WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION
ORGANISATION MONDIALE DU COMMERCE
ORGANIZACIÓN MUNDIAL DEL COMERCIO

A PAPER FOR THE
INTERNATIONAL COTTON ADVISORY COMMITTEE
60TH PLENARY MEETING
Victoria Falls, Zimbabwe
16-21 September 2001

A REVIEW OF DEVELOPMENTS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WTO AGREEMENT ON TEXTILES AND CLOTHING AND THE WTO AGREEMENT ON AGRICULTURE

I. Introduction

The year 2001 has been a very busy one for the 142 countries which compose the World Trade Organization as they continue their efforts to put into place comprehensive and effective legal ground rules for international commerce as part of their long-term goal of achieving an open, fair and predictable system of trade. These rules, which include not only the traditional area of trade in goods but also extend to trade in services and to the protection of intellectual property rights, are contained in the various agreements concluded by the Member countries in the previous rounds of multilateral trade negotiations and adopted by their legislatures.

Much of the Members' efforts this year has been directed towards the preparation of the agenda for the WTO Fourth Ministerial Conference which will be held at Doha, Qatar from 9 to 13 November 2001. At this meeting, trade ministers will examine the work being carried out in the WTO and will discuss the future work programme which they wish to undertake. This will include examination of the possible scope and content of a new round of multilateral trade negotiations. Concurrent with the preparations for the Ministerial Conference, the Member countries have been carrying out their ongoing work programme of implementing and administering the agreements already in place. In the area of international trade in cotton and in textile and clothing products, two of the most important of the agreements which Members are implementing are the Agreement on Agriculture and the Agreement on Textiles and Clothing. Both of these were negotiated in the Uruguay Round and entered into force in 1995, with the creation of the World Trade Organization.

To provide ICAC members with information on the work currently being carried out in the WTO which might be relevant to their deliberations at the 60th Plenary Meeting, this paper contains: (a) an overall review of the Agreement on Textiles and Clothing, including information on the implementation experience to date, and an outlook on the remaining steps to be taken under this Agreement, and (b) a description of the provisions of

Centre William Rappard Rue de Lausanne 154 Case postale CH - 1211 Genève 21
Téléphone: (+41 22) 739 51 11 Fax: (+41 22) 731 42 06
Internet: http://www.wto.org

the Agreement on Agriculture, including the experience thus far in its implementation, with reference to some cotton trading countries, and a consideration of the possible future course of action.

II. The Agreement on Textiles and Clothing (ATC)

Background

World trade in textiles and clothing has been heavily influenced by a system of import quotas which began in the 1960s. For more than a decade, arrangements, which applied only to cotton products, were maintained providing a framework for bilateral agreements or unilateral actions that established quotas limiting imports into countries whose domestic industries were facing serious damage from rapidly increasing imports. From 1974 until 1994 the trade was governed by the Multifibre Arrangement (MFA), which expanded the range of fibres covered by the quotas. These quotas conflicted with GATT's general preference for the use of customs tariffs instead of measures that restrict quantities. They were also exceptions to the GATT principle of treating all trading partners equally because they specified how much the importing country was going to accept from individual exporting countries.

The ATC, which was negotiated in the Uruguay Round and which entered into force on 1 January 1995, is a ten-year programme to progressively bring all textile and clothing trade fully under WTO rules and, thereby, to dismantle the extensive network of bilateral quotas that has had such a profound effect on this trade. It is broadly considered by economists that the removal of these quotas will lead to an expansion of world trade in textile and clothing products, largely to the benefit of the most efficient developing country producers, and will bring about reductions in prices to consumers as the trade become fully subject to normal market forces.

The Provisions of the ATC

The central element of the ATC is the transitional process for the integration of all textile and clothing products into WTO rules and disciplines. As products are integrated, that is, brought fully under normal WTO rules and out of the scope of the special rules of the ATC, quotas on them must be removed and no further bilateral quotas can be applied in the future. Operationally, when the ATC began in 1995, all existing quotas under the former MFA were carried over into it, which amounted to about 1,350 individual quotas maintained by the EC, US, Canada and Norway on exports from a number of developing countries.

The agreed rate for the integration of textile and clothing products fully into WTO rules in the first stage (1995-97) was 16 per cent of the total volume of each country's imports in 1990; and a further 17 per cent was integrated on 1 January 1998 at the beginning of the second stage. Consequently, at present, one-third of all textile and clothing products have been integrated fully into WTO rules and all quotas which were applied on those products have been removed. At the beginning of the third stage, on 1 January 2002, a further 18 per cent of products will be integrated and some additional quotas will be removed; the process will be completed on 31 December 2004 with the integration of all remaining products and the full removal of the quota regime (Table A).

Another key aspect of the ATC's transitional process is the requirement for automatic increases in the annual quota growth rates which were also carried over from the former MFA. For products remaining under quota, the rates of annual growth applicable to these quotas, which ranged from less than 1 per cent up to 7 per cent, have been increased: by a factor of 16 per cent in stage 1 and by a further factor of 25 per cent in stage 2. This represents a compound increase of 45 per cent over the former MFA quota growth rates. At the beginning of stage 3 on 1 January 2002, growth rates will be further increased by a factor of 27 per cent and at the conclusion of the transition period, on 31 December 2004, all remaining quotas will be eliminated (Table A).

TABLE A

Stages	**The Integration Process** (percentage of products to be brought fully under WTO rules)	**Increases in Quota Growth Rates** (based on MFA growth rate in 1994 of 6% as an example)
Stage 1: 1 Jan. 1995	**16%** (minimum, taking 1990 imports as base)	**6.96%** per year (i.e. 1994 rate + 16%)
Stage 2: 1 Jan. 1998	**17%** (minimum, taking 1990 imports as base)	**8.7%** per year (i.e. 1997 rate + 25%)
Stage 3: 1 Jan. 2002	**18%** (minimum, taking 1990 imports as base)	**11.05%** per year (i.e. 2001 rate + 27%)
Stage 4: 31 Dec. 2004 Full integration into WTO and final elimination of quotas; Agreement on Textiles and Clothing terminates	**49%** (maximum, all remaining products)	**Elimination of All Remaining Quotas**

The Implementation Experience of the ATC

Moving from this technical description of the provisions of the Agreement to the actual progress achieved thus far in its implementation, two points are clear as we reach the final months of Year Seven of the ten-year transitional process: first, the legal requirements of the ATC have been met by the countries maintaining the quotas, the EU, US, Canada and Norway, both in the integration of products and in the application of quota growth rates. Second, the integration of products into WTO rules by these countries has begun with the least sensitive products, mostly those not subject to quotas. In consequence, few quotas have been removed. In the first stage, no quotas were eliminated, with one exception in Canada. In the second stage, some additional products under quota were integrated in Canada while the first quotas were removed by the EU and US. For the third stage, at the beginning of 2002, these countries have notified that they will again remove some quotas as part of their integration programmes. Norway is an exception and has unilaterally removed all of its quotas, while not integrating the products. Thus, it has kept the right to re-introduce quotas under the ATC, if Norway should consider it necessary. Based on this situation, it is now clear that the textile and clothing products of greatest export interest to developing countries, along with more than 80 per cent of the quotas originally in place, could remain within the ATC up to the end of the transition period on 31 December 2004, though with progressive increases in their annual growth rates.

The Concerns of Developing, Exporting Countries

Many developing, exporting countries have expressed their concern about the way in which the process of market liberalization in textiles is being carried out. They argue that the implementation processes of the major importing countries have been highly unsatisfactory, with no real liberalization being achieved in the first seven years of its operation while the product integration programmes of these countries are not commercially meaningful for the developing countries, being concentrated in low value-added products of little export interest. Further, very few quotas have been removed thus far leaving the vast majority for the final stage. There is concern that the retention of quotas to the end of the process ("backloading") could lead to serious problems including possible demands for their continued application after 2004. In response to these concerns, the countries maintaining quotas have reconfirmed their commitment to full integration of this sector with the removal of all bilateral quotas by the end of the transition period.

These implementation problems and concerns have repeatedly been brought before the Members of the WTO by the developing, exporting countries. They have made proposals on how the developed countries that maintain quotas could make immediate and tangible improvements in the process and quality of implementation of the ATC in order to respond to these concerns. This was done without any intention of making changes to the Agreement; rather, to have the implementation of the ATC by the developed countries contribute concretely to realizing its objectives and to respond to the particular trade interests of developing countries. These suggestions include improvement in the integration process, more liberal application of the growth rate increases in products of interest to developing exporters, as well as other actions.

The most recent discussions of the problems of developing countries relating to the implementation of the ATC have taken place in the WTO General Council this year as part of the preparations for the Fourth Ministerial Conference in Qatar and the possible launch of a new round of multilateral trade negotiations. These discussions are on-going at the present time. Also, the WTO Council for Trade in Goods, which is responsible for overseeing the implementation of the Agreement, is currently conducting the major review of the implementation process in the second stage (1998-2001). The Member countries will be examining all aspects of the actions taken during the past four years to ensure that the requirements of the Agreement have been fully met.

The Remaining Stages of Implementation

Looking to the next step in the ATC's transition period, the third stage of the integration process will begin on 1 January 2002. At that time, a further 18 per cent of each country's textile and clothing products will be integrated, for a total over the three stages of not less than 51 per cent. The lists of products to be integrated in the third stage have been submitted to the WTO by the respective Members. Also at the beginning of Stage 3, the annual growth rates for the remaining quotas will be increased by a further factor of 27 per cent. Hence, the final integration process, right up to the end of the transition, has now been notified to the WTO. The final step, on 31 December 2004 will be the integration of all remaining products, the removal of all bilateral quotas and the termination of the Agreement itself.

Some Additional Considerations

The termination of the quota system at the end of 2004 will not mean the end of the WTO's activity affecting textiles and clothing trade. Governments will continue, through their on-going work in the WTO, to seek to extend market access liberalization by further developing the rules and procedures of the trading system. A new round of multilateral trade negotiations would be a key occasion to further develop this liberalization, which would include reductions in tariffs, the main vehicle for protection in the absence of quotas.

With the removal of the quota system, normal market forces will become the main determinants of the future course of textiles and clothing trade. While price will remain a key factor in this trade, other aspects, including product quality, dependability of the suppliers, favourable government policies, and efficient transportation will determine the most successful participants. The application of the rapid advances in production technology and electronic communication will also be important factors in global trade. Consideration of the future direction of global textiles and clothing trade must also include the impact of the completion of the accession process to the WTO of some of the larger traders in this sector. All of these taken together will lead to changes in the global trading pattern in this sector, with substantial growth anticipated in overall trade levels, to the greatest benefit of the most efficient producers.

III. The Agreement on Agriculture

Background

Up to 1995, GATT rules were largely ineffective in disciplining agricultural trade. In particular, export and domestic subsidies proliferated, while the strict disciplines on import restrictions were often flouted.

The WTO Agreement on Agriculture was negotiated in the Uruguay Round (1986–94) and is a significant first step towards fairer competition and a less distorted sector. It includes specific commitments by WTO Member governments to improve market access and reduce trade-distorting subsidies in agriculture. These commitments are being implemented over a six-year period (10 years for developing countries) that began in 1995.

The Agreement defines agricultural products in its Annex 1 by reference to the Harmonised System of Product Classification. The products in respect of which commitments are to be established are as follows: HS Chapters 1 to 24, less fish and fish products, plus a number of other HS Codes including 52.01 to 52.03 for raw cotton, waste and cotton carded or combed.

The Agreement on Agriculture established a new set of rules for agriculture trade along with, of course, specific commitments on support and protection which are quantifiable. Commitments were taken, in particular, in the areas of market access, domestic support and export subsidies.

Market Access

Prior to the Agreement on Agriculture, trade in many agricultural products was restricted by high tariffs and/or by non-tariff measures (NTMs). During the negotiations, it was decided that tariffs should become the only border protection measure which required that all non-tariffs measures be converted into their tariff equivalent. Once there was a tariff to work on, bindings and reductions could be negotiated. In the case of developed country Members, the initial tariffs are being reduced over a six-year period beginning in 1995 by, on average, 36 per cent with a minimum reduction of 15 per cent for each product. In the case of developing country Members, an average reduction of 24 per cent is taking place over 10 years with a minimum reduction of 10 per cent for each agricultural product. Least-developed country Members were not required to show tariff reductions in their schedules but were required, like all other Members, to bind all of their tariffs on agricultural products. One should also note that with regard to customs tariffs, a Member's applied tariff rates may be lower than or equal to its bound tariffs as listed in its schedule of commitments.

In cases where tariffs were very high or where import quotas had allowed in little imports, minimum and current market access opportunities were also negotiated. On the other hand, importing countries' fears that tariff only protection could lead to import surges or low priced imports were addressed, by allowing them to charge a special safeguard tariff in certain situations.

Domestic Support

In agriculture, the widespread use of production related subsidies, like price supports, led to increasing production in some countries. In some cases, the protection and subsidies increased production above the market equilibrium level and the excess had to be stock-piled or exported. However, with world market prices often much lower than domestic prices, the exports required export subsidies. Thus, one subsidy (domestic supports) led to another (export subsidies). Even without exports, domestic supports increase production and reduce demand for imports, thus affecting trade. Subsidies paid to farmers and the industries associated with agriculture also have the potential to distort trade because they may encourage production by reducing costs (subsidies for fertilizer) or increasing incomes or prices (guaranteed prices).

However, not all subsidies distort trade to the same extent. During the Uruguay Round, it became clear that non-distorting subsidies provided to or in favour of producers with legitimate policy objectives (including food security, regional and environmental objectives) had to be separated and placed in the "Green Box", away from distorting ones. The exempt categories also cover special treatment for developing countries ("the Special and Differential Box") and direct payments under production limiting programmes ("the Blue Box"). All other subsidies were subject to reduction commitments, i.e. the "Amber Box".

The reduction commitments are expressed in terms of a "Total Aggregate Measurement of Support" (Total AMS). Developed countries took the engagement to reduce their Total AMS by 20 per cent in equal instalments over a 6-year period (1995-2000). In the case of developing countries, this reduction was 13 per cent over 10 years (1995-2004). Members with no reduction commitments in their schedules may only use non-exempt support within *de minimis* levels (5 per cent for developed country Members and 10 per cent for developing country Members) but may make full use of the support measures that are covered by the Green Box and other exempt support categories under the Agreement on Agriculture.

Export Subsidies

Under Article XVI of GATT 1947 export subsidies were prohibited, but Article XVI.3 gave an exemption for primary products provided they did not give the Contracting Party more than "an equitable share of world export trade". The lack of clarity given by Article XVI.3 allowed some Contracting Parties to use export subsidies to increase or maintain their shares of world trade.

Export subsidies were, and are, considered by many economists to be the worst form of trade-distorting subsidy and for this reason were given special treatment in the Agreement on Agriculture. As well as strict rules on reductions, anti-circumvention rules were also introduced to ensure that Members did not avoid their obligations. The reduction commitments for export subsidies are shown in Members' schedules on a product-specific basis. Only those countries which have listed commitments for reducing export subsidies are allowed to use them and they must remain within the limits set out in their Schedules. No new subsidies can be introduced nor can existing commitments be transferred to other agricultural products. Members must reduce them by 21 per cent in volume and

36 per cent in budgetary value over the six-year period (1995 to 2000) compared to the 1986 - 1990 base period. For developing countries the reduction commitments are 14 per cent in volume and 24 per cent in budgetary value over the 10-year period to 2004.

Special and Differential Treatment and Non-Trade Concerns

Along with the commitments under the three main pillars, the provisions of the Agreement on Agriculture also take into account special and differential treatment and non-trade concerns. Indeed, special and differential treatment for developing countries will once again be an integral element of the negotiations. In addition, the reform programme aims to strike a balance between agricultural trade liberalization and governments' desire to pursue legitimate agricultural policy goals, including non-trade concerns.

Selected Commitments for Cotton

The Annex to this paper provides an overview of the cotton commitments undertaken under the Uruguay Round Negotiations by selected ICAC and WTO Members which are major players on the cotton scene. Information has been provided on the tariff reductions for Burkina Faso, Egypt, the European Communities, the United States and Zimbabwe. The reduction commitments for export subsidies for cotton are nil for these countries as shown in their respective WTO Schedules of Commitments. As domestic support reduction commitment levels are expressed on an aggregated basis for all agricultural products, information is provided on the levels of product-specific support for cotton as notified (for the most recent year for which a notification was made) by this same group of countries.

The WTO Negotiations on Agriculture

The Uruguay Round Agreement on Agriculture sets up a framework of rules and started reductions in protection and trade-distorting support. But this was only the first phase of the reform programme. Article 20 committed Members to start negotiations on continuing the reform at the end of 1999 (or beginning of 2000). Those negotiations are now well underway, using Article 20 as their basis.

In its introductory paragraph, Article 20 states clearly that the long term objective should be substantial progressive reductions in agricultural protection and support. These negotiations will examine what further commitments - e.g. a further reduction in customs tariffs and subsidies for all agricultural products, including of course cotton - are necessary to achieve fundamental reform of agricultural trade. The negotiations will take into account factors such as the experience gained during the implementation period, the effects of Uruguay Round reduction commitments on world trade in agriculture, non-trade concerns, the situation of developing country Members and the objective to establish a fair and market-oriented agricultural trading system.

The following issues are among those that have been raised so far in the negotiations.

Market Access

On market access a number of issues are being put on the table. These include the following:

Tariffs Levels: Average tariff rates for agriculture products are still much higher than those for industrial products and reducing the difference between them will be the objective of many Members in the negotiations. Further tariff cuts will be a key issue, with many Members proposing in one way or another formula approaches.

Tariff Peaks: In addition to high average tariffs many Members charge very high tariffs on certain products. Exporting countries have complained that they often face prohibitive tariffs for many products, which effectively prevents any opportunity to export sensitive products outside of tariff quotas. It has been suggested that some sort of approach will be needed which will require greater reductions from higher tariffs and reduce the variability between tariffs.

Tariff Escalation: Tariff escalation has been identified as a serious problem, especially for developing countries seeking to improve their food processing industries and exports thereof and there are a number of proposals calling for the elimination of tariff escalation.

Tariff Rate Quotas: The Uruguay Round Agreement on Agriculture included commitments to open market access opportunities by way of tariff rate quotas, i.e. opportunities for limited import volumes to access markets at relatively low tariffs. However, in many cases the fill rates have been relatively low. Although it is accepted that these commitments related to opportunities and not to import guarantees, many exporters feel that the methods of administration may be impeding exports and adequate market access. Therefore, many exporting countries seek, along with their expansion, better guidelines for the administration of tariff quotas.

Domestic Support

Domestic support is already the subject of intense discussion at this point of the negotiations. The negotiations may examine each of the three boxes and the way in which the reduction commitments are applied.

Many proposals on the table call for further reductions in **Amber Box** support. Some other proposals seek reductions leading to the elimination of Amber Box type supports. There are also proposals to have further reduction commitments on a product-specific basis rather than the aggregate agriculture-wide basis as is currently the case.

The Blue Box payments have been criticised by a number of Members and defended by others. There is nothing in the Agreement to suggest that Article 6.5, which covers payments under production limiting programmes, is temporary. However, there are proposals to have the Blue Box absorbed by the Amber Box or to have reduction commitments applied to it, including proposals leading to the elimination of the Blue Box.

The Green Box is designed to allow subsidies where they are minimally trade distorting. Many Members have defended the flexibility of the Green Box by pointing out that it allows them to address concerns in ways which do not distort trade while others have claimed that in some cases the scale of these payments means that they may have a significant trade or production effect.

Export Competition

A wide range of Members are seeking the abolition of export subsidies and tighter rules preventing circumvention. There is another proposal indicating readiness to negotiate further reductions of export subsidies on the condition that other forms of export subsidization are disciplined in an equivalent way.

In this regard, it is noteworthy that there is one piece of unfinished business in the export subsides area, namely an agreement on disciplines on agricultural export credits. State trading enterprises and certain food aid transactions also feature in the negotiating proposals submitted.

Special and Differential Treatment

Special and differential treatment will continue to be an integral part of the negotiations. Although it is widely accepted that developing countries need flexibility in implementing their commitments, there are differences in opinion as to the exact form this flexibility should take.

Non-Trade Concerns

Although the current negotiations are required to take account of non-trade concerns there is a wide difference of opinion about how these concerns should be addressed. Some Members feel that the Green Box already allows Governments to make payments under programmes aimed at addressing these issues, while others feel that they can address their non-trade concerns only through agricultural production and therefore that production needs to be adequately supported and protected by appropriate border measures.

Developing countries have pointed out that their non-trade concerns such as poverty alleviation, rural development and food security are of a fundamentally different dimension than those of developed countries.

The WTO Agreement on Agriculture and Prospects for Trade in Agricultural Products

The plethora of trade barriers, such as import quotas, variable levies, so-called voluntary export restraints, local content schemes and many other non-tariff measures which have plagued agricultural traders all over the world are now all gone - except for non-tariff measures covered by general, non-agriculture specific provisions of the WTO Agreements. What remains are tariffs which still are high in many cases. This is the logical and inevitable consequence of tariffication. In compensation, market access opportunities that traders had in the past are preserved through tariff rate quotas, and countries with low levels of import penetration have to offer additional market access.

The market access package of the Uruguay Round Agreement on Agriculture ensures that export-minded entrepreneurs can take a long-term view: all new market access opportunities are bound in the WTO and thus legally enforceable. This means predictability and the guarantee that foreign markets will remain open for business also in the future.

The Uruguay Round commitments on export subsidies and market access are supplemented by commitments on domestic support which help to ensure that domestic subsidies do not thwart the promise of more open markets. Governments cannot increase the level of product-specific trade-distorting domestic support beyond the level during the 1992 marketing year, or they risk being challenged in the WTO. This provision is meant to ensure that governments do not undermine the competitiveness of foreign suppliers by subsidizing domestic producers beyond consolidated, i.e. multilaterally agreed levels.

Sanitary and phytosanitary measures at the border can be easily misused. Here, the Uruguay Round Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures closes a potential loophole for disguised protectionism. Its provisions reaffirm that no Member should be prevented from adopting or enforcing measures necessary to protect human, animal or plant life or health, but it shelters exporters against arbitrary border treatment of their produce.

Finally, there are several other WTO provisions, including the GATT 1994, which apply to trade in agricultural products designed to contain arbitrary protectionary or trade-distorting practices, reinforced by a strong dispute settlement system, and the WTO provides, of course, also a forum for further trade negotiations such as those currently going on in agriculture.

However, at the same time, these new opportunities call for a domestic environment conducive to exports. Developing countries, in particular, must create and maintain the momentum towards a market-driven and outward-looking policy framework. Still today significant disparities in government assistance levels remain between the manufacturing sector and the agricultural sector, as well as within the agricultural sector. A more neutral structure of incentives would reduce inefficiencies and would further increase competitiveness in world agricultural markets.

ANNEX

TABLE 1

Cotton: Tariff Reductions of Selected ICAC and WTO Members

Country	Tariff Item Number	Description of Products	Pre-Uruguay Round Base Tariff Rate (simple average) (u = not bound)	Post-Uruguay Round Bound Tariff Rate (simple average)
Burkina Faso	5201-5203	Raw cotton, waste and cotton to carded or combed	100%	100%
Egypt	5201-5203	Raw cotton, waste and cotton to carded or combed	10%	5%
European Communities	5203.00 Remainder	Cotton, carded or combed -	1.4% 0	0 0
United States	5201.00 5201.00.05	Cotton, not carded or combed Harsh or rough	free (u)	free
	5201.00.14	Other	free (u)	free
	5201.00.18	Other	36.9¢/kg (u)	31.4¢/kg
	5201.00.24	Rough cotton, not carded or combed	4.4¢/kg	4.4¢/kg
	5201.00.28	Other	36.9¢/kg (u)	31.4¢/kg
	5201.00.34	Cotton, not carded or combed	4.4¢/kg	4.4¢/kg
	5201.00.38	Other	36.9¢/kg (u)	31.4¢/kg
	5201.00.60	Cotton, not carded or combed	1.5¢/kg	1.5¢/kg
	5201.00.80	Other	36.9¢/kg (u)	31.4¢/kg

Country	Tariff Item Number	Description of Products	Pre-Uruguay Round Base Tariff Rate (simple average) (u = not bound)	Post-Uruguay Round Bound Tariff Rate (simple average)
United States (cont'd)	5202	Cotton waste	free (u)	free
	5202.10.00	Yarn waste		
	5202.91.10	Other (garnetted stock under 28.575 mm)	5% (u)	4.3%
		Other (garnetted stock of 28.575 mm or more)	11¢/kg + 5%	
	5202.99	Other	free	free
	5202.99.10	Card strips made from cotton		
	5202.99.30	Other	9.2¢/kg	7.8¢/kg
	5202.99.50	Other	free	free
	5203.00	Cotton, carded or combed	5%	5%
	5203.00.10	Fibres of cotton processed but not spun		
	5203.00.30	Other	36.9¢/kg (u)	31.4¢/kg
	5203.00.50	Other	5%	4.3%
Zimbabwe	5201-5203	Raw cotton, waste and cotton to carded or combed	150%	150%

Source: WTO Secretariat.

TABLE 2

Cotton: Domestic Support of Selected ICAC and WTO Members as Notified

Country	Currency	Product-specific support	Current total product AMS (aggregate)
Burkina Faso		Notification not available	Notification not available
Egypt		0	0
European Communities	Million EURO	715.2	715.2
United States	Million US$	934.7	934.7
Zimbabwe		0	0

Source: WTO Secretariat.