Centre de Recherche en économie de l'Environnement, de l'Agroalimentaire, des Transports et de l'Énergie

Center for Research on the economics of the Environment, Agri-food, Transports and Energy

Trade performance and potential of North African countries: An application of a stochastic frontier gravity model

Lota D. Tamini
Houssem Eddine Chebbi
Abdessalem Abbassi

Cahier de recherche/Working Paper **2016-4**

Mai/May 2016

Tamini: Professor at the Department of Agricultural Economics and Consumer Science and CREATE, corresponding author, Pavillon Paul-Comtois, 2425, Rue de l'Agriculture, local 4412, Québec (QC), G1V 0A6, Canada. Email: lota.tamini@eac.ulaval.ca
Chebbi: Higher School of Economic and Commercial Sciences (ESSEC de Tunis), MACMA, University of Tunis, Tunisia and Economic Research Forum (ERF).
Abbassi: Faculty of Economics and Management of Nabeul, ENVIE, University of Carthage, Tunisia and CREATE, Université Laval

Les cahiers de recherche du CREATE ne font pas l'objet d'un processus d'évaluation par les pairs/CREATE working papers do not undergo a peer review process.

ISSN 1927-5544

Trade performance and potential of North African countries: An application of a stochastic frontier gravity model

Lota D. Tamini[a,b] , Houssem Eddine Chebbi[c] and Abdessalem Abbassi[d]

Abstract

The objective of this paper is to analyze trade potential versus actual realized trade among North African trading partners. Following the literature on production economics, we built a stochastic frontier gravity model. The underlying assumption is that all deviation from trade potential is not due to white noise but could also be due to inefficiencies. Time-variant country-specific trade efficiency estimates are obtained and analyzed.

Our results indicate that Mauritania as a country of destination and of origin is where the trading relationship is the least efficient. Conversely, Tunisia, followed by Morocco, faces the fewest "behind" and "beyond" the border effects.

Our analysis of market integration and trade efficiency at the disaggregated level indicates that trade efficiency scores exhibit high variability between the categories of products. Moreover, North African market integration is worst when considering the goods from the category "Textiles; Footwear & Headgear".

Our estimates indicate that trade efficiency for agricultural products is relatively low indicating the existence of significant "behind" and "beyond" border inefficiencies.

Our estimates also point at the presence of poor and counterproductive regulatory environment and underline the importance of improving domestic policies to encourage entrepreneurial development and business facilities. Our findings confirm the need for the North African countries to improve their trade logistics at the national level to enhance trade efficiency and to implement trade facilitation reform programs.

Key words: Trade integration; Industrial products; Agricultural products; Stochastic frontier analysis; Gravity model; North Africa.

JEL classification: F14, F15, O10

[a] Laval University, Department of Agricultural Economics and Consumer Science and Center for Research on the Economics of the Environment, Agri-food, Transports and Energy (CREATE).

[b] Corresponding author: Pavillon Paul-Comtois, 2425, Rue de l'Agriculture, local 4412, Québec (QC), G1V 0A6, Canada. Email: lota.tamini@eac.ulaval.ca.

[c] Higher School of Economic and Commercial Sciences (ESSEC de Tunis), MACMA, University of Tunis, Tunisia and Economic Research Forum (ERF).

[d] Faculty of Economics and Management of Nabeul, ENVIE, University of Carthage, Tunisia and Center for Research on the Economics of the Environment, Agri-food, Transports and Energy (CREATE), Laval University.

1 Introduction

The North Africa region, Mauritania, Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, Libya and Egypt, represents about one-third of Africa's total GDP and a market of nearly 172 million people. This region is viewed as a large regional trade market. However, intra-regional trade among North African countries is one of the lowest in the world (AfDB, 2012) even if these countries are involved in a variety of bilateral and regional trade agreements.

In fact, all but Egypt are founders of the Arab Maghreb Union (AMU), which was established in 1989 by the Treaty of Marrakech.[1] In addition, the North African countries are members of the Greater Arab Free Trade Area (GAFTA), also known as the Pan-Arab Free Trade Area (PAFTA), with the exception of Mauritania, which is in the process of joining the organization. The Arab League decided to create the GAFTA, in 1997, to facilitate and develop trade among the members of the league, notably through a gradual elimination of trade barriers[2]. In March 2001, the League decided to speed up the liberalization process, and on January 1, 2005 the elimination of most tariffs among GAFTA members was enforced. In addition, within this context of Pan-Arab integration, three North African countries (Egypt, Morocco and Tunisia) are founders of the Agadir Agreement, signed in 2004, to establish a free trade area and enjoy the expected benefits of the Pan-Euro-Mediterranean of cumulation of origin system (Rouis and Kounetsron, 2010).

These varieties of trade agreements have not yet achieved all its objectives and recent events may have worsened the pattern of low intra-regional trade. First, political and security tensions, including threats of terrorism have affected trade relationships and imposed tighter border controls. In particular, the Morocco-Algeria border has been closed since 1994 and Mauritania, Morocco,

[1] See at http://www.maghrebarabe.org/en/. Accessed April 06, 2016.

[2] Eighteen of the twenty-two Arab League states signed the GAFTA agreement.

Algeria, Tunisia and Egypt decided to implement the 1992 United Nations embargo on Libya. Second, in 2007–2008, food and financial crises affected world trade (i.e., the so-called trade collapse), and may also have influenced intra-regional trade.[3] Finally, North African countries have been affected by the Arab revolution of 2011. The region was distressed by a disruption of economic activity, a decline in investment, a sharp decrease in foreign direct investment inflows[4] and a reduction of tourism receipts.

Several studies have analyzed the impact of free trade agreements (FTAs) on trade among Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region. Söderling (2005) analyzed export performance in the MENA using a gravity model.[5] Among others, the gravity approach is also used by Ekanayake and Ledgerwood (2009) and Parra, Martinez-Zarzoso and Suárez-Burguet (2016). Overall the results show that FTAs have increased trade among trading partners with a higher impact (i) for south-south FTAs and (ii) industrial products.[6] A two-stage approach is common when analyzing trade potential within the gravity-model framework (Gros and Gonciarz, 1996; Nilsson, 2000; De Benedictis and Vicarelli, 2005; Papazoglou et al., 2006). In the first stage, the gravity model of trade is estimated and in the second stage the model's parameters are used to project the expected trade flows. The predicted trade flows can be compared with actual trade, the difference being the

[3] As reported by World Bank and European Union (2010), the North African countries (Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia and Egypt) have experienced a 10.6 percent drop in remittances in 2009 as a result of the global financial crisis.

[4] See the statistics of the UNCTAD at http://unctad.org/en/Pages/DIAE/FDI%20Statistics/FDI-Statistics.aspx. Accessed October 22, 2015.

[5] In its basic form, the standard gravity equation explains bilateral trade as a function of the economic size of two countries and the distance between them.

[6] This result is also found by Montalbano and Nenci (2014) who uses matching econometrics to estimate the impact of FTA because of its potential endogeneity.

gains that have to be made in order to achieve full trade potential.[7] However, assuming this implies that all the deviation between the observed and predicted trade is an indication on the spread between actual and potential trade. This is unlikely especially within small samples as mentioned in Head and Mayer (2014: 41-45). Using the two-stage approach described below could lead to false results.

The objective of this paper is to analyze trade potential versus actual realized trade among North African trading partners. Accordingly, we use a gravity model, which draws heavily on Anderson and van Wincoop (2003) and that reflects recent applications (e.g. Anderson and Yotov, 2010; Fally, 2015). Following the literature on production economics (Aigner et al., 1977), a stochastic trade frontier representing the maximum possible level of bilateral trade could be construed using a gravity model (Bhattacharya and Das, 2014; Ravishankar and Stack, 2014). Time-variant country-specific trade efficiency estimates can be obtained. The trade efficiency term is conditioned by country of destination and country of origin variables as well as some variables characterizing the bilateral relationship. If two countries achieve high integration, they will operate on the trade frontier and will realize their maximum trade potential. Failing that, deviations of observed trade levels from the trade frontier indicate inefficient levels of trade, which imply scope for further integration between markets. The underlying assumption is that not all deviation from observed trade is due to white noise; inefficiencies in trade could also be a factor. Indeed, trade occurs at the firm level. This assertion has been integrated in the gravity literature since the seminal papers of Melitz (2003), Chaney (2008), Helpman, Melitz and Rubinstein (2008) and Melitz and

[7] Using this approach, UNECA (2013) finds that the intra-regional trade potential is far from being achieved and the observed flows represent only 46% of the predictions. It is also clear from this study that Tunisia and Mauritania, with completion rates above 100% are far beyond projections. The Arab Maghreb Union sub-region averages 56% of the predicted level, but with a shade size for Libya that would achieve in this area 97% of its trade potential. According to this study, the main growth opportunities for intra-regional trade would be thus focused on the trade opportunities offered by Algerian and Moroccan markets (UNECA, 2013).

Ottaviano (2008), which united recent work on heterogeneous firms in the determination of bilateral trade flows.

Our work is innovative in several ways. First, we provide estimates of trade efficiency scores but also seller and buyer incidence for each country. This would enable us to examine the capability of each country to draw benefits from North African market integration. Second, we provide empirical results on the impact of some policy variables on trade efficiency, and present key policy recommendations for finding ways to increase market integration. Third, we analyze market integration and trade efficiency at the disaggregated level to provide some explanations for market integration and trade efficiency based on North African countries' structure of production.

Our analysis of the evolution of the countries' trade potential suggests that inefficiencies have decreased over time, especially for Morocco and Tunisia, the two most integrated countries in the North Africa region.

Tunisia faces the fewest "behind" and "beyond" the border effects. In contrast, Algeria is far from being at trade potential and this country does not trade noteworthy with its first round neighboring countries. It is also important to note that Mauritania as a country of destination and of origin is where the trading relationship is the least efficient and our results confirm that its "natural" trading partners are not North African countries.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 is devoted to an overview of North-Africa market integration and intra-regional trade. Section 3 presents the analytical framework and describes the data. Section 4 is devoted to the results and Section 5 concludes the paper.

2 A brief overview of regional integration and intra-regional trade

The evolution of total value of importations of the North African countries is represented in Figure 1. Even if modest it shows a growth in trade and, like other regions in the world, a negative impact of the economic crisis of 2008-2009.



Figure 1. Total value of importations (in millions of U.S. dollars) from trading partners in North Africa.
Source: Author's calculations based on UN Comtrade data.

Total trade (import + export) accounted for more than 90 percent of GDP in the North Africa region during the period 2011-2013 (Figure 2). Mauritania, Libya and Tunisia are the most open North African economies, with average trade volumes exceeding GDP during 2008–2013. However, for Egypt and Algeria, trade levels have decreased significantly between 2005-2007 and 2011-2013.



Figure 2. Total trade in North Africa region (% GDP).
Note: DZA: Algeria; EGY: Egypt; MAR: Morocco; MRT: Mauritania; TUN: Tunisia.
Source: Author's calculations based on UN Comtrade data.

On average, total export of the North African countries to their trading partners in the same region represented less than 5 percent of total export during 2011–2013 (Figure 3). For Algeria and Egypt, exports to the region have increased significantly between 2005-2007 and 2011-2013 (representing 4 and 8 percent of the total export, respectively for the last period). The economic crisis of 2008-2009 seems to have had an impact on the evolution of import from the North Africa region. Indeed, import of the North African countries from the region have continuously decreased and represented less than 4 percent of total import during 2011–2013.



Figure 3. Share of intra North Africa trade (in total trade).
Note: DZA: Algeria; EGY: Egypt; MAR: Morocco; MRT: Mauritania; TUN: Tunisia.
Source: Author's calculations based on UN Comtrade data.

For Algeria, Egypt and Tunisia, the shares of its exports to the North Africa region are higher than its share of imports, while imports of Morocco and Libya are higher than its exports to the region. Despite the visible consequences of the 2011 revolution on the Tunisian trade, the country remains the most integrated in the North Africa region.

3 Analytical framework and data

3.1 Intensity of trade

Following Anderson and Yotov (2010) and Fally (2015), we estimate the structural gravity equation as:

(1) $$M_{ij} = \frac{Y_i}{\Pi_i^{-\theta}} D_{ij}^{-\theta} \frac{E_j}{P_j^{-\theta}}$$

In equation (1), M_{ij} represents the value of trade, $P_j^{-\theta}$ and $\Pi_i^{-\theta}$ are respectively inward and outward multilateral resistance indexes, Y_i refers to total output in country *i*, E_j refers to total expenditure in country *j*, D_{ij} captures trade costs from *i* to *j* and the parameter θ reflects the elasticity of trade flows to trade costs. The log-linearization of equation (1) defines what Head and Mayer (2014) called the generalized gravity equation:

$$(2) \qquad \log\left(\frac{M_{ij}}{Y_i E_j}\right) = \Gamma_j + \Gamma_i - \ln\left(D_{ij}^{-\theta}\right)$$

where $\Gamma_j \equiv \ln\left(P_j^{-\theta}\right)$ and $\Gamma_i \equiv \ln\left(\Pi_i^{-\theta}\right)$ are exporter and importer fixed effects respectively. As indicated by Olivero and Yotov (2012), in estimating a size-adjusted gravity model we deal, at least partially, with expenditure and production endogeneity as well as the important issue of heteroscedasticity.[8] Also, by bringing output and expenditure shares on the left-hand side in our estimations, we impose unitary estimates of the coefficients of these variables, as suggested by gravity model theory (Anderson and van Wincoop, 2003).

3.2 Trade costs

The trade costs include the distance summarized by d_{ij} with $d_{ij} = d_{ji}$ and the effect of some factual factors of trade preference:

$$(3) \qquad D_{ij}^{-\theta} = \exp\left(\begin{array}{l} \vartheta_1 \ln d_{ij} + \vartheta_2 Contiguity\_DZA + \vartheta_3 MAR\_DZA \\ + \vartheta_4 MAR\_EU\_d + \vartheta_5 MAR\_EU\_o + \sum_{y=2002}^{2012} \lambda_y Year \end{array}\right)$$

[8] Santos Silva and Tenreyro (2006) show that heteroscedasticity renders the log-linearized version of gravity estimates inconsistent.

where the variable $Contiguity\_DZA$ is a binary variable taking the value of 1 if the trading partner is contiguous with Algeria and 0 otherwise. The variable captures the fact that Algeria is contiguous with the other studied countries except Egypt. We have no expectations about the sign of this variable. The potential positive value of contiguity could be counterbalanced by the fact that the Algerian economy is highly dominated by the energy sector. The variable MAR_DZA takes the value of 1 if the trading partners are Algeria and Morocco without any consideration for the country of origin and country of destination. We expect this variable to have a negative value because of the "tense" political relationship between these two countries. The indicator variables of year are included to control for the potential impact of the economic crisis on the value of trade, and the years 2011 and 2012 control for the impact of the political change and the popular uprisings in Tunisia and Egypt. We expect to observe a significant negative impact of the food and economic crises (2007, 2008 and 2009) and the wave of political change (2011 and 2012). Finally, the variables $MAR\_EU\_o(d)$ take the value of 1 after the year 2007 for Morocco as a country of origin (destination) and capture the advanced status of Morocco with the European Union.[9]

3.3 Efficiency of trade

Following Ravishankar and Stack (2014) and Bhattacharya and Das (2014), we use a stochastic frontier analysis applied to a gravity model. The underlying hypothesis is that we can define a trade frontier whereby inefficient refers to the degree to which trade falls short of the frontier. Figure A1 in the appendix provides a representation of trade potential under stochastic trade frontier

[9] See at http://ec.europa.eu/trade/policy/countries-and-regions/countries/morocco/ . Accessed March 12, 2016.

representation. The inefficiency effect shows progress required to achieve market integration. The stochastic trade frontier representation is achieved by specifying the error term of the gravity model to be estimated as follows:

$$(4) \qquad h\left(\varepsilon_{ij}\right) = \exp\left(v_{ij} - u_{ij}\right)$$

Given equation (4), the error term is an additive error with a symmetric noise component, v_f with zero mean and a half-normal distribution component u_f. Following Kumbhakar and Tsionas (2005) and Kumbhakar et al. (2009), we assume that v and u are not only mutually independent but are also independent of the explanatory variables. We also assume that $\varepsilon_{ij} \sim N_{ij(n-1)}\left(0_{ij(n-1)}, \Sigma \otimes I_{ij}\right)$ where Σ is a $(n-1)\times(n-1)$ covariance matrix, $v_{ij} \sim N\left(0, \sigma_v^2\right)$ and $u_{ij} \sim N^{+}\left(z_{ij}'\delta, \sigma_u^2\right)$ (i.e., u follows a half-normal distribution). The vector z represents a set of variables that condition differences in trade efficiency and use the following decomposition scheme:

$$(5) \qquad u_{ij} = \lambda_0 + \lambda_1 time + \lambda_2 Sim_{ij} + \sum_{i=1}^{5} \lambda_{3,i} C_j^o + \sum_{i=1}^{5} \lambda_{4,i} C_i^d + \lambda_5 2008 + \lambda_6 2011 + \lambda_7 2012$$

In equation (5) the variable *time* (from 2002 to 2012) captures progress in market integration over time and is expected to have a positive impact on trade efficiency; Sim represents economic similarity between the trading partners and is calculated as Egger (2000):

$$(6) \qquad Sim = \ln\left(1 + \left|\left(\frac{GDP\_PC_i}{GDP\_PC_i + GDP\_PC_j}\right)^2 - \left(\frac{GDP\_PC_j}{GDP\_PC_i + GDP\_PC_j}\right)^2\right|\right)$$

where GDP_PC is the GDP per capita. According to the Heckscher-Ohlin model, the variable Sim is expected to have a positive impact on trade efficiency since a larger difference in per capita

incomes of two countries result in stronger specialization and more trade.[10] 2008, 2011 and 2012 are indicator variables of crises; we expect to see a negative impact of political crises. Finally $C_i^d\left(C_j^o\right)$ are indicator variables of country of destination (origin). They are introduced in order to capture potential differences between countries trade efficiencies.

3.4 Estimation strategy

Given the above distributional assumptions, and following Battese and Corra (1977), the likelihood function of the model is:

$$(7) \qquad \ln L = -\frac{F(n-1)}{2}\ln(2\pi) - \frac{F}{2}\ln\left(\sigma^2\right) - \frac{F}{2}\ln|\Sigma| + \sum_{ij=1}^{F}\ln\Phi\left(-\frac{\varepsilon_f}{\sigma}\sqrt{\frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma}}\right) - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{ij=1}^{N}\left[\varepsilon_{ij}\Sigma^{-1}\varepsilon_{ij} + \varepsilon_{ij}^2\sigma^{-2}\right]$$

where $\varepsilon_{ij} \equiv u_{ij} - v_{ij}$, $\Phi(\cdot)$ is the cumulative distribution function of a standard normal random variable, $\sigma^2 \equiv \sigma_v^2 + \sigma_u^2$ and $\gamma \equiv \sigma_u^2/\sigma^2 \in [0,1]$. If $\gamma = 0$, then all deviations from the frontier are due to noise, while $\gamma = 1$ means that all deviations are due to trade inefficiency. The model is estimated with a constrained maximum likelihood estimator.

As Baldwin and Taglioni (2006) and many others demonstrate, to properly identify the elasticity of a trade policy in a gravity panel setting, one needs to control for time-varying importers' and exporters' fixed effects. This is because multilateral resistances should not be time-invariant. However, in the present study, and because of collinearity issues, we introduce 4-year time-varying importers' and exporters' fixed effects. Moreover, Baier and Bergstrand (2007) suggest that the best way to account for endogeneity, which is due to omitted variable bias (and other endogeneity

[10] Adding differences in first and second moments of income distributions to an augmented gravity model, Eppinger and Felbermayr (2015) revisit the effect of similarity in income distributions on bilateral trade flows and present new robust empirical regularity: while differences in average incomes between two countries increase trade, differences in income dispersion reduce it. Their result sheds new light on the Linder hypothesis and stresses the importance of demand-based theories of international trade.

issues), is to use time -invariant pair-fixed effects (see also Martínez-Zarzoso, Felicitas and Horsewood, 2009; Raimondi, Scoppola and Olper, 2012). Accordingly, our estimating equation includes (by clustering) a time-invariant country-pair effect Υ_{ij} with $\Upsilon_{ij} \neq \Upsilon_{ji}$. We estimate using a two-step procedure as suggested by Heckman (1979) to correct for zero trade flows. The first step involve a Probit model while in the second step, the inverse mills ratio (IMR) is introduced in the gravity model as an additional explanatory variable.

3.5 Data sources and description

Our empirical analysis below covers five North African countries (Algeria, Egypt, Mauritania, Morocco and Tunisia). Libya is excluded because of the lack of data. Trade volumes for the period 2001- 2012 were obtained from the UN Comtrade database[11]. We consider data for nine product categories constructed using the Harmonized System (HS) 2 digit level data.

Transport costs proxies are important variables in gravity models. Previous studies have found that trade elasticities with respect to transport costs and other transaction cost variables are sensitive to the method used to proxy transport cost (Head and Mayer, 2002). Some authors have designed more intricate measures that take into consideration the dispersion of economic activity within a region. Head and Mayer (2002) suggest the following indicator:

$$(8) \qquad d_{ij} = \sum_{g \in i} \left(\sum_{h \in j} \varpi_h d_{gh} \right) \varpi_g$$

[11] Data on trade were collected using the World Integrated Trade Solution (WITS) software developed by the World Bank, in close collaboration and consultation with various International Organizations including the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), International Trade Center (ITC), United Nations Statistical Division (UNSD) and World Trade Organization (WTO). See http://wits.worldbank.org/wits/)

where d_{gh} is the distance between the two sub-regions $g \in i$ and $h \in j$, and ϖ_g and ϖ_h represent the economic activity share of the corresponding sub-region. The *Centre d'Études Prospectives et d'Informations Internationales (CEPII)* uses the above formula to create a dataset.[12] Data on competiveness, GDP, population and trade openness come from the World Development Indicators[13], and data on industrial production are from UNIDO.[14] Table 1 present summary statistics concerning the data used.

[12] We also tested the CES aggregation method where $d_{ij} = \left[\sum_{g \in i} \left(\sum_{h \in j} \varpi_h d_{gh} \right) \varpi_g \right]^{1/\theta}$ as suggested by Head and Mayer (2010) and found estimates that are very close.

[13] See http://data.worldbank.org/indicator.

[14] See at http://www.unido.org/en/resources/statistics/statistical-databases.html.

Table 1. Summary statistics of data for two selected years.

Years	Variables	Mean	Standard deviation	Minimum	Maximum
2005	GDP (USD)	5.74e+10	3.79e+10	2.18e+09	1.03e+11
	Population	2.98e+07	2.46e+07	3.15E+06	7.18e+07
	GDP per capita (USD)	2 035.478	1 008.095	694.3201	3218.961
	Total trade	64 714.780	90 689.740	0	357 573.8
	Trade in Agricultural products (HS range 01-24)	5 809.248	8 628.975	0	27 895.3
	Trade in Mineral Products (HS range 25-27)	24 498.52	62 407.940	0	269 412.2
	Trade in Chemicals & Allied Industries (HS range 28-38)	7 207.636	12 576.330	0	48 042.26
	Trade in Plastics & Rubbers (HS range 39-40)	3 127.647	4 860.626	0	15 408.76
	Trade in Raw Hides, Skins, Leather & Furs (HS range 41-43)	166.384	446.048	0	1 931.218
	Trade in Wood & Wood Products (HS range 44-49)	2 899.107	4 188.183	0	13 004.15
	Trade in Textiles; Footwear & Headgear (HS range 50-67)	1 292.473	3 349.657	0	14 986.71
	Trade in Stone; Glass & Metal (HS range 68-83)	11 927.110	16 319.190	0	54 922.47
	Trade in Machinery; Electrical & Transportation (HS range 84-89)	5 499.385	10 533.860	0	39 448.5
2012	GDP (USD)	1.22e+11	9.96e+10	3.96e+09	2.63e+11
	Population	3.33e+07	2.77e+07	3 796 141	8.07e+07
	GDP per capita (USD)	3 351.503	1 454.572	1 042.823	5309.822
	Total trade	2 89377.8	354 401.50	117.242	1 127 520
	Trade in Agricultural products (HS range 01-24)	23 074.37	29 288.37	0	94 663.25
	Trade in Mineral Products (HS range 25-27)	176 335.8	356 410.5	0	1 071 413
	Trade in Chemicals & Allied Industries (HS range 28-38)	20 278.26	26 605.83	0	75 354.13
	Trade in Plastics & Rubbers (HS range 39-40)	7 464.012	12 863.78	0	46 149.11
	Trade in Raw Hides, Skins, Leather & Furs (HS range 41-43)	240.7774	493.9478	0	1 935.905
	Trade in Wood & Wood Products (HS range 44-49)	7 586.412	11 451.33	0	44 668.62
	Trade in Textiles; Footwear & Headgear (HS range 50-67)	3 952.826	5 786.085	0	18 978.87
	Trade in Stone; Glass & Metal (HS range 68-83)	29 150.13	47 832.17	0	158 008
	Trade in Machinery; Electrical & Transportation (HS range 84-89)	18 686.73	24 017.57	0	75 773.22

Note: Trade in 1000USD.

Source: Author's calculations based on UN Comtrade data.

4 Estimation results

4.1 Intensity of trade: gravity model estimates

Table 2 presents the estimated results of the stochastic frontier specification of the gravity model of imports between the five North African countries estimated by maximum likelihood over the period 2001-2012. Column [1] presents the results of the benchmark model.

A negative significant value of the distance is expected and the value of -2.557 is close to the results reported in the literature (See Head and Mayer, 2014).[15] In addition, political tension influence trade and the coefficient of the variable representing the conflicting relationship between Algeria and Morocco is negative and significant as expected. This result is in line with the findings of Davis et al. (2014). According to these authors, this effect is held for countries where the central government seeks to achieve political goals through state-owned enterprises, distorting the profit-maximizing behavior that encourages trade with all viable partners. Moreover, Algeria only joined the GAFTA agreement in 2005 and does not seem to benefit enough from its central geographical position. In fact, the negative value of the variable representing the contiguity between Algeria and the other countries except Egypt is negative (and significant) for the 2001-2012 period, indicating that, *all thing being equal*, Algeria does not trade noteworthy with its first round neighboring countries.

Our results regarding the food and economic crisis (2007, 2008 and 2009) indicate that it had no impact on the value of imports among North African countries. The 2011 sociopolitical crisis had a negative impact (at 10% level) on imports, with a decrease of 0.811%. Finally, the special status

[15] However the value of the coefficient of distance is lower in absolute value when considering the results of Elshehawy, Shen Ahmed (2014) for Egypt.

of Morocco with the EU has a negative impact on trade among North African countries but the coefficients are not significant.

Columns [2] to [4] of Table 2 present some robustness tests of the results. In specification [2], we estimate a non-adjusted trade frontier model. Our results indicate that overall, the estimated coefficients are stable in signs and values. The results of the estimation using and OLS procedure (Specification [3]) are also close to those of the benchmark model for the distance and the variable $Contiguity\_Algeria$ and the variable $Morroco\_Algeria$. Overall our results are stables over estimation procedures as also indicated by the results of the estimations using the PPML (Specification [4]).

Table 2. Estimated results of the gravity model.

		Frontier estimation				OLS estimation		PPML estimation	
		Adjusted trade $Log\left(M_{ij}/Y_iE_j\right)$ [1]		Non adjusted trade $Log\left(M_{ij}\right)$ [2]		Adjusted trade $Log\left(M_{ij}/Y_iE_j\right)$ [3]		Non adjusted trade $Log\left(M_{ij}\right)$ [4]	
Variables		Value	Standard error	Value	Standard error	Value	Standard error	Value	Standard error
Years dummy	2007	-0.173	0.490	2.235***	0.494	-0.111	0.483	0.978	3.370
	2008	-0.120	0.493	2.432***	0.489	-0.212	0.445	1.115	3.530
	2009	-0.340	0.492	2.252***	0.484	-0.545	0.444	1.108	3.533
	2011	-0.811*	0.479	2.633***	0.488	-0.851	1.598	1.049	3.558
	2012	-0.391	0.464	3.053***	0.472	-0.656	1.598	1.238	3.483
Log of distance		-2.557***	0.539	-2.447***	0.539	-2.429***	0.670	-2.646***	0.004
MAR_DZA		-0.798***	0.145	-0.727***	0.150	-0.739***	0.366	-0.795***	0.001
Contiguity_DZA		-1.686***	0.411	-1.746***	0.413	-1.796***	0.661	-1.385***	0.003
MAR_EU_o		-0.352*	0.186			0.257	0.635	0.415***	0.002
MAR_EU_d		-0.176	0.179	-0.006	0.164	0.327	0.613	-0.532***	0.011
Number of observations		240		240		240		240	
Log likelihood		-156.322		-153.793		0.403 (R^2)		-1.876 10^6	

Note: DZA: Algeria; EGY: Egypt; MAR: Morocco; MRT: Mauritania; TUN: Tunisia. Robust standard errors clustered within country pairs in parenthesis. ***, **, * indicate significance at 1%, 5% and 10% respectively. Estimates of fixed effects and some year dummy variables are omitted for brevity.

4.2 Regional integration and trade facilitation analysis

Table 3 presents the results for the variables that condition the inefficiency of trade. A negative sign indicates that the variable has a positive impact on market penetration by firms (reducing inefficiency term) whereas a positive sign indicates that the variable disfavors trade efficiency. Column [1] of Table 3 presents the results for the variables that condition the inefficiency of trade, using the benchmark specification of the gravity equation (Column [1] of Table 2). Column [2] presents the results of estimation when considering non adjusted trade while in Column [3], the estimated coefficients of a model with interaction variables between countries of origin and the 2012 is presented. Overall, Table 3 shows that, mostly, the results are stables in sign and magnitude.

Table 3. Estimation results of variables that condition trade efficiency.

Variables			Adjusted trade [1]		Non adjusted trade [2]		Adjusted trade [3]	
			Coefficient	Standard error	Coefficient	Standard error	Coefficient	Standard error
Time			-0.220***	0.062	0.082	0.16	-0.237***	0.063
Sim			-4.620*	2.063	-3.241	2.201	-4.766*	1.99
Country of destination	EGY		-4.909***	1.019	-6.569***	1.262	-5.050***	1.132
	TUN		-3.069***	0.566	-2.225***	0.562	-3.036***	0.554
	MAR		-2.331***	0.665	-2.821***	0.815	-2.421***	0.641
	MRT		3.380***	0.718	-0.516	2.445	3.433***	0.698
	DZA							
Country of origin	EGY		-1.014**	0.488	-1.187*	0.526	-1.115*	0.495
	TUN		-3.402***	0.681	-3.082***	0.626	-3.629***	0.647
	MAR		-1.788**	0.691	-1.562*	0.697	-1.912**	0.67
	MRT		4.833***	0.812	4.354***	0.877	4.782***	0.803
	DZA							
Crises	2008		0.459	0.537	0.292	0.622	0.411	0.538
	2011		0.446	0.529	0.421	0.555	0.455	0.53
	2012		1.694*	0.742	1.653*	0.786	1.763	0.95
		MAR_o					-29.693	1625.135
		DZA_o					-0.344	1.246
		MRT_o					-0.023	1.347
		TUN_o					1.526	1.414
		EGY_o						
Sigma_v			0.166	0.02	0.181	0.020	0.163	0.019

Note: DZA: Algeria; EGY: Egypt; MAR: Morocco; MRT: Mauritania; TUN: Tunisia. Robust standard errors clustered within country pairs in parenthesis. ***, **, * indicate significance at 1%, 5% and 10% respectively.

4.2.1 Estimated results

The value of -0.220 of the coefficient of the variable *Progress (time)* indicates that every year, all things being equal in our empirical model, there is more market integration between North African countries. This result is expected because, at the firm level, the learning-by-doing process makes the trading relationship more efficient over time. Economic similarity has a negative impact on trade inefficiency. This result can be interpreted as evidence of Heckscher-Ohlin forces and accordingly, the more comparable the GDP per capita between trading partners, the greater is trade efficiency.[16]

Our model includes countries of origin and of destination as indicator variables, with Algeria as a country of reference.[17] The value of -4.909 for Egypt as a country of destination indicates that the value of trade inefficiency is 4.909 lower than the trade inefficiency of Algeria. Our results indicate that, with a value of coefficient of 3.380, Mauritania as a country of destination is where the trading relationship is the least efficient. Therefore, "behind Mauritania's border" there are geographical and/or institutional constraints to trade efficiency. Also, as a country of origin, Mauritania faces the most important "beyond the border" constraints to trade (coefficient of 4.833). As both a country of origin, Tunisia exhibits the fewest trade inefficient followed by Morocco. Note that Egypt and Mauritania are both located respectively at the extreme East and the extreme West of North Africa. However, while Mauritania is the least integrated in the region it is not the case of Egypt.

We also analyze the impact of financial and political crises on trade efficiency. Our results indicate that the 2008 and 2011 crises had no impact on trade efficiency (the coefficients of the variable

[16] Elshehawy et al. (2014) shows that GDP similarity has a positive impact on the intensity of trade.

[17] We take Algeria as a reference because of its geographical position at the heart of North Africa.

2008 and *2011* are not significant even at the 10% level). However, the results are different when considering the year 2012 and indicate that, *all things being equal*, as a country of destination, the political crises have had a negative impact on the trade efficiency. In specification [3] of Table 3, we also experiment using interaction variables between country of origin and the year 2012. Our results indicate that there are no differences between countries of origin all interaction variables being non-significant.

4.2.2 Evolution of trade efficiency scores by country

Figure 4 presents trade efficiency evolution by country while considering countries' position as importer or exporter during the period 2005-2012. A value of one implies a high integration between markets whereas a value close to zero indicates that the trade flows are far from trade potential.

The key finding of our trade efficiency estimates, when considering the very scant literature that uses stochastic frontier analysis applied to gravity model (Bhattacharya and Das, 2014; Ravishankar and Stack, 2014), is that trade efficiency have increased over time reaching relatively high levels, with the exception of Mauritania and Algeria. The trade efficiency scores estimated as a measure of market integration reveal that Tunisia and Morocco are the two most integrated countries in the North Africa region. In addition, Tunisia and Morocco have the highest trade efficiency scores as countries of destination with the other trading partners, apart from with Mauritania. Moreover, Morocco as a country of origin reached a high trade efficiency score in the last years of our dataset. For Tunisia, its scores are also high as a country of origin albeit lower than as a country of destination.

As shown in Figure 4, the best and most stable trade efficiency of Algeria is with Tunisia as a partner. However, for the other trading partners, Algeria is far from being at trade potential although it is important to note that there is a continuous improvement in its score with Morocco (as a country of origin) during the period 2001-2012. This result is in line with the findings of Hosny (2012) that provide empirical evidence that Algeria's trade with GAFTA countries would have improved if Algeria had signed the agreement in 1998. Overall, Figure 4 shows that Egypt has relatively low and very instable trade efficiency score with Algeria and Mauritania, as countries of destination.

Mauritania is the least integrated country in the North African market. As a country of destination and of origin, only Tunisia has a medium level of trade efficiency. As mentioned, Mauritania is at the extreme West of North Africa. This fact, coupled with the specific context of having a border with the disputed territory of Western Sahara, could explain this situation[18]. Furthermore, our results confirm that its "natural" trading partners are not North African countries.



Trade efficiency of Algeria (DZA)

[18] Note that Mauritania left the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) zone in 2001 and joined the Community of Sahel-Saharan States (CENSAD) in 2009.





Trade efficiency of Egypt (EGY)





Trade efficiency of Morocco (MAR)





Trade efficiency of Mauritania (MRT)



Trade efficiency of Tunisia (TUN)

Figure 4. Trade efficiency of North African countries.
Note: DZA: Algeria; EGY: Egypt; MAR: Morocco; MRT: Mauritania; TUN: Tunisia.

Finally, estimates of trade efficiency scores confirm that the 2011 political crisis had an impact on trade efficiency. Indeed, when comparing the years 2010 and 2012, it is apparent that trade efficiency decreased sharply for most trading relationships.

4.2.3 Country policies and trade efficiency

The purpose of this section is to bring more light on the impact of some country policies on trade efficiency in North Africa region. As policy variables, we use the Logistic Performance Index –

Overall (LPIO)[19] and the Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA)[20] for the period 2005-2012. Table 4 provides some summary statistics of these policy variables for two selected years (2005 and 2012). Even if modest, North African countries experienced an improvement in their scores (except in the case of Policies for social inclusion cluster) and data shows that there is a room for improvement of the quality of policies and institutions for the most of the North Africa countries.

Table 4 – Summary statistics of policy indicators for two selected years.

Years	Variables	Mean	Standard deviation	Minimum	Maximum
2005	CPIA (1=low to 6=high)				
	Economic Management	4.233	0.645	3.333	5.000
	Structural Policies	3.633	0.273	3.167	4.000
	Policies for Social Inclusion and Equity	3.920	0.451	3.500	4.700
	Public Sector Management and Institutions	3.560	0.641	2.900	4.500
	LPIO (1=low to 5=high)	2.440	0.248	2.060	2.760
2012	CPIA (1=low to 6=high)				
	Economic Management	4.366	0.545	3.500	5.000
	Structural Policies	3.729	0.517	3.194	4.361
	Policies for Social Inclusion and Equity	3.824	0.270	3.400	4.127
	Public Sector Management and Institutions	3.648	0.647	2.725	4.475
	LPIO (1=low to 5=high)	2.798	0.335	2.400	3.170

[19] As defined by the World Bank "Logistics Performance Index overall score reflects perceptions of a country's logistics based on efficiency of customs clearance process, quality of trade- and transport-related infrastructure, ease of arranging competitively priced shipments, quality of logistics services, ability to track and trace consignments, and frequency with which shipments reach the consignee within the scheduled time." See at http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/LP.LPI.OVRL.XQ . Accessed September 19, 2015.

[20] The Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA) of the African Development Bank (AfDB) is a rating system designed to capture the quality of countries' policies and institutional arrangements. It is based on the scoring of several criteria grouped into clusters covering different aspects of development. The CPIA rates countries on a set of 16 criteria grouped in four sectors: economic management, structural policies, policies for social inclusion and equity, and public sector management and institutions. The AfDB published data for all African eligible countries up to, and including, 2011. For the year 2012, we use raw data of The Ibrahim Index of African Governance (The Mo Ibrahim Foundation) for Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia and Egypt.

We regress the trade efficiency scores on the selected policy variables and we expect these variables to have a positive impact on trade efficiency. The estimation results are presented in Table 5. In specification [1] trade efficiency scores are regressed on country of origin and country of destination variables while in specification [2] ([3]) trade efficiency scores are regressed on country of origin (destination) variables.

If significant, the estimated coefficients have the expected sign whenever the specification. "Economic management and structural policies" (policies affecting trade, the financial sector and the business environment) of country of origin and country of destination have a positive significant impact. The marginal impact is higher when considering the country of destination. In addition, the "Public sector management and Institutions" variable is statistically insignificant (and wrongly signed for a country of destination) and points at the presence of poor and counterproductive regulatory environment that is largely due to weak institutions (i.e., customs administrations). These results underline the importance of improving domestic policies to encourage entrepreneurial development and business facilities.

The logistic performance index of the country of origin has a positive impact on trade efficiency while it has a non-significant impact for the country of destination. This result confirms the need for the North African countries to improve their trade logistics at the national level to enhance trade efficiency and to implement trade facilitation reform programs.

Table 5- Estimation results of the policy variables that explain trade efficiency.

	Dependant variable : Trade efficiency score					
	Specification [1]		Specification [2]		Specification [3]	
Variables	Coefficient	Standard error	Coefficient	Standard error	Coefficient	Standard error
Country of origin						
CPIA - Economic Management	0.294**	0.117	0.21	0.142		
CPIA - Structural Policies	0.317**	0.143	0.167	0.211		
CPIA - Policies for Social Inclusion and Equity	-0.221	0.136	-0.152	0.179		
CPIA - Public Sector Management and Institutions	0.018	0.09	0.078	0.176		
LPIO	0.352**	0.129	0.312**	0.126		
Country of destination						
CPIA - Economic Management	0.338***	0.099			0.265	0.154
CPIA - Structural Policies	0.576***	0.136			0.497**	0.174
CPIA - Policies for Social Inclusion and Equity	-0.266*	0.15			-0.211	0.242
CPIA - Public Sector Management and Institutions	-0.245	0.186			-0.249	0.26
LPIO	0.198	0.157			0.11	0.156
Number of observations	148		148		148	
R2	0.532		0.283		0.172	

Note: Robust standard errors clustered within country pairs in parenthesis. ***, **, * indicate significance at 1%, 5% and 10% respectively.

4.2.4 Analyses by categories of products

The results of the computed trade efficiency scores are presented in Table 6 for the year 2012 and indicate that there is a high variability in trade efficiency between the nine categories of products.[21] North African market integration is highest for the "Wood and Wood products" category. Conversely, market integration is worst when considering the goods from the category "Textiles; Footwear & Headgear". Our result can be explained by the present similarity of specialization and the structure of the textile and garment industry as subcontractors for European suppliers, in Morocco, Tunisia and Egypt.

Although some studies show that GAFTA in particular has been fruitful to help to increase bilateral trade between Arab countries (e.g., Abedini and Péridy, 2008 and Parra, Martinez-Zarzoso and Suárez-Burguet, 2016), our estimates indicate that for the case of North African countries, trade efficiency for agricultural products is relatively low indicating the existence of significant inefficiencies.

We also compute the mean of trade efficiency by country and for the year 2012. Our results indicate that, as a country of destination, Egypt has the highest coefficient of variation of trade efficiency, and Algeria has the lowest. As a country of origin, Mauritania has the highest coefficient of variation whereas Morocco has the lowest. Overall, Morocco exhibits relatively stable efficiency when considering the subgroups of goods.

[21] Estimated results of the stochastic trade frontier model at the desegregated level are presented in Appendix Table A2.

Table 6. Trade efficiency by Product categories and countries for the year 2012.

	Product categories											
	Agricultural products (HS range 01-24)	Mineral Products (HS range 25-27)	Chemicals & Allied Industries (HS range 28-38)	Plastics & Rubbers (HS range 39-40)	Raw Hides, Skins, Leather & Furs (HS range 41-43)	Wood & Wood Products (HS range 44-49)	Textiles; Footwear & Headgear (HS range 50-67)	Stone; Glass & Metal (HS range 68-83)	Machinery; Electrical & Transportation (HS range 84-89)	Standard error	Mean	Coefficient of variation
Country of destination												
DZA	0.579	0.665	0.561	0.782	0.462	0.941	0.489	0.466	0.629	0.159	0.573	0.278
EGY	0.173	0.765	0.180	0.939	0.148	0.674	0.356	0.107	0.322	0.307	0.397	0.774
MAR	0.531	0.297	0.461	0.420	0.718	0.906	0.393	0.377	0.563	0.190	0.486	0.392
MRT	0.691	0.230	0.528	0.420	0.495	0.401	0.409	0.512	0.567	0.129	0.438	0.294
TUN	0.184	0.769	0.634	0.811	0.679	0.859	0.358	0.714	0.570	0.221	0.580	0.380
Total	0.445	0.521	0.459	0.645	0.560	0.744	0.403	0.431	0.541	0.111	0.486	0.228
Country of origin												
DZA	0.593	0.455	0.107	0.535	0.689	0.533	0.001	0.302	0.011	0.262	0.349	0.752
EGY	0.365	0.624	0.526	0.567	0.401	0.603	0.363	0.421	1.000	0.200	0.507	0.394
MAR	0.447	0.925	0.718	0.913	0.548	0.872	0.524	0.549	0.757	0.184	0.644	0.285
MRT	0.429	0.062	0.000	0.103	.	1.000	0.037	0.011	0.316	0.342	0.256	1.339
TUN	0.428	0.307	0.713	0.698	0.623	0.904	1.000	0.526	0.565	0.219	0.598	0.366
Total	0.445	0.521	0.459	0.645	0.560	0.744	0.403	0.431	0.541	0.111	0.486	0.228

Note: DZA: Algeria; EGY: Egypt; MAR: Morocco; MRT: Mauritania; TUN: Tunisia.

5 Concluding remarks

Our paper analyzed the trade potential versus actual realized trade among North African trading partners. We used a stochastic trade frontier representing the maximum possible level of bilateral trade that could be construed based on a gravity model. The trade efficiency term was conditioned by country of destination and country of origin variables, along with variables characterizing the bilateral relationship. Our approach allowed us to estimate not only trade efficiency scores but also seller and buyer incidence for each country.

In general, our analysis of the evolution of the countries' trade potential suggests that efficiencies have increased over time, especially for Morocco and Tunisia, the two most integrated countries in the North Africa region. Unsurprisingly, Tunisia faces the fewest "behind" and "beyond" the border effects.

In contrast, Algeria is far from being at trade potential and this country does not trade noteworthy with its first round neighboring countries. It is also important to note that Mauritania as a country of destination and of origin is where the trading relationship is the least efficient and our results confirm that its "natural" trading partners are not North African countries.

Moreover, our estimates indicate that economic crisis and trade collapse did not have a significant adverse impact on the value of imports and on trade efficiency among North African countries. On the other hand, intra-regional imports was negatively affected by both political tensions and the 2011 Arab revolutions and consequently trade efficiency decreased significantly for most trading relationships in 2012 reflecting the lagged effects of the deterioration in business conditions and productive activity on North African trade.

Our estimates of the impact of country policies on trade efficiency in North Africa region point at the presence of poor and counterproductive regulatory environment that is largely due to weak

institutions (i.e., customs administrations) and underline the importance of improving domestic policies to encourage entrepreneurial development and business facilities.

Our findings confirm the need for the North African countries to improve their trade logistics at the national level to enhance trade efficiency and to implement trade facilitation reform programs. Our analysis of market integration and trade efficiency at the disaggregated level indicates that trade efficiency scores exhibit high variability between the categories of products. Moreover, North African market integration is worst when considering the goods from the category "Textiles; Footwear & Headgear". This result can be explained by the present similarity of specialization and the structure of the textile and garment industry as subcontractors for European suppliers, in Morocco, Tunisia and Egypt. Our estimates indicate that trade efficiency for agricultural products is relatively low indicating the existence of significant "behind" and "beyond" border inefficiencies. The similarity of specialization can explain in part the existence of these inefficiencies but the presence of high and frequent technical barriers to trade and sanitary and phytosanitary measures is also a contributing factor.

Integration of North Africa market shall be pursued by improving structural policies to reap the benefits of international trade and improve trade efficiency. Indeed, the removals of the procedural inefficiencies, obstructions and discriminatory regulations are important aspects of trade reforms that need to be pursued by the North African countries. National trade facilitation policies and agendas need to be coordinated to reduce inefficiencies.

References

Abedini, J., and N. Péridy. 2008. "The Greater Arab Free Trade Area(GAFTA): An Estimation of Its Trade Effects."*Journal of Economic Integration* 23: 848–872.

AfDB. (2012). Unlocking North Africa's Potential through Regional Integration: Challenges and Opportunities, edited by E. Santi, S. Ben Romdhane and W. Shaw. Tunisia: African Development Bank

Aigner, D., C. A. Knox Lovell and P. Schmidt (1977). Formulation and Estimation of Stochastic Frontier Production Function Models. *Journal of Econometrics*, 6(1): 21–37.

Anderson, J. E. and E. van Wincoop. (2003). Gravity with gravitas: a solution to the border puzzle. *American Economic Review* 93: 170-192.

Anderson, J.E., and Y.V. Yotov. (2010). The Changing Incidence of Geography. *The American Economic Review*, 100(5), 2157-2186.

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, NBER Working Papers 12516, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.

Battese, G.E., and G.S. Corra. (1977). Estimation of a production frontier model: with application to the pastoral zone of Eastern Australia. *Australian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, *21*(3), 169-179.

Bhattacharya, S. K., and G.G. Das (2014). Can South–South Trade Agreements Reduce Development Deficits? An Exploration of SAARC during 1995–2008. *Journal of South Asian Development*, *9*(3), 253-285.

Chaney, T. 2008. Distorted gravity: the intensive and extensive margins of international trade. *American Economic Review* 98: 1707-1721.

Davis, C., A. Fuchs, and K. Johnson (2014). State control and the effects of foreign relations on bilateral trade. University of Heidelberg Department of Economics Discussion Paper Series (576).

De Benedictis, L., & Vicarelli, C. (2005). Trade potentials in gravity panel data models. *The BE Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy*, *5*(1).

Egger, P. (2000). A note on the proper econometric specification of the gravity equation. *Economics Letters*, *66*(1), 25-31.

Elshehawy, M. A., Shen, H., & Ahmed, R. A. (2014). The Factors Affecting Egypt's Exports: Evidence from the Gravity Model Analysis. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, *2*(11), 138.

Eppinger, P. S. and Gabriel J. Felbermayr (2015). Bilateral trade and similarity of income distributions: The role of second moments, Economics Letters, Volume 126, January 2015, Pages 159-162, ISSN 0165-1765,

Fally, T. (2015). Structural Gravity and fixed effects. *Journal of International Economics* 97: 76-85.

Head, K., and T. Mayer (2002). *Illusory Border Effects: Distance mismeasurement inflates estimates of home bias in trade* (Vol. 1). Paris: CEPII.

Head K., and T. Mayer (2014). Gravity Equations: Workhorse, Toolkit, and Cookbook. In *Handbook of International Economics,* Vol. 4, Gopinath, Helpman, and Rogoff (eds.), North Holland.

Heckman, J. J. 1979. Sample Selection Bias as a Specification Error. *Econometrica* 47: 153-161.

Helpman, E., Melitz, M.J. and Y. Rubinstein (2008). Estimating trade flow: trading partners and trading volumes. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 123: 444-487.

Hosny, A. (2012). "Algeria's Trade with GAFTA Countries: A Synthetic Control Approach," *Transition Studies Review*, Springer, vol. 19(1), pages 35-42, September.

Kumbhakar, S. C., and E.G. Tsionas. (2005). Measuring technical and allocative inefficiency in the translog cost system: a Bayesian approach. *Journal of Econometrics*, *126*(2), 355-384.

Kumbhakar, S., E. Tsionas, and T Sipiläinen (2009). Joint estimation of technology choice and technical efficiency: an application to organic and conventional dairy farming. *Journal of Productivity Analysis,* 31, 151-161.

Martínez-Zarzoso, I., Felicitas, N. L. D., and Horsewood, N. (2009). Are regional trading agreements beneficial?: Static and dynamic panel gravity models. *The North American Journal of Economics and Finance*, *20*(1), 46-65.

Meltiz, M. J. (2003). The impact of trade on intra-industry reallocations and aggregate industry productivity. *Econometrica* 71: 1695-1725.

Melitz, M. J., and Ottaviano, G. I. (2008). Market size, trade, and productivity. *The Review of Economic Studies*, *75*(1), 295-316.

Montalbano, P., & Nenci, S. (2014). Assessing the trade impact of the European Neighbourhood Policy on the EU-MED Free Trade Area. *Applied Economics*, *46*(7), 730-740.

Olivero, M., and Y. Yotov. (2012). Dynamic gravity: Theory and empirical implications. *Canadian Journal of Economics*, *45*(1), 64-92.

Parra, M. D., Martinez-Zarzoso, I., & Suárez-Burguet, C. (2016). The impact of FTAs on MENA trade in agricultural and industrial products. *Applied Economics*, 1-13.

Péridy, N. and Ghoneim, A. (2008). The Greater Arab Free Trade Area: An ex-post appraisal within an imperfect competition framework. FEMISE Project n°32-03.

Papazoglou, C., E. J. Pentecost and H. Marques (2006), 'A Gravity Model Forecast of the Potential Trade Effects of EU Enlargement: Lessons from 2004 and Path-dependency in Integration', The World Economy, 29, 8, 1077–89.

Raimondi, V., Scoppola, M., and A. Olper. (2012). Preference erosion and the developing countries exports to the EU: a dynamic panel gravity approach. *Review of World Economics*, *148*(4), 707-732.

Ravishankar, G., and M.M. Stack. (2014). The Gravity Model and Trade Efficiency: A Stochastic Frontier Analysis of Eastern European Countries' Potential Trade. *The World Economy*, *37*(5), 690-704.

Rouis, M and Kounetsron, K. (2010). Economic integration in the Maghreb. World Bank Middle East and North Africa region. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Santos Silva, J.M.C. and S. Tenreyro. (2006). The Log of Gravity. *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 88: 641-658.

Söderling, L. (2005). Is the Middle East and North Africa Region Achieving Its Trade Potential? IMF Working Paper WP/05/90.

World Bank and European Union. 2010. Middle East and North Africa Region: Labor Migration from North Africa: Development Impact, Challenges, and Policy Options. Volume I: Main Report.

Appendix



Figure A1. Trade potential under stochastic trade frontier representation.

Table A1. Estimated results of the stochastic trade frontier model at the desegregated level.

	Agricultural products (HS range 01-24)	Mineral Products (HS range 25-27)	Chemicals & Allied Industries (HS range 28-38)	Plastics & Rubbers (HS range 39-40)	Raw Hides, Skins, Leather & Furs (HS range 41-43)	Wood & Wood Products (HS range 44-49)	Textiles; Footwear & Headgear (HS range 50-67)	Stone; Glass & Metal (HS range 68-83)	Machinery; Electrical & Transportation (HS range 84-89)
				First stage Probit estimates					
Log of distance		-2.071**	0.444	-2.695***	-2.407***	-2.373***	-1.788**	-2.837***	-3.774***
Log of distance X TUN_d		-0.236**	0.326***	-1.064***	-0.303*	-0.768***	-0.461**	-0.991***	-0.277**
Log of distance X EGY_d	-1.142***	-0.236**		-0.872***	-0.326***	-0.625***	-0.553***	-0.797***	0.03
Log of distance X MAR_d	-0.870***	-0.015	0.250***	-0.698***	-0.257**	-0.428***	-0.386***	-0.632***	0.200**
Log of distance X MRT_d		0.247							1.046***
Log of distance X DZA_d			0.288***	-0.692***	-0.307*	-0.545***	-0.492***	-0.634***	
Contiguity	0.335	-1.424**	0.44	-3.756***	-2.160***	-2.260***	-1.705***	-3.666***	-3.339***
MAR_DZA	-0.721	-0.927							0.167
Log of GDP per capita_origin	-0.621	0.178	2.296***	-0.208	-0.662	0.354	0.007	-0.409	-1.136*
Log of GDP per capita_destination	5.612***	1.557**	-0.740**	2.481***	1.743***	2.335***	2.457***	2.431***	3.663***
				Gravity model estimates					
Log of distance	-1.671***	-2.317**	-1.893***	-4.419***	3.278	-0.823	-0.866**	-0.147***	-2.724***
Log of distance X TUN_d	0.287***	0.249***	-0.080***	0.602***	-1.167	-0.087	2.950***	-0.035***	-0.188***
Log of distance X EGY_d	0.318***	0.125		0.324***	-1.207	-0.223	0.325	-0.234***	-0.033
Log of distance X MAR_d	0.197***	1.118	0.112***	2.722***	-3.518	0.069	-0.645	-0.090***	1.189
Log of distance X MRT_d	0.336***	0.445***	0.251***	1.114***	-0.845	0.172	-0.688*	-0.043	-5.886***
Log of distance X DZA_d									
MAR_DZA	-1.749***	1.113	-0.804***	-0.317***	-4.340**	-2.771***	-1.962***		-1.355**
Contiguity_DZA	-0.985***	-1.763		-4.421***	5.847	0.281			
IMR	0.141***	-0.684	0.848***	2.059***	-2.719**	1.505***	0.013	0.326***	-0.909*
MAR_UE_o	0.544***	-0.6	-0.017	-0.703***	-0.883	-0.305	0.477	-0.296***	0.881*
MAR_UE_d	0.366	-0.576	0.031***	-2.197***	-1.046	0.117	-0.084	-0.287***	0.148

Note: DZA: Algeria; EGY: Egypt; MAR: Morocco; MRT: Mauritania; TUN: Tunisia. Note: Robust standard errors clustered within country pairs in parenthesis. ***, **, * indicate significance at 1%, 5% and 10% respectively.

Table A1. Estimated results of the stochastic trade frontier model at the desegregated level (Continued)

	Agricultural products (HS range 01-24)	Mineral Products (HS range 25-27)	Chemicals & Allied Industries (HS range 28-38)	Plastics & Rubbers (HS range 39-40)	Raw Hides, Skins, Leather & Furs (HS range 41-43)	Wood & Wood Products (HS range 44-49)	Textiles; Footwear & Headgear (HS range 50-67)	Stone; Glass & Metal (HS range 68-83)	Machinery; Electrical & Transportation (HS range 84-89)
				Trade inefficiency estimates					
Progress (time)	-0.006	0.221*	0.004	-0.347***	-0.236*	-0.451***	0.064	-0.125**	0.028
Economic similarity (Sim)	-2.216	7.112	-4.556***	0.461	-5.453	2.458	-3.953	0.06	7.852**
EGY_d	1.599***	4.994***	0.941	0.536	1.395	6.039***	1.01	1.128*	1.719
TUN_d	1.046**	3.874**	-1.655***	-2.723***	-3.237***	0.842	-1.682*	-2.854***	0.525
MAR_d	-1.599***	5.671***	-1.480***	0.987*	-1.444	1.451	0.343	-1.132*	0.261
MRT_d	0.992*	5.026**	1.376**	0.908	0.977	5.619***	2.848***	0.795	-1.388
DZA_d									
EGY_o	-1.508***	-0.593	-2.175***	-0.511	0.219	0.605	-3.787***	-0.382	-33.063
TUN_o	-1.232**	3.331***	-3.559***	-1.950***	-2.958*	-5.440***	-31.714	-3.317***	-2.827***
MAR_o	-1.279**	-0.784	-3.808***	-0.982*	-0.808	-2.313***	-3.354***	-1.530**	-3.618***
MRT_o	-0.13	2.88	2.876***	0.283	-26.875	-30.926	0.558	1.078	-2.084*
DZA_o									
a2008	0.215	-0.243	0.273	0.42	-0.524	0.968	0.059	-0.611	0.346
a2011	-0.327	-1.211	-0.369	0.391	0.933	0.489	0.75	0.798	-0.538
a2012	-0.255	-0.356	-0.318	0.735	0.382	0.963	1.329*	0.79	-0.613

Note: DZA: Algeria; EGY: Egypt; MAR: Morocco; MRT: Mauritania; TUN: Tunisia. Note: Robust standard errors clustered within country pairs in parenthesis. ***, **, * indicate significance at 1%, 5% and 10% respectively.