Impact of the EU enlargement on agri-food trade specialisation in Lithuania and Latvia

Dusan Drabik

Slovak Agricultural University in Nitra, Slovakia, E-mail: Dusan.Drabik@fem.uniag.sk

Lubica Bartova

Institute for Prospective Technological Studies (IPTS), DG JRC, European Commission, Spain, E-mail: Lubica.Bartova@ec.europa.eu The paper analyses the dynamics of development of agri-food trade specialisation of two Baltic states, Latvia and Lithuania, in the period from 2000 to 2005 by their trade partners / groupings, with an emphasis on a comparison of the situation after and prior to the 2004 EU enlargement. Most competitive commodities by trade groupings are identified. Latvia specialised strongly in products of fishery industry, while results for Lithuania reveal its comparative advantages in trade with milk and dairy products. Comparatively disadvantageous commodities were less likely to lose their status compared to comparatively advantageous ones, even from a longer time perspective.

Key words: agri-food trade, Latvia, Lithuania, specialisation, trade patterns

INTRODUCTION

The beginning of the transition period and the Russian crisis affected not only Central and Eastern European Countries (CEEC) grouped in the Central European Free Trade Agreement (CEFTA), but also the Baltic states – Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania – whose exports were formerly strongly oriented to Russia. To moderate the unfavourable trade situation, these countries created the Baltic Free Trade Area (BFTA) which came into force in 1994. The countries failed to build up a customs union, and each of them maintained individual trade barriers with third countries (Josling et al., 1999). Agriculture was one of the sectors where full trade liberalisation was not reached. It took two more years to include agriculture to BFTA and agree on agricultural provisions known as Baltic Agricultural Free Trade Agreement (BAFTA) which came into force in 1997.

The difficulties in reaching the BAFTA lied mostly in policy asymmetry, since Estonia had no import tariffs and the other countries had tariffs ranging from 20 to 60% for selected commodities (Kazlauskiene, Meyers, 1999). In addition, domestic support provided by Estonia and Latvia was rather modest compared to more generous support policies enjoyed by the Lithuanian farmers.

However, BAFTA was not the only preferential trade agreement (PTA) that Latvia and Lithuania were members of. After renewal of its independence, Latvia commenced to develop its bilateral trade relations progressively in the following years (Sweden, Norway, European Union, EFTA (European Free Trade Agreement), the Czech Republic, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Poland, Hungary Turkey, Bulgaria). In a similar way, Lithuania signed a series of bilateral trade agreements with neighbouring countries and the EU and EFTA. Moreover, a progressive preparation for the accession to the EU was made via the European Accession Agreements and approximation of national legislations with EU through "Aquis Communitaire". Much of bilateral agri-food trade of Latvia, Lithuania and the EU was completely liberalised prior to 2004 via the "Double zero" and "Double profit" agreements. These agreements eliminated tariffs on agri-food commodities and created duty-free quotas for others.

As suggested earlier, the EU and the CIS were the main partners in trade for Lithuania. Export share to these two destinations amounted to 98% of Lithuanian exports from 1993 to 68% in 2005 (Kazlauskiene, 2006). During the last ten years, there has been an increase in the share of exports to the EU and CEEC and a decline in the share of exports to CIS. Similarly, Lithuania witnesses a progressive diversion of imports from CIS in favour of those from the EU and CEEC.

METHODS AND DATA

The aim of the paper was to identify the most competitive commodities in the period 2000–2005 and to analyse the development dynamics of the agri-food trade specialisation of Latvia and Lithuania.

Identification of the most successful commodities in the agri-food trade of the two countries was based on the Lafay index (LFI) (Lafay, 1992) of trade specialisation:

$$LFI_{j}^{i} = 100 \left[\frac{x_{j}^{i} - m_{j}^{i}}{x_{j}^{i} + m_{j}^{i}} - \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{N} (x_{j}^{i} - m_{j}^{i})}{\sum_{j=1}^{N} (x_{j}^{i} + m_{j}^{i})} \right] \frac{x_{j}^{i} + m_{j}^{i}}{\sum_{j=1}^{N} (x_{j}^{i} + m_{j}^{i})}; \ i = \overline{1; k},$$

where:

 x_{j}^{i} – export of commodity j of country i to a selected grouping;

 m_{j}^{i} – import of commodity j of country i from a selected grouping;

N – number of commodities for which LFI is computed;

k – number of countries / groupings.

The index value also proxied the degree of trade specialisation of a commodity. The LFI index measures the position of each commodity in a country trade by taking into account the difference between an individual commodity and the overall normalised trade balances. This deviation is weighed by the share of a commodity turnover in the total turnover in trade with a partner / trade grouping. The higher the index value, the higher the degree of a commodity specialisation.

For identification of the most competitive commodities of Lithuanian and Latvian agri-food trade, we followed three conditions that had to be met simultaneously. First, we selected ten commodities with the highest LFI. Next, we considered how many times during the study period the same commodity met the first condition. It follows from an assumption that a commodity reveals a comparative advantage if trade in this commodity is specialised also over a longer period (in our case at least in four years out of the six examined). The last condition we took into consideration was an item's share of total export to a grouping in question.

To classify the most competitive commodities according to the level of processing, we followed commodity classification by Bergschmidt and Hartmann (1998).

The development dynamics of Lithuanian and Latvian agrifood trade specialisation was investigated by the Markov transition matrices. The approach tested by a number of empirical studies (Proudman, Redding, 2000; Redding, 2002; Brasili et al., 2000; Hinloopen, van Marrewijk, 2004; Fertö, Hubbard, 2003; Caselli, Zaghini, 2005), estimates square matrices which consist of probabilities of transition from one stage (of trade specialisation) in time τ to another point in time τ + n. The transition probabilities were estimated by counting the number of transitions out of and into each stage. The sum of elements in a row of the transition probability matrix is equal to unity (total probability).

In order to be able to construct a balanced panel of input data for the estimation of Markov's transition matrices, in case of zero trade flows we valued them by one EUR. The LFI values representing non-traded commodities were grouped into a special (middle) interval. The rest edges of the LFI range were split up into two equally sized intervals according to the number of commodities.

For the period 2000–2005, we estimated five one-year transition matrices for each reporter–partner pair. We also estimated one five-year transition matrix (for each partner) to capture a possible effect of dynamics in agri-food trade specialisation of both countries. Subsequently we computed the average one-year transition matrices for each reporter–partner pair to compare the dynamics of changes of the entire LFI distribution in a short (one year) and a longer (five years) term.

Yearly trade flow data from 2000 to 2005, specified at the six-digit code of the Harmonised System (HS) and expressed in EUR were used. Trade data files consist of 729 commodities for each observed year. We analysed trade flows by the following trade partners / groupings: the old EU Member States (EU-15), the Central and Eastern European Countries (CEEC)¹, Acceding Countries (Bulgaria and Romania), the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), the United States (USA) and the rest of the world (ROW). Data come from a unique CEEC database constructed under the TRADEAG FP6 project and from the Customs Statistics of the National Statistical Offices.¹

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Most competitive commodities in 2000–2005

Latvia and Lithuania revealed a high degree of specialisation in agri-food trade of a small number of commodities (Table 1). However, for both countries, we found significantly smaller shares of export to import from CEE countries.

This implies that agri-food exports to EU-15, CIS, ACC, ROW and the USA during the study period were specialised in a smaller group of commodities. Exports to CEE countries, however, were more diversified. Generally, the specialisation of exported commodities was higher than that of imported ones. Furthermore, agri-food trade with ACC and the USA showed highest shares of exports / imports. Our results show that all the most competitive commodities represent a high export share.

The Latvian and Lithuanian export of most competitive commodities by trade groupings in the period 2000 to 2005 was characterised by a higher level of value added given by the level of processing. In case of Lithuania, the presented facts can be partially explained by the fact that the main domestic products exported to EU-15 markets were for the most part products designated for further processing or re-export (Kriščiukaitienė, 2006). Favourable conditions for domestic production of milk and dairy

		La	tvia		Lithuania				
Trade grouping	Exp	oort	Import		Export		Import		
	min.	max.	min.	max.	min.	max.	min.	max.	
EU 15	76.4	85.2	29.9	35.4	66.6	85.3	31.0	39.7	
CEEC	37.7	46.8	32.3	42.0	34.9	58.4	28.8	36.4	
CIS	67.0	87.2	48.0	70.5	60.5	83.5	52.1	75.2	
ACC	97.6	100.0	95.9	100.0	93.3	100.0	99.1	99.7	
ROW	79.6	90.8	41.5	48.9	74.7	95.5	48.3	55.8	
USA	91.9	98.1	71.5	80	84.9	97.4	88.0	98.3	

Table 1. Trade share of ten most important commodities by value in 2000–2005, %

¹ Data collected by national CEEC experts.

	HS code	Description	HS code	Description
	0304 20	Frozen fillets	0811 90	Fruit and nuts – other
EU-15	0405 10	Butter	1001 90	Wheat and meslin – other
	0406 90	Other cheese	2309 10	Dog or cat food for retail sale
6556	0406 90	Other cheese	2101 11	Extracts, essences and conc.of coffee
CEEC	1806 31	Chocolate other, in blocks, slabs or bars	2402 20	Cigarettes containing tobacco
	0402 10	Milk and cream, fat <1.5%	1701 91	Raw sugar containing flavouring or colouring matter
ACC	0406 90	Other cheese	1803 10	Cocoa paste not defatted
	1604 20	Other prepared or preserved fish		
	0405 10	Butter	1701 99	Raw sugar other
CIC	0406 90	Other cheese	2309 10	Dog or cat food for retail sale
CIS	1001 90	Wheat and meslin – other	2309 90	Dog or cat food – other
	1604 20	Other prepared or preserved fish		
	0406 90	Other cheese	2105 00	Ice cream and other edible ice
USA	1904 10	Prepared foods obtained by the swelling or roasting of cereals or cereal products	2203 00	Beer made from malt
	1905 90	Bread, pastry, cakes – other		
	0402 10	Milk and cream, fat < 1.5 %	0709 59	Mushrooms and truffles – other
ROW	0404 10	Whey, concentrated or not	2309 10	Dog or cat food for retail sale
-	0405 10	Butter		

Table 2. Most competitive commodities of Lithuanian foreign agri-food trade according to trade groupings (2000–2005)

Source: our own calculations.

Table 3. Most competitive commodities of Latvian foreign agri-food trade according to trade groupings (2000–2005)

	HS code	Description	HS code	Description
	0304 20	Frozen fillets	0406 90	Other cheese
EU-15	0402 10	Milk and cream, fat <1.5%	1001 90	Wheat and meslin – other
	0405 10	Butter	1205 10	Low erucic acid rape or colza seeds
CEEC	0302 50	Cod, excluding livers and roes	2202 90	Waters, including mineral waters and aerated waters – other
CEEC	1604 13	Sardines, sardinella and brisling or sprats		
	1604 12	Herrings	1604 19	Fish – other
ACC	1604 13	Sardines, sardinella and brisling or sprats	1604 20	Other prepared or preserved fish
	1604 15	Mackerel	2106 90	Food preparations – other
	0303 71	Sardines, sardinella, brisling or sprats	2301 20	Flours, meals and pellets, of fish
CIS	1604 13	Sardines, sardinella, brisling or sprats	2309 90	Dog or cat food – other
	1604 20	Other prepared or preserved fish		
	0406 90	Other cheese	1806 90	Chocolate containing cocoa – other
USA	1604 12	Herrings	2208 60	Vodka
	1604 13	Sardines, sardinella and brisling or sprats	2402 20	Cigarettes containing tobacco
ROW	1205 10	Low erucic acid rape or colza seeds	2203 00	Beer made from malt
	1604 13	Sardines, sardinella and brisling or sprats	2208 60	Vodka
	1806 90	Chocolate containing cocoa		

Source: our own calculations.

products appear also to have a strong influence on export specialisation of the type of commodities. Dairy products were competitive in export to all considered trade groupings (Table 2).

Lithuania specialised significantly in exports of dairy commodities. Our study shows that Latvia had comparative advantages in either semi- or highly processed fish products. The results in Table 3 also show that semi-processed fish were exported to EU-15 countries and CEEC, while more processed commodities were exported to ACC, USA or ROW.

How did the specialisation pattern evolve?

Investigation of the evolution of trade patterns over time is able to answer the question whether the level of comparative advantages (disadvantages) of individual commodities remained unchanged or altered (especially with respect to the EU accession) during the study period.

In terms of trade with EU-15, CEEC and ROW, in the oneyear span (Tables 4 and 5) we observed the highest stability of trade in commodities significantly advantageous and disadvantageous. The highest probabilities underpinning the conclusion relate to the stages of a deep comparative disadvantage (I_1I_1) and a high comparative advantage (I_5I_5). It means that from a very short time (one-year) perspective, it was difficult for Latvia and Lithuania to improve the competitiveness of previously comparatively disadvantageous commodities in trade with all trade partners / groupings. It is also true that once obtained comparative advantage, the countries were able to maintain this trade commodity position over the study period.

Average 1 years transition materia 2000, 2005													
	Average 1-year transition matrix 2000-2005					EU 15	5-year transition matrix 2005/2000						
						EU IS							
	1	1 ₂	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	0.010			0.709	0.120	0.017	0.017	5		
<u>'</u> 1	0.075	0.096	0.007	0.010	0.011	I	0.798	0.150	0.017	0.017	0.036		
I2	0.112	0.730	0.106	0.042	0.009	I ₂	0.190	0.641	0.093	0.051	0.025		
I ₃	0.024	0.207	0.720	0.040	0.008	I_3	0.087	0.326	0.511	0.054	0.022		
I_4	0.087	0.389	0.136	0.291	0.097	I ₄	0.200	0.514	0.029	0.200	0.057		
I ₅	0.074	0.058	0.030	0.109	0.729	I ₅	0.229	0.114	0.057	0.114	0.486		
						CEEC							
	I ₁	I ₂	I ₃	I ₄	I ₅		I,	I ₂	I ₃	I ₄	I ₅		
I,	0.800	0.092	0.009	0.026	0.073	I ₁	0.724	0.086	0.007	0.039	0.145		
I ₂	0.130	0.564	0.136	0.134	0.035	l ₂	0.243	0.461	0.072	0.132	0.092		
I ₃	0.008	0.173	0.726	0.082	0.011	I ₃	0.049	0.299	0.436	0.174	0.042		
I ₄	0.094	0.261	0.098	0.446	0.101	I ₄	0.163	0.338	0.038	0.263	0.200		
I ₅	0.110	0.040	0.018	0.107	0.724	I ₅	0.284	0.074	0.012	0.123	0.506		
						ACC							
	I,	I ₂	I ₃	I ₄	I ₅		I,	I ₂	I ₃	I ₄	I ₅		
I,	0.613	0.154	0.209	0.025	0.000	I ₁	0.375	0.375	0.250	0.000	0.000		
I ₂	0.159	0.323	0.519	0.000	0.000	I ₂	0.375	0.000	0.625	0.000	0.000		
I ₃	0.003	0.005	0.980	0.007	0.005	I ₃	0.004	0.010	0.965	0.011	0.010		
I ₄	0.033	0.015	0.521	0.164	0.267	I ₄	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.000		
I ₅	0.014	0.000	0.336	0.095	0.555	١ _s	0.500	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.500		
						CIS							
	I,	I ₂	I ₃	I_4	I _s		I,	I ₂	I ₃	I ₄	I ₅		
I,	0.703	0.144	0.049	0.044	0.060	I ₁	0.376	0.176	0.059	0.212	0.176		
I ₂	0.115	0.373	0.264	0.159	0.088	I ₂	0.095	0.155	0.333	0.238	0.179		
I ₃	0.010	0.057	0.818	0.090	0.025	I ₃	0.017	0.049	0.779	0.106	0.049		
I_4	0.011	0.110	0.330	0.384	0.165	I ₄	0.038	0.076	0.267	0.381	0.238		
I ₅	0.051	0.054	0.094	0.127	0.675	I ₅	0.057	0.029	0.181	0.162	0.571		
						USA							
	I,	I ₂	I ₃	I ₄	I ₅		Ι,	I ₂	I ₃	I ₄	I ₅		
I,	0.599	0.134	0.231	0.012	0.025	I ₁	0.317	0.063	0.540	0.016	0.063		
I ₂	0.146	0.328	0.427	0.071	0.028	I ₂	0.095	0.159	0.667	0.032	0.048		
I ₃	0.017	0.040	0.912	0.024	0.007	I ₃	0.014	0.034	0.904	0.034	0.014		
I ₄	0.017	0.129	0.346	0.358	0.151	I ₄	0.000	0.095	0.524	0.286	0.095		
I,	0.045	0.031	0.104	0.119	0.701	I ₅	0.048	0.000	0.238	0.095	0.619		
						ROW							
	I,	I ₂	I ₃	I ₄	I ₅		I,	I ₂	I ₃	I ₄	I ₅		
I,	0.786	0.120	0.016	0.023	0.054	I,	0.573	0.188	0.052	0.094	0.094		
I ₂	0.113	0.489	0.191	0.138	0.069	I ₂	0.168	0.347	0.158	0.179	0.147		
I ₃	0.009	0.090	0.783	0.105	0.013	I ₃	0.021	0.096	0.664	0.144	0.075		
I ₄	0.041	0.124	0.176	0.511	0.148	I ₄	0.098	0.127	0.108	0.451	0.216		
I ₅	0.056	0.055	0.020	0.113	0.756	١ _s	0.126	0.039	0.029	0.155	0.650		

Table 4. Transition probability matrices for Latvia

Source: our own calculations.

The probability that the trade position of a strongly competitive commodity improved in the following year was approximately 13% and 12% for Latvia and Lithuania respectively in their trade with the EU-15. On the other hand, the probability that the trade position of highly competitive commodities deteriorated was 28 and 23% in Latvian and Lithuanian agri-food trade with CEEC, respectively.

The LFI intra-distribution dynamics of Latvian and Lithuanian agri-food trade according to trade groupings showed a significant development during the study period. Five-year

Average 1-year transition matrix 2000–2005						5-year transition matrix 2005 / 2000					
						EU 15					
	I,	I ₂	I ₃	I ₄	I ₅		I,	I ₂	I ₃	I ₄	I ₅
I,	0.883	0.077	0.011	0.014	0.015	I,	0.827	0.106	0.005	0.029	0.034
I ₂	0.098	0.731	0.110	0.052	0.009	I ₂	0.188	0.644	0.058	0.072	0.038
I ₃	0.028	0.186	0.710	0.060	0.016	I ₃	0.092	0.303	0.429	0.105	0.071
I ₄	0.070	0.281	0.107	0.409	0.133	I ₄	0.162	0.324	0.081	0.297	0.135
I ₅	0.055	0.037	0.025	0.107	0.775	I ₅	0.132	0.105	0.026	0.105	0.632
						CEEC					
	I,	I ₂	I ₃	I ₄	I ₅		I,	I ₂	I ₃	I ₄	I _s
I,	0.826	0.093	0.003	0.019	0.059	I,	0.695	0.107	0.000	0.061	0.137
I ₂	0.125	0.542	0.099	0.190	0.044	I ₂	0.246	0.346	0.062	0.208	0.138
I ₃	0.014	0.145	0.716	0.106	0.019	I ₃	0.100	0.293	0.377	0.167	0.063
I ₄	0.042	0.197	0.147	0.483	0.132	I ₄	0.107	0.357	0.036	0.286	0.214
I ₅	0.085	0.055	0.013	0.081	0.766	I ₅	0.250	0.071	0.024	0.107	0.548
						ACC					
	I,	I ₂	I ₃	I ₄	I ₅		I,	I ₂	I ₃	I ₄	I ₅
I,	0.677	0.129	0.172	0.022	0.000	Ι,	0.375	0.125	0.500	0.000	0.000
I ₂	0.072	0.340	0.545	0.020	0.022	I ₂	0.000	0.143	0.857	0.000	0.000
I ₃	0.003	0.007	0.979	0.007	0.005	I ₃	0.007	0.007	0.955	0.017	0.014
I_4	0.000	0.000	0.457	0.402	0.140	I ₄	0.000	0.000	0.667	0.000	0.333
I ₅	0.000	0.000	0.462	0.067	0.471	I ₅	0.000	0.000	0.667	0.000	0.333
						CIS					
	I,	I ₂	I ₃	I ₄	I ₅		I,	I ₂	I ₃	I ₄	۱ ₅
I,	0.724	0.140	0.062	0.038	0.035	I,	0.413	0.173	0.133	0.093	0.187
l ₂	0.112	0.442	0.215	0.170	0.062	I ₂	0.053	0.187	0.307	0.320	0.133
I ₃	0.012	0.042	0.825	0.100	0.021	I ₃	0.046	0.072	0.656	0.157	0.069
I ₄	0.024	0.073	0.233	0.509	0.162	I ₄	0.032	0.021	0.158	0.432	0.358
I_5	0.028	0.043	0.045	0.098	0.787	ا_5	0.063	0.053	0.126	0.126	0.632
						USA					
	I,	I ₂	I ₃	I ₄	I ₅		I,	I ₂	I ₃	I ₄	I ₅
I_	0.560	0.161	0.172	0.060	0.048	I,	0.182	0.068	0.523	0.068	0.159
l ₂	0.130	0.247	0.471	0.079	0.073	l ₂	0.045	0.091	0.727	0.114	0.023
I_3	0.011	0.026	0.887	0.052	0.024	I ₃	0.014	0.020	0.889	0.046	0.030
I	0.008	0.053	0.512	0.294	0.134	I ₄	0.050	0.000	0.650	0.175	0.125
l ₅	0.016	0.027	0.260	0.122	0.576	۱ ₅	0.025	0.075	0.500	0.050	0.350
						ROW					
	I,	I ₂	I ₃	I ₄	I ₅		I ₁	I ₂	I ₃	I ₄	I ₅
I,	0.809	0.104	0.047	0.024	0.016	I,	0.574	0.206	0.088	0.051	0.081
I_2	0.087	0.580	0.235	0.060	0.038	I ₂	0.103	0.294	0.309	0.162	0.132
I_3	0.017	0.090	0.785	0.086	0.022	I ₃	0.028	0.067	0.567	0.196	0.142
I ₄	0.050	0.079	0.202	0.400	0.269	I ₄	0.029	0.265	0.059	0.265	0.382
I ₅	0.023	0.056	0.073	0.093	0.755	I ₅	0.086	0.086	0.057	0.143	0.629

Table 5. Transition probability matrices for Lithuania

Source: our own calculations.

transition matrices reflect the situation. A fall in diagonal transition probabilities was reported for all trade groupings. However, the effect was stronger in trade with ACC, CIS and the USA than EU-15, CEEC and ROW. The result implies that Latvian and Lithuanian agri-food trade with former trade groupings was more sensitive to possible changes induced by the EU enlargement. It follows from the fact that after 2004 ACC, CIS, and the USA were viewed as third countries for the EU.

Similarly to other NMS, Latvia and Lithuania, following the common EU trade policies, experience a shift of their traded commodity competitiveness with regard to trade with the third countries. Moreover, the magnitude of five-year diagonal probabilities leads to a conclusion that the position of the most competitive agri-food commodities in Latvian and Lithuanian trade with the EU-15 and CEEC deteriorated over the study period. On the other hand, both countries improved their agri-food commodity trade position in trade with CIS, the USA and ROW over the five-year period.

Noticeable changes of transition probabilities after five years point to structural changes in agri-food trade patterns of Latvia and Lithuania (as well as of other CEEC). A progressive agrifood trade liberalisation, change of commitments in relation to the WTO (as non-EU and EU members) and reform of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) of the EU contributed to the structural changes as well.

CONCLUSIONS

Lithuania and Latvia during the period of economic transition underwent also a process of agri-food trade liberalisation, which together with their accession to the EU meant significant changes of agri-food trade patterns.

In the paper, we have analysed the development of both countries as regards their agri-food trade specialisation by their trade partners / groupings in the period 2000–2005.

We found a high level of specialisation in a relatively small number of commodities in the agri-food trade of Latvia and Lithuania with the majority of their trade partners / groupings. However, significantly smaller shares were found for trade with the CEE countries. This led to a higher diversification of Latvian and Lithuanian exports to CEEC than to the EU-15, CIS, ACC, ROW and the USA.

Latvian and Lithuanian export of the most competitive commodities was characterised by a higher level of value added in the period 2000 to 2005. While Lithuania specialised significantly in exports of dairy commodities, Latvia appeared to have comparative advantages in fish products. The results suggest that Latvian fish products designed for distant markets (ACC, USA, ROW) are processed domestically.

In a one-year span, it was rather difficult for Latvia and Lithuania to improve the competitiveness of non-competitive agri-food commodities. The position of the most competitive agri-food commodities in Latvian and Lithuanian trade with the EU-15 and CEEC has deteriorated over the study period. On the other hand, both countries improved their agri-food commodity trade position with CIS, the USA and ROW over the five-year period.

A progressive agri-food trade liberalisation; change of commitments in relation to the WTO (as non-EU and EU members) and the reform of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) may be considered the substantial factors influencing the composition of agri-food trade of an individual CEE country with respect to the level of the revealed comparative (dis) advantage.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The results presented in the paper are part of a research carried out within the FP6 n°513666 – TRADEAG financed by the European Commission and the Ministry of Education of the SR. The authors would like to thank Irena Kriščiukaitienė and Zigmars Kikans for co-operation and help in providing the trade data for Lithuania and Latvia, respectively.

References

- Bergschmidt A., Hartmann M. Agricultural Trade Policies and Trade Relations iIn Transition Economies. Institute of Agricultural Development in Central and Eastern Europe. Discussion Paper No. 12, 1998.
- Brasili A., Epifani P., Helg R. On the Dynamics of Trade Patterns // De Economist, 2000. Vol. 148(2). P. 233–58.
- Caselli P., Zaghini A. International specialisation models in Latin America: the case of Argentina // Banca D'Italia, Temi di discusione del Servizio Studi, Number 558 – June 2005.
- Fertö I., Hubbard L. J. The Dynamics of Agri-Food Trade Patterns. The Accession Countries' Case // Paper presented at the international conference "Agricultural policy reform and the WTO: where are we heading?". Capri (Italy), June 23–26, 2003.
- Hinloopen J., van Marrewijk C. Dynamics of Chinese comparative advantage. TI 2004–034/2 Tinbergen Institute Discussion Paper. March 2004.
- Josling T., Tangermann S., Henning T. CEFTA, BFTA and agricultural trade in CEEC // Casaki C., Nash J. (eds.). Regional and International Trade Policy Lessons for the EU Accession in the Rural Sector – World Bank/FAQ Workshop, June 20–23, 1998. 1999.
- Kazlauskiene N., Meyers W. H. The Baltic Free Trade AgreementinAgriculture:EarlyResultsoftheExperiment // Most – Bologna. 1999. Vol. 9. Part 3.
- Kazlauskiene N., Meyers W. H. Implications of EU Accession for Trade Regimes and Trade Flows of CEECs. Paper presented at the international Conference "Agricultural Policy Reform and the WTO: where are We [Heading?". Capri (Italy), June 23–26, 2003.
- Kikans Z. Description of agricultural trade policy of Latvia before the accession. A summary report prepared under FP6 TRADEAG project. 2006.
- Krisciukaitiene I. The Trends in Foreign Trade of Lithuanian Agricultural Products. A summary report prepared under FP6 TRADEAG project. 2006.
- 11. Lafay G. The Measurement of Revealed Comparative Advantages // Dagenais M. G., Muet P. A. (eds.). International Trade Modeling. London: Chapman & Hill, 1992.
- Proudman J., Redding S. Evolving patterns of international trade // Review of International Economics. 2000. Vol. 8(3). P. 373–396.
- Redding S. Specialisation dynamics // Journal of International Economics. 2002. Vol. 58. P. 299–334.

Dusan Drabik, Lubica Bartova

ES PLĖTROS ĮTAKA LIETUVOS IR LATVIJOS ŽEMĖS ŪKIO IR MAISTO PRODUKTŲ PREKYBOS SPECIALIZACIJAI

Santrauka

Analizuojama dviejų Baltijos valstybių – Latvijos ir Lietuvos žemės ūkio ir maisto produktų prekybos dinamika 2000–2005 m. pagal jų prekybos partnerius. Siekiama palyginti prekybos specializaciją iki ir po Europos Sąjungos (ES) išplėtimo 2004 m. Grupuojant prekes buvo nustatytos konkurencingiausios prekės. Latvija ryškiai specializavosi žuvų produktų gamyboje. Kol kas Lietuvos rezultatai rodo pieno ir pieno produktų lyginamąją naudą. Nustatyta nedidelė tikimybė keisti, palyginti, nenaudingų prekių poziciją, lyginant su naudingomis prekėmis, net ir ilgesniam laikotarpiui.

Raktažodžiai: Lietuva, Latvija, prekyba žemės ūkio ir maisto produktais, prekybos struktūra, specializacija

Душан Драбик, Любица Бартова

ВЛИЯНИЕ РАЗВИТИЯ ЕС НА СПЕЦИАЛИЗАЦИЮ ТОРГОВЛИ СЕЛЬСКОХОЗЯЙСТВЕННЫМИ И ПРОДОВОЛЬСТВЕННЫМИ ПРОДУКТАМИ В ЛИТВЕ И ЛАТВИИ

Резюме

Проведен анализ динамики развития специализации агропродовольственной торговли в 2000–2005 гг. в двух прибалтийских государствах – в Латвии и Литве. Особое внимание уделено сравнению специализации торговли до и после расширения ЕС (в 2004 г). Определены наиболее конкурентоспособные группы товаров. В Латвии это продукты рыбной промышленности, а в Литве – молочная продукция. Для сравнительно невыгодных товаров была выявлена некоторая возможность изменить со временем их позиции в лучшую сторону.

Ключевые слова: агропродовольственная торговля, Литва, Латвия, специализация, структура торговли