United Nations

A/C.5/64/SR.2

General Assembly
Sixty-fourth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
16 October 2009

Original: English

Fifth Committee

Summary record of the 2nd meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Monday, 5 October 2009, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Maurer . . . . (Switzerland)
Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions: Ms. McLurg

Contents

09-54178 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.05 a.m.

Agenda item 136: Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations (A/64/11 and A/64/68)

1. **Mr. Greiver** (Chairman of the Committee on Contributions), introducing the report of the Committee on Contributions on its sixty-ninth session (A/64/11), said that, since the General Assembly needed to adopt a new scale of assessments at its current session, the Committee's work at its sixty-ninth session had focused on the scale for 2010-2012. In the absence of specific guidance from the General Assembly, it had proceeded with its review in accordance with its general mandate under rule 160 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly and the relevant provisions of General Assembly resolution 58/1 B; it had also recalled the results of its previous reviews.

2. The Committee had reaffirmed its recommendation that the scale of assessments should be based on the most current, comprehensive and comparable data available for gross national income (GNI). While it had met with World Bank and International Monetary Fund representatives to discuss purchasing power parity (PPP) rates, it had reaffirmed its recommendation that conversion rates based on market exchange rates (MERs) should be used for the scale of assessments for 2010-2012, except where that would cause excessive fluctuations and distortions in income, in which case price-adjusted rates of exchange (PAREs) or other appropriate rates should be used. The Committee had agreed that, once chosen, there were advantages in using the same base period for as long as possible. Following consideration of the debt-burden adjustment and the low per capita income adjustment, it had decided to review them further at future sessions in the light of guidance from the General Assembly; it had also reaffirmed that the scale methodology should continue to take into account comparative per capita income. The Committee had recalled the current levels set by the Assembly for the ceiling rate, the ceiling rate for least developed countries and the floor rate. It had also considered the issue of large scale-to-scale increases and discontinuity and, following further discussion of the proposal for automatic annual recalculation of the scale, had decided to carry out a detailed study of that matter at its next session in the light of guidance from the General Assembly.

3. The Committee had taken note of a representation from the Czech Republic, on behalf of the European Union, concerning proposals for a methodology for the preparation of the scale of assessments for 2010-2012.

4. In considering the scale of assessments for 2010-2012, the Committee had had before it statistical information for 2002-2007. The primary source for income data had been the national accounts questionnaire completed for the United Nations by the countries concerned. The Committee had noted that the System of National Accounts, 2008 (2008 SNA) was being implemented and that 132 countries, representing an estimated 95.5 per cent of the total world GNI in 2007, had implemented the System of National Accounts, 1993 (1993 SNA). Information on external debt had been extracted in most cases from the World Bank database. Where no debt data were available after 2002, owing to changes in coverage, the authorities of the countries in question had been approached for alternative data; for those Member States that had not provided it, the Committee had, where applicable, used data from the current scale. In considering which MERs should be replaced in preparing the 2010-2012 scale, the Committee had identified 11 countries for review using the revised criteria outlined in annex II to the report on its sixty-eighth session (A/63/11). A country-by-country assessment of possible exchange rate overvaluation or undervaluation had been conducted for those countries, on the basis of which the Committee had decided to adjust the conversion rate of Iraq. In keeping with past practice and its recommendations on the scale methodology, it had decided to use MERs for the other 10 countries, although some members had considered that adjustments should also be made in those cases. The Committee had also examined the case of countries deemed to warrant review in light of a number of other factors outlined in paragraph 67 (b) of the current report (A/64/11); based on that review, it had decided to use United Nations operational rates of exchange for the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Myanmar and the Syrian Arab Republic. In order to identify the impact of new data on the scale of assessments for 2010-2012, the Committee had applied the new data to the methodology used in preparing the scale for 2007-2009, and had included the results in its report (A/64/11) for information.

5. Upon reviewing the report of the Secretary-General on multi-year payment plans (A/64/68), the

Committee had noted that Tajikistan had paid its arrears, resulting in the successful implementation of its multi-year payment plan during the first half of 2009. Such plans continued to be a viable means for Member States to reduce their unpaid assessed contributions and to demonstrate their commitment to meeting their financial obligations to the United Nations.

6. The Committee had considered six requests for exemption under Article 19 of the Charter. Two Member States requesting exemptions had also submitted multi-year payment plans; all Member States that requested exemptions were encouraged to present such plans. The Committee had concluded that the failure of the six Member States to pay the minimum amount required to avoid the application of Article 19 had been due to conditions beyond their control and recommended that they should be permitted to vote until the end of the sixty-fourth session of the General Assembly.

7. The Committee had recommended that the annual assessment of the remaining non-Member State of the United Nations, the Holy See, should continue to be based on 50 per cent of its notional rate of assessment, which should be fixed at 0.001 per cent for 2010-2012. It had noted that six Member States, in arrears in the payment of their assessed contributions under the terms of Article 19 of the Charter, had been permitted to vote in the Assembly until the end of the sixty-third session, while one Member State in arrears, namely Chad, had had no vote. The Secretary-General had accepted in 2008 the equivalent of $54,648 in a currency other than the United States dollar.

8. **Mr. Berridge** (Chief, Contributions and Policy Coordination Service), introducing the report of the Secretary-General on multi-year payment plans (A/64/68), said that the report provided information on the payment plans submitted by Liberia, Sao Tome and Principe and Tajikistan and the actual payments made under those plans. Subsequent to the preparation of the report, Tajikistan had made payments resulting in the full implementation of its plan. The updated situation for the two remaining plans was described in the report of the Committee on Contributions (A/64/11). While a number of other Member States had indicated that they were considering the submission of a plan, no other multi-year payment plans had thus far been submitted.

9. **Mr. Elhag** (Sudan), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, reaffirmed the Group's position that the resources provided to the United Nations must be commensurate with its mandates and that all Member States should therefore pay their assessed contributions on time, in full and without conditions. The decisions of the General Assembly on the agenda item under consideration should, however, take full account of the genuine difficulties that temporarily prevented some developing countries from fulfilling their financial obligations.

10. The Group stood ready to adopt immediately the scale of assessments for 2010-2012, as prepared on the basis of the current methodology, and it strongly urged all its partners to take the same stance. Any attempt to change the methodology in order to further shift the burden of financing the Organization to developing countries would only entail divisive, unproductive discussions with no meaningful outcomes. As a result of maintaining the current scale methodology, the contribution rates of most developing countries for 2010-2012 would undergo substantial increases, which those countries were prepared to accept in order to fulfil their responsibilities as stakeholders in the Organization. The Group reaffirmed the principle of capacity to pay as the fundamental criterion in the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations and emphasized that the core elements of the current scale methodology were non-negotiable and must be kept intact. That said, the current ceiling rate of 22 per cent, established as a political compromise, ran counter to the principle of capacity to pay and represented a fundamental source of distortion in the scale of assessments. The General Assembly should therefore undertake a review of that arrangement, pursuant to paragraph 2 of its resolution 55/5 C. While the Group stood ready to adopt the scale for 2010-2012 without delay, it was also prepared for a serious discussion on the ceiling rate if its partners wished to examine the various elements of the current methodology.

11. The Group endorsed the recommendation of the Committee on Contributions to allow the six States that had applied for Article 19 exemptions to continue voting until the end of the sixty-fourth session. It appreciated the efforts of those Member States that had submitted multi-year payment plans and honoured their commitments under them; however, such plans should remain voluntary, should not be used to exert pressure

on the Member States concerned, and should absolutely not be included as a factor when considering exemption under Article 19 of the Charter.

12. Finally, he reiterated the Group's strong opposition to decision-making on the agenda item in small group configurations. Negotiations must be conducted in an open, inclusive and transparent manner, without the imposition of any conditionalities.

13. **Mr. Lidén** (Sweden), speaking on behalf of the European Union; the candidate countries Croatia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; the stabilization and association process countries Albania, Montenegro and Serbia; and, in addition, Armenia and the Republic of Moldova, said the European Union had consistently maintained that the payment of assessed contributions on time, in full and without conditions was a fundamental duty of all Member States. Nevertheless, it recognized that some States might face genuine difficulties in discharging that duty for reasons beyond their control. It noted with concern the continuing increase in the accumulations of arrears of some Member States, the fact that no new multi-year payment plans had been submitted; and the failure of some Member States to adhere to the plans already submitted. In that connection, it encouraged further efforts by the Member States in question to reduce their unpaid assessed contributions and urged the Central African Republic to submit and follow a multi-year payment plan. Despite its concerns, the European Union stood ready to endorse the recommendations of the Committee on Contributions that the six States requesting Article 19 exemptions should be permitted to vote in the General Assembly until the end of the sixty-fourth session.

14. The European Union continued to stress the importance of capacity to pay as the basis for Member States' contributions. However, it considered that the current scale of assessments did not truly reflect existing economic realities and, hence, did not embody that principle. The assessed contribution of the European Union member States, for example, was significantly higher than their share of the world economy. It was therefore important to ensure that the scale of assessments for 2010-2012 more accurately and fairly reflected the capacity to pay of each Member State. While significant relief was certainly needed for the most vulnerable countries, some major emerging economies had seen substantial growth in the past decade and should assume a larger share of the Organization's expenses.

15. The low per capita income adjustment was an important element designed to provide relief to developing countries; however, its effect had been to restrict relief to a handful of Member States with a significant share of world GNI, while providing little benefit for the least developed countries. That issue should be addressed to ensure that the effects of the adjustment were consistent with the original intention. Similarly, the debt-burden adjustment should be re-examined, since it did not take full account of the data now available, especially in relation to public debt. The use of such data would better reflect the responsibility of the Government in question and would better correspond to the original intent. Such balancing adjustments would address the flaws of the current scale methodology, without affecting the majority of countries. For the European Union, maintaining the status quo was no longer a solution.

16. **Ms. Pataca** (Angola), speaking on behalf of the African Group, reiterated that the expenses of the Organization should be apportioned among Member States according to capacity to pay. Bearing in mind that the report of the Committee on Contributions (A/64/11) reflected an increase in the assessed contributions of many developing countries, including African States, while those of developed countries had significantly decreased owing to the financial downturn, the Group considered that the current scale methodology remained valid and to a major extent reflected a true picture of the global financial situation. It must therefore be kept intact and not reviewed.

17. While the Group recognized that making financial contributions to the United Nations was an obligation of every Member State, it also noted that circumstances beyond the control of six Member States had made it difficult for them to fulfil those obligations. It therefore supported the recommendation that the six Member States in question should be granted Article 19 exemptions that would permit them to vote until the end of the sixty-fourth session of the General Assembly.

18. **Mr. McNee** (Canada), speaking also on behalf of Australia and New Zealand, said that the three delegations fully endorsed the recommendation of the Committee on Contributions that the six Member States requesting Article 19 exemptions should be

permitted to vote until the end of the sixty-fourth session of the General Assembly.

19. The scale of assessments was the practical means of implementing Member States' shared responsibility for the functioning of the United Nations. The three delegations therefore remained committed to the principle of capacity to pay as the fundamental criterion governing the scale; in 2006, they had resisted proposals that could have brought them short-term gain because such proposals weakened the application of that principle. In their judgement, the current methodology did not adequately reflect the principle of capacity to pay and should be adjusted in order to arrive at a fairer, more balanced and more representative scale of assessments. In particular, the low per capita income adjustment applied the same discount rate to all countries falling below the threshold, without taking into account differences in capacity. As a result, much of the benefit went to a small number of large developing countries. Although the three delegations supported the concept and continued application of the adjustment, they considered that smaller developing countries should derive greater benefit from it and that the definition of the eligibility threshold should be given more attention. The debt-burden adjustment also had little or no demonstrable link to capacity to pay, as the effects of debt-servicing costs were already taken into account in the current measure of GNI. If that adjustment were to be retained, it should at least reflect the more accurate data for public debt now available, as a means of improving the measurement of capacity to pay.

20. **Ms. Azmee** (Malaysia) said that various socio-economic factors affecting the well-being of Member States must be considered during the formulation of the scale of assessments, which should continue to be governed by the principle of capacity to pay. The scale should reflect fair and balanced rates of assessment agreed upon by all Member States and based on the most current, comprehensive and comparable data available for GNI.

21. Her delegation supported the recommendation of the Committee on Contributions that MERs should be used in reviewing the scale of assessments for the period 2010-2012, with the judicious use of PAREs or other appropriate conversion rates to avoid excessive fluctuations and distortions in the income of certain Member States. The same base period should be maintained for as long as possible for the sake of stability and predictability in the scale over the course of consecutive periods. Since it would be impossible to determine a scale of assessments that would satisfy all Member States, the imperative was to avoid drastic changes in Member States' assessments. Above all, the United Nations must be given adequate and stable funding so that it could implement all of its mandates satisfactorily. She hoped that, to that end, all Member States would continue to pay their assessed contributions without any conditions attached.

22. **Mr. Melrose** (United States) said that complex technical and policy considerations went into formulating the scale of assessments to share the financial burden of United Nations activities equitably among Member States. When, in 2006, the Committee had last addressed the scale of assessments for the regular budget, proposals to change virtually every aspect of the methodology had been set aside for lack of consensus. His delegation remained convinced that the methodology could be improved by focusing on a number of underlying principles.

23. It was recognized that all Member States were responsible for meeting the financial obligations of the Organization and that the scale of assessments should be broadly based on capacity to pay. His delegation was of the view, however, that the United Nations should not be overly reliant on contributions from any one Member State. That principle had been central to the scale methodology from the inception of the Organization; to it could be added the principle of fairness. While some might argue that fairness was inherent in the principle of capacity to pay, others would argue that it depended on how that principle was applied. In the years since 2006, a global financial crisis had affected every country's economy. All Member States must work together, on the basis of the principles enumerated, to address the important issue before them.

24. **Mr. Heller** (Mexico) said that the current methodology must be changed if Member States intended to fulfil General Assembly decisions according to which they would bear the expenses of the Organization based on their capacity to pay. For the sake of consensus, his delegation had agreed to the current methodology during the previous two reviews of the scale of assessments, but that was no longer possible. Mexico would never hesitate to meet its financial obligations to the Organization. Nevertheless, it could not continue subsidizing Member States —

both developed countries and other developing countries — that had a higher capacity to pay. If the Organization was being called upon to reflect current realities when Member States deliberated political issues, then the same must hold true when they deliberated its finances.

25. Unfortunately, the Committee on Contributions had become engaged in a political dynamic that had impaired its ability to make specific recommendations on elements of a scale of assessments that would truly reflect Member States' capacity to pay. The Fifth Committee should thoroughly analyse every element of the current scale, including the debt-burden adjustment, which should be based on debt flows rather than debt stock; the low per capita income adjustment, which was too broad and affected middle-income countries disproportionately; the income measure; and the ceiling. The current methodology was technically questionable, politically unacceptable and financially unviable: it was the Committee's duty to review it and then to adopt the fairest possible scale of assessments.

26. **Mr. Cumberbatch** (Cuba) said that the scale of assessments was one of the main elements ensuring the equitable participation of all Member States in United Nations activities. The current methodology allowed a balanced measurement of their capacity to pay. The single flaw in the methodology was the ceiling that Member States had adopted under duress. Despite that measure, the Committee had witnessed, in recent sessions, attempts to transfer more of the financial burden to developing countries, quite contrary to the principle of capacity to pay.

27. He was dismayed to see an increasing share of the United Nations budget being devoted to issues of peace and security, rendering the Organization a de facto military pact, while ever fewer resources were directed towards economic and social development. Pressure was being exerted to silence developing countries in the decision-making process as a small group of Powers attempted to make decisions for all, thereby breaching the essential notion of democracy in the deliberations of the United Nations. Although it suffered from a unilateral embargo that affected its ability to pay its contributions, Cuba was fulfilling its financial obligations to the United Nations and would oppose any attempt to modify the scale of assessments that might further limit the democratic participation of developing countries in the Organization's work.

28. His delegation favoured the swift adoption of a draft resolution allowing the recommended exemptions under Article 19 of the Charter for those States that had been unable to settle their arrears owing to circumstances beyond their control.

29. **Mr. Tsymbaliuk** (Ukraine) said that a fair, balanced and depoliticized approach was required in discussing the scale of assessments. The current scale, a result of lengthy negotiations among Member States, should not undergo any drastic changes. Furthermore, consideration of the scale should not become an annual exercise.

30. The principle of capacity to pay should remain the basis for Member States' contributions. The use of purchasing power parity to calculate conversion rates would reflect capacity to consume rather than capacity to pay, in violation of rule 160 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, and should therefore no longer be considered in future deliberations of the Committee on Conferences. Price-adjusted rates of exchange should be used for those countries whose GNI would be significantly distorted with the application of market exchange rates. The low per capita income adjustment was an important part of the current scale and should be retained in its current form. Longer base periods — preferably six years — would provide greater stability in the scale and smooth out fluctuations in the income calculated for Member States. Large scale-to-scale increases could be avoided by adopting a scale of assessments in which increases of over 50 per cent were phased in gradually.

31. Ukraine endorsed the recommendations of the Committee on Contributions on exemptions from the application of Article 19 of the Charter to allow the Member States in question to vote until the end of the sixty-fourth session of the Assembly.

32. **Mr. Sumi** (Japan) said that his Government had paid its contributions faithfully, despite the huge debt that it was shouldering and the serious effects that the financial and economic crisis was having on Japan's economy. The principle of capacity to pay should continue to apply in calculating Member States' contributions. The report of the Committee on Contributions (A/64/11) showed substantial deviations between the GNI shares of individual States before and after the application of adjustments such as the low per capita income adjustment. The assessment rates of some Member States with large GNI shares were much

lower than warranted by their capacity to pay — and their influence within the Organization — while Japan's rate was some 30 per cent higher than its GNI share. The Fifth Committee must address that deviation from the basic principle of capacity to pay and, cognizant of the rapidly changing world economic situation, must find a more equitable methodology based on the most current, comprehensive and comparable data available. Despite the regrettable fact that the General Assembly had been unable to give the Committee on Contributions any specific guidance at the Assembly's sixty-third session, Member States should base their discussions of the scale of assessments on the report before them.

33. Lastly, Japan endorsed the Committee's recommendations on waiving the application of Article 19 to the six Member States in question.

34. **Mr. Prokhorov** (Russian Federation) said that the basic principle of United Nations funding was the equitable distribution of expenses among Member States, which must pay their contributions in full, on time and without conditions if the Organization was to carry out its increasingly complex mandates. That principle was all the more crucial at a time when economic crisis made it more difficult for them to meet their financial obligations. The members of the Fifth Committee were bound to come under greater pressure from their Governments during the deliberations on the issue at hand, but they must avoid politicizing what should remain a fundamentally technical discussion.

35. His delegation appreciated the work undertaken by the Committee on Contributions in examining the scale methodology and alternative proposals on how to calculate GNI. Using capacity to pay rather than purchasing power was the fairest means of apportioning the expenses of the United Nations; that was also precisely what made the Organization a truly universal body, in which each Member State had one vote regardless of its contribution to the budget. It was unfortunate that the Committee on Contributions had failed to reach unanimity on replacing market exchange rates with price-adjusted rates of exchange despite the information provided by the Secretariat on that matter. Applying PAREs was an important mechanism that would help avoid distortions in calculating the GNI of any country when converted into United States dollars, a currency that was influenced by many financial processes. The current methodology for formulating the scale of assessments, which had resulted from long and difficult negotiations, did not require any major changes for the immediate future.

36. The Russian Federation had no objection to granting voting rights until the end of the sixty-fourth session of the Assembly to the States whose arrears fell within the meaning of Article 19 of the Charter.

37. **Mr. Gürber** (Switzerland), speaking also on behalf of Liechtenstein, said that the United Nations could operate properly only if Member States met their financial obligations in accordance with the Charter. Switzerland had always done so and would make every effort to continue that practice. Nevertheless, the six Member States that had been unable to pay their contributions on time due to conditions beyond their control should be permitted to vote until the end of the sixty-fourth session of the General Assembly.

38. He commended the decision by major contributors to pay off their arrears, but was concerned that the arrears of some Member States continued to grow. Noting that multi-year payment plans had been a useful tool for addressing such situations, as illustrated by the commendable examples of Tajikistan and Liberia, he encouraged all States with significant arrears to intensify their efforts to reduce them and to demonstrate their commitment to the United Nations by submitting such plans.

39. Turning to the methodology for the scale of assessments, he underlined that the current methodology provided a reliable framework that should not be substantially changed. Nevertheless, given the growth patterns in different parts of the world since the previous revision of the methodology, it was unlikely that the current distribution of assessments sufficiently reflected actual capacity to pay. He hoped that the Committee's deliberations would result in a burden-sharing arrangement that all Member States perceived as more equitable. Delegations should focus less on how the scale affected individual assessments and more on whether it would enhance the financial stability and authority of the Organization. Furthermore, calculation of the scale should be simple and transparent; there should be no additions or changes that made the methodology more complicated.

40. The next scale of assessments would be applied in the period 2010-2012, yet it was based on data ranging from 2002 to 2007 that no longer reflected Member States' current economic status or capacity to

pay. To correct the discrepancy, the time lag between data collection and the assessment period, which would probably have the greatest effect on the countries that had been hit hardest by the financial and economic crisis, should be reduced. Other options would be to reduce the base period or to recalculate rates annually, provided that such recalculation was a purely technical process. With respect to the low per capita income adjustment, there was merit in creating a neutral zone, as explained in paragraph 43 of the report (A/64/11), to avoid abrupt rate increases despite relatively small GNI growth.

41. **Mr. Liu** Zhenmin (China) said that capacity to pay should remain the cornerstone of the scale methodology, as it had been since the United Nations was established. Per capita income must be taken into account when measuring a Member State's capacity to pay: it would be unfair to overemphasize gross national income and disregard the size of a country's population. The low per capita income adjustment, whose criteria were applicable to every Member State, was crucial in alleviating payment difficulties for those Member States that qualified. China's per capita GNI of $3,000 was still far below the world average, which was used as the threshold for the low per capita income adjustment. By the World Bank standard, the country had 250 million people living in poverty. Economic development, poverty eradication and modernization remained daunting challenges for China, whose specificities should be taken into account when determining its capacity to pay. Any proposal to limit the rate of adjustment ran counter to that principle.

42. Stability in the scale of assessments was key. The current scale was the outcome of long, painstaking negotiations in which different viewpoints and proposals had been considered. Having been applied for three consecutive periods, it had served Member States well and should be maintained, not least to ensure stable and sound financing for the United Nations. Moreover, with the global economic crisis deepening, it was inadvisable at present to make any major adjustments to the scale.

43. As a responsible developing country, China had always honoured its financial obligations to the Organization. Despite enormous losses from natural disasters in 2008 and the unprecedented level of its deficit, it had paid its assessed contributions in full and on time and, as a permanent member of the Security Council, had assumed additional financial obligations in peacekeeping. China's assessment rate had increased threefold in just seven years and would grow by a further 20 per cent with the current methodology. His delegation would nevertheless accept that rate, provided that the existing methodology for calculating the scale of assessments was retained.

44. **Mr**. Manjeev **Puri** (India) said that the current scale methodology, which had evolved over the decades as a result of lengthy deliberations by the members' predecessors, truly reflected the inviolable principle of capacity to pay and accounted for changes in the relative growth rates of Member States. Most developing countries would see a substantial increase in their assessed contributions in 2010-2012 based on the current scale of assessments. Although those countries were not responsible for the global economic and financial crisis, they had been hit the hardest by it and should not be asked to shoulder an even greater burden in the financing of the United Nations.

45. It was in the interest of all to maintain the current methodology, since any attempt to change it would unravel the consensus that had been achieved over the years. His delegation would therefore welcome the immediate adoption for 2010-2012 of the existing scale methodology, thus saving on precious conference resources and allowing more time for the deliberation of other pressing issues.

46. All Member States should pay their assessed contributions in full, on time and without conditionality, particularly since they had been determined by the General Assembly on the basis of clear and unanimously agreed guidelines. Nonetheless, India endorsed the recommendations of the Committee on Contributions on exemptions to the application of Article 19.

47. **Mr. Natalegawa** (Indonesia) said that his delegation was opposed to any proposal that deviated from the principle of capacity to pay, which represented the general consensus of the broad membership and had been reaffirmed by numerous General Assembly resolutions. The low per capita income adjustment should continue to be used, as that was the best way to measure Member States' actual capacity to pay. The current scale methodology, which represented a negotiated consensus, should be retained in preparing the 2010-2012 scale in order to ensure stable and predictable financing for the United Nations as it underwent numerous reforms.

48. While world leaders had consistently declared their commitment to the United Nations, the fact remained that the Organization's proposed budget for the biennium 2010-2011 represented only 0.009 per cent of estimated global gross national income for 2010. Granted, many Member States were enduring difficulties due to the global financial crisis. Despite its promising economic development in recent years, Indonesia still faced daunting challenges and its per capita GNI was outranked by that of over a hundred other States. Nevertheless, it was prepared to make an even greater contribution to the United Nations — calculated to increase by some 48 per cent — provided that the existing scale methodology was maintained.

The meeting rose at 12.10 p.m.