
**Position of the Canadian Egg, Dairy and Poultry Farmers on the Next Round of WTO
Negotiations in Agriculture**

Reference Manual¹

UPDATE December 2000

Many important events have occurred since the last update of the Reference Manual in August, 1999. The present document relates what has happened during the last year at the WTO and contains an update on the following issues:

1. **WTO Director-General**
2. **WTO Membership**
3. **AIE Process**
4. **Seattle Ministerial Meeting**
5. **WTO Negotiations on Agriculture**
6. **SPS: Precautionary Approach**
7. **Trade and Environment: Protocol on Biosafety**
8. **New Issues: Multifunctionality**
9. **Cairns Group**
10. **Country Specific Allocations**
11. **Updated and new tables on export competition – Chapter 6**
12. **Updated and new tables on– market access - Chapter 7**
13. **Updated and new tables on– domestic support - Chapter 8**
14. **Updated Annex M: CFA position**
15. **Updated Annex N: IFAP position**

1. WTO Director-General (Section 3.3, pages 3-4 of the manual)

The nomination of a successor to Renato Ruggiero former Director-General of the WTO, was solved in July 1999. Since it was not possible for Members to agree on one candidate for the five-year mandate, the Members agreed to separate the five-year term into two terms of three years each. Member Governments of the WTO agreed to appoint the Right Honourable Mike Moore of New Zealand as Director-General for a term of three years, beginning on September 1, 1999. Mr. Moore will be succeeded by Dr. Supachai Panitchpakdi of Thailand, who will serve a three-year term beginning September 1, 2002.

2. WTO Membership (Section 3.1, pages 3-1 and section 3.4, pages 3-8)

The number of WTO Members has increased from 134 to 141 since February 1999. The new Members are: Albania (8 September 2000), Croatia (30 November 2000), Estonia (13 November

¹ The SM5 Reference Manual was first released on March 23, 1999 at the time of Consensus 2000.

1999), Georgia (14 June 2000), Jordan (11 April 2000), Sultanate of Oman (9 November 2000) and Lithuania (8 December 2000). The complete list of Members can be found on the WTO website at <http://www.wto.org/>. Other accessions are expected in the coming months, including but not limited to the potential accession of China.

3. AIE Process (Section 5.1, page 5-1)

The Analysis and Information Exchange (AIE) process, undertaken in the framework of the WTO Committee on Agriculture, started in March 1997 and ended in September 1999. In total, 74 informal papers have been submitted by 36 countries (including 13 informal papers from 24 developing countries).

4. Seattle Ministerial Meeting and WTO Negotiations (Chapter 5, page 5-1 and following)

The next round of WTO trade negotiations was to be officially launched at the time of the Third Ministerial Conference, November 30 through December 3, 1999 in Seattle, U.S.A.

Unfortunately, the next round of negotiations was not launched at that meeting since WTO member countries could not agree on a draft declaration to launch the round.

Many reasons can explain the failure to launch the next round. First, the fact that some countries wanted to include specific provisions in the draft declaration while most of the WTO Members wanted a general statement to launch a round, showed there was great divergence of opinion on the approach to launch the next comprehensive round of negotiations. Some countries were perceived as trying to negotiate the outcome of the next round rather than the launching of the round.

The fact that the number of WTO Members increased significantly since the Uruguay Round also constitute an important element, rendering the negotiating process much more complex. Some member countries, particularly developing countries, felt excluded from the discussions and requested more access to both negotiating documents and negotiating rooms. In addition, the strong presence of protestors slowed down the beginning of the Ministerial Conference and clouded the atmosphere of the meeting.

It is important to note that the WTO Members were not far away from reaching an agreement on the agricultural section of the Declaration. It is fair to say, however, that such agreement was dependent upon the progress that could have been achieved in the other sectors. The Ministerial Conference having failed to launch the round has brought the agriculture negotiations back to square one. There is no indication that a new round will be launched soon and a new round is not likely to be launched before the next WTO Ministerial Meeting. The next Ministerial Conference has to take place at the latest in November 2001 given that the Ministers are required to meet at least once every two years. It remains premature to predict whether or not the next Ministerial Conference will finally launch the next comprehensive round of negotiations.

5. The WTO Negotiations on Agriculture

Article 20 of the Agreement on Agriculture provides for the start of negotiations on agriculture at the beginning of January 2000. Therefore, without the launch of a comprehensive round of negotiations, the WTO Committee on Agriculture (CoA) took the lead and at the March 23-24, 2000 meeting of the CoA, member countries agreed to undertake the mandatory agriculture negotiations through Special Sessions of the CoA; i.e. a process that would run in parallel with the normal activities² of the Committee.

The current negotiations on agriculture are scheduled to take place in three phases as per the following table:

WTO Negotiations on Agriculture	
Phase I	March 2000 - March 2001 Positioning: WTO member countries are invited to submit technical papers on various subjects or negotiating proposals.
Phase II	Beginning in March 2001 Proposals for the establishment of modalities for the negotiations will be submitted and discussed.
Phase III	Beginning in 2002 or later Phase III would normally be devoted to the submission of offers based on the agreed modalities (set of criteria according to which WTO member countries would finalise their offers regarding market access, domestic support, export subsidies, etc.)

After extensive discussions on the election of a Chairman for the Committee on Agriculture, it was agreed that Minister Suzuki from Japan would continue to chair the regular session of the Committee on Agriculture and that the Peruvian Ambassador, Mr. Jorge Voto-Bernales would become the Chairman for the special sessions of the WTO negotiations in agriculture. It was also agreed that the special sessions would be held following the regular meetings of the Committee on Agriculture.

5.1. Phase 1: Positioning of the WTO Member Countries

Phase I is well underway and the Special Session of the CoA has agreed on a timetable to conduct preparatory work leading to Phase II. According to this timetable, the WTO Members were invited to submit technical papers on various subjects or negotiating proposals at any of the three special sessions scheduled for June, September and November 2000. An additional session will be held on February 5-7, 2001.

² Normal activities of the Committee on Agriculture refer to the review of WTO member countries' notifications to the WTO on areas where commitments were made; i.e. domestic support, export competition and market access.

At the second, third and fourth meetings of the Special Session of the CoA, held respectively in Geneva in June, September and November 2000, a number of countries including Canada submitted proposals on various aspects of the agricultural negotiations. At this stage, these proposals must be seen as a positioning of the country with regard to the various questions at stake in this negotiation. The following tables briefly summarise the various proposals that were tabled before the WTO:

PROPOSALS SUBMITTED AT THE JUNE 2000 MEETING OF THE WTO COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE		
Country	Subject	Description
Cairns Group³	Export Subsidies⁴	Calls for the elimination and prohibition of all forms of export subsidies
Canada	Market Access⁵	Seeks recognition of different treatment for different tariffs
United States	Long Term Agricultural Reform⁶	Calls for a comprehensive package including significant improvement in market access, reduction of trade distorting domestic support and the elimination of export subsidies.
European Union	Blue Box and Other Support Measures⁷	The EU claims that given the considerable reduction in trade impact brought about by Blue Box policies, the concept of the blue box, like that of the Green Box , must be maintained.
	Food Quality and the Improvement of Market Access Opportunities⁸	The EU stresses that there is demand for products incorporating specific and identifiable characteristics, including traditional know-how and geographical origin, in order to ensure consumer protection and fair competition through regulation of labelling.
	Animal Welfare and Trade in Agriculture⁹	One objective of the EU is to ensure that trade does not undermine the EU efforts in improving the protection of the welfare of animals.

³ Australia, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Fiji, Guatemala, Indonesia, Malaysia, New Zealand, Paraguay, the Philippines, South Africa, Thailand and Uruguay

⁴ WTO document, reference number G/AG/NG/W/11

⁵ WTO document, reference number G/AG/NG/W/12

⁶ WTO document, reference number G/AG/NG/W/15

⁷ WTO document, reference number G/AG/NG/W/17

⁸ WTO document, reference number G/AG/NG/W/18

⁹ WTO document, reference number G/AG/NG/W/19

Cuba, Dominican Republic, Honduras, Pakistan, Haiti, Nicaragua, Kenya, Uganda, Zimbabwe, Sri Lanka and El Salvador	Special and Differential Treatment and a Development Box¹⁰	<p>Seeks recognition of the concept of Special and Differential Treatment (S&D) as a fundamental element of the multilateral trading system, acknowledging the fact that developing countries have very different economic, financial, technological and developmental circumstances as compared to developed countries.</p> <p>Recommends that a Development Box (providing developing countries with flexibility of import controls, tariff barriers and domestic supports) be created with policy instruments that encourage developing countries to maintain or increase their present domestic production capability of foods consumed domestically, as well as to protect the livelihoods of small farmers.</p>
	Green Box¹¹	<p>Argues that the Green Box has provided the legitimacy for higher rather than lower overall domestic support levels.</p> <p>Therefore calls for the creation of a single "General Subsidies" Box, allowing a common level of support to be allowed (e.g. 10 per cent of the value of the production)</p>

In addition to the above proposals, it should be noted that the United States presented a note on Domestic Support Reform (G/AG/NG/W/16).

¹⁰ WTO document, reference number G/AG/NG/W/13

¹¹ WTO document, reference number G/AG/NG/W/14

**PROPOSALS SUBMITTED AT THE SEPTEMBER 2000 MEETING
OF THE WTO COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE**

Country	Subject	Description
European Communities	Export Competition ¹²	The EU states it is willing to continue to negotiate further reduction in export subsidies provided that <u>all</u> forms of support to exports of agricultural food products are treated on a common footing (including export credits, abuse of food aid and state trading enterprises).
Cairns Group	Domestic Support ¹³	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Calls for major reductions in trade and production distorting domestic support based on a formula approach. The formula will include a substantial downpayment during the first year of the implementation. • A revision of the Green Box criteria. • Special and Differential Treatment in the area of domestic support to assist developing countries.
Cuba, Dominican Rep., El Salvador, Honduras, Kenya, India, Nigeria, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Uganda and Zimbabwe	Market Access ¹⁴	<p>After five years of implementation, the expected market accesses have not materialised for the developing countries, while there seems to have been more exports from developed countries into the markets of developing countries. Consequently this paper calls for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tariff peaks and escalation in developed countries to be eliminated. • The tariff schedules of developed countries to be made more transparent and less complex. • All tariffs to be converted to ad valorem. • The administration of TRQs by developed countries to be simplified and made more transparent and equitable for all trading partners. • Quotas to be based on specific products. • A mandatory filling of quotas in developed countries. • New suppliers from developing countries to have equal access to allotment within TRQs. • Dumping to be prohibited and developed countries to eliminate export subsidies of all forms.

The following additional documents were submitted at the September meeting.

- A discussion paper entitled "Export Subsidies-Food Security or Food Dependency" was submitted by the MERCOSUR countries and Chile, Bolivia and Costa Rica¹⁵.
- 24 countries submitted a note on Non-Trade Concerns¹⁶. The note includes various texts that were presented at the Conference on Non-Trade Concerns in Norway on July 1-4, 2000.

¹² WTO document, reference number G/AG/NG/W/34

¹³ WTO document, reference number G/AG/NG/W/35

¹⁴ WTO document, reference number G/AG/NG/W/37

¹⁵ WTO document, reference number G/AG/NG/W/38

¹⁶ WTO document, reference number G/AG/NG/W/36

**PROPOSALS SUBMITTED AT THE NOVEMBER 2000 MEETING
OF THE WTO COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE**

Country	Subject	Description
Cairns Group (Both Canada and Fiji refused to endorse this proposal)	Market Access¹⁷	<p>The proposal seeks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deep cuts to all tariffs using a formula approach. • Substantial increases in all tariff quota volumes. • Additional or strengthened rules and disciplines to ensure that tariff quota administration does not diminish the size and volume of market access opportunities. • Elimination of the special safeguard for agricultural products. • Continuation of the reform process during the WTO negotiations. • Special and differential treatment for developing countries.
Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Rep., Georgia, Hungary, Kyrgyz Rep., Latvia, Lithuania, Mongolia, Slovak Rep., and Slovenia	Domestic Support¹⁸	<p>Calls for the inclusion of a specific provision into the Agreement on Agriculture that would address the particular needs of Members who are in the difficult process of transforming to a fully-fledged market system or consolidating the significant changes in the agricultural sector.</p> <p>Such provision would exempt investment subsidies and input subsidies generally available to agriculture, interest subsidies to reduce the costs of financing, as well as grants to cover debt repayment from domestic support reduction commitments that would otherwise be applicable to such measures. It would also increase the <i>de minimis</i> threshold applicable to the transition economies. The provision could be invoked by individual countries only until the problems in the agricultural sector described above do persist.</p>
Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Rep., Estonia, Georgia, Hungary, Kyrgyz Rep., Latvia, Lithuania, Mongolia, Slovak Rep., and Slovenia	Market Access¹⁹	<p>It is proposed that a specific flexibility provision be included in any negotiating guidelines and modalities be agreed for the purpose of future tariff reductions and other market access commitments. Such a provision would, inter alia, exempt low tariffs from further reduction commitments for these countries, as well as would allow for selective reduction commitments.</p> <p>At the same time, these countries propose that any negotiating guidelines and modalities regarding future tariff reductions and other market access commitments address all non-tariff measures and practices that hinder imports and, through its effects, provide protection to domestic producers.</p>

¹⁷ WTO document, reference number G/AG/NG/W/54

¹⁸ WTO document, reference number G/AG/NG/W/56

¹⁹ WTO document, reference number G/AG/NG/W/57

**PROPOSALS SUBMITTED AT THE NOVEMBER 2000 MEETING
OF THE WTO COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE**

ASEAN ²⁰	Special and Differential Treatment for Developing Countries in World Agricultural Trade ²¹	<p>The document presents the essential elements of a meaningful manifestation and implementation of the Special and Differential Treatment for developing countries (covering export subsidies, domestic support and market access).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developed countries must immediately eliminate all forms of export subsidies. Developing countries must be able to continue using the existing flexibility with respect to export subsidies. • Developed countries must commit to a substantial downpayment of aggregate and specific support. • The Green Box criteria should be reviewed. • There should be an overall cap on the budget of developed countries allocated to Green Box measures. • The existing <i>de-minimis</i> must continue to be applied but only for developing countries. • The next round must result in the elimination of tariff disparities with developed countries committing to greater tariff reductions.
United States	Tariff Rate Quota Reform ²²	<p>Proposes to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop additional disciplines for TRQs that ensure that TRQ administration does not become a barrier to trade. The improved disciplines should be based on three following principles: 1) transparency, 2) non-restrictiveness and 3) reallocation. • Reduce in-quota duties based on the historical performance of TRQ fill rate (the lower the fill rate, the deeper the cut). • Members should cut tariffs using an approach that reduces disparities across countries and progressively increases TRQ quantities. • Members should agree to an automatic trigger mechanism to reduce in-quota duties when TRQ fill is low.

5.2. The Canadian Proposals

It is worth mentioning a few words on the proposals Canada tabled before the WTO during Phase I, either individually or jointly as part of the Cairns Group. Canada was associated to two proposals tabled in June. One was tabled individually on market access and the other was tabled

²⁰ Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Vietnam

²¹ WTO document, reference number G/AG/NG/W/55

²² WTO document, reference number G/AG/NG/W/58

jointly with the Cairns Group. Canada and the Cairns Group also tabled a proposal on domestic support at the November meeting of the special session of the CoA.

Regarding the Canadian proposal on market access, it must be pointed out that it constitutes an essential element of the Canadian position on the Next Round of WTO negotiations. Market access is regulated through two types of tariffs, including single-stage tariffs (often referred to as simple tariffs) and two-stage tariffs (often referred to as tariff rate quotas (TRQs)). The Canadian proposal insists on a different tariff treatment to be applied in the pursuit of the fundamental objective to achieve real and substantial improvement in access for all agricultural and food products. The Canadian proposal is innovative in the sense that not only does it call for different tariffs to be treated differently, but also it seeks that minimum access be offered when single-stage tariffs remain greater than a level to be determined through negotiations.

While the negotiations on market access promise to be one of the most divisive items on the agenda, the Canadian proposal offers an approach that is credible and that would result in meaningful minimum access. Furthermore, the Canadian approach, if agreed upon, would correct the inequalities that resulted from the Uruguay Round. The SM5 recognises and commends the Canadian strategy that sought, early in the negotiating process, recognition of different tariffs and a different treatment for these tariffs. Furthermore, the fact that Canada did not endorse the Cairns Group proposal is a sign that differences of opinion continue to exist on this critical aspect of the negotiations within the Cairns Group.

6. SPS: Precautionary Approach²³ (Section 9.1.1, page 9-3)

The debate on the precautionary principle/approach is becoming very important with regard to food safety as much as in environmental protection. The EU is trying to obtain an international recognition of the precautionary principle, which is usually used in environmental agreements, in the risk management on food safety. This issue is actually discussed in many fora such as the OECD, FAO (Codex), WHO, WTO, UN Protocol on Biosafety. The main concern with that concept is the danger of putting aside the science-based risk assessment. It is essential to ensure that this precautionary principle/approach will not be used inappropriately as protection of domestic market and as unjustified trade barriers.

Currently, in order to ensure that a product or a technology is safe for human health or the environment, risk assessments are based on science. Many agreements, such as the WTO SPS Agreement, include this science-based rule. Some countries, mostly the EU, find this rule too strict and would like to see other concerns such as ethical and social issues and animal welfare, recognised. The international community should carefully assess moving from a science-based system to a more flexible risk management approach based on ethic and social issues given that it could result in increased protectionism.

²³ It should be noted that a Canadian Official recommends that we use the expression “precautionary approach” instead of “precautionary principle” because a principle is a law, a rule of conduct that could apply to any agreement, while an approach is more a process, a manner to do things.

Although the expressions “precautionary principle/approach” are currently used, there is no international definition commonly agreed upon. Some forum, for example, the Codex Alimentarius, is trying to define this expression. It should be noted that Canada also does not currently have a clear definition of the precautionary principle/approach at the national level or the international level. The Canadian Government is working on the development of a Canadian position.

The fact that there is no commonly agreed upon definition of the precautionary principle/approach at the international level may cause some confusion and dispute. In some agreements the scope of the principle/approach is broader than in other agreements. When the relationship between those agreements is not clear there is a danger of conflict in using precautionary principle/approach.

It could be said, however, that the precautionary principle/approach is currently used to refuse any products considered risky for the human health or the environment, when scientific facts are insufficient or uncertain. The precautionary principle is characterised by some individuals (such as John Hathcok, U.S. Centre for Responsible Nutrition) as a political tool to be applied after the precautions of scientific are used.

There is a proliferation of fora where the precautionary approach is discussed, such as the OECD food safety working group and trade and environment committee, United Nations (UN Environment Program), NAFTA (Commission on Environment Cooperation) and WTO.

- In terms of the environment, the precautionary approach is found in the Montreal Protocol on Ozone, Convention on Climate Change, Rio Declaration (Principle 15), UN Convention on Biodiversity and Protocol on Biosafety (4 times: preamble, objective, art. 10.6 and 11.8).
- With regard to trade, the precautionary approach is found in the WTO SPS Agreement, Art.5.7 and the Fisheries Convention.

Existing uses of the Precautionary Approach or Principle

◆ Rio Declaration on Environment and Development

Principle 15 of the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development states that: “In order to protect the environment, the precautionary approach shall be widely applied by States according to their capabilities. Where there are threats of serious or irreversible damage, lack of full scientific certainty shall not be used as a reason for postponing cost-effective measures to prevent environmental degradation.”

◆ Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety

The Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety would allow countries to restrict imports, even if they do not have complete scientific proof that genetically modified crops may cause any harm to the environment.

The precautionary approach is mentioned 4 times in the Protocol²⁴. The preamble and Article 1 (objective) recognise Principle 15 of the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development. Articles 10 par. 6 and 11 par.8 state that: “Lack of scientific certainty due to insufficient relevant scientific information and knowledge regarding the extent of the potential adverse effects of a Living Modified Organism (LMO) on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity in the party of import, taking also into account risks to human health, shall not prevent that party from taking a decision, as appropriate, with regard to the import of the LMO (...), in order to avoid or minimise such potential adverse effects.”

It should be noted that the Protocol on Biosafety is an environmental agreement to protect biodiversity. The precautionary principle in this Protocol would not be used for food safety issues.

◆ WTO- Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures

Article 5, paragraph 7 of the SPS, entitled: Assessment of Risk and Determination of the Appropriate Level of Sanitary or Phytosanitary Protection, states that:

“In cases where relevant scientific evidence is insufficient, a Member may provisionally adopt sanitary or phytosanitary measures on the basis of available pertinent information, including that from the relevant international organizations as well as from sanitary or phytosanitary measures applied by other Members. In such circumstances, Members shall seek to obtain the additional information necessary for a more objective assessment of risk and review the sanitary or phytosanitary measure accordingly within a reasonable period of time.”

It is interesting to note the differences between the precautionary approach used in the Protocol on Biosafety, Principle 15 of the Rio Declaration, and Article 5.7 of the SPS Agreement. The precautionary approach in the Protocol on Biosafety is broader than the language on precaution in the SPS Agreement. Article 5.7 of the SPS Agreement only applies when evidence is “insufficient”, the measures must be provisional and there is a burden to develop new evidence in a “reasonable period of time”. The Rio Declaration Principle 15, used in the Protocol on Biosafety (also known as “the precautionary principle”) requires “full scientific certainty”, measures are not provisional, and there is no burden to develop new evidence.

Development of position

◆ EU Communication on Precautionary Principle

²⁴ It is interesting to note that the precautionary principle used to be included in the preamble of environmental agreements. However, in the Protocol on Biosafety, the precautionary principle is incorporated in the binding text of the agreement.

The EU considers that it has the right to establish the level of protection - particularly for the environment, human, animal and plant health - that it deems appropriate. The precautionary principle is a tool in the EU policy development.

In January 2000, the EU adopted a global position on food safety, called "White Paper on Food Safety". On February 2, 2000, the EU adopted a Communication on the use of the precautionary principle. The objective of the Communication was to inform all interested parties as to how the Commission intends to apply the principle. The Communication establishes guidelines for the application of the precautionary principle and provides input to the ongoing debate on the precautionary issue. The EU wants the guidelines to be a guard against unwarranted recourse to the precautionary principle as a disguised form of protectionism.

According to this Communication, the precautionary principle forms part of a structured approach to the analysis of risk, as well as being relevant to risk management. The precautionary principle covers cases where scientific evidence is insufficient, inconclusive or uncertain and preliminary scientific evaluation indicates that there are reasonable grounds for concern that the potentially dangerous effects on the environment, human, animal or plant health may be inconsistent with the high level of protection chosen by the EU.

A measure under the precautionary principle may be taken where an action is deemed necessary. The measure would be proportionate to the chosen level of protection, non-discriminatory in its application and consistent with similar measures already taken. The measure would also be based on an examination of the potential benefits and costs of action or lack of action and subject to review in the light of new scientific data. The measure would be maintained as long as the scientific data remain incomplete, imprecise or inclusive and as long as the risk is considered too high to be imposed on society.

◆ International Federation of Agricultural Producers (IFAP) Policy Statement

The IFAP is also working on a position on the precautionary principle. The issue was discussed at the May 2000 General Congress of IFAP. No policy was adopted at that meeting, and discussions are ongoing.

◆ Codex Alimentarius

The Codex Alimentarius Committee on General Principles is working on principles for risk analysis on food safety to be integrated in the Procedural Manual. The Committee has discussed the opportunity to include a reference to the precautionary principle in the framework of risk management. Since no consensus was reached at the last meeting, the section on the Risk Management was circulated for further comments and was discussed again at the meeting of April 10-14, 2000 in Paris. Since it was still impossible to agree on a text, further work will be done and a modified text will be presented in 2001.

The Committee is seeking comments on a definition of the precautionary principle or a statement of a precautionary approach and the conditions under which it would be applied. Here is the wording in the section on Risk Management:

“38. When risk assessors identify situations where scientific evidence is insufficient or where there is evidence to suggest that negative effects will occur but it is difficult to evaluate their nature and extent, it should be possible for risk managers to apply [a precautionary approach/ the precautionary principle] to protect the health of the consumer.”

Alternative wording “[In such situations it is possible to take measures intended to protect the health of the consumer without awaiting additional scientific data and a full risk assessment.]”

7. Trade and Environment: Protocol on Biosafety (Section 9.2, page9-4)

The relationship between trade and environment continues to be an important issue at the international level. Some environmental groups have requested an increase involvement of the WTO with regard to environment, while others favour multilateral environmental agreements. The recent adoption of the multilateral environmental agreement known as the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety raised some concerns regarding the relationship between multilateral environmental agreements and trade agreements.

On January 24-29, 2000, Montreal was the host of the Extraordinary Meeting of the Conference of the Parties for the adoption of a Protocol on Biosafety. In the early morning hours of January 29, the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety was adopted. Over 750 participants from 138 countries (governments, NGOs, industry organizations and the scientific community) attended the meeting in Montreal. It should be noted that the agreement is the result of many compromises and that consequently the text of the Protocol is often vague and ambiguous. The upcoming months and years will be devoted to clarifying many areas of the Protocol.

The Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety regulates the transboundary movement, transit, and handling and use of all Living Modified Organisms (LMOs) that may have adverse impacts on the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, also taking into account risks to human health²⁵. The Protocol would in fact allow countries to restrict imports of LMOs, even if they do not have complete scientific proof that genetically modified crops may cause any harm to the environment. The Protocol does not apply to the transboundary movement of LMOs that are pharmaceuticals for humans; neither does it apply to LMOs for transit or contained use.

The Protocol regulates the trade of LMOs, that may have adverse impacts on the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, through an exchange of information. The level of information required varies depending on the use of the LMO: 1) LMOs for intentional introduction into the environment; and 2) LMOs for direct use as food or feed, or for processing.

²⁵ It should be noted that, here it refers to the negative impact on human health of a bad environment and not to food safety.

The trade of LMOs that may have adverse impacts on the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity²⁶ and use for intentional introduction into the environment is ruled by Article 10. The Advance Informed Agreement (AIA) Procedure obliges the notification, in advance, of shipments on imports containing LMOs.

Since commodities could not be excluded from the scope of the Protocol, a simplified procedure (outlined in Article 11) is used for the first transboundary movement of LMOs for food, feed or processing and not intended for direct inclusion in the environment. The exchange of information is done through the newly created Biosafety Clearing-House. The decision to import LMOs for food, feed or processing is based on domestic standards of acceptability (Article 11.4).

The Protocol was opened for signature²⁷ at the fifth meeting of the Conference of the Parties which took place in Nairobi, Kenya, from May 15-26, 2000 and at the UN Headquarters in New York from June 5, 2000 to June 4, 2001. The Protocol would enter into force 90 days after the date of the deposit of the fiftieth instrument of ratification²⁸.

As of November 17, 2000, 79 countries had signed the Biosafety Protocol (Canada has not signed). The Canadian Government has not yet made the decision to sign the Biosafety Protocol. No decision will likely be made before the new Government is in place (i.e. not before 2001).

From August to September 2000, the Canadian Government held consultations on the Biosafety Protocol. The CFA and DFC participated in those consultations. Both DFC and the CFA are of the opinion that Canada should not sign the Protocol because the text is still too vague and ambiguous, particularly with regard to the definition of LMOs and the relationship with the WTO.

8. New Issues: Multifunctionality

Based on the Seattle experience, it is likely that, during the next round of negotiations, some WTO Members (such as EU, Norway, Switzerland, Japan and Korea) will insist upon the recognition of the right to support their agriculture based on the concept of the “multifunctionality of agriculture”. According to this concept, primary agriculture serves other functions than producing food and fibre (protection of the environment, food security, viability of rural areas, cultural heritage, tourism, etc.). Many papers on the multifunctional character of agriculture were presented in the AIE process last year.

The concept of multifunctionality is based on economical principles that are generally accepted by economists such as public good, and positive and negative externalities, or multi-output functions. However, these theoretical concepts have in many cases been diverted from their

²⁶ The AIA procedure shall not apply to the intentional transboundary movements of LMOs identified in a decision of the Conference of parties (of the Protocol) as being not likely to have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity. (Article 7.4)

²⁷ The signature process is the intention by government to ratify the Protocol and to live to its principles until ratification.

²⁸ The ratification process is the confirmation by a government that it has modified its national laws in order to respect the Protocol completely. The ratification by the Canadian Government can be done only after a consultation process with the Industry and the provinces, impact assessments and a bill passed by the Federal Parliament.

original meanings to justify massive government support to agriculture. OECD is currently preparing a document on multifunctionality that is expected to propose a clearer definition that would offer a more solid basis on which countries would be able to discuss.

The concept of multifunctionality in the debate of the WTO, rightly or wrongly, is related to the debate on “non-trade concerns.” Article 20 of the Agreement on Agriculture recognises that non-trade concerns should be taken into account in the continuation of the reform process. The Preamble of the Agreement on Agriculture identifies the need to protect the environment and the food security as non-trade concerns. The viability of rural areas is also generally recognised as a non-trade concern.

Currently, there is no internationally agreed definition of the term “multifunctionality”. This absence of a clear and universal definition has led to a multitude of definitions and confusions. Most of the WTO Members refused to use the term “multifunctionality” as a substitute for the expression “non-trade concerns.” Up until now, the only expression that has been used in the Agreement on Agriculture is the one of non-trade concerns and it has been used in a limited manner.

According to the European Union the role of agriculture is not only to produce agricultural goods at the lowest possible cost, but also to ensure safe and high quality goods, protect the environment, save finite resources, preserve rural landscapes and contribute to the socio-economic development of rural areas including the generation of employment opportunities.

According to Japan, the concrete contents of multifunctionality may vary with the history and national conditions of each country. Japan considers the following functions as the major elements:

- Land and water conservation (preventing floods, preventing soil erosion, and preventing landslides)
- Preservation of the natural environment (management of organic waste, resolution and removal of polluted substances, air purification, and maintenance of biodiversity and preservation of wildlife habit)
- Formation of scenic landscape
- Rural development (rural income and employment, and viable rural communities)
- Maintaining security
- Food security (elimination of hunger and assurance of the availability of food supply)
- Social functions (traditional country life, small farm structure, and cultural heritage)

The main concern regarding “multifunctionality” is that it might be used by some countries to justify government support and protectionism. Multifunctionality proponents claim that production-linked payments are necessary to obtain socially desired non-food benefits. These so-called non-food benefits are qualified as a public good, therefore justifying government intervention. It should be pointed out that the countries that are the strongest proponents of “multifunctionality” (such as EU, Norway, Switzerland, Japan and Korea) are usually the ones that have used their committed support to the maximum extent and have the least flexibility to add extra support.

Other countries, such as the United States and New Zealand, believe that it is possible to address the non-trade concerns within the existing Agreement on Agriculture through non-trade distorting policies in the green box.

The Canadian Federation on Agriculture adopted, in May 2000, a policy on multifunctionality that states:

“Recognizing that non-trade concerns shall be taken into account during the next round of negotiations, Canada should seek to:

- a) clarify the concepts of non-trade concerns and multifunctionality;
- b) minimize any trade distortions associated with the multifunctional character of agriculture; and
- c) ensure that any expenditures related to the financing of these concepts be made through the existing domestic support categories and be subject to a cap imposed on the total support based on a percentage of the total production.”

A similar policy was also endorsed by the SM-5 and is part of the revised SM-5 Joint Position on trade.

9. Cairns Group (Annex F-Glossary)

The Cairns Group, which was established in 1986, is now comprised of 18 Members. Bolivia, Costa Rica and Guatemala joined the Group at the 1999 Ministerial meeting in Seattle. The original members include Australia, Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Fiji, Indonesia, Malaysia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Thailand and Uruguay. Paraguay joined the Group at the 1997 Ministerial Meeting and South Africa joined at the 1998 Ministerial Meeting.

Cairns Group Farm Leaders

The “Cairns Group Farm Leaders” was only established in Sydney in 1998. It is a forum composed of farmers’ organizations from 18 country members of the Cairns Group. They are Australia, Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Canada, Fiji, Indonesia, Malaysia, New Zealand, Philippines, Paraguay, South Africa, Thailand and Uruguay. The Canadian Federation of Agriculture (CFA) represents Canada on this Group. The presence of the CFA on that group ensures a balance of views.

10. Country-Specific Allocations

10.1 Introduction

As a result of the Uruguay Round, tariff-rate quotas have been implemented by the WTO Members to replace the former non-tariff barriers. The tariff-rate quotas (TRQs) were implemented as a transparent means to provide minimum market access. Each WTO Member that has implemented TRQs has agreed to offer a minimum access to its domestic market for selected products. It could have been expected that this minimum access would be available to all WTO countries. Many WTO Members have, however, allocated a portion (or all) of their TRQs to specific countries. There is no rule in the Agreement on Agriculture preventing them to do so. The only provision that deals with country-specific allocation is Article XIII: 2d of the GATT 1947.

The country-specific allocation practice results in two major problems. First, it limits the minimum access to those countries that have not received privileged rights and second, this situation confers economic privileges to those countries that have received those rights over other WTO Members since they have guaranteed export market shares.

The SM5 believes that allocating TRQs to a number of specific countries goes against the WTO principle that aims at further liberalising trade. Indeed, these country-specific allocations impede on real access to the TRQs of some countries and this practice is harmful to trade. In order to achieve the objective of real market access, the SM5 advocates the elimination of country-specific allocations in the ongoing WTO negotiations on agriculture.

All the country-specific allocations that were granted by WTO Members can be found in Annex 1. The detailed country-specific allocations that were received by WTO members can be found in Annex2.

10.2 Country-specific allocations granted by WTO Members

As a result of the Uruguay Round, 14 WTO Members, out of the 37 that have implemented TRQs, decided to grant a portion, of the totality, of their TRQs to specific trading partners. This section takes a close look at those countries that have granted country-specific allocations. The following table presents, for 1999, the 14 countries that have granted country-specific allocations, the number of TRQs they have implemented as a result of the Uruguay Round, the number of their TRQs that have been allocated to specific countries²⁹ (through their schedules or notifications to the WTO), and the number of TRQs allocated to specific countries as a % of total TRQs. The same information is presented for the dairy sector.

In 1999, out of the 1,371 TRQs implemented by 37 WTO Members, 104 were allocated in part or in totality to specific countries, which represents 7.6% of all the TRQs implemented.

²⁹ It should be noted that the number of specific allocations is the number of TRQs that was allocated. This allocation could have been granted to more than one country and would still count for one specific allocation.

Country-specific allocations granted by WTO Members, 1999			
Member	TRQs Total	Number of specific allocations All sectors	% of TRQ allocated to specific countries
(A)	(B)	(C)	(C)/(B)=(D)
Barbados	36	1	2.8%
Bulgaria	73	4	5.5%
Canada	21	5	23.8%
Czech Rep.	24	4	16.7%
EC	87	18	21.2%
Israel	12	4	33.3%
Japan	20	1	5.0%
Mexico	11	9	81.8%
Norway	232	3	1.3%
Panama	19	1	5.3%
Slovak Rep.	24	8	33.3%
South Africa	53	3	5.7%
Switzerland	28	4	14.3%
US	54	39 ³⁰	72.2%
All countries	1,371	104	7.6%

Source: WTO Members schedules 1995 and notifications 1995-1999 to the WTO Secretariat.
Note: The Czech and Slovak Republics have not repeated 9 countries-specific allocations in their notifications for 1996 but in 1999 the Slovak Rep. has reallocated 4 TRQs for a total of 8.

10.3 Country-specific allocations received by WTO Members

The following table shows the number of country-specific allocations that were received by WTO Members.

It should be noted that more than 50% of the country-specific allocations received by Members have been made on dairy products. It could also be observed that few countries receive more than 10 country-specific allocations (schedule and notifications). They are Argentina, Australia, Canada, the EU, Hungary, New Zealand, Poland and the U.S. The major receivers of allocations on dairy products are Australia, Canada, the EU and New Zealand. In total (schedule and notifications), in the dairy sector, Australia received 11 specific allocations, Canada 6, the EU 12 and New Zealand 16.

³⁰ This number includes three allocations that are not mentioned in the U.S. Schedule and notifications but that are currently applied by U.S.

Number of country-specific allocations received by WTO Members, 1999					
Country Receiving Allocation	Allocation received in schedule Total	Allocation received in schedule Dairy	Allocation received in notifications Total	Allocation received in notifications Dairy	Total
ACP countries	1	0	1	0	2
Argentina	12	5	1	0	13
Australia	16	11	4	0	20
Austria	5	5	0	0	5
Barbados	0	0	1	0	1
Belgium	3	2	0	0	3
Benelux	0	0	1	0	1
Bosnie-Herz.	1	0	0	0	1
Brazil	2	0	2	0	4
Bulgaria	2	0	0	0	2
Canada	15	6	2	0	17
Caricom	1	0	0	0	1
Chile	4	2	0	0	4
China	3	0	0	0	3
Colombia	1	0	1	0	2
Costa Rica	4	2	1	0	5
Croatia	1	0	0	0	1
Czech Rep.	6	5	0	0	6
Cuba	0	0	1	0	1
Denmark	3	3	0	0	3
Dominican Rep.	1	0	1	0	2
El Salvador	0	0	1	0	1
Ecuador	0	0	2	0	2
EU	16	12	11	8	27
Finland	4	3	0	0	4
France	0	0	2	0	2
Germany	2	1	0	0	2
Greenland	1	0	0	0	1
Guatemala	1	0	1	0	2
Hungary	4	2	5	0	9
Iceland	3	2	0	0	3
India	3	0	1	0	4
Indonesia	1	0	0	0	1
Italy	0	0	3	0	3
Ireland	4	1	0	0	4
Israel	3	3	0	0	3
Jamaica	1	1	1	0	2
Japan	2	0	0	0	2
Macedonia	2	0	0	0	2
Malawi	1	0	1	0	2
Mexico	11	5	3	0	14
Netherlands	3	2	0	0	3
New Zealand	20	16	1	0	21
Nicaragua	1	0	1	0	2
Norway	3	3	0	0	3
Panama	0	0	2	0	2
Peru	0	0	1	0	1

Number of country-specific allocations received by WTO Members, 1999					
Country Receiving Allocation	Allocation received in schedule Total	Allocation received in schedule Dairy	Allocation received in notifications Total	Allocation received in notifications Dairy	Total
Philippines	1	0	1	0	2
Poland	6	3	2	0	8
Romania	3	1	0	0	3
Slovak Rep.	2	1	0	0	2
Slovenia	1	0	0	0	1
South Africa	0	0	1	0	1
Sweden	6	5	0	0	6
Switzerland	4	4	0	0	4
Thailand	2	0	3	0	5
UK	5	2	0	0	5
Uruguay	5	3	2	1	7
U.S.	11	2	6	0	17
Venezuela	0	0	2	0	2
Zimbabwe	1	0	1	0	2
Total	214	113	70	9	284

10.4 Conclusions

This analysis of country-specific allocation clearly shows that such a practice has had an impact on the real market access gains made during the Uruguay Round. In fact the study demonstrates that dairy is the sector most affected by the country-specific allocations. More than 50% of all country-specific allocations granted on TRQs were on dairy products. Market access in the dairy sector is therefore limited to a small number of players.

The privileges given to some WTO member countries to the detriment of all go against the WTO principles of trade liberalisation and non-discrimination against WTO Members. The elimination of this practice of specific allocation would render the minimum access available to all WTO Members, ensuring true competition exists for the minimum access commitments between countries. Moreover, it has been shown that specific allocation does not necessarily result in greater TRQ fill rates. In fact, country specific allocations are not linked to an obligation to export the allocated quantity.

It should be considered, during the upcoming negotiations, to reform the TRQ administration in order to ensure that the access be achievable and available to all WTO member countries. Rules in case of non-utilisation of TRQ allocations should also be considered.

11. Updated and new tables on export competition – Chapter 6

Chapter 6: Export subsidies

- Table 6.1 modified: Utilised subsidised exports as a % of permitted subsidised exports world total (volume basis), 1996 ,1997 and 1998 for the 25 WTO members that have reduction commitments.
- Table 6.3 modified: WTO restrictions on subsidised dairy, eggs and poultry exports, volume basis, 1995 and 2000, for the 25 WTO members that have reduction commitments.
- Table 6.4 modified: WTO restrictions on subsidised dairy, eggs and poultry exports, expenditures basis, 1995 and 2000, for the 25 WTO members that have reduction commitments.
- Table 6.5 modified: Percentage of the world subsidised exports, volume, 1997, for the 25 WTO members that have reduction commitments.

12. Updated and new tables on domestic support – Chapter 7

Chapter 7: Market access

- New table: Tariff rate quotas implemented by WTO Members for dairy, eggs and poultry.
- New tables on market access for selected countries on specific products (butter, cheese, skim milk powder, eggs, chicken, and turkey).
- Figures 7.2, 7.3, 7.4 and 7.5 updated: TRQs fill rates.
- Summary of DFC's study on country-specific allocations.

13. Updated and new tables on market access – Chapter 8

Chapter 8: Domestic support:

- Table 8.1 modified: Total aggregate measurement of support: committed and notified for 30 WTO Members with reduction commitments.
- Table 8.3 updated: Blue box expenditures measured against total value of production 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998.
- Table 8.4 updated: Green box expenditures measured against total value of production 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998 for the 30 WTO Members with reduction commitments.
- Table 8.5 modified: Total support measured against total value of production, 1997 for the 30 WTO Members with reduction commitments.
- Figure 8.1 updated: Internal Support as a % of committed AMS, 1997.
- Figure 8.2 updated: Total support, 1997.

14. Updated Annex M: CFA position

15. Updated Annex N: IFAP position

11. Updated and New Tables on Export Competition - Chapter 6

**Table 6.1 (Revised):
Utilized Subsidized Exports as a Percent of Permitted Subsidized Exports, (Volume Basis), 1995-1998**

Country	Butter				SMP				Cheese				Other Milk Products				Poultry Meat				Eggs and Egg Products			
	1995	1996	1997	1998	1995	1996	1997	1998	1995	1996	1997	1998	1995	1996	1997	1998	1995	1996	1997	1998	1995	1996	1997	1998
Australia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brazil	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bulgaria	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Canada	47	8	0	0	69	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cyprus	-	-	-	n.a.	-	-	-	-	n.a.	189	100	99	n.a.	0	0	0	n.a.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Czech Rep.	-	-	-	-	59	18	20	25	-	-	-	-	43	51	52	59	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
EU	30	59	37	38	72	84	57	74	99	99	84	62	98	100	102	91	96	99	105	99	75	56	90	104
Hungary	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	4	-	1	10	15	100	13	17	-	-	-	-
Iceland	-	-	-	n.a.	-	-	-	n.a.	-	-	-	n.a.	0	0	0	n.a.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Norway	61	35	36	28	-	-	-	-	82	86	102	122	74	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	75	99	117	89
Poland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Romania	0	0	0	n.a.	0	0	0	n.a.	-	-	-	n.a.	-	-	-	n.a.	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	n.a.
Slovakia	-	-	-	-	39	35	47	61	-	-	-	-	75	95	99	110	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
South Africa	6	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	219	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0
Switzerland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	86	82	82	80	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Turkey	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	37	100	0	68	78	100	0	97	60
Uruguay	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
U.S.A.	0	24	46	1	59	70	104	154	86	82	100	93	36	22	100	107	65	0	0	12	25	0	0	0
Venezuela	-	-	-	n.a.	-	-	-	n.a.	-	-	-	n.a.	0	0	0	n.a.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Source: WTO Members Schedules and notifications; Export Subsidies background paper (G/AG/NG/S/5).

"-": not applicable to the Member country

* 1997/98 annual commitment level for the Czech Republic combined commitments for cheese, butter and other dairy products into one volume.

n.a.: not available (no notification received from Member country)

Table 6.3 (Revised): WTO Restrictions on Subsidized Dairy, Eggs and Poultry Exports, Volume Basis (tonnes), 1995 and 2000

(Maximum Allowable Quantities, in '000 kgs unless otherwise specified)

Country	Butter		SMP		Cheese		Other Milk Products		Poultry		Eggs	
	1995/96	2000/01	1995/96	2000/01	1995/96	2000/01	1995/96	2000/01	1995/96	2000/01	1995/96	2000/01
Australia	63,706	38,828	106,308	67,636	71,997	49,880	19,989	13,056	-	-	-	-
Brazil	-	-	-	-	-	-	11,033	10,249	96,566	89,711	-	-
Bulgaria	-	-	-	-	6,240	5,060	-	-	7,680	6,230	670	550
Canada	9,464	3,500	54,910	44,953	12,448	9,076	36,990	30,282	-	-	-	-
Cyprus	-	-	-	-	986	916	296	275	493	458	-	-
Czech Rep.	-	-	81,700	66,900	-	-	76,700	62,800	27,800 **	22,800 **	**	**
EU	447,200	366,100	297,200	243,300	406,700	305,100	1,161,400	938,400	434,500	286,000	126,100	98,800
Hungary	-	-	-	-	1,930	2,000	-	-	136,000	111,000	-	-
Iceland	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.86 mil litres	3.16 mil litres	-	-	-	-
Norway	7,174	5,873	22,979	16,208	123	24	-	-	27	22	1,927	1,578
Poland	-	-	45,200	37,000	-	-	-	-	16	13	-	-
Romania	16,600	15,600	-	-	12,700	12,000	-	-	31,900	30,000	1.35 mil.pcs	1.27 mil.pcs
Slovakia	-	-	18,300	15,000	-	-	8,700	7,100	13,500 **	11,000 **	**	**
South Africa	1,168	956	4,144	3,392	281	230	444	363	1,597	1,307	2,443	2,000
Switzerland	-	-	-	-	-	-	75,931	62,161	-	-	-	-
Turkey	165	153	-	-	3,020	2,806	-	-	2,384	2,215	53,522	49,722
Uruguay	2,116	1,966	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
U.S.	42,989	21,097	108,227	68,201	3,829	3,030	12,456	34	34,196	27,994	30,262	6,920
Venezuela	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-

Source: WTO Members Schedules.

"-": not applicable to the Member country

** : egg commitments are combined with poultry commitments

Table 6.4 (Revised): WTO Restrictions on Subsidized Dairy, Poultry and Egg Exports, Expenditure Basis ('000 \$US), 1995 and 2000

Country	Butter		SMP		Cheese		Other Milk Products		Poultry		Eggs	
	1995	2000	1995	2000	1995	2000	1995	2000	1995/96	2000/01	1995/96	2000/01
Australia	18,083	7,540	28,515	12,486	22,888	11,415	31,080	14,697	-	-	-	-
Brazil	-	-	-	-	-	-	164	143	4,805	4,214	-	-
Bulgaria	-	-	-	-	9,629	2,298	-	-	16,031	11,023	241	164
Canada	28,332	7,187	33,343	20,304	21,028	10,578	24,090	14,670	-	-	-	-
Cyprus	-	-	-	-	187	116	62	39	442	388	-	-
Czech Rep.	-	-	66,575	31,034	-	-	68,387	31,881	8,571	5,836	**	**
EU	1,801,692	816,884	525,715	237,705	768,900	294,502	1,326,194	601,329	117,473	78,172	52,316	37,664
Hungary	-	-	-	-	-	-	332	101	17	11	-	-
Iceland	-	-	-	-	-	-	59	30	-	-	-	-
Norway	12,356	5,757	-	-	84,944	26,597	695	3	76	51	2,738	1,861
Poland	-	-	8,203	5,600	-	-	12,204	8,300	14	10	-	-
Romania	47	6	-	-	8	1	-	-	9	8	10	10
Slovakia	-	-	12,521	5,370	-	-	11,243	4,822	3,355	2,284	**	**
South Africa	146	48	770	252	37	12	62	20	111	76	464	316
Switzerland	-	-	-	-	-	-	353,629	160,744	-	-	-	-
Turkey	54	47	-	-	452	396	22	19	498	437	371	289
Uruguay	210	184	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
U.S.	44,809	30,497	121,164	82,464	5,342	3,636	14,379	21	21,377	14,555	7,588	1,604
Venezuela	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	3	-	-	-	-

Source: WTO Member Schedules. Exchange rates as at November 03, 2000.

"-": not applicable to the Member country

** : egg commitments are combined with poultry commitments

Table 6.5 (Revised): Percentage of World Subsidized Exports, (Volume Basis), 1995-1998

Country	Butter				SMP				Cheese				Other Milk Products				Poultry Meat				Eggs and Egg Products			
	1995	1996	1997	1998	1995	1996	1997	1998	1995	1996	1997	1998	1995	1996	1997	1998	1995	1996	1997	1998	1995	1996	1997	1998
Australia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brazil	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bulgaria	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Canada	3	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cyprus	-	-	-	n.a.	-	-	-	n.a.	0	0	0	n.a.	0	0	0	n.a.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Czech Rep.	-	-	-	-	12	4	5	5	-	-	-	-	3	3	3	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
EU	94	96	90	99	61	75	60	58	94	95	93	90	91	91	91	90	90	97	96	93	98	97	98	98
Hungary	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	0	0	4	3	4	5	-	-	-	-
Iceland	-	-	-	n.a.	-	-	-	n.a.	-	-	-	n.a.	0	0	0	n.a.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Norway	3	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	4	4	6	9	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	1	3	2	1
Poland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Romania	0	0	0	n.a.	0	0	0	n.a.	-	-	-	n.a.	-	-	-	n.a.	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	n.a.
Slovakia	-	-	-	-	2	2	3	3	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
South Africa	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	1	0	0	0
Switzerland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	5	5	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Turkey	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	n.a.	n.a.
Uruguay	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
U.S.	0	3	8	0	16	19	33	34	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	5	0	0	1	5	0	0	0
Venezuela	-	-	-	n.a.	-	-	-	n.a.	-	-	-	n.a.	0	0	0	n.a.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ALL COUNTRIES	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Source: WTO Members Schedules and notifications; Export Subsidies background paper (G/AG/NG/S/5).

"-": not applicable to the Member country

* 1997/98 annual commitment level for the Czech Republic combined commitments for cheese, butter and other dairy products into one volume.

n.a.: not available (no notification received from Member country)

12. Updated and New Tables on Market Access - Chapter 7

7.10 (New Table): Tariff Rate Quotas Implemented on Dairy Products, by WTO Member

Member	TRQs Total	TRQs Dairy	% of Total TRQs	Dairy Products under TRQs						
				Product	Tariff Line	Quantity 2000 (tonnes)				
(A)	(B)	(C)	(C)/(B)							
Australia	2	1	50%	Cheese	0406.10.00	11,500				
Barbados	36	2	6%	Milk and cream	401	468				
				Milk and cream	402	468				
Brazil	2	0	0%							
Bulgaria	73	6	8%	Milk and cream	0402.10.00	200				
				Yogurt	0403.10.00	300				
				Whey	0404.10.10, 0404.10.90	200				
				Butter	405	1,500				
				Fresh cheese	0406.10.00	3,000				
				Other cheeses	0406.90.90	400				
Canada	21	11	52%	Fluid milk	0401.10.10, 0401.20.10	64,500				
				Cream	0401.30.10	394				
				Concentrated /condensed milk	0402.91.10, 0402.99.10	12				
				Yogurt	0403.10.10	332				
				Powdered Buttermilk	0403.90.11	908				
				Dry Whey	0404.10.21	3,198				
				Other products of milk constituents	0404.90.10	4,345				
				Butter	0405.00.11, 0405.00.91	3,274				
				Cheese	406	20,412				
				Other dairy	1901.90.33	70				
				Ice cream	2105.00.91	484				
				Colombia	67	5	7%	Milk and cream	401	24 (2004)
								Milk and cream	402	4,529
Whey	404	771								
Butter	405	122								
Cheese	406	90								
Costa Rica	29	13	45%					Milk and cream	401	405 (2004)
Czech Rep.	24	4	17%	Milk and cream	402	344				
				Milk and cream	402	1,125				
				Evaporated milk	0402.91.10	1,125				
				Condensed milk	0402.99.10	2,563				
				Whey	403	50				
				Butter	404	253				
				Butteroil	405	45				
				Cheeses	406	375				
				Cheeses	0406.20.10	55				
				Cheeses	0406.20.90	50				
				Cheeses	0406.40.00	1				
				Cheeses	0406.90.00	50				
				Ice cream	2105	725				
Ecuador	15	1	6.60%	Milk in powder	0402.10.00,21,29	1,250				
				Milk and cream	401	23,749 (2004)				
				Milk and cream	0402...	903				
				Butteroil	403	55				
El Salvador	11	4	36%	Cheese	406	786				
				EU	85	12	14%	Butter	405	76,667
				Butter	0405.00.10, 0405.00.90	10,000				
				Skimmed milk powder	0402.10.19	68,000				
EU				Cheese for processing	0406.90.11, 0406.90.01	4,500				
				Cheese for processing	0406.90.01	20,000				
				Whole Cheddar	0406.90.21	10,250				
				Cheddar	0406.90.21	15,000				
				Aged Cheddar	0406.90.21	4,000				
				Emmentaler	0406.30.10, 0406.90.13	18,400				
				Gruyere	0406.30.10, 0406.90.15	5,200				
				Fresh cheese	0406.10.20, 0406.10.80	5,300				
				Other cheeses	0406.10.20	19,500				
				Guatemala	22	1	5%	Milk and cream	0401-0406	17,890 (2004)
				Hungary	70	4	6%	Milk and cream	4,010,402	181,015
								Sour cream/yogurt	403	252
								Butter	405	178
Cheese	406	1,206								
Iceland	90	4	4%	Butter	405	53				
				Cheese	406	119				
				Cheese	1905	2				
				Casein	3501.9	13				
Indonesia	2	1	50%	Milk and cream	402	414,700				
Israel	12	4	33%	Milk and cream	402.1	1,200				
				Milk and cream	402.2	100				
				Processed cheese	406.3	68				
				Other cheeses	406.9	1,080				
Israel	12	4	33%	Milk and cream	402.1	1,200				
				Milk and cream	402.2	100				
				Processed cheese	406.3	68				
				Other cheeses	406.9	1,080				
Japan	20	12	60%	Skimmed milk powder (for school)	0402.10, 0402.21	7,264				
				Skimmed milk powder (other)	0402.10, 0402.21...	85,878				
				Milk powder	0402.91.12, 0402.91.21	0.3				
				Evaporated milk	402.99	1,585				
				Condensed milk	0404.10.13....	13				
				Whey	0404.10.14...	45,000				
				Whey for infant formula	0405.10.12...	25,000				
				Butter and butteroil	0404.10.12...	1,873				
				Mineral concentrated whey	2106.90.12, 22.106.90.12	14,000				
				Prepare edible fat	0401.10.11..	18,977				
				Other dairy products	0402.10.11	133,940				
				Designated dairy products		137,202				
				Korea	67	5	7%	Skim milk powder	0402.10.1010...	850
Whole milk powder	0402.21.1000....	471								
Other milk/cream	0402.91.1000...	107								
Whey powder	0404.10.1000, 0404.10.9000	40,352								
Butter	0405.10.0000, 0405.90.00	344								
Malaysia	19	2	11%	Milk and cream	0401.10.92...	822,222 (litres)				
				Milk and cream	0401.30.2920	123,333 (kg)				
Mexico	11	2	18%	Milk powder	0402.10.01...	120,000				
				Cheese	0406.10.01...	9,385				

7.10 (New Table): Tariff Rate Quotas Implemented on Dairy Products, by WTO Member

Member (A)	TRQs Total (B)	TRQs Dairy (C)	% of Total TRQs (C)/(B)	Dairy Products under TRQs		
				Product	Tariff Line	Quantity 2000 (tonnes)
Morocco	16	1	6%	Milk	0401, 0402	31,711
New Zealand	3	0	0%			
Nicaragua	9	1	11%	Milk	0401, 0402, 0403	11.26 (mil litres)
Norway	232	14	6%	Milk and cream	401.1	1
				Milk and cream	401.2	8
				Milk and cream	401.3	4
				Milk and cream	402.1	241
				Milk and cream	402.21	7
				Milk and cream	402.29	3
				Milk and cream	402.91	11
				Milk and cream	402.99	6
				Buttermilk	0403.90.09	3
				Whey	404.1	221
				Other whey	404.9	47
				Butter	405	575
				Butter	405	47
				Cheese	406	2,494
Panama	19	11	58%	Milk and cream	0401.10.00	1,500
				Milk and cream	0401.20.10	181
				Milk and cream	0401.20.90	1,897
				Milk and cream	0402.10.20, 0402.10.91	1,282
				Milk and cream	0402.21.90, 0402.29.90	2,547
				Milk and cream	0402.91.91, 0402.91.92	849
				Milk and cream	0402.99.91, 0402.99.92	34
				Powdered Buttermilk	0403.90.13, 0406.90.11	3,326
				Powdered Buttermilk	0403.90.90, 0403.90.10	230
				Fresh cheese	0406.10.90	53
				Processed cheese	0406.30.00	174
Philippines	14	0	0%			
Poland	109	8	7%	Milk and cream	401	16,700
				Milk and cream	402	5,000
				Buttermilk/yogurt	403	850
				Whey	404	18,100
				Ice cream	2105	850
				Casein	3501	3,300
				Butter	405	16,900
				Cheese	406	5,000
Romania	12	3	25%	Powder milk	402.1	900 (2004)
				Cheese	406	2,600
				Ice cream	2105	700
Slovak Rep.	24	4	17%	Milk and cream	0402.10...	815
				Yogurt	403.1	2,374
				Butter	405	1,014
				Ice cream	2105.11	307
Slovenia	20	2	10%	Whole milk powder	402.21	100
				Butter	405	100
South Africa	53	6	11%	Milk and cream fresh	401	53,657
				Milk powder	402	4,470
				Buttermilk and yogurt	403	213
				Whey	404	2,786
				Butter	405	1,167
				Cheese	406	1,989
Switzerland	28	2	7%	Dairy products (in milk equivalent)	0401-0406	527,000
				Casein	3501.10, 3501.90	697
Thailand	23	2	9%	Milk and cream	0401, 2202.90	2,349
				Milk and cream	0402.10.0007	50,556
Tunisia	13	3	23%	Milk powder	402	20,000
				Butter	405	4,000
				Cheese	406	1,500
US	54	24	44%	Milk and Cream	0401.30.05, 0403.90.04	6,694,840 (litres)
				Milk and Cream	0401.30.05, 0403.90.04	437,000 (litres)
				Butter	0405.00.20...	6,977
				Butter	0405.00.20...	51
				Skim milk powder	0402.10.10, 0402.21.05	5,261
				Skim milk powder	0402.10.10, 0402.21.05...	504
				Dried milk/cream	0402.21.30, 0403.90.51	3,321
				Dried milk/cream	0402.21.75, 0403.90.61	100
				Dairy products	0402.29.10...	4,105
				Dairy products	0402.29.10...	923
				Evaporated/condensed milk	0402.91.10...	6,857
				Dried milk/cream/whey	0403.90.41, 0404.10.50	296
				Butter substitute	0405.00.60	6,080
				Cheese	406	6,626
				Cheese /substitutes	0406.10.04...	45,703
				Blue cheese	0406.10.14...	2,911
				Cheddar	0406.10.24...	14,406
				American type cheese	0406.10.34...	3,523
				Edam and Gouda	0406.10.44...	7,992
				Italian type cheese	0406.10.54...	12,558
				Swiss / Emmentaler	0406.10.64...	34,325
				Gruyere	0406.90.46...	7,855
				Lowfat cheese	0406.10.74...	5,725
				Ice cream	2105.00.10.	5,668 (litres)
Venezuela	61	6	10%	Milk and cream	401	15,081
				Milk in powder	402.1	119
				Whole milk	402.21	75,053
				Whey	404	1,745
				Butter	405	2,015
				Cheese	406	3,031
All countries (36)	1,370	183	13%			

7.11 (New Table): Tariff Rate Quotas Implemented on Eggs, by WTO Member

Member	TRQs Total	TRQs Eggs	% of Total TRQs	Egg Products under TRQs		
				Product	Tariff Line	Quantity 2000
Barbados	36	1	3%	Birds' eggs in shell, fresh excluding hatching eggs	Ex 0407	77990 kgs (for 2004)
Canada	21	1	5%	Shell eggs, not for hatching Egg yolks dried Egg yolks frozen Whole eggs dried Whole eggs frozen Egg albumin dried Egg albumin other	0407.00.18 & 0407.00.19 0408.11.10 & 0408.11.20 0408.19.10 & 0408.19.20 0408.91.10 & 0408.91.20 0408.99.10 & 0408.99.20 3502.11.10 & 3502.11.12 3502.19.10 & 3502.19.11	21,370,000 dozen
Costa Rica	27	1	4%	Poultry eggs for consumption Whole egg and egg yolk Albumin	0407.00.90 0408.00.00 3502.00.00	938.83 tonnes
European Union	87	3	3.45%	Poultry eggs for human consumption Egg yolks dried Egg yolk liquid Egg yolk other Whole dried Whole other Egg albumin dried Egg albumin other	407.00.30 0408.11.80 0408.19.81 0408.19.89 0408.91.80 0408.99.80 3502.11.90 3502.19.90	135 tonnes 7 tonnes 15.5 tonnes
Hungary	70	1	1.43%	Eggs for consumption Dried whole and egg yolk Egg albumin	0407.00N/A050 0408.11. 3502.1	8 tonnes
Iceland	90	1	1.11%	Bird's eggs, in shell, preserved or cooked Egg yolk & whole egg dried	0407.00.00 0408.11.00 & 0408.91.00	76 tonnes
Korea	67	1	1%	Poultry eggs for consumption Egg yolk Egg albumin Whole egg, dried Whole egg, other	0407.00.111 0408.11 & 0408.19 3502 0408.90. 0408.99.	19515.8 tonnes
Malaysia	19	1	5.26%	Poultry eggs for consumption Whole egg and egg yolk Egg albumin	0407.00.111 0408.00.00 3502.00.00	78,500,000 dozen
Norway	232	1	0.43%	Hen eggs Egg yolks dried Egg yolks other Whole egg dried Whole egg other Egg albumin	0407.00.10 0408.11.00 0408.19.00 0408.91.00 0408.19.00 3502.10.10	523 tonnes
Poland	109	2	1.83%	Birds' eggs in shell, preserved or cooked Whole egg and egg yolk, other Albumin Whole egg and egg yolk, dried	0407.00.00 0408.00.00 3502.00.00 0408.11 & 0408.19	4 million pieces 50 tonnes
South Africa	53	1	1.89%	Bird's eggs in shell (fresh, preserved, or cooked) Egg yolks	0407.00.00 0408.00.00	9000 tonnes brut
Switzerland	28	2	7.14%	Eggs for consumption Egg yolk dried Egg yolk other Other dried Other, not dried Egg albumin dried Egg albumin other	0407.00.00 0408.11.00 0408.19.00 0408.91.00 0408.99.00 3502.10.00 3502.10.00	33.735 tonnes brut 977 tonnes brut

Source: WTO Schedules and Notifications.

Figure 7.2 (Updated)




Figure 7.3 Updated




Figure 7.4 (Updated)





Figure 7.5 (Updated)



7.12.a (New Table): Market Access in Selected Countries, Butter

	Canada	U.S.	EU	Mexico	Brazil	Egypt	Poland	Australia	Japan	India
Tariff-rate quota, 2000 (tonnes)	3,274	6,977	86,667	None	None	None	16,900	None	1,873	None
In-quota tariffs, 2000	Cdn\$114/tonne (US\$74/tonne) ¹	US\$120/tonne	870 Ecus/tonne (US\$750/tonne) ¹	-	-	-	40%	-	35%	-
Over-quota tariffs (tariff equivalents), 2000	298.7% but not less than Cdn\$4,710/tonne (US\$3,070/tonne) ¹	US\$1,540/tonne	1,900 Ecus/tonne (US\$1638/tonne)	-	-	-	102% but not more than 2,313 Ecus/tonne (US\$1,938/tonne)	-	29.8% + 985,000 yen/tonne	-
TRQ fill rate - 1998	100%	99%	100%	-	-	-	-	-	20%	-
Allocation to specific countries	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	-	-	None	-	None	-
Ordinary tariffs, 2000	-	-	-	37.50% (2004)	55% (2004)	5-15% (2004)	-	1%	-	40% (2004)
TRQ as a % of average 1986-88 consumption	3.30%	1.40%	4.80%	-	-	-	5%	-	2%	-
Imports - 1998, from all countries (tonnes)	3,274	30,000	84,000	25,000	10,000	29,000	1,000	6,000	1,000	4,000

7.12.b (New Table): Market Access in Selected Countries, Cheese

	Canada	U.S.	EU	Mexico	Brazil	Egypt	Poland	Australia	Japan	India	Venezuela
Tariff-rate quota, 2000 (tonnes)	20,412	140,500	102,150	9,385 (2004)	None	None	5,000	11,500	None	None	3,686 (2004)
In-quota tariffs ¹ , 2000	Cdn\$77/tonne (US\$52/tonne) ³ except cheddar \$28/tonne (US\$19/tonne)	6-25%	130 -1,060 Ecus/tonne (US\$112 - US\$914/tonne)	50%	-	-	35%	A\$96/tonne (US\$50/tonne)	-	-	40%
Over-quota tariffs ¹ (tariff equivalents), 2000	245.7 %/tonne but not less than Cdn\$3,527 - Cdn\$5,784/tonne (US\$2,363 - US\$3,875/tonne)	US\$1,227 - US\$1,877/tonne	1,409 -1,671 Ecus/tonne (US\$1,214- \$1,440/tonne)	37.5% - 45% - US\$1,044/tonne but not less than 125.1%	-	-	160%	A\$1,220/tonne (US\$641/tonne) Stilton, Goatmilk and	-	-	98% (2004)
TRQ fill rate - 1998	100%	77%	89%	n.a.	-	-	n.a.	91%	-	-	19% 2
Allocation to specific countries	Yes	Yes	Yes	None	-	-	None	None	-	-	None
Ordinary tariffs, 2000	-	-	-	-	35-55% (2004)	20-30% (2004)	-	-	22.4-40%	40%	-
TRQ as a % of average 1986-88 consumption	8.20%	5.40%	2.60%	4.20%	-	-	3.90%	9%	-	-	4.50%
Imports - 1998, from all countries (tonnes)	23,242	156,000	122	28,000	24,000	14,000	2,000	31,000	184,000	n	5,000

7.12.c (New Table): Market Access in Selected Countries, Skim Milk Powder

	Canada	U.S.	EU	Mexico	Brazil	Poland	Australia	Japan	India	Venezuela
Tariff-rate quota, 2000 (tonnes)	0	5,261	68,000	120,000 2 (2004)	None	None	None	93,142	n.a.	145 (2004)
In-quota tariffs ¹ , 2000	Cdn\$33.20/tonne (US\$22/tonne) 5	US\$30/tonne	480 Ecus/tonne (US\$414/tonne)	0%	-	-	-	0-35%	-	40%
Over-quota tariffs ¹ (tariff equivalents), 2000	201.6% but not less than Cdn\$2,006/tonne (US\$1,344/tonne)	US\$870/tonne	1,190 Ecus/tonne (US\$1026/tonne)	US\$1,044/tonne but not less than 125.1% (2004)	-	-	-	21.3 -29.8% + 396,000 yen /tonne (US\$3,499/tonne)	-	100%
TRQ fill rate - 1998	-	84%	98%	-	-	-	-	45%	-	100% 4
Allocation to specific countries	Yes	Yes	None	Yes	-	-	-	None	-	None
Ordinary tariffs, 2000	-	-	-	-	31.5-55% (2004)	-	1%	-	0%	(2004)
TRQ as a % of average 1986-88 consumption	0.00%	1.50%	4.80%	-	-	-	-	34%	-	0%
Imports - 1998, from all countries (tonnes)	0	5,000	77,000	93,000	42,000	6,000	3,000	57,000	1,000	0

- : not applicable to the Member country

n.a. : not available (no notification yet received from Member country)

¹ exchange rate as of November 03, 2000.

Source: WTO, Member Country Schedules and Notifications

13. Updated and New Tables on Domestic Support

Table 8.1 (Revised): Total Aggregate Measure of Support: Committed and Notified

Member	Base Period 1986-1988	Committed AMS 2000	Year	Committed AMS	Notified AMS	Notified AMS as a % of Committed AMS
Argentina US\$ million	92	84	1995	91	122.8	143%
			1996	89	84.1	100%
			1997	88	n.a.	n.a.
			1998	87	n.a.	n.a.
Australia Australian dollar million	590	472	1995	570	152	27%
			1996	551	144	26%
			1997	531	132	25%
			1998	511	120	23%
Brazil US \$ million	1,053	969	1995	1,039	0	0%
			1996	1,025	0	0%
			1997	1,011	0	0%
			1998	996	n.a.	n.a.
Bulgaria ¹⁰ ECU million	2,513	520	1995	-	-	-
			1996	650	n.a.	n.a.
			1997	635	n.a.	n.a.
			1998	520	n.a.	n.a.
Canada Canadian dollar Million	5,376	4,301	1995	5,197	777	15%
			1996	5,017	619	12%
			1997	4,838	n.a.	n.a.
			1998	4,659	n.a.	n.a.
Colombia US \$ million	398	366	1995	392	58	15%
			1996	387	4	1%
			1997	382	14	4%
			1998	376	n.a.	n.a.
Costa Rica ¹¹ US \$ million	18	17	1995	18	n.a.	n.a.
			1996	18	n.a.	n.a.
			1997	18	n.a.	n.a.
			1998	17	n.a.	n.a.
Cyprus Cyprus Pound million	58	54	1995	58	37	63%
			1996	57	36	63%
			1997	56	26	45%
			1998	55	22	39%
Czech Republic Czech Koruna million	17,014	13,611	1995	16,447	1,152	7%
			1996	15,880	1,689	11%
			1997	15,313	1,054	7%
			1998	14,746	1,013	7%
EU ECU Million	80,975	67,159	1995	78,672	47,526	60%
			1996	76,369	51,009	67%
			1997	74,067	50,194	68%
			1998	71,760	n.a.	n.a.
Hungary Hungary Forint million	42,260	33,808	1995	40,851	20,949	51%
			1996	39,443	n.a.	n.a.
			1997	38,034	n.a.	n.a.
			1998	36,625	n.a.	n.a.
Iceland million SDR	163	130	1995	157	103	66%
			1996	152	108	71%
			1997	146	109	74%
			1998	141	119	84%
Israel US\$ million	654	603	1995	645	461	71%
			1996	637	501	79%
			1997	628	524	83%
			1998	620	n.a.	n.a.
Japan Yen billion	4,966	3,973	1995	4,801	3,508	73%
			1996	4,635	3,330	72%
			1997	4,470	3,171	71%
			1998	4,304	n.a.	n.a.

"-": not applicable

n.a.: not available (no notification yet received from Member country)

Source: WTO, Country Notifications

Table 8.1 (Revised): Total Aggregate Measure of Support: Committed and Notified

Member	Base Period 1986-1988	Committed AMS 2000	Year	Committed AMS	Notified AMS	Notified AMS as a % of Committed AMS
Jordan	N/A	N/A	1995	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
			1996	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
			1997	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
			1998	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Korea Won billion	2,719	1,798	1995	2,183	2,075	95%
			1996	2,106	1,967	93%
			1997	2,029	1,937	95%
			1998	1,952	1,563	80%
Mexico Pesos million	29,007	26,699	1995	28,622	1,365	5%
			1996	28,238	n.a.	n.a.
			1997	27,853	n.a.	n.a.
			1998	27,469	n.a.	n.a.
Morocco DHs million	790	727	1995	779	94	12%
			1996	769	250	33%
			1997	758	91	12%
			1998	748	126	17%
New Zealand NZ dollars million	360	288	1995	348	0	0%
			1996	337	0	0%
			1997	324	0	0%
			1998	312	0	0%
Norway Norway Kroner million	14,311	11,449	1995	13,834	9,786	71%
			1996	13,357	10,529	79%
			1997	12,880	10,526	82%
			1998	12,403	10,886	88%
Papua New Guinea US \$ million	39	36	1995	38	n.a.	n.a.
			1996	38	n.a.	n.a.
			1997	38	n.a.	n.a.
			1998	37	n.a.	n.a.
Poland US \$ million	4,160	3,329	1995	4,022	255	6%
			1996	3,883	227	6%
			1997	3,745	296	8%
			1998	3,606	301	8%
Slovak Republic Koruna million	12,675	10,140	1995	12,253	7,111	58%
			1996	11,830	6,982	59%
			1997	11,408	8,290	73%
			1998	10,985	7,727	70%
Slovenia ECU million	77	62	1995	75	70	94%
			1996	72	69	96%
			1997	70	70	99%
			1998	67	66	98%
South Africa Rand million	2,519	2,015	1995	2,435	1,640	67%
			1996	2,351	1,938	82%
			1997	2,267	2,198	97%
			1998	2,183	n.a.	n.a.
Switzerland Swiss Francs million	5,321	4,257	1995	5,143	4,287	83%
			1996	4,966	3,663	74%
			1997	4,789	3,445	72%
			1998	4,611	3,273	71%
Thailand Baht million	22,126	20,268	1995	21,816	15,773	72%
			1996	21,507	12,932	60%
			1997	21,197	16,757	79%
			1998	20,887	16,402	79%
Tunisia Dinars million	68.4	62.94	1995	67	59	87%
			1996	67	51	77%
			1997	66	53	81%
			1998	65	61	94%
U.S. US \$ million	23,879	19,103	1995	23,083	6,214	27%
			1996	22,287	5,898	27%
			1997	21,491	6,238	29%
			1998	20,695	n.a.	n.a.
Venezuela US \$ million	1,305	1,200	1995	1,287	542	42%
			1996	1,270	331	26%
			1997	1,252	457	36%
			1998	1,235	n.a.	n.a.

"-": not applicable

n.a.: not available (no notification yet received from Member country)

Source: WTO, Country Notifications

Table 8.3 (Revised): Blue Box Expenditures Measured Against Total Value of Production, 1995-1998

Member	Year	Notified Blue Box Expenditures	Total Value of Production	Notified Blue Box Expenditures as a % of Total Value of Production
EU	1995	20,846	207,400	10%
ECU	1996	21,521	219,700	10%
Million	1997	21,784	217,800	10%
	1998	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Iceland	1995	1,455	11,388	13%
million SDR	1996	0	11,418	0%
	1997	0	11,306	0%
	1998	0	n.a.	n.a.
Norway	1995	7,113	21,030	34%
Norway Kroner million	1996	7,246	21,428	34%
	1997	7,375	20,945	35%
	1998	7,880	n.a.	n.a.
Slovak Republic	1995	43	n.a.	n.a.
Koruna	1996	36	n.a.	n.a.
million	1997	44	n.a.	n.a.
	1998	0	n.a.	n.a.
U.S.	1995	7,030	190,110	4%
US \$ million	1996	0	205,701	0%
	1997	0	203,884	0%
	1998	0	n.a.	n.a.

Source: WTO Country Notifications; OECD Economic Accounting for Agriculture, 1999.
n.a. : not available (no notification received from Member country)

Table 8.4 (Revised): Green Box Expenditures Measured Against Total Value of Production, 1995-1998

Member	Green Box Expenditures Base Period 1986-1988	Year	Notified Green Box Expenditures	Total Value of Production	Notified Green Box Expenditures as a % of Total Value of Production
Argentina US\$ million	n.a.	1995	137	n.a.	n.a.
		1996	237.4	n.a.	n.a.
		1997	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
		1998	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Australia Australian dollar million	916,702	1995	931	29,238	3%
		1996	945	30,187	3%
		1997	1,256	30,381	4%
		1998	1,305	n.a.	n.a.
Brazil US \$ million	7,686	1995	4,883	n.a.	n.a.
		1996	2,600	n.a.	n.a.
		1997	3,458	n.a.	n.a.
		1998	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Bulgaria ECU million	n.a.	1995	-	-	-
		1996	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
		1997	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
		1998	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Canada Canadian dollar Million	1,670	1995	2,098	25,816	8%
		1996	1,995	28,051	7%
		1997	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
		1998	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Colombia US \$ million	226	1995	318	n.a.	n.a.
		1996	578	n.a.	n.a.
		1997	350	n.a.	n.a.
		1998	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Costa Rica US \$ million	n.a.	1995	66	n.a.	n.a.
		1996	30	n.a.	n.a.
		1997	40	n.a.	n.a.
		1998	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Cyprus Cyprus Pound million	n.a.	1995	59	n.a.	n.a.
		1996	60	n.a.	n.a.
		1997	67	n.a.	n.a.
		1998	71	n.a.	n.a.
Czech Republic Czech Koruna million	4,123	1995	3,507	125,661	3%
		1996	5,359	132,194	4%
		1997	3,846	125,948	3%
		1998	6,338	n.a.	n.a.
EU ECU Million	9,233	1995	18,780	207,400	9%
		1996	22,130	219,700	10%
		1997	18,167	217,800	8%
		1998	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Hungary Hungary Forint million	12,009	1995	13,150	751,042	2%
		1996	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
		1997	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
		1998	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Iceland million SDR	1,529	1995	1,901	11,388	17%
		1996	3,337	11,418	29%
		1997	2,955	11,306	26%
		1998	2,897	n.a.	n.a.
Israel US\$ million	n.a.	1995	292	3,474	8%
		1996	414	3,711	11%
		1997	338	3,522	10%
		1998	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Japan Yen billion	n.a.	1995	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
		1996	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
		1997	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
		1998	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Jordan	n.a.	1995	3,169	10,434	30%
		1996	2,818	10,248	28%
		1997	2,652	9,832	27%
		1998	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Korea Won billion	161 ¹	1995	3,990	28,013	14%
		1996	5,183	29,528	18%
		1997	5,796	29,551	20%
		1998	5,365	n.a.	n.a.

"-": not applicable.

n.a. : not available (no notification received from Member country).

Source: WTO, Country Notifications

Table 8.4 (Revised): Green Box Expenditures Measured Against Total Value of Production, 1995-1998

Member	Green Box Expenditures Base Period 1986-1988	Year	Notified Green Box Expenditures	Total Value of Production	Notified Green Box Expenditures as a % of Total Value of Production
Mexico Pesos million	n.a.	1995	4,906	n.a.	n.a.
		1996	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
		1997	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
		1998	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Morocco DHs million	1,576	1995	1,340	n.a.	n.a.
		1996	3,296	n.a.	n.a.
		1997	3,027	n.a.	n.a.
		1998	2,725	n.a.	n.a.
New Zealand NZ dollars million	234	1995	202	9,698	2%
		1996	203	9,855	2%
		1997	217	10,155	2%
		1998	225	n.a.	n.a.
Norway Norway Kroner million	2,330	1995	4,101	21,030	20%
		1996	4,116	21,428	19%
		1997	3,675	20,945	18%
		1998	3,889	n.a.	n.a.
Papua New Guinea US \$ million	n.a.	1995	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
		1996	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
		1997	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
		1998	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Poland US \$ million	n.a.	1995	436	24,318	2%
		1996	549	23,422	2%
		1997	890	23,038	4%
		1998	847	n.a.	n.a.
Slovak Republic Koruna million	n.a.	1995	25	n.a.	n.a.
		1996	42	n.a.	n.a.
		1997	121	n.a.	n.a.
		1998	381	n.a.	n.a.
Slovenia ECU million	48	1995	65	n.a.	n.a.
		1996	72	n.a.	n.a.
		1997	95	n.a.	n.a.
		1998	102	n.a.	n.a.
South Africa Rand million	n.a.	1995	2,767	31,180	9%
		1996	2,257	35,504	6%
		1997	2,507	47,728	5%
		1998	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Switzerland Swiss Francs million	n.a.	1995	2,719	8,810	31%
		1996	2,972	8,215	36%
		1997	3,088	7,929	39%
		1998	3,176	n.a.	n.a.
Thailand Baht million	25,258	1995	33,716	n.a.	n.a.
		1996	41,145	n.a.	n.a.
		1997	47,596	n.a.	n.a.
		1998	42,827	n.a.	n.a.
Tunisia Dinars million	24	1995	28	n.a.	n.a.
		1996	38	n.a.	n.a.
		1997	48	n.a.	n.a.
		1998	62	n.a.	n.a.
U.S. US \$ million	24,098	1995	46,033	190,110	24%
		1996	51,825	205,701	25%
		1997	51,249	203,884	25%
		1998	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Venezuela US \$ million	n.a.	1995	538	n.a.	n.a.
		1996	618	n.a.	n.a.
		1997	613	n.a.	n.a.
		1998	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

¹ The total is actually 1,748.05, but an amount of 1,586.8 was subtracted in the public stock holding for food security purp

"-": not applicable.

n.a. : not available (no notification received from Member country).

Source: WTO, Country Notifications

Table 8.5 (New): Total Support* Measured Against Total Value of Production, 1995-1998

Member	Year	Amber Programs	<i>de minimis</i> -5%	Blue Box	Green Box	Special and Differential Treatment	Total Support	Total Value of Production	Total Support as a % of Total Value of Production
Argentina US\$ million	1995	122.8	n.a.	-	137	0	259.79	n.a.	n.a.
	1996	84.1	n.a.	-	237	0	321.519	n.a.	n.a.
	1997	n.a.	n.a.	-	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
	1998	n.a.	n.a.	-	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Australia Australian dollar million	1995	152	0	-	931	-	1,083	29,238	4%
	1996	144	2.6	-	945	-	1,092	30,187	4%
	1997	132	2.5	-	1,256	-	1,390	30,381	5%
	1998	120	6.5	-	1,305	-	1,431	n.a.	n.a.
Brazil US \$ million	1995	n.a.	295	-	4,883	359	5,537	n.a.	n.a.
	1996	n.a.	363	-	2,600	269	3,233	n.a.	n.a.
	1997	n.a.	307	-	3,458	281	4,046	n.a.	n.a.
	1998	n.a.	0	-	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Bulgaria ¹⁰ ECU million	1995	n.a.	n.a.	-	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
	1996	n.a.	n.a.	-	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
	1997	n.a.	n.a.	-	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
	1998	n.a.	n.a.	-	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Canada Canadian dollar Million	1995	777	1,256	-	2,098	-	4,131	25,816	16%
	1996	619	n.a.	-	1,995	-	3,755	28,051	13%
	1997	n.a.	n.a.	-	n.a.	-	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
	1998	n.a.	n.a.	-	n.a.	-	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Colombia US \$ million	1995	58	n.a.	-	318	132	508	n.a.	n.a.
	1996	4	n.a.	-	578	141	723	n.a.	n.a.
	1997	14	n.a.	-	350	76	441	n.a.	n.a.
	1998	n.a.	n.a.	-	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Costa Rica ¹¹ US \$ million	1995	0	n.a.	-	66	133	200	n.a.	n.a.
	1996	0	n.a.	-	30	15	45	n.a.	n.a.
	1997	0	n.a.	-	40	14	54	n.a.	n.a.
	1998	n.a.	n.a.	-	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Cyprus Cyprus Pound million	1995	37	0	-	59	1.5	97	n.a.	n.a.
	1996	36	4	-	60	1.5	101	n.a.	n.a.
	1997	26	2	-	67	2	96	n.a.	n.a.
	1998	22	3	-	72	4	101	n.a.	n.a.
Czech Republic Czech Koruna million	1995	1,152	n.a.	-	3,507	-	4,660	125,661	4%
	1996	1,689	n.a.	-	5,359	-	7,048	132,194	5%
	1997	1,054	n.a.	-	3,846	-	4,900	125,948	4%
	1998	1,013	n.a.	-	6,338	-	7,351	n.a.	n.a.
EU ECU Million	1995	47,526	825	20,845	18,780	n.a.	90,476	207,400	44%
	1996	51,009	761	21,521	22,130	n.a.	95,422	219,700	43%
	1997	50,194	544	21,784	18,167	n.a.	90,689	217,800	42%
	1998	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Hungary Hungary Forint million	1995	0	21	-	13,150	-	34	751,042	5%
	1996	n.a.	n.a.	-	n.a.	-	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
	1997	n.a.	n.a.	-	n.a.	-	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
	1998	n.a.	n.a.	-	n.a.	-	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Iceland million SDR	1995	12,164	n.a.	1,455	1,901	-	15,503	1,344,733	1%
	1996	10,464	n.a.	0	3,334	-	13,798	1,106,394	1%
	1997	10,741	n.a.	0	2,955	-	13,696	1,114,063	1%
	1998	24,431	n.a.	0	2,897	-	27,328	n.a.	n.a.
Israel US\$ million	1995	461	71	-	292	-	825	3,474	37%
	1996	501	59	-	414	-	974	3,711	26%
	1997	524	29	-	338	-	891	3,522	25%
	1998	n.a.	n.a.	-	n.a.	-	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Japan Yen billion	1995	3,508	37	-	3,169	-	6,713	10,434	64%
	1996	3,330	37	-	2,818	-	6,185	10,250	60%
	1997	3,171	36	-	2,652	-	5,859	9,832	60%
	1998	n.a.	n.a.	-	n.a.	-	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Jordan	1995	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
	1996	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
	1997	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
	1998	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Korea Won billion	1995	2,075	282	-	3,990	20	6,368	28,013	23%
	1996	1,967	344	-	5,183	31	7,525	29,528	26%
	1997	1,937	655	-	5,796	38	8,426	29,551	29%
	1998	1,563	784	-	5,365	41	7,753	n.a.	n.a.

"-": not applicable

n.a.: not available

Source: WTO, Country Notifications

Table 8.5 (New): Total Support* Measured Against Total Value of Production, 1995-1998

Member	Year	Amber Programs	<i>de minimis</i> -5%	Blue Box	Green Box	Special and Differential Treatment	Total Support	Total Value of Production	Total Support as a % of Total Value of Production
Mexico Pesos million	1995	1,365	n.a.	-	4,906	1,943	8,214	n.a.	n.a.
	1996	n.a.	n.a.	-	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
	1997	n.a.	n.a.	-	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
	1998	n.a.	n.a.	-	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Morocco DHs million	1995	94	n.a.	-	1,340	1,261	2,695	n.a.	n.a.
	1996	250	n.a.	-	3,296	1,266	4,812	n.a.	n.a.
	1997	91	n.a.	-	3,027	1,474	4,592	n.a.	n.a.
	1998	126	n.a.	-	2,725	1,437	4,288	n.a.	n.a.
New Zealand NZ dollars million	1995	0	n.a.	-	202	-	202	9,698	2%
	1996	0	n.a.	-	203	-	203	9,855	2%
	1997	0	n.a.	-	217	-	217	10,155	2%
	1998	0	n.a.	-	225	-	225	n.a.	n.a.
Norway Norway Kroner million	1995	9,786	n.a.	7,113	4,101	-	21,000	21,030	100%
	1996	10,529	n.a.	7,246	4,116	-	21,891	21,428	102%
	1997	10,526	n.a.	7,375	3,675	-	21,576	20,945	103%
	1998	10,886	n.a.	7,880	3,889	-	22,655	n.a.	n.a.
Papua New Guinea US \$ million	1995	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
	1996	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
	1997	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
	1998	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Poland US \$ million	1995	255	0	-	436	-	691	24,318	3%
	1996	227	0	-	549	-	776	23,422	3%
	1997	296	11	-	890	-	1,197	23,038	5%
	1998	301	0	-	847	-	1,148	n.a.	n.a.
Slovak Republic Koruna million	1995	7,111	n.a.	43	25	-	7,178	n.a.	n.a.
	1996	6,982	n.a.	36	42	-	7,060	n.a.	n.a.
	1997	8,290	n.a.	44	121	-	8,455	n.a.	n.a.
	1998	7,727	n.a.	0	381	-	8,091	n.a.	n.a.
Slovenia ECU million	1995	70	n.a.	-	65	-	135	n.a.	n.a.
	1996	69	n.a.	-	72	-	141	n.a.	n.a.
	1997	69	n.a.	-	95	-	164	n.a.	n.a.
	1998	66	n.a.	-	102	-	168	n.a.	n.a.
South Africa Rand million	1995	1,640	598	-	2,767	-	5,006	31,180	16%
	1996	1,938	873	-	2,257	-	5,068	35,504	14%
	1997	2,198	301	-	2,507	-	5,006	47,728	10%
	1998	n.a.	n.a.	-	n.a.	-	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Switzerland Swiss Francs million	1995	4,287	0	-	2,719	-	7,006	8,810	80%
	1996	3,663	0	-	2,972	-	6,632	8,215	80%
	1997	3,445	0	-	3,088	-	6,533	7,929	82%
	1998	3,273	0	-	3,176	-	6,449	n.a.	n.a.
Thailand Baht million	1995	15,773	n.a.	-	33,716	5,362	54,852	n.a.	n.a.
	1996	12,932	1,152	-	41,145	12,215	67,445	n.a.	n.a.
	1997	16,757	n.a.	-	47,596	16,757	71,254	n.a.	n.a.
	1998	16,402	142	-	42,827	16,402	64,401	n.a.	n.a.
Tunisia Dinars million	1995	59	0	-	28	29	115	n.a.	n.a.
	1996	51	0	-	38	32	120	n.a.	n.a.
	1997	53	8	-	48	33	142	n.a.	n.a.
	1998	61	7	-	62	52	183	n.a.	n.a.
U.S. US \$ million	1995	6,214	1,641	7,030	46,033	n.a.	60,926	190,109	32%
	1996	5,898	1,153	0	51,825	n.a.	58,876	205,701	29%
	1997	6,238	812	0	51,246	n.a.	58,296	203,883	29%
	1998	n.a.	n.a.	0	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Venezuela US \$ million	1995	542	n.a.	-	538	178	1,259	n.a.	n.a.
	1996	331	n.a.	-	618	38	989	n.a.	n.a.
	1997	457	n.a.	-	613	63	1,132	n.a.	n.a.
	1998	n.a.	n.a.	-	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

* Total support includes Amber, *de minimis*, Blue and Green expenditures.

"-": not applicable

n.a.: not available

Source: WTO, Country Notifications

Figure 8.1 (Updated)




Figure 8.2 (Updated)

