



UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY



Distr.
GENERAL

A/C.5/35/7
1 August 1980

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Thirty-fifth session
FIFTH COMMITTEE
Item 99 (a) of the provisional agenda*

PERSONNEL QUESTIONS

Composition of the Secretariat

Geographical distribution of Professional staff

Interim report of the Secretary-General

CONTENTS

	<u>Paragraphs</u>	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	1 - 3	2
I. THE EVOLUTION OF DESIRABLE RANGES	4 - 19	2
II. FACTORS AND CRITERIA DETERMINING THE RANGES	20 - 32	7
III. ALTERNATIVE TABLES	33 - 34	12
IV. CONCLUSION	35	12

* A/35/150.

INTRODUCTION

1. The present report is submitted in pursuance of section I of General Assembly resolution 34/219 of 20 December 1979, in which the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to prepare a series of reports and submissions with respect to the system of desirable ranges for the representation of Member States in posts in the Secretariat subject to geographical distribution. In calling for the reports and studies, the General Assembly envisaged a comprehensive review of the subject at its thirty-fifth session. In that context, the resolution referred particularly to the possibility of revising the existing system by altering the relative weights to be given to the membership factor and the contribution factor in the calculation of the desirable ranges.
2. It may be recalled that the matters covered in resolution 34/219 were the subject of an exhaustive examination undertaken by the General Assembly at its sixteenth and seventeenth sessions in the early 1960s. That review was carried out by the General Assembly on the basis of a report ^{1/} submitted by a Committee of Experts in pursuance of its resolution 1559 (XV) of 18 December 1960. The wide divergence of views that existed among the Member States at that time made it difficult for the General Assembly to reach a decision on the subject and the then Acting Secretary-General was called upon by the Assembly to make proposals aimed at reconciling the differences of views. The deliberations at the last session of the General Assembly preceding the adoption of resolution 34/219 revealed a similar divergence of views among the Member States on this difficult and critical matter.
3. The Secretary-General is submitting the present report to the General Assembly in compliance with paragraph 2 of section I of resolution 34/219, which requested him to present the reports at least six weeks before the opening of the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly. This report covers those aspects of resolution 34/219 that relate to the factual presentation of data and alternative tables, i.e., with regard to the requests contained in paragraphs 1 (a), 1 (b) (i) and (ii) and the first part of 1 (e). Accordingly, the report does not express any judgement as to the desirability of the alternatives presented in the report. As regards the other aspects of the resolution, it is the intention of the Secretary-General to submit a subsequent report to the Assembly on the basis of a careful evaluation of the complex issues involved and in the light of consultations he intends to undertake on how best to determine the desirable ranges for the representation of Member States in the Secretariat for posts subject to geographical distribution.

I. THE EVOLUTION OF DESIRABLE RANGES

4. The Secretary-General was requested by paragraph 1 (a) of section I of resolution 34/219 to submit:

"(a) A detailed report outlining the basis on which the desirable ranges in effect in 1979 (posts subject to equitable geographical distribution) were

^{1/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixteenth Session, Fifth Committee, Annexes, agenda item 61, document A/4776.

established, including the factors and criteria, with their related percentage distributions, which determined these desirable ranges."

The basis for the establishment of these ranges can best be understood when seen in the context of the evolution of the concept of "desirable ranges" and the development of the system for calculating them.

5. The concept of "desirable ranges" for Member States was first introduced in 1948 to serve both as the definition of the objective of achieving an equitable distribution of staff and as a yardstick for measuring the progress made towards this end. These "desirable ranges" have always been determined in respect of those posts which were considered to be "subject to geographical distribution". The concept does not govern the administration of staff once appointed and has no effect on their assignment, promotion or other personnel actions.

6. The system of "desirable ranges" was developed as a tool to improve the geographical distribution of the Secretariat staff in response to General Assembly resolution 153 (II) of 15 November 1947. That resolution requested the Secretary-General "to take all practicable steps to ensure the improvement of the present geographical distribution of the staff, including the issuance of such rules and regulations as may be necessary to comply with the principles of the Charter as elaborated in this resolution". The purpose was stated in the first preambular paragraph of the resolution to be the attainment of "a balanced geographical distribution in the composition of the Secretariat, thus improving the present distribution, which results from unavoidable difficulties encountered in the initial stages of organization".

7. The Secretary-General issued a bulletin, 2/ announcing that priority would be given to appointments from underrepresented Member States until a more balanced geographical distribution was achieved, and that a national of an overrepresented Member State would be appointed only if there were no suitably qualified candidates available from underrepresented Member States, with sufficient time being allowed to look for such candidates except where the need to fill the post was urgent and could not have been foreseen. As a "rough guide", the representational criterion was defined in relation to the scale of assessments of Member States and assumed "that the numerical representation of a country in the Secretariat is reasonable if its percentage of total staff does not deviate more than 25 per cent from its percentage of total contribution to the budget of the United Nations save that this deviation should not apply in an upward direction to countries whose contribution is more than 10 per cent and that no country shall be regarded as overrepresented if the number of its nationals employed in the Secretariat is less than four".

8. The use of the scale of assessments was originally suggested by the Advisory Group of Experts appointed by the Executive Secretary of the Preparatory Commission on the recommendation of its Executive Committee and later reappointed by the Secretary-General at the request of the General Assembly in paragraph 18 of

2/ Official Records of the General Assembly, Third Session, Annexes, agenda item 40, document A/652, annex 1, Secretary-General's bulletin 77 of 11 April 1948.

resolution 13 (I) of 13 February 1946. In its report (UN A/C.5/AD, chap, II, para. 4 (b)), the Group stated that "a ratio of distribution of posts related to the ratio of Members' contributions may afford a rough 'rule of thumb' guide until an effective system is evolved". The Secretary-General noted that the scale of assessments itself was fixed in relation to a combination of pertinent criteria and that the representational standard for comparison was in line with the considerations discussed in the General Assembly and was resilient enough to afford reasonable freedom and discretion to the administration. In limiting the upward deviation for countries contributing more than 10 per cent, recognition was given to the need to avoid any Member State having an undue proportion of its nationals in the Secretariat by reason of prevailing economic conditions.

9. The General Assembly initiated a further study of this question in its resolution 1559 (XV) of 18 December 1960. This resolution requested the Committee of Experts appointed by the Secretary-General at the request of the Assembly in its resolution 1446 (XIV) of 5 December 1959 "to study the categories of posts subject to geographical distribution and the criteria for determining the range of posts for each Member State with a view to securing a wide geographical distribution of the staff of the Secretariat, taking into account, *inter alia*, the relative importance of various posts". The majority of the Committee proposed a formula which would establish for each Member State a figure representing the reasonable expectation of that Member State's share in the staff of the Secretariat in posts subject to geographical distribution. 3/ The formula took into account membership in the Organization, population, the desirability of securing an over-all geographical balance of the seven main geographical regions of the world and the level of the contribution of each Member State to the regular budget of the United Nations. Each Member State would have a minimum of two staff members and, in addition, one staff member for each 10 million population up to 150 million and one more staff member for each 30 million above 150 million. Fractional portions would be totalled for the States in a region and allotted to a regional float to be used as the requirements of the service and the availability of qualified candidates indicated. The remainder of the posts would be allotted to each Member State in accordance with the scale of contributions.

10. In the discussion at the sixteenth session an understanding was reached on a number of approaches, in particular, the introduction of factors reflecting membership and population as well as contribution to the budget, but no agreement was reached on other important points. The Secretary-General was therefore invited to present at its seventeenth session his considered views on how to improve the geographical distribution of the Secretariat. 4/

11. At the seventeenth session, the Acting Secretary-General, in his report, 5/

3/ See Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixteenth Session, Fifth Committee, Annexes, agenda item 61, document A/4776, para. 73.

4/ Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixteenth Session, Fifth Committee, Annexes, agenda item 61, document A/5063, para. 51.

5/ Official Records of the General Assembly, Seventeenth Session, Fifth Committee, Annexes, agenda item 70, document A/5270.

proposed a new formula in which the factors of membership, population and contribution would be taken into account. There would be a minimum range of 1 to 5 posts attributable to membership. One hundred posts would be reserved to take into account such differences in size of population as would not receive sufficient weight in the other two factors. The balance of posts would be assigned on the basis of the ratios of assessed contributions. The contribution factor would account for about 60 per cent of the 1,500 posts involved. He supported membership as a factor to emphasize the principle of universality in order for the Secretariat to include nationals of all Member States. He noted that there was widespread acceptance of the scale of assessments as a principal factor but that the weight to be given to it varied from about 72 per cent in the proposal of the Committee of Experts to 33 1/3 per cent in one of the proposals made at the previous session.

12. With respect to the population factor, the Acting Secretary-General drew attention to the disparities in size of population of different Member States and the counter-effect on the objective of correcting imbalances in the geographical distribution of the staff if the size of population of Member States were to be applied directly and given significant weight. He suggested a floor and a ceiling might have to be applied to this factor as was done in the case of the contribution scale. He pointed out, however, that population was taken into account in reaching the final scale of assessments. Then, as now, Member States with per capita income below a certain level had their assessment reduced. Thus a Member State with the same total national income as, but a larger population than, another Member State would have a lower assessment and as a result would have less posts allotted to it under the contribution factor. He therefore proposed that it would be preferable to allow a population reserve of 100 posts to compensate for this reduction which would, in addition, provide the advantage of giving him greater administrative flexibility than a true population factor.

13. The Assembly approved the Acting Secretary-General's proposals by its resolution 1852 (XVII) of 19 December 1962. The new method was based on separate calculations for the first and second figures of each range. The first figure was based on a membership factor of one post for each Member State. This took into account the fact that at that time many Member States did not have more than one of their nationals in a post subject to geographical distribution. The second figure was based on a membership factor of 5, or, since 1968, 6 posts for each Member State and therefore represented the situation which would be reached when most Member States had five or six of their nationals in such posts. The range therefore represented a transitional period during which the representation of Member States with large assessments would have their share of posts reduced in favour of Member States with small assessments as nationals of the latter were appointed. For Member States with small assessments, the first figure of the range was smaller than the second. For Member States with large assessments, the first figure was larger than the second. For some Member States with intermediate assessments, the first and second figures were exactly the same. It was as a result of this anomaly amongst others that the present system was introduced.

14. By resolution 31/26 of 29 November 1976, the Assembly adopted a new method of establishing the desirable ranges of posts for Member States and a new desirable range of 2 to 7 posts for Member States with the minimum assessment to provide for

a wider distribution of posts subject to geographical distribution. The ranges were calculated on a base figure of 2,700 posts and directly related to the three factors of membership, population and contribution. The following paragraphs explain how the desirable ranges in effect on 1979 were calculated.

15. On 30 June 1979, the membership factor consisted in the number of Member States (151) multiplied by the midpoint (4.5) of the minimum desirable range (2-7) or 679.5 posts, with a weight of 25.2 per cent of the base figure of 2,700 posts. The population factor continued to be calculated as in the past by reference to reduction of assessments of Member States with low per capita income levels. The figure of 240 posts for the population factor, with a weight of 8.9 per cent of the base figure of 2,700 posts, had remained unchanged since 1977. The 1,780.5 remaining posts, after subtracting the 679.5 posts for the membership factor and the 240 posts for the population factor from the base figure of 2,700 posts, comprised the contribution factor with a weight of 65.9 per cent.

16. The midpoint of the range of each Member State was determined by adding its share of posts by virtue of the membership factor, i.e., 4.5 posts, to its share of posts by virtue of the contribution factor. For a Member State paying the minimum assessment, this constituted 0.01 per cent of the 1,780.5 posts which comprised the contribution factor, i.e., 0.17805 posts plus 4.5 posts or 4.67805 posts. For a Member State paying the maximum assessment this constituted 25 per cent of 1,780.5, i.e., 445.125 posts plus 4.5 posts or 449.125 posts. The upper and lower limits of each range were determined by adding and subtracting 15 per cent of the midpoint, but not less than 2.5 posts, and rounding the resulting figures to the nearest whole number.

17. Paragraph (e) of section I of resolution 34/219 requested "(e) A detailed description of the way the present weighted desirable ranges have been calculated". The paragraph also contained a request for a study which is the subject of remarks in paragraph 3 above. Since the formula for establishing desirable ranges treated all posts equally, it was long recognized that it did not take into account the relative importance of posts at different levels. Since 1967, the Secretary-General has reported the weighted distribution of staff in posts subject to geographical distribution giving to each post a weight equivalent to the gross base salary per annum, rounded to the nearest \$100.00, of a staff member at the lowest step of its level. Thus, a post at the Under-Secretary-General (USG) level (salary \$76,030 p.a.) is given a weight of 76.0 points and a post at the Assistant Officer (P-1) level (salary \$14,300 p.a.) is given a weight of 14.3 points. The weighted staff position of each Member State is determined by multiplying the number of nationals of each State at each level by the weight of the level and adding these figures together to reach a single weight for each State.

18. The weighted desirable ranges against which to measure the weighted staff position of each Member State are developed by converting the base figure of 2,700 and the membership, population and contribution factors into figures which reflect the weight of the posts subject to geographical distribution at each level. On 30 June 1979, the number of posts subject to geographical distribution occupied at the USG level was 0.96 per cent of all such posts. This percentage of the base figure of 2,700 posts or 26 posts was multiplied by the weight of a USG post, or

/...

76.0, to produce a total weight of 1,970 points for the posts for the USG level. Similarly, the number of such posts occupied at the P-1 level was 2.5 per cent of all such posts. The weight given to the P-1 level was thus 2.5 per cent of 2,700 or 68 posts times 14.3, the weight of the P-1 level, or a total weight of 972 points for the P-1 level. The sum of the weights at each level provided a base figure of 81,796 points. The weight of the First Officer (P-4) level (29.9 points) which had the largest total weight was used to determine the weight of the membership factor, 4.5 times 151 times 29.9 (20,317 points) and the weight of the population factor, 240 times 29.9 (7,176 points). The weight of the base figure (81,796 points) less the weight of the membership factor (20,317 points) and less the weight of the population factor (7,176 points) provided the weight of the contribution factor (54,303 points). The ranges were then calculated in the same way as the unweighted ranges determining first the appropriate midpoint and then determining the upper and lower limits of each range by adding and subtracting 15 per cent of the midpoint but not less than 74.75 points, the weight of 2.5 posts.

19. The population reserve for each region was determined by distributing the 240 posts which comprise the population factor proportionately to the total of the reductions of the Member States in the region. The weighted and unweighted ranges for each region were established by adding the sum of the midpoints of the Member States in the region to the population reserve for the region and by adding and subtracting 15 per cent of the result to obtain the upper and lower limits of the regional ranges.

II. FACTORS AND CRITERIA DETERMINING THE RANGES

20. Membership in the Organization has always been a factor in the geographical distribution of posts. The first ranges in 1947 assumed that it was desirable to have at least one national of every Member State in a post subject to geographical distribution. Since 1963, two posts have been considered to be the minimum target. The first ranges in 1947 also assumed that no Member State was overrepresented if it had only three nationals in geographic posts. This figure increased to five in 1963, six in 1968 and seven in 1970.

21. Up to 1963, the membership factor was the only factor apart from the contribution factor and the question of the percentage weight it should be given was not specifically considered. When the population factor was added in 1963, it was noted that the separate calculation of the first and second figures of the range gave the membership and contribution factors different percentage weights for the lower and upper limits of the ranges while the population factor was always 6.6 per cent. The membership factor at that time had a weight of 7.4 per cent for the first figure and 37.0 per cent for the second figure of the ranges. If this method of calculating the ranges had been used in 1948, the percentage weights for the membership factor would then have been 4.8 and 14.5 per cent for the first and second figures respectively.

22. Since 1977, the membership factor has been calculated on the basis of the midpoint of the minimum range and its percentage weight has moved from 24.5 per cent to 25.3 per cent on 1 January 1980 with the increase in the number of Member States.

/...

If the number of Member States increases, the weight of the membership factor always increases unless the base figure for the calculation of the ranges is increased at the same time.

23. While the membership factor has always been a factor in the calculation of the ranges, it has always been combined with other factors. If the membership factor alone was taken into account, on the basis of 2,700 posts ($2,700/152 = 17.8$), each Member State should have about 18 posts only.

24. The scale of assessments to the regular budget has also always been considered a factor in the calculation of desirable ranges. Its percentage weight has varied from a high of 95.2 per cent in 1948 to a low of 52.8 per cent in the calculation of the upper limits of the ranges in 1967. With every change in the assessments of Member States, the ranges have to be recalculated to take the new assessment of each Member State into account. The percentage weight of the contribution factor is currently 65.8 per cent.

25. The present population factor was introduced in 1963 to compensate for the reduction of assessments of Member States whose per capita income is low. It is only indirectly related to the population of the Member State. If the Member State has a high gross national product as well as a large population, its per capita income may be above \$1,800 per annum. Its assessment would therefore not be reduced and the size of its population would have no further effect.

26. Up to 1963, the population of Member States was ignored in the calculation of the ranges except in so far as their assessed contribution was reduced, if their per capita income was lower than a particular amount. It therefore operated to reduce the range of those Member States while increasing those of others. From 1963 on, when the population reserve for each region was introduced to compensate for the total reductions of the assessments of the Member States in the region, this factor has been given a separate weight. It has varied from a low of 6.5 per cent between 1968 and 1972 to a high of 8.9 per cent since 1977.

27. The number of Member States, the number of staff in geographic posts, the base figure, the amounts of the membership and population factors, as well as the weights of the membership, contribution and population factors for each year since 1948, are given in the table below. The weights of the membership factor before 1963 have been calculated for both figures of the range with respect to the total number of staff in geographic posts each year.

28. The desirable ranges are not only affected by the factors of membership, contribution and population. They are also affected by the total number of posts subject to geographical distribution on which the calculation of the ranges is based, by the size of the minimum range, and by the percentage of flexibility used to determine the upper and lower limits of the ranges. The effect of these must therefore be considered before any decision can be made on the options to be examined.

/...

TABLE

The number of Member States, the number of staff in posts subject to geographical distribution, the base figure and the size and percentage weight of the membership, population and contribution factors by year

<u>Year</u>	<u>No. of Member States</u>	<u>No. of staff</u>	<u>Base figure</u>	<u>Member- ship factor</u>		<u>Popu- lation reserve</u>	<u>Percentage weights</u>					
				<u>1st</u>	<u>2nd</u>		<u>Member- ship</u>		<u>Contri- bution</u>		<u>Popu- lation</u>	
				<u>figure</u>	<u>figure</u>		<u>1st</u>	<u>2nd</u>	<u>1st</u>	<u>2nd</u>	<u>figure</u>	<u>figure</u>
1948	58	1,198	-	1 or 3		-	4.8	14.5	95.2	85.5	-	
1949	58	1,249	-	1 or 3		-	4.6	13.9	95.4	86.1	-	
1950	59	1,294	-	1 or 3		-	4.6	13.7	95.4	86.3	-	
1951	59	1,331	-	1 or 3		-	4.4	13.3	95.6	86.7	-	
1952	59	1,344	-	1 or 3		-	4.4	13.2	95.6	86.8	-	
1953	59	1,262	-	1 or 3		-	4.7	14.0	95.3	86.0	-	
1954	59	1,172	-	1 or 3		-	5.0	15.1	95.0	84.9	-	
1955	75	1,161	-	1 or 3		-	6.5	19.4	93.5	80.6	-	
1956	79	1,163	-	1 or 3		-	6.8	20.4	93.2	79.6	-	
1957	81	1,214	-	1 or 3		-	6.7	20.0	93.3	80.0	-	
1958	80	1,236	-	1 or 3		-	6.5	19.4	93.5	80.6	-	
1959	82	1,272	-	1 or 3		-	6.4	19.3	93.6	80.7	-	
1960	82	1,314	-	1 or 3		-	6.2	18.7	93.8	81.3	-	
1961	99	1,384	-	1 or 3		-	7.2	21.5	92.8	78.5	-	
1962	104	1,425	-	1 or 3		-	7.3	21.9	92.7	78.1	-	

/...

TABLE (continued)

Year	No. of Member States	No. of staff	Base figure	Member- ship factor		Popu- lation reserve	Percentage weights				Popu- lation
				1st	2nd		Member- ship		Contri- bution		
							figure	figure	1st	2nd	
1963	111	1,389	1,500	1	or 5	100	7.4	37.0	86.0	56.4	6.6
1964	112	1,434	1,500	1	or 5	100	7.5	37.3	85.9	56.1	6.6
1965	114	1,491	1,500	1	or 5	100	7.6	38.0	85.8	55.4	6.6
1966	118	1,647	1,500	1	or 5	100	7.9	39.3	85.5	54.1	6.6
1967	122	1,789	1,500	1	or 5	100	8.1	40.6	85.3	52.8	6.6
1968	124	1,908	2,000	1	or 6	130	6.2	37.2	87.3	56.3	6.5
1969	126	2,031	2,000	1	or 6	130	6.3	37.8	87.2	55.7	6.5
1970	126	2,170	2,000	1	or 6	130	6.3	37.8	87.2	55.7	6.5
1971	127	2,250	2,000	1	or 6	130	6.4	38.1	87.1	55.4	6.5
1972	132	2,256	2,000	1	or 6	130	6.6	39.6	86.9	53.9	6.5
1973	132	2,316	2,200	1	or 6	130	6.0	36.0	88.1	58.1	5.9
1974	135	2,382	2,400	1	or 6	200	5.6	33.7	86.1	58.0	8.3
1975	138	2,469	2,400	1	or 6	200	5.7	34.5	86.0	57.2	8.3
1976	144	2,616	2,600	1	or 6	220	5.5	33.2	86.0	58.3	8.5
1977	147	2,672	2,700	4.5		240	24.5		66.6		8.7
1978	149	2,714	2,700	4.5		240	24.8		66.3		8.9
1979	151	2,797	2,700	4.5		240	25.2		65.9		8.9
1980	152		2,700	4.5		240	25.3		65.8		8.9

/...

29. The number of posts subject to geographical distribution, on which the calculation of the ranges is based, affects the desirable ranges of Member States because if this base figure is increased but the number of Member States does not change, the percentage weight of the membership factor decreases and the weight of the contribution factor increases. If the base figure does not change but the number of Member States increases, the percentage weight of the membership factor increases and the weight of the contribution factor decreases. The percentage weight of the population factor is not affected by changes in the base figure but the size of the population reserve for each region and, as a whole, changes correspondingly. The number of posts subject to geographical distribution is therefore an important element to take into account in deciding on how the ranges are to be calculated.

30. In 1962, the base figure of 1,500 was related to the number of staff in posts subject to geographical distribution. The General Assembly, by its resolution 2359 A (XXII) of 19 December 1967, approved a proposal of the Secretary-General to raise the figure to 2,000 subject to review in the light of experience because the number of staff in such posts was already 1,789. In 1973, the figure was changed to 2,200. In 1975, the Secretary-General suggested in his report (A/10184, para. 28) that the number of posts "falling under the system might be changed from 2,400 to 2,600, in order to approximate more nearly the actual situation". The figure of 2,700 approved by the General Assembly in its resolution 31/26 was determined on the basis of the total number of posts which might be reached by the following year, 1977. The relationship between the base figure used to calculate the ranges and the number of staff in posts subject to geographical distribution each year can be seen from the table above.

31. The range for a Member State that is assessed at the minimum contribution of 0.01 per cent of the budget determines the percentage weight of the membership and population factors because the membership factor is directly related to the midpoint of the minimum range. The minimum range can, however, equally well be determined by deciding first on the percentage weight that should be given to the membership and other factors and deriving the midpoint of the minimum desirable range from this percentage weight. Any combination of figures, an equal amount above and below the midpoint, can then be chosen to constitute the minimum range. For instance, instead of having a minimum range with a midpoint of 4.5 and a flexibility of at least 2.5, the flexibility could have been fixed at 1.5 or 3.5 instead and the minimum range would then have been 3-6 or 1-8 respectively.

32. The limits of the minimum range affect the calculation of the higher ranges, for these must be given at least the same minimum margin of flexibility up and down from their calculated midpoints. The present minimum flexibility of at least 2.5 posts ensures that all Member States with an assessed contribution of less than 0.75 per cent have a range of at least 5 posts. The 15 per cent flexibility gives Member States with high assessments a range of 5 or more posts depending on the size of the midpoint of the range and always bearing the same proportion to the midpoint.

/...

III. ALTERNATIVE TABLES

33. Paragraph 1 (b) of section I of resolution 34/219 requested the Secretary-General to submit:

"(b) A series of alternative tables of desirable representation for all Member States on the basis of a redistribution of the percentages used at present for the criteria of contribution and membership so as to reflect a membership percentage of 50 per cent or a membership percentage equal to that of contribution while maintaining the existing percentage in respect of the population factor; these alternative tables, which shall take into account the new scale of assessment for 1980, 1981, and 1982, shall include:

- (i) A range of increases in the lower limit of the present minimum desirable range;
- (ii) An increase in the upper limit of the present minimum desirable range."

34. The tables requested are contained in the annex to this report. They are based on the percentages specified in the resolution. The alternative tables in columns B to G are based on a redistribution of the membership and contribution criteria so as to reflect a percentage weight of 50 per cent for the membership factor (columns E, F and G), an equal percentage weight for the membership and contribution factors (columns B, C and D). For comparison purposes, the percentage weights currently in force are reproduced in column A. The existing percentage weight of the population factor has been maintained. The tables have been calculated in exactly the same way as last year on the scale of assessments for 1980, 1981 and 1982. The tables show the ranges of Member States at each level of assessment. A base figure of 2,700 posts and a population reserve of 240 posts has been used to permit a comparison with the current desirable ranges. The tables provide a range of increases in the lower limits of the ranges from 3 to 6 and an increase in the upper limits from 7 to 11, 12, 13 or 14. These upper and lower limits are closely linked through the degree of flexibility to the midpoint of the minimum range and to the weight of the membership factor. The tables are based on a flexibility of 15 per cent or at least 2.5 posts (column A), 3 posts (columns B and E), 4 posts (columns C and F) or 5 posts (columns D and G).

IV. CONCLUSION

35. The Secretary-General hopes that the information provided above will assist further intensive efforts to find a common ground in this difficult but vital matter.

/...

ANNEX

Alternative ranges of 152 Member States at different assessments
calculated on a base figure of 2,700 posts and a population reserve of
240 posts and different minimum ranges

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Membership factor (percentage weight)	684 (25.3%)	----- 1,216 ----- (45.0%)			----- 1,368 ----- (50.7%)		
Target midpoint	4.5	----- 8.0 -----			----- 9.0 -----		
Flexibility + or - 15 per cent	2.5	3	4	5	3	4	5
Minimum range	2-7	5-11	4-12	3-13	6-12	5-13	4-14
Population factor (percentage weight)	240 (8.9%)	----- 240 ----- (8.9%)			----- 240 ----- (8.9%)		
Contribution factor (percentage weight)	1,776 (65.8%)	----- 1,244 ----- (46.0%)			----- 1,092 ----- (40.4%)		

A L T E R N A T I V E

R A N G E S

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
0.01	2-7	5-11	4-12	3-13	6-12	5-13	4-14
0.02	2-7	5-11	4-12	3-13	6-12	5-13	4-14
0.03	3-8	5-11	4-12	3-13	6-12	5-13	4-14
0.04	3-8	5-11	4-12	3-13	6-12	5-13	4-14
0.05	3-8	6-12	5-13	4-14	7-13	6-14	5-15
0.06	3-8	6-12	5-13	4-14	7-13	6-14	5-15
0.07	3-8	6-12	5-13	4-14	7-13	6-14	5-15
0.08	3-8	6-12	5-13	4-14	7-13	6-14	5-15
0.09	4-9	6-12	5-13	4-14	7-13	6-14	5-15
0.10	4-9	6-12	5-13	4-14	7-13	6-14	5-15
0.11	4-9	6-12	5-13	4-14	7-13	6-14	5-15
0.12	4-9	6-12	5-13	4-14	7-13	6-14	5-15
0.16	5-10	7-13	6-14	5-15	8-14	7-15	6-16
0.19	5-10	7-13	6-14	5-15	8-14	7-15	6-16
0.20	6-11	7-13	6-14	5-15	8-14	7-15	6-16
0.21	6-11	8-14	7-15	6-16	8-14	7-15	6-16
0.23	6-11	8-14	7-15	6-16	9-15	8-16	7-17
0.25	6-11	8-14	7-15	6-16	9-15	8-16	7-17

/...

	A L T E R N A T I V E				R A N G E S		
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
0.27	7-12	8-14	7-15	6-16	9-15	8-16	7-17
0.30	7-12	9-15	8-16	7-17	9-15	8-16	7-17
0.33	8-13	9-15	8-16	7-17	10-16	9-17	8-18
0.35	8-13	9-15	8-16	7-17	10-16	9-17	8-18
0.39	9-14	10-16	9-17	8-18	10-16	9-17	8-18
0.42	9-14	10-16	9-17	8-18	11-17	10-18	9-19
0.48	11-16	11-17	10-18	9-19	11-17	10-18	9-19
0.50	11-16	11-17	10-18	9-19	11-17	10-18	9-19
0.58	12-17	12-18	11-19	10-20	12-18	11-19	10-20
0.60	13-18	12-18	11-19	10-20	13-19	12-20	11-21
0.65	14-19	13-19	12-20	11-21	13-19	12-20	11-21
0.71	15-20	14-20	13-21	12-22	14-20	13-21	12-22
0.74	15-20	14-20	13-21	12-22	14-20	13-21	12-22
0.76	15-20	14-20	13-21	12-22	14-20	13-21	12-22
0.78	16-21	15-21	14-22	13-23	15-21	14-22	13-23
0.83	16-22	15-21	14-22	13-23	15-21	14-22	13-23
1.05	20-26	18-24	17-25	16-26	17-24	16-24	15-25
1.22	22-30	20-27	19-27	18-28	19-26	18-26	17-27
1.24	23-31	20-27	19-27	18-28	19-26	19-27	18-28
1.27	23-31	20-27	20-28	19-29	19-26	19-27	18-28
1.31	24-32	21-28	20-28	19-29	20-27	19-27	18-28
1.39	25-34	21-29	21-29	20-30	21-28	20-28	19-29
1.46	26-35	22-30	22-30	21-31	21-29	21-29	20-30
1.62	28-38	24-32	24-32	23-33	23-31	23-31	22-32
1.63	28-38	24-33	24-33	23-33	23-31	23-31	22-32
1.70	29-40	25-34	25-34	24-34	23-32	23-32	23-33
1.83	31-43	26-35	26-35	26-36	25-33	25-33	24-34
3.28	53-72	41-56	41-56	41-56	38-52	38-52	38-52
3.45	56-76	43-59	43-59	43-59	40-54	40-54	40-54
4.46	71-96	54-73	54-73	54-73	49-66	49-66	49-66
6.26	98-133	73-99	73-99	73-99	66-89	66-89	66-89
8.31	129-175	95-128	95-128	95-128	88-115	88-115	88-115
9.58	148-201	108-146	108-146	108-146	97-131	97-131	97-131
11.10	171-232	124-168	124-168	124-168	111-150	111-150	111-150
25.00	381-516	271-367	271-367	271-367	240-324	240-324	240-324