



17 March 2022

(22-2342)

Page: 1/20

**Committee on Agriculture  
Special Session**

Original: English

## **OBSERVATIONS ON PUBLIC STOCKHOLDING FOR FOOD SECURITY PURPOSES**

COMMUNICATION FROM AUSTRALIA, CANADA, CHILE, COLOMBIA,  
NEW ZEALAND, PARAGUAY, THE UNITED STATES AND URUGUAY

### *Revision*

The following communication, dated 17 March 2022, is being circulated at the request of the aforementioned Members.

---

1.1. The objective of this paper is to add to the factual and analytical information under the heading Public Stockholding for Food Security Purposes (PSH) by identifying programs and collecting available information from sources such as Members' WTO domestic support notifications, Members' written replies in AG-IMS as well as reports prepared under a Member's Trade Policy Review, and papers from the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). This information on the practices of Members with PSH programs will help provide a common basis upon which further negotiations on the development of new rules can proceed.

1.2. As Members continue to engage in negotiations on a permanent solution for PSH, it is important to have a factual and analytical basis to support the development of a PSH solution that meets the needs of all Members, that is designed in a manner that does not lead to distortions or uncertainty in international agriculture markets, and that does not adversely affect the food security of other Members, including developing country Members.

## **BACKGROUND**

### **1) Current Rules on Public Stockholding for Food Security Purposes**

#### **a. Rules in Agreement on Agriculture**

1.3. The Agreement on Agriculture (AoA) allows Members to exclude from their AMS calculation, expenditures (or revenue foregone) in relation to the accumulation and holding of stocks of products which form an integral part of a food security program identified in national legislation. To be eligible under this exemption, paragraph 3, Annex 2 of the AoA requires that:

1. The food security program is identified in the national legislation.
2. The volume and accumulation of such stocks shall correspond to predetermined targets related solely to food security.
3. The process of stock accumulation and disposal shall be financially transparent.
4. Food purchases by the government shall be made at current market 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.

1.4. In addition, developing country Members that have programs under which public stocks of foodstuffs for food security purposes are acquired and released at administered prices, can still be

classified as falling under Annex 2, paragraph 3, provided that the difference between the acquisition price and the external reference price is accounted in the AMS.

## **b. Bali Interim Solution and General Council Decision**

1.5. The 2013 Bali Ministerial Decision provides an interim solution whereby Members shall refrain from challenging PSH programs under the Dispute Settlement Understanding, in the event that a developing Member exceeds its annual domestic support commitment in relation to support provided to traditional staple food crops under PSH programs existing as of the date of the Decision.

1.6. To benefit from this "peace clause", a developing Member must be consistent with the criteria of footnote 5, and footnote 5&6, paragraph 3 of Annex 2 to the AoA, and meet specific notification, transparency and anti-circumvention/safeguard requirements specified in the Bali Decision. In 2014, the General Council clarified that the Bali interim arrangement shall continue to be in place until a permanent solution is agreed and adopted. The interim solution has so far been used by one Member (India) and reported in two domestic support notifications (2018 and 2019).

## **2) Analytical Overview**

1.7. The most recent information collected on PSH were responses submitted by Members to a questionnaire in 2013 prior to the negotiation of the Bali interim solution. Since then, no or very little information has been provided by Members on their PSH programs. Furthermore, since 1995 a total of three developing Members submitted a total of three Table DS:2 notifications on their programs (Brazil, Republic of Korea and India) and one Member (India) provided information on its programs in the two Table DS:1 notifications in which it used the interim solution.

1.8. This analysis combines available data from domestic support notifications and external sources to find basic information on (i) which Members operated PSH programs using applied administered prices, (ii) which products were involved, and (iii) whether these programs were still in operation in the last notification submitted by each of these Members. The objective of this analysis is to obtain more clarity on PSH programs currently implemented by developing country Members.

1.9. Section 4 of this analysis cross-references domestic support data provided by developing Members under Annex 2, paragraph 3 of the AoA in Supporting Table DS:1 (expenditures on PSH) and reported in Supporting Table DS:5 (market price support) to create a base set (Table 2) of Members who potentially have PSH programs for which products were acquired at an applied administered price. In theory, this base set could indicate the current scope of PSH programs using applied administered prices because, in principle, a Member that has a program for PSH for which quantities were acquired at an applied administered price is required to account for this in ST DS:5 and may also exempt the expenditure in ST DS:1. However, in practice, many factors make this base set of Members imperfect. First, there is no obligation to exempt expenditures under Annex 2, paragraph 3. Moreover, there is no requirement to clearly and transparently indicate whether expenditures exempted under Annex 2, paragraph 3 are directly related to support reported in Supporting Table DS:5. Furthermore, many Members do not provide clear information in the notification to identify the products to which the expenditures under Annex 2, paragraph 3 refer. This combination of factors makes this base set too broad in its application and requires further qualitative investigation to refine the data.

1.10. Section 5 explores the refinement of the base set using qualitative information. In this section, we make use of a variety of sources (including the WTO Secretariat Trade Policy Review reports, OECD, FAO publications and Members' written replies in AG-IMS) to exclude from the base set those Members that notified support under Supporting Table DS:1 and DS:5 for unrelated reasons. Reasons that would require the exclusion of a Member from the base set include support reported under Supporting Tables DS:1 and DS:5 that is not related to the same product, or not related to the same measure.

1.11. Section 6 of the paper explores limitations and transparency issues of using a base set based on Members' notifications, as well as potential programs that would be excluded from this base set methodology, notably due to different ways the AoA allows Members to exclude support related to the accumulation and holding of stocks.

### **3) Methodology**

1.12. Domestic support data was sourced from Canada's analytical tool (JOB/AG/190), and from Members' WTO notifications. This analysis includes all domestic support notifications of self-identified developing country Members<sup>1</sup> for notification years 2001 to 2020 submitted as of 20 February 2022. Exchange rates to convert Members' data into USD were sourced from the International Financial Statistics (IFS) database.

1.13. The notifications of the base set of Members only conveyed Members' own information and data, and is not necessarily proof or verification that Members that are not in the base set are acquiring their stocks at market prices. Furthermore, the analysis makes no claims or judgment as to whether expenditures exempted under Annex 2, paragraph 3 meet the classification criteria.

1.14. If for a particular reason the information for the base set Members was missing elements to adequately reflect the policies of a Member, we invite this Member to contact the authors of this paper directly so that we can make the necessary adjustments.

### **4) Building the Base Set of Members: Expenditures Reported Under Annex 2, Paragraph 3 and Market Price Support (STDS:5)**

1.15. Since 2001, twenty (20) developing Members notified expenditures under Annex 2, paragraph 3 at least once. A total of thirteen (13) Members have reported expenditures under Annex 2, paragraph 3 following the Bali Ministerial Decision (after year 2013), four (4) Members have reported no expenditures in all their notifications notified after 2013, and three (3) Members did not submit a notification after 2013.

---

<sup>1</sup> Without prejudice to WTO Members and authors positions on eligibility of Members identified to use special and differential treatment in regard to PSH.

**Table 1: List of Developing Members Reporting Expenditures under Annex 2, Paragraph 3, 2001-2020**

Member	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Albania		X	X	X	X	X	X	X			N	N		N	N	N		N	N	N
Armenia	**	**			X										N	N	N	N	N	N
Botswana	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X									N	N	N
Brazil	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
China	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	N	N	N	N
India	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	N
Indonesia					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Israel	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Korea, Republic of	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	N	N
Kyrgyz Republic	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	X		X						N
Moldova, Republic of	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		N	N	N	N
Namibia							X	X	X	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Nepal	**	**	**	**	X	N	X	N	X	X	X	X	N	X	N	N	N	X	N	N
Pakistan	X						X	X	X	X	X					N	N	N	N	N
Philippines	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of	**	**	**	**	**	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	N	N	N
North Macedonia	**	**		X	X	X	X	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Ukraine	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	N	X	X	X	X	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Viet Nam	**	**	**	**	**	**	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	N	N	N
Zambia	N	N	N		N	X	N	X	N	X	N	X	N	X	N	N	N	N	N	N

X = Have reported expenditures under Annex 2 paragraph 3 for that year.

N = Notification not submitted.

\*\* = Not a Member of the WTO at the time.

Blank = No expenditure reported under Annex 2 paragraph 3.

1.16. Of the twenty (20) developing Members who reported expenditures under Annex 2, paragraph 3, twelve (12) Members reported at least one time market price support in the same year that they reported expenditures under Annex 2, paragraph 3.

**Table 2: The Base Set - List of Developing Members Reporting Expenditures under Annex 2, Paragraph 3 and Market Price Support in the Same Year, 2001-2020**

Member	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Albania											N	N		N	N	N		N	N	N
Armenia	**	**													N	N	N	N	N	N
Botswana																		N	N	N
Brazil	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X					
China	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	N	N	N	N
India	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	N
Indonesia												X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Israel	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Korea, Republic of	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	N	N
Kyrgyz Republic	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N									N
Moldova, Republic of																	N	N	N	N
Namibia										N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Nepal	**	**	**	**		N		N				N		N		N	N	N	N	N
Pakistan	X						X	X	X	X	X					N	N	N	N	N
Philippines	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of	**	**	**	**	**	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			N	N	N
North Macedonia	**	**		X				N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Ukraine	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	N	X	X	X	X	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Viet Nam	**	**	**	**	**	**								X	X			N	N	N
Zambia	N	N	N		N		N		N		N		N		N	N	N	N	N	N

X = Have reported expenditures under Annex 2 paragraph 3 and Market price support for that year.

N = Notification not submitted.

\*\* = Not a Member of the WTO at the time.

Blank = No expenditure reported under Annex 2 paragraph 3 and market price support (STDS:5).

1.17. Information in Table 2, this is to say all developing Members that reported expenditures under Annex 2, paragraph 3 and market price support for the same year, represents the base set that will be referred and improved via qualitative information throughout the paper.

## 5) Qualitative Refinement of the Proxy

### a. Product Coverage

1.18. As demonstrated in Table 3, of the twelve (12) Members that reported market price support and expenditures under Annex 2, paragraph 3, concurrently for the same year at least one time, eleven (11) Members reported Annex 2, paragraph 3 expenditures for the product(s) that received market price support. Only four (4) out of the twelve (12) Members have included a description of which products were covered by the expenditures reported under Annex 2, paragraph 3 in all their DS:1 notifications. For eight (8) Members, other sources were used to identify at least some of the products to which the expenditures referred.

**Table 3: List of Developing Members that Reported Market Price Support (STDS:5) and Expenditures under Annex 2, Paragraph 3 - Products Covered under Both Types of Support**

Member	Product list - Market price support notified since 2001 (see Annex 5 for years)	Products listed in descriptions of expenditures notified under Annex 2, para. 3	Additional details on products related to expenditures notified under Annex 2, para. 3 (other sources)	Same product(s)? (comparing columns 2 with 3 & 4)	Source for additional precision on products
Brazil	Beans, Coffee, Cotton, Maize, Sisal, Soybean, Wheat, Orange	No specific product (2001-2020)	More than 500 types of products between 2003 and 2015 under PAA (including beans, maize and wheat)	Yes	1. Sumário Executivo - Execução do PAA - 2015 - CONAB
China	Cotton, Maize, Rapeseed, Rice, Soybean, Sugar, Wheat	Maize, Rice, Sugar, Vegetable oil and Wheat (2001-2016)	-	Yes	-
India	Coarse Cereals, Cotton, Groundnut, Jute, Mustard seed, Pulses, Rice, Soybean, Sunflower, Wheat	Food grain (2001-2013) No specific product (2014-2019)	At least rice, wheat, coarse grains and pulses (2001-2019)	Yes	Bali Annex in G/AG/N/IND/18, G/AG/N/IND/25
Indonesia	Rice	No expenditures (2001-2004) No specific product (2005-2020)	Rice (2005-2020)	Yes	TPR - Secretariat report 2020 - (WT/TPR/S/401)
Israel	Cucumbers, Eggs, Milk, Potato, Tomato	Cereals (2001-2020)	Mostly Wheat (2001-2018)	No	OECD review of agricultural policies Israel 2010
Korea, Republic of	Barley, Maize, Rapeseed, Rice, Soybean	Rice and Barley (2001-2004 & 2016-2018) <sup>2</sup> Rice, Barley, Soybean (2005-2015)	-	Yes	-

<sup>2</sup> For the 2016-2018 period, barley was listed under the description of the measure(s) reported under Annex 2, paragraph 3 in the Republic of Korea's notifications, however it was revealed by the Republic of Korea that barley was not included in the stockholding program for the purpose of food security (see Republic of Korea's reply to AGIMS ID 98161).

Member	Product list - Market price support notified since 2001 (see Annex 5 for years)	Products listed in descriptions of expenditures notified under Annex 2, para. 3	Additional details on products related to expenditures notified under Annex 2, para. 3 (other sources)	Same product(s)? (comparing columns 2 with 3 & 4)	Source for additional precision on products
North Macedonia	Wheat	No product specified (2003-2007)	Wheat and Barley	Yes	TPR - Secretariat report 2019 - (WT/TPR/S/390)
Pakistan	Wheat	Wheat (2001-2015)	-	Yes	-
Philippines	Rice and Corn	Rice and Corn (2001-2004) No specific product (2005-2020)	Rice and Corn (2005-2019)	Yes	TPR - Secretariat report 2018 - (WT/TPR/S/368)
Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of	Wheat	Grains (2006-2017)	Wheat (2006-2017)	Yes	TPR - Secretariat report 2021 - (WT/TPR/S/407)
Ukraine	Sugar	Seeds (2009 & 2012) No product specified (2010 & 2011)	Sugar (2009-2012)	Yes	TPR - Secretariat report 2016 - WT/TPR/S/334
Viet Nam	Rice	Rice (2007 & 2008) Rice and Maize (2009-2017)	-	Yes	-

1.19. Based on details reported in Table 3, Table 4 adjusts the Table 2 base set of Members for product coverage for each year. Table 4 provides further information on products that were simultaneously covered by a public stockholding measure and eligible to receive the applied administrative price in a given year.

**Table 4: Set of Developing Members Adjusted for Product Coverage Based on Table 3 Analysis, 2001-2020**

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Brazil*	T,M,R, L	T,M,R, L	M,H,W	M,W	e,M,R, W	T,e,M, R,W	T,e,M, R,L	T,e,M, R,L,W	e,M,R, L,W	f,e,M, R,L,W
China	W,R,M	W,R,M	W,R,M	-	R	W,R	W,R	W,R	W,R	W
India	R,W,P	R,W,P	R,W,P	R,W,C, P	R,W,C, P	R,W	R,W,C	R,W,C	R,W,C	R,W,C
Indonesia										
Korea, Republic of	R,B	R,B	R,B	R,B	B,Y	B,Y	B,Y	B,Y	B,Y	B
North Macedonia	**	**	W	W				N	N	N
Pakistan	W						W	W	W	W
Philippines	R	R	R	R	R	R	R,M	R,M	R,M	R,M
Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of	**	**	**	**	**	W	W	W	W	W
Ukraine	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	N	S	S
Viet Nam	**	**	**	**	**	**				

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Brazil*	e,M,R, W	e,R,W		f,e,M, W	e,M					
China	W,R, M,S	W,R, M,S	W,R,M	W,R,M	W,R,M	W,R,M	N	N	N	N
India	R,W,C	R,W, C,P	R,W, C,P	R,W, C,P	R,W, C	R,W, C,P	R,W, C,P	R,W, C,P	R,W, C,P	N
Indonesia		R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
Korea, Republic of	B		Y	Y	Y				N	N
North Macedonia	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Pakistan	W					N	N	N	N	N
Philippines	R,M	R,M	R,M	R,M	R,M				R	R
Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of	W	W	W	W	W			N	N	N
Ukraine	S	S	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Viet Nam				R	R			N	N	N

**Legend**

W = Wheat	C = Coarse Cereals	U = Cucumbers	e = Edible beans
R = Rice	G = Groundnut	E = Eggs	f = Coffee
M = Maize	J = Jute	I = Milk	
T = Cotton	P = Pulse	L = Sisal	N = Notification not submitted
A = Rapeseed	F = Sunflower	H = Sorghum	** = Not a Member of the WTO at the time
Y = Soybean	D = Mustard seed	O = Potato	Blank = No expenditures reported under Annex 2, paragraph 3 and market price support (STDS:5)
S = Sugar	B = Barley	t = Tomato	
* Included all products of Brazil because a comprehensive list of the 500 products could not be found			

**b. Are Expenditures Reported under Annex 2, Paragraph 3 for Stock Acquired at an Applied Administered Price?**

1.20. Of the eleven (11) Members identified in Table 3, nine (9) Members reported expenditures under Annex 2, paragraph 3 at least once since 2001, for stocks acquired at applied administrative prices, based on information gathered from other sources. Of these nine (9) Members, five (5) reported expenditures under Annex 2, paragraph 3 for stocks acquired at applied administrative prices after the Bali decision in 2013. One (1) Member stopped reporting expenditures under Annex 2, paragraph 3 for notifications available after 2013, one (1) Member started using market prices to procure its stocks and two (2) Members did not submit any notification after 2013.



**Table 5: List of Developing Members Reporting Expenditures under Annex 2, Paragraph 3 and Market Price Support (STDS:5) for the Same Product(s) – Clarification if Expenditures under PSH are for Stock Acquired at an Applied Administered Price**

Member	Annex 2, para. 3 expenditures reported for stock acquired at applied administered price since 2001?	Annex 2, para. 3 expenditures reported for stock acquired at applied administered price since 2014?	Related information	Source of reference
Brazil	No	No	Under its program reported under Annex 2, paragraph 3 (PAA) Brazil makes direct acquisitions from family farms at market prices. Support prices are used to form strategic stocks, but the expenses are not reported under Annex 2, paragraph 3. The Policy of Guaranteed Minimum Prices (PGPM) stocks are usually sold whereas those held under PAA are mostly donated to vulnerable people.  On 3 December 2021, Brazil introduced the "Feed Brazil" program which replaces "program of acquisition of agricultural products from family farming". The program promotes food security, nutrition and food security.	Based on information from TPR – Secretariat report 2017 - (WT/TPR/S/358) G/AG/N/BRA/68
China	Yes	Yes	The minimum procurement price scheme for grains is linked to the volume of China's grain reserves; the minimum-price system is in place to ensure a stable supply of grains. Grain reserves of maize, rice, soya beans and wheat are maintained by central and local authorities to ensure food security.	TPR – Secretariat report 2016 - (WT/TPR/S/342 – p. 123)
India	Yes	Yes	The Government policy of procurement of foodgrains has the objectives of ensuring Minimum Support Price (MSP) to the farmers and the availability of foodgrains to the marginalized and vulnerable sections at affordable prices. It also ensures effective market intervention thereby keeping the prices under check and also adding to overall food security of the country. Traditional staple food crops covered are: Rice, Wheat, Coarse Grains and Pulses.	India 2019 domestic support notification (G/AG/N/IND/25 pp. 10-11)
Indonesia	Yes	Yes	BULOG continues to manage the Government's rice policy. It, <i>inter alia</i> , manages the Government rice reserve, maintaining a buffer stock of between one to one-and-a-half million metric tonnes per year, through purchases of domestically produced rice as well as imports. This reserve is used for: rice distribution to low income groups; market operations to maintain price stability at the producer and consumer levels; and emergency purposes, ASEAN reserves, and international cooperation and assistance (p. 156) // As at the time of the previous Review, the Government remained involved in stabilizing the price of rice through the state-owned Perum BULOG's guaranteed purchase of rice from domestic producers at a set procurement price, and through its import activities (p. 127).	TPR – Secretariat report 2020 - (WT/TPR/S/401)
Korea, Republic of	Yes	No	Publicly funded purchase and stockholding schemes support agriculture by stabilizing prices at higher levels. Such schemes have been operated either directly by the Government, such as by MAF on rice and AFMC mainly on red peppers, garlic, onions and anchovies, or by several cooperatives, especially on crops such as maize, barley and soybeans, run by the NACF (p. 86) // The notified expenditures on PSH relate to operating storage, processing and transporting the rice and barley purchased for such purposes. (Answer concerning year 2002) // A public stockholding scheme for rice, also known as the "Public Storage System for	TPR – Secretariat report 2004 - (WT/TPR/S/137)  Korea reply to AGIMS ID 48065

Member	Annex 2, para. 3 expenditures reported for stock acquired at applied administered price since 2001?	Annex 2, para. 3 expenditures reported for stock acquired at applied administered price since 2014?	Related information	Source of reference
			Emergencies", was established in 2005. One of the main objectives for this scheme is to guarantee food security in times of natural disasters or a temporary shortage due to a mismatch between supply and demand. Under this scheme, the government purchases rice from farmers at the market price during the harvest season and releases the stocks at the market prices when necessary. // On 22 March 2013 the requirement to buy and sale stockpiles at the market price in the place of purchase and sale, was extended from Rice to Grains (Law Amendment: Grain Management Act (22 March 2013) – Article 10). // Soybean can be a subject of PSH according to the domestic law (Grain Management Act). Soybean is not included in Korea's PSH. Soybean procurement program is notified to WTO as market price support (MPS). (Answer concerning period 2005 to 2015).	OECD - Agricultural Policy Monitoring and Evaluation 2020  Grain Management ACT ( <a href="http://extwprlegs1.fao.org/docs/pdf/kor51825.pdf">http://extwprlegs1.fao.org/docs/pdf/kor51825.pdf</a> )  Korea reply to AGIMS ID 98161
North Macedonia	Yes	N/A (most recent notification 2007)	The Agency for stock reserves operates on the market but its competence is limited to the management of food security reserves. It manages only two primary agricultural products: wheat and barley. It applies competitive and transparent procurement procedures in accordance with the general procurement law. After accession to the WTO, the market price support operations competence was discontinued. When market prices are lower than average production costs, the Government, based on a proposal by the Ministry of Agriculture, can decide to establish a compensation for farmers for defined quantities of wheat purchased by the Agency for stock reserves (p. 86).	WT/TPR/S/390
Pakistan	Yes	No	Government intervention in wheat procurement is justified for food security reasons. (FAO)// The Government's wheat policy aims to balance support to farm incomes with price stability and affordable flour and bread prices for consumers. It maintains a guaranteed wheat price, which is PRs 1,300 per 40 kg in 2014/15. The Government procures around one-third of domestic wheat production. Wheat stocks are held by the Pakistan Agricultural Storage and Services Corporation (PASSCO), a public company, and food departments of provincial governments (pp. 66-67).	FAO - Pakistan Review of the wheat sector and grain storage issues (2013)  TPR - Secretariat report 2015 - (WT/TPR/S/311)
Philippines	Yes	Yes	The Philippines maintains a complex system of price and consumer support for rice. The support is provided through a combination of trade policy instruments: restricted imports via a rice quota, a producer support price scheme, where the administered price is considerably higher than the duty-paid import price, and which is underpinned by targeted NFA purchases (procurement) and buffer stocks of rice; which is then sold for local consumption at subsidized prices (p. 64) // As part of its mandate to ensure food security and the stabilization of the supply and price of rice and corn, the NFA intervenes as buyer of last resort in the markets for palay rice and (to a limited extent) corn (p. 64).	TPR - Secretariat report 2018 - WT/TPR/S/368

Member	Annex 2, para. 3 expenditures reported for stock acquired at applied administered price since 2001?	Annex 2, para. 3 expenditures reported for stock acquired at applied administered price since 2014?	Related information	Source of reference
Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of	Yes	Yes	The Agricultural Development Fund (ADF) (formerly the Saudi Arabia Agricultural Bank (SAAB)) provides low interest loans and loan repayment subsidies, and the Saudi Grain Organization (SAGO) (which replaced the Grain Silos and Flourmills Organization (GSFMO) in November 2015) purchases and stores wheat, mills wheat for human consumption, and is responsible for the strategic stockpile of six months' consumption. It also produces wheat-based animal feeds. // Until November 2015, the GSFMO was responsible for importing and purchasing domestically produced wheat, and milling wheat in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Under the Government Decree No. 335 of 2008, the GSFMO began reducing purchases of domestically produced wheat by 12.5% per year and replacing them with imports. The final purchases of domestic wheat were to have taken place in 2015. The SAGO buys domestically produced wheat at SAR 1,000 per tonne.	TPR - Secretariat report 2016 - WT/TPR/S/333 pp. 66-67
Ukraine	Yes	N/A (most recent notification 2012)	<p>The basic structure of Ukraine's sugar regime remains unchanged since its accession, with a domestic production quota, price support and public intervention (footnote 40: The Agrarian Fund has in the past carried out intervention purchases of sugar into the state food reserve, and a tariff quota) (p. 93 – 2016 TPR).</p> <p>The state agency Agrarian Fund can implement domestic price interventions through the operation of the State Intervention Fund. Initially dealing only with grain, the Agrarian Fund has become progressively involved in other activities, such as sugar sales from public stocks; state purchases and sales of a broad range of agricultural and food products; forward-contracting; flour processing and wholesaling.</p> <p>In 2018 Ukraine abolished the market price support (minimum prices) for sugar.</p>	<p>TPR - Secretariat report 2016 - WT/TPR/S/334</p> <p><b>OECD - Agricultural Policy Monitoring and Evaluation 2020</b></p> <p>Ukraine reply to AGIMS ID 90074</p>
Viet Nam	No	No	<p>The rice-related data in Supporting Table DS:5 is interest rate support to enterprises to purchase 1 million tonnes of rice at market prices for a maximum period of six months for temporary storage; and the Government is not responsible for the business efficiency of enterprises. Due to a translation error, the correct content in the "Measure Types" column of the Supporting Table DS:5 is "Interest rate support to purchase rice for temporary storage for business purpose" instead of "National temporary storage program for rice – Interest rates support".</p> <p>Meanwhile, purchasing rice to store temporarily in Supporting Table DS:1 is the Government's annual program of purchasing food to add to the national stockpile for food security and relief purposes if natural disasters, epidemics and hunger relief happen.</p>	Viet Nam reply to AGIMS ID 97148

1.21. Based on justifications provided in Table 5, Table 6 adjusts the Table 4 set of Members to clarify if stocks under the PSH programs of Members were acquired at the applied administered price. Table 6 lists all products that were procured each year at applied administered prices as part of a PSH program.

**Table 6: Set of Developing Members Adjusted for Products and Stock Acquired at Applied Administered Price based on Table 3 & 5 Analysis, 2001-2020**

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
China	W,R,M	W,R,M	W,R,M	-	R	W,R	W,R	W,R	W,R	W
India	R,W,P	R,W,P	R,W,P	R,W,C,P	R,W,C,P	R,W	R,W,C	R,W,C	R,W,C	R,W,C
Indonesia										
Korea, Republic of	R,B	R,B	R,B	R,B	B	B	B	B	B	B
North Macedonia	**	**	W	W				N	N	N
Pakistan	W						W	W	W	W
Philippines	R	R	R	R	R	R	R,M	R,M	R,M	R,M
Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of	**	**	**	**	**	W	W	W	W	W
Ukraine	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	N	S	S

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
China	W,R,M,S	W,R,M,S	W,R,M	W,R,M	W,R,M	W,R,M	N	N	N	N
India	R,W,C	R,W,C,P	R,W,C,P	R,W,C,P	R,W,C	R,W,C,P	R,W,C,P	R,W,C,P	R,W,C,P	N
Indonesia		R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
Korea, Republic of	B								N	N
North Macedonia	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Pakistan	W					N	N	N	N	N
Philippines	R,M	R,M	R,M	R,M	R,M				R	R
Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of	W	W	W	W	W			N	N	N
Ukraine	S	S	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N

### Legend

W = Wheat	C = Coarse Cereals	U = Cucumbers	e = Edible beans
R = Rice	G = Groundnut	E = Eggs	f = Coffee
M = Maize	J = Jute	I = Milk	
T = Cotton	P = Pulse	L = Sisal	N = Notification not submitted
A = Rapeseed	F = Sunflower	H = Sorghum	** = Not a Member of the WTO at the time
Y = Soybean	D = Mustard seed	O = Potato	Blank = No expenditures reported under Annex 2, paragraph 3 and market price support (STDS:5)
S = Sugar	B = Barley	t = Tomato	
* Included all products of Brazil because a comprehensive list of the 500 products could not be found			

### c. Findings

1.22. Based on the adjusted set of Members (Table 6), Table 7 summarizes information on products and years for which five (5) Members reported expenditures under Annex 2, paragraph 3 for stocks that were acquired at the applied administered prices since the Bali Decision.

1.23. Four (4) of the Five (5) Members reported expenditures under Annex 2, paragraph 3 for stocks that were acquired at applied administered prices in their last domestic support notification.

**Table 7: Developing Members, Products and Years, for which Expenditures under Annex 2, Paragraph 3 were Notified for Stocks that were Acquired at Applied Administered Price Since the Bali Decision (after 2013)**

Members	Products	Years	Reported in last notification
China	Rice, Wheat, Corn	2014; 2015; 2016	Yes (2016)
India	Rice, Wheat, Coarse Grains and Pulses	2014; 2015; 2016; 2017; 2018; 2019	Yes (2019)
Indonesia	Rice	2014; 2015; 2016; 2017; 2018, 2019, 2020	Yes (2020)
Philippines	Rice, Corn	2014; 2015; 2019, 2020	Yes (2020)
Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of	Wheat	2014; 2015	No (2017)

## 6) Limitation of the Approach and Further Investigations

1.24. While the paper uses a robust approach to identify Members and products, further investigation may be needed on programs and products from those Members that may have been excluded due to the limitations of the methodology of the based set. Below are limitations of the base set that may prevent this analysis from capturing additional programs.

### a. Expenditures under Annex 2, Paragraph 3 or Market Price Support Not Reported Every Year

1.25. Further analysis reveals that the base set could have been affected in some years by Members not having reported expenditures under Annex 2 paragraph 3 or Supporting Table DS:5 in a consistent manner. For example, one Member reported expenditures under Annex 2, paragraph 3 related to wheat in some years and market price support for wheat in all years. A review of the latest Secretariat Trade Policy Review of that Member revealed that this Member acquired wheat using applied administered prices for its public stocks in all years. This additional information raised the need for further clarification to better understand if this Member, and possibly others, were excluded in this analysis due to inconsistencies in reporting programs.

### b. Questions Regarding Expenditures Not Reported under Annex 2, Paragraph 3

1.26. Some questions and further analysis are required to determine if some PSH programs could be reported by some Members directly as market price support without expenditures being reported under Annex 2, paragraph 3. As PSH programs are often justified by Members as serving a dual purpose of stabilizing domestic prices and food security<sup>3</sup>, questions remain as to whether such programs could have been reported by some Members as market price support while excluding the related cost of the PSH programs via the Annex 3, paragraph 8 exemption of "budgetary payments made to maintain the gap, such as buying-in or storage costs". Some confusion exists in regard to understanding the overlapping of expenditures in relation to the accumulation and holding of stocks of products under Annex 2, paragraph 3 and the expenditures made to maintain the price gap, such as buying-in or storage costs as noted in Annex 3, paragraph 8.

1.27. In addition to the developing Members identified in the list in Table 6, a total of seven (7) developing country Members<sup>4</sup> (see Annex 1 of this paper) notified market price support at least one time between 2001 and 2019 without reporting expenditures under Annex 2, paragraph 3. Of these seven (7) Members, two Members did not appear to use market price support for food security purposes<sup>5</sup>, one Member stated in its accession document that his government would not claim any right granted under WTO Agreements to developing country Members<sup>6</sup> and it was not possible to conclude that the four (4) remaining Members<sup>7</sup> did not use market price support for food security purposes. As the methodology used in this analysis required that expenditure be reported under Annex 2, paragraph 3 for a Member to be included in the base set of Members, further investigation would be required to determine if these four (4) Members could be missing from the set of Members

<sup>3</sup> As demonstrated for many Members in the justification column of Table 3 of this paper.

<sup>4</sup> Bangladesh; Costa Rica; Jordan; Lao PDR; the Separate Customs Territory of Taiwan, Penghu, Kinmen and Matsu; Tunisia and Turkey.

<sup>5</sup> Costa Rica and Turkey.

<sup>6</sup> The Separate Customs Territory of Taiwan, Penghu, Kinmen and Matsu (WT/ACC/TPKM/18 - p. 9).

<sup>7</sup> Bangladesh, Jordan, Lao PDR and Tunisia.

identified in this paper. Basic information from external sources on procurement policies of the remaining four (4) Members can be found in Annex 2 of this paper.

### **c. Difficulty to Corroborate that Procurement was Made at a Market Price**

1.28. Further attempts to corroborate that purchases made by some Members, excluded from the final list, were made at a market price and not via a form of price support or administered prices were not successful. It was noticed that for some Members excluded from the list, that the prices at which stocks were acquired were fixed for a period of time and defined by parameters other than market forces. Without prejudice to what Members consider to be an applied administered price or not, the base set used in this analysis is not able to capture any of the excluded Members if the difference between the acquisition price and the external reference price is not accounted for in Supporting Table DS:5 when stocks are acquired at applied administered prices.

### **d. Observations from the Committee on Agriculture**

1.29. In the WTO Committee on Agriculture, 100 questions<sup>8</sup> have been raised to developing country Members regarding their expenditures related to PSH, however, as most question raise more than one issue or contain sub-questions the total number is much higher. The interest of Members to better understand the operation of PSH programs can be traced back to the first question at the 7<sup>th</sup> meeting of the CoA in 1997.

1.30. The questions and sub-questions can be grouped into the following themes:

- a. Describe how the measure meets the criteria for Public Stockholding Programs for Food Security Purposes in Annex 2 of the Agreement on Agriculture.
- b. What are the predetermined targets for stocks?
- c. What are the products that are covered by the program?
- d. Describe how the expenditures meet the requirements in the Bali Decision.
- e. Elaborate on use of market price support or an applied administered price.
- f. How are stocks stored and the conditions for their disposal?
- g. Export of products in public stocks.
- h. Additional information on the operation of the program.

1.31. Members have raised questions to 13 developing Members that have submitted notifications which have included expenditures related to PSH. Four Members account for 81% of the questions raised.

**Table 8: Questions to Developing Country Members on PSH at the WTO Committee on Agriculture**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Number of Questions</b>
India	34
Brazil	19
China	17
Indonesia	11
Korea, Republic of	7
Viet Nam	4
Philippines	2
Israel	1
North Macedonia	1
Pakistan	1
Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of	1
Sri Lanka	1
Ukraine	1

<sup>8</sup> The results of a search of the AG-IMS as of 23 February 2022.

## 7) Conclusion

1.32. This analysis found that only a small number of developing country Members are notifying market price support policies for stocks procured for PSH. Only five (5) Members notified expenditures under Annex 2, paragraph 3 for stocks acquired at an applied administrative price at least once after the Bali Decision in 2013, and only four (4) of these Members reported both types of support in their most recent DS:1 notification. Extending the approach for all reporting years since 2001 identified a total of only nine (9) Members.

1.33. This paper also identified some limitations in using a methodology that relies only on data notified by Members. Such limitations include inconsistent reporting of expenditures under Annex 2, paragraph 3 and/or support under Supporting table DS:5, market price support measures used for food security reasons without expenditures notified under Annex 2, paragraph 3, and difficulties in attesting that Members that only reported expenditures under Annex 2, paragraph 3 did not use administrative prices to acquire the stocks.

1.34. The amount of detail, variety of sources, and the approach taken in order to write this paper attests to inconsistencies and information gaps in the way Members notify expenditures for PSH. Most Members have provided very little information over the years in their annual DS:1 notification to help the WTO Membership better understand their programs. Basic information, such as the products covered by a program and on the types of expenditures reported under Annex 2, paragraph 3, was not included in most DS:1 notifications. Furthermore, since 1995 only two developing Members<sup>9</sup> submitted a combined total of two (2) DS:2 notifications where information was provided on their respective PHS measures.

1.35. This paper underscores the need for more transparency to help inform negotiations related to PSH. Basic requirements for the way Members notify expenditures under Annex 2, paragraph 3 could be implemented without increasing the administrative burden for developing Members and Least Developed Countries. These new requirements could be limited to clearly indicating in the description box which product(s) are covered by this measure, and a simple yes/no box in Supporting Table DS:1 to indicate whether support under Supporting Table DS:5 was reported to account for the difference between the acquisition price and the external reference price. These new requirements would come at no additional burden as this information is already required in order to notify expenditures under Annex 2, paragraph 3.

1.36. In addition, discussions may be warranted to clarify whether a developing country Member that does not report its PSH as a measure under Annex 2, paragraph 3, could benefit from the current Bali decision or a permanent solution on PSH.

1.37. Finally, the questionnaire on the PSH exercise that was undertaken in preparation for the Bali Ministerial Conference should also be re-administered periodically to ensure that the basic information that we have on these programs is still relevant for informing the negotiations.

---

<sup>9</sup> India and the Republic of Korea.

## ANNEX 1

### Additional list of Developing Members that Notified Market Price Support under Supporting Table DS:5, 2001-2020

Member	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Bangladesh	N	X	N	X	N	X	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Costa Rica	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					
Jordan	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	N	N	N	N	N	N
Lao PDR	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	X	N	N	N	N
Chinese Taipei	N	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	x	N
Tunisia	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	N
Turkey	X																N	N	N	N

X = Reported market price support under Supporting Table DS:5 for that year.

N = Notification not submitted.

\*\* = Not a Member of the WTO at the time.

Blank = No support reported in Supporting Table DS:5.



## ANNEX 2

### Info on Other Developing Members that Have Market Price Support Measures Related to Stocks for Food Security

Member	Product list - Market price support	Basic information	External source reference
Bangladesh	Wheat, Rice	<p>Bangladesh maintains a security stockpile of food grains to meet the demand for emergency and normal food distribution through different channels. This stockpile is built-up through local procurement, food-aid and occasional import by the Government (Secretariat TPR 2006 (Secretariat TPR 2006, pp. 93-94)) // The Government procures rice and wheat from the farmers and millers. The procurement price is fixed before harvesting taking into consideration the cost of production, the local market price, international market price, and farmers' profit margin (Secretariat TPR 2006, p. 96).</p> <p>State-trading operations were undertaken by the Bangladesh Agriculture Development Corporation (BADC) for the public storage of food grains, such as rice and wheat. Poor farm incomes were also supported, through domestic procurement of rice and wheat from poor farmers. In 2018, rice and flour were sold to poor families led by women under the Open Market Sale (OMS) policy. Under this policy, the authorities purchased rice and wheat flour, and sold it to poor families, at a per kilogram price of USD 0.36 for rice and USD 0.2 for wheat (Secretariat TPR 2019 p. 93).</p>	<p>TPR - 2006 Secretariat report - WT/TPR/S/168</p> <p>TPR - 2019 Secretariat report - WT/TPR/S/385</p>
Jordan	Wheat, Barley	<p>MITS is responsible for importing wheat and barley, which account for almost all (99%) domestic consumption needs. The Ministry also purchases wheat and barley from local farmers, at cost price which is set according to the average world price. The Government distributes wheat and barley to mills at cost price to produce various kinds of flour. The flour is then sold at market price to bakeries. Flour suitable for making bread is sold to bakeries at controlled prices and the bread sold to consumers at JD 0.16 per kilogram (p. 61). // An active strategic wheat reserve is in place and, in the aftermath of rising international prices in 2007/2008, the Government increased the reserves from three to 10 months consumption (p. 73). // Production of wheat and barley are also supported through minimum prices which vary from one year to another (p. 7).</p>	<p>TPR - 2015 Secretariat Report - WT/TPR/S/325</p>
Lao PDR	Rice	<p>To support farmers' incomes, a minimum (floor) price for glutinous rice continues to be determined, and is recommended annually by the Government to serve as an optional reference for sale and purchase between farmers and mill houses (p. 95). // A rice reserve policy remains in place since 2008. It consists of three components, namely: the National Rice Reserve (NRR), under the responsibility of the MoIC's Domestic Trade Department (DTD); seed reserves, under the responsibility of the MAF; and emergency rice distribution programs, under the MLSW. In 2009, the NRR started operating as a public-private partnership (PPP), whereby the MoIC provides subsidized credit (Section 4.1.4) to millers through state banks and the millers keep a specified minimum rice stock. More specifically, under the 2008 Prime Minister Decision on National Stock Holding, the Government provided rice mill owners with credit at an interest rate of 5% for a two year-period, for them to collect rice and stock it. The money is used by millers to contract farmers to deliver a certain quantity of rice at the price negotiated by private operators, so as to ensure inputs. The millers commit to retaining 40% of their purchase as an emergency reserve. The Government does not intervene in these transactions except for requesting the sale of the stock in times of scarcity but this has not occurred since 2010. For FY 2010/11, the total value of budget transfers to rice producers was estimated (pp. 95-96).</p>	<p>TPR - 2019 Secretariat Report - WT/TPR/S/394</p>
Tunisia	Wheat, Barley, Milk, Olive Oil, Sugar beet	<p>Tunisia's Grain Board is responsible for purchasing durum and common wheat on the domestic market at prices fixed by the State. It also acts as the intervention agency for barley. The Board sells cereals (domestic and imported) to the processing plants (mills and semolina factories) at a fixed price and recoups the difference between that fixed price and the cost price from the General Compensation Fund (CGC) (p. 107 - 2016 TPR). // The General Compensation Fund (CGC) was set up in 1970 to moderate the effects of fluctuations in the price of staples (especially imports) and to help preserve the purchasing power of low-income groups and has several objectives (p. 85 - 2016 TPR). The main forms of intervention are guaranteed prices for producers and buffer stocks (cereals) (p. 73 - 2005 TPR).</p>	<p>TPR - 2016 Secretariat Report - WT/TPR/S/341</p> <p>TPR - 2005 Secretariat Report - WT/TPR/S/152</p>

### ANNEX 3

#### Market Price Support Amount Notified by Developing Members in Supporting Table DS:5, 2001-2020 (USD Million)

Member	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Bangladesh	N	-4	N	-19	N	-7	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Brazil	269	115	70	55	19	24	69	152	177	433	108	226	0	105	4	0	0	0	0	0
China	-9407	-4840	-3473	0	-1804	-2901	-1169	-1553	-995	212	4592	11130	21015	20217	23505	15714	N	N	N	N
Costa Rica	7	5	7	2	4	8	16	62	92	110	104	82	86	76	4	0	0	0	0	0
India	-5115	-4333	-4084	-4150	-3934	-2417	237	591	901	2117	2764	2368	1213	1919	1171	2104	4919	8529	6413	N
Indonesia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133	27	48	71	158	30	265	302	558
Israel	247	235	263	308	321	324	390	578	512	516	612	564	672	643	527	485	595	615	454	647
Jordan	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	3	5	1	1	5	4	N	N	N	N	N	N
Korea, Republic of	1311	1289	1295	1309	108	105	91	67	48	24	9	0	30	34	36	6	29	8	N	N
Lao PDR	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	N	N	N	3	N	N	N	N
North Macedonia	**	**	4	7	0	0	0	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	
Pakistan	-966	-902	-449	-141	-43	0	264	660	574	609	647	689	592	644	662	N	N	N	N	N
Philippines	61	39	37	25	10	10	5	193	153	159	51	69	73	6	41	0	0	0	204	129
Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of	**	**	**	**	**	212	217	158	86	117	99	71	55	65	66	0	0	N	N	N
Chinese Taipei	**	289	180	106	91	99	85	98	88	94	218	243	264	230	188	198	239	262	271	N
Tunisia	1	11	13	16	3	-13	28	41	40	43	45	25	45	32	-4	-43	-82	-141	-189	N
Turkey	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	N	N	N	N
Ukraine	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	N	53	233	278	596	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Viet Nam	**	**	**	**	**	**	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	0	0	N	N	N

## ANNEX 4

### Expenditures Notified by Developing Members under Annex 2, Paragraph 3 of the AoA, 2001-2020 (USD Million)

Member	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Albania	0	0.4	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0	0	N	N	0	N	N	N	0	N	N	N
Armenia	**	**	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	N	N	N	N	N	N
Botswana	0.1	3	0.4	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	N	N	N
Brazil	72	45	6	65	148	157	181	234	237	653	749	205	317	372	124	173	90	78	63	29
China	7211	6421	6588	5082	5380	6318	7125	8337	10179	11380	5541	6650	9186	12709	24333	17295	N	N	N	N
India	3668	4996	5476	5730	5211	5640	7768	9495	12282	13812	14336	14809	14792	17175	15645	16271	18041	17212	18676	N
Indonesia	0	0	0	0	87	118	134	72	142	266	246	9	13	8	6	6	6	65	27	85
Israel	16	13	15	15	15	10	9	12	13	13	13	15	15	16	13	12	12	11	9	12
Korea, Republic of	89	147	153	141	166	150	176	124	133	167	167	136	118	154	154	187	198	324	N	N
Kyrgyz Republic	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	18	0	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	N
Moldova, Republic of	3	2	1	4	4	3	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	7	0	N	N	N	N
Namibia	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Nepal	**	**	**	**	4	N	4	N	5	1	2	1	N	1	N	N	N	1	N	N
Pakistan	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	69	109	69	112	0	0	0	0	N	N	N	N	N
Philippines	24	17	9	8	16	18	24	45	84	177	58	95	100	96	99	89	101	133	135	141
Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of	**	**	**	**	**	9	10	6	3	4	11	10	11	13	14	15	13	N	N	N
North Macedonia	**	**	0	3	2	1	1	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Ukraine	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	N	14	25	30	32	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Viet Nam	**	**	**	**	**	**	26	103	72	74	51	70	64	93	104	72	97	N	N	N
Zambia	N	N	N	0	N	39	N	21	N	251	N	58	N	165	N	N	N	N	N	N

## ANNEX 5

### Product that Received Market Price Support for Members Listed in Table 3, 2001-2020

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Brazil	T,M,R,L	T,M,R,L	M,H,W	M,W	e,M,R,W	T,e,M,R,W	T,e,M,R,L	T,e,M,R,L,W	e,M,R,L,W	f,e,M,R,L,W
China	W,R,M	W,R,M	W,R,M	-	R	W,R	W,R	W,R	W,R	W
India	R,W,P,T,D,J	R,W,P,T,D,J	R,W,P,T,J	R,W,C,P,T,D	R,W,C,P,T,D	R,W,T,D	R,W,C,T,D	R,W,F,C,T	R,W,C,T	R,W,C
Indonesia										
Israel	t,U,O,E,I	t,U,E,I	t,U,E,I	E,I	E,I	E,I	E,I	E,I	E,I	E,I
Korea, Republic of	R,B,M,A,Y	R,B,M,A,Y	R,B,M,A,Y	R,B,M,A,Y	B,M,Y	B,M,Y	B,M,Y	B,M,Y	B,Y	B
North Macedonia	**	**	W	W				N	N	N
Pakistan	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W
Philippines	R	R	R	R	R	R	R,M	R,M	R,M	R,M
Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of	**	**	**	**	**	W	W	W	W	W
Ukraine	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	N	S	S
Viet Nam	**	**	**	**	**	**				

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Brazil	e,M,R,W	e,R,W		f,e,M,W	e,M					
China	W,R,M,S,T, A,Y	W,R,M,S,T, A,Y	W,R,M,T,A,Y	W,R,M,T,A,Y	W,R,M,T,A	W,R,M	N	N	N	N
India	R,W,C,T	R,W,C,P,T,F	R,W,C,P,T, G,F	R,W,C,P,T, G,F,D	R,W,C,T,F	R,W,C,P,G,F	C,T,G,P,D, R,Y,F,W	C,T,G,P,D, R,Y,F,W	C,T,G,P,D, R,Y,F,W	N
Indonesia		R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
Israel	E,I	E,I	E,I	E,I	E,I	E,I	E,I	E,I	E,I	E,I
Korea, Republic of	B		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
North Macedonia	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Pakistan	W	W	W	W	W	N	N	N	N	N
Philippines	R,M	R,M	R,M	R,M	R,M				R	R
Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of	W	W	W	W	W			N	N	N
Ukraine	S	S	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Viet Nam				R	R			N	N	N

### Legend

W = Wheat	C = Coarse Cereals	U = Cucumbers	e = Edible beans
R = Rice	G = Groundnut	E = Eggs	f = Coffee
M = Maize	J = Jute	I = Milk	
T = Cotton	P = Pulse	L = Sisal	N = Notification not submitted
A = Rapeseed	F = Sunflower	H = Sorghum	** = Not a Member of the WTO at the time
Y = Soybean	D = Mustard seed	O = Potato	Blank = No expenditures reported under Annex 2, paragraph 3 and market price support (STDS:5)
S = Sugar	B = Barley	t = Tomato	
* Included all products of Brazil because a comprehensive list of the 500 products could not be found			