

IV—GENERAL ASSEMBLY—IMPORTANT VOTES AND CONSENSUS ACTIONS

Public Law 101-246 calls for analysis and discussion of “votes on issues which directly affected United States interests and on which the United States lobbied extensively.” An important basis for identifying issues is their consistency with the State Department’s Strategic Goals. For the 61st UN General Assembly (UNGA) in 2006, 13 votes and 11 consensus resolutions were identified for inclusion in this section.

Section IV contains five parts: (1) a listing and description of the 13 important votes at the 61st UNGA; (2) a listing and description of the 11 important consensus resolutions at the 61st UNGA; (3) voting coincidence percentages with the United States on these important actions that were adopted by votes, arranged both alphabetically by country and in rank order of agreed votes; (4) voting coincidence percentages by UN regional groups and other important groups; and (5) a comparison of voting coincidence percentages on important votes with those on overall votes from Section III. An additional column in the tables of important votes (parts three and four above) presents the percentage of voting coincidence with the United States after including the 11 important consensus resolutions as additional identical votes. Since not all states are equally active at the United Nations, these coincidence percentages were refined to reflect a country’s rate of participation in all UN voting overall. The participation rate was calculated by dividing the number of Yes-No-Abstain votes cast by a UN member in Plenary (i.e., the number of times it was not absent) by the total number of Plenary votes (108).

IMPORTANT VOTES

The following 13 important votes are identified by a short title, document number, date of vote, and results (Yes-No-Abstain), with the U.S. vote noted. For each vote, a summary of the resolution or decision is provided (“General Assembly” is the subject of the verbs in the first paragraph), followed by background on the resolution and an explanation of the U.S. position. The resolutions/decisions are listed in order by the date adopted, and then in numerical order.

1. U.S. Embargo Against Cuba

A/Res/61/11 November 8 183-4(US)-1

Calls upon all states to refrain from promulgating and applying laws and measures such as the “Helms-Burton Act,” whose extra-territorial consequences allegedly affect the sovereignty of other states and the legitimate interests of entities or persons under their jurisdiction and the freedom of trade and navigation. Urges states to repeal such laws.

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2006

Background: In 1960, the United States imposed a trade and financial transaction embargo on Cuba because of Castro's repressive policies and expropriation of U.S. property without compensation. The United States strengthened the embargo in 1962, 1992, and 1996. The General Assembly has adopted a resolution condemning this embargo since 1992.

Prior to taking action on the text, Australia's delegate submitted a first-ever amendment which would have added an operative paragraph noting that such laws and measures "were motivated by valid concerns about the continued lack of democracy and political freedom in Cuba" and calling on the Cuban Government to release, unconditionally, all political prisoners, cooperate fully with international human rights bodies, respect the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and comply fully with its obligations under all human rights treaties to which it is a party. Cuba presented a no-action motion to suppress the amendment, which was adopted by a vote of 126 to 51 (U.S. and members of the European Union, among others), with five abstentions (Kiribati, Liechtenstein, Samoa, Switzerland, and Tonga).

U.S. Position: The United States again voted against this resolution, emphasizing that the trade embargo is a bilateral issue that is not an appropriate subject for UN consideration. This resolution constituted an attempt by Cuba to divert attention from its government's failings. The measures imposed by the United States do not constitute a blockade, as the embargo does not affect Cuba's trade with other nations. Cuba remains free to trade with any other country in the world, and indeed does so. Moreover, U.S. law permits the sale of food and medicine. Israel, the Marshall Islands, and Palau also voted No; Micronesia abstained.

2. Situation of Human Rights in Uzbekistan (Third Committee vote)

Defeated by November 20 74-69(US)-24
no-action motion

Expresses its grave concern at the serious and continuing human rights violations occurring in Uzbekistan, in particular the following: credible eyewitness reports in 2005 of indiscriminate and disproportionate force used by government troops to quell demonstrations in Andijan; detention of the representatives of local nongovernmental organizations; harassment and detention of the members of nongovernmental organizations and civil society; reports of arbitrary arrest and detention; prevention of the functioning of independent media and the intolerance of any form of dissent expressed therein and increasing restrictions on freedom of expression; continued refusal to permit the registration of opposition political parties, and their consequent inability to participate in the electoral process; an increasing pattern of discrimination, harassment, and prosecution with regard to exercise of freedom of thought, conscience, and religion; continued restriction of access of

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

international monitors to places of detention; committing human rights activists to psychiatric wards and forcing them to take behavior-modification medications; and reports of the use of forced labor, including of children.

Deeply regrets the decision of the Government of Uzbekistan to reject both the repeated calls of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights for an independent commission of inquiry into the events in Andijan on May 13, 2005, and the requests of the special rapporteurs of the Human Rights Council; and the continued lack of response to General Assembly Resolution 60/174.

Strongly calls upon the Government of Uzbekistan to implement fully without any delay the recommendations of the report of the mission of the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights to Kyrgyzstan in June 2005; end the harassment and detention of journalists and members of civil society; ensure fair trials; ensure full respect for all human rights and fundamental freedoms; amend legislation on religious organizations to permit the full freedom of thought, conscience, and religion; work closely with the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights and cooperate fully with UN human rights mechanisms; register independent opposition political parties and allow them to participate in the electoral process; lift restrictions on the activities of civil society; protect freedom of expression for all; take legislative, judicial, administrative, and other appropriate measures to actively protect human rights defenders against any violence, threats, and other forms of harassment, and withdraw all measures that restrict their freedom of assembly and expression or that hinder them from carrying out their legitimate activities; and follow all recommendations and provide regular information under International Labor Organization (ILO) Convention No. 29 concerning Forced or Compulsory Labor and ILO Convention No. 105 concerning the Abolition of Forced Labor, and consider ratifying ILO Convention No. 182 concerning the Prohibition and Immediate Action for the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labor.

Background: On May 12–14, 2005, at least 176 men, women, and children (and reportedly hundreds more) died in the eastern city of Andijan, when Uzbek troops responded to mass demonstrations with gunfire. In May, the High Commissioner for Human Rights decided to send a mission to Kyrgyzstan, where many of the persons caught up in the violence in Andijan fled, to investigate the causes and circumstances of these incidents. On February 1, 2006, the mission reported on its findings and recommended the establishment of an international commission of inquiry.

The Secretary-General reported on October 18 that the lack of response from the Government of Uzbekistan to the call for this commission to examine the facts and circumstances of the Andijan events, coupled with the persistent allegations of serious human rights violations, demonstrated that there had been no improvement in the situation of human rights in Uzbekistan

U.S. Position: The United States cosponsored this resolution and was deeply disappointed that the resolution was defeated in a no-action motion that kept members from considering the substance of this resolution. The citizens of Uzbekistan do not enjoy the basic freedoms of expression, association, and peaceful assembly, among other things. The United States believes that it is the responsibility of UN member states to speak out for the citizens of these countries and against the violations of their human rights, and human rights resolutions should get a substantive vote.

since the adoption of General Assembly Resolution 60/174 in 2005. He was particularly concerned about the deteriorating situation of human rights defenders and the increased restrictions on the activities of civil society, including nongovernmental organizations.

U.S. Position: The United States cosponsored this resolution and was deeply disappointed that the resolution was defeated in a no-action motion that kept members from considering the substance of this resolution. The citizens of Uzbekistan do not enjoy the basic freedoms of expression, association, and peaceful assembly, among other things. The United States believes that it is the responsibility of UN member states to speak out for the citizens of these countries and against the violations of their human rights, and human rights resolutions should get a substantive vote.

3. Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People

A/Res/61/22

December 1

101-7(US)-62

Requests the Committee to continue to exert all efforts to promote the realization of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, to support the Middle East peace process, and to mobilize international support for and assistance to the Palestinian people. Authorizes the Committee to make such adjustments in its approved program of work as it may consider appropriate and necessary in the light of developments and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its 62nd session and thereafter.

Background: In 1975, the General Assembly established the Committee by Resolution 3376 and renews its support of the Committee annually.

U.S. Position: The United States believes that the continuation of this Committee that embodies institutional discrimination against Israel is inconsistent with UN support for the efforts of the Quartet to achieve a just and durable solution of democratic Israeli and Palestinian states living in peace. (The Quartet is a group comprised of the United States, the United Nations, the European Union, and Russia.) The activities of this committee continue to promulgate actively a one-sided view of Palestinian-Israeli issues and do not contribute constructively to efforts to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The United States believes this Committee should be abolished and actively lobbies other countries to withdraw their support for the annual resolution renewing the Committee's mandate.

4. Division for Palestinian Rights of the Secretariat

A/Res/61/23

December 1

101-7(US)-62

Requests the Secretary-General to continue to provide the Division with the necessary resources and to ensure that it continues to carry out its

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

program of work as detailed in relevant earlier resolutions, in consultation with the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and under its guidance. Requests the Secretary-General to ensure the continued cooperation of the Department of Public Information and other units of the Secretariat in enabling the Division to perform its tasks. Also requests the Committee on Palestinian Rights and the Division to continue to organize an annual exhibit on Palestinian rights or a cultural event, in observance of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People.

Background: The General Assembly established the Division for Palestinian Rights by Resolution 32/40 in 1977.

U.S. Position: The United States believes that the continuation of the Division, which embodies institutional discrimination against Israel, is inconsistent with UN support for the efforts of the Quartet to achieve a just and durable solution of democratic Israeli and Palestinian states living in peace. The activities of this Division continue to promulgate actively a one-sided view of Palestinian-Israeli issues and do not contribute constructively to efforts to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The United States believes this Division should be abolished and actively lobbies other countries to withdraw their support for the annual resolution renewing the division's mandate.

5. The Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons

A/Res/61/66

December 6 176-1(US)-0

Encourages all initiatives for the successful implementation of the Program of Action to Prevent, Combat, and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, and calls upon all member states to contribute towards the continued implementation of the Program of Action. Regrets the fact that the UN Conference to Review Progress Made in the Implementation of the Program of Action was not able to conclude an outcome document. Decides that, as stipulated in the Program of Action, the next biennial meeting of states to consider the national, regional, and global implementation of the Program of Action shall be held no later than in 2008, in New York. Encourages states to submit national reports on their implementation of the Program of Action.

Background: In 2001, member states at the UN Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects approved a Program of Action outlining steps states needed at the national, regional, and global level to stop the illicit trade of small arms and light weapons. The Review Conference convened in the summer of 2006 to review progress made in the implementation of the plan. Unfortunately, the conference was unable to agree to a substantive report due to disagreements over such issues as follow-on work, the link between disarmament and development, and transfers

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2006

to non-state actors. The sponsors of the resolution sought to continue the fight on follow-on work at the UN First Committee, and the United States was forced to vote against the resolution due to its call for such work.

U.S. Position: The United States strongly supported efforts to combat illicit trafficking in small arms and light weapons, and was one of the few nations that met its obligation to the Program of Action through implementation and international assistance. However, the United States did not support the idea of mandatory review conferences or meetings such as the Biennial Meeting of States, as they have not produced tangible results; therefore, the United States refused to commit to another review conference. The United States believed that the task of a review conference should be to determine what activities have effectively contributed to the effort, and what activities have failed to do so.

6. Towards an Arms Trade Treaty

A/Res/61/89

December 6

153-1(US)-24

Requests the Secretary-General to seek the views of member states on and to establish a group of governmental experts, on the basis of equitable geographical distribution, to examine, commencing in 2008, the feasibility, scope, and draft parameters for a comprehensive, legally binding instrument establishing common international standards for the import, export, and transfer of conventional arms.

Background: Tapping into more than 20 years of General Assembly debate on resolutions related to transparency in armaments, the illicit trade in small arms, and practical disarmament measures, the United Kingdom proposed an Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) to stem illicit trade in arms, which it saw as a threat to international security and regional stability. Since August 2006, when the United Kingdom announced its intention to introduce a resolution at the General Assembly to convene a UN Group of Governmental Experts to study the feasibility and scope of negotiating an ATT, the United Kingdom obtained support from numerous other countries and nongovernmental organizations.

In this resolution, the General Assembly recognized that the absence of common international standards on the import, export, and transfer of conventional arms is a contributory factor to conflict, the displacement of people, crime, and terrorism. It decided to draft a comprehensive, legally binding instrument to establish these common standards.

U.S. Position: The United States believes in the importance of reducing sales of illicit arms worldwide and has been a leader in promoting arms transfer responsibility and pressing other arms exporters to adopt more stringent export control regimes. While agreeing with the goal of reducing illicit and irresponsible arms transfers, the United States opposed the

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

resolution because the United States did not believe the ATT would accomplish that goal. Nations agreed that an ATT would require the support of all major arms suppliers to be effective. The United States believed that some major arms exporters would refuse to sign an ATT that required meaningful, effective conventional arms transfer controls policies. Therefore, the only way to ensure all major arms exporters would sign on to the ATT would be to weaken its provisions. Concluding a weak ATT would not address the problem of illicit arms transfers and would legitimize an international standard based on a lowest common denominator.

7. Work of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Palestinian People and Other Arabs of the Occupied Territories

A/Res/61/116

December 14 90-9(US)-81

Commends the efforts of the Special Committee in performing the tasks assigned to it by the General Assembly. Deplores those policies and practices of Israel that violate the human rights of the Palestinian people and other Arabs of the occupied territories, expresses grave concern about the situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and requests the Special Committee to continue to investigate Israeli policies and practices.

Requests the Secretary-General to provide the Special Committee with all necessary facilities and to continue to make available such staff as may be necessary so that the Special Committee may continue its work.

Background: The General Assembly established the Special Committee by Resolution 2443 in 1968.

U.S. Position: The United States believes that the continuation of this Committee that embodies institutional discrimination against Israel is inconsistent with UN support for the efforts of the Quartet to achieve a just and durable solution of democratic Israeli and Palestinian states living in peace. The activities of this Committee continue to promulgate actively a one-sided view of Palestinian-Israeli issues and do not contribute constructively to efforts to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The United States believes this Committee should be abolished and actively lobbies other countries to withdraw their support for the annual resolution that renews the Committee's mandate.

8. Combating Defamation of Religions

A/Res/61/164

December 19 111-54(US)-18

Expresses deep concern about the negative stereotyping of religions and manifestations of intolerance and discrimination in matters of religion or

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2006

belief still in evidence in some regions of the world. Notes with deep concern the intensification of the campaign of defamation of religions and the ethnic and religious profiling of Muslim minorities in the aftermath of the tragic events of September 11, 2001. Expresses its deep concern that Islam is frequently and wrongly associated with human rights violations and terrorism.

Deplores the use of the print, audio-visual, and electronic media, including the Internet, and any other means to incite acts of violence, xenophobia, or related intolerance and discrimination against Islam or any other religion. Stresses the need to effectively combat defamation of all religions, Islam and Muslims in particular, especially in human rights forums. Urges states to take resolute action to prohibit the dissemination of racist and xenophobic ideas and material aimed at any religion or its followers that constitute incitement to discrimination, hostility, or violence. Calls upon the international community to initiate a global dialogue to promote a culture of tolerance and peace based on respect for human rights and religious diversity, and urges states, nongovernmental organizations, religious bodies, and the print and electronic media to support and promote such a dialogue.

Background: In 2005, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to submit a report on the implementation of combating defamation of religions. In response to that request, the Secretary-General submitted a report in September 2006 referring to the contents of reports relevant to the theme of defamation of religions and the promotion of tolerance for all religions and their value systems. The Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia, and related intolerance submitted a report on the situation of Muslims and Arab peoples in various parts of the world, and the Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief submitted a report setting out the activities that have been carried out to monitor and encourage compliance with the provisions of the Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief. This resolution refers to the Secretary-General's report, which concluded that continuous reporting on allegations of incidents involving intolerance and discrimination on the grounds of religion or belief indicated that much more needed to be done. This resolution calls attention to the situation of Muslims and combating defamation of Islam in particular.

U.S. Position: Religious freedom is a principal cornerstone for the United States. Immigrants settled in the United States seeking freedom from religious discrimination; freedom to practice religion is protected in the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution. The United States believes that laws prohibiting religious discrimination can have the effect of reducing or eliminating other fears that divide people along ethnic, racial, and national lines. However, by drawing attention to only one religion, the United States believed that this resolution performed a disservice to the whole concept of religious tolerance and pluralism, and it failed to take sufficient account of

freedom of expression short of that inciting violence. Hence, the United States voted against it.

9. Situation of Human Rights in North Korea

A/Res/61/174

December 19 99(US)-21-56

Expresses its very serious concern at the continued refusal of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) to recognize the mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the DPRK or to extend cooperation to him, and at continuing reports of systemic, widespread, and grave violations of human rights in the DPRK, including the following: torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment, public executions, extrajudicial and arbitrary detention, the absence of due process and the rule of law, and the imposition of the death penalty for political reasons; the situation of refugees expelled or returned to the DPRK and sanctions imposed on citizens of the DPRK who have been repatriated from abroad; all-pervasive and severe restrictions on the freedoms of thought, conscience, religion, opinion, and expression, and limitations imposed on every person who wishes to move freely within the country and travel abroad; continuing violation of the human rights and fundamental freedoms of women; unresolved questions of international concern relating to the abduction of foreigners in the form of an enforced disappearance; the violations of economic, social, and cultural rights, which have led to the severe malnutrition and hardship of the population in the DPRK; and continuing reports of violations of the human rights and fundamental freedoms of persons with disabilities.

Expresses its strong concern that the Government of the DPRK has not engaged in technical cooperation activities with the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights and her Office, despite efforts by the High Commissioner to engage in a dialogue with the authorities of the DPRK.

Expresses its very deep concern at the precarious humanitarian situation in the country, compounded by the mismanagement on the part of the authorities. Strongly urges the Government of the DPRK to respect fully all human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Background: The UN Commission on Human Rights established the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the DPRK in 2004; the Human Rights Council extended the Rapporteur's mandate in 2005. His September 2006 report on the situation of human rights in the DPRK raised specific concerns including women's rights, particularly violence against women; child rights; the rights of older persons; the rights of those with disabilities; and the treatment of minorities. The report also noted the missile tests launched by the DPRK in July, which influenced contributors of humanitarian aid destined for the DPRK to reconsider that aid.

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2006

U.S. Position: The United States cosponsored this European Union-sponsored resolution. The United States believed that this resolution demonstrated the international community's concern over the human rights situation in the DPRK and the desire to hold the government accountable for its human rights abuses and to improve the situation of human rights in the DPRK.

10. Situation of Human Rights in Belarus

A/Res/61/175

December 19 72(US)-32-69

Expresses deep concern about the failure of the Government of Belarus to cooperate fully with all the mechanisms of the Human Rights Council, while noting the serious concern relating to the deterioration of the human rights situation in Belarus expressed by seven independent UN human rights experts; that in spite of detailed recommendations by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and dialogue between the government and the OSCE following previous elections, Belarus again failed to meet its commitments to hold free and fair elections; about the continuing and expanding criminal prosecutions, lack of due process, and closed political trials of leading opposition figures and human rights defenders; about the continuing harassment and detention of Belarusian journalists covering local opposition demonstrations, and that senior officials of the government were implicated in the enforced disappearance and/or summary execution of three political opponents of the incumbent authorities in 1999 and of a journalist in 2000, and in the continuing investigatory cover-up; and about persistent reports of harassment and closure of nongovernmental organizations, national minority organizations, independent media outlets, religious groups, opposition political parties and independent trade unions, and independent youth and student organizations, and the harassment and prosecutions of individuals, including students engaged in the promotion and protection of human rights, rule of law, and democracy.

Urges the Government of Belarus to bring the electoral process and legislative framework into line with international standards and demonstrate such commitment through the upcoming local elections in January 2007; respect the rights to freedom of speech, assembly, and association and release immediately all political prisoners and other individuals detained for exercising these rights; suspend from their duties officials implicated in any case of enforced disappearance, summary execution, and torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment, pending investigation of those cases; and investigate and hold accountable those responsible for the mistreatment, arbitrary arrest, and incarceration of civic and political activists leading up to and following the presidential elections of March 2006 and release immediately and unconditionally all political prisoners.

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

Insists that the Government of Belarus cooperate fully with all the mechanisms of the Human Rights Council.

Background: The situation of human rights in Belarus has been deteriorating since 2003, when the UN Commission on Human Rights adopted its first resolution on human rights in Belarus. Belarus held a presidential election on March 19, 2006. There were reports that the government routinely and arbitrarily harassed, detained, and arrested opposition candidates and political and civil society activists. Also, the vote count lacked minimum transparency.

In the Third Committee, Russia put forward a no-action motion to discontinue consideration of this resolution. It was defeated by a vote of 67 to 75(US), with 31 abstentions. Belarus submitted a resolution, Situation of Democracy and Human Rights in the United States of America, that was defeated by a vote of 6 to 114(US), with 45 abstentions. Belarus, Burma, Cuba, Iran, North Korea, and Syria voted “yes” on that resolution.

U.S. Position: The situation in Belarus continued to deteriorate, more so after the fraudulent 2006 presidential elections. Citizens were under constant threat of detention, arrest, and persecution for expressing their political views, or exercising their freedom of religion and assembly; minority groups continued to not be recognized; and civil society and pro-democracy organizations suffered unabated repression. The United States sponsored this resolution to keep world pressure and attention focused on a regime that violated its citizens’ human rights. The resolution also provided vital moral support to the Belarusian people, while upholding the values proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

11. Situation of Human Rights in Iran

A/Res/61/176

December 19 72(US)-50-55

Expresses its serious concern at Iran’s continuing harassment, intimidation, and persecution of human rights defenders, nongovernmental organizations, political opponents, religious dissenters, political reformists, journalists, parliamentarians, students, clerics, academics, webloggers, union members, and labor organizers; Iran’s persistent failure to comply fully with international standards in the administration of justice; the continuing use of torture and cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment such as flogging and amputations; the continuing of public executions; the continuing violence and discrimination against women and girls in law and in practice, the refusal of the Guardian Council to take steps to address this systematic discrimination, and recent arrests of and violent crackdowns on women exercising their right of assembly; and the increasing discrimination and other human rights violations against persons belonging to ethnic and religious minorities, recognized or otherwise.

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2006

Calls upon the Government of Iran to ensure full respect for citizens' rights and freedom of assembly, opinion, and expression, and for the right to take part in the conduct of public affairs in accordance with Iran's obligations under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights; increase actions to promote and facilitate human rights education at all levels and ensure that all those responsible for training lawyers, law enforcement officers, the personnel of the armed forces, and public officials include appropriate elements of human rights teaching in their training program; ensure full respect for the right to due process of law; eliminate, in law and in practice, the use of torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment and, as previously proposed by the elected Iranian parliament, accede to the Convention Against Torture; end impunity for violations of human rights that constitute crimes by bringing the perpetrators to justice in accordance with international standards; abolish, in law and in practice, public executions and other executions carried out in the absence of respect for internationally recognized safeguards; eliminate, in law and in practice, all forms of discrimination and violence against women and girls and, as previously proposed by the elected Iranian parliament, accede to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women; and eliminate, in law and in practice, all forms of discrimination based on religious, ethnic, or linguistic grounds, and other human rights violations against person belonging to minorities.

Encourages the thematic procedures of the Human Rights Council to visit or otherwise continue their work to improve the situation of human rights in Iran, and urges the Government of Iran to live up to the commitment it made when it issued a standing invitation to special rapporteurs, representatives, and experts.

Background: The Government of Iran continued its practices of conducting summary executions in the absence of internationally recognized safeguards; use of torture; discriminatory treatment towards women and girls; and persecution of minorities, journalists, students, academics, and clerics. When the draft resolution came up for a vote in the General Assembly, Iran put forth a proposal to take no action on this resolution. That proposal to adjourn debate was defeated by a vote of 75 to 81(US), with 24 abstentions.

For three years, Canada has sponsored this resolution which has been adopted by a tight margin each year.

U.S. Position: The United States cosponsored this Canadian-sponsored resolution and lobbied other delegations to vote in favor of the text. The United States believed that this resolution demonstrated the international community's concern over the human rights situation in Iran and the desire to hold the government accountable for its human rights abuses and to improve the situation of human rights in Iran.

12. International Trade and Development

A/Res/61/186

December 20

129-2(US)-52

Stresses that in order for the Doha Round [of trade negotiations of the World Trade Organization (WTO)] to be concluded satisfactorily, the negotiations should result in the establishment of rules and disciplines in the area of agriculture, adhering to the development imperatives and commitments of the Doha Ministerial Declaration (2001), the decision of the General Council of the WTO (2004), and the Hong Kong Ministerial Declaration (2005). Also stresses the need for negotiations of the WTO in non-agricultural market access to live up to the development imperatives and commitments of the Doha Ministerial Declaration, the decision of the General Council of the WTO, and the Hong Kong Ministerial Declaration.

Reaffirms the commitment to actively pursue the work program of the WTO with respect to addressing the trade-related issues and concerns affecting the fuller integration of countries with small, vulnerable economies into the multilateral trading system. Recognizes the need to ensure that the comparative advantage of developing countries is not undermined by any form of protectionism, including the arbitrary and abusive use of non-tariff measures, non-trade barriers, and other standards to unfairly restrict the access of developing countries' products to developed countries' markets. Reaffirms in this regard that developing countries should play an increasing role in the formulation of, among other things, safety, environment, and health standards. Recognizes the need to facilitate the increased and meaningful participation of the developing countries in the work of relevant international standard-setting organizations.

Background: Recommended to the General Assembly by the Second Committee, this proposal from the Group of 77 dealt with, among other things, the Doha Declaration adopted at the Fourth WTO Ministerial Conference in 2001 and negotiations that led up the sixth WTO Ministerial in December 2005.

U.S. Position: The United States is a leading advocate of trade liberalization and had hoped that the UN resolution on trade and development would encourage progress on the Doha agenda. However, the United States was disappointed when the Group of 77 chose to table their own original resolution at the Second Committee rather than the version that was under negotiation. This resolution contained several attempts to dictate the terms of resumption and the terms of the outcome of the negotiations in the WTO. For the third year in a row, the United States voted no on this resolution.

13. Situation of Human Rights in Burma

A/Res/61/232

December 22 82(US)-25-45

Expresses grave concern at the ongoing systematic violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms of the people of Burma; attacks by military forces on villages in Kayin State and other ethnic states in Burma; continued restrictions on activities of the National League for Democracy (NLD) and other political parties, and the consistent harassment of their members, including the extension of the house arrest of the General Secretary of the NLD, Aung San Suu Kyi, and her deputy, Tin Oo; absence of progress towards genuine democratic reform; the fact that the UN Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Burma and the former Special Envoy of the Secretary-General for Burma have been unable to visit the country for almost three years, despite repeated requests; and the continuing denial of the freedom of human rights defenders to pursue their activities.

Strongly calls upon the Government of Burma to end the systematic violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms in Burma; take urgent measures to put an end to the military operations targeting civilians in the ethnic areas and the associated human rights and humanitarian law violations, including widespread rape and other forms of sexual violence; put an immediate end to the continuing recruitment and use of child soldiers and intensify measures to ensure the protection of children affected by armed conflict; end the systematic forced displacement of large numbers of persons and other causes of refugee flows to neighboring countries; end impunity by investigating and bringing to justice any perpetrators of human rights violations, facilitating a genuinely independent investigation of continuing reports of sexual violence, and facilitating a genuinely independent investigation into the attack perpetrated near Depayin on May 30, 2003; release all political prisoners immediately and unconditionally, including NLD leaders Aung San Suu Kyi and Tin Oo, and desist from arresting and punishing persons for their peaceful political activities; lift all restraints on peaceful political activity of all persons; urgently resolve the serious issues identified by the International Labor Organization (ILO) concerning compliance with international labor standards, including the issue of forced labor; and cooperate fully with the Special Rapporteur and with other UN human rights mechanisms and ensure that no person cooperating with the Special Rapporteur or any international organization is subjected to any form of intimidation, harassment, or punishment.

Calls upon the Government of Burma to permit all political representatives and representatives of ethnic nationalities to participate fully in the political transition process without restrictions; pursue through dialogue and peaceful means the immediate suspension and permanent end of conflict with all ethnic nationalities in Burma and allow the full participation of representatives of all political parties and representatives of ethnic

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

nationalities; and fulfill its obligations to restore the independence of the judiciary and due process of law.

Background: Burma's human rights record continued to worsen in 2006, despite repeated efforts of the international community to encourage change. Burmese authorities had not allowed the Special Rapporteur to visit the country since November 2003, and the Special Envoy had not been permitted to visit Burma since March 2004. The Under Secretary-General for Political Affairs visited Burma in May 2006 and requested the government to release Aung San Suu Kyi, initiate an all-inclusive political dialogue, halt the military offensive against ethnic minorities, and permit international humanitarian organizations safe and unhindered access. He visited Burma for the second time on November 10–12.

On September 15, the Security Council placed the issue of Burma as a threat to international peace and security on its agenda. China, Congo, Qatar, and Russia voted “no,” claiming that the Security Council was not the appropriate forum for discussing Burma. Tanzania abstained.

U.S. Position: The Burmese regime's policies of political repression, forced relocations, massive human rights abuses, military offensives against ethnic minorities, restrictions on international humanitarian organizations, and use of rape as a tool of armed conflict have resulted in the destabilizing outflow of over a million Burmese to neighboring countries; cross-border trafficking in narcotics and persons; the unchecked spread of communicable diseases such as HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis; and the internal displacement of between 500,000 and 1 million people. The United States supported this resolution to keep world pressure and attention focused on a regime that egregiously violates its citizens' human rights.

IMPORTANT CONSENSUS ACTIONS

The 11 important consensus resolutions are listed and described below. For each resolution, the listing provides a short title, the document number, and date adopted. A summary of each resolution is provided (“General Assembly” is the subject of the verbs in the first paragraph), followed by background on the resolution and an explanation of the U.S. position. The resolutions are listed in order by date and then in numerical order.

1. Appointment of the UN Secretary-General

A/Res/61/3 October 13

Having considered the recommendation contained in Security Council Resolution 1715 (2006), appoints Mr. Ban Ki-moon UN Secretary-

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2006

General for a term of office beginning on January 1, 2007, and ending on December 31, 2011.

Background: Article 97 of the UN Charter provides in relevant part that the UN Secretary-General shall be appointed by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council. The Security Council, in a letter dated October 9, 2006, forwarded its recommendation, which was adopted by acclamation, to the General Assembly.

U.S. Position: The United States supported Secretary-General Ban and encouraged him to vigorously implement reforms agreed to by world leaders at the September 2005 World Summit.

2. Report of the International Criminal Court

A/Res/61/15

November 20

Welcomes the states that have become parties to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (ICC) in the past year, and calls upon all states from all regions of the world that are not yet parties to the Rome Statute to consider ratifying or acceding to it without delay. Encourages states parties to the Rome Statute that have not yet done so to adopt national legislation to implement obligations emanating from the Statute and to cooperate with the ICC in the exercise of its functions, and recalls the provision of technical assistance by states parties in this respect. Recalls that, by virtue of article 12, paragraph 3, of the Rome Statute, a state which is not a party to the Statute may, by declaration lodged with the ICC Registrar, accept the exercise of jurisdiction by the Court with respect to specific crimes mentioned in paragraph 2 of that article. Calls upon all states that have not yet done so to consider becoming parties to the Agreement on the Privileges and Immunities of the ICC.

Welcomes the effective cooperation and assistance provided to the ICC by states, the United Nations, and other international and regional organizations, and calls upon them to continue providing such cooperation and assistance in the future. Emphasizes the importance of the full implementation of the Relationship Agreement between the United Nations and the ICC, which forms a framework for close cooperation between the two organizations and for consultation on matters of mutual interest pursuant to the provisions of that Agreement and in conformity with the respective provisions of the UN Charter and the Rome Statute.

Notes the work of the Special Working Group on the Crime of Aggression, which is open to all states on an equal footing. Encourages all states to consider participating actively in the Working Group with a view to elaborating proposals for a provision on the crime of aggression.

Background: The Rome Statute was adopted in 1998. The General Assembly, beginning even before that in 1992, has adopted an annual

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

resolution on the ICC. The Relationship Agreement between the United Nations and the ICC, approved by the General Assembly in 2004, provides that the ICC may, if it deems appropriate, submit reports on its activities to the United Nations through the Secretary-General. This resolution concerns the second such report. The General Assembly held a meeting to discuss the report.

U.S. Position: As it has done in past years, the United States dissociated itself from consensus on this resolution. Prior to taking such action, however, the United States persuaded supporters of the ICC and drafters of the resolution to include language in the resolution that underscores the fact that all expenses incurred by the United Nations in connection with providing support to the ICC must be borne by parties to the Rome Statute. The United States, in an explanation of position, reiterated its well-known concerns about the ICC, including concerns related to the ICC's assertion of jurisdiction over nationals of states not parties to the Rome Statute, U.S. nationals among them, and the lack of adequate oversight of the ICC's activities. While respecting the views of supporters of the ICC, the United States disagreed with them about whether the Court as currently constituted under the Rome Statute could effectively and appropriately promote international criminal justice and accountability for genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity. The United States emphasized that it will continue to be a leading advocate for international criminal justice and accountability for war crimes, genocide, and crimes against humanity.

3. The Rule of Law at the National and International Levels

A/Res/61/39

December 4

Requests the Secretary-General to prepare an inventory of the current activities of the various organs, bodies, offices, departments, funds, and programs within the UN system devoted to the promotion of the rule of law at the national and international levels for submission at its 63rd session, and to submit an interim report to the General Assembly for its consideration at its 62nd session. Also requests the Secretary-General to seek the views of member states on matters addressed in this resolution and to submit a report on those views to the General Assembly at its 62nd session.

Further requests the Secretary-General, after having sought the views of member states, to include in the report to the 63rd session identification of ways and means for strengthening and coordinating the activities listed in the inventory, with special regard to the effectiveness of assistance that may be requested by states in building capacity for the promotion of the rule of law at the national and international levels.

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2006

Urges the Secretary-General, as a matter of priority, to submit the report on the establishment of a rule of law assistance unit within the Secretariat, in conformity with the 2005 World Summit Outcome.

Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its 62nd session the items entitled “The rule of law at the national and international levels.” Recommends that, as from the 62nd session, the Sixth Committee annually choose one or two sub-topics to facilitate a focused discussion on the rule of law agenda item for the subsequent session.

Background: Liechtenstein and Mexico sought inclusion of this new topic in the agenda for the 61st General Assembly and characterized their proposal as a follow-up to the 2005 World Summit Outcome document, which noted the need for “universal adherence to and implementation of the rule of law at both the national and international levels.” Furthermore, they stressed the importance of the United Nations in the international legal system and, as a prerequisite for improving the UN’s effectiveness, of the need to establish a systematic inventory of the rule of law programs of UN bodies.

U.S. Position: The United States believes in the value and importance of international law and welcomed the discussion on the rule of law in the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly. The United States joined consensus when the General Assembly adopted this resolution.

4. Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities

A/Res/61/106

December 13

Adopts the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the Optional Protocol to the Convention annexed to this resolution, which shall be open for signature at UN Headquarters as from March 30, 2007. Calls upon member states to consider signing and ratifying the Convention and the Optional Protocol. Requests the Secretary-General to implement progressively standards and guidelines for the accessibility of facilities and services of the UN system, taking into account relevant provisions of the convention, in particular when undertaking renovations. Expresses its appreciation to the *ad hoc* committee for having concluded the elaboration of the convention.

Background: In 2001, the General Assembly established an *ad hoc* committee to consider proposals for a comprehensive, international convention to promote and protect the rights and dignity of persons with disabilities. Key provisions of the convention include the following: equality of and non-discrimination against persons with disabilities; ensuring the rights of women and children with disabilities; accessibility; primary consideration given to the best interest of the child; access to justice and equal recognition before the law; freedom from torture, exploitation, violence, and abuse; freedom of expression; liberty of person; right to life; right to health; respect for privacy,

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

the home, and the family; protection of the integrity of the person; living independently and being included in the community; and personal mobility.

The concept of protecting the integrity of the person was inspired by a similar provision in the American Convention on Human Rights, while the concept of living independently and being included in the community is a key concept under U.S. law.

U.S. Position: Since negotiations for this convention began in 2003, the United States has stated that it does not intend to become a party to the convention because the best way for countries to protect the rights of their citizens with disabilities is to focus on strengthening their national legislative frameworks. At the same time, the United States clarified that it would join constructively in the work of the *ad hoc* committee which was negotiating the convention, including by sharing experiences and by offering technical assistance upon request on key principles and elements. U.S. negotiators made clear that this expansion of their engagement in the *ad hoc* committee did not signal that the United States intended to sign the proposed convention. The United States believed that its involvement improved the treaty and also that the convention would be a useful tool for many other states as they develop their national legal frameworks regarding persons with disabilities and joined consensus on the resolution.

5. Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman, or Degrading Treatment or Punishment

A/Res/61/153

December 19

Condemns all forms of torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment, including through intimidation, which are and shall remain prohibited at any time and in any place whatsoever and can thus never be justified. Calls upon all states to implement fully the absolute prohibition of torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment. Emphasizes that states must take persistent, determined, and effective measures to prevent and combat torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment, including their gender-based manifestations, and stresses that all acts of torture must be made offences under domestic criminal law. Reminds all states that prolonged incommunicado detention or detention in secret places may facilitate the perpetration of torture or other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment and can in itself constitute a form of such treatment. Urges all states to respect the safeguards concerning the liberty, security, and dignity of all persons.

Condemns any action or attempt by states or public officials to legalize, authorize, or acquiesce in torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment under any circumstances, including on grounds of national security or through judicial decisions. Stresses that all

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2006

allegations of torture or other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment must be promptly and impartially examined by the competent national authority. Stresses that those who encourage, order, tolerate, or perpetrate acts of torture must be held responsible and severely punished. Emphasizes that acts of torture are serious violations of international humanitarian law and in this regard constitute war crimes and can constitute crimes against humanity, and that the perpetrators of all acts of torture must be prosecuted and punished.

Urges states not to expel, return, extradite, or in any other way transfer a person to another state where there are substantial grounds for believing that the person would be in danger of being subjected to torture, and recognizes that diplomatic assurances, where used, do not release states from their obligations under international law, in particular the principle of non-refoulement.

Calls upon all states to take appropriate effective legislative, administrative, judicial, and other measures to prevent and prohibit the production, trade, export, and use of equipment that is specifically designed to inflict torture or other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment.

Urges all states that have not yet done so to become parties to the Convention Against Torture as a matter of priority. Calls upon all states to cooperate with and assist the special rapporteur of the Human Rights Council on torture in the performance of his task.

Background: The Convention against Torture established the Committee Against Torture, which among other things, is charged with reviewing periodic reports submitted by the states party to the Convention. The United States submitted a regular periodic report to the Committee in May 2005 and an interagency delegation engaged in a regular review dialogue with the Committee Against Torture in May 2006.

U.S. Position: The United States cosponsored this resolution. U.S. criminal law and treaty obligations prohibit torture, and the United States will not engage in or condone torture anywhere. The United States is a party to the Convention Against Torture.

6. Improving the Coordination of Efforts Against Trafficking in Persons

A/Res/61/180

December 20

Recognizes that broad international cooperation between member states and relevant intergovernmental and nongovernmental organizations is essential for the effective countering of the threat of trafficking in persons and other contemporary forms of slavery. Invites them to foster a global partnership against trafficking in persons and other contemporary forms of

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

slavery, with a view to eliminating all contemporary-forms of slavery, including trafficking in persons, and protecting and assisting their victims.

Urges member states that have not yet done so to consider taking measures to ratify or accede to the UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and its Protocol to Prevent, Suppress, and Punish Trafficking in Persons, especially Women and Children, and to implement fully all aspects of these instruments. Also urges member states that have not yet done so to consider taking measures to ratify or accede to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution, and child pornography; the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women; and the Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery, the Slave Trade, and Institutions and Practices Similar to Slavery, and to implement fully all aspects of these instruments.

Recognizes the need to arrive at a better understanding of what constitutes demand and how to combat it. Decides to strengthen efforts to counter demand for victims of trafficking in persons. Also recognizes the need to address the factors that make persons, especially women and children, vulnerable to trafficking and encourages member states to adopt measures to counter these factors. Invites member states to provide adequate training and resources to law enforcement bodies. Also invites member states to provide care and rehabilitation for victims.

Requests the Secretary-General to entrust the Executive Director of the UN Office on Drugs and Crime with coordinating the activities of the inter-agency coordination group on trafficking in persons, bearing in mind the availability of extrabudgetary resources. Encourages the UN Office on Drugs and Crime to cooperate with relevant international organizations outside of the UN system and to invite such organizations and interested member states to participate, when appropriate, in the meetings of the coordination group and to keep member states informed on the group's schedule and its progress.

Background: Every year, an estimated 600,000 to 800,000 human beings are bought, sold, or forced into conditions of exploitation across the world's borders. This commerce in human life generates billions of dollars each year—much of which benefits organized criminal groups. The UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (UNTOC), and its supplementary protocol against trafficking in persons, serves as the ground breaking international, legal instrument to combat this problem. The UNTOC requires countries to establish domestic criminal offenses of specified conduct related to transnational organized crime, and it also provides a framework for international cooperation, including extradition, mutual legal assistance, and law enforcement cooperation. For this reason, this resolution urges UN member states to ratify the UNTOC and its protocol against trafficking in persons, as well as other related instruments.

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2006

Besides generating enormous profits for traffickers, trafficking in persons contributes to societal corrosion and threatens the rule of law and democracy. This resolution highlights the needs of victims by promoting legislation and guidelines for their protection and calling for a greater allocation of resources for victim services, public awareness campaigns, and law enforcement activities directed at eliminating trafficking. In addition, it emphasizes the need to raise awareness among criminal justice officials on the needs of victims and their important role in detecting and prosecuting those involved.

This resolution also seeks to coordinate UN anti-trafficking assistance, and designates the UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) as the focal point for coordination, bearing in mind the availability of extrabudgetary resources.

U.S. Position: The United States has signed and ratified the UN Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime and its protocol against trafficking in persons, as well as its protocol to combat migrant smuggling. The United States is committed to eradicating trafficking in persons by vigorously enforcing U.S. laws against those involved. The United States is actively partnering with other nations and with non-governmental and multilateral organizations such as UNODC to combat this transnational crime, provide assistance to trafficking victims, and highlight the dangers of sex tourism and trafficking.

During negotiations of this resolution, the United States raised concerns about the financial burdens that might befall UNODC if it was to serve as an effective coordinating entity. However, after lengthy consultations with UNODC and its Secretariat, and the insertion of the budgetary language into the resolution, the United States was able to join consensus on the text.

The United States successfully negotiated for inclusion of provisions from a 2005 Commission on the Status of Women resolution addressing the demand for commercial sexual exploitation in prostitution as a cause of human trafficking.

The U.S. Government has a cabinet-level taskforce and a senior policy group that meets to coordinate its domestic and international anti-trafficking policy and programmatic efforts. Additionally, the State Department drafts an annual, congressionally mandated *Trafficking in Persons Report*, which is issued in June.

7. Preventing and Combating Corrupt Practices and Transfer of Assets of Illicit Origin and Returning Such Assets, in Particular to the Countries of Origin, Consistent with the UN Convention Against Corruption

A/Res/61/209

December 20

Urges all member states and competent regional economic integration organizations, within the limits of their competence, to consider ratifying or acceding to the UN Convention Against Corruption as a matter of priority. Calls upon all states parties to fully implement the convention as soon as possible.

Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at its 62nd session a report, completed within existing resources, on the implementation of previous resolutions that would elaborate further on the magnitude of corruption at all levels and on any scale, and on the scale of the transfer of assets of illicit origin derived from corruption, and the impact of corruption and such transfers on economic growth and sustainable development.

Background: The UN convention calls for governments to prevent corruption and to improve law enforcement cooperation. It requires countries to criminalize corrupt behaviors, such as bribery, embezzlement, and money laundering. State parties are expected to prevent corruption by ensuring that financial management systems are transparent, developing anti-corruption strategies, instituting codes of conduct, establishing appropriate accounting standards, and allowing public access to information. To develop a process for promoting implementation of this convention, states parties met for the First Conference of the State Parties (COSP) in Jordan from December 10–14, 2006.

U.S. Position: The United States ratified the Convention Against Corruption on October 6, and became a party to the convention on November 29. The convention contains an innovative chapter that develops a framework for international cooperation on asset recovery cases. These provisions promote international cooperation on confiscating illicitly acquired funds and returning them to their rightful owner(s). For these efforts to be successful, the United States believes there must be full participation of the international community so that corrupt entities cannot find safe havens for their illicit gain.

During the negotiations of this resolution, the United States unsuccessfully sought to remove reference in the title to transfer of assets of illicit origin and returning such assets, in particular to the countries of origin, because this gives undue weight to one part of the convention. In addition, the United States sought to eliminate the Secretary-General's report on corruption in order to prevent repeating the broad mandate for a report that is considered

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2006

by most to be of negligible value, and to avoid duplication of the reporting of the COSP. The United States, along with the European Union and Canada, faced solid opposition from Group of 77 countries, which sought the retention of this language. A compromise was agreed upon to allow the report to go forward with the understanding that it will not overlap with the COSP outcome report or other documentation, and will be produced within existing resources.

8. Humanitarian Assistance and Reconstruction of Liberia

A/Res/61/218

December 20

Invites all states and intergovernmental and nongovernmental organizations to provide assistance to Liberia to facilitate the continued creation of an enabling environment for the promotion of peace, socio-economic development, and regional security. Invites the international community to provide financial and technical assistance to support the government's national reconstruction and development agenda. Urges the government to continue to create an environment conducive to the promotion of socio-economic development, peace, and security in the country; to the reintegration of internally displaced persons; and to its commitment to ensure the upholding of human rights, the rule of law, and national reconciliation.

Background: In 2003, the Security Council established a mission in Liberia to support implementation of the ceasefire agreement, assist the government in restoring state authority, demobilizing and disarming ex-combatants and preparing for the 2005 elections, which brought about the first democratically elected female president in Africa. While progress has been made in many areas over the past four years, there are still humanitarian problems to be addressed.

U.S. Position: While the United States is concerned about the proliferation of country-specific resolutions under this agenda item, after evaluating each one individually, the United States supported this resolution because of its pronounced ongoing interest in and support of the reconstruction of Liberia.

9. Scale of Assessments for the Apportionment of UN Expenses

A/Res/61/237

December 22

Adopts a scale of assessments for member state contributions to the UN regular budget for the period 2007–2009. Decides that the methodology used to calculate the scale of assessments for this period shall remain unchanged from the scale governing member state assessments for the period 2004–2006.

Background: The scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations is determined by the Fifth Committee, on behalf of the General Assembly, every three years. UN assessments are based

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

on the idea that the expenses of the organization should be borne by all member states, broadly based on capacity to pay. The Fifth Committee bases its decision on the recommendations of the Committee on Contributions, which advocated in its June 2006 report that the scale for 2007–2009 continue to be calculated according to the Gross National Income (GNI) of each member state, not purchasing power parity (PPP) as advocated by the United States. Other member states agreed to support the use of GNI to calculate scale, even though some clearly would have benefited from a change to PPP.

The rate of assessment for the United States shall remain at 22 percent, the same as it has been since January 2001, despite an intense effort during negotiations by members of the European Union (EU), supported initially by the Group of 77 (G-77) and China, to seek an increase in the U.S. share of the UN budget to 25 percent. Since decisions regarding the scale have a significant financial impact on individual states for a three-year period, member states view negotiations on scale as a key national priority. During the fall 2006 negotiations, the EU sought to reduce the amount assessed to its individual members by demanding that the 22 percent ceiling for the United States be raised to 25 percent to reflect more accurately U.S. total share of the global economy. In addition, the EU pressed for a longer, six-year statistical base period because individual EU members would pay a lower overall amount under such a change, an issue they pushed for even when all other parties were prepared to adopt a formula by consensus. The EU also argued strongly, as did the United States and Japan, in favor of creating a new discount rate for those developing countries whose per capita income was below the world average and whose gross national income was one percent or more of GNI. Notably, had such a formula been adopted, EU and many G-77 member assessment rates, but not those of the United States, also would have decreased.

U.S. Position: The United States had the following main objectives during the scale negotiations: maintain the 22 percent ceiling; propose PPP to calculate the gross national income of member states; and advocate modification of the discount granted to all low per capita income countries.

The United States succeeded in maintaining the 22 percent ceiling, the U.S. overriding objective during the scale negotiations, despite the concerted efforts of both the EU and, initially, the G-77 to raise the ceiling to 25 percent. The United States also proposed using PPP to calculate the gross national income of member states, as the International Monetary Fund and several other international organizations do, since PPP removes the distortions resulting from fluctuating exchange rates and more accurately reflects the relative strength of individual national economies. The vast majority of other member states did not support this suggestion.

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2006

For its third objective, the United States, along with the EU and Japan, advocated establishment of a “stepped” gradient that would have reduced the discount of Brazil, China, India, and Russia, whose per capita income was below the world average but whose gross national income was one percent or more of global GNI. This would balance the methodology so that the financial burden of sustaining the United Nations is more broadly borne by the wider membership. The fact that 143 members, each enjoying different economic strengths and facing a variety of challenges, were all receiving the same, flat 80 percent discount, gave undue advantage to those major developing countries with fast-growing economies who received 59 percent of the total discount granted. Unlike the EU, however, whose members would have benefited from the reallocation of reduced benefits to the four large developing states, the United States proposed that such savings be apportioned among the remaining 138 member states whose per capita income remained below the world average.

Finally, the United States voiced support for a proposal originally advanced by Japan that would have established a three or five percent floor for assessments to be paid by the permanent five members of the Security Council, since so many of their decisions in the Council had broad financial implications for the entire membership. This proposal was rejected by the G-77 and China, and by the Russian Federation.

10. Capital Master Plan

A/Res/61/251

December 22

Decides to approve the Capital Master Plan, including the recommended scope options, to be completed from 2006 to 2014, at a total revised project budget not to exceed \$1,876.7 million. Requests the Secretary-General to make every effort to avoid budget increases through sound project management practices and to ensure that the Capital Master Plan will be completed within the approved budget and the envisaged time schedule. Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly for its consideration possible options on how to remain within the approved budget in the unlikely event that it becomes evident that the costs will exceed the approved budget. Decides that in the unlikely event of cost escalations beyond the approved budget, all member states will be subject to a further assessment to meet the revised financial requirements as approved by the General Assembly.

Approves the funding of the Capital Master Plan, based on a mix of one-time and equal multi-year assessments. Decides that under the mixed assessment option of one-time and multi-year assessment, all assessments will be based on the regular budget scale of assessments applicable for 2007.

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

Reiterates its request to the Secretary-General to ensure that procurement processes are conducted in a transparent manner and in full compliance with relevant General Assembly resolutions.

Background: The UN facilities in New York are over 50 years old and not compliant with current building codes for fire and life safety. They do not meet modern security requirements and are also energy inefficient. The Capital Master Plan (CMP) was first introduced by the UN Secretary-General in 2000 and endorsed, in principle, by the General Assembly in 2002 by Resolution 57/292. In 2005, the General Assembly agreed to continue the implementation of the project by providing additional design funds, while deferring until 2006 a decision on project implementation strategy, project budget, and financing methodology. In June, the General Assembly approved a new strategy for the CMP, while deferring until fall a decision on financing.

In his October 30 report, the Secretary-General updated the total project costs, provided information on the scope options, and presented financing options. He recommended establishing a commercial letter of credit in order to demonstrate full financial capability to complete the project, consistent with U.S. construction industry standard practice, and manage possible cash flow problems. The report also presented assessment options for member states, including one-time or multi-year payments, and a mix of the two.

U.S. Position: The United States advocated reaching agreement on a project budget and financing methodology in order to keep the project moving forward, emphasized the need to avoid any further budget increases, and pressed for language urging this when agreeing to a project budget. The United States also successfully proposed language requesting that scope offsets be identified as an alternative to seeking a budget increase in the event there are unforeseen cost increases. On financing methodology, the United States supported multi-year assessments over a five-year timeframe or a mix of this and one-time assessments and agreed to permit the United Nations to establish a commercial letter of credit, provided it was clear that it would be used as a last resort. The United States also made clear that it is legislatively prohibited from paying interest on external borrowing by international organizations.

11. Program Budget for the Biennium 2006–2007

A/Res/61/253 A-C December 22

Resolves that, for the biennium 2006–2007, the amount of \$3,829,916,200 appropriated by the General Assembly shall be adjusted by \$343,979,700.

Resolves that, for 2007, budget appropriations totaling \$2,274,439,650, and consisting of \$1,899,456,250, being half of the

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2006

appropriation initially approved for the biennium 2006–2007, \$26,443,300 being the additional appropriation approved on June 30, 2006; \$4,560,400 being approved on July 7, 2006; and \$343,979,700, being the increase approved in this resolution, shall be financed in accordance with regulations 3.1 and 3.2 of the Financial Regulations and Rules of the United Nations.

Background: The General Assembly agreed to a budget increase of over \$300 million. Most of this increase, some \$270 million, represented the net additional requirements for special political missions since December 2005, including those in Afghanistan and Iraq.

U.S. Position: The United States supported the funding for special political missions in 2006 and joined consensus on this resolution.

COMPARISON WITH U.S. VOTES

The tables that follow summarize UN member state performance at the 61st UNGA in comparison with the United States on the 13 important votes. In these tables, “Identical Votes” is the total number of times the United States and the listed state both voted Yes or No on these issues. “Opposite Votes” is the total number of times the United States voted Yes and the listed state No, or the United States voted No and the listed state Yes. “Abstentions” and “Absences” are totals for the country being compared on these 13 votes. “Voting Coincidence (Votes Only)” is calculated by dividing the number of identical votes by the total of identical and opposite votes. The column headed “Voting Coincidence (Including Consensus)” presents the percentage of voting coincidence with the United States after including the 11 important consensus resolutions as identical votes. The extent of participation was also factored in. (See the second paragraph in this section.)

The first table lists all UN member states in alphabetical order. The second lists them by number of identical votes in descending order; those states with the same number of identical votes are further ranked by the number of opposite votes in ascending order. Countries with the same number of both identical votes and opposite votes are listed alphabetically. Subsequent tables are comparisons of UN members by regional and other groupings to which they belong, again ranked in descending order of identical votes.

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2006

All Countries (Alphabetical)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Afghanistan	3	10	0	0	56.5%	23.1%
Albania	6	3	4	0	84.8%	66.7%
Algeria	0	13	0	0	45.4%	0.0%
Andorra	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Angola	1	8	3	1	57.9%	11.1%
Antigua-Barbuda	0	9	4	0	54.5%	0.0%
Argentina	5	7	1	0	69.6%	41.7%
Armenia	1	8	2	2	59.4%	11.1%
Australia	9	3	1	0	87.0%	75.0%
Austria	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Azerbaijan	0	11	1	1	47.3%	0.0%
Bahamas	4	8	1	0	64.9%	33.3%
Bahrain	0	9	4	0	55.0%	0.0%
Bangladesh	0	12	1	0	47.4%	0.0%
Barbados	0	9	4	0	54.3%	0.0%
Belarus	0	12	1	0	47.4%	0.0%
Belgium	6	3	4	0	84.9%	66.7%
Belize	2	9	2	0	58.7%	18.2%
Benin	0	7	5	1	54.7%	0.0%
Bhutan	1	9	3	0	56.7%	10.0%
Bolivia	2	7	3	1	64.3%	22.2%
Bosnia/Herzegovina	5	3	4	1	83.4%	62.5%
Botswana	0	4	5	4	57.9%	0.0%
Brazil	2	8	3	0	61.9%	20.0%
Brunei Darussalam	0	11	2	0	49.8%	0.0%
Bulgaria	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Burkina Faso	0	8	4	1	56.5%	0.0%
Burundi	3	6	3	1	68.4%	33.3%
Cambodia	0	9	1	3	52.3%	0.0%
Cameroon	0	5	6	2	65.9%	0.0%
Canada	9	3	1	0	87.0%	75.0%
Cape Verde	0	6	7	0	63.6%	0.0%
Central African Rep.	0	8	4	1	56.3%	0.0%
Chad	0	4	0	9	57.0%	0.0%
Chile	4	8	0	1	65.1%	33.3%
China	0	12	1	0	47.4%	0.0%
Colombia	0	4	9	0	73.0%	0.0%
Comoros	1	10	2	0	53.5%	9.1%
Congo	1	10	2	0	54.3%	9.1%
Costa Rica	1	7	5	0	63.0%	12.5%

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

All Countries (Alphabetical) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Côte d'Ivoire	0	6	4	3	61.0%	0.0%
Croatia	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Cuba	0	13	0	0	44.9%	0.0%
Cyprus	6	5	2	0	77.1%	54.5%
Czech Republic	6	3	4	0	84.9%	66.7%
DPR of Korea	0	10	1	2	44.0%	0.0%
Dem. Rep. Congo	0	8	0	5	38.9%	0.0%
Denmark	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Djibouti	0	9	4	0	54.3%	0.0%
Dominica	0	6	0	7	62.0%	0.0%
Dominican Republic	5	6	2	0	72.2%	45.5%
Ecuador	4	8	1	0	65.1%	33.3%
Egypt	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
El Salvador	5	6	1	1	72.1%	45.5%
Equatorial Guinea	0	2	0	11	47.8%	0.0%
Eritrea	1	9	2	1	56.3%	10.0%
Estonia	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Ethiopia	0	8	5	0	56.5%	0.0%
Fiji	3	5	5	0	73.3%	37.5%
Finland	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
France	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Gabon	0	7	0	6	53.2%	0.0%
Gambia	0	6	0	7	49.6%	0.0%
Georgia	5	3	5	0	84.1%	62.5%
Germany	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Ghana	1	8	4	0	59.4%	11.1%
Greece	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Grenada	0	8	0	5	55.3%	0.0%
Guatemala	5	5	3	0	76.0%	50.0%
Guinea	0	12	1	0	47.6%	0.0%
Guinea-Bissau	1	4	3	5	61.5%	20.0%
Guyana	0	8	5	0	57.7%	0.0%
Haiti	3	6	3	1	69.4%	33.3%
Honduras	5	7	1	0	69.3%	41.7%
Hungary	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Iceland	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
India	0	10	3	0	52.1%	0.0%
Indonesia	0	13	0	0	45.8%	0.0%
Iran	0	12	1	0	46.9%	0.0%

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2006

All Countries (Alphabetical) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Iraq	1	6	2	4	64.7%	14.3%
Ireland	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Israel	10	1	2	0	95.5%	90.9%
Italy	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Jamaica	0	8	5	0	57.2%	0.0%
Japan	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Jordan	1	9	2	1	55.9%	10.0%
Kazakhstan	2	10	1	0	54.9%	16.7%
Kenya	0	4	6	3	66.2%	0.0%
Kiribati	1	1	0	11	61.7%	50.0%
Kuwait	1	9	3	0	56.9%	10.0%
Kyrgyzstan	0	10	3	0	50.7%	0.0%
Laos	0	9	3	1	50.5%	0.0%
Latvia	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Lebanon	2	10	0	1	54.9%	16.7%
Lesotho	1	7	2	3	61.3%	12.5%
Liberia	1	7	2	3	57.5%	12.5%
Libya	0	12	1	0	47.6%	0.0%
Liechtenstein	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Lithuania	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Luxembourg	6	3	4	0	84.8%	66.7%
Madagascar	0	3	4	6	58.8%	0.0%
Malawi	1	4	8	0	74.2%	20.0%
Malaysia	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Maldives	1	10	0	2	53.5%	9.1%
Mali	0	8	5	0	57.0%	0.0%
Malta	6	5	2	0	77.3%	54.5%
Marshall Islands	9	0	2	2	100.0%	100.0%
Mauritania	0	11	2	0	49.1%	0.0%
Mauritius	1	9	3	0	56.9%	10.0%
Mexico	3	6	4	0	69.7%	33.3%
Micronesia	9	3	1	0	85.8%	75.0%
Moldova	7	3	3	0	85.4%	70.0%
Monaco	6	3	4	0	84.2%	66.7%
Mongolia	1	4	3	5	72.9%	20.0%
Montenegro	5	3	4	1	83.6%	62.5%
Morocco	2	11	0	0	54.0%	15.4%
Mozambique	0	8	5	0	57.0%	0.0%
Myanmar (Burma)	0	11	1	1	47.1%	0.0%

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

All Countries (Alphabetical) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Namibia	0	9	4	0	54.3%	0.0%
Nauru	4	3	2	4	79.1%	57.1%
Nepal	0	6	7	0	63.6%	0.0%
Netherlands	6	3	4	0	84.9%	66.7%
New Zealand	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Nicaragua	5	4	3	1	79.3%	55.6%
Niger	0	10	3	0	51.9%	0.0%
Nigeria	1	7	5	0	62.4%	12.5%
Norway	6	3	4	0	84.9%	66.7%
Oman	0	9	1	3	54.3%	0.0%
Pakistan	0	12	1	0	47.1%	0.0%
Palau	10	2	1	0	90.8%	83.3%
Panama	3	7	3	0	66.5%	30.0%
Papua New Guinea	1	4	6	2	72.2%	20.0%
Paraguay	5	8	0	0	66.5%	38.5%
Peru	5	5	3	0	76.2%	50.0%
Philippines	1	8	4	0	59.6%	11.1%
Poland	6	3	4	0	84.9%	66.7%
Portugal	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Qatar	0	10	3	0	52.1%	0.0%
Republic of Korea	5	3	5	0	84.2%	62.5%
Romania	6	3	4	0	84.9%	66.7%
Russia	0	8	5	0	57.9%	0.0%
Rwanda	0	4	5	4	65.3%	0.0%
St. Kitts and Nevis	0	4	0	9	56.5%	0.0%
Saint Lucia	0	7	0	6	57.8%	0.0%
St. Vincent/Grenadines	0	8	0	5	55.0%	0.0%
Samoa	3	4	4	2	76.3%	42.9%
San Marino	5	3	4	1	84.0%	62.5%
Sao Tome/Principe	0	6	3	4	60.7%	0.0%
Saudi Arabia	2	9	2	0	58.9%	18.2%
Senegal	0	10	2	1	51.7%	0.0%
Serbia	6	3	4	0	84.9%	66.7%
Seychelles	0	3	0	10	21.4%	0.0%
Sierra Leone	0	9	4	0	53.6%	0.0%
Singapore	0	9	4	0	55.0%	0.0%
Slovak Republic	6	3	4	0	84.8%	66.7%
Slovenia	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Solomon Islands	1	5	7	0	69.9%	16.7%
Somalia	0	6	3	4	42.8%	0.0%

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2006

All Countries (Alphabetical) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
South Africa	0	11	2	0	49.8%	0.0%
Spain	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Sri Lanka	0	10	3	0	52.1%	0.0%
Sudan	0	12	1	0	46.9%	0.0%
Suriname	0	9	4	0	54.3%	0.0%
Swaziland	0	5	6	2	65.5%	0.0%
Sweden	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Switzerland	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Syria	0	12	1	0	46.4%	0.0%
Tajikistan	0	10	0	3	48.1%	0.0%
Thailand	0	6	7	0	64.7%	0.0%
TFYR Macedonia	6	3	4	0	84.8%	66.7%
Timor-Leste	4	5	0	4	73.7%	44.4%
Togo	0	10	2	1	50.7%	0.0%
Tonga	3	3	3	4	76.4%	50.0%
Trinidad and Tobago	0	8	4	1	57.2%	0.0%
Tunisia	0	10	0	3	51.2%	0.0%
Turkey	4	7	1	1	67.6%	36.4%
Turkmenistan	0	8	3	2	46.0%	0.0%
Tuvalu	4	1	1	7	89.2%	80.0%
Uganda	0	3	7	3	73.3%	0.0%
Ukraine	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
United Arab Emirates	0	8	5	0	57.9%	0.0%
United Kingdom	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
UR Tanzania	2	5	4	2	70.4%	28.6%
Uruguay	4	6	3	0	71.3%	40.0%
Uzbekistan	0	12	0	1	43.6%	0.0%
Vanuatu	3	4	4	2	76.0%	42.9%
Venezuela	0	12	1	0	47.4%	0.0%
Vietnam	0	12	0	1	44.6%	0.0%
Yemen	0	9	4	0	55.0%	0.0%
Zambia	0	9	4	0	54.8%	0.0%
Zimbabwe	0	10	1	2	50.7%	0.0%
Average	2.4	6.5	2.9	1.2	65.7%	27.2%

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

All Countries (Ranked by Identical Votes)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Israel	10	1	2	0	95.5%	90.9%
Palau	10	2	1	0	90.8%	83.3%
Marshall Islands	9	0	2	2	100.0%	100.0%
Australia	9	3	1	0	87.0%	75.0%
Canada	9	3	1	0	87.0%	75.0%
Micronesia	9	3	1	0	85.8%	75.0%
Moldova	7	3	3	0	85.4%	70.0%
Albania	6	3	4	0	84.8%	66.7%
Andorra	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Austria	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Belgium	6	3	4	0	84.9%	66.7%
Bulgaria	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Croatia	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Czech Republic	6	3	4	0	84.9%	66.7%
Denmark	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Estonia	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Finland	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
France	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Germany	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Greece	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Hungary	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Iceland	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Ireland	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Italy	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Japan	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Latvia	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Liechtenstein	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Lithuania	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Luxembourg	6	3	4	0	84.8%	66.7%
Monaco	6	3	4	0	84.2%	66.7%
Netherlands	6	3	4	0	84.9%	66.7%
New Zealand	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Norway	6	3	4	0	84.9%	66.7%
Poland	6	3	4	0	84.9%	66.7%
Portugal	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Romania	6	3	4	0	84.9%	66.7%
Serbia	6	3	4	0	84.9%	66.7%
Slovak Republic	6	3	4	0	84.8%	66.7%
Slovenia	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2006

All Countries (Ranked by Identical Votes) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Spain	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Sweden	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Switzerland	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
TFYR Macedonia	6	3	4	0	84.8%	66.7%
Ukraine	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
United Kingdom	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Cyprus	6	5	2	0	77.1%	54.5%
Malta	6	5	2	0	77.3%	54.5%
Bosnia/Herzegovina	5	3	4	1	83.4%	62.5%
Georgia	5	3	5	0	84.1%	62.5%
Montenegro	5	3	4	1	83.6%	62.5%
Republic of Korea	5	3	5	0	84.2%	62.5%
San Marino	5	3	4	1	84.0%	62.5%
Nicaragua	5	4	3	1	79.3%	55.6%
Guatemala	5	5	3	0	76.0%	50.0%
Peru	5	5	3	0	76.2%	50.0%
Dominican Republic	5	6	2	0	72.2%	45.5%
El Salvador	5	6	1	1	72.1%	45.5%
Argentina	5	7	1	0	69.6%	41.7%
Honduras	5	7	1	0	69.3%	41.7%
Paraguay	5	8	0	0	66.5%	38.5%
Tuvalu	4	1	1	7	89.2%	80.0%
Nauru	4	3	2	4	79.1%	57.1%
Timor-Leste	4	5	0	4	73.7%	44.4%
Uruguay	4	6	3	0	71.3%	40.0%
Turkey	4	7	1	1	67.6%	36.4%
Bahamas	4	8	1	0	64.9%	33.3%
Chile	4	8	0	1	65.1%	33.3%
Ecuador	4	8	1	0	65.1%	33.3%
Tonga	3	3	3	4	76.4%	50.0%
Samoa	3	4	4	2	76.3%	42.9%
Vanuatu	3	4	4	2	76.0%	42.9%
Fiji	3	5	5	0	73.3%	37.5%
Burundi	3	6	3	1	68.4%	33.3%
Haiti	3	6	3	1	69.4%	33.3%
Mexico	3	6	4	0	69.7%	33.3%
Panama	3	7	3	0	66.5%	30.0%
Afghanistan	3	10	0	0	56.5%	23.1%
UR Tanzania	2	5	4	2	70.4%	28.6%
Bolivia	2	7	3	1	64.3%	22.2%

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

All Countries (Ranked by Identical Votes) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Brazil	2	8	3	0	61.9%	20.0%
Belize	2	9	2	0	58.7%	18.2%
Saudi Arabia	2	9	2	0	58.9%	18.2%
Kazakhstan	2	10	1	0	54.9%	16.7%
Lebanon	2	10	0	1	54.9%	16.7%
Morocco	2	11	0	0	54.0%	15.4%
Kiribati	1	1	0	11	61.7%	50.0%
Guinea-Bissau	1	4	3	5	61.5%	20.0%
Malawi	1	4	8	0	74.2%	20.0%
Mongolia	1	4	3	5	72.9%	20.0%
Papua New Guinea	1	4	6	2	72.2%	20.0%
Solomon Islands	1	5	7	0	69.9%	16.7%
Iraq	1	6	2	4	64.7%	14.3%
Costa Rica	1	7	5	0	63.0%	12.5%
Lesotho	1	7	2	3	61.3%	12.5%
Liberia	1	7	2	3	57.5%	12.5%
Nigeria	1	7	5	0	62.4%	12.5%
Angola	1	8	3	1	57.9%	11.1%
Armenia	1	8	2	2	59.4%	11.1%
Ghana	1	8	4	0	59.4%	11.1%
Philippines	1	8	4	0	59.6%	11.1%
Bhutan	1	9	3	0	56.7%	10.0%
Eritrea	1	9	2	1	56.3%	10.0%
Jordan	1	9	2	1	55.9%	10.0%
Kuwait	1	9	3	0	56.9%	10.0%
Mauritius	1	9	3	0	56.9%	10.0%
Comoros	1	10	2	0	53.5%	9.1%
Congo	1	10	2	0	54.3%	9.1%
Maldives	1	10	0	2	53.5%	9.1%
Equatorial Guinea	0	2	0	11	47.8%	0.0%
Madagascar	0	3	4	6	58.8%	0.0%
Seychelles	0	3	0	10	21.4%	0.0%
Uganda	0	3	7	3	73.3%	0.0%
Botswana	0	4	5	4	57.9%	0.0%
Chad	0	4	0	9	57.0%	0.0%
Colombia	0	4	9	0	73.0%	0.0%
Kenya	0	4	6	3	66.2%	0.0%
Rwanda	0	4	5	4	65.3%	0.0%
St. Kitts and Nevis	0	4	0	9	56.5%	0.0%

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2006

All Countries (Ranked by Identical Votes) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Cameroon	0	5	6	2	65.9%	0.0%
Swaziland	0	5	6	2	65.5%	0.0%
Cape Verde	0	6	7	0	63.6%	0.0%
Côte d'Ivoire	0	6	4	3	61.0%	0.0%
Dominica	0	6	0	7	62.0%	0.0%
Gambia	0	6	0	7	49.6%	0.0%
Nepal	0	6	7	0	63.6%	0.0%
Sao Tome/Principe	0	6	3	4	60.7%	0.0%
Somalia	0	6	3	4	42.8%	0.0%
Thailand	0	6	7	0	64.7%	0.0%
Benin	0	7	5	1	54.7%	0.0%
Gabon	0	7	0	6	53.2%	0.0%
Saint Lucia	0	7	0	6	57.8%	0.0%
Burkina Faso	0	8	4	1	56.5%	0.0%
Central African Rep.	0	8	4	1	56.3%	0.0%
Dem. Rep. Congo	0	8	0	5	38.9%	0.0%
Ethiopia	0	8	5	0	56.5%	0.0%
Grenada	0	8	0	5	55.3%	0.0%
Guyana	0	8	5	0	57.7%	0.0%
Jamaica	0	8	5	0	57.2%	0.0%
Mali	0	8	5	0	57.0%	0.0%
Mozambique	0	8	5	0	57.0%	0.0%
Russia	0	8	5	0	57.9%	0.0%
St. Vincent/Grenadines	0	8	0	5	55.0%	0.0%
Trinidad and Tobago	0	8	4	1	57.2%	0.0%
Turkmenistan	0	8	3	2	46.0%	0.0%
United Arab Emirates	0	8	5	0	57.9%	0.0%
Antigua-Barbuda	0	9	4	0	54.5%	0.0%
Bahrain	0	9	4	0	55.0%	0.0%
Barbados	0	9	4	0	54.3%	0.0%
Cambodia	0	9	1	3	52.3%	0.0%
Djibouti	0	9	4	0	54.3%	0.0%
Laos	0	9	3	1	50.5%	0.0%
Namibia	0	9	4	0	54.3%	0.0%
Oman	0	9	1	3	54.3%	0.0%
Sierra Leone	0	9	4	0	53.6%	0.0%
Singapore	0	9	4	0	55.0%	0.0%
Suriname	0	9	4	0	54.3%	0.0%
Yemen	0	9	4	0	55.0%	0.0%
Zambia	0	9	4	0	54.8%	0.0%

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

All Countries (Ranked by Identical Votes) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
DPR of Korea	0	10	1	2	44.0%	0.0%
India	0	10	3	0	52.1%	0.0%
Kyrgyzstan	0	10	3	0	50.7%	0.0%
Niger	0	10	3	0	51.9%	0.0%
Qatar	0	10	3	0	52.1%	0.0%
Senegal	0	10	2	1	51.7%	0.0%
Sri Lanka	0	10	3	0	52.1%	0.0%
Tajikistan	0	10	0	3	48.1%	0.0%
Togo	0	10	2	1	50.7%	0.0%
Tunisia	0	10	0	3	51.2%	0.0%
Zimbabwe	0	10	1	2	50.7%	0.0%
Azerbaijan	0	11	1	1	47.3%	0.0%
Brunei Darussalam	0	11	2	0	49.8%	0.0%
Mauritania	0	11	2	0	49.1%	0.0%
Myanmar (Burma)	0	11	1	1	47.1%	0.0%
South Africa	0	11	2	0	49.8%	0.0%
Bangladesh	0	12	1	0	47.4%	0.0%
Belarus	0	12	1	0	47.4%	0.0%
China	0	12	1	0	47.4%	0.0%
Egypt	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Guinea	0	12	1	0	47.6%	0.0%
Iran	0	12	1	0	46.9%	0.0%
Libya	0	12	1	0	47.6%	0.0%
Malaysia	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Pakistan	0	12	1	0	47.1%	0.0%
Sudan	0	12	1	0	46.9%	0.0%
Syria	0	12	1	0	46.4%	0.0%
Uzbekistan	0	12	0	1	43.6%	0.0%
Venezuela	0	12	1	0	47.4%	0.0%
Vietnam	0	12	0	1	44.6%	0.0%
Algeria	0	13	0	0	45.4%	0.0%
Cuba	0	13	0	0	44.9%	0.0%
Indonesia	0	13	0	0	45.8%	0.0%
Average	2.4	6.5	2.9	1.2	65.7%	27.2%

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2006

UN REGIONAL GROUPS

The following tables show the voting coincidence percentage with U.S. votes on the 13 important votes.

African Group

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Burundi	3	6	3	1	68.4%	33.3%
UR Tanzania	2	5	4	2	70.4%	28.6%
Morocco	2	11	0	0	54.0%	15.4%
Guinea-Bissau	1	4	3	5	61.5%	20.0%
Malawi	1	4	8	0	74.2%	20.0%
Lesotho	1	7	2	3	61.3%	12.5%
Liberia	1	7	2	3	57.5%	12.5%
Nigeria	1	7	5	0	62.4%	12.5%
Angola	1	8	3	1	57.9%	11.1%
Ghana	1	8	4	0	59.4%	11.1%
Eritrea	1	9	2	1	56.3%	10.0%
Mauritius	1	9	3	0	56.9%	10.0%
Comoros	1	10	2	0	53.5%	9.1%
Congo	1	10	2	0	54.3%	9.1%
Equatorial Guinea	0	2	0	11	47.8%	0.0%
Madagascar	0	3	4	6	58.8%	0.0%
Seychelles	0	3	0	10	21.4%	0.0%
Uganda	0	3	7	3	73.3%	0.0%
Botswana	0	4	5	4	57.9%	0.0%
Chad	0	4	0	9	57.0%	0.0%
Kenya	0	4	6	3	66.2%	0.0%
Rwanda	0	4	5	4	65.3%	0.0%
Cameroon	0	5	6	2	65.9%	0.0%
Swaziland	0	5	6	2	65.5%	0.0%
Cape Verde	0	6	7	0	63.6%	0.0%
Côte d'Ivoire	0	6	4	3	61.0%	0.0%
Gambia	0	6	0	7	49.6%	0.0%
Sao Tome/Principe	0	6	3	4	60.7%	0.0%
Somalia	0	6	3	4	42.8%	0.0%
Benin	0	7	5	1	54.7%	0.0%
Gabon	0	7	0	6	53.2%	0.0%
Burkina Faso	0	8	4	1	56.5%	0.0%
Central African Rep.	0	8	4	1	56.3%	0.0%
Dem. Rep. Congo	0	8	0	5	38.9%	0.0%
Ethiopia	0	8	5	0	56.5%	0.0%

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

African Group (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Mali	0	8	5	0	57.0%	0.0%
Mozambique	0	8	5	0	57.0%	0.0%
Djibouti	0	9	4	0	54.3%	0.0%
Namibia	0	9	4	0	54.3%	0.0%
Sierra Leone	0	9	4	0	53.6%	0.0%
Zambia	0	9	4	0	54.8%	0.0%
Niger	0	10	3	0	51.9%	0.0%
Senegal	0	10	2	1	51.7%	0.0%
Togo	0	10	2	1	50.7%	0.0%
Tunisia	0	10	0	3	51.2%	0.0%
Zimbabwe	0	10	1	2	50.7%	0.0%
Mauritania	0	11	2	0	49.1%	0.0%
South Africa	0	11	2	0	49.8%	0.0%
Egypt	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Guinea	0	12	1	0	47.6%	0.0%
Libya	0	12	1	0	47.6%	0.0%
Sudan	0	12	1	0	46.9%	0.0%
Algeria	0	13	0	0	45.4%	0.0%
Average	0.3	7.6	3.0	2.1	55.5%	4.3%

Asian Group

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Marshall Islands	9	0	2	2	100.0%	100.0%
Micronesia	9	3	1	0	85.8%	75.0%
Japan	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Cyprus	6	5	2	0	77.1%	54.5%
Republic of Korea	5	3	5	0	84.2%	62.5%
Tuvalu	4	1	1	7	89.2%	80.0%
Nauru	4	3	2	4	79.1%	57.1%
Timor-Leste	4	5	0	4	73.7%	44.4%
Tonga	3	3	3	4	76.4%	50.0%
Samoa	3	4	4	2	76.3%	42.9%
Vanuatu	3	4	4	2	76.0%	42.9%
Fiji	3	5	5	0	73.3%	37.5%
Afghanistan	3	10	0	0	56.5%	23.1%
Saudi Arabia	2	9	2	0	58.9%	18.2%
Kazakhstan	2	10	1	0	54.9%	16.7%

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2006

Asian Group (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Lebanon	2	10	0	1	54.9%	16.7%
Mongolia	1	4	3	5	72.9%	20.0%
Papua New Guinea	1	4	6	2	72.2%	20.0%
Solomon Islands	1	5	7	0	69.9%	16.7%
Iraq	1	6	2	4	64.7%	14.3%
Philippines	1	8	4	0	59.6%	11.1%
Bhutan	1	9	3	0	56.7%	10.0%
Jordan	1	9	2	1	55.9%	10.0%
Kuwait	1	9	3	0	56.9%	10.0%
Maldives	1	10	0	2	53.5%	9.1%
Nepal	0	6	7	0	63.6%	0.0%
Thailand	0	6	7	0	64.7%	0.0%
Turkmenistan	0	8	3	2	46.0%	0.0%
United Arab Emirates	0	8	5	0	57.9%	0.0%
Bahrain	0	9	4	0	55.0%	0.0%
Cambodia	0	9	1	3	52.3%	0.0%
Laos	0	9	3	1	50.5%	0.0%
Oman	0	9	1	3	54.3%	0.0%
Singapore	0	9	4	0	55.0%	0.0%
Yemen	0	9	4	0	55.0%	0.0%
DPR of Korea	0	10	1	2	44.0%	0.0%
India	0	10	3	0	52.1%	0.0%
Kyrgyzstan	0	10	3	0	50.7%	0.0%
Qatar	0	10	3	0	52.1%	0.0%
Sri Lanka	0	10	3	0	52.1%	0.0%
Tajikistan	0	10	0	3	48.1%	0.0%
Brunei Darussalam	0	11	2	0	49.8%	0.0%
Myanmar (Burma)	0	11	1	1	47.1%	0.0%
Bangladesh	0	12	1	0	47.4%	0.0%
China	0	12	1	0	47.4%	0.0%
Iran	0	12	1	0	46.9%	0.0%
Malaysia	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Pakistan	0	12	1	0	47.1%	0.0%
Syria	0	12	1	0	46.4%	0.0%
Uzbekistan	0	12	0	1	43.6%	0.0%
Vietnam	0	12	0	1	44.6%	0.0%
Indonesia	0	13	0	0	45.8%	0.0%
Average	1.5	8.0	2.4	1.1	59.0%	15.7%

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

Latin American and Caribbean Group (LAC)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Nicaragua	5	4	3	1	79.3%	55.6%
Guatemala	5	5	3	0	76.0%	50.0%
Peru	5	5	3	0	76.2%	50.0%
Dominican Republic	5	6	2	0	72.2%	45.5%
El Salvador	5	6	1	1	72.1%	45.5%
Argentina	5	7	1	0	69.6%	41.7%
Honduras	5	7	1	0	69.3%	41.7%
Paraguay	5	8	0	0	66.5%	38.5%
Uruguay	4	6	3	0	71.3%	40.0%
Bahamas	4	8	1	0	64.9%	33.3%
Chile	4	8	0	1	65.1%	33.3%
Ecuador	4	8	1	0	65.1%	33.3%
Haiti	3	6	3	1	69.4%	33.3%
Mexico	3	6	4	0	69.7%	33.3%
Panama	3	7	3	0	66.5%	30.0%
Bolivia	2	7	3	1	64.3%	22.2%
Brazil	2	8	3	0	61.9%	20.0%
Belize	2	9	2	0	58.7%	18.2%
Costa Rica	1	7	5	0	63.0%	12.5%
Colombia	0	4	9	0	73.0%	0.0%
St. Kitts and Nevis	0	4	0	9	56.5%	0.0%
Dominica	0	6	0	7	62.0%	0.0%
Saint Lucia	0	7	0	6	57.8%	0.0%
Grenada	0	8	0	5	55.3%	0.0%
Guyana	0	8	5	0	57.7%	0.0%
Jamaica	0	8	5	0	57.2%	0.0%
St. Vincent/Grenadines	0	8	0	5	55.0%	0.0%
Trinidad and Tobago	0	8	4	1	57.2%	0.0%
Antigua-Barbuda	0	9	4	0	54.5%	0.0%
Barbados	0	9	4	0	54.3%	0.0%
Suriname	0	9	4	0	54.3%	0.0%
Venezuela	0	12	1	0	47.4%	0.0%
Cuba	0	13	0	0	44.9%	0.0%
Average	2.2	7.3	2.4	1.2	63.4%	23.0%

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2006

Western European and Others Group (WEOG)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Israel	10	1	2	0	95.5%	90.9%
Australia	9	3	1	0	87.0%	75.0%
Canada	9	3	1	0	87.0%	75.0%
Andorra	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Austria	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Belgium	6	3	4	0	84.9%	66.7%
Denmark	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Finland	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
France	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Germany	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Greece	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Iceland	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Ireland	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Italy	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Liechtenstein	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Luxembourg	6	3	4	0	84.8%	66.7%
Monaco	6	3	4	0	84.2%	66.7%
Netherlands	6	3	4	0	84.9%	66.7%
New Zealand	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Norway	6	3	4	0	84.9%	66.7%
Portugal	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Spain	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Sweden	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Switzerland	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
United Kingdom	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Malta	6	5	2	0	77.3%	54.5%
San Marino	5	3	4	1	84.0%	62.5%
Turkey	4	7	1	1	67.6%	36.4%
Average	6.3	3.1	3.5	0.1	84.5%	66.5%

Eastern European Group (EE)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Moldova	7	3	3	0	85.4%	70.0%
Albania	6	3	4	0	84.8%	66.7%
Bulgaria	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Croatia	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Czech Republic	6	3	4	0	84.9%	66.7%

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

Eastern European Group (EE) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING INCLUDING CONSENSUS	COINCIDENCE VOTES ONLY
Estonia	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Hungary	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Latvia	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Lithuania	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Poland	6	3	4	0	84.9%	66.7%
Romania	6	3	4	0	84.9%	66.7%
Serbia	6	3	4	0	84.9%	66.7%
Slovak Republic	6	3	4	0	84.8%	66.7%
Slovenia	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
TFYR Macedonia	6	3	4	0	84.8%	66.7%
Ukraine	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Bosnia/Herzegovina	5	3	4	1	83.4%	62.5%
Georgia	5	3	5	0	84.1%	62.5%
Montenegro	5	3	4	1	83.6%	62.5%
Armenia	1	8	2	2	59.4%	11.1%
Russia	0	8	5	0	57.9%	0.0%
Azerbaijan	0	11	1	1	47.3%	0.0%
Belarus	0	12	1	0	47.4%	0.0%
Average	4.9	4.2	3.7	0.2	79.0%	54.1%

OTHER GROUPINGS

The following tables show percentage of voting coincidence with U.S. votes for major groups, in rank order by identical votes.

Arab Group

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Saudi Arabia	2	9	2	0	58.9%	18.2%
Lebanon	2	10	0	1	54.9%	16.7%
Morocco	2	11	0	0	54.0%	15.4%
Iraq	1	6	2	4	64.7%	14.3%
Jordan	1	9	2	1	55.9%	10.0%
Kuwait	1	9	3	0	56.9%	10.0%
Somalia	0	6	3	4	42.8%	0.0%
United Arab Emirates	0	8	5	0	57.9%	0.0%
Bahrain	0	9	4	0	55.0%	0.0%
Djibouti	0	9	4	0	54.3%	0.0%
Oman	0	9	1	3	54.3%	0.0%
Yemen	0	9	4	0	55.0%	0.0%
Qatar	0	10	3	0	52.1%	0.0%
Tunisia	0	10	0	3	51.2%	0.0%
Mauritania	0	11	2	0	49.1%	0.0%
Egypt	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Libya	0	12	1	0	47.6%	0.0%
Sudan	0	12	1	0	46.9%	0.0%
Syria	0	12	1	0	46.4%	0.0%
Algeria	0	13	0	0	45.4%	0.0%
Average	0.5	9.8	2.0	0.8	52.5%	4.4%

Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Philippines	1	8	4	0	59.6%	11.1%
Thailand	0	6	7	0	64.7%	0.0%
Cambodia	0	9	1	3	52.3%	0.0%
Laos	0	9	3	1	50.5%	0.0%
Singapore	0	9	4	0	55.0%	0.0%
Brunei Darussalam	0	11	2	0	49.8%	0.0%
Myanmar (Burma)	0	11	1	1	47.1%	0.0%
Malaysia	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Vietnam	0	12	0	1	44.6%	0.0%
Indonesia	0	13	0	0	45.8%	0.0%
Average	0.1	10.0	2.3	0.6	51.3%	1.0%

European Union (EU)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Austria	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Belgium	6	3	4	0	84.9%	66.7%
Czech Republic	6	3	4	0	84.9%	66.7%
Denmark	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Estonia	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Finland	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
France	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Germany	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Greece	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Hungary	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Ireland	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Italy	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Latvia	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Lithuania	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Luxembourg	6	3	4	0	84.8%	66.7%
Netherlands	6	3	4	0	84.9%	66.7%
Poland	6	3	4	0	84.9%	66.7%
Portugal	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Slovak Republic	6	3	4	0	84.8%	66.7%
Slovenia	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Spain	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Sweden	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
United Kingdom	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Cyprus	6	5	2	0	77.1%	54.5%
Malta	6	5	2	0	77.3%	54.5%
Average	6.0	3.2	3.8	0.0	84.3%	65.5%

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2006

Islamic Conference (OIC)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Albania	6	3	4	0	84.8%	66.7%
Turkey	4	7	1	1	67.6%	36.4%
Afghanistan	3	10	0	0	56.5%	23.1%
Saudi Arabia	2	9	2	0	58.9%	18.2%
Kazakhstan	2	10	1	0	54.9%	16.7%
Lebanon	2	10	0	1	54.9%	16.7%
Morocco	2	11	0	0	54.0%	15.4%
Guinea-Bissau	1	4	3	5	61.5%	20.0%
Iraq	1	6	2	4	64.7%	14.3%
Nigeria	1	7	5	0	62.4%	12.5%
Jordan	1	9	2	1	55.9%	10.0%
Kuwait	1	9	3	0	56.9%	10.0%
Comoros	1	10	2	0	53.5%	9.1%
Maldives	1	10	0	2	53.5%	9.1%
Uganda	0	3	7	3	73.3%	0.0%
Chad	0	4	0	9	57.0%	0.0%
Cameroon	0	5	6	2	65.9%	0.0%
Côte d'Ivoire	0	6	4	3	61.0%	0.0%
Gambia	0	6	0	7	49.6%	0.0%
Somalia	0	6	3	4	42.8%	0.0%
Benin	0	7	5	1	54.7%	0.0%
Gabon	0	7	0	6	53.2%	0.0%
Burkina Faso	0	8	4	1	56.5%	0.0%
Guyana	0	8	5	0	57.7%	0.0%
Mali	0	8	5	0	57.0%	0.0%
Mozambique	0	8	5	0	57.0%	0.0%
Turkmenistan	0	8	3	2	46.0%	0.0%
United Arab Emirates	0	8	5	0	57.9%	0.0%
Bahrain	0	9	4	0	55.0%	0.0%
Djibouti	0	9	4	0	54.3%	0.0%
Oman	0	9	1	3	54.3%	0.0%
Sierra Leone	0	9	4	0	53.6%	0.0%
Suriname	0	9	4	0	54.3%	0.0%
Yemen	0	9	4	0	55.0%	0.0%
Kyrgyzstan	0	10	3	0	50.7%	0.0%
Niger	0	10	3	0	51.9%	0.0%
Qatar	0	10	3	0	52.1%	0.0%
Senegal	0	10	2	1	51.7%	0.0%
Tajikistan	0	10	0	3	48.1%	0.0%

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

Islamic Conference (OIC) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Togo	0	10	2	1	50.7%	0.0%
Tunisia	0	10	0	3	51.2%	0.0%
Azerbaijan	0	11	1	1	47.3%	0.0%
Brunei Darussalam	0	11	2	0	49.8%	0.0%
Mauritania	0	11	2	0	49.1%	0.0%
Bangladesh	0	12	1	0	47.4%	0.0%
Egypt	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Guinea	0	12	1	0	47.6%	0.0%
Iran	0	12	1	0	46.9%	0.0%
Libya	0	12	1	0	47.6%	0.0%
Malaysia	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Pakistan	0	12	1	0	47.1%	0.0%
Sudan	0	12	1	0	46.9%	0.0%
Syria	0	12	1	0	46.4%	0.0%
Uzbekistan	0	12	0	1	43.6%	0.0%
Algeria	0	13	0	0	45.4%	0.0%
Indonesia	0	13	0	0	45.8%	0.0%
Average	0.5	9.1	2.2	1.2	53.5%	5.2%

Non-Aligned Movement (NAM)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Cyprus	6	5	2	0	77.1%	54.5%
Malta	6	5	2	0	77.3%	54.5%
Nicaragua	5	4	3	1	79.3%	55.6%
Guatemala	5	5	3	0	76.0%	50.0%
Peru	5	5	3	0	76.2%	50.0%
Dominican Republic	5	6	2	0	72.2%	45.5%
Honduras	5	7	1	0	69.3%	41.7%
Bahamas	4	8	1	0	64.9%	33.3%
Chile	4	8	0	1	65.1%	33.3%
Ecuador	4	8	1	0	65.1%	33.3%
Vanuatu	3	4	4	2	76.0%	42.9%
Burundi	3	6	3	1	68.4%	33.3%
Panama	3	7	3	0	66.5%	30.0%
Afghanistan	3	10	0	0	56.5%	23.1%
UR Tanzania	2	5	4	2	70.4%	28.6%
Bolivia	2	7	3	1	64.3%	22.2%

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2006

Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Belize	2	9	2	0	58.7%	18.2%
Saudi Arabia	2	9	2	0	58.9%	18.2%
Lebanon	2	10	0	1	54.9%	16.7%
Morocco	2	11	0	0	54.0%	15.4%
Guinea-Bissau	1	4	3	5	61.5%	20.0%
Malawi	1	4	8	0	74.2%	20.0%
Mongolia	1	4	3	5	72.9%	20.0%
Papua New Guinea	1	4	6	2	72.2%	20.0%
Iraq	1	6	2	4	64.7%	14.3%
Lesotho	1	7	2	3	61.3%	12.5%
Liberia	1	7	2	3	57.5%	12.5%
Nigeria	1	7	5	0	62.4%	12.5%
Angola	1	8	3	1	57.9%	11.1%
Ghana	1	8	4	0	59.4%	11.1%
Philippines	1	8	4	0	59.6%	11.1%
Bhutan	1	9	3	0	56.7%	10.0%
Eritrea	1	9	2	1	56.3%	10.0%
Jordan	1	9	2	1	55.9%	10.0%
Kuwait	1	9	3	0	56.9%	10.0%
Mauritius	1	9	3	0	56.9%	10.0%
Comoros	1	10	2	0	53.5%	9.1%
Congo	1	10	2	0	54.3%	9.1%
Maldives	1	10	0	2	53.5%	9.1%
Equatorial Guinea	0	2	0	11	47.8%	0.0%
Madagascar	0	3	4	6	58.8%	0.0%
Seychelles	0	3	0	10	21.4%	0.0%
Uganda	0	3	7	3	73.3%	0.0%
Botswana	0	4	5	4	57.9%	0.0%
Chad	0	4	0	9	57.0%	0.0%
Colombia	0	4	9	0	73.0%	0.0%
Kenya	0	4	6	3	66.2%	0.0%
Rwanda	0	4	5	4	65.3%	0.0%
Cameroon	0	5	6	2	65.9%	0.0%
Swaziland	0	5	6	2	65.5%	0.0%
Cape Verde	0	6	7	0	63.6%	0.0%
Côte d'Ivoire	0	6	4	3	61.0%	0.0%
Gambia	0	6	0	7	49.6%	0.0%
Nepal	0	6	7	0	63.6%	0.0%
Sao Tome/Principe	0	6	3	4	60.7%	0.0%

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Somalia	0	6	3	4	42.8%	0.0%
Thailand	0	6	7	0	64.7%	0.0%
Benin	0	7	5	1	54.7%	0.0%
Gabon	0	7	0	6	53.2%	0.0%
Saint Lucia	0	7	0	6	57.8%	0.0%
Burkina Faso	0	8	4	1	56.5%	0.0%
Central African Rep.	0	8	4	1	56.3%	0.0%
Dem. Rep. Congo	0	8	0	5	38.9%	0.0%
Ethiopia	0	8	5	0	56.5%	0.0%
Grenada	0	8	0	5	55.3%	0.0%
Guyana	0	8	5	0	57.7%	0.0%
Jamaica	0	8	5	0	57.2%	0.0%
Mali	0	8	5	0	57.0%	0.0%
Mozambique	0	8	5	0	57.0%	0.0%
Trinidad and Tobago	0	8	4	1	57.2%	0.0%
Turkmenistan	0	8	3	2	46.0%	0.0%
United Arab Emirates	0	8	5	0	57.9%	0.0%
Bahrain	0	9	4	0	55.0%	0.0%
Barbados	0	9	4	0	54.3%	0.0%
Cambodia	0	9	1	3	52.3%	0.0%
Djibouti	0	9	4	0	54.3%	0.0%
Laos	0	9	3	1	50.5%	0.0%
Namibia	0	9	4	0	54.3%	0.0%
Oman	0	9	1	3	54.3%	0.0%
Sierra Leone	0	9	4	0	53.6%	0.0%
Singapore	0	9	4	0	55.0%	0.0%
Suriname	0	9	4	0	54.3%	0.0%
Yemen	0	9	4	0	55.0%	0.0%
Zambia	0	9	4	0	54.8%	0.0%
DPR of Korea	0	10	1	2	44.0%	0.0%
India	0	10	3	0	52.1%	0.0%
Niger	0	10	3	0	51.9%	0.0%
Qatar	0	10	3	0	52.1%	0.0%
Senegal	0	10	2	1	51.7%	0.0%
Sri Lanka	0	10	3	0	52.1%	0.0%
Togo	0	10	2	1	50.7%	0.0%
Tunisia	0	10	0	3	51.2%	0.0%
Zimbabwe	0	10	1	2	50.7%	0.0%
Brunei Darussalam	0	11	2	0	49.8%	0.0%

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2006

Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Mauritania	0	11	2	0	49.1%	0.0%
Myanmar (Burma)	0	11	1	1	47.1%	0.0%
South Africa	0	11	2	0	49.8%	0.0%
Bangladesh	0	12	1	0	47.4%	0.0%
Belarus	0	12	1	0	47.4%	0.0%
Egypt	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Guinea	0	12	1	0	47.6%	0.0%
Iran	0	12	1	0	46.9%	0.0%
Libya	0	12	1	0	47.6%	0.0%
Malaysia	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Pakistan	0	12	1	0	47.1%	0.0%
Sudan	0	12	1	0	46.9%	0.0%
Syria	0	12	1	0	46.4%	0.0%
Uzbekistan	0	12	0	1	43.6%	0.0%
Venezuela	0	12	1	0	47.4%	0.0%
Vietnam	0	12	0	1	44.6%	0.0%
Algeria	0	13	0	0	45.4%	0.0%
Cuba	0	13	0	0	44.9%	0.0%
Indonesia	0	13	0	0	45.8%	0.0%
Average	0.8	8.1	2.7	1.4	56.7%	9.1%

Nordic Group

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Denmark	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Finland	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Iceland	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Norway	6	3	4	0	84.9%	66.7%
Sweden	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Average	6.0	3.0	4.0	0.0	85.0%	66.7%

North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Canada	9	3	1	0	87.0%	75.0%
Belgium	6	3	4	0	84.9%	66.7%
Bulgaria	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Czech Republic	6	3	4	0	84.9%	66.7%
Denmark	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Estonia	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
France	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Germany	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Greece	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Hungary	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Iceland	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Italy	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Latvia	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Lithuania	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Luxembourg	6	3	4	0	84.8%	66.7%
Netherlands	6	3	4	0	84.9%	66.7%
Norway	6	3	4	0	84.9%	66.7%
Poland	6	3	4	0	84.9%	66.7%
Portugal	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Romania	6	3	4	0	84.9%	66.7%
Slovak Republic	6	3	4	0	84.8%	66.7%
Slovenia	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Spain	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
United Kingdom	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Turkey	4	7	1	1	67.6%	36.4%
Average	6.0	3.2	3.8	0.0	84.3%	65.7%

COMPARISON OF IMPORTANT AND OVERALL VOTES

The following table shows the percentage of voting coincidence with the United States in 2006 for both important votes and all Plenary votes, in a side-by-side comparison.

Comparison of Important and Overall Votes

COUNTRY	IMPORTANT VOTES			OVERALL VOTES		
	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT
Afghanistan.....	3	10	23.1%	17	68	20.0%
Albania	6	3	66.7%	33	41	44.6%
Algeria	0	13	0.0%	5	80	5.9%
Andorra.....	6	3	66.7%	32	43	42.7%
Angola	1	8	11.1%	14	66	17.5%
Antigua-Barbuda	0	9	0.0%	13	74	14.9%
Argentina	5	7	41.7%	21	66	24.1%
Armenia	1	8	11.1%	14	62	18.4%
Australia	9	3	75.0%	46	29	61.3%
Austria	6	3	66.7%	30	45	40.0%
Azerbaijan.....	0	11	0.0%	12	63	16.0%
Bahamas	4	8	33.3%	18	71	20.2%
Bahrain	0	9	0.0%	6	73	7.6%
Bangladesh	0	12	0.0%	13	77	14.4%
Barbados	0	9	0.0%	11	74	12.9%
Belarus	0	12	0.0%	13	68	16.0%
Belgium	6	3	66.7%	32	42	43.2%
Belize.....	2	9	18.2%	15	74	16.9%
Benin	0	7	0.0%	12	54	18.2%
Bhutan	1	9	10.0%	12	73	14.1%
Bolivia	2	7	22.2%	14	71	16.5%
Bosnia/Herzegovina.....	5	3	62.5%	27	40	40.3%
Botswana	0	4	0.0%	2	37	5.1%
Brazil	2	8	20.0%	15	69	17.9%
Brunei Darussalam	0	11	0.0%	13	78	14.3%
Bulgaria	6	3	66.7%	32	43	42.7%
Burkina Faso.....	0	8	0.0%	13	71	15.5%
Burundi.....	3	6	33.3%	16	59	21.3%
Cambodia.....	0	9	0.0%	11	73	13.1%
Cameroon	0	5	0.0%	11	51	17.7%
Canada	9	3	75.0%	41	34	54.7%
Cape Verde	0	6	0.0%	13	66	16.5%
Central African Rep.....	0	8	0.0%	12	69	14.8%
Chad.....	0	4	0.0%	12	31	27.9%
Chile	4	8	33.3%	21	70	23.1%

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

Comparison of Important and Overall Votes (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IMPORTANT VOTES			OVERALL VOTES		
	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT
China	0	12	0.0%	14	73	16.1%
Colombia	0	4	0.0%	12	67	15.2%
Comoros	1	10	9.1%	6	74	7.5%
Congo	1	10	9.1%	13	75	14.8%
Costa Rica.....	1	7	12.5%	16	70	18.6%
Côte d'Ivoire.....	0	6	0.0%	12	52	18.8%
Croatia	6	3	66.7%	31	43	41.9%
Cuba.....	0	13	0.0%	12	78	13.3%
Cyprus	6	5	54.5%	30	48	38.5%
Czech Republic.....	6	3	66.7%	31	43	41.9%
DPR of Korea	0	10	0.0%	4	62	6.1%
Dem. Rep. of the Congo ...	0	8	0.0%	1	42	2.3%
Denmark	6	3	66.7%	32	43	42.7%
Djibouti.....	0	9	0.0%	6	72	7.7%
Dominica	0	6	0.0%	12	69	14.8%
Dominican Republic.....	5	6	45.5%	20	62	24.4%
Ecuador.....	4	8	33.3%	19	73	20.7%
Egypt	0	12	0.0%	6	75	7.4%
El Salvador	5	6	45.5%	18	68	20.9%
Equatorial Guinea.....	0	2	0.0%	0	10	0.0%
Eritrea	1	9	10.0%	14	75	15.7%
Estonia.....	6	3	66.7%	32	43	42.7%
Ethiopia	0	8	0.0%	11	68	13.9%
Fiji	3	5	37.5%	17	53	24.3%
Finland.....	6	3	66.7%	31	43	41.9%
France	6	3	66.7%	37	35	51.4%
Gabon	0	7	0.0%	4	62	6.1%
Gambia	0	6	0.0%	4	48	7.7%
Georgia	5	3	62.5%	30	44	40.5%
Germany	6	3	66.7%	32	43	42.7%
Ghana.....	1	8	11.1%	13	69	15.9%
Greece.....	6	3	66.7%	32	43	42.7%
Grenada.....	0	8	0.0%	12	70	14.6%
Guatemala.....	5	5	50.0%	22	67	24.7%
Guinea	0	12	0.0%	14	78	15.2%
Guinea-Bissau.....	1	4	20.0%	4	36	10.0%
Guyana.....	0	8	0.0%	13	71	15.5%
Haiti.....	3	6	33.3%	18	67	21.2%
Honduras.....	5	7	41.7%	21	67	23.9%
Hungary.....	6	3	66.7%	32	42	43.2%
Iceland	6	3	66.7%	32	43	42.7%

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2006

Comparison of Important and Overall Votes (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IMPORTANT VOTES			OVERALL VOTES		
	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT
India.....	0	10	0.0%	13	69	15.9%
Indonesia.....	0	13	0.0%	14	80	14.9%
Iran.....	0	12	0.0%	6	74	7.5%
Iraq.....	1	6	14.3%	5	67	6.9%
Ireland.....	6	3	66.7%	31	46	40.3%
Israel.....	10	1	90.9%	64	12	84.2%
Italy.....	6	3	66.7%	32	43	42.7%
Jamaica.....	0	8	0.0%	12	70	14.6%
Japan.....	6	3	66.7%	33	44	42.9%
Jordan.....	1	9	10.0%	4	71	5.3%
Kazakhstan.....	2	10	16.7%	13	69	15.9%
Kenya.....	0	4	0.0%	12	46	20.7%
Kiribati.....	1	1	50.0%	2	1	66.7%
Kuwait.....	1	9	10.0%	7	73	8.8%
Kyrgyzstan.....	0	10	0.0%	11	70	13.6%
Laos.....	0	9	0.0%	11	69	13.8%
Latvia.....	6	3	66.7%	33	41	44.6%
Lebanon.....	2	10	16.7%	7	73	8.8%
Lesotho.....	1	7	12.5%	13	70	15.7%
Liberia.....	1	7	12.5%	13	56	18.8%
Libya.....	0	12	0.0%	5	76	6.2%
Liechtenstein.....	6	3	66.7%	29	44	39.7%
Lithuania.....	6	3	66.7%	33	43	43.4%
Luxembourg.....	6	3	66.7%	32	42	43.2%
Madagascar.....	0	3	0.0%	3	25	10.7%
Malawi.....	1	4	20.0%	13	55	19.1%
Malaysia.....	0	12	0.0%	14	77	15.4%
Maldives.....	1	10	9.1%	15	74	16.9%
Mali.....	0	8	0.0%	12	73	14.1%
Malta.....	6	5	54.5%	30	48	38.5%
Marshall Islands.....	9	0	100.0%	54	12	81.8%
Mauritania.....	0	11	0.0%	12	76	13.6%
Mauritius.....	1	9	10.0%	14	71	16.5%
Mexico.....	3	6	33.3%	20	66	23.3%
Micronesia.....	9	3	75.0%	53	20	72.6%
Moldova.....	7	3	70.0%	29	41	41.4%
Monaco.....	6	3	66.7%	31	38	44.9%
Mongolia.....	1	4	20.0%	16	62	20.5%
Montenegro.....	5	3	62.5%	29	42	40.8%
Morocco.....	2	11	15.4%	7	76	8.4%
Mozambique.....	0	8	0.0%	12	71	14.5%

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

Comparison of Important and Overall Votes (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IMPORTANT VOTES			OVERALL VOTES		
	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT
Myanmar (Burma)	0	11	0.0%	5	72	6.5%
Namibia	0	9	0.0%	12	75	13.8%
Nauru	4	3	57.1%	22	30	42.3%
Nepal	0	6	0.0%	11	67	14.1%
Netherlands.....	6	3	66.7%	32	43	42.7%
New Zealand.....	6	3	66.7%	29	48	37.7%
Nicaragua.....	5	4	55.6%	19	62	23.5%
Niger.....	0	10	0.0%	13	75	14.8%
Nigeria.....	1	7	12.5%	14	69	16.9%
Norway.....	6	3	66.7%	32	42	43.2%
Oman.....	0	9	0.0%	6	73	7.6%
Pakistan.....	0	12	0.0%	15	70	17.6%
Palau.....	10	2	83.3%	58	16	78.4%
Panama.....	3	7	30.0%	18	69	20.7%
Papua New Guinea.....	1	4	20.0%	13	39	25.0%
Paraguay.....	5	8	38.5%	20	71	22.0%
Peru.....	5	5	50.0%	21	68	23.6%
Philippines.....	1	8	11.1%	14	72	16.3%
Poland.....	6	3	66.7%	32	42	43.2%
Portugal.....	6	3	66.7%	32	43	42.7%
Qatar.....	0	10	0.0%	6	74	7.5%
Republic of Korea.....	5	3	62.5%	28	44	38.9%
Romania.....	6	3	66.7%	32	42	43.2%
Russia.....	0	8	0.0%	16	62	20.5%
Rwanda.....	0	4	0.0%	10	47	17.5%
St. Kitts and Nevis.....	0	4	0.0%	11	35	23.9%
Saint Lucia.....	0	7	0.0%	12	69	14.8%
St. Vincent/Grenadines.....	0	8	0.0%	14	68	17.1%
Samoa.....	3	4	42.9%	19	51	27.1%
San Marino.....	5	3	62.5%	30	43	41.1%
Sao Tome and Principe.....	0	6	0.0%	12	62	16.2%
Saudi Arabia.....	2	9	18.2%	8	73	9.9%
Senegal.....	0	10	0.0%	13	76	14.6%
Serbia.....	6	3	66.7%	31	43	41.9%
Seychelles.....	0	3	0.0%	0	8	0.0%
Sierra Leone.....	0	9	0.0%	12	70	14.6%
Singapore.....	0	9	0.0%	14	71	16.5%
Slovak Republic.....	6	3	66.7%	31	42	42.5%
Slovenia.....	6	3	66.7%	32	42	43.2%
Solomon Islands.....	1	5	16.7%	13	66	16.5%
Somalia.....	0	6	0.0%	3	35	7.9%

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2006

Comparison of Important and Overall Votes (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IMPORTANT VOTES			OVERALL VOTES		
	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT
South Africa.....	0	11	0.0%	13	76	14.6%
Spain.....	6	3	66.7%	31	42	42.5%
Sri Lanka	0	10	0.0%	13	76	14.6%
Sudan.....	0	12	0.0%	5	75	6.3%
Suriname.....	0	9	0.0%	12	75	13.8%
Swaziland	0	5	0.0%	12	60	16.7%
Sweden	6	3	66.7%	30	46	39.5%
Switzerland.....	6	3	66.7%	29	44	39.7%
Syria.....	0	12	0.0%	4	73	5.2%
Tajikistan	0	10	0.0%	10	65	13.3%
Thailand.....	0	6	0.0%	13	71	15.5%
TFYR Macedonia	6	3	66.7%	30	43	41.1%
Timor-Leste	4	5	44.4%	18	67	21.2%
Togo.....	0	10	0.0%	13	73	15.1%
Tonga.....	3	3	50.0%	8	32	20.0%
Trinidad and Tobago	0	8	0.0%	12	73	14.1%
Tunisia	0	10	0.0%	5	76	6.2%
Turkey	4	7	36.4%	28	51	35.4%
Turkmenistan.....	0	8	0.0%	4	54	6.9%
Tuvalu.....	4	1	80.0%	9	18	33.3%
Uganda.....	0	3	0.0%	11	36	23.4%
Ukraine	6	3	66.7%	31	45	40.8%
United Arab Emirates	0	8	0.0%	6	72	7.7%
United Kingdom	6	3	66.7%	41	36	53.2%
UR Tanzania.....	2	5	28.6%	15	61	19.7%
Uruguay	4	6	40.0%	19	68	21.8%
Uzbekistan	0	12	0.0%	11	65	14.5%
Vanuatu	3	4	42.9%	16	42	27.6%
Venezuela	0	12	0.0%	11	77	12.5%
Vietnam	0	12	0.0%	5	76	6.2%
Yemen	0	9	0.0%	6	73	7.6%
Zambia.....	0	9	0.0%	12	75	13.8%
Zimbabwe.....	0	10	0.0%	13	71	15.5%
Average.....	2.4	6.5	27.2%	17.7	57.3	23.6%