



Committee on Agriculture

POINTS RAISED BY MEMBERS UNDER THE REVIEW PROCESS

COMPILATION OF QUESTIONS FOR THE MEETING ON 4 AND 5 JUNE 2015¹

The present document compiles questions received by the Secretariat by the deadline of 20 May 2015 as specified in WTO/AIR/AG/3.

¹ This document has been prepared under the Secretariat's own responsibility and is without prejudice to the positions of Members or to their rights and obligations under the WTO.

Table of contents

1 MATTERS RELEVANT TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMITMENTS:	
ARTICLE 18.6	4
1.1 Argentina's domestic support notifications.....	4
1.1.1 Question by the European Union (AG-IMS ID 77042)	4
1.2 Brazil's domestic support programmes.....	4
1.2.1 Question by the United States of America (AG-IMS ID 77066)	4
1.3 Canada's tariff-rate quota for cheese	4
1.3.1 Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID 77001).....	4
1.3.2 Question by Switzerland (AG-IMS ID 77037).....	5
1.4 China's cotton policies	5
1.4.1 Question by the United States of America (AG-IMS ID 77069)	5
1.5 China – TRQ underfill	5
1.5.1 Question by the United States of America (AG-IMS ID 77068)	5
1.6 China's maize subsidies	5
1.6.1 Question by the European Union (AG-IMS ID 77043)	5
1.7 Costa Rica's compliance with AMS commitments	6
1.7.1 Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID 77002)	6
1.7.2 Question by the United States of America (AG-IMS ID 77070)	6
1.8 Egypt's domestic support notifications	6
1.8.1 Question by the European Union (AG-IMS ID 77045)	6
1.9 India's sugar export subsidies	6
1.9.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 77035)	6
1.9.2 Question by the European Union (AG-IMS ID 77044)	7
1.10 Indonesia's regulation on importation of meat.....	7
1.10.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 77028).....	7
1.11 Pakistan's wheat export subsidies	8
1.11.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 77029).....	8
1.12 Switzerland's export subsidy budget	8
1.12.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 77030).....	8
1.12.2 Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID 77006)	8
1.13 Thailand's sugar policies	8
1.13.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 77031).....	8
1.13.2 Question by the European Union (AG-IMS ID 77046).....	8
1.14 Turkey's domestic support and export subsidies	9
1.14.1 Question by the European Union (AG-IMS ID 77047).....	9
1.15 Turkey's destination of wheat flour sale.....	9
1.15.1 Question by the United States of America (AG-IMS ID 77071)	9
1.16 Turkey's export subsidy programmes.....	10
1.16.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 77032).....	10

2	POINTS RAISED IN CONNECTION WITH INDIVIDUAL NOTIFICATIONS	10
2.1	ADMINISTRATION OF TARIFF AND OTHER QUOTA COMMITMENTS (TABLE MA: 1).....	10
2.1.1	Switzerland (G/AG/N/CHE/13/ADD.17)	10
2.2	IMPORTS UNDER TARIFF AND OTHER QUOTA COMMITMENTS (TABLE MA: 2)	11
2.2.1	Canada (G/AG/N/CAN/107)	11
2.2.2	Japan (G/AG/N/JPN/202)	11
2.3	DOMESTIC SUPPORT COMMITMENTS (TABLE DS: 1).....	11
2.3.1	Australia (G/AG/N/AUS/97)	11
2.3.2	Canada (G/AG/N/CAN/104)	12
2.3.3	China (G/AG/N/CHN/28)	12
2.3.4	Costa Rica (G/AG/N/CRI/48/REV.1)	18
2.3.5	European Union (G/AG/N/EU/20)	19
2.3.6	India (G/AG/N/IND/10, G/AG/N/IND/10/CORR.1)	20
2.3.7	Jordan (G/AG/N/JOR/17)	21
2.3.8	New Zealand (G/AG/N/NZL/88)	22
2.3.9	Norway (G/AG/N/NOR/78)	22
2.3.10	Oman (G/AG/N/OMN/7, G/AG/N/OMN/13)	22
2.3.11	Pakistan (G/AG/N/PAK/16)	23
2.3.12	Panama (G/AG/N/PAN/31, G/AG/N/PAN/36)	25
2.3.13	Paraguay (G/AG/N/PRY/21, G/AG/N/PRY/23)	26
2.3.14	Russian Federation (G/AG/N/RUS/5, G/AG/N/RUS/5/CORR.1)	27
2.3.15	South Africa (G/AG/N/ZAF/83)	27
2.3.16	United Arab Emirates (G/AG/N/ARE/7)	28
2.4	NEW OR MODIFIED DOMESTIC SUPPORT MEASURES (DS: 2)	28
2.4.1	Australia (G/AG/N/AUS/96)	28
2.4.2	Norway (G/AG/N/NOR/80)	28
2.4.3	Panama (G/AG/N/PAN/33)	29
2.5	EXPORT SUBSIDY notifications (TABLES ES: 1, ES: 2 AND ES: 3)	29
2.5.1	Argentina (G/AG/N/ARG/33)	29
2.5.2	Russian Federation (G/AG/N/RUS/6).....	29
2.5.3	United States of America (G/AG/N/USA/99).....	29
3	OVERDUE NOTIFICATIONS.....	30
3.1	Turkey.....	30

1 MATTERS RELEVANT TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMITMENTS: ARTICLE 18.6

1.1 Argentina's domestic support notifications

1.1.1 Question by the European Union (AG-IMS ID 77042)

The latest notification on domestic support from Argentina dates back to 2008. Can Argentina indicate when it intends to notify its domestic support for subsequent years?

1.2 Brazil's domestic support programmes

1.2.1 Question by the United States of America (AG-IMS ID 77066)

In previous responses by Brazil to questions from the United States, Brazil stated that the Prêmio para Escoamento do Produto (PEP) programme was suspended for a reassessment to address concerns regarding its control mechanism, in order to prevent irregularities. Further, no deadline was set for the completion of this reassessment and as such, Brazil is unable to provide a date upon which it can provide the data requested by the United States.

- a. Please provide a detailed explanation of: 1) what entity requested the reassessment, 2) what entity is carrying out the reassessment, 3) what the concerns with the control mechanism are, including a description of the cited irregularities, 4) what regulations, laws, or other guidance (official or unofficial) provide for this reassessment process.
- b. Have reassessments or other similar measures been carried out in the past for other programmes that provide precedence for how this reassessment is carried out? If so, please provide information.
- c. Is the data requested by the United States (see AG-IMS ID 76039, 75023, 74021, 66002) also being requested by the entity carrying out the reassessment?

The United States notes that in response to AG-IMS ID 76039, Brazil appears to have responded primarily in relation to the PEP programme and that the reassessment is a primary reason for not being able to provide a timeframe for or affirmation that the requested data will be made available. With regards to the Prêmio de Equalização pago ao Produtor (PEPRO) programme:

- d. Please provide an update on the progress made in the compilation of the requested data.
- e. Please provide the deadline provided to CONAB to provide the data and if no deadline was given, please explain why.

1.3 Canada's tariff-rate quota for cheese

1.3.1 Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID 77001)

New Zealand remains concerned about proposed changes to Canada's WTO tariff quota for cheese as part of the Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA) between Canada and the European Union. The proposal is for 800 tonnes of Canada's 20,411,866 kilograms WTO Tariff Rate Quota to be reallocated to the European Union. Canada has stated that the size of the tariff quota for cheese will remain at 20,411,866 kilograms.

- a. Will this reallocation result in the quantity of market access available to other WTO Members being reduced?
- b. If yes, how is this consistent with Canada's WTO obligations, including fundamental MFN obligations?

1.3.2 Question by Switzerland (AG-IMS ID 77037)

In the last two Committee meetings several Members raised their concerns regarding the proposed changes to Canada's tariff-rate quota for cheese in the context of the Comprehensive Trade and Economic Agreement (CETA) between Canada and the European Union. Switzerland shares the concern that the mentioned quota reallocation would result in the unilateral reduction of market access for other WTO members. Could Canada indicate the specific provisions of WTO law which serve as a legal basis for such a unilateral quota reallocation?

1.4 China's cotton policies

1.4.1 Question by the United States of America (AG-IMS ID 77069)

The United States thanks China for its response to AG-IMS ID 76051. The United States notes in China's response that it appears China has made the assertion that the cotton policies in the largest producing, consuming, and importing country of cotton do not affect the international market. However, the International Cotton Advisory Committee (ICAC) indicates that China held stocks of 11.6 million metric tonnes at the end of 2013/14, a quantity equivalent to 149% of Chinese domestic mill use and 57% of global stocks. In 2013/14, China purchased cotton that contributed to those stocks at a price of 151 cents per pound and the 2013/14 market year was the third consecutive year of stock build-ups. The ICAC estimates that amounts to \$5.8 billion and \$5.1 billion in direct assistance in 2012/13 and 2013/14, respectively. As noted by the ICAC, China's position in cotton markets permitted this build-up of stocks to distort not only domestic prices, but also international prices. In particular, China's stockpiling has led to an increase in use of polyester to the detriment of all cotton producing countries. China has announced that it plans not to expand the TRQ for cotton in 2015 beyond its WTO obligation. Imports are likely to fall close to the TRQ in-quota quantity of 0.894 million tonnes (894,000 metric tonnes) in 2015, a decrease from 5.1 million tonnes of imports in 2012.

Please provide a detailed description of why these policies implemented by China are not having a distorting effect on world cotton markets.

1.5 China – TRQ underfill

1.5.1 Question by the United States of America (AG-IMS ID 77068)

Despite high domestic prices and falling world prices, China continues to significantly under-fill the substantial tariff-rate quotas (TRQs) it established during its WTO accession for wheat, corn and rice. Starting in 2015, the United States understands that China has added a requirement that non-STE end users purchase domestic stocks in order to receive a TRQ allocation.

- a. Please confirm whether there is a new domestic purchase requirement. If yes, please provide the timeframe and conditions when it applies to purchases, and which products by tariff code line are subject to this requirement.
- b. Also, if there is such a requirement, please provide any further information on the implementation of this policy including where a copy of the policy is available to WTO Members and when it was notified to the WTO.

1.6 China's maize subsidies

1.6.1 Question by the European Union (AG-IMS ID 77043)

According to World Perspectives Inc newsletter, on 20 April 2015, China sold 38,700 tonnes of maize from state stocks. Further, the Heilongjiang government supported this sale with a subsidy to grains processors participating in the state grain auction of 200 CNY/t (=32.6 \$/t). This subsidy level would be the double of the subsidy of 100 CNY/t granted in 2013/14.

- a. Can China confirm that the Heilongjiang government has granted this type of subsidy? Who were the beneficiaries? For what quantity has this subsidy so far been granted in the current marketing year and the previous marketing year?

- b. Can China explain whether other local governments grant similar subsidies and if so what are the quantities concerned in 2013/14 and 2014/15?

1.7 Costa Rica's compliance with AMS commitments

1.7.1 Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID 77002)

Canada thanks Costa Rica for its transparency and engagement with Members over the past few years regarding its Current Total AMS which since 2007 has been in excess of its WTO commitment. At the March 2015 meeting of the Committee, Costa Rica indicated that after a period of domestic consultations a new Executive Decree came into force on 27 February 2015 and that the Costa Rica Ministry of Agriculture was implementing new measures aimed at rice producers. Could Costa Rica indicate when it expects to provide a notification to the Committee regarding the Executive Decree and details of the measures aimed at supporting its rice producers?

1.7.2 Question by the United States of America (AG-IMS ID 77070)

The United States thanks Costa Rica for its continued transparency; however, the United States is increasingly concerned by Costa Rica's continued lack of compliance with its WTO obligations. In particular, the United States notes that support to the rice sector increased from USD 81.85 million to USD 86.14 million from 2012 to 2013. While the United States has expressed hope in the past with regards to steps Costa Rica has indicated it would be taking to come into compliance, the United States notes the repeated delay of necessary reforms.

- a. Does Costa Rica intend to meet its AMS commitment?
- b. What specific steps is Costa Rica undertaking to bring its AMS into compliance with its commitments?

1.8 Egypt's domestic support notifications

1.8.1 Question by the European Union (AG-IMS ID 77045)

The latest notification on domestic support from Egypt dates back to 2001. Can Egypt indicate when it intends to notify its domestic support for subsequent years?

1.9 India's sugar export subsidies

1.9.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 77035)

Australia recalls the questions raised by Australia (AG-IMS ID 76016) at the 76th Committee on Agriculture in relation to Indian sugar export subsidies.

Australia has stated its concerns regarding the WTO-inconsistency of these measures on a number of occasions and urges India to end the programme.

Australia understands that in February 2015, India officially increased the rate of its export subsidy for raw sugar from Indian Rupees (INR) INR 3,371 to INR 4,000 per tonne, for a quantity of 1.4 million tonnes over the 2014-15 sugar season. At INR 4000, this level of subsidy represents over 20% of the current world benchmark price. Can India:

- a. Confirm who is eligible to receive subsidy payments?
- b. Advise if the raw sugar export subsidy programme has been allocated funds through the Union budget with respect of either the 2013-14 or 2014-15 sugar seasons?
- c. Identify the budget amounts for 2013-14 and 2014-15 as may apply?
- d. Advise if subsidy payments are now underway?

-
- e. Provide an update with regard to any applications that have been lodged for subsidy provision, including the amount of applications received and the total amount of subsidy claimed?
 - f. Confirm media reporting that the Indian state of Maharashtra has now announced a separate export subsidy programme for raw sugar, and confirm that this export subsidy will be INR 1,000 per tonne?
 - g. Advise whether Maharashtra farmers would be eligible for both the subsidy paid by the central Government and state of Maharashtra.

1.9.2 Question by the European Union (AG-IMS ID 77044)

After the introduction of the export subsidy of INR 4,000 per tonne of raw sugar by the Indian central government in February 2015, the web-site of "Business Standard" on 13 April reported "The Maharashtra government on 14 April announced an export subsidy of INR 1,000 (\$1=INR 62.31) per tonne for raw sugar to boost the cash-strapped sugar industry in the state, in addition to the INR4,000 already unveiled by the central government, according to the state's co-operative minister Chandrakant Patil".

- a. Could India confirm these figures of INR 4000 and INR 1000 and explain how these subsidies granted comply with its WTO commitments on export subsidies?
- b. Can India indicate the quantity of sugar that has/will be able to benefit from these subsidies?

1.10 Indonesia's regulation on importation of meat

1.10.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 77028)

Australia thanks Indonesia for its responses to its questions in the previous Committee on Agriculture in March regarding restrictions on the import of secondary beef cuts and offal except by state-owned enterprises in limited circumstances (Regulation of the Minister of Agriculture No. 139/Permentan/PD.410/12/2014 concerning Importation of Carcass, Meat and/or Processed Meat Products into the Territory of the Republic of Indonesia, as amended by Regulation of the Minister of Agriculture No. 02/Permentan/PD.410/01/2015).

However, Australia remains concerned that the measure effectively restricts the import of secondary beef cuts and offal, and is affecting Australian exports of boxed beef to Indonesia. Australia notes Indonesia's response that the restrictions are intended to lower market prices for meat.

- a. Can Indonesia please explain how restrictions on imports of secondary beef cuts would assist in lowering market prices?
- b. Can Indonesia please explain how such a measure is consistent with the prohibition on quantitative restrictions in the Agreement on Agriculture?

Australia also notes that the restrictions on imports of secondary beef cuts are in addition to existing trade-restrictive elements of Indonesia's import permit system for agricultural goods. These include Indonesia's system of issuing import permits for cattle and beef on a quarterly basis, which effectively acts as a quarterly quota on imports.

- c. Can Indonesia please explain how such a measure is consistent with the prohibition on quantitative restrictions in the Agreement on Agriculture?

In addition, Australia understands that Indonesia has restricted the volume of horticultural imports in 2015 to each importer's cold storage capacity.

- d. Can Indonesia please provide further information about existing or planned restrictions on the importation of horticultural goods in 2015, and how such restrictions are consistent with Indonesia's obligations under the Agreement on Agriculture?

1.11 Pakistan's wheat export subsidies

1.11.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 77029)

Australia thanks Pakistan for its response to Australia's questions raised at the 76th Committee on Agriculture (AG-IMS ID 76020) in relation to Pakistan's wheat export subsidy programme. Can Pakistan:

- a. Confirm that the programme has now ended, given the termination dates (31 March and 15 April 2015) advised by Pakistan at the 76th Committee on Agriculture meeting?
- b. If applicable, advise the quantity and value of wheat exports that were subsidised under the programme?
- c. If applicable, advise which markets received subsidized wheat exports from Pakistan under the programme?

1.12 Switzerland's export subsidy budget

1.12.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 77030)

At the last Committee on Agriculture meeting, Switzerland advised that there was a mooted proposal to increase the budgetary outlay for its export subsidies. Could Switzerland please provide an update on these increasing export subsidies in light of the declaration of restraint on the use of export subsidies made by Ministers at the 9th WTO Ministerial Conference (Bali 2013)?

1.12.2 Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID 77006)

New Zealand thanks Switzerland for its transparency in the Committee on Agriculture on its proposal to increase export subsidies on processed agricultural products by up to CHF 20 million. New Zealand is concerned about these plans given the trade distorting effects of export subsidies and the Bali Declaration on export subsidies in which Ministers committed to exercise utmost restraint with regard to any recourse to all forms of export subsidies. This included Members' export subsidies remaining significantly below their export subsidy commitments. The proposal would be an increase of nearly 30% over Switzerland's current export subsidy outlay of CHF 70 million, with outlays then being close to 80% of its CHF 114.9 million commitment level.

Please provide an update on the proposal to exceptionally increase the export subsidy budget for processed agricultural products for 2015 by a maximum of CHF 20 million.

1.13 Thailand's sugar policies

1.13.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 77031)

Australia thanks Thailand for its response to Australia's questions at the 76th Committee on Agriculture in relation to Thai policies that relate to rice and sugar production. Could Thailand provide an update on the draft study referred to in their response to Australia (AG-IMS ID 76021), and provide details of any specific policy initiatives that are currently planned to boost production in the cane and sugar industries?

1.13.2 Question by the European Union (AG-IMS ID 77046)

Since no reply has been received to EU question AG-IMS ID 76033, the European Union repeats its questions.

The European Union thanks Thailand for their reply to its questions of November 2014 (AG-IMS ID 75105). The European Union would seek further information on the operation and

administration of Thailand's sugar policy. Thailand states that the operation and administration of Thailand's sugar industry are not controlled by the government. It is also stated that there is a ceiling price for Quota X for retail sale and that Quota Y is the quantity for export by Thai Cane and Sugar Corporation Limited. In the light of this, could Thailand explain:

- a. whether ceiling prices for Quota X and minimum farm gate prices of sugarcane are set by the government?
- b. What are the administrative prices for domestic sugar in comparison to export prices during the most recent five years for which the data is available?
- c. Whether administrative prices for domestic sugar affect the quantities of sugar exported?
- d. Whether Thai Cane and Sugar Corporation Limited, which exports Quota Y sugar, has received any support from the government, including government financing, preferential access to capital, underwriting of losses or write-offs of debts; and whether any special legislative privileges have been granted to this company?
- e. If so, whether Thailand intends to notify it to the WTO pursuant to Article XVII:4(a) of the GATT?

1.14 Turkey's domestic support and export subsidies

1.14.1 Question by the European Union (AG-IMS ID 77047)

Follow up to question AG-IMS ID 75069:

The European Union would like to repeat the question asked at the Committee on Agriculture in March 2014 which has not yet been answered.

Further, the US Department of Agriculture in its Citrus Report for the year 2013 indicates (as in the 2011 report) that "the Turkish government makes support payments to exporters and the rates vary each year. The Ministry of Finance is providing a subsidy to citrus exporters of 200 YTL/MT in 2013. There is also a minimum price requirement for this specific subsidy. The government makes payments to a special account, which the exporter can only use to make tax and social security payments as well as utilities such as telecommunications, electricity, and natural gas. In order to protect domestic producers, the government kept the customs duty rates at 2007 levels for orange juice and citrus imports, which are 54%."

- a. Could Turkey confirm that since 2001 its budgetary outlays and eligible quantity as regards export subsidies, notably for citrus fruits, have remained below its commitments?
- b. Could Turkey indicate the level of AMS support in absolute amounts since 2002 per budget year?
- c. Does this level respect Turkey's *de minimis* commitment?
- d. When will Turkey make its DS:1 notifications for the years after 2002?

1.15 Turkey's destination of wheat flour sale

1.15.1 Question by the United States of America (AG-IMS ID 77071)

Turkey has not yet responded to questions from the March 2015 and November 2014 meetings that were originally posed on the floor during the June 2014 meeting. The United States repeats them.

- a. Please explain the TMO Sales Regulation (Code of Practice for Grain Sales after Export to Product Manufacturer-Exporters) that allows TMO to make sales to inward processing

certificate holders at world prices. Please provide details on any other measures that operationalize the TMO.

- b. Public records indicate annual sales of TMO wheat sales to inward processing certificate holders over the past several years. Does Turkey confirm that TMO sells domestic wheat to Turkey flour millers that export flour and hold inward processing certificates? If so, please provide wheat purchase and wheat sales prices for these transactions for the last three years.
- c. Please describe any government control or verification requirements for inward processing of wheat flour.
- d. The United States appreciates Turkey's response on exported flour and imported wheat as shown in the table (Annex 2 in G/AG/W/106; AG-IMS ID 73042). Are all of the quantities listed imported and exported through the inward processing system? If not, please elaborate on this table by stating how much of the imports and exports were through the inward processing system.
- e. In AG-IMS ID 73042, the United States requested data concerning both the quantity and quality of wheat imports and flour exports under Turkey's inward processing system. In response, Turkey provided data concerning only the quantity of such imports and exports. Please provide data for the last three years listing the quality of wheat imported and the quality of wheat flour exported under Turkey's inward processing system.
- f. Please confirm that the sale and trading of inward processing certificates received for exporting products occurs and is allowed under Turkey's regulations. Please also provide any measures that regulate this process.

1.16 Turkey's export subsidy programmes

1.16.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 77032)

Australia thanks Turkey for its response to Australia's questions at the 75th Committee on Agriculture (AG-IMS ID 75027). Nonetheless, Australia wishes to understand more about Turkey's agricultural export subsidy programme and accordingly, asks Turkey to advise the Committee, for each agricultural product and for the most recent year available:

- a. the value of export subsidies which have been provided;
- b. the volume of subsidised exports;
- c. the destinations of the subsidised exports.

2 POINTS RAISED IN CONNECTION WITH INDIVIDUAL NOTIFICATIONS

2.1 ADMINISTRATION OF TARIFF AND OTHER QUOTA COMMITMENTS (TABLE MA:1)

2.1.1 Switzerland (G/AG/N/CHE/13/ADD.17)

AG-IMS ID 77033: Question by Australia - Allocation of licences to importing entities

In the MA:1 notification (G/AG/N/CHE/13/Add.17), with regard to the allocation of import entitlements for "Animals for slaughter; meat mainly produced on the basis of coarse fodder", Switzerland has explained at 5 (b) that 50% of TRQ shares in bovine and sheep meat and offal are distributed on the basis of a contribution to Swiss production, and further, 40% of shares in goat and horse meat and offal are also distributed on the basis of a contribution to Swiss production. Can Switzerland explain what does "contribution to Swiss production" mean in this context?

AG-IMS ID 77072: Question by the United States of America - Allocation of licences to importing entities

Switzerland has increased the share of beef and sheep meat import quotas that are distributed based on the contribution to Swiss production from 10% to 50%. Therefore, with this change, only 50% of import quotas will be distributed by tender compared to 90% previously. Awarding quota allocations based on domestic purchases can be trade restrictive and could be in violation of WTO rules. Can Switzerland explain the reasoning behind this change?

2.2 IMPORTS UNDER TARIFF AND OTHER QUOTA COMMITMENTS (TABLE MA:2)

2.2.1 Canada (G/AG/N/CAN/107)

AG-IMS ID 77036: Question by Switzerland - Tariff quota fill

Switzerland notes that fill rates for several of Canada's tariff rate quotas for dairy products remain low. In particular, the fill rate for milk protein substances (MPS) for the quota year 2012/2013 fell to 56.3% from 68.4% in the previous quota year. Switzerland furthermore notes that the tariff quota administration for milk protein substances as indicated in G/AG/N/CAN/87/Rev.1 from 24 February 2012 is complex. Canada in response to Switzerland's previous inquiry on this issue stated that "Canada is committed to continuing to make its tariff rate quota fully available to Canadian importers of MPS".

- a. Could Canada explain in more detail in which way it intends to achieve the full availability of the tariff rate quota to importers? Specifically, how does Canada ensure that fill rates are not negatively affected by the administration of the tariff quota?
- b. Does Canada envisage implementing changes to the administration of the tariff rate quota for MPS? If so, what changes are envisaged and in which way would they help achieve substantive increases in quota fill rates in the future?

2.2.2 Japan (G/AG/N/JPN/202)

AG-IMS ID 77049: Question by the European Union - Tariff quota fill

For a certain number of tariff lines the quota utilisation is relatively satisfactory. However, for several import quotas underutilisation is observed, in particular in cases which can lead to shortages on the Japanese market, for instance butter (with restriction in the retail outlets). In the table below one can observe significant underutilisation of the TRQs for several dairy products (despite the high import tariffs for these dairy products) as well as other products. Can Japan indicate the reasons for these under-utilisations of TRQs?

Products	Quota (t)	Quota imports (t)	Fill rate (%)
Skimmed milk powder for school lunch	7,264	1,952	27
Skimmed milk powder for other purposes	74,973	22,988	31
Whey and modified whey for feeding purposes	45,000	30,265	67
Prepared whey for infant formula	25,000	6,975	28
Butter and butter oil	581	119	20
Mineral concentrated whey	14,000	6,653	48
Dried leguminous vegetable	120,000	77,872	65
Ground nuts	75,000	27,124	36

2.3 DOMESTIC SUPPORT COMMITMENTS (TABLE DS:1)

2.3.1 Australia (G/AG/N/AUS/97)

AG-IMS ID 77050: Question by the European Union - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

The environmental schemes "Auction for Landscape Recovery in Australia", "Victorian Bush Tender auctions" and "Eco Tender" are implemented in Australia (Eco Tender in Victoria). Can Australia

indicate how this and similar agri-environmental schemes are taken into account in the domestic support notification?

AG-IMS ID 77003: Question by Canada - Direct payments: structural adjustment assistance provided through producer retirement programmes

Under the heading "structural adjustment assistance through producer retirement programmes" the description for the programme funded by the Australian government states that the grant is to assist primary producers to "exit farming, ensuring that there is sufficient financial support available to enable re-establishment outside farming." Could Australia please provide details as to how it determines "sufficient financial support"?

AG-IMS ID 77004: Question by Canada - Other product-specific AMS/EMS

Canada notices an inconsistency in the footnote of Supporting Table DS:7 between 2011-12 and 2012-13. In 2011-12, the footnote provides the "total value of production of live animal exports". In 2012-13 however, the footnote refers to the "total value of production of live cattle exports". Could Australia please explain this inconsistency?

AG-IMS ID 77005: Question by Canada - Other product-specific AMS/EMS

In Supporting Table DS:7 for 2012-13, the figure under column 10 (Total AMS) for Live Cattle Exports is reported as "0.000". Given that the number in column 10 should be the result of adding columns 7 (Total other product-specific support), 8 (Market price support) and 9 (Non-exempt direct payments) should the figure not be 0.733?

2.3.2 Canada (G/AG/N/CAN/104)

AG-IMS ID 77108: Question by the European Union - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

The European Union understands that an East-central Saskatchewan scheme "Assiniboine River Watershed (ARW)" is implemented in Canada, whereby farmers or land-owners get grants based on delivery of environmental services referring to the values of public goods.

- a. Is this scheme included in Canada's notification under the environmental payments heading of Supporting Table DS:1?
- b. How is it ensured that payment levels in this scheme are strictly based on "costs incurred and income forgone"?

2.3.3 China (G/AG/N/CHN/28)

AG-IMS ID 77007: Question by Canada - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Historically, China has notified product-specific support for six products: wheat, rice, corn, soybean, cotton, rapeseed and pigs (starting in 2007). Potato was added to the list in 2009 and highland barley and peanuts were added in 2010. Could China please elaborate on the criteria for payments to these newly included products and the duration of these measures?

AG-IMS ID 77012: Question by Canada - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

China claims exemption for outlays for public stockholding of vegetable oils and sugar but does not report any market price support for these products. Does this imply that China does not use administered prices to acquire the public stocks of vegetable oils and sugar?

AG-IMS ID 77051: Question by the European Union - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

- a. Can China indicate whether the aid given to State Trading Enterprises either as direct or indirect support in the form of aid from the Industrialisation Funds or similar support instruments (which also includes agricultural and agro-food sectors) has been included in the notification and with which amounts?

Supporting Table DS:1

- b. The footnote to the Supporting Table DS:1 states that the data includes both the outlays of the national and subnational governments. Could China explain the national and subnational shares of the Green Box spending notified?
- c. Can China indicate in which heading of the current notification the Agricultural Insurance Programme has been included (CNY 116.9 billion in 2009, according to the annual budget for National People's Congress)?
- d. Can China elaborate on the reasons for the continued increase of the food security stocks (+33%) while at the same time production continue to increase?
- e. What types of farmers receive direct aides and which sectors are eligible, and which criteria must farmers fulfil to be eligible for this type of payments?

Supporting Table DS:4

- f. Can China give further details to the calculation of the Value of Production, including the sources for this calculation in DS:4?
- g. Can China give more details on the differences in definition of products categories as indicated in the foot note to table DS:4?

Supporting Table DS:5

- h. Could China provide information on total wheat and rice production in the notified years 2009 and 2010?
- i. Can China give more details on the reasons for the very significant differences in the production numbers in this notification and the figures given by the national administration in "Report on grain development in China – 2013". According to the latter the buying-in of wheat in China by State Enterprises in 2009 reached a total of 69.339 million tonnes, whereas this notification only indicates 39 million tonnes. Can China please explain this difference in detail? The difference for rice is even bigger. How have the quantities for this notification been calculated?
- j. What are the reasons not to include maize in this notification, when to EU knowledge, there exists a system of guaranteed prices for maize (minimum procurement price scheme).

AG-IMS ID 77027: Question by Japan - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

- a. When will China submit the notification of 2011 and the years after?
- b. Please indicate the amount and the price of rice, wheat, and cotton the government purchased in each year from 2011 to 2014.

AG-IMS ID 77080: Question by the United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

The United States notes that the Chinese government did not include market price support calculations for corn, soybeans, and rapeseed in 2009, despite the fact that an applied administered price was announced for these commodities under the temporary reserve price support programme. The temporary reserve programme operates as a price support programme and in a very similar manner to the Minimum Price Procurement programme that was notified by China. The government offers to purchase commodities at a specified price if the market price falls below that price. The government holds the commodities in reserve and re-sells them in future years when market prices are higher. During years of falling prices, like 2009, the government buys large volumes to prevent prices from falling. In 2009, for example, China set a target price for corn at CNY 1,500 per metric tonne, soybeans at CNY 3,700 per metric tonne, and rapeseed at CNY 3,700 per metric tonne.

According to the 2010 China Grain Industry Development Report edited by Nie Zhenbang, Director of the National Grain Bureau (p. 14), "to stabilize grain market prices, protect returns to grain-planting farmers, in 2009 the government implemented minimum procurement price programmes for rice and wheat, and temporary reserve purchases for corn, soybeans and Xinjiang wheat". The report said that the government's grain reserves were at a record-high level as a result of these market stabilization programmes (p.29).

Further, Xinhua News Service in 2010 (see http://news.xinhuanet.com/fortune/2010-01/11/content_12791971.htm) cited the government's increase in minimum procurement prices for rice and wheat and temporary reserve procurement of rice, wheat, corn, soybeans and central reserves of oils from soybeans and rapeseed as measures that prevented prices from falling during 2009.

The Xinhua article reported that purchases by the State to intervene in markets prompted an increase in market prices and effectively increased the income of farmers by CNY 40 billion (USD 5.9 billion) during 2009, "...effectively protecting the enthusiasm of farmers to plant grain". China clearly implements the "temporary reserve" programme in a manner that is intended to manipulate producer incentives and prevent market forces of supply and demand from determining prices. This was acknowledged by Chinese authorities during 2014 when "temporary reserve" programmes were ended for cotton and soybeans.

- a. Please revise the notification to include all relevant commodities for which an applied administered price was established under this or any other programme. If China does not consider these pre-determined prices to be administered prices for these commodities, please explain the rationale.
- b. If the rationale is that the pre-determined prices are based on market prices, please clarify whether, in cases where the market prices decline after the date the administered price is set, the administered price does not automatically adjust (in other words it remains constant throughout the period for which it is set).
- c. If so, please indicate the reason for fixing the price rather than allowing market prices to move freely throughout the year.

AG-IMS ID 77073: Question by the United States of America - General services: infrastructural services

China notified that outlays for agricultural infrastructure services include a number of programmes.

- a. Please identify all major programmes accounted for in the notified value and the respective value of outlays in 2009 and 2010.
- b. Please provide additional details with regards to what the Agricultural Comprehensive Development Programs are and how they are implemented.
- c. Please provide additional details on how "small scale watering facilities on farmland" are implemented and how they meet the requirements of paragraph 2(g) of Annex 2 of the Agreement on Agriculture, in particular that it excludes expenditures for on-farm facilities.

AG-IMS ID 77052: Question by the European Union - Public stockholding for food security purposes

- a. Can China indicate the products, quantity and the average buying-in price of each product for the years 2009 and 2010? Can China indicate how the buying-in price was fixed and the level for the different products in question?
- b. A continued upward trend in China's spending on public stockholding for food security purposes is seen in Supporting Table DS:1. Could China indicate what type of expenditure is included in the notified amount?

- c. Could China confirm that food purchases by the government under the public stockholding for food security purposes are made at current market prices as required by paragraph 3 of Annex 2 of the Agreement of Agriculture?
- d. Could China indicate the food security related pre-determined targets which guide the volume and accumulation of stocks under the public stockholding for food security purposes as required by paragraph 3 of Annex 2?

AG-IMS ID 77053: Question by the European Union - Domestic food aid

Amounts notified under domestic food aid vary annually during the notified years 2005-2010. There is a substantial variation between 2009 and 2010 in particular in the current notification. Could China explain why the amount notified for 2010 decreased so substantially compared to the previous years? Is this related to a policy change?

AG-IMS ID 77054: Question by the European Union - Direct payments: decoupled income support

The European Union notes a decrease in the amount notified under decoupled income support compared to the previous notification G/AG/N/CHN/21. Could China explain why this spending is decreasing? Is this related to a policy change?

AG-IMS ID 77023: Question by Japan - Direct payments: decoupled income support

In the previous notification, China explained that decoupled payment is made based on the farmland contracted by farmers.

- a. Could China provide the requirements of decoupled payment?
- b. Please make sure the base area in this scheme is fixed in terms of the year, following the requirement of the Agreement on Agriculture.
- c. If so, please indicate the year used to calculate base area.

AG-IMS ID 77075: Question by the United States of America - Direct payments: payments for relief from natural disasters

China's "payments for relief from natural disasters" have increased substantially since 2005, reaching CNY 583.84 hundred million in 2010. Per paragraph 8(a) of Annex 2 of the Agreement on Agriculture "...payments shall arise only following a formal recognition by government authorities that a natural or like disaster has occurred".

- a. Please provide a list of all relevant formal recognitions by either the central government or local governments that provided eligibility for payments in 2010.
- b. In response to AG-IMS ID 66050, China noted that notified payments under this subheading include "disaster prevention". Please clarify how this meets the criteria of paragraph 8. Please provide additional details as to what "disaster prevention" is.
- c. In response to AG-IMS ID 66050, China stated that it was not in a position to provide any specific resources related to other specific policy and implementing guidance regarding the notified programmes. Is China now in a position to do so? If not, what resources are available to help Members better understand programmes notified under this subheading?
- d. In response to AG-IMS ID 66050, China indicated that total payments only compensated for a small part of farmers' losses. Please provide an indication of the level of compensation provided to farmers compared to losses of income.
- e. Please provide a list of the individual programmes included under this subheading.

AG-IMS ID 77074: Question by the United States of America - Direct payments: payments under environmental programmes

The United States notes that China's notification of environment programme expenditures has increased over time. China, in response to AG-IMS ID 59032, stated that it was impossible to determine whether the payments under the various programmes notified under these programmes are dependent on the fulfilment of specific criteria, a requirement outlined in paragraph 12(a) of the Agreement on Agriculture. Further, China stated that all the support at the time was used solely for compensation to the farming households affected by the afforestation and reforestation programme.

- a. Is this notification still accurate in that all support is still for afforestation and reforestation programmes?
- b. Is China now able to provide the details of such criteria? In particular, what exactly are the payments compensating farmers for with regards to afforestation and reforestation?
- c. If China is still unable to provide the specific criteria, on what basis is China able to notify this programme under paragraph 12?

AG-IMS ID 77055: Question by the European Union - Direct payments: payments under regional assistance programmes

Could China provide more details on the aid provided to disadvantaged regions under regional assistance programmes? What are the criteria for disadvantaged regions?

AG-IMS ID 77076: Question by the United States of America - Direct payments: payments under regional assistance programmes

China's regional assistance programme includes "outlays on aid and assistance to disadvantaged regions".

- a. How does China define "disadvantaged regions" and what are those regions in China?
- b. Please provide additional details with regards to how this programme operates.

AG-IMS ID 77024: Question by Japan - Market price support

Despite that Chinese government purchases cotton at administered prices, the notification does not include cotton in Supporting Table DS:5.

- a. Could China provide the reason for this?
- b. Please indicate the prices and the amount of cotton Chinese government purchased in 2009 and 2010, respectively.
- c. Please indicate the external reference price of cotton calculated in the same manner of the external reference price for rice and wheat (i.e. the average price of 96-98)

AG-IMS ID 77026: Question by Japan - Market price support

Regarding market price support for rice and wheat, Japan is of the view that negative values derived from calculation of the market price support should be regarded as zero since administered price lower than the external reference price does not impose any burden on farmers, unlike associated fees or levies. Could China explain what burden farmers are bearing under the market price support scheme?

AG-IMS ID 77078: Question by the United States of America - Market price support

- a. The United States notes that China's calculation of market price support for rice is incorrect. The calculation uses a price for unmilled paddy rice as the administered price. However, the fixed external reference price for rice is for milled rice. These prices are not comparable. The administered price should be adjusted to make it comparable to the price for milled rice. Please revise your notification.

- b. In AG-IMS ID 65049, China states that the minimum purchasing price policy functions in the main grain producing provinces, not in the overall state. The United States notes that China often cites ensuring the livelihood of its poorest producers as a rationale for its domestic support policies.
- i. Please explain the basis for providing minimum support prices only to the producers in the main grain producing regions where the greatest grain surpluses are located.
 - ii. Even if only small surpluses were available to sell in other regions, wouldn't providing a market price support to those smaller producers still provide the same important benefit as it does to producers with larger surpluses as China claims?

AG-IMS ID 77011: Question by Canada - Market price support: Eligible production

Canada notices a significant increase in eligible production for rice in 2009 and a zero amount in eligible production in 2010. Could China please explain these significant changes? In 2010, would the zero amount in eligible production indicate that no rice was procured through the Minimum Procurement Price Scheme?

AG-IMS ID 77056: Question by the European Union - Market price support: Eligible production

Could China explain why the eligible production for rice in 2010 in Supporting Table DS:5 is indicated at 0?

AG-IMS ID 77025: Question by Japan - Market price support: Eligible production

The Agreement on Agriculture defines eligible production as "the quantity of production eligible to receive the applied administered price". Therefore, unless the amount of procurement is determined in advance, total production is regarded as "eligible to receive the applied administered price". Could China explain why the notification does not adopt total production as the eligible production in the calculation of market price support for rice and wheat?

AG-IMS ID 77077: Question by the United States of America - Market price support: Eligible production

With regards to the notified market price support programme for wheat and rice in Supporting Table DS:5, the United States already understands that according to China "only the grains sold to the state at the minimum purchasing price are entitled to the applied administered price" as noted in AG-IMS ID 65049. However, the methodology for market price support in paragraph 8, Annex 3, is clear that the quantity of production eligible to receive the applied administered price must be used. Eligible production is not the same as what was actually purchased, unless a predetermined limit was announced in conjunction to the support price.

- a. Please cite documentation that establishes the level of production eligible to receive the applied administered price.
- b. If pre-determined targets are not set by the government, please indicate whether there are any statutory limits on the quantities of product that are eligible to receive the applied administered price.

AG-IMS ID 77008: Question by Canada - Other product-specific AMS/EMS

Canada notes that payments to rapeseed producers relative to rapeseed value of production has increased significantly since China's previous domestic support notification for years 2005 to 2008 (G/AG/N/CHN/21). Could China elaborate on the reasons for this increase?

AG-IMS ID 77009: Question by Canada - Other product-specific AMS/EMS

Canada notes that payments to pig producers dropped considerably from CNY 630 million in 2009 to CNY 213 million in 2010. Could China elaborate on this change in support to pig producers?

AG-IMS ID 77010: Question by Canada - Other product-specific AMS/EMS

China indicated in a response to a previous question (AG-IMS ID 64056) from Canada that China increased the subsidy to breeding productive sows to CNY 100 per animal. Could China indicate if

there has been any change in the subsidy rate to breeding productive sows, and if so what is the new subsidy rate?

AG-IMS ID 77057: Question by the European Union - Other product-specific AMS/EMS

Can China explain in detail the reason for the sizeable variations for cotton between the years 2009 and 2010 in Supporting Table DS:7?

AG-IMS ID 77079: Question by the United States of America - Other product-specific AMS/EMS

As has been previously noted by multiple Members, China's inclusion of negative market price support in the summation of product-specific AMS in Supporting Table DS:7 is a serious concern and should be reported as a zero for purposes of summation. The United States would note that the intent of negative support in the AMS is to account for "specific agricultural levies or fees paid by producers" per Annex 3 of the Agreement on Agriculture.

- a. Please state the intended objective of China's price support programmes. Please clarify how these objectives are in line with providing a negative level of support as purported by China in its notification.
- b. China has previously indicated that it refers to the "rules of the WTO Secretariat" as a basis for notifying in this way. Please provide the relevant Secretariat documentation and specific rules that China believes permits this.

The United States appreciates the transparency provided by China in noting the various programmes notified in Supporting Table DS:7. The United States suggests China notify these programmes on a disaggregated basis.

- c. Please provide a breakdown of the product-specific programmes notified in the footnotes with their respective outlays by commodity.

AG-IMS ID 77013: Question by Canada - Non-product-specific AMS

Canada notes that outlays on input subsidies (Supporting Table DS:9), which rose dramatically in 2007, continued to increase by 10% in 2008 and then by 10% again in 2010, reaching more than CNY 95 billion or about USD 14 billion. This single large amount prompts Canada to repeat the unanswered question from the 65th Committee on Agriculture meeting (AG-IMS 65051) about the steps China is taking to be able to provide the information disaggregated by agricultural machines, fertilizers, agricultural diesel oil, and feeds.

AG-IMS ID 77058: Question by the European Union - Non-product-specific AMS

- a. Input subsidies: Can China elaborate on the functioning of the system aid for mechanisation which is given to the distributors of agricultural machinery for certain types of material which has to be produced for at least half in China? How can non-China based producer participate in this scheme?
- b. Is the aid given as tax rebates (for instance in the horticultural sector) included in this table?

2.3.4 Costa Rica (G/AG/N/CRI/48/REV.1)

AG-IMS ID 77082: Question by the United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

In response to AG-IMS ID 76052, Costa Rica indicates that it has set of goal of increasing rice production growth by 40% by 2018.

- a. Is this an indication that Costa Rica will continue to regulate prices for producers through at least 2018 in order to incentivize producers to increase production, in addition the actions outlined in the National Development Plan 2015-2018?
- b. When will the National Development Plan 2015-18 be implemented? If it has already been implemented:

- i. please specify the specific programmes that have been implemented to achieve the 40% increase in rice production;
- ii. when can WTO Members expect to receive notifications for any programmes exempt from reduction commitments (e.g., when will a DS:2 notification be provided)?

AG-IMS ID 77081: Question by the United States of America - General services: infrastructural services

The United States appreciates Costa Rica's revised submission of its notification on domestic support commitments for 2013. The description for the programme for the development of agricultural production, involving irrigation and drainage works, listed under infrastructural services on page 5, indicates that this programme provides support for the operation and maintenance of hydro-agricultural facilities. In a previous response to the United States concerning this programme, Costa Rica indicated that the rates under this programme cover four types of fees, including an operating and maintenance fee and an investment fee. It is unclear if the beneficiaries of this programme cover the full the cost of these fees or if the programme covers some or all of these fees.

Please clarify the nature of support provided under this programme with respect to the operation and maintenance of hydro-agricultural facilities.

2.3.5 European Union (G/AG/N/EU/20)

AG-IMS ID 77104: Question by India - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

In the Supporting Tables Relating to Commitments on Agricultural Products in Part IV of the Schedules (G/AG/AGST/EEC) the External Reference Price for many products - Common wheat, Durum wheat, barley, Maize, Oats, etc. - has been calculated on the basis of FoB/ CIF "reduced by handling costs plus commercial margin". In respect of these agricultural products could the European Union provide details of the FoB/ CIF price, handling costs and commercial margin? Could the European Union explain how the method of determining ERP for these products is in conformity with paragraph 9 of Annex 3 of the Agreement on Agriculture?

AG-IMS ID 77105: Question by India - Direct payments: decoupled income support

- a. In its Domestic Support Notification G/AG/N/EU/20, the European Union has categorized support under the Single Payment Scheme as Decoupled Income Support. Could the European Union clearly specify the defined and fixed base period for determining eligibility for such payments?
- b. Article 33 of Council Regulation (EC) No 73/2009 specifies that support under the Single Payment Scheme shall be available to farmers if they hold entitlements which they obtained in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003. Article 33 of the Council Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003 specifies 3 separate criteria for farmers to have eligibility to Single Payment Scheme. One of the criteria specified is that "they have received a payment entitlement from the national reserve or by transfer". Article 42.3 of the Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003 gives flexibility to Member States to use national reserve to grant "reference amount to farmers who commence their agriculture activity after 31 December 2002". How does the European Union justify such payment under Annex 2 of the Agreement on Agriculture, as the eligibility criteria for receiving payment appears to be dependent upon agriculture activity after the defined and fixed base period?
- c. Article 38 of Council Regulation (EC) No 73/2009 specifies that in respect of "deferred integration" the parcels shall not be eligible if used for production of fruits and vegetables, ware potatoes and nurseries. It appears that the Single Payment Scheme is related to the type of production undertaken by the producer in a year after the base period. It may not meet the criteria of being classified as Decoupled Income Support under paragraph 6 of Annex 2 of the Agreement on Agriculture. In the light of this, could the European Union provide reasons why the Single Payment Scheme should be classified under the Green Box?

2.3.6 India (G/AG/N/IND/10, G/AG/N/IND/10/CORR.1)

AG-IMS ID 77107: Question by Australia - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Australia wishes to repeat its questions posed at the Committee on Agriculture meeting in March 2015:

a. AG-IMS ID 76018

Australia thanks India for its answers to the questions raised by Australia at the 75th Committee of Agriculture, in relation to India's notification (G/AG/IND/10). Australia acknowledges India's answer to Australia's question (AG-IMS ID 75017) on the use of United States Dollars (USD) instead of Indian Rupees (INR) in India's recent notifications. Australia notes, however, that India's AGST requires that INR be used, and indeed INR was used by India prior to its last notification.

- i. Can India explain why it is no longer using INR in its notifications, and why it considers it more important "to provide comparable estimates" than to follow India's AGST?
- ii. Can India also explain why it considers USD as being more reflective of the real impact of Indian domestic support when domestic support is actually delivered in INR and not USD?

b. AG-IMS ID 76019

With respect to the question from Australia (AG-IMS ID 75021) on input subsidies, India states that "about 99% of farm holdings have less than ten hectares of land which is not considered to be adequate to generate enough income to maintain a minimum standard of living". India states that the situation has deteriorated further over the period 2001-2002 to 2010-2011. This is despite the fact that Indian input subsidies to these farms have increased by almost 300% in the notification period and that market price support has also been available for a range of agricultural commodities.

- iii. Can India explain why concessional farm inputs and market price support have not made any significant change to the economic circumstances of the recipient farmers?
 - iv. Can India also explain why rice production and wheat production have accelerated significantly in the period under notification, along with the value of agricultural output, yet according to India's response, the number of farmers deemed to be living without a sufficient income has increased over the same period?
- c. Does India consider these input subsidies and market price support programmes to have been effective despite almost all Indian farmers having insufficient income even in times of accelerated production in staples such as rice and wheat?

Could India please provide answers in writing to the questions that Australia asked at the last Committee on Agriculture meeting as Australia still has not received answers in writing?

AG-IMS ID 77083: Question by the United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

The United States notes that India's external reference price for wheat in 1986/87, 1987/88, and 1988/89 in G/AG/AGST/IND is INR 3,540 per metric tonne for each year. India's AGST document states these prices are the c.i.f. average unit price for RITC No. 0413002 (1986-87) and H.S. No. 1001.9002 (1987-88 and 1988-89) derived from Monthly Statistics of Foreign Trade in India. In G/AG/N/IND/10, India converted this to USD 264 per metric tonne. This price appears to be quite high compared to other WTO Members who scheduled fixed external reference prices (FERP) for wheat in their AGST documents. For example, the EU FERP is approximately USD 97 per metric tonne, the Turkish FERP is approximately USD 98.50 per metric tonne, and the Japanese FERP is approximately USD 160 per metric tonne when each is converted to U.S. dollars. Further, various measures of world prices also show the world price of wheat to be

much lower than that notified by India. For example, the U.S. No.2 Gulf soft red winter is USD 126 per metric tonne and the U.S. Gulf hard red winter was USD 135 per metric tonne. This would appear to indicate that for India's FERP, on a c.i.f. basis, to make sense shipping costs per tonne would have almost equalled the price of the wheat itself. For further comparison, even during the 2006-2008 period, the Russian Federation only scheduled a FERP of USD 211 per metric tonne.

- a. Please provide the source data for establishing India's FERP.
- b. Please provide an explanation for the variance between India's FERP and other relevant prices discussed above.
- c. Please confirm that the external reference price was indeed the same for each year at INR 3,540 per metric tonne.

AG-IMS ID 77084: Question by the United States of America - Market price support: Eligible production

In response to AG-IMS ID 75062, the United States understands that India only notified the procured quantity of production as the "eligible production" for purposes of Supporting Table DS:5 because "India procures the marketable surplus which farmers want to sell keeping aside their own consumption requirements and seed requirements for the next crop year." The United States appreciates this response regarding what the amount actually procured is. However, the question remains: "what is the reasoning behind India's decision to adopt a new understanding of eligible production and abandon its previous position of notifying all price supports as reflected in its AGST document".

- a. Please explain.
- b. Further, please explain whether there has been any policy change in how the administered price is operated during the period under review in India's most recent notification as compared to during the period covered by G/AG/AGST/IND. In particular, India notes in its AGST document that the "administered price shown in column 3 pertain to the following marketing years in which production shown under column 5 becomes eligible for the said administer price". In other words, India claimed, and as such made commitments under the WTO, that its administered prices were eligible to be received by all production.

2.3.7 Jordan (G/AG/N/JOR/17)

AG-IMS ID 77085: Question by the United States of America - Market price support

The United States notes that Jordan provides market price support for wheat and barley, and it appears that Jordan has notified the actual quantities of wheat and barley procured at the administered price.

Please provide additional details regarding the operation of Jordan's market price support programme, including whether there are any legislative or regulatory limits on the quantity of each product that may be purchased by the government at the administered price.

AG-IMS ID 77014: Question by Canada - Other product-specific AMS/EMS

Canada notes that the support provided to "government feed sales" for livestock increased significantly from JD 26,652,598 in 2011 to JD 38,832,064 in 2012. Could Jordan elaborate if this large increase was due to increased feed costs or is it also related to increased number of livestock?

AG-IMS ID 77086: Question by the United States of America - Other product-specific AMS/EMS

The United States notes that Jordan notifies subsidized feed sales for livestock. Please provide details on how this programme is implemented, including what types of feed are sold and if there are any limitations on the types of livestock eligible to receive the subsidized feed.

2.3.8 New Zealand (G/AG/N/NZL/88)

AG-IMS ID 77034: Question by Australia - General services: research

New Zealand has reported expenditure for a Sustainable Farming Fund (under General Services) in its DS:1. The Sustainable Farming Fund provides funding to "communities of interest".

- a. How is a "community of interest" determined and what criteria are used to determine the allocation of funds to such "communities of interest"?
- b. Is on-farm infrastructure or on-farm pasture improvement part of this programme?
- c. Exactly what sort of programme expenditure is involved for "communities of interest"?

2.3.9 Norway (G/AG/N/NOR/78)

AG-IMS ID 77059: Question by the European Union - Market price support

Norway notifies a sharp decrease in market price support for sheep meat in 2013 compared to previous years. Could Norway please provide more detailed information on the reason for this decrease and whether a policy shift influenced this?

2.3.10 Oman (G/AG/N/OMN/7, G/AG/N/OMN/13)

AG-IMS ID 77090: Question by the United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

In November 2012 (AG IMS-ID 68029) and September 2012 (AG IMS-ID 67038) the United States asked a question regarding Oman's notification G/AG/N/OMN/7 and the notification of new programmes. Oman stated it would respond at a later stage. The United States resubmits its question:

The United States asked questions in 2009 regarding Oman's notification G/AG/N/OMN/7. The United States notes that a number of those programmes appear in the most recent notification (G/AG/N/OMN/11). In 2009, Oman provided helpful responses to the U.S. questions and indicated a Table DS:2 notification regarding those programmes would be submitted. Please confirm if Oman submitted a Table DS:2 notification. If not, when will Oman be making its notification?

AG-IMS ID 77087: Question by the United States of America - General services: infrastructural services

In G/AG/N/OMN/13, Oman has notified "Development of natural pastures" under General service - infrastructure in Supporting Table DS:1.

- a. Can Oman provide further details on the programme to develop and maintain natural pastures on government land?
- b. Are the natural pastures used for animal grazing? If so, do individual producers benefit from the improvements made to the pasture land?

In G/AG/N/OMN/13, Oman has notified "Establishment of fodder production company in Najd" and "Establishment and development of agricultural and veterinarian quarantine" as exempt measures under Supporting Table DS:1. It is noted that these establishment costs have continued for several years.

- c. Please provide more details on the reason for these continuing payments and whether they extend beyond the initial establishment of the designated facilities (e.g., are payments made to defer costs, such as maintenance of facilities, etc. that would otherwise be passed on to customers in the form of higher prices).

- d. Previously in G/AG/N/OMN/12, Oman noted that the "Establishment of fodder production company in Najd" was support for a consultancy study. Is this still the purpose of these payments? What type of entities are the beneficiaries of these payments?

AG-IMS ID 77088: Question by the United States of America – Article 18.6 (Development Programmes): Other

In G/AG/N/OMN/13, budgetary expenditures under "National project for date palm development" increased substantially in 2013. Please describe how this programme operates and the reason for the large change in expenditures in the most recent notification.

2.3.11 Pakistan (G/AG/N/PAK/16)

AG-IMS ID 77038: Question by Australia - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Can Pakistan please explain why its notification (G/AG/N/PAK/16) uses U.S. Dollars instead of the local currency, Pakistan rupees, as currency in Pakistan's DS:1 and Supporting Tables for the marketing years 2007-2008 to 2011-12?

AG-IMS ID 77015: Question by Canada - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Pakistan's underlying AGST document G/AG/AGST/PAK uses Rs (Rupees) as its currency but its most recent and historical notifications are provided in U.S. dollars. This practice deviates from the requirement in Article 1(h)(ii) of the Agreement on Agriculture to calculate the level of support actually provided during any year "with the constituent data and methodology used in the tables of supporting material incorporated by reference in Part IV" of Pakistan's Schedule, i.e., G/AG/AGST/PAK. Could Pakistan please explain why its notifications do not use Pakistani rupees as per its constituent data and methodology?

AG-IMS ID 77020: Question by Canada - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

In the interest of increasing transparency, it would be helpful if Pakistan could include the value of production for each product for which support is provided as this data is already included as a footnote in Supporting Table DS:5. In addition, it would be useful to include the total agriculture value of production in supporting table DS:4 in future domestic support notifications.

AG-IMS ID 77064: Question by the European Union - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Can Pakistan explain the exchange rate used to calculate the annual total value of production (in the footnote to Supporting Table DS:9). Is this the same as in Column 3 of Supporting Table DS:5?

AG-IMS ID 77094: Question by the United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

The United States appreciates Pakistan's efforts to bring its domestic support notifications up to date and encourages Pakistan to continue to notify in a timely manner going forward.

The United States notes that Pakistan notifies in U.S. dollars despite the constituent data and methodology provisions of Article 1(a)(ii), which require Pakistan to calculate Current Total AMS in rupees.

- a. On what basis has Pakistan decided to notify in a currency other than that it made commitments in?
- b. Please provide a revised DS:1 notification in the same currency as its commitments were made.

AG-IMS ID 77016: Question by Canada - General services: research

Canada notes a substantive increase under "General services on research" from 2006-07 to 2007-08 which went from USD 8.6 million to USD 154.97 million. Could Pakistan please provide details on this significant increase? Is this the result of a new initiative?

AG-IMS ID 77017: Question by Canada - General services: infrastructural services

There seems to be a new addition under infrastructure services starting in 2007-08 entitled "Electricity Reticulation" which averaged USD 18.24 million in the 2007-08 to 2011-12 period.

- a. Could Pakistan provide details on this new measure, specifically, how does this initiative benefit the agriculture sector?
- b. When does Pakistan intend to submit a DS:2 notification for this programme?

AG-IMS ID 77091: Question by the United States of America - General services: infrastructural services

"Irrigation system rehabilitation" expenditures notified varied significantly from year to year in Pakistan's most recent notification.

- a. Please explain the reason for the large changes from year to year.

"Electricity reticulation" appears to be a newly notified measure by Pakistan.

- b. Does Pakistan plan on submitting a DS:2 notification for this programme?

AG-IMS ID 77018: Question by Canada - Domestic food aid

Canada noticed that significant amounts have been reported under Government Storage and Food Aid from 2007-08 to 2011-12 (average spending of USD 93.9 million) where no amounts were reported in the previous 5 years. Also, under the name and description of the measure, the programme now claims to satisfy the policy specific criteria of Annex 2, paragraph 3 and 4.

- a. Could Pakistan advise if this is a new programme? If so, how long will this programme be in place?
- b. Could Pakistan provide details on this measure including how it meets the policy specific criteria of both paragraph 3 and 4 under Annex 2?
- c. Does Pakistan intend to submit a DS:2 notification for this measure?

AG-IMS ID 77019: Question by Canada - Market price support

Over the reporting period Canada notices that the product-specific AMS support for wheat has been creeping closer to the 10% *de minimis* threshold, starting at 4.8% of wheat value of production in 2007-2008 to 9.2% of wheat value of production in 2011-2012. Canada understands from Pakistan's recent Trade Policy Review that many responsibilities in agricultural policy making have shifted to the provinces. Could Pakistan elaborate as to what mechanisms are in place to ensure that Pakistan's future spending remain within its WTO commitments?

AG-IMS ID 77021: Question by Canada - Market price support

In Supporting Table DS:5, Canada notes that the applied administered price for wheat has increased starting in 2007-08 from its historical amounts. Could Pakistan please explain this increase?

AG-IMS ID 77093: Question by the United States of America - Market price support

The United States thanks Pakistan for the additional transparency provided with regards to the footnotes provided in relation to its market price support notification. The United States does not agree with Pakistan's statement that "strictly speaking, support prices are not the administered prices."

The United States notes that Pakistan lists seed cotton, basmati rice, coarse rice, and sugar cane in Supporting Table DS:5, but does not list an administered price.

- a. Please confirm whether no administered price was announced or if the administered price was not announced because no procurement occurred.

The United States notes that Pakistan states "Actual procurement by public sector agencies on pre-determined targets from resource poor farmers defined in article 6.2".

- b. How does Pakistan define resource poor farmers?
- c. Does Pakistan set a pre-determined target quantity limit on the amount of product it will purchase at the administered price? If so, what were the announced quantities for each year covered by this notification?

AG-IMS ID 77022: Question by Canada - Market price support: Eligible production

In Pakistan's most recent DS:1 notification, eligible production for wheat has decreased substantially going from 23,294.7 thousand tonnes in 2006-07 to 3,525 thousand tonnes in 2007-08. Could Pakistan please explain this significant drop in eligible production?

AG-IMS ID 77063: Question by the European Union - Market price support: Eligible production

- a. Can Pakistan confirm that all wheat produced in Pakistan is eligible to be sold to the procurement agency during the post-harvest season?
- b. Can Pakistan indicate the total production of wheat produced per marketing year in all the years covered by this notification, i.e. 2007/08, 08/09, 09/10, 10/11 and 11/12.

AG-IMS ID 77092: Question by the United States of America - Classification of measures

Pakistan notifies "On-farm-water management" under paragraph 2(c) of Annex 2 of the Agreement on Agriculture. As Pakistan has previously noted in AG-IMS ID 51012, the programme, in the past, was categorized under paragraph 2(c) because more than 50% of spending is on training rather than infrastructure related support.

- a. Is this still accurate?

If so, the United States would suggest the two parts of the measure be separated for improved transparency.

- b. What percent of expenditures were determined to be categorized under 2(g) for each year of this notification?
- c. If support is still provided for measures categorized under 2(g), as in past notifications, please provide the basis for providing "on-farm-water management" despite the requirement that such measures "shall exclude the subsidized provision of on-farm facilities other than for reticulation of generally available public facilities."

2.3.12 Panama (G/AG/N/PAN/31, G/AG/N/PAN/36)

AG-IMS ID 77095: Question by the United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Panama indicated in response to AG IMS-ID 75065 that "In 2014 support will be paid to producers per quintal of damp and dirty rice sold. Panama will reflect these programmes in the respective notification for the corresponding year." The United States also notes that press releases (http://www.mida.gob.pa/noticias_id_2793.html) indicate that in 2014 corn producers began receiving government payments "corresponding to compensation incentives to production, as a commitment to increase crop and totaling more than \$200,000. Similarly, 60 industrial tomato producers received more than \$136,000..." Has Panama notified the stated support in its notification for 2014? If so, please indicate where.

AG-IMS ID 77096: Question by the United States of America - General services: training services

The United States thanks Panama for its responses to AG-IMS ID 69076 and 72039. The United States notes that Panama states no legislative change to its programme occurred between 2011 and 2012, but the manner in which the programme was implemented was modified resulting in

both the modification of how the programme is notified and the level of expenditures provided under the programme.

- a. For purposes of transparency and the intent of the Article 18.3 of the Agreement on Agriculture, the United States believes it is appropriate for Panama to submit a Table DS:2 notification that explains these changes.

Panama's previous response (AG IMS-ID 69076) states that the change in budgetary expenditures and notification are indicative of the government intent to strengthen and expand the programme.

- b. The level of expenditures were substantially reduced from 2012 to 2013 and then increased again in 2014. Please explain the cause of this fluctuation in budgetary expenditures from year to year.

AG-IMS ID 77039: Question by Australia - Investment subsidies generally available to agriculture

Panama has notified investment subsidies generally available to agriculture in Supporting Table DS:2 (G/AG/N/PAN/36).

- a. Can Panama explain how the system of subsidies and loans under the Agricultural credit and loan programme works in practice and how the investment subsidies are calculated?
- b. What are the eligibility criteria for these investment loans?
- c. Can Panama also explain the system by which the government provides funds to the banking system for concessional loans to agriculture and how the banks use these funds?

2.3.13 Paraguay (G/AG/N/PRY/21, G/AG/N/PRY/23)

AG-IMS ID 77099: Question by the United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

In response to AG -IMS ID 70049, Paraguay informed the United States that it was addressing the matter of the submission of a DS:2 notification for new measures notified in G/AG/N/PRY/21. Paraguay still has not made any DS:2 notifications. When can it be expected that Paraguay will notify its new programmes exempt under Annex 2 of the Agreement on Agriculture?

AG-IMS ID 77098: Question by the United States of America - General services: extension and advisory services

In G/AG/N/PRY/23, under General Services—Agricultural extension services, Paraguay notifies a number of programmes. Please provide further details on the content of each of the following programmes and whether they are limited to providing technical assistance to producers:

- "National Livestock Development Programme";
- "Promotion of food production through family farming";
- "Agricultural diversification";
- "Sustainable development of the western region";
- "Agricultural development of the eastern region – 2KR";
- "National Biofuels Programme";
- "Sustainable rural development project (PRODERS)".

AG-IMS ID 77100: Question by the United States of America - Input subsidies available to low-income or resource-poor producers

How does Paraguay define "low-income or resource-poor producers"?

2.3.14 Russian Federation (G/AG/N/RUS/5, G/AG/N/RUS/5/CORR.1)

AG-IMS ID 77065: Question by the European Union - Other product-specific AMS/EMS

- Can the Russian Federation please explain what kinds of meat are included in the product-specific AMS for "meat"?
- Can the Russian Federation please inform whether the notification of each product specific AMS for reindeer, horse, pig, poultry, sheep and goat, refers to live animals or to meat of these animals?

2.3.15 South Africa (G/AG/N/ZAF/83)

AG-IMS ID 77106: Question by the European Union - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

- It seems that some programmes under the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform (DRDLR), such as the programme for restitution of land property as well as the programme for redistribution of land property are not included in this notification. The table below shows the budget outlay according to DRDLR. Can South Africa inform on how these instruments have been included in the notification?

Million ZAR	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014
Restitution	2,376.3	2,865.7	2,836.7
Land Reform	3,317.8	3,326.5	2,863.2
Total Rural Development and Land Reform	5,694.10	6,192.20	5,699.90

- Can South Africa indicate how the support for the *Recapitalisation and Development Programme* has been taken into account in this notification? The table below shows the budget Outlay according to *Agricultural Land Holding Account*.

Million ZAR	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014
Budget Agricultural Land Holding Account	2,435,784	2,298,335	1,697,119
Number of farms recapitalised	257	200	442
Number of Hectares concerned	392,850	157,556	153,586

- Through the heading of food security and land reform South Africa is granting support for fertiliser, seeds and equipment through Food Security and Agrarian Reform, Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme (CASP) or Fetsa Tlala (zero hunger). How have these programmes been included in this notification?

Million ZAR	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014
Budget Food Security and Agrarian Reform	1,251.6	1,405.2	1,590.1

AG-IMS ID 77040: Question by Australia - Direct payments: payments under regional assistance programmes

South Africa has notified (G/AG/N/ZAF/83) in its DS:1 regional assistance programmes for development aid. How are underdeveloped and disadvantaged areas determined for the purpose of funding under the regional assistance programmes?

2.3.16 United Arab Emirates (G/AG/N/ARE/7)

AG-IMS ID 77101: Question by the United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

- a. Under sub-headings "pest and disease control" and "extension advisory services" the United Arab Emirates notified the values of support for each year; however, it is unclear from the notification what the difference between the two values is. Please explain what each value represents.
- b. It is noted that compared to G/AG/N/ARE/5 for the years 2000 and 2001, the United Arab Emirates introduced in 2002 a number of new programmes that are considered exempt under Annex 2 of the Agreement on Agriculture. In addition, the United Arab Emirates introduced one new programme in 2003 under subheading "Inspection". When does the United Arab Emirates plan on submitting its DS:2 notifications for these new programmes?

AG-IMS ID 77102: Question by the United States of America - Input subsidies available to low-income or resource-poor producers

- a. It is noted that all measures notified under the criteria of Article 6.2 were eliminated in 2006. What was the basis for the elimination of these measures and did the United Arab Emirates introduce any other measures as part of this reform? If so, what?
- b. How did the United Arab Emirates define low-income or resource-poor producers at the time these measures were operational?

2.4 NEW OR MODIFIED DOMESTIC SUPPORT MEASURES (DS:2)

2.4.1 Australia (G/AG/N/AUS/96)

AG-IMS ID 77103: Question by the United States of America - Classification of measures

Concerning the DS:2 notification for the Great Artesian Basin Sustainability Initiative Phase 3 (p. 12), Australia indicates that the measure is exempt from reduction commitments consistent with Annex 2, paragraph 2(g) in relation to "off-farm" infrastructure and also exempt from reduction commitments consistent with Annex 2, paragraph 12 in relation to "on-farm" infrastructure that meets paragraph 12 criteria for direct payments under environmental programmes.

- a. Could Australia explain how this programme meets both Annex 2, paragraph 2(g) and Annex 2, paragraph 12 criteria?
- b. What is the distinction between "off-farm" infrastructure and "on-farm" infrastructure under this programme? Can Australia provide specific examples and how this relates to the Annex 2 criteria?
- c. The United States notes that Australia has notified this programme under Annex 2, paragraph 2(g) in its DS:1 notification (G/AG/N/AUS/97) and not as a payment under environmental programmes (para. 12). So it is unclear why the DS:2 notification for this measure references both provisions.

2.4.2 Norway (G/AG/N/NOR/80)

AG-IMS ID 77041: Question by Australia - Payments based on 85 per cent or less of the base level of production

Norway has notified a DS:2 (G/AG/N/NOR/80) for the "Quality incentive support programme for beef".

- a. Can Norway inform Members whether payment under this programme has any conditions attached in terms of how the recipient may spend the payment?
- b. Do beef producers have to use the payment received under this scheme solely for the purpose of improving the quality of the beef herd to enhance beef quality specification?
- c. Alternatively, can recipients use payments received under this programme for any type of farm expenditure?

AG-IMS ID 77062: Question by the European Union - Payments based on 85 per cent or less of the base level of production

Could Norway please explain how the level of payments in the new Blue Box support measure for beef (quality incentive support programme for beef) was determined?

2.4.3 Panama (G/AG/N/PAN/33)

AG-IMS ID 77097: Question by the United States of America - Direct payments: payments for relief from natural disasters

The United States thanks Panama for its notification G/AG/N/PAN/33 in response to AG-IMS ID 69075. In Panama's response, it noted that funds were allocated "to compensate for losses suffered by producers and others as a result of the floods" that occurred on 7 and 8 December 2010. Panama notified in the description of the programme that payments for this natural disaster are being paid out over seven years terminating in 2017.

- a. Please provide additional detail on how compensation levels were determined for each producer or other entity.
- b. Please explain the reasoning that compensation is dispersed over the seven years.

2.5 EXPORT SUBSIDY notifications (TABLES ES:1, ES:2 AND ES:3)

2.5.1 Argentina (G/AG/N/ARG/33)

AG-IMS ID 77061: Question by the European Union - Quantity of total exports

According to the report of the chairperson on the issue of reviewing the list of significant exporters (G/AG/W/123), Argentina has been listed in Annex I among Members having a share exceeding 5% in total world exports for a number of product categories. The same document states in point 3.1 that "the designated significant exporters would include in annual Table ES:2 notifications the total quantity of exports of the relevant products or product groups." Could Argentina explain why it decided not to submit this data in its ES:2 notification?

2.5.2 Russian Federation (G/AG/N/RUS/6)

AG-IMS ID 77048: Question by the European Union - Quantity of total exports

According to the report of the chairperson on the issue of reviewing the list of significant exporters (G/AG/W/123), the Russian Federation has been listed in Annex I among Members having a share exceeding 5% in total world exports for wheat and wheat flour. Does the Russian Federation intend to separately submit ES:2 notification for 2014 concerning the total quantity of exports of wheat and wheat flour?

2.5.3 United States of America (G/AG/N/USA/99)

AG-IMS ID 77060: Question by the European Union - International food aid

The European Union notices that the United States continues to notify significant amounts of in-kind food aid in Table ES:1 for 2011 and 2012. Have the United States undertaken any reforms regarding its food aid policy in recent years in order to reduce the amount of food aid provided in physical form and replace it with assistance in the form of cash contributions to international agencies? If not, are there any plans to do so in the future?

3 OVERDUE NOTIFICATIONS

3.1 Turkey

AG-IMS ID 77089: Question by the United States of America

Turkey has not yet responded to the question AG-IMS ID 76013 by the United States. The United States re-asks the question and notes that Turkey has not made a domestic support notification since 2001. This lack of transparency for 14 years is of particular concern because Turkey ranks as the 7th largest agricultural producer in the world and has undergone a number of changes in domestic agricultural policy over that time.

Turkey remains seriously overdue in notifying its domestic support and export subsidies. When does Turkey plan to submit its domestic support and export subsidy notifications?
