

UN LIBRARY

JUN 7 1977



UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

UN/SA COLLECTION



Distr.
RESTRICTED

A/CN.2/R.392
19 May 1977

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

DRAFT REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONTRIBUTIONS

/Original: English/

CONTENTS

| | <u>Paragraphs</u> | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------------|-------------|
| I. MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE | 1 - 2 | 4 |
| II. TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE | 3 - 8 | 5 |
| III. STUDY OF WAYS AND MEANS OF INCREASING THE FAIRNESS AND EQUITY OF THE SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS . . . | 9 - 45 | 9 |
| A. Possible improvements in the statistical measurement of relative capacity to pay | 10 - 35 | 9 |
| 1. Economic and social indicators of capacity to pay | 10 - 22 | 9 |
| 2. Price trends in international trade | 23 - 25 | 18 |
| 3. Current and constant prices | 26 - 28 | 19 |
| 4. Coverage and comparability of international statistics | 29 - 35 | 20 |
| B. Possibility of mitigating extreme variations in assessments between two successive scales | 36 - 42 | 23 |
| C. Continuing disparity between the economies of developed and developing countries | 43 - 45 | 28 |
| IV. REVIEW OF THE SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS | 46 - 58 | 30 |
| A. Statistical information | 48 - 49 | 30 |
| B. Comparative income per head of population | 50 - 52 | 31 |
| C. Special measures of relief in the scale | 53 - 54 | 33 |
| D. Mitigation of changes in the scale | 55 | 34 |
| E. Representation on individual assessments | 56 - 58 | 35 |
| V. SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS | 59 - 67 | 37 |
| VI. ASSESSMENT OF NEW MEMBERS FOR 1976 AND 1977 | 68 - 71 | 47 |
| VII. ASSESSMENT OF NON-MEMBER STATES | 72 - 82 | 49 |

/...

CONTENTS (continued)

| | <u>Paragraphs</u> | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------------|-------------|
| VIII. OTHER MATTERS CONSIDERED BY THE COMMITTEE | 83 - 91 | 54 |
| A. Collection of contributions | 83 - 84 | 54 |
| B. Payment of contributions in currencies other than United States dollars | 85 - 87 | 54 |
| C. Scale of contributions for specialized agencies . . | 88 - 89 | 55 |
| D. Statements requested by the Fifth Committee | 90 | 55 |
| E. Date of the next session of the Committee | 91 | 56 |
| IX. RECOMMENDATION OF THE COMMITTEE | 92 | 57 |

Annexes

| | |
|---|-----|
| I. TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE | 68 |
| 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 WHICH MIGHT BE ADOPTED IN THE FORMULATION OF SCALES OF ASSESSMENT | 79 |
| III. DATA FOR ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL INDICATORS | 81 |
| Table 1. Availability of data for economic and social indicators | 81 |
| Table 2. Statistics in respect of selected indicators | 83 |
| IV. PRICE TRENDS IN INTERNATIONAL TRADE | 95 |
| Table 1. Terms of trade and trade balance | 95 |
| A. Terms of trade | 95 |
| B. Percentage of imports covered by exports | 98 |
| Table 2. Unit value index of manufactured goods exported by developed countries | 101 |
| Table 3. Price indices of primary commodities | 102 |
| V. CLASSIFICATION OF COUNTRIES INTO DEVELOPING, LEAST DEVELOPED AND MOST SERIOUSLY AFFECTED GROUPS | 110 |
| VI. UNITED NATIONS SCALES OF ASSESSMENTS FOR THE YEARS 1946-1977 | 115 |

/...

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 August 1977. The following members were present:

Mr. Abdel Hamid Abdel-Ghani

Syed Amjad Ali

Mr. Anatoly Semënovich Chistyakov

Mr. Miguel A. Dávila Mendoza

Mr. Talib El-Shibib

Mr. Gdadebo 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

Mr. Bernal Vargas-Saborio

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

/...

II. TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE

3. In its report to the General Assembly at its thirty-first session,^{1/} 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.

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

4. At its thirty-first session, the General Assembly, in adopting the scale of assessments recommended by the Committee on Contributions for the year 1977 (resolution 31/95 B of 14 December 1976), decided, by its resolution 31/95 A of 14 December 1976, to lower the minimum rate of assessment to 0.01 per cent in the coming scale. 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,

"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. At the same time, 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 on the basis of:

(a) The criteria contained in its report^{2/} (see para. 3 above);

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

^{2/} Ibid.

(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 the principal suggestions and proposals advanced during the debate in the Fifth Committee in connexion with new criteria and procedures which might be adopted in the formulation of scales of assessment is contained in annex II to the present report.

/...

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

9. Pursuant to General Assembly resolution 31/95 A and in accordance with the various suggestions and proposals advanced by the representatives of a number of Member States during the debate in the Fifth Committee, a detailed study was conducted by the Committee on Contributions on ways and means of increasing the equity of the scale of assessments. The Committee was fully conscious, throughout its review, that an equitable scale which would commend itself by its fairness and objectivity to the membership as a whole was a matter of the utmost importance. Its task, however, was an exceptionally difficult one, not only as a consequence of the magnitude of economic changes that had occurred in many areas of the world, but also as a result of the widely divergent views that had been expressed during the debate in the Fifth Committee as to the intrinsic meaning of relative capacity to pay. The Committee did not fail to recognize that capacity to pay was open to many definitions and approaches. As explained in the following paragraphs, however, in the present state of statistical science, the Committee had no alternative but to conclude that, for the measurement of relative capacity to pay, there was no substitute for national income.

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.^{3/} 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. In so doing, however, the Committee wishes to clarify the difference between the role played by absolute numerical values of indicators in comparable units that can form the basis of a scale, and that played by indicators which represent relative values for individual countries and which show rankings but do not provide, in themselves, a basis for a scale. The total energy consumption (in kilograms of coal equivalent) of each Member State, for example, can be allocated on a percentage basis among Members so as to total 100 per cent; per capita energy consumption expressed in equivalent units, on the other hand, merely ranks Member States with respect to energy consumption per inhabitant without permitting a percentage allocation to be made among Members.

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, 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.

^{3/} Ibid., para. 16.

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 indicators listed are expressed in relative values (such as per capita, per 1,000 inhabitants, or in percentage terms) rather than in the absolute amounts required for the formulation of a scale. Nevertheless, 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</u> (\$US) | <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 (viz., 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:

/...

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

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.^{4/}

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

^{4/} 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)).

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:

$$\begin{array}{lll} \text{Country "A"} & \frac{5,000 \times 6/5 + 5,000 \times 4 (9/10)}{5} & = \$4,800 \\ \text{Country "B"} & \frac{3,000 \times 4/5 + 3,000 \times 4 (1/5)}{5} & = \$960 \\ \text{Country "C"} & \frac{1,000 \times 3/5 + 1,000 \times 4 (4/5)}{5} & = \$760 \end{array}$$

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.

/...

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 statistics from Member States for a common and recent 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 covering 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 available for only 25 and three Member States, respectively. Nor was it likely that such data would be available for the membership as a whole for many years to come.

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. The almost universal adoption of standardized systems of national accounts, their regular publication and the totality of national resources portrayed by the aggregate of national income, however, reinforced the conclusion reached by the Committee at its 1976 session that national income is the only single indicator which, for the time being, can be statistically compiled for all countries. 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 developing 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 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 inevitably 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 therefore be duly taken into account in the ensuing scale.

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." 5/

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.

28. In reaching its conclusion, the Committee recognized that while the problem remains intractable, it will be largely alleviated by the recommendation made in paragraph 42 below.

4. Coverage and comparability of international statistics

29. 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

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

scale of assessments.^{6/} 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.^{7/} 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.

30. 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.

31. 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

^{6/} Ibid., Eighth Session, Annexes, agenda item 42, document A/2577 and Corr.1, para. 17.

^{7/} Ibid., Thirty-first Session, Supplement No. 11 (A/31/11), para. 58. /...

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. Rather, the problem is only one aspect of a more general one affecting all international comparisons at the present time.

32. In the latter connexion, and 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 it attaches to 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.

/...

33. 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 the special circumstances of the centrally planned economies with respect to the role played by exchange rates in their international transactions with the rest of the world, led the Committee to believe that the methodology of converting national incomes in national currencies into a common unit merited further exploration.

34. 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.

35. 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

36. 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".

37. 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 was unable to develop a workable and universally applicable system of limitations - either in percentage or in absolute terms - to be imposed on changes, both upward and downward. Moreover, the imposition of such limitations were found by the Committee to be in conflict with the basic principle of capacity to pay, a principle which had been laid down by the General Assembly at its first session (General Assembly resolution 14 (I)) and had been reaffirmed as recently as its thirty-first session. Having reached this conclusion, the Committee, in accordance with the request made by the General Assembly, therefore examined the consequences on individual rates of assessments of a variety of statistical base periods.

38. 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.^{8/} This step was taken in order to reduce the effect on

^{8/} Ibid., Eighth Session, Supplement No. 10 (A/2461), p. 9.

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,^{9/} 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:

"... 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."^{10/}

39. Nevertheless, in compliance with the decisions of the General Assembly (as outlined in para. 36 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,

^{9/} Ibid., Twenty-third Session, Annexes, agenda item 77, document A/7451, para. 7.

^{10/} Ibid., Twenty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 11 (A/7611 and Corr.1), para. 14.

the year of its last review). At its current session, however, data for 1975 were available and could thus be taken into account.

40. 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 consequence, of course, 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) and the sharp increases in 1973 of the prices of certain commodities. 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. 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 noted that in the case of countries whose national incomes had risen rapidly, the inclusion of data relating to the early years of an expanded base period

/...

would, to a certain extent, meet the contention of some representatives in the Fifth Committee that a high level of current income presented an exaggerated picture of actual wealth.

41. The opinion reached, however, was not a unanimous one. 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. One member, however, seriously questioned the introduction of a seven-year base period for the formulation of a scale, pointing to the fact that such a period not only failed to give the necessary weight to more recent economic realities, but in some cases actually reversed such realities. It was the view of this member that the scale for 1974-1976 and for 1977 had been a reflection of Members' relative capacity to pay during the years 1969-1971 and 1972-1974 and that to revert to the latter years for the purpose of a new scale was to distort the principle of capacity to pay not only for those countries whose economies had suffered reverses in more recent years, but also for those whose economies had flourished.

42. For the most part, however, the Committee agreed 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

43. 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.

44. 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" (LDCs) and the "most seriously affected countries" (MSAs), 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)

45. In the absence of a single and universally accepted definition of countries to be designated as developing, the Committee found itself unable 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 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. In so doing it refrained, to the extent practicable, from recommending increases in the rates of assessments of all countries generally considered to be developing.

/...

IV. REVIEW OF THE SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS

46. The General Assembly, by its resolution 31/95 B of 14 December 1976, established 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 and even three years' duration. In its judgement, however, the Committee felt that a two-year scale, encompassing the years 1978 and 1979, would not only give a degree of financial stability to the Organization, but would also complete the triennial cycle which commenced with the year 1977.

47. 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

48. In paragraphs 29 to 35 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 generally 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.

49. 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

50. 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.

51. 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 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,^{11/} 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.

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

^{11/} 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 reduction is made from that State's national income.

/...

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%)</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.

Bearing in mind its adoption of a seven-year base period and the decision of the General Assembly to lower the floor to 0.01 per cent, the Committee agreed that the possibility of any further adjustment in the allowance formula would be studied at the time of its next review of the scale.

C. Special measures of relief in the scale

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

54. 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

55. The Committee was somewhat divided 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, 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 increases 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 anomalies in individual rates of assessment.

/...

E. Representation on individual assessments

56. 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.

57. 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 would be transformed into a negotiating committee. 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.

58. In its review of the scale, the Committee examined in detail each of the written and oral representations it had received. 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. Evidence of this growth was found in an examination of rates of assessment which would have applied had the Committee based its review of the scale on 1973-1975, or on 1975 alone. Hence, while appreciative of the concerns expressed by Member States in their representations, the Committee kept in mind its obligation to avoid excessive variations in future scale. None the less, in keeping with its normal practice of taking account of natural disasters and other compelling economic factors, the Committee made certain downward adjustments in individual rates of assessments.

/...

V. SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS

59. 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).

60. 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.

61. Paragraph 52 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, 55 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.

62. 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.

63. 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.

64. The action taken by the Committee in systematically providing relief to countries within the low per capita ranges and to certain other countries whose rates of assessment had increased significantly between the 1974-1976 and 1977 scales did not allow it to give appropriate recognition to the deteriorating economies of a number of other Member States (except in very limited instances where circumstances were such that overriding and compelling reasons called for some mitigation).

65. In this connexion, it was the view of some members that the rate of assessment of industrialized countries should in no case 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.

66. 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

/...

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. 40), since it was the conclusion of the Committee that the extension of the base period would in the long run arrest further sharp variations, for 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. To the extent that the adjustments just described related to developing countries, one member was unable fully to support the conclusions of the Committee, it being his belief that 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.

67. A number of members of the Committee voiced objections to various aspects of the scale formulated for 1978-1979 and to rates of assessments proposed for certain Member States. With the exception of Mr. Hennes, Mr. Koschorreck and Mr. Rhodes, who could not lend their support to the scale as a whole, 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.

/...

| <u>Scale of assessments</u> | | | |
|---|----------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| | (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 |

/...

Scale of assessments (continued)

| | (1) | (2) | (3) |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| <u>Member State</u> | <u>1974-1976 scale</u> | <u>1977 scale</u> | <u>Scale recommended for 1978-1979</u> |
| 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 |
| 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 |

/...

Scale of assessments (continued)

| | (1) | (2) | (3) |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| <u>Member State</u> | <u>1974-1976 scale</u> | <u>1977 scale</u> | <u>Scale recommended for 1978-1979</u> |
| 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 |
| India | 1.20 | 0.70 | 0.68 |
| Indonesia | 0.19 | 0.14 | 0.14 |

/...

Scale of assessments (continued)

| | (1) | (2) | (3) |
|---|----------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| <u>Member State</u> | <u>1974-1976 scale</u> | <u>1977 scale</u> | <u>Scale recommended for 1978-1979</u> |
| 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 |

/...

Scale of assessments (continued)

| | (1) | (2) | (3) |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| <u>Member State</u> | <u>1974-1976 scale</u> | <u>1977 scale</u> | <u>Scale recommended for 1978-1979</u> |
| 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 |
| 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 |

/...

Scale of assessments (continued)

| | (1) | (2) | (3) |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| <u>Member State</u> | <u>1974-1976 scale</u> | <u>1977 scale</u> | <u>Scale recommended for 1978-1979</u> |
| 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 |
| Swaziland | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.01 |
| Sweden | 1.30 | 1.20 | 1.24 |
| Syrian Arab Republic | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 |

/...

Scale of assessments (continued)

| | (1) | (2) | (3) |
|---|----------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| <u>Member State</u> | <u>1974-1976 scale</u> | <u>1977 scale</u> | <u>Scale recommended for 1978-1979</u> |
| 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 | 100.12 | 100.00 | 100.00 |

/...

VI. ASSESSMENT OF NEW MEMBERS FOR 1976 AND 1977

68. Under the terms of rule 160 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly,^{12/} 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".

69. 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 |

70. 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.

^{12/} A/520/Rev.12 and Rev.12/Amend.1 (United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.74.I.6.

71. 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.

/...

VII. ASSESSMENT OF NON-MEMBER STATES

72. 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 |

73. 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 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 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.

74. 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.

75. 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^{13/} 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.

76. 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^{14/} 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

^{13/} Formerly the Republic of Viet Nam.

^{14/} Idem.

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.

77. 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.

78. 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.

79. 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 |

/...

| | <u>Percentage rates</u> <u>recommended for</u> <u>1978-1979</u> |
|--|---|
| Republic of Korea | 0.13 |
| San Marino | 0.01 |
| Socialist Republic of Viet Nam | 0.03 |
| Switzerland | 0.96 |
| Tonga | 0.01 |

80. 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.

81. 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.

82. At the same time, the Committee wishes to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the fact that the rates recommended in paragraphs 74, 76, 77 and 79 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

83. 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."

84. 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.

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

85. 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.

/...

86. 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.

87. 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

88. 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".

89. 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

90. 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

91. The Committee decided to open its next session on 24 April 1978.

IX. RECOMMENDATION OF THE COMMITTEE

92. 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 |

/...

| <u>Member State</u> | <u>Per cent</u> |
|--|-----------------|
| 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 |
| 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 |

/...

| <u>Member State</u> | <u>Per cent</u> |
|--|-----------------|
| 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 |
| Haiti | 0.01 |
| Honduras | 0.01 |
| Hungary | 0.33 |

/...

| <u>Member State</u> | <u>Per cent</u> |
|--|-----------------|
| 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 |

/...

| <u>Member State</u> | <u>Per cent</u> |
|----------------------------|-----------------|
| Mali | 0.01 |
| Malta | 0.01 |
| Mauritania | 0.01 |
| Mauritius | 0.01 |
| Mexico | 0.79 |
| Mongolia | 0.01 |
| Morocco | 0.05 |
| Mozambique | 0.02 |
| 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 |

/...

| <u>Member State</u> | <u>Per cent</u> |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|
| 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 |
| Thailand | 0.10 |
| Togo | 0.01 |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 0.03 |
| Tunisia | 0.02 |
| Turkey | 0.30 |

/...

| <u>Member State</u> | <u>Per cent</u> |
|--|-----------------|
| 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 |

/...

| <u>Non-member States</u> | <u>Per cent</u> |
|--|-----------------|
| 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^{15/} 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

^{15/} Formerly the Republic of Viet-Nam.

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.

/...

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

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).

/...

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.

"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;

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

/...

"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;"

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 scales 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;

d/ See resolution 665 (VII).

/...

"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,

"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,

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

"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,

"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."

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

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

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 which might be adopted
in the formulation of scales of assessment

(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 off 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);

a/ "Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations" (See report of the Fifth Committee (A/31/427)).

(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;

(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 INDICATORS

Table 1

A. Availability 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 |

/...

ANNEX III (continued)

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)

| Member State | Indicator | Per capita energy consumption (kilograms of coal equivalent) | Percentage share of manufactured exports in total exports | Percentage share of three main exported 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 survivals 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) |
| AFGHANISTAN | | 67 | 14.9 | 46 | 1 | .237 | 2 022 | 11 | 18.0 | 10 | .038 | 818 | 10 | ... | 1.95 | 38 | .237 |
| ALBANIA | | 725 | ... | ... | ... | .258 | 2 523 | 38 | 33.7 | ... | 6.289 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 1.655 |
| ALGERIA | | 511 | 2.7 | 87 | 14 | .059 | 2 138 | 12 | 49.6 | 26 | .122 | 914 | ... | 0.30 | 4.12 | 52 | 4.985 |
| ANGOLA | | 191 | 2.5 | 67 | 6 | .091 | 2 021 | 5 | 36.0 | ... | .065 | 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 |
| AUSTRALIA | | 5 997 | 16.9 | 33 | 377 | 1.305 | 3 310 | 21 | 93.0 | ... | 1.387 | 982 | 2 523 | 1.30 | 2.39 | 72 | 7.843 |
| AUSTRIA | | 3 883 | 82.8 | 16 | 262 | .493 | 3 310 | 36 | 87.5 | 99 | 1.961 | 974 | ... | .69 | 1.14 | 70 | 1.435 |
| BAHAMAS | | 7 985 | 6.3 | 94 | 270 | ... | 2 428 | ... | 93.1 | 93 | .831 | 963 | ... | .18 | .02 | 66 | ... |
| BAHRAIN | | 11 819 | 14.9 | 87 | 98 | ... | ... | 42 | 93.4 | 40 | .644 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 31.900 |
| BANGLADESH | | 31 | ... | ... | 1 | .243 | 2 024 | 8 | 14.0 | 22 | .107 | 860 | ... | .06 | .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 | .858 |
| BENIN | | 42 | 8.6 | 63 | 3 | .129 | 2 250 | 6 | 50.2 | ... | .028 | 890 | ... | ... | 2.91 | 39 | ... |
| BHUTAN | | ... | ... | ... | ... | .346 | 2 078 | ... | 5.6 | ... | .021 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| 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 | 13.4 | ... | .068 | 874 | ... | .16 | ... | 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 | 30.7 | 70 | .145 | 861 | ... | ... | 5.97 | 48 | .046 |
| BURUNDI | | 13 | 1.2 | 91 | 1 | .149 | 2 040 | 9 | 12.9 | ... | .021 | 862 | ... | ... | 6.63 | 41 | ... |
| BYELORUSSIAN SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC a/ | | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| CANADA | | 9 816 | 43.5 | 32 | 550 | 1.623 | 3 180 | 20 | 94.5 | 93 | 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 | .057 | 2 170 | 13 | 8.8 | ... | .037 | ... | ... | .38 | 2.23 | ... | .003 |
| CHAD | | 17 | 5.3 | 86 | 2 | .124 | 2 060 | 7 | 9.8 | 7 | .023 | 840 | ... | .35 | 5.73 | 39 | ... |
| CHILE | | 1 361 | 1.2 | 82 | 43 | .163 | 2 825 | 35 | 78.8 | 88 | .545 | 921 | ... | ... | 4.10 | 62 | .935 |
| CHINA | | 650 | ... | ... | ... | .284 | 2 050 | ... | 32.2 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 50 | .665 |
| COLOMBIA | | 636 | 26.4 | 57 | 47 | .123 | 2 183 | 22 | 74.1 | 73 | .458 | 930 | ... | .15 | .91 | 59 | .849 |
| COMOROS | | 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 | 2 537 | 20 | 63.6 | 89 | .708 | 940 | ... | ... | .57 | 67 | .080 |
| CUBA | | 1 178 | ... | 92 | 32 | .059 | 2 712 | 71 | 70.0 | ... | .867 | 971 | ... | 2.03 | ... | 67 | .027 |
| CYPRUS | | 1 419 | 8.7 | 54 | 107 | .153 | 2 670 | 13 | 71.8 | 89 | .837 | 974 | 566 | .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 | ... | 5.410 |
| DEMOCRATIC KAMPUCHEA | | 17 | 1.5 | 65 | 1 | .107 | 1 894 | 17 | 21.8 | 36 | .065 | 873 | ... | ... | 15.17 | ... | .001 |
| DEMOCRATIC YEMEN | | 360 | 5.4 | *80 | 6 | .053 | 2 070 | 2 | 35.5 | ... | .031 | ... | ... | ... | 14.04 | 42 | ... |

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 exported 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 survivals 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) |
| 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 | | 433 | 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 | 909 | ... | .30 | 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 | 20.0 | ... | .086 | ... | ... | ... | ... | 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 | 46.4 | ... | .483 | 981 | 258 | ... | .23 | 68 | ... |
| FINLAND | | 4 636 | 72.8 | 39 | 358 | .690 | 3 050 | 30 | 85.7 | 99 | 1.252 | 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 | 771 | ... | .003 | 1.15 | 39 | 28.960 |
| GAMBIA | | 73 | ... | 97 | 5 | .129 | 2 370 | 3 | 17.9 | ... | .053 | 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 | 41.6 | ... | .089 | 844 | ... | .94 | 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 | ... | ... | 5 | ... | ... | .210 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| GUATEMALA | | 252 | 26.3 | 51 | 10 | .188 | 1 994 | 13 | 43.0 | 38 | .231 | 917 | ... | .01 | .95 | 51 | .008 |
| GUINEA | | 94 | ... | ... | 2 | .174 | 2 040 | 6 | 15.3 | ... | .045 | ... | ... | ... | 5.22 | ... | .001 |
| GUINEA-BISSAU | | 41 | ... | ... | 5 | .128 | ... | 1 | 12.7 | ... | .057 | ... | ... | ... | ... | 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 | 988 | ... | .45 | ... | 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 | 865 | ... | ... | .21 | 48 | .814 |
| IRAN | | 1 268 | 1.4 | 97 | 24 | .254 | 2 368 | 39 | 58.1 | 37 | .329 | 860 | ... | .59 | 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 | .503 |
| IVORY COAST | | 370 | 7.6 | 67 | 10 | .130 | 2 490 | 15 | 15.5 | 20 | .072 | 860 | ... | .36 | 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 |
| KUWAIT | | 9 913 | 4.6 | 95 | 110 | ... | ... | 4 | 97.5 | 55 | 1.250 | 963 | ... | ... | 2.79 | 64 | 211.123 |

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 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 survivals 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) |
| 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 | 841 | ... | ... | .79 | 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 | 898 | ... | .90 | 1.42 | 42 | .003 |
| MALAWI | | 56 | 8.7 | 70 | 4 | .221 | 2 210 | 12 | 10.7 | 22 | .026 | 852 | 33 | ... | .74 | 39 | .005 |
| MALAYSIA | | 556 | 12.9 | 56 | 22 | .169 | 2 574 | 15 | 57.4 | 61 | .209 | 959 | ... | ... | 4.96 | 59 | .498 |
| MALDIVES | | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 1 827 | ... | ... | ... | .036 | ... | ... | ... | 4.26 | ... | ... |
| MALI | | 24 | 9.5 | 65 | 1 | .150 | 1 774 | 9 | 9.0 | 2 | .026 | 880 | ... | ... | 2.72 | 37 | .001 |
| MALTA | | 1 156 | 87.2 | 57 | 154 | .017 | 3 081 | 26 | 94.0 | 87 | 1.012 | 972 | 602 | .13 | ... | 68 | ... |
| MAURITANIA | | 112 | 5.1 | 91 | ... | .033 | 1 970 | 5 | 12.7 | 11 | .056 | ... | ... | ... | 2.53 | 41 | ... |
| MAURITIUS | | 275 | 5.7 | 93 | 28 | .003 | 2 360 | 13 | 71.8 | ... | .225 | 943 | ... | .54 | 1.38 | 63 | .006 |
| MEXICO | | 1 269 | 39.8 | 20 | 45 | .272 | 2 727 | 23 | 59.1 | 74 | .722 | 939 | ... | .25 | .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 | 26.6 | ... | .061 | 982 | ... | ... | 3.42 | 41 | .051 |
| NEPAL | | 12 | ... | ... | 1 | .309 | 2 088 | 10 | 5.6 | 12 | .010 | 838 | ... | ... | .75 | 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 | 955 | ... | .15 | 1.61 | 52 | .019 |
| NIGER | | 31 | 10.8 | 76 | 1 | .237 | 2 180 | 6 | 7.2 | ... | .023 | 800 | ... | ... | 1.45 | 42 | ... |
| NIGERIA | | 94 | 0.2 | 97 | 2 | .128 | 2 085 | 7 | 37.8 | ... | .039 | 850 | ... | .47 | 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 | ... | ... | 37.0 | ... | .451 | ... | ... | ... | 26.33 | ... | 28.780 |
| PAKISTAN | | 192 | 52.0 | 49 | 3 | .186 | 2 146 | 14 | 42.7 | 16 | .247 | 885 | ... | .22 | 5.48 | 49 | .131 |
| PANAMA | | 846 | 1.7 | 84 | 66 | .143 | 2 421 | 14 | 61.6 | 78 | .747 | 959 | ... | ... | .15 | 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 | 925 | ... | .44 | 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 | 942 | ... | .40 | 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 |
| RWANDA | | 13 | 1.8 | 82 | 1 | .050 | 1 960 | 4 | 6.7 | ... | .019 | 867 | ... | ... | 2.65 | 41 | .004 |
| SAMOA | | 126 | 4.8 | 80 | 17 | ... | ... | ... | 33.1 | 97 | .325 | 959 | ... | ... | ... | ... | .007 |
| SAO TOME AND PRINCIPE | | 104 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 3 | ... | ... | .150 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |

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 exported 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 survivals 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 | 34.0 | ... | .200 | ... | ... | ... | 5.58 | 42 | 72.504 |
| SENEGAL | | 184 | 21.9 | 47 | 9 | .199 | 2 300 | 13 | 20.3 | 10 | .068 | 844 | ... | .94 | 2.01 | 41 | .001 |
| SEYCHELLES | | 317 | ... | ... | 52 | ... | ... | 3 | 73.9 | 58 | .320 | 937 | ... | .26 | ... | ... | ... |
| 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 | 972 | ... | .24 | 1.87 | 70 | .549 |
| SRI LANKA | | 140 | 5.3 | 68 | 5 | .088 | 2 019 | 12 | 59.4 | 81 | .250 | 950 | ... | .04 | .65 | 66 | .007 |
| SUDAN | | 125 | 0.3 | 84 | 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 | .429 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | .302 |
| 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 | 920 | ... | .26 | 3.06 | 59 | .012 |
| TOGO | | 70 | 7.0 | 85 | 3 | .135 | 2 160 | 11 | 26.7 | ... | .047 | 873 | ... | 1.44 | 1.70 | 40 | .001 |
| TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO | | 3 885 | 4.7 | 91 | 60 | .022 | 2 530 | 16 | 86.1 | 90 | .464 | 965 | ... | .35 | .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 | 855 | ... | .27 | 3.82 | 55 | .318 |
| UGANDA | | 51 | 0.2 | 90 | 4 | .183 | 2 096 | 8 | 14.1 | ... | .028 | ... | ... | ... | 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 | 15.0 | ... | .039 | ... | 57 | .63 | .002 | 41 | .021 |
| UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA | | 75 | 8.0 | 52 | 4 | .093 | 2 003 | 10 | 9.8 | ... | .036 | 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 | 9.938 |
| UPPER VOLTA | | 14 | 8.5 | 77 | 1 | .186 | 1 859 | 10 | 13.2 | 5 | .017 | 818 | ... | .48 | 1.44 | 35 | ... |
| URUGUAY | | 900 | 8.6 | 82 | 89 | .324 | 3 080 | 22 | 84.8 | 90 | 1.098 | 957 | ... | .23 | 2.43 | 70 | .055 |
| VENEZUELA | | 2 895 | 1.4 | 95 | 47 | .094 | 2 427 | 19 | 81.4 | 82 | 1.155 | 951 | ... | .23 | 2.23 | 64 | 21.525 |
| YEMEN | | 30 | 1.0 | 81 | 1 | .298 | 2 040 | 2 | 20.8 | ... | .041 | ... | 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 | 20.2 | ... | .035 | 896 | ... | ... | 2.06 | 41 | .023 |
| 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.

/...

ANNEX III

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 Monthly Bulletin of Statistics (ST/ESA/STAT/SER.Q series).)

ANNEX IV

PRICE TRENDS IN INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Table 1. Terms of trade and trade balance

A. Terms of trade (1974 = 100)

| Country | 1969 | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | 1975 |
|--------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Algeria | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Argentina | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Bangladesh | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Brazil | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| 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 | 100 | 92 |
| Panama | 127 | 126 | 123 | 123 | 122 | 90 |
| Peru | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Philippines | 95 | 102 | 87 | 73 | 106 | 67 |
| Portugal | 100 | 106 | 105 | 105 | 106 | ... |
| Qatar | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Romania | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |

ANNEX IV (continued)

Table 1.A (continued)

| Country | 1969 | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | 1975 |
|-----------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Saudi Arabia | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| 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 |
| 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 |

ANNEX IV (continued)

Table 1.B (continued)

| Country | 1969 | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1975 | Period | 1976 |
|------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----------|------|
| 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 |
| Qatar | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| 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 |
| 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 |

ANNEX IV (continued)

Table 1.B (continued)

| Country | 1969 | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1975 | Period | 1976 |
|--------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----------|------|
| 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 | 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 | 32(1974) |
| Brazil | Coffee | 58 | 76 | 66 | 74 | 95 | 111 | 105 | 192 | 54(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 | |
| | Iron ore | 57 | 60 | 64 | 69 | 72 | 136 | 136 | 138 | |
| | Cotton | 41 | 41 | 45 | 51 | 82 | 80 | 79 | 103 | |
| | Maize | 47 | 51 | 51 | 51 | 79 | 97 | 101 | 86 | |

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 | |
| 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 | |
| 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) |
| Gabon | Crude petroleum | 16 | 16 | 20 | 22 | 31 | 102 | 99 | 106 | 67(1971) |
| | 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 9 months | |
| 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 | |
| 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) |

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 | |
| Iraq | Crude petroleum | 16 | 16 | 20 | 22 | 31 | 102 | 99 | 106 | 95(1974) |
| Israel | Fruits | 65 | 58 | 71 | 71 | 95 | 131 | 135 | 117 | 13(1974) |
| | Cotton | 41 | 41 | 45 | 51 | 82 | 80 | 79 | 103 | |
| Ivory Coast | Cocoa | 48 | 40 | 35 | 39 | 66 | 87 | 87 | 106 | 49(1974) |
| | Coffee | 58 | 76 | 66 | 74 | 95 | 111 | 105 | 192 | |
| Jamaica | Non-ferrous ores | 54 | 55 | 48 | 56 | 76 | 109 | 100 | 106 | 86(1974) |
| | Sugar | 16 | 17 | 19 | 28 | 35 | 71 | 79 | 45 | |
| Kenya | Coffee | 58 | 76 | 66 | 74 | 95 | 111 | 105 | 192 | 36(1974) |
| | Tea | 69 | 77 | 78 | 75 | 77 | 102 | 105 | 107 | |
| Kuwait | Crude petroleum | 16 | 16 | 20 | 22 | 31 | 102 | 99 | 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 | ... | ... | ... | |
| 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 | |

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 | |
| 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 | |
| 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 | 34(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 | 67(1971) |
| | 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 | |
| | 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 | |
| Philippines | Fruits | 65 | 58 | 71 | 71 | 95 | 131 | 135 | 117 | 71(1974) |
| | 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 | |
| Portugal | Wine | 55 | 58 | 57 | 67 | 105 | 103 | 105 | 91 | 11(1974) |
| | Fruits | 65 | 58 | 71 | 71 | 95 | 131 | 135 | 117 | |
| Qatar | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | |
| Romania | Wheat | 35 | 34 | 36 | 40 | 69 | 89 | 89 | 83 | 20(1973) |
| | 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 | |
| | Oil seeds, oils and fats | 33 | 38 | 39 | 39 | 71 | 73 | 75 | 68 | |
| 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 | |

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 | |
| Sri Lanka | Tea | 69 | 77 | 78 | 75 | 77 | 102 | 105 | 107 | 60(1974) |
| | Rubber | 73 | 57 | 45 | 46 | 95 | 77 | 76 | 103 | |
| 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) |
| Tunisia | Crude petroleum | 16 | 16 | 20 | 22 | 31 | 102 | 99 | 106 | 42(1975) |
| Turkey | Fruits | 65 | 58 | 71 | 71 | 95 | 131 | 135 | 117 | 51(1974) |
| | Tobacco | 67 | 71 | 74 | 77 | 84 | 121 | 121 | 130 | |
| | Cotton | 41 | 41 | 45 | 51 | 82 | 80 | 79 | 103 | |
| United Arab Emirates | Crude petroleum | 16 | 16 | 20 | 22 | 31 | 102 | 99 | 106 | 98(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 | 1975 9 months | 1976 9 months | |
| United Republic of Cameroon | Cocoa | 48 | 40 | 35 | 39 | 66 | 87 | 87 | 106 | 58(1975) |
| | Coffee | 58 | 76 | 66 | 74 | 95 | 111 | 105 | 192 | |
| United Republic of Tanzania | Cotton | 41 | 41 | 45 | 51 | 82 | 80 | 79 | 103 | 34(1974) |
| | Coffee | 58 | 76 | 66 | 74 | 95 | 111 | 105 | 192 | |
| 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 | |
| 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 | UNEF/ UNDOF scale (1) | Group of 77 (2) | LDCs (3) | MSAs (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 |

/...

ANNEX V (continued)

| Member State | UNEF/ UNDOF scale (1) | Group of 77 (2) | LDCs (3) | MSAs (4) | UNSO (5) | CDPPP (6) | UNCTAD (7) | World Bank (8) | IMF (9) | OECD (10) |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|----------------------|------------|--------------|
| 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 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | | | | | | | | | | |

/...

ANNEX V (continued)

| Member State | UNEF/ UNDOF scale (1) | Group of 77 (2) | LDCs (3) | MSAs (4) | UNSO (5) | CDPPP (6) | UNCTAD (7) | World Bank (8) | IMF (9) | OECD (10) |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|----------------------|------------|--------------|
| 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 |
| Lao 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 | <u>b/</u> | <u>b/</u> | <u>b/</u> | <u>b/</u> | <u>b/</u> |
| 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 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 |

/...

ANNEX V (continued)

| Member State | UNEF/ UNDOF Scale (1) | Group of 77 (2) | LDCs (3) | MSAs (4) | UNSO (5) | CDPPP (6) | UNCTAD (7) | World Bank (8) | IMF (9) | OECD (10) |
|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|----------------------|------------|--------------|
| 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 | | | | | | | | | | |

/...

ANNEX V (continued)

| Member State | UNEF/ UNDOF Scale (1) | Group of 77 (2) | LDCs (3) | MSAs (4) | UNSO (5) | CDPPP (6) | UNCTAD (7) | World Bank (8) | IMF (9) | OECD (10) |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|----------------------|------------|--------------|
| 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 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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): Countries marked "X" under this column are members of the Group of 77.

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 Secretary-General's 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.

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).

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 | | | | |

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> |
|--------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Fiji | | | | | | 0.04 | | | |
| Bahrain | | | | | | | 0.04 | | |
| Oman | | | | | | | 0.04 | | |
| Qatar | | | | | | | 0.04 | | |
| United Arab Emirates | | | | | | | 0.04 | | |
| Bangladesh | | | | | | | | 0.08 | |
| Grenada | | | | | | | | 0.02 | |
| Guinea-Bissau | | | | | | | | 0.02 | |
| Cape Verde | | | | | | | | | 0.02 |
| Comoros | | | | | | | | | 0.02 |
| Mozambique | | | | | | | | | 0.02 |
| Papua 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

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

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 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.

/...