



**AgEcon** SEARCH  
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

*The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library*

**This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.**

**Help ensure our sustainability.**

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search  
<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>  
[aesearch@umn.edu](mailto:aesearch@umn.edu)

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*



**IATRC**

**INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL  
TRADE RESEARCH CONSORTIUM**

# **Celebrating the First Thirty Years**

Edited by

**ALEX F. MCCALLA**  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,  
DAVIS

**ED ROSSMILLER**  
RETIRED

**LAURA BIPES**  
IATRC ADMINISTRATOR,  
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

# CONTENTS

## Introduction

*Part I Theme Day – Trade in Agriculture: Much Done, So Much More to Do*

- Chapter 1 **Birth of the IATRC**  
Tim Josling, Alex McCalla | Reflections by David Orden
- Chapter 2 **The Global Context That Forged the IATRC**  
Ed Rossmiller, Alex McCalla
- Chapter 3 **Creating a Virtual Think Tank: IATRC, 1980–1995**  
Maury Bredahl, Ed Rossmiller, Andy Schmitz, Jimmye Hillman
- Chapter 4 **Agricultural Trade 1980 vs. 2010: Some Progress, But Still So Far To Go**  
Stefan Tangermann | Discussion by David Blandford and Karl Meilke
- Chapter 5 **How Well Have We Done and Where Should We Go From Here: Perspectives from Around the World**  
Giovanni Anania, James Rude, Donald MacLaren
- Chapter 6 **Agricultural Trade Challenges: Doha and Beyond**  
Kym Anderson | Discussion by David Orden
- Chapter 7 **The Gains from International Trade Under Monopolistic Competition**  
Robert C. Feenstra | Discussion by Munisamy Gopinath

*Part II IATRC Through the Years: History from the Archives*


- Chapter 8 **An Analytical History of the IATRC 1997**  
Tim Josling, Alex McCalla, T. Kelley White | Addendum Update by Editors
- Chapter 9 **Status Report on IATRC: Progress on Recommendations of the 2010 Futures Steering Group**  
Mike Gifford, Joe Glauber, Stefan Tangermann, Linda Young, Alex McCalla  
**Status Report on IATRC by the 2010 Executive Committee**

## INTRODUCTION

At the December 2010 annual general meeting of the International Agricultural Trade Research Consortium (IATRC), the traditional Theme Day was organized as a celebration of the 30 year anniversary of that institution and was titled *Trade in Agriculture: So Much Done, So Much More to Do*. In the aftermath of that meeting a proposal was made that the 30 year history of the IATRC should be written while those who had lived through the full period were still available to provide the necessary institutional memory. The Executive Committee agreed and allocated \$2000 to the project as a token of their serious support, while Alex McCalla, Ed Rossmiller and Laura Bipes agreed to see it to fruition. It soon became clear that in the tight fiscal environment of the time, further funding would not be forthcoming. Thus the team decided that if they did most of the work themselves they would be able to publish the results of their efforts as an e-book on the internet, but would not have the resources to produce any paper copies.

They also determined that in addition to the three major papers (unfortunately, the fourth major presentation by Valeria Csukasi, *Future Challenges in Agricultural Trade Negotiations*, is not available to us for inclusion in this manuscript) and the panel presentations at the 30th anniversary theme day, several other documents were available that detailed much of the rationale for the creation of the IATRC, its evolution and its output over the period.

The first of these documents is IATRC Objectives, Organization, Operations and Origins, the so called 'Blue Book', the latest edition of which is Edition VI dated April 2010. The Blue Book is a rolling record of the decisions taken at the meetings of the membership and the Executive Committee and a listing of the various outputs of the Consortium since its beginning. Since the Blue Book is revised and updated periodically and is publically available on the IATRC website



(<http://iatrc.org/about/bluebook/BlueBook2010.pdf>) it will only be referenced here as needed rather than being reproduced in its entirety.

The second of the documents is *An Analytical History of the IATRC* by Tim Josling, Alex McCalla and T. Kelley White, as requested by the Executive Committee and published in October 1997. It is reproduced here in its entirety.

Another pair of documents that add to the historical picture are the report dated December 2004 to the Executive Committee and the membership as requested by the IATRC Chair, Tim Josling, by the Futures Steering Group consisting of Mike Gifford, Joe Glauber, Stefan Tangermann, Linda Young and Alex McCalla, Chair, and the January 2011 Status Report on IATRC: Progress on Recommendations of the Futures Steering Group by the 2010 Executive Committee. These two documents are also reproduced in their entirety. ■

## **PART II**

# **IATRC Through the Years: History from the Archives**

## CHAPTER 8

# An Analytical History of the IATRC 1997

TIM JOSLING  
STANFORD UNIVERSITY

ALEX MCCALLA  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS

T. KELLEY WHITE  
USDA, ERS

### INTRODUCTION

The International Agricultural Trade Research Consortium (IATRC, the Trade Consortium, or simply the Consortium) was founded in June 1980 as an informal association of government and university economists interested in agricultural trade. The idea had emerged from an earlier initiative by six economists on the West Coast to stimulate collaborative research in the emerging area of agricultural trade and trade policy. That effort was supported by the Ford Foundation and led to a Workshop in March 1979 and a book.<sup>1</sup> At the Workshop it was decided to extend the group to include economists at other universities and in particular to involve government economists. A planning meeting was held at Stanford University in December 1979 which led to the application for funding to the Economic Research Service (ERS) of the USDA and to organization of the first meeting at the University of Minnesota in June 1980.

The Trade Consortium grew rapidly in size from its initial thirteen members to the present membership of more than 160 people from 15 countries (see Annex Tables AI-A3 for lists of the original members, of officers, and a membership summary for 1997). Consortium activities revolve largely around its meetings. Thirty-three professional meetings and conferences have been held so far. Currently there are two meetings a year: the winter General Meeting which is attended by 70-100 members (see Annex Table A-4), and a summer Public Symposium (see Annex Table A-5) focused

<sup>1</sup> A. McCalla and Tim Josling (eds.), *Imperfect Markets in Agricultural Trade*, Allanheld-Osman, 1981.

on a specific trade topic which attracts up to 200 people and is designed for nonmembers as well.<sup>2</sup> The success of the Trade Consortium as a professional organization is reflected in the enthusiasm of the membership for these meetings.

The aim of this analytical history is to ascertain what conditions have led to the success and achievements of the Trade Consortium, and to explore the activities of the Consortium as guides to future initiatives. After a short discussion of the background against which the Consortium developed, and a review of the institutional changes that it underwent, we discuss the activities which appear to have been most (and least) useful or influential to the funding agencies and to the profession at large. This is followed by a discussion of the benefits that the organization has offered to its membership. A final section attempts to draw some lessons for the future.

## THE BACKGROUND

The Trade Consortium was established at a time when interest in agricultural trade was blossoming in the US. Exports of agricultural goods were rising sharply toward a peak in 1981. This export growth itself helped to highlight the very significant problems that beset the international trading system for agricultural goods, in particular as a result of high levels of protection in importing countries. At that time the study of agricultural trade and trade policy was not highly developed in the agricultural economics profession. Few agricultural economics departments had more than one specialist in trade, and many had none. Economists working in the area were in general aware of the failure of the GATT rules to constrain such protectionism, but had scant knowledge of trade rules and overseas policies. Most empirical work on agricultural trade concentrated on estimation of market parameters and construction of commodity market models. These models often were constructed with little understanding of the institutional, legal and political bases for policy and of the significance of the interaction among policies for the performance of global markets. The aim of the initial West Coast group was to improve communication among agricultural trade economists and to increase the sophistication and relevance of trade research by incorporating policy more fully into their analyses.


At the same time, government economists from ERS and USDA's Foreign Agricultural Service (FAS) were feeling the need for greater contact with academic ideas and developments. This was in part to enhance the professional capacity of the agency staff (some of whom had only limited formal background in trade theory and analysis) and in part as a vehicle for getting professional feedback on the research output of the agencies themselves. In this case there was no lack of understanding of institutions or of policy detail: the need was for ways of making use of such information in an analytical framework which would enable these agencies to provide more useful support for policy makers and sound information for the private sector. The interest of ERS and FAS in the Trade Consortium was born of the desire to have a mechanism for interaction with university economists in a forum which would allow them to focus on practical policy and projection issues.

The notable success of the Trade Consortium was helped immeasurably by the explosion of interest in agricultural trade policy over the 1980s. This was a period of high visibility for agricultural trade issues: from the US embargo on shipments of grain to the Soviet Union which started the decade, through the price wars which pushed world prices down to distress levels by 1986, to the dramatic early stages of the Uruguay Round and the breakdown of the talks in 1990. The 1990s kept attention focused on agricultural trade issues, with the [mal agreement in the GATT Round and

---

<sup>2</sup> The Public Symposium is called a Public Trade Policy Research and Analysis Symposium in the "IATRC Objectives, Organization, Operations, and Origins," (The IATRC Blue Book) of rules and procedures. We use the more familiar label "Public Symposium" here.





the negotiation of numerous regional agreements which began to include agriculture. New issues such as the interface with the environment arose to refresh attention and pose new analytical and institutional questions.

The history of the Trade Consortium is therefore one of the responses of the membership to the challenges posed by this moving tapestry of events; of the way in which the events themselves served to bring the membership together on group projects; of the sense of purpose as well as of professional convenience which the agenda gave to the meetings; and of the impression (real or imagined) that the Consortium was playing a significant role in the development of trade policy. Academics felt closer to the action, government economists were reassured and strengthened by the opportunities to associate professionally and, in some cases, collaborate with their university counterparts, and sponsoring government agencies felt that the Consortium was an effective means of influencing the research agenda of university economists and leveraging their limited trade analysis resources. This synergy has carried the Consortium forward over the past sixteen years.

## THE EVOLUTION OF THE IATRC

Membership was “international” from the start, with economists from both the US and Canada among the first members. The first European-based members joined in 1983. From the governmental side, in addition to ERS, FAS came on board as a cosponsor in 1981. In the same year Agriculture Canada (now Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada) began to participate in the meetings, and to support Canadian academics who wanted to take part in the Consortium. In part as a result of career moves by members, relations with international organizations such as the OECD, the FAO and the World Bank developed. The international visibility of the Consortium has been increased by holding some of the Analytical Symposia abroad, such as those in Calabria, Italy, and San Jose, Costa Rica; several of the General Meetings have taken place in Canada and one was held at CIMMYT in Mexico.

The Trade Consortium started with the most informal of structures. Two members initially served as Co-conveners for the first two years, followed by a single Chairman whose term was approved by the members but subject to no formal voting procedures. At the Rio Rico meeting in December 1983 the organization began to be more structured: a Constitution was proposed which would include an Executive Committee and a process for electing some of its members. The new Constitution and membership rules were adopted at the Asilomar meeting in December 1984. This new structure served to give more continuity and accountability, both to the members and to the financial supporters, and has continued with minor modifications since that time. At each annual winter General Meeting a business meeting is held, at which officers are elected and business conducted. The administration of the Consortium, including financial disbursements, meeting arrangements and membership services, settled in one place, the University of Minnesota.

Funding for the Consortium has evolved over the years, as financial needs have grown with expanding membership and activities. At the start the financial costs were covered entirely by ERS. FAS became a co-funder in 1982, and Agriculture Canada became a funding source for general Consortium activities (as opposed to financing Canadian member participation) in 1990. The Universities were deemed to “contribute” to the Consortium by paying for the costs of attending one meeting a year. The University of Minnesota absorbed the cost of the IATRC administration. The Consortium initially contributed to the expenses of members attending its meetings, but this contribution was reduced over time and eliminated in 1991. Other sources of targeted funds have been helpful in financing particular meetings or publications.

## “SUCCESSSES” OF THE IATRC

The members of the Trade Consortium collectively and individually have contributed significantly to the analysis of agricultural trade policy over the past sixteen years. While it is not possible to identify the precise contribution of the Consortium per se to this work several activities of the IATRC undoubtedly gave a focus and a stimulus to the efforts of its members. In particular the group activities which began to be a feature of the Consortium work after the Rio Rico meeting stand out as being “successes.” Before attempting to isolate the reasons for the success it is useful to recall some of these activities as indicative of the work of the Consortium.

## THE OECD TRADE MANDATE

An early example of the role of the Trade Consortium in linking academic analysis with practical policy requirements was that of the OECD Trade Mandate. In 1982 the OECD ministers gave a mandate to the Trade and Agriculture Committees to analyze the consequences of national policies for agricultural trade and to develop a practical framework for examining the impact of domestic price policies on the trade system. The Trade Mandate was discussed at two Trade Consortium meetings, in December 1983 and June 1984, and the official chairing the OEED Joint Working Party on Agriculture and Trade requested input from the membership. Subsequently three members of the Consortium presented a seminar in Paris to the Secretariat, which led to the calculation and publication of Producer and Consumer Subsidy Equivalents (PSEs and CSEs) for the OECD countries (and indirectly to the calculation of these measures by ERS for a number of other countries in the world), and the incorporation of domestic policy impacts in a global trade model. The output of the Trade Mandate study, which both demonstrated that it was indeed possible to quantify the effect of policies and also gave governments a clearer idea as to the negative impacts of such policies on international markets, had a profound impact on the conduct of the Uruguay Round.

Clearly the OECD might have elicited the same advice without going through the Consortium: PSEs had in fact been calculated by the FAO for several years before the Trade Mandate, and models of agricultural trade were readily available. But the role of the Consortium from the start was one of facilitating the exchange of ideas among policy makers and analysts. As such it has been as much about timing and communication as generating new research *per se*. Busy officials need reactions promptly, and universities are not normally set up to respond in a timely fashion. In the case of the OECD Trade Mandate the IATRC provided the channel of communication at a time when it was most fruitful.

## THE USDA EMBARGO STUDY

In 1985 Congress mandated ERS to conduct a thorough analysis of two of the most controversial aspects of US agricultural trade policy: embargoes and surplus disposal programs. The 1980 US embargo against the USSR had been blamed for the decline in US exports, domestic prices and farm income. The stock and surplus disposal policies of the Commodity Credit Corporation were also widely held to further depress farm prices. ERS turned to the Consortium (the initial discussions were held during the Vancouver meeting in December 1985) as a mechanism for recruiting a team of academics to work with its economists at ERS. The team was led by the Chair of the Consortium and comprised economists from several universities. The result was a comprehensive study which included both original conceptual analyses as well as new empirical work to explore the impact of embargoes and surplus disposal activities. The results were incorporated in a weighty report, completed in nine months, which was recognized by the profession

through an award by the American Agricultural Economics Association.<sup>3</sup> In all, the Embargo study represented a highly successful cooperative effort.

The preconditions for a significant policy contribution in this case included a clear mandate (the demand side), an enthusiastic and prompt response (the supply side) and an institutional mechanism (including financial resources) to allow the work to be performed, coordinated and presented in a timely fashion. The mandate was clear in this case, and the political sensitivity of the issue made the IATRC a natural vehicle for the study. The response was certainly facilitated by the existence of the Consortium, which made it possible to put together a team quickly: the fact that adequate resources were made available also helped to expedite the process. That the study was able to use analysts from different universities (with different models and approaches) focusing on a common set of issues undoubtedly led to the weight of the conclusions.

Whether the conclusions of the study had a direct impact on policy is not easy to say. The US has generally moved away from the use of export embargoes, and the study lent support to the growing recognition of their ineffectiveness. However surplus disposal continues to the present day, though usually reckoned to be supportive of domestic prices. In any case, the volume of quality work put together in a short period was itself impressive, and the conclusions were presented clearly enough to have direct impact. Moreover the habit of collaboration carried over into later studies and helped to develop the identity of the Consortium.

## THE URUGUAY ROUND

Perhaps the most elaborate and significant example of successful collaboration between officials and academics in the IATRC was on the Uruguay Round negotiations, and in particular in the “analytical” phase from September 1986 to December 1990. Very early in the Round the Consortium made the decision to follow closely the negotiations and more specifically to attempt to develop the analytical capacity to assist the officials involved in the technical aspects of the talks. The plan was followed through with considerable success. The Consortium heard from policy makers at its meetings and the academic members presented papers specifically geared to such issues as the use of protection and support measures in the negotiations. In order to allow as wide a currency of the ideas as possible a series of Commissioned Papers was initiated.<sup>4</sup> These were designed originally to distribute information to the membership about current events, in particular on the state of negotiations--and were sometimes referred to as “update” papers. They soon became the main vehicle for broadcasting the conclusions from the discussions of working groups. These working groups typically included economists from both universities and government departments, and focused on a particular issue in the negotiations.

The Public Symposium at Annapolis in June 1988 provided an opportunity for the Consortium to review analytically the progress in the trade talks and plot the path to an agreement (the Ministers were to have their own Mid-Term Review in December of that year). The meeting attracted considerable interest. The first three Commissioned Papers in the series “Bringing Agriculture into the GAIT” were in fact background documents for this meeting. Another four papers were circulated in June 1990, as countries were gearing up for the final phase of the Round. As the pace of the negotiations slowed and deadlines were missed the IATRC published another Commissioned Paper suggesting the way

<sup>3</sup> ERS, *Embargoes, Surplus Disposal, and US Agriculture*, Agric. Econ. Report No. 564, December 1986. The study received an Honorable Mention for Quality of Research Discovery Award from the American Agricultural Economics Association.

<sup>4</sup> They are “commissioned” in the sense of being requested by the IATRC Executive Board. No fees are paid to the authors, though some expense money is put aside to facilitate travel and other direct costs.

to get talks going again. When the negotiations finally ended three years later the Consortium came out with the ninth Commissioned Paper in the series, the first detailed analysis and evaluation of the Agreement on Agriculture. A follow up Commissioned Paper was completed in October 1997 dealing with the experience in implementing the Agreement.<sup>5</sup>

There is no way to be sure that the often frenetic activity of the Consortium over that period influenced the thinking of any of the major participants in the negotiations. But the fact that the US Trade Representative at that time (Clayton Yeutter) attended a Consortium meeting and was briefed on our reports suggested some interest and potential access. ERS and FAS personnel were certainly 4 They are “commissioned” in the sense of being requested by the IATRC Executive Board. No fees are paid to the authors, though some expense money is put aside to facilitate travel and other direct costs. taking ideas backwards and forwards between academic and political discussions. If the ideas that surfaced in the negotiations, such as the green box of acceptable subsidies and the techniques of tariffication, were not actually influenced by the IATRC, they were certainly remarkably consistent with them.

The formula for “success” of the IATRC with respect to the Uruguay Round negotiations was a little different from that in the embargoes and subsidies study. There was no clear mandate: the agenda was developed by Consortium members and evolved according to the needs of the analysts in government. However, US Trade Representative Yeutter had, in an open meeting of the ERS staff, noted the importance of sound economic analysis to the successful pursuit of US objectives, the importance of a successful outcome for US agriculture, and the dependence of USTR on ERS for this analysis. ERS clearly had a mandate (though not a legislative one with ear-marked funding as in the case of the embargo study) and drew heavily, both formally and informally, on the Consortium to complement its resources. The level of interest was very considerable, both among academics and government economists as well as among trade policy officials. Everyone was “flying in the dark” in the negotiations: it was the first time that domestic policies were on the negotiating table. This, rather than a clear mandate, kept the IATRC working parties going. The nine Commissioned Papers in the series provide a record of this intensive and productive collaboration, just as did the Embargoes report of a few years earlier.

The Uruguay Round was probably important to the development of the Consortium in another way. It gave trade research a higher profile within the agricultural economics profession--agricultural trade for a time was the thing to do and the IATRC was the place to get involved, whether as a graduate student, a mid-career academic or administrator, or a veteran economist. Without this high profile status for trade research it is doubtful that the Consortium would have experienced the rapid membership growth that it did or achieve the success as an organization.

## NAFTA

Activity of the Consortium on the issue of the North American Free Trade Area was neither so focused nor so close to the action of the negotiations. The topic had however been widely discussed in the meetings and the negotiations were followed closely by many members. Two Commissioned Papers were produced, each by a Working Party including academic as well as government economists as participants.

The issue of a North American common market had in fact been a major topic in the first Consortium meeting in June 1980, long before Mexico showed an interest in trade liberalization. The US-Mexico trade relations formed the subject of the theme-day at the meeting in Rio Rico in December 1983, at a time when Mexico was only just beginning to be

---

<sup>5</sup> The Commissioned Papers are listed in Annex Table A-7.

a factor in agricultural trade.<sup>6</sup> At Airlie House in December 1987 the Consortium discussed fully the US-Canada Free Trade Agreement and its agricultural provisions. However the Consortium as such had not been a player in the analysis for this trade accord.

The main discussions of NAFTA occurred in New Orleans in December 1991, when the two Commissioned Papers were presented and in San Diego in December 1993, when a preliminary appraisal was offered. In June 1995 the subject of the Public symposium held in Costa Rica was Economic Integration in the Western Hemisphere, a meeting which served to indicate how far the world, as well as the profession, had come in a few short years toward regional trade liberalization.

If the IATRC did not have as much impact on the NAFTA negotiations as on the Uruguay Round, the explanation may lie with the nature of the issues involved. The Uruguay Round was about major shifts in trade rules into the uncharted territory of restraints on domestic policies and mandated policy instrument changes. Issues of measurement became important, as did the global impact of trade policy changes. In NAFTA the issues were less significant for the US (and Canada) and the negotiations posed few new analytical challenges. In the case of the US-Canada Free Trade Area discussions, some new analytical twists were evident (such as the use of PSEs to compare relative cereal protection levels across the border) and these were indeed discussed by--and indirectly influenced by--the Trade Consortium. In general the demand was not evident for input by the Consortium on NAFTA, and members focused on the issues largely to educate themselves.

One other characteristic of both the US-Canada FTA and NAFTA that may have reduced demand for Consortium involvement from the funding government agencies was that both focused on bilateral trade issues between the US and Canada. This made it more politically sensitive and difficult for the funding agencies officially to request and use analyses conducted by teams of US and Canadian economists, especially government economists. Also, there was less enthusiasm on the part of policy officials for broad dissemination of economic analysis identifying winners and losers from trade reform by the time NAFTA negotiations were underway.

## EUROPEAN INTEGRATION

The other topic which has elicited considerable attention in the Trade Consortium over the years is the process of European Integration, particularly as it effects agricultural markets. The topic was on the agenda for the first meeting in Minnesota in June 1980, as first Greece and later Portugal and Spain joined the European Community. In December 1992 the theme-day topic was the new European configuration, as the countries of EFTA and those of Central and Eastern Europe lined up for membership in the European Union. The topic of the June 1993 conference in Calabria was USEC trade relations in the agricultural area, which served to underscore the inter-relatedness of the trade policy issues on both sides of the Atlantic. The topic for the Public symposium in the summer of 1997 was again on the integration of the agricultural sectors of West, Central and Eastern Europe.

The Consortium as such has not played any significant role in the analysis of integration of agricultural markets in Europe, nor in shaping recent developments in US-EC agricultural trade relations, much less in influencing internal European farm policy changes. Nevertheless the significance of a sizable body of scholars and officials working together on these issues must have some indirect benefit in terms of better understanding and mutual trust. Indeed several members of the IATRC participated at the request of the EC Commission in a major empirical study (also first

<sup>6</sup> The "Theme Day" is a one-day program at the winter General Meeting devoted to a single issue or topic selected in advance.

discussed at a Trade Consortium meeting) which helped to address issues of particular importance to the EC in the Uruguay Round talks.<sup>7</sup>

## SELF-EDUCATION

An equally important contribution of the Trade Consortium, alongside that of discussing current trade policy issues, is to have introduced members over the years to the new developments in the economics profession and to relate these developments to agricultural trade. This has been done in two ways: the designation of a theme-day at the annual winter meetings and the choice of topic for the Analytical Symposia. Theme-day topics that have been particularly successful have included macro-economic linkages (Tucson, 1980); political economy (Airlie House, 1987); international finance (San Antonio, 1988); public goods (San Diego, 1990); Computable General Equilibrium analysis (New Orleans, 1991); technical barriers to trade (Tucson, 1995); and implications of new growth theories (Washington, D.C., 1996). The Analytical Symposia have included such topics as exchange rates (Tahoe, 1986); the “new” trade theory (Montreal, 1989); competitiveness (Annapolis, 1992); environmental policy (Toronto, 1994); and global markets for processed foods (Minneapolis, 1995). The exposure of members to high-quality speakers from outside our immediate profession has been an unqualified success. The ability to focus for a theme day or for a summer conference on one topic has proved a valuable device for self-education by the membership. Thus, the program has been able to serve as a vehicle for cross fertilization and exposure of members to thinking of others than agricultural economists.

## AREAS ON WHICH THE CONSORTIUM HAS BEEN LESS SUCCESSFUL

### Trade and Development

If there is one area where the Trade Consortium has had a more mixed performance it is in the area of trade and development. This topic has been the main theme of the General Meeting on several occasions (Washington, 1981; Washington, 1982; Rio Rico, 1983; and CIMMYT, 1986) but no Commissioned Papers have been produced and no Public symposium convened on this subject. This presumably reflects in part the interests of the funding agencies (USAID and the World Bank have never been among the regular institutional funders). It may also reflect the interest of university-based Consortium members as a whole, many of whom tend to work on the agricultural trade and policies of OECD countries, though a sizable group of the membership are active in development work. As the analytical framework for studying development becomes more closely linked with that used in trade policy work, and as developing countries become more fully integrated into the world economy, the issues addressed by the Trade Consortium will become of wider relevance. The Consortium will undoubtedly return to consideration of these topics in the future.

### Provision of Consulting Services to Funding Agencies

In response to urging by government funding agencies for the Consortium to be more responsive to their needs, the Consortium established a service through which funding agencies could request short (one or two day) consultancies from members. The members’ home institution would make available the individual (without reimbursement or fees), and the requesting institution would pay travel and per diem costs. A roster was developed which would be used to identify appropriate people and the Chairman was to serve as the link between agencies and members in responding

<sup>7</sup> The study was published as E.C. Commission, *Disharmonies in EC and US Agricultural Policies: A Summary of Results and Major Conclusions*, Brussels, 1988.

to requests. This service has been used only once or twice. The failure of what seemed at the time a useful service function reflects more a lack of demand than of supply. This is probably inherent in the short time frame within which most policy issues arising in government agencies have to be dealt with--there just isn't time to go outside for assistance. Also, in this quick response mode it is often more crucial to have institutional knowledge than cutting edge theory or method.

### **Seed Grants to Stimulate Inter-institutional Team Research**

The success of the embargo study and other collaborative efforts described above led the Executive Committee to implement, with approval of the membership, a seed grant research funding program. This program funded, at very modest levels, research undertaken by teams of economists from more than one institution and including at least one Consortium member. The intent was to provide initial funding that would allow the team jointly to complete the initial phases of a larger research project and obtain funding from other sources to carry out the full program. Several activities were selected competitively and funded. They were "successful" in the sense that useful analytical results were obtained in most cases, but in every case the "seed" failed to germinate and produce additional funding. Maybe the problem was that this was a supply driven process and did not really respond to an effective demand.

### **THINGS THE CONSORTIUM DID NOT ATTEMPT TO DO**

There are at least a couple of things that the Consortium did not attempt to do. The absence of these ambitions may have contributed to its success. First, it never set out to be a big professional organization--growth per se was not a goal. In fact the growth has itself at times led to criticism. Some of the benefits of the early meetings were said to stem from the small size of the meetings, and this certainly helped the intensity of the interaction. Membership was restricted: from the beginning people had to apply for membership and meet a set of criteria (not overly stringent) in order to be accepted for membership. This has helped to avoid the tendency to try to become just another professional organization catering to all interests so as to broaden the potential membership base. It also helped maintain a membership with a common interest in agricultural trade research and analysis.

Second, the Consortium, while taking seriously the need to disseminate results of its activities never undertook to publish a journal or any other regular publication series. This helped avoid the tendency for the program to become supply driven (i.e., to have as a primary purpose the provision of an outlet for members' production of papers). The program has remained focused on particular trade policy issues, with publication (except for the Working Paper series) only of material that illuminates those topics.

### **BENEFITS OF THE IATRC TO THE MEMBERSHIP**

The continued success of the Trade Consortium indicates that it provides real benefits to its members. The key to this has been the agenda for the meetings. Each IATRC meeting contains a balance between two elements: the consideration of current issues which confront government economists in their work and to which trade and trade policy economists in universities address their analytical skills, and the advances in analytical techniques which members wish to explore and integrate into their own work. In this respect the agenda of the Trade Consortium has been "demand driven" in the topics that it considers. It therefore differs from the meetings of a regular professional association, which will normally have a much wider remit and be "supply driven" in their choice of papers and topics for meetings.

The focus on current trade policy issues has allowed university-based Consortium members to relate their work to particular topics of practical importance. Relative to many policy-related papers at other professional meetings the discussions at IATRC meetings are usually much better informed and focused. The benefit to university economists is therefore to understand the relevance of their analysis by discussing the policy issues with officials, and to be able to make their work more useful. The fact that the Consortium often invited policy-makers to meetings enhanced this test of relevance.

The attention given in the meetings to new theory and methods of analysis has prevented the Consortium from becoming too obsessed with the policy issues of the day. It has provided a valuable benefit to university economists, primarily through the invitation of prominent general economists who are specialists in the analytical techniques and theoretical advances that are under discussion.<sup>8</sup> In general the choice of speakers for the theme days and the Public Symposia has been excellent. Thus one gets the considerable advantages of attending quality presentations from related fields at the same time as discussing the issues with experts in ones own subdiscipline. The combination makes for meetings which are informative and enjoyable as well as intellectually stimulating. This has certainly been beneficial in upgrading and updating instruction in the area.

We should like to emphasize the constructive spirit and collegiality in which these meetings are invariably held. Though the analysis of the papers and the discussions is rigorous, the meetings have typically avoided the extremes of academic competitiveness and criticism and the tendency to grandstand which mar some of the professional conferences. There is a common sense of learning and a common set of interests in the Consortium which overcome such divisive tendencies.

For the members from government departments the main benefit is to keep up with analytical work going on in universities which is of direct relevance to the department concerned, and to discuss their own research with others. The ERS is the department with the most direct interest in current academic analysis. It has regularly used the Consortium meetings to present the methods and results of on-going research to a wider audience of researchers. Agriculture and Agri -Food Canada has also looked to the Consortium on occasions to get feedback on research findings. Government economists also learn much from the more analytical sessions, even if there is often a significant gap between theoretical and analytical advances and practical policy work.

## THE OUTPUT OF THE IATRC

The written output of the Trade Consortium comprises books and reports containing the proceedings of Conferences (Annex Table A-6); Commissioned Papers on topics of current interest about which the Consortium wishes to inform its members and others (Annex Table A-7); and Working Papers circulated to each member (Annex Table A-8). The Consortium also published a Newsletter through 1996 with a wealth of information relating to agricultural trade policy, and has recently initiated a Web Site With information about the organization and the upcoming meetings.<sup>9</sup>

To date there have been eleven published books comprising the proceedings of IATRC Conferences, usually the Public Symposia held in the summer--see list in Annex Table A-6.<sup>10</sup> These books make available to a wider audience the

<sup>8</sup> There may on occasion be some reciprocal benefits, as these speakers consider how their conceptual models and techniques relate to agricultural markets.

<sup>9</sup> With the newsletter discontinued, some of the information that it reported will now be available at the Web site.

<sup>10</sup> The IATRC has now taken over the responsibility from ERS of publishing these reports.



benefits that the members who attended the meetings derived from them: the success of these books was confirmed recently when the proceedings of the June 1994 Public Symposium on Agricultural Trade and the Environment won an AAEA Quality of Communication Award. As mentioned above these IATRC books have fostered the broadening of professional horizons through the judicious choice of outside speakers. In addition ERS has put out the proceedings from several other meetings as Staff Reports or other series papers (again, see Annex Table A-6). Altogether 14 such reports have been published. In total, 25 publications have therefore come from the IATRC meetings.<sup>11</sup>

Though the books and reports act as a record of Consortium activity, other publications have also been useful to members and to the profession at large. The Commissioned Papers are more focused publications and therefore have a shorter period of relevance. Of the eleven that are available, nine dealt with the Uruguay Round and two with NAFTA (see list in Annex Table A-7). Even though the particular policy issues addressed have been resolved, the analysis in the Commissioned Papers still remains relevant. To date there also have been 88 papers distributed in the Working Paper series, averaging about 8 each year since the series was started in 1985 (see list in Table A-6). No other comparable series exists for agricultural trade analysis, and the ability to circulate a paper to a specific audience is valuable.

## THE CHALLENGE OF THE FUTURE


This analytical history has emphasized several aspects of the successful development of the Trade Consortium which have relevance for the future. These can be summarized as follows. The collaboration between university and government economists that is at the heart of the Consortium has been mutually advantageous. This collaboration has rested on the provision of a policy-relevant agenda for the meetings and a shared sense of commitment to bring analysis to bear to current issues. The meetings have been collegial, constructive and informative. The successful collective activities have been in response to a need expressed to the Consortium by those who use economic analysis in policy work. Funders appear to have been satisfied with the ability of the Consortium to keep the focus on relevant issues. In parallel, the Consortium has preserved a strong interest in discussing advances in theory and method and hence keeping the professional toolbox up-to-date. The balance between policy discussion and self-education has been a key part in the success of the IATRC. In addition to the right mix of topics, the Consortium has been lucky always to have had leaders who were willing to put in their time and energies to organizing meetings and an efficient administration able to keep up with the demands of a growing membership.

This suggests a short list of elements to be considered for the future. First, the Consortium needs to keep the blend of policy discussion and self-education that has worked well in the past. Too much emphasis on current policy issues will blunt the enthusiasm of the more analytical members, and too many papers on new theory and models will reduce the value to the practitioners. Second, the Consortium is at its best when organizing small working groups to undertake focused work on a particular topic. The results of this collaboration are of course disseminated to the membership. Not only do these activities themselves develop habits of cooperation which extend outside the Consortium, but they have also proved an efficient way of generating timely work and “keeping up with events.” Without such a framework university research on policy issues can slip well behind the action.

Thirdly, continued success of the Trade Consortium may depend on preserving a flexible organizational structure. This structure has avoided excessive bureaucracy, kept a balance in the Executive Committee between the universities and

---

<sup>11</sup> Other books have stemmed from collaboration which was stimulated by IATRC activities. One recent example is the book on agriculture in the GATT (Timothy E. Josling, Stefan Tangermann and T.K. Warley, *Agriculture in the GATT*, Macmillan, 1996).



the funding agencies (three members from each constituency), and benefitted from a succession of office holders willing to put energy and imagination into the activities. Such a combination needs to be maintained. Fourthly, to retain the freshness and relevance of the meetings the Consortium needs to be stimulated by the continued exploration of emerging agricultural trade issues and the constant rejuvenation by new members. The Consortium has become an organization with professional prestige and a record of which it can be proud, but it cannot sit on its laurels.

So long as interesting issues continue to emerge in the area of agricultural trade the Consortium will find plenty of topics for analysis. The profession needs to anticipate these issues, without getting so far out ahead of the political process as to appear out of touch. Some topics for the Consortium are already becoming clear, and the program of future meetings reflects these issues. The next Round of trade negotiations in agriculture is already scheduled for the year 1999, and the likely agenda is already taking shape. The various regional trade arrangements have announced timetables for trade liberalization and the implications for agricultural trade policy of these changes are likely to be fundamental. The impact on agricultural markets of the transition to market regimes of many previously centralised-planned economies is still uncertain but is potentially significant. Other “old” topics may re-emerge onto the scene: issues of food security and income distribution have been less of a focus in the past few years but may well become major policy concerns again.<sup>12</sup>

Questions of environmental regulations, health and safety standards, and labor laws are still capable of posing challenges for agricultural trade policy, as the apparent consumer resistance to products of biotechnology shows. The design of new institutional arrangements to provide stability and ensure harmony in the multilateral trade system may also find its way back onto the agenda soon. The Consortium is in a strong position to take the lead in analyzing many of these issues. If it can perpetuate the coherence and commitment of the past sixteen years it will continue to play a significant role in the development of improved policies in the area of agricultural trade.

---

<sup>12</sup> The June 1998 Public Symposium will focus on, “Policy Reform, Market Stability, and Food Security.”

**ANNEX TABLE A-1: ORIGINAL 13 MEMBERS OF THE IATRC**

<b>Name</b>
Colin Carter
Charles Hanrahan
Jimmye Hillman
Tim Josling
Alex McCalla
Scott Pearson
Ed Rossmiller
Alexander Sarris
Andrew Schmitz
G. Edward Schuh
Vernon Sorenson
Gary Storey
Robert Thompson

**ANNEX TABLE A-2: OFFICERS OF THE IATRC, 1980–1996**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Dates</b>
<i>Co-Convenors</i>	
Alex McCalla and Charles Hanrahan	June 1980 and June 1981
<i>Chairpersons</i>	
Ian Sheldon	January 2008–present
Tom Wahl	December 2004–January 2008
Tim Josling	December 2002–December 2004
David Blandford	December 1999–December 2002
Dan Sumner	December 1997–December 1999
David Orden	December 1995–December 1997
Terry Roe	December 1994–December 1995
Alex McCalla	December 1993–December 1994
Maury Bredahl	December 1992–December 1993
Karl Meilke	December 1989–December 1992
David Blandford	December 1987–December 1989
Alex McCalla	June 1984–December 1987
G. Edward Schuh	January 1982–May 1984
Jimmy Hillman	July 1981–December 1982
<i>Executive Committee Members</i>	
Philip Abbott	June 1984–December 1987
Nicolle Ballenger	June 2001–December 2002
David Blandford	December 1987–December 1989, December 1998–December 2002
Maury Bredahl	December 1989–December 1993
Lars Brink	January 1994–January 2008
Colin Carter	December 1986–June 1987, December 1988–December 1992
Pierre Charlebois	December 2007–June 2009
Barbara Chattin	December 2005–December 2006
Praveen Dixit	December 2002–December 2005
Marcie Glenn	June 1984–December 1984
Thomas Heckeley	December 2005–December 2008
Debra Henke	December 1999–December 2005
Jimmy Hillman	July 1981–December 1982
Tim Josling	December 1998–December 2003
Alex McCalla	June 1984–December 1989, December 1993–December 1994

ANNEX TABLE A-2 (CONTINUED)

Name	Dates
Don McClatchy	December 1985–January 1994
Karl Meilke	June 1987–December 1993
Patrick Obrien/Lorna Aldrich	December 1994–June 1996
David Orden	December 1994–December 1998
Scott Pellow	June 2009–present
Dewain Rahe	May 1992–December 1994
Donna Roberts	December 2005–present
Bob Robinson	July 1990–December 1994
Sherman Robinson	December 2001–December 2003
Terry Roe	December 1992–December 1995
Jim Ross	July 1990–April 1992
Ed Rossmiller	June 1984–June 1986
G. Edward Schuh	January 1983–May 1984
Wayne Sharp	June 1984–July 1990
Patricia Sheikh	December 1998–December 1999
Ian Sheldon	December 2006–present
Gary Storey	June 1984–December 1986
Dan Sumner	December 1995–December 1999
Stefan Tangermann	December 1993–December 2001
Harald von Witzke	December 2003–December 2005
Tom Wahl	December 2002–present
T. Kelley White	June 1984–July 1990, June 1996–June 2001
Gregg Young	December 2006–present
Linda Young	December 2004–December 2006
Randy Zeitner	December 1994–December 1998
<i>Administrative Directors</i>	
Laura Bipes	December 1994–December 2003 March 2008–present
Charli Hochsprung	December 2003–December 2008
<i>Newsletter Editor</i>	
Bill Kost	September 1985–December 1996

**ANNEX TABLE A-3: IATRC MEMBERSHIP 1997**

<b>Membership</b>	
Total Number of Members	169
<i>Members by Country</i>	
United States	125
Canada	15
Europe	18
Other Countries	11
<i>Members by Affiliation</i>	
USDA	27
Agriculture Canada	2
US Universities	60
European Universities	9
Canadian Universities	10
Other Universities	7
No Affiliation	12

## ANNEX TABLE A-4: IATRC GENERAL MEETINGS, 1980-1997

<b>Dates/Location</b>	<b>Theme Day Topic</b>
<b>1997</b> December 14-16 San Diego, CA	<b>Implementation of the Uruguay Round Agreement on Agriculture</b> Organizers: Stefan Tangermann, P. Lynn Kennedy, and Kelley White
<b>1996</b> December 15-17 Washington, DC	<b>Implications of the New Growth Theory for Agricultural Trade Research and Trade Policy</b> Organizers: Terry Roe, Mathew Shane and Daniel Sumner
<b>1995</b> December 14-16 Tucson, AZ	<b>Understanding Administered Barriers to Trade</b> Organizers: David Orden and Donna Roberts
<b>1994</b> December 15-17 Washington, DC	<b>Agriculture After the Uruguay Round: The New Agenda for Trade Policy Analysis</b> Organizers: Tim Josling, Don McClatchy, and Lars Brink
<b>1993</b> December 12-14 San Diego, CA	<b>North American Free Trade Agreement: Dead or Alive?</b> Organizers: Thomas Grennes, Gary Williams and Karl Meilke
<b>1992</b> December 13-15 St. Petersburg, FL	<b>European Reconfiguration: Implications for World Agricultural Trade</b> Organizers: Robert Koopman, and Colin Carter
<b>1991</b> December 12-14 New Orleans, LA	<b>Applied General Equilibrium Analysis of International Trade</b> Organizers: Thomas Hertel and James Ross
<b>1990</b> December 16-18 San Diego, CA	<b>Public Goods in International Trade, Food Quality and Environmental Regulation</b> Organizers: Mathew Shane, Harald von Witzke and Don Mclatchy
<b>1989</b> December 14-16 Clearwater, FL	<b>Data and Information Issue for the Agricultural Trade Researcher</b> Organizers: Bill Kost
<b>1988</b> December 14-16 San Antonio, TX	<b>International Finance</b> Organizers: Thomas Grennes, David Orden and Karl Meilke
<b>1987</b> December 14-16 Airlie House, VA	<b>The Political Economy of Agricultural Trade</b> Organizers: T. Kelley White and Tim Josling
<b>1986</b> December 15-17 CIMMYT, Mexico City, Mexico	<b>Trade and Development</b> Organizers: James Longmire

ANNEX TABLE A-4 (CONTINUED)

<b>Dates/Location</b>	<b>Theme Day Topic</b>
<b>1985</b> December 16-18 Vancouver, BC, Canada	<b>Modeling Agricultural Trade</b> Organizer: Richard Barichello
<b>1984</b> December 17-18 Asilomar, CA	<b>U.S. Trade Relations with Canada, Mexico, and the EC: The 1985 Farm Bill</b> Organizer: Tim Josling
<b>1984</b> August 1-4 Wye Woods, MD	<b>OECD Mandate and U.S. Trade Relations Task Force</b> Organizer: T. Kelley White
<b>1983</b> December 15-17 Rio Rico, AZ	<b>Debt, Trade, and Payments Issues in Developing Countries and U.S.-Mexican Economic Interdependencies</b> Organizers: Jimmye Hillman, Maury Bredahl, and Charles Hanrahan
<b>1983</b> June 23-24 Ottawa, Ontario, Canada	<b>Agricultural Trade Policy Issues in the Eighties, Current Research, and Long-Term Forecasting</b> Organizers: Marcia Glenn, T. Kelley White, Alex MCalla and Charles Hanrahan
<b>1982</b> December 16-18 Washington, DC	<b>Agriculture, Trade, and Development: A Comparative Look at U.S., Canadian, and European Community Policies</b> Organizers: T. Kelley White and Tim Josling
<b>1982</b> June 24-25 St. Louis, MO	<b>Gains from Trade, Comparative Advantage, Protectionism and the Commodity Composition of Trade</b>
<b>1981</b> December 17-18 Berkeley, CA	<b>Price Formation, Market Structure, and Price Instability</b> Organizers: Andrew Schmitz and Alexander Sarris
<b>1981</b> June 24-26 Washington, DC	<b>Agricultural Import Demand in Low-Income, Middle- Income, and Centrally Planned Countries</b> Organizers: T. Kelley White, George E. Rossmiller, and Vernon Sorenson
<b>1980</b> December 15-17 Tucson, AZ	<b>Macroeconomic Linkages to Agricultural Trade</b> Organizers: Jimmye Hillman and Vernon Roningen
<b>1980</b> June 30-July 2 St. Paul, MN	<b>Agricultural Trade Implications of EC Enlargement: North America Common Market</b> Organizers: G.Edward Schuh and Charles Hanrahan



## ANNEX TABLE A-5: PUBLIC SYMPOSIA, 1986–1997

<b>Dates/Location</b>	<b>Symposium Topic</b>
<b>1997</b> June 12-14 Berlin, Germany	<b>Economic Transition in Central and East Europe and the Former Soviet Union: Implications for International Agricultural Trade</b> Organizers: Harald VonWitzke and Stefan Tangermann (co-sponsored by the German Ministry of Food, Agriculture, and Forestry and Humboldt University)
<b>1996</b> June 28-29 Minneapolis, MN	<b>Global Markets for Processed Foods: Theoretical and Practical Issues</b> Organizers: Daniel Pick, Jean Kinsey, Dennis Henderson and Ian Sheldon (co-sponsored by The Retail Food Industry Center at the University of Minnesota)
<b>1995</b> June 7-9 San Jose, Costa Rica	<b>Economic Integration in the Western Hemisphere</b> Organizers: Bob Robinson, John Link, Rodolfo Quiros and Constanza Valdez (co-sponsored by the International Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture)
<b>1994</b> June 17-18 Toronto, Ontario, Canada	<b>Agricultural Trade and the Environment: Understanding and Measuring the Critical Linkages</b> Organizers: Nicole Ballenger, Maury Bredahl, John Dunmore and Terry Roe (with financial support from The Environmental and Natural Resources Policy and Training Project funded by USAID, and from the Center for In'l Food and Ag Policy at the University of Mn)
<b>1993</b> June 20-23 Calabria, Italy	<b>New Dimensions in North American-European Agricultural Trade Relations</b> Organizers: Givovani Anania, Colin Carter, Alex McCalla, Bob Robinson (co-sponsored with the University of Calabria, Italy, University of California-Davis, USDA/ERS, and National Research Council)
<b>1992</b> August 7-8 Annapolis, MD	<b>Competitiveness in International Food Markets</b> Organizers: Phil Abbott, Maury Bredahl, and Michael Reed
<b>1990</b> August 1-2 Honolulu, HI	<b>Agriculture and Trade in the Pacific: Toward the 21st Century</b> Organizers: William Coyle, Dermot Hayes, Don McClatchy Ed Rossmiller and Hiroshi Yamauchi (with financial support from the University of Hawaii)
<b>1989</b> July 7-8 Montreal, Quebec, Canada	<b>New Developments in Trade Theory: Implications for Agricultural Trade Research</b> Organizers: Colin Carter, Alex McCalla and Jerry Sharples
<b>1988</b> August 19-20 Annapolis, MD	<b>Bringing Agriculture Into the GATT</b> Organizer: David Blandford
<b>1987</b> July 31-August 1 Dearborn, MI	<b>Elasticities in International Agricultural Trade</b> Organizer: Walt Gardiner and Colin Carter
<b>1986</b> July 23-26 Tahoe City, CA	<b>Agriculture, Macroeconomics, and the Exchange Rate</b> Organizer: Alex McCalla

ANNEX TABLE A-6: PUBLICATIONS FROM IATRC MEETINGS, 1980–1997

Year	Annual Meeting and Symposium Proceedings*	Proceedings from Meetings
1997	<b>Global Markets for Processed Foods: Theoretical and Practical Issues</b> Pick, D., J. Kinsey, D. Henderson, and I. Sheldon, eds. Boulder, CO: Westview Press	<b>June 1996</b> Minneapolis, MN
1997	<b>Economic Integration in the Western Hemisphere</b> Valdes, C., and T. Roe, eds. IATRC Proceedings Issue	<b>June 1995</b> San Jose, Costa Rica
1997	<b>Understanding Administered Barriers to Trade</b> Orden, D., and D. Roberts, eds. IATRC Proceedings Issue	<b>December 1995</b> Tucson, AZ
1997	<b>Implications of New Growth Theory to Agricultural Research and Policy</b> Roe, T., ed.	<b>December 1996</b> Washington, DC
1996	<b>Agriculture Trade and the Environment: Discovering and Measuring the Critical Linkages</b> Bredahl, M.E., N. Ballenger, J.C. Dunmore and T. Roe, eds. Boulder, CO: Westview Press	<b>June 1994</b> Toronto, Ontario, Canada
1994	<b>Agricultural Trade Conflicts and GATT</b> Anania, G., C.A. Carter and A.F. McCalla, eds. Boulder, CO: Westview Press	<b>June 1993</b> Calabria, Italy
1994	<b>Competitiveness in International Food Markets</b> Bredahl, M., P. Abbott, and M. Reed, eds. Boulder, CO: Westview Press	<b>August 1992</b> Annapolis, MD
1994	<b>NAFTA and Agriculture: Will the Experiment Work?</b> Williams, G.W., and T. Grennes, eds. College Station Texas: Center for North American Studies	<b>December 1993</b> San Diego, CA
1993	<b>The Environment, Government Policies, and International Trade: A Proceedings</b> Shane, M.D., and H. von Witzke, eds. Ag Trade Analysis Division, ERS, USDA Staff Report #AGES9314	<b>December 1990</b> San Diego, CA
1992	<b>Agriculture and Trade in the Pacific: Toward the Twenty-First Century</b> Coyle, W.T., D. Hayes, and H. Yamauchi, eds. Boulder, CO: Westview Press	<b>August 1990</b> Honolulu, HI
1990	<b>Imperfect Competition and Political Economy: The New Trade Theory in Agricultural Trade Research</b> Carter, C.A., A.F. McCalla, and J.A. Sharples, eds. Boulder, CO: Westview Press	<b>July 1989</b> Montreal, Quebec, Canada
1990	<b>International Financial Markets and Agricultural Trade</b> Grennes, Thomas, ed. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press	<b>December 1988</b> San Antonio, TX

\* Published as books by commercial or scholarly publishers, special issues in scholarly journals, or as IATRC Proceedings.

ANNEX TABLE A-6 (CONTINUED)

Year	Annual Meeting and Symposium Proceedings*	Proceedings from Meetings
1988	<b>Elasticities in International Agricultural Trade</b> Carter, C.A., and W. H. Gardiner, eds. Boulder, CO: Westview Press	<b>July–August 1987</b> Dearborn, MI
1988	<b>Macroeconomics, Agriculture, and Exchange Rates</b> Paarlberg, P.L. and R.G. Chambers, eds. Boulder, CO: Westview Press	July 1986 Tahoe City, CA
1988	<b>Trade and Development – Proceedings of the Winter 1986 Meeting of the International Agricultural Trade Research Consortium</b> Shane, M., ed. Agriculture and Trade Analysis Division, Economic Research Service, USDA Staff Report #AGES870928	<b>December 1986</b> CIMMYT, Mexico City, Mexico
1987	<b>Agricultural Trade Modeling – The State of Practice and Research Issues</b> Liu, K. and R. Seeley, eds. International Economics Division, Economic Research Service, USDA Staff Report #AGES861215	<b>December 1985</b> Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada
1985	<b>Agriculture, Trade, and Development: A Comparative Look at U.S., Canadian, and European Community Policies</b> White, T. K. and C. Hanrahan, eds. International Economics Division, Economic Research Service, USDA Staff Report #AGES850208	<b>December 1982</b> Washington, DC
1984	<b>International Agricultural Trade: Advanced Readings in Price Formulation, Market Structure, and Price Instability</b> Storey, G., A. Schmitz, and A.H. Sarris, eds. Boulder, CO: Westview Press	<b>December 1981</b> Berkeley, CA
1984	<b>Debt, Trade, and Payments Issues of Developing Countries and U.S.-Mexican Economic Interdependencies</b> Hanrahan, C. and M. Bredahl, eds. International Economics Division, Economic Research Service, USDA Staff Report #AGES840607	<b>December 1983</b> Rio Rico, AZ
1984	<b>Agricultural Trade Policy Issues in the Eighties, Current Research and Long-Term Forecasting</b> Glenn, M. and C. Hanrahan, eds. International Economics Division, Economic Research Service, USDA Staff Report #AGES840508	<b>June 1983</b> Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

ANNEX TABLE A-6 (CONTINUED)

Year	Annual Meeting and Symposium Proceedings*	Proceedings from Meetings
1983	<p><b>Imperfect Competition, Market Behavior, and Agricultural Trade Policy Analysis</b>            Hanrahan, C. and T.K. White, eds.            International Economics Division, Economic Research Service, USDA Staff Report #AGES830930</p>	<p><b>December 1981</b>            Berkeley, CA</p>
1982	<p><b>Agricultural Import Demand in Low-Income, Middle-Income, and Centrally Planned Economies</b>            Hanrahan, C. and G.E. Rossmiller, eds.            International Economics Division, Economic Research Service, USDA Report #FAER-173</p>	<p><b>June 1981</b>            Washington, DC</p>
1981	<p><b>Macroeconomic Linkages to Agricultural Trade</b>            Roningen, V. and J. Hillman, eds.            International Economics Division, Economics and Statistics Service, USDA Staff Report #ESS-10</p>	<p><b>December 1980</b>            Tucson, AZ</p>
1980	<p><b>Agricultural Trade Implications of European Community Enlargement: North America Common Market</b>            Friend, R. and A.H. Sarris, eds.            International Economics Division, Economics and Statistics Service, USDA Staff Report #ESS-2</p>	<p><b>June–July 1980</b>            St. Paul, MN</p>

## ANNEX TABLE A-7: IATRC COMMISSIONED PAPERS, 1988–1997

Issue No.	Commissioned Papers
1997 CP-12	<b>Bringing Agriculture into the GATT: Implementation of the Uruguay Round Agreement on Agriculture and Issues for the Next Round of Agricultural Negotiations</b> Tangermann, Stefan; Honma, Masayoshi; Josling, Tim; Lee, Jaeok; MacLaren, Donald; McClatchy, Don; Miner, Bill; Pursell, Garry; Sumner, Dan; Valdes, Alberto
1991 CP-11	<b>The Implications of a North American Free Trade Area for Agriculture</b> Barichello, Richard R.; Bivings, Leigh; Carter, Colin; Josling, Tim; Lindsey, Patricia; McCalla, Alex
1991 CP-10	<b>An Analysis of a United States-Canada-Mexico Free Trade Agreement</b> Grennes, Thomas; Estrada, Julio Hernandez; Krissoff, Barry; Gardea, Jaime Matus; Sharples, Jerry; Valdes, Constanza
1994 CP-9	<b>Bringing Agriculture Into the GATT: The Uruguay Round Agreement on Agriculture, An Evaluation</b> Josling, Tim; Honma, Masayoshi; Lee, Jaeok; MacLaren, Donald; Miner, Bill; Sumner, Dan; Tangermann, Stefan; Valdes, Alberto
1991 CP-8	<b>Bringing Agriculture Into the GATT: Reviving the GATT Negotiations on Agriculture</b> March 1991
1990 CP-7	<b>Bringing Agriculture Into the GATT: The Comprehensive Proposals for Negotiations in Agriculture</b> June 1990
1990 CP-6	<b>Bringing Agriculture Into the GATT: Reinstrumentation of Agricultural Policies</b> June 1990
1990 CP-5	<b>Bringing Agriculture Into the GATT: Potential Use of an Aggregate Measure of Support</b> June 1990
1990 CP-4	<b>Bringing Agriculture Into the GATT: Tariffication and Rebalancing</b> June 1990
1988 CP-3	<b>Bringing Agriculture Into the GATT: Designing Acceptable Agricultural Policies</b> August 1988
1988 CP-2	<b>Bringing Agriculture Into the GATT: Assessing the Benefits of Trade Liberalization</b> August 1988
1988 CP-1	<b>Bringing Agriculture Into the GATT: Negotiating a Framework for Action</b> August 1988
Year	Other Publications from IATRC Activities
1986	<b>Embargoes, Surplus Disposal, and U.S. Agriculture</b> Alex F. McCalla, University of California-Davis; T. Kelley White, International Economics Division, Economic Research Service (ERS); Kenneth Clayton, National Economics Division, ERS USDA, ERS Agricultural Economics Report 564
1981	<b>Imperfect Markets in Agricultural Trade</b> Alex F. McCalla and Tim Josling (eds.) Allanheld-Osman

## ANNEX TABLE A-8: IATRC WORKING PAPERS, 1985–1997

<b>Year/No.</b>	<b>Working Paper</b>
1997 97-4	<b>State Trading in Agriculture: An Analytical Framework</b> Praveen M. Dixit and Tim Josling
1997 97-3	<b>Impact of CFTA/NAFTA on U.S. and Canadian Agriculture</b> Luther Tweeten, Jerry Sharples and Linda Evers-Smith
1997 97-2	<b>Environmental Protection with Policies for Sale</b> Joachim Schleich (contact David Orden for copies)
1997 97-1	<b>Measuring the Effect of Increased Horticultural Imports: An Application to Winter Vegetables</b> Stephen Haley
1996 96-5	<b>Evaluation of Export Promotion Programs on Trade of High-Valued and Processed Food Products: Implications for North Carolina Agribusiness</b> William Amponsah, Kofi Adu-Nyako, and Daniel Pick
1996 96-4	<b>What is Happening to U.S. Farm Policy: A Chronology and Analysis of the 1995-1996 Farm Bill Debate</b> David Orden, Robert Paarlberg, and Terry Roe
1996 96-3	<b>National Administered Protection Agencies: Their role in the Post-Uruguay Round World</b> Karl D. Meilke and Rakhil Sarker
1996 96-2	<b>Nontariff Agricultural Trade Barriers Revisited</b> Jimmye S. Hillman (Contact Laura Bipes for copies)
1996 96-1	<b>International Commerce in Processed Foods: Patterns and Curiosities</b> Dennis R. Henderson, Ian M. Sheldon, and Daniel Pick
1995 95-7	<b>U.S. Trade Threats: Rhetoric or War?</b> Mylene Kherallah and John Beghin
1995 95-6	<b>Wheat Buffer Stocks and Trade in an Efficient Global Economy</b> Shiva S. Makki, Luther Tweeten, and Mario J. Maranda
1995 95-5	<b>Challenges in Quantitative Economic Analysis in Support of Multilateral Trade Negotiations</b> Karl Meilke, Don McClatchy, and Harry deGorter
1995 95-4	<b>Analysis of U.S. Export Enhancement Targeting and Bonus Determination Criteria</b> Stephen Haley and David Skully
1995 95-3	<b>Restricting Wheat Imports from Canada: Impact of Product Differentiation and U.S. Export Policy Goals</b> Stephen Haley
1995 95-2	<b>U.S. Imports of Canadian Wheat: Estimating the Effect of the U.S. Export Enhancement Program</b> Stephen Haley
1995 95-1	<b>Intra-Industry Trade in Agricultural Products in the Western Hemisphere: Preliminary Evidence and Implications for Economic Integration</b> Donna Roberts

ANNEX TABLE A-8 (CONTINUED)

<b>Year/No.</b>	<b>Working Paper</b>
1994 94-6	<b>The Economic Implications of Chemical Use Restrictions in Agriculture</b> Monika Hartmann and P. Michael Schmitz
1994 94-5	<b>Labor Adjustment and Gradual Reform: Is Commitment Important?</b> Larry Karp and Thierry Paul
1994 94-4	<b>Alternative Oligopolistic Structures in International Commodity Markets: Price or Quantity Competition?</b> Colin Carter and Donald A. MacLaren
1994 94-3	<b>Declining U.S. Tobacco Exports to Australia: A Derived Demand Approach to Competitiveness</b> John Beghin
1994 94-2	<b>Strategic Agricultural Trade Policy Interdependence and the Exchange Rate: A Game Theoretic Analysis</b> P. Lynn Kennedy, Harald vonWitzke, and Terry L. Roe
1994 94-1	<b>The Economics of Grain Producer Cartels</b> James Gleckler and Luther Tweeten
1993 93-9	<b>Wheat Cleaning and Its Effect on U.S. Wheat Exports</b> Stephen Haley, Susan Leetmaa, and Alan Webb
1993 93-8	<b>Evaluation of External Market Effects and Government Intervention in Malaysia's Agricultural Sector: A Computable General Equilibrium Framework</b> Kim Leng Yeah, John Yanagida, and Hiroshi Yamauchi
1993 93-7	<b>Domestic and Trade Policy for Central and East European Agriculture</b> Larry Karp and Stefanou Spiro
1993 93-6	<b>Phasing In and Phasing Out Protectionism with Costly Adjustment of Labour</b> Larry Karp and Thierry Paul
1993 93-5	<b>Measuring Protection in Agriculture: The Producer Subsidy Equivalent Revisited</b> William Masters
1993 93-4	<b>International Trade in Forest Products: An Overview</b> G. David Puttock, Marc Sabourin, and Karl D. Meilke
1993 93-3	<b>Environmental and Agricultural Policy Linkages in the European Community: The Nitrate Problem and Cap Reform</b> Stephen Haley
1993 93-2	<b>Testing Dynamic Specification for Import Demand Models: The Case of Cotton</b> Carlos Arnade, Daniel Pick, and Utpal Vasavada
1993 93-1	<b>Agricultural and Trade Deregulation in New Zealand: Lessons for Europe and the CAP</b> Jim Gibson, Jimmye Hillman, Timothy Josling, Ralph Lattimore, and Dorothy Stumme
1992 92-10	<b>MacSharry or Dunkel: Which Plan Reforms the CAP?</b> Tim Josling and Stefan Tangermann

ANNEX TABLE A-8 (CONTINUED)

<b>Year/No.</b>	<b>Working Paper</b>
1992 92-9	<b>The Evolving Farm Structure in Eastern Germany</b> Philip Paarlberg
1992 92-8	<b>Shifts in Eastern German Production Structure Under Market Forces</b> Philip Paarlberg
1992 92-7	<b>The Treatment of National Agricultural Policies in Free Trade Areas</b> Tim Josling
1992 92-6	<b>Implementing a New Trade Paradigm: Opportunities for Agricultural Trade Regionalism in the Pacific Rim</b> Luther Tweeten, Chin-Zen Lin, James Gleckler, and Norman Rask
1992 92-5	<b>Agricultural Trade Liberalization: Implications for Productive Factors in the U.S.</b> Peter Liapis and Mathew Shane
1992 92-4	<b>A Critique of Computable General Equilibrium Models for Trade Policy Analysis</b> Tim Hazledine
1992 92-3	<b>Whither European Community Common Agricultural Policy, MacSharried or Dunkeled in the GATT?</b> Vernon Roningén
1992 92-2	<b>Assessing Model Assumptions in Trade Liberalization Modeling: An Application to SWOPSIM</b> Michael Herlihy, Stephen Haley, and Brian Johnston
1992 92-1	<b>Estimated Impacts of a Potential U.S.-Mexico Preferential Trading Agreement for the Agricultural Sector</b> Barry Krissoff, Liana Neff, and Jerry Sharples
1991 91-10	<b>A Simple Measure for Agricultural Trade Distortion</b> Vernon Roningén and Praveen M. Dixit
1991 91-9	<b>Partial Report of World Rice Trade: Implications for the U.S. Rice Sector and Agribusiness</b> Stephen Haley
1991 91-8	<b>Agricultural Policymaking in Germany: Implications for the German Position in Multilateral Trade Negotiations</b> Stefan Tangermann and David Kelch
1991 91-7	<b>European Economic Integration and the Consequences for U.S. Agriculture</b> James Gleckler, Bob Koopman, and Luther Tweeten
1991 91-6	<b>The Export Enhancement Program: Prospects Under the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990</b> Stephen Haley
1991 91-5	<b>Global Grain Stocks and World Market Stability Revisited</b> Steve Martinez and Jerry Sharples



ANNEX TABLE A-8 (CONTINUED)

<b>Year/No.</b>	<b>Working Paper</b>
1991 91-4	<b>The Impact of Real Exchange Rate Misalignment and Instability on Macroeconomic Performance in Sub-Saharan Africa</b> Dhaneshwar Ghura and Thomas J. Grennes
1991 91-3	<b>U.S. Export Subsidies in Wheat: Strategic Trade Policy or an Expensive Beggar-My-Neighbor Tactic?</b> Giovanni Anania, Mary Bohman, and Colin Carter
1991 91-2	<b>Economic Impacts of the U.S. Honey Support Program on the Canadian Honey Trade and Producer Prices</b> Barry Prentice and Kwame Darko
1991 91-1	<b>Report of the Task Force on Reviving the GATT Negotiations in Agriculture</b> (Trade Update Notes) Maury Bredahl, Chair
1990 90-6	<b>Agricultural Policies and the GATT: Reconciling Protection, Support and Distortion</b> Harry de Gorter and David R. Harvey
1990 90-5	<b>Politically Acceptable Trade Compromises Between the EC and the US: A Game Theory Approach</b> Martin Johnson, Louis Mahe, and Terry L. Roe
1990 90-4	<b>Uncertainty, Price Stabilization and Welfare</b> E. Kwan Choi and Stanley Johnson
1990 90-3	<b>Report of the Task Force on The Comprehensive Proposals for Negotiations in Agriculture</b> Tim Josling, Chair
1990 90-2	<b>Optimal Trade Policies for a Developing Country Under Uncertainty</b> E. Kwan Choi and Harvey E. Lapan
1990 90-1	<b>Background Papers for Report of the Task Force on The Aggregate Measure of Support: Potential Use by GATT for Agriculture</b> G.E. Rossmiller, Chair
1989 89-9	<b>Agricultural Policy Adjustments in East Asia: The Korean Rice Economy</b> Yong Dae Kwon and Hiroshi Yamauchi
1989 89-8	<b>Report of the Task Force on The Aggregate Measure of Support: Potential Use by GATT for Agriculture</b> G.E. Rossmiller, Chair
1989 89-7	<b>Report of the Task Force on Reinstrumentation of Agricultural Policies</b> Stephen Magiera, Chair
1989 89-6	<b>Report of the Task Force on Tariffication and Rebalancing</b> Tim Josling, Chair
1989 89-5	<b>The Welfare Effects of Imperfect Harmonization of Trade and Industrial Policy</b> K. Gastios and Larry Karp

ANNEX TABLE A-8 (CONTINUED)

<b>Year/No.</b>	<b>Working Paper</b>
1989 89-4	<b>Export Supply and Import Demand Elasticities in the Japanese Textile Industry: A Production Theory Approach</b> Daniel Pick and Timothy Park
1989 89-3	<b>Does Arbitraging Matter? Spatial Trade Models and Discriminatory Trade Policies</b> Giovanni Anania and Alex McCalla
1989 89-2	<b>Report of ESCOP Subcommittee on Domestic and International Markets and Policy</b> Alex McCalla, Chair
1989 89-1	<b>Who Determines Farm Programs? Agribusiness and the Making of Farm Policy</b> Julian Alston, Colin Carter, and M. Wohlgenant
1988 88-7	<b>Targeted and Global Export Subsidies and Welfare Impacts</b> Mary Bohman, Colin Carter, and Jeffrey Dortman
1988 88-6	<b>A Comparison of Tariffs and Quotas in a Strategic Setting</b> Larry Karp
1988 88-5	<b>Market Effects of a In-Kind Subsidies</b> James P. Houck
1988 88-4	<b>Effect of Sugar Price Policy on U.S. Imports of Processed Sugar-Containing Foods</b> Cathy Jabara
1988 88-3	<b>Determinants of U.S. Wheat Producer Support Price: A Time Series Analysis</b> Harald von Witzke
1988 88-2	<b>Two-Stage Agricultural Import Demand Models Theory and Applications</b> Colin Carter, Richard Green, and Daniel Pick
1988 88-1	<b>Developing Country Agriculture in the Uruguay Round: What the North Might Miss</b> Carl Mabbs-Zeno and Nicole Ballenger
1987 87-9	<b>Agricultural Trade Liberalization in a Multi-Sector World Model</b> Barry Krissoff and Nicole Ballenger
1987 87-8	<b>Grain Markets and the United States: Trade Wars, Export Subsidies, and Price Rivalry</b> James P. Houck
1987 87-7	<b>Japanese Beef Policy and GATT Negotiations: An Analysis of Reducing Assistance for Beef Producers</b> Thomas Wahl, Dermot Hayes, and Gary Williams
1987 87-6	<b>An Analysis of Canadian Demand for Imported Tomatoes: One Market or Many?</b> Kwame Darko-Mensah and Barry Prentice
1987 87-5	<b>Deficits and Agriculture: An Alternative Parable</b> Richard Just and Robert Chambers

ANNEX TABLE A-8 (CONTINUED)

<b>Year/No.</b>	<b>Working Paper</b>
1987 87-4	<b>The Effect of Protection and Exchange Rate Policies on Agricultural Trade: Implications for Argentina, Brazil, and Mexico</b> Barry Krissoff and Nicole Ballenger
1987 87-3	<b>International Negotiations on Farm Support Levels: The Role of PSEs</b> Stefan Tangermann, Tim Josling, and Scott Pearson
1987 87-2	<b>Comparative Advantage, Competitive Advantage, and U.S. Agricultural Trade</b> Kelley White
1987 87-1	<b>Estimating Gains from Less Distorted Agricultural Trade</b> Jerry Sharples
1986 86-5	<b>Optimum Tariffs in a Distorted Economy: An Application to Agriculture</b> Larry Karp and John Beghin
1986 86-4	<b>Targeted Agricultural Export Subsidies and Social Welfare</b> Philip Abbott, Philip Paarlberg, and Jerry Sharples
1986 86-3	<b>An Econometric Model of the European Economic Community's Wheat Market</b> Harry de Gorter and Karl Meilke
1986 86-2	<b>Risk Aversion in a Dynamic Trading Game</b> Larry Karp
1986 86-1	<b>Basic Economics of an Export Bonus Scheme</b> James P. Houck
1985 85-1	<b>Do Macroeconomic Variables Affect the Agricultural Trade Sector? An Elasticities Analysis</b> Alex McCalla and Daniel Pick