

RSC 2023/47
Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies
Global Governance Programme-510

WORKING PAPER

The import effects of the Entry Price System

Fabio Gaetano Santeramo, Victor Martinez-Gomez,
Laura Márquez-Ramos, Emilia Lamonaca

European University Institute

Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies

Global Governance Programme-510

The import effects of the Entry Price System

Fabio Gaetano Santeramo, Victor Martinez-Gomez,
Laura Márquez-Ramos, Emilia Lamonaca

RSC Working Paper 2023/47

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 (CC-BY 4.0) International license which governs the terms of access and reuse for this work.
If cited or quoted, reference should be made to the full name of the author(s), editor(s), the title, the series and number, the year and the publisher.

ISSN 1028-3625

© Fabio Gaetano Santeramo, Victor Martinez-Gomez, Laura Márquez-Ramos,
Emilia Lamonaca, 2023

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 (CC-BY 4.0) International license.

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>


Published in July 2023 by the European University Institute.
Badia Fiesolana, via dei Roccettini 9
I – 50014 San Domenico di Fiesole (FI)
Italy

Views expressed in this publication reflect the opinion of individual author(s) and not those of the European University Institute.

This publication is available in Open Access in Cadmus, the EUI Research Repository:

<https://cadmus.eui.eu>

www.eui.eu



The European Commission supports the EUI through the European Union budget. This publication reflects the views only of the author(s), and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies

The Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, created in 1992 and currently directed by Professor Erik Jones, aims to develop inter-disciplinary and comparative research on the major issues facing the process of European integration, European societies and Europe's place in 21st century global politics.

The Centre is home to a large post-doctoral programme and hosts major research programmes, projects and data sets, in addition to a range of working groups and ad hoc initiatives. The research agenda is organised around a set of core themes and is continuously evolving, reflecting the changing agenda of European integration, the expanding membership of the European Union, developments in Europe's neighbourhood and the wider world.

For more information: <http://eui.eu/rscas>

The EUI and the RSC are not responsible for the opinion expressed by the author(s).

The Global Governance Programme

The Global Governance Programme is one of the flagship programmes of the Robert Schuman Centre. It is a community of outstanding professors and scholars, that produces high quality research and engages with the world of practice through policy dialogue. Established and early-career scholars work on issues of global governance within and beyond academia, focusing on four broad and interdisciplinary areas: Global Economics, Europe in the World, Cultural Pluralism and Global Citizenship.

The Programme also aims to contribute to the fostering of present and future generations of policy and decision makers through its executive training programme: the Academy of Global Governance, where theory and 'real world' experience meet and where leading academics, top-level officials, heads of international organisations and senior executives discuss on topical issues relating to global governance.

For more information: <http://globalgovernanceprogramme.eui.eu>

Abstract

The complexity of the trade policy environment in the European fruit and vegetables (F&Vs) market is mostly due to the Entry Price System (EPS), a non-tariff measure that regulates imports. We investigate the trade effects of the EPS by estimating a structural gravity model of trade flows from major European suppliers of apples, lemons, oranges, peaches, pears, table grapes and tomatoes. We assess how imports react to EPS overshoots, difference between import price and entry price threshold, and to level and volatility in Standard Import Values (SIVs). The EPS limits imports of F&Vs, but differences exist across products. While the efficacy of the EPS is valid for all products, its effectiveness is greater for less perishable F&Vs.

Keywords

Non-tariff measure; Price dynamics; Trade dynamics; EU agriculture; Fruit and vegetables

Acknowledgements

The authors gratefully acknowledge the financial support from the Marie Skłodowska-Curie Individual Fellowship (ID 101031139), the AXA Research Fund (ID 5257), the Australian Research Council (DP190103524), the INTECO research group (PROMETEO2018/102), PID2020-114646RB-C42 funded by MCIN-AEI/10.13039/501100011033 (a project from the Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación, and Agencia Estatal de Investigación, Plan de Promoción de la Investigación de la Universitat Jaume I, UJI-B2022-36-(22I587), the “Cátedra de Estructuras Agrarias UPV” and the UPV research line "Socio-economic analysis of innovation in sustainable agri-food systems (SAS)".

The authors thank the Directorate-General for Agriculture and Rural Development (DG AGRI) for sharing data. The authors thank Kym Anderson, Charlotte Emlinger, Christopher Findlay, Jasmin Gröschl, Benedikt Heid, and participants at conferences (2017 IATRC Annual Meeting, Australasian Agricultural and Resource Economics Society (AARES) 2018 Annual Conference) for their valuable comments and suggestions on earlier drafts. The authors also acknowledge the excellent research assistance of Àlvar Franch Doñate, Xavier Le Berre Castillo, and Irene Maccarone.

1. Introduction

The reduction of tariffs, witnessed in the agri-food sector since the mid-1990s, has been balanced out by the proliferation of non-tariff measures (Martin 2018), particularly in policy-sensitive sectors such as fruit and vegetables (F&Vs). The complexity of the trade policy environment is particularly evident for the European F&V market: domestic production and trade are heavily regulated. Countries of the European Union (EU) are both major producers and top importers of F&Vs: in 2021, the EU accounted for 6% of world production and 35% of world imports. The EU imports of F&Vs are regulated by a complex system of interventions (e.g. Fiankor et al., 2019), among which the Entry Price System (EPS)—the efficacy of which has been called into question—deserves attention. This border protection mechanism sets a minimum price threshold for imported F&Vs, below which an extra duty is applied. The EPS is comparable to the import regime for the Japanese pork market, which is protected by domestic support, several border measures, and a Gate Price System (GPS). According to Bergen and Kawaguchi (2004), the GPS is the major obstacle to Japanese imports of pork. The EPS and the GPS are analogous in that both systems apply a charge determined by comparing the import values with a threshold price¹. However, the limited coverage of the GPS (applied only to pork imports) and the constant level of the price threshold in the GPS makes it possible to predict its effectiveness. The EPS, on the other hand, is more complex: it is applied to numerous products and combines quotas and seasonally varying entry prices. While the main function of the EPS is to act as a price stabiliser, by preventing imports of low-priced F&Vs, the EPS may contribute to shaping trade flows.

A specific strand of literature has examined the relevance and efficacy of the EPS in terms of price stabilisation and trade effects: the relevance of the EPS seems to vary across products, suppliers, and periods (e.g. Goetz and Grethe 2009; Emlinger et al. 2010); the ability of the EPS as price stabiliser is rather limited (e.g. Cioffi et al. 2011; Santeramo and Cioffi 2012); conversely, the impacts of the EPS on trade are still not well established, in part due to a lack of transparency of this mechanism of protection (e.g. Cioffi and dell'Aquila 2004). The trade effects have often been evaluated jointly with other trade policy phenomena, such as tariff protection (e.g. Emlinger et al. 2008), non-tariff measures (e.g. Kareem et al. 2017), and preferential agreements (Cardamone 2011), with conflicting conclusions. The existing evidence is highly dependent on the products and countries under study, and on the proxies used to capture the functioning of the EPS. In addition, previous studies have neglected the issue of endogeneity between the EPS and trade, which tends to lead to biased results: low Standard Import Values (SIVs)² activate the mechanism of protection and reduce imports, which in turn influences the process of determining the SIVs.

Our focus is primarily on quantifying the role of the EPS in shaping imports of F&Vs. We use monthly data on EU imports of seven products under the EPS (i.e. apples, lemons, oranges, peaches, pears, table grapes, tomatoes, selected according to their relevance for the EPS as established by Goetz and Grethe, 2009), originating from twelve non-EU trading countries; for them we collected daily SIVs to proxy their respective prices at the EU border. We adopt novel

¹ A detailed comparison between the EPS and the GPS is provided in the Online Supplementary Material (table S.1).

² The SIV is a synthetic import price calculated by the European Commission for each product and origin as the weighted average of prices collected in representative markets, reduced by a marketing margin and costs of transport and insurance within the customs territory. Details on the calculation of the SIV are specified in Commission Regulation (EC) No 3223/94.

indicators capable of capturing the functioning of the EPS and the dynamics of SIVs. More precisely, the indicators provide information on how long SIVs stay below the entry price (EP) threshold, on how distant the EP and SIVs are, and on the level and variability of the SIVs. The first two indices proxies cases in which the extra duty may have been applied to imports and allows us to quantify the trade effects of the EPS when it effectively works. The position of the distribution of the SIVs (i.e. the level of SIVs, that is the monthly average SIV) and its dispersion (i.e. the variability of SIVs, that is the relative difference between the monthly mean and median SIV) is informative on the likelihood of observing SIVs below the EP, and allow us to quantify, in terms of trade values, the impact of potential strategic behaviour of suppliers that may temporarily reduce imports to circumvent tariffs imposed by the EPS. The empirical specification, a gravity-based model, controls for the functioning of the EPS, as well as for omitted variables bias, the endogeneity of the mechanism of protection, and heteroskedasticity.

Our contribution is twofold: first, we quantify and compare the impacts of the EPS for a large set of countries and products, so as to complement the existing strand of literature based on product- and country-specific studies; second, we emphasise how the statistics of the SIVs may provide information on the effects of the EPS.

Our research allows us to draw conclusions regarding the trade effects of applying extra duties and the potential strategic behaviour of suppliers attempting to circumvent higher tariffs (e.g. Cioffi and dell'Aquila 2004; Santeramo and Cioffi 2012). In addition, our findings open the path for building a synthetic and simple price index to infer on the efficacy/effectiveness of restrictive trade regimes.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we review the existing evidence on the EPS that is related to our research. In Section 3, we explain the estimation process, introducing the theoretical framework, the empirical setting, and describing the data used. In section 4, we present and discuss the results obtained. Lastly, in Section 5, we conclude and discuss the policy implications of our findings.

2. Existing evidence on the Entry Price System

Early studies on the EPS have analysed its functioning (e.g. Swinbank and Ritson 1995; Grethe and Tangermann 1999) and highlighted its flexibility and lesser degree of protectiveness as compared to its predecessor, the Reference Price System³.

Goetz and Grethe (2009) have examined the impact of the EPS on the 15 products under the EPS, concluding that the mechanism of protection has the greatest influence on artichokes, courgettes, cucumbers, lemons, plums, and tomatoes, and on the origin countries closest to the EU. Similar assessments of the EPS have been carried out by Cioffi and dell'Aquila (2004), focusing on apples, oranges, and tomatoes from countries of the Southern Hemisphere, and

³ Introduced in the first Common Market Organization (CMO) of F&Vs in 1972, the Reference Price System worked as minimum import prices: imports from specific non-EU countries were subject to the payment of an extra duty, if the import price of their products fell below the reference prices (Cioffi and dell'Aquila, 2004). When countervailing charges began to be applied on a product from a country, they increased as long as import flows tended to disappear, to detriment of extra-EU exporters (Swinbank and Ritson, 1995).

by Goetz and Grethe (2010) on pears and apples from China. To sum up, the influence of the EPS varies on a case-by-case basis and, as recently demonstrated (e.g. Romdhani and Thabet, 2017), its effects are concentrated in specific periods.

As for the role of the EPS in price stabilisation, i.e. the main function of the mechanism of protection, the report by Agrosynergie (2008) concludes that the EPS acts as a stabiliser in certain cases (i.e. tomatoes from Morocco, apples from China, lemons from Turkey). Similarly, Cioffi et al. (2011) and Santeramo and Cioffi (2012) conclude that the EPS has limited price stabilisation effects. It contributes to make F&Vs markets more efficient than the neighbouring markets of F&Vs subject, for instance, to seasonal tariff rate quotas (e.g. Hillen, 2019; Loginova et al., 2021).

The role of the EPS in trade flows, a side effect of the EPS, has been analysed as well. García-Álvarez-Coque et al. (2010) assess the trade effects of phasing out the supplementary tariff related to the entry price (EP) for tomatoes, cucumbers, clementines and table grapes, and conclude that the EPS has an effect only in specific periods and for few products: eliminating the EPS would increase exports of clementines (in December), Moroccan exports of cucumbers (in March and November) and tomatoes (from November to May). Similarly, the analysis by Agrosynergie (2008) on tomatoes, cucumbers, table grapes, and clementines reveals that the trade effects are limited to few months and products (e.g. November for tomatoes).

Emlinger et al. (2008) use a gravity-based approach to evaluate the sensitiveness to the EU tariffs of F&Vs exports from Mediterranean countries. They find that for products under the EPS, the tariffs hinder exports from Mediterranean countries, with heterogeneous impacts across exporters and periods of the year: Israel is more sensitive than Morocco to tariffs, Turkey is not sensitive to tariffs, Egypt is sensitive to tariffs only between March and October. A limitation of the study is that it does not disentangle the effects of the EPS from those of the tariffs. Cardamone (2011) assesses the effect of different preferential trade agreements granted by the EU on imports of fresh grapes, pears, apples, oranges and mandarins, showing that the preferential EP has a positive effect on imports of oranges, but is not relevant for the other products. Kareem et al. (2017) investigate the impact of pesticide standards and of the EPS on African exports of tomatoes, oranges, limes and lemons, and show that the EPS reduces the extensive margin of trade for tomatoes, but has no effect on trade of oranges, limes, and lemons. Table A.1 in the Appendix A summarises main findings of previous studies on the relevance of the EPS and its effects on price stabilisation and trade flows.

To sum up, while the existing literature agrees on the heterogeneous relevance of the EPS across products and exporters, and on the limited ability of the EPS to act as price stabiliser, current knowledge on the trade impacts of the EPS seems limited to few product- and country-specific cases, with contrasting evidence. For instance, Cardamone (2011) suggests the relevance of the EPS for trade of oranges, in contrast to Kareem et al. (2017), who find no effects for the same product. It is plausible that the inference regarding the trade effects may be influenced by the type (and pros and cons) of the proxies used for the EPS. For instance, a dummy variable can capture the existence of preferential EP (e.g. Cardamone 2011), but does not provide information about cases in which the mechanism of protection effectively works; the gap between SIVs and the EP (e.g. Kareem et al. 2017) captures the accumulation

of SIVs slightly below the EP, but cannot explain the dynamics of prices over time; the tariffication⁴ of the EPS (e.g. Emlinger et al. 2008) does not capture the pricing behaviour of exporters.

A further limitation of the literature on trade effects of the EPS is that it does not take into account the issue of endogeneity between SIVs and imports. Trefler (1993) argues that treating a mechanism of protection as exogenous tends to bias the estimated impacts on imports. In the EPS, low SIVs activate the mechanism of protection and reduce imports, which in turn influences the price determination process of the SIVs: as a result, imports and SIVs are likely to be endogenous, a characteristic that we recognise and model in our empirical analysis.

3. Estimating the trade effects of the Entry Price System

3.1 Theoretical framework

Evaluations of trade policy measures frequently rely on gravity models, which explain how bilateral trade reacts to changes in income, country-specific characteristics of importers and exporters, and country-pair specific determinants of trade (Mayer et al. 2019). In line with Peterson et al. (2013) who assess the impact of phytosanitary measures on imports of F&Vs, we use a product-level gravity model to evaluate how the EPS affects F&Vs imports of the EU countries (i) from non-EU countries (j)⁵. We assume that all varieties of each k -th F&V are differentiated by their destination and source (i and j) and are imperfect substitutes. Accordingly, consumer preferences in i are weakly separable and can be represented by

a Constant Elasticity of Substitution (CES) function $\sum_j \left\{ \alpha_{jk}^{\frac{1-\sigma_k}{\sigma_k}} c_{ijk}^{\frac{\sigma_k-1}{\sigma_k}} \right\}^{\frac{\sigma_k}{\sigma_k-1}}$, where $\alpha_{jk} > 0$ is the exogenous CES preference parameter, $\sigma_k > 1$ is the elasticity of substitution between all varieties of each k , c_{ijk} is the consumption of varieties from j in i . We also assume perfect competition among all varieties in i and j (i.e. prices are marginal cost of production). The total expenditure in i is equal to the total spending on varieties from all countries $E_{ik} = \sum_j p_{ijk} c_{ijk}$, where $p_{ijk} = p_{jk} \theta_{ijk}$ are delivered prices depending on prices in the country of origin (p_{jk}) and bilateral trade costs ($\theta_{ijk} > 1$). The structural form of the gravity model is as follows⁶:

$$X_{ijk} = \frac{E_{ik}}{\Phi_{ik}^{1-\sigma_k}} \frac{Y_{jk}/Y}{\Omega_{jk}^{1-\sigma_k}} \theta_{ijk}^{1-\sigma_k} \quad (1)$$

where the i -th imports of k from j (X_{ijk}) depend on the i -th total expenditure on k (E_{ik} , defined as above), the j -th value of production of k (i.e., the total expenditure on j 's outputs of product k in all countries in the world, including j itself, $Y_{jk} = \sum_l X_{ljk} \forall i$) divided by the total value of

⁴ The tariffication is the conversion of all existing non-tariff barriers to trade into bound tariffs.

⁵ The motivation for treating trade as a country decision, that aggregate the economic decisions of heterogeneous firms in that country, has a theoretical foundation in the model of international trade in differentiated products in which firms face fixed and variable trade costs developed by Helpman et al. (2008). They argue that, since only the more productive firms find it profitable to export, trade flows from a country aggregate exports over heterogeneous firms. Accordingly, trade flows aggregated at the country level predict the selection of heterogeneous firms into export markets and their associated aggregate trade flows.


⁶ Time period (t) subscript is initially suppressed for ease of notation.

output (Y), the relative price indices in i ($\Phi_{ik}^{1-\sigma_k}$) and j ($\Omega_{jk}^{1-\sigma_k}$), and bilateral trade costs ($\theta_{ijk}^{1-\sigma_k}$). The terms $\Phi_{ik}^{1-\sigma_k}$ and $\Omega_{jk}^{1-\sigma_k}$ are based on market clearing conditions for each k and proxy multilateral resistances (Anderson and van Wincoop, 2003). The term $\theta_{ijk}^{1-\sigma_k}$ captures time-invariant (e.g. distance, common language, contiguity) and time-varying (e.g. product-specific trade policy measures, such as the EPS) country-pair determinants of trade.

The relationship between protection and imports may be endogenously determined (Trefler 1993; Santeramo and Lamonaca, 2022a; b): low SIVs for a certain product activate the mechanism of protection and reduce imports of that product, which in turn influences the price determination process of the SIVs for that product. Let us assume that the EU countries are price setters while non-EU countries are price takers, and the daily process of price determination in the EU market for a certain product under the EPS occurs as shown in figure 1. The EU daily domestic supply for that product (S^{EU}) is complemented by the import supply of the same product (IMP^{EU}). The EU sets a threshold entry price (EP) for that product that serves as a benchmark to establish the duty to levy on the imports of the product according to their price, the SIV. The EP, set by the EU, is a minimum import price, varying according to seasonality, product, and origin. Product- and origin-specific SIVs, a proxy of import prices, are computed daily by the European Commission (EC). The SIV is an index built as weighted average of representative prices, collected from the EU import markets. For the specific product, when the SIVs are above the EP, the EU applies an *ad valorem* duty (i.e. the specific duty provided in the EU's list of concessions to the WTO). When SIVs are lower than the EP, the EU applies an extra duty, that is the difference between the EP and the SIV: for instance, if the SIV is 2, 4, 6 or 8% lower than the EP, the specific customs quota duty shall be equal respectively to 2, 4, 6 or 8% of the EP. When SIVs fall below 92% of the EP, the extra duty is augmented to the maximum tariff equivalent (MTE): i.e. the specific customs duty bound within the WTO shall apply.

The mechanism of protection is activated by the dynamics of SIVs, which are determined by the level of imports. However, the level of imports depends on the dynamics of SIVs, whose position with respect to the EP may trigger the mechanism of protection.

Figure 1. The daily import price determination process for a generic product under the Entry Price System




Notes: Acronyms are domestic demand (D^{EU}), domestic supply (S^{EU}), imported supply (IMP^{EU}), entry price (EP), Standard Import Value (SIV).

3.2 Indexes capturing the functioning of the Entry Price System

The existing literature has proposed several approaches to investigate the functioning of the EPS⁷. Emlinger et al. (2008, 2010) and Kareem et al. (2017) consider specific duties of the EPS and compute a global measure of tariff protection, without focusing on the pricing strategies of exporters. Agrosynergie (2008) and Cardamone (2011) use dummy variables to model the EPS, hence focusing on the relevance of the system, rather than on its effectiveness and efficacy. Goetz and Grethe (2009, 2010) and García Álvarez-Coque et al. (2010) compute the shares of negative gaps, defined as the difference between the SIV and the EP, and draw conclusions regarding the relevance of the EPS, and the accumulation of SIVs (closely) above the EP. Kareem et al. (2017) also focus on gaps to examine the pricing strategies of exporters. We complement the existing literature, proposing four indicators based on the empirical distribution of SIVs, to draw conclusions about the functioning of the EPS (figure 2). Following the standard approach of assuming prices to be log-normally distributed with positive skewness, the first and the second moment of the distribution are enough to characterise the entire distribution of the SIVs (Goodwin and Ker 2002). As a result, the four (importer-product-specific) indicators computed are (i) the overshoot index, i.e. the sum of days in a month in which the SIVs are below the EP, (ii) the distance index, i.e. the distance between the EP and SIVs when SIVs are below or equal to the EP⁸, (iii) the position index, i.e. the mean of the empirical distribution of the SIVs (monthly average SIV), and (iv) the dispersion index, i.e. the standard deviation of the empirical distribution of the SIVs (relative difference between the monthly mean and median SIV).

Figure 2. Three indexes to capture the functioning of the Entry Price System



Notes: Acronyms are Standard Import Value (SIV) and entry price (EP).

⁷ The indicators that have been adopted in recent empirical studies are summarised in table B.1 of the Appendix B.

⁸ This indicator measures the deviation between the monthly EP and the monthly average SIV, when SIVs are below or equal to the EP at least once in a month.

Firms in non-EU countries export their F&Vs subject to quotas and duties. The extra duty (or MTE) is applied when the SIVs of the traded F&Vs fall below the EP (or 92% of the EP). The four indicators mimic the precise functioning of the EPS. The overshoot index represents a proxy of the number of days in which the extra duty may have been applied to imports of the product. The distance between the EP and SIVs if SIVs are below or equal to the EP further capture the effect of the mechanism of protection when it works: it is referred to the potential deterrence mechanism of the EPS⁹. The expectation is that imports tend to be limited when the extra duty (or MTE) is applied; thus, frequent overshoots and larger distance between the EP and SIVs should lower the imports. The position and dispersion of SIVs are referred to the general behaviour of SIVs. The position index provides information on the likelihood of observing SIVs below the EP for a certain product: our approach extends that adopted by Cioffi and dell'Aquila (2004) who describe the daily distribution of SIVs compared with the EP. The higher the level of SIVs, the higher the likelihood that SIVs are above the EP and the extra duty is avoided to the benefit of imports. The dispersion index provides information on the variability of the product-specific distribution of SIVs: *ceteris paribus*, the higher the variability, the higher the likelihood of observing SIVs below the EP and the extra duty applied to the detriment of imports.

3.3 Empirical setting

Model (1) is estimated in its log-linearised form:

$$X_{ijk,t} = e^{\frac{E_{ik}}{\Phi_{ik}^{1-\sigma_k}} \frac{Y_{jk}/Y}{\Omega_{jk}^{1-\sigma_k}} \theta_{ijk}^{1-\sigma_k} \{\beta_{ikt} + \beta_{jkt} + \beta_{ijk} + EPS'_{ijk,t} \delta\}} \eta_{ijk,t} \quad (2)$$

where the dependent variable is the value of the i -th imports of k from j in a period ($X_{ijk,t}$).

We include importer-product-time and exporter-product-time fixed effects (β_{ikt} and β_{jkt}) to proxy multilateral resistances in the importing and exporting countries (Yotov et al., 2016): they remove cross-section and time series correlation (Baldwin and Taglioni 2006). Country-pair fixed effects at the product level (β_{ijk}) capture time-invariant determinants of trade (e.g. distance, common language, contiguity) and do not prevent the estimation of the effects of time-varying bilateral trade policies (Egger and Nigai, 2015). The use of country-pair fixed effects also allows us to circumvent the endogeneity problems since they account for unobservable relationships between covariates proxying the endogenous trade policy (i.e. overshoot, distance, position and dispersion indices) and the error term (Baier and Bergstrand, 2007).

The variable of interest (in log) proxying the functioning of the EPS ($EPS'_{ijk,t}$)¹⁰ is, alternately, the overshoot, the distance, the position and the dispersion indices. In particular, we use (i) the number of days in a month in which SIVs are below the EP (' $SIV < EP$ ') as overshoot index, (ii) the distance between 92% of EP and monthly average SIVs if SIVs are below or equal to

⁹ The EPS deters low priced imports from main EU partner countries, as explained in Santeramo and Cioffi (2012).

¹⁰ Note that the EP is product-specific and does not vary across origins and destinations, SIVs are product- and origin-specific but do not vary across EU countries.

the EP as distance index, (iii) the monthly average (\overline{SIV}) of the empirical distribution of SIVs as position index, and (iv) the relative difference between the monthly mean and median of the SIVs ($\frac{\overline{SIV} - Me(SIV)}{\overline{SIV}}$) as dispersion index. The vector δ contains the parameters of interest, while $\eta_{ijk,t}$ stands for an error term assumed to be independently and identically distributed.

Equation (2) allows us to establish the overall protectionist effect on imports of the EPS when the mechanism of protection is triggered. We also perform product-specific analyses to identify potential heterogeneity in trade effects: in particular, we interact the explanatory variables with specific dummies that consider each product. All specifications are estimated using the Poisson Pseudo-Maximum-Likelihood (PPML) estimator, which is robust to heteroskedastic errors and provides a natural way to deal with zeros in trade data (Silva and Tenreyro, 2006). We compute the trade volume effects for indices proxying the functioning of the EPS and the associated change in the average import values. The interpretation of the estimate of the coefficient on the logarithm of the indices (δ) is the elasticity of the value of imports with respect to the indices (Yotov et al., 2016).

3.3.1 Robustness check

To test if the use of country-pair fixed effects properly accounts for potential reverse causality between imports and indices used to proxy the functioning of the EPS, we add forwarded variables, $EPS'_{ijk,t+3}$ (Baier and Bergstrand, 2007). In the absence of reverse causality, the parameter associated with the forwarded variables should be statistically not different from zero.

To further address the endogeneity issue, we follow the approach used by Trefler (1993) and estimate the following equations:

$$EPS'_{ijk,t} = e^{\{\beta_{it} + \beta_{jt} + \beta_{ij} + \beta_{kt} + X_{ijk,t}\gamma\}} \varepsilon_{ijk,t} \quad (3.1)$$

and

$$X_{ijk,t} = e^{\left\{ \frac{E_{ik}}{\Phi_{ik}^{1-\rho}} \frac{Y_{jk}}{\Omega_{jk}} \frac{\theta_{ijk}^{1-\rho}}{\overline{EPS'_{ijk,t} \delta}} \right\}} \eta_{ijk,t} \quad (3.2)$$

Equation (3.1) captures the effects of imports on the functioning of the EPS: indicators based on the empirical distribution of SIVs ($EPS'_{ijk,t}$) are regressed against time-varying importer, exporter, and product fixed effects (β_{it} , β_{jt} , and β_{kt}), time-invariant country-pair fixed effects (β_{ij}), and bilateral imports (X_{ijk}). The regressors control for the strategic trading decisions made by importers (e.g. to avoid imports of low-priced F&Vs) and exporters (e.g. to circumvent EPS duties), for product characteristics (e.g. perishability, seasonality), and for country-pair factors (e.g. quotas, preferential EP, trade agreements).

Equation (3.2) captures the effects of the functioning of the EPS on imports: imports ($X_{ijk,t}$) are a function of time-varying importer and exporter fixed effects (β_{it} and β_{jt}), and time-invariant country-pair fixed effects (β_{ij}). The vectors δ and γ contain the parameters of interest, whereas $\varepsilon_{ijk,t}$ and $\eta_{ijk,t}$ are error terms. In the absence of reverse causality, results of this specification should be comparable to results of the baseline model (equation 2).

To test the robustness of our indicators, we use additional variables proxying the functioning of the EPS. To complement the indicator on the distance between EP and SIVs, we also control for the effect of the distance between monthly average SIVs and 92% of EP if SIVs are above the EP. The proxies for the position index are monthly average (\overline{SIV} , the baseline), monthly median value ($Me(SIV)$), and monthly minimum value ($Min\{SIV\}$). The rationale is that the higher the average (or median or minimum), the higher the likelihood that the SIVs are above the EP. The proxies for the dispersion index are the relative difference between the mean and the median ($\frac{\overline{SIV}-Me(SIV)}{\overline{SIV}}$, the baseline), between the mean and the minimum ($\frac{\overline{SIV}-Min\{SIV\}}{\overline{SIV}}$), and between the median and the minimum ($\frac{Me(SIV)-Min\{SIV\}}{Me(SIV)}$). The second and third dispersion indexes are more variable due to their dependence on extreme values of the distribution.

3.4 Data description

We compiled a rich dataset comprising monthly data, from January 2000 to December 2019, for seven out of fifteen F&Vs covered by the EPS, originating in twelve exporting countries in the world. As also done in Cardamone (2011), we use monthly data in order to account for seasonality. Goetz and Grethe (2009) found a heterogeneous relevance of the EPS among products and countries of origin: on the basis of their findings, we selected F&Vs with high (i.e. lemons and tomatoes), medium (i.e. apples and pears), and low (i.e. oranges, peaches, and table grapes) relevance. The selected exporters are direct competitors of the EU domestic producers (Cioffi and dell'Aquila 2004): we consider Southern Mediterranean countries (i.e. Egypt, Israel, Morocco, Tunisia, Turkey), exporters of the Southern Hemisphere (i.e. Argentina, Brazil, Chile, New Zealand, South Africa, Uruguay), and the top global producer of F&Vs (i.e. China). By adopting a wide-ranging set of suppliers, we are able to gain a deeper understanding of the functioning of the EPS: the majority of previous studies on the trade effects of the EPS focus on few countries, such as Southern Mediterranean countries (Emlinger et al. 2008), or African countries (Kareem et al. 2017).

Monthly trade data are collected from ComExt and refer to F&Vs imports of five EU countries (i.e. France, Germany, Italy, Spain, United Kingdom) from the selected exporting countries¹¹. We work at the six-digit level of the Harmonised System classification (HS 6-digit), an aggregation level detailed enough to keep variance among groups of products (Disdier et al., 2008): in particular, we focus on imports of 'Vegetables; tomatoes, fresh or chilled' (HS 1996: 070200), 'Fruit, edible; oranges, fresh or dried' (HS 1996: 080510), 'Fruit, edible; lemons (Citrus limon, Citrus limonum) limes (Citrus aurantifolia, Citrus latifolia), fresh or dried' (HS 1996: 080550), 'Fruit, edible; grapes, fresh' (HS 1996: 080610), 'Fruit, edible; apples, fresh' (HS 1996: 080810), 'Fruit, edible; pears, fresh' (HS 1996: 080830), 'Fruit, edible; peaches, including nectarines, fresh' (HS 1996: 080930).

Bilateral trade data are combined with data on monthly EP and daily SIVs for each product originating in each exporting country. Using daily data on SIVs, we constructed monthly average, median, and minimum values for SIVs to study the relationship between imports and the trends observed in the SIVs¹². The monthly frequency of data in the final dataset is coherent

¹¹ Although the EPS is defined at the EU level, we account for five EU country separately in order to consider differences in the magnitude of import flows for each product originating in each exporting country.

¹² Although daily SIVs are correlated (Cioffi et al., 2011), the focus of this analysis is not on the structure of prices but on the positioning of prices with respect to the EP, that is correlated with the application of the extra duty.

with the shipping decisions of firms which can take several days and can be adjusted as a reaction to the potential application of the extra duty (or MTE) implied by the EPS.

The descriptive statistics (i.e., mean and standard deviation) for the main variables are presented in table C.1 of the Appendix C.

4. Results and discussion

4.1 Overall effect

The results of the PPML estimation of the gravity equation are reported in table 1. They are robust to the use of different estimators: we estimate the gravity equation in (2) through least squares. The results show that the OLS and the PPML estimates are similar in terms of signs and statistical significance (table S.2 in the Online Supplementary Material).

The overshoot index has a negative effect on imports: the more the days in which SIVs are below the EP, the lower the imports. For instance, a 100 percent increase in the number of days in which SIVs are below the EP (say from 1 to 2 days) should be accompanied by a 15 percent reduction in the value of imports (say from 1,240 mln € to 1,054 mln € on average). The EPS acts as a barrier to F&Vs imports from non-EU countries when it effectively works, that is when SIVs falls below the EP (92% of EP) and the extra duty (maximum tariff equivalent) is applied. In fact, the coefficient estimated for the distance between 92% of EP and monthly average SIVs, if SIVs are below or equal to the EP, implies that a 10 percent increase in distance decreases import values by 4 percent (-50 mln € on average). Differently, when SIVs are above the EP thus when the mechanism of protection is not triggered, import values benefit of a 1 percent increase (+12 mln € on average) for a 10 percent increase in the distance between monthly average SIVs and 92% of EP. The position and dispersion indexes, referred to the general behaviour of SIVs, tend to be not correlated with trade flows.

Table 1. Standard import values (SIVs) below entry price (EP) reduce imports; imports increase with higher level of SIVs and decrease with variable SIVs

Variables	Overshoot index	Distance 92% of EP – SIV	Distance SIV – 92% of EP	Position index	Dispersion index
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
EPS	-0.1498*** (0.0459)	-0.3528*** (0.0412)	0.1406** (0.0550)	0.1821 (0.1938)	-1.1801 (1.0386)
Observations	10,007	10,007	10,007	10,007	10,007

Notes: Poisson Pseudo-Maximum-Likelihood (PPML) estimation of the gravity equation in (2). The dependent variable is value of imports. The explanatory variables of interest (in log) are, alternatively, the number of days in a month in which SIVs are below the EP (A), the distance between 92% of EP and monthly average SIVs if SIVs are below or equal to the EP (B), the distance between monthly average SIVs and 92% of EP if SIVs are above the EP (C), the monthly average SIVs (D), the relative difference between the monthly mean and median SIVs (E). All specifications include a constant, importer-product-time, exporter-product-time, and country-pair-product fixed effects. Robust standard errors are in parentheses.

*** indicates statistical significance at 1%.

** indicates statistical significance at 5%.

* indicates statistical significance at 10%.

4.1.1 Sensitivity analyses

Sensitivity analyses¹³ are performed to control if the use of country-pair fixed effects in the gravity equation properly account for the endogeneity between imports and the mechanism of protection (Baier and Bergstrand, 2007). The results confirm the absence of reverse causality between imports and indices proxying the functioning of the EPS (tables S.3-S.5 in the Online Supplementary Material). Our results are in line with Trefler (1993), who suggests that treating mechanisms of protection as exogenously set policy instruments yields downward-biased estimates of the impact of protection on imports.

To draw conclusions regarding the overall effect on imports of the EPS, and regarding the protectionist effect on imports, when the EPS is triggered, we simultaneously estimate the EPS equation in (3.1) and the import equation in (3.2) by including separately the number of overshoots and, alternatively, the indexes of position and dispersion (tables S.6 and S.7 in the Online Supplementary Material). The overshoots reduce imports: a 1 percent increase in the number of days in which SIVs are below the EP reduces imports by 0.3 percent. By interacting the indexes with the number of overshoots, we find lower estimates: a 1 percent increase in average SIVs increases imports by 0.015 percent. When the analysis is not controlling for the number of overshoots, the equivalent increase is 1.059 percent. Similarly, the higher the variability of SIVs, the lower the imports: the equivalent marginal reduction is 9 percent by interacting the indexes with the number of overshoots, and 19 percent without interaction term.

Our results are robust to different econometric specifications that control for alternative measures of the level and the variability of SIVs (tables S.6-S.11 in the Online Supplementary Material). The greatest coefficients are estimated for the position indices proxied by minimum SIV: it is plausible to suppose that the higher the minimum value of SIVs, the higher the likelihood that SIVs will be above the EP. The greatest impacts are found for the dispersion index computed as relative difference between the mean and the median. Notably, the relative difference between the mean and median is a better proxy for skewness than the dispersion index computed as relative difference between the mean and minimum: the larger the difference between average and median SIVs, the greater the likelihood of having imports. Higher values for the dispersion indices indicate higher volatility of SIVs, which are more likely to fall below the EP.

To control for seasonality, in a sensitivity analysis we introduce country-pair-product-month fixed effects. The results confirm the baseline results (table S.12 in the Online Supplementary Material).

4.2 Product-specific effects

The results of analyses by products, reported in tables 2 (estimation results) and 3 (trade volume effects and change in average import values), show the regularity of the trade effects of the EPS although with different magnitude across products.

¹³ Sensitivity analyses are run on a sample covering the period between 2000 and 2014.

Table 2. Product-specific analysis: Standard import values (SIVs) lower than entry price (EP) reduce import values

Variables	Overshoot index (A)	Distance index (B)	Position index (C)	Dispersion index (D)
Apples	-0.732*** (0.00063)	-1.114*** (0.00605)	-0.456*** (0.00058)	1.358*** (0.00204)
Lemons	0.130*** (0.00081)	-1.248*** (0.00143)	1.597*** (0.00089)	0.716*** (0.00069)
Pears	-0.692*** (0.00365)	-1.426*** (0.02250)	-0.554*** (0.00376)	-5.843*** (0.01430)
Oranges	-0.566*** (0.00006)	0.787*** (0.00085)	-1.019*** (0.00022)	0.335*** (0.00102)
Table grapes	-3.371*** (0.00200)	-0.734*** (0.00049)	1.918*** (0.00092)	-0.0372*** (0.00099)
Tomatoes	-0.192*** (0.00194)	-0.322*** (0.00005)	-0.0387*** (0.00021)	-1.932*** (0.00669)
Observations	10,001	10,001	10,001	10,001

Notes: Poisson Pseudo-Maximum-Likelihood (PPML) estimation of the gravity equation in (2). The dependent variable is value of imports. The explanatory variables of interest (interacted with a product-specific dummy) are, alternatively, the log number of days in a month in which SIVs are below the EP (A), the log distance between 92% of EP and monthly average SIVs if SIVs are below or equal to the EP (B), the log monthly average SIVs (C), the log relative difference between the monthly mean and median SIVs (D). All specifications include a constant, importer-product-time, exporter-product-time, and country-pair-product fixed effects. Robust standard errors of the order of 10^{-12} are in parentheses.

*** indicates statistical significance at 1%.

Table 3. Trade volume effect and change in average import values

Product	Perishability (months)	Avg imports (mln €)	Overshoot index	Distance index	Position index	Dispersion index
			SIV < EP (+1 day)	92% of EP – SIV (+10%)	Avg SIV (+10%)	(Avg–Me) / Avg SIV (+10%)
F&Vs		1,240	-15%; -186 mln €	-4%; -50 mln €	0%; 0 mln €	0%; 0 mln €
Apples	12	1,270	-73%; -927 mln €	-11%; -140 mln €	-5%; -64 mln €	+14%; +178 mln €
Lemons	6	617	+13%; +80 mln €	-12%; -74 mln €	+16%; +99 mln €	+7%; +43 mln €
Pears	3-6	411	-69%; -284 mln €	-14%; -58 mln €	-5%; -21 mln €	-58%; -238 mln €
Oranges	3	503	-57%; -287 mln €	+8%; +40 mln €	-10%; -50 mln €	+3%; +15 mln €
Table grapes	0.5-1	858	-337%; -2,891 mln €	-7%; -60 mln €	+19%; +163 mln €	-0.4%; -3 mln €
Tomatoes	1.5	3,185	-19%; -605 mln €	-3%; -96 mln €	-0.4%; -13 mln €	-19%; -605 mln €

Notes: Perishability based on shelf-life at the optimum storage conditions (by temperature or controlled atmosphere) (Gross et al., 2016).

The coefficients estimated for the overshoot index are negative in all but one case (lemons, for which imports are positively correlated with the regressor). Put differently, in all but one specific case, the higher the number of days in which SIVs are low (below the trigger EP), the lower the imports of F&Vs from non-EU countries. The EPS is relevant for apples, pears, oranges, and tomatoes, but table grapes is the most affected with a 337% reduction in the value of imports (-2,891 mln € on average). When the mechanism of protection is triggered, that is when SIVs falls below the 92% of EP, import values of products tend to be hindered: the greater the distance between 92% of EP and monthly average SIVs, the lower the imports. The most and less impacted products are respectively apples (-140 mln € on average) and pears (-58 mln € on average), whereas oranges are favoured +40 mln € on average). Our results are in line with Goetz and Grethe (2009), who highlight the relevance of the EPS for apples and pears. However, our results differ from the evidence provided by Cioffi and dell'Aquila (2004), who find no relevance of the EPS for oranges, and support the findings of Cardamone (2011), who suggest a positive effect of the EPS on imports of oranges. The divergences are partly due to the differences in the methodological approaches: Cioffi and dell'Aquila (2004) limit their analysis to descriptive statistics and conclude that the EPS is not effective for oranges as the imports occur in periods in which the EPS is not working (late spring and summer).

Besides the general tendency in the behaviour of SIVs (see table 1), products have different responses to higher (lower) level and variability of the SIVs (i.e. position and dispersion indices). We observe that higher variability of SIVs does not impede imports of less perishable F&Vs. For instance, imports of apples and lemons increase, respectively, by 14% (+178 mln € on average) and 7% (+43 mln € on average) for a 10% increase in the dispersion index. Our findings are in line with previous studies: Emlinger et al. (2008, 2010) suggest that the relevance of the EPS depends on the perishability of the products in question. These patterns point to the existence of strategic behaviour: when the SIVs are below the EP, importers may delay imports of less perishable F&Vs until SIVs once again rise above the EP, a strategy that deprives the EPS of its efficacy (Goetz and Grethe 2009; Cioffi et al. 2011). The rationale is that when the SIVs are more variable tend to be below the EP only for a few periods, as compared to the SIVs that are less variable. The strategic behaviour of exporters would consist in storing products when the SIV is below the EP and market them when SIV is again above the EP. Such a strategic behaviour is feasible only for low perishable products and for distant countries. In support of this rationale, we found that the overshoot index is negatively correlated with the importer-exporter-distance and with low or medium perishable products (table S.13, figure S.1 in the Online Supplementary Material): SIVs of storable F&Vs and of products from distant countries tend to be durably above the EP, thus systematically avoiding levying the extra-duty.

To sum up, the results reveal the efficacy of the mechanism of protection. The EPS is a barrier to trade of F&Vs: imports tend to decrease when SIVs are below the EP and the effects are observed on imports of most of F&Vs. While the EPS is able to accomplish its protection aim for all F&Vs, its efficacy is more evident for products characterised by low perishability.

5. Concluding remarks and policy implications

The European fruit and vegetables (F&Vs) market is governed by a complex and widely debated set of regulations. In particular, the Entry Price System (EPS), which attempts to control imports by setting a minimum price for imported goods, has been under the spotlight due to its doubtful effectiveness in limiting trade and stabilising the domestic market. The intervention requires daily monitoring of the SIVs in representative markets: this procedure makes the EPS expensive, complex, and of questionable usefulness (Goetz and Grethe 2009; Santeramo and Cioffi 2012). We investigated the extent to which the EPS affects imports of F&Vs from major suppliers, focusing on novel indicators: the overshoot, the distance, the position, and the dispersion indices.

We found the EPS to be an effective trade barrier that contributes to limit imports of F&Vs. On average, for each day of overshoot (i.e. Standard Import Values –SIVs– below the entry price –EP–), imports decrease by 15 percent (-186 mln €). The imports of less perishable F&Vs (e.g. apples, pears, and lemons) are the most affected by variable SIVs. It is plausible that less perishable products are traded in longer distances and countries in longer distances may have less preferences, boosting the effects of the mechanism. More distant countries are also developing economies whose agricultural exports tend to be highly affected by duties (Emlinger and Guimbar, 2021). The negative relationships we found between imports and the variability of SIVs suggest that suppliers may tend to adopt strategic behaviours in order to (temporarily) reduce imports, until SIVs once again rise above the threshold EP. While these strategies have been hypothesised in previous studies (García Álvarez-Coque et al. 2010; Cioffi et al. 2011), our analysis quantifies their impact in terms of trade values. In addition, the use of a novel approach opens the path for building a synthetic and simple price index, based on the moments of price distribution, that would be useful to infer on the efficacy/effectiveness of restrictive trade regimes.

The barrier effect of the EPS for imports of F&Vs, revealed by our analysis, calls attention to the effectiveness of this measure and the usefulness of keeping it in force. This is particularly relevant for regional trade negotiations involving the EU. Our findings support the bilateral negotiations of agricultural trade preferences. Many more procedures and barriers that hinder trade among countries persist in agri-food than in manufacturing sectors (e.g. Santeramo and Lamonaca, 2019; Beghin and Schweizer, 2021; Fiankor and Santeramo, 2023). Therefore, gaining a better understanding of the overall consequences of a non-tariff barrier such as the EPS for agricultural trade among countries, which has been the main aim of this research, is of great policy relevance.

Further related research might focus on the analysis of the dynamics of the SIVs mechanism over time. In addition, access to firm-level and transaction data might shed light on other interesting issues, such as the strategy of the exporters, who can wait for a higher SIV to enter into the European market.

References

- Agrosynergie. 2008. Evaluation of the system of entry prices and export refunds in the fruit and vegetables sector. European Commission, Agricultural and Rural Development Evaluation.
- Anderson, J.E. and E. van Wincoop. 2003. Gravity With Gravititas: a Solution to the Border Puzzle. *American Economic Review* 93(1): 170-192.
- Anderson, J.E. and E. van Wincoop. 2004. Trade Costs. *Journal of Economic Literature* 42(3): 691-751.
- Baier, S.L., and J.H. Bergstrand. 2007. Do Free Trade Agreements Actually Increase Members' International Trade? *Journal of International Economics* 71(1): 72-95.
- Baldwin, R., and D. Taglioni. 2006. Gravity for dummies and dummies for gravity equations. National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER) Working Paper 12516, Cambridge, MA.
- Beghin, J.C., and H. Schweizer. 2021. Agricultural Trade Costs. *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy*. 43(2): 500-530
- Bergen, M., and T. Kawaguchi. 2004. Introducing a spatial equilibrium model under consideration of a realistic differential tariff system to the Japanese pork import market: Reflecting upon the impact of the gate-price under perfect competition. *Journal of the Faculty of Agriculture-Kyushu University* 49(2): 477-496.
- Cardamone, P. 2011. The effect of preferential trade agreements on monthly fruit exports to the European Union. *European Review of Agricultural Economics* 38(4): 553-586.
- Cioffi, A., and C. dell'Aquila. 2004. The effects of trade policies for fresh fruit and vegetables of the European Union. *Food Policy* 29(2): 169-185.
- Cioffi, A., F.G. Santeramo, and C.D. Vitale. 2011. The price stabilization effects of the EU entry price scheme for fruit and vegetables. *Agricultural Economics* 42(3): 405-418.
- Disdier, A.C., L. Fontagné, and M. Mimouni. 2008. The impact of regulations on agricultural trade: evidence from the SPS and TBT agreements. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 90(2): 336-350.
- Egger, P.H., and S. Nigai. 2015. Structural gravity with dummies only: Constrained ANOVA-type estimation of gravity models. *Journal of International Economics* 97(1): 86-99.
- Emlinger, C., and H. Guimbar. 2021. Shipping the good agricultural products out: the differentiated impact of per-unit duties on developing countries. *European Review of Agricultural Economics* 48(3): 598-623.
- Emlinger, C., E. Chevassus-Lozza, and F. Jacquet. 2010. Fruit and vegetable access to EU markets: Dissecting tariffs faced by Mediterranean countries. *Food Policy* 35(6): 599-611.
- Emlinger, C., F. Jacquet, and E. Chevassus-Lozza. 2008. Tariffs and other trade costs: assessing obstacles to Mediterranean countries' access to EU-15 fruit and vegetable markets. *European Review of Agricultural Economics* 35(4): 409-438.
- Fiankor, D.D.D., I. Martínez-Zarzoso, and B. Brümmer. 2019. Exports and governance: the role of private voluntary agrifood standards. *Agricultural Economics* 50(3): 341-352.
- Fiankor, D. D., & Santeramo, F. G. (2023). Revisiting the impact of per-unit duties on agricultural export prices. *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy*.

- García Álvarez-Coque, J.M., V. Martinez-Gomez, and M. Villanueva. 2010. Seasonal protection of F&V imports in the EU: impacts of the entry price system. *Agricultural Economics* 41(2): 205-218.
- Godo, Y. 2014. The Gate Price System for Japan's Pork Imports. FFTC Agricultural Policy Articles.
- Goetz, L., and H. Grethe. 2009. The EU entry price system for fresh fruits and vegetables—Paper tiger or powerful market barrier? *Food Policy* 34: 81-93.
- Goetz, L., and H. Grethe. 2010. The entry price system for fresh fruit and vegetable exports from China to the EU—Breaking a fly on the wheel? *China Economic Review* 21: 377-393.
- Goodwin, B.K., and A.P. Ker. 2002. Modeling price and yield risk. In *A Comprehensive Assessment of the Role of Risk in US Agriculture*, ed. Richard E. Just and Rulon D. Pope, 289-323. Springer US.
- Grethe, H., and S. Tangermann. 1999. The EU import regime for fresh fruit and vegetables after implementation of the results of the Uruguay Round. Institute of Agricultural Economics. Institute of Agricultural Economics, University of Göttingen.
- Gross, K.C., C.Y. Wang, and M.E. Saltveit. 2016. *The commercial storage of fruits, vegetables, and florist and nursery stocks*. United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service.
- Helpman, E., Melitz, M., and Y. Rubinstein. 2008. Estimating trade flows: Trading partners and trading volumes. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 123(2): 441-487.
- Hillen, J. 2019. Market integration and market efficiency under seasonal tariff rate quotas. *Journal of Agricultural Economics* 70(3): 859-873.
- Kareem, F.O., B. Brümmer, and I. Martinez-Zarzoso. 2017. European Union Market Access Conditions and Africa's Extensive Margin of Food Trade. *The World Economy* 40(10): 2277-2300.
- Loginova, D., Portmann, M., and M. Huber. 2021. Assessing the Effects of Seasonal Tariff-rate Quotas on Vegetable Prices in Switzerland. *Journal of Agricultural Economics* 72(2): 607-627.
- Martin, W. 2018. A research agenda for international agricultural trade. *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy* 40(1): 155-173.
- Mayer, T., V. Vicard, and S. Zignago. 2019. The Cost of Non-Europe, Revisited. *Economic Policy* 34(98): 145-199.
- Peterson, E., J.H. Grant, D. Roberts, and V. Karov. 2013. Evaluating the trade restrictiveness of phytosanitary measures on US fresh fruit and vegetable imports. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 95(4): 842-858.
- Romdhani, A., and B. Thabet. 2017. Access of Tunisian Fruits and Vegetables to the EU Market: Potential Impacts of the Revision of the Entry Price System. *Journal of Food Products Marketing* 23(5): 504-521.
- Santeramo, F.G., and A. Cioffi. 2012. The entry price threshold in EU agriculture: Deterrent or barrier?. *Journal of Policy Modeling* 34(5): 691-704.
- Santeramo, F.G., and E. Lamonaca. 2019. The effects of non-tariff measures on agri-food trade: A review and meta-analysis of empirical evidence. *Journal of Agricultural Economics* 70(3): 595-617.
- Santeramo, F.G., and E. Lamonaca. 2022a. On the trade effects of bilateral SPS measures in developed and developing countries. *The World Economy* 45(10): 3109-3145.
- Santeramo, F.G., and E. Lamonaca. 2022b. Standards and regulatory cooperation in regional trade agreements: What the effects on trade?. *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy* 44(4): 1682-1701.

- Silva, J.S., and S. Tenreyro. 2006. The log of gravity. *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 88(4): 641-658.
- Swinbank, A. and C. Ritson. 1995. The impact of the GATT agreement on EU fruit and vegetable policy. *Food Policy* 20(4): 339-357.
- Trefler, D. 1993. Trade liberalization and the theory of endogenous protection: an econometric study of US import policy. *Journal of political Economy* 101(1): 138-160.
- Yotov, Y.V., R. Piermartini, J.A. Monteiro, and M. Larch. 2016. *An advanced guide to trade policy analysis: The structural gravity model*. Geneva: World Trade Organization.

Appendix A. Existing evidence on the Entry Price System

Table A.1. Previous studies on the Entry Price System (EPS), by effects under investigation

Reference	Product	Country of origin	Methodology	Main findings
Influence of the EPS				
Cioffi and dell'Aquila (2004)	Apples, oranges, tomatoes	Countries of Southern Hemisphere (Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Israel, Morocco, New Zealand, South Africa)	Analysis of data related to the application of the EPS	Varying influence on a case-by-case basis
Goetz and Grethe (2009)	All F&Vs under the EPS	Main exporters (81 origin-product combinations)	Cluster analysis based on indicators measuring the influence of the EPS	Heterogeneous influence among products and countries of origin
Goetz and Grethe (2010)	Apples, pears	China	Cluster analysis based on indicators measuring the influence of the EPS	The relevance is temporary for apples and general for pears originating in China
Price stabilisation effects of the EPS				
Agrosynergie (2008)	F&Vs under the EPS	Main origins	Analysis of price elasticities of demand	The stabilisation effect occurs for tomatoes from Morocco, apples from China, lemons from Turkey
Cioffi et al. (2011)	Lemons, tomatoes	Argentina, Morocco, Turkey	Econometric analysis of the effects of the EPS on the EU prices of F&Vs	The stabilisation effect is rather small, particularly, in the case of tomatoes imported from Morocco

The import effects of the Entry Price System

Santeramo and Cioffi (2012)	Apples, lemons, tomatoes	Argentina, Morocco, Turkey	Econometric analysis of the effects of the isolation effect of an endogenous price threshold	The EPS plays an insulation effect when the SIVs of Moroccan tomatoes drop below the estimated threshold
<hr/>				
Trade effects of the EPS				
<hr/>				
Agrosynergie (2008)	Apples, artichokes, clementines, courgettes, cucumbers, oranges, pears, tomatoes, table grapes	Main origins	Analysis based on a gravity model and on a partial equilibrium model	The trade effects are product- and season-specific
Emlinger et al. (2008)	70 products included F&Vs under the EPS	232 origins	Analysis based on a gravity model, considering the tariffication of the EPS	The trade effect of tariffs is negative for products under the EPS
Cardamone (2011)	Apples, fresh grapes, mandarins, oranges, pears	191 origins	Analysis based on a gravity model, using the preferential EP (proxied by a dummy) as explanatory variable	The preferential EP has a positive effect on imports of oranges only
García-Álvarez-Coque et al. (2010)	Clementines, cucumbers, table grapes, tomatoes	Brazil, Israel, Morocco, Turkey	Analysis based on a partial equilibrium model	Trade impacts of eliminating EP are significant for particular origins, during specific seasons, most notably for Moroccan tomatoes.
Kareem et al. (2017)	Limes and lemons, oranges, tomatoes	African countries	Analysis based on a gravity model, using the gaps between SIVs and EP	Negative effects occur for the extensive margins of trade of tomato

References

- Agrosynergie. 2008. Evaluation of the system of entry prices and export refunds in the fruit and vegetables sector. European Commission, Agricultural and Rural Development Evaluation.
- Cardamone, P. 2011. The effect of preferential trade agreements on monthly fruit exports to the European Union. *European Review of Agricultural Economics* 38(4): 553-586.
- Cioffi, A., and C. dell'Aquila. 2004. The effects of trade policies for fresh fruit and vegetables of the European Union. *Food Policy* 29(2): 169-185.
- Cioffi, A., F.G. Santeramo, and C.D. Vitale. 2011. The price stabilization effects of the EU entry price scheme for fruit and vegetables. *Agricultural Economics* 42(3): 405-418.
- Emlinger, C., F. Jacquet, and E. Chevassus-Lozza. 2008. Tariffs and other trade costs: assessing obstacles to Mediterranean countries' access to EU-15 fruit and vegetable markets. *European Review of Agricultural Economics* 35(4): 409-438.
- García Álvarez-Coque, J.M., V. Martínez-Gómez, and M. Villanueva. 2010. Seasonal protection of F&V imports in the EU: impacts of the entry price system. *Agricultural Economics* 41(2): 205-218.
- Goetz, L., and H. Grethe. 2009. The EU entry price system for fresh fruits and vegetables—Paper tiger or powerful market barrier? *Food Policy* 34: 81-93.
- Goetz, L., and H. Grethe. 2010. The entry price system for fresh fruit and vegetable exports from China to the EU—Breaking a fly on the wheel? *China Economic Review* 21: 377-393.
- Kareem, F.O., B. Brümmer, and I. Martínez-Zarzoso. 2017. European Union Market Access Conditions and Africa's Extensive Margin of Food Trade. *The World Economy* 40(10): 2277-2300.
- Santeramo, F.G., and A. Cioffi. 2012. The entry price threshold in EU agriculture: Deterrent or barrier?. *Journal of Policy Modeling* 34(5): 691-704.

Appendix B. Indexes capturing the functioning of the Entry Price System in literature

Table B.1. Indexes used in the literature to capture the functioning of the Entry Price System

Indicator	Description	References
<i>Ad valorem</i> equivalent (AVE)	$ad\ valorem\ tax + \frac{specific\ duty}{import\ price}$	Emlinger et al. (2008, 2010)
Dummy	1 with EP (0 otherwise)	Agrosynergie (2008), Cardamone (2011)
Share of negative gap	$\frac{GAP_{<0}}{GAP_{tot}}$	Goetz and Grethe (2009, 2010)
Distribution's 0.05-quantile of positive gap	$\ln\left(\frac{Q_{0.05}}{sd(GAP)}\right)$	
Relative gap	$-5\% \leq \frac{SIV - EP}{EP} \leq +5\%$	García Álvarez-Coque et al. (2010)
Absolute gap	$SIV - EP$	Kareem et al. (2017)

References

- Agrosynergie. 2008. Evaluation of the system of entry prices and export refunds in the fruit and vegetables sector. European Commission, Agricultural and Rural Development Evaluation.
- Cardamone, P. 2011. The effect of preferential trade agreements on monthly fruit exports to the European Union. *European Review of Agricultural Economics* 38(4): 553-586.
- Emlinger, C., E. Chevassus-Lozza, and F. Jacquet. 2010. Fruit and vegetable access to EU markets: Dissecting tariffs faced by Mediterranean countries. *Food Policy* 35(6): 599-611.
- Emlinger, C., F. Jacquet, and E. Chevassus-Lozza. 2008. Tariffs and other trade costs: assessing obstacles to Mediterranean countries' access to EU-15 fruit and vegetable markets. *European Review of Agricultural Economics* 35(4): 409-438.
- García Álvarez-Coque, J.M., V. Martinez-Gomez, and M. Villanueva. 2010. Seasonal protection of F&V imports in the EU: impacts of the entry price system. *Agricultural Economics* 41(2): 205-218.
- Goetz, L., and H. Grethe. 2009. The EU entry price system for fresh fruits and vegetables—Paper tiger or powerful market barrier? *Food Policy* 34: 81-93.
- Goetz, L., and H. Grethe. 2010. The entry price system for fresh fruit and vegetable exports from China to the EU—Breaking a fly on the wheel? *China Economic Review* 21: 377-393.
- Kareem, F.O., B. Brümmer, and I. Martinez-Zarzoso. 2017. European Union Market Access Conditions and Africa's Extensive Margin of Food Trade. *The World Economy* 40(10): 2277-2300.

Appendix C. Data description

Over the period between 2000 and 2014, in our sample, on average imports of apples originate mostly in New Zealand, South Africa and Chile; while Argentina is the greatest exporter of lemons and pears, Morocco is the most important suppliers of tomatoes; imports of oranges mostly come from Tunisia and Egypt; similarly, Egypt is a relevant exporter of table grapes, joint with Brazil and Morocco. The EP quotas hold for apples, pears, oranges originating from Egypt, Israel, and Morocco, and tomatoes originating from Morocco. For lemons and tomatoes, it is more frequent to have a number of consecutive days (“max length”) in which the SIVs are below the EP: this is in line with Goetz and Grethe (2009) who suggest that the relevance of the EPS is highest for lemons and tomatoes. Across origins, the average monthly SIV is less variable for apples (from 74 €/100 kg of Uruguay to 106 €/100 kg of New Zealand) and lemons (from 62 €/100 kg of Egypt and 91 €/100 kg of Chile). Overall, SIVs are more dispersed for tomatoes.

Table C.1. Mean and standard deviation (in parentheses) for variables of interest over the period 2000-2014, classified by product and origin

	EU imports (mIn €)	SIV<EP (days per month)	\overline{SIV} (€/100 kg)	$\frac{\overline{SIV} - Me(SIV)}{\overline{SIV}}$
Apples				
ARG	501 (± 679)	0 (± 1)	93 (± 32)	.006 (± .067)
BRA	650 (± 746)	0 (± 2)	79 (± 13)	.002 (± .045)
CHL	1,993 (± 2,537)	0 (± 1)	91 (± 18)	-.003 (± .042)
CHN	267 (± 345)	1 (± 2)	88 (± 23)	.008 (± .063)
NZL	2,874 (± 5,079)	0 (± 0)	106 (± 23)	-.002 (± .026)
TUR	6 (± 4)	0 (± 1)	84 (± 21)	.021 (± .061)
URY	95 (± 93)	1 (± 2)	74 (± 22)	-.001 (± .053)
ZAF	2,726 (± 5,186)	0 (± 0)	98 (± 21)	.002 (± .044)
Lemons				
ARG	2,454 (± 3,361)	4 (± 6)	68 (± 24)	.002 (± .034)
BRA	62 (± 75)	3 (± 4)	69 (± 32)	-.007 (± .024)
CHL	306 (± 437)	0 (± 1)	91 (± 32)	-.004 (± .036)
EGY	31 (± 39)	1 (± 2)	62 (± 14)	.021 (± .072)
ISR	57 (± 70)	0 (± 0)	81 (± 28)	.007 (± .032)
MAR	61 (± 79)	2 (± 4)	69 (± 31)	.003 (± .056)
TUR	274 (± 497)	1 (± 3)	68 (± 20)	.006 (± .045)
URY	326 (± 278)	3 (± 5)	72 (± 25)	-.006 (± .061)
ZAF	510 (± 845)	2 (± 4)	76 (± 23)	.008 (± .036)

The import effects of the Entry Price System

Peaches				
ISR	147 (± 205)	0 (± 1)	146 (± 48)	.001 (± .046)
MAR	197 (± 295)	0 (± 0)	250 (± 118)	.000 (± .000)
TUR	65 (± 133)	0 (± 0)	130 (± 24)	.000 (± .018)
Pears				
ARG	2,213 (± 5,015)	0 (± 1)	95 (± 39)	.008 (± .065)
CHL	738 (± 1,313)	0 (± 2)	92 (± 38)	.010 (± .042)
CHN	53 (± 45)	2 (± 3)	68 (± 21)	.022 (± .074)
NZL	58 (± 64)	0 (± 0)	145 (± 33)	-.024 (± .039)
TUR	18 (± 15)	0 (± 0)	118 (± 30)	-.005 (± .036)
URY	204 (± 267)	0 (± 1)	74 (± 25)	-.013 (± .031)
ZAF	1,112 (± 1,318)	0 (± 0)	94 (± 20)	-.0001 (± .029)
Oranges				
BRA	1 (± 2)	2 (± 4)	35 (± 15)	-.002 (± .020)
EGY	1,145 (± 1,856)	0 (± 1)	49 (± 8)	.002 (± .042)
ISR	301 (± 459)	0 (± 0)	68 (± 11)	.001 (± .027)
MAR	683 (± 744)	0 (± 0)	56 (± 12)	.004 (± .051)
TUN	1,411 (± 1,409)	0 (± 1)	54 (± 11)	.019 (± .038)
TUR	156 (± 419)	0 (± 1)	62 (± 8)	-.008 (± .044)
ZAF	176 (± 525)	1 (± 2)	56 (± 15)	.005 (± .063)
Table grapes				
BRA	3,175 (± 5,013)	0 (± 0)	224 (± 82)	-.002 (± .054)
CHL	88 (± 84)	1 (± 1)	104 (± 46)	.020 (± .073)
EGY	1,261 (± 3,354)	0 (± 0)	145 (± 35)	.007 (± .065)
ISR	465 (± 727)	0 (± 0)	148 (± 29)	.005 (± .045)
MAR	1,058 (± 1,096)	0 (± 0)	147 (± 38)	.006 (± .060)
TUN	56 (± 95)	0 (± 0)	189 (± 45)	-.008 (± .016)
TUR	377 (± 631)	0 (± 0)	120 (± 27)	.003 (± .035)
ZAF	509 (± 686)	0 (± 0)	138 (± 106)	-.009 (± .035)
Tomatoes				
BRA	3 (± 0.2)	3 (± 2)	32 (± 0)	.000 (± .000)
ISR	487 (± 739)	1 (± 2)	129 (± 41)	.013 (± .095)

MAR	5,385 (± 9,730)	5 (± 6)	64 (± 20)	.020 (± .061)
TUN	467 (± 556)	2 (± 4)	112 (± 24)	.002 (± .053)
TUR	143 (± 234)	4 (± 5)	88 (± 24)	.016 (± .047)

Notes: Standard deviations are in parentheses. Acronyms are Argentina (ARG), Brazil (BRA), Chile (CHL), China (CHN), Egypt (EGY), Israel (ISR), Morocco (MAR), New Zealand (NZL), South Africa (ZAF), Tunisia (TUN), Turkey (TUR), Uruguay (URY).

Online Supplementary Material

Table S.1. The Entry Price System (EPS) vs. the Gate Price System (GPS)

	EPS	GPS
Area of implementation	EU	Japan
Markets	Fruit and vegetables	Meat
Commodity	Apples, apricots, cherries, clementines, lemons, mandarins, oranges, peaches (including nectarines), pears, plums, table grapes, artichokes, courgettes, cucumbers, tomatoes	Pork
Entry into force	1995	1971
Previous regime	Reference Price System	Quota system
Import value	Standard Import Value (SIV): proxy of import price, computed daily by the European Commission	Standard Import Price (SIP): 482.5 yen/kg, fixed by the government as the arithmetic average between upper stabilisation price (515 yen/kg) and lower stabilisation price (450 yen/kg)
Threshold price	Entry Price (EP): set by the government, variable according to product, supplier, seasonality Variable: <i>ad valorem</i> tariff with $SIVs < EP$	Gate Price (GP): Fixed $SIP/1.05 = 459.5$ yen/kg
Import tariff	<i>ad valorem</i> tariff + $(EP - SIV)$ with $EP < SIVs < 0.92EP$ <i>ad valorem</i> tariff + MTE with $SIVs < 0.92EP$	Mixed: 5% <i>ad valorem</i> tariff Variable levy = $GP - CIF$ price

Source: Cioffi and dell'Aquila (2004) and Godo (2014).

Table S.2. Ordinary Least Square (OLS) estimation of the gravity equation in (2)

Variables	Overshoot index	Overshoot index (lag)	Position index	Dispersion index
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)
EPS	-0.120*** (0.037)	-0.118*** (0.036)	0.917*** (0.109)	-0.211*** (0.023)
Observations	6,485	6,432	6,485	3,223
R-squared	0.619	0.618	0.623	0.708

Notes: The dependent variable is log of import values. The explanatory variables of interest are, alternatively, the number of days in a month in which SIVs are below the EP at time t (A) and t-1 (B), the monthly average SIVs (C), the relative difference between the monthly mean and median SIVs (D). All specifications include a constant, importer-product-time, exporter-product-time, and country-pair-product fixed effects. Standard errors are in parentheses.

*** indicates statistical significance at 1%.

Table S.3. Addressing potential reverse causality (Baier and Bergstrand, 2007)

Variables	Overshoot index	Position index	Dispersion index
	(A)	(B)	(C)
EPS	-0.117*** (0.038)	0.842*** (0.114)	-0.484 (0.474)
EPS (forwarded)	-0.013 (0.034)	-0.147 (0.094)	-0.193 (0.384)
Observations	6,252	6,252	6,252
R-squared	0.618	0.622	0.617

Notes: Ordinary least Square (OLS) estimation of the gravity equation in (2). The dependent variable is log of import values. The explanatory variables of interest (in log) are, alternatively, the number of days in a month in which SIVs are below the EP (A), the monthly average SIVs (C), the relative difference between the monthly mean and median SIVs (C). All specifications include a constant, importer-product-time, exporter-product-time, and country-pair-product fixed effects. Standard errors are in parentheses.

*** indicates statistical significance at 1%.

Table S.4. Addressing potential reverse causality (Trefler, 1993): EPS equation

	Overshoot index	Position index	Dispersion index
	(A)	(B)	(C)
Variables	$(SIV < EP)$	$((SIV < EP) * \overline{SIV})$	$((SIV < EP) * \frac{SIV - Me(SIV)}{\overline{SIV}})$
Log of imports	-0.010 (0.015)	-0.085 (0.075)	-0.007 *** (0.001)
Observations	1,346	6,485	6,485
R-squared	0.533	0.464	0.132

Notes: Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) estimation of the EPS equation in (3.1). The dependent variables are, alternatively, the number of days in a month in which SIVs are below the EP (A), the monthly average SIVs interacted with the number of overshoots (A), the relative difference between the monthly mean and median SIVs interacted with the number of overshoots (C). All specifications include a constant, time-varying importer, time-varying exporter, country-pair, and time-varying product fixed effects. Standard errors are in parentheses.

*** indicates statistical significance at 1%.

Table S.5. Addressing potential reverse causality (Trefler, 1993): import equation

Variables	Overshoot index (A)	Position index (B)	Dispersion index (C)
Overshoot index ($SIV < EP$)	-0.180 *** (0.059)	-0.261 *** (0.063)	0.0003 (0.059)
Position index ($(SIV < EP) * \overline{SIV}$)		0.015 *** (0.004)	
Dispersion index ($(SIV < EP) * \frac{\overline{SIV} - Me(SIV)}{\overline{SIV}}$)			-9.391 *** (0.557)
Observations	6,485	6,485	6,485
R-squared	0.369	0.371	0.397

Notes: Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) estimation of the import equation in (3.2). The dependent variable is logs of imports. The explanatory variables of interest are, alternatively, the number of days in a month in which SIVs are below the EP (A), the monthly average SIVs interacted with the number of overshoots (B), the relative difference between the monthly mean and median SIVs interacted with the number of overshoots (C). All specifications include a constant, time-varying importer, time-varying exporter, and country-pair fixed effects. Standard errors are in parentheses.

*** indicates statistical significance at 1%.

Table S.6. A rise in imports increases the level of the Standard Import Values (SIVs) but lowers its variability when SIVs are below entry price (EP)

Variables	Position index		Dispersion index	
	Without	With	Without	With
	interaction term (\overline{SIV})	interaction term $((SIV < EP) * \overline{SIV})$	interaction term $(\frac{\overline{SIV} - Me(SIV)}{\overline{SIV}})$	interaction term $((SIV < EP) * \frac{\overline{SIV} - Me(SIV)}{\overline{SIV}})$
Log of imports	0.008 *** (0.002)	-0.085 (0.075)	-0.0005 (0.0003)	-0.007 *** (0.001)
Observations	6,485	6,485	6,485	6,485
R-squared	0.684	0.464	0.133	0.132

Notes: Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) estimation of the EPS equation in (3.1) without (and with) interacting the dependent variables with the number of overshoots. The dependent variables are, alternatively, the monthly average SIVs not interacted and interacted with the number of overshoots (position index), the relative difference between the monthly mean and median SIVs not interacted and interacted with the number of overshoots (dispersion index). All specifications include a constant, time-varying importer, time-varying exporter, country-pair, and time-varying product fixed effects. Standard errors are in parentheses.

*** indicates statistical significance at 1%.

Table S.7. The estimated effects of the level and the variability of Standard Import Values (SIVs) are lower when the estimation is limited to periods in which SIVs are below the entry price (EP) than when the estimation is not limited

Variables	Position index		Dispersion index	
	Without interaction term	With interaction term	Without interaction term	With interaction term
Index of overshoots	-0.315 *** (0.061)	-0.261 *** (0.063)	-0.196 *** (0.059)	0.0003 (0.059)
Position index	1.059 *** (0.110)	0.015 *** (0.004)		
Dispersion index			-19.120 *** (3.019)	-9.391 *** (0.557)
Observations	6,485	6,485	6,485	6,485
R-squared	0.379	0.371	0.373	0.397

Notes: Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) estimation of the import equation in (3.2). The dependent variable is logs of imports. The explanatory variables of interest (in log) are, alternatively, the monthly average SIVs not interacted and interacted with the number of overshoots (position index), the relative difference between the monthly mean and median SIVs not interacted and interacted with the number of overshoots (dispersion index). All specifications include a constant, time-varying importer, time-varying exporter, and country-pair fixed effects. Standard errors are in parentheses.

*** indicates statistical significance at 1%.

Table S.8. A rise in imports increases the level of the Standard Import Values (SIVs)

Variables	Position index					
	Without interaction term			With interaction term		
	\overline{SIV}	$Me(SIV)$	$Min\{SIV\}$	$(SIV < EP) * \overline{SIV}$	$(SIV < EP) * Me(SIV)$	$(SIV < EP) * Min\{SIV\}$
Log of imports	0.008 *** (0.002)	0.009 (0.002)	0.014 *** (0.002)	-0.085 (0.075)	-0.077 (0.075)	-0.064 (0.070)
Observations	6,485	6,485	6,485	6,485	6,485	6,485
R-squared	0.684	0.664	0.657	0.464	0.465	0.461

Notes: Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) estimation of the EPS equation in (3.1) using different position indexes. The dependent variables are, alternatively, the monthly average SIVs, the monthly median SIVs, and the monthly minimum SIVs not interacted and interacted with the number of overshoots. All specifications include a constant, time-varying importer, time-varying exporter, country-pair, and time-varying product fixed effects. Standard errors are in parentheses.

*** indicates statistical significance at 1%.

Table S.9. The greatest impacts are estimated for the position indexes proxied by minimum SIV

Variables	Position index					
	Without interaction term			With interaction term		
	\overline{SIV}	$Me(SIV)$	$Min\{SIV\}$	$(SIV < EP) * \overline{SIV}$	$(SIV < EP) * Me(SIV)$	$(SIV < EP) * Min\{SIV\}$
$SIV < EP$	-0.315 *** (0.061)	-0.321 *** (0.061)	-0.305 *** (0.060)	-0.261 *** (0.063)	-0.264 *** (0.063)	-0.268 *** (0.063)
Position index	1.059 *** (0.110)	1.102 *** (0.110)	1.253 *** (0.105)	0.015 *** (0.004)	0.016 *** (0.004)	0.017 *** (0.004)
Observations	6,485	6,485	6,485	6,485	6,485	6,485
R-squared	0.379	0.379	0.383	0.371	0.371	0.371

Notes: Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) estimation of the import equation in (3.2) using different position indexes. The dependent variable is logs of imports. The explanatory variables (in log) are, alternatively, the monthly average SIVs, the monthly median SIVs, and the monthly minimum SIVs not interacted and interacted with the number of overshoots. All specifications include a constant, time-varying importer, time-varying exporter, country-pair, and time-varying product fixed effects. Standard errors are in parentheses.

*** indicates statistical significance at 1%.

Table S.10. A rise in imports lowers the variability of the Standard Import Values (SIVs)

Variables	Dispersion index					
	Without interaction term			With interaction term		
	$\frac{\overline{SIV} - Me(SIV)}{\overline{SIV}}$	$\frac{\overline{SIV} - Min\{SIV\}}{\overline{SIV}}$	$\frac{Me(SIV) - Min\{SIV\}}{Me(SIV)}$	$(SIV < EP) * \frac{\overline{SIV} - Me(SIV)}{\overline{SIV}}$	$(SIV < EP) * \frac{\overline{SIV} - Min\{SIV\}}{\overline{SIV}}$	$(SIV < EP) * \frac{Me(SIV) - Min\{SIV\}}{Me(SIV)}$
Log of imports	-0.0005 (0.0003)	-0.003 *** (0.001)	-0.003 *** (0.001)	-0.007 *** (0.001)	-0.014 *** (0.005)	-0.008 * (0.004)
Observations	6,485	6,485	6,485	6,485	6,485	6,485
R-squared	0.133	0.283	0.255	0.132	0.438	0.436

Notes: Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) estimation of the EPS equation in (2.1) using different dispersion indexes. The dependent variables are, alternatively, the monthly average SIVs, the monthly median SIVs, and the monthly minimum SIVs not interacted and interacted with the number of overshoots. All specifications include a constant, time-varying importer, time-varying exporter, country-pair, and time-varying product fixed effects. Standard errors are in parentheses.

*** indicates statistical significance at 1%.

* indicates statistical significance at 10%.

Table S.11. The greatest impacts are found for the dispersion index computed as relative difference between the mean and the median

Variables	Dispersion index						
	Without interaction term			With interaction term			
	$\frac{\overline{SIV} - Me(SIV)}{\overline{SIV}}$	$\frac{\overline{SIV} - Min\{SIV\}}{\overline{SIV}}$	$\frac{Me(SIV) - Min\{SIV\}}{Me(SIV)}$	$(SIV < EP) * \frac{\overline{SIV} - Me(SIV)}{\overline{SIV}}$	$(SIV < EP) * \frac{\overline{SIV} - Min\{SIV\}}{\overline{SIV}}$	$(SIV < EP) * \frac{Me(SIV) - Min\{SIV\}}{Me(SIV)}$	
<i>SIV < EP</i>	-0.196 *** (0.059)	-0.053 (0.061)	-0.087 (0.062)	0.0003 (0.059)	-0.183 *** (0.064)	-0.226 *** (0.064)	
Dispersion index	-19.120 *** (3.019)	-5.958 *** (0.735)	-4.256 *** (0.754)	-9.391 *** (0.557)	0.009 (0.071)	0.155 ** (0.076)	
Observations	6,485	6,485	6,485	6,485	6,485	6,485	
R-squared	0.373	0.376	0.373	0.397	0.369	0.370	

Notes: Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) estimation of the import equation in (3) using different position indexes (specification (iii)). The dependent variable is logs of imports. The explanatory variables (in log) are, alternatively, the monthly average SIVs, the monthly median SIVs, and the monthly minimum SIVs not interacted and interacted with the number of overshoots. All specifications include time-varying importer, time-varying exporter, country-pair, and time-varying product fixed effects. Constant included. Standard errors are in parentheses.

*** indicates statistical significance at 1%.

** indicates statistical significance at 5%.

Table S.12. Sensitivity analysis: controlling for seasonality

Variables	Overshoot	Distance	Distance	Position index	Dispersion index
	index	92% of EP – SIV	SIV – 92% of EP		
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
EPS	-0.125***	-0.124***	0.154***	0.767***	-0.143
	(0.006)	(0.001)	(0.024)	(0.159)	(0.155)
Observations	6,485	6,485	6,485	6,485	6,485
R-squared	0.948	0.943	0.951	0.951	0.941

Notes: Poisson Pseudo-Maximum-Likelihood (PPML) estimation of the gravity equation in (2). The dependent variable is value of imports. The explanatory variables of interest (in log) are, alternatively, the number of days in a month in which SIVs are below the EP (A), the distance between 92% of EP and monthly average SIVs if SIVs are below or equal to the EP (B), the distance between monthly average SIVs and 92% of EP if SIVs are above the EP (C), the monthly average SIVs (D), the relative difference between the monthly mean and median SIVs (E). All specifications include a constant, importer-product-time, exporter-product-time, and country-pair-product-month fixed effects. Robust standard errors are in parentheses.

*** indicates statistical significance at 1%.


Table S.13. Effects of products' perishability and distance on the overshoot and dispersion indices

Dependent variable	Overshoot index		Dispersion index	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)
Distance	-0.031***	0.006	-0.002***	-0.002***
	(0.008)	(0.007)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Low perishability	-0.271***		-0.004***	
	(0.017)		(0.001)	
Medium perishability	-0.456***		-0.005***	
	(0.016)		(0.001)	
High perishability		0.378***		0.005***
		(0.015)		(0.001)

Notes: Ordinary Least Square (OLS) estimate. The log of importer-exporter distance is in km. Low, medium, high perishability are dummies indicating, respectively, products with a shelf life of 6-12 months, 1-6 months, less than one month. All specifications include a constant. Observations are 15,290. Standard errors are in parentheses.

*** indicates statistical significance at 1%.

Figure S.1. Effects of products' storability and distance on the overshoot and dispersion indices



Notes: Storability based on shelf-life at the optimum storage conditions (by temperature or controlled atmosphere) (Gross et al., 2016).

Authors

Fabio Gaetano Santeramo (*Corresponding author*)

University of Foggia (Italy) and European University Institute (Italy)

fabio.santeramo@eui.eu

Victor Martinez-Gomez

Universitat Politècnica de València (Spain)

vicmargo@esp.upv.es

Laura Márquez-Ramos

University of Adelaide (Australia) and Universitat Jaume I (Spain)

lmarquez@uji.es

Emilia Lamonaca

University of Foggia (Italy)

emilia.lamonaca@unifg.it