SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY AUSTRALIA ON THE REPLIES BY THE UNITED STATES ON THE UNITED STATES NOTIFICATION OF SUBSIDIES UNDER ARTICLE XVI:1 OF THE AGREEMENT

The following communication, dated 27 October 1992, has been received from the Permanent Delegation of Australia.

First Answer:

It is noted that EEP funding could be modified by legislation giving effect to Uruguay Round outcomes. Which of these outcomes would affect EEP funding, and how would they affect that funding?

Second Answer:

Which countries have given the assurances referred to, and what are the terms of each assurance? How does the US limit the "quantities of EEP initiatives to allow opportunities for competitors..."?

Third Answer:

In the absence of a definition of minimal effect, would the US adopt the ordinary dictionary meaning of the term "minimal" in applying the guidelines (e.g. "of, being or having the number or degree: extremely minute..." - Websters Third New International Dictionary, Encyclopaedia Britannica)?

Sixth Answer:

The US says export prices will "generally" conform with IDA prices. Does this mean that all the relevant US prices will not vary much from the IDA prices, or that only some US prices will vary occasionally from the IDA prices (although these variations may not necessarily be small)?

These questions relate to replies given by the United States in SCM/W/275.
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Last Answer:

Does the US consider that the MPP is not notifiable because it does not involve the Government giving an economic benefit to an industry (or group of industries), or does not directly or indirectly increase exports or decrease imports? If the US considers that the MPP does not increase exports or decrease imports, does it consider this to be the case in a "historical" sense, or rather in the sense that the MPP does not maintain exports at a higher level, or imports at a lower level, than would otherwise exist in the absence of a subsidy?