## **Executive Summary**

The agriculture sector in many OECD countries continued to be characterised by high levels of support and protection.

In 2003 support to producers across the OECD area, as measured by the percentage PSE, accounted for 32% of farm receipts, a slight increase from 2002, but down from 37% in 1986-88. The PSE in 2003 is estimated at USD 257 billion, or EUR 229 billion.

Reform has been reflected in the composition of support.

The share of the most production and trade distorting forms of support - output and input-linked support - has declined from over 90% of producer support in 1986-88 to about 75% in 2001-03. There has also been a slight narrowing of the spread of support levels between commodities. While this progress is notable, there is only a very modest use of policies targeted to specific objectives and beneficiaries, and hence a need for further efforts in these directions. Further efforts are also needed to ensure that policies are more transparent, tailored to specific outcomes, flexible in responding to changing priorities, and equitable. The still large share of output and input-linked support encourages domestic production, distorts trade and contributes to depressing world prices of agricultural commodities. Agricultural policies in OECD countries sometimes impose unnecessary costs on domestic consumers and taxpayers, and many support policies put pressure on the environment and penalise competitive suppliers, including those in developing countries.

Reform of agricultural policies remains highly uneven across countries.

There are large and increasing differences in the levels of support among OECD countries, and the extent to which further reform is necessary varies considerably. Support to producers in 2001-03 was below 5% of farm receipts in Australia and New Zealand, 20% or less in Canada, Mexico, Poland, Slovakia, Turkey and the United States, around 25% in the Czech Republic and Hungary, 35% in the European Union, and 60% or more in Iceland, Japan, Korea, Norway and Switzerland.

A number of policy changes were introduced in 2003.

It was the first year of implementation of the Agricultural Policy Framework in **Canada** and full implementation of the 2002 FSRI Act in the **United States. Norway** introduced a new

standard per hectare payment available to all farmers for their contribution to the cultural landscape. Emergency payments were provided in **Australia** (drought) and **Canada** (BSE). Some efforts were made to improve the efficiency of domestic markets behind significant border protection in **Japan** and **Korea** (rice) and **Norway** (dairy). The **Czech Republic**, **Hungary**, **Poland** and **Slovakia** continued to prepare for accession to the **European Union** in May 2004, including through changes to producer payments, spending on infrastructure, and development of food safety systems. Agreement was reached in the **European Union** on the reform of the Common Agricultural Policy, involving a significant further step in the direction of decoupling support from production decisions, to be implemented in 2005-07. A decision was also reached in **Switzerland** on the new agricultural reform package, to be implemented over the period 2004-07, continuing the long-term shift away from the most trade distorting measures.

Strong world prices for meat and oilseeds, dairy products and rice contrasted with lower world prices for sugar, wheat and maize in 2003. Meat markets were disrupted by disease outbreaks in several parts of the world. Significant exchange rate movements, in particular a weaker US dollar and a stronger Euro, were important factors influencing trade flows. While a number of countries continued to pursue needed policy reforms on a unilateral basis, multilateral trade negotiations stalled at the Ministerial meeting in Cancún. *Making progress at the WTO would invigorate the process of agricultural policy reform.* 

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary	9
Part I. EVALUATION OF SUPPORT POLICY DEVELOPMENTS	13
1. Evaluation of Support Policy Developments	14
Developments in policy and markets	15
The level of support to producers remains high	15
but has fallen somewhat over the longer term	19
The level of support varies widely among countries	19
The most distorting forms of support have declined but still dominate	19
New forms of support have been introduced	25
Differences in support levels across commodity also cause distortions	26
Support for general services to agriculture is increasing but remains low	
relative to support to producers	30
Total support to agriculture has decreased	32
Overall, some progress in reform has occurred	32
but remains highly uneven across countries	34
Further efforts to reform agricultural policies are clearly required	35
Annex I.1. Policy Principles	36
Annex I.2. Operational Criteria	37
Annex I.3. Definitions of the OECD Indicators of Support	38
Part II. COUNTRY FOCUS	41
Australia	42
Canada	44
Czech Republic	46
European Union	48
-	50
Iceland	52
Japan	54
Korea	56
Mexico	58
New Zealand	60
Norway	62
Poland	64
Slovak Republic	66
Switzerland	68
Turkey	70
United States	72

Part II	I. ANNEX TABLES ON ESTIMATES OF SUPPORT TO AGRICULTURE	75
Part IV	7. NON-MEMBER ECONOMIES	137
	Russia	138
	Ukraine	142
List of	f boxes	
ī 1	Methodology for evaluating policy developments	14
	Evaluating annual changes in the level of support in the OECD as a whole	
	f tables	10
I.1.		17
I.1.		
I.2.	OECD: Producer Support Estimate by country	
I.4.	OECD : Producer Support Estimate by commodity	
I.5.		
II.1.		
II.1.		
II.2. II.3.	Czech Republic: Estimates of support to agriculture	
II.4.	European Union: Estimates of support to agriculture	
II.5.	Hungary: Estimates of support to agriculture	
II.6.	Iceland: Estimates of support to agriculture	
II.6. II.7.	Japan: Estimates of support to agriculture	
II.7. II.8.		
	Korea: Estimates of support to agriculture	
II.9.	11 8	
II.10.	New Zealand: Estimates of support to agriculture	
II.11.	Norway: Estimates of support to agriculture	
II.12.	Poland: Estimates of support to agriculture	
II.13.	Slovak Republic: Estimates of support to agriculture	
II.14.	Switzerland: Estimates of support to agriculture	
II.15.	Turkey: Estimates of support to agriculture	
II.16.	United States: Estimates of support to agriculture	
III.1.	OECD: Composition of Producer Support Estimate	
III.2.	OECD: Composition of General Services Support Estimate	
III.3.	OECD: Consumer Support Estimate by country	
III.4.	OECD: Consumer Support Estimate by commodity	
III.5.	OECD: Total Support Estimate by country	
III.6.	Australia: Main indicators by commodity	
III.7.	Canada: Main indicators by commodity	
III.8.	Czech Republic: Main indicators by commodity	
III.9.	European Union: Main indicators by commodity	
	Hungary: Main indicators by commodity	
	Iceland: Main indicators by commodity	
	Japan: Main indicators by commodity	
	Korea: Main indicators by commodity	
	Mexico: Main indicators by commodity	
	New Zealand: Main indicators by commodity	
III.16.	Norway: Main indicators by commodity	117

III.17.	Poland: Main indicators by commodity	120
III.18.	Slovak Republic: Main indicators by commodity	123
III.19.	Switzerland: Main indicators by commodity	126
III.20.	Turkey: Main indicators by commodity	129
III.21.	United States: Main indicators by commodity	132
III.22.	Change in Producer Support Estimate (PSE) 2002 to 2003: Contribution	
	of Market Price Support (MPS) and Budgetary Payments (BP)	135
III.23.	Change in Market Price Support (MPS) 2002 to 2003: Contribution of its elements	136
IV.1.	Russia: Estimates of support to agriculture	139
IV.2.	Russia: Main indicators by commodity	140
IV.3.	Ukraine: Estimates of support to agriculture	143
IV.4.	Ukraine: Main indicators by commodity	144
List of	figures	
I.1.	Evolution of Producer Support Estimate (% PSE), Nominal Protection	
	Coefficient (NPCp) and Nominal Assistance Coefficient (NACp)	16
I.2.	Producer Support Estimate by country	20
I.3.	Producer Nominal Assistance Coefficient by country	20
I.4.	Composition of Producer Support Estimate for the OECD	23
I.5.	Composition of Producer Support Estimate by country, 1986-88 and 2001-03	23
I.6.	Producer Nominal Protection Coefficient by country	
I.7.	Consumer Support Estimate by country	25
I.8.	Producer Support Estimate by commodity, 1986-88 and 2001-03	27
I.9.	Producer Nominal Protection Coefficient by commodity	27
I.10.	Spread in commodity support by country	30
I.11.		
I.12.	Changes in the level, spread and composition of support in the OECD	33



#### From:

# **Agricultural Policies in OECD Countries 2004**At a Glance

### Access the complete publication at:

https://doi.org/10.1787/agr\_oecd-2004-en

### Please cite this chapter as:

OECD (2004), "Executive Summary", in *Agricultural Policies in OECD Countries 2004: At a Glance*, OECD Publishing, Paris.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1787/agr\_oecd-2004-2-en

This work is published under the responsibility of the Secretary-General of the OECD. The opinions expressed and arguments employed herein do not necessarily reflect the official views of OECD member countries.

This document, as well as any data and map included herein, are without prejudice to the status of or sovereignty over any territory, to the delimitation of international frontiers and boundaries and to the name of any territory, city or area. Extracts from publications may be subject to additional disclaimers, which are set out in the complete version of the publication, available at the link provided.

The use of this work, whether digital or print, is governed by the Terms and Conditions to be found at http://www.oecd.org/termsandconditions.

