

**Elements of Overall Trade-Distorting Support and Implications of US Subsidy Proposal**  
**Kimberly Elliott**  
**Center for Global Development and Institute for International Economics**

	Current ceilings	US proposed ceilings	2001 <sup>a</sup>	Estimated from USDA Data					
				2002	2003	2004	2005	2006e	2007e
<b>Amber Box (most trade-distorting)</b>									
Aggregate measurement of support	19.1	7.6	14.4	15.6	12.3	7.4	15.2	16.4	9
Subsidies	N/A	N/A	8.6	9.8	6.8	1.9	<b>9.7</b>	<b>10.9</b>	3.5
Market price support	N/A	N/A	5.8	5.8	5.5	5.5	5.5	5.5	5.5
De minimis									
Product-specific	9.5	5	0.2	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Non-product-specific	9.5	5	6.8	~2 <sup>b</sup>	~2 <sup>b</sup>	~2 <sup>b</sup>	~2 <sup>b</sup>	~2 <sup>b</sup>	~2 <sup>b</sup>
<b>Blue Box<sup>c</sup></b>	none	<b>5</b>	0	0	1.7	0.8	2.8	4	3.1
<b>Overall Trade-Distorting Support</b>	none	22.6	21.4	17.6	16	10.2	20	22.4	14.1

**NB: OTDS without P-S DM = 17.6**

N/A = not applicable; n.a. = not available.

a. From last official WTO notification.

b. Approximate average value of non-product-specific de minimis for 1995-2001, without emergency market loss assistance, which was replaced with counter-cyclical payments in 2002 farm bill and which will be allocated to blue box.

c. The United States has not notified any blue box spending to the WTO. The values here for counter-cyclical payments, which the United States will probably notify as non-product-specific de minimis in the Amber Box, but which it hopes to move to the Blue Box as part of the Doha agreement.