



**REPORT
OF THE COMMITTEE
ON CONTRIBUTIONS**

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

OFFICIAL RECORDS: THIRTY-SECOND SESSION

SUPPLEMENT No. 11 (A/32/11)

UNITED NATIONS



**REPORT
OF THE COMMITTEE
ON CONTRIBUTIONS**

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

OFFICIAL RECORDS: THIRTY-SECOND SESSION

SUPPLEMENT No. 11 (A/32/11)

UNITED NATIONS

New York, 1977

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. MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE	1 - 2	1
II. TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE	3 - 8	2
III. STUDY OF WAYS AND MEANS OF INCREASING THE FAIRNESS AND EQUITY OF THE SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS	9 - 45	5
A. Possible improvements in the statistical measurement of relative capacity to pay	10 - 35	5
1. Economic and social indicators of capacity to pay	10 - 22	5
2. Price trends in international trade	23 - 25	11
3. Current and constant prices	26 - 27	11
4. Coverage and comparability of international statistics	28 - 34	12
B. Possibility of mitigating extreme variations in assessments between two successive scales	35 - 41	14
C. Continuing disparity between the economies of developed and developing countries	42 - 44	16
IV. REVIEW OF THE SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS	45 - 57	18
A. Statistical information	47 - 48	18
B. Comparative income per head of population	49 - 51	18
C. Special measures of relief in the scale	52 - 53	19
D. Mitigation of changes in the scale	54	20
E. Representation on individual assessments	55 - 57	20
V. SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS	58 - 70	22
VI. ASSESSMENT OF NEW MEMBERS FOR 1976 AND 1977	71 - 74	30
VII. ASSESSMENT OF NON-MEMBER STATES	75 - 85	31

CONTENTS (continued)

	<u>Paragraphs</u>	<u>Page</u>
VIII. OTHER MATTERS CONSIDERED BY THE COMMITTEE	86 - 97	35
A. Collection of contributions	86 - 90	35
B. Payment of contributions in currencies other than United States dollars	91 - 93	36
C. Scale of contributions for specialized agencies . .	94 - 95	36
D. Statements requested by the Fifth Committee	96	36
E. Date of the next session of the Committee	97	36
IX. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE	98	37
X. SEPARATE OPINIONS	99 - 102	44

ANNEXES

I. TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE	45
II. SUMMARY OF SUGGESTIONS AND PROPOSALS ADVANCED DURING THE DEBATE IN THE FIFTH COMMITTEE ON AGENDA ITEM 100 IN CONNEXION WITH NEW CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES	55
III. DATA FOR ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL INDICATORS	57
Table 1. Availability of data for economic and social indicators	57
Table 2. Statistics in respect of selected indicators	59
IV. PRICE TRENDS IN INTERNATIONAL TRADE	70
Table 1. Terms of trade and trade balance	70
A. Terms of trade	70
B. Percentage of imports covered by exports	73
Table 2. Unit value index of manufactured goods exported by developed countries	76
Table 3. Price indices of primary commodities	77
V. CLASSIFICATION OF COUNTRIES INTO DEVELOPING, LEAST DEVELOPED AND MOST SERIOUSLY AFFECTED GROUPS	91
VI. UNITED NATIONS SCALES OF ASSESSMENTS FOR THE YEARS 1946-1977 . . .	95

I. MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE

1. The thirty-seventh session of the Committee on Contributions was held at United Nations Headquarters from 4 to 30 April 1977 and at the United Nations Office at Geneva during the period from 8 to 13 August 1977. The following members were present:

Mr. Abdel Hamid Abdel-Ghani

Syed Amjad Ali

Mr. Anatoly Semënovich Chistyakov

Mr. Miguel A. Dávila Mendoza 1/

Mr. Talib El-Shibib

Mr. Gbadebo Oladeinde George

Mr. Richard V. Hennes

Mr. Junpei Kato

Mr. Japhet G. Kiti

Mr. Wilfried Koschorreck

Mr. Angus J. Matheson

Mr. John I. M. Rhodes

Mr. Michel Rougé

Mr. Dragos Serbanescu

Mr. David Silveira da Mota

Mr. Euthimios Stoforopoulos

Mr. Tien Yi-nung 1/

Mr. Bernal Vargas-Saborio

2. The Committee re-elected Syed Amjad Ali Chairman and Mr. Silveira da Mota Vice-Chairman.

1/ Mr. Dávila Mendoza and Mr. Tien Yi-nung were unable to attend the resumed session of the Committee at Geneva.

II. TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE

3. In its report to the General Assembly at its thirty-first session, ^{2/} the Committee on Contributions, in recommending a scale of assessments for 1977, 1978 and 1979, applied its original terms of reference, as amended and supplemented by further directives given it by the Assembly. These may be summarized as follows:

(a) The expenses of the United Nations should be apportioned broadly according to capacity to pay, with comparative estimates of national income as the fairest guide. The main factors to be taken into account in order to prevent anomalous assessments resulting from the use of such comparative estimates to include:

(i) Comparative income per head of population;

(ii) The ability of members to secure foreign currency;

(b) As a matter of principle, the maximum contribution of any one Member State to the ordinary expenses of the United Nations should not exceed 25 per cent of the total;

(c) The minimum rate of assessment should be 0.02 per cent;

(d) An allowance formula should be applied in establishing rates of assessment for low per capita income countries;

(e) Due regard should be accorded to developing countries, especially those with the lowest per capita income, in view of their special economic and financial problems.

4. At its thirty-first session the General Assembly adopted the scale of assessments recommended by the Committee on Contributions for the year 1977 only (resolution 31/95 B of 14 December 1976) and decided, by its resolution 31/95 A of 14 December 1976, to lower the minimum rate of assessment to 0.01 per cent in formulating the coming scale of assessments. The relevant part of the resolution reads as follows:

"The General Assembly,

"...

"Recalling that the capacity to pay of the countries recognized by the United Nations as the least developed among the developing countries and those most seriously affected is being adversely affected, inter alia, by inflation and currency instability,

^{2/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-first Session, Supplement No. 11 (A/31/11) and A/31/11/Add.1.

"Recognizing the need for reconsideration of the scale of assessments of the least developed countries and those most seriously affected in order to help them meet their priorities at home and to allow the adjustment necessary for these countries,

"Believing that the existing arrangement of assessment on the floor level is incompatible with the principle of capacity to pay,

"Believing also that the collective financial responsibility implies that all Member States pay at least a minimum percentage of the expenses of the Organization,

"1. Reaffirms that the capacity of Member States to contribute towards the payment of the budgetary expenses of the United Nations is the fundamental criterion on which scales of assessment are based;

"2. Decides to lower the floor for purposes of formulating and establishing the rates of assessment;

"3. Requests the Committee on Contributions to reflect this decision in formulating the coming scale of assessments in so far as purely practical and technical limitations in calculating permit, which should be understood to mean minimum payment of no less than 0.01 per cent of the total expenses of the Organization;"

5. By the same resolution, the General Assembly addressed the following requests to the Committee:

"The General Assembly,

"...

"4. Also requests the Committee on Contributions to study urgently and in depth ways and means of increasing the fairness and equity of the scale of assessments in the light of views expressed by Member States at the thirty-first session of the General Assembly, in particular by:

(a) Seeking improvements in the statistical measurement of the relative capacity to pay, including new or additional statistical indicators and criteria;

(b) Considering the possibility of mitigating extreme variations in assessments between two successive scales, without departing essentially from the principle of the capacity to pay, either by increasing the statistical base period from three years to some longer period or by any other appropriate method;

(c) Bearing in mind the fact that the capacity to pay of Member States may be subject to severe fluctuations in economic activity for a variety of reasons;

"5. Further requests the Committee on Contributions to embody as appropriate in subsequent reports of the Committee the particular justification for any significant increases in the assessment of any Member State between two successive scales;

"6. Requests the Committee on Contributions to report in depth on its findings to the General Assembly at its thirty-second session with a view to enabling the Assembly to consider early action on a new scale; ..."

6. For the purpose of future scales of assessment, the General Assembly decided in resolution 31/95 B that such scales should be formulated by the Committee on the basis of:

"(a) The criteria contained in its report" 3/ (see para. 3 above);

"(b) The additional criteria contained in resolution 31/95 A" (see paras. 4 and 5 above);

"(c) The continuing disparity between the economies of developed and developing countries;

"(d) Methods which avoid excessive variations of individual rates of assessment between two successive scales;

"(e) The debate under agenda item 100 in the Fifth Committee during the thirty-first session, especially the concern expressed regarding steep increases in individual rates of assessment."

7. The Committee's terms of reference, including relevant parts of General Assembly resolutions 31/95 A and 31/95 B, are contained in annex I below.

8. A summary of suggestions and proposals advanced during the debate in the Fifth Committee in connexion with new criteria and procedures is contained in annex II to the present report.

3/ Ibid.

III. STUDY OF WAYS AND MEANS OF INCREASING THE FAIRNESS AND EQUITY OF THE SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS

9. In resolution 31/95 A, the General Assembly requested the Committee on Contributions to study urgently and in depth ways and means of increasing the fairness and equity of the scale of assessments. Whilst the Committee has always striven to achieve those objectives it recognized that a thorough reappraisal of its methodology was necessary in the light of the views expressed during the debate in the Fifth Committee. The diversity of those views, particularly as to the intrinsic meaning of relative capacity to pay, presented the Committee with a task of great difficulty. That difficulty was compounded by the magnitude of the economic changes which have occurred in recent years in many areas of the world and the disturbances in the monetary system and price mechanism of the market economies. In the present section, the Committee discusses the more fundamental aspects of the question after giving the most careful attention to all the considerations which emerged during the course of the debates at the thirty-first session of the General Assembly.

A. Possible improvements in the statistical measurement of relative capacity to pay

1. Economic and social indicators of capacity to pay

10. In its report to the General Assembly at its thirty-first session, the Committee pointed to the fact that the single aggregate of national income expressed in monetary terms might not fully reflect economic realities and that, hypothetically, a new general index of development covering economic and social, as well as value and structural aspects of development, might provide a more comprehensive indicator of a country's over-all level of development than does per capita national income. ^{4/} In response to General Assembly resolution 31/95 A, and in its continuing search for possible improvements in the statistical measurement of relative capacity to pay, the Committee, at its current session, again explored in depth the possibility of combining with national income other indicators of an economic and social nature.

11. It should be stressed at the outset that a distinction must be drawn between indicators which can be expressed in absolute amounts required for the formulation of a scale and those which, although indicative of relative ranking, do not permit of a percentage allocation between Member States for that purpose. The indicators listed in the following paragraph are all expressed in relative terms although some of them can be converted to absolute amounts.

12. During the debate in the Fifth Committee, a number of possible indicators to supplement national income were cited by various delegations. For its present study, the Committee examined the 18 indicators listed below which are among those generally used for the purpose of economic and social analyses relating to health,

^{4/} Ibid., para. 16.

including demographic conditions; food and nutrition; education, including literacy and skills; conditions of work; employment; aggregate consumption and savings; transportation; housing, including household facilities; recreation and entertainment; and social security. With the exception of national wealth and net national welfare (which, as in the case of national income, are comprehensive indicators which encompass the entire economy of a country), the remaining 16 are partial or sectoral indicators:

1. Per capita energy consumption (kilograms of coal equivalent);
2. Percentage share of manufactured exports in total exports;
3. Percentage share of three main export commodities in total exports;
4. Number of telephones per 1,000 persons;
5. Per capita cereal production (metric tons);
6. Per capita national wealth (national currencies);
7. Per capita food consumption (daily calorie intake);
8. Percentage share of manufacturing in total gross domestic product;
9. Percentage share of economically active population outside agriculture;
10. Percentage of literate population;
11. Number of physicians per 1,000 inhabitants;
12. Number of infant survivals per 1,000 births;
13. Value of production of basic industries per capita (national currencies);
14. Percentage share of funds allocated for technical and scientific research in total national income;
15. Percentage share of military expenditures in total national income;
16. Life expectancy at birth (years);
17. Per capita energy production (metric tons of coal equivalent);
18. Per capita net national welfare (national currencies).

The Committee explored the feasibility of combining some or all of these into one which would measure the relative level or stage of development of a country or its socio-economic status. Conceivably, the single indicator so developed could then be utilized for the purpose of adjusting per capita national income, in itself an indicator of relative values. Hypothetically, therefore, an indicator of adjusted per capita national income could be obtained for each Member State, which, when multiplied by the population of a given country, would provide an absolute figure in United States dollar terms.

13. The method just described is illustrated below:

<u>Country</u>	<u>Per capita national income (\$US)</u>	<u>Percentage share of manufacturing in total GDP</u>	<u>Percentage of literate population</u>
A.	5,000	30 (6/5)	90 (9/10)
B	3,000	20 (4/5)	20 (1/5)
C	1,000	15 (3/5)	80 (4/5)
United States of America	6,000	25 (1)	100 (1)

The parentheses against the first three countries show the ratios of the two respective indicators for those countries to those of the United States (namely, percentage share of manufacturing in total gross domestic product (GDP) in country "A" is six fifths that of the United States and the percentage of literate population in country "A" is nine tenths that of the United States). After a composite adjustment is made to embrace one economic indicator (percentage share of manufacturing in total GDP) and one social indicator (percentage of literate population), the per capita income of countries "A", "B" and "C", become \$5,250, \$1,500 and \$700, respectively, compared with \$6,000 for the United States, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Country A} & \quad \frac{5,000 \times 6/5 + 5,000 \times 9/10}{2} = \$5,250 \\
 \text{Country B} & \quad \frac{3,000 \times 4/5 + 3,000 \times 1/5}{2} = \$1,500 \\
 \text{Country C} & \quad \frac{1,000 \times 3/5 + 1,000 \times 4/5}{2} = \$700
 \end{aligned}$$

14. The illustrations given above demonstrate that, while it is theoretically possible to combine per capita national income expressed in monetary terms with other economic and social indicators expressed in varying relative units, it is extremely difficult to quantify the level of socio-economic development into a single valid and internationally acceptable measure for the purpose of comparison among countries and that there is at present no satisfactory method of statistically developing a single comprehensive indicator. The Committee was informed that the problem had attracted considerable attention at the international and regional levels and noted with interest that the United Nations Expert Group on Welfare-oriented Supplements to the National Accounts and Balances and Other Measures of Levels of Living, which met in New York in March 1976, agreed that level of living (and the same conclusion would apply to the level of socio-economic development) was a complex concept which, certainly at present, is not susceptible to measurement as a single numerical aggregate in internationally comparable terms. The Expert Group, therefore, did not recommend the establishment of international

standards for compiling such a measure, in monetary terms or in any other unit of account. 5/

15. Aside from the difficulties outlined in the preceding paragraph, the selection of a set of indicators (among the very large number available) which would jointly specify the level of socio-economic development would involve subjective judgements as to the significance or otherwise of particular indicators. In the illustrations given in paragraph 13 above, two indicators were combined: percentage share of manufacturing in total GDP and percentage of literate population. In point of fact, any combination could be utilized, with each such combination yielding different results. The Committee found, moreover, that even if expert agreement could be reached at the international level on the selection of individual indicators, other factors militated against the preparation of a composite or synthetic indicator.

16. One such factor would involve the weighting of individual indicators. Since indicators are generally correlated (a country with a high industrial output, for example, will generally consume a high level of energy), the problem thus arises of removing the correlation in order to achieve an unduplicated synthesis of the correlated indicators. While the Committee noted that this problem was not incapable of solution, it also recognized that, as in the case of the selection of indicators, their weighting would call for an essentially subjective judgement. In the illustrations given in paragraph 13 above, equal weights were attached to two indicators. If the percentage of literate population had been given four times the weight of the percentage of manufacturing in total GDP, the calculation of the combined indicator for countries "A", "B" and "C" would have been as follows:

<u>Country "A"</u>	$\frac{5,000 \times 6/5 + 5,000 \times 4 (9/10)}{5} = \$4,800$
<u>Country "B"</u>	$\frac{3,000 \times 4/5 + 3,000 \times 4 (1/5)}{5} = \960
<u>Country "C"</u>	$\frac{1,000 \times 3/5 + 1,000 \times 4 (4/5)}{5} = \760

Thus, in contrast to the adjusted per capita national incomes of \$5,250, \$1,500 and \$700 shown in paragraph 13 above, the weights attached to the two indicators in the present illustrations result in adjusted per capita national incomes of \$4,800, \$960 and \$760 for countries "A", "B" and "C", respectively. Similarly if the percentage of manufacturing in total GDP had been given four times the weight of the percentage of literate population, the calculation of the combined indicator for countries "A", "B" and "C" would have been as follows:

5/ Report of the Expert Group on Welfare-oriented Supplements to the National Accounts and Balances and Other Measures of Levels of Living (ESA/STAT/AC.4/5, para. 9 (a)).

Country "A"	$\frac{5,000 \times 4 (6/5) + 5,000 \times 1 (9/10)}{5}$	= \$5,700
Country "B"	$\frac{3,000 \times 4 (4/5) + 3,000 \times 1 (1/5)}{5}$	= \$2,040
Country "C"	$\frac{1,000 \times 4 (3/5) + 1,000 \times 1 (4/5)}{5}$	= \$640

17. In connexion with both the selection of indicators and the weights to be attached thereto, the Committee's examination showed that it was virtually impossible to establish a composite indicator which would reflect the widely diverse historical patterns of socio-economic development and of ethical and cultural attitudes of the United Nations membership as a whole.

18. As may be seen from annex III below, a further difficulty which the Committee encountered was the lack of recent statistics from Member States for a common year. Data collected from decennial population censuses (such as percentage share of economically active population outside agriculture, percentage of literate population, number of infant survivals per 1,000 births and life expectancy at birth) relate to years close to 1970, with the next set of data for these variables expected to cluster near 1980. Furthermore, data such as are available are not only incomplete, but are not comparable between countries with differing statistical systems, concepts, scopes, coverages, definitions etc. In the case of per capita energy consumption, the one indicator available for the preponderance of Member States, this was found to be highly correlated with per capita national income, with the use of the former in conjunction with the latter leading to duplication. On the other hand, data relating to national wealth and net national welfare, which the Committee agreed would not only broaden the base of capacity to pay, but would serve to measure the infrastructure of a country, were partially available for only 25 and 3 Member States, respectively. Nor was it likely that such data would be available for the membership as a whole for many years to come. For this reason, data relating to these two indicators are not shown in annex III, table 2.

19. The Committee was informed that in spite of the difficulties cited above, attempts had been made by research institutes and universities to rank countries by combining a number of variables with per capita national income or per capita gross national product. Both economic and social indicators of the type examined by the Committee at its current session had been used for the purpose of these studies. Again, since the choice of indicators and of weights was necessarily subjective, the results were inconclusive. Notwithstanding the inconclusive nature of the studies made, the Committee was interested to note that the ranking of countries obtained by the use of a composite or synthetic indicator did not differ significantly from that obtained by the use of per capita national income, which remains the principal indicator of the broad dimension of a country's poverty or wealth and of the general capacity of its economy to produce goods and services.

20. In a study on developing countries and levels of development made by the Secretariat in 1975 for the twelfth session of the Committee for Development Planning, which met from 29 March to 7 April 1976, it was stated that:

"A second point to emerge notwithstanding the variations in ranking on per capita product and on other indicators already referred to above, is that the most typical experience is for the ranking order on per capita product to

diverge relatively little from the ranking order on most other indicators. This pattern comes into sharper focus when the information contained in table 1 is rearranged so as to show only a number of strata into which countries may be fitted in respect of each separate indicator. Such an arrangement has the additional advantage in that it gives less prominence to the precise ranking of each country on any indicator, a precision which is not justified by the nature of the available data; no significance should in fact be attached to differences of a few places in the rankings." (E/AC.54/L.81, p. 19)

21. In its re-examination of possible improvements in economic and social indicators of a country's capacity to pay, the Committee took cognizance of the fact that, for the time being, the totality of resources available to a nation can only be expressed in terms of a single monetary figure representing the national income of a country. Since national income comprises the total income of residents of a country accruing from their participation in productive activities (in agriculture, hunting, forestry and fishing, mining and quarrying, manufacturing, utilities, construction and services, as well as net factor income from abroad), it is a relatively comprehensive indicator of the determinants of the level of living and of socio-economic development as a whole. It could be argued that a nation's accumulated wealth as well as its current annual income could be jointly considered as the influencing factors of its capacity to pay. Applying as a parallel national taxation levied on a country's citizens to countries as members of the world community, it could be further argued that net income should be supplemented by net worth as a measure of capacity to pay. Certainly, in mature developed countries capital assets have been developed over hundreds of years. On the other hand, countries whose incomes have increased substantially in recent years but which do not have well developed infrastructures must, of necessity, refrain for some time to come from devoting to consumption large portions of their national income before they are in a position to match mature developed countries in terms of the latter's accumulated wealth. Available estimates of national wealth, however, are far from uniform in scope. This lack of uniformity and, as explained in paragraph 18 above, the very limited availability of statistics, unfortunately render the estimates inadequate for the purpose of international comparisons. The Committee was informed that international guidelines for the preparation of data on national wealth are expected to be published by the United Nations in the near future. However, such guidelines represent only the first step in a lengthy process of establishing a systematic body of statistics of national wealth.

22. The difficulties encountered in the utilization of indicators other than national income have been described in some detail. These, together with the almost universal adoption of standardized systems of national accounts, their regular publication and the general international understanding that the aggregate of national income portrays the totality of the national production of goods and services, compelled the Committee to conclude once again that, in the present stage of statistical science, national income is the only single indicator which can be statistically compiled for all countries and therefore utilized as the principal measure of capacity to pay. Nevertheless, the Committee agreed that its examination of a broad range of economic and social indicators had been valuable and that, in exercising its collective judgement, they would be taken into account in individual cases to the extent possible and feasible.

2. Price trends in international trade

23. The Committee was also aware that in the case of countries with commodity-oriented economies, account should be taken of the effect of sharp declines in export prices and of the increasing price of imports on their capacity to pay.

24. In this connexion, the Committee studied a paper, prepared by the Secretariat at its request, on terms of trade and trade balances, the unit value index of manufactured goods exported by developed countries (which serves as a proxy for import price indices of developing countries whose exports of primary commodities represent a large share of their total exports) and price indices of primary commodities. These data are contained in annex IV to the present report.

25. The Committee wishes to draw attention to the fact that the elements contained in annex IV represent an intrinsic determinant of national income and, as such, are automatically taken into account whenever data on national income are compiled for the purpose of a review of the scale of assessments. In so far as commodity prices decline or prices of manufactured goods imported by developing countries increase in years subsequent to the period under review, the Committee noted that, as in the case of any other factor affecting the economy of a country, such declines would be reflected in the national incomes of Member States in the following period and would to some extent, therefore, be taken into account in the ensuing scale. The Committee was also aware of the sentiment expressed in the Fifth Committee that, in the case of developing countries whose national income depends to a large extent on the export of non-renewable natural resources, account should be taken of this fact when assessing their capacity to pay.

3. Current and constant prices

26. The problem of ensuring that the element of inflation does not distort the statistical measurement of a country's national income and therefore its capacity to pay is one which has engaged the attention of the Committee for a number of years.

27. In its report to the General Assembly at its twenty-fourth session, in 1969, the Committee stated as follows:

"... It noted that movements in the current price value of the national product of Member States, when expressed in United States dollars, could normally result from changes in: (a) quantity of output; (b) price levels; and (c) exchange rates. Traditionally, the Committee has based its calculations on a measure of national output data expressed in current prices converted into United States dollars but has taken account of price changes wherever they were found to have had a noticeable effect on the level of assessment. The Committee recognized that the choice between using current or constant prices was not important when changes in a country's exchange rate were in line with changes in its price level. The Committee also recognized that the need for special attention in its work arose where changes in price levels were not proportionately reflected in exchange rates, either for the whole or part of the period under review.

"At the same time, the Committee considered that there were serious

difficulties involved in the use of constant prices instead of current prices. These difficulties include: (a) non-availability of constant price data for the economies of many Member States; (b) the possibility that the rate of conversion applied to the base period might by itself be undervalued or overvalued; and (c) imperfections in price indexes." 6/

The Committee also did not find it possible at the time to standardize the price changes for the determination of the national income of Member States. In seeking improvements in the statistical measurement of relative capacity to pay, the same difficulties were encountered by the Committee at its current session, since data in constant prices compiled in the manner required for international comparisons are not universally available. Nor does an internationally-agreed set of statistical techniques exist to the degree necessary for the work of the Committee even if data were available. As a consequence, the Committee concluded that it had no alternative but to continue its use of national income data in current prices.

4. Coverage and comparability of international statistics

28. At the eighth session of the General Assembly, the Fifth Committee agreed that Member States should be informed of the dates of the meetings of the Committee on Contributions in order to ensure that national income and related data would be submitted by Governments in sufficient time for the Committee to take them into account in the formulation of its recommendations to the General Assembly on the scale of assessment. 7/ Accordingly, in its report to the General Assembly at its thirty-first session, the Committee stated that its next session would open on 4 April 1977. 8/ In a communication dated 22 February 1977 to Member States and to non-member States, the Secretary-General confirmed the opening date of the session and requested Governments to make available any supplementary data or information that they might wish the Committee to consider. In January 1977, the Statistical Office of the United Nations, following its customary practice, had already requested Member States to submit national income data for the use of the Committee. Those data, together with such supplementary information as was transmitted in response to the Secretary-General's request, or by way of representations from a number of States, were examined in detail by the Committee.

29. The Committee was gratified to note that an increasing number of countries had been able to improve the quality and coverage of their estimates of national income and to publish revised estimates of national income in national currencies based on more adequate material. In those cases where data were not submitted by Governments, statistics obtained from national sources, from regional economic surveys (prepared by the regional commissions) and from reports of statistical experts appointed under technical co-operation programmes also showed improvement over previous years. Where extrapolations from previous years were found to be necessary, the publication of more detailed basic economic and financial statistics has also resulted in more reliable estimates.

6/ Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 11 (A/7611 and Corr.1), paras. 15 and 16.

7/ Ibid., Eighth Session, Annexes, agenda item 42, document A/2577 and Corr.1, para. 17.

8/ Ibid., Thirty-first Session, Supplement No. 11 (A/31/11), para. 58.

30. The Committee again examined the question of the comparability of the two systems of national accounts: the System of National Accounts (SNA), used by the market economies, and the Material Product System (MPS), used by the centrally planned economies. The concept of national income according to SNA was briefly defined in paragraph 21 above. The concept of national income used in the centrally planned economies, unlike SNA, excludes the value of services not contributing directly to material production (such as passenger transportation; communication services rendered to the population; public baths, laundries, housing, recreation and entertainment; sanitation services and barber shops; services of teachers, physicians, nurses etc.; administration and defence services; science and research; and banking and insurance). The extent of the difference between SNA and MPS arising from differences in coverage varies from one country to another within the group of centrally planned economies, depending not only on the stage of economic development, but also on economic policy (such as the allocation of labour to the various sectors of the economy and price policy as between services and commodities). A second major source of incomparability arises from differences in the concepts and methods governing the valuation of goods and services produced. The Committee, however, did not regard these problems as vitiating comparisons between MPS countries and those with market economies, since over the years more methodological research on establishing links and comparability between the two systems and better availability of data have allowed for more reliable estimates of national income at market prices to be made for the centrally planned economies.

31. Notwithstanding the improvement in coverage and comparability achieved to date, the Committee once again wishes to draw the attention of Member States to the importance of the timely and complete submission of national accounts data. Only in this manner can the Committee improve upon the statistical measurement of Members' relative capacity to pay.

32. In past reviews of the scale, estimates expressed in national currencies have been converted into a common currency unit, the United States dollar, for the purpose of comparing the national incomes of Member States. However, the uncertainties and disturbances which have been experienced in the international monetary system of the market economies by the substitution of floating exchange rates for the par value régime, including the introduction of a floating exchange rate between the United States dollar and other currencies, and certain specific features of the system of currency exchange rates in countries with centrally planned economies, led the Committee to believe that the methodology of converting national incomes in national currencies into a common unit merited further exploration.

33. The Committee, therefore, discussed alternative possibilities, such as the use of purchasing power parities or the conversion into a common unit comprising a basket of currencies. It noted, however, that both alternatives were statistically and conceptually complex for the membership at large whose economic systems and stages of development varied widely. The Committee agreed that the question would be re-examined at its next session.

34. For the present, therefore, the Committee was satisfied that it should continue to rely on information compiled by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) for the market economies and on conversion rates (representing the annual average of effective rates) communicated to the Secretariat by the centrally planned economies.

B. Possibility of mitigating extreme variations
in assessments between two successive scales

35. Under the terms of General Assembly resolution 31/95 A of 14 December 1976, the Committee was requested to consider "the possibility of mitigating extreme variations in assessments between two successive scales, without departing essentially from the principle of the capacity to pay, either by increasing the statistical base period from three years to some longer period or by any other appropriate method" and to "bear in mind that the capacity to pay of Member States may be subject to severe fluctuations in economic activity for a variety of reasons". The Assembly's resolution 31/95 B of 14 December 1976 directed the Committee to draw up future scales of assessments on the basis of, inter alia, "methods which avoid excessive variations in individual rates of assessments between two successive scales".

36. During the course of the debate in the Fifth Committee, a suggestion was made by certain representatives that increases between successive scales should be limited to a fixed percentage, such as 10 to 30 per cent. The Committee on Contributions examined in detail the suggestion and several proposals related to it. While recognizing, as it always has, the need to mitigate excessive variations in rates of assessment between two successive scales, the Committee was unable to develop a workable, universally and directly applicable system of limitations, either in percentage or in absolute terms, to be imposed on changes, both upward and downward. Moreover, most members of the Committee felt that the imposition of such limitations would depart essentially from the basic principle of capacity to pay laid down by the General Assembly at its first session (General Assembly resolution 14 (I)), a principle which had been reaffirmed by the Assembly as recently as its thirty-first session. In this latter connexion, other members of the Committee still believed that the imposition of a ceiling on variations in rates of assessment between two consecutive scales would be in keeping with the General Assembly's request to the Committee to consider "the possibility of mitigating extreme variations in assessments between two successive scales" and would not constitute an essential departure from the principle of capacity to pay since the General Assembly itself had already decided to impose limits on the rates of assessment of the highest and lowest contributors. In view of the above, the Committee decided to proceed to the examination, requested by the General Assembly, of the consequences on individual rates of assessment of a variety of statistical base periods.

37. At its session in 1953, the Committee adopted the use of averages of national income statistics for a period of three years rather than for a single year, as had been its original practice. ^{9/} This step was taken in order to reduce the effect on the scale of short-term fluctuations in economic conditions and of movements in exchange rates. In response to a suggestion made in the Fifth Committee at the twenty-third session of the General Assembly in 1968, ^{10/} that the base period be extended to six or even nine years, the Committee on Contributions, in its report to the twenty-fourth session of the Assembly in 1969 stated as follows:

^{9/} Ibid., Eighth Session, Supplement No. 10 (A/2461), p. 9.

^{10/} Ibid., Twenty-third Session, Annexes, agenda item 77, document A/7451, para. 7.

"... In connexion with this suggestion, it may be recalled that under the present procedure, the scale to be established in 1970, which would apply for the three years 1971, 1972 and 1973, would be based on averages of national income statistics for the period 1966-1968. There is thus a considerable time-lag between the period used as a basis for the scale and the period of application of the scale, and it might be questioned if a further extension of the time-lag would be desirable and equitable. The Committee recognized that an extension of the base period to six or nine years would not only, as stated, further retard the effects of short-term fluctuations in economic conditions but would also fail to disclose adequately differential rates of expansion in the economies of Member States. The Committee was of the opinion, therefore, that for a three-year scale, a three-year base period is a more appropriate means of reflecting the relative economic developments of Member States and is sufficiently long to provide for correction of the effects of short-term fluctuations." 11/

38. Nevertheless, in compliance with the decisions of the General Assembly (as outlined in para. 35 above), the Committee, at its current session examined alternative base periods for the formulation of the forthcoming scale. In so doing, it recalled that the scale it had recommended for 1977-1979, which had been adopted by the Assembly for 1977, had been based on national income and related data for the years 1972-1974 (no later data having been available in 1976, the year of its last review). At its current session, however, data for 1975 were available and could thus be taken into account.

39. The Committee recognized that, had it adhered to its practice of formulating a scale based on data for the most recent three years, in this case 1973, 1974 and 1975, the sharp increases and decreases which were characteristic of the 1977 scale would not only have continued to obtain, but would, in certain instances, have been quite significant. For example, one Member State whose rate of assessment quadrupled in the 1977 scale would have had that rate doubled in the subsequent scale. Variations of the foregoing nature were the consequences, of course, of the significant increases since 1973 of the prices of certain commodities and of disturbances in the monetary system of the market economies (more particularly, the changes in the rate of exchange in 1971 and in 1973 between the United States dollar and other trading currencies). The situation obtaining with a five-year base period, or with the addition of 1971 and 1972 to the three most recent years for which data were available, although somewhat less accentuated, was found to be similar. On the other hand, the further addition of the years 1969 and 1970, which pre-dated the events described above, tended to retard the severity of movements in national income averages and, as a consequence, increases and decreases in individual rates of assessment. Also, in this case, such an extension of the base period had the additional advantage of generally minimizing distortions arising from the use of national income statistics in current prices which reflected the relative rises of price levels not offset by appropriate changes in exchange rates. The Committee was generally of the opinion, therefore, that a seven-year base period, which would include the years 1969-1975, served best to alleviate the sharp variations in rates of assessment which it has been called upon to avoid. Some members further stated that, in the case of countries whose national incomes had risen rapidly in recent years but whose accumulated national wealth remained

11/ Ibid., Twenty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 11 (A/7611 and Corr.1), para. 14.

far smaller than that of mature developed countries where capital assets have been developed over hundreds of years, the expansion of the base period would, to a certain extent, make the estimation of their actual capacity to pay more equitable.

40. The opinion reached, however, was neither unanimous nor unqualified. Following the adoption of the seven-year base period, several members stressed that, in formulating each scale, the Committee should have full latitude to adjust the length of the base period in the way best suited to serve the purpose of ensuring the fairness and equity of the scale of assessments. Some members, in expressing their reservation concerning the validity of such an extended base period, did not oppose its adoption so long as it did not establish a precedent for the future work of the Committee. Other members thought that, if a new base period were adopted, its application ought to be continued for some time into the future in the interests of fairness and consistency. Some members seriously questioned the utility of the introduction of a seven-year base period entailing the use of statistics which would be 9 or 10 years out of date when the scale of assessments came to be applied and, more particularly, if these statistics were used as a point of departure for further mitigation, except for countries within the "least developed country" (LDC) and "most seriously affected" (MSA) categories.

41. The Committee agreed, nevertheless, that, for the purpose of its current review of the scale, it would base its work on national income and related statistics for the years 1969-1975.

C. Continuing disparity between the economies of developed and developing countries

42. The General Assembly, in paragraph (c) (iii) of its resolution 31/95 B, calls for the Committee to draw up future scales of assessment on the basis of the continuing disparity between the economies of developed and developing countries. A proposal was also advanced during the debate in the Fifth Committee that, as long as the gap between developed and developing countries, adequately documented by statistics, continued to increase, the total percentage of the budget borne by the developing countries should not be increased; or, as was also suggested, increased contributions of developing countries with rising national incomes should be devoted entirely to the needs of other developing countries..

43. In addressing itself to the foregoing questions and in particular to the resolution of the General Assembly, the Committee found that aside from the "least developed countries" and the "most seriously affected countries", eight classifications of countries termed "developing" were generally in use within the United Nations and various international organizations. A table of the various classifications may be found in annex V to the present report. The Committee noted in this connexion that, in a paper entitled "Developing countries and levels of development", which was prepared by the Secretariat for the Committee for Development Planning at its twelfth session in 1976, as referred to in paragraph 20 above, the following statement was made in regard to the characterization of developed and developing countries:

"While it has become an established practice to refer to countries as either developed or developing, or, in different circumstances as developed market economies, developing market economies or centrally planned economies,

the designations used do not in all cases apply to exactly the same groups of countries. It is also noteworthy that the classification of countries into groups is normally for essentially statistical and analytical purposes. Indeed there is no instance in which the characterization of countries as developed or developing is used as the sole basis for determining a country's eligibility to benefits under international assistance measures or concessions in other fields. In the case of the United Nations regular programme of technical assistance, as also of the United Nations Development Programme and the programmes of specialized agencies, the principle has always been followed that all nations which desire assistance will be considered for it. And, indeed, several countries normally characterized as developed or centrally planned economies, some of which themselves provide substantial development assistance, have requested and received assistance under a variety of such programmes in recent years. Similarly, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development is ready to lend to countries which it characterizes as developed. The International Monetary Fund, for its part, does not exclude any of its members from access to any of the various Fund facilities, as long as the conditions governing the operation of the relevant facility are met." (E/AC.54/L.81, p. 3)

44. In the absence of a single and universally accepted definition of countries to be designated as developing, the Committee found it difficult to implement the directive given it by the General Assembly with the degree of precision it would have wished. Nevertheless, in drawing up its recommendations for a scale, the Committee, as usual, paid particular attention to the least developed and the most seriously affected countries and attempted to act within the spirit of the General Assembly's resolution in other cases by keeping to a minimum the number of increases in the rates of assessments of countries generally considered to be developing. Furthermore, as will be shown in section V below, a substantial reduction in the burdens of most developing countries was realized through the normal operation of the low per capita income formula and the effect of the extension of the base period.

IV. REVIEW OF THE SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS

45. The General Assembly, by its resolution 31/95 B of 14 December 1976, adopted a scale of assessments for the year 1977. For the purpose of its present review, the Committee considered the possibility of a scale of one, two or three years' duration. In its judgement, however, the Committee felt that a two-year scale, encompassing the years 1978 and 1979, would give a degree of stability to the Organization by completing the triennial cycle which commenced with the year 1977.

46. The scale recommended for 1978 and 1979 includes three new Members (Angola, Samoa and Seychelles) admitted to membership in the United Nations by the General Assembly at its thirty-first session. Accordingly, it assesses 147 Member States.

A. Statistical information

47. In paragraphs 28 to 34 above, reference was made to the manner in which national income statistics in national currencies are compiled, compared and converted into a common currency unit. In the latter connexion, and for the period under review, the Committee used the following procedures for the years subsequent to 1969 and 1970 (in 1969 and 1970 exchange rates were as a rule at the par value of national currencies) for the conversion of national income estimates of the market economies into United States dollars. For those countries which had a single fluctuating exchange rate, the conversion rate used was normally the annual average of market rates shown by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) in its publication entitled International Financial Statistics. Those annual averages were prepared on the basis of market rates communicated to the Fund by the monetary authorities of the countries concerned. In the absence of a free market rate, use was made of the official exchange rate, being the rate at which the monetary authority of a country is obligated to support its currency by central bank intervention in order to maintain a predetermined parity vis-à-vis another currency. For the centrally planned economies, national income estimates were converted at rates communicated to the Secretariat by the Government concerned.

48. The population figures used by the Committee in calculating per capita national income were generally mid-year estimates assembled by the Statistical Office of the United Nations from replies of Governments to the United Nations Demographic Yearbook questionnaire, to the United Nations Monthly Bulletin of Statistics questionnaire, and from official publications. In the few instances where official information was lacking, estimates were obtained by the Statistical Office from other sources.

B. Comparative income per head of population

49. In using national income statistics for the measurement of Member States' relative capacity to pay, the Committee is required, under its original terms of reference, to take into account "comparative income per head of population". The question of a low per capita income allowance and the attention to be given by the Committee to developing countries has continued to be reflected in a number of decisions taken by the General Assembly.

50. At its 1976 session, the Committee recognized that economic changes, including inflationary pressures, had been such as to call for an adjusted low per capita income allowance. It recommended, therefore, and the General Assembly approved a scale of assessments for 1977 based on an adjusted formula consisting of an upper limit of \$1,800 and a maximum deduction of 70 per cent, ^{12/} thus increasing the progressive relief provided to low per capita income countries. The Committee took note at the time that it was as recently as in the scale for 1974-1976 that the formula had been increased from an upper limit of \$1,000 to \$1,500 and from a maximum deduction of 50 to 60 per cent. Prior to that adjustment the same formula had operated since 1953 or for 21 years.

51. At its current session the Committee re-examined the effect of the existing allowance formula for Member States with the per capita income levels indicated below.

Percentage scale based on averages of national income for
1969-1975

<u>Per capita income group</u>	<u>Before application of the formula</u>	<u>After application of the formula (\$1,800, 70 per cent)</u>	<u>Change in percentage points</u>	<u>Change in dollar terms a/</u>
Over \$2,500	59.79	63.78	+3.99	+15,863,794
\$2,000-\$2,499	3.27	3.64	+0.37	+1,471,079
\$1,500-\$1,999	16.19	17.64	+1.45	+5,765,038
\$1,000-\$1,499	2.38	2.18	-0.20	-795,178
\$500-\$999	6.77	4.45	-2.32	-9,224,061
Below \$500	11.60	8.31	-3.29	-13,080,672

a/ Based on the gross amount of \$397,588,829 assessed on Member States for the year 1977.

The Committee agreed that the possibility of changing the allowance formula would be studied at the time of its next review of the scale.

C. Special measures of relief in the scale

52. For its review of the scale, the Committee had before it the latest available

^{12/} The operation of the formula is as follows: the difference between \$1,800 and a per capita national income below that figure is expressed as a ratio of \$1,800, with 70 per cent of that ratio applied as a percentage reduction from the total national income of a Member State for the purpose of assessment. Thus, when the per capita national income of a Member State is less than \$1,800, that State would receive a percentage reduction from its total national income, as illustrated below:

$$\frac{(1,800 - \text{per capita national income}) \times 70 \text{ per cent}}{1,800}$$

On the other hand, when the per capita national income of a Member State is equal to or greater than \$1,800, no change is made in that State's national income.

statistics on external public debt and its relationship to the current account of the balance of payments, as well as to the international reserves of individual countries. The Committee examined ratios of international reserves, external public debt and debt-servicing (interest payments and amortization) to earnings from the export of goods and services; also ratios of external public debt outstanding, new public debt and debt-servicing (interest payments and amortization) to international reserves. In formulating its recommendations for a scale of assessments for 1978 and 1979, the Committee paid particular attention to those developing countries so designated by the World Bank (World Debt Tables, 1976) that had to devote a substantial portion of their foreign earnings to the servicing of external public debts and, to the extent possible, it made downward adjustments in individual assessments.

53. In addition to the factor of external public indebtedness, the Committee, as is its customary practice, gave additional relief wherever possible to countries with very low per capita incomes. It also carefully considered and gave special attention to countries undergoing exceptional difficulties or dislocations, such as natural disasters and wars in years subsequent to the base period.

D. Mitigation of changes in the scale

54. Differences of opinion arose in the Committee over the justification of any further mitigations. In the view of some members, the adoption of the seven-year base period (which retarded significantly the effects of steep rises in national incomes in recent years due to domestic inflation not offset by appropriate exchange rate changes, the appreciation of currencies and other causes) and the application of the low per capita income allowance formula, in themselves, provided a sufficient measure of relief. They pointed out, furthermore, that, if increases between two successive scales which were justified by relative changes in national incomes were to be mitigated, then decreases justified on similar ground would not be possible. In the judgement of one member, such additional concessions as the Committee might give should be confined to countries within the LDC and MSA categories. Notwithstanding the views of these members, the Committee exercised its judgement, to the extent practicable, in alleviating increases in individual rates of assessment.

E. Representation on individual assessments

55. The Committee had before it representations from the Governments of Cuba, Cyprus, Greece, Israel, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Singapore, Spain and Uruguay.

56. In connexion with the representation of one Member State, its Government, the Committee was informed, had decided to send an expert, who would appear before the Committee to explain the economic situation of that State. In considering the matter, the Committee recognized the importance of having as complete information as possible from Member States. At the same time, it noted that existing arrangements gave Governments every opportunity of submitting to the Committee statistical data and such other relevant information as they might wish it to take into account in arriving at its recommendations. The Committee was of the view,

furthermore, that, if a procedure were adopted whereby representatives of Member States were given the possibility of appearing before the Committee, not only would it require that the Committee's sessions be of far greater duration, but it would also raise constitutional problems in that the Committee, which is responsible to the General Assembly as a whole, would instead be transformed into a negotiating committee vis-à-vis individual delegations. The Committee agreed, therefore, that its Chairman and Vice-Chairman would make themselves available if representatives of Member States wished to supplement orally the information before the Committee. Accordingly, oral presentations were made to the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee by representatives of Cuba, Israel, New Zealand, Portugal, Singapore and Spain.

57. In its review of the scale, the Committee examined in detail each of the representations it had received. The Committee arrived at the conclusion that the rates of assessment recommended for the Member States were justified in the light of the pertinent national economic data and of its terms of reference. In this regard, it noted that the introduction of a seven-year base period had served, in several instances, to mitigate the rapid growth in recent years of national income expressed in United States dollars which, in turn, had led to mitigation of the assessments of a great number of Member States. The Committee, furthermore, in keeping with its practice of taking account of natural disasters and other compelling economic factors, made certain downward adjustments in individual rates of assessments.

V. SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS

58. The scale of assessments recommended by the Committee for the years 1978 and 1979, together with the scale for 1976, which totals 100.12 per cent, and for 1977, appears in the table below (see end of sect. V). The Committee also felt it useful to append the scales of assessment approved for the years 1946 to date (see annex VI below).

59. In the preceding paragraphs, the Committee has attempted to respond in detail to General Assembly resolutions 31/95 A and 31/95 B and to the concern expressed by some representatives during the debate in the Fifth Committee. As explained in paragraph 9, however, the Committee's task was an exceptionally difficult one.

60. Paragraph 51 above clearly shows that in the application of the low per capita income allowance formula within the base period spanning the years 1969-1975, a total of 5.81 per cent of the scale has been transferred from countries with low per capita incomes to those with higher per capita incomes. Expressed in numerical terms, and prior to further concessions of relief which the Committee judged to be necessary, 70 Member States benefit from the operation of the formula within the extended base period. The Committee noted, moreover, that aside from the transfer of percentage points under the low per capita allowance formula, a not insignificant shift from low to high per capita income countries had taken place as a consequence of the extension of the base period to seven years.

61. Notwithstanding the automaticity of the relief to the low per capita income countries described above, the Committee paid special attention to developing countries and, in particular, to countries characterized as LDC and MSA, ensuring in each case that rates of assessment were adjusted downwards to the degree possible. For example, of the 24 Member States categorized as both LDC and MSA, the recommended rates of assessment of 23 are at 0.01 per cent. Of four Member States exclusively termed LDC, the proposed scale provides for all to be assessed at the floor. Lastly, of the 21 Members exclusively in the MSA category, 13 are shown at the floor in the recommended scale. For the remaining countries within the MSA category, the Committee ensured that rates of assessment in each case were below those which would have been derived on the basis of relative national incomes.

62. In the scale adopted by the General Assembly for 1977, a total of 81 Member States were assessed at the then existing floor of 0.02. In the scale now recommended, the rates of assessment for 66 Members are shown at the new floor of 0.01 per cent. On the basis of their national incomes and the principle of relative capacity to pay, the rates of assessment of a further 17 Members are shown at 0.02 per cent.

63. The action taken by the Committee in systematically providing relief to countries within the low per capita income ranges and to certain other countries whose rates of assessment had increased significantly between the 1974-1976 and 1977 scales reduced its ability to extend relief to a number of other Member States.

64. In considering the view expressed in the Fifth Committee regarding the

decreases in the assessments of certain developed countries, one member suggested that, in general, the rate of assessment of industrialized countries should not be lowered from one scale to another. Other members were of the opinion that each case should be judged on its own merits, bearing in mind that the economies of individual countries were subject to fluctuations and that their relative positions changed accordingly. Still other members doubted whether the continued lowering of the assessment of major industrialized countries was consistent with the terms of reference of the Committee. One member observed that in the proposed scale these effects were mainly automatic consequences of the Committee's decision to base its judgement of a Member State's capacity to pay on a seven-year base period when implementing the directives of the General Assembly. Additionally, another member pointed out that, in the 1977 scale, those 117 Member States who were termed developing countries by the UNEF/UNDOF formula were being assessed as a group 11.73 per cent of the Organization's budget. The remainder of the membership, 27 Member States, were assessed 88.27 per cent as a group. It was the opinion of this member that the continued existence of the Organization could be imperilled if the share of this relatively small number of Member States continued to expand towards 90 or 95 per cent of the expenses of the Organization.

65. General Assembly resolution 31/95 B calls upon the Committee to draw up future scales of assessments on the basis of "methods which avoid excessive variations of individual rates of assessment between two successive scales". The Committee was unable, in this connexion, to reach agreement on whether such excessive variations should be considered in terms of the scale for 1974-1976 or the scale for 1977. In considering individual rates of assessment, therefore, the Committee bore in mind both earlier scales, taking into account, at the same time, economic trends discernible for the future. As previously explained (see para. 38), since it was the conclusion of the Committee that the extension of the base period might arrest further sharp variations from the scale now recommended, it exercised its judgement in making such adjustments as it found to be appropriate in the case of those countries whose rates of assessment had increased most sharply in recent scales.

66. The Committee was cognizant of the General Assembly's request "to embody as appropriate in subsequent reports of the Committee the particular justification for any significant increases in the assessment of any Member State between two successive scales". The Committee was also aware that some Member States might measure their proposed increases against the 1977 scale; other Member States might use the 1974-1976 scale as their point of reference. Because of this uncertainty, it has been difficult for the Committee to meet the Assembly's request, but the examples given below may serve to illustrate some of the difficulties involved.

67. The assessment proposed for Spain is unchanged in relation to the 1977 scale, although significantly increased by 0.54 percentage points over 1974-1976. The reasons for this increase are threefold: (a) the steep increase, amounting to 91 per cent in national income, between 1969-1971 and 1972-1974, the two base periods used for formulating the 1974-1976 and 1977 scales, respectively; (b) the loss of relief under the low per capita income allowance formula between the 1974-1976 and 1977 scales, amounting to 24.2 per cent; and (c) the upward-revised estimates of national income for 1969, 1970 and 1971 available during the formulation of the 1977 scale, amounting to 11.5 per cent.

68. In the case of Iran, the proposed assessment has decreased to 0.40 per cent

from 0.43 per cent in the 1977 scale, although significantly increased in the present scale from 0.20 per cent in the 1974-1976 scale. This is explained by the sharp increase, amounting to 196 per cent, in national income between 1969-1971 and 1972-1974 and the loss of relief under the low per capita income allowance formula between the 1974-1976 and 1977 scales amounting to 11 per cent.

69. In the case of Singapore, the proposed assessment is unchanged in relation to the 1977 scale, although significantly increased to 0.08 per cent in the present scale from 0.04 per cent in the 1974-1976 scale. This is explained by the significant rise, amounting to 106 per cent, in national income between 1969-1971 and 1972-1974 and the loss of relief under the low per capita income allowance formula between the 1974-1976 and 1977 scales amounting to 21 per cent.

70. A number of members of the Committee voiced objections to various aspects of the scale formulated for 1978-1979. Three members could not lend their support unreservedly to the scale as a whole for the reasons given in section X of the present report. The Committee nevertheless decided that the scale, as recommended, represented the closest formulation it could devise in implementing the directives given it by the General Assembly.

Scale of assessments

	(1)	(2)	(3)
<u>Member State</u>	<u>1974-1976 scale</u>	<u>1977 scale</u>	<u>Scale recommended for 1978-1979</u>
Afghanistan	0.02	0.02	0.01
Albania	0.02	0.02	0.01
Algeria	0.08	0.10	0.10
Angola	-	-	0.02
Argentina	0.83	0.83	0.84
Australia	1.44	1.52	1.54
Austria	0.56	0.63	0.64
Bahamas	0.02	0.02	0.01
Bahrain	0.02	0.02	0.01
Bangladesh	0.08	0.04	0.04
Barbados	0.02	0.02	0.01
Belgium	1.05	1.07	1.08
Benin	0.02	0.02	0.01
Bhutan	0.02	0.02	0.01
Bolivia	0.02	0.02	0.01
Botswana	0.02	0.02	0.01
Brazil	0.77	1.04	1.04
Bulgaria	0.14	0.13	0.14
Burma	0.03	0.02	0.01
Burundi	0.02	0.02	0.01
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	0.46	0.40	0.41
Canada	3.18	2.96	3.04
Cape Verde	-	0.02	0.01
Central African Empire	0.02	0.02	0.01
Chad	0.02	0.02	0.01
Chile	0.14	0.09	0.09
China	5.50	5.50	5.50
Colombia	0.16	0.11	0.11
Comoros	-	0.02	0.01
Congo	0.02	0.02	0.01

Scale of assessments (continued)

<u>Member State</u>	(1)	(2)	(3)
	<u>1974-1976</u> <u>scale</u>	<u>1977</u> <u>scale</u>	<u>Scale</u> <u>recommended</u> <u>for 1978-1979</u>
Costa Rica	0.02	0.02	0.02
Cuba	0.11	0.13	0.11
Cyprus	0.02	0.02	0.01
Czechoslovakia	0.89	0.87	0.84
Democratic Kampuchea	0.02	0.02	0.01
Democratic Yemen	0.02	0.02	0.01
Denmark	0.63	0.63	0.64
Dominican Republic	0.02	0.02	0.02
Ecuador	0.02	0.02	0.02
Egypt	0.12	0.08	0.08
El Salvador	0.02	0.02	0.01
Equatorial Guinea	0.02	0.02	0.01
Ethiopia	0.02	0.02	0.01
Fiji	0.02	0.02	0.01
Finland	0.42	0.41	0.44
France	5.86	5.66	5.82
Gabon	0.02	0.02	0.01
Gambia	0.02	0.02	0.01
German Democratic Republic	1.22	1.35	1.33
Germany, Federal Republic of	7.10	7.74	7.70
Ghana	0.04	0.02	0.02
Greece	0.32	0.39	0.35
Grenada	0.02	0.02	0.01
Guatemala	0.03	0.02	0.02
Guinea	0.02	0.02	0.01
Guinea-Bissau	0.02	0.02	0.01
Guyana	0.02	0.02	0.01
Haiti	0.02	0.02	0.01
Honduras	0.02	0.02	0.01
Hungary	0.33	0.34	0.33
Iceland	0.02	0.02	0.02

Scale of assessments (continued)

<u>Member State</u>	(1)	(2)	(3)
	<u>1974-1976 scale</u>	<u>1977 scale</u>	<u>Scale recommended for 1978-1979</u>
India	1.20	0.70	0.68
Indonesia	0.19	0.14	0.14
Iran	0.20	0.43	0.40
Iraq	0.05	0.10	0.08
Ireland	0.15	0.15	0.15
Israel	0.21	0.24	0.23
Italy	3.60	3.30	3.38
Ivory Coast	0.02	0.02	0.02
Jamaica	0.02	0.02	0.02
Japan	7.15	8.66	8.64
Jordan	0.02	0.02	0.01
Kenya	0.02	0.02	0.01
Kuwait	0.09	0.16	0.15
Lao People's Democratic Republic . .	0.02	0.02	0.01
Lebanon	0.03	0.03	0.03
Lesotho	0.02	0.02	0.01
Liberia	0.02	0.02	0.01
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	0.11	0.17	0.16
Luxembourg	0.04	0.04	0.04
Madagascar	0.02	0.02	0.01
Malawi	0.02	0.02	0.01
Malaysia	0.07	0.09	0.09
Maldives	0.02	0.02	0.01
Mali	0.02	0.02	0.01
Malta	0.02	0.02	0.01
Mauritania	0.02	0.02	0.01
Mauritius	0.02	0.02	0.01
Mexico	0.86	0.78	0.79
Mongolia	0.02	0.02	0.01
Morocco	0.06	0.05	0.05
Mozambique	-	0.02	0.02

Scale of assessments (continued)

<u>Member State</u>	(1)	(2)	(3)
	<u>1974-1976 scale</u>	<u>1977 scale</u>	<u>Scale recommended for 1978-1979</u>
Nepal	0.02	0.02	0.01
Netherlands	1.24	1.38	1.42
New Zealand	0.28	0.28	0.26
Nicaragua	0.02	0.02	0.01
Niger	0.02	0.02	0.01
Nigeria	0.10	0.13	0.13
Norway	0.43	0.43	0.45
Oman	0.02	0.02	0.01
Pakistan	0.14	0.06	0.07
Panama	0.02	0.02	0.02
Papua New Guinea	-	0.02	0.01
Paraguay	0.02	0.02	0.01
Peru	0.07	0.06	0.06
Philippines	0.18	0.10	0.10
Poland	1.26	1.40	1.39
Portugal	0.15	0.20	0.19
Qatar	0.02	0.02	0.02
Romania	0.30	0.26	0.24
Rwanda	0.02	0.02	0.01
Samoa	-	-	0.01
Sao Tome and Principe	-	0.02	0.01
Saudi Arabia	0.06	0.24	0.23
Senegal	0.02	0.02	0.01
Seychelles	-	-	0.01
Sierra Leone	0.02	0.02	0.01
Singapore	0.04	0.08	0.08
Somalia	0.02	0.02	0.01
South Africa	0.50	0.40	0.42
Spain	0.99	1.53	1.53
Sri Lanka	0.03	0.02	0.02
Sudan	0.02	0.02	0.01
Surinam	-	0.02	0.01

Scale of assessments (continued)

	(1)	(2)	(3)
<u>Member State</u>	<u>1974-1976</u> <u>scale</u>	<u>1977</u> <u>scale</u>	<u>Scale</u> <u>recommended</u> <u>for 1978-1979</u>
Swaziland	0.02	0.02	0.01
Sweden	1.30	1.20	1.24
Syrian Arab Republic	0.02	0.02	0.02
Thailand	0.11	0.10	0.10
Togo	0.02	0.02	0.01
Trinidad and Tobago	0.02	0.02	0.03
Tunisia	0.02	0.02	0.02
Turkey	0.29	0.30	0.30
Uganda	0.02	0.02	0.01
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic .	1.71	1.50	1.53
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics .	12.97	11.33	11.60
United Arab Emirates	0.02	0.08	0.07
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	5.31	4.44	4.52
United Republic of Cameroon	0.02	0.02	0.01
United Republic of Tanzania	0.02	0.02	0.01
United States of America	25.00	25.00	25.00
Upper Volta	0.02	0.02	0.01
Uruguay	0.06	0.04	0.04
Venezuela	0.32	0.40	0.39
Yemen	0.02	0.02	0.01
Yugoslavia	0.34	0.38	0.39
Zaire	0.02	0.02	0.02
Zambia	0.02	0.02	0.02
Grand total	<u>100.12</u>	<u>100.00</u>	<u>100.00</u>

VI. ASSESSMENT OF NEW MEMBERS FOR 1976 AND 1977

71. Under the terms of rule 160 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, 13/ the Committee is called upon to advise the Assembly on assessments to be fixed for new Members. At the same time, regulation 5.8 of the Financial Regulations of the United Nations provides that "new Members shall be required to make a contribution for the year in which they become Members and to provide their proportion of the total advances to the Working Capital Fund at rates to be determined by the General Assembly".

72. At the thirty-first session of the General Assembly, three States were admitted to membership in the Organization. The new Members, their dates of admission and the related General Assembly resolution are shown below:

<u>Member State</u>	<u>Date of admission</u>	<u>General Assembly resolution</u>
Seychelles	21 September 1976	31/1
Angola	1 December 1976	31/44
Samoa	15 December 1976	31/104

73. Under the provisions of General Assembly resolution 69 (I) of 14 December 1946, new Members are required to contribute to the annual budget of the year in which they are admitted at least 33.33 per cent of their percentage of assessment determined for the following year, applied to the budget for the year of admission. However, by subsequent decisions of the Assembly, exceptions have been made to the one-third rule, with the prescribed minimum having been reduced to one ninth for the majority of States newly admitted to membership in the Organization since 1955.

74. The United Nations scale of assessments for the year 1977, as established by the General Assembly in resolution 31/95 B of 14 December 1976, was based on national income and related data for the years 1972, 1973 and 1974. On the same basis, and after exercising its practice of granting downward adjustments in individual cases, the Committee recommends that the States admitted to membership in the Organization in 1976 be assessed at the rate of 0.02 per cent for 1977 and at the rate of one ninth of 0.02 per cent for 1976. The Committee further recommends that, for 1976 and 1977, the contributions of the new Members be applied to the same basis of assessment as for other Member States, except that in the case of appropriations approved under General Assembly resolution 3374 B (XXX) of 28 November 1975, under section II of Assembly resolution 3374 C (XXX) of 2 December 1975 and under Assembly resolutions 31/5 C and 31/5 D of 22 December 1976 for the financing of the United Nations Emergency Force and the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force, the contributions of those States (in accordance with the group to which the new Members may be assigned by the Assembly) should be calculated in proportion to the calendar year.

13/ A/520/Rev.12 and Rev.12/Amend.1 (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.74.I.6).

VII. ASSESSMENT OF NON-MEMBER STATES

75. By its resolution 31/95 B of 14 December 1976, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Committee on Contributions, decided that the following States, which are not Members of the United Nations but which participate in certain of its activities, should contribute towards the 1977 expenses of such activities at the following rates:

	<u>Percentage rates</u>
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	0.05
Holy See	0.02
Liechtenstein	0.02
Monaco	0.02
Nauru	0.02
Republic of Korea	0.13
San Marino	0.02
Switzerland	0.96
Tonga	0.02

76. The percentage rates for States not Members of the United Nations are calculated in the same manner and follow the same basic principles as are applied by the Committee in the assessment of Members. In reviewing the rates of assessment at which non-member States should be called upon to contribute towards the 1978 and 1979 expenses of the United Nations activities in which they participate, the Committee used national income statistics for the years 1969-1975, adjusted by the application of the same allowance formula for low per capita income as for the assessment of Member States. Similarly, where the Committee was required to recommend rates of assessment for the years 1974-1976 and 1977, it based its recommendations on national income statistics for the periods 1969-1971 and 1972-1974, respectively. In accordance with its normal practice, the percentage rates of non-member States were computed by relating the adjusted national income of each country to the combined adjusted national income of those Member States not subject to the "ceiling" and "floor" provisions. The Committee considered also a representation submitted by the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam.

77. Angola, which became a Member of the United Nations on 1 December 1976, participated in the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) with effect from 19 May 1976. Accordingly, the Committee recommends that, for 1976, Angola shall be called upon to contribute towards the expenses of UNCTAD at the rate of one half of 0.02 per cent.

78. The Committee recalled that, at its thirty-sixth session in 1976, it had recommended to the General Assembly rates of assessment, for the years 1977-1979,

for the Republic of South Viet Nam 14/ and for the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam. On 2 July 1976, following the conclusion of the Committee's session, the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam succeeded to the States previously existing in that country. Accordingly, the recommendations of the Committee with respect to the Republic of South Viet-Nam and the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam were omitted in Assembly resolution 31/95 B.

79. For the year 1976 the Committee recommends that, notwithstanding the provisions of subparagraph (f) of General Assembly resolution 3062 (XXVIII), which established a rate of assessment for the Republic of South Viet-Nam 15/ for that year, the Republic of South Viet-Nam shall be called upon to contribute to the expenses of those United Nations activities in which it participated from 1 January to 1 July 1976 at the rate of one half of 0.06 per cent; and that, with effect from 2 July 1976, the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam be called upon to contribute to the expenses of those United Nations activities in which it participated at the rate of one half of 0.02 per cent.

80. For the year 1977, the Committee recommends that the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam be called upon to contribute to the expenses of those United Nations activities in which it participated at the rate of 0.03 per cent.

81. In connexion with the assessment of non-member States, the attention of the Committee was also drawn to the change in status, with effect from December 1975, of the Holy See from Representative to Observer to the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO). Accordingly, the Committee recommends that, notwithstanding the provisions of subparagraph (f) of General Assembly resolution 3062 (XXVIII) and subparagraph (h) of Assembly resolution 31/95 B, the Holy See should not be required to contribute towards the 1976 and 1977 expenses of UNIDO.

82. The Committee's recommendations as to the percentage rates at which non-member States may be called upon to contribute towards the 1978 and 1979 expenses of the activities in which they participate are set forth below:

	<u>Percentage rates recommended for 1978-1979</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	0.13
San Marino	0.01
Socialist Republic of Viet Nam	0.03

14/ Formerly the Republic of Viet-Nam.

15/ Idem.

Percentage rates
recommended for
1978-1979

Switzerland	0.96
Tonga	0.01

83. The related United Nations activities to the expenses of which the participating non-Member States shall be required to contribute for 1978 and 1979 on the basis of the rates recommended in the preceding paragraph are listed below:

(a) International Court of Justice:

Liechtenstein,
San Marino,
Switzerland;

(b) International Control of Narcotic Drugs:

Holy See,
Liechtenstein,
Monaco,
Republic of Korea,
Socialist Republic of Viet Nam,
Switzerland,
Tonga;

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

Republic of Korea,
Socialist Republic of Viet Nam;

(d) Economic Commission for Europe:

Switzerland;

(e) United Nations Conference on Trade and Development:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea,
Holy See,
Liechtenstein,
Monaco,
Republic of Korea,
Socialist Republic of Viet Nam,
San Marino,
Switzerland;

(f) United Nations Industrial Development Organization:

Liechtenstein,

Monaco,

Republic of Korea,

Socialist Republic of Viet Nam,

Switzerland.

84. 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.

85. At the same time, the Committee wishes to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the fact that the rates recommended in paragraphs 77, 79, 80 and 82 may also be utilized for any other United Nations activity in which non-member States might participate and to which they may be required to contribute.

VIII. OTHER MATTERS CONSIDERED BY THE COMMITTEE

A. Collection of contributions

86. Under its terms of reference, one of the functions of the Committee is "to consider and report to the General Assembly on the action to be taken with regard to Article 19 of the Charter", which reads as follows:

"A Member of the United Nations which is in arrears in the payment of its financial contributions to the Organization shall have no vote in the General Assembly if the amount of its arrears equals or exceeds the amount of the contributions due from it for the preceding two full years. The General Assembly may, nevertheless, permit such a Member to vote if it is satisfied that the failure to pay is due to conditions beyond the control of the Member."

87. The Committee took note of a report of the Secretary-General which showed that, at the conclusion of its session, eight Member States - the Central African Empire, the Congo, Democratic Kampuchea, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Nicaragua, Paraguay and South Africa - were in arrears in the payment of their contributions to the expenses of the United Nations within the terms of Article 19. The Committee decided, in regard to this question, to authorize its Chairman to issue an addendum to the present report, should it be necessary.

88. In addition, and on the basis of information conveyed by the Secretariat, the Committee took note of the position taken by Democratic Kampuchea in the foregoing regard. In a communication dated 20 July 1977, the Secretariat was informed by Democratic Kampuchea that it had reoccupied its seat at the United Nations only in May 1975. Prior to 7 April 1975 and since the beginning of 1970, the United Nations, it was stated, had recognized the previous régime as its lawful Member. For the reason given, the Government of Democratic Kampuchea has indicated that it cannot regard as pertinent requests made for the payment of arrear contributions.

89. At the time of the preparation of the Committee's report, United Nations records show the following assessed contributions due from Democratic Kampuchea:

	<u>\$US</u>
United Nations regular budget	241,957.82
United Nations Emergency Force (1973) and the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force	<u>14,513.00</u>
	256,470.82

The amount of contributions shown above as due exceeded on 1 January 1977 assessed contributions for 1975 and 1976 by \$36,982.82.

90. Given the legal and political implications of the position taken by Democratic Kampuchea, the Committee agreed that to give advice at this stage on the course of action to be taken regarding the amount of arrear contributions of that Member State would transcend its terms of reference. Accordingly, the Committee was of the opinion that the question was one for the General Assembly to resolve.

B. Payment of contributions in currencies other than United States dollars

91. By its resolution 31/95 B, the General Assembly authorized the Secretary-General 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 year 1977 in currencies other than United States dollars.

92. At its present session, the Committee considered a report of the Secretary-General on the arrangements made for payments by Member States of their 1977 contributions in currencies other than United States dollars. The Committee noted that 11 Member States had availed themselves of the opportunity of paying the equivalent of \$4.4 million in 8 of the 19 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.

93. The Committee recommends that the Secretary-General should continue to be authorized to make similar arrangements for the years 1978 and 1979.

C. Scale of contributions for specialized agencies

94. The General Assembly, by its resolution 311 B (IV) of 24 November 1949, authorized the Committee "to recommend or advise on the scale of contributions for a specialized agency if requested by that agency to do so".

95. In considering requests for advice received from the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the World Health Organization (WHO) and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), the Committee decided to provide these agencies, as requested, with the rates of assessment recommended by the Committee for Members of the United Nations and with theoretical rates of assessment for States that are not Members of the United Nations, but are members of such agencies.

D. Statements requested by the Fifth Committee

96. In accordance with the wishes of the Fifth Committee, the Committee on Contributions has arranged for a statement of assessed and voluntary contributions paid by both Member and non-member States to the United Nations, the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency, in each of the years 1975 and 1976, to be issued as an addendum to the present report.

E. Date of the next session of the Committee

97. The Committee decided that, on the basis of the work programme currently envisaged, it would meet for a period of three weeks from 15 May to 2 June 1978 in New York. The Committee's decision to extend by one week the normal duration of its session in a year in which it assumes that it will not be called upon to undertake a review of the scale of assessments not only recognizes the inevitability of more prolonged discussions in a Committee which has been enlarged from 13 to 18 members, but also takes into account its experience of the past two years (since which time full translation of its documentation has become necessary) as to the time consumed in the preparation and translation of its report.

IX. RECOMMENDATION OF THE COMMITTEE

98. 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:

(a) The scale of assessments for the contributions of Member States to the United Nations budget for the financial years 1978 and 1979 shall be as follows:

<u>Member State</u>	<u>Per cent</u>
Afghanistan	0.01
Albania	0.01
Algeria	0.10
Angola	0.02
Argentina	0.84
Australia	1.54
Austria	0.64
Bahamas	0.01
Bahrain	0.01
Bangladesh	0.04
Barbados	0.01
Belgium	1.08
Benin	0.01
Bhutan	0.01
Bolivia	0.01
Botswana	0.01
Brazil	1.04
Bulgaria	0.14
Burma	0.01
Burundi	0.01
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	0.41
Canada	3.04

<u>Member State</u>	<u>Per cent</u>
Cape Verde	0.01
Central African Empire	0.01
Chad	0.01
Chile	0.09
China	5.50
Colombia	0.11
Comoros	0.01
Congo	0.01
Costa Rica	0.02
Cuba	0.11
Cyprus	0.01
Czechoslovakia	0.84
Democratic Kampuchea	0.01
Democratic Yemen	0.01
Denmark	0.64
Dominican Republic	0.02
Ecuador	0.02
Egypt	0.08
El Salvador	0.01
Equatorial Guinea	0.01
Ethiopia	0.01
Fiji	0.01
Finland	0.44
France	5.82
Gabon	0.01
Gambia	0.01
German Democratic Republic	1.33
Germany, Federal Republic of	7.70
Ghana	0.02
Greece	0.35
Grenada	0.01
Guatemala	0.02
Guinea	0.01
Guinea-Bissau	0.01
Guyana	0.01

<u>Member State</u>	<u>Per cent</u>
Haiti	0.01
Honduras	0.01
Hungary	0.33
Iceland	0.02
India	0.68
Indonesia	0.14
Iran	0.40
Iraq	0.08
Ireland	0.15
Israel	0.23
Italy	3.38
Ivory Coast	0.02
Jamaica	0.02
Japan	8.64
Jordan	0.01
Kenya	0.01
Kuwait	0.15
Lao People's Democratic Republic	0.01
Lebanon	0.03
Lesotho	0.01
Liberia	0.01
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	0.16
Luxembourg	0.04
Madagascar	0.01
Malawi	0.01
Malaysia	0.09
Maldives	0.01
Mali	0.01
Malta	0.01
Mauritania	0.01
Mauritius	0.01
Mexico	0.79
Mongolia	0.01
Morocco	0.05
Mozambique	0.02

<u>Member State</u>	<u>Per cent</u>
Nepal	0.01
Netherlands	1.42
New Zealand	0.26
Nicaragua	0.01
Niger	0.01
Nigeria	0.13
Norway	0.45
Oman	0.01
Pakistan	0.07
Panama	0.02
Papua New Guinea	0.01
Paraguay	0.01
Peru	0.06
Philippines	0.10
Poland	1.39
Portugal	0.19
Qatar	0.02
Romania	0.24
Rwanda	0.01
Samoa	0.01
Sao Tome and Principe	0.01
Saudi Arabia	0.23
Senegal	0.01
Seychelles	0.01
Sierra Leone	0.01
Singapore	0.08
Somalia	0.01
South Africa	0.42
Spain	1.53
Sri Lanka	0.02
Sudan	0.01
Surinam	0.01
Swaziland	0.01
Sweden	1.24
Syrian Arab Republic	0.02

<u>Member State</u>	<u>Per cent</u>
Thailand	0.10
Togo	0.01
Trinidad and Tobago	0.03
Tunisia	0.02
Turkey	0.30
Uganda	0.01
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	1.53
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	11.60
United Arab Emirates	0.07
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	4.52
United Republic of Cameroon	0.01
United Republic of Tanzania	0.01
United States of America	25.00
Upper Volta	0.01
Uruguay	0.04
Venezuela	0.39
Yemen	0.01
Yugoslavia	0.39
Zaire	0.02
Zambia	0.02
Grand total	<u>100.00</u>

(b) Subject to rule 160 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the scale of assessments given in subparagraph (a) above shall be reviewed by the Committee on Contributions in 1979, when a report shall be submitted to the Assembly for its consideration at its thirty-fourth session;

(c) 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 1978 and 1979 in currencies other than United States dollars;

(d) For the year 1976, Seychelles, Angola and Samoa, which became members of the United Nations on 21 September, 1 December and 15 December 1976, respectively, shall contribute amounts equal to one ninth of 0.02 per cent;

(e) For the year 1977, Seychelles, Angola and Samoa shall contribute amounts equal to 0.02 per cent;

(f) The contributions of the three new Member States for 1976 and 1977 shall

be applied to the same basis of assessment as for other Member States, except that in the case of appropriations approved under General Assembly resolution 3374 B (XXX) of 28 November 1975, under section II of Assembly resolution 3374 C (XXX) of 2 December 1975 and under Assembly resolutions 31/5 C and 31/5 D of 22 December 1976, for the financing of the United Nations Emergency Force and of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force, the contributions of those States, in accordance with the group of contributors to which they may be assigned by the Assembly, shall be calculated in proportion to the calendar year;

(g) Subject to 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 1978 and 1979 expenses of such activities on the basis of the following rates:

<u>Non-member States</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	0.13
San Marino	0.01
Socialist Republic of Viet Nam	0.03
Switzerland	0.96
Tonga	0.01

the following countries being called upon to contribute to the:

(i) International Court of Justice:

Liechtenstein,
San Marino,
Switzerland;

(ii) International control of narcotic drugs:

Holy See,
Liechtenstein,
Monaco,
Republic of Korea,
Socialist Republic of Viet Nam,
Switzerland,
Tonga;

(iii) Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific:

Republic of Korea,
Socialist Republic of Viet Nam;

(iv) Economic Commission for Europe:

Switzerland;

(v) United Nations Conference on Trade and Development:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea,
Holy See,
Liechtenstein,
Monaco,
Republic of Korea,
Socialist Republic of Viet Nam,
San Marino,
Switzerland;

(vi) United Nations Industrial Development Organization:

Liechtenstein,
Monaco,
Republic of Korea,
Socialist Republic of Viet Nam,
Switzerland;

(h) Angola, which became a Member of the United Nations on 1 December 1976 but which participated in the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development with effect from 19 May 1976, shall be called upon to contribute towards the 1976 expenses of the Conference at the rate of one half of 0.02 per cent;

(i) Notwithstanding the provisions of subparagraph (f) of General Assembly resolution 3062 (XXVIII) of 9 November 1973, the Republic of South Viet Nam 16/ shall be called upon to contribute towards the 1976 expenses of those United Nations activities in which it participated at the rate of one half of 0.06 per cent, and the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam shall contribute towards the 1976 and 1977 expenses of the activities in which it participated at the rate of one half of 0.02 per cent and at 0.03 per cent, respectively;

(j) Notwithstanding the provisions of subparagraph (f) of General Assembly resolution 3062 (XXVIII) and subparagraph (h) of Assembly resolution 31/95 B, the Holy See, by virtue of its change in status from Representative to Observer to the United Nations Industrial Development Organization with effect from December 1975 shall not be called upon to contribute towards the expenses of that organization for the calendar years 1976 and 1977.

16/ Formerly the Republic of Viet-Nam.

X. SEPARATE OPINIONS

99. To the extent that the Committee made downward adjustments in the assessment rates of developing countries whose rates had increased sharply in recent scales beyond those provided by the extension of the base period, Mr. Hennes was unable to associate himself with this action. He believed that in these cases an insufficient distinction had been made between developing countries in serious financial difficulties and developing countries with huge national incomes and sizable amounts of available foreign currency.

100. Mr. Koschorreck and Mr. Rhodes, although recognizing the dilemma posed by the conflicting views and interests voiced by the membership of the United Nations, as reflected in the two resolutions, believed that some of the assessments recommended depart essentially from the principle of capacity to pay. In this connexion, they noted that General Assembly resolution 31/95 A reaffirmed that the capacity of Member States to contribute towards the payment of budgetary expenses of the United Nations is the fundamental criterion on which scales of assessment are to be based.

101. They fully accepted the additional reliefs given by the Committee when assessing the least developed of the developing countries and those most seriously affected which, together with the reduction of the floor to 0.01 per cent, are consistent with that principle.

102. They were not, however, persuaded (see para. 40 above) that the granting of reliefs over and above the benefits conferred by the extension of the base period was justified in the case of the more advanced developing countries and those described by Mr. Hennes as having huge national incomes and sizable amounts of available foreign currency. Apart from being inconsistent with the principle of capacity to pay, these artificial and arbitrary adjustments were made at the expense of Member States in the higher income category irrespective of their economic condition. Moreover, they are likely to aggravate rather than ameliorate the situation when future scales of assessment come to be formulated.

ANNEX I

Terms of reference of the Committee

A. Original terms of reference

The original terms of reference of the Committee on Contributions are contained in chapter IX, section 2, paragraphs 13 and 14, of the report of the Preparatory Commission of the United Nations a/ and in the report of the Fifth Committee of 11 February 1946, b/ and were adopted at the first part of the first session of the General Assembly on 13 February 1946 (resolution 14 (I), para. 3). The relevant paragraphs are as follows:

"The apportionment of expenses

"...

"13. The expenses of the United Nations should be apportioned broadly according to the capacity to pay. It is, however, difficult to measure such capacity merely by statistical means, and impossible to arrive at any definite formula. Comparative estimates of national income would appear prima facie to be the fairest guide. The main factors which should be taken into account in order to prevent anomalous assessments resulting from the use of comparative estimates of national income include:

"(a) Comparative income per head of population;

"(b) Temporary dislocation of national economies arising out of the Second World War;

"(c) The ability of Members to secure foreign currency.

"Two opposite tendencies should also be guarded against: some Members may desire unduly to minimize their contributions, whereas others may desire to increase them unduly for reasons of prestige. If a ceiling is imposed on contributions the ceiling should not be such as seriously to obscure the relation between a nation's contributions and its capacity to pay. The Committee should be given discretion to consider all data relevant to capacity to pay and all other pertinent factors in arriving at its recommendations. Once a scale has been fixed by the General Assembly it should not be subjected to a general revision for at least three years or unless it is clear that there have been substantial changes in relative capacities to pay.

a/ Report of the Preparatory Commission of the United Nations (PC/20).

b/ Official Records of the General Assembly, First Part of the First Session, Plenary Meetings, annex 19 (A/44).

"14. Other functions of the Committee would be:

"(a) To make recommendations to the General Assembly on the contributions to be paid by new Members;

"(b) To consider and report to the General Assembly on appeals by Members for a change of assessment; and

"(c) To consider and report to the General Assembly on the action to be taken if Members fall into default with their contributions.

"In connexion with the latter, the Committee should advise the Assembly in regard to the application of Article 19 of the Charter."

B. Resolution 238 A (III) adopted by the General Assembly on 18 November 1948

"The General Assembly,

"Recognizing

"(a) That in normal times no one Member State should contribute more than one third of the ordinary expenses of the United Nations for any one year,

"(b) That in normal times the per capita contribution of any Member should not exceed the per capita contribution of the Member which bears the highest assessment,

"(c) That the Committee on Contributions needs for its work more adequate statistical data,

"Accordingly

"1. Reaffirms the terms of reference of the Committee on Contributions accepted by the General Assembly in its resolution of 13 February 1946 (resolution 14 (I), A, 3);

"2. Calls upon Member States to assist the Committee on Contributions by providing the available statistics and other information essential to its work;

"3. Accepts the principle of a ceiling to be fixed on the percentage rate of contributions of the Member State bearing the highest assessment;

"4. Instructs the Committee on Contributions, until a more permanent scale is proposed for adoption to recommend how additional contributions resulting from (a) admission of new Members and (b) increases in the relative capacity of Members to pay, can be used to remove existing maladjustments in the present scale or otherwise used to reduce the rates of contributions of present Members;

"5. Decides that when existing maladjustments in the present scale have been removed and a more permanent scale is proposed, as world economic conditions improve, the rate of contribution which shall be the ceiling for the highest assessment shall be fixed by the General Assembly."

C. Resolution 582 (VI) adopted by the General Assembly
on 21 December 1951

"The General Assembly,

"...

"Resolves:

"...

"3. That the review to be undertaken in 1952 by the Committee on Contributions shall be based on the General Assembly resolutions c/ relating to the criteria for determining the scale of assessments, on the views expressed by Members during the sixth session of the General Assembly, and on rule 159 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, with particular attention to countries with low per capita income which requires special consideration in this connexion;"

D. Resolution 665 (VII) adopted by the General Assembly
on 5 December 1952

"The General Assembly,

"...

"1. Notes with satisfaction the action taken by the Committee on Contributions to implement the recommendations of General Assembly resolution 582 (VI) of 21 December 1951 by giving additional recognition to countries with low per capita income, and urges the Committee to continue to do so in the future;

"2. Instructs the Committee on Contributions to defer further action on the per capita ceiling until new Members are admitted or substantial improvement in the economic capacity of existing Members permits the adjustments to be gradually absorbed in the scale;

"3. Decides that from 1 January 1954 the assessment of the largest contributor shall not exceed one third of total assessments against Members;"

c/ See resolutions 14 A (I), 69 (I) and 238 A (III).

E. Resolution 876 A (IX) adopted by the General Assembly
on 4 December 1954

"The General Assembly,

"1. Reaffirms the decision d/ of the General Assembly at its seventh session to defer further action on the per capita ceiling until new Members are admitted or substantial improvement in the economic capacity of existing Members permits the adjustments to be gradually absorbed in the scale of assessments;

"2. Reaffirms resolution 582 (VI) of 21 December 1951, by which the Committee on Contributions was requested to give additional recognition to countries with low per capita income, and instructs the Committee to continue to do so in the future;

"3. Instructs the Committee on Contributions to apply the decision referred to in paragraph 1 above to future scale of assessments, so that the percentage contributions of those Members subject to the per capita principle will be frozen against any increase over the level approved for the 1955 budget until they reach per capita parity with the highest contributor and that downward adjustments will occur when the conditions cited in resolution 665 (VII) of 5 December 1952 have been fulfilled or changes in relative national incomes warrant lower assessments."

F. Resolution 1137 (XII) adopted by the General Assembly
on 14 October 1957

"The General Assembly,

"Recalling its resolution 14 (I) of 13 February 1946, 238 (III) of 18 November 1948 and 665 (VII) of 5 December 1952, regarding the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations among its Members and the fixing of the maximum contribution of any one Member State,

"Noting that, when the maximum contribution of any one Member State was fixed at 33.33 per cent effective 1 January 1954, the United Nations consisted of sixty Member States;

"Noting further that, since 1 January 1954, twenty-two States have been admitted to membership in the United Nations,

"Recalling its resolution 1087 (XI) of 21 December 1956, whereby the percentage contributions of the first sixteen new Member States admitted since 1 January 1954 were incorporated into the regular scale of assessments for 1956 and 1957 and were applied to reduce the percentage contributions of all Member States except that of the highest contributor and those of the Member States paying minimum assessments,

"Noting that there are now six new Member States - Ghana, Japan, Malaya (Federation of), Morocco, Sudan and Tunisia - whose percentage contributions have not yet been fixed by the Committee on Contributions or incorporated into the 100 per cent scale of assessments,

d/ See resolution 665 (VII).

"Decides that:

"1. In principle, the maximum contribution of any one Member State to the ordinary expenses of the United Nations shall not exceed 30 per cent of the total;

"...

"3. The Committee on Contributions shall take the following steps in preparing scales of assessment for 1958 and subsequent years:

"(a) The percentage contributions fixed by the Committee on Contributions for Ghana, Japan, Malaya (Federation of), Morocco, Sudan and Tunisia for 1958 shall be incorporated into the 100 per cent scale for 1958; this incorporation shall be accomplished by applying the total amount of the percentage contributions of the six Member States named above to a pro rata reduction of the percentage contributions of all Members except those assessed at the minimum rate, taking into account the per capita ceiling principle and any reductions which may be required as a result of a review by the Committee on Contributions, at its session commencing 15 October 1957, of appeals from recommendations made previously by that Committee;

"(b) During the three-year period of the next scale of assessments, (1959-1961), further steps to reduce the share of the largest contributor shall be recommended by the Committee on Contributions when new Member States are admitted;

"(c) The Committee on Contributions shall thereafter recommend such additional steps as may be necessary and appropriate to complete the reduction;

"(d) The percentage contribution of Member States shall not in any case be increased as a consequence of the present resolution."

G. Resolution 1927 (XVIII) adopted by the General Assembly on 11 December 1963

"The General Assembly,

"...

"2. Requests the Committee on Contributions, in calculating rates of assessment, to give due attention to the developing countries in view of their special economic and financial problems;".

H. Resolution 2118 (XX) adopted by the General Assembly on 21 December 1965

"The General Assembly,

"...

"2. Notes with appreciation the action taken by the Committee on Contributions to meet the request made in General Assembly resolution 1927 (XVIII) with respect to the attention due to the developing countries, and requests the Committee, in calculating rates of assessments, to continue its efforts to give due attention to the situation of those countries in view of their special economic and financial problems."

I. Resolution 2961 B (XXVII) adopted by the General Assembly on 13 December 1972

"The General Assembly,

"Recalling its resolution 14 (I) of 13 February 1946, 238 (III) of 18 November 1948, 665 (VII) of 5 December 1952 and 1137 (XII) of 14 October 1957 relating to the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations among its Members and the fixing of the maximum contribution of any one Member State,

"Affirming that the capacity of Member States to contribute towards the payment of the ordinary expenses of the United Nations is a fundamental criterion on which scales of assessment are based,

"Noting that, when it was decided by the General Assembly in 1957 that, in principle, the maximum contribution by any one Member State to the ordinary expenses of the United Nations should not exceed 30 per cent of the total, the United Nations consisted of eighty-two Member States,

"Noting further that, since the General Assembly decision of 1957, fifty States have been admitted to membership in the United Nations,

"Recalling that, since the General Assembly decision of 1957, there has been a reduction in the percentage contribution of the State paying the maximum contribution from 33.33 per cent to 31.52 per cent,

"Decides that:

"(a) As a matter of principle, the maximum contribution of any one Member State to the ordinary expenses of the United Nations shall not exceed 25 per cent of the total;

"(b) In preparing scales of assessment for future years, the Committee on Contributions shall implement subparagraph (a) above as soon as practicable so as to reduce to 25 per cent the percentage contribution of the Member State paying the maximum contribution, utilizing for this purpose to the extent necessary:

"(i) The percentage contributions of any newly admitted Member States immediately upon their admission;

"(ii) The normal triennial increase in the percentage contributions of Member States resulting from increases in their national incomes;

"(c) Notwithstanding subparagraph (b) above, the percentage

contribution of Member States shall not in any case in the United Nations, the specialized agencies or the International Atomic Energy Agency be increased as a consequence of the present resolution."

J. Resolution 2961 C (XXVII) adopted by the
General Assembly on 13 December 1972

"The General Assembly,

"Recalling its resolutions 582 (VI) of 21 December 1951, 665 (VII) of 5 December 1952, 876 A (IX) of 4 December 1954, 1927 (XVIII) of 11 December 1963 and 2118 (XX) of 21 December 1965 relating to the additional recognition to be given to low per capita income countries and to the attention to be given to the developing countries in the calculation of their rates of assessment,

"Having considered the report of the Committee on Contributions on its thirty-second session, e/

"Noting the views of the Committee on Contributions on the question of allowance for low per capita income, expressed in paragraph 21 of its report,

"1. Reaffirms its previous directives to the Committee on Contributions regarding the additional recognition to be given to the low per capita income countries and the attention to be given to the developing countries in the calculation of their rates of assessment;

"2. Requests the Committee on Contributions, at its next review of the scale of assessments, to change the elements of the low per capita income allowance formula so as to adjust it to the changing world economic conditions."

K. Resolution 2961 D (XXVII) adopted by the
General Assembly on 13 December 1972

"The General Assembly,

"Recalling its resolutions 582 (VI) of 21 December 1951, 665 (VII) of 5 December 1952, 876 A (IX) of 4 December 1954, 1927 (XVIII) of 11 December 1963 and 2118 (XX) of 21 December 1965 relating to the attention and recognition to be accorded by the Committee on Contributions to the countries with low per capita income when calculating the rates of their assessment, in view of their economic and financial problems,

"Noting that the ceiling for the highest contribution has been lowered twice and that the per capita ceiling principle has been fully implemented since 1956, but that the floor for minimum contribution set at 0.04 per cent has not been lowered since 1946, in spite of the increase in the membership of the United Nations and other factors,

e/ Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-seventh Session,
Supplement No. 11 (A/8711 and Corr.1) and A.8711/Add.1.

"Taking into consideration that the allowance formula was benefiting mainly those developing countries with assessments higher than the floor and that the countries with the lowest per capita income, including the least developed among the developing countries, were not benefiting from any recommendations in favour of the developing countries in this respect, because of the rigidity of the fixed floor,

"1. Reaffirms that due regard should be accorded to the developing countries, especially those with the lowest per capita income, to help them meet their priorities at home and to help them offset the inflationary trends continuously affecting their payments in dollar terms;

"2. Requests the Committee on Contributions, in formulating the coming scale of assessment to lower the floor from 0.04 per cent to 0.02 per cent to allow the adjustments necessary for the developing countries, in particular those with the lowest per capita income."

L. Decision taken by the General Assembly
at its twenty-eighth session

(2164th plenary meeting on 9 November 1973)

"... the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Fifth Committee f/ decided to delete from the terms of reference of the Committee on Contributions the provision concerning the temporary dislocation of national economies arising out of the Second World War."

M. Resolution 3228 (XXIX) adopted by the General Assembly
on 12 November 1974

"The General Assembly,

"Recalling its resolutions 238 (III) of 18 November 1948, 582 (VI) of 21 December 1951, 665 (VII) of 5 December 1952, 876 A (IX) of 4 December 1954, 1137 (XII) of 14 October 1957 and 2961 D (XXVII) of 13 December 1972,

"Recalling further the decision of the Fifth Committee which it endorsed at its 2164th plenary meeting on 9 November 1973,

"Noting the recommendation of the Committee on Contributions on the per capita ceiling principle, as contained in the report on its thirty-fourth session,

"Decides to abolish the per capita ceiling principle in the formulation and establishment of rates of assessment, commencing with the scale for the triennium 1977-1979."

f/ Ibid., Twenty-eighth Session, Annexes, agenda item 84, document A/9292, para. 19.

N. Resolution 31/95 A adopted by the General Assembly
on 14 December 1976

"The General Assembly,

"Recalling its resolutions 582 (VI) of 21 December 1951, 665 (VII) of 5 December 1952, 1927 (XVIII) of 11 December 1963, 2118 (XX) of 21 December 1965, 2961 C (XXVII) of 13 December 1972 and 3062 (XXVIII) of 9 November 1973 relating to the additional recognition to be given to the low per capita income countries in calculating their rates of assessment in view of their economic and financial problems,

"Recalling that the capacity to pay of the countries recognized by the United Nations as the least developed among the developing countries and those most seriously affected is being adversely affected, inter alia, by inflation and currency instability,

"Recognizing the need for reconsideration of the scale of assessments of the least developed countries and those most seriously affected in order to help them meet their priorities at home and to allow the adjustment necessary for these countries,

"Believing that the existing arrangement of assessment on the floor level is incompatible with the principle of capacity to pay,

"Believing also that the collective financial responsibility implies that all Member States pay at least a minimum percentage of the expenses of the Organization,

"1. Reaffirms that the capacity of Member States to contribute towards the payment of the budgetary expenses of the United Nations is the fundamental criterion on which scales of assessment are based;

"2. Decides to lower the floor for purposes of formulating and establishing the rates of assessment;

"3. Requests the Committee on Contributions to reflect this decision in formulating the coming scale of assessments in so far as purely practical and technical limitations in calculating permit, which should be understood to mean a minimum payment of no less than 0.01 per cent of the total expenses of the Organization;

"4. Also requests the Committee on Contributions to study urgently and in depth ways and means of increasing the fairness and equity of the scale of assessments in the light of views expressed by Member States at the thirty-first session of the General Assembly, in particular by:

"(a) Seeking improvements in the statistical measurement of the relative capacity to pay, including new or additional statistical indicators and criteria;

"(b) Considering the possibility of mitigating extreme variations in assessments between two successive scales, without departing essentially

from the principle of the capacity to pay, either by increasing the statistical base period from three years to some longer period or by any other appropriate method;

"(c) Bearing in mind the fact that the capacity to pay of Member States may be subject to severe fluctuations in economic activity for a variety of reasons;

"5. Further requests the Committee on Contributions to embody as appropriate in subsequent reports of the Committee the particular justification for any significant increases in the assessment of any Member State between two successive scales;

"6. Requests the Committee on Contributions to report in depth on its findings to the General Assembly at its thirty-second session with a view to enabling the Assembly to consider early action on a new scale."

O. Resolution 31/95 B adopted by the General Assembly
on 14 December 1976

"The General Assembly,

"Resolves that:

"...

"(c) The Committee on Contributions shall draw up future scales of assessments, on the basis of:

"(i) The criteria contained in its report; g/

"(ii) The additional criteria contained in resolution A above;

"(iii) The continuing disparity between the economies of developed and developing countries;

"(iv) Methods which avoid excessive variations of individual rates of assessments between two successive scales;

"(v) The debate under agenda item 100 in the Fifth Committee during the thirty-first session, especially the concern expressed regarding steep increases in the rates of individual assessments."

g/ Ibid., Thirty-first Session, Supplement No. 11 (A/31/11) and
A/31/11/Add.1.

ANNEX II

Summary of suggestions and proposals advanced during the debate in the Fifth Committee on agenda item 100 a/ in connexion with new criteria and procedures b/

(a) As long as the gap between developed and developing countries, adequately documented by statistics, continued to increase, the total percentage of the budget borne by the developing countries should not be increased; or, as was also suggested, increased contributions of developing countries with rising national incomes should be devoted entirely to the needs of other developing countries;

(b) Increases between scales should not exceed a fixed percentage (proposals in this regard ranged from 10 to 30 per cent);

(c) Recognition should be given to the special financial obligations of the permanent members of the Security Council, as in the case of peace-keeping operations, or by imposing a lower limit to their rates of assessment or an upper limit to the rates of Member States not permanent members of the Council;

(d) In the case of developing countries with commodity-oriented economies or non-renewable raw materials, account should be taken of the effect on their capacity to pay of sharp declines in export prices and of the increasing price of imports;

(e) The evaluation of a country's capacity to pay should not only be based on national income, but also on other indices of national wealth and welfare (an approximate indicator of national wealth, it was suggested might be the aggregate of the net national product, adjusted by the net national welfare, over the preceding 10 or 20 years);

(f) The per capita income formula, which was presently applied by way of granting relief to low per capita income countries, should be applied to all Member States, as was the case with systems of progressive income tax; or, as was also suggested, consideration should be given to establishing a high per capita income extra assessment in order to avoid large reductions in the assessments of developed countries;

a/ "Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations" (see report of the Fifth Committee (Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-first Session, Annexes, agenda item 100, document A/31/427)).

b/ The present annex does not purport to be exhaustive and excludes in particular the views of those members of the Fifth Committee who expressed themselves satisfied with the existing procedures and practices of the Committee on Contributions.

(g) In order to avoid sharp fluctuations in rates of assessment between triennial scales, new scales should be developed annually, possibly based on three-year reference periods (it was also suggested by two delegations that the scale should correspond with the budgetary cycle);

(h) In addition to its net national product, the determination of a Member's capacity to pay should take account of its relative level or stage of development, its source of income (including the depletability of that income), its access to foreign exchange, its economic and social status, the wealth pattern of its people in relation to development, the extent of illiteracy, per capita production and consumption of energy, the value and amount of production of basic industries and funds allocated for technical and scientific research, cereal production and consumption and structure of foreign trade;

(i) Consideration should be given to the adverse effects of aggression and territorial occupation by foreign troops and to the damage suffered by newly independent countries during colonial rule;

(j) In assessing Members' capacity to pay, account should be taken of their respective military expenditures;

(k) A study should be undertaken as to whether higher assessments in the new scale would affect voluntary contributions to international organizations as well as foreign aid by developing countries.

ANNEX III

Data for economic and social indicatorsTable 1Availability of data for economic and social indicators

(Distribution of number of countries by the most recent year for which data are available)

Indicator	Year	1974 or later	1973	1972	Prior to 1972	Not available
1. <u>Per capita</u> energy consumption (kilogrammes of coal equivalent)		142	5
2. Percentage share of manufactured exports in total exports		80	18	17	7	25
3. Percentage share of three main export commodities in total exports		82	19	18	6	22
4. Number of telephones per 1,000 persons		111	20	5	4	7
5. <u>Per capita</u> cereal production (metric tons)		134	13
6. <u>Per capita</u> national wealth (national currencies)		9	2	...	14	122
7. <u>Per capita</u> food consumption (daily calorie intake)		74	56	17
8. Percentage share of manufacturing in total gross domestic product		65	31	15	26	10
9. Percentage share of economically active population outside agriculture		30	6	4	103 ^{a/}	4
10. Percentage of literate population		111 ^{a/}	36

Table 1 (continued)

Indicator \ Year	1974 or later	1973	1972	Prior to 1972	Not available
11. Number of physicians per 1,000 inhabitants	16	82	18	30	1
12. Number of infant survivals per 1,000 births	10	3	2	103 ^{a/}	29
13. Value of production of basic industries <u>per capita</u> (national currencies)	20	11	3	4	109
14. Percentage share of funds allocated for technical and scientific research in total national income	...	8	17	46	76
15. Percentage share of military expenditures in total national income	79	23	18	6	21
16. Life expectancy at birth (years)	122 ^{a/}	25
17. <u>Per capita</u> energy production (metric tons of coal equivalent)	113	3	31
18. <u>Per capita</u> net national welfare (national currencies)	3	144

^{a/} This number clusters around the year 1970, since the data are normally derived from information collected during population censuses.

ANNEX III (continued)

Table 2

Statistics in respect of selected indicators
(For the most recent year for which data are available)

Indicator	Per capita energy consumption (kilograms) of coal equivalent	Percentage share of manufactured exports in total exports	Percentage share of three main export commodities in total exports	Number of telephones per 1 000 persons	Per capita cereal production (metric tons)	Per capita food consumption (daily calorie intake)	Percentage share of manufacturing in total gross domestic product	Percentage share of economically active population outside agriculture	Percentage of literate population	Number of physicians per 1 000 inhabitants	Number of infant survivors per 1 000 births	Value of production of basic industries per capita (US dollars)	Percentage share of funds allocated for technical and scientific research in total national income	Percentage share of military expenditures in total national income	Life expectancy at birth (years)	Per capita energy production (metric tons of coal equivalent)
Number State	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)
AFGHANISTAN	67	14.9	46	1	.237	2 022	11	18.0	10	.038	818	10	...	1.95	38	.237
ALBANIA	725258	2 523	38	33.7	...	6.289	1.655
ALGERIA	511	2.7	87	14	.099	2 138	12	49.6	26	.122	914	...	0.30	4.12	32	4.985
ANGOLA	191	2.5	67	6	.091	2 021	5	36.0065	976	4.61	34	2.122
ARGENTINA	1 861	24.5	33	94	.913	3 408	35	85.2	93	2.088	942	...	0.11	1.60	68	1.699
AUSTRAL	5 997	16.9	33	377	1.305	3 310	21	93.0	...	1.387	982	2 523	1.30	2.39	72	7.845
AUSTRIA	3 883	82.8	16	262	.493	3 310	36	87.5	99	1.961	97469	1.14	70	1.435
BAHAMS	7 985	6.3	94	270	...	2 428	...	93.1	93	.831	96318	.02	66	...
BAHRAIN	11 819	14.9	87	98	42	93.4	40	.644	31.908
BAKALASH	31	1	.243	2 024	8	14.0	22	.107	86006	.57	48	.016
BARBADOS	1 175	34.1	56	158	.008	3 251	12	83.8	97	.667	955	70	.013
BELGIUM	6 709	71.4	20	272	.148	3 380	31	96.6	99	1.692	979	...	1.40	3.12	71	.898
BENIN	42	8.6	63	3	.129	2 250	6	50.2088	890	2.91	39	...
BHUTAN346	2 078	...	5.6021
BOLIVIA	283	0.5	77	9	.108	1 849	12	44.5	38	.472	846	2.81	45	1.011
BOTSWANA	6	.094	2 040	6	13.4068	87416	...	41	...
BRAZIL	652	23.8	35	25	.245	2 516	19	55.7	66	.494	890	1.29	63	.234
BULGARIA	4 195	38.0	25	82	.811	3 070	52	55.6	90	2.045	977	9.11	...	1.512
BURMA	56	4.4	68	1	.305	2 223	8	50.7	70	.145	861	5.97	48	.046
BURUNDI	13	1.2	91	1	.149	2 040	9	12.9021	862	6.65	41	...
BYELORUSSIAN SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC 2/
CAMBODIA	9 816	43.5	32	550	1.623	3 180	20	94.5	95	1.631	981	5 185	1.30	1.98	72	12.585
CAPE VERDE	90	...	58	5	.044	...	2	39.1	27	.052	921	6.25
CENTRAL AFRICAN EMPIRE	57	2.2	83	2	.097	2 170	13	8.805738	2.23005
CHAD	17	5.3	86	2	.124	2 060	7	9.8	7	.023	84035	5.73	39	...
CHILE	1 361	1.2	82	43	.163	2 825	35	78.8	88	.545	921	4.10	62	.955
CHINA	650284	2 090	...	32.2	30	.665
COLOMBIA	656	26.4	57	47	.123	2 183	22	74.1	73	.458	93015	.91	59	.849
CONGO	47	5	.052	...	3	33.0	58	.072
CONGO	216	30.1	76	8	.010	2 160	11	58.2	50	.162	...	170	...	4.69	41	2.779
COSTA RICA	491	19.5	68	51	.106	2 337	20	63.6	89	.708	94057	67	.080
CUBA	1 178	...	92	32	.099	2 712	71	70.0867	971	...	2.05	...	67	.027
CYPRUS	1 419	8.7	54	107	.133	2 670	13	71.8	93	.837	974	366	.42	1.21	71	...
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	6 826	84.7	28	168	.630	3 030	63	83.6	...	2 320	979	2 820	3.92	4.67	...	3.410
DEMOCRATIC CAMPU-SEA	17	1.5	65	1	.107	1 894	17	21.8	36	.065	873	13.17001
DEMOCRATIC YEMEN	360	5.4	80	6	.053	2 070	2	35.5051	14.04	42	...

ANNEX III (continued)

Table 2 (continued)

Indicator	Per capita energy consumption (kilograms of coal equivalent)	Percentage share of manufactured exports in total exports	Percentage share of three main export commodities in total exports	Number of telephones per 1 000 persons	Per capita cereal production (metric tons)	Per capita food consumption (daily calorie intake)	Percentage share of manufacturing in total gross domestic product	Percentage share of economically active population outside agriculture	Percentage of literate population	Number of physicians per 1 000 inhabitants	Number of infant survivors per 1 000 births	Value of production of basic industries per capita (US dollars)	Percentage share of funds allocated for technical and scientific research in total national income	Percentage share of military expenditures in total national income	Life expectancy at birth (years)	Per capita energy production (metric tons of coal equivalent)
Number State	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)
DENMARK	5 114	55.2	16	428	1.245	3 240	27	90.7	99	1.603	986	3 066	1.11	2.15	73	.026
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	333	0.9	79	21	.066	2 213	17	55.7	68	.536	950	1.82	58	.005
ECUADOR	363	2.3	79	26	.105	2 123	14	53.5	67	.342	90930	2.34	57	2.045
EGYPT	322	26.3	66	14	.218	2 637	16	46.7	40	.660	897	10.88	53	0.321
EL SALVADOR	248	29.9	60	12	.141	1 914	18	53.4	49	.246	933	1.75	55	.016
EQUATORIAL GUINEA	87	5	20.0086	41	...
ETHIOPIA	31	1.9	66	2	.153	1 914	8	15.9	7	.014	2.09	39	.002
FIJI	487	14.1	70	46	.049	...	12	46.4483	981	25823	68	...
FINLAND	4 636	72.8	39	358	.690	3 050	30	85.7	99	1.822	987	4 434	1.02	1.59	69	.328
FRANCE	4 342	71.1	21	236	.676	3 210	35	89.2	99	1.380	982	3 933	2.08	3.73	72	.897
GABON	1 070	7.5	86	12	.006	2 210	8	18.2	30	.192	771003	1.15	39	28.960
GAMBIA	73	...	97	5	.129	2 370	3	17.9053	917	41	...
GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC	6 946	57.6	...	145	.528	3 040	62	88.3	...	1.795	984	4 165	5.071
GERMANY, FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF	5 698	85.5	25	302	.344	3 432	40	93.6	99	1.887	976	...	2.57	3.44	71	2.788
GHANA	184	1.4	86	6	.093	2 318	10	41.6089	84494	1.79	46	.046
GREECE	2 048	43.6	26	207	.415	3 190	19	59.4	84	1.905	970	755	.18	.004	70	.545
GRENADA	340	43	5210
GUATEMALA	252	26.3	51	10	.188	1 994	13	43.0	38	.231	91701	.95	51	.008
GUINEA	94	2	.174	2 040	6	15.3045	5.22001
GUINEA-BISSAU	41	5	.128	...	1	12.7057	34	...
GUYANA	931	2.6	91	24	.337	2 351	10	70.4	83	.279	962	3.77	66	...
HAITI	31	34.9	53	2	.127	2 026	11	38.5	20	.118	800	1.30	45	.003
HONDURAS	224	3.2	72	5	.090	2 041	14	41.2	52	.298	966	1.81	52	.016
HUNGARY	3 557	67.9	...	96	1.151	3 560	44	77.3	98	2.123	967	2 014	2.72	2.62	...	2.315
ICELAND	5 138	5.5	79	404	...	2 900	18	82.3	100	1.529	98845	...	75	1.268
INDIA	201	48.2	18	3	.207	1 976	14	28.0	36	.240	870	45	.44	3.18	50	.171
INDONESIA	158	0.8	79	2	.196	2 126	9	37.8	60	.050	86521	48	.814
IRAN	1 268	1.4	97	24	.254	2 368	39	58.1	37	.329	86059	4.53	50	14.814
IRAQ	906	1.1	97	17	.136	2 160	9	53.4	26	.422	896	68	.06	8.11	53	13.392
IRELAND	3 296	46.7	23	127	.402	3 410	34	74.6	98	1.196	980	1 681	.83	1.50	72	.679
ISRAEL	2 914	39.8	48	217	.091	2 960	19	93.7	84	2.849	977	...	1.45	31.28	72	2.717
ITALY	3 224	80.4	22	246	.306	3 180	31	84.9	91	1.992	970	2 239	1.08	2.37	71	.903
IVORY COAST	370	7.6	67	10	.130	2 490	15	15.5	20	.072	86036	1.30	42	.007
JAMAICA	1 439	4.8	88	47	.005	2 664	12	71.0	86	.268	968	842	.10	.48	69	.008
JAPAN	3 839	92.0	32	356	.159	2 510	35	87.5	99	1.152	987	...	2.25	.93	72	.332
JORDAN	388	24.3	59	16	.028	2 430	9	66.3	62	.257	964	14.42	54	...
KENYA	177	13.0	55	9	.162	2 117	12	17.9	30	.061	945	54	.88	1.54	48	.004
KIMAT	9 913	4.6	95	110	4	97.5	55	1.250	963	2.79	64	211.123

ANNEX III (continued)

Table 2 (continued)

Indicator		Per capita energy consumption (kilograms of coal equivalent)	Percentage share of manufactured exports in total exports	Percentage share of three main export commodities in total exports	Number of telephones per 1 000 persons	Per capita cereal production (metric tons)	Per capita food consumption (daily calorie intake)	Percentage share of manufacturing in total gross domestic product	Percentage share of economically active population outside agriculture	Percentage of literate population	Number of physicians per 1 000 inhabitants	Number of infant survivors per 1 000 births	Value of production of basic industries per capita (US dollars)	Percentage share of funds allocated for technical and scientific research in total national income	Percentage share of military expenditures in total national income	Life expectancy at birth (years)	Per capita energy production (metric tons of coal equivalent)
Member State		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)
LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC		65	4.1	94	2	.284	2 090	...	21.2	15	.075	863	7.89	48	.010
LEBANON		1 073	68.3	18	77	.026	2 280	14	82.2	69	.752	918	3.39	58	.036
LESOTHO		3	.204	...	2	10.3	59	.049	819	2.01	44	...
LIBERIA		432	1.0	89	2	.117	2 040	4	24.4	32	.080	84179	53	.023
LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA		975	...	100	20	.112	2 570	2	67.9	22	.736	16.17	52	48.421
LUXEMBOURG		19 539	71.4	20	397	.386	3 380	44	92.5	99	1.072	975	6 768	...	1.13	71	.314
MADAGASCAR		71	9.3	53	3	.264	2 386	12	10.6	39	.093	89890	1.42	42	.003
MAJAWI		56	8.7	70	4	.221	2 210	12	10.7	22	.026	852	3374	39	.005
MALAYSIA		556	12.9	56	22	.169	2 574	15	57.4	61	.209	959	4.96	59	.498
MAJALVES		1 827036	4.26
MAJAL		24	9.5	65	1	.150	1 774	9	9.0	2	.026	880	2.72	37	.001
MAJZA		1 156	87.2	57	154	.017	3 081	26	94.0	87	1.012	972	602	.13	...	68	...
MAJURITANIA		112	5.1	91033	1 970	5	12.7	11	.056	2.53	41	...
MAJURITIUS		275	5.7	93	28	.003	2 360	13	71.8225	94354	1.38	63	.006
MEXICO		1 269	39.8	20	45	.272	2 727	23	59.1	74	.722	93925	.70	64	1.273
MONGOLIA		1 046	20	.279	2 475	...	38.1	...	1.931	...	90	.32	...	58	.649
MOROCCO		257	11.3	68	11	.215	2 611	14	50.0	21	.075	851	2.66	50	.050
MOZAMBIQUE		141	3.0	47	6	.058	1 975	12	26.6061	982	3.42	41	.051
NEPAL		12	1	.309	2 088	10	5.6	12	.010	83875	44	.001
NETHERLANDS		6 191	55.0	21	344	.080	3 220	28	93.9	99	1.439	987	3 670	2.43	3.90	74	8.485
NEW ZEALAND		3 444	13.8	54	481	.261	3551	21	88.0	99	1.182	983	2 653	.49	1.66	71	1.456
NICARAGUA		453	15.5	56	10	.193	2 390	20	53.2	57	.696	95515	1.61	52	.019
NIGER		31	10.8	76	1	.237	2 180	6	7.2023	800	1.45	42	...
NIGERIA		94	0.2	97	2	.128	2 085	7	37.8039	85047	4.62	40	2.700
NORWAY		4 925	59.1	36	339	.189	3 213	23	90.1	99	1.605	987	4 332	1.46	3.59	74	3.098
OMAN		250	4	.006	37.0451	26.33	...	28.780
PAKISTAN		192	52.0	49	3	.186	2 146	14	42.7	16	.247	88522	5.48	49	.131
PANAMA		846	1.7	84	66	.143	2 421	14	61.6	78	.747	95915	64	.007
PAPUA NEW GUINEA		250	5.8	70	6	.001	...	6	14.1	31	.088	904	2.44	47	.008
PARAGUAY		173	10.8	40	13	.165	2 723	18	51.4	75	.533	933	1.77	61	.021
PERU		650	1.0	60	21	.095	2 360	23	59.1	72	.555	92544	2.30	58	.469
PHILIPPINES		309	8.7	58	11	.216	1 971	20	48.0	83	.380	920	93	...	2.85	58	.014
POLAND		4 687	55.5	24	71	.583	3 140	56	65.4	98	1.647	975	2 335	2.65	3.16	...	5.425
PORTUGAL		1 026	64.4	23	117	.188	2 900	32	70.4	65	1.065	94240	6.20	68	.137
QATAR		18 423	48.7	...	114	21	.889	201.237
ROMANIA		3 543	20.6	18	51	.715	3 010	57	42.8	89	1.242	951	...	1.30	3.99	69	3.656
RUANDA		13	1.8	82	1	.050	1 960	4	6.7019	867	2.65	41	.004
SANDA		126	4.8	80	17	33.1	97	.325	959007
SAO TOME AND PRINCE		104	3150

ANNEX III (continued)

Table 2 (continued)

Member State	Indicator	Per capita energy consumption (kilograms of coal equivalent)	Percentage share of manufactured exports in total exports	Percentage share of three main export commodities in total exports	Number of telephones per 1 000 persons	Per capita cereal production (metric tons)	Per capita food consumption (daily calorie intake)	Percentage share of manufacturing in total gross domestic product	Percentage share of economically active population outside agriculture	Percentage of literate population	Number of physicians per 1 000 inhabitants	Number of infant survivors per 1 000 births	Value of production of basic industries per capita (US dollars)	Percentage share of funds allocated for technical and scientific research in total national income	Percentage share of military expenditures in total national income	Life expectancy at birth (years)	Per capita energy production (metric tons of coal equivalent)
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)
SAUDI ARABIA		976	...	98	10	.062	2 270	6	34.0200	5.58	42	72.504
SENEGAL		184	21.9	47	9	.199	2 300	13	20.3	10	.068	84494	2.01	41	.001
SEYCHELLES		317	52	3	73.9	58	.320	93726
SIERRA LEONE		123	...	79	3	.191	2 240	5	28.5	7	.058	817	1.01	41	...
SINGAPORE		2 060	40.0	50	125	...	2 819	24	98.0	75	.715	980	5.00	68	...
SOMALIA		40	0.7	79	2	.101	1 830	8	15.3	5	.064	5.24	40	...
SOUTH AFRICA		2 754	19.2	23	78	.474	2 886	23	72.0	57	.496	878	3.16	49	...
SPAIN		2 063	63.7	19	200	.402	2 600	27	77.7	90	1.486	97224	1.87	70	.549
SRI LANKA		140	5.3	68	5	.088	2 019	12	59.4	81	.250	95004	.65	66	.007
SUDAN		125	0.3	64	3	.190	2 074	10	33.5	19	.080	906	29	...	4.80	48	.001
SURINAM		2 834	2.1	87	34	.418	2 376	6	77.8	84	.429302
SWAZILAND		14	.261	...	19	18.7	30	.113	...	236	44	...
SWEDEN		5 804	74.7	28	633	.630	2 810	29	93.6	99	1.550	989	5 296	1.64	3.60	75	.894
SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC		590	8.0	83	21	.301	2 597	13	49.2	40	.344	907	252	...	13.36	55	1.362
THAILAND		300	13.9	38	7	.438	2 382	17	28.2	79	.117	92026	3.06	59	.012
TOGO		70	7.0	85	3	.135	2 160	11	26.7047	873	...	1.44	1.70	40	.001
TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO		3 885	4.7	91	60	.022	2 530	16	86.1	90	.464	96535	.35	68	15.018
TUNISIA		416	18.5	65	20	.220	2 440	10	59.0	32	.192	894	271	...	1.36	56	1.127
TURKEY		628	21.1	43	23	.556	2 849	21	32.4	51	.496	85527	3.82	55	.318
UGANDA		51	0.2	90	4	.183	2 096	8	14.1028	2.80	48	.009
UKRAINIAN SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC b/	
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS		5 252	31.4	29	62	.529	3 540	53	73.7	99	2.755	972	...	4.14	4.25	...	6.082
UNITED ARAB EMIRATES		13 503	97	92.0	21	1.005	4.01	...	221.847
UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND		5 464	73.5	21	366	.247	3 190	26	97.5	97	1.271	982	3 667	2.53	5.69	72	2.889
UNITED REPUBLIC OF CAMEROON		86	8.9	65	4	.117	2 230	11	15.0039	...	57	.63	.002	41	.021
UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA		75	8.0	52	4	.093	2 003	10	9.8036	840	2.95	43	.003
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA		11 485	62.9	22	677	1.162	3 330	25	96.2	99	1.608	980	...	2.77	6.40	70	9.998
UPPER VOLTA		14	8.5	77	1	.186	1 859	10	13.2	5	.017	81848	1.44	35	...
URUGUAY		900	8.6	82	89	.324	3 080	22	84.8	90	1.098	95723	2.43	70	.055
VENEZUELA		2 895	1.4	95	47	.094	2 427	19	81.4	82	1.155	95123	2.23	64	21.925
YEMEN		30	1.0	81	1	.298	2 040	2	20.8041	...	2	...	4.54	42	...
YUGOSLAVIA		1 883	66.0	17	54	.704	3 190	42	55.4	83	1.157	944	1 424	.85	4.75	65	1.261
ZAIRE		76	0.7	78	1	.030	1 885	9	20.2035	896	2.06	41	.083
ZAMBIA		557	0.3	97	15	.155	2 590	12	84.8	47	.074	...	468	.18	.85	44	.319

a/ Statistics are included with those of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

b/ Ibid.

Notes to table 2

Sources of statistics in respect of selected indicators

1. Per capita energy consumption (kilograms of coal equivalent)

United Nations, World Energy Supplies, 1950-1974, Statistical Papers, Series J, No. 19 (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.76.XVII.5).

2. Percentage share of manufactured exports in total exports

United Nations, Yearbook of International Trade Statistics, 1975, ST/ESA/STAT/SER.G/24 and Add.1, vols. I and II (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.76.XVII.10, vols. I and II).

3. Percentage share of three main export commodities in total exports

United Nations, Yearbook of International Trade Statistics, 1975.

4. Number of telephones per 1,000 persons

United Nations, Statistical Yearbook, 1975, ST/ESA/STAT/SER.S/3 (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.F.76.XVII.1).

5. Per capita cereal production (metric tons)

Basic data: Total cereal production (metric tons)

FAO, Production Yearbook 1975.

(Statistics available in the above source were divided by population estimates obtained from the United Nations Monthly Bulletin of Statistics.)

6. Per capita food consumption (daily calorie intake)

Main source: FAO, Monthly Bulletin of Agricultural Economics and Statistics (April and July/August 1976).

Other sources: United Nations, Statistical Yearbook, 1972 (Sales No. E.F.73.XVII.1)

IBRD, World Tables, 1976.

7. Percentage share of manufacturing in total GDP

Main source: United Nations, Yearbook of National Accounts Statistics, 1975, vol. III, ST/ESA/STAT/SER.O/5 and Add.2 (United Nations publication, Sales No. 76.XVII.2, vol. III).

Other sources: United Nations, Monthly Bulletin of Statistics, February 1977 (ST/ESA/STAT/SER.Q/50)

IBRD, World Tables, 1976

ECLA, Economic Activity - 1975 - Caribbean Community Countries (future ECLA/POS/76)

ECA, Estimates prepared by the Commission

Asian Development Bank, Key Indicators of Developing Member Countries of ADB, October 1975.

8. Percentage share of economically active population outside agriculture

Main source: ILO; Yearbook of Labour Statistics, 1976.

Other sources: FAO, Production Yearbook, 1975

IBRD, World Tables, 1976.

9. Percentage of literate population

Main source: UNESCO, Statistical Yearbook, 1973 and 1974.

Other sources: IBRD, World Tables, 1976

Asian Development Bank, Key Indicators of Developing Member Countries, October 1975.

10. Number of physicians per 1,000 inhabitants

Main source: United Nations, Statistical Yearbook, 1975.

Other sources: ESCAP, Statistical Yearbook for Asia and the Pacific, 1974 (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.75.II.F.15)

OECD, Economic Surveys (by country).

11. Number of infant survivals per 1,000 births

Main source: IBRD, World Tables, 1976.

Other sources: United Nations, Demographic Yearbook, 1975 (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.F.76.XIII.1)

Asian Development Bank, Key Indicators of Developing Member Countries of ADB, October 1975.

12. Value of production of basic industries per capita (United States dollars)

Basic data: Total production of basic industries (national currencies)

United Nations, Yearbook of Industrial Statistics, 1975, ST/ESA/STAT/SER.P/12 (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.76.XVII.3).

(Statistics available in the above source were first converted into United States dollars and then divided by population estimates obtained from the Monthly Bulletin of Statistics.)

13. Percentage share of funds allocated for technical and scientific research in total national income

Basic data: Expenditures for scientific and technical research (national currencies)

United Nations, Statistical Yearbook, 1975.

(Statistics available in the above source were divided by national income estimates in national currencies.)

14. Percentage share of military expenditures in total national income

Basic data: Military expenditures (national currencies)

United Nations, Statistical Yearbook, 1973, 1974 and 1975 (United Nations publications, Sales Nos. 74.XVII.1, 75.XVII.1 and 76.XVII.10).

Other sources: IBRD, World Tables, 1976.

ECA, African Statistical Yearbook, 1974 and 1975.

(Statistics available in the above sources were divided by national income estimates in national currencies.)

15. Life expectancy at birth (years)

Basic data: IBRD, World Tables, 1976.

Other source: United Nations, Statistical Yearbook, 1975.

16. Per capita energy production (metric tons of coal equivalent)

Basic data: Total energy production (metric tons of coal equivalent)

United Nations, World Energy Supplies 1950-1974.

(Statistics available in the above source were divided by population estimates obtained from the United Nations Monthly Bulletin of Statistics (ST/ESA/STAT/SER.Q series).)

Price trends in international tradeTable 1. Terms of trade and trade balanceA. Terms of trade (1974 = 100)

Country	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1975
Algeria
Argentina
Bangladesh
Brazil	94	106	96	102	113	90
Burma
Chile
Colombia
Costa Rica
Cuba
Cyprus	120	122	112	117	116	107
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Egypt	109	104	96	98	106	...
Ethiopia	89	109	93	94	103	86
Gabon
Ghana
Greece	115	112	108	104	110	93
Guatemala
India	136	138	151	159	138	...

ANNEX IV (continued)

Table 1.A (continued)

Country	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1975
Indonesia
Iran
Iraq
Israel	119	119	119	121	118	101
Ivory Coast
Jamaica
Kenya	120	136	118	118	116	97
Kuwait
Lebanon
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya
Malaysia
Mexico	91	89	87	90	98	...
Morocco	75	74	73	69	64	101
Nigeria
Pakistan	98	102	92
Panama	127	126	123	123	122	90
Peru
Philippines	95	102	87	73	106	67
Portugal	100	106	105	105	106	...
Romania
Saudi Arabia

ANNEX IV (continued)

Table 1.A (continued)

Country	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1975
Singapore
Spain	126	124	123	129	132	93
Sri Lanka	153	145	134	128	114	79
Sudan
Syrian Arab Republic	76	71	73	71	75	77
Thailand	115	100	89	87	117	90
Trinidad and Tobago	83	81	80	76	84	108
Tunisia	60	58	57	61	67	89
Turkey	117	114	102	116	119	90
United Arab Emirates
United Republic of Cameroon
United Republic of Tanzania
Uruguay
Venezuela
Yugoslavia	110	110	111	112	110	104
Zaire
Zambia	154	118	86	82	108	50

Source: United Nations, Monthly Bulletin of Statistics, February 1977 (ST/ESA/STAT/Ser.Q/50).

ANNEX IV (continued)

Table 1. Terms of trade and trade balance (continued)B. Percentage of imports covered by exports (trade in national currencies)

Country	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1975	Period	1976
Algeria	93	80	70	87	84	106	76
Argentina	102	101	93	99	142	111	91	83	8 months	182
Bangladesh	156	44	50	44	43	6 months	50
Brazil	102	96	79	84	89	56	64	62	6 months	67
Burma	86	64	65	76	120	128	126
Chile	118	133	98	90	112	130	92
Colombia	89	86	74	100	111	89	107	93	6 months	82
Costa Rica	77	73	64	81	75	62	71	72	6 months	84
Cuba	55	80	62	65	79
Cyprus	47	46	44	42	39	37	50	67	6 months	66
Dominican Republic	85	80	78	103	105	96	113	136	9 months	85
Ecuador	80	77	71	92	102	110	201	76	6 months	112
Egypt	117	97	86	92	123	64	36	45	9 months	70
Ethiopia	77	71	67	88	112	94	76	92	6 months	94
Gabon	182	145	193	145	173	275	201	165	6 months	187
Ghana	87	105	78	131	126	79	89
Greece	35	33	31	37	42	46	43	39	6 months	42
Guatemala	103	105	96	104	103	84	85
India	83	96	85	110	91	76	69	68	9 months	105
Indonesia	109	111	112	114	118	193	149	138	8 months	155

ANNEX IV (continued)

Table 1.B (continued)

Country	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1975	Period	1976
Iran	136	158	204	169	184	397	193	202	9 months	162
Iraq	237	216	220	187	242	294	297	360	6 months	345
Israel	53	52	51	56	47	42	44	44	10 months	55
Ivory Coast	137	121	114	123	120	126	105	78	6 months	123
Jamaica	59	66	62	61	59	78	70	66	9 months	63
Kenya	58	55	43	54	63	48	52	48	6 months	65
Kuwait	238	304	396	383	363	706	376	429	6 months	293
Lebanon	32	35	38	41	44
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	321	427	384	282	222	299	192
Malaysia	145	123	115	106	117	103	108	100	6 months	129
Mexico	69	57	62	63	64	47	43	45	9 months	50
Morocco	87	71	72	83	80	90	60	63	8 months	44
Nigeria	128	117	120	143	186	334	132	149	6 months	128
Pakistan	98	98	63	48	47	8 months	58
Panama	37	31	29	28	29	26	32
Peru	144	169	119	119	103	99	49
Philippines	82	97	93	87	113	76	59	66	9 months	68
Portugal	66	60	58	58	61	49	51	51	7 months	50
Romania	94	94	100	100	107	107	95
Saudi Arabia	265	352	481	485	456	738	388
Singapore	76	64	63	64	71	69	66	65	10 months	72

ANNEX IV (continued)

Table 1.B (continued)

Country	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1975	Period	1976
Spain	45	51	60	56	54	46	47	46	11 months	48
Sri Lanka	75	87	98	94	96	76	75
Sudan	93	96	93	102	100	73	46	37	6 months	60
Syrian Arab Republic	56	57	48	53	57	64	56	59	9 months	57
Thailand	55	55	65	72	76	78	76
Trinidad and Tobago	98	89	78	73	88	110	120	124	9 months	112
Tunisia	62	60	63	68	64	81	60	57	9 months	50
Turkey	71	67	55	55	61	41	30	28	10 months	38
United Arab Emirates
United Republic of Cameroon	111	93	83	78	108	109	75	59	9 months	89
United Republic of Tanzania	119	88	74	84	77	49	49	38	6 months	82
Uruguay	102	101	90	101	113	79	69	59	6 months	106
Venezuela	166	109	170	146	189	286	168
Yugoslavia	69	58	56	69	63	51	53	52	10 months	67
Zaire	150	147	129	96	130	123	91	80	6 months	135
Zambia	246	210	122	134	214	179	86

Source: United Nations, Monthly Bulletin of Statistics, February 1977 (ST/ESA/STAT/Ser.Q/50).

ANNEX IV (continued)

Table 2. Unit value index of manufactured goods exported by developed countries
(dollar value)

1974 = 100

	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1975	1976
58		62	65	70	82	112	113

Source: United Nations, Monthly Bulletin of Statistics, March 1977 (ST/ESA/STAT/Ser.Q/51).

ANNEX IV (continued)

Table 3. Price indices of primary commodities

Country	Main commodities exported	Indices 1974 = 100									Percentage of commodities shown over total exports and year
		1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1975	1975 9 months	1975 9 months	1976 9 months	
Algeria	Crude petroleum	16	16	20	22	31	102	99		106	84(1973)
	Wine	55	58	57	67	105	103	105		91	
Argentina	Maize	47	51	51	51	79	97	101		86	51(1974)
	Meat (beef)	55	64	77	86	113	100	104		106	
	Wheat	35	34	36	40	69	89	89		83	
	Sugar	16	17	19	28	35	71	79		45	
	Wool	47	40	37	66	142	82	82		90	
	Oil seeds, oils and fats	33	38	39	39	71	73	75		68	
Bangladesh	Jute	89	82	84	93	88	111	117		95	
Brazil	Coffee	58	76	66	74	95	111	105		192	32(1974)
	Cocoa	48	40	35	39	66	87	87		106	
	Sugar	16	17	19	28	35	71	79		45	
	Oil seeds, oils and fats	33	38	39	39	71	73	75		68	

ANNEX IV (continued)

Table 3 (continued)

Country	Main commodities exported	Indices 1974 = 100									Percentage of commodities shown over total exports and year
		1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1975	1975 9 months	1976 9 months		
Brazil (cont'd.)	Iron ore	57	60	64	69	72	136	136	138	54(1974)	
	Cotton	41	41	45	51	82	80	79	103		
	Maize	47	51	51	51	79	97	101	86		
Burma	Rice	34	31	31	34	60	72	74	53	68(1974)	
	Wood	47	44	50	62	95	88	89	98		
Chile	Copper	70	68	53	52	86	60	62	71	72(1974)	
Colombia	Coffee	58	76	66	74	95	111	105	192	53(1974)	
	Cotton	41	41	45	51	82	80	79	103		
	Sugar	16	17	19	28	35	71	79	45		
Costa Rica	Fruits	65	58	71	71	95	131	135	117	58(1972)	
	Coffee	58	76	66	74	95	111	105	192		

ANNEX IV (continued)

Table 3 (continued)

Country	Main commodities exported	Indices 1974 = 100									Percentage of commodities shown over total exports and year
		1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1975	1975 9 months	1976 9 months		
Cuba	Sugar	16	17	19	28	35	71	79	45	88(1972)	
Cyprus	Fruits	65	58	71	71	95	131	135	117	25(1974)	
Dominican Republic	Sugar	16	17	19	28	35	71	79	45	72(1974)	
	Non-ferrous ores	54	55	48	56	76	109	100	106		
Ecuador	Crude petroleum	16	16	20	22	31	102	99	106	67(1973)	
	Fruits	65	58	71	71	95	131	135	117		
Egypt	Rice	34	31	31	34	60	72	74	53	54(1974)	
	Cotton	41	41	45	51	82	80	79	103		
Ethiopia	Coffee	58	76	66	74	95	111	105	192	28(1974)	

ANNEX IV (continued)

Table 3 (continued)

Country	Main commodities exported	Indices 1974 = 100									Percentage of commodities shown over total exports and year
		1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1975 9 months	1975 9 months	1976 9 months		
Gabon	Crude petroleum	16	16	20	22	31	102	99	106	67(1971)	
	Wood	47	44	50	62	95	88	89	98		
Ghana	Cocoa	48	40	35	39	66	87	87	106	72(1974)	
Greece	Tobacco	67	71	74	77	84	121	121	130	10(1974)	
	Aluminium	77	81	81	73	73	114	113	119		
Guatemala	Coffee	58	76	66	74	95	111	105	192	45(1972)	
	Cotton	41	41	45	51	82	80	79	103		
India	Tea	69	77	78	75	77	102	105	107	19(1974)	
	Sugar	16	17	19	28	35	71	79	45		
	Tobacco	67	71	74	77	84	121	121	130		
	Iron ore	57	60	64	69	72	136	136	138		

ANNEX IV (continued)

Table 3 (continued)

Country	Main commodities exported	Indices 1974 = 100									Percentage of commodities shown over total exports and year
		1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1975 9 months	1975 9 months	1976 9 months		
Indonesia	Crude petroleum	16	16	20	22	31	102	99	106	86(1974)	
	Copper	70	68	53	52	86	60	62	71		
	Oil seeds, oils and fats	33	38	39	39	71	73	75	68		
	Coffee	58	76	66	74	95	111	105	192		
	Rubber	73	57	45	46	95	77	76	103		
	Wood	47	44	50	62	95	88	89	98		
	Tin	43	45	44	47	59	85	86	92		
Iran	Crude petroleum	16	16	20	22	31	102	99	106	88(1974)	
Iraq	Crude petroleum	16	16	20	22	31	102	99	106		
Israel	Fruits	65	58	71	71	95	131	135	117	13(1974)	
	Cotton	41	41	45	51	82	80	79	103		

ANNEX IV (continued)

Table 3 (continued)

Country	Main commodities exported	Indices 1974 = 100									Percentage of commodities shown over total exports and year
		1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1975	1975 9 months	1976 9 months	1976	
Ivory Coast	Cocoa	48	40	35	39	66	87	87	106	106	49(1974)
	Coffee	58	76	66	74	95	111	105	192	192	
Jamaica	Non-ferrous ores	54	55	48	56	76	109	100	106	106	86(1974)
	Sugar	16	17	19	28	35	71	79	45	45	
Kenya	Coffee	58	76	66	74	95	111	105	192	192	36(1974)
	Tea	69	77	78	75	77	102	105	107	107	
Kuwait	Crude petroleum	16	16	20	22	31	102	99	106	106	83(1974)
Lebanon	Fruits	65	58	71	71	95	12(1973)
	Wool	47	40	37	66	142	
	Tobacco	67	71	74	77	84	
	Hides, skins	61	56	56	107	126	

ANNEX IV (continued)

Table 3 (continued)

Country	Main commodities exported	Indices 1974 = 100							Percentage of commodities shown over total exports and year	
		1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1975 9 months	1975 9 months	1976 9 months	1976 9 months
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	Crude petroleum	16	16	20	22	31	102	99	106	99(1974)
Malaysia	Rubber	73	57	45	46	95	77	76	103	72(1974)
	Wood	47	44	50	62	95	88	89	98	
	Oil seeds, oils and fats	33	38	39	39	71	73	75	68	
	Tin	43	45	44	47	59	85	86	92	
Mexico	Fruits	65	58	71	71	95	131	135	117	28(1973)
	Sugar	16	17	19	28	35	71	79	45	
	Coffee	58	76	66	74	95	111	105	192	
	Cotton	41	41	45	51	82	80	79	103	
Morocco	Fruits	65	58	71	71	95	131	135	117	70(1974)
	Crude phosphates	25	24	25	26	30	141	140	104	

ANNEX IV (continued)

Table 3 (continued)

Country	Main commodities exported	Indices 1974 = 100									Percentage of commodities shown over total exports and year
		1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1975 9 months	1975 9 months	1976 9 months		
Nigeria	Crude petroleum	16	16	20	22	31	102	99	106	97(1974)	
	Cocoa	48	40	35	39	66	87	87	106		
	Tin	43	45	44	47	59	85	86	92		
	Oil seeds, oils and fats	33	38	39	39	71	73	75	68		
Pakistan	Rice	34	31	31	34	60	72	74	53	35(1974)	
	Cotton	41	41	45	51	82	80	79	103		
Panama	Fruits	65	58	71	71	95	131	135	117	66(1972)	
	Fish	37	43	51	60	81	90	91	100		
Peru	Sugar	16	17	19	28	35	71	79	45		
	Cotton	41	41	45	51	82	80	79	103		
	Copper	70	68	53	52	86	60	62	71		
	Fish meal	47	53	45	64	146	70	63	134		

ANNEX IV (continued)

Table 3 (continued)

Country	Main commodities exported	Indices 1974 = 100								Percentage of commodities shown over total exports and year
		1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1975 9 months	1975 9 months	1976 9 months	
Peru (cont'd)	Oil seeds, oils and fats	33	38	39	39	71	73	75	68	67(1971)
Philippines	Fruits	65	58	71	71	95	131	135	117	
	Sugar	16	17	19	28	35	71	79	45	
	Wood	47	44	50	62	95	88	89	98	
	Copper ore	70	69	54	54	85	63	64	74	
	Oil seeds, oils and fats	33	38	39	39	71	73	75	68	71(1974)
Portugal	Wine	55	58	57	67	105	103	105	91	
	Fruits	65	58	71	71	95	131	135	117	11(1974)
Romania	Wheat	35	34	36	40	69	89	89	83	
	Meat	57	62	69	79	110	109	111	116	
	Fruits	65	58	71	71	95	131	135	117	
	Wood	47	44	50	62	95	88	89	98	

ANNEX IV (continued)

Table 3 (continued)

Country	Main commodities exported	Indices 1974 = 100									Percentage of commodities shown over total exports and year
		1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1975	1975 9 months	1976	1976 9 months	
Romania (cont'd)	Oil seeds, oils and fats	33	38	39	39	71	73	75	68	20(1973)	
Saudi Arabia	Crude petroleum	16	16	20	22	31	102	99	106	92(1973)	
Singapore	Rubber	73	57	45	46	96	77	76	103	11(1974)	
	Oil seeds, oils and fats	33	38	39	39	71	73	75	68		
Spain	Fish	37	43	51	60	81	90	91	100	18(1974)	
	Fruits	65	58	71	71	95	131	135	117		
	Wine	55	58	57	67	105	103	105	91		
Sri Lanka	Tea	69	77	78	75	77	102	105	107	60(1974)	
	Rubber	73	57	45	46	95	77	76	103		

ANNEX IV (continued)

Table 3 (continued)

Country	Main commodities exported	Indices 1974 = 100									Percentage of commodities shown over total exports and year
		1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1975	1975	1976	1976	
Sudan	Cotton	41	41	45	51	82	80	79	103		78(1975)
	Oil seeds, oils and fats	33	38	39	39	71	73	75	68		
Syrian Arab Republic	Crude petroleum	16	16	20	22	31	102	99	106		80(1974)
	Cotton	41	41	45	51	82	80	79	103		
Thailand	Rice	34	31	31	34	60	72	74	53		56(1974)
	Maize	47	51	51	51	79	97	101	86		
	Sugar	16	17	19	28	35	71	79	45		
	Rubber	73	57	45	46	95	77	76	103		
	Tin	43	45	44	47	59	85	86	92		
Trinidad and Tobago	Petroleum	16	16	20	22	31	102	99	106		87(1975)

ANNEX IV (continued)

Table 3 (continued)

Country	Main commodities exported	Indices 1974 = 100										Percentage of commodities shown over total exports and year
		1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1975	1975 9 months	1976 9 months	1976		
Tunisia	Crude petroleum	16	16	20	22	31	102	99	106			42(1975)
Turkey	Fruits	65	58	71	71	95	131	135	117			
	Tobacco	67	71	74	77	84	121	121	130			
	Cotton	41	41	45	51	82	80	79	103			51(1974)
United Arab Emirates	Crude petroleum	16	16	20	22	31	102	99	106			98(1974)
United Republic of Cameroon	Cocoa	48	40	35	39	66	87	87	106			
	Coffee	58	76	66	74	95	111	105	192			58(1975)
United Republic of Tanzania	Cotton	41	41	45	51	82	80	79	103			

ANNEX IV (continued)

Table 3 (continued)

Country	Main commodities exported	Indices 1974 = 100									Percentage of commodities shown over total exports and year
		1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1975	1975 9 months	1976 9 months	1976	
United Republic of Tanzania (cont'd)	Coffee	58	76	66	74	95	111	105	192	34(1974)	
Uruguay	Meat (beef)	55	64	77	86	113	100	104	106	72(1972)	
	Wool	47	40	37	66	142	82	82	90		
Venezuela	Crude petroleum	16	16	20	22	31	102	99	106	97(1974)	
	Iron ore	57	60	64	69	72	136	136	138		
Yugoslavia	Meat	57	62	69	79	110	109	111	116	20(1974)	
	Tobacco	67	71	74	77	84	121	121	130		
	Wood	47	44	50	62	95	88	89	98		
	Copper	70	68	53	52	86	60	62	71		
	Aluminium	77	81	81	73	73	114	113	119		
	Zinc	29	31	33	39	69	78	79	77		
	Lead	48	51	42	50	71	70	75	75		

ANNEX IV (continued)

Table 3 (continued)

Country	Main commodities exported	Indices 1974 = 100									Percentage of commodities shown over total exports and year
		1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1975	1975 9 months	1976 9 months	1976	
Zaire	Copper	70	68	53	52	86	60	62	71		73(1974)
	Coffee	58	76	66	74	95	111	105	192		
Zambia	Copper	70	68	53	52	86	60	62	71		96(1973)
	Zinc	29	31	33	39	69	78	79	77		

Sources: United Nations, Monthly Bulletin of Statistics, 1976 (ST/ESA/STAT/Ser.Q/series). United Nations, Yearbook of International Trade Statistics, 1975, ST/ESA/STAT/Ser.G/24 and Add.1 (Sales No. 76.XVII.10, vols. I and II).

ANNEX V

Classification of countries into developing, least developed
and most seriously affected groups

Member State	UNEP/ UNDOF scale (1)	Group of Seventy- seven (2)	LDCs (3)	NEAs (4)	UNSO (5)	CDPPP (6)	UNCTAD (7)	World Bank (8)	IMF (9)	OECD (10)
Afghanistan	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Albania	X									
Algeria	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Angola	a/	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Argentina	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Australia										
Austria										
Bahamas	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Bahrain	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Bangladesh	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Barbados	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Belgium										
Benin	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Bhutan	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
Bolivia	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Botswana	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
Brazil	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Bulgaria	X									
Burma	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Burundi	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic										
Canada										
Cape Verde	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Central African Empire	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Chad	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Chile	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
China										
Colombia	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Comoros	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Congo	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Costa Rica	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Cuba	X	X			X	X	X	b/	b/	X
Cyprus	X	X			X		X	X	X	X
Czechoslovakia										
Democratic Kampuchea	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Democratic Yemen	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Denmark										
Dominican Republic	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Ecuador	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Egypt	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
El Salvador	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Equatorial Guinea	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Ethiopia	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Fiji	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Finland										
France										

Number State	UNEP/ UNDOF scale (1)	Group of Seventy- seven (2)	LDCs (3)	NRAs (4)	UNDO (5)	CDPTT (6)	UNCTAD (7)	World Bank (8)	IMF (9)	OECD (10)
Gabon	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Gambia	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
German Democratic Republic										
Germany, Federal Republic of										
Ghana	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Greece	X							X		X
Grenada	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Guatemala	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Guinea	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Guinea-Bissau	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Guyana	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Haiti	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Honduras	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Hungary	X									
Iceland										
India	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Indonesia	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Iran	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Iraq	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Ireland										
Israel	X					X	X	X	X	X
Italy										
Ivory Coast	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Jamaica	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Japan										
Jordan	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Kenya	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Kuwait	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Laos People's Democratic Republic	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Lebanon	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Lesotho	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Liberia	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Luxembourg										
Madagascar	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Malawi	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
Malaysia	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Maldives	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
Mali	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Malta	X	X					X	X		X
Mauritania	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Mauritius	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Mexico	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Mongolia	X				X	b/	b/	b/	b/	b/
Morocco	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Mozambique	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Nepal	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Netherlands										
New Zealand										

ANNEX V (continued)

Member State	UNEP/ UNDOF scale (1)	Group of Seventy- seven (2)	LDCs (3)	NRAs (4)	UNDO (5)	CDPPF (6)	UNCTAD (7)	World Bank (8)	IMF (9)	OECD (10)
Nicaragua	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Niger	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Nigeria	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Norway										
Oman	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Pakistan	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Panama	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Papua New Guinea	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Paraguay	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Peru	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Philippines	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Poland										
Portugal	X							X		X
Qatar	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Romania	X	X						X		
Rwanda	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Samoa	a/		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Sao Tome and Principe	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Saudi Arabia	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Senegal	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Seychelles	a/	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Sierra Leone	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Singapore	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Somalia	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
South Africa										
Spain	X							X		X
Sri Lanka	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Sudan	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Surinam	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Swaziland	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Sweden										
Syrian Arab Republic	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Thailand	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Togo	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Trinidad and Tobago	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Tunisia	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Turkey	X				X			X		X
Uganda	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic										
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics										
United Arab Emirates	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland										
United Republic of Cameroon	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
United Republic of Tanzania	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
United States of America										

ANNEX V (continued)

Member State	UNEP/ UNDOF scale (1)	Group of Seventy- seven (2)	LDCs (3)	MSAs (4)	UNSO (5)	CDPPP (6)	UNCTAD (7)	World Bank (8)	IMF (9)	OECD (10)
Upper Volta	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Uruguay	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Venezuela	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Yemen	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Yugoslavia	X	X						X		X
Zaire	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Zambia	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X

Notes:

Column (1): In financing the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) and the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF), countries marked "X" under this column are termed "economically less developed Member States" for the purpose of paras. 2 (c) and 2 (d) of General Assembly resolutions 31/5 C and D.

Column (2): As at March 1977, countries marked "X" under this column were members of the Group of Seventy-seven.

Column (3): Countries marked "X" under this column are the least developed among the developing countries as approved by the General Assembly in resolutions 2768 (XXVI) and 3487 (XXX).

Column (4): Countries marked "X" under this column are included in the list of most seriously affected developing countries.

Columns (5), (6) and (7): Countries marked "X" under these columns are classified as developing countries by the United Nations Statistical Office (UNSO), the Centre for Development Planning, Projections and Policies (CDPPP) and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD). The reference to "developing" countries is intended for statistical convenience and does not necessarily express a judgement about the stage reached by a particular country in the development process; moreover, the criteria for characterizing a country as "developing" are varied and are subject to review at any time.

Columns (8), (9) and (10): Countries marked "X" under these columns are classified as developing countries by the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). The classifications are mainly intended for statistical convenience and economic analysis and do not necessarily in all cases constitute official country classifications applied by the organizations in their operations or policy decisions; moreover, these criteria for characterizing a country as "developing" are varied and are subject to review at any time.

Sources:

Column (4): Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-first Session, Supplement No. 21 (A/31/21, annex IV).

Column (5): United Nations, Statistical Yearbook, 1975.

Column (6): United Nations, World Economic Survey, 1975.

Column (7): UNCTAD, Handbook of International Trade and Development Statistics, 1976.

Column (8): World Bank, World Tables, 1976.

Column (9): International Monetary Fund, International Financial Statistics, March 1977.

Column (10): OECD, Development Co-operation: Efforts and Policies of the Members of the Development Assistance Committee, 1976 Review.

a/ The classification of Angola, Samoa and Seychelles for the purpose of the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations Emergency Force and the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force remains to be established by the General Assembly.

b/ Not covered by classification.

ANNEX VI

United Nations scales of assessments for the years 1946-1977

1. The United Nations scales of assessments adopted by the General Assembly for the years 1946-1977 are contained in the table which follows. These scales were used by the Organization for the calculation of annual assessments of Member States.

2. In addition, rates of assessment for a full year were established retroactively for the new Members listed below. The resulting contributions were taken into account as income in the assessment of Member States for the following year:

<u>Member States</u>	<u>1957</u>	<u>1959</u>	<u>1963</u>	<u>1964</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1975</u>	<u>1976</u>
Japan	1.97								
Morocco	0.12								
Sudan	0.11								
Tunisia	0.05								
Guinea		0.04							
Algeria			0.10						
Burundi			0.04						
Jamaica			0.05						
Rwanda			0.04						
Trinidad and Tobago			0.04						
Uganda			0.04						
Kenya				0.04					
Southern Yemen <u>a/</u>					0.04				
Fiji						0.04			
Bahrain							0.04		
Oman							0.04		
Qatar							0.04		
United Arab Emirates							0.04		
Bangladesh								0.08	

a/ Now Democratic Yemen.

<u>Member States</u>	<u>1957</u>	<u>1959</u>	<u>1963</u>	<u>1964</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1975</u>	<u>1976</u>
Grenada								0.02	
Guinea-Bissau								0.02	
Cape Verde									0.02
Comoros									0.02
Mozambique									0.02
Papua New New Guinea									0.02
Sao Tome and Principe									0.02
Surinam									0.02

3. During the 10 years from 1946 to 1955, annual scales of assessments were adopted by the General Assembly. Thereafter, scales for triennial periods were recommended by the Committee on Contributions, with such additions to the 100 per cent scale as were necessary to provide for the assessment of new Member States during the course of a triennium. In 1963, however, following an expert study on conceptual differences between the United Nations System of National Accounts and the Material Product System, the Committee found that revisions in the rates of assessment for Czechoslovakia and Hungary were warranted. Accordingly, the Committee recommended b/ and the General Assembly, by its resolution 1927 (XVIII) of 11 December 1963, approved downward adjustments in the rates of assessment for the two States, with retroactive effect to 1962 and 1963. Such reductions were achieved by offsetting the amounts involved against income derived from the contributions of seven States admitted to membership in the Organization during the course of those two years.

4. The recommendations of the Committee on Contributions for triennial scales of assessments were approved by the General Assembly with the following exceptions:

(a) Following the admission of 16 new Member States in 1955, the previously adopted scale for 1956-1958 was revised for 1956 and 1957 to incorporate assessments for the new States. These assessments served to reduce, on a pro rata basis, the percentage contributions of all Members except for those at the ceiling (33.33 per cent), at the floor (0.04 per cent) and those subject to the per capita ceiling principle. For 1958, the General Assembly, by its resolution 1137 (XII) of 14 October 1957, decided that the maximum contribution of any Member State in principle should not exceed 30 per cent of the total and that the percentage contributions of a further six States admitted to membership

b/ Official Records of the General Assembly, Eighteenth Session, Supplement No. 10 (A/5510), para. 30.

in the Organization in 1956 and in 1957 should be incorporated into a 100 per cent scale for 1958. The Assembly further decided that such incorporation was to be accomplished by applying the total amount of the percentage contribution of the six new States to a pro rata reduction of all Members except those at the floor, taking into account the per capita ceiling principle and reductions which might be required as a result of appeals. Accordingly, a new scale was adopted for 1958.

(b) More recently, the scale recommended by the Committee for 1977-1979 was adopted for 1977 only, pending studies called for by General Assembly resolution 31/95 A of 14 December 1976.

UNITED NATIONS SCALES OF ASSESSMENTS FOR THE YEARS 1946-1977

Member State	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	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
Afghanistan	-	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02	
Albania	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02	
Algeria	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Argentina	1.94	1.85	1.85	1.85	1.85	1.85	1.62	1.45	1.40	1.32	1.17	1.14	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.01	1.01	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	
Australia	2.00	1.97	1.97	1.97	1.97	1.92	1.77	1.75	1.75	1.80	1.65	1.61	1.79	1.79	1.79	1.66	1.66	1.66	1.58	1.58	1.58	1.52	1.52	1.52	1.52	1.47	1.47	1.47	1.44	1.44	1.44	
Austria	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.36	0.35	0.43	0.43	0.43	0.43	0.43	0.43	0.43	0.43	0.43	0.53	0.53	0.53	0.53	0.53	0.53	0.53	0.53	0.53	0.53	
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	1.24	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.20	1.20	1.20	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.05	
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	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	
Botswana	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Brazil	1.94	1.85	1.85	1.85	1.85	1.85	1.62	1.45	1.40	1.32	1.09	1.06	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.03	1.03	1.03	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	
Bulgaria	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Burma	-	-	-	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.10	0.10	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	
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	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.52	0.52	0.52	0.52	0.52	0.52	0.52	0.51	0.51	0.51	0.51	0.51	0.51	0.51	0.51	0.51	
Canada	3.35	3.20	3.20	3.20	3.20	3.30	3.35	3.30	3.30	3.63	3.15	3.09	3.11	3.11	3.11	3.12	3.12	3.12	3.12	3.17	3.17	3.17	3.02	3.02	3.02	3.02	3.02	3.02	3.02	3.02	3.02	
Cape Verde	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Central African Empire	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Chad	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Chile	0.47	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.41	0.35	0.33	0.33	0.30	0.30	0.29	0.27	0.27	0.27	0.26	0.26	0.26	0.26	0.26	0.26	0.27	0.27	0.27	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23	
China	6.30	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	5.75	5.62	5.62	5.62	5.14	5.01	5.01	5.01	5.01	4.57	4.57	4.57	4.25	4.25	4.25	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	
Colombia	0.39	0.37	0.37	0.37	0.37	0.37	0.37	0.35	0.41	0.41	0.37	0.36	0.31	0.31	0.31	0.26	0.26	0.26	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.19	
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	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	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	0.26	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.22	0.22	0.22	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	
Cyprus	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Czechoslovakia	0.95	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.99	1.05	1.05	1.05	0.94	0.84	0.82	0.87	0.87	0.87	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84	
Democratic Kampuchea	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
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	0.64	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.58	0.58	0.58	0.62	0.62	0.62	0.62	0.62	0.62	0.62	0.62	0.62	0.62	0.62	0.62	0.62	
Dominican Republic	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	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	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	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	0.35	0.32	0.32	0.32	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.20	0.20	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.18	
El Salvador	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	
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	0.11	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	
Fiji	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Finland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
France	6.30	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	5.75	5.75	5.75	5.90	5.70	5.56	6.40	6.40	6.40	5.94	5.94	5.94	6.09	6.09	6.09	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	

Member State	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	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
Gabon	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02
Gambia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
German Democratic Republic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.22	1.22	1.35
Germany, Federal Republic of	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ghana	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.07	0.07	0.07	7.10	7.10	7.74
Greece	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.19	0.21	0.21	0.20	0.19	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.29	0.29	0.29	0.29	0.32	0.32	0.39
Grenada	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Guatemala	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.03	0.03	0.02
Guinea	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02
Guinea-Bissau	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Guyana	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02
Haiti	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02
Honduras	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02
Hungary	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.46	0.39	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.56	0.56	0.51	0.56	0.56	0.56	0.56	0.52	0.52	0.48	0.48	0.33	0.33	0.34
Iceland	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02
India	4.09	3.95	3.95	3.25	3.25	3.41	3.53	3.45	3.40	3.30	2.97	2.90	2.46	2.46	2.46	2.03	2.03	2.03	1.85	1.85	1.85	1.74	1.74	1.55	1.55	1.55	1.20	1.20	0.70
Indonesia	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.56	0.51	0.50	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.45	0.45	0.45	-	-	-	0.39	0.34	0.34	0.28	0.28	0.19	0.19	0.14
Iran	0.47	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.40	0.33	0.28	0.25	0.27	0.26	0.21	0.21	0.21	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.22	0.22	0.22	0.22	0.22	0.20	0.20	0.15
Iraq	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.14	0.12	0.12	0.11	0.12	0.12	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.05	0.05	0.10
Ireland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.19	0.18	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.17	0.17	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15
Israel	-	-	-	-	0.12	0.12	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.16	0.16	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.21	0.21	0.24
Italy	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.08	2.03	2.25	2.25	2.25	2.24	2.24	2.24	2.54	2.54	2.54	3.24	3.24	3.24	3.24	3.54	3.60	3.60	3.30
Ivory Coast	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.06	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02
Jamaica	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02
Japan	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.92	2.19	2.19	2.19	2.27	2.27	2.27	2.77	2.77	2.77	3.78	3.78	5.40	5.40	5.40	7.15	7.15	8.66
Jordan	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02
Kenya	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02
Kuwait	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.08	0.08	0.09	0.09	0.16
Laos People's Democratic Republic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lebanon	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02
Lesotho	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02
Liberia	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Luxembourg	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.04
Madagascar	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Malawi	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02
Malaysia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02
Maldives	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.22	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.15	0.12	0.12	0.11	0.11	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.07	0.07	0.09
Mali	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02
Malta	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02
Mauritania	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mauritius	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02
Mexico	0.66	0.63	0.63	0.63	0.63	0.63	0.65	0.70	0.75	0.80	0.70	0.68	0.71	0.71	0.71	0.74	0.74	0.74	0.81	0.81	0.81	0.87	0.87	0.87	0.88	0.88	0.86	0.86	0.78
Mongolia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02
Morocco	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.12	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.10	0.10	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.06	0.06	0.05
Mozambique	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nepal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02
Netherlands	1.47	1.40	1.40	1.40	1.40	1.35	1.27	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.15	1.12	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.16	1.16	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.24	1.24	1.38
New Zealand	0.52	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.48	0.48	0.48	0.45	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.36	0.36	0.32	0.32	0.32	0.28	0.28	0.28
Nicaragua	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.								

Member State	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	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
Niger	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02	
Nigeria	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.21	0.21	0.21	0.21	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.10	
Norway	0.52	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.49	0.48	0.49	0.49	0.49	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.44	0.44	0.44	0.43	0.43	0.43	0.43	0.43	0.43	0.43	0.43	0.43	
Oman	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Pakistan	-	-	-	0.70	0.70	0.74	0.79	0.79	0.75	0.67	0.55	0.54	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.37	0.37	0.37	0.37	0.37	0.37	0.34	0.34	0.34	0.14	0.14	0.06	
Panama	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02	
Papua New Guinea	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Paraguay	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02	
Peru	0.21	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.15	0.15	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.07	0.07	0.06	
Philippines	0.30	0.29	0.29	0.29	0.29	0.29	0.29	0.39	0.45	0.45	0.41	0.40	0.43	0.43	0.43	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.34	0.34	0.31	0.31	0.31	0.31	0.18	0.18	0.10	
Poland	1.00	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	1.05	1.36	1.58	1.73	1.73	1.56	1.52	1.37	1.37	1.37	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.45	1.45	1.45	1.45	1.47	1.47	1.41	1.41	1.41	1.41	1.26	1.26	1.40	
Portugal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.25	0.24	0.20	0.20	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.15	0.15	0.20	
Qatar	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Romania	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.50	0.49	0.34	0.34	0.34	0.32	0.32	0.32	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.36	0.36	0.30	0.30	0.26	
Rwanda	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02	
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	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.05	0.05	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.02	
Senegal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02	
Sierra Leone	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02	
Singapore	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.08	
Somalia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
South Africa	1.15	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.04	0.90	0.83	0.78	0.78	0.71	0.67	0.56	0.56	0.56	0.53	0.53	0.53	0.52	0.52	0.52	0.52	0.52	0.52	0.54	0.54	0.54	0.54	0.50	0.50	0.40	
Spain	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.14	1.11	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.86	0.86	0.73	0.73	0.73	0.73	0.92	0.92	1.04	1.04	1.04	0.99	0.99	1.53	
Sri Lanka	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.11	0.11	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.09	0.09	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.03	0.03	0.02	
Sudan	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.11	0.11	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02	
Suriname	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Swaziland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Sweden	-	2.35	2.04	2.00	1.98	1.85	1.73	1.65	1.65	1.59	1.46	1.43	1.39	1.39	1.39	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.26	1.26	1.26	1.26	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.30	1.30	1.20	
Syrian Arab Republic	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.11	0.09	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	
Thailand	-	-	0.27	0.27	0.27	0.24	0.21	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.11	0.11	0.10	
Togo	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Trinidad and Tobago	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02	
Tunisia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Turkey	0.93	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.75	0.65	0.65	0.65	0.63	0.61	0.59	0.59	0.59	0.59	0.59	0.59	0.59	0.59	0.59	0.59	0.59	0.59	0.59	0.59	0.59	0.59	0.59	0.59	0.59	
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	1.85	1.80	1.80	1.80	1.80	1.80	1.98	1.98	1.98	1.97	1.97	1.97	1.97	1.93	1.93	1.87	1.87	1.87	1.71	1.71	1.50	
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	13.96	13.62	13.62	13.62	13.62	13.62	14.97	14.97	14.97	14.92	14.92	14.92	14.92	14.61	14.61	14.18	14.18	14.18	12.97	12.97	11.33	
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	7.81	7.62	7.78	7.78	7.78	7.78	7.58	7.58	7.58	7.21	7.21	7.21	7.21	6.62	6.62	5.90	5.90	5.90	5.31	5.31	4.44	
United Republic of Cameroon	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02	
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	33.33	32.51	32.51	32.51	32.51	32.51	32.02	32.02	32.02	31.91	31.91	31.91	31.91	31.91	31.91	31.91	31.91	31.91	31.91	31.91	31.91	
Upper Volta	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Uruguay	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.16	0.16	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.04	
Venezuela	0.28	0.27	0.27	0.27	0.27	0.30	0.32	0.35	0.39	0.44	0.43	0.42	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.32	0.32	0.32	0.32	0.32	0.32	0.32	0.32	0.32	0.32	0.32	0.32	0.32	0.32	0.32	

Member State	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	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
Yemen	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02
Yugoslavia	0.34	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.36	0.43	0.44	0.44	0.44	0.36	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.40	0.40	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.34	0.34	0.38
Zaire	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02
Zambia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.04	100.95	100.00	100.16	100.33	99.73	99.82	100.37	100.00	100.16	100.00	100.08	100.24	100.00	100.12	100.00

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 Organisation 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. استعلم 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.
