# Trade Agreements in the Sugar Industries of East and Southern Africa

**Presentation**

**1- The Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA)**
Sugar in COMESA
Problems and Perspectives

**2- The Southern African Development Community (SADC)**
Sugar in SADC
The SADC Sugar Cooperation Agreement

**Perspectives**

**Appendixes**

Table 1 - Sugar Balance in COMESA
Table 2 - Sugar Balance in the Southern Africa Development Community (SADC)
Table 3 - SACU in Relation to SADC and Africa

# Trade Agreements in the Sugar Industries of East and Southern Africa

## Presentation

This report deals with the process of development of two trade agreements in the sugar industries of East and Southern Africa: the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA) and the Southern African Development Community (SADC). Information on the current membership and processes is presented for both cases, as well as a brief discussion on the future perspectives.

These two trade blocs in formation aims to cover most of the sugar producing countries in the African continent; the picture that emerges, therefore, is basically two net surplus producers entities. This might give a biased view on the African situation as a whole because major importing countries (e.g. Algeria, Nigeria, Tunisia) are not members of either COMESA or SADC. Also, it should be underlined the overlapping of membership, in particular of important producers at the regional level such as Malawi, Mauritius, Swaziland, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

The reports complements two other reports *Structural Aspects of the Sugar Industries in East and Southern Africa* and *Corporate Developments in the Sugar Industries of East and Southern Africa*, which are also related to the IUF African Sugar Project in 2002.

## 1- The Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA)

The Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA) was established in 1994 to replace the Preferential Trade Area for Eastern and Southern Africa (PTA), which had been in existence since 1981. The twenty current member states are: Angola, Burundi, Comoros, the Democratic Republic of the Congo (Kinshasa), Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Namibia, Rwanda, Seychelles, Sudan, Swaziland, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

COMESA foresees four different stages in the integration process leading to an Economic Community:

| Stage | Objective | Date |
|---|---|---|
| Preferential Trade Area | Trade is conducted on preferential basis, according to rules of origin; countries keep their tariffs on imports from a third country. | |
| Free Trade Area | Tariffs and non-tariff barriers are eliminated; members keep tariffs on imports from a third country. | FTA by 31 October 2000 |
| Customs Union | Countries operate common external tariffs, free movement of goods once they enter the customs union, tariff revenues shared among members or allocated according to destination of goods. After four years of FTA, Customs Union will be in place. | A Common External Tariff (CET) by 2004. |
| Common Market | Free movement of good, services, labour and capital; right of residency. Establishment of a common external tariff, (CET) or customs union by the year 2004 with less restricted movement of people (Common Market status). | Year 2004 |
| Economic Community | Single currency, and common monetary and fiscal policies – in addition to Common Market. Establishment of a Monetary Union, free movement of people including right of establishment (economic community status). | Year 2025 |

*Source: COMESA in Brief*

It has to be noted that trade agreements within COMESA, because of its organic links to the Preferential Trade Area for Eastern and Southern Africa (PTA), actually date to July 1984. Initially, the member countries had agreed to an 8-year transition period (to 1992) in which tariffs would be phased-out on a common list of commodities, which would have been produced according to the “expressed import and export interests in member States.” The process did not progressed as expected – tariffs were reduced to a 60 percent baseline by 1992 –, a decision was taken to eliminate the common list and to phase-out tariffs on all product complying with COMESA’s rules of origin in a new 8-year period. In this period, tariffs would be reduced by 10

percent every two years, from the 60 percent baseline of 1992, until achieving a zero tariff by October 2000.

The COMESA Free Trade Area (FTA) was launched on 31 October 2000. Nine of the twenty member states agreed to participate in the FTA, and the rest of members agreed to reduced tariffs on COMESA products.

| **Country** | **Rate of duty applied on COMESA originating goods** |
|---|---|
| Djibouti, Egypt, Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Sudan, Zambia and Zimbabwe | Duty-free trade. No duties or charges of equivalent effect on all goods originating from these countries. |
| Comoros, Eritrea, Rwanda and Uganda | 20 percent of the general (Most Favoured Nation) duty rates |
| Burundi | 40 percent of the general (Most Favoured Nation) duty rates |
| Ethiopia | 90 percent of the general (Most Favoured Nation) duty rates |
| Angola, Congo (Kinshasa) and Seychelles | Full Most Favoured Nation rates |
| Namibia and Swaziland | Full Most Favoured Nation rates until the derogation lapses |

*Source: Comesa web site*

The step after the FTA is the introduction of the Common External Tariff (CET) by 2004. A CET is a normal feature in the process of creation of a free trade area, and refers to the preferential treatment among the bloc members and the closing of the same area to third parties. COMESA members have agreed to a CET of zero tariffs on capital goods, 5 percent on raw materials, 15 percent on intermediate goods and 30 percent on final goods. COMESA Secretariat says there are still issues to be agreed about the CET, including the actual tariff percentages, administration and compliance procedures, classification of products, alternative sources of revenues in case the introduction of the CET represents a loss of revenues for a given member country, among others.

## Sugar in COMESA

The twenty member countries of COMESA accounted for about 60 percent of the total African sugar production in 2000. The bloc is a net exporter, with close to 45 percent of the total African exports – a relatively small positive balance. The net-exporting status is thanks to the presence of important exporting countries at the regional level like Malawi, Mauritius, Swaziland, Zambia and Zimbabwe; countries which are also members of the Southern African Development Community (SADC), another regional trade agreement to be examined later in the report.

The COMESA bloc accounts for about 43 percent of the African sugar consumption, which is largely dependant on the membership of Egypt, and medium-size consumers like Kenya and Sudan.

Egypt is a country with a complex sugar-and-sweetener industry, which produces sugar from both cane and beet and also has corn sweeteners facilities. Egypt ranks among the three largest African importers, and it is the second largest sugar producer, after South Africa. Another country with some features worthy of note is Sudan, which has been investing in processing facilities with the goal of increasing production in 1 million tonnes by 2006. This news is complemented with information of quite efficient and low-cost operations. If the plants to increase Sudan's sugar production materialize, the regional configuration of the industry would go through important changes. At present, Sudan exports less than 10 percent of its production and keeps a positive net trade; the additional sugar produced would be exported, targeting mainly the European Union (EU) under the "Everything but Arms (EBA)" trade initiative, taking advantage of its UN-status as a "least developed country." (Egypt and Sudan were not part of the IUF sugar project and research in 2002.)

The COMESA bloc does not have a clear sugar outline. From the twenty members, seven (Burundi, Comoros, Djibouti, Eritrea, Namibia, Rwanda and Seychelles) have no impact on the sugar configuration – the International Sugar Organization publishes no sugar statistics on five of them. On the other side of the spectrum, there are another seven countries that export at least 25 percent of their production (Ethiopia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Swaziland, Zambia and Zimbabwe), underlining the importance the international and/or regional markets have on their sugar economies. In the area of sugar imports, the situation is extremely unbalanced: Egypt imports more sugar than the rest of the COMESA members put together. Egypt accounts for about two thirds of COMESA's total sugar imports. From this viewpoint, it should be expected that COMESA members would require extensive talks to find common grounds and policies regarding the future of the sugar industry.

**Table 1 - Sugar Balance in COMESA**
**(Year 2000, metric tonnes, raw value)**

| Country | Production | Imports | Exports | Net Trade | Consumption | Ending stocks |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Angola (*) | 30,000 | 109,726 | 0 | (109,726) | 130,000 | 57,187 |
| Burundi | na | na | na | na | na | na |
| Comoros | na | na | na | na | na | na |
| Congo (D.R.) (*) | 75,000 | 8,100 | 0 | (8,100) | 70,000 | 23,027 |
| Djibouti | na | na | na | na | na | na |
| Egypt | 1,450,000 | 618,243 | 40 | (618,203) | 2,250,000 | 1,360,340 |
| Eritrea | na | na | na | na | na | na |
| Ethiopia | 250,869 | 4,347 | 64,652 | 60,305 | 246,365 | 48,163 |
| Kenya | 436,938 | 125,912 | 3,260 | (122,652) | 662,520 | 75,852 |
| Madagascar | 70,000 | 8,451 | 24,765 | 16,314 | 97,500 | 41,974 |
| Malawi (*) | 208,804 | 4,725 | 64,890 | 60,165 | 126,644 | 109,423 |
| Mauritius (*) | 603,561 | 41,743 | 449,836 | 408,093 | 41,527 | 213,726 |
| Namibia (*) | 0 | 39,975 | 0 | (39,975) | 45,000 | 18,323 |
| Rwanda (*) | 0 | 3,040 | 0 | (3,040) | 3,000 | 395 |
| Seychelles (*) | na | na | na | na | na | na |
| Sudan | 679,850 | 0 | 57,801 | 57,801 | 429,996 | 555,888 |
| Swaziland (*) | 552,979 | 0 | 339,298 | 339,298 | 245,808 | 377,946 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Uganda | 130,000 | 27,594 | 0 | (27,594) | 155,000 | 32,976 |
| Zambia (*) | 190,000 | 4,438 | 47,191 | 42,753 | 145,000 | 174,184 |
| Zimbabwe (*) | 571,289 | 0 | 217,155 | 217,155 | 373,714 | 171,756 |
| **Total Comesa** | **5,249,290** | **996,294** | **1,268,888** | **272,594** | **5,022,074** | **3,261,160** |
| Total Africa | 9,267,970 | 4,918,157 | 2,808,005 | | 11,465,887 | |
| **Comesa as % of Africa** | **56.6** | **20.2** | **45.1** | | **43.8** | |

(*) Also member or the Southern African Development Community (SADC)

*Source: International Sugar Organization, Sugar Year Book, 2000*

## Problems and Perspectives

Almost immediately after the COMESA Free Trade Area (FTA) was introduced in October 2000, problems and disputes in the sugar trade appeared. Some of the difficulties experienced by individual industries have been described in the country reports included in *Structural Aspects of the Sugar Industries in East and Southern Africa.*

The most publicised sugar trade-related problems took place in Kenya. In July 2002, a spokesperson for the COMESA Secretariat said that Kenya's increased sugar imports showed the progress of the FTA in COMESA. In effect, for some eighteen months imported sugar had flooded the Kenyan market; which were identified as coming from Malawi, Swaziland, Zambia and Zimbabwe (even though there were also constant complains that non-COMESA sugar had illegally entered the country). It is not difficult to see, in terms of economics and statistics, why and how a net sugar importer like Kenya, with relatively better economic indexes than neighbouring countries easily became the target for lower-cost producers like the countries mentioned above. (For more information on the Kenya sugar situation – politics included – see the *Structural …* report.)

In February 2002, Kenya introduced a 200,000-tonne duty-free quota on COMESA imports, with COMESA Secretariat's agreement, and applied a 100 percent tariff on imports outside quota. Although the import quota is in effect for one year - until early 2003 –, the decision points to a main factor influencing the FTA process in COMESA: the apparent lack of preparedness among the member countries for a FTA, even though the process had been in place since 1984.

Within the COMESA framework exist legal venues to deal with loss of revenue due to the implementation of trade-related decisions within the bloc. For instance, member countries are able of imposing quantitative restrictions or prohibitions on goods that are produced by local sensitive or newly developed industries, when injuries to an industry are the result of the implementation of COMESA decisions, in case of dumping practices, and similar situations.

In mid 2002, as a result of the worsening of the crisis in Zimbabwe, countries in COMESA (Zambia, Malawi) changed some rules to prevent trade imbalances with Zimbabwe. Again, the COMESA Secretariat agreed. Among some measures was Zambia's decision to temporarily ban the importation of basic products from Zimbabwe, including sugar; and Malawi's introduction of a more stricter import system. Not surprisingly, COMESA Secretariat said that member countries were taking a more protectionist stance and recommended formulating a regional policy to

encourage freer trade. The basic question is, however, whether the legal and institutional framework would allow COMESA to deal with trade turbulences that result from social and political instability, as the Zimbabwe crisis underlines. (This comment is also relevant on whether COMESA countries have the state agencies and resources – e.g. trained personnel, knowledge, equipment, and infrastructure - required to orderly implement trade agreements.)

In September 2000 Tanzania left COMESA, a development that shows yet another obstacle for the bloc. According to some sources two main reasons were behind the decision: one, Tanzania is already a member of the Southern African Development Community (SADC), under which the country has access some of the trade benefits offered by COMESA; and, two, that its economy in transition – liberalization programs, etc. – would have not been able to withstand the elimination of tariffs as required by COMESA. (In the background, there is also the fact that Tanzania, Kenya and Uganda are members of the East African Community (EAC), which was signed in November 1999 – based on past experiences dating for several decades – with a short-tem objective of regional cooperation. The long-term goals are to establish a common market, followed by a monetary union and, eventually, a political federation.)

Although Tanzania appears to be one extreme of the overlapping in trade agreements membership, both COMESA and SADC, the two agreements examined here, face the challenge of policy harmonisation, in relation to those countries of shared membership and to their interaction as blocs.

Finally, a major challenge is mustering political support from its members to enable the bloc to deal – and resolve – trade-related issues arising from the members' own economic and political developments. COMESA, for instance, launched a free trade area in 2000, a step that was agreed by nine of its twenty members. The FTA is to be followed by a Common External Tariff (CET) and a Common Market by 2004 (the Economic Community would come in 2025). Some obstacles in achieving these goals have already been identified, in addition to the problems encountered in the implementation of the FTA. In the sugar industry, an additional source of challenges is the diversity of sugar situations, as explained earlier, which might require long talks to find common grounds on where to base policy decisions.

## 2- The Southern African Development Community (SADC)

The Southern African Development Community (SADC) traces its roots to April 1980, when nine countries in the region established the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference (SADCC), an initiative that pursued less dependency on apartheid South Africa and development programs of national and regional impact. In 1992 the SADC was formed with the Declaration and Treaty signed at Windhoek, Namibia. The SADC objectives are more ambitious than the previous Co-ordination Conference aiming at integrating the economies in the region. Current members of SADC are: Angola, Botswana, the Democratic Republic of the Congo (Kinshasa), Lesotho, Malawi, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Seychelles, South Africa, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

The regional integration through SADC aims to achieve development and economic growth in the countries and improve standards and quality of life for the population. Negotiations and talks have been translated into several protocols dealing with specific areas and economic sectors. For instance, protocols have been signed in several areas such as Energy, Transport, Wildlife Conservation, Law Enforcement, and Trade. Most of the protocols have been ratified and are at different stages of implementation.

### Sugar in SADC

The Trade Protocol was ratified in January 2000 and its implementation was launched on 1 September the same year, with the main objective is to create a free trade area by 2008. Annex VII of the Trade protocol concerns with the sugar industry in the region, which includes sophisticated analysis and processes, closely related to the importance of the industry for the SADC region. Table 2 shows the sugar balance of the SADC in 2002.

SADC accounted for 54.3 percent of the African sugar production and, because the bloc comprises most of the African net sugar exporters, it is responsible for a commanding 85 percent of the continent’s total sugar exports. Evidently, the fact that South Africa, by far the largest sugar industry in Africa, belongs to SADC makes a significant difference with any other regional trade agreement in the sector. But also, members of SADC are countries like Malawi, Mauritius, Swaziland, Zambia and Zimbabwe which make an important contribution to the bloc’s net sugar balance. Included in SADC is Mozambique, where the sugar industry is under a rehabilitation program with perspectives of surpassing the 300,000-tonne mark in the immediate future. (Mozambique produced around 300,000 tonnes per year before the civil war in the 1970s. In the 1980s and 1990s, production collapsed to about 30,000 tonnes per year.) Not surprisingly, therefore, sugar is a “sensitive” product, regulated by special rules, which are described in Annex VII of the Trade Protocol.

**Table 2 - Sugar Balance in the Southern Africa Development Community (SADC)**
**(Year 2000, metric tonnes, raw value)**

| Country | Production | Imports | Exports | Net Trade | Consumption | Ending stocks |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Angola (*) | 30,000 | 109,726 | 0 | (109,726) | 130,000 | 57,187 |
| Congo (D.R.) (*) | 75,000 | 8,100 | 0 | (8,100) | 70,000 | 23,027 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Malawi (*) | 208,804 | 4,725 | 64,890 | 60,165 | 126,644 | 109,423 |
| Mauritius (*) | 603,561 | 41,743 | 449,836 | 408,093 | 41,527 | 213,726 |
| Mozambique | 45,000 | 23,411 | 26,065 | 2,654 | 75,000 | 61,353 |
| Rwanda (*) | 0 | 3,040 | 0 | (3,040) | 3,000 | 395 |
| Tanzania | 130,000 | 88,583 | 17,375 | (71,208) | 207,500 | 31,508 |
| Zambia (*) | 190,000 | 4,438 | 47,191 | 42,753 | 145,000 | 174,184 |
| Zimbabwe (*) | 571,289 | 0 | 217,155 | 217,155 | 373,714 | 171,756 |
| **SACU/SADC** | | | | | | |
| Botswana | na | na | na | na | na | na |
| Lesotho | na | na | na | na | na | na |
| Namibia (*) | 0 | 39,975 | 0 | (39,975) | 45,000 | 18,323 |
| South Africa | 2,690,741 | 0 | 1,291,110 | 1,291,110 | 1,296,167 | 2,082,959 |
| Swaziland (*) | 552,979 | 0 | 339,298 | 339,298 | 245,808 | 377,946 |
| Total SACU | 3,243,720 | 0 | 1,630,408 | 1,630,408 | 1,541,975 | 2,460,905 |
| **Total SADC** | **5,097,374** | **323,741** | **2,452,920** | **2,129,179** | **2,759,360** | **3,321,787** |
| Total Africa | 9,267,970 | 4,918,157 | 2,808,005 | | 11,465,887 | |

(*) Also member of the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA)

*Source: International Sugar Organization, Sugar Yearbook 2000*

## The SADC Sugar Cooperation Agreement

In 1998, South Africa and Swaziland initiated talks with Zimbabwe on special rules for sugar trade, talks that moved to multilateral negotiations in 1999. On 16 June 2000, sugar negotiations were finalized in the Sugar Cooperation Agreement, involving all nine SADC sugar-producing countries. The agreement calls for a complete free trade in sugar by 2012, which would be dependent on a “positive review” of the conditions in the world sugar market five years after the Agreement came into effect: A mid-term review by 2006.

An important starting point for the Sugar Agreement is that it takes into account the trend to an international sugar economy where freer trade practices would prevail. In this perspective, the Agreement aims at:

- Promoting production and consumption of sugar and sugar-containing products within the region, in conditions of fair-trading and in an orderly regional market;
- Harmonising sugar policies within the region and implement some temporary measure to isolate the industries from destabilizing effects of distortions in the global market;
- Creating a stable climate for investment and improving competitiveness of the national industries; and,
- Improving competitiveness through the exchange of information, research and training; the development of small-scale holders programs; and the strengthening institutional frameworks.

Free trade, by year 2012, would mean liberalisation on a reciprocal basis and the removal of non-tariff barriers in the sugar trade within SADC. In the transition period, however, there will be a non-reciprocal treatment in terms of market access to countries in the Southern African Custom Union or SACU. The Southern African Custom Union (SACU) was established on 11 December 1969 – in effect since 1 March 1970 – with a Custom Union Agreement between South Africa,

Botswana, Lesotho, Namibia and Swaziland. Some long-term objectives of SACU are a free exchange of goods and a common external tariff. It should be noted that although there are five members, only South African and Swaziland are relevant to the SADC Sugar Agreement. Namibia has a very small market of only 3,000 tonnes of sugar consumed annually according to the International Sugar Organization (ISO); while the ISO has no sugar information on Botswana and Lesotho. (See Table 3.)

**Table 3 - SACU in Relation to SADC and Africa**
**(Year 2000, metric tonnes, raw value)**

| | Production | Imports | Exports | Net Trade | Consumption |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total SACU | 3,243,720 | 0 | 1,630,408 | 1,630,408 | 1,541,975 |
| Total SADC | 5,097,374 | 323,741 | 2,452,920 | 2,129,179 | 2,759,360 |
| Total Africa | 9,267,970 | 4,918,157 | 2,808,005 | | 11,465,887 |
| **SACU as** | | | | | |
| **% of SADC** | **63.6** | **0** | **66.4** | **76.5** | **55.9** |
| **% of Africa** | **34.9** | **0** | **58.0** | | **13.4** |

In relation to the SADC Sugar Cooperation Agreement, a portion of the SACU sugar market (i.e. South Africa and Swaziland), based on the annual growth of that market, is allocated to each of the net surplus producers in SADC. Starting in 2000, when the Sugar Cooperation Agreement was signed, the volumes are: 45,000 tonnes in marketing year one, 90,000 tonnes in year two and 138,000 tonnes in year three. For marketing years four and five, the growth of the SACU market will be reviewed but the minimum market access will be 138,000 tonnes.

A second segment of the SACU market in the form of an annual 20,000-tonne duty-free quota, will be allocated to non-SACU SADC surplus producers. The actual share of the duty-free quota will be determined according to each producer's contribution to the total surplus of the non-SACU SADC members. (Tonnes of sugar are *tel quel.*)

The Sugar Cooperation Agreement includes a strong political and technical component. There is a Technical Committee on Sugar in charge of implementing the concrete steps of the agreement. In this context, representatives of the sugar industries of Malawi, Mauritius, Mozambique, South Africa, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe met in Johannesburg on 13 & 14 November 2000, and they formed the Federation of SADC Sugar Producers. The main objectives of the Federation are to promote the common interests of the participating industries in cooperation with the SADC's Technical Committee on Sugar, to provide a forum for discussion, and to promote specific development programs. Membership in the Federation is open to the sugar associations of the countries or, in the absence of such associations, a body representing the sugar producing industry. The Federation is to meet twice a year, and agreements are to be taken by consensus.

## Perspectives

Even though there has been news of delays in the revision of some custom regulations in the SACU members of SADC in relation to the duty-free quota allocated to non-SACU SADC members, such delays appear to be of a technical and administrative nature. There are two key factors in favour of the agreement in sugar: one is the political will that the members seemed

ready to devote to the process and, two, the internal homogeneity of a bloc that in sugar comprises mostly sugar exporters. From this perspective, the sugar process in SADC appears to be on a relatively more solid basis than the process in COMESA, previously examined. Other be favourable conditions are the long transition period towards a sugar free trade area (2012), the recognition of the destabilizing effects of the global sugar market, the provision of a review of the proposal for a complete free-trade in sugar (2006), and the expertise in the sugar industries of the bloc.

In the transition period, the non-reciprocal treatment between SACU and non-SACU members of SADC is a promising way to build some compatibility between the industries, with most of the burden to be carried by South Africa. Some of the most developed industries in the world (e.g. in terms of expertise, know-how, trade, etc.) are part of SADC, like South Africa, Swaziland, and Mauritius. The long and available expertise would be a major asset in the actual implementation of the political agreements.

Not less important is the corporate structure within the region, where South African (Illovo Sugar and Tongaat-Hulett) and Mauritian companies dominate almost all the SADC main sugar industries countries: South Africa, Swaziland, Zimbabwe, Zambia, Malawi, Mozambique and Mauritius. (For instance, when talking about "countries" it is necessary to keep in mind that Illovo Sugar controls all the processing of cane in Malawi and Zambia, more than half in South Africa, a third of Swaziland's, and also participates in Tanzania and Mozambique. The sugar "producing" industry associations or bodies have a high degree of corporate participation built-in.)

The SADC bloc is a net exporter area to the tune of over 2 million tonnes per year, while the African continent as a whole is a deficit area. It should be expected that arrangements between SADC and other African blocs/countries be negotiated in the near future. Internationally, SADC could play a relevant role in the discussions on free trade in sugar. SADC comprises some of the lowest-cost producers in the world; producers that are beneficiaries in the only two sugar preferential markets (the European Union and the United States) and who also have access to the EU's market through the "Everything by Arms" trade initiative. It would be interesting for the international sugar industry to learn about the reaction of some SADC members (Malawi, Mozambique, Swaziland, Zambia, Zimbabwe and, quite especially, Mauritius) to the recent challenge to the EU sugar regime presented by Australia and Brazil at the World Trade Organisation (September 2002). Australia and Brazil are members of the Cairns Group, where South Africa is also a prominent member among sugar producers.

# Appendixes

**Basic Information on country members of Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA)**

| Country | Area (km2) | Population millions (1998) | UN - status | WTO - status |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Angola | 1,246,700 | 11.9 | Least Developed Country | 1/12/1966 |
| Burundi | 27,834 | 6.6 | Least Developed Country | 23/7/1995 |
| Comoros | 2,171 | 0.7 | Least Developed Country | Non member |
| Congo (D.R.) | 2,345,409 | 49.4 | Least Developed Country | 1/1/1997 |
| Djibouti | 22,000 | 0.6 | Least Developed Country | 3/15/1995 |
| Egypt | 1,001,450 | 65.8 | | 30/6/1995 |
| Eritrea | 121,144 | 3.9 | Least Developed Country | Non member |
| Ethiopia | 1,130,138 | 61.9 | Least Developed Country | Observer |
| Kenya | 582,646 | 30.6 | | 1/1/1995 |
| Madagascar | 587,041 | 16.3 | Least Developed Country | 17/11/1995 |
| Malawi | 118,484 | 12.0 | Least Developed Country | 31/5/1995 |
| Mauritius | 2,045 | 1.1 | | 1/1/1995 |
| Namibia | 825,418 | 1.6 | | 1/1/1995 |
| Rwanda | 26,338 | 8.7 | Least Developed Country | 22/5/1996 |
| Seychelles | 280 | 0.1 | | Applied |
| Sudan | 2,505,813 | 30.4 | Least Developed Country | Applied |
| Swaziland | 17,363 | 1.0 | | 1/1/1995 |
| Uganda | 236,036 | 23.3 | Least Developed Country | 1/1/1995 |
| Zambia | 752,614 | 10.1 | Least Developed Country | 1/1/1995 |
| Zimbabwe | 390,580 | 11.9 | | 3/3/1995 |
| **Total** | **11,941,504** | **347.9** | | |

*Source: COMESA, November 2000*

**Basic information on country members of the Southern African Development Community (SADC)**

| | Area (km2) | Population (million) | UN Status | WTO status |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Angola | 1,246,700 | 11.9 | Least Developed Country | 23/11/1996 |
| Botswana | 582,000 | 1.6 | | 31/5/1995 |
| Congo (D.R.) | 2,345,409 | 49.4 | Least Developed Country | 1/1/1997 |
| Lesotho | 30,355 | 2.1 | Least Developed Country | 31/5/1995 |
| Malawi | 118,484 | 12.0 | Least Developed Country | 31/5/1995 |
| Mauritius | 2,045 | 1.1 | | 1/1/1995 |
| Mozambique | 799,380 | 16.8 | Least Developed Country | 26/8/1995 |
| Namibia | 825,418 | 1.6 | | 1/1/1995 |
| Seychelles | 280 | 0.1 | | Applied |
| South Africa | 1,221,000 | 43.1 | | 1/1/1995 |
| Swaziland | 17,363 | 1.0 | | 1/1/1995 |
| Tanzania | 945,000 | 32.0 | | 1/1/1995 |
| Zambia | 752,614 | 10.1 | Least Developed Country | 1/1/1995 |
| Zimbabwe | 390,580 | 11.9 | | 3/3/1995 |
| **Total** | **9,276,628** | **194.7** | | |

*Source: SADC, COMESA, United Nations, World Trade Organization web sites.*