



Committee on Agriculture

POINTS RAISED BY MEMBERS UNDER THE REVIEW PROCESS

COMPILATION OF QUESTIONS FOR THE MEETING ON 21-22 NOVEMBER 2022¹

The present document compiles questions received by the Secretariat by the deadline of noon on 9 November 2022 as specified in WTO/AIR/AG/62.

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

1 MATTERS RELEVANT TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMITMENTS: ARTICLE 18.6	7
NEW SPECIFIC IMPLEMENTATION MATTERS (SIM).....	7
1.1 Argentina's currency controls and import licensing rules (SIM 768).....	7
1.1.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 103012).....	7
1.2 Argentina's foreign exchange regime to facilitate soy exports (SIM 769).....	7
1.2.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 103041).....	7
1.2.2 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 103013).....	7
1.3 Australia, Canada, European Union, Iceland, Japan, New Zealand, United Kingdom, United States – Restrictions on agricultural and agriculture-related services (SIM 770).....	7
1.3.1 Question by Russian Federation (AG-IMS ID 103078, 103079, 103080, 103081, 103082, 103083, 103084, 103085).....	7
1.4 Australia, Canada, New Zealand, United Kingdom, United States - Import duties in excess of the bound rates applied on agricultural goods (SIM 771).....	8
1.4.1 Question by Russian Federation (AG-IMS ID 103061, 103062, 103063, 103064, 103065) .	8
1.5 Canada, European Union, Iceland, Norway, New Zealand, Japan – Prohibitions and restrictions on agricultural machinery supplies (SIM 772).....	8
1.5.1 Question by Russian Federation (AG-IMS ID 103070, 103069, 103071, 103072 103073, 103074).....	8
1.6 China's grain subsidies (SIM 773).....	9
1.6.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 103087).....	9
1.7 China's recent agricultural policy modifications (SIM 774).....	9
1.7.1 Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID 103004).....	9
1.8 China's pork reserve programme (SIM 775).....	9
1.8.1 Question by United States of America, Canada, Australia (AG-IMS ID 103015).....	9
1.8.2 Question by United States of America, Canada, Australia (AG-IMS ID 103016).....	10
1.8.3 Question by United States of America, Canada, Australia (AG-IMS ID 103017).....	10
1.9 China's swine support (SIM 776).....	11
1.9.1 Question by United States of America, Canada, Brazil, Australia (AG-IMS ID 103014).....	11
1.10 China's Export Restrictions on corn starch (SIM 777).....	11
1.10.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 103042).....	11
1.10.2 Question by United Kingdom, Switzerland, Japan (AG-IMS ID 103051).....	11
1.11 European Union, Iceland, Norway – Prohibitions on road freight transport (SIM 778).....	12
1.11.1 Question by Russian Federation (AG-IMS ID 103075, 103076, 103077).....	12
1.12 EU's Temporary Framework for State Aid (SIM 779).....	12
1.12.1 Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID 103089).....	12
1.13 EU's Blue Box programmes (SIM 780).....	13
1.13.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID 103136).....	13
1.14 France - "European Food and Agricultural Resilience Mission" initiative (SIM 781).....	13
1.14.1 Question by Brazil, Paraguay (AG-IMS ID 103005).....	13
1.15 European Union, Norway, Iceland – Prohibitions on access to ports (SIM 782).....	13
1.15.1 Question by Russian Federation (AG-IMS ID 103066, 103067, 103068).....	13
1.16 India's dairy subsidies (SIM 783).....	14

1.16.1	Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 103090)	14
1.17	India's food security policies (SIM 784)	14
1.17.1	Question by United States of America, Japan, Paraguay (AG-IMS ID 103027)	14
1.18	Republic of Korea's tariff policies (SIM 785)	15
1.18.1	Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 103095)	15
1.18.2	Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID 103124)	15
1.19	Mexico's ban on exports of agricultural products (SIM 786)	15
1.19.1	Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 103043)	15
1.19.2	Question by Switzerland (AG-IMS ID 103097)	15
1.19.3	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 103030)	16
1.20	Morocco's export restriction of chickpea (Licence exportation pois chiches) (SIM 787)	16
1.20.1	Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 103044)	16
1.21	South Africa's poultry TRQ administration (SIM 788)	16
1.21.1	Question by Uruguay (AG-IMS ID 103045)	16
1.22	Türkiye's stone fruit support (SIM 789)	17
1.22.1	Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 103098)	17
1.23	U.S. Inflation Reduction Act 2022 (SIM 790)	17
1.23.1	Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 103100)	17
1.24	U.S. expanded insurance coverage for soybean and grain sorghum (SIM 791)	17
1.24.1	Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID 103002)	17
1.25	U.S. corn support (SIM 792)	18
1.25.1	Question by China (AG-IMS ID 103049)	18
1.26	U.S. fertilizers (SIM 793)	18
1.26.1	Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 103053)	18
1.27	U.S. biofuel infrastructure grants (SIM 794)	18
1.27.1	Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 103055)	18
1.28	U.S. Urban Agriculture and Innovative Production (SIM 795)	19
1.28.1	Question by India (AG-IMS ID 103138)	19
1.29	U.S. Farm Bill 2023 (SIM 796)	19
1.29.1	Question by India (AG-IMS ID 103139)	19
	SPECIFIC IMPLEMENTATION MATTERS (SIM) RAISED PREVIOUSLY	19
1.30	Argentina's export restrictions (SIM 710)	19
1.30.1	Question by United Kingdom, Switzerland, Japan, New Zealand (AG-IMS ID 103048)	19
1.31	Canada's Special Milk Class Scheme (SIM 26)	19
1.31.1	Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID 103130)	19
1.32	Canada's review of the TRQ system (SIM 536)	20
1.32.1	Question by United Kingdom (AG-IMS ID 103086)	20
1.33	Canada's compensation for farmers after trade concessions (SIM 512)	20
1.33.1	Question by India (AG-IMS ID 103135)	20
1.34	China's cotton reserves purchasing system (SIM 295)	21

1.34.1	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 103019)	21
1.34.2	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 103020)	21
1.34.3	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 103021)	21
1.34.4	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 103022)	21
1.35	China's Cotton Policies (SIM 647)	21
1.35.1	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 103018)	21
1.36	Ecuador's new milk law (SIM 766)	22
1.36.1	Question by United States of America, New Zealand, Australia (AG-IMS ID 103023)	22
1.37	Egypt's Export Prohibitions on Agricultural Products (SIM 597)	22
1.37.1	Question by Switzerland, United Kingdom (AG-IMS ID 103088)	22
1.38	EU's Deforestation and Forest Degradation Strategy (SIM 558)	23
1.38.1	Question by Brazil, Argentina, Paraguay (AG-IMS ID 103006)	23
1.39	India's export restrictions on wheat (SIM 744)	23
1.39.1	Question by United Kingdom, Switzerland, Ukraine (AG-IMS ID 103060)	23
1.40	India's public stockpiling (SIM 525)	23
1.40.1	Question by United States of America, Canada, Japan, Thailand, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay, Australia (AG-IMS ID 103025)	23
1.40.2	Question by United States of America, Canada, Japan, Thailand, Ukraine, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay, Australia (AG-IMS ID 103026)	24
1.41	India's other support for rice (SIM 743)	24
1.41.1	Question by United States of America, Canada, Japan, Thailand, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay, Australia (AG-IMS ID 103029)	24
1.42	India's price support (SIM 753)	24
1.42.1	Question by United States of America, Paraguay, Australia (AG-IMS ID 103024)	24
1.43	India's export restriction on sugar (SIM 420)	25
1.43.1	Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 103091)	25
1.44	India's export restrictions on wheat (SIM 744)	25
1.44.1	Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 103092)	25
1.45	India's export restriction measures on rice (SIM 767)	26
1.45.1	Question by United States of America, Canada, Japan, Switzerland, United Kingdom, Paraguay, Australia (AG-IMS ID 103028)	26
1.46	Indonesia's stockholding programmes (SIM 326)	26
1.46.1	Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID 103093)	26
1.47	Japan's stockpiles of skim milk powder (SIM 754)	27
1.47.1	Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 103094)	27
1.48	Malaysia's chicken and egg subsidies and export restrictions for chicken (SIM 745)	27
1.48.1	Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 103096)	27
1.49	Thailand's Paddy Pledging Scheme (SIM 313)	27
1.49.1	Question by India (AG-IMS ID 103137)	27
1.50	Türkiye's export restrictions on agricultural products (SIM 729)	28
1.50.1	Question by United Kingdom, Switzerland, Japan, New Zealand (AG-IMS ID 103054)	28
1.51	Türkiye's freight support (SIM 730)	28

1.51.1	Question by United States of America, Brazil, Australia (AG-IMS ID 103031)	28
1.52	U.S. American Rescue Plan Act (SIM 689)	29
1.52.1	Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 103099)	29
1.53	United States' soybean programmes (SIM 387)	29
1.53.1	Question by China (AG-IMS ID 103046)	29
1.53.2	Question by China (AG-IMS ID 103047)	29
1.54	U.S. funding for environmental action (SIM 763)	30
1.54.1	Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID 103107)	30
2	POINTS RAISED IN CONNECTION WITH INDIVIDUAL NOTIFICATIONS	30
2.1	IMPORTS UNDER TARIFF AND OTHER QUOTA COMMITMENTS (TABLE MA:2)	30
2.1.1	China (G/AG/N/CHN/57)	30
2.1.2	Iceland (G/AG/N/ISL/65, G/AG/N/ISL/66)	31
2.1.3	Malaysia (G/AG/N/MYS/54, G/AG/N/MYS/55)	31
2.1.4	United States of America (G/AG/N/USA/162)	31
2.2	DOMESTIC SUPPORT COMMITMENTS (TABLE DS:1)	32
2.2.1	Australia (G/AG/N/AUS/129, G/AG/N/AUS/129/Rev.1)	32
2.2.2	Australia (G/AG/N/AUS/142)	32
2.2.3	Canada (G/AG/N/CAN/151)	32
2.2.4	European Union (G/AG/N/EU/79)	33
2.2.5	Georgia (G/AG/N/GEO/28, G/AG/N/GEO/25)	33
2.2.6	Japan (G/AG/N/JPN/277)	34
2.2.7	Malaysia (G/AG/N/MYS/53)	34
2.2.8	Mexico (G/AG/N/MEX/55, G/AG/N/MEX/56)	35
2.2.9	New Zealand (G/AG/N/NZL/132)	37
2.2.10	Pakistan (G/AG/N/PAK/17/Corr.1, G/AG/N/PAK/18/Corr.1, G/AG/N/PAK/19/Corr.1)	37
2.2.11	Paraguay (G/AG/N/PRY/34)	37
2.2.12	Philippines (G/AG/N/PHL/85)	37
2.2.13	Russian Federation (G/AG/N/RUS/37)	37
2.2.14	United Kingdom (G/AG/N/GBR/11)	38
2.2.15	United States of America (G/AG/N/USA/157)	38
2.2.16	United States of America (G/AG/N/USA/166)	39
2.3	NEW OR MODIFIED DOMESTIC SUPPORT MEASURES (DS:2)	43
2.3.1	Brazil (G/AG/N/BRA/68)	43
2.3.2	United Kingdom (G/AG/N/GBR/14)	43
2.4	EXPORT PROHIBITIONS AND RESTRICTIONS (TABLE ER:1)	44
2.4.1	European Union (G/AG/N/EU/77/Rev.2)	44
2.4.2	Malaysia (G/AG/N/MYS/52/Add.1)	45
2.5	NOTIFICATIONS IN THE CONTEXT OF THE NFIDC DECISION (TABLE NF:1)	45
2.5.1	Japan (G/AG/N/JPN/269)	45
2.5.2	Russian Federation (G/AG/N/RUS/36/Rev.1)	45

3 OVERDUE NOTIFICATIONS.....	45
3.1 Uruguay.....	45

1 MATTERS RELEVANT TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMITMENTS: ARTICLE 18.6**NEW SPECIFIC IMPLEMENTATION MATTERS (SIM)****1.1 Argentina's currency controls and import licensing rules (SIM 768)****1.1.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID [103012](#))**

Argentina's currency controls and import licensing rules have made it more difficult for farmers to import crucial inputs such as seeds, fertilizers, and agricultural machinery. At a time when world grain and oilseed stocks are low and prices are elevated, does Argentina have a plan to eliminate these measures to allow farmers to meet global demand for food?

1.2 Argentina's foreign exchange regime to facilitate soy exports (SIM 769)**1.2.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID [103041](#))**

Argentina has announced in September a special exchange rate for the country's soy producers in a bid to incentivise exports, shore up central bank reserves and avoid a currency devaluation. Exporters of soy, the country's top commodity, will be able to sell dollars from their shipments abroad at a rate of 200 pesos per dollar, more lucrative than the official rate of 139 per dollar.

- a. Could Argentina provide more descriptive information on the justifications for such a measure and the application of the new exchange rate for soy exports, including as of when it will become applicable?
- b. Has Argentina noted any recent change of trade patterns for soy in the region?
- c. How does this measure affect Argentina's commitments in relation to export subsidies?

1.2.2 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID [103013](#))

In September 2022, Argentine Minister of Economy Sergio Massa announced a special foreign exchange regime to facilitate soy exports. The measure allows soy farmers to receive a preferential exchange rate of 200 pesos per U.S. dollar – compared to the official rate of 142 pesos per U.S. dollar – until the end of September.

- a. Please provide additional information on the rules that applied to this programme and its payment mechanism to producers.
- b. Please explain how this measure complies with WTO rules, in particular export subsidy and export subsidy circumvention rules.

1.3 Australia, Canada, European Union, Iceland, Japan, New Zealand, United Kingdom, United States – Restrictions on agricultural and agriculture-related services (SIM 770)**1.3.1 Question by Russian Federation (AG-IMS ID [103078](#), [103079](#), [103080](#), [103081](#), [103082](#), [103083](#), [103084](#), [103085](#))**

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.

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

1.4.1 Question by Russian Federation (AG-IMS ID [103061](#), [103062](#), [103063](#), [103064](#), [103065](#))

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.

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

1.5.1 Question by Russian Federation (AG-IMS ID [103070](#), [103069](#), [103071](#), [103072](#), [103073](#), [103074](#))

On 9 April 2022, the European Union has prohibited the sale, supply, transfer or export of goods which, according to the Council Regulation № 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.

1.6 China's grain subsidies (SIM 773)

1.6.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID [103087](#))

Australia notes recent media reports (<https://www.chinadaily.com.cn/a/202209/07/WS6317eab3a310fd2b29e765a5.html>) that "China has pledged to provide grain farmers with subsidies totalling 10 billion yuan (USD 1.44 billion) from its central government budget to ease the impact of the rising prices of farm supplies and to boost farmers' incentives to keep producing food.

This year, the central government has already allocated 40 billion yuan in subsidies to grain farmers in three outlays, according to the Ministry of Finance."

Australia asks that China:

- a. outline the eligibility criteria for farmers receiving this subsidy; and
- b. note how these measures will be classified in the context of notifications to the Committee on Agriculture.

1.7 China's recent agricultural policy modifications (SIM 774)

1.7.1 Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID [103004](#))

According to information available online, the period covered in China's latest notifications (2011-2016) seems to represent the end of an agricultural policy cycle.

For instance, according to a publication from the World Bank Group (Learning from Experience: Insights from China's Progress in Disaster Risk Management, available at <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/34090>), China has put in place a large rural insurance programmes, which, since 2014, has led to an insured area coverage of more than 80% of its agricultural land. However, expenditures related to the government's financial participation in such programs are not discernible in China's notification.

Recently the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs of the People's Republic of China announced a new stimulus package, which includes, among others, a focus on stabilizing grain production, expanding soybean and oilseed production, and firming up supplies of seeds, and attaches importance to the role of finance and insurance in supporting agriculture, would have been launched (http://www.moa.gov.cn/xw/zwdt/202206/t20220610_6402176.htm).

In light of the above, could China inform:

- a. when it would be submitting its new DS:1 and, if applicable, DS:2 notifications;
- b. details of its rural insurance and in which supporting table it will be notified;
- c. if it would be open to make a descriptive presentation on its agricultural policies in the meantime.

1.8 China's pork reserve programme (SIM 775)

1.8.1 Question by United States of America, Canada, Australia (AG-IMS ID [103015](#))

Media reports on China's purchases of pork for public stocks suggest the Chinese government announced purchases of pork for national reserves in June 2021 in order to support prices, and, at the time, the Chinese National Development and Reform Commission had issued a level 1 warning on low hog farmer profits based on its monitoring of the hog-to-grain price ratio. Further, media reports indicated in early March that China undertook its first round of 2022 hog reserve purchases in an attempt to raise prices after a post-Lunar New Year slump.

- a. Please explain what factors are used to determine when to purchase pork for the central reserve.
- b. Please provide a copy of the measures that govern the hog price monitoring system and reserve purchases.
- c. Does the National Development and Reform Commission's price monitoring system provide a price floor for pork?
- d. Please explain how reserve purchase prices are determined for pork.
- e. Please provide data on the quantities of pork purchased and the purchase prices for all reserve procurement instances in the last three years.

1.8.2 Question by United States of America, Canada, Australia (AG-IMS ID [103016](#))

On 6 September 2022 the State Council of the People's Republic of China reported on its website that Chinese authorities would release pork from central reserves on 8 September. The notice indicated that the action was being taken because "public holidays such as the Mid-Autumn Festival and the National Day Holiday are around the corner." In AG-IMS ID 92047, China stated that release of pork reserves would be made when there is a serious natural disaster, accident, or unexpected public sanitary events, etc.

On 22 September 2022 the State Council of the People's Republic of China reported on its website that two releases of reserve pork had already taken place in September, one on 8 September and one on 18 September. The notice also reported that a third release of pork would take place that week. The National Pork Reserve website reported a fourth release of pork planned for 30 September. News sources reported expectations that the amount of reserve pork released in September 2022 would reach 200,000 tonnes, the highest for any month on record.

- a. Please provide an update on what factors are used to determine when to release pork onto the domestic market.
- b. Please provide data on the quantities of pork released and the sale prices for the September 2022 releases, and any other releases of pork since 2012.

1.8.3 Question by United States of America, Canada, Australia (AG-IMS ID [103017](#))

On 16 September 2022 China News Service reported that the sale price of pork reserves in China nationally and in all regions was less than the domestic market price.

For example: on 9 September 2022 Heilongjiang News reported that the Harbin Municipal Government began a reserve pork release on 8 September. The report indicated that Harbin would release 500 tonnes of reserve pork in two batches, one from 8 September through 13, and the other from 25 September through 30, to correspond with local holidays. The article also stated: "the retail price of the stocked pork at the delivery point is unified at 12 yuan/half kilogram, which is more than 10% lower than the average retail price of the same grade pork in the domestic market. Residents are limited to 10 kilograms of reserve meat".

- a. Please explain how reserve sale prices are determined for pork.
- b. Please explain how the sale price is determined when reserve pork is released at the municipal level in China.
- c. Please share with the Committee the price of reserve pork released in Harbin in September 2022.

1.9 China's swine support (SIM 776)

1.9.1 Question by United States of America, Canada, Brazil, Australia (AG-IMS ID [103014](#))

It is understood that China implements various measures to support pork production in China beyond the "subsidy for breeding productive sows", the only pork-related measure notified by China in its last domestic support notification for 2016.

According to various Chinese media reports, it is estimated that China's central Government reportedly paid national support measures to the swine industry of RMB 6.9 billion (USD 998.8 million) in 2019, of which RMB 814 million was paid as a culling subsidy, as part of a preferential loan policy, and as increased swine insurance coverage. In addition, various Chinese media reports also indicate that several provinces, including Sichuan, Hubei, Guangdong, and Jiangsu, have also undertaken their own pork-related support measures. Combined with national support, it is estimated based on various Chinese media reports that China provided at least RMB 10,860 million (USD 1,572 million) in support in 2019.

For each support measure provided to the swine industry between 2019 and 2021 by the central government or sub-national level government, please provide:

- a. the name of the measure;
- b. a copy of or link to the regulation or legislation implementing the measure; and
- c. the expenditures under the measure for each year - 2019, 2020, and 2021.

1.10 China's Export Restrictions on corn starch (SIM 777)

1.10.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID [103042](#))

Customs data show China's corn starch exports fell to just 900 tonnes in August from more than 40,000 tonnes in July and 23,240 tonnes a year earlier.

The government has asked companies to suspend shipments to stabilize corn prices and contain inflation risks, according to an analyst at the Beijing Orient Agribusiness Consultant Co.

In this regard and in the absence of any official notification on Export restrictions, could China provide more information on:

- a. Duration of the measure – since when the measure has been in force? What is the envisaged end date of the measure?
- b. Could China provide more descriptive and detailed information on the nature of the measure?
- c. When does China intend to submit official notification to the WTO on export restriction of the staples concerned by the measure?
- d. What is the expected impact on the exports of corn starch in the Region?

1.10.2 Question by United Kingdom, Switzerland, Japan (AG-IMS ID [103051](#))

The United Kingdom understands that China has introduced an export restriction on corn starch. Could China please explain what consideration it has given to the effects of this measure on importing Members' food security in accordance with Article 12.1(a)? Additionally, could China please provide an update on when it plans to notify this measure through the required ER:1 table?

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

1.11.1 Question by Russian Federation (AG-IMS ID [103075](#), [103076](#), [103077](#))

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 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?

1.12 EU's Temporary Framework for State Aid (SIM 779)

1.12.1 Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID 103089)

According to information available online, on 28 October, the European Commission announced the extension of the EU's Temporary Framework for state aid, which was supposed to have been terminated by 30 June 2022.

Sources: https://competition-policy.ec.europa.eu/state-aid/coronavirus/temporary-framework_en; https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/IP_22_4622>

In light of the above, Brazil would appreciate if the EU could provide the following clarifications:

- a. Is this programme the same that was originally adopted upon the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic?
- b. Has the programme been operating under the same rules regarding eligibility and maximum payments since its adoption?
- c. How should Members expect to identify such state aid in future DS:1 notifications by the EU?

1.13 EU's Blue Box programmes (SIM 780)

1.13.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID [103136](#))

EU plans to implement a new Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) at the start of 2023. In the past, the EU implemented Blue Box programmes to support the farmers. As per the domestic support notification for the marketing year 2019-20, the EU provided the Blue Box support based on fixed area and yields; and livestock payments were made on a fixed number of heads.

- a. It is requested to provide information about the level of support to various crops and livestock under this production limiting programme for the marketing years 2020-21 and 2021-22.
- b. Does the EU intend to implement the Blue Box programmes under the new Common Agricultural Policy (CAP)?

1.14 France - "European Food and Agricultural Resilience Mission" initiative (SIM 781)

1.14.1 Question by Brazil, Paraguay (AG-IMS ID [103005](#))

Brazil would like to consult France on the "European Food and Agricultural Resilience Mission" (FARM) initiative. In a recent Communiqué issued by the Presidency of the Republic (<https://franceintheus.org/spip.php?article10921>), it was explained that:

"(.) The private sector is encouraged to collaborate with WFP by providing food commodities, supply chain solutions, and agricultural inputs at favorable costs to ensure that WFP operations are sustained and able to reach countries and people most in need. To this end, WFP has started discussions with the Global Business for Food Security (GFS) coalition."

Furthermore, in document G/AG/GEN/205, circulated by the WFP to the last CoA meeting, it is explained that:

"3.3. The principle underpinning the initiative is global solidarity - a multisectoral response mechanism where countries with surpluses of cereals avail these surpluses to deficit countries."

Taking into account the food aid rules in the AoA and in the Nairobi Ministerial Decision on Export Competition, could France provide further information:

- a. on the proposition that sales to the WFP should occur at favorable costs and whether and to what extent will European governments be involved with such sales at favorable costs?
- b. on the nature of the stocks that it intends to export through the initiative.

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

1.15.1 Question by Russian Federation (AG-IMS ID [103066](#), [103067](#), [103068](#))

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 N° 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.

1.16 India's dairy subsidies (SIM 783)

1.16.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID [103090](#))

Australia notes public reporting (<https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/kerala/subsidy-for-dairy-farmers-societies-minister/article65775341.ece> and https://www.business-standard.com/article/economy-policy/milk-scheme-benefits-more-than-800-000-producers-in-rajasthan-official-122102001163_1.html) that dairy farmers across multiple Indian states will be receiving or have already received payments per litre of milk produced; subsidies in the form of cows to farms; and payments per acre to promote fodder grass cultivation. Payments have also been made to state-level dairy cooperatives.

Australia asks that India provide information on the measures, including:

- a. the different payments available to dairy farmers at the national and state levels,
- b. the intended duration of these payment programmes,
- c. eligibility and calculation of payments for each of the agents identified, and
- d. the allocated budget for the programmes.

1.17 India's food security policies (SIM 784)

1.17.1 Question by United States of America, Japan, Paraguay (AG-IMS ID [103027](#))

In [AG-IMS ID 102025](#), India did not respond to part b. or part c., and gave the same non-working website link in response to part d., and also responded to part a. by saying that factors such as the cost of cultivation/production, changes in input prices, input/output price parity, inter-crop price parity, effects on the cost of living, effects on general price level, and parity between prices paid and prices received by farmers, have resulted in the change in applied administered price over the years.

- a. Which of these factors changed between the period 2018-2019 and the period 2020-2021, and how did any such change cause the government to change the applied administered prices?
- b. We ask part b. again: What policies or reforms is India implementing or considering to achieve its food security objectives in a manner consistent with WTO rules?
- c. We ask part c. again: Please explain the steady increase in open market sales of public stocks between 2018 and 2021.
- d. The link provided (<http://fci.gov.in/sales.php?view=224>) times out without ever loading and gives the error "This site can't be reached." Please provide a working link to the information or provide the requested information directly in written response to this question.

1.18 Republic of Korea's tariff policies (SIM 785)

1.18.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID [103095](#))

Australia notes Korea's decision to apply zero tariff quotas for a number of agricultural commodities until the end of 2022, including beef (chilled and frozen), chicken, powdered milk (whole and skim), green onions, coffee beans (green and roasted), refined spirits, manioc chips, and pork belly.

In relation to these quotas, Australia asks that the Republic of Korea:

- a. provide an update on how much of this year's quota has been filled for each commodity
- b. advise whether these quotas apply to all tariff lines for each commodity and
- c. advise whether this measure has been successful in reducing prices.

1.18.2 Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID [103124](#))

New Zealand notes Korea's measures to combat avian influenza and inflationary pressure by introducing a zero-tariff policy on eggs, and a reduction in tariff rates from 30% to 0% on other imported fruits. New Zealand would welcome more details on how effective these trade-liberalizing measures were in achieving Korea's goals.

1.19 Mexico's ban on exports of agricultural products (SIM 786)

1.19.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID [103043](#))

The Mexican President announced trade-related measures affecting a number of agrifood products, in another attempt to curb inflation. These include lifting red tape related to SPS requirements, eliminating import tariffs, and an outright export ban on a number of staple foods. The measures were designed with the country's major food producers and retailers' consent, and will be enforced once the official legal instrument is published in the Official Gazette. Initial reactions are not positive, arguing the measures run the risk of being WTO-incompatible, discriminatory towards SMEs and counterproductive (in reducing prices).

Halting exports of popular foods such as beans, white corn and sardines are amongst the measures which aim to reduce by February 2023 their price as it stands today by 8% (3% only for corn flour).

Could Mexico provide more information:

- a. What will be the duration of the measure?
- b. When does Mexico intend to submit official notification to the WTO on export restriction of the staples concerned by the measure?
- c. Could this measure possibly impact the World Food Programme humanitarian purchases (if such)?
- d. What is Mexico's latest production forecast for those staples?

1.19.2 Question by Switzerland (AG-IMS ID [103097](#))

Switzerland understands that Mexico has announced the Opening Agreement against Inflation and Scarcity (APECIC) on 3 October 2022. This agreement included a ban on Mexico's exports of, amongst others, white corn, beans and sardines until February 2023. However, the decree implementing the APECIC that was published in the Official Federal Gazette on 19 October 2022 does not contain such an export ban. Could Mexico please clarify whether export bans were implemented according to the earlier announcement or whether it has refrained from imposing the

export restrictions? Switzerland is interested in any further information that Mexico can provide on its export restriction policy.

1.19.3 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID [103030](#))

On 3 October 2022, the Office of the President of Mexico announced the Opening Agreement against Inflation and Scarcity (APECIC) between the government of Mexico and fifteen private companies, aimed at combatting food price inflation. The agreement extends through February 2023 and pledges to reduce the prices of 24 basic goods (mostly food items) by 8%. Provisions include a ban on Mexico's exports of white corn, beans, sardines, and some food packaging materials. The United States is concerned about this measure and submits the following questions:

- a. Please explain the reasoning for instituting these export restrictions.
- b. How did Mexico determine the agricultural products for which it will restrict exports?
- c. How does Mexico plan to implement these export restrictions?
- d. Does Mexico plan to notify its export restrictions to the WTO Committee on Agriculture?

1.20 Morocco's export restriction of chickpea (Licence exportation pois chiches) (SIM 787)

1.20.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID [103044](#))

With circular N 6368/311, the export of chickpea was banned until 27 June 2022. The measure has been extended without end date (permanent character) as published in Official Journal n 2256-22 of 25.08.2022.

- a. Could Morocco provide more information on the expected impact on the exports of chickpea?
- b. What is Morocco's latest production forecast for chickpea?
- c. When does Morocco intend to submit official notification to the WTO on export restriction measure?

1.21 South Africa's poultry TRQ administration (SIM 788)

1.21.1 Question by Uruguay (AG-IMS ID [103045](#))

Uruguay would like to ask the following questions regarding South Africa's TRQ for meat and edible offal of poultry (ZAFQ005), which according to South Africa's most recent MA:2 notifications has not been opened in the years 2017-2020 given that "the MFN applied rates for the corresponding tariff lines were below the in-quota tariff rate".

- a. Is this a fully *erga omnes* TRQ, or are there any country-specific allocations?
- b. We understand that South Africa is in the process of elaborating its MA:2 for 2021; however, we would like to ask if this TRQ has been opened in the years 2021 and 2022. In other words, is this TRQ currently functional?
- c. According to South Africa's WTO Schedule, we understand that maximum in-quota tariff rates would equal 20% of the MFN bound rates, which vary from 82% (for HS 0207.11, 0207.12 and 0207.14) to 37% (for HS 0207.13). This would mean that maximum in-quota tariff rates would equal 16,4% and 7,4% ad valorem (i.e. 20% of the bound rates). Is this understanding correct? If not, could South Africa indicate its maximum in-quota tariff rates for the relevant products?

- d. Which have been the applied MFN rates for the relevant products, and in particular tariff lines 020714 91, 020714 93, 020714 95, 020714 96, 020714 97, 020714 98 and 020714 99, in the years 2020, 2021 and 2022?
- e. Paragraph 3.19 of Annex 4 (South Africa) of the last WTO Secretariat's TPR report for SACU (2015) says that TRQs for agricultural products "are administered through import licences issued by the Department of Agriculture on a quarterly or bi-annual basis and applicants need to register with SARS and the DTI. The licence allocation system takes into account: Black Economic Empowerment (BEE) status of the applicants, i.e. eligibility of companies under the Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment Act (Act No. 53 of 2003); the market share of applicants, derived from historical data for the past three years; the number of applicants; and the quota available. Out-of-quota imports are subject to the SACU CET, while lower (reduced) tariff rates apply to in-quota imports". Could South Africa confirm whether this information is still accurate, and whether it is applicable to ZAFQ005?
- f. Are there any other TRQs for the import of poultry meat to South Africa, in addition to the aforementioned ZAFQ005?

1.22 Türkiye's stone fruit support (SIM 789)

1.22.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID [103098](#))

Australia understands that Türkiye has approved measures to support its stone fruit industry, which include payments to producers.

Australia asks that Türkiye provide information on the measures, including

- a. the policy objectives of the support;
- b. the different components of the support programme;
- c. eligibility and calculation of payments; and
- d. the allocated budget for the programme?

1.23 U.S. Inflation Reduction Act 2022 (SIM 790)

1.23.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID [103100](#))

Australia notes that a public release (https://www.agriculture.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/ag_reconciliation_one-pager.pdf) on the US *Inflation Reduction Act 2022* states that USD 14 billion will be provided to lower costs for families including farmers and support good-paying, clean energy jobs in rural communities.

Australia asks that the United States:

- a. elaborate on how the *Inflation Reduction Act 2022* will lower costs for families;
- b. outline the eligibility requirements for farmers to receive this support; and
- c. outline how the United States intends to report notifiable expenditure relating to support provided to farmers under this Act to the Committee on Agriculture.

1.24 U.S. expanded insurance coverage for soybean and grain sorghum (SIM 791)

1.24.1 Question by Brazil (AG-IMS ID [103002](#))

According to information available online, the United States has approved a plan to expand soybean and grain sorghum double-cropping insurance coverage in hundreds of additional counties for 2023,

as part of the administration`s effort to boost US agricultural production to help counter food price volatility linked to supply chain disruptions and the conflict in Ukraine (source: <https://www.usda.gov/media/press-releases/2022/07/12/usda-makes-it-easier-american-farmers-grow-food-ease-burdens>).

Brazil notes that the US has provided support above the "*de minimis*" for both sorghum and soybeans, mainly because it notifies their expenditures under crop insurance premium subsidy as product-specific (G/AG/N/USA/157 and G/AG/N/USA/166).

Therefore, Brazil would appreciate it if the US could explain to Members how it envisions that the "Double Cropping - Expanded Insurance Coverage" will affect its compliance to domestic support entitlements.

1.25 U.S. corn support (SIM 792)

1.25.1 Question by China (AG-IMS ID [103049](#))

According to the US domestic support notifications, during 2018-2021, product-specific AMS for corn were: 2.2 billion dollars, 2.1 billion dollars, 4.6 billion dollars and 4.9 billion dollars. In marketing year 2019/2020 and 2020/2021, Crop Insurance subsidy and CFAP specialty crop subsidy constitute a 50-50 split of corn subsidies, as a result, subsidies for corn doubled in 2020 and 2021.

The US ranks top for corn production and export; the data from the U.S. Census Bureau show that in 2021, corn exports of the US rose by 34.6% compared to those in 2020.

- a. Please explain in the case of rising export, why the US government believed that corn producers were in a position to receive higher subsidies.
- b. Please clarify different policy targets of Crop Insurance subsidy and CFAP subsidy.
- c. Could the US provide data on domestic consumption of corn during the last 10 years?

1.26 U.S. fertilizers (SIM 793)

1.26.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID [103053](#))

The US Biden-Harris Administration made USD 500 million available to increase innovative American-made fertilizer production.

- a. Could the US provide more details on the criteria to benefit from financing under "Innovative American-Made Fertilizer Production"?
- b. What type of measures are available under this programme?
- c. Who are the targeted beneficiaries?

1.27 U.S. biofuel infrastructure grants (SIM 794)

1.27.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID [103055](#))

USDA announced in August 2022 a USD 100 million biofuel Infrastructure grants.

- a. Can the US indicate how it intends to notify this subsidy in its DS:1 notification?

1.28 U.S. Urban Agriculture and Innovative Production (SIM 795)

1.28.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID 103138)

Recently, the US invested USD 14.2 million in Urban Agriculture and Innovative Production (UAIP) efforts. The UAIP provides support through two types of grants: planning projects and implementation projects.

- a. What is the eligibility criteria for beneficiaries under this measure?
- b. What type of produce/ products are covered under this support?
- c. How and when will this programme be notified under the domestic support notification?

1.29 U.S. Farm Bill 2023 (SIM 796)

1.29.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID [103139](#))

It is understood that the US would implement the new Farm Bill to support its farmers and agriculture. In the Agricultural Improvement Act of 2018, the US implemented various programs including the price loss coverage (PLC). In this context, the US is requested to provide the following information:

- a. Whether the US intends to implement the PLC in the forthcoming Farm Bill 2023?
- b. Whether the product coverage under the programme would be expanded?
- c. How the reference prices for various agricultural products under the PLC would be determined?

SPECIFIC IMPLEMENTATION MATTERS (SIM) RAISED PREVIOUSLY

1.30 Argentina's export restrictions (SIM 710)

1.30.1 Question by United Kingdom, Switzerland, Japan, New Zealand (AG-IMS ID [103048](#))

The United Kingdom thanks Argentina for their response to AG-IMS ID 102076 and understands the challenges they are facing including high inflation and extreme weather events. Nevertheless, we would remind Argentina of their obligations under Article 12.1(b) and the importance of transparency to facilitate reliable information for importers in order to keep prices down and prevent pre-emptive restrictions. Could Argentina therefore provide an update on when they plan to notify this export restriction to the Committee on Agriculture through the required Table ER:1?

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

1.31.1 Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID [103130](#))

New Zealand continues to raise questions around Canada's milk classes, due to the continued clarification needed with regards to answers provided in Canada's responses in AG-IMS ID 102073, AG-IMS ID 101013, AG-IMS ID 100064 and AG-IMS ID 99098.

Canada's answer to AG-IMS ID 102073 states that New Zealand's calculation of the CDC published cost of production for milk protein is inaccurate.

New Zealand believes it has calculated the cost of production accurately but welcomes Canada's review in more detail. The cost of production (COP) for solids non fat (SNF) is calculated as follows: first, the cost of production of SNF per hl is established by calculating 57% of the total COP of \$84.57 per one standard hl of milk (as per the table in page 5 of the CDC Cost of Production study dated October 2022 which allocates 57% of the total COP to SNF and 43% to Butterfat), which comes to

\$48.20 hl ; second, because the sample milk composition is 9.026 kg/hl of SNF, \$48.20 is divided by 9.026 kg to obtain the COP per kg for SNF which is \$5.34 kg. Alternatively, standard milk composition of 8.9177 kg/hl could be used, resulting in the COP per kg for SNF which is \$5.40 kg. Irrespective of the use of sample or standard milk composition, setting milk class 4(a) for October 2022 at CAD 3.8549/kg for protein and other solids remains substantially below the cost of production for milk protein.

- a. Can Canada please confirm that Class 4(a) is set below the cost of production for milk proteins?
- b. Can Canada please explain how the benefit to exporters resulting from Class 4(a) pricing is materially different from the benefit to exporters under the Commercial Export Milk scheme above?

Regarding the Canadian value-added protein products onto the world market, New Zealand would appreciate if Canada could fully respond to the question in AG-IMS ID 102073.

- c. Of Canada's total production of value-added milk protein products including milk protein concentrates, infant formula, skim milk powder (SMP) and SMP blends, (specifically including HS 0404.90, HS 0402.10, HS 1901.10, HS 1901.90 and 3504.00 respectively) what percentage was accounted for by domestic Canadian demand as compared to exports annually since 2019?
- d. What are the reasons for the growth in exports under these tariff lines (in particular their dairy component), given the supply managed system?

New Zealand would particularly appreciate detailed information that includes all forms of milk protein products. The product coverage in Canada's previous replies, as well as the data from Statistics Canada on the supply and disposition of milk products, does not take into account the higher percentage protein products being exported through SMP blends.

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

1.32.1 Question by United Kingdom (AG-IMS ID [103086](#))

In follow-up to AG-IMS IDs 99110, 100065, 101016 and 102090, the United Kingdom would like to reiterate its interest in the results of Canada's Comprehensive Review of the Allocation and Administration of Tariff Rate Quotas (TRQs) for Dairy, Poultry and Egg Products. The United Kingdom would once again request clarity from Canada on the timeframe for the review's release.

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

1.33.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID [103135](#))

In 2019, Canada announced a Dairy Direct Programme with the objective to support dairy producers as a result of market access commitments made under the international trade agreements, namely the Canada-European Union Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA) and the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership (CPTPP). As informed by Canada in its reply to AG-IMS ID 100040, under the programme CAD 937 million is being provided as direct payments to dairy producers, where CAD 469 million is given for the years 2021-22 and CAD 468 million for 2022-23.

- a. What are the specific measures taken under this programme?
- b. What are the criteria for dairy producers to be eligible to get this support?
- c. How and when would Canada notify this at the WTO under the Agreement on Agriculture?

1.34 China's cotton reserves purchasing system (SIM 295)

1.34.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID [103019](#))

In AG-IMS ID 102033, China indicated that the cotton purchases were made for central cotton reserves, and not made under an extension of the measure entitled "Deepening the Target Price Policy Reform of Cotton." In response to a request for the regulation that governs the release of government- or state-owned stocks of cotton, China instructed interested parties to refer to the circulars issued by China National Food and Strategic Reserve Administration or China Cotton Reserve Corporation.

Please provide copies or website links to the circulars issued by the China National Food and Strategic Reserve Administration or China Cotton Reserve Corporation that govern the release of government- or state-owned stocks of cotton.

1.34.2 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID [103020](#))

In AG-IMS ID 102033, the United States asked whether there are any limits placed on the maximum quantity of cotton that the government of China may purchase for the cotton reserve. China responded that the maximum amount purchased by the government shall not exceed the reserve scale.

Please clarify, what is the "reserve scale"?

1.34.3 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID [103021](#))

In AG-IMS ID 102033, China stated that reserve cotton was purchased in 2019 at market prices.

Please provide the quantities and prices for each of the 2019 purchases of reserve cotton.

1.34.4 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID [103022](#))

In AG-IMS ID 102033, China stated that the amount of cotton purchased by the government is determined by factors including optimizing the structure of the cotton reserve and replenishing the cotton reserve. China also stated that the highest auction price is determined according to the domestic spot price of cotton.

- a. Please provide the formula that the government of China uses to determine the highest auction price from the domestic spot price of cotton.
- b. Please provide the sources that the government of China uses to identify the domestic spot price of cotton.

1.35 China's Cotton Policies (SIM 647)

1.35.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID [103018](#))

In AG-IMS ID 102034, China provided the following table of the volume in millions of tonnes of cotton production for both Xinjiang and for China, nationally, for each of the years from 2012 to 2021.

Year	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
China Nationwide	6.61	6.28	6.30	5.91	5.34	5.65	6.10	5.89	5.91	5.73
Xinjiang Uygur Autonomous Region	3.88	3.94	4.15	4.19	4.08	4.57	5.11	5.00	5.16	5.13

In AG-IMS ID 102035, China asked that the United States clarify part d. of the question. Here, we seek to clarify.

In G/AG/N/CHN/48, which notified the "Deepening the Target Price Policy Reform of Cotton" measure, China stated "According to Article 6, paragraph 5 (b) of the Agreement on Agriculture, such payments are made based on 85% or less of the base level production. ("Blue Box" measure) The amount of subsidized cotton is subject to a limit, which is 85% of the average cotton production in the base period (2012-2014)." The average of the China nationwide cotton production figures provided above for 2012 through 2014 is 6.40 million tons. 85% of the average nationwide cotton production from 2012 to 2014 would be 5.44 million tonnes.

The average of the Xinjiang cotton production figures provided above for 2012 through 2014 is 3.99 million tonnes. 85% of the average Xinjiang cotton production from 2012 to 2014 would be 3.39 million tonnes.

If the limit had been set based on Xinjiang production, rather than nationwide production, the limit would have been much smaller. A limit of 5.44 million tonnes is 136% of Xinjiang's average cotton production from 2012 to 2014.

Please explain why China chose to use nationwide production figures to set the limit instead of Xinjiang production figures, given that the programme only operates in Xinjiang.

1.36 Ecuador's new milk law (SIM 766)

1.36.1 Question by United States of America, New Zealand, Australia (AG-IMS ID [103023](#))

At the previous Committee on Agriculture meeting, the United States added AG-IMS ID 102131 to the agenda due to serious concerns related to Ecuador's "Organic Law to Promote the Production, Marketing, Industrialization, Consumption, and Fixation of the Price of Milk and its Derivatives" that bans the importation of powdered milk for ten years, as of the date of registration.

Registered on 17 August 2022, the law is a comprehensive regulatory law on milk products in Ecuador.

The law includes regulations on all aspects of milk production, processing, and sale.

Concerning the ban of powdered milk, the law reads (translated): "It is prohibited the importation of milk powder for the next ten years while the conditions are created so that the industry can compete in better conditions."

Noting that Ecuador has not yet provided a substantive response to AG-IMS ID 102131, the United States resubmits and expands its questions as follows:

- a. How will Ecuador implement this ban on imports of powdered milk?
- b. Please explain how this import ban complies with Ecuador's WTO commitments and obligations.
- c. What steps is Ecuador taking in implementing this law to ensure that Ecuador remains compliant with its WTO obligations?

1.37 Egypt's Export Prohibitions on Agricultural Products (SIM 597)

1.37.1 Question by Switzerland, United Kingdom (AG-IMS ID [103088](#))

Switzerland welcomes the decision that Egypt lifted its ban on the export of staple goods such as wheat, flour, fava beans, vegetable oils, corn, lentils and pasta in September. However, we have noted that the ban on rice export was extended in order to meet local market needs. Could Egypt please

- a. clarify how this measure is in accordance with Article 12 of the Agreement on Agriculture?

- b. Provide information on the measures taken to ensure due consideration to the effects of such an export ban on importing Members' food security, in accordance with Article 12(a) of the Agreement on Agriculture.
- c. Give an update on when it intends to submit the corresponding notification?

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

1.38.1 Question by Brazil, Argentina, Paraguay (AG-IMS ID [103006](#))

Brazil thanks the EU for its replies to questions AG-IMS IDs 100071 and 101033.

Taking into account the explanation provided regarding the country benchmarking system the EU is adopting, Brazil would like to consult on the following:

- a. since one of the criteria of the benchmarking system relates to a Multilateral Environmental Agreement (MEA) - a country's "nationally determined contributions (NDCs) to the UNFCCC" -, how does the EU follow the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, set out in the same Convention and its Paris Agreement?
- b. How does the EU assess risk in countries which have all but eliminated their native vegetation and forests through their development process?
- c. Does the EU intend to adopt legislation, as a criterion to define market access conditions, to oblige countries to reforest their territory to bring forest cover levels to levels similar to those found in the Members that will be most affected by the current legislation?

1.39 India's export restrictions on wheat (SIM 744)

1.39.1 Question by United Kingdom, Switzerland, Ukraine (AG-IMS ID [103060](#))

The United Kingdom thanks India for their response to AG-IMS IDs 102012 and 102021 but notes that the required ER:1 table, notifying the Committee on Agriculture of India's export restriction on wheat, is still outstanding. We would therefore like to remind India of their obligations under Article 12.1(b) of the Agreement on Agriculture and request an update on when the required ER:1 table will be provided to this Committee.

1.40 India's public stockpiling (SIM 525)

1.40.1 Question by United States of America, Canada, Japan, Thailand, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay, Australia (AG-IMS ID [103025](#))

In AG-IMS ID 102018 several Members asked India about information on state bonuses provided in addition to the Indian central government's minimum support prices. In response, India stated "The information would be provided when available" but did not respond to parts b(i), b(ii), or b(iii) of the question. Given that no information has been provided since the last Committee meeting, we therefore ask the following questions:

- a. Please provide an update on if the information on state bonuses is available.
- b. If the information is not available, please provide a time estimate for when the information will be available.
- c. If the information is not available, please provide an update including:
 - i. when the request was made to the State governments;
 - ii. the time frame which India gave State governments to respond; and

iii. whether any preliminary information has been collected.

1.40.2 Question by United States of America, Canada, Japan, Thailand, Ukraine, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay, Australia (AG-IMS ID [103026](#))

In AG-IMS ID 102019, the Members asked for India to show where annual quantitative levels of current, historical, and pre-determined levels of wheat and rice stocks since 2010 can be found. India's response discusses notified procurement levels, which is not the same as current, historical, and pre-determined levels of wheat and rice stocks.

Further, India went on to state that the government procures food grains to provide food security to 75% of the rural and 50% of the urban population.

However, the share of the population receiving subsidized food grains does not answer the question asked.

Also in AG-IMS ID 102019, India stated that it believes summaries of consultative meetings between the government and the Food Corporation of India (FCI) held to assess the availability of wheat and rice for procurement at Minimum Support Prices (MSP) constitute information that is beyond the remit of CoA and AoA notification requirements. Members have requested this information as it was India that stated in AG-IMS ID 87156 that the government of India decides target levels for wheat and paddy/rice procurement based on this information. India also referred generally to the Department of Food and Public Distribution homepage, but not to any specific location for the requested information, which Members have been unable to identify.

- a. Please provide current, historical, and pre-determined levels of wheat and rice stocks since 2010.
- b. If unable to provide the quantitative levels for each, please confirm that India does not maintain predetermined targets for the quantity and procurement of wheat and rice annually.

1.41 India's other support for rice (SIM 743)

1.41.1 Question by United States of America, Canada, Japan, Thailand, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay, Australia (AG-IMS ID [103029](#))

In AG-IMS ID 102020, several Members sought clarity with regards to India's response to AG-IMS ID 101037, which states "After consulting with relevant Ministries/Departments, it was found that no support other than that for the PSH purposes has been provided for rice." India re-stated this statement without any further clarification than that 'other support for rice' does not include the state bonuses.

Please confirm whether India has consulted with state governments to confirm whether there are any additional sub-national rice support measures (other than state bonuses) and if there are any other state-level support measures that are not notified.

1.42 India's price support (SIM 753)

1.42.1 Question by United States of America, Paraguay, Australia (AG-IMS ID [103024](#))

In AG-IMS ID 102017, WTO Members (the United States, Australia, and Paraguay) asked what policy change occurred prior to 1995-96 that necessitated a change in how India notifies support for commodities including barley, maize, millet, sorghum, gram (chickpeas), arhar/tur (pigeon peas), urad (black matpe), moong (mung beans), and lentils, which resulted in India's subsequent consistent notification of price supports on an aggregate basis. The Members also asked for India to provide the level of procurement for the following commodities for the notification period 2020/21 in G/AG/N/IND/27: jowar, bajra, maize, tur, moong, urad, barley, gram, and masur.

In addition, the Members asked for India to provide the value of production for each of the following commodities for the notification period 2020/21 in G/AG/N/IND/27: jowar, bajra, maize, tur, moong, urad, barley, gram, and masur.

India provided a few sentences of reasoning related to why India has notified various pulses on an aggregated basis, but did not provide information on any policy change that occurred prior to 1995-1996.

India did not provide any levels of procurement for any of the commodities requested.

India provided aggregated value of production for pulses and coarse cereals, but did not provide value of production for any of the individual commodities requested.

Thus, we resubmit all three questions:

- a. Please explain what policy change occurred prior to 1995-96 that necessitated a change in how India notifies support for these commodities, which resulted in India's subsequent consistent notification of price supports on an aggregate basis.
- b. Please provide the level of procurement for the following commodities for the notification period 2020/21 in G/AG/N/IND/27: jowar, bajra, maize, tur, moong, urad, barley, gram, and masur.
- c. Please provide the value of production for each of the following commodities for the notification period 2020/21 in G/AG/N/IND/27: jowar, bajra, maize, tur, moong, urad, barley, gram, and masur.

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

1.43.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID [103091](#))

Australia notes India's Directorate General of Foreign Trade has extended for one year India's export restrictions on sugar, which were set to expire on 31 October (Public notice no 40/2015-20).

In relation to these export restrictions, Australia asks that India:

- a. confirm when these export restrictions will be permanently lifted; and
- b. indicate when they intend on notifying these export restrictions to the Committee on Agriculture through the required Table ER:1 notification?

1.44 India's export restrictions on wheat (SIM 744)

1.44.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID [103092](#))

Australia asked India a follow-up question at 102nd CoA (AG-IMS ID 102092) on export restrictions on wheat. As this was not answered, it is asked again.

Australia thanks India for its response to its previous question on India's announcement of export restrictions on wheat (AG-IMS ID 101019). In its response, India answered that the conditions of its implementation of the export restriction is notified in Notification 13 May 2022, issued by the Directorate General of Foreign Trade (DGFT) and subsequent DGFT notices. Australia notes the length of the restriction has not been indicated in DGFT notices.

In light of this, Australia asks that India indicate how long it intends for the restriction to remain place.

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

1.45.1 Question by United States of America, Canada, Japan, Switzerland, United Kingdom, Paraguay, Australia (AG-IMS ID [103028](#))

On 8 September 2022, India announced an export ban on broken rice, as well as export restrictions on rough, semi-, and wholly-milled rice. It is also noted that these export restrictions have not been notified to the Committee on Agriculture. As the world's largest and growing exporter of rice – accounting for more than 40% of global rice exports – these restrictions during a period of already increased market and price volatility will contribute to and exacerbate market volatility and contribute to increased food insecurity. It has been reported in the media that India's restrictions could result in a decrease of 16-17 million tonnes of rice from being exported this year.

Beyond this global impact, the effects will likely be felt most strongly by developing and African countries. Nine out of the top ten export markets for Indian rice were developing countries, which have grown to depend on imported Indian rice, now affected by these export restrictions. The most significant impact of this export ban and restrictions may occur in West and Central Africa, areas that were already experiencing a major food crisis. According to the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), West and Central Africa rely on imported rice to cover 40% of local demand, despite increases in local production in recent years. In several ECOWAS countries, rice is a major or main staple crop, and a majority of imports were from India prior to the restrictions.

In 2007, when India imposed a rice export ban, the result was increased food inflation, which contributed to Asian rice prices increasing by almost 80%, according to news sources, creating a food security issue in many countries that relied on rice as a staple.

- a. When will these export restrictions and bans be lifted? If there is no set date, please explain what factors will be used to end these measures.
- b. When will India notify these export restrictions/bans to this Committee?
- c. At the September 2022 meeting of this Committee, India responded to the European Union that developing countries' food security was not at risk due to these export restrictions. Given India's primary export markets are developing countries, a number of these countries primarily import rice from India, and the export ban and export restriction directly limits the types of rice imported by these Members from India, please explain how developing countries' food security is not at risk.
- d. With numerous countries around the globe experiencing unprecedented food security issues, please explain why India has decided to implement these export restrictions on rice.
- e. Please confirm whether the World Food Program is exempt from the export duty and the export ban imposed by India. We note that neither notification by the Directorate General of Foreign Trade of India directly provides such an exemption and the ban only provides an exemption until 15 September for a limited number of circumstances relating to exports that began before the date of the announcement.

1.46 Indonesia's stockholding programmes (SIM 326)

1.46.1 Question by Canada (AG-IMS ID [103093](#))

According to media reports, authorities in Indonesia have been seeking to build up adequate reserves of various staple foods to ensure price stability at a time of soaring inflation (Source: <https://www.world-grain.com/articles/17664-indonesia-building-rice-stocks-amid-inflation>). Under a new presidential regulation, which took effect 24 October 2022, the Indonesia National Food Agency (Bapanas) with the help of state-owned enterprises plans to secure stocks of 11 staple foods, such as rice, corn, soybeans, shallots, chili, sugar for household, cooking oil, as well as some meat and fish.

Could Indonesia please explain:

- a. What criteria is Bapanas using to determine the volume of the reserves of each staple food product?
- b. Will the stocks of staple foods be procured from the domestic and international markets based on market prices?

1.47 Japan's stockpiles of skim milk powder (SIM 754)

1.47.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID [103094](#))

Australia thanks Japan for its response to Australia's question (AG-IMS ID 102093). Australia would like to request further details on Japan's efforts to decrease its skim milk powder stockpiles.

In relation to Japan's efforts, Australia asks that Japan:

- a. indicate the target weight goal for its skim milk powder stockpile and whether a timeframe has been set to achieve that goal;
- b. indicate whether alternative options are being considered if the target weight goal is not achieved;
- c. indicate whether the scheme may be extended beyond September 2023;
- d. indicate whether exports of Japanese skim milk powder are being directed at particular countries; and
- e. note any anticipated long-term impacts this might have on skim milk powder imports to Japan.

1.48 Malaysia's chicken and egg subsidies and export restrictions for chicken (SIM 745)

1.48.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID [103096](#))

Australia understands that Malaysia has extended production subsidies for chicken and egg producers until the end of 2022.

Can Malaysia provide information on whether export restrictions for chicken will remain in place until the end of 2022? Can Malaysia give an update on when it intends to submit the corresponding Domestic Support notification?

1.49 Thailand's Paddy Pledging Scheme (SIM 313)

1.49.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID [103137](#))

It is known that Thailand's Rice Policy and Management Committee has approved a budget, amounting to about 150 billion baht, to guarantee the income of more than 4.6 million rice farming households for their 2022-23 rice crops. The Committee also agreed to extend the period for the rice pledging scheme for another year. In this context, Thailand is requested to provide the following information:

- a. Details of the working of the rice pledging scheme?
- b. What are the eligibility criteria prescribed to receive support under farmer's rice income guarantee scheme, as approved by Thailand's Rice Policy and Management Committee?
- c. Under the rice pledging scheme, how is the administered price determined?
- d. What quantity of rice is eligible to be sold to the government?

- e. How much quantity of rice is currently in stock under the rice pledging scheme?
- f. What is the mechanism to dispose of the rice stock accumulated under the rice pledging scheme?
- g. How will this support be notified in the domestic support notification?

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

1.50.1 Question by United Kingdom, Switzerland, Japan, New Zealand (AG-IMS ID [103054](#))

As a follow up to AG-IMS IDs 101042 and 102029, the United Kingdom would like to reiterate its concern with the lack of transparency around Türkiye's export restrictions and would appreciate a response to the following questions:

- a. firstly, could Türkiye please confirm that these measures will expire on the 31 December 2022?
- b. Regardless of the temporary nature of these measures, the United Kingdom would like to reiterate the importance of compliance with Article 12.1(b) in order to ensure transparency and support predictable trade. Could Türkiye therefore confirm when they will be notifying these restrictions to the Committee on Agriculture through the required ER:1 table?

1.51 Türkiye's freight support (SIM 730)

1.51.1 Question by United States of America, Brazil, Australia (AG-IMS ID [103031](#))

The United States remains concerned with Türkiye's reimbursement of freight costs for certain exports and resubmits AG-IMS ID 100014, which has not yet received a response in AG-IMS.

The United States understands that the Turkish Ministry of Industry and Trade reimburses freight costs for certain agricultural products exported from Türkiye beginning in 2016, as reported by various exporter associations and trade consulting firms, such as here: (<https://igeme.com.tr/ihracat-tasimalarina-navlun-destegi/>). The Turkish Ministry of Industry and Trade's KUSGEM agency describes the purpose of the measure as intended to "increase both the export level of enterprises and the export level to the specified countries by support in the freight expenses in the exports..." (translated from: <https://www.kosgeb.gov.tr/site/tr/ulusaldestekler/destekkategori/13/pazara-giris>).

- a. Please provide a copy of or link to the legal measures authorizing the reimbursement of freight costs for certain exports, specifically a 2016 decision entitled "İhraç Taşımlarına 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 reimbursement and amount of reimbursement per tariff code. In addition, please identify the quantities and total amount of reimbursement 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.

1.52 U.S. American Rescue Plan Act (SIM 689)

1.52.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID [103099](#))

Australia notes that the USDA has announced (<https://www.usda.gov/media/press-releases/2022/08/22/usda-invest-300-million-new-organic-transition-initiative>) that it is making USD 300 million of *American Rescue Plan Act* funding available for an Organic Transition Initiative. Australia understands that the initiative will include direct support through financial assistance and crop insurance assistance to producers, as well as market development projects.

How does the US intend to classify these payments in the context of notifications to the Committee on Agriculture?

1.53 United States' soybean programmes (SIM 387)

1.53.1 Question by China (AG-IMS ID [103046](#))

China notices that in marketing year 2018/2019, the US provides nearly USD 8.5 billion product-specific AMS for soybeans, compared with around 1.6 billion dollars in previous years.

According to the US soybean quality annual reports and the U.S. Census Bureau, every year the US exports are around half volume of its soybean production.

- a. Please explain reasons for raising soybean subsidy in 2018/2019.
- b. Could the US provide data on domestic consumption of soybean during last 10 years?
- c. In case of declining export, how did the US government deal with domestic production surplus?
- d. Please clarify the difference between the US subsidies for soybean and a subsidy for export.

1.53.2 Question by China (AG-IMS ID [103047](#))

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, after a short decrease in 2018, the export value of soybeans experienced a strong increase in 2019 2020 and 2021, the USDA website reported that "In 2021, the value of U.S. soybean exports to the world reached a new record at USD 27.4 billion, up 7% from the prior year's record." However, in 2021, the US still raised its product-specific AMS for soybeans from 1.9 billion dollars to 2.3 billion dollars, compared to 2020.

- a. Please explain the reason.
- b. Please explain how subsidies for soybeans are determined, e.g. what factors are used to determine when to raise the amount of subsidies?
- c. Please evaluate the influence that US soybean subsidies have on the international market during last 10 years.

1.54 U.S. funding for environmental action (SIM 763)

1.54.1 Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID [103107](#))

Following question AG-IMS ID 102102, New Zealand is seeking further information on the Inflation Reduction Act ahead of a DS:2 notification.

Can the United States outline:

- a. How the implementing agency is planning to measure the climate impact of this investment at the farm and sector level.
- b. Whether the funds will be reallocated should they not have the desired impact?
- c. How the tax credits to help rural communities transition away from fossil fuels will be implemented?
- d. How payments will be limited to the extra costs or loss of income for the agricultural producer in deploying climate-smart practices.

2 POINTS RAISED IN CONNECTION WITH INDIVIDUAL NOTIFICATIONS

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

2.1.1 China (G/AG/N/CHN/57)

AG-IMS ID 103101: Question by Australia - Tariff quota fill

Australia thanks China for submitting its MA:2 notification for calendar year 2021 (G/AG/N/CHN/57).

Australia notes that the tariff rate quota (TRQ) for short and medium grain rice (CHNQ003) had a fill rate of just 8.9% in 2021, well below the 65% fill rate threshold. This follows a 54.7% fill rate reported in 2020 (reflecting China reporting the combined usage of both its rice quotas against the same quota line) and 10% fill rate in 2019.

Australia notes that it previously asked questions relating to low fill rates for China's TRQ in AG-IMS ID 93090 at the 93rd CoA and in AG-IMS ID 97123 at the 97th CoA with respect to underfills in calendar years 2018 and 2019. China's response to these questions was that their TRQ administration is in line with the obligations of WTO Members.

Australia asks that China provide additional details on how the TRQ for short and medium grain rice (CHNQ003) is administered and reasons for why the TRQ remains significantly underfilled.

AG-IMS ID 103102: Question by Paraguay - Tariff quota fill

The delegation of Paraguay thanks the delegation of the People's Republic of China for submitting notification G/AG/N/CHN/57. We note the low fill rate for quota CHNQ003, 8.9%, corresponding to short and medium grain rice. Could you please indicate:

- a. The reasons for the low fill rate of this tariff quota?
- b. Whether there are plans to modify the TRQ administration mechanism in line with the Bali Decision for a better TRQ fill rate?

AG-IMS ID 103103: Question by Thailand - Other

Thailand appreciates the submission on Market Access Notification of Calendar Year 2021 by China.

With respect to TQ ID CHNQ003 (Rice, short and medium grain) and CHNQ004 (Rice, long grain) under G/AG/N/CHN/57, China has only reported total import of short, medium and long grain rice. Would China be able to provide more specific information on the import of rice flours under TQ ID CHNQ003 and CHNQ004?

2.1.2 Iceland (G/AG/N/ISL/65, G/AG/N/ISL/66)

The delegation of Paraguay thanks the delegation of Iceland for submitting notifications G/AG/N/ISL/65 and G/AG/N/ISL/66. We note the low fill rate for the following tariff quotas:

- ISLQ057: 0.4% in both years, corresponding to other prepared or preserved meat, meat offal or blood;
- ISLQ082: 0% and 0.3%, corresponding to meat and edible offal of sheep;
- ISLQ085: 0% in both years, corresponding to meat and edible offal of horses;
- ISLQ088: 0% and 9.4%, corresponding to butter.

Could you please indicate:

- a. The reasons for the low fill rate of these tariff quotas?
- b. Whether there are plans to modify the TRQ administration mechanism in line with the Bali Decision for a better TRQ fill rate?

AG-IMS ID 103105: Question by New Zealand - Tariff quota fill

In G/AG/N/ISL/66, New Zealand notes the low fill rate for Iceland's butter TRQ (ISLQ088) at 9.4% in marketing year 2021-22. New Zealand also notes that the fill rate for this quota has remained below 15% over the past three marketing years. Could Iceland please explain:

- a. the reasons for underfill of this quota, including historically; and
- b. confirm how Iceland administers its TRQ for butter, and whether Iceland plans to change the TRQ administration scheme, to increase fill rates?

2.1.3 Malaysia (G/AG/N/MYS/54, G/AG/N/MYS/55)

AG-IMS ID 103003: Question by Brazil

Malaysia reported on its latest MA:2 notifications, pertaining to calendar year 2017 and 2018, the following fill rates for tariff-rate quotas:

- MYSQ002 (Meat of swine, fresh, chilled or frozen): 0%/0%;
- MYSQ007 (Meat and edible offal of poultry, of heading 0105 fresh, chilled or frozen): 0%/0,1%.

Brazil would appreciate if Malaysia could provide the following information:

- a. data on market circumstances that would explain the low volume of imports under the aforementioned TRQs;
- b. updates on policy developments that would explain the relatively low volume of imports under the aforementioned TRQs;
- c. volume of imports taking place outside the TRQ.

2.1.4 United States of America (G/AG/N/USA/162)

AG-IMS ID 103001: Question by Brazil, Argentina - Tariff quota fill

Brazil is thankful for the information provided by the United States in its reply to question AG-IMS ID 101047, including the indication of the website containing up-to-date data on quota fill status. Brazil notices that there seems to be a sustained underfill of country-specific quota shares for the past few years.

In this regard, and taking into account the experience related to the administration of the U.S. Raw Sugar Tariff-Rate Quota, Brazil would like to consult if the US is considering any action to improve fill rates, such as a surrender and reallocation process for unused portions, an alternative that was mentioned in the U.S. answer to question AG-IMS ID 102001.

2.2 DOMESTIC SUPPORT COMMITMENTS (TABLE DS:1)

2.2.1 Australia (G/AG/N/AUS/129, G/AG/N/AUS/129/Rev.1)

AG-IMS ID 103140: Question by India - Non-product-specific AMS

India thanks Australia for issuing the modified DS:1 (G/AG/N/AUS/129/Rev.1) for the financial year 2017/18. In footnote 17 regarding the Queensland (QLD) Exceptional Disaster Assistance Scheme: "Category C Community Recovery package, cash grants of up to AUD 25,000 to assist with repair work due to major flooding. Category B concessional loans and freight subsidies to assist with recovery activities". In this context India requests Australia for providing the following information:

- a. Kindly provide the details about the nature of repair works eligible for receiving assistance under Queensland (QLD) Exceptional Disaster Assistance Scheme.
- b. Further, kindly provide the difference in nature of Category C Community Recovery package and Category B concessional loans and freight subsidies to assist with recovery activities.

2.2.2 Australia (G/AG/N/AUS/142)

AG-IMS ID 103032: Question by United States of America - Other product-specific AMS/EMS

In G/AG/N/AUS/142 Australia notified AUD 2.668 million for the Dairy Recovery Concessional Loans Scheme, down from AUD 3.2397 million in in 2017/18 in G/AG/N/AUS/129/Rev.1.

Australia notes that, though the scheme stopped taking applications at the end of October 2016, businesses will continue to benefit over the 10-year loan terms. According to a February 2021 independent review of Australia's Regional Investment Corporation, Australia had announced up to AUD 555 million in Dairy Recovery Concessional Loans (<https://www.awe.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/independent-review-of-the-regional-investment-corporation.docx>).

Please explain how Australia calculates the level of notified support for each year under this scheme.

2.2.3 Canada (G/AG/N/CAN/151)

AG-IMS ID 103106: Question by India - Market price support

India thanks Canada for submitting their DS:1 notification (G/AG/N/CAN/151) for the calendar year 2018. India observes that Canada provides market price support of CAD 655 million for Butter, as reported under the supporting table DS:5.

- a. Canada is requested to provide the value of production of Butter for the year 2018.
- b. Canada is requested to elaborate on the factors considered in determination of the applied administered price for Butter and skim milk powder.
- c. As per supporting table DS:5, the eligible production for skim milk powder is indicated as zero. Could Canada provide the reasons behind the zero level of eligible production for skim milk powder in 2018.
- d. Please provide the eligible production for skim milk powder for the year 2019 to 2021. (The Notifications for 2019 to 2021 are still not filed by Canada as asked in the subsequent question below).

- e. When will Canada submit the outstanding DS:1 notification for the calendar years 2019, 2020, 2021?

2.2.4 European Union (G/AG/N/EU/79)

AG-IMS ID 103108: Question by Australia - Other product-specific AMS/EMS

Australia asked the EU a question at 102nd COA (AG-IMS ID 102123). As this was not answered, it is asked again.

Australia thanks the EU for submitting its 2019-20 marketing year DS:1 notification G/AG/N/EU/79. Australia notes an increase in spending shown in Supporting Table DS:6 of EUR 320 million between marketing year 2019-20 and marketing year 2018-19. This is across a range of commodities, including milk, beef, sheep, pig, fruit, and vegetables. The EU has listed the type of measure as a national aid 'covid measure'.

- a. Could the EU please elaborate on the reasons for variation in the levels of support reported in this table?
- b. Could the EU please indicate whether it expects further increases to this level of support and whether similar variations are expected for other commodities listed in Supporting Table DS:6?

Australia would appreciate the EU updating the Membership as to whether this information is available, and if so, providing it in AG-IMS.

2.2.5 Georgia (G/AG/N/GEO/28, G/AG/N/GEO/25)

AG-IMS ID 103034: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

The United States remains concerned with some of the information in Georgia's domestic support notifications.

At the September 2022 WTO Committee on Agriculture, the United States asked Georgia a question about its 2020 Table DS:1 notification in AG-IMS ID 102043, which has not been answered. The United States is resubmitting the question again, noting that we also have similar concerns with Georgia's 2021 DS:1 notification (G/AG/N/GEO/28), and as such, request that Georgia also respond with regards to revising both Table DS:1 notifications for 2020 and 2021 to account for the noted discrepancies.

From [AG-IMS 102043](#): In Georgia's January 2022 Trade Policy Review (TPR) the Secretariat reported that Georgia's Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture provided 243.5 million Georgian lari (GEL) in subsidies to the agricultural sector in 2020 (WT/TPR/S/420/Rev.1 page 102).

In Georgia's 2020 Table DS:1 domestic support notification (G/AG/N/GEO/25) the total notified domestic support was GEL 150.9 million.

There also appeared to be other discrepancies noted in the TPR with regards to measures that appear to have not been included in Georgia's domestic support notifications and a lack of required Table DS:2 notifications.

In responses to questions raised by Members, Georgia informed Members that it would submit the respective notifications in the first half of 2022.

- a. Please provide an update on the status of Georgia submitting revised Table DS:1 notification to account for noted discrepancies.
- b. Please provide an update on the status of submitting the required Table DS:2 notifications for any new or modified domestic support measures exempt from reduction commitments.

AG-IMS ID 103033: Question by United States of America - General services: infrastructural services

In G/AG/N/GEO/28 for calendar year 2021, Georgia notified in Supporting Table DS:1 the measure "Modernization of Amelioration System."

This measure was not notified in Georgia's domestic support notifications for calendar years 2017 through 2020, but did appear in notifications for calendar years 2015 and 2016.

- a. Please confirm whether the measure notified in 2021 is the same as the measure last notified in 2016.
- b. If the same, what was the reason for the measure not being notified from 2017 to 2020?

2.2.6 Japan (G/AG/N/JPN/277)**AG-IMS ID 103141: Question by India - Public stockholding for food security purposes**

In DS:1 notification (G/AG/N/JPN/277) of Japan for the Fiscal Year 2020/2021, Supporting Table DS:1 (Measures exempt from the reduction commitment - "Green Box"), Japan has notified a measure "Public stockholding for food security purposes" with 18 billion JPY as support. In this regard, India requests Japan to:

- a. Provide details of this measure.
- b. Provide information at what price the foodstuffs are acquired and released? How are these prices determined?
- c. Provide information about the quantity of acquired and released stocks during 2019-20 and 2020-21.

2.2.7 Malaysia (G/AG/N/MYS/53)**AG-IMS ID 103035: Question by United States of America, Australia - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)**

In G/AG/N/MYS/53 for 2015, Malaysia notified two rice-specific domestic support measures: Paddy Price Subsidy Income Support (MYR 497 million) in Supporting Table DS:1 and the fertilizer subsidy scheme for rice (MYR 465 million) in Supporting Table DS:2. However, Malaysia's Ministry of Finance government expenditure report for 2016 includes estimated expenditures on rice support for the year 2015 in section B/P21 (found on pages 257 and 258 here: https://www.mof.gov.my/portal/arkib/expenditure/2016/b21_2.pdf), which includes other support for rice. The other measures include the Incentive to Increase Rice Yield (MYR 20 million), the Paddy Production Incentive (MYR 563 million), the Certified Paddy Seed Subsidy (MYR 85 million), the Subsidy for Fertilizer for Hill Paddy (MYR 70 million), and Price Rice Subsidy (MYR 528 million).

- a. Please confirm the budgetary expenditures for each of the identified measures for 2015 and confirm whether each measure is included in G/AG/N/MYS/53 and if so, where.
- b. If not, please explain why Malaysia has not included the measure in its domestic support notification.
- c. Noting that 2015 was more than six years ago, please provide an update on Malaysia's plans to bring its domestic support notifications up to date.

AG-IMS ID 103036: Question by United States of America, Australia - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

In G/AG/N/MYS/53, Malaysia notified Paddy Price Subsidy Income Support (MYR 497 million) in Supporting Table DS:1.

In response to AG-IMS ID 91185, Malaysia noted that payments are "based on the context of poverty redressal and upliftment of the socio-economic well-being of paddy farmers".

Further, Malaysia did not specifically confirm that payments were not tied to the type or volume of current production, noting only which farmers were eligible to receive payment. According to the Malaysian Parliament website ([here](#)), the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Industries is described as subsidizing "agricultural output" through the Skim Subsidi Harga Padi (SSHP), the Malay name for the Paddy Price Subsidy Income Support scheme.

Media reports indicate that the SSHP in 2021 was allocated MYR 1.53 billion, a substantial increase over the notified level of support in 2015.

Further, the Parliament website indicates that eligible producers in 2021 will receive MYR 360 per metric tonne in 2019, indicating payments are not decoupled income support.

- a. Please confirm that the SSHP is the same measure as the Paddy Price Subsidy Income Support measure notified by Malaysia in G/AG/N/MYS/53.
- b. Please explain how the actual value of payments are determined for eligible producers for the Paddy Price Subsidy Income Support measure notified in 2015, including whether support was based on the quantity of output sold or produced by eligible producers and the payment rate per unit of output.
- c. Please indicate whether there has been any change in the programme since 2015 as compared to the SSHP measure described by the Malaysian Parliament website for 2021.

2.2.8 Mexico (G/AG/N/MEX/55, G/AG/N/MEX/56)

AG-IMS ID 103109: Question by Australia - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Australia thanks Mexico for submitting its 2020 DS:1 notification G/AG/N/MEX/56. Mexico has notified that under the Strategic Programme of Guaranteed Prices, eligible rice production increased to 165,900 tonnes in 2020 from 53,000 tonnes in 2019.

Australia asks that Mexico indicate what proportion of eligible rice production is being exported.

AG-IMS ID 103110: Question by Canada - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Canada thanks Mexico for its 2020 DS:1 notification (G/AG/N/MEX/56).

Canada is seeking further information related to the Supporting Table DS:1.

- a. Could Mexico provide additional information on the types of projects that fall under the heading "2(g) Infrastructural services"?
- b. Could Mexico provide additional information on the types of programs or activities that are covered under a measure called "Production for welfare" notified under "Structural adjustment assistance provided through investment aids"?

AG-IMS ID 103112: Question by Japan - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Japan would like to thank Mexico for its submission of DS:1 notification for MY2020 (G/AG/N/MEX/56). We also appreciate that Canada raised a question regarding expenditures related to fertilizers at the 100th COA, and Mexico's detailed description of in-kind support programme on fertilizers. (AG-IMS ID 100099)

According to [an article \(20/07/2022\) on the website Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality of the Netherlands](#), the Mexican President Lopez Obrador announced an ambitious investment plan to reactivate national fertilizers production. Furthermore, the Mexican government is tackling the price inflation with several policies: 1) New investments in fertilizer plants; 2) Expansion of free fertilizer handout programme; 3) Duty-free fertilizer imports; 4) Organic fertilizers.

Mexico's most recent DS:1 notification shows that the expenditure on fertilizer increased by MXN 64.2 million to MXN 186.9 million in CY2020. Could Mexico break down this fertilizer subsidy for 2020 and provide an outline?

AG-IMS ID 103113: Question by New Zealand - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

New Zealand notes Mexico has not provided full information in Supporting Table DS:1.

New Zealand would appreciate further information regarding the name and description of the domestic support measures notified, in Supporting Table DS:1 including: 2(a); 2(b); 2(e); 2(g); 4; and 11.

AG-IMS ID 103037: Question by United States of America - Direct payments: structural adjustment assistance provided through investment aids

G/AG/N/MEX/56, covering calendar year 2020, contains a measure called "Agriculture, Livestock, Fisheries and Aquaculture Promotion Programme" valued at 96.4 million Mexican 1991 pesos.

G/AG/N/MEX/55, covering calendar year 2019, contained the "Agriculture Promotion Programme" valued at 99.9 million Mexican 1991 pesos, and the "Livestock Promotion Programme" valued at 5.7 million Mexican 1991 pesos.

- a. Please indicate whether the "Agriculture Promotion Programme" and the "Livestock Promotion Programme" were merged into the "Agriculture, Livestock, Fisheries, and Aquaculture Promotion Programme" between 2019 and 2020.
- b. If so, please explain the changes that were made to the programme as a result of the merger.
- c. Please indicate whether the notified budgetary outlays represent only funding provided to agricultural commodities and livestock or also includes non-agricultural commodities, such as fish.

AG-IMS ID 103039: Question by United States of America - Direct payments: structural adjustment assistance provided through investment aids

Mexico's notification G/AG/N/MEX/55 contained "Rural Development Programme" and "Cooperation Programme," both of which do not appear in G/AG/N/MEX/56.

Have these two measures been terminated? If not, please provide an update on their status

AG-IMS ID 103038: Question by United States of America - Input subsidies available to low-income or resource-poor producers

G/AG/N/MEX/56 contains an "electric power subsidy" in Supporting Table DS:2. A note on the table indicates that funds were spent on electricity charges for agricultural use.

- a. Does the Mexican government provide funding for electricity charges for uses other than agriculture?
- b. If so, does the Mexican government use one programme for funding all electricity programmes, or is there a separate programme specifically to fund electricity for agriculture?
- c. How did the Mexican government determine what electricity charges are for agricultural use for the purposes of notifying this electric power subsidy?

2.2.9 New Zealand (G/AG/N/NZL/132)

AG-IMS ID 103142: Question by India - General services: pest and disease control

In DS:1 notification of New Zealand for the Financial Year 2020/2021, it has been noted that one of the programme titled as "Biosecurity Incursion Response and Long Term Pest Management" notified under Green Box measure "2(b) Pest and disease control" shows a sharp increase of 47.85% from NZD 48.29 million to NZD 71.4 million when compared with the previous DS:1 notification.

New Zealand is requested to describe the factors responsible for this growth and also provide a detailed description of "Biosecurity Incursion Response and Long Term Pest Management."

2.2.10 Pakistan (G/AG/N/PAK/17/Corr.1, G/AG/N/PAK/18/Corr.1, G/AG/N/PAK/19/Corr.1)

AG-IMS ID 103114: Question by European Union - Public stockholding for food security purposes

Pakistan has submitted corrigendum to the DS:1 notifications in relation to MY 2012-2013 (G/AG/N/PAK/17/corr.1); MY 2013-2014 (G/AG/N/PAK/18/corr.1); MY 2014-2015 (G/AG/N/PAK/19/corr.1) and MY 2015-2016 (G/AG/N/PAK/20/corr.1).

- a. Could Pakistan provide more information on the Public stockholding measures included in the corrigendum of the notifications (as listed above)?
- b. Could Pakistan provide the quantities of the wheat concerned?
- c. Could Pakistan confirm whether the measure concerned only wheat or other agricultural products as well?

2.2.11 Paraguay (G/AG/N/PRY/34)

AG-IMS ID 103143: Question by India - Domestic food aid

In DS:1 notification (G/AG/N/PRY/34) of Paraguay for the calendar year 2020, Supporting Table DS:1 (Measures exempt from the reduction commitment - "Green Box"), Paraguay has notified a new scheme "Improving market integration of the eastern region (PIMA)" under measure "Domestic Food aid" with 14.43 million USD. In this context, India requests Paraguay:

- a. to elaborate upon the Scheme for improving market integration?
- b. How does this measure comply with provisions under para 4 of Annex 2 of the AoA?

2.2.12 Philippines (G/AG/N/PHL/85)

AG-IMS ID 103115: Question by Japan - Input subsidies available to low-income or resource-poor producers

Japan would appreciate if Philippines could reply to our question raised at the last COA meeting (AG-IMS ID 102015) on Philippines' DS:1 notification G/AG/N/PHL/85.

Regarding Philippines' Development Programme (b) Provision of access to farm inputs, Japan notices that the increase of the support is more than double (CY2020: PHP 5,593,702 thousand to CY2021: PHP 14,188,318 thousand). Could Philippines please explain the reason behind and illustrate the details of the support?

2.2.13 Russian Federation (G/AG/N/RUS/37)

AG-IMS ID 103007: Question by Brazil - Direct payments: other

Brazil would appreciate it if the Russian Federation could provide further details on the nature of the "subsidies to legal entities for forming, holding, insuring of intervention fund, for loan servicing, and

relevant measures" that it has been notifying under Supporting Table DS:1 (Measures exempt from the reduction commitment - "Green Box"), as "other direct payment".

AG-IMS ID 103117: Question by Thailand - Direct payments: other

Thailand appreciates the notification concerning domestic support commitments of Russian Federation. Under Supporting table DS1, the Russian Federation notified measures under the other direct payment as "Subsidies to legal entities for forming, holding, insuring of intervention fund, for loan servicing, and relevant measures" at federal and sub-federal level.

Thailand would like to seek clarification from Russian Federation on the above-mentioned projects. What are the functions and roles of the legal entities? Please, provide an example as it will be helpful in understanding above mentioned legal entities.

AG-IMS ID 103116: Question by Paraguay - Other product-specific AMS/EMS

The delegation of Paraguay thanks the delegation of the Russian Federation for submitting notification G/AG/N/RUS/37 concerning its domestic support. We note a substantial increase in product-specific subsidies granted to flax and hemp, from 13% of value of production in 2019 to 38.7% of value of production in 2020. Could you please provide:

- a. the reasons for such an increase and the programmes that have been implemented that may have caused it?
- b. Disaggregated data on flax and hemp subsidies, if available?
- c. The main export destinations of Russian hemp?

2.2.14 United Kingdom (G/AG/N/GBR/11)

AG-IMS ID 103050: Question by European Union - Market price support: Eligible production

In United Kingdom's reply to India's question AG-IMS ID 102107, the United Kingdom explained that the eligible productions for butter, skimmed milk powder and common wheat were reported as zero in Supporting Table DS:5 because "prices have remained significantly higher than the applied administered price throughout the reporting period and no applications for support were received during the reporting period".

Is it a correct interpretation that the United Kingdom applies administered prices for all three mentioned commodities and still reports eligible production as zero? If so, can the United Kingdom explain how that is compatible with its obligations under the WTO Agreement on Agriculture?

2.2.15 United States of America (G/AG/N/USA/157)

AG-IMS ID 103118: Question by Canada - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

- a. In G/AG/N/USA/157 Supporting Table DS:1 General notes, it is mentioned that "Wages and salaries and administrative expenses were excluded except where such outlays reflect the level of service provided to agriculture".

Could the United States elaborate on how it determines which wages and salaries and administrative expenses reflect the level of service provided to agriculture?

- b. In G/AG/N/USA/157 Supporting Table DS:4, the United States reports the Current Total Aggregate Measurement of Support (CTAMS) for beef cattle and calves, sheep and lambs and livestock. In notes (2) of the same table, the U.S. indicates: "Livestock category includes all species eligible for Livestock Forage Program (LFP), Livestock Indemnity Program (LIP), and Emergency Assistance for Livestock Program (ELAP) program cattle & calves, sheep & lambs, poultry, swine, goats, llamas, alpacas, emus, deer, elk, reindeer, and equine. Value of production does not include reindeer, for which data are not reported."

Can the United States explain why support provided under the LFP, LIP and ELAP programmes for cattle, calves, sheep and lambs is not reported under their respective categories?

- c. Can the United States clarify why it has decided to report the support provided by the Coronavirus Food Assistance Program (CFAP) 1 and CFAP 2 as a single programme even though both programmes covered different commodities and used different calculation formulas?

AG-IMS ID 103119: Question by Canada - Other product-specific AMS/EMS

In G/AG/N/USA/157 Supporting Table DS:6, the United States reported support provided to the dairy sector through the Dairy Margin Coverage (DMC) program. In December 2021, the United States retroactively modified the DMC regulations as follows:

These changes were made retroactive to January 2020 and increase both the likelihood and the size of potential payments under the program. Can the United States clarify if these retroactive payments were reported in the G/AG/N/USA/166 since they are associated with production in 2020 and 2021?

- a. Premium alfalfa hay is now being used instead of blended alfalfa hay in the feed cost calculation which is then used to determine the National average margin for each month, and;
- b. The supplemental DMC provision allows producers to update their annual milk production history to levels produced in 2019 instead of the baselines created in 2011, 2012, or 2013.

2.2.16 United States of America (G/AG/N/USA/166)

AG-IMS ID 103122: Question by Australia - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Australia thanks the United States for submitting its 2020-21 DS:1 notification G/AG/N/USA/166.

Australia notes that the US has reported substantial year-on-year product specific AMS growth for barley (158% growth), buckwheat (374% growth), millet (173% growth), oats (232% growth), rye (446% growth), and safflower (209% growth) – predominantly due to payments made under the Coronavirus Food Assistance Program (CFAP). The US has also reported an increase in the proportion of support relative to the value of production of these products.

Australia asks that the United States indicate the reason for these increases and the main export markets for these products for the year to which this notification refers.

AG-IMS ID 103131: Question by New Zealand, Paraguay - Annex 2 (Green Box)

New Zealand commends the US on a decreased AMS expenditure from USD 18,247 million in 2019-20 to USD 15,984 million in 2020-21 (decrease of USD 2,263 million). However, New Zealand notes that US Annex 2 spending has significantly increased over this period from USD 139,220 to USD 188,735.958 mill (increase of USD 49,515.958 million).

Could the US please:

- a. explain the reasons for this significant increase;
- b. indicate the policies in place to ensure such a significant increase in spend is in compliant with the chapeau of Annex 2 and has no, or at most minimal, trade-distorting effects or effects on production;
- c. advise if this is the result of a change in policy, and if the US intends to continue to increase support under Annex 2?

AG-IMS ID 103120: Question by Australia - General services: infrastructural services

Australia thanks the United States for submitting its 2020-21 DS:1 notification G/AG/N/USA/166.

Australis notes that the US has reported that expenditure under the "Risk Management Agency (RMA): Underwriting gains to insurers – Underwriting gains provided to insurance companies under the Standard Reinsurance Agreement program" has increased by almost USD 1 billion, from USD 583 million in marketing year 2019-20 to USD 1,517 million in marketing year 2020-21. Australia notes that the US has responded to questions by Brazil (AG-IMS ID 101054 and 100108) that "the agreement specifies the payment of administrative and operating costs and the sharing of underwriting risk to support that delivery and servicing activity."

Australia asks that the US:

- a. indicate if this will permit the USDA RMA to increase the provision of crop insurance, and
- b. outline its assessment of whether an increase in the provision of crop insurance would have no or at most minimal effects on production.

AG-IMS ID 103121: Question by Australia - Domestic food aid

Australia thanks the United States of America (US) for its submission of DS:1 notification G/AG/N/USA/166. Australia seeks further clarification from the US on its Table DS:1 and Supporting Tables.

Expenditure for domestic food aid increased significantly between 2019-20 and 2020-21 (G/AG/N/USA/157), mainly due to an increase in expenditure on the Food & Nutrition Service's Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) of USD 48.8 billion.

Australia asks that the United States explain the reason for this increase.

AG-IMS ID 103009: Question by Brazil, Paraguay - Domestic food aid

According to G/AG/N/USA/166, expenditures under "Food & Nutrition Service (FNS): Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)" have increased more than 50% from 2019/2020 to 2020/2021. Could the US provide any clarification on the causes of this increase, such as changes in the number of beneficiaries, volume or prices of the food purchased?

AG-IMS ID 103126: Question by Japan - Domestic food aid

Japan would like to thank the US for its submission of DS:1 notification for MY2020 (G/AG/N/USA/166).

We note 40% increase of subsidies for "domestic food aid," which accounts for 90% of "Green Box", from USD 85.6 billion in MY2019 to USD 134.5 billion in MY2020.

The USD 48.8 billion increase (57% up) in "Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)" is more than remarkable above all. Could the US please outline the eligibility criteria related to nutritional objectives of SNAP, in accordance with paragraph 4, Annex 2 of AOA?

AG-IMS ID 103132: Question by New Zealand - Domestic food aid

New Zealand acknowledges the impact of COVID-19 on food affordability over the period covered by G/AG/N/USA/166. New Zealand notes the US has significantly increased support from the previous marketing year (USD 49,633 million) under Annex 2 (4) Domestic food aid (increase from USD 120,315 million (2019-20) to USD 169,948 million (2020-21)). Could the US please provide the policy rationale for such a significant increase in support?

New Zealand is particularly interested in the Milk Donation Reimbursement Program notified under Annex 2 (4). New Zealand is of the understanding that the purpose of the Milk Donation Reimbursement Program is to allow "eligible dairy organisations to partner with non-profit organizations that distribute food to low-income individuals" (taken from the USDA website: [Milk Donation Reimbursement Program | Agricultural Marketing Service \(usda.gov\)](https://www.usda.gov/ams/programs/milk-donation-reimbursement-program)), and then the eligible dairy organisations receive limited reimbursements relating to these donations. According to the USDA website, these reimbursements are only open to domestic processors. Does the United States have any plans to expand this programme to international dairy processors?

AG-IMS ID 103056: Question by European Union - Direct payments: payments under environmental programmes

The European Union notes a decrease in notified support under Environmental Programmes from USD 6,019 million in Marketing Year 2019/2020 to USD 4,513 million in Marketing Year 2020/2021.

What are the reasons for this decrease in support?

AG-IMS ID 103052: Question by European Union - Current Total AMS (Amber Box)

Amber Box Support - Overall Current Total AMS plus *de minimis* support.

The EU notes, that since the 2017 DS:1 notification the overall support within the Amber Box support, the figures were:

2017	USD 12.6 billion	of which Current Total AMS	USD 4.0 billion
2018	USD 23.4 billion		USD 13.1 billion
2019	USD 36.0 billion		USD 18.2 billion and
2020	USD 37.7 billion		USD 16.0 billion.

In fact, the amount in the current notification is the highest since before the year 2000. The US AMS commitment is USD 19.1 billion. Total *De minimis* support (Product Specific and Non-Product Specific) is USD 20.8 billion. So, the US support under *de minimis* is higher than the actual AMS limit of USD 19.1 billion, which is fully within the 5% *de minimis* limit – NPS arriving at 4.3% of VoP.

The EU would like to ask the US the following question:

Does the US see this trend of Amber Box support to be in line with the aim of the reform in the Agreement on Agriculture "to provide for substantial progressive reductions in agricultural support?"

AG-IMS ID 103133: Question by New Zealand - Current Total AMS (Amber Box)

New Zealand notes that applications for the CFAP closed on 12 October 2021. Will the United States' next DS:1 notification reflect decreased levels of assistance, considering the CFAP currently accounts for 67.6% of the U.S. total AMS?

AG-IMS ID 103010: Question by Brazil - Market price support: Eligible production

In G/AG/N/USA/166, Supporting Table DS:5, the US has informed that eligible production for sugar during market-year 2020-2021 was 8.376 billion tonnes, which represented an increase of almost 1 billion eligible tonnes in comparison to marketing-year 2019-2020. Additionally, the value of the US sugar production grew around 36% on a year-to-year basis.

In light of the above, could the US provide an update on recent developments of its sugar policies that could explain the growth in eligible production and in value of production?

AG-IMS ID 103123: Question by Australia - Other product-specific AMS/EMS

Australia thanks the United States for submitting its DS:1 notification G/AG/N/USA/166. Australia seeks further clarification from the US on its Table DS:1 and Supporting Tables.

Over several years, including 2020-21, the US has reported direct payments issued under the Market Facilitation Program (MFP) and the Coronavirus Food Assistance Program (CFAP). Specifically in relation to Supporting Table DS:6:

- in 2020-21 the US reported direct payments under MFP of roughly USD 23 billion and under CFAP of USD 24 billion;
- in 2019-20 the US reported direct payments under MFP of roughly USD 26 billion and under CFAP of USD 26 billion;
- in 2018-19 the US reported direct payments under MFP of roughly USD 19 billion.

Based on the MFP information, direct payments to producers spiked sharply between 2018-19 and 2019-20 and fell slightly in 2020-21. The case is similar for CFAP.

- a. Does the US expect these decreases to continue, based on market conditions?
- b. Does the decrease in the spending from these programs mean they have achieved their policy objectives?

AG-IMS ID 103125: Question by Australia - Other product-specific AMS/EMS

Australia thanks the US for its submission of DS:1 notification G/AG/N/USA/166. Australia seeks further clarification from the US on its Table DS:1 and Supporting Tables.

Australia also notes that cherries, cranberries, dairy, ginseng, grapes/raisins, hogs and pigs, and tree nuts have not BEEN receiving direct MFP payments since 2018-19.

Could the US please indicate the reason why these products are no longer receiving direct payments?

AG-IMS ID 103144: Question by New Zealand - Other product-specific AMS/EMS

New Zealand notes the US has notified a significant increase in product-specific AMS for sheep and lamb from the previous marketing year. Could the US please provide further information on the policy developments that led to the increased product-specific outlay?

AG-IMS ID 103057: Question by European Union - Non-product-specific AMS

What are the reasons for the large increase in support under the Coronavirus Food Assistance Program (CFAP) in Supporting Table DS:9 in Marketing Year 2020/2021 as compared to the Marketing Year before?

AG-IMS ID 103008: Question by Brazil - Classification of measures

Brazil notices that the US has once again notified operating costs related to the federal crop insurance as "infrastructural services" subsidies.

Taking note of the answers provided to questions AG-IMS IDs 100108 and 10154, Brazil would like to consult the US if it has given further consideration on the possibility of notifying such outlays in another category of the Agreement on Agriculture.

AG-IMS ID 103134: Question by New Zealand - Classification of measures

New Zealand notes that there has been a significant increase in the level of spending (USD 1,927.807 million) under the PLC between the marketing years 2019-2020 and 2020-2021, and a smaller, albeit still significant increase in spend (USD 297.797 million) under the ARC-CO programme. Can the US offer more information on the reasons behind the increases in spending under each programme?

New Zealand appreciates the information the US has previously provided on PLC and ARC-CO.

However, New Zealand reiterates question AG-IMS ID 100109 (and numerous other Member's questions) on the U.S. justification for notifying these payments as Non-Product-Specific AMS when a farmer's eligibility to receive payments under these programmes is based on whether they have produced a specific type of crop. Can the US please explain how PLC and ARC-CO payments comply with the requirement for non-product-specific support to be provided in favour of agricultural producers in general?

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

2.3.1 Brazil (G/AG/N/BRA/68)

AG-IMS ID 103145: Question by India - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

As per the DS:2 notification (G/AG/N/BRA/68) submitted on 9 February 2022, Programme "Feed Brazil" replaces "Program of acquisition of agricultural products from family farming". The Programme "Feed Brazil" is intended to promote food security and nutritional actions and building stocks. In this context, India requests Brazil to provide the following details:

- a. How does "Feed Brazil" differ from "Program of acquisition of agricultural products from family farming"?
- b. What are the agricultural products covered under the programme?
- c. At what price does the "Feed Brazil" programme procure from farmers? How this price is determined?
- d. What is the eligibility criteria for farmers to be covered under this programme?

2.3.2 United Kingdom (G/AG/N/GBR/14)

AG-IMS ID 103011: Question by Brazil, Paraguay - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

Brazil appreciates the United Kingdom's transparency in relation to its new Green Box programmes. Overall, the programmes descriptions are clear. Nonetheless, Brazil has some specific questions, as follows:

- a. In what regards the "Environmental Land Management: Sustainable Farming Incentive (SFI)", the UK has explained that farmers are required to choose land-based actions in order to be entitled for the benefits arising from the SFI. Could the UK provide a listing, or at least some examples, of such land-based actions?
- b. In what regards the "Landscape Recovery (LR)" Project Development Phase (PDP)", the UK has claimed that it meets the policy-specific criteria set out in Annex 2, paragraph 11. Could the UK indicate what "structural disadvantages" the programme seeks to remedy?
- c. In what regards the "National Test Programme (NTP) Scotland", the UK listed, as an example of a loss of income, a producer participating in a survey. Could the UK further elaborate on this circumstance and why it could lead to loss of income?

AG-IMS ID 103059: Question by European Union - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

In most cases the UK indicates that the measures notified fulfill Green Box criteria and in particular "Annex 2 Para 1".

However, could the UK for every single measure notified please indicate how it intends to notify in the DS:1 notification the different measures according to paragraphs 2 (preferably separately point a to g) to 12 of the Annex 2.

AG-IMS ID 103146: Question by India - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

India thanks the UK for submitting its DS:2 notification (G/AG/N/GBR/14) on 24 August 2022, under which UK has mentioned about a "Lump Sum Exit Scheme". From the notification, it is found that the period of application of this measure is from April 2022 to September 2022.

- a. India requests the UK to inform whether the Scheme still continues or has been terminated?

- b. What is the actual amount disbursed under the Scheme during the period April to September 2022?
- c. Under the heading "Detailed Description of Measure With Reference To Criteria", it is written that "*Recipients must have transferred their agricultural land in England (with limited exceptions for up to 5 hectares of that land and for any land planted with trees under certain woodland creation schemes)*". India requests the UK to kindly share details of the "certain woodland creation schemes".

AG-IMS ID 103040: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)

In G/AG/N/GBR/14 the United Kingdom provided a Table DS:2 notification for the Sustainable Farming Incentive (SFI). The notification indicates the measure is to help maintain food production while "Farmers will be incentivized to produce public goods by meeting standards relating to water quality, biodiversity, animal health and welfare standards, climate change mitigation."

- a. Please provide additional details with regards to the SFI standards, how they were developed and whether the United Kingdom has developed metrics to determine the effectiveness of the standards in delivering positive environmental benefits.
- b. Please provide some examples of the kinds of environmental benefits this measure is designed to produce and how producers will be incentivized to continue the practices beyond the lifecycle of the initiative.

AG-IMS ID 103127: Question by Australia - Classification of measures

Australia thanks the United Kingdom for its submission of DS:2 notification G/AG/N/GBR/4 on 6 April 2021. The DS:2 submission states that this measure is not subject to reduction commitments as it is consistent with Blue Box criteria according to Article 6.5 of the AoA.

Australia notes public reporting that the programme aims to create a domestically produced source of protein for animal feed (https://www.farminguk.com/news/ni-protein-crops-scheme-payments-extended-until-end-of-2023_61105.html) in place of imported soya and other protein (<https://www.daera-ni.gov.uk/consultations/daera-consultation-proposal-introduce-protein-crops-payment-pilot-scheme-2021>).

Australia seeks clarification on the Coupled Support for Protein Crops programme and its notification as a programme consistent with Article 6.5 of the AoA.

Australia asks that the UK explain how this measure limits production. In this regard, Australia notes that this measure is targeted at producers that grow protein crops; that the total area eligible for payment under the pilot scheme of this measure is capped at 1,000 hectares (ha); and that in 2020, only 153 ha of protein crops were grown in Northern Ireland. Australia's understanding is that these factors combined suggest the measure would tend to increase, rather than limit, the production of protein crops.

2.4 EXPORT PROHIBITIONS AND RESTRICTIONS (TABLE ER:1)

2.4.1 European Union (G/AG/N/EU/77/Rev.2)

AG-IMS ID 103147: Question by Paraguay - Timely notification

The delegation of Paraguay thanks the delegation of the European Union for submitting notification G/AG/N/EU/77/Rev.2. We note again with concern the considerable delay in notifying the measure, which was already extended from 15 July, for a second time, and was not notified until more than two months later.

Paraguay has already expressed its concerns regarding this notification, its delay and the continuous renewal of the measure at the meeting of the Committee on Agriculture in June. We regret that the scenario both for renewal and for the delay continues to recur. In this regard, we request the EU to report on:

- a. The reasons for the notification's further delay.
- b. Whether the measure will be extended again.

2.4.2 Malaysia (G/AG/N/MYS/52/Add.1)

AG-IMS ID 103058: Question by United Kingdom, Switzerland, Japan - Importing Members' food security

The United Kingdom would like to thank Malaysia for its response to AG-IMS ID 102047 and 102008.

The United Kingdom understands that Malaysia is planning to ease their export restriction on live commercial broiler chickens in phases but that restrictions will be retained on round chickens, chicken cuts and day-old chickens. The United Kingdom would therefore welcome an update on the analysis that has been undertaken on how these continued restrictions will impact the food security of importing Members and when they will be fully lifted.

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

2.5.1 Japan (G/AG/N/JPN/269)

AG-IMS ID 103128: Question by Australia - NFIDC

Australia thanks Japan for its food aid support to LDCs and NFIDCs and the transparency provided regarding this support over 2017, 2018, 2019 and 2020. Australia notes Japan's breakdown of in-kind commodities shipped, and other technical and financial support given, including in G/AG/N/JPN/269.

Australia asks that Japan indicate whether it is considering aligning its food aid support with other OECD DAC peers via the provision of cash rather than in-kind support and in line with the Food Assistance Convention.

2.5.2 Russian Federation (G/AG/N/RUS/36/Rev.1)

AG-IMS ID 103129: Question by Australia - NFIDC

Australia thanks the Russian Federation for submitting its revised 2021 notification G/AG/N/RUS/36/Rev.1.

Australia requests that the Russian Federation:

- a. provide further details as to its reported disbursements through the WFP. We note the source of data was not attributed to a specific WFP publication.
- b. Provide further details of its food aid and any provision of technical assistance, and note the sparse details included in Russia's notification.
- c. Indicate whether it has any further plans for the coming financial year to support the WFP to distribute food to LDCs and NFIDCs.

3 OVERDUE NOTIFICATIONS

3.1 Uruguay

AG-IMS ID 103111: Question by India

The last DS:1 notification (G/AG/N/URY/63) issued by Uruguay is for the calendar year 2016. Uruguay may kindly update the Committee by when the pending notifications would be issued.
