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Contribution

- Examining influence of voluntary unilateral (product) standards on international trade patterns.
- Distinguishing between baseline product quality effect and the environmental standard/agreement effect.
- Comparative static analysis:
  - ITTA’s trade impact on extensive and intensive margin?
  - Differential impact of ITTA on international vs. domestic trade?
The International Tropical Timber Agreement (ITTA)

- ITTA entered into force in 1986.
- Original agreement renegotiated twice, in 1994 and 2006.
- Primary objective: protection of natural tropical forests from destruction, degradation and excision.
- Further objectives: promoting trade in high quality, sustainably produced TT.
- 1994 ITTA includes ‘ITTO Objective 2000’ and Bali Partnership Fund
- Harmonization of environmental standards in TT production due to implementation of
  - forest certification schemes,
  - criteria and indicators for sustainable management,
  - transparent harvesting data of tropical wood,
  - financial assistance for the implementation of sustainable TT management.
- 1994 ITTA was signed by 65 member countries whereof the producing member countries possess about 80 % of the world’s tropical forests.
Related literature

- Standards & trade patterns:
  Swann et al. (1996), Moenius (2004), Maertens & Swinnen (2009), Maskus et al. (2013)

- Distributional consequences of agreements/standards: Chen et al. (2008), Disdier et al. (2008), Shepherd & Wilson (2013), Disdier et al. (2014)

- Product quality & international trade
  Linder (1961), Hallak (2010)

- International trade literature:
  Anderson & van Wincoop (2003), Anderson & Yotov (2010)
Theoretical model

- Partial equilibrium monopolistic competition model
- Demand of country $j$ for country $i$’s tropical wood exports, $x_{ij}$, is derived from CES utility function

$$x_{ij} = \frac{\left( \frac{p_i \tau_{i,j}}{\theta_i^{\gamma_j}} \right)^{-\sigma}}{\sum_{h=1}^{J} \left( \frac{p_h \tau_{h,j}}{\theta_h^{\gamma_j}} \right)^{1-\sigma} \phi Y_j}.$$ 

with

- mill price $p_i$,
- elasticity of substitution $\sigma > 1$,
- iceberg-type transportation costs $\tau > 1$,
- income share $\phi Y_j$ spent on TT,
- quality indicator for production $\theta_i = e^{\kappa D_i} e^{\alpha q_i}$,
- $j$’s consumer preferences for quality $\gamma_j = \delta D_j + \beta y_j$. 
Theoretical model

- Taking logs of quality parameters leads to

\[ \gamma_j \ln \theta_i = \delta \kappa D_j D_i + \beta \kappa D_i y_j + \delta \alpha D_j q_i + \beta \alpha y_j q_i. \]

with \( D_j, D_i, y_j, q_i \) indicating the importer’s and exporter’s ITTA status, the wealth of consumers, and timber quality, respectively.

- Trading partners’ ITTA status and their economic and resource endowments influence quality demand and supply.

- Four different combinations of ITTA standard effects on TT trade:

  \[
  \begin{align*}
  \ln(\theta_i^\gamma_j) &= \alpha \beta q_i y_j & \text{if } D_i = 0 \text{ and } D_j = 0 \\
  \ln(\theta_i^\gamma_j) &= \alpha \beta q_i y_j + \alpha \delta D_j q_i & \text{if } D_i = 0 \text{ and } D_j = 1 \\
  \ln(\theta_i^\gamma_j) &= \alpha \beta q_i y_j + \beta \kappa D_i y_j & \text{if } D_i = 1 \text{ and } D_j = 0 \\
  \ln(\theta_i^\gamma_j) &= \alpha \beta q_i y_j + \alpha \delta D_j q_i + \beta \kappa D_i y_j + \delta \kappa D_j D_i & \text{if } D_i = 1 \text{ and } D_j = 1
  \end{align*}
  \]
Empirical Specification

Econometric specification is based on two equations

- Nominal value of TT exports from \(i\) to \(j\), \(X_{ij}\), if \(V_{ij} = 1\), 0 otherwise:

\[
\ln X_{ij} = (1-\sigma) \ln \tau_{ij} + (\sigma - 1) \gamma_j \ln \theta_i + (\sigma - 1) \ln (P_j) + (1-\sigma) \ln (p_i) + \ln (\phi Y_j)
\]

with \(P_j = \left( \sum_{h=1}^{J} \left( \frac{p_{h\tau_{h,j}}}{\theta_{h,j}} \right)^{1-\sigma} \right)^{1/(1-\sigma)}\)

- Propensity of exporter \(i\) to serve import market \(j\), \(V_{ij}^*\):

\[
V_{ij}^* = (1-\sigma) \tau_{ij} + (\sigma - 1) \gamma_j \ln \theta_i + (\sigma - 1) \ln (P_j) + (1-\sigma) \ln (p_i) \\
+ \ln (\phi Y_j) - \ln (f_{ij}) - \ln \sigma
\]

- Estimation: Heckman-sample selection model (Heckman 1976) with exporter, importer and product fixed effects.
Comparative static analysis

Quantifying impact of ITTA standard on extensive and intensive margin of TT trade:

- Comparison of predicted expected export flows in the baseline scenario with counterfactual world assuming no ITTA
- Decomposing expected aggregated export volume (Yen and Rosinski 2008) into extensive and intensive margin:

\[
\Delta_{ij} = \frac{E[e^{x_{ij}}]}{E[e^{x_{ij}}]} - 1
\]

\[
= \frac{E[e^{x_{ij}} | V_{ij}^C > 0]P(V_{ij}^C > 0) - E[e^{x_{ij}} | V_{ij}^C > 0]P(V_{ij}^C > 0)}{E[e^{x_{ij}} | V_{ij}^C > 0]P(V_{ij}^C > 0)}
\]

(intensive margin at constant probability to export)

\[
+ \frac{E[e^{x_{ij}} | V_{ij}^* > 0]P(V_{ij}^* > 0) - E[e^{x_{ij}} | V_{ij}^C > 0]P(V_{ij}^C > 0)}{E[e^{x_{ij}} | V_{ij}^C > 0]P(V_{ij}^C > 0)}
\]

( extensive margin at constant positive export flows)
The data
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- Log of import flows (import value in 1000 USD) in TT

Explanatory variables
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- Trading partners’ ITTA status and interaction with their economic and resource endowments
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- Exporter, importer, product fixed effects
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- 132 (71) importing (exporting) countries (non tropical exporters were excluded)
- 37,204 observations; 12 % positive trade flows (N = 4,321)
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### Descriptive statistics

#### Table: Trade flows in TT in % of import value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exporter</th>
<th>Importer</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TT, overall import value: 3,480 mill. USD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>14.33</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>23.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>48.07</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>8.86</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>67.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) North America</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) South America</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>7.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>56.40</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>25.52</td>
<td>12.95</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes: Figures are based on the aggregate bilateral trade flows for the product classes 4403, 4407, 4408 and 4412. ‘−’ indicates that no bilateral trade flows occurred between these country groups; ‘0.00’ means that bilateral trade is of minor value (smaller than a one-hundredth of a percent).*
**Table**: Largest importers and exporters of TT (ranked by aggregated value imported\(^a\))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importers</th>
<th>Exporters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>of tropical timber trade (codes 4403, 4407, 4408, 4412)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>1062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Korea</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**: \(^a\) Sum of TT trade (in million US$).
Descriptive statistics

Table: Trade flows in TT in % of import value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exporter</th>
<th>Importer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT, overall import value: 3,480 mill. USD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) no ITTA</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) ITTA</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>87.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10.96</td>
<td>89.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Figures are based on the aggregate bilateral trade flows for the product classes 4403, 4407, 4408 and 4412.
**Table: Trade flows in TT – estimation results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Heckman, two-step</th>
<th>Heckman, restricted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>exogenous ITTA</td>
<td>restricted model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Selection</strong></td>
<td><strong>Outcome</strong></td>
<td><strong>Outcome</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_i D_j$</td>
<td>0.037 (0.582)</td>
<td>0.494*** (3.102)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_i GDP_j$</td>
<td>0.055*** (2.598)</td>
<td>0.093* (1.774)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_j QUAL_i$</td>
<td>0.117*** (3.499)</td>
<td>0.126 (1.460)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linder term</td>
<td>0.105*** (9.522)</td>
<td>0.112*** (3.854)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ln(Distance)</td>
<td>−0.788***(-30.774)</td>
<td>−1.188***(-13.106)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contiguity</td>
<td>0.467*** (5.986)</td>
<td>0.245 (1.446)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com Language</td>
<td>0.270*** (6.098)</td>
<td>0.288*** (2.783)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com Colonizer</td>
<td>0.315*** (5.524)</td>
<td>0.328** (2.282)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colony</td>
<td>0.287*** (2.661)</td>
<td>0.459** (2.210)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTA</td>
<td>0.098** (2.160)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>0.014 (0.205)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.619*** (10.270)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exporter FE, $\chi^2$**

- 3342.23***
- 630.43***

**Importer FE, $\chi^2$**

- 2686.36***
- 1076.18***

**Product FE, $\chi^2$**

- 1040.03***
- 205.26***

**Observations**

- 37204
- 4321
- 4321
Robustness checks

- Endogeneity of the ITTA accession
  - Contiguity sig positive, $D_jQUAL_i$ insig

- Estimates based on recent years (2004-2008)
  - 9.3% non-zero trade flows; $D_jQUAL_i$ insig in selection eq

- Different proxies for wood quality
  - Proxies: GDP/capita (technological dimension), degree of corruption and level of property rights (institutional dimension)
  - Selection eq: $D_iD_j$ sig positive; $D_jQUAL_i$ insig; Linder term sig negative or insig

- Semi-parametric estimation
  - 1st stage probit using semi-parametric SNP estimator (De Luca 2008)
  - Outcome equation using two-step semi-parametric series estimator (Newey 2009)
  - $D_iGDP_j$ insig in outcome eq
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## Counterfactual Analysis

### Table: Changes (in %) in intensive/extensive margin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exporter</th>
<th>Decomposition</th>
<th>Importer</th>
<th>Non-ITTA</th>
<th>ITTA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>poor</td>
<td>rich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Quality</td>
<td>Int margin</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ext margin</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Quality</td>
<td>Int margin</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ext margin</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITTA</td>
<td>Int margin</td>
<td></td>
<td>82.20</td>
<td>138.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ext margin</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>84.67</strong></td>
<td><strong>141.28</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Int margin</td>
<td></td>
<td>92.02</td>
<td>148.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ext margin</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>101.40</strong></td>
<td><strong>150.39</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes:* Partial equilibrium effects of ITTA membership on tropical timber trade. Figures represent weighted average changes in % in extensive and intensive margin if no trading partner were an ITTA member (counterfactual world) compared to the observed status were some countries are (not) ITTA signatories.
Figure: Total change in trade volume (import markets)
Figure: Total change in export trade volume into (a) Northern and (b) Southern import markets
Counterfactual Analysis

Table: Counterfactual analysis – φ-ness of trade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Product Standard Effect</th>
<th>Environm. Preference Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$(D_i = 1, D_j = 0)$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor Imp.</td>
<td>Rich Imp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Quality</td>
<td>34.07</td>
<td>5.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Quality</td>
<td>47.05</td>
<td>44.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74.44</td>
<td>25.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>301.60</td>
<td>175.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Quality</td>
<td>64.07</td>
<td>64.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Quality</td>
<td>93.93</td>
<td>80.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>153.78</td>
<td>121.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>532.54</td>
<td>329.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Figures represent changes of international trade flows relative to domestic trade flows when ITTA is in force compared to the relative changes where no ITTA exists, i.e., $\phi_{ij}/\phi_{ij}^C$. The importer is classified as poor (rich) whenever its 2012 Gross National Income (GNI) is below (above) USD 12,615 (Source: World Bank classification of countries). Exporters with an annual precipitation below (above) 1000 mm are defined as low (high) timber quality countries.
Conclusion

- **Effect of ITTA on international trade patterns in TT?**
- Monopolistic competition setting; gravity equation including baseline quality and sustainable TT production indicators.
- Findings based on Heckman two-step estimation & counterfactual analysis:
  - Strong increase in TT trade if exporter’s supply of TT quality matches importer’s preference for TT quality.
  - Increasing trade intensity if both trading partners agreed on ITTA standard.
  - Given that the trading partner is an ITTA signatory, trade in TT is the higher the higher the importer’s economic (exporter’s timber) endowment.
  - Increase in TT trade due to ITTA is higher in rich importer markets than poorer importer markets.
  - ITTA especially benefits exporters producing qualitative timber and serving rich importer markets.
  - Compliance with ITTA favors international trade compared to domestic trade.
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