



## FOR DEBATE AND GUIDANCE

### FIFTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

## Review of the ILO field structure

### *Addendum*

1. The discussion of the paper on the review of the ILO field structure<sup>1</sup> in the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee on 10 March 2009 was suspended by the Chairperson to allow the Office to respond to a number of requests for clarifications and more detailed information. This addendum supplements and elaborates further on the information already provided in that paper as well as on the one submitted to the Committee in March 2008.<sup>2</sup>
2. The questions and the requests for further clarifications made during the discussion on 10 March 2009 have been carefully reviewed by the Office. In response, this paper provides more detailed information under the following eight headings:
  - Improved effectiveness
  - Human resources issues
  - Financial implications
  - Organizational structure
  - Roles and responsibilities
  - National coordinators
  - The role of the International Training Centre, Turin
  - UN reform

Tables providing additional data are also attached.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> GB.304/PFA/5.

<sup>2</sup> GB.301/PFA/4.

<sup>3</sup> The data in these tables have been taken from the ILO system at an aggregate level to provide total costs.

3. Further to consultations, this addendum also introduces a number of clarifications and refinements to the Office proposals. These aim to clarify further the respective roles and responsibilities and the reporting hierarchy as well as to simplify the nomenclature. The chart in Appendix IV represents a high-level overview of the proposed reporting lines, the flow of technical support, as well as the coordinating functions. More detailed operational arrangements will take account of the specificities of each region. A correction should also be noted to table 2 in paper GB.304/PFA/5, to include Cairo, Dakar, Pretoria and Yaoundé in the list of ILO offices.

## Improved effectiveness

*What are the problems and issues that the Office is trying to address with these proposals?*

4. These were identified in the paper submitted in March 2008<sup>4</sup> and are based on the main findings of the report of the consultants. They can be summarized as follows: the technical capacity of the Office spread too thinly; practical rigidity in the deployment of technical staff; lack of clarity in roles and responsibilities and the absence of a robust accountability framework; and work methods that do not maximize the use of the considerable knowledge base of the Office.

*Why did the Office not present a more comprehensive set of proposals in line with the terms of reference set down for the review and addressing all issues, including the future of ILO offices in Western Europe, Tokyo and Washington, DC?*

5. The first priority of the Office was to strengthen the ILO's capacity to serve the needs of its constituents in the regions. Having regard to the financial, political and other constraints within which this exercise was undertaken, the Office presented proposals that it considered realistic and feasible and that could be implemented relatively quickly. These proposals should be seen as a first phase with other issues, including the future role of offices in industrialized countries, to be addressed at a later date.

*How will the proposed changes enhance capacity, improve technical cooperation delivery and respond to the gaps and needs which are not currently being met?*

6. All the proposals seek to enhance the effectiveness in the regions. First, specialization is a key underlying principle of improving overall effectiveness. The proposals will enable technical specialists in the Decent Work Technical Support Teams (DWTs) to allocate all of their time to technical matters while ILO offices will have primary responsibility to ensure the implementation of ILO programmes. Second, greater clarity in roles and responsibilities, shorter reporting lines, changes in internal controls and the introduction of more formal accountability frameworks will contribute to overall effectiveness. Third, combining several technical specialists in one team will contribute to better coordination, improved information flows, and greater exchange of experience. It will also allow more junior staff to interact directly with more senior staff thereby encouraging on-the-job learning, a key factor in competency development. Finally, greater flexibility in the deployment of technical specialists across a region in response to constituents' needs will be an additional contributory factor to improved effectiveness.

<sup>4</sup> GB.301/PFA/4.

## Human resources issues

*What are the human resources implications of the proposals, including the implications for local staff and technical cooperation staff? What is the breakdown of staff by function in each region?*

7. A number of staff movements will be required to give effect to the proposal to create DWTs. In Africa, the proposals envisage consolidating the technical specialists in four locations. This will involve the relocation of the technical positions currently assigned to the subregional offices in Harare (five) and in Addis Ababa (nine) to the proposed four locations in Africa for DWTs (Cairo, Dakar, Yaoundé and Pretoria). Similarly for the Asia and Pacific region, the technical positions currently assigned to the Manila subregional office (five) will be relocated to the two proposed DWTs in the region (Bangkok and New Delhi). No additional staff movements are envisaged, at this stage, for the other regions.
8. Where the staff movements are within the same country, relocation should be possible for all categories of staff. However, if movement is required across countries, relocation will only be possible in respect of international professional staff, as national officers and general service staff are not subject to geographical mobility. Most of the support staff is in these latter categories. Where there are opportunities in other projects or other UN organizations in the country, all efforts will be made to match existing local staff with any such opportunities.
9. In response to a statement about the Office guaranteeing that there will be no job losses, no such guarantee can be given at this stage. In the presentations of the proposals both to the staff and to constituents, the Office has given assurances that all efforts will be made to retrain serving staff to discharge the new functions required as well as to avoid non-voluntary cessations of service to the extent possible. As in any establishment, there is a certain level of staff turnover in the ILO (persons leaving the ILO through normal attrition) which will also provide some scope for redeployment. Any cessations that may be required will be in full conformity with the Staff Regulations.
10. Other important human resources measures which will be required to implement these proposals include intensive staff training and development, clarification of new roles and responsibilities and the development of accountability frameworks, and the implementation of new work methods as envisaged in the Programme and Budget proposals for 2010–11 and the implementation plan on the ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization.

**Table 1. Distribution of occupied technical positions by function and region (January 2009)**

Region	Standards	Employment	Social Protection	Social Dialogue	Cross-cutting	Total
Africa	5	14	8	11	5	43
Asia	4	9	3	9	4	29
Americas	6	12	4	12	5	39
Arab States	2	3	1	2	1	9
Europe	1	2	4	5	0	12
<b>Total</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>132</b>

*What explains the current level of vacancies?*

11. The level of vacancies at any one point in time is a function of the rules and regulations governing the filling of vacancies as well as the pattern of recruitment twice a year through RAPS. Vacancies arise as a result of the “domino” effect of RAPS as serving staff are either transferred or promoted or because of other unplanned departures. These vacant positions are immediately incorporated into the compendium of the next cycle of RAPS.

**Table 2. Distribution of vacant technical specialist positions by function and region (January 2009)\***

Region	Standards	Employment	Social Protection	Social Dialogue	Cross-cutting	Total
Africa	1	3	0	4	0	8
Asia	1	4	1	1	1	8
Americas	1	2	1	0	0	4
Arab States	0	0	2	0	0	2
Europe	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>22</b>

\*These vacancies arise from normal movements of staff and are due to be filled in the first half of 2009 following the current recruitment and selection round.

## Financial implications

*What are the financial implications of the proposals, including additional mission costs, moving and rent and the cost of finding new or enlarging existing office accommodation?*

12. As indicated in paragraph 7 above, an estimated total of 19 professional technical positions will need to be transferred under the proposals. Some of the appointments to the DWTs will be made as part of the normal cycle of rotation and assignment of staff, so there will not be any incremental cost. The exact number of transfers that can be included as part of the normal rotation and assignment cycle will depend on the timing of decisions on the new structure and of its implementation. The average cost to the ILO of transferring an official is US\$35,000. The actual cost varies considerably depending on the source and destination of the transfer. Assuming ten of the proposed staff movements were outside of the normal cycle, an additional cost of some \$350,000 would result.
13. Office accommodation costs for the DWTs in the medium to longer term will be offset by reduced accommodation costs in the current locations of the technical specialists. The current average office accommodation costs in proposed DWT locations are lower than those of the current locations of technical specialists. Incremental costs would only arise if the Office was unable to terminate its lease arrangements or sublet vacant space.
14. The Programme and Budget proposals for 2010–11 provide for the continuation of current office arrangements and a normal level of staff movements. In addition, increased resources, not yet earmarked, have been proposed for the regions to support the delivery of the Decent Work Agenda and the follow-up to the Social Justice Declaration. The implementation of the revised field structure has a direct relationship to both of these activities and incremental transitional costs, if any, could be covered from these additional resources.

15. In the event of any cessation of contracts of staff, benefits due under the Staff Regulations would be covered by resources available in the Terminal Benefits Fund.

## Organizational structure

*What does the statement mean in paragraph 3 of paper GB.304/PFA/5 that “no one formula can be applied uniformly across all ILO regions”? Why is there inconsistency in the size of DWTs having regard to the size of the population and the number of countries to be serviced? Should not the DWTs be in the same location as the UN hubs?*

16. As it is necessary to implement these proposals within existing resource levels, the size of DWTs is determined in the first instance by the number of technical specialist positions currently available in each region. The size broadly correlates with the number of countries covered by each team, although this is an imperfect measure as the size of countries and geopolitical characteristics have to be considered. Some ILO offices will continue to benefit from residential technical expertise depending on needs. Language and distance have also to be taken into account. The statement that “no one formula can be applied uniformly across all ILO regions” is designed to reflect different factors which vary from region to region. This approach represents the starting point for implementation of these proposals but the Office will gradually move to rationalize the allocation of staff to the DWTs based on the initial experience and a better appreciation of the number of specialists required to maximize the effectiveness of each team.
17. The proposals seek, as far as possible, to consolidate ILO technical capacity in the same locations as UN regional hubs. However, the proposals also take into account the specificity of the ILO mandate as well as minimizing the financial and human costs of relocation.

## Roles and responsibilities

*What are the interrelationships between ILO offices, DWTs, regional offices and headquarters and what are the controls in place to ensure good governance and transparency at the level of ILO offices? What are the roles, responsibilities and reporting lines of chief technical advisers (CTAs)?*

18. All ILO office directors will report directly to the regional directors assisted by one or two deputy regional directors. ILO office directors are responsible for the implementation of ILO activities in the countries they cover. This responsibility extends to the design and implementation of Decent Work Country Programmes in consultation with the tripartite constituents, as well as to implement ILO policies and decisions adopted by the Governing Body and the International Labour Conference.
19. ILO office directors will be responsible and accountable to the regional directors for the good governance and management of their offices in accordance with ILO rules and regulations and best practices in the UN system. The roll-out of IRIS to the regions will enhance transparency and facilitate performance and implementation reporting. As recommended in the annual report of the Chief Internal Auditor for the year ended 31 December 2008,<sup>5</sup> a more formalized accountability framework will be introduced in 2009 by the Office to further underpin internal governance mechanisms already in place, as well as to strengthen internal control Office-wide. This initiative will be accompanied

<sup>5</sup> GB.304/PFA/6/2.

by a management training programme targeted at those taking up management level responsibilities in the field.

20. DWTs will be managed by the ILO office director of their geographical location. The work plans of DWTs will be coordinated by the regional office. DWTs will foster an integrated approach to the promotion of the four strategic objectives of the Decent Work Agenda as required by the ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization. Technical specialists in DWTs will be deployed flexibly across countries in a region.
21. Technical sectors at headquarters will retain overall responsibility for quality control, coherence and development of ILO technical work, and global products. Requests from the regions for technical assistance from headquarters will come through the ILO offices managing the relevant DWTs in the region.
22. The roles and responsibilities of CTAs are both managerial and technical as they have overall responsibility for the management and implementation of technical cooperation projects in their field of expertise. The coverage of a CTA's responsibility depends on the geographical scope of the project. Reporting lines will vary from project to project, depending on the level of decentralization, the number of countries covered and the technical areas covered.

## National coordinators

*What are the selection processes and contractual status of national coordinators, their reporting lines as well as their role in UN country teams?*

23. National coordinators will operate at the national level only and will act as a liaison with the country office to which they report. Their role is to maintain close contact with the national tripartite constituents, to manage the negotiations and consultations on the priorities, outcomes and targets of Decent Work Country Programmes, to facilitate their implementation at the national level and coordinate ILO activities and project staff, in the countries.
24. At present, national coordinators (all located in Europe and Central Asia) are selected through a consultative process with the tripartite constituents of the country concerned. Independence and compliance with ILO values and principles are essential. However, the Office accepts that there have been some problems in relation to their perceived independence and that there is a need to clarify and formalize the process and criteria for their selection. Tripartite consultations will be maintained for their appointment but the Office will elaborate job descriptions and specific selection, recruitment and performance criteria.
25. In relation to the reporting relationship of national coordinators, at present they report to the director of the competent subregional office. In the proposed new structure, they will report to the director of the ILO office covering the country in which the national coordinator is located.
26. The terms and conditions of employment of existing national coordinators are governed by the *Rules Governing Conditions of Service of Branch Offices*. It is not proposed to make any changes to their contractual status.
27. National coordinators will ensure a continuing presence for the ILO within the UN reform process at the country level. They will be supported by the relevant ILO office director when higher level participation is required in UN country team deliberations.

## Role of the International Training Centre, Turin

*What is the role of the International Training Centre, Turin (the Centre), and how will it support field offices and provide services to constituents?*

28. In document GB.304/PFA/5, reference is made to the role of the Centre in relation to the provision of training for ILO field staff to ensure that the new roles and responsibilities are well understood in the process of reform of the field structure. In addition to this, it is clear that the Centre will continue to work closely with regional offices, as it does with headquarters, particularly in the implementation of its field programme. The Centre is involved in the delivery of training and learning components of regional and country programmes funded by RBTC, extra-budgetary funds and RBSA.
29. Examples of cooperation between the Centre and regional offices will continue to include:
- consultation on the allocation of fellowships for courses in the Centre in accordance with Decent Work Country Programme priorities;
  - joint planning and organization of courses in the field in response to national demands;
  - joint design and implementation of projects; and
  - staff development. In particular, in 2009 the Centre will be responsible for the delivery of a series of training workshops aiming at developing the capacity of ILO field staff to design and plan Decent Work Country Programmes in accordance with a results-based management approach; working with UN country teams in common planning and delivery processes; promoting and mainstreaming ILO policies and tools across UN organizations through the *Toolkit for Mainstreaming Employment and Decent Work*; project design and management.
30. The Centre has recently reached an agreement with regional offices on a communication protocol aimed at ensuring coherence and coordination of its work with the field. Regional focal points will coordinate Turin Centre activities in each region. Focal points already exist in the Americas, the Arab States and Africa and similar arrangements are being formalized with the regional offices for Asia and the Pacific and Europe and Central Asia.

## UN reform

*How will these proposals assist the ILO to advance its agenda in the UN reform process and to identify more clearly the synergies with UN reform? What does the statement in paragraph 27 of document GB.304/PFA/5 mean that “a priority for ILO–UN cooperation is to strengthen consultations with employers’ and worker’ organizations”?*

31. Greater responsibilities to ILO offices and greater technical mass are two principles in line with UN reform and “Delivering as One”. This alignment can only strengthen the cooperation between ILO and UN country teams. The increase in the number of national coordinators will provide the ILO with a presence in the UN country teams in a number of countries where it is currently not present.
32. The Office proposals are fully compatible with UN reform and “Delivering as One”. ILO offices will have greater responsibility for implementing programmes and this will enable them to better coordinate with UNDAFs and UN Resident Coordinators, including through national coordinators in those countries where the ILO is not resident. In Albania for

example, where the ILO works through a national coordinator reporting to the office in Budapest, this has led to much improved coordination with the UN Resident Coordinator. The flexible deployment of the technical specialists in DWTs across regions responding to demands from ILO offices is also very much in line with the UN reform. DWTs will also facilitate regional coordination with UN technical hubs being established in each region.

33. The statement in paragraph 27 reflects the mandate of the ILO and discussions at the Governing Body on the UN reform. The involvement at country level of Worker and Employer representatives, as well as ministries of labour and social affairs is a major priority for ILO office directors where it is necessary for the Office to advocate that they have a voice in the “Delivering as One” and national development framework processes.

## Other questions

*Why are the New York office and the Special Liaison arrangement in Myanmar not covered by the proposals?*

34. The New York office is not part of the field structure of the ILO as it is formally an extension of the Department of Partnerships and Development Cooperation at headquarters. The Special Liaison in Myanmar is a temporary arrangement established following a Governing Body decision and its continuation and role is subject to ongoing review by the Governing Body in the light of developments in Myanmar.

*Are there any other ILO offices/liaison arrangements that are not referred to in the paper?*

35. The ILO has project offices, which are linked to the lifespan of specific projects, in a number of locations in all regions. They are not therefore part of the formal ILO field structure. Special liaison arrangements exist in Bogotá, Kabul and in the Democratic Republic of Timor-Leste and these have been put in place on a temporary basis to respond to specific needs.

*What is meant by “a light coordination” capacity for Panama and why not place a DWT in Panama?*

36. The DWT in San José will provide technical support to Panama. However, the Office will continue to maintain a presence in Panama through the small team responsible for statistical activities for the region. This presence is supported by the Government of Panama which has provided facilities, including office accommodation, for this team. It is intended that the leader of this group will also undertake light coordination duties, i.e. serve as a resident focal point for the ILO within the framework of UN regional hub activities for which he/she will report to the regional director or the San José ILO office director, as appropriate.

*Which countries have approved Decent Work Country Programmes?*

- 37.** Up to date information on the number of approved Decent Work Country Programmes in each region as well as the status of those in preparation is available on the ILO public web site,<sup>6</sup> which includes copies of approved Decent Work Country Programmes.

Geneva, 23 March 2009.

*Submitted for debate and guidance.*

<sup>6</sup> [www.ilo.org/public/english/bureau/program/dwcp/countries/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/public/english/bureau/program/dwcp/countries/index.htm)



## Appendix I

### Staff and operating costs per location

Location	Accommodation				Operating and staff costs (2008)			
	Owned	Free	UN	Rent	Total operating and staff costs	Rent and related costs (2010–11) <sup>1</sup>	Other operating costs <sup>2</sup>	Staff costs (US\$)
					(1+2+3)	(1)	(2)	(3)
					<b>79 408 850</b>	<b>5 665 273</b>	<b>5 148 738</b>	<b>68 594 840</b>
New York				x	1 352 396	358 516	62 081	931 799
<b>AFRICA</b>								
Addis Ababa			x	x	7 703 648	179 993	801 307	6 722 347
Abidjan	x				1 576 723	7 996	47 486	1 521 240
Abuja			x		1 180 476	130 612	80 000	969 864
Antananarivo				x	738 980	48 769	88 341	601 870
Dar es Salaam	x				972 064	52 879	155 469	763 715
Cairo				x	1 412 646	43 039	65 983	1 303 624
Algiers			x		562 439	120 487	61 934	380 018
Dakar		x		x	2 274 181	87 925	174 467	2 011 790
Harare				x	2 144 279	202 175	120 146	1 821 958
Pretoria				x	971 407	163 798	163 599	644 010
Lusaka				x	1 049 864	136 810	149 856	763 198
Yaoundé		x			2 546 543	41 687	197 916	2 306 940
Kinshasa			x		702 779	72 906	139 449	490 424
<b>AMERICAS</b>								
Lima	x				5 827 989	152 645	244 200	5 431 144
Brasilia	x				1 424 954	73 258	78 090	1 273 606
Buenos Aires	x				759 682	34 421	89 870	635 391
Mexico City				x	1 403 382	117 736	116 748	1 168 898
Montevideo		x			903 349	46 671	110 142	746 536
Port-of-Spain				x	2 352 074	190 162	148 874	2 013 039
Santiago	x				3 159 471	95 973	190 417	2 873 080
San José				x	3 030 571	280 582	111 526	2 638 463
Washington				x	981 852	291 000	60 897	629 955
<b>ARAB STATES</b>								
Beirut				x	3 750 790	59 926	175 412	3 515 453

Location	Accommodation				Operating and staff costs (2008)			
	Owned	Free	UN	Rent	Total operating and staff costs	Rent and related costs (2010–11) <sup>1</sup>	Other operating costs <sup>2</sup>	Staff costs (US\$)
					(1+2+3)	(1)	(2)	(3)
Kuwait		x			301 921	4 373	15 641	281 907
Jerusalem				x	311 944	23 278	97 076	191 589
<b>ASIA</b>								
Bangkok			x	x	9 261 617	528 123	164 677	8 568 817
Yangon				x	398 088	52 000	32 169	313 919
Islamabad	x				901 086	98 470	81 268	721 348
Beijing				x	1 379 638	127 016	47 656	1 204 966
Hanoi				x	470 485	56 784	38 878	374 823
Manila				x	2 043 038	410 000	124 184	1 508 854
Suva				x	414 040	61 984	60 483	291 573
Jakarta				x	1 110 739	125 048	48 564	937 126
Dili		x			25 728	0	25 728	0
New Delhi	x				3 278 608	129 753	132 899	3 015 956
Kabul				x	311 930	47 676	28 683	235 572
Dhaka				x	579 499	79 384	40 540	459 575
Kathmandu				x	472 359	85 922	56 189	330 248
Colombo		x	x		466 392	55 394	38 879	372 119
Tokyo			x		1 251 132	253 500	110 488	887 145
<b>EUROPE</b>								
Ankara		x			698 048	17 944	27 169	652 936
Berlin				x	349 199	43 671	22 391	283 137
Brussels	x				584 932	18 473	26 292	540 168
Lisbonne		x			186 183	0	0	186 183
Madrid		x			181 990	0	13 984	168 006
Paris				x	583 767	140 598	34 330	408 839
Rome		x			440 661	24 322	19 479	396 860
Budapest		x			1 581 337	0	46 249	1 535 088
Moscow				x	2 181 316	269 551	0	1 911 765
National Coordinators (10)		5	5		697 158	22 042	180 636	494 480
<b>OTHER</b>								
ACT/EMP (Clermont Ferrand)					163 480	0	0	163 480

<sup>1</sup> Includes rent, building repairs and maintenance, contractual cleaning and supplies, UNDP shared premises costs, heating and utilities. <sup>2</sup> Includes communications, office supplies, furniture, equipment rent and maintenance, freight, insurance and miscellaneous and security costs (including estimated UNDSS shared security costs for 2008 to be billed in the second year of the biennium). Excludes travel.

## Appendix II

### Headcount and staff costs per location

Location	Headcount regular staff <sup>1</sup> (December 2008)				Staff costs (2008) <sup>2</sup> (US\$)
	Total	Professional staff	National officers and local branch office professionals <sup>3</sup>	Local General Service staff	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>747</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>418</b>	<b>68 594 840</b>
New York	7	3	0	4	931 799
<b>AFRICA</b>					
Addis Ababa	50	25	3	22	6 722 347
Abidjan	15	0	1	14	1 521 240
Abuja	11	1	1	9	969 864
Antananarivo	10	2	2	6	601 870
Dar es Salaam	12	1	1	10	763 715
Cairo	19	6	2	11	1 303 624
Algiers	9	0	3	6	380 018
Dakar	35	16	2	17	2 011 790
Harare	15	4	2	9	1 821 958
Pretoria	11	4	1	6	644 010
Lusaka	13	1	3	9	763 198
Yaoundé	26	9	2	15	2 306 940
Kinshasa	7	1	2	4	490 424
<b>AMERICAS</b>					
Lima	43	16	7	20	5 431 144
Brasilia	16	3	4	9	1 273 606
Buenos Aires	10	1	3	6	635 391
Mexico City	14	3	3	8	1 168 898
Montevideo	13	2	3	8	746 536
Port-of-Spain	22	8	3	11	2 013 039
Santiago	21	8	3	10	2 873 080
San José	27	10	4	13	2 638 463
Washington	3	1	0	2	629 955
<b>ARAB STATES</b>					
Beirut	33	13	2	18	3 515 453
Kuwait	3	0	0	3	281 907
Jerusalem	4	1	1	2	191 589

Location	Headcount regular staff <sup>1</sup> (December 2008)				Staff costs (2008) <sup>2</sup> (US\$)
	Total	Professional staff	National officers and local branch office professionals <sup>3</sup>	Local General Service staff	
<b>ASIA</b>					
Bangkok	74	27	11	36	8 568 817
Yangon	4	1	1	2	313 919
Islamabad	8	2	1	5	721 348
Beijing	17	6	3	8	1 204 966
Hanoi	8	2	1	5	374 823
Manila	20	4	1	15	1 508 854
Suva	9	1	0	8	291 573
Jakarta	17	4	3	10	937 126
New Delhi	37	10	5	22	3 015 956
Kabul	1	0	0	1	235 572
Dhaka	11	1	2	8	459 575
Kathmandu	6	1	2	3	330 248
Colombo	9	1	1	7	372 119
Tokyo	8	0	3	5	887 145
<b>EUROPE</b>					
Ankara	4	0	2	2	652 936
Berlin	3	0	1	2	283 137
Brussels	3	2	0	1	540 168
Lisbonne	1	0	1	0	186 183
Madrid	1	0	1	0	168 006
Paris	2	0	1	1	408 839
Rome	3	0	1	2	396 860
Budapest	20	6	1	13	1 535 088
Moscow	20	7	3	10	1 911 765
Turin	1	1	0	0	0
Clermont Ferrand	1	1	0	0	163 480
National Coordinators:	10	0	10	0	494 480
<i>Baku</i>	1	0	1	0	
<i>Minsk</i>	1	0	1	0	
<i>Almaty</i>	1	0	1	0	
<i>Bishkek</i>	1	0	1	0	
<i>Yerevan</i>	1	0	1	0	
<i>Belgrade</i>	1	0	1	0	
<i>Tirana</i>	1	0	1	0	

Location	Headcount regular staff <sup>1</sup> (December 2008)				Staff costs (2008) <sup>2</sup> (US\$)
	Total	Professional staff	National officers and local branch office professionals <sup>3</sup>	Local General Service staff	
<i>Sarajevo</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	
<i>Kiev</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	
<i>Chisinau</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	

<sup>1</sup> Regular staff funded on regular budget and associated sources of fund, excluding extra-budgetary funds. <sup>2</sup> Regular budget and associated sources of fund. <sup>3</sup> Includes national coordinators.

## Appendix III

### Extra-budgetary Technical Cooperation Expenditure by region and country (excluding administrative expenditure) (in US\$'000)

Country or territory	2007	2008 (preliminary data)	Total
<b>Africa</b>			
Africa regional	11 347	12 656	24 002
East Africa subregional	58	68	125
Sahel subregional	290	48	339
Southern Africa subregional	2 756	2 746	5 502
West Africa subregional	1 059	1 715	2 774
Angola		5	5
Benin	48	45	93
Botswana		136	136
Burkina Faso	191	216	407
Burundi	-21		-21
Cameroon	603	684	1 286
Congo	40	85	125
Côte d'Ivoire	83	127	209
Democratic Republic of the Congo	2 069	1 294	3 363
Egypt	152	245	398
Ethiopia	599	1 133	1 732
Gambia	85		85
Ghana	1 715	940	2 655
Kenya	1 617	1 382	3 000
Lesotho	103	126	229
Liberia	1 046	1 750	2 796
Madagascar	4 623	6 411	11 034
Malawi	847	743	1 590
Mali	1 201	2 187	3 388
Mauritania	76	0	76
Morocco	1 313	1 371	2 684
Mozambique	331	936	1 266
Niger	888	223	1 111
Nigeria	14		14
Rwanda	63	93	157
São Tome and Principe	7		7

Country or territory	2007	2008 (preliminary data)	Total
Senegal	908	1 110	2 018
Sierra Leone		123	123
Somalia	3 818	2 301	6 119
South Africa	1 652	2 126	3 778
Sudan	100	568	668
Swaziland		159	159
Tanzania, United Republic of	1 571	2 924	4 495
Togo	84	419	503
Uganda	325	529	854
Zambia	1 412	2 525	3 937
Zimbabwe	248	271	519
<b>Total Africa</b>	<b>43 321</b>	<b>50 418</b>	<b>93 740</b>
<b>Americas</b>			
Latin-American regional	7 356	6 902	14 257
Andean countries subregional	50	368	418
Caribbean subregional	12	43	55
Central America subregional	2 282	2 793	5 074
Southern Cone subregional	1 091	645	1 736
Argentina	2 651	3 529	6 180
Aruba	12		12
Belize	11		11
Bolivia	312	979	1 291
Brazil	2 434	2 711	5 144
Chile	98	181	278
Colombia	145	1 410	1 556
Costa Rica	4	13	16
Dominica	5		5
Dominican Republic	527	775	1 301
Ecuador	1 079	529	1 608
El Salvador	794	1 366	2 160
Guatemala	50		50
Guyana	187	253	440
Haiti	267	477	744
Honduras		25	25
Mexico	338		338
Nicaragua	2	1	2
Panama	264	635	899
Peru		7	7
Saint Lucia	-5	25	20

Country or territory	2007	2008 (preliminary data)	Total
Trinidad and Tabago	203	125	329
Uruguay	661	1 092	1 753
<b>Total Americas</b>	<b>20 827</b>	<b>24 884</b>	<b>45 711</b>
<b>Asia and the Pacific</b>			
Regional	6 263	6 853	13 116
Eastern Asia subregional	151	99	251
South Eastern Asia subregional	212	773	985
Afghanistan	1 457	2 311	3 768
Bangladesh	436	1 397	1 834
Cambodia	3 491	3 166	6 657
China	3 662	3 573	7 235
Fiji	134	257	391
India	7 866	4 130	11 996
Indonesia	9 790	9 353	19 144
Lao People's Democratic Republic	471	64	534
Malaysia		23	23
Mongolia	519	562	1 080
Myanmar		4	4
Nepal	471	1 318	1 789
Pakistan	4 542	5 019	9 562
Papua New Guinea	154	227	382
Philippines	1 627	151	1 777
Sri Lanka	4 488	3 708	8 196
Thailand	1 157	1 559	2 716
Timor-Leste, Democratic Republic of	4 152	2 913	7 065
Viet Nam	1 591	1 989	3 580
<b>Total Asia and the Pacific</b>	<b>52 635</b>	<b>49 449</b>	<b>102 084</b>
<b>Europe</b>			
Regional	2 415	2 834	5 249
Central and Eastern Europe subregional	892	1 835	2 727
Eastern Europe and Central Asia subregional	2 661	1 901	4 562
Albania	99	83	182
Armenia		38	38
Belarus		13	13
Cyprus	9	27	36
Finland		11	11
France	158	80	238
Germany	224	177	400
Greece	132	74	206

Country or territory	2007	2008 (preliminary data)	Total
Hungary	51	93	144
Italy	29		29
Moldova, Republic of	59	273	332
Portugal	94	121	215
Russian Federation	684	526	1 210
Serbia	3	106	109
Serbia and Montenegro	87	86	173
Spain		61	61
Sweden	149		149
Switzerland	26	275	301
Tajikistan	402	208	610
Turkey	3 693	152	3 844
Ukraine	328	387	716
Uzbekistan		95	95
<b>Total Europe</b>	<b>12 195</b>	<b>9 454</b>	<b>21 649</b>
<b>Arab States, Middle East</b>			
Regional	981	893	1 874
Arab States subregional	397	327	724
Occupied Arab territories		91	91
Iraq	249	1 654	1 903
Jordan	540	1 168	1 708
Kuwait	8		8
Lebanon	151	1 328	1 479
Oman		29	29
Qatar	401	39	440
Syrian Arab Republic	32	21	53
Yemen		145	145
<b>Total Arab States</b>	<b>2 760</b>	<b>5 693</b>	<b>8 453</b>
<b>Total interregional</b>	<b>27 745</b>	<b>31 081</b>	<b>58 826</b>
<b>Total global</b>	<b>9 811</b>	<b>13 040</b>	<b>22 851</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>169 294</b>	<b>184 020</b>	<b>353 314</b>

Note: Negative figures indicate previous year adjustments. Due to rounding off, some totals may appear incorrect and under 500 appears as zero.



