



منظمة الأغذية  
والزراعة  
للأمم المتحدة

联合国  
粮食及  
农业组织

Food  
and  
Agriculture  
Organization  
of  
the  
United  
Nations

Organisation  
des  
Nations  
Unies  
pour  
l'alimentation  
et  
l'agriculture

Organización  
de las  
Naciones  
Unidas  
para la  
Agricultura  
y la  
Alimentación

## COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES

### Second Session

Rome, 26 – 30 March 2007

### Potential Funding Arrangements of the IPPC

### Agenda Item 10.6 of the Provisional Agenda

#### I. Introduction

1. In 2006 CPM-1 discussed potential funding arrangements of the IPPC on the basis of recommendations made by the Informal Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance (SPTA). The basis for the SPTA recommendations was the result of deliberations of a Focus Group on the Analysis of the Potential Funding Arrangements of the IPPC, which met in July 2005. The Focus Group analyzed different funding options and schemes, indicating their advantages and disadvantages and incorporating their practical and legal implications. The funding options analysed were:

- mandatory assessed contribution
- voluntary assessed contributions
- expanding the scope of the multilateral IPPC trust fund
- bilateral trust funds and in-kind contributions
- fees or service charges.

2. In discussing the different funding options, CPM-1 recognized that mandatory assessed contributions would result in additional obligations and should not be pursued further. The CPM also:

1. Invited contracting parties to support the IPPC by providing in-kind contributions, particularly through sponsorship of meetings;
2. Invited SPTA members to make a contribution to the next meeting of the SPTA as to how they could imagine a fee system for the IPPC;
3. Recommended that an FAO legal analysis of service charges and fees should be carried out (managed by the Secretariat) and be considered in the framework of the evaluation of the IPPC. If there was a positive outcome to the legal analysis, then such service fees and charges should be investigated further by the Secretariat with the view of reporting to the CPM;

For reasons of economy, this document is produced in a limited number of copies. Delegates and observers are kindly requested to bring it to the meetings and to refrain from asking for additional copies, unless strictly indispensable.  
Most FAO meeting documents are available on Internet at [www.fao.org](http://www.fao.org)

4. Requested the Secretariat discuss the use of fees with other organizations that were in similar activity areas (e.g. OIE, International Seed Testing Association) to enquire about their systems of fees;
  5. Recommended that information collected (including that from the IPPC evaluation) be considered next year and further action taken accordingly;
  6. Agreed to the further investigation of the use of a voluntary assessed contribution scheme for funding the IPPC, and recommended that an information package, including a schedule of contributions and the likelihood of members making their assessed contributions, be prepared to be presented to CPM-2; and
  7. Agreed that recommendations made do not imply any advanced acceptance of these potential funding structures.
3. In October 2006 the SPTA, with participation from FAO Legal Office, analysed the possibilities of charging fees for certain services provided by the IPPC. The discussion was based on an information package prepared by the IPPC Secretariat on practices in other international organizations. It believed that the collection of fees would not be practical as the infrastructure to charge and collect fees in most instances would cost more to administer and maintain than the amount collected. Collecting funds through voluntary assessed contributions, however, was supported by several SPTA members. The consensus of the SPTA was that a fee system was impractical, there could be legal problems associated with it, both for the IPPC and contracting parties, and that the Secretariat should highlight the IPPC trust fund and in-kind contributions.
4. The development of different funding options for the IPPC has been on the agenda of ICPM and CPM since ICPM-3 (2001). Over the years, considerable resources of the IPPC have been committed to discuss, analyse and develop new avenues for increasing the financial resources of the IPPC. The Bureau of the CPM considers that, although secure and sufficient funding is of prime importance to the CPM, further analysis will not bring about better results than what has already been achieved and it is time to focus energy and resources of the IPPC on different subjects. The following pages summarize the discussions held on the different funding options over the years and propose actions for their conclusion.

## **II. Mandatory Assessed Contributions**

5. The possibility of supplementing the IPPC budget through mandatory assessed contributions was first raised in ICPM-3 (document ICPM01/INF 7). ICPM-3, however, did not pursue this possibility further. The subject of mandatory assessed contributions was further considered by Focus Groups in 2004 and 2005, but did not receive favourable consideration. CPM-1 recognized that mandatory assessed contributions would result in additional obligations to contracting parties and should not be implemented (report of CPM-1, paragraph 123).
6. CPM-2 is invited to consider that mandatory assessed contributions to supplement the IPPC budget would require a revision to the IPPC to establish the necessary financial instrument and would create additional obligations to contracting parties of the IPPC. Considering previous discussions in the ICPM and CPM-1, CPM-2 may consider recommending that the subject of mandatory assessed contributions should not be further pursued as a mechanism to supplement the IPPC budget, unless in the framework of a possible future general revision of the IPPC.

## **III. Voluntary Assessed Contributions**

7. A system for the establishment of a general trust fund, financed through voluntary assessed contributions, to realize a number of outputs beyond the contribution of the Regular Programme of FAO was proposed at ICPM-3 and further considered at ICPM-4 (2002). Early discussions in ICPM-4 identified the main difficulty of some countries with a system of voluntary assessed contributions as it was argued that, despite the voluntary character of such contributions, the fact that they are assessed could be regarded as a new obligation to contracting parties (report of ICPM-4, paragraph 76). A system of voluntary assessed contributions was again

discussed by Focus Groups in 2004 and 2005, and proposed to the SPTA for further consideration.

8. At its meeting in 2005, the SPTA strongly supported the further investigation of the use of a voluntary assessed contribution system for funding the IPPC. An information package prepared by the Secretariat was presented to CPM-1 for discussion (document CPM 2006/22). CPM-1 agreed to the further investigation of the use of a voluntary assessed contribution scheme for funding the IPPC, and recommended that an information package, including a schedule of contributions and the likelihood of members making their assessed contributions, be prepared for presentation to CPM-2 with the understanding that this would not imply an advanced acceptance of the issue of voluntary assessed contributions.

9. Based on the information provided to CPM-1, Annex 1 provides an example of voluntary assessed contributions which indicates a possible magnitude of financial contributions of individual countries. The example is **for information only** and is based on the following elements:

- an additional IPPC budget requirement of US\$ 2 million (to match the FAO contribution)
- the UN scale of assessment for 2003
- the assumption that all member countries of the UN would pay their contribution to the IPPC. The actual contributions would vary depending on the number of countries that are party to the Convention, the scale of assessments adopted by the CPM, and the amount of additional funding required to meet the objectives of the Business Plan.

10. Another example of a category system is that utilized by the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) where contributions are calculated according to which of six different categories a State may choose to be registered (see Annex 2). The annual total contribution is defined by Article 14 of the OIE Organic Rules and for each State consists of the basic annual contribution plus an additional complementary annual contribution fixed by the OIE International Committee in accordance with the budget established by the Committee.

11. Annex 3 provides the third example of assessed contributions taken from the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade (taken from document UNEP/FAO/RC/COP.3/23 of 29 June 2006). Of a total approved budget of US\$ 3,542,159 and US\$ 3,710,224 for the years 2005 and 2006, US\$ 2,098,116 and US\$ 2,246,809 respectively had to be covered by assessed contributions. It should be noted that the Rotterdam Convention has 112 contracting parties, far less than the IPPC. Annex 3 also provides information on the recovery rate of the pledged assessed contributions which can be roughly estimated for 2005 at about 70% of the pledges within the year.

12. The estimation for the likelihood of members making their voluntary assessed contributions can only be speculative at best. This would depend on different criteria, foremost the conditions under which a scheme of voluntary assessed contributions would be adopted. At discussions in the ICPM and the CPM-1, it became apparent in particular that potential donor countries which would carry a substantial part of the share of the contributions objected to the establishment of such a scheme. It may be assumed that the likelihood of members making their voluntary assessed contributions would increase with the degree of consensus under which the provisions were to be adopted. In such a case the experiences of the Rotterdam Convention as shown in Annex 3 may give a good indication.

13. CPM-2 may wish to consider the information provided in Annexes 1 to 3. It may consider recommending that the subject of voluntary assessed contributions should not be further pursued as a mechanism to supplement the IPPC budget, unless recommendations of the independent evaluation of the IPPC or a possible future general revision of the IPPC warrant it.

#### **IV. Service Charges or Fees**

14. The idea of supplementing the IPPC budget through charging fees or service charges (e.g. selling phytosanitary certificates, charges for activities such as the recognition of pest status, charges for the use of the mark for wood packaging) was first raised at the SPTA meeting in 2003. In 2004 and 2005, Focus Groups analysed the possibilities of raising service charges or fees. Discussions were difficult since legal implications of a system of fees and charges could not be sufficiently analysed. CPM-1 decided that SPTA should discuss the system of fees and charges again, with a special focus on the activities of other organizations and the legal implications.

15. In 2006 the SPTA, with the participation of FAO Legal Office, discussed the subject on the basis of information provided by the Secretariat on the funding of other organizations, i.e. the International Seed Testing Association (ISTA) and the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE). The SPTA believed that collection of fees would not be practical as the infrastructure in most instances would cost more to administer and maintain than the amount collected. The SPTA was informed by the FAO Legal Office that as countries already contributed to FAO, and the IPPC was part of FAO, the only solution would be to voluntarily contribute to the Trust Fund for the IPPC or contribute in-kind. It was further mentioned that if a situation arose where the Secretariat undertook an activity, outside the IPPC mandate, at the request of a country, it could charge for the service. However, it would incur a legal responsibility.

16. The consensus of the SPTA was that the fee system was impractical, that there could be legal problems associated with it, both for the IPPC and contracting parties, and that the Secretariat should highlight the Trust Fund for the IPPC and in-kind contributions.

17. The CPM may wish to consider following the advice of the SPTA and not further pursue the possibility of supplementing the IPPC budget through service charges or fees.

#### **V. In-kind Contributions**

18. The likelihood of supplementing the work-programme of the IPPC Secretariat through in-kind contributions, such as the provision of expertise to the Secretariat and the provision of Associate Professional Officers had also been raised at ICPM-3 and received favourable considerations. ICPM-4 decided to urge countries to volunteer to commit professional officers to assist with the work programme of the IPPC Secretariat (report of ICPM-4, paragraph 75). CPM-1 also revisited the subject and invited contracting parties to support the IPPC by providing in-kind contributions, particularly through sponsorship of meetings (report of CPM-1, paragraph 125).

19. Although the provision of in-kind contributions to the IPPC has been promoted by the ICPM and CPM since 2002, limited use of this possibility has been made to date. The provision of support to the IPPC Secretariat by providing 'Associate Professional Officers' or 'Visiting Scientists' has been satisfactory, but the 'sponsorship' of meetings by countries has fallen well short of its potential.

20. The CPM may wish to reiterate that countries are invited to provide in-kind contributions. The IPPC Secretariat may be requested to develop and implement a strategy to promote the provision of in-kind contributions. In addition to recommending that the governments pay for their own representatives to contribute and participate in the activities of the IPPC, such a strategy could especially focus on the sponsorship of expert working groups and the long term hosting of technical panels, Standards Committee and Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement.

#### **VI. The Multilateral Trust Fund for the IPPC**

21. ICPM-3 discussed the establishment of a multilateral trust fund for the IPPC. ICPM-4 discussed the subject again and it was decided that a special trust fund to accommodate voluntary contributions for technical assistance be considered, subject to an analysis by the SPTA of the

benefits and drawbacks of such a fund and full consideration of other funding options (report of ICPM-4, paragraph 81). ICPM-5 (2003) (report of ICPM-5, paragraphs 84-86) established a trust fund for voluntary contributions under three basic conditions:

- exclusive use to the direct benefit of developing countries;
- supplementary character of such funding; and
- ICPM responsibility for the selection of outputs to be funded out of this source.

22. In addition, ICPM-5 adopted financial guidelines for the Trust Fund for the IPPC, which were revised by ICPM-7 (2005). Provisions in relation to the allocation of funds to different activities under the Trust Fund for the IPPC were adopted by ICPM-6 (2004), and revised at ICPM-7 and CPM-1. ICPM-6 also agreed that the Secretariat develops a strategy for promoting the Trust Fund for the IPPC and encouraging donors to contribute to it (report of ICPM-6, paragraph 53).

23. Despite the fact that the Trust Fund for the IPPC has been in existence since 2003, only three countries, Canada, New Zealand and the United States of America, have donated funds to it over the past four years. Other financial contributions have been made to further the objectives of the IPPC, but these have been made outside the Trust Fund for the IPPC. It can also be observed that a strategy to promote the Trust Fund for the IPPC has not been developed by the IPPC Secretariat, although a letter to contracting parties was sent in 2004 inviting donations to the trust fund. Donations could be substantially increased through an active promotion of the Trust Fund for the IPPC and its aims.

24. CPM-2 may wish to consider again to request the IPPC Secretariat to develop a promotion strategy for the Trust Fund for the IPPC. It may also consider establishing a more project-oriented planning of the activities carried out under the trust fund, providing costing for individual projects and inviting potential donors to pledge their financial support to projects which they believe to be of greatest importance.

## **VII. Conclusions**

25. The CPM is invited to *consider*:

1. that the subject of mandatory assessed contributions should not be further pursued as a mechanism to supplement the IPPC budget, unless in the framework of a possible future general revision of the IPPC;
2. that the subject of voluntary assessed contributions should not be further pursued as a mechanism to supplement the IPPC budget, unless recommendations of the independent evaluation of the IPPC or a possible future general revision of the IPPC warrants it;
3. not to further pursue the subject of supplementing the IPPC budget through service charges or fees;
4. that countries are again invited to provide in-kind contributions and that the IPPC Secretariat develops and implements a strategy to promote the provision of in-kind contributions;
5. stressing again the need for a promotion strategy, developed by the IPPC Secretariat, for the Trust Fund for the IPPC, and to establish a more project oriented planning of the activities carried out under the trust fund, with costing of activities and potential donors invited to pledge their financial support to projects which they believe to be of greatest importance;
6. to adopt actions pertaining to the above.

## ANNEX 1

**Example of an apportionment of the costs to IPPC contracting parties to meet an estimated budget deficit of US\$ 2 million for 2006 using the United Nations scale of assessment for 2003**

	State <sup>1</sup>	2003 Scale (%)	Assessment (US\$)
1	*Afghanistan	0.00900	180
2	Albania	0.00300	60
3	Algeria	0.07000	1400
4	*Andorra	0.00400	80
5	*Angola	0.00200	40
6	Antigua and Barbuda	0.00200	40
7	Argentina	1.14900	22980
8	Armenia	0.00200	40
9	Australia	1.62700	32540
10	Austria	0.94700	18940
11	Azerbaijan	0.00400	40
12	Bahamas	0.01200	40
13	Bahrain	0.01800	160
14	Bangladesh	0.01000	200
15	Barbados	0.00900	160
16	Belarus	0.01900	380
17	Belgium	1.12900	22580
18	Belize	0.00100	20
19	*Benin	0.00200	40
20	Bhutan	0.00100	20
21	Bolivia	0.00800	160
22	Bosnia and Herzegovina	0.00400	80
23	*Botswana	0.01000	200
24	Brazil	2.39000	47800
25	*Brunei Darussalam	0.03300	660
26	Bulgaria	0.01300	260
27	Burkina Faso	0.00200	40

\* Not a contracting party to the IPPC (as of 20 December 2006).

<sup>1</sup> IPPC contracting parties that are not UN members (and therefore do not appear in this table) are Cook Islands, European Community, Niue, Republic of Serbia and Switzerland.

	State <sup>1</sup>	2003 Scale (%)	Assessment (US\$)
28	Burundi	0.00100	20
29	Cambodia	0.00200	40
30	Cameroon	0.00900	1800
31	Canada	2.55800	51160
32	Cape Verde	0.00100	20
33	Central African Republic	0.00100	20
34	Chad	0.00100	20
35	Chile	0.21200	4240
36	China	1.53200	30640
37	Colombia	0.20100	4020
38	*Comoros	0.00100	20
39	Congo	0.00100	20
40	Costa Rica	0.02000	400
41	Côte d'Ivoire	0.00900	180
42	Croatia	0.03900	780
43	Cuba	0.03000	600
44	Cyprus	0.03800	760
45	Czech Republic	0.20300	4060
46	Democratic People's Republic of Korea	0.00900	180
47	*Democratic Republic of the Congo	0.00400	80
48	Denmark	0.74900	14980
49	*Djibouti	0.00100	20
50	Dominica	0.00100	20
51	Dominican Republic	0.02300	460
52	Ecuador	0.02500	500
53	Egypt	0.08100	1620
54	El Salvador	0.01800	360
55	Equatorial Guinea	0.00100	20
56	Eritrea	0.00100	20
57	Estonia	0.01000	100
58	Ethiopia	0.00400	80
59	Fiji	0.00400	80
60	Finland	0.52200	10440
61	France	6.46600	129320

	State <sup>1</sup>	2003 Scale (%)	Assessment (US\$)
62	*Gabon	0.01400	280
63	*Gambia	0.00100	20
64	*Georgia	0.00500	100
65	Germany	9.76900	195390
66	Ghana	0.00500	100
67	Greece	0.53900	10780
68	Grenada	0.00100	20
69	Guatemala	0.02700	560
70	Guinea	0.00300	60
71	*Guinea-Bissau	0.00100	20
72	Guyana	0.00100	20
73	Haiti	0.00200	40
74	Honduras	0.00500	100
75	Hungary	0.12000	2400
76	Iceland	0.03300	660
77	India	0.34100	6820
78	Indonesia	0.20000	4000
79	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	0.27200	5440
80	Iraq	0.13600	2720
81	Ireland	0.29400	5880
82	Israel	0.41500	8300
83	Italy	5.06475	101295
84	Jamaica	0.00400	80
85	Japan	19.51575	390315
86	Jordan	0.00800	160
87	*Kazakhstan	0.02800	560
88	Kenya	0.00800	160
89	*Kiribati	0.00100	20
90	*Kuwait	0.14700	2940
91	Kyrgyzstan	0.00100	20
92	Lao People's Democratic Republic	0.00100	20
93	Latvia	0.01000	200
94	Lebanon	0.01200	240
95	*Lesotho	0.00100	20

	State <sup>1</sup>	2003 Scale (%)	Assessment (US\$)
96	Liberia	0.00100	20
97	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	0.06700	1340
98	*Liechtenstein	0.00600	120
99	Lithuania	0.01700	340
100	Luxembourg	0.08000	1600
101	Madagascar	0.00300	60
102	Malawi	0.00200	400
103	Malaysia	0.23500	4700
104	Maldives	0.00100	20
105	Mali	0.00200	40
106	Malta	0.01500	300
107	*Marshall Islands	0.00100	20
108	Mauritania	0.00100	20
109	Mauritius	0.01100	220
110	Mexico	1.08600	21720
111	*Micronesia (Federated States of)	0.00100	20
112	*Monaco	0.00400	80
113	*Mongolia	0.00100	20
114	Morocco	0.04400	880
115	*Mozambique	0.00100	20
116	Myanmar	0.01000	20
117	*Namibia	0.00700	140
118	*Nauru	0.00100	20
119	Nepal	0.00400	80
120	Netherlands	1.73800	34760
121	New Zealand	0.24100	4820
122	Nicaragua	0.00100	20
123	Niger	0.00100	20
124	Nigeria	0.06800	1360
125	Norway	0.64600	12920
126	Oman	0.06100	1220
127	Pakistan	0.06100	1220
128	Palau (Republic of)	0.00100	20
129	Panama	0.01800	360

	State <sup>1</sup>	2003 Scale (%)	Assessment (US\$)
130	Papua New Guinea	0.00600	120
131	Paraguay	0.01600	320
132	Peru	0.11800	2860
133	Philippines	0.10000	2000
134	Poland	0.37800	7560
135	Portugal	0.46200	9244
136	Qatar	0.03400	680
137	Republic of Korea	1.85100	37020
138	Republic of Moldova	0.00200	40
139	Romania	0.05800	1160
140	Russian Federation	1.20000	24000
141	*Rwanda	0.00100	20
142	Saint Kitts and Nevis	0.00100	20
143	Saint Lucia	0.00200	40
144	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	0.00100	20
145	Samoa	0.00100	20
146	*San Marino	0.00200	40
147	Sao Tome and Principe	0.00100	20
148	Saudi Arabia	0.55400	11080
149	Senegal	0.00500	100
150	Seychelles	0.00200	40
151	Sierra Leone	0.00100	20
152	*Singapore	0.39300	7860
153	Slovakia	0.04300	860
154	Slovenia	0.08100	1620
155	Solomon Islands	0.00100	20
156	*Somalia	0.00100	20
157	South Africa	0.40800	8160
158	Spain	2.51875	50375
159	Sri Lanka	0.01600	320
160	Sudan	0.00600	120
161	Suriname	0.00200	40
162	Swaziland	0.00200	40
163	Sweden	1.02675	20535

	State <sup>1</sup>	2003 Scale (%)	Assessment (US\$)
164	Syrian Arab Republic	0.08000	1600
165	*Tajikistan	0.00100	20
166	Thailand	0.29400	5880
167	The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	0.00600	120
168	Togo	0.00100	20
169	Tonga	0.00100	20
170	Trinidad and Tobago	0.01600	320
171	Tunisia	0.03000	600
172	Turkey	0.44000	8800
173	*Turkmenistan	0.00300	60
174	Tuvalu	0.00100	20
175	*Uganda	0.00500	100
176	Ukraine	0.05300	1060
177	United Arab Emirates	0.20200	4040
178	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	5.53600	110720
179	United Republic of Tanzania	0.00400	80
180	United States of America	22.00000	440000
181	Uruguay	0.08000	1600
182	*Uzbekistan	0.01100	220
183	*Vanuatu	0.00100	20
184	Venezuela	0.20800	4160
185	Viet Nam	0.01600	320
186	Yemen	0.00600	120
187	*Yugoslavia	0.02000	400
188	Zambia	0.00200	40
189	*Zimbabwe	0.00800	160
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100.00000</b>	<b>approximately \$2,000,000</b>

## ANNEX 2

**RESOLUTION No. V****Financial Contributions from OIE Member Countries for 2005**

In accordance with Article 11 of the Internal Statutes and Article 14 of the Organic Rules, and

Considering the need to meet the budgetary expenses of the OIE for 2005,

THE COMMITTEE

RESOLVES

that overall contributions from Member Countries of the Office International des Epizooties be established for the 2005 Financial Year as follows (in EUR):

Countries in the 1st category	109 725
Countries in the 2nd category	87 780
Countries in the 3rd category	65 835
Countries in the 4th category	43 890
Countries in the 5th category	21 945
Countries in the 6th category	13 167

(Adopted by the International Committee of the OIE on 28 May 2004)

## ANNEX 3

## General Trust Fund for the Operational Budget (RO) of the Rotterdam Convention

Table 1. Contributions to the Trust Fund for the years 2005 and 2006 as of 31 May 2006

## Operational budget 2006 (in dollars)

	Member State	Scale for the Trust Fund with 22% ceiling and 0,01% base <i>Percentage</i>	Unpaid contributions for 2005	Pledges for 2006 <sup>1/</sup>	Received		Unpaid pledges for 2005 and 2006
					Collections in 2006 for prior year <i>Member State</i>	Collections in 2006 for 2006 <i>Percentage</i>	
1	Argentina	1.307	33,116	28,013			61,129
2	Armenia	0.010	0	216			216
3	Australia	2.177	0	46,649		46,649	0
4	Austria	1.174	0	25,170		25,170	0
5	Belgium	1.462	0	31,324		32,838	-1,514
6	Belize	0.010	93	225	93	210	15
7	Benin	0.010	222	216			438
8	Bolivia	0.012	312	263			575
9	Brazil	2.082	52,757	44,628			97,385
10	Bulgaria	0.023	0	498		498	0
11	Burkina Faso	0.010	222	216			438
12	Burundi	0.010	222	216			438
13	Cameroon	0.011	277	235			512
14	Canada	3.846	47,994	82,428			130,422
15	Chad	0.010	222	216			438
16	Chile	0.305	5,150	6,850			12,000
17	China	2.807	35,558	63,066			98,624
18	Congo, Dem. Republic	0.010	111	216			327
19	Cook Islands	0.010	222	216			438
20	Côte d'Ivoire	0.014	346	293			639
21	Cyprus	0.053	1,013	1,198	1,013		1,198
22	Czech Republic	0.250	0	5,363		5,363	0
23	Democratic People's Republic of Korea	0.014	346	293			639
24	Denmark	0.982	0	21,039			21,039
25	Djibouti	0.010	185	225			410
26	Ecuador	0.026	0	557			557
27	El Salvador	0.030	762	645			1,407
28	Equatorial Guinea	0.010	222	216			438
29	Eritrea	0.010	111	225			336
30	Ethiopia	0.010	0	216			216
31	European Community	2.500	-718	53,898			5,392
32	Finland	0.729	0	15,618		15,290	328
33	France	8.244	0	176,693		176,693	0

	<i>Member State</i>	<b>Scale for the Trust Fund with 22% ceiling and 0,01% base</b>	Unpaid contributions for 2005	<b>Pledges for 2006</b> <sup>1/</sup>	<b>Received</b>		Unpaid pledges for 2005 and 2006
					Collections in 2006 for prior year	Collections in 2006 for 2006	
	<i>Member State</i>	<i>Percentage</i>			<i>Member State</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	
34	Gabon	0.012	312	263			575
35	Gambia	0.010	222	216			438
36	Germany	11.843	0	253,815		253,815	0
37	Ghana	0.010	222	216			438
38	Greece	0.725	18,359	15,530	18,359		15,530
39	Guinea	0.010	222	216			438
40	Hungary	0.172	0	3,693			3,693
41	India	0.576	0	12,933			12,933
42	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	0.215	5,439	4,601			10,040
43	Ireland	0.479	0	10,752			10,752
44	Italy	6.679	169,218	143,142	169,218	150,061	-6,919
45	Jamaica	0.011	0	235		215	20
46	Japan	22.000	0	474,298		97,808	376,490
47	Jordan	0.015	0	322			322
48	Kenya	0.012	182	276	182	359	-83
49	Kyrgyzstan	0.010	222	216			438
50	Latvia	0.021	520	440	520	440	0
51	Liberia	0.010	222	216			438
52	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	0.180	4,573	3,868			8,441
53	Liechtenstein	0.010	222	216		216	222
54	Lithuania	0.033	0	703		682	21
55	Luxembourg	0.105	2,667	2,256	2,667	2,256	0
56	Madagascar	0.010	0	216		187	29
57	Malaysia	0.278	0	5,948		7,017	-1,069
58	Mali	0.010	222	216			438
59	Marshall Islands	0.010	222	216			438
60	Mauritania	0.010	0	225			225
61	Mauritius	0.015	0	338		32	306
62	Mexico	2.574	21,743	57,843			79,586
63	Moldova	0.010	148	225			373
64	Mongolia	0.010	222	216			438
65	Namibia	0.010	0	225			225
66	Netherlands	2.311	0	49,521		49,513	8
67	New Zealand	0.302	0	6,476		6,476	0
68	Nigeria	0.057	1,455	1,231			2,686
69	Norway	0.928	0	19,896			19,896
70	Oman	0.096	2,425	2,051	2,425	2,051	0
71	Pakistan	0.075	318	1,690		1,690	318
72	Panama	0.026	658	557			1,215
73	Paraguay	0.016	416	352			768
74	Peru	0.126	0	2,826			2,826
75	Poland	0.630	0	14,161			14,161
76	Portugal	0.643	0	14,438			14,438

	<i>Member State</i>	Scale for the Trust Fund with 22% ceiling and 0,01% base	Unpaid contributions for 2005	Pledges for 2006 <sup>1/</sup>	Received		Unpaid pledges for 2005 and 2006
					Collections in 2006 for prior year	Collections in 2006 for 2006	
	<i>Member State</i>	<i>Percentage</i>			<i>Member State</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	
77	Qatar	0.088	1,663	1,966			3,629
78	Republic of Korea	2.456	62,214	52,627	62,214	52,627	0
79	Romania	0.082	0	1,758			1,758
80	Rwanda	0.010	222	216	63	222	153
81	Samoa	0.010	0	216			216
82	Saudi Arabia	0.975	24,699	20,892			45,591
83	Senegal	0.010	222	216			438
84	Singapore	0.530	0	11,919		11,919	0
85	Slovenia	0.112	0	2,403		2,403	0
86	South Africa	0.399	10,115	8,556		18,671	0
87	Spain	3.445	87,294	73,842			161,136
88	Sudan	0.011	162	246			408
89	Suriname	0.010	222	216			438
90	Sweden	1.364	0	29,243			29,243
91	Switzerland	1.637	0	35,074		35,049	25
92	Syrian Arab Republic	0.052	0	1,113			1,113
93	Thailand	0.286	0	6,124		6,124	0
94	Togo	0.010	222	216			438
95	Ukraine	0.053	1,351	1,143			2,494
96	United Arab Emirates	0.321	8,141	6,886			15,027
97	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	8.377	0	179,535		179,535	0
98	United Republic of Tanzania	0.010	222	216			438
99	Uruguay	0.066	1,663	1,406			3,069
100	Venezuela	0.234	2,468	5,253			7,721
		100	605,925	2,155,912	256,754	1,182,079	<b>1,323,004</b>

<sup>1/</sup> Source: United Nations General Assembly fifty-eighth session, agenda item 124, resolution 58/1 B.

## ANNEX 3 (cont.)

Table 2. Summary of Income received as of 31 May 2006 (RO) (in dollars)

	2005	2006	
Total approved budget 2005-2006	3,542,159	3,710,224	
Host country contribution	(1,444,043)	(1,463,415)	(contribution of 1.2 million euros)
<b>Total to be covered by assessed contributions</b>	<b>2,098,116</b>	<b>2,246,809</b>	(minus 2005 prorated income for new Parties)

**Total income received**

Carry-over from PP Trust Fund	0	236,996	
Assessed contributions received	1,691,737	1,182,079	
Contributions paid for prior year	256,754	0	
Interest	10,660	0	
Host Government Switzerland	768,264	724,949	
Host Government Italy	€600,000	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,727,415</b>	<b>2,144,024</b>	
Balance	(814,744)	(1,566,200)	