

FICSA CIRCULAR



FICSA/CIRC/1211
Ref: Offorg/HLCM

Geneva, 23 October 2015

To: Chairs, Member Associations/Unions
Members of the Executive Committee
Chairs, Members with Associate Status
Chairs, Associations with Consultative Status
Presidents, Federations with Observer Status
Chairs and Vice-Chairs of Standing Committees

From: Diab El-Tabari, President

**JOINT FICSA/CCISUA REPORT ON THE
30th SESSION OF THE HIGH-LEVEL COMMITTEE ON MANAGEMENT (HLCM)¹
(IMO London, 5 and 6 October 2015)**

by Diab El-Tabari, FICSA President, and Marianne Ward, CCISUA

The 30th session of the HLCM was chaired by Ms. Irina Bakova, UNESCO Director General, and the Vice-Chair Ms. Jan Beagle, Deputy Executive Director of UNAIDS.

CCISUA and FICSA represented staff at the meeting. Interventions were focused on the ICSC compensation review, the mandatory age of separation (MAS), after-service health insurance (ASHI), duty of care and staff security issues.

There was a general discussion amongst the HLCM members that there should not be “jobs for life” in the UN system. Linked to this were concerns about mobility between organizations of the common system, which would help to expand employee skills and professional perspectives. FICSA commented that “jobs for life” should indeed not be in one just organization; the system should become flexible and practical to accommodate for staff to move between the UN organizations. As it stands, the system is almost set up to prevent such moves.

Compensation review package

The International Civil Service Commission (ICSC) was represented by the Vice-Chair, Mr. Wolfgang Stöckl. The statement was quite defensive with regard to the comments outlined in the CEB document (ref. CEB/2015/HLCM/12, see Annex 1). A written response to the CEB paper was provided at the meeting (Annex 2).

¹ See FICSA/CIRC/1209/Rev.1 for the FICSA statement.

While there were aspects of the ICSC proposal that the organizations embraced, which supported simplicity and cost containment, the majority felt that the package as it stood was not helping the UN to be fit for purpose, nor did it meet the criteria outlined by the Chief Executives Board (CEB) at the beginning of the process. There was also concern that the package as proposed was not in alignment with the strategic direction of the UN. Organizations, across-the-board, emphasized concerns with:

- Dis-incentivizing mobility at a time when the UN was trying to increase staff mobility
- Removal of aspects of support to staff in hardship duty stations that would make it even more difficult to recruit in these locations
- Undermining support to single parents at a time when the UN was making efforts to support gender diversity.

It should be noted that UNICEF was the only agency which explicitly stated that they were against the Professional to Director category decompression aspects of the proposal.

Also UN Women commented that the new package would have an adverse effect on single parents.

An Information Paper dated 5 October 2015 on proposed changes to the field package is attached (Annex 3).

The UN Medical Director expressed great concern that the package was undermining organizational efforts to support mental health and well-being of staff, particularly those in the most difficult locations. The UN Medical Doctors also noted the increasing statistics of sick leave and disabilities among UN staff.

The staff federations, in a joint intervention, emphasized that the views were generally in line with those of the CEB, with the exception of decompression. There was concern that, with the end to accelerated home leave, no DSA for R&R, which is compounded with the elimination of the APA from next year, the review was putting a disproportionate impact on staff who were mobile and in hardship locations. It would demotivate staff in the most difficult locations, who would feel unsupported by the organization for the important work that they do, as well as for making the already hard decision to leave their families behind to do critical work for the UN, even harder for them.

Mandatory age of separation (MAS)

The ICSC presented their proposal to increase the MAS to 65 as of 1 January 2017, outlining that this timing was related to the implementation of the compensation review. The organizations were very concerned about the timing of this change for their budgetary cycles and would prefer its implementation from 1 January 2018.

In a joint statement, FICSA outlined the clear disagreement between staff and management on this issue, which has now been discussed for more than 5 years. There was a request for clarification on the linkage between the implementation date for the change in the MAS and that of the compensation review. The ICSC stated that as the two issues were in the same report to the General Assembly, they felt that they would be implemented in tandem. The staff federations would therefore need to ensure the separation of the two issues once lobbying with the Fifth Committee started.

After-service health insurance (ASHI)

Given that not all agencies had fully funded ASHI for their retiring staff and the perception that health-care costs were increasing, the HLCCM had a working group (WG) to look at the issue within the UN system. The recommendations of the WG included:

- Ensuring collective negotiation by agencies to get better value for money on insurance contracts
- Finding ways to encourage the use of national systems, where possible
- Underwriting reviews of existing and future insurance schemes to ensure cost competitiveness.

In a joint statement, CCISUA outlined that it was a good idea to use the collective bargaining of the UN system, but needed to keep a high level of coverage, as currently enjoyed by staff, which they can also expect for the future. It would be good to use national systems, but only where such national systems could provide a reasonable level of quality care. Finally, it was important to ensure that UN insurance schemes were adequately covering preventative care for staff, as it was a noble investment for the system and for staff.

Safety and security

A briefing was held by the Under-Secretary-General of the UN Department for Safety and Security (UNDSS), Mr. Peter Thomas Drennan. Important points of discussion included how the UN system could better support victims of violence as well as their families and ensure a higher level of responsibility from host governments for safety and security. The federations asked for information on any foreseen changes regarding the UN policy and practice on the evacuation of national staff, in particular after the recent issues in this regard in Yemen.

Mr. Drennan outlined that the justice registry should help senior UN officials continue to bring up issues regarding safety and security and specific incidents in their interaction with Member States. He also outlined that there were improvements in the provision of counselling services. With regards to the relocation of national staff, the UN system needed to be realistic as it was a difficult issue. For the national staff in Yemen, more communication regarding the contingency plans in place for them and their families has helped to improve the situation, and the continued dialogue with national staff was an important lesson learned from that operation.

Duty of care

There was only an update on the ongoing work of the WG which, as part of phase one had looked at issues emanating from Afghanistan, Haiti, Mali, Somalia, Syria and the Ebola countries. Thus far, more medical and psycho-social support in high-risk environments had been identified as a concern. A full report would be provided in December, and phase two would commence to bring recommendations to the HLCCM in March 2016.

The FICSA proposal for cost sharing the release with pay the two positions of President and General Secretary was briefly discussed. It was agreed to establish a working group to look at how this issue could better be addressed. Ms. Carole Wainaina from UNOHRM commented that it was important to look at alternatives; including membership fees and for such support to cover all staff associations/unions rather than just FICSA.

Outcome of the ICSC Review of the UN Compensation Package

Statement given by the Vice-Chair of the ICSC at the 13th HLCM Session,
London, 5 October 2015

Dear colleagues,

It is a pleasure for me to address this High-Level Committee also on behalf of our Chairman, who is on official mission to assess hardship duty stations.

At the same time, I wish to express our concern that *some of the observations and statements contained in document HLCM/12 are based on incomplete information and may lead to misleading conclusions. Unfortunately the final and official version of our annual report is only available as of this morning.*

We are circulating a written response to this paper with additional clarifications and explanations, along with some illustrative calculations relating primarily to the field package.

We will of course be ready to provide any additional information which you may find necessary.

At this stage, I will not deal with every individual point and concern raised in the paper as most of them are covered by the supplementary information we are providing. I would however like to make a number of comments of a more general nature so as to enable the Committee to take a more holistic view of the review results.

Firstly, *the scope of the review*. It should be stressed from the outset that this exercise undoubtedly went far beyond any of the comprehensive review done in the past. The Commission reviewed *fundamental approaches* towards expatriate pay compensation, assessed the rationale and purpose of every package element, whenever necessary, revised them to be fit for purpose, within the overall impact of the package.

The ICSC assessed the usefulness and effectiveness of the different remuneration elements, addressing specific issues identified, analyzing interrelationships within the overall package, eliminating overlapping and outdated elements, and enhancing or recalibrating others in order to achieve the best fit for purpose and value for money.

More than that: it also looked at broader fields relating to the conditions of service, including the total rewards concept, as well as assessed and flagged a possible impact on other related areas such as pensions, staff assessment, etc. Throughout this process the Commission remained open to the programmatic needs of organizations and repeatedly invited your representatives to become more engaged in the working groups and the Commission sessions as well as on the margins of the sessions. The legal implications of the proposed changes were also reviewed. And, as you know, this is Phase I of the project: review of other categories of staff is coming up.

Some of elements of the package were revalidated and confirmed, others were completely revamped, still others revised in accordance with the review criteria – but all of

them were reviewed with utmost care. In essence, no issue – whether perceived or real – was left unattended. So, we are puzzled at some comments which characterize this review as incremental or piecemeal. We would certainly disagree with this.

It is obvious that no outcome could be perfect, nor can it be expected that everyone would be completely satisfied with the outcome.

Yes, it would of course produce winners and losers and, yes, some transitional arrangements are proposed to mitigate the impact for the serving staff, when justified, but should winners and losers really be the main yardstick for measuring the results of the review? We think not.

After all, if it is our major concern, we might as well forget about implementing any change. But even as regards winners and losers, there seems to be quite a lot of misunderstanding floating around about the review's impact, especially regarding the field package. To help with this, we are also circulating some data to set the record straight.

In our view, the review should be assessed against the established criteria. Returning to the claim that the ICSC and HLCM *criteria* for the review are different, I wish to point out that, in fact, both are aligned to a large degree.

In this regard, we do believe that the overall package brings substantial structural improvements, in particular with regard to the unified scale structure, performance-related pay, the streamlined social package, the revamped education grant scheme, the revised field package, the introduction of recruitment and performance bonuses, and several significant changes in the post adjustment system.

These changes aim at achieving most of the review goals - whether they concern competitiveness, simplification, streamlining and cohesiveness as well as sustainability - in a comprehensive and balanced manner.

And one more general comment. Contrary to some claims we hear from a number of quarters, the review was conducted on an as inclusive a basis as possible. Both the organizations and the staff have participated in every stage of the compensation review over almost three years, and had ample opportunity to come forward with proposals. Obviously, not all of these proposals were accepted by ICSC, but all of them were certainly considered.

I think we can only achieve it by working together in an open and interactive way and I welcome the introductory remarks of the Chair at the opening of the session.

Now, if I could dwell on selected specific concerns which we think require our reaction.

We have heard from staff associations that the *new package steals from the poor to give to the rich*. This claim is simply misleading. The purpose of giving D-level staff more steps is to attract and retain more staff at that level, to decompress pay between D-level and P-level staff, to deal with margin issues, and to align the pay structure at those grades more with the one at the other grade levels.

We have heard from the organizations and the staff federations that the new package disadvantages *single parents*. We do not believe that any compensation package should be used to meet all staff personal choices; other measures, including flexible working arrangements, can be applied by organizations to ease the burden for single parents. As you know, transitional measures are planned for any affected staff.

We do not see that the new package unfairly impacts *staff in the field*. It is true that the Commission had found that the current relocation provisions were a mix of incentives that duplicated other allowances in the scheme and an inefficient cost recovery mechanism that often allows staff to benefit from windfall gains on moves.

The new relocation package might not give staff the same amount as the current one, but would be more appropriate and would not duplicate other benefits.

We also heard that the new package would increase *administration costs*, but see no evidence to this effect. De facto, several new elements, such as the streamlining of the education grant, and the lump-summing of allowances, will ease the administrative burden.

The transition measures may be initially be cumbersome and costly to administer, but the purpose of these measures is to ease the impact on staff, not to ease the administrative burden, and are in any event time bound. These measures are being proposed to protect staff and organizations alike.

The *scale structure* was reviewed for competitiveness versus the comparator pay levels. The resulting proposal would bring base UN pay more in line with the comparator and would allow some decompression at senior levels. The scope of decompression is limited by the comparator pay levels but can hardly be called minimal, especially as proposed at the D-2 and ASG/USG levels.

I wish to highlight that, contrary to what is implied in the HLCM paper, the *post adjustment* system was, in fact, comprehensively reviewed by the Advisory Committee on Post Adjustment Questions (ACPAQ) and by the Commission.

As a result, several important changes pertaining to both the methodology underlying the post adjustment index calculation, and the operational rules governing the determination and adjustment of salary levels, have been introduced. These changes will enhance the predictability of salary adjustments and serve as a tool for cost containment both in the short and long term.

These changes include the synchronization of the adjustment cycle for all group I duty stations with New York, the modification of the operational rule regulating adjustment of salaries to account for inflation, which would limit application of this rule exclusively to cases of significant annual inflation, and the modification of the transitional arrangements in cases of significantly low cost-of-living survey results.

While reviewing the compensation package, the Commission took note of various letters from Executive Heads to the ICSC Chairman and the requests from governing bodies requesting it to take into consideration the *financial constraints* a number of organizations were facing. Furthermore, many Member States and Executive Heads stressed the need for *better recognition of performance* as well as managing under-performance.

The Commission listened and proposed a revised Performance Management Framework which gives the organizations the flexibility they are requesting. The Commission expects some financial and programmatic impact from the pay for performance proposal.

With regard to *mobility*, the Commission was of the view that international civil servants, by the nature of their jobs, should be mobile and accept assignments where their services are needed.

Therefore it did not see a strong need for having a separate allowance to incentivize geographical mobility. It also noted that the comparator does not pay a mobility allowance. However, given the recent introduction of mobility schemes in some organizations, the Commission agreed to maintain a mobility incentive scheme for the near future, but to review this incentive in five years to re-evaluate its continuing need.

Any incentive for mobility should function as a tool in the interest of the organization rather than for past moves of individual staff as in the current system, and, therefore, the recommended system would focus on encouraging future moves.

In recognition of the very difficult situations that staff members face in hardship locations, no reduction in the amounts of the *hardship allowance* is proposed. It would have one unified rate for staff with dependants and single staff.

The Commission found that the current *relocation package* is complex and not easily understood by staff. The elements of the new package would be simpler to understand, paid at the time of the move and not continue for years after the staff member had moved. It would also be more predictable as the lump sum portion would be based on one month salary at the P-4/6 level and not on individual staff members' salary.

Finally, I could not stress enough the fact that the comprehensive review aims to strike a *balance* among various important objectives which are not always complementary.

For example, what could foster simplification may not necessarily promote equity or cost containment;

what could help coherence may not be instrumental for flexibility, etc. and the review results should be looked at from this comprehensive platform.

Overall, based on the above, we do believe that the review of the UN compensation package has largely achieved this balance in a comprehensive manner, and *is definitely more fit for purpose than the current system*.

As regards some pending concerns, we believe the compensation package should not be cast in stone for decades to come as has more or less been the case up till now.

Work on improving and updating some of its elements should continue as necessary to ensure that it keeps pace with our rapidly changing times.

5 October 2015

Response from ICSC on HLCM document CEB/2015/HLCM/12, Update on outcome of the ICSC Review of the UN Compensation Package

HLCM/CEB Review criteria

CEB had identified as its main principle for the ICSC review that a future compensation system had to be *fit for purpose and internationally competitive*. It should serve to attract, retain and promote high performing staff, cater for the broad set of knowledge-intensive skills and profiles needed by the UN system organizations to deliver on their respective mandates, and be adaptable to the organizations' different business models.

The overarching objectives for organizations were to encourage mobility across organizations and geographic locations, with a particular focus on hardship duty stations; to develop the new compensation system around a core package, based on common principles, and implement it with the flexibility necessary to meet different organizational needs; to promote innovation, transparency and cost-effectiveness, and reduce transaction costs through simplification.

Points of critique by HLCM

HLCM, in its document, claims that the package proposed by the ICSC to the General Assembly is not fit for purpose, that it decreases the competitiveness of the organizations, that it leads to only marginal savings, that it cuts field staff entitlements disproportionately to those of other staff, and that it leads to high transitional and transactional cost.

ICSC Response to HLCM observations made in HLCM/2015/12

The ICSC criteria and those expressed by the HLCM/CEB are to a large degree aligned.

The Commission reviewed fundamental approaches towards expatriate pay compensation, assessed the rationale of every package element, and holistically looked at the overall impact of the package. The ICSC assessed the usefulness and effectiveness of the different remuneration elements, addressing specific issues identified, analyzing interrelationships within the overall package, eliminating overlapping and outdated elements, and enhancing or recalibrating others in order to achieve the best value for money.

The Commission is of the opinion that the overall package brings substantial structural improvements, in particular with regard to the new scale structure, the streamlined social package, the revamped Education Grant scheme, the revised field package, and several significant changes in the post adjustment system. These changes aim at achieving most of the review goals, whether they concern competitiveness, simplification, streamlining, or cohesiveness.

The scale structure was reviewed for competitiveness versus the comparator pay levels. The resulting proposal would bring base UN pay more in line with the comparator and would allow some decompression at senior levels. The scope of decompression is limited by the

comparator pay levels but can hardly be called minimal, especially as proposed at the D-2 and ASG/USG levels.

The Commission also studied and discussed other competing labour markets, including some international organizations and other entities, but never lost sight of the institutionalized link with the U.S. civil service as clearly established by the General Assembly.

Although the Commission had requested real data on costs from the organizations, many organizations faced challenges in complying with ICSC's request for data. Therefore several costing calculations had to be based on scenarios and assumptions.

Cost effectiveness and predictability

While reviewing the compensation package, the Commission took note of various letters from Executive Heads to the ICSC Chairman and the requests from governing bodies requesting to take into consideration the financial constraints a number of organizations were facing.

Besides the cost savings relating to the redesign of the package, the impact of the revised step periodicity should not be underestimated. It can be expected that, in the long run, this would be an important cost containment tool.

Post Adjustment Matters

Contrary to what is implied in the HLCM paper, the post adjustment system was, in fact, comprehensively reviewed by the Advisory Committee on Post Adjustment Questions (ACPAQ) and by the Commission, and these changes are reflected and explained in our Annual Report.

Equity

With regard to equity, in-depth discussions took place as to the degree with which family circumstances needed to be considered.

The Commission was very clear, from the beginning of the review. Reviewing all categories together would have caused confusion and delays. In this context, it should not be forgotten that the remuneration of the different categories are governed by completely different pay principles.

Simplification

The proposed new package has:

- A scale structure of unified rates which only focuses on paying for the job and replaces a structure which included dependency elements, and which had unexplainable and different number of steps at various grades;
- A social package which pays for dependants based on straightforward eligibility criteria which are no longer interchangeable (i.e. spouse for child);
- An education grant scheme that is applied globally, with a simplified and streamlined expenses list and no longer driven by circularity;

- A field package with a significantly reduced number of rates;
- A post adjustment system which is more streamlined as expressed above;
- Separation payments which have all been revalidated or been revised for relevance.

Given the above, it is obvious that the proposed package would be simpler than the present package.

Support for Diversity

The Commission discussed several matters brought up under this issue, such as early childcare under the education grant scheme. The Commission found that expanding the scheme to include pre-school institutions would contradict several goals of the review, including being fit for purpose, simplification and cost. The ICSC found that financial concerns could not cover all aspects of a staff member's family situation and believed that Organizations should provide non-monetary incentives to assist staff in this respect. A number of work/life policies and measures are already in place in common system organizations to support staff to balance their professional and private lives.

Motivation for staff and rewards for performance

The Commission would expect some impact from the pay for performance proposal. The revised Performance Management Framework gives the organizations the flexibility they are requesting. Many Member States and Executive Heads stressed the need for better recognition of performance as well as managing under-performance. The global staff survey also indicated that staff wanted to see closer links to pay and performance.

Support for mobility programmes

The Commission was of the view that international civil servants, by the nature of their jobs, should be mobile and accept assignments where their services are needed. Therefore it did not see a strong need for having a separate allowance to incentivize geographical mobility. It also noted that the comparator does not pay a mobility allowance. However, given the recent introduction of mobility schemes in some organizations, the Commission agreed to maintain a mobility incentive scheme for the near future, but to review this incentive in five years to re-evaluate its continuing need. Any incentive for mobility should function as a tool in the interest of the organization rather than for past moves of individual staff as in the current system, and, therefore, the recommended system would focus on encouraging future moves.

In recognition of the very difficult situations that staff members face in hardship location, there would be no reduction in the amounts of the hardship allowance and that staff currently at the single rate would have gains. The hardship allowance would have one unified rate for staff with dependents and single staff.

The Commission found that the current relocation package is complex, not easily understood by staff, continued to be paid for five years after the staff member had moved to the new location (non-removal allowance) and included the payment of one month salary after the beginning of the third year of assignment in a field duty station. The ICSC also observed that the current lump-sum amounts for relocation shipment (i.e. relocation grant) paid by some

organizations was not set by the Commission as a common system payment modality. All elements in the recommended relocation package are based on a cost recovery approach with the additional intention that staff should not lose or gain significant amounts. The elements of the new package would be simpler to understand, paid at the time of the move and not continue for years after the staff member had moved. It would also be more predictable as the lump sum portion would be based on one month salary at the P-4/6 level and not on individual staff members' salary.

In conclusion, we wish to highlight that the proposed system would definitely be more fit for purpose than the current system since all elements have been reviewed in a comprehensive manner and revised as appropriate.

The proposed system would be more competitive because (a) its pay has been brought more in line with that of the comparator; (b) proposed recruitment bonuses would provide the organizations with a flexible tool to hire to hard-to-fill positions; (c) the proposed change in the management of the net remuneration margin would allow for better alignment of pay with that of the comparator; and (d) incentives for serving in hardship locations would be enhanced; The system also be better linked to staff members' actual performance and would be simpler and more streamlined: it would have a unified salary rate structure, a straightforward social package, a much simpler education grant scheme, a simplified field package and a more predictable post adjustment system;

The comprehensive review aims to strike a balance among various important objectives which are not always complementary. Overall, based on the above, we do believe that the review of the UN compensation package has largely achieved its goals in a comprehensive and balanced manner.

5 October 2015

Information Paper

Compensation Review of the United Nations Common system

Proposed changes to the field package

Summary

The present document provides a comparison of key elements of the current and proposed field remuneration package of the UN common system. The elements considered for this analysis include the base/floor salary, the post adjustment, the proposed spouse allowance and the field allowances such as the mobility allowance (to be replaced by the mobility incentive), the hardship allowance, the additional hardship allowance (to be replaced by the non-family service allowance) and the danger pay. The comparison does not include elements such as education grant, child allowance and rental subsidy.

For analytical purposes, Dhaka, which is a "B" category duty station and Kabul, a "E" category duty station are used as examples. The situation in a "B" category family duty station would not be different from a "C" category family duty station as there would be no change in the amount of mobility allowance/incentive as well as no reductions in the hardship allowance. In the same way, the situation in a "D" category non-family duty station would not be different from a "E" category non-family duty station as there would be no change in the amount of mobility allowance/incentive as well as no reductions in the hardship allowance.

For the purposes of the current mobility allowance, assignment numbers are put together into three groups: 2-3, 4-6 and, 7 and over. Therefore, it should be noted that the field packages of staff on 2nd and 3rd assignments would be similar in a specific duty station, and the same would be true for staff on 4th, 5th and 6th assignments. Further, the scenarios presented here would not be applicable to staff who have moved to a new duty station before the implementation of the mobility incentive. It is because the Commission has decided to recommend as a transitional measure continuation of the current amounts for the mobility allowance for up to five years at the same duty station or until they moved to another duty station.

Dhaka, Bangladesh: "C" category family duty station

Table 1: Total emoluments and amount accruing from the field package (in US\$/year)

Single Staff		1 st Assignment		2 nd -3 rd Assignments		4 th - 6 th Assignments		7 th + Assignments	
		Current	Future	Current	Future	Current	Future	Current	Future
P-2-3	Total Package	78,941	82,877	84,291	89,377	86,181	89,377	88,701	89,377
	Field Package	7,840	10,470	13,190	16,970	15,080	16,970	17,600	16,970
P-4-6	Total Package	117,691	123,740	123,851	131,865	126,001	131,865	128,901	131,865
	Field Package	9,590	12,780	15,750	20,905	17,900	20,905	20,800	20,905
D-1-2	Total Package	151,904	157,632	158,854	167,382	161,294	167,382	164,574	167,382
	Field Package	11,340	15,110	18,290	24,860	20,730	24,860	24,010	24,860
Staff with dependents									
P-2-3	Total Package	86,402	87,222	93,532	93,722	96,042	93,722	99,412	93,722
	Field Package	10,470	10,470	17,600	16,970	20,110	16,970	23,480	16,970
P-4-6	Total Package	129,142	130,397	137,342	138,522	140,212	138,522	144,082	138,522
	Field Package	12,780	12,780	20,980	20,905	23,850	20,905	27,720	20,905
D-1-2	Total Package	167,353	168,997	176,623	178,747	179,873	178,747	184,253	178,747
	Field Package	15,110	15,110	24,380	24,860	27,630	24,860	32,010	24,860

Table 2: Amount accruing from the field package as a percentage of net remuneration

Single Staff		1 st Assignment		2 nd -3 rd Assignments		4 th -6 th Assignments		7 th + Assignments	
		Current	Future	Current	Future	Current	Future	Current	Future
P-2-3		11%	14%	19%	23%	21%	23%	25%	23%
P-4-6		9%	12%	15%	19%	17%	19%	19%	19%
D-1-2		8%	11%	13%	17%	15%	17%	17%	17%
Staff with dependents									
P-2-3		14%	14%	23%	22%	26%	22%	31%	22%
P-4-6		11%	11%	18%	18%	20%	18%	24%	18%
D-1-2		10%	10%	16%	16%	18%	16%	21%	16%

Table 3: Summary of winners/losers (in US\$/year)

Single Staff		1 st Assignment		2 nd - 3 rd Assignments		4 th -6 th Assignments		7 th + Assignments	
		Gain/Loss	Gain/Loss	Gain/Loss	Gain/Loss	Gain/Loss	Gain/Loss		
P-2-3	Total Package		3,937		5,087		3,197		677
	Field Package		2,630		3,780		1,890		-630
P-4-6	Total Package		6,049		8,014		5,864		2,964
	Field Package		3,190		5,155		3,005		105
D-1-2	Total Package		5,728		8,528		6,088		2,808
	Field Package		3,770		6,570		4,130		850
Staff with dependents									
P-2-3	Total Package		820		190		-2,320		-5,690
	Field Package		0		-630		-3,140		-6,510
P-4-6	Total Package		1,256		1,181		-1,689		-5,559
	Field Package		0		-75		-2,945		-6,815
D-1-2	Total Package		1,644		2,124		-1,126		-5,506
	Field Package		0		480		-2,770		-7,150

Kabul, Afghanistan: "E" category non-family duty station with 6 weeks R & R breaks

Table 4: Total emoluments and amount accruing from the field package (in US\$/year)

Single Staff		1 st Assignment		2 nd -3 rd Assignments		4 th - 6 th Assignments		7 th + Assignments	
		Current	Future	Current	Future	Current	Future	Current	Future
P-2-3	Total Package	115,635	122,366	120,985	128,866	122,875	128,866	125,395	128,866
	Field Package	38,820	44,140	44,170	50,640	46,060	50,640	48,580	50,640
P-4-6	Total Package	159,523	167,497	165,683	175,622	167,833	175,622	170,733	175,622
	Field Package	42,735	47,620	48,895	55,745	51,045	55,745	53,945	55,745
D-1-2	Total Package	197,220	203,925	204,170	213,675	206,610	213,675	209,890	213,675
	Field Package	45,360	49,950	52,310	59,700	54,750	59,700	58,030	59,700

Staff with dependents

P-2-3	Total Package	136,114	139,360	143,244	145,860	145,754	145,860	149,124	145,860
	Field Package	54,080	56,440	61,210	62,940	63,720	62,940	67,090	62,940
P-4-6	Total Package	186,753	186,989	194,953	195,114	197,823	195,114	201,693	195,114
	Field Package	61,040	59,920	69,240	68,045	72,110	68,045	75,980	68,045
D-1-2	Total Package	230,177	228,504	239,447	238,254	242,697	238,254	247,077	238,254
	Field Package	65,700	62,250	74,970	72,000	78,220	72,000	82,600	72,000

Table 5: Amount accruing from the field package as a percentage of net remuneration

Single Staff	1 st Assignment		2 nd -3 rd		4 th - 6 th		7 th +		
	Current	Futur	Current	Future	Current	Future	Curre	Future	
P-2-3	51%	56%	58%	65%	60%	65%	63%	65%	
P-4-6	37%	40%	42%	47%	44%	47%	46%	47%	
D-1-2	30%	32%	34%	39%	36%	39%	38%	39%	
Staff with dependents									
P-2-3	66%	68%	75%	76%	78%	76%	82%	76%	
P-4-6	49%	47%	55%	54%	57%	54%	60%	54%	
D-1-2	40%	37%	46%	43%	48%	43%	50%	43%	

Table 6: Summary of winners/losers (in US\$/year)

Single Staff		1 st Assignment	2 nd -3 rd Assignments	4 th -6 th Assignments	7 th + Assignments
		Gain/Loss	Gain/Loss	Gain/Loss	Gain/Loss
P-2-3	Total Package	6,731	7,881	5,991	3,471
	Field Package	5,320	6,470	4,580	2,060
P-4-6	Total Package	7,974	9,939	7,789	4,889
	Field Package	4,885	6,850	4,700	1,800
D-1-2	Total Package	6,705	9,505	7,065	3,785
	Field Package	4,590	7,390	4,950	1,670
Staff with dependents					
P-2-3	Total Package	3,246	2,616	106	-3,264
	Field Package	2,360	1,730	-780	-4,150
P-4-6	Total Package	236	161	-2,709	-6,579
	Field Package	-1,120	-1,195	-4,065	-7,935
D-1-2	Total Package	-1,674	-1,194	-4,444	-8,824
	Field Package	-3,450	-2,970	-6,220	-10,600

Table 7: Assignment patterns of staff at Professional & Higher categories: 1991-2012

Year	Assignment Number and Percentage							Total staff	Average min. assignments per staff
	1	2	3	4	5/5+)	6	7+		
1991	82%	6%	4%	3%	4%			100%	1.4
2003	81%	6%	4%	3%	5%			100%	1.4
2004	77%	9%	6%	4%	5%			100%	1.5
2005	81%	7%	5%	3%	5%			100%	1.4
2006	74%	10%	6%	4%	6%			100%	1.6
2007	73%	10%	6%	4%	4%	1%	1%	100%	1.6
2008	74%	11%	6%	4%	3%	1%	1%	100%	1.6
2012	62%	15%	10%	5%	3%	2%	3%	100%	1.91

Table 8: Staff in the field by assignment number and dependency status

Dependency status	Assignment number				Total
	1	2-3	4-6	7+	
D	34%	26%	12%	3%	75%
S	14%	7%	3%	1%	25%
Total	48%	33%	15%	3%	100%

Table 9: Staff in the field by grade and dependency status

Dependency status	P-1 to P-3	P-4 to P-5	D-1 and above	Total
D	28%	41%	7%	75%
S	13%	10%	2%	25%
Total	40%	51%	8%	100%

Analysis:

- About 87% of staff members are on 1st, 2nd and 3rd assignments in the UN common system, including staff in headquarters as well as field duty stations (Table 7).
- There are about 14,200 staff members in the field. Among them, 75% of them are with dependents and the remaining 25% of them are single (Table 8). A total of 81% of staff are on their 1st, 2nd and 3rd assignments in the field.
- About 51% of staff members in the field are at the P-4 and P-5 grades and another 40% are at the P-1 to P-3 grades while staff at D-1 and above grade levels constitutes 8% of staff population in the field (Table 9).
- As shown in tables 1, 2 and 3, all single staff in Dhaka (i.e. in a "C" category, family duty station) regardless of assignment number would have increases in the total amount accruing from field allowances in the range of \$105 to \$6,570, except for staff at P-2/3 on 7th assignment in which case it would be a reduction of \$630 per year but the total package would increase.

- In Dhaka, staff with dependents at the D-1 and D-2 levels with one to three assignments would not have any decreases in the total amount accruing from field allowances. Staff at P-2/3 and P-4/6 on 2 -3 assignments would have slight decreases of \$630 per year (\$53 per month) and \$75 per year (\$6 per month) respectively. However, in these cases, there would be increases in the total emoluments. Staff with dependents on 4th assignments and higher would have reductions, ranging from \$2,770 to \$7,150.
- As shown in tables 4, 5 and 6, all single staff in Kabul (i.e. in a "E" category, non-family duty station) regardless of assignment number would have increases in the total amount accruing from field allowances in the range of \$1,670 to \$7,390.
- In Kabul, staff with dependents at P-2 and P-3 levels with 1-3 assignments would not have any decreases in the total amount accruing from field allowances. Staff at P-4/6 on 1-3 assignments would have decreases ranging from \$1,120 to \$1,195 per year (i.e. \$93 - \$100 per month) while there would be increases in the total emoluments. Staff at D-1/2 on 1-3 assignments would also have decreases from \$2,970 - \$3,450 per year (i.e. \$248 - \$288 per month) and their proposed field packages would be about \$62,000 - \$75,000 per year.
- Staff with dependents on 4th assignment or more in Kabul would have decreases in the total amount accruing from field allowances in the range of \$780 to US\$10,600 per year. However, the proposed field packages for this group would be in the range of \$63,000 to \$72,000 per year.

Conclusions:

- All single staff in the field would have increases in the total amount accruing from field allowances (in family and non-family duty stations) except for staff at P-2/3 on 7th assignment and higher in family duty stations, in which case it would be a slight reduction of \$53 per month. This group of staff constitutes **25%** of the staff population in the field.
- Staff with dependents on 1st, 2nd and 3rd assignments would have no decrease or decreases in the range of \$6 - \$288 per month in their field packages in family and non-family duty stations. This group of staff constitutes **60%** of the field staff population.
- Therefore, about **85%** of staff in the field would have no reductions or reductions less than \$288 per month in their field packages.
- Staff with dependents on their 4th assignments or more would have decreases in their field packages up to US\$10,600 per year depending on the grade and type of duty station (i.e. family or non-family duty station). This group constitutes **15%** of the staff in the field. However, the total amount accruing from the field allowances for this group of staff under the proposed package would be in the range of \$17,000 to \$25,000 per year for family duty stations while it would range from \$63,000 to \$72,000 per year for non-family duty stations.

