

M.A. Markosyan, J. Cen

**COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ARMENIA AND GEORGIA'S EXPORT STRUCTURE AND COMPETITIVENESS
(ON THE EXAMPLE OF THE MAIN COMMODITY GROUPS)**

UDC – 339.5:339.137.2

**COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ARMENIA AND GEORGIA'S EXPORT
STRUCTURE AND COMPETITIVENESS (ON THE EXAMPLE OF THE
MAIN COMMODITY GROUPS)**

Meruzhan A.Markosyan

Institute of Economics after M. Kotanyan
15, Grigor Lusavorich st., Yerevan
e-mail: markosyan844@gmail.com
ORCID iD: 0000-0003-3608-0375
Republic of Armenia

Jiaming Cen

South China University of Technology
81 Wushan Road, Tianhe District, Guangzhou,
e-mail: 178269232@qq.com
ORCID iD: 0009-0001-1412-4202
China

<https://doi.org/10.56243/18294898-2025.4-69>

Abstract

This study analyzes the dynamics of Armenia's and Georgia's foreign trade structures through the lens of Comparative Competitive Advantage (CCA) across the years 2020–2024. Focusing on the top ten product groups with the highest CCA indicators, the research highlights key differences in the export profiles of the two countries. Armenia's trade is characterized by a strong and consistent competitive advantage in a limited number of resource-based sectors, particularly ores, slag and ash, as well as processed agricultural goods such as alcoholic beverages and tobacco. In contrast, Georgia shows signs of increasing diversification and adaptability in its export structure, with notable improvements in the competitiveness of value-added goods such as animal and vegetable fats and oils, textiles, and footwear. The findings suggest that while Armenia maintains depth and stability in specific sectors, Georgia demonstrates broader flexibility and emerging strengths across various industries. This comparative perspective offers valuable insights into the evolving nature of trade specialization and competitiveness in the South Caucasus region.

Keywords: Comparative Competitive Advantage (CCA), foreign trade, Armenia, Georgia, export structure, trade specialization, economic competitiveness, South Caucasus, product groups, trade analysis.

Introduction

Foreign trade remains a vital instrument in the economic development and integration of countries, particularly for small, open economies such as those of Armenia and Georgia.

*M.A. Markosyan, J. Cen***COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ARMENIA AND GEORGIA'S EXPORT STRUCTURE AND COMPETITIVENESS
(ON THE EXAMPLE OF THE MAIN COMMODITY GROUPS)**

These post-Soviet South Caucasian nations have undergone significant structural transformations in their trade patterns over the past two decades, striving to enhance export competitiveness, diversify their trade portfolios, and strengthen their positions in the global economy. Amid global economic fluctuations, regional instability, and shifting trade alliances, identifying sectors with comparative competitive advantage (CCA) is critical for developing sustainable trade policies and boosting national economic performance.

The theory of comparative advantage suggests that countries should specialize in producing and exporting goods for which they have the lowest opportunity cost relative to other nations. However, this theoretical premise must be contextualized within modern global trade dynamics, where value chains, technological intensity, and market access determine competitiveness. Therefore, empirical assessments such as the CCA index provide practical insights into the real-world trade performance of individual product groups. By analyzing trade flows through this lens, policymakers can identify priority sectors and address inefficiencies in foreign trade structures.

This paper focuses on examining and comparing the foreign trade performance of Armenia and Georgia by analyzing the CCA indicators of product groups from 2010 to 2024. In doing so, it explores both the best-performing and worst-performing sectors based on their relative trade balances. The analysis reveals the degree of specialization, structural shifts, and emerging trends in each country's export and import composition. For Armenia, particular strengths are found in the export of mineral products, ores, precious metals, alcoholic beverages, and tobacco, while Georgia's competitive edge lies in precious metals, fats and oils, and select industrial products. At the same time, both countries demonstrate significant trade deficits in machinery, chemical products, and various manufactured goods—highlighting critical gaps in industrial capacity and value-added production.

By comparing the trade structures and CCA trends of these two economies, the study not only maps sectoral strengths and weaknesses but also contributes to broader discussions on regional integration, trade-driven growth, and economic security in the South Caucasus. This work also aims to offer practical recommendations for improving trade policy, enhancing competitiveness, and fostering sustainable export development in both Armenia and Georgia.

The analysis of foreign trade structures and export competitiveness is firmly grounded in both classical and modern international trade theory. A substantial body of literature emphasizes the role of gravity models as a fundamental empirical tool for explaining bilateral trade flows. Shengelia [1] provides a structured overview of gravity-model applications, highlighting their relevance for evaluating trade intensity and forecasting international trade relations. Complementing this approach, Sartania [2] examines the driving forces behind Georgia's economic integration with the European Union, emphasizing the importance of foreign trade liberalization, institutional convergence, and regulatory alignment.

Building on gravity-based approaches, Shengelia [1] and related studies demonstrate that trade flows in small open economies are influenced not only by economic size and distance but also by policy orientation and institutional quality. In this context, Charaia [3] analyzes China–Georgia economic relations within the Belt and Road Initiative, stressing the role of infrastructure development and trade facilitation in strengthening bilateral cooperation.

M.A. Markosyan, J. Cen

**COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ARMENIA AND GEORGIA'S EXPORT STRUCTURE AND COMPETITIVENESS
(ON THE EXAMPLE OF THE MAIN COMMODITY GROUPS)**

Abesadze [4] further explores Georgia's post-independence growth trajectory, underlining the increasing importance of foreign trade and structural reforms in supporting long-term economic development.

A parallel strand of the literature focuses on export diversification as a key determinant of economic resilience and growth. Hesse [5] argues that diversification reduces vulnerability to commodity price shocks, particularly in developing and transition economies. Imbs and Wacziarg [6] propose a dynamic, U-shaped relationship between diversification and income levels, suggesting that economies diversify at early stages of development and re-specialize as they mature.

Earlier empirical work by Love [7] demonstrates that export concentration is associated with higher earnings instability, while diversified export structures contribute to more stable growth paths. Gourdon [8] provides further empirical evidence that both product and market diversification are positively associated with higher growth rates and economic resilience. Cadot, Carrère, and Strauss-Kahn [9] distinguish between extensive diversification (new products) and intensive diversification (expansion of existing products into new markets), showing that both dimensions enhance export performance.

The role of public policy in promoting diversification is emphasized by Lederman and Maloney [10], who highlight infrastructure development, trade facilitation, and trade agreements as critical enablers of export diversification. Rodrik [11] argues that industrial policy can play a constructive role in overcoming coordination failures and fostering new competitive sectors, while later contributions [12] stress the importance of pragmatic and context-specific policy design. However, Agosin [13] notes that diversification efforts face significant constraints, including limited access to finance, technology, and skilled labor, as well as high entry costs and regulatory barriers in international markets.

Innovation-oriented perspectives on diversification are explored by Klinger and Lederman [14], who link export diversification to entrepreneurial discovery and experimentation with new products. Korea's development experience, analyzed by Kim and Lin [15], illustrates how strategic industrial policy, investment in human capital, and technological upgrading can transform an economy from primary production to high-value-added exports. More recent contributions emphasize not only diversification but also export sophistication. Hidalgo et al. [16] introduce the concept of the "product space," arguing that countries with more complex and diversified export baskets are better positioned for sustained growth. Hausmann, Hwang, and Rodrik [17] reinforce this argument by demonstrating that the composition and quality of exports significantly influence long-term economic growth outcomes. Overall, the literature suggests that export competitiveness is shaped by a combination of structural factors, diversification strategies, institutional quality, and policy interventions. This theoretical foundation provides a robust basis for applying the Comparative Competitive Advantage (CCA) framework to analyze and compare the export structures of Armenia and Georgia.

Conflict Setting

Armenia and Georgia face a strategic conflict between maintaining existing competitive

M.A. Markosyan, J. Cen

**COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ARMENIA AND GEORGIA'S EXPORT STRUCTURE AND COMPETITIVENESS
(ON THE EXAMPLE OF THE MAIN COMMODITY GROUPS)**

strengths and pursuing broader export diversification. Armenia's exports are concentrated in a few resource-based sectors, offering stability but limiting flexibility in response to global market fluctuations. Conversely, Georgia shows increasing diversification and competitiveness in value-added goods, but this approach carries risks associated with overextension and volatility in emerging sectors. This tension creates a policy and economic setting where decisions must balance depth in established industries with flexibility to exploit new trade opportunities, highlighting the need for informed, data-driven strategies based on Comparative Competitive Advantage (CCA) analysis.

Research Results

Foreign trade diversification research involves a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods to comprehensively analyze the extent, determinants, and effects of trade diversification.

Analysis of statistical series of export and import of product groups (sections) was used in the study: methods of induction and deduction, approaches of scientific abstraction. The authors put the theory of comparative advantages as the basis of the policy of development of export and import diversification possibilities and ways of product groups (sections). The point is that according to that theory, it is possible to assess (quantify) the degree of specialization of export and import of product groups (sections) and therefore trade circulation. Such an approach with foreign and mutual trade partner countries makes it possible to choose the best partner (partners) in the region and the global economy, based on the mutual benefit (efficiency) of the process, according to which the comparative advantage coefficients of product groups (sections) are the basis of these calculations, and the calculations are carried out based on available and published rich statistical information on foreign and mutual trade. The CCAs of a product group (section) is calculated from the export of the commodity group (section) - import of the commodity group (section) / their export + import. In the form of a formula, it is expressed as follows:

$$\text{CCA of the product group (section)} = \frac{\text{Product group (section) E} - \text{Product group (section) I}}{\text{Product group (section) E} + \text{Product group (section) I}},$$

where: the product group (section) E- is the country's export volume, and the product group (section) I – is the country's import volume.

The magnitude of CCAs varies in the range [-1,+1]. According to that, the greater the CCAs, the higher the expediency of foreign trade. This criterion was adopted by the authors as a predictor of diversification of foreign and mutual trade.

The data for Armenia were collected from the official publications of the Statistical Committee of the Republic of Armenia, including the “Statistical Yearbook of Armenia” and monthly reports on the socio-economic situation. The data for Georgia were obtained from the External Trade Portal of the National Statistics Office of Georgia (Geostat). In addition to the CCA calculation, each product group's share in total exports and imports was computed to analyze structural significance. Based on these indicators, the study identifies the top ten product groups with the highest and lowest CCA values for both countries, providing insights into export diversification, specialization, and vulnerability to external shocks. The analysis was conducted using Microsoft Excel for data cleaning, aggregation. Descriptive statistics and trend analysis were used to interpret the results across years and product categories.

M.A. Markosyan, J. Cen

**COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ARMENIA AND GEORGIA'S EXPORT STRUCTURE AND COMPETITIVENESS
(ON THE EXAMPLE OF THE MAIN COMMODITY GROUPS)**

Analysis

Table 1 shows the volumes and structure of RA exports and imports by product categories in 2022-2023, thousand dollars.

Table 1

**Volumes and structure of RA export and import by product categories in 2022-2023,
thousand dollar [18][19]**

Product section	Export			Import			Specific gravity, %			
	2022 January-December	2023 January - December	growth rate, %	2022 January-December	2023 January - December	growth rate, %	export 2022	export 2023	import 2022	import 2023
Total	5,419,064.5	8,415,155.1	155.3	8,775,859.2	12,307,957.0	140.2	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
including:										
live animals and animal products	170,832.5	98,189.9	57.5	261,145.7	248,349.3	95.1	3.2	1.2	3.0	2.0
products of plant origin	225,944.0	182,576.3	80.8	421,935.1	356,687.0	84.5	4.2	2.2	4.8	2.9
animal and vegetable oils and fats	7,516.5	1,526.6	20.3	105,646.0	66,255.6	62.7	0.1	0.0	1.2	0.5
prepared food products	882,197.1	885,061.9	100.3	579,422.2	617,800.4	106.6	16.3	10.5	6.6	5.0
mineral products	1,027,520.8	887,650.7	86.4	1,196,064.5	1,113,167.0	93.1	19.0	10.5	13.6	9.0
products of chemical and allied industries	83,491.5	120,940.5	144.9	588,239.6	622,775.8	105.9	1.5	1.4	6.7	5.1
plastics and articles thereof, rubber and rubber articles	63,111.5	66,443.4	105.3	327,685.5	351,811.6	107.4	1.2	0.8	3.7	2.9
leather raw materials, leather, fur, and articles made from them	11,130.5	21,988.4	197.6	28,444.1	42,344.0	148.9	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.3
wood and wood products	4,726.6	9,353.0	197.9	93,977.9	88,373.5	94.0	0.1	0.1	1.1	0.7
paper and paper products	6,742.2	4,771.2	70.8	137,730.2	147,545.8	107.1	0.1	0.1	1.6	1.2
textile items	224,409.9	357,657.2	159.4	397,899.9	648,713.9	163.0	4.1	4.3	4.5	5.3
footwear, hats, umbrellas	12,640.8	41,456.5	3.3 times	76,689.9	116,616.9	152.1	0.2	0.5	0.9	0.9
things made of stone, plaster, cement	37,247.2	37,209.3	99.9	160,974.4	174,657.5	108.5	0.7	0.4	1.8	1.4
precious and semi-precious stones, precious metals, and articles thereof	989,410.8	3,211,869.9	3.2 times	691,595.9	2,302,882.6	3.3 times	18.3	38.2	7.9	18.7
base metals and articles made from them	460,401.4	452,236.7	98.2	624,041.4	602,692.5	96.6	8.5	5.4	7.1	4.9
machines, equipment, and mechanisms	718,756.0	1,290,921.6	179.6	1,728,318.9	2,459,173.6	142.3	13.3	15.3	19.7	20.0
land, air, and water vehicles	332,562.0	548,276.8	164.9	957,936.9	1,832,380.6	191.3	6.1	6.5	10.9	14.9
devices and apparatus	117,571.1	142,955.8	121.6	196,927.5	265,833.7	135.0	2.2	1.7	2.2	2.2
various industrial products	39,519.5	53,315.9	134.9	191,855.2	243,560.7	127.0	0.7	0.6	2.2	2.0
works of art	3,332.7	753.5	22.6	9,328.4	6,334.9	67.9	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1

Note: These and the following tables were compiled and calculated by the authors.

M.A. Markosyan, J. Cen

**COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ARMENIA AND GEORGIA'S EXPORT STRUCTURE AND COMPETITIVENESS
(ON THE EXAMPLE OF THE MAIN COMMODITY GROUPS)**

From the data in Table 1, it follows that the volume of exports to RA in 2023 increased by 155.3% compared to the previous year, and imports increased by 140.2%, respectively. Such a high rate of growth of export and import is mainly due to the Russian-Ukrainian conflict, as a result of which RA's re-export to the Russian Federation has increased significantly.

Table 2

**Volumes and Structure of Georgia's Export and Import by Product Categories
in 2023–2024, thousand USD [20]**

Product section	Export 2023 (thsd USD)	Export 2024 (thsd USD)	Import 2023 (thsd USD)	Import 2024 (thsd USD)	Export growth rate (%)	Import growth rate (%)	Export share 2023 (%)	Export share 2024 (%)	Import share 2023 (%)	Import share 2024 (%)
Live animals and animal products	182071.9	158600.2	446326.1	458329.4	87.1	102.7	3.0	2.4	2.9	2.7
Products of plant origin	264414.8	324332.3	430050.6	486164.4	122.7	113.0	4.3	4.9	2.8	2.9
Animal or vegetable fats and oils	21813.94	25267.82	88153.31	97407.6	115.8	110.5	0.4	0.4	0.6	0.6
Prepared food products	968550.6	1171606	1053212	1155379	121.0	109.7	15.9	17.9	6.8	6.8
Mineral products	719750.9	491033.2	2161457	2164519	68.2	100.1	11.8	7.5	13.9	12.8
Products of chemical and allied industries	432189.1	423025.9	1398865	1534361	97.9	109.7	7.1	6.5	9.0	9.1
Plastics and articles thereof, rubber and rubber articles	86053.13	67754.62	601099.8	620322.6	78.7	103.2	1.4	1.0	3.9	3.7
Leather, fur, and related products	3589.93	3441.89	36164.88	39565.42	95.9	109.4	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2
Wood and wood products	41881.09	48030.94	211596.5	224035.5	114.7	105.9	0.7	0.7	1.4	1.3
Paper and paper products	40861.48	57568.09	194830.9	208468.5	140.9	107.0	0.7	0.9	1.3	1.2
Textile items	231407.7	247242.5	596273.5	663037.4	106.8	111.2	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.9
Footwear, hats, umbrellas	7074.38	6708.21	126794.6	143725	94.8	113.4	0.1	0.1	0.8	0.8
Stone, plaster, cement items	16470.88	20758.34	347199.4	336906.8	126.0	97.0	0.3	0.3	2.2	2.0
Precious and semi-precious stones, metals	95405.37	109215.6	15837.8	18699.33	114.5	118.1	1.6	1.7	0.1	0.1
Base metals and products	326660.4	475727.2	1122532	1381393	145.6	123.1	5.4	7.3	7.2	8.2
Machines and equipment	259694.2	254433.7	2152043	2373585	98.0	110.3	4.3	3.9	13.8	14.0
Vehicles (land, air, water)	2272665	2559511	3917832	4316954	112.6	110.2	37.4	39.0	25.2	25.5
Devices and apparatus	85300.17	79502.46	218603.1	232968.2	93.2	106.6	1.4	1.2	1.4	1.4
Various industrial products	25466.12	34006.22	448969.2	454748.9	133.5	101.3	0.4	0.5	2.9	2.7
Works of art	441.06	355.33	798.96	2417.54	80.6	302.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total	6081762	6558122	15568639	16912988	2148.6	2364.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

The share of precious and semi-precious stones, precious metals, and their articles has the largest share of RA product groups (sections) - 38.2% in 2023, the share of machines, equipment, and mechanisms - 15.3%, ground, ready-made food products - 10.5%, for air and water vehicles - 6.5%. The divisions of other product groups are not large, which implies that the diversification of divisions of the mentioned product groups is not related to certain difficulties and the period of assimilation of new markets. Import volumes of the mentioned

*M.A. Markosyan, J. Cen***COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ARMENIA AND GEORGIA'S EXPORT STRUCTURE AND COMPETITIVENESS
(ON THE EXAMPLE OF THE MAIN COMMODITY GROUPS)**

product groups also have the largest specific weight, which also confirms the previous statement.

The analysis of Armenia's and Georgia's foreign trade for the periods 2022–2023 and 2023–2024 respectively reveals several strategic and structural differences. In both countries, the total volumes of exports and imports have undergone significant changes, while also exhibiting important distinctions in their commodity composition.

In 2023, Armenia's export volume reached approximately USD 8.4 billion, marking a 155.3% increase compared to the previous year. Import volume stood at over USD 12.3 billion, showing a 140.2% growth. In contrast, Georgia's exports in 2024 amounted to around USD 6.6 billion, a modest increase of 7.8%, while imports reached approximately USD 16.9 billion, growing by 8.6%. Thus, Armenia's export growth was significantly more rapid and intensive, especially in high-value product groups.

At the level of product composition, important differences emerge. In Armenia's export structure, precious metals and articles made thereof dominated in 2023, accounting for 38.2% of total exports. In Georgia, however, similar goods represented only 1.7% of total exports. This discrepancy is attributed not only to external demand but also to Armenia's re-export strategy and its orientation toward specific foreign markets.

Conversely, transport equipment, particularly motor vehicles, play a dominant role in Georgia's export structure, comprising 39% of total exports in 2024. This reflects Georgia's function as a regional hub for vehicle import and re-export. Imports of transport equipment were also substantial, accounting for 25.5% of total imports—highlighting both domestic consumption and re-export activity.

In Armenia, machinery and equipment (15.3%) and prepared food products (10.5%) were among the most important exported categories after precious metals. In Georgia, machinery and equipment accounted for just 3.9% of exports, while prepared food products were more significant at 17.9%. These figures suggest that Armenia is more intensively engaged in the manufacturing and processing industry, whereas Georgia has stronger positioning in agro-processing sectors.

Regarding mineral products, both countries showed a decline in export shares. In Armenia, their share dropped from 19% in 2022 to 10.5% in 2023. In Georgia, the decline was from 11.8% in 2023 to 7.5% in 2024. This is partially attributable to global raw material price fluctuations and declining demand in international markets.

In terms of import structure, both countries are heavily dependent on machinery, equipment, chemical products, and mineral resources. This indicates a shared reliance on high-tech goods and production inputs. Georgia's import volumes remained large and displayed a relatively diversified structure.

In conclusion, Armenia's export system in 2023 demonstrated dynamic growth, particularly in high-value commodities, although it remains concentrated around a limited number of product groups, which introduces certain vulnerabilities. Georgia's export structure is more balanced, while both economies continue to exhibit high external dependency in import flows, especially in machinery and transport sectors.

M.A. Markosyan, J. Cen

**COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ARMENIA AND GEORGIA'S EXPORT STRUCTURE AND COMPETITIVENESS
(ON THE EXAMPLE OF THE MAIN COMMODITY GROUPS)**

Table 3 shows the RA foreign trade CCAs by product groups (sections) for 2010-2023, in descending order of indicators for 2023.

Table 3

**RA foreign trade CCAs by product groups (sections) in 2010-2023,
in descending order of 2023 indicators [18][19]**

Product groups	2010	2015	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
prepared food products	-0.405	-0.028	0.161	0.189	0.172	0.179	0.207	0.178
precious and semi-precious stones, precious metals, and articles thereof	-0.085	0.269	0.034	0.167	0.440	0.145	0.177	0.165
mineral products	-0.421	-0.165	-0.054	-0.045	0.043	0.024	-0.076	-0.113
base metals and articles made from them	-0.051	-0.049	-0.068	-0.139	-0.223	-0.035	-0.151	-0.143
Total	-0.578	-0.373	-0.346	-0.352	-0.287	-0.279	-0.236	-0.188
textile items	-0.895	-0.333	-0.171	-0.287	-0.295	-0.243	-0.279	-0.289
devices and apparatus	-0.809	-0.498	-0.383	-0.121	-0.293	-0.565	-0.252	-0.301
machines, equipment, and mechanisms	-0.912	-0.928	-0.911	-0.902	-0.908	-0.876	-0.413	-0.312
leather raw materials, leather, fur, and articles made from them	-0.620	-0.285	-0.279	-0.473	-0.496	-0.609	-0.437	-0.316
products of plant origin	-0.862	-0.680	-0.399	-0.369	-0.305	-0.216	-0.303	-0.323
live animals and animal products	-0.626	-0.391	-0.445	-0.490	-0.254	-0.218	-0.209	-0.433
footwear, hats, umbrellas	-0.915	-0.877	-0.855	-0.918	-0.875	-0.854	-0.717	-0.475
land, air, and water vehicles	-0.967	-0.897	-0.865	-0.920	-0.868	-0.776	-0.485	-0.539
various industrial products	-0.954	-0.695	-0.684	-0.819	-0.777	-0.833	-0.658	-0.641
things made of stone, plaster, cement	-0.672	-0.707	-0.591	-0.712	-0.646	-0.687	-0.624	-0.649
products of chemical and allied industries	-0.935	-0.903	-0.866	-0.878	-0.868	-0.833	-0.751	-0.675
plastics and articles thereof, rubber and rubber articles	-0.811	-0.848	-0.867	-0.879	-0.853	-0.845	-0.677	-0.682
works of art	-0.330	0.299	0.553	-0.294	0.300	0.568	-0.474	-0.787
wood and wood products	-0.974	-0.941	-0.934	-0.967	-0.978	-0.970	-0.904	-0.809
paper and paper products	-0.980	-0.952	-0.971	-0.972	-0.972	-0.962	-0.907	-0.937
animal and vegetable oils and fats	-0.999	-0.997	-0.997	-0.998	-0.997	-0.998	-0.867	-0.955

From the data in Table 3, it follows that the state of RA's foreign trade in 2010-2023 has improved, as the CCAs had a decreasing trend, from -0.578 in 2010 to 2023: -0.289. According to this, in recent years, they have had positive CCAs: prepared food products, precious and semi-precious stones, precious metals, and articles thereof. The CCAs of the remaining product groups (sections) had a negative value, which once again proves the problem of renewing the RA export policy and finding new markets.

Of considerable practical interest is the picture of the 10 product groups with the highest CCAs and 10 product groups with the lowest CCAs of the RA product groups.

Table 4 presents Georgia's foreign trade Comparative Competitive Advantage (CCA) indicators by product groups (sections) for the years 2010, 2015, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, and 2024, ranked in descending order based on 2024 CCA values.

The analysis of Armenia's and Georgia's foreign trade structures based on Comparative Competitive Advantage (CCA) indicators between 2010 and 2024 allows us to identify fundamental differences in their export profiles, trade dynamics, and competitiveness.

M.A. Markosyan, J. Cen

**COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ARMENIA AND GEORGIA'S EXPORT STRUCTURE AND COMPETITIVENESS
(ON THE EXAMPLE OF THE MAIN COMMODITY GROUPS)**

Table 4

Georgia's foreign trade CCAs by product groups (sections) in 2010, 2015, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, in descending order of 2024 indicators [20]

Product section	2010	2015	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Animal or vegetable fats and oils and their cleavage products; prepared edible fats; animal or vegetable waxes	-0.302	-0.609	-0.347	-0.156	-0.171	-0.065	-0.367	0.79
Natural or cultured pearls, precious or semi-precious stones, precious metals, metals clad with precious metal and articles thereof; imitation jewellery; coin	0.297	0.278	0.702	-0.057	-0.648	-0.409	0.535	0.656
Special classification provisions; Goods not intended for economic activity	0.322	-0.908	0.319	-0.877	0.597	0.657	0.005	0.58
Footwear, headgear, umbrellas, sun umbrellas, walking-sticks, seat-sticks, whips, riding-crops and parts thereof; prepared feathers and articles made therewith; artificial flowers; articles of human hair	-0.281	-0.431	-0.353	-0.813	-0.989	-0.466	-0.132	0.458
Pulp of wood or of other fibrous cellulosic material; recovered (waste and scrap) paper or paperboard; paper and paperboard and articles thereof	-0.437	0.031	-0.834	-0.944	-0.969	0.314	-0.414	0.327
Plastics and articles thereof; rubber and articles thereof	-0.356	0.847	-0.316	0.612	-0.685	-0.198	-0.245	0.251
Textiles and textile articles	-0.04	-0.305	-0.317	-0.622	0.379	0.639	-0.517	0.242
Machinery and mechanical appliances; electrical equipment; parts thereof; sound recorders and reproducers, television image and sound recorders and reproducers, and parts and accessories of such articles	-0.577	0.186	-0.467	-0.384	-0.185	-0.342	0.309	0.159
Wood and articles of wood; wood charcoal; cork and articles of cork; manufactures of straw, of esparto or of other plaiting materials; basketware and wickerwork	-0.216	-0.605	-0.211	0.129	0.039	0.037	0.141	-0.131
Works of art, collectors pieces and antiques	0.455	-0.149	-0.747	0.891	-0.423	0.484	-0.467	-0.131
Raw hides and skins, leather, fur skins and articles thereof; saddlery and harness; travel goods, handbags and similar containers; articles of animal gut (other than silk-worm gut)	0.399	0.579	0.118	-0.127	-0.765	0.31	0.046	-0.137
Vegetable products	-0.349	0.057	-0.35	-0.362	-0.15	0.049	0.862	-0.196
Vehicles, aircraft, vessels and associated transport equipment	-0.852	0.925	-0.575	-0.916	-0.304	-0.917	0.258	-0.228
Base metals and articles of base metal	-0.791	-0.268	0.166	-0.468	-0.157	-0.546	0.058	-0.273
Prepared foodstuffs; beverages, spirits and vinegar; tobacco and manufactured tobacco substitutes	0.818	-0.27	-0.812	-0.729	-0.169	-0.547	0.426	-0.323
Live animals; animal products	-0.004	0.655	-0.203	-0.005	-0.3	-0.555	-0.786	-0.394
Mineral products	0.23	-0.61	0.029	0.037	0.121	0.158	0.63	-0.505
Swords, cutlasses and similar arms and parts, scabbards and sheaths therefor	-0.206	-0.174	0.191	0.188	-0.25	0.006	-0.755	-0.64
Optical, photographic, cinematographic, measuring, checking, precision, medical or surgical instruments and apparatus; clocks and watches; musical instruments; parts and accessories thereof	-0.289	-0.28	-0.734	0.192	-0.403	0.39	0.154	-0.789
Products of the chemical or allied industries	-0.212	0.53	-0.613	0.227	-0.041	0.284	0.633	-0.889

M.A. Markosyan, J. Cen

**COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ARMENIA AND GEORGIA'S EXPORT STRUCTURE AND COMPETITIVENESS
(ON THE EXAMPLE OF THE MAIN COMMODITY GROUPS)**

Articles of stone, plaster, cement, asbestos, mica or similar materials; ceramic products; glass and glassware	-0.345	-0.972	-0.119	-0.657	-0.379	-0.239	0.299	-0.958
Miscellaneous manufactured articles	0.051	-0.167	-0.738	0.241	0.916	-0.122	-0.124	-0.971
Total	-2.685	-1.66	-6.211	-4.6	-4.936	-1.078	0.549	-3.102

In the case of Armenia, the product groups with positive CCA values in 2023 are limited.

The highest-ranking groups are prepared food products and precious metals and stones, with CCA values of 0.178 and 0.165, respectively. These groups also hold significant shares in Armenia's export structure, which suggests some level of export competitiveness, albeit with a high concentration in a few sectors.

On the other hand, Georgia in 2024 demonstrated significantly different results. The highest CCA value was recorded for the group of animal or vegetable fats and oils at 0.79. Other high-performing groups include precious metals (0.656) and goods not intended for economic activity (0.58), although the latter has limited economic importance. These figures indicate that Georgia's foreign trade is largely driven by re-exports, and the high competitiveness scores in certain product groups may not be backed by strong domestic production bases.

Among mid-level product groups, Armenia's mineral products show some progress. In 2023, their CCA was -0.113, which, despite being negative, indicates gradual improvement compared to earlier years.

Machinery and mechanical appliances also show a shift from strongly negative to near-neutral positions, reflecting some structural stabilization.

A similar trend can be observed in Georgia, where product groups such as plastics and rubber, textiles, and technical equipment reported neutral or slightly positive CCA values. This could point to a gradual activation of processing and light manufacturing industries.

When examining product groups with low competitiveness, both countries still face challenges. In Armenia, the CCA values remain strongly negative for sectors such as transport vehicles, paper, wood products, textiles, and vegetable oils and fats. For instance, the 2023 CCA for the latter was as low as -0.955.

In Georgia, similar concerns are seen in the chemical industry, vehicles, and base metals. Notably, sectors with significant import volumes, such as transport equipment, continue to show negative competitiveness indicators, underlining a reliance on foreign supply.

Looking at total CCA indicators, Armenia shows gradual improvement. Its aggregate CCA score in 2023 was -0.188, compared to -0.578 in 2010, reflecting some positive shifts in export competitiveness. In contrast, Georgia registered a positive total CCA of 0.549 in 2023, but this dropped drastically to -3.102 in 2024. This sharp decline suggests a serious imbalance that may stem from structural shifts in export composition, a surge in imports, or methodological changes. It highlights the fragility of trade equilibrium in the Georgian context.

M.A. Markosyan, J. Cen

**COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ARMENIA AND GEORGIA'S EXPORT STRUCTURE AND COMPETITIVENESS
(ON THE EXAMPLE OF THE MAIN COMMODITY GROUPS)**

Table 5

RA exports and imports by product groups, their structure, and the 10 product groups with the best indicators of CCAs in 2020-2022 (calculated for 2022 in descending order of CCAs) [18][19]

Place	Product Group	2020		2021		2022		CCA		
		Exports (1,000 US dollars)	Imports (1000 US dollars)	Exports (1000 US dollars)	Imports (1000 US dollars)	Exports (1000 US dollars)	Imports (1000 US dollars)	2020	2021	2022
	Total	2,536,974.1	4,564,032.3	3,015,987.2	5,362,209.0	5,419,064.5	8,775,859.2	-0.285	-0.280	-0.236
1	Ores, slag and ash	733,415.9	2,852.2	923,205.7	2,274.7	922,281.7	3,154.1	0.992	0.995	0.993
	% in total	28.91	0.06	30.61	0.04	17.02	0.04			
2	Tin and articles thereof	-	314.0	1,906.1	147.1	1,759.8	81.0	-	0.857	0.912
	% in total	-	9.27	3.01	1.53	1.47	0.38			
3	Fish and crustaceans, mollusks, and other aquatic invertebrates	49,692.0	3,386.8	63,367.1	9,632.4	119,501.6	21,571.5	0.872	0.736	0.694
	% in total	1.96	0.07	2.10	0.18	2.21	0.25			
4	Alcoholic and non-alcoholic and vinegar	240,572.1	34,607.7	291,792.4	55,916.3	364,595.1	68,236.0	0.748	0.678	0.685
	% in total	9.48	0.76	9.67	1.04	6.73	0.78			
5	Tobacco and manufactured tobacco substitutes	256,544.2	127,106.3	249,793.1	89,240.9	344,464.1	88,664.1	0.337	0.474	0.591
	% in total	10.11	2.78	8.28	1.66	6.36	1.01			
6	Live animals	15,579.9	7,016.9	23,268.0	8,136.3	17,531.9	8,046.9	0.379	0.482	0.371
	% in total	0.61	0.15	0.77	0.15	0.32	0.09			
7	Pulp of wood or other fibrous cellulosic material; waste and scrap of paper or paperboard	0.0	42.8	174.3	53.9	129.8	60.5	-1.000	0.528	0.364
	% in total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			
8	Preparations of vegetables, fruit, nuts, or other parts of plants	33,997.0	23,968.5	43,372.1	30,083.1	84,493.4	46,568.8	0.173	0.181	0.289
	% in total	1.34	0.53	1.44	0.56	1.56	0.53			
9	Edible vegetables and certain roots and tubers	46,793.2	18,686.0	72,737.9	23,485.0	73,629.8	41,517.3	0.429	0.512	0.279
	% in total	1.84	0.41	2.41	0.44	1.36	0.47			
10	Copper and articles thereof	13,039.0	6,522.7	20,561.1	8,420.1	20,713.0	12,755.9	0.333	0.419	0.238
	% in total	0.51	0.14	0.68	0.16	0.38	0.15			

M.A. Markosyan, J. Cen

**COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ARMENIA AND GEORGIA'S EXPORT STRUCTURE AND COMPETITIVENESS
(ON THE EXAMPLE OF THE MAIN COMMODITY GROUPS)**

Table 6

Georgia's Exports and Imports by Product Groups, Their Structure, and the 10 Product Groups with the Best Indicators of CCA in 2022–2024 (Ranked by 2024 CCA in Descending Order) [20]

Place	Product Group	Export 2022	Import 2022	Export 2023	Import 2023	Export 2024	Import 2024	CCA 2022	CCA 2023	CCA 2024
1	Animal or vegetable fats and oils and their cleavage products; prepared edible fats; animal or vegetable waxes	22303.0 ₁	127119.4	21813.94	88153.3 ₁	25267.8 ₂	97407.6	-0.867	-0.604	0.790
	% in total	2.81	3.43	2.75	2.17	3.07	2.2			
2	Natural or cultured pearls, precious or semi-precious stones, precious metals, metals clad with precious metal and articles thereof; imitation jewellery; coin	103508	9403.21	95405.37	15837.8	109215.6	18699.3 ₃	0.833	0.714	0.656
	% in total	13.04	0.25	12.04	0.39	13.29	0.42			
3	Special classification provisions; Goods not intended for economic activity	4713.9	27550.2 ₉	4648.86	34952.2	2238.06	34675.9 ₈	-0.707	-0.765	0.580
	% in total	0.59	0.74	0.59	0.86	0.27	0.78			
4	Footwear, headgear, umbrellas, sun umbrellas, walking-sticks, seat-sticks, whips, riding-crops and parts thereof; prepared feathers and articles made therewith; artificial flowers; articles of human hair	10829.5	107225.5	7074.38	126794.6	6708.21	143725	-0.814	-0.893	0.458
	% in total	1.36	2.89	0.89	3.12	0.82	3.25			
5	Pulp of wood or of other fibrous cellulosic material; recovered (waste and scrap) paper or paperboard; paper and paperboard and articles thereof	35163.9 ₃	198863.4	40861.48	194830.9	57568.0 ₉	208468.5	-0.699	-0.653	0.327
	% in total	4.43	5.37	5.16	4.8	7	4.71			
6	Textiles and textile articles	240368.3	541380.2	231407.7	596273.5	247242.5	663037.4	-0.385	-0.44	0.242
	% in total	30.28	14.61	29.2	14.69	30.08	14.99			
7	Machinery and mechanical appliances; electrical equipment; parts thereof; sound recorders and reproducers, television image and sound recorders and reproducers, and parts and accessories of such articles	250316.8	1870604	259694.2	2152043	254433.7	2373585	-0.788	-0.784	0.159
	% in total	31.53	50.49	32.77	53.04	30.96	53.66			
8	Plastics and articles thereof; rubber and articles thereof	89890.7 ₉	597090.7	86053.13	601099.8	67754.6 ₂	620322.6	-0.738	-0.749	0.251
	% in total	11.32	16.11	10.86	14.81	8.24	14.02			
9	Raw hides and skins, leather, fur skins and articles thereof; saddlery and harness; travel goods,	3669.98	27648.1 ₇	3589.93	36164.8 ₈	3441.89	39565.4 ₂	-0.765	-0.818	-0.137

M.A. Markosyan, J. Cen

**COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ARMENIA AND GEORGIA'S EXPORT STRUCTURE AND COMPETITIVENESS
(ON THE EXAMPLE OF THE MAIN COMMODITY GROUPS)**

	handbags and similar containers; articles of animal gut (other than silk-worm gut)									
	% in total	0.46	0.75	0.45	0.89	0.42	0.89			
10	Wood and articles of wood; wood charcoal; cork and articles of cork; manufactures of straw, of esparto or of other plaiting materials; basketware and wickerwork	33115.9 1	198374. 9	41881.09	211596. 5	48030.9 4	224035. 5	-0.713	-0.669	- 0.13 1
	% in total	4.17	5.35	5.29	5.21	5.84	5.06			

Table 7

**RA exports and imports by product groups, their structure, and the 10 product groups with the worst indicators of CCAs in 2020-2022 (calculated for 2022 in descending order of CCAs)
[18][19]**

Key Contrasts

Criteria		Armenia				Georgia				
Most Competitive Sector		Ores, slag and ash (CCA 0.993)				Animal/vegetable oils (CCA 0.790)				
Nature of Top Exports		Resource-based, alcohol, fish				Mixed: processed food, chemicals, footwear				
Shift in CCA Trend		Stable high CCAs				Steep improvements in 2024				
Manufactured Goods		Limited competitiveness				Growing competitiveness				
Place	Product Group	2020		2021		2022		CCA		
		Exports (1000 US dollars)	Imports (1000 US dollars)	Exports (1000 US dollars)	Imports (1000 US dollars)	Exports (1000 US dollars)	Imports (1000 US dollars)	2020	2021	2022
	Total	2,536,974.1	4,564,032.3	3,015,987.2	5,362,209.0	5,419,064.5	8,775,859.2	-0.285	- 0.280	- 0.236
87	Meat and edible meat offals	143.7	57,170.2	286.1	81,995.3	1,787.6	104,680.4	-0.995	- 0.993	- 0.966
	% in total	0.01	1.25	0.01	1.53	0.03	1.19			
88	Chemical filaments	316.0	23,177.3	164.2	30,458.9	556.7	35,133.7	-0.973	- 0.989	- 0.969
	% in total	0.01	0.51	0.01	0.57	0.01	0.40			

M.A. Markosyan, J. Cen

**COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ARMENIA AND GEORGIA'S EXPORT STRUCTURE AND COMPETITIVENESS
(ON THE EXAMPLE OF THE MAIN COMMODITY GROUPS)**

89	Products of the milling industry; malt; starches; inulin and other	368.2	17,473.3	392.3	13,014.6	295.5	24,321.8	-0.959	-0.941	-0.976
	% in total	0.01	0.38	0.01	0.24	0.01	0.28			
90	Explosives; matches; certain combustible preparations	31.6	2,201.7	19.1	2,331.1	21.0	2,392.2	-0.972	-0.984	-0.983
	% in total	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.03			
91	Special woven fabrics; tufted textile fabrics; lace; tapestries; trimmings; embroidery	95.4	7,283.7	38.6	7,811.7	95.3	11,611.4	-0.974	-0.990	-0.984
	% in total	0.00	0.16	0.00	0.15	0.00	0.13			
92	Vegetable textile material; paper yarn and wove	-	1,083.1	22.6	789.0	1.9	246.0	-	-0.944	-0.985
	% in total	-	0.02	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00			
93	Zinc and articles thereof	0.3	167.1	-	313.9	5.4	1,020.6	-0.996	-	-0.989
	% in total	0.00	0.00	-	0.01	0.00	0.01			
94	Lacs, gums, resins, and other vegetable saps and extracts	17.9	7,576.4	9.0	9,798.8	70.5	13,339.1	-0.995	-0.998	-0.989
	% in total	0.00	0.17	0.00	0.18	0.00	0.15			
95	Cereals	45.9	96,915.3	601.6	89,534.8	749.1	149,495.9	-0.999	-0.987	-0.990
	% in total	0.00	2.12	0.02	1.67	0.01	1.70			
96	Fertilisers	8.2	24,193.7	0.0	21,053.9	67.9	40,867.5	-0.999	-1.000	-0.997
	% in total	0.00	0.53	0.00	0.39	0.00	0.47			

Armenia demonstrates strong and stable competitive advantages in a few key export sectors, especially ores, slag and ash, with consistently high CCA values above 0.99 in 2020–2022. Other high-performing sectors include tin products, fish and seafood, alcoholic beverages, and tobacco products.

M.A. Markosyan, J. Cen

**COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ARMENIA AND GEORGIA'S EXPORT STRUCTURE AND COMPETITIVENESS
(ON THE EXAMPLE OF THE MAIN COMMODITY GROUPS)**

These are mainly based on natural resources and agro-processing.

The dominance of these sectors suggests a more concentrated export structure.

Georgia, in contrast, shows a more dynamic export structure. Some product groups that had negative CCA values in 2022, such as animal and vegetable fats and oils and footwear and accessories, significantly improved by 2024. Georgia's precious metals, special classification goods, and textiles also emerged as areas of growing competitiveness. This reflects a diversification trend and adaptive capacity in external trade.

Key Insights

- Armenia's export advantage is concentrated in natural resources and traditional agro-industries.
- Georgia shows growing competitiveness across a wider range of sectors, with significant improvements in value-added exports.
- Armenia relies on stable advantages, while Georgia reflects flexibility and structural adaptation in foreign trade.

This suggests that while Armenia benefits from depth in specific sectors, Georgia is developing broader, more flexible trade strengths.

It follows from Table 5 that RA exports and imports CCAs for 2020-2022 had a negative magnitude, although a decrease in that magnitude was observed. All other product groups in the table had a positive value in 2020-2022. This circumstance means that all the mentioned product groups have the maximum export potential and it is necessary to promote their export.

It follows from Table 4 that all the given product groups are significantly dependent on import volumes, which implies that it is necessary to look for more efficient and profitable partners for new import markets.

Table 8**Georgia's Exports and Imports by Product Groups, Their Structure, and the 10 Product Groups with the Worst CCA Indicators in 2022–2024 (Ranked by 2024 CCA in Ascending Order) [20]**

Place	Product Group	Export 2022	Import 2022	Export 2023	Import 2023	Export 2024	Import 2024	CCA 2022	CCA 2023	CCA 2024
1	Miscellaneous manufactured articles	732293.2	936614.2	2171633.9	2785545.5	56119.3	3838139.0	-0.122	-0.124	-0.971
	% in total	2.3	2.19	6.91	7.86	0.21	9.79			
2	Articles of stone, plaster, cement, asbestos, mica or similar materials; ceramic products; glass and glassware	2390648.3	3891948.8	2017423.0	1088608.3	39168.1	1844825.0	-0.239	0.299	-0.958
	% in total	7.5	9.1	6.42	3.07	0.15	4.71			
3	Products of the chemical or allied industries	997299.3	556232.1	1636470.0	367516.1	182225.8	3111856.2	0.284	0.633	-0.889
	% in total	3.13	1.3	5.21	1.04	0.69	7.94			
4	Optical, photographic, cinematographic, measuring, checking, precision, medical or surgical instruments and apparatus; clocks and watches; musical instruments; parts and accessories thereof	760921.3	333594.5	2497129.0	1830000.9	145301.6	1234172.3	0.390	0.154	-0.789

M.A. Markosyan, J. Cen

**COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ARMENIA AND GEORGIA'S EXPORT STRUCTURE AND COMPETITIVENESS
(ON THE EXAMPLE OF THE MAIN COMMODITY GROUPS)**

	% in total	2.39	0.78	7.94	5.16	0.55	3.15			
5	Swords, cutlasses and similar arms and parts, scabbards and sheaths therefor	1653832.1	1634892.3	382126.3	2736292.5	507991.3	2314396.4	0.006	-0.755	-0.640
	% in total	5.19	3.82	1.22	7.72	1.93	5.91			
6	Mineral products	2036356.6	1480652.6	1440069.9	327293.1	1023886.4	3116994.6	0.158	0.630	-0.505
	% in total	6.39	3.46	4.58	0.92	3.89	7.95			
7	Live animals; animal products	1123342.2	3927499.3	347330.4	2905121.5	318311.8	732792.3	-0.555	-0.786	-0.394
	% in total	3.52	9.18	1.1	8.2	1.21	1.87			
8	Prepared foodstuffs; beverages, spirits and vinegar; tobacco and manufactured tobacco substitutes	750618.0	2561495.3	1481273.2	596317.1	1427060.8	2791019.0	-0.547	0.426	-0.323
	% in total	2.36	5.99	4.71	1.68	5.42	7.12			
9	Base metals and articles of base metal	1065399.1	3627156.4	259564.9	230943.5	1827676.5	3201185.6	-0.546	0.058	-0.273
	% in total	3.34	8.48	0.83	0.65	6.95	8.17			
10	Vehicles, aircraft, vessels and associated transport equipment	57791.1	1339249.2	1788460.8	1055851.4	1307381.1	2080152.2	-0.917	0.258	-0.228
	% in total	0.18	3.13	5.69	2.98	4.97	5.31			

Cross-Country Comparison

Criterion	Armenia (2020–2022)	Georgia (2022–2024)
Most persistent low CCA group	Meat and cereals	Misc. manufactured goods, chemicals
Level of diversification in low CCA groups	Concentrated in food, agri, chemicals	Broader: includes industrial, transport, and tech products
Export share of worst performers	Extremely low (often <0.05%)	Some groups over 5%, though with large deficits
Import dependency	Heavy and consistent	More volatile, with periodic competitiveness
Policy implication	Need for structural development in agriculture and industry	Focus on sustaining competitive sectors, reduce volatility

A comparison of the foreign trade structures of Armenia and Georgia reveals both common challenges and distinct differences stemming from their production capacities, competitiveness levels, and economic structures.

In Armenia, from 2020 to 2022, the product groups with the lowest CCA (Comparative Competitive Advantage) indicators were mostly concentrated in agricultural, food, and chemical sectors. For example, meat and edible meat offal consistently had extremely negative CCA values, nearing -1, indicating almost complete import dependency. Similar patterns are observed in cereals, fertilizers, and technical textiles, which show negligible export volumes and CCA values close to -1, demonstrating Armenia's lack of export competitiveness in these groups. Their share in total exports rarely exceeds 0.01%, while imports for these categories remain significant.

In contrast, Georgia's data from 2022 to 2024 shows a more dynamic but unstable trend. Some product groups that had positive or neutral CCA values in previous years experienced sharp declines in 2024. For instance, the "miscellaneous manufactured articles" group saw a dramatic drop in export volume and a significant increase in imports, causing the

*M.A. Markosyan, J. Cen***COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ARMENIA AND GEORGIA'S EXPORT STRUCTURE AND COMPETITIVENESS
(ON THE EXAMPLE OF THE MAIN COMMODITY GROUPS)**

CCA to plunge to nearly -1. Similar cases are observed in chemical products and precision instruments, which had positive CCA values in 2022–2023 but ranked among the weakest by 2024.

At the same time, several product groups in Georgia, despite having negative CCA values-accounted for a significant share of total exports (above 5%), indicating a broader but often vulnerable export base. This suggests that Georgia benefits from a relatively more diversified export structure, but with greater volatility and exposure to market fluctuations, reflecting either unstable demand or limitations in maintaining competitiveness.

Overall, Armenia faces long-term structural issues related to limited production capacity and low competitiveness, particularly in key food and industrial sectors. Georgia's challenges are more associated with sharp shifts in export-import balances and a lack of consistency, even in product groups with considerable export volumes.

For both countries, strategic responses are necessary: in Armenia, this includes boosting domestic production and reducing dependency on imports, while in Georgia, the focus should be on enhancing the stability of export sectors and more effective management of import flows.

Conclusion

This study examined the export and import structures of Armenia and Georgia through the lens of Comparative Competitive Advantage (CCA), focusing on the product groups with the best and worst trade performance between 2020 and 2024. The results underscore significant differences and emerging patterns in the trade specialization of the two South Caucasus countries, shaped by both structural factors and economic policy directions.

Armenia's strongest trade positions lie in a few highly concentrated sectors, most notably ores, precious metals, alcoholic beverages, and tobacco products, which consistently show strong positive CCA indicators. However, this narrow specialization also points to vulnerability, as the country remains highly dependent on a limited set of raw material exports with limited value addition. Conversely, sectors such as fertilizers, cereals, meat, and chemical filaments continue to display deep and persistent comparative disadvantages, reflecting structural weaknesses in agricultural processing and industrial capacity.

Georgia, on the other hand, demonstrates a more dynamic shift in certain product categories, with a marked improvement in CCA indicators for vegetable oils, precious metals, and textile-related products in recent years. However, similar to Armenia, Georgia shows chronic negative CCA values in machinery, vehicles, plastics, and chemical products—highlighting its heavy dependence on imports in key industrial sectors.

The analysis also revealed that both countries face a significant trade deficit in high-tech and capital-intensive goods, while their competitive advantages are mostly limited to natural resources and low to medium-processed products. These trends emphasize the need for targeted industrial policies, investment in technology, and export diversification strategies.

In conclusion, while Armenia and Georgia have made progress in building comparative advantage in specific sectors, their overall foreign trade patterns remain highly imbalanced and vulnerable to external shocks. Strengthening regional cooperation, investing

*M.A. Markosyan, J. Cen***COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ARMENIA AND GEORGIA'S EXPORT STRUCTURE AND COMPETITIVENESS
(ON THE EXAMPLE OF THE MAIN COMMODITY GROUPS)**

in value-added production, and fostering innovation and infrastructure development will be essential to improving their long-term trade competitiveness and economic resilience.

References

1. Shengelia, T. (2024). Analysis of the development of trade relations based on the gravity model. *Bulletin of the Georgian National Academy of Sciences*, 18(1), 28–33. http://science.org.ge/bnas/t18-n1/28_Shengelia_Economics.pdf
2. Sartania, M. (2023). Stimulating factors for the integration of Georgia's economy into the European Union. *Bulletin of the Georgian National Academy of Sciences*, 17(4), 26–30.
3. Charaia, V. (2017). China–Georgia economic relations in the context of the Belt and Road Initiative. *Bulletin of the Georgian National Academy of Sciences*, 12(1), 25–30.
4. Abesadze, R. (2015). Economic development and economic growth in Georgia at modern stage. *Bulletin of the Georgian National Academy of Sciences*, 15(4), 24–29.
5. Hesse, H. (2008). Export diversification and economic growth (Commission on Growth and Development Working Paper No. 21). The World Bank.
6. Imbs, J., & Wacziarg, R. (2003). Stages of diversification. *American Economic Review*, 93(1), 63–86. <https://doi.org/10.1257/000282803321455349>
7. Love, J. (1981). Commodity concentration and export earnings instability: A shift from cross-section to time series analysis. *Journal of Development Studies*, 17(2), 35–52. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388108421807>
8. Gourdon, J. (2010). FDI flows and export diversification: Looking at extensive and intensive margins (CEPII Working Paper No. 2010-07). CEPII Research Center.
9. Cadot, O., Carrère, C., & Strauss-Kahn, V. (2011). Trade diversification: Drivers and impacts. *The World Bank Economic Review*, 25(1), 115–145. <https://doi.org/10.1093/wber/lhr013>
10. Lederman, D., & Maloney, W. F. (2007). Trade structure and growth. In D. Rodrik & M. Rosenzweig (Eds.), *Handbook of Development Economics* (Vol. 3, pp. 4411–4477). Elsevier. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1573-4471\(07\)03026-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1573-4471(07)03026-7)
11. Rodrik, D. (2007). Industrial policy for the twenty-first century. In *One Economics, Many Recipes: Globalization, Institutions, and Economic Growth* (pp. 99–152). Princeton University Press.
12. Rodrik, D. (2008). Industrial policy: Don't ask why, ask how. *Middle East Development Journal*, 1(1), 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1142/S179381200800002X>
13. Agosin, M. R. (2009). Export diversification and growth in emerging economies (WIDER Working Paper No. 2009/21). United Nations University.
14. Klinger, B., & Lederman, D. (2004). Discovery and development: An empirical exploration of “new” products (World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 3450). The World Bank.
15. Kim, D. H., & Lin, S. C. (2009). Trade and growth at different stages of economic development. *Journal of Development Studies*, 45(8), 1211–1224. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220380902890268>

M.A. Markosyan, J. Cen

**COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ARMENIA AND GEORGIA'S EXPORT STRUCTURE AND COMPETITIVENESS
(ON THE EXAMPLE OF THE MAIN COMMODITY GROUPS)**

16. Hidalgo, C. A., Klinger, B., Barabási, A.-L., & Hausmann, R. (2007). The product space conditions the development of nations. *Science*, 317(5837), 482–487. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1144581>
17. Hausmann, R., Hwang, J., & Rodrik, D. (2007). What you export matters. *Journal of Economic Growth*, 12(1), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10887-006-9009-4>
18. Statistical Committee of the Republic of Armenia. (2023). *Statistical Yearbook of Armenia 2023* (pp. 523–537). Yerevan.
19. Statistical Committee of the Republic of Armenia. (2024). *Socio-economic situation of the Republic of Armenia in January–December 2023* (p. 159). Yerevan.
20. National Statistics Office of Georgia. (2025, March 13). *External Trade Portal*. <https://ex-trade.geostat.ge/en>

**ՀԱՅԱՍՏԱՆԻ ԵՎ ՎՐԱՍՏԱՆԻ ԱՐՏԱՀԱՆՄԱՆ ԿԱՌՈՒՑՎԱԾՔԻ ԵՎ
ՄՐՑՈՒՆԱԿՈՒԹՅԱՆ ՀԱՄԵՄԱՏԱԿԱՆ ՎԵՐԼՈՒԾՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ (ՀԻՄՆԱԿԱՆ
ԱՊՐԱՆՔԱՅԻՆ ԽՄԲԵՐԻ ՕՐԻՆԱԿՈՎ)**

Մ.Ա. Մարկոսյան¹, Զ. Ցեն²¹ ՀՀ ԳԱԱ Մ. Քոթանյանի անվան տնտեսագիտության ինստիտուտ² Հարավչինական տեխնոլոգիական համալսարան

Սույն ուսումնասիրությունը վերլուծում է Հայաստանի և Վրաստանի արտաքին առևտրի կառուցվածքների դինամիկան՝ հիմնված համեմատական մրցակցային առավելության (ՀՄԱ) ցուցիչների վրա 2020–2024 թթ. ընթացքում: Ուսումնասիրվել են տասն առավել բարձր ՀՄԱ ունեցող ապրանքային խմբերը՝ բացահայտելով երկու երկրների արտահանման կառուցվածքների հիմնական տարբերությունները: Հայաստանի առևտուրը բնութագրվում է սահմանափակ թվով ռեսուրսային ուղղվածություն ունեցող ոլորտներում՝ մասնավորապես հանքաքարերի, շլակների և մոխրի, ինչպես նաև վերամշակված գյուղատնտեսական ապրանքների (ալկոհոլային խմիչքներ, ծխախոտ) արտահանման կայուն և բարձր մրցակցային առավելությամբ: Ի տարբերություն Հայաստանի՝ Վրաստանը ցուցաբերում է աճող դիվերսիֆիկացիայի և հարմարվողականության միտում՝ արտահանման կառուցվածքում նկատվում է ավելացված արժեքով ապրանքների մրցունակության աճ, ինչպիսիք են կենդանական և բուսական ճարպերն ու յուղերը, տեքստիլը և կոշիկները: Վերլուծության արդյունքները վկայում են, որ Հայաստանը պահպանում է խորություն և կայունություն մի շարք ընտրված ոլորտներում, մինչդեռ Վրաստանը ցուցաբերում է ավելի լայն ճկունություն և նոր զարգացող ուժեղ կողմեր տարբեր արդյունաբերական ճյուղերում: Այս համեմատական դիտանկյունը արժեքավոր պատկերացումներ է տալիս Հարավային Կովկասի տարածաշրջանում առևտրային մասնագիտացման և մրցունակության զարգացման ընթացքի վերաբերյալ:

M.A. Markosyan, J. Cen

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ARMENIA AND GEORGIA'S EXPORT STRUCTURE AND COMPETITIVENESS
(ON THE EXAMPLE OF THE MAIN COMMODITY GROUPS)

Բանալի բաներ. համեմատական մրցակցային առավելություն (ՀՄԱ), արտաքին առևտուր, Հայաստան, Վրաստան, արտահանման կառուցվածք, առևտրային մասնագիտացում, տնտեսական մրցունակություն, Հարավային Կովկաս, ապրանքային խմբեր, առևտրի վերլուծություն:

**СРАВНИТЕЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ СТРУКТУРЫ ЭКСПОРТА И
КОНКУРЕНТОСПОСОБНОСТИ АРМЕНИИ И ГРУЗИИ (НА ПРИМЕРЕ
ОСНОВНЫХ ТОВАРНЫХ ГРУПП)**

М. А.Маркосян¹, Ц. Цэнь²

¹ Институт экономики имени М. Котаняна, НАН РА

² Южно-Китайский технологический университет

В данном исследовании анализируется динамика внешнеторговых структур Армении и Грузии с точки зрения сравнительного конкурентного преимущества (СКП) в период с 2020 по 2024 годы. Основное внимание уделено десяти товарным группам с наивысшими показателями СКП, что позволяет выявить ключевые различия в экспортных профилях двух стран. Экспорт Армении характеризуется выраженным и устойчивым конкурентным преимуществом в ограниченном числе отраслей, основанных на природных ресурсах, в частности, руды, шлак и зола, а также переработанные сельскохозяйственные товары, такие как алкогольные напитки и табачные изделия. В противоположность этому, Грузия демонстрирует признаки растущей диверсификации и адаптивности экспортной структуры, с заметным улучшением конкурентоспособности товаров с добавленной стоимостью — животных и растительных жиров и масел, текстиля и обуви. Результаты исследования свидетельствуют о том, что в то время как Армения сохраняет глубину и стабильность в определённых секторах, Грузия проявляет более широкую гибкость и формирующиеся конкурентные преимущества в различных отраслях. Такой сравнительный подход предоставляет ценные сведения о развитии торговой специализации и конкурентоспособности в регионе Южного Кавказа.

Ключевые слова: сравнительное конкурентное преимущество (СКП), внешняя торговля, Армения, Грузия, структура экспорта, торговая специализация, экономическая конкурентоспособность, Южный Кавказ, товарные группы, торговый анализ.

Submitted on 23.07.2025

Sent for review on 31.07.2025

Guaranteed for printing on 29.12.2025