Examining How Removing Trade Barriers Have Influenced GDP Growth in Emerging Economies

Kamaran Qader Yaqub[1], Dr. Kiran Mustufa[2], Muhammad Fahad Shakoor[3], Azka Sarwar[4], Muhammad Asif[5]

Abstract

For each of the 119 countries under consideration, this paper constructs a trade barrier index out of tariff data. In situations where such data was unavailable, total imports corresponding to the structure of the 6-digit HS classification were retrieved from the UNCTAD TRAINS database. Concerning cross-sectional differences of the generated trade barrier indices, econometric tools have been administrated, including bivariate and multivariate and ANOVA estimations. Thus, in light of the current study, it can be inferred that cross-country derived trade barrier indices are not totally different and are a function of differences in per capita income, population, and literacy rate. This article explains the differences between various trade barrier indices by different product classification levels and uses Pakistan as an example. Besides, comparing the rankings of the trade barrier indices between two countries might not, in fact, mean a comparison between trade barrier indices of different industries.

Keywords: trade barriers, GDP growth, emerging economies

1. Introduction

Regarding international trade rules, nobody has more sway than the World Trade Organization (WTO). Important to the structure of the WTO are the treaties that the legislatures of the majority of the trading states in the world have ratified. The objective is to make it easier for companies that make goods and services and those that import and export to run their businesses. You can be sure of the result. Everybody knows that having a steady supply and a wider range of finished goods, parts, raw materials, and services is good for business and for consumers. The availability of foreign markets is a given for producers and exporters. The result is a more prosperous, tranquil, and responsible economic climate. The parliaments of the member nations that make up the World Trade Organization usually approve the decisions that are reached by consensus. When countries' trade policies diverge, the World Trade Organization's dispute resolution process steps in to help clarify and enforce compliance with all parties' obligations and agreements. Taking this tack reduces the possibility of disagreements turning into full-blown war. The WTO's methodology dismantles trade barriers and other impediments between states and people. Most of the world's trading states have accepted the World Trade Organization's treaties, which form the backbone of the multilateral trade system. These accords are the legal basis for international trade. At their core, these pacts guarantee substantial economic advantages to the member nations. They also make governments follow predetermined trade policy limits, which is good for everyone.

Since several approaches are used to ascertain the level of economic openness, there appears to be no straightforward approach to addressing this subject. Similarly, the openness criterion comprises both country-specific and generic settings applicable across countries. This suggests that as time goes on or while considering the trade conditions of other nations, the value of openness in relation to the trade system can be seen as building up. To be more specific, three broad categories of instrumental variables are used to assess various degrees of economic openness. The first of these factors is the end result, which is the export GDP ratio plus the trade GDP ratio of the trading partners. The second index group is based on policy considerations and comprises trade obstacles such as tariffs and non-tariff barriers. For further information on the openness indicators, see Appendix 1. Conversely, the third group includes using non-trade variables or measuring a country's trading environment. There is much debate over which variable is most suited for openness when doing international or national-level analyses. The use of the trade-GDP ratio to track the evolution of a nation's comprehensive trade regime has only been criticized when utilized as a measure of openness across countries. Since shifts in the trade regime and differences in the trade-to-GDP ratio over different time periods are not mutually exclusive, this possibility is not out of the question.

Structure considerations, such as geographical endowment, may largely explain the disparity between trade to GDP, according to Rodriguez and Rodrik (1999). Finally, the third set of indicators has drawn criticism for its reliance on subjective measures of what are now recognized as non-trade barriers, such as the exchange rate and the black-market premium. Several types of research have made use of the second group of indicators. There is a lack of useful data on policy variables, such as tariffs and NTBs, which makes it difficult to compare cross-sectional data.

On the other hand, remember that each of these indicators has advantages and disadvantages regarding their application. For example, it is possible to hide the degree of tariff volatility in multiple economies by simply averaging tariffs. Thus, the study establishes the import-weighted ratio as an improvement above the basic tariff average. An issue that may arise with an import-weighted tariff is that it compares the economic protection level with the tariff intended for a particular commodity, which may or may not have an import request. The second issue is that when calculating import-weighted tariffs, the usual level of aggregation is way too coarse. When looking at the discrepancies between import weights and tariffs, the finer level of analysis is not always enough. Nevertheless, most nations have scant data regarding non-tariff trade obstacles. Understanding the extent to which these figures can be mathematically reduced for the purpose of conducting a cross-sectional analysis becomes thus exceedingly complex. However, to fill the gaps in relevant import data, this study will use tariff information for many nations to build a trade barrier index. This index has two main benefits: As a first step, it has accurately compiled import data and tariff quantities and quality. It has done its job right by giving these concerns the attention they deserve. The second one concerns the state of imported weights at each tariff line in relation to a specific CPS level. Consequently, identifying the country's formal openness degree and concentrating on the

identified structural elements is the primary goal of this work. When considering structural variables, it is important to remember that governments typically have little control over some geographical elements of their countries (Amsden, 2000; Razzaque, 2002).

2. Formulation of An Index of Trade Barri

The author's Trade Barrier database, which is used to construct and organize the indexes presented here, can be accessed by writing to the author. The database shows the current status of tariffs as a trade barrier for 119 developed and developing nations. Most of these nations utilize the years 2000–2001 as their base (to learn more about these nations and the years used as a benchmark, see Appendix 2. This particular analysis uses the sectoral technique to disaggregate the national data. Products are categorized in the database using the HS code. 95 industries classified by the 2-digit HS code are accessible at the 2-digit level (for a list of industries that fall under this categorization, see Appendix 4). Data on imports and tariffs is sourced from the UNCTAD Trade Analysis and Information System (TRAINS) on a 6-digit HS level accessible online. There are a total of three data sets in the database. The first group represents the 2-digit HS basic average tariff. That second one concerns the import-weighted duty on HS items classified at the 2-digit level. The last datasets show the trade barrier indices at the 2-digit HS categorization level. The subject might benefit from the aforementioned database's extensiveness in comparing tariff barriers across nations and industries of the 2-digit Standard International Trade Classification. Headings for HS codes. From a cross-state and cross-industry perspective, the provided database demonstrates that trade fluctuations provide substantial protection. Using the trade barrier indices, the cross-sectional average of the applied tariffs, and the tariff applied to imported goods weighted by the share of imports in the domestic GNP, a recently compiled database also shows the important comparisons of the countries' positions at the 2-digit level.

Our criteria for cross-country and cross-industry comparisons of tariff barriers at the two-digit level of the HS classifications are thus satisfied by the aforementioned database. Inconsistencies in trade are exposed by the compiled databases that span national and industrial borders. The data set shows the rise in malaria infections in the Americas and ranks the countries according to three quantitative factors with a tariff protection level of two digits. The Index of Trade Barriers, the Weighted Average Tariff by Imports, and the Simple Average Tariff are three important measures. We also use 6-digit HS code level data to determine the extensive WTWBIs of trade barriers for 119 nations. Here is the process for creating this index: Below is the formula that was used to determine this index:

$$TRB_j = \frac{1}{n}[\sum (1+\frac{M_{ij}}{Mj})\ln(1+T_{ij})]\times 100 \qquad (1)$$

In order to calculate the trade barrier indices at a relatively disaggregated level (at the 2-digit HS code level) equation (1) has been modified to equation (2):

$$TRB_j^{hs} = \frac{1}{n}[\sum (1+\frac{M_{ij}^{hs}}{Mj^{hs}})\ln(1+T_{ij}^{hs})]\times 100 \qquad (2)$$

By dividing Equation (2) by the number of commodities within the relevant HS code, we can compare trade barrier indices consistently across 2-digit HS commodity groups. Due to the wide variety of goods falling into several 2-digit HS code categories, this is of the utmost importance. Since n is constant for every given HS code across all countries, dividing the trade barrier index formula by n has no effect on the comparative levels of trade barriers for the goods in the nations under consideration. Since equation (1) could be represented without division (and was sufficient for a macro-level comparison of nations), we decided to separate it so that both equations (1) and (2) correspond to a traditional format. The trade barrier indices show that when the value of the index increases, the trade barrier also increases, as stated in equations (1) and (2). According to equation (1), Table 1 shows the aggregate trade barrier indices calculated for 119 countries. More closed economies are indicated by higher numbers in this table, which illustrates the comparative assessments of these countries.

3. Determinants of Trade Barriers

To what extent do various countries' trade barriers differ, and what factors might explain this variation? Why do various countries exhibit varied levels of protectionism?2 We have compiled a set of critical structural variables that affect a country's choice to open or close. First, we find out how these variables are related to the trade barrier indices by running an econometric analysis. In order to assess these relationships, we next build a multivariate econometric model. Key indicators include levels of trade barriers and gross domestic product per capita. How much of the diversity in national per capita GDP explains the differences in trade barriers across countries? One may argue that countries with higher GDP per capita have less trade barriers. With GDP per capita on the y-axis and TI on the x-axis, Figure 1 shows the empirical results for the sample of 101 countries and the two types of trade barriers. The nominal exchange rate, expressed in constant prices, is derived from the natural logarithm of GDP per capita in US dollars and is used to determine the economic magnitude.

One goal of tariffs is to raise tax money for the government; another is to shield homegrown businesses from international rivals (Root, 2000). Governments need to maximize tariff revenue by setting tariff rates at an appropriate level, which is actually quite low. This helps with revenue function. Since this is not the intended use of import duties, they cannot be considered tariff barriers. Normal tariff collections are also generally accepted practices, particularly in the industrial age past, as instruments of national economic policy to regulate a nation's foreign trade. Truly, the only tariffs that serve as quantitative restrictions—i.e., fees with an emergency, short-lived character—are those that are extraordinarily high and supplementary. That is the tariff's true protective role. However, according to Franklin, it depends on whether imports are partially or fully restricted. Full protection tariffs aim to ensure that domestic producers pay as little as all foreign manufacturers, including transportation and incidental import expenditures, for each unit of output. However, the duty must stay below this difference if the tariff merely provides partial protection. The government will collect customs duties, and commodities will be imported in lower quantities when partial protection is needed. While its primary goal is protection, the protection function, similar to the revenue function, will typically provide both protection and revenue.

Table 1: Aggregate Trade Barrier Indices and Ranking for 119 Countries

Countries	Aggregate TRB Index	Rank	Countries	Aggregate TRB index	Rank
Albania	9.11	63	Korea	7.91	75
Algeria	17.81	7	Lao PDR	8.01	74
Antigua	8.15	72	Latvia	2.95	113
Armenia	2.59	114	Lebanon	5.04	99
Australia	3.59	109	Libya	14.12	26
Bahamas	0.47	118	Lithuania	2.97	112
Bahrain	6.61	87	Madagascar	5.87	96
Bangladesh	17.48	8	Malawi	11.01	40
Barbados	9.89	56	Malaysia	7.57	79
Belarus	10.65	42	Maldives	16.69	9
Belize	8.80	66	Mali	10.24	50
Bemuda	10.24	46	Malta	6.38	90
Benin	14.58	25	Mauritania	9.28	59
Bhutan	12.72	31	Mauritius	21.15	5
Bolivia	8.53	68	Mexico	14.64	24
Bosnia and Herz	5.31	98	Moldova	4.31	102
Brunei	1.83	117	Morocco	23.43	3
Bulgaria	10.43	45	Mozambique	11.4	39
Burkina Faso	10.24	47	New Zealand	2.30	115
Cameroon	14.95	16	Nicaragua	4.11	105
Canada	3.85	107	Niger	10.24	51
Central African Rep	14.95	17	Norway	2.1	116
Chad	14.95	18	Oman	4.23	104
Chile	7.08	83	Pakistan	16.56	11
China	6.72	84	Panama	6.70	86
China (Taiwan)	13.16	29	Papua New Guinea	15.53	14
Colombia	10.47	44	Paraguay	10.91	41
Congo Rep.	14.95	19	Peru	11.76	36
Costa Rica	4.75	101	Philippines	6.29	92
Cote d'Ivoire	10.24	48	Poland	10.16	55
Croatia	9.07	65	Romania	13.99	27
Cuba	9.13	61	Russia	9.71	57
Czech Rep	4.87	100	Rwanda	8.44	69
Dominica	8.13	73	Saudi Arabia	10.22	54
Dominican Rep	14.65	23	Senegal	10.24	52
Ecuador	11.74	37	Seychelles	20.88	6
Egypt	16.59	10	Slovenia	8.31	71
El Salvador	6.10	93	Solomon Islands	24.73	2
Equational Guinea	14.95	20	South Africa	6.72	85
Estonia	0.06	119	Sri Lanka	7.88	76
Ethiopia	15.33	15	St. Kitts Nevis	7.78	78
EU	3.91	106	St. Lucia	7.37	80
Formar Yug Macedonia	11.94	34	St. Vincent & Grenadines	8.33	70
Gabon	14.95	21	Sudan	4.24	103
Georgia	9.22	60	Thailand	14.92	22
Ghana	12.01	33	Togo	10.24	53
Guatemala	5.78	97	Trinidad & Tobago	6.46	88
Guinea-Bissau	10.24	49	Tunisia	23.15	4
Guyana	9.13	62	Turkey	8.61	67
Honduras	5.94	94	U. Rep. Of Tanzania	13.65	28
Hungary	9.37	58	Uganda	7.85	77
Iceland	2.99	111	Ukrainian	7.34	81
India	25.42	1	Uruguay	11.74	38
Indonesia	7.13	82	USA	3.35	110
Iran	6.36	91	Uzbekistan	9.10	64
Israel	6.40	89	Venezuela	10.63	43
Jamaica	5.93	95	Vietnam	12.93	30
Japan	3.84	108	Zambia	11.9	35
Jordan	12.27	32	Zimbabwe	15.62	12
Kenya	15.57	13			

Note: Ranking is done from higher to lower values of trade barrier indices.

4. Analysis of Geographical Location and Trade Barriers

Is a country's location a factor in its trade limitations with other countries? Based on studies conducted by Clarke and Tavares (2000), Frankel Romer (1999), and Soloaga Winters (1997), the 'gravity models' of commerce suggest that their relative distances influence the amount of trade between two countries. As the distance between trading partners grows, the transaction volume typically decreases. Aside from trade volume, there is a dearth of information in the current literature regarding the relationship between geographical distance and trade difficulties. This study examines how different countries' trade barriers relate to their geographical differences. We have determined the locations of all things by computing distances using the 'weighted distance' method. In his

340

analysis of weighted distance data, Razzaque (2002) employed the following methodology: We used import levels in 1997 to determine the weights and then compiled a list of the top ten importing countries. All nations' weights are as follows: 0.29 for the United States, 0.15 for Germany, 0.11 for Japan, 0.09 for France, 0.09 for the United Kingdom, 0.06 for Italy, 0.055 for Canada, 0.055 for Hong Kong, 0.055 for the Netherlands, and 0.04 for Belgium. After that, we find the nations with the highest imports and calculate their weighted distances.

5. Analysis of Cross-Country Trade Barriers Using a Multivariate Model

Differences in trade barrier indices between countries are explained by certain structural characteristics, as shown by the bi-variate correlations between these aspects and our trade barrier indices. Still, a wide range of circumstances affect the degree of influence. However, such bilateral exercises are ineffective in resolving the discrepancies in trade barriers with other nations and present difficulties. In bivariate regressions, bias results from missing variables. The assumption of a relationship between two variables in bi-variate correlations, with all other variables held constant, may also not reflect reality. Therefore, we use a multivariate cross-country regression model to evaluate the trade barrier index. All the previously recognized structural components are being attempted to be incorporated in this model. An essential paradigm for the trade barrier index between countries is outlined below:

The equation TRB = β + β PCY + β XY + β POP + β LIT + β D +ε. ……… (3)

The trade barrier index (TRB) measures the per capita GDP expressed in hundreds of 1995 US dollars (US$). The export-GDP ratio (PCY XY) is a percentage, the population is measured in thousands, the literacy rate (POP LIT) is a percentage, the weighted distance is measured in 100 kilometers, and Dε is the classical error term.

6. Analysis of Trade Barriers at a Disaggregated Level: A Case Study of Pakistan

The ranking, however, is based on a consolidated index, and it is inarguable that this consolidation might not provide a more accurate picture of the real situation of trade barriers. So, we used the formula from equation (2) to determine the trade barrier indices for all 119 nations at the 2-digit HS code level. As a result of this study, 119 nations' trade barrier indices at the 2-digit HS code level have been compiled.

In the table, you can see Pakistan's relative position in the dataset. The trade barrier indices for Pakistan at the 2-digit HS code levels are printed in the second column. As a part of the international trade barrier framework, the third column ranks Pakistan's trade barrier indices for 2-digit HS codes. This kind of research is useful for determining where Pakistan's trade rules are low or high compared to global standards. Table 5, column 4, displays the trade barrier indices for ninety-five Pakistani sectors. These rankings are considered in the context of different industries and are based on the 2-digit HS code levels. You can think of the rankings in Table 5 as follows: in a global context, rankings above 80 signify relatively loose trade restrictions, rankings between 60 and 79 are moderately low, rankings 40 to 59 are moderately high, and rankings below 40 as severely controlled. Table 5 reveals that out of a total of 95 industries, only 8 (or 8.4%) have a free trade policy in Pakistan, according to the previously established classifications. Conversely, 3 out of 95 industries (or 3.15 percent) have trade barrier indices ranging from moderate to high. High trade barrier indices are seen in the other 84 sectors, making up 88.4 percent of the total 95 industries. Umbrellas, sun umbrellas, walking sticks, whips, riding crops, components, and HS 47 (wood pulp, rubbish, scrap paper) are subject to the laxest trade regulations in Pakistan, whilst HS 31 (fertilizers) are subject to the strictest restrictions. Notably, according to Table 5, there is no guarantee that the rankings of trade barrier indices within a given industry will coincide with the rankings of trade barrier indices between nations. It suggests that the trade barrier index for a particular group of commodities might not be as low when viewed in a cross-country context as it is when viewed in an industry-specific one. If we assume that Pakistan ranks 86 out of 95 industries for HS code 30 and has a lower trade barrier index of 8.39 in the cross-industry ranking, then we find that Pakistan ranks 15 out of 119 countries with a trade barrier index that is much higher.

7. Conclusion

The international trade barrier indices for 119 countries were constructed using tariff and import indices at the 6-digit HS code level. Regarding economic similarity, Although Pakistan ranks closest among the 119 nations in the study, but Estonia is the most liberalized country according to the aggregate trade barriers indices. Therefore, this review employs cross-sectional bi-variate and multivariate econometric methods to reconcile the disparities among several nations' trade barrier indices. According to these results, trade barrier indices are heavily impacted by large deviations from the mean of population size, literacy fraction, per capita income, and worldwide income. In addition, we have shown that there are substantial differences in country-level trade barrier indices that can be explained by different levels of product analysis. Evidence from Pakistan shows that national trade barrier indices do not necessarily point to erratic trade barrier indices.

References

Amsden, A. (2000). "Selective Seclusion" Chapter 7 in *The Rise of the Rest: Late Industrialization Outside the North Atlantic Economies*, Manuscript.

Bernard A. Gelb. (2001). Textile and Apparel Trade Issues. Congressional Research Service Report for Congress. RS20436. pp2.

Clark, X. and Tavares, J. (2000). "A Quantitative Approach Using the Gravity Equation",

Development Discussion Paper, No. 748, Harvard Institute for International Development.

Dollar, D. and Kraay, A. (2001). "Trade Growth and Poverty". World Bank Policy Research

Department Working Paper No. 2587. Washington DC.

Caifa Song. (2004). WTO regulations and China textiles and clothing brand protection. South-West National University. Chengdu. China

Edwards, S. (1998). "Openness, productivity and growth: What do we really know?" *Economic Journal*. 108, pp 383-398.

Fischer, S. (1993). "The role of macroeconomic factors in growth", *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 32, pp: 485-512.

Frankel, J.A. and Romer, D. (1999). "Does Trade Cause Growth", *American Economic Review*, vol.89, pp.379-99.

Franklin R. Root. (2000). International Trade and Investment. Seventh edition. The Wharton School University of Pennsylvania. South-Western Publishing Co

Gylfason, T. (1999). "Exports, Inflation and Growth", *World Development*, vol. 27, no.6, pp:1031-1057.

Harrison, A. and Hanson, G. (1999). "Who gains from trade reform? Some remaining puzzles" *Journal of Development Economics*, 59, pp:124-154.

Mayda, A. M. and Rodrik, D (2001). "Why are some people (and countries) more protectionist than others?" NBER Working Paper 8461.

Razzaque, M.A. (2002). "Essays on Export Sector in Pakistan" Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Sussex.

Rodrik, D. (1999). The New Global Economy and Developing Countries: Making Openness Work, Overseas Development Council, Washington DC.

Rodriguez, F. and Rodrik, D. (1999). "Trade policy and economic growth: a skeptic's guide to the cross-national evidence". NBER Working paper 7081.

Sachs, J.D. and Warner, A. (1995). "Economic reform and the process of global integration" Brookings Papers on Economic Activity, 1, pp:1-118.

S. Tamer Cavusgil and Michael R. Czinkota. (2001). International Perspectives on Trade Promotion and Assistance. Quorum books

Ting Li. (2003). ATC and anti-dumping issues in Chinese textile trade. Dong Hua University Journals. Social Science

Soloaga, I. and Winters. L.A. (1997). "Regionalism in the Nineties: What Effect on Trade?" World Bank Policy Research Working Paper, no. 2156, Washington, D.C.

Winters, L.A. McCulloch, N.A. and Cirera, X. (2002). Trade Liberalization and Poverty: A Handbook, Centre for Economic Policy Research. London.

Weimin Hao and Qiang Gu. (2003). International competition environment for textiles industry and countermeasures. International Economy Cooperation. Beijing. Pp14-17.

World Bank (2002). *World Development Indicators 2002*, Washington DC. The World Bank.

Yao Shen. (1999). Economics Analysis on dumping and anti-dumping. Hang Zhou. Zhejiang University Publication House. Pp177-124.

Yonghui Xu. (2003). The changing of international textiles & clothing market and the countermeasures of China's textiles industry. Social Science Fronter. Changchun. Pp27-33.

Appendix 1

Measures of Openness	Measure Definition
Trade dependency ratio	The ratio of exports and imports to GDP
Growth rate of exports	The growth rate of exports over the specified period
Tariff averages	A simple or trade-weighted average of tariff levels
Collected tariff ratios	The ratio of tariff revenues to imports
Coverage of quantitative restrictions	The percentage of goods covered by quantitative Restrictions

Appendix 2
Harmonized System Codes (HS-Codes)- Commodity Classification

The Products Classified by Harmonised System (HS) is the standard code for importers and exporter used by International trade and developed under the auspices of the Customs Cooperation Council. The Harmonised Code consists of 10 digits number. It is a system of progressively more specific identifiers for a commodity. For example, concentrated frozen apple juice is assigned a 10-digit identifier. This number is an aggregate of a series of codes starting with a broad category assigned a 2-digit identifier described as Preparations of Vegetables, Fruit, Nuts etc. It is then assigned a 4-digit identifier described as fruit juices and vegetable juices, etc. The 6-digit identifier is described as apple juice. The HS Code list is thus a hierarchical structure. The first 2 digits of a code represent a broad category. Additional digits are added in pairs to represent increasingly specific sub-categories until all 10 digits have been given.

2 Digits HS Code Reference
Live animals; animal products
01 live animals
02 meat & edible meat offal
03 fish & crustaceans
04 dairy, eggs, honey, & ed. products
05 products of animal origin
Vegetable products
06 live trees & other plants
07 edible vegetables

08 ed. fruits & nuts, peel of citrus/melons
09 coffee, tea, mate & spices>
10 cereals
11 milling industry products
12 oil seeds/misc. grains/med. plants/straw
13 lac, gums, resins, etc.
14 vegetable plaiting materials
15 animal or vegetable fats, oils & waxes

Prepared food; beverages, spirits, tobacco
16 ed. prep. of meat, fish, crustaceans, etc
17 sugars & sugar confectionery
18 cocoa & cocoa preparations
19 preps. of cereals, flour, starch or milk
20 preps of vegs, fruits, nuts, etc.
21 misc. edible preparations
22 beverages, spirits & vinegar
23 residues from food industries; animal feed
24 tobacco & manuf. tobacco substitutes

Mineral products
25 salt; sulphur, earth & stone, lime & cement
26 ores slag & ash
27 mineral fuels, oils, waxes & bituminous sub chemicals & allied industries
28 inorganic chem, org/inorg compounds of precious metals,
29 organic chemicals
30 pharmaceutical products
31 fertilizers
32 tanning or dyeing extracts; dyes, pigments; paints & varnishes; putty; & inks
33 oils & resinoids, perfumery, cosmetic or toilet preparations
34 soaps, waxes, scouring products, candles, modeling pastes, dental waxes
35 albuminoidal sub, starches, glues, enzymes
36 explosives, matches, pyrotechnic products
37 photographic or cinematographic goods
38 miscellaneous chemical products

Plastics/rubbers & articles thereof
39 plastics & articles thereof
40 rubbers & articles thereof

Raw hides, skins, leather, & furs
41 raw hides & skins & leather
42 articles of leather, saddlery & harness, travel goods, handbags, articles of gut
43 furskins & artificial fur, manufactures

Wood/wood charcoal/cork/straw/plaiting materials and articles thereof
44 wood & articles of wood; wood charcoal
45 cork & articles of cor
46 manu. of straw, esparto, or other plaiting

Materials, basketware and wickerwork paper and articles thereof
47 pulp of wood, waste & scrap of paper
48 paper & paperboard, articles of paper pulp
49 printed books, newspapers, pictures, manuscripts, typescripts & plans

Textiles & textile articles
50 silk, inc. yarns & woven fabrics thereof
51 wool & fine or coarse animal hair, inc.

Yarns & woven fabrics thereof
52 cotton, inc. yarns & woven fabrics thereof
53 veg. textile fibers nesoi, yarns & woven etc.
54 man-made filaments, inc. yarns & woven etc.
55 man-made staple fibers, inc. yarns etc.
56 wadding, felt & nonwovens, special yarns;

Twine, cordage, ropes & cables & articles
57 carpets & other textile floor coverings
58 special woven fabrics, tufted textiles; lace
59 impregnated, coated, covered, or laminated

Textile prod, textile prod for industrial use
60 knitted or crocheted fabrics
61 articles of apparel & clothing accessories-knitted or crocheted

62 articles of apparel & clothing accessories-not knitted or crocheted

63 made-up textile articles nesoi; needlecraft sets; worn clothing; rags

Footwear, headgear, umbrellas, walking sticks, riding crops & parts thereof

64 footwear, gaiters, & the like

65 headgear & other parts

66 umbrellas, sun umbrellas, walking-sticks, whips, riding-crops & parts

67 prepared feathers, human hair & articles thereof, artificial flowers

Articles of stone, plaster, cement, asbestos, mica or similar materials, glass & glassware

68 articles of stone, plaster, cement, asbestos, mica or similar materials

69 ceramic products

70 glass & glassware

Pearls, precious stones/metals and articles thereof; imitation jewelry; coins

71 pearls, stones, prec. metals, imitation jewelry, coins

Base metals & articles of base metal

72 iron & steel

73 articles of iron or steel

74 copper & articles thereof

75 nickel & articles thereof

76 aluminum & articles thereof

78 lead & articles thereof

79 zinc & articles thereof

80 tin & articles thereof

81 base metals nesoi; cermets; articles etc.

82 tools, spoons & forks of base metal

83 miscellaneous articles of base metal

Machinery & mechanical appliances; electrical equipment/appliances, parts & accessories

84 nuclear reactors, boilers, machinery & mechanical appliances, computers

85 electrical machinery & equip. & parts; telecommunications equip., sound recorders, television recorders

Vehicles, aircraft, vessels & associated transportation equipment

86 railway or tramway locomotives, rolling stock, track fixtures & fittings, signals

87 vehicles other than railway or tramway rolling stock

88 aircraft, spacecraft, & parts thereof

89 ships, boats, & floating structures

Optical, photographic, measuring, checking,precision, medical or surgical instruments; clocks & watches; musical instruments;

parts & accessories thereof

90 optical, photographic, cinematographic, measuring, checking, precision, medical or surgical instruments & accessories

91 clocks & watches & parts thereof

92 musical instruments; parts & accessories

93 arms & ammunition; parts & accessories

Miscellaneous manufactured articles

94 furniture; bedding, cushions; lamps & lighting fittings nesoi; illuminated signs, nameplates & the like, prefabricated buildings

95 toys, games & sports equip; parts & acces.

96 miscellaneous manufactured articles

Source: TRAINS, UNCTAD