

FACULTY OF JURIDICAL SCIENCES

Lecture-22



Coverage of the Agreement

Part I of the Agreement defines the coverage of the Agreement. Specifically, it establishes a definition of the term “subsidy” and an explanation of the concept of “specificity”. Only a measure which is a “specific subsidy” within the meaning of Part I is subject to multilateral disciplines and can be subject to countervailing measures.

Definition of subsidy Unlike the Tokyo Round Subsidies Code, the WTO SCM Agreement contains a definition of the term “subsidy”. The definition contains three basic elements: (i) a financial contribution (ii) by a government or any public body within the territory of a Member (iii) which confers a benefit. All three of these elements must be satisfied in order for a subsidy to exist.

The concept of “financial contribution” was included in the SCM Agreement only after a protracted negotiation. Some Members argued that there could be no subsidy unless there was a charge on the public account. Other Members considered that forms of government intervention that did not involve an expense to the government nevertheless distorted competition and should thus be considered to be subsidies. The SCM Agreement basically adopted the former approach. The Agreement requires a financial contribution and contains a list of the types of measures that represent a financial contribution, e.g., grants, loans, equity infusions, loan guarantees, fiscal incentives, the provision of goods or services, the purchase of goods.

In order for a financial contribution to be a subsidy, it must be made by or at the direction of a government or any public body within the territory of a Member. Thus, the SCM Agreement applies not only to measures of national governments, but also to measures of sub-national governments and of such public bodies as state-owned companies.

A financial contribution by a government is not a subsidy unless it confers a “benefit.” In many cases, as in the case of a cash grant, the existence of a benefit and its valuation will be clear. In some cases, however, the issue of benefit will be more complex. For example, when does a loan, an equity infusion or the purchase by a government of a good confer a benefit? Although the SCM Agreement does not provide complete guidance on these issues, the Appellate Body has ruled (*Canada – Aircraft*) that the existence of a benefit is to be determined by comparison with the market-place (i.e., on the basis of what the recipient could have received in the market). In

the context of countervailing duties, Article 14 of the SCM Agreement provides some guidance with respect to determining whether certain types of measures confer a benefit. In the context of multilateral disciplines, however, the issue of the meaning of “benefit” is not fully resolved.

Specificity. Assuming that a measure is a subsidy within the meaning of the SCM Agreement, it nevertheless is not subject to the SCM Agreement unless it has been specifically provided to an enterprise or industry or group of enterprises or industries. The basic principle is that a subsidy that distorts the allocation of resources within an economy should be subject to discipline. Where a subsidy is widely available within an economy, such a distortion in the allocation of resources is presumed not to occur. Thus, only “specific” subsidies are subject to the SCM Agreement disciplines. There are four types of “specificity” within the meaning of the SCM Agreement:

- Enterprise-specificity. A government targets a particular company or companies for subsidization;
- Industry-specificity. A government targets a particular sector or sectors for subsidization.
- Regional specificity. A government targets producers in specified parts of its territory for subsidization.
- Prohibited subsidies. A government targets export goods or goods using domestic inputs for subsidization.