



Discrepancies in Forest Products Trade Statistics: with China as the importing hub Presented by Dr. Indroneil Ganguly¹

CO-AUTHORS AND CONTRIBUTORS: FEI LU², DR. KENT WHEILER¹ AND DR. GOPALAKRISHNAN¹

¹CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN FOREST PRODUCTS,, UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON; ²BEIJING FORESTRY UNIVERSITY

VENUE:

WASHINGTON'S FOREST LEGALITY WEEK, WORLD RESOURCES INSTITUTE, WASHINGTON D.C.

OCTOBER 24, 2018



Overall Goal

The goal of the study is to develop a pragmatic understanding on how illegal timber and forest products move through the global supply chain, by identifying the key supply chain nodes within the remanufacturing and redistribution hubs, like **China** and Vietnam.







Estimating Illegal Logging and Associated Trade

Two common methods for estimating illegal logging and wood products trade are wood balance analysis and import source analysis (IURFRO 2016).

- 1. Wood balance analysis compares timber inputs (production plus imports) and outputs (consumption plus exports). Where a deficit emerges and cannot be otherwise explained, it is interpreted as an indication of illegality.
- 2. Import source analysis multiplies estimated illegal logging rates in source countries by trade volumes.
- 3. A more **objective import source analysis** using <u>trade data discrepancies</u>. (i.e., the mismatch between the data reported by the exporting country to that of the importing country.)





What are Trade Statistic Discrepancies

Discrepancies in trade statistics are generally termed as **'normal/benign',** and are attributed to a wide variety of <u>intentional</u> <u>and unintentional factors</u>.



For example: Unit conversion issues from Scribner Scale to Metric Scale





What are Trade Statistic Discrepancies

Discrepancies in trade statistics are generally termed as 'normal/benign', and are attributed to a wide variety of intentional and unintentional factors.

However, in some instances within the forest products sector, such discrepancies cannot be justified as 'normal', and can be associated with <u>systemic factors that distort the trade statistics</u>, including,

- I. illegal smuggling that avoids detection at the source country
- II. underreporting of export volumes
- III. misrepresenting product types and product volumes
- IV. misreporting of timber species



1st/11 4th/11 3rd/12 end/13

1/bu

China import statistics — Exporter export statistics

600000

40000 20000



What are Trade Statistic Discrepancies

Discrepancies in trade statistics are generally termed as 'normal/benign', and are attributed to a wide variety of intentional and unintentional factors.

However, in some instances within the forest products sector, such discrepancies cannot be justified as 'normal', and can be associated with systemic factors that distort the trade statistics, including,

- I. illegal smuggling that avoids detection at the source country,
- II. underreporting of export volumes,
- III. misrepresenting product types and product volumes
- IV. misreporting of timber species



Hardwood Lumber (m3): Ghana to China





How we calculated the discrepancies

To be able to calculate true data discrepancies, we factored in lag factors, transportation time.

- 1. We calculated a time lagged "new" export data X_{it}^* using Eq.(2) from ith country to China, which should equal the imports (M_{it}) reported by China for the same period from the same country.
- 2. Then we calculated the discrepancies using the logarithm of the ratio, as in equation 4.

$$l_{it} = \left(\frac{M_{it+1}}{M_{it}}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} - 1 \qquad (1) \quad \text{--- Lag factor}$$
$$X_{it}^* = X_{it} * (1 + l_{it}) \qquad (2)$$

The equation about discrepancies is,

Where, M_{it} is the imports reported by China from exporter i; X_{it} is exports reported by country i' to China; I represents export country; t represents quarter; T represents transportation time period in month.

Non-lagged discrepancies is represented in Eq.(3), according to M.J. Ferrantino et al.(2012).

$$D_{it} = \ln(\frac{M_{it}}{X_{it}}) = \ln(M_{it}) - \ln(X_{it})$$
 (3)

Then, we use the time lag factor to adjust the export data and the original transformed to Eq.(6).

$$D_{it} = \ln(M_{it}) - \ln(X_{it}^{*})$$
(4)

$$D_{it} = \ln(M_{it}) - \ln(X_{it} * (1 + l_{it}))$$
(5)

$$D_{it} = \ln(M_{it}) - \ln\left(X_{it} * \left(\frac{M_{it+1}}{M_{it}}\right)^{\frac{T}{3}}\right)$$
(6)



Some aspects of forest trade timeline







Discrepancies in Logs & Lumber trade statistics and its partner countries



Discrepancies in Logs & Lumber trade statistics and its partner countries







Discrepancies in Logs & Lumber tradeer for International Trade in Forest Products statistics and its partner countries



Discrepancies in trade statistics and center Structure in Forest Products partner countries





Discrepancies in Lumber trade statistic for some statistic and its partner countries



Impact of illegal wood in China on the US wood products industry and the US economy

USING COMPUTABLE GENERAL EQUILIBRIUM MODELING FRAMEWORK





Center for International Trade in Forest Products



The GTAP model builds off the core household, firm, factor markets and product markets by adding four main additional blocks:

- Firms. Allows for inter-industry trade and linkages.
- Government. Allows taxes and expenditures to affect other sectors.
- Rest-of-world. Allows for bilateral trade at the commodity/industry level and connects it to overall domestic demand and foreign production
- Global Bank. Allows for global savings and investment flows to balance each other globally, and intertemporal dynamics.



Impact on the US wood products industry





Based on preliminary data, it was modelled that illegal logs/lumber are anywhere between 20% to 50% cheaper than its legal counterpart.

Post-lacey act period has a beneficial impact on the US wood products industry for both logs and lumber. The positive impact on the lumber industry is more consistent.

Average annual loss in revenue



Can we conclude that legality legislations have resulted in saving the US forestry industry \$1 billion per year since 2008?



Thank you

Indroneil Ganguly Assistant Professor and Associate Director Center for International Trade in Forest Products University of Washington Box 352100 Seattle, WA 98195 E-mail: indro@uw.edu

