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Combining the industry growth rate and relative market share, each along a high and low dimension provides a strategic options to give directions in which produces and its trade prospects can be appropriately determined. The growth share matrices of farm produces sampled in the present study and constructed in the preceding chapters for pre WTO and Post WTO periods using BCG models underline the sound rationing principle for government finance towards the farm industry at the global level. The Industry Growth Rate of Agriculture sector and Relative Market Share of sampled nations for their sampled farm produces have been compiled in the preceding chapter for 16 years divided into two periods of Pre and Post WTO phases which indicate how agriculture sector has been behaving globally during this period.

Agriculture industry growth rate explains the overall prospects at the global level. The average growth rate for the pre WTO and post WTO period highlights the growing prospects or otherwise for all the sampled farm produces. Relative Market share pinpoints the strength of particular farm produce of that country in comparison with its largest competitor. It speaks about the availability of competitive advantage or otherwise for the respective farm produce of the country. The four quarters of the matrix are detailed below in the context of agriculture industry in general and financing thereof in particular.

**Star:** The area of this quarter is defined by the high industry growth rate of agriculture sector at the global level along with the high relative market share of the farm produces. The quarter indicates the good industry prospects encashed by the respective farm produces of the countries occupying here.

**Question Mark:** The quarter is occupied by agriculture produces of respective nations having very high industry growth rate but very low relative market share. This means that the nations experience a dilemma regarding continuance or otherwise of farm produces production and trade. And have therefore to be very cautious in policy decisions regarding these produces.

**Cash Cow:** This quadrant reflects the decline in growth rate of agriculture industry but a very
high relative market share of agriculture produces of respective nations. The farm produces and countries positioned in this area require to utilize surplus resources generated from this segment for supporting farm produces fall in question mark area so that their relative market share increases and these produces move in the better quarter called Star on the matrix.

**Dog**: Produces fall in this segment are low both on industry growth rate as well as on relative market share. This means neither the product is capable of performing good nor the industry is attractive so that the produces may see its prospects. As a matter of fact the strategy proposed for produces fall in this quarter is that of divestment strategy where it is always better to withdraw the produces from the business.

In the light of the significance of the BCG matrix and the strategic options that it suggests the investigator use this matrix to try and find out a logical foundation for pushing up negotiation at WTO forum amongst the member nations for an unbiased, suitable and consensus global trade strategy for agriculture produces which has received the greatest setback in WTO process inspite of number of deadline lapsing in finalizing agreement on agriculture. The investigator therefore proposes following findings of this study.

1) **Number of Produces and their respective countries falling under Star Quarter in the pre WTO period:**

During pre WTO period seven agriculture produces enjoyed the best global trade response and production status as listed below. However Tea, Rice, Sugarcane, Maize and Soybean produces of only two nations each had this advantageous position as clear from the following list. On the other hand Tomatoes of five nations and Apples of four nations enjoyed this status. Amongst the seven nations which could find one or the other of the listed seven agriculture produces in the star quarter three nations namely United States, China and India had their four agricultural produces each placed in this quadrant. Italy could have only one of its agriculture produces that is Tomatoes in the Star segment and so was France for its Apples. Brazil and Russia had two of their agriculture produces each falling in this segment. Thus a stepel produces like Rice and Maize had highest production and trade during this period. As was the case of other categories of agriculture produces viz Tea and Sugarcane, Apples and Tomatoes, and Soybean

- Tomatoes of India, Russia, Italy, China and United States of America
- Apples of France, Russia, United States of America and China.
- Soybean of Brazil and United States of America.
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- Maize of China and United States of America
- Sugarcane of India and Brazil.
- Rice of India and China.
- Tea of China and India

(Reference: Matrix Nos. 8.1.1, 8.1.2, 8.1.3, 8.2.3, 8.3.1, 8.3.2, and 8.3.3 of Page Nos. 322, 324, 326, 334, 336, 338 and 340.)

2) Number of Produces and their respective countries falling under Star Quarter in the post WTO period:

During Post WTO period three agriculture produces namely Sugarcane, Rice and Tea Slipped in their positions from that of pre WTO period. Which means only remaining four produces as mentioned above namely Maize, Apples, Tomatoes and Soybean could retain their star position in post WTO period as well. Of which three agriculture produces of United States continue to remain in that position. Two agriculture produces namely Rice and Tea have been completely dislodged from their pre WTO Star positions. Notably, US has not been a global player for these two agriculture produces. It becomes therefore clear that US being the member of group of quad nations had little to no impact of WTO phenomenon adverse to the prospects of its agriculture industry. This country could loose its position for only one agriculture produces i.e. Apples in favour of China. Interestingly two nations namely Russia and Italy which are members of the group of developed nations were completely wiped out from their Star position in terms of global trade and production for agriculture produces. This is why, the investigator feels, US joined Quad nations even though historically it is a developed nation. The competition too for produces of US has weakened during post WTO period where number of competing countries fell down from 5 to 4 in case of Tomatoes. India is another loosing country due to this phenomenon where she could retain her position for tomatoes only loosing out her position for three produces namely rice, tea and sugarcane. Similar situation has been faced by china which too has lost its position during post WTO period for two of its produces namely tea and rice. Brazil, another nation belonging to the group of developing nation, has been the victim of the WTO phenomena as its lost its position for Soybean and Sugarcane during post WTO period. This evidences the worries of developing nations like India and China who have emerged major stumbling blocks on the negotiation table of WTO for culmiulating Doha declaration for agreement on agriculture. Brazil however remains to benefit in advancing its position for Coffee where it emerged as the only Star player on the...
global trade scenario during post WTO period. As is clear from the following list, US has dominated the global agriculture trade during post WTO with little or negligible fight from India, China and Brazil.

- Soybean of Brazil and United States of America.
- Tomatoes of India, United States of America and China.
- Coffee of Brazil.
- Maize of China and United States of America.
- Apples of China.

Sugarcane has been pushed downward during post WTO due to fall in Industry growth rate globally getting located almost on the boundary of Star and Cow segments. India and China have been the two players for this produce.

(Reference: Matrix Nos. 8.7.3, 8.8.1, 8.8.2, and 8.8.3 of Page Nos. 366, 368, 370 and 372.)

3) Number of Produces and their respective countries falling under Question Mark quarter in the pre WTO period:

Under the question mark segment of matrix fall the same set of seven produces which fell under the star segment during pre WTO period as per the list given below. However these produces belong to more number of countries which are fourteen as against just seven in the Star quarter of pre WTO. The names of these nations are also given in the following list against their produces. There are eleven nations producing Maize which fall in this quarter followed by ten nations producing rice and equal number of nations producing Soybean further followed by eight nations producing tomatoes, seven nations producing sugarcane and six nations producing apples. What is obvious here is more agriculture produces of more nations occupy position in question mark segment however this is indicative of higher Industrial growth rate. Countries like Indonesia, Bangladesh, Myanmar, Philippines are all occupying position in this segment for the said farm produces. US finds its place here only for two produces i.e. Rice and Sugarcane and UK finds its place here only for three products i.e. Maize, Tomatoes and Apples. This evidences the fact that countries and their agriculture produces of this segment, except for UK, US, Russia, Japan etc. needed government support in terms of subsidy and tariff protection to capitalize upon high industrial growth rate during pre WTO period and reap the benefits of the neoglobal trade order. These nations are India, Indonesia, Myanmar, Philippines and Bangladesh which belong to the group of developing nations and least
developed nations.

- Apples of Brazil, Canada, India, Italy, Japan and United Kingdom.
- Tomatoes of Bangladesh, Brazil, Canada, France, Indonesia, Japan, Philippines and United Kingdom.
- Soybean of Canada, China, France, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Myanmar, Philippines and Russia.
- Maize of Bangladesh, Brazil, Canada, France, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Myanmar, Philippines, Russia and United Kingdom.
- Sugarcane of Bangladesh, China, Indonesia, Japan, Myanmar, Philippines, United States of America.
- Rice of Bangladesh, Brazil, France, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Myanmar, Philippines, Russia and United States of America.
- Tea of Bangladesh, Brazil, Indonesia, Japan, Myanmar and Russia.

(Reference: Matrix Nos. 8.1.1, 8.1.2, 8.1.3, 8.1.4, 8.2.1, 8.2.2, 8.2.3, 8.3.1, 8.3.2, 8.3.3, 8.3.4, 8.4.1, 8.4.2, and 8.4.3 of Page Nos. 322, 324, 326, 328, 330, 332, 334, 336, 338, 340, 342, 344, 346 and 348.)

4) Number of Produces and their respective countries falling under Question Mark quarter in the post WTO period

All those nations which occupied position in the pre WTO question mark segment have sustained their position during post WTO period as well. However some of the agriculture produces like sugarcane, rice and tea slipped out of this segment during post WTO period. Thus four out of seven produces namely soyabean, Tomatoes, Maize and Apples continued to remain in question mark segment even during post WTO phaze. The detail list of these agriculture produces and their nations has been given below.

- Soybean of Canada, China, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Myanmar, Philippines, Russia.
- Tomatoes of Bangladesh, Brazil, Canada, France, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Philippines, Russia and United Kingdom.
- Coffee of China, India, Indonesia, Myanmar, Philippines and United States.
- Maize of Bangladesh, Brazil, Canada, France, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Myanmar, Philippines, Russia, United Kingdom.
- Apples of Brazil, Canada, France, India, Italy, Japan, Russia, United Kingdom and United States of America.
It is thus clear that there was a sharp decline in growth rate of agriculture produces like rice, tea, and sugarcane during post-WTO period, which may be conferred as the consequents of WTO phenomenon. However, like the Post-WTO star performer of Coffee, there is found post-WTO question mark performer of coffee as well, which mean that WTO phenomena has caused a consistent rise in growth rate of coffee, though for only select list of nations, pushing it up in the matrix segment order. Another evident fact that emergence here is that US has added two more products in this segment during post-WTO namely Apples and Coffee and has since consolidated its position as a result of WTO phenomenon. India has remained unaffected as it continued itself in this segment for both its agriculture produces namely soybean and Maize during post-WTO as it were during pre-WTO period. Thus Coffee continues to be major beneficiary agriculture produce during post-WTO period in question mark segment like it was in Star segment as a result of WTO phenomenon costing Tea and Rice to loose its position. It therefore appears that Tea and Rice, which are prominently grown in South Asia Sub continent, have received maximum heat of WTO phenomenon.

Sugarcane grown by nations like Bangladesh, China, Indonesia, Japan, Myanmar, Philippines, and US has received major setback during post-WTO in terms of sharp decline in its growth rate, market share already remaining low, that it was pushed down on the boundary of question mark and dog segment during post-WTO period. (Reference: Matrix Nos. 8.6.1, 8.6.2, 8.6.3, 8.6.4, 8.7.1, 8.7.2, 8.7.3, 8.8.1, 8.8.2, 8.8.3, 8.8.4, 8.9.1, 8.9.2, and 8.9.3 of Page Nos. 354, 356, 358, 360, 362, 364, 366, 368, 370, 372, 374, 376, 378 and 380.)

5) Number of Produces and their respective countries falling under Cash Cow quarter in the pre-WTO period:

Produces falling in cow segment are those which are very rumenerative on account of high relative market share but which provide for no scope of further investment on account of low growth rate. During Pre-WTO, as clear from the following list, four produces namely Wheat, Potatoes, Coffee, and Barley fell under cow segment. Of these produces two viz wheat and barley are stiplke foods, Wheat was produced by India, Russia, US and China, Barley by Canada and Russia, during pre-WTO period. Thus five nations as per the list below, occupied position in cow segment during pre-WTO period. Incidentally Russia had all these four produces in cow segment followed by US and China having only two produces in this segment and India and Canada with just one produce.
each falling in this segment. Coffee makes an impact here also however this time it is coffee of Russia which is seen in any segment of the matrix during pre WTO period. It is also evident that the five nations in the list here which India, Russia, Canada, China and US have had highest market share though in a low growing industry of Wheat, Potatoes, Coffee and Barley during the pre WTO phase.

- Wheat of India, Russia, United States of America and China.
- Potatoes of United States of America, China, Russia.
- Coffee of Russia.
- Barley of Canada and Russia.

(Reference: Matrix Nos. 8.1.3, 8.2.1, 8.2.3, 8.3.2 and 8.3.3, of Page Nos. 326, 330, 334, 338 and 340.)

6) Number of Produces and their respective countries falling under Cow quarter in the post WTO period:

During post WTO period two more produces rice and tea found its place in cow segment of the matrix as clear from the list given below. These two produces from India, China and India, China & Brazil could only occupy this position. It may be noted that these are the two produces which slipped from Star and question mark segment during post WTO period. A downward fall in position of any produce on BCG Matrix is an indication of decline in Industry growth rate. This means that globally there is a decline in growth rate of rice and tea but inspite of that India, China and Brazil have had highest market share for these two produces resulting in their placement in cow segment. This further means that India, China and Brazil have been dominant players for these producer but probably the WTO induce global trade order suffocated the growth rate globally to create pressure on these nations for withdrawing from rice and tea production as it has no scope for further investment. It must be remembered that very large population of the world residing in this part like India, Bangladesh, Pakistan, China, Philippines, Indonesia, Myanmar etc. is rice eating population and tea totaling population. On the other hand two agricultural produces namely potato and Wheat have maintained its position in cow segment even during post WTO period for all its nation during pre WTO period and India being addition for potato only. Similarly coffee of Russia has been thrown out of this segment during post WTO period giving way to Tea produced by India, China and Brazil. What is further obvious from the following list is that Potatoes and Wheat have been produces of US and therefore sustainability of its position during post WTO can be related
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to the presence of US in this segment. Here also it may be inferred that WTO phenomena
have been mostly pro US
➢ Potatoes of India, Russia, United States of America and China.
➢ Rice of India and China
➢ Wheat of Russia, United States of America, India and China
➢ Tea of Brazil, India and China
➢ Barley of France, United Kingdom, United States of America, Canada and Russia
(Reference: Matrix Nos. 8.6.1, 8.6.3, 8.6.4, 8.7.1, 8.7.3, 8.8.1, 8.8.2 and 8.8.3, of Page Nos. 354, 358, 360, 362, 366, 368, 370 and 372)
7) Number of Produces and their respective countries falling under Dog quarter in the
pre WTO period:

Produces falling under dog segment of BCG matrix are characterized as already noted
in earlier pages, by very low market share and a correspondingly very low growth rate.
From strategic point of view it is advisable to wrap up the business of these produces for
better economic prospects. It is found that four produces namely, wheat potatoes, coffee
and barley of the nations listed below fell under this segment during pre WTO period.
Only two produces namely coffee and Barley belong to US in which US has never been
interested. Most of the nations belonging to these developed countries group and
developing countries group find their place for the listed produces in pre WTO dog
segment. Two of these produces namely wheat and barley are staple foods where as the
remaining two produces namely potatoes and coffee are cash crops, thus countries like
Bangladesh, Indonesia, Myanmar, Philippines and to some extend India, China, Brazil are
struggling in the production and trade of these produces.

➢ Wheat of Bangladesh, Brazil, Canada, France, Italy, Japan, Myanmar and United
   Kingdom.
➢ Potatoes of Bangladesh, Brazil, Canada, France, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan,
   Myanmar, Philippines and United Kingdom.
➢ Coffee of China, India, Indonesia, Myanmar, Philippines and United States of
   America.
➢ Barley of Bangladesh, Brazil, China, France, India, Italy, Japan, Myanmar, United
   Kingdom and United States of America.
(Reference: Matrix Nos. 8.1.1, 8.1.2, 8.1.4, 8.2.1, 8.2.2, 8.2.3, 8.3.1, 8.3.2, 8.3.3,
8.3.4, 8.4.1, 8.4.2, and 8.4.3 of Page Nos. 322, 324, 328, 330, 332, 334, 336, 338, 340, 342, 344, 346 and 348."

8) **Number of Produces and their respective countries falling under Dog quarter in the post WTO period**:

Rice and Tea produced by nations like Bangladesh, Indonesia, Myanmar, Philippines, Brazil, etc. slipped down to dog segment during post WTO period as obvious from the list given below. On the other hand a status of Wheat, Potatoes and Barley produced by pre WTO nations, as mentioned above, has remained the same during the post WTO continuing in the Dog quarter of the matrix. This suggests that produces of pre WTO Dog quarter have shown no improvement during post WTO period, instead few more produces like rice and tea have been added to the list of poorly performing agriculture produces during this period. Coffee remains to be only conspicuous case, which has egested out of dog segment of BCG matrix during post WTO period. Once again Coffee was a US produce during pre WTO. It further evidences that trade dominating nations of the world have used the local platform to ease out even their poorly performing agriculture produces as in this case coffee of US could escape from Dog segment during post WTO however it was in the same segment during pre WTO period.

- Potatoes of Bangladesh, Brazil, Canada, France, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Myanmar, Philippines and United Kingdom.
- Rice of Bangladesh, Brazil, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Myanmar, Philippines, Russia and United States of America.
- Wheat of Bangladesh, Brazil, Canada, France, Italy, Japan, Myanmar and United Kingdom
- Tea of Bangladesh, Indonesia, Japan, Myanmar and Russia.
- Barley of Bangladesh, Brazil, China, India, Italy, Japan, Myanmar.

(Reference: Matrix Nos. 8.6.1, 8.6.2, 8.6.3, 8.6.4, 8.7.1, 8.7.2, 8.7.3, 8.8.1, 8.8.2, 8.8.3, 8.8.4, 8.9.1, 8.9.2, and 8.9.3 of Page Nos. 354, 356, 358, 360, 362, 364, 366, 368, 370, 372, 374, 376, 378 and 380.)

9) **Movement of Country with produces from Star to Question mark to Cow to Dog segments in the matrix**:

Theretoeically speaking Star positiongin of a produce is the best followed by question mark positioning as second best further followed by cow positioning and dog positioning
of the produce being the worst for a produce. From this angle the investigator attempted to determine which agriculture produces of the respective nations observed a movement from star to question mark to cow to Dog segments during post WTO period which could be correlated, other things remaining the same, with the WTO phenomena and which can be seen as adverse impact of this neoglobal trade order. Such movements have been shown as follows:

a) **Star to Question Mark**
   - Apples of France, Russia, United States of America
   - Tomatoes of Italy and Russia

b) **Star to Cow**
   - Rice of India and China, Tea of China and India.

c) **Star to Dog**
   - Nil

d) **Question Mark to Cow**
   - Tea of Brazil

e) **Question Mark to Dog**
   - Rice of Bangladesh, Brazil, France, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Myanmar, Philippines, Russia and United States of America.
   - Tea of Bangladesh, Indonesia, Japan, Myanmar and Russia.

f) **Cow to Dog**
   - Nil

No produces placed in cow segment during pre WTO move to Dog segment during post WTO and so was the case for produces place in pre WTO star segment not moving to post WTO dog segment. However Apples and Tomatoes observe a sharp decline in their relative market share for countries namely France, Russia & US, and Italy & Russia respectively causing their movement from left to right and thus pushing them out of star segment into question mark segment. Similarly rice and tea of India and China observe a downward movement falling down from pre WTO star segment to Post WTO cow segment indicating a sharp decline in the global growth rate for these two produces. A similar downward movement is observed for rice of Bangladesh, Brazil France, Indonesia, Italy Japan, Myanmar Philippines Russia and US and Tea of Bangladesh, Indonesia Japan Myanmar and Russia whereby these produces slipped down from pre WTO question mark segment to post WTO Dog segment indicating again a sharp decline in global growth rate for these produces. This can be inferred therefore that WTO phenomenon has forced a fall in growth rate for many important agricultural produces such that the respective growing nations of these produces have found their domestic productions declining equally. The
example of rice exporting nation of pre WTO Indonesia becoming rice importing Indonesia during post WTO period is a case in testimony. Another observation that the investigator tempted to make here that the movement of this kind noted under the present paragraph is an indication of downfall of agriculture produces industry during post WTO of which United States has been an exception and so have been most of the countries of the group of developed nations and quad nations. Sugarcane is the only produce which did move downwards from pre WTO question mark segment but did not fall into post WTO dog segment. Thus this produce of Bangladesh, China, Indonesia, Japan, Myanmar, Philippines, and US observe a decline in growth rate comparatively lower than similar decline of produces which changed the segment due to downward movement. Similarly sugarcane of India and Brazil moved downward from pre WTO star segment but did not fall into post WTO cow segment for identical reasons mentioned just before. This product therefore in both the noted cases of movement remained at the boundary between question and Dog segment in first case and Star and Cow segment in the second case.

(Reference: Matrix Nos. 8.1.1, 8.1.2, 8.1.3, 8.1.4, 8.2.1, 8.2.2, 8.2.3, 8.3.1, 8.3.2, 8.3.3, 8.3.4, 8.4.1, 8.4.2, and 8.4.3 of pre WTO phase and Matrix Nos. 8.6.1, 8.6.2, 8.6.3, 8.6.4, 8.7.1, 8.7.2, 8.7.3, 8.8.1, 8.8.2, 8.8.3, 8.8.4, 8.9.1, 8.9.2, and 8.9.3 of post WTO phase from the Page Nos. 322, 324, 326, 328, 330, 332, 334, 336, 338, 340, 342, 344, 346, 350, 354, 356, 358, 360, 362, 364, 366, 368, 370, 372, 374, 376, 378 and 380.)

10) Tariff and Subsidy structure v/s downward movement of produces:

There has been revision in tariff rates and government subsidy on agriculture sector by most of the WTO member nations during post WTO period in order to comply with the WTO format. Such revisions, meant for establishing free trade regime in the world, have been lopsided as nations belonging to developed and quad group were under no mandate to revise it. It appears that this revision opened the floodgate for rich nations to export their agriculture produces making importing nations dependent on agriculture produces from abroad. The movement of country with produces shown above only indicates an unjust tariff and subsidy mandate of the global trade organisation and hence there is no surprise that agreement on agriculture has not been concluded as yet. It would be only appropriate to take into accounts these facts for this agreement to be pursued at WTO for its logical conclusion.
11) Movement of Country with produces from Dog to Cow to Question mark to Star segments:

An upward movements of the produces of different countries in its position from Dog segment to cow segment to question mark segment to finally star segment is an indication, theoretically, of betterment of its trade and production. The invistigator therefore used the analysis given in foregoing chapter to identify whether there has been such movements and if so these movements relate to which produces of which nations during the identified two periods. The movements have been indicated as follows.

a) Dog to Cow: Potatoes of India, Barley of United Kingdom and United States of America.

b) Dog to Question Mark: Coffee of China, India, Indonesia, Myanmar, Philippines and United States.

c) Dog to Star: NIL

d) Cow to Question Mark: NIL

e) Cow to Star: NIL

f) Question Mark to Star: NIL

There were not many upward movement observed from pre WTO period to post WTO period as shown above. Such as no produces move upward from cow to Star segment, and from cow to question mark segment. Similarly no produces moved upward from dog to Star segment nor there was any movement for produces from question mark to star segment. However potatoes of India and Barley of UK & US moved from Dog to Cow segment indicating a sharp rise in their relative market share during post WTO period over the corresponding pre WTO period. Only one produce i.e. coffee of China, India, Indonesia, Myanmar, Philippines and US observed an upward movement from pre WTO dog segment to post WTO question mark segment indicating a sharp rise in its growth rate.

(Reference: Matrix No: 8.1.4, 8.2.3, 8.3.2, 8.3.3, 8.3.4, 8.4.2 and 8.4.3 of pre WTO phase and Matrix No. 8.6.4, 8.7.3, 8.8.2, 8.8.3, 8.8.4, 8.9.2 and 8.9.3 of post WTO phase from the page nos: 328, 334, 338, 340, 342, 346, 350, 360, 366, 370, 372, 374, 378 and 380)

12) Tariff and Subsidy structure v/s upward movement of produces:

US stands to be greatest beneficiary during post WTO period in terms of its rise in trade for coffee and barley as a result of revised tariff and subsidy structure under WTO phenomena, followed by UK for barley and India for coffee and potatoes. However since
there has been low relative market share for coffee this benefit for India, US and other countries has not been substantial. Nevertheless it can be inferred here that US, UK and India have gained during post WTO. There is no surprise therefore that India took the lead in pressuring the negotiating nations for conceding its demands for designing tariff and subsidy structure and thereby government financing in agriculture sector. The four groups of nations emerged due to this very intervention by India.

13) Identification of Group of Nations based on Upward Movement:

The upward movement from pre WTO to post WTO phase has mostly benefited developing nations like India, China and Indonesia followed by only one nation each from the group of developed and quad nations i.e. UK and US respectively as shown below. Whereas two nations Myanmar and Philippines belonging to least developed nations group have also been benefited. Thus out of the drawn sample of fourteen nations only seven nations i.e. 50% of them have been benefited during post WTO period. It is therefore understandable now that agreement on agriculture is not being seen in its final form for so long a period nor even in the near futures as the interest of remaining 50% of the nations is not accommodated. It is therefore apt that the global body peeps into the requisites of the remaining seven nations, for the purpose of this study, in order to foster the pace of negotiation on AoA.

a) Dog to Cow
- India under Developing Nations group
- UK under Developed Nations group
- US under Quad Nations group

b) Dog to Question Mark
- China, India & Indonesia under developing nations group.
- Myanmar and Philippines under Least Developed Nations group.

(Reference: Matrix No: 8.1.4, 8.2.3, 8.3.2, 8.3.3, 8.3.4, 8.4.2 and 8.4.3 of pre WTO phase and Matrix No. 8.6.4, 8.7.3, 8.8.2, 8.8.3, 8.8.4, 8.9.2 and 8.9.3 of post WTO phase from the page nos: 328, 334, 338, 340, 342, 346, 350, 360, 366, 370, 372, 374, 378 and 380)

14) Identification of Group of Nations based on Downward Movement

The straight fall from upper segment to lower segment in matrices has occurred with nations belonging to least developed group and developing group as obvious from the following chart. This downward movement has been either from star to cow segment like for India, China, Brazil and Indonesia or from Question mark to dog segment like for...
Bangladesh, Myanmar and Philippines. Thus these seven nations are the greatest victims of WTO effect as obvious from this analysis. However developed nations like Italy, France and Russia and Quad nations like Japan and US have also been partly hit during post WTO period. Brazil is the only country which did decline in growth rate but improved substantially on its relative market share causing its movement from question mark segment to cow segment. Similarly few developed nations like France, Russia and Italy moved laterally from star to question mark segment indicating a decline in relative market share without any significant decline in growth rate. There has been no movement of any group of nations from cow segment to dog segment, while group of nations other than developed nations did observe a slip from question mark segment but only upto the boundary of question mark to dog segment and thus the segment positions remain more or less the same.

- a) Star to Question Mark
  - France, Russia, Italy under Developed Nations group
  - United States of America under Quad Nations group

- b) Star to Cow
  - India and China under developing nations group

- c) Star to the boundary of cow
  - India and Brazil under developing nations group

- d) Question Mark to the boundary of question mark-dog
  - Bangladesh, Myanmar and Philippines under Least Developed Nations group
  - China and Indonesia under Developing Nations group
  - Japan, and United States of America under Quad Nations group.

- e) Question Mark to cow
  - Brazil under Developing Nations group

- f) Question Mark to dog
  - Bangladesh, Myanmar and Philippines under Least Developed Nations group
  - Brazil, and Indonesia under Developing Nations group
  - Italy, Russia and France under Developed Nations group
  - Japan, and United States of America under Quad Nations group

It is hence inferred that two groups of nations viz. group of least developed nations and that of developing nations have been most adversely affected for the global trade and productions of their agriculture produces during post WTO period.

*(Reference: Matrix Nos. 8.1.1, 8.1.2, 8.1.3, 8.1.4, 8.2.1, 8.2.2, 8.2.3, 8.3.1, 8.3.2, 8.3.3, 398*
8.3.4, 8.4.1, 8.4.2, and 8.4.3 of pre WTO phase and Matrix Nos. 8.6.1, 8.6.2, 8.6.3, 8.6.4, 8.7.1, 8.7.2, 8.7.3, 8.8.1, 8.8.2, 8.8.3, 8.8.4, 8.9.1, 8.9.2, and 8.9.3 of post WTO phase from the Page Nos. 322, 324, 326, 328, 330, 332, 334, 336, 338, 340, 342, 344, 346, 350.) 354, 356, 358, 360, 362, 364, 366, 368, 370, 372, 374, 376, 378 and 380.)

15) **Number and Names of agriculture produces adversely hit during post WTO:**

There are five produces as listed below which have received major setback in global trade during post WTO period. These produces like apples, Tomatoes, rice, tea and sugarcane belong mostly to countries, as named below, of least developed and developing group except for apples and tomatoes. In case of remaining produces from US, Japan, Russia etc. it is found that these are not their main agriculture produces and hence this bring no major setback to their agriculture economyu. Also rice, tea and sugarcane have substantial global consumption level and these are substantially grown in the countries which have been adversely hit due to WTO phenomenon. It would therefore be advisable here that tariff, subsidy and government financing issues in AoA should not be addressed at a flat level rather these should be negotiated selectively for certain produces and for certain countries which saw a sharp decline during post WTO. This to say, as investigator feels, that a tariff and subsidy cut on a produce of a nation belonging to developed and quad group should not be imposed if the same was adversely hit due to WTO phenomenon.

a. Apples of France, Russia, United States of America
b. Tomatoes of Italy and Russia
c. Rice of India, Bangladesh, Brazil, France, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Myanmar, Philippines, Russia and United States of America and China
d. Tea of China, Bangladesh, Indonesia, Japan, Myanmar, Russia Brazil and India
e. Sugarcane of India, Brazil Bangladesh, China, Indonesia, Japan, Myanmar, Philippines and United States of America.

(Reference: Matrix Nos. 8.1.1, 8.1.2, 8.1.3, 8.1.4, 8.2.1, 8.2.2, 8.2.3, 8.3.1, 8.3.2, 8.3.3, 8.3.4, 8.4.1, 8.4.2, and 8.4.3 of pre WTO phase and Matrix Nos. 8.6.1, 8.6.2, 8.6.3, 8.6.4, 8.7.1, 8.7.2, 8.7.3, 8.8.1, 8.8.2, 8.8.3, 8.8.4, 8.9.1, 8.9.2, and 8.9.3 of post WTO phase from the Page Nos. 322, 324, 326, 328, 330, 332, 334, 336, 338, 340, 342, 344, 346, 350.) 354, 356, 358, 360, 362, 364, 366, 368, 370, 372, 374, 376, 378 and 380.)

16) **Number and Names of agriculture produces favorably hit during post WTO:**

There are three produces namely potatoes, barley and coffee of the nations listed below for which global trade performance rose during post WTO period. US has two of
these products and so as India whereas UK, Myanmar, Indonesia, China and philippines have only one of each of these products. The investigator therefore suggests a similar selective approach on negotiating for tariff and subsidy cut in AoA where the same may be imposed immaterial of the economic status of the producing nations. This is to say as investigator feel, that a tariff and subsidy cut disrupting government fianancing to agriculture sector may even be considered for a nation from least developed and developing group for a produceon which there was favorable impact of WTO phenomenon.

   a. Potatoes of India  
   b. Barley of United Kingdom and United States of America  
   c. Coffee of China, India, Indonesia, Myanmar, Philippines and United States.

(Reference: Matrix No: 8.1.4, 8.2.3, 8.3.2, 8.3.3, 8.3.4, 8.4.2 and 8.4.3 of pre WTO phase and Matrix No. 8.6.4, 8.7.3, 8.8.2, 8.8.3, 8.8.4, 8.9.2 and 8.9.3 of post WTO phase from the page nos: 328, 334, 338, 340, 342, 346, 350, 360, 366, 370, 372, 374, 378 and 380)

17) Number and Names of Countries adversely hit during post WTO:

   There are twelve nations from the sample nations of this study which has been adversely hit in terms of global agriculture trade during post WTO for selected agricultural produces as per the list given below.

   ➢ Bangladesh-Rice, Tea and Sugarcane  
   ➢ Brazil- Rice, Tea and Sugarcane  
   ➢ China- Rice, Tea and Sugarcane  
   ➢ France- Apples and Rice  
   ➢ India- Rice and Sugarcane  
   ➢ Indonesia- Rice and Sugarcane  
   ➢ Italy-Rice and Tomatoes  
   ➢ Japan-Rice, Tea and Sugarcane  
   ➢ Myanmar- Rice, Tea and Sugarcane  
   ➢ Philippines-Sugarcane and Rice  
   ➢ Russia-Apples, Tomato, Rice and Tea.  
   ➢ United States of America- Apples, Rice and Sugarcane.

   It may be inferred here that these adversaries have been caused due to WTO phenomenon
in the area of agriculture sector. Since WTO works for a free global trade it does not intend to victimize any country as a result. It would therefore be apt to suggest here that these twelve nations should be consulted rigorously and should also be given weightage for their viewpoints in finalizing AoA with a specific reference to their those agricultural produces which took a back sit during post WTO.

(Reference: Matrix Nos. 8.1.1, 8.1.2, 8.1.3, 8.1.4, 8.2.1, 8.2.2, 8.2.3, 8.3.1, 8.3.2, 8.3.3, 8.3.4, 8.4.1, 8.4.2, and 8.4.3 of pre WTO phase and Matrix Nos. 8.6.1, 8.6.2, 8.6.3, 8.6.4, 8.7.1, 8.7.2, 8.7.3, 8.8.1, 8.8.2, 8.8.3, 8.8.4, 8.9.1, 8.9.2, and 8.9.3 of post WTO phase from the Page Nos. 322, 324, 326, 328, 330, 332, 334, 336, 338, 340, 342, 344, 346, 350.) 354, 356, 358, 360, 362, 364, 366, 368, 370, 372, 374, 376, 378 and 380.)

18) Number and Names of Countries favorably hit during post WTO:

There are seven nations from the sample for this study, which drew advantage during post WTO for agriculture produces as listed below against them.

- India-Potatoes and Coffee
- United Kingdom-Barley
- United States-Barley and Coffee
- China-Coffee
- Indonesia-Coffee
- Myanmar-Coffee
- Philippines-Coffee

It may be noted here that coffee stands out to be major agriculture produce which could see rising global trade and production for six of these nations. And hence WTO has helped just one of the agriculture produces only to get global reception as a result of WTO provisions. Coffee is not a staple food nor it is a major produce supporting agriculture economy of any of these nations. It may be suggested that the interest of these nations for coffee produces would not have much impact on AoA and therefore the same can be ignored in the negotiation process.

(Reference: Matrix No: 8.1.4, 8.2.3, 8.3.2, 8.3.3, 8.3.4, 8.4.2 and 8.4.3 of pre WTO phase and Matrix No. 8.6.4, 8.7.3, 8.8.2, 8.8.3, 8.8.4, 8.9.2 and 8.9.3 of post WTO phase from the page nos: 328, 334, 338, 340, 342, 346, 350, 360, 366, 370, 372, 374, 378 and 380)

19) Agriculture produces of respective countries which were market leader during pre WTO:

There were eleven agriculture produces of nations as listed below which occupied the position of market leader during pre WTO periods as noted from the analysis made in
preceeding chapter.

- Apples-China
- Barley-Russia
- Coffee-Brazil
- Maize-United States of America
- Potatoes-Russia
- Rice-China
- Soybean-United States of America
- Sugarcane-Brazil
- Tea-India
- Tomatoes-United States of America
- Wheat-China.

(Reference: Matrix No.8.1.3, 8.2.3, 8.3.1, 8.3.2, 8.3.3 of page Nos.: 326, 334, 336, 338, 340)

20) **Agriculture produces of respective countries which were market leader during post WTO:**

There are eleven agriculture produces which lead the market during post WTO period. These produces and their respective nations have been shown in the list below.

- Apples-China
- Barley-Russia
- Coffee-Brazil
- Maize-United States of America
- Potatoes-China
- Rice-China
- Soybean-United States of America
- Sugarcane-Brazil
- Tea-India
- Tomatoes-China
- Wheat-China.

(Reference: Matrix No.: 8.6.3, 8.7.3, 8.8.1, 8.8.2, 8.8.3 of page Nos: 358, 366, 368, 370, 372)

21) **Market Leaders of pre WTO retaining their position in post WTO:**

Nine agriculture produces of nations listed below could sustain their market leader position of pre WTO period during post WTO period as well. This implies that WTO
phenomenon did not have much adverse impact on market leaders in agriculture sector.

- Apples-China
- Barley-Russia
- Coffee-Brazil
- Maize-United States of America,
- Rice-China
- Soybean-United States of America
- Sugarcane-Brazil
- Tea-India
- Wheat-China.

(Reference: Matrix No.8.1.3, 8.2.3, 8.3.1, 8.3.2, 8.3.3 of pre WTO phase and Matrix Nos.: 8.6.3, 8.7.3, 8.8.1, 8.8.2, 8.8.3 of post WTO phase from the page Nos.: 326, 334, 336, 338, 340, 358, 366, 368, 370, 372)

22) Market Leaders of pre WTO loosing their position to respective ranks in post WTO:

Two produces of nations listed below had to lose their position as a market leader enjoyed in pre WTO period during the following period i.e. post WTO phase. Both these produces i.e Tomatoes and Potatoes are not stipple foods produces.

- Russia-Potatoes- Second rank
- United States-Tomatoes-Second rank

(Reference: Matrix Nos.: 8.1.3, 8.2.3, 8.6.3, 8.7.3 of page Nos.: 326, 334, 358, 366)

23) Market leaders of Post WTO gaining their position from respective ranks of Pre WTO: China appears to the only country which became major beneficiary of WTO as two of its agriculture produces namely Potatoes and Tomatoes marked a substantial gain in its rank from pre WTO to post WTO period during which the two produces of this nations reached second rank amongst the trading nations of these produces. It should be worth noting here that China is a late entrant within the WTO fold.

- China-Potatoes-Second rank
- China-Tomatoes-Second rank

(Reference: Matrix Nos.: 8.3.2 and 8.8.2 of page Nos.: 338 and 370)

24) Recommended Strategy Chart-Pre WTO:

The position of farm produces on the BCG matrix invites some obvious strategic guidelines to be followed. The following table pinpoints the expected government financing policy corresponding to the strategic position of the farm produces for the
sampled nations during pre WTO period.

**Table No. T-9.1 showing the subsidy strategies corresponding to respective quarters for the pre WTO period**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Produces</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Star</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Soybean</td>
<td>Build and Grow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Tomatoes, Rice, Maize, Apples and Tea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Apples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Sugarcane, Rice and Tea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Tomatoes and Apples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Tomatoes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Tomatoes, Apples, Soybean and Maize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Tomato, Maize, Sugarcane, Rice and Tea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Apples, Tomato, Maize, Rice and Tea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Apples, Tomatoes, Soybean and Maize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Soybean and Sugarcane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Tomatoes, Soybean, Maize and Rice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Apples, Soybean, Maize</td>
<td>Subsidize selectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Tomatoes, Soybean, Maize, Rice, Sugarcane and Tea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Apples, Soybean, Maize and Rice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Apples, Tomatoes, Soybean, Maize, Sugarcane, Rice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>Soybean, Maize, Sugarcane, Rice and Tea.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Tomatoes, Soybean, Maize, Sugarcane and Rice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Soybean, Maize, Rice and Tea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Apples, Tomatoes and Maize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Barley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Continue deploying</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dog</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25) Recommended Strategy Chart-Post WTO:

The suitable strategic option for the respective farm produces of the sampled nations are provided below for the post WTO period, based on the theoretical guidelines emerged from the construction and analysis of BCG model.

**Table No. T-9.2 showing the subsidy strategies corresponding to respective quarters for the pre WTO period**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Produces</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Star</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Soybean and Coffee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Tomatoes, Maize, Apples and Sugarcane (Boundary)</td>
<td>Build and Grow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Tomatoes and Sugarcane (Boundary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Soybean, Tomatoes and Maize</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Tomatoes, Maize and Sugarcane</td>
<td>Subsidize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Cash Cow Products</td>
<td>Dog Products</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Tomatoes, Maize and Apples</td>
<td>Potatoes, Rice, Wheat, Tea and Barley</td>
<td>Withdraw Subsidies and Redploy proceeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Soybean, Maize and Apples</td>
<td>Potatoes and Wheat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Soybean, Sugarcane and Coffee</td>
<td>Barley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Tomatoes, Maize and Apples</td>
<td>Potatoes and Wheat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Soybean, Coffee, Maize and Apples</td>
<td>Barley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Soybean, Tomato, Maize, Sugarcane and Coffee</td>
<td>Soybean, Tomato, Maize, Sugarcane and Apples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Soybean, Tomato, Maize, Sugarcane and Apples</td>
<td>Soybean, Tomato, Maize, Sugarcane and Apples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>Soybean, Sugarcane, Maize and Coffee</td>
<td>Soybean, Tomato, Maize, Sugarcane and Apples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Soybean, Tomato, Maize, Sugarcane and Coffee</td>
<td>Soybean, Tomato, Maize, Sugarcane and Apples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Soybean, Tomato, Maize and Apples</td>
<td>Soybean, Tomato, Maize and Apples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Apples and Sugarcane</td>
<td>Soybean, Tomato, Maize and Apples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Tomato, Maize and Apples</td>
<td>Soybean, Tomato, Maize and Apples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Apples and Sugarcane</td>
<td>Soybean, Tomato, Maize and Apples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Cow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Continue deploying subsidies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Tea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Barley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Potatoes, Wheat, Rice and Tea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Potatoes, Wheat, Rice and Tea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Potatoes, Wheat and Barley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Barley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Potatoes, Wheat and Barley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Agriculture Produces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Potatoes, Rice, Wheat and Barley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Potatoes, Rice, Wheat, Tea and Barley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>Potatoes, Rice, Wheat, Tea and Barley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Potatoes and Rice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Rice and Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Potatoes and Wheat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Rice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26) Implications for movements in quarters.

Movement of agriculture produces and respective countries implies either change in growth rate or a change in relative market share or a simultaneous change in both in the favorable direction or unfavorable direction. Thus a lateral movement from a star to question mark or cow to dog segment indicates that relative market shares of affected produces and countries have declined implying further that these have lost their competitive positions, however a reverse lateral movement means that these have improved their competitive positions. It further means that few nations have gained in global trade of their agriculture produces at the cost of few other nations which otherwise is not the essence of WTO agreement. If however this lateral movement in either direction is due to simultaneous change in both the relative market share and the industry growth rate it is a healthy sign of fair global trade. The investigator therefore suggests that agreement on agriculture must take into consideration the ill effects of lateral movement of first type and any enforcement tariff and subsidy structure and government financing to agriculture sector on victim countries of this category should be refrained from if at all the neo global trade has to stay for ever. It may be suggested further that reasons for lateral movement of second type be picked up as the basis for this agreement to be finalised as the same would not smack of any biased or ulterior intention of the negotiating member nations.

A vertical movement in either direction causing shift from star to cow or question mark to dog and vice-versa implies that there is favorable or unfavorable change in growth rate of agriculture produces. If a produce of a given nation fails to grow at a rate at which global growth rate is occurring it looses its position vertically and vice-versa. It therefore calls for, as the investigator strongly feels, increased government financing and support to
that agriculture produce in that nation so that it growth does not lag behind the global growth rate. Knowing well that increase in global growth rate is the cumulative effect of growth of produces of all nations of the world it further implies that a few nations grow in their agriculture produces more rapidly than the other nations leading to a possibility of monopolies and oligopolies in future. WTO being a global body would never like to support a philosophy where hundreds of nations become dependent on one or a few large nations for agricultural produces. Hence the investigato suggests that agreement relating to tariff and subsidy should take a more lineant view for those nations and their agriculture produces which have not picked up corresponding growth during post WTO to that of global growth rate. It may even be suggested here that nations with outstanding growth performance during post WTO should show the courage to accommodate this lineancy in the AoA for a better global future.

It is thus found that the hypothesis of this research work is proved. Hence, the investigator feels no hesitation in marking his suggestions that an early negotiatted settlement for AoA at WTO would be possible if countries which continued to remain market leaders for some of their agriculture produces during both the periods i.e Pre WTO as well as post WTO should refrain from this negotiation process. At the same time countries which lost their market leader position of pre WTO period during post WTO period should get priority in the WTO negotiation. In any case the negotiation should lead to finalization of agreement on selective basis for agriculture produces and their nations rather than on a flat basis. It will help safeguard the interest of faltering produces and nations upholding ultimately the global interest and will also ensure that undue favor is not given to produces and nations which are already good performing produces and nations on agriculture front. This will truly endorse a fair trade, a fair agreement and would strengthen the functioning of a global body of the order of World Trade Organisation.

Non-agriculture market access, or NAMA in WTO jargon, and agriculture are major stumbling blocks in the conclusion of Doha round. When countries try to guard their particular interests as best as they can, even as they continue to espouse the multilateral framework on paper, progress in negotiation is bound to be slower. But then that is how multilateral negotiations – especially in matters as contentious as trade where economic interests are so closely involved – are bound to proceed. We must not forget how tortuous the Uruguay round was during the ten years that it took to bring the round to a successful conclusion. Developing countries (like India), which are an overwhelming majority in the
WTO, are now a force to reckon with and so it will no longer be possible to blatantly ram unfair agreements like the multi-fiber agreements (MFAs) down their throats. On the other hand, bilateral trade agreements are a poor second to multilateral agreements. Hence it is always better to identify common grounds amongst WTO members for agreement than to identify differences for its resolution. The observations made by the investigator here based on BCG matrix provide ample common grounds amongst the trading nations to chip in agreements on agriculture.