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I. The two dimensions of globalization

Globalization has become a fashionable concept. There is no doubt that it corresponds to an economic and social reality, but it should be handled with some caution in order to avoid purely dogmatic or political interpretations. First, it is not a completely new phenomenon. Historically, economic links between some regions have been sometimes very strong, for example around the Mediterranean Sea, or between Asia and Europe. However, these links were more regional or bilateral rather than worldwide as today, and focused on some specific products such as silk or spices from Asia to Europe. Second, it is not uniform as the degree of integration of various regions into the world economy is very different: not only the participation of various countries to international trade is very different, but also their participation to technology, communications, education, and to all the other "tertiary" aspects of globalization.

Food and agriculture are very much involved in the globalization process. The most obvious example is the development of trade. Agricultural trade increased substantially, although less fast than total trade. However, trade developments differed among regions and commodities. One of the most important, and worrying aspect is the fact that agricultural trade from developing countries increased less fast that trade from developed countries. Over the last 40 years, the agricultural trade surplus of developing countries has practically disappeared, and the share of agricultural exports in total merchandise trade has decreased from 50 to 6 percent. Taking into account market and policy factors, FAO expects that developing countries will become net importers, in particular of temperate-zone commodities. The least-developing countries have even a more negative position in terms of agricultural
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trade, as they became net importers already in the mid-80s.

Many other aspects of globalization could be mentioned beyond trade. For example, a certain convergence of consumption habits have been noticed, with consequences on diets and on production patterns in response to demand shifts.

To a large extent, dietary patterns are converging, in the direction of higher consumption of animal products, although cultural and religious factors continue to lead to significant differences. This convergence is particularly clear among the developed countries, with a degree of convergence with the US dietary pattern of 75 percent. However, health and food safety concerns have more impact on food consumption pattern than before: the levelling off of meat consumption, and the expansion of demand for olive oil are two significant examples in Europe.

The "geographical" dimension of globalization has been well documented, but less attention has been paid to another aspect of globalization, i.e. the increased integration of the various economic sectors towards the creation of a real "global economy". This "sectoral" dimension of globalization affects in particular food and agriculture, which is increasingly integrated with other economic sectors. This can be seen through the increased use of inputs, the increased share of processing and marketing in the final food products, and more substantially through the growing interdependence between agricultural and non-agricultural activities of the farmers, a phenomenon well known in South East Asia.

The purpose of this paper is not to make an exhaustive analysis of the globalization process of the food and agricultural sector, but rather to illustrate how it is interlinked with the reform of agricultural policies. There is indeed a very strong link with regard to both aspects of globalization (geographical and sectoral). First, the reform of agricultural policies reflects the fact that food and agriculture cannot be dissociated from the overall towards development of trade and reductions of obstacles to trade, and more generally from the general movement towards more integration of the world economy. Second, it also involves the recognition that agricultural policies are closely interlinked with other economic and social policies. In a sense, one should not consider the reform of agricultural policies in isolation, but rather the overall process of reform of all policies affecting in one way or another food and agriculture.
II. The beginning of the agricultural policy reform

This broad perspective was present, but not so explicitly, when the process of agricultural policy reform was first developed in 1986/1987 with the launch of the Uruguay Round by the GATT Contracting Parties in Punta del Este, and through the 1987 Communiqué of the OECD Ministerial Council.

At that time, the major objectives were to reduce the trade tensions which had led to real "trade wars", in particular between Europe and North America, and to reduce the budgetary cost of agricultural support. Basically, the origin of these problems was the imbalance between supply and demand which had been made possible because of support measures boosting production and reducing demand. Therefore, the major objective was to restore market balance, by reducing price support, the main distorting factor, and the obstacles to trade linked to it. The possible use of supply control was also mentioned, but with some caution as it also involves economic distortions. More importantly, the use of non-distorting direct support was already recognised, in particular in relation with rural development and environment those aspects which became much more important over time.

The key ideas of the 1987 OECD Communiqué are still valid today, and they were reaffirmed at many occasions, notably by OECD Agricultural Ministers at their last meeting in 1998. At this occasion, Ministers recognised as well the multifunctional character of agriculture. They agreed on a set of "shared goals", which reflect well the wider range of agricultural policy objectives, including market orientation, improved standard of living for farmers, integration into the multilateral trading system, responding to consumer concerns, contributing to sustainable management of natural resources, to environment and to rural development, and ensuring food security. The key issue for policymakers it to ensure that these objectives, which may appear at first sight as contradictory, are integrated into a coherent framework, which would strengthen their inherent complementarities. Having explicitly recognised the multifunctional character of agriculture, Ministers agreed that the challenge lay in designing well-targeted policies in order to meet the various "multifunctional concerns" in ways that maximize benefits, are most cost-efficient and avoid distortions to production and trade. At a more operational level, Ministers defined key criteria for agricultural policies, such as transparency, targeting, and cost-efficiency, in order to achieve these shared goals.

The general foundations of agricultural policy reform are therefore well established, even if
the practical implementation is seen differently in various countries.

III. The evolution of the reform process

1. at the domestic level

The reform process developed both at the domestic and at the international level in parallel. There is always an active debate on the question whether the reform process is driven by international negotiations and pressure, or whether it originates mainly from domestic considerations. Even if this debate has a certain meaning from a tactical viewpoint, it is somewhat sterile as the international and domestic processes are closely interrelated. No progress could have been achieved at the international level, if there would not have been some degree of agreement that the reform of agricultural policies was also required for domestic economic and political reasons.

At the domestic level, the most obvious example is the reform of the EU Common Agricultural Policy which went through a number of phases. The most recent and important one is the "Agenda 2000 CAP reform", sometimes called the "Berlin Agreement". It provides for a significant reduction of intervention prices for cereals and beef, with a partial compensation through an increase in area payments for cereals and of headage payments for beef. In the case of beef, some of the additional payments are subject to a maximum stocking density. These decisions reflect indeed the general tendency to move from price support to direct payments, and to better take into account environmental concerns.

Beyond the various changes affecting commodity policy, the most significant element of the Berlin Agreement is probably the new rural development policy. It streamlines the previous measures in bringing them into one single regulation. It also require Member countries to define suitable environmental measures and allow payments to be subject to environmental requirements (cross-compliance). In addition, farmers in areas subject to environmental constraints can also benefit from payments intended to compensate for the resulting costs and income losses. These are just some examples which show the increased importance of the environmental dimension of agricultural policy.

The simplification of the management of the structural funds, and the reduction of the percentage of the population covered from 51% to 40% illustrates the need for more
selectivity, for more targeting, and for a reduction in administrative costs. Many measures can be financed through structural funds, such as early retirement, training, investment, processing and marketing, setting up of young farmers, forestry, etc, but half of the total amount (4.3 billion euros) is for agri-environmental measures. The environmental dimensions are therefore present everywhere, and cannot be dissociated from rural development and structural policies, even if they are covered by different regulations. One can draw the general conclusion that more synergy is required among various policies, avoiding a piecemeal approach. This has important implications for the process of policy formulation and implementation.

The creation of the European Food Authority is not part of the Berlin Agreement itself, but it reflects the priority attached in Europe to food safety. The Authority would provide an independent, high-level advice on food safety, nutrition, animal health and welfare, and plant health. This independent risk assessment would facilitate effective risk management by the public authorities. In principle, this new institution is already operational, but the unsettled debate on its definitive site is limiting its effectiveness.

The recent proposal presented by the EU Commission in July 2002 in the context of the "Mid-term Review" foreseen by the Berlin Agreement in the middle of its implementation period, go further in the same directions. The proposal constitutes a further step in the direction of policy reform, continuing the process started in 1992, and continued in 2000. The objectives of the new proposal are in line with previous policy decisions, but they give even more importance to environment and rural community, and to the simplification and coherence of policy.

Some of the key concrete measures proposed are a further cut of 5% of cereal intervention price, a simplification of the system for direct payments for beef, and various alternatives for the reform of dairy policy. The most innovative parts of the proposal relate to the introduction of a decoupled system of direct payments per farm, based on historical references and conditional upon cross-compliance to environmental, animal welfare and food quality criteria. This single farm income payment, which cover most but not all products at the beginning, would have the advantage of being fully compatible with the WTO Green Box requirement, of allowing producers to react directly to the market, and to reduce the transaction costs of policy.

The shift away from production-linked support would be reinforced by the introduction of "compulsory dynamic modulation"of direct payments: all payments would be reduced by 3% per year to reach 20%, but with a significant "franchise"for smaller farms (5000 EUR for a
two full time work units) which would exclude 3/4 of farms (but representing only 1/5 of direct payments). As a result, the maximum sum of payments to a farm would be 300,000 EUR. The amounts saved by modulation would be given to Member States for "second pillar" actions, to target specific rural needs.

The addition of a new chapter on food quality in the rural development programme would further strengthen the second pillar of the CAP.

This whole programme would of course respect the overall budgetary ceiling defined by the EU Council for the CAP until 2006.

This Commission's proposal will certainly lead to intensive debate among Member countries, but it is an excellent example on the way in which the reform principles agreed upon over the last fifteen years can be implemented in a practical manner, achieving a rather good balance between the many objectives, expectations and constraints surrounding agricultural policies.

Another interesting example of reform of agricultural policy in Europe is the case of Switzerland. Although this country has one of the highest level of support among OECD countries, it implemented a significant shift in the composition of support, reducing price support and increasing direct payments, in particular for environmental purposes. The new version of the Swiss Constitution makes clear that agriculture should take account of both market conditions and sustainable development; it defines three main objectives are defined: food security, conservation of natural resources and of landscape, decentralized occupation of the territory.

On this basis, the Agricultural Act of 1998 defines the programme "Agriculture 2002". It provides for a significant reduction of State intervention on the market, in particular in relation to price and intervention guarantees. The semi-public bodies for the butter and cheese market have been abolished. The price guarantees for the major products, including milk, have been considerably limited, and now the price of milk is fixed by the market as the Government publishes only a non-binding target price. However, there are still various forms of market support measures for the dairy sector, including for export subsidies. The introduction of the transferability of dairy quotas has contributed to increased flexibility. These developments have led to a significant restructuring of the dairy sector, in particular at the processing and marketing level, and the number of dairy plants and marketing cooperatives has been drastically reduced. The guaranteed prices for cereals have also been discontinued.
On the other hand, direct payments increased significantly and represent now more than half of total Government expenditure for agriculture. Out of this, about 60% benefits hill and mountain farming. About 10% of direct payments are granted in the form of deficiency payments, the rest being subject to compliance with a set of environmental standards and farm-management practices requirements. These direct payments are granted through a very wide range of measures, ranging from area payments and headage payments to specific ecological payments or support to organic farming. As a result, the share of direct payments in gross farm return represents 20% in total, and as much as 36% in mountain regions.

2. at the international level

At the international level, the Uruguay Round Agreement on Agriculture (URAAA) has materialized the multilateral commitment to reform agricultural policy. Through the "three pillars approach", it recognised the interrelationship between border measures and domestic policy, which is a major conceptual and political achievement. The commitments to reduce tariffs (the only import restriction accepted as a result of the tariffication process), export subsidies and domestic support represent a major step forward. For the first time, agriculture became part of an international trade agreement, and multilateral commitments were undertaken by all countries on a broad range of measures.

However, the Agreement itself had obvious limitations and its concrete impact in terms of trade liberalization has been limited, even if all countries completed legally with their commitments.

On market access, tariffication was a major progress, providing transparency and allowing the negotiation process to take place in a much more effective way than with the previous wide array of import restrictions. However, the general level of agricultural tariffs remain quite high: it has been estimated to about 60%, compared with a range of 5-10% for industrial goods. The bound tariff is often much higher than the level of protection existing before the URRAA, and than the tariff actually applied, which means that this "water in the tariff"provides a significant potential for protection. Tariff spikes can be quite high, protecting mainly temperate products. Furthermore, tariff escalation remains significant, protecting processed products much more than raw materials.

Tariff rate quotas (TRQs) represent a complex problem. Their initial objective, ie. to guarantee existing access, was certainly justified. However, the implementation of the system
has shown that the TRQ are generally under-filled by a significant margin. According to estimates, the average fill rate in OECD countries is about 60%. This issue has been widely debated in the context of WTO, and it is not easy to identify the reason for this situation, and the ways to remedy. Obviously, one reason is that many TRQs are granted to specific countries under preferential agreements. More generally, the methods for allocating and administering the TRQs are often inefficient.

Export subsidies have been disciplined by the URAA provisions, but not abolished, which means that agriculture remains an exception within the WTO system on this point. At present, about 90% of total export subsidies are granted by the EU, which explains the tense negotiations on this topic in Doha. In fact, due to the market conditions prevailing in the 90s, and to the "roll-over" provision, export subsidy entitlements have not been used during the implementation period. The effectiveness of the system has also been reduced by the fact that the subsidy level of the base period were abnormally high because of the depressed market conditions.

The complete abolition of export subsidies will be one of the main negotiating issues in the present Round. According to the OECD calculations, its impact would not be dramatic, in particular for cereals, as the EU price is likely to move closer to the world price, due to market conditions and to the Agenda 2000 reform. The biggest impact is likely to be on the dairy market, affecting the dairy sector of some countries such as the EU, Canada and the US.

The issue of export subsidies should however be seen in the wider context of "export competition" in general. Export credits, some forms of state trading, abuse of food aid can have the same distorting impact as export subsidies. In political terms, this is particularly relevant to export credits, which are mainly used by the US. However, the share of agricultural trade covered by export credits is rather small (about 5%), and the subsidy element in export credit has been estimated by OECD to be about 6.6% on average. Furthermore, it is somewhat surprising to note that more than half of export credits are used in intra-OECD trade, and that only 9% benefit Net Food Importing Developing countries. This being said, there is a real need to bring agricultural export credits under the same disciplines as other export credits, and to include them in the forthcoming negotiations.

The disciplines on domestic support are the most innovative element of the URAA. Reducing production- and trade- distorting domestic support while allowing for non-distorting support, was an important principle of the URAA, economically and politically justified. In
reality, the domestic support discipline proved the least binding as most countries had little
difficulty in meeting their commitments. Most OECD countries have reported total AMS
levels below 70% or more than the permitted levels, with the exception of Korea, Japan,
Norway and Switzerland. In the US and the EU, this resulted from the switch to Blue Box
payments. Another factor is the fact that the base year, 1986, was an all-time record for
agricultural support.

In spite of these limitations, it can be argued that the switch towards Blue Box and Green
Box payments has a positive character. Now, 60% of the total domestic support in OECD
countries belongs to these two boxes, and is therefore exempt from reduction commitments.
Over a ten-years period, the total Green Box payments within OECD doubled. Whether all
Green Box measures are really non-, or minimally-trade distorting may however be discussed.
When the level of direct payments becomes as high as it may be in some countries now, it
can also be argued that they do have, as a whole, a major impact on investment and
production decisions by farmers. The whole issue of "decoupling" needs further theoretical
and empirical analysis. Domestic support will therefore also be an important issue in the new
WTO negotiations.

Beyond the "three pillars" which form the cornerstone of the URAA, many other elements
of the overall Marrakesh agreement have a decisive impact on the agro-food sector. The most
obvious example is the Sanitary and Phytosanitary Agreement, which reveals itself particularly
relevant as food safety issues come to the forefront. Other examples are the TRIPS and TBT
Agreements: they go much beyond agriculture, but their implementation is crucial in the food
sector. In the new "Doha Development Round", the connections between the agricultural
negotiations strincto sensu and the more general negotiations on those other instruments
represent a major challenge for the negotiators.

IV. An assessment of the present situation

The reform process implemented in all OECD countries led indeed to greater market
orientation and lower support and protection since the mid-80s, but wide differences remain
across countries and commodities. Despite the development of direct payments, price support
remains the major form of support. Therefore the 2002 OECD Monitoring and Evaluation
Report concluded: "although there has been some progress in agricultural policy reform, it has
been slow, variable and insufficient". OECD Agricultural Ministers themselves had agreed at their 1998 meeting that "more needs to be done".

In 2001, for OECD as a whole, total support to agriculture (TSE) amounted to USD 311 billion, i.e. below the two previous years. This amount accounts for 1.3% of total OECD GDP, compared with 2.3% in 1986-1988. Support to producers (PSE) represents about two-thirds of this amount, and 31% of total farm receipts, compared with 38% in 1986-1988. These comparisons over the last fifteen years show indeed some improvement in the direction of a reduction of support.

However, there is still a very wide range of support levels across countries and among commodities. Support levels are very low in New Zealand (1% PSE) and Australia (4% PSE), and highest in Iceland, Japan, Korea, Norway and Switzerland (around or over 60% PSE). The PSE level is 35% in the EU, and around or less than 20% in Mexico, Canada and the United States. The variation among commodities is also striking, with a PSE level of 80% for rice, 45% for sugar and milk, 36% for wheat and beef, and below 30% for poultry, pig meat, oilseeds and maize.

As already mentioned, the major change over the last fifteen years has been the shift from market price support to direct payments not based on output. For the OECD as a whole, the share of market price support has decreased from about 90% to 78%. This decline has been even more marked in the EU (from 95% to 75%), in Iceland (from 100% to 85%) and in Switzerland (from 90% to 68%). But one should remember that total support in Switzerland remains the highest of all OECD countries. On the other hand, there has been no similar trend in Japan, and the reduction in the share of market price support has been very small in Korea, even if the new Agricultural Law was giving indications in this direction, in particular with reference to agri-environmental measures.

The evolution of agricultural policies in individual countries is therefore mixed. Some progress has been made, for example in the EU and in some other European countries, but in most of the latter, the total level of support remains very high. The Commission's proposal for a a further reform of the CAP in the context of the Mid-Term Review would represent a positive step in the direction of a more market-oriented agriculture, while ensuring that the priority expectations of the society would be met. However, political discussions among EU countries on this proposal have just started, and it is will known that there are major divergences among them, which may be difficult to reconcile.

On the other hand, in the United States, the emergency payments which have been granted
over the last few years, and the new Farm Bill (the US Farm Security and Rural Investment Act), seem to go in a direction opposite to the reform principles. The new Act would indeed allow for an additional spending of USD 82.8 billion over the ten-year period, compared with expenditure which would have resulted from the continuation of the 1996 Farm Bill. Of this total additional spending allowance, nearly 70% reflects spending on commodity programmes which is obviously not a step in the direction of more decoupling. However, it should be recognised that the new Act puts also more emphasis on conservation, rural development and forestry.

Therefore, the discussions on the reform of agricultural policies are likely to remain very tight, both domestically and internationally. The difficult drafting negotiations of the agricultural paragraphs of the "Doha Declaration", and the new phase of agricultural negotiations within WTO, which have revealed very different starting positions (but within a framework which is generally well defined and agreed), are clear evidence of the difficulties to be expected in the near future. Once again, there will be a very close interdependence between the discussions on domestic reform, in particular within the EU, and the international negotiations.

V. The key challenges for tomorrow

1. In spite of these difficulties, the general trend towards more market orientation and greater liberalization will continue, both for domestic and international reasons. This is generally recognised in all the proposals submitted in the ongoing WTO negotiations, although the concrete measures proposed to this effect vary widely on practically all topics, including on the new commitments to be taken in the "three pillars"of the URAA. The "architecture" of the "three pillars" is not put into question, and the interdependence between them, the relationship with some other "non-agricultural elements"of the negotiations, and the need for special and differential treatment for developing countries are also recognised, making the process more complex. In any case, progress further progress will be required on each of the three pillars:

- with regard to market access, the level of tariffs will need to be, further reduced with a suitable negotiated formula. The "Swiss formula"which leads to a greater harmonization in the
level of tariffs, has been advocated by some as it would help to reduce tariff peaks. A special effort should be also be made to limit tariff escalation, in order to facilitate trade in processed products, a factor particularly useful for increasing value added of developing countries' exports;

- with regard to export subsidies, there is a widespread agreement that this is the most trade-distorting measure which should be drastically reduced, or even eliminated (see the carefully negotiated text of the "Doha Declaration"). Generally, developing countries would benefit from such a change, as it would eliminate the disincentive for local production. In cases where their import bill would be negatively affected, special financing facilities could be used. In addition, other forms of unfair export competition, such as export credits, should also be included in the negotiations and submitted to commitments, which has not been the case so far.

- the third pillar, domestic support, may be the most difficult one from a conceptual viewpoint, as it affects directly domestic policies, and their evolution in a new direction. It may be more difficult to justify the continuation of the Blue Box exemption (as the case for supply control is economically debatable) than the Green Box which covers non-trade distorting measures, often corresponding to new demands of the society ("non-trade concerns", as defined by Article 20 of the URAW). This applies in particular to environment and rural development, which are so important in Europe and Asia. However, the evidence of the "non-trade distorting" character of the Green Box measures should be very solid. More basically, the quantitative expansion of Green Box measures cannot be without impact on producers' decisions, therefore opening the question whether or not "full decoupling" is a realistic proposition.

2. Beyond these "classical", issues related to the trade negotiations themselves, there are many other key policy issues which are partly related to other international negotiations, such as the Multilateral Environment Agreements (MEAs) (climate change, biodiversity, desertification), and which are as much relevant to agriculture as the trade negotiations, at least in the long-run. Environment, rural development, food security and food safety are probably the most striking examples of these new concerns which are particularly strong in Europe. Most of them are closely related to the debate on "multifunctionality", a concept
which has been recently analysed more in depth, in particular by OECD. To ensure that this concept can be used in a sound manner for policy formulation, it is necessary to consider whether there is really "joint production" between commodity output and non-commodity output, whether there is a real market failure, and whether non-governmental options such as market creation have been explored. When these conditions are fulfilled, and when the non-commodity output has therefore the characteristic of a public good, government intervention should be envisaged in the most targeted and cost-efficient form.

3. The "non-production" objectives of the agro-food sector will be increasingly important. This is already obvious in developed countries, but this will also be true in developing countries although in a different manner. To ensure a fair debate on those issues, three points should be stressed. First, the principle that countries are free to set such policy objectives for their domestic policies cannot be put into question. Second, the measures chosen to achieve those objectives should be as economically efficient as possible, and should never be used as a disguised form of protectionism. Third, it should be stressed that these objectives cannot be achieved only through sectoral agricultural policies, but will depend more and more upon the general policies applied in these fields. In other words, the food and agricultural sector will be increasingly affected by non-agricultural policies, or at least by a very strong interdependence between agricultural and non-agricultural policies.

4. This last comment applies even more to the policy issues of the "new generation", such as geographical indications (to be discussed also in the context of the WTO TRIPS Agreement). Competition policy is also highly relevant: it is very important that the functioning of markets is not hampered by monopolies or other forms of market-distorting practices, and that the benefits of reform are effectively transmitted to consumers. These two issues are very high on the political agenda of European farmers: they are very keen to ensure recognition for their high quality food products which have a high value added, give an assurance of food safety and of environmentally-friendly practices, and which are linked to a given region. They are also concerned about the market power of the concentrated food industries and retailing firms. All these new issues require more economic research in order to help policy makers to define the right policies.

5. The specific problems of developing countries are covered in other papers. However, it
should be stressed here that they have to be taken into account as a matter of the highest priority by all OECD countries when formulating their agricultural policies. The need for more "policy coherence" is particularly acute in the agro-food sector. Providing much improved market access to developing countries as part of the WTO negotiations, and helping developing countries to boost their investment in the agro-food sector as proposed by the FAO World Food Summit, are two complementary actions.

6. Lastly, the institutional framework for the formulation and implementation of agricultural policies needs to be reconsidered in the light of the growing interdependence between policies, and of the greater role played by a wider range of NGOs this last development being especially strong in Europe. These two factors are relevant both domestically (new relations between Parliaments, Governments and NGOs) and internationally (the "architecture"of international organizations is under constant evolution). Political science, as well as sociology or cultural sciences, should play a greater role in relation to food and agricultural policies than in the past, reflecting the society's wider range of expectations. Multi-disciplinarity should become a reality.

VI. Conclusion

The globalization process affecting the agro-food sector has many interrelated facets which mean that it is less isolated than ever from the rest of the economy. Being often at the centre of the new concerns of the society represents a major responsibility, but also a great chance, for all actors in the agro-food sector, including in the research community.
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유럽을 중심으로 살펴본
농업의 세계화와 농업 정책의 개혁

제라드 비아즈

〈국문초록〉
이 보고서는 식량 및 농업 부문의 세계화 과정이 농업 정책 개혁과 얼마나 연관이 있는가는 설명하려는 것이다. 실제로 농업 정책 개혁은 세계화의 두 측면(지역적 및 부분적) 모두와 매우 강력한 연관이 있다. 첫째로, 농업 정책 개혁은, 식량 및 농업이 무역의 성장과 무역 잠복의 감소라는 전체적인 경향, 보다 일반적으로 세계경제의 통합이 점차 가속화되어 가는 전체적인 추세와 분리될 수 없다는 사실을 반영하고 있다. 둘째로, 농업 정책 개혁은, 농업 정책이 다른 경제 및 사회 정책과 밀접하게 연관되어 있다는 인식을 포함하고 있다. 어떤 의미에서는, 농업 정책 개혁을 본리에서 검토해서는 안 되며 어떤 식으로든 식량 및 농업에 영향을 미치는 모든 정책 개혁의 전체 과정을 검토해야 할 것이다.

농업 정책 개혁에 대한 논의가 국내적으로나 국제적으로나 매우 광범한 가능성이 크다. “도하
언언”에서 어렵게 입안된 협상들이 농업 황과 WTO 내에서의 새로운 농업 협상은 각기 출발점이 매우 다르지만(그리나 일반적으로 규장이 정확하고 깨끗한 협의를 이끌어낸 구조 내에서), 가까운 미래에 어려움이 예상되더라도 이를 분명히 보여주고 있다. 또 다시, 특히 EU 내에서 국내 개혁에 대한 논의와 국제 협약간의 매우 밀접한 상호의존성이 생기게 될 것이다.

농식량 부문에 영향을 미치는 세계화 과정은 여러 상관관계를 가진 측면들을 가지고 있다. 즉, 다른 경제 부문과 따로 떨어져 있지 않는다는 것을 의미한다. 사회와 세관은 관세율의 증가에 있다
는 것은 책이 크다는 의미이기도 하지만, 연구단체 뿐 아니라 농식량 부문의 모든 영역에 커다
란 기회이기도 하다.

해심주제어 : 농업의 세계화, 농업정책, WTO, 관세, OECD, EU