



# **Agricultural Policies in OECD Countries AT A GLANCE**



**OECD** 

**OECD PUBLISHING**

**2006**



# **Agricultural Policies in OECD Countries**

AT A GLANCE 2006



ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

# ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

The OECD is a unique forum where the governments of 30 democracies work together to address the economic, social and environmental challenges of globalisation. The OECD is also at the forefront of efforts to understand and to help governments respond to new developments and concerns, such as corporate governance, the information economy and the challenges of an ageing population. The Organisation provides a setting where governments can compare policy experiences, seek answers to common problems, identify good practice and work to co-ordinate domestic and international policies.

The OECD member countries are: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Korea, Luxembourg, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Slovak Republic, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States. The Commission of the European Communities takes part in the work of the OECD.

OECD Publishing disseminates widely the results of the Organisation's statistics gathering and research on economic, social and environmental issues, as well as the conventions, guidelines and standards agreed by its members

*This work is published under the responsibility of OECD Committee for Agriculture.*

*The integration of European Union countries that are not members of the OECD in indicators of support of the European Union reported in this document has been carried out with the financial assistance of the European Union. The views expressed in the report can in no way be taken to reflect the official opinion of the European Union.*



Also available in French under the title:  
**Les politiques agricoles des pays de l'OCDE**  
PANORAMA 2006

© OECD 2006

No reproduction, copy, transmission or translation of this publication may be made without written permission. Applications should be sent to OECD Publishing: [rights@oecd.org](mailto:rights@oecd.org) or by fax (33 1) 45 24 13 91. Permission to photocopy a portion of this work should be addressed to the Centre français d'exploitation du droit de copie, 20, rue des Grands-Augustins, 75006 Paris, France ([contact@cfcopies.com](mailto:contact@cfcopies.com)).

## Foreword

**T**his is the 2nd edition of *Agricultural Policies in OECD Countries: At a Glance*, which has been published in alternate years with the *Agricultural Policies in OECD Countries: Monitoring and Evaluation* since 2004 when the 1st edition appeared.

Based on a comprehensive and comparative system for measuring and classifying support to agriculture the report consists of three parts. Chapter 1 provides a short description and an overall assessment of agricultural support policy developments and agricultural support overall in OECD member countries and in selected non-member economies. Chapter 2 provides that information in individual member countries and Chapter 3 contains more detailed tables on support estimates.

The OECD's Committee for Agriculture approved the publication of the report in June 2006.

**Acknowledgements.** This edition of *Agricultural Policies in OECD Countries: At a Glance*, was prepared by the Food, Agriculture and Fisheries Directorate of the OECD with the active participation of member countries. The following people from the OECD Secretariat contributed to drafting this report: Catherine Moreddu (co-ordinator), Ken Ash, Carmel Cahill, Andrea Cattaneo, Alexandra de Matos Nunes, Dimitris Diakosavvas, Piret Hein, Hsin Huang, Osamu Kubota, Andrzej Kwiecinski, Il Jeong Jeong, Jussi Lankoski, Wilfrid Legg, Roger Martini, Kevin Parris, Luis Portugal, Véronique de Saint-Martin, Stefan Tangermann, Wyatt Thompson, Frank Van Tongeren and Václav Vojtech. Alexandra de Matos Nunes co-ordinated the preparation of the main tables and graphs for the report. Statistical assistance was provided by Joanna Komorowska, Florence Mauclert, Laetitia Reille, Véronique de Saint-Martin and Noura Takrouri Jolly. Secretarial services were provided by Françoise Benicourt and Michèle Patterson. Technical assistance in the preparation of the PSE/CSE database for the Web site presentation was provided by Eric Espinasse and Frano Ilicic. Many other colleagues in the OECD Secretariat furnished useful comments on various drafts of the report.

## Note to Readers

On-going changes in agricultural policies require that the methods used to calculate and present the Producer and Consumer Support Estimates (PSEs and CSEs) and related indicators be reviewed periodically. One such review is currently underway, with the participation of experts nominated by OECD member countries. The focus of current reflections is on the classification of policy instruments within the PSE and on the definition of the PSE by commodity and the procedures used to derive it. The experts have not yet completed their deliberations. Consequently and in order to avoid prejudging the outcome of these deliberations, it has been decided that the current report should not include any commodity specific indicators. This is an interim measure for the 2006 report only. The expert group currently working on these issues will, as soon as possible, make a series of recommendations to the OECD body responsible for the preparation of the indicators of agricultural support (the Working Party on Agricultural Policies and Markets). It is intended that the changes resulting from that process will be incorporated in the 2007 edition of the report *Agricultural Policies in OECD Countries: Monitoring and Evaluation*.

Detailed information on definitions and calculations is available in the documentation on the OECD Web site ([www.oecd.org/agr/support](http://www.oecd.org/agr/support)).

### This book has...



## StatLinks

**A service from OECD Publishing  
that delivers Excel™ files from the printed page!**

Look for the StatLinks at the bottom right-hand corner of the tables or graphs in this book. To download the matching Excel™ spreadsheet, just type the link into your internet browser, starting with the <http://dx.doi.org> prefix. If you're reading the PDF e-book edition, and your pc is connected to the Internet, simply click on the link. You'll find StatLinks appearing in more OECD books.

## Table of Contents

<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	9
<b>Chapter 1. Evaluation of Support Policy Developments</b> .....	13
1. Evaluation of support policy developments in OECD countries .....	14
2. Agricultural policies in Brazil, China and South Africa through OECD indicators of agricultural support .....	36
Annex 1.A1. Policy Principles .....	39
Annex 1.A2. Operational Criteria .....	40
Annex 1.A3. Definitions of the OECD Indicators of Support .....	41
<b>Chapter 2. Country Focus</b> .....	43
Australia .....	44
Canada .....	46
European Union .....	48
Iceland .....	52
Japan .....	54
Korea .....	56
Mexico .....	58
New Zealand .....	60
Norway .....	62
Switzerland .....	64
Turkey .....	66
United States .....	68
<b>Chapter 3. Additional Tables on Estimates of Support to Agriculture</b> .....	71
<b>List of Boxes</b>	
1.1. Method for evaluating policy developments .....	14
1.2. Major policy changes in Korea .....	16
1.3. Evaluating annual changes in the estimated level of support in the OECD ....	18
1.4. Water policy reform and agriculture in OECD countries .....	30
<b>List of Tables</b>	
1.1. OECD: Estimates of support to agriculture (USD million) .....	19
1.2. OECD: Estimates of support to agriculture (EUR million) .....	20
1.3. OECD: Producer Support Estimate by country .....	21
1.4. Contribution to change in Producer Support Estimate by country, 2004 to 2005 .....	24

1.5. Contribution to change in Market Price Support by country, 2004 to 2005 . . . . .	25
1.6. OECD: General Services Support Estimate by country . . . . .	31
1.7. OECD: Total Support Estimate by country. . . . .	34
1.8. Producer Support Estimate in selected OECD and non-OECD countries, 1993-2004. . . . .	36
2.1. Australia: Estimates of support to agriculture . . . . .	45
2.2. Canada: Estimates of support to agriculture . . . . .	47
2.3.A. European Union: Estimates of support to agriculture (EU25 from 2004) . . . . .	49
2.3.B. European Union: Estimates of support to agriculture (EU15). . . . .	50
2.4. Iceland: Estimates of support to agriculture . . . . .	53
2.5. Japan: Estimates of support to agriculture . . . . .	55
2.6. Korea: Estimates of support to agriculture . . . . .	57
2.7. Mexico: Estimates of support to agriculture. . . . .	59
2.8. New Zealand: Estimates of support to agriculture . . . . .	61
2.9. Norway: Estimates of support to agriculture . . . . .	63
2.10. Switzerland: Estimates of support to agriculture . . . . .	65
2.11. Turkey: Estimates of support to agriculture . . . . .	67
2.12. United States: Estimates of support to agriculture . . . . .	69
3.1. OECD: Composition of Producer Support Estimate by country . . . . .	72
3.2. OECD: Composition of General Services Support Estimate by country . . . . .	75
3.3. OECD: Consumer Support Estimate by country . . . . .	77

### List of Figures

1.1. Evolution of OECD Producer Support Estimate (%PSE), Nominal Protection Coefficient (NPCp) and Nominal Assistance Coefficient (NACp) . . . . .	18
1.2. Producer Support Estimate by country . . . . .	23
1.3. Producer Nominal Assistance Coefficient by country. . . . .	23
1.4. Composition of OECD Producer Support Estimate (PSE), 1986-2005 . . . . .	25
1.5. Composition of Producer Support Estimate by country, 1986-88 and 2003-05. . . . .	26
1.6. Producer Nominal Protection Coefficient by country . . . . .	26
1.7. Consumer Support Estimate by country. . . . .	27
1.8. Total Support Estimate by country . . . . .	33
1.9. Composition of Producer Support Estimate in selected OECD and non-OECD countries, 1995-97 and 2001-03 . . . . .	37
1.10. Total Support Estimate for selected OECD and non-OECD countries, 2001-03 . . . . .	38
2.1. Australia: Producer Support Estimate: level and composition over time. . . . .	44
2.2. Canada: Producer Support Estimate: level and composition over time . . . . .	46
2.3. European Union: Producer Support Estimate: level and composition over time . . . . .	48
2.4. Iceland: Producer Support Estimate: level and composition over time . . . . .	52
2.5. Japan: Producer Support Estimate: level and composition over time. . . . .	54
2.6. Korea: Producer Support Estimate: level and composition over time. . . . .	56
2.7. Mexico: Producer Support Estimate: level and composition over time . . . . .	58
2.8. New Zealand: Producer Support Estimate: level and composition over time . . . . .	60
2.9. Norway: Producer Support Estimate: level and composition over time . . . . .	62



2.10. Switzerland: Producer Support Estimate: level and composition over time . . . .	64
2.11. Turkey: Producer Support Estimate: level and composition over time . . . . .	66
2.12. United States: Producer Support Estimate: level and composition over time . . .	68



# Executive Summary

---

*The agriculture sector across the OECD area continues to be characterised by high levels of support*

---

In 2005, support to producers in the OECD area, as measured by the percentage PSE, accounted for 29% of farm receipts, the same as in 2004, but down from 37% in 1986-88. The PSE in 2005 is estimated at USD 280 billion or EUR 225 billion. Total support to the agricultural sector, which combines support to producers, budgetary transfers to consumers and general services to agriculture, was equivalent to 1.1% of GDP in 2005 compared to 2.3% in 1986-88.

---

*There continues to be a gradual shift away from the most production and trade distorting policy instruments*

---

Policy reform is changing the way in which support is provided to producers. The share of the most production and trade distorting forms of support – those linked to production or input use – declined from 91% of producer support in 1986-88 to 72% in 2003-05. A decrease in output-linked support is also shown by a significant reduction in the gap between domestic producer and border prices. In 1986-88, the average OECD producer price was 57% higher than the border price; by 2003-05 the gap had fallen to 27%. Reductions in these forms of support have been accompanied by increases in payments based on area or animal numbers or on historical entitlements, dampening the impact on farm receipts. Compliance conditions, especially environmental, are increasingly being attached to such payments. However, measures linked to production or input use still dominate producer support in most countries, encouraging output, putting stress on natural resources and distorting trade. Moreover, there has been only very modest progress towards policies targeted to clearly defined objectives and beneficiaries. Further efforts are needed to ensure that policies are more transparent in operation, tailored to specific outcomes and flexible in responding to changing priorities.

---

*Reform of agricultural policies has been uneven across countries*

---

Since 1986-88, producer support as a percentage of farm receipts has fallen in virtually all countries. The largest decrease in percentage points of this indicator has occurred in Canada, Mexico (since 1991-93) and New Zealand. Among the high support countries, the greatest reductions have occurred in Iceland, Switzerland and Korea. Total support to agriculture has also fallen in virtually all OECD countries as a share of total agricultural support in GDP.

---

*Some policy changes were implemented at the national level in 2005, and others were decided*

---

The implementation of the 2003 reform continued in the European Union with the partial shift to the milk payment and, in ten member states, the Single Payment Scheme. Korea began implementing revisions to its rice policy that include the abolition of government purchasing and the introduction of direct payments. Canada introduced the Farm Income Payment programme to make exceptional payments to producers, the latest of a series of *ad hoc* payments. In the United States, the quota and price support for tobacco were replaced by term-limited payments, and the dairy income loss payment was extended to 2007. Turkey extended its Agricultural Reform Implementation Project to 2007. Iceland reorganised its institutions to improve administrative efficiency.

In 2005, the European Union Council agreed to change the sugar regime. From 2006, the administered price for raw and white sugar will be cut and a new payment will be integrated into the Single Payment Scheme. Also, a new Rural Development Regulation was adopted for the 2007-13 period. A new basic plan for Food, Agriculture and Rural Areas was established in Japan. One of its features is the introduction, from 2006, of new direct payments which will shift the basis of support from individual commodity to multi-commodities. A final agreement was reached in Norway on the national environmental programme, while regional programmes were established.

---

*Multilateral reform of agricultural policies remained elusive*

---

The Doha Development Agenda (DDA) round of trade negotiations continued, with discussion on agriculture based on the framework agreed in 2004. A method to establish *ad valorem* tariff-equivalents was agreed and concrete proposals were made. Negotiations at the Hong Kong Ministerial in December 2005 achieved an agreement to ensure the parallel elimination of all forms of export subsidies and disciplines on all export measures with equivalent effect by the end of 2013, subject, of course, to agreement on the DDA more generally. Important issues related to trade distorting forms of domestic support and to improving market access, in particular rates of tariff cuts, are also still outstanding. Progress in these negotiations is urgently needed to inject new life into the process of agricultural policy reform.



## *Chapter 1*

# **Evaluation of Support Policy Developments**

## 1. Evaluation of support policy developments in OECD countries

The short-term changes and long-term trends in OECD countries' agricultural support are described in this section. The latest data provide preliminary estimates of 2005 support that are compared against the previous year to provide a short-term assessment. Long-term trends in agricultural policy are best evaluated by comparing the 2003-05 and 1986-88 periods (Box 1.1).

### Box 1.1. Method for evaluating policy developments

In 1987 Ministers stressed the need for a progressive reduction in agricultural support and a move towards those forms of support that are less production and trade distorting in order to let the agricultural sector respond more to market signals. Ministers also recognised that governments need flexibility in the choice of policy measures and in the pace of reform, taking into account the diverse situations in OECD countries, and the desire to address a range of policy goals. In 1998, they agreed on a set of principles for agricultural policy reform (Annex 1.A1), and a set of operational criteria that should apply in designing and implementing policy measures (Annex 1.A2).

The Producer Support Estimate (PSE) and related indicators (Annex 1.A3) are the principal tools used to monitor and evaluate agricultural policy developments. It is important to distinguish between transfers that are provided to producers and that can affect individual production decisions, and those that are provided to general services that support the agricultural sector as a whole. Policy measures within the PSE are classified in terms of how policies are implemented. A full explanation of the concepts, method, interpretation and guidelines for the use of the OECD support indicators in policy evaluation can be found in *Methodology for the Measurement of Support and Use in Policy Evaluation* [[www.oecd.org/dataoecd/36/47/1937457.pdf](http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/36/47/1937457.pdf)], and a less technical discussion is available in *Agricultural Support: How Is It Measured and What Does It Mean?* [[www.oecd.org/dataoecd/63/8/32035391.pdf](http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/63/8/32035391.pdf)].

This section first sets out the broad context of policy and market developments. Then, the variation in estimated levels of producer support between OECD countries is identified, and the composition of support is described – an important element given that the effects of support on production, trade, the environment, income and other indicators depend on the way the support is given, and not just the magnitude of support. In addition to support to producers, this assessment of agricultural policies shows the amount of support to general agricultural services, to consumers and the agricultural sector as a whole. The section draws some conclusions about OECD countries' progress toward agricultural policy reform.



### Overall developments in policy and markets

Agricultural policy developments during 2005 were dominated by the negotiations towards a Doha Development Agenda agreement – intense preparations that brought about some progress at the Hong Kong Ministerial in December 2005, but fell short of comprehensive agreement. The opportunity exists in 2006 to reform agricultural policy multilaterally by lowering tariff walls and reducing the most distorting forms of support.

Numerous OECD countries are still digesting recent policy changes that directly led to observable changes in support in 2005, and others are preparing to introduce new policies. Agricultural policy in the **European Union (EU)** was marked by the implementation of the 2003 Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) reform, and the accession on 1 May 2004 of ten new member states, including four OECD members: the **Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland** and the **Slovak Republic**. Significant re-instrumentation is being brought about by **European Union** reform. More and more members apply the Single Payment Scheme, a unified payment based on historical levels of support, in place of programmes tied to the area planted to certain crops or the number of certain types of animals. The shift in the composition of the PSE should be more pronounced when all members apply the new mechanism in 2006, and as dairy and sugar support is included. **Korea** began implementing the revisions to its rice policy as announced in 2004, but the process had only started in 2005 so the full change is not yet fully manifested in PSE data (Box 1.2). Other OECD countries are preparing for further policy decisions. In **Australia**, the independent Agriculture and Food Policy Reference Group reviewed policy for the Minister of Agriculture, **Switzerland** looks forward to the next legislative package (AP 2011) and the **United States** prepares for the 2007 Farm Bill. Many governments are exploring the potential for support policies to encourage increased biofuel production. There were also some important decisions taken in 2005: the agreement on sugar reform struck in November 2005 by **European Union** members and the New Basic Plan for Food, Agriculture and Rural Areas of **Japan**. The **European Union** sugar policy will begin re-instrumentation in 2006 as guaranteed prices and quotas are lowered and, as noted above, the Single Payment Scheme becomes the primary mechanism of support to sugar producers, thus reducing the commodity-specificity of these transfers. The **Japanese** policy change, once in place, will also entail a further re-instrumentation of support as many direct payments currently attached to certain commodities will no longer be commodity-specific.

As ever, variations in weather conditions and other events led several member countries to provide weather related payments to producers. **Australia** provided such assistance as drought persisted there, and the **United States** paid for weather damages chiefly associated with hurricanes. Modest shifts in policy priorities were apparent in 2005: **Iceland** reorganised its institutions to raise efficiency; and the **United States** spent more on environmental (such as the Environmental Quality Incentive Program and the Conservation Security Program) and food access (Food Stamps Program) objectives. At the same time, existing mechanisms of farm support were reinforced, as **Canada** offered producers further *ad hoc* support through the new Farm Income Payment (FIP) programme, **Mexico** stepped up subsidies to energy use and **Turkey** raised tariffs on cereals. Some programmes were extended: **Turkey** extended to 2007 its Agricultural Reform Implementation Project, with a new conservation-related payment (CATAK), and the **United States** extended the support to dairy producers in the form of the Milk Income Loss Contract or the National Dairy Market Loss Payment to 2007.

### Box 1.2. Major policy changes in Korea

Rice is an important commodity for Korean producers and consumers – and accounts for almost one-third of Korea's PSE, much of it provided by Market Price Support (MPS). Barriers to imports have long played a central part in rice policy, but Korea is committed to allowing greater room for foreign goods in domestic markets. The result of the Uruguay Round Agreement on Agriculture (URAA) negotiation was that Korea received special treatment for rice permitting the suspension of tariffication (the process whereby existing trade barriers were converted to bound tariffs) for ten years (from 1995 to 2004). Instead, Korea agreed to increase Minimum Market Access for rice imports from 1% of domestic consumption in 1995 to 4% in 2004.

In 2004, these special provisions were re-negotiated and an agreement was reached to continue special treatment for another 10 years from 2005 to 2014. Under this new agreement, the Minimum Market Access volume would be increased from 4.4% of domestic consumption in the year 2005 to about 8% of domestic consumption in the year 2014. Also, the Korean government was required to sell some of the imported rice in the domestic market for table use. To date the imported rice had been incorporated exclusively in processed products.

Until 2004, the government purchased 15-30% of harvested rice directly from farmers. Government purchasing essentially provided a guideline for the post-harvest rice market. The support arising from this system of purchasing rice constituted almost all of Korea's Aggregate Measure of Support (AMS), a category of support that Korea committed to constrain as a consequence of the URAA. However, as the AMS limit decreased in line with the provisions of the UR Agreement on Agriculture, the amount of government purchases also decreased. Following the 2004 agreement, the Korean government decided to reduce its reliance on price support and to introduce direct income support mechanisms.

The direct income support mechanism comprises a fixed payments system and a variable payments system from the 2005/06 crop year. To be eligible for the fixed payment, paddy fields had to be in production during the period 1998-2000. There are no restrictions on current production. The land may be used to produce agricultural products or set aside. The fixed payment per hectare for registered paddy fields is KRW 600 000 (about USD 600). The fixed payment is designed with a view to meet the criteria of the Green Box of the URAA.

The variable payment is given only to farmers who are currently producing rice on registered farmland. The amount of the variable payment is determined according to the difference between a target price and each year's post-harvest price. Once the target price is determined, it is fixed for three years. For the years 2005-07, the target price is KRW 170 083 (about USD 170) per 80 kilograms of rice which was determined by adding the income effect of past government purchasing and paddy-field environmental conservation payments to the 3 year average of the harvest price from 2001 to 2003. If the post-harvest price is lower than the target price, farmers receive 85% of the difference, after deduction of the fixed payment, which is multiplied by a fixed national reference yield to calculate the payment per hectare.

Following the abolition of government purchasing, the average post-harvest price for the 2005/06 crop year dropped sharply. The introduction of the fixed payment is reflected in the increase in the payments based on historical entitlements in the PSE. Even a partial shift from price support to direct income support will improve the composition of the PSE – and reduce price distortion – although MPS will not be abolished as long as import barriers are binding. As for the new system, the fixed payment is not linked to any specific commodity, whereas the variable payment is conditional on rice production. These payments have the effects of raising and stabilising farm income following the sharp decrease in the price of rice resulting from the abolition of government purchasing, thereby smoothing the transition to the new policy framework.

The context in which agricultural policies operated helps understand developments in support as the transfers generated by border measures, such as tariffs and export support, depend in part on the evolution of the border prices at which domestically produced goods would be traded in the absence of such intervention. In addition, some other forms of support are counter-cyclical to producer prices, with support rising when prices fall. There was some depreciation in the US dollar, the euro and more so the yen relative to almost all other OECD currencies. Dollar-denominated commodity prices in 2005 were mostly little changed as compared to 2004. Nonetheless, nominal prices were often higher in 2003-05 than in 1986-88. Cereal price movements were mixed in 2005 as compared to 2004, with wheat unchanged, rice a little higher and maize lower, and of these the wheat price remained well above the 1986-88 level. Oilseed prices continued a second year of weakness following the peaks in 2003, but still exceeded 1986-88 levels. The raw sugar price rose even faster in 2005 than in 2004 – by about 50% in 2005 after a rise of 34% the year before – and is now about 25% higher than in the base period. Traded dairy product prices rose for a third year in a row, raising the equivalent milk price yet higher so the 2003-05 average price was about 75% above the average in 1986-88. Some prices of beef and pork in international trade rose substantially in 2005 relative to 2004, but many other meat prices changed little, or even fell. However, individual countries' border prices may be determined as much or more by the shifts in trade patterns brought about by further outbreaks of animal diseases. **Canada, Japan** and the **United States** discovered further cases of Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy (BSE) in 2005, but the greater threat to global animal health was avian influenza. With early 2006 already witnessing the outbreaks of avian influenza in **Turkey** and in the **European Union**, affecting consumption as well as production, and with new cases of Foot and Mouth Disease (FMD) in some Latin American countries and the possibility of further cases of BSE, there is little doubt that animal health issues will continue to have impacts on trade flows and meat prices, as well as on feed demand.

### **Overall support to producers in 2005**

Support provided by OECD countries to agricultural producers has remained stable overall between 2003 and 2005. The key indicator of the support provided to agricultural producers expresses the estimated monetary value of transfers from consumers and budgetary payments to producers as a share of gross farm receipts (Box 1.3). Support to producers in the OECD as a whole, as measured by this % PSE, is estimated at 29% in 2005, which is the same level as in 2004 and only marginally below the 30% of 2003 (Figure 1.1; Tables 1.1 and 1.2).

Support can also be measured by an indicator derived from the PSE: the producer Nominal Assistance Coefficient (NAC), an expression of the monetary value of transfers from consumers and taxpayers to producers relative to current production valued at border prices. The producer NAC for the OECD as a whole has changed slightly more than the % PSE, falling moderately over the last three years. This indicator shows that current farm receipts were 44% higher than if entirely generated in world markets without any support in 2003, 42% higher in 2004 and 41% higher in 2005.

### **Overall support to producers over the long-term**

The long term trend exhibits a gradual, if unsteady, reduction in the overall level of support provided to OECD agricultural producers (Figure 1.1). The share of producer support in gross farm receipts has fallen from 37% in 1986-88 to 30% in 2003-05. Likewise,


### Box 1.3. Evaluating annual changes in the estimated level of support in the OECD

The PSE, the total monetary figure for the estimated level of transfers to producers, is denominated in the local currency of each country, so must be converted into a single currency to allow comparison across countries. Consequently, the year-on-year change in the total level of transfers denominated in a single currency will result from both changes in the level of transfers measured in each national currency and exchange rates movements.

It is estimated that the level of transfers to producers measured by the PSE in US dollars was hardly changed, at USD 280 billion in 2004 and 2005, but was higher than the USD 259 billion of 2003 (Table 1.1). When measured in euros, the value of transfers was likewise stable in 2005 relative to 2004, but is lower than in 2003 – EUR 225 billion in 2005 as compared to EUR 229 billion (Table 1.2). While the PSE provides an indication of the level of support provided, how can these changes over time in different currencies be interpreted? In what sense did the amount of support provided to producers remain stable between 2003 and 2005, as stated in the text?

The most appropriate measure to compare changes in the level of support provided to producers in the OECD as a whole is the % PSE, which measures the share of transfers in the value of gross producer receipts. The % PSE solves this dilemma because the same exchange rates are used to convert the denominator into a single currency and to convert the numerator. Consequently, the % PSE is the same regardless of the currency. Moreover, the % PSE is a relative measure, so this indicator also provides a sense of the importance of policy-induced transfers in the sector, and is appropriate for comparisons among OECD countries.

Figure 1.1. Evolution of OECD Producer Support Estimate (% PSE), Nominal Protection Coefficient (NPCp) and Nominal Assistance Coefficient (NACp)



Source: OECD, PSE/CSE database, 2006.

StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/201716870234>

the producer NAC indicates that while in 1986-88 farm receipts were on average 60% higher than they would be if entirely generated in world markets without any support, by 2003-05 they had fallen to 42% above their world market value. These changes indicate some improvement in market orientation, with a greater share of farm receipts generated in markets than created by government intervention.

Table 1.1. **OECD: Estimates of support to agriculture (USD million)**  
USD million

	1986-88	2003-05	2003	2004	2005p
<b>Total value of production (at farm gate)</b>	<b>594 246</b>	<b>807 406</b>	<b>748 531</b>	<b>836 876</b>	<b>836 811</b>
<i>of which share of MPS commodities (%)</i>	72	68	67	70	68
<b>Total value of consumption (at farm gate)</b>	<b>556 587</b>	<b>785 288</b>	<b>751 447</b>	<b>797 832</b>	<b>806 586</b>
<b>Producer Support Estimate (PSE)</b>	<b>242 474</b>	<b>272 738</b>	<b>258 798</b>	<b>279 572</b>	<b>279 845</b>
Market price support	187 078	156 470	155 057	164 500	149 853
<i>of which MPS commodities</i>	134 472	106 781	104 619	114 367	101 358
Payments based on output	12 207	12 892	10 261	13 527	14 888
Payments based on area planted/animal numbers <sup>1</sup>		41 059	38 849	46 064	38 264
Payments based on historical entitlements	515	19 272	12 842	13 084	31 890
Payments based on input use	20 838	26 223	25 375	26 205	27 088
Payments based on input constraints	3 471	12 461	11 736	12 508	13 138
Payments based on overall farming income	2 250	4 624	4 615	4 182	5 076
Miscellaneous payments	283	-262	63	-499	-352
<b>Percentage PSE</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Producer NPC</b>	<b>1.57</b>	<b>1.27</b>	<b>1.29</b>	<b>1.27</b>	<b>1.25</b>
<b>Producer NAC</b>	<b>1.60</b>	<b>1.42</b>	<b>1.44</b>	<b>1.42</b>	<b>1.41</b>
<b>General Services Support Estimate (GSSE)</b>	<b>39 600</b>	<b>65 541</b>	<b>60 752</b>	<b>65 935</b>	<b>69 935</b>
Research and development	3 647	6 540	6 049	6 635	6 937
Agricultural schools	761	1 919	1 781	1 997	1 979
Inspection services	1 094	2 500	2 291	2 498	2 712
Infrastructure	13 349	21 116	19 943	22 367	21 039
Marketing and promotion	11 925	27 550	24 791	26 561	31 298
Public stockholding	6 646	2 116	2 223	2 128	1 996
Miscellaneous	2 178	3 799	3 673	3 749	3 975
<b>GSSE as a share of TSE (%)</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>17.7</b>	<b>17.3</b>	<b>17.4</b>	<b>18.2</b>
<b>Consumer Support Estimate (CSE)</b>	<b>-171 365</b>	<b>-144 207</b>	<b>-150 499</b>	<b>-147 677</b>	<b>-134 445</b>
Transfers to producers from consumers	-187 361	-155 161	-154 324	-161 416	-149 743
Other transfers from consumers	-17 602	-24 635	-29 359	-21 538	-23 006
Transfers to consumers from taxpayers	21 697	32 964	30 634	32 774	35 484
Excess feed cost	11 900	2 625	2 550	2 503	2 821
<b>Percentage CSE</b>	<b>-32</b>	<b>-19</b>	<b>-21</b>	<b>-19</b>	<b>-17</b>
<b>Consumer NPC</b>	<b>1.59</b>	<b>1.30</b>	<b>1.32</b>	<b>1.30</b>	<b>1.27</b>
<b>Consumer NAC</b>	<b>1.47</b>	<b>1.24</b>	<b>1.26</b>	<b>1.24</b>	<b>1.21</b>
<b>Total Support Estimate (TSE)</b>	<b>303 771</b>	<b>371 243</b>	<b>350 183</b>	<b>378 281</b>	<b>385 264</b>
Transfers from consumers	204 963	179 796	183 683	182 954	172 750
Transfers from taxpayers	116 410	216 082	195 860	216 865	235 521
Budget revenues	-17 602	-24 635	-29 359	-21 538	-23 006
<b>Percentage TSE (expressed as share of GDP)<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>2.32</b>	<b>1.14</b>	<b>1.15</b>	<b>1.11</b>	<b>1.10</b>

p: Provisional. NPC: Nominal Protection Coefficient. NAC: Nominal Assistance Coefficient.

Market price support is net of producer levies and excess feed costs.

MPS commodities: See notes to individual country tables in Chapter 2.

1. This category provisionally includes the US counter cyclical payments from 2002.

2. TSE as a share of GDP for 1986-88 for the OECD total excludes the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and the Slovak Republic as GDP data is not available for this period.

Source: OECD, PSE/CSE database, 2006.

StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/662628741015>

Table 1.2. **OECD: Estimates of support to agriculture (EUR million)**  
EUR million

	1986-88	2003-05	2003	2004	2005p
<b>Total value of production (at farm gate)</b>	<b>538 223</b>	<b>669 813</b>	<b>662 572</b>	<b>673 570</b>	<b>673 298</b>
<i>of which share of MPS commodities (%)</i>	<i>72</i>	<i>68</i>	<i>67</i>	<i>70</i>	<i>68</i>
<b>Total value of consumption (at farm gate)</b>	<b>503 736</b>	<b>652 092</b>	<b>665 153</b>	<b>642 144</b>	<b>648 979</b>
<b>Producer Support Estimate (PSE)</b>	<b>220 381</b>	<b>226 419</b>	<b>229 078</b>	<b>225 017</b>	<b>225 163</b>
Market price support	169 969	130 074	137 251	132 400	120 572
<i>of which MPS commodities</i>	<i>122 248</i>	<i>88 736</i>	<i>92 605</i>	<i>92 050</i>	<i>81 553</i>
Payments based on output	11 140	10 650	9 083	10 887	11 979
Payments based on area planted/animal numbers <sup>1</sup>		34 083	34 388	37 075	30 787
Payments based on historical entitlements	489	15 852	11 367	10 531	25 659
Payments based on input use	18 887	21 782	22 461	21 091	21 795
Payments based on input constraints	3 133	10 342	10 388	10 068	10 571
Payments based on overall farming income	2 077	3 845	4 085	3 366	4 084
Miscellaneous payments	269	-209	56	-401	-283
<b>Percentage PSE</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Producer NPC</b>	<b>1.57</b>	<b>1.27</b>	<b>1.29</b>	<b>1.27</b>	<b>1.25</b>
<b>Producer NAC</b>	<b>1.60</b>	<b>1.42</b>	<b>1.44</b>	<b>1.42</b>	<b>1.41</b>
<b>General Services Support Estimate (GSSE)</b>	<b>35 942</b>	<b>54 371</b>	<b>53 775</b>	<b>53 069</b>	<b>56 270</b>
Research and development	3 300	5 425	5 354	5 340	5 581
Agricultural schools	690	1 592	1 577	1 607	1 592
Inspection services	992	2 074	2 028	2 011	2 182
Infrastructure	12 125	17 528	17 653	18 003	16 928
Marketing and promotion	10 834	22 835	21 944	21 378	25 182
Public stockholding	6 032	1 762	1 968	1 712	1 606
Miscellaneous	1 968	3 156	3 251	3 017	3 198
<b>GSSE as a share of TSE (%)</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>17.6</b>	<b>17.3</b>	<b>17.4</b>	<b>18.2</b>
<b>Consumer Support Estimate (CSE)</b>	<b>-155 434</b>	<b>-120 083</b>	<b>-133 216</b>	<b>-118 860</b>	<b>-108 174</b>
Transfers to producers from consumers	-170 162	-129 001	-136 602	-129 918	-120 483
Other transfers from consumers	-15 872	-20 611	-25 988	-17 335	-18 511
Transfers to consumers from taxpayers	19 716	27 348	27 116	26 379	28 550
Excess feed cost	10 884	2 180	2 257	2 014	2 270
<b>Percentage CSE</b>	<b>-32</b>	<b>-19</b>	<b>-21</b>	<b>-19</b>	<b>-17</b>
<b>Consumer NPC</b>	<b>1.59</b>	<b>1.30</b>	<b>1.32</b>	<b>1.30</b>	<b>1.27</b>
<b>Consumer NAC</b>	<b>1.47</b>	<b>1.24</b>	<b>1.26</b>	<b>1.24</b>	<b>1.21</b>
<b>Total Support Estimate (TSE)</b>	<b>276 039</b>	<b>308 139</b>	<b>309 969</b>	<b>304 464</b>	<b>309 983</b>
Transfers from consumers	186 033	149 612	162 589	147 253	138 994
Transfers from taxpayers	105 877	179 138	173 368	174 546	189 500
Budget revenues	-15 872	-20 611	-25 988	-17 335	-18 511
<b>Percentage TSE (expressed as share of GDP)<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>2.32</b>	<b>1.14</b>	<b>1.15</b>	<b>1.11</b>	<b>1.10</b>

p: Provisional. NPC: Nominal Protection Coefficient. NAC: Nominal Assistance Coefficient.

Market price support is net of producer levies and excess feed costs.

MPS commodities: See notes to individual country tables in Chapter 2.

1. This category provisionally includes the US counter cyclical payments from 2002.

2. TSE as a share of GDP for 1986-88 for the OECD total excludes the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and the Slovak Republic as GDP data is not available for this period.

Source: OECD, PSE/CSE database, 2006.

StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/817775234621>

### Differences in support among countries

The absence of any major initiative to reduce support in 2005 explains the minor changes in the % PSE of individual OECD countries (Table 1.3). In 2005, support to producers is estimated to have increased in **Iceland, Mexico** and **New Zealand**, although the rise was

Table 1.3. **OECD: Producer Support Estimate by country**

		1986-88	2003-05	2003	2004	2005p
<b>Australia<sup>1</sup></b>	USD mn	1 320	1 404	1 339	1 421	1 453
	EUR mn	1 218	1 166	1 185	1 143	1 169
	Percentage PSE	8	5	5	5	5
	Producer NPC	1.05	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
	Producer NAC	1.09	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.05
<b>Canada</b>	USD mn	6 066	5 884	5 941	5 695	6 015
	EUR mn	5 533	4 894	5 258	4 584	4 840
	Percentage PSE	36	22	25	21	21
	Producer NPC	1.46	1.14	1.17	1.12	1.13
	Producer NAC	1.57	1.28	1.33	1.26	1.26
<b>European Union<sup>2</sup></b>	USD mn	100 147	129 693	119 149	136 144	133 785
	EUR mn	90 924	107 563	105 467	109 577	107 644
	Percentage PSE	41	34	36	33	32
	Producer NPC	1.78	1.29	1.33	1.29	1.25
	Producer NAC	1.69	1.51	1.56	1.49	1.48
<b>Iceland</b>	USD mn	197	196	178	180	230
	EUR mn	177	163	157	145	185
	Percentage PSE	77	66	68	63	67
	Producer NPC	4.24	2.68	2.84	2.50	2.69
	Producer NAC	4.42	2.95	3.15	2.71	2.99
<b>Japan</b>	USD mn	49 579	48 324	48 171	49 368	47 435
	EUR mn	44 951	40 180	42 639	39 735	38 166
	Percentage PSE	64	58	59	58	56
	Producer NPC	2.64	2.27	2.36	2.27	2.19
	Producer NAC	2.76	2.36	2.46	2.36	2.27
<b>Korea</b>	USD mn	12 075	20 434	17 271	20 721	23 310
	EUR mn	10 840	16 906	15 287	16 677	18 755
	Percentage PSE	70	62	61	63	63
	Producer NPC	3.34	2.53	2.44	2.59	2.57
	Producer NAC	3.39	2.66	2.58	2.70	2.70
<b>Mexico<sup>3</sup></b>	USD mn	8 261	5 519	6 587	4 441	5 528
	EUR mn	6 723	4 618	5 831	3 575	4 448
	Percentage PSE	28	15	19	12	14
	Producer NPC	1.35	1.09	1.14	1.06	1.08
	Producer NAC	1.39	1.18	1.24	1.14	1.17
<b>New Zealand</b>	USD mn	474	212	165	208	262
	EUR mn	451	175	146	168	211
	Percentage PSE	11	2	2	2	3
	Producer NPC	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02
	Producer NAC	1.13	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.03
<b>Norway</b>	USD mn	2 802	2 935	2 993	2 928	2 885
	EUR mn	2 535	2 442	2 650	2 357	2 321
	Percentage PSE	71	67	71	67	64
	Producer NPC	4.22	2.41	2.70	2.31	2.23
	Producer NAC	3.42	3.10	3.50	3.00	2.80
<b>Switzerland</b>	USD mn	5 427	5 619	5 390	5 848	5 620
	EUR mn	4 897	4 667	4 771	4 707	4 522
	Percentage PSE	78	69	71	68	68
	Producer NPC	4.97	2.41	2.55	2.38	2.31
	Producer NAC	4.49	3.24	3.43	3.14	3.14
<b>Turkey</b>	USD mn	3 169	11 550	11 142	11 250	12 257
	EUR mn	2 873	9 593	9 862	9 055	9 862
	Percentage PSE	16	26	28	25	25
	Producer NPC	1.17	1.32	1.35	1.30	1.30
	Producer NAC	1.20	1.36	1.39	1.34	1.33

Table 1.3. **OECD: Producer Support Estimate by country (cont.)**

		1986-88	2003-05	2003	2004	2005p
<b>United States</b>	USD mn	36 958	40 489	35 929	42 869	42 669
	EUR mn	33 782	33 546	31 803	34 504	34 332
	Percentage PSE	22	16	15	16	16
	Producer NPC	1.14	1.07	1.07	1.08	1.07
	Producer NAC	1.29	1.19	1.18	1.19	1.19
<b>OECD<sup>4</sup></b>	USD mn	242 474	272 738	258 798	279 572	279 845
	EUR mn	220 381	226 419	229 078	225 017	225 163
	Percentage PSE	37	30	30	29	29
	Producer NPC	1.57	1.27	1.29	1.27	1.25
	Producer NAC	1.60	1.42	1.44	1.42	1.41

p: Provisional. NPC: Nominal Protection Coefficient. NAC: Nominal Assistance Coefficient.

1. As a result of a technical revision of the Australian PSE database from 1990 onwards there has been an increase in the calculated PSE. This revision reflects improved information on the allocation of budgetary payments across the PSE time series and not any change in actual support provided by Australia.
2. EU12 for 1986-94 including ex-GDR from 1990; EU15 for 1995-2003; EU25 from 2004.
3. For Mexico, 1986-88 is replaced by 1991-93.
4. Austria, Finland and Sweden are included in the OECD total for all years and in the EU from 1995. The Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and the Slovak Republic are included in the OECD total for all years and in the EU from 2004. The OECD total does not include the six non-OECD EU member states.

Source: OECD, PSE/CSE database, 2006.

StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/788281742221>

marginal in all cases. The % PSE decreased somewhat in **the European Union,\* Japan and Norway**. In most cases, namely in **Australia, Canada, Korea, Switzerland, Turkey** and the **United States**, the % PSE remained roughly constant in 2005 as compared to 2004.

There are large differences in estimated support among OECD countries (Figures 1.2 and 1.3; Table 1.3). These reflect among other things variations in policy objectives, different historical uses of policy instruments, and the varying pace and degree of progress in agricultural policy reform. The average % PSE for 2003-05 was at or below 5% in **Australia** and **New Zealand**. The average was higher but less than 20% in **Mexico** and the **United States**. Support in **Canada** and **Turkey** accounted for somewhat larger shares of gross farm receipts, but these were still below the OECD average % PSE of 30%. The **European Union**, at 34%, just exceeded the OECD average for 2003-05. In **Iceland, Japan, Korea, Norway** and **Switzerland** the % PSE was greater than 50%, approaching 70% in some cases.


Over the longer term, producer support has almost universally fallen in OECD countries (Figure 1.2; Table 1.3). The average % PSE in 2003-05 was lower than the 1986-88 average in all countries except **Turkey** where the share of agriculture in the economy remains large at 12% of GDP and 34% of employment. The largest relative decreases in the % PSE have occurred in **New Zealand, Mexico, Canada, Australia** and the **United States** – countries that provide less support than the OECD average.

\* On 1 May 2004, ten countries (Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Malta, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, the Slovak Republic and Slovenia) joined the European Union. Consequently, from 2004, the estimates of support and derived indicators for the European Union are calculated for the EU25, as well as the EU15. Unless indicated otherwise, the text refers to indicators for the EU25. It should be noted that the six new EU countries that are not members of the OECD are excluded from the calculation of the total OECD estimates of support and derived indicators.



Figure 1.2. **Producer Support Estimate by country**

Per cent of value of gross farm receipts



Countries are ranked according to 2003-05 levels. For more detail, see Table 1.3.


1. EU12 for 1986-94 including ex-GDR from 1990; EU15 for 1995-2003; EU25 from 2004.

2. For Mexico, 1986-88 is replaced by 1991-93.

3. Austria, Finland and Sweden are included in the OECD total for all years and in the EU from 1995. The Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and the Slovak Republic are included in the OECD total for all years and in the EU from 2004. The OECD total does not include the six non-OECD EU member states.

Source: OECD, PSE/CSE database, 2006.

StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/200700086384>

Figure 1.3. **Producer Nominal Assistance Coefficient by country**

Countries are ranked according to 2003-05 levels. For more detail, see Table 1.3.

1. EU12 for 1986-94 including ex-GDR from 1990; EU15 for 1995-2003; EU25 from 2004.

2. For Mexico, 1986-88 is replaced by 1991-93.

3. Austria, Finland and Sweden are included in the OECD total for all years and in the EU from 1995. The Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and the Slovak Republic are included in the OECD total for all years and in the EU from 2004. The OECD total does not include the six non-OECD EU member states.

Source: OECD, PSE/CSE database, 2006.

StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/843633413305>

### Changes in the PSE and market price support in 2005

The change in the PSE in 2005 relative to 2004 was driven largely by changes in market price support (MPS), as was the case in **Japan, Mexico, Norway, Switzerland** and **Turkey** in 2005 (Table 1.4). Increased budgetary support in the **United States** offset some or all of the reduction in MPS, so the net effect was a modest decrease in the total PSE. The

Table 1.4. **Contribution to change in Producer Support Estimate by country, 2004 to 2005**

	Value of Producer Support (PSE) <sup>1</sup>	Contribution of:		Contribution of budgetary payments (BP) based on:						
		MPS	BP	Output	Area or number	Historical entitlement	Input use	Input constraint	Farm income	Misc.
% change		% change in PSE if all other variables are held constant								
Australia	-1.2	0.0	-1.2	0.0	0.0	3.8	-0.7	0.3	-4.6	-0.1
Canada	-1.6	0.8	-2.4	0.7	-6.3	-6.7	-0.5	0.4	10.0	0.0
European Union	-2.0	-9.6	7.6	0.9	-7.5	13.6	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.1
Iceland	14.4	8.6	5.8	1.0	0.0	3.7	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Japan	-2.2	-2.0	-0.1	-0.4	0.1	0.1	-0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0
Korea	0.1	-0.7	0.9	0.0	-2.1	2.4	0.2	0.0	0.3	0.0
Mexico	20.1	16.1	4.1	-0.9	0.1	0.8	4.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
New Zealand	18.7	8.2	10.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	-1.5	0.0	11.9	0.0
Norway	-5.8	-4.2	-1.7	-0.2	-1.5	0.0	0.1	0.0	-0.2	0.0
Switzerland	-3.7	-4.4	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Turkey	2.4	2.1	0.3	1.6	0.0	-2.6	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
United States	-0.5	-8.9	8.5	0.1	6.9	-0.1	0.6	0.9	0.2	0.0
OECD <sup>2</sup>	-1.2	-4.2	3.0	0.4	-2.2	4.5	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.0

For more information on these calculations, see Box 2.1 in *Agricultural Policies in OECD countries: Monitoring and Evaluation*, 2005.

1. Per cent changes in national currency.

2. Per cent changes in national currency weighted by the value of PSE in the previous year i.e. not equivalent to the variation in OECD PSE in any common currency.

Source: OECD, PSE/CSE database, 2006.

StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/737883854280>

re-instrumentation introduced by the policy decisions in 2003 and 2004 is readily apparent in the **European Union** data: the PSE decreased as the reductions in MPS and in payments based on area planted or on animal numbers, were only partly offset by the increase in support based on historical entitlement that reflects the introduction of the Single Payment Scheme and the gradual phasing-in of payments in new member states. Conversely, both MPS and budgetary support increased and led to higher PSEs in **Iceland**, **Mexico** and **New Zealand**, whereas they both decreased and resulted in a lower PSE in **Norway**.

Most border prices, except those for dairy products and sugar, did not change significantly as developments in OECD exchange rates and most world prices were modest (Table 1.5). Producer prices in most OECD countries fell in 2005, but generally not enough to reduce the gap between domestic and world prices. The absolute value of MPS, taking into account the quantity of production, rose significantly in **Mexico**, **Iceland**, and **New Zealand**, and fell significantly in the **United States**, the **European Union** and **Norway**. Despite the mixed impacts among OECD countries, MPS for the OECD as a whole was lower in 2005 than in either of the preceding two years.

### Composition of support

The composition of support is important because output-linked support measures (MPS and payments based on output) distort production and trade and limit the extent to which world markets influence domestic production decisions. Payments tied to purchased inputs tend to have even greater effects on production. Thus, these three categories are the most distorting forms of support. While the estimated producer support for the OECD as a whole has fallen, there has been greater success in re-instrumenting support. OECD countries have changed the composition of support, with some movement away from consumer transfers (MPS) to budgetary payments, and also between the

Table 1.5. **Contribution to change in Market Price Support by country, 2004 to 2005**

	Market Price Support (MPS) <sup>1</sup>	Contribution to change in MPS of:		Contribution to change in Unit MPS of:			Contribution to change in Border Price of:	
		Quantity	Unit MPS	Producer price	Excess cost	Border price	Exchange rate	World price (USD)
	% change	% change in MPS if all other variables are held constant						
Australia	7.4	-6.2	13.6	-9 847.2	0.0	9 860.9	4 416.4	5 444.5
Canada	1.8	-1.1	3.0	13.1	0.0	-10.2	14.5	-24.7
European Union	-18.9	-0.8	-18.1	-3.3	-0.4	-14.5	0.1	-14.6
Iceland	23.0	-0.8	23.8	28.7	0.0	-4.8	13.0	-17.8
Japan	-6.0	2.4	-8.3	-8.5	0.0	0.2	-1.3	1.4
Korea	-3.7	-0.4	-3.3	-5.4	0.0	2.1	7.0	-5.0
Mexico	41.4	6.8	34.5	-43.8	5.7	72.6	53.6	19.1
New Zealand	12.9	4.5	8.5	-5.5	0.0	14.0	7.7	6.3
Norway	-10.3	-1.5	-8.8	-5.8	-0.6	-2.4	4.4	-6.8
Switzerland	-6.3	-0.2	-6.1	-7.3	0.3	0.9	-0.2	1.1
Turkey	0.5	1.7	-1.1	3.3	-0.7	-3.7	23.7	-27.4
United States	-31.6	1.1	-32.7	-17.6	0.0	-15.0	0.0	-15.0

For more information on these calculations, see Box 2.1 in *Agricultural Policies in OECD countries: Monitoring and Evaluation*, 2005.

1. Per cent changes in national currency.

Source: OECD, PSE/CSE database, 2006.


StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/525638627041>

different types of budget payments provided to producers. The share of MPS, output payments and payments based on input use taken together decreased from 91% of overall OECD support to producers in 1986-88 to 72% in 2003-05 (Figures 1.4 and 1.5).

The reduction in the prevalence of output-linked support brought about by re-instrumentation is shown by the movement in the producer Nominal Protection Coefficient (NPC), which demonstrates the degree of output market protection provided to producers (Figures 1.1 and 1.6). In 1986-88, the overall OECD producer NPC indicated that the sum of prices and payments based on output that producers received per unit they sold was on average 57% higher than border prices. By 2003-05, the gap had decreased by more

Figure 1.4. **Composition of OECD Producer Support Estimate (PSE), 1986-2005**

Percentage share in PSE




Source: OECD, PSE/CSE database, 2006.

StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/774634777881>

Figure 1.5. **Composition of Producer Support Estimate by country, 1986-88 and 2003-05**

Percentage share in PSE



For each country the first vertical bar relates to 1986-88, the second to 2003-05.

Countries are ranked according to 2003-05 levels of market price support and payments based on output or on input use.

1. EU12 for 1986-94 including ex-GDR from 1990; EU15 for 1995-2003; EU25 from 2004.


2. For Mexico, 1986-88 is replaced by 1991-93.

3. Austria, Finland and Sweden are included in the OECD total for all years and in the EU from 1995. The Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and the Slovak Republic are included in the OECD total for all years and in the EU from 2004. The OECD total does not include the six non-OECD EU member states.

Source: OECD, PSE/CSE database, 2006.

StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/183305606625>

Figure 1.6. **Producer Nominal Protection Coefficient by country**



Countries are ranked according to 2003-05 levels. For more detail, see Table 1.3.

1. EU12 for 1986-94 including ex-GDR from 1990; EU15 for 1995-2003; EU25 from 2004.

2. For Mexico, 1986-88 is replaced by 1991-93.

3. Austria, Finland and Sweden are included in the OECD total for all years and in the EU from 1995. The Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and the Slovak Republic are included in the OECD total for all years and in the EU from 2004. The OECD total does not include the six non-OECD EU member states


Source: OECD, PSE/CSE database, 2006.

StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/005714815472>

than half, to 27%, reflecting a lower NPC in each OECD country, with the exception of the substantial increase in **Turkey**. The largest reductions have occurred in the high support countries of **Switzerland, Norway, Iceland** and in the **European Union**. In these and almost all other OECD countries, market protection has fallen faster than overall support. Reductions in MPS are also shown by changes in the % CSE, an indicator showing the costs that policies impose on consumption by increasing the prices paid by consumers (measured at the farm gate). These costs have fallen since the 1986-88 period as policy re-instrumentation allowed consumer prices to fall to levels that are closer to, but still above, world prices (Figure 1.7). The effect might have been larger, but some countries reduced subsidies provided to consumers as prices fell. Two exceptions stand out in these data: in the **United States** the % CSE is positive in the recent period as the cost of MPS is offset by greater direct subsidies to consumers, and the one instance of a growing burden on consumers, **Turkey**.

Figure 1.7. **Consumer Support Estimate by country**

Per cent of consumption expenditure at farm gate



Countries are ranked according to 2003-05 levels. A negative percentage CSE is an implicit tax on consumption. For more detail, see Table 1.3.

1. EU12 for 1986-94 including ex-GDR from 1990; EU15 for 1995-2003; EU25 from 2004.
2. For Mexico, 1986-88 is replaced by 1991-93.
3. Austria, Finland and Sweden are included in the OECD total for all years and in the EU from 1995. The Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and the Slovak Republic are included in the OECD total for all years and in the EU from 2004. The OECD total does not include the six non-OECD EU member states.

Source: OECD, PSE/CSE database, 2006.

StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/601524101786>

In addition to output-linked support, payments based on input use also distort production. While not as large as MPS for the OECD as a whole, payments based on input do account for a larger part of support than payments based on output and, for some countries, represent a significant share of the transfers to farmers. Moreover, while the share of input payments in the PSE has remained fairly constant at about 9-10% for the OECD as a whole, it has varied substantially in some countries, reflecting either changes in levels of input payments or changes in overall support to producers, or both. For example, as input payments were almost eliminated in **Turkey**, their share fell from 30% in 1986-88 to 2% in 2003-05. Conversely, their share in the PSE increased from 30% to 57% in **Australia**, as the overall level of support to producers decreased.

The decreasing share of the most distorting support, MPS and payments based on output and on input use, in the OECD overall hides wide disparities among countries. In 1986-88, 90% or more of transfers in the **European Union, Iceland, Japan, Norway and Switzerland** took one of these forms. It was 100% in **Korea and Turkey** and in **Mexico** (1991-93), while the shares were 82% in **Canada**, 80% in **Australia** and lower in the **United States** and **New Zealand**. As a consequence of policy developments, the share of these transfers in the PSE is now below the 2003-05 OECD average of 72% in the **European Union, Norway and Switzerland**. However, MPS and payments based on output and on input use continue to account for more than 91% in **Japan and Korea** in recent years.

Overall, the changes in composition are positive steps in the direction of the long-term reform objective of reducing the most production and trade distorting forms of support, particularly for those countries which have reduced the share of these transfers the most. Nevertheless, the current level of market protection and payments based on input use is still an important factor in encouraging domestic production, distorting trade and reducing world prices of agricultural commodities. These policies create costs not only to domestic consumers and taxpayers, but also to competing producers of the same commodities in other countries, including developing countries. Moreover, market protection is regressive because it mainly benefits large farms at the expense of food consumers, for the poorest of whom food constitutes a larger share of their budget.

### **Re-instrumentation of support**

The reduction in the most distorting forms of support in some countries has been accompanied by the introduction of new mechanisms of support, which are less distorting. In 2003-05, payments based on area planted or animal numbers accounted for 15% of the PSE, compared to 7% in 1986-88. In recent years, these payments were particularly important in the **European Union**, but the data show a sharp reduction from a 28% share in 2004 to 21% in 2005 as the provisions of the 2003 CAP Reform are implemented. This re-instrumentation partly shifts the basis of payments away from payments based on area planted or animals to payments based on historical entitlements – a category that rose sharply from 2% to 16% of the PSE in 2005. In **Korea**, too, policy changes being implemented introduced new payments based on historical entitlements, although these transfers account for a small share of the PSE so far. Indeed, payments based on historical entitlements (area, animal numbers, yields, support or receipts) were first introduced only in 1993, but represented about 7% of overall support to OECD producers in 2003-05, rising to 11% in 2005. These payments are mainly used in **Mexico** (23% of PSE in 2003-05), **Switzerland** (19% of PSE), **Turkey** (16% of PSE) and the **United States** (14% of PSE). Another new category of support is specific to the **United States**: the price-linked, counter-cyclical payments which do not meet precisely the criteria of payments based on output, area or historical entitlement, but in any case amounted to 8% of estimated US producer support in 2003-05.

While payments based on historical entitlements can be independent of current production decisions (based on past support, farm receipts, or area and yields of specific commodities), area or headage payments are determined by current planting or animal numbers, and counter-cyclical payments lie somewhere in between. Links to current production or production factors makes payments based on area or animal numbers more production distorting than payments based on historical entitlements. These forms of payments may affect current production decisions in so far as they may lower production

risks by reducing the variability of revenues and alter land values, although they are considerably less distorting than equivalent amounts of support based on output or on the use of other inputs.

Some countries are increasingly using payments based on input constraints for sharing the costs of reducing, replacing or withdrawing resources from production, or changing production techniques, including for environmental purposes. While these have expanded from almost zero in 1986-88, they still represent only 5% of the overall OECD PSE in recent years. In 2003-05, the share of these payments in the PSE was 7% in the **United States** and 6% the **European Union**, 3% in **Japan**, and 2% in **Norway** and **Switzerland**, but 1% or effectively zero in all other countries. Payments based on input constraints are among the categories of support likely having smaller impacts on the production and trade of specific commodities.

MPS and payments based on output or on input use often exacerbate the very environmental problems that payments based on input constraints are intended to assuage. Payments based on input constraints are put in place to compensate producers for their higher costs in adopting input restricting policy measures – land rental costs, costs of adopting and maintaining good farming practices, or costs in terms of income forgone – and these costs will increase with greater production. Thus, the level of payments based on input constraints and the costs of providing environmental services or reducing environmental damage, is higher than would be the case in the absence of MPS and payments based on output or on input use. Policies requiring producers to pay for pollution they cause, such as through taxes and charges or meeting the costs of environmental regulations, also contribute to improving the environmental performance of agriculture. Reforms to water policies related to agriculture, particularly in terms of market-based instruments, are also gaining importance in OECD countries (Box 1.4).

Some countries also use payments based on overall farming income or revenue. In 2003-05 these payments represented 30% of the PSE in **Australia**, 24% in **Canada**, 5% in **New Zealand** and the **United States**, 3% in **Norway** and 2% in **Korea**. While significant in a few countries, the importance of these payments has remained consistently low at around 2% or less of the OECD PSE.

### **Support for general services to agriculture**

While transfers to producers have been falling, there has been an increase in budgetary transfers for general services to the agricultural sector such as research, infrastructure, inspection, and marketing and promotion. The transfers provided to the sector but that are not received by producers individually are reflected in the General Services Support Estimate (GSSE). Support to producers and transfers from taxpayers to consumers, combined with general service transfers, make up Total Support Estimate (TSE), which measures the totality of the transfers to the agricultural sector. Such general service transfers at the overall OECD level have increased from 13% of the TSE in 1986-88 to 18% in 2003-05 (Table 1.1).

The OECD average hides differences between countries. The average share of GSSE in TSE (% GSSE) in 2003-05 was 41% in **New Zealand**, and these programmes accounted for about one-third of TSE for **Australia** and the **United States**. The % GSSE was between 20 and 30% in **Canada** and **Japan**, and less than 15% in all other countries (Table 1.6). For many countries GSSE was higher than in 1986-88, both in monetary terms (measured in USD or euros) and as a share of the TSE. Exceptions are the lower shares in the **European Union** and **Turkey**, and the lower absolute levels in **Mexico** and **Switzerland**.

#### Box 1.4. Water policy reform and agriculture in OECD countries

Water used by farming has increased rapidly in OECD countries over the past decade, currently accounting for about 45% of total OECD water use. Overuse of scarce water resources in agriculture is an increasing concern, and farming is a major source of water pollution, especially from nutrients and pesticides, but also pathogens, salts and heavy metals.

In most OECD countries regulations are in place to limit water pollution, but government support to agricultural production and input subsidies – including for the supply of water and maintenance of water infrastructure – misalign farmer incentives and aggravate overuse and pollution of water across most OECD countries. Property rights to water used by farmers are sometimes poorly defined and the “polluter pays” principle applying to farmers is often weakly enforced. Overall, households and industries in OECD countries often pay significantly more for water than farmers.<sup>1</sup>

Most Governments are beginning to ensure water resources are not overused by farmers, seek the best allocation among competing demands to efficiently produce food, fibre and biomass, minimise pollution and support ecosystems, while meeting social aspirations under different property right arrangements and institutional systems and structures.

In response policies are beginning to shift toward more sustainable agricultural water management in OECD countries. Market-based, voluntary and regulatory approaches are being implemented. But there is widespread recognition of greater scope for using better pricing structures, tradable permits, accompanied by government regulations, as well as co-operative and community efforts amongst different water users at the water catchment level.

Countries are at different stages in reforming their water policies, partly reflecting the varying importance of water-related issues in agriculture and current systems of property rights and management structures. But there is a lack of robust comparative data on the support given to irrigators and other agricultural water users as a result of policies, and the costs and benefits of water used in agriculture. There is little monitoring and evaluation of current water policy reform initiatives. An OECD Workshop<sup>2</sup> held in Australia in November 2005 recommended a number of actions for consideration by policy makers:

- use a mix of cost-effective and coherent policy measures, ranging from the watershed to the national level, to improve the management of water both for farming and to support aquatic ecosystems;
- draw on and improve scientific research, water use accounts and water quality indicators to underpin policy making;
- identify property rights attached to water withdrawals, water pollution and ecosystem provision;
- establish clear lines of responsibility in water management, with a commitment from governments to resource the necessary actions, especially given the challenges related to climate change;
- strengthen water policy reforms with the aim to encourage water pricing and trading, water service competition or benchmarking performance where competition is limited, and nutrient trading; and
- enhance the capacity for farmers, industry and community groups to participate in the design and delivery of policies for water management.

1. Subject to data availability, the amount of support resulting from reduced water prices for farmers is included in the PSE as payments based on the use of variable inputs. Government support for the operation and maintenance of water infrastructure is included in the General Services Support Estimate, but initial investments for building the infrastructure are not taken into account. The OECD is currently in the process of improving the coverage and measurement of irrigation subsidies in the OECD indicators of support.

2. OECD (2006), *Water and Agriculture: Sustainability, Markets and Policies*, Publication Service, Paris, France, [[www.oecd.org/agr/env](http://www.oecd.org/agr/env)].



Table 1.6. **OECD: General Services Support Estimate by country**

		1986-88	2003-05	2003	2004	2005p
<b>Australia</b>	USD mn	387	644	576	667	688
	EUR mn	350	533	510	537	554
	Percentage of TSE	22	34	32	35	35
<b>Canada</b>	USD mn	1 464	2 012	1 700	1 965	2 372
	EUR mn	1 328	1 665	1 505	1 581	1 909
	Percentage of TSE	19	26	22	26	28
<b>European Union<sup>1</sup></b>	USD mn	9 799	11 174	9 412	11 901	12 210
	EUR mn	8 872	9 245	8 331	9 579	9 824
	Percentage of TSE	9	8	7	8	8
<b>Iceland</b>	USD mn	19	16	16	16	17
	EUR mn	17	14	14	13	14
	Percentage of TSE	7	8	8	8	7
<b>Japan</b>	USD mn	8 775	12 678	12 391	13 546	12 098
	EUR mn	7 889	10 535	10 968	10 903	9 734
	Percentage of TSE	15	21	20	22	20
<b>Korea</b>	USD mn	1 069	3 017	3 181	2 757	3 113
	EUR mn	954	2 513	2 816	2 219	2 504
	Percentage of TSE	8	13	15	12	12
<b>Mexico<sup>2</sup></b>	USD mn	1 105	858	878	828	867
	EUR mn	900	714	777	667	698
	Percentage of TSE	10	14	12	16	13
<b>New Zealand</b>	USD mn	104	144	122	146	164
	EUR mn	94	119	108	117	132
	Percentage of TSE	17	41	42	41	38
<b>Norway</b>	USD mn	124	264	238	279	275
	EUR mn	112	219	211	225	221
	Percentage of TSE	4	8	7	9	9
<b>Switzerland</b>	USD mn	438	399	402	404	391
	EUR mn	396	332	355	325	315
	Percentage of TSE	7	7	7	6	6
<b>Turkey</b>	USD mn	309	1 105	984	664	1 667
	EUR mn	277	916	871	534	1 341
	Percentage of TSE	10	9	8	6	12
<b>United States</b>	USD mn	15 710	32 960	29 956	32 772	36 153
	EUR mn	14 362	27 327	26 516	26 377	29 088
	Percentage of TSE	24	33	33	32	33
<b>OECD<sup>3</sup></b>	USD mn	39 600	65 541	60 752	65 935	69 935
	EUR mn	35 942	54 371	53 775	53 069	56 270
	Percentage of TSE	13	18	17	17	18

p: Provisional.

1. EU12 for 1986-94 including ex-GDR from 1990; EU15 for 1995-2003; EU25 from 2004.

2. For Mexico, 1986-88 is replaced by 1991-93.

3. Austria, Finland and Sweden are included in the OECD total for all years and in the EU from 1995. The Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and the Slovak Republic are included in the OECD total for all years and in the EU from 2004. The OECD total does not include the six non-OECD EU member states.

Source: OECD, PSE/CSE database, 2006.

StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/376620646042>

There have been some changes in the composition of support within the GSSE, but these changes are less pronounced at the aggregate level. Marketing and promotion support has increased the most since 1986-88, rising from 30% in 1986-88 to 42% of the overall GSSE in 2003-05, whereas the costs associated with public stockholding of agricultural products have fallen substantially since 1986-88, from 17% to only 3% of the

overall GSSE in the recent period. About one-third of OECD support to the sector is spent on infrastructure, and just over a tenth is allocated to research and development or to education – shares that vary little over time. The OECD as a whole allocates less than 5% of GSSE, equivalent to less than 1% of TSE, to inspection services.

The composition of GSSE within countries is not uniform, and shows greater changes over time. Marketing and promotion play a particularly important part in the **United States** and, recently, in **Turkey**. Infrastructure dominates the GSSE in **Japan** and, to a lesser extent, **Korea**. The **European Union** has emphasised these two types of expenditure lately as well, whereas the costs of public stockholding fell from over half of overall **European Union** expenditure on general services in 1986-88 to 10% in 2003-05. Support for research and development and for education rose in many countries, and is around 50% of the GSSE in **New Zealand** and **Norway**, and over 70% in **Australia**. The share of inspection services in the overall GSSE rose substantially in **Canada** and **Norway**, but the most striking increase is seen in **Mexico** where it rose from a minimal amount in 1991-93 to nearly one-fifth of GSSE in recent years.

Support for general services to agriculture does not depend on individual farmers' production decisions regarding output or use of factors of production, and does not directly affect farm receipts. Inspection services to ensure plant, animal and human health benefit both consumers and producers. General services in the area of advisory services, training and research and development can improve long-term productivity or expand the sector's production capacity, reducing costs of production over time.

### **Total support to agriculture**

For the OECD as a whole, transfers to agriculture amounted to USD 385 billion (EUR 310 billion) in 2005, as measured by the TSE (Tables 1.1 and 1.2). When expressed as a share of GDP (% TSE) overall support changed very little – from 1.11% in 2004 to 1.08% in 2005. The 2003-05 average of 1.11% is less than half the 1986-88 average of 2.32%. Within the overall figure there has been a decrease in the transfers from consumers, who on average pay prices for their products that are closer to border prices, and an increase in transfers from taxpayers, reflecting the change in composition of producer support.


The size of transfers relative to GDP has fallen almost universally, often substantially (Figure 1.8; Table 1.7). The sole exception is **Turkey**, in which agriculture accounts for a larger than average share in the economy and in employment, where % TSE rose slightly from 4.0% in 1986-88 to 4.2% in 2003-05. The % TSE fell by two-thirds or more in **Iceland** and **New Zealand**, and by over half in other countries, except **Japan** and the **United States**. By 2003-05, the % TSE ranged from less than 0.5% in **Australia** and **New Zealand** to over 3% in **Korea** and **Turkey**. This broad reduction reflects a combination of factors including overall GDP growth, changes in the relative contribution of agriculture to GDP, and changes in the monetary value of transfers associated with agricultural policies.

### **Status of agricultural policy reform**

Progress towards the long-term objectives of less distorting and better targeted policies are evaluated here using trends in two facets of estimated producer support: the share of support in gross farm receipts and the composition of support in terms of the share of the most distorting mechanisms. Trends in these two indicators of support for the OECD as a whole show that there has been some progress towards the goals of policy reform: the share of support in gross farm receipts (% PSE) has decreased from 37% to 30%

Figure 1.8. **Total Support Estimate by country**

Percentage of GDP



Countries are ranked according to 2003-05 levels. For more detail, see Table 1.7.

1. EU12 for 1986-94 including ex-GDR from 1990; EU15 for 1995-2003; EU25 from 2004.

2. For Mexico, 1986-88 is replaced by 1991-93.

3. Austria, Finland and Sweden are included in the OECD total for all years and in the EU from 1995. The Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and the Slovak Republic are included in the OECD total for all years and in the EU from 2004. The OECD total does not include the six non-OECD EU member states. TSE as a share of GDP for the OECD total in 1986-88 excludes the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and the Slovak Republic as GDP data is not available for this period.

Source: OECD, PSE/CSE database, 2006.

StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/066474284233>

between 1986-88 and 2003-05 and the share of market price support, payments based on output and payments based on input use (i.e. the most distorting forms of support) in support to producers has decreased from 91% to 72% during the same period. There have been, however, year-on-year fluctuations (Table 1.1).

In almost all countries, there has been some progress in policy reform; most have improved on one aspects of support and many on both. However, the extent to which further progress is necessary varies considerably.

- **Australia:** support has fallen – the % PSE is the second lowest in the OECD – and domestic and border prices are aligned.
- **Canada:** considerable progress has been made in reducing the support and the reliance on the most distorting forms of support.
- **European Union:** support has fallen and more progress has been made in reducing the most distorting forms of support. The full implementation of recent reforms is likely to improve further the composition of support.
- **Iceland:** support has been reduced only slightly with somewhat greater progress made in reducing the most distorting forms of support, although both indicators remain high.
- **Japan:** there has been little reduction in support and no noticeable movement to less distorting forms of support, but recent policy decisions may lead to future improvements.
- **Korea:** there has been a slight fall in the two indicators of support, and the share provided by the most distorting forms of support should decrease more as the new rice policy is implemented, but both indicators remain high.
- **Mexico:** progress has been made in reducing support and improving the composition of support.

Table 1.7. **OECD: Total Support Estimate by country**

		1986-88	2003-05	2003	2004	2005p
<b>Australia</b>	USD mn	1 708	1 894	1 773	1 933	1 976
	EUR mn	1 568	1 572	1 569	1 556	1 590
	Percentage of GDP	0.8	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
<b>Canada</b>	USD mn	7 561	7 917	7 702	7 660	8 388
	EUR mn	6 891	6 577	6 817	6 165	6 749
	Percentage of GDP	1.8	0.8	0.9	0.8	0.7
<b>European Union<sup>1</sup></b>	USD mn	114 797	145 419	132 947	152 807	150 501
	EUR mn	104 183	120 587	117 680	122 989	121 093
	Percentage of GDP	2.8	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.1
<b>Iceland</b>	USD mn	256	217	198	201	252
	EUR mn	230	180	175	162	203
	Percentage of GDP	5.0	1.7	1.9	1.6	1.6
<b>Japan</b>	USD mn	58 247	61 040	60 599	62 954	59 568
	EUR mn	52 742	50 746	53 640	50 669	47 928
	Percentage of GDP	2.4	1.3	1.4	1.3	1.3
<b>Korea</b>	USD mn	13 218	23 588	20 704	23 562	26 499
	EUR mn	11 860	19 537	18 327	18 964	21 321
	Percentage of GDP	9.3	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.4
<b>Mexico<sup>2</sup></b>	USD mn	10 880	6 411	7 499	5 304	6 430
	EUR mn	8 851	5 360	6 638	4 269	5 173
	Percentage of GDP	3.0	0.9	1.2	0.8	0.9
<b>New Zealand</b>	USD mn	578	356	286	354	427
	EUR mn	545	294	253	285	343
	Percentage of GDP	1.7	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4
<b>Norway</b>	USD mn	3 146	3 216	3 248	3 223	3 177
	EUR mn	2 849	2 675	2 875	2 594	2 556
	Percentage of GDP	3.5	1.3	1.5	1.3	1.1
<b>Switzerland</b>	USD mn	6 516	6 158	5 948	6 399	6 128
	EUR mn	5 881	5 115	5 265	5 150	4 931
	Percentage of GDP	3.9	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.7
<b>Turkey</b>	USD mn	3 478	12 655	12 126	11 914	13 924
	EUR mn	3 149	10 509	10 734	9 589	11 203
	Percentage of GDP	4.0	4.2	5.1	3.9	3.8
<b>United States</b>	USD mn	64 136	101 608	91 663	103 482	109 680
	EUR mn	58 562	84 225	81 137	83 289	88 248
	Percentage of GDP	1.3	0.9	0.8	0.9	0.9
<b>OECD<sup>3</sup></b>	USD mn	303 771	371 243	350 183	378 281	385 264
	EUR mn	276 039	308 139	309 969	304 464	309 983
	Percentage of GDP	2.3	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1

p: Provisional.

1. EU12 for 1986-94 including ex-GDR from 1990; EU15 for 1995-2003; EU25 from 2004.

2. For Mexico, 1986-88 is replaced by 1991-93.

3. Austria, Finland and Sweden are included in the OECD total for all years and in the EU from 1995. The Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and the Slovak Republic are included in the OECD total for all years and in the EU from 2004. The OECD total does not include the six non-OECD EU member states.

Source: OECD, PSE/CSE database, 2006.

StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/771636837507>

- **New Zealand:** support has been reduced from an already low base – to the lowest % PSE in the OECD – domestic prices are closely aligned to border prices and payments based on input use have decreased.
- **Norway:** there has been little reduction in support but progress in lowering the share of the most distorting forms of support, although both indicators remain high.

- **Switzerland:** while support has only fallen slightly – % PSE is the highest in the OECD in 2005 – significant improvements have been made in shifting away from the most distorting forms of support.
- **Turkey:** there has been an increase in support, but the share of the most distorting forms of support has been reduced.
- **United States:** there has been a modest reduction in support and reliance on the most distorting forms of support.

### ***Further efforts to reform agricultural policies are required***

Government intervention continues to be significant, creating important spill-over effects on production, trade and the environment. Although some progress has been made since 1986-88, the current percentage PSE and composition of support in OECD countries still create distortions. Producer support accounts for about 30% of farm receipts. Three-quarters of support is generated by the most distorting forms of support.

The cost imposed on consumers by agricultural support policies has fallen for the OECD as a whole, but 57% of estimated support to producers continues to be provided through policies that raise prices in the domestic market. Such transfers can bear heavily on low-income households for whom food constitutes a larger share of their total expenditure. Moreover, as 72% of the estimated support provided to producers is still linked either to output or to input use, and a further 15% is tied to current area or animal numbers, a high share of support goes to larger farms. Price and production linked support can increase disparities in income. Support tied to outputs or use of inputs may also be counter-productive with respect to environmental goals; where the negative effects of these production-enhancing forms of support on the environment are dealt with by the introduction of offsetting mechanisms, such as compliance requirements or payments tied to input constraints. Policies that directly target objectives relating to resources and externalities might achieve the environmental objectives at lower cost.

A number of countries are continuing to undertake unilateral efforts to reform their agricultural policies. These are reducing trade distortions and improving the targeting of policies to specific objectives, although the extent of reform varies quite considerably. In addition, many countries have entered into bilateral or regional trade agreements. These arrangements can offer possibilities for increased competition among the countries concerned and spur structural adjustment, thereby providing economy-wide efficiency gains. However, limited tariff reductions could modify trade flows and reduce transparency in tariffs and market access administration.

A successful conclusion to the on-going trade negotiations in the context of the WTO Doha Development Agenda could reinforce the process of agricultural policy reform in some countries, and re-start it in others. Lower barriers to imports and commitments to discipline the use of domestic support and all forms of export subsidies would allow price signals to play a greater part in producer and consumer decision-making, leading to improved resource allocation and sectoral efficiency and, thus, to better economic performance.

## 2. Agricultural policies in Brazil, China and South Africa through OECD indicators of agricultural support

In 2005 the OECD carried out its first ever reviews of agricultural policies in Brazil, China and South Africa. The reports provided sound bases for peer reviews of agricultural policies in the countries concerned and contributed to first ever joint High Level Meeting with the participation of representatives from thirty OECD member countries, together with Argentina, Brazil, Chile, China, India and South Africa.

Economies in Brazil, China and South Africa have undergone radical reforms over the past 10-15 years. These reforms have provided a more stable macroeconomic and investment climate and stimulated agricultural growth. Agriculture both contributed to these reforms and benefited from them. Considerable progress has been made, not the least in poverty reduction, demonstrating that agriculture can contribute towards achieving sustainable economic development and poverty alleviation. However, there is a number of problems which those countries are facing such as: persisting rural poverty, urban-rural imbalance (in particular in China), dual agricultural systems (subsistence and commercial farming, in particular in Brazil and South Africa), poorly functioning land markets, slow progress in land reform (in Brazil and South Africa), poorly identified farmers' rights to land (in China), acute environmental issues (water scarcity in the northern part of China and in South Africa, soil erosion and deforestation in Brazil).

### Levels of producer support are low

The levels of support from policies fluctuated at low levels in all three countries and remained significantly below the OECD average (Table 1.8). The low levels of support result from reforms in domestic and trade policies, radical in Brazil and South Africa and gradual in China. Domestic policy reforms covered the deregulation of domestic markets and prices as well as reduction and/or refocusing of budgetary support. Trade policy reform consisted of an opening of agricultural markets, including cuts in import tariffs, elimination or limitation of state trading, and progress in regional and international trade integration.

Table 1.8. **Producer Support Estimate in selected OECD and non-OECD countries, 1993-2004**

Per cent of value of gross farm receipts

	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Brazil	n.c.	n.c.	-1	1	1	6	1	4	3	3	4	3
China	-14	1	6	1	1	1	-3	3	5	7	8	n.c.
South Africa	n.c.	10	16	8	12	8	9	5	2	8	5	n.c.
OECD	35	34	31	29	29	33	35	33	29	31	30	29
European Union <sup>1</sup>	38	37	36	33	34	37	39	34	32	35	36	33
United States	18	15	10	14	14	22	26	24	22	18	15	16

n.c.: Not calculated.

1. 1993-94: EU12; 1995-2003: EU15; 2004: EU25.


Source: OECD, PSE/CSE database, 2006 for OECD countries and 2005 for Brazil, China and South Africa.

StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/687718245272>

### The composition of support varies across countries

In Brazil, producer support is provided mostly through taxpayer transfers associated with preferential credits and debt rescheduling implemented in the mid-1990s. MPS was negative between 1995 and 1997 mostly due to price regulations and export constraints on sugar cane products. Since then it has increased, but remains small and results mainly from border protection on import-competing staples and cotton (Figure 1.9).

Figure 1.9. **Composition of Producer Support Estimate in selected OECD and non-OECD countries, 1995-97 and 2001-03**



For each country the first vertical bar relates to 1995-97, the second to 2001-03.

Source: OECD, PSE/CSE database, 2006 for OECD countries and 2005 for Brazil, China and South Africa.

StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/050732467633>

In China, MPS is the largest component, mostly due to border protection on selected imported commodities. Budgetary support consists mainly of input and credit subsidies, direct payments (for grain producers, based on the area of land they sow to rice, wheat and corn) and payments for returning farmland to forests (“grain for green” programme).


In South Africa, MPS dominates and largely arises from support provided to sugar producers. Sugar is one of the key South Africa’s exports with around one-half of production exported. Its producers are supported by the price pooling system under which import tariffs are applied and losses on exports are effectively compensated by higher prices for domestic sales compared to that destined for exports. Budgetary support is provided mostly through input subsidies on variable (fuel tax and interest rate rebates) and fixed (land grants and on-farm investment) inputs. In 2003, flood, drought and fire damage assistance were allocated to the sector.

### The cost of support to the economy varies across countries

The TSE as a percentage of GDP is relatively low in South Africa and Brazil, but high in China (Figure 1.10). In China, the high percentage TSE is partly due to the economic importance of agriculture in a relatively poor economy, and partly due to large budgetary expenditures on general services at 56% of TSE compared to 44% for South Africa, 36% for Brazil and just 18% for the OECD average in 2001-03. The large share of general services in TSE is a positive feature of support in China as this type of support can improve long-term productivity or expand the sector’s production capacity while its distorting effects on production and trade are generally much lower than other forms of support.

Figure 1.10. **Total Support Estimate for selected OECD and non-OECD countries, 2001-03**

Percentage of GDP



Source: OECD, PSE/CSE database, 2006 for OECD countries and 2005 for Brazil, China and South Africa.

StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/254507733726>



## ANNEX 1.A1

### *Policy Principles*

OECD Agriculture Ministers in 1998 adopted a set of policy principles, building on the agricultural policy reform principles agreed by OECD Ministers in 1987. These principles stress the need to:\*

- pursue agricultural policy reform in accordance with Article 20 of the Uruguay Round Agreement on agriculture and the commitment to undertake further negotiations as foreseen in that article and to the long-term goal of domestic and international policy reform to allow for a greater influence of market signals;
- address the problem of additional trade barriers, emerging trade issues and discipline on export restrictions and export credits;
- strengthen world food security;
- promote innovative policies that facilitate responsiveness to market conditions by agricultural producers;
- facilitate improvement in the structures of the agriculture and agro-food sectors;
- enhance the contribution of the agro-food sector to the viability of the rural economy;
- take actions to ensure the protection of the environment and sustainable management of natural resources in agriculture;
- take account of consumer concerns;
- encourage increased innovation, economic efficiency, and sustainability of agro-food systems; and
- preserve and strengthen the multifunctional role of agriculture.

\* The full text from the relevant Ministerial Communiqués can be found via the OECD home page, in [www.oecd.org/agr/ministerial/commune.htm](http://www.oecd.org/agr/ministerial/commune.htm).

## ANNEX 1.A2

### *Operational Criteria*

OECD Agriculture Ministers in 1998 agreed that policy measures should seek to meet a number of operational criteria, to apply in both the domestic and the international contexts, which should be:\*

- **transparent:** having easily identifiable policy objectives, costs, benefits and beneficiaries;
- **targeted:** to specific outcomes and as far as possible decoupled;
- **tailored:** providing transfers no greater than necessary to achieve clearly identified outcomes;
- **flexible:** reflecting the diversity of agricultural situations, be able to respond to changing objectives and priorities, and applicable to the time period needed for the specific outcome to be achieved; and
- **equitable:** taking into account the effects of the distribution of support between sectors, farmers and regions.

\* The full text from the Ministerial Communiqués can be found via the OECD home page, at [www.oecd.org/agr/ministerial/commune.htm](http://www.oecd.org/agr/ministerial/commune.htm).

## ANNEX 1.A3

*Definitions of the OECD Indicators of Support\**

The term *producers* refers to producers of primary agricultural products (generally farmers, growers and ranchers) and the term *consumers* refers to first consumers of these primary products – e.g. mills, dairies and slaughterhouses – and not to final consumers. Numbers relating to 2005 should be treated as provisional. All changes in prices and expenditure data are expressed in nominal terms unless stated otherwise.

**Producer Support Estimate (PSE):** an indicator of the annual monetary value of gross transfers from consumers and taxpayers to agricultural producers, measured at the farm-gate level, arising from policy measures that support agriculture, regardless of their nature, objectives or impacts on farm production or income. It includes market price support and budgetary payments, i.e. gross transfers from taxpayers to agricultural producers arising from policy measures based on: current output, area planted/animal numbers, historical entitlements, input use, input constraints, and overall farming income. The % PSE measures the transfers as a share of gross farm receipts.

**Market Price Support (MPS):** an indicator of the annual monetary value of gross transfers from consumers and taxpayers to agricultural producers arising from policy measures that create a gap between domestic market prices and border prices of a specific agricultural commodity, measured at the farm-gate level.

**Payments based on output:** an indicator of the annual monetary value of gross transfers from taxpayers to agricultural producers arising from policy measures based on current output of a specific agricultural commodity or a specific group of agricultural commodities.

**Payments based on area planted/animal numbers:** an indicator of the annual monetary value of gross transfers from taxpayers to agricultural producers arising from policy measures based on current plantings, or number of animals, in respect of a specific agricultural commodity or a specific group of agricultural commodities.

**Payments based on historical entitlements:** an indicator of the annual monetary value of gross transfers from taxpayers to agricultural producers arising from policy measures based on historical support, area, animal numbers or production of a specific agricultural commodity, or a specific group of agricultural commodities, without any obligation to continue planting or producing such commodities.

\* Source: OECD (2002), *Methodology for Measurement of Support and Use in Policy Evaluation*, [www.oecd.org/agr/policy](http://www.oecd.org/agr/policy).

**Payments based on input use:** an indicator of the annual monetary value of gross transfers from taxpayers to agricultural producers arising from policy measures based on the use of a specific fixed or variable input, or a specific group of inputs or factors of production.

**Payments based on input constraints:** an indicator of the annual monetary value of gross transfers from taxpayers to agricultural producers arising from policy measures based on constraints on the use of a specific fixed or variable input, or a specific group of inputs, through constraining the choice of production techniques.

**Payments based on overall farming income:** an indicator of the annual monetary value of transfers from taxpayers to agricultural producers arising from policy measures based on overall farming income (or revenue), without constraints or conditions to produce specific commodities, or to use specific fixed or variable inputs.

**Miscellaneous payments:** an indicator of the annual monetary value of all transfers from taxpayers to agricultural producers that cannot be disaggregated and allocated to the other categories of transfers to producers.

**Producer Nominal Protection Coefficient (NPCp):** the ratio between the average price received by producers (at farm gate), including payments per tonne of current output, and the border price (measured at farm gate).

**Producer Nominal Assistance Coefficient (NACp):** the ratio between the value of gross farm receipts including support and gross farm receipts valued at border prices.

**Consumer Support Estimate (CSE):** an indicator of the annual monetary value of gross transfers to (from) consumers of agricultural commodities, measured at the farm-gate level, arising from policy measures that support agriculture, regardless of their nature, objectives or impacts on consumption of farm products. If negative, the CSE measures the burden on consumers by agricultural policies, from higher prices and consumer charges or subsidies that lower prices to consumers. The % CSE measures the implicit tax (or subsidy, if CSE is positive) on consumers as a share of consumption expenditure at the farm gate.

**Consumer Nominal Protection Coefficient (NPCc):** the ratio between the average price paid by consumers (at farm gate) and the border price (measured at farm gate).

**Consumer Nominal Assistance Coefficient (NACc):** the ratio between the value of consumption expenditure on agricultural commodities (at farm gate) and that valued at border prices.

**General Services Support Estimate (GSSE):** an indicator of the annual monetary value of gross transfers to general services provided to agriculture collectively, arising from policy measures that support agriculture regardless of their nature, objectives and impacts on farm production, income, or consumption.

**Total Support Estimate (TSE):** an indicator of the annual monetary value of all gross transfers from taxpayers and consumers arising from policy measures that support agriculture, net of the associated budgetary receipts, regardless of their objectives and impacts on farm production and income, or consumption of farm products. The % TSE measures the overall transfers from agricultural policy as a percentage of GDP.

## Chapter 2

### Country Focus

*This part of the report provides detailed information on the recent and long-term developments of the level, composition and variability of support to agriculture in each OECD country. It provides a concise, consistent snapshot of support to agriculture in OECD member countries and the European Union as a whole. A substantial database underpins the material in this part, and is available on an OECD Web site (the link is [www.oecd.org/agr/policy/under](http://www.oecd.org/agr/policy/under) Statistics).*


## Australia

The main policy development was an increase in support for sugar, reflecting higher funding under the 2004 *Sugar Industry Reform Program*, which provided a combination of short-term financial assistance and longer-term measures to help the industry undertake necessary reform.

- Support to producers (% PSE) changed little in 2005 compared to 2004. It decreased from 8% in 1986-88 to 5% by 2003-05, the second lowest in the OECD area.
- The combined share of the most distorting forms of support (market price support, output and input payments) in the PSE fell from 80% in 1986-88 to 55% by 2003-05. Nearly a third of producer support in 2003-05 was provided by fuel excise tax credits. Prices received by farmers have been aligned with world prices since 2001.
- The cost to consumers, as measured by the % CSE, declined from 8% in 1986-88 to 2% by 2003-05.
- Support for general services provided to agriculture was 34% of total support in 2003-05, compared to 22% in 1986-88, mainly due to higher expenditures on infrastructure, research and development. Total support to agriculture fell from 0.8% of GDP in 1986-88 to 0.3% by 2003-05.

Overall, Australia has eliminated most agricultural production and trade distorting support, reflecting the comprehensive market-orientated reforms undertaken over the past 15 years. The level of remaining support is low. The sector's environmental performance is being enhanced by using market based instruments, as in the case of the water reform agenda.

Figure 2.1. **Australia: Producer Support Estimate: level and composition over time**



StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/218460650573>

Table 2.1. **Australia: Estimates of support to agriculture**  
AUD million

	1986-88	2003-05	2003	2004	2005p
<b>Total value of production (at farm gate)</b>	<b>23 077</b>	<b>38 296</b>	<b>38 458</b>	<b>38 375</b>	<b>38 056</b>
<i>of which share of MPS commodities (%)</i>	<i>86</i>	<i>81</i>	<i>80</i>	<i>82</i>	<i>80</i>
<b>Total value of consumption (at farm gate)</b>	<b>6 189</b>	<b>11 748</b>	<b>11 397</b>	<b>11 595</b>	<b>12 252</b>
<b>Producer Support Estimate (PSE)</b>	<b>1 874</b>	<b>1 968</b>	<b>2 066</b>	<b>1 931</b>	<b>1 907</b>
Market Price Support (MPS)	939	3	4	3	3
<i>of which MPS commodities</i>	<i>784</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>
Payments based on output	0	0	0	0	0
Payments based on area planted/animal numbers	0	37	37	37	37
Payments based on historical entitlements	0	231	256	183	256
Payments based on input use	558	1 091	1 072	1 106	1 094
Payments based on input constraints	0	11	1	13	20
Payments based on overall farming income	376	593	697	585	496
Miscellaneous payments	1	2	0	3	1
<b>Percentage PSE</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Producer NPC</b>	<b>1.05</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>
<b>Producer NAC</b>	<b>1.09</b>	<b>1.05</b>	<b>1.05</b>	<b>1.05</b>	<b>1.05</b>
<b>General Services Support Estimate (GSSE)</b>	<b>539</b>	<b>900</b>	<b>888</b>	<b>907</b>	<b>904</b>
Research and development	298	640	633	644	643
Agricultural schools	0	0	0	0	0
Inspection services	89	99	99	101	98
Infrastructure	62	136	132	138	137
Marketing and promotion	49	8	8	8	8
Public stockholding	0	0	0	0	0
Miscellaneous	41	16	16	16	17
<b>GSSE as a share of TSE (%)</b>	<b>22.3</b>	<b>33.9</b>	<b>32.5</b>	<b>34.5</b>	<b>34.8</b>
<b>Consumer Support Estimate (CSE)</b>	<b>-489</b>	<b>-221</b>	<b>-223</b>	<b>-215</b>	<b>-224</b>
Transfers to producers from consumers	-493	-3	-4	-3	-3
Other transfers from consumers	0	-2	0	-2	-3
Transfers to consumers from taxpayers	0	-216	-219	-210	-217
Excess feed cost	4	0	0	0	0
<b>Percentage CSE</b>	<b>-8</b>	<b>-2</b>	<b>-2</b>	<b>-2</b>	<b>-2</b>
<b>Consumer NPC</b>	<b>1.09</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>
<b>Consumer NAC</b>	<b>1.09</b>	<b>1.02</b>	<b>1.02</b>	<b>1.02</b>	<b>1.02</b>
<b>Total Support Estimate (TSE)</b>	<b>2 413</b>	<b>2 652</b>	<b>2 736</b>	<b>2 627</b>	<b>2 594</b>
Transfers from consumers	493	5	4	5	6
Transfers from taxpayers	1 920	2 649	2 732	2 624	2 591
Budget revenues	0	-2	0	-2	-3
<b>Percentage TSE (expressed as share of GDP)</b>	<b>0.82</b>	<b>0.32</b>	<b>0.35</b>	<b>0.31</b>	<b>0.29</b>
<b>GDP deflator 1986-88 = 100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>169</b>

p: Provisional. NPC: Nominal Protection Coefficient. NAC: Nominal Assistance Coefficient.

As a result of a technical revision of the Australian PSE database from 1990 onwards there has been an increase in the calculated PSE. This revision reflects improved information on the allocation of budgetary payments across the PSE time series and not any change in actual support provided by Australia.

Market price support is net of producer levies and excess feed costs.

MPS commodities for Australia are: wheat, other grains, rice, oilseeds, sugar, cotton, milk, beef and veal, sheepmeat, wool, pigmeat, poultry and eggs.

Source: OECD, PSE/CSE database, 2006.

StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/777261582773>


## Canada

The Farm Income Payment (FIP) was introduced to make exceptional payments to producers. This programme is similar in method and intent to the Transitional Industry Support Payment (TISP) offered in 2004. Supplementary payments of this type have been offered every year since 2000, and form a significant percentage of total budgetary payments.

- Support to producers (% PSE) was unchanged over 2004 and 2005 at 21%, but it fell from 36% in 1986-88 to 22% in 2003-05, compared to an OECD average of 30%.
- The combined share of the most distorting forms of support (market price support, output and input payments) in the PSE fell from 82% in 1986-88 to 56% in 2003-05. Prices received by farmers were 46% above those on the world market in 1986-88, but only 14% higher in 2003-05.
- The composition of support continues to move towards less-distorting forms such as payments based on historical entitlements or farm income. At 34%, the share of these payments in the PSE is one of the highest among OECD countries.
- The cost to consumers, as measured by the % CSE, fell from 25% in 1986-88 to 14% in 2003-05.
- Support for general services provided to agriculture, 19% of total support in 1986-88, has increased to 25% in 2003-05. Total support to agriculture as a percentage of GDP declined from 1.8% in 1986-88 to 0.8% in 2003-05.

Progress has been made to shift support from production and trade distorting policy instruments to more efficient and less distorting alternatives, although supply management schemes and *ad hoc* payments remain in place. While the percentage PSE remains below its 1986-88 average and below the OECD average, it has been trending upward since reaching a low of 14% in 1997.

Figure 2.2. **Canada: Producer Support Estimate: level and composition over time**



StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/016462215311>



Table 2.2. **Canada: Estimates of support to agriculture**  
CAD million

	1986-88	2003-05	2003	2004	2005p
<b>Total value of production (at farm gate)</b>	<b>18 458</b>	<b>30 925</b>	<b>29 598</b>	<b>31 653</b>	<b>31 522</b>
<i>of which share of MPS commodities (%)</i>	<i>82</i>	<i>74</i>	<i>73</i>	<i>74</i>	<i>74</i>
<b>Total value of consumption (at farm gate)</b>	<b>15 367</b>	<b>23 729</b>	<b>24 376</b>	<b>22 815</b>	<b>23 997</b>
<b>Producer Support Estimate (PSE)</b>	<b>8 003</b>	<b>7 677</b>	<b>8 332</b>	<b>7 410</b>	<b>7 289</b>
Market Price Support (MPS)	4 176	3 494	3 964	3 230	3 288
<i>of which MPS commodities</i>	<i>3 435</i>	<i>2 580</i>	<i>2 912</i>	<i>2 393</i>	<i>2 437</i>
Payments based on output	1 263	335	357	299	348
Payments based on area planted/animal numbers	1 247	642	432	981	513
Payments based on historical entitlements	0	754	1 407	676	179
Payments based on input use	1 160	505	476	536	501
Payments based on input constraints	0	43	2	47	80
Payments based on overall farming income	0	1 825	1 521	1 606	2 347
Miscellaneous payments	155	80	173	34	32
<b>Percentage PSE</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Producer NPC</b>	<b>1.46</b>	<b>1.14</b>	<b>1.17</b>	<b>1.12</b>	<b>1.13</b>
<b>Producer NAC</b>	<b>1.57</b>	<b>1.28</b>	<b>1.33</b>	<b>1.26</b>	<b>1.26</b>
<b>General Services Support Estimate (GSSE)</b>	<b>1 920</b>	<b>2 605</b>	<b>2 385</b>	<b>2 556</b>	<b>2 875</b>
Research and development	332	466	470	470	458
Agricultural schools	277	272	288	263	266
Inspection services	327	659	595	634	749
Infrastructure	435	498	432	509	554
Marketing and promotion	549	709	600	680	848
Public stockholding	0	0	0	0	0
Miscellaneous	0	0	0	0	0
<b>GSSE as a share of TSE (%)</b>	<b>19.3</b>	<b>25.3</b>	<b>22.1</b>	<b>25.6</b>	<b>28.3</b>
<b>Consumer Support Estimate (CSE)</b>	<b>-3 785</b>	<b>-3 405</b>	<b>-3 699</b>	<b>-3 228</b>	<b>-3 289</b>
Transfers to producers from consumers	-4 126	-3 443	-3 816	-3 227	-3 286
Other transfers from consumers	-11	-2	-2	-2	-3
Transfers to consumers from taxpayers	42	28	85	0	0
Excess feed cost	310	11	34	0	0
<b>Percentage CSE</b>	<b>-25</b>	<b>-14</b>	<b>-15</b>	<b>-14</b>	<b>-14</b>
<b>Consumer NPC</b>	<b>1.37</b>	<b>1.17</b>	<b>1.19</b>	<b>1.16</b>	<b>1.16</b>
<b>Consumer NAC</b>	<b>1.33</b>	<b>1.17</b>	<b>1.18</b>	<b>1.16</b>	<b>1.16</b>
<b>Total Support Estimate (TSE)</b>	<b>9 965</b>	<b>10 311</b>	<b>10 803</b>	<b>9 966</b>	<b>10 163</b>
Transfers from consumers	4 137	3 445	3 818	3 228	3 289
Transfers from taxpayers	5 839	6 868	6 986	6 740	6 878
Budget revenues	-11	-2	-2	-2	-3
<b>Percentage TSE (expressed as share of GDP)</b>	<b>1.77</b>	<b>0.80</b>	<b>0.89</b>	<b>0.77</b>	<b>0.75</b>
<b>GDP deflator 1986-88 = 100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>149</b>

p: Provisional. NPC: Nominal Protection Coefficient. NAC: Nominal Assistance Coefficient.

Market price support is net of producer levies and excess feed costs.

MPS commodities for Canada are: wheat, maize, other grains, oilseeds, milk, beef and veal, pigmeat, poultry and eggs.

Source: OECD, PSE/CSE database, 2006.

StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/050427424211>


## European Union

The sugar regime was revised in line with the 2003 and 2004 Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) reforms. From 2006, the administered price for raw and white sugar will be cut and a new payment will be integrated into the Single Payment Scheme. Implementation of the latter began in 2005 in ten EU countries and in 2006 in five others, while new member states can implement a transitional scheme up to the end of 2008. A new Rural Development Regulation was adopted for the 2007-13 period.

- Support to producers (% PSE) declined from 33% to 32% between 2004 and 2005 due to lower domestic prices and higher border prices. It fell from 41% in 1986-88 to 34% in 2003-05, compared to an OECD average of 30%.
- The combined share of market price support, output and input payments (those that are most distorting), fell from 97% of the PSE in 1986-88 to 63% in 2003-05. Prices received by farmers were 29% higher than those on the world market in 2003-05, compared to 78% in 1986-88.
- Since 1986-88, there has been a significant move from market price support to payments based on area planted and animal numbers, which accounted for 25% of the PSE in 2003-05. Since 2004, payments based on historical entitlements have partially replaced these earlier payments. They accounted for 16% of the PSE in 2005.
- The cost to consumers, as measured by the % CSE, fell from 37% in 1986-88 to 19% in 2003-05.
- Support for general services provided to agriculture decreased from 8.5% of total support in 1986-88 to 7.7% in 2003-05. Total support to agriculture as a percentage of GDP has halved since 1986-88, to 1.2% in 2003-05.

The sugar reform to be implemented in 2006 and the on-going 2003 and 2004 CAP reforms, including the introduction of the single payment, are consolidating the long term reduction in the most trade distorting forms of support. Although they have been falling gradually over the longer run, support and protection levels remain significant.

Figure 2.3. **European Union: Producer Support Estimate: level and composition over time**



StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/452361530352>

Table 2.3.A. **European Union: Estimates of support to agriculture (EU25 from 2004)**

EUR million

	1986-88	2003-05	2003	2004	2005p
<b>Total value of production (at farm gate)</b>	<b>211 407</b>	<b>265 369</b>	<b>244 189</b>	<b>280 139</b>	<b>271 779</b>
<i>of which share of MPS commodities (%)</i>	<i>75</i>	<i>73</i>	<i>72</i>	<i>73</i>	<i>73</i>
<b>Total value of consumption (at farm gate)</b>	<b>189 637</b>	<b>254 710</b>	<b>241 488</b>	<b>264 465</b>	<b>258 177</b>
<b>Producer Support Estimate (PSE)</b>	<b>90 924</b>	<b>107 563</b>	<b>105 467</b>	<b>109 577</b>	<b>107 644</b>
Market Price Support (MPS)	78 791	53 560	56 139	57 519	47 021
<i>of which MPS commodities</i>	<i>58 869</i>	<i>38 981</i>	<i>40 610</i>	<i>42 147</i>	<i>34 186</i>
Payments based on output	4 524	4 025	3 562	3 740	4 772
Payments based on area planted/animal numbers	2 415	27 349	29 401	30 292	22 353
Payments based on historical entitlements	0	6 578	621	2 084	17 029
Payments based on input use	4 525	9 899	9 331	10 096	10 270
Payments based on input constraints	643	6 524	6 602	6 366	6 605
Payments based on overall farming income	0	17	0	29	22
Miscellaneous payments	26	-389	-190	-549	-428
<b>Percentage PSE</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Producer NPC</b>	<b>1.78</b>	<b>1.29</b>	<b>1.33</b>	<b>1.29</b>	<b>1.25</b>
<b>Producer NAC</b>	<b>1.69</b>	<b>1.51</b>	<b>1.56</b>	<b>1.49</b>	<b>1.48</b>
<b>General Services Support Estimate (GSSE)</b>	<b>8 872</b>	<b>9 245</b>	<b>8 331</b>	<b>9 579</b>	<b>9 824</b>
Research and development	1 063	1 630	1 532	1 656	1 702
Agricultural schools	93	1 024	895	1 098	1 078
Inspection services	156	391	303	449	421
Infrastructure	1 122	2 448	2 067	2 449	2 827
Marketing and promotion	1 625	2 546	2 406	2 621	2 612
Public stockholding	4 776	928	999	965	819
Miscellaneous	38	279	130	341	365
<b>GSSE as a share of TSE (%)</b>	<b>8.5</b>	<b>7.7</b>	<b>7.1</b>	<b>7.8</b>	<b>8.1</b>
<b>Consumer Support Estimate (CSE)</b>	<b>-68 272</b>	<b>-47 712</b>	<b>-50 310</b>	<b>-50 775</b>	<b>-42 050</b>
Transfers to producers from consumers	-79 233	-52 230	-54 642	-55 421	-46 626
Other transfers from consumers	-1 496	-645	-951	-451	-533
Transfers to consumers from taxpayers	4 387	3 780	3 882	3 833	3 626
Excess feed cost	8 070	1 383	1 402	1 264	1 483
<b>Percentage CSE</b>	<b>-37</b>	<b>-19</b>	<b>-21</b>	<b>-19</b>	<b>-17</b>
<b>Consumer NPC</b>	<b>1.75</b>	<b>1.26</b>	<b>1.30</b>	<b>1.27</b>	<b>1.22</b>
<b>Consumer NAC</b>	<b>1.59</b>	<b>1.24</b>	<b>1.27</b>	<b>1.24</b>	<b>1.20</b>
<b>Total Support Estimate (TSE)</b>	<b>104 183</b>	<b>120 587</b>	<b>117 680</b>	<b>122 989</b>	<b>121 093</b>
Transfers from consumers	80 729	52 875	55 594	55 872	47 159
Transfers from taxpayers	24 950	68 358	63 038	67 568	74 467
Budget revenues	-1 496	-645	-951	-451	-533
<b>Percentage TSE (expressed as share of GDP)</b>	<b>2.77</b>	<b>1.23</b>	<b>1.24</b>	<b>1.20</b>	<b>1.14</b>
<b>GDP deflator 1986-88 = 100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>159</b>

p: Provisional. NPC: Nominal Protection Coefficient. NAC: Nominal Assistance Coefficient.

Market price support is net of producer levies and excess feed costs.

MPS commodities for the European Community are: wheat, maize, other grains, rice, oilseeds, sugar, milk, beef and veal, sheepmeat, pigmeat, poultry, eggs, potatoes, tomatoes, plants and flowers and wine.

EU12 for 1986-94, including ex-GDR from 1990; EU15 for 1995-2003, EU25 from 2004.

Source: OECD, PSE/CSE database, 2006.

StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/253838887772>

Table 2.3.B. **European Union: Estimates of support to agriculture (EU15)**

EUR million

	1986-88	2003-05	2003	2004	2005p
<b>Total value of production (at farm gate)</b>	<b>211 407</b>	<b>247 457</b>	<b>244 189</b>	<b>253 449</b>	<b>244 733</b>
<i>of which share of MPS commodities (%)</i>	<i>75</i>	<i>72</i>	<i>72</i>	<i>73</i>	<i>72</i>
<b>Total value of consumption (at farm gate)</b>	<b>189 637</b>	<b>240 960</b>	<b>241 488</b>	<b>241 890</b>	<b>239 504</b>
<b>Producer Support Estimate (PSE)</b>	<b>90 924</b>	<b>101 866</b>	<b>105 467</b>	<b>101 632</b>	<b>98 498</b>
Market Price Support (MPS)	78 791	50 890	56 139	53 315	43 216
<i>of which MPS commodities</i>	<i>58 869</i>	<i>36 851</i>	<i>40 610</i>	<i>38 767</i>	<i>31 174</i>
Payments based on output	4 524	3 954	3 562	3 540	4 759
Payments based on area planted/animal numbers	2 415	26 601	29 401	29 489	20 914
Payments based on historical entitlements	0	5 506	621	622	15 275
Payments based on input use	4 525	8 946	9 331	8 930	8 577
Payments based on input constraints	643	6 394	6 602	6 311	6 268
Payments based on overall farming income	0	0	0	0	0
Miscellaneous payments	26	-426	-190	-576	-511
<b>Percentage PSE</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>Producer NPC</b>	<b>1.78</b>	<b>1.30</b>	<b>1.33</b>	<b>1.30</b>	<b>1.26</b>
<b>Producer NAC</b>	<b>1.69</b>	<b>1.52</b>	<b>1.56</b>	<b>1.51</b>	<b>1.49</b>
<b>General Services Support Estimate (GSSE)</b>	<b>8 872</b>	<b>8 463</b>	<b>8 331</b>	<b>8 488</b>	<b>8 569</b>
Research and development	1 063	1 566	1 532	1 563	1 602
Agricultural schools	93	934	895	983	923
Inspection services	156	315	303	320	321
Infrastructure	1 122	2 235	2 067	2 190	2 449
Marketing and promotion	1 625	2 453	2 406	2 476	2 479
Public stockholding	4 776	813	999	794	646
Miscellaneous	38	147	130	162	149
<b>GSSE as a share of TSE (%)</b>	<b>8.5</b>	<b>7.4</b>	<b>7.1</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>7.7</b>
<b>Consumer Support Estimate (CSE)</b>	<b>-68 272</b>	<b>-45 966</b>	<b>-50 310</b>	<b>-48 119</b>	<b>-39 469</b>
Transfers to producers from consumers	-79 233	-50 593	-54 642	-52 959	-44 178
Other transfers from consumers	-1 496	-635	-951	-375	-578
Transfers to consumers from taxpayers	4 387	3 723	3 882	3 667	3 620
Excess feed cost	8 070	1 539	1 402	1 549	1 667
<b>Percentage CSE</b>	<b>-37</b>	<b>-19</b>	<b>-21</b>	<b>-20</b>	<b>-17</b>
<b>Consumer NPC</b>	<b>1.75</b>	<b>1.27</b>	<b>1.30</b>	<b>1.28</b>	<b>1.23</b>
<b>Consumer NAC</b>	<b>1.59</b>	<b>1.24</b>	<b>1.27</b>	<b>1.25</b>	<b>1.20</b>
<b>Total Support Estimate (TSE)</b>	<b>104 183</b>	<b>114 051</b>	<b>117 680</b>	<b>113 787</b>	<b>110 687</b>
Transfers from consumers	80 729	51 228	55 594	53 335	44 756
Transfers from taxpayers	24 950	63 458	63 038	60 827	66 509
Budget revenues	-1 496	-635	-951	-375	-578
<b>Percentage TSE (expressed as share of GDP)</b>	<b>2.77</b>	<b>1.16</b>	<b>1.24</b>	<b>1.15</b>	<b>1.09</b>
<b>GDP deflator 1986-88 = 100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>159</b>

p: Provisional. NPC: Nominal Protection Coefficient. NAC: Nominal Assistance Coefficient.

Market price support is net of producer levies and excess feed costs.

MPS commodities for the European Community are: wheat, maize, other grains, rice, oilseeds, sugar, milk, beef and veal, sheepmeat, pigmeat, poultry, eggs, potatoes, tomatoes, plants and flowers and wine.

EU12 for 1986-94, including ex-GDR from 1990; EU15 from 1995 on.

Source: OECD, PSE/CSE database, 2006.

StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/543676084176>




## Iceland

The major policy development in 2005 was the re organisation of several agricultural institutions in order to increase efficiency and reduce administrative costs. The Agricultural University of Iceland, which was established on 1 January 2005, had taken over the operation of three institutions. The Agricultural Authority of Iceland started operations on 1 January 2006.

- Support to producers (% PSE) increased in 2005 to 67% compared to 63% in 2004, due to higher domestic prices. It fell from 77% in 1986-88 to 66% in 2003-05, but it is still more than twice the OECD average.
- The combined share of market price support, output and input payments (the most distorting measures) in the PSE fell from 99% in 1986-88 to 85% in 2003-05. Prices received by farmers in 1986-88 were almost 320% higher than those received in the world market. By 2003-05, the gap had decreased to 170%.
- There were no payments based on historical entitlements in the 1980s but in 2005, such payments totalled ISK 2 161 million and became the third most important component of support.
- The cost to consumers, as measured by the % CSE, fell from 71% in 1986-88 to 48% in 2003-05.
- Support for general services provided to agriculture has remained unchanged at around 7% of total support. Total support to agriculture as a share of GDP decreased from 5% in 1986-88 to 2% in 2003-05.

Overall, although there has been some progress in reducing the share of market price support in the PSE, the level of support to Iceland's farmers remains among the highest in the OECD. Further efforts to reduce the support level and to shift to less production and trade distorting policies are needed.

Figure 2.4. **Iceland: Producer Support Estimate: level and composition over time**



StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/205132204351>

Table 2.4. **Iceland: Estimates of support to agriculture**  
ISK million

	1986-88	2003-05	2003	2004	2005p
<b>Total value of production (at farm gate)</b>	<b>9 644</b>	<b>13 739</b>	<b>13 104</b>	<b>13 566</b>	<b>14 547</b>
<i>of which share of MPS commodities (%)</i>	<i>80</i>	<i>80</i>	<i>77</i>	<i>79</i>	<i>83</i>
<b>Total value of consumption (at farm gate)</b>	<b>8 750</b>	<b>12 764</b>	<b>11 752</b>	<b>12 789</b>	<b>13 751</b>
<b>Producer Support Estimate (PSE)</b>	<b>8 034</b>	<b>13 586</b>	<b>13 628</b>	<b>12 653</b>	<b>14 476</b>
Market Price Support (MPS)	7 245	6 728	6 766	6 164	7 256
<i>of which MPS commodities</i>	<i>5 816</i>	<i>5 367</i>	<i>5 228</i>	<i>4 875</i>	<i>5 998</i>
Payments based on output	98	4 267	4 137	4 267	4 398
Payments based on area planted/animal numbers	48	0	0	0	0
Payments based on historical entitlements	0	1 981	2 096	1 687	2 161
Payments based on input use	643	609	629	535	662
Payments based on input constraints	0	0	0	0	0
Payments based on overall farming income	0	0	0	0	0
Miscellaneous payments	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Percentage PSE</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>67</b>
<b>Producer NPC</b>	<b>4.24</b>	<b>2.68</b>	<b>2.84</b>	<b>2.50</b>	<b>2.69</b>
<b>Producer NAC</b>	<b>4.42</b>	<b>2.95</b>	<b>3.15</b>	<b>2.71</b>	<b>2.99</b>
<b>General Services Support Estimate (GSSE)</b>	<b>769</b>	<b>1 143</b>	<b>1 203</b>	<b>1 152</b>	<b>1 074</b>
Research and development	140	338	344	319	352
Agricultural schools	47	129	168	160	60
Inspection services	40	137	129	131	151
Infrastructure	124	159	200	164	113
Marketing and promotion	54	97	97	92	102
Public stockholding	359	277	260	280	290
Miscellaneous	5	6	6	6	6
<b>GSSE as a share of TSE (%)</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>7.6</b>	<b>7.9</b>	<b>8.2</b>	<b>6.8</b>
<b>Consumer Support Estimate (CSE)</b>	<b>-5 007</b>	<b>-6 023</b>	<b>-5 942</b>	<b>-5 572</b>	<b>-6 555</b>
Transfers to producers from consumers	-6 614	-6 166	-6 180	-5 721	-6 598
Other transfers from consumers	-98	-168	-82	-159	-262
Transfers to consumers from taxpayers	1 705	311	320	309	305
Excess feed cost	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Percentage CSE</b>	<b>-71</b>	<b>-48</b>	<b>-52</b>	<b>-45</b>	<b>-49</b>
<b>Consumer NPC</b>	<b>4.37</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>2.14</b>	<b>1.85</b>	<b>2.00</b>
<b>Consumer NAC</b>	<b>3.58</b>	<b>1.95</b>	<b>2.08</b>	<b>1.81</b>	<b>1.95</b>
<b>Total Support Estimate (TSE)</b>	<b>10 509</b>	<b>15 040</b>	<b>15 151</b>	<b>14 113</b>	<b>15 855</b>
Transfers from consumers	6 712	6 334	6 262	5 880	6 860
Transfers from taxpayers	3 895	8 873	8 972	8 392	9 257
Budget revenues	-98	-168	-82	-159	-262
<b>Percentage TSE (expressed as share of GDP)</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>1.69</b>	<b>1.87</b>	<b>1.59</b>	<b>1.62</b>
<b>GDP deflator 1986-88 = 100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>278</b>	<b>289</b>

p: Provisional. NPC: Nominal Protection Coefficient. NAC: Nominal Assistance Coefficient.

Market price support is net of producer levies and excess feed costs.

MPS commodities for Iceland are: milk, beef and veal, sheepmeat, wool, pigmeat, poultry and eggs.

Source: OECD, PSE/CSE database, 2006.

StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/312345248847>


## Japan

The major policy development in 2005 was a new basic plan for Food, Agriculture and Rural Areas. A feature of the new basic plan is a new orientation in direct payments which will shift from individual commodity to multi-commodity support and which will be restricted to farms above a minimum size. This new direct payment will be implemented from 2006.

- Support to producers (% PSE) fell from 58% in 2004 to 56% in 2005. It declined from 64% in 1986-88 to 58% in 2003-05 and remained at almost twice the OECD average.
- The combined share of market price support, output and input payments (those that are most distorting) has remained unchanged, at around 97% of the PSE in 1986-88 and 2003-05. Prices received by farmers were almost 170% higher than those in the world market in 1986-88, and 130% higher in 2003-05.
- There were no payments based on historical entitlements in the 1980s, but in 2005 such payments totalled JPY 23 billion. However, they account for less than 1% of the PSE.
- The cost to consumers, as measured by the % CSE, declined from 61% in 1986-88 to 51% in 2003-05.
- Support for general services provided to agriculture increased between 1986-88 and 2003-05, from 15% to 21% of total support. Total support to agriculture declined from 2.4% of GDP in 1986-88 to 1.4% in 2003-05.

Overall, although some progress has been made in reducing the level of support since the mid-80s, it remains very high. Moreover, trade distorting forms of support still dominate, although the changes decided in 2005 may, when implemented, bring about some improvement. Further efforts in reducing both are therefore needed.

Figure 2.5. **Japan: Producer Support Estimate: level and composition over time**



StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/405020717845>



Table 2.5. **Japan: Estimates of support to agriculture**

JPY billion

	1986-88	2003-05	2003	2004	2005p
<b>Total value of production (at farm gate)</b>	<b>10 610</b>	<b>8 833</b>	<b>8 857</b>	<b>8 786</b>	<b>8 858</b>
<i>of which share of MPS commodities (%)</i>	<i>68</i>	<i>67</i>	<i>64</i>	<i>69</i>	<i>67</i>
<b>Total value of consumption (at farm gate)</b>	<b>13 385</b>	<b>13 037</b>	<b>13 566</b>	<b>12 668</b>	<b>12 875</b>
<b>Producer Support Estimate (PSE)</b>	<b>7 242</b>	<b>5 383</b>	<b>5 587</b>	<b>5 339</b>	<b>5 222</b>
Market Price Support (MPS)	6 496	4 881	5 039	4 857	4 747
<i>of which MPS commodities</i>	<i>4 447</i>	<i>3 250</i>	<i>3 225</i>	<i>3 363</i>	<i>3 162</i>
Payments based on output	220	151	171	151	131
Payments based on area planted/animal numbers	0	4	0	4	8
Payments based on historical entitlements	0	21	23	17	23
Payments based on input use	298	174	175	175	172
Payments based on input constraints	228	151	179	135	140
Payments based on overall farming income	0	0	0	0	0
Miscellaneous payments	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Percentage PSE</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>Producer NPC</b>	<b>2.64</b>	<b>2.27</b>	<b>2.36</b>	<b>2.27</b>	<b>2.19</b>
<b>Producer NAC</b>	<b>2.76</b>	<b>2.36</b>	<b>2.46</b>	<b>2.36</b>	<b>2.27</b>
<b>General Services Support Estimate (GSSE)</b>	<b>1 267</b>	<b>1 411</b>	<b>1 437</b>	<b>1 465</b>	<b>1 332</b>
Research and development	46	91	84	94	96
Agricultural schools	29	18	24	15	15
Inspection services	8	9	8	10	10
Infrastructure	1 008	1 126	1 150	1 192	1 037
Marketing and promotion	22	26	29	24	25
Public stockholding	43	28	32	28	24
Miscellaneous	110	113	110	102	126
<b>GSSE as a share of TSE (%)</b>	<b>14.9</b>	<b>20.8</b>	<b>20.4</b>	<b>21.5</b>	<b>20.3</b>
<b>Consumer Support Estimate (CSE)</b>	<b>-8 137</b>	<b>-6 623</b>	<b>-7 210</b>	<b>-6 475</b>	<b>-6 183</b>
Transfers to producers from consumers	-6 409	-4 880	-5 038	-4 856	-4 747
Other transfers from consumers	-1 724	-1 754	-2 183	-1 631	-1 448
Transfers to consumers from taxpayers	-16	4	4	4	4
Excess feed cost	11	7	7	7	7
<b>Percentage CSE</b>	<b>-61</b>	<b>-51</b>	<b>-53</b>	<b>-51</b>	<b>-48</b>
<b>Consumer NPC</b>	<b>2.55</b>	<b>2.04</b>	<b>2.14</b>	<b>2.05</b>	<b>1.93</b>
<b>Consumer NAC</b>	<b>2.55</b>	<b>2.04</b>	<b>2.14</b>	<b>2.05</b>	<b>1.92</b>
<b>Total Support Estimate (TSE)</b>	<b>8 494</b>	<b>6 798</b>	<b>7 029</b>	<b>6 808</b>	<b>6 558</b>
Transfers from consumers	8 133	6 634	7 221	6 487	6 195
Transfers from taxpayers	2 085	1 918	1 991	1 952	1 812
Budget revenues	-1 724	-1 754	-2 183	-1 631	-1 448
<b>Percentage TSE (expressed as share of GDP)</b>	<b>2.36</b>	<b>1.35</b>	<b>1.41</b>	<b>1.35</b>	<b>1.28</b>
<b>GDP deflator 1986-88 = 100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>100</b>

p: Provisional. NPC: Nominal Protection Coefficient. NAC: Nominal Assistance Coefficient.

Market price support is net of producer levies and excess feed costs.

MPS commodities for Japan are: wheat, other grains, rice, sugar, milk, beef and veal, pigmeat, poultry, eggs, apples, cabbage, cucumbers, grapes, mandarins, pears, spinach, strawberries and Welsh onions.

Source: OECD, PSE/CSE database, 2006.

StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/632262610887>


## Korea

The major policy developments in 2005 were the abolition of government purchasing of rice and the introduction of a direct income support system, following the re-negotiation of Special Treatment in the WTO that was completed at the end of 2004 and ratified in Korea in late 2005. The direct income support system has two components, one which is fixed and the other which will be triggered by market price levels.

- Support to producers (% PSE) in 2005 remained unchanged from 2004. It decreased from 70% in 1986-88 to 62% in 2003-05, but it is still double the OECD average.
- The share of market price support fell from 99% of producer support in 1986-88 to 92% in 2003-05. Prices received by farmers in 1986-88 were 234% higher than those received in the world market. By 2003-05 the gap had decreased to 153%.
- Payments based on area, on input use and on overall farm income each accounted for 2% of the PSE in 2003-05. Payments based on historical entitlements accounted for 1%, almost all of which was due to the recently introduced fixed payment for paddy fields.
- The cost to consumers, as measured by the % CSE, fell from 66% in 1986-88 to 59% in 2003-05. Consumers still paid on average two and a half times the world price for agricultural commodities in 2003-05.
- Support provided to general services for agriculture increased between 1986-88 and 2003-05, from 8% to 13% of the TSE. Total support to agriculture is 3.4% of GDP, less than half of the share in 1986-88.

The shift from price support to direct income support, when fully implemented, will improve the composition of the Korean PSE (Box 1.2). Since some key commodities, including rice, remain isolated from international market signals, further efforts are needed to decrease the support level and bring about a shift to less trade distorting forms of support.

Figure 2.6. **Korea: Producer Support Estimate: level and composition over time**



StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/630455827574>

Table 2.6. **Korea: Estimates of support to agriculture**

KRW billion

	1986-88	2003-05	2003	2004	2005p
<b>Total value of production (at farm gate)</b>	<b>13 624</b>	<b>34 685</b>	<b>31 809</b>	<b>36 156</b>	<b>36 092</b>
<i>of which share of MPS commodities (%)</i>	<i>72</i>	<i>58</i>	<i>57</i>	<i>59</i>	<i>57</i>
<b>Total value of consumption (at farm gate)</b>	<b>14 367</b>	<b>44 837</b>	<b>44 543</b>	<b>42 926</b>	<b>47 042</b>
<b>Producer Support Estimate (PSE)</b>	<b>9 638</b>	<b>22 716</b>	<b>20 544</b>	<b>23 729</b>	<b>23 874</b>
Market Price Support (MPS)	9 541	21 007	18 780	22 177	22 063
<i>of which MPS commodities</i>	<i>6 855</i>	<i>12 128</i>	<i>10 787</i>	<i>13 042</i>	<i>12 556</i>
Payments based on output	0	0	0	0	0
Payments based on area planted/animal numbers	0	359	555	498	25
Payments based on historical entitlements	0	208	0	10	614
Payments based on input use	69	501	506	473	523
Payments based on input constraints	0	103	103	109	99
Payments based on overall farming income	28	538	600	463	550
Miscellaneous payments	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Percentage PSE</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>Producer NPC</b>	<b>3.34</b>	<b>2.53</b>	<b>2.44</b>	<b>2.59</b>	<b>2.57</b>
<b>Producer NAC</b>	<b>3.39</b>	<b>2.66</b>	<b>2.58</b>	<b>2.70</b>	<b>2.70</b>
<b>General Services Support Estimate (GSSE)</b>	<b>845</b>	<b>3 376</b>	<b>3 784</b>	<b>3 157</b>	<b>3 188</b>
Research and development	52	444	382	450	499
Agricultural schools	5	73	54	83	83
Inspection services	21	132	131	137	126
Infrastructure	374	2 056	2 450	1 878	1 839
Marketing and promotion	0	38	36	36	42
Public stockholding	394	634	730	573	599
Miscellaneous	0	0	0	0	0
<b>GSSE as a share of TSE (%)</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>12.9</b>	<b>15.4</b>	<b>11.7</b>	<b>11.7</b>
<b>Consumer Support Estimate (CSE)</b>	<b>-9 415</b>	<b>-26 334</b>	<b>-25 660</b>	<b>-24 787</b>	<b>-28 555</b>
Transfers to producers from consumers	-9 294	-20 763	-18 780	-21 446	-22 063
Other transfers from consumers	-180	-5 730	-7 180	-3 438	-6 571
Transfers to consumers from taxpayers	59	159	301	97	79
Excess feed cost	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Percentage CSE</b>	<b>-66</b>	<b>-59</b>	<b>-58</b>	<b>-58</b>	<b>-61</b>
<b>Consumer NPC</b>	<b>2.93</b>	<b>2.44</b>	<b>2.40</b>	<b>2.38</b>	<b>2.56</b>
<b>Consumer NAC</b>	<b>2.92</b>	<b>2.44</b>	<b>2.38</b>	<b>2.37</b>	<b>2.55</b>
<b>Total Support Estimate (TSE)</b>	<b>10 542</b>	<b>26 251</b>	<b>24 629</b>	<b>26 983</b>	<b>27 141</b>
Transfers from consumers	9 475	26 493	25 961	24 883	28 634
Transfers from taxpayers	1 248	5 488	5 849	5 538	5 078
Budget revenues	-180	-5 730	-7 180	-3 438	-6 571
<b>Percentage TSE (expressed as share of GDP)</b>	<b>9.26</b>	<b>3.41</b>	<b>3.40</b>	<b>3.47</b>	<b>3.35</b>
<b>GDP deflator 1986-88 = 100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>239</b>	<b>234</b>	<b>241</b>	<b>241</b>

p: Provisional. NPC: Nominal Protection Coefficient. NAC: Nominal Assistance Coefficient.

Market price support is net of producer levies and excess feed costs.

MPS commodities for Korea are: other grains, garlic, red pepper, Chinese cabbage, rice, oilseeds, milk, beef and veal, pigmeat, poultry and eggs.

Source: OECD, PSE/CSE database, 2006.

StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/514808083528>


## Mexico

No change in the overall policy setting, a slight appreciation of the peso and some increases in domestic prices, helped drive market price support higher in 2005 relative to 2004. Increases in domestic prices led to lower payments based on output under the Target Income Programme. Whereas PROCAMPO payments rose very little, payments based on input use rose by 15% in 2005 as compared to 2004 with higher energy and capital subsidies.

- Support to producers (% PSE) increased to 14% in 2005 compared to 2004. It was 15% in 2003-05, as compared to 3% in 1986-88 and 28% in the more stable 1991-93 period. It was half the OECD average of 30% in 2003-05.
- The share of the most distorting forms of support (market price support, output and input payments) fell from 100% of the PSE in 1991-93 to 73% in 2003-05. Prices received by farmers were 9% higher than world prices in 2003-05.
- Payments based on historical entitlement – PROCAMPO – accounted for 23% of the PSE in 2003-05, and support linked to input use accounted for 25%.
- The cost to consumers, as measured by the % CSE, was 10% in 2003-05, as compared to 23% in 1991-93.
- Support to general services provided to agriculture has increased from 10% of total support in 1991-93 to over 13% in 2003-05. Total support to agriculture fell from 3% as a per cent of GDP in 1991-93 to less than 1% in 2003-05.

Agricultural policy in Mexico was re-oriented over the last 15 years away from trade restrictions and market intervention and towards payments tied to historical entitlements. The process appears to have faltered recently: production-enhancing payments based on input use have risen, lifting the level of support.

Figure 2.7. **Mexico: Producer Support Estimate: level and composition over time**



StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/728750770301>

Table 2.7. **Mexico: Estimates of support to agriculture**  
MXN million

	1991-93	2003-05	2003	2004	2005p
<b>Total value of production (at farm gate)</b>	<b>86 539</b>	<b>366 562</b>	<b>336 553</b>	<b>377 470</b>	<b>385 662</b>
<i>of which share of MPS commodities (%)</i>	<i>69</i>	<i>68</i>	<i>67</i>	<i>69</i>	<i>68</i>
<b>Total value of consumption (at farm gate)</b>	<b>80 624</b>	<b>356 818</b>	<b>331 554</b>	<b>365 673</b>	<b>373 229</b>
<b>Producer Support Estimate (PSE)</b>	<b>25 454</b>	<b>60 457</b>	<b>71 074</b>	<b>50 103</b>	<b>60 194</b>
Market Price Support (MPS)	21 218	27 034	37 346	17 855	25 901
<i>of which MPS commodities</i>	<i>14 578</i>	<i>18 321</i>	<i>25 075</i>	<i>12 383</i>	<i>17 504</i>
Payments based on output	160	2 183	2 774	2 121	1 654
Payments based on area planted/animal numbers	10	2 599	2 679	2 546	2 571
Payments based on historical entitlements	0	13 717	13 111	13 810	14 231
Payments based on input use	4 066	14 857	14 964	13 771	15 837
Payments based on input constraints	0	0	0	0	0
Payments based on overall farming income	0	67	200	0	0
Miscellaneous payments	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Percentage PSE</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Producer NPC</b>	<b>1.35</b>	<b>1.09</b>	<b>1.14</b>	<b>1.06</b>	<b>1.08</b>
<b>Producer NAC</b>	<b>1.39</b>	<b>1.18</b>	<b>1.24</b>	<b>1.14</b>	<b>1.17</b>
<b>General Services Support Estimate (GSSE)</b>	<b>3 407</b>	<b>9 420</b>	<b>9 474</b>	<b>9 342</b>	<b>9 445</b>
Research and development	339	1 641	1 585	1 625	1 712
Agricultural schools	550	2 005	1 944	2 064	2 008
Inspection services	0	1 804	1 378	1 828	2 204
Infrastructure	809	1 204	1 264	1 323	1 024
Marketing and promotion	322	2 684	3 213	2 394	2 444
Public stockholding	1 210	0	0	0	0
Miscellaneous	177	84	89	109	54
<b>GSSE as a share of TSE (%)</b>	<b>10.2</b>	<b>13.4</b>	<b>11.7</b>	<b>15.6</b>	<b>13.5</b>
<b>Consumer Support Estimate (CSE)</b>	<b>-17 651</b>	<b>-33 486</b>	<b>-44 459</b>	<b>-24 940</b>	<b>-31 057</b>
Transfers to producers from consumers	-22 158	-27 537	-38 654	-19 199	-24 758
Other transfers from consumers	-770	-6 937	-6 665	-7 167	-6 978
Transfers to consumers from taxpayers	4 666	378	367	390	377
Excess feed cost	612	610	493	1 036	302
<b>Percentage CSE</b>	<b>-23</b>	<b>-10</b>	<b>-13</b>	<b>-7</b>	<b>-8</b>
<b>Consumer NPC</b>	<b>1.40</b>	<b>1.11</b>	<b>1.16</b>	<b>1.08</b>	<b>1.09</b>
<b>Consumer NAC</b>	<b>1.30</b>	<b>1.11</b>	<b>1.16</b>	<b>1.07</b>	<b>1.09</b>
<b>Total Support Estimate (TSE)</b>	<b>33 527</b>	<b>70 255</b>	<b>80 915</b>	<b>59 836</b>	<b>70 016</b>
Transfers from consumers	22 929	34 474	45 319	26 366	31 736
Transfers from taxpayers	11 369	42 718	42 261	40 637	45 258
Budget revenues	-770	-6 937	-6 665	-7 167	-6 978
<b>Percentage TSE (expressed as share of GDP)</b>	<b>3.02</b>	<b>0.93</b>	<b>1.17</b>	<b>0.78</b>	<b>0.85</b>
<b>GDP deflator 1991-93 = 100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>492</b>	<b>466</b>	<b>494</b>	<b>517</b>

p: Provisional. NPC: Nominal Protection Coefficient. NAC: Nominal Assistance Coefficient.

Market price support is net of producer levies and excess feed costs.

MPS commodities for Mexico are: wheat, maize, other grains, coffee beans, tomatoes, rice, oilseeds, sugar, milk, beef and veal, pigmeat, poultry and eggs.

Source: OECD, PSE/CSE database, 2006.

StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/443455626742>


## New Zealand

Recent policy initiatives in New Zealand relate to sustainable development, biosecurity controls, and water management. In 2005, there was a sharp increase in emergency payments for climatic disaster resulting from two severe floods in 2004.

- Support to producers (% PSE) rose from 2% to 3% in 2005. It was 2% in 2003-05, down from 11% in 1986-88 and has been the lowest in the OECD since the agricultural reforms in the mid-1980s.
- Price support is provided only for poultry and eggs through border measures. As a result, prices received by farmers have been 2% above those on the world market since 1986-88.
- The share of input payments has decreased from 39% of the PSE in 1986-88 to 17% in 2003-05. The share of payments based on overall farm income has increased sharply in 2005 over 2003 and 2004, but is nonetheless only 5% of the total.
- The cost to consumers, as measured by the % CSE, was 8% in 2003-05 (9% in 1986-88).
- Support for general services provided to agriculture as a share of total support increased between 1986-88 and 2003-05, from 17% to 41%. This support consists mainly of basic research, the control of pests and diseases, and flood control. Total support to agriculture as a share of GDP is the lowest among the OECD countries at 0.4%, which is a quarter of the share in 1986-88.

Overall, New Zealand agriculture is market-oriented and domestic prices of agricultural products are aligned with world market prices. Accomplishing freer rules-based trade through the WTO Doha Round negotiation is the top agricultural policy priority.

Figure 2.8. **New Zealand: Producer Support Estimate: level and composition over time**



StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/062802274257>

Table 2.8. **New Zealand: Estimates of support to agriculture**

NZD million

	1986-88	2003-05	2003	2004	2005p
<b>Total value of production (at farm gate)</b>	<b>6 860</b>	<b>14 247</b>	<b>14 319</b>	<b>14 208</b>	<b>14 214</b>
<i>of which share of MPS commodities (%)</i>	<i>72</i>	<i>76</i>	<i>76</i>	<i>76</i>	<i>78</i>
<b>Total value of consumption (at farm gate)</b>	<b>1 671</b>	<b>2 807</b>	<b>2 816</b>	<b>2 868</b>	<b>2 738</b>
<b>Producer Support Estimate (PSE)</b>	<b>852</b>	<b>324</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>314</b>	<b>373</b>
Market Price Support (MPS)	158	251	231	249	275
<i>of which MPS commodities</i>	<i>114</i>	<i>192</i>	<i>175</i>	<i>189</i>	<i>214</i>
Payments based on output	3	0	0	0	0
Payments based on area planted/animal numbers	0	0	0	0	0
Payments based on historical entitlements	315	0	0	0	0
Payments based on input use	334	56	53	60	55
Payments based on input constraints	0	0	0	0	0
Payments based on overall farming income	42	16	0	6	43
Miscellaneous payments	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Percentage PSE</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Producer NPC</b>	<b>1.02</b>	<b>1.02</b>	<b>1.02</b>	<b>1.02</b>	<b>1.02</b>
<b>Producer NAC</b>	<b>1.13</b>	<b>1.02</b>	<b>1.02</b>	<b>1.02</b>	<b>1.03</b>
<b>General Services Support Estimate (GSSE)</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>233</b>
Research and development	77	93	98	96	86
Agricultural schools	0	18	15	18	21
Inspection services	54	72	69	75	71
Infrastructure	47	37	28	29	55
Marketing and promotion	0	0	0	0	0
Public stockholding	0	0	0	0	0
Miscellaneous	0	0	0	1	0
<b>GSSE as a share of TSE (%)</b>	<b>17.2</b>	<b>40.6</b>	<b>42.5</b>	<b>41.2</b>	<b>38.5</b>
<b>Consumer Support Estimate (CSE)</b>	<b>-156</b>	<b>-233</b>	<b>-222</b>	<b>-227</b>	<b>-250</b>
Transfers to producers from consumers	-152	-233	-222	-227	-250
Other transfers from consumers	-4	0	0	0	0
Transfers to consumers from taxpayers	0	0	0	0	0
Excess feed cost	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Percentage CSE</b>	<b>-9</b>	<b>-8</b>	<b>-8</b>	<b>-8</b>	<b>-9</b>
<b>Consumer NPC</b>	<b>1.10</b>	<b>1.09</b>	<b>1.09</b>	<b>1.09</b>	<b>1.10</b>
<b>Consumer NAC</b>	<b>1.10</b>	<b>1.09</b>	<b>1.09</b>	<b>1.09</b>	<b>1.10</b>
<b>Total Support Estimate (TSE)</b>	<b>1 029</b>	<b>545</b>	<b>493</b>	<b>534</b>	<b>606</b>
Transfers from consumers	156	233	222	227	250
Transfers from taxpayers	877	311	271	307	356
Budget revenues	-4	0	0	0	0
<b>Percentage TSE (expressed as share of GDP)</b>	<b>1.71</b>	<b>0.38</b>	<b>0.37</b>	<b>0.37</b>	<b>0.40</b>
<b>GDP deflator 1986-88 = 100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>156</b>

p: Provisional. NPC: Nominal Protection Coefficient. NAC: Nominal Assistance Coefficient.

Market price support is net of producer levies and excess feed costs.

MPS commodities for New Zealand are: wheat, maize, other grains, milk, beef and veal, sheepmeat, wool, pigmeat, poultry and eggs.

Source: OECD, PSE/CSE database, 2006.

StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/071810150502>


## Norway

The major policy development in 2005 was the national agri-environmental programme. All counties have established regional environmental programmes, while some national environmental programmes, such as payments to extensive grazing and mountain farming were removed. Target prices were increased for beef, milk, poultry and horticultural products. The maximum milk quota per farm was also increased.

- Support to producers (% PSE) fell to 64% in 2005 compared to 67% in 2004. It declined from 71% in 1986-88 to 67% in 2003-05, and is still more than twice the OECD average.
- The combined share of the most distorting forms of support (market price support, output and input payments) fell from almost 90% of producer support in 1986-88 to 67% in 2003-05. Prices received by farmers in 2003-05 were around three times higher than those received in the world market.
- Reductions in the most distorting forms of support have been offset in terms of farm receipts by increases in area and headage payments, and more recently by payments based on overall farm income and historical entitlements.
- The cost to consumers, as measured by the % CSE, declined from 56% in 1986-88 to 53% in 2003-05, with reduced consumer subsidies partially offsetting some price reductions.
- Support for general services provided to agriculture increased from 4% to 8% of total support between 1986-88 and 2003-05. Total support to agriculture represented 1.3% of GDP in 2003-05, down from 3.5% in 1986-88.

The most production and trade distorting forms of support have been reduced but they remain dominant and the level of support remains among the highest in OECD countries. The national agri-environmental programme with regional-based payments and individual farm plans is a step towards targeting, but the transfers involved are low. Further efforts are needed to achieve the long-term reform objectives.

Figure 2.9. **Norway: Producer Support Estimate: level and composition over time**



StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/677588067662>



Table 2.9. **Norway: Estimates of support to agriculture**  
NOK million

	1986-88	2003-05	2003	2004	2005p
<b>Total value of production (at farm gate)</b>	<b>17 354</b>	<b>18 521</b>	<b>18 543</b>	<b>18 704</b>	<b>18 317</b>
<i>of which share of MPS commodities (%)</i>	<i>73</i>	<i>80</i>	<i>80</i>	<i>81</i>	<i>80</i>
<b>Total value of consumption (at farm gate)</b>	<b>17 899</b>	<b>18 299</b>	<b>18 270</b>	<b>18 240</b>	<b>18 388</b>
<b>Producer Support Estimate (PSE)</b>	<b>19 203</b>	<b>19 834</b>	<b>21 185</b>	<b>19 732</b>	<b>18 584</b>
Market Price Support (MPS)	9 351	8 969	10 085	8 821	8 001
<i>of which MPS commodities</i>	<i>6 849</i>	<i>7 215</i>	<i>8 060</i>	<i>7 160</i>	<i>6 425</i>
Payments based on output	4 554	1 423	1 519	1 390	1 359
Payments based on area planted/animal numbers	1 645	3 820	3 912	3 920	3 629
Payments based on historical entitlements	0	1 684	1 689	1 679	1 685
Payments based on input use	3 346	2 899	2 888	2 892	2 917
Payments based on input constraints	308	430	431	432	428
Payments based on overall farming income	0	608	662	597	566
Miscellaneous payments	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Percentage PSE</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>Producer NPC</b>	<b>4.22</b>	<b>2.41</b>	<b>2.70</b>	<b>2.31</b>	<b>2.23</b>
<b>Producer NAC</b>	<b>3.42</b>	<b>3.10</b>	<b>3.50</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>2.80</b>
<b>General Services Support Estimate (GSSE)</b>	<b>848</b>	<b>1 780</b>	<b>1 688</b>	<b>1 883</b>	<b>1 769</b>
Research and development	472	789	723	817	825
Agricultural schools	0	0	0	0	0
Inspection services	33	300	251	365	285
Infrastructure	133	376	399	365	363
Marketing and promotion	210	77	108	81	43
Public stockholding	0	5	14	0	1
Miscellaneous	0	233	194	253	252
<b>GSSE as a share of TSE (%)</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>8.2</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>8.7</b>	<b>8.6</b>
<b>Consumer Support Estimate (CSE)</b>	<b>-9 244</b>	<b>-9 582</b>	<b>-10 433</b>	<b>-9 271</b>	<b>-9 043</b>
Transfers to producers from consumers	-11 474	-9 843	-10 709	-9 633	-9 188
Other transfers from consumers	-969	-349	-353	-216	-480
Transfers to consumers from taxpayers	1 522	111	111	108	113
Excess feed cost	1 677	500	518	470	512
<b>Percentage CSE</b>	<b>-56</b>	<b>-53</b>	<b>-57</b>	<b>-51</b>	<b>-49</b>
<b>Consumer NPC</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Consumer NAC</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Total Support Estimate (TSE)</b>	<b>21 573</b>	<b>21 725</b>	<b>22 984</b>	<b>21 723</b>	<b>20 466</b>
Transfers from consumers	12 443	10 193	11 062	9 849	9 668
Transfers from taxpayers	10 099	11 881	12 276	12 090	11 278
Budget revenues	-969	-349	-353	-216	-480
<b>Percentage TSE (expressed as share of GDP)</b>	<b>3.56</b>	<b>1.28</b>	<b>1.47</b>	<b>1.29</b>	<b>1.11</b>
<b>GDP deflator 1986-88 = 100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>185</b>

p: Provisional. NPC: Nominal Protection Coefficient. NAC: Nominal Assistance Coefficient.

Market price support is net of producer levies and excess feed costs.

MPS commodities for Norway are: wheat, other grains, milk, beef and veal, sheepmeat, wool, pigmeat, poultry and eggs.

Source: OECD, PSE/CSE database, 2006.

StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/070803267653>


## Switzerland

There were no major policy changes during 2005. The AP 2007 agricultural policy reform programme, which provides the basic legislative framework governing agricultural policy for 2004-07 is currently being implemented and discussions on a new policy reform package for 2008-11 (AP 2011) are underway. A revision of the food hygiene legislation in line with the EU legislation was adopted by the Federal Council.

- Support to producers (% PSE) remained unchanged in 2005 at 68%, declining from 78% in 1986-88 to 70% in 2003-05. However, it remains more than twice the OECD average. While in 1986-88 prices received by farmers were on average more than three and a half times world prices, in 2003-05 this had fallen to around two and a half times.
- The share of market price support, output and input payments (those that are most distorting) fell from 91% of the PSE in 1986-88 to 64% in 2003-05.
- Payments based on historical entitlements, area and headage, witnessed the largest increase and are subject to environmental cross-compliance conditions. Payments based on input constraints, which include measures for environmental purposes, are increasing, but represent only 2% of producer support.
- The cost to consumers, as measured by the % CSE, decreased from 74% in 1986-88 to 56% in 2003-05.
- Support for general services remained fairly stable between 1986-88 and 2003-05, at around 7% of total support. Total support to agriculture is 1.8% of GDP, less than half of its share in 1986-88.

Changes in support measures have substantially narrowed the gap between domestic and border prices and improved the targeting of policies, but overall support remains the highest in the OECD area. Further efforts are needed to reduce the level of support and the most production and trade distorting policies to achieve the long-term reform objectives.

Figure 2.10. **Switzerland: Producer Support Estimate: level and composition over time**



StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/730110604520>

Table 2.10. **Switzerland: Estimates of support to agriculture**  
CHF million

	1986-88	2003-05	2003	2004	2005p
<b>Total value of production (at farm gate)</b>	<b>9 482</b>	<b>7 091</b>	<b>6 948</b>	<b>7 381</b>	<b>6 945</b>
<i>of which share of MPS commodities (%)</i>	<i>85</i>	<i>78</i>	<i>79</i>	<i>76</i>	<i>78</i>
<b>Total value of consumption (at farm gate)</b>	<b>11 624</b>	<b>8 577</b>	<b>8 418</b>	<b>8 885</b>	<b>8 429</b>
<b>Producer Support Estimate (PSE)</b>	<b>8 505</b>	<b>7 173</b>	<b>7 249</b>	<b>7 267</b>	<b>7 002</b>
Market Price Support (MPS)	7 046	3 877	3 967	3 991	3 673
<i>of which MPS commodities</i>	<i>5 959</i>	<i>3 012</i>	<i>3 121</i>	<i>3 053</i>	<i>2 860</i>
Payments based on output	102	337	349	332	329
Payments based on area planted/animal numbers	494	956	952	956	959
Payments based on historical entitlements	0	1 337	1 318	1 318	1 375
Payments based on input use	647	322	320	324	322
Payments based on input constraints	0	150	144	154	154
Payments based on overall farming income	0	0	0	0	0
Miscellaneous payments	216	194	199	193	190
<b>Percentage PSE</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>Producer NPC</b>	<b>4.97</b>	<b>2.41</b>	<b>2.55</b>	<b>2.38</b>	<b>2.31</b>
<b>Producer NAC</b>	<b>4.49</b>	<b>3.24</b>	<b>3.43</b>	<b>3.14</b>	<b>3.14</b>
<b>General Services Support Estimate (GSSE)</b>	<b>688</b>	<b>510</b>	<b>540</b>	<b>502</b>	<b>488</b>
Research and development	135	91	94	91	89
Agricultural schools	38	19	20	18	19
Inspection services	14	12	12	12	12
Infrastructure	137	94	102	95	85
Marketing and promotion	45	60	69	56	55
Public stockholding	103	40	44	38	38
Miscellaneous	216	194	199	193	190
<b>GSSE as a share of TSE (%)</b>	<b>6.7</b>	<b>6.5</b>	<b>6.8</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>6.4</b>
<b>Consumer Support Estimate (CSE)</b>	<b>-7 823</b>	<b>-4 673</b>	<b>-4 729</b>	<b>-4 800</b>	<b>-4 491</b>
Transfers to producers from consumers	-7 258	-3 898	-3 876	-4 078	-3 742
Other transfers from consumers	-1 959	-1 055	-1 158	-1 013	-994
Transfers to consumers from taxpayers	1 020	179	210	183	145
Excess feed cost	374	101	96	108	99
<b>Percentage CSE</b>	<b>-74</b>	<b>-56</b>	<b>-58</b>	<b>-55</b>	<b>-54</b>
<b>Consumer NPC</b>	<b>4.83</b>	<b>2.37</b>	<b>2.49</b>	<b>2.34</b>	<b>2.28</b>
<b>Consumer NAC</b>	<b>3.82</b>	<b>2.26</b>	<b>2.36</b>	<b>2.23</b>	<b>2.18</b>
<b>Total Support Estimate (TSE)</b>	<b>10 213</b>	<b>7 862</b>	<b>7 998</b>	<b>7 952</b>	<b>7 635</b>
Transfers from consumers	9 217	4 953	5 034	5 091	4 735
Transfers from taxpayers	2 955	3 963	4 122	3 874	3 893
Budget revenues	-1 959	-1 055	-1 158	-1 013	-994
<b>Percentage TSE (expressed as share of GDP)</b>	<b>3.94</b>	<b>1.77</b>	<b>1.84</b>	<b>1.78</b>	<b>1.68</b>
<b>GDP deflator 1986-88 = 100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>133</b>

p: Provisional. NPC: Nominal Protection Coefficient. NAC: Nominal Assistance Coefficient.

Market price support is net of producer levies and excess feed costs.

MPS commodities for Switzerland are: wheat, maize, other grains, oilseeds, sugar, milk, beef and veal, sheepmeat, pigmeat, poultry and eggs.

Source: OECD, PSE/CSE database, 2006.

StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/424461625550>


## Turkey

The main policy development in 2005 was the extension of the 2001-05 Agricultural Reform Implementation Project (ARIP) to the end of 2007 with the addition of a new Conservation Reserve Payment (CATAK). To define the strategic objectives, principles, and priorities of agricultural policies to be implemented after the ARIP, the Government published the Agricultural Policy Paper 2006-10, which could move agricultural policies closer to those of the European Union.

- In 2005, support to producers (% PSE) remained unchanged from the previous year at 25%, but it increased from 16% in 1986-88 to 26% in 2003-05.
- The combined share of market price support, output and input payments (those that are most distorting) fell from 100% of producer support in 1986-88 to 83% in 2003-05. Prices received by farmers in 2003-05 were about 32% higher than those received in the world market.
- The share of input payments fell from 30% in 1986-88 to less than 2% in 2003-05. Reductions in the most distorting forms of support have been offset by a flat rate per hectare payment to all farmers, which represents 16% of support.
- The cost to consumers, as measured by the % CSE, increased from 16% in 1986-88 to 23% in 2003-05. Consumer prices were 21% higher than the world prices in 1986-88 and 32% in 2003-05.
- Support for general services provided to agriculture decreased from about 10% of total support in 1986-88 to 9% in 2003-05. Total support to agriculture averaged around 4% of GDP in 1986-88 and 2003-05.

Overall, the recent shift from market price support and input payments to an income support payment is in line with an improvement in market orientation. Together with improved marketing infrastructure and support services such as training, advisory and research, this could increase the efficiency and productivity of the agricultural sector.

Figure 2.11. **Turkey: Producer Support Estimate: level and composition over time**



StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/757630084082>

Table 2.11. **Turkey: Estimates of support to agriculture**  
New Turkish Lira, TRY, million

	1986-88	2003-05	2003	2004	2005p
<b>Total value of production (at farm gate)</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>59 174</b>	<b>55 960</b>	<b>59 266</b>	<b>62 296</b>
<i>of which share of MPS commodities (%)</i>	<i>57</i>	<i>60</i>	<i>60</i>	<i>61</i>	<i>59</i>
<b>Total value of consumption (at farm gate)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>54 300</b>	<b>51 290</b>	<b>54 170</b>	<b>57 440</b>
<b>Producer Support Estimate (PSE)</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>16 403</b>	<b>16 741</b>	<b>16 043</b>	<b>16 425</b>
Market Price Support (MPS)	2.1	12 834	13 381	12 395	12 725
<i>of which MPS commodities</i>	<i>1.2</i>	<i>7 723</i>	<i>8 080</i>	<i>7 524</i>	<i>7 564</i>
Payments based on output	0.0	542	353	509	765
Payments based on area planted/animal numbers	0.0	0	0	0	0
Payments based on historical entitlements	0.0	2 660	2 740	2 830	2 409
Payments based on input use	0.9	367	267	308	527
Payments based on input constraints	0.0	0	0	0	0
Payments based on overall farming income	0.0	0	0	0	0
Miscellaneous payments	0.0	0	0	0	0
<b>Percentage PSE</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Producer NPC</b>	<b>1.17</b>	<b>1.32</b>	<b>1.35</b>	<b>1.30</b>	<b>1.30</b>
<b>Producer NAC</b>	<b>1.20</b>	<b>1.36</b>	<b>1.39</b>	<b>1.34</b>	<b>1.33</b>
<b>General Services Support Estimate (GSSE)</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>1 553</b>	<b>1 479</b>	<b>946</b>	<b>2 234</b>
Research and development	0.1	43	54	38	37
Agricultural schools	0.0	7	9	6	5
Inspection services	0.1	132	107	132	157
Infrastructure	0.0	5	6	4	4
Marketing and promotion	0.1	1 347	1 282	750	2 008
Public stockholding	0.0	0	0	0	0
Miscellaneous	0.1	20	21	17	23
<b>GSSE as a share of TSE (%)</b>	<b>9.7</b>	<b>8.6</b>	<b>8.1</b>	<b>5.6</b>	<b>12.0</b>
<b>Consumer Support Estimate (CSE)</b>	<b>-2.3</b>	<b>-12 222</b>	<b>-13 282</b>	<b>-11 331</b>	<b>-12 053</b>
Transfers to producers from consumers	-2.4	-13 536	-14 205	-12 885	-13 519
Other transfers from consumers	0.0	396	106	634	450
Transfers to consumers from taxpayers	0.0	0	0	0	0
Excess feed cost	0.1	918	817	921	1 016
<b>Percentage CSE</b>	<b>-16</b>	<b>-23</b>	<b>-26</b>	<b>-21</b>	<b>-21</b>
<b>Consumer NPC</b>	<b>1.21</b>	<b>1.32</b>	<b>1.38</b>	<b>1.29</b>	<b>1.29</b>
<b>Consumer NAC</b>	<b>1.20</b>	<b>1.29</b>	<b>1.35</b>	<b>1.26</b>	<b>1.27</b>
<b>Total Support Estimate (TSE)</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>17 956</b>	<b>18 220</b>	<b>16 989</b>	<b>18 660</b>
Transfers from consumers	2.4	13 140	14 100	12 251	13 069
Transfers from taxpayers	1.0	4 420	4 015	4 104	5 141
Budget revenues	0.0	396	106	634	450
<b>Percentage TSE (expressed as share of GDP)</b>	<b>3.96</b>	<b>4.21</b>	<b>5.06</b>	<b>3.95</b>	<b>3.81</b>
<b>GDP deflator 1986-88 = 100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>273 231</b>	<b>249 888</b>	<b>274 511</b>	<b>295 294</b>

p: Provisional. NPC: Nominal Protection Coefficient. NAC: Nominal Assistance Coefficient.

Market price support is net of producer levies and excess feed costs.

MPS commodities for Turkey are: wheat, maize, other grains, oilseeds, sugar, potatoes, tomatoes, grape, apple, cotton, tobacco, milk, beef and veal, sheepmeat, poultry and eggs.

Source: OECD, PSE/CSE database, 2006.

StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/226567123325>


## United States

The main policy developments in 2005 were the termination of the tobacco quota and price support programme, compensated by new term-limited payments, and the extension of the National Dairy Market Loss Payment to 2007. There was also an increase in disaster and counter-cyclical payments for crops. Other provisions of the multi-year current Farm Act continue through to 2007.

- In 2005, support to producers (% PSE) remained unchanged from the previous year at 16%. But it decreased from 22% in 1986-88 to 16% in 2003-05 and remained below the OECD average.
- The combined share of market price support, output and input payments (those that are most distorting) in the PSE decreased from 64% in 1986-88 to 60% in 2003-05. Prices received by farmers in 2003-05 were around 7% higher than those received in the world market. They were 14% higher in 1986-88.
- The share of area payments requiring production of specific crops decreased from 31% of the PSE in 1986-88 to 5% in 2003-05. Payments with no production requirement were 22% of the PSE in 2003-05.
- Although domestic prices were on average 6% higher than world prices, the cost to consumers (as measured by the % CSE) changed from a tax of 3% in 1986-88 to a subsidy of 9% in 2003-05 mainly due to Food Stamps.
- Support for general services provided to agriculture increased from nearly 25% of total support in 1986-88 to 32% in 2003-05. Total support to agriculture represents 0.9% of GDP, down from 1.4% in 1986-88.

While the termination of tobacco price support improves market orientation, the extension of the dairy price compensation does not. Continuously large output payments together with an increase in area and counter-cyclical payments also reduced the market orientation for crops.

Figure 2.12. **United States: Producer Support Estimate: level and composition over time**



StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/178602356641>

Table 2.12. **United States: Estimates of support to agriculture**  
USD million

	1986-88	2003-05	2003	2004	2005p
<b>Total value of production (at farm gate)</b>	<b>143 469</b>	<b>226 691</b>	<b>214 023</b>	<b>234 094</b>	<b>231 955</b>
<i>of which share of MPS commodities (%)</i>	<i>69</i>	<i>67</i>	<i>67</i>	<i>68</i>	<i>67</i>
<b>Total value of consumption (at farm gate)</b>	<b>134 717</b>	<b>207 882</b>	<b>200 131</b>	<b>212 940</b>	<b>210 574</b>
<b>Producer Support Estimate (PSE)</b>	<b>36 958</b>	<b>40 489</b>	<b>35 929</b>	<b>42 869</b>	<b>42 669</b>
Market Price Support (MPS)	13 640	10 514	10 271	12 550	8 721
<i>of which MPS commodities</i>	<i>9 401</i>	<i>7 085</i>	<i>6 846</i>	<i>8 554</i>	<i>5 854</i>
Payments based on output	2 919	5 201	3 213	6 176	6 214
Payments based on area planted/animal numbers	11 313	2 274	2 103	1 385	3 333
“Counter cyclical payments”	0	3 331	544	4 224	5 224
Payments based on historical entitlements	0	5 675	6 488	5 299	5 239
Payments based on input use	7 061	8 365	8 404	8 226	8 466
Payments based on input constraints	1 114	2 956	2 450	3 025	3 394
Payments based on overall farming income	912	2 173	2 456	1 984	2 078
<b>Percentage PSE</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Producer NPC</b>	<b>1.14</b>	<b>1.07</b>	<b>1.07</b>	<b>1.08</b>	<b>1.07</b>
<b>Producer NAC</b>	<b>1.29</b>	<b>1.19</b>	<b>1.18</b>	<b>1.19</b>	<b>1.19</b>
<b>General Services Support Estimate (GSSE)</b>	<b>15 710</b>	<b>32 960</b>	<b>29 956</b>	<b>32 772</b>	<b>36 153</b>
Research and development	1 099	2 057	1 976	2 049	2 144
Agricultural schools	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Inspection services	384	808	768	797	859
Infrastructure	3 862	5 413	4 814	5 901	5 524
Marketing and promotion	9 266	22 387	20 112	21 730	25 320
Public stockholding	0	155	167	143	154
Miscellaneous	1 098	2 140	2 119	2 151	2 151
<b>GSSE as a share of TSE (%)</b>	<b>24.5</b>	<b>32.4</b>	<b>32.7</b>	<b>31.7</b>	<b>33.0</b>
<b>Consumer Support Estimate (CSE)</b>	<b>-3 030</b>	<b>15 874</b>	<b>13 638</b>	<b>13 430</b>	<b>20 553</b>
Transfers to producers from consumers	-13 306	-10 514	-10 271	-12 550	-8 721
Other transfers from consumers	-1 486	-1 771	-1 869	-1 861	-1 584
Transfers to consumers from taxpayers	11 468	28 159	25 778	27 841	30 858
Excess feed cost	294	0	0	0	0
<b>Percentage CSE</b>	<b>-3</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Consumer NPC</b>	<b>1.13</b>	<b>1.06</b>	<b>1.06</b>	<b>1.07</b>	<b>1.05</b>
<b>Consumer NAC</b>	<b>1.03</b>	<b>0.92</b>	<b>0.93</b>	<b>0.93</b>	<b>0.90</b>
<b>Total Support Estimate (TSE)</b>	<b>64 136</b>	<b>101 608</b>	<b>91 663</b>	<b>103 482</b>	<b>109 680</b>
Transfers from consumers	14 793	12 285	12 140	14 411	10 306
Transfers from taxpayers	50 830	91 094	81 392	90 932	100 958
Budget revenues	-1 486	-1 771	-1 869	-1 861	-1 584
<b>Percentage TSE (expressed as share of GDP)</b>	<b>1.35</b>	<b>0.87</b>	<b>0.84</b>	<b>0.88</b>	<b>0.88</b>
<b>GDP deflator 1986-88 = 100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>153</b>

p: Provisional. NPC: Nominal Protection Coefficient. NAC: Nominal Assistance Coefficient.

Market price support is net of producer levies and excess feed costs.

MPS commodities for the United States are: wheat, maize, other grains, rice, oilseeds, sugar, milk, beef and veal, sheepmeat, wool, pigmeat, poultry and eggs.

Source: OECD, PSE/CSE database, 2006.

StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/421374348780>





## *Chapter 3*

# **Additional Tables on Estimates of Support to Agriculture**

Table 3.1. **OECD: Composition of Producer Support Estimate by country**  
Percentage share in PSE

	1986-88	2003-05	2003	2004	2005p
<b>Australia</b>					
Market Price Support	50	0	0	0	0
Payments based on output	0	0	0	0	0
Payments based on area planted/animal numbers	0	2	2	2	2
Payments based on historical entitlements	0	12	12	9	13
Payments based on input use	30	55	52	57	57
Payments based on input constraints	0	1	0	1	1
Payments based on overall farm income	20	30	34	30	26
Miscellaneous payments	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Canada</b>					
Market Price Support	52	46	48	44	45
Payments based on output	16	4	4	4	5
Payments based on area planted/animal numbers	16	8	5	13	7
Payments based on historical entitlements	0	10	17	9	2
Payments based on input use	14	7	6	7	7
Payments based on input constraints	0	1	0	1	1
Payments based on overall farm income	0	24	18	22	32
Miscellaneous payments	2	1	2	0	0
<b>European Union<sup>1</sup></b>					
Market Price Support	87	50	53	52	44
Payments based on output	5	4	3	3	4
Payments based on area planted/animal numbers	3	25	28	28	21
Payments based on historical entitlements	0	6	1	2	16
Payments based on input use	5	9	9	9	10
Payments based on input constraints	1	6	6	6	6
Payments based on overall farm income	0	0	0	0	0
Miscellaneous payments	0	0	0	-1	0
<b>Iceland</b>					
Market Price Support	90	50	50	49	50
Payments based on output	1	31	30	34	30
Payments based on area planted/animal numbers	1	0	0	0	0
Payments based on historical entitlements	0	15	15	13	15
Payments based on input use	8	4	5	4	5
Payments based on input constraints	0	0	0	0	0
Payments based on overall farm income	0	0	0	0	0
Miscellaneous payments	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Japan</b>					
Market Price Support	90	91	90	91	91
Payments based on output	3	3	3	3	3
Payments based on area planted/animal numbers	0	0	0	0	0
Payments based on historical entitlements	0	0	0	0	0
Payments based on input use	4	3	3	3	3
Payments based on input constraints	3	3	3	3	3
Payments based on overall farm income	0	0	0	0	0
Miscellaneous payments	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Korea</b>					
Market Price Support	99	92	91	93	92
Payments based on output	0	0	0	0	0
Payments based on area planted/animal numbers	0	2	3	2	0
Payments based on historical entitlements	0	1	0	0	3
Payments based on input use	1	2	2	2	2
Payments based on input constraints	0	0	1	0	0
Payments based on overall farm income	0	2	3	2	2
Miscellaneous payments	0	0	0	0	0

Table 3.1. **OECD: Composition of Producer Support Estimate by country (cont.)**

Percentage share in PSE

	1986-88	2003-05	2003	2004	2005p
<b>Mexico<sup>2</sup></b>					
Market Price Support	83	45	53	36	43
Payments based on output	1	4	4	4	3
Payments based on area planted/animal numbers	0	4	4	5	4
Payments based on historical entitlements	0	23	18	28	24
Payments based on input use	16	25	21	27	26
Payments based on input constraints	0	0	0	0	0
Payments based on overall farm income	0	0	0	0	0
Miscellaneous payments	0	0	0	0	0
<b>New Zealand</b>					
Market Price Support	19	78	81	79	74
Payments based on output	0	0	0	0	0
Payments based on area planted/animal numbers	0	0	0	0	0
Payments based on historical entitlements	37	0	0	0	0
Payments based on input use	39	17	19	19	15
Payments based on input constraints	0	0	0	0	0
Payments based on overall farm income	5	5	0	2	12
Miscellaneous payments	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Norway</b>					
Market Price Support	49	45	48	45	43
Payments based on output	24	7	7	7	7
Payments based on area planted/animal numbers	9	19	18	20	20
Payments based on historical entitlements	0	8	8	9	9
Payments based on input use	17	15	14	15	16
Payments based on input constraints	2	2	2	2	2
Payments based on overall farm income	0	3	3	3	3
Miscellaneous payments	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Switzerland</b>					
Market Price Support	83	54	55	55	52
Payments based on output	1	5	5	5	5
Payments based on area planted/animal numbers	6	13	13	13	14
Payments based on historical entitlements	0	19	18	18	20
Payments based on input use	8	4	4	4	5
Payments based on input constraints	0	2	2	2	2
Payments based on overall farm income	0	0	0	0	0
Miscellaneous payments	3	3	3	3	3
<b>Turkey</b>					
Market Price Support	70	78	80	77	77
Payments based on output	0	3	2	3	5
Payments based on area planted/animal numbers	0	0	0	0	0
Payments based on historical entitlements	0	16	16	18	15
Payments based on input use	30	2	2	2	3
Payments based on input constraints	0	0	0	0	0
Payments based on overall farm income	0	0	0	0	0
Miscellaneous payments	0	0	0	0	0
<b>United States</b>					
Market Price Support	37	26	29	29	20
Payments based on output	8	13	9	14	15
Payments based on area planted/animal numbers	31	6	6	3	8
"Counter cyclical payments"	0	8	2	10	12
Payments based on historical entitlements	0	14	18	12	12
Payments based on input use	19	21	23	19	20
Payments based on input constraints	3	7	7	7	8
Payments based on overall farm income	2	5	7	5	5

Table 3.1. **OECD: Composition of Producer Support Estimate by country (cont.)**  
 Percentage share in PSE

	1986-88	2003-05	2003	2004	2005p
<b>OECD<sup>3</sup></b>					
Market Price Support	77	57	60	59	54
Payments based on output	5	5	4	5	5
Payments based on area planted/animal numbers <sup>4</sup>	7	15	15	16	14
Payments based on historical entitlements	0	7	5	5	11
Payments based on input use	9	10	10	9	10
Payments based on input constraints	1	5	5	4	5
Payments based on overall farm income	1	2	2	1	2
Miscellaneous payments	0	0	0	0	0

p: Provisional.

1. EU12 for 1986-94 including ex-GDR from 1990; EU15 for 1995-2003; EU25 from 2004.

2. For Mexico, 1986-88 is replaced by 1991-93.

3. Austria, Finland and Sweden are included in the OECD total for all years and in the EU from 1995. The Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and the Slovak Republic are included in the OECD total for all years and in the EU from 2004. The OECD total does not include the six non-OECD EU member states.

4. This category provisionally includes the US counter cyclical payments from 2002.

Source: OECD, PSE/CSE database, 2006.

StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/537750840815>

Table 3.2. **OECD: Composition of General Services Support Estimate by country**

Percentage share in GSSE

		1986-88	2003-05	2003	2004	2005p
<b>Australia</b>	Research and Development	55	71	71	71	71
	Agricultural schools	0	0	0	0	0
	Inspection services	16	11	11	11	11
	Infrastructure	12	15	15	15	15
	Marketing and promotion	9	1	1	1	1
	Public stockholding	0	0	0	0	0
	Miscellaneous	8	2	2	2	2
<b>Canada</b>	Research and Development	17	18	20	18	16
	Agricultural schools	14	10	12	10	9
	Inspection services	17	25	25	25	26
	Infrastructure	23	19	18	20	19
	Marketing and promotion	29	27	25	27	29
	Public stockholding	0	0	0	0	0
	Miscellaneous	0	0	0	0	0
<b>European Union<sup>1</sup></b>	Research and Development	12	18	18	17	17
	Agricultural schools	1	11	11	11	11
	Inspection services	2	4	4	5	4
	Infrastructure	13	26	25	26	29
	Marketing and promotion	18	28	29	27	27
	Public stockholding	54	10	12	10	8
	Miscellaneous	0	3	2	4	4
<b>Iceland</b>	Research and Development	18	30	29	28	33
	Agricultural schools	6	11	14	14	6
	Inspection services	5	12	11	11	14
	Infrastructure	16	14	17	14	11
	Marketing and promotion	7	8	8	8	10
	Public stockholding	47	24	22	24	27
	Miscellaneous	1	1	0	1	1
<b>Japan</b>	Research and Development	4	6	6	6	7
	Agricultural schools	2	1	2	1	1
	Inspection services	1	1	1	1	1
	Infrastructure	80	80	80	81	78
	Marketing and promotion	2	2	2	2	2
	Public stockholding	3	2	2	2	2
	Miscellaneous	9	8	8	7	9
<b>Korea</b>	Research and Development	6	13	10	14	16
	Agricultural schools	1	2	1	3	3
	Inspection services	2	4	3	4	4
	Infrastructure	44	61	65	59	58
	Marketing and promotion	0	1	1	1	1
	Public stockholding	47	19	19	18	19
	Miscellaneous	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Mexico<sup>2</sup></b>	Research and Development	10	17	17	17	18
	Agricultural schools	16	21	21	22	21
	Inspection services	0	19	15	20	23
	Infrastructure	24	13	13	14	11
	Marketing and promotion	9	28	34	26	26
	Public stockholding	36	0	0	0	0
	Miscellaneous	5	1	1	1	1

Table 3.2. **OECD: Composition of General Services Support Estimate by country (cont.)**

Percentage share in GSSE

		1986-88	2003-05	2003	2004	2005p
<b>New Zealand</b>	Research and Development	43	42	47	44	37
	Agricultural schools	0	8	7	8	9
	Inspection services	31	32	33	34	30
	Infrastructure	26	17	13	13	24
	Marketing and promotion	0	0	0	0	0
	Public stockholding	0	0	0	0	0
	Miscellaneous	0	0	0	1	0
<b>Norway</b>	Research and Development	56	44	43	43	47
	Agricultural schools	0	0	0	0	0
	Inspection services	4	17	15	19	16
	Infrastructure	16	21	24	19	21
	Marketing and promotion	25	4	6	4	2
	Public stockholding	0	0	1	0	0
	Miscellaneous	0	13	11	13	14
<b>Switzerland</b>	Research and Development	20	18	17	18	18
	Agricultural schools	6	4	4	4	4
	Inspection services	2	2	2	2	3
	Infrastructure	20	18	19	19	17
	Marketing and promotion	7	12	13	11	11
	Public stockholding	15	8	8	8	8
	Miscellaneous	31	38	37	38	39
<b>Turkey</b>	Research and Development	16	3	4	4	2
	Agricultural schools	1	0	1	1	0
	Inspection services	17	9	7	14	7
	Infrastructure	2	0	0	0	0
	Marketing and promotion	35	87	87	79	90
	Public stockholding	0	0	0	0	0
	Miscellaneous	29	1	1	2	1
<b>United States</b>	Research and Development	7	6	7	6	6
	Agricultural schools	0	0	0	0	0
	Inspection services	2	2	3	2	2
	Infrastructure	25	16	16	18	15
	Marketing and promotion	59	68	67	66	70
	Public stockholding	0	0	1	0	0
	Miscellaneous	7	6	7	7	6
<b>OECD<sup>3</sup></b>	Research and Development	9	10	10	10	10
	Agricultural schools	2	3	3	3	3
	Inspection services	3	4	4	4	4
	Infrastructure	34	32	33	34	30
	Marketing and promotion	30	42	41	40	45
	Public stockholding	17	3	4	3	3
	Miscellaneous	5	6	6	6	6

p: Provisional.

1. EU12 for 1986-94 including ex-GDR from 1990; EU15 for 1995-2003; EU25 from 2004.

2. For Mexico, 1986-88 is replaced by 1991-93.

3. Austria, Finland and Sweden are included in the OECD total for all years and in the EU from 1995. The Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and the Slovak Republic are included in the OECD total for all years and in the EU from 2004. The OECD total does not include the six non-OECD EU member states.

Source: OECD, PSE/CSE database, 2006.

StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/306714855470>

Table 3.3. **OECD: Consumer Support Estimate by country**

		1986-88	2003-05	2003	2004	2005p
<b>Australia<sup>1</sup></b>	USD mn	-340	-158	-145	-158	-170
	EUR mn	-317	-131	-128	-128	-137
	Percentage CSE	-8	-2	-2	-2	-2
	Consumer NPC	1.09	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
	Consumer NAC	1.09	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02
<b>Canada</b>	USD mn	-2 876	-2 611	-2 637	-2 481	-2 714
	EUR mn	-2 605	-2 172	-2 334	-1 997	-2 184
	Percentage CSE	-25	-14	-15	-14	-14
	Consumer NPC	1.37	1.17	1.19	1.16	1.16
	Consumer NAC	1.33	1.17	1.18	1.16	1.16
<b>European Union<sup>2</sup></b>	USD mn	-75 154	-57 395	-56 837	-63 086	-52 262
	EUR mn	-68 272	-47 712	-50 310	-50 775	-42 050
	Percentage CSE	-37	-19	-21	-19	-17
	Consumer NPC	1.75	1.26	1.30	1.27	1.22
	Consumer NAC	1.59	1.24	1.27	1.24	1.20
<b>Iceland</b>	USD mn	-123	-87	-77	-79	-104
	EUR mn	-112	-72	-69	-64	-84
	Percentage CSE	-71	-48	-52	-45	-49
	Consumer NPC	4.37	2.00	2.14	1.85	2.00
	Consumer NAC	3.58	1.95	2.08	1.81	1.95
<b>Japan</b>	USD mn	-55 952	-59 399	-62 161	-59 874	-56 163
	EUR mn	-50 569	-49 467	-55 022	-48 190	-45 189
	Percentage CSE	-61	-51	-53	-51	-48
	Consumer NPC	2.55	2.04	2.14	2.05	1.93
	Consumer NAC	2.55	2.04	2.14	2.05	1.92
<b>Korea</b>	USD mn	-11 771	-23 698	-21 571	-21 644	-27 880
	EUR mn	-10 582	-19 649	-19 094	-17 420	-22 432
	Percentage CSE	-66	-59	-58	-58	-61
	Consumer NPC	2.93	2.44	2.40	2.38	2.56
	Consumer NAC	2.92	2.44	2.38	2.37	2.55
<b>Mexico<sup>3</sup></b>	USD mn	-5 729	-3 061	-4 120	-2 211	-2 852
	EUR mn	-4 665	-2 574	-3 647	-1 779	-2 295
	Percentage CSE	-23	-10	-13	-7	-8
	Consumer NPC	1.40	1.11	1.16	1.08	1.09
	Consumer NAC	1.30	1.11	1.16	1.07	1.09
<b>New Zealand</b>	USD mn	-91	-152	-129	-150	-176
	EUR mn	-83	-126	-114	-121	-142
	Percentage CSE	-9	-8	-8	-8	-9
	Consumer NPC	1.10	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.10
	Consumer NAC	1.10	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.10
<b>Norway</b>	USD mn	-1 345	-1 418	-1 474	-1 376	-1 404
	EUR mn	-1 222	-1 180	-1 305	-1 107	-1 130
	Percentage CSE	-56	-53	-57	-51	-49
	Consumer NPC	3.35	2.27	2.53	2.17	2.11
	Consumer NAC	2.31	2.13	2.35	2.05	1.98
<b>Switzerland</b>	USD mn	-4 997	-3 661	-3 517	-3 862	-3 604
	EUR mn	-4 505	-3 040	-3 113	-3 108	-2 900
	Percentage CSE	-74	-56	-58	-55	-54
	Consumer NPC	4.83	2.37	2.49	2.34	2.28
	Consumer NAC	3.82	2.26	2.36	2.23	2.18

Table 3.3. **OECD: Consumer Support Estimate by country (cont.)**

		1986-88	2003-05	2003	2004	2005p
<b>Turkey</b>	USD mn	-2 446	-8 593	-8 840	-7 946	-8 994
	EUR mn	-2 224	-7 152	-7 825	-6 395	-7 237
	Percentage CSE	-16	-23	-26	-21	-21
	Consumer NPC	1.21	1.32	1.38	1.29	1.29
	Consumer NAC	1.20	1.29	1.35	1.26	1.27
<b>United States</b>	USD mn	-3 030	15 874	13 638	13 430	20 553
	EUR mn	-2 797	13 139	12 072	10 809	16 537
	Percentage CSE	-3	9	8	7	11
	Consumer NPC	1.13	1.06	1.06	1.07	1.05
	Consumer NAC	1.03	0.92	0.93	0.93	0.90
<b>OECD<sup>4</sup></b>	USD mn	-171 365	-144 207	-150 499	-147 677	-134 445
	EUR mn	-155 434	-120 083	-133 216	-118 860	-108 174
	Percentage CSE	-32	-19	-21	-19	-17
	Consumer NPC	1.59	1.30	1.32	1.30	1.27
	Consumer NAC	1.47	1.24	1.26	1.24	1.21

p: Provisional. NPC: Nominal Protection Coefficient. NAC: Nominal Assistance Coefficient.

1. As a result of a technical revision of the Australian PSE database from 1990 onwards there has been an increase in the calculated PSE. This revision reflects improved information on the allocation of budgetary payments across the PSE time series and not any change in actual support provided by Australia.
2. EU12 for 1986-94 including ex-GDR from 1990; EU15 for 1995-2003; EU25 from 2004.
3. For Mexico, 1986-88 is replaced by 1991-93.
4. Austria, Finland and Sweden are included in the OECD total for all years and in the EU from 1995. The Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and the Slovak Republic are included in the OECD total for all years and in the EU from 2004. The OECD total does not include the six non-OECD EU member states.

Source: OECD, PSE/CSE database, 2006.

StatLink: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/418264347416>



OECD PUBLICATIONS, 2, rue André-Pascal, 75775 PARIS CEDEX 16  
PRINTED IN FRANCE  
(51 2006 05 1 P) ISBN 92-64-02275-9 – No. 55035 2006

# Agricultural Policies in OECD Countries

## AT A GLANCE

Support to farmers in OECD countries accounted for 29% of farm receipts in 2005. The current level of support is the same as almost a decade ago and varies widely across countries. Today, although governments are gradually moving away from providing support through the most production and trade distorting measures, these measures remain dominant. Greater efforts are needed to better target policies towards clearly defined income and environmental objectives.

This book is a unique source of up-to-date estimates of support to agriculture. It provides the most comprehensive description and evaluation of agricultural support developments in OECD member countries and a summary of agricultural policy developments in Brazil, China and South Africa.

*Agricultural Policies in OECD Countries: At a Glance* is published every other year, alternating with *Agricultural Policies in OECD Countries: Monitoring and Evaluation*.

The full text of this book is available on line via these links:

<http://www.sourceoecd.org/agriculture/9264022759>

<http://www.sourceoecd.org/transitions/economies/9264022759>

Those with access to all OECD books on line should use this link:

<http://www.sourceoecd.org/9264022759>

SourceOECD is the OECD's online library of books, periodicals and statistical databases. For more information about this award-winning service and free trials ask your librarian, or write to us at [SourceOECD@oecd.org](mailto:SourceOECD@oecd.org).



2006

[www.oecd.org](http://www.oecd.org)



**OECD PUBLISHING**

ISBN 92-64-02275-9  
51 2006 05 1 P



9 789264 022751