



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

Executive Board

Two hundred and tenth session

210 EX/5.IV Add.2

PARIS, 23 November 2020

Original: French

Item 5 of the provisional agenda

FOLLOW-UP TO DECISIONS AND RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE EXECUTIVE BOARD AND THE GENERAL CONFERENCE AT THEIR PREVIOUS SESSIONS

PART IV

HUMAN RESOURCES ISSUES

ADDENDUM 2

COMMENTS BY THE INTERNATIONAL STAFF ASSOCIATION OF UNESCO (ISAU)

SUMMARY

Report on the geographical distribution and gender balance of the staff of the Secretariat and on the implementation of the measures taken to redress any imbalance.

Pursuant to item 9.2.7 of the UNESCO Human Resources Manual, the International Staff Association of UNESCO (ISAU) submits its comments on human resources issues (document 210 EX/5.IV).

1. ISAU takes good note of the efforts to increase the level of representation of non-represented Member States. We must stress, however, that significant efforts are still required to achieve a more balanced geographical distribution within grades. In this connection, ISAU deplores the fact that the Administration has resumed the regrettable habit of presenting the distribution of regional groups within grades only for Directors and above. In order to provide clear and readable information, we have prepared a table on the distribution of geographical posts by grade and by regional group.

Geographical posts Distribution by grade and by regional group										
Groups \ Grades	DDG	ADG	D-2	D-1	P-5	P-4	P-3	P-2	P-1	Group Totals
Europe and North America	0	2	7	13	51	53	61	28	1	216
Eastern Europe	0	1	1	3	8	14	17	12	0	56
GRULAC	0	2	2	5	8	16	20	20	0	73
ASPAC	1	0	2	6	14	38	39	23	0	123
Africa	0	2	2	7	17	31	34	18	0	111
Arab States	0	1	1	7	3	9	13	14	0	48
Grade totals	1	8	15	41	101	161	184	115	1	627
Non-Member States										
Israel	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	3
United States of America	0	0	0	2	5	4	5	1	0	17



Job - 202003607

2. It is recalled that the tables provided at previous sessions showed significant imbalances, as some countries, particularly in Group I, were better represented in P-4 and P-5 posts, which are policy-making and management posts, than in P-2 and P-3 posts, which are implementation and support posts. Again, we call for this information to be provided to Member States so that they can decide how best to correct such imbalances.

3. In this connection, the information we were able to compile ourselves on the basis of the raw data provided by the Administration on recruitment and promotions is not encouraging. For the period from June 2019 to July 2020, Group I nationals accounted for 38% of promotions and 42% of recruitments. The current staff movements therefore do not augur well for demonstrable improvements in the long term. We regret this.

Appointments June 2019 - July 2020				
Regional group	Appointments with promotion	Appointments	Appointments (YPP)	Total
Europe and North America	14	42	0	56
Eastern Europe	2	3	0	5
GRULAC	3	8	2	13
ASPAC	6	18	3	27
Africa	10	12	1	23
Arab States	1	5	1	7
Total	36	88	7	131

4. As we have already remarked, it is absurd to discuss the geographical and cultural balance in the Secretariat when the statistics do not take into account the non-geographical posts that outnumber the geographical posts. The latter represent no more than 28% of the Secretariat's staff when GS staff are taken into account. The table below shows that out of the 1,625 non-geographical posts, Group I nationals amount to 684 or 42% (37% if only Director (D), Professional (P) and National Officer (NO) posts are taken into account).

Staff with NON-geographical posts						
Regional group	D/P		NO	GS		Total
	HQ	Field offices		HQ	Field offices	
Europe and North America	146	97	0	290	151	684
Eastern Europe	12	8	5	36	16	77
GRULAC	19	16	30	22	78	165
ASPAC	58	30	36	37	88	249
Africa	20	34	92	65	109	320
Arab States	19	11	16	40	44	130
Total	274	196	179	490	486	1625

5. With regard to the representation of geographical groups within the sectors, the Administration notes that it reflects their distribution within the Organization. However, we cannot fail to point out significant imbalances in the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC), where 46% of the staff are from Group I, and in the Culture Sector (CLT), where the rate of this same group is 37%.

6. We must remind Member States that the overall credibility of our Organization partly depends on geographical distribution. How far can UNESCO effectively carry out its mandate if its Culture Sector, in particular, is not geoculturally diverse?

7. Annex V to document 210 EX/5.IV does not give visibility to the geographical distribution of the staff according to a weighting system. For better readability, we have drawn up the table below:

Total by grade and by regional group using a weighting system (ADG-DDG: 4 points; D-1 to D-2: 3 points; P-4 to P-5: 2 points; P-1 to P-3: 1 point)										
Group \ Grade	DDG	ADG	D-2	D-1	P-5	P-4	P-3	P-2	P-1	Total
Europe and North America	0	8	21	39	102	106	61	28	1	366
Eastern Europe	0	4	3	9	16	28	17	12	0	89
GRULAC	0	8	6	15	16	32	20	20	0	117
ASPAC	4	0	6	18	28	76	39	23	0	194
Africa	0	8	6	21	34	62	34	18	0	183
Arab States	0	4	3	21	6	18	13	14	0	79
Total grade	4	32	45	123	202	322	184	115	1	1028
Non-Member States										
Israel	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	5
United States of America	0	0	0	6	10	8	5	1	0	30
Total	0	0	0	6	12	10	6	1	0	35

8. The new measures proposed to improve geographical distribution do not seem to us to adequately address a problem that has persisted for far too long. We regret to note, for example, that there is no mention of internal promotion among these measures.

9. Why not give preference to appointing PA/temporary staff from non- or under-represented countries who, in some cases, have worked in the Organization for many years? Why not encourage the internal promotion of colleagues from non- or under-represented countries? This measure would also address the problem of career advancement, which is non-existent in our Organization.

10. We are struggling to understand the choice to pilot a programme targeting P-3/P-4 posts. The justification given by the Administration that these are the most numerous positions does not seem to us to be very relevant. We believe that there is a need for real measures at all levels. Furthermore, we see no point in consulting non- or under-represented Member States in the prospecting strategy, or in attracting the largest number of candidates if, in the end, when it comes to recruitment, Group I nationals are appointed in their place.

Gender parity

11. We welcome the progress made by the Organization in achieving gender parity, while stressing the need to increase gender parity in the distribution of women and men throughout the grades. The Administration reports that parity has been achieved at all grades, except at the P-5 level, where women represent only 35% of the staff.

12. In this connection, it should be pointed out that while women represent 35% of the staff among the highest Professional grade posts, they account for 63% of P-1/P-2 posts, i.e. the lowest level at that grade. These are therefore profound inequalities that we are dealing with and they cannot be resolved without a more proactive approach to the issue. Careers for women at P-5 level and above must therefore be promoted. All too often at these levels, recruitment is carried out for the benefit of external candidates; this creates a "glass ceiling" to the detriment of the career development of our incumbent female colleagues.