

# DIGITALES ARCHIV

ZBW – Leibniz-Informationszentrum Wirtschaft  
ZBW – Leibniz Information Centre for Economics

Gnutzmann, Hinnerk

## Article

# The trade effect of GSP removal

### Provided in Cooperation with:

Belarusian Economic Research and Outreach Center (BEROC), Minsk

*Reference:* Gnutzmann, Hinnerk (2017). The trade effect of GSP removal.

This Version is available at:

<http://hdl.handle.net/11159/2062>

### Kontakt/Contact

ZBW – Leibniz-Informationszentrum Wirtschaft/Leibniz Information Centre for Economics  
Düsternbrooker Weg 120  
24105 Kiel (Germany)  
E-Mail: [rights\[at\]zbw.eu](mailto:rights[at]zbw.eu)  
<https://www.zbw.eu/econis-archiv/>

### Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieses Dokument darf zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen. Sofern für das Dokument eine Open-Content-Lizenz verwendet wurde, so gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

<https://zbw.eu/econis-archiv/termsfuse>

### Terms of use:

*This document may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes. You are not to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public. If the document is made available under a Creative Commons Licence you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the licence.*

# The Trade Effect of GSP Removal: Evidence from Belarus

Hinnerk Gnutzmann<sup>a</sup>, Arevik Gnutzmann-Mkrtchyan<sup>a,b,\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Institute for Macroeconomics, Leibniz University Hannover, Germany*

<sup>b</sup>*Belarusian Economic Research and Outreach Center*

---

## Abstract

Under the Generalized Scheme of Preferences (GSP), rich countries grant unilateral trade preferences to developing countries. We study the EU's withdrawal of GSP preferences from Belarus in 2007 to understand how the GSP affects export patterns. The withdrawal caused a significant drop in trade for affected products (26%-29% trade decline) and some trade reduction at the extensive margin. However, there is little evidence of a GSP effect on total trade. This is due to the fact that the main exports of Belarus were not eligible for the GSP program.

*Keywords:* GSP, preference withdrawal, Belarus

*JEL:* F13, F14, O19

---



BEROC Working Paper № 44

---

\*Corresponding author

*Email addresses:* gnutzmann@mak.uni-hannover.de (Hinnerk Gnutzmann),  
mkrtchyan@mak.uni-hannover.de (Arevik Gnutzmann-Mkrtchyan)

## 1. Introduction

Under the *Generalized System of Preferences* (GSP), rich countries may unilaterally grant trade preferences to developing countries. The GSP is an exception to the Most Favoured Nation (MFN) principle of the World Trade Organization, thus providing considerable flexibility to the preference grantee. As a result, GSP has become the most widespread and extensive program of special treatment for developing countries (see the surveys by Ornelas (2016) and Hoekman and Özden (2005)). At the same time, it is not clear how strongly the system actually promotes exports of developing countries: e.g., exporters can face considerable bureaucratic barriers when seeking to use the preference, leading to underutilization of preferences. In some cases, the “discount” granted compared to MFN is small; and countries may see their preference revoked when they actually start exporting a product in large quantities (a process known as “graduation”). In this paper, we exploit the experience of Belarus to investigate how the EU’s GSP program affects both exports overall and at the product level for “eligible” sectors; we are interested in the causal effect of GSP both on the value of trade as well as the number of different products traded.

Belarus received preferences under the EU’s GSP program until 2007, when the preferences were withdrawn. This followed a report by the International Labor Organization (ILO) determining labour rights violations. Hence, accordingly Belarus lost its GSP preference for all goods; but its neighbors, Ukraine and Russia, continued to enjoy GSP benefits afterwards. Thus, we can employ a triple difference-in-differences regression to understand how Belarusian economy was effected by the loss of preferences. In particular, we assess the export performance of Belarusian sectors eligible for preferences after the loss of preferences relative to the period before, relative to those those sectors that were not ever eligible, and relative to the export performance of Russia and Ukraine. Our main finding is that, although the total trade has not been significantly affected, the eligible exporters, particularly the smaller ones, saw a significant drop in their exports.

Developing countries at times intend to gain political leverage through GSP, but the effectiveness is in practice limited by the small trade effects of the program. For example, Carnegie (2015) studies the GSP as one tool of “coercive diplomacy”, and policy conditionality is a common feature of GSP programs. In particular, European Union GSP program foresees withdrawing the preferences when the beneficiary does not meet la-

bor rights standards (UNCTAD, 2015); this clause was used in the case of Belarus. In practice, political considerations may also play a role: EU officials may have influenced the outcome of the ILO report on Belarus to justify the GSP withdrawal from Belarus.<sup>1</sup> On the topic of conditionality, Zhou and Cuyvers (2011) study the two cases when the EU withdrew GSP preferences – besides Belarus, Myanmar was affected – and find that the sanction impact of GSP withdrawal has been very limited in each case: they argue that labor standards have not improved since.

We find that GSP withdrawal strongly affected eligible products, although it had little impact on overall trade. For Belarusian exports that were initially covered by GSP, the withdrawal had a noticeable adverse effect on exports to the EU. Depending on specification, the average export reduction is estimated between 26% and 29%. This effect is stronger for products where trade is small, and there is some evidence of trade reductions at the extensive margin after GSP withdrawal. When limiting the sample to products with average EU exports of at least \$100 000, we estimate that GSP withdrawal caused a 20% export reduction. Moreover, the main Belarusian export goods were not covered by any GSP preference; as a result, thus the impact on *total* exports to the EU appears to be limited. Thus, our findings suggest that the EU GSP program was to some extent successful in raising export diversity, having rather localized impacts on a number of small industries.

Our findings are in line with the empirical studies of preference programs. Trade preference programs like GSP have been found to be important for the exports of beneficiaries, particularly for the specific sectors. Frazer and Van Biesebroeck (2010) analyze the impact of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA), a system of preferences within the GSP framework provided by the U.S. for certain products and certain African countries. The authors find that AGOA had a significant impact on the exports to the United States, most notably for the apparel goods. The paper uses the variation in the coverage of goods and covered countries to assess the impact of the preferences. Similarly, Hakobyan (2013) finds that the loss of trade preferences granted by the US reduces the exports of beneficiaries, particularly for agricultural and textiles and clothing. Here

---

<sup>1</sup>According to Rettman (2007), “[a]n EU official said that close personal ties between senior ILO and EU officials have helped Brussels get the kind of ILO reports it wants, with other issues such as political prisoners also impacting the reading of ILO texts.”

the analyzed context is Lederman and Özden (2007) in their analysis of the U.S. trade find that the GSP program does not lead to an overall higher exports to the U.S. by the GSP beneficiaries. It is possible that the effects are confined within certain affected sectors. Thelle and Biesebroeck (2015) assess the impact of EU's GSP program, using the same approach as Frazer and Van Biesebroeck (2010). Exports of products covered by GSP are found to be, on average, 5% higher.

## **2. Background**


Belarus lost its EU GSP status in 2007. Hajduk and Silitski (2007) discuss the events that led to the removal of the GSP from Belarus. In particular, Belarus was accused in the ILO by the independent trade unions of limiting the ability of trade unions to register via legal and bureaucratic barriers and lack of protections for members. Trade unions were reporting persecution and failure to extend fixed-term contracts of members. This, in turn, would serve as a barrier for joining the independent trade unions. As respect for labour rights is a condition for receiving EU GSP, the EU Council removed Belarus' preferences in December 2006, effective from 21 June 2007.

The loss of GSP is not apparent in its aggregate exports to the EU. Figure 1(a) shows EU imports from Belarus, Ukraine and Russia. EU imports from these three countries follow a similar pattern both before and after the loss of GSP by Belarus. Additionally, the exports of Belarus to the EU remained at similar level: EUR4.4 billion in 2006 (year before withdrawal) and 2007 (withdrawal year) and EUR4.6 billion in 2008 (year after the withdrawal). For Belarus, the largest beneficiary sectors in absolute terms were textiles, as well as mineral and chemical products. However, for chemicals and minerals, the share of eligible trade was small. The sectors with the highest share of trade covered by GSP are footwear, plastics, and glass.


Figure 1(b) shows the share of exports that were exported using GSP. We see that only about 12-13% of Belarusian exports to the EU used the GSP. Combining with the total export value, the GSP exports of Belarus were at about EUR500 million in 2006, the year before the removal of preferences. The small value of exports that utilized the GSP benefits explains why the impact of GSP removal is not visible in total trade. This helps us understand why the removal of GSP served only as a signal of disapproval rather than bearing a significant economic impact on the economy. Moreover, the negative effect would fall on the vulnerable exporters that were benefiting from preferences.

**FIGURE 1**  
**Total Exports and GSP Trade Share**

(a) Total Exports to the European Union, by Country



(b) Share of Exports to EU traded under GSP, by Country



Source: Authors, based on COMEXT database

Total trade values can hide significant variation for distinct sectors. First, few very large traded products (oil, fertilizers) can overshadow changes in trade of other products. Second, since not all products qualify for GSP, exports of those should not be affected by the loss of preferences and, again, can mask the impact on affected products. Finally, eligible sectors utilize preferences unevenly, depending on the expected tariff gains and administrative costs of claiming the benefits. Thus the eligible products that did not use GSP should not be affected by the loss of preferences.


Figures 2 and 3 present the share of exports eligible for GSP and the utilization rate to address the issues discussed above and understand better how affected products were impacted by the GSP loss. Figure 2 (a) shows that the share of Belarusian exports eligible for GSP was somewhat decreasing in the years before the removal of the GSP – from about 26% in 2004 to 20% in 2006. At the same time, the share of GSP eligible trade for Ukraine and Russia remained rather stable. This decrease suggests that Belarus experienced disproportional growth in sectors that were excluded from GSP or had duty-free imports on MFN basis. In particular, this can be caused by the unprecedented increase in oil exports by Belarus from negligible values in 2004 up to the largest export in 2006 as EU imports oil duty-free on MFN basis, and so it is not a GSP product. Indeed, the Hajduk and Silitski (2007) report discusses the limited scope of EU GSP removal as a policy tool due to its marginal impact on oil exports and lack of public communication. Figure 2 (b) presents the share of GSP eligible products without mineral fuels to account for the oil export growth. GSP was more important for non-fuel exports, with a slight reduction from 45% of exports that could benefit from GSP in 2004 and to about 40% in 2006.

The declining share of GSP eligible Belarusian exports comes on a backdrop of increasing utilization rate by the eligible sectors. Figure 3 shows that Belarusian firms were learning to utilize the preferences as the utilization rate of eligible goods increased from slightly above 50% in 2004 to 60% in 2006. Ukrainian exporters similarly increased their utilization of preferences over time as exporters learn how to use the preferences. At the same time, Russian exporters did not manage to steadily increase the utilization rate.


Thus, from the one side GSP was becoming less important for Belarus as its exports were booming in sectors not covered by the GSP, but from the other side, GSP was becoming more important for the eligible sectors as they were increasing the utilization

**FIGURE 2**  
**Share of Exports Eligible for GSP, by Country**

(a) All Products



(b) Excluding Mineral Fuels




Source: Authors, based on COMEXT database

---

**FIGURE 3**  
**EU GSP Preference Utilization Rate, by Country**

---



Source: Authors, based on COMEXT database

of preferences.

### 3. Data

We collected total imports, imports by trade regime of the European Union, eligibility and utilization of the EU GSP from the COMEXT database provided by the EC. Data covers the period from 2004 to 2013 and includes imports of the European Union from Belarus, Ukraine and Russia on 4-digit HS product classification. GSP eligibility and utilization data is reported as a total for all EU members. We omit the years before the EU enlargement to avoid differences due to the changing set of included countries.

GSP eligibility is determined at the tariff line level; but in practice, there is little variation within a HS-4 group. Figure A1 shows a histogram of the share of products eligible for GSP within a HS-4 group. It is clear that the histogram peaks close to zero, meaning no products within the HS-4 group eligible, and full GSP coverage. For the purpose of our analysis, we focus on HS-4 groups where the overwhelming majority

of products is either eligible for GSP (thresholds: 95% and 80%), or not eligible for GSP (thresholds: 5% and 20%).

#### 4. Empirical Analysis

This section makes an empirical assessment of the impact of GSP removal on the exports of Belarus using product variation in GSP eligibility. Figure 4 shows the exports of GSP eligible products compared to non-eligible products for Belarus, Russia and Ukraine relative to 2004, excluding mineral fuels. The figure presents first evidence that Belarus' GSP eligible sectors have suffered from the loss of GSP preferences. All trends except the GSP eligible exports of Belarus show large growth relative to the 2004 over the sample period, bar the drop in the crisis year 2009. GSP eligible exports of Belarus show a similar pattern until 2007, the withdrawal year. However from 2008 growth turns negative until exports of Belarus of goods that used to be eligible for GSP converge to values close to the 2004 level. Next, we proceed to the regression analysis to assess the impact of GSP withdrawal on the GSP eligible sectors of Belarus.

We apply the triple differences in differences approach as in Hakobyan (2013) and Frazer and Van Biesebroeck (2010) for our regression analysis. The method explores the difference in trade flows over time between affected and non-affected countries and between affected and non-affected products. In our case, we exploit the differences in the imports of EU GSP eligible products from Belarus relative to GSP non-eligible products before and after GSP removal and relative to the imports from Ukraine and Belarus that did not lose EU GSP (although note that Ukraine lost the US GSP preferences in 2001 and had them reinstated in 2006).


We estimate the following empirical specification:

$$\ln\text{Imports}_{jpt} = \beta (\text{GSPremoval}_{jt} \times \text{GSPeligible}_p) + \gamma_{jp} + \delta_{jt} + \theta_{pt} + \epsilon_{jpt} \quad (1)$$

where  $\gamma_{jp}$ ,  $\delta_{jt}$ ,  $\theta_{pt}$  denote the exporter-product, exporter-time and product-time fixed effects, respectively.  $\text{GSPremoval}_{jt}$  is a dummy equal to 1 if the exporter is Belarus and years are up to 2007.  $\text{GSPeligible}_p$  is a dummy that equals to 1 if 4-digit sector for which at least 95% (80% is used in some regressions) of exports to the EU were eligible for GSP benefits. The dummy is equal to 0 (non-GSP product) if at most 5% (20% in some regressions) of sector's exports were eligible for GSP. We exclude the sectors that

FIGURE 4

Exports of GSP eligible and non-eligible sectors, 2004=1, by Country



Source: Authors, based on COMEXT database. We define an HS-4 sector as GSP eligible if more than 95% of its trade is eligible for GSP, and not eligible if less than 5% of trade is covered by GSP preference. See also section 3.

couldn't be clearly classified as GSP or non-GSP product. Only a small minority of 4-digit sectors cannot be attributed to being GSP or non-GSP products as it can be seen from Table A1.

Next, we turn to estimating the effect of the removal of GSP on the probability to export a certain good. We follow Hakobyan (2013) and apply a linear probability model to assess the effect of loss of GSP benefits by Belarus at the extensive margin. The model estimates the probability to have positive exports to the EU. The dependent variable is a dummy that equals to one when there was a non-zero export of a product.

Table 1 presents the estimation results. Column (1) contains all products from sectors where GSP eligibility is less than 5% or greater than 95%, including those where Belarus does not export to the EU or exports are very small. For this sample, the estimated impact of GSP removal is 29% ( $e^{-0.34}$ ). This means that the Belarusian exports to the EU of GSP sectors fell about 29% lower due to GPS removal. Next, column (2) defines a GSP product a sector with at least 80% of exports eligible for GSP benefits and non-GSP

TABLE 1  
Regression Results

Dependent Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Log Trade Value				Extensive Margin	
GSP eligibility	95/5%	80/20%	95/5%	80/20%	95/5%	80/20%
Trade Value Restriction			≥EUR 100 000	≥EUR 100 000		
GSPremoval×GSPeligible	-0.34*** (0.10)	-0.30*** (0.09)	-0.22* (0.11)	-0.18† (0.10)	-0.02 (0.01)	-0.03* (0.01)
Fixed Effects	exporter-product, exporter-time and product-time fixed effects					
Num. obs.	19900	26207	5325	6781	29610	37230

\*\*\* $p < 0.001$ , \*\* $p < 0.01$ , \* $p < 0.05$ , † $p < 0.1$

Source: Authors

product a sector with at most 20% of GSP eligible exports. The removal of GSP has a negative 26% ( $e^{-0.30}$ ) effect on exports for affected Belarusian sectors. Thus the exact definition which 4-digit exports are GSP or non-GSP products has almost no impact.

Columns (3) and (4) restrict the sample to the products that have an export value from Belarus to the EU of at least EUR 100 000 in each year prior to the removal of GSP (2004-2006). Thus we limit the sample to the goods that are relevant for the exports of Belarus and remove the noise from products with very small export values. GSP sectors in this sample experienced smaller effect from the removal of Belarus' GSP benefits. The exports of GSP-eligible sectors were about 17 – 20% lower due to the removal of GSP. Smaller exporters were affected most by the removal of benefits suggested by the larger effect in the full sample.

Finally, columns (5) and (6) present the analysis for the extensive margin. In line with the expectations, the removal of benefits had a trade-stifling impact on the extensive margin as well. The removal of Belarusian benefits reduced the probability of exporting to the EU by 2 – 3% for the GSP eligible products.

Our coefficient estimates suggest a larger impact of GSP than found in the prior literature. Hakobyan (2013) studies the trade impact of a temporary suspension in the US GSP program, which affected *all* countries. She finds that the interruption in GSP was associated with a 3% fall in exports, even though the exporters could have reasonably

expected to receive reimbursement for preferences later. One reason why our estimate is larger, differences between US and EU GSP programs aside, is that withdrawal of preferences *for an individual country* may encourage more trade diversion than wholesale suspension of the program. Thelle and Biesebroeck (2015) find that removal of EU GSP preferences leads to a 5% fall in exports on average; their main source of variation is the graduation of countries due to high export growth and becoming “too competitive”. Presumably, sectors that graduate have developed a comparative advantage and thus one should not be surprised that the trade impact of preference withdrawal is smaller; in contrast, the largest beneficiaries of GSP in Belarus (by GSP export share) were industries where Belarus had no comparative advantage, such as footwear. Such industries may no longer be viable once the trade preference has been withdrawn.

## **5. Conclusion**

After Belarus lost its GSP preference, total exports to the EU did not decline. However, there is a statistically significant and economically important adverse trade impact on those industries that benefited from the program. Among beneficiary sectors, exports fell by more than a quarter due to the withdrawal. The effect is especially strong for products where trade to the EU was small; when considering only sectors with more EUR 100 000 trade value per year, the GSP withdrawal effect shrinks to 17-20%. However, the overall impact on the economy was limited, because the most important export products – fuels and fertilizers – were not covered by the GSP.

## References


- Carnegie, A. (2015). *Power plays: how international institutions reshape coercive diplomacy*. Cambridge University Press.
- Frazer, G. and Van Biesebroeck, J. (2010). Trade growth under the african growth and opportunity act. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 92(1):128–144.
- Hajduk, K. and Silitski, V. (2007). After the gsp withdrawal: the case for the revision of the eu policy towards belarus. *Belarusian Institute for Strategic Studies*, <http://pdc.ceu.hu/archive/00003465>, 12(09).
- Hakobyan, S. (2013). GSP expiration and declining exports from developing countries. *Mimeo*.
- Hoekman, B. M. and Özden, Ç. (2005). *Trade Preferences and Differential Treatment of Developing Countries: A Selective Survey*, volume 3566. World Bank Publications.
- Lederman, D. and Özden, Ç. (2007). Geopolitical interests and preferential access to us markets. *Economics & Politics*, 19(2):235–258.
- Ornelas, E. (2016). Special and differential treatment for developing countries. *Handbook of Commercial Policy*, 1:369–432.
- Rettman, A. (2007). Belarus joins Burma as EU trade outcast. Online; posted 21-June-2007.
- Thelle, Martin, T. J. C. G.-L. and Biesebroeck, J. V. (2015). Assessment of economic benefits generated by the E.U. Trade Regimes towards the developing countries. *European Commission, DEVCO*.
- UNCTAD (2015). GSP – Handbook on the scheme of the European Union.
- Zhou, W. and Cuyvers, L. (2011). Linking international trade and labour standards: the effectiveness of sanctions under the european union’s gsp. *J. World Trade*, 45:63.

**Appendix**

---

FIGURE A1  
EU GSP Preference Utilization Rate, by Country

---



---

Source: Authors, based on COMEXT database