



United Nations

Report of the International Civil Service Commission for the year 2021

**General Assembly
Official Records
Seventy-sixth Session
Supplement No. 30**



Report of the International Civil Service Commission for the year 2021



United Nations • New York, 2021

Note

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Contents

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Page</i>
Abbreviations	6
Glossary of technical terms	7
Letter of transmittal	8
Summary of recommendations of the International Civil Service Commission that call for decisions by the General Assembly and the legislative organs of the other participating organizations	9
Summary of financial implications of the decisions and recommendations of the International Civil Service Commission for the United Nations and other participating organizations of the common system	10
I. Organizational matters	11
A. Acceptance of the statute	11
B. Membership	11
C. Sessions held by the Commission and questions examined	12
D. Programme of work of the Commission for 2022–2023	12
II. Reporting and monitoring: monitoring of implementation of decisions and recommendations of the International Civil Service Commission and the General Assembly	13
III. Conditions of service of staff in the Professional and higher categories	15
A. Base/floor salary scale, including the update of separation statistics for financial implications	15
B. Evolution of the United Nations/United States net remuneration margin	16
C. Education grant: detailed review of the sliding scale and the level of the boarding lump sum	17
D. Comprehensive assessment report on the compensation package for the United Nations common system	20
E. Post adjustment issues: status report on 2021 baseline surveys at headquarters duty stations and agenda for the forty-third session of the Advisory Committee on Post Adjustment Questions	32
F. Mobility incentive: review of purpose, effectiveness and efficiency	34
G. Monitoring of the age distribution of the workforce	39
H. Monitoring of geographical diversity in the United Nations common system	44
I. Monitoring of the implementation of existing gender policies and the achievement of gender parity in the United Nations common system	49

IV.	Conditions of service in the field: payment of amount in lieu of settling-in grant at category E duty stations that are not designated as non-family	54
V.	Measures to address non-compliance with decisions and recommendations of the Commission	60
Annexes		
I.	Programme of work of the International Civil Service Commission for 2022–2023	66
II.	Proposed salary scale and pay protection points	68
III.	Yearly comparison and the development of the margin over time	70
IV.	Adjustment to the declining reimbursement scale and the boarding lump sum of the education grant, as recommended in the annual report for 2019 of the International Civil Service Commission (A/74/30)	71
V.	Summary of the organizations’ assessment of compensation package attributes	72
VI.	Estimated costs in 2015 and 2021, compared with pre-2015 compensation package	73
VII.	Detailed description of the 2015 revisions to the compensation package	74
VIII.	Age distribution of the workforce in organizations of the United Nations common system as at 31 December 2019	79
IX.	Age distribution of staff in the Professional and higher categories by organization as at 31 December 2019	81
X.	Age distribution of staff in the General Service and related categories by organization as at 31 December 2019	83
XI.	Age distribution of staff in the Professional and higher categories in the United Nations common system by grade and gender as at 31 December 2019	85
XII.	Age distribution of staff in the Professional and higher categories by region in the United Nations common system as at 31 December 2019	86
XIII.	Average ages of staff in the organizations of the United Nations common system as at 31 December 2019	87
XIV.	Member States unrepresented in three or more organizations with established desirable ranges as at 31 December 2019	88
XV.	Member States underrepresented in three or more organizations with established desirable ranges as at 31 December 2019	89
XVI.	Member States overrepresented in three or more organizations with established desirable ranges as at 31 December 2019	90
XVII.	Number of staff members at the senior/decision-making level from Member States that are underrepresented in three or more organizations with established desirable ranges as at 31 December 2019	91
XVIII.	Number of staff members at the senior/decision-making level from Member States that are overrepresented in three or more organizations with established desirable ranges as at 31 December 2019	92
XIX.	Countries that have no staff members in 10 or more organizations with no formal guidelines for geographical distribution as at 31 December 2019	93
XX.	Status of regional representation of staff members in the Professional and higher categories in the organizations of the United Nations common system as at 31 December 2019	95

XXI.	Distribution, by gender, of staff in the Professional and higher categories (P-1 to ungraded) in the United Nations common system: trends from 2007 to 2017	97
XXII.	Implementation, by organization, of policies and measures to achieve gender balance, as at 1 January 2020	98

Abbreviations

CCISUA	Coordinating Committee for International Staff Unions and Associations of the United Nations System
CEB	United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FICSA	Federation of International Civil Servants' Associations
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Agency
ICAO	International Civil Aviation Organization
ICSC	International Civil Service Commission
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
ILO	International Labour Organization
IMO	International Maritime Organization
ITC	International Trade Centre
ITU	International Telecommunication Union
PAHO	Pan American Health Organization
UNAIDS	Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNHCR	Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
UNISERV	United Nations International Civil Servants Federation
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Project Services
UNRWA	United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East
UN-Women	United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women
UNWTO	World Tourism Organization
UPU	Universal Postal Union
WFP	World Food Programme
WHO	World Health Organization
WIPO	World Intellectual Property Organization
WMO	World Meteorological Organization

Glossary of technical terms

The glossary of technical terms can be found in a separate document on the website of the International Civil Service Commission at: <https://unicsc.org/Home/Library>.

Letter of transmittal

**Letter dated 13 September 2021 from the Chair of the
International Civil Service Commission addressed to the
Secretary-General**

I have the honour to transmit herewith the forty-seventh annual report of the International Civil Service Commission, prepared in accordance with article 17 of its statute.

I should be grateful if you would submit this report to the General Assembly and, as provided in article 17 of the statute, also transmit it to the governing organs of the other organizations participating in the work of the Commission, through their executive heads, and to staff representatives.

(Signed) Larbi **Djacta**
Chair

Summary of recommendations of the International Civil Service Commission that call for decisions by the General Assembly and the legislative organs of the other participating organizations

Paragraph
reference

Remuneration of staff in the Professional and higher categories

1. Base/floor salary scale

24 The Commission recommends to the General Assembly, for approval with effect from 1 January 2022, the revised unified base/floor salary scale, as well as the updated pay protection points for the Professional and higher categories, as shown in annex II to the present report, reflecting a 0.92 per cent adjustment, to be implemented by increasing the base salary and commensurately decreasing post adjustment multiplier points, resulting in no change in net take-home pay.

2. Evolution of the United Nations/United States net remuneration margin

30 The Commission reports to the General Assembly that the margin between the net remuneration of officials in the Professional and higher categories of the United Nations in New York and officials in comparable positions in the United States federal civil service in Washington, D.C., for the calendar year 2021 was estimated at 113.3.

3. Education grant: detailed review of the sliding scale and the level of the boarding lump sum

42 The Commission reports to the General Assembly that the revised education grant scheme had been working as intended and was more streamlined, simple and cost-effective than the previous scheme, and reconfirms for implementation, as from the academic year in progress on 1 January 2022, its 2019 recommendation to the Assembly regarding the adjustment to the sliding scale for the education grant and the boarding lump sum as presented in its 2019 annual report ([A/74/30](#), para. 85) and reproduced in annex IV to the present report.

4. Payment of amount in lieu of settling-in grant at category E duty stations that are not designated as non-family

212 The Commission recommends to the General Assembly to extend the pilot measure of granting a reduced amount of the non-family service allowance in the amount of \$15,000 per year to staff members with eligible dependants at duty stations with a hardship classification of E in lieu of the option to install eligible dependants at the duty station. The Commission also recommends that this measure be extended to category D duty stations not designated as non-family, as was originally proposed in 2018.

Summary of financial implications of the decisions and recommendations of the International Civil Service Commission for the United Nations and other participating organizations of the common system

Paragraph
reference

Remuneration of staff in the Professional and higher categories

1. Base/floor salary scale

20 The financial implications associated with the Commission's recommendation on an increase of the base/floor salary scale, as shown in annex II to the present report, were estimated at approximately \$494,000 per annum, system-wide.

2. Education grant: detailed review of the sliding scale and the level of the boarding lump sum

39 The financial implications of the adjustment to the sliding reimbursement scale and the boarding lump sum, as recommended by the Commission to the General Assembly in 2019 ([A/74/30](#), para. 84), were revised from a previous estimate of \$7.85 million to \$6.55 million by use of the most recent education grant database collected from common system organizations.

3. Payment of amount in lieu of settling-in grant at category E duty stations that are not designated as non-family

212 The financial implications of the continued payment of an amount in lieu of a settling-in grant at category E duty stations that are not designated as non-family were estimated at \$0.94 million per annum, system-wide. Expanding this measure to duty stations that are classified in the D category of the hardship scheme and that are not designated as non-family were estimated at \$3.8 million per annum, system-wide. The combined financial implications of the proposal by the Commission would thus be \$4.74 million per annum.

Chapter I

Organizational matters

A. Acceptance of the statute

1. Article 1 of the statute of the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC), approved by the General Assembly in its resolution 3357 (XXIX) of 18 December 1974, provides that:

The Commission shall perform its functions in respect of the United Nations and of those specialized agencies and other international organizations which participate in the United Nations common system and which accept the present statute.

2. To date, 16 organizations have accepted the statute of the Commission and, together with the United Nations itself and its funds and programmes, participate in the United Nations common system of salaries and allowances.¹ One other organization, although not having formally accepted the statute, participates fully in the work of the Commission.² Therefore, 28 organizations, agencies, funds and programmes (hereinafter “organizations”) cooperate closely with the Commission and apply the provisions of its statute.

B. Membership

3. The membership of the Commission for 2021 is as follows:

Chair:

Larbi Djacta (Algeria)*** (Chair**)

Vice-Chair:

Aldo Mantovani (Italy)* (Vice-Chair*)

Members:

Andrew Bangali (Sierra Leone)**
 Marie-Françoise Bechtel (France)**
 Claudia Angélica Bueno Reynaga (Mexico)*
 Carleen Gardner (Jamaica)**
 Igor Golubovskiy (Russian Federation)***
 Pan-Suk Kim (Republic of Korea)***
 Yuji Kumamaru (Japan)*
 Ali Kurer (Libya)**
 Jeffrey Mounts (United States of America)*
 Wolfgang Stöckl (Germany)*
 Xiaochu Wang (China)***
 Boguslaw Winid (Poland)**
 El Hassane Zahid (Morocco)***

* Term of office expires 31 December 2021.

** Term of office expires 31 December 2022.

*** Term of office expires 31 December 2024.

¹ ILO, FAO, UNESCO, ICAO, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO, WIPO, IAEA, UNIDO, UNWTO, the International Seabed Authority, the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea and the Preparatory Commission of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization.

² IFAD.

C. Sessions held by the Commission and questions examined

4. The Commission held two sessions in 2021: the ninety-first, held virtually from 3 to 7 May, and the ninety-second, held at WIPO in Geneva, from 16 to 27 August.

5. At those sessions, the Commission examined issues that derived from decisions and resolutions of the General Assembly and from its own statute. A number of decisions and resolutions adopted by the Assembly that required action or consideration by the Commission are discussed in the present report.

D. Programme of work of the Commission for 2022–2023

6. The programme of work of the Commission for 2022–2023 is contained in annex I.

Chapter II

Reporting and monitoring: monitoring of implementation of decisions and recommendations of the International Civil Service Commission and the General Assembly

7. The Commission considered a note by its secretariat on the implementation of decisions and recommendations of the Commission (under article 17 of its statute) and the General Assembly. The note also provided broad information on other human resources matters of potential interest to the Commission. A questionnaire was disseminated by the secretariat to gather information, to which 26 of the common system organizations responded.³

8. In accordance with the Commission's decision under article 11 of its statute, the Commission had decided to increase the levels of danger pay for both internationally and locally recruited staff as from 1 January 2021. The General Assembly, in its resolution 75/245 A, expressed appreciation for the valuable work done under hazardous conditions by the international and local field staff of the Organization, and in that regard took note of the decision of the Commission as reflected in paragraph 135 of its report (A/75/30) to increase danger pay effective 1 January 2021. The Commission was informed that all organizations to which danger pay was applicable had implemented its decision.

9. In its consideration of the issue of the implementation of the principles and guidelines for performance appraisal and management for the recognition of different levels of performance, the Commission, under article 14 of its statute, had urged the organizations to continue to make more efforts to address issues of underperformance by holding managers accountable. The Commission was informed of various measures taken by the organizations in that regard.

Discussion in the Commission

10. The CEB Human Resources Network took note of the report.

11. All three staff federations were pleased that the decision by the Commission to increase the levels of danger pay had been implemented by all organizations to which it was relevant, in accordance with the Commission's decision. FICSA noted with interest the efforts of different organizations to address concerns regarding performance management and stated that it would continue to follow developments in that regard in the Commission and other forums, given that performance management continued to be raised as a concern by many of its members. CCISUA was of the view that middle-level managers within the common system organizations were recruited primarily for their substantive expertise rather than people management skills and that this needed to be addressed. It reiterated the importance of having continuous training for managers to equip them with the skills necessary to conduct an objective assessment of staff performance and considered that 360-degree feedback mechanisms needed to be introduced more widely within the common system organizations for all managers. UNISERV fully supported the statements of both FICSA and CCISUA on the issue of performance management.

12. The Commission noted with appreciation that all organizations to which danger pay was applicable had implemented the increase in the levels of the allowance as from 1 January 2021, in conformity with the Commission's decision. Commission members noted that not all organizations had responded to the questionnaire from its

³ Including PAHO. The International Seabed Authority, the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea and WMO did not respond.

secretariat. While individual items might not be applicable to some organizations, the Commission underscored that it expected all organizations to provide information in a timely manner.

13. Consideration was given by the Commission to the various measures reported by organizations to address issues of underperformance and holding managers accountable in that regard. These measures included requiring managers to complete performance reviews of their staff in a timely manner and evaluations against specific indicators or competencies relating to their responsibility for the performance management of their staff. Several organizations encouraged and expected managers to have more frequent and/or continuous dialogue with staff members to ensure that they could identify and deal with issues in a timely manner. A few organizations mentioned having instituted 360-degree feedback mechanisms for managers for developmental purposes and tracking related progress or reporting global staff surveys at the team level, which gave more visibility of performance management behaviour at that level and elevated it among senior management. Several organizations also reported that they had developed training resources and/or conducted training to support managers in performance management. Guidance for managers on providing honest feedback and having difficult conversations was also noted in some of the responses.

14. Some Commission members stated that managers played a key role in people management and in carrying out timely and fair appraisals. If staff members did not face consequences for poor performance, then this would hamper the work of the organizations. On the issue of performance appraisals of staff members, some Commission members noted the importance of training managers, including on recognizing different types of bias such as the halo, horn or contrast effects and excessive inflexibility or lenience, given that this would improve the quality and fairness of performance appraisals. Members of the Commission also encouraged organizations to implement 360-degree feedback mechanisms within their performance processes to improve objectivity and accuracy.

15. Members of the Commission concluded that the measures taken by the organizations were consistent in large part with its principles and guidelines for performance appraisal and management for the recognition of different levels of performance and encouraged them to continue their efforts in that area. This is essential to the effective functioning of the organizations and employee engagement.

Decision of the Commission

16. The Commission took note of the information provided.

Chapter III

Conditions of service of staff in the Professional and higher categories

A. Base /floor salary scale, including the update of separation statistics for financial implications

17. The concept of the base/floor salary scale was introduced, with effect from 1 July 1990, by the General Assembly in its resolution 44/198 (sect. I, H, para. 1). The scale is set by reference to the General Schedule salary scale of the comparator civil service, currently the federal civil service of the United States of America. Periodic adjustments are made on the basis of a comparison of net base salaries of United Nations officials at the established reference point of the scale (P-4, step VI) with the corresponding base salaries of their counterparts in the United States federal civil service (step VI in grades GS-13 and GS-14, with a weight of 33 per cent and 67 per cent, respectively).

18. A 1.0 per cent increase in the base General Schedule scale of the comparator civil service was implemented with effect from 1 January 2021. In addition, tax changes were introduced in the United States in 2021. In the federal tax system, the income levels of tax brackets and the standard deduction amounts were increased. The standard deduction amount for the District of Columbia was also increased. No changes were registered in the tax legislation of the State of Virginia and the State of Maryland in 2021.

19. In order to reflect the combined effect of the movement of gross salaries under the General Schedule and the tax changes in the United States and to maintain the common system salaries in line with those of the comparator, an increase of 0.92 per cent in the base/floor salary scale with effect from 1 January 2022 was proposed. In addition, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 70/244 of 23 December 2015 (sect. III, paras. 9 (a) and (b)), the adjustment to the salary scale should also be applied to the pay protection points for staff whose salaries were higher than those at the maximum steps of their grade upon conversion to the unified salary scale. The proposed salary scale and pay protection points are shown in annex II to the present report.

20. The annual system-wide financial implications resulting from an increase in the base/floor salary were estimated as follows:

(United States dollars)

(a) For duty stations with low post adjustment where net salaries would otherwise fall below the level of the new base/floor	0
(b) In respect of the scale of separation payments	494 000

21. The separation statistics for staff in the Professional and higher categories used for estimating financial implications were updated in 2021. The information received from common system organizations showed an increase in the number of separations from 2,400 to 2,800 per annum, which is reflected in the estimated financial implications presented above.

Discussion in the Commission

22. The Human Resources Network took note of the proposal. The representatives of the staff federations, noting the increase in the comparator civil service base

salaries, supported the increase in the base/floor salary scale. The increased number of separations and its impact in the financial implications were also noted.

23. The Commission noted that an increase in the base/floor salary of 0.92 per cent as at 1 January 2022 would be implemented through the standard no-loss-no-gain procedure, i.e. by increasing the base/floor salary scale and commensurately decreasing post adjustment multipliers. The Commission also took note of the proposed adjustment of the pay protection points, in accordance with resolution [70/244](#). Finally, the Commission recalled that the base scale adjustment procedure, while generally cost neutral in terms of net remuneration, would have implications in respect of separation payments, as indicated in the table above. In this regard, it noted that, according to the latest statistics collected from the organizations, the average number of separations had increased from 2,400 to 2,800 per annum.

Decision of the Commission

24. The Commission recommends to the General Assembly, for approval with effect from 1 January 2022, the revised unified base/floor salary scale as well as the updated pay protection points for the Professional and higher categories, as shown in annex II to the present report, reflecting a 0.92 per cent adjustment, to be implemented by increasing the base salary and commensurately decreasing post adjustment multiplier points, resulting in no-loss/no-gain in net take-home pay.

B. Evolution of the United Nations/United States net remuneration margin

25. Under a standing mandate from the General Assembly (resolution [44/198](#), sect. I.C, para. 4), the Commission reviews the relationship between the net remuneration of United Nations officials in the Professional and higher categories in New York and that of United States federal civil service officials in comparable positions in Washington, D.C. For that purpose, the Commission tracks, on an annual basis, changes occurring in the remuneration levels of both civil services. In addition, in its resolution [71/264](#), the Assembly requested the Commission to include information on the development of the margin over time in an annex to its annual reports.

26. As from 1 January 2021, the comparator civil service implemented a 1.0 per cent increase in the base salaries of federal employees under the General Schedule and other statutory systems. The locality pay for Washington, D.C., was maintained at the 2020 level of 30.48 per cent. Other developments relevant to the comparison were:

(a) Revisions to the federal tax brackets and the standard deduction amounts, as well as to the standard deduction amounts for the District of Columbia, which resulted in a slight reduction in overall income taxes in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area;

(b) An increase in the post adjustment multiplier for New York, from 67.1 for January to 69.3 as from 1 February 2021, owing to the normal operation of the post adjustment system, that is, the evolution of the cost of living at the duty station.

27. On the basis of the foregoing, the Commission was informed that the estimated net remuneration margin for 2021 amounted to 113.3. The details of the comparison and information on the development of the margin over time are shown in annex III to the present report.

Discussion in the Commission

28. The representatives of the Human Resources Network and the staff federations took note of the findings. It was noted that the secretariat of the Commission would continue to monitor the margin level so that, should the margin fall below 113 or rise above 117, corrective action would be taken through the operation of the post adjustment system.

29. The Commission noted that the updated margin had been estimated on the basis of the latest cost-of-living differential between New York and Washington, D.C., and statistics available at the time of consideration.

Decisions of the Commission

30. The Commission decided:

(a) To report to the General Assembly that the margin between the net remuneration of United Nations officials in the Professional and higher categories in New York and that of officials in comparable positions in the United States federal civil service in Washington, D.C., was estimated at 113.3 for the calendar year 2021;

(b) To continue to monitor the margin level so that corrective action could be taken as necessary through the operation of the post adjustment system should the trigger levels of 113 or 117 be breached in 2022.

C. Education grant: detailed review of the sliding scale and the level of the boarding lump sum

31. In 2019, the Commission recommended to the General Assembly an adjustment to the sliding reimbursement scale and the boarding lump sum under the revised education grant scheme. The Assembly, in its resolution [74/255 B](#), decided to defer the consideration of the recommendation pending a detailed review on the scale and the level of the boarding lump sum, taking into consideration a maximum amount per household. At its ninety-second session, the Commission conducted the detailed review requested by the Assembly on the basis of relevant education-related data collected from the common system organizations.

32. These data reviewed by the Commission included a database of education grant claims covering the 2018/19 academic year, which were analysed in terms of their distribution by staff location, by education level and by relative share of tuition and enrolment-related fees between headquarters and field locations. The distribution of schools was also examined by bracket of the sliding scale. In addition, the breakdown of boarding assistance claims by staff location and by education level was reviewed. The education grant claims data were also used to analyse the financial support per household provided by the organizations in order to assess the feasibility of establishing a limit on such support. Practices of other external entities, such as other intergovernmental organizations whose provision of the education-related benefits appeared to be comparable to the common system's education grant scheme, were also examined.

Discussion in the Commission

33. The Human Resources Network believed that, in general, the revised education grant scheme served its intended purposes. It established incentives to send children to less expensive schools by having a sliding scale and was easier to administer. Given that roughly half of the education grant claims fell in the lowest bracket, the Network saw this as a demonstration that the intended incentive towards less costly educational

institutions was indeed working well. While school fees in field duty stations were, in general, lower than at headquarters duty stations, the new scheme provided the necessary flexibility for the very diverse circumstances. The Network suggested further studies by the ICSC secretariat, which could be considered at the next review of the methodology for adjusting the level of the boarding lump sum.

34. With regard to analysis of the patterns of support provided per household, the organizations, noting that the number of staff with six or more children under the education grant scheme was negligible, that the total financial support in those instances was below that for staff with families with fewer children and that the average support per child decreased with increasing household size, considered this as an illustration that the revised education grant scheme worked as intended in terms of cost containment. Therefore, the Network concurred explicitly with the analysis finding that there appeared to be no compelling or justifiable reason to introduce a maximum amount per household in the education grant scheme. On the basis of the above, the Network supported the proposal that the Commission should reconfirm its 2019 recommendation (A/74/30, para. 85) to the General Assembly on the adjustment, as from the academic year in progress on 1 January 2022, of the declining scale and the boarding lump sum.

35. CCISUA, in reiterating the importance of the education grant in the compensation package as a tool to facilitate the attraction and retention of a globally mobile workforce, regretted that items such as books, meals and transportation were no longer covered under the new scheme and noted that there were divergences in the billing system of some schools, whereby those items were not always included in the tuition fees, which led to a different treatment among staff. It also mentioned that staff at some duty stations, mainly at category H duty stations, were compelled to choose more expensive schools because of the lack of less expensive options at those locations. CCISUA was of the view that boarding assistance should be available to staff at all locations to encourage a culture of mobility among all duty stations, regardless of their hardship ratings, and called for the reintroduction of the boarding assistance at category H duty stations. Lastly, CCISUA concurred with the Commission's recommendation to update the sliding scale and lump-sum boarding assistance to reflect increases in tuition and boarding fees in the past years. CCISUA also was of the view that there was no need to introduce a maximum amount per household because the costs of education-related expenses were shared by the organizations and staff.

36. UNISERV, in its statement, with which FICSA aligned, stressed that the education grant remained an essential element of the compensation package and an important tool to attract and retain a global mobile workforce to deliver the mandates of the organizations, in particular a mid-career workforce with school-age children. Therefore, UNISERV expressed full support for the proposed adjustment to the sliding scale and the lump-sum boarding assistance, which should be resubmitted to the General Assembly in relation to the academic year in progress on 1 January 2022. While boarding assistance was granted to staff serving in field locations and only exceptionally to those who served at category H locations, UNISERV observed that there were clear cases at some category H locations, primarily in some European Union member States, in which no relevant and certified schooling was available. The federations therefore requested that the Commission reconsider the eligibility requirement for boarding at category H locations and encouraged heads of entities to exercise their discretionary authority to grant exemptions under the provisions of Assembly resolution 70/244 (sect. III, para. 29). In the light of this, the federations encouraged the Commission to continue to analyse and improve the functioning of the education grant scheme and ensure that it was fit for purpose for all staff, regardless of where they were located.

37. UNISERV, recalling that adjustments to the sliding scale and the lump sum pertained to both the regular and special education grant, stated that not adjusting those elements would hamper the organization's disability inclusion efforts to some extent. In that regard, it mentioned that various General Assembly resolutions, as well as the overall principle of respect for diversity, integral to the mission of the United Nations and codified in its Charter, had to be borne in mind. It was important to emphasize the values of diversity and inclusion that are supported through the recruitment and retention of staff who have dependants living with disabilities. UNISERV also saw no compelling reason to introduce a maximum amount per household in the education grant because the cost-sharing principle was effective in addressing that concern.

38. There was a general agreement among Commission members that the revised education grant scheme worked well and was more cost-effective, streamlined and transparent than the previous one. It was noted that three quarters of the reported claims were found to be within the lower brackets of the sliding scale, while the combined percentage of claims falling in the highest two brackets was less than 10 per cent and was concentrated primarily at category H locations. Therefore, the introduction of a sliding scale, combined with the cost-sharing principle underlying the education grant scheme, was considered an effective tool in encouraging a prudent approach by staff to selecting suitable schools for their children. In that regard, the concentration of claims exceeding the established reimbursement ceiling at certain category H locations appeared to indicate the limited availability of less expensive schools at those locations, which confirmed the need to adjust the scale. The Commission observed that, given the nature of the declining scale and the distribution of claims by bracket, the increased financial support resulting from the scale adjustment would be focused in large part on claims exceeding the reimbursement ceiling, providing significantly lower or no additional reimbursement to those within the declining scale. In that context and in view of the rapidly increasing tuition and boarding fees, the Commission agreed that reconfirming its earlier recommendation was justified.

39. The Commission noted that the average reimbursement level per claim under the new scheme was approximately \$1,160 lower than the estimated average reimbursement under the previous scheme updated to the current level (\$13,130, compared with \$14,299). Upon request by the Vice-Chair, the Commission was also informed that the financial implications of the adjustment to the sliding reimbursement scale and the boarding lump sum, as recommended by the Commission to the General Assembly in 2019 (A/74/30, para. 84), would be revised from \$7.85 million to \$6.55 million and would amount to approximately \$355 per claim. The revision of the estimate, compared with 2019, was explained by use of the most recent education grant database collected from organizations.

40. The Commission noted a significant reduction in the number of boarding-related claims because, under the revised scheme, boarding assistance was targeted primarily at staff serving in field locations, whose children attended primary or secondary schools outside the duty station and was now provided to staff at category H duty stations only on an exceptional basis and under the discretionary authority of executive heads. The lump-sum approach to providing boarding assistance was seen as a significant improvement in terms of simplification and transparency. The Commission agreed, however, that tracking boarding fees was not always straightforward owing to various ways in which boarding fees were established by different schools. It therefore considered that the matter should be kept under review so that any emerging issues could be identified and addressed during the review of the education grant methodology.

41. Turning to the issue of a maximum amount per household, the Commission observed that the average out-of-pocket education-related cost per staff almost doubled from one-child households to two-child households. However, the additional costs per child decreased from the third child onwards and dropped drastically for households with more than six children. This reflected the fact that the education-related expenses were only a part of the entire expenses of child-rearing. As a result, staff with many children were not likely to be able to afford high educational costs. The cost-sharing principle of the scheme appeared to work as a natural limit to the education grant claim amount per staff. The household-based analysis showed that the financial support provided per staff by the organization was the highest for staff with five children and declined for those with six or more children, which in any case represented only a negligible portion of the staff population. The Commission also reviewed the practices of other organizations that offered similar allowances to their employees, such as the World Bank and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. It noted that none of those organizations had imposed limits per household. In view of the above, the Commission agreed that there was no compelling conceptual or financial reason to limit the maximum amount per household.

Decision of the Commission

42. The Commission decided:

(a) To report to the General Assembly that the revised education grant scheme had been working as intended and was more streamlined, simple and cost-effective than the previous scheme;

(b) To reconfirm, for implementation as from the academic year in progress on 1 January 2022, its 2019 recommendation to the General Assembly regarding the adjustment to the declining scale for the education grant and the boarding lump sum as presented in its 2019 annual report (A/74/30, para. 85) and reproduced in annex IV to the present report.

D. Comprehensive assessment report on the compensation package for the United Nations common system

43. In its resolution 70/244, the General Assembly approved, with a number of modifications, a revised compensation package for staff in the Professional and higher categories recommended by the Commission. By the same resolution, the Assembly also invited the Commission to present to it, no later than its seventy-fifth session, a comprehensive assessment report on the implementation of the package. However, owing to the outbreak of the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic, which prevented the Commission's secretariat from the timely collection of the necessary information, the consideration of the comprehensive assessment report had to be rescheduled to the ninety-second session of ICSC.

44. The revised compensation package had resulted from a comprehensive review conducted by the Commission, in close collaboration with the organizations and staff federations of the common system organizations. In conducting the review, the Commission had followed the agreed objectives of the exercise and guidance from the General Assembly, whereby the new compensation system should support the delivery of the organizations' mandates, reward excellence and manage underperformance, while remaining competitive and being more equitable, fair, transparent, simple in design, easy to administer and better understood by staff and stakeholders. It was also expected that the revised system would be cohesive at its core but would allow for some flexibility to the organizations and be premised on overall cost containment and be sustainable in the long term.

45. The full description of the revisions to the compensation package as a result of the comprehensive review is reproduced in annex VII to the present report. The major changes were the following:

- (a) Introduction of the unified salary scale;
- (b) Establishment of a dependant spouse allowance and a single parent allowance;⁴
- (c) A change in step periodicity;
- (d) A streamlined education grant scheme;
- (e) A revised field-related package of allowances, including:
 - (i) Revision of the mobility allowance to a mobility incentive;⁴
 - (ii) Revised hardship allowance;
 - (iii) Revision of the additional hardship allowance to a non-family service allowance;
 - (iv) Discontinuation of the non-removal allowance;
- (f) Changes in eligibility for repatriation grant;
- (g) Discontinuation of accelerated home leave, except at category D and E duty stations not falling within the rest and recuperation framework;⁴
- (h) Revision of the relocation package;⁴
- (i) A new incentive payment for the recruitment of experts in highly specialized fields.

46. As part of the assessment of the revised compensation package, the Commission was presented with data from multiple sources, with a view to facilitating its evaluation of whether the agreed objectives and desired attributes of the comprehensive review had been met. These data included feedback from the surveys of common system organizations, the results of the 2019 global staff survey, and the most recent common system staff statistics and education grant claims data. A cost comparison between the revised and old systems was also carried out on the basis of the 2019 common system personnel statistics to determine whether the percentage differences between the two systems were comparable to the initial projections reported to the General Assembly in 2015. An additional analysis for some field-related elements was conducted on the basis of the 2015 to 2019 common system personnel statistics.

Survey of common system organizations

47. In terms of the key attributes, most organizations felt that the new system was more equitable, simpler and transparent than the previous one. Specifically, many considered that the new salary structure was fairer because it better supported the principle of equal pay for work of equal value. Having a separate provision to recognize dependants was also viewed as an improvement that reflected modern practices. Overwhelmingly, respondents acknowledged that the new education grant scheme and relocation options were simpler and easier to both explain and administer.

48. Most of the organizations considered that the compensation package continued to be competitive. Some viewed, however, that salary levels were not sufficiently competitive to attract experts, especially in specialized fields or candidates at higher

⁴ A feature introduced or revised by the General Assembly.

levels. At the same time, no evidence of recruitment and retention issues was provided.

49. From the cost-effectiveness perspective, most organizations experienced overall staffing cost decreases owing mainly to a longer cycle for step increments, changes in the education grant scheme, discontinuation of the non-removal element and changes in accelerated home leave. Organizations also mentioned that the revised compensation package reduced their administrative costs specifically in administering the education grant scheme, in which the global sliding scale for tuition and enrolment-related fee reimbursement and lump-sum boarding assistance allowed for automation versus manual reviews of claims.

50. According to some organizations, although trends in staff turnover appeared to be stable, reduced education cost coverage, revisions to the accelerated home leave and discontinuation of the mobility incentive at category H duty stations were perceived negatively and could affect employee engagement, although this was not observed in the results of the global staff survey. A number of organizations also reported that, in some field duty stations, in particular those with a hardship classification of C, recruiting candidates with comparable qualifications had been challenging. However, there was no evidence to demonstrate that this was attributable to the revised compensation system.

51. Most field-based organizations reported that the revised compensation package was satisfactory or had somewhat improved incentivizing service in hardship and high-risk locations and encouraged mobility to the field. Positive effects were due to the combined impact of several changes in the field related elements. These included increases in the hardship allowance for single staff members, increases in the non-family service allowance for staff in lower grades with dependants, and the new education grant scheme, which was more favourable to staff in the field locations, where tuition fees tended to fall in the lower brackets of the sliding scale, resulting in higher rates of reimbursement.

52. Diverse views were expressed on the level of flexibility in the new (2015) compensation package. The general view was that the United Nations compensation system needed more flexibility. Notwithstanding, most respondents affirmed that the current compensation supported the delivery of their organizations' mandates. Additional information on responses of the organizations is presented in annex V to the present report.

Global staff survey

53. A total of 10,065 staff in the Professional and higher categories participated in the 2019 global staff survey. The key findings of the survey were that the overall level of engagement among staff in the Professional and higher categories was high, with 82 per cent feeling engaged, which was slightly below the results from the previous survey, conducted in 2013 (86 per cent). A total of 93 per cent of respondents would willingly put in extra effort to help their organization succeed and 88 per cent indicated that they were proud to tell people that they worked for their organization (both percentages were slightly lower than the 2013 results of 96 and 90 per cent, respectively). Staff in the Professional and higher categories who had fewer than two years of service at the time of the survey (i.e., who joined after the new compensation package had gone into effect)⁵ appeared to have the highest level of engagement (86 per cent). Approximately 95 per cent of this group of respondents would willingly put in extra effort to help their organization succeed and 93 per cent indicated that they were proud to tell people that they worked for their organization.

⁵ A total of 825 respondents (8.2 per cent of all respondents).

54. With respect to the overall views on the current compensation system, the survey results indicated that almost half of the respondents in the Professional and higher categories (44 per cent) were positive in their overall views on the current compensation system and one third (32 per cent) were negative.⁶ When comparing compensation packages with other similar organizations⁷ outside of the United Nations system, 32 per cent felt that the compensation was competitive.

55. The comparative analysis of staff survey results showed that, some variations in staff perceptions about the compensation between 2013 and 2019 notwithstanding, staff retention was stable. Approximately 76 percent of the 2019 survey participants said that they intended to remain in the common system in the coming 12 months, while 13 per cent said that, ideally, they would like to leave and 8 per cent indicated that they intended to leave. In 2013, 79 per cent of respondents had indicated that they intended to remain in the organization in the coming 12 months, approximately 10 per cent said that, ideally, they would like to leave and 7 per cent indicated that they intended to leave.

Costing comparison

56. In 2015, the Commission reported the projected costs from the implementation of the revised compensation package. It was determined at that time that the proposed modifications would, overall, be cost-effective, although the spending trajectory for individual compensation elements was expected to vary. Using the most recent staff statistics, an updated cost estimation for 2021 was provided for the Commission's consideration. The result of this estimation is displayed in annex VI to the present report.

57. In 2015, the Commission calculated that making the transition to the unified salary structure would lead to savings of approximately 0.65 per cent. On the basis of the updated staff statistics, it was estimated that the new scheme was some 0.36 per cent less costly.⁸ The difference between the two percentages is explained by the decision of the General Assembly to introduce the single parent allowance and by the difference in staff composition according to the 2012 and 2019 CEB databases used in the cost projections. Overall, however, the 2015 cost projections regarding the unified salary scale remained within the anticipated limits.

58. Changes in frequency for step periodicity also resulted in savings within the projected cost limits. This was confirmed by comparing salaries (including base salary, post adjustment and spouse allowance) over a three-year period. In 2015, the annual projected savings for the first three years were estimated to be approximately 0.75 per cent.⁹ In 2021, using salary figures from 2017 to 2019, savings were calculated to be approximately 0.71 per cent annually. The slight percentage variation is again due to the difference in the staff composition in different years.

⁶ During the period in which the survey was live, the United Nations common system staff federations sent an email in which they advised staff to answer some survey questions in a specific way. While this concern was addressed directly with an email sent to all organization focal points, who were asked to pass the message on to staff, this may have had an impact on some of the responses to the survey.

⁷ When asked with which organizations staff compared their compensation package, they indicated other international organizations (72 per cent), followed by private sector organizations (58 per cent), Governments (33 per cent), non-governmental organizations (18 per cent) and the self-employed (10 per cent).

⁸ This estimation excludes transitional measures that are set to expire in 2023.

⁹ In 2015, the estimated savings were reported to be approximately 1 per cent on average per year for the five-year time frame. Only a three-year average is compared in the present assessment because no staff data for 2020 and 2021 were available.

59. In terms of field-related allowances, slightly higher cost comparison differences regarding accelerated home leave and mobility incentives were observed. These were due to the decision of the General Assembly to increase the mobility incentive by 25 per cent from the fourth assignment and 50 per cent from the seventh assignment, as well as its decision to maintain the accelerated home leave for category D and E duty stations that were outside of the rest and recuperation framework. Other than these, the cost projections are consistent in large part with 2015 cost projections. The slight percentage differences for hardship and non-family service allowances between 2015 and 2021 were due to differences in staff composition and changes in hardship, danger pay and non-family status.

60. With regard to separation elements, the removal of the dependency element from the salary structure, which was some 6 per cent for applicable cases, led to a reduction in the costs associated with separation payments. Staff statistics from 2017 to 2019 were analysed, and it was estimated that the cost for separation payments in the common system organizations was approximately 4.1 per cent less due to the introduction of the unified salary scale. In addition, changes in the payment schedule of the repatriation grant produced further savings. The total savings incurred from the revised approach to separation payments were calculated at 10.2 per cent, compared with the anticipated 5.2 per cent. The increased number of separations of staff with fewer than five years of expatriate service contributed significantly to the difference.

61. Changes in the education grant scheme were noted by organizations as positive from the perspective of simplicity and transparency. To assess the budgetary impact of the changes, education grant claims in 2015/16 from 24 organizations and in 2018/19 from 25 organizations were analysed. The new scheme provided a higher reimbursement for schools with moderate tuition levels and appeared to be favourable for staff in field-based locations. When controlling for the rate of tuition inflation¹⁰ since 2015, the average reimbursement amount per claim did not show a significant upward trend. As anticipated, the number of claims for boarding-related expenses decreased significantly because of the new reimbursement approach for boarding costs. Overall, using a combination of education grant claim data and qualitative responses from the organizations, the new education grant scheme appeared to meet the cost-effectiveness attribute.

62. In summary, the cost comparison showed that the 2015 projections remained valid for most of the items that the Commission had proposed. Apart from the elements modified by the General Assembly, the overall cost for the discussed compensation elements appeared to be on a downward trajectory.

Discussion in the Commission

63. The Human Resources Network confirmed that the revised compensation package was more equitable, simpler, transparent and fairer because it supported the principle of equal pay for work of equal value. From a cost-effectiveness perspective, it was mentioned that, while the effect of the revised compensation system was difficult to separate from other ongoing measures or events, many organizations experienced overall staffing cost decreases over time owing to, among others, a longer cycle for step increments, changes in the education grant scheme, discontinuation of the non-removal element and changes in the accelerated home leave. The administrative costs and workload to administer elements such as the education grant

¹⁰ The average tuition inflation rate was found to be some 4 per cent annually, calculated in local currencies, from 2011 to 2014 and 3 per cent, calculated annually, in dollar terms, from 2014 to 2019, as discussed in previous studies conducted by the Commission.

had been reduced because of the new global sliding scale and uniform lump-sum boarding assistance allowing for higher degrees of automation.

64. In general, although the revised compensation package continued to be competitive, in some instances it had its limits in terms of competitiveness, such as in efforts to recruit experts in specialized fields or identify candidates for higher level positions. Therefore, in the opinion of the Human Resources Network, the option to grant recruitment bonuses needed to be retained, even though it had been used rarely in recent years.

65. With regard to the field-based allowances, the view of the Human Resources Network was that they had either improved or were at satisfactory levels in incentivizing service at field-based locations. This was due to increases in the hardship allowance for single staff members, an increase in the non-family service allowance for staff in lower grades with dependants and the new education grant scheme, which was more favourable for staff in field locations, where tuition tended to fall in the lower brackets. It was mentioned that the changes made in the previously existing accelerated home leave provisions at category C duty stations had negatively affected staff and, to some degree, made that category of hardship locations less attractive. The mobility incentive played a key role in fostering mobility to field duty stations. In the same vein, the Network drew the Commission's attention to the need for active resolution of the long-standing issue of adjusting dependency allowances.

66. FICSA stated that the compensation package should be competitive, fair, equitable, transparent, easy to administer and understood by stakeholders, reward excellence and be grounded in the principle of Article 101 of the Charter. While agreeing that there had been movement towards the stated goals of the revised package and that staff had, in general, welcomed initiatives such as the single parent allowance, FICSA pointed out that there were some areas in which changes in the compensation package resulted in reports from staff of increased hardship. A reference was made to the ongoing pulse survey launched by the federations to gather staff perceptions of the compensation changes. A preliminary assessment of that survey revealed that staff felt a negative impact of changes in the education grant and step periodicity. In that respect, FICSA welcomed the Commission's intention to reconfirm its 2019 recommendations to the General Assembly for an adjustment to the sliding reimbursement education grant scale and to a boarding lump sum based on a two-year review cycle of the grant level in accordance with the approved methodology. In terms of cost-effectiveness, FICSA recalled that the original purpose of the reform was not to reduce costs by reducing staff benefits but through increased simplification, efficiency and streamlining. The Federation also pointed out that the lengthy and complicated implementation process of the new compensation package, including the costly adaptation of individual enterprise resources planning systems, should also be borne in mind. While it was difficult to assess and quantify those issues, in particular with regard to cost implications, FICSA believed that it was important to document those areas of impact, in particular with an eye on "lessons learned". With respect to the contractual framework, FICSA noted that any discussion on the matter should be reserved until the relevant working group was convened. It drew the Commission's attention to the situation regarding dependency allowances and pointed out that the lack of action by the Assembly for adjusting them for more than 10 years was untenable.

67. CCISUA, while agreeing that equitability and transparency had been achieved in the new compensation package, had some reservations regarding cost-effectiveness because it discouraged competitiveness. The common system should strive to recruit the most talented pool of candidates by offering them competitive entitlements. The federation expressed concerns about the effectiveness of the incentive payments for recruiting experts in highly specialized fields. It felt that such an incentive might not

offset the losses incurred through the changes in other entitlements. It regretted the discontinuation of annual step increments and of the accelerated step increase linked to language proficiency. For the education grant, while the introduction of the sliding scale was welcomed, the rationale for considering some school fees as non-admissible in the new package was questioned. With regard to the field-related allowances, CCISUA stated that improved family entitlements would contribute to more gender balance and mobility. In that respect, it expressed reservations about the discontinuation, at category H duty stations, of boarding assistance in the education grant scheme and of mobility incentives and the discontinuation of the accelerated home leave cycle at category C, D and E duty stations. It believed that reconsidering those decisions, formalizing other elements, such as the granting of allowance in lieu of family installation, and considering extending the coverage of travel cost and time for rest and recuperation to the home country, would have positive effects on the workforce and the organization. It requested the establishment of a working group to address any inadequacy or gaps in family-related entitlements. CCISUA noted that the issue of teleworking or flexible working arrangements, triggered by the COVID-19 pandemic, should not be seen as the future way of working. Flexible working arrangements should remain the choice of the staff members and should not be imposed on staff as part of their contractual arrangements.

68. UNISERV pointed out that the implementation of the new compensation package had required additional work for human resources departments in organizations. With regard to the specific compensation elements, the preliminary findings from the staff federations' "pulse survey" were cited. Survey respondents were concerned about the reduction in the frequency of step increments and were less satisfied with the new education grant scheme as applicable at headquarters locations. The federation underlined the need for periodic adjustments to education grant sliding scales to reflect rising tuition costs. With respect to the discontinuation of the language incentive, UNISERV supported the recommendations made by the Joint Inspection Unit in its report on multilingualism ([JIU/REP/2020/6](#)) and suggested that the reinstatement of a language incentive would align with those recommendations. It asked the Commission to reconsider the change regarding accelerated home leave, owing to its negative effects, in particular on staff serving at remote category C duty stations, and invited the Commission to re-examine the link between compensation and performance in further detail.

69. The Commission, having analysed the data by the organizations and input from the global staff survey, found that, overall, the new compensation package appeared to be in alignment with the desirable attributes and effectively facilitated the delivery of organizations' mandates. The new salary structure was perceived as more equitable, given that it supported the principle of equal pay for work of equal value. Having a separate provision to recognize dependants was also viewed as an improvement reflecting modern practices. The new education grant scheme and relocation options were simpler and easier to both explain and administer. It was also pointed out that the review, while streamlining and simplifying the administration of salaries and allowances had been one of the important objectives of the compensation revision, had also focused on identifying and eliminating possible overlap or duplication in the old package. The latter was particularly evident in modifications regarding the unified salary scale, relocation-related elements and accelerated home leave.

70. When reviewing the feedback from the organizations, several Commission members noted that, while most organizations were, in general, positive in their assessment of the revised compensation package, this was not the case for two of the organizations. The Commission, in seeking further information from those organizations, learned that one perceived a lack of attractiveness of the compensation system for single staff members, while the other was of the view that the revised

system was more field-focused and did not provide sufficient assistance in covering education-related expenses for staff at headquarters locations. In that regard, the Commission recalled that several fundamental improvements had been made for single staff, both in terms of the structure of the salary scale and field-related allowances (hardship allowance and mobility incentive). The Commission underscored the magnitude of the review of the compensation system, which had been the first of its kind in more than 20 years, and several members recalled the long and sometimes difficult discussions that had ensued during the review. Therefore, the field-related views expressed by stakeholders could be considered in the normal course of the Commission's review of relevant subjects, and it would be premature to attempt to tailor or adjust individual elements at the present time in the absence of more information.

71. The Commission turned its attention to individual elements of the compensation package.

Unified salary scale and dependency allowances

72. The Commission recalled its discussions leading to the implementation of the unified salary scale for the Professional and higher categories that transferred the reference of family status from the salary into three newly created allowances: spouse, transitional and single parent allowances (the latter implemented at the request of the General Assembly). It was noted that the scale and related allowances had been implemented in all organizations without problems in most of them.

73. Commission members emphasized the importance of maintaining the Noblemaire principle as the cornerstone of the compensation for Professional staff. In that regard, the Commission noted recent changes to the margin management aimed at strengthening the reference of common system salaries to those of the comparator civil service. The Commission also confirmed that the revised step periodicity was more comparable with that of the United States General Schedule base pay scale and global compensation practices. Furthermore, the Commission recalled its suggestion that savings generated as a result of the modifications to the step periodicity could be used to fund the cost of performance incentives within the performance appraisal and recognition framework.

74. With regard to the proposed reinstatement of the language incentive, the Commission, while highlighting the value placed on multilingualism within the organizations, was of the view that it could be promoted through other means, such as non-pensionable cash or non-cash awards or incentives. In that regard, it was noted that, while most organizations offered free language courses to staff members, only one organization, prior to the review, had availed itself, and only for a limited number of positions, of the accelerated step increment linked to language proficiency. It thus appeared that discontinuing that incentive had no effect on the multilingualism initiatives of the common system. Some Commission members suggested that the issue of multilingualism be included in the Commission's future programme of work for further discussion.

75. With respect to the concerns expressed about the difficulty in the recruitment of experts in highly specialized fields, it was recalled that an incentive to facilitate the recruitment of such experts had been approved as part of the compensation review. While provisions for the use of the incentive had been made in the relevant policies of several of the organizations, in 2019 only one organization had reported to the Commission a payment. Some of the organizations had indicated that they planned to implement the recruitment incentive to meet their needs.

76. The Commission discussed the degree by which the intended attributes of the revised compensation system had been achieved. With regard to the changes in the

salaries and family-related allowances, it was observed that the system had not only become more modern, equitable, simpler, and transparent, but also more cost-effective. It noted that the assessment of the cost difference between the current and the previous systems was comparable to the cost projections presented to the General Assembly prior to implementation.

Education grant scheme

77. The Commission agreed that the introduction of the sliding scale and the lump-sum format of boarding assistance had achieved the objectives of making the education grant scheme simpler and more transparent and easier to administer and understand. Claims data collected before and after the implementation of the new education grant scheme and questionnaire responses received from common system organizations indicated that the modifications had, in general, worked as intended and designed. Most organizations reported a reduction in the administrative burden as a result of the simplification and streamlined provision of the grant.

78. It was recalled that some concerns had been expressed at the time of designing a globally uniform scale in the revised education grant scheme with a higher ceiling. However, the claims data did not indicate any evidence that more expensive schools were selected by staff for their children. On the contrary, the analysis of the claims data appeared to indicate that the selection of schools by the common system staff for their children's education shifted to less-expensive alternatives, where possible.

79. Members noted that the reduction in the number of admissible expenses might have had a larger impact on the out-of-pocket expenses to staff whose children attended schools charging lower tuition fees. Consequently, the higher reimbursement rates applicable to the lower claim amounts appeared to be justified from an equitability perspective. In addition, it was noted that two changes in the scheme had resulted in a reduction in the scheme's overall cost. These were: (a) the streamlined provision of boarding assistance, with eligibility limited to staff in the field with children studying at the primary and the secondary levels; and (b) the reduction in education travel only to one round trip per boarding assistance recipient. The average regular education grant per claim, inclusive of the boarding assistance and estimated travel expenses, had increased at a lower rate under the new scheme than the average estimated rate of education cost increase during the three academic years under analysis.

80. While some staff might not be satisfied with or fully agreeable to the revised scheme, especially those at category H locations or those with children studying at the tertiary level, it was recalled that compromises had been made during the comprehensive review owing to the trade-off between simplification and equity and other desired objectives. Therefore, while the revised education grant scheme would need to be monitored over time, it was overwhelmingly viewed as more transparent, simple and streamlined, compared with the previous scheme.

81. With respect to the new mechanism of adjusting the education grant level, it was observed that the revised approach, which no longer took into consideration the distribution of claims but utilized only the rates of tuition and boarding fee movements, proved to be robust, significantly less labour-intensive and more likely to attain the target level of reimbursement while removing a potential spiral effect and achieving higher transparency. Moreover, efficiency was attained with no need for the organizations to compile and submit claim data for analysis biennially and for the Commission to review the grant level ceilings for multiple zones.

82. Some participants noted that the revised scheme was considered more favourable to staff in the field and that more consideration could be given to staff at category H duty stations. Commission members, however, recalled that the revised

grant scheme had been designed with an objective to facilitate staff mobility to field duty stations and, accordingly, the current provisions for boarding assistance contributed to reaching that objective. It was agreed that the matter should be kept under further review, given the relatively short time of operation of the new system.

Field- and relocation-related elements

83. The Commission noted that the responses from the organizations to the questionnaire related to individual field-related elements were positive or neutral for the most part and that no negative effect on organizations' ability to recruit or retain staff in field locations was noted. This was the case for the hardship allowance, non-family service allowance and mobility incentive. An analysis of the data also showed that the proportion of women at category A to E duty stations had increased from 37.5 to 40.3 per cent between 2015 and 2019. The Commission also noted that the engagement level of Professional and higher categories of staff at field locations, standing at 86 per cent, was relatively higher than the overall engagement level in those staff categories. At the same time, the Commission recognized that the engagement levels of staff in the United Nations common system was driven by many factors other than compensation, such as the missions of the organizations.

84. The Commission noted that no negative impact had been observed from the rationalization and simplification of some of the overlapping elements of the previous field- and relocation-related elements of the compensation package. It noted that the discontinuation of the non-removal allowance, which was previously payable for up to five years in any duty station and the second month's lump-sum portion of the assignment grant for assignments of two years or more, had not posed any notable issues. In that regard, the responses from the organizations showed that the revised and simplified relocation-related elements consisting of relocation travel, relocation shipment and a settling-in grant met the needs of the organizations in a cost-effective manner and that they provided a degree of flexibility, among others, with a maximum lump-sum option in lieu of the relocation shipment.

85. The Commission, while noting some of the views regarding the discontinuation of the mobility incentive for staff movements to category H duty stations, saw no indication that the organizations faced any significant difficulty in recruiting staff to such locations, which typically had other advantages such as improved quality of life, education or opportunities for spousal employment. With regard to the views of the organizations and staff on specific aspects such as accelerated home leave, the Commission recalled its earlier considerations of the perceived overlap between the accelerated home leave and rest and recuperation entitlements. The Commission also noted the issues raised of family support for staff serving in difficult locations. It noted that, in response to a question from the global staff survey, regarding whether staff would take an assignment to a category D or E hardship duty station, 36 per cent of Professional and higher staff responded negatively. The top three reasons cited by those staff related to family considerations and not to compensation elements (impact on children, 55 per cent; impact on spouse, 51 per cent; and impact on family in general, 50 per cent). The Commission concluded that those issues could be considered in due course.

86. The Commission also considered the results of the analysis of cost differences between the field-related elements of the previous and revised compensation system based on the CEB personnel statistics for 2019 (see annex II). The Commission noted that, after accounting for the increases in the levels of some of the field-related allowances since 2015, the percentage difference in costs between the two systems was in line in large part with what had been reported to the General Assembly in 2015, except for those elements that the Assembly had revised, as in the case of the mobility incentive. Otherwise, any minor differences otherwise could be attributed to the

difference in staff compositions between the personnel statistics used for the estimates in 2015 (CEB 2012) and the current assessment (CEB 2019).

87. The Commission found that, on the basis of available information, the revised compensation system did not affect the organizations' ability to recruit and retain staff in field duty stations. The data had shown that the proportion of staff with eligible dependants and single staff at category A to E duty stations had remained stable during the period from 2015 to 2019. In the same period, the proportion of women at category A to E duty stations had increased steadily, from 37.5 to 40.3 per cent, and the Commission recognized the many efforts of the organizations regarding gender parity. While noting the comments by some organizations about the difficulty in assessing the impact of any single element on staff recruitment and retention, the Commission agreed that the lack of timely and more quality data of relevance to its assessment was an issue that needed to be addressed. It noted that only three organizations had been able to provide data on applications from staff members to category H and A to E duty stations. Such data were important for a more robust quantitative analysis and more informed decisions, and their absence was an issue that the organizations should address as a matter of priority.

88. Some organizations had provided suggestions for possible improvements in the compensation system, including with regard to modalities for remote and non-location-specific work arrangements, which, in their view, could require adjustments to the compensation system and/or the framework for contractual arrangements. The Commission was of the view that, at present, any such considerations would be premature, noting that the issue of contractual arrangements was included in its programme of work.

89. The Commission noted that the broader assessment by most organizations was that the revised compensation package incentivized service in hardship and high-risk duty stations and encouraged mobility. The Commission was therefore convinced that the revised system, as it pertained to the field- and relocation-related elements, balanced the many competing demands and constituted an improvement over the previous system. The Commission considered that the assessment indicated that the attributes that it had established for the review had been achieved in a cost-effective manner regarding the field-related elements overall. The Commission was continuously seeking improvements to the system, as needed, on the basis of feedback from the organizations and the staff federations, and any issues raised could be addressed in the course of its regularly scheduled reviews of relevant items.

Separation payments

90. The Commission noted that the impact of the changes in separation payments was mainly a natural consequence of the implementation of the unified salary scale. The removal of family status from the salaries of Professional staff had eliminated the unintended overlap, whereby, under the previous system, the difference in net pay depending on family status had been automatically expanded to all allowances set as a percentage of salary. With respect to the repatriation grant – confirmed as an earned service benefit payable to expatriate staff members who leave the country of the last duty station upon separation – a threshold of five years of expatriate service was introduced as part of the eligibility requirements. The threshold was implemented, respecting the acquired rights of existing staff members. The Commission noted that eliminating the double differentiation in the repatriation grant payments simplified the compensation package. In addition, introducing an eligibility threshold of five years of expatriate service made it more sustainable in the long run. The Commission was informed that, while most organizations had not experienced any issues in implementing changes related to separations payments, additional work had to be done

to adapt their enterprise resource planning systems, update staff rules and regulations, and manage a dual repatriation grant scheme during the transitional period.

Overall conclusions of the Commission

91. The Commission noted that, on the basis of the analysis of the questionnaires submitted by the organizations and the findings from other data, the desired attributes of the compensation review had been met overall and that the new compensation package facilitated the delivery of the organizations' mandates. As confirmed by available data, many elements in the new package were more streamlined and were expected to be sustainable. In general, the compensation system continued to be competitive, allowing the organizations to attract the optimal combination of talent, competence and diversity.

92. The Commission had approached the revised compensation system as a package in its entirety, which was a product of consensus on individual elements. The Commission underscored that, in any review of such magnitude, it was inevitable that some issues would be raised regarding individual elements, but it was important to focus on the totality of the review on the understanding that specific individual elements could be further adjusted or refined over time. It was, in general, agreed that the revised compensation package, as a whole, was a significant improvement and was working as designed. The unified salary scale and separate dependency elements eliminated the possibility of undesirable or unintended overlaps with other allowances and made the compensation system modern, equitable, transparent, simple to administer and easier to explain to stakeholders. The education grant scheme resulted in administrative simplicity and overall cost-effectiveness, and the revised field-related compensation components were fit for purpose, rationalized and simplified and incentivized geographical mobility and service in hardship locations.

93. The Commission constantly strove for improvements in various aspects of the compensation system during its various reviews. Several elements of the compensation package were also subject to regular reviews by the Commission. Noting some concerns expressed during the assessment, the Commission stressed that further refinements and fine-tuning of any elements was an ongoing process and that any concerns raised by the participants could be discussed more closely during those reviews.¹¹

94. The Commission recognized that reliable data remained a critical component for it to be able to make evidence-based decisions and quality assessments. In that regard, it reiterated its call for cooperation from the organizations in submitting data in a timely manner. While noting an upward trend in the response rate of the survey of the organizations, it further stressed the continued need for improved communication with the common system organizations on that matter.

Decisions of the Commission

95. The Commission decided to:

(a) Report to the General Assembly that, on the basis of the assessment, the objectives of the comprehensive review of the compensation package of staff in the Professional and higher categories were met overall;

(b) Inform the General Assembly that, to the extent that any relevant issues, including field-related ones, had been raised by some organizations and staff

¹¹ Annex IV of the Commission's 2016 annual report (A/71/30) contains a list of the periodicity and review schedules of the relevant elements as decided by the Commission.

federations, the Commission would examine them in the course of its normal review schedule on related items;

(c) Reiterate the importance of the timely collection of quality data relating to human resources to better facilitate evidence-based assessments and decision-making.

E. Post adjustment issues: status report on 2021 baseline surveys at headquarters duty stations and agenda for the forty-third session of the Advisory Committee on Post Adjustment Questions

96. Pursuant to article 11 of its statute, the Commission continued to keep under review the operation of the post adjustment system, and in that context, at its ninety-first session, considered the report on the forty-second session of the Advisory Committee on Post Adjustment Questions. In particular, the Commission considered the Advisory Committee's main conclusions and recommendations on both methodological proposals for improving the methodology for the compilation of the post adjustment index, and operational issues pertaining to the operations for the 2021 baseline surveys at headquarters duty stations and Washington, D.C., which are traditionally the first to be surveyed in a new round. After a thorough discussion and taking into consideration the views of representatives of the organizations and staff federations, the Commission decided to approve all the Advisory Committee's recommendations contained in the report, as outlined below.

Decisions of the Commission

On the compilation of the post adjustment index

97. The Commission considered the recommendations of its Advisory Committee and decided that the secretariat should:

(a) Continue to use the modified multilateral Walsh index formula, based on common expenditure weights, for the aggregation of the in-area (excluding housing) component;

(b) Use a modified set of duty stations that includes Bangkok, Geneva, London, Madrid, Montreal, Nairobi, New York, Paris, Rome, Vienna and Washington, D.C., to derive the common expenditure weights;

(c) Continue to conduct further studies regarding the top-level aggregation of the cost-of-living index and related matters, including the effects on the evolution of the post adjustment index over time, so as to determine whether a more appropriate index formula, taking into account the context of application of the post adjustment index, could be utilized;

(d) Continue to use the current approach of updating the rent index using the projection factor based on International Service for Remunerations and Pensions market rent data because this was more specific for the purposes of the post adjustment system;

(e) Modify the current approach for treating expenditure on major household appliances in the post adjustment index, both by removing the fixed-dollar amount that represents major household appliances from dollar-driven expenditure and modifying the relevant parts of the housing section of the staff expenditure survey questionnaire to allow respondents to indicate whether their expenditure on major household appliances had been incurred in area or out of area;

(f) Remove the three residual "other housing costs" items from the staff expenditure survey questionnaire;

(g) Continue to use the current method for calculating the domestic service index for group I duty stations, based on a cost comparison approach, and to continue to conduct further studies to assess the feasibility of using market price data for the estimation of the domestic service index for group I duty stations, taking into account the practical and methodological constraints associated with the implementation of such an approach;

(h) Modify the treatment of domestic services for group II duty stations and align it to the approach followed for group I duty stations, by having a separate basic heading in the in-area (excluding housing) component (instead of being part of the overall housing component) of the post adjustment index and by taking into account both part-time and full-time services in the calculation of the domestic service index;

(i) Include expenditure on supplementary medical insurance in the calculation of the post adjustment index.

On operative aspects for the launch of the 2021 survey round

98. The Commission decided:

(a) To approve the proposed list of items and their specifications, subject to minor revisions prior to finalization before the launch of the 2021 round of surveys, and to grant the secretariat some flexibility in adjusting the list of items and specifications within the round, if needed;

(b) To approve the proposed general guidelines for outlet selection both for headquarters duty stations and for specific product groups, subject to further refinements by the secretariat before the launch of the 2021 round of surveys;

(c) That the secretariat should finalize the redesign of the survey instruments for their use in the 2021 round of surveys, taking into account the suggestions and comments made during the discussions and implementable feedback received after the testing of the staff expenditure questionnaire, and that both the pricing book and the “survey solutions” package be used for price data collection for the baseline surveys of the 2021 round of surveys;

(d) That, for duty stations not reaching the precision requirements prescribed by the Committee, the expenditure pattern derived from the household expenditure questionnaire be replaced by the current common weights after updating them using consumer price indices;

(e) That the current “household-based” weighting approach be maintained for the derivation of the weights used to aggregate the in-area (excluding housing) index;

(f) That the higher level expenditure in the categories “food”, “non-alcoholic beverages” and “alcoholic beverages” be split into individual basic headings using the weights of national consumer price indices;

(g) To approve the procedures and guidelines for the conduct of the 2021 baseline surveys as described in the report of the Advisory Committee;

(h) To approve criteria for the 2021 baseline cost-of-living surveys at all headquarters duty stations (Geneva, London, Madrid, Montreal, New York, Paris, Rome and Vienna) and Washington, D.C., in view of the possible impact of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic;

(i) To call for the active cooperation of organizations and staff federations, through the established local survey committees, with the secretariat in order to ensure the successful conduct of the surveys.

99. At its ninety-second session, the Commission also considered the secretariat's progress report on its implementation of the approved methodology, procedures and guidelines pertaining to the 2021 round of cost-of-living surveys, as outlined above. The report covered the preparatory activities, including the finalization of the staff expenditure survey questionnaire and other survey instruments, the development of a dedicated survey support microsite, the development of a new integrated data management system, the secretariat's strategy for improving staff participation in the surveys, and its plan to conduct pre-survey consultations with local survey committees at the duty stations concerned. The report also provided an update on the New York price survey, which was successfully conducted in July 2021, with full collaboration with the local survey committee for New York during all phases of the planning and execution of the survey. Prior to conducting the price survey, the secretariat, together with the local survey committee, had assessed the criteria for the conduct of the survey, on the basis of factual information collected from a number of verifiable sources, and concluded that it was feasible to conduct the price survey in New York as scheduled. The discussions at the ninety-second session are contained in the report of that session.

100. At its ninety-second session, the Commission decided to:

(a) Take note of the information presented by the secretariat regarding the state of preparations for the 2021 round of surveys;

(b) Call for the continued cooperation of organizations and staff federations through the established local survey committees in order to facilitate the successful conduct of the baseline cost-of-living surveys, and approve the schedule thereof;

(c) Request the secretariat to conduct studies into the feasibility of establishing cost-of-living relativities between Geneva and Bern, and between Rome and Turin and Trieste;

(d) Approve the proposed agenda for the forty-third session of the Advisory Committee.

F. Mobility incentive: review of purpose, effectiveness and efficiency

101. In 2015, within the context of the review of the common system compensation package, the Commission recommended to the General Assembly that a mobility incentive be introduced in lieu of the previous mobility allowance to encourage the mobility of staff to field duty stations, with annual payments for a maximum period of five years at the same duty station. The eligibility criteria remained unchanged, except that it is no longer payable to staff serving at category H category duty stations. The mobility incentive came into effect on 1 July 2016 in accordance with General Assembly resolution [70/244](#).

102. During its deliberations on the review of the compensation system, the Commission noted that mobility should be driven by work requirements relating to the international character of the organizations of the United Nations common system. Hence, the Commission decided to revisit the mobility incentive after five years of its implementation, in order to re-evaluate the need for such an incentive, with the expectation that, by that time, all organizations in the common system would have a mobility culture ([A/70/30](#), paras. 427–432).

103. The General Assembly, in its resolution [74/255](#) B, noted paragraph 144 of the report of the Commission ([A/74/30](#)) on its plan for a review of the mobility incentive in 2021, and urged the Commission to conduct a thorough review of the purpose, effectiveness and efficiency of the current mobility incentive programme in encouraging the mobility of staff to field duty stations and to report in detail on the

outcome of the review in its report for 2021. The Assembly also encouraged the organizations of the United Nations common system to consider the application of alternative administrative measures, including non-financial incentives, to promote staff mobility.

104. In response to the Assembly's request, the Commission was provided with information on the views of the organizations on the mobility incentive in terms of the above elements. The information included statistical data relating to the level of geographical mobility and examined the continued need for the mobility incentive and its relevance to strengthening the culture of mobility in the common system and had been collected through a questionnaire survey, to which 26 organizations of the common system responded.

105. Most organizations noted that the mobility incentive encouraged geographical mobility and supported effectiveness of the organization, and performance and efficiency of programme delivery. The field-based organizations, in particular, underscored that the encouragement of mobility enabled them to deliver their mandates. Almost all organizations found the mobility incentive to be a tool to attract, manage, develop, deploy and retain talent.

106. With regard to organizational policies and practices, the review showed an increase in the number of organizations that reported having a formal mobility scheme, with an 89 per cent increase since 2012.

107. In 2013 and 2019, the Commission conducted global staff surveys with the purpose of seeking staff views on the compensation package. In 2019, 78 per cent of respondents indicated that they were in receipt of the mobility incentive or were aware of it. In the same year, 65 per cent of respondents indicated being mobile (i.e., served in two or more duty stations continuously for one year or more), representing an 11 per cent increase compared with 2013. Compared with 49 per cent of respondents at headquarters duty stations, 81 per cent of respondents at field duty stations were mobile. A total of 63 per cent of staff who responded to the survey indicated that they would like to transfer to another duty station within two years. It was noted that 16 per cent of respondents indicated that they had turned down the offer of a post in another duty station, with the most-cited reason being the belief that a move would create difficulties for the staff or their family.

108. In 2019, the average number of assignments was 1.73, which was virtually unchanged, compared with 1.75 in 2015. The level of mobility in the common system varies. For example, the average assignment number in the United Nations and its funds and programmes ranged from 1.00 (UNOPS) to 3.46 (WFP). Among specialized agencies with a field presence, the average assignment number ranged from 1.00 (IFAD) to 1.65 (ILO).

109. Sustaining a willingness by staff to move geographically might be even more relevant in the post-COVID-19 pandemic environment as organizations continued to embark on interventions in support of the Sustainable Development Goals (normative, development-related, humanitarian, peace-related), in particular in high-risk locations.

110. The organizations mentioned that they applied other administrative approaches to fostering mobility, such as encouraging mobility as an opportunity to gain varied experiences and to strengthen career development and facilitate professional advancement.

Discussion in the Commission

111. The Human Resources Network stated that, at the time of the comprehensive compensation review five years earlier, organizations felt strongly that a mobility incentive was an adequate and necessary human resources tool. While a number of

organizations had mandatory and/or managed mobility schemes, others did not, not because of a lack of commitment to mobility but rather due to their business models. Organizations had, in the meantime, also made efforts to use other, non-monetary interventions such as policy changes or stronger links between mobility and promotion in order to further promote a culture of mobility within and across United Nations system organizations. The Network was of the strong view that the mobility incentive not only served its purpose well, but also remained relevant and needed. The COVID-19 pandemic had significantly hampered free movement across countries and had made relocations significantly more complex and cumbersome. The motivation and willingness of staff for mobility might, under those circumstances, be compromised in the coming years, given that normalizing the situation might still take some time.

112. The Human Resources Network noted that the focus of the mobility incentive was less on one-time geographical moves but more on incentivizing continued mobility throughout the career of staff, and on promoting mobility to field duty stations. The operational needs of field-based organizations included a smooth rotation of staff across all categories of duty stations, in particular when staff experienced stages of life in which continued mobility meant more constraints, given evolving family situations. The incentive also served as a vital staff retention tool within rotation exercises. Organizations therefore supported the conclusions presented by the secretariat and regarded the mobility incentive as a powerful tool that should be continued in its current form and amounts in the coming years, while welcoming a further review in five years.

113. FICSA highlighted the lack of a consistent and common understanding of the definition of mobility across the common system. It encouraged the Commission to recognize that staff mobility requirements varied according to the mandates, size, operational needs, programmes and activities of the organizations, and supported a review of the mobility incentive after five years to re-evaluate the need for such an incentive, with the expectation that, by that time, all organizations in the common system, in particular organizations with a field presence, would have a fully developed mobility culture.

114. CCISUA welcomed the introduction of the mobility incentive in 2016 in lieu of the mobility allowance to encourage the mobility of staff. It reiterated the importance of the incentive in order to foster a culture of mobility in the common system and welcomed the decision taken by the General Assembly in 2015 to increase the amounts as from the fourth move of a staff member. CCISUA reiterated the importance of having a mobility policy scheme in the organizations driven by the needs of the organizations. It regretted that the mobility incentive was no longer payable to staff serving at category H duty stations. It was of the view that paying the incentive only to staff at category A to E duty stations did not encourage the move to category H duty stations and went against the objective of encouraging the mobility of staff, regardless of the classification of the duty station. For that reason, CCISUA asked that the Commission consider reintroducing the mobility incentive to category H duty stations.

115. UNISERV stated that the mobility incentive was fit for purpose and, on the basis of the responses from the staff survey launched by the staff federations to gather input from staff on the compensation package, it noted that a large majority of staff reported being satisfied with the mobility incentive. UNISERV would appreciate a review of the category H duty stations within the European Union, with the aim of potentially rectifying some inconsistencies related to the issue, and highlighted that there remained a peacekeeping operation in at least one of those European Union duty stations and that staff members were disadvantaged because they were not eligible to receive the mobility incentive at category H duty stations. UNISERV emphasized that mobility, including geographical mobility, should be encouraged and incentivized across the board. To consider that staff only needed to be incentivized to move to field

duty stations was somewhat disingenuous. Field staff might not always be that keen on relocating to a category H duty station, in particular if this would negatively affect them financially. This built-in disincentive might have negative effects on effective mandate delivery, given that organizations were depriving themselves of staff with valuable field experience returning to headquarters duty stations. UNISERV considered that there was a need to continue the incentive to contribute to a culture of mobility within the United Nations system but noted that a culture change initiative was often a multi-year project. In its opinion, a movement of staff between field and headquarters entities would not only create a more rounded and skilled workforce, but also create a United Nations culture that was more field focused, with staff who had a keen understanding of what was required in the field locations to ensure the most effective and efficient support possible.

116. The Commission recalled that, during the comprehensive review of the compensation package, which had earlier included a mobility allowance, it had discussed whether mobility should be incentivized. It had recommended a flat amount as a payment to incentivize mobility to field locations and agreed to re-evaluate its need in five years, with the expectation that the common system would have a mobility culture by then. The Commission noted that it was the decision of the General Assembly at that time to increase the amount of the allowance by 25 per cent for the fourth to sixth assignments and by 50 per cent for the seventh and subsequent assignments of staff.

117. The Commission noted that organizations had indicated that the incentive was necessary and considered it vital to the delivery of their mandates and had indicated that the mobility incentive was an effective tool for attracting talent to field locations and enhancing the mobility culture in the common system organizations. Even during normal times, it was difficult to uproot families and start life in a new location. However, during the COVID-19 pandemic, in order to continue to deliver on their mandates in the field, the need for such an incentive had become even more acute because some staff members had no choice but to continue to work under sometimes very difficult conditions and with few options to leave their duty stations for long periods of time. That experience had unequivocally demonstrated the need for an incentive for geographical mobility, in the absence of which staff members and external candidates might be unwilling to relocate to field duty stations in particular.

118. While the exclusion of category H duty stations from the mobility incentive had been raised by staff federations, the Commission recalled that no data had been presented to suggest that the organizations were experiencing any difficulties in moving staff members to category H duty stations. To the extent that any organizations might have seen some decreases in applications to category H duty stations, this could be taken as an indication that they were able to incentivize service in field locations. Some members also considered that category H duty stations had implicit incentives and that, therefore, no additional monetary incentives were required at those locations.

119. Some members of the Commission considered that mobility should be incentivized further by linking it to career development. The organizations could take mobility into account in their promotion and selection policies, especially for higher level posts. Some other members noted that this was already being done in some organizations. While noting the laudable intent of linking career development to mobility, some members of the Commission considered that this could have unintended negative consequences on other areas, such as gender diversity. Given the often-difficult conditions in field duty stations, women might not readily accept such assignments, thus placing them at a disadvantage. Therefore, there was a need for caution regarding this.

120. UNISERV supported the idea that mobility be considered in promotion and selection decisions, noting that there was a relatively high number of posts at the senior levels in the missions. It added that staff members in the Field Service category had no possibility of moving to category H duty stations because there were no posts in that category in such locations.

121. Some members of the Commission were of the view that this was not only a career management issue, but also an issue of mobility culture, as the Commission had recognized earlier, and this needed to be engrained in the organizations. Therefore, mobility for staff in category H duty stations should be obligatory. Other members of the Commission expressed the view that there should be flexibility in the system in the light of organizations having different mandates.

122. Members of the Commission also noted that the mobility incentive was no longer payable after five years at a single duty station but increased on the basis of the number of geographical moves. Those features appeared to be incentivizing mobility, given that organizations reported that staff had requested new assignments when their incentive payment was coming to an end.

123. Some members of the Commission expressed the view that, in future reviews of the mobility incentive, the possibility could be explored of increasing the amount of mobility incentive for category C, D and E hardship duty stations and reducing it for category A and B hardship duty stations, thereby further incentivizing mobility to the most difficult locations.

124. In general, the Commission considered that the mobility incentive was a good tool that needed to be retained for duty stations where there might be shortfalls in staffing. In addition, the lessons of the COVID-19 pandemic had demonstrated a clear need for the continued payment of an incentive for geographical mobility. The Commission, while noting the progress made in instilling a culture of mobility, also noted the uneven progress among the organizations.

Decisions of the Commission

125. The Commission decided to:

(a) Take note of the information provided relating to the purpose, effectiveness and efficiency of the mobility incentive and existing mobility policies and practices, and mobility levels in the organizations of the United Nations common system;

(b) Recognize that staff mobility requirements vary according to the mandates, size, operational needs, programmes and activities of the organizations of the United Nations common system;

(c) Note the purpose of the mobility incentive as a powerful tool for enhancing a mobility culture in the common system;

(d) Review the mobility incentive after five years to re-evaluate the need for such an incentive, with the expectation that, by that time, all organizations in the common system, in particular organizations with a field presence, would have a fully developed mobility culture;

(e) Take note of General Assembly resolution [74/255](#) B, by which the Assembly encouraged the organizations of the United Nations common system to consider the application of alternative administrative measures, including non-financial incentives, to promote staff mobility. In that regard, the Commission encouraged the organizations to further consider linking mobility to staff development and career progression, to the extent possible.

G. Monitoring of the age distribution of the workforce

126. In 2017, the Commission last reviewed generational diversity under its report on the diversity of the workforce of the United Nations common system. At its eighty-fifth session, the Commission, among other things, decided to urge organizations to:

- (a) Increase their efforts and invest time and resources to deal with all aspects of diversity, including training for managers and staff;
- (b) Establish an overall strategy on diversity that included concrete action plans, specific targets and timelines towards achieving gender balance and equitable geographical representation if they had not yet taken the initiative to do so;
- (c) Continue to review all aspects of diversity periodically.

127. In its resolution [72/255](#), the General Assembly requested the Commission to continue to monitor the age distribution of the workforce and to report thereon to the Assembly. For this purpose, the secretariat collected information through a questionnaire sent to the common system organizations in 2020, to which 25 organizations responded.¹² The geographical groupings used in the report followed those used by the Assembly.¹³

128. It was noted in the report presented to the Commission that five generations¹⁴ were represented in the current common system staff. Generational differences were viewed as useful in understanding the diversity of workers' values, attitudes and behaviours, which, in turn, inform key managerial policies and practices. The report also provided an analysis of the data provided by the organizations.

129. Most staff (81.3 per cent) were between the ages of 35 and 60, which include "Baby Boomers", "Generation X" and "Generation Y". While staff under 35 years of age represented some 12 per cent, only approximately 3 per cent of staff were under 30 years of age in the United Nations common system, and that group included "Generation Z". Approximately 6 per cent of the workforce was 60 years of age and over, and a fraction of staff in that group could also be from the "Silent Generation".

130. While the proportion of women staff of the United Nations common system was more than 50 per cent in the age groups of less than 35 years, it was markedly lower for age groups over 35 years and it was lowest in the age group of 60 to less than 65 years (38.3 per cent). Within the age group of staff over 35 to less than 65 years, men constituted more than 50 per cent of the workforce. Men represented more than 60 per cent of staff in the age groups above 50 years.

131. The age distribution of staff of the organizations of the United Nations common system as at 31 December 2019 is provided in annex VIII to the present report. In the United Nations Secretariat, which has the most staff (34.9 per cent) within the common system, the largest age group was 40 to less than 45 years (7,053 staff). The highest proportion of the youngest staff (under 30 years of age) was found in ITC (10.8 per cent), followed by UNHCR (6.5 per cent). Within the age group of 30 to less than 35 years, the International Seabed Authority (22.7 per cent) and UNHCR (15.9 per cent) had the highest proportion of staff among the organizations, while the

¹² Includes PAHO. IAEA, the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea, UNIDO and WMO did not respond.

¹³ See www.un.org/dgacm/en/content/regional-groups.

¹⁴ The five generations are the "Silent Generation", born between 1925 and 1945 (75–95 years of age); "Baby Boomers", born between 1946 and 1964 (56–74 years of age); "Generation X", born between 1965 and 1980 (40–55 years of age); "Generation Y" (millennials), born between 1981 and 1995 (25–39 years of age); and "Generation Z" (iGen), born in 1996 and later (24 years of age and under).

latter, at 20.6 per cent, had the highest proportion of staff in the age group of 35 to less than 40 years. UNWTO (24.7 per cent), UNOPS (23.6 per cent) and UN-Women (23.6 per cent) had the highest proportion of staff in the age group of 40 to less than 45 years. Within the age group of 45 to less than 50 years, UNOPS (22.5 per cent) had the highest proportion of staff. WIPO had more than 40 per cent of staff in the age groups of 50 to less than 60 years and PAHO had the highest proportion of staff (39.6 per cent) over 55 years.

132. A comparison of the overall age distribution of staff of the United Nations common system in 2016 and 2019 showed that there was a noticeable increase in the proportion of staff in the age groups of 30 to less than 50 years, from 58.9 per cent to 62.7 per cent, and a corresponding decrease in the age groups of 50 to less than 65 years, from 37.5 per cent to 33.9 per cent. With regard to the staff in the Professional and higher categories, the age distribution was similar to that of the overall staff. A total of 82.5 per cent of staff were in the age groups of 35 to less than 60 years. Staff in the age groups of less than 35 years constituted approximately 9 per cent; the proportion of staff 60 years of age and over was 8.6 per cent. The proportion of women decreased with the increase in age, and it was less than 40 per cent in the age groups of 55 to less than 65 years. Women represented more than 50 per cent of staff in the age groups of less than 45 years. The pattern observed in the age distribution of staff in General Service and related categories was consistent with the pattern seen in the staff in the Professional and higher categories above. The only significant observation to be made was that the proportion of younger staff, in the age groups of less than 35 years, was 14.8 per cent and thus relatively higher than that in the Professional and higher categories. The overall average age among staff of the United Nations common system stood at 44.5 years in 2019, while the average age of staff in the Professional and higher categories was 45.9 years.

133. Additional data on the staff population as at 31 December 2019 were presented. Annexes IX and X to the present report show the age distribution of staff in the Professional and higher categories and General Service and related categories, respectively, by organization. Annex XI shows the age distribution of staff in the Professional and higher categories in the United Nations common system by grade and gender, while annex XII shows the age distribution of staff in the Professional and higher categories by region and annex XIII shows the average ages of staff in the organizations. Seven organizations had no staff rules to preclude recruiting candidates below any given age, while the minimum age to be eligible for consideration for a position in other organizations varied from 18 to 22 years. In 15 organizations, the staff regulations and staff rules precluded recruiting candidates above the mandatory age of separation. Some other organizations' rules prevented the recruitment of candidates over the ages of 60, 62, 63 or 64. Nine reporting organizations had no constraints on promoting the rejuvenation of staff. UNOPS did not see major constraints on promoting the rejuvenation of its workforce due to its targeted action. Others reported the low number of posts at the P-1 and P-2 levels, restrictions on recruitment from the General Service and related categories to the Professional and higher categories, and selection processes that favoured applicants with more work experience as other barriers for rejuvenating its workforce. Some organizations also mentioned the increase in the mandatory age of separation and low turnover rates as barriers. In terms of programmes supporting generational diversity, internship, young professional, Junior Professional Officer/Associate Professional Officer and fellowship programmes were reported.

Discussion in the Commission

134. The Human Resources Network thanked the secretariat for its analysis of the situation and practices in the organizations and reserved any additional comments for the discussion.

135. FICSA acknowledged that the organizational demography had undergone a major shift with regard to age distribution. As different generations contributed their relevant skills, talents and outlooks, it was important for the United Nations organizations to proactively recruit younger generations. Organizations needed to ensure that they remained relevant to future generations and constantly adapt and improve. With increasing longevity, people worked to an older age, reducing the share for young generations. A holistic approach to ensuring workforce diversity in all its forms, including age, was required across the common system. FICSA noted that there were signs of improvement in some areas, with women representing more than 50 per cent of staff in the age group of less than 45 years and applauded those organizations that reported the implementation of specific programmes to embrace and support generational diversity and rejuvenate the workforce, and urged the other organizations to introduce such initiatives without delay. FICSA noted that age diversity in the common system was linked directly to the educational and experience requirements for posts and agreed that there should be concerted efforts to use entry-level grades to attract the younger generation. Lastly, FICSA found that the COVID-19 pandemic had brought an unprecedented health crisis, which meant millions of job losses, business closures and extensive economic insecurity. Therefore, resilience and flexibility were key for all organizations in the medium term and to ensuring an age-inclusive workforce going forward.

136. CCISUA welcomed the attention given to generational diversity and the fact that the five generations were represented in the current workforce of the organizations, although it noted differences in the percentages among the organizations. Interaction between these five generations was necessary for the organizations of the common system to be representative of the wider populations of the countries that they represented and served. CCISUA considered it necessary for organizations to eliminate any rules that discriminated on the basis of age at the time of recruitment. CCISUA believed that the relatively low percentage of posts at the P-1 and P-2 levels hindered the rejuvenation of the workforce and recalled the importance of having a pyramid grade structure by increasing such posts, allowing the recruitment of younger people. The number of years of experience required for posts at the P-3 and P-4 levels were a barrier to those under the age of 30. In addition, the recruitment of retirees, although employed on a temporary basis, did not promote the rejuvenation of the organizations at the desired pace. CCISUA believed that raising awareness among young people of the values of the common system organizations and attracting them to join were needed. With regard to regional diversity, CCISUA noted that 46 per cent of the staff came from one regional group. It suggested that a study be conducted on the causes of this imbalance and asked for the guidance of the Commission on measures that could be considered to rectify the situation. It reiterated the importance of awareness-raising efforts to attract young people from poorly represented regional groups. CCISUA, while noting the programmes aimed at promoting generational diversity in the organizations, requested clarification on how internship and fellowship programmes were relevant, given that they were not part of an organization's workforce. In conclusion, it believed that more efforts should be made by organizations to promote generational diversity and regional diversity without sacrificing the elements of merit and skill.

137. UNISERV was of the view that a diverse workforce was fundamental to serve the diverse constituencies of the common system organizations. In this sense, age diversity

was one of the factors that would shape the future of work in the United Nations. While noting that all five generations were represented in the common system's current staff, UNISERV observed a noticeable change from 2016 to 2019 with an increase of staff aged 30 to 50 and women holding a majority of posts up to age 35, which, while promising for gender diversity, required tracking of trends to determine whether it translated into their mid-career years when choosing to form a family. On the other hand, the lack of progress in regional diversity by age group was of concern, given that the dominant regional group was more strongly represented in the lower age ranges. UNISERV recognized the efforts made by the organizations, as well as the challenges in achieving more equitable age distribution. Further action was required to ensure an age-diverse workforce able to respond to the high demands brought about by, among others, technological innovation and climate change, given that this was linked to the ability of the organizations to deliver on the Sustainable Development Goals. UNISERV was of the view that, in addition to an inflation of senior posts, there had been no recruitment at the lower grades for some time, which would have facilitated the onboarding of younger people and increased the scope for career progression over time. UNISERV proposed measures to support balancing age diversity, namely, by developing programmes to attract young talent, especially from underrepresented countries and regions; providing incentives to recruit, in particular, women over 50 years of age; incorporating the age distribution factor in any analysis of grade/post structure and geographical diversity; precluding the recruitment of candidates above the mandatory age of separation; harmonizing the minimum age for recruitment at age 18; and reviewing the existing staffing structures so as to use all grade levels.

138. Some members of the Commission considered that the age distribution of the common system, while it might not be reflective of external trends, reflected the requirement for considerable education and experience within the context of the work of the common system organizations. They noted that working in the common system organizations was often a second career for many staff, who joined after serving in their national Governments or elsewhere. This would explain, to an extent, the average age of 45.9 years in the Professional and higher categories. Therefore, they considered that the current age distribution was appropriate overall. Nevertheless, given technological and other changes, it was important that the common system organizations be able to reskill and upskill staff, in particular older staff, through the provision of appropriate training, in order for them to be fully effective. In that regard, some other members of the Commission considered that the increase in the mandatory age was a positive development, given greater longevity and that rejuvenation of the workforce would take place gradually.

139. Most members of the Commission noted that the issue of age diversity was important for the organizations of the common system and that they should look for ways to increase opportunities for younger generations. An age-diverse common system, fully representative of the five generations in the current wider workforce, would improve organizational performance by unleashing the potential, skills and perspectives of each generation. Some members noted in that regard that the number of posts available for recruiting at the entry-level grades was limited to posts at the P-1 level, which is rarely used, leading to a smaller number of younger candidates entering the common system. In addition, the qualifications requirements were stringent, leading to external candidates who were older applying for entry-level positions within the common system. The organizations should therefore look at their recruitment policies in their efforts to rejuvenate the workforce. Those Commission members noted that the proportion of staff under the age of 30 had dropped from 3.3 to 2.9 per cent.

140. Members of the Commission also noted that, in the absence of meaningful turnover within the common system organizations, it would be difficult to rejuvenate the staffing structure. In that regard, members of the Commission, while noting that

some organizations had reported that low turnover was a barrier to rejuvenation, considered that it would be important to track trends and analyse possible future impact on staffing. Doing so would require analysis of data, including on separations and the reasons related to separations, over longer periods of time, both overall and by age group.

141. Some members of the Commission noted that some 46 per cent of staff were from the Group of Western European and Other States and that the Group represented more than 50 per cent of staff under the age of 35. They considered that more efforts were needed to increase the recruitment of candidates from developing countries or those that were unrepresented or underrepresented, in particular candidates who were younger. Members of the Commission also noted that, with regard to staff in the Professional and higher categories, women represented more than 50 per cent of staff in the age groups of less than 45 years, and within that age group, across most grades. The average ages of women were also lower than that of men in all but one organization. Whether such trends would translate into increased gender parity going forward remained to be seen.

142. The Commission took note of the use of other measures to support generational diversity in the common system organizations, including internships, fellowships, young professional programmes and associate expert programmes. Most members considered that those programmes were useful because they provided exposure to the work of the organizations and increased the pool of younger candidates who might be interested in careers in the international civil service. Some members noted the practice of many of the organizations that provided a stipend to interns, and they considered that such measures levelled the playing field by allowing access to opportunities for candidates from developing countries who otherwise might be disadvantaged. A few Commission members were cautious regarding the use of paid internship arrangements, given that this could be perceived as increasing the employment of personnel on precarious contractual arrangements. However, most members of the Commission agreed that this should not be a cause for any concern, given the stringent criteria governing internships, including that they were provided to those currently enrolled in a university or to recent graduates, and for limited durations. The representative of the Human Resources Network confirmed that this was indeed the case.

143. Some Commission members considered that the effectiveness of young professional programmes needed to be assessed because some candidates either were not selected for long periods of time or, if selected, remained for many years at the entry-level grades at which they were recruited. Those members therefore considered that the issue of career development and advancement, or the limited possibilities thereof, was an issue that related directly to the issue of generational diversity. Some members of the Commission also suggested that the organizations should present information to the Commission on their young professionals or similar programmes. In seeking information on fellowship programmes, the Commission was informed that some organizations had introduced such programmes for young talent that provided relevant training by the organizations concerned and subsequent work experience.

Decisions of the Commission

144. The Commission strongly urged the United Nations common system organizations:

- (a) To continue programmes that foster dynamism, creativity and innovative contributions of younger staff members and to recommend to organizations to enhance the recruitment of young professionals, reversing the current negative trend;
- (b) To expand opportunities for entry-level recruitment for younger candidates;

(c) To financially support internships and similar programmes for candidates from developing countries;

(d) To ensure appropriate age distribution and to establish clear indicators to track progress in this regard;

(e) To publish more detailed and publicly available information on diversity such as gender, age and geography.

H. Monitoring of geographical diversity in the United Nations common system

145. The Commission last reported on geographical diversity in the United Nations common system in 2017 (A/72/30).

146. The General Assembly, in its resolutions 72/255 and 73/273, requested the Commission to continue to provide information on the progress made by organizations of the United Nations common system in strengthening geographical diversity, bearing in mind Article 101, paragraph 3, of the Charter of the United Nations, within the common system, including at senior levels. The report prepared by the secretariat and presented to the Commission was based on information that had been collected through a questionnaire to the common system organizations in 2020, to which 25 organizations had responded¹⁵ with data as at 31 December 2019. The geographical groupings used in the report followed those used by the Assembly.¹²

147. Six organizations¹⁶ of the reporting organizations had established criteria for the equitable representation of the States in their organizations through quotas and desirable ranges, although the base figures, factors and weighting used by each organization differed. The number of member States unrepresented in three or more organizations with established desirable ranges increased to 39 (20 per cent) in 2019 (see annex XIV), compared with 37 (19 per cent) in 2016. However, there was slight progress regarding the number of underrepresented member States in three or more organizations with established desirable ranges, which decreased to 14 (7 per cent) in 2019 (see annex XV), from 16 (8 per cent) in 2016. The number of overrepresented member States in three or more organizations with established desirable ranges also increased to 30 (16 per cent) in 2019 (see annex XVI), compared with 25 in 2016 (13 per cent).

148. The largest number of unrepresented (17) and underrepresented (8) countries were in the Asia and the Pacific region. Of the 30 countries that were overrepresented in the six organizations, 10 African countries and 11 European countries were overrepresented in at least three organizations. Annex XVII to the present report shows the total number of staff at the senior and/or decision-making levels (P-5, D-1, D-2, Assistant Secretary-General and Under-Secretary-General) from the underrepresented member States in three or more of the organizations with established desirable ranges. Annex XVIII to the present report provides the total number of staff at the senior and/or decision-making levels from the overrepresented member States in three or more organizations with established desirable ranges.

149. Of the 19 organizations that did not have formal guidelines for geographical distribution, 17 provided lists of countries that were not represented in their organizations, using the 193 countries that are members of the General Assembly as a reference. Table 1 provides a snapshot of the status of geographical diversity in these organizations. While organizations such as the Preparatory Commission of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization, IMO, the International

¹⁵ IAEA, the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea, UNIDO and WMO did not respond.

¹⁶ FAO, ICAO, ILO, UNESCO, the United Nations Secretariat and WHO.

Seabed Authority, ITC, UNRWA, UNWTO and UPU had staff from fewer countries, these were small organizations with fewer than 300 staff members in the Professional and higher categories in total (see annex XX).

Table 1
Geographical diversity in the organizations with no formal guidelines on geographical distribution, as at 31 December 2019

<i>Organization</i>	<i>Number of countries with no staff in the Professional and higher categories</i>
PAHO	3 ^a
UNICEF	23
WFP	30
UNHCR	38
UN-Women	57
UNAIDS	70
IFAD	71
UNFPA	74
WIPO	76
UNOPS	96
Preparatory Commission of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization	103
ITC	111
IMO	123
UPU	129
UNRWA	134
International Seabed Authority	146
UNWTO	164

^a Covers only the Americas.

150. Annex XIX to the present report shows that staff were not represented from 64 countries in 10 or more organizations that did not have formal guidelines for geographical distribution. Among them, 25 countries were from the Asia and the Pacific region and another 15 from the Africa region. There were no staff from Saint Kitts and Nevis in any of the 17 organizations, while there were staff from Marshall Islands in only 1 organization. Twelve countries did not have staff in 15 of the organizations, with seven of these countries from Asia and the Pacific and one from Africa.

151. All organizations, except WIPO, reported that there were no specific rules governing regional representation. Annex XX to the present report provides an overview of staffing profiles by region of origin as at 31 December 2019, based on the data received from the reporting organizations. The considered population includes staff in the Professional and higher categories in the reporting organizations of the common system using geographical groupings. The staff from the Group of Western European and other States constituted 41 per cent of the workforce in the United Nations common system. Nearly one quarter of staff were from Africa and the share of the staff from Eastern Europe was the smallest. It was also noted that the data at the senior and/or decision-making levels showed that more than 50 per cent of such staff were from the Group of Western European and other States.

152. Some organizations reported constraints on achieving geographical diversity, which included the low number of suitable applicants from unrepresented and underrepresented countries, overcoming racial bias in hiring, a diminishing workforce due to downsizing, fewer applications from women in developing countries and language requirements for posts. In addition, some organizations, mainly those in need of highly specialized technical experts, were particularly concerned about the limited number of qualified applicants from unrepresented and underrepresented countries.

153. The suggested measures to improve geographical diversity included establishing specific relevant policies, concerted internal direction and monitoring, targeted and more effective outreach and leveraging professional and other networks, internal guidance and specific consideration of geographical diversity in recruitment decisions.

Discussion in the Commission

154. The Human Resources Network stated that organizations were committed to continuously promoting geographical diversity among their workforce in accordance with the guidance of their relevant governing bodies through a variety of diverse measures, among them targeted outreach to underrepresented countries or specific focus on non-represented countries, as described in the secretariat's report.

155. The representatives of the three staff federations noted that only six responding organizations had targets for equitable geographical representation through a system of desirable ranges and that, even among these, the base figures reflected only a small subset of posts in the Professional and higher categories. The three federations also noted that one regional group dominated in terms of representation (41 per cent), and this was even more pronounced at the senior decision-making levels. Such severe imbalances needed to be corrected. In addition, they considered that the base of posts should be widened beyond only the posts funded through the regular budget to include all posts. Moreover, they were of the view that all organizations should have policies and measurable targets to achieve geographical diversity. The outreach and recruitment efforts targeting, in particular, candidates from unrepresented and underrepresented member States should also be improved and strengthened across the common system organizations.

156. FICSA, while noting Article 101, paragraph 3, of the Charter, noted that the goal of a geographically diverse workforce could be achieved only as part of a holistic approach to workforce diversity. FICSA noted the concerns by 11 organizations on the constraints that they faced in achieving geographical diversity and pointed out that many organizations had cited a low number of suitable applicants from unrepresented or underrepresented countries. Some organizations, mainly those in need of highly specialized technical experts, were particularly concerned about the limited number of qualified applicants from unrepresented and underrepresented countries. Ensuring geographical and other forms of diversity were long-term efforts. In addition to existing outreach efforts, alternative channels of advertising vacancies and accepting offline applications, especially in parts of the world where there was a digital divide and low Internet access, should be considered.

157. CCISUA was of the view that the discussion was timely, given the recent declaration of the Secretary-General that one of the means of combating racism in the organizations was to have improved geographical representation, and CCISUA supported that stance. While cognizant of the provisions of Article 101 (3) of the Charter, in the view of CCISUA, the language requirements for many posts (e.g., excellent command of the English language) made it difficult for candidates from some regional groups to compete fairly. CCISUA pointed out a recommendation made

by the Joint Inspection Unit in 2007 to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights aimed at freezing the recruitment of candidates from overrepresented regional groups and reiterated the importance of implementing such a recommendation across the board in order to achieve equitable geographical representation. Owing to the complexity of the issue, CCISUA proposed establishing a tripartite working group on equitable geographical representation. The federation noted that, thanks to the adoption of a strategy coupled with quantitative objectives, the common system was on the right track regarding gender equality and that the same could be achieved for geographical representation.

158. UNISERV had concerns regarding the representativity of some of the data presented, given that the figures might not be representative of the entire workforce because only a proportion of the overall posts was included in the system of desirable ranges and should therefore be treated with caution as a measure of diversity. The figures referring to regional diversity were more representative because they reflected the entire organization's staff composition in the Professional and higher categories. UNISERV considered that this issue should be approached from a regional angle in addition to an analysis according to country. UNISERV noted the constraints faced by the organizations on achieving geographical diversity and supported the measures proposed by organizations. Organizations should consider hiring outcomes in the aggregate and should hold individual hiring managers and departments or offices accountable if the outcome of their hiring decisions did not reflect the diversity that their organizations espoused. Organizations had to ensure that they devoted equivalent importance to both gender and geographical diversity, avoiding any perception that the former took precedence over the latter. The effectiveness of measures in that regard needed to be monitored and reported with accountability mechanisms in place for non-compliance.

159. Some members of the Commission noted that the principle of equitable geographical distribution had been developed by member States over decades. They noted that, in the organizations with systems of desirable ranges, only a fraction of all posts was included in the base figure. Moreover, the factors used and the associated weights to arrive at the desirable ranges had been decided upon by the General Assembly and the other governing bodies of the common system organizations. These Commission members noted that, given how the system of desirable ranges worked, care needed to be taken in considering the data. For example, countries deemed to be overrepresented were often those that were smaller. On the other hand, they noted that some regions, such as Africa, appeared not to be well represented when viewed from the perspective of the number of member States from that region and they noted, in that regard, the impact of the contribution factor in arriving at the desirable ranges. Some other members noted that the data and trends that were presented reflected, to an extent, the decisions of the governing bodies of the organizations, which those bodies could review at any time. Other members also noted that, in considering the base number of posts, it should be recognized that extrabudgetary sources were, by their very nature, subject to fluctuations, even if they were provided for long periods.

160. Some members observed that only 6 of the 25 reporting organizations had established criteria through a system of desirable ranges. They considered that all organizations should have established criteria for geographical distribution. Some members also encouraged the executive heads to take up the responsibility of ensuring equitable geographical representation. They also considered that the system of desirable ranges should be strengthened so that all member States could be adequately represented. In that regard, some members noted the significant improvement in the figures for FAO and considered that this should be highlighted as a good practice. Some other members were cautious in that regard and wished to receive more information on the FAO strategy, which appeared to be successful. Other members,

while underscoring the importance of geographical diversity, noted that the issues should be viewed from the perspective of the provisions of Article 101 (3) of the Charter. In that regard, the Commission's mandate was to provide information, considering its monitoring role.

161. Upon request, the representative of the United Nations Secretariat informed the Commission that the Secretary-General, in his assessment of the system of desirable ranges (A/73/372/Add.3), had presented for consideration by the General Assembly proposals for a comprehensive review of the system of desirable ranges with a view to establishing a more effective tool for ensuring equitable geographical distribution within the Secretariat. The proposal included options to increase the number of posts subject to geographical distribution, as well as changes in the factors and weights used. The Assembly deferred the consideration of the report from its seventy-third session to the first resumed seventy-sixth session, in March 2022. In addition, the Secretary-General had launched the Geographical Diversity Strategy for the Secretariat to further the goal of increasing representation of unrepresented and underrepresented Member States in geographical posts, as well as representation of regional groups in non-geographical posts.

162. Other members of the Commission considered that more efforts were required by the organizations to increase the number of staff from unrepresented and underrepresented countries. This could include coordinating the outreach efforts of the organizations and pooling together resources in that regard. They also considered that, given the importance of the issue, it should not only be the responsibility of the human resources function, but also the cooperation of the public information departments of the organizations should be sought so as to disseminate information on vacancies more widely and better reach candidates in unrepresented and underrepresented member States. Other members, while supporting such efforts, were of the view that the system was evolving and that improvements would be made mainly through the process of attrition and new recruitments. Persistent efforts were required in that regard.

163. Some members were of the view that the language requirements for posts in the common system organizations should be reviewed because they considered that encouraging multilingualism, among others, by requiring the knowledge of two languages would support efforts to increase geographical diversity. Other members considered that, while such a measure could be useful, it would need to be ensured that the mother tongue was not counted.

164. Members of the Commission, while noting the rich information presented, considered that, in future reports on the issue of geographical diversity, it would be important to capture additional information and trends for those organizations that had systems of desirable ranges, in particular for posts that were not subject to those ranges, for example, those funded through extrabudgetary resources. This, in their view, would provide a more complete picture of geographical diversity. More information would also be welcomed on the reasons why candidates from some countries might not be applying for positions in the common system organizations. Other Commission members were of the view that information on geographical diversity should be collated for all organizations and published annually on a publicly available website so that changes could be monitored over the long term.

Decisions of the Commission

165. The Commission urged:

(a) The organizations to increase the number of posts available for equitable geographical distribution in those organizations that had targets or desirable ranges;

(b) The organizations that did not have targets to ensure equitable geographical representation, in order to establish clear indicators to track progress in that regard;

(c) The organizations to publish more detailed and publicly available information on diversity such as gender, age and geography.

(d) Its secretariat to keep track of trends in the organizations regarding geographical distribution and report to the Commission in the context of its next report on diversity.

I. Monitoring of the implementation of existing gender policies and the achievement of gender parity in the United Nations common system

166. The Commission has periodically reviewed the status of women in the United Nations common system as an important agenda item under its standing mandate from the General Assembly. The Commission plays a pivotal role in ensuring coherence of the common system in relation to gender balance through common recruitment practices that adhere to the principles of the Charter. The Commission reviewed the status of women in the organizations of the common system in 1985, 1993, 1998, 2004, 2006, 2008, 2010, 2014, 2016 and 2017.

167. In accordance with the request of the Commission at its eighty-third session (2016), the secretariat presented a report to the Commission at its eighty-fifth session (2017) covering all issues relating to inclusiveness and diversity, such as gender parity, geographical distribution, multiculturalism, generational diversity and multilingualism. During the deliberation of the report, the Commission expressed its support for setting gender-specific targets in the organizations to meet the goals. However, members highlighted that the achievement of gender balance should not be an end and that it should not compromise the professionalism and competence of staff. The priority was to recruit competent staff, as stipulated in Article 101 of the Charter and confirmed in various resolutions of the General Assembly. The Commission further acknowledged that, in some instances, inconsistencies in the balance of objectives regarding meeting gender targets and geographical representation could emerge and that there should be a correlation between the two goals.

168. In its resolutions [72/255](#) and [73/273](#), the General Assembly requested the Commission to continue to provide information on the progress made by organizations of the United Nations common system in the implementation of existing gender policies and measures towards achieving the goal of a 50-50 gender balance and strengthening geographical distribution, bearing in mind Article 101, paragraph 3, of the Charter, within the common system, including at senior levels.

169. In response to the above resolutions, the secretariat presented a report that provided a summary of the current status of women in the United Nations system, a report on the implementation of the Commission's recommendations and an analysis of available gender-sensitive policies and measures concerning recruitment (selection to a higher level post/promotion/strategic placement, retention policies, work-life balance-related policies, gender awareness and standards of conduct, and monitoring and accountability that have been put in place to support a work environment conducive to achieving gender balance in the organizations). In addition, the report provided information on the recent developments towards achieving gender parity in the United Nations system since the report of the Secretary-General on the

improvement in the status of women (A/74/220).¹⁷ As at 31 December 2017, the representation of women in the United Nations system in the Professional and higher categories stood at 44.2 per cent, up from 42.8 per cent as at 31 December 2015 and 38 per cent as at 31 December 2007 (see annex XXI).

170. For the period from 2007 to 2017, the average annual gains were between 0.3 and 1.1 percentage points per grade level and 0.6 per cent for the Professional and higher categories overall. In 18 entities, the overall representation of women was between 40 and 49 per cent, while in 11 entities, compared with 13 in 2015, that figure was below 40 per cent. Increases were achieved at entities such as FAO, ITC and the secretariat of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. The entities with the lowest representation of women predominantly had mandates in technical fields, illustrating the persistent occupational segregation within the United Nations system.

171. With regard to appointments, overall gains were registered, compared with previous reporting periods, with the proportion of women appointed in the Professional and higher categories increasing from 45.7 to 47.4 per cent. At the Under-Secretary-General and Assistant Secretary-General levels, there have also been significant gains, with women for the first time comprising the majority of Under-Secretary-General appointments at headquarters locations during the reporting period. However, women comprised only one third of non-headquarters appointments at the ungraded level.

172. Since the previous reporting period, the same number of entities (25) registered at least 40 per cent women among new appointments. Of the 11 entities with lower than the 40 per cent threshold, 8 were among those with the lowest representations of women. That status will likely continue unless opportunities are created through new appointments and are better capitalized upon, such as by improving outreach, mitigating bias in selection, implementing targets and holding managers accountable for hiring decisions.

173. In line with the previous reporting period, career advancement at the P-1 to P-4 levels continued to be at, near or above gender parity. However, this was owing in large part to higher proportions at headquarters locations, which exceeded those at non-headquarters at every level by, on average, more than 10 percentage points. The one exception was the D-1 level, where women's career advancements at the non-headquarters level (52 per cent) significantly exceeded that of headquarters (39.1 per cent). Non-headquarters locations had achieved notable improvement overall since the previous reporting period, when women staff comprised 36.8 per cent of all career advancements in the Professional and higher categories, increasing 7.1 percentage points.

174. Women comprised at least 40 per cent of career advancements in the Professional and higher categories in 27 entities and more than 50 per cent in 13 entities. Of the nine entities with the lowest proportions of career advancement, four were among those with the lowest representations of women.

175. The three main reasons for separation were appointment expiration, resignation and retirement, and accounted for 85 per cent of separations of female staff and 83 per cent of separations of male staff.

176. From 2012 to 2019, the share of women from every region increased: for Africa, from 30.7 to 34.1 per cent; for Asia and the Pacific, from 40 to 44.4 per cent; for

¹⁷ While the report by the ICSC secretariat included figures from the report of the Secretary-General, the Commission was subsequently provided at its plenary the updated information contained in A/76/115.

Eastern Europe, from 39.3 to 48.4 per cent; for Latin America and the Caribbean, from 44.7 to 47.3 per cent; and for Western Europe and other States, from 45.4 to 50.7 per cent. The largest increase was registered with respect to Eastern Europe, at 9.1 per cent.

177. A wide range of work-life policies has been implemented by the organizations of the common system to help to balance staff members' professional and private lives and to assist staff, in particular women. All but five organizations have implemented a gender strategy. Most organizations have policies and measures in place to achieve gender balance (see annex XXII).

Discussion in the Commission

178. The Human Resources Network noted the commitment of organizations to promoting gender parity. The system-wide strategy on gender parity had been instrumental in that regard, as evidenced by the overall increase in the percentage of women, in particular at senior levels. Achieving gender parity, however, required a continuous effort to monitor the adequacy of human resources policies and remuneration practices, through which the Commission played a critical role. In that regard, the Network looked forward to the upcoming working group on parental leave, given that organizations considered parental leave provisions to be a key enabler for gender parity. The organizations congratulated the Chair of ICSC for his dedicated efforts to enhance gender parity at the Advisory Committee on Post Adjustment Questions and looked forward to seeing that trend reflected within the Commission.

179. FICSA was pleased with the increased number of female staff across all categories from 2007 to 2017, in particular at the higher levels, and expressed delight in the fact that the representation of women resident coordinators had reached gender parity in 2018. FICSA fully supported the efforts reported to sustain the gains made, including by improving gender parity in candidate pools and pipelines by targeting women, in particular from the global South. FICSA indicated that all related policies and ways of working supported the stated goal of gender parity, including areas such as career development plans, parental leave policies, flexible working arrangements, including part-time and job-sharing at all levels, as well as the development, strict implementation and monitoring of policies to address harassment and sexual harassment. FICSA noted with concern that, notwithstanding some progress and positive developments in some organizations, the pace of progress towards gender parity in the United Nations system had not met expectations. At the same time, it stressed that the paramount consideration in the recruitment, employment and promotion of staff should be to secure employees of the highest standards of efficiency, technical competence and integrity, irrespective of their gender, age, race, religion or nationality.

180. CCISUA reiterated its commitment to the principle of gender equality and welcomed the progress made during the period 2016–2017. It expressed concern about the negative correlation between senior-level posts and the proportion of women and considered it important to ensure the representation of women at all ranks, including at higher levels. It agreed that there was a strong correlation between gender equality and geographical representation, noting that 50.9 per cent of women belonged to the Group of Western European and other States. Although progress had been made in increasing the proportion of women coming from other regional groups, CCISUA was of the view that more efforts should be made in that regard and stressed the importance of having a gender equality policy that ensured equitable geographical distribution. The federation agreed that, for recruitment, it was important to consider factors of diversity such as geographical balance and recalled the need for a more detailed analysis of the patterns of recruitment and departure of women, broken down by region of origin. CCISUA regretted that the system-wide strategy on gender parity

considered only staff in the Professional and higher categories, leaving out posts in the General Service and related categories. It noted that progress in gender parity was slower at non-headquarters duty stations than at headquarters. This was due to the living conditions prevailing in field duty stations and that were not conducive to the family life to which some women aspired. It welcomed the efforts of organizations to address sexual harassment through the activities of the CEB Task Force on Addressing Sexual Harassment within the Organizations of the United Nations System and believed that no public servant should escape accountability measures when allegations of sexual harassment were confirmed against them. With regard to temporary special measures, CCISUA found that they were the best way to achieve real progress but insisted on the need to ensure that merit prevailed in all decisions related to recruitment and promotion.

181. UNISERV noted that the common system had not met the target of 50-50 gender parity at all levels pursuant to the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, but that progress had been made, with 44.2 per cent women in the Professional and higher categories as of 2017 and 35.1 per cent at the D-1 and higher levels. UNISERV regretted that data were available only for Professional staff and not for the entire workforce and called for sustained and expanded efforts to achieve gender parity at all levels and for all contract types. The higher proportion of women resigning from the system also required attention. UNISERV expressed concern over the slower level of progress at field locations and felt that more emphasis on retention and career advancement support was needed. The creation of a “field-specific enabling environment”, as developed by UN-Women, and ongoing support for a family-friendly compensation package remained critical to addressing those imbalances. UNISERV called upon the common system to address gender parity and geographical representation together and not as separate issues, stating that greater efforts should be made to achieve gender parity across all regions, while simultaneously aiming for more equal geographical representation. UNISERV also highlighted the interconnectedness of the three dimensions of diversity examined during the session and invited the secretariat to continue to highlight salient intersections in its future reports, as well as to strengthen the chronological angle, to allow the Commission to follow the evolution of those important trends.

182. With respect to the review, members of the Commission acknowledged that there was progress that was due in part to the leadership of the system-wide strategy on gender parity and the collective will of all the organizations. Some members of the Commission were of the view that progress was modest. One member of the Commission expressed that 21 organizations that had reached between 40 and 49 per cent parity represented a significant achievement and that the 6 below 40 per cent should be urged to make efforts towards improvement. Another member of the Commission underscored that, in some organizations, there was an imbalance in favour of female staff and emphasized that gender balance essentially meant parity of both female and male staff.

183. The Commission considered the percentage of women joining the common system organizations at the entry level at an average age of 30 as an indication and positive trend of a pipeline that could be sustained. The Commission called for organizations to take a closer look at exit interviews in order to establish why women were leaving the organizations at a faster rate than men.

184. The Commission, in looking at the representation of women by region, noted with concern the slow pace and disproportionate parity between the west and the rest of the world, in particular Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean and Eastern Europe. It reiterated its previous concerns over the inconsistencies in the balance of objectives regarding meeting gender targets and geographical representation and that there should be a correlation between the two goals.

185. The Commission noted that the picture was incomplete because it excluded staff in the General Service and related categories who comprised a very important component for measuring the entire global workforce.

186. The Commission also noted the temporary measures in place to achieve gender parity and called upon organizations to implement such strategies, while further noting that the paramount consideration in the employment of staff was the need to secure the highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity, in conformity with Article 101, paragraph 3, and Article 8 of the Charter.

187. The Commission highlighted that it would like to see all organizations implement gender policies and quantifiable programmes and report on their progress by means of data and statistics published on a public platform.

Decision of the Commission

188. The Commission decided to:

(a) Take note of the information provided in the present report with regard to available gender policies and measures towards achieving gender parity in the Professional and higher categories in organizations of the United Nations common system;

(b) Strongly urge organizations to continue to implement existing gender balance policies and measures, including the recommendations of the Commission outlined in its previous annual reports, as approved by the General Assembly, while ensuring the highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity of candidates in accordance with Article 101 of the Charter, and urge the organizations that did not have targets to ensure gender balance to establish clear indicators to track progress in that regard;

(c) Request its secretariat to continue to monitor the progress made in achieving gender parity as part of a comprehensive report on diversity in the United Nations common system and provide an update in the next regular report.

Chapter IV

Conditions of service in the field: payment of amount in lieu of settling-in grant at category E duty stations that are not designated as non-family

189. In 2018, the Commission decided that a reduced sum of the non-family service allowance, in the amount of \$15,000 per year, could be granted to staff members with eligible dependants at duty stations with hardship classifications of D or E, in lieu of the option to install eligible dependants at the duty station. However, in its resolution [73/273](#), the General Assembly decided to grant, on a pilot basis, an amount of \$15,000 for staff members with eligible dependants in duty stations with E hardship classification conditions only, as specified in paragraphs 156 (a), (c) and (d) of the report of the Commission for 2018 ([A/73/30](#)), in which it stipulated that: (a) the option of whether to install eligible dependants at duty stations classified at hardship levels D or E that were not designated as non-family duty stations should be left to the staff member; (c) the above-mentioned amount would be granted to a staff member who requested such an allowance at the time of taking up an assignment at a D or E duty station not designated as non-family, in lieu of the option to install the eligible dependants at the duty station; and (d) if any eligible dependant was installed at the duty station, the allowance would not be payable.

190. The Commission was requested by the General Assembly, in its resolution [73/273](#), to submit a recommendation on that payment, including on its continuation, to the Assembly at its seventy-fifth session. However, that timeline had to be adjusted, as noted by the Commission in its report for 2020 ([A/75/30](#)).

191. In its resolution [75/245](#), the General Assembly decided to continue the pilot scheme in 2021, on the understanding that the payment would be granted to eligible staff members only when they actually reported to their duty stations, and requested the Commission to submit to the General Assembly at its seventy-sixth session a recommendation on the payment, including on its continuation, based on a review of the impact thereof, including workforce planning, in different categories of duty stations, including non-family duty stations, and the actual cost to the organizations.

192. In its report for 2018, the Commission had stressed the importance of receiving data from the organizations on the utilization rate of the pilot scheme, in order to facilitate a review. Following the adoption of the pilot scheme by the General Assembly, the secretariat reiterated the importance of capturing the relevant data and provided the necessary guidance to organizations.

193. When the pilot scheme was approved, effective 1 January 2019, 26 category E duty stations were not designated as non-family and were therefore eligible for the pilot scheme. At the time of the review, of the 567 active duty stations classified under the hardship scheme, only 18 category E duty stations, in eight countries, were not designated as non-family and were eligible for the pilot scheme. There had been a decrease in the number of eligible duty stations since the implementation of the pilot scheme for several reasons, namely, a change in the hardship classification of some duty stations; the absence of internationally recruited staff members, rendering the duty station no longer eligible for inclusion; or a change in designation to non-family owing to security restrictions. Except for the two capital cities (Bissau and Pyongyang), the duty stations participating in the pilot scheme had only small numbers of staff members.

194. When internationally recruited staff members who hold an appointment other than a temporary appointment take up assignments at duty stations participating in the pilot scheme, they are given the option to either install their eligible dependants and

receive the allowances related to their relocation to the duty station, or to not install their eligible dependants and receive \$15,000 per annum under the pilot scheme.

195. Staff members who opt for the payment under the pilot scheme do not receive relocation-related and other entitlements in respect of their dependants at the staff member's duty station of assignment. This includes payments for travel to and from the duty station of assignment; the relocation shipment (or lump sum in lieu); the daily subsistence allowance and lump-sum portions of the settling-in grant; and home leave and accelerated home leave travel in respect of their dependants. If any eligible dependant is installed at the organization's expense at the staff member's duty station, the pilot payment is not payable.

196. The organizations reported that, prior to the introduction of the pilot scheme, approximately 80 per cent of staff members in those locations installed their eligible dependants (some only for a short period) and 20 per cent did not. This depended on individual family circumstances, the age of the dependants, schooling requirements, availability of medical services and the isolation of the duty station.

197. While installation of eligible dependants at the duty stations participating in the pilot scheme remained possible, the Commission noted in its earlier consideration of the issue that staff members who served at those duty stations faced the hard choice between installing their eligible dependants in difficult conditions or maintaining them in a separate location. Staff members maintaining a family in a separate location bear some financial costs, in addition to the psychological hardship of separation from their dependants. The Commission considered that, in such cases, some recognition of the additional costs involved would be appropriate. The Commission considered that an amount lower than the non-family service allowance (\$19,800 per annum) would be appropriate, considering that the option to install eligible dependants would continue to be made available to staff members upon acceptance of an assignment to duty stations under the pilot. Therefore, an amount of \$15,000 had been recommended by the Commission and approved by the General Assembly.

198. The organizations with staff members in the affected locations provided data related to the implementation of the pilot scheme, including financial costs. The United Nations Secretariat had limited presence in the affected locations and there were no staff members eligible during the review period; two staff members requested the pilot scheme, but no payments had yet been made at the time of the review. UNHCR reported that, of 58 staff members with eligible dependants, only 4 opted to install their eligible dependants at the duty station of assignment, while 52 (90 per cent) opted for the pilot scheme. UNDP had eight staff members with eligible dependants (two working remotely from home countries), of whom three opted to install eligible dependants, two opted for the pilot (40 per cent) and one was in the process of deciding. UNICEF reported that 10 staff members were eligible for installation of eligible dependants, of whom 8 opted for the pilot scheme (80 per cent). Of the nine eligible staff members at WFP, four opted to install eligible dependants (only one of the four cases included the installation of eligible children), while five (56 per cent) opted for the pilot. For WHO, which had a limited presence at such duty stations, both eligible staff members (100 per cent) opted for the pilot scheme. Other field-based organizations reported that they had no staff at duty stations participating in the pilot scheme and had therefore not implemented the measure.

199. On the basis of the expenditure data collected by the organizations, during the period 2019/20 or parts thereof, at the duty stations eligible for the pilot, \$234,904 was paid in respect of 12 staff members (15 per cent) who opted for installation of eligible dependants. Expenditure by organizations as part of the pilot scheme amounted to \$943,733 in respect of 69 staff members (85 per cent).

Discussion in the Commission

200. The Human Resources Network stated that the report of the Secretariat provided a good overview of the current figures and an update on the pilot provisions. While the total numbers were low owing to the COVID-19 pandemic, the relatively short pilot period and the limited number of eligible duty stations and staff, the financial costs were quite minimal. The pilot had nevertheless proved to be successful in the view of the organizations. The Network therefore requested that the pilot provisions be regularized. Organizations recalled that the Commission, in 2018, had considered it appropriate to include category D duty stations that are not designated as non-family in its consideration, and suggested that, from their perspective, this would be the recommended way to proceed.

201. UNISERV stated that the pilot project had served its purpose and had proved to be of benefit for both staff and organizations. UNISERV acknowledged and appreciated the solicitation and usage of feedback from staff from the various organizations, which helped to put a human face on those types of entitlements, recognizing the impact on staff who served the United Nations system. It was, in their view, also important to note the trends in relation to the reasons for staff opting for the pilot entitlement, which appeared to centre mostly on the lack of medical, educational and recreational facilities, and isolation. With regard to the process and methodology for the designation of duty stations as not non-family, UNISERV noted that, while the importance of security should not be underestimated, a lack of suitable health systems and family medical care facilities should carry appropriate weight. Similarly, issues such as social isolation, lack of educational facilities and entertainment options understandably weighed significantly in terms of staff deciding to utilize the entitlement. UNISERV recalled that a delegation of the Commission personally experienced the dire conditions in one of the duty stations in Guinea-Bissau that was not designated as a non-family duty station. There, even very basic medical facilities, among others, simply did not exist. With that in mind, UNISERV requested that those elements be given more careful consideration and appropriate weight in the determination and designation of not non-family duty stations. UNISERV pointed out that the entitlement created a win-win situation, in that staff were happy with the arrangement and the organization saved money. On the basis of the results of the pilot project and given the positive responses from organizations and staff and the original request for the entitlement to be applied to both category D and E duty stations, UNISERV reiterated its earlier request to expand the use of the provision to category D duty stations. If the arrangement were not formalized, then at least the pilot should, in their view, be extended further and include category D duty stations, with the aim of undertaking a final review one year from now to gather data from the expanded pilot scheme.

202. FICSA and CCISUA aligned with the statement of UNISERV. FICSA was of the view that the pilot had proved successful, the trying circumstances notwithstanding. The Federation recalled that some 36 per cent of Professional and higher category staff in the Global Staff Survey had responded that they would not accept an assignment to a category D or E duty station owing mainly to family reasons. On that basis, FICSA aligned with CEB and encouraged the formalization of the pilot and the extension of the scheme to category D duty stations.

203. CCISUA stated that it was in agreement with the Human Resources Network statement above, namely, that, on the basis of the experience to date, the pilot scheme had proved a useful and effective tool to attract staff members to very difficult and remote duty stations. For staff, the grant was an important factor in deciding whether to accept a post at a hardship duty station. CCISUA supported the Commission's intention to recommend to the General Assembly that the pilot scheme be formalized

and that the reduced non-family service allowance be payable in lieu of family installation benefits, where applicable. CCISUA also supported the inclusion in the scheme of category D duty stations that are not designated as non-family, as the Commission had considered appropriate in 2018.

204. The Commission noted that the running of the pilot scheme was a good example of how to address the needs expressed by field-based organizations, given that it was a transparent measure that increased mobility. The pilot was much preferred by staff members (85 per cent opted for the measure, while 15 per cent opted for the installation of dependants) and cost less for organizations. The Commission was of the view that a system that was fair, offered options to staff members and saved money was welcome and should be continued and expanded to include category D duty stations as the Commission had previously approved in 2018.

205. Some members of the Commission noted that the pilot had been implemented under highly exceptional circumstances, when staff movements had been limited because of the pandemic (81 staff members were eligible for the pilot), and thus suggested the extension of the pilot for an additional year. Other members of the Commission recalled that the pilot had been launched effective 1 January 2019, before the pandemic, and that the organizations had provided data and arguments supporting its effectiveness. The organizations did this notwithstanding the small data set attributable to the low number of eligible duty stations and staff, as well as the pandemic in 2020. Some Commission members were of the view that the pilot scheme should be prolonged, rather than formalized at this stage, in order to fully understand its effect on staff.

206. The representative of UNHCR stated that, as a field-based organization serving in some of the least hospitable places in the world and with a very stringent mandatory rotation policy, UNHCR depended on a fully inclusive, family-friendly approach to the appointment and assignment of international professional staff to successfully deliver on its mandate. UNHCR had undertaken a series of efforts to make hardship duty stations more attractive, but the recruitment and retention of highly qualified staff members remained a major challenge in the absence of tangible support for families, and given the duty of care towards families. The representative further stated that UNHCR staff were aware of what it meant to work in deep field locations and that they often paid a high price in terms of work-life balance and family relationships. They also knew what worked best for them and their families when serving at non-family duty stations and tended to organize their own lives accordingly. The organization aimed to support them in doing so through a partnership-based approach. Testimonials on the personal experiences of staff members serving at category D and E duty stations not designated as non-family had been collected and shared with the ICSC secretariat and included in the report; they were extremely revealing and provided some detailed descriptions of the living conditions that prevented staff from installing their families in those locations. The testimonials from colleagues serving at category D duty stations not designated non-family revealed that the same living conditions were present as at category E duty stations currently eligible for the pilot scheme.

207. On the basis of the experience of UNHCR (58 of 81 staff members were eligible for the pilot scheme, or 72 per cent), the introduction of the pilot scheme in January 2019, albeit small in scope, had already made a difference in empowering its staff to make choices that worked for them. As evidenced by the fact that 90 per cent of UNHCR colleagues appointed to category E duty stations selected the option offered by the pilot scheme, it was an unambiguous way to support those who served in hardship and remote locations not conducive to family life. However, given the limited number of such duty stations, the impact in addressing the strategic needs of the organization had, to date, been rather minimal, and a further expansion through

regularization of the pilot and inclusion of D duty stations was warranted, especially given that many staff had been negatively affected by the COVID-19 situation at a time when medical care for dependants had also added further stress to staff.

208. The representative of the United Nations made comments that aligned with those of UNHCR and recalled that, when the pilot scheme was initially discussed, the United Nations had more than 180 eligible staff members in 14 missions, but the exclusion of category D duty stations brought those numbers down to only 1 downsizing mission with no eligible staff members in it. However, all four staff members recruited while the pilot scheme was running and who were eligible for the reduced non-family service allowance had opted for it. The United Nations strongly supported formalizing or prolonging the pilot and expanding it to include category D duty stations not designated as non-family.

209. The Commission appreciated hearing the testimonials and first-hand experiences of the affected staff members. Some members of the Commission noted that the category E duty stations eligible for the pilot scheme were in large part not conducive to family life. However, they noted that the current process of designating non-family duty stations, where staff members were precluded from installing dependants, was based solely on reasons of safety and security. On the other hand, some staff members opted to install spouses or young children at some of the category E duty stations eligible for the pilot scheme because they were not designated as non-family, the lack of educational facilities notwithstanding, which might not be relevant to their circumstances, and suggested a review of the designation of non-family duty stations.

210. Commission members expressed the view that category D duty stations that are not designated as non-family should be included under that measure, as the Commission had considered appropriate in 2018. The Commission stressed that the successful implementation of the pilot at the eligible category E duty stations strengthened the argument that category D duty stations should be included, given that there were also very difficult hardship conditions at those duty stations. The Commission noted the reasons why staff members opted for the pilot scheme in lieu of installing their eligible dependants. The reasons included the lack or absence of medical facilities, educational or preschool facilities, markets or supplies; poor social and recreational facilities; isolation due to remoteness; and difficulty in travelling within the country and to the outside world. In addition, some spouses had jobs outside the duty stations and, for career reasons, had decided not to join the staff members at those duty stations.

211. Notwithstanding the limited sample, the Commission noted the positive trend of staff with eligible dependants applying for positions at the duty stations included in the pilot. On the basis of the data and experiences provided by both the organizations and staff members, the Commission considered the pilot scheme to be a very useful instrument for attracting staff to duty stations where the delivery of organizational mandates was most critical.

Decisions of the Commission

212. The Commission decided to:

(a) Inform the General Assembly that the implementation of the pilot scheme at category E duty stations that were not designated as non-family was successful and was found to be a useful and effective tool;

(b) Recommend to the General Assembly that the pilot scheme be formalized and that the reduced non-family service allowance of \$15,000 per annum continue to be payable in lieu of family installation benefits, where applicable;

(c) Recall its decision from its eighty-seventh session ([A/73/30](#), para. 156) regarding a reduced non-family allowance for the category D duty stations not designated as non-family and recommended that the measure be expanded to include D duty stations not designated as non-family;

(d) Request its secretariat to continue to monitor the utilization rate of the reduced non-family service allowance and report to the Commission at its ninety-fourth session, stressing the importance of receiving data from the organizations to facilitate the review.

Chapter V

Measures to address non-compliance with decisions and recommendations of the Commission

213. In its resolution [75/245](#), the General Assembly requested that the Commission recommend measures to address non-compliance with the decisions and recommendations of the Commission in the context of its next report. In the same resolution, the Assembly expressed concern at the continued application of two concurrent post adjustment multipliers in the United Nations common system at the Geneva duty station, and urged the member organizations of the common system to cooperate fully with the Commission, in line with its statute, to restore consistency and unity to the post adjustment system as a matter of priority.

214. While the request was made in the context of the post adjustment system, the General Assembly had, in recent years, also deliberated over other actual or perceived cases of non-compliance with some of the Commission's recommendations and decisions and with Assembly resolutions. Those cases included, in particular, the implementation of some of the elements of the compensation package that was approved by the Assembly in December 2015, the late implementation by some organizations of the revised mandatory age of separation and the interpretation by one organization of how performance bonuses could be awarded.

215. As early as 1985 the General Assembly, in its resolution [40/244](#), requested the Secretary-General, in his capacity as Chair of the Administrative Committee on Coordination (now CEB), and, through him, the other executive heads of organizations participating in the United Nations common system, to promote endeavours to maintain and strengthen the common system for the regulation and coordination of the conditions of service. It also requested the executive heads of participating organizations, through the Secretary-General, to inform their respective governing bodies of the resolution; urged Member States to ensure that their representatives in organizations of the common system were informed about the positions taken by them in the Assembly on matters relating to the conditions of service; and expressed its concern over actions taken by some of the participating organizations that had led to disparities in the common system. The Assembly also requested ICSC to report in detail to the Assembly at future sessions on the consideration and implementation of the decisions and recommendations of the Commission by organizations of the common system.

216. Similarly, in its resolution [41/207](#), adopted in 1986, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General, in his capacity as Chair of the Administrative Committee on Coordination, and, through him, the other executive heads of organizations participating in the United Nations common system, to ensure that all necessary measures were taken to promote uniform and coordinated action in the common system regarding conditions of service. In the same resolution, the Assembly stressed the importance of ensuring that the governing organs of the specialized agencies did not take, on matters of concern to the common system, positions conflicting with those taken by the Assembly. In 1987, the Assembly, in its resolution [42/221](#), expressed its concern over actions taken by some of the participating organizations that had led to disparities in the United Nations common system. The Assembly also urged executive heads of organizations concerned to undertake a revision of their rules and regulations, so that they might conform with decisions taken by the Commission. In all three resolutions, the Assembly requested the Commission to continue to report to the Assembly on the implementation of its recommendations and decisions.

217. In its resolutions [72/255](#), [73/273](#) and [75/245](#), the General Assembly reiterated to the executive heads and governing bodies of the United Nations common system that failure to fully respect post adjustment decisions taken by the Commission under article 11 (c) of its statute could prejudice claims to enjoy the benefits of participation in the common system and jeopardize the participation of organizations in the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund, as stated in article 3 (b) of the Fund's Regulations. According to this article, "Membership in the Fund shall be open to the specialized agencies referred to in Article 57, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations and to any other international, intergovernmental organization which participates in the common system of salaries, allowances and other conditions of service of the United Nations and the specialized agencies".

218. In its most recent resolution on the United Nations common system ([75/245](#)), the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to consult with the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board to review whether all participating organizations were observing the common system of salaries, allowances and other conditions of service and include the results of the review in his next report to the Assembly.

219. The ICSC secretariat presented possible measures that could be recommended by the Commission and that fell into two categories: pre-emptive and corrective measures. With regard to pre-emptive measures, both the Commission and the General Assembly might have a greater role to play. It was clear from Assembly resolutions [40/244](#), [41/207](#) and [42/221](#) that the Assembly had been concerned that the governing bodies of member organizations of the United Nations common system and representatives of Member States in those bodies lacked full or accurate information about decisions and recommendations taken by the Commission and the Assembly with regard to the common system. In certain cases, that lack of information might have resulted in action leading to discrepancies in the common system. This concern appears to remain valid today.

220. One option presented was that the General Assembly might wish to consider formalizing its information exchange with the governing bodies by requesting the President of the General Assembly to share with them the resolutions of the Assembly on the common system and to circulate those resolutions as official communications. Such a measure might also ensure that the governing bodies are provided with first-hand information, which should help to minimize any misunderstanding and misinterpretations.

221. Another potential pre-emptive measure could be for the General Assembly to request the governing bodies to invite either the Chair or Vice-Chair of the Commission to participate in their sessions, where relevant. Such invitations could become a regular feature of the governing bodies' programmes of work, so as to enable clear communication and prevent distortions.

222. Another issue mentioned was uninterrupted and undistorted communication with organizations and governing bodies as key to ensuring that they understand, embrace and ultimately comply with the decisions and recommendations of the Commission and the General Assembly. While the Commission's website was a valuable source of information, the Commission's outreach could be improved. To that end, one additional post of Communications Officer had already been requested, as reflected in the annual reports of the Commission for 2019 and 2020. It had also been requested in the budget of the Commission for 2022, and its cost-sharing implications had been reviewed by the Finance and Budget Network of CEB.

223. A further complicating matter was the existence of two distinct tribunals, one of which did not even have an appeals mechanism. The recent developments concerning the post adjustment multiplier had shown how the system could severely hinder the uniform application of the common system. The General Assembly had invited the

Commission to comment on the relevant report (A/75/690) prepared by the Secretary-General in his capacity as Chair of CEB. This had been discussed at the ninety-first session of the Commission, in May 2021, and the Chair had sent the comments of the Commission to the President of the General Assembly and to the Chair of the Fifth Committee. Recently, the Commission had been invited to provide comments on options that would be discussed by a Working Group of the United Nations Legal Advisers Network on the Review of the Jurisdictional Setup of the United Nations Common System, and the ICSC Chair had nominated two Commission members as focal points.

Discussion in the Commission

224. The spokesperson of the Human Resources Network emphasized that good collaboration with the Commission and all related stakeholders was essential. Organizations were committed to achieving greater coherence across the system, as expressed by their original formal entry into the United Nations common system. The current situation, including the COVID-19 pandemic and other external events, demanded even stronger collaboration and enhanced mutual understanding, and the Network believed that all were making positive strides in that direction.

225. From the perspective of the Human Resources Network, the vast majority of decisions and recommendations of the Commission were jointly agreed and duly implemented. Exceptions were minimal, came in very specific contexts and were laid out in specific General Assembly resolutions; references were to General Assembly resolutions adopted in the 1980s. Accordingly, organizations did not consider perceived non-compliance a significant issue.

226. In the case of the post adjustment, the Human Resources Network did not consider non-compliance to be the proper characterization of a situation in which organizations had implemented the ICSC recommendations and decisions but were then legally bound to implement final and binding judgments of their administrative tribunals. The Network noted that efforts to enhance collaboration and coherence between tribunals were under consideration. These efforts should help to address some of the challenges that had been identified. Organizations stood ready to collaborate with the Commission on the matter and to offer their practical experience in tribunal cases.

227. The Human Resources Network did not believe that active or punitive measures were necessary in resolving the challenges and agreed with the observation by the ICSC secretariat that the organizations overwhelmingly addressed decisions and recommendations on common system matters in good faith, and that any harsh corrective measures taken without thoroughly balanced consideration could be counterproductive and might have a detrimental effect on the cohesiveness of the common system. In fact, organizations had a strong track record of keeping their governing bodies fully informed of reports and decisions of the Commission and of the General Assembly. Therefore, the Network did not consider the possible measures that had been mentioned as relevant or necessary in that context, except in terms of any legal considerations related to their implementation. In closing, the Network expressed its willingness to take any opportunity to enhance collaboration with the Commission in order to avoid any perception of non-compliance.

228. The President of FICSA expressed the Federation's support for the Commission and its mandate and for the principles of the common system. The Federation believed that a balanced approach, also taking into account the programmatic and strategic needs of organizations, would benefit all stakeholders and might facilitate the implementation of Commission decisions without any delays.

229. With regard to the report of the Secretary-General on the review of the jurisdictional set-up of the United Nations common system (A/75/690), all federations appreciated the recent opportunities to engage with the substantive United Nations department dealing with the matter and with the Office of Legal Affairs to ensure that the views of all stakeholders, including those of staff, were fully included in the final report to the General Assembly. Federations were assured that they would continue to be briefed on each of the steps going forward. FICSA strongly encouraged the continuation of such a collegial approach in the next steps of the review, which should include consultation with individual staff associations/unions by the organizations' legal advisers. In the view of the Federation, the process was ongoing and therefore not much could be achieved by debating the issue further at this time.

230. FICSA expressed its support for the proposed post of Communications Officer in the budget of the Commission and hoped that this would significantly increase the capacity of the ICSC secretariat to ensure transparency in all matters, including on issues concerning the post adjustment and related cost-of-living surveys.

231. The President of CCISUA appreciated the fact that the vast majority of the Commission's decisions were being implemented and that exceptions were few. CCISUA believed that non-compliance with recommendations and decisions of the Commission, whenever it occurred, represented a threat to the common system and all its staff members, and suggested that the Commission carry out analytical work to understand the reasons behind non-compliance. CCISUA was of the view that the source of the problems could not be confined to a lack of communication, because, clearly, the Commission was making enormous efforts to communicate with its stakeholders; communication was vital and could always be improved. The communication measures proposed by the ICSC secretariat, including the recruitment of a Communications Officer, were a good idea but would not be sufficient to resolve the issue. As early as its opening speech, CCISUA had highlighted the importance of tripartism in the work of the Commission and reiterated that view under the relevant agenda item. CCISUA was ready to make concrete proposals on tripartism if the idea was acceptable to the Commission. For CCISUA, the best way to address the issue of non-compliance was through the involvement of all stakeholders in the decision-making processes. CCISUA had strong reservations about the observation that the existence of two tribunals did not promote compliance with the decisions of ICSC.

232. The spokesperson for UNISERV stated that the Federation was fully aware of the disruption to the stability of the common system caused by divergences in compliance with the Commission's post adjustment decisions applicable to Geneva. Having followed the issue closely, the Federation was alarmed by signs of escalation as time went by and positions hardened. It was not serving anyone's interest that the General Assembly had questioned, in paragraph 7 of its resolution 75/245, the eligibility of organizations – which were doing nothing more than following a binding judgment of their applicable jurisdiction – to participate in the common system and the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund.

233. UNISERV stated that there were certainly important questions to be asked about the role, scope and reach of the dual jurisdictions and that there might well be a need to differentiate their role as administrative tribunals, in order to deter any temptation to act as constitutional courts with oversight over the decisions of the legislative bodies. The nature of the relationship between the Commission and the legislative bodies was certainly unique and perhaps not always fully understood by the tribunals. In the Federation's view, the General Assembly should not hesitate to reassert the legal principles underpinning that relationship in terms that left no ambiguity in the minds of future magistrates who might examine those issues. To that end, the spokesperson added that the report by the Secretary-General (A/75/690) contained

valuable recommendations, any combination of which could effectively resolve any ambiguity in the future.

234. While the review of the jurisdictional set-up was ongoing, UNISERV emphasized the fact that the divergence in Geneva post adjustment multipliers was temporary. The issue would ideally be resolved on the basis of the results of the next cost-of-living survey. The Federation invited the Commission to apply a cautionary approach, to exercise patience and to allow some time for the issue to resolve itself organically.

235. UNISERV underlined that the tribunals served a much broader and, indeed, critical function of judicial oversight and protection for the rights of more than 60,000 staff worldwide. A rich ecosystem of expertise, knowledge and procedure had evolved around each tribunal, embodied and transmitted by the staff, their representative associations and legal counsels, and the human resources, disciplinary and legal officers of each organization. The Federation urged everyone not to allow a single issue to distract and destabilize the tribunal system and asked that, given the importance of the federations and staff representatives as representatives of the system's primary beneficiaries, the federations remain closely involved in any discussion on the jurisdictional set-up.

236. In response to enquiries, ILO and other Geneva-based organizations confirmed that they had initially implemented the recommendations. At ILO, this had been endorsed by its Governing Body. However, it was underscored that staff had the right to appeal administrative decisions. Only after the decision of the ILO Administrative Tribunal did the ILO consider itself legally bound to implement the judgment. Unless it was believed that staff did not have the right to challenge ICSC recommendations/decisions or that organizations should not implement the judgments of their administrative tribunal, the term non-compliance was an inappropriate characterization of the situation.

237. Most Commission members confirmed the need to continue to report to the General Assembly on an annual basis about the implementation, or lack thereof, of the Commission's recommendations and decisions or of relevant Assembly resolutions on the common system. Commission members emphasized that only the Assembly could take measures when organizations did not comply with the Commission's recommendations or decisions. The Statute of the Commission did not accord it that role.

238. One Commission member recommended that ICSC explicitly and annually report to the General Assembly those organizations that were not compliant with specific decisions, pursuant to Article 17 of the ICSC statute, or information requests of ICSC. The Commission member highlighted article 3 (b) of the Regulations of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund, in which it is stated that "Membership in the Fund shall be open to the specialized agencies referred to in Article 57, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations and to any other international, intergovernmental organization which participates in the common system of salaries, allowances and other conditions of service of the United Nations and the specialized agencies". The Commission member recommended that the Assembly, after reviewing the item as covered in the Commission's annual report, communicate to the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board a recommendation, if necessary, that any organization not in compliance with specific ICSC decisions or other aspects of the United Nations common system be removed from the Pension Fund.

239. Other Commission members cautioned against using removal of membership in the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund as a punitive measure for organizations that did not comply in full with recommendations or decisions of the Commission, adding that there were many implications to that suggestion and that it should be

studied carefully. The Pension Fund also included organizations that were not formal members of the common system. Furthermore, the Pension Fund asked only for confirmation, at the entry stage, of whether an organization followed the provisions of the common system, but did not make membership in the common system an entry requirement. Therefore, even in the Pension Fund's own regulations and rules regarding its membership, compliance with common system provisions was required only at the time of entry but was not a requirement for continuation in the Fund, and it was difficult to exclude a participating organization from the Fund. Such an exclusion could provide grounds for future litigation.

240. A Commission member pointed out that it was up to the Pension Board to decide whether to exclude any organization from the Pension Fund. Given that such an exclusion meant serious financial implications for the Pension Fund, as well as burdensome legal procedures and weakening of the investment capacity of the Fund, it was unlikely that the Pension Board would be interested in such a move, even if the General Assembly urged it. This might bring another common system problem to the forefront of discussions that could even have negative implications for the Commission. He stated that one should not forget the financial burden that the Member States would face should an organization be excluded from the Pension Fund. The Pension Fund was very stable and Member States were interested in keeping their assessments predictable. An expulsion of any organization from the Pension Fund would not serve those interests.

241. Commission members concluded that such a recommendation had serious financial and legal implications that could have a negative impact on the future of the common system and therefore should be further analysed as to their feasibility.

242. Many Commission members believed that ICSC had an institutionalized reporting mechanism that worked well. They noted that the incidence of non-compliance by organizations with requests or decisions of the Commission was rather low.

243. Decisions by the Commission or the General Assembly might, in several instances, require acceptance by the governing body of the participating organization and sometimes did not allow for immediate implementation. A Commission member pointed out that ICSC could control communication and advocacy with stakeholders only before, during and after changes had been proposed and approved by the Assembly.

Decision of the Commission

244. The Commission:

- (a) Noted the options proposed during the discussion and recommended they be further analysed as to their feasibility;
- (b) Agreed to work towards improved communication with stakeholders;
- (c) Reiterated its request for an additional post of Communications Officer;
- (d) Noted the work undertaken by the Secretary-General in his role as Chair of the CEB regarding the jurisdictional set-up of the common system and confirmed the Commission's willingness to collaborate in the exercise.

Annex I**Programme of work of the International Civil Service Commission for 2022–2023**

1. Resolutions and decisions adopted by the General Assembly and the legislative/governing bodies of the other organizations of the common system.
2. Conditions of service applicable to both categories of staff:
 - (a) Review of the framework for contractual arrangements;
 - (b) Parental leave;
 - (c) Review of the human resources framework;
 - (d) Review of the implementation of Common Classification of Occupational Groups codes;
 - (e) Review of standards of conduct;
 - (f) Standard of accommodation for air travel.
3. Conditions of service of the Professional and higher categories:
 - (a) Base/floor salary scale;
 - (b) Evolution of the United Nations/United States net remuneration margin;
 - (c) Post adjustment issues: reports and agendas of the Advisory Committee on Post Adjustment Questions and status report on the 2021 baseline surveys at headquarters duty stations;
 - (d) Children's and secondary dependant's allowances: review of methodology;
 - (e) Children's and secondary dependant's allowances: review of level;
 - (f) Review of staff assessment rates for grossing-up purposes;
 - (g) Review of the implementation of the recruitment incentive;
 - (h) Payment of amount in lieu of settling-in at category E duty stations that are not designated as non-family;
 - (i) Mobility incentive: review of level;
 - (j) Hardship allowance: review of level;
 - (k) Non-family service allowance: review of level;
 - (l) Relocation shipment: review of level.
4. Conditions of service of the General Service and other locally recruited categories: review of local salary survey methodologies.
5. Conditions of service in the field:
 - (a) Danger pay: review of level;
 - (b) Security evacuation allowance.
6. Review of the consultative process and working arrangements of the Commission.
7. Monitoring of the implementation of the decisions and recommendations of ICSC and the General Assembly by organizations of the United Nations common system.

8. Measures to address non-compliance with decisions and recommendations of the Commission.
9. Jurisdictional set-up of the United Nations common system.

Annex II

Proposed salary scale and pay protection points

A. Proposed salary scale for the Professional and higher categories showing annual gross salaries and net equivalents after application of staff assessment (effective 1 January 2022)

(United States dollars)

Level		Steps												
		I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII	XIII
USG	Gross	207 368												
	Net	152 363												
ASG	Gross	188 253												
	Net	139 747												
D-2	Gross	150 252	153 708	157 164	160 623	164 082	167 539	170 994	174 455	177 911	181 367			
	Net	114 666	116 947	119 228	121 511	123 794	126 076	128 356	130 640	132 921	135 202			
D-1	Gross	134 514	137 376	140 243	143 107	145 961	148 827	151 792	154 824	157 864	160 897	163 933	166 965	170 003
	Net	103 660	105 663	107 670	109 675	111 673	113 679	115 683	117 684	119 690	121 692	123 696	125 697	127 702
P-5	Gross	115 949	118 384	120 821	123 253	125 690	128 123	130 561	132 994	135 430	137 863	140 300	142 730	145 170
	Net	90 664	92 369	94 075	95 777	97 483	99 186	100 893	102 596	104 301	106 004	107 710	109 411	111 119
P-4	Gross	94 871	97 036	99 200	101 481	103 830	106 180	108 533	110 883	113 231	115 579	117 933	120 277	122 627
	Net	75 602	77 247	78 892	80 537	82 181	83 826	85 473	87 118	88 762	90 405	92 053	93 694	95 339
P-3	Gross	77 884	79 887	81 891	83 892	85 897	87 899	89 901	91 908	93 909	95 911	97 918	99 921	102 090
	Net	62 692	64 214	65 737	67 258	68 782	70 303	71 825	73 350	74 871	76 392	77 918	79 440	80 963
P-2	Gross	60 203	61 993	63 784	65 575	67 370	69 163	70 958	72 743	74 537	76 328	78 120	79 914	81 704
	Net	49 254	50 615	51 976	53 337	54 701	56 064	57 428	58 785	60 148	61 509	62 871	64 235	65 595
P-1	Gross	46 413	47 806	49 198	50 646	52 164	53 688	55 207	56 729	58 249	59 771	61 291	62 811	64 332
	Net	38 523	39 679	40 834	41 991	43 145	44 303	45 457	46 614	47 769	48 926	50 081	51 236	52 392

Abbreviations: ASG, Assistant Secretary-General; USG, Under-Secretary-General.

Note: The normal qualifying period for in-grade movement between consecutive steps is one year. The shaded steps in each grade require two years of qualifying service at the preceding step.

B. Pay protection points for staff whose salaries are higher than the maximum salaries on the unified salary scale

(United States dollars)

<i>Level</i>		<i>Pay protection point 1</i>	<i>Pay protection point 2</i>
P-4	Gross	124 981	127 331
	Net	96 987	98 632
P-3	Gross	104 263	106 437
	Net	82 484	84 006
P-2	Gross	83 495	–
	Net	66 956	–
P-1	Gross	65 851	–
	Net	53 547	–

Annex III

Yearly comparison and the development of the margin over time

A. Comparison of average net remuneration of United Nations officials in the Professional and higher categories in New York and United States officials in Washington, D.C., by equivalent grades (margin for calendar year 2021)

Grade	Net remuneration (United States dollars)		United Nations/ United States ratio (United States, Washington, D.C. =100)	United Nations/ United States ratio adjusted for cost-of-living differential	Weights for calculation of overall ratio ^d
	United Nations ^{a,b}	United States ^c			
P-1	71 780	58 855	122.0	108.1	0.6
P-2	92 877	73 733	126.0	111.6	11.0
P-3	119 122	94 141	126.5	112.0	30.3
P-4	143 219	112 035	127.8	113.2	33.3
P-5	169 814	128 386	132.3	117.2	17.7
D-1	192 076	147 872	129.9	115.1	5.4
D-2	209 062	183 602	113.9	100.9	1.7
Weighted average ratio before adjustment for New York/Washington, D.C., cost-of-living differential					127.9
New York/Washington, D.C., cost-of-living ratio					112.9
Weighted average ratio, adjusted for cost-of-living differential					113.3

^a For the calculation of average United Nations salaries, personnel statistics of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination as at 31 December 2020 were used.

^b Average United Nations net salaries by grade, reflecting 1 month at multiplier 67.1 and 11 months at multiplier 69.3 on the basis of the unified salary scale in effect from 1 January 2021.

^c For the calculation of average United States federal civil service salaries, personnel statistics as at 31 December 2020, received from the United States Office of Personnel Management, were used.

^d These weights correspond to the United Nations common system staff in grades P-1 to D-2, inclusive, serving at Headquarters and established offices as at 31 December 2020.

B. Calendar year margin levels, 2012–2021

Year	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Margin	116.9	119.6	117.4	117.2	114.5	113.0	114.4	113.4	113.0	113.3

Annex IV

Adjustment to the declining reimbursement scale and the boarding lump sum of the education grant, as recommended in the annual report for 2019 of the International Civil Service Commission (A/74/30)

- (a) Revised declining reimbursement scale:

<i>Claim amount bracket (United States dollars)</i>	<i>Reimbursement rate (percentage)</i>
0–13 300	86
13 301–20 000	81
20 001–26 700	76
26 701–33 400	71
33 401–40 000	66
40 001–46 700	61
46 701 and above	–

- (b) Revised boarding lump sum: \$5,300.

Annex V

Summary of the organizations' assessment of compensation package attributes

Attributes	WHO	WIPO	WFP	UPU	UNWTO	UNWOMEN	UNWRA	UNOPS	UN	UNIDO	UNICEF	UNHCR	UNFPA	UNDP	PAHO	ITU	ITC	International Seabed Authority	IMO	ILO	IFAD	ICAO	IAEA	FAO	Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Organization	Majority responses
Fairness/equity	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	N/A	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗
Competitiveness	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗
Transparency	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗
Simplification	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗
Cost-effectiveness	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	N/A	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗
Flexible	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	N/A	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗
Supports the delivery of organizational mandates	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	N/A	N/A	↗	N/A	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗
Incentivizes service in hardship and high-risk duty	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	N/A	↗	N/A	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗
Encourage mobility	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	N/A	↗	N/A	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗

Abbreviation: N/A, not applicable.

Note: The table serves to summarize the responses of organizations to the question as to whether the pursued attributes were achieved overall in the new compensation package. Their responses were categorized according to a Likert scale, as follows: positive (↗); somewhat positive (↘); neutral (→); somewhat negative (↙); and negative (↘). The table shows input from human resources departments only. The World Meteorological Organization and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization indicated that they would need to more time before providing their assessments, while the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS did not supply responses. Thus, those organizations were excluded.

Annex VI

Estimated costs in 2015 and 2021, compared with pre-2015 compensation package

(Percentage)

<i>Compensation elements</i>	<i>Projected difference in cost in 2015</i>	<i>Estimated difference in cost in 2021</i>
Base salary	} (1.2) }	} (1.1) }
Post adjustment		
Spouse allowance		
Single parent allowance	N/A	N/A
Child allowance	19.0	17.0
Hardship allowance	6.9	6.7 ^a
Non-family service allowance	2.6	3.2
Mobility	(17.6)	(8.4) ^{b,c}
Accelerated home leave	(100.0)	(92.1) ^d
<i>Relocation^e</i>	(5.3) ^f	
Separation payments:	(5.2)	(10.3)
Termination indemnity	(5.5)	(3.9)
Death grant	(2.7)	(3.9)
Repatriation grant	(5.1)	(13.0)
Education grant	N/A	N/A ^g

Abbreviation: N/A, not applicable.

^a After adjustment for the approximately 2 per cent increase, effective 1 January 2020.

^b Estimated cost reduction was lower owing to the General Assembly's decision to increase the amounts recommended by the Commission by 25 per cent and 50 per cent upon the fourth and seventh assignments, respectively.

^c After adjustment for the approximately 3.08 per cent increase, effective 1 January 2020.

^d Estimated cost reduction was lower owing to the General Assembly's decision to maintain this element for category D and E duty stations that do not fall under the rest and recuperation framework.

^e No estimates are possible for the difference in cost in 2021, given the discontinuation of the non-removal allowance.

^f Overall cost decrease estimated from a combination of the discontinuation of the non-removal allowance and an increase in the proposed relocation lump sum in lieu of relocation shipment, compared with the previous relocation grant. The General Assembly's decision to maintain the relocation lump sum at one month of base salary plus post adjustment at the staff member's assigned duty station was estimated to be slightly less expensive than the Commission's recommendation of a uniform amount based on P-4, step VI.

^g Cost-effectiveness is measured against the inflation rate of educational expenses observed over the applicable years. The cost difference between the two schemes reported in the 2015 report cannot be reproduced owing to a lack of information resulting from the simplified new scheme, which no longer requires the organizations to track detailed data.

Annex VII

Detailed description of the 2015 revisions to the compensation package^a

Salary and dependency

<i>Old system</i>	<i>Current system</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two net salaries: one for staff with dependants and another for staff with no dependants • Dependant rate salary paid in respect of a spouse with earnings less than a threshold amount. The dependant rate is also paid in respect of a first dependant child for staff without a dependant spouse. • Differing numbers of step increments within different grades 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One base salary scale, applied uniformly to all staff, regardless of family circumstances • Dependant spouse/single parent allowance equivalent to 6 per cent of net remuneration (base salary plus post adjustment) payable to staff with a spouse earning below the threshold amount and to those who are single parents. The spouse allowance would not transfer to the first dependant child in the case of a staff member with a non-dependant spouse; rather, a child allowance would be paid. • A more uniform salary scale: 13 steps for grades P-1 to P-5, with additional steps at grades D-1 and D-2

Step periodicity

<i>Old system</i>	<i>Current system</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Step increments granted annually for most grades, subject to satisfactory performance • Biennial step increments in a small number of cases (all steps of grade D-2 and some steps near the top of the range for grades P-3 to P-5 and D-1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steps granted on an annual basis for grades P-1 to P-5, up to step VII • Biennial increments from step VII to the top of the new scale for grades P-1 to P-5 (step XIII). Current periodicity would be retained for grades D-1 and D-2, with additional steps

^a As part of the compensation review process, changes were made to the methodology for calculating the post adjustment index and to the operational rules for determining the post adjustment multiplier with a view to making salary adjustments simpler, more accurate, more transparent and more predictable. After those modifications, a further review specific to the post adjustment system was initiated. This review is ongoing, and its progress, in the specific context of application to the 2021 round of cost-of-living surveys, is reported under a separate agenda item.

Education grant

<i>Old system</i>	<i>Current system</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scheme based on 15 currency/country zones, with a maximum threshold of admissible expenses associated with each zone. Staff are reimbursed up to 75 per cent of costs, based on the cost-sharing principle • Scheme covers admissible expenses from primary, secondary and tertiary level expenses • Admissible expenses limited to tuition, enrolment-related fees, books, daily transportation to school and other expenses (including capital assessment fees) • Boarding expenses dealt with within admissible expenses for all levels and locations (up to a maximum in cases in which the child is studying away from the duty station of the staff member), with additional support to staff serving at designated duty stations • Education grant travel provided for each scholastic year for child studying away from the duty station of the staff member (twice a year for staff in designated duty stations; once a year otherwise) • Updating of maximum admissible expenses based on pragmatic decision of the Commission, with reference to a dual system of movement in fees data from representative schools and level of claims made by staff members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scheme based on one global sliding scale for reimbursement consisting of seven brackets, thus retaining the cost-sharing principle. Take-up of low-cost options is incentivized, with higher rates of reimbursement for lower expenses • Scheme covers admissible expenses from primary, secondary and tertiary level expenses • Admissible expenses limited to tuition (including mother tongue language tuition) and enrolment-related fees. Capital investment fees to be dealt with outside of the scheme • Boarding expenses to be reimbursed only for staff in the field based on a flat amount of \$5,000 if child is in primary or secondary education and is boarding at a school outside of the staff member's duty station. Special flexibility to be granted to organizations to provide boarding support to staff in at category H duty stations, under certain conditions • One round trip for each scholastic year for child of a staff member in receipt of assistance with boarding expenses • Updating of sliding scale for reimbursement based on pragmatic decision of the Commission, with reference to movement in fees data for representative schools on a biennial basis

Hardship allowance

<i>Old system</i>	<i>Current system</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flat amount, differentiated by the classification of duty station and grade and dependency status of the staff member • Staff paid at the dependency rate are paid more than their peers at the single rate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flat amount, differentiated by the classification of duty station and grade of staff member • Staff would be paid the equivalent of the old dependency rate, regardless of their family status

Non-family service allowance

Old system

Payment differentiated by grade and dependency status, as follows: staff at grades P-1 to P-3 are paid \$6,540 at the single (S) rate or \$17,440 at the dependency (D) rate; P-4 to P-5: \$7,845 (S), \$20,920 (D); D-1 to D-2: \$8,700 (S), \$23,250 (D)

Current system

Payment differentiated, as follows: staff members with a dependant would be paid an allowance of \$19,800 per annum, while other staff members would be paid \$7,500

Mobility

Old system

- At category A to E duty stations, the allowance is paid as of the second assignment and is increased for each subsequent move up to the seventh assignment, after which the rate remains the same and is no longer increased
- At category H locations, staff must have had at least two previous assignments at category A to E locations. The allowance is not payable until the fourth assignment at category H locations and reaches a maximum on the seventh or subsequent assignment
- A flat amount, differentiated by the number of assignments, grade and dependency status. Payments range from \$2,020 for staff members at grades P-1 to P-3, paid at the single rate, serving at a category H duty station and with four to six assignments, up to \$16,900 for staff members at the D-1 level and above, paid at the dependency rate, serving at a category A to E duty station with seven or more assignments

Current system

- Mobility incentive payable to staff serving at a category A to E duty station with at least two assignments in such a location
 - Not payable at category H locations
 - A flat amount, differentiated by grade and number of assignments: payments range from \$6,700 per annum at grades P-1 to P-3 with two to three assignments to \$15,057 at grades D-1 and above with seven or more assignments^b
-

^b While the Commission had recommended flat amounts by grade only, the General Assembly decided to increase those amounts by 25 per cent from the fourth assignment and 50 per cent from the seventh assignment. Amounts reflect an increase of approximately 3.08 per cent as at 1 January 2020.

Relocation package

<i>Element</i>	<i>Old system</i>	<i>Current system</i>
Relocation travel	Provided to staff member and eligible accompanying family members by the most direct and cost-effective route	Provided to staff member and eligible accompanying family members by the most direct and cost-effective route
Relocation shipment	(a) Full removal of household goods by organization up to an established weight/volume entitlement by family size	(a) Full removal managed by organization up to an established volume entitlement by family size (standard 20-ft. container for single staff; 40-ft. container for staff with family)
	OR	OR
	(b) Non-removal of household goods by organization plus assignment grant (lump-sum portion) plus non-removal allowance	(b) Full removal managed by staff and reimbursed by organization up to an established volume entitlement by family size (standard 20-ft. container for single staff; 40-ft. container for staff with family)
	OR	OR
	(c) Relocation grant (\$15,000 for staff with eligible family members and \$10,000 for single staff) plus assignment grant (lump-sum portion) plus non-removal allowance	(c) Lump sum paid to staff equivalent to 70 per cent of the actual cost of shipment for the established entitlement (standard 20-ft. container for single staff; 40-ft. container for staff with family)
		OR
		(d) Lump sum set by organization based on 70 per cent of cost of past shipments, not exceeding \$18,000
Settling-in grant (formerly assignment grant)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lump-sum portion: one month's salary • Daily subsistence allowance portion: 30-day local daily subsistence allowance for staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lump-sum portion: one month's salary^c • Daily subsistence allowance portion: 30-day local daily subsistence allowance for staff
	PLUS	PLUS
	30-day daily subsistence allowance at 50 per cent for each eligible family member	15-day daily subsistence allowance for each accompanying eligible family member

^c Based on the decision of the General Assembly. The Commission had recommended a lump sum equivalent to the base salary plus applicable post adjustment of grade P-4, step VI.

Repatriation grant

*Old system**Current system*

Four weeks of net base salary for each of the first two years of expatriate service plus two weeks for each additional year up to 12 years of service for staff with dependants. A reduced amount for single staff

Grant payable starting on five years of expatriate service according to the old system's payment schedule

Accelerated home leave

*Old system**Current system*

Accelerated home leave travel for category C, D and E duty stations every year

Approved only at category D and E duty stations that do not fall under the rest and recuperation framework

Annex VIII

Age distribution of the workforce in organizations of the United Nations common system as at 31 December 2019

Organization	Less than 30 years	30 to less than 35 years	35 to less than 40 years	40 to less than 45 years	45 to less than 50 years	50 to less than 55 years	55 to less than 60 years	60 to less than 65 years	65 years and over	Total
Preparatory Commission of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization	2 (0.7%)	23 (8.4%)	42 (15.4%)	52 (19.0%)	50 (18.3%)	57 (20.9%)	37 (13.6%)	10 (3.7%)	0 (0.0%)	273 (0.3%)
FAO	49 (1.6%)	195 (6.2%)	335 (10.7%)	489 (15.6%)	583 (18.6%)	607 (19.4%)	609 (19.5%)	260 (8.3%)	3 (0.1%)	3 130 (3.0%)
ICAO	5 (0.7%)	31 (4.4%)	80 (11.4%)	113 (16.1%)	117 (16.6%)	132 (18.8%)	143 (20.3%)	80 (11.4%)	2 (0.3%)	703 (0.7%)
IFAD	11 (1.7%)	61 (9.3%)	73 (11.1%)	119 (18.2%)	119 (18.2%)	135 (20.6%)	97 (14.8%)	40 (6.1%)	0 (0.0%)	655 (0.6%)
ILO	112 (3.5%)	366 (11.3%)	521 (16.1%)	539 (16.6%)	572 (17.6%)	469 (14.5%)	426 (13.1%)	233 (7.2%)	3 (0.1%)	3 241 (3.1%)
IMO	5 (1.8%)	15 (5.3%)	36 (12.8%)	39 (13.8%)	51 (18.1%)	52 (18.4%)	59 (20.9%)	25 (8.9%)	0 (0.0%)	282 (0.3%)
International Seabed Authority	2 (4.5%)	10 (22.7%)	3 (6.8%)	9 (20.5%)	7 (15.9%)	4 (9.1%)	3 (6.8%)	6 (13.6%)	0 (0.0%)	44 (0.0%)
ITC	38 (10.8%)	44 (12.5%)	63 (17.8%)	66 (18.7%)	56 (15.9%)	40 (11.3%)	36 (10.2%)	10 (2.8%)	0 (0.0%)	353 (0.3%)
PAHO	1 (0.1%)	24 (3.1%)	61 (7.9%)	102 (13.2%)	124 (16.1%)	153 (19.9%)	178 (23.1%)	124 (16.1%)	3 (0.4%)	770 (0.7%)
United Nations Secretariat	844 (2.3%)	2 968 (8.1%)	5 385 (14.7%)	7 053 (19.3%)	6 867 (18.8%)	5 923 (16.2%)	4 828 (13.2%)	2 330 (6.4%)	376 (1.0%)	36 574 (34.9%)
UNAIDS	8 (1.1%)	17 (2.4%)	82 (11.8%)	112 (16.1%)	154 (22.1%)	135 (19.4%)	124 (17.8%)	63 (9.1%)	1 (0.1%)	696 (0.7%)
UNDP	162 (2.3%)	612 (8.5%)	1 262 (17.6%)	1 529 (21.4%)	1 357 (19.0%)	1 098 (15.3%)	793 (11.1%)	340 (4.7%)	7 (0.1%)	7 160 (6.8%)
UNESCO	50 (2.2%)	149 (6.7%)	255 (11.5%)	366 (16.4%)	439 (19.7%)	405 (18.2%)	345 (15.5%)	214 (9.6%)	3 (0.1%)	2 226 (2.1%)
UNFPA	57 (1.9%)	274 (9.3%)	442 (15.1%)	536 (18.3%)	569 (19.4%)	451 (15.4%)	418 (14.2%)	186 (6.3%)	2 (0.1%)	2 935 (2.8%)
UNHCR	838 (6.5%)	2 035 (15.9%)	2 647 (20.6%)	2 415 (18.8%)	1 904 (14.8%)	1 476 (11.5%)	1 021 (8.0%)	485 (3.8%)	13 (0.1%)	12 834 (12.2%)
UNICEF	461 (3.0%)	1 597 (10.5%)	2 758 (18.1%)	3 181 (20.8%)	2 731 (17.9%)	2 166 (14.2%)	1 676 (11.0%)	692 (4.5%)	16 (0.1%)	15 278 (14.6%)
UNOPS	11 (1.3%)	61 (7.4%)	134 (16.4%)	193 (23.6%)	184 (22.5%)	115 (14.0%)	80 (9.8%)	40 (4.9%)	1 (0.1%)	819 (0.8%)
UNRWA	2 (1.3%)	10 (6.3%)	22 (13.8%)	36 (22.5%)	27 (16.9%)	26 (16.3%)	25 (15.6%)	9 (5.6%)	3 (1.9%)	160 (0.2%)
UN-Women	30 (2.7%)	135 (12.0%)	217 (19.3%)	265 (23.6%)	205 (18.2%)	126 (11.2%)	107 (9.5%)	37 (3.3%)	2 (0.2%)	1 124 (1.1%)
UNWTO	5 (5.6%)	10 (11.2%)	16 (18.0%)	22 (24.7%)	13 (14.6%)	10 (11.2%)	7 (7.9%)	1 (1.1%)	5 (5.6%)	89 (0.1%)
UPU	4 (1.6%)	17 (6.8%)	44 (17.7%)	41 (16.5%)	47 (18.9%)	36 (14.5%)	41 (16.5%)	19 (7.6%)	0 (0.0%)	249 (0.2%)
WFP	194 (3.4%)	650 (11.3%)	1 070 (18.6%)	1 144 (19.9%)	1 064 (18.5%)	844 (14.7%)	542 (9.4%)	239 (4.2%)	1 (0.0%)	5 748 (5.5%)

<i>Organization</i>	<i>Less than 30 years</i>	<i>30 to less than 35 years</i>	<i>35 to less than 40 years</i>	<i>40 to less than 45 years</i>	<i>45 to less than 50 years</i>	<i>50 to less than 55 years</i>	<i>55 to less than 60 years</i>	<i>60 to less than 65 years</i>	<i>65 years and over</i>	<i>Total</i>
WHO	141 (1.7%)	575 (7.0%)	1 054 (12.8%)	1 438 (17.5%)	1 539 (18.7%)	1 509 (18.3%)	1 372 (16.7%)	584 (7.1%)	21 (0.3%)	8 233 (7.9%)
WIPO	17 (1.4%)	55 (4.6%)	115 (9.6%)	149 (12.5%)	208 (17.4%)	284 (23.8%)	243 (20.4%)	115 (9.6%)	7 (0.6%)	1 193 (1.1%)
Total	3 049 (2.9%)	9 934 (9.5%)	16 717 (16.0%)	20 008 (19.1%)	18 987 (18.1%)	16 253 (15.5%)	13 210 (12.6%)	6 142 (5.9%)	469 (0.4%)	104 769 (100.0%)

Source: Data from United Nations common system organizations in 2020.

Annex IX

Age distribution of staff in the Professional and higher categories by organization as at 31 December 2019

Organization	Less than 30 years	30 to less than 35 years	35 to less than 40 years	40 to less than 45 years	45 to less than 50 years	50 to less than 55 years	55 to less than 60 years	60 to less than 65 years	65 years and over	Total
Preparatory Commission of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization	0 (0.0%)	12 (6.6%)	31 (17.1%)	34 (18.8%)	32 (17.7%)	38 (21.0%)	26 (14.4%)	8 (4.4%)	0 (0.0%)	181 (0.5%)
FAO	23 (1.4%)	119 (7.2%)	172 (10.4%)	233 (14.1%)	299 (18.1%)	321 (19.5%)	323 (19.6%)	155 (9.4%)	3 (0.2%)	1 648 (4.4%)
ICAO	1 (0.3%)	6 (1.7%)	31 (8.9%)	57 (16.4%)	68 (19.5%)	65 (18.7%)	75 (21.6%)	44 (12.6%)	1 (0.3%)	348 (0.9%)
IFAD	5 (1.4%)	31 (8.4%)	43 (11.7%)	61 (16.5%)	67 (18.2%)	77 (20.9%)	57 (15.4%)	28 (7.6%)	0 (0.0%)	369 (1.0%)
ILO	28 (2.2%)	112 (9.0%)	156 (12.5%)	182 (14.6%)	236 (18.9%)	204 (16.3%)	210 (16.8%)	121 (9.7%)	1 (0.1%)	1 250 (3.3%)
IMO	0 (0.0%)	5 (3.1%)	18 (11.2%)	29 (18.0%)	27 (16.8%)	36 (22.4%)	33 (20.5%)	13 (8.1%)	0 (0.0%)	161 (0.4%)
International Seabed Authority	0 (0.0%)	4 (15.4%)	2 (7.7%)	5 (19.2%)	3 (11.5%)	4 (15.4%)	2 (7.7%)	6 (23.1%)	0 (0.0%)	26 (0.1%)
ITC	31 (13.2%)	34 (14.5%)	47 (20.1%)	39 (16.7%)	31 (13.2%)	22 (9.4%)	22 (9.4%)	8 (3.4%)	0 (0.0%)	234 (0.6%)
PAHO	1 (0.2%)	11 (2.4%)	27 (5.9%)	66 (14.5%)	69 (15.2%)	92 (20.2%)	108 (23.7%)	78 (17.1%)	3 (0.7%)	455 (1.2%)
United Nations Secretariat	239 (1.8%)	1 015 (7.6%)	1 673 (12.5%)	2 326 (17.3%)	2 426 (18.1%)	2 322 (17.3%)	2 006 (15.0%)	1 075 (8.0%)	330 (2.5%)	13 412 (35.6%)
UNAIDS	4 (1.2%)	7 (2.1%)	31 (9.4%)	42 (12.7%)	74 (22.4%)	70 (21.2%)	66 (20.0%)	35 (10.6%)	1 (0.3%)	330 (0.9%)
UNDP	30 (1.2%)	158 (6.5%)	339 (14.0%)	533 (22.0%)	521 (21.5%)	440 (18.2%)	279 (11.5%)	115 (4.8%)	5 (0.2%)	2420 (6.4%)
UNESCO	34 (3.2%)	79 (7.4%)	118 (11.1%)	164 (15.4%)	197 (18.5%)	194 (18.2%)	166 (15.6%)	112 (10.5%)	2 (0.2%)	1 066 (2.8%)
UNFPA	15 (2.0%)	75 (9.8%)	82 (10.7%)	112 (14.7%)	147 (19.3%)	146 (19.1%)	128 (16.8%)	56 (7.3%)	2 (0.3%)	763 (2.0%)
UNHCR	76 (2.1%)	370 (10.0%)	677 (18.3%)	712 (19.2%)	689 (18.6%)	545 (14.7%)	417 (11.3%)	205 (5.5%)	12 (0.3%)	3 703 (9.8%)
UNICEF	63 (1.4%)	329 (7.3%)	706 (15.7%)	989 (22.0%)	883 (19.7%)	707 (15.8%)	582 (13.0%)	218 (4.9%)	10 (0.2%)	4487 (11.9%)
UNOPS	9 (1.4%)	54 (8.5%)	93 (14.6%)	147 (23.1%)	146 (23.0%)	91 (14.3%)	64 (10.1%)	30 (4.7%)	1 (0.2%)	635 (1.7%)
UNRWA	2 (1.3%)	10 (6.3%)	22 (13.8%)	36 (22.5%)	27 (16.9%)	26 (16.3%)	25 (15.6%)	9 (5.6%)	3 (1.9%)	160 (0.4%)
UN-Women	21 (3.8%)	69 (12.5%)	84 (15.3%)	123 (22.4%)	106 (19.3%)	61 (11.1%)	63 (11.5%)	21 (3.8%)	2 (0.4%)	550 (1.5%)
UNWTO	2 (4.3%)	9 (19.1%)	9 (19.1%)	9 (19.1%)	8 (17.0%)	3 (6.4%)	4 (8.5%)	1 (2.1%)	2 (4.3%)	47 (0.1%)
UPU	2 (2.2%)	6 (6.5%)	13 (14.0%)	7 (7.5%)	15 (16.1%)	16 (17.2%)	27 (29.0%)	7 (7.5%)	0 (0.0%)	93 (0.2%)
WFP	8 (0.5%)	66 (4.2%)	185 (11.7%)	295 (18.6%)	339 (21.4%)	300 (18.9%)	262 (16.5%)	128 (8.1%)	3 (0.2%)	1 586 (4.2%)

<i>Organization</i>	<i>Less than 30 years</i>	<i>30 to less than 35 years</i>	<i>35 to less than 40 years</i>	<i>40 to less than 45 years</i>	<i>45 to less than 50 years</i>	<i>50 to less than 55 years</i>	<i>55 to less than 60 years</i>	<i>60 to less than 65 years</i>	<i>65 years and over</i>	<i>Total</i>
WHO	25 (0.8%)	152 (4.9%)	321 (10.4%)	492 (15.9%)	595 (19.2%)	626 (20.2%)	582 (18.8%)	290 (9.4%)	10 (0.3%)	3 093 (8.2%)
WIPO	9 (1.3%)	35 (5.2%)	77 (11.4%)	98 (14.5%)	115 (17.1%)	134 (19.9%)	126 (18.7%)	74 (11.0%)	6 (0.9%)	674 (1.8%)
Total	628 (1.7%)	2 768 (7.3%)	4 957 (13.2%)	6 791 (18.0%)	7 120 (18.9%)	6 540 (17.4%)	5 653 (15.0%)	2 837 (7.5%)	397 (1.1%)	37 691 (100.0%)

Source: Data from United Nations common system organizations in 2020.

Annex X

Age distribution of staff in the General Service and related categories by organization as at 31 December 2019

Organization	Less than 30 years	30 to less than 35 years	35 to less than 40 years	40 to less than 45 years	45 to less than 50 years	50 to less than 55 years	55 to less than 60 years	60 to less than 65 years	65 years and over	Total
Preparatory Commission of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization	2 (2.2%)	11 (12.0%)	11 (12.0%)	18 (19.6%)	18 (19.6%)	19 (20.7%)	11 (12.0%)	2 (2.2%)	0 (0.0%)	92 (0.1%)
FAO	26 (1.8%)	76 (5.1%)	163 (11.0%)	256 (17.3%)	284 (19.2%)	286 (19.3%)	286 (19.3%)	105 (7.1%)	0 (0.0%)	1 482 (2.3%)
ICAO	4 (1.1%)	25 (7.0%)	49 (13.8%)	56 (15.8%)	49 (13.8%)	67 (18.9%)	68 (19.2%)	36 (10.1%)	1 (0.3%)	355 (0.5%)
IFAD	6 (2.1%)	30 (10.5%)	30 (10.5%)	58 (20.3%)	52 (18.2%)	58 (20.3%)	40 (14.0%)	12 (4.2%)	0 (0.0%)	286 (0.4%)
ILO	84 (4.2%)	254 (12.8%)	365 (18.3%)	357 (17.9%)	336 (16.9%)	265 (13.3%)	216 (10.8%)	112 (5.6%)	2 (0.1%)	1 991 (3.1%)
IMO	5 (4.1%)	10 (8.3%)	18 (14.9%)	10 (8.3%)	24 (19.8%)	16 (13.2%)	26 (21.5%)	12 (9.9%)	0 (0.0%)	121 (0.2%)
International Seabed Authority	1 (5.9%)	7 (41.2%)	1 (5.9%)	4 (23.5%)	3 (17.6%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (5.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	17 (0.0%)
ITC	7 (5.9%)	10 (8.4%)	16 (13.4%)	27 (22.7%)	25 (21.0%)	18 (15.1%)	14 (11.8%)	2 (1.7%)	0 (0.0%)	119 (0.2%)
PAHO	0 (0.0%)	13 (4.1%)	34 (10.8%)	36 (11.4%)	55 (17.5%)	61 (19.4%)	70 (22.2%)	46 (14.6%)	0 (0.0%)	315 (0.5%)
United Nations Secretariat	597 (3.0%)	1 924 (9.8%)	3 511 (17.8%)	4 137 (21.0%)	3 594 (18.2%)	2 772 (14.1%)	2 145 (10.9%)	975 (4.9%)	46 (0.2%)	19 701 (30.2%)
UNAIDS	4 (1.1%)	10 (2.7%)	51 (13.9%)	70 (19.1%)	80 (21.9%)	65 (17.8%)	58 (15.8%)	28 (7.7%)	0 (0.0%)	366 (0.6%)
UNDP	132 (2.8%)	454 (9.6%)	923 (19.5%)	996 (21.0%)	836 (17.6%)	658 (13.9%)	514 (10.8%)	225 (4.7%)	2 (0.0%)	4 740 (7.3%)
UNESCO	16 (1.4%)	70 (6.0%)	137 (11.8%)	202 (17.4%)	242 (20.9%)	211 (18.2%)	179 (15.4%)	102 (8.8%)	1 (0.1%)	1 160 (1.8%)
UNFPA	42 (1.9%)	199 (9.2%)	360 (16.6%)	424 (19.5%)	422 (19.4%)	305 (14.0%)	290 (13.4%)	130 (6.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 172 (3.3%)
UNHCR	762 (8.3%)	1 665 (18.2%)	1 970 (21.6%)	1 703 (18.7%)	1 215 (13.3%)	931 (10.2%)	604 (6.6%)	280 (3.1%)	1 (0.0%)	9 131 (14.0%)
UNICEF	398 (3.7%)	1 268 (11.8%)	2 052 (19.0%)	2 192 (20.3%)	1 848 (17.1%)	1 459 (13.5%)	1 094 (10.1%)	474 (4.4%)	6 (0.1%)	10 791 (16.6%)
UNOPS	2 (1.1%)	7 (3.8%)	41 (22.3%)	46 (25.0%)	38 (20.7%)	24 (13.0%)	16 (8.7%)	10 (5.4%)	0 (0.0%)	184 (0.3%)
UNRWA	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (22.2%)	3 (33.3%)	1 (11.1%)	2 (22.2%)	1 (11.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	9 (0.01%)
UN-Women	9 (1.6%)	66 (11.5%)	133 (23.2%)	142 (24.7%)	99 (17.2%)	65 (11.3%)	44 (7.7%)	16 (2.8%)	0 (0.0%)	574 (0.9%)
UNWTO	0 (0.0%)	3 (7.7%)	1 (2.6%)	7 (17.9%)	13 (33.3%)	5 (12.8%)	7 (17.9%)	3 (7.7%)	0 (0.0%)	39 (0.1%)
UPU	1 (1.2%)	6 (7.0%)	12 (14.0%)	15 (17.4%)	19 (22.1%)	13 (15.1%)	11 (12.8%)	9 (10.5%)	0 (0.0%)	86 (0.1%)
WFP	194 (3.4%)	650 (11.3%)	1 070 (18.6%)	1 144 (19.9%)	1 064 (18.5%)	844 (14.7%)	542 (9.4%)	239 (4.2%)	1 (0.0%)	5 748 (8.8%)
WHO	116 (2.3%)	423 (8.2%)	733 (14.3%)	946 (18.4%)	944 (18.4%)	883 (17.2%)	790 (15.4%)	294 (5.7%)	11 (0.2%)	5 140 (7.9%)

<i>Organization</i>	<i>Less than 30 years</i>	<i>30 to less than 35 years</i>	<i>35 to less than 40 years</i>	<i>40 to less than 45 years</i>	<i>45 to less than 50 years</i>	<i>50 to less than 55 years</i>	<i>55 to less than 60 years</i>	<i>60 to less than 65 years</i>	<i>65 years and over</i>	<i>Total</i>
WIPO	8 (1.5%)	20 (3.9%)	38 (7.3%)	51 (9.8%)	93 (17.9%)	150 (28.9%)	117 (22.5%)	41 (7.9%)	1 (0.2%)	519 (0.8%)
Total	2 416 (3.7%)	7 201 (11.1%)	11 721 (18.0%)	12 900 (19.8%)	11 354 (17.4%)	9 177 (14.1%)	7 144 (11.0%)	3 153 (4.8%)	72 (0.1%)	65 138 (100.0%)

Source: Data from United Nations common system organizations in 2020.

Annex XI

Age distribution of staff in the Professional and higher categories in the United Nations common system by grade and gender as at 31 December 2019

Age group	Men by grade									Women by grade									Grand total	Percentage
	P-1	P-2	P-3	P-4	P-5	D-1	D-2	UG	Total	P-1	P-2	P-3	P-4	P-5	D-1	D-2	UG	Total		
Less than 30 years	15	127	20	1	–	–	–	–	163	64	314	43	2	1	–	–	–	424	587	1.6
30 to less than 35 years	18	492	424	54	2	–	–	–	990	54	873	685	101	2	–	–	–	1 715	2 705	7.3
35 to less than 40 years	12	417	1 140	516	44	3	2	–	2 134	22	575	1 481	643	46	–	–	1	2 768	4 902	13.3
40 to less than 45 years	3	306	1 374	1 235	322	34	4	3	3 281	13	291	1 415	1 363	316	32	3	–	3 433	6 714	18.2
45 to less than 50 years	7	195	1 249	1 483	706	167	21	6	3 834	8	179	965	1 313	623	127	17	6	3 238	7 072	19.1
50 to less than 55 years	5	116	943	1 409	961	329	80	24	3 867	2	130	570	986	653	208	49	17	2 615	6 482	17.5
55 to less than 60 years	1	81	629	1 258	1 048	398	145	44	3 604	1	86	330	643	565	244	94	36	1 999	5 603	15.2
60 to less than 65 years	1	30	248	545	571	250	115	51	1 811	–	23	113	265	287	149	63	36	936	2 747	7.4
65 years and over	–	–	10	17	13	10	5	32	87	–	1	8	9	5	9	2	25	59	146	0.4
Total	62	1 764	6 037	6 518	3 667	1 191	372	160	19 771	164	2 472	5 610	5 325	2 498	769	228	121	17 187	36 958	100.0

Source: Data from United Nations common system organizations in 2020.

Note: UG includes the Assistant Secretary-General and Under-Secretary-General levels.

Annex XII

Age distribution of staff in the Professional and higher categories by region in the United Nations common system as at 31 December 2019

<i>Age group</i>	<i>Africa</i>	<i>Asia and the Pacific</i>	<i>Eastern Europe</i>	<i>Latin America and the Caribbean</i>	<i>Western Europe and Others (including North America)</i>	<i>Other^a</i>	<i>Total</i>
Less than 30 years	56 (9.0%)	123 (19.7%)	49 (7.8%)	26 (4.2%)	368 (58.9%)	3 (0.5%)	625 (1.7%)
30 to less than 35 years	269 (10.0%)	522 (19.4%)	197 (7.3%)	166 (6.2%)	1 527 (56.8%)	7 (0.3%)	2 688 (7.1%)
35 to less than 40 years	846 (17.2%)	966 (19.6%)	328 (6.7%)	351 (7.1%)	2 418 (49.1%)	17 (0.3%)	4 926 (13.1%)
40 to less than 45 years	1 529 (22.5%)	1 269 (18.7%)	444 (6.5%)	464 (6.8%)	3 072 (45.2%)	24 (0.4%)	6 802 (18.0%)
45 to less than 50 years	1 687 (23.6%)	1 309 (18.3%)	474 (6.6%)	448 (6.3%)	3 191 (44.7%)	28 (0.4%)	7 137 (18.9%)
50 to less than 55 years	1 685 (25.7%)	1 126 (17.2%)	347 (5.3%)	471 (7.2%)	2 891 (44.2%)	26 (0.4%)	6 546 (17.4%)
55 to less than 60 years	1 495 (26.5%)	913 (16.2%)	324 (5.8%)	443 (7.9%)	2 439 (43.3%)	20 (0.4%)	5 634 (14.9%)
60 to less than 65 years	747 (26.1%)	423 (14.8%)	160 (5.6%)	283 (9.9%)	1 249 (43.6%)	5 (0.2%)	2 867 (7.6%)
65 years and over	90 (19.2%)	48 (10.2%)	40 (8.5%)	44 (9.4%)	246 (52.5%)	1 (0.2%)	469 (1.2%)
Total	8 404 (22.3%)	6 699 (17.8%)	2 363 (6.3%)	2 696 (7.2%)	17 401 (46.2%)	131 (0.3%)	37 694 (100.0%)

Source: Data provided by United Nations common system organizations in 2020.

^a Includes staff from the State of Palestine and from Kiribati for WHO and UNICEF.

Annex XIII

**Average ages of staff in the organizations of the United Nations
common system as at 31 December 2019**

Organization	Professional and higher categories			General Service and related categories			All staff in the organization		
	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total
Preparatory Commission of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization	44.7	47.1	46.4	44.0	45.7	44.7	44.4	46.8	45.8
FAO	44.6	49.2	47.2	46.6	47.2	46.8	45.8	48.5	47.0
IAEA	43.9	48.4	47.0	46.5	46.5	46.5	45.4	47.9	46.8
ICAO	47.4	49.7	49.1	47.3	45.5	46.9	47.3	48.7	48.0
IFAD	45.4	45.8	45.6	44.8	44.0	44.6	45.1	45.3	45.2
ILO	43.6	47.7	45.7	42.4	42.8	42.6	42.8	44.9	43.7
IMO	46.1	49.7	48.1	45.2	49.5	46.7	45.6	49.6	47.5
International Seabed Authority	43.1	52.9	47.7	36.0	41.2	37.9	39.6	48.4	43.3
ITC	37.6	42.6	40.2	43.8	41.1	43.1	40.4	42.3	41.2
ITU	45.0	47.8	46.6	47.3	45.1	46.6	46.2	47.2	46.7
PAHO	49.0	50.1	49.5	48.8	45.0	47.8	48.9	48.6	48.8
United Nations Secretariat	43.8	47.9	46.1	43.4	43.8	43.6	44.1	45.8	45.2
UNAIDS	46.6	49.6	48.0	45.8	47.4	46.5	46.2	48.5	47.2
UNDP	44.2	46.3	45.3	42.8	44.3	43.5	43.2	45.0	44.1
UNESCO	44.9	46.9	45.8	45.5	47.3	46.2	45.2	47.1	46.0
UNFPA	44.7	47.6	46.1	44.0	45.0	44.5	44.2	45.7	44.9
UNHCR	42.2	45.6	44.0	38.0	41.2	40.0	39.4	42.3	41.1
UNICEF	43.7	46.0	44.8	42.0	43.7	42.9	42.5	44.4	43.5
UNIDO	45.7	49.2	47.9	44.9	47.3	46.2	45.2	48.1	46.9
UNOPS	41.5	45.3	43.9	44.1	44.6	44.4	42.3	45.1	44.0
UNRWA	42.7	46.6	44.7	43.0	49.9	48.9	42.7	46.9	45.0
UN-Women	42.7	44.0	42.9	41.9	42.6	42.2	42.3	43.1	42.5
UNWTO	43.5	47.0	45.3	48.2	45.2	47.1	46.0	46.4	46.1
UPU	45.1	50.1	49.2	46.3	48.0	46.9	46.0	49.5	48.1
WFP	44.1	46.9	45.7	41.8	43.7	43.0	42.4	44.4	43.6
WHO	46.1	48.5	47.4	44.2	46.2	45.2	44.9	47.1	46.0
WIPO	46.0	47.7	46.9	47.1	49.3	47.9	46.6	48.2	47.3
WMO	44.1	50.1	47.7	48.6	47.0	48.2	46.3	49.5	47.9
Total	44.0	47.4	45.9	42.8	43.8	43.3	43.4	45.3	44.5

Source: CEB database of personnel statistics, 2019.

Annex XIV

**Member States unrepresented in three or more organizations with
established desirable ranges as at 31 December 2019**

<i>Region</i>	<i>Member States</i>	<i>United Nations Secretariat</i>	<i>ILO</i>	<i>FAO</i>	<i>UNESCO</i>	<i>WHO</i>	<i>ICAO</i>	<i>Total</i>
Africa	Angola	X	X		X			3
	Cabo Verde	X	X		X	X		4
	Equatorial Guinea	X	X		X		X	4
	Libya	X	X			X	X	4
	Sao Tome and Principe	X	X				X	3
	Seychelles		X			X	X	3
	Somalia		X			X	X	3
	South Sudan		X		X		X	3
Asia and the Pacific	Bahrain		X		X		X	3
	Brunei Darussalam	X	X		X	X	X	5
	Kiribati	X	X		X	X	X	5
	Kuwait		X		X	X	X	4
	Marshall Islands	X	X	X	X	X	X	6
	Micronesia (Federated States of)			X	X	X	X	4
	Nauru	X		X	X	X	X	5
	Palau	X	X		X	X	X	5
	Papua New Guinea		X			X	X	3
	Qatar	X	X	X	X	X	X	6
	Samoa		X		X	X	X	4
	Solomon Islands		X		X	X	X	4
	Timor-Leste	X	X		X		X	4
	Tonga		X		X	X	X	4
	Tuvalu	X	X		X	X	X	5
	United Arab Emirates	X	X		X	X	X	5
	Vanuatu	X	X		X	X	X	5
Eastern Europe	None							
Latin America and the Caribbean	Bahamas		X	X	X	X	X	5
	Barbados		X		X	X	X	4
	Belize	X	X				X	3
	Grenada		X			X	X	3
	Jamaica		X			X	X	3
	Saint Kitts and Nevis		X			X	X	3
	Saint Lucia	X	X			X	X	4
	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		X		X	X		3
	Suriname		X		X	X	X	4
Western Europe and other States (including North America)	Andorra	X			X	X	X	4
	Malta		X		X		X	3
	Monaco	X			X	X	X	4
	San Marino		X		X	X	X	4

Annex XV**Member States underrepresented in three or more organizations
with established desired ranges as at 31 December 2019**

<i>Region</i>	<i>Member States</i>	<i>United Nations Secretariat</i>	<i>ILO</i>	<i>FAO</i>	<i>UNESCO</i>	<i>WHO</i>	<i>ICAO</i>	<i>Total</i>
Africa	None							
Asia and the Pacific	China	X	X	X	X	X	X	6
	Indonesia		X		X		X	3
	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	X	X		X		X	4
	Japan	X	X	X		X	X	5
	Republic of Korea	X	X			X		3
	Saudi Arabia	X		X	X	X	X	5
	Singapore		X	X	X	X	X	5
	Turkey				X	X	X	3
Eastern Europe	Poland		X		X	X		3
	Russian Federation	X	X		X	X	X	5
Latin American and the Caribbean	Brazil	X	X		X	X		4
	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	X			X	X		3
Western Europe and other States (including North America)	Israel			X		X	X	3
	United States of America	X	X	X		X	X	5

Annex XVI

**Member States overrepresented in three or more organizations
with established desirable ranges as at 31 December 2019**

<i>Region</i>	<i>Member States</i>	<i>United Nations Secretariat</i>	<i>ILO</i>	<i>FAO</i>	<i>UNESCO</i>	<i>WHO</i>	<i>ICAO</i>	<i>Total</i>
Africa	Cameroon	X	X		X	X		4
	Egypt	X	X			X	X	4
	Ethiopia	X	X		X	X	X	5
	Ghana		X			X	X	3
	Kenya	X	X			X	X	4
	Senegal		X		X	X	X	4
	South Africa	X	X		X	X	X	5
	Tunisia		X		X		X	3
	Uganda	X				X	X	3
	Zimbabwe	X	X			X	X	4
Asia and the Pacific	India		X			X	X	3
	Jordan		X			X	X	3
	Lebanon	X	X		X	X		4
	Sri Lanka		X			X	X	3
Eastern Europe	Bulgaria	X	X		X			3
	Romania		X		X		X	3
Latin America and the Caribbean	Argentina	X	X		X			3
	Mexico	X			X		X	3
	Uruguay	X	X				X	3
Western Europe and other States (including North America)	Australia	X				X	X	3
	Belgium	X	X		X	X		4
	Canada	X			X	X	X	4
	Denmark		X		X	X		3
	France	X	X		X	X	X	5
	Ireland	X	X	X		X		4
	Italy	X	X	X	X	X	X	6
	Netherlands	X	X			X		3
	New Zealand		X			X	X	3
	Spain	X	X		X	X	X	5
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	X				X	X	3

Annex XVII**Number of staff members at the senior/decision-making level from Member States that are underrepresented in three or more organizations with established desirable ranges as at 31 December 2019****No senior staff members**

Indonesia
Singapore

Fewer than 10 senior staff members

Iran (Islamic Republic of)
Israel
Poland
Saudi Arabia
Turkey
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

More than 10 but fewer than 50 senior staff members

Brazil
Republic of Korea
Russian Federation

More than 50 but fewer than 100 senior staff members

China
Japan

More than 200 senior staff members

United States of America

Annex XVIII

Number of staff members at the senior/decision-making level from Member States that are overrepresented in three or more organizations with established desirable ranges as at 31 December 2019

Fewer than 15 senior staff members

Bulgaria
Ethiopia
Ghana
Jordan
New Zealand
Romania
Senegal
Sri Lanka
Tunisia
Uruguay
Zimbabwe

15 to fewer than 35 senior staff members

Argentina
Cameroon
Denmark
Egypt
Ireland
Lebanon
Mexico
South Africa
Uganda

35 to fewer than 100 senior staff members

Australia
Belgium
Canada
India
Kenya
Netherlands
Spain

100 or more senior staff members

France
Italy
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Annex XIX

Countries that have no staff members in 10 or more organizations with no formal guidelines for geographical distribution as at 31 December 2019

<i>Region</i>	<i>Country</i>	<i>Number of organizations (of 17)</i>	
Africa	Equatorial Guinea	15	
	Seychelles	14	
	Sao Tome and Principe	13	
	Cabo Verde	12	
	Djibouti	12	
	Gabon	12	
	Guinea-Bissau	12	
	Angola	11	
	Eswatini	11	
	Comoros	10	
	Gambia	10	
	Liberia	10	
	Libya	10	
	Lesotho	10	
	Somalia	10	
	Asia and the Pacific	Marshall Islands	16
		Bahrain	15
Nauru		15	
Oman		15	
Palau		15	
Qatar		15	
Tonga		15	
Tuvalu		15	
Brunei Darussalam		14	
Maldives		14	
Micronesia (Federated States of)		14	
Solomon Islands		14	
Vanuatu		14	
Kiribati		13	
Papua New Guinea		13	
Samoa		13	
Timor-Leste		13	
Kuwait		12	
Singapore		12	
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		10	
Lao People's Democratic Republic	10		
Myanmar	10		
Turkmenistan	10		
United Arab Emirates	10		
Yemen	10		

<i>Region</i>	<i>Country</i>	<i>Number of organizations (of 17)</i>
Latin America and the Caribbean	Saint Kitts and Nevis	17
	Antigua and Barbuda	15
	Bahamas	15
	Saint Lucia	15
	Grenada	14
	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	14
	Dominica	13
	Paraguay	13
	Suriname	12
	Barbados	11
	Belize	11
	Cuba	10
	Guyana	10
	Nicaragua	10
Eastern Europe	Estonia	13
	Montenegro	12
	Azerbaijan	11
	Slovenia	11
Western Europe and other States (including North America)	Monaco	15
	San Marino	14
	Liechtenstein	12
	Andorra	11
	Iceland	11
	Malta	11

Annex XX

**Status of regional representation of staff members in the
Professional and higher categories in the organizations of the
United Nations common system as at 31 December 2019**

<i>Organization</i>	<i>Africa</i>	<i>Asia and the Pacific</i>	<i>Eastern Europe</i>	<i>Latin America and the Caribbean</i>	<i>Western Europe and other States (including North America)</i>	<i>Other States</i>	<i>Total</i>
FAO	173 (15.4%)	234 (20.8%)	95 (8.5%)	145 (12.9%)	476 (42.3%)	1 (0.1%)	1 124
ICAO	48 (19.7%)	37 (15.2%)	12 (4.9%)	39 (16.0%)	108 (44.3%)	0 (0.0%)	244
IFAD	140 (21.4%)	88 (13.4%)	6 (0.9%)	56 (8.5%)	365 (55.7%)	0 (0.0%)	45
ILO	159 (12.7%)	205 (16.4%)	60 (4.8%)	136 (10.9%)	690 (55.2%)	0 (0.0%)	1 250
IMO	37 (13.1%)	36 (12.8%)	17 (6.0%)	26 (9.2%)	166 (58.9%)	0 (0.0%)	552
International Seabed Authority	3 (10.7%)	8 (28.6%)	1 (3.6%)	6 (21.4%)	10 (35.7%)	0 (0.0%)	330
ITC	34 (14.5%)	34 (14.5%)	24 (10.3%)	24 (10.3%)	117 (50.0%)	1 (0.4%)	234
Preparatory Commission of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization	24 (13.3%)	35 (19.3%)	27 (14.9%)	12 (6.6%)	83 (45.9%)	0 (0.0%)	455
United Nations Secretariat	2 716 (20.3%)	2 254 (16.8%)	1 037 (7.7%)	1 024 (7.6%)	6 347 (47.3%)	34 (0.3%)	13 412
UNAIDS	102 (30.9%)	46 (13.9%)	26 (7.9%)	23 (7.0%)	133 (40.3%)	0 (0.0%)	181
UNDP ^a	2 552 (35.7%)	2 091 (29.2%)	489 (6.8%)	762 (10.7%)	1 259 (17.6%)	0 (0.0%)	7 153
UNESCO	134 (21.1%)	130 (20.5%)	55 (8.7%)	69 (10.9%)	243 (38.3%)	3 (0.5%)	634
UNFPA	228 (29.9%)	144 (18.9%)	25 (3.3%)	52 (6.8%)	312 (40.9%)	2 (0.3%)	763
UNHCR	1 139 (30.8%)	625 (16.9%)	252 (6.8%)	149 (4.0%)	1 534 (41.4%)	4 (0.1%)	3 703
UNICEF	1 286 (28.7%)	861 (19.2%)	180 (4.0%)	242 (5.4%)	1 903 (42.4%)	15 (0.3%)	4 487
UNOPS	91 (14.3%)	114 (18.0%)	49 (7.7%)	38 (6.0%)	334 (52.6%)	9 (1.4%)	635
UNRWA	15 (8.5%)	38 (21.6%)	10 (5.7%)	1 (0.6%)	112 (63.6%)	0 (0.0%)	176
UNWTO	3 (6.7%)	8 (17.8%)	6 (13.3%)	5 (11.1%)	23 (51.1%)	0 (0.0%)	550
UN-Women	103 (18.7%)	97 (17.6%)	26 (4.7%)	32 (5.8%)	289 (52.5%)	3 (0.5%)	28
UPU	21 (22.6%)	11 (11.8%)	9 (9.7%)	12 (12.9%)	40 (43.0%)	0 (0.0%)	93
WHO	782 (25.3%)	673 (21.8%)	189 (6.1%)	90 (2.9%)	1 351 (43.7%)	8 (0.3%)	3 093

<i>Organization</i>	<i>Africa</i>	<i>Asia and the Pacific</i>	<i>Eastern Europe</i>	<i>Latin America and the Caribbean</i>	<i>Western Europe and other States (including North America)</i>	<i>Other States</i>	<i>Total</i>
PAHO	5 (1.1%)	9 (2.0%)	0 (0.0%)	284 (62.4%)	157 (34.5%)	0 (0.0%)	41 665
WIPO	59 (10.7%)	115 (20.8%)	49 (8.9%)	42 (7.6%)	287 (52.0%)	0 (0.0%)	655
WFP	434 (27.4%)	265 (16.7%)	68 (4.3%)	64 (4.0%)	755 (47.6%)	0 (0.0%)	1 586
Total	10 288	8 158	2 712	3 333	17 094	80	41 665
Percentage	24.7	19.6	6.5	8.0	41.0	0.2	100.0

^a Staff population may include staff from other categories, in addition to staff in the Professional and higher categories.

Annex XXI

Distribution, by gender, of staff in the Professional and higher categories (P-1 to ungraded) in the United Nations common system: trends from 2007 to 2017^a

Year	P-1			P-2			P-3			P-4			P-5			D-1			D-2			Ungraded			Total		
	Men	Women	Women (%)	Men	Women	Women (%)	Men	Women	Women (%)	Men	Women	Women (%)	Men	Women	Women (%)	Men	Women	Women (%)	Men	Women	Women (%)	Men	Women	Women (%)	Men	Women	Women (%)
2007	71	81	53	1 407	1 742	55	3 874	2 881	43	4 962	2 774	36	3 708	1 575	30	1 260	473	27	404	122	23	172	56	25	15 858	9 704	38.0
2008	59	67	53	1 363	1 690	55	3 869	3 058	44	5 155	2 949	36	3 792	1 727	31	1 262	509	29	423	147	26	186	60	24	16 109	10 207	38.8
2009	68	80	54	1 473	1 975	57	4 347	3 531	45	5 528	3 331	38	3 979	1 843	32	1 319	534	29	427	155	27	180	65	27	17 321	11 514	39.9
2010	51	77	60	1 467	1 968	57	4 630	3 805	45	5 731	3 569	38	4 040	1 879	32	1 296	561	30	417	144	26	177	79	31	17 809	12 082	40.4
2011	48	75	61	1 477	1 965	57	4 816	4 027	46	5 947	3 805	39	4 125	2 004	33	1 295	565	30	430	158	27	182	78	30	18 320	12 677	40.9
2012	43	75	64	1 418	1 902	57	4 986	4 185	46	6 021	3 975	40	4 123	2 095	34	1 304	594	31	423	167	28	194	78	29	18 512	13 071	41.4
2013	58	71	55	1 417	1 917	57	5 208	4 270	45	6 029	4 092	40	4 114	2 116	34	1 268	606	32	405	174	30	194	72	27	18 693	13 318	41.6
2014	63	92	59	1 449	1 943	57	5 243	4 275	45	6 090	4 164	41	4 087	2 215	35	1 244	611	33	394	174	31	198	76	28	18 768	13 550	41.9
2015	61	95	61	1 464	1 984	58	5 288	4 407	45	6 070	4 363	42	4 046	2 281	36	1 138	573	33	380	169	31	221	81	27	18 668	13 953	42.8
2016	67	111	62	1 621	2 176	57	5 642	4 770	46	6 490	4 657	42	4 142	2 375	36	1 226	630	34	349	168	33	218	76	26	19 755	14 963	43.1
2017	83	140	63	1 565	2 129	58	5 432	4 791	47	6 399	4 842	43	4 040	2 427	38	1 254	685	35	393	204	34	180	91	34	19 346	15 309	44.2

^a Data for 2007 to 2014 are drawn from the annual reports of CEB on human resources statistics (see <https://unsceb.org/human-resources-statistics>) and reflect staff on contracts of one year or more. Data for 2014 onwards reflect staff on permanent, continuous and fixed-term appointments.

Annex XXII

Implementation, by organization, of policies and measures to achieve gender balance, as at 1 January 2020

Policy/measure	FAO	ICAO	IFAD	IMO	International Seabed Authority					Preparatory Commission of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization	United Nations Secretariat	UNAIDS	UNDP	UNESCO	UNFPA	UNHCR	UNICEF	UNOPS	UPU	UNRWA	UNWTO	UN-Women				Total	
					Authority	ILO	ITC	ITU	PAHO													Women	WFP	WHO	WIPO		
A. Recruitment																											
1. Special measures to achieve gender balance	X	X	X	-	-	-	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	-	X	X	-	18	
2. Authority granted to review bodies to overrule selection decisions when a qualified man is selected over an equally qualified woman	X	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	X	-	X	-	X	-	-	X	-	-	-	7	
3. Human resources planning measures on gender balance	-	X	X	-	-	X	-	X	-	-	X	X	X	-	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	16
4. Targeted search initiatives to achieve gender balance	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	13	
5. Outreach initiatives to achieve gender balance	-	X	X	X	-	X	-	X	-	-	-	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	-	-	X	X	X	14	
B. Selection to higher level posts, promotion and strategic placement																											
6. Special measures to achieve gender balance	-	X	X	X	-	-	X	X	-	X	X	-	-	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	-	X	X	-	16	
7. Authority granted to review bodies to overrule selection decisions when a qualified man is promoted over an equally qualified woman	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	3	
8. Human resources planning measures on gender balance	-	X	X	-	-	X	-	X	-	-	X	X	-	X	X	X	-	-	X	X	-	X	X	-	X	13	
C. Retention policies																											
9. Induction training programmes	-	X	X	X	-	X	-	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	-	X	X	-	X	X	X	18	
10. Talent management tools	-	X	X	X	-	X	-	X	X	X	-	-	X	X	-	X	X	-	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	16	

Policy/measure					International Seabed Authority					Preparatory Commission of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization	United Nations Secretariat	UNAIDS	UNDP	UNESCO	UNFPA	UNHCR	UNICEF	UNOPS	UPU	UNRWA	UNWTO	UN-Women				Total	
	FAO	ICAO	IFAD	IMO	ILO	ITC	ITU	PAHO														Women	WFP	WHO	WIPO		
11. Mentoring and counselling programmes	-	-	X	-	-	X	X	X	-	-	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	-	X	X	X	16
12. Management skills development programmes	-	X	X	X	-	X	-	X	X	X	-	-	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	18
13. Leadership development programmes	-	X	X	-	-	X	-	X	X	-	-	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	17
14. Career coaching	-	-	-	X	-	X	X	X	X	-	-	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	-	X	X	X	X	16
15. Career development for women in mid-level management	-	X	-	X	-	X	-	X	X	X	-	-	X	X	X	-	X	X	-	X	-	-	-	X	X	X	15
D. Retention – work-life policies	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
16. Flexible working arrangements	X	-	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	22
17. Staggered working hours	-	-	-	X	X	-	X	-	X	-	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	-	-	X	X	-	-	X	14
18. Maternity leave	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	24
19. Paternity leave	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	22
20. Childcare facilities	X	-	X	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	X	-	-	X	-	X	-	-	-	-	X	-	X	9
21. Breastfeeding policies	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	23
22. Family leave (for childcare or family emergency)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	24
23. Adoption leave	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	23
24. Part-time work	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	-	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	21
25. Job sharing	X	-	X	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	X	X	X	-	-	-	-	X	X	-	9
26. Spouse employment policy	X	X	X	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	X	X	-	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	-	-	12
27. Mandatory exit interviews	X	X	X	-	-	-	X	-	X	-	-	-	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	-	X	-	-	X	-	-	13
28. Special leave without pay after maternity (for childcare or family emergency)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	22
29. Additional parental leave as special leave with full pay	X	-	X	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	X	X	X	X	-	X	-	-	X	X	X	-	11

<i>Policy/measure</i>	<i>FAO</i>	<i>ICAO</i>	<i>IFAD</i>	<i>IMO</i>	<i>International Seabed Authority</i>	<i>ILO</i>	<i>ITC</i>	<i>ITU</i>	<i>PAHO</i>	<i>Preparatory Commission of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test- Ban Treaty Organization</i>	<i>United Nations Secretariat</i>	<i>UNAIDS</i>	<i>UNDP</i>	<i>UNESCO</i>	<i>UNFPA</i>	<i>UNHCR</i>	<i>UNICEF</i>	<i>UNOPS</i>	<i>UPU</i>	<i>UNRWA</i>	<i>UNWTO</i>	<i>UN- Women</i>	<i>WFP</i>	<i>WHO</i>	<i>WIPO</i>	<i>Total</i>	
E. Gender awareness and standards of conduct	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
30. Gender mainstreaming in programmes and policies	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	-	X	X	X	X	20
31. Gender sensitivity programmes (including training)	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	-	-	-	X	X	X	X	19
32. Mandatory training on unconscious biases	X	X	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	X	X	-	X	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8
33. Policies on discrimination, harassment and abuse	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	23
34. Policies on harassment, including sexual harassment	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	24
35. Special measures for protection from sexual exploitation and abuse	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	-	X	-	-	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	19
36. Mediator programme to deal with harassment issues (including Ombudsman, Ethics Office and protection against retaliation)	X	X	X	X	-	X	-	-	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	-	X	X	X	X	19
F. Monitoring and accountability	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
37. Establishment of targets to achieve gender balance in the Professional and higher categories	X	X	X	-	-	X	X	-	X	-	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	-	X	X	X	18
38. Annual reviews to assess progress towards established goals for gender balance	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	-	X	-	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	-	X	X	X	19
39. Annual gender audits	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	X	-	X	X	X	-	-	-	X	-	X	X	-	-	X	-	-	-	9
40. Reporting to the governing body on gender targets	X	X	X	-	-	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	-	X	X	X	20
41. Management audits	X	X	X	-	-	X	-	X	-	-	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	18
42. Reporting to United Nations System-wide Action Plan on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women	X	X	-	X	-	X	X	X	-	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	21

Policy/measure	International Seabed Authority									Preparatory Commission of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization	United Nations Secretariat	UNAIDS	UNDP	UNESCO	UNFPA	UNHCR	UNICEF	UNOPS	UPU	UNRWA	UNWTO	UN-				Total
	FAO	ICAO	IFAD	IMO	Authority	ILO	ITC	ITU	PAHO													Women	WFP	WHO	WIPO	
43. Procedures for checks and balances in the staff selection process	X	X	-	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	20
44. Gender/diversity scorecards	-	X	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	X	-	X	-	-	X	X	X	-	X	-	-	-	X	X	10
45. Holding managers accountable for the achievement of established gender goals in their unit, section, division or organization through their annual performance appraisal	X	-	-	-	-	X	X	X	-	-	X	-	X	-	-	-	X	X	-	X	-	-	-	X	-	10
46. Designation of a gender focal point for staffing ^a	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	24

Source: Responses from organizations in 2020.

^a Grade level of the gender focal point(s), according to organization: P-5 (Preparatory Commission of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization); D-1 and P-2 (FAO); P-5 (ICAO); P-5 (IFAD); D-1 (ILO); P-5 (IMO); P-4 and P-3 (ITC); P-4 (ITU); P-4 (PAHO); P-level (United Nations Secretariat); P-4 (UNAIDS); D-1 (UNDP); P-4 (UNESCO); P-5 and P-4 (UNFPA); P-5 (UNHCR); D-1 (UNICEF); D-2 and P-5 (UNOPS); P-4 (UNRWA); D-1 (UN Women); P-2 (UNWTO); P-3 (UPU); Consultant (WFP); D-1 and P-5 (WHO); and P-4 (WIPO).