



**Committee on Agriculture**

**POINTS RAISED BY MEMBERS UNDER THE REVIEW PROCESS**

COMPILATION OF QUESTIONS FOR THE MEETING ON 14-15 SEPTEMBER 2022<sup>1</sup>

The present document compiles questions received by the Secretariat by the deadline of noon on 1 September 2022 as specified in WTO/AIR/AG/60.

---

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>1 MATTERS RELEVANT TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMITMENTS: ARTICLE 18.6 .... 6</b>	
NEW SPECIFIC IMPLEMENTATION MATTERS (SIM) .....	6
1.1 Canada – Financial support for wine production (SIM 747).....	6
1.1.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 102009) .....	6
1.2 China's grain reserve (SIM 748) .....	6
1.2.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 102075) .....	6
1.3 China's Blue Box support to cotton (SIM 749) .....	6
1.3.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 102032) .....	6
1.4 Egypt's increase in planted area (SIM 751).....	7
1.4.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 102011) .....	7
1.5 EU's new CAP (SIM 752).....	7
1.5.1 Question by Korea, Republic of (AG-IMS ID 102091).....	7
1.6 India's price support (SIM 753) .....	7
1.6.1 Question by United States of America, Australia, Paraguay (AG-IMS ID 102017) .....	7
1.7 Japan's stockpiles of skim milk powder (SIM 754) .....	7
1.7.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 102093) .....	7
1.8 Kazakhstan's export quotas on meslin, wheat, and wheat flour (SIM 755) .....	8
1.8.1 Question by United States of America, Switzerland, Japan (AG-IMS ID 102028) .....	8
1.9 Mexico - Tariff reductions on foodstuffs to improve food security (SIM 756).....	8
1.9.1 Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID 102101) .....	8
1.10 Panama's support to rice, milk, and maize (SIM 757) .....	8
1.10.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 102023).....	8
1.11 Panama's compliance with its domestic support commitments (SIM 758).....	9
1.11.1 Question by United States of America, Canada, European Union (AG-IMS ID 102022) .....	9
1.12 Philippines' import regime for rice (SIM 759).....	9
1.12.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 102038).....	9
1.13 Saudi Arabia's tariff increases on agricultural goods (SIM 760) .....	9
1.13.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 102109) .....	9
1.14 Chinese Taipei's import tariff on Champagne (SIM 750).....	10
1.14.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 102085) .....	10
1.15 UK's SSG entitlements (SIM 761) .....	10
1.15.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID 102095) .....	10
1.16 UK's Bound Total AMS (SIM 762) .....	10
1.16.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID 102094) .....	10
1.17 U.S. funding for environmental action (SIM 763) .....	11
1.17.1 Question by New Zealand, Paraguay (AG-IMS ID 102102) .....	11
1.18 United States - Climate Smart Agriculture and Forestry Strategy (SIM 764) .....	11
1.18.1 Question by New Zealand, Paraguay (AG-IMS ID 102103) .....	11
1.19 U.S. support to biofuel producers (SIM 765) .....	11

1.19.1	Question by India (AG-IMS ID 102096) .....	11
	SPECIFIC IMPLEMENTATION MATTERS (SIM) RAISED PREVIOUSLY .....	11
1.20	Argentina's export restrictions (SIM 710).....	11
1.20.1	Question by United States of America, United Kingdom, Japan, Switzerland (AG-IMS ID 102076) .....	11
1.21	Canada's Special Milk Class Scheme (SIM 26) .....	12
1.21.1	Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID 102073) .....	12
1.22	Canada's Review of the TRQ System (SIM 536) .....	12
1.22.1	Question by United Kingdom (AG-IMS ID 102090) .....	12
1.23	China's cotton policies (SIM 647).....	12
1.23.1	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 102034).....	12
1.23.2	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 102035).....	12
1.24	China's cotton reserves purchasing system (SIM 295) .....	13
1.24.1	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 102033).....	13
1.25	Egypt's Export Prohibitions on Agricultural Products (SIM 597) .....	14
1.25.1	Question by New Zealand, Paraguay, United Kingdom, Australia (AG-IMS ID 102074)....	14
1.26	Egypt's import requirement (SIM 741) .....	14
1.26.1	Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID 102010) .....	14
1.27	India's export restrictions on wheat (SIM 118) .....	14
1.27.1	Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID 102092) .....	14
1.27.2	Question by Paraguay (AG-IMS ID 102078).....	14
1.27.3	Question by European Union, United States of America, Switzerland, United Kingdom (AG-IMS ID 102012).....	14
1.27.4	Question by United States of America, Japan, Brazil, Paraguay, United Kingdom, Canada, Ukraine, New Zealand, European Union (AG-IMS ID 102021) .....	15
1.28	India's oilseeds policies (SIM 673) .....	16
1.28.1	Question by Paraguay (AG-IMS ID 102080).....	16
1.29	India's public stockpiling (SIM 525).....	16
1.29.1	Question by Paraguay (AG-IMS ID 102079).....	16
1.29.2	Question by Paraguay (AG-IMS ID 102081).....	16
1.29.3	Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID 102083) .....	16
1.29.4	Question by United States of America, Thailand, Japan, Brazil, Australia, Paraguay, Canada, European Union (AG-IMS ID 102018).....	17
1.29.5	Question by United States of America, Thailand, Japan, Brazil, Australia, Paraguay, Canada, European Union (AG-IMS ID 102019).....	17
1.30	India's other support for rice (SIM 743).....	17
1.30.1	Question by United States of America, Thailand, Japan, Brazil, Australia, Paraguay, Canada, European Union (AG-IMS ID 102020).....	17
1.31	Philippines - Sanitary and Phytosanitary Import Clearance (SPSIC) permits (SIM 655) .....	18
1.31.1	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 102036).....	18
1.31.2	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 102037).....	18
1.32	Tajikistan's poultry tariffs (SIM 687) .....	18

1.32.1	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 102030)	18
1.33	Tajikistan's new Tax Code (SIM 702)	19
1.33.1	Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID 102031)	19
1.34	Türkiye's export restrictions on agricultural products (SIM 729)	19
1.34.1	Question by United States of America, Switzerland, Japan, United Kingdom (AG-IMS ID 102029)	19
1.35	U.S. domestic support programmes (SIM 660)	20
1.35.1	Question by India (AG-IMS ID 102129)	20
<b>2</b>	<b>POINTS RAISED IN CONNECTION WITH INDIVIDUAL NOTIFICATIONS</b>	<b>20</b>
2.1	Imports under tariff and other quota commitments (Table MA:2)	20
2.1.1	Brazil (G/AG/N/BRA/70)	20
2.1.2	Dominican Republic (G/AG/N/DOM/48)	20
2.1.3	El Salvador (G/AG/N/SLV/82)	20
2.1.4	European Union (G/AG/N/EU/76)	20
2.1.5	India (G/AG/N/IND/28)	21
2.1.6	Japan (G/AG/N/JPN/278)	21
2.1.7	Kazakhstan (G/AG/N/KAZ/13)	21
2.1.8	Korea, Republic of (G/AG/N/KOR/89)	21
2.1.9	Norway (G/AG/N/NOR/121)	22
2.1.10	Panama (G/AG/N/PAN/60)	22
2.1.11	Philippines (G/AG/N/PHL/82)	22
2.1.12	United Kingdom (G/AG/N/GBR/13)	23
2.1.13	United States of America (G/AG/N/USA/162)	24
2.2	Special agricultural safeguards (Tables MA:3 to MA:5)	25
2.2.1	Philippines (G/AG/N/PHL/53)	25
2.2.2	Philippines (G/AG/N/PHL/81)	25
2.3	Domestic support commitments (Table DS:1)	25
2.3.1	Argentina (G/AG/N/ARG/49, G/AG/N/ARG/50, G/AG/N/ARG/51)	25
2.3.2	Bolivia, Plurinational State of (G/AG/N/BOL/30, G/AG/N/BOL/31, G/AG/N/BOL/32)	26
2.3.3	Botswana (G/AG/N/BWA/35)	27
2.3.4	Cuba (G/AG/N/CUB/66, G/AG/N/CUB/67)	27
2.3.5	European Union (G/AG/N/EU/79)	27
2.3.6	Georgia (G/AG/N/GEO/25)	29
2.3.7	Hong Kong, China (G/AG/N/HKG/52)	29
2.3.8	India (G/AG/N/IND/27)	29
2.3.9	Japan (G/AG/N/JPN/277)	30
2.3.10	Malaysia (G/AG/N/MYS/53)	31
2.3.11	Philippines (G/AG/N/PHL/85)	31
2.3.12	Switzerland (G/AG/N/CHE/114)	31
2.3.13	United Kingdom (G/AG/N/GBR/11)	32
2.3.14	United States of America (G/AG/N/USA/157)	33

2.4	New or modified domestic support measures (Table DS:2)	34
2.4.1	Argentina (G/AG/N/ARG/52)	34
2.4.2	Argentina (G/AG/N/ARG/53)	34
2.5	Export prohibitions and restrictions (Table ER:1)	34
2.5.1	Kazakhstan (G/AG/N/KAZ/19)	34
2.5.2	Malaysia (G/AG/N/MYS/52, G/AG/N/MYS/52/Add.1)	35
<b>3</b>	<b>OVERDUE NOTIFICATIONS</b>	<b>35</b>
3.1	Botswana	35
3.2	Canada	35
3.3	China	35
3.4	Egypt	36
3.5	Kazakhstan	36
3.6	Malaysia	36
3.7	Morocco	37
3.8	South Africa	37
<b>4</b>	<b>EXPORT COMPETITION</b>	<b>37</b>
4.1	Australia	37
4.2	Canada	37
4.3	China	38
4.4	European Union	38
4.5	Ghana	39
4.6	India	39
4.7	Indonesia	39
4.8	Korea, Republic of	40
4.9	Thailand	40
4.10	Türkiye	40

---

**1 MATTERS RELEVANT TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMITMENTS: ARTICLE 18.6****NEW SPECIFIC IMPLEMENTATION MATTERS (SIM)****1.1 Canada – Financial support for wine production (SIM 747)****1.1.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID [102009](#))**

Canada has introduced a new support programme for wine production (<https://agriculture.canada.ca/en/agricultural-programs-and-services/wine-sector-support-program>), whereby Canada will support its wine industry with a total amount of CAD 166 million over two years, which is in the order of CAD 1.11 per litre and per year. We understand that this programme was initially proposed by the Government of Canada in Budget 2021 for a total amount of CAD 101 million over two years, under the title "Support for Jobs in the Canadian Wine Sector".

- a. Can Canada explain the reasons for introduction of such a significant aid scheme for its wine industry, and why the total amount was increased by 64%, compared to the initial proposal?
- b. Can Canada elaborate how this new aid scheme is in line with the ongoing discussion in WTO to reduce Trade Distorting support measures and
- c. Which measures has Canada taken to ensure that such a significant aid schemes for a specific sector does not influence trade patterns?

**1.2 China's grain reserve (SIM 748)****1.2.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID [102075](#))**

Australia notes that the China Grain Reserves Corporation Group (Sinograin), which manages the national grain reserve, purchased 110,000 metric tonnes of wheat.

Could China please explain:

- a. What was the purchase price paid for the wheat?
- b. What are the influencing factors whereby the Sinograin determines the volume of the reserve?
- c. How does the Sinograin determine the price at which grains are sold on the open market?
- d. Will the stocks of wheat procured be from the domestic market only?

**1.3 China's Blue Box support to cotton (SIM 749)****1.3.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID [102032](#))**

On 14 December 2018, China submitted a Table DS:2 notification ([G/AG/N/CHN/48](#)) on a measure entitled "Deepening the Target Price Policy Reform of Cotton". According to the notification, "The amount of subsidized cotton is subject to a limit, which is 85% or less of the average cotton production in the base period (2012-2014)" and the period of application was 2017-2019.

Taking note that China's most recent Table DS:1 notification is for 2016 and noting the notified measure ended in 2019:

Please provide an update on whether this measure continued to be applied after 2019.

#### **1.4 Egypt's increase in planted area (SIM 751)**

##### **1.4.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID [102011](#))**

According to press report in Agricensus, Egypt is targeting an increase in planted area of up to one million acres in 2023. Egypt had managed to add 200,000 acres to its planted area, reclaiming it back from unusable land in order to plant more corn.

Can Egypt explain which support measures were implemented to achieve this increase in planted area?

#### **1.5 EU's new CAP (SIM 752)**

##### **1.5.1 Question by Korea, Republic of (AG-IMS ID [102091](#))**

As far as we know with regard to "The new CAP 2023-2027", the European Commission (EC) sent observation letters to all of the member States in May. According to the latest press release on 31 August, the Commission approved the first package of CAP strategic plans for seven countries: Denmark, Finland, France, Ireland, Poland, Portugal, and Spain. The Republic of Korea would like to request additional information from the EU on the progress made in the preparation of "The new CAP" which is scheduled to implement on 1 January 2023.

#### **1.6 India's price support (SIM 753)**

##### **1.6.1 Question by United States of America, Australia, Paraguay (AG-IMS ID [102017](#))**

The United States remains concerned by India's aggregation of price supports for different commodities in [G/AG/N/IND/27](#). India establishes unique and different price supports for each coarse cereal, including barley, maize, millet, and sorghum, and each pulse including gram (chickpeas), arhar/tur (pigeon peas), urad (black matpe), moong (mung beans), and lentils. In past Committee responses India has noted that it has consistently aggregated these commodities, such as in response to AG-IMS ID [91177](#). However, India has yet to provide an explanation as to what policy action resulted in India changing its notification methodology as compared to its Agricultural Supporting Tables, which are the basis of India's domestic support commitments.

- 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](#) for each of the following commodities: 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.

#### **1.7 Japan's stockpiles of skim milk powder (SIM 754)**

##### **1.7.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID [102093](#))**

Australia notes that in April 2022 Japan has introduced a scheme (<https://www.j-milk.jp/gyokai/2022zaiko.html>) to reduce excess stockpiles of skim milk powder (SMP), which was expected to have reached a record high of 100,000 tonnes at the end of August.

In relation to butter and SMP, could Japan please:

- a. Clarify whether Japan expects that these stockpiles will continue to increase?

- b. Explain whether existing government and industry-led efforts have led to a reduction in the level of stockpiles?
- c. Clarify whether the existence of these stockpiles will have any long-term structural impacts to its dairy industry?

## **1.8 Kazakhstan's export quotas on meslin, wheat, and wheat flour (SIM 755)**

### **1.8.1 Question by United States of America, Switzerland, Japan (AG-IMS ID [102028](#))**

Kazakhstan has instituted export quotas on meslin, wheat, and wheat flour beginning 16 April 2022 and extended until 30 September 2022 under Orders of the Minister of Agriculture No. 110 and 214.

The United States reminds Kazakhstan that as a WTO Member it agreed to notify export restrictions implemented on products for which Kazakhstan is a net-food exporter to the WTO Committee on Agriculture.

- a. Please explain the reasoning for instituting these quantitative export restrictions.
- b. When will Kazakhstan notify its export restrictions to the WTO Committee on Agriculture?
- c. According to paragraph 5 of Order 110, the export quotas will be distributed to applicants who have sold 10% of the quota volume declared for export at a fixed price, published by the Ministry of Agriculture. Please explain the purpose of this provision.
- d. Please clarify what Kazakhstan means by a fixed price. Has Kazakhstan instituted set prices at which meslin, wheat, or wheat flour must be sold, if applicants are to receive quota allocations?

## **1.9 Mexico - Tariff reductions on foodstuffs to improve food security (SIM 756)**

### **1.9.1 Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID [102101](#))**

New Zealand commends Mexico for their recent tariff reductions on foodstuffs to improve Mexican food security, demonstrating how trade liberalisation can be used to address domestic food security concerns. New Zealand would appreciate more detail on the effects of this tariff reduction on Mexico's food security.

## **1.10 Panama's support to rice, milk, and maize (SIM 757)**

### **1.10.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID [102023](#))**

The United States' request for more information about Panama's support provided to rice, milk, and maize, outlined in AG-IMS ID [99082](#) and in reference to [G/AG/N/PAN/58](#), remains valid for Panama's most recent Table DS:1 notification ([G/AG/N/PAN/61](#)). As Panama has yet to provide a response to AG-IMS ID [99082](#), the United States repeats the question:

The United States understands, based on AG-IMS ID [93196](#), that the notified value represents payments made for any rice sold during the notified calendar year – whether production is from the current agricultural year or a previous agricultural year. This is also noted in AG-IMS ID [92062](#) where the United States understands Panama to state that the eligible production figure represented 2018 production as well as production from the last few months of 2017.

Further, the United States notes that the same measure as for rice is notified for milk and maize in Supporting Table DS:6. It was the United States' understanding that all outlays made during the given calendar year, for rice, milk, and maize, regardless of when production occurred, was the notified outlay value. However, in [G/AG/N/PAN/58](#), Panama includes a new footnote only for rice in Supporting Table DS:4 stating, "Amount includes support for previous years."

- a. Please provide further clarification on what the reporting year for notified outlays in Supporting Table DS:4 and Supporting Table DS:6 represent and whether there is a difference for rice versus other commodities.
- b. Please provide further clarification as to what the eligible production listed represents specifically. For example, does the volume notified in [G/AG/N/PAN/58](#) represent all production sold during specific months at the end of 2019 and most/all of 2020?

### **1.11 Panama's compliance with its domestic support commitments (SIM 758)**

#### **1.11.1 Question by United States of America, Canada, European Union (AG-IMS ID [102022](#))**

The United States takes note that Panama has not responded to any Members' questions since the 97<sup>th</sup> Committee meeting regarding Panama's compliance with its domestic support commitments, particularly with respect to notified support for rice. In addition to Panama's lack of engagement in this Committee, the United States is concerned that notified domestic support for rice remained above *de minimis* in calendar year 2021 ([G/AG/N/PAN/61](#)).

We request that Panama answer all outstanding questions, in particular those raised by Members concerned with Panama's notified non-compliance with its WTO commitments.

The United States remains keenly interested to learn more from Panama with regards to Panama's response to AG-IMS ID [97141](#), which notes that a commission would review Law 17 of 2018 in the first half of 2021. As requested in AG-IMS ID [99081](#) and [101071](#), please provide an update on this review and what the findings were.

As requested in AG-IMS ID [101088](#), what actions are being taken by Panama to bring its domestic support for rice within the *de minimis* level?

### **1.12 Philippines' import regime for rice (SIM 759)**

#### **1.12.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID [102038](#))**

According to media reports, the Department of Agriculture is reviewing the role of the National Food Authority in importing rice (Source: "DA reviewing Rice Tariffication Law, role of NFA," GMA News, 21 July 2022, <https://www.gmanetwork.com/news/money/economy/838900/da-reviewing-rice-tariffication-law-role-of-nfa/story/?amp>).

Is the Philippines considering modifying its import regime for rice, and if so, how?

### **1.13 Saudi Arabia's tariff increases on agricultural goods (SIM 760)**

#### **1.13.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID [102109](#))**

On 12 June 2022, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia announced (<https://uqn.gov.sa/?p=13904>) that it would increase tariffs on a range of imported products, including agricultural goods. Australia notes that these tariff increases are now set to the upper bound limit. In the announcement the Zakat, Customs and Taxation Authority stated the justification for these increases was for the purpose of protecting and encouraging national industries and local agricultural products.

- a. Given the diverse range of agricultural products subject to the tariff increases, can the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia explain the domestic circumstances and policy rationale for increasing these tariffs?
- b. Could the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia please indicate how long it expects these tariffs to remain at the higher rate?
- c. Does the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia envisage further tariff increases on other products in the short-to-medium term?

- d. Is the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia intending on introducing any other measures to protect their national agricultural industries?

#### **1.14 Chinese Taipei's import tariff on Champagne (SIM 750)**

##### **1.14.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID [102085](#))**

On 26 April 2022 Chinese Taipei Legislature passed an amendment bill to halve the import tariff on Champagne to 10%. Statements made by Democratic Progressive Party Legislator Lin Chu-yin (<https://focustaiwan.tw/business/202204260022>) explained that the reduction of the tariff of champagne was to address "unfair international trade practice", as champagne was taxed at double the rate of non-sparkling wine. The tariff rate on sparkling wines which were produced outside of Champagne region of France remains unchanged at 20%.

Can Chinese Taipei please explain how this measure is in line with their commitments under the GATT, specifically that Members should not discriminate between like goods originating in different countries, as the reduction only applies to sparkling wine produced in the Champagne region of France, not like products produced elsewhere.

#### **1.15 UK's SSG entitlements (SIM 761)**

##### **1.15.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID [102095](#))**

The United Kingdom has replicated its market access concessions from the EU-28 schedule. In this context, India seeks clarification on the following:

- a. According to World Tariff Profile 2022, the United Kingdom has claimed agricultural special safeguards (SSG) on 30.2% of agricultural tariff lines, while EU-27 has claimed SSGs only on 23.0% of their agricultural tariff lines. Could the United Kingdom elaborate on why there is a difference in the percent of agriculture SSGs between UK and EU-27 despite replicating EU-28 concessions?
- b. The United Kingdom has claimed the right to impose SSGs on certain agricultural products as evident from its schedule of concession, which includes both volume-based and price-based SSGs. India understands that a price-based SSG can be imposed when the import price falls below the product-specific trigger price. In this context, could the United Kingdom provide details on how the trigger prices for products entitled with SSG have been determined?

#### **1.16 UK's Bound Total AMS (SIM 762)**

##### **1.16.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID [102094](#))**

The United Kingdom has claimed an AMS of 5,914.1 million Euros, which was later redenominated in as 4,949.3 million GBP. In the document no. G/MA/TAR/RS/570, the United Kingdom has mentioned that the AMS has been calculated by rerunning the original calculation undertaken in the Uruguay Round for the United Kingdom only, including the 20% reduction and apportionment for credit for reform measures already taken at the time. In this context, India requests the United Kingdom to furnish further details on:

- a. How was the AMS calculated?
- b. What is the basis of apportionment of credit between the United Kingdom and the remaining members of the European Union?

### **1.17 U.S. funding for environmental action (SIM 763)**

#### **1.17.1 Question by New Zealand, Paraguay (AG-IMS ID [102102](#))**

New Zealand appreciates the United States' support for environmental action in agriculture through the Inflation Reduction Act.

New Zealand hopes that the funding provided under the act will be consistent with the United States' WTO obligations, and that it will be notified in due course. Can the United States please advise:

- a. When and how the act will be notified as part of the Agreement on Agriculture?
- b. How the United States is giving respect to their WTO obligations when providing farmers with funding for environmental action?

### **1.18 United States - Climate Smart Agriculture and Forestry Strategy (SIM 764)**

#### **1.18.1 Question by New Zealand, Paraguay (AG-IMS ID [102103](#))**

New Zealand would appreciate an update from the United States' on the progress of its *Climate Smart Agriculture and Forestry Strategy*, including how the US intends to meet its WTO obligations when developing this Strategy?

### **1.19 U.S. support to biofuel producers (SIM 765)**

#### **1.19.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID [102096](#))**

In December 2021, USDA announced that it will provide USD 800 million as economic relief to biofuel producers impacted by the pandemic (<https://www.usda.gov/media/press-releases/2021/12/07/usda-make-800-million-available-provide-economic-relief-biofuel>). Out of this, USD 700 million will be directly paid to biofuel producers and the rest USD 100 million will be used to increase the sales of biofuel. By making payments to biofuels producers, the programme will help agricultural producers maintain and create more viable markets for products that supply biofuel production, such as corn, soybeans, or biomass. India requests the United States to provide details on the following:

- a. How would this support be categorized in the domestic support notification?
- b. What are the eligibility criteria for producers to benefit under this scheme?

## **SPECIFIC IMPLEMENTATION MATTERS (SIM) RAISED PREVIOUSLY**

### **1.20 Argentina's export restrictions (SIM 710)**

#### **1.20.1 Question by United States of America, United Kingdom, Japan, Switzerland (AG-IMS ID [102076](#))**

As Argentina has yet to provide a response to the United States', United Kingdom's, and Japan's request for more information about Argentina's export restrictions in AG-IMS ID [101030](#), the United States repeats the question:

We take note that Argentina has imposed an increasing number of export restrictions affecting agricultural products, including beef, wheat, corn, and barley. For example, in December 2021, the Argentinian Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, and Fisheries published Resolution 276/2021 and Circular 06/2021 – an export quota on maize and wheat; however, the quotas for maize in 2021-22 and wheat in 2022-23 are below average export volumes in recent years.

- a. Please confirm when these export restrictions will be permanently lifted.

- b. When will Argentina notify these export restrictions to the Committee on Agriculture through the required Table ER:1 notification?

## **1.21 Canada's Special Milk Class Scheme (SIM 26)**

### **1.21.1 Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID [102073](#))**

New Zealand has previously raised questions around Canada's milk classes, and notes Canada's responses in AG-IMS ID [101013](#), AG-IMS ID [100064](#) and AG-IMS ID [99098](#). New Zealand continues to seek further explanation on how setting milk class 4(a) prices at only CAD 4.2127/kg – substantially below the cost of production for milk protein, (which the Canadian Dairy Commission estimates to be CAD 5.41/kg<sup>2</sup>), is substantively different to the implementation of the previous Classes 6 and 7.

Further, New Zealand seeks to clarify the effect on the increased Canadian value-added protein products onto the world market. Canadian exports of refined lactose, as a by-product of highly processed Milk Protein Concentrate (MPC), has risen dramatically since 2019. Of Canada's total production of value-added milk protein products including milk protein concentrates, infant formula, skim milk powder (SMP) and SMP blends, what percentage was accounted for by domestic Canadian demand as compared to exports annually since 2019?

## **1.22 Canada's Review of the TRQ System (SIM 536)**

### **1.22.1 Question by United Kingdom (AG-IMS ID [102090](#))**

As a follow-up to AG-IMS ID [99110](#), [100065](#) and [101016](#), the United Kingdom wishes 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. Is Canada able to provide an update on the expected delivery date of the review's results?

## **1.23 China's cotton policies (SIM 647)**

### **1.23.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID [102034](#))**

In AG-IMS ID [90075](#), the United States asked for statistics on the volume of cotton production for both Xinjiang and for China, nationally, for each of the years from 2012 to 2017. China stated that statistics were being updated and the response would be provided later. However, the data has not yet been provided to this Committee.

Please provide the volume of cotton production for both Xinjiang and for China, nationally, for each of the years from 2012 to 2021.

### **1.23.2 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID [102035](#))**

In AG-IMS ID [90075](#), China stated that the cotton target price subsidy was only being provided to the Xinjiang autonomous region, and not to any other cotton producing provinces during the transition period.

- a. Has the transition period concluded?
- b. Is Xinjiang still the only region that receives the cotton target price subsidy?
- c. Has there been any change to the calculation of the base period cotton production?
- d. What was the rationale for setting a limit against national production, but limiting production that can be procured to only one sub-national region?

---

<sup>2</sup> Per the 2020 Cost of Production for Solids Non Fat and the sample milk production reported in October 2021 by the Canadian Dairy Commission.

## 1.24 China's cotton reserves purchasing system (SIM 295)

### 1.24.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID [102033](#))

On 13 July 2022, the China State Cotton Reserve Corporation began buying cotton. Since this date the China State Cotton Reserve Corporation has procured 58,660 tonnes of cotton at an average price of 15,951 yuan/tonne. The following table includes the daily volume and prices of cotton purchases made by the China State Cotton Reserve Corporation as of 19 August 2022, according to notices posted on the China National Cotton Exchange website (<http://www.cottonchina.org.cn/news/newsser.php?relnews1=2022%C2%D6%C8%EB&relnews=%C2%D6%C8%EB%C6%C0%CA%F6>).

Date	Purchase Quantity (tonnes)	Average Price (yuan/tonne)
7/13/2022	5,000	16,254
7/14/2022	6,000	16,286
7/15/2022	6,000	16,057
7/18/2022	480	16,490
7/19/2022	2,960	15,950
7/20/2022	3,040	16,130
7/21/2022	2,960	15,928
7/22/2022	2,360	15,776
7/25/2022	2,860	15,849
7/26/2022	2,600	15,872
7/27/2022	2,000	15,891
7/28/2022	2,200	15,868
7/29/2022	1,400	15,793
8/1/2022	3,800	15,829
8/2/2022	4,960	15,797
8/3/2022	3,600	15,779
8/4/2022	1,920	15,703
8/5/2022	2,120	15,706
8/8/2022	1,600	15,712
8/9/2022	800	15,658

- a. Please confirm whether these purchases were made under an extension of the measure entitled "Deepening the Target Price Policy Reform of Cotton", which was notified in [G/AG/N/CHN/48](#), or under some new measure.
- b. Please confirm whether any other government or state-owned enterprise purchases were made for the current season. If so, please provide the quantities and purchase prices.
- c. Have similar purchases occurred in 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020 or 2021? If so, please provide the quantities and purchase prices made by the China State Cotton Reserve Corporation or other entities for each year, as well as a clarification of the measure under which purchases were made for each year, if different.
- d. Please explain the processes for these auctions, including how it is determined how much the government will purchase and how the price is determined.
- e. Please indicate whether there are any limits placed on the maximum quantity of cotton that the government may purchase.
- f. What entities are allowed to participate in these auctions?
- g. Please explain the rules for eventual release of these stocks of cotton.
- h. Please provide the regulation that governs the release of government or state-owned stocks of cotton.

## **1.25 Egypt's Export Prohibitions on Agricultural Products (SIM 597)**

### **1.25.1 Question by New Zealand, Paraguay, United Kingdom, Australia (AG-IMS ID [102074](#))**

New Zealand recognizes the significant challenges to food security that Egypt is facing. We understand that Egypt has introduced two export restrictions in June of 2022. Firstly, on the 10<sup>th</sup> of June, a restriction on Flour, oils, lentils, pasta, and beans. Secondly, on the 12<sup>th</sup> of June, a restriction on Vegetable oil and maize. New Zealand is interested in any further information that Egypt can provide on their export restriction policies.

## **1.26 Egypt's import requirement (SIM 741)**

### **1.26.1 Question by European Union (AG-IMS ID [102010](#))**

The EU would like to reiterate its question AG-IMS [101003](#) to Egypt and ask for a reply:

The European Union would like to express its concerns concerning the mandatory usage of Letters of Credit as unique method of payment for imports into Egypt.

This requirement has increased the administrative burden and cost of exporting to Egypt, and has led to significant delays and import blockages, including for strategic and/or perishable agricultural products (seeds, apples).

Taking into account Article X (1) of GATT 1994, as well as the Agreement on Trade facilitation Article 1: Publication and availability of information:

- a. Can Egypt explain the reasons behind this restriction of payments methods – economic as well as administrative?
- b. Which measures has Egypt taken to ensure that this change will not delay the import of strategic and perishable food products?

## **1.27 India's export restrictions on wheat (SIM 118)**

### **1.27.1 Question by Australia (AG-IMS ID [102092](#))**

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 the 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, could India please indicate how long it intends the restriction to remain place?

### **1.27.2 Question by Paraguay (AG-IMS ID [102078](#))**

In follow-up to the reply received from India to question AG-IMS ID [101032](#), in which it states that the notification would be submitted "in due course", we ask India to explain the current state of preparation of the notification and provide any other update with regard to its submission "in due course" to this Committee.

### **1.27.3 Question by European Union, United States of America, Switzerland, United Kingdom (AG-IMS ID [102012](#))**

- a. Export restriction on wheat

On 13 May, India has announced a ban on wheat exports, with domestic prices at a record high as a heatwave cut production (ban implemented via the Indian Ministry of Commerce and Industry Trade Notice No. 06/2022-23).

According to it, the restriction would not apply in cases where prior commitments have been made by private trade through Letter of Credit as well as in situations where permission is granted by the Government of India to other countries to meet their food security needs and on the requests of their governments. The government said the order served three main purposes: ensure India's food security and check inflation, it helps other countries facing food deficit, and it maintains India's reliability as a supplier.

The ban on wheat exports imposed by India in May was already subject to several questions during the 101<sup>st</sup> CoA in June, some of them still to be replied by India.

In this context, could India reply to the following 2 additional questions?

- i. What is India's latest soft wheat production forecast?
- ii. Considering the lately adopted decision by the membership at the MC 12 on exempting the World Food Programme humanitarian purchases from export restrictions, could India confirm that humanitarian purchases by the World Food Programme are not under this export restriction?

b. Export restriction on wheat flour

On 6 July 2022 India announced Notification No.18/2015-2020 – an export ban for wheat flour.

According to it, the Export Policy of wheat flour (atta) remains 'Free', but export shall be subject to recommendation of Inter-Ministerial Committee (IMC) on export of wheat. The Notification came into effect on 12<sup>th</sup> of July 2022. The provisions as under Para 1.05 of the Foreign Trade Policy, 2015-2020 regarding transitional arrangement shall not be applicable under this Notification. Necessary modalities with regard to quality of wheat flour will be notified separately.

- i. Could India explain how, and on what basis the Inter- Ministerial Committee (IMC) on export of wheat issued the recommendations?
- ii. What will be the duration of the measure?
- iii. When does India intend to submit official notification to the WTO on export restriction of wheat flour?

#### **1.27.4 Question by United States of America, Japan, Brazil, Paraguay, United Kingdom, Canada, Ukraine, New Zealand, European Union (AG-IMS ID [102021](#))**

In AG-IMS ID [101032](#) several Members asked for the criteria that India will use to determine which countries are eligible for exceptions to India's wheat export ban, how long the ban will be in place, and when India will notify the export restriction.

India responded to AG-IMS ID [101032](#) by giving its reason for the ban, stating that India will consider requests from other country governments for wheat exports, and stating that the notification will be made in due course.

Given this did not answer the questions in AG-IMS ID [101032](#) and that no Table ER:1 notification has been submitted, we re-submit the questions from AG-IMS ID [101032](#):

- a. What criteria will the Government of India use to determine whether to grant this special permission? For example, what criteria must a country meet for provision of wheat to be considered humanitarian aid? Or what criteria must a country meet to demonstrate need of wheat to "meet their food security needs"?
- b. Please explain the length of time that the ban will be in place. If the length of time is contingent on certain conditions, please explain those conditions, as well as the metrics used to measure when those conditions are satisfied.

- c. When will India notify this export restriction to the Committee on Agriculture through the required Table ER:1 notification?

## **1.28 India's oilseeds policies (SIM 673)**

### **1.28.1 Question by Paraguay (AG-IMS ID [102080](#))**

In follow-up to the reply received from India to question AG-IMS ID [101044](#), we note that, as was indicated at the previous meeting of this Committee, the hyperlink provided in the reply is inactive and inaccessible. We therefore reiterate the request already made to India in the room to submit the requested information in an accessible format, including via email to the Mission of Paraguay.

## **1.29 India's public stockpiling (SIM 525)**

### **1.29.1 Question by Paraguay (AG-IMS ID [102079](#))**

In follow-up to the reply received from India to question AG-IMS ID [101028](#), we note that India indicated that the information would be provided "as soon as it is available". In this connection, we ask India to explain how the collection of this information is currently progressing and provide any other update with regard to its submission to this Committee.

### **1.29.2 Question by Paraguay (AG-IMS ID [102081](#))**

In follow-up to the reply received from India to question AG-IMS ID [101038](#), we note that India indicated that the information was included in its DS:1 notification. In this connection, we ask India to indicate in which specific section of the DS:1 notification this information can be found.

### **1.29.3 Question by New Zealand (AG-IMS ID [102083](#))**

New Zealand recognises well-targeted and appropriately safeguarded public stockholding programmes under the AoA as important for some countries' development needs. New Zealand would like to thank India for their engagement thus far with Members on questions raised regarding their public stockholding programmes that make use of the Bali Ministerial Decision on Public Stockholding for Food Security Purposes. However, New Zealand is concerned with the lack of detailed responses by India to these questions (i.e. AG-IMS IDs [101087](#), [101028](#), [101032](#), [101037](#), [101038](#) amongst others). As India knows, domestic support reform is New Zealand's key priority in the agricultural negotiations, and accurate and timely notification and transparency of support is crucial. New Zealand is particularly concerned by the lack of information on how India ensures its minimum support price (MSP) programme for rice and wheat (as notified in [G/AG/N/IND/27](#)) does not distort trade or adversely affect the food security of other Members, in compliance with paragraph 4 of the Bali Ministerial Decision on Public Stockholding for Food Security Purposes.

India is the world's largest exporter of rice and India's exports have doubled over recent years. And at the same time India's MSP for rice has increased by approximately 32% (2018-2021) and sales on to the open market have increased from 0.85 million tonnes to 2.46 million tonnes according to [G/AG/N/IND/27](#). We are concerned that the scale of India's procurement of rice and wheat under the MSP programme has the potential to distort world markets for these products.

To address these concerns, could India please:

- a. Provide full details of the measures and safeguards it has in place to ensure its MSP programme does not have production or trade distorting effects? The details provided in [G/AG/N/IND/27](#), Annex, paragraph 4 lacks information in this regard, therefore could India please provide the policy documents that outline measures in place to prevent exports from public stockholdings, including from open market sales.
- b. Provide the relevant statistical information on the volume of wheat and rice exports and explain how it guarantees such exports do not originate from government stockpiles?

**1.29.4 Question by United States of America, Thailand, Japan, Brazil, Australia, Paraguay, Canada, European Union (AG-IMS ID [102018](#))**

In AG-IMS ID [101028](#), several Members requested information regarding state bonuses provided in addition to the minimum support price from India that has been outstanding for many Committee on Agriculture meetings.

India responded that the government has sought information from the State governments and will inform the CoA as soon as it is available.

- a. Is the requested information available?
- b. If not, 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.

**1.29.5 Question by United States of America, Thailand, Japan, Brazil, Australia, Paraguay, Canada, European Union (AG-IMS ID [102019](#))**

On a number of occasions, including most recently in AG-IMS ID [101038](#), Members have requested that India provide a) where annual quantitative levels of current, historical, and pre-determined levels of wheat and rice stocks since 2010 can be found in India's notifications and b) summaries of consultative meetings between the Government and the Food Corporation of India (FCI), which are held to assess the availability of wheat and rice for procurement at Minimum Support Prices (MSP).

In response, India again stated that the information is in its notifications despite no Member being able to identify this information in the notification and requesting clarification.

We kindly request India to provide a responsive answer as to where exactly the information can be found.

If it is indeed in the notification, please provide document numbers, page numbers and table numbers/line letters to assist Members that have been unable to find this information.

**1.30 India's other support for rice (SIM 743)**

**1.30.1 Question by United States of America, Thailand, Japan, Brazil, Australia, Paraguay, Canada, European Union (AG-IMS ID [102020](#))**

In response to AG-IMS ID [101037](#) India stated that "After consulting with relevant Ministries/Departments, it was found that no support other than that for the PSH purposes has been provided for rice". At the last Committee meeting, a number of Members asked a follow-up question to this, requesting that India confirm a) whether this response referred to only central-government support or if it also included state-level support and b) whether any support has been provided for rice other than that which India has already notified.

- a. Please explain whether India has consulted with state governments to confirm whether there are any additional sub-national rice support measures and if there are any other state-level support measures that are not notified.
- b. Please explain whether there are any other support measures related to PSH purposes that have not been notified, beyond the state bonuses India is currently collecting.

---

### **1.31 Philippines - Sanitary and Phytosanitary Import Clearance (SPSIC) permits (SIM 655)**

#### **1.31.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID [102036](#))**

The United States thanks the Philippines for providing the import volume data for whole chicken for 2018-May 2021 in its response to AG-IMS ID [98131](#).

- a. Has the Philippines imported any whole chicken in 2021 and 2022?
- b. If so, please provide the volume and country-of-origin of the imports.
- c. Does the Philippines restrict imports of whole chickens from trading partners other than the United States and, if so, why?

#### **1.31.2 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID [102037](#))**

The United States remains concerned that the SPSIC system is used to restrict the flow of trade.

On 22 February, 2022, the Department of Agriculture Secretary announced that the Department of Agriculture "aims to address the concerns of the onion industry to manage onion importation while ensuring its availability for the local market, thus additional guidelines and requirements shall be implemented on the issuance of [SPSIC]" and "that the issuance of SPSICs for fresh onion will be based on the importation period specified in the Certificate of Necessity to Import (CNI), which shall include the volume to be imported and the specific period for import arrival."

This measure is cited to be based on the 14 December 2021 Department Circular No. 08, series of 2021 or the Additional Guidelines on the Importation of Fresh Onions.

- a. Please explain how restricting the volume of imports over a given period via the CNI requirement prior to the issuance of SPSIC is different from a quantitative restriction, and explain the phytosanitary justification for implementing the CNI.
- b. Has 2021 Department Circular No. 08, Series of 2021, or the Additional Guidelines on the Importation of Fresh Onions been notified to the appropriate World Trade Organization committee(s), and could the Philippines provide a copy to Members?
- c. What is the volume of the CNI and how is it determined?

On 10 August 2022, the Department of Agriculture Under Secretary stated the Department is looking at importing white onions and "how much we will import and up to when we will do so, we will have to discuss this with producers so as not to have the imported onions come in at the same time farmers harvest their crops."

- d. Please explain the role of the Department of Agriculture and the domestic Philippine onion industry in determining the volume of onions allowed to be imported.

### **1.32 Tajikistan's poultry tariffs (SIM 687)**

#### **1.32.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID [102030](#))**

The United States would like to thank the Republic of Tajikistan for its responses to U.S. questions concerning Tajikistan's poultry tariff resolution ([G/MA/W/167](#)) in the Committee on Agriculture (AG-IMS ID [98139](#)) and through Tajikistan's Trade Policy Review.

The United States notes that Tajikistan's reasoning for raising its poultry tariff rate to 15%, above its bound rate of 10%, was due to concerns about the potential for low quality of imported product and the effect on public health, significant increases in imports of poultry products, and the development of Tajikistan's poultry industry. Based on this response, the United States has additional questions for Tajikistan.

- a. Please clarify which specific articles of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) 1994, WTO Agreement on Agriculture, or other WTO agreements it is citing to justify the tariff increase above the bound rate.
- b. Please clarify what Tajikistan meant by "low quality of imported product and the effect on public health," in its response to the Committee on Agriculture (AG-IMS ID [98139](#)). Is Tajikistan referencing a specific WTO agreement? If so, which one(s)?
- c. Have poultry imports violated Tajikistan's sanitary and phytosanitary regulatory standards? If so, please provide the specific standards.
- d. Please explain how raising tariffs on imported poultry is an effective measure towards protecting public health.
- e. Noting Tajikistan's concern with "significant increases in imports of poultry," has Tajikistan conducted an economic study pursuant to Article XIX of the GATT which demonstrates a significant increase in imports and that the level of imported poultry products caused or threatens serious injury to domestic industry? If so, please share this study.
- f. Please clarify how long Tajikistan intends to keep this tariff rate above its bound rate.

### **1.33 Tajikistan's new Tax Code (SIM 702)**

#### **1.33.1 Question by United States of America (AG-IMS ID [102031](#))**

The United States would like to thank the Republic of Tajikistan for responding to U.S. questions regarding tax incentives in Tajikistan's tax code (AG-IMS ID [98138](#)).

In its response, Tajikistan confirms that Article 414, Chapter 57 of the tax code exempts domestic "business entities in the field of poultry farming, fish farming, and the production of combined feed for bird and animals" from paying taxes on income, VAT, real estate, and land for a period of six years.

- a. Please confirm that the exemption (Article 414, Chapter 57) in the tax code still applies.
- b. Please clarify if imports of foreign poultry products are subject to a VAT or any other internal taxes.

### **1.34 Türkiye's export restrictions on agricultural products (SIM 729)**

#### **1.34.1 Question by United States of America, Switzerland, Japan, United Kingdom (AG-IMS ID [102029](#))**

The United States thanks Türkiye for its response to the joint question by the United States, United Kingdom, and Japan (AG-IMS ID [101042](#)).

In Türkiye's reply it cited authorities granted in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994 (GATT) for its justification for imposing these export bans on 20 different agricultural commodities. The United States would remind Türkiye that as a WTO Member it agreed to notify export restrictions imposed on products for which Türkiye is a net-food exporter, even for those temporary in nature, to the WTO Committee on Agriculture.

- a. When does Türkiye intend to notify its export restrictions to the Committee on Agriculture through the required Table ER:1 notification?

The United States remains concerned with Türkiye's export restrictions and the lack of transparency around them, including the inability to find the announcement of the export restrictions, the start or end date of the restrictions, or the regulation giving the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MinAF) the authority to impose restrictions.

As a signatory of the WTO Agreement on Trade Facilitation, Türkiye agreed to promptly publish in an easily accessible manner import, export, or transit restrictions or prohibitions (Article 1, paragraph 1.1:f).

- b. Please provide a copy of or link to both the authorities given to MinAF and the regulations/documentation of MinAF implementing these authorities for specific commodities.

### **1.35 U.S. domestic support programmes (SIM 660)**

#### **1.35.1 Question by India (AG-IMS ID [102129](#))**

- a. The United States may please provide details and explain the differences in the operation of the following programmes:
  - i. Price Loss Coverage;
  - ii. Counter Cyclical Payments; and
  - iii. Agri Risk Payments."
- b. It is seen that there is a rise in support for Marketing and Promotion Services under Green Box in the year 2019-20; the US may kindly provide the reasons for such an increase."

## **2 POINTS RAISED IN CONNECTION WITH INDIVIDUAL NOTIFICATIONS**

### **2.1 Imports under tariff and other quota commitments (Table MA:2)**

#### **2.1.1 Brazil (G/AG/N/BRA/70)**

##### **AG-IMS ID 102002: Question by European Union - Tariff quota fill**

The EU would like to thank Brazil for the submission of the MA:2 notification for the calendar year 2021. Could Brazil explain the reasons behind the underfill of BRAQ002? What changes did the Ordinance n°38 of 19 June 2020, referenced in the footnote to BRAQ002, introduce to the administration of BRAQ002?

#### **2.1.2 Dominican Republic (G/AG/N/DOM/48)**

##### **AG-IMS ID 102003: Question by European Union - Tariff quota fill**

The EU would like to thank the Dominican Republic for the submission of the MA:2 notification for the calendar year 2021. When analysing previous MA:2 notifications the EU noted that for many years the tariff quota for poultry (DOMQ001) has constantly had a fill rate of 0%, whereas the fill rate in 2021 soared to over 100%. Could the Dominican Republic explain what changed that allowed the full use of this quota?

#### **2.1.3 El Salvador (G/AG/N/SLV/82)**

##### **AG-IMS ID 102064: Question by Paraguay, Brazil - Transparency issues**

In follow-up to the reply received from El Salvador to question AG-IMS ID 101018, could El Salvador explain the reasons why the other tariff quotas are not open?

#### **2.1.4 European Union (G/AG/N/EU/76)**

##### **AG-IMS ID 102098: Question by India - Tariff quota fill**

In the MA:2 notifications ([G/AG/N/EU/76](#)), the EU has notified zero or near zero fill rate on husked (brown) rice and broken rice. India requests the European Union to provide details on the following:

- a. Reasons for such a low fill rate?

- b. What actions are being undertaken to increase the fill rates?

#### **AG-IMS ID 102097: Question by India - Scheduled commitment level**

India thanks the European Union for its submission of DS:1 notification ([G/AG/N/EU/79](#)) for the marketing year 2019-20. The AMS entitlement of the EU is mentioned as EUR 72,378 million in the submitted notification. The United Kingdom on the other hand has claimed an AMS entitlement of EUR 5,914.1 million or GBP 4,949.3 million in its latest DS notification ([G/AG/N/GBR/11](#)) for calendar year 2021. In this context, what would be the applicable AMS entitlement for the remaining member of the EU (EU-27)?

#### **2.1.5 India (G/AG/N/IND/28)**

##### **AG-IMS ID 102110: Question by Brazil - Tariff quota fill**

Brazil has raised the underfill issue regarding India's TRQ INDQ002 - Maize (corn) in previous occasions (AG-IMS ID [97128](#) and [99048](#)). Once again, there have been no imports under such TRQ during financial year from 2021-04-01 to 2022-03-31.

In this regard, Brazil would like to request India to provide the following information:

- a. Are imports taking place outside the TRQ? How much has India imported under tariff line 100590 from 1 April 2021 to 31 March 2022?
- b. What were the applied intra-quota and extra-quota tariffs?
- c. Who/what body is entitled to apply for the allocation of the tariff rate quota?

#### **2.1.6 Japan (G/AG/N/JPN/278)**

##### **AG-IMS ID 102111: Question by Australia - Tariff quota fill**

Australia thanks Japan for submitting its most recent MA:2 notification ([G/AG/N/JPN/278](#)). In that submission, Australia notes very low fill rates for the following quotas:

JPNQ001 - Skimmed milk powder (For school lunch) – 20.7% filled of 7,264 metric tonne quota  
JPNQ002 - Skimmed milk powder (For other purposes) – 22% filled of 74,973 metric tonne quota  
JPNQ007 - Prepared whey (For infant formula) – 15.3% filled of 25,000 metric tonne quota  
JPNQ008 - Butter and butteroil – 3.8% filled of 581 metric tonne quota

Australia also notes that tariff rate quotas for butter (7,600 MT) and non-fat dairy milk (750 MT) for Japan's current fiscal year have been maintained at the same level as Japan's last fiscal year.

Can Japan please explain the need to maintain these special TRQ, given that existing skimmed milk powder and butter quotas remain underfilled?

#### **2.1.7 Kazakhstan (G/AG/N/KAZ/13)**

##### **AG-IMS ID 102004: Question by European Union - Transparency issues**

The EU would like to thank Kazakhstan for the submission of the MA:2 notification for the calendar year 2020. Could Kazakhstan inform the membership when it expects to submit its MA:2 notification for 2021? Could Kazakhstan also provide a reply to the question asked by the EU under AG-IMS [93189](#) from 93<sup>rd</sup> CoA meeting?

#### **2.1.8 Korea, Republic of (G/AG/N/KOR/89)**

##### **AG-IMS ID 102084: Question by New Zealand - Tariff quota fill**

In Korea's latest MA:2 notification, the fill rates for dairy products and natural honey ranged between 40% and 4%. Does the Republic of Korea have any plans to change tariff quota administration with the aim of increasing the low fill rates for dairy and honey products in the future?

### 2.1.9 Norway (G/AG/N/NOR/121)

#### AG-IMS ID 102065: Question by Paraguay, Brazil - Transparency issues

Paraguay and Brazil thank Norway for submitting notification [G/AG/N/NOR/121](#) on the fill of its tariff quotas (MA:2). On the cover page of this document, Norway states that: "*For other current access quotas included in Norway's Schedule, as of 2000 the bound MFN tariff has been at the level of the in-quota tariff. A tariff-only regime applies to these TRQs from 2000 and onwards. Since Norway has fulfilled its commitments, for the current access quotas with a tariff-only regime, these will not be a part of the notification*".

While we note that this declaration has been included in Norway's MA:2 notifications since 2001 ([G/AG/N/NOR/38](#)), we recall that Paraguay and Brazil, along with a number of other Members, has reservations about Norway's proposed modification of its schedule of commitments, which has sought to eliminate these tariff quotas since 2020. The reasons for these reservations have been fully explained to the delegation of Norway at the bilateral level and stem from systemic concerns that Norway has been unable to address to our satisfaction.

Could Norway indicate which section of the current transparency obligations provides the grounds for this unilateral decision to not notify certain quotas that continue to form part of its schedule of commitments and have not been eliminated? We ask that Norway indicate the specific rules that allow a Member to decide which quotas form part of its notification and which do not, particularly in cases where the proposed changes to the schedule of commitments have not been accepted.

#### AG-IMS ID 102112: Question by United Kingdom - Tariff quota fill

The United Kingdom thanks Norway for its recent submission of [G/AG/N/NOR/121](#). We note that Norway has recorded a 100% fill rate for NORQ032. Could Norway please confirm whether the fill rate reported excludes imports under any preferential terms offered by Norway on the same product bilaterally? If not, could Norway please explain how usage of this TRQ has been determined?

### 2.1.10 Panama (G/AG/N/PAN/60)

#### AG-IMS ID 102113: Question by Australia - Tariff quota fill

Australia thanks Panama for submitting its 2021 calendar year MA:2 notification [G/AG/N/PAN/60](#). Australia notes that Panama has again reported nil, or close to nil, fill rates for ten TRQs across dairy and other agricultural products. We note that multiple TRQs remain underfilled from the 2020 notification ([G/AG/N/PAN/59](#)).

- a. Can Panama explain the reasons for the underfill of its quotas?
- b. Could Panama explain what it is doing to increase utilisation of underfilled tariff quotas, as per the Bali Decision on TRQ Administration?

Australia has asked this question previously (AG-IMS ID [101021](#)) and note Panama has still not provided a response. Australia would appreciate Panama updating the membership as to whether this information is available.

#### AG-IMS ID 102005: Question by European Union - Tariff quota fill

Can Panama explain the reasons behind the 0% fill rate of its "Milk and milk products" quotas (PANQ008, PANQ009, PANQ011), its "liquid Milk" and related "other" quota (PANQ004, PANQ005), and its "Processed cheese" quota (PANQ013) in their in table MA:2 for the calendar year 2021?

### 2.1.11 Philippines (G/AG/N/PHL/82)

#### AG-IMS ID 102039: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues

WTO Notification [G/AG/N/PHL/82](#) indicates in 2021, Philippine in-quota corn imports totalled 216,940 metric tonnes.

According to the Philippines Statistics Authority, in 2021, the Philippines imported a total of 459,581 metric tonnes of corn under Harmonized System (HS) heading 1005; Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) accounted for 439,278 metric tonnes or 96% of total imported corn.

It is noted that ASEAN members, including the Philippines eliminated all Tariff-Rate Quotas (TRQs) for other ASEAN members under Article 20 of the ASEAN Trade in Goods Agreement and the Philippines' schedule has a tariff of 5%. This compares to the most-favoured-nation (MFN) in-quota rate of 35% and out-quota rate of 50%.

This disadvantages the MFN trading partners of the Philippines who do not have access to the lower in-quota tariff because the MFN in-quota volume is filled by trading partners with preferential tariff treatment. The United States also notes that other ASEAN members exclude preferential imports from other ASEAN members in the calculation of their WTO tariff-rate quota fill.

- a. Please confirm the total quantity of corn that was imported in 2021 at a preferential rate, and the total quantity imported at the MFN rate during that same time period.
- b. Why does the Philippines count its corn imports from regional trade agreements such as ASEAN, as part of its WTO tariff rate quota fill when many of the Philippines' regional trade agreement partners exclude preferential imports from the calculation of their WTO tariff rate quota fill?
- c. Please confirm whether the Philippines includes imports of popcorn (1005.90.10) and seed corn (1005.10.00) as part of its in-quota volume fill.

#### **AG-IMS ID 102114: Question by Brazil - Tariff quota fill**

Brazil has noticed a reduced fill-rate (11.2%) in Philippines' TRQ PHLQ006 (Beef) during calendar year 2021. Could the Philippines provide data or information on any circumstances, including the difference of applied intra-quota and extra-quota tariffs and extra-quota import volume, that would explain the relatively low volume of imports under the aforementioned TRQ?

#### **AG-IMS ID 102099: Question by New Zealand - Tariff quota fill**

The latest MA:2 notification put forward by the Philippines records the fill rate for beef at 11.2%. Does the Philippines have any plans to change tariff quota administration with the aim of increasing the low fill rate for beef products in the future?

#### **2.1.12 United Kingdom (G/AG/N/GBR/13)**

#### **AG-IMS ID 102115: Question by Australia - Tariff quota fill**

Australia thanks the United Kingdom for submitting its 2021 marketing year MA:2 notification, [G/AG/N/GBR/13](#). Australia has previously questioned in AG-IMS ID [100090](#) low fill rates for a range of the UK's quotas and notes that this is the second year of very low utilisation rates of a range of quotas, including the meat of bovine animals quotas (GBRQ001 – GBRQ007). While fill rates of these quotas has improved over the past year, given COVID-19 related restrictions have now largely been lifted in the United Kingdom, they still remain very low.

Could the United Kingdom please provide additional detail on the administration of these quotas?

#### **AG-IMS ID 102116: Question by Brazil - Tariff quota fill**

Brazil has raised the underfill issue regarding some of the UK's TRQs in previous occasions (AG-IMS ID [99052](#) and ID [100043](#)).

According to notification [G/AG/N/GBR/13](#), there have been no imports under TRQ GBRQ007 during marketing year from 2021-07-01 to 2022-06-30 and imports under TRQs GBRQ064 and GBRQ067 were 58.2% and 6.2% lower, respectively.

- a. Could the United Kingdom provide data or information on any circumstance, including the difference of applied intra-quota and extra-quota tariffs and extra-quota import volumes, that would explain the low volume of imports under the aforementioned TRQs?

- b. Is Regulation 1432/2020, which establishes a performance requirement to apply for licenses, affecting fill-rates of such TRQs?

**AG-IMS ID 102066: Question by Paraguay - Tariff quota fill**

Paraguay thanks the United Kingdom for submitting notification [G/AG/N/GBR/13](#) on tariff quota fill (MA:2). We note with concern the underfill of quotas GBRQ001 (20.7%), GBRQ002 (15%), GBRQ004 (30.2%) and GBRQ007 (0%). In this connection, could the United Kingdom:

- a. Explain the reasons for the underfill of these quotas?
- b. Indicate whether it is considering amending its administration method, in accordance with the Bali Decision, in order to guarantee an increased fill of these quotas?
- c. Explain notes (1) and (2) on the joint administration of quotas GBRQ003 and GBRQ005 with quota GBRQ001 and the impact that this may have on the fill of these three tariff quotas?

**AG-IMS ID 102117: Question by Thailand - Tariff quota fill**

Thailand thanks the United Kingdom for its notification [G/AG/N/GBR/13](#) and would like to have more information concerning imports under tariff rate quota during the marketing year from 1 July 2021 to 30 June 2022.

- a. Could the United Kingdom explain the reason for the empty fill rate of the UK TRQ ID GBRQ015 (Fresh chicken cuts chilled or frozen)?
- b. Could the United Kingdom explain the reason for the TRQ's underfill rate for the UK TRQ ID GBRQ064 (Process uncooked chicken meat containing 57% or more weight of poultry meat or offal)?
- c. Thailand noted in this notification that the United Kingdom did not report the tariff rate quota fill rate for rice imports. As a result, could the United Kingdom explain why the aforementioned information was not included in the notification?

**2.1.13 United States of America (G/AG/N/USA/162)****AG-IMS ID 102104: Question by India - Tariff quota fill**

In the recent MA:2 notification ([G/AG/N/USA/162](#)) of the USA, the fill rates for many agricultural products such as cotton-related products (USAQ049, USAQ050, USAQ051), chocolate (USAQ036), cheese (USAQ019, USAQ023) and dried milk (USAQ006) is significantly low. India requests the United States to provide details on the following:

- a. the reasons for the underfill, or zero-fill rate of the products?
- b. What actions are being undertaken to increase the fill rates?

**AG-IMS ID 102001: Question by Switzerland - Tariff quota fill**

Switzerland welcomes the United States of America's notification on imports under tariff quotas (Table MA:2) during 2021. We note the low fill rate of 56% of TRQ USA Q024 concerning "Swiss and Emmentaler cheese with eye formation". The quota is subdivided into several country specific quotas. Their respective quantities no longer seem to reflect current trade flows.

- a. Is the United States of America planning any specific steps in order to increase the fill rates of this quota?
- b. The Bali Decision on tariff rate quota administration requests the importing Member to contact private operators holding unused entitlements in order to make them available to other potential users (para. 9). Is the USA issuing such requests to holders of unused entitlements in order to make them available for other importers?

## **2.2 Special agricultural safeguards (Tables MA:3 to MA:5)**

### **2.2.1 Philippines (G/AG/N/PHL/53)**

#### **AG-IMS ID 102040: Question by United States of America - Trigger calculations**

In [G/AG/N/PHL/53](#), the Philippines states the average Trigger Price is "weighted average by import volume." Further, it is noted that the same Trigger Price is used for both chicken wings (0207.14.10), frozen poultry offal and other cuts (0207.14.99), and fresh or chilled poultry meat and edible offal (0207.11.00).

Please provide calculation methodology, including all necessary data (e.g., the volume of imports (in kilograms)), used to derive the special safeguard trigger-price for tariff item number 0207.14.10, 0207.14.99, and 0207.11.00.

### **2.2.2 Philippines (G/AG/N/PHL/81)**

#### **AG-IMS ID 102118: Question by Indonesia - Transparency issues**

Indonesia notes that the Philippines has notified recently the application of SSG for instant coffee products that has been carried out for more than four years in the document [G/AG/N/PHL/81](#) for the calendar year of 2021.

Indonesia has raised questions on the said issue at the 100<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the COA in March 2022. Indonesia appreciates the Philippines for its response.

Following the Philippines' response, Indonesia would like to inform the Philippines that Indonesia has adjusted the CIF price for instant coffee, in particular for the single packs, above the trigger price.

Subsequently, Indonesia would like to inquire to the Philippines whether they have been informed about this updated price?

Furthermore, Indonesia also would like to seek clarification and explanation whether the application of the SSG will still be in place for Indonesian instant coffee in light of the adjusted CIF price?

Lastly, Indonesia would like to request the Philippines to further explain the progress on the implementation of the SSG measure. In this regard, Indonesia wishes to refer to Paragraph 5.7, Article 5 of the AoA, which requires the applicant Member to provide transparency in the implementation of SSG in writing, including the latest data.

Therefore, would the Philippines kindly elaborate further on this matter?

## **2.3 Domestic support commitments (Table DS:1)**

### **2.3.1 Argentina (G/AG/N/ARG/49, G/AG/N/ARG/50, G/AG/N/ARG/51)**

#### **AG-IMS ID 102006: Question by European Union - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)**

The EU has noticed that Argentina prepared its notifications by using the "1992 peso". In this regard:

- a. Can Argentina indicate the exchange rate used for calculation from "current peso" to "1992 peso"?

The applied administered price was 0.69 per kg ([G/AG/N/ARG/50](#) for agricultural year 2018/2019). The administered price was increased to 1 per kg for agricultural year 2019/2020 ([G/AG/N/ARG/51](#)) and also the quantity of the eligible production was increased by approx.10 million kg.

- b. Could Argentina explain the reasons behind the increased administered price for tobacco?
- c. Could Argentina confirm the link between the increased price and the increase in the production?

**AG-IMS ID 102120: Question by United Kingdom - Direct payments: structural adjustment assistance provided through investment aids**

The United Kingdom thanks Argentina for its recent submission of [G/AG/N/ARG/51](#). The United Kingdom is interested in the support notified under Measure Type 11: 'Structural adjustment assistance provided through investment aids' in Supporting Table DS:1. In particular, the United Kingdom would appreciate further information on:

- a. How Argentina interprets the concept of "objectively demonstrated structural disadvantage" in relation to eligibility for payments?
- b. How does Argentina ensure that such payments are 'limited to the amount required to compensate for the structural disadvantage'?

**AG-IMS ID 102119: Question by Australia - Other product-specific AMS/EMS**

Australia thanks Argentina for submitting its 2019-20 agricultural year DS:1 notification [G/AG/N/ARG/51](#). Australia notes Argentina has reported soya beans as receiving product-specific support as part of a stimulus programme measure.

Could Argentina please provide further details of the measures, including the type of payments, the eligibility criteria and the duration of the measure?

**AG-IMS ID 102041: Question by United States of America - Other product-specific AMS/EMS**

In 2017/2018, Argentina reported a support price of 0.69 1992 pesos per kilogram for tobacco, applied to 104,093,000 kilograms, and market price support of 71,983,580 in 1992 pesos.

In 2018/2019, Argentina reported a support price of 0.66 1992 pesos per kilogram for tobacco, applied to 107,349,000 kilograms, and market price support of 71,056,788 in 1992 pesos.

In 2019/2020, Argentina reported a support price of 1 1992 peso per kilogram for tobacco, applied to 112,856,000 kilograms, and market price support of 74,181,773 in 1992 pesos.

Based on this information, the support price provided to farmers went down slightly from 2017/2018 to 2018/2019, and then went up quite sharply in 2019/2020.

Does Argentina take into account market conditions when setting the support price for tobacco, or is the support price based solely on the calculation of the maximum support Argentina has policy space to provide?

**2.3.2 Bolivia, Plurinational State of (G/AG/N/BOL/30, G/AG/N/BOL/31, G/AG/N/BOL/32)****AG-IMS ID 102042: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)**

The United States welcomes the efforts undertaken by the Plurinational State of Bolivia to bring its Table DS:1 notifications up to date.

It is noted that calendar year 2019 was the first year the Plurinational State of Bolivia has notified domestic support, which is comprised solely of support under Supporting Table DS:1.

Since 2019, the Plurinational State of Bolivia has notified support for "Implementing the plant health system for the coffee sector at the national level. Persons with disabilities".

In 2020, this measure references Law 223, which the United States understands was enacted in 2012.

The Plurinational State of Bolivia has also notified support for research under "The National Agricultural and Forestry Initiative...", which references Supreme Decree No. 2454.

The United States understands that this Decree is dated from 2015.

- a. Please confirm whether or not the Plurinational State of Bolivia provided any domestic support prior to 2019.
- b. When will the Plurinational State of Bolivia be submitting a Table DS:2 notification as required for all newly notified exempt domestic support measures?
- c. In light of no Table DS:2 notification to date, please explain how "persons with disabilities"/"personas con discapacidad" at the end of the description of the 2 (b) Pest and disease control measure in Supporting Table DS:1 relates to the pest and disease control measures notified.

### **2.3.3 Botswana (G/AG/N/BWA/35)**

#### **AG-IMS ID 102121: Question by Thailand - Input subsidies available to low-income or resource-poor producers**

According to notification [G/AG/N/BWA/35](#) on domestic support for fiscal year 2020/2021, Botswana spent 738.70 million BWP to support low-income or resource-poor producers. Could Botswana provide more information on the eligibility criteria for low-income or resource-poor producers to participate in the aforementioned project, as well as the payment rate for farmers?

### **2.3.4 Cuba (G/AG/N/CUB/66, G/AG/N/CUB/67)**

#### **AG-IMS ID 102014: Question by Japan - General services: training services**

Japan thanks Cuba for its submission of DS:1 notifications, [G/AG/N/CUB/66](#) and [G/AG/N/CUB/67](#).

Japan would like to ask Cuba to explain the reason behind and illustrate the details of "Education and vocational training in rural areas" under 2 (c). The monetary value of support under training services in Supporting Table DS:1 of [G/AG/N/CUB/66](#) (CY2021) soared by 1,280% from the previous year (CY2020: 2,682.4 million CUP to CY2021: 37,094 million CUP).

### **2.3.5 European Union (G/AG/N/EU/79)**

#### **AG-IMS ID 102122: Question by Australia - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)**

Australia thanks the EU for submitting its 2019-20 marketing year DS:1 notification [G/AG/N/EU/79](#).

Australia notes the significant increase in Green Box spending between MY17-18 to MY19-20 from EUR 65,846 million to EUR 68,516 million largely owing to increases in spending to structural adjustment assistance provided through investment aids.

Could the EU please explain the policy rationale for this significant increase under this programme?

#### **AG-IMS ID 102068: Question by Paraguay, Brazil - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)**

Paraguay and Brazil thank the European Union for submitting notification [G/AG/N/EU/79](#) and notes the following:

A EUR 192.5 million increase in its current total AMS

Could the EU explain the reasons for this increase?

- a. For the following items in particular: fruit and vegetables, common wheat, potatoes, other crops products, flowers and cider; and
- b. For non-product-specific AMS.

**AG-IMS ID 102069: Question by Paraguay, Brazil - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)**

Paraguay and Brazil thank the European Union for submitting notification [G/AG/N/EU/79](#) and notes the following:

Change in the reporting format of non-product-specific AMS and the inclusion of new items.

- a. Could the EU explain the reason for the change in format of the reported measures?
- b. Could the EU provide more information on the new measures, including: "Horizontal support in the Fruit and Vegetables sector: green harvesting and non-harvesting" and "Horizontal support in the Fruit and Vegetables sector: harvest insurance"?
- c. Could the EU clarify the criteria for the classification as non-product-specific AMS of programmes geared specifically towards fruit and vegetables?

**AG-IMS ID 102070: Question by Paraguay, Brazil - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)**

Paraguay and Brazil thank the European Union for submitting notification [G/AG/N/EU/79](#) and note the following:

A EUR 629.9 million increase in the Green Box, particularly paragraphs 2(a), 2(g), 4 and 11.

- a. Could the EU explain the reasons for the increase in these types of measures?
- b. Could the EU explain how animal welfare is related to pest and disease control, or whether this programme should be included under another category? Could the EU also explain the EUR 217.8 million increase in this paragraph?

**AG-IMS ID 102067: Question by Paraguay, Brazil - Scheduled commitment level**

Paraguay and Brazil thank the European Union for submitting notification [G/AG/N/EU/79](#) and notes the following:

The maintenance of the total AMS commitment level:

Could the EU provide an update on the status of the amendment to its commitments to reflect a reduction in its AMS entitlement that is identical to that notified by the United Kingdom as part of its withdrawal from the European Union?

**AG-IMS ID 102123: Question by Australia - Other product-specific AMS/EMS**

Australia thanks the EU for submitting its 2019-20 marketing year (MY) 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 MY19-20 and MY18-19. This is across a range of commodities including milk, beef, sheep, pig, fruit and vegetables. The EU has listed the measure types as national aid 'covid measure'.

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

**AG-IMS ID 102124: Question by Thailand - Other product-specific AMS/EMS**

According to notification [G/AG/N/EU/79](#) on domestic support for fiscal year 2020/2021, the European Union spent 130.10 million euros on national aid for the sugar support measure. Could the European Union provide more information on the above- mentioned measures, as well as the procedures and criteria for farmers to apply for such government assistance?

**AG-IMS ID 102016: Question by Japan - Non-product-specific AMS**

Japan thanks the EU for its submission of DS:1 notification [G/AG/N/EU/79](#).

Japan notes EU's 2.9 million EUR of fertilizer subsidy notified as Non-Product-Specific AMS in Supporting Table DS:9 of DS:1 notification, which were notified twice in the last decade (MY2016/17: EUR 1.0 million, MY2017/18: EUR 1.1 million), and no notification in MY2018/19 DS:1. Would the EU please provide some details of this support programme including its eligibility criteria?

Recognizing that the EU Farm to Fork Strategy in May 2020 set a target of reducing fertilizer use by at least 20% by 2030, Japan would like to know whether the programme would be adjusted to achieve the F2F target or it is to be phased out.

**2.3.6 Georgia (G/AG/N/GEO/25)****AG-IMS ID 102043: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)**

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.

**2.3.7 Hong Kong, China (G/AG/N/HKG/52)****AG-IMS ID 102044: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)**

The United States thanks Hong Kong, China for submitting [G/AG/N/HKG/52](#).

Hong Kong's prior Table DS:1 notification ([G/AG/N/HKG/50](#)) included expenditures for Anti-epidemic fund 2.0 under "6. Decoupled income support".

[G/AG/N/HKG/52](#) includes expenditures for Anti-epidemic fund 5.0 and Anti-epidemic fund 6.0.

Please explain why Anti-epidemic fund 3.0 and Anti-epidemic fund 4.0 were not listed in Hong Kong's DS:1 notifications.

Did these funds not contain support for agriculture?

**2.3.8 India (G/AG/N/IND/27)****AG-IMS ID 102007: Question by European Union - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)**

The EU thanks India to its partial reply to the question AG-IMS [101012](#), and recall point (b) of that question:

b. In its reply to question AG-IMS ID [98056](#) India indicated that some of the quantities in end stocks was not husked rice. Can India indicate which quantity in the end stocks that husked, semi-milled or milled rice for the years 2019-20 and 2020-21.

Can India reply to this question using comparable figures preferably by indicating in the stock figures (both beginning and end stocks) on how much is:

- Paddy;
- Semi-milled; and
- Milled.

#### **AG-IMS ID 102082: Question by Paraguay - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)**

In follow-up to the reply received from India to question AG-IMS ID [101087](#), we note that, as was indicated at the previous meeting of this Committee, the hyperlink provided in the reply is inactive and inaccessible. We therefore reiterate the request already made to India in the room to submit the requested information in an accessible format, including via email to the Mission of Paraguay.

#### **AG-IMS ID 102025: Question by United States of America, Paraguay, New Zealand - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)**

We would like thank India for the responses it provided to AG-IMS ID [101087](#); however, India did not respond to all of the questions. We therefore resubmit the following questions:

- a. We recognize the mathematical reason for the steady increase in Current Total AMS between the period 2018-2019 and the period 2020-2021 but would appreciate a more explanatory reason for the factors behind the changes in the applied administered price and eligible production.
- b. What policies or reforms is India implementing or considering to achieve its food security objectives in a manner consistent with WTO rules?
- c. Please explain the steady increase in open market sales of public stocks between 2018 and 2021.
- d. Please provide information on monitoring mechanisms to ensure that these sales do not end up in international markets. 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."

#### **2.3.9 Japan (G/AG/N/JPN/277)**

##### **AG-IMS ID 102100: Question by New Zealand - Public stockholding for food security purposes**

New Zealand would appreciate further information regarding the public stockholding programme notified in Japan's DS:1 table for 2020/2021:

*Public stockholding: public stockholding of rice, wheat and feedgrains - 18 JPY, billion*

Can Japan give more insight into the programme, and confirm when a DS:2 notification will be provided?

##### **AG-IMS ID 102105: Question by India - Direct payments: structural adjustment assistance provided through investment aids**

We thank Japan for submitting its DS:1 notification [G/AG/N/JPN/277](#) for the fiscal year 2020-2021.

In 2019-2020 notification ([G/AG/N/JPN/276](#)), under the Green box (Supporting Table DS:1), an expenditure of JPY 4.7 billion was notified for the measure 'Agricultural loans: interest concessions for government programmed agricultural loans', while in 2020-21 notification ([G/AG/N/JPN/277](#)) the expenditure for the same measure was JPY 49.9 billion which amounts to an increase by 961.70%. In this context, India requests Japan to provide:

- a. the reason for this increase;
- b. provide the details related to agricultural loans eligible for interest concession under this measure; and
- c. what is the term of these loans?

#### **AG-IMS ID 102106: Question by India - Non-product-specific AMS**

In DS:1 notification [G/AG/N/JPN/277](#), Supporting Table DS:9 (Non-Product Specific AMS), Japan has mentioned a measure "Support for production in the next crop season to cope with the COVID-19 pandemic" with 158.5 billion JPY. India requests Japan to provide the details of this measure?

#### **2.3.10 Malaysia (G/AG/N/MYS/53)**

##### **AG-IMS ID 102125: Question by Thailand - Input subsidies available to low-income or resource-poor producers**

According to notification [G/AG/N/MYS/53](#) on domestic support for fiscal year 2020/2021, Malaysia spent 497 million MYR on the Paddy Price Subsidy (PPS) measure to support low-income or resource-poor rice farmers and to improve rice farmers' socioeconomic well-being. Could Malaysia provide more information on the eligibility criteria for low-income or resource-poor producers to participate in the aforementioned?

#### **2.3.11 Philippines (G/AG/N/PHL/85)**

##### **AG-IMS ID 102126: Question by Brazil - Input subsidies available to low-income or resource-poor producers**

Brazil notices that the Philippines has notified, in Supporting Table DS:2, a notable increase in expenditures under "Input subsidies available to low-income or resource-poor producers", from PHP 5,593,702 thousand in 2020 to PHP 14,188,318 thousand in 2021. Brazil would appreciate it if the Philippines could explain the reason(s) behind such a difference between 2020 and 2021.

##### **AG-IMS ID 102015: Question by Japan - Input subsidies available to low-income or resource-poor producers**

Japan thanks Philippines for its submission of 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: 5,593,702 thousand PHP to CY2021: 14,188,318 thousand PHP). Could Philippines please explain the reason behind and illustrate the details of the support?

#### **2.3.12 Switzerland (G/AG/N/CHE/114)**

##### **AG-IMS ID 102077: Question by Paraguay, Brazil - Direct payments: payments under regional assistance programmes**

Paraguay and Brazil thank Switzerland for submitting notification [G/AG/N/CHE/114](#). We note that in paragraph 13 of the Green Box "Regional assistance programmes" Switzerland includes "Contribution to the maintenance of an open landscape" and "Contribution to landscape quality":

- a. Which disadvantaged regions are receiving those payments?
- b. What impartial and objective criteria, set out in law or regulation, are used to identify those regions as underprivileged?
- c. How would direct payments related to landscape maintenance and landscape quality lead to overcoming the difficulties faced by this region?

- d. What are the additional costs or income losses resulting from carrying out agricultural production in this region that direct payments seek to compensate?

### **2.3.13 United Kingdom (G/AG/N/GBR/11)**

#### **AG-IMS ID 102108: Question by India - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)**

With regard to UK's DS:1 Notification [G/AG/N/GBR/11](#) dated 4 April/2022, the Calendar Year 2021, the following is requested:

- a. As per the Supporting Table DS:1 Para 2 (f): Marketing and promotion services, the United Kingdom has disbursed 42.18 million GBP through payment agencies towards marketing campaigns; support to producer groups; stimulation of farmer/producer markets; promotion of quality and accreditation schemes. The United Kingdom may explain how it supports the producer groups and provide the details of the programmes.
- b. As per the Supporting Table DS:1 Para 6: Decoupled income support, the United Kingdom is continuing with the previous EU Common Agriculture Policy (CAP). Is the United Kingdom planning changes in the decoupled income support measures? If so, details of the same may be provided.
- c. As per the Supporting Table DS:1 Para 13, the United Kingdom has mentioned it provides annual support to farmers and crofters operating in constrained areas (Scotland). It is requested to provide details of these programmes, including the eligibility criteria to receive support under this measure.
- d. As per the Supporting Table DS:1 Para 14: other Direct Payments, certain Covid response measures are provided by the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom may provide details of the programme of direct payment under Covid-response measures?
- e. As per the Supporting Table DS:3 Measures Exempt from the Reduction Commitment – Direct Payments under Production-limiting Programmes - "Exempt Direct Payments, the United Kingdom has mentioned two programmes - Voluntary Coupled Support fixed area payments: Protein Crops (Northern Ireland) and Livestock payments made on a fixed number of head Voluntary Coupled Support headage payments: Beef and sheep. The United Kingdom is requested to provide details of the programme, including eligibility conditions. We may also ask to clarify if these programmes satisfy the production limiting condition. If so, how?
- f. For measures notified under the Supporting Table DS:5, the United Kingdom is requested to elaborate as to how the eligible production determined for the programmes?

#### **AG-IMS ID 102072: Question by Paraguay - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)**

In follow-up to the reply received from the United Kingdom to question AG-IMS ID [101089](#), could the United Kingdom:

- a. Confirm that mechanical harrowing is not used in organic crop farming? We note that the United Kingdom has pointed to carbon sequestration and the fact that organic farming prevents erosion as elements demonstrating that organic farming is sustainable. We ask the United Kingdom to indicate how it is only organic crops, and not conventional crops, that sequester carbon and how the former prevent erosion.
- b. Which criteria are used to categorize organic farming as a climate change mitigation measure, considering that this type of farming can increase the carbon footprint of products by requiring more land and water use than conventional farming to produce the same amount of food? In this connection, we also ask how organic farming helps conserve water.
- c. How is organic farming considered to be linked to animal welfare?

**AG-IMS ID 102107: Question by India - Market price support**

We thank the United Kingdom for submitting its DS:1 notification [G/AG/N/GBR/11](#). India observes that the United Kingdom has provided market price support calculation for butter, skimmed milk powder and common wheat in Supporting Table DS:5. In this context, India requests the United Kingdom to provide details on the following:

- a. Whether the United Kingdom Government is still announcing the applied administered price for butter, skimmed milk powder and common wheat? If yes, then what is the applicable applied administered price and coverage of products for the year 2022?
- b. India observes that the production eligible to receive market price support for all three products mentioned in the notification is zero tonnes. Could the United Kingdom provide reasons on why the eligible production is zero?
- c. How was the ERP for butter, skimmed milk powder and common wheat calculated?
- d. It is observed that the administered price and the external reference prices in the DS:5 supporting table have been redenominated using the exchange rate that prevailed on 31 December 2020, 1 Euro = 0.89903. This is in contrast with the UK's communication via document no. G/MA/TAR/RS/570/Add.1, where the currency components of the schedule of concessions were redenominated using the average exchange rate of 2015-19, 1 Euro = 0.83687 GBP. Could the United Kingdom explain the rationale behind using different exchange rates in the Schedule and DS:1 notification?
- e. As per the notification requirements and format under [G/AG/2](#), Members with Total AMS commitment in Part IV of their Schedule are required to notify the domestic support measures no later than 90 days following the end of the calendar (or, marketing, fiscal, etc.) year in question. In the context, India would like to know the reasons for not notifying the domestic support notification by the United Kingdom as per the timeline of [G/AG/2](#).

**AG-IMS ID 102071: Question by Paraguay, Brazil - Classification of measures**

Paraguay and Brazil thank the United Kingdom for submitting notification [G/AG/N/GBR/11](#). On this matter, further to the questions submitted at the previous meeting of the Committee on Agriculture, we note that the United Kingdom includes "verification of compliance with feed and food law, animal welfare rules" in paragraph 2(b) of the Green Box.

Could the United Kingdom explain how animal welfare is related to pest and disease control, or whether this programme should be included under another category?

**2.3.14 United States of America (G/AG/N/USA/157)****AG-IMS ID 102130: Question by Australia - General services: extension and advisory services**

Australia thanks the US for submitting its DS:1 notification G/AG/N/USA/157 and notes the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP), administered by the US Farm Service Agency (FSA), valued at USD 2,868 million. Australia notes the 'other environmental benefits' described in this notification, as well as the FSA fact sheet (<https://www.fsa.usda.gov/Assets/USDA-FSA-Public/usdfiles/FactSheets/2022/conservation-reserve-program-fact-sheet-2022.pdf>) which outlines other 'on-farm benefits' from reduced erosion.

- a. Could the US please clarify what the 'on-farm benefits' are in relation to this programme?
- b. Could the US please elaborate on who the CRP participants are who receive payments from the FSA?

## 2.4 New or modified domestic support measures (Table DS:2)

### 2.4.1 Argentina (G/AG/N/ARG/52)

#### **AG-IMS ID 102045: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)**

In [G/AG/N/ARG/52](#) Argentina notified a domestic support measure entitled "Programme for the promotion of local employment, integration and procurement." The description only states "Advisory service and technical support to facilitate local food production and creation of jobs for producers engaged in family farming".

Please provide further details with regards to this measure and how the measure facilitates local food production and creation of jobs for producers.

The title of the measure includes the word "procurement"; does the Government of Argentina purchase food from producers under this measure and, if so, how?

### 2.4.2 Argentina (G/AG/N/ARG/53)

#### **AG-IMS ID 102046: Question by United States of America - Transparency issues (including Table DS:2)**

In [G/AG/N/ARG/53](#) Argentina notified a domestic support measure entitled "Programme for direct and critical assistance for family, rural and indigenous farming."

The description only states "Aid for producers engaged in family, rural and indigenous farming, whose production is at risk from the effects of climatic events (bad weather), social crises or extreme occurrences (geographical isolation)."

- a. Please provide further details with regards to this measure and how the measure aids producers, including how levels of payment are determined.
- b. Please elaborate on what is meant by "extreme occurrences (geographical isolation)" and how this relates to adherence with paragraph 8 of Annex 2 of the Agreement on Agriculture.

#### **AG-IMS ID 102127: Question by United Kingdom - Direct payments: payments for relief from natural disasters**

The United Kingdom thanks Argentina for its submission of [G/AG/N/ARG/53](#) and notes that some additional supporting information would be beneficial. Could Argentina provide further information on how this support meets the criteria set out in paragraph 8 (a) that eligibility for such payments "shall be determined by a production loss which exceeds 30% of the average of production in the preceding three-year period or a three-year average based on the preceding five-year period, excluding the highest and the lowest entry"?

## 2.5 Export prohibitions and restrictions (Table ER:1)

### 2.5.1 Kazakhstan (G/AG/N/KAZ/19)

#### **AG-IMS ID 102128: Question by United Kingdom - Transparency issues**

The United Kingdom thanks Kazakhstan for notification [G/AG/N/KAZ/19](#). The United Kingdom welcomes the transparency that Kazakhstan has provided to the WTO by notifying this export restriction and would encourage other Members, especially net exporters, to follow this example where they have restrictive measures in place. The United Kingdom notes that Kazakhstan's restriction on wheat and wheat flour has been extended to the 30<sup>th</sup> of September 2022. Could Kazakhstan indicate whether it plans to further extend this restriction and what factors will inform its decision?

### 2.5.2 Malaysia (G/AG/N/MYS/52, G/AG/N/MYS/52/Add.1)

#### AG-IMS ID 102047: Question by United States of America, Japan, United Kingdom - Transparency issues

On 1 August 2022, Malaysia's Minister of Agriculture and Food Industry [stated](#) that Malaysia's chicken supply has re-stabilized, and the country is now dealing with a chicken oversupply.

The Minister also stated that Malaysia has the capacity to export chicken supplies but will not yet lift its export ban. (Source: <https://www.theedgemarkets.com/article/ronald-malaysia-currently-facing-slight-chicken-oversupply-after-effective-measures-taken>).

The stated purpose of the original export ban was "to ensure sufficient domestic supply to address the ongoing domestic chicken shortage situation in Malaysia."

Given that Malaysia now has an oversupply of chicken and the capacity to export, and taking into consideration the effects that export bans may have on an importing Member's food security, is Malaysia considering lifting its export ban on poultry sooner than the recently notified dates of 30 November ([G/AG/N/MYS/52](#)) and 7 December ([G/AG/N/MYS/52/Add.1](#))?

#### AG-IMS ID 102008: Question by European Union, United Kingdom - Other

On June 24, Malaysia has submitted a notification to the WTO - [G/AG/N/MYS/52](#) (issued on 27/06/2022) as well as an addendum to it on 21/07/2022, informing of an export restrictions on: *Live day old chick broilers and live broilers (except coloured birds and village chicken), whole chicken, chicken cuts and parts*. The measure is in force from 1 June 2022 until 7 December 2022.

The EU thanks Malaysia for notifying this measure.

Could Malaysia explain what would be the expected impact of the measure on trade in the products concerned?

## 3 OVERDUE NOTIFICATIONS

### 3.1 Botswana

#### AG-IMS ID 102048: Question by United States of America

The United States thanks Botswana for submitting its DS:1 notification ([G/AG/N/BWA/35](#)) for financial year 1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021.

The next most recent DS:1 notification Botswana submitted was for the financial year 1 April 2017 to 31 March 2018.

When does Botswana plan to submit the notifications for the period from 1 April 2018 to 31 March 2020?

### 3.2 Canada

#### AG-IMS ID 102086: Question by New Zealand

New Zealand notes that Canada's last DS:1 notification was for the calendar year 2018. Can Canada please advise when they plan to submit their outstanding DS:1 notifications covering the years 2019-2021?

### 3.3 China

#### AG-IMS ID 102049: Question by United States of America

Table ES:3 and Table NF:1 Notifications

As a follow-up to AG-IMS IDs [93166](#), [92029](#) and [88082](#), China stated that it was conducting a study to determine whether it is required to submit notifications of tables ES:3 (showing total volume of

food aid) and NF:1 (reporting the quantity of food aid as well as technical and financial assistance provided to least-developed and net food importing developing countries).

- a. What was China's conclusion as to whether it needs to submit these notifications?
- b. Please clarify when the Committee can expect these notifications, or explain why China believes it does not need to notify them.

### **3.4 Egypt**

#### **AG-IMS ID 102013: Question by European Union**

Egypt – DS:1 notifications

The latest DS:1 notification from Egypt covers the marketing year 2016/17.

When will Egypt introduce its notifications for the following years? Can Egypt indicate a timeline?

#### **AG-IMS ID 102087: Question by New Zealand, Paraguay**

New Zealand notes that Egypt's last DS:1 notification was for 2017. Can Egypt please advise when they plan to submit their outstanding DS:1 notifications covering the years 2018-2021?

#### **AG-IMS ID 102050: Question by United States of America**

The United States notes that Egypt's most recent notification submission ([G/AG/N/EGY/3](#)) concerning domestic support commitments (Tables DS:1 and DS:2) covering financial years 2005/2006 to 2016/2017 is from February 2017.

Please specify when Egypt will submit Tables DS:1 and DS:2 notifications for financial years 2017/2018 and 2018/2019.

### **3.5 Kazakhstan**

#### **AG-IMS ID 102024: Question by United States of America**

The United States takes note that Kazakhstan implements a number of domestic support measures.

Kazakhstan's Ministry of Agriculture published two policy documents: "Concept Note of Industrial Agricultural Development of the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2021-2030," and "National Agricultural Sector Development Project: 2021-25".

In the documents, the Ministry of Agriculture noted Kazakhstan provided approximately 260.5 billion Kazakhstani Tenge (KZT) in 2020 and 471.9 billion KZT in 2021 of domestic support to its agricultural sector through various subsidies, loans, and developmental programs.

The United States is concerned as Kazakhstan has never notified a Table DS:1 or Table DS:2 notification to the Committee on Agriculture despite stating in response to AG-IMS ID [92040](#) in October 2019 that notifications would be submitted "in the nearest future."

When will Kazakhstan provide its overdue domestic support notifications (Tables DS:1 and DS:2)?

### **3.6 Malaysia**

#### **AG-IMS ID 102088: Question by New Zealand**

New Zealand thanks Malaysia for their recent submission of their DS:1 notification for 2015. Can Malaysia please advise when they plan to submit their outstanding DS:1 notifications covering the years 2016-2021?

New Zealand is particularly interested in further information on Malaysia's support to the poultry sector, any information Malaysia can provide on the scale and nature of this support would be greatly appreciated.

### 3.7 Morocco

#### AG-IMS ID 102051: Question by United States of America

As a follow-up to AG-IMS ID [91182](#), the United States would like to reiterate the following question, for which Morocco has not provided a written answer:

"The United States notes that Morocco is overdue in notifying (Table ES:1 and Supporting Table ES:2), and responses to the export competition questionnaire (ECQ) from calendar year 2016 to the present."

Please provide all overdue Table ES:1 and Supporting Table ES:2 notifications, and a response to the ECQ on operational changes in export subsidy measures.

### 3.8 South Africa

#### AG-IMS ID 102089: Question by New Zealand, Paraguay

New Zealand notes that South Africa's last DS:1 notification was for 2014. Can South Africa please advise when they plan to submit their outstanding DS:1 notifications covering the years 2015-2021?

## 4 EXPORT COMPETITION

### 4.1 Australia

#### AG-IMS ID 102052: Question by United States of America

The United States notes Australia reported in its Export Competition Questionnaire that Export Finance Australia (EFA) issued bonds worth AUD 11.86 million for food product manufacturing exports and responded "n/a" for the maximum repayment term. In the past, Australia reported a maximum repayment of 18 months under the EFA bonds program.

- a. Please clarify why the maximum repayment term is "n/a" for bonds issued.

Australia only provided a value figure for "food product manufacturing" but did not provide which product groups are included or its value figures under the bond programs.

- b. Please provide the value figures for each product or product group for the bond program.

Australia reported that EFA issued Risk Participation Agreements (RPA) risk cover worth AUD 8.84 million for basic material wholesaling.

Australia only provided a value figure for "basic material wholesaling" but did not provide which product groups are included or its value figure under the RPA program.

- c. Please explain why value figures for agricultural product or product group for the RPA program were not provided.

### 4.2 Canada

#### AG-IMS ID 102053: Question by United States of America

The United States notes that Canada reported in its Export Competition Questionnaire for item 7 that CAD 3,324 million was used for North America under Credit Insurance.

- a. Please list what agricultural products were being financed to North America during the notification period.
- b. What countries are covered under the geographic area of "North America," as Canada reports Mexico with Central America and the Caribbean?

### 4.3 China

#### AG-IMS ID 102054: Question by United States of America

The United States notes China did not provide a reply to the 2021 Export Competition Questionnaire (ECQ).

Please provide a data update for year 2021 in the ECQ.

#### AG-IMS ID 102055: Question by United States of America

##### Export Credit

The United States notes that China responded to the 2020 ECQ for item 8 with "Nil". On 15 March 2022, China responded to AG-IMS ID [100026](#) that "There are no readily available statistics on usage by product or product group".

- a. Please clarify when will China provide data for "program use by product or product group".
- b. If SINOSURE is not able to provide this data, please explain why that is the case, and what steps are being taken to correct this information gap for information required to be reported to Members of this Committee.

We note that China responded in the ECQ that the Export-Import Bank under the export order financing program covered a total of USD 272 million of agricultural products.

- c. Please provide the annual average premium rates/fees for this programme.

#### AG-IMS ID 102056: Question by United States of America

##### Food Assistance

In its 2020 ECQ response, China stated that it provided USD 6 million in food assistance to developing countries through the UN's World Food Program and the United Nations Children's Fund, which is multilateral food assistance in nature.

- a. Please clarify and confirm that China did not provide bilateral food assistance of any kind in 2019 and 2020.
- b. If bilateral food aid was provided by means of cash transfers, vouchers, or locally and regionally procured food, please provide the total value of food aid for years 2019 and 2020.

### 4.4 European Union

#### AG-IMS ID 102057: Question by United States of America

In the Export Competition Questionnaire response, related to export credits, EU member States of Austria, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovak Republic, Spain, and Sweden did not provide a value figure for each agricultural product or product group exported under their programmes.

- a. For each of these EU member States, please provide the figures for programme use (i.e., the monetary value of export) by product or product group (e.g., agricultural products) in 2021.
- b. For each of these EU member States, if the information is not readily available, what specific steps is each of these countries taking to gather the information and when will it be made available to WTO Members as required by the Nairobi Decision on Export Competition ([WT/MIN\(15\)/45](#))?

**AG-IMS ID 102058: Question by United States of America**

## Food Assistance

In the Export Competition Questionnaire response, the United States notes that the European Union omitted information for Denmark, which is a signatory to the Food Assistance Convention (FAC).

- a. Please provide an update on Denmark's food assistance data.
- b. While Belgium, Ireland, Italy, and Netherlands are not FAC members yet, would the European Union please provide information on their bilateral food assistance programmes and include this information in subsequent ECQ responses?

**4.5 Ghana****AG-IMS ID 102059: Question by United States of America**

## State Trading Enterprises

The United States notes Ghana's Cocoa Board (COCOBOD) has not yet been notified to the WTO as a state trading enterprise (STE) under Article XVII of the GATT 1994 and has also not been reported in the Export Competition Questionnaire's (ECQ) STE section in the WTO Committee on Agriculture.

Since COCOBOD is a state-owned enterprise having monopoly rights over the export of all cocoa beans from Ghana, and in 2021 Ghana was the world's largest exporter of cocoa beans (42% of total export value), the United States requests the following information:

- a. Please provide an update on the steps Ghana is taking to notify COCOBOD as a STE to the Working Party on STEs, which Ghana informed the Working Party it would do eight years ago.
- b. What steps is Ghana taking to respond to the WTO Committee on Agriculture Export Competition Questionnaire's (ECQ) STE section, taking note of COCOBOD's role in Ghana's dominant position in cocoa bean exports?

**4.6 India****AG-IMS ID 102026: Question by United States of America**

The United States notes that India did not provide a response to the 2021 Export Competition Questionnaire (ECQ).

When can Members expect India to provide the required information?

**AG-IMS ID 102027: Question by United States of America**

In AG-IMS ID [100028](#), India provided a breakdown of agricultural products for its 2020 ECQ but there was no value for cotton, and also reported "others" valued at USD 2.89 billion.

- a. Please confirm whether "others" refers to cotton or any other commodities.
- b. If it refers to something other than only cotton, please specify the total value of cotton financed under ECGC Credit risk insurance program for 2019-20, and for 2020-21 in the 2021 ECQ.

**4.7 Indonesia****AG-IMS ID 102060: Question by United States of America**

The United States notes that Indonesia has not provided data updates of its export credit programmes in the required Export Competition Questionnaire (ECQ) for years 2019, 2020 and 2021.

Please provide these updates for years 2019, 2020 and 2021.

#### **4.8 Korea, Republic of**

##### **AG-IMS ID 102061: Question by United States of America**

The United States notes that the Republic of Korea, in responding to the Export Competition Questionnaire (ECQ), said, "There is no data as regards agricultural export value covered by export credit guarantees or export insurance programmes since they do not separately manage agricultural products from other exports."

Please explain what steps is the Republic of Korea taking to correct these information gaps and make this data available to Members of this Committee in the future as required by the Nairobi Decision on Export Competition ([WT/MIN\(15\)/45](#)).

#### **4.9 Thailand**

##### **AG-IMS ID 102062: Question by United States of America**

The United States notes that in the Export Competition Questionnaire response, Thailand did not provide a value figure for agricultural products listed in item 8 for both the Export Credit and Export Credit Insurance Programs for 2019 and 2020.

Also, Thailand did not provide a data update for 2021.

Please provide the value figure for the agricultural products listed in item 8 for both programmes for 2019 and 2020.

#### **4.10 Türkiye**

##### **AG-IMS ID 102063: Question by United States of America**

The United States notes that Türkiye in its 2020 and 2021 ECQs did not provide in item 8 a breakdown of products or product groups (e.g., agricultural products) and value figures exported under its short export credit insurance programme. Please provide the figures for programme use by product or product group in 2020 and 2021.

---