code (HS)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group)									
											1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	GSP (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports GSP-covered	Imports GSP-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
72024100	Ferrochromium containing more than 4 per cent of carbon	1.9	0.0	86 701	86 701	86 701	86 158	39.9	39.9	1	KAZ	100.0								
71131950	Precious metal (o/than silver) articles of jewellery and parts	5.5	0.0	66 105	66 105	66 105	30 873	14.3	54.2	4	BOL	55.2	ARM	35.9	KAZ	8.0	UZB	0.9		
72025000	Ferrosilicon chromium	10.0	0.0	28 365	28 365	28 365	28 365	13.1	67.3	1	KAZ	100.0								
72022150	Ferrosilicon containing more than 55 per cent silicon (not more than 80 per cent)	1.5	0.0	10 864	10 864	10 864	10 858	5.0	72.3	1	KAZ	100.0								
44182080	Doors of wood (not French doors)	4.8	0.0	12 820	12 820	12 820	8 130	3.8	76.1	4	BOL	99.2	MKD	0.4	PRY	0.2	MDA	0.1		
72024950	Ferrochromium containing 3 per cent or less carbon	3.1	0.0	5 276	5 276	5 276	5 276	2.4	78.5	1	KAZ	100.0								
44189045	Builders' joinery & carpentry of wood	3.2	0.0	5 671	5 671	5 671	5 086	2.4	80.9	2	PRY	90.3	BOL	9.7						

Table 29A
US major non-agricultural products and their principal suppliers, ranked by descending value of GSP received imports (2001)

Product code (HS)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $ 000)				Share in reporter's Total imports from partner countries (per cent)	Cumulated share in reporter's total imports from partner countries (per cent)	No of suppliers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group)									
											1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	GSP (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports GSP-covered	Imports GSP-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
79011250	Zinc (o/than alloy	1.5	0.0	81 067	81 067	81 067	81 067	31.5	31.5	1	KAZ	100.0								
74031100	Refined copper cathodes and sections of cathodes	1.0	0.0	85 103	85 103	85 103	53 184	20.6	52.1	2	KAZ	98.4	UZB	1.6						
72024100	Ferrochromium	1.9	0.0	20 031	20 031	20 031	19 834	7.7	59.8	1	KAZ	100.0								
71131950	Precious metal (o/than silver)	5.5	0.0	39 936	39 936	39 936	15 405	6.0	65.8	4	BOL	66.8	ARM	32.3	MKD	0.8	UZB	0.1		
72023000	Ferrosilicon manganese	3.9	0.0	14 383	14 383	14 383	14 383	5.6	71.4	1	KAZ	100.0								
81031060	Tantalum	2.5	0.0	12 931	12 931	12 931	10 943	4.2	75.6	1	KAZ	100.0								
28191000	Chromium trioxide	3.7	0.0	10 751	10 751	10 751	10 684	4.1	79.7	1	KAZ	100.0								
16043020	Caviar	15.0	0.0	9 984	9 984	9 984	9 975	3.9	83.6	1	KAZ	100.0								
72022150	Ferrosilicon	1.5	0.0	5 106	5 106	5 106	5 061	2.0	85.6	2	KAZ	76.7	MKD	23.3						
81039000	Tantalum, articles nesoi	4.4	0.0	4 948	4 948	4 948	4 948	1.9	87.5	1	KAZ	100.0								
72025000	Ferrosilicon chromium	10.0	0.0	3 924	3 924	3 924	3 924	1.5	89.0	1	KAZ	100.0								
26110060	Tungsten concentrates	37.5c/kg on tungsten content	0.0	4 829	4 829	4 829	3 681	1.4	90.5	2	BOL	92.2	MNG	7.8						
81041100	Magnesium	8.0	0.0	3 307	3 307	3 307	3 150	1.2	91.7	1	KAZ	100.0								
28419020	Ammonium perrhenate	3.1	0.0	2 936	2 936	2 936	2 936	1.1	92.8	1	KAZ	100.0								
81122060	Chromium	3.0	0.0	3 541	3 541	3 541	2 864	1.1	93.9	1	KAZ	100.0								
44182080	Doors of wood, other than French doors	4.8	0.0	12 391	12 391	12 391	2 839	1.1	95.0	2	BOL	99.4	PRY	0.6						

Table 30
US major agricultural products and their LLDC principal suppliers, ranked by descending value of AGOA received imports (2004)

Product code (HS)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in Reporter's Total imports from Partner Countries (per cent)	Cumulated Share in Reporter's Total imports from Partner Countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group)									
											1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	AGOA (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports AGOA-covered	Imports AGOA-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
20083070	Grapefruit - otherwise prepared or preserved	1.1¢/kg	0.0	413	413	413	295	100.0	100.0	1	SWZ	100.0								
17019950	Cane/beet sugar & pure sucrose - refined & solid w/o added coloring or flavoring	7.062¢/kg less 42.05¢/kg 0.1¢/kg for each degree under 100 degrees	0.0	35	35	0	0	0.0	100.0	1	SWZ	100.0								
17011150	Cane sugar (raw) - solid form w/o flavoring or coloring	7.062¢/kg less 42.05¢/kg 0.1¢/kg for each degree under 100 degrees	0.0	27	27	0	0	0.0	100.0	1	SWZ	100.0								
07142020	Sweet potatoes - fresh, chilled or dried	4.5	0.0	10	10	0	0	0.0	100.0	1	BWA	100.0								
20079935	Peach jam	7.0	0.0	3	3	3	0	0.0	100.0	1	SWZ	100.0								
20079945	Jams	5.6	0.0	3	3	0	0	0.0	100.0	1	SWZ	100.0								

Table 31
US major non-agricultural products and their LLDC principle suppliers, ranked by descending value of AGOA received imports (2004)

Product code (HS)	Product description	Tariff rates		Values of imports from partner countries (in $000)				Share in Reporter's Total imports from Partner Countries (per cent)	Cumulated Share in Reporter's Total imports from Partner Countries (per cent)	No. of sup-pliers	Principal suppliers (with their respective ISO3 codes and shares in total imports of the product from partner group)									
											1st supplier		2nd supplier		3rd supplier		4th supplier		5th supplier	
		MFN appl. (per cent)	AGOA (per cent)	Total imports	Imports dutiable	Imports AGOA-covered	Imports AGOA-received				ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)	ISO3 code	Share (per cent)
91059960	Clocks not electrically operated	23¢ each +3.2%	0.0	3	3	3	3	100.0	100.0	1	SWZ	100.0								
61102020	Sweaters, pullovers etc., knitted or crocheted, of cotton	16.5	0.0	44 526	44 526	0	0	0.0	100.0	2	SWZ	92.8	BWA	7.2						
61103030	Sweaters, pullovers etc., knitted or crocheted, of manmade fibers	32.0	0.0	24 059	24 059	0	0	0.0	100.0	2	SWZ	77.0	BWA	23.0						
62034240	Men's or boys' trousers & shorts, not knitted or crocheted - cotton	16.6	0.0	21 891	21 891	0	0	0.0	100.0	2	SWZ	90.6	BWA	9.4						
62046240	Women's or girls' trousers, breeches & shorts, not knitted or crocheted - cotton	16.6	0.0	21 113	21 113	0	0	0.0	100.0	2	SWZ	96.3	BWA	3.7						

Table 32. Imports of preference–giving countries from non-LDC effective beneficiaries of their GSP schemes (1994–2004) (US$ millions)

Country	Year	Total imports	Dutiable imports	GSP imports		Percentages		
				Covered	Receiving	(5)/(4)	(6)/(5)	(6)/(4)
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Canada	1995	17 890.8	6 704.7	3 858.4	2 411.6	57.5	62.5	36.0
	1996	18 577.5	6 684.6	4 185.8	2 636.6	62.6	63.0	39.4
	1997	20 574.9	7 366.0	4 455.7	2 939.0	60.5	66.0	39.9
	1998	18 534.9	6 851.7	3 579.0	2 387.4	52.2	66.7	34.8
	1999	24 044.6	7 102.6	4 016.5	2 552.0	56.5	63.5	35.9
	2000	31 014.2	8 472.4	4 803.3	3 080.6	56.7	64.1	36.4
	2001	27 882.3	8 883.4	5 365.0	3 255.1	60.4	60.7	36.6
	2002	32 139.1	10 111.7	6 417.4	3 882.4	63.5	60.5	38.4
	2003	33 592.8	10 661.8	7 066.8	4 113.8	66.3	58.2	38.6
European Union	1994	209 056.3	130 657.3	96 045.3	47 050.3	73.5	49.0	36.0
	1995	254 630.4	164 570.1	121 667.0	68 946.3	73.9	56.7	41.9
	1996	268 981.6	166 971.1	101 936.0	61 292.8	61.1	60.1	36.7
	1997	275 961.8	176 245.0	113 050.9	64 013.8	64.1	56.6	36.3
	1998	275 629.4	163 286.6	86 593.1	41 528.2	53.0	48.0	25.4
	1999	242 277.3	132 576.1	74 885.4	36 010.0	56.5	48.1	27.2
	2000	299 630.0	141 307.3	78 139.6	37 848.8	55.3	48.4	26.8
	2001	291 093.2	138 020.7	79 099.1	38 365.6	57.3	48.5	27.8
	2002	306 460.3	146 768.8	85 774.4	47 861.6	58.4	55.8	32.6
	2003	390 471.4	193 931.5	101 202.0	71 037.6	52.2	70.2	36.6
	2004	553 368.6	263 145.4	102 569.4	68 431.8	39.0	66.7	26.0
Japan	1994	142 081.2	87 165.4	36 933.0	16 733.9	42.4	45.3	19.2
	1995	162 201.5	92 475.8	40 766.5	16 927.1	44.1	41.5	18.3
	1996	183 270.5	103 866.0	42 102.8	17 664.5	40.5	42.0	17.0
	1997	171 846.2	92 707.5	39 710.9	16 789.6	42.8	42.3	18.1
	1998	140 244.5	73 583.4	55 462.2	13 105.2	75.4	23.6	17.8
	1999	164 569.2	85 031.7	63 717.7	14 187.4	74.9	22.3	16.7
	2000	148 004.5	77 027.8	60 842.5	12 872.0	79.0	21.2	16.7
	2001	140 288.3	71 639.0	71 639.0	11 769.8	100.0	16.4	16.4
United States	1994	91 212.3	61 740.5	26 968.1	17 959.4	43.7	66.6	29.1

	1995	98 180.9	62 835.8	26 428.8	18 015.2	42.1	68.2	28.7
	1996	103 868.4	65 632.1	27 044.8	16 708.9	41.2	61.8	25.5
	1997	95 731.9	61 543.5	36 406.6	14 528.7	59.2	39.9	23.6
	1998	98 456.6	59 277.1	31 540.0	14 393.2	53.2	45.6	24.3
	1999	106 315.2	55 871.0	17 731.7	11 370.2	31.7	64.1	20.4
	2000	130 994.4	69 783.1	19 443.5	12 983.3	27.9	66.8	18.6
	2001	116 337.9	65 385.5	20 130.7	13 167.5	30.8	65.4	20.1
	2002	139 860.3	82 252.1	18 668.8	14 986.2	22.7	80.3	18.2
	2003	158 766.6	97 316.8	20 724.1	16 881.6	21.3	81.5	17.3
	2004	200 646.1	118 593.5	21 568.3	18 648.3	18.2	86.5	15.7
TOTAL	1994	442 349.8	279 563.2	159 946.4	81 743.6	57.2	51.1	29.2
	1995	532 903.6	326 586.4	192 720.7	106 300.2	59.0	55.2	32.5
	1996	574 698.0	343 153.8	175 269.4	98 302.8	51.1	56.1	28.6
	1997	564 114.8	337 862.0	193 624.1	98 271.1	57.3	50.8	29.1
	1998	532 865.4	302 998.8	177 174.3	71 414.0	58.5	40.3	23.6
	1999	537 206.3	280 581.4	160 351.3	64 119.6	57.1	40.0	22.9
	2000	609 643.1	296 590.6	163 228.9	66 784.7	55.0	40.9	22.5
	2001	578 733.6	283 517.6	175 672.1	66 383.5	62.0	37.8	23.4

Source: Notifications and UNCTAD secretariat calculations.
Figures for 1994 not available.
Figures for 1994–1995 exclude Austria, Finland and Sweden.
Fiscal years.
Total figures for 1994 do not include Canada.

Table 33
Market access conditions for LDCs: List of top 3 per cent of non-covered products ranked by descending Total imports. Reporter: USA; tariffs and imports of 2004

Product		MFN Rate		LDC rate (per cent)	The "best" rate applied for LDCs (per cent)	Reporter s imports from LDCs				World imports from LDCs ($000)
HS Code	Description	Ad val (per cent)	Duty nature			Total ($000)	Total s share in WLD imp. from LDCs (per cent)	Rec. pref. treatmet ($000)	Utilization rate (per cent)	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
TOTALS	**ALL PRODUCTS**	**5.1**			**2.6**	**12 863 496**	**23.7**	**4 640 925**	**68.5**	**54 176 725**
TOTALS	**PRODUCTS NOT COVERED BY GSP SCHEME**	**16.7**			**16.7**	**5 070 879**	**36.5**	**0**		**13 877 598**
TOTALS	**TOP 3 per cent OF PRODUCTS NOT COVERED BY GSP SCHEME**	**12.5**			**12.5**	**5 068 870**	**49.6**	**0**		**10 227 464**
RATES	**TOP 3 per cent OVER NOT COVERED**					**100**				**73.7**
RATES	**TOP 3 per cent OVER ALL PRODUCTS**					**39.4**				**18.9**
61102020	Sweaters, pullovers etc - knitted	16.5	Ad Val		16.5	643 343	93.9	0		684 988
62046240	Women s or girls trousers	16.6	Ad Val		16.6	578 095	99.9	0		318 169
62034240	Men s or boys trousers & shorts	16.6	Ad Val		16.6	490 868	99.9	0		465 125
62052020	Men s or boys shirts - not knitted	19.7	Ad Val		19.7	345 333	96.2	0		358 903
61103030	Sweaters, pullovers etc - knitted	32	Ad Val		32	206 492	54.7	0		377 648
61091000	T-shirts, singlets, tank tops etc -	16.5	Ad Val		16.5	180 803	11.9	0		1 514 460
62063030	Women s or girls blouses & shirts -	15.4	Ad Val		15.4	167 148	99.9	0		77 659
62045220	Women s or girls skirts & divided -	8.2	Ad Val		8.2	125 677	99.9	0		88 187
61083100	Women s or girls nightdresses	8.5	Ad Val		8.5	84 651	81.9	0		103 354
61051000	Men s or boys shirts - knitted	19.7	Ad Val		19.7	78 691	31.4	0		250 456
65059020	Headwear, cotton (not knitted)	7.5	Ad Val		7.5	76 042	99.9	0		14 343
62019330	Men s or boys anoraks	7.1	Ad Val		7.1	68 689	99.9	0		30 822
61083200	Women s or girls nightdresses	16	Ad Val		16	66 917	95.7	0		69 941
61034315	Men s or boys trousers, breeches	28.2	Ad Val		28.2	63 607	99.9	0		28 895
62064030	Women s or girls blouses & shirts -	26.9	Ad Val		26.9	63 545	99.9	0		27 424
61046220	Women s or girls trousers	14.9	Ad Val		14.9	60 077	99.9	0		53 778
61082100	Women s or girls briefs & panties -	7.6	Ad Val		7.6	54 911	36.7	0		149 731
62111110	Men s or boys swimwear -	27.8	Ad Val		27.8	53 375	99.9	0		21 384
62053020	Men s or boys shirts - not knitted	.	Specific		.	52 148	60.9	0		85 655
61061000	Women s or girls blouses & shirts -	19.7	Ad Val		19.7	47 720	44.6	0		107 081
62034340	Men s or boys trousers, breeches	27.9	Ad Val		27.9	44 256	99.9	0		36 726
63026000	Toilet linen & kitchen linen - terry	9.1	Ad Val		9.1	43 945	64.6	0		68 040
65059080	Hats & headgear - felt or o/textile	.	Specific		.	41 425	99.9	0		14 343
61046320	Women s or girls trousers	28.2	Ad Val		28.2	38 942	99.9	0		20 637
62082100	Women s or girls nightdresses	8.9	Ad Val		8.9	37 033	77.1	0		48 026
62034335	Men s or boys trousers & breeches	7.1	Ad Val		7.1	36 938	99.9	0		36 726
61099010	T-shirts, singlets, tank tops etc -	32	Ad Val		32	36 380	99.9	0		34 371
61124100	Women s or girls knitted	24.9	Ad Val		24.9	35 166	91.9	0		38 285
61072200	Men s or boys nightshirts	16	Ad Val		16	33 441	94.1	0		35 547
62019220	Men s or boys anoraks	9.4	Ad Val		9.4	33 382	99.9	0		17 482

62045330	Women s or girls skirts & divided	16	Ad Val		16	33 298	99.9	0		12 851
62029345	Women s or girls anoraks	7.1	Ad Val		7.1	32 477	99.9	0		17 444
61079100	Men s or boys bathrobes, dressing	8.7	Ad Val		8.7	29 990	98.5	0		30 444
62121090	Brassieres - not containing lace	16.9	Ad Val		16.9	29 233	99.9	0		20 430
61101210	Sweaters, pullovers, sweatshirts	4	Ad Val		4	29 126	65.5	0		44 501
62029220	Women s or girls anoraks	8.9	Ad Val		8.9	27 999	99.9	0		13 508
61072100	Men s or boys nightshirts	8.9	Ad Val		8.9	27 990	79.3	0		35 308
61142000	Garments - knitted or crocheted	10.8	Ad Val		10.8	27 694	52.2	0		53 077
62114200	Women s or girls track suits	8.1	Ad Val		8.1	27 467	77.8	0		35 317
62104050	Men s or boys garments - mmf	7.1	Ad Val		7.1	26 764	99.9	0		15 106
62079130	Men s or boys singlets	6.1	Ad Val		6.1	26 188	99.9	0		13 851
61071100	Men s or boys underpants & briefs	7.4	Ad Val		7.4	25 695	58.1	0		44 193
61034210	Men s or boys trousers, breeches	16.1	Ad Val		16.1	25 640	99.9	0		23 253
61013020	Men s or boys overcoats, carcoats	28.2	Ad Val		28.2	25 580	99.9	0		17 294
62046335	Women s or girls trousers	28.6	Ad Val		28.6	25 432	65.3	0		38 976
63062290	Tents other than backpacking tents	8.8	Ad Val		8.8	25 263	99.9	0		24 141
62089130	Women s or girls undershirts	11.2	Ad Val		11.2	24 140	99.9	0		14 212
61089100	Women s or girls negligees knitted	8.5	Ad Val		8.5	21 731	86.7	0		25 058
61062020	Women s or girls blouses & shirts -	32	Ad Val		32	20 741	99.9	0		16 965
62092030	Babies trousers, breeches & shorts	14.9	Ad Val		14.9	20 501	99.9	0		18 504
62082200	Women s or girls nightdresses	16	Ad Val		16	20 385	90.4	0		22 561
62044230	Women s or girls	8.4	Ad Val		8.4	19 651	99.9	0		11 954
61082290	Women s or girls briefs & panties	15.6	Ad Val		15.6	17 602	70.6	0		24 924
61012000	Men s or boys overcoats, carcoats	15.9	Ad Val		15.9	17 207	74.2	0		23 197
62092050	Babies garments	9.3	Ad Val		9.3	15 981	86.4	0		18 504
61052020	Men s or boys shirts	32	Ad Val		32	15 974	46.5	0		34 358
62071100	Men s or boys underpants & briefs	6.1	Ad Val		6.1	15 685	83.3	0		18 819
62105050	Women s or girls garments	7.1	Ad Val		7.1	15 331	99.9	0		10 005
61112060	Babies garments & clothing	8.1	Ad Val		8.1	14 683	99.9	0		8 542
61022000	Women s or girls overcoats	15.9	Ad Val		15.9	13 977	55.7	0		25 108
62044340	Women s or girls dresses	16	Ad Val		16	13 970	99.9	0		4 189
62072100	Men s or boys nightshirts	8.9	Ad Val		8.9	12 793	65.2	0		19 633
61045200	Women s or girls skirts & divided	8.3	Ad Val		8.3	12 667	73.3	0		17 281
62114300	Women s or girls track suits	16	Ad Val		16	12 625	31.7	0		39 772
62043220	Women s or girls suit-type jackets	9.4	Ad Val		9.4	12 399	93.4	0		13 270
61023020	Women s or girls overcoats	28.2	Ad Val		28.2	12 272	54.9	0		22 368
61089200	Women s or girls negligees	16	Ad Val		16	11 535	77.6	0		14 859
62043350	Women s or girls suit-type jackets	27.3	Ad Val		27.3	11 352	99.9	0		5 691
61045320	Women s or girls skirts & divided	16	Ad Val		16	9 974	99.9	0		5 724
62034220	Men s or boys bib & brace overalls	10.3	Ad Val		10.3	9 950	2.1	0		465 125
62046220	Women s or girls bib & brace	8.9	Ad Val		8.9	9 459	3	0		318 169
62041320	Women s or girls suits - not knitted	.	Specific		.	8 893	99.9	0		4 637
63071020	Floor cloths, dishcloths etc - textile	5.3	Ad Val		5.3	8 735	99.9	0		6 937
61130090	Garments	7.1	Ad Val		7.1	8 601	99.9	0		5 736
62093030	Babies garments & clothing	16	Ad Val		16	8 213	99.9	0		4 030
61079200	Men s or boys bathrobes, dressing	14.9	Ad Val		14.9	8 122	90.8	0		8 949
62113200	Men s or boys track suits or other	8.1	Ad Val		8.1	8 006	42.5	0		18 856
62046330	Women s or girls trousers	7.1	Ad Val		7.1	7 835	20.1	0		38 976
62031190	Men s or boys suits of wool or fine	17.5	Ad Val		17.5	7 663	99.9	0		6 477

62019310	Men s or boys anoraks	4.4	Ad Val		4.4	7 599	24.7	0		30 822
62029310	Women s or girls anoraks	4.4	Ad Val		4.4	7 369	42.2	0		17 444
61113050	Babies garments & clothing	16	Ad Val		16	7 174	99.9	0		3 652
61101100	Sweaters, pullovers, sweatshirts	16	Ad Val		16	7 069	5.8	0		122 824
62019335	Men s or boys anoraks	27.7	Ad Val		27.7	6 737	21.9	0		30 822
62069000	Women s or girls blouses, shirts	6.7	Ad Val		6.7	6 615	81.8	0		8 089
62046990	Women s or girls trousers	2.8	Ad Val		2.8	6 039	99.9	0		4 806
62113300	Men s or boys track suits or other	16	Ad Val		16	5 985	15.6	0		38 437
62021220	Women s or girls overcoats	8.9	Ad Val		8.9	5 918	99.9	0		4 806
62046312	Women s or girls bib & brace	7.1	Ad Val		7.1	5 904	15.1	0		38 976
62034315	Men s or boys bib & brace overalls	7.1	Ad Val		7.1	5 881	16	0		36 726
62111180	Men s or boys swimwear - textile	7.5	Ad Val		7.5	5 547	25.9	0		21 384
61044200	Women s or girls dresses - knitted	11.5	Ad Val		11.5	5 445	34	0		16 012
63023190	Bed linen - not knit/croc	6.7	Ad Val		6.7	5 423	62.6	0		8 668
62034118	Men s or boys trousers & breeches	.	Specific		.	5 267	99.9	0		2 969
61103015	Sweaters, etc. - knitted or crocheted	17	Ad Val		17	5 237	1.4	0		377 648
63029100	Toilet & kitchen linen	9.2	Ad Val		9.2	5 157	55.6	0		9 267
65059025	Hats & headgear	7.5	Ad Val		7.5	4 615	32.2	0		14 343
62092020	Babies blouses & shirts	14.9	Ad Val		14.9	4 552	24.6	0		18 504
62045930	Women s or girls skirts & divided	16	Ad Val		16	4 512	99.9	0		2 275
62044440	Women s or girls dresses	16	Ad Val		16	4 487	99.9	0		2 097
61143010	Tops - knitted or crocheted	28.2	Ad Val		28.2	4 420	53.7	0		8 228
63071010	Dustcloths, mop cloths & polishing	4.1	Ad Val		4.1	3 885	56	0		6 937
62111210	Women s or girls swimwear	11.8	Ad Val		11.8	3 674	99.9	0		1 734
61143030	Garments - knitted or crocheted -	14.9	Ad Val		14.9	3 646	44.3	0		8 228
62059040	Men s or boys shirts - not knitted	2.8	Ad Val		2.8	3 527	87.9	0		4 013
62142000	Shawls, scarves, mufflers	6.7	Ad Val		6.7	3 488	21.3	0		16 374
62029350	Women s or girls anoraks	27.7	Ad Val		27.7	3 477	19.9	0		17 444
62021100	Women s or girls overcoats	.	Specific		.	3 439	81.1	0		4 240
62071990	Men s or boys underpants & briefs	10.5	Ad Val		10.5	3 296	99.9	0		1 895
62043120	Women s or girls suit-type jackets	17.5	Ad Val		17.5	3 260	99.9	0		1 868
65059060	Hats & headgear - mmf - knitted	.	Specific		.	3 245	22.6	0		14 343
61143020	Bodysuits & bodyshirts - knitted	32	Ad Val		32	3 210	39	0		8 228
63022190	Bed linen - not knit or croc	6.7	Ad Val		6.7	3 197	24.3	0		13 143
62089110	Women s or girls bathrobes	7.5	Ad Val		7.5	3 122	22	0		14 212
62089200	Women s or girls singlets & other	16	Ad Val		16	3 103	77.3	0		4 014
61044320	Women s or girls dresses - knitted	16	Ad Val		16	2 979	88.1	0		3 380
61112030	Babies sweaters, pullovers	14.9	Ad Val		14.9	2 922	34.2	0		8 542
63025300	Table linen of man-made fibers -	11.3	Ad Val		11.3	2 842	90.7	0		3 134
62034980	Men s or boys trousers, bib	2.8	Ad Val		2.8	2 724	99	0		2 751
62019120	Men s or boys anoraks crocheted -	.	Specific		.	2 624	99.9	0		1 632
62045940	Women s or girls skirts & divided	6.6	Ad Val		6.6	2 339	99.9	0		2 275
52081260	Woven cotton fabric - 85 per cent or more	9	Ad Val		9	2 306	68.6	0		3 362
55121100	Woven fabrics containing 85 per cent	12	Ad Val		12	2 287	96.1	0		2 380
61161044	Gloves, mittens & mitts	9.9	Ad Val		9.9	2 277	99.9	0		362
62046190	Women s or girls trousers	13.6	Ad Val		13.6	2 258	99.9	0		1 776
62092010	Babies dresses - not knitted	11.8	Ad Val		11.8	2 246	12.1	0		18 504
62031220	Men s or boys suits - synthetic	27.3	Ad Val		27.3	2 232	91.4	0		2 441
61112050	Babies trousers, breeches &	14.9	Ad Val		14.9	2 224	26	0		8 542

	shorts									
62121050	Brassieres containing lace, net	16.9	Ad Val		16.9	2 213	10.8	0		20 430
62046925	Women s or girls trousers	28.6	Ad Val		28.6	2 053	42.7	0		4 806
61169264	Gloves, mittens & mitts	23.5	Ad Val		23.5	2 036	99.9	0		407
62019320	Men s or boys padded, sleeveless	14.9	Ad Val		14.9	1 940	6.3	0		30 822
63021000	Bed linen - knitted or crocheted	6	Ad Val		6	1 766	48.7	0		3 629
61021000	Women s or girls overcoats	.	Specific		.	1 722	61	0		2 824
61112010	Babies blouses & shirts	19.7	Ad Val		19.7	1 708	20	0		8 542
65059050	Hats & headgear - mmf - knitted	6.8	Ad Val		6.8	1 679	11.7	0		14 343
62029120	Women s or girls anoraks	.	Specific		.	1 558	99.9	0		1 430
62034920	Men s or boys trousers, breeches	27.9	Ad Val		27.9	1 476	53.7	0		2 751
62044950	Women s or girls dresses	6.9	Ad Val		6.9	1 446	99.9	0		1 304
63025130	Tablecloths & napkins, other than	5.8	Ad Val		5.8	1 383	99.9	0		1 304
61171020	Shawls, scarves, mufflers	11.3	Ad Val		11.3	1 347	99.9	0		1 312
61109090	Sweaters, pullovers, sweatshirts	6	Ad Val		6	1 326	7.7	0		17 329
61121200	Track suits - knitted or crocheted	28.2	Ad Val		28.2	1 317	20.1	0		6 536
62033310	Men s or boys suit-type jackets	22	Ad Val		22	1 293	19	0		6 800
62019215	Men s or boys anoraks	6.2	Ad Val		6.2	1 286	7.4	0		17 482
62045100	Women s or girls skirts & divided	14	Ad Val		14	1 228	83.6	0		1 469
62112015	Men s or boys ski-suits	7.1	Ad Val		7.1	1 223	99.9	0		313
61113040	Babies sweaters, pullovers etc	30	Ad Val		30	1 220	33.4	0		3 652
61112020	Babies T-shirts, singlets etc, except	14.9	Ad Val		14.9	1 168	13.7	0		8 542
62021340	Women s or girls overcoats	27.7	Ad Val		27.7	1 143	17.8	0		6 424
62033990	Men s or boys suit-type jackets	6.5	Ad Val		6.5	1 118	99.9	0		699
63039100	Curtains (including drapes)	10.3	Ad Val		10.3	1 092	7.3	0		14 987
63022170	Bed linen - not knit or crocheted	2.5	Ad Val		2.5	1 046	8	0		13 143
57011090	Carpets & other textile floor	4.5	Ad Val		4.5	1 044	3.9	0		26 568
62019210	Men s or boys anoraks	4.4	Ad Val		4.4	986	5.6	0		17 482
62021310	Women s or girls overcoats	4.4	Ad Val		4.4	959	14.9	0		6 424
63013000	Blankets	8.4	Ad Val		8.4	878	79.8	0		1 100
46021029	Luggage, handbags & flat goods	5.3	Ad Val		5.3	873	96.4	0		906
61121100	Track suits - knitted or crocheted	14.9	Ad Val		14.9	870	21.7	0		4 015
62102050	Men s or boys	7.1	Ad Val		7.1	854	99.9	0		534
61045910	Women s or girls skirts & divided	8	Ad Val		8	853	99.9	0		470
61169394	Gloves, mittens & mitts	18.6	Ad Val		18.6	849	99.9	0		244
62079110	Men s or boys bathrobes, dressing	8.4	Ad Val		8.4	843	6.1	0		13 851
62011220	Men s or boys overcoats, carcoats	9.4	Ad Val		9.4	830	42.3	0		1 962
42029230	Travel, sports & similar bags	17.6	Ad Val		17.6	725	99.9	0		570
52091100	Unbleached plain weave fabrics	6.5	Ad Val		6.5	721	15.1	0		4 779
61161017	Gloves, mittens & mitts - coated	23.5	Ad Val		23.5	712	99.9	0		362
62033190	Men s or boys suit-type jackets	17.5	Ad Val		17.5	695	99.9	0		611
61081990	Women s or girls slips & petticoats	6.6	Ad Val		6.6	674	99.9	0		390
62033320	Men s or boys suit-type jackets	27.3	Ad Val		27.3	663	9.8	0		6 800
61123100	Men s or boys swimwear - knitted	25.9	Ad Val		25.9	661	36.3	0		1 823
62093020	Babies trousers, breeches & shorts	28.6	Ad Val		28.6	613	15.2	0		4 030
62034320	Men s or boys bib & brace overalls	14.9	Ad Val		14.9	593	1.6	0		36 726
62041920	Women s or girls suits - not knitted	.	Specific		.	579	99.9	0		162
65059040	Hats & headgear - wool - n/knitted	.	Specific		.	574	4	0		14 343
62034330	Men s or boys trousers	.	Specific		.	525	1.4	0		36 726
62104090	Men s or boys garments -	6.2	Ad Val		6.2	516	3.4	0		15 106

62032300	Men s or boys ensembles	.	Specific		.	502	32.2	0		1 557
62043920	Women s or girls suit-type jackets	.	Specific		.	498	57.6	0		864
61169388	Gloves, mittens & mitts	18.6	Ad Val		18.6	498	99.9	0		244
61130010	Garments - k/c fabrics of 5903	3.8	Ad Val		3.8	487	8.5	0		5 736
62171095	Made up clothing accessories	14.6	Ad Val		14.6	472	78.3	0		603
61113010	Babies trousers, breeches & shorts	28.2	Ad Val		28.2	459	12.6	0		3 652
61043200	Women s or girls suit-type jackets	14.9	Ad Val		14.9	447	18.6	0		2 398
62099090	Babies garments & clothing	2.8	Ad Val		2.8	444	99.9	0		273
61178095	Made up clothing accessories	14.6	Ad Val		14.6	412	99.9	0		259
62079240	Men s or boys singlets & other	10.5	Ad Val		10.5	405	66	0		614
61044420	Women s or girls dresses knitted	14.9	Ad Val		14.9	396	93.8	0		422
62043930	Women s or girls suit-type jackets	27.3	Ad Val		27.3	368	42.6	0		864
61169100	Gloves, mittens & mitts -	.	Specific		.	357	52.7	0		678
61042200	Women s or girls ensembles	.	Specific		.	353	20.3	0		1 742
62114990	Women s or girls garments	7.3	Ad Val		7.3	350	47.3	0		740
62029990	Women s or girls anoraks	2.8	Ad Val		2.8	350	86.6	0		404
62072200	Men s or boys nightshirts	16	Ad Val		16	348	15.8	0		2 200
42022280	Handbags with/without shoulder	17.6	Ad Val		17.6	342	95.8	0		357
63022220	Bed linen - not knitted or crocheted	11.4	Ad Val		11.4	342	2.1	0		16 262
64039960	Footwear w/outer soles	8.5	Ad Val		8.5	330	0.9	0		34 849
64039160	Footwear w/outer soles	8.5	Ad Val		8.5	322	1.8	0		17 676
61103020	Sweaters, pullovers etc - knitted	6.3	Ad Val		6.3	322	0.1	0		377 648
63049200	Furnishing articles	6.3	Ad Val		6.3	315	15.1	0		2 090
58109210	Badges, emblems & motifs	.	Specific		.	314	99.9	0		197
62031210	Men s or boys suits - synthetic	17.5	Ad Val		17.5	312	12.8	0		2 441
61124900	Women s or girls swimwear	13.2	Ad Val		13.2	308	84.6	0		364
61046920	Women s or girls trousers	28.2	Ad Val		28.2	306	42.1	0		726
63014000	Blankets	8.5	Ad Val		8.5	300	58	0		517
63025120	Plain woven tablecloths	4.8	Ad Val		4.8	298	22.9	0		1 304
65059030	Hats & headgear - wool - knitted	.	Specific		.	295	2.1	0		14 343
62043980	Women s or girls suit-type jackets	6.3	Ad Val		6.3	295	34.1	0		864
61159290	Stockings, socks, etc	13.5	Ad Val		13.5	291	17.8	0		1 633
55093200	Yarn (not sewing thread) cont. 85 per cent	10	Ad Val		10	285	79.6	0		358
62042300	Women s or girls ensembles	.	Specific		.	274	30.6	0		894
62122000	Girdles & panty-girdles	20	Ad Val		20	274	23.4	0		1 170
62033220	Men s or boys suit-type jackets	9.4	Ad Val		9.4	271	9.5	0		2 863
61112040	Babies dresses - knitted	11.5	Ad Val		11.5	270	3.2	0		8 542
55151200	Woven fabrics of polyester staple	12	Ad Val		12	260	84.4	0		308
63023170	Bed linen - not knit/croc	3.8	Ad Val		3.8	249	2.9	0		8 668
61113020	Babies blouses & shirts	32	Ad Val		32	245	6.7	0		3 652
62011340	Men s or boys overcoats, carcoats	27.7	Ad Val		27.7	239	7.5	0		3 184
65059090	Hats & headgear - textile materials	.	Specific		.	236	1.6	0		14 343
62029210	Women s or girls anoraks	4.4	Ad Val		4.4	236	1.7	0		13 508
61171010	Shawls, scarves, mufflers	9.6	Ad Val		9.6	226	17.2	0		1 312
62029320	Women s or girls padded	14.9	Ad Val		14.9	222	1.3	0		17 444
58063920	Narrow woven fabric - not pile	4.9	Ad Val		4.9	216	99.9	0		175
65059015	Hats & headgear - cotton	7.9	Ad Val		7.9	215	1.5	0		14 343
62141020	Shawls, scarves, mufflers	3.9	Ad Val		3.9	198	2.4	0		8 187
61045980	Women s or girls skirts & divided	5.6	Ad Val		5.6	194	41.3	0		470
62045320	Women s or girls skirts & divided	14.9	Ad Val		14.9	191	1.5	0		12 851
63049960	Furnishing articles	3.2	Ad Val		3.2	186	99.9	0		157
62045920	Women s or girls skirts & divided	14.9	Ad Val		14.9	182	8	0		2 275
62046325	Women s or girls trousers	13.6	Ad Val		13.6	175	0.4	0		38 976
42022270	Handbags with or w/o shoulder	7	Ad Val		7	172	48.2	0		357

57031000	Carpets & other textile floor	6	Ad Val		6	169	18.4	0		916
61119050	Babies garments & clothing	14.9	Ad Val		14.9	166	99.9	0		72
62129000	Braces, suspenders, garters	6.6	Ad Val		6.6	165	27.9	0		592
61102010	Sweaters, pullovers etc - knitted	5	Ad Val		5	164	0	0		684 988
61062010	Women s or girls blouses & shirts	14.9	Ad Val		14.9	163	1	0		16 965
61101900	Sweaters, pullovers, sweatshirts	16	Ad Val		16	157	1.4	0		11 091
61046100	Women s or girls trousers, bib	14.9	Ad Val		14.9	157	26.6	0		591
52084960	Woven fabrics cotton - 85 per cent	9.7	Ad Val		9.7	147	99.9	0		146
42031040	Articles of apparel - leather	6	Ad Val		6	146	68.2	0		214
62104070	Men s or boys garments	3.3	Ad Val		3.3	142	0.9	0		15 106
62029215	Women s or girls anoraks	6.2	Ad Val		6.2	139	1	0		13 508
52084980	Woven fabrics cotton - 85 per cent	14.7	Ad Val		14.7	138	94.5	0		146
52102140	Bleached plain weave fabrics	8.1	Ad Val		8.1	138	99.9	0		60
65059070	Hats & headgear - mmf, made up	6.8	Ad Val		6.8	137	1	0		14 343
62043110	Women s or girls suit-type jackets	7.5	Ad Val		7.5	128	6.9	0		1 868
63061200	Tarpaulins, awnings & sunblinds	8.8	Ad Val		8.8	111	70.7	0		157
54023160	Multiple or cabled textured yarn	8	Ad Val		8	109	88.6	0		123
64039990	Footwear w/outer soles	10	Ad Val		10	106	0.3	0		34 849
62112078	Women s or girls ski-suits	14.9	Ad Val		14.9	105	33.5	0		313
94049080	Arts.of bedding etc stuffed	4.4	Ad Val		4.4	102	32.2	0		317
61071200	Men s or boys underpants & briefs	14.9	Ad Val		14.9	97	1.8	0		5 359
52091900	Unbleached woven fabrics cotton	6.5	Ad Val		6.5	97	27.5	0		353
61034980	Men s or boys trousers, bib	5.6	Ad Val		5.6	96	18	0		532
62019990	Men s or boys anoraks	4.2	Ad Val		4.2	92	32.4	0		284
62041200	Women s or girls suits - not knitted	14.9	Ad Val		14.9	86	16.4	0		524
62103050	Women s or girls	7.1	Ad Val		7.1	85	31.5	0		270
62021330	Women s or girls overcoats	.	Specific		.	83	1.3	0		6 424
60041000	Knitted or crocheted fabrics, width	12.3	Ad Val		12.3	83	13.4	0		621
62149000	Shawls, scarves, mufflers	11.3	Ad Val		11.3	82	5.9	0		1 391
63079089	Surgical towels, cotton towels etc -	7	Ad Val		7	81	9.1	0		893
42023295	Articles of a kind normally carried	17.6	Ad Val		17.6	79	55.6	0		142
62033950	Men s or boys suit-type jackets	1	Ad Val		1	79	11.3	0		699
61081100	Women s or girls slips & petticoats	14.9	Ad Val		14.9	78	11.9	0		658
62114100	Women s or girls track suits	12	Ad Val		12	78	67.2	0		116
63025140	Table linen, other than tablecloths	6.3	Ad Val		6.3	77	5.9	0		1 304
52084240	Plain weave fabrics cotton - 85 per cent	11.4	Ad Val		11.4	76	99.9	0		43
42029100	Cases, bags & containers w/outer	4.5	Ad Val		4.5	76	8.3	0		920
62044120	Women s or girls dresses	13.6	Ad Val		13.6	75	89.3	0		84
42029215	Travel, sports & similar bags	6.3	Ad Val		6.3	74	13	0		570
62144000	Shawls, scarves, mufflers	5.3	Ad Val		5.3	74	36.3	0		204
62103070	Women s or girls	3.3	Ad Val		3.3	74	27.4	0		270
58089000	Ornamental trimmings in the piece	3.9	Ad Val		3.9	73	17.3	0		421
62101090	Garments - fabrics of heading 5602	16	Ad Val		16	71	3.4	0		2 090
42022245	Handbags w/ or w/o shoulder strap	6.3	Ad Val		6.3	70	19.6	0		357
62152000	Ties, bow ties & cravats	.	Specific		.	69	7.4	0		937
62041100	Women s or girls suits - not knitted	14	Ad Val		14	69	90.8	0		76
62046315	Women s or girls bib & brace	14.9	Ad Val		14.9	68	0.2	0		38 976
52104980	Woven fabrics cotton - < 85 per cent	15.5	Ad Val		15.5	67	85.9	0		78
55141100	Plain weave fabrics of poly	14.9	Ad Val		14.9	67	44.1	0		152

	staple									
63069900	Camping goods - textile materials	4.5	Ad Val		4.5	67	46.2	0		145
62034112	Men s or boys trousers & breeches	.	Specific		.	66	2.2	0		2 969
61045100	Women s or girls skirts & divided	14.9	Ad Val		14.9	66	33.8	0		195
52111900	Unbleached woven fabrics cotton	7.7	Ad Val		7.7	65	100	0		65
42029260	Bags, cases & similar containers	6.3	Ad Val		6.3	63	11.1	0		570
61043100	Women s or girls suit-type jackets	.	Specific		.	62	28.1	0		221
62043340	Women s or girls suit-type jackets	.	Specific		.	62	1.1	0		5 691
62099030	Babies garments & clothing	14.9	Ad Val		14.9	62	22.7	0		273
62123000	Corsets	23.5	Ad Val		23.5	61	29.9	0		204
52082980	Bleached woven fabrics cotton	13.5	Ad Val		13.5	60	65.2	0		92
52101140	Unbleached plain weave fabrics	8.4	Ad Val		8.4	59	99.9	0		28
52082240	Woven cotton fabric - 85 per cent or more	8.4	Ad Val		8.4	56	28.1	0		199
62105090	Wom s or girls garments	6.2	Ad Val		6.2	55	0.5	0		10 005
42029220	Travel, sports & similar bags	5.7	Ad Val		5.7	54	9.5	0		570
62021990	Women s or girls overcoats	2.8	Ad Val		2.8	53	44.9	0		118
52083240	Dyed plain weave fabrics cotton	9.7	Ad Val		9.7	52	32.3	0		161
61169274	Gloves, mittens & mitts	23.5	Ad Val		23.5	50	12.3	0		407
62011100	Men s or boys overcoats, carcoats	.	Specific		.	47	14.5	0		325
61041200	Women s or girls suits - knitted	9.4	Ad Val		9.4	46	12	0		383
62044220	Women s or girls dresses	5.5	Ad Val		5.5	46	0.4	0		11 954
61141000	Garments - knitted or crocheted	12	Ad Val		12	44	14.4	0		305
63023220	Bed linen - not knitted or crocheted	11.4	Ad Val		11.4	44	0.7	0		6 614
57023120	Carpets & other textile floor	4	Ad Val		4	44	41.9	0		105
62111280	Women s or girls swimwear	7.5	Ad Val		7.5	43	2.5	0		1 734
61103010	Sweaters, pullovers, sweatshirts etc	6	Ad Val		6	43	0	0		377 648
62114910	Women s or girls garments	1.2	Ad Val		1.2	43	5.8	0		740
62031910	Men s or boys suits - not knitted	13.2	Ad Val		13.2	41	9.2	0		448
62160038	Gloves, mittens & mitts	23.5	Ad Val		23.5	40	99.9	0		10
62179090	Parts of garments or of clothing	14.6	Ad Val		14.6	40	9.3	0		431
52112900	Bleached woven fabrics cotton	8.4	Ad Val		8.4	40	100	0		40
94049010	Pillows, cushions etc, cotton	5.3	Ad Val		5.3	40	12.6	0		317
61046980	Women s or girls trousers, bib	5.6	Ad Val		5.6	39	5.4	0		726
57050020	Carpets & other textile floor	3.3	Ad Val		3.3	38	6	0		632
42022260	Handbags with or w/o shoulder	5.7	Ad Val		5.7	37	10.4	0		357

Table 34
Market access conditions for LDCs: List of top 3 per cent of non-covered products ranked by descending total import Reporter: Japan; tariffs and imports of 2004

Product		MFN Rate		LDC rate (per cent)	The "best" rate applied for LDCs (per cent)	Reporter s imports from LDCs				World imports from LDCs ($000)
HS Code	Description	Ad val (per cent)	Duty nature			Total ($000)	Total share in WLD imp. from LDCs (per cent)	Rec. pref. treatment ($000)	Utilization rate (per cent)	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
TOTALS	**ALL PRODUCTS**	**11.1**			**8**	**2 422 109**	**4.5**	**458 763**	**87.3**	**54 169 426**
TOTALS	**PRODUCTS NOT COVERED BY THE GSP SCHEME**	**62.2**				**1 488 756**	**6.1**	**0**		**24 392 166**
TOTALS	**TOP 3 per cent OF PRODUCTS NOT COVERED BY THE GSP SCHEME**	**51.2**				**1 488 756**	**6.3**	**0**		**23 454 281**
RATES	**TOP 3 per cent OVER NOT COVERED**					**100**				**96.2**
RATES	**TOP 3 per cent OVER ALL PRODUCTS**					**61.5**				**43.3**
270900090	Petroleum oils & oils obtained		Specific			1 410 626	12.5			11 263 477
30234000	Bigeye tunas (Thunnus obesus)	3.5	Ad Val		3.5	11 397	95.1			11 989
30749110	Mongo ika - frozen	3.5	Ad Val		3.5	11 111	42.3			26 253
30232000	Yellowfin tunas (Thunnus)	3.5	Ad Val		3.5	11 081	34.4			32 218
30343000	Skipjack or stripe-bellied bonito	3.5	Ad Val		3.5	8 533	55.1			15 479
30344000	Bigeye tunas (Thunnus obesus)	3.5	Ad Val		3.5	8 515	95.7			8 893
30342000	Yellowfin tunas (Thunnus)	3.5	Ad Val		3.5	6 507	44.3			14 682
30799121	Mongo ika, incl flours, meals	3.5	Ad Val		3.5	3 065	99.9			2 057
30379099	Other fish (excl fish fillet etc)	3.5	Ad Val		3.5	2 589	53.5			4 840
71339226	Other beans (Vigna spp)	10	Ad Val		10	2 444	33.2			7 359
30799142	Abal1, incl flours, meals	7	Ad Val		7	2 101	99.9			2 057
30490099	Fish meat of other fish, excl	3.5	Ad Val		3.5	1 145	99.9			448
30490095	Itoyori, Surimi - frozen	3.5	Ad Val		3.5	1 034	99.9			448
200980123	Juice of any single fruit	19.1	Ad Val		19.1	846	99.9			419
30379098	Swordfish (excl fish fillet etc)	3.5	Ad Val		3.5	803	16.6			4 840
30619010	Ebi, incl flours, meals & pellets	2	Ad Val		2	712	21.1			3 373
30379031	Sea breams (excl fish fillet etc	2	Ad Val		2	653	13.5			4 840
20230090	B1less	38.5	Ad Val		38.5	644	99.9			333
640299010	Shoes w/outer soles & uppers	8	Ad Val		8	632	5			12 566
640299029	sandals, w/outer soles & uppers	10	Ad Val		10	500	4			12 566
30379091	Marlin (excl swordfish)	3.5	Ad Val		3.5	354	7.3			4 840
20230020	B1less	38.5	Ad Val		38.5	320	96.1			333
410449122	Tanned or crust hides & skins	30	Ad Val		30	288	14.3			2 012
30231000	Albacore or longfinned tunas	3.5	Ad Val		3.5	275	19.3			1 424
30749190	Cuttle fish (Sepia officinalis)	3.5	Ad Val		3.5	260	1			26 253
71339221	Pegin beans (Phaseculus)	10	Ad Val		10	242	3.3			7 359
441213231	Plywood w/at least 1 outer ply	6	Ad Val		6	235	27.8			845
20230010	B1less	38.5	Ad Val		38.5	223	67			333
30614030	Swimming crabs (Portunus spp)	4	Ad Val		4	191	10.9			1 760
640299021	sandals, w/outer soles & uppers	10	Ad Val		10	156	1.2			12 566
30614090	Crabs, other than King crabs	4	Ad Val		4	156	8.9			1 760
640291000	Other footwear, covering	8	Ad Val		8	124	0.8			15 802
30269099	Other fish (excl fish fillet etc)	3.5	Ad Val		3.5	115	1.4			8 390
210111210	Extracts, essences & concentrates	8.8	Ad Val		8.8	104	30.3			343
121299190	Tubers of konnyaku	1 705.00	Specific		1705	94	1.6			5 904
20230030	B1less	38.5	Ad Val		38.5	80	24			333
30375000	Dogfish & other sharks	2.5	Ad Val		2.5	80	2.1			3 820
30799149	Other molluscs & aquatic	7	Ad Val		7	54	2.6			2 057
220290200	Non-alcoholic beverages	9.6	Ad Val		9.6	48	0.8			6 106
441214042	Plywood w/at least 1 outer ply	6	Ad Val		6	39	4.3			912
30420096	Fillets of swordfish - frozen	3.5	Ad Val		3.5	27	0.2			11 826
110630200	Flour, meal & powder	15	Ad Val		15	25	36.8			68
30559090	Other fish -dried, excl smoked	10.5	Ad Val		10.5	25	0.2			16 197

71080090	Other vegetables, uncooked	6	Ad Val		6	24	5.1			470
420310200	Articles of apparel - leather	10	Ad Val		10	23	10.7			214
71333221	Kidney beans, incl white pea	10	Ad Val		10	22	0.3			6 388
441213125	Plywood w/at least 1 outer ply	8.5	Ad Val		8.5	22	2.6			845
30341000	Albacore or longfinned tunas	3.5	Ad Val		3.5	21	1.4			1 515
30379093	Hairtails (excl fish fillet etc)	3.5	Ad Val		3.5	19	0.4			4 840
121299110	Tubers of konnyaku	40	Ad Val		40	18	0.3			5 904
20621000	Edible of bovine animals	12.8	Ad Val		12.8	18	100			18
441213233	Plywood w/at least 1 outer ply	6	Ad Val		6	18	2.1			845
250100010	Salt & pure sodium chloride	.	Specific		.	14	1.3			1 117
441213229	Plywood w/at least 1 outer ply	6	Ad Val		6	13	1.5			845
71390221	Other beans, excl rendered	10	Ad Val		10	9	0			33 168
640299090	Other footwear, excl	10	Ad Val		10	9	0.1			12 566
220421020	Other wine of fresh grapes	15	Ad Val		15	8	6.3			127
30211000	Trout (Salmo trutta) etc.	3.5	Ad Val		3.5	8	16.3			49
30269091	Marlin (excl swordfish & fish)	3.5	Ad Val		3.5	8	0.1			8 390
20629010	Edible of bovine animals, internal	12.8	Ad Val		12.8	7	99.9			2
441213121	Plywood w/at least 1 outer ply	10	Ad Val		10	6	0.7			845
100590096	maize (corn) for other purpose	3	Ad Val		3	6	0.1			5 908
100630090	Semi-milled or wholly milled rice	778.3	Specific		778.3	4	0.2			2 158
610990016	T-shirts, singlets & other vests	10.9	Ad Val		10.9	3	0			15 276
30379094	Croakers (excl fish fillet etc)	3.5	Ad Val		3.5	3	0.1			4 840
640699200	Part of footwear, excl outer soles	3.4	Ad Val		3.4	3	0.6			484
151590520	Other fixed vegetable fats & oils	3.2	Specific		3.2	3	0.5			616
190230290	Other pasta (not cont added)	21.3	Ad Val		21.3	2	1.2			170
200490212	Leguminous vegetables, prepared	17	Ad Val		17	2	22.2			9
420329200	Gloves, mittens & mitts - leather	10	Ad Val		10	2	16.7			12
30614020	Snow crabs (Chionoecetes spp)	4	Ad Val		4	2	0.1			1 760
290559090	Halogenated, sulphonated	3.9	Ad Val		3.9	2	99.9			1
30410199	Fish fillets, excl of Nishin	3.5	Ad Val		3.5	2	0			21 686
30410299	etc, excl fillets - fresh or chilled	3.5	Ad Val		3.5	2	0			21 686
10110122	Other pure-bred breeding horses		Specific			0	0			3
10190122	Other horses other than pure-bred		Specific			0	0			11
20312022	2 Other		Specific			0	.			0
20319022	2 Other		Specific			0	0			7
20322022	2 Other		Specific			0	.			0
20329022	2 Other		Specific			0	0			66
21099011	1 Swine		Specific			0	0			43
21099020	Edible flours & meals of meat		Specific			0	0			43
70310012	Onions - fresh or chilled		Specific			0	0			455
110319590	Groats & meal - rice		Specific			0	0			4
110320190	Pellets - wheat		Specific			0	0			2
110320390	Pellets - rice		Specific			0	0			2
110320490	Pellets - barley		Specific			0	0			2
110320590	Pellets - rye		Specific			0	0			2
110419490	Barley - rolled or flaked		Specific			0	0			6
110429490	Barley - other worked		Specific			0	0			43
121220110	Edible seaweeds & other algae		Specific			0	0			263
151411100	Low erucic acid rape or colza oil		Specific			0	.			0
151411200	Low erucic acid rape or colza oil		Specific			0	.			0
151419000	Low erucic acid rape or colza oil		Specific			0	0			1
151491100	Other, crude, not chemically		Specific			0	0			9
151491200	Other, crude, not chemically		Specific			0	0			9
151499000	Other, excl crude, not chemically		Specific			0	0			24
190430090	Cereals, other than maize (corn)		Specific			0	0			1
270900010	Petroleum oils & oils obtained		Specific			0	0			11 263 477
271011131	Petroleum spirits for aviation		Specific			0	0			11 903
271011132	Petroleum spirits for aviation		Specific			0	0			11 903
271011137	Petroleum spirits (light oils)		Specific			0	0			11 903
271011139	Petroleum spirits (light oils)		Specific			0	0			11 903
271011143	Kerosenes (light oils)		Specific			0	0			11 903
271011149	Kerosenes (light oils)		Specific			0	0			11 903
271011150	Gas oils (light oils & preparation)		Specific			0	0			11 903
271011181	Petroleum spirits (light oils)		Specific			0	0			11 903
271019143	Kerosenes		Specific			0	0			15 668
271019149	Kerosenes, other than light oils		Specific			0	0			15 668
271019150	Gas oils, other than light oils		Specific			0	0			15 668
271019161	Heavy fuel oils - a specific		Specific			0	0			15 668

271019162	Raw oils - a specific gravity		Specific			0	0			15 668
271019163	Heavy fuel oils		Specific			0	0			15 668
271019164	Raw oils - a specific gravity		Specific			0	0			15 668
271019165	Heavy fuel oils		Specific			0	0			15 668
271019166	Raw oils - a specific gravity		Specific			0	0			15 668
271019167	Heavy fuel oils		Specific			0	0			15 668
271019169	Raw oils - a specific gravity		Specific			0	0			15 668
271019171	Heavy fuel oils		Specific			0	0			15 668
271019172	Raw oils - a specific gravity		Specific			0	0			15 668
271019173	Heavy fuel oils		Specific			0	0			15 668
271019174	Raw oils - a specific gravity		Specific			0	0			15 668
271019175	Heavy fuel oils		Specific			0	0			15 668
271019179	Raw oils - a specific gravity		Specific			0	0			15 668
110419290	maize - rolled or flaked	2 112.00	Specific		2112	0	0			6
40291129	Milk & cream	1 738.70	Specific		1738.7	0	0			319
100610090	Rice in the husk (paddy or rough)	1 721.50	Specific		1721.5	0	0			80
71310229	Peas (Pisum sativum)	1 418.40	Specific		1418.4	0	0			4 435
100640090	Broken rice	1 319.30	Specific		1319.3	0	0			1 294
190120117	Mixes & doughs	1 138.50	Specific		1138.5	0	0			15
40310190	Yogurt - frozen preserved	1 018.60	Specific		1018.6	0	0			9
40130119	Milk (sterilized - frozen)	947.2	Specific		947.2	0				0
40390138	Buttermilk, curdled milk	939.4	Specific		939.4	0	0			2
40410169	Mineral concentrated	897.8	Specific		897.8	0	0			4
40410179	Whey & modified whey	897.8	Specific		897.8	0	0			4
20630093	2 Other	894.1	Specific		894.1	0	0			6
110429290	Rice - other worked	860.7	Specific		860.7	0	0			43
110230090	Rice flour, n.e.s	823.4	Specific		823.4	0	0			3
120220099	Ground-nuts, not roasted	791.3	Specific		791.3	0	0			3 172
120210099	Ground-nuts, not roasted	763.6	Specific		763.6	0	0			227
71350229	Broad beans (Vicia faba var).	723.9	Specific		723.9	0	0			197
110419129	Rye - rolled or flaked. n.e.s.	693.7	Specific		693.7	0	0			6
190120112	Mixes & doughs	676.9	Specific		676.9	0	0			15
40410189	Whey & modified whey	666.4	Specific		666.4	0	0			4
40130129	Milk (sterilized - frozen)	666.2	Specific		666.2	0	.			0
20649093	2 Other	651.5	Specific		651.5	0	.			0
71339222	Pegin beans (Phaseculus)	638.9	Specific		638.9	0	0			7 359
71339227	Other beans (Vigna spp)	638.9	Specific		638.9	0	0			7 359
210120237	Preparations w/a basis of tea	625.8	Specific		625.8	0	0			12
40410149	Whey & modified whey	584.1	Specific		584.1	0	0			4
110814090	Manioc (cassava) starch	583.3	Specific		583.3	0	0			82
40590229	Other fats & oils	568.5	Specific		568.5	0	0			172
40410139	Whey & modified whey	566.8	Specific		566.8	0	0			4
100620090	Husked (brown) rice	561.6	Specific		561.6	0	0			1 709
40520090	Dairy spreads	547	Specific		547	0	0			61
210690123	Preparations cont by weight	513.3	Specific		513.3	0	0			92
40390133	Butter milk powder & other	494.5	Specific		494.5	0	0			2
210112237	Preparations w/a basis of coffee	490.6	Specific		490.6	0	0			4
500100090	Silk-worm cocoons	488.7	Specific		488.7	0	0			4
40510229	Butter - a fat content, by weight	482.2	Specific		482.2	0	0			71
110419119	Wheat - rolled or flaked	478.7	Specific		478.7	0	0			6
40229129	Milk & cream, in powder	454	Specific		454	0	0			25
180620319	Food preparations of goods	431.3	Specific		431.3	0				0
71332090	Small red (Adzuki) beans	405.9	Specific		405.9	0	0			2 366
40299129	Milk & cream, excl whipped	397.8	Specific		397.8	0	0			137
40390128	Buttermilk, curdled milk	387.6	Specific		387.6	0	0			2
40390113	Butter milk powder & other	381.9	Specific		381.9	0	0			2
210120232	Preparations w/a basis of tea	379	Specific		379	0	0			12
190120128	Mixes & doughs	360.7	Specific		360.7	0	0			15
190120168	Mixes & doughs	360.7	Specific		360.7	0	0			15
40510129	Butter - a fat content, by weight	360.4	Specific		360.4	0	0			71
20649092	2 Other	340.9	Specific		340.9	0				0
21012010	Bellies (streaky) & cuts thereof	339.4	Specific		339.4	0	0			13

40221129	Milk & cream, in powder	336.2	Specific		336.2	0	0			55
190190137	Food preparations of goods	334.4	Specific		334.4	0	0			35
100190092	Meslin	326	Specific		326	0	0			831
100190093	Wheat (excl durum wheat)	326	Specific		326	0	0			831
160249210	1 Ham or bacon	320.7	Specific		320.7	0	0			6
210690129	Preparations cont by weight	318.8	Specific		318.8	0	0			92
100110090	Durum wheat	317.9	Specific		317.9	0	0			277
20321020	2 Other	312.3	Specific		312.3	0	.			0
20630092	2 Other	311.7	Specific		311.7	0	0			6
210112232	Preparations w/a basis of coffee	299.8	Specific		299.8	0	0			4
160242011	1 Ham or bacon	297.2	Specific		297.2	0				0
190110129	Preparation for infant use	296.2	Specific		296.2	0	0			1
40390118	Buttermilk, curdled milk	292.3	Specific		292.3	0	0			2
40390123	Buttermilk powder & other	291.7	Specific		291.7	0	0			2
500200222	Raw silk, 20/22 denier & 2A	286	Specific		286	0				0
110819019	Sago starch	283.2	Specific		283.2	0	0			21
40590190	Other fats & oils	273.5	Specific		273.5	0	0			172
71390229	Other beans, excl rendered	271	Specific		271	0	0			33 168
190190148	Food preparation, cont groats	270.9	Specific		270.9	0	0			35
190190132	Food preparations of goods	270.4	Specific		270.4	0	0			35
40410129	Mineral concentrated whey	264.9	Specific		264.9	0	0			4
160241011	1 Ham or bacon	264.3	Specific		264.3	0	0			9
21011010	Hams, shoulders & cuts thereof	260.6	Specific		260.6	0	0			4
20322021	2 Other	255.3	Specific		255.3	0				0
500200227	Other eaw silk, excl imported	253.6	Specific		253.6	0				0
500200221	Double cocoons silk	253.4	Specific		253.4	0				0
110100200	Wheat of meslin flour	252.8	Specific		252.8	0	0			1 132
500200223	Raw silk, excl 20/22 denier & 2A	251.9	Specific		251.9	0				0
100190099	Wheat (excl durum wheat)	251.9	Specific		251.9	0	0			831
100300091	Barley, for feeding purposes	243.8	Specific		243.8	0	0			6
40291290	Milk & cream, excl in powder	243	Specific		243	0	0			319
100300099	Barley, excl for feeding purposes	240.2	Specific		240.2	0	0			6
20321030	2 Other	239.5	Specific		239.5	0				0
110319290	Rye & meal - wheat	235.9	Specific		235.9	0	0			4
40210217	Milk & cream, in powder	234.5	Specific		234.5	0	0			9
110813090	Potato starch	234.2	Specific		234.2	0				0
110429119	Wheat - other worked	227.2	Specific		227.2	0	0			43
110429129	Rye - other worked	227.2	Specific		227.2	0	0			43
500200226	Raw silk, excl 26/29 denier	227.1	Specific		227.1	0				0
190420212	Food preparations	224.3	Specific		224.3	0	0			3
71333229	Kidney beans, incl white pea	219.2	Specific		219.2	0	0			6 388
110812090	maize (corn) starch	218.2	Specific		218.2	0	0			37
40210229	Milk & cream, in powder	217.9	Specific		217.9	0	0			9
110319190	Barley & meal - wheat	217.5	Specific		217.5	0	0			4
40229119	Milk & cream, in powder	215.9	Specific		215.9	0	0			25
110290290	Rye flour	215.9	Specific		215.9	0	0			71
20312021	2 Other	213.9	Specific		213.9	0				0
40210212	Milk & cream, in powder	210.8	Specific		210.8	0	0			9
40229291	Milk & cream, in powder	207.8	Specific		207.8	0	0			25
20311020	2 Other	203.5	Specific		203.5	0				0
20311030	2 Other	203.5	Specific		203.5	0				0
110290190	Barley flour	199.1	Specific		199.1	0	0			71
190190588	"Mochi" (rice-cake), "dango"	188.9	Specific		188.9	0	0			35
190110119	Preparation for infant use	183.4	Specific		183.4	0	0			1
21019010	Other	182.6	Specific		182.6	0	0			26
210610140	Protein concentrates & textured	177.9	Specific		177.9	0	0			46
40221212	Milk & cream, in powder	176.2	Specific		176.2	0	0			55
40221217	Milk & cream, in powder	176.2	Specific		176.2	0	0			55
40490118	Products consisting of natural	169.2	Specific		169.2	0	.			0
110311090	Groats & meal - wheat	163.9	Specific		163.9	0	0			6
170310099	Cane molasses	162.1	Specific		162.1	0	0			6 006
40221119	Milk & cream, in powder	155.8	Specific		155.8	0	0			55
40120190	Milk & cream, not concentrated	154.8	Specific		154.8	0	0			94
40210129	Milk & cream, in powder	153.2	Specific		153.2	0	0			9
170390091	Molasses, excl cane molasses	148.8	Specific		148.8	0	0			158
170310091	Cane molasses	147.8	Specific		147.8	0	0			6 006
10392011	Swine other than pure-bred	140.6	Specific		140.6	0	.			0
10392012	Swine other than pure-bred	140.6	Specific		140.6	0	.			0
20329021	2 Other	135.7	Specific		135.7	0	0			66

190120152	Mixes & doughs	128.9	Specific		128.9	0	0			15
100890029	Triticale, excl rendered suitable	128.6	Specific		128.6	0	0			362
190490130	Cereals, other than maize (corn)	123.4	Specific		123.4	0	0			15
40110190	Milk & cream, not concentrated	120.3	Specific		120.3	0	0			8
20319021	2 Other	117.9	Specific		117.9	0	0			7
40299290	Milk & cream, excl whipped	116	Specific		116	0	0			137
190190172	Food preparation, cont groats	114.2	Specific		114.2	0	0			35
180690319	Food prerarations of goods	110.7	Specific		110.7	0	0			240
40221229	Milk & cream, in powder	108.4	Specific		108.4	0	0			55
10290092	Bovine animals	99.8	Specific		99.8	0	0			1 716
190410212	Food preparations	98.6	Specific		98.6	0	0			19
190120159	Mixes & doughs	95.5	Specific		95.5	0	0			15
110811090	Wheat starch	90.4	Specific		90.4	0	.			0
190120139	Mixes & doughs	83.9	Specific		83.9	0	0			15
190410239	Food preparations	82	Specific		82	0	0			19
190120149	Mixes & doughs	79.8	Specific		79.8	0	0			15
10290099	Bovine aminals	78.3	Specific		78.3	0	0			1 716
170390099	Molasses, excl cane malasses	77.2	Specific		77.2	0	0			158
190490290	Cereals, other than maize (corn)	70.5	Specific		70.5	0	0			15
110819099	Other starch	70.4	Specific		70.4	0	0			21
110820090	Inulin	66.9	Specific		66.9	0	0			1
110710019	Malt, fumigated w/peat, excl	65.9	Specific		65.9	0				0
220720200	Ethyl alcohol & other spirits	63.2	Specific		63.2	0	0			5
190190169	Food preparation, cont groats	60	Specific		60	0	0			35
190490390	Cereals, other than maize (corn)	58.9	Specific		58.9	0	0			15
110710029	Malt, excl fumigated w/peat	56.1	Specific		56.1	0	.			0
190420229	Food preparations, cont	55.9	Specific		55.9	0	0			3
190190159	Food preparation, cont groats	54.8	Specific		54.8	0	0			35
210690119	Preparations cont by weight	52.5	Specific		52.5	0	0			92
20610020	Edible of bovine animals, cheek	50	Ad Val		50	0	0			5
20629020	Edible of bovine animals, cheek	50	Ad Val		50	0	0			2
100590091	Maize (corn) intended for use	50	Ad Val		50	0	0			5 908
100590092	Maize (corn) intended for use	50	Ad Val		50	0	0			5 908
100590095	Maize (corn) for feeding purpose	50	Ad Val		50	0	0			5 908
100590099	Maize (corn)	50	Ad Val		50	0	0			5 908
160250910	Other prepared or preserved	50	Ad Val		50	0	0			3