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U.S. Sugar Industry: Status and Challenges

Industry Profile, Status

• Large, important, competitive U.S. industry
  – 146,000 jobs in 19 states
  – About $10 billion in annual economic activity
  – Rough balance of beet and cane sugar production; sugar and corn sweetener consumption
  – Political alliance with corn industry

• World’s largest 5th largest producing, consuming country; 4th leading net importer

• Among world’s lower cost producers
Like other U.S. farmers, American sugar farmers are:

- Efficient by world standards
- Ready to compete with foreign farmers on a level playing field
- Concerned about unfair, subsidized foreign competition
- Struggling to cope with cost inflation, declining real prices for ag commodities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>U.S. Rank (Lowest = 1)</th>
<th>Number of Producing Countries/Regions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beet Sugar</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cane Sugar</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Domestic Support (DS):

WTO FRAMEWORKS CALLS FOR:

- Substantial Reductions in Trade-Distorting DS [per Doha Declaration]
- Overall Reduction in AMS + de Minimis + Blue Box via Tiered Formula [greater cuts for those with higher levels of support; US will likely fall in second tier; EU in top tier]
- Tiered Cuts in Bound Levels of AMS (Amber Box) support. (now $19.1 billion for U.S.)
- Caps on product-specific AMS at average levels – “methodology to be agreed.”
- Reductions in De Minimis DS
- Cap on Blue Box Support : 5% total value of ag production
- Review and Clarification of Green Box criteria
Overall U.S. Position On Agriculture Negotiations:

• U.S. Willing to Make Major Changes/Cuts in its Farm Support Program –But Only If Major Improvement in Access to Other WTO Markets.

• Strong Reasons to Doubt Such Improvements Will Be Forthcoming.
Market Access Improvement Impeded By:

- Loopholes for Developing Countries Include: Lower cuts, Longer Transition Periods, Special Products, Special Safeguards, Cuts Made from Bound not Applied Tariffs
- G-10 (Japan, Korea, Switzerland, etc) Unlikely to Agree to Significant Market Opening
- EU Reform Not Likely to Result in Real Improvement in Market Access [b/c have switched from price support to direct payments can make tariff cuts w/o actually improving access.]
U.S. Sugar Industry Position: WTO Negotiations:

• Changes in U.S. Sugar Program, Domestic and Import, Should be Contingent on Achievement of Fundamental Reform of the Grossly Distorted World Sugar Market.

• Prospects for Such Reform Do Not Appear Bright at This Point [EU pledge to eliminate export subsidies but little interest so far in comprehensive product specific approach, S&D problem, three pillar approach appears ill-suited to get at range of distorting policies, esp. indirect, non-transparent]
U.S. Sugar and Trade Policy

Trade Policy Opportunities and Dangers

U.S. sugar producers have endorsed goal of genuine global free trade in sugar: Efficient, can compete.

- Global problem: *Address sugar subsidies globally, in WTO*

- Do *not* address partially, piecemeal:
  - FTA approach: Ineffective, dangerous – wrench open markets w/o addressing subsidies
  - Virtually every FTA ever done excludes sugar
U.S. Sugar and Trade Policy

To address global sugar subsidies:

*Sector-specific WTO approach:*

1. **All countries** – including developing countries – 75% of sugar production, exports

2. **All programs** – including non-transparent or indirect supports
## Summary of Support for Sugar Industry in Selected Countries, 2002 -- Direct Supports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Brazil</th>
<th>China</th>
<th>Colombia</th>
<th>Cuba</th>
<th>EU</th>
<th>Guatemala</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>Mexico</th>
<th>Russia</th>
<th>S. Africa</th>
<th>Thailand</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSPARENT SUPPORT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Market Controls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Quotas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guaranteed Support Prices</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply Controls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Sharing/Sales Quotas</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Import Controls</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Quota</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Tariff</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Licences</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Restrictions</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Export Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export Subsidies</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Import Tariff Level (refined, a.v. or equivalent)</strong></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>164%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>172%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>138%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Review of sugar policies in major sugar industries: Transparent and non-transparent or indirect policies
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## Summary of Support for Sugar Industry in Selected Countries, 2002 -- Indirect Supports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NON-TRANSPARENT SUPPORT</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Brazil</th>
<th>China</th>
<th>Colombia</th>
<th>Cuba</th>
<th>EU</th>
<th>Guatemala</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>Mexico</th>
<th>Russia</th>
<th>S. Africa</th>
<th>Thailand</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Financial Aid</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Ownership</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Support</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Financing</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input Subsidies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect Long Term Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Desk Selling</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D Subsidies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency Programs</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethanol Programs/Subsidies</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Demand Support</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Wholesale Sugar Price (cents/lb)</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Review of sugar policies in major sugar industries: Transparent and non-transparent or indirect policies

© LMC International Ltd, 2003
Sugar In The WTO Negotiations:

• U.S. Cash Subsidies for Export Crops [cotton, wheat, corn, soybeans] Are Focus-- Not Sugar.

• While Aggressive Exporters Like Brazil, Thailand, Australia May Seek Major Cuts in DS, Large Group of ACP and Other Developing Countries Want to Maintain Good Prices, Preferential Access for Sugar in U.S. EU.

• Few Countries Willing to Expose Their Industries to World Dump Market
World Dump Market for Sugar

• World market price barely half world average cost of production for 20 years
  – But domestic wholesale prices average double the world price
• All countries’ governments intervene to some degree
• Most price depressing factor of past 10 years: Brazil exports rise from 2 mmt/yr to 18 mmt
  – Ethanol cross subsidies; debt relief; low labor/environmental enforcement; currency devaluations
World Sugar Dump Market Price:
Barely More Than Half the World
Average Cost of Producing Sugar
(20-Year Average, 1983/84 - 2002/03)

Average World Dump Price*  World Average Production Cost**

9.19  15.70

*New York contract #11, f.o.b. Caribbean ports. Source: USDA.
Actual Wholesale Refined Sugar Prices Average Double the World Dump Market Price; U.S. at World Average Level; Other Developed Countries 65% Higher (¢/lb, 2004)

Data Sources: World refined price, London futures contract #5, USDA; all others, LMC International, April 2005. Countries surveyed represent 82% of global production.
Wholesale Refined Sugar Prices, North American and World:
U.S. Price Lower than Mexico, at Canada and World Level*
(Cents/lb, refined, 2004)

Does AMS Really Measure U.S. Support For Sugar?


• World dump price reflects neither production costs nor prices in national domestic market

• If true reform achieved, world price would rise and AMS calculation would decline.
2002 Farm Bill Sugar Provisions:

Three Key Elements

1. Non-recourse loan program at no cost to the government

Two tools to administer at no cost:

2. Limit imports: TRQ

3. Limit domestic sales: Marketing allotments
   - Expected consumption, minus imports
     = U.S. producers’ share of U.S. market
Inventory management: Market-oriented solution to over-supply, mandatory imports.

U.S. sugar producers:

– Earn all returns from the marketplace
  • *No government payments*
– Store surpluses at their own expense to balance the market
  • *Shifts inventory management cost from government to producers*
U.S. Sugar Policy Benefits

Taxpayer, consumer benefits from U.S. sugar policy

• **Taxpayer Benefits**: No cost, revenue raiser some years

• **Consumer Benefits**: Below developed country prices; affordable
  – Could be greater: Lack of pass-through of lower prices from manufacturers, retailers to consumers
Government Net Outlays for Sugar and All Other Commodity Programs, 1996-2006

- Million dollars -

1991-2006 Totals
All Other Program Total Net Outlays:
$235,284 million
Sugar Total Net Revenues:
$110 million

Developed Countries' Average Retail Sugar Prices:
30% Higher Than USA


"DEVELOPED-COUNTRY AVERAGE" represents the weighted average of 23 foreign developed countries.
Minutes of Work Required to Buy One Pound of Sugar: USA Second Lowest in World


Wholesale - retail sugar price gap doubles, from 9 cents/lb average in 1982-84 to 18.5 cents/lb in 2001-04: Revenue transfer from producers and consumers to grocers

December 2004 wholesale-retail gap: 19.8 cents/lb

From 1996 through 2004: Farmer Prices for Sugar Fall, Consumer Prices for Sugar and Sweetened Products Rise*

- Farmer Prices Fall
  - Raw Cane Sugar
  - Wholesale Refined Sugar
  - Retail Refined Sugar: -8.7%
  - Cereal: 2.0%
  - Cereal: 7.1%
  - Candy: 12.5%
  - Cookies, Cakes: 18.6%
  - Other Bakery Products: 20.0%
  - Ice Cream: 23.3%

FEASIBILITY OF SHIFT TO
“STANDARD” COMMODITY PROGRAM

• 2007 Farm Bill Constraints [out of whose hide will money come?]
• Payment Limitations [not just big corporations; mixed crop beet farmers very vulnerable]
• Industry Strongly Opposed
• Dubious Value in Doha Negotiations [if result is just lower US prices with no increase in MFN imports (a la FB study), what good is that to other WTO countries?]
Conclusions:

- Overall: Unless Major Concessions Secured In Market Access And Other Areas, US Should Not Commit To Major Changes In Domestic Farm Support
- Sugar: Comprehensive, Effective Reform Of World Sugar Market Provides Only Basis For Significant Change In US Domestic, Import Policy
- Sugar AMS Calculation Should Reflect Realistic Measurement Of Support
- Shift To “Standard” Type Domestic Policy Will Not Provide Panacea