



17 November 2023

(23-7810)

Page: 1/66

Committee on Agriculture

Original: English

POINTS RAISED BY MEMBERS UNDER THE REVIEW PROCESS

COMPILATION OF QUESTIONS FOR THE MEETING ON 27-29 NOVEMBER 2023¹

The present document compiles questions received by the Secretariat by the deadline of 15 November 2023 as specified in [WTO/AIR/AG/71](#).

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 or obligations under the WTO. Questions cosponsored via the AG-IMS as of 17:00 on 17 November are already reflected accordingly in this document.

1 MATTERS RELEVANT TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMITMENTS: ARTICLE 18.6 8

NEW SPECIFIC IMPLEMENTATION MATTERS (SIM).....	8
1.1 Australia - Farm Investment Loans programme (SIM 864).....	8
1.1.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID 107076).....	8
1.1.2 Question by India (AG-IMS ID 107077).....	8
1.2 Canada - Dairy Innovation and Investment Fund (SIM 865).....	9
1.2.1 Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID 107010).....	9
1.3 Costa Rica's rice policy (SIM 866).....	9
1.3.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 107014).....	9
1.4 Costa Rica's support to micro, small and medium-sized producers (SIM 867)	10
1.4.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID 107080).....	10
1.5 Egypt's export restriction on onions (SIM 868).....	10
1.5.1 Question by United Kingdom, United States of America, Switzerland, Canada (AG-IMS ID 107003)	10
1.6 France's new livestock support package (SIM 869)	10
1.6.1 Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID 107038)	10
1.7 Morocco's vegetable and fertilizer subsidies (SIM 870)	11
1.7.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 107030)	11
1.8 Morocco's export restriction on olive oil (SIM 871).....	12
1.8.1 Question by United Kingdom, United States of America, Switzerland, Canada, Japan (AG-IMS ID 107005)	12
1.9 Myanmar's export restriction on rice (SIM 872).....	12
1.9.1 Question by United Kingdom, Canada (AG-IMS ID 107006).....	12
1.10 New Zealand - Productive and Sustainable Land Use Programme (SIM 873)	12
1.10.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID 107082)	12
1.11 Türkiye's transport tax on imported goods (SIM 874).....	13
1.11.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 107132).....	13
1.12 U.S. food security programmes (SIM 875).....	14
1.12.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 107033)	14
1.13 U.S. Regional Agriculture Promotion Program (SIM 876).....	14
1.13.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID 107085)	14
1.13.2 Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID 107135)	14
SPECIFIC IMPLEMENTATION MATTERS (SIM) RAISED PREVIOUSLY	15
1.14 Argentina's export restrictions (SIM 710)	15
1.14.1 Question by United Kingdom, Canada, United States of America, Switzerland, Japan (AG-IMS ID 107001)	15
1.15 Brazil's Plano Safra programme (SIM 842)	15
1.15.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 107034)	15
1.15.2 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 107035)	15
1.16 Brazil's new programme to restore pastureland (SIM 843)	16
1.16.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 107007).....	16

1.17	Canada's Dairy Policies (SIM 594)	16
1.17.1	Question by India (AG-IMS ID 107078)	16
1.18	Canada's Advanced Payments Program (SIM 847)	17
1.18.1	Question by India (AG-IMS ID 107079)	17
1.19	Canada's Special Milk Class Scheme (SIM 26)	17
1.19.1	Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID 107012)	17
1.20	Canada's Review of the TRQ System (SIM 536)	18
1.20.1	Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID 107037)	18
1.20.2	Question by United Kingdom, Australia (AG-IMS ID 107002)	18
1.21	Canada's tariff rate quota for cheese (SIM 345)	18
1.21.1	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 107011)	18
1.22	China's grain subsidies (SIM 773)	18
1.22.1	Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID 107013)	18
1.23	EU's Deforestation and Forest Degradation Strategy (SIM 558)	19
1.23.1	Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID 107021)	19
1.23.2	Question by India (AG-IMS ID 107081)	19
1.24	India's Transport and Marketing Assistance (TMA) (SIM 515)	20
1.24.1	Question by Australia, Canada (AG-IMS ID 107039)	20
1.24.2	Question by United States of America, Australia (AG-IMS ID 107072)	20
1.25	India's national food security bill (SIM 319)	20
1.25.1	Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID 107120)	20
1.26	India's annex to DS notification pursuant to the Bali PSH Decision (SIM 852)	21
1.26.1	Question by United States of America, Japan (AG-IMS ID 107017)	21
1.26.2	Question by United States of America, Australia, Canada (AG-IMS ID 107022)	21
1.27	India's public stockpiling (SIM 525)	21
1.27.1	Question by United States of America, Australia, Canada, Japan (AG-IMS ID 107016)	21
1.28	India's export restriction measures on rice (SIM 767)	22
1.28.1	Question by United States of America, United Kingdom, Switzerland (AG-IMS ID 107020)	22
1.28.2	Question by Australia, Switzerland (AG-IMS ID 107025)	22
1.28.3	Question by Japan, Switzerland (AG-IMS ID 107121)	22
1.28.4	Question by Switzerland, United Kingdom (AG-IMS ID 107122)	22
1.29	India's export restrictions on wheat and rice (SIM 306)	23
1.29.1	Question by United Kingdom, Australia, Switzerland, Ukraine, Canada, Japan (AG-IMS ID 107075)	23
1.30	India's export restriction on sugar (SIM 420)	23
1.30.1	Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 107024)	23
1.31	India's export restrictions on onions (SIM 652)	23
1.31.1	Question by Australia, Switzerland (AG-IMS ID 107023)	23
1.31.2	Question by Canada, Switzerland (AG-IMS ID 107074)	23
1.32	India's export restrictions (SIM 306)	24

1.32.1 Question by United States of America, Australia, United Kingdom, Switzerland, Ukraine, Canada, Japan (AG-IMS ID 107019)	24
1.33 Japan-US Trade Agreement (SIM 564)	24
1.33.1 Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID 107123, 107136)	24
1.34 Korea's tariff policies (SIM 785)	25
1.34.1 Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID 107124)	25
1.35 Nigeria's import prohibitions on certain agricultural products and use of reference prices for customs valuation purposes (SIM 223).....	25
1.35.1 Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID 107125)	25
1.36 Panama's compliance with its domestic support commitments (SIM 758)	25
1.36.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 107126)	25
1.37 South Africa's import measures on poultry meat (SIM 807).....	25
1.37.1 Question by United Kingdom, United States of America (AG-IMS ID 107004)	25
1.38 Tajikistan's export ban on onions and other vegetables (SIM 808)	25
1.38.1 Question by Switzerland, Australia, United Kingdom (AG-IMS ID 107041)	25
1.39 Tanzania's export restriction on maize and onions (SIM 860)	25
1.39.1 Question by United Kingdom, Canada (AG-IMS ID 107073)	25
1.40 Thailand's corn farmer income guarantee scheme (SIM 861).....	26
1.40.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 107128)	26
1.41 Türkiye's export restrictions on agricultural products (SIM 729).....	26
1.41.1 Question by United Kingdom, Switzerland, Japan (AG-IMS ID 107133)	26
1.42 Türkiye's export restrictions on olive oil (SIM 703).....	26
1.42.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 107031)	26
1.43 UK's SSG entitlements (SIM 761).....	26
1.43.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID 107084)	26
1.44 United States' dairy policies (SIM 462).....	27
1.44.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID 107086)	27
1.45 U.S. Inflation Reduction Act (SIM 811).....	27
1.45.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 107032)	27
2 POINTS RAISED IN CONNECTION WITH INDIVIDUAL NOTIFICATIONS	28
2.1 IMPORTS UNDER TARIFF AND OTHER QUOTA COMMITMENTS (TABLE MA:2)	28
2.1.1 Ecuador (G/AG/N/ECU/58)	28
2.1.2 Ecuador (G/AG/N/ECU/70, G/AG/N/ECU/71, G/AG/N/ECU/72)	28
2.1.3 India (G/AG/N/IND/30)	29
2.1.4 Israel (G/AG/N/ISR/93)	29
2.1.5 Switzerland (G/AG/N/CHE/124)	29
2.2 SPECIAL AGRICULTURAL SAFEGUARDS (TABLES MA:3 to MA:5)	30
2.2.1 Chinese Taipei (G/AG/N/TPKM/227).....	30
2.2.2 European Union (G/AG/N/EU/86)	30
2.3 DOMESTIC SUPPORT COMMITMENTS (TABLE DS:1).....	30
2.3.1 Australia (G/AG/N/AUS/142, G/AG/N/AUS/157, G/AG/N/AUS/157/Rev.1)	30

2.3.2	Brazil (G/AG/N/BRA/74)	33
2.3.3	Canada (G/AG/N/CAN/158, G/AG/N/CAN/159)	33
2.3.4	China (G/AG/N/CHN/47)	35
2.3.5	Costa Rica (G/AG/N/CRI/88, G/AG/N/CRI/93)	33
2.3.6	Ecuador (G/AG/N/ECU/67, G/AG/N/ECU/68, G/AG/N/ECU/69)	35
2.3.7	India (G/AG/N/IND/29)	35
2.3.8	Japan (G/AG/N/JPN/282)	36
2.3.9	Kazakhstan (G/AG/N/KAZ/21, G/AG/N/KAZ/22, G/AG/N/KAZ/23)	37
2.3.10	New Zealand (G/AG/N/NZL/138)	38
2.3.11	Paraguay (G/AG/N/PRY/36)	38
2.3.12	Thailand (G/AG/N/THA/85)	39
2.3.13	United Kingdom (G/AG/N/GBR/11/Rev.1, G/AG/N/GBR/20)	39
2.3.14	United States of America (G/AG/N/USA/166/Rev.1, G/AG/N/USA/169)	40
2.3.15	Uruguay (G/AG/N/URY/81, G/AG/N/URY/82, G/AG/N/URY/83, G/AG/N/URY/84)	41
2.3.16	Viet Nam (G/AG/N/VNM/20)	43
2.4	NEW OR MODIFIED DOMESTIC SUPPORT MEASURES (TABLE DS:2)	45
2.4.1	Australia (G/AG/N/AUS/155, G/AG/N/AUS/155/Rev.1, G/AG/N/AUS/158)	45
2.4.2	Canada (G/AG/N/CAN/160)	45
2.4.3	Canada (G/AG/N/CAN/161)	49
2.4.4	European Union (G/AG/N/EU/88)	50
2.4.5	Nigeria (G/AG/N/NGA/27)	52
2.4.6	United States of America (G/AG/N/USA/170)	53
2.4.7	Uruguay (G/AG/N/URY/52)	53
2.5	EXPORT PROHIBITIONS AND RESTRICTIONS (TABLE ER:1)	53
2.5.1	Kazakhstan (G/AG/N/KAZ/27)	53
2.6	NOTIFICATIONS IN THE CONTEXT OF THE NFIDC DECISION (TABLE NF:1)	54
2.6.1	Canada (G/AG/N/CAN/154, G/AG/N/CAN/155, G/AG/N/CAN/156)	54
3	OVERDUE NOTIFICATIONS.....	54
3.1	Australia	54
3.2	Brazil.....	55
3.3	Canada	55
3.4	European Union.....	55
3.5	India	55
3.6	Thailand.....	55
4	DEFERRED REPLIES.....	56
4.1	MATTERS RELEVANT TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMITMENTS: ARTICLE 18.6	56
4.1.1	Angola's import policies (SIM 660)	56
4.1.1.1	Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 107044)	56
4.1.2	Australia, Canada, European Union, Iceland, Japan, New Zealand, United Kingdom, United States – Restrictions on agricultural and agriculture-related services (SIM 770)	57

4.1.2.1 Question by Russian Federation (AG-IMS ID 107036, 107046, 107049, 107053, 107056, 107058, 107065, 107068)	57
4.1.3 United Kingdom's banking and financial restrictions (SIM 810)	57
4.1.3.1 Question by Russian Federation (AG-IMS ID 107066)	57
4.1.4 Australia, Canada, New Zealand, United Kingdom, United States - Import duties in excess of the bound rates applied on agricultural goods (SIM 771)	57
4.1.4.1 Question by Russian Federation (AG-IMS ID 107045, 107047, 107062, 107067, 107069)	57
4.1.5 Burkina Faso's domestic support (SIM 845)	58
4.1.5.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 107008)	58
4.1.6 Canada, European Union, Iceland, Japan, New Zealand, Norway – Prohibitions and restrictions on agricultural machinery supplies (SIM 772)	58
4.1.6.1 Question by Russian Federation (AG-IMS ID 107048, 107050, 107054, 107059, 107064, 107060)	58
4.1.7 Cameroon's import substitution policy (SIM 846)	59
4.1.7.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 107009)	59
4.1.8 Côte d'Ivoire – Tax on imported spirits (SIM 649)	59
4.1.8.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 107118)	59
4.1.9 European Union, Iceland, Norway – Prohibitions on road freight transport (SIM 778)	59
4.1.9.1 Question by Russian Federation (AG-IMS ID 107051, 107055, 107061)	59
4.1.10 European Union, Iceland, Norway – Prohibitions on access to ports (SIM 782)	60
4.1.10.1 Question by Russian Federation (AG-IMS ID 107052, 107057, 107063)	60
4.1.11 India's rice sale under the Open Market Sale Scheme (SIM 471)	61
4.1.11.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 107028)	61
4.1.11.2 Question by United States of America, Canada (AG-IMS ID 107149)	61
4.1.12 India's annex to DS notification pursuant to the Bali PSH Decision (SIM 852)	61
4.1.12.1 Question by Australia, Canada (AG-IMS ID 107151)	61
4.1.12.2 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 107152)	61
4.1.12.3 Question by United States of America, Australia, Canada (AG-IMS ID 107018)	61
4.1.13 Tanzania's export restriction on maize (SIM 860)	62
4.1.13.1 Question by United States of America, United Kingdom (AG-IMS ID 107127)	62
4.1.14 Thailand's Paddy Pledging Scheme (SIM 313)	62
4.1.14.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID 107083)	62
4.1.15 Türkiye's increased import tariffs (SIM 833)	62
4.1.15.1 Question by United States of America, Canada (AG-IMS ID 107131)	62
4.1.16 Türkiye's freight support (SIM 730)	63
4.1.16.1 Question by United States of America, United Kingdom, Canada (AG-IMS ID 107130)	63
4.1.17 Türkiye's export restrictions on agricultural products (SIM 729)	63
4.1.17.1 Question by United States of America, United Kingdom, Switzerland, Japan (AG-IMS ID 107129)	63
4.1.18 United Arab Emirates - Rice export ban (SIM 862)	64
4.1.18.1 Question by United States of America, United Kingdom, Switzerland (AG-IMS ID 107134)	64

4.2	POINTS RAISED IN CONNECTION WITH INDIVIDUAL NOTIFICATIONS.....	64
4.2.1	DOMESTIC SUPPORT COMMITMENTS (TABLE DS:1)	64
4.2.1.1	Bangladesh (G/AG/N/BGD/5, G/AG/N/BGD/6, G/AG/N/BGD/7)	64
4.2.1.2	Burkina Faso (G/AG/N/BFA/20, G/AG/N/BFA/21, G/AG/N/BFA/22)	65
4.2.1.3	India (G/AG/N/IND/29).....	65

1 MATTERS RELEVANT TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMITMENTS: ARTICLE 18.6

NEW SPECIFIC IMPLEMENTATION MATTERS (SIM)

1.1 Australia - Farm Investment Loans programme (SIM 864)

1.1.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID [107076](#))

India notes that Australia has been running the Farm Investment Loans programme through the Regional Investment Corporation. India also notes from the official guidelines that the programme is used to provide loans to farm businesses that are in financial need of loans, especially if the farm business has been impacted by factors outside its control. The guidelines also mention that the program replaces and builds on other concessional loan schemes such as Farm Finance, Drought Recovery, Drought Assistance, Dairy Recovery, and Business Improvement Concessional loans.

Several regional initiatives continue to provide concessional loans for drought recovery and drought assistance. For example, Queensland provides Drought Ready and Recovery Finance Loans, and Drought Preparedness Grants and New South Wales also has several programs for payments related to disaster relief.

Refer to:

https://www.ric.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/20230807_Farm-Investment-Guidelines-v4.5_WEB_0.pdf, [Farm investment loan guidelines: loans for farm businesses \(ric.gov.au\)](https://www.ric.gov.au/farm-investment-loan-guidelines-loans-for-farm-businesses) and <https://www.agriculture.gov.au/agriculture-land/farm-food-drought/drought/assistance/ric>.

In this context, India requests Australia to provide details, as follows:

- a. What has been the total number of beneficiaries under the Farm Investment Loans programme, as on date?
- b. Whether the Farm Investment Loans operate alongside these other regional programmes to provide concessional loans?
- c. Further, in continuation of part (b), whether a farmer who has benefited from the Farm Investment Loan after demonstrating financial need (based on the damage suffered due to drought) under the guidelines, can avail the benefits under the other initiatives for drought assistance or recovery in operation, at the State level?

1.1.2 Question by India (AG-IMS ID [107077](#))

India notes that the eligibility criteria of the Farm Investment Loans program states that the loans are only available to "Farm businesses that solely or mainly supply, or intend to solely or mainly supply, products into supply chains that are interstate and/or outside Australia". The guidelines of the program also state that a business will be eligible for a Farm Investment Loan regardless of the mix between its actual or intended interstate and/or overseas sales, as long as the business demonstrates intent to supply outside the state or territory. (https://www.ric.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/20230807_Farm-Investment-Guidelines-v4.5_WEB_0.pdf). Thus, as per India's understanding, the purpose of the program is to provide credit to agricultural exporters in Australia.

In this context, India seeks the following details:

- a. As the loans under the program have a repayment term of 5-10 years, with only repayments on interests to be made for the first five years, could Australia state how the repayment terms under this program comply with Para 15(a) of the Nairobi Ministerial Decision, 2015?
- b. How is Australia ensuring that this export-contingent programme is compliant with Australia's commitments under the AoA, the Nairobi Ministerial Decision on Export Competition (2015) and the Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures?

1.2 Canada - Dairy Innovation and Investment Fund (SIM 865)

1.2.1 Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID [107010](#))

New Zealand notes that the Canadian government has launched a new CAD 333 million 'Dairy Innovation and Investment Fund' to "help the Canadian dairy sector increase its competitiveness and adapt to new market realities" through providing Canadian dairy processors funding to "increase solids non-fat processing capacity" in order to "better manage the structural surplus of solids non-fat in Canada" (press release [here](#)). Could Canada please provide some additional information regarding this programme:

- a. How large is Canada's surplus solids non-fat in total, in each of the past five years?
- b. What additional solids non-fat processing capacity - which products, and in what volumes - does Canada expect or aim for this Fund to deliver?
- c. Will additional production be consumed domestically, or could it lead to an increase in exports of Canada's structural surplus of solids non-fat onto the global market?
 - i. The Dairy Innovation and Investment Fund 'Applicant Guide' ([here](#)) notes that to be eligible, applicants must "demonstrate there is a market for all milk components", and the Project Application Package requires "copies of dairy product(s) market studies" if available - "for example, marketing plans identifying the products being sold and targeted market segments". Will Canada approve funding for projects that identify exports as a targeted market?
 - ii. If so, what increase in exports of solids non-fat could this Fund lead to or support? What products, and in what volumes? Will Canada report such exports supported by this government subsidy?
- d. Will this Fund, and its subsidies for new solids non-fat processing capacity, lead to an increase or permit an increase in exports of Canada's structural surplus of solids non-fat onto the global market? If so, what products and in what volumes?
- e. How will this Fund interrelate with Canada's Milk Class System solids non-fat pricing, e.g. Class 4(a) and Special Milk Classes 5(b) and 5(c)? New Zealand notes that the cumulative effect of subsidising additional processing capacity of solids non-fat under this Fund and providing special (cross-subsidised?) pricing for the purchase of solids non-fat under such Milk Classes could have a significant impact on trade.

1.3 Costa Rica's rice policy (SIM 866)

1.3.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID [107014](#))

Costa Rica's use of market price support, followed by its use of reference prices, to manipulate rice prices domestically for both producers and consumers have been a long-standing concern in this Committee. However, it is welcome news that on 3 August 2022, the Government of Costa Rica signed two Decrees (38884-MEIC and 39763 MAG-MEIC-COMEX), which repealed the rice reference prices. Further, the MFN tariff on paddy rice was reduced from 35% to 4.5% and milled rice was reduced from 35% to 5%.

It is understood that these actions were amongst the first actions taken under the "Rice Path", which was developed by an inter-institutional team that included the Vice President and Ministers of agriculture, economy, and foreign trade. For purposes of experience sharing amongst Members:

- a. Please describe the policy changes undertaken by Costa Rica.
- b. Please explain why these changes were undertaken.

1.4 Costa Rica's support to micro, small and medium-sized producers (SIM 867)

1.4.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID [107080](#))

In ([WT/TPR/S/392](#)), it is stated that Costa Rica provides domestic support to the micro, small and medium-sized producers through the Institutional Supply Programme, which the National Production Council (CNP) implements, to meet the food supply needs of State institutions. The latter are obliged by law to acquire these supplies through direct procurement, via the CNP, which must ensure that supplies are produced by micro, small and medium-sized agricultural and agro-industrial producers and national fisheries.

In this regard, India would like to seek information on the following:

- a. At what prices does the National Production Council (CNP) procure food supplies from the micro, small and medium-sized agricultural and agro-industrial producers and national fisheries?
- b. What items are included in "food supplies" under the Institutional Supply Program?
- c. What are the eligibility criteria for the micro, small and medium-sized agricultural and agro-industrial producers and national fisheries to participate in this programme?
- d. Is the above-mentioned programme still in operation?

1.5 Egypt's export restriction on onions (SIM 868)

1.5.1 Question by United Kingdom, United States of America, Switzerland, Canada (AG-IMS ID [107003](#))

Media reporting indicates that Egypt have applied an export restriction on onions. Could Egypt please clarify if this is correct? If an export restriction on onions has been applied, could Egypt please confirm:

- a. The nature of this measure and its intended duration?
- b. What consideration has been given to the potential effects of this measure on importing Members' food security, in accordance with Article 12.1(a) of the Agreement on Agriculture?
- c. Whether Egypt plans to submit an ER:1 notification for this measure?

1.6 France's new livestock support package (SIM 869)

1.6.1 Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID [107038](#))

The French Court of Auditors, Cour de Comptes, in a report (OBSERVATIONS DÉFINITIVES) published on 22 May 2023, entitled "Les soutiens publics aux éleveurs de bovins", considered the economic model of French livestock farming to be fragile, as its viability depended on the "high level of public support". The report characterizes the sector as the most heavily subsidized in the country, with support of EUR 4.3 billion a year. The Court of Auditors recommends pursuing the goal of reducing the country's cattle herd, including converting producers to other crops. The report is available at:

<https://www.ccomptes.fr/fr/publications/les-soutiens-publics-aux-eleveurs-de-bovins>

For his part, the Minister for Agriculture and Food Sovereignty, Marc Fesneau, on the occasion of the Livestock Summit in Clermont-Ferrand (2-4 October), announced a new support package for the sector, exemptions and direct payments of more than EUR 30 million, as well as financing lines of around EUR 400 million.

Given the high level of tariff protection (with mixed MFN tariffs of up to 12.8% plus specific tariffs that can exceed EUR 3,000/tonne for beef cuts) and non-tariff protection (such as the anti-deforestation legislation that is about to come into force), how does France believe that granting additional support to its livestock sector is in line with the best trade practices pursued in this Organization, and how does it contribute to greater global efficiency in the use of financial/natural resources and to the transition to more sustainable models of production and consumption?

1.7 Morocco's vegetable and fertilizer subsidies (SIM 870)

1.7.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID [107030](#))

The Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries of Morocco, announced that the Government will, for the first time ever, subsidize the production of tomatoes, onions, and potatoes, by 50 to 70% of their value, due to the "high price" of the seeds.

In the House of Representatives, he stated that tomato production would be subsidized with 40,000 to 70,000 dirhams (between 3,600 and 6,300 euros) per hectare, potato production with 8,000 to 15,000 dirhams (between 720 and 1,300 euros) per hectare, and onion production with 4,000 to 5,000 dirhams (between 360 and 450 euros) per hectare.

The government will also provide 600,000 tonnes of phosphate fertilizers for the coming season and subsidize the import of nitrogen fertilizers with 2.2 billion dirhams (EUR 200 million).

Seddiki recalled four consecutive years of drought, rising cultivation costs, and the earthquake that struck several provinces last month.

- a. Could Morocco confirm this information and provide the legal acts?
- b. When these payments are scheduled to take place, already in 2023 or as of 2024?

According to the latest data published by the specialised portal **EastFruit, between July 2022 and June 2023, Morocco exported a total of 716,700 tonnes of tomatoes** to international markets, representing a revenue of **990 million dollars**.

Fresh tomatoes are also **among the top 10 products exported by Morocco**. According to data from the **2022 Annual Report on Foreign Trade, prepared by the Moroccan Bureau de Change**, exports of fresh tomatoes accounted for 2.4% of the total in 2022, with an increase of 35% over the previous year's figure. More than half of the export of tomatoes go to the EU member States. The EU fears that the announced subsidies (for tomatoes, onions and potatoes producers) would lead to further increases in the production and exports of those goods which might unfairly increase the competitive advantage of Moroccan producers vis-à-vis EU producers and have an impact on the EU market in terms of prices and profitability as Morocco is a major supplier (e.g. Morocco has an estimated market share of 8% of total apparent consumption in the EU for tomatoes). Moreover, subsidies linked to production, tend to reduce incentives for producers to boost efficiency and more sustainable agriculture.

- c. Could Morocco provide an estimation of the total hectares used for tomatoes and onions growing between 2020 and 2022?
- d. What kind of tomatoes are targeted by the measure? What is the proportion of tomatoes for export that will benefit from the aid?
- e. What are the criteria and conditions for receiving this type of subsidy?
- f. What is the expectation in terms of take-up of this measure in terms of number of farmers, production and surface for the three crops mentioned?
- g. What is the percentage as compared to the total figures for the three crops?
- h. What is the average level of the aid compared to the total costs incurred by farmers and or total turnover for the three crops mentioned?

- i. How would Morocco notify this type of support in their DS:1 notification? The last DS:1 notification from Morocco is from 2012.
- j. As concerns the news on the fertilisers that: *The government will also provide 600,000 tonnes of phosphate fertilizers for the coming season and subsidize the import of nitrogen fertilizers with 2.2 billion dirhams (EUR 200 million)*, the EU wonders whether Morocco has reflected on alternative approaches which could result in more sustainable use of fertilisers and pesticides thereby limiting soil degradation and other negative environmental impacts.

1.8 Morocco's export restriction on olive oil (SIM 871)

1.8.1 Question by United Kingdom, United States of America, Switzerland, Canada, Japan (AG-IMS ID [107005](#))

Media reporting indicates Morocco have applied an export restriction on olive oil. Assuming this reporting is accurate, could Morocco please confirm:

- a. The nature and intended duration of this measure?
- b. What consideration Morocco has given to the effects of this measure on importing Members in line with Article 12.1(a) of the Agreement on Agriculture?
- c. Whether Morocco will be submitting an ER:1 notification for this measure?

1.9 Myanmar's export restriction on rice (SIM 872)

1.9.1 Question by United Kingdom, Canada (AG-IMS ID [107006](#))

Media reporting indicates that Myanmar have introduced an export restriction on rice. We understand this is, in part, in response to export restrictive measures being introduced by others. If this reporting is correct, could Myanmar please clarify:

- a. The background and rationale, including any market analysis used to inform the decision taken on the imposition of this restriction?
- b. The nature and intended duration of this measure?
- c. If Myanmar plans to submit an ER:1 notification to the Committee on Agriculture?

1.10 New Zealand - Productive and Sustainable Land Use Programme (SIM 873)

1.10.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID [107082](#))

India notes that the Ministry of Primary Industries (MPI) offers Farming Funds and programs under its 'Funding and Rural Support' initiative. Farming Funds and programme provides a package named 'Productive and Sustainable Land Use' (PSLU). This package aims to promote farm land-use practices that deliver more value and improved environmental outcomes. Work of this programme is said to incorporate supporting market access and export systems through protecting high-value food exports.

(<https://www.mpi.govt.nz/funding-rural-support/farming-funds-and-programmes/productive-and-sustainable-land-use/>)

In this regard,

- a. How does New Zealand classify this measure?
- b. Has the measure been notified in its DS notification?

- c. What has been the total expenditure under the programme in the most recent year?
- d. The MPI New Zealand website states that the programme is also aimed at protecting high-value exports. Could New Zealand clarify what protection is being advanced to the exports and what is the quantum of expenditure under PSLU dedicated to protecting high-value exports?
- e. What products are classified as high-value exports for PSLU?

1.11 Türkiye's transport tax on imported goods (SIM 874)

1.11.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID [107132](#))

In Presidential Decree 7708, dated 15 October 2023, it is stated that various levels of "an additional financial liabilities... shall be imposed... along with the import duty" on various HS tariff lines (or customs tariff statistics positions [GTIP]) under Chapter 08.

In Presidential Decree 4107, dated 22 June 2020, it is stated that various levels of "an additional financial liabilities ... shall be imposed... along with the import duty" on various HS tariff lines (or customs tariff statistics positions [GTIP]) under Chapters 07, 08, 09, 12, 18, 19, and 20.

In Presidential Decree 2818, dated 5 August 2020, it is stated that various levels of "a mass housing fund surcharge... shall be imposed... along with the import duty" on various HS tariff lines (or customs tariff statistics positions [GTIP]) under Chapters 07, 08, 09, and 12.

For all tariff items in Türkiye's Goods Schedule, Türkiye has bound "other duties and charges" at non-zero rates for all items except for those marked "free". This includes taxes of 4% applied to imports arriving by maritime transport and 3% for imports arriving by road, rail, or air transport. However, information was not available on whether these taxes are still levied according to the *WTO Trade Policy Review Secretariat Report* ([WT/TPR/S/439](#)).

- a. Please clarify whether Türkiye still imposes an additional transport tax on imported goods?
- b. If so, is the tax applied for all items not marked as 'free'. If not, could Türkiye list the HS lines for which the tax applies?
- c. The various Presidential Decrees cited above indicate additional duties or charges that are imposed on various agricultural imports into Türkiye.
- d. Please clarify whether each of the identified charges applied along with the import duty is applied only for imported goods or if the charge is paid by importers and domestic producers alike.
- e. If the charges are paid only by importers, please explain whether these charges are included as part of Türkiye's MFN tariff rate. If so, please explain how Türkiye ensures these additional charges do not result in Türkiye exceeding its bound MFN tariff rate.
- f. If these charges are only applied for imported goods, please explain how these charges align with Türkiye's Goods Schedule.
- g. What is the difference between "additional financial liabilities" and "mass housing fund surcharges"?
- h. What was the basis for identifying the agricultural products covered in each Presidential decree?
- i. What was the reason for changing the charges from "an additional financial liabilities" to "a mass housing fund surcharge"?
- j. Why are some countries exempted from the charges or assessed lower charges?

1.12 U.S. food security programmes (SIM 875)

1.12.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID [107033](#))

In September 2023, US has announced that the United States is investing USD 455 million to strengthen global food security and international capacity-building efforts. The investment will utilize more than 375,000 metric tonnes of U.S. commodities.

The commodities in the Food for Progress programme will be sold in local and regional markets and proceeds will help strengthen short- and long-term food security through development of agricultural value chains and trade-promoting activities. Prior to investing in a project, USDA conducts numerous analyses to ensure that local production and markets will not be impacted, and U.S. commercial interests will not be affected.

The EU is interested to receive more details on the analyses conducted by the US in order to ensure that those programmes would not have a negative impact on the local markets.

While appraising the efforts of the US against the global hunger and food insecurity, the EU is also concerned by the continued use of in-kind food aid by the US, as well as the monetization of international food aid, which may be counter-productive in the efforts to improve local agricultural value chains.

- a. Is there an assessment available as to whether the commodities under the Food for Progress programme will all be monetised or only in case when there is a demonstrable need for such monetisation?
- b. Has the US considered to procure international food aid from local or regional sources instead of utilizing US commodities?
- c. The EU is looking forward to see the allocation tables for FY 2024 once available as announced by the USDA (fas.usda.gov/topics/food-security).

1.13 U.S. Regional Agriculture Promotion Program (SIM 876)

1.13.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID [107085](#))

In a press release No. 0215.23, dated 24 October 2023, Agriculture Secretary Tom Vilsack announced that the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) is providing USD 2.3 billion to help American producers maintain and develop markets for their commodities and use U.S. commodities to bolster international food aid. The USDA will use USD 1.3 billion for the Regional Agricultural Promotion Program and support for specialty crop industries to diversify export markets and USD 1 billion to help address global hunger.

In this context, India with an intent to understand the Regional Agriculture Promotion Program better, requests the US to respond to the following:

- a. What are the specialty crops covered in this Program?
- b. What are the eligibility criteria to claim support under the Program?
- c. The press release states that in 2018 USDA developed the Agricultural Trade Promotion Program (ATP) to help exporters diversify their markets. The funds from ATP will expire next year and with that, many exporters are already curtailing their activities. Has the US Notified the ATP support? If yes, please provide the details.

1.13.2 Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID [107135](#))

New Zealand understands that the US has introduced a Regional Agricultural Trade Promotion Program for USD 1.3 billion and has further dedicated an additional USD 1 billion to commodity-based international food aid.

Could the United States please:

- a. Provide an outline of how the Regional Agricultural Trade Promotion Program will operate?
- b. Explain how and when both programmes will be notified to this Committee?
- c. And, finally, give details regarding what form the international food aid will take.

SPECIFIC IMPLEMENTATION MATTERS (SIM) RAISED PREVIOUSLY

1.14 Argentina's export restrictions (SIM 710)

1.14.1 Question by United Kingdom, Canada, United States of America, Switzerland, Japan (AG-IMS ID [107001](#))

We thank Argentina for their response to AG-IMS ID [106006](#). This does not replace Argentina's obligation to provide an ER:1 table to this Committee. Could Argentina please confirm when they will submit this notification?

1.15 Brazil's Plano Safra programme (SIM 842)

1.15.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID [107034](#))

The EU has taken note of the reply of Brazil to its question AG-IMS ID [106069](#) at the 106th CoA session concerning Plano Safra and its relation to the requirements of the Nairobi Decision on Export Competition. From the reply provided by Brazil it is not clear that credit lines available for Brazilian farmers can not be used as export financing.

The EU would like Brazil to confirm that none of the available credit lines within Plano Safra are contingent on exports of agricultural products.

1.15.2 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID [107035](#))

In its reply to question AG-IMS ID [106070](#) at the 106th CoA Brazil claimed that access to favourable interest rates under Plano Safra is not conditional upon the use of Brazilian materials, and requested the EU to indicate where the information of such conditionality was found.

The EU would like to inform Brazil, that the information comes from the webpage of [BNDES - O banco nacional do desenvolvimento](#). And more precisely:

The programme "moderfrota" (direct page Moderfrota – Programa de Modernização da Frota de Tratores Agrícolas e Implementos Associados e Colheitadeiras ([bndes.gov.br](#)) gives information on the financing of tractors and harvesters. If you click on "O que pode ser financiado", the following statement appears: Os bens devem ser credenciados pelo BNDES ou importados sem similar nacional, com a devida comprovação.

Another example is the PCA. (direct page PCA - Programa para Construção e Ampliação de Armazéns ([bndes.gov.br](#)) gives information on the financing of irrigation. Similarly, it is necessary to click on "o que pode ser financiado" and the same mention appears.

Finally, on another page of the BNDES, concerning the Pronaf (familiar agriculture) Pronaf - itens financiáveis ([bndes.gov.br](#)), the following details appear:

Máquinas e equipamentos

1. Itens novos: produzidos no Brasil, que constem da relação da Secretaria Especial de Agricultura Familiar e do Desenvolvimento Agrário, observando a descrição mínima e valor máximo de cada item; constem da relação do Credenciamento de Fornecedores Informatizado (CFI) do BNDES; atendam aos parâmetros relativos aos índices mínimos de nacionalização definidos nos normativos do BNDES aplicáveis ao Finame; e tenham até 80 CV de potência, quando se tratar de tratores e

motocultivadores; observado, por fim, que o plano, projeto ou orçamento deve conter o código do MDA e do CFI do BNDES, referente ao item a ser adquirido;

2. itens novos produzidos no Brasil não credenciados: que não constem da relação da da Secretaria Especial de Agricultura Familiar e do Desenvolvimento Agrário e da relação do CFI do BNDES, até o limite de crédito de R\$ 10 mil por item financiado; salvo ordenhadeiras e seus componentes, que devem constar da relação de CFI do BNDES, mesmo quando de valor inferior igual ou inferior a R\$ 10 mil;

3. itens usados: de valor financiado de até R\$ 200 mil por beneficiário final quando se tratar de colheitadeira automotriz, e de R\$ 96 mil para os demais casos, fabricados no Brasil, revisados e com certificado de garantia emitido por concessionária ou revenda autorizada. O certificado de garantia pode ser substituído por laudo de avaliação emitido pelo responsável técnico do projeto atestando a fabricação nacional, o perfeito funcionamento, o bom estado de conservação e que a vida útil estimada da máquina ou equipamento é superior ao prazo de reembolso do financiamento.

4. Itens novos importados: desde que não haja fabricação no Brasil de itens com a mesma função atestada no plano, projeto ou orçamento, exclusivamente para apoio por meio das Linhas PRONAF Mais Alimentos e PRONAF Agroindústria. A comprovação de inexistência de similar nacional deverá ser realizada por meio dos documentos exigidos pelo produto BNDES Automático, os quais deverão ser mantidos no dossiê da operação.

Can Brazil explain how the condition upon the use of Brazilian materials complies with paragraph 4 of Article III of GATT 1994 in the light of paragraph 1 (a) of the Annex to the TRIMS agreement?

1.16 Brazil's new programme to restore pastureland (SIM 843)

1.16.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID [107007](#))

In response to AG-IMS ID [106021](#), Brazil stated that some programme design aspects of its newly announced programme to restore pastureland with funding of up to USD 120 billion were still being defined and that more information could be provided in the future.

- a. Is Brazil able to now provide further information regarding this programme?
- b. If so, please provide further information regarding this programme.
- c. If so, please describe if and how environmental and social gains accruing from this programme will be measured.
- d. If not, please provide further details with regards to the timeline for the development of this programme and when it is scheduled to be fully implemented.

1.17 Canada's Dairy Policies (SIM 594)

1.17.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID [107078](#))

India understands from Canada's response to AG-IMS ID [106134](#), that the Dairy Direct Payments Program is aimed at "the transition to a new market environment as a result of the market access concessions Canada has made in recent trade agreements, and to support the industry in mitigating these impacts". According to Canada's statement, these market access concessions include concessions made under the CETA, CPTPP, and CUSMA.

India thanks Canada for its response to AGIMS ID 106134, however, the details about the economic methodology used by Canada are still awaited to understand the determination of the quantum of payments under the Dairy Direct Payments, to specifically assess the impact of the three above-mentioned Free Trade Agreements.

1.18 Canada's Advanced Payments Program (SIM 847)

1.18.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID [107079](#))

Canada runs the Advance Payments Program (APP) as a federal loan guarantee programme that provides agricultural producers with easy access to low-cost cash advances. A cash advance for the purpose of this program is calculated based on up to 50% of the anticipated market value of the eligible agricultural products that are being produced or that are held in storage. (<https://agriculture.canada.ca/en/programs/advance-payments>)

In this regard, India requests Canada to answer the following:

- a. Canada stated in its reply to AGIMS ID 106136 part (c) "Since the APP constitutes non-product specific support provided in favour of agricultural producers in general, the share of expenditures for sheep and beef is unavailable". If the support is non-product specific in nature, then how APP payments are calculated based on the anticipated market value of eligible products?
- b. In light of Part (a) could Canada provide the anticipated market value determined for certain eligible products such as sheep, cattle, and foodgrains?
- c. Further, based on determined anticipated market values for eligible products mentioned in part (b), could Canada share the total expenditure on each eligible product out of the APP budget?
- d. The eligibility criteria of the APP states that 'the majority of agricultural products are eligible for an APP advance'. India also notes "Livestock that has been sent for slaughter, animals under supply management (for example, dairy cows and poultry), and breeding animals that are not intended for the market during the production period are **not eligible** under the program". Canada may please provide a list of other agricultural products which are not eligible for the APP advances?

1.19 Canada's Special Milk Class Scheme (SIM 26)

1.19.1 Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID [107012](#))

New Zealand thanks Canada for directing New Zealand to the Canadian Dairy Information Centre (CDIC) for information on Canadian exports of dairy products.

New Zealand notes, however, that Canada's "Canadian Dairy Exports" data on the CDIC website ([here](#)) provides export data at the HS8-digit level for most dairy exports, but it does not do so for certain products which Canada's customs tariff, and Canada's MA:2 notifications to the WTO, outline as dairy products, or contain high levels of dairy content. For example in subheadings HS3054.00 and 1901.90:

- Canada's customs tariff specifies that "*Milk protein substances with a milk protein content of 85% or more by weight, calculated on the dry matter, are classified in tariff item No. 3504.00.11 or 3504.00.12*" (Chapter 35 Supplementary Note 1, p457, [here](#)).
 - Further, Canada's customs tariff specifies, for example, that 1901.90.53/54 and 1901.90.33/34 are for "food preparations of goods of headings 04.01 to 04.04", containing "50% or more on a dry weight basis of milk solids" and "more than 10% but less than 50% on a dry weight basis of milk solids" respectively.
 - These codes are also specified in Canada's MA:2 notifications setting out Canada's dairy quotas ([link](#)): TQ ID CANQ022 "Milk Protein Substances" and CANQ014 "Other Dairy".
- a. New Zealand notes that for these products, Canada only publishes data at the HS6-digit level (3504.00 and 1901.90). Could Canada please provide export data at the 8-digit level within these subheadings for transparency?

In the absence of published 8-digit data to date, New Zealand notes the HS6-digit data published by Statistics Canada, available on the CDIC website ([here](#)), and replicated on the Global Trade Atlas,

demonstrates that Canada's exports of these products have increased sharply over the past five calendar years (2018-2022):

- HS3504.00 export volumes have increased by 369% (from 4,758 tonnes to 22,331 tonnes), and
- HS 1901.90 export volumes have increased by 178% (from 65,025 tonnes to 180,957 tonnes).
- In both cases, this is a historical peak in Canada's exports of these HS subheadings, which as noted above in question 1 can contain high levels of dairy content.

This would suggest that there has in fact been a sharp increase in Canada's overall dairy exports in recent years, when taking into account dairy containing exports under these subheadings.

- b. Can Canada please comment on this, and provide information to help Members understand the reasons for such an increase?

1.20 Canada's Review of the TRQ System (SIM 536)

1.20.1 Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID [107037](#))

In reference to question AG-IMS ID [105024](#), Brazil would like to refer to the recent approval of Bill C-282 in the House of Commons by a comfortable margin, with prospects that the bill could become law in the coming weeks. This piece of legislation excludes products covered by the "supply management system" from possible trade negotiations and, thus, from any form of facilitating access to the Canadian market.

Considering the possible impairment of the Canadian Government's capability to fulfill its commitments under the Uruguay Round, notably the balance in each Member's concessions between the areas of industrial and agricultural goods, services and TRIPS, crowned by the principle of "single undertaking", are there plans to question the validity of Bill C-282 in case of parliamentary approval?

1.20.2 Question by United Kingdom, Australia (AG-IMS ID [107002](#))

We note Canada's response to AG-IMS ID [106007](#). Please could Canada clarify the remaining steps that need to be completed in order for them to conclude their TRQ review, and when the outcomes from the review will be available to WTO Members?

1.21 Canada's tariff rate quota for cheese (SIM 345)

1.21.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID [107011](#))

Is Canada considering proportionately reallocating its WTO tariff rate quota (TRQ) for cheese back to the MFN quota allocation for non-EU exporters to reflect the exit of the United Kingdom from the EU in 2020?

1.22 China's grain subsidies (SIM 773)

1.22.1 Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID [107013](#))

In light of the responses China has provided to previous questions asked by Canada in AG-IMS IDs [104105](#), [105028](#), [105029](#), and [106073](#), as well as in AG-IMS IDs [105025](#) and [106074](#), Canada would like to follow up in the hope of receiving comprehensive and complete answers.

In response to Canada's questions in AG-IMS ID 104105, 105028, 105029, and 106073 on how China's Blue Box measures for rice in husk ([G/AG/N/CHN/66](#)) and corn and soybeans ([G/AG/N/CHN/67](#)) are production-limiting, China stated that "the signal of production limit was released". Could China provide official publications that would include details of programme eligibility criteria, conditions, mechanisms or policy tools that have the effect of limiting the production of these commodities (e.g., production quotas), and that demonstrate that production needs to be limited for producers to receive Blue Box payments?

Furthermore, China has yet to provide detailed responses to questions in AG-IMS ID 105025 and 106074. Canada would appreciate full and detailed responses for each of these questions.

With respect to key beef/cattle sector information, China indicated that "the current statistical system of Chinese central government makes it difficult to count support measures of local governments. There is no further information to be provided." In this regard, Canada would like to seek the following clarifications:

- a. Could China confirm whether the current statistical system's difficulties in obtaining local/provincial measures applies to all commodity sectors including beef and cattle?
- b. In light of the difficulties encountered by the central government's statistical system, could China confirm whether it has included and accounted for all local/provincial domestic support measures in its domestic support notifications, as per paragraph 3 of Annex 3 of the Agreement on Agriculture?
- c. If not, could China provide information on steps and approaches it is taking to address this issue?

1.23 EU's Deforestation and Forest Degradation Strategy (SIM 558)

1.23.1 Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID [107021](#))

Following up on question AG-IMS ID [106010](#), to which the European Union replied it hoped "to turn this regulation into an opportunity", Brazil should emphasize that agricultural exports represented 47.6% of the country's total exports in 2022, when the commodities potentially impacted by the UEDR correspond to more than 60% of this value.

There is much concern about potential disruption in international trade by December 2024, with halted flows, not for non-compliance, but simply because there is no agreed means of proving compliance. In the meantime, countries that have already consumed their native vegetation in the past will be in an advantageous position to gain market share in a highly competitive environment, with possible tectonic shifts in global trade, derived from an unilateral, discriminatory and rushed piece of legislation. In this regard, Brazil demands that the European Union indicate precisely in the UEDR and the respective implementing acts:

- a. the cooperation mechanisms raised in the response under consideration, which seem to motivate optimism about the effects of the legislation, given the order of commercial importance it represents for Brazil and other Members of this Committee, recalling that the cooperation mechanisms indicated in the response to question AG-IMS ID [105034](#) are non-specific;
- b. provisions against disruptive effects on the global market for the commodities indicated, in the event of imbalances in the initial phase of implementation.

1.23.2 Question by India (AG-IMS ID [107081](#))

In response to AG-IMS ID [106140](#), the EU stated that the rules are designed to ensure that products sold in the EU from any country, including the EU member States, comply with the same requirements in terms of preventing deforestation. However, the benchmarking system established by the regulation imposes different due diligence obligations on operators from high-risk and low-risk countries.

Further, for a measure to be justified under Article XX of the GATT 1994, the measure should also satisfy the requirements of the chapeau of the Article i.e., it is not applied in a manner that would constitute "a means of arbitrary or unjustifiable discrimination between countries where the same conditions prevail", and is not a "disguised restriction on international trade".

In this context, India reiterates its question and again requests the EU to explain how does the EU's measure justify the chapeau requirements of Article XX of the GATT 1994?

1.24 India's Transport and Marketing Assistance (TMA) (SIM 515)

1.24.1 Question by Australia, Canada (AG-IMS ID [107039](#))

Australia thanks India for its response to AG-IMS ID [106028](#). However, we note that India did not adequately answer the question. With regard to the Transport and Marketing Assistance (TMA) for Specified Agricultural Products Scheme:

- a. Please provide the following data for each year (2019 to present):
 - i. the total value of export subsidy provided, including breakouts by agricultural product or product group (please identify at the HS 6-digit level);
 - ii. the total quantity of subsidized exports; and
 - iii. the average subsidy rates.
- b. Please explain whether the TMA scheme has been extended after 31 March 2022. If the TMA is still in effect, please explain whether it will expire on 31 December 2023, in accordance with the Nairobi Decision.

1.24.2 Question by United States of America, Australia (AG-IMS ID [107072](#))

In AG-IMS ID [106028](#), we welcome the news that India is committed to eliminating all export subsidies by 31 December 2023. However, India did not respond to the question asked and therefore it is resubmitted.

As a follow up to AG-IMS IDs [95051](#) and [93010](#), it is noted that India's Department of Commerce introduced the "Transport and Marketing Assistance (TMA) for Specified Agriculture Products Scheme" to provide assistance for the international component of freight costs faced by Indian exporters of agriculture products. The scheme was in effect between 1 March 2019 and 31 March 2021. However, the Department notified a "Revised TMA for exports after 1 April 2021 to 31 March 2022." We note that major changes have been made in the revised TMA Scheme, such as the coverage of dairy products, which were not previously covered, and that rates of assistance were increased, by 50% for exports by sea and by 100% for exports by air.

- a. Please provide the following data for each year (2019 to present):
 - i. The total value of export subsidy provided, including breakouts by agricultural product or product group (please identify at the HS 6-digit code);
 - ii. The total quantity of subsidized exports; and
 - iii. The average subsidy rates.
- b. Please explain whether the TMA scheme has been extended after 31 March 2022. If the TMA is still in effect, please explain whether it will expire on 31 December 2023, in accordance with the Nairobi Ministerial Decision on Export Competition.

1.25 India's national food security bill (SIM 319)

1.25.1 Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID [107120](#))

On 5 November 2023, the Times of India (<https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/free-ration-scheme-to-be-extended-5-more-years-pm-modi/articleshow/104974993.cms?from=mdr>) reported that India had announced the extension of the PM Garib Kalyan Ann Yojna (PMGKAY) free foodgrains scheme, under the National Food Security Act (NFSA), for the next five years, with the intention to provide free foodgrain to 800 million poor people.

- a. Could India clarify whether procurement under the extended PMGKAY will be made at current market prices or through an applied administered price?
- b. If India's procurement of foodgrains under the extended PMGKAY will be made through an applied administered price, could India:
 - i. Clarify how the impact of this approach on its WTO domestic support commitments has been considered in its decision-making process?
 - ii. Provide the considerations that would make procurement at applied administered prices preferable to procurement at current market prices, considering the latter would minimize trade distortions while preserving its effectiveness?

1.26 India's annex to DS notification pursuant to the Bali PSH Decision (SIM 852)

1.26.1 Question by United States of America, Japan (AG-IMS ID [107017](#))

In response to AG-IMS ID [106029](#), India stated it was still collecting the requested information regarding how it calculates its public stockholding for food security expenditures; therefore, the question is being resubmitted.

In response to AG-IMS ID [105038](#), India stated it was not able at the time to provide details with regards to what the notified value under Annex 2, paragraph 3 includes and excludes as compared to "Total Food Subsidy" in the Government of India's Expenditure Budget for 2020-21 through 2023-24, or why the values for "Total Food Subsidy" were significantly larger than what was notified under Annex 2, paragraph 3.

- a. Is India in a position to provide the requested information in parts (a) and (b) of AG-IMS ID [105038](#)?
- b. Please indicate the data source and methodology for the notified value provided by India for "public stockholding for food security" in its domestic support notifications.

1.26.2 Question by United States of America, Australia, Canada (AG-IMS ID [107022](#))

In response to AG-IMS ID [106027](#) India stated "The information is not compiled in the requested form" with regards to information that is required as part of its response to 2.d of the Annex of the Bali Decision on Public Stockholding for Food Security Purposes.

Is India currently compiling the requested information?

1.27 India's public stockpiling (SIM 525)

1.27.1 Question by United States of America, Australia, Canada, Japan (AG-IMS ID [107016](#))

Dating back as far as 2015, Members have been asking India about state bonuses provided over the announced minimum support prices reported in Supporting Table DS:5, as well as in more recent years the Statistical Appendix ("f. Purchase prices").

When Members last inquired as to an update on the ability of India to provide information on state bonuses in March 2023 (AG-IMS ID [104021](#)), India stated, "The information is not available at the moment."

- a. Please provide Members an update on the gathering of this information that has been requested for many years and has yet to be appropriately included in India's domestic support notifications.

When Members inquired in AG-IMS ID [105050](#) about information on state bonuses in India's response to "f. Purchase Prices" in the Statistical Appendix, India stated, "India has duly

notified all the required information under the Bali Annex" for each of the three sub-questions.

- b. Please explain whether this response was solely related to India's position that only information on rice should be included in the Statistical Appendix per sub-question a) or if Members should understand India's response in the context of sub-question b) that India is of the opinion that the purchase prices, which in many years, for certain states, includes bonuses, are not required to be included in the Statistical Appendix.
- c. Please confirm that for sub-question c), India is not willing to share all of the data sources used to compile the Statistical Appendices in [G/AG/N/IND/29](#), [G/AG/N/IND/18/Corr.1](#), [G/AG/N/IND/25/Corr.1](#), and [G/AG/N/IND/27/Corr.1](#).

1.28 India's export restriction measures on rice (SIM 767)

1.28.1 Question by United States of America, United Kingdom, Switzerland (AG-IMS ID [107020](#))

In AG-IMS ID [106022](#), India noted that the quantity of non-basmati rice India considered to be for adequate availability varies "depending on various elements, including population size, agriculture production, food habits, demand & supply, natural calamities, and unforeseen pandemics." It is recognized that various factors could contribute to this quantity varying over time, but we remain interested in understanding India's assessment regarding "adequate availability of non-basmati white rice in the Indian market" at the time of the decision to impose an export ban on non-basmati rice. At the time of the decision there were various media reports indicating there were sufficient supplies to meet domestic demand. Further, USDA estimates of Indian rice production were 134 million tonnes in August 2023 and its estimates of Indian rice stocks were 36 million tonnes in 2023/24.

What quantity of public stocks of rice did India consider adequate for domestic needs at the time this export restriction was put in place?

1.28.2 Question by Australia, Switzerland (AG-IMS ID [107025](#))

Australia thanks India for its response to question AG-IMS ID [106022](#) and has a follow-up question relating to its export restrictions on non-basmati white rice. We appreciate the need for India to ensure domestic food security, however, we are aware of media reporting that rice stocks are exceeding Government targets by millions of metric tonnes (<https://www.reuters.com/markets/commodities/indias-november-rice-stocks-state-warehouses-around-double-target-2023-11-08/>).

We would like to again question India on the quantity of public stocks required to ensure domestic needs are met?

1.28.3 Question by Japan, Switzerland (AG-IMS ID [107121](#))

Japan thanks India for its replies to our questions raised at the previous COA meeting, AG-IMS IDs [106001](#), [106003](#), [106004](#) and [106005](#).

Japan is of the view that it is problematic, despite advance notifications are clearly stipulated in the Article 12 of the Agreement on Agriculture, not only advance notifications but also the notifications themselves have not been made for the cases of many export restrictions that have been introduced by WTO Members. Japan would like to listen to India's view about the fact that India has not submitted ER:1 notification even for the ongoing export restrictions on non-basmati white rice, broken rice, etc.

1.28.4 Question by Switzerland, United Kingdom (AG-IMS ID [107122](#))

Switzerland notes that India has announced an export quota for non-basmati white rice for several countries after imposing a ban on this commodity in July 2023.

- a. Can India indicate which countries have been granted an export quota for non-Basmati white rice and the respective export volumes?
- b. How many requests for export of non-Basmati white rice has India received since the ban was imposed and how many of these requests have resulted in exports?
- c. On what basis does India decide whether or not to grant a requesting country an export quota for non-Basmati white rice?

1.29 India's export restrictions on wheat and rice (SIM 306)

1.29.1 Question by United Kingdom, Australia, Switzerland, Ukraine, Canada, Japan (AG-IMS ID [107075](#))

The United Kingdom notes India's responses provided in AG-IMS IDs [106008](#), [106011](#), [106037](#); in particular that the relevant measures are intended to be 'temporary' and are being reviewed from 'time-to-time'. Notwithstanding this, we would again request that India submit their ER:1 notifications covering the relevant measures, in line with their obligations under Article 12 1.b. of the Agreement on Agriculture.

1.30 India's export restriction on sugar (SIM 420)

1.30.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID [107024](#))

Australia thanks India for its response to question AG-IMS ID [103091](#) and has a follow-up question relating to its export restrictions on sugar.

On 18 October 2023 the Indian government issued Notification No. 36/2023-Customs to extend the date for restrictions on export of sugar beyond the previously notified expiration date of 31 October 2023, with no end date specified.

Noting Article 12, paragraph 1(b), of the Agreement on Agriculture, which states that Members shall specify the duration of export restrictions, could India please inform the Membership of the expected duration of this export restriction?

1.31 India's export restrictions on onions (SIM 652)

1.31.1 Question by Australia, Switzerland (AG-IMS ID [107023](#))

Australia thanks India for its response to question AG-IMS ID [106005](#) and has a follow-up question relating to onion exports. On 28 October 2023, the Indian government issued the Notification No. 42/2023-Customs (<https://content.dgft.gov.in/Website/dgftprod/d73aebd9-ab58-4652-8987-607fa0cc69ef/DGFT%20Notification%20No%2042-2023%20dated%2028.10.2023-ENGLISH.pdf>) to impose a minimum export price on onions of USD 800 per metric tonne.

- a. Noting that in the first six months of 2023, according to trade statistics compiled by the Ministry of Commerce and Industry of India, the monthly export price of onions averaged approximately USD 207 per metric tonne. Could India please explain how it has given consideration to the effects of the measure on importing Members' food security given that only onions valued at four times the average export price will be eligible for export?
- b. Could India also explain its reasoning for the selection of a minimum export price as the appropriate measure to control exports rather than quantitative restrictions or prohibitions?

1.31.2 Question by Canada, Switzerland (AG-IMS ID [107074](#))

On 28 October 2023, India announced the imposition of a minimum export price (MEP) of USD 800 FOB per metric tonne on its export of onions (Tariff items 0703 10 10 and 0712 20 00), effective from 29 October 2023 until 31 December 2023 (Directorate General of Foreign Trade

notification No.42/2023). Previously, co-sponsors of AG-IMS ID [106005](#) also raised questions with respect to India's imposition of a 40% export duty on India's exports of onions (sub-heading 0703 10), effective since 19 August 2023, until 31 December 2023 (Department of Revenue No. 48/2023).

- a. Could India provide its rationale for imposing a MEP on its exports of onions?
- b. Could India confirm whether the export duty measure on onions is still in effect?
- c. If so, for onions that fall under 0703 10 10 and that would, as such, appear to be under the scope of both measures, could India clarify whether the 40% export duty is applied in addition to the MEP?
- d. Could India explain how the food security of importing Members has been considered in its decision to impose these export restrictions?
- e. Could India provide the timelines as to when it intends to provide an ER:1 notification for each of its MEP and export duty on onions?
- f. According to Reuters (<https://www.reuters.com/world/india/india-sets-800-per-ton-minimum-export-price-onions-till-end-december-2023-10-28>), India also announced the procurement of 200,000 tonnes of onions for its buffer, over and above the 500,000 tonnes already procured. Could India confirm whether there are applied minimum procurement prices and quantities for onions as part of India's procurement of onions its buffer stock? If so, could India cite an online official source that would provide this information?

1.32 India's export restrictions (SIM 306)

1.32.1 Question by United States of America, Australia, United Kingdom, Switzerland, Ukraine, Canada, Japan (AG-IMS ID [107019](#))

In response to various questions regarding India's use of export restrictions and prohibitions, India has made statements similar to that in response to AG-IMS ID [106008](#): "The measures are temporary and are being reviewed from time to time to enable necessary changes based on domestic demand and supply situations. India's measures were necessitated by the need to manage its food security concerns."

Given that India has noted these measures are temporary, for each export restriction or prohibition measure currently in place, please provide the current date that each measure is set to expire or confirm the measure has expired as of the date of this Committee meeting.

- a. Export ban on sugar.
- b. Export duty of 40% on onions.
- c. Export ban on non-basmati white rice.
- d. Export duty of 20% on non-basmati white rice.
- e. Export duty of 20% on parboiled, non-basmati rice.
- f. Minimum export price on basmati rice.
- g. Export ban on wheat and wheat products.
- h. Export ban on broken rice.
- i. Export duty of 20% on rice in the husk, husked brown rice.
- j. Export ban on de-oiled rice bran (DORB).

1.33 Japan-US Trade Agreement (SIM 564)

1.33.1 Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID [107123](#), [107136](#))

With regard to questions AG-IMS ID [106012](#), [105035](#), [106017](#), and [105036](#), Brazil would like to know when Japan and the United States will notify the Committee on Regional Trade Agreements about the 2019 bilateral trade agreement under purview?

1.34 Korea's tariff policies (SIM 785)

1.34.1 Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID [107124](#))

New Zealand would welcome an update from the Republic of Korea regarding the effectiveness of the tariff rate reductions/zeroing on imported fruits and eggs respectively. Have these adjustments met the expectations set out when these trade-liberalising measures were introduced?

1.35 Nigeria's import prohibitions on certain agricultural products and use of reference prices for customs valuation purposes (SIM 223)

1.35.1 Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID [107125](#))

Regarding questions AG-IMS ID [98129](#), [99105](#) and others, Brazil celebrates the decision by the Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN), on 12 October, to allow free float of the national currency against the dollar and other global currencies including "all the 43 items previously restricted by the 2015 Circular referenced TED/FEM/FPC/GEN/01/010".

In line of the stated, Brazil would like to ask Nigeria to confirm that no other technical barrier obstruct our bilateral trade of these items, including rice.

1.36 Panama's compliance with its domestic support commitments (SIM 758)

1.36.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID [107126](#))

Since 2017, Panama has consistently reported being above its authorized *de minimis* levels of domestic support for rice. In response to AG-IMS ID [106047](#), Panama noted that the resolution established a temporary, one-time and non-extendable support.

- a. Please confirm when this temporary, one-time and non-extendable support will conclude.
- b. Please confirm the name of the resolution that established this support.

1.37 South Africa's import measures on poultry meat (SIM 807)

1.37.1 Question by United Kingdom, United States of America (AG-IMS ID [107004](#))

We appreciate South Africa's response to AG-IMS ID [105037](#). In addition, could South Africa provide further detail as to the criteria, analysis and evidence used to determine the suspension of anti-dumping duties? Furthermore, we understand the period of suspension of anti-dumping duties on poultry for several Members has since lapsed – without anti-dumping duties being reapplied. Could South Africa also confirm whether a full review of duties on all WTO Members are being considered and if so, provide a status update on this review?

1.38 Tajikistan's export ban on onions and other vegetables (SIM 808)

1.38.1 Question by Switzerland, Australia, United Kingdom (AG-IMS ID [107041](#))

In its oral response to AG-IMS ID [104070](#) (written answer outstanding) Tajikistan informed that it will submit an ER:1 notification on previous export restrictions in due course.

Can Tajikistan please provide an update as to when it intends to submit the ER:1 to the CoA?

1.39 Tanzania's export restriction on maize and onions (SIM 860)

1.39.1 Question by United Kingdom, Canada (AG-IMS ID [107073](#))

We acknowledge Tanzania's response provided in the room during the 106th Committee on Agriculture to AG-IMS ID [106015](#), in which it was stated that reporting on an export restriction

applied by Tanzania on maize was inaccurate. We think this exposes some of the current challenges around monitoring export restrictions and prohibitions.

Recent reporting has also indicated that Tanzania has applied an export restriction on onions. If this reporting is accurate, please could Tanzania provide detail on the nature and expected duration of the measure, and when they will be able to submit an ER:1 notification to the Committee on Agriculture?

1.40 Thailand's corn farmer income guarantee scheme (SIM 861)

1.40.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID [107128](#))

Could Thailand provide information on the status of their support measure for corn production in form of deficiency payments, known as "Corn farmer income guarantee scheme" in English, running from December 2019?

- a. When does this measure expire?
- b. What is the financial allocation planned for this programme and what was the actual spending in the years since 2019? How is the "guarantee price" and "average market price" for corn calculated under the scheme?
- c. How does Thailand intend to notify this support programme in their overdue DS:1 notification covering the period since 2016?
- d. How does Thailand assess the compatibility of this programme with its domestic support commitments under Agreement of Agriculture?

1.41 Türkiye's export restrictions on agricultural products (SIM 729)

1.41.1 Question by United Kingdom, Switzerland, Japan (AG-IMS ID [107133](#))

We would like to thank Türkiye for their response to AG-IMS ID [106056](#). Notwithstanding, could Türkiye please confirm when they will provide an ER:1 notification to the Committee on Agriculture covering the relevant measures?

1.42 Türkiye's export restrictions on olive oil (SIM 703)

1.42.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID [107031](#))

In August 2023, Türkiye has re-introduced export restrictive measure on olive oil for a period of three months due to the shortage of olive oil production in Mediterranean countries and subsequent negative effects on domestic prices.

The Ministry of Trade (of Türkiye) stated that the additional measures have been put into effect for the export of olive oil in bulk or in barrels until the beginning of the next olive oil harvest period (1 November 2023).

- a. Could Türkiye confirm that the temporary measures have not been renewed as initially stated?
- b. Did the measures have the desired effect on the domestic market?

1.43 UK's SSG entitlements (SIM 761)

1.43.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID [107084](#))

The AoA Article 5 clause 1(b), stipulates that the trigger price for a particular product designated under the SSG must be determined using the average import prices from 1986-88 for that specific product. In response to AG-IMS ID [106161](#), [105104](#) and [102095](#), the UK has expressed its

commitment to adhere to AoA Article 5. Therefore, could the UK confirm if the trigger prices for the relevant commodities will indeed be calculated based on the average cost, insurance and freight (c.i.f.) unit values from the years 1986-88?

1.44 United States' dairy policies (SIM 462)

1.44.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID [107086](#))

In a news release dated 29 September 2023, there was additional dairy support to producers through two programmes i. e. the Milk Loss Program (MLP) and the Organic Dairy Marketing Assistance Program (ODMAP). The US has notified the MLP in the DS:1 notification for the marketing year 2020-21 ([G/AG/N/USA/166/Rev.1](#)) as non-exempted direct payments in the Supporting Table:6. Whereas, the ODMAP was created to assist certified organic dairy producers facing a unique set of challenges in recent years and provides financial assistance on one-time cost-share payment for a producer's projected marketing costs in 2023 based on 2022 costs. USDA recently announced a second round of payments for dairy producers through ODMAP, providing an additional USD 5 million to help dairy producers with marketing costs to mitigate market volatility, higher input and transportation costs, and unstable feed supply and prices that have created unique hardships in the organic dairy industry.

(<https://www.fsa.usda.gov/news-room/news-releases/2023/dairy-margin-coverage-program-provides-critical-support-for-dairy-operations>)

In this context, India seeks to know the following,

- a. How does the one-time cost-share payment work? Is there any limit on dairy operations who can benefit from this programme?
- b. How much is the total budget under ODMAP?

1.45 U.S. Inflation Reduction Act (SIM 811)

1.45.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID [107032](#))

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) is making more than USD 3 billion in funding available for agricultural producers and forest landowners nationwide to participate in voluntary conservation programs and adopt climate-smart practices in fiscal year 2024 as part of President Biden's Investing in America agenda. The announcement comes as the Biden-Harris Administration hosts the first-ever White House Climate Resilience Summit.

These funds are provided by President Biden's [Inflation Reduction Act – the largest climate and conservation investment in history](#). This law invests an additional USD 19.5 billion for USDA's popular conservation programmes. These programmes also advance the President's Justice Initiative, which aims to ensure 40% of the overall benefits of certain climate, clean energy, and other federal investments reach disadvantaged communities that have been marginalized by underinvestment and overburdened by pollution. The USDA's Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) saw record producer interest in these resources in fiscal year 2023, the agency is now accepting applications from producers interested in this additional conservation assistance for fiscal year 2024.

This includes investing in cover crops, waste and fertilizer management, and grazing practices, while continuing to work through existing programmes to help producers address other natural resource challenges. Ultimately, this will lead to economic opportunity for producers, more productive soil, cleaner water and air, healthier wildlife habitat and natural resource conservation for future generations."

The EU notes the additional funding announced in September for agricultural producers and forest landowners who would participate in voluntary conservation programs and adopt climate-smart practices in fiscal year 2024.

According to the same source, the USDA's Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) saw record producer interest in these resources in fiscal year 2023.

- a. Could US confirm whether certain funds have been already used in 2023 fiscal year?
- b. What were the programmes/schemes eligible for funding?
- c. The EU is looking forward to the DS:2 notification of the US, providing details on the different programmes/measures and budget distributions.

2 POINTS RAISED IN CONNECTION WITH INDIVIDUAL NOTIFICATIONS

2.1 IMPORTS UNDER TARIFF AND OTHER QUOTA COMMITMENTS (TABLE MA:2)

2.1.1 Ecuador ([G/AG/N/ECU/58](#))

AG-IMS ID 107043: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues

As noted previously in AG-IMS ID [99029](#), the HS code for whole turkey, fresh or chilled, in Ecuador's Table MA:2 notification is incorrect. The code listed aligns with whole turkey, frozen. Ecuador responded to AG-IMS ID 99029 stating that it would conduct a legal analysis about this matter.

Please provide an update on whether or not this legal analysis has been concluded, the analysis's findings, and if there are plans to update the HS codes.

2.1.2 Ecuador ([G/AG/N/ECU/70](#), [G/AG/N/ECU/71](#), [G/AG/N/ECU/72](#))

AG-IMS ID 107137: Question by Canada - Transparency issues

Canada thanks Ecuador for its MA:2 notifications. Canada notes that, for calendar year 2019, Ecuador notified 0 in-quota imports for all of its tariff-rate quotas (ECUQ001 through to ECUQ014), and that for 2020, 2021 and 2022, Ecuador notified in-quota imports only for ECUQ005 – flint maize other, which have increased substantially in 2022. In the General notes, Ecuador explains that: (1) applied MFN tariffs for some subheadings remained below the quota tariff levels; (2) imports were from partners that benefit from preferential treatment under trade agreements with Ecuador; and (3) no imports were recorded under some subheadings.

Could Ecuador clarify:

- a. Which of Ecuador's TRQs were subject to MFN tariffs that were below the quota tariff level;
- b. Whether the MFN applied tariff mentioned in the notes were applied to 'out-of-quota' imports, below the in-quota bound tariff rate?
- c. How much was imported from partners that benefitted from preferential treatment and to which WTO TRQ these imports were linked;
- d. For which TRQ or subheading no imports were recorded, and the reasons why?

AG-IMS ID 107138: Question by United States of America - Tariff quota fill

In Ecuador's Table MA:2 notifications from Calendar Years 2019 through 2022 ([G/AG/N/ECU/70](#) through [G/AG/N/ECU/73](#)), the MA:2 tables show a 0 percent fill rate for all products except for Flint Maize in each reported year.

- a. For these products with 0 percent fill rates, are applied MFN rates lower than the in-quota tariff rates? Please provide the MFN and the in-quota tariff rates applied in each reported year and clarify where the rates are published yearly.
- b. Noting that the tariff levels and allocations of WTO tariff-rate quotas (TRQs) were not published for the years 2020 through 2022 on Ecuador's Ministry of Agriculture's website at <https://www.agricultura.gob.ec/organizacion-mundial-de-comercio/>, please clarify if the import quotas were opened for any of the TRQs from 2019 through 2022.

- c. The United States observes a significant increase in fill rate of Flint Maize in 2022, from below 20% in 2019, 2021, and 2022 to over 80 percent. What caused this increased fill rate?

2.1.3 India ([G/AG/N/IND/30](#))

AG-IMS ID 107139: Question by European Union - Tariff quota fill

The European Union would like to thank India for submitting its MA:2 notification for the financial year 2022/2023 in [G/AG/N/IND/30](#). As other Members have noted in previous questions submitted in the framework of the Committee on Agriculture the tariff quota INDQ001 has been having a fill rate of 0% for years now.

- a. Has India considered changing the method of management of this tariff rate quota (INDQ001)?
- b. Is India taking any kind of measures to ensure that the management of its WTO tariff rate quotas which have a low fill rate is trade conducive?

2.1.4 Israel ([G/AG/N/ISR/93](#))

AG-IMS ID 107140: Question by Paraguay - Tariff quota fill

We thank the delegation of Israel for submitting its MA:2 notification for 2022. We would like to know:

- a. The reasons for the low fill rate for quota ISRQ010 – Sweet corn; and
- b. Whether Israel has considered modifying the method of administering the quota to increase its use.

2.1.5 Switzerland ([G/AG/N/CHE/124](#))

AG-IMS ID 107141: Question by Canada - Transparency issues

Canada would like to thank Switzerland for its most recent MA:2 notification. Could Switzerland confirm whether its 2022 imports of goods for industrial processing were not charged to CHEQ019, CHEQ020 and CHEQ021, as was the case in 2021 ([G/AG/N/CHE/119](#)) and 2020 ([G/AG/N/CHE/113](#))? If not, could Switzerland:

- a. provide details of the tariff treatment it applied to its imports of goods for industrial processing, including the duty rates applied?
- b. explain why its approach to tariff treatment for imports of goods for industrial processing was different in 2020 and 2021 vs. 2022?

AG-IMS ID 107202: Question by Paraguay - Tariff quota fill

We thank the delegation of Switzerland for submitting its MA:2 notification for 2022. We would like to know:

- a. The reasons for the low fill rates (below 65%) for the following quotas:
 - CHEQ003: Live swine (4%)
 - CHEQ010: Dried egg products (56%)
 - CHEQ017: Fresh apples, pears and quinces (64.1%)
 - CHEQ020: Fruit for cider and distillation (0%)
 - CHEQ026: Durum wheat, undenatured (54.6%)
 - CHEQ028: Coarse grains for human consumption (51.1%)
- b. Whether Switzerland has considered modifying the method of administering the quota to increase its use.
- c. In cases where Switzerland has notified a fill rate exceeding 100% on a constant basis, why consideration is not being given to the permanent expansion of the quotas concerned,

e.g. CHEQ005 - Animals for slaughter; meat mainly produced on the basis of coarse fodder, CHEQ012 - Bovine semen, and CHEQ015 - Vegetables.

2.2 SPECIAL AGRICULTURAL SAFEGUARDS (TABLES MA:3 to MA:5)

2.2.1 Chinese Taipei ([G/AG/N/TPKM/227](#))

AG-IMS ID 107203: Question by Paraguay - Transparency issues

We welcome Chinese Taipei's submission of its notification on SSGs applied to the category "Other Chicken Cuts" during the period of application 5 September-31 December 2023. In this connection, we would like to know:

- a. The origins of the imports concerned; and
- b. Whether, given the small difference between the trigger level and the volume of imports indicated, Chinese Taipei, as one of the few Members that still use the SSG, has considered not using it as part of the reform process that envisages the elimination of SSG duties as set out in Art. 5.9 of the AoA.

2.2.2 European Union ([G/AG/N/EU/86](#))

AG-IMS ID 107087: Question by India - Trigger calculations

In response to AG-IMS ID [106171](#), the EU stated that the trigger price for "boneless cuts of fowl of the species" has been notified in [G/AG/N/EEC/2](#) and no changes have been made since then. However, we are unable to locate the reference to HS 02071410 in [G/AG/N/EEC/2](#).

India requests the EU to identify the same or provide clarification if there have been any modifications to the HS code reference.

2.3 DOMESTIC SUPPORT COMMITMENTS (TABLE DS:1)

2.3.1 Australia ([G/AG/N/AUS/142](#), [G/AG/N/AUS/157](#), [G/AG/N/AUS/157/Rev.1](#))

AG-IMS ID 107089: Question by India - Non-product-specific AMS

Australia in its DS:1 Notification for FY 2018-19 ([G/AG/N/AUS/142](#)) and for FY 2019-20 ([G/AG/N/AUS/157](#)) has provided the following information with respect to non-product specific Amber box support:

- i. A total increase from AUD 350.14 million in 2018-19 to AUD 950.60 million in 2019-20;
- ii. an increase in support under the Farm Household Allowance Program from AUD 116.155 million in 2018-19 to AUD 134.377 million in 2019-20, and a further increase to AUD 180.730 million in 2020-21 (as per Australia's response to AG-IMS ID [106130](#)); and
- iii. an expenditure of AUD 415.673 million during FY 2019-20 on concessional loans under the Regional Investment Corporation (RIC) Loans scheme.

In this regard, India has the following questions:

- a. What are the reasons behind this massive rise in non-product specific support?
- b. Could Australia state why the support under the Farm Household Allowance Program has shown such a marked increase in the period between 2018-19 and 2020-21?
- c. Is the RIC an umbrella programme for several smaller schemes? If so, Australia may provide a scheme-wise breakup of the expenditure.

AG-IMS ID 107142: Question by Canada - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

In [G/AG/N/AUS/157/Rev.1](#), in Supporting Table DS:6, for the financial year 2019/20, Australia notified AUD 628,000 in expenditures for the "South Australia: Red Meat and Wool Program."

As part of an associated footnote, Australia states that the programme contributes to improving sheep and cattle quality and productivity.

- a. Could Australia provide disaggregated data of the non-exempt direct payments for separate sheep and cattle categories?

Under Supporting Table DS:9, Australia also notified AUD 628,000 in expenditures for the "South Australia: Red Meat and Wool Growth Program."

- b. Is this programme the same programme notified in Supporting Table DS:6? If not, how do these programmes differ from the perspective of product-specificity?

AG-IMS ID 107157: Question by Canada - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

In [G/AG/N/AUS/157](#) and [G/AG/N/AUS/157/Rev.1](#), Australia notified AUD 3.4 billion in expenditures related to "South Australia: On-Farm Emergency Water Infrastructure Rebate Scheme" as payments for relief from natural disasters. At the same time, the programme is described as support to install vital on-farm water infrastructure (e.g., water storages, pipes, power generators, etc.).

- a. Given its apparent focus on infrastructure, could Australia explain how this programme meets all the conditions set out in sub-paragraph (a) through (e) of Annex 2, paragraph 8?
- b. If this is a new/modified programme, could Australia submit a Table DS:2 notification?

Australia has also notified expenditures under two other separate programmes, i.e., "On-Farm Emergency Water Infrastructure Rebate Scheme" and "Queensland: Drought Relief Assistance Scheme Emergency Water Infrastructure Rebate (EWIR)" in Supporting Table DS:9.

- c. Could Australia provide the considerations as to how these programmes are different from "South Australia: On-Farm Emergency Water Infrastructure Rebate Scheme," the perspective of their domestic support classification?

AG-IMS ID 107158: Question by Canada - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Canada notes that in [G/AG/N/AUS/157](#) and [G/AG/N/AUS/157/Rev.1](#), Australia has not notified any expenditures from "Australian Government: Farm Management Deposit Scheme." Could Australia provide a rationale as to why it has not notified any expenditures under that programme?

AG-IMS ID 107088: Question by India - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

India thanks Australia for submitting the DS:1 notification for Marketing Year 2019-20 ([G/AG/N/AUS/157](#)). India also notes that in the given marketing year, Australia has provided support to Red Meat under the South Australia Red Meat and Wool Programme. With reference to Supporting Tables DS:4, DS:6 and DS:9, India has the following questions:

- a. What specific conditions in the given marketing year prompted Australia to initiate the programme? Is the programme still in operation?
- b. India notes that Australia has notified support of AUD 628,000 under the South Australia Red Meat and Wool Program as product-specific non-exempt direct payments under Supporting Table DS:6. It is also noted that Australia has notified AUD 628,000 of support under the same programme as non-product specific support under Supporting Table DS:9. India seeks to know if the programme has both product specific and non-product specific components and if so, whether the amount of support is equal under both product-specific and non-product specific components?

AG-IMS ID 107155: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

We note an increase in Australia's notified Amber Box support in [G/AG/N/AUS/157](#), due in large part to the significant increase in spending under the Regional Investment Corporation Loans Scheme.

- a. Please describe this measure.
- b. Please explain the reason for the increase in expenditures in FY 2019/20.

AG-IMS ID 107156: Question by Canada - Direct payments: payments for relief from natural disasters

- a. Canada notes that in [G/AG/N/AUS/157](#) and [G/AG/N/AUS/157/Rev.1](#), the support Australia notified for "New South Wales: Natural Disaster Relief Scheme" increased from AUD 88.77 million in 2018/19 to AUD 243.62 million in 2019/20.
- b. Could Australia confirm whether the programme's payment eligibility criteria excluded any primary producers who did not meet the trigger criteria of a production loss exceeding 30%, as per subparagraph 8(a) of Annex 2?

AG-IMS ID 107154: Question by Japan - Non-product-specific AMS

Japan welcomes Australia's submissions of DS:1 notification, [G/AG/N/AUS/157](#).

With respect to the RIC loan scheme, budgetary outlays of AUD 415.673 million in FY2019 was significantly higher than in FY2018 when it was first established, which accounts for nearly half of Total Non-Product-Specific AMS (de minimis). It is de minimis level, however it is exceeding far above the AMS commitment level.

The provision of two-year interest free period for the drought related loans seems to have unprecedentedly increased the demand for loan applications (<https://www.ric.gov.au/news/ric-loans-deliver-relief-drought-affected-communities>). It seems that large part of the AUD 400 million could be explained as interest subsidies for Drought Loans and AgBiz Drought Loans. Could Australia provide a breakdown of the AUD 400 million? Is this increase in budget expenditure a temporary phenomenon, or could it be considered as leading to constant budget increase?

AG-IMS ID 107153: Question by Canada - Classification of measures

In [G/AG/N/AUS/157/Rev.1](#), in Supporting Table DS:9, Australia notified AUD 16 million in expenditures for the "Australian Government: Export and Regional Wine Support Package." According to Wine Australia's website ([https://www.wineaustralia.com/whats-happening/highlights-of-the-\\$50m-package](https://www.wineaustralia.com/whats-happening/highlights-of-the-$50m-package)), this is an AUD 50 million package which included a component of targeted marketing campaigns in China and the United States.

- a. Could Australia explain why this programme, which appears to be specific to wine, is classified as non-product specific support in Supporting Table DS:9?

In addition, the programme description, available on Wine Australia's website, indicates that, in round 1 of the programme, 135 Australian wine producers secured an average grant of approximately AUD11,100 to support export promotional activities in China and the United States (https://www.wineaustralia.com/getmedia/c2665c7e-7fc1-4b34-9055-633da97562e0/ERWSP_WEG_FactSheet3_v2-%281%29.pdf). These grants appear to be reducing the cost of marketing and promotion activities in support of exports in specific destinations.

- b. Could Australia clarify whether any portion of the grants can or has been used to reduce the cost of its wine exports?

2.3.2 Costa Rica ([G/AG/N/CRI/88](#), [G/AG/N/CRI/93](#))

AG-IMS ID 107098: Question by India - Direct payments: payments under environmental programmes

India noticed a significant decline of 26% in expenditure on environmental programmes from USD 1,133 thousand in 2021 ([G/AG/N/CRI/88](#)) to USD 831.21 thousand in 2022 ([G/AG/N/CRI/93](#)). Could Costa Rica provide reasons for such a sharp decline?

2.3.3 Brazil ([G/AG/N/BRA/74](#))

AG-IMS ID 107093: Question by India - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

India notices the introduction of the "Program of Acquisition of Agricultural Products from Family Farming" under the measure 'Domestic food aid' for the year 2020/21 ([G/AG/N/BRA/74](#)) with an allocation of USD 10 million. Also, the same programme has been notified under the 'Public stockholding for food security purposes' with an allocation of USD 34 million for the same year.

In this regard, India requests Brazil to answer the following:

- a. Why is the "Program of Acquisition of agricultural products from family farming" notified under two measures namely: 'Public stockholding for food security purposes' and 'Domestic food aid' for the year 2020/21, as compared to 2019/20?
- b. Could the farmers participating in the "Program of acquisition of Agricultural Products from Family Farming" sell their crops both under 'public stockholding for food security purposes' and 'Domestic food aid measures' at the same time?
- c. How many farmers have benefited from this programme during 2019-20 and 2020-21?
- d. How does the government dispose of the crops procured under this scheme?
- e. What was the budget allocation of the aforementioned programmes for the years 2021-22 and 2022-23?

2.3.4 Canada ([G/AG/N/CAN/158](#), [G/AG/N/CAN/159](#))

AG-IMS ID 107161: Question by European Union - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Follow-up of question of AG-IMS ID [106094](#)

During 106th CoA, the EU has requested Canada to provide more details concerning Canada's Dairy Direct Payment Programme (question AG-IMS ID 106094).

As part of the reply, Canada has provided the following additional information:

CAD 1.75 billion in support was made available to dairy producers through the Dairy Direct Payment Program for the impacts of CETA and CPTPP. Support was initially intended to be distributed over eight years, but in 2020, after the first year of the program, Canada set the schedule to provide the remaining payments over three years only. Support through the Dairy Direct Payment Program for the impacts of CETA and CPTPP concluded in 2022-23.

In November 2022, Canada announced CAD 1.2 billion, over six years starting in 2022-23, through the Dairy Direct Payment Program to account for impacts resulting from Canada's market access commitments in the Canada-United States-Mexico Agreement (CUSMA).

The EU thanks Canada for the reply and the additional information.

- a. Could Canada explain whether the Dairy Direct Payment Programme would be further extended, beyond the six years, which have started in 2022-2023?

- b. Does Canada consider shifting the scope and the purpose of the payments towards programmes aimed at more efficient and sustainable production methods?

AG-IMS ID 107162: Question by United States of America - Direct payments: payments under environmental programmes

In [G/AG/N/CAN/158](#) and [G/AG/N/CAN/159](#), environmental measure outlays notified at the provincial level were only a fraction of the funding notified in the Table DS:2 notifications [G/AG/N/CAN/160](#) and [G/AG/N/CAN/161](#) averaged annually over the five-year period.

Please explain the reasoning, including whether actual expenditures were significantly less than that reported in [G/AG/N/CAN/160](#) and [G/AG/N/CAN/161](#) or if expenditures were primarily undertaken in years other than those covered by [G/AG/N/CAN/158](#) and [G/AG/N/CAN/159](#).

AG-IMS ID 107096: Question by India - Market price support

Concerning [G/AG/N/CAN/159](#), India notes that the Applied Administered Price (AAP) for Buttermilk shows an increasing trend, as it increased from 7,824.99 CAD/tonne in 2016 to 8,585.6 CAD/tonne in 2020. In this context, India requests the following information:

- a. What is the mechanism to calculate AAP for buttermilk?
- b. What is the difference between a 'calendar year' and a 'dairy year'? Why is the latter used instead of the former for calculating AAP?
- c. What factors have been responsible for increasing AAP in the last five years?
- d. What was the AAP for butter and skimmed milk for the years 2021 and 2022?

AG-IMS ID 107094: Question by India - Non-product-specific AMS

India notes that Canada has provided DS:1 notifications for the calendar years 2019 ([G/AG/N/CAN/158](#)) and 2020 ([G/AG/N/CAN/159](#)) on 28 August, 2023.

In this regard, India requests Canada to answer the following:

- a. India observes non-product specific support for Federal Credit Concessions was CAD 36.7 million during the year 2019 while, in the year 2020, the support for the same programme was CAD 337.5 million. The support increased by approximately 820%. What are the reasons behind this drastic increase in support and allocation of the expenditure?
- b. India would like to know more about the programme and requests Canada to provide details of accessible web links, if available.

AG-IMS ID 107095: Question by India - Non-product-specific AMS

India notes in Canada's latest DS:1 notification filed for Calendar Year 2020 ([G/AG/N/CAN/159](#)), that Canada provides certain non-product specific payments under Provincial Programs to the extent of CAD 322.5 million.

In this regard, India requests Canada to provide the following information:

- a. Details of programmes covered under the 'Provincial Programs'
- b. The break-up of the expenditure notified under Provincial Programs with respect to specific provincial schemes covered.

AG-IMS ID 107097: Question by India - Non-product-specific AMS

In the Supporting Table DS:9, India observes that the support for "Canadian Agricultural Partnership Non-Business Risk (BRM) Management Initiatives" has increased over the years. In 2018 it was CAD 39 million, in 2019 it increased to CAD 45.9 million and in 2020 it was CAD 65.1 million.

In this regard, India requests Canada to respond to the following:

- a. What are the reasons for the consistent increase in support under this particular programme?
- b. India would like to know more about the programme and requests Canada to provide details of accessible web links, if available.

2.3.5 China ([G/AG/N/CHN/47](#))

AG-IMS ID 107206: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Following up on AG-IMS ID [104015](#) regarding corn, soybean, and cotton support, China indicated it "is implementing corn and soybeans producer subsidies in Northeast China."

- a. What, if any, domestic support is being provided at the sub-national level for soybeans and what is the breakdown of support by province for the Northeast region?
- b. What, if any, domestic support is being provided at the sub-national level for corn and what is the breakdown of support by province for the Northeast region?

2.3.6 Ecuador ([G/AG/N/ECU/67](#), [G/AG/N/ECU/68](#), [G/AG/N/ECU/69](#))

AG-IMS ID 107163: Question by Canada - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Canada would like to thank Ecuador for its 2019, 2020 and 2021 domestic support notifications. Canada notes that in [G/AG/N/ECU/56](#), Ecuador notified expenditures under paragraphs 2(a), 2(f), 2(g) and paragraph 4, whereas in [G/AG/N/ECU/67](#); [G/AG/N/ECU/68](#); [G/AG/N/ECU/69](#), Ecuador has not notified any expenditures under these paragraphs.

In addition, starting in 2019, Ecuador notified expenditures under Supporting Table DS:2, for a programme to 'Support agricultural producers for the purchase of agrochemical inputs under the Socio Siembra Programme.' However, Canada notes that Ecuador does not appear to have submitted a Table DS:2 to demonstrate how this new domestic support measure is exempt from reduction commitments and meets the criteria of Article 6.2 of the Agreement on Agriculture.

- a. Could Ecuador provide the reasons why no expenditures have been reported under paragraphs 2(a), 2(f), 2(g) and paragraph 4?
- b. Could Ecuador provide timelines as to when it intends to submit a Table DS:2 for the Socio Siembra Programme?

2.3.7 India ([G/AG/N/IND/29](#))

AG-IMS ID 107027: Question by Australia, Canada - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Australia notes India's response to AG-IMS ID [106031](#). However, India did not answer the question adequately.

Could India please provide the value of production for each of the following individual products: maize, barley, millet, sorghum, ahrar/tur, gram, urad, lentils, and rapeseed/mustard.

AG-IMS ID 107165: Question by Australia - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Australia thanks India for its response to AG-IMS ID [106033](#) and notes that measures notified in the Supporting Table DS:1, DS:2, and DS:9 of the domestic support notification [G/AG/N/IND/29](#) include expenditures incurred by both the Central government and State governments.

Australia requests that India provide a breakdown of expenditure for the measures listed in Supporting Tables DS:1, DS:2 and DS:9 of the domestic support notification [G/AG/N/IND/29](#) that

clearly differentiates the expenditure for measures by the central government and the expenditure for measures by the state government as distinct expenditure amounts.

AG-IMS ID 107040: Question by Australia - Public stockholding for food security purposes

In response to AG-IMS ID [105038](#), India states it was not able at the time to provide details with regards to what the notified value under Annex 2, paragraph 3 includes and excludes as compared to "Total Food Subsidy" in the Government of India's Expenditure Budget for 2020-21 through 2023-24 or why the values for "Total Food Subsidy" were significantly larger than what was notified under Annex 2, paragraph 3.

Is India in a position to provide the requested information in parts (a) and (b) of AG-IMS ID 105038? Please indicate the data source and methodology for notified value provided by India for "public stockholding for food security" in its domestic support notifications.

2.3.8 Japan ([G/AG/N/JPN/282](#))

AG-IMS ID 107100: Question by India - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

According to para 4.24 of Japan's TPR ([WT/TPR/S/438/Rev.1](#)), under the Emergency Measures to Develop New Sales Channels of Agricultural, Forestry, and Fishery Products, the Government provides financial support to compensate for part of the expenses for those who develop new sales channels for certain products such as e-commerce and for those who supply certain products for school lunches and children's cafeterias in response to excess inventories of agricultural, forestry, and fishery products caused by the substantial decrease in demand, including reduced inbound tourism consumption due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The budget for this support amounted to JPY 19 billion in FY2021.

In this regard, could Japan:

- a. specify where this expenditure has been notified in its DS:1 notification.
- b. Name the products eligible to receive this government support.

AG-IMS ID 107101: Question by India - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

As per para 4.32 of Japan's TPR ([WT/TPR/S/438/Rev.1](#)), the government provides direct payments to farmers who produce crops other than table rice in the paddy field under the 'Direct Payments for Rice Paddy Utilization' programme, to optimize the use of paddy fields, against the background of diminishing domestic demand for rice. The Payments are classified into (i) direct payments to assist the production of strategic crops (other than table rice); (ii) grants for production areas; and (iii) direct payments for promoting high profitability in paddy farming. (iv) payments for farmers who produce certain products like wheat, barley, and soybeans in the paddy field for new market development. The Payments under these programs are made when producers meet at least three of the specific requirements including those for environmental protection such as direct sowing seeding and efficient fertilization, to promote the cultivation of paddy fields. An expenditure of 370 JPY Billion for this programme has been notified under the Green box paragraph 12 in Japan's latest DS:1 notification ([G/AG/N/JPN/282](#)).

In this context, Japan is requested to provide answers to the following questions:

- a. Could Japan confirm if the expenditure under 'Direct payments for rice paddy utilization' has been notified under the Green Box as 'Payments for conversion from rice production: payments for maintaining paddy fields in environmentally good condition through growing any plants other than rice or other appropriate management'?
- b. The official [web link](#) to the programme states 'self-sufficiency' and 'strengthening rice paddy profitability' as its objectives. In this regard, how can it be classified as an 'environmental or conservation program' as provided in para 12 of Annex 2 of the Agreement on Agriculture?
- c. What are the strategic crops grown under this programme and how are they disposed of?

- d. Who is eligible to receive payments under this programme?
- e. Please provide the list of specific requirements to be met by the beneficiaries to receive payments under this programme.
- f. Please elaborate on the environmental reasons associated with the 4 streams of payments under this program, as mentioned above.
- g. Please provide the expenditure under each of these payments, for the year 2020-21.

AG-IMS ID 107099: Question by India - Non-product-specific AMS

As per AG-IMS ID [106174](#), Japan has notified the crop income stabilization payments to Rice, Wheat, Barley, Soybean, Sugar beet, and Potato used for the manufacture of starch, Buckwheat, and Rapeseed as non-product specific support. Moreover, Japan has mentioned that business farmers who produce the above crops are exclusively eligible to benefit from the program, which leaves the Japanese producers of beef and veal, the meat of swine, eggs, starch, and other crops if any, ineligible to receive payments under this program.

In this context, Japan is requested to respond to these follow-up questions:

- a. Given the crop income stabilization payments apply only to selected products mentioned above, how does Japan justify notifying this support as 'non-product specific'?
- b. India requests Japan to provide the estimate of support provided to the eligible crops individually.
- c. India further requests an English translation of the details of implementation of the crop income stabilization programmes, for greater transparency.

2.3.9 Kazakhstan ([G/AG/N/KAZ/21](#), [G/AG/N/KAZ/22](#), [G/AG/N/KAZ/23](#))

AG-IMS ID 107168: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Kazakhstan's submission of a number of overdue Table DS:1 notifications in [G/AG/N/KAZ/21](#) to [G/AG/N/KAZ/26](#) is greatly appreciated. However, it is noted there appears to be substantial differences in how agricultural support is provided in Kazakhstan in recent years as compared to its Agricultural Supporting Tables for 2010-2012 where a better understanding of Kazakhstan's current support would be appreciated.

- a. Kazakhstan has not notified any sub-national expenditures in Table DS:1. Please confirm that sub-national support is no longer provided in Kazakhstan. If no longer provided, can Kazakhstan provide the reason for this change.
- b. Kazakhstan no longer notifies procurement of a large number of commodities in Supporting Table DS:5. Please confirm Kazakhstan or entities operating on the behalf of the government do not undertake procurement of agricultural commodities other than at market prices.
- c. Please for further details with regards to what the notified expenditures in Supporting Table DS:1 under Public stockholding for food security purposes includes. What, if any, commodities are procured and whether those commodities are procured at market prices.
- d. Milk powder, butter, cheese, and milk all have a measure entitled "Subsidizing the costs of processing enterprises of the purchase of agricultural products for the production of its deep processing products" in Supporting Table DS:6.
 - i. Please explain how these measures for various dairy products are implemented.

- ii. Please provide details of how producers benefit from the subsidies to processors and how purchase prices are determined.
- iii. Please explain how the budgetary expenditures are determined.
- e. Please explain the measure "Reimbursement of a part of expenses incurred by a subject of the agro-industrial complex, in investments" in Supporting Table DS:9, including how the measure is implemented and who the beneficiaries are.

AG-IMS ID 107167: Question by European Union - Non-product-specific AMS

The European Union notes that in Supporting Table DS:9, Kazakhstan has reported *subsidies for development of livestock breeding, improving the productivity and quality of animal products*.

- a. Could Kazakhstan explain whether these subsidies are aimed to support private entities or organisation (public or private)?
- b. What are the criteria to receive the subsidies?

2.3.10 New Zealand ([G/AG/N/NZL/138](#))

AG-IMS ID 107102: Question by India - General services: research

India notes that in its reply to AG-IMS ID [106175](#), New Zealand provided the following clarification regarding the Primary Growth Partnership PGP:

"The PGP is now closed to new applications, and they are instead covered under the Sustainable Food and Fiber Futures (SFFF). However, there are still 10 programs which were under the PGP that are now captured under SFFF."

In this regard, India requests New Zealand to provide:

- a. The current number of beneficiaries under the 10 programmes that were earlier under PGP and presently under SFFF.
- b. Total funding provided for these 10 programmes since their coverage under SFFF.

2.3.11 Paraguay ([G/AG/N/PRY/36](#))

AG-IMS ID 107103: Question by India - Domestic food aid

In response to 'part-e' of AG-IMS ID [105114](#), Paraguay had stated that, "Some of the programs are aimed at helping subsistence farmers to grow crops for their own consumption".

To seek more clarity on the programmes aimed at helping subsistence farmers grow crops for their own consumption under 'Project to improve campesina and indigenous family farming' and 'Project to improve campesina and indigenous family farming in the Eastern Region', India raised a question (AG-IMS ID 105114) to which Paraguay replied in Spanish. The English translation as per Google stands as follows,

"Paraguay greets India and clarifies what follows: the 2 (two) projects cited in the response are to help peasant and indigenous family agriculture, said support is intended for self-consumption in basic fruit and vegetable crops and small livestock: - Beans - Bananas - Corn - Pineapple - Tomato - Onion - Potato - Cassava - Locote - Pork - Chickens. Currently the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock has a Vice Ministry of Family Agriculture (FA) where all assistance is channelled to the FA sector. The projects: Improvement of Peasant Family Agriculture and Improvement of Peasant and Indigenous Family Agriculture in the Eastern Region. The items can be corroborated by official data from the Central Bank of Paraguay, which do not belong to Paraguay's exportable supply, as these are intended for self-consumption for small farmers and are framed in internal food aid."

In this context, India has the following queries for Paraguay:

- a. Does giving direct payments to farmers for producing crops for their own consumption qualify as 'domestic food aid' under the AoA?
- b. How does Paraguay ensure that crops produced under the two projects mentioned above aren't used for export purposes?
- c. Please provide official documents or web links, having English translation, that can explain the objectives of the two projects mentioned above along with their programmes individually.

2.3.12 Thailand ([G/AG/N/THA/85](#))

AG-IMS ID 107105: Question by India - Input subsidies available to low-income or resource-poor producers

In the DS:1 notification [G/AG/N/THA/85](#), the input subsidies provided by Thailand vary significantly for the notified years. Notably, the expenditures for the years 2014, 2015, and 2016 were 39,552.82 million Baht, 0.42 million Baht, and 64,712.26 million Baht respectively.

In this regard, please explain the following,

- a. While answering a similar question raised by Australia (AG-IMS ID [86023](#)) on the input subsidy expenditure, Thailand replied that the expenditure varied due to 'different circumstances and policies' at the time of application of the measure. Please elaborate on these circumstances and enumerate the policies responsible for the variation in expenditure.
- b. How does Thailand define and identify low-income or resource-poor farmers? What is the eligibility criteria applicable for a farmer to be classified as low-income or resource-poor?
- c. Has the definition ever changed over the years notified?
- d. Please provide the list of input subsidies given in favour of farmers.
- e. Please name the agricultural products eligible to receive such input subsidies.

AG-IMS ID 107104: Question by India - Other product-specific AMS/EMS

In the DS:1 notification [G/AG/N/THA/85](#), non-exempted product-specific support for rice has been provided in the form of loans for production, loans for stockholding, and payments for stockholding in 2014-2016.

- a. Could Thailand elaborate on how these support measures were implemented, including their purpose/objective?
- b. Are the measures still operational in 2023?

2.3.13 United Kingdom ([G/AG/N/GBR/11/Rev.1](#), [G/AG/N/GBR/20](#))

AG-IMS ID 107107: Question by India - Direct payments: payments under environmental programmes

India requests the UK to provide the reasons for the decrease in environmental programmes' support from GBP 545.57 million in CY 2021 ([G/AG/N/GBR/11/Rev.1](#)) to GBP 532.77 million in CY 2022 ([G/AG/N/GBR/20](#)).

2.3.14 United States of America ([G/AG/N/USA/166/Rev.1](#), [G/AG/N/USA/169](#))

AG-IMS ID 107169: Question by Canada - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Concerning [G/AG/N/USA/166/Rev.1](#), in its response to AD-IMS ID [106099](#) and [106102](#), the United States noted that data on direct payments to dairy producers and beef cattle producers under the United States Department of Agriculture's (USDA) Livestock Forage Disaster Program (LFP), Livestock Indemnity Program (LIP) and, Emergency Assistance for Livestock, Honeybees and Farm-Raised Fish Program (ELAP), is not available due to the lack of species-specific data for standing disaster programmes. However, Canada notes that USDA's Program Factsheets for certain disaster programmes include species-specific livestock payment rates per head, including for dairy and for beef cattle.

For example, under the LFP, the 2023 payment rate per head for an adult dairy cow/bull is USD 151.12, while the 2023 payment rate per head for an adult beef bull/cow is USD 58.12 (https://www.fsa.usda.gov/Assets/USDA-FSA-Public/usdafiles/FactSheets/fsa_lfp_livestockforageprogramfactsheet_2022.pdf). Under the LIP, the 2023 payment rate per head for an adult dairy cow is USD 1,198.13, while the 2023 payment rate per head for an adult beef bull is USD 1,512.19 (https://www.fsa.usda.gov/Assets/USDA-FSA-Public/usdafiles/FactSheets/2023/FSA_LIP_LivestockIndemnityProgram_Factsheet_2023.pdf).

Canada also notes that for both the LFP and the LIP, species-specific payment rates per head appear to be available for most species eligible under either programmes. In this context:

- a. Could the United States confirm whether LFP and LIP applicants are required to specify which species and what quantities for which they are claiming a payment, including to determine the direct payment rates and amounts?
- b. Could the United States provide further details on its response that species-specific data is not available?
- c. If the number of heads per species per producer is not available, how are payments calculated?
- d. If this data is available, could the United States provide the amount of non-exempt direct payments to dairy and to beef cattle and calve producers under the LFP, LIP, and ELAP programmes during market year 2021/22.

AG-IMS ID 107205: Question by New Zealand - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Following the United States' answers to questions AG-IMS IDs [106109](#) and [106110](#), New Zealand is seeking additional detail regarding what ad hoc measures in the US concluded in the marketing years 2020-2022, and why these measures were concluded.

AG-IMS ID 107108: Question by India - Direct payments: payments under environmental programmes

India thanks the US for its response to AG-IMS ID [106178](#). India requests a list of programs that were phased out other than the *Klamath River Basin Block Grant*.

AG-IMS ID 107170: Question by Canada - Non-product-specific AMS

Canada takes note of the United States' response in AG-IMS ID [106100](#) on its notification of non-product specific AMS for its Agriculture Risk Coverage-County (ARC-CO) expenditures and Price Loss Coverage (PLC) expenditures. Canada would like to ask the below follow-up questions:

- a. Could the United States provide more information on both programmes' eligibility criteria, specifically whether applicants are required to specify whether they are still producers as part of their applications?

- b. Could the United States provide information on the number of producers that have received payments and that were active producers at the time they received a payment versus those that have received payments and were no longer in production?
- c. Of the active producers, which were involved in the production of the same commodity for which they were receiving a commodity-specific payment?
- d. Could the United States provide the total dollar amount that active producers received during the marketing year 2020/21?

2.3.15 Uruguay ([G/AG/N/URY/81](#), [G/AG/N/URY/82](#), [G/AG/N/URY/83](#), [G/AG/N/URY/84](#))

AG-IMS ID 107173: Question by Japan - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Japan welcomes Uruguay's DS:1 notifications for four years (CY2017-2020).

There can be seen almost threefold increase in total of Green Box compared to the notifications before CY 2016. Japan would like to know the reason behind this increase mainly related to paragraph 2(b) 'Pest and disease control' and 2(g) 'Infrastructural services', Annex II, Agreement on Agriculture.

AG-IMS ID 107112: Question by India - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

For the Calendar Year 2019 DS:1 notification ([G/AG/N/URY/83](#)), it is observed that the Green Box support declined by 11.92% from CY 2018 (USD 137,313,727 in CY 2018 to USD 120,944,573 in CY 2019). With both general services and environmental programmes support declining, India would like to understand the factors contributing to the reduction in the support.

AG-IMS ID 107175: Question by Canada - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Canada notes that, in [G/AG/N/URY/82](#), [G/AG/N/URY/83](#) and [G/AG/N/URY/84](#), under Annex 2 paragraph 2(f), Uruguay has notified expenditures for the programme Mejor de estación – Canasta inteligente, and in [G/AG/URY/84](#) under paragraph 2 2(g) for the 'Metropolitan Agri-Food Unit', both of which were not included in Uruguay's previous DS:1 notifications. In addition, Uruguay notified expenditures under Annex 2 paragraph 8 in 2018 and 2020 following a Declaration of agricultural emergency, pursuant to a drought situation. Uruguay does not appear to have submitted a Table DS:2 to demonstrate how these domestic support measures are exempt from reduction commitments and meet the criteria of Annex 2 of the Agreement on Agriculture.

- a. Could Uruguay provide timelines as to when it intends to submit a Table DS:2 to provide the required information related to Mejor de estación – Canasta inteligente and the Metropolitan Agri-Food Unit?
- b. Could Uruguay provide details as to the eligibility criteria for a producer to receive a direct payment under Annex 2, paragraph 8 in 2018 and 2020, including whether payments were made in situations where a producer's losses exceeded 30% of its average production in the preceding three years, or based on an Olympic average?

AG-IMS ID 107174: Question by United States of America - General services: other

The recent submission of overdue domestic support notifications for Calendar Years 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020 from Uruguay are appreciated.

In [G/AG/N/URY/81](#), Supporting Table DS:1 notes the implementation of the Pilot Livestock Index Insurance Plan to gather information for the design of a potential index-based insurance product based on the normalized difference vegetation index. It was noted that family farmers from the Basalto and Sierras del Este landscape units were financially supported to be able to participate in the program. This programme was also notified in the two following notifications ([G/AG/N/URY/82](#), [G/AG/N/URY/83](#)). However, the pilot program is not listed in [G/AG/N/URY/84](#) nor does there appear to be a permanent program.

- a. Please clarify how these family farmers from the Basalto and Sierras del Este landscape unit received financial support.
- b. Please confirm the pilot programme has ended and no permanent Livestock Index Insurance Plan has been implemented.
- i. If there is a permanent programme, do participants receive financial support to participate? What are the eligibility criteria for producers to participate?

AG-IMS ID 107113: Question by India - Direct payments: payments under environmental programmes

India thanks Uruguay for their domestic support notification for the calendar years 2017 ([G/AG/N/URY/81](#)), 2018 ([G/AG/N/URY/82](#)), 2019 ([G/AG/N/URY/83](#)), and 2020 ([G/AG/N/URY/84](#)). India notices that the environmental programmes mentioned in DS:1 CY 2016 ([G/AG/N/URY/63](#)) "national directorate of natural resources" and "development and climate change adaptation" are not mentioned in CY 2017, CY 2018, CY 2019, and CY 2020 DS:1 notification.

In this context, India seeks clarification from Uruguay on the following:

- a. Have these programmes ended or merged with new programmes?
- b. Would Uruguay provide a DS:2 notification concerning the new or modified domestic support environmental programmes?

AG-IMS ID 107172: Question by Canada - Investment subsidies generally available to agriculture

Canada would like to thank Uruguay for its 2017, 2018, 2019 and 2020 domestic support notifications. Canada notes that Uruguay has notified expenditures under Supporting Table DS:2 in 2017, 2018, 2019 and 2020 for the 'Associative Water Strategies for Production (EAAP)' and for 2017, 2018 and 2020 for the 'Water for Rural Development Programme (MADR),' both of which appear to have been introduced in 2017, as these programmes do not appear in Uruguay's 2016 DS:1 notification. Canada also notes that Uruguay does not appear to have submitted a Table DS:2 to demonstrate how these two domestic support measures are exempt from reduction commitments and meet the criteria of Article 6.2 of the Agreement on Agriculture.

- a. Could Uruguay provide timelines as to when it intends to submit a Table DS:2 to provide the required information related to the EAAP and the MADR?
- b. Could Uruguay provide a rationale as to why no expenditures were reported for the MADR in 2019?

AG-IMS ID 107110: Question by India - Investment subsidies generally available to agriculture

In Domestic Support notification DS:1 for the calendar year 2019 ([G/AG/N/URY/83](#)), Development Programmes in Supporting Table DS:2 declined from USD 878,929 (CY 2018) to USD 415,254 (CY 2019). India understands that *Value Chains and Family Production (Enhancing Value in Family Production)* implementation stopped in 2018, however, what was the reason behind the decline in *Associative Water Strategies for Production (EAAP)* support?

AG-IMS ID 107114: Question by India - Investment subsidies generally available to agriculture

In the recent DS:1 notification ([G/AG/N/URY/84](#)) for the calendar year 2020, India observes that Uruguay's development programme support has increased to USD 1,705,942 from USD 415,254 in CY 2019 due to the addition of "More Water for Rural Development Programme (MADR)" programme. India understands that this programme helps rural producers use natural resources in a sustainable way, enhancing their ability to adapt to climate variability and change. Through this programme, non-reimbursable support is provided to offset the extraordinary costs of implementing projects for the supply and distribution of water on the farms of small, medium-sized and family farmers

throughout the country, as well as technical assistance that contributes to a farm development project. In this context, India seeks further information:

- a. What constitute the "extraordinary costs"?
- b. How does Uruguay define small, medium-sized farmers?
- c. What kind of technical assistance is provided to a farm development project?

AG-IMS ID 107115: Question by India - Other product-specific AMS/EMS

In AG-IMS ID [105111](#), Uruguay responded that MGAP and the BSE subsidize the insurance premium for the farming sector since 2002, under Law No. 17.503 of 30 June 2002, as amended by Law No. 17.844 of 21 October 2004 and Law No. 18.827 of 21 October 2011, which set up the Farm Development Fund (FFG), formerly known as the Farm Reconstruction and Development Fund (FRFG).

Since the amount of insurance premium subsidy is determined based on the actual size of poultry farmers in square meters and for pigs in sows, please provide the breakdown of support for 'poultry' and 'pigs' individually under the Supporting Table DS:7 Farm Development in CY 2020 ([G/AG/N/URY/84](#)).

AG-IMS ID 107171: Question by United States of America - Other product-specific AMS/EMS

In Supporting Table DS:7 of [G/AG/N/URY/81](#), Uruguay notifies that the dairy sector receives discounted electricity tariffs. This same measure is also notified in [G/AG/N/URY/82](#), [G/AG/N/URY/83](#), and [G/AG/N/URY/84](#), but for other sectors (e.g., rice).

- a. Please provide additional details regarding discounted energy tariffs and what commodities were eligible for CY 2017 through CY 2020?
- b. What was the reason for different commodities having notified support in different years? For example, was rice eligible in all years and support was only provided in specific years or are eligible commodities determined annually. If the latter, on what basis is this determination made.

AG-IMS ID 107111: Question by India - Other product-specific AMS/EMS

As per the Supporting Table DS:7 of CY 2017 ([G/AG/N/URY/81](#)) and CY 2018 ([G/AG/N/URY/82](#)) 'More Meat and Wool Livestock Programme' and 'More Value to Sheep Production programme' offer non-repayable financial support to partially offset the costs of implementing projects in livestock and sheep value chain systems. In this regard, please provide the following information:

- a. What are the eligibility criteria for projects to take advantage of the non-repayable financial support?
- b. Is there any limit to financial support that can be claimed by small, medium-sized family producers, if so, what is it?

2.3.16 Viet Nam ([G/AG/N/VNM/20](#))

AG-IMS ID 107119: Question by Australia - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Australia thanks Viet Nam for submitting their 2020 DS:1 notification ([G/AG/N/VNM/20](#)) and the relevant supporting tables. Australia notes that the total agricultural value of production (VoP) is missing from Supporting Table DS:4.

Could Viet Nam please provide its total agricultural VoP for 2020?

AG-IMS ID 107176: Question by Canada - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Canada notes that Viet Nam's expenditures for "Payments for relief from natural disasters" decreased significantly from the calendar year 2017-2019 average of VND 2,899.05 billion, to current 2020 levels of VND 1,209.76 billion.

- a. Viet Nam noted in its response to Canada's question, in AG-IMS ID [97150](#), that the Government had issued a new policy on support for agricultural insurance. Could Viet Nam confirm whether such a decrease was due to the policy reform referred to in its response? If so, could Viet Nam provide information as to what has been changed and when?
- b. Further to AG-IMS ID 97150, could Viet Nam explain how each current programme notified under paragraph 8 of Annex 2 meets all the criteria, particularly the trigger criteria (30% loss of income) and the base period criteria (three or five years) of paragraph 8(a)?
- c. If any of these programmes are new or modified, could Viet Nam provide timelines as to when it intends to submit a Table DS:2 notification to demonstrate how these meet the relevant Annex 2 criteria?

AG-IMS ID 107177: Question by Canada - Direct payments: payments under regional assistance programmes

Viet Nam has notified VND 1,447 billion expenditures under paragraph 13 for "Supporting the poor in remote and mountainous areas in order to alleviate hunger and poverty."

- a. Could Viet Nam provide more detail about the programme, including on how it meets each criteria under sub-paragraph 13(a)-13(f)?
- b. If this is a new or modified programme, could Viet Nam provide timelines as to when it intends to submit a Table DS:2 notification to demonstrate how these meet the relevant Annex 2 criteria?

AG-IMS ID 107178: Question by Canada - Direct payments: payments under regional assistance programmes

Could Viet Nam confirm if the total monetary value of all expenditures Viet Nam has notified under paragraph 13 (regional assistance programs) should read VND 10,490.69 billion instead of VND 20,981.37 billion? If not, could Viet Nam provide the rationale as to why total expenditures under paragraph 13 are greater than the added total of each of the programme-specific expenditures notified?

AG-IMS ID 107180: Question by United States of America - Direct payments: payments under regional assistance programmes

In Supporting Table DS:1 of [G/AG/N/VNM/20](#), Viet Nam reported VND 20,981 million in regional assistance support. The second largest category of support was the measure with the description beginning "Program on rapid and sustainable poverty reduction..., well known as Resolution 30 (supporting reclamation costs, varieties, fertilizer, loan interest on agricultural production, vaccine, livestock, poultry, food aid, extension, plant protection, etc...."

- a. Please confirm if the sub-total for regional assistance is the correct value or an error.
- b. Given the numerous different activities covered under this description that appear to possibly be more appropriately broken out in either other parts of Supporting Table DS:1 or other supporting tables, please explain why this has been notified as regional assistance and how it meets the exemption criteria therein. For example, how does fertilizer, loan interest on agricultural production qualify within the green box and why is food aid, extension, plant protection, and animal health notified here and not under other respective types of Supporting Table DS:1 measures?
- c. Please describe what type of measure is being referred to for the terms "livestock", "poultry", and "fertilizer"?

- d. What was the reason for the more than doubling of expenditures under this measure since the previous notification for CY 2019?

AG-IMS ID 107179: Question by Canada - Other product-specific AMS/EMS

Canada notes that the expenditures Viet Nam notified for "Variety Support" across various products (e.g., pig, buffalo, cow, etc.) in Supporting Table DS:7 declined from a total amount of VND 10,907.60 billion in 2019 ([G/AG/N/VNM/19](#)) to VND 106.18 billion in 2020 ([G/AG/N/VNM/20](#)). Could Viet Nam provide a rationale, including potential policy changes, that would explain this significant decline in "Variety Support"?

AG-IMS ID 107181: Question by United States of America - Other product-specific AMS/EMS

In Supporting Table DS:4 of [G/AG/N/VNM/20](#), the value of production for poultry declined significantly.

Please explain the reason for this sharp decline.

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

2.4.1 Australia ([G/AG/N/AUS/155](#), [G/AG/N/AUS/155/Rev.1](#), [G/AG/N/AUS/158](#))

AG-IMS ID 107182: Question by European Union - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

- a. Last Australia's DS:2 Notifications [G/AG/N/AUS/155](#) issued in September 2023 and [G/AG/N/AUS/158](#) issued in November 2023 cover measures implemented over the years belonging to the past, many of which have already expired in 2021 or 2022.

What are the reasons for those notification delays?

- b. Can Australia specify how its programmes contained in notifications [G/AG/N/AUS/155](#) and [G/AG/N/AUS/158](#) comply with the indicated paragraphs of Annex 2 of the AoA, as this information is not provided in the notifications?
- c. In particular, how does the Bushfire Recovery Programme comply with paragraph 8 of Annex 2?

2.4.2 Canada ([G/AG/N/CAN/160](#))

AG-IMS ID 107183: Question by European Union - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

- a. The European Union notes that measures notified by Canada in [G/AG/N/CAN/160](#) cover the period 2018-2023. Given the fact that we are in November 2023, Could Canada please explain the reasons for the substantial delay in notifying these measures, which renders the information provided less useful for other WTO Members? Will these measures continue to be in place beyond 2023?
- b. Canada specifies, that the AgriMarketing programme provides "*up to CAD 121 million in support for Canada's agriculture and agri-food industry to promote and market their products globally*". Are payments under this programme contingent on exports?
- c. The Expanding Markets and Regional Opportunities programme aims to support Ontario's agri-food and agri-products industry to gain and maintain access to new and growing markets, including taking advantage of market opportunities. What precisely is being financed under this programme? Are payments under this programme contingent on exports?
- d. The Agriculture Development Fund (ADF) supports the growth of the agriculture industry by developing solutions to emerging problems that constrain production and value-added processing. What precisely is being financed under this programme?

- e. Climate Change (Alberta): The programme is to contribute to climate change action and the Partnership's Environmental Sustainability and Climate Change priority area by helping the sector reduce GHG emissions and implement practices to adapt to climate change, position itself in a low carbon economy, minimize resource waste and optimize resource utilization, and understand the risk and opportunities related to GHG emissions. Can Canada explain how payments under this programme notified under paragraph 12 of Annex 2 to the AoA comply with the requirements thereof? In particular, how is it ensured that the amount of payment is limited to the extra costs or loss of income involved in complying with the government programme?
- f. The Environmental Sustainability and Climate Change initiative is designed to increase the sector's capacity to maintain competitiveness, manage risks, enhance productivity and contribute to economic growth through action on climate change and increasing environmental sustainability. The initiative addresses priority environmental issues related to water quality, air quality, soil health and biodiversity, and includes the following programmes: an Environmental Farm Plan, Beneficial Management Practices (BMP) and Climate Change Adaptation Program (CCAP). Can Canada explain how payments under this programme notified under paragraph 12 of Annex 2 to the AoA comply with the requirements thereof? In particular, how is it ensured that the amount of payment is limited to the extra costs or loss of income involved in complying with the government programme?
- g. Action Manitoba will help farmers implement and adopt beneficial management practices (BMPs) on their farm identified in their Environmental Farm Plan. The BMPs are grouped into categories related to: resource efficiency planning; soil improvement and GHG reduction; manure and livestock management; drainage water management; and hazardous products management. Can Canada explain how payments under this programme notified under paragraph 12 of Annex 2 to the AoA comply with the requirements thereof? In particular, how is it ensured that the amount of payment is limited to the extra costs or loss of income involved in complying with the government programme?
- h. The Environmentally Sustainable Agriculture programme will assist producers to evaluate the environmental and climate change risks associated with their operations, acquire knowledge and tools to address these risks, provide financial incentives to help them implement solutions and assist them to enhance their land base. The programme is separated in three sub-programmes: Environmental Management Planning, Agro-Environmental Club Program, and Adoption of Environmental Beneficial Management Practices. It is stated that financing under this Programme is notified under Annex 2, paragraph 2(d) and paragraph 12 of the Agreement on Agriculture. Can Canada specify which elements of the Programme are notified under paragraph 12? Can Canada explain how payments under this programme notified under paragraph 12 of Annex 2 to the AoA comply with the requirements thereof? In particular, how is it ensured that the amount of payment is limited to the extra costs or loss of income involved in complying with the government programme?
- i. The Agricultural Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation Program will support projects aimed at reducing the level of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and addressing the impacts of climate change such as extreme weather events, changing water availability, soil conditions, pests, etc., and at improving the sector's ability to manage climate change risks, including through clean technology innovation and adoption, while building public confidence in the environmental performance of the sector. Can Canada explain how payments under this programme notified under paragraph 12 of Annex 2 to the AoA comply with the requirements thereof? In particular, how is it ensured that the amount of payment is limited to the extra costs or loss of income involved in complying with the government programme?
- j. The environmental stewardship programme supports the sector by better reflecting the commitments that have been identified within the Canada-Ontario Lake Erie Action Plan, Ontario's Agricultural Soil Health and Conservation Strategy, and the Made-in-Ontario Environment Plan. Can Canada explain how payments under this programme notified under paragraph 12 of Annex 2 to the AoA comply with the requirements thereof? In

particular, how is it ensured that the amount of payment is limited to the extra costs or loss of income involved in complying with the government programme?

- k. The Environmental Sustainability and Climate Change programme features two subprogrammes: Agriculture Stewardship Program (ASP) and Alternative Land Use Services program (ALUS). The first is a suite of initiatives designed to increase environmental sustainability, climate change mitigation and adaptation by providing technical and financial support to encourage producers to voluntarily implement Beneficial Management Practices (BMPs). The focus of the ALUS programme will be to prevent soil erosion and siltation of watercourses and wet lands, improve water quality and enhance wildlife habitat in targeted areas beyond those covered by Prince Edward Island's regulations on agricultural practices. It is stated that financing under this Programme is notified under Annex 2, paragraph 2(d) and paragraph 12 of the Agreement on Agriculture. Can Canada specify which elements of the Programme are notified under paragraph 12? Can Canada explain how payments under this programme notified under paragraph 12 of Annex 2 to the AoA comply with the requirements thereof? In particular, how is it ensured that the amount of payment is limited to the extra costs or loss of income involved in complying with the government programme?
- l. The Prime-Vert program aims to increase the adoption of agri-environmental practices by agricultural businesses that benefit the environment and human health. Areas of intervention include: preservation and improvement of water quality, soil health and conservation, pesticide usage reduction and risk assessment, biodiversity conservation and the fight against climate change (including GHG emission reductions and adaptation). It is stated that financing under this Programme is notified under Annex 2, paragraph 2(d) and paragraph 12 of the Agreement on Agriculture. Can Canada specify which elements of the Programme are notified under paragraph 12? Can Canada explain how payments under this programme notified under paragraph 12 of Annex 2 to the AoA comply with the requirements thereof? In particular, how is it ensured that the amount of payment is limited to the extra costs or loss of income involved in complying with the government programme?
- m. Saskatchewan's environmental sustainability and climate change programme objective is to enhance the resiliency and sustainability of the agriculture sector by proactively managing environmental risks. The initiative includes the following programmes and activities: Environmental Farm Plans (EFP) and Farm Stewardship Program (FSP). Can Canada explain how payments under this programme notified under paragraph 12 of Annex 2 to the AoA comply with the requirements thereof? In particular, how is it ensured that the amount of payment is limited to the extra costs or loss of income involved in complying with the government programme?

AG-IMS ID 107184: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

The initiatives of various provinces to address climate change is welcomed as notified in [G/AG/N/CAN/160](#). A few examples of what has been notified by Canada include: Alberta's measure aims to contribute to climate change action through reducing greenhouse gas emissions and implementing practices to adapt to climate change, British Columbia's measure aims to maintain competitiveness, manage risk, and enhance productivity through action on climate and increasing environmental sustainability, and Nova Scotia's measure aims to reduce the level of greenhouse gas emissions and address the impacts of climate change.

Many of these measures are notified under Annex 2, paragraph 12 of the Agreement on Agriculture, which states "Eligibility for such payments shall be determined as part of a clearly-defined government environmental or conservation programme and be dependent on the fulfilment of specific conditions under the government programme, including conditions related to production methods or inputs."

In order to better understand this measure and to facilitate a Member-sharing experience in addressing the important issue of climate change:

- a. Please explain how payments to producers are determined.

- b. What are the specific conditions that producers must meet?
- c. What metrics have been adopted to ensure actions undertaken by producers are positively contributing to reducing greenhouse gas emissions and other factors outlined.
- d. How has Canada facilitated cooperation and information across provinces?
- e. Has Canada considered ways to share its experiences internationally?
- f. Noting these measures all expire at the end of 2023, what lessons has Canada and its provinces learned from these experiences and can Canada share what the next steps are following the end of these measures?

AG-IMS ID 107190: Question by United States of America - Direct payments: income insurance and income safety-net programmes

We appreciate the explanation of how the AgriStability program has been modified under the CAP in [G/AG/N/CAN/160](#). We note that one of the modifications to this programme was the removal, starting in programme year 2020, of the reference margin limit, which was introduced in the 2013 programme year.

- a. Why was the reference margin limit removed starting in programme year 2020?
- b. What effect does this removal have on the level of payments to producers? We note that in calendar year 2018, expenditures notified under this programme were CAD 238.5 million. In calendar 2019, they rose to CAD 443.5 million, falling slightly in calendar year 2020 (CAD 361.2 million).
- c. We note that this programme is notified on a "stabilization year" – (note 1 to supporting table DS:1). Does that mean that payments notified in 2020 reflect lost income in a different year?

AG-IMS ID 107185: Question by United States of America - Classification of measures

Regarding the AgriAssurance program notified in [G/AG/N/CAN/160](#), we note that funding is provided directly to small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) operating in the agriculture sector to adopt assurance systems and obtain third party certification when it is required to meet an export opportunity.

Please explain how this is not a direct payment to producers.

AG-IMS ID 107186: Question by United States of America - Classification of measures

We are interested in learning more about the AgriRisk Initiatives programme notified in [G/AG/N/CAN/160](#).

- a. We understand that this is a new measure that covers the period FY 2018 to FY 2023. However, it is unclear if this programme is notified in [G/AG/N/CAN/158](#) or [G/AG/N/CAN/159](#). Please explain if the measure is included in these notifications, and if not, when it will be notified in a Table DS:1 notification.
- b. Please explain how this programme relates to the AgriInsurance program that is notified in Supporting Table DS:9 in [G/AG/N/CAN/159](#).
- c. We note that both components of this programme are being notified under Annex 2, paragraph 2(a) of the Agreement on Agriculture. The research and development (R&D) component fits the policy-specific criteria under para. 2(a), but the second component, Administrative Capacity Building (ACB), does not seem to meet the policy-specific criteria for research (para 2(a)). According to the notification, ACB "...provides funding to build administrative capacity during the early years of delivering new risk management tools and help demonstrate the operational viability of these new tools to attract and secure

private sector support." Please explain why ACB is being notified under Annex 2, paragraph 2(a) of the Agreement on Agriculture and not under a different paragraph 2 category?

2.4.3 Canada ([G/AG/N/CAN/161](#))

AG-IMS ID 107192: Question by European Union - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

The European Union notes that the three measures notified by Canada in [G/AG/N/CAN/161](#) were applied 15 June - 15 July 2020, fiscal years 2018 - 2021 and 1 April 2021 - 31 January 2023 with an extension to 1 March 2024 respectively. Could Canada please explain the reasons for the substantial delay in notifying these measures, which renders the information less useful for other WTO Members?

AG-IMS ID 107193: Question by Japan - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Japan thanks Canada for its DS:2 notification, [G/AG/N/CAN/161](#).

Regarding Agricultural Clean Technology (ACT) program on page 3, it is described that this programme consists of two components, "Research and Innovation Stream" and "Adoption Stream". It seems the expenditure for this programme is included in either Paragraph 2(a) 'Research' or Paragraph 12 'Payments under environmental programmes' of Annex II of the Agreement on Agriculture. Could Canada provide the breakdown to illustrate the amount of each stream in the DS:1 notifications for CY2018, 2019 and 2020?

AG-IMS ID 107194: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

On 25 August 2023, Canada circulated a Table DS:2 notification ([G/AG/N/CAN/161](#)) that addresses new or modified programmes associated with the Canadian Agricultural Partnership (CAP), which is a five-year investment covering 2018-2023. Noting that this submission was made only a few months before the end of the period covered by the CAP:

- a. Please explain the cause of the delay in making this submission.
- b. Please provide an update on what is planned to occur or replace the CAP upon its expiration at the end of 2023.

AG-IMS ID 107196: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

The description of the programme, "CAP priority area: *Markets and Trade* (Cost-Shared)" is insufficient to fully understand how the components of this programme meet the criteria for exemption under Annex 2, paragraph 2 of the Agreement on Agriculture. Specifically:

- a. Please identify the eligible applicants to receiving funding under each component.
- b. Please provide more details for the "Buy BC Partnership Programme," specifically, what activities are covered under these two components (Buy BC logo licensing and Buy BC cost-shared funding) and how does this measure meet the policy-specific criteria under Annex 2, paragraph 2(f) of the Agreement on Agriculture.
- c. Please provide more details for the "Expanding Markets and Regional Opportunities" program and how it meets the policy-specific criteria set out in Annex 2, paragraph 2(d) of the Agreement on Agriculture.
- d. For the "Programme services-conseils," what is meant by adapting to a "constantly changing business environment while respecting societal expectations," and how do the advisory services under this program address those conditions?

- e. Please explain how the funding streams under the "Product2Market-Value-Added" programme meet the policy-specific criteria under Annex 2, paragraph 2(f) of the Agreement on Agriculture.

AG-IMS ID 107191: Question by European Union - Domestic food aid

Follow-up of question of AG-IMS ID [106093](#)

The EU thanks Canada for the reply to question AG-IMS ID [106093](#).

Canada has referred to DS:2 notification [G/AG/N/CAN/161](#), where details of the *Surplus Food Rescue Program* have been provided.

Canada has stated in paragraph (3) *Detailed description of measure* that: "*Eligibility for payments is determined by clearly-defined criteria related to nutritional objectives for vulnerable populations and avoiding food waste. Administration and financing of the programme is transparent and is publicly available on the Government of Canada website. The programme's funding allowed eligible organizations to bid on perishable surplus products competitively.*"

The EU thanks Canada for the reply.

Could Canada provide more details on the defined criteria and the financing of the programme?

AG-IMS ID 107195: Question by United States of America - Classification of measures

Regarding the programmes notified under the CAP priority area: "*Science, research, and innovation* (Cost Shared)," we have a few questions regarding their classification. Specifically:

- a. According to the notification, the Ontario Agri-food Research Initiative supports "...Knowledge Translation and Transfer (KTT) activities" and provides support for "advancing innovative technologies, services and products by funding market validation and product development activities." Please explain how the funding under this programme meets the policy-specific criteria of Annex 2, paragraph 2(a) of the Agreement on Agriculture.
- b. There is insufficient information to determine if the "Agriculture Development Fund" meets the policy-specific criteria of Annex 2, paragraph 2(a) of the Agreement on Agriculture. Please provide more details in support of this notification.
- c. Based on the description in the notification, the ADOPT programme appears to be broader in scope than just research. What other activities are funded under this programme; for example, what type of demonstration and evaluation projects fall under this program?

2.4.4 European Union ([G/AG/N/EU/88](#))

AG-IMS ID 107204: Question by Paraguay - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

We thank the EU for its replies to the questions submitted under AG-IMS ID 106120 regarding how the additional costs or loss of revenue incurred in complying with environmental programmes are measured; however, these replies focus on who makes the calculation, details concerning adjustment to different sectors and areas, and whose responsibility the calculation is made under, but do not cover how the calculation is made or how compliance with the provisions of paragraph 12 of Annex 2 of the AoA could be verified.

AG-IMS ID 107147: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Regarding sectorial interventions, which are described in Section 1.3.3 of [G/AG/N/EU/88](#), the EU indicated that it established interventions in certain sectors that follow the requirements of Annex 2 of the Agreement on Agriculture.

- a. Are all of these measures new, or are some modified existing measures? Please specify which measures fall into which category (new or modified).

- b. Please provide more detail on each specific component listed under each sectoral category. For example, we count nearly 30 individual programmes under the category "fruit and vegetables, hops, olive oil, table olives and other sectors referred to in Article 42, point (f)" and each entry includes one or more different references to paragraphs in Annex 2, which presumably are the basis for exemption. It is not possible to evaluate some of these measures without additional information on how they meet the policy-specific criteria.
- c. Under the EU's sectorial interventions for fruits and vegetables, hops, olive oil, table olives, and other sectors, the EU establishes investments in tangible and intangible assets, research, experimental and innovative production methods, and other actions in improving resilience against pests and reducing risks and impacts of pesticide use, including implementing Integrated Pest Management Techniques.
 - i. How will the EU provide financial support under its 2023-2027 Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) to reduce the risks of pesticide use while facilitating food security and minimizing the impact on trading partners?
 - ii. The United States notes that there is no definition of "Integrated Pest Management Techniques" in Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013 or in Regulation (EU) No 2021/2115. Please provide a definition of "Integrated Pest Management Techniques" and explain how the EU's investments in Integrated Pest Management Techniques are consistent with its obligations under the Agreement on Agriculture?

AG-IMS ID 107148: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

In [G/AG/N/EU/88](#), Section 3.1.4 provides information on types of interventions in rural development. We note that member States had "...the freedom to design their interventions as Green Box compatible, choosing the Paragraph most suitable to their situation out of those listed in Annex 2..." While there is a lot of descriptive information in this section, we do not see specific examples of member State programmes (interventions) and would ask the following questions:

- a. Please provide the specific programmes that EU member States have developed in accordance with Annex 2 criteria, along with a description of each programme and the basis for exemption.
- b. In particular, please provide more details about investments in irrigation, which is referenced on p. 8, and explain why paragraph 11 or paragraph 8 of Annex 2 would serve as the basis for exemption.

AG-IMS ID 107144: Question by Australia - Article 6.5 (Blue Box)

Australia thanks the EU for its response to AG-IMS ID [106115](#). We note in the EU's answer that only one EU member State made a choice to design two Coupled Support interventions in a way to comply with the requirements of Article 6.5.

- a. Could the EU please clarify which member State decided to design its Coupled Support interventions to comply with the requirements of Article 6.5?
- b. Could the EU please provide further information on these two Coupled Support interventions including, if available, relevant links to webpages containing further information?

AG-IMS ID 107146: Question by United States of America - Article 6.5 (Blue Box)

In [G/AG/N/EU/88](#) Section 1.3.2 Coupled Direct Payments, the EU explains that member States may grant Coupled Income Support under production-limiting programmes within defined quantitative limits and based on fixed areas and yields or on a fixed number of animals in compliance with Article 6.5. Moreover, the notification states that other types of Coupled Support Payments applied without the production-limiting constraints are out of scope of this notification.

- a. Please provide an example of a member State Coupled Income Support under production-limiting programmes, compared to an example of a member State Coupled Income Support that is applied without the production-limiting constraints.
- b. Will the EU's Table DS:1 notification provide specific legal or regulatory references for each programme notified in Supporting Table DS:3 to enhance transparency and provide Members with the ability to review how each member State is implementing this type of program?

AG-IMS ID 107145: Question by United States of America - Classification of measures

In [G/AG/N/EU/88](#), for a number of new or modified measures described under 1.3.1 Decoupled Direct Payments, paragraph 5 of Annex 2 is cited as the basis for exemption rather than paragraph 6 of Annex 2 as was the case for the previous decoupled income support measures.

- a. For those measures in this category for which payments are not based on payment entitlements and the EU is claiming paragraph 5 of Annex 2 as the basis for exemption, please provide a fuller explanation of how these payments will be structured.
- b. Will the payment rate be unchanged or is there a different basis on which the payments will be made?

2.4.5 Nigeria ([G/AG/N/NGA/27](#))

AG-IMS ID 107197: Question by Canada - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Canada would like to thank Nigeria for notifying its Economic Recovery and Growth Plan (ERGP) as part of its latest Table DS:2 notification. In the notification, Nigeria mentions that measures under ERGP fall under Annex 2 and Article 6.2 of the Agreement on Agriculture. Canada understands that ERGP is a wide-ranging plan that includes various policy tools that aim to boost agricultural productivity and self-sufficiency.

Could Nigeria provide detailed information for each measure of the ERGP that meet the criteria of Annex 2, including how each of these measures meet the criteria as well as which policy-specific criteria are met?

AG-IMS ID 107198: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

In [G/AG/N/NGA/27](#), Nigeria has notified the Economic and Recovery Growth Plan (ERGP) that was established in February 2017 and concluded in December 2020. Nigeria notes that this plan includes various measures that meet various Annex 2 and Article 6.2 criteria. While efforts to boost productivity are welcomed, particularly through the use of Annex 2 and Article 6.2 support, further information is requested.

- a. Utilizing Nigeria's most recent Table DS:1 notification, [G/AG/N/NGA/20](#), please identify which measures correspond to the EGRP notified in [G/AG/N/NGA/27](#).
- b. For each measure within the ERGP, that is included in Supporting Table DS:2 [G/AG/N/NGA/27](#), how does each meet the criteria established under Article 6.2 and Annex 2 of the Agreement on Agriculture?

AG-IMS ID 107199: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

While [G/AG/N/NGA/27](#) is a welcome contribution, the notification has aggregated measures to such an extent that it is not possible to identify how measures comply with various exemption criteria. Nigeria is encouraged to provide additional details in a revision, as well as to respond to a number of outstanding questions that could be partially or fully answered through a more fulsome Table DS:2 notification. These questions include AG-IMS IDs [99076](#), [99077](#), [98174](#), and [98175](#).

- a. When will responses to these questions, dating back to 2021, be provided for Members to review?

- b. When will a revised Table DS:2 be provided with the required information?

2.4.6 United States of America ([G/AG/N/USA/170](#))

AG-IMS ID 107109: Question by India - Direct payments: payments under environmental programmes

India thanks the US for their DS:2 notification ([G/AG/N/USA/170](#)). With respect to the Organic and Transitional Education and Certification Program (OTECP), India understands it is a new programme that is included in environmental programmes in Annex 2 Paragraph 12 of the AoA. India also notes that US runs the Organic Certification Cost Share Program (OCCSP) to provide cost share assistance to producers and handlers of agricultural products who are obtaining or renewing their certification. In this regard the USA is requested to provide the following information:

- a. Under OTECP, what is the meaning of "portion of eligible expense", under the criteria "payments only cover a portion of eligible expense"?
- b. Since the OTECP and Organic Certification Cost Share Program (OCCSP) are both cost-sharing programmes, what is the difference between them?
- c. India understands that the period of application is from FY 2022 and FY 2023. Are there any plans to extend the support post-2023 for OTECP?

2.4.7 Uruguay ([G/AG/N/URY/52](#))

AG-IMS ID 107200: Question by United States of America - Direct payments: payments under environmental programmes

In 2013, Uruguay notified the Development and Climate Change Adaptation Project in its Table DS:2 notification ([G/AG/N/URY/52](#)). Under paragraph 5, [G/AG/N/URY/52](#) says that the programme will be applied until March 2017. Uruguay has continued to notify programmes under DACC-World Bank, most recently the More Water for Rural Development Programme in the Supporting Table DS:2 of [G/AG/N/URY/84](#) for CY 2020.

- a. Please provide the current implementation period for the Development and Climate Change Adaptation Project.
- b. How has the measure been changed or modified since it was originally notified in 2013? If there have been changes, will a Table DS:2 notification be issued?

2.5 EXPORT PROHIBITIONS AND RESTRICTIONS (TABLE ER:1)

2.5.1 Kazakhstan ([G/AG/N/KAZ/27](#))

AG-IMS ID 107026: Question by United Kingdom - Transparency issues

We would like to thank Kazakhstan for their submission of [G/AG/N/KAZ/27](#), notifying their export restrictions on live cattle and small cattle.

We strongly encourage other WTO Members to follow Kazakhstan's good example, providing timely notification of export restrictions and prohibitions to the Committee on Agriculture, and adopting measures (e.g. temporary quotas) that seek to mitigate the consequences on importing Members.

We note that it is helpful for Members to understand the intended duration of any restrictive measures - could Kazakhstan provide further information on how the timescales for their measures were determined?

AG-IMS ID 107029: Question by United States of America, Switzerland - Transparency issues

In December 2022, Kazakhstan introduced an export quota for bulls, rams, and cattle breeding stock at 60,000 head for bulls over 12 months of age and 120,000 head for ram over six months of age;

the measure was set to expire in March 2023. In March 2023, the Ministry of Agriculture extended the export quota until 24 December 2023. The most recent extension was notified in [G/AG/N/KAZ/27](#).

- a. Please explain how export controls on live cattle from Kazakhstan have impacted producer income and profitability?
- b. Has Kazakhstan considered other policy options that would not distort markets or reduce income for Kazakhstan producers as a result of exports of live cattle to international markets? If so, please explain the options considered.

2.6 NOTIFICATIONS IN THE CONTEXT OF THE NFIDC DECISION (TABLE NF:1)

2.6.1 Canada ([G/AG/N/CAN/154](#), [G/AG/N/CAN/155](#), [G/AG/N/CAN/156](#))

AG-IMS ID 107201: Question by European Union - Quantity and concessionality of food aid

Canada indicates that its "food assistance incorporates a mix of tools, including provision of eligible products, cash, vouchers, nutritional interventions, and livelihood protection in emergency and early recovery situations". What proportion of Canadian food assistance was given as in-kind assistance in the notified period 2019 - 2021?

3 OVERDUE NOTIFICATIONS

3.1 Australia

AG-IMS ID 107187: Question by European Union

Last Australia's DS1 notification covers the years 2018/2019. When will Australia provide its updated notifications?

AG-IMS ID 107090: Question by India

India thanks Australia for filing the long overdue DS:1 notification for Marketing Year 2019-20. However, India notes that Australia's notifications for Marketing Years 2020-21, remains pending for two years. In previous responses to questions regarding due DS:1 notifications, Australia had replied that it would file the notifications in due course. Given that Australia is a developed country and technologically advanced economy, India seeks to know what factors or constraints are causing delays in notifying their Domestic Support programmes.

AG-IMS ID 107091: Question by India

India notes that Australia's DS:1 notification for Marketing Years 2021-22, remains pending for more than a year. As per [G/AG/2](#) Australia as a Member with base and annual commitment Australia should provide notifications no later than 90 days following the end of the calendar (or, marketing, fiscal, etc.) year in question. And provide a final notification no later than 120 days if a provisional notification was submitted within 90 days.

In this regard, India has the following question:

Considering DS:1 notification requirements of [G/AG/2](#) are not fulfilled by Australia repeatedly, does Australia consider these timelines too difficult to adhere to?

AG-IMS ID 107092: Question by India

India notes that Australia's DS:1 notification for Marketing Years 2022-23 remains to be filed. With this, Australia has outstanding notifications for three years. For effective monitoring and functioning of the Committee on Agriculture, transparent information on the measures adopted by Members is essential, particularly if that Member is a developed economy with base and annual commitments; in the absence of notification by the Members, this function is adversely affected.

In this regard, India would like to know what measures Australia is taking to expedite the process of filing the notifications at the WTO in time and to submit its outstanding notifications.

AG-IMS ID 107188: Question by United States of America

Noting Australia has just submitted [G/AG/N/AUS/157](#) for FY 2019/20:

When can Members expect Australia to notify for subsequent years?

3.2 Brazil

AG-IMS ID 107117: Question by India

The latest DS notification ([G/AG/N/BRA/74](#)) submitted by Brazil is for the Agricultural Year 2020/21. Could Brazil indicate when it plans to submit its outstanding DS notification for 2021-22?

3.3 Canada

AG-IMS ID 107189: Question by United States of America

Efforts taken by Canada to bring its Table DS:1 and Table DS:2 notifications more up to date are greatly appreciated. However, Canada's most recent notification is for CY 2020.

When can Members expect Canada to notify for subsequent years?

3.4 European Union

AG-IMS ID 107116: Question by India

In response to AG-IMS ID [106172](#), the EU stated that it is working actively to overcome the delays in the DS:1 notifications for marketing years 2020-21 and 2021-22. In this context, India seeks information on the following:

- a. What are the difficulties faced by the EU in adhering to the notification obligations?
- b. What steps is the EU taking to actively overcome the delays in the DS:1 notification for marketing years 2020-21 and 2021-22?

3.5 India

AG-IMS ID 107042: Question by Australia

The below question is asked to India as a follow up to AG-IMS IDs [106038](#), [97081](#), [93168](#), [92030](#), [91143](#) and [88085](#) and considering that 1) India's last Table ES:1 was for 2013/14 and India has utilized agricultural export subsidies since then, and 2) India has never notified a Table ES:3 notification even though India has provided international food aid.

Please provide an update on the status of preparation of its overdue Table ES:1 and Table ES:3 notifications. Also, please clarify when the Committee on Agriculture can expect to receive these notifications.

3.6 Thailand

AG-IMS ID 107106: Question by India

In response to question AG-IMS ID [105113](#), Thailand stated that they were in the process of gathering information for publishing their outstanding DS:1 notifications for calendar years 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, and 2021 and would notify the CoA at the earliest.

For effective monitoring and functioning of the Committee on Agriculture, transparent information on the measures adopted by Members is essential; in the absence of notification by the Members, this function is adversely affected. As a developing country, Thailand is required to notify their

Domestic Support notification within one year. However, Thailand has failed to submit its DS:1 notifications for the calendar year 2017 onwards. The last submitted notification pertains to the calendar years 2014 to 2016 ([G/AG/N/THA/85](#)) dated 6th October 2017. In this regard:

- a. To maintain transparency, when does Thailand plan to submit its outstanding DS:1 for the calendar year 2017, which has been pending for five years?
- b. To maintain transparency, when does Thailand plan to submit its outstanding DS:1 for the calendar year 2018, which has been pending for four years?
- c. To maintain transparency, when does Thailand plan to submit its outstanding DS:1 for the calendar year 2019, which has been pending for three years?
- d. To maintain transparency, when does Thailand plan to submit its outstanding DS:1 for the calendar year 2020, which has been pending for two years?
- e. To maintain transparency, when does Thailand plan to submit its outstanding DS:1 for the calendar year 2021, which has been pending for more than a year?

In view of the above, could Thailand

- f. Please explain what measures has Thailand undertaken so far to comply with its outstanding notification obligations.
- g. Please provide reasons for the delay in filing the notifications.

4 DEFERRED REPLIES

4.1 MATTERS RELEVANT TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMITMENTS: ARTICLE 18.6

4.1.1 Angola's import policies (SIM 660)

4.1.1.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID [107044](#))

The EU would like to reiterate its previous question AG-IMS [100058](#).

On 14 January 2019, Angola published Presidential Decree 23/19, i.e., The Regulation of the Commercial Chain of Supply of Goods of Basic Basket and Other Priority Goods of National Origin, which provides new import rules on 54 products, mainly agricultural goods. This Presidential Decree seeks to support domestic production and economic development by restricting importers' access to imports, including through an import licensing system that appears to prioritize the use of domestic production, similar to an import substitution policy. Given the potential impacts on EU's exports to Angola of agricultural products covered by Presidential Decree 23/19, the EU would appreciate if Angola could provide clarifications on the following points:

- a. Could Angola provide additional information on the agricultural products covered by the scope of Presidential Decree 23/19, including the specific HS codes for each commodity, as well as a list of specific goods produced in the Special Luanda-Bengo Economic Zone that are subject to the Decree?
- b. Could Angola explain how the restrictions are implemented, and notably if licenses are used to manage these restrictions?
- c. Could Angola elaborate on the process importers and wholesalers have to follow to be eligible for an import license, including on the specific steps required?
- d. Could Angola provide additional clarifications on the quantitative restrictions laid down by Article 11 of the Decree, especially on how the assessment of the existence of internal capacity for import substitution is conducted?

Angola previously indicated that cancellation of the Decree will depend on the achievement of its objectives.

- e. Could Angola elaborate on the methodology and process for the assessment of the achievement of those objectives?

4.1.2 Australia, Canada, European Union, Iceland, Japan, New Zealand, United Kingdom, United States – Restrictions on agricultural and agriculture-related services (SIM 770)

4.1.2.1 Question by Russian Federation (AG-IMS ID [107036](#), [107046](#), [107049](#), [107053](#), [107056](#), [107058](#), [107065](#), [107068](#))

The Russian Federation did not receive an answer on the substance of the matter, so our question still remains valid and we await a response in due course:

The following restrictive measures have been introduced against the Russian Federation with severe negative effects on domestic agricultural production cycle and the global food security:

- a. Prohibitions to provide technical assistance, brokering services or other services related to certain goods, including agriculture goods, for any sale, supply, transfer or export of those goods.
- b. Prohibitions to provide financing or financial assistance related to certain goods, including agriculture goods, for any sale, supply, transfer or export of those goods.
- c. Prohibitions to provide insurance and reinsurance for any sale, supply, transfer or export of those goods.
- d. Application of financial restrictions on Russian Agriculture Bank assets, as well as prohibitions to deal with their assets.

To our regret, we have to acknowledge that for the most part, these are the developing, including net-food-importing developing countries and the least-developed countries, that pay the highest price for such restrictive measures.

Could Australia, Canada, the European Union, Iceland, Norway, Japan, New Zealand, the United Kingdom and the United States, please, clarify how the application of such measures contributes to global food security. In particular, whether they believe that the observed disruptions in the supply chains of goods and services related to the production and distribution of agricultural products, including wheat and fertilizers, and increased volatility in the global agricultural market should be considered as useful contributions to food security.

4.1.3 United Kingdom's banking and financial restrictions (SIM 810)

4.1.3.1 Question by Russian Federation (AG-IMS ID [107066](#))

The Russian Federation is examining the amendment to General Licence – Transactions related to agricultural commodities including the provision of insurance and other services (INT/2022/2349952) as of June 6, 2023. Could the United Kingdom please confirm that this regulation lifts any restrictions imposed earlier on collaboration of Russian exporters and GAFTA?

4.1.4 Australia, Canada, New Zealand, United Kingdom, United States - Import duties in excess of the bound rates applied on agricultural goods (SIM 771)

4.1.4.1 Question by Russian Federation (AG-IMS ID [107045](#), [107047](#), [107062](#), [107067](#), [107069](#))

The Russian Federation did not receive an answer on the substance of the matter, so our question still remains valid and we await a response in due course:

In 2022, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and the United States have introduced import tariffs on agricultural products in excess of their bound rates violating a number of their bound rate commitments.

Such an apparent violation of the WTO commitments contributed to deteriorations in the agricultural markets.

We expect information from mentioned Members about the timing of elimination of the inconsistencies as part of their contributions to world food security and on compliance with tariff commitments.

4.1.5 Burkina Faso's domestic support (SIM 845)

4.1.5.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID [107008](#))

No response has been provided to AG-IMS ID [106039](#) for which a response is requested through this resubmission.

In [G/AG/N/BFA/20](#), [G/AG/N/BFA/21](#), and [G/AG/N/BFA/22](#), Burkina Faso notified that it provided no domestic support for the period 2019 through 2022. However, it appears that Burkina Faso may have provided various forms of domestic support during this time period, which may fall within various WTO categories of support including Green and Amber Boxes.

For example, official Burkina Faso government data indicates that there was a fixed farm gate price for cotton as well as subsidized prices for fertilizer for cotton during 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22, and 2022/23. Another example is the National Rice Development Strategy, which includes among other things, government funded research and extension for the rice sector.

- a. Please describe the government's role in setting prices for cotton and fertilizer in Burkina Faso during the time period covered by [G/AG/N/BFA/20](#), [G/AG/N/BFA/21](#), and [G/AG/N/BFA/22](#).
- b. Please provide additional details regarding the National Rice Development Strategy and the government's role in the strategy.
- c. Please explain why such measures were not notified, and confirm whether any other domestic support measures were provided from 2019 through 2022.

4.1.6 Canada, European Union, Iceland, Japan, New Zealand, Norway – Prohibitions and restrictions on agricultural machinery supplies (SIM 772)

4.1.6.1 Question by Russian Federation (AG-IMS ID [107048](#), [107050](#), [107054](#), [107059](#), [107064](#), [107060](#))

The Russian Federation did not receive an answer on the substance of the matter, so our question still remains valid and we await a response in due course:

On 9 April 2022, the European Union has prohibited the sale, supply, transfer or export of goods which, according to the Council Regulation N° 833/2014, could contribute to the enhancement of the Russian Federations' industrial capacities. Such goods, in particular, include tractors, track-laying tractors and road tractors for semi-trailers, etc., which are used in the agricultural sector.

Similar trade restrictions were undertaken by Iceland (Regulation No 281/2014), Norway (Decision No. 1076), New Zealand (Regulation SL 2022/74), Canada (Regulation SOR/2014-58) and Japan (Cabinet of Ministers Decision of 7 June 2022 on Measures Concerning the Situation in Ukraine).

As one of the major suppliers of agricultural products, including critical foodstuffs and grains, in particular wheat, the Russian Federation ensures food security of a large number of countries, net-food importing developing countries included. However, the trade prohibitions and restrictions applied on agricultural machinery including spare parts already now has a negative impact on

Russia's agricultural output, which, in turn, will progressively contribute to the food crisis and jeopardize global food security in the long run.

In this regard, we would like to find out how the application of such measures correlates with the declared objective to mitigate the food security concerns.

4.1.7 Cameroon's import substitution policy (SIM 846)

4.1.7.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID [107009](#))

No response has been provided to AG-IMS ID [106040](#) for which a response is requested through this resubmission.

In February 2023, the Ministry of Economy, Planning and Regional Development (MINEPAT) released the MINEPAT report (MINEPAT Economic Reports - MINEPAT Cameroun), which describes the implementation of an import substitution policy focused on the agricultural industry.

- a. Please explain how this measure will not restrict imports.
- b. Please explain how this measure is compliant with commitments under Article 4.2 of the Agreement on Agriculture, Article III:4 of the GATT, and other relevant WTO commitments.

4.1.8 Côte d'Ivoire – Tax on imported spirits (SIM 649)

4.1.8.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID [107118](#))

The EU wants to reiterate its previous question AG-IMS ID [96046](#).

Côte d'Ivoire appears to apply a tax of 25% only on imported spirits, under Article 419(3) of the Code général des impôts². This tax discriminates between imported products and local products.

How does Côte d'Ivoire explain that this tax does not restrict imports?

How does it respect the following WTO commitments:

- Article II:1(b) GATT (Schedules of Concessions);
- Article III:2, first sentence, GATT (National Treatment on Internal Taxation and Regulation).

4.1.9 European Union, Iceland, Norway – Prohibitions on road freight transport (SIM 778)

4.1.9.1 Question by Russian Federation (AG-IMS ID [107051](#), [107055](#), [107061](#))

The Russian Federation did not receive an answer on the substance of the matter, so our question still remains valid and we await a response in due course:

On 9 April 2022, the European Union has prohibited for any road transport undertaking established in the Russian Federation to transport goods by road within the territory of the EU, including in transit (Council Regulation N° 833/2014). Similar measures were adopted by Norway (Decision No. 1076) and Iceland (Regulation No 281/2014).

Application of such measures only creates impediments for trade and imposes conditions that can negatively affect the stability of global agricultural market.

At the same time, according to the above-mentioned regulations, competent authorities of the EU/Norway/Iceland may authorize the transport of goods by a road transport undertaking established in the Russian Federation if the competent authorities have determined that such

² <http://www.dgi.cgici.com/indexs.htm>.

transport is necessary for the purchase, import or transport of agricultural and food products, including wheat and fertilizers whose import, purchase and transport is allowed under the Regulation.

In our view, the above-mentioned provisions of the regulations can be interpreted ambiguously, and are inherently discretionary. Such situation can lead to overcompliance, which, in turn, results in non-application of the exemptions and de-facto restrictions in respect of agricultural products.

In this regard, we would be grateful if the EU, Norway and Iceland could clarify the following:

- a. Can the competent authorities withhold authorizations for the transport of goods by a road transport undertaking established in the Russian Federation even if such transport is necessary for the purchase, import or transport of agricultural and food products, including wheat and fertilizers, given the wording used in the Regulation?
- b. What is the procedure for obtaining such an authorization? And what regulations govern this procedure?
- c. How many authorizations have been issued under this Regulation to date?
- d. Is there an approved form of such an authorization?

4.1.10 European Union, Iceland, Norway – Prohibitions on access to ports (SIM 782)

4.1.10.1 Question by Russian Federation (AG-IMS ID [107052](#), [107057](#), [107063](#))

The Russian Federation did not receive an answer on the substance of the matter, so our question still remains valid and we await a response in due course:

On 16 April 2022, the European Union has prohibited access to ports in the EU territory to any vessel registered under the flag of the Russian Federation, as well as to vessels that have changed their Russian flag or their registration to the flag or register of any other State after 24 February 2022 (Council Regulation № 833/2014). Similar measures were adopted by Norway (Decision No. 1076) and Iceland (Regulation No 281/2014).

At the same time, according to the mentioned regulations, competent authorities of the EU/Norway/Iceland may authorize a vessel to access a port under such conditions as they deem appropriate, after having determined that the access is necessary for the purchase, import or transport of agricultural and food products, including wheat and fertilizers whose import, purchase and transport is allowed under the Regulation.

There is no settled procedure or conditions for obtaining such authorization. There is no form of proof of such authorization, and no information on the number of permits issued.

Such artificial logistical barriers, as well as non-transparent and ambiguous regulations are destabilizing global agricultural markets and have even more severe consequences for the global food security. For instance, according to the last estimations of the WTO, fertilizer prices rose 60% year-on-year in August. Meanwhile, imposing prohibitions on logistical capabilities of one of the major suppliers of fertilizers, will only consolidate this upward trend, which, in turn, will lead to food insecurity and debt distress in developing countries.

We expect Members concerned to explain how they are willing to ensure effective elimination of the above-mentioned restrictions in respect of agricultural products. Currently their exemptions to regulations are not working.

4.1.11 India's rice sale under the Open Market Sale Scheme (SIM 471)

4.1.11.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID [107028](#))

In response to AG-IMS ID [106024](#), India stated that it had noted the question and would revert. We would like to repeat the question:

- a. Please confirm whether India sells foodgrains, including rice, at prices below costs under the Open Market Sale Scheme.
- b. Please clarify what costs are being borne by the Price Stabilization Fund.

4.1.11.2 Question by United States of America, Canada (AG-IMS ID [107149](#))

In response to AG-IMS ID [106024](#), India stated it would revert with a response at a later date, which has not yet been uploaded to AG-IMS. Therefore, the question is resubmitted.

The Indian Food Secretary Sanjeev Chopra [told media](#), "There has been a sharp increase in prices of wheat and rice recently.... The government has decided to offload 50 lakh tonnes (5 million tonnes) wheat and 25 lakh tonnes (2.5 million tonnes) rice under the Open Market Sale Scheme."

Further it is noted that the reserve price for rice released under open market sales was reduced and the Food Secretary [told media](#), "The cost on account of reduction in the reserve price will be borne from the Price Stabilization Fund maintained by the Department of Consumer Affairs."

- a. Please confirm whether India sells foodgrains, including rice, at prices below costs under the Open Market Sale Scheme.
- b. Please clarify what costs are being borne by the Price Stabilization Fund.

4.1.12 India's annex to DS notification pursuant to the Bali PSH Decision (SIM 852)

4.1.12.1 Question by Australia, Canada (AG-IMS ID [107151](#))

Australia notes India's answer to AG-IMS ID [106027](#). However, India did not provide an adequate answer. Therefore, we would like to ask the question again:

As we have not yet received a reply from India to AG-IMS ID [105051](#), we would like to repeat the question: Item 2. d. of the Annexes that appear in [G/AG/N/IND/18](#), [G/AG/N/IND/25](#), and [G/AG/N/IND/27](#) mentions that "Relevant laws and regulations" includes various State legislation/orders. However, item 2. d. of the Annexes that appear in [G/AG/N/IND/29](#), [G/AG/N/IND/18/Corr.1](#), [G/AG/N/IND/25/Corr.1](#), and [G/AG/N/IND/27/Corr.1](#) does not contain reference to States.

Please provide a complete list identifying all state legislation/orders that are relevant to the stockholding programme, as well as copies of those documents or specific URLs/weblinks.

4.1.12.2 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID [107152](#))

Australia notes India's response to AG-IMS ID [106030](#). However, India did not answer the question adequately.

Please provide data (and the source) for 2017/18 through 2021/22 of the quantities of paddy and wheat procured by NAFED both on behalf of the Food Corporation of India and those purchased on a commercial basis.

4.1.12.3 Question by United States of America, Australia, Canada (AG-IMS ID [107018](#))

In response to AG-IMS ID [106030](#), India noted that, according to NAFED's Annual Report 2021-22, there is no indication of any paddy or wheat procurement done on a commercial basis and it only

provided details of procurement done on behalf of the Food Corporation of India. Further, the NAFED website specifically indicates that foodgrain procurement was done on behalf of the Food Corporation of India and states that the NAFED Annual Report provides the current/updated details regarding procurement.

In response, India stated "The referred shipment (AG-IMS ID [105043](#)) of rice to Bangladesh (G2G trade), rice and wheat to Myanmar (humanitarian aid) and all other trades carried by NAFED are based on commercial purchases from the open market by way of floating tenders/e-auctions and are not linked with public stocks procured at MSP."

However, India did not provide the data requested. Therefore, the question is resubmitted:

Please provide data (and the source) for 2017/18 through 2021/22 of the quantities of paddy and wheat procured by NAFED both on behalf of FCI and those purchased on a commercial basis.

4.1.13 Tanzania's export restriction on maize (SIM 860)

4.1.13.1 Question by United States of America, United Kingdom (AG-IMS ID [107127](#))

No response has been provided to AG-IMS ID [106015](#) for which a response is requested through this resubmission.

The United Kingdom is aware of media reporting on Tanzania's application of an export restriction on maize. To provide clarity to Members, could Tanzania please confirm: the nature of these measures; their intended duration; and what consideration it has given to the effects of this measure on importing Members' food security in accordance with Article 12.1(a) of the Agreement on Agriculture? The United Kingdom notes that Tanzania is a net-exporter of maize. We would be interested to understand when Tanzania plans to provide an ER:1 Table to the Committee on Agriculture for their export restrictions on this specific foodstuff.

4.1.14 Thailand's Paddy Pledging Scheme (SIM 313)

4.1.14.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID [107083](#))

India reiterates the question asked in AGIMS ID [106158](#) since no response was received for the same.

India thanks Thailand for their answers to AG-IMS IDs [103137](#), [104101](#), and [105103](#). However, the answers provided do not sufficiently aid us in analysing the WTO compatibility of the rice policy. With Thailand's DS:1 notifications pending for the last six years, India believes the information sought here is vital to uphold transparency and determine the WTO consistency of rice policies. In this context, India requests Thailand to respond to the following:

- a. India observes that over the years Thailand has implemented support measures like pledging programs and price insurance programs, among others, for rice producers. Since it is difficult to determine which of these programs are currently being implemented, India requests Thailand to provide the name and the implementation details of all the schemes designed to support rice farmers, at present.
- b. How does Thailand intend to notify these measures in the DS:1 notification?
- c. For the sake of transparency, India further requests links to the official websites which provide the objectives, working details and timely updates for these, if any.

4.1.15 Türkiye's increased import tariffs (SIM 833)

4.1.15.1 Question by United States of America, Canada (AG-IMS ID [107131](#))

No response has been provided to AG-IMS ID [106055](#) for which a response is requested through this resubmission.

We would like to follow up on the joint question by Canada and the European Union AG-IMS ID [105090](#) regarding Türkiye's increase in tariffs for certain grains.

- a. Please explain whether foreign purchases by the Turkish Grain Board (TMO) are subject to the increased tariffs.
- b. If TMO is not subject to the 130% import tariffs:
 - i. Please provide a copy of the decree or relevant authority authorizing TMO's exemption, and
 - ii. explain if there are any other entities also exempt from these import duties.

4.1.16 Türkiye's freight support (SIM 730)

4.1.16.1 Question by United States of America, United Kingdom, Canada (AG-IMS ID [107130](#))

No response has been provided to AG-IMS ID [106054](#) for which a response is requested through this resubmission.

We would like to follow up on AG-IMS IDs [103031](#) and [100014](#) regarding Türkiye's reimbursements of freight costs for certain agricultural products. Understanding that certain freight subsidies may be authorized under the 2015 Nairobi Decision on Export Competition, this authorization is set to soon expire. We request that Türkiye provide information on its freight reimbursement programme so that WTO Members may better understand its export regime. We repeat AG-IMS IDs [103031](#) and [100014](#) below:

- a. Please provide a copy of or link to the legal measures authorizing these subsidies, specifically a 2016 decision entitled "İhraç Taşımalarına Navlun Desteği Sağlanması Hakkında Karar" (Decision on Freight Support for Exports) and subsequent implementing measures.
- b. What products are eligible to receive freight support?
- c. What are the eligible destinations?
- d. How is the freight support determined? How much may an exporter receive per shipment?
- e. Please confirm the years and periods within each year that Türkiye has authorized such freight support since 2016, including for 2022 and beyond, if applicable.
- f. Please provide quantities of goods receiving support by tariff code (at least the 4-digit level) and the total amount of subsidy and amount of subsidy per tariff code. In addition, please identify the quantities and total amount of subsidy for goods exported to the United States, including for dry milled corn products (HS 1104.23).
- g. Noting the apparent contingency on export performance and understanding these measures were introduced following the 2015 Nairobi Decision on Export Competition and may still be authorized to provide support, please explain how these measures comply with Türkiye's export subsidy scheduled commitments and its commitments under the Nairobi Decision on Export Competition?

4.1.17 Türkiye's export restrictions on agricultural products (SIM 729)

4.1.17.1 Question by United States of America, United Kingdom, Switzerland, Japan (AG-IMS ID [107129](#))

No response has been provided to AG-IMS ID [106056](#) for which a response is requested through this resubmission.

We would like to follow up on AG-IMS IDs [101042](#) and [102029](#) regarding Türkiye's export restrictions. We note that Türkiye announced another export ban on olive oil from 1 August 2023 until 1 November 2023 and introduced restrictions on chickpea and lentil exports that have not yet been notified to the Committee on Agriculture. We remind Türkiye that as a WTO Member it agreed to notify export restrictions imposed on products for which Türkiye is a net-food exporter, even for those temporary in nature, to the WTO Committee on Agriculture.

- a. Please provide a copy of or link to both the authorities given to the Turkish Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MinAF) and the regulations or documentation of MinAF implementing these authorities for specific commodities.
- b. When will Türkiye notify its export restrictions on olive oil, chickpeas, lentils, or other agricultural products to the Committee on Agriculture through the required Table ER:1 notification?

4.1.18 United Arab Emirates - Rice export ban (SIM 862)

4.1.18.1 Question by United States of America, United Kingdom, Switzerland (AG-IMS ID [107134](#))

No response has been provided to AG-IMS ID [106061](#) for which a response is requested through this resubmission.

It is understood that the United Arab Emirates' Ministry of Economy banned the export and re-export of rice on 28 July 2023.

- a. What was the reason for implementing this measure?
- b. Please confirm when the measure will be lifted and whether an extension will be considered.

4.2 POINTS RAISED IN CONNECTION WITH INDIVIDUAL NOTIFICATIONS

4.2.1 DOMESTIC SUPPORT COMMITMENTS (TABLE DS:1)

4.2.1.1 Bangladesh ([G/AG/N/BGD/5](#), [G/AG/N/BGD/6](#), [G/AG/N/BGD/7](#))

AG-IMS ID 107159: Question by Canada - Non-product-specific AMS

In light of the lack of a written response from Bangladesh regarding question AG-IMS ID [106019](#), Canada would like to reiterate its question:

In reviewing Bangladesh's Table DS:1 notifications for reporting periods 2008/09 ([G/AG/N/BGD/5](#)), 2010/2011 ([G/AG/N/BGD/6](#)), 2012/2013 ([G/AG/N/BGD/7](#)), 2014/2015 ([G/AG/N/BGD/8](#)), 2016/2017 ([G/AG/N/BGD/9](#)), 2018/2019 ([G/AG/N/BGD/10](#)), and 2020/2021 ([G/AG/N/BGD/11](#)), Canada would like to seek clarification on measures reported in Supporting Table DS:9:

- a. Could Bangladesh clarify what programmes or measures are included as part of its notification of indirect subsidies?
- b. How are these indirect subsidies provided to farmers with respect to imported urea and non-urea fertilizers?
- c. Could Bangladesh provide an example to illustrate the methodology used to calculate the outlays for these indirect subsidies?

4.2.1.2 Burkina Faso ([G/AG/N/BFA/20](#), [G/AG/N/BFA/21](#), [G/AG/N/BFA/22](#))

AG-IMS ID 107160: Question by Canada - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

In light of the lack of written response from Burkina Faso regarding question AG-IMS ID [106090](#), Canada would ask again the following:

Canada appreciates the effort Burkina Faso has made in submitting its annual domestic support notification for 2019, 2021 and 2022. Burkina Faso's notifications state that its government does not provide domestic support to its agricultural sector.

Despite this, Canada understands that Burkina Faso's Ministère de l'Agriculture et des Aménagements Hydro-agricoles has recently launched a regional (Sud-Ouest, Hauts-Bassins, Cascades and Boucle du Mohoun) agriculture support project (https://www.agriculture.gov.bf/accueil/details?tx_news_pi1%5Baction%5D=detail&tx_news_pi1%5Bcontroller%5D=News&tx_news_pi1%5Bnews%5D=108&cHash=4cb2ca8cfb1fb45a33385705fc73f283), and that the Ministère des Ressources Animales et Halieutiques has provided input subsidies for forage seeds to Burkina Faso's agriculture producers (https://www.mra.gov.bf/accueil/details?tx_news_pi1%5Baction%5D=detail&tx_news_pi1%5Bcontroller%5D=News&tx_news_pi1%5Bnews%5D=127&cHash=271542e9e70fc0888cefd065a196028).

- a. Considering the above, could Burkina Faso elaborate on potential plans to provide a domestic support notification to this Committee, which would reflect the implementation of these domestic support measures by Burkina Faso?
- b. Could Burkina Faso also provide an update on its plans to submit its domestic support notification for 2020?

4.2.1.3 India ([G/AG/N/IND/29](#))

AG-IMS ID 107166: Question by Australia, Canada - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

As we have not yet received a reply from India to AG-IMS ID [105047](#), we would like to repeat the question: In the Annex to [G/AG/N/IND/29](#), and also in the annexes that appear in [G/AG/N/IND/18/Corr.1](#), [G/AG/N/IND/25/Corr.1](#), and [G/AG/N/IND/27/Corr.1](#), item 2. c., under "Agency in charge of implementation" the following entities are listed: the Ministry of Agriculture & Farmers Welfare, Ministry of Consumer Affairs, Food & Public Distribution, Government of India; Food Corporation of India (FCI); National Agricultural Cooperative Federation of India (NAFED); and State governments and their agencies.

Please provide a list of all state agencies involved in implementation of the programme.

AG-IMS ID 107164: Question by Australia - Non-product-specific AMS

As we have not yet received a reply from India to AG-IMS ID [105042](#), we would like to repeat the question:

In Supporting Table DS:9 of [G/AG/N/IND/29](#), India has provided limited information about the insurance premium and interest subsidies extended to various crops or agricultural products, and also does not appear to include information on any state-specific measures. For example, it is understood the states of Bihar, Punjab, and West Bengal have their own state crop insurance programs, which are funded by the states and not the central government.

- a. Please confirm what schemes are included under the measure notified as "insurance premium subsidy" and provide a breakdown of expenditures for each. For example, does "insurance premium subsidy" include the following crop insurance schemes: Pradhan Mantri Fasal Bima Yojana, Weather Based Crop Insurance Scheme, Unified Package Insurance Scheme, National Agricultural Insurance Scheme, National Crop Insurance Program?

- b. Please confirm what Indian states implement crop insurance schemes in addition to or separate from the national crop insurance program and provide links to the operational guidelines for each.
- c. Please confirm whether the notified value for crop insurance includes these state-level measures and if not, why.
- d. Please identify what crops or agricultural products are eligible for the national insurance premium and interest subsidies.
- e. Please explain why India notifies insurance premiums as non-product specific given that at least some of the insurance schemes have varying premiums rates for different eligible crops. For example, under the National Agricultural Insurance Scheme, the premium rate for wheat is the lesser of 1.5% or the actuarial rate, while that for bajra and oilseeds is the lesser of 3.5% or the actuarial rate, and horticultural crops are the actuarial rate.

AG-IMS ID 107150: Question by United States of America - Non-product-specific AMS

In response to AG-IMS ID [106032](#) India stated it was compiling the requested information; however, the information has not been provided in writing. Therefore, the question is resubmitted for a response:

As we have not yet received a reply from India to AG-IMS ID [105042](#), we repeat the question: In Supporting Table DS:9 of [G/AG/N/IND/29](#), India has provided limited information about the insurance premium and interest subsidies extended to various crops or agricultural products, and also does not appear to include information on any state-specific measures. For example, it is understood the states of Bihar, Punjab, and West Bengal have their own state crop insurance programs, which are funded by the states and not the central government.

- a. Please confirm what schemes are included under the measure notified as "insurance premium subsidy" and provide a breakdown of expenditures for each. For example, does "insurance premium subsidy" include the following crop insurance schemes: Pradhan Mantri Fasal Bima Yojana, Weather Based Crop Insurance Scheme, Unified Package Insurance Scheme, National Agricultural Insurance Scheme, National Crop Insurance Program?
- b. Please confirm what Indian states implement crop insurance schemes in addition to or separate from the national crop insurance program and provide links to the operational guidelines for each.
- c. Please confirm whether the notified value for crop insurance includes these state-level measures and if not, why.
- d. Please identify what crops or agricultural products are eligible for the national insurance premium and interest subsidies.
- e. Please explain why India notifies insurance premiums as non-product specific given that at least some of the insurance schemes have varying premium rates for different eligible crops. For example, under the National Agricultural Insurance Scheme, the premium rate for wheat is the lesser of 1.5% or the actuarial rate, while that for bajra and oilseeds is the lesser of 3.5% or the actuarial rate, and horticultural crops are the actuarial rate.