



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Twenty-seventh Regular Meeting
15 - 17 May, 2007

IICA/CE/Doc.502(07)
Original: Spanish
15 – 17 May 2007

**Approval of the Quota Scales for
Financing the 2008-09 Program Budget**

San Jose, Costa Rica

**APPROVAL OF THE QUOTA SCALES FOR FINANCING
THE 2008-09 PROGRAM BUDGET**

(Document Requested by the Special Advisory Commission On
Management Issues at its March 2007 Meeting)

APPROVAL OF THE QUOTA SCALES FOR FINANCING THE 2008-09 PROGRAM BUDGET

(Document Requested by the Special Advisory Commission
On Management Issues at its March 2007 Meeting)

Mandatory annual quotas contributed by the IICA Member States provide the major part of the financing for the Biennial Program Budget of the Institute. Article 8(b) of the IICA Convention, which entered into force in 1980, charges the Inter-American Board of Agriculture (“IABA”) with establishing those quotas by a vote of two thirds of the Institute’s members. The Board normally takes that decision by approving a Quota Scale, as an annex to the approved Biennial Program Budget, which establishes the percentage of the total quota financed portion of the budget each Member State must pay, along with the corresponding amount due.

Since 1962, the policy of IICA’s governing bodies has been to adopt for use in the IICA Quota Scale the percentages adopted by the OAS General Assembly for the OAS Quota Scale for financing the quota financed portion of the annual OAS Program Budget. The legal basis for that policy is now Article 23 of the IICA Convention. It provides that the annual quotas must be established by the Board “in accordance with the system for calculating quotas of the Organization of American States.”

At a Special General Assembly Meeting held on January 31, 2006, the OAS General Assembly voted to adopt a new OAS Quota Scale for the first time in sixteen years. The Quota Scale is a “transitional scale,” which will be in force to finance the 2007-2008 OAS Program Budgets. By June 2008 when the OAS General Assembly convenes to approve the 2009 annual OAS Program Budget, the OAS Member States hope to approve a scale which better reflects the capacity of the Member States to pay and their desire to support the Organization equitably – the two principles which govern the establishment of the OAS Scale under Article 55 of the OAS Charter.

Under the Transitional Quota Scale approved for 2007-08, some eighteen countries had their quotas reduced from 2006 levels. Several experienced substantial increases. Nonetheless, in a show of solidarity for the OAS, those countries whose quotas were reduced under the Transitional Scale voluntarily agreed to continue paying their quotas for 2007 at the same level in force in 2006. At its next Regular Session in June 2006, the OAS General Assembly, by Resolution AG/RES. 2257 (XXXVI-O/06), also approved an additional 3% increase in portion of the OAS program-budget financed by Member State quotas – the first since 1995.

Since the General Assembly approved the transitional 2007-08 OAS Quota Scale in January 2006, there has been little progress made towards developing an alternative scale. The OAS Permanent Council has a mandate to propose an alternative scale to the next General Assembly for its consideration, and its Commission on Administrative and Budgetary Affairs (“CAAP”) is scheduled to begin discussing this matter again in the final weeks of March.

At this juncture, there are little signs that the CAAP will produce a final product for the consideration of the Permanent Council and then the General Assembly in time for the General Assembly’s June meeting in Panama 2007. Thus, we consider it most likely that the transitional scale will be approved once more for financing the 2008 OAS Program Budget. What will happen in 2009 is anyone’s guess.

At its Fourteenth Regular Meeting to be held in Guatemala City in July of this year, the IABA shall have to approve the IICA Quota Scales to be used for financing the 2008-09 IICA Program Budget. By that time, the OAS General Assembly will have then approved the OAS Quota Scale for 2008, and the IABA will have that Quota Scale for its consideration in establishing IICA's scale for financing that first year of its biennial Program Budget.

With regard to the Quota Scale for 2009, the IABA will have several choices. One is simply to approve an IICA Quota Scale for 2008 for use in 2009 with the percentages set out in the OAS 2008 Quota Scale, as the best good faith indicator of what the OAS Quota Scale will be for 2009. But some Member States may not find that satisfactory because if the OAS does adopt a different scale for 2009, then the IICA Scale for 2009, based on the 2008 scale, will not reflect the OAS Scale then in force.

Another alternative is to adopt the equivalent of the percentages in the 2008 OAS Quota Scale for the 2008-2009 IICA Quota Scales, and authorize the convocation of a Special IABA Meeting to approve a different Scale for 2009 if the percentages in the OAS Scale change for 2009 Scale. The Administration advises against this alternative because it would require substantial additional expenditures for the Institute.

Still another alternative, which has been suggested by some delegations, is simply to place a paragraph in the budget resolution that adopts for incorporation into the 2008-2009 IICA Quota Scales the same percentages set out in the OAS Quota Scales in force for those years. That, to the Administration, seems the most logical alternative in light of Article 23 of the Convention and the uncertainty over what may happen at the OAS in 2008 for 2009.

Member States whose quotas are reduced because of the application in IICA of the percentages in the OAS Transitional Scale or any other newly approved OAS Scale may wish to consider offering to maintain their quotas at an amount at least equal to current levels, as they did in January 2006 at the OAS. At its recent meeting, the SACMI asked the Director General to urge those Member States to do so.

Also at that meeting, the SACMI instructed the General Directorate to:

“make available to Member States, as soon as possible, a working document explaining the process followed by the Organization of American States for determining its transitional quota scale in force and the anticipated process for setting a final scale for 2009; the General Directorate should also explain the regulatory aspects that govern establishment of the quota scale in the specific case of IICA and the relationship to the OAS quota scale.”

To that end, we have prepared this document, and submit for the consideration of the Member States the following documents annexed:

1. The 2007-08 OAS Quota Scale: Methodology and Institutional Process.
2. Resolution “AG/RES. 1 (XXXI-E/06) Scale of Regular Fund Quota Assessments and Ceiling of the 2007 Budget”. (Approved January 31, 2006).
3. Table B of Resolution “AG/RES. 2257 /XXXVI-O-06) Program-Budget of the Organization for 2007, Quotas and Contributions to FEMCIDI for 2007”. (Approved June 6, 2006).

4. Article 23 of the Convention on the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture: The System for Establishing Member state Quotas for the Institute.
5. A proposed IICA Quota Scale for 2008-09 based on the OAS Transitional Scale.
6. A proposed IICA Quota Scale for 2008-09 based on the OAS Transitional Scale with a 3% increase.
7. A proposed IICA Quota Scale for 2008-09 based on the OAS Transitional Scale Assuming Member States whose Quotas are Reduced Under the Scale Volunteer to maintain their Current 2007 Quota Levels for Those Years.

THE 2007-08 OAS QUOTA SCALE: METHODOLOGY AND INSTITUTIONAL PROCESS

I. INTRODUCTION

By Resolution AG/RES. 1 (XXXI-E/06) (“the Resolution”), the OAS General Assembly, meeting in a Special Period of Sessions on January 31, 2006, voted to modify its Quota Scale for computing Member State quota assessments to finance the annual OAS Regular Fund Budget. The Scale sets out the percentage of the approved annual Budget that each Member State must contribute. This was the first time that the percentages in the Quota Scale had been modified in sixteen years. The Resolution is Attached hereto as Annex I.

The Resolution provides that the new Quota Scale will be in force for the 2007-08 fiscal years, or until such time, if sooner, that the General Assembly approves a more permanent Scale and methodology for computing it. In that regard, the Resolution instructs the Permanent Council to continue developing “a draft methodology” for computing quotas which “take[s] into account the criteria established in Article 55 of the OAS Charter and current data on the ability to pay of the member countries.” It further instructs the Council to present that new methodology, together with a definitive Quota Scale for 2009 and subsequent years, to the General Assembly for adoption at its 2007 Regular Meeting.

Article 55 of the OAS Charter which contains the “criteria” referenced in the Resolution, states:

The General Assembly shall establish the bases for fixing the quota that each Government is to contribute to the maintenance of the Organization, taking into account the ability to pay of the respective countries and their determination to contribute in an equitable manner. Decisions on Budgetary matters require the approval of two thirds of the Member States.

(Emphasis added.). Thus, according to that article, the General Assembly must take into account two criteria to establish the basis for computing the quotas the Member States are obligated to pay: One is the ability of each country to pay; the other is the will of each country to contribute, in an equitable manner. The first is a technical criteria; the second is political. The “basis” for the computation, to be established in taking account those criteria, is the “methodology and resulting scale” which the General Assembly has charged the Permanent Council with developing for its approval by a two thirds vote of the OAS Member States in its 2007 Regular Meeting.

The purpose of this paper is to summarize briefly the methodology that the OAS used to develop the 2007-8 Quota Scale set out in the Resolution, and to describe the institutional process which resulted in its approval. It does not seek to evaluate any strengths or weaknesses of that methodology, or of any other methodologies currently under consideration.

II. THE METHODOLOGY USED IN ESTABLISHING THE THE 2007-08 OAS QUOTA SCALE

The methodology used by the General Assembly in establishing the 2007-08 Quota Scales reflected the technical and political criteria set out in Article 55 of the OAS Charter. Before voting to approve the Scale, the General Assembly received documentation and heard testimony that showed that the Scale had been derived from the UN Quota Scale, by way of a mathematical formula, and that accordingly, the Scale took into account the relative capacity of each Member State to pay. The General Assembly also learned that the Scale incorporated adjustments which took into account the determination of each Member State to contribute equitably, and the General Assembly made additional adjustments in that regard prior to giving its prior approval. A more detailed explanation of the methodology underlying the Scale follows below:

A. Capacity to pay: The Technical Component

The methodology used by the OAS in developing its scale is based on the presumption that the Quota Scale used by the United Nations is a reasonably reliable indicator of the relative capacity to pay of each Member State. Thus, instead of collecting original data on the ability of Member States to pay, the OAS uses the UN quota schedule as its source of data for that purpose. It does so by applying a formula which multiplies the UN scale by a series of variables to produce an OAS Scale reflecting the same relative capacity of countries to pay established in the UN Scale. The formula also takes into account certain decisions made by the General Assembly taking into account the political component -- the determination of each country to contribute in an equitable manner.

The current UN scale incorporated into the OAS formula for taking into account "capacity to pay" is based on GNP per capita data for each country. The UN computed its current scale first by calculating the percentage of the UN Budget each UN Member States would pay based on GNP. The measure of GNP used was a figure for each country equaling the average of the country's average GNP for the six-year 1996-2001 period and the country's average GNP for the three year 1999-2001 period. Then the UN made a series of adjustments to those figures in an effort to reflect more precisely "capacity to pay." They included, among others, reductions in the computation of GNP based on the amount of external debt and additional reductions for low GNP per capita income relative to average world GNP per capita for the corresponding periods. Based on considerations of a more political nature, the UN further adjusted its Scale so as to provide for a maximum quota of 22% for the United States, a minimum quota of 0.001% for the poorest countries, and a maximum quota of .01% for lesser developed countries.

Many UN Member States have criticized the UN scale as not fully reflecting the capacity of the UN Member States to pay, and proposed refinements are currently under consideration. Thus, to the extent the UN scale may be considered less than fully satisfactory as a measure for "capacity to pay," the OAS scale and methodology, which uses the UN scale as its basic data on capacity to pay, may be equally less than fully satisfactory. Nonetheless, in both the case of the UN and of the OAS, the current UN scale is the indicator of capacity to pay that the Member States have collectively approved for now.

B. Determination to Contribute Equitably – The Political Component

The current formula applied by the OAS to the UN Quota Scale to derive the OAS Scale not only incorporates the “capacity to pay criteria,” but it also reflects political decisions taken with regard to the criteria of “determination to pay equitably.” One of those political decisions was the establishment of a maximum quota for the United States of America. Another was the establishment of a minimum quota of .022. The first was based on the determination of the United States to pay no more than 59.47% of the budget and on the position taken by many Member States that payment of a larger percentage by any single Member State was not in the Organization’s best interests. The second was based on the will of the smallest member states to increase their financial stake in the Organization.

After application of the formula, the General Assembly further approved refinements in the scale to reflect more precisely the determination of countries to contribute equitably. For example, under the resulting scales without further adjustment, Mexico’s quota would have increased under the 2007-08 scales more than 50% over the 2006 amount. Mexico determined it could not pay that full amount for those years. Hence, its increase was reduced to a level it was willing to pay. A special dispensation was made to Dominica, to pay a quota of .017% -- less than the .022% minimum assessment established. St. Lucia subsequently voluntarily increased its commitment to pay an amount above the .022% minimum assessment. Eighteen countries whose quotas would have decreased from the 2006 levels --some substantially -- indicated their determination to maintain their contributions at that level, thus resulting in an effective total percentage of 103.5. The scale was then further adjusted to distribute the surplus to help ease the burden of those countries who requested relief from substantial increases which they might have been required to pay under a Scale without those adjustments.

III. THE INSTITUTIONAL PROCESS FOR DEVELOPING AND APPROVING THE SCALE

The OAS Member States have recognized the need to adjust the percentages in the OAS Quota Scale for many years. Aside from a serious effort undertaken under the leadership of Mexico in 1999 and 2000, however, little progress was made until 2005. By then, it was evident to all concerned that the OAS, then in the eleventh year of a freeze on the amount of its Regular Fund Budget, was in dire need of an increase. But many Member States made it clear that they would not entertain any serious discussion over an increase in the budget without a change in the Quota Scale which would take into account more current data on the capacity of member states to pay. The Scale in use since 1990 had been based on relative GNP per capita country data from the 1970s -- more than twenty-five years old. For those reasons, the OAS General Assembly, meeting in Ft. Lauderdale in 2005, resolved by Resolution AG/RES. 2157 (XXXV-05) to convene a special session of the OAS General Assembly no later than January 31, 2006, to consider a proposal for a revised scale. It also charged the OAS Permanent Council with developing and presenting the proposed scale for the special General Assembly’s consideration.

In response to that Resolution, the Permanent Council instructed its Committee for Administrative and Budgetary Affairs (“CAAP”), under the chairmanship of Paraguayan Ambassador Manuel Cáceres Cardozo, to prepare the proposal. The CAAP then formed a Working Group in September 2005, and the Permanent Representative of Jamaica and former

CAAP Chair, Ambassador Joshua Sears, agreed to serve as its chair. The Working Group reviewed the extensive work done by the CAAP in 2000 on the issue, together with updated versions of the technical working papers the CAAP had used in that exercise. The Chairman worked to develop consensus on key questions, like the use of the UN Scale as a basis for evaluating the capacity to pay, the establishment of minimum and maximum quotas, and automatic adjustments linked to adjustments to the UN scale. Unfortunately, no such consensus was reached, and in his report to the CAAP of December 14, 2005, Chairman Sears recommended that the dialogue continue at the level of the full CAAP. See Annex II, CP/CAAP-2810/05. For that purpose, the Working Group produced a proposal, but indicated that it did not have the consensus of all the Group members. See Annex III, CP/CAAP-2806/05.

On December 15, 2005, Ambassador Cáceres reported to the Permanent Council on the status of discussions over the proposed Quota Scale. The Permanent Council then decided to convene a group of experts to propose a new methodology prior to the Special Meeting of the General Assembly scheduled for the end of January 2006.

Pursuant to that request, experts from Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Chile, the Dominican Republic, Mexico, Nicaragua and Venezuela and members of delegations met in Washington from January 18-20, 2006. All the experts made presentations, but most of the discussion, centered around proposals from México and Brazil. The proposals are summarized in the Report of the Chair of that Group, Ambassador Cáceres, REG/NEC/doc.6/06 corr.1, Annex IV.

Ambassador Cáceres submitted his Report to the Permanent Council for its consideration and transmission to the Preparatory Committee for the Special General Assembly. That Report, in addition to technical documentation prepared by the OAS General Secretariat at the request of delegations and the Chair of the Assembly, were the General Assembly's principal working documents.

The basis of the Scale adopted by a unanimous decision of the General Assembly has already been discussed in the Section of this Paper on "Methodology" above. The Scale was generated from the UN Scale by application of a formula known as the "modified traditional methodology," described in the Working Group's December 13th Proposal paper(Annex III), and was subsequently adjusted in accordance with considerations set out in the Brazilian proposal and suggestions of other Member States.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY



THIRTY-FIRST SPECIAL SESSION
January 30 and 31, 2006
Washington, D.C

OEA/Ser.P
AG/RES. 1 (XXXI-E/06)
30 May 2006
Original: Spanish

AG/RES. 1 (XXXI-E/06)^{1/}

SCALE OF REGULAR FUND QUOTA ASSESSMENTS
AND CEILING OF THE 2007 BUDGET

Adopted at the third plenary session, held on January 31, 2006)

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY,

HAVING SEEN the report of the Preparatory Committee on the proposal for a revised scale of quota assessments [AG/doc.6 (XXXI-E/06)]; and

CONSIDERING:

That, by resolution AG/RES. 2157 (XXXV-O/05), the Permanent Council was instructed to finalize a draft proposal for a revised scale of Regular Fund quota assessments for 2007, which, in accordance with Article 55 of the Charter of the Organization of American States, would take into account “the ability to pay of the respective countries and their determination to contribute in an equitable manner,” and to convene a special session of the General Assembly for the purpose of considering the proposal and establishing the ceiling of the 2007 budget;

That, pursuant to that mandate, the Permanent Council, after considering the report of its Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Affairs on a General Secretariat proposal for a revised scale of quota assessments, held a meeting of government experts from January 18 to 20, 2006, to propose alternative methodologies for the adoption of a new scale of quota assessments that would be more consistent with the criteria established in Article 55 of the OAS Charter;

That the Chair of the Meeting of Experts presented his report to the Permanent Council on January 24, 2006 (REG/NEC/doc.6/06 corr. 2);

That the Permanent Council, in its resolution CP/RES. 897 (1526/06), adopted on January 24, 2006, convened the thirty-first special session of the General Assembly and submitted the Report of the Chair of the Meeting of Experts (REG/NEC/doc.6/06 corr. 2) to the Preparatory Committee for consideration during this special session;

That the Secretary General will have the authority to explore alternatives that might be conducive to improving the financial situation of the Organization; and

^{1/} Annex B of this resolution was considered and approved by the Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Affairs at the meeting of April 24, 2006.

That, in fulfillment of the obligations established in the OAS Charter, the General Secretariat shall ensure that all its offices and dependencies perform their tasks within the bounds of approved budgets and with the necessary transparency,

RESOLVES:

1. To adopt the transitional scale of Regular Fund quota assessments (Appendix A) to fund the 2007 and the 2008 program-budget.

2. To instruct the Permanent Council to continue considering a draft methodology for assessing quotas to the member states—one that will take into account the criteria established in Article 55 of the OAS Charter and current data on the ability to pay of the member countries; and to present to the General Assembly, at its thirty-seventh regular session, its conclusions and recommendations for the adoption of a revised, definitive scale of quota assessments for 2009 and subsequent years.

3. To instruct the General Secretariat to submit to the Preparatory Committee a proposed program-budget for the Regular Fund for 2007, at a level for which the Secretary General can demonstrate available financing, but not to exceed US\$81.5 million (Appendix B).

APPENDIX A

Transitional scales of Regular Fund quota assessments to fund the 2007 and the 2008 program-budget

Country	2006		Approved quota scale 2007 %	Approved quota scale 2008 %
	Current quota scale %	Current Contributions \$		
Antigua and Barbuda	0,020	14,9	0,024	0,024
Dominica	0,020	14,9	0,017	0,017
Guyana	0,020	14,9	0,022	0,022
Saint Kitts and Nevis	0,020	14,9	0,022	0,022
Saint Vincent and The Grenadines	0,020	14,9	0,022	0,022
Belize	0,030	22,4	0,026	0,026
Grenada	0,030	22,4	0,022	0,022
Saint Lucia	0,030	22,4	0,024	0,024
Bahamas	0,070	52,3	0,084	0,084
Bolivia	0,070	52,3	0,060	0,060
El Salvador	0,070	52,3	0,084	0,084
Haiti	0,070	52,3	0,060	0,060
Honduras	0,070	52,3	0,060	0,060
Nicaragua	0,070	52,3	0,060	0,060
Suriname	0,070	52,3	0,060	0,060
Barbados	0,080	59,7	0,080	0,080
Costa Rica	0,130	97,0	0,150	0,150
Guatemala	0,130	97,0	0,150	0,150
Panama	0,130	97,0	0,130	0,130
Ecuador	0,180	134,4	0,165	0,165
Jamaica	0,180	134,4	0,163	0,163
Paraguay	0,180	134,4	0,165	0,165
Dominican Republic	0,180	134,4	0,165	0,165
Trinidad and Tobago	0,180	134,4	0,180	0,180
Uruguay	0,260	194,1	0,223	0,223
Peru	0,410	306,1	0,443	0,443
Chile	0,540	403,1	1,141	1,112
Colombia	0,940	701,7	0,807	0,807
Venezuela	3,200	2.388,9	2,692	2,747
Argentina	4,900	3.658,0	4,282	4,282
Mexico	6,080	4.538,9	6,262	6,513
Brazil	8,550	6.382,8	7,626	7,626
Canada	12,360	9.227,1	13,761	13,761
United States	59,470	44.396,0	59,470	59,470
Subtotal	98,76	\$ 73.727,1	98,702	98,979
Cuba	1,24	925,7	1,021	1,021
Total	100,00	\$ 74.652,8	99,723	100,000

Reference Document
Projected Member States Quotas Towards 2007 Budget
(In US \$1,000)

Country	I		II		III		IV		V			VI		VII	
	2006 Current Quotas				2007 * Approved Quotas				Proposed 2007 Quotas assuming a 3% increase New Base: \$76,892,400						
	Current Base: \$74,652,800				Current Base: \$74,652,800				Adjusted Quotas		Over-Quota Contributions		Total Adjusted Assessment		
	%		US \$		%		US \$		US \$		US \$		US \$		
Antigua and Barbuda	0,020	14,9	0,024	17,9	18,5	-	18,5								
Dominica	0,020	14,9	0,017	12,7	13,1	1,9	14,9								
Guyana	0,020	14,9	0,022	16,4	16,9	-	16,9								
Saint Kitts and Nevis	0,020	14,9	0,022	16,4	16,9	-	16,9								
St. Vincent and Grenadines	0,020	14,9	0,022	16,4	16,9	-	16,9								
Belize	0,030	22,4	0,026	19,4	20,0	2,4	22,4								
Grenada	0,030	22,4	0,022	16,4	16,9	5,5	22,4								
Saint Lucia	0,030	22,4	0,024	17,9	18,5	3,9	22,4								
Bahamas	0,070	52,3	0,084	62,4	64,3	-	64,3								
Bolivia	0,070	52,3	0,060	44,6	45,9	6,3	52,3								
El Salvador	0,070	52,3	0,084	62,7	64,6	-	64,6								
Haiti	0,070	52,3	0,060	44,6	45,9	6,3	52,3								
Honduras	0,070	52,3	0,060	44,6	45,9	6,3	52,3								
Nicaragua	0,070	52,3	0,060	44,6	45,9	6,3	52,3								
Suriname	0,070	52,3	0,060	44,6	45,9	6,3	52,3								
Barbados	0,080	59,7	0,080	59,7	61,5	-	61,5								
Costa Rica	0,130	97,0	0,150	111,7	115,1	-	115,1								
Guatemala	0,130	97,0	0,150	111,7	115,1	-	115,1								
Panamá	0,130	97,0	0,130	97,2	100,1	-	100,1								
Ecuador	0,180	134,4	0,165	123,5	127,2	7,2	134,4								
Jamaica	0,180	134,4	0,163	122,0	125,6	8,7	134,4								
Paraguay	0,180	134,4	0,165	123,5	127,2	7,2	134,4								
República Dominicana	0,180	134,4	0,165	123,2	126,9	7,4	134,4								
Trinidad and Tobago	0,180	134,4	0,180	134,7	138,7	-	138,7								
Uruguay	0,260	194,1	0,223	166,7	171,7	22,4	194,1								
Perú	0,410	306,1	0,443	330,4	340,3	-	340,3								
Chile	0,540	403,1	1,141	851,8	877,3	-	877,3								
Colombia	0,940	701,7	0,807	602,4	620,5	81,2	701,7								
Venezuela	3,200	2.388,9	2,692	2.009,8	2.070,1	318,8	2.388,9								
Argentina	4,900	3.658,0	4,282	3.196,5	3.292,4	365,6	3.658,0								
México	6,080	4.538,9	6,262	4.674,8	4.815,0	-	4.815,0								
Brasil	8,550	6.382,8	7,626	5.693,1	5.863,9	518,9	6.382,8								
Canada	12,360	9.227,1	13,761	10.273,2	10.581,4	-	10.581,4								
United States	59,470	44.396,0	59,470	44.396,0	45.727,9	-	45.727,9								
Sum	98,76	\$ 73.727,1	98,702	\$ 73.683,6	\$ 75.894,1	\$ 1.382,8	\$ 77.276,9								
Cuba	1,24	925,7	1,021	762,4	785,3	140,4	925,7								
Total	100,00	\$ 74.652,8	99,723	\$ 74.446,0	\$ 76.679,4	\$ 1.523,2	\$ 78.202,6								

* Although, according to the proposed transitional scale of quotas, the contribution amounts for Argentina, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Dominica, Grenada, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Saint Lucia, Suriname, Uruguay, and Venezuela have been reduced, these countries have decided to keep the nominal amounts of their current contributions to the Regular Fund unchanged in 2007 and 2008, as shown in this appendix. This was recognized by the member states, who expressed their gratitude.

AG/RES. 2257 (XXXVI-O/06)

PROGRAM-BUDGET OF THE ORGANIZATION FOR 2007,
QUOTAS AND CONTRIBUTIONS TO FEMCIDI FOR 2007

(Adopted at the fourth plenary session, held on June 6, 2006)



TABLE B
ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES
REGULAR FUND
QUOTA ASSESSMENT FOR 2007
(US\$)

Quotas for the Year						
Member States	Assessed Percentage	Assessed Quota	Over-Quota Commitments	Tax Reimbursement	(a) Credits	Total
Antigua and Barbuda	0,024%	18.500	0			18.500
Argentina	4,282%	3.292.400	365.600			3.658.000
Bahamas	0,084%	64.300 *	0		1.569	62.731
Barbados	0,080%	61.500	0	8.500 (c)		70.000
Belize	0,026%	20.000	2.400		672	21.728
Bolivia	0,060%	45.900	6.400			52.300
Brazil	7,626%	5.863.900	518.900			6.382.800
Canada	13,761%	10.581.400	0		207.610	10.373.790
Chile	1,141%	877.300	0		8.062	869.238
Colombia	0,807%	620.500	81.200		14.034	687.666
Costa Rica	0,150%	115.100	0			115.100
Dominica	0,017%	13.100	1.800			14.900
Dominican Republic	0,165%	126.900 **	7.500			134.400
Ecuador	0,165%	127.200 ***	7.200			134.400
El Salvador	0,084%	64.600	0			64.600
Grenada	0,022%	16.900	5.500			22.400
Guatemala	0,150%	115.100	0			115.100
Guyana	0,022%	16.900	0		298	16.602
Haiti	0,060%	45.900	6.400			52.300
Honduras	0,060%	45.900	6.400			52.300
Jamaica	0,163%	125.600	8.800			134.400
Mexico	6,262%	4.815.000	0			4.815.000
Nicaragua	0,060%	45.900	6.400			52.300
Panama	0,130%	100.100	0			100.100
Paraguay	0,165%	127.200 ***	7.200			134.400
Peru	0,443%	340.300	0			340.300
Saint Kitts and Nevis	0,022%	16.900	0		298	16.602
Saint Lucia	0,024%	18.500	3.900		672	21.728
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	0,022%	16.900	0			16.900
Suriname	0,060%	45.900	6.400			52.300
Trinidad and Tobago	0,180%	138.700	0			138.700
United States	59,470%	45.727.900	0	10.000.000 (c)		55.727.900
Uruguay	0,223%	171.700	22.400			194.100
Venezuela	2,692%	2.070.100	318.800			2.388.900
Subtotal	98,702%	75.894.000	1.383.200	10.008.500	233.215	87.052.485
Cuba (b)	1,0210%	785.300	140.400			925.700
TOTAL	99,723%	76.679.400	1.523.600	10.008.500	233.215	87.978.185

a. Represents 2% of 2005 quota assessment if full payment of 2006 quota was received by April 30, 2006, plus 3% of any payment received before January 31, 2006.

b. Shown only to establish the percentage corresponding to each member state.

c. The amount shown is estimated and may differ from the actual amount billed.

* Calculated on the basis of 0.083619, then rounded to the nearest hundred dollar.

** Calculated on the basis of 0.0165086, then rounded to the nearest hundred dollar.

*** Calculated on the basis of 0.0165402, then rounded to the nearest hundred dollar.

ARTICLE 23 OF THE CONVENTION ON THE INTER-AMERICAN
INSTITUTE FOR COOPERATION ON AGRICULTURE:
THE SYSTEM FOR ESTABLISHING MEMBER
STATE QUOTAS FOR THE INSTITUTE

I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

Article 23 of the Convention on the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (“IICA Convention” or “the Convention”) states:

Article 23. The Member States shall contribute to the maintenance of the Institute through annual quotas established by the Board, in accordance with the system for calculating quotas of the Organization of American States.

(Emphasis added). In recent discussions directed at improving the financial basis of the Institute, at least one delegation has questioned the meaning of the phrase “in accordance with the system for calculating quotas of the Organization of American States.” The Director General has thus requested a legal opinion on that question.

The question is not so simple as it may first appear. Does the phrase “in accordance with the system for calculating quotas of the Organization of American State” refer solely to the basic principles and process outlined in Article 55 of the OAS Charter – that is, a decision by at least two thirds of the OAS Member States at the OAS General Assembly, “taking into account the ability to pay of the respective countries and their determination to contribute in an equitable manner?” Or does that phrase refer to something more – like the specific methodology used by the OAS to compute the quotas based on those broad principles, or, maybe even the annual percentages for quota contributions approved by the General Assembly resulting from the application of that methodology? All of the above are plausible interpretations from the words of Article 23 without reference to the context under which it was adopted or how it has since been applied. But once those other elements are considered, the meaning becomes clearer.

It is our opinion that the phrase “in accordance with the system for calculating quotas of the Organization of American States” means using the percentages for quota contributions approved by the General Assembly, and adjusting them for differences in membership between the two Organizations, when they occur. We base this opinion on the provisions governing treaty interpretation set out in the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, taking into account the legislative context in which the IICA Convention was adopted; how Article 23 was applied when the IICA Convention entered into force; and how it has been applied since. The supporting factual and legal analysis follows below:

II. THE RELEVANT FACTS

1. Prior to the entry into force in December 1980 of the IICA Convention, IICA was known as the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences and it was governed by the 1944 Convention on the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences. Article IX of the 1944 Convention set out a method for fixing the annual quotas to be paid by Member States for the support of the Institute. It required adoption by a unanimous vote of the Institute’s members, fixed the maximum quota as no more than \$1.00 for every one thousand inhabitants, and

required that the quotas be based on population, taking into account the latest populations figures on file at the Pan American Union.

2. In December 1958, a protocol to the 1944 Convention amending Article IX and several other articles was opened for signature. In pertinent part, the new Article IX stated:

The Contracting States shall contribute to the maintenance of the Institute by means of annual quotas to be fixed by the Board of Directors on the same basis that is used for determining the quotas for the maintenance of the Pan American Union.

All the IICA Member States signed the protocol. Unlike the OAS Charter and many-other protocols of inter-American treaties, however this Protocol required ratification of all the state parties to the 1944 Convention as a precondition to entry into force. All but one, Chile, did ratify, and for that reason, it seems that the Protocol never entered into force.

3. Nonetheless, in 1962 IICA's then governing body, the Board of Directors, relying on a provision which would have allowed the Institute¹ upon the entry into force of the Protocol to apply Article IX retroactively and anticipating that Chile would eventually ratify it, voted unanimously to apply Article IX immediately. It declared:

As annual quotas, those corresponding to the scale of quotas of the Pan American Union are accepted, with the understanding that the budget for each fiscal year shall require the approval of two thirds of the members who represent contracting states;²

(Emphasis added). This resolution appears to have been, in part, in response to a condition established by Brazil in exchange for its agreement to ratify the Protocol. On depositing its instrument of ratification, Brazil stated:

Considering the opinion of the Brazilian Government, which was stated at the time of signing the international acts referred to, (Convention and Protocol), the present instrument of ratification will be deposited with the understanding that the Board of Directors of the Inter-American Institute of

¹ In pertinent part, Article X of the Protocol provided:

The new quota system established by Article VI of the present Protocol shall not begin to be applied until the first fiscal year commencing six months or more after the date on which all Member States of the Organization of American States have deposited their respective instruments of ratification or adherence, unless all the Contracting States agree, through their representatives on the Board of Directors, to initiate such quota system in a previous fiscal year and agree upon the manner of doing so.

By the vote of the Board of Directors, all the Contracting parties to the Convention so Agreed.

² See Doc. IICA/JD-282 (1962).

Agricultural Sciences, by Resolution of May 18, 1962, adopted a scale of annual contributions equal to that of the Pan American Union.³

(Emphasis added).

4. In 1969, the Board of Directors of the Institute adopted Resolutions IICA/JD-652, rev. 2 and IICA/JD-658-7 establishing that the maximum assessed quota for any Member State could not exceed 66% and establishing the methodology for adjusting the OAS quota scales for IICA so as to take into account that not all OAS Member States belonged to IICA and visa versa. Under this procedure, IICA began with the OAS Scale. It then eliminated from the scale those few OAS Members that were not IICA Members, and then added Canada and Guayana, two non-OAS Members. The percentage assessments for Guyana and Canada were computed from the UN Scale using the same data the OAS would have used had they been OAS Members. The resulting IICA scale was a scale in excess of 100%.

5. Beginning in the early 1970's, the IICA Member States initiated discussions over a new Convention for the Institute which culminated with the signing of the IICA Convention in 1979 and its entry into force in December 1980. The archives in IICA's files for those discussions do not indicate or suggest that the Member States, in their drafting of Article 23, wished to change the system for computing quotas that they had implemented under the 1962 and 1969 Board Decisions – that is, use of the OAS Quota Scale as a basis for establishing the IICA Scale.⁴

6. At its very first Meeting held in February 1981, the Inter-American Board of Agriculture ("IABA") adopted Resolution IICA/JIARes. 7 (E-O/81) which "ratif[ied] the resolutions adopted by the Board of Directors of the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences that do not contradict the 1979 Convention on the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture."

7. At its first Regular Meeting in August 1981, the IABA, citing Resolution IICA/JIA/Res. 7 and the earlier 1962 and 1969 decisions of the Board of Directors for establishing IICA's quota scales, adopted the first quota scale of the Institute governed by Article 23 of the Convention. In so doing, it followed the methodology used by the Board since 1969 – using the percentages on the OAS scale as the based, eliminating from the OAS scale those countries that were not IICA Members, and adding Canada and Guyana.⁵

8. When Canada entered the OAS in 1990, the OAS General Assembly, meeting in Paraguay, adjusted its quota scale so as to use the additional quota paid by Canada to reduce the maximum quota to 59.47%. It also adopted a minimum quota, and reduced the quotas of the other largest contributors. The percentages in the resulting 1991 OAS Quota Scale

³ See Table of Ratifications, OAS Treaty Series, [www.oas.org/juridico/english/sigs/c-12\(1\).html](http://www.oas.org/juridico/english/sigs/c-12(1).html).

⁴ Those Archives include Observations of the Member States on the proposed drafts of the new Convention, Reports of the Working Group charged with developing a draft text, Observations of the Director General, and Reports of the Permanent Committee of the Board charged with reviewing draft texts.

⁵ See IICA/JIA/Res. 3 (I-O/81).

remained virtually unchanged for the next sixteen years.⁶ At the time those adjustments were made, the OAS had not re-computed its scale with updated UN data since the late 1970s. And it did not use more recent UN data to adjust those percentages for the 1991 scale adopted in Paraguay.

9. In its first meeting following those adjustments to the OAS quota system, the IADB did not waiver from what prior Boards had done. That is, it equated the phrase “system for calculating quotas of the Organization of American States” with the OAS Quota Scale itself. It thus adopted an IICA quota scale for the 1992-93 biennium which was nothing more than the 1991 OAS quota scale adopted by the OAS General Assembly in 1990 in Paraguay, slightly adjusted to take into account that Belize and Bahamas were not yet IICA members. In so doing, it referenced Article 23 of the Convention, stating:⁷

That in compliance with Article 23 of the Convention of the Institute, the quota sale for the 1962-1993 biennium was prepared following the system for calculating the quotas of the Organization of American States (OAS), excluding the contribution of the Bahamas and Belize, which are Member States of the OAS but nor of IICA.

And the next time it met in 1993, the Board passed a virtually identical text in adopting the quota scale for the 1994-95 biennium.⁸

10. At its Thirty-First Special Session held on January 31, 2006, the OAS General Assembly voted for the first time in 16 years to adjust the OAS quota scale based on the most recent figures from the UN quota scales, which, in turn, are based, in part, on more contemporary data on gross national product and other data reflecting member-state capacity to pay. The OAS General Assembly made it clear that the new scale would apply for the 2007 and 2008 fiscal years, but that it expected to approve a more satisfactory scale for implementation in 2009, pending further study and recommendations from the OAS Permanent Council.

II. ANALYSIS

A. The 1969 Vienna Convention on Treaties Provides the Applicable Framework for Legal Analysis

The issue is: What is the meaning of the words “in accordance with the system for calculating quotas of the Organization of American States?” Does it mean using the percentages in the OAS quota scale? Or does it mean simply following the principles established in Article 55 of the OAS Charter – adopting by a two thirds vote of the member states a quota scale, “taking into account the ability to pay of the respective countries and their determination to contribute in an equitable manner?”

⁶ See Resolution AG/RES. 1073 (XX-O/90). The reduction of the maximum quota was not immediate, but was rather applied gradually. For example, in 1991, the maximum quota was lowered to 61.79%; the next year, 60.96%, and so on.

⁷ See IICA/JIA/Res.189 (VI-O/91),

⁸ See IICA/JIA/Res. 222 (VII-O/93).

Article 31 of the 1969 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (“the 1969 Vienna Convention”) provides the legal framework for interpreting the meaning of Article 23 of the IICA Convention, inasmuch as the IICA Convention is a treaty. The Article provides that a treaty should be interpreted in accordance with the intentions of the parties, as reflected in the plain or “ordinary” meaning of the words used within the appropriate context, taking into account as well the contemporaneous and subsequent practices and agreements of the parties on its application. More specifically, Article 31 states:

1. A treaty shall be interpreted in good faith in accordance with the ordinary meaning to be given to the terms of the treaty in their context and in light of its object and purpose.

2. The context for the purpose of the interpretation of a treaty shall comprise, in addition to the text, including its preamble and annexes (a) any agreement relating to the treaty which was made between all the parties in connexion with the conclusion of the treaty; (b) any instrument which was made by one or more parties in connexion with the conclusion of the treaty and accepted by the other parties as an instrument related to the treaty.

3. There shall be taken into account, together with the context: (a) any subsequent agreement between the parties regarding the interpretation of the treaty or the application of its provisions; (b) any subsequent practice in the application of the treaty which establishes the agreement of the parties regarding its interpretation; (c) any relevant rules of international law applicable in the relations between the parties.

4. A special meaning shall be given to a term if it is established that the parties so intended.

(Emphasis added).

B. The Ordinary Meaning of the Word “System.” When Placed in the Context of the Treaty Suggests that Article 23 Was Not Intended to Modify the Practice of Using OAS Quota Scales as the Basis for the IICA Quota

The “ordinary meaning” of the word “system” in English connotes both procedures and methods.⁹ Websters New Collegiate Dictionary defines it as “an organized established procedure,” synonymous with “method.” It defines the term “method” as “a procedure or process for attaining an object.”¹⁰

Spanish language dictionaries give a broader meaning to the word “system” so as to include not only procedures but rationally linked “principles” as well. The Royal Academy’s Dictionary of the Spanish Language¹¹ defines “systema” as “Conjunto de reglas o principios

⁹ Dictionaries are considered a reliable source for determining the ordinary meaning of words.

¹⁰ Websters New Collegiate Dictionary (Springfield 1977), at pp. 1181, 723.

¹¹ Real Academia Española, Diccionario de la Lengua Española (Madrid 1992), p1888.

sobre una material racionalmente enlazados entre si. Cabanellas' Dictionary-Encyclopedia of Usual Law defines it as endorses that same definition.¹²

Thus, without reference to the context and other factors mentioned in Article 31 of the 1969 Vienna Convention, the "ordinary meaning" of the word "system" is inconclusive for answering the questions raised. Under the English language definition, it could be construed to mean the procedure or method in force since 1962 of taking the OAS Quota Scale and adjusting it, when necessary, to reflect differences in the membership between IICA and OAS. But under the Spanish definition, it could mean simply the principles set forth in Article 55 of the OAS Charter as well.

Nonetheless, Article 31 of the 1969 Vienna Convention provides that the plain or "ordinary" meaning of the words alone is not always sufficient to determine the intent of the parties; but rather the words must be construed in the "context." The context includes, *inter alia*, the preamble, annexes, and agreements made between the parties "in connexion with the conclusion of the treaty."

There is nothing in the preamble of the IICA Convention which sheds light on Article 23; nor are there any annexes. There are, however, two resolutions of the Inter-American Board of Agriculture in its first meetings which suggest strongly the intention of the Member States to construe the concept "system used for calculating quotas of the Organization of American States" as meaning use of the percentages in the OAS Quota Scales as the basis for creating the IICA Quota Scales." The first, Resolution IICA/JIA/Res. 7 ((I-E/81) ratified the prior decisions of the pre-Convention IICA's Board of Directors. Those decisions included the 1962 and 1969 Board decisions approving the use of the OAS percentages, with adjustments for differences in membership, as the basis for the IICA quotas. The second was Resolution IICA/JIA/Res. 3 (I-O/81), by which the IICA Member states agreed to adopt the first quota scale for the new IICA, using the percentages from the OAS Scale. The State Parties to the IICA Convention, meeting in the Board, adopted those resolutions to facilitate the entry into force of the IICA Convention. Thus, they may be considered "agreements" and/or "instruments" adopted "in connexion" with the IICA Convention.

There is nothing in other documents contemporaneous to the entry into force of the IICA Convention and the negotiations that preceded its opening for signature that suggests that the Member States intended the words "in accordance with the system for computing the quotas of the Organization of American States" in Article 23 to refer solely to the principles set out in Article 55 of the Charter; nor is there any evidence in the legislative history of the negotiations that the State Parties intended to create an alternative scale under Article 23 using methods or figures other than those established in the OAS Scale, as adjusted for differences in membership. Rather the best evidence of the context is that provided by Resolutions IICa/JIA/Res. 7 (I-E/81) and IICA/JIA/Res. 3 (3-O/81), and it suggests that the reference to the "system" was the percentages from the OAS quota scale provided by the OAS to IICA.

¹² Guillermo Cabanellas, VII Diccionario Enciclopédico de Derecho Usual, 26th Ed. (Buenos Aires 1998), at p. 449.

C. Application and Subsequent Practice Also Strongly Suggest that “System” in Article 23 Means Use of the OAS Quota Scales

As already stated, the 1969 Vienna Convention further provides that subsequent “practices” adopted by the Parties and agreed upon by them shall also be taken into account with the context for the purposes of interpreting treaty provisions. Those practices, as embodied in the resolutions of the IABA approving the quota scales for the years following entry into force of the IICA Convention, reinforce the conclusion above that the intention of the Parties to the IICA Convention was to continue the system of using the OAS Quota Scales as the basis for the IICA scales, and that Article 23 should be interpreted consistently with that intent.

When in 1990 the OAS General Assembly altered those percentages to conform with its new policies adopted under Resolution AG/RES. 1073 (XX-O/90), the IABA followed suit when it met one year later. In Resolution IICA/JIA/Res. 189 (VI-O/91), it too, adjusted its scale to include the maximum quota and minimum quotas and to reflect the same percentages in the OAS scales for the 1992-93 Biennium, as adjusted for differences in membership. Meeting again in 1993, the IABA again adopted a quota scale based on the OAS percentages. The practice of using the OAS percentages has continued up until the present date.

III. CONCLUSION

In the years immediately prior to the entry into force of the IICA Convention, IICA, in accordance with decisions of the pre-Convention IICA's Board of Directors, adopted its quota scales using the percentages set out in the corresponding OAS Scales and adjusted them to reflect differences in membership. There is nothing in the legislative history of the Convention, nor in the wording of Article 23, nor in the resolutions adopted to facilitate its entry into force, that suggests that the Member States intended to depart from that system. To the contrary, the context in which Article 23 was adopted suggest that the Member States wished to retain it. And even when the OAS modified its system in 1990 to reflect more the level of the desire of the countries to contribute rather than their capacity to pay, IICA followed suit and continued using the OAS percentages, as adjusted for membership differences, for its quota scale. For those reasons, in accordance with the legal framework for interpreting treaties under Article 31 of the 1969 Vienna Convention, we conclude that the language of Article 23 “in accordance with the system used for calculating quotas of the Organization of American States” means, in the application, in accordance with the percentages computed by the OAS, as adjusted for differences in membership, if any.

William M. Berenson,
Legal Advisor to IICA
May 23, 2006

2008-2009 Program Budget
Quota Scale of the Member States

Based on the OAS Quota Scale for 2008¹. (US\$)

MEMBER STATES	2007		2008						2009			
	IICA		OAS	IICA			VARIATION		IICA		VARIATION	
	%	AMOUNT	%	%	AMOUNT	2008/2007		%	AMOUNT	2009/2008		
						AMOUNT	%			AMOUNT	%	
Antigua and Barbuda	0,02	5.502	0,024	0,024	6.587	1.086	19,7	0,024	6.587	0	0,0	
Argentina	4,90	1.347.925	4,282	4,282	1.175.315	(172.610)	(12,8)	4,282	1.175.315	0	0,0	
Bahamas	0,07	19.256	0,084	0,084	23.056	3.800	19,7	0,084	23.056	0	0,0	
Barbados	0,08	22.007	0,080	0,080	21.958	(49)	(0,2)	0,080	21.958	0	0,0	
Belize	0,03	8.253	0,026	0,026	7.136	(1.116)	(13,5)	0,026	7.136	0	0,0	
Bolivia	0,07	19.256	0,060	0,060	16.469	(2.787)	(14,5)	0,060	16.469	0	0,0	
Brazil	8,55	2.351.992	7,626	7,626	2.093.170	(258.822)	(11,0)	7,626	2.093.170	0	0,0	
Canada	12,36	3.400.073	13,761	13,761	3.777.094	377.021	11,1	13,761	3.777.094	0	0,0	
Chile	0,54	148.547	1,112	1,112	305.220	156.673	105,5	1,112	305.220	0	0,0	
Colombia	0,94	258.582	0,807	0,807	221.504	(37.078)	(14,3)	0,807	221.504	0	0,0	
Costa Rica	0,13	35.761	0,150	0,150	41.172	5.410	15,1	0,150	41.172	0	0,0	
Dominica	0,02	5.502	0,017	0,017	4.666	(836)	(15,2)	0,017	4.666	0	0,0	
Dominican Republic	0,18	49.516	0,165	0,165	45.289	(4.227)	(8,5)	0,165	45.289	0	0,0	
Ecuador	0,18	49.516	0,165	0,165	45.289	(4.227)	(8,5)	0,165	45.289	0	0,0	
El Salvador	0,07	19.256	0,084	0,084	23.056	3.800	19,7	0,084	23.056	0	0,0	
Grenada	0,03	8.253	0,022	0,022	6.039	(2.214)	(26,8)	0,022	6.039	0	0,0	
Guatemala	0,13	35.761	0,150	0,150	41.172	5.410	15,1	0,150	41.172	0	0,0	
Guyana	0,02	5.502	0,022	0,022	6.039	537	9,8	0,022	6.039	0	0,0	
Haiti	0,07	19.256	0,060	0,060	16.469	(2.787)	(14,5)	0,060	16.469	0	0,0	
Honduras	0,07	19.256	0,060	0,060	16.469	(2.787)	(14,5)	0,060	16.469	0	0,0	
Jamaica	0,18	49.516	0,163	0,163	44.740	(4.776)	(9,6)	0,163	44.740	0	0,0	
Mexico	6,08	1.672.528	6,513	6,513	1.787.676	115.148	6,9	6,513	1.787.676	0	0,0	
Nicaragua	0,07	19.256	0,060	0,060	16.469	(2.787)	(14,5)	0,060	16.469	0	0,0	
Panama	0,13	35.761	0,130	0,130	35.682	(79)	(0,2)	0,130	35.682	0	0,0	
Paraguay	0,18	49.516	0,165	0,165	45.289	(4.227)	(8,5)	0,165	45.289	0	0,0	
Peru	0,41	112.786	0,443	0,443	121.594	8.808	7,8	0,443	121.594	0	0,0	
Saint Kitts and Nevis	0,02	5.502	0,022	0,022	6.039	537	9,8	0,022	6.039	0	0,0	
Saint Lucia	0,03	8.253	0,024	0,024	6.587	(1.665)	(20,2)	0,024	6.587	0	0,0	
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	0,02	5.502	0,022	0,022	6.039	537	9,8	0,022	6.039	0	0,0	
Suriname	0,07	19.256	0,060	0,060	16.469	(2.787)	(14,5)	0,060	16.469	0	0,0	
Trinidad and Tobago	0,18	49.516	0,180	0,180	49.406	(110)	(0,2)	0,180	49.406	0	0,0	
United States of America	59,47	16.359.412	59,470	59,470	16.323.215	(36.197)	(0,2)	59,470	16.323.215	0	0,0	
Uruguay	0,26	71.523	0,223	0,223	61.209	(10.314)	(14,4)	0,223	61.209	0	0,0	
Venezuela	3,20	880.278	2,747	2,747	753.991	(126.286)	(14,3)	2,747	753.991	0	0,0	
SUB TOTAL	98,76	27.167.572	98,979	98,979	27.167.572	(0)	0,0	98,979	27.167.572	0	0,0	
Cuba	1,24		1,021	1,021				1,021				
TOTAL QUOTAS	100,00	27.167.572	100,000	100,000	27.167.572	0	0,0	100,000	27.167.572	0	0,0	

Note: The percentage for Cuba is not taken into consideration when calculating the Member State quotas.

1/ As per OAS General Assembly Resolution AG/RES. 1 (XXXI-E/06).

2008-2009 Program Budget
Quota Scale of the Member States

Based on the OAS Quota Scale for 2008, with an annual increase of 3% ¹. (US\$)

MEMBER STATES	2007		2008					2009			
	IICA		OAS	IICA			IICA				
	%	AMOUNT	%	%	AMOUNT	VARIATION		%	AMOUNT	VARIATION	
						2008/2007				2009/2008	
					AMOUNT	%			AMOUNT	%	
Antigua and Barbuda	0,02	5.502	0,024	0,024	6.785	1.283	23,3	0,024	6.989	204	3,0
Argentina	4,90	1.347.925	4,282	4,282	1.210.575	(137.350)	(10,2)	4,282	1.246.892	36.317	3,0
Bahamas	0,07	19.256	0,084	0,084	23.748	4.492	23,3	0,084	24.460	712	3,0
Barbados	0,08	22.007	0,080	0,080	22.617	610	2,8	0,080	23.296	679	3,0
Belize	0,03	8.253	0,026	0,026	7.351	(902)	(10,9)	0,026	7.571	221	3,0
Bolivia	0,07	19.256	0,060	0,060	16.963	(2.293)	(11,9)	0,060	17.472	509	3,0
Brazil	8,55	2.351.992	7,626	7,626	2.155.965	(196.027)	(8,3)	7,626	2.220.644	64.679	3,0
Canada	12,36	3.400.073	13,761	13,761	3.890.407	490.334	14,4	13,761	4.007.119	116.712	3,0
Chile	0,54	148.547	1,112	1,112	314.376	165.829	111,6	1,112	323.808	9.431	3,0
Colombia	0,94	258.582	0,807	0,807	228.149	(30.433)	(11,8)	0,807	234.993	6.844	3,0
Costa Rica	0,13	35.761	0,150	0,150	42.407	6.646	18,6	0,150	43.679	1.272	3,0
Dominica	0,02	5.502	0,017	0,017	4.806	(696)	(12,6)	0,017	4.950	144	3,0
Dominican Republic	0,18	49.516	0,165	0,165	46.648	(2.868)	(5,8)	0,165	48.047	1.399	3,0
Ecuador	0,18	49.516	0,165	0,165	46.648	(2.868)	(5,8)	0,165	48.047	1.399	3,0
El Salvador	0,07	19.256	0,084	0,084	23.748	4.492	23,3	0,084	24.460	712	3,0
Grenada	0,03	8.253	0,022	0,022	6.220	(2.033)	(24,6)	0,022	6.406	187	3,0
Guatemala	0,13	35.761	0,150	0,150	42.407	6.646	18,6	0,150	43.679	1.272	3,0
Guyana	0,02	5.502	0,022	0,022	6.220	718	13,0	0,022	6.406	187	3,0
Haiti	0,07	19.256	0,060	0,060	16.963	(2.293)	(11,9)	0,060	17.472	509	3,0
Honduras	0,07	19.256	0,060	0,060	16.963	(2.293)	(11,9)	0,060	17.472	509	3,0
Jamaica	0,18	49.516	0,163	0,163	46.082	(3.433)	(6,9)	0,163	47.465	1.382	3,0
Mexico	6,08	1.672.528	6,513	6,513	1.841.306	168.779	10,1	6,513	1.896.546	55.239	3,0
Nicaragua	0,07	19.256	0,060	0,060	16.963	(2.293)	(11,9)	0,060	17.472	509	3,0
Panama	0,13	35.761	0,130	0,130	36.753	991	2,8	0,130	37.855	1.103	3,0
Paraguay	0,18	49.516	0,165	0,165	46.648	(2.868)	(5,8)	0,165	48.047	1.399	3,0
Peru	0,41	112.786	0,443	0,443	125.242	12.456	11,0	0,443	128.999	3.757	3,0
Saint Kitts and Nevis	0,02	5.502	0,022	0,022	6.220	718	13,0	0,022	6.406	187	3,0
Saint Lucia	0,03	8.253	0,024	0,024	6.785	(1.468)	(17,8)	0,024	6.989	204	3,0
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	0,02	5.502	0,022	0,022	6.220	718	13,0	0,022	6.406	187	3,0
Suriname	0,07	19.256	0,060	0,060	16.963	(2.293)	(11,9)	0,060	17.472	509	3,0
Trinidad and Tobago	0,18	49.516	0,180	0,180	50.888	1.373	2,8	0,180	52.415	1.527	3,0
United States of America	59,47	16.359.412	59,470	59,470	16.812.912	453.500	2,8	59,470	17.317.299	504.387	3,0
Uruguay	0,26	71.523	0,223	0,223	63.045	(8.478)	(11,9)	0,223	64.936	1.891	3,0
Venezuela	3,20	880.278	2,747	2,747	776.611	(103.667)	(11,8)	2,747	799.910	23.298	3,0
SUB TOTAL	98,76	27.167.572	98,979	98,979	27.982.599	815.027	3,0	98,979	28.822.077	839.478	3,0
Cuba	1,24		1,021	1,021				1,021			
TOTAL QUOTAS	100,00	27.167.572	100,000	100,000	27.982.599	815.027	3,0	100,000	28.822.077	839.478	3,0

Note: The percentage for Cuba is not taken into consideration when calculating the Member State quotas.

1/ As per OAS General Assembly Resolutions AG/RES. 1 (XXXI-E/06) and AG/RES. 2257 (XXXVI-O/06).

2008-2009 Program Budget
Quota Scale of the Member States

Based on the OAS Quota Scale for 2008¹, with additional contributions from the Member States whose percentage share of the Quota Scale is reduced¹. (US\$)

MEMBER STATES	2007		2008						2009				
	IICA		OAS	IICA				IICA					
	%	AMOUNT	%	%	ASSESSED QUOTA	OVER-QUOTA CONTRIBUTION	TOTAL CONTRIBUTION	VARIATION 2008/2007	%	ASSESSED QUOTA	OVER-QUOTA CONTRIBUTION	TOTAL CONTRIBUTION	VARIATION 2009/2008
Antigua and Barbuda	0,02	5.502	0,024	0,024	6.587	-	6.587	19,7%	0,024	6.587	0	6.587	0,0%
Argentina	4,90	1.347.925	4,282	4,282	1.175.315	172.610	1.347.925	0,0%	4,282	1.175.315	172.610	1.347.925	0,0%
Bahamas	0,07	19.256	0,084	0,084	23.056	-	23.056	19,7%	0,084	23.056	0	23.056	0,0%
Barbados	0,08	22.007	0,080	0,080	21.958	49	22.007	0,0%	0,080	21.958	49	22.007	0,0%
Belize	0,03	8.253	0,026	0,026	7.136	1.116	8.253	0,0%	0,026	7.136	1.116	8.253	0,0%
Bolivia	0,07	19.256	0,060	0,060	16.469	2.787	19.256	0,0%	0,060	16.469	2.787	19.256	0,0%
Brazil	8,55	2.351.992	7,626	7,626	2.093.170	258.822	2.351.992	0,0%	7,626	2.093.170	258.822	2.351.992	0,0%
Canada	12,36	3.400.073	13,761	13,761	3.777.094	-	3.777.094	11,1%	13,761	3.777.094	0	3.777.094	0,0%
Chile	0,54	148.547	1,112	1,112	305.220	-	305.220	105,5%	1,112	305.220	0	305.220	0,0%
Colombia	0,94	258.582	0,807	0,807	221.504	37.078	258.582	0,0%	0,807	221.504	37.078	258.582	0,0%
Costa Rica	0,13	35.761	0,150	0,150	41.172	-	41.172	15,1%	0,150	41.172	0	41.172	0,0%
Dominica	0,02	5.502	0,017	0,017	4.666	836	5.502	0,0%	0,017	4.666	836	5.502	0,0%
Dominican Republic	0,18	49.516	0,165	0,165	45.289	4.227	49.516	0,0%	0,165	45.289	4.227	49.516	0,0%
Ecuador	0,18	49.516	0,165	0,165	45.289	4.227	49.516	0,0%	0,165	45.289	4.227	49.516	0,0%
El Salvador	0,07	19.256	0,084	0,084	23.056	-	23.056	19,7%	0,084	23.056	0	23.056	0,0%
Grenada	0,03	8.253	0,022	0,022	6.039	2.214	8.253	0,0%	0,022	6.039	2.214	8.253	0,0%
Guatemala	0,13	35.761	0,150	0,150	41.172	-	41.172	15,1%	0,150	41.172	0	41.172	0,0%
Guyana	0,02	5.502	0,022	0,022	6.039	-	6.039	9,8%	0,022	6.039	0	6.039	0,0%
Haiti	0,07	19.256	0,060	0,060	16.469	2.787	19.256	0,0%	0,060	16.469	2.787	19.256	0,0%
Honduras	0,07	19.256	0,060	0,060	16.469	2.787	19.256	0,0%	0,060	16.469	2.787	19.256	0,0%
Jamaica	0,18	49.516	0,163	0,163	44.740	4.776	49.516	0,0%	0,163	44.740	4.776	49.516	0,0%
Mexico	6,08	1.672.528	6,513	6,513	1.787.676	-	1.787.676	6,9%	6,513	1.787.676	0	1.787.676	0,0%
Nicaragua	0,07	19.256	0,060	0,060	16.469	2.787	19.256	0,0%	0,060	16.469	2.787	19.256	0,0%
Panama	0,13	35.761	0,130	0,130	35.682	79	35.761	0,0%	0,130	35.682	79	35.761	0,0%
Paraguay	0,18	49.516	0,165	0,165	45.289	4.227	49.516	0,0%	0,165	45.289	4.227	49.516	0,0%
Peru	0,41	112.786	0,443	0,443	121.594	-	121.594	7,8%	0,443	121.594	0	121.594	0,0%
Saint Kitts and Nevis	0,02	5.502	0,022	0,022	6.039	-	6.039	9,8%	0,022	6.039	0	6.039	0,0%
Saint Lucia	0,03	8.253	0,024	0,024	6.587	1.665	8.253	0,0%	0,024	6.587	1.665	8.253	0,0%
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	0,02	5.502	0,022	0,022	6.039	-	6.039	9,8%	0,022	6.039	0	6.039	0,0%
Suriname	0,07	19.256	0,060	0,060	16.469	2.787	19.256	0,0%	0,060	16.469	2.787	19.256	0,0%
Trinidad and Tobago	0,18	49.516	0,180	0,180	49.406	110	49.516	0,0%	0,180	49.406	110	49.516	0,0%
United States of America	59,47	16.359.412	59,470	59,470	16.323.215	36.197	16.359.412	0,0%	59,470	16.323.215	36.197	16.359.412	0,0%
Uruguay	0,26	71.523	0,223	0,223	61.209	10.314	71.523	0,0%	0,223	61.209	10.314	71.523	0,0%
Venezuela	3,20	880.278	2,747	2,747	753.991	126.286	880.278	0,0%	2,747	753.991	126.286	880.278	0,0%
SUB TOTAL	98,76	27.167.572	98,979	98,979	27.167.572	678.768	27.846.340	2,5%	98,979	27.167.572	678.768	27.846.340	0,0%
Cuba	1,24		1,021	1,021					1,021				
TOTAL QUOTAS	100,00	27.167.572	100,000	100,000	27.167.572	678.768	27.846.340	2,5%	100,000	27.167.572	678.768	27.846.340	0,0%

Note: The percentage for Cuba is not taken into consideration when calculating the Member State quotas.

1/ As per OAS General Assembly Resolution AG/RES. 1 (XXXI-E/06).