

**ADDENDUM
TO THE
REPORT
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON CONTRIBUTIONS**

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

OFFICIAL RECORDS: THIRTY-SEVENTH SESSION

SUPPLEMENT No. 11 A (A/37/11/Add.1)



UNITED NATIONS

New York, 1983

NOTE

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

[29 November 1982]

CONTENTS

	<u>Paragraphs</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE	1 - 3	1
II. DELIBERATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE	4 - 13	2
III. RECOMMENDATION OF THE COMMITTEE	14	4
IV. SEPARATE OPINIONS AND EXPLANATION OF VOTES	15 - 17	10
V. COMMUNICATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS FROM MEMBER STATES AND NON-MEMBER STATES	18 - 21	13
VI. DATE OF THE NEXT SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE	22	14

ANNEXES

I. Letter dated 29 October 1982 from the Permanent Representative of the Dominican Republic to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General	15
II. Note verbale dated 2 November 1982 from the Permanent Observer of the Republic of Korea to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General	16
III. Distribution of 58 points submitted by a member of the Committee on Contributions at the request of the Committee	17

I. MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE

1. At its 69th plenary meeting, on 16 November 1982, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Fifth Committee (A/37/617, para. 11), adopted decision 37/408, which reads as follows:

"The General Assembly requests the Committee on Contributions to re-examine the proposed scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations contained in its report 1/ and, bearing in mind the discussions on this agenda item at the current session, to submit its recommendations by 3 December 1982, so as to enable the Assembly at its thirty-seventh session to decide on the matter before it adjourns in December 1982."

2. In response to that decision, the Committee on Contributions held a special session at United Nations Headquarters from 22 to 24 November 1982.

Mr. Fathih K. Bouayad-Agha was unable to attend the meetings. The following members were present:

Syed Amjad Ali
Mr. Mohammed Sadiq Al-Mahdi
Mr. Anatoly Semënovich Chistyakov
Mr. Miguel Angel Dávila Mendoza
Mr. Hélio De Burgos-Cabal
Mr. Leoncio Fernández Maroto
Mr. Richard Vognild Hennes
Mr. Lance Joseph
Mr. Japhet Gideon Kiti
Mr. Wilfried Koschorreck
Mr. Rachid Lahlou
Mr. Atilio Norberto Molteni
Mr. Katsumi Sezaki
Mr. Ladislav Šmid
Mr. József Tardos
Mr. Yang Hushan
Mr. Philippe Zeller

3. The Committee was presided over by Syed Amjad Ali, Chairman of the Committee.

II. DELIBERATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE

4. Taking the decision of the General Assembly as its mandate (see para. 1), the Committee proceeded to discuss its applications.

5. The Chairman summarized for the members of the Committee the debates that took place in the Fifth Committee. He stated that 62 delegations had made statements and he noted, in particular, the points raised by those delegations that were critical of the scale of assessments and of what they deemed to be the failure of the Committee to carry out the mandate of the General Assembly in not submitting the study requested in paragraph 3 of Assembly resolution 36/231 A of 18 December 1981. He mentioned that a group of delegations had wanted the old scale to continue. The majority of those said it should continue for three years. Another group of delegations supported the proposed scale with a few applying it for only one instead of three years. Suggestions were made to form an open-ended group to consult and negotiate. Some delegations were of the opinion that the Committee on Contributions should be enlarged.

6. After the brief account given by the Chairman, summary records of the discussion of the item in the Fifth Committee were provided to the members.

7. A member explained the background of the decision adopted by the General Assembly. He mentioned that the two opposite points of view of freezing the current scale and of accepting the proposed scale could not be reconciled. He also stated that the general feeling was that neither of the two draft resolutions (A/C.5/37/L.20/Rev.1, A/C.5/37/L.21) could obtain a two-thirds majority if put to the vote. He therefore took upon himself to find a via media and, with the co-operation of countries that had secured decreases, worked out an alternative. He said that it took him weeks to achieve the result and he had the support of the majority of the Group of 77 in his reconciliation efforts. He finally was able to obtain 58 points of the scale of assessments from the following countries:

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	20
Poland	10
China	7
Canada	7
India	4
Australia	4
Hungary	3
Czechoslovakia	2
Argentina	<u>1</u>
	58

8. There were two conditions specified by the countries that were ready to give points - the first was that the relief should go principally to the countries of the Group of 77 whose assessments were increased sharply. Secondly, if the negotiations were not successful, then the status quo would prevail. In other words, the assessments of countries giving points would remain the same as in the scale proposed by the Committee on Contributions.

9. The Committee discussed briefly how it would interpret the decision of the General Assembly. Some members felt that the decision called for a complete review of the scale as it expressly referred to giving attention to the deliberations that took place in the Fifth Committee.

10. The majority of the Committee members felt that they had been seized with a new situation occasioned by the availability of 58 points, a situation that had not existed at the time the Committee had drafted its original recommendation for a scale of assessments for 1983-1985.

11. Nevertheless, in the light of the new situation, the Committee examined the question of ameliorating further the increases contemplated for a number of members in the previously recommended scale.

12. Members of the Committee requested the member who gave the background of the decision to give some ideas about the distribution of the 58 points received by him. The member informed the Committee of his ideas on how the 58 points could be distributed (see annex III). Some members of the Committee suggested improvements and modifications and, to attain those, it was decided to take 5 points from the proposed decrease of the assessment of South Africa. A member of the Committee had pointed out that this had been done during the review of the scale of assessments in 1979.

13. Adding these 5 points to the 58 already mentioned in paragraph 7, the distribution, as revised, was decided upon by a vote. Some members objected to taking away 5 points from the proposed decrease of South Africa's rate of assessment, as that Member State was already in arrears and not paying its contribution. A vote was taken on the proposal to take 5 points from the proposed decrease of South Africa's assessment. Ten members voted in favour and 3 members voted against the proposal, with 3 abstentions. The Committee then proceeded to vote on the revised version of the decreases in assessments of certain Member States; the result of the voting was 10 votes in favour of the new proposal and 4 against, with 2 abstentions. The Chairman did not participate in either vote.

III. RECOMMENDATION OF THE COMMITTEE

14. The Committee on Contributions recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of the following draft resolution, containing a modified scale of assessments for the period 1983-1985:

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

The General Assembly

Resolves that:

1. The scale of assessments for the contributions of Member States to the United Nations budget for the financial years 1983, 1984 and 1985 shall be as follows:

<u>Member State</u>	<u>Per cent</u>
Afghanistan	0.01
Albania	0.01
Algeria	0.13
Angola	0.01
Antigua and Barbuda	0.01
Argentina	0.71
Australia	1.57
Austria	0.75
Bahamas	0.01
Bahrain	0.01
Bangladesh	0.03
Barbados	0.01
Belgium	1.28
Belize	0.01
Benin	0.01
Bhutan	0.01
Bolivia	0.01
Botswana	0.01
Brazil	1.39
Bulgaria	0.18
Burma	0.01
Burundi	0.01
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	0.36
Canada	3.08
Cape Verde	0.01
Central African Republic	0.01
Chad	0.01
Chile	0.07
China	0.88
Colombia	0.11
Comoros	0.01
Congo	0.01
Costa Rica	0.02
Cuba	0.09

<u>Member State</u>	<u>Per cent</u>
Cyprus	0.01
Czechoslovakia	0.76
Democratic Kampuchea	0.01
Democratic Yemen	0.01
Denmark	0.75
Djibouti	0.01
Dominica	0.01
Dominican Republic	0.03
Ecuador	0.02
Egypt	0.07
El Salvador	0.01
Equatorial Guinea	0.01
Ethiopia	0.01
Fiji	0.01
Finland	0.48
France	6.51
Gabon	0.02
Gambia	0.01
German Democratic Republic	1.39
Germany, Federal Republic of	8.54
Ghana	0.02
Greece	0.40
Grenada	0.01
Guatemala	0.02
Guinea	0.01
Guinea-Bissau	0.01
Guyana	0.01
Haiti	0.01
Honduras	0.01
Hungary	0.23
Iceland	0.03
India	0.36
Indonesia	0.13
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	0.58
Iraq	0.12
Ireland	0.18
Israel	0.23
Italy	3.74
Ivory Coast	0.03
Jamaica	0.02
Japan	10.32
Jordan	0.01
Kenya	0.01
Kuwait	0.25
Lao People's Democratic Republic	0.01
Lebanon	0.02
Lesotho	0.01
Liberia	0.01
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	0.26
Luxembourg	0.06
Madagascar	0.01
Malawi	0.01

<u>Member State</u>	<u>Per cent</u>
Malaysia	0.09
Maldives	0.01
Mali	0.01
Malta	0.01
Mauritania	0.01
Mauritius	0.01
Mexico	0.88
Mongolia	0.01
Morocco	0.05
Mozambique	0.01
Nepal	0.01
Netherlands	1.78
New Zealand	0.26
Nicaragua	0.01
Niger	0.01
Nigeria	0.19
Norway	0.51
Oman	0.01
Pakistan	0.06
Panama	0.02
Papua New Guinea	0.01
Paraguay	0.01
Peru	0.07
Philippines	0.09
Poland	0.72
Portugal	0.18
Qatar	0.03
Romania	0.19
Rwanda	0.01
Saint Lucia	0.01
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	0.01
Samoa	0.01
Sao Tome and Principe	0.01
Saudi Arabia	0.86
Senegal	0.01
Seychelles	0.01
Sierra Leone	0.01
Singapore	0.09
Solomon Islands	0.01
Somalia	0.01
South Africa	0.41
Spain	1.93
Sri Lanka	0.01
Sudan	0.01
Suriname	0.01
Swaziland	0.01
Sweden	1.32
Syrian Arab Republic	0.03
Thailand	0.08
Togo	0.01
Trinidad and Tobago	0.03
Tunisia	0.03

<u>Member State</u>	<u>Per cent</u>
Turkey	0.32
Uganda	0.01
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	1.32
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	10.54
United Arab Emirates	0.16
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	4.67
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
Vanuatu	0.01
Venezuela	0.55
Viet Nam	0.02
Yemen	0.01
Yugoslavia	0.46
Zaire	0.01
Zambia	0.01
Zimbabwe	0.02
GRAND TOTAL	<u>100.00</u>

2. In accordance with rule 160 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the scale of assessments given in paragraph 1 above shall be reviewed by the Committee on Contributions in 1985, when a report shall be submitted to the Assembly for consideration at its fortieth session;

3. Notwithstanding the terms of regulation 5.5 of the Financial Regulations of the United Nations, the Secretary-General shall be empowered to accept, at his discretion and after consultation with the Chairman of the Committee on Contributions, a portion of the contributions of Member States for the calendar years 1983, 1984 and 1985 in currencies other than United States dollars;

4. For the year 1981, Vanuatu, Belize and Antigua and Barbuda, which became Members of the United Nations on 15 September, 25 September and 11 November 1981, respectively, shall contribute amounts equal to one ninth of 0.01 per cent;

5. For the year 1982, Vanuatu, Belize and Antigua and Barbuda shall contribute amounts equal to 0.01 per cent;

6. The contributions of the three new Member States for 1981 and 1982 shall be applied to the same basis of assessment as for other Member States, except that, in the case of appropriations approved in General Assembly resolutions 35/45 A of 1 December 1980 and 36/66 A of 30 November 1981 for the financing of the United Nations Emergency Force and the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force and Assembly resolutions 35/115 A of 10 December 1980 and 36/138 A of 16 December 1981 for the financing of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, 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;

7. In accordance with rule 160 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, States that are not Members of the United Nations but that participate in certain of its activities shall be called upon to contribute towards the 1983, 1984 and 1985 expenses of such activities on the basis of the following rates:

<u>Non-member State</u>	<u>Per cent</u>
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	0.05
Holy See	0.01
Liechtenstein	0.01
Monaco	0.01
Nauru	0.01
Republic of Korea	0.18
San Marino	0.01
Switzerland	1.10
Tonga	0.01

the following countries being called upon to contribute:

(a) To the International Court of Justice:

Liechtenstein,
San Marino,
Switzerland;

(b) To international drug control:

Holy See,
Liechtenstein,
Monaco,
Republic of Korea,
Switzerland,
Tonga;

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

Republic of Korea;

(d) To the Economic Commission for Europe:

Switzerland;

(e) To the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development:

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

(f) To the United Nations Industrial Development Organization:

Holy See,
Liechtenstein,
Monaco,
Republic of Korea,
Switzerland;

(g) To the United Nations Environment Programme:

Switzerland.

IV. SEPARATE OPINIONS AND EXPLANATION OF VOTES

15. The separate opinions of certain individual members were as follows:

A. Mr. Japhet G. Kiti

[Original: English]

"I voted in favour of the newly recommended scale of assessments not because I believe it significantly differs from the recommended scale contained in the report of the Committee on Contributions. 1/ Like many of my colleagues, I voted in favour to avert an impasse in the General Assembly.

"I carefully read the summary records of the debate in the Fifth Committee during the thirty-seventh session on the agenda item and I cannot agree with the general criticism levelled at the Committee on Contributions with regard to the implementation of paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 36/231 A. In section V of its report, the Committee fully explained the circumstances that led it not to complete the studies requested in the said resolution. Moreover, the Assembly itself, in adopting resolution 36/231 A, was fully aware that this task could not be accomplished during the Committee's last session. This is clearly evident at the beginning of paragraph 4 of the resolution concerned.

"I am firmly of the opinion that the Committee on Contributions will not be able to comply with paragraph 4 (c) of resolution 36/231 A unless the Fifth Committee, which is the political arm of the General Assembly responsible for budgetary matters, takes its responsibilities and defines what constitutes a 'reasonable' variation between successive scales."

B. Mr. Hélio De Burgos-Cabal

[Original: English]

"I cannot associate myself with the decision of the Committee on Contributions for two reasons: first, as everyone knows, since I have made my opinion clear on various occasions, it conflicts with my consistently maintained position; and second, because the points were distributed according to a criterion that lacked the appropriate technical requirements."

C. Mr. M. A. Dávila Mendoza

[Original: Spanish]

Mr. Dávila Mendoza said that he opposed the report on the ground that the proposal did not reflect the measures envisaged in the mandate given to the Committee on Contributions by the General Assembly in resolution 36/231 A, in particular paragraph 4. As a result, the proposed scale of assessments, even with the modifications provided for in the report, was still inconsistent with the principles of justice and equity.

D. Mr. Lance Joseph

[Original: English]

"I was able to support the new proposals for the scale. At the same time, I was of the view that the Committee on Contributions had been asked to discharge an essentially political task which should have been better undertaken by the Fifth Committee itself. The integrity of the Committee was correspondingly diminished. It was thus hoped that the present extraordinary session should not be allowed to become a precedent for the future."

E. Mr. Katsumi Sezaki

[Original: English]

"When the Committee decided, by a majority vote of 10 to 3, to add 5 points to the recommended scale of South Africa, I was fully aware of the fact that the Committee had taken a similar measure in 1979, adding 5 points to the machine scale for South Africa. At that time, no member of the Committee, including those who voted against this time, raised an objection to that practice."

"I voted in favour of the proposal in order to avoid deviating from the past practice of the Committee."

F. Joint statement by Mr. Wilfried Koschorreck
and Mr. Philippe Zeller

[Original: English/French]

Members of the Committee considered that the draft decision contained in document A/C.5/37/L.23 of 10 November 1982, subsequently adopted by the General Assembly on 16 November 1982, by which the Assembly instructed the Committee to re-examine the scale of assessments proposed in its report 1/ in the light of the discussion which had taken place in the Fifth Committee prior to its current session, did not mean that the Committee was bound by any given proposal for the redistribution of points arrived at outside the Fifth Committee. In particular, they considered that the offer made by the nine Member States to assume a number of additional points could be considered by the Committee only on the understanding that it was to redistribute points on a fair and equitable basis, in accordance with statistical and economic data duly recognized and reviewed by the Committee during its regular session in 1982, and not on the basis of purely political criteria arbitrarily limiting the number of countries to benefit. If the latter was what had been intended, they considered that it was for the Fifth Committee itself, and not for the Committee on Contributions, to make the desired redistribution of points.

Whereas, in their opinion, the original draft proposal of the Committee provided some balance in sharing the burden emanating from the sharp decline in the capacity to pay of some industrialized Member States among the rest of the membership, this is no more the case with the present proposal. They therefore could not concur.

Those members were therefore constrained to reject the Committee's present conclusions as being, in their view, contrary to the methodology, rules and functions of the Committee on Contributions and as failing to comply objectively with the mandate given to it in the decision adopted by the General Assembly on 16 November 1982.

They were equally concerned with the method of assessing the Republic of South Africa because it added to the financial problems of the Organization and only offered a fallacy. In this context, they referred to a statement by the Controller of the United Nations before the Committee to the effect that any additional point for South Africa produced a deficit of about \$US 70,000 for the Organization's budget.

16. In explaining his vote on the Working Group's proposal concerning the distribution of 58 points, Mr. Leoncio Fernández Maroto, reiterating the considerations he had set forth in his previous statements, said that he had voted against the proposal because he considered that the situation and the procedure that had been adopted were unprecedented and irregular from the outset. He took the view that the concessions that had been made, in an arbitrary amount, restricted the freedom of independent action of the Committee on Contributions and undermined the technical basis on which it worked. He maintained that the proposed decision was devoid of any economic justification or distributive justice.

17. Speaking in explanation of vote on the proposal to modify South Africa's assessment in order to provide reductions for other Member States, Mr. Fernández Maroto stated that he was absolutely opposed to any such change, which, in his view, reflected a total disregard for the most basic rules of financial administration, having regard to the special circumstances affecting the status of payments of the State Member of the United Nations. The financial emergency of the Organization would be worsened by such a measure, which was improper for the Committee on Contributions to take.

V. COMMUNICATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS FROM MEMBER STATES AND
NON-MEMBER STATES

18. A statement was received from the Permanent Mission of China to the United Nations which read as follows:

"Calculated on the basis of uniform criteria, the new rate of assessment for China should be 0.6784 per cent. (see annex IV to the report of the Committee on Contributions, 1/). Taking into consideration the difficulties facing the Committee on Contributions and the Fifth Committee at the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly, however, China accepted certain appeals by agreeing to the assessment rate of 0.88 per cent for the current period (1983-1985). Nevertheless, China retains its reservations with regard to the method of computation which is not in keeping with the principle of taking the capacity to pay as the basic criterion in determining the scale of assessments."

19. The Committee had before it representations in writing from the Governments of the Dominican Republic and the Republic of Korea, a non-member State.

20. The Committee, in review of the assessment for the Dominican Republic, examined carefully the representation it had received and arrived at the conclusion that the rate of assessment recommended for the Dominican Republic was justified and that the Committee could not recommend the reduction at this stage.

21. The Committee considered an appeal by the Republic of Korea, a non-member State, for a downward adjustment in its rate of assessment. It was observed that the taxable income of the Republic of Korea was very close to that of Nigeria, and since the Committee made downward adjustments for Nigeria, the Republic of Korea should receive similar treatment.

VI. DATE OF THE NEXT SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE

22. In view of the work still pending on guidelines and methodology that the Committee will have to undertake at the next session in response to paragraphs 2 and 3 of General Assembly resolution 36/231 A, and considering its extremely complex nature, the Committee decided to hold its forty-third session in New York from 3 to 27 May 1983.

Notes

1/ Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-seventh Session, Supplement No. 11 (A/37/11).

ANNEX I

Letter dated 29 October 1982 from the Permanent Representative
of the Dominican Republic to the United Nations addressed to
the Secretary-General

[Original: Spanish]

I have the honour, on the instructions of my Government, to request the World Organization, through you, to reduce the assessed contribution to the expenses of the United Nations from 0.03 to 0.01 for the period 1983-1985.

My Government also wishes, should it be possible, to pay the greater proportion of the contribution in national currency (Dominican pesos).

As you know, my country, like most countries of the third world, is undergoing an economic crisis owing to the high cost of petroleum and petroleum products and of the products we import, which come from developed countries, whereas the world market price of our commodity exports, such as sugar, is less than half of the production cost.

The economic situation we are experiencing has induced our Government to make budgetary cuts in all sectors of national life.

As you know, we are a founding Member of the United Nations, and this is the first time we have made a request of this kind; in so doing we are basing our request on resolution 36/231 A of 18 December 1981, several paragraphs of which apply to our case.

My Government hopes for your understanding in this case.

(Signed) Enriquillo A. DEL ROSARIO C.
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

ANNEX II

Note verbale dated 2 November 1982 from the Permanent Observer
of the Republic of Korea to the United Nations addressed to
the Secretary-General

[Original: English]

The Permanent Observer of the Republic of Korea to the United Nations presents his compliments to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and has the honour to submit the following observations of the Government of the Republic of Korea regarding the latter's letter TRS/CNT 2-3 dated 14 September 1982 concerning the rates of assessments proposed by the Committee on Contributions for the 1983-1985 period.

While appreciating the efforts of the Committee on Contributions to formulate the new scale of assessments for 1983-1985, the Government of the Republic of Korea regrets to inform the Secretary-General that it would not be able to agree fully to the proposed scale of assessments for the following reasons:

1. The Government of the Republic of Korea considers it unreasonable that the share of the developing countries as a whole should be considerably increased while that of some developed countries and the countries of centrally planned economies is being decreased drastically. The Government of the Republic of Korea considers that the newly proposed scale of assessments in some cases lacks objective justification and deviates from the guidelines set out in resolution 36/231 A which specifically require that due consideration be given to developing countries.

2. Furthermore, the guidelines of resolution 36/231 A specifically stipulate that "special measures should be taken in favour of countries whose rates of assessments have already been increased at the previous review of the scale of assessments." It should be recalled that the scale of assessments for the Republic of Korea has continuously increased since 1977. For example, the scale of assessment for the Republic of Korea was increased from 0.13 per cent to 0.15 per cent at the previous review in 1979. And yet the proposed scale affecting the Republic of Korea indicates an increase from the current 0.15 per cent to 0.21 per cent, another 40 per cent increase, in clear deviation from the intent of the above resolution.

3. It should also be noted that the oil crisis and current world-wide recession has brought about a very serious economic situation in the Republic of Korea, resulting in a sharp decline of the gross national product in 1980 with the rate of annual economic growth dropping to minus 6 per cent. The Committee on Contributions, however, proposes that the new scale for the Republic of Korea, a non-member State, be increased drastically by 40 per cent, whereas that for a permanent member of the Security Council be decreased by 50 per cent.

The Government of the Republic of Korea is prepared, as ever, to contribute positively to all activities being carried out by the United Nations. However, it finds it difficult to accept the proposed scale of assessments for the reasons described above. The Government of the Republic of Korea fully supports the view expressed by many members of the 77 Group that the present scale should be frozen until a new formula attracting the maximum degree of consensus can be found.

ANNEX III

Distribution of 58 points submitted by a member of the Committee
on Contributions at the request of the Committee

	<u>Scale 1980-1982</u>	<u>Recommended scale 1983-1985</u>	<u>Proposed mitigation</u>	<u>Revised rate of assessment</u>
Algeria12	.15	2	.13
Bahrain01	.02	1	.01
Brazil	1.27	1.47	7	1.40
Chile07	.08	1	.07
Ecuador02	.03	1	.02
Egypt07	.08	1	.07
Gabon02	.03	1	.02
Iraq12	.15	2	.13
Kuwait20	.28	3	.25
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya23	.28	2	.26
Mexico76	.97	7	.90
Morocco05	.06	1	.05
Nigeria16	.22	3	.19
Oman01	.02	1	.01
Peru06	.09	2	.07
Qatar03	.04	1	.03
Saudi Arabia58	.91	8	.83
Singapore08	.10	1	.09
Syrian Arab Republic03	.04	1	.03
Trinidad and Tobago02	.04	1	.03
United Arab Emirates10	.19	3	.16
United Republic of Cameroon01	.02	1	.01
Uruguay04	.05	1	.04
Venezuela50	.58	3	.55
Yugoslavia42	.48	3	.45