

Financing of the OSCE

In December 1994 the Heads of State or Government of the participating States in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE), in the course of their meeting in Budapest, decided to rename the CSCE, effective 1 January 1995, as the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). This indicator of a new phase was meant to take account of the growth in activities during the preceding years as well as meet the desire of the participating States for a central role for the OSCE in creating a secure and stable OSCE community. It was also the expression of a fundamental change in the CSCE and of a general strengthening of its role in building their common security space.

Parallel to this kind of repositioning of the Organization there came about, with time - *inter alia* - the development of a new administration, especially the finance. More activities meant and mean a need for more resources, along with growing complexity in the efficient and economic administration of these resources.

This article will therefore deal with the relationship between the OSCE's growing political commitments and the attendant consequences for the Organization as a whole as well as for the individual participating States. Which arrangements and activities need to be financed, how great are the financial requirements and how great is the willingness of the participating States to make their contribution? A summary of the developments during the last few years is followed by a look into the future, along with proposals and ideas for increasing the OSCE's financial strength.

1994 - The Year of Organizational Change

The year was characterized by significant organizational change. Effective on 1 January, a new Secretariat was established consisting of the Office of the Secretary General, the Conflict Prevention Centre, the Executive Secretariat and the CSCE Secretariat in Prague, which until then had been independent. Already in existence and in operation at this time were: the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) with headquarters

¹ The author was Chief of Budget in the Department for Administration and Budget in the Secretariat in Vienna until September 1998. He has written this article from his personal vantage point, i.e. the views expressed in it are his own and do not necessarily correspond to those of the OSCE. He would like here to thank the OSCE's Treasurer, Mr. Stuart Baldwin, for his thoughts and suggestions with regard to financing mechanisms.

in Warsaw; the High Commissioner on National Minorities, headquartered in The Hague; the Minsk Conference/Minsk Group, which concerns itself with the conflict over Nagorno-Karabakh; the CSCE Missions and the Sanctions Assistance Missions with the Sanctions Co-ordinator.

In addition to the structural changes, new missions were also established in 1994 - e.g. in Sarajevo, Tajikistan and Ukraine - so that the budget plan finally approved for 1994 at a level of ATS 288.9 million (Austrian Schillings)² was ATS 122 million higher than the one for 1993. Actual expenses for 1994 amounted to ATS 228.3 million.

In addition to this regular budget, voluntary contributions - mainly by participating States - were made to the CSCE in the amount of ATS 4.8 million for a variety of projects. Here the actual expenditures came to ATS 2.3 million.

1995 - The CSCE Turns into the OSCE and Keeps on Growing

As mentioned above, the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe was renamed as the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) effective on 1 January 1995. Apart from the formal changes that this entailed it had no direct effect on the budget plan. What did make itself strongly felt in the budget plan, however, was the fact that political developments in the OSCE area required the Organization to become more heavily involved. In 1995 the OSCE sent an Assistance Group to Chechnya and a Liaison Office was set up in Tashkent to provide an important link between the Organization and the five Central Asian participating States. Towards the end of the year, moreover, the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina began to cast its shadow when it became clear that the Dayton Agreement and the responsibilities it was to create for the Organization would require a substantial enlargement of the Mission to Sarajevo and, consequently, of the Secretariat. Taken together with the increased activities of the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights and of the High Commissioner on National Minorities, this led to an increase over 1994 of ATS 36.6 million in the budget plan to a total of ATS 325.4 million. The actual expenses for 1995 came to ATS 259.8 million.

Again in 1995 voluntary contributions were put at the OSCE's disposal for diverse projects. They amounted to ATS 9.5 million, of which ATS 4.5 million were spent.

2 100 ATS are equivalent to 14.21 German Marks or 7.90 US Dollars (as of 20 August 1998).

1996 was marked by three major events or developments, two of which had consequences for the following years and continue to do so today.

First: the involvement in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In accordance with the Dayton Peace Agreement of December 1995 the OSCE established in Bosnia and Herzegovina a large mission which was entrusted with preparation, conducting and monitoring of the general elections and also with responsibilities relating to human rights and democracy issues. In addition, the Personal Representatives of the Chairman-in-Office, operating out of Vienna, carried out certain tasks in connection with the implementation of Articles II and IV of Annex 1-B of the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Understandably, this also required a temporary enlargement of the Secretariat and of the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights. The result was an overall budget for the work in Bosnia and Herzegovina in the sum of ATS 253.9 million, a very substantial figure compared with the ATS 10.2 million in 1995 - and this figure does not include the direct costs for preparation, conducting and monitoring of the elections. For this purpose voluntary contributions, mainly from participating States, in the sum of ATS 511 million were made available; of this, ATS 314.3 million were spent.

Second: the need for an intensified presence in Croatia which began with the establishment of a mission in the country that in 1997 had to be enlarged several fold.

Third: the removal of UN sanctions against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) and the consequent reduction of activities of the Sanctions Assistance Missions until the expiration of their mandate on 30 September.

This resulted, *summa summarum*, in a 1996 budget plan of ATS 531.9 million of which ATS 480.2 million were actually spent.

As already indicated, the voluntary contributions must be divided into two categories: on the one hand, the ATS 511 million designated for work in connection with the elections in Bosnia and Herzegovina (with actual expenditures of ATS 314.3 million) and, on the other hand, voluntary contributions for special projects in the sum of ATS 5.2 million (with actual expenditures of ATS 5.4 million). Thus one can see that the involvement in Bosnia and Herzegovina led almost to a doubling of the regular budget - and the succeeding years were to see further increases.

The development begun in the previous years continued in 1997. From Albania to Bosnia, from the Baltic states to Croatia, the OSCE was more and more frequently called upon to demonstrate its ability to function as one of the main instruments in Europe for early warning, conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation. But let's take them in order. What were the main theatres of action in this year?

Bosnia and Herzegovina: As during the previous year, elections were central to the activities of the Mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina. The OSCE was entrusted with preparation, conducting and monitoring of the municipal elections and also of the elections to the parliament of the Republika Srpska; added to that were the long-term activities of the Mission such as democratization and promotion of human rights, the rule of law and development of the media. The Personal Representatives of the Chairman-in-Office also went on with their activities in connection with the implementation of Articles II and IV of Annex 1-B of the General Framework Agreement on Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Temporary enlargement of the Secretariat and of the ODIHR was again necessary in 1997 so that the total budget for the tasks in Bosnia and Herzegovina, at ATS 248.9 million, was only slightly less than it had been the previous year. Actual expenditures for 1997 came to ATS 239 million.

As in 1996 the direct costs for preparation, conducting and monitoring of the elections were financed by voluntary contributions. In addition to the unused monies from 1996, ATS 382.7 million were made available in 1997, making it possible to cover most of the total costs of ATS 563.2 million.

Croatia: Expiration of the mandate of the United Nations Transitional Administration for Eastern Slavonia, Baranja and Western Sirmium (UNTAES) made it necessary to strengthen the Mission to Croatia substantially. The budget for this Mission grew from ATS 10.5 million in 1996 to ATS 79.5 million in 1997, and continued to increase many times over in the following year. But more on that later.

Albania: The decision to establish an OSCE Presence in Albania led in the course of the year to the approval of an additional budget item in the sum of ATS 24.2 million.

Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights: 1997 saw the establishment of a new concept which, among other things, provided for the creation of new structures requiring a substantial increase in personnel and also more activities on the local scene - e.g. the support and monitoring of parliamentary elections in Albania. This meant that supplementary budget items of ATS 17.2 million had to be approved in the course of the year as a result

of which the ODIHR budget ultimately reached ATS 50.6 million, in contrast to the modest sum of ATS 33.4 million in 1996.

All of these things, along with increased activity in several other areas, led to an overall OSCE budget of ATS 649.5 million in 1997 - i.e. the 1996 figure of ATS 531.9 million was exceeded by ATS 117.6 million or 22.1 per cent. Actual expenses came to ATS 595.8 million.

Once again in 1997 there were voluntary contributions for special projects, over and above the ATS 382.7 million already mentioned that were earmarked for work especially in connection with the elections in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Altogether, participating States, other countries and international institutions made available ATS 75.3 million of which about ATS 40 million were designated for the elections in Albania and Chechnya. Of this sum ATS 49.6 were actually expended.

In sum: The OSCE's involvement is increasing - and that of course has its price.

1998 - The One Billion Mark is Passed

At the present time, i.e. on 15 May 1998, the total budget approved for 1998 comes to ATS 1,443.8 million. How did this almost incredible leap of ATS 794.3 million, or 122.3 per cent, over 1997 come about? The answer is: new activities (as in the previous years), expansion of already existing activities, and a changed method of financing certain of these activities.

New activities: Examples that can be mentioned here are the creation of the office of the OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media, the new Coordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities and, in the area of the missions, the Advisory and Monitoring Group in Belarus.

Expansion of Existing Activities: 1998 is witnessing an increase in such activities as public relations, economic and environmental issues, seminars and conferences, and work related to the reorganization of the Secretariat already begun in 1997. With regard to the missions, the budget for the Mission to Croatia is rising from ATS 79.5 million in 1997 to ATS 268 million, an increase of ATS 188.5 million or 237 per cent.

Changed method of financing: This affects the Mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina and all of its activities and responsibilities. The community of states had already made clear in 1997 that it would not be possible to go on with the previous financing practices. In 1996 and again in 1997, a large portion of the activities carried out by this Mission - especially in connection with the organization, conducting and monitoring of various elections - was financed by voluntary contributions. Only the basic structure of the Mission and the activities related to its core responsibilities were financed out of the

regular budget - meaning that these costs were borne by all participating States in accordance with the prevailing scale of distribution.

This practice came to an end in 1998 when it became clear that voluntary contributions would no longer be available at the accustomed level. Thus all of the activities that had previously been financed in this way now reverted to the regular budget.

The consequence was that, as a first step, a so-called normal budget for the Mission amounting to ATS 322.8 million was adopted (in 1997 it had been only ATS 248.9 million). Then, in a second step, a supplemental budget was adopted at the end of April providing ATS 488.9 million for the organization, conducting and monitoring of the general elections of 1998, thus raising the overall 1998 budget for the Mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina to ATS 811.7 million.

It should be mentioned here that a changed scale of distribution has been applied to the budget of this Mission and also to the one to Croatia. But this does not alter in any fundamental way the fact that, as things now stand, the OSCE will have to finance an overall budget of almost ATS 1.5 billion for 1998.

How are the activities of the OSCE financed now? Who contributes how much?

Assessed Contributions - Scale of Distribution in Accordance with the Helsinki Document of 1992

Chapter XII, Paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Helsinki Document 1992 establishes a scale of distribution for determining the contributions of all participating States to the adopted budget, including any adjustments. Changes in this scale of distribution require approval by the Permanent Council and have already been necessary a number of times owing to the admission of new participating States. According to this scale, contribution percentages range from 0.125 per cent for such countries as Andorra, Liechtenstein, Malta and San Marino to nine per cent for Germany, France, Italy, the Russian Federation, the United States and the United Kingdom (see Annex 2). Contributions for the current budget year are determined after the budget has been approved by the Permanent Council, with a first bill for fifty per cent of the contribution payable on January 20 and a second bill for the remaining fifty per cent due by 1 April of the year for which the budget has been approved. If the Permanent Council, owing to additional activities that create supplemental funding requirements, makes an adjustment in the budget, the appropriate sums are billed separately to the participating States or, if the timing makes it possible, are included in the second bill. It is also possible that to-

wards the end of the year a final bill may be sent whose purpose is usually to account for all of the budgetary adjustments throughout the year and any portions of the regular budget not already covered by earlier bills. Naturally this process also works "in the opposite direction", i.e. for any budget reductions that may have been approved.

Assessed Contributions - Scale for Large Missions and Projects

On 19 December 1997 at the meeting of Foreign Ministers in Copenhagen the Ministerial Council, with its Decision No. 8, approved a supplemental financing mechanism which is to be applied only to OSCE missions and/or extraordinary projects/activities above a certain financial magnitude (budgetary requirements of at least ATS 185 million) and which is also based on a scale of distribution that differs slightly from the one just described. What led to this decision?

In the course of the OSCE's involvement in organizing, conducting and monitoring the various elections in Bosnia and Herzegovina it proved to be ever more difficult and, in the end, almost impossible to get voluntary contributions for the financing of these activities. While the general elections of 1996 and the municipal elections of 1997 were still completely financed by voluntary contributions, there were problems with this kind of financing in the autumn of 1997 in connection with the elections in Republika Srpska - i.e. it could be seen in advance that the voluntary contributions might no longer be sufficient. The Permanent Council dealt with this problem through its Decision No. 192 of 30 October 1997 which specified that those portions of the budget for organization, conducting and monitoring of the elections in Republika Srpska which could not be covered by voluntary contributions would be billed to the participating States.

The changed scale (see Annex 2, last column) was, moreover, a consequence of the dissatisfaction of a number of participating States with the existing scale of distribution based on the Helsinki Document of 1992, as that scale obviously did not (any longer) adequately reflect the economic strength and ability to pay of all participating States. The new scale deals with this problem in the sense that it is calculated mainly on the basis of the gross domestic product of the individual participating States. The following points are worth mentioning in this connection:

- The Permanent Council must decide on a case-by-case basis whether this new - supplementary - financing mechanism will be used or whether contributions will be billed to the participating States in accordance with the scale of distribution based on Helsinki 1992.

- When a decision has been made in favour of the new mechanism and the budget for the project or mission in question has been adopted, the participating States will be billed, initially, only up to two thirds of the approved budget. The remaining third is to be financed by voluntary contributions. As soon as it becomes clear how much the community of states is prepared to do through voluntary contributions, the portion of the final third which cannot be financed in this way will be billed to the participating States on the basis of the new scale. That means that in the worst case the entire budget and, in the best case, only two thirds of it must be raised in this way.
- This new financing mechanism will be applied until 31 December 2000. At the same time, the Decision provides that both the old and the new scale will be reviewed under the auspices of the Permanent Council.

Voluntary Contributions

Apart from financing through assessed contributions, various OSCE activities and projects are financed by voluntary contributions from participating States, other countries, organizations and private parties. Examples are the elections in Bosnia and Herzegovina already mentioned, activities related to the elections in Chechnya and Albania, the fund to promote the integration of recently admitted participating States, the fund for activities related to economic aspects of security, voluntary contributions for various seminars and workshops, and for other special projects.

There are precise OSCE rules that lay down the procedures to be followed, e.g. the decision in principle to accept such contributions, the supervision of their proper use, and reporting to the donors in accordance with their requirements and desires. Without the system of voluntary contributions, a number of activities and projects - often small ones that at first sight seem "insignificant" - could not be carried out.

The Financing of Activities - Actual

Following the issue just discussed - methods and techniques through which the participating States are "invited to the cashier's desk" - this section deals with the willingness and/or ability of participating States to pay. We have come to the subject of arrears - an irksome but important matter for all international and national organizations.

As of 23 April 1998 the total of arrears came to ATS 560.3 million, divided by year as follows:

–	1993 and previous	2.3	million ATS
–	1994	3.7	million ATS
–	1995	6,7	million ATS
–	1996	14,3	million ATS
–	1997	95,2	million ATS
–	1998	438,1	million ATS ³

What does this mean in concrete terms? Does the OSCE have *liquidity problems*? In principle, the answer is simple: not yet. The figures given here should not (and should not be allowed to) give the impression that the OSCE shares the fate of other international organizations in terms of financial resources. Despite current arrears amounting to ATS 560.3 million there is as yet no danger of liquidity bottle-necks and/or payments difficulties (and, with the exception of short-term problems, this was always the case in the past). The still unpaid contributions for 1998 must be viewed in the correct light. While the sum of ATS 438.1 million seems at first to be shockingly high, it does not necessarily reflect greater unwillingness or inability to pay on the part of all or some participating States but, rather, the fact that the due date for the second billing for this year was 1 April and many participating States do not observe the due date very meticulously.

All the same, I wish to emphasize here the necessity of payments discipline on the part of the participating States. It is of the greatest importance, especially for a rapidly growing organization such as the OSCE that is steadily being given new and additional responsibilities, that the participating States pay their bills on time and in full - with equal importance attaching to the *timeliness*.

Excursus: The Permanent Council took account of the problem that may arise from the thirty-days period, foreseen in the Financial Regulations, between billing and payment of assessed contributions by its Decision No. 133 of 27 June 1996. This Decision provides for the creation of a Revolving Fund of ATS 37.3 million that can be used if liquidity bottle-necks should arise during this period of time.

In addition, the Permanent Council, through Decision No. 182 of 17 July 1997, approved the establishment of a Contingency Fund in the amount of ATS 30 million. This Fund is to be used when the Permanent Council has adopted a basic decision on an additional activity of the Organization and there is a need to act immediately but the relevant budget has not yet been adopted and hence not yet been billed to the participating States.

3 As of the above date only ATS 753.7 million or 52.3 per cent of the approved budget had been billed for the year 1998.

These two measures, however, are only designed to bridge short-term financing bottle-necks resulting from "technical circumstances". They offer no real assistance in the event of payments difficulties or unwillingness to pay on a larger scale.

Is the OSCE Fit for the Next Millennium?

When I pose - and try to answer - the question whether the OSCE is fit for the next millennium, my attention is drawn (in the spirit of this article and in view of my function in this Organization) quite naturally to the financial aspects. Whether the activities of the OSCE in coming years increase, stay at the present level or are reduced will of course depend on political developments within the common security space and the relevant decisions of the decision-makers.

All the same, I do not yet perceive any real impairment of the Organization's financial fitness. It is able to react quickly and unbureaucratically to new events and responsibilities and, despite the enormous growth of its consolidated budget in recent years, it has not yet taken on the dimensions (and related problems) of other international organizations.

Nonetheless, I can see (and, judging from the relevant decisions of the Permanent Council, I am not the only one) a future need to do something in two fields - *adaptation of the scale of distribution* and *measures to take in the event of arrears* - so that, over the long term, the financial mobility and health of the Organization will not be impaired or put at risk.

Adaptation of the Scale of Distribution

As already explained, the billing of assessed contributions to the approved budget is based on the scale of distribution in the Helsinki Document of 1992. This scale was slightly changed for large missions and projects and the Decision No. 8 of the Ministerial Council, through which this was done, called in Point 5 for a review of the old ("normal") scale and for a report to the next Summit Meeting of the Heads of State or Government. Point 5 also states that this report is also to be taken into consideration when establishing the scale for large missions and projects for the period after 31 December 2000.

What does this mean? It means, quite simply, that the highest decision-makers of the OSCE are convinced that the scale of distribution established in 1992 has not kept pace with developments in recent years and no longer accurately reflects the real economic circumstances.

Will a change have any influence on the payments ethics of all or some participating States? I am inclined to say "yes" to this question even though it is not easy to demonstrate a relationship between the scale of distribution and the level of unpaid contributions, and failure to pay contributions on time can have, and will have, other reasons than the ones just mentioned. But it seems plausible and understandable that dissatisfaction with a percentage share can have an effect on willingness to pay the assessed contribution on time.

Measures in the Event of Arrears

Regulation 4.09 of the current Financial Regulations of the OSCE describes in detail the steps to be taken in the event of arrears. If a participating State, by 1 April of the current financial year, has not yet paid all its assessed contributions for the preceding financial year, the Secretary General will request the offending state to pay its arrears within 60 days. If this is not done, the Secretary General asks the state in question for the reasons occasioning the payments delay. If the amount of arrears equals or exceeds the sum of the contributions due for the preceding two full years, the Chairman-in-Office will refer the case to the Permanent Council which will then take measures to obtain rapid payment of the outstanding contribution from the participating State in arrears.

What Needs to Be Changed? And Why?

As for the *why*, one hardly needs to waste words if one bears in mind that a participating State can be 17 months behind in the payment of its contributions before the Secretary General becomes, or can become, involved - and this involvement consists in asking the country in question for an explanation of the delay.

The *what*, however, is a fit subject for discussion. The main objective must be to retain or strengthen the Organization's financial ability to function or, to put it another way, to avoid situations in which necessary and agreed activities and projects, owing to the absence of financial resources, cannot be carried out or cannot be done on time. I am thinking of shortening the currently valid time limits, and I am thinking of the (possibly not very popular) imposition of concrete sanctions in the event of arrears - a practice, by the way, which exists in various forms in other international organizations. Sanctions provide no guarantee that arrears will be minimized or eliminated but they can substantially increase the willingness to pay on time.

That is what is important in the long run. We cannot permit all the work and effort on the political and thus substantive side of the OSCE to be impeded (or even founder) owing to financial and administrative problems. All par-

ticipating States need to be aware that the words "activities" and "payments" should be spoken in the same breath. Or, as they say in Vienna: "No money, no music!"

Annex 1: The Development of the Consolidated CSCE/OSCE Budget Proposal

Fund	94 Budget	95 Budget	96 Budget	97 Budget	98 Budget	Difference	
	ATS	ATS	ATS	ATS	as of 15.5.98 ATS	Bud. 98/94 ATS	%
General Fund	119.854.793	126.382.929	124.441.465	131.719.927	149.948.573	30.093.780	25,1
ODHIR	22.345.000	39.662.645	33 359.902	50.563.104	49.181.250	26.836.250	120,1
HCNM	5.832.288	9.406.451	11.713.000	12.727.500	14.660.407	8.828.119	151,4
Representative on Freedom of the Media	-	-	-	-	4.910.471	4.910.471	-
Minsk Conference	31.814.350	24.294.544	23.846.154	28.527.675	30.950.172	(864.178)	(2,7)
OSCE Missions	64.929.680	82.611.396	331.980.817	431.012.797	1.199.155.535	1.134.225.855	1.746,9
SAMs	44.081.008	43.066.588	10.556.540	-	-	(44.081.008)	100,0
Sub-total	288.857.119	325.424.553	535.897.878	654.551.003	1.448.806.408	1.159.949.289	401,6
Income	-	-	4.000.000	5.000.000	5.000.000	5.000.000	-
Grand Total	288.857.119	325.424.553	531.897.878	649.551.003	1.443.806.408	1.154.949.289	399,8

Annex 2: Applied Scales of Distribution

Participating States	1994	1995	Jan. - May 1996	June - Dec. 1996	1997	1998	1998 Larger Missions & Projects (%)
France	9,00	9,00	9,00	9,00	9,00	9,00	10,34
Germany	9,00	9,00	9,00	9,00	9,00	9,00	10,34
Italy	9,00	9,00	9,00	9,00	9,00	9,00	10,34
Russian Federation	9,00	9,00	9,00	9,00	9,00	9,00	5,50
United Kingdom	9,00	9,00	9,00	9,00	9,00	9,00	10,34
United States of America	9,00	9,00	9,00	9,00	9,00	9,00	12,40
Canada	5,45	5,45	5,45	5,45	5,45	5,45	5,45
Spain	3,65	3,65	3,65	3,65	3,65	3,65	4,20
Belgium	3,55	3,55	3,55	3,55	3,55	3,55	4,07
Netherlands	3,55	3,55	3,55	3,55	3,55	3,55	4,07
Sweden	3,55	3,55	3,55	3,55	3,55	3,55	4,07
Switzerland	2,30	2,30	2,30	2,30	2,30	2,30	2,65
Austria	2,05	2,05	2,05	2,05	2,05	2,05	2,36
Denmark	2,05	2,05	2,05	2,05	2,05	2,05	2,36
Finland	2,05	2,05	2,05	2,05	2,05	2,05	2,36
Norway	2,05	2,05	2,05	2,05	2,05	2,05	2,36
Ukraine	1,75	1,75	1,75	1,75	1,75	1,75	0,18
Poland	1,40	1,40	1,40	1,40	1,40	1,40	1,05
Turkey	1,00	1,00	1,00	1,00	1,00	1,00	0,75
Belarus	0,70	0,70	0,70	0,70	0,70	0,70	0,07
Greece	0,70	0,70	0,70	0,70	0,70	0,70	0,53
Hungary	0,70	0,70	0,70	0,70	0,70	0,70	0,53
Romania	0,70	0,70	0,70	0,70	0,70	0,70	0,07
Czech Republic	0,67	0,67	0,67	0,67	0,67	0,67	0,50
Bulgaria	0,55	0,55	0,55	0,55	0,55	0,55	0,06
Ireland	0,55	0,55	0,55	0,55	0,55	0,55	0,63
Kasakstan	0,55	0,55	0,55	0,55	0,55	0,55	0,06

Luxembourg	0,55	0,55	0,55	0,55	0,55	0,55	0,63
Portugal	0,55	0,55	0,55	0,55	0,55	0,55	0,41
Uzbekistan	0,55	0,55	0,55	0,55	0,55	0,55	0,06
Yugoslavia (membership suspended)	0,55	0,55	0,55	0,55	0,55	0,55	0,00
Slovakia	0,33	0,33	0,33	0,33	0,33	0,33	0,25
Albania	0,20	0,20	0,19	0,19	0,19	0,19	0,02
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0,20	0,20	0,19	0,19	0,19	0,19	0,02
Croatia	0,20	0,20	0,19	0,19	0,19	0,19	0,14
Cyprus	0,20	0,20	0,19	0,19	0,19	0,19	0,14
Estonia	0,20	0,20	0,19	0,19	0,19	0,19	0,02
Iceland	0,20	0,20	0,19	0,19	0,19	0,19	0,21
Latvia	0,20	0,20	0,19	0,19	0,19	0,19	0,02
the former Yugo- slav Republic of Macedonia	0,00	0,00	0,19	0,19	0,19	0,19	0,02
Lithuania	0,20	0,20	0,19	0,19	0,19	0,19	0,02
Moldova	0,20	0,20	0,19	0,19	0,19	0,19	0,02
Slovenia	0,20	0,20	0,19	0,19	0,19	0,19	0,14
Armenia	0,20	0,20	0,185	0,185	0,185	0,185	0,02
Azerbaijan	0,20	0,20	0,185	0,185	0,185	0,185	0,02
Georgia	0,20	0,20	0,185	0,185	0,185	0,185	0,02
Kyrgyzstan	0,20	0,20	0,185	0,185	0,185	0,185	0,02
Tajikistan	0,20	0,20	0,185	0,185	0,185	0,185	0,02
Turkmenistan	0,20	0,20	0,185	0,185	0,185	0,185	0,02
Andorra	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,125	0,125	0,125	0,02
Holy See	0,15	0,15	0,15	0,125	0,125	0,125	0,02
Liechtenstein	0,15	0,15	0,15	0,125	0,125	0,125	0,02
Malta	0,15	0,15	0,15	0,125	0,125	0,125	0,02
Monaco	0,15	0,15	0,15	0,125	0,125	0,125	0,02
San Marino	0,15	0,15	0,15	0,125	0,125	0,125	0,02
GRAND TOTAL	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00