



20 June 2019

(19-4221)

Page: 1/16

Committee on Agriculture

Original: English

ANNUAL EXPORT COMPETITION REVIEW

SUBMISSION FROM THE CAIRNS GROUP TO THE 91ST MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE (COA) IN JUNE 2019

The following communication, received on 17 June 2019, is being circulated at the request of the Cairns Group.

At the 10th WTO Ministerial Conference (MC10) Ministers adopted the Decision on Export Competition (WT/MIN(15)/45; WT/L/980 of 19 December 2015, "Nairobi Decision"). The Cairns Group welcomed this historic Decision as an important milestone in the reform process. Importantly, the Decision represented a legally binding commitment to both eliminate export subsidies, and to tackle measures with equivalent effect.

The following paper draws on the Secretariat's background documents G/AG/W/125/Rev.10 (and associated papers G/AG/W/125/Rev.10/Add.1, G/AG/W/125/Rev.10/Add.2, G/AG/W/125/Rev.10/Add.3 and G/AG/W/125/Rev.10/Add.4) is submitted with the intention of helping to draw out important observations about the implementation of the MC10 Decision to aid Members' understanding of progress so far, and areas which require further attention.

A note on transparency: Under the Decision, Members are required to provide additional information in the context of an annual review process. The Secretariat's questionnaire forms part of that process. We note that 21% (only 29¹ of the 136²) of WTO Members replied to the questionnaire^{3,4}. We would encourage those Members to submit a response prior to the end of this year.

1 EXPORT SUBSIDIES

1.1 Elimination of Scheduled Export Subsidy Entitlements

1.1. As part of the commitment by Members at MC10 to eliminate all remaining scheduled export subsidy entitlements, Members agreed to submit new schedules demonstrating the elimination of export subsidies. Eighteen Members are conferred agricultural export subsidy entitlements under the WTO Agreement. Since the last Cairns Group paper in 2018, six Members have certified changes to their schedule, one has increased the number of products for which it has eliminated export subsidies, and an additional one has tabled its draft schedule. This takes the total Members with certified and draft schedule changes to 14, leaving only four yet to submit an amended schedule.

1.2. Brazil, Indonesia, Turkey and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela have not provided an update on their respective domestic processes since the February 2018 Committee on Agriculture.

¹ The European Union and its 28 member States are counted as one Member.

² The European Union and its 28 member States are counted as one Member.

³ Refer Annex 1 for the full table of respondents. If a Member is not listed in the table, it did not provide a response to the export finance, state trading enterprises, or food aid sections of the questionnaire.

⁴ Annex 2 provides a table showing response rates since MC10.

Table 1: Status of Scheduled Export Subsidy Entitlements by Member

Eliminated Entitlements Pre-MC10		
1	New Zealand	Scheduled entitlements eliminated for all products in 2000
2	Panama	Scheduled entitlements eliminated for all products in 2003
Amended Entitlements Post-MC10		
3	Australia	Scheduled entitlements eliminated for all products 22 May 2017
4	Norway	Scheduled entitlements eliminated for 7 of 11 products as at 28 February 2018; remainder by end 2020
5	Israel	Scheduled entitlements eliminated for 2 of 5 products as at 11 March 2018; remainder by end 2020
6	Switzerland-Liechtenstein	Scheduled entitlements eliminated for 4 of 5 products as at 2 August 2018, remainder by end 2020
7	Colombia	Scheduled entitlements eliminated for all products 22 September 2018
8	Uruguay	Scheduled entitlements eliminated for all products 26 September 2018
9	United States	Scheduled entitlements eliminated for all products 8 November 2018
10	South Africa	Scheduled entitlements eliminated for all products 29 November 2018
11	Mexico	Scheduled entitlements eliminated for all products 10 April 2019
Initiated WTO procedures to amend entitlements		
12	European Union	Draft Schedule circulated 17 October 2017
13	Canada	Draft Schedule circulated 11 December 2017
14	Iceland	Draft Schedule circulated 15 March 2019

2 COTTON

2.1. The Nairobi Decision required developed Members to immediately eliminate their cotton export subsidy entitlements. Developing Members had until 1 January 2017 to eliminate their entitlements. This Decision also extended the transparency and monitoring process initiated at the Bali Ministerial Conference to trade in cotton.

2.2. The situation for implementing this Decision in respect of scheduled entitlements for cotton remains the same as it was last year. Of the four Members with scheduled entitlements, Colombia, Israel and South Africa have submitted amended schedules. Brazil is yet to eliminate its scheduled export subsidy entitlements for cotton. No export subsidy outlays for cotton have been notified since 2002.

3 EXPORT FINANCING SUPPORT

3.1. The Nairobi Decision establishes a set of disciplines on export financing support (export credits, export credit guarantees and insurance programmes) for exports of agricultural products. Self-financing requirements apply with immediate effect while an 18-month maximum repayment term applies to developed Members from the last day of 2017. A phase-in period applies to developing Members: initially 36 months (from 1 January 2016); 27 months after two years of implementation (from 1 January 2018); and finally 18 months after four years of implementation (from 1 January 2020).

3.2. Twenty-one Members (counting the European Union as one Member) replied to the current questionnaire on export financing support provided by Members for the export of agricultural products.

3.3. Seventeen Members⁵, again counting the European Union as one Member, replied that they provided no export financing support. In addition, five Members, notwithstanding having a programme in place, have either not provided agricultural export financing support in recent years or negligible support.⁶ Twenty-four Members provided replies with information on their export financing support programmes. Analysis here is based on replies to the current questionnaire and previous ones that remain applicable to Members' situations in 2018.

⁵ Counting 28 nil replied to previous questionnaires, plus two new nil replies to the current questionnaire (Mexico and Togo).

⁶ Germany has notified zero support since 2011, while Iceland notified zero for at least the last eight years. Switzerland notified that its export financing support has been negligible due to very low demand. In addition, Austria and Romania have notified programmes, but did not provide any support in 2018.

3.4. The European Union provided questionnaire responses for over a half of its member States.⁷ It also indicated that no export financing support programmes are in operation at the European Union level or for eight of its member States, though we note that in March 2016 the European Commission reported that it was examining the feasibility of an export credit scheme.⁸ This enhanced detailed information is welcomed and the European Union is encouraged to complete its report by providing data on the remaining unreported member States.⁹

3.5. Of the four types of export financing support disciplined in the Nairobi Decision, risk cover (comprising export credit insurance or reinsurance and export credit guarantees) is the most common form of such support to agricultural goods. Of the 66 programmes in the sample, 41 (62%) fall within the category of risk cover and 31 out of 34 (91%) Members that have active programmes reported having risk cover programmes.

3.6. Over 80% of the reported agricultural exports that received export financing in 2018 were supported by some type of risk cover, with most of this provided by Canada (41.56%), the United States (25.52%), China (13.59%) and Turkey (12.83%). Comparing 2018 with 2019 data, the value of agricultural exports from the US supported by risk cover increased from around USD 2.21 billion to USD 2.60 billion, which is an approximate return to 2017 levels. Exports from Canada supported by risk cover decreased from around USD 5.88 billion to USD 5.74 billion.

3.7. The second most used kind of programme within the sample is direct financing support (comprising direct credits/financing, refinancing, and interest rate support). Argentina, Brazil, Canada, China, Czech Republic, Slovak Republic, Indonesia, Jamaica, Malaysia, Paraguay, Trinidad and Tobago and Viet Nam provide at least one type of direct financing support and 17 types of programmes were reported in total.

3.8. Just under half of the programmes reported have maximum repayment terms that exceed the 18 months maximum repayment period established in the Nairobi Decision for agricultural products.¹⁰ Such programmes were reported by four Members (New Zealand¹¹, Indonesia, Trinidad and Tobago and Turkey).

3.9. One of the conditions of the Nairobi Decision established with immediate effect is the requirement for export finance to be self-financing. This was not part of the questionnaire circulated by the Secretariat, although four Members provided information relevant to this on a voluntary basis:

- Canada indicated that its official Export Credit agency is self-financing;
- Australia reported the Export Finance and Insurance Corporation (EFIC) to be self-funded;
- New Zealand stated clearly that its programme covers all operation costs; and,
- While the United States reported that its Export-Import Bank (export credit insurance programme) is "self-sustaining", it did not report (as it did in 2014) that its GSM-102 programmes must cover the operating costs and losses of the programmes over 'the long term'. Thus, it remains unclear, as in 2018, whether this represents a change in policy or a change in reporting.

3.10. The export destination or group of destinations of Members' programmes varies greatly without a clear pattern across them if each programme is given equal weight. However, from an

⁷ The European Union provided responses for 19 of its 28 member States: Austria, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Croatia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, The Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Sweden, and United Kingdom.

⁸ The European Commission press release 14 March 2016: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-16-806_en.htm.

⁹ The EU responded that no programmes are operated in Belgium, Cyprus, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Malta, Portugal and Spain. It is also reported that no data on export financing programmes operated has been submitted by Luxembourg.

¹⁰ The financing entities of some reporting Members provide financing for agricultural products specified in the Ministerial Decision with a maximum repayment term of 18 months in compliance with the decision, however, for general programmes they provide support with a term of up to two years.

¹¹ New Zealand did not issue any Export Credit guarantee policies in support of agricultural exports during 2018.

exports-weighted point of view, at least around 70% of financed agricultural goods are exported from a developed to a developing country.

4 AGRICULTURAL EXPORTING STATE TRADING ENTERPRISES

4.1. The Nairobi Decision includes a commitment that Members shall not use agricultural exporting state trading enterprises (STEs) to circumvent the other disciplines in the Decision. It also requires Members to make their best efforts to ensure that the use of export monopoly powers by agricultural exporting STEs is exercised in a manner that minimizes trade distorting effects and does not displace or impede the exports of another Member.

4.2. Since the last questionnaire, the number of STEs notified has not increased. Twenty-one Members indicated they have no agricultural exporting STEs. Trinidad and Tobago and Canada have each indicated recent reforms of agricultural STEs. There is no evidence to suggest therefore that the Members which have eliminated export subsidy entitlements appear to be turning to STEs as an alternative means of facilitating exports for those products.

4.3. In the questionnaire and related notifications, 15 Members notified the existence of 59 agricultural exporting STEs.

Table 2: Notified Agricultural Exporting State Trading Enterprises

Member	# notified	Products
Australia	1	Rice
China	26	Rice
		Corn
		Cotton
		Tobacco
		Tea
Colombia	4	Liquor beverages
Costa Rica	1	Sugar
Dominica	1	Bananas
Ecuador	1	Maize
		Rice
		Cereals
Fiji	1	Sugar
Grenada	1	Cocoa
India	14	Onions
		Gum karaya ¹²
		Sugar
Indonesia	1	Rice
Israel	3	Groundnuts
		Eggs & poultry
		Plants
Moldova, Republic of	1	Wine
New Zealand	1	Kiwifruit
Tunisia	2	Tobacco
		Vegetable oils
Ukraine	1	Ethanol & fruit alcohol

5 INTERNATIONAL FOOD AID

5.1. The MC10 Decision established disciplines on international food aid with the objective of preventing or minimising commercial displacement of international trade resulting from such aid. Members are encouraged to provide exclusively cash-based food aid. Monetisation is permitted subject to conditions, including minimising or eliminating disruptions to local or regional markets and effects upon production.

5.2. Of the 29 Members that responded to the questionnaire circulated on 25 October 2018, 11 provided responses with respect to food aid (Australia, Canada, the European Union¹³, Indonesia,

¹² This product no longer appears in the responses to the Export Competition Questionnaire prepared for the June 2019 Review.

¹³ The European Union is counted as one Member for the purposes of discussing donors.

Japan, New Zealand, Norway, the Russian Federation, Switzerland, Turkey and the United States). Responses from these Members form the basis of the comments below and an overview is provided in Table 3.

5.3. On the basis of responses contained within G/AG/W/125/Rev.10/Add.3, the vast majority of reported food aid appears to have been donated on terms substantially, or fully consistent with, the MC10 Decision. All 11 donors responding to the questionnaire confirmed their aid is fully in grant form.

5.4. Of those Members providing International Food Aid that responded to the questionnaire, eight Members provided untied cash-based food assistance (Australia, Canada, the European Union, New Zealand, Norway, the Russian Federation and the United States) and one (Switzerland) provided a mixture of untied and tied cash-based food assistance. Of those Members providing cash-based assistance, six provided cash exclusively (Australia, Canada, New Zealand, Norway, the Russian Federation and Switzerland). There was a lack of detail in responses on whether or not cash-based food aid assistance was provided on a fully un-tied or tied basis.

5.5. Four Members provided in-kind food assistance (i.e. they provide actual commodities as aid - the European Union, Indonesia, Turkey and the United States). Japan provided food aid assistance, but it was not clear from G/AG/W/125/Rev.10/Add.3 if this was cash-based or in-kind food assistance. Japan and the United States permit monetisation.

Table 3: Overview of Members' food aid programmes

Member	Is aid provided on a cash basis and if so how much?	Is aid provided 'in-kind' i.e. actual commodities and if so how much?	If aid is provided 'in-kind' is it provided to the WFP, relevant international organisation or in response to an emergency?	Is the aid provided in fully grant form (i.e. not tied)?	If aid is provided 'in-kind', is monetisation of the aid prohibited or not possible?	Is re-export of 'in-kind' food aid permitted?	Most Recent Year of Reporting in Response
Australia	Yes, AUD 84.7 million	No	N/A	Yes	N/A	N/A	2017-18
Canada	Yes, CAN 361.8 million	No	N/A	Yes	N/A	N/A	2016
European Union	Yes, EUR 1.71 million (Austria); and <i>not specified</i> (Czechia – CZK 7,090,602.90 provided as partly in kind/partly cash-based)	Yes, Ultra High Temperature drinking milk (valued at EUR 30 million in two-year period 06/2016-05/2018); and not specified (Czech Republic – CZK 7,090,602.90 provided as partly in-kind/partly cash-based)	In response to an emergency, provided through international organisations (WFP, ICRC, SARC)	Yes	N/A, except for in-kind food aid provided by Czechia, where monetisation is permitted	No	Mixed (2016-18)
Indonesia	No	Yes, 5,000 tonnes of rice (HS 1006)	In response to an emergency	Yes	Monetisation is not permitted	No	2017
Japan¹⁴	<i>not specified</i>	<i>not specified</i>	<i>Not specified</i>	Yes	Monetisation is permitted	No	2017
New Zealand	Yes, NZD 6 million WFP core funding and NZD 4.05 million for one-off WFP funding	No	N/A	Yes	N/A	N/A	2017-18
Norway	Yes, NOK 277 million for WFP core funding and NOK 548.6 million for WFP multi-bilateral support	No	N/A	Yes	N/A	N/A	2017
Russian Federation	Yes, USD 30 million to WFP in 2018	No	N/A	Yes	N/A	N/A	2018
Switzerland	Yes, CHF 75 million to WFP in in 2018 of which CHF 4.71 million was tied ¹⁵	No	N/A	Yes	N/A	N/A	2018

¹⁴ Japan reported YEN 11.1 billion in food aid in 2017, however it is not clear within G/AG/W/125/Rev.10/Add.3 if this was provided on a cash basis or in-kind basis.

¹⁵ In accordance with an agreement between Switzerland and the WFP, 1,883 tonnes/CHF4.71 million of skimmed milk powder from Switzerland was purchased as part of the Swiss CH75 million WFP funding.

Member	Is aid provided on a cash basis and if so how much?	Is aid provided 'in-kind' i.e. actual commodities and if so how much?	If aid is provided 'in-kind' is it provided to the WFP, relevant international organisation or in response to an emergency?	Is the aid provided in fully grant form (i.e. not tied)?	If aid is provided 'in-kind', is monetisation of the aid prohibited or not possible?	Is re-export of 'in-kind' food aid permitted?	Most Recent Year of Reporting in Response
Turkey	No	Yes, USD 206,634,343.89 worth of products provided by the Turkish Red Crescent; USD 8,839,000 provided by the Turkish Cooperation and Coordination Agency; USD 10,089,487.45 provided by the Disaster and Emergency Management Authority; and 47,993 tonnes of wheat by the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry	Yes	Yes	Monetisation is not permitted	No.	2018
United States	Yes, USD 1.8 billion on a cash basis	Yes, 1.534 million tonnes of commodities worth USD 572 million.	Yes, to WFP among others	Yes	Monetisation is permitted	No	2018

- The information summarised in this table has been drawn from submissions made to the export competition questionnaire circulated on 25 October 2018 and the information compiled in G/AG/W/125/Rev.10/Add.3.
- The phrase 'not specified' indicates where a relevant response or relevant data was not clear within G/AG/W/125/Rev.10/Add.3.
- The value or volume of assistance listed is taken from the last available year listed for the Member in document G/AG/W/125/Rev.10/Add.3.

6 TRANSPARENCY

6.1. There continues to be variability in the number and quality of notifications and replies to the Secretariat questionnaire¹⁶ from across the WTO Membership.

6.2. Notifications for ES have improved significantly¹⁷. At the time of publication of the 2017 report, only 20 Members had provided their notification for 2016. As of 24 May, 94 Members have submitted their ES:1 notification for 2016, 78 have submitted their notification for 2017 and 50 have submitted their notification for 2018.

6.3. The Secretariat received 29 responses to the questionnaire.¹⁸

7 CONCLUSIONS

7.1. There is a substantial increase in Members submitting their ES:1 notifications, which is particularly positive. Members who have yet to submit any notifications or who are yet to submit their most recent notifications are encouraged to do so as.

7.2. The rate of response to the questionnaire is a slight improvement upon last year, however, the continuing poor response rate, including 83 Members that have never responded to the questionnaire, is concerning.

7.3. The monitoring function of the Committee is fundamental to the transparency principle of the WTO. Furthermore, implementation of Ministerial Decisions is important to a well-functioning WTO. The MC10 Decision made responding to the questionnaire, like notifications, a binding obligation. This obligation is with immediate effect for developed Members while the obligation applies to developing country Members with an implementation period of four years following the adoption of the Decision (i.e. December 2020) unless they are in a position to respond sooner.

7.4. The Cairns Group urges Members to make further efforts to improve transparency, including submitting overdue notifications, submitting outstanding questionnaire responses, and updating the Committee on progress on domestic implementation of MC10 commitments. The Secretariat's questionnaire, the information it garners, and the resulting analysis enable robust processes in the WTO to empower the reform agenda.

¹⁶ Footnote 17 of the Annex of the MC10 Decision set out that "Notwithstanding paragraph 4 of [the] Decision, developing country Members, unless they are in a position to do so at an earlier date, shall implement [the] Annex no later than five years following the date of adoption of this decision".

¹⁷ See Annex 3: Members providing ES:1 notifications for 2016 – 2018.

¹⁸ The European Union and its 28 member States are counted as one Member.

ANNEX 1**MEMBERS RESPONDING TO THE 2019 EXPORT COMPETITION QUESTIONNAIRE**

✓ = Response provided.

EU = Response provided as part of wider EU response.

EU NIL = Nil response provided as part of wider EU response.

Nil = Nil response provided confirming absence of relevant programmes.

X = No response provided.

Member	Export Financing	STEs	Food Aid
Australia	✓	✓	✓
Austria	EU	EU NIL	X
Belgium	X	EU NIL	X
Brazil	✓	NIL	NIL
Bulgaria	EU	EU NIL	X
Burundi	NIL	NIL	NIL
Canada	✓	NIL	✓
Colombia	NIL	X	NIL
Costa Rica	NIL	✓	NIL
Croatia	EU	EU NIL	X
Cyprus	X	EU NIL	X
Czech Republic	EU	EU NIL	X
Denmark	EU	EU NIL	X
Ecuador	NIL	✓	NIL
Estonia	EU	EU NIL	X
European Union	✓	NIL	✓
Finland	EU	EU NIL	X
France	EU	EU NIL	X
Germany	EU	EU NIL	X
Greece	X	EU NIL	X
Hong Kong, China	✓	NIL	NIL
Hungary	EU	EU NIL	X
Indonesia	✓	✓	NIL
Ireland	X	EU NIL	X
Israel	NIL	✓	✓
Italy	X	EU NIL	X
Japan	✓	NIL	✓
Latvia	EU	EU NIL	X
Liechtenstein	NIL	NIL	NIL
Lithuania	EU	EU NIL	X
Luxembourg	X	EU NIL	X
Macao, China	NIL	NIL	NIL
Malta	X	EU NIL	X
Mauritius	NIL	NIL	NIL
Mexico	NIL	NIL	NIL
Montenegro	NIL	NIL	NIL
Netherlands	EU	EU NIL	X
New Zealand	✓	✓	✓
Nicaragua	X	NIL	NIL
Norway	NIL	NIL	✓
Oman	NIL	NIL	NIL
Paraguay	✓	NIL	NIL
Poland	EU	EU NIL	X
Portugal	X	EU NIL	X

Member	Export Financing	STEs	Food Aid
Romania	EU	EU NIL	X
Russian Federation	✓	NIL	✓
Singapore	NIL	NIL	NIL
Slovak Republic	EU	EU NIL	X
Slovenia	EU	EU NIL	X
Spain	X	EU NIL	X
Sweden	EU	EU NIL	X
Switzerland	✓	NIL	✓
Turkey	✓	NIL	✓
Ukraine	NIL	✓	NIL
United Kingdom	EU	EU NIL	X
United States of America	✓	NIL	✓
Uruguay	NIL	NIL	NIL
TOTAL	28 (17%)	28 (17%)	29 (18%)

ANNEX 2**MEMBERS RESPONDING TO THE EXPORT COMPETITION QUESTIONNAIRE
SINCE THE NAIROBI MINISTERIAL (MC10)**

Member	No. RESPONSES BY MEMBER	2016	2017	2018	2019
Albania	1	✓			
Argentina	2		✓	✓	
Australia	4	✓	✓	✓	✓
Brazil	3	✓		✓	✓
Burundi	1				✓
Canada	4	✓	✓	✓	✓
Chile	2	✓	✓		
China	1		✓		
Colombia	2		✓		✓
Costa Rica	4	✓	✓	✓	✓
Dominican Republic	1	✓			
Ecuador	4	✓	✓	✓	✓
European Union ¹	4	✓	✓	✓	✓
Fiji	1		✓		
Georgia	1	✓			
Guatemala	1			✓	
Honduras	2	✓	✓		
Hong Kong, China	4	✓	✓	✓	✓
Iceland	1		✓		
Indonesia	1				✓
Israel	4	✓	✓	✓	✓
Jamaica	1	✓			
Japan	4	✓	✓	✓	✓
Jordan	1	✓			
Liechtenstein	1				✓
Macao, China	4	✓	✓	✓	✓
Madagascar	1	✓			
Malaysia	3	✓	✓	✓	
Mauritius	3		✓	✓	✓
Mexico	2			✓	✓
Montenegro	2	✓			✓
New Zealand	4	✓	✓	✓	✓
Nicaragua	1				✓
Norway	4	✓	✓	✓	✓
Oman	1				✓
Panama	3	✓	✓	✓	
Paraguay	1				✓
Peru	2		✓	✓	
Philippines	2		✓	✓	
Russian Federation	4	✓	✓	✓	✓
Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of	1	✓			
Seychelles	2	✓	✓		
Singapore	4	✓	✓	✓	✓
South Africa	1	✓			
Switzerland	4	✓	✓	✓	✓

¹ Responding on behalf of the EU-28.

Member	No. RESPONSES BY MEMBER	2016	2017	2018	2019
Chinese Taipei	2	✓	✓		
Thailand	2	✓	✓		
Togo	1			✓	
Trinidad and Tobago	1		✓		
Turkey	4	✓	✓	✓	✓
Ukraine	4	✓	✓	✓	✓
United States of America	4	✓	✓	✓	✓
Uruguay	4	✓	✓	✓	✓
Viet Nam	1	✓			
TOTAL		36 (22%)	34 (21%)	28 (17%)	29 (18%)

Members not responding to the questionnaire since the Nairobi Ministerial: Afghanistan; Angola; Antigua and Barbuda; Armenia; Bahrain, Kingdom of; Bangladesh; Barbados; Belize; Benin; Bolivia, Plurinational State of; Botswana; Brunei Darussalam; Burkina Faso; Cabo Verde; Cambodia; Cameroon; Central African Republic; Chad; Congo, Democratic Republic of; Côte d'Ivoire; Cuba; Djibouti; Dominica; Egypt; El Salvador; Eswatini; Gabon; The Gambia; Ghana; Grenada; Guinea; Guinea-Bissau; Guyana; Haiti; India; Kazakhstan; Kenya; Korea, Republic of; Kuwait, the State of; Kyrgyz Republic; Lao People's Democratic Republic; Lesotho; Liberia; Malawi; Maldives; Mali; Mauritania; Moldova, Republic of; Mongolia; Morocco; Mozambique; Myanmar; Namibia; Nepal; Nicaragua; Niger; Nigeria; North Macedonia, Republic of; Pakistan; Papua New Guinea; Qatar; Rwanda; Saint Kitts and Nevis; Saint Lucia; Saint Vincent and the Grenadines; Samoa; Senegal; Sierra Leone; Solomon Islands; Sri Lanka; Suriname; Tajikistan; Tanzania; Tonga; Tunisia; Uganda; United Arab Emirates; Vanuatu; Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of; Yemen; Zambia; Zimbabwe.

ANNEX 3**MEMBERS PROVIDING ES:1 NOTIFICATIONS FOR 2016 – 2018**

✓ = Response provided.

EU = Response provided as part of wider EU response.

EU NIL = Nil response provided as part of wider EU response.

NIL = Nil response provided confirming absence of relevant programmes.

X = No response provided.

Member	2016 Export Subsidy (ES:1) Notifications	2017 Export Subsidy (ES:1) Notifications	2018 Export Subsidy (ES:1) Notifications
Afghanistan	X	X	X
Albania	X	X	X
Angola	X	X	X
Antigua and Barbuda	X	X	X
Argentina	X	X	X
Armenia	NIL	X	X
Australia	NIL	NIL	X
Austria	EU	EU	EU
Bahrain, Kingdom of	NIL	NIL	X
Bangladesh	X	X	X
Barbados ¹	NIL	NIL	X
Belgium	EU	EU	EU
Belize	X	X	X
Benin	X	X	X
Bolivia, Plurinational State of	NIL	X	X
Botswana ²	NIL	NIL	NIL
Brazil	✓	✓	X
Brunei Darussalam	X	X	X
Bulgaria	EU	EU	EU
Burkina Faso	X	X	X
Burundi	NIL	NIL	X
Cabo Verde	X	X	X
Cambodia	NIL	NIL	NIL
Cameroon	NIL	NIL	X
Canada ³	✓	✓	✓
Central African Republic	X	X	X
Chad	NIL	X	X
Chile	X	X	X
China	NIL	NIL	X
Colombia	X	X	X
Congo, Democratic Republic of	X	X	X
Costa Rica	NIL	NIL	NIL
Côte d'Ivoire	NIL	NIL	NIL
Croatia	EU	EU	EU
Cuba	NIL	NIL	NIL
Cyprus	EU	EU	EU

¹ Barbados makes its export subsidies notification on a fiscal year basis. Barbados has notified up until the 2016/2017 fiscal year.

² Botswana makes its export subsidies notification on a fiscal year basis. Botswana has notified up until the 2017/2018 fiscal year.

³ Canada makes its export subsidies notification on a marketing year basis. Canada has notified up until the period of 1 August 2017 to 31 July 2018.

Member	2016 Export Subsidy (ES:1) Notifications	2017 Export Subsidy (ES:1) Notifications	2018 Export Subsidy (ES:1) Notifications
Czech Republic	EU	EU	EU
Democratic Republic of the Congo	X	X	X
Denmark	EU	EU	EU
Djibouti	X	X	X
Dominica	X	X	X
Dominican Republic	X	X	X
Ecuador	NIL	X	X
Egypt	X	X	X
El Salvador	NIL	NIL	X
Estonia	EU	EU	EU
Eswatini	X	X	X
European Union ⁴	✓	✓	✓
Fiji	X	X	X
Finland	EU	EU	EU
France	EU	EU	EU
Gabon	NIL	X	X
The Gambia	X	X	X
Georgia	X	X	X
Germany	EU	EU	EU
Ghana	X	X	X
Greece	EU	EU	EU
Grenada	X	X	X
Guatemala	NIL	NIL	X
Guinea	X	X	X
Guinea-Bissau	X	X	X
Guyana	X	X	X
Haiti	X	X	X
Honduras	NIL	X	X
Hong Kong, China	NIL	NIL	NIL
Hungary	EU	EU	EU
Iceland	✓	NIL	X
India	X	X	X
Indonesia	✓	✓	X
Ireland	EU	EU	EU
Israel	✓	✓	X
Italy	EU	EU	EU
Jamaica ⁵	NIL	NIL	X
Japan	NIL	NIL	NIL
Jordan	X	X	X
Kazakhstan	NIL	X	X
Kenya	X	X	X
Korea, Republic of	X	X	X
Kuwait, the State of	X	X	X
Kyrgyz Republic	X	X	X
Lao People's Democratic Republic	X	X	X
Latvia	EU	EU	EU
Lesotho	X	X	X
Liechtenstein	X	X	X
Lithuania	EU	EU	EU
Luxembourg	EU	EU	EU

⁴ The European Union makes its export subsidies notification on a marketing year basis. The European Union has notified up until the period of 1 July 2017 to 30 June 2018.

⁵ Jamaica makes its export subsidies notification on a fiscal year basis. Jamaica has notified up until the 2016/2017 fiscal year.

Member	2016 Export Subsidy (ES:1) Notifications	2017 Export Subsidy (ES:1) Notifications	2018 Export Subsidy (ES:1) Notifications
Macao, China	NIL	NIL	NIL
Madagascar	X	X	X
Malawi	NIL	X	X
Malaysia	NIL	X	X
Maldives	X	X	X
Mali	NIL	NIL	X
Malta	EU	EU	EU
Mauritania	X	X	X
Mauritius ⁶	✓	✓	✓
Mexico	NIL	NIL	NIL
Moldova, Republic of	NIL	NIL	NIL
Mongolia	X	X	X
Montenegro	NIL	NIL	NIL
Morocco	X	X	X
Mozambique	X	X	X
Myanmar	X	X	X
Namibia	X	X	X
Nepal	X	X	X
Netherlands	EU	EU	EU
New Zealand	NIL	NIL	NIL
Nicaragua	NIL	NIL	NIL
Niger	X	X	X
Nigeria	NIL	X	X
North Macedonia, Republic of	NIL	NIL	X
Norway	✓	✓	X
Oman	NIL	NIL	X
Pakistan	X	X	X
Panama	NIL	NIL	X
Papua New Guinea	X	X	X
Paraguay	NIL	NIL	X
Peru	NIL	NIL	X
Philippines	NIL	NIL	NIL
Poland	EU	EU	EU
Portugal	EU	EU	EU
Qatar	NIL	X	X
Romania	EU	EU	EU
Russian Federation	NIL	NIL	NIL
Rwanda	X	X	X
Saint Kitts and Nevis	X	X	X
Saint Lucia	X	X	X
Saint Vincent & the Grenadines	NIL	NIL	X
Samoa	NIL	NIL	NIL
Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of	NIL	NIL	X
Senegal	NIL	X	X
Seychelles	NIL	X	X
Sierra Leone	X	X	X
Singapore	NIL	NIL	X
Slovak Republic	EU	EU	EU
Slovenia	EU	EU	EU
Solomon Islands	X	X	X
South Africa	✓	X	X
Spain	EU	EU	EU

⁶ Mauritius makes its export subsidies notification on a marketing year basis. The European Union has notified up until the period of 1 July 2017 to 30 June 2018.

Member	2016 Export Subsidy (ES:1) Notifications	2017 Export Subsidy (ES:1) Notifications	2018 Export Subsidy (ES:1) Notifications
Sri Lanka	NIL	NIL	X
Suriname	X	X	X
Sweden	EU	EU	EU
Switzerland	✓	✓	X
Chinese Taipei	NIL	NIL	NIL
Tajikistan	NIL	NIL	NIL
Tanzania	X	X	X
Thailand	X	X	X
Togo	NIL	X	X
Tonga	X	X	X
Trinidad and Tobago	X	X	X
Tunisia	X	X	X
Turkey	X	X	X
Uganda	X	X	X
Ukraine	NIL	NIL	NIL
United Arab Emirates	NIL	X	X
United Kingdom	EU	EU	EU
United States of America	X	X	X
Uruguay	NIL	X	X
Vanuatu	X	X	X
Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of	X	X	X
Viet Nam	X	X	X
Yemen	X	X	X
Zambia	NIL	X	X
Zimbabwe	NIL	NIL	X
TOTAL	94	78	50