

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL 2025

Topic: Development of a proposal for a new financial contributions system for the APPU: Report of the Joint Sub-Committee of the Finance Committee and Reform Working Group (JSC)

| 1. Subject | References/ Paragraphs |
|--|------------------------|
| Informing the EC on: | |
| - the requirement for the JSC to identify a sustainable, fair and equitable | § 1.2 (ii) |
| contribution class system at the 2025 EC meeting | |
| - the background to the current system, its relationship with the former | § 2, Appendix 1 |
| UPU system, and the need to find a new basis for the APPU system | |
| - work undertaken by the JSC since the 2024 EC meeting | § 4 |
| - the five contribution class variants developed and the assessment of | §§ 8 – 9 |
| these variants | Appendices 2 – 6 |
| - two variants that meet the criteria for a new contribution class system | § 10 |
| - draft amendments to the Acts to enable either of the two variants (that | |
| meet the criteria) to apply | § 10.3, Appendix 8 |
| - the preferred variant and accompanying reasons | §§ 10.4 – 10.5 |
| 2 Decision synasted | |
| 2. Decision expected The EC is asked to: | |
| - note the requirement for the JSC to identify a sustainable, fair and | \$ 1 2 /ii\ |
| equitable contribution class system at the 2025 EC meeting | § 1.2 (ii) |
| - note the background to the current system, its relationship with the | S 2 Appardix 1 |
| former UPU system, and the need to find a new basis for the APPU | § 2, Appendix 1 |
| system | |
| - note the work undertaken by the JSC since the 2024 EC meeting | § 4 |
| - note the five contribution class variants developed and the assessment | §§ 8 – 9 |
| of these variants | Appendices 2 – 6 |
| - note the two variants that meet the criteria for the new APPU | § 10 |
| contribution class system | Appendix 4, Appendix 6 |
| - note the basis for deciding which of the two variants is submitted as the | §§ 10.4 – 10.5 |
| preferred option | 33 10.4 10.5 |
| - agree with the JSC recommendations that: | |
| - Variant 5 be accepted, in principle, by the 2025 EC as the proposed new | § 11 (i) |
| contribution class system for the APPU; | Appendix 4 (Variant 3) |
| - the JSC, supported by the Reform Consultant, undertakes any further | Appendix 8 (proposals) |
| work required on Variant 5 until such time as the membership confirms | § 11 (ii) |
| the proposed new contribution class system is considered fit-for- | 3 11 (11) |
| , , | |
| purpose; and | |
| - the JSC, supported by the Reform Consultant, be available as required | 6.44 (111) |
| remains in place until the new contributions system is adopted by the | § 11 (iii) |
| Union for the purpose of supporting members and the Bureau with | |
| information and guidance on the proposals to ensure there is an | |
| efficient conclusion to the mandate from the 2022 APPU Congress per | |
| Resolution C 6/2022. | |

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This document responds to Resolution C 6/2022 ("Full review of the financial contributions system"). The Resolution was supported by Congress 2022 Doc 24.6.
- 1.2 To enable the necessary work to be done, Resolution EC 3/2023 ("Work programme on the full review of the financial contributions system"), requested the Joint Sub-Committee of the Finance Committee and Reform Working Group (JSC) to proceed as follows.
 - (i) By the 2024 Executive Council meeting, to analyse data, sourced by the Bureau and the Reform Consultant, on the current apportionment of the Union's income, and to identify the most appropriate income level of the Union to maximise values and benefits brought to member countries (this was undertaken and completed as set out in EC 2024 Doc 17).
 - (ii) By the 2025 Executive Council meeting, to identify a sustainable, fair and equitable contribution class system of the Union, with regard to the contribution system for the Universal Postal Union and member countries' level of development, by referring, if required, to contribution systems for restricted unions governed by Article 8 of the Constitution of the Universal Postal Union. (This is now presented in this document.)

2. Background

- 2.1 The financial contributions system is a mandatory arrangement to cover the operating cost of the Union i.e., the expenses of the Administrative Section of the Bureau. Members' contributions are set in contribution units, these (up until 2018) being based on a member's contribution class in the UPU.
- 2.2 Appendix 1 sets out the relationship between the UPU and APPU contribution classes from 1962 onwards (i.e., from the establishment of the APPU through to the present day). Because of its relevance to the issue that this document deals with (i.e., the need for a new basis for the APPU contributions system), the more recent information in Appendix 1 is copied below.

Table 41: Third Revision of Relationship between the two Contribution Class Systems (2019-2021)

| Contribution Units for UPU Expenses | Contribution Units for APPU Expenses |
|--|--|
| 50, <mark>47,</mark> 45, <mark>43</mark> , 40, <mark>37</mark> , 35, <mark>33,</mark> 30, <mark>27,</mark> 25, <mark>23,</mark> 20, <mark>17</mark> | 5 |
| 15, <mark>13,</mark> 10, <mark>7</mark> , 5 | 3 |
| 3, 1 | 2 |
| 0.5 (available only to LDCs and other countries | 1 (available only to LDCs and other countries as |
| designated by the CA) | decided in the UPU system) |
| 0.1 (available only to SIDS with population less than 200,000) | No corresponding contribution class |

-

¹ Table number is from sequence in Appendix 1.

Table 5²: Uncoupling of Relationship between the two Contribution Class Systems (2022 onwards)

| Contribution Units for UPU Expenses | Contribution Units for APPU Expenses | |
|---|--|--|
| Based on scale of assessments for UN expenses | 5 | |
| | 3 | |
| | 2 | |
| 0.5 (available only to LDCs and other countries | 1 (available only to LDCs and other countries as | |
| designated by the CA) | decided in the UPU system) | |
| 0.1 (available only to SIDS with population | 0.5 (available only to SIDS with population | |
| less than 200,000) | less than 200,000) | |

2.3 The issue is clear from the two tables. Table 4 shows that up until 2021 there was a relationship between the two organisations' financial contributions systems. From 2022, however, when the UPU moved to a system based on the UN scale of assessments, it ceased to be the point of reference for the APPU system (apart from LDCs and SIDS³). A key issue being that UPU members would be recorded in contribution classes of one-unit steps (or, possibly, half-unit steps in some instances) and any relationship with the APPU classes needed revision.

3. JSC activity - recap on 2024 work

- 3.1 At the 2024 EC meeting the JSC identified that the most appropriate income level for the Union (i.e., the expenditure covered by mandatory member contributions) should be based on the current range of services / work undertaken in the Administrative Section. There was no support for mandatory contributions to cover any activities in either the Training Section or the Consultancy Section.
- 3.2 As far as an actual expenditure figure was concerned (i.e., what should the income level for the Union be expressed in USD), nothing was confirmed. This is a matter that can be dealt with during the preparation of budgets for future years.

4. JSC work - 2025

- 4.1 As set out in paragraph 1.2 (ii), the JSC is required to "... identify a sustainable, fair and equitable contribution class system of the Union ... ". This work has been undertaken. A proposal has been prepared for presentation and review.
- 4.2 The format for describing the work that has been done is as follows.
 - (i) Definition of key terms to ensure JSC meets the requirements of "sustainable, fair and equitable".
 - (ii) Re-statement of the issue to be resolved.
 - (iii) Summary of approach to developing options for a new contribution class system.
 - (iv) Calculations and financial impacts of options developed.

² Table number is from sequence in Appendix 1.

³ The 0.5-unit APPU contribution class for SIDS is an interim arrangement pending review.

- (v) Assessment of the options developed.
- (vi) Preferred option.

5. Definition of key terms

5.1 It is important to the assessment of the options that there is an understanding of what the criteria are. In this regard, the JSC agreed on the following definitions.

| Term | Definition |
|-------------|--|
| Sustainable | Relates to the capacity for a system to maintain its initial design and not require modification, in whole or in part, due to financial stress caused for members. |
| Fair | Relates to: what is covered by expenditure in terms of balancing the interests / needs of members and the interests / needs of the Administrative Section e.g., members are entitled to money being spent carefully, staff are entitled to reasonable conditions and equipment for their work minimising the financial impact of any change in system on members |
| Equitable | Relates to the importance of recognising different financial capacities among members and keeping contributions at an appropriate level on an individual basis. |

6. The issue to be resolved

- 6.1 The APPU contributions system was originally based on the UPU contributions system
- 6.2 The UPU has changed its contributions system. Thus, the linkage in APPU General Regulations Article 116, § 1 no longer exists. The APPU needs to establish a new basis for its contributions system.
- 7. Summary of approach to developing options for a new contribution class system
- 7.1 The new contributions system considered possible approaches: developing a system unique to the APPU; or reviewing systems used in other organisations and applying or adapting them to the APPU.

8. Calculations and financial impacts of options developed

8.1 Five variants were developed under the two approaches set out in paragraph 7.

| Approach | Variant | Туре |
|-----------------|---------|--|
| 1: Developing a | | Fixed and variable cost system where there is a fixed element that is |
| system unique | 1 | the same for all 32 members, and a variable cost levied on current 2, |
| to the APPU | | 3, 4 ⁴ and 5-unit members |
| | 2 | UPU system 1.0 - based on UN scale of assessments at system design |
| | | level |
| 2: Reviewing | 3 | UPU system 2.0 – based on UN scale of assessments at practical |
| systems used in | 3 | application level |
| other | 4 | PAPU system based on scale of assessments using a grouping |
| organisations | 4 | methodology that equalizes contribution amounts |
| | - | PUASP system of voluntary contribution classes but expanded to |
| | 5 | better match divergent financial capacities. |

8.2 For ease of presentation, the details on each of the five variants are set out in appendices viz.,

Appendix 2: Variant 1 - Fixed and variable cost system

Appendix 3: Variant 2 - UPU system 1.0

Appendix 4: Variant 3 – UPU system 2.0

Appendix 5: Variant 4 - PAPU system

Appendix 6: Variant 5 - PUASP system

8.3 All calculations have been based on the approved 2025 budget (EC 2024 Doc 6b Annex 1 Rev 1). This is included in Appendix 7.

9. Assessment of the options developed

- 9.1 The information in Appendices 2 to 6 outlines the principles and outcomes of each of the variants. Further, there is a detailed calculation of cost impacts for each system.
- 9.2 The table below provides a summary assessment of the material in Appendices 2 to 6.

⁴ The 4-unit contribution class is not provided for in the General Regulations. However, it was selected by one member (Bangladesh) in 2019 when it volunteered to move to a higher level of contribution.

| Feature | Variant 1 | Variant 2 | Variant 3 | Variant 4 | Variant 5 |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Document Ref | Appendix 2 | Appendix 3 | Appendix 4 | Appendix 5 | Appendix 6 |
| System Type | Fixed and variable components | UN Scale of Assessments – system design level (UPU 1.0) | UN Scale of Assessments – practical application level (UPU 2.0) | PAPU Tiers based on Scale of Assessment | PUASP system based on voluntary unit selection |
| Degree of change from current system | Significant | Significant, albeit with UPU now using the system | Minor | Significant | Minor |
| Need to recalculate key components for new Congress cycle | Yes, but not significant work | Only contribution unit value for revised ceiling and unit numbers. | Only contribution unit value for revised ceiling and unit numbers. | Yes, but not significant work | Only contribution unit value for revised ceiling and unit numbers. |
| Sustainability | Untested, but two components will probably give rise to ongoing debate | System has created transitional difficulties in UPU | No issues | Untested, but two components will probably give rise to ongoing debate | No issues |
| Fairness (financial impacts on members) | Significant variations (from -42% to +16%) | Extremely significant variations (from -99% to +610%) | No change to current contribution levels | Significant variations (from -69% to +40%) | No change to current contribution levels |
| Equitability | No. Produces increases for a number of less financially able members, and decreases for those with strong financial capacity. | No | Yes. Members have some control over their contribution class, and there is scope to increase contributions on a voluntary basis to a greater degree than currently applies. Does not allow members to automatically decrease contributions. | Undecided. Provides decreases for less financially able members, and increases for those with strong financial capacity. | Yes. Members have some control over their contribution class, and there is scope to increase contributions on a voluntary basis to a much greater degree than currently applies. Allows members to decrease contributions. |
| Linked to UPU system | No | No | Yes | No | No |
| Revision of Acts | Requires new material to be drafted | Requires new material to be drafted | Minor change to text currently in Acts | Requires new material to be drafted | Requires new material to be drafted |

Note: Both Variant 3 and Variant 5 retain the status quo for APPU contribution classes.

The point of difference between the two Variants is that Variant 3 re-establishes the link with the UPU contribution class system; as such it is not a voluntary system. Variant 5 on the other hand is a voluntary system which generally uses the rules established by PUASP for the management of contributions.

10. Variants that meet review criteria

- 10.1 From the summary assessment in the table at paragraph 9.2, there are two Variants that meet the review criteria i.e.,
 - (i) Variant 3: UN Scale of Assessments practical application level (UPU 2.0); and
 - (ii) Variant 5: PUASP system based on voluntary unit selection.
- 10.2 Both Variants 3 and 5 retain a structure identical to the current system, have no financial impact on members, and generally meet the criteria of sustainable, fair and equitable. The other three variants are complex in comparison to Variants 3 and 5. Further, and significantly, they result in contribution changes, some of which may be unacceptable.
- 10.3 As part of the assessment process for Variants 3 and 5, amendments to the Acts have been drafted to understand what might be involved. The details are at Appendix 8 where it can be seen that Variant 3 is a much simpler procedure.
- 10.4 Refining Variants 3 and 5 to identify a preferred option is set out below.

| Feature | Variant 3 | Variant 5 | Comment |
|----------------------|---|--|--|
| Equitability | Yes. Members have some control over their contribution class, and there is scope to increase contributions on a voluntary basis to a greater degree than currently applies. Does not allow members to automatically decrease contributions. | Yes. Members have some control over their contribution class, and there is scope to increase contributions on a voluntary basis to a much greater degree than currently applies. Allows members to decrease contributions. | Both Variants introduce classes higher than those currently used to provide scope for voluntary increases for the current highest class. However, Variant 3 is limited to the current UPU model (6 units), whereas the PUASP basis for Variant 5 has three additional classes at the top end (6, 7 and 8 units). |
| Linked to UPU system | Yes | No | Variant 3 is not a voluntary system i.e., members are encouraged to increase contributions up to their UN Scale of Assessment, but members are not able to automatically decrease contributions. In the sense that it encourages alignment with the UN Scale of Assessment, it continues a link with the UPU system. Variant 5 is a voluntary system and as such, allows members to |
| Revision of Acts | Minor change to text currently in Acts | Requires new material to be drafted | increase or decrease contributions. Treaty drafting for Variant 3 is more straightforward than for Variant 5. |

10.5 While both Variants have positive aspects, Variant 5 was regarded as the preferred option when discussed at the JSC on 5 June, noting that Variant 3 had not yet been developed. Having assessed the new Variant 3, developed in response to comments from the APPU Bureau, against Variant 5,

which had received some support from APPU member countries, it appears that the two Variants are similar in merit, but with Variant 5 having flexibility for APPU member countries to decrease contributions.

11. Recommendation

11.1 The JSC **recommends** that:

- (i) Variant 5 be accepted, in principle, by the 2025 EC as the proposed new contribution class system for the APPU;
- (ii) the JSC, supported by the Reform Consultant, undertakes any further work required on Variant 5 until such time as the membership confirms the proposed new contribution class system is considered fit-for-purpose; and
- (iii) the JSC, supported by the Reform Consultant, be available as required until the new contributions system is adopted by the Union for the purpose of supporting members and the Bureau with information and guidance on the proposals to ensure there is an efficient conclusion to the mandate from the 2022 APPU Congress per Resolution C 6/2022.

Relationship Between APPU and UPU Contribution Class Systems

- 1. The contribution class system for apportioning the administrative expenses of the APPU is set out in the APPU General Regulations (Article 116). The system is based on a member's contribution to the expenses of the UPU.
- 2. The relationship between the UPU and APPU contribution class systems has generally been stable. Since the founding of the APPU in 1962, there have been four revisions of the relationship between the two contribution class systems.
- 3. The original and revised relationships between the contribution class systems are set out below.

Table 1: Original Relationship between the two Contribution Class Systems (1962-1965)

| Contribution Units for UPU Expenses | Contribution Units for APPU Expenses |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 25, 20 | 7 |
| 15, 10, 5 | 3 |
| 3, 1 | 1 |

Table 2: First Revision of Relationship between the two Contribution Class Systems (1966-1985)^{5 6}

| Contribution Units for UPU Expenses | Contribution Units for APPU Expenses |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <mark>50</mark> , 25, 20 | 5 |
| 15, 10, 5 | 3 |
| 3, 1 | 2 |

Table 3: Second Revision of Relationship between the two Contribution Class Systems (1986-2018)⁷

| Contribution Units for UPU Expenses | Contribution Units for APPU Expenses |
|---|---|
| 50, 40, 35, 25, 20 | 5 |
| 15, 10, 5 | 3 |
| 3, 1 | 2 |
| 0.5 (available only to LDCs and other countries designated by the CA) | 1 (available only to LDCs and other countries as decided in the UPU system) |

⁵ The APPU changed from 7/3/1 to 5/3/2 in 1966.

⁶ The 1974 UPU Lausanne Congress created a new 50-unit class.

⁷ The APPU added (APPU Bangkok Congress, 1985) the 1-unit class to reflect, in principle, the 0.5-unit class (UPU Hamburg Congress, 1984) in the UPU system. (The 0.5-unit class was created by the UPU for the Least Developed Countries as specific recognition of the affordability aspect.)

Table 4: Third Revision of Relationship between the two Contribution Class Systems (2019-2021)8

| Contribution Units for UPU Expenses | Contribution Units for APPU Expenses |
|--|--|
| 50, <mark>47,</mark> 45, <mark>43</mark> , 40, <mark>37</mark> , 35, <mark>33,</mark> 30, <mark>27,</mark> 25, <mark>23,</mark> 20, <mark>17</mark> | 5 |
| 15, <mark>13,</mark> 10, <mark>7</mark> , 5 | 3 |
| 3, 1 | 2 |
| 0.5 (available only to LDCs and other countries | 1 (available only to LDCs and other countries as |
| designated by the CA) | decided in the UPU system) |
| 0.1 (available only to SIDS with population less than 200,000) | No corresponding contribution class |

Table 5: Uncoupling of Relationship between the two Contribution Class Systems (2022 onwards)⁹

| Contribution Units for UPU Expenses | Contribution Units for APPU Expenses |
|--|--|
| | 5 |
| Based on scale of assessments for UN expenses | 3 |
| | 2 |
| 0.5 (available only to LDCs and other countries | 1 (available only to LDCs and other countries as |
| designated by the CA) | decided in the UPU system) |
| 0.1 (available only to SIDS with population less than 200,000) | 0.5 (available only to SIDS with population less than 200,000)10 |

⁸ The 2018 Addis Ababa UPU Extraordinary Congress introduced:

⁽i) 47, 43, 37, 33, 27, 23, 17, 13 and 7 units where the motivation was to reduce the financial impact of a member changing (down) from one class to another; and

⁽ii) a new class of 0.1-unit reserved for countries which are recognised by the United Nations as Small Island Developing States (SIDS) with a population of under 200,000.

⁹ Apart from LDCs and SIDS, the UPU contribution class system, in principle, changed to a system where contributions started at one unit and rose in incremental one-unit steps to a level defined with reference to the most recent scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations.

¹⁰ Introduced on an interim basis by 2022 APPU Bangkok Congress pending further review (Resolution C 5/2022 refers).

Variant 1: Fixed and variable cost system

Principles

- 1. Retains current contribution units (i.e., 5, 4, 3, 2, 1, 0.5).
- 2. All members contribute equally to a minor proportion of the budget.
- 3. Members in certain contribution classes contribute to the balance of the budget based on their selected unit class.
- 4. Standard rules apply to selection of contribution class and movement between classes.

Example definition of Principles 2 and 3 to show how Variant 1 works

| Principle | Quantified Principle | Impact on Members |
|---|---|------------------------------------|
| 2 – All 32 members contribute equally | 25% of budget = \$US 50,969 | \$US 1,593 each for all members as |
| to a minor proportion of the budget | 25% of budget = 303 50,969 | contribution to fixed cost |
| 3 – Members in certain contribution | Contribution classes 2, 3, 4, 5 | 2-unit class: \$US 4,634 |
| classes contribute to the balance of the budget based on their selected | contribute to 75% of the budget based on their selected unit class. | 3-unit class: \$US 6,950 |
| unit class. | 75% of budget = \$US 152,908 | 4-unit class: \$US 9,267 |
| | Number of contribution units = 66. | 5-unit class: \$US 11,584 |
| | Cost per contribution unit = \$US 2,317 | |

Impact of Variant 1 on members

As shown on next page

Assessment of Variant 1: financial

- 13 members decrease between -1% to -42%
- 19 members increase between 4% to 16%

Assessment of Variant 1: general

- Interesting concept for all members to meet a portion of budget equally, and the balance funded variably (according, in principle, to financial capacity).
- Impossible to design without impacting current payment levels.
- Will result in ongoing debate about the correct split of fixed and variable budget percentages, and thus potentially a divisive methodology.

| | | | Vari | ant 1 | | |
|-------------------|---|--|--|---|--|--|
| | 25% of Budget Pa | id by All Members in | | | embers in 2, 3, 4 and | 5 Unit Classes on |
| Member | Member Contribution Per Fixed Component | Contribution Units for Calculating Variable Component | Pro Rai Member Contribution Per Variable Component | Total Member Contribution Per Variant 3 | Change in Member Contribution v Current System (\$) | Change in Member Contribution v Current System (%) |
| Afghanistan | 1,593 | | | 1,593 | -1,144 | -41.80% |
| Australia | 1,593 | 5 | 11,584 | 13,177 | -506 | -3.70% |
| Bangladesh | 1,593 | 4 | 9,267 | 10,860 | -86 | -0.79% |
| Bhutan | 1,593 | | | 1,593 | -1,144 | -41.80% |
| Brunei Darussalam | 1,593 | 2 | 4,634 | 6,226 | 753 | 13.76% |
| Cambodia | 1,593 | | | 1,593 | -1,144 | -41.80% |
| China | 1,593 | 5 | 11,584 | 13,177 | -506 | -3.70% |
| Fiji | 1,593 | 2 | 4,634 | 6,226 | 753 | 13.76% |
| India | 1,593 | 5 | 11,584 | 13,177 | -506 | -3.70% |
| Indonesia | 1,593 | 3 | 6,950 | 8,543 | 333 | 4.06% |
| Iran | 1,593 | 3 | 6,950 | 8,543 | 333 | 4.06% |
| Japan | 1,593 | 5 | 11,584 | 13,177 | -506 | -3.70% |
| Korea | 1,593 | 5 | 11,584 | 13,177 | -506 | -3.70% |
| Lao | 1,593 | | | 1,593 | -1,144 | -41.80% |
| Malaysia | 1,593 | 2 | 4,634 | 6,226 | 753 | 13.76% |
| Maldives | 1,593 | 2 | 4,634 | 6,226 | 753 | 13.76% |
| Mongolia | 1,593 | 2 | 4,634 | 6,226 | 753 | 13.76% |
| Myanmar | 1,593 | | | 1,593 | -1,144 | -41.80% |
| Nauru | 1,593 | | | 1,593 | 224 | 16.41% |
| Nepal | 1,593 | 2 | 4,634 | 6,226 | 753 | 13.76% |
| New Zealand | 1,593 | 3 | 6,950 | 8,543 | 333 | 4.06% |
| Pakistan | 1,593 | 3 | 6,950 | 8,543 | 333 | 4.06% |
| Papua New Guinea | 1,593 | 2 | 4,634 | 6,226 | 753 | 13.76% |
| Philippines | 1,593 | 2 | 4,634 | 6,226 | 753 | 13.76% |
| Samoa | 1,593 | | | 1,593 | 224 | 16.41% |
| Singapore | 1,593 | 2 | 4,634 | 6,226 | 753 | 13.76% |
| Solomon Islands | 1,593 | | | 1,593 | -1,144 | -41.80% |
| Sri Lanka | 1,593 | 3 | 6,950 | 8,543 | 333 | 4.06% |
| Thailand | 1,593 | 2 | 4,634 | 6,226 | 753 | 13.76% |
| Tonga | 1,593 | | | 1,593 | 224 | 16.41% |
| Vanuatu | 1,593 | | | 1,593 | -1,144 | -41.80% |
| Vietnam | 1,593 | 2 | 4,634 | 6,226 | 753 | 13.76% |
| | 50,969 | 66 | 152,908 | 203,877 | 0 | |

Variant 2: UPU system 1.0

Principles

- 1. Based on UN Scale of Assessments system design level.
- 2. APPU LDC and SIDS included in the overall Scale of Assessments calculation simply because keeping them in their 1-unit class and 0.5-unit class respectively (as applies in the UPU) does not have any material impact on the outcome of Variant 2.

Impact of Variant 2 on members

As shown on next page

Assessment of Variant 2: financial

- 29 members decrease between -2% to -99%
- 3 members increase:
 - China +610%
 - Japan +274%
 - Korea +20%

Assessment of Variant 2: general

Inequitable and unfair

| | | Varia | ant 2 | |
|-------------------|------------------------------|---|--------------------|--|
| | Base | ed on UN Scale of As | sessment (UPU Syst | em) |
| Member | % Share Based on UN Scale | Member Contribution Per UN Scale of Assessment | Contribution v | Change in Member Contribution v Current System (%) |
| Afghanistan | 0.019 | 38 | -2,698 | -98.60% |
| Australia | 6.591 | 13,438 | -245 | -1.79% |
| Bangladesh | 0.031 | 64 | -10,883 | -99.42% |
| Bhutan | 0.003 | 6 | -2,730 | -99.77% |
| Brunei Darussalam | 0.066 | 134 | -5,340 | -97.56% |
| Cambodia | 0.022 | 45 | -2,692 | -98.37% |
| China | 47.627 | 97,101 | 83,418 | 609.64% |
| Fiji | 0.012 | 25 | -5,448 | -99.53% |
| India | 3.260 | 6,646 | -7,037 | -51.43% |
| Indonesia | 1.714 | 3,495 | -4,715 | -57.43% |
| Iran | 1.158 | 2,362 | -5,848 | -71.23% |
| Japan | 25.081 | 51,135 | 37,452 | 273.71% |
| Korea | 8.037 | 16,385 | 2,702 | 19.75% |
| Lao | 0.022 | 45 | -2,692 | -98.37% |
| Malaysia | 1.087 | 2,215 | -3,258 | -59.53% |
| Maldives | 0.012 | 25 | -5,448 | -99.53% |
| Mongolia | 0.012 | 25 | -5,448 | -99.53% |
| Myanmar | 0.031 | 64 | -2,673 | -97.67% |
| Nauru | 0.003 | 6 | -1,362 | -99.53% |
| Nepal | 0.031 | 64 | -5,410 | -98.84% |
| New Zealand | 0.965 | 1,967 | -6,243 | -76.04% |
| Pakistan | 0.356 | 726 | -7,484 | -91.16% |
| Papua New Guinea | 0.031 | 64 | -5,410 | -98.84% |
| Philippines | 0.662 | 1,350 | -4,124 | -75.34% |
| Samoa | 0.003 | 6 | -1,362 | -99.53% |
| Singapore | 1.574 | 3,208 | -2,265 | -41.38% |
| Solomon Islands | 0.003 | 6 | -2,730 | -99.77% |
| Sri Lanka | 0.141 | 286 | -7,923 | -96.51% |
| Thailand | 1.149 | 2,343 | -3,131 | -57.20% |
| Tonga | 0.003 | 6 | -1,362 | -99.53% |
| Vanuatu | 0.003 | 6 | -2,730 | -99.77% |
| Vietnam | 0.290 | 592 | -4,881 | -89.18% |
| | 100.000 | 203,877 | 0 | |

Variant 3: UPU system 2.0

Principles

- 1. Based on UN Scale of Assessments practical application level.
- 2. APPU LDC and SIDS included in the overall Scale of Assessments calculation simply because keeping them in their 1-unit class and 0.5-unit class respectively (as applies in the UPU) does not have any material impact on the outcome of Variant 3.

Impact of Variant 3 on members

As shown on next page

Assessment of Variant 3: financial

• No impact – all member contributions are unchanged.

Assessment of Variant 3: general

- Variant 3 would commence as being the current system with the General Regulations containing the classes.
- Continuing the link between the APPU contributions system and the UPU contributions system
 means that the APPU is not a voluntary system and there may be greater stability in the system as
 a result.
- Re-establishing the link between the APPU and UPU systems would require amendment to how the respective contribution classes in the two organisations are aligned. This is because, theoretically, a UPU member (that is not LDC or SIDS) could be on any one of 60 1-unit steps (between 1 and 60 units), with the possibility of extending further (i.e., more 1-unit steps beyond the current maximum of 60 units).

| Current alignment of L | Current alignment of UPU and APPU systems | | or alignment of systems | |
|------------------------|---|---------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| UPU Units | APPU Units | UPU Units | APPU Units | |
| | | More than 55 | 6 | |
| Over 50 | | | | |
| 50 | | | | |
| 40 | _ | More than 20 and up to | F | |
| 35 | 5 | and including 55 | 5 | |
| 25 | | | | |
| 20 | | | | |
| 15 | | Mara than F and up to and | | |
| 10 | 3 | More than 5 and up to and | 3 | |
| 5 | | including 20 | | |
| 3 | 2 | More than 1 and up to and | 2 | |
| 1 | 2 | including 5 | 2 | |
| 0.5 | 1 | 0.5 | 1 | |
| 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.5 | |

| | | | Variant 3 | | | |
|-------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| Member | UPU Contribution Units | APPU Contribution Units | Member Contribution Per Approved 2025 Budget | Member Contribution Per Current System of Contribution Units | Change in Member Contribution v Current System (\$) | Comment on Relationship Between UPU and APPU Contribution Units |
| Afghanistan | 0.5 | 1 | 2,737 | 2,737 | 0 | Correct |
| Australia | 20 | 5 | 13,683 | 13,683 | 0 | Correct |
| Bangladesh | 3 | 4 | 10,946 | 10,946 | 0 | See Note 1 |
| Bhutan | 1 | 1 | 2,737 | 2,737 | 0 | See Note 2 |
| Brunei Darussalam | 1 | 2 | 5,473 | 5,473 | 0 | Correct |
| Cambodia | 1 | 1 | 2,737 | 2,737 | 0 | See Note 3 |
| China | 40 | 5 | 13,683 | 13,683 | 0 | Correct |
| Fiji | 1 | 2 | 5,473 | 5,473 | 0 | Correct |
| India | 20 | 5 | 13,683 | 13,683 | 0 | Correct |
| Indonesia | 5 | 3 | 8,210 | 8,210 | 0 | Correct |
| Iran | 5 | 3 | 8,210 | 8,210 | 0 | Correct |
| Japan | 55 | 5 | 13,683 | 13,683 | 0 | Correct |
| Korea | 15 | 5 | 13,683 | 13,683 | 0 | See Note 4 |
| Lao | 0.5 | 1 | 2,737 | 2,737 | 0 | Correct |
| Malaysia | 3 | 2 | 5,473 | 5,473 | 0 | Correct |
| Maldives | 1 | 2 | 5,473 | 5,473 | 0 | Correct |
| Mongolia | 1 | 2 | 5,473 | 5,473 | 0 | Correct |
| Myanmar | 1 | 1 | 2,737 | 2,737 | 0 | See Note 5 |
| Nauru | 0.1 | 0.5 | 1,368 | 1,368 | 0 | Correct |
| Nepal | 0.5 | 2 | 5,473 | 5,473 | 0 | See Note 6 |
| New Zealand | 5 | 3 | 8,210 | 8,210 | 0 | Correct |
| Pakistan | 9 | 3 | 8,210 | 8,210 | 0 | Correct |
| Papua New Guinea | 1 | 2 | 5,473 | 5,473 | 0 | Correct |
| Philippines | 1 | 2 | 5,473 | 5,473 | 0 | Correct |
| Samoa | 0.1 | 0.5 | 1,368 | 1,368 | 0 | Correct |
| Singapore | 4 | 2 | 5,473 | 5,473 | 0 | Correct |
| Solomon Islands | 0.5 | 1 | 2,737 | 2,737 | 0 | Correct |
| Sri Lanka | 3 | 3 | 8,210 | 8,210 | 0 | Correct |
| Thailand | 3 | 2 | 5,473 | 5,473 | 0 | Correct |
| Tonga | 0.1 | 0.5 | 1,368 | 1,368 | 0 | Correct |
| Vanuatu | 1 | 1 | 2,737 | 2,737 | 0 | See Note 7 |
| Vietnam | 1 | 2 | 5,473 | 5,473 | 0 | Correct |
| | | 74.5 | 203,877 | 203,877 | 0 | |

Note 1: Bangladesh is an LDC. It qualifies for 0.5 units in UPU and 1 unit in APPU. However, it pays 3 units in UPU and 4 units in APPU.

Note 2: Bhutan graduated out of LDC status in 2023; it should be recategorised as a 2-unit APPU contributor.

Note 3: Cambodia is an LDC. It qualifies for 0.5 units in UPU but pays 1 unit. The APPU contribution unit is correct.

Note 4: Korea pays 15 units in UPU and qualifies for 3 units in APPU. However, it pays 5 units in APPU.

Note 5: Myanmar is an LDC. It qualifies for 0.5 units in UPU but pays 1 unit. The APPU contribution unit is correct.

Note 6: Nepal is an LDC. It qualifies for 1 unit in APPU but pays 2 units.

Note 7: Vanuatu graduated out of LDC status in 2020; it should be recategorised as a 2-unit APPU contributor.

Variant 4: PAPU system

Principles

- 1. PAPU's system is as follows.
 - It uses a scale of assessment
 - Members are grouped into Tiers according to their place on the assessment scale
 - Tier 1 six countries @ 7.525% of annual budget (for a total percentage contribution of +/- 45%)
 - Tier 2 12 countries @ percentages of annual budget ranging from 4.000% down to 1.200% (for a total percentage contribution of +/- 33%)
 - Tier 3 37 countries @ percentages of annual budget ranging from 1.199% down to 0.115% (for a total percentage contribution of +/- 22%)
- 2. The APPU adaption of the PAPU contributions model is designed as follows:
 - (i) Group members within a defined range on the UN Assessment Scale into a single Tier
 - (ii) Allocate a percentage of APPU budget to each Tier
 - (iii) Minimise to the extent possible increases or decreases to current contributions

Example definition of Principle 2 to show how Variant 4 works

| Principle | Quantified Principle | Principle Applied to Members |
|---|-----------------------------------|--|
| | Tier 1: UN Scale 1.001 upwards | 5 members (Australia, China, India, Japan, Korea) |
| (') Consumer of the constant of | Tier 2: UN Scale 0.101 to 1.000 | 8 members (Indonesia, Iran, Malaysia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand) |
| (i) Group members within a defined range on the UN Assessment Scale into a single Tier | Tier 3: UN Scale 0.011 to 0.100 | 3 members (Brunei Darussalam, Sri Lanka, Vietnam) |
| | Tier 4: UN Scale 0.004 to | 10 members (Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Cambodia, Fiji, Lao, |
| | 0.010 | Maldives, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Papua New Guinea) |
| | Tier 5: UN Scale 0.001 to | 6 members (Bhutan, Nauru, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, |
| | 0.0039 | Vanuatu) |
| | Tier 1 | 40.00% of budget |
| (ii) Allocate a | Tier 2 | 30.00% of budget |
| percentage of APPU | Tier 3 | 8.75% of budget |
| budget to each Tier | Tier 4 | 18.75% of budget |
| | Tier 5 | 2.50% of budget |
| (iii) Minimise to the exter | nt possible increases or decrea | ases to current contributions - shown on next page |

Assessment of Variant 4: financial

- 17 members decrease between -7% to -69%
- 15 members increase between 9% to 40%

Assessment of Variant 4: general

- Because it is based on the UN Scale of Assessments, there is an element of fairness that is not present in more traditional Variants. However, some of this is lost when the Tier-grouping is applied to equalise the extremes of increases and decreases.
- As with Variant 1, there is the risk of Variant 4 being a divisive methodology i.e., ongoing debate about the correct allocation of budget percentage to each of the Tiers.
- Members would be looking for / expecting an outcome that produced smaller variations versus current contributions.

| | Variant 4 | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|-------------|--------------|---|-----------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|---|--|
| Bas | e Informat | ion | | | | C | esign and | and Calculation | | |
| Member | Current Units | Current Contrib | UN Scale | APPU Tier | Tier Share of Budget for Cycle | Contrib Unit for Tier | Current Contrib | Variant 3 Contrib | Change in Member Contribution v Current System (\$) | Change in Member Contribution v Current System (%) |
| India | 5 | 13,683 | 1.044 | | , | | 13,683 | 16,320 | 2,637 | 19% |
| Australia | 5 | 13,683 | 2.111 | | | | 13,683 | 16,320 | 2,637 | 19% |
| Korea | 5 | 13,683 | 2.574 | Tier 1 | 40% | 16,320 | 13,683 | 16,320 | 2,637 | 19% |
| Japan | 5 | 13,683 | 8.033 | | | | 13,683 | 16,320 | 2,637 | 19% |
| China | 5 | 13,683 | 15.254 | | | | 13,683 | 16,320 | 2,637 | 19% |
| Pakistan | 3 | 8,210 | 0.114 | | | | 8,210 | 7,650 | -560 | -7% |
| Philippines | 2 | 5,473 | 0.212 | | | | 5,473 | 7,650 | 2,177 | 40% |
| New Zealand | 3 | 8,210 | 0.309 | | | | 8,210 | 7,650 | -560 | -7% |
| Malaysia | 2 | 5,473 | 0.348 | 1 | 200/ | 7.650 | 5,473 | 7,650 | 2,177 | 40% |
| Thailand | 2 | 5,473 | 0.368 | Tier 2 | 30% | 7,650 | 5,473 | 7,650 | 2,177 | 40% |
| Iran | 3 | 8,210 | 0.371 | | | | 8,210 | 7,650 | -560 | -7% |
| Singapore | 2 | 5,473 | 0.504 | | | | 5,473 | 7,650 | 2,177 | 40% |
| Indonesia | 3 | 8,210 | 0.549 | | | | 8,210 | 7,650 | -560 | -7% |
| Brunei Darussalam | 2 | 5,473 | 0.021 | | | | 5,473 | 5,950 | 477 | 9% |
| Sri Lanka | 3 | 8,210 | 0.045 | Tier 3 | 8.75% | 5,950 | 8,210 | 5,950 | -2,260 | -28% |
| Vietnam | 2 | 5,473 | 0.093 | | | | 5,473 | 5,950 | 477 | 9% |
| Fiji | 2 | 5,473 | 0.004 | | | | 5,473 | 3,825 | -1,648 | -30% |
| Maldives | 2 | 5,473 | 0.004 | | | | 5,473 | 3,825 | -1,648 | -30% |
| Mongolia | 2 | 5,473 | 0.004 | | | | 5,473 | 3,825 | -1,648 | -30% |
| Afghanistan | 1 | 2,737 | 0.006 | | | | 2,737 | 3,825 | 1,088 | 40% |
| Cambodia | 1 | 2,737 | 0.007 | Tion 4 | 10.750/ | 2.025 | 2,737 | 3,825 | 1,088 | 40% |
| Lao | 1 | 2,737 | 0.007 | Tier 4 | 18.75% | 3,825 | 2,737 | 3,825 | 1,088 | 40% |
| Bangladesh | 4 | 10,946 | 0.010 | | | | 10,946 | 3,825 | -7,121 | -65% |
| Myanmar | 1 | 2,737 | 0.010 | | | | 2,737 | 3,825 | 1,088 | 40% |
| Nepal | 2 | 5,473 | 0.010 | | | | 5,473 | 3,825 | -1,648 | -30% |
| Papua New Guinea | 2 | 5,473 | 0.010 | | | | 5,473 | 3,825 | -1,648 | -30% |
| Bhutan | 1 | 2,737 | 0.001 | | | | 2,737 | 850 | -1,887 | -69% |
| Nauru | 0.5 | 1,368 | 0.001 | | | | 1,368 | 850 | -518 | -38% |
| Samoa | 0.5 | 1,368 | 0.001 | Tion 5 | 2 500/ | 850 | 1,368 | 850 | -518 | -38% |
| Solomon Islands | 1 | 2,737 | 0.001 | Tier 5 | 2.50% | 650 | 2,737 | 850 | -1,887 | -69% |
| Tonga | 0.5 | 1,368 | 0.001 | | | | 1,368 | 850 | -518 | -38% |
| Vanuatu | 1 | 2,737 | 0.001 | | | | 2,737 | 850 | -1,887 | -69% |
| | | 203,877 | | | | | 203,877 | 204,000 | 123 | |

Variant 5: PUASP system

Principles

- 1. PUASP's system is as follows.
 - It is a voluntary system where members can select a contribution class of 10, 9, 8, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2 or 1.25 units.
 - Decreases in contribution class can only be requested per Congress cycle. Increases can be advised at any time.
 - Members' choices of contribution class are formalised in a Congress Resolution and renewed at each Congress.
- 2. The APPU adaption of the PUASP contributions model is designed as follows:
 - Members retain their current contribution class of 5, 4, 3, 2, 1, or 0.5¹¹ units.
 - Additional classes are included to provide flexibility for members with greater financial capacity (i.e., 6, 7, 8).
 - As with PUASP:
 - Decreases in contribution class can only be requested per Congress cycle. Increases can be advised at any time.
 - Members' choices of contribution class are formalised in a Congress Resolution and renewed at each Congress.

Assessment of Variant 5: financial

No impact – all member contributions are unchanged (as shown on next page).

Assessment of Variant 5: general

- Variant 5 would commence as being the current system with the General Regulations containing the classes
- Uncoupling the APPU contributions system from the UPU contributions system means that the APPU becomes a voluntary system in its own right (in its previous link to the UPU system it was subject to voluntary movements in the member selection of UPU contribution classes). Becoming a voluntary system in its own right may be perceived as presenting a risk, however, at this time of financial and transitional difficulty for the postal sector, the ability to decrease contribution units may be valued by postal operators. In this regard, it is noted that:
 - 83% of APPU funds are currently provided on a voluntary basis
 - In the past, members have voluntarily contributed more to the APPU mandatory budget than required under the link to the UPU contribution system. On the most recent review (2021), there were four members in this category.

¹¹ Although 0.5-unit class is an interim arrangement, it is included in the assessment of Variant 5 to understand all aspects of applying the PUASP model.

| | Variant 5 | | | | | |
|-------------------|-----------------------|---|--|---|--|--|
| Member | Contribution Units | Member Contribution Per Approved 2025 Budget | Member Contribution Per Current System of Contribution Units | Change in Member Contribution v Current System (\$) | | |
| Afghanistan | 1 | 2,737 | 2,737 | 0 | | |
| Australia | 5 | 13,683 | 13,683 | 0 | | |
| Bangladesh | 4 | 10,946 | 10,946 | 0 | | |
| Bhutan | 1 | 2,737 | 2,737 | 0 | | |
| Brunei Darussalam | 2 | 5,473 | 5,473 | 0 | | |
| Cambodia | 1 | 2,737 | 2,737 | 0 | | |
| China | 5 | 13,683 | 13,683 | 0 | | |
| Fiji | 2 | 5,473 | 5,473 | 0 | | |
| India | 5 | 13,683 | 13,683 | 0 | | |
| Indonesia | 3 | 8,210 | 8,210 | 0 | | |
| Iran | 3 | 8,210 | 8,210 | 0 | | |
| Japan | 5 | 13,683 | 13,683 | 0 | | |
| Korea | 5 | 13,683 | 13,683 | 0 | | |
| Lao | 1 | 2,737 | 2,737 | 0 | | |
| Malaysia | 2 | 5,473 | 5,473 | 0 | | |
| Maldives | 2 | 5,473 | 5,473 | 0 | | |
| Mongolia | 2 | 5,473 | 5,473 | 0 | | |
| Myanmar | 1 | 2,737 | 2,737 | 0 | | |
| Nauru | 0.5 | 1,368 | 1,368 | 0 | | |
| Nepal | 2 | 5,473 | 5,473 | 0 | | |
| New Zealand | 3 | 8,210 | 8,210 | 0 | | |
| Pakistan | 3 | 8,210 | 8,210 | 0 | | |
| Papua New Guinea | 2 | 5,473 | 5,473 | 0 | | |
| Philippines | 2 | 5,473 | 5,473 | 0 | | |
| Samoa | 0.5 | 1,368 | 1,368 | 0 | | |
| Singapore | 2 | 5,473 | 5,473 | 0 | | |
| Solomon Islands | 1 | 2,737 | 2,737 | 0 | | |
| Sri Lanka | 3 | 8,210 | 8,210 | 0 | | |
| Thailand | 2 | 5,473 | 5,473 | 0 | | |
| Tonga | 0.5 | 1,368 | 1,368 | 0 | | |
| Vanuatu | 1 | 2,737 | 2,737 | 0 | | |
| Vietnam | 2 | 5,473 | 5,473 | 0 | | |
| | 74.5 | 203,877 | 203,877 | 0 | | |

Approved Budget for 2025

| No. | Member Country | Contribution Unit | Contribution Share |
|-----|-------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | Afghanistan | 1 | 2,737 |
| 2 | Australia | 5 | 13,683 |
| 3 | Bangladesh | 4 | 10,946 |
| 4 | Bhutan | 1 | 2,737 |
| 5 | Brunei Darussalam | 2 | 5,473 |
| 6 | Cambodia | 1 | 2,737 |
| 7 | China | 5 | 13,683 |
| 8 | Fiji | 2 | 5,473 |
| 9 | India | 5 | 13,683 |
| 10 | Indonesia | 3 | 8,210 |
| 11 | Iran | 3 | 8,210 |
| 12 | Japan | 5 | 13,683 |
| 13 | Korea | 5 | 13,683 |
| 14 | Lao PDR | 1 | 2,737 |
| 15 | Malaysia | 2 | 5,473 |
| 16 | Maldives | 2 | 5,473 |
| 17 | Mongolia | 2 | 5,473 |
| 18 | Myanmar | 1 | 2,737 |
| 19 | Nauru | 0.5 | 1,368 |
| 20 | Nepal | 2 | 5,473 |
| 21 | New Zealand | 3 | 8,210 |
| 22 | Pakistan | 3 | 8,210 |
| 23 | Papua New Guinea | 2 | 5,473 |
| 24 | Philippines | 2 | 5,473 |
| 25 | Samoa | 0.5 | 1,368 |
| 26 | Singapore | 2 | 5,473 |
| 27 | Solomon Islands | 1 | 2,737 |
| 28 | Sri Lanka | 3 | 8,210 |
| 29 | Thailand | 2 | 5,473 |
| 30 | Tonga | 0.5 | 1,368 |
| 31 | Vanuatu | 1 | 2,737 |
| 32 | Vietnam | 2 | 5,473 |
| | Total | 76.5 <u>74.5</u> | 203,877 |

Contribution unit = \$US 2,737

| Current Text | Proposed Text – Variant 3 | Proposed Text – Variant 5 |
|--|---|---|
| CONSTITUTION | CONSTITUTION | CONSTITUTION |
| Article 13 - Expenditure of the Union | Article 13 - Expenditure of the Union | Article 13 - Expenditure of the Union |
| The annual expenditure of the Union shall be separate for the administrative section and for the training section. Each Congress of the Union decides on the maximum amount for the annual expenditure for the administrative section on the basis of the recommendation made by the Director of the Bureau. The expenditure for the administrative section is shared by all the member-countries of the Union. The contribution units of each member-country shall be determined on the basis of that member-country's Universal Postal Union contribution class, as prescribed in the General Regulations of the Asian-Pacific Postal Union. The annual expenditure for the training section is covered in principle by participating countries in direct proportion to their use of the training course and by voluntary contributions of the other countries or organisations or the administrative section. | The annual expenditure of the Union shall be separate for the administrative section and for the training section. Each Congress of the Union decides on the maximum amount for the annual expenditure for the administrative section on the basis of the recommendation made by the // Secretary General of the Bureau. The expenditure for the administrative section is shared by all the member-countries of the Union. The contribution units of each member-country shall be determined on the basis of that member-country's Universal Postal Union contribution class, as prescribed in the General Regulations of the Asian-Pacific Postal Union. Other provisions that may be necessary from time to time to ensure the efficient management of the Union, may be prescribed in resolutions of Congress or as delegated to the Executive Council by Congress for specific situations. The annual expenditure for the training section is covered in principle by: (i) participating countries in direct proportion to their use of // training courses; (ii) voluntary contributions of the administrative section. | The annual expenditure of the Union shall be separate for the administrative section and for the training section. Each Congress of the Union decides on the maximum amount for the annual expenditure for the administrative section on the basis of the recommendation made by the // Secretary General of the Bureau. The expenditure for the administrative section is shared by all the member-countries of the Union. The contribution units of each member-country shall be determined on the basis of / / contribution / / units as prescribed in the General Regulations of the Asian-Pacific Postal Union. Other provisions that may be necessary from time to time to ensure the efficient management of the Union, may be prescribed in resolutions of Congress or as delegated to the Executive Council by Congress for specific situations. The annual expenditure for the training section is covered in principle by: (i) participating countries in direct proportion to their use of // training courses; (ii) voluntary contributions of the administrative section. |

| Current Text | Proposed Text – Variant 3 | Proposed Text – Variant 5 |
|--|--|---|
| GENERAL REGULATIONS | GENERAL REGULATIONS | GENERAL REGULATIONS |
| | | GENERAL REGULATIONS Article 116 Contribution Classes 1. For the apportionment of the expenses of the administrative section, / / member-countries / / will select, on a voluntary basis, the contribution class they wish to be placed in, from the classes listed in this paragraph. - 8-unit class |
| those contributing as members of the 3 and 1 unit classes contribute 2 units; and those contributing as members of the half-unit class contribute 1 unit. However, a member-country may contribute more units. | UPU Contribution ClassCorresponding APPU Contribution ClassMore than 55 units6 unitsMore than 20 units and up to and including 55 units5 units | - 7-unit class - 6-unit class - 5-unit class - 4-unit class - 3-unit class - 2-unit class |
| Countries which accede to the Union as well as those which withdraw from the Union share in the | More than 5 units and up to and including 20 units | - 1-unit class - 0.5-unit class (reserved for SIDS with a |
| expenditure of the administrative section for the entire year during which their accession or | More than 1 unit and up to and including 5 units | population of less than 200,000). |
| withdrawal becomes effective. | 0.5 units (reserved for LDCs) 1 unit (reserved for LDCs | |
| | 0.1 units (reserved for SIDS with a population of less than 200,000)0.5 unit (reserved for SIDS with a population o | by each Congress starting from the first Congress following the one scheduled for 2026. Until the Congress that follows the Congress scheduled for 2026, members will remain in the contribution class |
| | 1 bis A member-country may voluntarily move to higher contribution class at any time. | applying on 1 January 2026, unless there is a change of contribution class for any group of member-countries. |
| | Countries which accede to the Union as well as those which withdraw from the Union share in th expenditure of the administrative section for the entire year during which their accession or | 1 tor Mombor countries may change their |

| Current Text | Proposed Text – Variant 3 | Proposed Text – Variant 5 |
|--------------|-------------------------------|---|
| | withdrawal becomes effective. | notices will be reported to the other member- countries and to the Congress, with the new contribution class coming into effect on the date applying to the financial provisions approved by the Congress. |
| | | 1 quater. Member-countries may lower their contribution class by only one class at a time. Those member countries who fail to disclose their wish to lower their contribution class six months prior to the opening of a Congress will remain in their current class. |
| | | 1 quinquies. There are no restrictions on transfers to higher contribution classes. |
| | | 2. Countries which accede to the Union as well as those which withdraw from the Union share in the expenditure of the administrative section for the entire year during which their accession or withdrawal becomes effective. |
| | | |