



REPUBLIC OF BELARUS

PERMANENT MISSION TO THE UNITED NATIONS

136 EAST 67th STREET, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10021
(212) 535-3420

PRESS RELEASE

Please check against delivery

Fifth Committee of the United Nations General Assembly

Agenda item 122 “Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations”

10 October 2006

Statement

by Yuri Yaroshevich, Counsellor of the Permanent Mission of the Republic of Belarus to the United Nations

- The delegation of Belarus supports the recommendation of the Committee on Contributions that the scale of assessments should be based on the most current, comprehensive and comparable data available for Gross National Income (GNI). The existing scale methodology has served us well and meets the interest of the general membership.
- Low per capita income adjustment and the debt burden adjustment are the integral factors of the scale methodology. These elements in combination with the GNI data allow Member-States to adhere to the fundamental principle of the “capacity to pay” as they take into account a country’s economic and social strength and its per capita income which reflects the actual paying capacity.
- In order to ensure a fair treatment of the countries especially vulnerable to unforeseen economic challenges and critical market fluctuations the delegation of Belarus proposes to use for the calculation of the average GNI data a six-year base period. We insist on a six-year base period as an only tried methodology to avoid sudden and painful changes in the scale of assessments for developing countries and countries with economies in transition. The six-year base periods will allow the biggest group of Member-States to cope more efficiently with the new assessments and to be well-prepared to meet their financial obligations in a full, open and timely manner.
- Attempts to promote a minimum assessment rate for the permanent members of the Security Council as well as to use Purchasing Power Parity are contrary to the principle of capacity to pay and do not meet the criterion that the data we use should be reliable, fair and comparable. The proposal for the annual recalculation of the scale of assessments is impractical, less stable and more expensive.