RESPONSES BY THE UNITED STATES TO SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY AUSTRALIA\(^1\) ON THE UNITED STATES NOTIFICATION OF SUBSIDIES UNDER ARTICLE XVI:1 OF THE AGREEMENT

The following communication, dated 19 September 1994, has been received from the Permanent Delegation of the United States.

First Answer:

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

**Answer:** An amendment making the Export Enhancement Programme consistent with the Uruguay Round commitments on agricultural export subsidies will be submitted to the Congress as part of the implementing legislation for the Round.

Second Answer:

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

**Answer:** The United States seeks assurances when appropriate in light of market conditions to ensure that importing countries will continue to purchase traditional volumes from non-subsidizing suppliers. The terms of the assurances, when sought, vary by country according to market conditions.

The initiatives allow sales opportunities for non-subsidizing suppliers, the United States limits the quantities of EEP initiatives to an appropriate level below the import estimate for the targeted country and commodity.

Third Answer:

**Question:** 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 ...") - Webster's Third New International Dictionary, Encyclopedia Britannica)?
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