



Committee on Agriculture

POINTS RAISED BY MEMBERS UNDER THE REVIEW PROCESS

COMPILATION OF QUESTIONS FOR THE MEETING OF 28 JULY 2020¹

Revision

This revision compiles: (1) questions received by the Secretariat by the deadline of 10 March 2020 as specified in WTO/AIR/AG/41 and as included in G/AG/W/205 (AG-IMS ID 93001 to AG-IMS ID 93180); and (2) additional questions received by the extended deadline of 10 July 2020² (AG-IMS ID 93181 to AG-IMS ID 93311).

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.

² As specified in the Secretariat's email communication dated 25 June 2020.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	2
1 MATTERS RELEVANT TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMITMENTS:	
ARTICLE 18.6.....	10
1.1 Brazil – Public Stockholding programmes.....	10
1.1.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 93182).....	10
1.2 Brazil's subsidized loans	10
1.2.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID 93044).....	10
1.3 China – China-US Economic and Trade Agreement.....	10
1.3.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 93049).....	10
1.3.2 Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID 93050).....	11
1.4 United States of America - China-US Economic and Trade Agreement	11
1.4.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 93078).....	11
1.4.2 Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID 93080).....	12
1.4.3 Question by Ukraine (AG-IMS ID 93082)	13
1.5 China's agricultural insurance.....	13
1.5.1 Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID 93051).....	13
1.6 China - Exemptions to retaliatory tariffs	13
1.6.1 Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID 93052).....	13
1.7 China's stimulus package for corn.....	14
1.7.1 Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID 93224)	14
1.8 Colombia's coffee price stabilization fund	14
1.8.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93006)	14
1.9 Colombia's sugar fund.....	14
1.9.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 93183).....	14
1.10 Egypt's import license regime.....	15
1.10.1 Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID 93054).....	15
1.11 Egypt's ban on sugar imports	15
1.11.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 93185)	15
1.12 EU "From farm to fork" ("F2F") strategy	15
1.12.1 Question by Colombia (AG-IMS ID 93127)	15
1.13 The EU's deforestation and forest degradation strategy	15
1.13.1 Question by Colombia (AG-IMS ID 93128)	15
1.14 EU- Border adjustment mechanism for carbon emissions	16
1.14.1 Question by Colombia (AG-IMS ID 93143)	16
1.15 EU's environmental policies.....	16
1.15.1 Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID 93057)	16
1.15.2 Question by Paraguay (AG-IMS ID 93059)	17
1.15.3 Question by Paraguay (AG-IMS ID 93238)	17
1.15.4 Question by Colombia (AG-IMS ID 93300) and Paraguay (AG-IMS ID 93301).....	17

1.16	EU's production subsidies resulted from implementation of SPS measures	18
1.16.1	Question by Paraguay (AG-IMS ID 93060)	18
1.16.2	Question by Paraguay (AG-IMS ID 93239)	19
1.17	Italy's support to wine producers.....	19
1.17.1	Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID 93225).....	19
1.18	France - Bpifrance Assurance Export	20
1.18.1	Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID 93226).....	20
1.19	European Union's sugar policies.....	20
1.19.1	Question by China (AG-IMS ID 93231)	20
1.20	Japan - Supplementary budget to address impact of new trade deal	20
1.20.1	Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 93069)	20
1.21	Japan's beef special safeguard (SSG) and pork safeguard (SG)	21
1.21.1	Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID 93070).....	21
1.22	Japan- Japan-US Trade Agreement	21
1.22.1	Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID 93071).....	21
1.23	United States of America - Japan-US Trade Agreement.....	21
1.23.1	Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID 93081).....	21
1.24	Nigeria – Foreign currency exchange restrictions for dairy imports.....	21
1.24.1	Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 93016)	21
1.24.2	Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID 93073)	22
1.25	Russian Federation - Subsidies to "certification of agricultural products in foreign markets".....	22
1.25.1	Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 93186)	22
1.26	Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of - New system for issuing import licenses.....	22
1.26.1	Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID 93074).....	22
1.27	Sri Lanka - Suspension of importation of processed agricultural products.....	23
1.27.1	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93258)	23
1.28	Chinese Taipei - Rice TRQ tender system	23
1.28.1	Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 93053)	23
1.29	Thailand's "licence" charge on eggs.....	24
1.29.1	Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID 93075)	24
1.30	Thailand's sugar support.....	24
1.30.1	Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 93203)	24
1.30.2	Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID 93227).....	24
1.31	United Kingdom - Policy update resulted from Brexit.....	25
1.31.1	Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID 93077).....	25
1.32	U.S. domestic support policies and notifications.....	25
1.32.1	Question by India (AG-IMS ID 93085)	25
1.33	US – Excise duty exemptions for alcohol on Puerto Rico the US Virgin Islands	26
1.33.1	Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 93187)	26
1.34	US – Overcompensation through MFP 1 and MFP 2.....	26

1.34.1	Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 93188)	26
1.35	U.S. insurance programmes	27
1.35.1	Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID 93285)	27
1.36	Viet Nam - Potential tariff reductions on certain agricultural products	27
1.36.1	Question by Ukraine (AG-IMS ID 93083)	27
1.37	Brazil's wheat quota	27
1.37.1	Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID 93043)	27
1.38	Canada's New Milk Ingredient Class	28
1.38.1	Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID 93048)	28
1.38.2	Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID 93184)	28
1.38.3	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93002)	28
1.38.4	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93003)	28
1.38.5	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93247)	28
1.39	Canada's wine sale policy	29
1.39.1	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93004)	29
1.39.2	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93005)	29
1.40	Canada's review of the TRQ system	30
1.40.1	Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 93045)	30
1.40.2	Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID 93046)	30
1.41	Canada's compensation for farmers after trade concessions	30
1.41.1	Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID 93047)	30
1.42	Canada's agriculture support package	31
1.42.1	Question by India (AG-IMS ID 93241)	31
1.43	China's rice policies	31
1.43.1	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93248)	31
1.44	China's state trading enterprises	31
1.44.1	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93249)	31
1.45	Egypt's export subsidy and Arrears Program	32
1.45.1	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93042)	32
1.46	Egypt's export prohibitions on agricultural products	32
1.46.1	Question by Japan (AG-IMS ID 93192)	32
1.47	The EU's coupled payments	32
1.47.1	Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID 93055)	32
1.48	EU's support measures in response to COVID-19	33
1.48.1	Question by India (AG-IMS ID 93242)	33
1.48.2	Question by India (AG-IMS ID 93243)	33
1.49	India's sugar policies	33
1.49.1	Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 93001)	33
1.50	India's pulses policies	34
1.50.1	Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 93058)	34

1.50.2	Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID 93066)	34
1.50.3	Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID 93282)	35
1.50.4	Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID 93283)	35
1.50.5	Question by Russian Federation (AG-IMS ID 93067)	36
1.50.6	Question by Russian Federation (AG-IMS ID 93229)	36
1.50.7	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93250)	37
1.51	India's export subsidies/export credits	37
1.51.1	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93007)	37
1.52	India's skim milk powder export subsidies	37
1.52.1	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93008)	37
1.53	India's support to rice exports	38
1.53.1	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93009)	38
1.54	India's Transport and Marketing Assistance (TMA)	38
1.54.1	Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 93065)	38
1.54.2	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93010)	38
1.55	India's wheat policies	39
1.55.1	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93013)	39
1.56	India - Dairy Loans	39
1.56.1	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93011)	39
1.56.2	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93255)	39
1.57	India's short-term crop loans	39
1.57.1	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93012)	39
1.57.2	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93254)	40
1.58	India's wheat public stockpiling	40
1.58.1	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93014)	40
1.58.2	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93251)	40
1.58.3	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93252)	40
1.58.4	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93253)	40
1.59	India - National Dairy Plan Phase I	41
1.59.1	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93256)	41
1.60	Indonesia's Measure 18 in DS477 and DS478	41
1.60.1	Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID 93068)	41
1.61	Japan's support package	41
1.61.1	Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID 93259)	41
1.62	Mongolia's quota regime for importation	42
1.62.1	Question by Russian Federation (AG-IMS ID 93072)	42
1.62.2	Question by Russian Federation (AG-IMS ID 93191)	42
1.63	Nigeria's import prohibitions on certain agricultural products	43
1.63.1	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93015)	43
1.64	Oman's Table DS:2 notification	43

1.64.1	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93257)	43
1.65	Russia's export subsidies	43
1.65.1	Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 93017)	43
1.66	Tajikistan's export prohibitions on certain food products	43
1.66.1	Question by Japan (AG-IMS ID 93305)	43
1.67	Turkey - Turkish Grain Board (TMO)	43
1.67.1	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93019)	43
1.67.2	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93021)	44
1.68	Turkey's flour export and Turkish Grain Board	44
1.68.1	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93018)	44
1.69	Turkey - Prior export authorization/registration	45
1.69.1	Question by Japan (AG-IMS ID 93193)	45
1.70	United Kingdom - Modification of the EU's agricultural schedule of commitments	45
1.70.1	Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 93076)	45
1.71	U.S. Proposed domestic support measures	45
1.71.1	Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 93079)	45
1.71.2	Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID 93084)	46
1.71.3	Question by Colombia (AG-IMS ID 93144)	46
1.71.4	Question by Mexico (AG-IMS ID 93086)	47
1.71.5	Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID 93087)	47
1.72	U.S. Coronavirus Food Assistance Program	48
1.72.1	Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID 93284)	48
1.72.2	Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID 93286)	48
1.72.3	Question by China (AG-IMS ID 93232)	48
1.72.4	Question by India (AG-IMS ID 93245)	49
1.72.5	Question by Mexico (AG-IMS ID 93299)	49
1.72.6	Question by Paraguay (AG-IMS ID 93240)	50
2	POINTS RAISED IN CONNECTION WITH INDIVIDUAL NOTIFICATIONS	50
2.1	Administration of tariff and other quota commitments (Table MA:1)	50
2.1.1	Brazil (G/AG/N/BRA/55)	50
2.1.2	Japan (G/AG/N/JPN/247)	50
2.2	Imports under tariff and other quota commitments (Table MA:2)	51
2.2.1	Brazil (G/AG/N/BRA/56)	51
2.2.2	Canada (G/AG/N/CAN/137)	51
2.2.3	Chile (G/AG/N/CHL/64)	51
2.2.4	China (G/AG/N/CHN/50)	52
2.2.5	European Union (G/AG/N/EU/57)	52
2.2.6	Japan (G/AG/N/JPN/253)	54
2.2.7	Kazakhstan (G/AG/N/KAZ/7)	54
2.2.8	Korea, Republic of (G/AG/N/KOR/71, G/AG/N/KOR/72, G/AG/N/KOR/73)	54

2.2.9 Morocco (G/AG/N/MAR/48, G/AG/N/MAR/48/Corr.1 G/AG/N/MAR/49, G/AG/N/MAR/50, G/AG/N/MAR/51, G/AG/N/MAR/52)	55
2.2.10 Nicaragua (G/AG/N/NIC/54)	56
2.2.11 Norway (G/AG/N/NOR/110)	56
2.2.12 Panama (G/AG/N/PAN/55)	56
2.2.13 Russian Federation (G/AG/N/RUS/27)	57
2.2.14 Switzerland (G/AG/N/CHE/98)	57
2.2.15 Chinese Taipei (G/AG/N/TPKM/191)	57
2.2.16 Ukraine (G/AG/N/UKR/35)	57
2.2.17 Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of (G/AG/N/VEN/28)	58
2.2.18 Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of (G/AG/N/VEN/29)	58
2.2.19 Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of (G/AG/N/VEN/29, G/AG/N/VEN/30)	58
2.2.20 Viet Nam (G/AG/N/VNM/9, G/AG/N/VNM/10, G/AG/N/VNM/11, G/AG/N/VNM/12)	58
2.3 Special agricultural safeguards (Tables MA:3 to MA:5)	59
2.3.1 Japan (G/AG/N/JPN/251)	59
2.3.2 Chinese Taipei (G/AG/N/TPKM/182)	59
2.3.3 Chinese Taipei (G/AG/N/TPKM/183)	59
2.3.4 Chinese Taipei (G/AG/N/TPKM/185, G/AG/N/TPKM/187)	59
2.3.5 United States of America (G/AG/N/USA/130)	60
2.4 Domestic support commitments (Table DS:1)	60
2.4.1 Argentina (G/AG/N/ARG/44, G/AG/N/ARG/45)	60
2.4.2 Australia (G/AG/N/AUS/129)	61
2.4.3 Bolivia, Plurinational State of (G/AG/N/BOL/14 - G/AG/N/BOL/26)	61
2.4.4 Brazil (G/AG/N/BRA/58)	62
2.4.5 Burkina Faso (G/AG/N/BFA/18, G/AG/N/BFA/19)	63
2.4.6 Cambodia (G/AG/N/KHM/14)	64
2.4.7 Cameroon (G/AG/N/CMR/11)	64
2.4.8 Canada (G/AG/N/CAN/131)	64
2.4.9 Colombia (G/AG/N/COL/69)	66
2.4.10 European Union (G/AG/N/EU/61)	66
2.4.11 European Union (G/AG/N/EU/61, G/AG/N/EU/55)	68
2.4.12 Georgia (G/AG/N/GEO/18)	69
2.4.13 Georgia (G/AG/N/GEO/19)	69
2.4.14 Guatemala (G/AG/N/GTM/64)	69
2.4.15 India (G/AG/N/IND/18)	70
2.4.16 Indonesia (G/AG/N/IDN/67)	77
2.4.17 Israel (G/AG/N/ISR/74)	78
2.4.18 Korea, Republic of (G/AG/N/KOR/60/CORR.1 - G/AG/N/KOR/63/CORR.1)	79
2.4.19 Korea, Republic of (G/AG/N/KOR/61, G/AG/N/KOR/62, G/AG/N/KOR/63)	79
2.4.20 Nigeria (G/AG/N/NGA/17)	79
2.4.21 Norway (G/AG/N/NOR/108, G/AG/N/NOR/108/Corr.1 and G/AG/N/NOR/108/Corr.2)	80

2.4.22	Panama (G/AG/N/PAN/54)	80
2.4.23	Philippines (G/AG/N/PHL/67, G/AG/N/PHL/68, G/AG/N/PHL/69).....	81
2.4.24	Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of (G/AG/N/SAU/18)	81
2.4.25	Singapore (G/AG/N/SGP/34)	81
2.4.26	Chinese Taipei (G/AG/N/TPKM/181)	82
2.4.27	Tunisia (G/AG/N/TUN/58)	82
2.4.28	Turkey (G/AG/N/TUR/36 - G/AG/N/TUR/39)	83
2.4.29	United Arab Emirates (G/AG/N/ARE/16, G/AG/N/ARE/17)	87
2.4.30	Vanuatu (G/AG/N/VUT/9, G/AG/N/VUT/10)	87
2.5	New or modified domestic support measures (Table DS:2)	88
2.5.1	India (G/AG/N/IND/19)	88
2.5.2	United Kingdom (G/AG/N/GBR/1)	88
2.6	Export subsidy notifications (Tables ES:1, ES:2 and ES:3)	89
2.6.1	Argentina (G/AG/N/ARG/40, G/AG/N/ARG/41, G/AG/N/ARG/42).....	89
2.6.2	Brazil (G/AG/N/BRA/54)	89
2.6.3	Canada (G/AG/N/CAN/135).....	90
2.6.4	Morocco (G/AG/N/MAR/46, G/AG/N/MAR/46/Corr.1, G/AG/N/MAR/44, G/AG/N/MAR/44/Corr.1, G/AG/N/MAR/47)	90
2.6.5	Turkey (G/AG/N/TUR/40, G/AG/N/TUR/41, G/AG/N/TUR/42, G/AG/N/TUR/43)	90
2.7	EXPORT PROHIBITIONS AND RESTRICTIONS (TABLE ER:1)	91
2.7.1	Myanmar (G/AG/N/MYN/21).....	91
2.8	NOTIFICATIONS IN THE CONTEXT OF THE NFIDC DECISION (TABLE NF:1)	91
2.8.1	Korea, Republic of (G/AG/N/KOR/74, G/AG/N/KOR/75)	91
3	DEFERRED REPLIES TO QUESTIONS ON NOTIFICATIONS.....	91
3.1	Domestic Support commitments (Table DS:1).....	91
3.1.1	Bahrain, Kingdom of (G/AG/N/BHR/7, G/AG/N/BHR/10, G/AG/N/BHR/11, G/AG/N/BHR/14)	91
3.1.2	Singapore (G/AG/N/SGP/32)	92
3.1.3	Tunisia (G/AG/N/TUN/58)	93
3.2	EXPORT PROHIBITIONS AND RESTRICTIONS (TABLE ER:1)	94
3.2.1	Kyrgyz Republic (G/AG/N/KGZ/8)	94
4	OVERDUE NOTIFICATIONS.....	94
4.1.1	China	94
4.1.2	Egypt	95
4.1.3	European Union	95
4.1.4	India	95
4.1.5	Kenya	96
4.1.6	Korea, Republic of.....	96
4.1.7	Morocco.....	96
4.1.8	South Africa	96
4.1.9	United States of America	96

5 OTHER.....	97
5.1.1 China	97
5.1.2 Japan	97
5.1.3 Myanmar	97
5.1.4 Russian Federation.....	98
5.1.5 Thailand	98
5.1.6 Viet Nam	98

1 MATTERS RELEVANT TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMITMENTS: ARTICLE 18.6

1.1 Brazil – Public Stockholding programmes

1.1.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 93182)

During the special COVID-19 meeting on 18 June, in one of its interventions Brazil indicated that it has used Public Stockholding programmes in relation to COVID-19.

- a. Can Brazil explain in detail the operation of such programmes, notably the products concerned and the amount of expenditure.
- b. Would Brazil consider including such programmes in an ad hoc report on its COVID-19 measures?

1.2 Brazil's subsidized loans

1.2.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID 93044)

As per the FAO, Brazil's Agriculture Ministry plans to increase funds available to finance the farm sector through subsidized loans in 2018-19 noting that a decline in inflation has allowed the Government to boost funding in a country that already is the world's largest exporter of staples like soybeans and coffee. [Source: <http://www.fao.org/in-action/agronoticias/detail/en/c/1116679/>]

In this regard, response to the following is requested:

- a. Whether this information has been notified in Brazil's domestic support notification for year 2018 which has been recently submitted with the WTO?
- b. If not, how much has been spent under this initiative till now? India requests Brazil to elucidate the provision under the Agreement on Agriculture under which the programme is intended to be notified?
- c. What are the eligibility criteria for availing such loans?

1.3 China – China-US Economic and Trade Agreement

1.3.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 93049)

Australia welcomes Phase One of the Economic and Trade Agreement Between the United States of America and the People's Republic of China. This is a positive step forward in resolving existing trade tensions and will provide a greater level of certainty to help lift global economic confidence during what is a challenging time.

With respect to the commitments made by China under the Agreement in relation to agriculture, we welcome China's assurances that it will implement the measures in a fully WTO-consistent and non-discriminatory manner. We appreciate this with respect to the provisions that concern this Committee, but also with respect to the provisions concerning other agriculture-related aspects of the WTO Agreement, for example on the SPS commitments in the US-China Agreement.

We would welcome if China can provide further advice on how it plans to do this, for example:

- a. Is China planning on changes to applied MFN tariffs to facilitate the purchase and import of at least USD 80 billion in agricultural goods over the next two years?
- b. Does China intend on reallocating unused or returned wheat, rice and corn TRQ amounts pursuant to a particular mechanism?
 - i. For example, the mechanism established under Annex A of the Bali Ministerial Decision on tariff-rate quota (TRQ) Administration.

- c. We would further welcome China advise the Membership on how it plans to implement the obligations of Chapter 6, Article 6.2: Trade Opportunities, paragraph 5, whereby "...purchases will be made at market prices based on commercial considerations...".

1.3.2 Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID 93050)

The recently signed Economic and Trade Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the People's Republic of China includes a requirement in paragraph 1 (b) of Chapter 6, Trade in Food and Agricultural Products for the minimum purchase of agricultural goods by the People's Republic of China. Chapter 6, Trade in Food and Agricultural Products—paragraph 1 b. "For the category of agricultural goods identified in Annex 6.1, no less than \$12.5 billion above the corresponding 2017 baseline amount is purchased and imported into China from the United States in calendar year 2020, and no less than \$19.5 billion above the corresponding 2017 baseline amount is purchased and imported into China from the United States in calendar year 2021."

- a. Could China provide the value of 2017 imports from the United States for the following commodities:
 - i. beef;
 - ii. pork;
 - iii. wheat;
 - iv. canola;
 - v. soybeans.
- b. Could China elaborate if there is a commitment to purchase specific volumes of particular agricultural products?
- c. Could China please elaborate if private companies, state-owned enterprises or state trading enterprises will be given direction to purchase specific volumes of a given commodity in order to meet these value targets?
- d. What role will the Government of the People's Republic of China play in potentially "matching" US exporters of agricultural products identified in Annex 6.1 with importers in China?
- e. Paragraph 5 "The Parties acknowledge that purchases will be made at market prices based on commercial considerations and that market conditions, particularly in the case of agricultural goods, may dictate the timing of purchases within any given year." Could China elaborate how "commercial considerations" will be taken into account when there is a defined value commitment for the purchase of agricultural goods from the United States?
- f. Could China elaborate as to how it ensures that these new purchase requirements will not displace existing commercial relationships?

1.4 United States of America - China-US Economic and Trade Agreement

1.4.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 93078)

Australia welcomes Phase One of the Economic and Trade Agreement Between the United States of America and the People's Republic of China. This is a positive step forward in resolving existing trade tensions and will provide a greater level of certainty to help lift global economic confidence during what is a challenging time.

With respect to Chapter 6, Article 6.2, Section 1 (b), whereby China ensures that: "For the category of agricultural goods identified in Annex 6.1, no less than \$12.5 billion above the corresponding 2017 baseline amount is purchased and imported into China from the United States in calendar year 2020, and no less than \$19.5 billion above the corresponding 2017 baseline amount is purchased and imported into China from the United States in calendar year 2021".

Can the US please respond to the following questions with respect to these commitments:

- a. Can the US please provide the 2017 baseline amount for each agricultural good used to measure China's compliance with this commitment?
- b. Can the US provide further disaggregated information on the amounts China is expected to purchase for each agricultural good under Annex 6.1?
- c. Can the US explain how the implementation of this Agreement will support market-orientation in both the US and Chinese markets, and in the global trading system more broadly? and
- d. Can the US reassure the WTO Membership that the Agreement will not unduly impact other Members or markets?

1.4.2 Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID 93080)

The recently signed Economic and Trade Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the People's Republic of China includes a requirement in paragraph 1 (b) of Chapter 6, Trade in Food and Agricultural Products for the minimum purchase of agricultural goods by the People's Republic of China. Chapter 6, Trade in Food and Agricultural Products Paragraph 1 b. "For the category of agricultural goods identified in Annex 6.1, no less than \$12.5 billion above the corresponding 2017 baseline amount is purchased and imported into China from the United States in calendar year 2020, and no less than \$19.5 billion above the corresponding 2017 baseline amount is purchased and imported into China from the United States in calendar year 2021."

- a. There are reports that the "2017 baseline amount" is USD 24 billion. Could the United States share its analysis on the market conditions that would support increasing its agricultural exports by 52% to USD 36.5 billion over a three-year period?
- b. Could the United States provide the value of 2017 exports to China for the following commodities:
 - i. beef;
 - ii. pork;
 - iii. wheat;
 - iv. canola;
 - v. soybeans.
- c. There have been reports that this Agreement includes a commitment by China to purchase specific volumes of particular agricultural products. Could the United States share the specific quantities by value or volume for the following products:
 - i. beef;
 - ii. pork;
 - iii. wheat;
 - iv. canola;
 - v. soybeans.
- d. What role will the United States play in potentially "matching" US exporters of agricultural products identified in Annex 6.1 with importers in China?
- e. Paragraph 5: "The Parties acknowledge that purchases will be made at market prices based on commercial considerations and that market conditions, particularly in the case of agricultural goods, may dictate the timing of purchases within any given year." Could the United States elaborate how "commercial considerations" will be taken into account when there is a defined value commitment for the purchase of US agricultural goods?
- f. Could the United States elaborate as to how it ensures that these new purchase requirements will not displace existing commercial relationships?

1.4.3 Question by Ukraine (AG-IMS ID 93082)

As widely reported, the United States and China recently signed a "phase one" trade accord. Noteworthy in this bilateral arrangement, among other things, are commitments to reduce or withdraw punitive tariffs as well as obligations to purchase set monetary amounts of goods. China agrees to import an additional \$200 billion worth of U.S. goods and services during the next two years, including agricultural products. Ukraine strongly supports the WTO as a rules-based institution. A key characteristic of the WTO's rules-based system is to enable fair trade opportunities for all Members to compete in an open and transparent system. A core WTO discipline is the most-favoured nation principle. Provisions of Article XXIV GATT also provide Members additional bilateral trade opportunities. A review of the WTO's Regional Trade Agreements database indicates that no such arrangement exists between China and the United States.

- a. Could the US provide information on which agricultural products are covered by the phase one accord and amount of targeted purchases for these products?
- b. Could the US also kindly elaborate on how the US views the very concrete and preferential phase one purchase obligations fit within the WTO's rules-based system?

1.5 China's agricultural insurance

1.5.1 Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID 93051)

In October 2019, the Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs, China Banking and Insurance Regulatory Commission and State Administration of Forestry and Grassland released a document called "Guiding options on accelerating the quality of development of agricultural insurance". Canada understands that the document aims to promote and standardize the development of agricultural insurance.

- a. Could China provide an update on the development of agricultural insurance products?
- b. Would agricultural insurance cover livestock and crops?
- c. Will the cost of premiums be shared between Government(s) and producers? If so, what will be the respective contributions?
- d. Will the agricultural insurance products be actuarially sound i.e., will the premiums cover the cost of indemnities?

1.6 China - Exemptions to retaliatory tariffs

1.6.1 Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID 93052)

On 18 February 2020, China announced that it will allow importers to apply for exemptions to the retaliatory tariffs imposed against the United States on 697 product lines including farm products such as soybeans, pork and beef. The exemption will have to undergo an approval process and would only be effective for one year. Importers could apply for the tariff exemptions starting 2 March 2020.

- a. Could China indicate if there is a limit on the number of entities that are eligible for this exemption and if so how many?
- b. Could China confirm if both State-Owned Enterprises and private companies can apply for these tariff exemptions?
- c. Could China provide an estimate as to the value of this exemption?

1.7 China's stimulus package for corn

1.7.1 Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID 93224)

It has come to Brazil's attention, that, on 15 April 2020, China has launched a stimulus package to overturn a recent reduction trend on corn-planted area.

Nonetheless, on December 2018, China has submitted notification G/AG/N/CHN/49 (Table DS:2) regarding its "Corn Producer Subsidy System", under Article 6, paragraph 5 (a) of the Agreement on Agriculture.

In the light of the above, could China provide the following information on:

- a. The termination of the "Corn Producer Subsidy System" on 2018, as per G/AG/N/CHN/49, and on its substitution by another corn-specific policy.
- b. The evolution of corn planted area and on the value of corn production since 2014 (the base year for the "Corn Producer Subsidy System").
- c. The legislation that established the stimulus package launched last April (if possible, could China provide a copy of said legislation?).
- d. The stimulus package budget and if it relies on price-support, direct payments or other forms of subsidies.

1.8 Colombia's coffee price stabilization fund

1.8.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93006)

The United States notes a new programme, the Coffee Price Stabilization Fund signed into law in July 2019, which provides subsidies to coffee growers when the price of coffee falls below production costs.

Can Colombia please provide:

- a. The measure and any other relevant implementing regulations; and
- b. A description of how the measure operates including:
 - i. eligibility criteria;
 - ii. how support prices and production costs are determined;
 - iii. whether there are limits on the quantity of product receiving the subsidy;
 - iv. whether there are mechanisms in place to reduce production costs; and
 - v. any other information on how the programme operates.

1.9 Colombia's sugar fund

1.9.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 93183)

Colombia – Sugar Fund

Colombia has established a sugar fund, which grants support for sugar exported from Colombia. For the three latest marketing years, 2017, 2018 and 2019, can Colombia indicate:

- a. Total production of sugar;
- b. Total quantity exported, and how much benefited from subsidies from the sugar fund;
- c. Total payments made from the sugar fund for the export of sugar;

- d. The average amount per tonne of sugar paid into the fund from sugar sold on the Colombian market.

1.10 Egypt's import license regime

1.10.1 Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID 93054)

- a. Is the import of agriculture goods, such as poultry meat, live animals and corned-beef, subject to an import license regime?
- b. If positive, could Egypt provide details on the administration of this import license regime (criteria for granting the license; economic agents who can request; existence of import limits, among others)?
- c. Are decisions on the granting of licenses made available to the public?

1.11 Egypt's ban on sugar imports

1.11.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 93185)

On June 4 Egypt announced a ban on all imports of sugar. Can Egypt explain how it sees this measure respecting the requirements of the GATT Article XI :2(c).

1.12 EU "From farm to fork" ("F2F") strategy

1.12.1 Question by Colombia (AG-IMS ID 93127)

On 17 February 2020, the European Commission published a communication concerning its "Farm to Fork" ("F2F") strategy. In that document, it stated the following: "The strategy will set out relevant ambitions and actions to stimulate sustainable food production and to create new business models for food producers to thrive in a sustainable food system. The strategy will include measures to significantly reduce the use and risk of chemical pesticides, as well as the use of fertilizers and antibiotics. These actions will go hand in hand with actions seeking an improvement of animal welfare. The Common Agricultural Policy and the Common Fisheries Policy will be instrumental in implementing the Farm to Fork Strategy. The Common Agriculture Policy funded National Strategic Plans will have to reflect the ambition of the Green Deal."

- a. How will food security and the effective control of pests and diseases be guaranteed worldwide if the EU proceeds to substantially reduce the use of pesticides in third countries? Are there any alternative methods authorized in the EU that are affordable for farmers?
- b. How does the EU plan to reduce the use of pesticides? By eliminating a number of authorized substances? If so, how does the EU reconcile this objective with the fact that good agricultural practices recommend the rotation and combining of agrochemicals, precisely to ensure soil sustainability? How does the EU expect to encourage this type of crop practice if it is constantly eliminating substances that form part of the farmer's "toolbox"?
- c. How can the EU guarantee that active substances already freely circulating in the market (generic products) will remain in the system, if leading producers do not have the economic incentive to conduct and submit the scientific studies requested by the EU to ensure the safety of the active substances? This is particularly relevant in the EU, where the precautionary principle is applied when there is a lack of information due to the absence of studies. We ask the same question in relation to minor crops.

1.13 The EU's deforestation and forest degradation strategy

1.13.1 Question by Colombia (AG-IMS ID 93128)

On 5 February 2020, the European Commission announced an impact assessment for the strategy "Deforestation and forest degradation – reducing the impact of products placed on the EU market".

In the document concerned, the EU stated the following: "There are many drivers of deforestation, but the expansion of agriculture is the most important one. Some studies estimate that 80% of global deforestation is driven by agricultural expansion, a phenomenon which has roots in the global demand for products such as palm oil, soya and beef."

- a. The community authorities recognize that there are many reasons for deforestation and that these reasons are based on very different realities depending on the country in which the phenomenon takes place. In Colombia, 75% of deforestation is linked to unlawful activities or practices (illicit crops, illegal mining activities, land grabbing). Will the EU take into account these situations in order to avoid unfairly punishing countries like Colombia that face specific situations? In other words, how does the EU plan to ensure that "the innocent do not pay for the sins of the guilty" and that each country receives appropriate technical assistance and support? "There is a market and regulatory failure reflected in the lack of level playing field between companies that act responsibly towards deforestation and those who do not; and information asymmetries, derived from the lack of common standards and reliable information in the hands of consumers. The EU already has in place measures related to fighting deforestation, such as the Forest Law Enforcement Governance and Trade (FLEGT) Action Plan to tackle illegal logging and the Renewable Energy Directive which includes EU sustainability criteria for biofuels and bioliquids. However, while the EU FLEGT Action Plan tackles illegal logging, it does not address deforestation caused by agricultural expansion. The recast Renewable Energy Directive for the period post 2020 extends the obligation to fulfil the EU sustainability criteria from biofuels to all bioenergy end uses (including heating/cooling and electricity), but it only covers raw material used for bioenergy production." (a) The RED II and the Delegated Act on biofuels completely exclude, for the fulfilment of the renewable energy target, biofuels that are produced using sustainable palm oil, as this raw material is considered to pose a high risk of indirect land use change (ILUC). How does the EU plan to encourage the production of sustainable palm oil, if it does not allow member States to consider this product to be renewable energy?
- b. The additional costs that new measures could generate for European entrepreneurs and consumers are clear. However, no reference is made to the cost of traceability and transparency for farmers, since it is mistakenly assumed that this cost will be transmitted to other actors in the chain. How does the EU plan to ensure that these additional requirements to test the sustainability of agricultural products will not be assumed by the weakest actors in the chain, namely third country farmers? Are there any plans to take into account the special situation of farmers in post conflict zones or in areas marked by the production of illicit crops who are trying to move ahead with new activities?

1.14 EU- Border adjustment mechanism for carbon emissions

1.14.1 Question by Colombia (AG-IMS ID 93143)

"Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism": in a communication published on 4 March 2020, the EU stated that in addition to general public consultation, dialogue with third countries would take place through the WTO and other channels.

- a. Could the EU please elaborate on the way in which it will conduct consultations with third countries, whether it plans to submit notifications to the multilateral bodies on time, and how it will ensure that our comments are properly taken into account?

1.15 EU's environmental policies

1.15.1 Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID 93057)

New Zealand welcomes the EU's focus on reducing the environmental impact and climate effects of its agricultural production in the next CAP. New Zealand also notes that a key feature of the current CAP reform is the introduction of national strategic plans.

- a. How does the EU propose to ensure that the devolution of CAP responsibilities to member States does not result in an increase of trade distorting AMS and Blue Box Support, particularly in light of their environmental impacts of these forms of support?
- b. What are the reasons for delay in the notification?

1.15.2 Question by Paraguay (AG-IMS ID 93059)

European Union – Green Deal:

On 11 December 2019, the European Union made an announcement on the European Green Deal. The Green Deal is an ambitious programme which, according to the European Union, aims to transform the EU into a fully sustainable economy, creating a change in the EU's social and economic model, while providing the economic resources required for a fair transition, and which will turn the EU into a carbon-free economy by 2050.

As a consequence of the Green Deal and to prevent potential "carbon leakage", the EU is reportedly considering a "carbon border adjustment mechanism", which is viewed by many as a future *de facto* import tax. In view of this situation, could the EU:

- a. Confirm its plan to introduce this "adjustment mechanism";
- b. Explain how the mechanism would be consistent with the EU's WTO commitments and obligations, including national treatment;
- c. State whether there are plans to provide "carbon credit" for products from countries whose carbon footprint is lower than that of EU countries;
- d. Provide further information on the EU strategies which will be developed as part of the Green Deal, and which will have implications for the EU's agricultural production; and
- e. Provide further information on the implications of the "Just Transition Fund" for European agriculture, specifically with regard to the subsidies to be granted, the types of programmes and the amounts awarded.

1.15.3 Question by Paraguay (AG-IMS ID 93238)

EU: Carbon adjustment tax

The Republic of Paraguay is submitting this question as a follow-up to the EU's reply to question AG-IMS ID 93059. We thank the EU for referring us to the replies provided concerning this matter within the framework of its trade policy review process. These replies do not, however, cover all our questions and we therefore request the EU to provide replies to the following questions:

- a. Which selected sectors may be subject to a carbon tax? More specifically, do they include the agricultural sector?
- b. Is the EU planning to establish "carbon credit" for products from Members with lower carbon emissions than the EU?
- c. How will the "Just Transition Fund" work for European agriculture, in particular with regard to (1) subsidies granted, (2) types of programmes and (3) amounts disbursed?

1.15.4 Question by Colombia (AG-IMS ID 93300) and Paraguay (AG-IMS ID 93301)

- a. On 11 December 2019, the European Union (EU) launched the European Green Deal.³ Colombia and Paraguay note that, in order to meet the objectives of the Deal, the EU has adopted a number of strategies – including the Biodiversity and Farm to Fork Strategies –

³ See: https://ec.europa.eu/info/strategy/priorities-2019-2024/european-green-deal_en.

that provide for, *inter alia*, the granting of direct payments to agricultural producers who deliver on the green ambition.⁴

Colombia and Paraguay also note that these direct payments will be granted within the framework of a new Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) 2021-2027 based on conditionality, i.e. compliance with climate/environment-related requirements in order to receive direct payments.⁵ Furthermore, provision is made for the adoption of "eco-schemes" that seek to recompense farmers who voluntarily implement certain agricultural practices.⁶

In regard to this matter:

- i. In what amounts would these direct payments be granted?
 - ii. What are the requirements for accessing these direct payments?
 - iii. How many agricultural producers will benefit from these direct payments?
 - iv. When would these direct payments enter into effect?
 - v. According to the Farm to Fork Strategy, in 2017, CAP subsidies, with the exception of investment support, represented 57% of net farm income in the EU.⁷ With the introduction of these additional direct payments, by how much will the subsidized percentage of net farm income in the EU increase?
 - vi. Does the EU consider the subsidization of around two thirds of net farm income in the EU to reflect "sustainable" agriculture?
 - vii. How do these direct payments differ from the "greening payments"⁸ already provided by the EU under Regulation (EU) No. 1307/2013, Delegated Regulation (EU) No. 639/2014, and Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 641/2014? Will they apply alternatively or cumulatively?
- b. Please confirm that these direct payments would fall into the amber box within the meaning of Articles 3, 6 and 7 of the Agreement on Agriculture.

1.16 EU's production subsidies resulted from implementation of SPS measures

1.16.1 Question by Paraguay (AG-IMS ID 93060)

European Union – Production subsidies for the implementation of EU SPS measures for the elimination of the use of certain plant protection products:

Following the announcement on the prohibition of the use of several plant protection products in the European Union as a consequence of the implementation of SPS measures, European producers from various EU member States, such as France, Germany, Ireland and the Netherlands, have protested against the measures in view of the repercussions that they would have for agricultural production.

⁴ A Farm to Fork Strategy for a fair, healthy and environmentally-friendly food system, pages 8, 11. See also: COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT, THE COUNCIL, THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMITTEE AND THE COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS, EU Biodiversity Strategy for 2030, Bringing nature back into our lives, page 7.

⁵ A Farm to Fork Strategy for a fair, healthy and environmentally-friendly food system, pages 8, 11. See also: COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT, THE COUNCIL, THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMITTEE AND THE COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS, EU Biodiversity Strategy for 2030, Bringing nature back into our lives, page 7, and https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/food-farming-fisheries/key_policies/documents/cap-post-2020-environ-benefits-simplification_en.pdf, page 5.

⁶ A Farm to Fork Strategy for a fair, healthy and environmentally-friendly food system, pages 10-11. See also: https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/food-farming-fisheries/key_policies/documents/cap-post-2020-environ-benefits-simplification_en.pdf.

⁷ A Farm to Fork Strategy for a fair, healthy and environmentally-friendly food system, footnote 23.

⁸ See: https://ec.europa.eu/info/food-farming-fisheries/key-policies/common-agricultural-policy/income-support/greening_en.

In response to these protests, several European politicians have announced the introduction of new subsidies to assist farmers. A recently introduced subsidy to compensate farmers for the loss of plant protection products was announced on 16 January in Luxembourg. In order to better understand the purpose and scope of these subsidies, and their compliance with the Agreement on Agriculture, Paraguay requests the European Union to provide information on:

- a. the number of EU members that have already officially announced the establishment of this type of programme;
- b. The quantity, scope of application and amounts planned for these new subsidy programmes for producers;
- c. The configuration of these new programmes within the framework of the new Common Agricultural Policy (CAP); and
- d. The expectations for the official notification of these programmes: date of notification and box in which they will be notified.

1.16.2 Question by Paraguay (AG-IMS ID 93239)

The Republic of Paraguay is submitting this question following the EU's reply to question AG-IMS ID 93060.

We thank the EU for its partial reply to our question. According to press reports published in January, 592 of the 1,005 agricultural producers in Luxembourg have voluntarily signed up to receive subsidies to stop using glyphosate. We note that, in accordance with the individual notification (DS:2 G/AG/N/EU/35), in the reply given to our original question, payments for rural development include agri-environment payments and that the exact content of these measures is decided by member States and regions.

It is also our understanding, from this notification, that the EU considers all these measures to come under the Green Box and that it views them as consistent with paragraph 12 of Annex 12 of the Agreement on Agriculture. In the case of Luxembourg and the rural development programme, priority 4, we note that according to the website indicated by the EU in its reply, the most recent version of this programme involves costs totalling EUR 110.121.138. Unfortunately, we have been unable to find document 20/01/2020 C(2020) 361 final on the EU website and would be grateful if the EU could provide us with a copy of the document or a hyperlink that would enable us to access it. In this light, we request the EU to:

- a. indicate the total amount to be received by producers as a subsidy for no longer using this plant protection product, disaggregated by producer and product affected; and
- b. we reiterate our question as to whether any other EU member has introduced or is planning to introduce similar subsidies to help its farmers, as, according to press reports, this type of assistance has been promised to European farmers in other countries, following protests by European producers in late 2019 and early 2020.

1.17 Italy's support to wine producers

1.17.1 Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID 93225)

On 19 May, Italy has announced, within the framework of its "Decreto Rilancio" that the amount of 100 million euros has been set aside for the year 2020, to be allocated to wine-growing enterprises that commit themselves to the voluntary reduction of the production of grapes destined for wines with denomination of origin and geographical indication through the practice of the partial green harvest to be carried out in the current campaign.

Since the reduction in the production of grapes destined for winemaking cannot be less than 15% compared to the average value of the quantities produced in the last five years, it could be understood that the program was crafted to be compatible with Article 6.5 of the AoA. Nonetheless, the UE has not submitted a DS:2 notification so far.

Could the EU inform if it plans to notify Italy's domestic support program for the wine sector as a blue box programme?

1.18 France - Bpifrance Assurance Export

1.18.1 Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID 93226)

The French Government has announced that for SMEs and mid-tier companies, and for the entire duration of the COVID-19 pandemic, Bpifrance Assurance Export can now cover its insurees (credit institutions) for up to 90% of issued and declared guarantee commitments (export guarantee insurance) or pre-financing that has been set up (pre-financing guarantee) compared to 80% previously. For other businesses, insurees may be covered for up to 70% as against 50% in the past.

Since Bpifrance Assurance Export was mentioned on France's last answer to the Export Competition questionnaire (G/AG/W/125/Rev.11/Add.2), could France/the EU clarify if:

- a. These new conditions apply to agricultural products exports;
- b. The program is still self-financing and covers its long-term operating costs and losses.

1.19 European Union's sugar policies

1.19.1 Question by China (AG-IMS ID 93231)

In its reform of the sugar sector since 2006, a temporary scheme was established to restructure the sugar industry. In 2015, a voluntary coupled support for sugar beet was further introduced. Paragraph 11. (d) of the Annex 2 of the AoA requires that structural adjustment assistance "shall be given only for the period of time necessary for the realization of the investment in respect of which they are provided". According to the notification of the EU (G/AG/N/EEC/65), the Separate Sugar Payment and Restructuring scheme would last four years and terminated in 2010. However, both measures have been implemented longer than the planned timeframe, with the Restructuring scheme still effective in EU's latest notification (G/AG/N/EU/61).

- a. Could the EU explain the rationale for extending the two schemes?
- b. What's the impact of the voluntary coupled support on the income of beet growers, comparing with the former minimum support price? It would be highly appreciated if the EU could provide further information on this important reform.

1.20 Japan - Supplementary budget to address impact of new trade deal

1.20.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 93069)

Australia understands the Japanese Government plans on securing around 355 billion yen in the FY2019 Supplementary Budget for measures to support and protect its agricultural sector from the impact of the Japan-United States Trade Agreement signed in October 2019.

- a. Can Japan provide detailed information on the types of support measures it is planning to implement through this additional budgetary expenditure? Including, if these will be new measures, or expansion of existing measures?
- b. How will Japan ensure that these measures do not negatively impact third countries' exports to Japan, either directly or indirectly?

1.21 Japan's beef special safeguard (SSG) and pork safeguard (SG)

1.21.1 Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID 93070)

On 20 December 2019, the Government of Japan announced that as of 1 April 2020, it will no longer apply its beef special safeguard (SSG) and pork safeguard (SG) to imported products from WTO Members. Japan will retain its WTO pork special safeguard (SSG). It is Canada's understanding that the elimination of these safeguards in April would result in Japan's non-economic partnership agreement (EPA) trading partners being able to export beef and pork products to Japan with fewer volume-based safeguards whereas Japan's EPA's partners, including Canada, continue to be subject to volume based safeguards under their respective trade agreements for a number of years before they are eliminated.

Could Japan explain why non-EPA members are being treated more favourably than its EPA partners including Canada, with the elimination of the WTO beef (SSG) and pork safeguard (SG) before the beef and pork safeguards in some of Japan's EPAs?

1.22 Japan- Japan-US Trade Agreement

1.22.1 Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID 93071)

On 7 October 2019, Japan and the United States signed the United States — Japan Trade Agreement. At the time, reports indicated that there would be further negotiations to achieve a comprehensive agreement to address outstanding tariff and non-tariff issues.

- a. What are the timelines for the second round of negotiations between Japan and the United States?
- b. Would the scope of this second round include additional commitments on agriculture such as purchase commitments?

1.23 United States of America - Japan-US Trade Agreement

1.23.1 Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID 93081)

On 7 October 2019, the Japan and the United States signed the United States - Japan Trade Agreement. At the time, reports indicated that there would be further negotiations to achieve a comprehensive agreement to address outstanding tariff and non-tariff issues.

- a. What are the timelines for the second round of negotiations between Japan and the United States?
- b. Would the scope of this second round include additional commitments on agriculture such as purchase commitments?

1.24 Nigeria – Foreign currency exchange restrictions for dairy imports

1.24.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 93016)

This restriction was published on 11 February. Its effect is a clear restriction on the import of dairy products into Nigeria.

How does Nigeria explain that this measure is not restricting imports and that it respects the following commitments:

- Article 4.2 of the Agreement on Agriculture (Market Access);
- Article III:4 GATT (National Treatment);
- Article X GATT (Publication and Administration of Trade Regulations); and
- Article XI GATT (General Elimination of Quantitative Restrictions).

1.24.2 Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID 93073)

Nigeria recently restricted access to foreign currency for the importation of dairy products. Nigeria has provided exemptions to a select few dairy companies on the condition, New Zealand understands, that they "backward integrate"; i.e. set up production or engage in dairy development activities locally.

Can Nigeria please explain how this measure is consistent with its WTO obligations?

1.25 Russian Federation - Subsidies to "certification of agricultural products in foreign markets"

1.25.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 93186)

The new Decree of the Government of the Russian Federation of 25 December 2019 N° 1816 (as amended on 13 May 2020) "On state support of organizations in order to compensate for part of the costs associated with the certification of agricultural products in foreign markets" appears to be an export subsidy, falling under Article 9.1(d) of the Agreement on Agriculture.

The "certification of agricultural products in foreign markets" seems to cover the following: assessment of conformity of agri-food products with requirements of foreign markets, veterinary and phytosanitary measures, transportation, storage, testing and disposal of test samples, assessment of conformity of products with the requirements, contained in the foreign trade contract for the supply of agricultural products to foreign markets (hereinafter - the contract), including during voluntary certification for obtaining Halal and Kosher certificates. The provision of certificate of costs incurred to meet the requirements of external markets appears necessary to obtain the aid.

- a. Can the Russian Federation explain how it ensures that this new subsidy does not compensate for costs incurred as part of and during the process of selling a product to foreign markets and is not an illegal export subsidy?
- b. Can the Russian Federation explain how the decree in question complies with the requirements of Articles 8 - 10 of the Agreement on Agriculture?

1.26 Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of - New system for issuing import licenses

1.26.1 Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID 93074)

On 27 January 2020, the Saudi Government adopted a new system for issuing import licenses, without prior consultations with interested parties or granting an adaptation period on the new measure. The new system requires local importers to file with the Saudi Government, six months in advance, "import plans". These plans must include detailed information about the exporter. The measure puts at risk not only trade flows, given that most agricultural goods are traded on a monthly basis, according to supply and demand conditions, but also business confidentiality terms, since the new measure would make it necessary to disclose to the importer sensitive information, such as production capacity. Furthermore, although it creates a series of new requirements, the criteria for approving import plans seem to lack transparency.

- a. Could the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia provide an English version of the "Amendment of Import Licensing Procedures and Guide" notified through document (G/LIC/N/2/SAU/2)?
- b. Could the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia explain how the new procedure complies with:
 - i. Article 4 of the Agreement on Agriculture (determining that access to Members' markets can only be regulated through customs duties, rendering prohibited, among others, the establishment of quantitative restrictions and discretionary import licensing regimes);
 - ii. Article XI, 2 of the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (establishing exceptions to the general obligation to eliminate quantitative restrictions on imports and to regulate market access only through customs duties, even if operated through quotas or licenses);

- iii. Article 1, 2 and 3 of the Agreement on Import Licensing Procedures (Members should ensure that administrative procedures used to implement import licensing regimes do not distort trade and that the rules applicable to the import licensing procedure will be neutral and that the procedures will be fair and equitable).

1.27 Sri Lanka - Suspension of importation of processed agricultural products

1.27.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93258)

From 16 April to 15 July 2020, Sri Lanka suspended the importation of a large number of processed agricultural products, with the aim to prevent a rapid depreciation of the Sri Lankan Rupee. Some of the products include bread, pasta, non-alcoholic beverages, alcoholic beverages, oils, rice, and confectionary products. However, in the same regulation, the Government of Sri Lanka announced that it will facilitate importation of other agricultural products, including dairy products, dried vegetables, wheat, palm oil, sunflower seed, and cane sugar.

- a. How does the Government of Sri Lanka expect to prevent the depreciation of the Sri Lankan Rupee by banning imports of some products while encouraging others?
- b. Why were those specific products banned? How did Sri Lanka determine to ban those specific products?
- c. What steps will Sri Lanka take to ensure this intervention has minimal trade distortions in the international market?

1.28 Chinese Taipei - Rice TRQ tender system

1.28.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 93053)

Australia refers to Chinese Taipei's administration of its simultaneous buy-and-sell (SBS) 'private' tender system under its WTO tariff-rate quota for rice imports.

Australia understands through bilateral consultations that Chinese Taipei implements a floor price under this SBS tender which includes three factors:

- the rice export price;
- fees and charges associated with transportation and port clearance; and
- the price of imported rice in Chinese Taipei.

With respect to the administration of the SBS system, Australia requests Chinese Taipei provide answers to the following questions with respect to the floor price:

- a. Are there any laws, regulations, or other ordinances governing the way in which the floor price is determined?
- b. Which agencies, private enterprises or entities are responsible for setting and administering the floor price?
- c. Which agencies, private enterprises or entities are engaged in commercial transactions under the SBS tender (i.e. who is the buyer in Chinese Taipei)?
- d. What are the policy reasons for including the price of imported rice in the floor price?
- e. What are the fees and charges associated with transportation and port clearance? (please provide a detailed breakdown of each component, including the policy rationale for their inclusion and an explanation of how each reflects the actual costs of services rendered)
- f. Are there any other factors beyond factors 1 to 3 that are included in the floor price?
- g. Is the floor price and its factors the same for all parties bidding in an SBS tender?

- h. Is an equivalent floor price also applied to rice produced in Chinese Taipei?
- i. If so, please provide details about this and how it is calculated.

1.29 Thailand's "licence" charge on eggs

1.29.1 Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID 93075)

Thailand's Department of Livestock Development imposes a 25 Baht (USD 0.80) per chick/hatching egg "licence" charge on day old chicks/hatching eggs shipments transiting through or entering into Thailand. These fees appear highly disproportionate to the actual cost of regulating commercial shipments which can contain upwards of 20,000 birds each and are effectively functioning as an unjustified tariff barrier. This matter was first raised with Thailand nearly two years ago and despite assurances that the charges would be reviewed, no action appears to have occurred.

Can Thailand please provide an update on progress toward the legislative changes required to remove these fees, and the expected dates for revised charges to be implemented?

1.30 Thailand's sugar support

1.30.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 93203)

Australia understands Thailand has approved measures to support its sugar industry, which has been impacted by the disruptions caused by COVID-19. We understand the support package is valued at THB 10 billion (approx. USD 320 million).

- a. Can Thailand provide information on this support package, including details on:
 - the different parts of this support package?;
 - the policy objectives of each part?; and
 - how payments for each part are calculated?

1.30.2 Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID 93227)

According to media reports, Thailand has approved over 10 billion baht (over USD 300 million) in subsidies to sugarcane farmers (<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-thailand-sugar/thailand-approves-300-million-aid-for-drought-stricken-sugarcane-farmers-idUSKBN23G28H>).

Thailand's most recent WTO DS:1 notification of domestic support commitments (G/AG/N/THA/85, 6 October 2017) applicable to calendar years 2014-2016, reported a product-specific sugarcane subsidy of 450 million baht per year. Although Thailand's notification did not report its value of production, the new subsidies appear to exceed the sugarcane product-specific "*de minimis*".

The recently announced program is more than 20 times larger than the last domestic support program notified by Thailand and more than half of Thailand's Total AMS commitment level.

In the light of the above, could Thailand provide the following information:

- a. Copies of the applicable measures granting and administering the subsidies, including Cabinet Resolutions and any other legal or regulatory instruments.
- b. An estimation of when Thailand plans to submit a new WTO domestic support commitment (DS:1) notification.
- c. An estimation of when Thailand plans to notify the new sugar subsidies to the WTO.
- d. Confirmation that the 450 million bath Government subsidy has continued after 2016.
- e. Updated data on the value of its annual sugarcane production for 2017, 2018, and 2019.

- f. Would Thailand explain the eligibility criteria for the aforementioned program, especially regarding the following:
 - i. Is the program exclusive for sugarcane producers or is it generally available for farmers?
 - ii. Is the payment contingent upon the cultivation of sugarcane?
 - iii. Is the program related with the acquisition of inputs and production factors by farmers? If so, how does that affect the payment?
 - iv. Are there any sugarcane producers that are not entitled to apply for the subsidy?
- g. Since drought has been mentioned as a justification for the announced domestic support, is there an obligation for farmers to prove production losses as a condition for payment of the subsidy? If positive, how much as a percentage of expected production must these losses be?

1.31 United Kingdom - Policy update resulted from Brexit

1.31.1 Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID 93077)

Canada understands that the United Kingdom and the European Union have signed a Withdrawal Agreement that establishes a transition period that is set to end 31 December 2020, unless extended. Previously, producers in the United Kingdom have benefited from the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP). In a February 2020 the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs issued a policy update called Farming for the Future: policy and progress update for England. The policy update indicates that England will move away from the EU CAP and established its own agriculture policy framework. (<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-future-for-food-farming-and-the-environment-policy-statement-2020>).

- a. Could the UK indicate when CAP will no longer apply in the England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland?
- b. The February 2020 policy update indicates that England will phase out EU CAP direct payments over seven years from 2021 to 2027. Could the UK indicate if similar phase-out of direct payments will occur in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland?
- c. Could the UK indicate if Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland will provide similar policy updates on their respective agriculture policy frameworks? And if so, what are the timelines?

1.32 U.S. domestic support policies and notifications

1.32.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID 93085)

- a. As per a Congressional Research Service report, (https://www.everycrsreport.com/reports/R45940.html#_Toc21341718, accessed on 2 March 2020), the USDA planned to make MFP payments for year 2019 trade assistance program under a different formulation that avoids identifying payments with a specific crop i.e. shifting product specific support to non-product specific support. India requests the United States to kindly confirm this.
- b. The United States has notified its DS:1 notification up to marketing year 2016. In this regard, India requests the United States the following:
 - i. When is the United States planning to file DS:1 notifications for years post 2016?
 - ii. What are the reasons for delay in the notification?

- c. The United States on 28 February 2020 announced that it intends to make available up to USD 100 million in competitive grants for activities designed to expand the sale and use of renewable fuels through the Higher Blends Infrastructure Incentive Program (available at <https://www.usda.gov/media/press-releases/2020/02/28/secretary-perdue-directs-usda-fleet-increase-biofuels-usage>). The factsheet for the Higher Blends Infrastructure Incentive Program, mentions that "U.S. farmers are producing record amounts of feedstocks for renewable fuels. However, lower commodity prices, paired with this record production, have caused uncertain times for U.S. feedstocks producers". In this light, the US is requested to answer:
 - i. Whether this programme will in any way benefit the farmers producing feedstocks such as corn and soybean for renewable fuels.
 - ii. How is the US intending to notify this programme under domestic support notifications.?

1.33 US – Excise duty exemptions for alcohol on Puerto Rico the US Virgin Islands

1.33.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 93187)

The EU understand that for every litre of pure alcohol exported to the US from the US Virgin Islands or Puerto Rico, the producers receive 50% of the excise taxes on that product, as well as excise tax on any rum from other sources exported to the US. This is equivalent to a subsidy of about USD 3 per litre. According to data available to the EU unaged rum costs about USD 1 – 1.50 per litre to produce in these countries.

- a. Can the US explain how this scheme works in practice including the origin of alcohol, eligible products, exact amount of excise duty exemptions per product, the estimated annual amount in question and the final beneficiaries of this scheme.
- b. Can the US give statistical information about quantities exported to the US benefiting from this scheme for the years 2014 to 2019.
- c. Can the US explain how it ensures that products being exported (from Puerto Rico and the US Virgin Islands) to other parts of the world than the US does not benefiting directly or indirectly from this scheme?
- d. Has this subsidy been included in the recent DS:1 notifications from the US?

1.34 US – Overcompensation through MFP 1 and MFP 2

1.34.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 93188)

US – Overcompensation through MFP 1 and MFP 2

According to a study from Kansas State University published in Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy (2020) volume 42, number 2, pp. 205–226 by Joseph P. Janzen and Nathan P. Hendricks: Are Farmers Made Whole by Trade Aid? (<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1002/aepp.13045>) many farmers and sectors received more in compensation than their actual losses. In the case of cotton the study shows an overcompensation of 33 times the actual loss.

During the Special COVID-19 meeting the US several times underlined that all its support measures would respect its WTO commitments, without however indicating how or when it would submit its outstanding DS:1 notifications.

- a. Does the US agree with the results presented in this study? If not, can the US explain what in the study it disagrees with.
- b. Has the US calculated the real losses of farmers compared to the compensation payments through MFP 1 and MFP 2? What are the results of any such calculations?

- c. How will the US ensure that similar overcompensation will not take place in future given it clearly influences farmers' production decisions in both the short and long term?

1.35 U.S. insurance programmes

1.35.1 Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID 93285)

On 9 June 2020, the USDA Risk Management Agency announced changes to the Livestock Risk Protection (LRP) insurance program for feeder cattle, fed cattle and swine starting this summer with the 2021 crop year. Changes include moving premium deadlines to the end of the endorsement period and increasing premium subsidies to assist producers. <https://rma.usda.gov/en/News-Room/Press/Press-Releases/2020-News/USDA-Announces-Improvements-to-the-Livestock-Risk-Protection-Insurance-Program-This-Summer>

- a. Could the US indicate what will be the new subsidy rate under the LRP program following these changes?
- b. Are these changes temporary and if so, when is the expected end date?
- c. In the last months, did the U.S. also increase the subsidy level for other insurance program or do they have the intention to increase the subsidy level for other insurance program? If so, by how much?

1.36 Viet Nam - Potential tariff reductions on certain agricultural products

1.36.1 Question by Ukraine (AG-IMS ID 93083)

According to media reports, Viet Nam is considering decreasing import tariffs on some agricultural products. Viet Nam's motivation for possible tariff reductions on chicken, processed chicken meat, almonds, grapes, wheat, pork, and potatoes, however is not entirely clear. On the one side such action follows bilateral discussions with the United States and appears to have the objective of reducing Viet Nam's agricultural bilateral trade surplus. A review of the WTO's Regional Trade Agreements database indicates that no such agreement exists between Viet Nam and the United States. On the other side, the Vietnamese Ministry also noted the potential tariff cuts on these agricultural products are in line with the first-year reductions foreseen under the Comprehensive and Progressive Trans-Pacific Partnership (CPTPP). Ukraine understands that the CPTPP has entered into force for 7 countries and that ratification for 4 other countries is in their respective process. Ukraine also understands that the United States is not a signatory to CPTPP, and would not benefit if the tariff reductions were taken in line with Vietnam's CPTTP commitments.

- a. Could Viet Nam confirm their intention to cut import tariffs on certain agricultural products?
- b. Could Viet Nam also provide more background to the potential basis for such tariff reductions on these agricultural products, in particular, will this be limited based on a Regional Trade Agreement, might the possible tariff reductions be based on most-favoured nation conditions?

1.37 Brazil's wheat quota

1.37.1 Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID 93043)

Canada appreciates Brazil's response to its question during the 30 October 2019 meeting (AG-IMS ID 92046) relating to the implementation of its 750,000 metric tonnes duty-free tariff rate quota (TRQ) for wheat. Brazil indicated in its response in October that the executive branch of Brazil's Foreign Trade Chamber (CAMEX) approved the establishment of the wheat TRQ, but that it needed a CAMEX resolution and a Presidential Decree revoking Decree No. 1.892/96. Could Brazil provide an update its internal process to make this wheat TRQ operational?

1.38 Canada's New Milk Ingredient Class

1.38.1 Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID 93048)

New Zealand understands the ratification process for the Canada-United States-Mexico (CUSMA) agreement is now underway. Can Canada advise what steps it is taking to eliminate milk classes 6 and 7, including their associated milk class prices, within six months of this preferential trade agreement entering into force?

1.38.2 Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID 93184)

New Zealand has previously expressed interest in this committee in Canada's milk classes 6 and 7 and their consistency with the Agriculture Agreement. We understand that, as a result of the Canada-United States-Mexico Agreement (CUSMA) entering into force on 1 July 2020, Canada is moving to eliminate these milk classes. Can Canada please advise how it will ensure the elimination of milk classes 6 and 7 within the specified timelines?

1.38.3 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93002)

In AG-IMS ID 92002, regarding data related to milk class prices, utilization, and sales, Canada stated that it "has been working towards updating the reporting system in order to be as transparent as possible."

- a. Please confirm if data related to milk class prices, utilization, and sales will be made publicly available once verifications to ensure accuracy are complete.
- b. If so, please provide an update on when and where this information will become available.

1.38.4 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93003)

In AG-IMS ID 87015, Canada stated:

"Federal authority for the marketing of dairy products is delegated to provincial milk marketing boards or provincial agencies for interprovincial and export trade of dairy products pursuant to the Canadian Dairy Commission Act and the Agricultural Products Marketing Act. This would also include the power in respect of pricing. Provincial boards and agencies are also delegated provincial authority for pricing based on provincial legislation and statute. Under the Canadian Milk Supply Management Committee (CMSMC) and federal-provincial agreements, these entities coordinate the exercise of their delegated federal and provincial authorities. Although responsibilities vary from province to province, boards and agencies generally license producers, allocate milk quotas, and establish or negotiate the prices or accounting values charged to processors, according to the milk's end use."

- a. Please confirm that the setting of milk class prices, and determination of which products are eligible for each milk class price, are the exercise of federal and provincial authority.

According to media reports, Canada's Agriculture Minister Bibeau in February publicly commented on Canadian Government compensation for dairy farmers affected by the Canada-EU Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement and the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership, adding that, "The compensation for the new-NAFTA will come soon as well."

- b. Please elaborate on the anticipated timeline and method for the compensation related to the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement.

1.38.5 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93247)

Milk Class Pricing Transparency

In AG-IMS ID 93002, Canada stated that "Canada does not have a timeline to provide for the release of any data related to milk class prices, utilization and sales," and "Once completed, information will be provided in a more relevant format."

- a. Has Canada developed a timeline to provide this data?
- b. Could Canada describe the format that the data will take when released?

1.39 Canada's wine sale policy

1.39.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93004)

Canada has not yet responded to the following questions posed by the United States in AG-IMS ID 92003, AG-IMS ID 91137, AG-IMS ID 90040, AG-IMS ID 85012, AG-IMS ID 86034, AG-IMS ID 87016, AG-IMS ID 88096, and AG-IMS ID 89021 regarding wine. As such, the United States repeats its previous questions.

- a. In AG-IMS ID 84105, Canada states that "The LCBO will consider making wines from Vintages Essentials, a sub-category of Vintages comprising products that are continuously available, available to grocers by moving them to the LCBO Wines category".
 - i. Are Ontario and/or Canadian wines that are on the Vintages Essential list allowed to be sold in grocery stores?
 - ii. Would Ontario and/or Canadian wines that are on the Vintages Essential list need to move to the LCBO Wine category (and off of the Vintages Essential list) in order to be sold in grocery stores?
 - iii. If Ontario and/or Canadian wines are allowed to be sold in grocery stores without moving off the Vintages Essential list to the LBCO Wines category, but imported products are not, what is the policy justification?
- b. In the implementation of Ontario Regulation 232/16, how many authorizations have been distributed for a "wine boutique sales agent" (a single authorization that permits the operator of a grocery store to sell, as agent of a winery that operates a wine boutique inside the store, wine offered for sale in the boutique)?
- c. What is the rationale for the Liquor Control Board of Ontario (LCBO) product call that Canada provided in AG-IMS ID 82002, which specifies different retail price parameters and size parameters for imported bag in box wine than for the category of existing Ontario bag in box wine? (<http://www.doingbusinesswithlcbo.com/tro/Forms-Documents/LettersToTheTrade/Downloads/LCBO%20Wines%20Bag%20in%20Box%20Tender.pdf>)
- d. Would Canada please confirm imported bag in box wine is limited to four stock keeping units (SKUs) in LCBO stores, while Ontario bag in box wine is limited to 40 SKUs? If confirmed, please explain the rationale for this split between imported and Ontario products.

1.39.2 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93005)

According to the 6 June 2019 public backgrounder issued by Ontario (<https://news.ontario.ca/mof/en/2019/06/more-choice-convenience-and-fairness-for-beer-and-wine-consumers.html>):

"Eighty-seven grocers will be selected to sell imported and domestic beer, cider and wine under unrestricted authorizations."

"And for the 35 existing grocers that have restricted authorizations, most of their initial restrictions will be lifted and they will be able to expand their assortments to a larger selection of wine starting in October 2019."

- a. Have 87 additional grocers been authorized to sell imported and domestic beer, cider and wine under unrestricted authorizations?

- b. For the 35 grocers referred to in the backgrounder, what restrictions have been lifted?

1.40 Canada's review of the TRQ system

1.40.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 93045)

Australia refers to Canada's Comprehensive Review of Tariff Rate Quotas and thanks Canada for confirming subsequently that the second phase of the Review is underway and that the final policies for each TRQ should be published in September of this year.

Australia appreciates the opportunity to engage in the second phase of the Review and will direct substantive questions on the policy options developed by Canada through the Review process. However, Australia would like to raise some high-level questions with respect to Canada's policy options as detailed on the Government of Canada website: <https://www.international.gc.ca/trade-commerce/consultations/TRQ-CT/instructions.aspx?lang=eng>.

- a. What was the methodology for establishing the specific options detailed on the Government of Canada's website?
- b. How is Canada planning on making its final policy decisions, for example:
 - i. Will the final policy decision be made based on majority vote/support for a particular policy option?
- c. Where a final policy option further protects Canada's supply managed sectors, does Canada plan on implementing other liberalising trade policy changes as offsets to ensure the overall effect of the new policies are in line with the long-term objective enshrined in the Agreement on Agriculture for substantial progressive reductions in agricultural support and protection?

1.40.2 Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID 93046)

New Zealand acknowledges that Canada is currently undertaking Phase II of its comprehensive review of the allocation and administration of tariff rate quotas for supply-managed products. Noting that some of Canada's TRQs suffer from chronic underfill, such as dry whey and powdered buttermilk, can Canada advise how the current consultation process will remove restrictive measures, and enable 100% quota fill?

1.41 Canada's compensation for farmers after trade concessions

1.41.1 Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID 93047)

New Zealand refers to Canada's responses to similar questions asked at the October 2019 Committee on Agriculture (AG-IMS 92075). Since there is a consistent lag in Canada's notifications, its response last time that the CAD 345 million paid directly to dairy farmers based on the size of their production quotas, would "be notified as appropriate in Canada's 2019 Domestic Support notification" raises the concern for New Zealand that this and other, similar payments can be made with a lack of transparency. In 2019, Canada submitted notifications for the 2016 year. On this basis Members will have to wait at least three years to see how this trade- and production-distorting support is notified, and review it accordingly.

- a. Can Canada provide an indication of how it intends to notify the CAD 345 million in direct payments to dairy farmers based on the size of their production quotas? i.e. whether it will be notified in due course as AMS.
- b. Can Canada confirm that the compensation packages paid in 2019 to farmers and producers in supply-managed sectors impacted by trade agreements was a one-time payment, or does Canada expect to make similar compensatory payments in 2020?

1.42 Canada's agriculture support package

1.42.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID 93241)

The Prime Minister of Canada, H.E. Mr. Justin Trudeau has announced a CAD 252 million federal programme to support Canadian farmers during the COVID-19 pandemic. Under the programme, the Government plans to create a CAD 77.5 million Emergency Fund to allow food producers to access personal protective equipment (PPE), a CAD 125 million programme to help support the beef and pork producers adapt to the crisis due to the pandemic, and a price-support surplus food purchase programme of CAD 50 million, aimed at redistributing existing and unsold inventories, including products such as potatoes and poultry to local food organizations who are serving vulnerable Canadians.

India requests Canada to provide more details regarding the following points:

- a. Is there any update on the product list identified by Canada in their response to the question asked by Australia in question ID 94001?
- b. What are the eligibility criteria to qualify as a beneficiary under the programme?
- c. What is the payment mechanism to be used to assist beneficiary organizations/producers/processors?
- d. Who would undertake the procurement and distribution aspects under the Surplus Food Purchase programme?
- e. How does Canada plan to notify this programme in its agricultural notifications?

1.43 China's rice policies

1.43.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93248)

In China's response to the U.S. question AGIMS-ID 91133, China notes that "bidding rules", and other relevant information in the document including "the trading announcement" is published on the National Development and Reform Commission, the Ministry of Finance, the National Food and Strategic Reserves Administration.

- a. Please provide links to these announcements specifically related to the recent rice auctions.
- b. Do the auction procedures have any requirements related to exportation of the rice?
- c. Of the recently auctioned rice, what quantities remained in China and what quantities have been exported?

The United States repeats its questions in AGIMS-ID 91133:

- d. Is COFCO the main exporter of this rice?
- e. Are other STEs exporting rice?

1.44 China's state trading enterprises

1.44.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93249)

In response to China's answer to AG-IMS-ID 91115, the United States provides the link to a Bloomberg news article (<https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2019-05-07/china-is-said-to-plan-overhaul-of-state-agriculture-giants>). Based on the linked article, the United States understands that the Government of China plans to transfer the trading assets of Sinograin, which includes its stockpiles and oilseed crushing capacity, to COFCO Corporation.

- a. Please explain the rationale behind its restructuring of assets for its agricultural state trading enterprises.

In reference to #115 on page 192 of G/C/W/701 dated 14 August 2014:

- b. Please provide an overview of operations of the China Grain Reserves Corp. (Sinograin).
- c. Please explain the differences in grain activities or roles carried out between Sinograin and COFCO.
- d. Please explain whether or not Sinograin can influence through their purchases or sales the level or direction of imports or exports.

1.45 Egypt's export subsidy and Arrears Program

1.45.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93042)

As a follow up to AG-IMS ID 91138, the United States has seen press reports that the Government of Egypt settled judicial cases for overdue export subsidies administered by the Egyptian Export Development Fund (ESF), to promote several economic sectors, including agricultural companies.

- a. Please provide the legislation and/or decisions that made this export subsidy available, including an explanation of eligibility criteria and how payment rates are determined for the export of agricultural products.
- b. Please explain how the settlement agreements reached on export subsidies with agricultural companies impacts the provision of support under this measure.

1.46 Egypt's export prohibitions on agricultural products

1.46.1 Question by Japan (AG-IMS ID 93192)

At the Committee on Agriculture meeting held on 18 June 2020, Japan asked Egypt to provide the reason why required notification concerning its export prohibitions on leguminous vegetables and products thereof had not been made in accordance with Article 12 of the Agreement of Agriculture. In Egypt's response to the said question, Egypt explained that it would be exempt from the notification requirement as Egypt is a net importer of the food stuffs concerned. However, according to the statistical data such as FAOSTAT, Japan recognizes that Egypt is a net exporter of the foodstuff concerned. Japan would appreciate if Egypt could provide the clarification by providing such data as to well support that Egypt is a net importer of the foodstuff concerned.

1.47 The EU's coupled payments

1.47.1 Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID 93055)

Brazil understands that the Omnibus Agricultural Provisions Regulation (EU) 2017/2393 has introduced a significant relaxation of the conditions that member States need to meet to gain approval for their voluntary coupled support (VCS) schemes, which should lead to the deletion of paragraph 5 of Article 52 of Regulation 1307/2013 (Regulation 1307/2013 was notified in 2017 - G/AG/N/EU/35).

- a. Does the EU intend to provide a DS:2 notification regarding the Omnibus Agricultural Provisions Regulation (EU) 2017/2393?
- b. Could the EU explain the impact of the Omnibus Agricultural Provisions Regulation on its blue box domestic support programmes?

1.48 EU's support measures in response to COVID-19

1.48.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID 93242)

In the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic, the European Union has promised to support the economy of its members by increasing the temporary state-aid limit to a maximum of EUR 100,000 per farmer and EUR 800,000 for food processing and marketing companies, under the Temporary Framework for state-aid Measures.

In this context, India requests the European Union to provide the following details:

- a. How many European Union members have availed of this increased flexibility that is being provided in terms of the state aid rules?
- b. On the basis of what factors has the maximum state-aid per beneficiary been determined?

1.48.2 Question by India (AG-IMS ID 93243)

Pursuant to the European Union's Ad-hoc Report on measures taken during the COVID-19 pandemic (G/AG/GEN/159), India notes that the Netherlands instituted the 'compensation for damages caused by COVID-19 outbreak to horticulture, floriculture and potato sectors' amounting to €650 million.

With regards to this, India requests the European Union to provide the following information:

- a. What is the nature of these payments and how will they be notified under the AoA?
- b. Please provide the details regarding eligibility for receiving these payments, the method of calculation of damages for farmers and traders and the ceiling limit for damages (if any)?

India notes that a few European Union members such as Belgium, Denmark, France, and the Netherlands have instituted export financing schemes. The European Union, in their ad-hoc report in document G/AG/GEN/159, states that these schemes are general and non-agriculture specific.

The document further mentions that 'all agriculture-specific or agricultural part of general schemes are required to respect the Nairobi Ministerial Decision on Export Competition.'

With regards to these schemes, India requests the European Union to respond to the following:

- c. Please provide details regarding the export financing measures being adopted by these EU members.
- d. What is the estimated expenditure/outlay for these measures?
- e. What are the eligibility requirements under these export financing schemes?
- f. How will these schemes be notified under the Agreement on Agriculture?
- g. How is it proposed to comply with the statement included in the above document regarding respecting the Nairobi Ministerial Decision on Export Competition. Have any further guidelines been issued in this context?

1.49 India's sugar policies

1.49.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 93001)

Follow-up question to AG-IMS ID 92007:

- a. Can India indicate for the five years 2011 to 2015 prior to the Nairobi Ministerial meeting the following:
 - Total export of sugar from India per year;

- Quantity of this which had received export subsidy (federal or state) and the amount spend on these subsidies annually 2011 to 2015.
- b. Can India explain how it sees the increasing subsidy level and increasing quantity of sugar exports to be subsidised to be in line with Nairobi Ministerial Decision paragraphs 9, 10 and 11? In particular how does India see the 2019/20 export programme as respecting paragraph 10: Members shall seek not to raise their export subsidies beyond the average level of the past five years on a product basis"?

1.50 India's pulses policies

1.50.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 93058)

Australia's concerns with respect to India's trade-restricting measures on pulses are very well known to Members. Australia has raised its concerns in this and every other relevant Committee for over two years, with a particular focus on the quantitative restrictions (QRs) set on a range of pulses. Unfortunately, India continues to implement these measures, which are having a detrimental impact on the global pulses market, including producers in developed and developing countries, with traders and with consumers.

Australia was disappointed that in addition to the continued extension of these measures – which cannot be considered 'temporary' given they have been in place for over two years – India has recently implemented even more trade-restrictive measures.

For example, in December 2019, India announced that the 150,000 tonnes QR on peas would be subject to additional restrictions, whereby imports would need to meet a minimum import price of Rs 200/kg and would only be allowed through one specific port (Kolkata sea port). Additionally, while India expanded the QR on Urad (black gram beans) from 150,000 tonnes to 400,000 tonnes, the additional tonnage (250,000 tonnes) would be limited to Indian millers and refiners and applications to import under the QR could only be submitted between 20 December and 31 December 2019 (12 days), with imports having to occur by no later than 31 March 2020.

With respect to India's QRs on pulses and these additional measures:

- a. Can India explain why it restricted pea imports to only one specific port?
- b. Can India provide a justification for the minimum import price for peas?
- c. Can India explain why it restricted the additional imports of Urad to Indian millers and refiners?
- d. Can India explain why it gave such a limited period for applications to be submitted for Urad?
- e. Can India explain how the additional measures identified are consistent with India's WTO obligations and the WTO basis for the measures?
- f. Can India provide advice on the amount of imports for each QR during the current quota year?
- g. Can India confirm whether it will continue to apply the QRs on pulses after 31 March 2020 (i.e. for the fiscal year 2020/21 commencing on 1 April)?

1.50.2 Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID 93066)

On 18 December 2019, the Government of India notified an amendment to its import policy for dried peas under HS code 0713 1000 (Gazette of India No. 37/2015-2020). According to this amendment, in addition to the quantitative restriction of 150,000 MT already in place, imports of dried peas will be subject to a minimum import price of Rs. 200/CIF (Cost, Insurance & Freight) per kg and imports will only be allowed through Kolkata seaport. Indian importers have reported that this minimum

import price of Rs. 200 per Kg is around six times the price imported dried peas have traditionally been traded (around Rs. 30 to 35 per Kg).

- a. Could India provide more information as to why it amended its quantitative restriction policy to include a minimum import price on dried peas?
- b. Could India provide detailed information as to how this minimum import price works? Especially please provide information on the implementation of this policy and the relevant documents that explain how this the minimum import price is being applied.
- c. Could India explain how it determined the level of this minimum import price, and why it was set at such a prohibitive level?
- d. Could India explain how this minimum import price is consistent with Article 4 of the Agreement on Agriculture?
- e. Could India explain how a minimum import price requirement is consistent with GATT Article XI?
- f. Could India explain how the single port of entry requirement is consistent with GATT Article XI?
- g. Please indicate whether the quota will be maintained after 31 March 2020, and please indicate whether the minimum import price and the single port of entry requirements will also be maintained after 31 March 2020.

1.50.3 Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID 93282)

On 28 March 2020, the Ministry of Commerce and Industry of India notified Notification No. S.O.1225 (E) which extended its quantitative restriction for dried peas under HS code 071310 for the fiscal year 2020-21. The notice specifies that the quantitative restriction for dried peas are set at 150,000 MT for the 2020-21 fiscal year, and that the import policy conditions such as Minimum Import Price (MIP) of Rs.200/ and a port restriction through Kolkata sea port only for all peas. Imported dried peas have traditionally been traded on India's domestic market at Rs. 30 to 35 per kg so this minimum import price of Rs. 200 per Kg is around six times higher than market prices.

- a. Could India provide more information as to why it has put and place and continues to apply a minimum import price on dried peas?
- b. Could India provide detailed information as to how this minimum import price works? In particular provide information on the implementation of this policy and the relevant documents that explain how this the minimum import price is being applied at the port of entry.
- c. Could India explain how it has determined the level of this minimum import price, and why it was set at such a prohibitive level?
- d. Could India explain how this minimum import price is consistent with Article 4 of the Agreement on Agriculture?
- e. Could India explain how a minimum import price requirement is consistent with GATT Article XI?
- f. Could India explain how the single port of entry requirement is consistent with GATT Article XI?

1.50.4 Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID 93283)

On 16 April 2020, India's Ministry of Commerce and Industry issued a trade notice (S.O. 1260(E)) in the Gazette of India which fixed the quantity of peas by type that can be imported under the quantitative restriction for fiscal year 2020-2021 (1 April 2020, to 31 March 2021) previously

announced in trade notice S.O.1225 (E). Of the 150,000 metric tonnes (MT) announced, 75,000 MT is allocated to green peas, and 75,000 MT to "other" peas. The quota for yellow peas is explicitly set to 0 MT, which effectively bans its importation for this fiscal year.

- a. Could India explain its rationale to ban the import of yellow peas for fiscal year 2020?
- b. Could India indicate which provision of the GATT or WTO Agreements is being used to support this import ban?
- c. Could India indicate when it will inform, and in which relevant committee it will provide the relevant provision of the GATT or WTO Agreements it believes supports this import ban of yellow peas?

1.50.5 Question by Russian Federation (AG-IMS ID 93067)

In March 2019 India issued a notification establishing a new quota of 150 000 MT for the period from 1 April 2019 until 31 March 2020. However, according to the Trade notice No. 32/2019-2020 after seven months of this quota application India completely prohibited the import of pulses to its territory from 31 October 2019. According to Notification No. 38/2015-2020 dated 1st of January 2020 in addition to quantitative restrictions for peas remained in force India have introduced minimum import price requirement for yellow and green peas. Ports of entry for yellow and green peas are also limited to only one seaport Kolkata.

- a. Could India provide the reasons for tightening restrictive policy in relation to imports of pulses?
- b. Could India describe the administration of yellow peas import? Could India clarify how the minimum import price on yellow peas is applied?
- c. Could India explain how quantitative restrictions, import prohibition, recently introduced minimum import prices requirement and limitation of ports of entry for pulses to only one port are consistent with the WTO rules, including Article 4.2 of the Agreement on Agriculture?

1.50.6 Question by Russian Federation (AG-IMS ID 93229)

In March 2020, India established new import quota on yellow peas with volume of 150 thousand tonnes allowed for import up to 31 March 2021. This quota is subdivided by three sub-quotas: 75 000 tonnes for green peas, other types of peas – 75 000 tonnes, while allowed volume for import of yellow peas equals zero. Could India please clarify whether zero for sub-quota volume means that import of yellow peas is prohibited even under the quota in question? If yes, what are the reasons behind the introduction of import prohibition on yellow peas? How do these import prohibition and restrictions correlate with Article 4.2 of the WTO Agreement on Agriculture and Article XI of the GATT?

- a. In January 2020, India introduced minimum import price requirement for peas (200 Rs/kg and above). What are the reasons and the purpose of introducing minimum import price requirement in addition to existing quantitative restrictions? What is the methodology for the minimum import price calculation? Please, provide the dynamic of domestic prices for yellow peas since April 2019. In what way is the introduction of minimum import price consistent with Article 4.2 of the WTO Agreement on Agriculture?
- b. Number of ports of import for peas were also limited to only one (seaport Kolkata). What are the reasons and goals for introducing restrictions on ports of entry? Why is it necessary to import peas exactly through the port of Kolkata? How does it comply with India's WTO commitments? How does restricting ports of entry correlate with Article 4.2 of the WTO Agreement on Agriculture?
- c. When in April 2018 quotas were introduced, India announced that this measure was temporary. However, two years later, import restrictions not only continue to operate, but

have been expanded. What are the estimated time frames during which restrictive measures (quotas, minimum import price, restriction on ports of entry) will be in force?

1.50.7 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93250)

In response to AG-IMS ID 92008, India stated that its quantitative restrictions on mung beans, peas, black gram lentils, and pigeon peas are temporary, yet India again notified quantitative restrictions on these products in March 2020 that will be in effect through March 2021. By the end of this latest extension, these quantitative restrictions will have been in place for three years.

India states the measures will be further extended or removed based on "market situation." Please describe what market situation is necessary for the permanent removal of these restrictions.

1.51 India's export subsidies/export credits

1.51.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93007)

India stated in AG-IMS ID 89045 that the Interest Equalisation Scheme on Pre and Post Shipment Rupee Export Credit (IES) "is in the nature of working capital support, which is WTO compatible."

The United States notes that Reserve Bank of India's (RBI) notices refer to IES as being an export credit program and not a working capital support program. However, the United States also notes in RBI notices DBR.Dir.BC.No 62/04.02.001/2015-16 dated 4 December 2015 and DCBR.CO.SCB.Cir.No 1/13.05.000/2015-16 dated 11 February 2016 explain a procedure for Indian banks to pass on the benefit of IES by reducing the interest rate charged to the eligible exporters upfront. The notices also describe how banks submit claims to RBI for reimbursement.

- a. Please explain in detail why India does not believe IES is an interest rate support programme as covered under paragraph 13 (a) direct financing support of the Nairobi Decision.
- b. Please explain how RBI's premiums are charged and how RBI's financial contribution/claims are recovered under the IES.

Per DBR. Dir. BC. No 09/04.02.001/2018-19 dated 29 November 2018 and DBR. Dir. BC. No 22/04.02.001/2018-19 dated 11 January 2019, the United States notes that India's IES rate of interest equalization has increased from 3% to 5% for Micro, Small & Medium Enterprises (MSME), and that since 2019 the scheme has expanded to allow large merchant/corporate exporters to participate at an interest equalization rate of 3%.

- c. Please explain the reasoning for increasing the export financing support and allowing large merchants to participate in the IES.

The United States understands that since inception in 2015 to July 2018, the RBI has spent ₹4,829 crore (USD 679 million) on the export support scheme for all eligible manufacture and agricultural products. The notice instructs RBI to keep records and send a monthly report to India's Dept. of Commerce and Directorate of General of Foreign Trade (DGFT) indicating reimbursements made, on both a commodity and bank basis.

- d. Please provide the total agricultural product-specific export support spent under the scheme and the total value of agricultural products benefited up to the present day.

1.52 India's skim milk powder export subsidies

1.52.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93008)

India Export Subsidies / Export Credits

As a response to AG-IMS ID 89026, India stated that MSMEs exporting dairy products are eligible for exports under the IES based on RBI's list of allowable agricultural products (see list per annex https://rbidocs.rbi.org.in/rdocs/content/pdfs/NT322AN120216_1.pdf).

Please confirm or clarify if the list is inclusive of all agricultural products covered under the scheme or please provide an up-to-date annex.

1.53 India's support to rice exports

1.53.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93009)

Export Subsidies and Transparency

The United States understands that India has decided not to withdraw prohibited export subsidies as recommended by a WTO panel on October 2019 and that MEIS for non-Basmati rice, and other products, will possibly be extended beyond 31 March 2020.

- a. Please explain if this export subsidy scheme still includes agricultural products and whether the export subsidy benefits were increased in 2019 and/or in 2020.
- b. Please provide India's Government notices for the extensions and increases in 2019 and 2020 if applicable.
- c. Does India provide any other forms of export subsidies to non-Basmati rice? If so, please describe those programmes.

1.54 India's Transport and Marketing Assistance (TMA)

1.54.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 93065)

Australia refers to its questions to India at 91th CoA (AG-IMS ID 91006) and 92th CoA (AG-IMS ID 92095) with respect to its Transport and Marketing Assistance (TMA) scheme.

Australia acknowledges that as per Paragraph 8 of the Nairobi Ministerial Decision on Export Competition, developing country Members shall continue to benefit from the provisions of Article 9.4 of the Agreement on Agriculture until the end of 2023. Article 9.4 of the AoA allows developing country Members to provide export subsidies under Article 9.1 (d) & (e).

However, Paragraphs 9 through 11 establish clear obligations on India with respect to the implementation of export subsidies.

Australia therefore requests India provide specific details on:

- a. The average level of export subsidies provided for those products covered by the TMA for the past five years?
- b. What steps and assessment India have undertaken in the development of the TMA to ensure it is consistent with paragraph 11 of the Nairobi Decision and has at most, a minimal trade distorting effect on other Members?

If it is the case that India does not believe Paragraphs 9 through 11 apply to it, Australia would further request India:

- c. Explain under what grounds it has made the decision to not apply the commitments and provisions of Paragraphs 9 through 11 of the Nairobi Decision in the development of the TMA scheme?

1.54.2 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93010)

Noting the introduction of the Transport and Marketing Assistance (TMA) scheme by India in March 2019, India has stated in response to AG-IMS ID 92095 that the measure complies with the Nairobi Ministerial Decision on Export Competition regarding Article 9.4 export subsidies. The measure covers a wide variety of products and lists eligible export destinations including West Africa, South America, ASEAN, Oceania, and several other regions.

- a. Given the broad scope of this measure, how does India analyze this programme in the context of paragraph 10 of the Ministerial Decision on Export Competition, regarding not raising the level of export subsidy use, and paragraph 11 of the Decision, regarding having at most minimal trade distorting effects and not displacing or impeding the exports of another Member?
- b. Can exporters benefit from the IES for agricultural products through at least March 2020 and from TMA (or other export subsidy measures) for the same agricultural products?
- c. If products do benefit concurrently from these measures, please describe what steps are taken by India to ensure that the export does not benefit from the measures in excess of what is permitted under Article 9.4.

1.55 India's wheat policies

1.55.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93013)

It is the understanding of the United States from press articles that India has recently sought to export wheat to other Governments through tenders for purchase.

- a. Is this process stipulated in any Government measures? If so, please provide those measures.
- b. What is India's process for determining a price at which India sells stock to foreign entities?
- c. What steps does India take to ensure that exports of stocks do not distort trade?

1.56 India - Dairy Loans

1.56.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93011)

In AG-IMS ID 92011, India responded to some, but not all, of the U.S. questions regarding "soft loans" administered by the National Dairy Development Board (NDDB). To follow up on some of those unanswered questions:

- a. Is export performance a requirement for cooperatives to receive an NDDB loan?
- b. Is there a grace period for these loans?

1.56.2 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93255)

The United States thanks India for its response to AG-IMS ID 92011 and seeks further clarification on whether these loans under the "Supporting Dairy Cooperatives and Farmer Producer Organizations engaged in dairy activities" scheme are contingent upon export performance as this was not addressed in India's response to part b of the question.

1.57 India's short-term crop loans

1.57.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93012)

In response to AG-IMS ID 91147, India referred the United States to <http://agricoop.nic.in/> with regards to information regarding the Interest Subvention Scheme.

- a. Please provide data, direct responses, or a more specific website location regarding how the measure is implemented, including the value of loans covered in 2016/17 and 2017/18.
- b. Please confirm whether this measure is notified by India in its domestic support notification. If so, where? If not, on what basis?

1.57.2 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93254)

The United States resubmits AG-IMS ID 92010, as India has not provided a written response.

In response to AG-IMS-ID 91147, India referred the United States to <http://agricoop.nic.in/>.

- a. Please provide data or a more specific website location for the value of loans covered by the measures in 2016/17.
- b. Please confirm whether this measure is notified by India in its domestic support notification. If so, where? If not, on what basis?

1.58 India's wheat public stockpiling

1.58.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93014)

In response to AG-IMS ID 92009, India stated with regards to sale of its wheat stocks that "[f]or price stabilization, some wheat may also be released for sale in domestic market with the stipulation that the same would not be used for exports."

- a. Is the process stipulated in any Government measure? If so, please provide those measures.
- b. Per India's response to AG-IMS 92009, how does India ensure that wheat stocks released for sale in the domestic market are not exported?

1.58.2 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93251)

In response to AG-IMS ID 92009 regarding state bonuses, India responded that no state announced a bonus for wheat in the marketing season 2016/17, 2017/18, and 2018/19. However, Madhya Pradesh announced a bonus for both marketing years 2017/18 and 2018/19. The Minister of Agriculture in Madhya Pradesh is quoted stating "This means the state will pay Rs. 2,000 per quintal for acquisition of wheat." This was greater than the announced MSP of Rs. 1,840 per quintal.

- a. Please confirm any payments made to producers above the announced MSP for wheat in Madhya Pradesh since 2016/17 through the current marketing season.
- b. Please confirm any such payments to producers in other India states and territories as well as for other commodities.

1.58.3 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93252)

In response to AG-IMS ID 92009 regarding a request for current, historical and pre-determined targets levels of wheat since 2010, India did not provide the quantitative levels of each, but rather indicated only that "procurement of wheat is done based on the assessment made with regard to the requirements under various food security programs."

- a. Please provide the annual quantitative levels for current, historical, and pre-determined levels of wheat since 2010.
- b. Please indicate any report, publication or website that contains the assessments referenced in India's previous response.

1.58.4 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93253)

In response to AG-IMS ID 92009 regarding steps taken to ensure record stockpiles of wheat do not impact global markets and do not distort markets, India stated that "some wheat may also be released for sale in domestic market in the stipulation that the same would not be used for exports."

Please indicate what the specific stipulation states and where this stipulation can be found in any regulation or other official Government document related to governing the sales of public stocks in the domestic market.

1.59 India - National Dairy Plan Phase I

1.59.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93256)

The United States notes that in response to AG-IMS ID 88107 and 92012, India stated it will submit a Table DS:2 notification on its NDP I measure in due course, however, India has not notified this measure in G/AG/N/IND/19 nor is the measure identified in G/AG/N/IND/18.

- a. When will India be making a Table DS:2 notification for this measure?
- b. Within Supporting Table DS:1 of G/AG/N/IND/18, the NDP I has not been identified. Please confirm the measure is included in the Table DS:1 notification.
- c. If the measure is included, please indicate the monetary value of NDP I in 2018/19 and under which measure type this measure is notified.
- d. Please provide details of what measures will be implemented following the conclusion of Phase I. Please confirm whether India plans to submit any applicable DS:2 notifications for those measures and whether India will identify such measures specifically within Supporting Table DS:1.

1.60 Indonesia's Measure 18 in DS477 and DS478

1.60.1 Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID 93068)

New Zealand would like to acknowledge the steps that have been taken by Indonesia towards compliance to date in the WT/DS/477.

- a. Can Indonesia provide an update on progress toward the legislative changes required to remove outstanding issues within measures 1-17, an explanation of the steps that need to be taken to remove the outstanding issues, and the expected dates for the completion of those steps. In particular, can Indonesia provide these details in respect of the following measures:
 - Limited application windows and validity periods;
 - Import restrictions based on cold storage capacity;
 - Domestic sufficiency legislation.
- b. Can Indonesia provide an update on progress toward the legislative changes required to remove measure 18, an explanation of the steps that need to be taken to remove measure 18, and the expected dates for the completion of those steps.

1.61 Japan's support package

1.61.1 Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID 93259)

While thanking Japan for the explanations provided to question AG-IMS ID 94044 during the last CoA Meeting, Brazil would appreciate if Japan could give more information on the allocation of the First Complementary Budget Law, approved on 30 April 2020.

It has come to Brazil's attention that some of the resources (approximately JPY 14.7 billion) will reportedly be allocated towards stimulating the export of agricultural products. Apparently, those subsidies aim at expanding Japanese exports of agricultural products and at gaining "market share" in foreign markets that are considered promising.

As far as Brazil knows, the policy includes, among others, subsidies designed at improving the frozen food production infrastructure for export, including the acquisition or modernization of low-temperature production line and conservation equipment; and subsidies to promote the export of rice and rice-based processed products, including improvements in storage infrastructure.

Taking into account that these subsidies could be understood as falling within the scope of AoA's Article 9, could Japan provide further details on the export promotion portion of the economic measures adopted by Japan to cope with the COVID-19 pandemic?

1.62 Mongolia's quota regime for importation

1.62.1 Question by Russian Federation (AG-IMS ID 93072)

Follow up to questions AG-IMS ID 87094, AG-IMS ID 88104, AG-IMS ID 90027, AG-IMS ID 91011 and AG-IMS ID 92098:

In 2013 Mongolia established a quantitative regime for importation of certain agricultural products, including wheat flour and liquid milk. In August 2019 the Government of Mongolia issued a new Resolution describing the system of importation of agricultural products under quota regime. Mongolia did not open the quotas for import of wheat flour and liquid milk for 2020. However, Mongolia did not exclude these products from the list of agricultural products subject to quota regime either. The Russian Federation is seeking further clarification from Mongolia regarding its quota regime, in particular:

- a. Does Mongolia plan to exclude wheat flour and liquid milk from the list of agricultural products subject to quota regime? When?
- b. Does Mongolia plan to introduce new quotas for importation of these products in future?
- c. Please confirm that Mongolia will not apply quotas for importation of wheat flour and liquid milk.

1.62.2 Question by Russian Federation (AG-IMS ID 93191)

Follow up to questions AG-IMS ID 87094, AG-IMS ID 88104, AG-IMS ID 90027, AG-IMS ID 91011, AG-IMS ID 92098 and AG-IMS ID 93072:

In 2013 Mongolia established a quantitative regime for importation of certain agricultural products, including wheat flour and liquid milk. Mongolia did not open quotas for import of these two products for 2020, while stated that there were no quantitative restrictions for the following products at all.

However, Mongolia did not exclude wheat flour and liquid milk from the list of agricultural products subject to quota regime. According to the current information, Mongolian competent authorities do not issue permits for the import of the following products referring to the fact that there are no quotas allocated for these two products. Thus, the absence of import permits made the importation of wheat flour and liquid milk in fact impossible.

The Russian Federation is seeking further clarification from Mongolia regarding its restrictions, in particular:

- a. Does the fact that there are no quotas for wheat flour and liquid milk in 2020 mean that import of the following products is prohibited? How does this fact correspond to the previous statements of Mongolia that no quotas are being imposed on these products following the recommendations of the National Food Safety Council?
- b. Does Mongolia plan to exclude wheat flour and liquid milk from the list of agricultural products subject to quota regime? When?
- c. Does Mongolia plan to introduce new quotas for importation of these products in future?
- d. Please explain how Mongolia's import restrictions are consistent with Article XI of the GATT 1994 and Article 4.2 of the Agreement on Agriculture.

1.63 Nigeria's import prohibitions on certain agricultural products

1.63.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93015)

The United States notes that Nigeria continues to maintain import prohibitions on several agricultural products (see https://customs.gov.ng/?page_id=3075), including frozen poultry, beef, and pork from all countries.

- a. Please provide the measure or implementing regulations for these prohibitions and specify on what basis these imports prohibited?
- b. Can Nigeria explain why import bans are still in place, especially given that Nigeria stated in AG-IMS ID 48012 from March of 2007 that many of the restrictions were temporary?

1.64 Oman's Table DS:2 notification

1.64.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93257)

In response to AG-IMS ID 92028, the United States would like to thank Oman for their thorough responses. As a follow up, the United States would like to inquire if Oman will be submitting a Table DS:2 notification for the programs it has outlined across its Table DS:1 notifications, noting the difference between a Supporting Table DS:2 within the Table DS:1 notification, and the separate Table DS:2 notification where Members are required to give detail on new domestic support programs.

1.65 Russia's export subsidies

1.65.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 93017)

Follow-up to question AG-IMS ID 92044.

The EU is concerned about the recent amendment of Article 78 to the Russian Budget Code (amendment by Federal law № 330-ФЗ of 1 October 2019), which appears to allow for subsidies for alcoholic products intended for export. In the answer to the EU question No AG-IMS ID 92044 (Committee on Agriculture, 30.10.2019) on the subject the Russian Federation stated that "... the Budget Code of the Russian Federation does not provide for any forms of exports subsidies".

Could the Russian Federation further elaborate on that answer in light of the explicit link between eligible subsidies and export destination of alcoholic beverages in the amended Article 78 of the Budget Code?

1.66 Tajikistan's export prohibitions on certain food products

1.66.1 Question by Japan (AG-IMS ID 93305)

Japan would appreciate it if Tajikistan could explain how export prohibitions on certain food products including wheat, wheat flour and vegetable introduced by the Member on 25 April 2020 meet the conditions required in Article XI of General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT): namely i) essentiality of the products, ii) criticalness of the shortages, and iii) temporality of the measure. Japan would also appreciate it if Tajikistan could provide the reason why it resorted to the export prohibitions on the products, rather than arranging quotas which reflect the situation of domestic supply and demand.

1.67 Turkey - Turkish Grain Board (TMO)

1.67.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93019)

Turkey's response to AG-IMS ID 90064 provides no information on the reasoning behind Turkey's consideration of a state-owned enterprise as fully autonomous, nor does it explain the reasoning for not notifying wheat purchases at prices referred to by TMO and published on its website as "intervention purchasing prices". Article 4 of the relevant measure indicates that its objective is,

among other things, "...to prevent abnormal increases or decreases in the price of grain products to the determinant of producers...". Therefore, we would like to reiterate the questions and request a more detailed response.

- a. Please clarify how the board maintains full autonomy while being a state-owned enterprise with 100% public ownership.
- b. Please explain the rationale for Turkey's judgment that TMO's announcement and implementation of prices for commodities does not qualify as the setting of an applied administered price, as stated in response to EU question No. 44 and referenced in AG-IMS ID 90064.

1.67.2 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93021)

According to TMO's website, TMO has been charged with helping to control food inflation by buying and selling commodities more actively than in previous years with shortened tender periods. It has also been charged with additional oversight as to the price of domestic purchases, "in order to carry out market regulation more rapidly and actively, to reduce the cost to our country by providing products at a more affordable price than the world markets offer in short-term price options, and to provide an opportunity for effective and timely intervention in accordance with international trade conditions".

- a. Please provide the relevant legislation or implementing regulation that gives TMO the authority to undertake these activities?
- b. Does TMO receive funding from the Government of Turkey to implement these programs? If so, please describe the manner in which funding is provided and the amount of funding provided since 2002.
- c. How does Turkey plan to notify these TMO activities to the WTO COA and STE Working Party?

1.68 Turkey's flour export and Turkish Grain Board

1.68.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 93018)

In AG-IMS ID 90009 to Turkey, the EU cited 2013 purchase prices of wheat being higher than domestic sales prices. The EU requested more information on these transactions and asked when the price support for wheat was going to be notified by Turkey. Turkey replied with "TMO determines independent policies within the framework of profitability and efficiency principles, regarding the products that fall within its scope. In this sense, Turkey would like to repeat the answers given in the previous committee meetings and its last TPR".

In AG-IMS ID 90064, the United States asked Turkey to clarify how the board maintains full autonomy while being a state-owned enterprise with 100% public ownership. It also asked Turkey how TMO's announcement and implementation of prices for commodities does not qualify it as providing market price support when it is a 100% state-owned enterprise. Turkey referred to their response to AG-IMS ID 90009, which simply references TMO's framework of profitability and efficiency principles.

As the EU indicated in AG-IMS ID 90009, there are instances where TMO is procuring wheat for more than it is selling it.

Please explain how sales at a price lower than the procurement price comports with the "profitability and efficiency principles", as Turkey cited.

1.69 Turkey - Prior export authorization/registration

1.69.1 Question by Japan (AG-IMS ID 93193)

Japan recognizes that Turkey continues implementing prior export authorization/registration on fresh lemons introduced on 7 April 2020, but finds that required notification to the Committee on Agriculture has not been made in accordance with Article 12 of the Agreement of Agriculture so far. Japan would appreciate if Turkey could provide the reason behind.

1.70 United Kingdom - Modification of the EU's agricultural schedule of commitments

1.70.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 93076)

Australia is pleased that the EU and the UK reached agreement on the Withdrawal Agreement and Brexit subsequently occurred on 31 January 2020. The UK Government appears committed to not extend the transition period, meaning that the splitting of current EU WTO tariff-rate quotas (TRQs) will be implemented on 1 January 2021.

Australia is aware that both the UK and EU are engaged in Article XXVIII negotiations with affected WTO Members, including Australia. We have remained constructive during these negotiations and have continued to offer Australia's own quota usage data to support both the UK and EU throughout this process.

The continued Brexit uncertainty has created significant commercial disruption for Australian businesses currently holding licenses to export agricultural products into the EU under existing EU WTO tariff-rate quotas (TRQs). Australia previously raised concerns in the lead up to a possible no-deal Brexit that the UK and EU were proposing two conflicting approaches to split TRQs midway through a quota year (i.e. potentially splitting a EU28 calendar year quota between the EU27 and UK with two months remaining). These same issues will again arise at the end of the transition period, a situation that Australia would like to avoid.

For a number of Australia's country-specific quotas, the differing UK and EU approaches would have resulted in an EU27 and UK CSQ that, when added together, will be less than Australia's current EU28 entitlement.

- a. Could the UK confirm whether it will take the same approach to splitting quotas at the end of the transition period as had been proposed in the lead up to a possible no-deal Brexit?
- b. Could the UK please provide an explanation for the different approach it had previously proposed to take from the EU?
- c. How would the UK have ensured that any proposal to split TRQs midway through a quota year does not leave quota holders worse off (i.e. that newly split TRQs/CSQs add up to current EU28 entitlements)?
- d. In the event that the proposed splits leave TRQ/CSQs fully exhausted, how would the UK have treated agricultural products (exported under licence) which were currently on route and arrive after the end of the transition period? Would the UK have allowed these products to arrive without paying the associated out-of-quota rates?

1.71 U.S. Proposed domestic support measures

1.71.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 93079)

At the 92nd Committee on Agriculture meeting, in response to Australia's question AG-IMS ID 92102 that queried if any plans were in place or being developed to manage the end of the US' farmer Trade Aid Package for 2019, the delegate from the United States advised that there were no plans beyond the 2019 programme.

Since that advice, Australia has noted commentary from the U.S. President that indicates the US is considering further packages to provide aid for farmers that may be negatively impacted by any

trade deal that the US has negotiated, is negotiating or that it is preparing to negotiate. This could reasonably be extended to possible deals with, *inter alia*: the EU, India, Kenya, the UK, and also the next phase of the Economic and Trade Agreement between the US and China.

- a. Can the United States confirm if additional farmer Trade Aid Packages are now under development, planned or being considered?
 - i. Can the United States provide detail on any possible packages, including whether they would be similar to the 2018 or 2019 Packages?
- b. Can the United States confirm what trade deals (either signed, under negotiation, or contemplated) would be considered in the establishment of possible further trade aid packages?

1.71.2 Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID 93084)

According to the USDA, a higher proportion (approximately 30%) of net farm income is expected to come from federal assistance programmes in 2019.

- a. Could the United States discuss how the next Farm Bill could be structured in order to address producer expectations and reliance on these current payments? USDA forecasts USD 139 billion in exports in fiscal year 2020, up USD 4 billion from 2019 numbers. That's significantly lower than the expectation that China would purchase USD 40 billion in agricultural products from the U.S. or USD 36 billion higher than USDA projections. Additionally, the COVID-19 outbreak is slowing global economic activity. On 21 February 2020, President Trump suggested that he might again push for new trade aid for farmers. On 4 March 2020, House Agriculture Committee Ranking Member Rep. Mike Conaway of Texas said that another round of Market Facilitation Program payments would be vital to the survival of producers affected by trade disruptions if agricultural exports do not increase soon.
- b. Could the United States confirm the possibility of an additional trade aid package for U.S. farmers in 2020?
- c. Could the United States elaborate as to how an additional aid package would be distributed geographically and among commodity sectors? H.R. 2157, the Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Act of 2019, was signed into law by President Trump, requiring a change to the first round of Market Facilitation Program (MFP) assistance provided in 2018. Producers previously deemed ineligible for MFP in 2018 because they had an average adjusted gross income (AGI) level higher than \$900,000 limit may now be eligible for 2018 MFP benefits.
- d. Could the United States indicate the amount of these retroactive payments to previously ineligible producers now eligible for MFP payments in 2018?
- e. Could the United States indicate under which notification year will these retroactive payments will be notified?

1.71.3 Question by Colombia (AG-IMS ID 93144)

How are the trade assistance programmes for agricultural producers and exporters affected by disputes with China being implemented, given that the USDA (United States Department of Agriculture) has repeatedly announced increases in the aid and assistance budgets for these producers?

It is important to understand what amounts have been allocated, to which products, and for which specific activities, and, in particular, how this support is consistent with multilateral commitments.

1.71.4 Question by Mexico (AG-IMS ID 93086)

According to recent news, the United States is increasing the aid package for its farmers, which was created to mitigate the effects of tariffs on certain products for 2018 and 2019. In light of the above, we request the United States to provide information on:

- a. the total amount of subsidies granted to producers as part of these compensation measures;
- b. the eligibility criteria for beneficiaries;
- c. the main products for which the support is granted;
- d. the manner in which the United States will notify these subsidies in the DS:1 notification, and when the notification for 2018 will be issued.
- e. Whether this support is the last round of payments or whether funds have been allocated for future payments, given that the purpose of the support is to mitigate the effects of specific circumstances; and 6. the producer states that benefited most from the payments.

1.71.5 Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID 93087)

New Zealand refers to its question at the October Committee on Agriculture (AG-IMS ID 92082). The US advised at the time that the data was not yet available to answer New Zealand's question. As such, New Zealand again asks:

- a. How many producers have signed up for USDA Market Facilitation Program (MFP) payments so far, i.e. since 29 July 2019?

MFP payments are to be made in up to three tranches, with the first payments starting in mid-late August. As a result of the Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Act of 2019, producers previously ineligible for MFP in 2018 may now be eligible for 2018 MFP benefits.

- b. Are these benefits funded out of the USD 12 billion (originally applied in 2018/19)?
- c. Can the US confirm how many producers have signed up for these retrospective payments from the 2018 MFP, during the parallel signup period (29 July to 6 December 2019)?

In February 2020, the USDA released a press statement confirming that the third and final tranche of payments were being made to farmers.

- d. Can the US confirm that the third tranche of payments are included in the overall USD 14.5 billion authorised under the Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) Charter Act for use in direct support for producers?

This statement appears to be at odds with an announcement from President Trump stating "if our formally targeted farmers need additional aid until such time as the trade deals with China, Mexico Canada, and others fully kick in, that aid will be provided by the federal Government..."

- e. Can the US confirm that the third tranche of payments announced by the Secretary of Agriculture, Sonny Perdue, is the final payment in the 2019/20 package of direct support to farmers?
- f. Can the US advise the total amount of funding required for ongoing direct payments to farmers impacted by trade deals that are yet to be implemented? And confirm when this additional package of support will be notified to the WTO?

1.72 U.S. Coronavirus Food Assistance Program

1.72.1 Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID 93284)

As part of the Coronavirus Food Assistance Program, Secretary Perdue announced on 17 April that USDA is exercising authority under the Families First Coronavirus Response Act to purchase and distribute agricultural products to those in need. Through this program, USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service (AMS) is partnering with national, regional and local suppliers to purchase up to USD 3 billion in fresh produce, dairy and meat products. The program will allow the purchase of USD 461 million in fresh fruits and vegetables, USD 317 million in dairy products, USD 258 million in meat products and USD 175 million in a combination box of fresh produce, dairy or meat products. Suppliers will package these products totalling USD 1.2 billion into family-sized boxes, then transport them to food banks, community and faith-based organizations, and other non-profits serving Americans in need from 15 May through 30 June 2020.

On 4 June 2020, some U.S. news outlet reported that the USDA was paying as much as twice the average retail price for milk purchases through the food box program. <https://www.thebullvine.com/news/to-buy-wholesale-milk-for-its-food-boxes-usda-is-paying-well-above-retail-prices/>

- a. Could the U.S. confirm whether USDA is buying commodities at prices higher than the average market price?
- b. Will the U.S. release the average price paid for commodities purchased through the food box program or the average per-unit prices indicated in the food box contracts awarded?

1.72.2 Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID 93286)

On 12 May 2020, the United States announced the USD 19 billion Coronavirus Food Assistance Program (CFAP), which will provide USD 16 billion in direct support to farmers and ranchers. In the CFAP Cost-Benefit Analysis released on May 14, 2020, the USDA indicated that approximately USD 637 million is available to producers of commodities identified through the Notice of Funding Availability released on 22 May 2020.

- a. Could the U.S. confirm if the amount of USD 637 million being considered for other commodities is included in the original CFAP announcement? Is the amount of USD 637 still the amount being considered?
- b. Since multiple commodity groups in the U.S. have asked for additional support through the CFAP or other programs, is the U.S. considering additional direct payments for the U.S. agriculture sector? If so, to what commodity groups?
- c. Under the CFAP, what oversight mechanisms are in place to monitor the funds flowing out through the USDA and the CCC, keeping in mind that producer self-certification of the farm data is needed to calculate losses?
- d. How is USDA addressing the possibility that this may create an incentive to over-report losses?

1.72.3 Question by China (AG-IMS ID 93232)

The US announced the Coronavirus Food Assistance Program (CFAP), a 19 billion dollars program that provides financial supports to those affected by the COVID-19 pandemic, including farmers and ranchers. While the title of this new program is different from the trade mitigation programs of 2018 and 2019, the structure of the programs appears to be quite similar, which all cover non-specialty crops, animal products, specialty crops and so on. The CFAP uses the fund of the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (CARES ACT), a temporary and new emergency appropriation.

The payment rates are calculated based on price declines and payments are coupled to the production or inventory of each agricultural product.

According to statistics released by the USDA, a total of 365,262 applicants have received about 5.36 billion dollars as of 9 July. Cattle, milk, corn, hogs, soybeans, upland cotton and wheat are among the commodities that received most supports.

- a. Could the US share with Members its evaluation on the impact of CFAP on the international agricultural market?
- b. Is there any linkage between the CFAP and the Trade Mitigation Programs of 2018 and 2019? If not, will the US provide any new agricultural trade aid package in 2020?
- c. How does the US intend to notify CFAP, especially the direct payment program? How could the US ensure its compliance with the WTO rules?

1.72.4 Question by India (AG-IMS ID 93245)

The United States recently decided to roll out a plan to promise the purchase of USD 3 billion worth of dairy, meat and fruits and vegetable produce from farmers under the "Farmers to Family Food Box" scheme, in order to help farmers during the Corona virus pandemic as part of the USD 19 billion Coronavirus Food Assistance Program. The products procured would be used to provide pre-approved boxes of fresh produce, dairy and meat to food banks and other non-profit organizations, as a part of the Agricultural Marketing Services.

(Source: <https://www.ams.usda.gov/content/usda-purchase-3-billion-agricultural-commodities-issuesolicitations-interested>).

The United States announced that it had already completed the first round of purchases at USD 1.2 billion on 30 June 2020, and that it plans to spend USD 1.47 billion in the second round of purchases through July and August 2020.

(Source : <https://www.ams.usda.gov/selling-food-to-usda/farmers-to-families-food-box>)

In this context, India requests the United States to provide the following information:

- a. Details regarding the actual procurement of fresh produce, dairy and meat products, as well as the actual expenditure on the procurement of each of these commodities.
- b. Details regarding the manner in which such procurement is being made, along with the procurement prices.
- c. How is this scheme different in operation from the general scheme under the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) distribution programmes, such as the emergency food assistance programme? Also, please specify the exclusion criteria, if any, under both these schemes.
- d. How does the United States plan to notify this measure under the Agreement on Agriculture?

1.72.5 Question by Mexico (AG-IMS ID 93299)

With regard to the Coronavirus Food Assistance Program (CFAP):

Can the United States provide a breakdown of the following:

- a. Payments made under the CARES Act to compensate for losses due to the disappearance of normal marketing channels:
 - Amount per product;
 - Number of producers that have benefitted;
 - Main states that have benefitted.
- b. Payments made by the CCC to compensate for losses due to market disruptions:
 - Amount per product;
 - Number of producers that have benefitted;

- Main states that have benefitted.
- c. With regard to payments made by the CCC, are market disruptions understood to be price declines, or are there other types?
- d. With regard to the Farmers to Families Food Box Program, what criteria were used to choose which producers' products should be purchased and distributed under the Program?
- e. With regard to the Farmers to Families Food Box Program, USD 3 billion has been budgeted, but there is talk of significant delays in implementation.
 - i. What is the amount currently spent by the USDA on this Program?
 - ii. Is the goal of distributing the USD 3 billion expected to be met on time? If not, will the surplus be re-appropriated by Congress or can the USDA use it for other payments to producers?

1.72.6 Question by Paraguay (AG-IMS ID 93240)

On 17 April, the Secretary of Agriculture, Sonny Perdue, announced that the Coronavirus Food Assistance Program (CFAP) had been set up. This is a programme designed to provide critical assistance to US farmers, totalling USD 19 billion. It was indicated that the CFAP would provide USD 16 billion indirect aid, based on losses in the marketing year 2020 caused by COVID-19, and USD 3 billion for the purchase of food as food aid. Furthermore, the USDA will provide additional funds for the purchase and distribution of food as food aid. The Republic of Paraguay would like to have greater clarity on this Program and would thus like to ask the United States for:

- a. Confirmation of whether this type of direct aid can be considered as market price support (MPS);
- b. Eligibility criteria to receive such aid;
- c. Products covered by this Program;
- d. If it is foreseen to pursue the Program beyond the 2020 marketing year;
- e. When the corresponding DS:1 notification is expected to be submitted and if the possibility of submitting a partial notification is being considered.

2 POINTS RAISED IN CONNECTION WITH INDIVIDUAL NOTIFICATIONS

2.1 Administration of tariff and other quota commitments (Table MA:1)

2.1.1 Brazil (G/AG/N/BRA/55)

AG-IMS ID 93088: Question by Australia - Tariff quota fill

Australia welcomes Brazil's implementation of a 750,000 metric tonnes tariff rate quota for wheat with a zero in-quota duty.

Can Brazil advise the current fill rate of the quota, and whether this information is publicly available for interested traders?

2.1.2 Japan (G/AG/N/JPN/247)

AG-IMS ID 93089: Question by Australia - Transparency issues

Australia welcomes Japan's submission of a MA:1 notification regarding the opening of a number of TRQs. Can Japan confirm:

- a. The policy rationale for the implementation of each of the TRQs;
- b. The date that each TRQ was first opened?

2.2 Imports under tariff and other quota commitments (Table MA:2)

2.2.1 Brazil (G/AG/N/BRA/56)

AG-IMS ID 93020: Question by European Union - Transparency issues

Brazil indicates in the footnote that imports of common wheat reached 6,817,138 metric tonnes in 2018.

- a. At what duty rates did these imports take place?
- b. What were the origins of these imports?

2.2.2 Canada (G/AG/N/CAN/137)

AG-IMS ID 93306: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues

The United States thanks Canada for submitting its market access (MA:2) notification (G/AG/N/CAN/137) for marketing year 2017/18, quota year 2017/18, and calendar year 2018.

It appears there is an error in reporting on the Milk and Dairy Products: Cheese tariff quota. In table MA:2, the access quantity is reported as 20,411.866 tonnes, but that is incorrect, the correct access quantity is 20,411,866 tonnes. The in-quota imports reported for this tariff quota are 20,146 tonnes, and the fill rate is reported as 98.7%. If the in-quota quantity imported were actually 20,146 tonnes, then the fill rate was very low. Please clarify the correct figures for Milk and Dairy Products: Cheese tariff quota in Table MA: 2.

AG-IMS ID 93304: Question by United States of America - Tariff quota fill

The United States thanks Canada for submitting its market access (MA:2) notification (G/AG/N/CAN/137) for marketing year 2017/18, quota year 2017/18, and calendar year 2018. The United States would like to note its concern regarding the consistently low fill rates for several of Canada's tariff-rate quotas (TRQ), which continue in the most recent notification. In particular, concentrated/condensed milk/cream, yogurt, and powdered buttermilk, for which the fill rate of each product has remained below 65% for at least the past four years. In addition, the fill rates for yogurt and powdered buttermilk decreased from 2017 to 2018; in the case of powdered buttermilk, the decrease in fill rate was quite significant. The United States notes Canada's response to NZ question AGIMS ID 91017 on tariff rate quota administration, including for dairy products. In response to that question, Canada stated, "In May 2019, Global Affairs Canada launched a comprehensive review of TRQ administration and allocation of supply-managed tariff rate quotas." and "Consultation results will inform recommendations for longer-term allocation and administration policies."

- a. Phase II of Canada's comprehensive review of TRQ administration was halted on 1 May 2020. When will Canada's review recommence?
- b. Based on the information gained from Canada's comprehensive review of TRQ administration so far, does Canada have any plans to revise its policies for administration of dairy tariff-rate quotas?

2.2.3 Chile (G/AG/N/CHL/64)

AG-IMS ID 93307: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues

Chile notes that importers filled 0% of its Tariff Rate Quota (TRQ) CHLQ001 in the 2019 calendar year (G/AG/N/CHL/64) but does not list the fill rate for 2018 in its submission.

Was the TRQ opened in 2018 and, if so, what was the fill rate?

2.2.4 China (G/AG/N/CHN/50)

AG-IMS ID 93090: Question by Australia - Tariff quota fill

Australia thanks China for submitting its MA:2 for Calendar Year 2018 (G/AG/N/CHN/50). Australia notes a number of tariff quotas had a fill rate of less than 65% (wheat: 32.2%, corn: 39.3%, rice 57.8%).

- a. Can China explain if it is considering changes to the administration of the TRQs for wheat, corn and rice to improve the TRQ fill rates?
- b. If so, can China please provide details of the possible changes, including the timelines for such changes?

AG-IMS ID 93091: Question by Brazil - Transparency issues

China's latest MA:2 notification, pertaining to calendar year 2018, demonstrates that the fill-rate for tariff-rate quota CHNQ002 ("corn") decreased during the past years, coming from 72% in 2012 (G/AG/N/CHN/26) to 39,3% in 2018.

- a. Could China provide data on market circumstances that could explain such reduction of the volume of imports under TRQ CHNQ002?
- b. Are imports taking place outside the TRQ?
- c. What are the procedures and criteria for granting import licenses for corn?
- d. What is the share of state-owned enterprises in the total of Chinese corn imports?

AG-IMS ID 93092: Question by Russian Federation - Tariff quota fill

TRQs for wheat (CHNQ001), corn (CHNQ002) and rice (CHNQ003, CHNQ004) are filled by less than 60%. Share of state-trading enterprises (STEs) in TRQ for wheat which has the lowest fill-in rate (32,2%) is 90%; share of STEs in TRQ for corn (fill-in rate: 39,3%) is 60%; share of STEs in TRQ for rice (fill-in rate: 57,8%) is 40%. During the period from 2013 to 2018 in 2014, 2015 and 2018 fill-in rates of TRQ for wheat were lower than 36%. In comparison with fill-in rate in 2017, in 2018 fill-in rate of wheat TRQ decreased by more than 10%. Since 2015 to 2018 fill-in rate of TRQ for corn declined from 65% to 39%. In 2018 in comparison with the data of 2017 fill-in rate of TRQ for rice declined from 75,7% to 57,8%.

- a. Could China please provide explanations for instantly low fill-in rate of TRQ for wheat and declines in fill-in rates of TRQs for wheat, corn and rice?
- b. Could China please explain direct correlation between the low fill-in rate and the share of state trading enterprises in imports under TRQs?

2.2.5 European Union (G/AG/N/EU/57)

AG-IMS ID 93094: Question by Brazil - Transparency issues

- a. Could the European Union provide data on the "apportionment" of imports under the TRQs listed in document G/AG/N/EU/57 between the EU-27 and the United Kingdom during marketing year 2018/2019?
- b. Does the field "in-quota imports during period" indicate all imports of goods under the tariff lines included in the TRQs?
- c. Why were some of the EU TRQs not included in the notification? Specifically, would the European Union have data on in-quota imports for EECQ026 and EECQ028?

AG-IMS ID 93093: Question by Australia - Tariff quota fill

Australia thanks the EU for submitting its MA:2 for marketing year 2018/2019 (G/AG/N/EU/57). Australia notes a number of tariff quotas did not record any fill (0%) or less than 65% fill rate.

- a. Can the EU explain the reasons for the significant underfill of some of its tariff quotas?
- b. For each underfilled quota, can the EU explain whether the under-fill was due to market circumstances, SPS measures for the product, or restrictive tariff quota administration?
- c. Did the EU consider using the TRQ underfill mechanism as outlined by the Bali Decision?

AG-IMS ID 93095: Question by New Zealand - Tariff quota fill

New Zealand welcomes the European Union's notification concerning imports under tariff rate quotas during the marketing year 2018/2019. New Zealand notes that a significant number of the TRQ quotas have very low fill rates, particularly in regard to dairy products.

Could the EU please provide an explanation of the circumstance such as market conditions or other factors which lead to the low fill rates of these quotas. Additionally, has the EU considered removing in quota tariffs?

AG-IMS ID 93061: Question by Paraguay - Tariff quota fill

The Republic of Paraguay thanks the European Union for the submission of the notification contained in document G/AG/N/EU/57 concerning imports under tariff quotas (Table MA:2) during the marketing year 2018/2019. It notes with concern that several tariff quotas have very low tariff fill rates.

In this regard, Paraguay requests the European Union to provide further information on:

- a. The reasons for the under-fill of the following tariff quotas:
 - EECQ011: tariff fill rate of 1.6%;
 - ECCQ015: tariff fill rate of 2.4%;
 - ECCQ017: tariff fill rate of 2.2%;
 - ECCQ018: tariff fill rate of 3.9%;
 - ECCQ022: tariff fill rate of 50.6%;
 - ECCQ022: tariff fill rate of 0%;
 - ECCQ066: tariff fill rate of 1.6%;
 - ECCQ089: tariff fill rate of 27.3%;
 - ECCQ091: tariff fill rate of 31%.
- b. It also wishes to know whether the European Union is taking appropriate steps to ensure the effective utilization of these quotas.

AG-IMS ID 93237: Question by Paraguay - Tariff quota fill

The Republic of Paraguay is submitting this question following the EU's reply to question AG-IMS 93061.

In this respect, we wish to point out that the question does not refer to the EU's policy regarding the administration of quotas in general, as in the question posed within the TPR context, but to a specific notification subject to this review process in which quotas of interest have been identified.

Furthermore, by the date of the EU's reply to this question from Paraguay, i.e. 24 March 2020, and by the date of the submission of this follow-up question, Paraguay had still not received the EU's replies to the questions submitted to it as part of its TPR process. It should be noted that these replies were not circulated to the Membership until May and are currently being examined by our authorities. We therefore request once again that the EU provide further information on:

- a. The reasons for the low fill rate in respect of the following quotas: EECQ011 (1.6%), EECQ015 (2.4%), EECQ017 (2.2%), EECQ018 (3.9%), EECQ066 (1.6%), EECQ089 (27.3%) and EECQ091 (31.2%);
- b. Whether the EU is taking the necessary steps to ensure the effective utilization of these quotas and whether it could provide examples of the steps it is taking.

AG-IMS ID 93096: Question by Russian Federation - Tariff quota fill

The Russian Federation thanks the European Union for its MA:2 notification concerning import under TRQs. The Russian Federation noticed that 15 of 60 TRQs under which volumes were imported during 2018-2019 marketing year (EECQ001, EECQ002, EECQ003, EECQ013, EECQ014, EECQ019, EECQ021, EECQ023, EECQ027, EECQ030, EECQ035, EECQ036, EECQ037, EECQ097, EECQ111) had zero or almost zero fill-in rate.

Could European Union provide the reasons for the absence of import under mentioned TRQs?

2.2.6 Japan (G/AG/N/JPN/253)

AG-IMS ID 93204: Question by Australia - Tariff quota fill

Australia thanks Japan for the submission of its MA:2 for 2018. Australia notes that Japan notified a fill rate of less than 65% for nine of its quotas.

- a. Can Japan explain the reasons for the underfill of some of its quotas?
- b. For each underfilled quota, was the underfill due to market circumstances, SPS measures for the product, or restrictive tariff quota administration?
- c. Has Japan considered using the TRQ underfill mechanism as outlined by the Bali Decision?

2.2.7 Kazakhstan (G/AG/N/KAZ/7)

AG-IMS ID 93205: Question by Australia - Tariff quota fill

Australia thanks Kazakhstan for the submission of its MA:2 for 2019. Australia notes that Kazakhstan notified a fill rate of less than 65 % for two of its three quotas.

- a. Can Kazakhstan explain the reasons for the underfill of some of its quotas?
- b. For each underfilled quota, was the underfill due to market circumstances, SPS measures for the product, or restrictive tariff quota administration?
- c. Has Kazakhstan considered using the TRQ underfill mechanism as outlined by the Bali Decision?

AG-IMS ID 93189: Question by European Union - Tariff quota fill

Could Kazakhstan explain the reason for the low fill rate of the TRQ for fresh, chilled and frozen beef?

2.2.8 Korea, Republic of (G/AG/N/KOR/71, G/AG/N/KOR/72, G/AG/N/KOR/73)

AG-IMS ID 93097: Question by Australia - Tariff quota fill

Australia thanks the Republic of Korea for submitting its MA:2 for Calendar Years 2016, 2017 and 2018 (G/AG/N/KOR/71, G/AG/N/KOR/72 and G/AG/N/KOR/73). Australia notes a number of tariff quotas had a fill rate of less than 65% (in 2018 potatoes: 49.1%, onions: 0%, citrus fruits: 36.7%).

- a. Can the Republic of Korea explain the reasons for the significant underfill of some of its tariff quotas?

- b. For each underfilled quota, can the Republic of Korea explain whether the under-fill was due to market circumstances, SPS measures for the product, or restrictive tariff quota administration?
- c. Did the Republic of Korea consider using the TRQ underfill mechanism as outlined by the Bali Decision?

AG-IMS ID 93098: Question by Brazil - Tariff quota fill

Korea's most recent MA:2 notifications indicated a steep decline on the fill rate of TRQs KORQ020 (onions) and KORQ021 (garlic), from 99.5% and 100% respectively during calendar year 2016 to 0% during calendar year 2018.

- a. Could the Republic of Korea provide data on market circumstances that could explain such a reduction of the volume of imports under TRQs KORQ020 and KORQ021?
- b. Are imports taking place outside the TRQ?

AG-IMS ID 93099: Question by Russian Federation - Tariff quota fill

During three consecutive years (2016-2018) several TRQs were zero filled or about to be zero-filled: KORQ001 (cattle and buffalo: pure bred breeding animals); KORQ002 (swine: pure bred breeding); KORQ012 (bird's eggs; not in shell/not dried); KORQ014 (powder of bones); KORQ015 (silkworm eggs); KORQ016 (fruit trees); KORQ017 (mulberry trees); KORQ018 (seed potatoes); KORQ026 (sweet potatoes); KORQ044 (foxtail millet); KORQ055 (ginseng); KORQ063 (oil-cake and other residues of sesamum seeds); KORQ066 (silk-worm cocoons suitable for reeling).

Could the Republic of Korea please indicate the reasons for zero fill-in rate of mentioned TRQs?

2.2.9 Morocco (G/AG/N/MAR/48, G/AG/N/MAR/48/Corr.1 G/AG/N/MAR/49, G/AG/N/MAR/50, G/AG/N/MAR/51, G/AG/N/MAR/52)

AG-IMS ID 93100: Question by Russian Federation - Tariff quota fill

The Russian Federation thanks Morocco for its MA:2 notifications (G/AG/N/MAR/48, G/AG/N/MAR/49, G/AG/N/MAR/50, G/AG/N/MAR/51, G/AG/N/MAR/52). The Russian Federation noticed that during the period from 2013 to 2017 TRQ for sheep meat (MARQ002) were zero filled or about to be zero filled. Could Morocco please indicate the reasons for such low fill-in rates?

AG-IMS ID 93101: Question by Brazil - Transparency issues

Morocco's latest MA:2 notifications, pertaining to calendar years 2013 to 2017, indicate that tariff-rate quota MARQ003 ("white meat") has had a very low fill rate, ranging from 6.4% in 2017 to 30% in 2013.

- a. Could Morocco provide data on market circumstances that could explain such reduced volume of imports under TRQ MARQ003?
- b. Are imports taking place outside the TRQ?
- c. Has there been any change in the administration method or the establishment of new non-tariff requirements for the imports of products under TRQ MARQ003?
- d. Which economic operators are entitled to apply for an import license for white meat?
- e. Is Morocco considering updating its TRQ administration method in order to allow economic operators to seize the commercial opportunities deriving from TRQ MARQ003?

2.2.10 Nicaragua (G/AG/N/NIC/54)

AG-IMS ID 93206: Question by Australia - Tariff quota fill

Australia thanks Nicaragua for the submission of its MA:2 for 2019. Australia notes that Nicaragua recorded a fill rate of 55.8% for milk.

- a. Can Nicaragua explain the reasons for that underfilled quota?
- b. Was the underfill due to market circumstances, SPS measures for the product, or restrictive tariff quota administration?
- c. Has Nicaragua considered using the TRQ underfill mechanism as outlined by the Bali Decision?

2.2.11 Norway (G/AG/N/NOR/110)

AG-IMS ID 93207: Question by Australia - Tariff quota fill

Australia thanks Norway for the submission of its MA:2 for 2019. Australia notes that Norway recorded a fill rate of less than 65% for ten of those TRQs opened.

- a. Can Norway explain the reasons for the underfill of some of its quotas?
- b. For each underfilled quota, was the underfill due to market circumstances, SPS measures for the product, or restrictive tariff quota administration?
- c. Has Norway considered using the TRQ underfill mechanism as outlined by the Bali Decision?

AG-IMS ID 93181: Question by New Zealand - Tariff quota fill

New Zealand welcomes Norway's notification (G/AG/N/NOR/104) concerning imports under tariff quotas (Table MA:2) during the calendar year 2019.

New Zealand notes that a number of a number of tariff rate quotas are consistently under filled particularly NORQ229 – butter, butter and other fats and oils derived from milk.

- a. Can Norway please advise whether the under fill is due to market circumstances or other causes?
- b. For those quotas that are significantly and consistently under filled, can Norway explain what steps it is taking to ensure that quotas are not under filled and any consideration it has given to moving to a tariff only regime?

2.2.12 Panama (G/AG/N/PAN/55)

AG-IMS ID 93208: Question by Australia - Tariff quota fill

Australia thanks Panama for the submission of its MA:2 for 2019. Australia notes that Panama recorded a fill rate of less than 65% for ten of those TRQs opened.

- a. Can Panama explain the reasons for the underfill of some of its quotas?
- b. For each underfilled quota, was the underfill due to market circumstances, SPS measures for the product, or restrictive tariff quota administration?
- c. Has Panama considered using the TRQ underfill mechanism as outlined by the Bali Decision?

2.2.13 Russian Federation (G/AG/N/RUS/27)

AG-IMS ID 93209: Question by Australia - Tariff quota fill

Australia thanks the Russian Federation for the submission of its MA:2 for 2019. Australia notes that the Russian Federation recorded a fill rate of less than 65% for all quotas.

- a. Can the Russian Federation explain the reasons for the underfill of its quotas?
- b. For each underfilled quota, was the underfill due to market circumstances, SPS measures for the product, or restrictive tariff quota administration?
- c. Has the Russian Federation considered using the TRQ underfill mechanism as outlined by the Bali Decision?

2.2.14 Switzerland (G/AG/N/CHE/98)

AG-IMS ID 93062: Question by Paraguay - Tariff quota fill

The Republic of Paraguay thanks Switzerland for the submission of the notification contained in document G/AG/N/CHE/98 concerning imports under tariff quotas (Table MA:2) for the calendar year 2018. Paraguay requests Switzerland to provide further information on the reasons for the under-fill of tariff quotas CHEQ026 (tariff fill rate of 58.5%) and CHEQ028 (tariff fill rate of 45.7%).

2.2.15 Chinese Taipei (G/AG/N/TPKM/191)

AG-IMS ID 93214: Question by Australia - Tariff quota fill

Australia thanks Chinese Taipei for the submission of its MA:2 for reporting period 2019. Australia notes that Chinese Taipei recorded no or little quota fill for a number of products, including bananas and mangoes.

- a. Can Chinese Taipei explain the reasons for the underfill of some of its quotas?
- b. For each underfilled quota, was the underfill due to market circumstances, SPS measures for the product, or restrictive tariff quota administration?
- c. Has Chinese Taipei considered using the TRQ underfill mechanism as outlined by the Bali Decision?

2.2.16 Ukraine (G/AG/N/UKR/35)

AG-IMS ID 93102: Question by Brazil - Transparency issues

Ukraine's latest MA:2 notification, pertaining to calendar year 2019, indicate that there have not been any imports under TRQ UKRQ001 ("raw cane sugar", tariff line 1701.11), even though there is no indication on the notification that it was not opened.

- a. Could Ukraine provide data on market circumstances that could explain the absence of applications under TRQ UKRQ001?
- b. Are imports taking place outside the TRQ?
- c. What are the criteria for the State Reserve Agency of Ukraine and the Ministry of Agrarian Policy and Food of Ukraine to approve the issue of a license (ref. G/AG/N/UKR/34)?

AG-IMS ID 93103: Question by Thailand - Tariff quota fill

Ukraine bound Raw Cane Sugar (HS 170111) as TRQ product, which import quota is 267,800 tonnes/year. However, in 2019, the fill rate of in-quota quantity is 0%. Could Ukraine please elaborate the reason?

2.2.17 Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of (G/AG/N/VEN/28)**AG-IMS ID 93104: Question by New Zealand - Transparency issues**

New Zealand refers to Venezuela's response to Canada's question at the November 2014 Committee on Agriculture (AG-IMS ID 75033). In response, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela advised that it would submit its 2013 MA:2 notification for the 16 remaining products within a few days of the meeting. New Zealand notes that the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela has not yet submitted its MA:2 notification for the remaining 16 products for the 2013 year. Can the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela please confirm when this notification will be submitted?

2.2.18 Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of (G/AG/N/VEN/29)**AG-IMS ID 93105: Question by Russian Federation - Tariff quota fill**

- a. The Russian Federation took note that TRQ for cheese (VENQ010) in 2016 was fully filled (100%) while in 2017 fill-in rate of the same TRQ dropped to 0%. Could the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela please indicate the reasons for such a significant decline?
- b. Several TRQs in 2016-2017 were zero filled: VENQ020 (wheat), VENQ034 (palm nuts and kernels), VENQ043 (other oils), VENQ046 (coconut oil), VENQ047 (other vegetable fats and oils). Could the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela indicate the reasons for the absence of imports under mentioned TRQs?
- c. Russian Federation noticed that in 2016 fill-in rate of TRQ for animal or vegetable fats and oils was 21,8% while in 2017 fill-in rate decreased to zero percent. Could Venezuela please provide the reason for this decline?

2.2.19 Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of (G/AG/N/VEN/29, G/AG/N/VEN/30)**AG-IMS ID 93106: Question by New Zealand - Transparency issues**

New Zealand refers to Canada's question at the November 2014 Committee on Agriculture (AG-IMS ID 75032). In response, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela advised that it intended to bring its notifications up to date as soon as possible. New Zealand notes that the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela has still not submitted MA:2 notifications for 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012. Additionally, New Zealand notes that the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela has not submitted MA:2 notifications for 2014 and 2015.

Can the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela please advise when it expects to provide these notifications?

2.2.20 Viet Nam (G/AG/N/VNM/9, G/AG/N/VNM/10, G/AG/N/VNM/11, G/AG/N/VNM/12)**AG-IMS ID 93210: Question by Australia - Tariff quota fill**

Australia thanks Viet Nam for the submission of its MA:2s for reporting years 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019. Australia notes that Viet Nam recorded a fill rate of 0 for eggs in each period, and a downward trend in quota fill for sugar.

- a. Can Viet Nam provide further information on the 0% fill rate for eggs, including whether it was due to market circumstances, SPS measures for the product, or restrictive tariff quota administration?
- b. Can Viet Nam provide information on the downward trend on in-quota sugar imports?

2.3 Special agricultural safeguards (Tables MA:3 to MA:5)

2.3.1 Japan (G/AG/N/JPN/251)

AG-IMS ID 93211: Question by Australia - Transparency issues

Australia thanks Japan for the submission of its MA:5 for 2019. Australia notes that Japan invoked price based or volume based SSG action during the period for all of the products listed.

- a. Can Japan provide information on the volume of imports at which the SSG action was invoked for each of the products?
- b. Can Japan provide domestic consumption statistics for the same reporting period for each of the products?
- c. For the volume-based SSG on butter and other fats and oils derived from milk; dairy spreads, can Japan confirm the SSG was in-place for the entire reporting period? (the MA:5 is for the period 01/04/2019-31/03/2020, with the SSG being in place from 01/01/2019 to 31/03/2020).

2.3.2 Chinese Taipei (G/AG/N/TPKM/182)

AG-IMS ID 93022: Question by United States of America - Link with TRQ commitments

On 27 September 2019, Chinese Taipei notified a volume-based special safeguard for fresh milk.

Chinese Taipei's imports of fresh milk have increased significantly over the years and annually fill the tariff-rate quota (TRQ) within only a matter of months suggesting the growth in domestic production remains unable to meet the demand. Has Chinese Taipei considered reviewing its TRQ administration and SSG policies?

2.3.3 Chinese Taipei (G/AG/N/TPKM/183)

AG-IMS ID 93023: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues

On 4 November 2019, Chinese Taipei notified a volume-based special safeguard on chicken legs and wings. It is noted that during the relevant preceding years period (2015-17), both imports and domestic consumption declined. However, the percent decrease in imports was nearly double the percent decrease in consumption.

- a. Please describe what factors contributed to the decrease in domestic consumption and also any factors contributing to changes in domestic production during this period.
- b. Has Chinese Taipei considered reviewing its SSG policies to ensure its consumers have access to sufficient quantities of affordable chicken legs and wings?

2.3.4 Chinese Taipei (G/AG/N/TPKM/185, G/AG/N/TPKM/187)

AG-IMS ID 93107: Question by Thailand - Transparency issues

According to Chinese Taipei's latest MA:3 notifications, notifying that the Trigger Volume of Garlic (G/AG/N/TPKM/185) and Other Milk Products (G/AG/N/TPKM/187) are 20,436.3 tonnes and 13,564.8 tonnes respectively. In this regard, Thailand would like to seek more clarifications as follows:

- a. In MA:3 notifications of Garlic and Other Milk Products, Chinese Taipei used 125% as base trigger level to calculate trigger volumes. However, Article 5.4 and footnote 3 of AoA allows using 125% (Article 5.4 (a)) if the domestic consumption were not taken into account. Thailand views that Chinese Taipei already has domestic consumption on both notifications. Could Chinese Taipei clarify why the domestic consumption is not taken into account?

- b. Article 5.7 stated that Members shall give notice in advance as may be practicable and in any 10 day of implementation. Thailand would like to seek clarification for the delay of submissions.

2.3.5 United States of America (G/AG/N/USA/130)

AG-IMS ID 93190: Question by European Union - Transparency issues

The EU welcomes the US finally notifying its SSG use for 2016. The US had recourse to the SSG on no less than 55 tariff lines. When does the US intend to notify its outstanding notifications subsequent years?

AG-IMS ID 93194: Question by New Zealand - Transparency issues

- a. New Zealand notes that special safeguards have been applied to a small volume of many tariff line products, including (but not limited to) the following.
- 04015025: 34 kgs;
 - 04021050: 36 kgs;
 - 04051020: 4 kgs;
 - 04062033: 8 kgs;
 - 04062039: 4 kgs.

Can the US:

- i. explain why price-based special safeguard measures were invoked in these instances, for such small quantities of products?
 - ii. Advise when corresponding MA:4 notifications will be submitted, identifying the trigger price applicable in each case?
 - iii. Advise how much additional duty was payable on these 5 tariff lines?
- b. New Zealand notes that the US imported 47,140 tonnes of boneless frozen beef (HS 0202.30.80) in 2015 and applied a price-based safeguard on 72 kgs of product. However, in 2016 the US only imported 15,318 tonnes (68% less product than the previous year) and yet applied a price-based safeguard on 11,670 kgs of product.

Can the US:

- i. provide more detail on the trigger price and additional duty payable for HS 0202.30.80 in calendar year 2016 and in calendar year 2015?
- ii. Confirm if an MA:4 notification will be submitted for HS 0202.30.80, and when?

2.4 Domestic support commitments (Table DS:1)

2.4.1 Argentina (G/AG/N/ARG/44, G/AG/N/ARG/45)

AG-IMS ID 93109: Question by India - General services: training services

India requests Argentina to respond to Canada's question AG-IMS ID 92052 seeking the reasons for increase in the amount notified under "Special Fund for Tobacco" from 1992 Pesos 240,703,683 to 1992 Pesos 379,331,941 in the Green Box, that is, approximately 58% rise, as per notification documents G/AG/N/ARG/44 and G/AG/N/ARG/45 for years 2015-16 to 2016-17.

AG-IMS ID 93108: Question by India - Other product-specific AMS/EMS

Canada in its question AG-IMS ID 92054 sought information about Argentina's "Belgrano Agricultural Stimulus Plan" which remains unanswered. In this context, India requests Argentina to answer the following:

In its 2016/2017 domestic support DS:1 notification document G/AG/N/ARG/45, Argentina notified the "Belgrano Agricultural Stimulus Plan" for the first time under product-specific domestic support for soya.

- a. What type of interventions are covered under the plan?
- b. What is the eligibility criteria of getting support?
- c. Is this plan only restricted to soya or are there any other products covered?

2.4.2 Australia (G/AG/N/AUS/129)

AG-IMS ID 93110: Question by Canada - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

The Australian Government has in place a programme called the Fuel Tax Credits (FTC) that is available to its agriculture sector. However, it appears that Australia has not notified this support in its most recent domestic support notification (G/AG/N/AUS/129) or any previous domestic support notification.

- a. Could Australia please explain why it has not notified this programme in its domestic support notification?
- b. Could Australia explain why this support provided to its agricultural producers does not constitute revenue forgone, an input subsidy or any another type of domestic support that benefits Australian agricultural producers?

2.4.3 Bolivia, Plurinational State of (G/AG/N/BOL/14 - G/AG/N/BOL/26)

AG-IMS ID 93111: Question by Australia - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Australia thanks the Plurinational State of Bolivia for its DS:1 notifications for the Calendar Years 2006-2018, in which it confirms no domestic support was provided for any of these years.

Australia thanks the Plurinational State of Bolivia for updating its compliance with its WTO Domestic Support notification obligations.

On Bolivia's Ministry of Rural Development and Land website - <https://www.ruralytierras.gob.bo/>, the financial accounts report for calendar year 2018 indicates that around 612,827,012 Bolivianos (approximately USD 89 million), was expended through Government investments or transfers. There has also been media reporting that the Plurinational State of Bolivia is providing agricultural subsidies to diversify production away from quinoa.

Can the Plurinational State of Bolivia explain why the expenditure detailed and reported in its official Government websites has not been included in Bolivia's Domestic Support notifications?

AG-IMS ID 93025: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

In its notifications for 2006-2018, the Plurinational State of Bolivia reports that no domestic support measures exist. For each of the following programme, please confirm whether any or all of these measures were in place between 2006-2018, their current status, and whether/when the Plurinational State of Bolivia will notify the measures.

- a. CRIAR: Provides technical assistance and vouchers that partially cover the cost of agricultural technology such as irrigation, greenhouses, or storage units, among others, targeting small landholder farmers.
- b. Agricultural Innovation and Services Project: The project innovation in agriculture and forestry and research, technical assistance, and seed certification activities, benefitting small-scale commercial seed producers.
- c. Catastrophe Insurance Subsidy Program: The insurance programme covers ten commodities and compensates farmers for losses.

2.4.4 Brazil (G/AG/N/BRA/58)

AG-IMS ID 93029: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Supporting Table DS:6 & DS:7

Brazil stated in its response to AG-IMS ID 87014 that "there is no new forecast for new PEP/PEPRO auctions for the 2017/2018 crop" outside of rice and maize, and in AG-IMS ID 91165 stated "market conditions do not indicate the need to use these mechanisms for any crop" in 2019.

Are any PEP or PEPRO auctions expected for agricultural commodities in 2020?

AG-IMS ID 93112: Question by Australia - Public stockholding for food security purposes

Australia thanks Brazil for the submission of its DS:1 for Agricultural year 2017-2018. Australia is interested in the Program of acquisition of agricultural products from family farming, listed under Public Stockholding for food security purposes in Supporting Table DS:1.

Can Brazil provide more information on this programme, including:

- a. Are the agricultural products purchased at market rates?
- b. How are the products sold and/or distributed following their purchase and storage?

AG-IMS ID 93028: Question by United States of America - Article 6.2 (Special and Differential Treatment / Development Programmes)

Supporting Table DS:2

Brazil's notified expenditures in ST/DS:2 decreased significantly between 2014/15 and 2017/18, mainly due to the reduction of input subsidy expenditures through the National Program to Strengthen Family Farming (PRONAF) program, and the 90% drop in spending on investment credits since the last notification in 2016/2017.

Please explain the reason for the drop in expenditures for each of the identified measures, i.e. PRONAF and investment credits.

AG-IMS ID 93026: Question by European Union - Input subsidies available to low-income or resource-poor producers

Debt rescheduling – Supporting table DS:2

Brazil has indicated USD 28 million as input subsidy for debt rescheduling under PRONAF and PROCERA.

- a. Can Brazil explain how it sees debt rescheduling as fulfilling the criteria of being an input subsidy for low-income resource-poor producers?
- b. Can Brazil indicate the proportion of the outstanding loans benefitted from this rescheduling?

AG-IMS ID 93027: Question by European Union - Non-product-specific AMS

Debt rescheduling – Supporting table DS:9

Brazil indicates an amount of USD 957 million as debt rescheduling.

- a. What was the overall total debt that benefitted from this subsidy?
- b. What has been the average rescheduled programme interest rate during the reporting period?

- c. What has been the average subsidy rate (expressed as percentage points of interest per year) for the debt benefitting from this subsidy?

AG-IMS ID 93030: Question by United States of America - Non-product-specific AMS

Supporting Table DS:9

In ST/DS:9, Brazil has notified a line for production and marketing credit expenditures [described as an Implicit subsidy based on the difference between the interest rate of each of the following programmes and SELIC (Special System for Liquidation and Custody) interest rate (interest rate for the overnight interbank loans collateralized by Government bonds): Constitutional Funds (FNO, FNE and FCO), Pronamp (Medium-Scale Agricultural Producer Support Program), and Rural Savings and Mandatory Resources at controlled interest rates] in each of the previous three years, with outlays totalling more than USD 650 million each year. However, that line was not included in Brazil's 2018 DS:1 notification.

Please explain the reason for the exclusion of expenditures on non-product specific production and marketing credits.

2.4.5 Burkina Faso (G/AG/N/BFA/18, G/AG/N/BFA/19)

AG-IMS ID 93213: Question by European Union - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

The EU appreciates the effort Burkina Faso has made in submitting its Domestic Support notification for 2015 and 2017. The notifications indicate: Burkina Faso did not apply any domestic support measures in the calendar year 2017".

Taking into account the importance of the cotton sector in the country and the efforts Burkina Faso is making to improve the sector, the EU wonders whether these efforts are made without any Government support, whether Green Box, Article 6.2 subsidies or otherwise.

- a. Can Burkina Faso confirm that it does not provide any domestic support for the cotton sector?

AG-IMS ID 93212: Question by Australia - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Australia thanks Burkina Faso for the submission of DS:1s for 2015 and 2017 confirming that no domestic support was provided during these reporting periods. Australia notes FAO reporting (<http://www.fao.org/3/i3760e/i3760e.pdf>) indicates Burkina Faso began re-investing government funding in its agricultural sector following the 2007/08 food crisis. This reportedly included input subsidies, price-setting mechanisms and irrigation infrastructure.

- a. Noting the DS:1 response for 2015 and 2017, can Burkina Faso confirm that no support covered by the Agreement on Agriculture was provided during these reporting periods, for example under Article 6.2?

AG-IMS ID 93260: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Burkina Faso's notification states that its Government does not provide domestic support to its agricultural sector. However, it is the United States' understanding that Burkina Faso has provided financial support to cotton companies to purchase and distribute fertilizer at subsidized rates for targeted commodities. As a result, studies have shown that subsidized fertilizer is approximately one-quarter cheaper than those purchased at market prices. It is also understood that seeds, pesticides, and equipment may also be subsidized. The United States also understands the Government of Burkina Faso provides funding for agricultural research.

- a. Please confirm whether Burkina Faso provided such input subsidies during the period covered by these notifications, CY 2015 and CY 2017.
- b. If so, what was the basis for not notifying these measures and will Burkina Faso be submitting a revised notification?

- c. Please confirm no other domestic support was provided to the agricultural sector in CY 2015 or CY 2017, such as public funding for agricultural research.

2.4.6 Cambodia (G/AG/N/KHM/14)

AG-IMS ID 93288: Question by Canada - Direct payments: payments for relief from natural disasters

In its 2018 notification, Cambodia introduced a new programme classified under paragraph 8 of the Annex 2 of the AoA described as "Expenditure on the provisions of agricultural inputs, equipment and pest and disease control to agricultural producers for relief from natural disaster in accordance with Annex II: 8 of the Agreement on Agriculture".

- a. Could Cambodia provide the name of the measure and general information as to how this measure works, who is eligible and what are the eligibility criteria to receive a payment under this measure?
- b. Could Cambodia explain how this measure complies with the specific criteria of paragraph 8 of the Annex 2 of the AoA?

2.4.7 Cameroon (G/AG/N/CMR/11)

AG-IMS ID 93031: Question by European Union - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Cameroon indicates that no support is granted towards agricultural production. The notification indicates that support is provided under the environmental protection programme through the Ministry of the Environment, Nature Protection and Sustainable Development.

- a. Can Cameroon elaborate more in details of what types of programmes are implemented, and who are the beneficiaries, along with eligibility criteria.
- b. How much was spent on these programmes in 2018?
- c. Would Cameroon consider including the amounts paid out under such programmes in the supporting table DS:1 in the future?

AG-IMS ID 93032: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Cameroon's notification states that its Government does not provide domestic support to its agricultural sector. However, Cameroon's notification also states that its Government provides assistance to the agricultural sector through the Ministry of Environment, Nature Protection and Sustainable Development's environmental protection programme.

Please elaborate on what the assistance to the agricultural sector is with regards to environmental protection programme.

2.4.8 Canada (G/AG/N/CAN/131)

AG-IMS ID 93113: Question by New Zealand - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

According to Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, Growing Forward 2 concluded in 2018. As Canada reports its domestic support with a significant time lag, can Canada confirm that this is the case, and that we can anticipate no further domestic support measures under "growing forward 2" to be notified after 2018?

AG-IMS ID 93035: Question by United States of America - Market price support: Eligible production

Supporting Table DS:5

"Note 2" to "Supporting Tables DS:5" indicates that "eligible production" of skim milk powder equals total production (102,953 tonnes) less product sales for further processing and animal feed under Special Classes 5a, b, and c (11,840 tonnes) and 4m (69,964 tonnes) less total exports (23,687 tonnes), plus that portion of exports that had received the support price (0 tonne).

- a. Is SMP produced in Ontario using components priced under Class 6, which was implemented in April 2016, also excluded from eligible production in the same manner as is done for SMP product sales under Special Classes 5 a, b, and c and 4m?
- b. If so, how much SMP was produced in Ontario in 2016 under Class 6 and was excluded from eligible production?
- c. The United States notes that Canada continues to exclude butter and skim milk powder for further processing under Classes 4m (powder) and 5 a, b, and c and for exports from eligible production. Following up on AG-IMS ID 83079, what measure specifically excludes butter and skim milk powder for further processing and exports from receiving the price?

AG-IMS ID 93114: Question by New Zealand - Other product-specific AMS/EMS

In 2016, total product-specific AMS for beef increased from CAD 20.3 million to CAD 64.3 million – mainly as a result of CAD 37.6 million (increased from CAD 0.7 million in calendar year 2015) listed under "assurance stabilisation des revenus agricoles".

Can Canada confirm if this increase is the result of a one-off event, and what that event was? Or if Members can expect to see similar large increases in product-specific AMS in future notifications?

AG-IMS ID 93033: Question by United States of America - Other product-specific AMS/EMS

Supporting Table DS:7

Support was provided for several commodities under the measures "Provincial Programs", "Hog Industry Loan Loss Reserve Program (HILLRP)", "Ontario Marketing and Vineyard Improvement program", and "Nova Scotia Vineyard Quality Enhancement" notified in column 5 "Other product specific support (with calculation details)", however, no calculation details are provided.

Please provide calculation details for payments made under each of these programs so that Members may understand how the reported values were derived.

AG-IMS ID 93115: Question by New Zealand - Non-product-specific AMS

Spending under AgriInsurance increased from CAD 894 million in 2015, to CAD 1,038.3 million in 2016. The amount appears to represent the premiums cost-shared by Federal and Provincial Governments. Can Canada explain what caused the significant increase in premiums, and if we can expect similar increases in future notifications?

AG-IMS ID 93034: Question by United States of America - Non-product-specific AMS

Supporting Table DS:7

Canada notified negative support under "Other product specific support (with calculation details)" for pork under the "Provincial Programs" measure without any associated fees/levies reported. This support was deducted from Total AMS.

- a. Please explain how this measure is implemented, including the basis for notifying negative values of support in column 5.
- b. Please specify the province in question, and the nature and amount of each levy or fee on producers that forms the basis for the claim of negative domestic support.
- c. Please also provide a copy of all legal instruments related to the programme.

2.4.9 Colombia (G/AG/N/COL/69)

AG-IMS ID 93037: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

The footnote in Colombia's DS:4 states "the calculation of value of production corresponds to the revised methodology from base year 2015 and Central Product Classification (CPC)" for cotton and rice. The VoP for cotton nearly doubled between 2015 and 2016.

Please explain the difference between the previous and current methodology for calculating VoP, the basis for changing the methodology and what the 2016 VoP for cotton and rice would be when applying the 2015 methodology.

AG-IMS ID 93038: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

The United States understands, from a Government of Colombia website, that in 2015 the Agricultural Bank of Colombia introduced an agricultural insurance programme for rice, cotton, corn, and potatoes with the goal of expanding to additional products. Further, the insurance programme is understood to be subsidized by the Colombian Government at a rate of 60% - 80%.

- a. Please provide the measure as well as an explanation of how this measure is implemented.
- b. Please clarify whether the measure is notified in Colombia's most recent domestic support notification.

AG-IMS ID 93036: Question by United States of America - Other product-specific AMS/EMS

Colombia has notified "direct support for producers" for rice for the first time in 2016. Please provide the measure and explain how this measure is implemented.

2.4.10 European Union (G/AG/N/EU/61)

AG-IMS ID 93219: Question by Australia - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Australia notes that in Supporting Table DS:4, value of production for some products has not been provided.

- a. Can the European Union provide values of production for those products that were listed as part of their current total AMS, particularly for butter and skim milk powder?
- b. If the VoP is not available for those products, can the EU explain its decision to notify these products in its current total AMS?

AG-IMS ID 93215: Question by Australia - General services: marketing and promotion services

Australia thanks the European Union for the submission of its DS:1 for implementation year 2017.

Australia notes that EU expenditure on marketing and promotion services increased by EUR 304.7 million Euros from the 2016 implementation year.

- a. Can the EU provide further details on the programmes funded through this support?
- b. and details on the significant increase in funding?

AG-IMS ID 93289: Question by Canada - Direct payments: structural adjustment assistance provided through investment aids

In G/AG/N/EU/61 the European Union notified a total of EUR 6,240 million in domestic support under paragraph 11 structural adjustment assistance provided through investment aids for the marketing

year 2017-2018. This represents an increase of approximately EUR 2,380 million compared to the last notification covering marketing year 2016-2017.

Could the European Union provide additional information on the conditions that led to this significant increase in spending?

AG-IMS ID 93216: Question by Australia - Direct payments: payments under environmental programmes

Australia notes that EU expenditure on Environmental Services increased by almost two billion Euros (EUR 1,939.2 million) from 2016 to 2017.

- a. Can the European Union provide a disaggregation of the specific programs funded under these Environmental Services?
- b. Can the European Union explain what led to the significant increase in reported funding under Environmental Services?
- c. Can the European Union explain what specific programmes "created conditions of fair competition" and how they do so?

AG-IMS ID 93217: Question by Australia - Payments based on fixed areas or yields

Australia notes that EU Blue Box payments include "Aid for bananas (Title III, Regulation 247/2006)" totalling 278.9 million Euros.

- a. Can the European Union provide further information on how these Blue Box payments align with and implement Title III, Regulation 247/2006? and
- b. Can the European Union provide disaggregated data on the programmes funded, including their location, through this "aid for bananas" measure?

AG-IMS ID 93218: Question by Australia - Livestock payments made on a fixed number of head

Australia notes that EU Blue Box payments include "Livestock payments made on a fixed number of head", including almost 1,676.1 million on Beef, EUR 580.8 million on Sheep and Goat Meat, and EUR 921.2 million on Dairy and Milk Products.

- a. Can the European Union confirm that these payments are made on number of head of the relevant livestock? and
- b. Can the European Union provide disaggregated head count for each type of animal funded through this measure?

AG-IMS ID 93261: Question by United States of America - Other product-specific AMS/EMS

Supporting Table DS:6

The United States thanks the EU for submitting its domestic support notification for marketing year 2017/2018 and seeks further information on measures in supporting table DS:6. In marketing year MY 2015/16 and MY 2016/17 the EU notified EUR 52.4 million in aid for sheep and EUR 10.1 million for sheep and goat meat, respectively. For both years, the support was provided by Extraordinary support measures from Commission Delegated Regulation 2015/1853 providing for temporary exceptional aid to farmers in the livestock sector noting the EU's response to AG-IMS ID 88078. In MY 2017/18, notified outlays for sheep was EUR 50 million and the support was provided by National aid.

- a. Please describe the evolution of sheep and goat policy since 2015/16, including whether support for goats was only provided in MY 2016/17.

- b. Please describe how the national aid for MY 2017/18 is implemented and the reason for increase in support in 2017/18 after the temporary exceptional aid measures were discontinued.

AG-IMS ID 93262: Question by United States of America - Other product-specific AMS/EMS

Supporting Table DS:6

In marketing year MY 2015/16 and MY 2016/17 the EU notified EUR 2.1 million in aid for Other Livestock (rabbit, reindeer and eggs). For both years, the support was provided by Extraordinary support measures from Commission Delegated Regulation 2015/1853 providing for temporary exceptional aid to farmers in the livestock sector noting the EU's response to AG-IMS ID 88078. In MY 2017/18, notified outlays for Other Livestock (livestock, rabbit, reindeer and eggs) was EUR 63.7 million and the support was provided by National aid.

- a. Please describe the evolution of the category of "Other Livestock" since 2015/16, including what livestock are included in MY 2017/18 support noting that the notified support lists livestock in addition to rabbit, reindeer, and eggs.
- b. Please describe how the national aid for MY 2017/18 is implemented and the reason for the significant (approximately 3,000%) increase in support in 2017/18 after the temporary exceptional aid measures were discontinued.

2.4.11 European Union (G/AG/N/EU/61, G/AG/N/EU/55)

AG-IMS ID 93302: Question by Colombia and AG-IMS ID 93303: Question by Paraguay - Classification of measures

In notifications G/AG/N/EU/61 (page 4) and G/AG/N/EU/55 (page 4), under the category "Environmental programmes", the EU includes "support and protection of organic production by creating conditions of fair competition".

In this regard:

- a. Which specific measures does "support and protection of organic production by creating conditions of fair competition" refer to exactly? Please indicate the regulations that reflect these measures.
- b. What is the basis for notifying such support as an "environmental programme" under Annex 2, paragraph 12, of the Agreement on Agriculture?
- c. In the document "COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT *Accompanying the document* REPORT FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND THE COUNCIL Evaluation of Regulation (EC) No. 1107/2009 on the placing of plant protection products on the market and of Regulation (EC) No. 396/2005 on maximum residue levels of pesticides {COM(2020) 208 final}" (available in English only), the Commission notes the following:

Pesticides policy is not sufficiently consistent with EU climate policy. While the EU's climate policy aims to minimise greenhouse gas emissions, no such considerations are made when approving or not approving active substances. This relates most prominently to herbicides as their use may reduce the need for mechanical tillage. Tillage releases carbon emissions both through the use of machinery and by releasing carbon stored in the soil.⁹

In this respect, the Commission recognises that organic farming may have an adverse impact in terms of carbon emissions, and that it may therefore not be suitable for

⁹ COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT *Accompanying the document* REPORT FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND THE COUNCIL Evaluation of Regulation (EC) No. 1107/2009 on the placing of plant protection products on the market and of Regulation (EC) No. 396/2005 on maximum residue levels of pesticides {COM(2020) 208 final}, page 87.

protecting the environment. Why were measures that may not be suited to protecting the environment (organic farming) notified under the category "Environmental programmes" of Annex 2, paragraph 12, of the Agreement on Agriculture?

2.4.12 Georgia (G/AG/N/GEO/18)

AG-IMS ID 93117: Question by Canada - General services: research

Canada notes that in its 2018 DS:1 notification, Georgia notified a new programme titled "Elaboration and Management of Environmental Protection and Agriculture Development Policy" under paragraph 2 (a) research, Annex 2.

- a. Could Georgia please advise when it expects to submit a DS:2 notification for this programme?
- b. Could Georgia elaborate on the types of activities that are eligible under this programme?

2.4.13 Georgia (G/AG/N/GEO/19)

AG-IMS ID 93118: Question by Canada - General services: infrastructural services

Canada notes that in its 2016 DS:1 notification, Georgia notified for the first time a programme titled "Agro Sector Support/Development" under paragraph 2 (g) Infrastructural services, Annex 2.

- a. Could Georgia please advise when it expects to submit a DS:2 notification for this programme?
- b. Could Georgia elaborate on the types of infrastructural services that are eligible under this programme?

2.4.14 Guatemala (G/AG/N/GTM/64)

AG-IMS ID 93264: Question by United States of America - Direct payments: payments for relief from natural disasters

In calendar year 2018 Guatemala has notified a new measure "Emergency response following the eruption of the Fuego volcano" as a payment for relief from natural disasters.

- a. Please describe how the measure is implemented and how payment rates are determined.
- b. How does this measure comply with Annex 2 paragraph 8 of the Agreement on Agriculture and when will Guatemala be notifying this information in Table DS:2?

AG-IMS ID 93265: Question by United States of America - Direct payments: payments for relief from natural disasters

In calendar year 2018 Guatemala has notified a new measure "Coffee Trust Fund" for the first time to assist in addressing rust fungus disease. However, the United States understands the Coffee Trust Fund was created in 2001 and is administered by the Rural Development Bank and supervised by the Ministry of Agriculture. The United States further understands the fund provides for 1) non-reimbursable funds for inputs and assistance to coffee production, 2) low interest loans for producers, and 3) public transfers of up to USD 100 million.

- a. Please confirm whether the Coffee Trust Fund was funded by the Government of Guatemala prior to 2018.
- b. Please provide further details on how the Coffee Trust Fund is implemented, including the types of support provided via the fund in calendar year 2018.
- c. How does the Coffee Trust Fund comply with Annex 2 paragraph of the Agreement on Agriculture and when will Guatemala be notifying this information in Table DS:2?

AG-IMS ID 93263: Question by United States of America - Input subsidies available to low-income or resource-poor producers

In calendar year 2018 Guatemala no longer notified agricultural input subsidies in Supporting Table DS:2.

Please confirm the measures notified in 2017 are no longer operational.

2.4.15 India (G/AG/N/IND/18)

AG-IMS ID 93228: Question by Brazil - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Through its latest DS:1 notification (G/AG/N/IND/18), dated 31 March 2020, India notified that it has exceeded the "*de minimis*" level for rice for the marketing year 2018-2019. India also claimed that its public stockholding programs for food security purposes (covering rice and a number of other commodities) have been consistently reported in its Table DS:1 notifications since 1995 and that its program is consistent with the criteria of paragraph 3, footnote 5, and footnote 5 and 6 of Annex 2 to the AoA. For these reasons, the breach of the "*de minimis*" limits for rice is covered by the peace clause set out in the Bali Ministerial Decision on Public Stockholding for Food Security Purposes (WT/MIN (13)/38) and the General Council Decision (WT/L/939).

Brazil appreciates India's efforts in complying with its transparency notification obligations and asks if India could provide comments on the following questions:

- a. How does India understand that it has complied with the additional transparency obligations provided for in the Bali Decision so that it can invoke the Peace Clause therein?
- b. Why the PSH program template provided for in the Bali Decision was not submitted in previous notifications?
- c. When did rice public stockholding begin? What are the criteria and rules for the formation of rice stocks? In which regulation are they defined?
- d. How is the recently announced rise on the Minimum Support Price for rice from INR 18,15 to 18,68 related to the PSH policy?
- e. When will information on other domestic support policies for rice be provided (footnote 3 from DS: ST 5)?
- f. Does India intend to provide data related to PSH programs for wheat, coarse grains and pulses in the format of the statistical appendix of the Bali Decision for the period between 2013 and 2019?

AG-IMS ID 93291: Question by Canada - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

As part of its 2018/2019 domestic support notification, India notified the relevant statistical information described in the Statistical Appendix of the Annex of the Bali ministerial decision. Canada noted some discrepancies between the rice stock variations and the quantities purchased and released (under the program and open market sale). Canada calculated this discrepancy of 3.427 million of tonnes for 2016-2017, 3.211 millions of tonnes for 2017-2018 and of 9.733 millions of tonnes for 2018-2019.

Could India provide an explanation of these discrepancies? Please include detailed information of what happened to these stocks, notably how they were disposed, through which channel, at what price, and if they were exported.

AG-IMS ID 93274: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

In the Statistical Appendix, with regards to the Opening and Ending Balance of Stocks (a. and i.) notified by India:

- a. Please provide the source of these statistics and please confirm whether the values include private stocks.
- b. If private stocks are included, please provide a breakdown of public and private stocks.

AG-IMS ID 93275: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

In the Statistical Appendix, with regards to "Annual Releases under the programme" in line (e.) of the table notified by India:

Please provide the source of these statistics.

AG-IMS ID 93277: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

With regards to all statistics in the Statistical Appendix of India's DS:1 Notification, please confirm all data is on a marketing year basis. If any statistics are not, please identify which ones and what yearly basis is used.

AG-IMS ID 93268: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

As noted in the statistical annex for rice, open market sales are made from the stocks accumulated in reference to the expenditures notified by India as the "allocation for distribution and buffer stock."

- a. Please confirm whether open market sales for all commodities are sold from the public stocks at the same price as they are procured, which is the applied administered price noted in Supporting Table DS:5.
- b. Please provide the expenditure or revenue forgone from open market sales if the procurement and sales prices are not the same.

AG-IMS ID 93273: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Statistical Appendix

India announced a Market Support Price for unmilled paddy rice, therefore it should be notifying all statistics in the Annex, along with rice market price support in ST DS:5, on an unmilled basis rather than a milled basis. However, India notified its statistics on a milled basis.

What is the basis for providing the statistical annex on a milled basis rather than on the basis of the product supported?

AG-IMS ID 93195: Question by Japan - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

- a. Japan would appreciate if India could provide the value of production data for each of the agricultural products listed in Supporting Table DS:4 of G/AG/N/IND/18 including Coarse cereal, Cotton, Groundnut, Pulses, Rapeseed/Mustard, Soyabean Yellow, Sunflower and Wheat, as well as the total value of India agricultural production. This is for us to make sure the value of support for each commodity is under *de minimis* threshold.
- b. Japan would appreciate if India could provide a clarification to explain why the value of support for wheat is negative (-30.53m USD) in Supporting Tables DS:4 and DS:5 of G/AG/N/IND/18.

AG-IMS ID 93266: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

While we thank India for providing a timely notification for Table DS:1 for reporting period 2018/19, the notification, in particular Supporting Table DS:1, lacks any detail of transparency beyond broad levels of support by classification type. We take note that India has identified 11 exempt from reduction measures in its first ever Table DS:2 notification. However, none of these measures appear

to be discernable in anyway in Table DS:1 with the exception of the Public Distribution System and Pradhan Mantri Fasal Bima Yojana (PMFBY) and that is only because the values notified in Table DS:2, an ad hoc non-annual notification, could be manually matched with values notified in Table DS:1.

- a. India has neglected to provide the name and descriptions of any measure notified in Supporting Table DS:1.
- b. Please resubmit a completed Supporting Table DS:1 for MY 2017/18, inclusive of names, descriptions, and monetary value of each of India's exempt measures.
- c. If India is unable to provide this information in a timely manner, India is encouraged to clarify that the Supporting Table is provisional, as other Members have done in the past.
- d. Further, if data for 2017/18 that is required in a Supporting Table DS:1 notification is not accessible at this time, please provide a completed Supporting Table DS:1 for the most recent year such information is available and provide a timeline for when India will bring its more recent notification up to date with required information.

AG-IMS ID 93267: Question by United States of America - Domestic food aid

The United States understands that the Public Distribution System accounts for the largest share of stocks released from public stocks; however, India operates a number of nutritional/welfare programs that provide domestic food aid. Other distribution schemes under the National Food Security Act include the Integrated Child Development Services Scheme, and the Midday Meal Scheme. Further, food is distributed from public stocks under several other schemes not subject to the National Food Security Act.

Please provide a breakdown of the "expenditures in relation to the provision of domestic food aid to sections of the population in need" for each of these measures and confirm whether all are notified in the aggregated value notified by India.

AG-IMS ID 93278: Question by United States of America - Domestic food aid

India has notified USD 17.2 billion for the "allocation for distribution and buffer stock". According to G/AG/N/IND/19, this value represented the "Public Distribution System, National Food Security Act, 2013." Further, G/AG/N/IND/19 states outlays are covered by both paragraph 3 and 4 of Annex 2 of the Agreement on Agriculture.

- a. Please provide a breakdown of the "expenditures in relation to the accumulation... of stocks of products" under paragraph 3 of Annex 2 of the AoA.
- b. Please provide a breakdown of the "expenditures in relation to the...holding of stocks of products" under paragraph 3 of Annex 2 of the AoA.
- c. Please provide a breakdown of the "expenditures in relation to the provision of domestic food aid to sections of the population in need" under paragraph 4 of Annex 2 of the AoA.

AG-IMS ID 93294: Question by Canada - Direct payments: decoupled income support

In its last notification, India notified a programme called Pradhan Mantri Kisan Samman Nidhi (PM-KISAN) under paragraph 6 of the Annex 2 of the AoA.

- a. Could India clarify who is eligible for this programme and what are the criteria that determined eligibility for a payment?
- b. Could India indicate if payment levels are determined by income of producers and if so, what is the defined and fixed base period used to define eligibility?

AG-IMS ID 93234: Question by Paraguay and AG-IMS ID 93235: Question by Canada - Input subsidies available to low-income or resource-poor producers

The Republic of Paraguay wishes to thank India for submitting notification G/AG/N/IND/18. In Table DS:2 of the notification, India reports a subsidy of USD 24.1 billion in reference to Article 6.2, indicating that it provides "other input subsidies" amounting to that value. Could India please provide information on:

- a. the types of inputs subsidized,
 - i. whether such inputs are limited to those indicated in the footnote or whether others are also included; and
 - ii. the disaggregated value of the subsidy per type of input;
- b. eligibility criteria and whether the subsidies are available exclusively or "in general" for low-income and resource-poor farmers;
- c. whether India is planning reforms to reduce its farmers' dependence on this type of subsidy, in respect of which we note an increase of approximately USD 2 billion between the notification covering the marketing year 2017-2018 (G/AG/N/IND/15) and notification G/AG/N/IND/18; in this regard, could India explain the reasons for this considerable increase from one marketing year to the next?

AG-IMS ID 93276: Question by United States of America - Input subsidies available to low-income or resource-poor producers

In Supporting Table DS:2, India listed "Other input subsidies" as the name and description of more than USD 24 billion in support based on data from the Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers' Welfare, Ministry of Chemicals and Chemistry, Ministry of Power, and Ministry of Statistics and Program Implementation. The footnote to this table indicates this includes subsidies for irrigation, fertilizers, and electricity.

India has neglected to provide the name and descriptions of any measure notified in Supporting Table DS:2.

- a. Please resubmit a completed Supporting Table DS:2 for MY 2017/18, inclusive of names, descriptions, and monetary value of each of India's exempt measures.
- b. If India is unable to provide this information in a timely manner, India is encouraged to clarify that the Supporting Table is provisional, as other Members have done in the past.
- c. Further, if data for 2017/18 that is required in a Supporting Table DS:2 notification is not accessible at this time, please provide a completed Supporting Table DS:2 for the most recent year such information is available and provide a timeline for when India will bring its more recent notification up to date with required information.

AG-IMS ID 93281: Question by United States of America - Input subsidies available to low-income or resource-poor producers

As Members have asked with previous notifications, could India please provide a breakdown of expenditures on irrigation, fertilizers and electricity notified under Supporting Table DS:2. For each monetary value, please also identify:

- a. the published data sources from which the monetary values provided are sourced, and
- b. the name of each scheme or schemes (e.g., measures) that contribute to the value provided.

AG-IMS ID 93220: Question by Australia - Market price support

Australia thanks India for its DS:1 notification for marketing year 2018-19 (G/AG/N/IND/18). Australia notes that India provided product-specific domestic support for a rice in excess of India's product-specific *de minimis* commitments. Australia understands that India asserts that the breach is covered by the peace clause set out in the Bali Ministerial Decision on Public Stockholding for Food Security Purposes (WT/MIN (13)/38) and the General Council Decision (WT/L/939). Australia would like to ask the following questions:

- a. What was the total production of rice (in both value and volume) in marketing year 2018-19?
- b. What is the eligibility criteria to receive the minimum support price?
- c. And what is the minimum price support available to all rice growers?

Paragraph 3, Annex 2 of the AoA states, "The volume and accumulation of such stocks shall correspond to predetermined targets related solely to food security". For the period covered by the notification, could India provide:

- d. The pre-determined targets, when these were established, and under which legislation; and; an explanation of how these targets are in compliance with the requirement of a sole focus on food security?

AG-IMS ID 93290: Question by Canada - Market price support

In its 2018/2019 domestic support notification, India reported support for rice in excess of its *de minimis* level for rice. By doing so, India breached its WTO domestic support commitment to limit its support for rice at 10% of its value of production.

Please indicate what concrete steps India is taking to rectify the situation and fulfil its WTO domestic support commitment for rice in the future.

AG-IMS ID 93198: Question by European Union - Market price support**a. STOCKS AND RELEASE**

Based on the figures in notification in the statistical annex the EU has drawn up the following balance sheet for the rice public stockholding programme.

Mio. t.		2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
opening stocks	a	28,811	29,784	30,043
Annual purchase	b	38,110	38,130	44,330
Total availability	c=a+b	66,921	67,914	74,373
Annual releases	d	33,52	34,2	34,4
open market sales	e	0,190	0,460	0,850
Total release	f=e+d	33,71	34,66	35,25
Total availability - total release	g=c-f	33,211	33,254	39,123
End stocks IND/18	h	29,784	30,043	29,390
Discrepancy	i=g-h	3,427	3,211	9,733

Can India explain in detail the discrepancies in this table? Where have these quantities of rice gone? Notably, the discrepancy for 2018-19 is 25% of total annual purchases which seems extremely large.

b. TOTAL IMPORTS AND EXPORTS

India claims that no imports to or exports from public stocks occurred.

However, in order to examine compliance with paragraph 4 of the Bali Ministerial Decision, it is necessary to examine import and export figures for the entire production of India for each year concerned.

Can India indicate the total quantities and value of rice imported and respectively exported for each year concerned.

c. RESPECT OF PARAGRAPHS 3C AND 3D OF THE BALI MINISTERIAL DECISION

"Paragraph 3c of the Bali Ministerial Decision requires the Member to provide on an annual basis, additional information by completing the template contained in the Annex, for each public stockholding programme that it maintains for food security purposes "

In point 2b of the Annex India indicates that its public stockholding programmes cover rice, wheat, coarse grains and pulses. However, the statistical Annex only includes rice. Can India submit the required statistical annex for wheat, coarse grains and pulses.

d. SUPPORT OTHER THAN PUBLIC STOCKHOLDING FOR RICE

In footnote 3 in Supporting table 5 India indicates that "Other support for rice, that is, other than public stockholding for food security purposes, will be notified subsequently". However, this information is necessary to verify whether India has respected paragraph 5 of the Bali Ministerial Decision which requires that there be no increase of Amber Box support for programmes other than public stockholding.

- i. Can India indicate what types of support are concerned
- ii. Can India indicate when this notification will be submitted.
- iii. Will this notification also include revisions of prior notifications (for instance for 2014 and subsequent years) to include this type of support for the years in question?

AG-IMS ID 93233: Question by Paraguay and AG-IMS ID 93236: Question by Canada - Market price support

The Republic of Paraguay wishes to thank India for submitting notification G/AG/N/IND/18. We note with concern that India has exceeded its *de minimis* levels for rice production and that it has submitted an annex to the notification pursuant to the Bali Ministerial Decision. We therefore request that India provide clarification on the following points:

- a. Could India please explain why these PSH programmes could not be included under the Green Box, like the USD 17.2 billion worth of PSH measures already notified as such in the same notification?
- b. Why was this annex not submitted in previous years, as required under paragraph 3(c) of the Bali Decision, given that it concerns a programme in existence since 2013, according to information provided by India in the Annex to notification G/AG/N/IND/18?
- c. Could India please provide information on the volume and notification of stocks, in accordance with paragraph 3(b);
- d. What steps has India taken to ensure that purchased stocks subsequently sold in the domestic market (approximately 850,000 tonnes, according to the figures notified) are not later exported?
- e. How does India consider itself to have met the requirements of paragraph 3(a) of the Bali Decision by submitting a notification covering the period 2018-2019?

- f. Is India considering reviewing its notifications to amend the total amount of eligible production, and not only the production actually purchased, in accordance with the Agreement on Agriculture and existing jurisprudence in this area?

AG-IMS ID 93311: Question by Thailand - Market price support

Thailand appreciates India's notification to the Committee on Agriculture. In this regard, Thailand seeks clarification on the notification of public stock holding for food security purposes as follows;

- a. Thailand notes that the Bali Decision requires a developing Member benefiting from this Decision to notify the Committee on Agriculture that it is exceeding or is at risk of exceeding either or both of its Aggregate Measurement of Support (AMS) limits (the Member's Bound Total AMS or the *de minimis* level) as result of such programmes.

Could India please clarify whether such notification has been submitted to the COA prior to the implementation?

- b. Could India provide further details on how purchase prices and release prices on public stock holding for food security purposes for rice were determined?

AG-IMS ID 93271: Question by United States of America - Market price support

In Supporting Table DS:5 the methodology for calculating Market Price Support is same as previous notifications, despite concerns raised by various Members over a number of years, including but not limited to aggregation of applied administered prices across separately supported products and the inclusion of sub-national support.

- a. For each product for which India announced a Minimum Support Price (MSP) for marketing year 2018/19, please identify the corresponding MSP.
- b. If applied administered prices in Supporting Table DS:5 do not include additional bonuses above the MSP that certain states may provide, please specify the values of any bonuses provided by each state and to which products bonuses applied during marketing year 2018/19.

AG-IMS ID 93272: Question by United States of America - Market price support

Supporting Table DS:5

India has notified in footnote 3 of Supporting Table DS:5 that "other support for rice" will be notified subsequently. When will this support be notified in a revised Table DS:1 notification?

AG-IMS ID 93293: Question by Canada - Classification of measures

In its last notification, India classified the measure called Pradhan Mantri Fasal Bima Yojana (PMFBY) as Green Box under paragraph 8 of the annex 2 of the AoA. In its DS:2 notification (G/AG/N/IND/19) India explained that:

"Provisions are consistent with criteria in Annex 2, paragraph 8, as the Government subsidies are on premium of agricultural insurance for production loss exceeding 30% of the average of yield of past years."

- a. Could India indicate what is the period used to calculate average past yield under this programme? More specifically, what is the methodology on the number of "past years" used to calculate the average reference period yield?
- b. Could India explain how it meets the base period requirement to calculate the average production level, as defined by Annex 2 paragraph 8 (a)?

A program described as Insurance premium subsidy is also reported for in supporting table DS:9 for Government subsidies on premiums of agricultural insurance for production loss not exceeding 30% of the average of production.

- c. Could India indicate if the support reported is part of the same insurance program of the one reported under Annex 2 paragraph 8 (a)?
- d. Please indicate how the two support programs are related and how they interact with each other.

2.4.16 Indonesia (G/AG/N/IDN/67)

AG-IMS ID 93039: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

The United States notes two measures notified in ST/DS:1 for 2018 under Public stockholding for food security purposes that were not notified in Indonesia's notification for 2017: the "Storage and maintenance costs" and "Reserve fund for government to purchase foodstuff at market prices" programs.

- a. Please confirm the effective date of the new measures.
- b. Please confirm whether a DS:2 notification will be submitted.
- c. Please confirm what foodstuffs are purchased for the reserve fund at market prices.

AG-IMS ID 93040: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

In ST/DS:1 Indonesia notified a new measure for 2018, "Cash-based food aid for Poor and Low Income Society (BPNT)", that was not included in its 2017 notification.

- a. Please confirm this is a new measure. If so, please confirm whether a DS:2 notification will be submitted.
- b. Does BPNT replace some or all of the in-kind food aid provided under "Rice for Poor and Low-Income Society (RASTRA)" with cash-based food aid to consumers or does it supplement food aid provided by RASTRA?

AG-IMS ID 93119: Question by United States of America - Market price support

The United States would like to repeat parts of question 2 for Indonesia from AG-IMS ID 89041, for which we only received partial responses:

- a. In response to question 2a which asked "Supporting Tables DS:5 in Indonesia's notifications are notified on a calendar year basis rather than marketing year. Please confirm the dates for which the applied administered price is applicable.", Indonesia responded that the date of the applied administered price is in accordance with the applicable regulation. Please provide a copy of the applicable regulation and confirm whether the dates contained in the applicable regulation are based on calendar year or marketing year.
- b. The US reiterates question 2d ("Please explain how the procurement target quantity is determined and when.") as no response was received.
- c. The US reiterates 2e ("Please confirm whether the applied price and the eligible production notified are on a milled basis or paddy basis.") as no response was received.

AG-IMS ID 93041: Question by United States of America - Market price support: Eligible production

Supporting Table DS:5

It is noted that the eligible production quantity for MPS for rice in 2018 is nearly 10 times larger than in 2017 quantity, resulting in an 800% increase in market price support.

Please explain the reason behind the significant change in the quantity of eligible production and whether eligible production was notified as the procured quantity, as noted by Indonesia in response to AG-IMS ID 89041.

2.4.17 Israel (G/AG/N/ISR/74)

AG-IMS ID 93120: Question by Australia - Scheduled commitment level

Australia notes that Israel has reported domestic support in excess of its annual commitments for the 2018 calendar year. Australia notes that Israel has exceeded its domestic support for the calendar years 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014 and 2017. Australia appreciates Israel's commitment to transparency and the information provided in the notification G/AG/N/ISR/74 for 2018.

- a. Could Israel provide an update on the concrete steps it is taking, and the progress made with respect to the additional reforms in its dairy and egg sectors so that Israel is in compliance with its WTO obligations in the future?
- b. Does Israel expect to be notifying a further breach for the calendar year 2019?

AG-IMS ID 93122: Question by Canada - Scheduled commitment level

Canada notes that for 2018 Israel has notified domestic support over its annual commitment and that the amount reported is an increase of USD 18.5 million above the amount notified in 2017 when Israel also exceeded its domestic support commitment. Canada appreciates the transparency and the information provided in its domestic support notification G/AG/N/ISR/74 and in previous notifications when it exceeded its commitment (G/AG/N/ISR/66 for 2017 and G/AG/N/ISR/55 for the years 2011, 2012, 2013 and 2014). In Israel's response to Canada's questions AG-IMS 91102, Israel indicated that it was taking specific steps to comply with its WTO domestic support commitment. Could Israel provide an update on the additional reforms under discussion in the dairy and egg sectors which will bring Israel's Current Total AMS back to its annual commitment?

AG-IMS ID 93123: Question by European Union - Scheduled commitment level

The EU is disappointed to see a further increase in the overshoot of Israel's AMS commitments in 2018. The increase of \$19 million in current Total AMS to \$631 million leads to an overshoot in the year 2018 of \$62 million or 11% of Israel's AMS commitment. Further, this increase is not only due to increased production of eggs and milk, but also due to increased administered support prices for the two products in question. The EU is disappointed to see a WTO Member taking decisions that lead to an even greater overshoot of its WTO commitments.

- a. Can Israel explain the reasoning for the increased administered support prices for eggs and milk that has led to this greater overshoot of its AMS commitments? Was respect of Israel's AMS commitment part of the decision-making process leading up to the increase in administered prices?
- b. Can Israel explain what measures will be taken to ensure that Israel will respect its WTO obligations?

AG-IMS ID 93124: Question by United States of America - Scheduled commitment level

Supporting Table DS:5

The United States welcomes Israel's transparency on the issue of breaching its Total AMS commitment level in 2018. Israel has noted that AMS is expected to fall below Israel's commitment level. The United States remains concerned with the multi-year breach of commitments.

Please provide an update on the reform process.

AG-IMS ID 93121: Question by Brazil - Market price support

First of all, Brazil would like to congratulate Israel for including an explanatory note "background and adjustments in policy" in its latest DS:1 notification (G/AG/N/ISR/74). Considering this information:

Could Israel provide comparative data on the international price of feed that it has been using to define its administered prices for milk and eggs in recent years?

AG-IMS ID 93125: Question by United States of America - Market price support

Following up on AG-IMS ID 90066, it is still unclear as to how total quality improvement for milk are determined using the protein, fat and water coefficients provided.

Is there a formula Israel is able to provide that would allow the US to verify these calculations?

AG-IMS ID 93126: Question by United States of America - Other product-specific AMS/EMS

Supporting Table DS:6

Please explain the reason for the increase behind "growers support" for flowers, which accounts for most of the 27% increase in support for flowers.

2.4.18 Korea, Republic of (G/AG/N/KOR/60/CORR.1 - G/AG/N/KOR/63/CORR.1)

AG-IMS ID 93130: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

In the corrigendum to Korea's domestic support notifications the value of production values was modified for several products. For example, the value of production for a number of products in 2012 increased significantly, such as white radish, sweet potatoes, red pepper, potato, pear, onion, green onion, etc. Meanwhile, there was a significant decrease in the value of production for ginseng and small downward adjustments for several other commodities. The total value of production remains unchanged.

Please explain how value of production is determined and the reason for these significant changes.

2.4.19 Korea, Republic of (G/AG/N/KOR/61, G/AG/N/KOR/62, G/AG/N/KOR/63)

AG-IMS ID 93129: Question by Australia - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Australia thanks the Republic of Korea (ROK) for submitting a number of corrigenda to its DS:1 notifications for calendar years 2012, 2013, 2014 and 2015. With respect to Korea's original DS:1 for 2015 - G/AG/N/KOR/63, Australia would be grateful if the ROK can respond to the following questions:

- a. In the ROK's Supporting Table DS:1, under Decoupled income support, the ROK notifies a fixed payment scheme for paddy fields. Can the ROK provide details of this programme, including eligibility criteria and how the payments are calculated?
- b. In Supporting Table DS:2, the ROK notifies payments under Article 6.2 measures. Can the ROK provide further details on this expenditure, including what sectors and products were aided through these investment subsidies and details of the investment subsidies provided?

2.4.20 Nigeria (G/AG/N/NGA/17)

AG-IMS ID 93131: Question by Australia - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Australia would like to follow-up with Nigeria with respect to question AG-IMS ID 90034 that Australia asked at the 90th CoA and question AG-IMS ID 92117 that Australia asked at the 92nd CoA: Nigeria's domestic support notifications for the period 2012 to 2016 (G/AG/N/NGA/17) notified that it did not provide domestic support during this period.

- a. Australia would like to know if Nigeria plans to include key agricultural elements of its Economic Recovery and Growth Plan (2017-2020) in its future domestic support notifications.

- b. Specifically, how will Nigeria notify its support programme for the integrated transformation of the agriculture sector aimed at boosting productivity and improving access to markets?

2.4.21 Norway (G/AG/N/NOR/108, G/AG/N/NOR/108/Corr.1 and G/AG/N/NOR/108/Corr.2)

AG-IMS ID 93063: Question by Paraguay - Direct payments: payments under environmental programmes

The Republic of Paraguay thanks Norway for the submission of the second corrigendum of the notification contained in document G/AG/N/NOR/108 concerning domestic support commitments (Table DS:1) for the calendar year 2018.

We note that the value of NOK 3,066.5 million has been corrected to NOK 3,889 million for the National Environmental Programme. Could Norway please explain this difference of over NOK 800 million and give the reasons for the miscalculation of the amount disbursed for this programme in the original notification?

AG-IMS ID 93132: Question by Australia - Direct payments: payments under environmental programmes

Australia thanks Norway for the submission of DS:1 for Calendar year 2018 - G/AG/N/NOR/108 - and its corrigenda.

With respect to Supporting Table DS:1 - Green Box measures - Can Norway provide additional information on the 'Subsidy to organic production', including whether there is a requirement for producers to engage in (apply for/use?) the programme, and how the subsidy is calculated?

AG-IMS ID 93134: Question by New Zealand - Direct payments: other

New Zealand welcomes Norway's Domestic Support notification for calendar year 2018. New Zealand notes that Norway has notified 1,259.6 NOK million for a "vacation and replacement scheme".

Can Norway please clarify the criteria that determines the value of payments under this scheme and explain the consistency of this scheme with Annex 2 of the Agreement on Agriculture.

AG-IMS ID 93133: Question by European Union - Classification of measures

The European Union notes that Norway's Amber Box support for beef has increased from 132.2 million NOK in 2017 to 409 million NOK in 2018. This relatively large increase could be explained by a change of classification of the measure "quality incentive programme for beef" from blue box support (Supporting Table DS:3) to amber box support (Supporting Table DS:6).

What changes have been made to the quality incentive programme between 2017 and 2018 that leads to this change of classification?

2.4.22 Panama (G/AG/N/PAN/54)

AG-IMS ID 93221: Question by Australia - Scheduled commitment level

Australia thanks Panama for the submission of its DS:1 for 2019. Australia notes Panama is reporting a breach of *de minimis* for support provided to rice during this reporting period.

Can Panama explain what caused this breach and how it has worked to prevent a similar breach in the subsequent reporting periods?

AG-IMS ID 93295: Question by Canada - Scheduled commitment level

Canada notes that Panama has exceeded its annual domestic support commitment for a third consecutive year by PAB 41.7 million in 2017, by PAB 54.3 million in 2018 and by PAB 22,5 million in 2019, as a result of Panama exceeding its product specific *de minimis* for rice.

At the 92nd session of the Regular Committee on Agriculture, Canada questioned Panama on what actions it would be taking to ensure compliance with its domestic support commitments (question AG-IMS ID 92062). Panama did not clarify what steps it would take. Canada would like to reiterate its question to Panama.

What steps will Panama take to come back into compliance with its domestic support commitment?

AG-IMS ID 93196: Question by European Union - Scheduled commitment level

Again the notification from Panama shows an overshoot of its *de minimis* limit for rice and so a failure to respect its WTO commitments.

- a. Can Panama explain the reason behind the decrease in eligible production from 328 628 tonnes to 135 815 tonnes?
- b. Which measures has Panama taken to ensure that it will respect its commitments in the future?

2.4.23 Philippines (G/AG/N/PHL/67, G/AG/N/PHL/68, G/AG/N/PHL/69)

AG-IMS ID 93135: Question by New Zealand - Direct payments: payments for relief from natural disasters

New Zealand thanks the Philippines for its Domestic Support notifications for calendar years 2016-2018. New Zealand seeks clarification from the Philippines regarding payments for relief from natural disasters - crop insurance. From 2012 to 2015 the monetary value of crop insurance was consistent at PHP 1,183,771 thousand each year. This amount increased in calendar year 2016 to PHP 1,600,000 thousand, increased again in 2017 to PHP 2,500,000, and again in 2018 to PHP 3,500,000. Can the Philippines explain why the value of crop insurance remains the same for the three-year period 2012-2015, and why it increased nearly 200% between 2015 and 2018?

2.4.24 Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of (G/AG/N/SAU/18)

AG-IMS ID 93136: Question by European Union - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

In the Methodological Note point 4 it is indicated that the support price for common wheat since 2004 has been 1000 SAR/t. However, in Supporting Table 4 no administered price is mentioned, and no eligible production indicated.

Can the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia explain whether any common wheat has benefitted from the 1000 SAR/t support price and if so, for what quantity?

2.4.25 Singapore (G/AG/N/SGP/34)

AG-IMS ID 93269: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

The United States takes note that Singapore has introduced its first notified domestic support measures. According to Singapore Food Agency's (SFA) website, in order to buffer from supply disruptions, Singapore aims to produce 30% of its nutritional needs by 2030 by implementing its "30 by 30" Food Production Target. Through funding and technology transfer, SFA assists local farmers transfer and adopt technology to increase and intensify their output. The United States understands that the Basic Capability Upgrading (BCU) scheme for example co-funds up to 50% of the cost of purchasing equipment and other qualifying costs. Similarly, the Productivity Enhancement Standard (PES) scheme provides up to 30-70% of the cost of purchasing equipment and other qualifying costs.

- a. Please describe how all notified measures comply with relevant exemption criteria set out in Annex 2 of the Agreement on Agriculture.

- b. Will Singapore be submitting a Table DS:2 notification providing full information on how the measure meets specific eligibility criteria?

2.4.26 Chinese Taipei (G/AG/N/TPKM/181)

AG-IMS ID 93116: Question by Australia - *De minimis*

Australia thanks Chinese Taipei for its DS:1 notification for Calendar Year 2016 (G/AG/N/TPKM/181). Australia notes that Chinese Taipei provided product-specific domestic support for a number of products in excess of product-specific *de minimis* commitments, but within its Total AMS commitment level.

Australia understands this support is provided under the "Adjusting the Cultivation System and Revitalizing Fallow Land Program", which looks to support rice farmers move away from rice production. This Program appears to have operated (including under different names) for a decade or more. Despite this Program, Chinese Taipei's eligible production of rice appears to have grown significantly. Based on Chinese Taipei's DS:1 from reporting period 2006, eligible rice production in 2006 totalled 245,660 tonnes. In the most recently submitted DS:1 from Chinese Taipei for the reporting period 2016, eligible rice production appears to have reached almost 400,000 tonnes.

- a. Can Chinese Taipei provide more detail on the purpose and objective of this Program? and
- b. Can Chinese Taipei explain if the Program is achieving its purpose and objective?

2.4.27 Tunisia (G/AG/N/TUN/58)

AG-IMS ID 93137: Question by Brazil - Excessive rates of inflation

Tunisia has stated, in its DS:1 notification for calendar year 2018 (G/AG/N/TUN/58), that it has used the reference prices of the reference period and adjusted them to take account of inflation and exchange rate movements. Brazil recognizes that developing countries may be vulnerable to higher domestic inflation rates and currency volatility that renders its fixed external reference price (FERP) values in domestic currency outdated. Nonetheless, Members, to fulfill their notification obligations, have to abide by the terms of their domestic support commitments. Article 18, paragraph 4 of the AoA, establishes that "In the review process Members shall give due consideration to the influence of excessive rates of inflation on the ability of any Member to abide by its domestic support commitments." Thus, it is the review work in the Committee on Agriculture that has to be carried out taking into account excessive general increases in prices.

- a. Would Tunisia consider submitting its DS tables concurrently on both an unadjusted and an inflation-adjusted basis, as suggested previously by WTO Secretariat (G/AG/W/45)?
- b. Could Tunisia provide data on its domestic inflation rate for recent years?

AG-IMS ID 93138: Question by Canada - Excessive rates of inflation

Canada notes that Tunisia has unilaterally adjusted its fixed external reference price for inflation. Canada notes that under Article 18.4 of the Agreement on Agriculture, it is the responsibility of the Committee during the review process, and not of Tunisia, to give consideration to excessive rates of inflation. In response to question AG-IMS ID 82022, Tunisia provided its Current Total Aggregate Measurement of Support between 2002 and 2015 without any adjustments to its fixed external reference prices.

- a. a. Could Tunisia please update this table by including the Current Total Aggregate Measurement of Support for the years 2016, 2017 and 2018 without any changes to its external reference prices?

Canada notes that a written response is outstanding for the question AG-IMS ID 91105 regarding G/AG/N/TUN/56. It is copied below for reference:

- b. In response to question AG-IMS ID 82022, Tunisia provided its current total aggregate measurement of support level between 2002 and 2015 without any changes to its external reference prices. Could Tunisia please update this table by including the current total

aggregate measurement of support for the years 2016 and 2017 without any changes to its external reference prices?

- c. Canada wishes to remind Tunisia that under Article 18.4 of the Agreement on Agriculture, it is the responsibility of the Membership as a whole, and not of Tunisia, to give consideration to excessive rates of inflation. In response to question AG-IMS ID 82048 from Canada, Tunisia stated as follows: "Regarding the steps to be taken to address this situation so that the external reference prices will no longer be adjusted in the future, the investigations under way will identify alternative options for notifying support and the steps to be taken".
- d. Could Tunisia please provide an update on its investigations under way to identify alternative options for notifying support and the steps to be taken?
- e. Could Tunisia please indicate when it will notify its domestic support without adjustments to its external reference prices?

2.4.28 Turkey (G/AG/N/TUR/36 - G/AG/N/TUR/39)

AG-IMS ID 93154: Question by Paraguay - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

The Republic of Paraguay thanks Turkey for the submission of the notification contained in document G/AG/N/TUR/36 concerning domestic support commitments (Table DS:1) for the year 2010. We would like further information on:

- a. Supporting Table DS:2: (i) the total amount of support for each of the three types of support notified in section (a) which amount to USD 550,775,029; (ii) the type of support provided in the context of investment support within the framework of the development of animal husbandry; and (iii) the manner in which Turkey considers that the support to promote organic agriculture and good agricultural practices qualifies as falling under Article 6.2. of the Agreement on Agriculture.
- b. Supporting Table DS:4: (i) the percentages for support in relation to the value of production; (ii) the reasons for which Turkey has exceeded its product-specific domestic support limits for sunflower; (iii) Turkey's current levels of subsidies for these products; (iv) plans or programmes implemented by the Turkish Government to bring its subsidy levels into line with its WTO commitments and obligations.
- c. Supporting Table DS:9: (i) the reasons for which support is provided for diesel; (ii) the continuity of this type of subsidy; (iii) plans or programmes implemented by the Turkish Government to reduce or eliminate this type of support, taking into account the adverse effects of fossil fuel subsidies on the environment and the fight against climate change.

AG-IMS ID 93178: Question by Paraguay - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

The Republic of Paraguay thanks Turkey for the submission of the notification contained in document G/AG/N/TUR/37 concerning domestic support commitments (Table DS:1) for the calendar year 2011. We would like further information on:

- a. Supporting Table DS:1: (i) the total amount of support for each of the three types of support notified in section 12, "Environmental programmes", which are Green Box subsidies and which total USD 60,500,000; (ii) the functioning, characteristics and purpose of the disbursements made under the biological combat support programme.
- b. Supporting Table DS:2: (i) the total amount of support for each of the three types of support notified in section (a) which amount to USD 686,832,130; (ii) the reasons for the increase of more than USD 130,000,000 in one year for this type of subsidy; (iii) the type of support provided in the context of investment support within the framework of the development of animal husbandry; (iv) the manner in which Turkey considers that the support to promote organic agriculture and good agricultural practices qualifies as falling under Article 6.2. of the Agreement on Agriculture.

- c. Supporting Table DS:4: (i) the percentages for support in relation to the value of production; (ii) the reasons for which Turkey has exceeded its product-specific domestic support limits for soybeans, and the reasons for the significant increase in the support provided for this product in one year; (iii) Turkey's current subsidy levels for this product; (iv) plans or programmes implemented by the Turkish Government to bring its subsidy levels into line with its WTO commitments and obligations.
- d. Supporting Table DS:9: (i) the reasons for which support is provided for diesel; (ii) the continuity of this type of subsidy; (iii) plans or programmes implemented by the Turkish Government to reduce or eliminate this type of support, taking into account the adverse effects of fossil fuel subsidies on the environment and the fight against climate change.

AG-IMS ID 93156: Question by Paraguay - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

The Republic of Panama thanks Turkey for the submission of the notification contained in document G/AG/N/TUR/38 concerning domestic support commitments (Table DS:1) for the calendar year 2012. We would like further information on:

- a. Supporting Table DS:1: (i) the total amount of support for each of the three types of support notified under point 12, "Environmental programmes", which are Green Box subsidies and which total USD 69,219,553; (ii) the functioning, characteristics and purpose of the disbursements made under the biological combat support programme.
- b. Supporting Table DS:2: (i) the total amount of support for each of the three types of support notified in section (a) which amount to USD 907,867,165; (ii) the reasons for the increase of more than USD 220,000,000 in one year for this type of subsidy; (iii) the type of support provided in the context of investment support within the framework of the development of animal husbandry; (iv) the manner in which Turkey considers that the support to promote organic agriculture and good agricultural practices qualifies as falling under Article 6.2. of the Agreement on Agriculture.
- c. Supporting Table DS:4: (i) the percentages for support in relation to the value of production; (ii) the reasons for which Turkey has exceeded its product-specific domestic support limits for soybeans, and the reasons for the significant increase in the support provided for this product in one year; (iii) Turkey's current subsidy levels for this product; (iv) plans or programmes implemented by the Turkish Government to bring its subsidy levels into line with its WTO commitments and obligations.
- d. Supporting Table DS:9: (i) the reasons for which support is provided for diesel; (ii) the continuity of this type of subsidy; (iii) plans or programmes implemented by the Turkish Government to reduce or eliminate this type of support, taking into account the adverse effects of fossil fuel subsidies on the environment and the fight against climate change.

AG-IMS ID 93157: Question by Paraguay - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Turkey – G/AG/N/TUR/39: The Republic of Paraguay thanks Turkey for the submission of the notification contained in document G/AG/N/TUR/39 concerning domestic support commitments (Table DS:1) for the calendar year 2013. We wish to have further information on:

- a. Supporting Table DS:1: (i) the total amount of support for each of the three types of support notified in section 12, "Environmental programmes", which are Green Box subsidies and which total USD 73,656,316; (ii) the functioning, characteristics and purpose of the disbursements made under the biological combat support programme.
- b. Supporting Table DS:2: (i) the total amount of support for each of the three types of support notified in section (a) which amount to USD 1,047,159,664; (ii) the reasons for the increase of more than USD 130,000,000 in one year for this type of subsidy; (iii) the type of support provided in the context of investment support within the framework of the development of animal husbandry; (iv) the manner in which Turkey considers that the support to promote organic agriculture and good agricultural practices qualifies as falling under Article 6.2. of the Agreement on Agriculture.

- c. Supporting Table DS:4: (i) the percentages for support in relation to the value of production; (ii) the reasons for which Turkey has exceeded its product-specific domestic support limits for soybeans, and the reasons for the increase in these subsidies from 2012 to 2013; (iii) Turkey's current subsidy levels for this product; (iv) plans or programmes implemented by the Turkish Government to bring its subsidy levels into line with its WTO commitments and obligations.
- d. Supporting Table DS:9: (i) the reasons for which support is provided for diesel; (ii) the continuity of this type of subsidy; (iii) plans or programmes implemented by the Turkish Government to reduce or eliminate this type of support, taking into account the adverse effects of fossil fuel subsidies on the environment and the fight against climate change.

AG-IMS ID 93148: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Supporting Table DS:1

The United States notes a number of changes in measures notified in G/AG/N/TUR/36- G/AG/N/TUR/39 as compared to Turkey's last notification G/AG/N/TUR/20.

- a. Research expenditures increased substantially in 2013 as compared to 2008. Please provide an explanation for this increase. In addition, please confirm whether any new measures were introduced or old measures modified that contributed to the change in support.
- b. In 2010 Turkey introduced a decoupled income support and a structural adjustment measure for hazelnuts. Please provide information on how the measure was implemented.
- c. For each of the above identified new or modified measures, as well as any other relevant exempt measures, please indicate when this Committee can expect a Table DS:2 notification.

AG-IMS ID 93064: Question by United States of America - Investment subsidies generally available to agriculture

Supporting Table DS:2, G/AG/N/TUR/36

Turkey notified investment subsidies of more than USD \$1 billion in 2013. This value is increased substantially from USD 500 billion in 2009. Further, the notification describes investment subsidies and includes the following description "Support given to increase usage of hybrid seed and certified seed and seedling."

- a. Please explain the reason behind the significant increase in expenditures between 2009 and 2013.
- b. Please explain how support for use of hybrid and certified seed/seedlings is implemented, including how eligibility for the support is determined and how payment rates are determined.
- c. Please clarify why this measure is not classified as an input subsidy.

AG-IMS ID 93145: Question by United States of America - Investment subsidies generally available to agriculture

The ST/DS:2 describes investment subsidies and includes the following description "Support given to promote organic agriculture and good agricultural practices".

- a. Please explain how this support is implemented, including how payment rates are determined.
- b. Please clarify why this measure is notified as an investment subsidy under Article 6.2.

AG-IMS ID 93147: Question by Japan - *De minimis*

According to the Turkey's notification concerning the domestic support commitments (Table DS1 and the relevant supporting tables), most product specific subsidies are below the *de minimis* level. At the same time, some product subsidies exceed the *de minimis* level and the notification shows the support for such products as the current total AMS. Japan would like to ask how Turkey rationalize this situation in terms of consistency with the Agreement of Agriculture.

AG-IMS ID 93153: Question by Australia - Scheduled commitment level

Australia welcomes Turkey's submission of their DS:1 notifications for the calendar years 2010-13. Australia notes that Turkey has reported domestic support in excess of its annual commitment for each of these calendar years. Australia notes that Turkey also previously notified it exceeded its domestic support for the calendar years 2005, 2007, and 2009.

- a. Does Turkey expect to be notifying further breaches of its WTO commitments in notifications for its remaining overdue DS:1 notifications?
- b. Could Turkey advise if it has reformed those programmes that resulted in the recorded breaches? If so, could Turkey provide the relevant details for each programme?
- c. Could Turkey provide an update on its preparations to submit domestic support notifications for 2014 and onwards?

AG-IMS ID 93150: Question by Brazil - Scheduled commitment level

According to notifications G/AG/N/TUR/36-39, Turkey has provided domestic support in excess of its "*de minimis*" for cotton, sunflower, rapeseed, safflower, leading to a Current Total AMS that breaches its commitments.

- a. What is Turkey's justification for such level of domestic support under its WTO commitments?
- b. Could Turkey provide details on the agricultural policies not exempted from reduction commitments (the premium payments) that were in place for cotton, sunflower, soybeans, rapeseed, safflower between 2010 and 2013?
- c. Are the programmes indicated above still in place? If not, when were they terminated?
- d. Which other policy changes has Turkey implemented, since 2013, to ensure that its domestic support commitments will be upheld?

AG-IMS ID 93151: Question by Canada - Scheduled commitment level

Canada appreciates Turkey providing more recent domestic support notifications to this Committee, which brings Turkey up to 2013 and providing an accurate account of its domestic support. Canada encourages Turkey to continue its work to submit its domestic support notifications. However, Canada continues to be concerned that Turkey's domestic support is in excess of its annual commitment. Canada notes the extremely large increase in its Current Total AMS from 2011 (USD 17,577,492) to USD 479,096,942 and USD 400,721,589 USD in 2012 and 2013, respectively.

- a. What concrete, meaningful steps has Turkey taken to ensure that it complies with its WTO domestic support commitment?
- b. What is the current situation with Turkey's domestic support commitment?

AG-IMS ID 93152: Question by European Union - Scheduled commitment levelG/AG/N/TUR/39

The EU thanks Turkey for reducing its backlog in notifications. However, as in the previous DS:1 notification, Turkey did not respect its commitments. For this notification, three sectors did not respect the 10% *de minimis* limit.

Can Turkey for the three sectors in question, cotton, soybeans and rapeseed, state for how long these support schemes have been applied after 2012 and whether they have been replaced by other support measures?

AG-IMS ID 93149: Question by Thailand - Scheduled commitment level

Thailand thanks Turkey for submitting its Domestic Support Notifications. Thailand noticed that the Total AMS used between 2010-2013 exceeded Turkey's commitment.

Thailand would like to therefore seek Turkey's plan on the current policy on this related issue.

AG-IMS ID 93146: Question by United States of America - Non-product-specific AMS

Supporting Table DS:9

Please explain the factors that caused the \$500 million increase for agricultural credit between 2009 and 2013.

2.4.29 United Arab Emirates (G/AG/N/ARE/16, G/AG/N/ARE/17)

AG-IMS ID 93270: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

While the United States thanks United Arab Emirates for continuing to regularly provide its Table DS:1 notifications in a timely manner, the United States notes that United Arab Emirates has not responded to any question it has ever been asked in this Committee. The United States would encourage United Arab Emirates to bring its responses to these questions up to date, many of which also apply to its current notifications.

When can Members expect United Arab Emirates to provide responses?

AG-IMS ID 93279: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

In notification G/AG/N/ARE/12 covering the United Arab Emirates' 2016 domestic support spending, line 2 (d) "Extension and advisory services" is accompanied by the description "Support for agricultural research and to facilitate the transfer of information and the results of research to producers and consumers" and with the data source of the Abu Dhabi Food Control Authority. In notifications G/AG/N/ARE/16 and G/AG/N/ARE/17, covering calendar years 2018 and 2019, no description is given under the extension and advisory services and spending is reported by the Ministry of Climate Change and Environment and the Dubai Municipality, as well as the Abu Dhabi Food Control Authority.

- a. Please describe the spending in line 2 (d) Extension and Advisory Services for calendar years 2018 and 2019, including whether this is a new measure compared to the outlays identified for 2016 and if a Table DS:2 notification will be made for this measure.
- b. Noting that the United Arab Emirates has not notified a Table DS:1 for calendar year 2017, please indicate when that notification will be submitted to this Committee.

2.4.30 Vanuatu (G/AG/N/VUT/9, G/AG/N/VUT/10)

AG-IMS ID 93155: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

A number of measures notified in G/AG/N/VUT/1 for 2015, V/AG/N/VUT/9 for 2014, and V/AG/N/VUT/10 for 2017 including "research" and "training services" have the same monetary value for each year.

- a. Please confirm whether notified values are actual or projected budgetary outlays or expenditures.

- b. If values are not actual budgetary outlays, please provide such values for all notified years.

AG-IMS ID 93158: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

The United States notes Vanuatu's submission of domestic support notifications for 2014, 2015, and 2017, but not 2016. When will Vanuatu be submitting its notification for 2016? Why was it withheld?

2.5 New or modified domestic support measures (Table DS:2)

2.5.1 India (G/AG/N/IND/19)

AG-IMS ID 93280: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Could India please confirm whether any activities under the measures below include input subsidies to farmers and, if so, whether these subsidies are being notified under Supporting Table DS:2:

- Rashtriya Krishi Vikas Yojana (RKVY);
- Pradhan Mantri Krishi Sinchayee Yojana (PMKSY);
- National Mission for Sustainable Agriculture (NMSA);
- Mission for Integrated Development of Horticulture (MIDH);
- Pradhan Mantri Kisan Samman Nidhi (PM-KISAN).

AG-IMS ID 93296: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Could India please provide information on additional financial assistance and direct input subsidies provided by any state governments, including those provided as matching grants under any central government programmes, and any additional state programs supporting the provision of seed, chemicals, agriculture machines, etc.

AG-IMS ID 93297: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

India has notified Pradhan Mantri Krishi Sinchayee Yojana – Per Drop More Crop component (PMKSY-PDMC) in Table DS:2. India states the scheme meets the general criteria of paragraph 1 and the general criteria in paragraph 2 of Annex 2. According to the PMKSY website, categories of beneficiaries under the measure include "small and marginal farmers" and "other than small and marginal farmers" and the subsidy payment will be limited to unit costs specified in the guidelines of the PMKSY-PDMC. It is also unclear where India has notified this value in Supporting Table DS:1 of G/AG/N/IND/15 and G/AG/N/IND/18.

- a. Please identify where in Supporting Table DS:1 the PMKSY-PDMC is notified, inclusive of the related monetary value for 2018/19.
- b. Please confirm whether the PMKSY-PDMC provides payments or other benefits directly to producers.
- c. Noting that PMKSY-PDMC, among other things, aims to "improve on-farm water use", please confirm whether the measure provides benefits for on-farm facilities.

2.5.2 United Kingdom (G/AG/N/GBR/1)

AG-IMS ID 93159: Question by Australia - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Australia welcomes the United Kingdom's submission of its first notification pursuant to the Agreement on Agriculture notification obligations. Australia looks forward to having the UK engage fully in this important transparency work. Australia hopes the UK can set a new standard of best practice in terms of quality and timeliness of notifications, drawing on the extensive discussions

in the Committee on Agriculture on how to provide the most relevant, fulsome and timely information to facilitate other Members' review and understanding of the UK's agricultural sector.

With respect to G/AG/N/GBR/1, Australia notes the notification states 'the territorial application of this instrument is England only'. Can the UK confirm the notification is only applicable to England and can the UK provide further information on how programmes in Scotland, Northern Ireland and Wales will be notified to this Committee?

AG-IMS ID 93160: Question by European Union - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Can the UK explain whether this or similar programmes will be implemented in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland?

AG-IMS ID 93287: Question by United States of America - General services: other

The United States welcomes the United Kingdom's first notification to the Committee on Agriculture. The notification states that Countryside Stewardship (England) Regulations 2020 "will be a simplified version of the current EU scheme designed to encourage more applicants; increase delivery of environmental benefits and decrease the administrative burden..."

Please provide additional details with regards to how this measure differs from the EU scheme with regards to increasing delivery of environmental benefits.

2.6 Export subsidy notifications (Tables ES:1, ES:2 and ES:3)

2.6.1 Argentina (G/AG/N/ARG/40, G/AG/N/ARG/41, G/AG/N/ARG/42)

AG-IMS ID 93161: Question by India - Quantity of total exports

Argentina is the highest exporter of Soybean oil in the world. [Source: <https://oec.world/en/profile/hs92/1507/; WITS- 2017 data>]. Argentina has notified soya bean oil under its export subsidy notification documents G/AG/N/ARG/40, G/AG/N/ARG/41, G/AG/N/ARG/42 for years since 2015-16, 2016-17 and 2017-18. However, Argentina is not entitled to provide export subsidies as per its schedule. Could Argentina clarify the following:

- a. How does Argentina ensure its compliance under Article 9 of the Agreement on Agriculture?
- b. Kindly provide the outlays for each product notified in the ES:2 tables provided in G/AG/N/ARG/40, G/AG/N/ARG/41, G/AG/N/ARG/42.
- c. How does Argentina ensure that its subsidized soybean oil is not displacing or impeding the soya exports of other Members?

2.6.2 Brazil (G/AG/N/BRA/54)

AG-IMS ID 93162: Question by Australia - International food aid

Australia welcomes Brazil's submission of its ES:3 for calendar year 2018, in which it notified 14,478.7 tonnes of rice provided as food aid. Australia fully supports the provision of assistance to address humanitarian emergencies and to support food security in locations that have poor access to sufficient nutrition. With respect to this food aid, can Brazil advise:

- a. Which Member/country was the recipient of that food aid?
- b. If Brazil is considering moving to only cash-based food aid?
- c. How it ensures the physical food aid does not cause adverse effects on recipient Members' agricultural industries, nor on their region's production and commercial markets of either like-products, or substitute products?

2.6.3 Canada (G/AG/N/CAN/135)

AG-IMS ID 93223: Question by Australia - Transparency issues

Australia thanks Canada for the submission of its ES:1 for 2018. Australia welcomes this good example of a fulsome notification, with clear information on the ongoing implementation of the Nairobi Decision outcomes by Canada, including confirmation that the remaining export subsidies in Canada's schedule will be eliminated by the end of this year.

With respect to the notification, Australia notes that Canada provided producer financed subsidies for butter, cheese and other dairy products.

Can Canada provide further information on these measures, including the funding organisation, any operational details of these subsidies?

AG-IMS ID 93197: Question by European Union - Transparency issues

The European Union notes that Canada's export subsidies for butter increased in 2018/2019 compared to the year before and that both the outlays and quantity of subsidised exports exceeded the average level of the past five years.

How does Canada consider this to respect the Nairobi Ministerial Decision on export competition?

AG-IMS ID 93199: Question by New Zealand - Transparency issues

Canada's ES:1 notification for Marketing Year 1 (August 2016-31 July 2017) confirmed no outlays on butter, despite Canada having a scheduled commitment of 905 tonnes. Canada's ES:1 notification for Marketing Year 2018 confirms the reintroduction of a subsidy on 151 tonnes of its scheduled commitment for butter. New Zealand also notes that Canada continues to subsidise exports of cheese.

How is Canada ensuring that export subsidies on butter and cheese (as well as skim milk powder and products using dairy ingredients) will be effectively eliminated by 31 December 2020, as per the Nairobi Ministerial Decision on Export Competition?

2.6.4 Morocco (G/AG/N/MAR/46, G/AG/N/MAR/46/Corr.1, G/AG/N/MAR/44, G/AG/N/MAR/44/Corr.1, G/AG/N/MAR/47)

AG-IMS ID 93163: Question by Australia - Special and differential treatment (Article 9.4)

Australia welcomes Morocco's submission of its ES :1 notification for 2014, 2016 and 2017. Noting Morocco's export subsidies are provided subject to Article 9.4 of the Agreement on Agriculture, can Morocco provide responses to the following questions:

- a. Can Morocco provide details on the cost-reduction measures provided for vegetables, fruits, flowers and ornamental plants, olive oil and hatching eggs and day-old chicks?
- b. Can Morocco provide details on how these export subsidies meet Morocco's commitments under Nairobi Ministerial Decision, particularly paragraphs 9, 10 and 11?

2.6.5 Turkey (G/AG/N/TUR/40, G/AG/N/TUR/41, G/AG/N/TUR/42, G/AG/N/TUR/43)

AG-IMS ID 93165: Question by Australia - Transparency issues

Australia welcomes Turkey's submission of its ES:1 notifications for 2010 through to 2013. This is an important demonstration of Turkey's commitment to transparency. With respect to Turkey's remaining overdue ES notifications:

- a. Can Turkey advise when it expects to submit its outstanding notifications (for 2014 onwards).

Further, with respect to Schedule XXXVII – Turkey – Part IV – Section II – Export Subsidies (document G/MA/TAR/RS/588), which outlines Turkey's export subsidy reduction commitments, the

Schedule indicates Turkey will cease to provide export subsidies as of 1 January 2019 for a range of agricultural products, including beef (0201, 0202), sheep meat (0204), milk (0401.30) and tomatoes (0702).

- b. Can Turkey confirm that no export subsidies have been provided for those commodities consistent with the Nairobi Decision?

AG-IMS ID 93164: Question by Brazil - Transparency issues

Taking into due account that Turkey's notifications relates to calendar years 2010 to 2013, hence before MC10, and that, according to the notifications, none of its export subsidy reduction commitments have been disregarded, it is worth noticing that there is a considerable array of agricultural products that were entitled to subsidies. Could Turkey provide information on the reforms it has implemented on its agricultural policy related to export subsidies comply with the Nairobi Decision?

2.7 EXPORT PROHIBITIONS AND RESTRICTIONS (TABLE ER:1)

2.7.1 Myanmar (G/AG/N/MYN/21)

AG-IMS ID 93222: Question by Australia - Transparency issues

Australia thanks Myanmar for the submission of an ER:1, notifying an export restriction on rice from 1 May to 30 June to prevent critical shortages of rice.

Can Myanmar advise if the measures ended as notified – on 30 June – and if any further measures are being considered or developed with respect the export of rice from Myanmar?

2.8 NOTIFICATIONS IN THE CONTEXT OF THE NFIDC DECISION (TABLE NF:1)

2.8.1 Korea, Republic of (G/AG/N/KOR/74, G/AG/N/KOR/75)

AG-IMS ID 93298: Question by United States of America -

The United States thanks the Republic of Korea for the transparency provided in notifying its Table NF:1 for 2018 and 2019.

As a follow up to AG-IMS ID 93170 and 91123:

The United States notes that the Republic of Korea provided food aid donations to the WFP for all years between 2008 and 2017 but did not notify any Table NF:1 for this period or Table ES:3 since 2013. Also, we noted that the Republic of Korea through the Asean Plus Three Emergency Rice Reserve's (APTERR) food aid program provided in-kind food aid in year 2017.

- a. Please indicate when the Republic of Korea will be providing NF:1 notifications for years 2008 to 2017.
- b. Please explain whether food aid donations to APTERR in 2017 should be notified in Tables ES:3 and NF:1. If not, why not.

3 DEFERRED REPLIES TO QUESTIONS ON NOTIFICATIONS

3.1 Domestic Support commitments (Table DS:1)

3.1.1 Bahrain, Kingdom of (G/AG/N/BHR/7, G/AG/N/BHR/10, G/AG/N/BHR/11, G/AG/N/BHR/14)

AG-IMS ID 93308: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

The United States notes that the Kingdom of Bahrain has not responded to any of the questions it has been asked since 2014 and would encourage the Kingdom of Bahrain to bring its responses to these questions up to date.

The United States resubmits AG-IMS ID 89035/88101, for which the Kingdom of Bahrain has not responded and also applies to G/AG/N/BHR/11 and G/AG/N/BHR/14:

In Supporting Table DS:1 for 2012 and 2014 the Kingdom of Bahrain notified "plant protection" as a pest and disease control measure under Annex 2. No pest and disease control measure was notified for 2013 in G/AG/N/BHR/7, but the Kingdom of Bahrain did notify "Land preparation, crop protection, veterinary services" as a general services measure for that year as well as in 2011 and previous years. In 2015, 2016 and 2017, the Kingdom of Bahrain notified "Plant Protection, national campaign for the control of red palm weevil" as a pest and disease control measure.

- a. It is unclear whether the intermittent use of some of these measures (e.g., "plant protection" and "land preparation, crop protection, veterinary services") indicates whether the same programme received funding in only certain years or if a new programme was introduced with the same name. Please clarify.
- b. For each measure notified in Supporting Table DS:1 by the Kingdom of Bahrain in G/AG/N/BHR/10, please provide a short description of how the measure is implemented.
- c. Please confirm when a Table DS:2 notification for each new exempt measure (e.g., "plant protection" and "Plant Protection, national campaign for the control of red palm weevil") will be submitted to this Committee.

AG-IMS ID 93309: Question by United States of America - Input subsidies available to low-income or resource-poor producers

The United States notes that the Kingdom of Bahrain has not responded to any questions it has been asked since 2014 and would encourage the Kingdom of Bahrain to bring its responses to these questions up to date.

The United States notes no response has been provided for AG-IMS ID 88100/74038 regarding G/AG/N/BHR/7 and also applies to G/AG/N/BHR/11 and G/AG/N/BHR/14. The Kingdom of Bahrain has notified input subsidies for crops and animal products inputs generally available to low-income or resource-poor producers.

- a. How does the Kingdom of Bahrain define "low-income or resource-poor"?
- b. What percent of Bahraini agricultural producers meets this definition?
- c. Please describe what inputs are eligible to receive a subsidy, how the support measure implemented, and how the subsidy is calculated.

3.1.2 Singapore (G/AG/N/SGP/32)

AG-IMS ID 93177: Question by Australia - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Australia would like to follow up with Singapore with respect to question AG-IMS ID 92120 that Australia asked at the 92nd CoA:

Australia thanks Singapore for its DS:1 notification for Calendar Year 2018 (G/AG/N/SGP/32), in which it confirms no domestic support was provided or maintained. Singapore has not notified the provision of any domestic support for the last decade.

On Singapore's Food Agency website, there are a number of programmes that may fall within the Agreement of Agriculture commitments made by Singapore, for example: the Agriculture Productivity Fund; the Productivity Enhancement Scheme; the Research & Development scheme; and the Cash Advancement program.

Can Singapore confirm that it has not provided any domestic support under these programmes, or explain how any expenditure under these programmes do not fall under Singapore's Agreement on Agriculture commitments.

3.1.3 Tunisia (G/AG/N/TUN/58)

AG-IMS ID 93141: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

The United States repeats AG-IMS ID 91195, noting the same issues appear in Tunisia's notification for 2018.

The United States notes that Tunisia only notifies product specific support for milk in the form of market price support. However, the United States understands that Tunisia operates several additional programmes related to milk which were not notified at all.

- a. For the three measures identified below, please confirm how the measure is notified in Tunisia's most recent domestic support notification or provide the basis for exclusion.
- b. Please also provide the same information for any other programs related to milk not already identified including programs that:
 - i. Provide a subsidy for dairy projects.
 - ii. Provide funding of approximately USD 17 million for milk collection and cooling.
 - iii. Provide USD 8 million to process milk stocks when there is overproduction. Please also confirm for the most recent five notified years whether such funding was used and if so, how much.

The United States understands for certain commodities (e.g., sugar and tobacco) the Government operates a public storage program intended to stabilize market prices.

- c. Please provide the measure and additional details as to how this program is operated and please specify how this program is notified in Tunisia's domestic support notifications.

Tunisia provides support to farmers in the form of agricultural input subsidies for items such as fertilizer, pesticide, and irrigation at rates below cost.

- d. For each type of input, fertilizer, pesticide, and irrigation, as well as any others not identified by the United States, please explain how the program is administered and the basis for not including such measures in Tunisia's domestic support notification.

AG-IMS ID 93140: Question by United States of America - Market price support: Eligible production

The United States repeats AG-IMS ID 91191 noting the same issues appear in Tunisia's notification for 2018.

In Tunisia's response to AG-IMS 87041 regarding production levels in 2016 compared to notified eligible production, Tunisia indicated that it would provide a response at a later stage. The United States repeats the question in the context of both 2016 and 2017. It is the United States understanding that Tunisia produced 840,000 MT of durum, 150,000 MT of common wheat, 390,000 MT of barley and over 900,000 MT of milk in 2016.

- a. Please explain what the volume of eligible production notified represents. For example, in 2016 Tunisia notified eligible production of 5,300 MT for durum, 500 MT for common wheat, 1,100 MT of barley and 865,000 MT of milk in 2016.
- b. Please provide the relevant measures and explain how the measures limit the quantity of eligible production of each of these commodities.

AG-IMS ID 93139: Question by United States of America - Excessive rates of inflation

The United States repeats AG-IMS ID 91190 noting the same issues appear in Tunisia's notification for 2018.

In Tunisia's response to AG-IMS ID 87040, Tunisia indicated that it would provide a response at a later stage. The United States repeats the question and notes that Tunisia has also adjusted the fixed external reference price for 2017 for the same commodities. For the reporting period of 2016, Tunisia has adjusted the fixed external reference prices for durum wheat, common wheat, barley and milk to take account of inflation and exchange rates. The same was done for products notified for 2014 in G/AG/N/TUN/47, at which time, in response to AG-IMS ID 62036, Tunisia stated that it considered the rate of inflation between 1998-2014 to be excessive.

- a. Please provide additional information for Members to consider with the request, including inflation rates for all years since 1986, noting that Tunisia's inflation rates are well within the range of most other Members' rates.
- b. Please provide information and data that shows all calculations regarding inflation in Tunisia's most recent notification (G/AG/N/TUN/52).
- c. Please submit a revised notification showing domestic support calculated with an unadjusted FERP.
- d. Is Tunisia considering making substantive reforms to its policies that will bring it into compliance with its obligations?

3.2 EXPORT PROHIBITIONS AND RESTRICTIONS (TABLE ER:1)

3.2.1 Kyrgyz Republic (G/AG/N/KGZ/8)

AG-IMS ID 93230: Question by Japan - Transparency issues

- a. Japan recognizes that Kyrgyz Republic introduced export prohibitions on certain food products including wheat and meslin, wheat flour, rice, and sugar on 22 March 2020, and appreciates the measure was notified to the Committee on Agriculture on 31 March 2020. Japan would appreciate it if Kyrgyz Republic could provide the reason why the notification was not made before the measure was taken while "prior notification" is required in Article 12 of the Agreement on Agriculture.
- b. Japan would appreciate it if Kyrgyz Republic could explain how the measure meets the conditions required in Article XI of General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT): namely i) essentiality of the products, and ii) criticalness of the shortages. Japan would also appreciate it if Kyrgyz Republic could provide the reason why it resorted to the export prohibitions on the products, rather than arranging quotas which reflect the situation of domestic supply and demand.

4 OVERDUE NOTIFICATIONS

4.1.1 China

AG-IMS ID 93166: Question by United States of America

Table ES:3 and Table NF:1 Notifications

Taking into account China has not responded to AG-IMS ID 92029 and 88082, the United States notes that China in responding to the ECQ and AG-IMS ID 92031, China stated that it has provided food aid through both multilateral and bilateral channels through 2018 but has never notified Table ES:3 (showing the total volume of food aid provided). Further China stated in response to AG-IMS ID 90080 that it would study whether a Table ES:3 notification is necessary.

- a. Has China determined if notification of Table ES:3 is necessary?
- b. If not necessary, please explain.

The United States notes that the volume of international food assistance provided by China as reported in the export competition questionnaire from 2015 to 2018, is over 2 billion RMB per year,

making China the third largest food donor, after the United States and the European Union and its member States. As a food aid donor or donors of technical and financial assistance:

- c. When can Members expect China to notify Table NF:1?
- d. If China does not plan to notify, please explain why.

4.1.2 Egypt

AG-IMS ID 93167: Question by United States of America

The United States notes that Egypt's last notification (G/AG/N/EGY/2) concerning export subsidy commitments (Table ES:1) is for the year 1998. As a follow up to AG-IMS ID 90081, Egypt stated that it was undertaking the necessary steps to update its ES notifications. Please provide an update on the steps being taken by Egypt to submit its overdue notifications.

4.1.3 European Union

Question by India (AG-IMS ID 93180)

The European Union has notified its DS:1 notification up to marketing year 2016-17. In this regard, India requests the European Union the following:

- a. When is it planning to file DS:1 notifications for years post 2016-17?
- b. What are the reasons for delay in the notification?

4.1.4 India

AG-IMS ID 93200: Question by European Union

ES:1 notifications

The latest ES:1 notification for India covers the year 2009.

- a. Can India indicate when the outstanding ES:1 notifications will be submitted?
- b. Can India indicate whether it will include all Article 9:4 subsidies granted at Federal and State level in these notifications as suggested in earlier discussions in the Committee?

AG-IMS ID 93168: Question by United States of America

As a follow up to AG-IMS ID 92030, AG-IMS ID 91143 and AG-IMS ID 88085, India states the preparation of notifications are underway and it would notify its export subsidies "shortly". Please provide an update on the status of preparation of its numerous years of overdue notifications and tell Members when the Committee can expect to be notified.

AG-IMS ID 93169: Question by United States of America

The United States noticed that the Food Corporation of India has provided humanitarian food aid, on behalf of the Government of India, for example to Afghanistan in 2018-19, (see: <http://fci.gov.in/app/webroot/upload/Import/ENGLISH%202011-2020.pdf>).

- c. Please provide additional information on FCI's activities, including in what years humanitarian food aid has been provided.
- d. Please indicate whether India will be submitting ES:3 notifications for all relevant years. If not, please explain why not.

4.1.5 Kenya

AG-IMS ID 93201: Question by European Union

DS:1 notification

The latest notification submitted in 1998 by Kenya concerns the year 1996.

Can Kenya indicate when its outstanding notifications will be submitted, in particular for recent years?

4.1.6 Korea, Republic of

AG-IMS ID 93170: Question by United States of America

As a follow up to AG-IMS ID 91123, the Republic of Korea stated that ES notification for food aid will be submitted in due course after the data collection.

- a. Please explain when the Republic of Korea will finish collecting its food aid data and submit Table ES:3 notification for food aid for all relevant years?
- b. Since the Republic of Korea is a food aid donor and donors of technical and financial assistance, will the Republic of Korea provide a Table NF:1 Notification? If not, please explain why not.

4.1.7 Morocco

AG-IMS ID 93171: Question by European Union

The EU appreciates the efforts Morocco has made in reducing the backlog of notifications in particular on export subsidies. However, Morocco's most recent DS:1 notification is from 2012 covering the years 2003 to 2007. Can Morocco indicate any timetable for submission of its outstanding DS:1 notifications?

4.1.8 South Africa

AG-IMS ID 93172: Question by European Union

South Africa's most recent DS:1 notification is from 2016 covering the year 2014. Can South Africa indicate any timetable for submission of its outstanding DS:1 notifications?

4.1.9 United States of America

AG-IMS ID 93202: Question by European Union

ES:1 Notifications

The latest ES:1 notification submitted covers 2017/18. Can the US indicate when the outstanding ES:1 notifications will be submitted?

AG-IMS ID 93246: Question by India

India notes that the United States submitted its last domestic support notification (DS:1 notification) as contained in document G/AG/N/USA/123 in 2018, for the marketing year 2016. According to the G/AG/2 document, the United States is required to submit its domestic support notification no later than 90 days following the end of the calendar (or, marketing, fiscal, etc.) year in question.

Lately, the United States has announced a number of programmes for supporting its domestic agriculture sector. These programmes may have significant implications for the international prices of agricultural goods.

In this context, India requests the United States to elucidate the reasons for not submitting its DS:1 notification for the years 2017, 2018 and 2019. By when can WTO Members expect the United States to notify its domestic support for the years 2017, 2018 and 2019?

AG-IMS ID 93310: Question by Mexico

The review process, which is conducted on the basis of Members' notifications to the Committee on Agriculture, is the principal means of reviewing compliance with Uruguay Round commitments. As a result, the Secretariat, Mexico and numerous developed and developing Members have combined their resources and technical efforts to keep abreast of the reporting of budgetary outlays for domestic support. We note with concern that the last DS:1 notification from the United States was for the marketing year 2016 and therefore ask:

When will the United States submit domestic support notifications for the years 2016/17, 2017/18, 2018/19 and 2019/20?

5 OTHER

5.1.1 China

AG-IMS ID 93024: Question by United States of America

The United States thanks China for the transparency provided in responding to the export competition questionnaire.

As a follow up to AG-IMS 92031, China stated that SINOSURE export insurance programmes covered a total value of USD 13.9 billion, USD 13.6 billion and USD 15.95 billion of agricultural products exports in calendar years 2016, 2017 and 2018 respectively.

Please provide the programme use (i.e., the total value of exports) by product or product group (i.e., agricultural products) from 2016 to 2018. If China is unable to provide this data at this time, please explain if China is taking steps to provide this data after the end of 2020 when the Nairobi Decision Annex should be fully adopted by all Members.

5.1.2 Japan

AG-IMS ID 93173: Question by United States of America

In response to AG-IMS ID 91158 and AG-IMS ID 89028, Japan stated that certain "Subsidies for the Creation of Production Areas" under the "Direct Payment for Full Rice Paddy Utilization" program do not constitute export subsidies because they are not contingent on export performance.

The United States seeks to understand how Japan has reached this conclusion, as the payments are made in specific cases where rice is planted for new market development overseas (e.g., for export). The previous responses discussed how decision-making is conducted between the local agricultural councils, prefectural governments, and national government, and pointed out that there is no requirement to allocate a certain amount for new market development overseas, i.e. exports. However, the responses did not explain how there is no "provision by governments or their agencies of direct subsidies... contingent on export performance" for those payments that are made for this purpose.

Please provide details on how subsidies for new market development in overseas markets are structured and what requirements or conditions apply.

5.1.3 Myanmar

AG-IMS ID 93174: Question by Australia

Australia would like to follow up with Myanmar with respect to question AG-IMS ID 92124 that Australia asked at the 92nd CoA:

Australia welcomes Myanmar's submission of ten overdue ES:1 notifications. Australia welcomes this commitment to bringing notification submissions up to date and the transparency that comes with that. Australia looks forward to the submission of the ES:1 notifications for 2015 and onwards, and in the absence of these:

Can Myanmar advise if it has provided any export subsidies in those reporting periods (2015 onwards)?

5.1.4 Russian Federation

AG-IMS ID 93175: Question by United States of America

The United States thanks the Russian Federation for the transparency provided in responding to the export competition questionnaire.

As a follow up to AG-IMS ID 92032, the United States would like to repeat question (c) as the Russian Federation has not provided a written response:

The United States notes that according to the website of the Russian Agricultural Bank (Rosselkhozbank), the bank provides trade financial products and services for the export of agricultural products. Please explain whether Rosselkhozbank's trade financing activities should be reported in the ECQ.

5.1.5 Thailand

AG-IMS ID 93176: Question by United States of America

The United States thanks Thailand for the transparency provided in responding to the export competition questionnaire.

The United States noted in Thailand's ECQ response that Export-Import Bank of Thailand (EXIM Thailand) covered a total value of THB 5,282.49 million (USD 147.7 million), THB 8,322.5 million (USD 246.1 million), and THB 13,732.3 (USD 424.5 million) of agricultural product exports in calendar years 2016, 2017 and 2018 respectively.

Can Thailand please provide the programme use (i.e., the total value of exports) by product or product group (i.e., agricultural products) from 2016 to 2018.

5.1.6 Viet Nam

AG-IMS ID 93142: Question by United States of America

The United States resubmits AG-IMS ID 91109 on export competition for which Viet Nam has not provided a written response:

The United States notes that Viet Nam has not updated its response to the Secretariat's Questionnaire since 2016 and has not provided data for export financing support programs run by The Vietnam Development Bank for years 2016, 2017 and 2018. When will Viet Nam provide data updates for years 2016, 2017 and 2018 to the ECQ? If Viet Nam is not able to provide this data, please explain why.
