



Committee on Agriculture

POINTS RAISED BY MEMBERS UNDER THE REVIEW PROCESS

COMPILATION OF QUESTIONS FOR THE MEETING ON 17-18 JUNE 2021¹

The present document compiles questions received by the Secretariat by the deadline of noon 2 June 2021 as specified in WTO/AIR/AG/51.

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

TABLE OF CONTENT

1 MATTERS RELEVANT TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMITMENTS: ARTICLE 18.6	7
NEW SPECIFIC IMPLEMENTATION MATTERS (SIM).....	7
1.1 Argentina – Export restrictions on beef (SIM 689)	7
1.1.1 Question by Japan (AG-IMS ID 98117)	7
1.1.2 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 98116)	7
1.2 Canada - Emergency Food Security Fund (SIM 690).....	7
1.2.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID 98001)	7
1.3 Canada's support to the wine sector (SIM 691)	7
1.3.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID 98002)	7
1.4 China's TRQ notifications (SIM 692)	8
1.4.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 98090)	8
1.5 France - minimum selling prices for rural products (SIM 693)	8
1.5.1 Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID 98120)	8
1.6 France - Indication of the origin of meats offered in cafeterias and foodservices (SIM 694) ...	8
1.6.1 Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID 98121)	8
1.7 Italy - assistance to local processing companies that purchase Italian inputs (SIM 695)	9
1.7.1 Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID 98122)	9
1.8 Germany - domestic support to the livestock sector (SIM 696).....	9
1.8.1 Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID 98123)	9
1.9 Austria - draft resolution to change the criteria for granting the AMA seal (SIM 697).....	10
1.9.1 Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID 98124)	10
1.10 India's cotton support (SIM 698)	10
1.10.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 98092)	10
1.11 Japan - Rice Paddy Renovation for New Market Development (SIM 699)	10
1.11.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 98127)	10
1.12 Morocco - increase in wheat tariffs (SIM 700).....	11
1.12.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 98094)	11
1.13 South Africa - Review of tariff structure for poultry meat imports (SIM 701)	11
1.13.1 Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID 98137).....	11
1.14 Tajikistan's new Tax Code (SIM 702).....	12
1.14.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 98138)	12
1.15 Turkey's ban on olive oil exports (SIM 703)	12
1.15.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 98140)	12
1.16 Ukraine - Licensing requirement for exports of sunflower seeds (SIM 704).....	12
1.16.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 98141)	12
1.17 Ukraine - Memorandum of Understanding with the effect of an export restriction (SIM 705)	13
1.17.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 98142)	13
1.18 United Kingdom - Agricultural Act 2020 (SIM 706)	13
1.18.1 Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID 98032) and New Zealand (AG-IMS ID 98031)	13

1.19	U.S. Conservation Reserve Program (SIM 707).....	14
1.19.1	Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID 98143).....	14
1.20	United States – American Rescue Plan Debt Payments (SIM 708)	14
1.20.1	Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 98144)	14
1.21	Viet Nam's input subsidies (SIM 709)	15
1.21.1	Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 98146)	15
	SPECIFIC IMPLEMENTATION MATTERS (SIM) RAISED PREVIOUSLY	15
1.22	Brazil's wheat quota (SIM 511).....	15
1.22.1	Question by India (AG-IMS ID 98024)	15
1.23	Canada's compensation for farmers after trade concessions (SIM 512)	15
1.23.1	Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 98085)	15
1.24	Canada's review of the TRQ system (SIM 536)	15
1.24.1	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 98118)	15
1.25	China's cotton policies (SIM 647)	16
1.25.1	Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 98088)	16
1.26	Egypt's Sugar import restrictions (SIM 650).....	16
1.26.1	Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 98119)	16
1.27	EU's environmental policies (SIM 560).....	17
1.27.1	Question by India (AG-IMS ID 98030)	17
1.28	India - Agriculture Infrastructure Fund (SIM 676)	17
1.28.1	Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 98093)	17
1.29	India's export subsidies for skim milk powder (SIM 480)	17
1.29.1	Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 98091)	17
1.30	India's pulses policies (SIM 442).....	17
1.30.1	Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 98084), Canada (AG-IMS ID 98086), European Union (AG-IMS ID 98105), Russian Federation (AG-IMS ID 98096), Ukraine (AG-IMS ID 98097), and United States of America (AG-IMS ID 98098).....	17
1.30.2	Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 98125)	18
1.31	India's public stockpiling (SIM 525).....	18
1.31.1	Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID 98087), European Union (AG-IMS ID 98101), and United States of America (AG-IMS ID 98099)	18
1.31.2	Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID 98089), European Union (AG-IMS ID 98100), and United States of America (AG-IMS ID 98103)	19
1.32	India's export prohibitions on onions (SIM 652)	20
1.32.1	Question by Japan (AG-IMS ID 98095) and United States of America (AG-IMS ID 98107)	20
1.33	Indonesia's imports of citrus, melons, strawberries and persimmons (SIM 677)	20
1.33.1	Question by Japan (AG-IMS ID 98126)	20
1.34	Moldova's amendments to the Law on Internal Trade (SIM 473)	21
1.34.1	Question by Ukraine (AG-IMS ID 98128).....	21
1.35	Mongolia's quota regime for importation (SIM 463)	21
1.35.1	Question by Russian Federation (AG-IMS ID 98074).....	21

1.36	Nigeria - Foreign currency exchange restrictions to wheat and sugar imports (SIM 566)	22
1.36.1	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 98130)	22
1.37	Nigeria's import prohibitions on certain agricultural products (SIM 233).....	22
1.37.1	Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID 98129).....	22
1.38	Philippines - Sanitary and Phytosanitary Import Clearance (SPSIC) permits (SIM 655)	22
1.38.1	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 98131)	22
1.39	Russian Federation's Permanent export quota for cereals (SIM 633).....	23
1.39.1	Question by India (AG-IMS ID 98025)	23
1.40	Russian Federation's formula-based grain export tax (SIM 683).....	23
1.40.1	Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 98132)	23
1.40.2	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 98136)	24
1.41	Russian Federation's support on exports of high value-added agricultural products (SIM 679)	24
1.41.1	Question by India (AG-IMS ID 98027)	24
1.42	Russian Federation – Permanent export quota for cereals (SIM 633)	24
1.42.1	Question by India (AG-IMS ID 98028)	24
1.43	Russian Federation's grain export duties (SIM 682).....	24
1.43.1	Question by India (AG-IMS ID 98026)	24
1.44	Russian Federation's export restrictions (SIM 658).....	25
1.44.1	Question by Japan (AG-IMS ID 98133)	25
1.44.2	Question by Ukraine (AG-IMS ID 98134).....	25
1.44.3	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 98135)	26
1.45	Tajikistan's poultry tariffs (SIM 687)	26
1.45.1	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 98139)	26
1.46	United Kingdom - Modification of the EU's agricultural schedule of commitments (SIM 570)	26
1.46.1	Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID 98033)	26
1.47	U.S. support to cotton sector (SIM 468)	27
1.47.1	Question by India (AG-IMS ID 98004)	27
1.48	US – Excise duty exemptions for alcohol on Puerto Rico the US Virgin Islands (SIM 588) ...	27
1.48.1	Question by India (AG-IMS ID 98005)	27
1.49	U.S. Coronavirus Food Assistance Program (SIM 616)	27
1.49.1	Question by India (AG-IMS ID 98006)	27
1.49.2	Question by India (AG-IMS ID 98003)	28
1.49.3	Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID 98145)	28
2	POINTS RAISED IN CONNECTION WITH INDIVIDUAL NOTIFICATIONS	29
2.1	Administration of tariff and other quota commitments (Table MA:1).....	29
2.1.1	European Union (G/AG/N/EU/65/ADD.1).....	29
2.1.2	United Kingdom (G/AG/N/GBR/2, G/AG/N/GBR/2/Corr.1)	29
2.2	Imports under tariff and other quota commitments (Table MA:2)	30
2.2.1	Brazil (G/AG/N/BRA/59)	30

2.2.2	Ecuador (G/AG/N/ECU/57, G/AG/N/ECU/58)	30
2.2.3	European Union (G/AG/N/EU/68)	30
2.2.4	India (G/AG/N/IND/20)	30
2.2.5	Japan (G/AG/N/JPN/263)	31
2.2.6	Morocco (G/AG/N/MAR/58, G/AG/N/MAR/58/Corr.1, G/AG/N/MAR/59)	32
2.2.7	Nicaragua (G/AG/N/NIC/57)	32
2.2.8	Norway (G/AG/N/NOR/116)	32
2.2.9	Russian Federation (G/AG/N/RUS/27)	33
2.2.10	Russian Federation (G/AG/N/RUS/32)	34
2.2.11	United States of America (G/AG/N/USA/148)	34
2.3	Domestic support commitments (Table DS:1)	34
2.3.1	Argentina (G/AG/N/ARG/45)	34
2.3.2	Brazil (G/AG/N/BRA/58, G/AG/N/BRA/63)	34
2.3.3	Brazil (G/AG/N/BRA/58, G/AG/N/BRA/63)	34
2.3.4	China (G/AG/N/CHN/47)	35
2.3.5	Côte d'Ivoire (G/AG/N/CIV/27, G/AG/N/CIV/28)	36
2.3.6	European Union (G/AG/N/EU/61, G/AG/N/EU/69)	36
2.3.7	Guinea (G/AG/N/GIN/10, G/AG/N/GIN/11)	38
2.3.8	India (G/AG/N/IND/18, G/AG/N/IND/25)	39
2.3.9	Japan (G/AG/N/JPN/259)	43
2.3.10	Korea, Republic of (G/AG/N/KOR/80, G/AG/N/KOR/81, G/AG/N/KOR/82)	44
2.3.11	Kyrgyz Republic (G/AG/N/KGZ/33)	47
2.3.12	Kyrgyz Republic (G/AG/N/KGZ/34)	47
2.3.13	Nigeria (G/AG/N/NGA/19, G/AG/N/NGA/20)	48
2.3.14	Pakistan (G/AG/N/PAK/17, G/AG/N/PAK/18, G/AG/N/PAK/19, G/AG/N/PAK/20)	49
2.3.15	Paraguay (G/AG/N/PRY/33)	49
2.3.16	Russian Federation (G/AG/N/RUS/29)	50
2.3.17	Switzerland (G/AG/N/CHE/109)	50
2.3.18	Tunisia (G/AG/N/TUN/60)	50
2.3.19	United States of America (G/AG/N/USA/135, G/AG/N/USA/135/REV.1, G/AG/N/USA/150)	51
2.3.20	Viet Nam (G/AG/N/VNM/14, G/AG/N/VNM/15, G/AG/N/VNM/16, G/AG/N/VNM/17)	55
2.4	NEW OR MODIFIED DOMESTIC SUPPORT MEASURES (DS:2)	55
2.4.1	United Kingdom (G/AG/N/GBR/4)	55
2.5	EXPORT SUBSIDY notifications (TABLES ES:1, ES:2 AND ES:3)	55
2.5.1	Canada (G/AG/N/CAN/135, G/AG/N/CAN/139)	55
2.5.2	India (G/AG/N/IND/24)	56
2.5.3	Korea, Republic of (G/AG/N/KOR/78, G/AG/N/KOR/79)	56
3	OVERDUE NOTIFICATIONS	56
3.1.1	Canada	56

3.1.2	European Union	57
3.1.3	United States of America	57

1 MATTERS RELEVANT TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMITMENTS: ARTICLE 18.6

NEW SPECIFIC IMPLEMENTATION MATTERS (SIM)

1.1 Argentina – Export restrictions on beef (SIM 689)

1.1.1 Question by Japan (AG-IMS ID 98117)

- a. Regarding the official announcement of a 30-day ban on all beef exports from Argentina, Japan finds that the required notification to the Committee on Agriculture has not been made in accordance with Article 12 of the Agreement on Agriculture.
 - i. Japan would appreciate if Argentina could provide the reason behind and indicate if it intends to make a notification on this measure in the near future.
 - ii. Japan would also appreciate if Argentina could explain how it has given due consideration to the effects of the measure on importing Members' food security, as required in Article 12 of the Agreement on Agriculture.
 - iii. Is it possible to provide the reason why it resorted to the export prohibitions on the products rather than an export quota which would allow a certain amount of exports?
- b. Japan is concerned that the decision may set to have ramifications for the trade globally. Japan would appreciate if Argentina 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.

1.1.2 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 98116)

We understand that Argentina has recently introduced an export restriction/ban on beef.

When does Argentina intend to submit an ER:1 notification?

1.2 Canada - Emergency Food Security Fund (SIM 690)

1.2.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID 98001)

India appreciates Canada for its several policies to manage the effect of the coronavirus to the agricultural and allied activities.

In April 2020, the government of Canada announced up to \$100 million through the Emergency Food Security Fund to Canadian food banks and other national food rescue organizations to help improve access to food for people experiencing food insecurity in Canada due to the COVID-19 pandemic. On 9 October 2020, the Government of Canada announced an additional \$100 million to further support food security. Indigenous Services Canada (ISC) was provided with \$30 million from this funding to bolster its Indigenous Community Support Fund."

- a. What measures are being taken under the programme?
- b. How much amount of support has Canada disbursed during 2020 for this programme?

1.3 Canada's support to the wine sector (SIM 691)

1.3.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID 98002)

Canada's Budget document for 2021 provides for \$101 million over two years, starting in 2022-23, to Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, to implement a programme for the wine sector that will support wineries in adapting to ongoing and emerging challenges, in line with Canada's trade obligations. (<https://www.budget.gc.ca/2021/pdf/budget-2021-en.pdf>, Page No 217).

- a. What does the programme 'Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada' entail?
- b. Under what provision of the AoA would the programme be notified?

1.4 China's TRQ notifications (SIM 692)

1.4.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 98090)

Australia thanks China for its answer to its question regarding the administration of wheat TRQs (AG-IMS 97123).

We note China referred to its MA notification to be notified. Could China please advise when it will make this notification?

1.5 France - minimum selling prices for rural products (SIM 693)

1.5.1 Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID 98120)

Last April, the Ministry of Agriculture and Food of France released the report entitled "Rapport concernant le bilan de la loi EGAlim et la nécessité de mieux rémunérer la chaîne de valeur agricole" ("Rapport Papin"), which proposes amendments to legislation aimed at "improving payments" for local farmers, through the establishment of minimum selling prices for rural products.

In view of the above, could the European Union:

- a. explain how the future French policy of minimum selling prices would suit EU pricing policy notified in "Supporting Table" DS:5 of their DS:1 notifications?
- b. Update other Members on debates related to the approval of the so-called "Loi EGAlim 2"?

1.6 France - Indication of the origin of meats offered in cafeterias and foodservices (SIM 694)

1.6.1 Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID 98121)

Last May, the Minister of Agriculture and Food of France, Julien Denormandie, announced in an interview to the television channel "BMF TV", that will become mandatory "from next summer" the indication of the origin of meats offered in cafeterias and foodservices ("restauration collective", such as schools, hospitals, nursing homes, businesses and institutions of public administration). It should be noted that this is the second recommendation of the Papin's report, which stressed the desirability "d'identifier systématiquement l'Origine France des ingrédients et des produits, y compris en restauration collective" in a topic entitled "pour plus de patriotisme agriculture". Furthermore, one of the objectives of the measure is to remedy the fact that "la plupart des poulets viennent d'Ukraine, du Brésil. Mais très peu de France." (Source: <https://www.lefigaro.fr/conjoncture/l-origine-de-la-viande-devra-etre-indiquee-dans-les-cantines-des-cet-ete-20210421>). Could the European Union provide the following additional information:

- a. Will the measure be mandatory for public and private establishments?
- b. Will financial incentive be granted to purchase products of French origin?
- c. Will there be any restrictions on the sale of goods that are not produced in France?
- d. How is this measure compatible with the clause of National Treatment enshrined in Article III of GATT?

1.7 Italy - assistance to local processing companies that purchase Italian inputs (SIM 695)

1.7.1 Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID 98122)

Under the "National Plan for Recovery and Resilience" (PNRR) for the use of resources from "Next Generation EU", the Italian government announced that it will allocate an estimated amount of EUR 6.9 billion to the agri-food sector.

Out of these EUR 6.9 billion, EUR 1.2 billion will be allocated to the so-called "contratti di filiera", understandings brokered by the Italian government through financing for local processing companies that buy Italian inputs.

It should be noted that on April 17 the Minister of Agricultural, Food and Forestry Policies of Italy, Stefano Patuanelli, gave an interview to the newspaper "Il Sole 24 Ore", in which he stressed the importance of "contratti di filiera" as an instrument of Italian "food sovereignty".

In light of the above, could the European Union provide the following clarifications:

- a. Will the "contratti di filiera" be implemented through a minimum price policy?
- b. May exporting companies also benefit from the "contratti di filiera"?

1.8 Germany - domestic support to the livestock sector (SIM 696)

1.8.1 Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID 98123)

On 4 March, the entity "Bundnis Gemeinsam gegen die Tierindustrie" published an estimate according to which total domestic support to German livestock would amount to EUR 13.2 billion per year.

According to the most recent FAO data from 2018, German animal production recorded the following figures:

	2018	
	Unit	Value
Eggs, hen, in shell [1062]	1000 USD	1,521,511.00
Livestock [2044]	1000 USD	29,976,877.00
Meat indigenous, cattle [944]	1000 USD	4,475,027.00
Meat indigenous, chicken [1094]	1000 USD	1,407,794.00
Meat indigenous, duck [1070]	1000 USD	227,533
Meat indigenous, geese [1077]	1000 USD	31,693
Meat indigenous, horse [1120]	1000 USD	2,16
Meat indigenous, pig [1055]	1000 USD	7,183,068.00
Meat indigenous, sheep [1012]	1000 USD	189,312
Meat indigenous, total [1770]	1000 USD	14,347,127.00
Meat indigenous, turkey [1087]	1000 USD	830,541
Milk, Total [1780]	1000 USD	13,805,181.00
Milk, whole fresh cow [882]	1000 USD	13,792,683.00
Milk, whole fresh goat [1020]	1000 USD	12,498

In light of the above-mentioned, Brazil would appreciate it if the European Union could reply to the following questions:

- a. Does the European Union confirm that domestic support provided by Germany to its livestock production totals EUR 13.2 billion per year (approximately USD 16.1 billion per year or 53% of its VoP)?
- b. In which items EU's domestic support notifications include support provided by Germany to its livestock?

- c. On 13 April, Germany's Common Agricultural Policy Strategic Plan for the period 2023-2027 was sent to the Bundestag. Would the European Union be able to confirm whether there will be changes regarding domestic support for livestock in this Strategic Plan if compared to the policy currently in force?

1.9 Austria - draft resolution to change the criteria for granting the AMA seal (SIM 697)

1.9.1 Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID 98124)

Austrian parliamentarians submitted a draft resolution to the Agriculture Commission aiming at changing the criteria for granting the "AMA seal" (the most known certificate for food quality in Austria), with a view to preventing it from being granted to foods of animal origin in whose production or breeding extra-EU protein feeds have been used.

Considering that the certification is granted by "Agrarmarkt Austria Marketing GesmbH" (AMA-Marketing), an Austrian government-commissioned agency and subsidiary of the regulatory body for agricultural affairs (AMA), could the European Union explain how the proposal is consistent with Article III of GATT?

1.10 India's cotton support (SIM 698)

1.10.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 98092)

Australia notes that from 2017/18 to 2019/20, eligible production under the price support programme for cotton increased from 0.07 million tons to 1.79 million tons. This has resulted in sizeable differences in the levels of support during this period, with India's support for cotton increasing from USD 14.83 million to USD 184.83 million. The applied administered price also increased by USD 270 per tonne.

As highlighted previously, Australia notes that the United States issued a counter notification on 9 November 2018 (G/AG/W/188) outlining information that indicated India had provided market price support for cotton in excess of its *de minimis* limits under Article 6 of the Agreement on Agriculture (AoA).

Australia kindly asks India to:

- a. please explain the reason for the variations in eligible production;
- b. provide the value of production for cotton;
- c. confirm that India has not exceeded its *de minimis* limits under Article 6 of the AoA.

1.11 Japan - Rice Paddy Renovation for New Market Development (SIM 699)

1.11.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 98127)

The United States understands that Japan's third FY 2020 supplementary budget set aside 29 billion Yen for a new programme, "Rice Paddy Renovation for New Market Development." The United States understands that under this programme, a payment of 40,000 Yen per 10 acres is provided to farmers in cases where rice, "profitable crops," wheat, barley, and soybeans are planted for new market development, including for export.

- a. Please provide a detailed explanation of this programme, including on eligible and non-eligible end-uses for rice produced under the programme.
- b. Please provide all criteria required to receive payments, including how payment eligibility related to overseas markets are determined.
- c. Please provide the amount of direct payments made under the programme.

- d. In the event payments are made for rice that is exported, please explain whether the payment constitutes an export subsidy as described in Article 9 of the Agreement on Agriculture.
- e. Please confirm the rice paddy areas that receive the Rice Paddy Renovation Project for New Market Development support payments will not be eligible for the Direct Payments for Rice Paddy Utilization support payments, an existing production conversion programme funded by MAFF's annual budget.

1.12 Morocco - increase in wheat tariffs (SIM 700)

1.12.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 98094)

Australia notes Morocco has announced increases in customs duties on common and durum wheat. Circular 6193/211 increases the duty on common wheat from zero per cent to 135% effective 15 May 2021. Circular 6192/211 increases the duty on durum wheat from zero percent to 170% effective 1 June 2021. Australia notes this is within Morocco's allowed maximum duty for both products. However, noting the impacts that large increases can have on Member's trading with Morocco and the wheat market globally, could Morocco please:

- a. outline the policy rationale for the increased tariffs?
- b. Advise if it has considered the impact of these increases on other Members and the global wheat market?

1.13 South Africa - Review of tariff structure for poultry meat imports (SIM 701)

1.13.1 Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID 98137)

On 16 March, a ministerial directive from the Department of Trade, Industry and Competition of South Africa (DTIC) regarding the review of the tariff structure for the importation of poultry meat was published in the country's official press.

According to that document, the Minister directed ITAC to focus its review on the following items:

- "a) Considering the introduction of specific rather than ad valorem duties;
- b) Considering simplifying the tariff structure by reducing the number of tariff lines for poultry in Schedule 1 to the customs and Excise Act, Act 91 of 1964, by operating at a 6-digit, 7-digit or 8-digit level;
- c) Considering specific anti-dumping measures where appropriate and consider how these impact on the level of the ad valorem tariffs;
- d) Considering the introduction of an appropriate system of rebates whereby tariff levels on certain imports can be reduced where parties are achieving exports; and
- e) Considering the possibility of other measures such as an entry price system."

Could South Africa provide further clarification on the aforementioned process, in particular:

- a. What is the status of the review of the tariff structure for the import of poultry meat?
- b. What is the forecast for concluding the review?
- c. Considering that in the review exercise, the adoption of specific tariffs and an "entry price system" are being evaluated, what precautions is South Africa taking to ensure that its possible new tariff structure does not violate its commitments in terms of terms of market access at the WTO, including its schedule of concessions and Article 4 and footnote 1 of the AoA?

1.14 Tajikistan's new Tax Code (SIM 702)

1.14.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 98138)

Tajikistan has published a new Tax Code that will enter into force on 1 January 2022. Chapter 57, Article 414, paragraph 1 of Tajikistan's new tax law exempts "business entities in the field of poultry farming, fish farming, and the production of combined feed for bird and animals," from paying tax on income of legal entities, value added tax (VAT), taxes on real estate, and land taxes for a period of six years. Imports of these products into Tajikistan would remain subject to a VAT, customs duty and "other taxes".

Noting the exemption of the VAT for domestic business entities and products, but no similar exemption for importing entities and products, please explain how this measure complies with Tajikistan's WTO obligations, including GATT Article III.

1.15 Turkey's ban on olive oil exports (SIM 703)

1.15.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 98140)

It has been [reported](https://www.oliveoiltimes.com/business/turkey-bans-bulk-olive-oil-exports/92345) (<https://www.oliveoiltimes.com/business/turkey-bans-bulk-olive-oil-exports/92345>) that Turkey's Ministry of Commerce has imposed a ban on the export of bulk olive oil until 31 October 2021 upon request from the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry. In the article, The Aegean Olive Oil Exporters Association of Turkey is quoted saying "Exports [of olive oil] are at low levels compared to past seasons. Turkey's annual domestic consumption is 140,000 tons, and we have around 60,000 to 70,000 tons that can be exported."

- a. Please explain Turkey's reasoning for implementation of the ban on bulk olive oil exports, particularly if there is not a shortage.
- b. Please explain how the export ban complies with its WTO commitments, including Art. 12 of the Agreement on Agriculture and Article XI of GATT 1994.
- c. Noting paragraph 1(a) of Art. 12 of the Agreement on Agriculture, has Turkey assessed the effect of this export ban on fellow Members and the impact on global food security?
- d. If so, could Turkey please provide this analysis.
- e. When does Turkey intend to notify the measure to the Committee on Agriculture?

1.16 Ukraine - Licensing requirement for exports of sunflower seeds (SIM 704)

1.16.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 98141)

Ukraine's Ministry of Economic Development, Trade and Agriculture (MEDTA) has proposed draft [resolution](https://www.me.gov.ua/Documents/Detail?lang=uk-UA&id=98146033-c486-4de1-9bbf-3101e4e4d165&title=ProktPostanoviKabinetuMinistrivUkrainiproVnesenniaZminUDodatok1-DoPostanoviKabinetuMinistrivUkrainiVid28-Grudnia2020-R-1329-) No. 1329, which would impose a licensing requirement for exports of sunflower seeds (HS Code 1206009900) with a quota of zero tons from 15 May to 30 September 2021. This resolution would effectively ban Ukraine's exports of sunflower seeds during this period. (<https://www.me.gov.ua/Documents/Detail?lang=uk-UA&id=98146033-c486-4de1-9bbf-3101e4e4d165&title=ProktPostanoviKabinetuMinistrivUkrainiproVnesenniaZminUDodatok1-DoPostanoviKabinetuMinistrivUkrainiVid28-Grudnia2020-R-1329->)

In an [article](https://www.agriculture.com/markets/newswire/ukraine-farm-minister-opposes-sunflower-seed-export-ban), dated 23 April 2021, Roman Leshchenko, Minister for Agrarian Policy and Food (MAPF) is quoted saying "The ban on sunflower (seed) exports is an illegal measure because according to current legislation, the reason for its introduction is a violation of market equilibrium, or deficit. However, there is no shortage of sunflower in Ukraine." He said the ban could create conditions for anti-competitive actions. (<https://www.agriculture.com/markets/newswire/ukraine-farm-minister-opposes-sunflower-seed-export-ban>)

- a. Please confirm if this resolution has been adopted. If so, please provide a copy or link to the final resolution.

- b. Please explain whether Ukrainian legislation does or does not allow imposing a licensing requirement, with a zero quota, on exports (i.e., an export ban) of sunflower seeds from Ukraine.
- c. If Ukrainian legislation does allow this, please cite the relevant legal act(s).
- d. Please explain Ukraine's justification for implementing a licensing requirement, with a zero quota, on the export of sunflower seeds.
- e. Has MEDTA or MAPF completed an analysis on the sunflower seed market in Ukraine, or determined the impact of this resolution on fellow Member's food security? If so, could Ukraine please share this analysis. If not, does Ukraine plan to conduct this analysis?
 - i. Please explain how this draft resolution is in line with Ukraine's WTO commitments, including with respect to article XI of GATT 1994.
 - ii. When will Ukraine notify this resolution to the WTO?

1.17 Ukraine - Memorandum of Understanding with the effect of an export restriction (SIM 705)

1.17.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 98142)

On 19 April 2021, the Ukraine's Ministry of Economic Development, Trade and Agriculture (MEDTA) announced it had signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on sunflower oil with industry, where producers agreed to limit exports to 5.38 million tons for marketing year 2020/21. The United States is concerned as this MOU and similar MOU's for wheat and corn appear to have the effect of an export restriction.

In a previous question about MEDTA's corn MOU, (AG-IMS 97037) Ukraine responded that "*As it was mentioned at some previous CoA meetings, starting from 2011 on an annual basis the Ministry for Development of Economy, Trade and Agriculture of Ukraine (or Ministry of Agrarian Policy and Food of Ukraine) and grain market participants (grain market entities and their public associations) have signed a Memorandum of understanding.*"

- a. Please explain if Ukraine's industry representatives were required to participate in MOU discussions with MEDTA for corn, wheat and/or sunflower oil.
- b. Please explain if Ukraine's market entities and public associations were required to sign the final MOU for each respective commodity.
- c. Please explain how Ukraine determines which commodities require signing of a MOU in a given marketing year.

In the same response, Ukraine stated that "In accordance with the forecast balance of supply and demand of grain in 2020/2021 marketing year, the export potential of corn is estimated at 24 million tons, subject to the formation of optimal transitional stocks."

- d. Please detail all criteria that MEDTA considers in its calculation of "the export potential" for commodities subject to an MOU.
- e. Please explain how public associations allocate export volumes among specific entities when an optimal export volume is determined.

1.18 United Kingdom - Agricultural Act 2020 (SIM 706)

1.18.1 Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID 98032) and New Zealand (AG-IMS ID 98031)

As part of the Agricultural Act 2020, the UK has announced a shift towards public money for public goods with payments based on rewarding farmers for safeguarding the environment, animal welfare

and the UK's food system. We welcome the stated direction of UK agricultural policy and the shift away from more trade distorting measures this implies. Given the greater clarity now available on the direction of UK agricultural policy, we would appreciate updated information on the implications this new UK approach will have on actual UK levels of trade distorting support, noting that the UK's current AMS claim (dating from 2017) represents 83% of the entire AMS expenditure declared by the EU-28 in 2015-16 and over 20% of the value of UK agricultural production?

1.19 U.S. Conservation Reserve Program (SIM 707)

1.19.1 Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID 98143)

Last April, the US has announced the reopening of registrations for the "Conservation Reserve Program" (CRP). Since the CRP is notified in the Supporting Table DS: 1 as an "environmental program", could the US provide the following information:

- a. In addition to the goal of adding 4 million acres to the CRP, have other conditions of the programme been changed, such as farmers' eligibility criteria, eligible commodities and payment rates?
- b. According to notification G/AG/N/USA/150, expenditures under the programme were USD 635 million. These expenses are significantly lower than the USD 1.8 billion notified in 2016 (G/AG/N/USA/123) and the USD 1.31 billion notified in 2017 (G/AG/N/USA/135/Rev.1) and the USD 1.68 billion announced by the USDA for 2020. Could the US explain the reason for this fluctuation in expenditure under the "Conservation Reserve Program"? (Source: <https://www.fsa.usda.gov/news-room/news-releases/2020/usda-issues-168-billion-in-payments-to-producers-enrolled-in-the-conservation-reserve-program>)
- c. According to USDA information, "The Environmental Benefits Index (EBI) is used to evaluate and rank land offered for enrolment in the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) during a general signup. Scores are based on the expected environmental benefits to soil resources, water quality, wildlife habitat, and other resource concerns during the time the land is to be enrolled in the program. Each offer submitted is assigned a point score based on its relative environmental benefits ". How does the EBI relate to the criterion in paragraph 12 of Annex 2 to the AoA (payment is "limited to the extra costs or loss of income involved in complying with the government program")? (Source: [https://www.iatp.org/sites/default/files/Environmental_Benefits_IndexConservation Reser.pdf](https://www.iatp.org/sites/default/files/Environmental_Benefits_IndexConservation_Reser.pdf))
- d. What is the estimated increase in expenditure due to the reopening of registrations for the "Conservation Reserve Program" (CRP)?

1.20 United States – American Rescue Plan Debt Payments (SIM 708)

1.20.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 98144)

The American Rescue Plan includes provisions for USDA to pay up to 120% of loan balances, as of 1 January 2021, for Farm Service Agency (FSA) Direct and Guaranteed Farm Loans and Farm Storage Facility Loans debt relief to any socially disadvantaged producer who has a qualifying loan with FSA. This includes producers who identify as one or more of the following: Black/African American, American Indian, Alaskan Native, Hispanic/Latino, Asian American, or Pacific Islander. Since this debt payment will qualify as income, Congress determined the 20% additional payment is intended to help mitigate liabilities that occur when clearing a debt, which may include tax liabilities, among others.

- a. Can the US explain more in detail how it intends to include this aid scheme in its DS:1 notification?
- b. Does the US intend to notify separately the loan and the 20% additional payment?

(https://www.farmers.gov/americanrescueplan?utm_campaign=AmericanRescuePlan&utm_medium=email&utm_source=govdelivery)

1.21 Viet Nam's input subsidies (SIM 709)

1.21.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 98146)

Follow-up on question AG-IMS ID 97082

No reply to this question has been uploaded in AG-IMS. Can Viet Nam indicate when the reply will be available? The question is reproduced below.

Viet Nam indicates it spends VND 5.3 trillion on input subsidies. Could Viet Nam explain in more detail how much is provided for fuel subsidies, fertiliser, seeds and other inputs.

SPECIFIC IMPLEMENTATION MATTERS (SIM) RAISED PREVIOUSLY

1.22 Brazil's wheat quota (SIM 511)

1.22.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID 98024)

India thanks Brazil for providing response to AG-IMS 95010 on Brazil's Wheat quota.

- a. In response to (a)-(d) part, Brazil has provided the URL "http://www.mdic.gov.br/images/REPOSITORIO/secex/gab/portarias_secex_2019/Portaria_SECEX_044_2019.pdf" of Portaria SECEX no. 44 which regulates the operationalization and distribution of the quota. While accessing the link, it directs us to a website and not to the relevant text. In this regard, India requests Brazil to provide the specific link of the text Portaria SECEX no. 44.
- b. In response to (e) Brazil has provided the URL "<http://www.siscomex.gov.br/informacoes/importacao/>" which is related to updated quota fill information. While accessing the link, it was published in Brazil's official language. India requests Brazil to provide response to the question itself.

1.23 Canada's compensation for farmers after trade concessions (SIM 512)

1.23.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 98085)

Australia notes the recent Canadian budget included USD 230 million to compensate Canadian dairy, poultry and egg producers for market access concessions made under the Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement, and the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership. Can Canada please:

- a. confirm this compensation will be fully consistent with its obligations under the Agreement on Agriculture.
- b. Confirm if the Membership should expect further compensation for domestic producers of these commodities to be announced when the Comprehensive Review of the Allocation and Administration of Tariff Rate Quotas for Dairy, Poultry and Egg Products – Phase II is published in September 2021?

1.24 Canada's review of the TRQ system (SIM 536)

1.24.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 98118)

The Canadian government held a series of consultations on allocation and administration of supply-managed tariff-rate quotas, with the most recent comment period open from 6 January 2021 to 5 March 2021. Please comment on the stakeholder feedback received during that comment period and what changes the Canadian government may make in response.

1.25 China's cotton policies (SIM 647)

1.25.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 98088)

Australia thanks China for its answer to its question regarding the purchase of Australia cotton (AG-IMS ID 97098).

Given Chinese millers and other importers have told Australian exporters they have been discouraged from purchasing Australian cotton, what steps has China taken to inform Chinese millers, businesses or enterprises that there is no prohibition on importing Australian cotton?

Australia thanks China for the additional data provided in China's response on Australian cotton imports. China did not provide, however, total cotton import data or import license data as requested. As such, could China please provide:

- a. total imports of cotton for the first four months of 2017, 2018, 2019 and 2020;
- b. total imports of Australian cotton for the first four months 2017, 2018, 2019 and 2020;
- c. total imports of cotton for the first four months of 2021;
- d. total imports of Australian cotton for the first four months of 2021;
- e. whether import licences are being issued upon request, consistent with WTO obligations;
- f. the number of import licences issued for cotton year to date for 2021, and the equivalent period in 2020.

1.26 Egypt's Sugar import restrictions (SIM 650)

1.26.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 98119)

Follow-up on question AG-IMS ID 96047 and 97030.

Egypt has neither replied to question AG-IMS ID 96047 nor to the follow-up question AG-IMS ID 97030. The EU therefore repeats its questions and is looking forward to receiving a reply.

Decree No 117/2021 prolonged the sugar import restrictions in Decree No 606/2020 for another three months. In relation to Decree No 117/2021 the EU seeks clarifications from Egypt on the following points:

- a. could Egypt explain how the import restrictions on white sugar and raw sugar respect its commitments under GATT Article XI (General Elimination of Quantitative Restrictions)?
- b. Could Egypt submit an update on its current national sugar market situation including balance sheet for 2018, 2019 and 2020? Has the temporary surplus of 2020 been reduced?
- c. Could Egypt please explain how the "import approval" for raw and white sugar imports is implemented and administered in practice? What are the rules and procedures for the submission of applications, what are the available sources of information on the measures and the various steps of the application procedure? Is the eligibility of the applicants defined and available for economic operators?
- d. Could Egypt provide information on the deadlines within which "import approvals" are issued as well as the criteria for issuing the approvals?
- e. Are any fees charged for the "import approval" or are any other formalities required?

- f. Could Egypt explain how many import approval requests have been lodged for white and brown sugar since 4 June 2020 and 3 December 2020 respectively and how many requests have been granted since the introduction of the measure as well as distribution of such licenses among applying countries?
- g. Could Egypt share import statistics (value and volume) on imports of raw and white sugar respectively for each of the years 2018, 2019 and 2020, with the origins of the imports for each year?

1.27 EU's environmental policies (SIM 560)

1.27.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID 98030)

The EU's farming subsidy programme, which is being reformed, will offer farmers EUR 38-58 billion over 2023-2027 for eco-schemes, including organic production.

- a. What subsidy measures would be introduced through this programme?
- b. Who would be the eligible beneficiaries?
- c. How would the assessment for identifying beneficiaries be carried out?
- d. Which products would be covered under the proposed subsidy programme?

1.28 India - Agriculture Infrastructure Fund (SIM 676)

1.28.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 98093)

Australia thanks India for its response to its question on the Agriculture Infrastructure Fund (AIF) (AG-IMS 97110). In its response, India advised that projects have been identified for "providing supply chain infrastructure for export clusters of crops like fruits, vegetables, spices etc.". Australia requests if could please specify which fruits and vegetables are included in the export clusters, and provide specific details of any other commodities included in the export clusters.

1.29 India's export subsidies for skim milk powder (SIM 480)

1.29.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 98091)

Follow-up on question AG-IMS ID 96053

In its reply to this question India indicated that they were collecting the data and that a reply would be provided in due course.

Is India now in a position to share this data with Members and upload it into AG-IMS?

1.30 India's pulses policies (SIM 442)

1.30.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 98084), Canada (AG-IMS ID 98086), European Union (AG-IMS ID 98105), Russian Federation (AG-IMS ID 98096), Ukraine (AG-IMS ID 98097), and United States of America (AG-IMS ID 98098)

AG-IMS ID 97115 (Canada) and AG-IMS ID 97022 (USA) and AG-IMS ID 97114 (Russian Federation) and AG-IMS ID 97112 (Australia)-pulses QR

Members are well aware of our collective concerns regarding India's trade restrictive measures on pulses, particularly India's quantitative restrictions on a variety of pulses. We have continued to pose a range of questions to India and to date, India's responses have been insufficient.

Following up on AG-IMS IDs 97112, 97114, 97115 and 97022, India's quantitative restrictions on various pulses were scheduled to expire on 31 March 2020, but India has indicated these "temporary" measures, which were introduced in 2017 and 2018, will be extended for 2021-22 with an annual quota of 400,000 MT for tur (pigeon peas), 400,000 MT for urad, and 150,000 MT for moong. However, the announcement in the Gazette of India on 15 May 2021 (No. 1731) permitting the import of tur, urad, and moong albeit temporarily through 31 October 2021 is welcome

news. India has not announced measures for 2021-22 with respect to import of yellow peas, but it is understood in media reports that import restrictions remain in place for yellow peas. When Members have inquired how decisions are made with regards to the implementation of quantitative restrictions on pulses, India has responded that it reviews the overall demand and supply situation or market situation.

- a. Noting India's previous responses regarding "market situation," please provide more specific information, including data (e.g., domestic vs world price, domestic production, consumption, etc.) that supports India's claims regarding how it determined to extend the quantitative restrictions for the 2021-22 Indian fiscal year, which began in April 2021 and subsequently lifted in May 2021.
- b. Please explain why restrictions were lifted for the identified pulses only through 31 October 2021, including providing any relevant data.
- c. Please outline how and when India will assess whether the temporary restriction will be re-introduced after 31 October 2021.
- d. Please confirm the current status of restrictions on the importation of yellow peas for fiscal year 2021-22. If the quantitative restrictions on yellow peas is extended for fiscal year 2021-22, please provide a copy of the official notice or indicate when it will be published.
- e. Has India considered less trade-distorting measures that could address the underlying objectives of India's imposition of import restrictions on pulses? If so, why were such measures not adopted?
- f. In AG-IMS ID 97115, India did not explain why it considers these measures to be "temporary" considering they have been applied since 2017 and 2018. Please explain, including how India defines "temporary" and on what basis these measures are not considered permanent quantitative restrictions.
- g. Please provide a detailed explanation regarding the WTO-consistency of the quantitative restrictions imposed on certain varieties of pulses in relation to Article 4 of the Agreement on Agriculture.
- h. Please explain whether the minimum import price requirement or port of import restriction is applicable to any of the measures extended for the 2021-22 Indian fiscal year.

1.30.2 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 98125)

According to publicly available information, the EU understands that as from now yellow peas can be imported into India when a certain minimum price and an additional 50% duty are respected.

- a. Can India please indicate the minimum price in place?
- b. Can India confirm that an additional 50% duty is applicable?
- c. Are there any time limits fixed for this import regime?

1.31 India's public stockpiling (SIM 525)

1.31.1 Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID 98087), European Union (AG-IMS ID 98101), and United States of America (AG-IMS ID 98099)

AG-IMS IDs 97010, 97012, and 97060 (United States) - State Support (for wheat and rice)

India has not provided a written response with regards to the provision of state bonuses related to the Minimum Support Price scheme for wheat in several Committee on Agriculture meetings, including AG-IMS IDs 97010 and 97060 in March 2021, which themselves are a repeated question with no response (AG-IMS IDs 95032 and 93271) and follow up on AG-IMS IDs 93251 and 92009.

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 awarded a wheat bonus of Rs.2000/MT in MY 2017/18 and Rs.2650/MT in MY2018/19, in addition to the MSP, according to http://mpkrishi.mp.gov.in/hindisite_New/pdfs/MKSY_24042018.pdf. 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."

Since these questions were raised, it is reported (<https://www.livemint.com/news/india/maharashtra-farmers-to-get-700-per-quintal-additional-incentive-above-msp-for-paddy-11606228134080.html>) that the Maharashtra cabinet in November 2020 approved a Rs. 700 per quintal bonus for paddy for the 2020/21 kharif marketing season above the announced MSP.

- a. Please confirm the Madhya Pradesh government's official announcement of the above-referenced wheat bonuses in MY 2017/18 and MY 2018/19.
- b. Please provide information any other state announced wheat bonuses since MY 2016/17 through the current marketing season.
- c. Please confirm Maharashtra cabinet announced paddy bonus for MY 2020/21.
- d. Please provide any other state announced paddy bonuses since MY 2016/17 through the current marketing season.
- e. Please provide information regarding any other Indian States or Union territories having made any such payments for other commodities to producers.

If India is unable to provide a written response or indicates the information will be provided in due course with regards to parts a) and b) of this question, which have been discussed in this Committee since at least 2019, please respond to the following:

- f. What specific steps has India taken to collect information on state bonuses from states and union territories since 2019?
- g. Once this information is collected, will India be submitting revised domestic support notifications?
- h. Please explain whether there is any relation between state bonuses for paddy, such as those identified in MY 2020/21 for Maharashtra, and footnotes in India's 2018/19 and 2019/20 domestic support notifications, which state "Other support for rice, that is, other than public stockholding for food security purposes, will be notified subsequently." and "Based on the available provisional data."?

1.31.2 Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID 98089), European Union (AG-IMS ID 98100), and United States of America (AG-IMS ID 98103)

AG-IMS IDs 97013 (United States) and 95085 (EU) – Pre-Determined Stocks

In response to AG-IMS ID 97013, India provided a brief explanation of the assessment process and how procurement estimates are drawn up by the Government of India; however, it did not respond to the specific requests. Therefore, the questions are repeated:

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

1.32 India's export prohibitions on onions (SIM 652)

1.32.1 Question by Japan (AG-IMS ID 98095) and United States of America (AG-IMS ID 98107)

AG-IMS ID 96054 and 97113 (Japan) – Export Prohibition on Onions

In AG-IMS IDs 96054 and 97113, India was requested to provide the explanation about export prohibition on all varieties of onion. However, India failed to provide any specific answer, only answering that it was temporarily in force.

- a. Please provide an explanation as to why the notification was not made before the measure was taken when prior notification is required per Article 12 of Agreement on Agriculture. When does India intend to make the notification on this measure?
- b. Please explain how India has given due consideration to the effects of the measure on importing Member's food security.
- c. Please provide the reason why India resorted to the export prohibitions on the products rather than an export quota which would allow a certain amount of exports.

1.33 Indonesia's imports of citrus, melons, strawberries and persimmons (SIM 677)

1.33.1 Question by Japan (AG-IMS ID 98126)

Indonesia stated at the 97th Committee on Agriculture, that the import measure is being implemented under laws and regulations for food safety, and PRA is implemented based on criteria whether there is a commercial import record in the Indonesian government data or not.

Japan has checked and taken the official import data of 4 items (Citrus, Melons, Strawberries and Persimmons) that we want to be listed from FAOSTAT and Global Trade Atlas and created a table as below.

These four items can be identified as having import records before 2016 which was explained by Indonesia in 2019 as a requirement for items to be added to the importable list.

Moreover, Indonesia changed the condition for the addition to the importable list, to have import records for the past 10 years from 2019 when Japan enquired Indonesia in October 2019. But you can see that there was an import record for persimmons during that period.

On the other hand, Grapes that are already added to the importable list, have an import record up to 2008, but no import record before the addition to the list which is from 2009 to 2016.

As the aforementioned fact, Japan consider that there is no big difference between 4 items (Citrus, melons, strawberries and persimmons) that we are requesting to be added to the importable list and the those items such as Chilies/peppers (dry), Grapes, Peaches/Nectarines and Pears that are already on the list. This fact is inconsistent with the explanation by Indonesia.

Japan understands that for items with no import record it is required to have PRA under the Minister's Decree, and there is no stipulation of the actual import record required period in the Decree. Japan would like Indonesia to explain clearly the following:

- a. why did Indonesia judge against the actual record that these imports were not for commercial purposes?
- b. What exactly is the necessary condition to add the four items to the importable list?

Import Record from Japan into Indonesia (2006-2016) (Unit: tons)

Item	Approved product list	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Oranges	Not listed	1	< 0.5									
Melons		12	9	54	18							
Strawberries		1	< 0.5									
Persimmons	Listed										6	8
Chillies and peppers		1	1	< 0.5	< 0.5		< 0.5	1		2	26	6
Grapes		< 0.5	< 0.5	1								
Peaches and nectarines		< 0.5	< 0.5								< 0.5	
Pears		< 0.5	< 0.5		< 0.5		< 0.5					10

Data Source: FAOSTAT (Persimmons is from Global Trade Atlas, HS-0810909900).

1.34 Moldova's amendments to the Law on Internal Trade (SIM 473)**1.34.1 Question by Ukraine (AG-IMS ID 98128)**

The Parliament of the Republic of Moldova has adopted amendments to the Law on Internal Trade that seem to be not consistent with paragraphs 1 and 4 of Art. III of the GATT since they can hardly ensure an equality of competitive conditions for imported products in relation to domestic products, but instead provide a less favourable treatment for imported goods. In particular, according to Art. 21¹ of the Law, the food merchants, with the exception of those working in small retail trade units, are obliged to purchase and ensure the laying of food products from the short food chain on the shelf in the amount of at least 50% of the linear length of the shelf in the case of the sale of food products from the same category as included in the list of food products originating from a short food chain. The list of food products subject to the provisions of Art. 21¹ of the Law is approved by the government and is updated annually. The mentioned amendments also foresee monetary sanctions in case of violation by the merchant and/or supplier of the established norms regarding the quota for the goods on the shelf.

- Could the Republic of Moldova please confirm that the above-mentioned amendments will enter into force from 1 July 2021?
- Which agricultural products are currently included in the list of food products approved by the Moldova's Government?
- Could the Republic of Moldova please explain how such measures comply with paragraphs 1 and 4 of Art. III of the GATT that call for effective equality of opportunities for imported products in respect of the application of laws, regulations and requirements affecting the internal sale, offering for sale, distribution or use of products?

1.35 Mongolia's quota regime for importation (SIM 463)**1.35.1 Question by Russian Federation (AG-IMS ID 98074)**

Follow up to questions AG-IMS ID 87094, AG-IMS ID 88104, AG-IMS ID 90027, AG-IMS ID 91011, AG-IMS ID 92098, AG-IMS 93072, AG-IMS ID 95060, AG-IMS ID 96058 and AG-IMS ID 97118:

We appreciate Mongolia's decision not to open quotas for importation of liquid milk and wheat flour for 2021. We also bear in mind Mongolia's statement that The Food Law is included in the list of the laws to be amended by the Parliament by 2024 and that the amendments will ensure the compliance with the WTO Agreements. However, it's a long period and we insist on making it earlier. At the very moment the uncertainty in trade conditions still remains, as Mongolia did not exclude wheat flour and liquid milk from the list of agricultural products subject to quota regime. We would like to refer once again to Mongolia's answer to the question AG-IMS ID 93072, where Mongolia states that import quotas were applied only before the Law on the Enrichment of Food Products would come into force.

Referring to the previous questions the Russian Federation expects to receive the following information from Mongolia:

- a. Is Mongolia planning to exclude wheat flour and liquid milk from the list of agricultural products subject to quota regime as early as possible?
- b. What amendments will Mongolia make considering the Food Law? Why couldn't they be made earlier than 2024?
- c. Will there be any confirmation that Mongolia will not apply quotas for importation of wheat flour and liquid milk in future? If yes, when then?

1.36 Nigeria - Foreign currency exchange restrictions to wheat and sugar imports (SIM 566)

1.36.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 98130)

On 16 April 2021, the Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN) stated that it is planning to apply foreign exchange restrictions to wheat and sugar imports. (<https://www.reuters.com/world/africa/nigeria-halt-foreign-currency-sugar-wheat-imports-central-bank-2021-04-16/>)

- a. Please explain CBN's procedure for deciding to place foreign exchange restrictions on agricultural products.
- b. Please explain how the CBN announces its decision to restrict access to foreign exchange for certain commodities.
- c. Will the CBN give advance notice before imposing foreign exchange restrictions on additional commodities?

1.37 Nigeria's import prohibitions on certain agricultural products (SIM 233)

1.37.1 Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID 98129)

Nigeria maintains a list of agricultural products whose imports are prohibited. This list can be found on the website of the "Federal Ministry of Finance" ("Nigeria Customs Service"), at the following address: https://customs.gov.ng/?page_id=3075.

Among the products whose import is prohibited are "live or dead birds including frozen poultry; pork; beef; birds eggs; refined vegetable oils and fats; cane or beet sugar; coca butter, powder and cakes; spaghetti / noodles and fruit juice in retail packs".

In the light of the above, could Nigeria explain how the import ban on the products listed above is consistent with the obligation taken by Nigeria in Article 4 of the AoA, which prohibits Members to maintain or adopt quantitative restrictions on imports?

1.38 Philippines - Sanitary and Phytosanitary Import Clearance (SPSIC) permits (SIM 655)

1.38.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 98131)

The United States thanks the Philippines for its response to AG-IMS ID 96015 regarding the Philippines' administration of sanitary and phytosanitary import clearance (SPSIC) permit issuances. The United States is still concerned that SPSIC permits are used for purposes other than ensuring that imported agricultural products meet the standards to protect human, animal, or plant life or health.

During the 22 October 2020 Philippine Senate Committee on Agriculture, Food, and Agrarian Reform hearing on proposed Senate Resolution Number 536 "Improve the Rice Importation Procedure" (<https://youtu.be/0v2fxLoK3kw>), Department of Agriculture (DA) Undersecretary Rodolfo V. Vicerra told the Senate Committee, "[DA] need[s] to really manage the issuance of SPSIC, specifically on

the timing so that the arrivals of these imports will not combine with our main harvest. So, we will have to come up with an administrative order on [rice imports]." On October 16, 2020, DA Secretary William Dar informed the Philippine Senate Committee on Finance (<https://youtu.be/7541ggmm2ZM>) that the DA has "institutionalized management strategy not to really bring feed wheat during the main harvest of corn... and so that management strategy is now put in place." These statements point to the Department of Agriculture using SPSIC permits to restrict imports of various products for reasons other than those stated by the Philippines in their reply to AG-IMS 96015.

- a. Please explain how using SPSIC permits to manage the timing of import arrivals so that they do not coincide with the main Philippine rice and corn harvest seasons is an effective tool to protect human, animal, or plant life or health.
- b. Please explain the role of the Secretary of Agriculture and the DA Bureaus in reviewing and approving SPSIC issuances.

According to the DA Bureau of Animal Industry (<https://www.bai.gov.ph/index.php/importation-data?download=3968:spsic-issued-2020-monthly>), no SPSICs were issued for whole chickens during March and July-December 2020.

- c. Please explain why SPSIC issuances for whole chickens during calendar year 2020 were limited.
- d. Have any SPSICs for whole chickens been issued since the beginning of 2021? If not, why?

According to the DA Bureau of Plant Industry (<http://bpi.da.gov.ph/bpi/index.php/reports-documentation/spsic-for-rice/10450-spsic-issued-and-volume-applied-per-month-as-of-april-30-2021>), SPSICs were not issued for rice in September-October 2019 or October-November 2020, and were only issued on a limited basis in September 2020. These dates appear to correspond with part of the harvest season for rice in the Philippines.

- e. Please explain why SPSIC were not issued for rice during these time periods.
- f. Please provide information on SPSIC permits, including volumes, applied for and/or issued for corn, wheat, and other commodities for 2019, 2020, and year-to-date for 2021.

1.39 Russian Federation's Permanent export quota for cereals (SIM 633)

1.39.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID 98025)

India would like to follow up on the question asked by the European Union in AG-IMS 95067 on Russia's export quota for cereals. In the response provided, the Russian Federation mentions that it established a temporary tariff quota on exportation of certain grains, which will be in effect from 15 February 2021 to 30 June 2021. Since the period of export quota is coming to an end,

- a. India would like to know the current status of the measure.
- b. Could the Russian Federation explain what its plans are with respect to such measures after 30 June 2021?
- c. How much export has been made by the Russian Federation under this tariff quota system for the quota period?
- d. What are the commodities that fall under this temporary tariff quota?

1.40 Russian Federation's formula-based grain export tax (SIM 683)

1.40.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 98132)

Follow-up to question AG-IMS ID 97039 and AG-IMS ID 97064

No replies to these questions have been uploaded in AG-IMS. Can the Russian Federation indicate when the replies will be available?

1.40.2 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 98136)

The United States would like to follow up on the European Union's question (AG-IMS 97039) about the Russian Federation's formula-based grain export tax system that will become effective on 2 June 2021. It is also noted that the Russian Federation has not provided a response to that question. The formula would apply an export tax of 70% of the difference between the export base price of wheat per ton and USD 200. For barley and corn the tax would be 70% the difference the export base price per ton and USD 185.

- a. Please explain how the export base price of wheat, barley, and corn will be determined.
- b. Please explain how this measure complies with the requirements of Art. 12 of the Agreement on Agriculture and Article XI of GATT 1994.
- c. Will the Russian Federation notify this measure to the WTO, specifically within the obligated notification timeframe of 30 days after implementation (i.e., 2 July 2021)?

1.41 Russian Federation's support on exports of high value-added agricultural products (SIM 679)**1.41.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID 98027)**

India would like to request the Russian Federation to provide response to question AG-IMS ID 97086. For convenience, India repeats the question:

As per the Ministry of Agriculture of the Russian Federation, the Russian Federation will adopt new support measures to develop exports of high value-added agricultural products.

- a. What all measures are being adopted and when will these measures be implemented?
- b. What products are considered to be high-value added and also elaborate on the criteria for identification of such products?

1.42 Russian Federation – Permanent export quota for cereals (SIM 633)**1.42.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID 98028)**

India would like to follow up on the question asked by the European Union in AG-IMS ID 95067 on Russia's export quota for cereals. In the response provided, the Russian Federation mentions that it established a temporary tariff quota on exportation of certain grains, which will be in effect from 15 February 2021 to 30 June 2021. Since the period of export quota is coming to an end,

- a. India would like to know the current status of the measure.
- b. Could the Russian Federation explain what its plans are with respect to such measures after 30 June 2021?
- c. How much export has been made by the Russian Federation under this tariff quota system for the quota period?
- d. What are the commodities that fall under this temporary tariff quota?

1.43 Russian Federation's grain export duties (SIM 682)**1.43.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID 98026)**

India would like to request the Russian Federation to provide response to question AG-IMS ID 97087. For convenience, India repeats the question:

As per the Ministry of Agriculture of the Russian Federation, Russian Prime Minister signed a resolution on grain export duties. The export duties will be charged on wheat (from 15 February to 28 February); corn and barley (from 15 February to 14 March). Such duties will be increased in future.

- a. How does the Russian Federation see the impact of such measures on food security of importing countries?
- b. In view of the short duration of implementation of these export duties, India would like to know if these export duties have stabilized prices for the products in the domestic market? How does the Russian Federation calculate the impact of these measures on domestic prices and international prices?

1.44 Russian Federation's export restrictions (SIM 658)

1.44.1 Question by Japan (AG-IMS ID 98133)

- a. Japan recognizes that the Russian Federation introduced export prohibition for three months on buckwheat from June 2021. However, finds that the required notification to the Committee on Agriculture has not been made in accordance with Article 12 of the Agreement on Agriculture.
 - i. Japan would appreciate if Russian Federation could provide the reason behind and intend to make the notification on this measure near future.
 - ii. Japan would also appreciate if Russian Federation could explain how it has given due consideration to the effects of the measure on importing Member's food security, as required in Article 12 of the Agreement on Agriculture.
 - iii. Is it possible to provide the reason why it resorted to the export prohibitions on the products rather than an export quota which would allow a certain amount of exports.
- b. Japan is concerned the decision may set to have ramifications for the trade globally. Japan would appreciate if Russian Federation 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.

1.44.2 Question by Ukraine (AG-IMS ID 98134)

Ukraine recognizes that according to the Government Resolution No. 684 of 30 April 2021 the Russian Federation introduced temporary export prohibition on barley valid from 5 June to 31 August 2021, however it did not provide required notification to the Committee on Agriculture in accordance with Article 12 of the Agreement on Agriculture. In view of that, could the Russian Federation:

- a. Provide more specific information, including statistical data regarding domestic production, consumption, stocks, import and export, on the basis of which the export prohibition on buckwheat was undertaken?
- b. Explain how it has given due consideration to the effects of the measure on importing Members' food security, as required in Article 12 of the Agreement on Agriculture?
- c. Provide explanation of how the measure meets the conditions required in Article XI of GATT, namely essentiality of the products and criticality of the shortages?
- d. Inform when it is going to submit a notification to the Committee on Agriculture in accordance with Article 12 of the Agreement on Agriculture and relevant notification in accordance with Article XI of GATT?

1.44.3 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 98135)

The Russian Federation published Decree of the Government of the Russian Federation No. 684, dated 30 April 2020. The Decree imposes an export ban on buckwheat (HS Codes 100810000, 11003199009, and 1004293000) for the period 5 June to 31 August 2021.

This is the second consecutive year that the Russian Federation has implemented quantitative export restrictions on cereal grains. Concerns about this potential annual recurrence have been raised repeatedly by the United States (AG-IMS ID 97031, 97026, 96018, and 96019) and other WTO Members given the effect that Russia's export bans would have on world food security. The Russian Federation has not provided a written response to these questions or only provided partial responses, which do not provide any analysis on the effect that these export restrictions may have on fellow Members.

- a. Please identify on what basis the Russian Federation justifies this export ban on buckwheat through Decree No. 684.
- b. Noting paragraph 1(a) of Art. 12 of the Agreement on Agriculture, has the Russian Federation assessed the effect of this export ban on fellow Members and the impact on global food security?
- c. If so, please share this analysis. If not, please explain any plans to conduct such analysis.

The United States remains concerned about the Russian Federation's lack of transparency because it has never notified to the Committee on Agriculture an export restriction, including this Decree.

- d. When will the Russian Federation notify Decree No. 684 to the WTO?

1.45 Tajikistan's poultry tariffs (SIM 687)

1.45.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 98139)

In February 2021, Tajikistan notified the WTO Committee on Market Access of a draft resolution (G/MA/W/167) to increase Tajikistan's import duties on poultry from 10% to 15%. The United States is concerned about this increase as it is higher than Tajikistan's 10% bound rate for poultry. Through bilateral discussions the United States confirmed that the 15% tariff is already in effect and permanent. The United States requests that Tajikistan provide answers to the following questions:

- a. please explain the rationale for increasing tariffs on poultry imports from 10% to 15%.
- b. Please explain how a 15% tariff for poultry imports is in compliance with Tajikistan's final WTO bound rate of 10%.

1.46 United Kingdom - Modification of the EU's agricultural schedule of commitments (SIM 570)

1.46.1 Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID 98033)

The issues created by the UK's proposed treatment of its WTO tariff rate quota commitments post Brexit continue unresolved and are generating direct and negative commercial impacts for WTO Members. Most immediately, our exporters are being denied the ability to use legally established tariff rate quotas into Northern Ireland. While we appreciate that the UK Government has made resolving this issue a priority, we request an update on the specific timeline by which the UK expects to have resolved this particular immediate access blockage?

1.47 U.S. support to cotton sector (SIM 468)**1.47.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID 98004)**

- a. What measures are being taken by the United States to ensure that the product-specific AMS to cotton of USD 1,388.57 million which amounts to 19.1% of the value of production of cotton during MY 2018-19 does not affect the world cotton prices?
- b. The United States is requested to provide the area, production, domestic price, export and import (quantity and value) of cotton for the last 10 years?
- c. Has the United States undertaken any study/analysis examining the impact of the U.S. cotton subsidies on world cotton price? If yes, kindly provide the details of the study.

1.48 US – Excise duty exemptions for alcohol on Puerto Rico the US Virgin Islands (SIM 588)**1.48.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID 98005)**

With respect to Question AG-IMS ID 93187 to which the United States responded that it is looking into the matter and will respond as appropriate, India is interested in the United States' response to the question reproduced below:

- 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 2020?
- 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 other than the US do not benefit directly or indirectly from this scheme?
- d. Has this subsidy been included in the recent DS:1 notifications of the US, if yes, under which Supporting table?
- e. Please elaborate on the nature of the measure and under what provisions of the Agreement on Agriculture can it be classified? Please provide the relevant URL for notification of the measure.

1.49 U.S. Coronavirus Food Assistance Program (SIM 616)**1.49.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID 98006)**

India thanks the United States for its response to AG-IMS-ID 95014 on the Paycheck Protection Program. In its response, US states that under the Paycheck Protection Programme, there is no budgeted allocation or target for agriculture sector. But, it is known from various reports that the Paycheck Protection Program (PPP) provided forgivable loans to small businesses, including farms.

Could the United States clarify the following:

- a. Eligibility criteria under the scheme for loans for the farmers?
- b. How does this programme comply with the provision under the AoA?
- c. It is understood that this programme currently offers PPP loans until May 31, 2021. Is this expected to be extended?

- d. In response to AG-IMS-ID 95014, regarding continuation of the programme, US responded "The U.S. Congress would need to pass new legislation to extend the Paycheck Protection Program. To date, no such legislation has been enacted." Has the new legislation been passed? Kindly provide details.

1.49.2 Question by India (AG-IMS ID 98003)

It is understood that United States' new Pandemic Assistance for Producers initiative will provide USD 2 million to farmers.

- a. Could the United States elaborate on how this USD 2 million sum would work in practice?
- b. How long would the programme be in operation?

1.49.3 Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID 98145)

New Zealand notes recent media reporting that Agriculture Secretary Tom Vilsack has announced the new USDA Pandemic Assistance for Producers initiative, to make financial assistance available to a broader set of producers than in previous aid programs. USDA reported it is dedicating at least USD 6 billion toward the new programs. We understand that the existing Coronavirus Food Assistance Program (CFAP) will fall within the new initiative with some alterations under the new CFAP-AA.

<https://www.usda.gov/media/press-releases/2021/03/24/after-identifying-gaps-previous-aid-usda-announces-pandemic>

New Zealand understands that the **Pandemic Assistance for Producers initiative encompasses four sections:**

- Part 1: Investing USD 6 Billion to expand help & assistance to more producers;
- Part 2: Adding USD 500 Million of new funding to existing programmes;
- Part 3: Carrying out formula payments under CFAP 1, CFAP 2, CFAP AA;
- Part 4: Reopening CFAP 2 sign-Up to improve access & outreach to underserved producers.

The US had previously approved more than USD 9.5 billion in payments in the second round of the Coronavirus Food Assistance Program (CFAP), of an allocated USD 14 billion, in addition to the USD 10.4 billion in the first round of CFAP of USD 14 billion through 2019 and 2020.

New Zealand awaits the formal notification of these programmes to this Committee but notes the strong likelihood that these payments may see the US exceed their AMS limits of USD 19.1 billion. In the purpose of transparency:

- a. Can the US provide an update on the total amount of funding delivered to date?
- b. Can the US clarify how it will ensure that any remaining funds allocated under the CFAP will be deployed in a way that is proportionate to the harm it seeks to address, transparent, consistent with WTO obligations, and wound back as soon as they are no longer necessary?

And when we can expect to see notification of payments consistent with commitments made under the Agreement on Agriculture.

2 POINTS RAISED IN CONNECTION WITH INDIVIDUAL NOTIFICATIONS

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

2.1.1 European Union (G/AG/N/EU/65/ADD.1)

AG-IMS ID 98075: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues

The United States appreciates the MA:1 addendum in G/AG/N/EU/65/Add.1, which excludes the UK from participating in the EU's TRQs.

- a. Noting the information notified both in G/AG/N/EU/65 and this addendum, are there any other free trade agreement (FTA) partners that should be (or are) excluded from WTO TRQ allocations? If so, please provide a list of these FTA partners that are excluded from applicable WTO TRQ allocations.
- b. Will TRQ EU-Q078, TRQ EU-Q090, and TRQ EU-Q104 be updated to reflect the adoption of legislation implementing the provisions of the EU-UK Trade and Cooperation Agreement (TCA)? If so, will the EU submit a revision of G/AG/N/EU/65, incorporating both these TRQs and the information shared in G/AG/N/EU/65/Add.1?

AG-IMS ID 98076: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues

The United States requests that the EU please provide an update on the status of legislation concerning the TRQs listed in paragraph 2 of G/AG/N/EU/65/Add.1.

- a. Did legislation go into effect in April 2021 as expected?
- b. Additionally, TRQ EU-Q113 is for a USA-only TRQ; will TCA-related legislation affect this TRQ?

AG-IMS ID 98077: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues

Allocations for TRQ EU-Q098 have been updated in G/AG/N/EU/65/Add.1 from "Australia, Brazil, Cuba, other third countries." to "Australia, Brazil, Cuba, All third countries except the United Kingdom".

- a. Please clarify whether there has been a change with respect to Australia's, Brazil's, and/or Cuba's participation in the general allocation.
- b. Are Australia, Brazil and Cuba now able to participate in the "all third countries except the United Kingdom" allocation?

AG-IMS ID 98078: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues

Paragraphs 1 m. and 1 n. of G/AG/N/EU/65/Add.1 both refer to TRQ EU-Q077.

Please clarify which paragraph contains the appropriate language for TRQ EU-Q077 and whether the other paragraph refers to another TRQ.

2.1.2 United Kingdom (G/AG/N/GBR/2, G/AG/N/GBR/2/Corr.1)

AG-IMS ID 98079: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues

The United States congratulates the United Kingdom on submitting its first Table MA:1 notification to the Committee on Agriculture and providing WTO Members the opportunity to review.

- a. The United Kingdom has noted that the EU is excluded from *erga omnes* TRQs. Are there any other FTA partners that should also be excluded from *erga omnes* or other TRQ allocations and if so, please specify the countries.
- b. It appears that the United Kingdom copied over the tariff codes from the EU's 2017 schedule, for which the EU has since made corrections. Specifically, in document

G/MA/TAR/RS/506/Add.3 the EU makes corrections to the tariff code for malting barley and fruit juices. Please verify whether these updates need to be incorporated in the UK's MA:1 along with the corrected codes.

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

2.2.1 Brazil (G/AG/N/BRA/59)

AG-IMS ID 98007: Question by India - Tariff quota fill

India thanks Brazil for submitting its MA:2 notification (G/AG/N/BRA/59) for calendar year 2019. India notes that Apples; peaches (BRAQ001) (0%); and Durum wheat, other (than seeds); Other (than durum wheat), other (than seeds) (BRAQ002) (6.2%) had a fill rate of less than 10%.

- a. Can Brazil elaborate on the reason for the underfill for each of the products?
- b. Can Brazil provide information on any efforts to improve administration for greater fill rates?

2.2.2 Ecuador (G/AG/N/ECU/57, G/AG/N/ECU/58)

AG-IMS ID 98080: Question by Brazil - Transparency issues

In the last two notifications MA:2, referring to calendar years 2017 (G/AG/N/ECU/57) and 2018 (G/AG/N/ECU/58), Ecuador reported that there were no intra-quota imports and that "Applied MFN tariffs for some subheadings remained below the quota tariff levels."

Could Ecuador clarify whether:

- a. all TRQs have been opened. If not, which ones were opened?
- b. There are "subheadings" of each one of the TRQs whose applied rate is higher than the intra-quota rate. If so, for which TRQ?

2.2.3 European Union (G/AG/N/EU/68)

AG-IMS ID 98149: Question by Paraguay - Transparency issues

The following question is being asked in follow-up to the reply received to AG-IMS ID 97133. The European Union has indicated that the beef tariff quotas EUQ005 and EUQ007 are country-specific. Could the European Union indicate the utilization levels of these quotas by tariff line?

AG-IMS ID 98081: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues

It is noted in G/AG/N/EU/68 that EU-Q033 is not marked closed, and it does not provide data on in-quota imports (columns 4 and 5).

Please confirm that this TRQ is closed or provide the relevant import data for this TRQ.

2.2.4 India (G/AG/N/IND/20)

Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 98034) and United States of America (AG-IMS ID 98035) - Tariff quota fill

In AG-IMS IDs 97128 and 97127 India was requested to provide data on market circumstances that could explain the underfill of the maize (INDQ002) and milk (INDQ001) TRQs in G/AG/N/IND/20. In response, India failed to provide any data and stated that the TRQ underfill was demand-driven and based on the market situation.

- a. Please provide quantitative data and any relevant qualitative information that would substantiate the claim made by India. For example, was the domestic market price for maize less than the world price?

Further, India was requested to provide information on the quota administration of maize (INDQ002) and milk (INDQ001), and in response, India directed Members to review Paragraph 2.62 of Handbook of Procedures, 2015-20. Paragraph 2.62 states that imports of maize will be through designated STEs.

- b. Please confirm if the Handbook of Procedures, 2015-20, which states it applies only through 31 March 2020, is still the relevant document regarding the administration of tariff rate quotas for the current year 2021. When is a revised version expected to replace it?
- c. Please provide further details on the reallocation procedures undertaken by India if no applications are received by a designated STE. Please also provide links to any relevant government documentation governing this process.

2.2.5 Japan (G/AG/N/JPN/263)

AG-IMS ID 98082: Question by Australia - Tariff quota fill

Australia thanks Japan for its MA:2 notification for the fiscal year 2019/2020. Australia notes Japan recorded a fill rate of less than 65% for nine of its quotas:

1. skimmed milk powder (for school lunch);
2. skimmed milk powder (for other purposes);
3. prepared whey (for infant formula);
4. butter and butteroil;
5. mineral concentrated whey;
6. dried leguminous vegetables;
7. barley and its processed parts;
8. ground-nuts; tubers of konnyaku; and
9. silk-worm cocoons and raw silk.

Australia notes that we have asked Japan questions on these TRQs in the past, but we kindly request similar confirmation to explain these underfills, including:

- a. can Japan explain the reasons for the underfill of its quotas?
- b. For each underfilled quota, can Japan explain whether the under-fill was due to market circumstances, the existence of SPS measures for the product, or restrictive tariff quota administration?
- c. Can Japan explain what it is doing to increase utilisation of its under-filled tariff quotas, as per the objective of the Bali Decision on TRQ Administration?

AG-IMS ID 98083: Question by New Zealand - Tariff quota fill

New Zealand welcomes Japan's notification (G/AG/N/JPN/263) regarding imports under tariff quotas (Table MA:2) during the fiscal year 2019/2020.

New Zealand notes the concerning and continual trend in a persistent underfill of some of Japan's tariff quotas. (JPNQ007 Prepared Whey 26.8%, JPNQ009 Mineral concentrated whey 26.9%, JPNQ001 Skimmed milk powder 23.4%, JPNQ002 Skimmed milk powder (For other purposes) 41.4%, JPNQ008 Butter and butteroil 30.3%).

Japan has previously argued a lack of domestic demand as being a key contributing factor regarding Japan's continual TQ underfill. However, quotas for these products in free trade agreements have been heavily subscribed.

New Zealand would like to know:

- a. Can Japan provide an update on reasons for the continued significant under-fill of several WTO dairy tariff quotas (JPNQ007, JPNQ009, JPNQ001, JPNQ002, etc)?
- b. Given the quota underutilisation, has Japan considered further or completely liberalising the trade?
- c. For quotas with chronic underfill, will Japan consider simplifying tariff quota administration and removing restrictive quota conditions?

2.2.6 Morocco (G/AG/N/MAR/58, G/AG/N/MAR/58/Corr.1, G/AG/N/MAR/59)

AG-IMS ID 98102: Question by Australia - Tariff quota fill

Australia thanks Morocco for its MA:2 notifications for the calendar years 2018 and 2019.

- a. Can Morocco please explain the reasons for the significant underfill for sheep meat (0.9% for 2018 and 2019), and the underfill for white meat (37.7% in 2019). Can Morocco explain whether the under-fill was due to market circumstances, the existence of SPS measures for the product, or restrictive tariff quota administration?
- b. For sheep-meat, which is chronically underfilled, has Morocco considered moving to a tariff-only regime for this product?
- c. Australia welcomes the increase in the TRQ fill rate for white meat from 5.8% in 2018 to 37.7% in 2019. However, can Morocco explain what it is doing to increase utilisation of its under-filled tariff quotas for sheep meat and white meat as per the objective of the Bali Decision on TRQ Administration?

2.2.7 Nicaragua (G/AG/N/NIC/57)

AG-IMS ID 98104: Question by Australia - Tariff quota fill

Australia thanks Nicaragua for its MA:2 notification for CY2020. Australia notes that Nicaragua recorded a fill rate of 20.4% for milk, a reduction from 55.8% in CY2019. Australia notes that we have asked Nicaragua questions on this TRQ in the past, but we kindly request similar confirmation to explain this underfill, including:

- a. could Nicaragua please explain the reasons for the underfilled quota?
- b. Was the under-fill due to market circumstances, the existence of SPS measures for the product, or restrictive tariff quota administration?
- c. Could Nicaragua please explain what it is doing to increase utilisation of its under-filled tariff quota for milk as per the objective of the Bali Decision on TRQ Administration?

2.2.8 Norway (G/AG/N/NOR/116)

AG-IMS ID 98106: Question by Australia - Tariff quota fill

Australia thanks Norway for its MA:2 notification for CY2020. Australia notes that Norway recorded a fill rate of less than 65% for eleven quotas:

1. meat of bovine animals, meat to promotional fairs;
2. meat of sheep or goats, fresh, chilled or frozen;
3. apples, pears and quinces, fresh, apples from 16 March to 31 July;
4. swedes, mangolds, fodder roots, hay, lucerne (alfalfa), clover, sainfoin, forage kale, lupines, vetches and similar forage products, whether or not in the form of pellets, other, other hay;
5. other prepared or preserved meat, meat offal or blood, of poultry of heading No.01.05, of bovine animals;
6. meat and edible offal of swine, carcasses and half carcasses, frozen;

7. meat and edible offal of poultry, poultry not cut in pieces, frozen, fowls of the species *Gallus domesticus*;
8. meat and edible offal of poultry, poultry not cut in pieces, frozen, turkeys;
9. eggs, hens' eggs;
10. white and red cabbages, white cabbages; and
11. white and red cabbages, red cabbages.

Australia notes that we have asked Norway similar questions in the past, but we kindly request similar confirmation to explain these underfills, including:

- a. could Norway please 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 98108: Question by Brazil - Transparency issues

In its notification G/AG/N/NOR/116, referring to the calendar year 01/01/2020 to 12/31/2020, Norway reported reduced fill rates of its TRQs for products of animal origin, as follows:

- NORQ007 ("Meat of bovine animals, meat to promotional fairs"): 17.1%;
 - NORQ174 ("Other prepared or preserved meat, meat offal or blood, of poultry of heading No.01.05, of bovine animals"): 43.4%;
 - NORQ224 ("Meat and edible offal of swine, carcasses and halfcarcasses, frozen"): 21.9%;
 - NORQ226 ("Meat and edible offal of poultry, poultry not cut in pieces, frozen, fowls of the species *Gallus domesticus*"): 5.4%;
 - NORQ227 ("Meat and edible offal of poultry, poultry not cut in pieces, frozen, turkeys"): 0%;
 - NORQ230 ("Eggs, hens' eggs"): 28.1%
- a. Could Norway provide data on market conditions that could explain the reduced volume of imports under TRQs NORQ007, NORQ174, NORQ224, NORQ226, NORQ227 and NORQ230?
 - b. Are imports taking place outside the TRQs? How much?

AG-IMS ID 98109: Question by European Union - Transparency issues

The European Union notes that, in the notification for 2020, Norway has included an additional tariff rate quota for natural honey (NORQ035), not previously notified. What are the reasons for this change in notification practice?

AG-IMS ID 98150: Question by Paraguay - Tariff quota fill

Could Norway explain the reasons for the low utilization of the tariff rate quota for bovine meat NORQ007 (17.1%) and indicate whether it has considered amending the administration method for this quota to increase its utilization?

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

AG-IMS ID 98008: Question by India - Tariff quota fill

With respect to the Russian Federation's response to AG-IMS ID 93209, could the Russian Federation:

- a. elaborate on the market conditions resulting in under fill?
- b. Can Russian Federation provide information on any efforts to improve administration to improve fill rates?

2.2.10 Russian Federation (G/AG/N/RUS/32)

AG-IMS ID 98110: Question by Brazil - Tariff quota fill

Referring to the calendar year 01/01/2020 to 12/31/2020, five Russian TRQs for products of animal origin have low fill rates, which range from 1% to 24.9%.

- a. Could the Russian Federation provide data on market conditions that could explain the low volume of imports under TRQs RUSQ001, RUSQ002, RUSQ005, RUSQ006 and RUSQ007?
- b. Are imports taking place outside the TRQ? How much?

2.2.11 United States of America (G/AG/N/USA/148)

AG-IMS ID 98009: Question by India - Tariff quota fill

India thanks the United States for its Table MA:2 notification for 2019 (G/AG/N/USA/148) which shows low fill rates for products like Dried milk, whether or not containing added sugar or other sweetening matter (USAQ006); American-type cheese, including Colby, washed curd and granular cheese (but not including Cheddar cheese), and cheese and substitutes for cheese containing, or processed from, such American - type cheese (USAQ019); Cheese and substitutes for cheese, containing 0.5% or less by weight of butterfat (except articles within the scope of other import quotas provided for in additional (USAQ023).

- a. Can the US elaborate on the reason for the underfill in USAQ006 (dried milk)- 2.5%, USAQ019 (American -type cheese)- 1.7%, USAQ023 (Cheese and substitutes for cheese)- 0.1%?
- b. What changes in the administration are being envisaged to improve the fill rates?

2.3 Domestic support commitments (Table DS:1)

2.3.1 Argentina (G/AG/N/ARG/45)

AG-IMS ID 98111: Question by Canada - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Canada noticed that Argentina notifies its domestic support on the basis of the 1992 pesos.

Could Argentina explain if and how it converted its support amount from current pesos to 1992 pesos? If yes, could Argentina provide the exchange rate used to convert its support amount into 1992 pesos for its 2016 notification?

2.3.2 Brazil (G/AG/N/BRA/58, G/AG/N/BRA/63)

AG-IMS ID 98010: Question by India - General services: extension and advisory services

In Brazil's DS:1 notification for calendar year 2018 submitted vide document symbol G/AG/N/BRA/58, under Measures exempt from the reduction commitment - "Green Box", 2 (d). Extension and advisory services, Brazil has provided 4,278.5 USD thousand for the acquisition of equipment by municipalities for services in rural areas. But in the DS:1 notification, G/AG/N/BRA/63, the same is not notified. Has the support been discontinued for agricultural year 2018/19?

2.3.3 Brazil (G/AG/N/BRA/58, G/AG/N/BRA/63)

AG-IMS ID 98112: Question by European Union - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

G/AG/N/BRA/63- Supporting Table DS:2

Brazil indicates that it has used the SELIC rate as basis for calculating the subsidy element.

- a. What has been the actual rate used in the calculation for the subsidy element under a) and b) respectively?

- b. Could Brazil indicate the rate used for the different investment credit schemes under a)?
- c. Could Brazil indicate the effective rate applied to beneficiaries for the different production credit schemes under b)?

AG-IMS ID 98012: Question by India - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

- a. It is noted from Brazil's most recent DS:1 notification for period Agriculture year 2018-19 (G/AG/N/BRA/63) that the period for notification of support under Annex 2 is changed from Calendar year to Agriculture year. Brazil is requested to kindly elaborate on the reason for this change. Would Brazil modify all its previous DS:1 notifications in the similar manner?
- b. An FAO report, available at <http://www.fao.org/in-action/agronoticias/detail/en/c/1116679/> states that Brazil subsidized loans for the 2018/19 agriculture programme will reach USD 58 bn. In this regard, the report also mentions, "the government to boost funding in a country that is the world's largest exporter of staples like soybeans and coffee".
 - i. Brazil is requested to elucidate if this measure is notified in its recent DS:1 notification? If yes, then under which supporting table?
 - ii. What is the amount of subsidy during 2018-19 and 2019-20?
 - iii. For which products is this loan offered?

AG-IMS ID 98014: Question by India - Public stockholding for food security purposes

India thanks Brazil for submitting its DS:1 notification (G/AG/N/BRA/63) for agricultural year 2018/2019. India notices that under Supporting Table DS:1, Measures exempt from the reduction commitment - "Green Box", under Public stockholding for food security purposes, Brazil has provided additional support to two new measures namely: Maintenance and management and Implementation of food and nutritional security in health. In this regard,

- a. India requests Brazil to provide details of the above mentioned measures.
- b. How do these measures satisfy the criteria under Annex 2 of the AoA?

AG-IMS ID 98011: Question by India - Input subsidies available to low-income or resource-poor producers

In Brazil's DS:1 notification for calendar year 2018 submitted vide document no. G/AG/N/BRA/58, under Measures exempt from the reduction commitment – Special and Differential Treatment – "Development Programmes" (b) Input subsidies available to low-income or resource-poor producers- DEBT RESCHEDULING - Rescheduling of debts in longer terms and most favorable conditions (under PRONAF and PROCERA Programs), Brazil has provided 27,981 USD thousand. But in the DS:1 notification (G/AG/N/BRA/63), the same is not notified. Brazil is requested to provide the reason.

AG-IMS ID 98015: Question by India - Non-product-specific AMS

With respect to Brazil's DS:1 notification, G/AG/N/BRA/63, for the agricultural year 2018/2019, it is noticed that under Supporting table DS:9 - Non-Product-Specific AMS, Brazil has provided USD 10,309 thousand to Non-product-specific production and marketing credit. This seems to be a new support being provided. India requests Brazil to provide details of this non-product specific support including the description, eligibility criteria, amount allocated, duration of the credit.

2.3.4 China (G/AG/N/CHN/47)

AG-IMS ID 98013: Question by United States of America - Classification of measures

The United States would like to follow up on its last several questions on China's environmental programs, including the most recent questions from 2015 and 2016 under AG-IMS IDs 77074, 78065, 79012 and 80038. In its response to AG-IMS ID 79012, China indicated "Since the budgetary

expenditure planning system has been in place for decades, China could not base on the rules of the Agreement on Agriculture, nor notification requirements to be specific, in preparing Supporting Table DS:1. Chinese experts have to identify the heading or subheading that each subsidy programme in the budgetary expenditure report belongs to, and then add up the expenditures of all the items under the same subheading so as to have the total amount of subsidy for each subheading. Experts studied the questions raised by Australia, the European Union and the United States very carefully, and found that some programmes notified under these subheadings included certain programmes that were not accurately categorized, some were even not payments for agriculture covered by the Agreement on Agriculture."

The United States seeks an update on the response provided above in 2016, specifically seeking the following information:

- a. A breakdown of the individual programmes that fall under the notified environmental outlays along with outlays for each programme, correcting for any inaccurately categorized programs as mentioned in its response to AG-IMS ID 79012.
- b. Identification of the programmes falling under the notified environmental outlays that are specifically tied to agriculture, as well as a very brief description of each to better understand its objectives and how it is implemented.

2.3.5 Côte d'Ivoire (G/AG/N/CIV/27, G/AG/N/CIV/28)

AG-IMS ID 98114: Question by Canada - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

According to the website of the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development of Côte d'Ivoire: "On Thursday 1 October 2020, the Head of State, Alassane Ouattara, inaugurated the Seventh National Coffee and Cocoa Day. During this ceremony, he announced the field price of cocoa per kilo which has increased from CFAF 825 to CFAF 1000" (http://www.agriculture.gouv.ci/accueil/details_actualite/le-prix-d-achat-bord-champ-du-kg-de-cacao-fixe-a-1000-francs-cfa292).

Could the Republic of Côte d'Ivoire indicate the reason why this measure was not reported in its domestic support notifications for 2019 and 2020?

AG-IMS ID 98113: Question by European Union - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Côte d'Ivoire indicates no support granted. However, from public sources the EU has seen that Côte d'Ivoire has a support programme for cacao bean producers through the Sustainable Cocoa initiative and other means.

Could Côte d'Ivoire please explain how its support programmes operates for cacao bean producers, in particular:

- a. who fixes the price, and based on which criteria?
- b. At which level of the production is the price fixed?
- c. Which operators have to respect this price?
- d. How is it controlled whether the price is paid, and who controls this.
- e. Are there any regulations on exports of cacao that are influenced/dependant on the fixed price being paid to producers?

2.3.6 European Union (G/AG/N/EU/61, G/AG/N/EU/69)

AG-IMS ID 98147: Question by Australia - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Australia would like to thank the EU for its DS:1 notification and welcomes the level of detail provided.

Australia requests additional information regarding a number of programmes notified in G/AG/N/EU/69.

Skimmed milk

In MY17/18, the EU notified EUR 1,549.3 million in price support for skimmed milk powder, and in MY18/19, the EU notified EUR 0, noting there was zero eligible production. Given this:

- a. could the European Union please confirm that skimmed milk powder did not receive any price support in MY18/19?
- b. Does skimmed milk powder receive funds through other support mechanisms?

Wine

Could the EU please provide additional information on the programmes under its 'National Support' measure provided to wine under supporting table DS:6 and 'Market Support' in supporting table DS:8

Insurance and Interest

Could the EU please provide additional information, including the names of programmes, sources and specific commodities for the insurance subsidies and interest concessions notified in Supporting Table DS:9?

AG-IMS ID 98016: Question by India - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

With respect to EU's DS:1 notification for marketing year 2017/2018 (G/AG/N/EU/61), what is the value of production for the following products: Butter, Common wheat, Skimmed Milk Powder, Other livestock, Fruits and Vegetables, Beekeeping, Apricots, Nectarines, Aubergines, Melon, Watermelon, Clementines, Satsumas, Other products not mentioned in Annex X of EU Regl 1580/2007, Potatoes and Other crop products?

AG-IMS ID 98198: Question by Paraguay - Direct payments: Decoupled income support

G/AG/N/EU/69- Decoupled payments:

Could the European Union explain the grounds for the increase of almost 400 million euros in decoupled payments from the financial year 2017-2018 to 2018-2019?

AG-IMS ID 98153: Question by Paraguay - Direct payments: structural adjustment assistance provided through investment aids

G/AG/N/EU/69 - Adjustment programmes provided through investment aids

Could the European Union explain the grounds for the increase of over 400 million euros in such payments in the financial year 2018-2019?

AG-IMS ID 98154: Question by Paraguay - Direct payments: payments under environmental programmes

G/AG/N/EU/69 - Environmental programmes

- a. Could the European Union indicate how much of the total of 8,163 million euros was allocated to the "support and protection of organic production by creating conditions of fair competition"?
- b. Could the European Union explain how the subsidies create conditions of fair competition?

AG-IMS ID 98148: Question by Australia - Other product-specific AMS/EMS

G/AG/N/EU/69

Australia would like to thank the EU for its DS:1 notification and welcomes the level of detail provided.

Could the EU please provide additional information on the programmes under its 'Restructuring' and 'National Support' measures provided to wine listed in Supporting Table DS:6 and 'Market Support' in Supporting Table DS:8, including names of programmes and sources?

AG-IMS ID 98151: Question by Australia - Non-product-specific AMS

G/AG/N/EU/69

Australia would like to thank the EU for its DS:1 notification and welcomes the level of detail provided.

Could the EU please provide additional information, including the names of programmes, sources and specific commodities for the insurance subsidies and interest concessions notified in Supporting Table DS:9?

AG-IMS ID 98152: Question by Australia - Classification of measures

G/AG/N/EU/69

Australia would like to thank the EU for its DS:1 notification and welcomes the level of detail provided.

Could the EU please explain how 'support and protection of organic production by creating conditions of fair competition' in Supporting Table DS:1 meets the Annex 2 requirements under Environmental programmes?

AG-IMS ID 98017: Question by India - Non-product-specific AMS

India thanks the EU for providing its DS:1 notification (G/AG/N/EU/69) for the Marketing Year 2018/2019. Considering the Supporting table DS:9 - Non product specific AMS, in the DS:1 notification (G/AG/N/EU/69) for the Marketing Year 2018/2019 and DS:1 notification (G/AG/N/EU/61) for the Marketing year 2017/2018, it is noticed that Measures- Fruits & Vegetables - Green harvesting and non- harvesting and Fruits & Vegetables - harvest insurance have not been notified in DS:1 (G/AG/N/EU/69) notification. Why have these measures not been notified in the 18-19 notification?

2.3.7 Guinea (G/AG/N/GIN/10, G/AG/N/GIN/11)

AG-IMS ID 98115: Question by Canada - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

The government of Canada welcomes the efforts made by Guinea to update its domestic support notifications to the WTO.

The notifications for 2017, 2018 and 2019 indicate in a footnote for certain measures that: "Outlays correspond to the period 2017-2019".

Could Guinea specify whether the amounts for the measures that refer to this footnote account for the total outlays for these three years in each of the notifications, or whether the total outlays for the three years was divided equally among the notifications for 2017, 2018 and 2019?

AG-IMS ID 98155: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

The United States would like to thank Guinea for submitting its first-ever Table DS:1 notifications and looks forward to reviewing and learning more about Guinea's domestic support measures. The United States welcomes the transparency provided and would like to seek clarification in certain areas:

- a. Guinea has notified "Crop season support" as an "extension and advisory service" measure. Please provide additional details explaining this measure.
- b. The general note at the bottom of the table in ST DS:1 states the "outlays correspond to the period 2017-2019". Please confirm whether the values notified in each annual notification are 1) actual expenditures or budgetary funding/estimates and 2) the total

expenditures/funding for the three years or the expenditures/funding for the three years allotted into three equal amounts.

- c. It is noted that the notified measure "Support for West African Agricultural Productivity (PPAO/WAAP) – FA" appears to be a World Bank funded measure according to <https://www.waap-ppaao.org>. Please confirm whether the notified values in Guinea's notification represent only government expenditures/funding or include other sources, such as the World Bank.

2.3.8 India (G/AG/N/IND/18, G/AG/N/IND/25)

Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 98061), European Union (AG-IMS ID 98062), Japan (AG-IMS ID 98063), Paraguay (AG-IMS ID 98064), Russian Federation (AG-IMS ID 98066), and United States (AG-IMS ID 98065) - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

It is noted that between MY 2018/19 and MY 2019/20, in the Annex and Statistical Appendix to India's most recent Table DS:1 notifications, the notified value of rice purchases by the government of India increased by over \$3 billion, annual purchases in the quantity of rice increased by more than 7 million tons, the quantity released to beneficiaries in MY 2019/20 dropped by 1 million tons, and the quantity released for open-market sales doubled, increasing by almost 800,000 tons.

- a. Given the large decline in beneficiaries in MY 2019/20 and the subsequent result of open market sales doubling between MY 2018/19 and MY 2019/20, what is the reasoning behind the 7 million tons increase in annual purchases of rice under India's public stockholding program in MY 2019/20?

India remains the world's largest exporter of rice, and in 2020, India's number one export position grew substantially; India now exports more than twice as much rice, by value, than its second-closest competitor. Noting the also sizeable increase in open-market sales, there are concerns about the impact government stock releases have on India's export position, directly or indirectly.

- b. In response to AG-IMS ID 97049, India stated "open market sale is arrived at on the basis of a number of factors including MPS, handling cost, freight charged, etc.". We thank India for this overview, but repeat the request for a copy of or specific URL(s) for the requested information on price methodology for open-market sales of food grains from public stocks.
- c. What steps is India taking to ensure that open-market sales from government stocks are not crowding out domestic sales by the private sector, which must then turn to export markets to sell their products?

AG-IMS ID 98068: Question by Canada - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

G/AG/N/IND/25

In the statistical appendix of India 2019-2020 domestic support notification, the stock variation number for rice was off by 14,187,000 tons. Could India please explain what happened to these 14,187,000 tons of rice?

AG-IMS ID 98055: Question by European Union - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

The European Union welcomes India's domestic support notification for 2019/2020 (G/AG/N/IND/25).

- a. The European Union notes that India does not provide value of production data in Supporting Table DS:4, which makes it difficult for Members to verify the claims made on *de minimis*. Could India please provide value of production data for the products concerned as well as for total agricultural production for 2019/2020?

- b. Would India consider including value of production data in Supporting Table DS:4 in future domestic support notifications?
- c. In footnote (3) to Supporting Table DS:5, India states, "other support for rice, that is, other than public stockholding for food security purposes, will be notified subsequently". The same statement was made in India's domestic support notification for 2018/2019 (G/AG/N/IND/18), but no additional data has been provided so far. How does India consider the missing data for "other support for rice" complies with the requirement to "have fulfilled and continue to fulfil its domestic support notification requirements under the AoA", as stipulated in the Bali Ministerial Decision on Public Stockholding for Food Security Purposes (WT/MIN(13)/38)?
- d. The European Union notes an increase of more than 40% in notified non-product-specific AMS in Supporting Table DS:9 for 2019/2020 as compared to 2018/2019. Increases in support are substantial for both "Insurance Premium Subsidy" and "Interest Subsidy". Could India please elaborate on the reasons behind this increase and whether any policy changes have taken place?

AG-IMS ID 98056: Question by European Union - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Discrepancies in PSH stock data.

Based on the data in the statistical Annex for the PSH data in DS:1 notification 2018/19 and 2019/20 the following data can be established:

India PSH stock figures from Statistical Annex in notification

Mio. T		2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
opening stocks	A	28,81	29,78	30,04	29,39
Annual purchase	B	38,11	38,13	44,33	52,00
Total availability	c=a+b	66,92	67,91	74,37	81,39
Annual releases	D	33,52	34,20	34,40	33,36
open market sales	E	0,19	0,46	0,85	1,61
Total release	f=e+d	33,71	34,66	35,25	34,97
Total Availabilities - Total release	g=c-f	33,21	33,25	39,12	46,42
End stocks IND/25	H	29,78	30,04	29,39	32,23
Discrepancies	i=g-h	3,43	3,21	9,73	14,19

This table shows a discrepancy between what goes in and out of 14 million tons in marketing year 2019/20.

Can India explain what happened to these 14 million tons of rice in the marketing year 2019/20? Based on the average purchase price this quantity corresponds to an amount of more than \$5 billion

Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 98042), Canada (AG-IMS ID 98043), Japan (AG-IMS ID 98044), Paraguay (AG-IMS ID 98045), Russian Federation (AG-IMS ID 98046), and United States (AG-IMS ID 98047) - Domestic food aid

AG-IMS ID 97058 (USA) – Para 3 and 4 of Annex 2

In response to AG-IMS ID 93278, India stated that data would be submitted in due course to a request for a breakdown of the \$17.2 billion in notified expenditures reported in G/AG/N/IND/18 and G/AG/N/IND/19 for measures related to paragraph 3 and paragraph 4 of Annex 2 of the Agreement on Agriculture, including 1) expenditures related to the accumulation of stocks of products, 2) holding of stocks of products, and 3) provision of domestic food aid to a section of the population in need. However, in AG-IMS ID 97058 re-requesting this information, India stated the information had been notified in India's DS:1 notification for relevant years. India's most recent notification shows this aggregated value has increased \$18.7 billion in G/AG/N/IND/25 with no breakdown of the relevant data, despite stating that the value includes funding that falls under paragraph 3 and 4 of the AoA.

As requested in AG-IMS ID 93278, please provide the following data for G/AG/N/IND/18, G/AG/N/IND/19, and G/AG/N/IND/25, which does not exist in the notifications cited:

- a. a breakdown of the "expenditures in relation to the accumulation... of stocks of products" under paragraph 3 of Annex 2 of the Agreement on Agriculture (AoA).
- b. a breakdown of the "expenditures in relation to the...holding of stocks of products" under paragraph 3 of Annex 2 of the AoA.
- c. 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.

Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 98067), Canada (AG-IMS ID 98069), European Union (AG-IMS ID 98070), Japan (AG-IMS ID 98071), Paraguay (AG-IMS ID 98072), United States (AG-IMS ID 98073) - Direct payments: decoupled income support

Outlays on 'decoupled income support' measures increased over 700% from \$853 million to \$6.9 billion between MY 2018/19 and MY 2019/20.

- a. Please provide the reason(s) behind this large increase in outlays.
- b. Please explain if there has been a change in the programme(s) under this measure that contributed to this significant increase.
- c. Please identify all schemes or programmes that fall under 'decoupled income support' measures.

Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 98048), European Union (AG-IMS ID 98049), and United States (AG-IMS ID 98050) - Input subsidies available to low-income or resource-poor producers

G/AG/N/IND/18

AG-IMS ID 97057 (USA) – Input Subsidies

Between 2018 and 2020, a number of questions have been submitted to India (AG-IMS IDs 88108, 91173, 93281, 93276 and 97057) seeking additional information on understanding what specific schemes or programs contribute to the notified outlays on electricity notified under Supporting Table DS:2. India's most recent response states that input subsidies are duly notified under Article 6.2 of the Agreement on Agriculture without addressing the questions posed. Therefore, we again request the following information on India's notified outlays on electricity:

- a. Please provide the name and description of the scheme(s)/program(s) that provide electricity subsidies in India.
- b. Please provide the monetary value on each program if more than one or the methodology used to calculate the benefit to agricultural producers.
- c. Please provide the legislation authorizing the scheme(s)/program(s).
- d. Please confirm whether the following types of subsidies identified by the United States based on GOI Union Budget and Planning Commission documents are included in notified outlays on electricity: Electricity Subsidy to Agricultural Consumers, Diesel subsidy in drought and deficient rains affected areas.
- e. If the above-mentioned subsidies in part d are included in outlays for electricity, please provide the names of the specific programs that fall under these subsidies along with the affiliated outlays for each program.
- f. Please provide the names of any other programs that contribute to outlays on electricity that are not listed in part d.

Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 98051), Canada (AG-IMS ID 98052), and United States of America (AG-IMS ID 98053) - Input subsidies available to low-income or resource-poor producers

G/AG/N/IND/18

AG-IMS ID 97057 (USA) – Input Subsidies

Between 2018 and 2020, a number of questions have been submitted to India (AG-IMS IDs 88108, 91173, 93281, 93276 and 97057) seeking additional information on understanding what specific schemes or programs contribute to the notified outlays on fertilizer subsidies notified under Supporting Table DS:2. India's most recent response states that input subsidies are duly notified under Article 6.2 of the Agreement on Agriculture without addressing the questions posed. Therefore, we again request the following information on India's notified outlays on fertilizer subsidies:

- a. Please provide the name and description of the program(s) that provide fertilizer subsidies in India.
- b. Please provide the monetary value on each program if more than one.
- c. Please provide the legislation authorizing the program(s).
- d. Please confirm whether the following types of subsidies identified by the United States based on GOI Union Budget and Planning Commission documents are included in notified outlays on fertilizers: Subsidy on Imported Fertilizers, Subsidy on Decontrolled Fertilizers, Subsidy on Indigenous Fertilizers, Investment in Public Enterprises where loans and investments are provided to various public sector fertilizer companies.
- e. If the above-mentioned subsidies in part d are included in outlays for fertilizers, please provide the names of the specific programs that fall under these subsidies along with the affiliated outlays for each program.
- f. Please provide the names of any other programs that contribute to outlays on fertilizers that are not listed in part d.

Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 98036), European Union (AG-IMS ID 98037), Japan (AG-IMS ID 98038), Paraguay (AG-IMS ID 98039), Russian Federation (AG-IMS ID 98040), and United States (AG-IMS ID 98041) - Market price support

G/AG/N/IND/18

AG-IMS IDs 97001/93198 (EU) and 97140 (Brazil) and 97059 (USA)- Other Support for Rice

In response to AG-IMS IDs 97001, 97140, 93198, and 97059, India indicated that a reply would be made in due course with regards to requests for information regarding footnote 3 in Supporting table 5, which states "Other support for rice, that is, other than public stockholding for food security purposes, will be notified subsequently".

This information is necessary to verify whether India has adhered to paragraph 5 of the Bali Ministerial Decision, which requires that there be no increase of Amber Box support for programmes other than public stockholding.

Given the lack of any indication of what type of other support may be involved, it is difficult to assess whether India is complying with the commitments outlined in the Bali Decision on Public Stockholding for Food Security.

- a. Please indicate what specific schemes, measures, or types of support are concerned, and confirm whether these existed prior to 2018/19.
- b. How much support is provided for each identified measure?

- c. If unable to provide detailed information at this stage, please indicate when this information will be notified for all relevant years.
- d. If India remains unable to provide any information, it would be appreciated if India could give some indication of what issues it is experiencing with collecting this information or notifying it and whether any preliminary information could be provided at this stage.

Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 98054), European Union (AG-IMS ID 98057), Japan (AG-IMS ID 98058), Paraguay (AG-IMS ID 98059), and United States (AG-IMS ID 98060) - Market price support

G/AG/N/IND/25

India notes in footnote 4 of Supporting Table DS:5 that the calculation of market price support is "Based on the available provisional data."

- a. Please indicate which notified data in the calculation of market price support for rice is provisional data and which is final data.
- b. Please indicate when the relevant final data will be notified.

2.3.9 Japan (G/AG/N/JPN/259)

AG-IMS ID 98156: Question by Brazil - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

For fiscal year 04/01/2018 to 03/31/2019, Japan continued to notify "Payments related to price" and "Deficiency payments" in Supporting Table DS:6 ("Product-Specific Aggregate Measurements of Support: Non-Exempt Direct Payments") for products such as "beef and veal"; "eggs"; "fruits"; "meat of swine"; "milk" and "vegetables".

To the question AG-IMS ID 63065, from Canada, Japan gave the following answer:

"(a) "Payments related to price" refer to the payments, the amount of which is part of the difference between the reference price and the market price, paid when the market price falls below the reference price. The "deficiency payments" refer to the payments, the amount of which is the entirety of the difference between the reference price and the market price, paid when the market price falls below the reference price."

In light of the above, Japan could provide the following additional information:

- a. Do the descriptions provided in 2011 under AG-IMS ID 63065 remain applicable to the programmes notified in G/AG/N/JPN/259?
- b. If so, what is the difference between these programmes and the "Price Stabilization" measures indicated in Supporting Table DS:5 ("Product-Specific Aggregate Measurements of Support: Market Price Support") for "Beef and veal" and "Meat of swine"?

AG-IMS ID 98157: Question by Canada - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Canada notes that Japan, in Supporting Table DS:4, provides value of production data for those products where the total product-specific support falls under the *de minimis* threshold and in Supporting Table DS:9, the total agriculture value of production. The addition of value of production data for all products in Supporting Table DS:4 would complement the existing transparency in Japan's notification. In its next annual domestic support notification, would Japan provide value of production data for all products?

AG-IMS ID 98158: Question by Paraguay - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

- a. Could Japan indicate the subsidy equivalent regarding the value of production for the following products for which it has provided subsidies that are higher than *de minimis* subsidies:
 - Beef: JPY 266.9 billion

- Sugar: 19.5 billion
- b. Could Japan explain the reasons for the increase of over JPY 20 billion in AMS support for beef?

AG-IMS ID 98159: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

The United States thanks Japan for its most recent Table DS:1 notification (G/AG/N/JPN/259); however, further clarity is sought with regard to the programmes implemented by Japan and where they are reported in Japan's notification and the relation between several different measures.

- a. It is noted that Japan notified "agricultural insurance scheme" in Supporting Table DS:1 under "Payments for relief from natural disasters" and also "agricultural insurance scheme" in Supporting Table DS:9. Please provide additional information indicating the name of the program/measure notified in each Supporting Table and whether there is any relation between the two programs/measures.
- b. Please indicate what program/measures are reported as "crop income stabilization payment". Does this include "Direct Payments for Upland Field Crop" based on the Act on Farming Income Stabilization or any other measures?

AG-IMS ID 98160: Question by United States of America - Non-product-specific AMS

In Japan's most recent Table DS:1 notification (G/AG/N/JPN/259), outlays for Japan's Agricultural Insurance Scheme increased over 150% between FY 2017 and FY 2018.

Please explain the reason for the large increase in expenditures.

2.3.10 Korea, Republic of (G/AG/N/KOR/80, G/AG/N/KOR/81, G/AG/N/KOR/82)

AG-IMS ID 98163: Question by Australia - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Australia thanks the Republic of Korea for its DS:1 notifications for 2016 – 2018.

Australia notes that in Supporting Table DS:4 of G/AG/N/KOR/81, Korea notified product-specific support for rice at KRW 1,489.78 billion in CY 2017, an increase from KRW 726.22 billion in CY 2016. However, Australia also notes Korea notified a subsequent decrease in support for rice at KRW 539.33 billion for CY2018. Given this:

- a. could Korea please explain the reasons for these highly variable levels of support for rice provided through deficiency payments?
- b. Could Korea provide the following information on its deficiency payments for rice in 2016, 2017 and 2018:
 - i. what was the eligibility criteria for the program (e.g. was it limited by volume or availability to specific producers)?
 - ii. What were the specific payment rates per tonne and average amounts received per farmer?
 - iii. What were the policy objectives of the deficiency payments?
 - iv. Could Korea please confirm if the deficiency payments are provided directly or indirectly to potential rice exporters in the Republic of Korea.

Australia notes that the value of production for rice increased from KRW 6,619 billion in 2017 to KRW 8,401 billion in 2018 (approximately USD 1,590 million).

- c. If so, what volumes of rice and to which destinations did Korea export?
- d. Can Korea explain the significant increase in the production of rice, and whether the deficiency payments contributed to that increase?
- e. Should we therefore expect to see an increase in production, and possibly the level of deficiency payments to rice in 2019, 2020, and 2021 as seen in previous years?

AG-IMS ID 98168: Question by Brazil - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Brazil is pleased to note that, in 2017, Korea managed to keep its CTAMS of KRW 1,489.78 billion below its FBTAMS of KRW 1,490 billion (G/AG/N/KOR/81).

Nevertheless, there is a noticeable variation in the "deficiency payments" for rice between 2016 and 2018: KRW 726.22 billion (G/AG/N/KOR/80), KRW 1,489.78 billion (G/AG/N/KOR/81) and KRW 539.33 billion (G/AG/N/KOR/82), respectively.

There was also a notable increase in rice VoP between 2016 and 2018: KRW 6,391.9 billion (G/AG/N/KOR/80), KRW 6,619.6 billion (G/AG/N/KOR/81) and KRW 8,401.2 billion (G/AG/N/KOR/82), respectively.

In light of the above, could Korea explain:

- a. The functioning of the "deficiency payments" programme reported in Supporting Table DS:6 ?
- b. The reason for the reduction in "deficiency payments" expenditure for rice between 2017 and 2018?
- c. The reason for the growth of rice VoP between 2017 and 2018?
- d. The reason for the increase in "crop insurance" and "direct payment" expenditures reported as "non-product specific AMS"?

AG-IMS ID 98164: Question by Australia - Public stockholding for food security purposes

Australia thanks the Republic of Korea for its DS:1 notifications for 2016–2018.

Australia notes that in Supporting Table DS:1 of G/AG/N/KOR/82, Korea notified spending on public stockholding for food security purposes of KRW 356.31 billion in CY2018, an increase of KRW 132.7 billion from CY2017. Given this:

- a. could Korea please explain the reason for this increase?

Annex 2, paragraph 3 of the Agreement of Agriculture (AoA) states, "The volume and accumulation of such stocks shall correspond to predetermined targets related solely to food security." In this context:

- b. could Korea explain the policy basis for these measures, how it pre-determines the targets and that it is consistent with Annex 2, paragraph 3?

Annex 2, paragraph 3 of the AoA further states, "Food purchases by government shall be made at current prices and sales from food security stocks shall be made at no less than the current domestic market price for the product and quality in question". Could Korea please provide:

- c. a breakdown of commodities covered by the notified spending?
- d. The prices and volumes of the commodities when they were purchased and sold?

- e. Confirmation the purchase and sale of commodities were made at domestic market prices?

AG-IMS ID 98161: Question by Canada - Public stockholding for food security purposes

From 2005 to 2015, Korea's description for its public stockholding for food security purposes specified that expenditure was related to staple grains including barley, rice and soybean. For notifications 2016, 2017 and 2018, the reference to soybean was removed from the description.

- a. Could the Republic of Korea clarify if soybean is still part of its public stockholding for food security purposes programme?
- b. Could the Republic of Korea clarify how and if the expenditures reported under its public stockholding for food security purposes were related to its administered price for soybean for the 2005 to 2015 period?
- c. Could the Republic of Korea describe how soybean was procured for public stockholding for food security purposes during the 2005 to 2015 period, and if soybean was procured at Korea's applied administered price?
- d. For the 2016 to 2018 period, could the Republic of Korea describe its procurement policies for barley under its public stockholding for food security measure, and clarify at what price barley was procured during that period?

AG-IMS ID 98165: Question by Australia - Direct payments: decoupled income support

Australia thanks the Republic of Korea for its DS:1 notifications for 2016–2018.

Australia seeks further information regarding Korea's notified 'decoupled income support' reported in G/AG/N/KOR/80, G/AG/N/KOR/81 and G/AG/N/KOR/82.

- a. Could Korea please advise how much of the funds were directed to the "Fixed payment scheme for paddy fields" for 2016, 2017 and 2018?
- b. Could Korea please provide eligibility criteria for the measure (under AoA Annex 2 paragraph 6)?

AG-IMS ID 98162: Question by Australia - Market price support

Australia thanks the Republic of Korea for its DS:1 notifications for 2016–2018.

Australia notes that in Supporting Table DS:5 of G/AG/N/KOR/81, Korea notified total market support for soybeans at KRW 33.27 billion in CY2017. This was an increase from KRW 7.26 billion notified in G/AG/N/KOR/80 for CY2016. Australia notes this was due to the increase in eligible production. Given this:

Could Korea please explain this significant increase and why eligible production decreases in G/AG/N/KOR/82 for CY2018 to 2.33 thousand tons (from 8.85 thousand tons in CY2017).

AG-IMS ID 98169: Question by Canada - Other product-specific AMS/EMS

In its 2017 notification (G/AG/N/KOR/81), the Republic of Korea reported a Current Total AMS of KRW 1,489.78 billion, which was only KRW 0.3 billion below Korea's Final Bound Total AMS. All support reported in Korea's Current Total AMS related to its rice deficiency payment.

Could the Republic of Korea clarify if the support under its rice deficiency payment is capped to prevent its rice AMS from increasing beyond KRW 1,490 billion? If not, how does the Republic of Korea plan to ensure that its deficiency payments are not going to result in its Current Total AMS exceeding its Final Bound Total AMS going forward?

AG-IMS ID 98167: Question by United States of America - Other product-specific AMS/EMS

The United States thanks the Republic of Korea for its domestic support notifications for CY2016 through CY2018. We note that deficiency payments made for rice put the Republic of Korea right at their Final Bound Total AMS commitment level in CY2017. Deficiency payments for rice in CY2016 were approximately half of the total payments in CY2017, and payments in CY2018 fell below CY2016 levels. Noting the Republic of Korea's response to AG-IMS ID 76042 stating deficiency payments are made "when the market price of rice falls to a certain level during the harvest season":

- a. Please explain the reason for the increase in payments for CY2017.
- b. Please explain if changes in market price trigger levels played a role in the increase. If so, is there any legislation outlining new or altered trigger levels?
- c. Did the Republic of Korea take a policy action in CY2017 that prevented it from exceeding its commitment levels? If so, please explain.

AG-IMS ID 98166: Question by Australia - Non-product-specific AMS

Australia thanks the Republic of Korea for its DS:1 notifications for 2016–2018.

Australia seeks further information regarding Korea's Supporting Tables DS:9 in G/AG/N/KOR/80, G/AG/N/KOR/81 and G/AG/N/KOR/82.

Could Korea provide the names of programs reported under 'Self-help fund raising' and 'Other'?

2.3.11 Kyrgyz Republic (G/AG/N/KGZ/33)

AG-IMS ID 98170: Question by Canada - Non-product-specific AMS

Canada notes that in Supporting Table DS:9, there is an expenditure called "Breeding of cattle support". Could the Kyrgyz Republic elaborate how this measure, which appears to be directed at cattle, is considered to be a non-product specific measure?

2.3.12 Kyrgyz Republic (G/AG/N/KGZ/34)

AG-IMS ID 98171: Question by Canada - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Supporting Table DS:1

- a. The Kyrgyz Republic includes an expenditure called "The Project: Investments to Villages – 3" (WB)(loan)" claimed as Green Box under *Structural adjustment assistance provided through investment aids*. Could the Kyrgyz Republic elaborate on the activities covered by this project?

Supporting Table DS:9

- b. There are a number of expenditures for "Animal breeding and market development programme – 2 IFAD" and "Animal breeding and market development programme – 2 IFAD – loan".

Could the Kyrgyz Republic provide more information on the types of animals that are eligible for the breeding portion of this programme?

- c. There are two separate expenditures for "Comprehensive development of dairy sector productivity (WB) (loan)".
 - i. Could the Kyrgyz Republic elaborate how this measure, which appears to be directed at the dairy sector, is considered to be a non-product specific measure?

- ii. Could the Kyrgyz Republic elaborate on the differences between the two expenditures for this measure?

2.3.13 Nigeria (G/AG/N/NGA/19, G/AG/N/NGA/20)

AG-IMS ID 98172: Question by Canada - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

- a. In calendar year 2020, Nigeria did not report any expenditures related to Domestic Food Aid as it did in calendar year 2019. Could Nigeria elaborate if the programme is still operational?
- b. Nigeria reports an expenditure for "Support for infrastructural Projects in Rural Areas" under Infrastructural Services. Could Nigeria elaborate on the types of projects that are covered under this measure?
- c. Nigeria reports an expenditure under Article 6.2 for "Other input subsidies for resource poor producers".
 - i. Could Nigeria elaborate on the types of inputs that are supported under this measure?
 - ii. Could Nigeria elaborate on its criteria to define "resource poor producers"?

AG-IMS ID 98173: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

The United States would like to thank Nigeria for its 2019 and 2020 Table DS:1 notifications. It is noted that these are Nigeria's first notified domestic support measures under the Agreement on Agriculture. We look forward to reviewing notifications covering 2017 and 2018, as well as any revised notifications for 2012 to 2016, which Nigeria noted it is reviewing in response to AG-IMS ID 96059.

It is noted Nigeria has not notified the name or description of any measure in Supporting Table DS:1. For example, the name and description of the measure under the category of support "Inspection services" is simply "Inspection of Agricultural Services," which neither indicates what measures were actually undertaken by Nigeria nor gives an indication of the type of support provided. Such information is useful in the review of notifications by Members of this Committee and serves as a basis for greater sharing of information on how Members support their agricultural sectors.

We encourage Nigeria to provide the necessary information in its forthcoming notifications and revisions to any prior notifications.

Noting that Nigeria has notified the introduction of many new measures, when will Nigeria be able to provide a Table DS:2 notification reflecting these new measures?

AG-IMS ID 98174: Question by United States of America - Input subsidies available to low-income or resource-poor producers

G/AG/N/NGA/19.

Under Supporting Table DS:2, Nigeria lists "Input subsidies available to low-income or resource-poor producers." The United States understands that Nigeria incentivizes domestic fertilizer production and distribution of fertilizer to farmers at subsidized rates under the Presidential Fertilizer Initiative according to the Nigeria Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development.

- a. Noting that Nigeria has not notified the name or description for any measure in Supporting Table DS:2, please provide the names and brief description of any programmes or schemes, such as the Presidential Fertilizer Initiative, that are included in the notified measure category "Other input subsidies available to low-income or resource-poor producers."

- b. For each identified programme or scheme, please identify what inputs are subsidized and the eligibility requirements for producers.
- c. How does Nigeria define 'low-income or resource-poor producers'?

AG-IMS ID 98175: Question by Australia - Input subsidies available to low-income or resource-poor producers

Australia welcomes Nigeria's DS:1 notifications for CY2019 and CY2020. We encourage Nigeria to provide as much information as possible in future DS notifications to enable analysis of its agriculture policies by Members. In this context, Australia requests further details on the types of input subsidies that are provided in the support outlined in Supporting Table DS:2 in both notifications.

AG-IMS ID 98176: Question by Canada - Domestic food aid

G/AG/N/NGA/20

In calendar year 2019, Nigeria reports an expenditure called "Supply of Food Items to vulnerable Persons" under Domestic Food Aid.

Could Nigeria elaborate on the food items that are covered under this expenditure and indicate if these food products were acquired at market prices?

2.3.14 Pakistan (G/AG/N/PAK/17, G/AG/N/PAK/18, G/AG/N/PAK/19, G/AG/N/PAK/20)

AG-IMS ID 98177: Question by Canada - Public stockholding for food security purposes

Canada noticed that Pakistan's public stockholding for food security measure for wheat was listed in Supporting Table DS:1 for notification year 2012 to 2015, but that the amount listed for each year was 0 (zero). For that same period, Pakistan reported market price support for wheat in each year.

- a. Could Pakistan clarify if the public stockholding measure(s) for which support was reported during the 2007 to 2011 period were still operational for the 2012 to 2015 period?
- b. Could Pakistan explain the policy changes that resulted in support being reported for public stockholding for food security in the 2007 to 2011 period, but not in the 2012 to 2015 period?
 - i. For the 2012 to 2015 period, could Pakistan explain if the wheat quantity reported in Supporting Table DS:5 was procured as part of Pakistan's public stockholding for food security purposes?
 - ii. For the 2007 to 2011 period, could Pakistan clarify if the wheat quantity reported in Supporting Table DS:5 was procured as part of Pakistan's public stockholding for food security purposes?

2.3.15 Paraguay (G/AG/N/PRY/33)

AG-IMS ID 98018: Question by India - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

With regards to Paraguay's DS:1 notification for year 2019 (G/AG/N/PRY/33). Kindly provide:

- a. details of the programmes "Support for family farming" and "Development of competitiveness in agriculture.
- b. How do the above two programmes meet the criteria under Article 6.2. Please provide the relevant website links for the above programmes.
- c. Details of the following schemes notified under Domestic Food Aid:

- i. Improving Rural and Indigenous Family Farming;
 - ii. Improving Rural and Indigenous Family Farming in the Eastern Region.
- d. Also explain how these programmes meet the criteria under Annex 2.

2.3.16 Russian Federation (G/AG/N/RUS/29)

AG-IMS ID 98022: Question by India - Non-product-specific AMS

According to Russian Federation's DS:1 notification for Calendar year 2018, two schemes by the name "Federal - Agricultural cargoes transportation on preferential terms" and "Sub-federal - Agricultural cargoes transportation on preferential terms" have been notified.

Given this, can the Russian Federation elaborate on the following:

- a. which agricultural products are eligible to receive support under these programmes?
- b. Are these subsidies also available to exported products?

2.3.17 Switzerland (G/AG/N/CHE/109)

AG-IMS ID 98196: Question by Paraguay - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

- a. Could Switzerland explain the reasons for the increase in AMS spending of almost CHF 100 million?
- b. Payments made under Annex 2:
 - i. Could Switzerland provide details on the programmes amounting to CHF 135.7 million, financed under the "research" section?
 - ii. Could Switzerland provide details on the programmes amounting to CHF 312 million, financed under the "biodiversity payments" section?
 - iii. Could Switzerland explain the justification behind the notification of animal welfare programmes under paragraph 12 of Annex 2?

AG-IMS ID 98180: Question by Australia - Non-product-specific AMS

Australia thanks Switzerland for submitting its DS:1 notification for CY2019. Australia notes an estimate figure is used for the 'Refund of fuel tax to farmers' under Supporting Table DS:9.

- a. Could Switzerland confirm that the final figure is still not yet available?
- b. If the figure is available, Australia kindly encourages Switzerland to update its DS:1 notification to reflect the new information.

2.3.18 Tunisia (G/AG/N/TUN/60)

AG-IMS ID 98181: Question by United States of America - Excessive rates of inflation

The United States thanks Tunisia for its most recent domestic support notification. We would like to re-submit AG-IMS ID 93139, itself a repeated question from AG-IMS ID 91190, to which Tunisia has yet to provide a response. We note the concerns raised in these questions apply to all of Tunisia's recent domestic support notifications, including G/AG/N/TUN/60.

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 for inflationary adjustments, 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 show 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 reforms to its domestic support policies? If so, please explain.

2.3.19 United States of America (G/AG/N/USA/135, G/AG/N/USA/135/REV.1, G/AG/N/USA/150))

AG-IMS ID 98189: Question by Australia - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Australia would like to thank the United States for its DS:1 notification (G/AG/N/USA/150) and welcomes the level of detail provided.

Australia notes the United States' current total AMS increased by approximately \$10 billion from MY17/18 to MY18/19, which according to the notification, was largely attributed by the Market Facilitation Program. In this context:

- a. could the United States please elaborate on the type of support provided to farmers to manage disrupted markets, deal with surplus commodities and expand and develop new markets at home and abroad highlighted in Supporting Table DS:9?
- b. Further, could the United States please elaborate on the 'storage forgiven' and 'commodity loan forfeiture' measures for peanuts and cotton as outlined in Supporting Table DS:7?

AG-IMS ID 98182: Question by Brazil - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

From what one can infer from recent notifications, in G/AG/N/USA/135/Rev.1, the US categorized payments in 2018 from the 2018 Market Facilitation Program (MFP) as product-specific support and reclassified expenditure under "Wildfires and Hurricane Indemnity Program" (WHIP) and federal insurance programs, such as "Agriculture Risk Coverage, county-based" (ARC-CO) and part of the "Price Loss Coverage" (PLC) as non-product-specific. Also, from what one can infer, the 2019 MFP payments were reported as non-product-specific.

In view of the above, could the United States:

- a.
 - i. confirm that payments for the 2018 and 2019 Market Facilitation Program have been notified differently?
 - ii. If so, explain the reasons for classifying part of the expenditure as non-product-specific and part of the expenditure as product-specific.
- b.
 - i. Inform if all payments related to MFP 2018 and MFP 2019 were included in the notifications G/AG/N/USA/135/Rev.1 and G/AG/N/USA/150 or if there is still a residual amount of payments to be notified for marketing year 2019/2020?

- ii. Confirm the total amount of payments under MFP 2018 and under MFP 2019?
- c. Explain, in the light of the AoA disciplines, the reasons that led to the reclassification of WHIP, ARC-CO and PLC?
- d. Inform whether it intends to notify the MFP also as an export subsidy, since a significant part of the payments went to soybean and cotton producers, products in relation to which the USA is among the largest exporters in the world?

AG-IMS ID 98188: Question by Canada - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

G/AG/N/USA/135 and G/AG/N/USA/135/Rev.1.

- a. Canada understands that the revised notification changed the reporting date range (which excludes the month of September 2017 and includes the month of September 2018) to reflect the Marketing Year of 2017/2018. Could the U.S. please explain what the difference between the two Current Total AMS values (Overall change of \$264.486 million) from G/AG/N/USA/135 to G/AG/N/USA/135/Rev.1 represent?
- b. Is this difference mainly the result of the date change, or are there also changes in programme spending for the same months during the covered period?
- c. Could the U.S. please clarify why there is a lack of data on specific livestock species in Supporting Tables DS:4 and 6 in G/AG/N/USA/135/Rev.1 (e.g. cattle & calves, alpacas, bison etc.) as compared to G/AG/N/USA/135, which had disaggregated data on specific livestock species? Will this aggregation of livestock continue in future notifications?

AG-IMS ID 98191: Question by Canada - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

G/AG/N/USA/150

- a. Could the United States please clarify why portions of the Agriculture Risk Coverage (ARC) and Price Loss Coverage (PLC) payments are no longer listed in Product-Specific Non-Exempt Direct Payments (Supporting Table DS:6)?
- b. Could the United States please explain which variables impacted the decrease in ARC and PLC payments from \$6,607.32 million in 2017-18 to \$2929.93 million in 2018-19?
- c. Canada understands that payments made under the Market Facilitation Program (MFP) were classified both as non-product specific and product specific. Could the United States please detail what aspect of the MFP programme falls under the non-product specific category?

AG-IMS ID 98178: Question by China - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

The US has changed the notifying period from marketing year to fiscal year and made a revision for marketing year 2017 (G/AG/N/USA/135/Rev.1). With the change, there are some non-negligible inconsistencies of data in G/AG/N/USA/135/Rev.1 and G/AG/N/USA/135. Please further explain.

- a. Can the US please elaborate on the reasons why the notifying period is revised to fiscal year 2017/2018 (1 October 2017 to 30 September 2018) from marketing year 2017 (1 September 2017 to 30 August 2018), which was notified in G/AG/N/USA/135. Won't the data in September 2017 be missing from notification?
- b. Could the US please explain "All standing and ad hoc disaster and emergency relief programs are notified on a fiscal-year basis that aligns with the marketing year of the notification."? What months are covered in the notification?
- c. With the change of notifying period, why National Institute for Food and Agriculture (NIFA) expenditure is reduced from \$11 million in G/AG/N/USA/135 to \$1 million in G/AG/N/USA/135/Rev.1?

- d. With the change of notifying period, why WHIP in Green Box is reduced from \$152 million in G/AG/N/USA/135 to \$1 million in G/AG/N/USA/135/Rev.1?

AG-IMS ID 98179: Question by China - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

- a. The US has changed the notifying methods and removed several product-specific support programmes to non-product specific boxes (G/AG/N/USA/135/Rev.1). With the change, please further explain:
- b. Why specific product support for Banana is reduced from \$3.844 million in G/AG/N/USA/135 to \$0.004 million in G/AG/N/USA/135/Rev.1, thus being no longer calculated into AMS?
- c. Why specific product support for Coffee is reduced from \$83.081 million in G/AG/N/USA/135 to \$0.032 million in G/AG/N/USA/135/Rev.1, thus being no longer calculated into AMS?
- d. Why specific product support for Grapefruit is reduced from \$28.333 million in G/AG/N/USA/135 to \$6.095 million in G/AG/N/USA/135/Rev.1, thus being no longer calculated into AMS?
- e. Why specific product support for Honey is reduced from \$46.532 million in G/AG/N/USA/135 to \$13.289 million in G/AG/N/USA/135/Rev.1, thus being no longer calculated into AMS?
- f. Why specific product support for Papaya is reduced from \$1.572 million in G/AG/N/USA/135 to \$0.023 million in G/AG/N/USA/135/Rev.1, thus being no longer calculated into AMS?

AG-IMS ID 98186: Question by China - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

According to U.S. congress report (<https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/IF/IF11539>) on WHIP, U.S. government authorized \$2.36 billion for agricultural production losses for the losses occurred in 2017 and 2018, and another 3 billion for 2018 and 2019. From 2017 to 2019, the total budget for WHIP was \$5.36 billion. In US notifications (G/AG/N/USA/135/Rev.1 and G/AG/N/USA/150), only a total of \$293.4 million were notified. Please explain.

AG-IMS ID 98019: Question by India - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

With regard to the United States' DS:1 notification for marketing year 2018/2019 (G/AG/N/USA/150), details on the following may be provided:

- a. The notification provides that support of USD 5,190 million is provided under the Market Facilitation Programme under table DS:9, however it was earlier, i.e. for MY17-18 (G/AG/N/USA/135/Rev.1), notified under DS:6 table. Why is the product-specific support under the Market Facilitation Programme shifted from DS:6 supporting table to DS:9?
- b. Since the MFP clearly identifies products for which markets were disrupted, as explained through various footnotes to the DS:1 notification, how does the programme meet the non-product specific criteria?
- c. How were the product-specific MFP payments computed for MY17-18?
- d. The expenditure notified under the WHIP programme under Supporting Table DS:9 is seen to have increased from USD 2.710 Million in the MY17-18 to USD 288.699 Million in MY18-19. What is the reason for this more than hundred times increase in the support in just one year?

AG-IMS ID 98197: Question by Paraguay - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

G/AG/N/USA/150

Food and consumer services - Child nutrition programmes:

- a. Which commodities are eligible?
- b. The description of the programme indicates that the expenses include both commodities and cash. Could you indicate how much of the USD 23 billion was used for commodities?
- c. Are there local purchasing requirements for commodities in these programmes?

AMS

The product-specific AMS spending of the United States of America increased by almost USD 9 million from the period 2017-2018 to 2018-2019. Similarly, non-product-specific AMS increased by almost USD 2 billion. While we recognize that this spending is within the entitlements of the United States, it represents a significant increase in trade-distorting subsidies.

- d. Could the United States confirm that this trend will not continue in subsequent notifications?
- e. We note with concern the considerable increase in support for soybeans (23.08% of value of production), sorghum (29.49% of value of production) and sesame (10.3% of value of production). Could the United States indicate:
 - i. the reason for these increases; and
 - ii. the main export markets for these products for the year to which this notification refers?
- f. What steps have been taken to reduce these subsidies?

AG-IMS ID 98187: Question by China - Market price support

Could the US please justify the adjustment made to the reference price of sugar based on 1986-1988 average price to include transportation costs and how is the adjustment complies with Annex 3 of Agriculture Agreement?

AG-IMS ID 98190: Question by Australia - Other product-specific AMS/EMS

Australia would like to thank the United States for its DS:1 notification (G/AG/N/USA/150) and welcomes the level of detail provided.

Could the United States please elaborate on the 'storage forgiven' and 'commodity loan forfeiture' measures for peanuts and cotton as outlined in Supporting Table DS:7?

AG-IMS ID 98183: Question by China - Classification of measures

The US has made significant changes to its notifying method, including box-shifting. Please further explain:

- a. could the US please justify why the federal crop insurance coverage has been moved from Supporting Table DS:6 (product-specific AMS – non-exempt direct payments) to Supporting Table DS:9 (nonproduct-specific AMS), since premium rates vary from products and counties? From a newspiece on Illinois farmdaily, the premium rate for corn in 2020 is USD 0.55 (50% loss) while the rate for cotton is USD 0.21? (<https://farmdocdaily.illinois.edu/2021/02/higher-2021-crop-insurance-premiums-and-2021-decisions.html>)

- b. Could the US please justify why Wildfires and Hurricane Indemnity Program (WHIP) has been moved from supporting table DS:6 (product-specific AMS – non-exempt direct payments) to supporting table DS:9 (nonproduct-specific AMS). According to USDA information, the WHIP+ payment formula was: $\text{WHIP+ Payment} = \text{Expected Value of Crop} \times \text{WHIP Factor} - \text{Actual Value of Crop Harvested} \times \text{Payment Factor} - \text{NAP Payment or Crop Insurance Indemnity Received by Producer}$ (<https://www.farmers.gov/recover/whip-plus>). The payment is clearly calculated based on different commodity?
- c. Could the US please explain why the Wildfire and Hurricane Indemnity Program (WHIP) is reported in "Payments for relief from natural disasters" in Green Box support as well as in Supporting Table DS:9 (nonproduct-specific AMS)?

AG-IMS ID 98184: Question by China - Classification of measures

Could the US please explain why "net budget outlays for livestock grazing on public range" is reported as non-product-specific support rather as product-specific support under the product group "livestock"?

AG-IMS ID 98185: Question by China - Classification of measures

Could the US please explain why ARC-CO and PLC are reported as non-product specific support when each covered commodity has different payment rate, and even the payment is based on historical production, the payment still goes to the active producer of that commodity?

2.3.20 Viet Nam (G/AG/N/VNM/14, G/AG/N/VNM/15, G/AG/N/VNM/16, G/AG/N/VNM/17)

AG-IMS ID 98192: Question by Canada - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Canada would like to mention that answers are pending from Viet Nam on question AG-IMS IDs 97147, 97148, 97149 and 97150.

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

2.4.1 United Kingdom (G/AG/N/GBR/4)

AG-IMS ID 98193: Question by Brazil - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

In notification G/AG/N/GBR/4 (DS:2), through which it claims exemption from domestic support reduction commitments for the programme "Coupled Support for Protein Crops", the UK reported that "The total area eligible for payment under the Pilot Scheme will be capped at 1,000 hectares (ha). In 2020, 153 ha of Protein Crops were grown in Northern Ireland."

Could the UK clarify the following points:

- a. how does a domestic support measure aimed at increasing the protein crops production area in 6,535 times meets the requirement of being a "production-limiting" measure?
- b. How will the UK ensure that the increase in the planted area will not cause damage to the local ecosystem?

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

2.5.1 Canada (G/AG/N/CAN/135, G/AG/N/CAN/139)

AG-IMS ID 98029: Question by India - Transparency issues

India thanks Canada for submitting its ES:1 for the marketing year 2019/2020. While comparing the ES:1 notification for the marketing year 2018/2019 (G/AG/N/CAN/135) and latest published notification for marketing year 2019-2020 (G/AG/N/CAN/139), India notices that for "Cheese" (XSID: CANX008), there is an increase in subsidized exports outlays and quantity. The subsidized

exports outlays increased from 9,299 CAD Thousand to 11,696 CAD Thousand, showing an increase of around 26%, while the subsidized exports quantity increased from 4293 to 4582, showing an increase of around 7%.

As per Nairobi Ministerial Decision, "developed Members shall immediately eliminate their remaining scheduled export subsidy entitlements as of the date of adoption of this Decision". But this statement of NMD has an exemption clause as mentioned in footnote (4) : "This paragraph shall not cover processed products, dairy products, and swine meat of a developed Member that agrees to eliminate as of 1 January 2016 all export subsidies on products destined for least developed countries, and that has notified export subsidies for such products or categories of products in one of its three latest export subsidy notifications examined by the Committee on Agriculture before the date of adoption of this Decision. For these products, scheduled export subsidies shall be eliminated by the end of 2020, and quantity commitment levels shall be applied as a standstill until the end of 2020 at the actual average of quantity levels of the 2003-05 base period. Furthermore, there shall be no export subsidies applied either to new markets or to new products".

India understands that Canada would be in the process of reducing the subsidized export outlays and quantities with respect to dairy products in view of the provisions under the NMD, however, the same increased in 2019-20. In this regard, what steps and measures are being taken to eliminate the export subsidies?

2.5.2 India (G/AG/N/IND/24)

AG-IMS ID 98194: Question by European Union - Transparency issues

On 22 March 2021 India submitted the ES:1 notifications for the years 2010/11, 2011/12 and 2012/13. When can Members expect India to submit the remaining outstanding ES:1 notifications, which are now up to eight years late compared to deadline set out in G/AG/2?

2.5.3 Korea, Republic of (G/AG/N/KOR/78, G/AG/N/KOR/79)

AG-IMS ID 98195: Question by Australia - Special and differential treatment (Article 9.4)

Australia thanks the Republic of Korea for its ES:1 notifications for CY 2018 and 2019. Australia notes export subsidies were provided for fruits, and vegetables. Could the Republic of Korea please:

- a. provide a breakdown of the specific types of fruits or vegetables (or HS-6/HS-8 tariff lines) that received support in the form of 'cost reduction measures' along with the associated outlay for each type of fruit or vegetable.
- b. If such information is not readily available, please indicate whether any specific types of fruits or vegetables (or HS-6/HS-8 tariff lines) are known to receive a large share of the notified support.
- c. Could the Republic of Korea provide a detailed explanation as to what is covered in the 'cost reduction measures' and the specific eligibility criteria?

3 OVERDUE NOTIFICATIONS

3.1.1 Canada

AG-IMS ID 98020: Question by India

India thanks Canada for submitting DS:1 notification, G/AG/N/CAN/131, for the calendar year 2016. According to the G/AG/2 document, Canada 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. By when would Canada notify its pending domestic support notifications?

3.1.2 European Union

AG-IMS ID 98021: Question by India

India takes note of the European Union's recently submitted DS:1 notification for the marketing year (2018-19) (G/AG/N/EU/69). By when can the WTO Members expect the European Union to notify its pending DS:1 notifications?

3.1.3 United States of America

AG-IMS ID 98023: Question by India

India notes that the United States' latest submitted DS:1 notification is for the marketing year 2018-19 (G/AG/N/USA/150). In its response to question AG-IMS ID 97092, the United States highlighted the importance of timeliness and accuracy of the notifications. By when can the WTO Members expect the United States to notify the above-mentioned notification?
