

**REPORT  
OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON CONTRIBUTIONS**

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

OFFICIAL RECORDS: FORTIETH SESSION

SUPPLEMENT No. 11 (A/40/11)



**UNITED NATIONS**

New York, 1985

#### NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

## CONTENTS

	<u>Paragraphs</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. ORGANIZATION AND ATTENDANCE .....	1 - 2	1
II. CONSIDERATION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 39/247 B ..	3 - 29	2
A. Statistical base period .....	5	3
B. Low per capita income allowance formula .....	6	3
C. Redistribution of the burden of relief .....	7 - 10	4
D. Rates of assessment of least developed countries ...	11	4
E. Methodology to take into account the high levels of indebtedness .....	12 - 25	5
F. The scheme of limits to avoid excessive variations of individual rates of assessment between successive scales .....	26 - 29	7
III. REVIEW OF THE SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS .....	30 - 55	9
A. Statistical information .....	30 - 53	9
B. Representations by Member States .....	54 - 55	13
IV. SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS .....	56 - 59	14
V. ASSESSMENT OF NON-MEMBER STATES .....	60 - 63	15
VI. OTHER MATTERS CONSIDERED BY THE COMMITTEE .....	64 - 70	18
A. Alternative methodologies for assessment: A comparative study .....	64	18
B. Collection of contributions .....	65 - 66	18
C. Payment of contributions in currencies other than United States dollars .....	67 - 69	18
D. Date of next session .....	70	18
VII. RECOMMENDATION OF THE COMMITTEE .....	71	19
VIII. SEPARATE OPINION .....	72	23

CONTENTS (continued)

Page

ANNEXES

I.	Countries for which relief was recommended on account of the seriousness of the debt situation .....	24
II.	Revised national income estimates in United States dollars as a consequence of the decision of the Committee on Contributions .....	25
III.	Official scale for 1983-1985, machine scale and recommended scale for 1986-1988 .....	27
IV.	United Nations scale of assessments for the years 1946-1985 .....	32

## I. ORGANIZATION AND ATTENDANCE

1. The forty-fifth session of the Committee on Contributions was held at United Nations Headquarters from 3 June to 3 July 1985. The following members were present:

Mr. Andrzej Abraszewski  
Syed Amjad Ali  
Mr. Mohammed Sadiq Al-Mahdi  
Mr. Ernesto Battisti  
Mr. Javier Castillo Ayala  
Mr. Anatoly Semënovich Chistyakov  
Mr. Marco Antônio Diniz Brandao  
Mr. Hamed Arabi El Houderi  
Mr. Leoncio Fernández Maroto  
Mr. Richard V. Hennes  
Mr. Lance L. E. Joseph  
Mr. Zoran Lazarević  
Mr. Atilio Norberto Molteni  
Mr. Yasuo Noguchi  
Mr. Aluseye D. Oduyemi  
Mr. Omar Sirry  
Mr. Dominique Souchet  
Mr. Wang Liansheng

2. The Committee elected Syed Amjad Ali as Chairman and Mr. Atilio Norberto Molteni as Vice-Chairman.

II. CONSIDERATION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 39/247 B

3. At its thirty-ninth session, the General Assembly adopted resolution 39/247 B of 12 April 1985, which reads as follows:

"The General Assembly,

"Recalling its resolutions 31/95 A and B of 14 December 1976, 34/6 B of 25 October 1979, 36/231 A of 18 December 1981, 37/125 B of 17 December 1982 and 38/33 of 25 November 1983,

"Taking into account the views expressed in the Fifth Committee 1/ during the debate on the report of the Committee on Contributions 2/ and having considered the report and the recommendations contained therein,

"Reconfirming that the real capacity to pay of Member States is the fundamental criterion for determining the scale of assessments,

"Deeply concerned, in general, by the persistent serious economic and financial situation in the world and, in particular, by the external indebtedness and other serious economic problems which continue to affect adversely the capacity to pay of developing countries,

"Conscious of the problem of Member States whose national income is mostly generated by the export of one or a few products,

"Noting with appreciation the efforts of the Committee on Contributions,

"1. Decides that, in the preparation of the next scale of assessments:

"(a) The ten-year statistical base period should be maintained;

"(b) The upper limit of the low per capita income allowance formula shall be raised from \$2,100 to \$2,200;

"(c) In the redistribution of the burden of relief, the Committee on Contributions should apply a limit to the relief burden borne by Member States to take into account their developmental status and developmental requirements;

"(d) The individual rates of assessments of the least developed countries should not exceed the present level;

"(e) The Committee on Contributions should develop a methodology to take into account the problem of the serious economic and financial situation in the world, in pursuance of the deliberations mentioned in paragraph 54 of its report;

---

"1/ See Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-ninth Session, Fifth Committee, 4th-11th, 13th and 14th meetings; and *ibid.*, Fifth Committee, Sessional Fascicle, corrigendum.

"2/ *Ibid.*, Thirty-ninth session, Supplement No. 11 (A/39/11 and Corr.1).

"(f) Scheme III, as defined in paragraph 49 of the report of the Committee on Contributions, should be used to limit the variations of individual rates of assessment between successive scales after pertinent modifications in the light of the views expressed by Member States in the Fifth Committee, particularly in respect of rates below the level of 1 per cent;

"2. Takes note of the intention of the Committee on Contributions to continue to study and examine subjects indicated in its report, including the study on comparative methods of assessment mentioned in paragraph 66;

"3. Requests the Committee on Contributions to examine the conceptual feasibility of supplementing the present methodology so that each Member State may be assigned a relevant base relief gradient on the basis of its national income and, if possible, to report to the General Assembly at its fortieth session;

"4. Also requests the Committee on Contributions to intensify its co-operation with other international organizations engaged in the development and collection of statistics and appeals to Member States to continue to co-operate with the United Nations Statistical Office by submitting national statistics on time;

"5. Requests the Secretary-General to provide the Committee on Contributions with the facilities it requires to carry out its work, including supplementary assistance if necessary."

4. The Committee reviewed the resolution carefully, following which it proceeded to discuss paragraph 1 of the resolution. It had as information papers the summary records of debates in the Fifth Committee and the General Assembly on the question (A/C.5/39/SR.4-11, 13, 14, 51, 53 and 55-58; A/39/PV.107), as well as the relevant report of the Fifth Committee (A/39/844 and Add.1). The Committee also heard an opening address by the Controller of the United Nations who reviewed briefly the background to the adoption of resolution 39/247 B by the General Assembly at its resumed session in April 1985.

#### A. Statistical base period

5. The Committee was glad to note that the General Assembly had accepted the recommendation of the Committee at its forty-fourth session 1/ to maintain a statistical base period of 10 years for the scale for 1986-1988, although some members expressed their continuing preference for a shorter period or for more weight being given to the last three years to reflect better the capacity to pay.

#### B. Low per capita income allowance formula

6. It was also noted that the General Assembly had decided to accept the Committee's decision to raise the upper limit of the low per capita income allowance formula from \$2,100 to \$2,200. 2/ It was understood that the relief gradient should remain at the current level of 85 per cent. Thus, the two parameters, \$2,200 and 85 per cent, were used in the calculation of relief on account of low per capita income.

### C. Redistribution of the burden of relief

7. In paragraph 1 (c) of resolution 39/247 B, the General Assembly decided that, in the preparation of the next scale of assessments, the Committee on Contributions should apply a limit to the relief burden borne by Member States to take into account their developmental status and developmental requirements. The Committee had before it a working paper giving a summary of the discussions in the Fifth Committee on that item, a list of Member States having an average per capita national income above the limit of \$2,200 and, for illustrative purposes, the effects of "limiting" the relief burden of the developing countries having a per capita income above the limit.

8. It was interpreted by some members that, while the previous application of the low per capita income allowance formula made a distinction between Member States with per capita income above the limit and those Member States with per capita income below the limit, paragraph 1 (c) seemed to show that, even in the former group of Member States, a differentiation should be made between developed and developing countries for purposes of redistribution of the relief burden as a general principle. Other members were disinclined to allow such differentiation as a general principle. Some thought that any limit on sharing the relief burden should be applied "primarily" to developing countries, given that other countries not classified as developing nevertheless manifested the characteristics of a developing country's economy.

9. A question was raised regarding the scope of the relief burden mentioned in paragraph 1 (c), in terms of whether it related only to the burden of relief resulting from the application of the low per capita income allowance formula or also included the relief derived from a methodology to take into account the problem of the serious economic and financial situation in the world. No clear conclusions were reached.

10. It was noted that, because of the application of the limits formula, on the one hand, and the fact that the relief burden above the line was distributed in proportion to overall magnitudes of national income, on the other, few high per capita income developing countries were in practice required to absorb relief and those that were did so minimally. In that situation, the Committee agreed that for the 1986-1988 scale, exemption from the relief burden distribution formula should be applied on an ad hoc basis, leaving the issue of principle for later resolution. Four Member States were identified by the Committee to receive reduction in relief burden. They were: Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Kuwait: 2 index points each; Singapore: 1 index point; and Venezuela: 5 index points.

### D. Rates of assessment of least developed countries

11. In reviewing paragraph 1 (d), of resolution 39/247 B, the Committee had before it a list of 36 least developed countries. The Committee also had a note verbale from the Permanent Mission of Bangladesh. The Committee agreed to recommend the lowering of Bangladesh's assessment rate by the maximum permissible amount under the limits formula from the indicative machine scale of 0.03 to 0.02 per cent in light of Bangladesh's particular difficulties.

E. Methodology to take into account the high levels of indebtedness

12. The Committee had before it a paper prepared by the Secretariat that included proposals to incorporate in the present assessment scale methodology indicators regarding debt, international reserves and terms of trade. It discussed extensively the relevance of two of those indicators, i.e., debt and international reserves, while briefly reviewing the suggested modified assessment methodology which it felt needed further study at future sessions.

13. In discussing the indicators, it noted a number of deficiencies in the data that would have to be resolved in the future before a systematic incorporation of that information in the assessment scale formula could be feasible. The data on debt suffered from incomparability as they were obtained from different sources. Some of the data were obtained directly from the countries concerned, through a questionnaire sent by the United Nations Statistical Office. Others were derived from the World Tables on debt published by the World Bank or from a publication by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), both of which included mainly data on developing countries.

14. Most of the information thus compiled referred to long-term external debt, but for some countries short-term private debt was also included, resulting in considerable inflation of the figures. For other countries, only data on public external debt were available. Data on debt for some developed countries referred only to government external debt; and for the majority of developed countries no data on debt at all could be obtained.

15. Some members noted that the debt of developing countries generally referred to funds required for financing development projects in the country, while debt of developed countries, particularly their private external debt, might have been just a transfer of funds to finance their lending to other countries. That applies in particular to the short-term debt of private banks, which, if included, would, for many countries, reflect the financial intermediary function of those countries in the international financial markets. They added that to use the figures of those countries as information on debt without presenting the counterpart information on assets would seriously distort the comparability of the debt data.

16. Some members expressed preference for using debt service rather than information on debt as debt service had a more immediate effect on the capacity to pay than debt itself. Debt service showed more clearly the impact because debt outstanding with different payment schedules and interest rates would result in different amounts of debt service which could not be clearly identified in the total amount of debt outstanding. On the other hand, it was recognized that for some countries, a large proportion of their total external debt was composed of concessional loans, i.e., soft-term credit, and thus the use of total debt could be overrepresenting their financial pressure. It was, however, recognized that less information on debt service was available. It was, furthermore, pointed out that debt service includes the repayment of the principal as well as the interest payments and that the latter are already deducted to arrive at national income. As a majority of countries were now paying only interest and not the principal, incorporation of debt service into the assessment formula would result in duplication of deductions. It was explained that use of debt service as an indicator might provide a distorted picture because renegotiation of debt may

result in delayed interest payments or in the incorporation of debt service in the principal, so that debt-service information might underrepresent the difficulties faced by many countries with regard to debt.

17. Comparability and relevance of data were also the main issues in the discussion of data on international reserves. For the majority of countries, information could be obtained through the International Financial Statistics (IFS), a publication of the International Monetary Fund (IMF). Some members wanted to include also gold in international reserves, which were defined by the United Nations Statistical Office as the sum of a country's foreign currency reserves, its holdings of special drawing rights (SDRs) and its reserve position in IMF. Others pointed out that international reserve data for some developed countries that had convertible currencies were not comparable with those of other countries, as currencies of developed countries were generally accepted as a form of payment. That would reduce their need to hold large foreign currency reserves. Other members, however, pointed out that this advantage would not apply to those developed countries whose currencies, though convertible, were internationally not accepted as a form of payment.

18. In general, there was considerable unease about the lack of data, the inadequacies of data available and the crudeness of information for comparison purposes. It was agreed that the data presented constituted only a very rough indicator for the financial difficulties faced by several Members. Some members of the Committee expressed doubt regarding the feasibility of ever developing a balanced and equitable methodology that could take into account the serious economic and financial situation of the world. Nevertheless, in light of deep concern expressed, inter alia, in the Fifth Committee and in the preambular part of General Assembly resolution 39/247 B about the overall problem of indebtedness, particularly for developing countries, it was concluded that this important new problem must be taken into account in developing a new scale of assessments. That said, the Committee was disinclined to adopt now a methodology that would be binding for future scales, believing that future refinements and perhaps new approaches would not only be desirable but essential. Accordingly, the Committee opted for a pragmatic formula in its recommendation for the 1986-1988 scale without prejudice to the future position it might adopt on the basis of more comprehensive and systematic information. It was a strong sense of the Committee that all Member States should co-operate with the United Nations Statistical Office in providing such information in future years.

19. As to what then should be done for 1986-1988, on the basis of available data, essentially three approaches suggested themselves. One was to take debt as a ratio of export earnings and to rank countries accordingly. Another was to do the same but using the ratio of debt to national income. A third approach was a combination of the two. The Committee in the event opted for the latter, using a weighting of 80 for debt/export earnings and 20 for debt/national income.

20. Having thus established a ranking of countries, the next question was to decide which should benefit and where to establish the cut-off point. It was recognized that the answers to each of these questions were, in the nature of things, going to be arbitrary. Nevertheless, a decision of some kind needed to be made. The overall sense of the Committee was to make as a cut-off point the index of 100 and then to include all countries above that line except in the case of some developed countries, viz. Australia, Denmark, Iceland, Sweden and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

21. The third question to be resolved was the nature of the relief deduction to be made. Again, various options were considered, implying either straight percentage deductions from national income or percentage of debt then deducted from national income. The final choice of the Committee was to make deductions of 10, 7.5, 5 and 2.5 per cent of debt from national income according to whether the countries' weighted average ratio referred to in paragraph 19 exceeded a specified percentage. Some members considered those percentage deductions too low and expressed their preference for another formula that would have reflected more adequately the situation of heavily indebted countries.

22. The foregoing is a highly compressed account of very detailed exchanges bearing on quite complex issues. For example, in regard to the ranking of countries, some members were of the view that the only credible index was debt as a proportion of export earnings, on the grounds that exports were the main source of funds for repayment of principal and interest. Others considered the ratio of net exports, i.e., the difference between exports and imports, to debt more meaningful. Another view expressed was to rank countries only according to the ratio between debt and national income.

23. A further matter requiring decision was whether the relief of debt should be deducted from national or assessable income. In the end, it was decided that the former was more appropriate, in part because it compensated better for the strains on developing countries' economies. A further protracted discussion ensued over the sequence of the various steps in the process of preparing the scale, with some members holding that the scheme of limits should be applied in advance of any relief afforded for debt and others maintaining that the limits must follow logically as the final step in the process, if only to prevent variations beyond those mandated under paragraph 1 (f) of resolution 39/247 B.

24. The list of countries for which relief was recommended on account of the seriousness of the debt situation is given in annex I.

25. In addition to the debt problem, members of the Committee recognized other serious problems facing developing countries, including shortfalls in growth and export earnings and, especially in the case of African countries, drought and even famine. There was a sense, widely shared in the Committee, that the situation should be addressed as a specific response to paragraph 1 (e) of the resolution. In many cases, of course, the countries concerned were already assessed at the floor. Where that was not so, however, some additional relief was thought appropriate and was later effected through a carefully constructed mitigation process.

F. The scheme of limits to avoid excessive variations of individual rates of assessment between successive scales

26. In paragraph 1 (f) of resolution 39/247 B, the Committee was requested to use scheme III, as defined in paragraph 49 of its report for 1984, 3/ to limit the variations of individual rates of assessment between successive scales after pertinent modifications in the light of the views expressed by Member States in the Fifth Committee, particularly in respect of rates below the level of 1 per cent. Note was taken of the widespread sentiment expressed in the Fifth Committee (as articulated by its Chairman) that the percentage and percentage point limits earlier recommended for the rates below 1 per cent were too high and in some

instances the Member States at the lower end of the brackets would be called upon to absorb increases that would still appear to be unacceptably high.

27. The following modifications were made accordingly by the Committee for four brackets under 1 per cent:

<u>Rate bracket</u>	<u>Percentage limits</u>		<u>Index point limits</u>	
	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
0.76 - 0.99 per cent	15.0	12.5	14	11
0.51 - 0.75 per cent	20.0	15.0	12	10
0.25 - 0.50 per cent	25.0	17.5	8	6
0.05 - 0.24 per cent	30.0	20.0	3	2

28. A modified scheme III, as given below, was developed and adopted by the Committee for use in the preparation of the scale of assessments for 1986-1988. Scheme III, as presented in paragraph 49 of the Committee's report for 1984, is also included below to facilitate comparison.

Combination of percentage limits and index point  
limits with eight rate brackets

If the present official scale is      the percentage change in the new machine scale should not be more than the lesser of:

	<u>Previous scheme III</u>		<u>Modified scheme</u>	
	<u>Percentage limits</u>	<u>Index point limits</u>	<u>Percentage limits</u>	<u>Index point limits</u>
Above 5.00 per cent	5.0	75 points	5.0	75 points
2.50 - 4.95 per cent	7.5	30 points	7.5	30 points
1.00 - 2.49 per cent	10.0	20 points	10.0	20 points
0.76 - 0.99 per cent	15.0	14 points	12.5	11 points
0.51 - 0.75 per cent	20.0	12 points	15.0	10 points
0.25 - 0.50 per cent	25.0	8 points	17.5	6 points
0.05 - 0.24 per cent	30.0	3 points	20.0	2 points
0.01 - 0.04 per cent	-	1 point	-	1 point

29. On the basis of the formula adopted to take into account the high levels of indebtedness, the Committee then applied the modified scheme III limits to the machine scales taking into account its decision given in paragraph 10 above on reducing the share in the relief burden for four Member States and paragraph 1 (d) of resolution 39/247 B on assessment rates of least developed countries.

### III. REVIEW OF THE SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS

#### A. Statistical information

30. For its review of statistical information on national income and related statistics, the Committee had before it documents prepared by the United Nations Statistical Office showing separately for each Member State and non-member State estimates of total national income at market prices and in national currencies for the years 1974 through 1983, exchange rates in terms of national currency units per United States dollar, the mid-year estimates of population and as total and per capita national income data expressed in United States dollars for each year and for the average 10-year period 1974-1983, as well as the average population estimates for 1978-1979.

31. In response to the Committee's expressed concern at the serious economic and financial situation in the world and in particular of the problems of high levels of external indebtedness, the 1985 national income questionnaire had also included a request for data on relevant economic indicators such as international reserves, total external debt broken down into components of public debt (and/or publicly-guaranteed debt) and private non-guaranteed debt, as well as total debt servicing which comprised interest payments and amortization, all expressed in United States dollars. In addition, exports and imports of goods and services in national currencies and import price-deflator indices were also requested from Member States for the period 1979-1982. The discussion on data other than national and per capita income is reflected in paragraphs 13 to 18 above.

32. Requests for information from Member States and non-member States for the current review were sent out early in January 1985. Subsequent reminders had been addressed to the Permanent Missions of each Member State early in February. As in the past, from countries with market economies, data were sought on the aggregate national income at market prices according to the present system of national accounts (SNA) or, if that type of income aggregate was not available, Member States were requested to provide data on other income aggregates as well as supplementary data that were necessary to derive national income estimates. Countries with centrally planned economies, which utilized the material product system (MPS), were invited to provide the value of national income at market prices according to the present SNA and such additional information that might be needed to derive that aggregate from the net material product.

33. The Committee was informed that 123 Member States had replied to the questionnaire. Among them, 109 Member States had submitted complete national income data for the period 1974-1983 and 14 Member States had provided only partial information. Among the 36 countries that had not sent any information, 33 had rates of assessment at or below 0.03 per cent and only 3 countries in the group of non-respondents had rates of assessment above 0.03 per cent. As in the past, the United Nations Statistical Office had to make estimates of national income for the years for which data had not been provided by Governments. In order to ensure that all countries were assessed on data covering the same period of time, the questionnaire specifically requested calendar-year data from all Members. In cases where fiscal year data were supplied, the Statistical Office adjusted the submitted data to a calendar-year basis.

34. For purposes of comparison of national income, estimates expressed in national currencies must be converted into United States dollars, using as a conversion factor the average rate of exchange between the national currency concerned and the United States dollar for that year. For countries members of IMF, the conversion rates were selected from the average exchange rates for the period published in the IMF International Financial Statistics or provided by the Fund. They were averages based on the market rates communicated to IMF by the monetary authority of each country or average of daily or end-of-month quotations in the market of the country or in New York. The preference was always market rates; only when a free market rate was not available was use made of the official rate.

35. For centrally planned economies, the conversion rate was the average of United Nations operational rates of exchange established for accounting purposes according to rules 111.5 and 111.6 of the United Nations Financial Rules and Regulations and published on a regular basis in the United Nations Monthly Bulletin of Statistics.

36. The population figures used by the Committee in calculating per capita national income were mid-period estimates generally provided by national statistical offices for inclusion in the United Nations Monthly Bulletin of Statistics and Demographic Yearbook. Where official information was not available, estimates were made on the basis of extrapolations of census and survey results.

37. The Committee reviewed in great detail on a country-by-country basis data on national income estimates in national currencies, the rates of exchange used for their conversion into United States dollars and the derivation of national income from other aggregates such as gross domestic product or net material product.

38. As in the past, several Member States had advised the Committee of adjustments to previously reported national income figures. Such adjustments have become customary and many times they are upward adjustments of earlier data. What particularly engaged the Committee at the present time were new data from Saudi Arabia that significantly reduced that State's 10-year income. The Committee decided to proceed, as in the past, by accepting the revisions notified by a sovereign Government although the Committee also decided to seek further clarification for possible correction before the next (1989-1991) scale. Some members were of the opinion that data provided by a Member State should be accepted without question for assessment purposes. Others considered that the Committee's role should not be limited to accepting whatever data were presented but also to take note of possible discrepancies and, whenever necessary, to seek clarification from the Member State concerned.

39. As in the past, whenever glaring anomalies appeared to exist in data presented by a Member State or in estimates made by the United Nations Statistical Office, the Committee examined comparative data from other sources. Thus, it decided to correct data for the following countries: Argentina, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq and Yugoslavia.

40. For the Islamic Republic of Iran and Iraq, the revisions were made only for the last four years, 1980 through 1983, which showed wide discrepancies with data from another source, the 1983 OPEC Yearbook of the Organization of the Petroleum-Exporting Countries (OPEC). In other words, the Committee substituted data submitted by the Islamic Republic of Iran and estimates made for Iraq by data from the OPEC Yearbook for the period 1980 through 1983. In the case of the Islamic Republic of Iran, national income in United States dollars for 1983

exceeded that for 1979 by 72 per cent which, according to the perception of the Committee, seemed far from representing a true picture of the situation. Since Iraq did not supply directly data on national income for 1978 onwards, the Committee looked into various sources such as the Economic Commission for Western Asia, the Annual Abstract of Statistics published by the Central Statistical Organization of the Ministry of Planning of Iraq and the Arab Fund for Economic and Social Development for estimates on gross domestic product. It also compared data on exports of petroleum presented in the OPEC Yearbook and the IMF International Financial Statistics. It was noted that data from all those sources were very similar for each of the years in the base period under consideration.

41. For Argentina, Egypt and Yugoslavia, World Bank inflation-adjusted data were either partially or fully substituted for data from the United Nations Statistical Office in order better to reflect their true situation and, in particular, to dampen anomalies caused by inflation. Thus, decision was made to adopt for Yugoslavia data from the World Bank Atlas for the period 1978 to 1983, which resulted in a figure lower than the total submitted by the Member State by 7.4 per cent. The Committee revised data for Argentina for 1978 through 1983 using information from the 1984 World Bank Atlas. The resulting estimates for the entire base period were 24 per cent lower than the average of the data submitted by the Member State. For Egypt, the Committee adopted for the entire base period 1974-1983 data from the World Bank Atlas which were, as a whole, 18 per cent lower than those supplied directly by the Member State.

42. A measure of concern was expressed in regard to comparisons of per capita national income among four neighbouring countries (Bulgaria, Hungary, Romania and Yugoslavia) which, on the basis of figures provided, seemed to yield a paradoxical result.

43. Besides reviewing the data submitted directly by Member States, the Committee also looked into data from the World Bank Atlas for Chile, Costa Rica, Ghana, Hungary, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela and from the OPEC Yearbook for the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Nigeria. It observed that data supplied by these Member States did not differ significantly from those presented in the World Bank Atlas or in the OPEC Yearbook, as inflation rates for those countries were corrected as a result of changes in the exchange rates within the same 10-year period. The Committee, therefore, decided to use for assessment purposes data provided directly by the Member States themselves.

44. Several members expressed their reservations regarding the corrections made by the Committee on national income data. They felt that those adjustments should be limited to exceptional cases that presented flagrant distortions and they should be justified on a technical basis. They considered not satisfactory the practice of replacing data from the United Nations Statistical Office - whose data were provided either directly by the Member States or estimated by the Office according to procedures approved by this Committee - with data from other sources, e.g., the World Bank Atlas or the OPEC Yearbook, for a number of countries selected in a rather arbitrary manner. The Committee reaffirmed its policy of working from a common data base to the maximum extent possible.

45. While recognizing the serious concern by some members, the Committee nevertheless had to take a pragmatic approach to correct serious anomalies in data, particularly when the continuously high rate of inflation in the economy of a Member State was inadequately compensated by the depreciation of its currency. In

that context, the paper presented by the Secretariat on price-adjusted exchange rate (PARE) was of limited assistance in the sense that the comparison was made between the two 10-year periods during which the inflation rate was not compensated by a lagged change in rate of exchange, while compensation through PARE was not apparent because considerable price increases occurred in years which were included in both periods of comparison, i.e., 1971-1980 and 1974-1983.

46. The Committee felt that both distortions could have been avoided if price adjustment was applied annually, as has been done by the World Bank for data in United States dollars shown in the World Bank Atlas. Because of the deficiency of the PARE method, the Committee had no choice but to use World Bank data for those countries where price distortions were considered to be anomalous. That procedure had been adopted even though the Committee was aware that differences between national income data of the United Nations Statistical Office and gross national product (GNP) data of the World Bank in United States dollars might reflect not only a different price-adjustment methodology but also different concepts or compilation methodology.

47. At the present session, the Committee was deeply concerned by the conversion factors used in translating national income of countries with centrally planned economies from national currencies into United States dollars. The conversion factor used in those cases was the average of United Nations operational rates of exchange, these rates being established by the Controller for accounting purposes such as for recording all United Nations transactions that include salaries, pension fund benefits, post adjustment, subsistence allowances and other payments. Revisions of the United Nations operational rates of exchange were based either on forecasts derived from immediate past experience and the current range of market rates or on rates provided directly by Governments for use in the immediate future. The latter was particularly true in the case of centrally planned economies.

48. Most of the debates on these situations focused on a representation from the Government of Bulgaria. In essence, Bulgaria sought to have a post-dated adjustment to its figures such as would apply an exchange rate with premium for all 10 years of the reporting period.

49. Some members of the Committee observed that there was no technical basis for choosing between various rates of exchange. They did not see any justification for revising retroactively those rates used as conversion factors of national income into United States dollars. Nor did they find it appropriate for the countries themselves to determine their own rates of conversion. Other members adopted the approach that the Committee should accept the rates of exchange submitted by the Government of Bulgaria but allowed that that action should not prejudice future action that the Committee might take on the general issue. After extensive discussions on the subject, it was decided to accept for the time being the rates with premium proposed by the Government of Bulgaria as conversion factors. The Committee then decided that it would undertake a thorough review at its next session on what type of exchange rate should be used for countries with a multiple exchange rate system.

50. On the same basis, the Committee decided to accept calculations of national income for 1981 and 1982 by the Government of Romania.

51. The Committee also agreed that an adjustment of the exchange rate for Poland should be activated one month earlier than originally intended in the initial calculation by the Secretariat.

52. The Committee had received a communication from the Permanent Mission of Venezuela stating that the exchange rate for the conversion of bolívares into dollars in 1983 and 1984 was Bs 7.50 = \$US 1. However, since the actual effective date for that rate was 24 February 1984, that rate could not be used for converting national income in 1983 from bolívares into United States dollars.

53. Decisions made by the Committee on either national income data or conversion factors that affected national income data in United States dollars and the basis for the computation of assessment rates are given in annex II to the present report.

#### B. Representations by Member States

54. The Committee had before it representations in writing from Bangladesh, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Israel, Iraq, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saudi Arabia and Venezuela. Those that contained information pertinent to national income estimates and related statistics are discussed above. With regard to the overall economic and financial difficulties of the Member States concerned, it noted that Portugal was among those countries listed in annex I that received relief on account of indebtedness. The assessment rates of Iraq and Peru on the basis of the machine scale had been mitigated. A decision on Bangladesh's rate is reflected in paragraph 11 above.

55. The resulting machine scale, as given in annex III, was found to require some mitigation to reflect better the problems faced by countries with heavy indebtedness and to make it more equitable. Some members of the Committee expressed the view that mitigation had no place in the work of a body composed of independent experts whose task was to prepare a scale on a technical base; that mitigation process according to these members should be carried out at the stage of discussions among Member States.

#### IV. SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS

56. The scale of assessments that the Committee agreed to recommend for the years 1986, 1987 and 1988 appears in section VII below and in annex III to the present report, which shows also the official scale for 1983-1985 and the machine scale used by the Committee in the establishment of the currently recommended scale. As in previous reports, it was considered useful to append the United Nations scales of assessment adopted by the General Assembly for the years 1946 through 1985 (see annex IV below).

57. In the scale of assessments now recommended, there are 78 Member States assessed at 0.01 per cent, 11 Member States at 0.02 per cent and 5 Member States at 0.03 per cent. Thus, a total of 94 Member States or 59 per cent of the membership of the Organization are assessed at or below 0.03 per cent. The assessment rates of the Group of 77 as a whole has increased from 9.34 to 9.67 per cent. This is due to the increase in rates of assessment of OPEC countries from the current 3.30 per cent to the proposed 3.63 per cent. The distribution of the assessment rates by groups of countries is shown below:

	<u>1978-1979</u>	<u>1980-1982</u>	<u>1983-1985</u>	<u>Proposed 1986-1988</u>
A. Group of 77 <u>a/</u>	7.87	8.98	9.34	9.67
of which OPEC	1.90	2.89	3.30	3.63
B. OECD countries <u>b/</u>	68.39	71.81	73.66	74.00
C. Countries with centrally planned economies <u>c/</u>	17.58	16.91	15.51	14.87
D. China	5.50	1.62	0.88	0.79

a/ Including Romania and Yugoslavia.

b/ Excluding Yugoslavia.

c/ Excluding Romania and Yugoslavia.

58. One member of the Committee expressed dissatisfaction with the scale recommended to the General Assembly for the years 1986-1988. His reservation is included in section VIII of the present report. Some members of the Committee observed that the rates of assessment of the Permanent Members of the Security Council, as a whole, had decreased during the last three scales.

59. Once again the Committee recognized the enormous difficulties it faced in comparing data from various groups having different accounting methods and different exchange rate systems. It was recalled that one of the alternative methods of assessment examined by the Committee was assessment by groups. That alternative would have greatly facilitated the gathering of comparable information within each group of countries and also meet the expressed wishes of the Fifth Committee for a better and more equitable distribution of financial responsibilities for support of the Organization. Several Committee members who had previously been unpersuaded about this alternative now saw greater merit in exploring it further, hopefully, in the near future.

## V. ASSESSMENT OF NON-MEMBER STATES

60. In reviewing the rates of assessment at which non-member States should be called upon to contribute towards the 1986, 1987 and 1988 expenses of the United Nations activities in which they participate, the Committee followed the same basic principles as were applied in the assessment of Members.

61. The Committee's recommendations as to the percentage rates at which non-member States shall be called upon to contribute towards the 1986, 1987 and 1988 expenses of the activities in which they participate are as follows:

<u>Non-member State</u>	<u>Per cent</u>
Democratic People's Republic of Korea .....	0.05
Holy See .....	0.01
Liechtenstein .....	0.01
Monaco .....	0.01
Nauru .....	0.01
Republic of Korea .....	0.20
San Marino .....	0.01
Switzerland .....	1.12
Tonga .....	0.01
Tuvalu .....	0.01

62. The related United Nations activities towards which expenses the participating non-member States will be contributing for 1984 on the basis of the scale for 1983-1985 are listed below for information:

(a) International Court of Justice

Liechtenstein  
San Marino  
Switzerland

(b) International drug control

Republic of Korea

(c) Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific

Republic of Korea  
Tonga

(d) Economic Commission for Europe

Switzerland

(e) United Nations Conference on Trade and Development

Democratic People's Republic of Korea  
Holy See  
Liechtenstein  
Republic of Korea  
Switzerland

- (f) United Nations Industrial Development Organization  
Switzerland
- (g) United Nations Environment Programme  
Holy See  
Republic of Korea  
Switzerland
- (h) Transnational corporations  
Republic of Korea  
Switzerland
- (i) International Conference on Population  
Democratic People's Republic of Korea  
Holy See  
Republic of Korea  
Switzerland
- (j) Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees  
Holy See  
Switzerland
- (k) Second International Conference on Assistance to Refugees in Africa  
Republic of Korea  
San Marino
- (l) Committee on the Development and Utilization of New and Renewable Sources of Energy  
Switzerland
- (m) Preparatory Commission for the International Sea-bed Authority and for the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea  
Democratic People's Republic of Korea  
Holy See  
Republic of Korea  
Switzerland
- (n) Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development  
Democratic People's Republic of Korea  
Holy See  
Republic of Korea  
Switzerland

(o) World Food Council

Holy See  
Switzerland

(p) United Nations Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space

Switzerland

63. In accordance with the procedure established by the General Assembly, the rates of assessment for non-member States are subject to consultation with the Governments concerned.

## VI. OTHER MATTERS CONSIDERED BY THE COMMITTEE

### A. Alternative methodologies for assessment: A comparative study

64. The Committee had before it a comparative study on methodologies used by the United Nations and 28 organizations, of which 12 are affiliated with the United Nations system and 16 are outside the United Nations system. The information provided by the surveyed organizations showed that the contributions of their members were determined by various criteria: (a) ability to pay, (b) selection of a contribution class or unit, (c) equal shares, (d) self-financing and (e) quota based solely or partly on the organization's activities or performance of service. Giving the urgent need to finalize the preparation of the scale for 1986-1988, the Committee planned to review in detail that study at its next session.

### B. Collection of contributions

65. The Committee took note of the report of the Secretary-General which indicated that, at the conclusion of its session, eight Member States, the Central African Republic, Comoros, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, the Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, Mauritania and South Africa, were in arrears in the payment of their assessed contributions to the expenses of the United Nations under the terms of Article 19 of the Charter.

66. In regard to the collection of contributions, the Committee reaffirmed its previous decision to authorize its Chairman to issue an addendum to the present report, should it be necessary.

### C. Payment of contributions in currencies other than United States dollars

67. Under the provisions of paragraph 3 of resolution 37/125 A of 17 December 1982, the General Assembly authorized the Secretary-General to accept, at his discretion and after consultation with the Chairman of the Committee, a portion of the contributions of Member States for the calendar years 1983, 1984 and 1985 in currencies other than United States dollars.

68. At its current session, the Committee considered a report of the Secretary-General on the arrangements made for payments by Member States of their 1985 contributions in currencies other than United States dollars. The Committee noted that five Member States would avail themselves of the opportunity of paying the equivalent of \$US 1.1 million in 3 of the 17 non-United States dollar currencies acceptable to the Organization. In accordance with the recommendation of the Fifth Committee, the Committee also noted that the Secretary-General had continued to give absolute priority to each Member for payment in its own currency.

69. The Committee recommends that the Secretary-General should continue to be authorized to make similar arrangements for the year 1986.

### D. Date of the next session

70. The Committee decided to hold its forty-sixth session in New York from 9 to 27 June 1986. The forty-seventh session is tentatively scheduled for three weeks in June 1987, with the location to be decided at a later date.

VII. RECOMMENDATION OF THE COMMITTEE

71. The Committee on Contributions recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of the following draft resolution:

Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses  
of the United Nations

The General Assembly

Resolves that:

1. The scale of assessments for the contributions of Member States to the United Nations budget for the financial years 1986, 1987 and 1988 shall be as follows:

<u>Member State</u>	<u>Per cent</u>
Afghanistan .....	0.01
Albania .....	0.01
Algeria .....	0.14
Angola .....	0.01
Antigua and Barbuda .....	0.01
Argentina .....	0.62
Australia .....	1.66
Austria .....	0.74
Bahamas .....	0.01
Bahrain .....	0.02
Bangladesh .....	0.02
Barbados .....	0.01
Belgium .....	1.18
Belize .....	0.01
Benin .....	0.01
Bhutan .....	0.01
Bolivia .....	0.01
Botswana .....	0.01
Brazil .....	1.40
Brunei Darussalam .....	0.04
Bulgaria .....	0.16
Burkina Faso .....	0.01
Burma .....	0.01
Burundi .....	0.01
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic .....	0.34
Cameroon .....	0.01
Canada .....	3.06
Cape Verde .....	0.01
Central African Republic .....	0.01
Chad .....	0.01
Chile .....	0.07
China .....	0.79
Colombia .....	0.13
Comoros .....	0.01
Congo .....	0.01

<u>Member State</u>	<u>Per cent</u>
Costa Rica .....	0.02
Cuba .....	0.09
Cyprus .....	0.02
Czechoslovakia .....	0.70
Democratic Kampuchea .....	0.01
Democratic Yemen .....	0.01
Denmark .....	0.72
Djibouti .....	0.01
Dominica .....	0.01
Dominican Republic .....	0.03
Ecuador .....	0.03
Egypt .....	0.07
El Salvador .....	0.01
Equatorial Guinea .....	0.01
Ethiopia .....	0.01
Fiji .....	0.01
Finland .....	0.50
France .....	6.37
Gabon .....	0.03
Gambia .....	0.01
German Democratic Republic .....	1.33
Germany, Federal Republic of .....	8.26
Ghana .....	0.01
Greece .....	0.44
Grenada .....	0.01
Guatemala .....	0.02
Guinea .....	0.01
Guinea-Bissau .....	0.01
Guyana .....	0.01
Haiti .....	0.01
Honduras .....	0.01
Hungary .....	0.22
Iceland .....	0.03
India .....	0.35
Indonesia .....	0.14
Iran (Islamic Republic of) .....	0.63
Iraq .....	0.12
Ireland .....	0.18
Israel .....	0.22
Italy .....	3.79
Ivory Coast .....	0.02
Jamaica .....	0.02
Japan .....	10.84
Jordan .....	0.01
Kenya .....	0.01
Kuwait .....	0.29
Lao People's Democratic Republic .....	0.01
Lebanon .....	0.01
Lesotho .....	0.01
Liberia .....	0.01
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya .....	0.26
Luxembourg .....	0.05

<u>Member State</u>	<u>Per cent</u>
Madagascar .....	0.01
Malawi .....	0.01
Malaysia .....	0.10
Maldives .....	0.01
Mali .....	0.01
Malta .....	0.01
Mauritania .....	0.01
Mauritius .....	0.01
Mexico .....	0.89
Mongolia .....	0.01
Morocco .....	0.05
Mozambique .....	0.01
Nepal .....	0.01
Netherlands .....	1.74
New Zealand .....	0.24
Nicaragua .....	0.01
Niger .....	0.01
Nigeria .....	0.19
Norway .....	0.54
Oman .....	0.02
Pakistan .....	0.06
Panama .....	0.02
Papua New Guinea .....	0.01
Paraguay .....	0.02
Peru .....	0.07
Philippines .....	0.10
Poland .....	0.64
Portugal .....	0.18
Qatar .....	0.04
Romania .....	0.19
Rwanda .....	0.01
Saint Christopher and Nevis .....	0.01
Saint Lucia .....	0.01
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines .....	0.01
Samoa .....	0.01
Sao Tome and Principe .....	0.01
Saudi Arabia .....	0.97
Senegal .....	0.01
Seychelles .....	0.01
Sierra Leone .....	0.01
Singapore .....	0.10
Solomon Islands .....	0.01
Somalia .....	0.01
South Africa .....	0.44
Spain .....	2.03
Sri Lanka .....	0.01
Sudan .....	0.01
Suriname .....	0.01
Swaziland .....	0.01
Sweden .....	1.25
Syrian Arab Republic .....	0.04
Thailand .....	0.09

<u>Member State</u>	<u>Per cent</u>
Togo .....	0.01
Trinidad and Tobago .....	0.04
Tunisia .....	0.03
Turkey .....	0.34
Uganda .....	0.01
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic .....	1.28
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics .....	10.20
United Arab Emirates .....	0.18
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland .	4.86
United Republic of Tanzania .....	0.01
United States of America .....	25.00
Uruguay .....	0.04
Vanuatu .....	0.01
Venezuela .....	0.60
Viet Nam .....	0.01
Yemen .....	0.01
Yugoslavia .....	0.46
Zaire .....	0.01
Zambia .....	0.01
Zimbabwe .....	0.02
Grand total	<u>100.00</u>

2. In accordance with rule 160 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the scale of assessments given in paragraph (1) above shall be reviewed by the Committee on Contributions in 1988, when a report shall be submitted to the Assembly for its consideration at its forty-third session;

3. Notwithstanding the terms of regulation 5.5 of the Financial Regulations of the United Nations, the Secretary-General shall be empowered to accept, at his discretion and after consultation with the Chairman of the Committee on Contributions, a portion of the contributions of Member States for the calendar years 1986, 1987 and 1988 in currencies other than United States dollars;

4. In accordance with rule 160 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, States which are not Members of the United Nations but which participate in certain of its activities shall be called upon to contribute towards the 1986, 1987 and 1988 expenses of such activities on the basis of the following rates:

<u>Non-member State</u>	<u>Per cent</u>
Democratic People's Republic of Korea .....	0.05
Holy See .....	0.01
Liechtenstein .....	0.01
Monaco .....	0.01
Nauru .....	0.01
Republic of Korea .....	0.20
San Marino .....	0.01
Switzerland .....	1.12
Tonga .....	0.01
Tuvalu .....	0.01

## VIII. SEPARATE OPINION

72. Mr. Fernández Maroto stated that he could not accept the recommended scale for the following reasons:

"(1) The scale contained rates of assessment which were ill adjusted to or inconsistent with the respective capacities to pay of the Member States concerned.

"(2) The corrections made in the last phase of the formulation of the scale for the most part lacked proportion; some were excessive, others inadequate.

"(3) Application of the formula for the limitation of excessive variations between two successive scales had produced instances where the reduction of such variations failed to reflect the capacity to pay of the country concerned.

"(4) No generally applicable procedure had been employed to take account of the considerable impact of inflation on nominal national income figures, with consequent repercussions on the proposed scale.

"(5) The limitation formula notwithstanding, excessive increases in the rates of assessment of some developing countries and hardly justifiable decreases in those of developed countries had resulted.

"(6) Once more, the combined assessments of the Permanent Members of the Security Council had reached a new record low in terms of their combined share of the budget for United Nations expenditure, amounting to 47.22 per cent, compared with 47.60 per cent for the three-year period 1983-1985 and 48.44 per cent for the three-year period 1980-1982."

### Notes

1/ Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 11 (A/39/11 and Corr.1, para. 38.

2/ Ibid., para. 43.

3/ Ibid., para. 49.

ANNEX I

Countries for which relief was recommended on account  
of the seriousness of the debt situation

Deduction of a fixed percentage of debt from national income			
10 per cent of debt	7.5 per cent of debt	5 per cent of debt	2.5 per cent of debt
Ghana	Paraguay	Yugoslavia	Egypt
Sudan	Pakistan	Kenya	Tunisia
Argentina	Mexico	Uganda	Algeria
Bangladesh	Ecuador	Colombia	Greece
Bolivia	New Zealand	Ivory Coast	Hungary
Poland	Uruguay	Cameroon	Jamaica
Chile	Panama	Portugal	
Costa Rica	Peru	Guatemala	
Morocco	Dominican Republic	Israel	
Brazil	Turkey	Philippines	
		India	

## ANNEX II

**A. Revised national income estimates in United States dollars as a consequence of the decision of the Committee on Contributions**

	<u>National income</u>	
	<u>Previous data</u>	<u>Revised data</u>
	(Millions of US dollars)	
<b>Argentina</b>		
1978	61 290	51 293
1979	101 380	57 898
1980	144 498	68 880
1981	113 065	69 235
1982	50 505	56 506
1983	60 355	56 218
<b>Egypt</b>		
1974	10 552	7 887
1975	12 575	8 968
1976	16 437	10 039
1977	20 780	12 173
1978	25 910	15 877
1979	18 684	18 396
1980	22 766	21 958
1981	27 493	26 470
1982	30 183	27 777
1983	33 253	29 967
<b>Iran (Islamic Republic of)</b>		
1980	90 020	83 526
1981	95 073	88 595
1982	113 384	99 492
1983	140 339	103 906
<b>Iraq</b>		
1980	50 461	35 206
1981	28 397	21 190
1982	39 963	28 277
1983	38 103	31 325
<b>Yugoslavia</b>		
1978	51 366	41 526
1979	64 012	47 380
1980	66 151	51 165
1981	65 398	57 015
1982	58 091	62 540
1983	41 723	51 498

B. Effects of revised conversion factors on national income expressed in US dollars

	<u>National income</u>	
	<u>Using United Nations operational rate of exchange</u>	<u>Using rate with premium</u>
	(Millions of US dollars)	
<b>Bulgaria</b>		
1974	8 827	8 994
1975	12 838	12 838
1976	14 813	13 579
1977	17 098	13 850
1978	18 627	13 067
1979	21 584	14 528
1980	25 893	17 142
1981	27 982	17 151
1982	29 230	17 057
1983	26 526	17 460

	<u>National income</u>	
	<u>Using average commercial rate</u>	<u>Using rate submitted by the Member States</u>
	(Millions of US dollars)	
<b>Romania</b>		
1981	38 433	32 027
1982	45 007	37 563

	<u>National income</u>	
	<u>Using the rate of 80 zlotys per US dollar from 1 March 1982</u>	<u>from 1 February 1982</u>
	(Millions of US dollars)	
<b>Poland</b>		
1982	63 510	60 309

## ANNEX III

Official scale for 1983-1985, machine scale and  
recommended scale for 1986-1988

Member State	Official scale 1983-1985	Machine scale <u>a/</u>	Recommended scale for 1986-1988
Afghanistan	0.01	0.01	0.01
Albania	0.01	0.01	0.01
Algeria	0.13	0.15	0.14
Angola	0.01	0.01	0.01
Antigua and Barbuda	0.01	0.01	0.01
Argentina	0.71	0.61	0.62
Australia	1.57	1.68	1.66
Austria	0.75	0.74	0.74
Bahamas	0.01	0.01	0.01
Bahrain	0.01	0.02	0.02
Bangladesh	0.03	0.03	0.02
Barbados	0.01	0.01	0.01
Belgium	1.28	1.15	1.18
Belize	0.01	0.01	0.01
Benin	0.01	0.01	0.01
Bhutan	0.01	0.01	0.01
Bolivia	0.01	0.02	0.01
Botswana	0.01	0.01	0.01
Brazil	1.39	1.53	1.40
Brunei Darussalam	0.03	0.04	0.04
Bulgaria	0.18	0.16	0.16
Burkina Faso	0.01	0.01	0.01
Burma	0.01	0.01	0.01
Burundi	0.01	0.01	0.01
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	0.36	..	..
Cameroon	0.01	0.02	0.01
Canada	3.08	3.03	3.06
Cape Verde	0.01	0.01	0.01
Central African Republic	0.01	0.01	0.01
Chad	0.01	0.01	0.01
Chile	0.07	0.08	0.07
China	0.88	0.77	0.79
Colombia	0.11	0.13	0.13
Comoros	0.01	0.01	0.01
Congo	0.01	0.01	0.01

Member State	Official scale 1983-1985	Machine scale <u>a</u> /	Recommended scale for 1986-1988
Costa Rica	0.02	0.02	0.02
Cuba	0.09	0.11	0.09
Cyprus	0.01	0.02	0.02
Czechoslovakia	0.76	0.66	0.70
Democratic Kampuchea	0.01	0.01	0.01
Democratic Yemen	0.01	0.01	0.01
Denmark	0.75	0.70	0.72
Djibouti	0.01	0.01	0.01
Dominica	0.01	0.01	0.01
Dominican Republic	0.03	0.03	0.03
Ecuador	0.02	0.03	0.03
Egypt	0.07	0.07	0.07
El Salvador	0.01	0.01	0.01
Equatorial Guinea	0.01	0.01	0.01
Ethiopia	0.01	0.01	0.01
Fiji	0.01	0.01	0.01
Finland	0.48	0.50	0.50
France	6.51	6.30	6.37
Gabon	0.02	0.03	0.03
Gambia	0.01	0.01	0.01
German Democratic Republic	1.39	1.29	1.33
Germany, Federal Republic of	8.54	8.12	8.26
Ghana	0.02	0.01	0.01
Greece	0.40	0.44	0.44
Grenada	0.01	0.01	0.01
Guatemala	0.02	0.03	0.02
Guinea	0.01	0.01	0.01
Guinea-Bissau	0.01	0.01	0.01
Guyana	0.01	0.01	0.01
Haiti	0.01	0.01	0.01
Honduras	0.01	0.01	0.01
Hungary	0.23	0.21	0.22
Iceland	0.03	0.03	0.03
India	0.36	0.34	0.35
Indonesia	0.13	0.15	0.14
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	0.58	0.67	0.63
Iraq	0.12	0.14	0.12
Ireland	0.18	0.18	0.18
Israel	0.23	0.22	0.22
Italy	3.74	3.81	3.79

Member State	Official scale 1983-1985	Machine scale a/	Recommended scale for 1986-1988
Ivory Coast	0.03	0.03	0.02
Jamaica	0.02	0.02	0.02
Japan	10.32	10.84	10.84
Jordan	0.01	0.02	0.01
Kenya	0.01	0.01	0.01
Kuwait	0.25	0.29	0.29
Lao People's Democratic Republic	0.01	0.01	0.01
Lebanon	0.02	0.01	0.01
Lesotho	0.01	0.01	0.01
Liberia	0.01	0.01	0.01
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	0.26	0.29	0.26
Luxembourg	0.06	0.05	0.05
Madagascar	0.01	0.01	0.01
Malawi	0.01	0.01	0.01
Malaysia	0.09	0.11	0.10
Maldives	0.01	0.01	0.01
Mali	0.01	0.01	0.01
Malta	0.01	0.01	0.01
Mauritania	0.01	0.01	0.01
Mauritius	0.01	0.01	0.01
Mexico	0.88	0.99	0.89
Mongolia	0.01	0.01	0.01
Morocco	0.05	0.05	0.05
Mozambique	0.01	0.01	0.01
Nepal	0.01	0.01	0.01
Netherlands	1.78	1.72	1.74
New Zealand	0.26	0.24	0.24
Nicaragua	0.01	0.01	0.01
Niger	0.01	0.01	0.01
Nigeria	0.19	0.21	0.19
Norway	0.51	0.54	0.54
Oman	0.01	0.02	0.02
Pakistan	0.06	0.07	0.06
Panama	0.02	0.02	0.02
Papua New Guinea	0.01	0.01	0.01
Paraguay	0.01	0.02	0.02
Peru	0.07	0.08	0.07
Philippines	0.09	0.11	0.10
Poland	0.72	0.62	0.64
Portugal	0.18	0.18	0.18

Member State	Official scale 1983-1985	Machine scale <u>a</u> /	Recommended scale for 1986-1988
Qatar	0.03	0.04	0.04
Romania	0.19	0.21	0.19
Rwanda	0.01	0.01	0.01
Saint Christopher and Nevis	0.01	0.01	0.01
Saint Lucia	0.01	0.01	0.01
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	0.01	0.01	0.01
Samoa	0.01	0.01	0.01
Sao Tome and Principe	0.01	0.01	0.01
Saudi Arabia	0.86	0.97	0.97
Senegal	0.01	0.01	0.01
Seychelles	0.01	0.01	0.01
Sierra Leone	0.01	0.01	0.01
Singapore	0.09	0.11	0.10
Solomon Islands	0.01	0.01	0.01
Somalia	0.01	0.01	0.01
South Africa	0.41	0.44	0.44
Spain	1.93	2.06	2.03
Sri Lanka	0.01	0.01	0.01
Sudan	0.01	0.01	0.01
Suriname	0.01	0.01	0.01
Swaziland	0.01	0.01	0.01
Sweden	1.32	1.22	1.25
Syrian Arab Republic	0.03	0.04	0.04
Thailand	0.08	0.10	0.09
Togo	0.01	0.01	0.01
Trinidad and Tobago	0.03	0.04	0.04
Tunisia	0.03	0.04	0.03
Turkey	0.32	0.34	0.34
Uganda	0.01	0.01	0.01
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	1.32	..	..
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	10.54	11.62 <u>b</u> /	11.82 <u>b</u> /
United Arab Emirates	0.16	0.18	0.18
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	4.67	4.87	4.86
United Republic of Tanzania	0.01	0.01	0.01
United States of America	25.00	25.00	25.00

Member State	Official scale 1983-1985	Machine scale <u>a/</u>	Recommended scale for 1986-1988
Uruguay	0.04	0.05	0.04
Vanuatu	0.01	0.01	0.01
Venezuela	0.55	0.60	0.60
Viet Nam	0.02	0.01	0.01
Yemen	0.01	0.01	0.01
Yugoslavia	0.46	0.52	0.46
Zaire	0.01	0.01	0.01
Zambia	0.01	0.01	0.01
Zimbabwe	<u>0.02</u>	<u>0.02</u>	<u>0.02</u>
Grand total	<u>100.04</u>	<u>100.00</u>	<u>100.00</u>

a/ Based on average data for the period 1974-1983 adjusted by the low per capita income allowance formula of \$2,200 and 85 per cent, a reduced share in relief burden for 4 developing countries, a relief deduction on account of indebtedness (10, 7.5, 5 and 2.5 per cent of debt outstanding deducted from average national income) and the modified scheme III limits to avoid excessive variations of individual rates of assessment between successive scales.

b/ Includes rates of assessment for the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

## ANNEX IV

United Nations scale of assessments for the years 1946-1985

	<u>1946</u>	<u>1947</u>	<u>1948</u>	<u>1949</u>	<u>1950</u>	<u>1951</u>	<u>1952</u>	<u>1953</u>	<u>1954</u>	<u>1955</u>	<u>1956</u> <u>1957</u>
AFGHANISTAN	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.06
ALBANIA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04
ALGERIA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ANGOLA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ARGENTINA	1.94	1.85	1.85	1.85	1.85	1.85	1.62	1.45	1.40	1.32	1.17
AUSTRALIA	2.00	1.97	1.97	1.97	1.97	1.92	1.77	1.75	1.75	1.80	1.65
AUSTRIA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.36	0.36
BAHAMAS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BAHRAIN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BANGLADESH	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BARBADOS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BELGIUM	1.42	1.35	1.35	1.35	1.35	1.35	1.35	1.37	1.38	1.38	1.27
BERLIZE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BENIN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BHUTAN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BOLIVIA	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.05
BOTSWANA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BRAZIL	1.94	1.85	1.85	1.85	1.85	1.85	1.62	1.45	1.40	1.32	1.09
BRUNEI DARUSSALAM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BULGARIA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.14	0.14
BURKINA FASO	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BURMA	-	-	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.10
BURUNDI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BYELORUSSIAN SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC	0.23	0.22	0.22	0.22	0.22	0.24	0.34	0.43	0.50	0.53	0.48
CAMEROON	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CANADA	3.35	3.20	3.20	3.20	3.20	3.30	3.35	3.30	3.30	3.63	3.15
CAPE VERDE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CHAD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CHILE	0.47	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.41	0.35	0.33	0.33	0.30	0.30
CHINA	6.30	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	5.75	5.62	5.62	5.62	5.14
COLOMBIA	0.39	0.37	0.37	0.37	0.37	0.37	0.37	0.35	0.41	0.41	0.37
COMOROS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CONGO	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
COSTA RICA	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04
CUBA	0.30	0.29	0.29	0.29	0.29	0.31	0.33	0.34	0.34	0.30	0.27
CYPRUS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	0.95	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	1.05	1.05	1.05	0.94	0.84
DEMOCRATIC KAMPUCHEA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04
DEMOCRATIC YEMEN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DENMARK	0.81	0.79	0.79	0.79	0.79	0.79	0.79	0.78	0.78	0.74	0.66
DJIBOUTI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DOMINICA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
ECUADOR	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.05
EGYPT	0.81	0.79	0.79	0.79	0.79	0.71	0.60	0.50	0.47	0.40	0.36
EL SALVADOR	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.06	0.06
EQUATORIAL GUINEA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ETHIOPIA	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.12	0.11
FIJI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FINLAND	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.37	0.37
FRANCE	6.30	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	5.75	5.75	5.75	5.90	5.70
GABON	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
GAMBIA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

<u>1954</u>	<u>1955</u>	<u>1956</u>	<u>1958</u>	<u>1959</u>	<u>1962</u>	<u>1965</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1974</u>			<u>1980</u>	<u>1983</u>	
		<u>1957</u>		<u>1960</u>	<u>1963</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1975</u>		<u>1978</u>	<u>1981</u>	<u>1984</u>	
				<u>1961</u>	<u>1964</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>1979</u>	<u>1982</u>	<u>1985</u>	
0.08	0.08	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	AFGHANISTAN
-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	ALBANIA
-	-	-	-	-	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.09	0.68	0.10	0.10	0.12	0.13	ALGERIA
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	ANGOLA
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.01	0.01	ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA
1.40	1.32	1.17	1.14	1.11	1.01	0.92	0.93	0.85	0.83	0.83	0.84	0.78	0.71	ARGENTINA
1.75	1.80	1.65	1.61	1.79	1.66	1.58	1.52	1.47	1.44	1.52	1.54	1.83	1.57	AUSTRALIA
-	0.36	0.36	0.35	0.43	0.45	0.53	0.57	0.55	0.56	0.63	0.64	0.71	0.75	AUSTRIA
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	BAHAMAS
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	BAHRAIN
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.03	BANGLADESH
-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	BARBADOS
1.38	1.38	1.27	1.24	1.30	1.20	1.15	1.10	1.05	1.05	1.07	1.08	1.22	1.28	BELGIUM
-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	BELIZE
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	BENIN
0.06	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	BHUTAN
-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	BOLIVIA
1.40	1.32	1.09	1.06	1.02	1.03	0.95	0.89	0.80	0.77	1.04	1.04	1.27	1.39	BOTSWANA
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.03	BRAZIL
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	BRUNEI DARUSSALAM
-	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.16	0.20	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.14	0.13	0.14	0.16	0.18	BULGARIA
-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	BURKINA FASO
0.13	0.13	0.10	0.10	0.08	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	BURMA
-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	BURUNDI
0.50	0.53	0.48	0.47	0.47	0.52	0.52	0.51	0.50	0.46	0.40	0.41	0.39	0.36	BYELORUSSIAN SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC
-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	CAMEROON
3.30	3.63	3.15	3.09	3.11	3.12	3.17	3.02	3.08	3.18	2.96	3.04	3.28	3.08	CANADA
-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	-	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	CAPE VERDE
-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC
-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	CHAD
0.33	0.30	0.30	0.29	0.27	0.26	0.27	0.23	0.20	0.14	0.09	0.09	0.07	0.07	CHILE
5.62	5.62	5.14	5.01	5.01	4.57	4.25	4.00	4.00	5.50	5.50	5.50	1.62	0.88	CHINA
0.41	0.41	0.37	0.36	0.31	0.26	0.23	0.20	0.19	0.16	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.11	COLOMBIA
-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	COMOROS
-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	CONGO
0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	COSTA RICA
0.34	0.30	0.27	0.26	0.25	0.22	0.20	0.19	0.16	0.11	0.13	0.11	0.11	0.09	CUBA
-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	CYPRUS
1.05	0.94	0.84	0.82	0.87	1.17	1.11	0.92	0.90	0.89	0.87	0.84	0.83	0.76	CZECHOSLOVAKIA
-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	DEMOCRATIC KAMPUCHEA
-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	DEMOCRATIC YEMEN
0.78	0.74	0.66	0.64	0.60	0.58	0.62	0.62	0.62	0.63	0.63	0.64	0.74	0.75	DENMARK
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	DJIBOUTI
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.01	0.01	0.01	DOMINICA
0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.03	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
0.04	0.04	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	ECUADOR
0.47	0.40	0.36	0.35	0.32	0.25	0.23	0.20	0.18	0.12	0.08	0.08	0.07	0.07	EGYPT
0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	EL SALVADOR
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	EQUATORIAL GUINEA
0.10	0.12	0.11	0.11	0.06	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	ETHIOPIA
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	FIJI
-	0.37	0.37	0.36	0.36	0.37	0.43	0.49	0.45	0.42	0.41	0.44	0.48	0.48	FINLAND
5.75	5.90	5.70	5.56	6.40	5.94	6.09	6.00	6.00	5.86	5.66	5.82	6.26	6.51	FRANCE
-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.02	GABON
-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	GAMBIA

## ANNEX IV (continued)

	<u>1946</u>	<u>1947</u>	<u>1948</u>	<u>1949</u>	<u>1950</u>	<u>1951</u>	<u>1952</u>	<u>1953</u>	<u>1954</u>	<u>1955</u>
GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
GERMANY, FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
GHANA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
GREECE	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.19	0.21	0.21
GRENADA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
GUATEMALA	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.07
GUINEA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
GUINEA-BISSAU	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
GUYANA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HAITI	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04
HONDURAS	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04
HUNGARY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.46
ICELAND	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04
INDIA	4.09	3.95	3.95	3.25	3.25	3.41	3.53	3.45	3.40	3.30
INDONESIA	-	-	-	-	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.56
IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)	0.47	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.40	0.33	0.28	0.25
IRAQ	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.14	0.12	0.12	0.11
IRELAND	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.19
ISRAEL	-	-	-	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.17
ITALY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.08
IVORY COAST	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
JAMAICA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
JAPAN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
JORDAN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04
KENYA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
KUWAIT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04
LEBANON	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.05
LESOTHO	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LIBERIA	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04
LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04
LUXEMBOURG	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.06
MADAGASCAR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MALAWI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MALAYSIA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MALDIVES	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MALI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MALTA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MAURITANIA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MAURITIUS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MEXICO	0.66	0.63	0.63	0.63	0.63	0.63	0.65	0.70	0.75	0.80
MONGOLIA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MOROCCO	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MOZAMBIQUE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
NEPAL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04
NETHERLANDS	1.47	1.40	1.40	1.40	1.40	1.35	1.27	1.25	1.25	1.25
NEW ZEALAND	0.52	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.48	0.48	0.48
NICARAGUA	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04
NIGER	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
NIGERIA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
NORWAY	0.52	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50
OMAN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PAKISTAN	-	-	-	0.70	0.70	0.74	0.79	0.79	0.75	0.67
PANAMA	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
PAPUA NEW GUINEA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

<u>1954</u>	<u>1955</u>	<u>1956</u> <u>1957</u>	<u>1958</u>	<u>1959</u> <u>1960</u> <u>1961</u>	<u>1962</u> <u>1963</u> <u>1964</u>	<u>1965</u> <u>1966</u> <u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u> <u>1969</u> <u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u> <u>1972</u> <u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u> <u>1975</u> <u>1976</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>1978</u> <u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u> <u>1981</u> <u>1982</u>	<u>1983</u> <u>1984</u> <u>1985</u>	
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.22	1.22	1.35	1.33	1.39	1.39	GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7.10	7.10	7.74	7.70	8.31	8.54	GERMANY, FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF
0.21	0.21	0.07 0.20	0.07 0.19	0.07 0.23	0.09 0.23	0.08 0.25	0.08 0.29	0.07 0.29	0.04 0.32	0.02 0.39	0.02 0.35	0.03 0.35	0.02 0.40	GHANA
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	GREECE
0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.05	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	GRENADA
-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	GUATEMALA
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	GUINEA
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	GUINEA-BISSAU
0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	GUYANA
0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	HAITI
-	0.46	0.46	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	HONDURAS
0.04	0.04	0.04	0.39	0.42	0.56	a/ 0.56	0.52	0.48	0.33	0.34	0.33	0.33	0.23	HUNGARY
3.40	3.30	2.97	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.03	ICELAND
0.60	0.56	0.51	2.90	2.46	2.03	1.85	1.74	1.55	1.20	0.70	0.68	0.60	0.36	INDIA
-	-	-	0.50	0.47	0.45	0.39	c/ 0.34	0.28	0.19	0.14	0.14	0.16	0.13	INDONESIA
0.28	0.25	0.27	0.26	0.21	0.20	0.20	0.22	0.22	0.20	0.43	0.40	0.65	0.58	IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)
0.12	0.11	0.12	0.12	0.09	0.09	0.08	0.07	0.07	0.05	0.10	0.08	0.12	0.12	IRAQ
-	0.19	0.19	0.18	0.16	0.14	0.16	0.17	0.17	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.16	0.18	IRELAND
0.17	0.17	0.16	0.16	0.14	0.15	0.17	0.20	0.20	0.21	0.24	0.23	0.25	0.23	ISRAEL
-	2.08	2.08	2.03	2.25	2.24	2.54	3.24	3.54	3.60	3.30	3.38	3.45	3.74	ITALY
-	-	-	-	0.06	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.03	IVORY COAST
-	-	-	-	-	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	JAMAICA
-	0.04	0.04	1.92	2.19	2.27	2.77	3.78	5.40	7.15	8.66	8.64	9.58	10.32	JAPAN
-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	JORDAN
-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	KENYA
-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.06	0.07	0.08	0.09	0.16	0.15	0.20	0.25	KUWAIT
-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC
0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.02	LEBANON
0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	LESOTHO
-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	LIBERIA
-	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.05	0.06	LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA
-	-	-	-	0.06	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	LUXEMBOURG
-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	MADAGASCAR
-	-	0.22	0.22	0.17	0.13	0.12	d/ 0.11	0.10	0.07	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	MALAWI
-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	MALAYSIA
-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	MAIDIVES
-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	MALI
-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	MALTA
-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	MAURITANIA
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	MAURITIUS
0.75	0.80	0.70	0.68	0.71	0.74	0.81	0.87	0.88	0.86	0.78	0.79	0.76	0.88	MEXICO
-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	MONGOLIA
-	-	-	0.12	0.14	0.14	0.11	0.10	0.09	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	MOROCCO
-	0.04	0.04	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	MOZAMBIQUE
-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	NEPAL
1.25	1.25	1.15	1.12	1.01	1.01	1.11	1.16	1.18	1.24	1.38	1.42	1.63	1.78	NETHERLANDS
0.48	0.48	0.43	0.42	0.42	0.41	0.38	0.36	0.32	0.28	0.28	0.26	0.27	0.26	NEW ZEALAND
0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	NICARAGUA
-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	NIGER
-	-	-	-	0.21	0.21	0.17	0.14	0.12	0.10	0.13	0.13	0.16	0.19	NIGERIA
0.50	0.50	0.49	0.48	0.49	0.45	0.44	0.43	0.43	0.43	0.43	0.45	0.50	0.51	NORWAY
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	OMAN
0.75	0.67	0.55	0.54	0.40	0.42	0.37	0.37	0.34	0.14	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.06	PAKISTAN
0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	PANAMA
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	PAPUA NEW GUINEA

## ANNEX IV (continued)

	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955
PARAGUAY	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04
PERU	0.21	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.18	0.18	0.18
PHILIPPINES	0.30	0.29	0.29	0.29	0.29	0.29	0.29	0.39	0.45	0.45
POLAND	1.00	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	1.05	1.36	1.58	1.73	1.73
PORTUGAL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.25
QATAR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ROMANIA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.50
RWANDA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SAINT CHRISTOPHER AND NEVIS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SAINT LUCIA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SAINT VINCENT AND THE GRENADINES	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SAMOA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SAO TOME AND PRINCIPE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SAUDI ARABIA	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.07	0.07	0.07
SENEGAL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SEYCHELLES	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SIERRA LEONE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SINGAPORE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SOLOMON ISLANDS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SOMALIA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SOUTH AFRICA	1.15	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.04	0.90	0.83	0.78	0.78
SPAIN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.14
SRI LANKA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.11
SUDAN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SURINAME	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SWAZILAND	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SWEDEN	2.35	2.35	2.04	2.00	1.98	1.85	1.73	1.65	1.65	1.59
SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.11	0.09	0.08	0.08	0.08
THAILAND	-	0.27	0.27	0.27	0.27	0.24	0.21	0.18	0.18	0.18
TOGO	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TUNISIA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TURKEY	0.93	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.75	0.65	0.65	0.65
UGANDA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
UKRAINIAN SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC	0.88	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.92	1.30	1.63	1.88	2.00
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS	6.62	6.34	6.34	6.34	6.34	6.98	9.85	12.28	14.15	15.08
UNITED ARAB EMIRATES	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	11.98	11.48	11.48	11.37	11.37	11.37	10.56	10.30	9.80	8.85
UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	39.89	39.89	39.89	39.89	39.79	38.92	36.90	35.12	33.33	33.33
URUGUAY	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.18
VANUATU	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
VENEZUELA	0.28	0.27	0.27	0.27	0.27	0.30	0.32	0.35	0.39	0.44
VIET NAM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
YEMEN	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04
YUGOSLAVIA	0.34	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.36	0.43	0.44	0.44	0.44
ZAIRE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ZAMBIA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ZIMBABWE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	<u>102.44</u>	<u>100.31</u>	<u>100.15</u>	<u>100.12</u>	<u>100.60</u>	<u>100.51</u>	<u>100.00</u>	<u>100.00</u>	<u>100.00</u>	<u>105.84</u>

1953	1954	1955	1956 1957	1958	1959 1960 1961	1962 1963 1964	1965 1966 1967	1968 1969 1970	1971 1972 1973	1974 1975 1976	1977	1978 1979	1980 1981 1982	1983 1984 1985	
0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	PARAGUAY
0.18	0.18	0.18	0.15	0.15	0.11	0.10	0.09	0.10	0.10	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.07	PERU
0.39	0.45	0.45	0.41	0.40	0.43	0.40	0.35	0.34	0.31	0.18	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.09	PHILIPPINES
1.58	1.73	1.73	1.56	1.52	1.37	1.28	1.45	1.47	1.41	1.26	1.40	1.39	1.24	0.72	POLAND
-	-	0.25	0.25	0.24	0.20	0.16	0.15	0.16	0.16	0.15	0.20	0.19	0.19	0.18	PORTUGAL
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.03	QATAR
-	-	0.50	0.50	0.49	0.34	0.32	0.35	0.36	0.36	0.30	0.26	0.24	0.21	0.19	ROMANIA
-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	RWANDA
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	SAINT CHRISTOPHER AND NEVIS
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.01	0.01	0.01	SAINT LUCIA
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.01	0.01	SAINT VINCENT AND THE GRENADINES
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	SAMOA
0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.05	0.07	0.06	0.24	0.23	0.58	0.86	SAO TOME AND PRINCIPE
-	-	-	-	-	0.06	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	SAUDI ARABIA
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	SENEGAL
-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	SEYCHELLES
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04 d/	0.05	0.05	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	SIERRA LEONE
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.09	SINGAPORE
-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	-	-	0.01	0.01	0.01	SOLOMON ISLANDS
0.83	0.78	0.78	0.71	0.67	0.56	0.53	0.52	0.52	0.54	0.50	0.40	0.42	0.42	0.41	SOMALIA
-	-	1.14	1.14	1.11	0.93	0.86	0.73	0.92	1.04	0.99	1.53	1.53	1.70	1.93	SOUTH AFRICA
-	-	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.10	0.09	0.08	0.06	0.05	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	SPAIN
-	-	-	0.11	0.11	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	SRI LANKA
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	SUDAN
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	SURINAME
1.65	1.65	1.59	1.46	1.43	1.39	1.30	1.26	1.25	1.25	1.30	1.20	1.24	1.31	1.32	SWAZILAND
0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	b/	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.03	SWEDEN
0.18	0.18	0.18	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.14	0.13	0.13	0.11	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.08	SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC
-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	THAILAND
-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.03	TOGO
-	-	-	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.03	TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO
0.65	0.65	0.65	0.63	0.61	0.59	0.40	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.29	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.32	TUNISIA
-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	TURKEY
1.63	1.88	2.00	1.85	1.80	1.80	1.98	1.97	1.93	1.87	1.71	1.50	1.53	1.46	1.32	UGANDA
12.28	14.15	15.08	13.96	13.62	13.62	14.97	14.92	14.61	14.18	12.97	11.33	11.60	11.10	10.54	UKRAINIAN SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.02	0.08	0.07	0.10	0.16	
10.30	9.80	8.85	7.81	7.62	7.78	7.58	7.21	6.62	5.90	5.31	4.44	4.52	4.46	4.67	UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	UNITED ARAB EMIRATES
35.12	33.33	33.33	33.33	32.51	32.51	32.02	31.91	31.57	31.52	25.00	25.00	25.00	25.00	25.00	UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
0.18	0.18	0.18	0.16	0.16	0.12	0.11	0.10	0.09	0.07	0.06	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA
0.35	0.39	0.44	0.43	0.42	0.50	0.52	0.50	0.45	0.41	0.32	0.40	0.39	0.50	0.55	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.02	URUGUAY
0.44	0.44	0.44	0.36	0.35	0.35	0.38	0.36	0.40	0.38	0.34	0.38	0.39	0.42	0.46	VANUATU
-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.07	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	VANUATU
-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	VENEZUELA
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.02	VIET NAM
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	YEMEN
100.00	100.00	105.84	102.37	100.04	101.11	100.67	100.42	100.21	108.58	100.26	100.11	100.07	100.07	100.04	YUGOSLAVIA
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.02	0.02	ZAMBIA
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	ZIMBABWE

### Notes

a/ The rates of assessment for Czechoslovakia and Hungary for the years 1962 and 1963 were retroactively decreased by General Assembly resolution 1927 (XVIII) of 11 December 1963 to 1.04 and 0.51, respectively. These decreases were offset in 1964 against additional income arising from the admission of seven new Member States in 1962 and 1963.

b/ For the years 1959, 1960 and 1961, Egypt and Syria were assessed jointly as the United Arab Republic.

c/ Indonesia ceased to co-operate with the Organization with effect from 1 January 1965, resuming full participation on 28 September 1966.

d/ Singapore, which had formed part of Malaysia, became an independent State in August 1965.

---

## كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم. استلم منها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف.

### 如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

### HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

### COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

### КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

### COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

---