



UNITED NATIONS
 GENERAL
 ASSEMBLY



Distr.
 GENERAL

A/C.5/35/36
 27 October 1980

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Thirty-fifth session
 FIFTH COMMITTEE
 Agenda Item 98 (a)

PERSONNEL QUESTIONS

Composition of the Secretariat

Geographical distribution of Professional staff

Report of the Secretary-General

CONTENTS

	<u>Paragraphs</u>	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	1 - 2	2
I. PRINCIPLES AND GUIDELINES GOVERNING THE RECRUITMENT OF STAFF	3 - 4	2
II. STAFF IN POSTS SUBJECT TO GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION . .	5 - 13	3
III. OPTIONS FOR NEW RANGES	14 - 25	5
IV. PROPOSALS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL	26 - 35	10

Annexes

- I. Alternative ranges
- II. Distribution of new posts between the membership and contribution factors
- III. Effect on the minimum and maximum ranges of distributing new posts equally between the membership and contribution factors

INTRODUCTION

1. The General Assembly, in section I of its resolution 34/219 of 20 December 1979, requested the Secretary-General to prepare a series of reports and submissions with respect to the system of desirable ranges for the representation of Member States in posts in the Secretariat subject to geographical distribution. The Secretary-General, in an interim report (A/C.5/35/7) of 1 August 1980, covered a number of aspects of the resolution relating to the requests in paragraphs 1 (a), 1 (b) (i) and (ii) and the first part of 1 (e).

2. This report responds to the remaining requests of the Assembly in resolution 34/219 and concludes with proposals which, in the opinion of the Secretary-General, may provide a basis for reaching agreement on the method of determining the ranges for Member States which should guide the Secretary-General in future years. The report first considers the principles which govern the appointment of the staff of the Secretariat by the Secretary-General in accordance with Article 101 of the Charter. It next examines the groups of posts that are subject to or excluded from the system of desirable ranges for the geographical distribution of the staff and explains the principles on which their inclusion or exclusion are based. The report then studies a number of additional criteria which might be used, as well as changes which could be made in the method of calculation of the ranges in the light of the remaining requests in the resolution. Finally, the report outlines the Secretary-General's proposals for the calculation of new ranges.

I. PRINCIPLES AND GUIDELINES GOVERNING THE RECRUITMENT OF STAFF

3. The basic principles governing the recruitment policy of the United Nations are set out in Article 101 of the Charter. Paragraph 1 of that Article provides that "The staff shall be appointed by the Secretary-General under regulations established by the General Assembly". The two major principles which govern the employment of the staff under this Article are embodied in its paragraph 3 as follows:

"The paramount consideration in the employment of the staff and in the determination of the conditions of service shall be the necessity of securing the highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity. Due regard shall be paid to the importance of recruiting the staff on as wide a geographical basis as possible."

These principles apply to the whole staff of the Organization, whether appointed by the Secretary-General or by other officials to whom such authority has been delegated by or with the approval of the General Assembly.

4. In his report to the third session of the General Assembly on the composition of the Secretariat and the principle of geographical distribution, 1/ the first Secretary-General of the United Nations observed:

1/ Official Records of the General Assembly, Third Session, Annexes, agenda item 40 (A/652), para. 7.

"Rightly understood, the cardinal principle of geographical distribution is not that nationals of a particular nation should have a specified number of posts at a particular grade or grades, or that they should receive in salary as a group a particular percentage of the total outlay in salaries, but that, in the first place, the administration should be satisfied that the Secretariat is enriched by the experience and culture which each Member nation can furnish and that each Member nation should, in its turn, be satisfied that its own culture and philosophy make a full contribution to the Secretariat."

He therefore concluded that the whole problem was that of

"establishing criteria which are administratively workable. Any rigid mathematical formula to whatever yardstick it may be related, whether to national income, literacy, financial contribution to the budget of the United Nations, or any other criterion, would restrict in an impracticable fashion the flexibility on which the success of any good administration must depend, and is therefore unacceptable."

The Secretary-General continues to believe that it is essential for him to administer the ranges flexibly in the interest of the Organization and that this is of far greater importance than the precise level to which the ranges of Member States may be set.

II. STAFF IN POSTS SUBJECT TO GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION

5. The phrase "staff in posts subject to geographical distribution" was introduced in General Assembly resolution 1559 (XV) of 18 December 1960. It refers to the staff of the regular Secretariat who are appointed by and responsible directly to the Secretary-General and whose geographical distribution is to be judged by reference to the system of desirable ranges for the representation of each Member State. The posts in question include not only the posts authorized in the regular budget but those authorized out of extrabudgetary funds, because the source of financing alone could not justify the exclusion of posts from the system of desirable ranges or from the normal procedures for the recruitment and appointment of staff. Staff are only considered to occupy such posts if they are in the Professional category or above and are either appointed for at least a year or are appointed initially for a lesser period and then have their appointment extended to one year or more of total service.

6. Since the group consists of staff members only, the Secretary-General and other officials of the Organization who are not staff in the sense of Article 97 of the Charter of the United Nations have never been counted within the group. Staff who are not appointed by the Secretary-General but by other officials have also never been considered to occupy "posts subject to geographical distribution", because the responsibility for their appointment belongs to the other officials and the choice of nationality of the staff of these bodies is outside the control of the Secretary-General. Thus, the staff of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), of the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), of the United Nations Institute for

Training and Research (UNITAR), of the United Nations Relief and Welfare Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA), of the International Trade Centre - UNCTAD/GATT (ITC), of the Registry of the International Court of Justice (ICJ) and of the United Nations University (UNU) do not occupy "posts subject to geographical distribution" in the sense of being taken into account in the system of desirable ranges.

7. The nearly 900 staff in the Professional category in posts with special language requirements are the largest group of staff in the regular Secretariat appointed by and responsible directly to the Secretary-General who are considered not to occupy posts subject to geographical distribution. This is because to ensure the functioning of the Organization in its official and other languages they have to have a particular language as their main language (mother-tongue) and are therefore, for the most part, nationals of countries in which the language is normally spoken. The Secretary-General is therefore not free to take into account on appointment the nationality of candidates for language posts. This exclusion only operates to exclude staff in the Professional category from P-1 to P-5 from the scope of the desirable ranges. Staff at the Principal Officer (D-1) level and above who occupy posts with special language requirements are therefore still considered to occupy posts subject to geographical distribution.

8. About 100 staff specifically appointed for mission service have also been considered not to occupy posts subject to geographical distribution. This is principally because of the political nature of such missions, which limits the range of nationalities from which the Secretary-General may choose candidates for appointment to such posts.

9. Staff who are appointed, after interagency consultation, to posts financed on an interagency basis are also considered to be excluded from the group of posts subject to geographical distribution. This is because the selection of such staff is not exclusively within the control of the Secretary-General and the geographical distribution of one particular organization could not be accepted by the other organizations as a valid reason for objecting to a candidate for such a post.

10. The more than 2,000 technical co-operation project personnel who advise Governments on the implementation of technical co-operation projects are also excluded from the group of posts subject to geographical distribution because their appointments are normally subject to the approval of the recipient Government. This group includes the technical advisers and interregional and regional advisers on whom information is given in table 3 of the annex to the report on the composition of the Secretariat each year and the staff at the Professional and higher level of the United Nations institutes which are established as technical co-operation projects.

11. Staff with permanent resident status in the country of their duty station have also been excluded from the scope of the formula for establishing desirable ranges since the decision of the Fifth Committee 2/ in 1953 that internationally recruited

2/ Official Records of the General Assembly, Eighth Session, Annexes, agenda item 51 (A/2615) para. 67.

staff could not benefit from the home leave, education grant and other entitlements related to international recruitment at the same time as they derived advantages from their status as permanent residents of the country of their duty station. At that time, it was agreed that those who opted to keep their permanent resident status were not to be counted against the range of the country of their nationality. ^{3/} Since 1953, candidates with permanent resident status have only been appointed to posts subject to geographical distribution if they first relinquish their permanent resident status.

12. Staff on secondment to a specialized agency or to one of the bodies whose staff is appointed by a United Nations official other than the Secretary-General, staff on special leave without pay and staff who are detailed or assigned as project personnel to a technical co-operation project are not considered to occupy posts subject to geographical distribution during the period of their secondment, leave, detail or assignment.

13. Finally, staff appointed by the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) to posts financed out of the Environment Fund have been considered to be outside the scope of the formula for establishing desirable ranges and are reported separately each year, in accordance with the decision of the General Assembly taken at its 2206th plenary meeting on 18 December 1973.

III. OPTIONS FOR NEW RANGES

14. The way in which the desirable ranges have been calculated up to the present time and the factors and criteria which determine them have been outlined in paragraphs 4 to 32 of the interim report referred to in paragraph 1 above. In paragraph 1 (c) of section I of resolution 34/219, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to submit "an outline of any possible additional criteria which, in the Secretary-General's considered view, might also be utilized in determining a system of desirable ranges or representation", with suggestions for their incorporation in the system. A number of such other criteria have been considered, two of which were directly suggested by the resolution itself.

15. The first new criterion, suggested in subparagraph 1 (b) (iii) of section I of the resolution, is the level of development of the Member States. The only grouping of all Member States related to this criterion which has the authority of the General Assembly is found in the lists of Member States in different groups eligible for membership in the Industrial Development Board. The General Assembly established the lists in its resolution 2152 (XXI) of 17 November 1966 and has amended them from time to time. Other groupings either refer to limited groups of countries, such as the least developed countries and the most seriously affected developing countries, or do not have the authority of any organ of the United Nations. It would be impossible to apply this criterion in the calculation of numerical ranges without numerical values being given to different levels of development or to the different groups of Member States. In the absence of any such agreed numerical values, it would seem more appropriate to use this criterion,

^{3/} Ibid., paras. 72 and 73.

as has been done in the past four years, as an alternative yardstick against which to judge the distribution of staff between the developed and the developing countries in the organization, using the UNIDO grouping or the groups of the 77 and non-77 countries.

16. The second new criterion, suggested in subparagraph 1 (b) (iv) of section I of the resolution, is the direct application of the population of Member States. As indicated in paragraph 9 of the interim report, a proposal for the direct application of the size of the population of individual Member States on a graduated basis was made in 1961 but not adopted. It would require a decision to adopt a particular formula such as that proposed but found impractical at that time since the population of individual Member States varies from less than 1 million to more than 900 million. The Secretary-General considers the use of population to distribute posts to individual Member States in this way would not contribute to a resolution of the present divergence of views. Subparagraph 1 (b) (iv), however, refers to the application of regional population totals. This would obviate the difficulties posed by the fact that the populations of different Member States vary so greatly, because, apart from Asia and the Pacific which account for somewhat more than half of the total world population, the populations of the regions used for the geographical distribution vary between 3 and 10 per cent of the world total. This criterion could therefore be introduced and would provide a further measure of flexibility for the Secretary-General. The percentage weight to be given to the factor would have to be determined by the General Assembly.

17. A third possible new criterion, which was proposed in the debate leading up to the adoption of resolution 34/219, would depend on how the assessed contribution of each Member State was viewed. While the scale of assessments is based on the concept of capacity to pay, the actual contributions paid represent differing proportions of each Member State's gross national product. Their per capita contribution also differs. The total contribution of each Member State, including voluntary as well as assessed contributions to the different programmes of the Organization, may then represent both a different order of magnitude from the assessed contribution and a different proportion of the total expenses of the Organization. However, it would seem that to take into account the assessed contribution as a percentage of gross national product or its size per capita would be impractical. Either factor would substantially increase the ranges of some Member states with small populations which remain unrepresented despite the Secretary-General's best efforts to recruit their nationals into the Secretariat. To give weight to the high per capita contribution of some Member States would also appear to be somewhat in contradiction to the effect of the current population criterion. To take voluntary contributions into account would make the ranges of individual Member States liable to change on the basis of factors beyond the control of the Organization but directly within the control of the Member State in question. It would introduce an element of uncertainty into the calculation of the ranges, which would appear to be as undesirable as it would be unpredictable.

18. A fourth possibility would be the adoption of one of the alternative economic and social indicators of capacity to pay that were considered by the Committee on Contributions in its report to the General Assembly at the thirty-second session. These might be combined to measure the relative level or stage of development of a

country or its socio-economic status and might then be used to adjust the per capita national income of each Member State. The Committee on Contributions, after examining possible improvements in economic and social indicators of a country's capacity to pay, came to the conclusion that the national income is the only single indicator which can be statistically compiled for all countries and therefore utilized as the principal measure of capacity to pay.^{4/} In view of the position taken with regard to the contribution scale itself, it would seem inappropriate to propose the adoption of any such alternative with regard to the calculation of the desirable range of any Member State.

19. Paragraph 1 (d) of section I of resolution 34/219 requested "a study of the implications of the establishment of a ceiling on the percentage contribution for calculating the personnel entitlement of any Member State". If this is understood to require Member States with a contribution to the budget above a certain level to be treated in exactly the same way, it would either result in the reduction of only one Member State whose contribution is already less than its gross national income would justify on the basis of capacity to pay because of the 25 per cent ceiling on the contribution of any individual Member State or it would result in the first two, three or four etc. largest contributors all having exactly the same upper limit to their range. Any such decision would have to be based on similar grounds as the 25 per cent ceiling on the contribution to the budget of any individual Member State. Since the contribution factor is only one of the factors which affect the ranges, the upper limit of the range of the largest contributor under the present system is only 17.2 per cent. Any reduction which is not a result of a change in the weight of the contribution factor might have implications for the 25 per cent ceiling of the contribution scale.

20. A fifth possible additional criterion would be the weight of the posts. This is currently used in table 16 of the annex to the report of the Secretary-General on the composition of the Secretariat. The table shows the ranges and actual staff position weighted by the annual gross salary of step I of each level. However useful this indicator may be, it would always be necessary to show the number and level of nationals of each Member State and how these figures relate to the unweighted ranges. The added complexity would make it difficult to see the effect of individual appointments, promotions and other staff movements on the representation of each Member State. Using a weighted, rather than an unweighted range, rarely makes a difference as to whether a Member State is within its range or over- or under-represented. Weighting each post therefore appears more valuable as an additional but separate yardstick, rather than as one of the factors used in the calculation of the ranges for normal use.

21. Paragraph 1 (e) of resolution 34/219 asks also for "a study dealing with an indicative evaluation of posts so as to ensure that Member States will have a balanced qualitative and quantitative representation". As a result of an earlier

^{4/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-second Session, Supplement No. 11 (A/32/11), paras. 21 and 22.

study, 5/ requested by the General Assembly in its resolution 2241 A (XXI) of 20 December 1966, of how to determine the desirable ranges of posts for individual countries, taking into account the level of appointment, together with the number of posts, four different weighting systems were examined. Two, which gave arbitrary weights to the levels, were derived from ideas cited in the Fifth Committee's discussions, a third was the system used by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the fourth was the present system as described in paragraphs 17 and 18 of the interim report. Now that point ranges have been developed by the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC) for the classification of posts at each level, a viable new alternative weighting system is now available, if desired. 6/ The ICSC weights would not make a substantial difference, as is shown in the table below, but would have the advantage of relating the weights more closely to the functions and responsibilities of each post, rather than the gross salary, which takes other factors into account.

ICSC point ranges for the classification of Professional and higher level posts and the gross annual salary at step 1 of each level

(showing each level as a percentage of the USG level)

<u>Point ranges</u>	<u>Per cent</u>	<u>Level</u>	<u>Gross annual salary</u> \$	<u>Per cent</u>
800-969	21.7	P-1	14,300	18.8
970-1319	26.4	P-2	19,000	25
1320-1669	35.9	P-3	23,900	31.4
1670-2039	45.4	P-4	29,900	39.3
2040-2479	55.4	P-5	38,200	50.3
2480-2939	67.4	D-1	43,900	57.8
2940-3339	79.9	D-2	52,700	69.3
3340-3679	90.8	ASG	67,400	88.7
3680-3799	100	USG	76,000	100

22. The series of tables requested in paragraph 1 (b) of section I of resolution 34/219 specifically referred to subparagraph (iii) to the inclusion of "formulae for relating the population criterion directly to regional populations, with suggestions for its utilization by individual Member States". Paragraph 16 of

5/ Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-second Session, Annexes, agenda item 82 (a) (A/6860), paras. 38-41.

6/ Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 30 (A/35/30), para. 242.

the present report examined the feasibility of a new criterion related to the population of Member States. The application to individual Member States of the present population factor is a quite separate question. The present population factor is related to the reductions in the assessments of Member States because their per capita income is less than \$1,800. The factor therefore only indirectly takes into account the population of Member States. Its effect is to give back to the region the share of posts that it would have had under the contribution factor if some of the Member States of the region had not had their assessments reduced for this reason. If applied to individual Member States, the population factor should not affect the range of any Member State with a per capita income of \$1,800 or more, however large its population.

23. Although the population factor relates in this way to the contribution factor, it has, in the past, been calculated on the total number of posts subject to geographical distribution used as a basis for the calculation of the ranges. The current total reduction of 8.57 per cent when applied to the base figure ($2,700/100 \times 8.57 = 231.39$) was rounded up to 240. If it is to be applied to individual Member States, it would have to be incorporated into the calculation of the contribution factor itself and not determined separately. The reduction of 8.57 per cent would then be applied after the subtraction of the membership factor from the base figure ($2,700 - 684 = 2,016$). The resulting figure of 2,016 posts would have to be divided by 108.57 and then multiplied by 100 to find the figure ($2,016/108.57 \times 100 = 1,857$ posts) equal to 100 per cent, representing the contribution scale. By multiplying by 8.57, instead, a separate figure ($2,016/108.57 \times 8.57 = 159$ posts) is obtained, representing the 8.57 per cent reduction to be restored. The range of each Member State would then be calculated on a contribution factor of 1,857 posts rather than on the figure of 1,780.5 referred to in paragraph 16 of the Secretary-General's interim report. The Member States whose assessments had been reduced would then have their desirable ranges calculated on the basis of their unreduced assessment. Of these Member States, 23 would then have had desirable ranges with upper limits from 2 to 32 posts higher than at present. The remaining Member States whose assessments had been reduced would have the same ranges as at present, or the upper level of their range would go up by only one post. Since the population factor is smaller, the upper limit of the ranges of 20 other Member States whose assessments had not been reduced would also be increased, 11 of them by between 2 and 23 posts.

24. If this were to be done, it should be recognized that a considerable degree of flexibility that has been available to the Secretary-General up to now would disappear. At present, it is possible, as a result of this flexibility, for many Member States to be over-represented without other Member States being prevented from reaching the lower limits of their ranges. If there were no regional population reserve, such over-representation would only be possible in proportion as other Member States were under-represented. It might therefore be more in the interest of the Organization as a whole if a regional population factor was maintained rather than having the population reserve distributed among individual Member States.

25. While the reference to reductions in assessments has always been used as a measure of the size of the population reserve, this rationale has always been

difficult to explain and has resulted since the new method of calculating the ranges was introduced in 1976 in a figure which could, in the light of the considerations expressed in paragraph 23, be considered inflated. It might be appropriate to consider relating the population factor directly to the total population of the Member States in each of the regions used by the Secretary-General to report on the composition of the Secretariat and to reduce the percentage. This would retain a measure of the flexibility which the Secretary-General has at the present time to appoint outstanding candidates who are nationals of over-represented Member States when he thinks it essential to carry out the programmes of the Organization, while not preventing nationals of any Member State which is unrepresented or under-represented from being appointed because of the over-representation of other Member States. The percentage distribution of total population between the regions at present is as follows:

<u>Region</u>	<u>Per cent</u>
Africa	10.50
Asia and the Pacific	54.24
Europe (Eastern)	9.53
Europe (Western)	8.23
Latin America	8.09
Middle East	3.45
North America and the Caribbean	5.96

IV. PROPOSALS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

26. With a view to formulating proposals as called for by resolution 34/219, the Secretary-General and his representatives held a series of discussions with representatives of regional groups over a period of time. During the course of those contacts, the groups reaffirmed their positions enunciated during the debates on the question in the Fifth Committee at the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly.

27. Specifically, the major contributors rejected the objectives sought by resolution 34/219, mainly on the grounds that it had been adopted without taking into account their fundamental interests. In addition, they could not accept any changes in the ranges that were based on either a weight of 50 per cent in the membership factor or a parity between the membership and contribution factors. Those Member States that supported resolution 34/219 - the Group of 77 - maintained their view that the existing criteria for determining the ranges were incompatible with their interests, and they therefore wished for a change as envisaged in the resolution.

28. Although no common ground has as yet been achieved, the Secretary-General is fully conscious of the general desire of all Member States to avoid a confrontation on this vital matter. Accordingly, it is hoped that no effort will be spared to

/...

achieve a mutually acceptable solution. Bearing this objective in mind, the following proposals are aimed at facilitating a decision by the General Assembly. Exchanges of views and considerations, both formal and informal, with Member States representing differing perspectives have helped considerably in formulating these proposals.

29. In the Secretary-General's view, the system of calculating the ranges should continue to be based on the three factors of membership, contribution and population. The membership and contribution factors should continue to be established as in the past. However, the population factor should also be given whatever weight consistent with its importance that the General Assembly considers appropriate, as is the case for the other two factors. The factor might then be distributed by region in proportion to the total population of each region.

30. In determining any change in the method of calculating desirable ranges of Member States or in the weights to be given to the three factors on which they are based, the Secretary-General is of the view that the General Assembly might seek to avoid any decision that would cause a substantial reduction in the present range of any Member State. Indeed, it would be most helpful if considerable efforts could be made to ensure that no reduction occurred at all.

31. The base figure on which the desirable ranges of Member States are calculated should be approximately midway between the number of posts subject to geographical distribution currently occupied by staff reported each year and the total number of regular budget and extrabudgetary posts authorized at the time which could be considered subject to geographical distribution. On 30 June 1980, there were 2,769 staff in the approximately 3,500 posts which would have been subject to geographical distribution if not vacant or filled by staff on short-term appointments. A base figure of 3,200 has therefore been adopted in the demonstration of the proposals. This does not mean that any more posts are authorized or that more will be filled. This is purely a figure used to calculate desirable ranges and not to determine how any particular post or posts will, in fact, be filled.

32. In order to demonstrate the nature of the changes, annex I shows a series of alternative tables calculated as indicated in paragraphs 29 to 31, showing for each level of assessment, first, the desirable range on 30 June 1980 under the present system and, then, in columns A to F, ranges calculated on the basis of different relative percentage weights for the membership and contribution factors. Solely for the purpose of demonstrating the results of the Secretary-General's proposals, the population factor has been maintained at 240 posts as before or a weight of 7.5 per cent of the new base figure of 3,200 posts. Column A reflects the weight given to the membership factor at present, and column F reflects what would happen if the membership factor were to be given a weight of 50 per cent. Columns B to E show intermediate positions, with progressive increases in the weight given to the membership factor. Although the size of the midpoint of the minimum ranges, from which the membership factor is derived, also increases from columns A to F, the lower level of the minimum ranges is kept in each case at two, as this provides a higher upper limit. This can be changed by reducing the minimum flexibility up and down from the midpoint.

33. The will to reach an agreement on this matter will diminish considerably if Member States perceive that an agreed arrangement at the present time would be subject to frequent changes. It is therefore essential that any agreement should provide for some element of stability over a period of years. The longer such an agreement can last, the more effective will the ranges be as a guide to the Secretary-General and as a yardstick to judge the geographical distribution of the staff.

34. Accordingly, in order to ensure the continued viability of these ranges, it is proposed that in future a slight change should be made in the procedure followed in recalculating the ranges when the base figure is increased. At present, when a new State is admitted to membership, the number of posts which comprise the membership factor is increased by the number of posts which constitute the midpoint of the minimum range, e.g., between 5.5 posts under column A and 10.5 posts under column F, and the number of posts which comprise the contribution factor is reduced by the same amount. When the base figure is increased, it is raised by at least 100 posts, and in the past these have always been added to those constituting the contribution factor. In order to provide a more balanced distribution of the additional posts, it is therefore proposed that in future whenever the base figure is raised by 100 posts, 7.5 shall go to the population factor and the remaining posts shall be assigned equally to the membership and contribution factors.

35. As a consequence of this proposed change, the midpoint of the minimum range would have to be calculated thereafter by dividing the number of posts which comprise the membership factor, increased in this way, by the number of Member States. The difference between the lower limit of the minimum range and its midpoint would be added to the midpoint and rounded to the nearest whole figure to determine the upper limit of the range. The effect on the number of posts to be distributed for, and the percentage weights of, the membership and contribution factors of increasing both factors by the same amount in this way is shown in annex II below. It will result over time in the gradual increase in the weight of the membership factor and a corresponding decrease in the weight of the contribution factor. Annex III shows the minimum and maximum ranges which would result in this way under each of the options in columns A to F, taking into account both increases in the base figure and in the number of Member States.

ANNEX I

Alternative ranges of 154 Member States at different assessments with different percentage weights given to the membership and contribution factors calculated on a base figure of 3,200 posts and a population factor of 240 posts compared with the ranges on 30 June 1980

	A	B	C	D	E	F
Membership factor (percentage weight)	847 (26.5)	1 001 (31.3)	1 155 (36.1)	1 309 (40.9)	1 463 (45.7)	1 617 (50.5)
Contribution factor (percentage weight)	2 113 (66.0)	1 959 (61.2)	1 805 (56.4)	1 651 (51.6)	1 497 (46.8)	1 343 (42.0)
Population factor (percentage weight)	240 (7.5)	240 (7.5)	240 (7.5)	240 (7.5)	240 (7.5)	240 (7.5)
Midpoint of minimum range	5.5	6.5	7.5	8.5	9.5	10.5
Flexibility + or - 15 per cent or	3.5	4.5	5.5	6.5	7.5	8.5

Assessment	Range on 30/06/80	Alternative ranges					
		A	B	C	D	E	F
0.01	2-7	2-9	2-11	2-13	2-15	2-17	2-19
0.02	2-7	2-9	2-11	2-13	2-15	2-17	2-19
0.03	3-8	3-10	3-12	3-14	2-15	2-17	2-19
0.04	3-8	3-10	3-12	3-14	3-16	3-18	3-20
0.05	3-8	3-10	3-12	3-14	3-16	3-18	3-20
0.06	3-8	3-10	3-12	3-14	3-16	3-18	3-20
0.07	3-8	3-10	3-12	3-14	3-16	3-18	3-20
0.08	3-8	4-11	4-13	3-14	3-16	3-18	3-20
0.09	4-9	4-11	4-13	4-15	3-16	3-18	3-20
0.10	4-9	4-11	4-13	4-15	4-17	3-18	3-20
0.11	4-9	4-11	4-13	4-15	4-17	4-19	3-20
0.12	4-9	5-12	4-13	4-15	4-17	4-19	4-21
0.16	5-10	5-12	5-14	5-16	5-18	4-19	4-21
0.19	5-10	6-13	6-15	5-16	5-18	5-20	5-22
0.20	6-11	6-13	6-15	6-17	5-18	5-20	5-22
0.21	6-11	6-13	6-15	6-17	5-18	5-20	5-22
0.23	6-11	7-14	7-16	6-17	6-19	5-20	5-22
0.25	6-11	7-14	7-16	7-18	6-19	6-21	5-22
0.27	7-12	8-15	7-16	7-18	6-19	6-21	6-23
0.30	7-12	8-15	8-17	7-18	7-20	6-21	6-23
0.33	8-13	9-16	8-17	8-19	7-20	7-22	6-23
0.35	8-13	9-16	9-18	8-19	8-21	7-22	7-24

/...

<u>Assessment</u>	<u>Range on 30/06/80</u>	<u>Alternative ranges</u>					
		<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>F</u>
0.39	9-14	10-17	10-19	9-20	8-21	8-23	7-24
0.42	9-14	11-18	10-19	10-21	9-22	8-23	8-25
0.48	11-16	12-20	11-20	11-22	10-23	9-24	8-25
0.50	11-16	13-20	12-21	11-22	10-23	9-24	9-26
0.58	12-17	14-21	13-22	12-23	12-25	11-26	10-27
0.60	13-18	15-22	14-23	13-24	12-25	11-26	10-27
0.65	14-19	16-23	15-24	14-25	13-26	12-27	11-28
0.71	15-20	17-24	16-25	15-26	14-27	13-28	12-29
0.74	15-20	18-25	16-25	15-26	14-27	13-28	12-29
0.76	15-20	18-25	17-26	16-27	15-28	13-28	12-29
0.78	16-21	18-25	17-26	16-27	15-28	14-29	12-29
0.83	16-22	20-27	18-27	17-28	16-29	14-29	13-30
1.22	22-30	27-36	26-35	24-35	22-35	20-35	18-35
1.24	23-31	27-36	26-35	24-35	22-35	21-36	19-36
1.27	23-31	27-37	27-36	25-36	23-36	21-36	19-36
1.31	24-32	28-38	27-37	26-37	24-37	22-37	20-37
1.39	25-34	30-40	29-39	27-38	25-38	23-38	21-38
1.46	26-35	31-42	30-40	28-39	26-39	24-39	22-39
1.62	28-38	34-46	33-44	31-42	29-42	26-41	24-41
1.63	28-38	34-46	33-44	31-42	29-42	26-41	24-41
1.70	29-40	35-48	34-46	32-44	30-43	27-42	25-42
1.83	31-43	38-51	36-49	34-47	32-45	29-44	27-40
3.28	53-72	64-86	60-81	57-77	53-72	50-67	46-63
3.45	56-76	67-90	63-85	59-80	56-75	52-70	48-65
4.46	71-96	85-115	80-108	75-101	70-94	65-88	60-81
6.26	98-133	117-158	110-149	102-139	95-129	88-119	80-109
8.31	129-175	154-208	144-195	134-181	124-168	114-154	104-140
9.58	148-201	177-239	165-223	153-207	142-192	130-176	118-160
11.10	171-232	204-276	190-258	177-239	163-221	149-202	136-184
25.00	381-516	454-614	422-571	390-528	358-484	326-441	294-398

/...

ANNEX II

Effect on the number of posts to be distributed for, and the percentage weights of, the membership and contribution factors of increasing them both by the same amount when the base figure is raised by 100 posts

(The population factor is always 7.5 per cent)

<u>Base figure</u>	<u>1. Posts to be distributed for the membership factor</u>						<u>Posts to be distributed for the contribution factor</u>						<u>Popu- lation</u>
	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>Posts</u>
3 200	847	1 001	1 155	1 309	1 463	1 617	2 113	1 959	1 805	1 651	1 497	1 343	240
3 600	1 032	1 186	1 340	1 494	1 648	1 797	2 298	2 144	1 990	1 836	1 682	1 528	270
4 000	1 217	1 371	1 525	1 679	1 833	1 987	2 483	2 329	2 175	2 021	1 867	1 713	300

<u>Base figure</u>	<u>2. Percentage weights of membership factor</u>						<u>Percentage weights of contribution factor</u>						<u>Popu- lation percent- age</u>
	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>Posts</u>
3 200	26.5	31.3	36.1	40.9	45.7	50.5	66.0	61.2	56.4	51.6	46.8	42.0	7.5
3 600	28.7	32.9	37.2	41.5	45.8	49.9	63.8	59.6	55.3	51.0	46.7	42.6	7.5
4 000	30.4	34.3	38.1	42.0	45.8	49.7	62.1	58.2	54.4	50.5	46.7	42.8	7.5

/...

ANNEX III

Effect on the minimum and maximum ranges if the membership and contribution factors are increased by the same amount when the base figure is raised by 100 with 154, 157 or 160 Member States under the different columns in annex II (showing the midpoint from which the minimum ranges is calculated)

<u>Base figure</u>		<u>Column A</u>			<u>Column B</u>		
		154	157	160	154	157	160
3 200	Mid.	(5.5)	(5.39)	(5.29)	(6.5)	(6.38)	(6.26)
	Min.	2-9	2-9	2-9	2-11	2-11	2-11
	Max.	454-614	454-614	454-614	422-571	422-571	422-570
3 600	Mid.	(6.70)	(6.57)	(6.45)	(7.70)	(7.55)	(7.41)
	Min.	2-11	2-11	2-11	2-13	2-13	2-13
	Max.	494-668	494-668	494-668	462-625	462-625	462-624
4 000	Mid.	(7.90)	(7.75)	(7.60)	(8.90)	(8.73)	(8.57)
	Min.	2-14	2-14	2-14	2-16	2-15	2-15
	Max.	534-723	534-723	534-723	502-680	502-680	502-679
<u>Base figure</u>		<u>Column C</u>			<u>Column D</u>		
		154	157	160	154	157	160
3 200	Mid.	(7.50)	(7.36)	(7.22)	(8.50)	(8.34)	(8.18)
	Min.	2-13	2-13	2-12	2-15	2-15	2-14
	Max.	390-528	390-527	390-527	358-484	358-484	358-484
3 600	Mid.	(8.70)	(8.54)	(8.38)	(9.70)	(9.52)	(9.34)
	Min.	2-15	2-15	2-15	2-17	2-17	2-17
	Max.	430-582	430-582	430-582	398-539	398-539	398-539
4 000	Mid.	(9.90)	(9.71)	(9.53)	(10.90)	(10.69)	(10.49)
	Min.	2-18	2-18	2-17	2-20	2-19	2-19
	Max.	471-637	470-636	470-636	439-594	439-593	438-593
<u>Base figure</u>		<u>Column E</u>			<u>Column F</u>		
		154	157	160	154	157	160
3 200	Mid.	(9.50)	(9.32)	(9.14)	(10.50)	(10.30)	(10.11)
	Min.	2-17	2-17	2-16	2-19	2-19	2.20
	Max.	326-441	326-441	326-441	294-398	294-398	294-398
3 600	Mid.	(10.70)	(10.50)	(10.30)	(11.66)	(11.45)	(11.23)
	Min.	2-19	2-19	2-19	2-21	2-21	2-20
	Max.	367-496	366-496	366-495	335-453	334-452	334-452
4 000	Mid.	(11.90)	(11.68)	(11.46)	(12.90)	(12.66)	(12.42)
	Min.	2-22	2-21	2-21	2-24	2-23	2-23
	Max.	407-550	407-550	406-550	375-507	375-507	375-507