# Banana in Europe in 2007 <br> MFNs up, ACP and EU down 

Not all suppliers benefited from the dynamics of a strongly growing market. MFN suppliers profited to the full from the liberalisation of the European market while ACP and community producers suffered extremely bad weather that hit their production capacity.

## Dollar suppliers: a hold-up

Bananas shipped by MFNs, more commonly referred to as dollar bananas, confirmed their hold on the European market. Their market share has never been so large, reaching 73.4\% in 2007, $5.4 \%$ up on 2006 on an import market that increased by $7 \%$. Brazil ( $-6 \%$ ) and Guatemala (-12\%) were practically the only suppliers to show signs of weakness. The position of Ecuador in the EU stabilised, with shipments displaying a $1 \%$ decrease. However, it just maintained its lead over Costa Rica, Colombia and Panama. The three latter countries displayed two-figure growth at $+21 \%,+16 \%$ and $+13 \%$ respectively. Peru and Honduras also scored better with $+48 \%$ and $+40 \%$. These trends are sometimes related to the choice of target market that differs from one year to the next. For example, Colombia's position dwindled considerably on the United States market (-20\%) and it therefore chose to concentrate on the EU. The case was precisely the opposite for Guatemala which, after a disastrous European season in mid-2006,
 returned to the United States market. Ecuador cumulated deficits in both the USA and the EU and concentrated more on the Russian market. Finally, Honduras and Costa Rica played in both courts, proving their substantial production potential expressed in 2007. As regards regulations, the question of the European customs tariff is still the exciting subject. The EU has been condemned
twice, to the benefit of Ecuador (end of 2007) and then the United States (beginning of 2008). This does not make much difference to the banana imbroglio. Customs dues are still set at EUR176 per tonne for these origins in 2008 and are very likely to remain so until the end of the year. In these hard times for European budgets, the member states and the Commission can still share the some EUR680 million in customs revenue.



## ACPs, or the very discreet hegemony

Expiatory victims of the dollar banana supplier countries, the ACP states kept a low profile in 2007. They reduced their shipments to the European market by 69000 tonnes (total 837000 tonnes), a $7 \%$ decrease in comparison with 2006. ACP bananas formed only $16 \%$ of total EU supplies in comparison with $18.7 \%$ in 2006 and $21.3 \%$ at the peak in 1994 just after the creation of the single European market for banana. An unusual feature is that the African ACP countries account for $95 \%$ of the decrease. Africa's share in ACP group supplies dwindled from 56 to $53 \%$ in 2007. The other ACP countries have gained 10\% since 2003 and now stand at $47 \%$. All the other major sources reduced their shipments, except for the Dominican Republic, Surinam and Ghana. This situation is the result of bad weather (hurricanes and gales). Growth rates are in two figures for Ghana (+ 49\%) and Surinam (+ $20 \%$ ), showing that both countries are still in the investment and development phases as regards production capacity. The Dominican Republic, a favourite for organic and fair trade bananas, also displayed exceptional growth (+ 17\%) in spite of floods and wind (in the south in the spring and in the north in December). Exports to the EU have increased five-fold since 1999! The year was one of suspense as regards regulations. The signing of economic partnership agreements (EPAs) between the ACP states and the EU right at the end of the year reassured the banana
 bananas now enter the EU duty-free and quota free (DFQF). The system is a better replacement of the ACP quota that was tight (775000 tonnes) and required two monthly management of import rights on a first come, first served basis, making the system very complex, expensive and often uncertain. Even if many people consider that EPAs are bad for ACP economies-especially in Africa-because of the reciprocity of market opening (EUACP), they are a chance for export sectors like banana.

## EU production: <br> bad news from the sky

The fall was a tough one. In 2007, the market share of European production fell to $10.5 \%$ in comparison with $13.3 \%$ in 2006. This is the lowest figure ever seen. European producers have lost $7 \%$ in terms of market share since the common market organisation of banana came into force in 1993. Two effects were cumulated in 2007-the damage caused by weather to plantations in Martinique and Guadeloupe and enlargement to two new member states (Romania and Bulgaria), that purchase dollar bananas. Hurricane Dean reduced shipments from Martinique by nearly 100000 t in comparison with the 2004-05-06 three year average and those from Guadeloupe were down by 14000 t . This short-term trend conceals another that is more worrying still, that of the steady decrease of European banana production. Since 2002, not counting the effect of hurricanes, it has decreased by 150000 t , that is to say by nearly a fifth of the total in 2002. The Canaries have lost 60000 t , Martinique 43000 t , Guadeloupe 47000 t and Madeira nearly 7000 t . We are now far from the record of 810537 t reached in 1997. The undertakings made by the EU in favour of its producers will be remembered (Regulation (EEC) 404/1993, 7th 'Whereas' clause): '... introduction of the market organisation should not place producers in a worse situation than at present, and since it is likely to alter the levels of prices on those markets, provisions should be made for compensation to cover the loss of income which may derive from implementation of the new system so as to permit the continuation of Community production at the costs entailed by the specific structural situation for as long as this remains unadjusted by the structural measures implemented...'.

Often perceived and qualified as generous by certain member states and the majority of third country banana suppliers, Europe's policy of aiding its production did not have all the effects hoped for. Will the new European production support regime formula correct certain imbalances? For the second year running, some EUR280 million has been paid to European producers within the framework of European POSEI programmes that include specific measures for ensuring the continuity and development of local crops in extremely remote regions, taking their specific handicaps into account ■
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