Appendices
Appendix I
The Multilateral Trading System: A Short Bibliographical Note

For the purposes of readability, this Report is written in a non-scholarly style. Footnotes and referencing in the text have been kept to an absolute minimum. However, the Report has drawn on a wide range of sources and literature. This short bibliographical note is indicative only. In no way does it purport to comprehensiveness. But it does provide a guide to some of the materials that have informed the preparation of this Report and which anyone wishing to follow up further on various sections of the Report might find useful.

INTRODUCTION
Five Challenges Facing the Global Trade Regime


The literature on the World Trade Organization (WTO) is vast. Those interested in the agreements of the WTO in general, and recent negotiations in particular, should start at the website of the Organization (www.wto.org) and the Doha briefings of bodies such as the International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development (www.ictsd.org/pubs/dohabriefings). The recent impasse of the Doha Development Round raises immediate concerns regarding the progress of the trade negotiations, but also longer term questions about the sustainability of the processes and everyday workings of the system in its current form. A good starting point here is Paul Collier, ‘Why the WTO is Deadlocked: And What Can Be Done About It’, *The World Economy*, 29(10) 2006: 1423-1449, but see also the essays in Donna Lee and Rorden Wilkinson (eds.) *The WTO after Hong Kong: Progress in, and prospects for, the Doha Development Agenda*, London: Routledge, 2007.

CHAPTER 1
The Global Economic Paradox: Deeper Integration, Shallower Support


CHAPTER 2
The Management of Global Trade: Purposes, Boundaries and Decision-Making


Since the inception of the multilateral trading system there have been calls for more explicit disciplines on certain types of trade policy measures. A good starting point for those interested in the boundaries of WTO activity, and possible directions of expansion, is the Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization, available at www.wto.org. The debate on this question and proposals for reform can be followed in Simon Evenett, ‘The Failure of the WTO Ministerial Meeting in Cancún: What Implications for Future Research on the Word Trading System?’ CESifo Forum, 4(3), Autumn 2003: 11-17 and, especially, the recent World Trade Report, Geneva: WTO, 2007 which discusses a number of policy areas that have been subject to negotiation in the GATT and/or the WTO. The outcome of these negotiations has differed significantly across policy areas.

In his article, ‘When should new areas be added to the WTO?’ World Trade Review, 4(2) 2005: 273-293, Peter Lloyd explores how WTO members might make decisions about the addition of new areas to WTO rules, and applies his criteria to three particular areas: international investment, competition law and the environment. Lloyd argues that the Doha Development Agenda opened the door for negotiations on the environment and competition policy and, conditional upon the protection of intellectual property rights in the WTO, a case may even be made for including competition rules. Keith Maskus resists this line of argument, especially with regards to environmental regulation and labour standards (see Keith E. Maskus, ‘Regulatory standards in the WTO: Comparing intellectual property rights with competition policy, environmental protection, and core labour standards.’ World Trade Review, 1(2) 2002 135-152). The controversy surrounding the Singapore Issues presents an important insight into the contested scope of the WTO and its evolving agenda. See Simon Evenett, ‘Five Hypotheses concerning the fate of the Singapore Issues’, 4 August 2007, Oxford Review of Economic Policy, forthcoming, accessed at http://www.evenett.com/articles/Fate_SIs.pdf.

A 2002 special edition of the American Journal of International Law 96(1) 2002 also addresses the boundary questions in the WTO’s mandate. K. Bagwell, P.C. Mavroidis, and R. Staiger, ‘It’s A Question of Market Access’, (pp 56-76) argue that market access issues associated with the question of the optimal mandate of the WTO should be separated from non-market access issues. They identify “race-to-the-bottom” issues as market access issues and suggest that the WTO should address these concerns. Other relevant papers in this special edition include Robert Howse, ‘From Politics to Technocracy – and Back Again: the Fate of the Multilateral Trading System’ (pp 94-117) and John Jackson, ‘Afterword: The Linkage Problem – Comments on Five Texts’ (pp 118-125).

One scholar questions whether the difficulties in reaching an agreement in the Doha Round signal the need for institutional reform of the WTO. Procedural improvements by themselves will not solve policy disagreements, but the lessons being learned in the Round on how to manage traditional negotiations involving many more Members within a changing global power structure might pay off in any subsequent negotiations (see Robert Wolfe, ‘Can the trading system be governed? Institutional implications of the WTO’s suspended animation.’ Working Paper, Centre for International Governance Innovation, No. 3: 2-92, Waterloo, Canada, 2007). In an interesting theoretical exploration of these boundary issues, Paola Conconi and Carlo Perroni analyse “issue tie-in” – the possibility to make trade-co-operation conditional on co-operation in another field – between multilateral trade negotiations and environmental issues. They suggest that linking the two negotiations could in some situations play a facilitating role, while in other situations could lead to worse negotiation outcomes in both fields (see Paola Conconi, and Carlo Perroni, ‘Issue Linkage and Issue Tie-in in Multilateral Negotiations’, Journal of International Economics, 57, 2002: 423-447).


Shortcomings in the current dispute process, such as “foot-dragging” tactics by offending WTO Members are identified in Robert Z. Lawrence, *Crimes and Punishments? Retaliation under the WTO*, Washington, DC: Institute of International Economics, 2003. To mitigate this, Lawrence proposes that Members pre-commit sectors that they promise to liberalise in case they lose a dispute. Other authors have proposed making retaliation rights tradable, such that Members who do not find it opportune to retaliate can obtain some monetary reparation, while others would acquire the right to protect their industries, supposedly at a discount (see K. Bagwell, P. C. Mavroidis and R. W. Staiger, ‘The Case for Auctioning Countermeasures in the WTO’, *Working Paper No. 9920*, Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research, 2003.

In order to increase the incentive to comply, Chad Bown proposes “stiffer” penalties, that is, deliberately punitive damage awards, in ‘The Economics of Trade Disputes, the GATT’s Article XXIII, and the WTO’s Dispute Settlement Understanding’, *Economics and Politics* 14(2), 2002: 283-322. Other proposals for implementing monetary compensation can be found in N. Limão and K. Saggi, ‘Tariff Retaliation versus Financial Compensation in the Enforcement of International Trade Agreements’, *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper* No. 3873, Washington, DC: World Bank, 2006. They recommend that each country post a bond with a neutral party at the time a trade agreement is concluded. If a country is found to have violated its commitments, it has to decide whether to pay the fine and recover the right to its bond or to not pay the fine and forfeit the bond, which is then disbursed to the damaged country as compensation.

The other key issues for consideration surrounding dispute settlement include why countries choose to file complaints in the first instance, the costs of retaliation, and the plaintiff’s legal capacity and retaliatory power on the one hand and defendant government’s willingness to comply on the other. These issues are discussed in C. P. Bown ‘On the Economic Success of GATT/WTO Dispute Settlement’, *Review of Economics and Statistics* 86(3) 2004: 811-823. Bown argues that a government’s decision to initiate a formal complaint is determined primarily by a

Other analysts have shown that the decision to bring a case depends on the strength of the implementation mechanism and the probability of reaching a favourable decision. Both aspects were strengthened with the Dispute Settlement Understanding, which removed the possibility to block panel establishment and reports as well as introducing sophisticated implementation procedures. This can help explain the boost in WTO dispute settlement activity relative to the GATT (see M. Büttler, M. and H. Hauser, ’The WTO Dispute Settlement Mechanism: A First Assessment from an Economic Perspective’, Journal of Law, Economics, & Organization 16(2) 2000: 503-33.

It is now understood that early settlement offers the greatest likelihood of securing full concessions from a defendant, but developing countries have been less able to do so than developed ones (see M. L. Busch and E. Reinhardt, ‘Developing Countries and General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade/World Trade Organization Dispute Settlement’, Journal of World Trade 37 (4) 2003: 719-735). Small countries are frequently confronted with higher costs of information gathering given that the national mechanisms, as well as resourceful private groups, that could monitor foreign trade practices are often lacking. Once a violation of another country has been detected, many developing and Least Developed Countries may only have limited legal expertise at their disposal to bring or defend a case and may have to rely on (expensive) outside expertise (see B. Hoekman, and P. C. Mavroidis, ’WTO Dispute Settlement, Transparency and Surveillance’, World Economy 23(4) 2000: 527-542). Unsurprisingly, therefore, developing countries are likely to pursue complaints according to their immediate trade interests. The literature suggests that while they may not be deterred from filing a dispute against bigger players, they often face difficulties in detecting an infringement and building a case and, hence, are constrained in their capacity to launch disputes (see A. T. Guzman and B. A. Simmons, ’Power Plays and Capacity Constraints: The Selection of Defendants in World Trade Organization Disputes’, Journal of Legal Studies 34(2) 2005: 557-598).

The literature also suggests that participation of third parties, including at the consultation stage, has a major impact on dispute settlement outcomes. Third party participation increases the transaction costs of reaching a mutually agreed solution and may deter disputes from being filed in the first place (see M. L. Busch, E. Reinhardt, ‘Three’s a Crowd: Third Parties and WTO Dispute Settlement’, World Politics, 58(3) 2006: 446-77). The nature of the disputed issue also has an impact on the likelihood that settlement will be reached through consultations. When the subject matter of the dispute – such as a health measure – has an all-or-nothing character and leaves little room for compromise, there is considerably less opportunity for a negotiated compromise than when “continuous” variables, such as tariff levels are concerned (see A. T. Guzman and B. A. Simmons, B. ’To Settle or Empanel? An Empirical Analysis of Litigation and Settlement at the World Trade Organization’, Journal of Legal Studies, 31(1) 2002: S205-S235).

CHAPTER 3
Trade and Development: Making the WTO Deliver More for its Weaker Members

There is another large literature on the relationships between international trade, WTO rules, and the development of nations. But not only large, this literature is often a contested area of inquiry. A survey of the contribution of trade policy to the development process can be found in the 2003 World Trade Report, Geneva: WTO, 2003. The various writings of Joseph Stiglitz, Dani Rodrik, and Bernard Hoekman referred to in this Bibliographical Note contain a number of different critical
perspectives on the effect of WTO rules and negotiating processes on developing countries. More positive assessments of trade policies’ contributions to development can be found in the writings of Jagdish Bhagwati and Martin Wolf noted earlier. Particularly useful are the essays gathered together in Bernard Hoekman, Aaditya Mattoo and Philip English (eds.) Development, Trade and the WTO, Washington: The World Bank, 2002.

Most analysts, both scholars and practitioners, today recognise that trade is a necessary, if not a sufficient, condition for growth and development. Accounts of the other necessary factors in development, especially institutions, are presented in the work of economists such as Dani Rodrik. See, for example, Dani Rodrik, Arvind Subramanian and Francesco Trebbi, ‘Institutions Rule: The Primacy of Institutions over Geography and Integration in Economic Development’, NBER Working Paper 9305, Oct. 2002 and Rodrik, ‘Global Governance as if Development Really Mattered: UNDP: www.undp.org/mainundp/propoor/docs/povglobalgovernancetrade.pdf.


More relevant to this Report are two key issues identified in Chapter 3, Special and Differential Treatment (S&DT) and Aid for Trade (AfT). For a good survey of the S&DT literature in terms of both development issues, such as preferences and industrial policy, and implications for WTO rules, such as questions of differentiation and adjustment assistance, see P. Kleen and S. Page, ‘S&DT of Developing Countries in the World Trade Organization’, Global Development Studies No. 2, 2005 Stockholm: Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Sweden. The many types of S&DT, their apparent rationales, and potential reform are discussed by Alexander Keck and Patrick Low, ‘Special and Differential Treatment in the WTO: Why, When and How?’ in Simon Evenett and Bernard Hoekman, (eds.) Economic Development and Multilateral Trade Co-operation, Basingstoke: Palgrave and Washington DC World Bank, 2005. They argue in favour of an issue-specific approach to S&DT that would not require an a priori differentiation between developing country Members. Derogations from the rules would be based on economic arguments for otherwise prohibited government interventions. Access to these exemptions would be conditioned on the fulfilment of measurable provision-specific criteria. The authors demonstrate how the list of eligible countries would vary depending on the S&DT provision in question and the threshold criteria used.


AfT, as this Report argues, can present an important vehicle for harnessing trade for development. For a discussion of the origins of the policy see IMF/World Bank, Doha Development Agenda and Aid for Trade, Washington DC: 2005 and Susan Prowse, Aid for Trade: Increasing Support for Trade Adjustment and Integration, (A Draft Concept Paper, London: UK Department for International Development, May
The debate over AfT and its implementation has been usefully surveyed by Sheila Page in a recent paper, *The Potential Impact of the Aid for Trade Initiative*, UNCTAD, G-24 Discussion Paper Series No. 45, April 2007. One set of comments on the importance of AfT is to be found in the recent writings on the subject by the WTO Director-General Pascal Lamy (see http://www.ideas4development.org/contributors/lyamy/en/); South Africa’s Ambassador to the WTO, Faizel Ismail, sees AfT as ‘an essential component of the multilateral trading system’; see Ismail, *Mainstreaming Development in the WTO: Developing Countries in the Doha Round*, New Delhi: Fredrich Ebert Stiftung and CUTS International, 2007.

**CHAPTER 4**

Reconciling Parallel Universes: Multilateralism and the Challenge of Preferentialism

The seminal work on the problems of Preferential Trade Agreements (PTAs) is Jacob Viner’s *The Customs Union Issue*, London: Stevens & Sons, 1950. Viner first theorised the difference between trade creation, which is a positive, welfare-enhancing development, and trade diversion, which is welfare-reducing. Nobel Laureate James E. Meade added to the debate with his book on *The Theory of Customs Unions*, Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1955.
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