



**12<sup>th</sup> MEETING OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE**  
*31 January – 01 February 2017, Paris, France*

---

**REPORT OF THE SECRETARIAT ON THE SCALE USED TO DETERMINE ANNUAL  
CONTRIBUTIONS BY THE CONTRACTING PARTIES TO  
THE AEWA CORE BUDGET**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

At its 6<sup>th</sup> Session the Meeting of the Parties, through Resolution 6.18, “*request[ed] the Secretariat, using the financial and staff rules and regulations of the United Nations including UNEP financial rules, and other administrative issuances promulgated by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, to develop a series of budget scenarios for further consideration by Parties at the 7<sup>th</sup> Session of the Meeting of Parties and describe any differences between the UN Scale of Assessments and the scale used to determine contributions to AEWA.*”

The purpose of this document is to receive guidance from the Standing Committee on the scale to be used to determine AEWA contributions under the budget scenarios to be presented to MOP7. At this stage the Secretariat will not present AEWA budget scenarios for 2019-2021.

**Actions Requested from the Standing Committee**

1. Note the Report of the Secretariat on the scale used to determine annual contributions by the Contracting Parties to the AEWA core budget;
2. Advise the Secretariat on the scale to be used to determine annual contributions by the Contracting Parties to the AEWA core budget under the proposed budget scenarios to be presented to MOP7.

## II. BACKGROUND

### 1. UN scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations

The UN scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations derives from the fundamental principle that the expenses of the Organisation shall be apportioned broadly according to capacity of the member states to pay. It is based on a precise methodology which takes into account different criteria and elements referring to a country's economic situation.<sup>1</sup>

The scale of assessment is regularly adopted by the United Nations General Assembly and valid for a three-year period<sup>2</sup>. It assesses contributions for all UN member states worldwide and is particularly adapted to share a budget on a worldwide scale. There is no specific scale provided for regional multilateral environmental agreements.

### 2. Annual contributions from Contracting Parties to the AEWA core budget

Article V.2 of the Agreement requires that “(a) *Each Party shall contribute to the budget of the Agreement in accordance with the United Nations scale of assessment. The contributions shall be restricted to a maximum of 25 per cent<sup>3</sup> of the total budget for any Party that is a Range State. No regional economic integration organization shall be required to contribute more than 2.5 per cent of the administrative costs.* (b) *Decisions relating to the budget and any changes to the scale of assessment that may be found necessary shall be adopted by the Meeting of the Parties by consensus.*”

Thus according to the Agreement, AEWA contributions should, in principle, be calculated on the basis of the UN scale of assessments.<sup>4</sup> However, Art. V.2(b) allows Parties to change the scale of assessment.

## III. AEWA HISTORY

At **MOP1 (1999)** AEWA contributions were strictly calculated on the basis of the UN scale of assessments, using a maximum threshold of 25 % as foreseen in Article V.2 of AEWA, which applied to two countries at that time.

At **MOP2 (2002)** Parties agreed to introduce a **minimum contribution** of 100 USD and the maximum threshold of 25 % was maintained. The UN scale of assessments was used as the basis for calculating the remaining contributions.

---

<sup>1</sup> a) Estimates of gross national income; b) Average statistical base periods of three and six years; c) Conversion rates based on market exchange rates, except where that would cause excessive fluctuations and distortions in the income of some Member States, when price-adjusted rates of exchange or other appropriate conversion rates should be employed [...]; d) The debt-burden approach employed in the scale of assessments for the period from 2013-2015; e) a low per capita income adjustment of 80 per cent, with a threshold per capita income limit of the average per capita gross national income of all Member States for the statistical base periods; f) a minimum assessment rate of 0.0001 per cent; g) a maximum assessment rate for the least developed countries of 0.01 per cent; h) a maximum assessment rate of 22 per cent.

<sup>2</sup> Resolution 70/245 on the Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations for the period 2016-2018 is available here: [http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view\\_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/70/245](http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/70/245)

<sup>3</sup> The maximum ceiling of 25 % was in line with the UN scale of assessments at that time. The UN maximum assessment rate is meanwhile at 22 % (compare General Assembly Resolution 70/245).

<sup>4</sup> As only 39 % of the UN member states are Parties to AEWA the UN scale percentages need to be recalculated of course, and cannot be taken over 1:1.

At **MOP3 (2005)** Parties decided to adopt the budget in EUR instead of USD. The **minimum contribution** of 100 USD was converted to a minimum contribution of 100 EUR and **the maximum threshold** of 25 % was decreased to 20 %. The UN scale of assessments was used as the basis for calculating the remaining contributions.

At **MOP4 (2008)** the **minimum contribution** was increased to 2,000 EUR<sup>5</sup>, an amount which was readily accepted by the Parties concerned and therefore retained at the subsequent sessions of the MOP. The **threshold of 20 %** was maintained. Parties also agreed to pay the same amount each year (reflecting the average annual budget) instead of different amounts reflecting the actual annual budgets. This practice has been maintained since then.

The UN scale was not strictly applied at MOP4 to determine annual contributions to the AEWA core budget. Contributions were the result of negotiation between the Parties present. As no records were kept on the internal discussions of the working group on financial and administrative matters, it is very difficult to retrace how individual contributions were determined.

At **MOP5 (2012)** the minimum and maximum thresholds were maintained and the Parties decided to keep the relative apportioning established by MOP4.

At **MOP6 (2015)** the Secretariat proposed to use the scale adopted at MOP4 and used at MOP5. The Parties decided to freeze all contributions at the MOP5 level which led to a kind of “zero – zero budget” (zero nominal growth and zero increase).

Annex 1 to this document shows all contributions as adopted from the 1<sup>st</sup> to the 6<sup>th</sup> Sessions of the Meeting of the Parties to AEWA.

---

<sup>5</sup> The Secretariat’s initial proposal was to set the minimum contribution at 1,000 €. A number of African countries argued for a minimum contribution of 5,000 EUR; finally, consensus was reached on a minimum contribution of 2,000 EUR.

**Overview of criteria and elements used to assess annual contributions by the Contracting Parties to the  
AEWA core budget at MOP1 – MOP6**

	<b>MOP1 (1999)</b>	<b>MOP2 (2002)</b>	<b>MOP3 (2005)</b>	<b>MOP4 (2008) *</b>	<b>MOP5 (2012)</b>	<b>MOP6 (2015)</b>
<b>UN Scale of assessment applied</b>	yes	yes	yes	No	No, previous contributions were frozen (not exact match of figures, but very close)	No, contributions were frozen (exact match of figures)
<b>Maximum contribution (per definition)</b>	25 % of total budget (Art. V.2(a) AEWA)	25 % of total budget (Art. V.2(a) AEWA)	20 % of total budget (Res. 3.14, para. 4)	20 % of total budget (Res. 4.8, para. 5)	20 % of total budget (Res. 5.21, para. 6)	20 % of total budget (Res. 6.18, para. 4)
<b>Minimum contribution</b>	-	USD 100	EUR 100	EUR 2,000	EUR 2,000	EUR 2,000
<b>No. of Contracting Parties</b>	24	34	53	62	65	75
<b>No. of minimum payers</b>	-	12	13	39	43	53
<b>EU contribution (per definition)</b>	-	-	Max. 2.5 % of total budget	Max. 2.5 % of total budget	Max. 2.5 % of total budget	Max. 2.5 % of total budget
<b>EU contribution (as adopted)</b>	-	-	2.5 % of total budget	1.85 % of total budget	1.83 % of total budget	1.79 % of total budget
<b>Total budget adopted</b>	USD 1,469,283	USD 1,790,937	EUR 1,741,814	EUR 3,746,200	EUR 3,078,778	EUR 3,078,778
<b>Budget to be shared</b>	USD 1,469,283	USD 1,590,937	EUR 1,741,814	EUR 3,606,201	EUR 2,708,778	EUR 2,768,778
<b>Withdrawal from reserve</b>	-	USD 200,000	-	EUR 140,000	EUR 370,000	EUR 310,000
<b>Annual budget (on average)</b>	USD 489,761	USD 596,979	EUR 580,605	EUR 936,550	EUR 1,026,259	EUR 1,026,259

\*4-year period (2009 – 2012)

## IV. ASSESSMENT OF AEWA CONTRIBUTIONS 2019-2021

### 1. Introduction

For the purpose of the analysis as to which scale to use for the budget proposal to be submitted to MOP7, the Secretariat has developed a number of scenarios on the basis of the budget adopted at MOP6 (see Annex 2). This allows an easy comparison of figures. However, it should be noted that the MOP6 budget was a zero nominal growth budget and had not increased compared to the one adopted at MOP5 (2012). The adoption of the same budget again would necessarily lead to a loss of Secretariat posts and to a significant decrease in implementation activities.

### 2. Analysis

The Secretariat has not elaborated on a scenario which applies the UN scale of assessment without setting a minimum contribution as this was not requested by the resolution; a minimum contribution has been set at each MOP since MOP2 in 2002 (and with the currently applied amount of 2,000 EUR since MOP4 in 2008) to avoid Parties receiving invoices on very low amounts (28 EUR). The Secretariat assumes that this reasoning will still apply at MOP7.

#### Scenario 1: Maintenance of a minimum contribution of 2,000 EUR and 20 % maximum threshold, and application of UN scale of assessments for others

Scenario 1 shows how the contributions would be calculated if the UN scale was applied to all Parties to which the minimum contribution does not apply. After deduction of the total minimum contributions and the EU contribution of 2.5 %, the budget would be shared proportionally in accordance with the UN scale percentages. The figures show that, compared to the contributions agreed at MOP6, some countries' contributions would significantly increase (especially Germany, Czech Republic and Italy, but also Algeria and Nigeria). Those countries, which - given the importance of migratory bird conservation in their countries - had agreed to contribute higher amounts than required under the UN scale of assessments since MOP4, would experience a decrease.

#### Scenario 2: Introduction of a minimum contribution of 3,000 EUR, maintenance of a 20 % maximum threshold and application of UN scale of assessments for others

Since the African Parties had even expressed their willingness to adopt a minimum contribution of 5,000 EUR at MOP4, Parties could consider increasing the minimum contribution at MOP7. As an example, scenario 2 suggests the introduction of a minimal contribution of 3,000 EUR. This would obviously increase the share of the minimum payers and decrease the remaining budget to be shared by other Parties, compared to Scenario 1. Thus, Parties could avoid a decrease of the total budget and potentially losing the African Initiative Unit which was established in the core budget with two part-time posts at MOP5 although the budget shared by Parties was not considerably increased (the budget was complemented by a relatively high withdrawal from the reserve instead).

This scenario, however, can only function, if the situation of contributions in arrears improves<sup>6</sup>; otherwise the increase of minimal contributions might lead to serious budget concerns if a significant amount of contributions from this group of Parties are outstanding, creating a financial gap that cannot be balanced by the reserve.

---

<sup>6</sup> Compare document UNEP/AEWA/StC/12.18/Corr.1.

Scenario 3: Introduction of a minimum contribution of 3,000 EUR, maintenance of a maximum threshold of 20 %, application of the UN scale of assessment, thereby freezing certain contributions

Scenario 3 illustrates how the budget could be calculated if the MOP6 contributions of those countries to which the new minimum contribution does not apply, were frozen.

Under Scenario 3 contributions are calculated as follows:

Step 1:

1. First a total budget needs to be set (for ease of comparison, the Secretariat chose the MOP6 budget).
2. Contributions above the maximum threshold of 20 % of the total budget are set at 20 %.
3. The EC contribution is set at 2.5 % of the total budget.
4. A minimum contribution of 3,000 EUR is applied to all Parties whose UN scale contributions are below 3,000 EUR.
5. The part of the budget not covered by minimum, maximum and the EC contribution is shared by the remaining Parties in accordance with the UN scale of assessments.

*At this point the contributions would correspond to the UN scale with the only difference being the introduction of a new minimum threshold, as provided for under Art. V.2(b) of AEWA.*

Step 2:

6. Contributions that were higher at MOP6 than they would be according to the UN scale at MOP7 are “frozen”, which means the previous figures are applied again. Thus the relevant countries pay higher contributions than they would under the UN scale; however, there would be no increase in their contributions, compared to MOP6.

The freezing of contributions leads to a higher total budget and offers ground for a potential budget increase or decrease of an eventual withdrawal from the reserve.

## **V. DISCUSSION**

The UN scale of assessment was applied to calculate AEWA contributions at MOP 1, MOP2 and MOP3. Since MOP4 (2008), however, the apportioning of annual contributions to the AEWA core budget has not strictly followed the UN scale of assessments. The contributions to the remaining budget - after deduction of the minimum contributions and the amount to be withdrawn from the reserve – were negotiated among the Parties.

It would generally be advisable to return to using the UN scale in future, as primarily foreseen by the Agreement. At this point, however, it would create considerable increases in case of a number of Parties if the UN scale of assessments was strictly applied to the AEWA budget, even if the budget was maintained at a zero nominal growth level. Other countries, however, would benefit from the application of the UN scale of assessments, although they might be willing to, at least, maintain the current level of financial commitment.

In view of the budget scenarios to be proposed to MOP7, the Secretariat seeks advise from the Standing Committee on the below points; we would like to point out that it will be crucial for the further functioning of the Agreement to choose a scale which will have no negative impact on the total budget to be shared by Parties:

1. Should the minimum contribution of 2,000 EUR be maintained and even increased (e.g. 3,000 EUR)?
2. Should the EU contribution be brought back to 2.5 % of the total budget to be shared?
3. Should the maximum threshold of 20 % be maintained?
4. In order to enter into a transitional period and to prepare a future move towards the application of the UN scale of assessments, should the Resolution on Financial and Administrative Matters:
  - a) foresee an increase for those Parties, which would have higher contributions under the UN scale of assessment, gradually year by year towards their official UN scale percentage;
  - b) plan for the application of the UN scale to new Parties joining the Agreement; if desired, should this also relate to Parties that would normally have to pay the minimum contribution or should the minimum contribution be maintained in the long term?

**Annex 1: Overview of the annual contributions by the Contracting Parties to the AEW A core budget adopted at MOP1 – MOP6**

		MOP1	MOP2	MOP3	MOP4	MOP5	MOP6
N°	Party	average yearly contribution in USD	average yearly contribution in USD	average yearly contribution in EUR	in EUR	in EUR	in EUR
1	Albania		99	140	2,000	2,000	2,000
2	Algeria				2,000	2,000	2,000
3	Belarus						
4	Belgium				23,635	23,494	23,494
5	Benin	59	66	100	2,000	2,000	2,000
6	Bulgaria		430	475	2,000	2,000	2,000
7	Burkina Faso						2,000
8	Burundi						2,000
9	Chad					2,000	2,000
10	Congo	89	33	100	2,000	2,000	2,000
11	Côte d'Ivoire						2,000
12	Croatia		1,292	1,034	2,000	2,000	2,000
13	Cyprus				2,000	2,000	2,000
14	Czech Republic				2,801	2,784	2,784
15	Denmark	20,480	24,818	20,060	23,069	22,932	22,932
16	Djibouti			100	2,000	2,000	2,000
17	Egypt	1,924	2,684	3,352	3,856	3,833	3,833
18	Equatorial Guinea			100	2,000	2,000	2,000
19	Estonia				2,000	2,000	2,000
20	Ethiopia					2,000	2,000
21	Finland	16,070	17,297	14,892	17,298	17,195	17,195
22	France			116,121	133,539	132,745	132,745
23	Gabon						2,000
24	Gambia	29	33	100	2,000	2,000	2,000
25	Georgia		165	100	2,000	2,000	2,000
26	Germany	122,441	116,669	116,121	133,539	132,745	132,745
27	Ghana			100	2,000	2,000	2,000
28	Guinea	89	99	100	2,000	2,000	2,000
29	Guinea-Bissau				2,000	2,000	2,000
30	Hungary			2,889	3,322	3,302	3,302
31	Iceland						2,000
32	Ireland			8,025	9,229	9,174	9,174
33	Israel		13,751	13,047	15,004	14,915	14,915
34	Italy				75,456	75,007	75,007
35	Jordan	178	265	922	2,000	2,000	2,000
36	Kenya		265	251	2,000	2,000	2,000
37	Latvia			402	2,000	2,000	2,000
38	Lebanon			670	2,000	2,000	2,000
39	Libya			2,802	3,222	3,203	3,203
40	Lithuania			528	2,000	2,000	2,000
41	Luxembourg			1,765	2,031	2,000	2,000
42	Madagascar				2,000	2,000	2,000
43	Mali	54	66	100	2,000	2,000	2,000
44	Mauritania						2,000
45	Mauritius		364	307	2,000	2,000	2,000
46	Monaco	118	133	100	2,000	2,000	2,000
47	Montenegro					2,000	2,000
48	Morocco						2,000
49	Netherlands	48,298	57,588	47,216	54,300	53,977	53,977
50	Niger	59	33	100	2,000	2,000	2,000

		MOP1	MOP2	MOP3	MOP4	MOP5	MOP6
N°	Party	average yearly contribution in USD	average yearly contribution in USD	average yearly contribution in EUR	in EUR	in EUR	in EUR
51	Nigeria			925	2,000	2,000	2,000
52	Norway				16,385	16,288	16,288
53	Portugal			10,356	11,909	11,838	11,838
54	Republic of Moldova		66	100	2,000	2,000	2,000
55	Romania	1,657	1,922	1,676	2,000	2,000	2,000
56	Rwanda						2,000
57	Senegal	178	165	139	2,000	2,000	2,000
58	Slovakia		1,425	1,425	2,000	2,000	2,000
59	Slovenia			1,880	2,162	2,149	2,149
60	South Africa	10,831	13,519	8,158	9,382	9,326	9,326
61	Spain	76,679	83,460	70,405	62,950	62,576	62,576
62	Sudan	178	199	223	2,000	2,000	2,000
63	Swaziland						2,000
64	Sweden	31,932	34,023	27,883	32,065	31,874	31,874
65	Switzerland	35,809	42,214	33,442	38,459	38,230	38,230
66	Syrian Arab Republic			871	2,000	2,000	2,000
67	FYR Macedonia	118	199	167	2,000	2,000	2,000
68	Togo	29	33	100	2,000	2,000	2,000
69	Tunisia			679	2,000	2,000	2,000
70	Uganda		133	167	2,000	2,000	2,000
71	Ukraine			1,089	2,000	2,000	2,000
72	UK	122,441	116,669	116,121	133,539	132,745	132,745
73	United Republic of Tanzania	89	133	167	2,000	2,000	2,000
74	Uzbekistan			308	2,000	2,000	2,000
75	Zimbabwe						2,000
76	EU	0	0	0	16,593	16,593	16,593
	<b>TOTAL TO BE SHARED BY PARTIES</b>	<b>489,829</b>	<b>530,310</b>	<b>628,400</b>	<b>901,745</b>	<b>902,925</b>	<b>922,925</b>
	<b>WITHDRAWAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>200,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>140,000</b>	<b>370,000</b>	<b>310,000</b>

**Annex 2: AEWA annual contribution scenarios (in EUR) on the basis of the budget shared by Parties at MOP6 (zero nominal growth assumed and withdrawal from reserve deducted)**

N°	Party	UN Scale for all parties		MOP 6	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3 (Step 1)	Scenario 3 (Step 2)
1	Albania	0.008	223	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
2	Algeria	0.161	4,478	2,000	4,102	3,845	3,265	3,265
3	Belarus	0.056	1,558	0	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
4	Belgium	0.885	24,615	23,494	22,548	21,137	20,305	23,494
5	Benin	0.003	83	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
6	Bulgaria	0.045	1,252	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
7	Burkina Faso	0.004	111	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
8	Burundi	0.001	28	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
9	Chad	0.005	139	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
10	Congo	0.006	167	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
11	Côte d'Ivoire	0.009	250	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
12	Croatia	0.099	2,754	2,000	2,522	3,000	3,000	3,000
13	Cyprus	0.043	1,196	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
14	Czech Republic	0.344	9,568	2,784	8,765	8,216	6,976	6,976
15	Denmark	0.584	16,243	22,932	14,879	13,948	20,827	22,932
16	Djibouti	0.001	28	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
17	Egypt	0.152	4,228	3,833	3,873	3,630	3,285	3,833
18	Equatorial Guinea	0.010	278	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
19	Estonia	0.038	1,057	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
20	Ethiopia	0.010	278	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
21	Finland	0.456	12,683	17,195	11,618	10,891	15,552	17,195
22	France	4.859	135,146	132,745	123,799	116,049	115,233	132,745
23	Gabon	0.017	473	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
24	Gambia	0.001	28	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
25	Georgia	0.008	223	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
26	Germany	6.389	177,701	132,745	162,781	152,590	129,564	132,745
27	Ghana	0.016	445	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
28	Guinea	0.002	56	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
29	Guinea-Bissau	0.001	28	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
30	Hungary	0.161	4,478	3,302	4,102	3,845	3,265	3,302
31	Iceland	0.023	640	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
32	Ireland	0.335	9,318	9,174	8,535	8,001	7,967	9,174
33	Israel	0.430	11,960	14,915	10,956	10,270	13,365	14,915
34	Italy	3.748	104,245	75,007	95,493	89,514	76,007	76,007
35	Jordan	0.020	556	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
36	Kenya	0.018	501	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
37	Latvia	0.050	1,391	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
38	Lebanon	0.046	1,279	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
39	Libya	0.125	3,477	3,203	3,185	3,000	3,000	3,203
40	Lithuania	0.072	2,003	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
41	Luxembourg	0.064	1,780	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
42	Madagascar	0.003	83	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
43	Mali	0.003	83	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
44	Mauritania	0.002	56	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
45	Mauritius	0.012	334	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000

N°	Party	UN Scale for all parties		MOP 6	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3 (Step 1)	Scenario 3 (Step 2)
46	Monaco	0.010	278	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
47	Montenegro	0.004	111	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
48	Morocco	0.054	1,502	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
49	Netherlands	1.482	41,220	53,977	37,759	35,395	48,636	53,977
50	Niger	0.002	56	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
51	Nigeria	0.209	5,813	2,000	5,325	4,992	4,238	4,238
52	Norway	0.849	23,614	16,288	21,631	20,277	17,217	17,217
53	Portugal	0.392	10,903	11,838	9,987	9,362	10,425	11,838
54	Republic of Moldova	0.004	111	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
55	Romania	0.184	5,118	2,000	4,688	4,395	3,731	3,731
56	Rwanda	0.002	56	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
57	Senegal	0.005	139	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
58	Slovakia	0.160	4,450	2,000	4,077	3,821	3,245	3,245
59	Slovenia	0.084	2,336	2,149	2,140	3,000	3,000	3,000
60	South Africa	0.364	10,124	9,326	9,274	8,693	8,014	9,326
61	Spain	2.443	67,949	62,576	62,243	58,347	53,772	62,576
62	Sudan	0.010	278	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
63	Swaziland	0.002	56	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
64	Sweden	0.956	26,590	31,874	24,357	22,832	28,429	31,874
65	Switzerland	1.140	31,707	38,230	29,045	27,227	34,121	38,230
66	Syrian Arab Republic	0.024	668	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
67	FYR Macedonia	0.007	195	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
68	Togo	0.001	28	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
69	Tunisia	0.028	779	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
70	Uganda	0.009	250	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
71	Ukraine	0.103	2,865	2,000	2,624	3,000	3,000	3,000
72	UK	4.463	124,132	132,745	113,710	106,591	116,661	132,745
73	United Republic of Tanzania	0.010	278	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
74	Uzbekistan	0.023	640	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
75	Zimbabwe	0.004	111	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
76	EU	0.025	23,073	16,593	22,500	22,497	23,065	23,073
	<b>TOTAL PARTIES</b>		<b>922,926</b>	<b>922,926</b>	<b>922,519</b>	<b>922,364</b>	<b>922,603</b>	<b>996,078</b>