



FIFTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Review of the ILO field structure**Introduction**

1. At the 301st Session of the Governing Body (March 2008), the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee discussed proposals by the Office concerning the ILO field structure.¹ The Governing Body asked the Office to provide more detailed proposals on the basis of additional analysis and consultations consistent with the terms of reference it adopted in March 2007.²
2. The March 2008 Office proposals outlined the context and rationale for a review of the ILO field structure, based on proposals made by the external consultants and in the light of the guidance provided by the Governing Body and the resource situation of the Office. The ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization, including its follow-up and associated resolution, as well as the Strategic Policy Framework 2010–15, provide additional elements in support of strengthening ILO capacity.
3. The Governing Body confirmed in March 2008 that the rationale of a review of the ILO field structure was to strengthen the capacity of the Office as a whole to respond to the needs of its Members. The overall approach is to adapt the structures and functioning of the Office where practicable, including having regard to a rapidly evolving UN development and operational framework. This also suggests that no one formula can be applied uniformly across all ILO regions.
4. The proposals put forward in March 2008 addressed the structure of offices in the regions and their broad operating principles. The more detailed proposals developed below are based on these same organizing principles. The general issues are addressed first. These are followed by more detailed proposals for each region. Appendix I provides additional elements in support of the proposals, which are consistent with the terms of reference adopted in March 2007.³

¹ See GB.301/PFA/4 and GB.301/10/1(Rev.).

² GB.298/PFA/6(Rev.)

³ GB.298/PV, para. 216.

A two-tier structure in the regions

5. A two-tier structure is proposed for the regions, with country offices (servicing constituents in one or several countries) reporting directly to the regional office in each region. This structure simplifies and clarifies reporting lines. It is already in effect in the Latin America and Caribbean region where all office directors report directly to the regional office.

Decent work technical support teams

6. It is proposed to establish in each region a limited number of decent work technical support teams (DWTs). These will be located in country offices and include a number of technical specialists who cover all four strategic objectives and work as a team in a coordinated fashion. DWTs will not introduce any dual authority since in the country offices where a DWT is located, there will be only one director.
7. The establishment of DWTs seeks to reorganize, where relevant, existing technical capacity so as to achieve greater critical mass and flexibility in the deployment of technical specialists. The total number of technical specialists per region would not change. The DWTs will provide technical support to ILO Members. The technical specialists will support country offices in the design and implementation of Decent Work Country Programmes. They will work under the overall coordination of the regional office and through country offices. Knowledge-sharing systems will facilitate the exchange of information, analysis and experience within and across regions.
8. Employers' and workers' specialists will be integral members of DWTs retaining their full responsibility to liaise with and support employers' and workers' organizations respectively.
9. Table 1 reflects the effect of the proposals in terms of the number of ILO offices in all regions in a "before" and "after" situation.

Table 1. Summary view of ILO field structure "before" and "after"

	Before	After
Regional offices	5	5
Subregional offices	15	None
Country offices	31	46
DWTs	None	13 (located in country offices)

National ILO coordinators

10. In those countries in which the ILO has no office and where a large programme of technical cooperation warrants a stronger presence, the ILO will draw on the services of national ILO coordinators. Such coordinators will report to, and be supervised by, the corresponding ILO country office director. Current experience with national ILO coordinators is broadly positive. National ILO coordinators are not permanent positions and are subject to change as the ILO programmes of cooperation evolve. The Office will introduce clear selection procedures and criteria to ensure independence of national ILO coordinators. National coordinator positions will enable the ILO to participate effectively

in more countries in common UN programmes under the coordination of the UN Resident Coordinator.

Roles and responsibilities

11. To realize the full potential of the above proposals, greater clarity is necessary in the distribution of roles and responsibilities between different levels of authority. This is key to strengthening ILO capacity to efficiently use ILO resources and service Members' needs.
12. Single- or multi-country offices will have primary responsibility to assist Members and support constituents to develop and implement activities in the context of the Decent Work Agenda, mainly in the form of Decent Work Country Programmes, in close coordination, where appropriate, with UN Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAFs). Country offices will draw on the services of technical specialists in DWTs, as and when needed. This specialization of ILO country offices in delivering assistance to Members would confirm an ongoing trend underlying their greater efficiency. Country office responsibilities will include the supervision of technical cooperation staff performing defined and time-bound tasks, again drawing on the support of DWTs, as and when needed.
13. The primary responsibility of DWTs will be to support country offices and Members with technical advice, information and analysis on the promotion of the Decent Work Agenda.
14. The above implies a clear division of tasks between the frontline implementation responsibility of country offices and the technical support function of DWTs. Technical support should be demand-driven by ILO country offices. This basic principle will be reflected in the accountability and performance evaluation of the respective staff.
15. The proposals do not preclude that, in the case of certain countries and circumstances (size, distance, special needs), resident expertise could be assigned for a limited period of time. Such arrangements currently operate in ILO Offices in Beijing, Brasilia and Suva. Technical staff deployed to country offices will however be required to closely coordinate their work programmes with the DWTs in the region.
16. Regional offices will retain their overall political and management responsibilities for the promotion of ILO principles and policies in the region and the implementation of the approved programme and budget. All country office directors will be accountable to, and report to, the regional director.
17. Headquarters will retain overall responsibility for global policy design and development, and quality assurance under the overall leadership of the Director-General and within the framework of decisions taken by the International Labour Conference and the Governing Body. This implies in particular that headquarters will have no direct country or regional operational responsibility, save in very specific cases as decided by the Director-General. Headquarters will exercise joint responsibility with regions in the selection of technical specialists assigned to DWTs. In addition, headquarters will exercise joint responsibility with the regions for the quality assurance of Decent Work Country Programmes.
18. Headquarters will work in close collaboration with regional offices, country offices and DWTs to deliver services to Members in countries and regions. In turn, regional offices, DWTs and country offices will be responsible for promoting and applying ILO policies. Regional offices and headquarters units will exercise joint responsibility for reporting on

results achieved against agreed targets, indicators and outcomes as specified in successive programme and budgets.

19. Three additional consequences flow from the above proposals.

Decentralization of technical cooperation

20. Further decentralization of administrative responsibility for delivering ILO extra-budgetary technical cooperation will be pursued. Regional and country offices will have primary responsibility for the delivery of technical cooperation in regions and countries. In 2007, the regions were directly responsible for the delivery of 66.6 per cent of the ILO's \$170 million extra-budgetary technical cooperation expenditure, compared to 33.4 per cent for headquarters (see Appendix II). The target is for all technical cooperation of direct benefit to a country or region to be administered by the regions. Headquarters and regions will continue to cooperate closely in the implementation of extra-budgetary technical cooperation. Technical cooperation addressing global policy development will continue to be administered by headquarters. These general principles will not apply to the Bureaux for Employers' and for Workers' Activities who have their own arrangements regarding delivery of technical cooperation.
21. Additional efforts will be required in regions that currently have a lower rate of management responsibility for technical cooperation, particularly Europe and Central Asia and to a lesser extent Africa (see table 2 below). Technical cooperation projects of a distinct regional or country characteristic currently managed at headquarters will be considered for further decentralization.
22. In several regions, and depending on country conditions, measures are taken to locate technical cooperation support staff in the same location and offices in order to reduce cost, facilitate exchanges and liaison with constituents and ILO offices. Such arrangements also enable the ILO to designate one staff member with some coordination responsibilities in countries without an established ILO office or national ILO coordinator. Current examples are Bamako and Kabul.

Staff mobility

23. Mobility of technical staff within and between the regions and with headquarters is necessary for the effective functioning of an international organization as well as for the professional development of staff. Enhanced staff mobility is a key component of the current human resources strategy. Specifically, appointment to senior managerial and technical positions will be premised on serving at least one period in the regions and at headquarters during a professional career.

Regional directors and the Senior Management Team

24. Regional directors participate regularly in Senior Management Team meetings and are thus fully associated in the policy discussions and decisions of the Office. Additional consultations with regional directors are carried out as needed.

ILO and UN reform

25. The ILO is an integral part of UN country teams and collaborates closely in the preparation and implementation of UNDAFs. The ILO participates actively in UN country teams and UN regional directors teams. The proposals developed here take account of UN reform developments and seek to strengthen ILO capacity to effectively participate in joint UN country programme development and implementation.
26. Regional UN hubs of technical assistance are being established in Bangkok (for Asia and the Pacific), Cairo (for North Africa and the Middle East), Pretoria (for sub-Saharan Africa) and Panama (for South and Central America and the Caribbean). The current proposals seek to place DWTs in those same locations. This is expected to further strengthen ILO–UN synergies and joint collaboration. The exception is Panama where the ILO has established a light coordination capacity.
27. A priority for ILO–UN cooperation is to strengthen consultations with employers' and workers' organizations, in particular on policy issues of direct concern to them.

Extension of IRIS to the regions and decentralization of information processing

28. The first phase of the pilot deployment of IRIS to the Budapest Office was successfully completed at the end of 2008 and the second phase is under way. Extension to the other regions will be done according to a detailed deployment strategy to be implemented during 2010–11.⁴
29. The implementation of IRIS in external offices will create opportunities to realize efficiencies through consolidation and the decentralization of information processing functions currently performed in Geneva. As indicated in the Strategic Policy Framework 2010–15, the Office will explore the feasibility of creating shared service centres in ILO external offices. This would make it possible to centralize certain processing functions which are performed in every established ILO office, thereby creating economies of scale and reducing the administrative burden on the local office.

Proposed regional distribution of offices by category

30. Table 2 details the proposed arrangements in each region. It also provides information on the regional share of total ILO technical cooperation expenditure in 2007 and on the share of regional technical cooperation administered directly in the region.

⁴ See GB.303/PFA/ICTS/2.

Table 2: Distribution of ILO country offices and DWTs by region

Region	Country offices	Decent work technical support teams	National coordinators	Technical cooperation expenditure
Africa	Nine offices: Abidjan Abuja Addis Ababa Algiers Antananarivo Dar es Salaam Kinshasa Harare Lusaka	Four teams: Cairo (7 countries, 8 specialists), Dakar (16 countries, 13 specialists), Yaoundé (11 countries, 9 specialists) and Pretoria (19 countries, 12 specialists)	Five positions under consideration	Share of total expenditure: 25.6 % Administered directly by the region: 72 %
Arab States	One office in Beirut and ILO representatives in Jerusalem and Kuwait	One team in Beirut covering 12 countries with 11 specialists.	Two positions foreseen in the Syrian Arab Republic and Yemen; possibly one more in Jordan	Share of total expenditure: 1.6 % Administered directly by the region: 84.2 %
Asia and the Pacific	12 offices: Bangkok Beijing Colombo Dhaka Hanoi Islamabad Jakarta Kathmandu Manila New Delhi Tokyo Suva (special arrangements exist in Dili, Kabul and Yangon)	Two teams: Bangkok (21 countries, 22 specialists) New Delhi (9 countries, 11 specialists)	Seven positions proposed: Cambodia Islamic Rep. of Iran Lao People's Dem. Rep. Mongolia Papua New Guinea Samoa Timor-Leste	Share of total expenditure: 31.1 % Administered directly by the region: 97.2 %
Europe and Central Asia	Three country offices: Ankara Budapest Moscow Five ILO offices Berlin Lisbon Madrid Paris Rome One ILO liaison office in Brussels	Two (complementary) teams: Budapest (18 countries, 6 specialists) Moscow (10 countries, 6 specialists)	11 positions: Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Republic of Moldova, Serbia, Tajikistan, Ukraine Another position considered for The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	Share of total expenditure: 7.2 % Administered directly by the region: 62.1 %

Region	Country offices	Decent work technical support teams	National coordinators	Technical cooperation expenditure
Americas	<p>Seven offices:</p> <p>Buenos Aires Brasilia Lima Mexico Port-of-Spain San José Santiago</p> <p>One regional centre (CINTERFOR) in Montevideo</p> <p>One ILO office in Washington DC (reporting to headquarters)</p>	<p>Four teams:</p> <p>Lima (5 countries, 7 specialists) Port-of-Spain (13 countries and 8 Non-Metropolitan Territories, 7 specialists) San José (8 countries, 8 specialists) Santiago (5 countries, 8 specialists)</p>	No current plans for national coordinators	<p>Share of total expenditure: 12.3 %</p> <p>Administered directly by the region: 93 %</p>

ILO offices in industrialized countries

31. The ILO has offices in seven industrialized countries. These offices promote ILO objectives and activities in these countries and liaise with governments and social partners, in particular on promoting ILO technical cooperation. The offices in Berlin, Lisbon, Madrid, Paris and Rome benefit from varying cost-sharing arrangements with the host government, including free premises (Lisbon, Madrid and Rome), contributions towards the cost of premises (Berlin and Paris) and contributions towards operating costs and technical and support staff (all). These contributions are additional to the regular budget contributions of the host governments. The other two ILO offices are in Tokyo and Washington. The ILO Office in London was closed in December 2006. These proposals do not envisage any changes to the role and status of these offices.

Timetable and resource implications

32. Detailed measures will be developed in 2009 for the establishment of the new structure, which will become fully operational early in 2010 to coincide with the start of the new biennium. These will include detailed staffing and operational plans for each type of office. In the case of the DWTs, the implementation of the plans will involve some reassignment of professional staff to new duty stations. It will also involve the design and implementation of targeted training to acquaint team members with the desired operational modalities of the teams, including the adoption of more collaborative and integrated methods of work. In the case of the subregional offices that will be converted into country offices, the plans will outline the new functions and responsibilities, the associated staff profiles and a strategy to adapt existing staff to the new functions where practicable. Proposals for relevant amendments to the Staff Regulations, as well as revisions to existing policies to implement required changes will be made in consultation with staff and the staff union. Policies to reinforce these changes will form part of the revised Human Resources Strategy to be submitted to the Committee in November 2009. Resources will be reallocated to meet the additional costs involved in 2009. Costs incurred during the next biennium will be covered from the resources approved for 2010–11.

Roles and responsibilities and accountability frameworks

33. Internal procedures will be revised to clearly define the roles and responsibilities within the new structure and clarify the division of tasks between directors of country offices, DWT team leaders and regional directors as well as between the regions and headquarters. This will be done in 2009. In cooperation with the International Training Centre of the ILO in Turin, training support and programmes will be provided to ensure the new roles and responsibilities are well understood.

Joint responsibility for ILO outcomes

34. The Strategic Policy Framework 2010–15 and the Programme and Budget for 2010–11 establish the principle and the arrangements for the joint responsibility of the regions and headquarters to achieve the agreed outcomes.

National ILO coordinators

35. As indicated above, national ILO coordinator positions will be created and discontinued in countries depending on programme needs and financial resources. The number of positions will depend on country situations and the evolving ILO programme in the country. Recently for instance, the positions in Bulgaria and Romania were discontinued. A number of new positions will be created in 2009 to be financed through extra-budgetary technical cooperation resources, including the Regular Budget Supplementary Account.
36. *The Committee may wish to recommend to the Governing Body that it invite the Director-General to take the necessary immediate steps to implement the proposals outlined in this paper in order to strengthen the ILO's capacity to service its Members in regions and countries in line with the Social Justice Declaration and UN reform principles.*

Geneva, 23 February 2009.

Point for decision: Paragraph 36.

Appendix I

A numerical profile of the ILO in the regions

1. This appendix provides a numerical profile of the ILO in the regions.

Rising expenditure in the regions

2. Expenditure in the regions has been rising steadily over the last ten years. A main driver of expansion has been increased extra-budgetary income, which is mainly spent in the regions. In 2007, the ILO delivered \$169 million in extra-budgetary technical cooperation, compared to \$91 million in 1996. During the same period, the ILO regular budget declined by over 4 per cent in constant dollars. In 2006–07, the regions were directly responsible for \$215.5 million of extra-budgetary technical cooperation expenditure, or 65 per cent of the \$330 million expended by the ILO during the biennium. The share of the regions in the total ILO regular budget has also increased.

ILO staff in the regions

3. The total number of staff serving in the regions increased by almost 44 per cent between 1996 and 2006. Regular budget staff and technical cooperation staff both increased. Table 1 below reflects the increase in the total number of staff in the regions and the different types of staff.

Table 1. ILO staff in the regions

	Regular budget			Technical cooperation			Total
	Professional staff	National officers	Support staff	Professional staff	National experts	Support staff	
1996	195	60	445	225	0	375	1 300
2006	238	112	492	181	280	568	1 871
Change %	22.1	86.7	10.6	-19.6	–	51.5	43.9

4. Between 1996 and 2006, the share of professional national staff under the regular budget and the technical cooperation programme increased significantly. This reflects the greater use of national expertise, particularly in technical cooperation programmes which rely less and less on international experts. The total number of professional staff increased from 480 to 811, with the share of national officers and experts increasing from 12.5 per cent to 48.3 per cent.
5. At the end of 2006, the ILO counted 352 professional staff and 476 support staff funded by the regular budget in the regions. The professional category comprises directors and deputy directors of offices, specialists, professionals in management, finance, administration and project support, and national officers. Of the total professional staff, 133 were specialists (including employers' and workers' specialists) and 60 were professionals in management, administration, finance, human resource and technical cooperation project support.
6. On average, the ratio of support staff to professional staff was 1.4 (i.e. 40 per cent more support staff than professional staff). Only in the Europe and Central Asia region was this ratio below one. This is explained by the fact that the regional office is located at headquarters and can thus rely substantially on support staff in central administrative services.

Table 2. Profile of ILO regular budget staff in the regions

	Director/ Deputy	Specialists	Professionals*	National officer	Total	Support staff	Support staff/ P staff
Africa	10	47	22	28	107	153	1.4
Arab States	2	7	1	4	14	26	1.9
Asia/Pacific	13	35	19	36	103	157	1.5
Europe/Central Asia	11	11	2	15	39	35	0.9
Americas/Caribbean	11	33	16	29	89	105	1.2
Total	47	133	60	112	352	476	1.4

* Management, finance, administration and project support.

7. Most professional and support staff in the regions work in subregional offices. Globally, combining all categories of staff, 57 per cent of staff in the regions is located in subregional offices, 25 per cent in country offices and 17 per cent in regional offices. Over 50 per cent of all staff in the Europe and Central Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean, and Africa regions are located in subregional offices while in the Asia and Pacific region the share is 45 per cent.
8. The share of staff in regional offices ranges from 19 per cent in the Asia and Pacific and Latin America and the Caribbean regions to 15 per cent in Africa and 16 per cent in Europe and Central Asia. The regional office for the Arab States combines both regional and subregional functions and is therefore atypical.
9. The share of staff in country offices ranges from 36 per cent in Asia and the Pacific, to 34 per cent in Africa, 26 per cent in Latin America and the Caribbean and 7 per cent in Europe and Central Asia, which has only one country office.
10. At the end of 2006, of 352 professional regular budget staff located in the regions, 177 were in subregional offices. Of these, 115 were classified as technical specialists, a share of 65 per cent (see table 3). On average, an ILO subregional office comprised 11 professional staff, of which seven were specialists. The number of specialists per subregional office varied from a low of four (in Cairo and Lima) to a high of 13 (Bangkok) with the most frequent being eight specialists. On average, subregional offices cover around nine countries.

Table 3. Professional staff in subregional offices, end 2006

	Professional staff	Of which specialists	Percentage of specialists
Abidjan	8	5	63
Addis Ababa	11	8	73
Cairo	7	4	57
Dakar	12	8	67
Harare	12	10	83
Yaoundé	10	6	60
Lima	8	4	50
Port-of-Spain	12	7	58
San José	13	8	62
Santiago	14	9	64

	Professional staff	Of which specialists	Percentage of specialists
Beirut	10	7	70
Bangkok	19	13	68
New Delhi	15	8	53
Manila	10	7	70
Budapest	8	5	63
Moscow	8	6	75
Total	177	115	65
Average	11.1	7.2	65

Note: Beirut excludes the regional director and her deputy.

11. The expertise of regular budget professional specialist staff in the regions is distributed unevenly across strategic objectives. The highest share is found in employment, followed by social dialogue, social protection and standards and fundamental principles and rights at work.
12. The distribution of extra-budgetary technical cooperation across strategic objectives (see table 4) follows an inverse pattern, starting with standards and fundamental principles and rights at work, followed by employment, social protection and ending with social dialogue. In recent years however there has been an increase in the relative share of employment.
13. At headquarters, the distribution of regular budget professional staff is more even, with approximately 22 per cent each in social dialogue and employment, followed by 18 per cent each for standards and fundamental principles and rights at work and social protection. A larger share of staff at headquarters is classified as cross-cutting, including communications, external relations and partnerships, gender and policy integration.

Table 4. Distribution of ILO specialists by strategic objective

	Standards	Employment	Social protection	Social dialogue	Cross-cutting	Total
Specialist P staff (31/12/2006) in the regions	12.0	35.3	15.0	29.3	8.3	100
Technical cooperation expenditure (2007)	43.0	36.0	15.0	6.0	0.0	100
P staff at HQ (2006–07)	18.2	21.6	17.3	21.5	21.4	100

Note: Cross-cutting at HQ includes communications, external partnerships, statistics and policy integration.

Country offices deliver technical cooperation

14. As reflected in table 5, several indicators point to the greater efficiency of country offices in delivering technical cooperation. First, the average staff size of country offices (30 staff on average combining regular budget and technical cooperation, professional and support staff) is smaller than either subregional offices (57 staff on average) or regional offices (41 staff on average). Second, the ratio of total staff to regular budget professional staff is much higher in country offices, 9.3 on average, compared to 4.9 in subregional offices and 2.9 in regional offices. In other words, professional staff in country offices directly supervise almost twice as many staff as in subregional offices.

Table 5. Expenditure and staffing in ILO offices (all regions average), 2006–07

	Staff per office (RB and TC)	Ratio of total staff per RB professional	TC expenditure per RB staff	Ratio RB to TC expenditure
Regional	41	2.9	152 923	0.4
Subregional	57	4.9	219 390	1.1
Country	30	9.3	775 748	3.4

Source: IRIS database.

15. The value of technical cooperation delivered in 2006–07 per regular budget staff in country offices amounted to \$775,000, compared to \$219,000 in subregional offices and \$152,000 in regional offices (see table 5). Finally, for every dollar spent on the regular budget, country offices spend 3.4 dollars in extra-budgetary technical cooperation, when subregional offices spend one dollar in technical cooperation for every dollar spent on the regular budget. This ratio is highest in Asia and the Pacific, followed by Africa, and Latin America and the Caribbean. Clearly, country offices have specialized in the delivery of technical cooperation and this specialization has produced efficiency gains.
16. In 2006–07 technical cooperation expenditure per office in 20 country offices ranged from less than \$100,000 to over \$25 million. Four country offices delivered over \$9 million; six between \$4 and \$7.5 million, while six were in the range of \$1.6 to \$3.6 million (see table 6).
17. The average staffing of a country office is 1.95 regular budget international professional staff, 2.3 regular budget national professional staff, 7.8 regular budget support staff and 25.4 technical cooperation staff.

Table 6. Technical cooperation expenditure and staffing in 20 country offices (2006–07)

	TC expenditure (in '000s)	Regular budget staff		
		International	National	Support
Algiers	54	1	2	6
CINTERFOR	438	1	3	8
Suva	719	1	1	9
Mexico	865	3	3	8
Kathmandu	1 673	1	1	9
Antananarivo	2 368	2	3	10
Dhaka	2 458	1	3	10
Kinshasa	2 840	1	2	9
Hanoi	3 271	1	1	4
Abuja	3 599	3	2	10
Lusaka	3 968	1	3	9
Buenos Aires	4 611	2	3	6
Ankara	5 390	1	1	2
Brasilia	5 656	3	3	3
Beijing	6 217	6	2	9
Islamabad	7 459	2	4	6

	TC expenditure (in '000s)	Regular budget staff		
		International	National	Support
Pretoria	9 176	3	2	9
Colombo	9 670	1	2	7
Dar es Salaam	14 467	2	1	13
Jakarta	25 468	3	4	9
Total	110 367	39	46	156
Average per office	5 518	1.95	2.3	7.8

Conclusion

18. The above data suggest that country offices should specialize in the delivery of technical cooperation; that country offices should be placed directly under the authority of the regional office with overall responsibility for shaping and monitoring the ILO in the region; that professional specialist staff currently located in subregional offices should be concentrated in fewer but larger technical support teams specializing in analysis and advisory services. For this operational mode to function, a precise set of operating rules defining responsibilities and accountabilities is required.

Appendix II

Extra-budgetary technical cooperation expenditure in 2007 by region and administrative responsibility

Region	Headquarters		Field		Total region	
	US\$'000s	% share of headquarters expenditure	US\$'000s	% share of field expenditure	US\$'000s	% share of grand total
Africa	12 127	21.4	31 195	27.7	43 321	25.6
Americas	1 451	2.6	19 375	17.2	20 827	12.3
Asia	1 499	2.6	51 136	45.4	52 635	31.1
Europe	4 626	8.2	7 569	6.7	12 195	7.2
Arab States	436	0.8	2 324	2.1	2 760	1.6
Global	9 811	17.3	0	0.0	9 811	5.8
Interregional	26 654	47.1	1 091	1.0	27 745	16.4
Grand total	56 604	100.0	112 690	100.0	169 294	100.0

Region	Headquarters		Field		Total region	
	US\$'000s	% share of regional expenditure	US\$'000s	% share of regional expenditure	US\$'000s	% share total region
Africa	12 127	28.0	31 195	72.0	43 321	100.0
Americas	1 451	7.0	19 375	93.0	20 827	100.0
Asia	1 499	2.8	51 136	97.2	52 635	100.0
Europe	4 626	37.9	7 569	62.1	12 195	100.0
Arab States	436	15.8	2 324	84.2	2 760	100.0
Global	9 811	100.0	0	0.0	9 811	100.0
Interregional	26 654	96.1	1 091	3.9	27 745	100.0
Total	56 604	33.4	112 690	66.6	169 294	100.0