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Historically the role of non-tariff barriers (NTBs) in the international textile trade gained strength when World Trade Organization (WTO) signed the Agreement on Textile and Clothing in 1995. The main emphasis of it was four stage gradual reductions of quotas as the most influential non-tariff trade barrier within 10 years period of time ending January 1, 2005. The Agreement also provided the reduction of all other types trade barriers in order to liberate international trade. However, the traditional non-tariff barriers to trade found replacement by modern trade distortions. There is no doubt about their existence but they are not widely investigated especially in terms of non-tariff barriers in the textile trade. The research is studying the classification of non-tariff barriers, the influence of the barriers to the international trade in textiles, discusses its specifics in the context of European Union. The survey is looking for the best option to classify non-tariff barriers in the international textile trade markets and examines variety of their aspects.

Scientific and other sources do not provide any specific classification of non-tariff barriers to the textile trade. Though, the NTBs are widely and deeply investigated in terms of world and regional trade, separate industries, even individual companies and products.

The aim of this survey is to analyse the classification of non-tariff barriers in the international textile trade markets and to ground its principles on EU and world trade.

First, the article presents different definitions of non-tariff barriers and existing classification systems of NTBs.

Comprehensive extensions are related to a few most general but scientifically explored enough grouping: administrative procedures, market structure and political, social and cultural or so called institutional factors. Each group includes a great number of various non-tariff barriers.

The empiric test is based on the top EU textile export countries and seeks for the following aims: to identify non-tariff barriers, most influential to the related markets, to compare the degree of market protection to the EU clothing export flows and to resume the classification of NTBs suitable for textile sector.

The test results conclude that individual barriers have different power to influence trade flows, the same name of the barrier may have different interpretation and regulation in every country and create different barriers in terms of significance.

The article acknowledges the existence of a great number of NTBs in textile trade especially having in mind their different interpretation in separate markets and different influence as an outcome. The survey summarizes highlighting classification of Doha Development Agenda as a principle general classification to ground identification and classification of NTBs in international textile trade.
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Introduction

The balance between tariff and non-tariff international trade restriction methods is changing latterly: the liberalization of the world trade is reducing tariff barriers but faces a growing number of non-tariff measures.

Textile producers traditionally are influencing state authorities by lobbying and financial power. The large market players often have a power to affect legislative and executive authorities to favour local business maintaining current and introducing new market protection measures. On the other hand, as often as not those mighty market players have different interests and start to fight for the power to influence shaping policy of international trade. Obviously it confirms the events in August – September, 2005 – the clash of interests between the EU textile producers and large retailers – textile importers from China. The point of the issue was to let in or not over quota textile products from China produced for the EU retailers and sitting at the European ports already. The EU countries crossed the swords to support their companies at the Commission level. It was not for the first time when on one side there were countries with strong textile industry (Spain, Portugal, Italy, Lithuania) and the states, largest textile importers (UK, Sweden, Germany). The latter won: the Commission allowed over quota textile shipments. The next year quota size remained the same.

Quota is a prime non-tariff barrier in the international textile trade though how to classify NTBs, how to rank them and their impact in the international textile trade, what are their peculiarities in the EU context?

Various sources present a bit different classification. The authors did not succeed in finding any scientific classification related to the textile sector. Overall, peculiarities of NTBs in terms of separate industries are not investigated excluding Stephenson (2001) study of NTBs in telecommunication sector.

Non-tariff market protection measures, their influence to the state economy Lithuanian scientists have not
studied widely. V.Kavaliauskienė (1992) overviewed the key international agreements in the world trade, V.Snieska (2002) discussed the methods of non-tariff international trade measures.

The relevance and profoundness of the topic is indicated by abundance of foreign authors’ studies. The NTBs are examined in different dimensions: world market, regional, industrial and even individual companies and products.

The topic got a solid consideration on a global plane: looking at deep depression period (Madsen, 2001), plumbing into NTBs measurement problems (Prusa, 2001; Laird, 1999; Ker, 2000; Gawande, 2000; Deardorff, 1998), analysing political and economic meanings of market restriction measures (Mansfield, 1995; Laird, 1990). The role of NTBs in the international trade is outlined at the comprehensive studies in terms of biggest countries as the USA, Canada, China, Russia (Daly, 2000; Busch, 1999; Wilkenmann, 1998 and others) and economic communities, regions (Head, 2002, Mayer, 2000; Chan, 1999 and others).

The importance of NTBs to the international trade develops a background to consistent analysis on industrial or product basis. Predominant attention of foreign analysts was devoted to the strategic sectors: agriculture and food industry (Henson, 2001; Barret, 2000; Ker, 1997), oil and gas trade (Taran, 1997, Hankel, 1990), including shoes (Winters, 1991) and textile (Khanna, 1990, Kathuria, 1998). That provide a possibility to open specific world trade restraints, their influence and economic weight.

The aim of the study – to analyse the principles of classification of NTBs in terms of textile and base them on the EU top export markets. The object of the research is textile sector because of its long term though unstudied protectionism and its important role in Lithuanian, the EU and world economy. Research methods – interpretation of different classifications of NTBs in terms of textile, market practices, expert estimations and empirical test.

Definitions of NTBs, classification

Course books of international economics do not provide specific definitions of NTBs, do not examine their classification possibilities (Yarborough, 1988, Krugman, 2003).

Referring to Lithuanian Customs ruling (www.cust.lt, 2005), NTBs are described as various measures restricting or forbidding import or export of goods. Prohibitions and restrictions includes market supervision or protection measures and quantitative restraints. There are no any formal methods to evaluate or administrate non-tariff restrictions as well as any specific regimentation. However, non-tariff market protection tools conditionally could be grouped according to the type of control on imported goods, the kind of measures applied and the specific executive institution. The following kinds of customs control could be applied to textile trade:

- customs procedures,
- quality control,
- product safety control,
- other types of control.

The broadest definition of a non-tariff barrier is any measure other than a tariff that distorts trade (Linkins, 2002). Deardorff (1998) states that according to the type NTBs could get into four groups:

- official regulations and policies,
- administrative procedures,
- market structure,
- political, social and cultural institutional factors.

United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) trade analysis and information system provides a comprehensive list of non-tariff barriers classified according to the trade control measures. The measures fall into five broad categories:

- price control measures: administrative pricing (minimum import prices, administrative pricing, voluntary export price restraint (variable levies, variable components, compensatory elements, flexible import fees, variable charges), antidumping measures (antidumping investigations, duties, price undertakings),
- finance measures: advance payment requirements (advance import deposit, cash margin requirement, advance payment of customs duties, refundable deposits for sensitive product categories, multiple exchange rates, restrictive official foreign exchange allocation (prohibition of foreign exchange allocation, bank authorization, transfer delays, queuing),
- quantity control measures: non-automatic licensing, quotas: global quotas, bilateral, seasonal, link with export performance, linked with purchase of local goods, quotas for sensitive product categories, for political reasons, prohibitions: total, seasonal, temporary prohibition, suspension of issuance of licences, import diversification, prohibition for political reasons (embargo), export restraint arrangements: voluntary export restraint arrangements, multifibre arrangement (MFA), enterprise-specific restrictions: selective approval of importers, enterprise-specific quota,
- monopolistic measures: single channel for imports: state trading administration, sole importing agency, compulsory national services: compulsory national insurance, transport,
- technical measures: requirements for product characteristics, marking, labelling, packaging, testing, inspection and quarantine, information, requirement to pass through specified customs, pre-shipment inspection, special customs formalities, return obligation.

The broadest description of NTBs in the textile and clothing sector is concluded in the Doha Development Agenda and related to all forms of restrictions to trade (EURATEX, 2003):

- any additional duties on the import or sale of products other than on local,
- technical regulations, standards or conformity assessment and certification rules, procedures or
practices not adding value,
- any formal or informal minimum import price requirement, other customs valuation rules, procedures or practices rising transhipment barriers,
- discriminatory, non-transparent and excessively lengthy customs controls for the clearance of goods,
- excessively burdensome, costly, arbitrary rules, procedures or practices concerning certification of the origin of products,
- any non-automatic or discretionary licensing requirements,
- requirements or practices concerning marking, labelling, the description or composition of the products in any form discriminatory as compared with domestic products,
- subsidies causing injury to the WTO members industries and not covered by existing WTO rules.

Informal barriers could be conscious protection of domestic producers or the system of rules and practices of local authorities turned into barriers. The following part of the article will investigate informal market protection measures.

**Administrative procedures.** It is well known, confident Deardoff (1997), that the procedures employed to administer policies and regulations could themselves constitute a restriction to trade. For example, customs procedures may rely on specially constructed measures of price for valuation purposes and involve costly administrative methods in order to favour domestic producers. Miškinis (2002) states that present international customs valuation rules were initiated by Uruguay Round. The General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT) requires, that customs valuation of the goods should be based on the real value of the imported goods or value of the similar goods but not on the value of domestic goods or any other controversial value (WTO, 2005). The real value is a price of the goods sold or supplied under perfect competition conditions. The Uruguay customs valuation agreement says that the value of goods imported is equal to the value of the transaction and that is the price paid or to be paid for a good sold on export basis to the importing country. But in doubt of validity of transaction value, the agreement recommends to apply other methods: value of identical goods, similar goods, deduction method or estimated value (Miškinis, 2002). Lithuanian customs code includes similar attitude. Taking as an example in textile case let say Lithuanian government wants to favour Alytaus tekstilė AB, domestic fabric producer. Next step would be to establish a list of so called comparable prices which would be not lower than domestic producers. All the fabrics imported with the price lower than on the list would a subject of suspicion, suspended to justify the lower price evidence or required to pay a price difference between the price declared and the comparable price from the list. Clearly the importer or foreign producer is affected by a few negative factors: delay, additional costs (price difference, customs formalities) and having in mind transport costs, the price of a fabric per meter could rise significantly.

**Market structure,** according to Deardoff (1997), may range from perfectly competitive to single firm monopolies and to create presumptions to trade barriers. The government policy may depend on type of ownership, ownership structure. In terms of textile, Byelorussian case may illustrate. The local authorities, holding the ownership of large textile companies in the country, protect and favour domestic fabric producers making difficulties for temporal import of goods to process and putting other barriers forcing to purchase domestic raw materials (fabrics, trims). Some market structure NTBs may be recognized in case of Mažeikių nafta in Lithuania.

**Institutional factors.** Differences in political, social and cultural institutions should be viewed as constituting informal barriers to trade (Deardoff, 1997). For instance, the EU is one economic-political space, but countries member states may have different requirements which may become a trade barrier between the states internally as well as externally. In case of textile and clothing it may be particular requirements for marking and labelling effecting additional costs. Another case, the different approach to the second hand clothing develops a different regulations: some countries (Ukraine, Poland) protect their markets from „waste“ imposing heavy taxes, the other ones (Lithuania) “solve” social problems under free trade conditions. As a cultural factor, consumers favour domestic or necessarily imported garment. The list can continue with exhortation “buy domestic” or label “made in Europe”.

In summary, it is true to say that there may be a variety of informal trade barriers arising and they are especially difficult to measure.

The empirical test is based on Euratex (2003) data about NTBs for the EU clothing exporters to selected markets and focuses on following goals:

1. To identify most powerful NTBs to export textile and clothing to selected markets.
2. To compare degree of protection in selected markets with dynamics of the EU clothing export to target markets.
3. Referring to empirical test results to conclude which classification method is most fitting textile and clothing peculiarities.

Table 1 presents NTBs, based on Euratex test results forthcoming from interviews of exporting companies and market analysis (Euratex, 2003). The object of recent research is countries – largest EU clothing export markets.

Table 1 shows that countries employ different NTBs though all selected states impose standards and technical requirements as NTBs. China, Mexico and South Korea apply the highest number of NTBs to the EU textile and clothing, least – Canada and Australia. Futher the survey will analyse dynamics of the trade flows of the top EU clothing export markets (Figure 1). Maybe there is a relationship between the number of NTBs and export trade flows? The test faces a shortcoming – a lack of NTBs dynamics during the period.
### Non-tariff barriers in textile and clothing for selected markets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>S.Korea</th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>Mexico</th>
<th>Taiwan</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>China</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registration, documentation, total, of which:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visas, documents, import licence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsory custom and control procedures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custom valuation, minimum import price</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance delay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origin requirement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import restrictions/quotas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duties and charges other than tariffs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards, technical requirements, total, of which:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marking, labelling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality conformity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary requirement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidies</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual property</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export restrictions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restriction on terms of payment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition/distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of border measures identified</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Euratex, 2003.*

### Export of the EU clothing, Thousand Euros
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*Source: MAIA, 2004.*

Comparing a number of NTBs with the volume of trade, it is difficult to make unambiguous conclusions. On one hand, it is evident, that the lowest volume of the EU clothing export went to China employing the largest number of NTBs and USA and Japan apply least number of NTBs and are the largest EU clothing export markets. Still, on the other hand, how to explain low export volumes to Canada and Australia, also applying minimal number of NTBs? Maybe it is because of the unequal power of the same NTBs in different countries?
Comparing the EU export of clothing in 1999-2003 (figure 1) with the EU export of goods to the selected countries (figure 2) and considering number of NTBs related to those markets the survey concludes that there is no absolutely direct relationship between number of NTBs and volume of exports although certain penetrations seams to be extremely important:

1. China and South Korea impose the largest number of NTBs. Comparable analysis of the trade volumes for clothing with trade volumes for goods shows that China variation of trade volumes in goods and clothing is different (goods – growing, clothing – stable) while in South Korea case, both clothing and goods export volumes are similar and stable. Hereof it brings to the assumption that NTBs may have a different market power.

2. China, applying the largest number of NTBs (21), keeps stable low import volumes of clothing from the EU whereas the import of the EU goods is continuously growing. USA and Japan employs a significant number of NTBs as well (6 and 5 accordingly) and also imports more goods from the EU than clothing.

3. The NTB carrying the same name may have different interpretation in a different country with a different market protection power (Market Access Database, 2005). The present proposition is well-founded by the Eurotex NTBs test. The research shows that the same called NTB to the EU textile and clothing builds barriers of unequal weight (Table 2).

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NTB dismantling priority for Eutatex</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Description of barriers</th>
<th>Perception of level of difficulty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Compulsory custom documentation and origin requirements are burdensome, complex and delaying clearance.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>The „Container Security Initiative“, products exported from accredited ports (Le Havre, Rotterdam, Genoa) are overcoming more easily the custom clearance procedure than the ones exported from non-accredited ports (Marseille).</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Origin requirements, there is a different regime based on fibre composition</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>New request for marking and labelling. Since January 1, 2002 the labelling legislation has changed imposing a sewn label that has to encompass fibre composition, care instructions using the US standard as well as the origin of the product. This is imposing additional costs to customs clearance.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Technical regulations: still the subject of complains.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Marking and labelling. Despite the fact that the Japanese legislation requires the fibre composition for furnishing and clothing products in Japanese, the size of the market may explain why companies with the help of the importers are doing their utmost to label in native language, including the care labelling.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Technical regulation remains important. In some cases the importer is requesting on a “private base” to receive from the exporter some “health declaration and/or quality certificate”.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
High South Korea Problems with import documentation and minimum custom value while for some specific products a health/environmental certificate is requested. Medium/high

High South Korea Customs procedures are time-consuming, finished goods face greater delays than raw materials Medium/high

High South Korea Marking and labelling, the request of information in a woven label: country of origin, fibre composition, name of the manufacturer, name of the importer, size and cleaning instructions. In addition for specific products one should add information such as the date of manufacturing, the specificities of the fabric (“waterproof”), the price of the product CIF and the estimated retail price. Medium/high

High South Korea Import financing restricted by burdensome (very short – 20 days) payment terms. Medium/high

High South Korea Distribution limits and restriction Medium/high

High Canada Import licence: validity limited to 30 days Medium/high

High Canada Marking and labelling. Marking fibre composition in % and indication of the name and address of the company, the country of origin and care label instructions. The main problem – delays to obtain the number of the exporter and this number should be placed in the country of origin. Medium/high

High Taiwan Intellectual property rights not sufficiently protected Low

High Taiwan Technical regulations seems to be the main exporting problem Low

High China Customs procedures: difficult, time-consuming and non-transparent concerning import documentation procedure High

High China Reference pricing: non-transparent custom valuation procedures, use of unofficial reference price lists to hike effective tariff rates, tariffs differ depending on port entry and importing agents – tariffs often "negotiated" with local customs agents. High

High China Additional duties: internal taxes and charges, VAT taxes may be applied in discriminatory manner High

High China Import licensing procedures: importing of textile products to foreign trading companies, Chinese only in origin. Distribution channels for textile products controlled by state agencies. High

High China Technical regulations, standards: expensive, time-consuming and discriminatory technical/quality testing procedures for imported goods. High

High China Marking and labelling: the specific labelling standard for textile products establishes a long series of information requests. The labels should have a strict presentation form according to the product. High

High China Subsidies: numerous export and domestic industry subsidies including cotton subsidization, widespread use of export rebates, numerous export restrictions on textile raw materials keep price of domestic supply low. High

High China Intellectual property rights High

High China Distribution limits: companies are forced to open at least two commercial offices in Beijing and Shangai to comply with all the administrative request. High


Summarizing the results of empirical test and referring to the Eurotex study of NTBs in textile and clothing, the survey emphasizes that classification of NTBs according to UNCTAD and Doha Development Agenda is very general and do not cover peculiarities of textile and clothing sector.

The research proofs that most relevant classification of NTBs in a broad sense is at Doha Development Agenda, describing substantial groups of NTBs in textile and clothing. Every group is characterizing type existing barriers and “leaves a space” for the coming new ones.

Exploring this classification it is possible to work down to the single NTB and to measure it. This conclusion is based on test results and market practices. The key NTBs in textile and clothing trade according to Doha Development Agenda classification would be as follows:

1. Any additional duties on the import or sale of products other than on local: visas, documents, import licences, import restrictions, quotas, export restrictions, distribution and terms of payments restrictions.
2. Technical regulations, standards or conformity as-
essment and certification rules, procedures or practices not adding value: quality conformity, sanitary and certification requirements: quality management system ISO 9001, environmental quality system ISO 14001, EN/ISO norms, social responsibility certificate SA 8000, eco labels, codes of conduct, CE marking. For example, UK textile and clothing sector is very active recently in Fair Trade Cotton initiative, strongly advising the consumers to be interested in fair conditions the garment was produced. The articles in the press are stressing the inhuman working conditions in China clothing factories. The other initiative is called “Go green” and is dedicated to environmental friendly production. Initiative encourages not using harmful chemicals (Stravinskiene, 2006).

3. Any formal or informal minimum import price requirement, other customs valuation rules, procedures or practices rising transhipment barriers: custom valuation, minimum import price, other than tariffs duties and charges.

4. Discriminatory, non-transparent and excessively lengthy customs controls for the clearance of goods: clearance delays, compulsory custom and control procedures.

5. Excessively burdensome, costly, arbitrary rules, procedures or practices concerning certification of the origin of products: origin and different classification requirements.

6. Any non-automatic or discretionary licensing requirements: intellectual property rights.

7. Requirements or practices concerning marking, labelling, the description or composition of the products in any form discriminatory as compared with domestic products: marking and labelling, composition requirements.

8. Subsidies causing injury to the WTO members industries and not covered by existing WTO rules. Export subsidy is a financial support provided by a state to an individual company exporting goods: a company gets a subsidy to a price of goods paid by foreign customer (Yarbrough, Yarbrough, 1988). Subsidies are forbidden in the EU member’s states so they are transforming into the new forms: financial support from the state to trade missions, exhibitions, product certification, etc. For example, there are an Export Promotion Fund and Business Development Council under Ministry of Economy of Lithuania. Those institutions are dedicated to export development projects. Lithuanian Apparel and Textile Industry Association apply to get financial aid for domestic companies to go to trade missions to UK, France, other countries. Accordingly individual companies reduce their costs and time to enter new markets. New kinds of subsidies have a potential to be exploited more and more.

Conclusions

1. There is no single one NTBs classification and the existing classification is durative because of the need to include new nascent NTBs indirectly influencing trade volumes in terms of quantity and value.

2. The research proofs that most relevant classification of NTBs in a broad sense is at Doha Development Agenda, describing substantial groups of NTBs in textile and clothing.

3. There is a large number of NTBs in international textile trade, especially taking into account their different way of action and a different market protection effect. The barriers are full of variations, complex as the textile products.

4. The measurement of a role of a specific NTB to the trade is rather complicated because the market influenced by a lot of factors and to estimate the power of each factor eliminating the other ones is almost impossible. The same problem exists to measure the impact of particular NTB group to the volume of international trade.

5. The NTB carrying the same name may have different interpretation in a different country with a different market protection power.

6. Some inconvenience is caused by the lack of data concerning dynamics of NTBs in the international textile trade.

7. The research proofs that most relevant classification of NTBs in a broad sense is at Doha Development Agenda, describing substantial groups of NTBs in textile and clothing. Every group is characterizing type existing barriers and „leaves a space“ for the coming new ones. Exploring this classification, it is possible to work down to the single NTB and to measure it.
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Istoriskai netarifinių barjėrių reikšmė tarptautinėje prekyboje trūko, tačiau pastaraisiais metais jų ėmė augti. Tai susijęs su daugybės politikų ir įmonių įtakos strategijomis prieš teisėtą prekybos saugą, kaip ir su panagytinio prekybos laipsnio verslo interesų. Netarifiniai barjerai sudaro išplitusią ir intensyvų konkurso aukšties sistemą. Tai yra rezultatas globos rūpesčių, o ne didžiulės verslo interesų apsaugos galių. Apatiniams ir viršutiniams įmonių grupėms netarifiniai barjerai gali būti sudėtingi ir dažnai susiję su kitomis prekybos ribų, tokiomis kaip tariariniai barjerai. 

Vis dėlto netarifiniai barjerai gali turėti daug žymUSTOMUS įvairių aplinkos sektorių sektoriaus apžvalgai. L R

Apibendrinant analitinių tyrimo dažniausiai išsiskyrė keli tikslių: identifikuoti netarifinius barjerus, labiausiai trukdžiančius prekybos eksportui į pasirašytas sutartis šalis, palyginti pasirinktų šalių rinkos apsaugos laipsnių. 

Empirinis tyrimas atliekamas siekiant kelių tikslų: identifikuoti netarifinius barjerus, labiausiai trukdžiančius prekybos eksportui į pasirašytas sutartis šalis, palyginti pasirinktų šalių rinkos apsaugos laipsnių.
su ES drabužių eksporto dinamika į šias šalis, remiantis tyrimo rezultatais apibendrinti, kuris netarifinių barjerų klasifikavimo būdas geriausiai tinka tekstilės sektoriaus specifikai.


Apibendrinami šiame darbe atlikto empirinio tyrimo rezultatus ir remdamiesi Euratex netarifinių barjerų tekstilei tyrimu, šio straipsnio autoriai pažymi, kad tiek Jungtinių Tautų Prekybos ir pletros konferencijos duomenų bazėje, tiek Dohos vystymo protokole pateikiamas grupavimas yra labai apibendrintas.

Remdamiesi atliktu tyrimu, autoriai teigia, kad geriausiai bendrais bruožais netarifinius barjerus tarptautinėje prekyboje tekstile apibūdina Doha vystymo protokolas, išskiriantis esmines kliūčių prekybos tekstile ir drabužiais formas. Šiame dokumente pateiktas klasifikavimas identifikuoją kiekvieną netarifinių barjerų grupę, esančią tarpautinės prekybos tekstile rinkose. Taip grupuojant galima skverbėtis į atskirų netarifinių barjerų identifikavimo ir kiekvieno jų poveikio pamatavimo. Šis darbas apibendrinamas teigiant, kad nėra bendro netarifinių barjerų klasifikatorius, o ir esamas klasifikavimas yra nebaigtinis, nes turi apimtis nėribotą kiekį vis atsirandančių naujų netarifinių barjerų, kurie netiesiogiai veikia tiek kiekines, tiek vertines prekybos apimtis.

Dar pažymima, kad geriausiai bendrais bruožais netarifinius barjerus tarptautinėje prekyboje tekstile rinkose atspindinė Doha vystymo protokolas, apibendrinantis visų kliūčių prekybos tekstile ir drabužiais formų grupes. Netarifinių barjerų tarptautinėje prekyboje tekstile yra labai daug, ypač jei vertinsime, kad taip pat vadinamas barjeras skirtingoje rinkose turi skirtinę veikimo būdą ir poveikį. Be to, barjerai yra įvairūs, kompleksiški, kaip ir patys tekstilės pramonės produktai.

Išvadose teigiamai, kad konkretių netarifinio barjero įtaka prekybos apimtims pamatuoti gana kebulu, nes rinka yra veikia įvairių veiksnių ir pamatuoti vieno veiksnio poveikį, eliminuojant kitų veiksnų įtaką, praktiškai nereale. Taip pat nėra paprasta įvertinti atskirų netarifinių barjerų derinių poveikį tarptautinės prekybos apimtims. Tokius pat vardu apibūdinas netarifinis barjeras skirtingoje šalyse gali turėti skirtinas interpretacijas ir poveikio galias.

Autoriai pažymi, kad tyrimą apsunkina duomenų aptikę netarifinių barjerų tekstilės tarptautinėje prekybėje dinamiką nagrinėjant laikotarpio stoką.

Tyrimas pagrindžia tai, kad naudojant Doha vystymo protokolo netarifinių barjerų grupavimą, galima skverbėtis į atskirų netarifinių barjerų identifikavimo ir kiekvieno jų poveikio pamatavimo. Raktažodžiai: tarptautinė prekyba, netarifinių barjerų klasifikavimas, tarptautinė prekyba tekstile.

The article has been reviewed.
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