

PARIS, 25 March 2022  
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 III**

**HUMAN RESOURCES ISSUES**

**ADDENDUM**

**COMMENTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL STAFF ASSOCIATION OF UNESCO (ISAU)**

**SUMMARY**

**C. Report on the geographical distribution of the staff of the Secretariat**

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 214 EX/5.III.C).

1. The International Staff Association of UNESCO (ISAU) is pleased to note that document 214 EX/5.III.C, containing the report on the geographical distribution of the staff of the Secretariat, engages in an in-depth methodological reflection on subjecting to geographical distribution posts not financed by the regular budget. This has been the subject of a long-standing request repeated over the years, particularly with regard to international Professional-level Project Appointments (PAs).

2. We would like to begin by pointing out that ISAU's reason for requesting that these posts be subject to geographical distribution has less to do with their source of funding than with the concrete



fact that they are **staff** posts, and that it is logical that they be subject to the principle of staff geographical diversity, which constitutes an essential aspect of UNESCO's work.

3. As for the details of the method proposed by the Secretariat, ISAU must nevertheless express its wariness with regard to the principle of taking into account only PAs on projects of a minimum of four years. While it is indeed appropriate to adopt criteria which enable consistent analysis over the years, it bears recalling that professional posts are financed on the basis of the regular budget, which is adopted every two years. We would therefore like to consider having PAs on projects of a minimum of two years included in the calculation, which would but increase its transparency and better reflect the Organization's geographical distribution.

4. ISAU would also like to draw Member States' attention to the current practice at the World Health Organization (WHO), where an integrated budget allows all professional posts, regardless of their source of funding, to be subject to geographical distribution. The suitability of such an option for UNESCO should be discussed.

5. ISAU notes with interest the results of the Secretariat's simulation. It is good to see that the number of countries represented increases from 78% to 80% when all staff posts are taken into account. However, ISAU wishes to draw Member States' attention to the fact that this new calculation method shows that the number of overrepresented countries increases from 11% to 15%, with a differential which is not negligible and which should ultimately emphasize the importance of the efforts necessary for improving geographical distribution in the Organization.

6. Availing itself of the opportunity afforded by this effort to better integrate PAs into UNESCO's regular procedures, ISAU wishes to point out that the tools established to improve the recruitment process cannot be effective without the close involvement of the Bureau of Human Resources Management (ADM/HRM). This is especially relevant when it comes to the recruitment of PAs, to which, we feel, ADM/HRM is not at all committed. In addition, ISAU again requests that recruitment for these posts be submitted to the Appointment Review Board (ARB).



**unesco**

United Nations  
Educational, Scientific  
and Cultural Organization

**214 EX/5.III.C**

**Executive Board**

**Two hundred and fourteenth session**

PARIS, 4 March 2022  
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 III**

**HUMAN RESOURCES ISSUES**

**SUMMARY**

**C. Report on the geographical distribution of the staff of the Secretariat**

Further to 41 C/Resolution 64, this document presents a simulation of the geographical quotas for each Member State in the event that the following categories should be subject to geographical distribution: international Professional-level Project Appointments (PAs) on multi-year projects of more than four years; fixed-term posts financed by the Special Account for Management Costs (MCA); and fixed-term posts financed by revenue-generating funds. It also includes a comparison with the practices adopted regarding long-term posts funded by voluntary contributions in other agencies of the United Nations system with geographical quotas.

Decision required: paragraph 13.



Job: 20220052

## INTRODUCTION

1. In accordance with the resolution adopted by the General Conference at its 41st session concerning the examination of the recommendations of the Executive Board on the report of the working group on geographical distribution, this document presents a simulation of the geographical quotas for each Member State in the event that the following categories should be subject to geographical distribution: international Professional-level Project Appointments (PAs) on multi-year projects of more than four years; fixed-term posts financed by the Special Account for Management Costs (MCA); and fixed-term posts financed by revenue-generating funds. This report also includes a comparison with the practices adopted regarding long-term posts funded by voluntary contributions in other agencies of the United Nations system with geographical quotas.

2. The principle of geographical distribution applies to professional staff occupying geographical posts, that is, established posts financed by UNESCO's regular programme budget. The methodology for calculating geographical quotas was adopted by the General Conference in 2003<sup>1</sup> and has not been revised since then.

3. In 40 C/Resolution 78, the General Conference addressed the matter of methodology, inviting the Director-General to revisit the basis on which geographical posts were determined and inviting her to report on the possibility of subjecting temporary posts and project appointments to equitable geographical distribution. Pursuant to this resolution, the Secretariat presented options for revising the methodology at the 209th and 211th sessions of the Executive Board. In accordance with the corresponding decision adopted by the Executive Board at its 211th session, the report on geographical distribution submitted at the 212th session presented an option including a category of international Project Appointments concerning multi-year projects exceeding four years<sup>2</sup>.

### **Option including international Project Appointments concerning multi-year projects exceeding four years, established posts financed by the Special Account for Management Costs and established posts financed by revenue-generating funds (Annex 1)**

4. As requested by the Executive Board, Annex I presents a simulation of the geographical quotas for each Member State in the event that the above posts should be subject to geographical distribution. This option is based on the current methodology: the base figure at 850 – the Member State factor at 65%, the contribution factor at 30% and the population factor at 5%. In addition to the geographical posts as defined by the current methodology, this option therefore includes the following items:

- **Twenty-three** posts financed by the **Special Account for Management Costs** (these are established posts with permanent programme-management support functions which belong to the Bureau of Strategic Planning (11) and to the Sector for Administration and Management (9), mainly in the Bureau of Financial Management; there are also two posts in the Internal Oversight Service (IOS)).
- **Three** posts financed by **revenue-generating funds** which, like the above posts, have long-term programme-support functions (these posts are in the Division of Conferences, Languages and Documents (ADM/CLD)).
- **One hundred and seven** international Project Appointments for multi-year projects of more than four years, at Headquarters and in the field, excluding category 1 institutes. This option includes all staff members who have been hired for projects with an expected duration of four years or more, regardless of their time-in-post. A number of these staff members thus have fewer than four years of accrued service on the project (51; 48%). The majority of these PAs work on projects in the Education Sector (48), including: the HIV/AIDS (acquired immunodeficiency syndrome) project; the Global Education Monitoring Report; Capacity Development for Education (CapED). They also work in the Culture

<sup>1</sup> [32 C/Resolution 71](#), Report by the Director-General on the situation concerning the geographical distribution of the staff.

<sup>2</sup> Document [212 EX/5.IV.C.I](#)

Sector (23), mainly at the World Heritage Centre. Seventy-seven of them are at Headquarters and 30 are in the field offices.

### Impact of the simulation on quotas

5. As at January 2022, 78% of UNESCO's Member States are represented; 35% are adequately represented countries, 32% are underrepresented countries and 11%, overrepresented countries.

6. The inclusion of the only 23 posts financed by the Special Account for Management Costs and the three posts financed by revenue-generating funds would have a positive impact on geographical representation, with two Member States becoming represented (Andorra and Bahamas) and one Member State becoming adequately represented (Sierra Leone). However, three countries would become overrepresented: Congo, Kenya and Ukraine.

7. The inclusion of the 107 international Project Appointments on multi-year projects of more than four years, plus the 23 posts financed by the Special Account for Management Costs and the three posts financed by revenue-generating funds, which makes for a total of 133 additional geographical posts, would have the following impact:

- Three Member States would become represented at UNESCO: Andorra, Bahamas and Tajikistan. Overall representation would thus improve, going from 78% to 80%.
- Six Member States would become adequately represented: Costa Rica, Kyrgyzstan, New Zealand, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone and Trinidad and Tobago. However, the percentage of adequately represented countries would decrease (from 35% to 34%) on account of the increase in overrepresented countries.
- Eight (adequately represented) Member States would become overrepresented: Australia, Congo, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Romania, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and Ukraine. The percentage of overrepresented countries would increase from 11% to 15%.

Table 1, below, presents the situation by representation category.

**Table 1: Comparison between current geographical distribution and simulation**

|                           | UNESCO's current methodology<br>(January 2022) |      | Simulation<br>(107 PAs + 26 MCA and RGF) |      | Difference    |     |
|---------------------------|--|------|--|------|---------------|-----|
|                           | Member States                                  | %    | Member States                            | %    | Member States | %   |
| Adequately represented    | 68   | 35%  | 66                                       | 34%  | -2            | -1% |
| Overrepresented           | 21   | 11%  | 29                                       | 15%  | +8            | +4% |
| Underrepresented          | 62   | 32%  | 59                                       | 31%  | -3            | -1% |
| Member States represented | 151  | 78%  | 154                                      | 80%  | +3            | +2% |
| Unrepresented             | 42   | 22%  | 39                                       | 20%  | -3            | -2% |
| Total                     | 193  | 100% | 193                                      | 100% |               |     |

### Impact of the simulation on methodology

8. Inclusion of the posts financed by the Special Account for Management Costs and those financed by revenue-generating funds as geographical posts would be apt, as today the Special Account for Management Costs includes both geographical posts (financed under the regular programme) and former FITOCA (Funds-in-Trust Overhead Costs Account) posts which were not geographical. However, when the Special Account for Management Costs was created within the framework of the integrated budget, the posts which were transferred to it retained the (geographical or non-geographical) character associated with them before the account was created. Therefore, categorizing all these posts, which are similar in nature, as geographical would ensure consistency and would eliminate the artificial distinction between former FITOCA posts and other programme-support posts.

9. Project Appointments are financed by voluntary contributions. However, the option as presented only takes into account Member States' contributions to the regular budget at the rate of 30%, in accordance with the current methodology. Consideration should be given to including in the contribution factor voluntary funding for these projects from Member States or international organizations. A new methodology would be needed to take this funding into account. This would be complex, considering that this type of funding fluctuates regularly, as projects are time-bound and can vary from one year to another. This may also require a regular review of the base figure, and hence would result in a regular revision of quotas.

### Comparison of the methodology of other agencies of the United Nations (Annex II)

10. The General Conference requested a comparative study of the practices of the United Nations Secretariat and of other agencies of the United Nations system with regard to the geographical nature of long-term posts funded by voluntary contributions.

11. In the Report of the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC) for the year 2021<sup>3</sup>, the ICSC provides information on its monitoring of geographical diversity in agencies of the United Nations. It notes that most United Nations agencies have not established formal guidelines for geographical distribution. Only six United Nations entities have a formalized system of geographical quotas: the United Nations Secretariat, the World Health Organization (WHO), the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the International Labour Organization (ILO), the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) and UNESCO.

12. Of the six entities mentioned above, the majority do not consider posts financed by voluntary contributions to be geographical posts. The comparative table in Annex II details the methodologies of the entities cited. Only the WHO, which has an integrated budget, considers all professional posts as geographical, regardless of their source of funding. These are established, long-term posts and not project-based posts such as the Project Appointments which exist at UNESCO.

### Proposed draft decision

13. In light of the above, the Executive Board may wish to adopt a decision along the following lines:

The Executive Board,

1. Recalling 41 C/Resolution 64,
2. Having examined document 214 EX/5.III.C,
3. Takes note of the information provided by the Director-General on the option including international Project Appointments (PAs) for multi-year projects of more than four years,

---

<sup>3</sup> A/76/30.

established posts financed by the Special Account for Management Costs and established posts financed by revenue-generating funds;

4. Also takes note of the comparative information on the methodology used by agencies of the United Nations system for the calculation of geographical quotas;
5. Requests the Director-General to submit to it at its 215th session a report on the situation concerning the geographical distribution of staff.













|  |     |           |   |   |   |        |        |        |        |      |         |    |    |   |    |    |    |   |  |  |        |  |
|--|-----|-----------|---|---|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|------|---------|----|----|---|----|----|----|---|--|--|--------|--|
| Spain  | ESP | Group I   |   |   |   | 6      | 2      | 6 (+1) | 1 (+2) |      | 15 (+3) | 13 | 8  | + | 15 | 13 | 8  | + |  |  |        |  |
| Sri Lanka  | LKA | Group IV  |   |   |   |        |        |        |        |      |         | 4  | 2  | O |    | 4  | 2  | O |  |  |        |  |
| Sudan  | SDN | Group Vb  |   |   |   | 1      |        |        | 1      |      | 2       | 4  | 2  | = | 2  | 4  | 2  | = |  |  |        |  |
| Suriname   | SUR | Group III |   |   |   |        |        |        |        |      |         | 4  | 2  | O |    | 4  | 2  | O |  |  |        |  |
| Sweden   | SWE | Group I   |   |   | 1 | 1      |        | 1      | 1      |      | 4       | 7  | 4  | = | 4  | 7  | 4  | = |  |  |        |  |
| Switzerland  | CHE | Group I   |   |   | 1 |        |        | 1      | (+1)   |      | 2 (+1)  | 8  | 5  | - | 2  | 8  | 5  | - |  |  |        |  |
| Syrian Arab Republic                                 | SYR | Group Vb  |   |   | 1 | 1      |        | 1      |        |      | 3       | 4  | 2  | = | 3  | 4  | 2  | = |  |  |        |  |
| Tajikistan   | TJK | Group II  |   |   |   |        |        |        | (+1)   |      | (+1 PA) | 4  | 2  | - |    | 4  | 2  | O |  |  | 0 to - |  |
| Thailand   | THA | Group IV  |   |   |   |        |        |        | 1      |      | 1       | 6  | 3  | - | 1  | 6  | 3  | - |  |  |        |  |
| Timor-Leste  | TLS | Group IV  |   |   |   |        |        |        |        |      |         | 4  | 2  | O |    | 4  | 2  | O |  |  |        |  |
| Togo   | TGO | Group Va  |   |   |   |        |        |        | 1      | 1    | 2       | 4  | 2  | = | 2  | 4  | 2  | = |  |  |        |  |
| Tonga  | TON | Group IV  |   |   |   |        |        |        |        |      |         | 4  | 2  | O |    | 4  | 2  | O |  |  |        |  |
| Trinidad and Tobago                                  | TTO | Group III |   |   |   | 1      | (+1)   |        |        |      | 1 (+1)  | 4  | 2  | = | 1  | 4  | 2  | - |  |  | - to = |  |
| Tunisia  | TUN | Group Vb  | 1 |   | 2 |        | 2      | 4 (+1) | 1      |      | 10 (+1) | 4  | 2  | + | 10 | 4  | 2  | + |  |  |        |  |
| Turkey   | TUR | Group I   |   | 1 |   |        | 1      | (+1)   | 1      |      | 3 (+1)  | 8  | 5  | - | 3  | 8  | 5  | - |  |  |        |  |
| Turkmenistan   | TKM | Group IV  |   |   |   |        | 1      |        |        |      | 1       | 4  | 2  | - | 1  | 4  | 2  | - |  |  |        |  |
| Tuvalu   | TUV | Group IV  |   |   |   |        |        |        |        |      |         | 4  | 2  | O |    | 4  | 2  | O |  |  |        |  |
| Uganda   | UGA | Group Va  |   |   |   |        |        | 4      |        |      | 4       | 4  | 2  | = | 4  | 4  | 2  | = |  |  |        |  |
| Ukraine  | UKR | Group II  |   |   |   |        |        | 3 (+1) | 1      |      | 4 (+1)  | 4  | 2  | + | 4  | 4  | 2  | = |  |  | = to + |  |
| United Arab Emirates                                 | ARE | Group Vb  |   |   |   |        |        |        |        |      |         | 6  | 4  | O |    | 6  | 4  | O |  |  |        |  |
| United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland | GBR | Group I   | 1 |   |   | 6 (+2) | 3 (+1) | 4 (+3) | 2      | (+1) | 16 (+7) | 22 | 13 | + | 16 | 22 | 13 | = |  |  | = to + |  |
| United Republic of Tanzania                          | TZA | Group Va  |   |   |   |        | 2      |        |        |      | 2       | 4  | 2  | = | 2  | 4  | 2  | = |  |  |        |  |
| Uruguay  | URY | Group III |   |   |   |        |        | 1      | 1      |      | 2       | 4  | 2  | = | 2  | 4  | 2  | = |  |  |        |  |
| Uzbekistan   | UZB | Group II  |   |   |   |        | 2      |        |        |      | 2       | 4  | 2  | = | 2  | 4  | 2  | = |  |  |        |  |
| Vanuatu  | VUT | Group IV  |   |   |   |        |        |        |        |      |         | 4  | 2  | O |    | 4  | 2  | O |  |  |        |  |
| Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)                   | VEN | Group III |   |   | 1 |        |        | 1      |        |      | 2       | 5  | 3  | - | 2  | 5  | 3  | - |  |  |        |  |
| Viet Nam   | VNM | Group IV  |   |   |   |        | 1      | 2      | 1      |      | 4       | 5  | 3  | = | 4  | 5  | 3  | = |  |  |        |  |
| Yemen  | YEM | Group Vb  |   |   |   |        |        | 1      |        |      | 1       | 4  | 2  | - | 1  | 4  | 2  | - |  |  |        |  |

|              |     |          |          |          |           |                |                 |                  |                  |                  |               |                   |   |   |   |
|--------------|-----|----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------|-------------------|---|---|---|
| Zambia       | ZMB | Group Va |          |          |           |                |                 | 1                | (+1)             | 1                |               | 2 (+1)            | 4 | 2 | = |
| Zimbabwe     | ZWE | Group Va |          |          |           |                | (+1)            |                  | 2 (+1)           |                  |               | 2 (+2)            | 4 | 2 | = |
| <b>TOTAL</b> |     |          | <b>1</b> | <b>8</b> | <b>13</b> | <b>35 (+1)</b> | <b>108 (+6)</b> | <b>173 (+23)</b> | <b>169 (+58)</b> | <b>116 (+35)</b> | <b>3 (+7)</b> | <b>626 (+130)</b> |   |   |   |

|            |   |   |   |
|------------|---|---|---|
| <b>2</b>   | 4 | 2 | = |
| <b>2</b>   | 4 | 2 | = |
| <b>626</b> |   |   |   |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

SAMC = Staff on established posts funded by Special Account for Management Costs

PA = Project Appointment

|                          |     |         |  |  |  |   |   |        |        |        |  |         |
|--------------------------|-----|---------|--|--|--|---|---|--------|--------|--------|--|---------|
| Israel                   | ISR | Group I |  |  |  |   | 1 | 1      | 1      |        |  | 3       |
| United States of America | USA | Group I |  |  |  | 1 | 5 | 4 (+1) | 5 (+1) | 1 (+1) |  | 16 (+3) |

|    |
|----|
| 3  |
| 16 |

## ANNEX II



# Methodology for the calculation of Quotas in other UN Agencies

|   | UN Secretariat<br>(1988)   | FAO<br>(2004)  | WHO<br>(2003, rev 2013)   | UNESCO<br>(2003)   | ILO (2003)   | ICAO (1981 rev 1991)   |
|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| <b>Geographical posts</b>                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Professional and above (P/D)</li> <li>Regular Budget</li> <li>Excluding language posts</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Professional and above (P/D)</li> <li>Regular Budget</li> <li>Excluding language posts</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Professional and above (P/D) (fixed-term)</li> <li>All sources of funds</li> <li>Excluding language posts</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Professional and above (P/D)</li> <li>Regular Budget</li> <li>Excluding language posts</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Professional and above (P/D)</li> <li>Regular Budget</li> <li>Excluding language posts</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Professional and above (P/D)</li> <li>Regular Budget</li> <li>Excluding language posts</li> </ul> |
| <b>Base figure</b>                        | 3,604 posts<br>(GA Resolution 65/247)  | 1,399 posts<br>(updated on a biennial basis)   | 1,800 posts   | 850 posts  | 780 (in Dec. 2020)   | 275  |
| <b>Membership factor</b>                  | 40 %   | 40 %   | 45 %  | 65 %   | Nil* *Minimum range of [1-2] Posts for member States whose assessed contribution <= 0.20% of the ILO budget.                             | 47 %   |
| <b>Contribution factor</b>                | 55 %   | 55 %   | 45 %  | 30 %   | 100 %  | 53 %   |
| <b>Population factor</b>                  | 5 %  | 5 %  | 10 %  | 5 %  | Nil  | Nil  |
| <b>Upper and Lower limit of the range</b> | 15 %<br>(min 4,8 – 14 posts)   | 15 %<br>(min 2, 03 – 7,53 posts)   | Minimum upper limit based on population   | 25 %   | 25 % (except for large contributors , only minus 25 % applies)   |  |

Annexe 3 EB 214

Source: Benchmark and ICSC Report on Monitoring of geographical diversity in the UN common system - 2021