



WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

FIFTY-SIXTH WORLD HEALTH ASSEMBLY
Provisional agenda item 18.2

A56/40
15 April 2003

Representation of developing countries in the Secretariat

Report by the Director-General

1. Resolution WHA55.24 on the need for increased representation of developing countries in the Secretariat underlined that the Secretariat of WHO is a common secretariat for all Member States and should therefore reflect the composition of its membership; stressed adherence to the principle of equitable geographical representation and gender balance at **all** levels in the Secretariat, especially at headquarters; emphasized the principles of transparency, fair selection, objectivity, competence and merit in appointments; underlined that country ranges for appointments in the Secretariat should be based on membership, equitable geographical representation, population criteria, and balance between developed and developing countries, with less emphasis on financial contributions to the Organization; and requested the Director-General to ensure that the principles of equitable geographical representation, gender balance and a balance of experts from developed and developing countries were respected in making appointments in the Secretariat, and to report to the Fifty-sixth World Health Assembly on the implementation of the resolution, including different alternatives to the current representation formula in the Secretariat.
2. A preliminary report on the issue of geographical representation of Members and Associate Members of WHO in the Secretariat was submitted to the Executive Board.¹
3. The present report, submitted in response to resolution WHA55.24, updates the report submitted to the Executive Board. It has four main objectives: to present the current situation as regards geographical distribution, including the formula used in WHO and other organizations of the United Nations system (Part I); to define a number of options for updating and/or adapting WHO's present formula (Part II); to provide information on the measures undertaken to improve geographical representation in WHO (Part III); and to make suggestions regarding possible action to be taken by the Health Assembly (Part IV).

¹ EB111/35.

I. CURRENT SITUATION

Background

4. The Staff Regulations established by the governing bodies of all organizations of the United Nations common system include a number of similar cardinal principles as regards recruitment of staff. The relevant WHO Staff Regulation reads as follows:

4.2 The paramount consideration in the appointment, transfer or promotion of the staff shall be the necessity of securing the highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity. Due regard shall be paid to the importance of recruiting and maintaining the staff on as wide a geographical basis as possible.

4.3 Selection of staff members shall be without regard to race, creed or sex. So far as is practicable, selection shall be made on a competitive basis.

4.4 Without prejudice to the inflow of fresh talent at the various levels, vacancies shall be filled by promotion of persons already in the service of the Organization in preference to persons from outside. This preference shall also be applied, on a reciprocal basis, to the United Nations and specialized agencies brought into relationship with the United Nations.

5. In considering the best way to monitor implementation of the requirement for geographical balance, the governing bodies of the various organizations and agencies have first had to define which posts should be subject to geographical representation. An approach common to all organizations having such a requirement has been to exclude from it both general service posts and professional posts with linguistic prerequisites. In addition, all organizations, **except WHO**, also exclude posts financed from extrabudgetary resources.

6. The next step for some governing bodies which sought to formalize and quantify the approach to geographical representation within their organization has been to establish a formula for defining a desirable range for each Member State. Various methods of calculation are used, based on one, two or three factors.

7. One factor, common to all organizations, is contributions. Indeed, it is the only factor used by FAO. The second factor is membership. ILO, UNESCO and ICAO have a formula that combines membership and contributions; in each, the latter are clearly preponderant. The third factor is population. Only three organizations, the United Nations, UNIDO and WHO, use a combination of all three factors.

WHO's formula

8. WHO's approach is based on that of the United Nations, as various resolutions of the Health Assembly (resolutions WHA32.37, WHA34.15 and WHA42.12) have called on the Director-General to follow as closely as possible the formula used by the United Nations to determine the desirable ranges regarding the equitable geographical distribution of staff.

9. As a result of resolution WHA42.12, the formula for establishing desirable ranges is based on the same parameters and related weights as that currently applicable in the United Nations, as follows:

-
- (a) 40% of the total number of posts is assigned to the **membership factor** and therefore distributed equally among all Members;
 - (b) 55% of the total number of posts is assigned to the **contribution factor** and is therefore distributed in proportion to the scale of assessments;
 - (c) 5% of the total number of posts is assigned to the **population factor** and is distributed among Member States in direct proportion to their population;
 - (d) the midpoint of the desirable range for each country is the arithmetical sum of the three factors listed above;
 - (e) the upper and lower limits of the desirable range for each country is the greater of (i) 15% of the midpoint, or (ii) 0.1778% of the total number of posts used for geographical representation purposes,¹ with the resulting amount added to or subtracted from the midpoint;
 - (f) the upper limit of the desirable range is subject to a minimum figure representing 0.51852% of the total number of posts used for geographical representation purposes.¹

10. The formula outlined above allows for the automatic accommodation of additional Member States.

11. For purposes of geographical representation, WHO's practice has been to include virtually all nonlinguistic professional and higher graded posts, regardless of their location or **source of funding**, apart from those (a) in IARC and PAHO (separate budgets) and (b) entities for which WHO Geneva provides administrative services and whose staff hold WHO contracts, such as UNAIDS, the International Computing Centre, the Joint Medical Service and the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria.

12. The number of posts to be taken into account under that approach was last defined in resolution WHA50.15 which, in paragraph 3, "Requests the Director-General to modify the method of calculating desirable ranges by reducing the number of posts used in the calculation to 1450".

13. As a result of the Director-General's recommendation to follow United Nations practice in the matter,² and related resolution WHA46.23, four groupings have been determined in WHO to assess the representativeness of Member States:

- A: unrepresented and underrepresented countries
- B1: countries within their range but below midpoint
- B2: countries at or above midpoint of range, including those at the maximum of their range
- C: countries above the maximum of their range.

¹ Currently 1450, as indicated in paragraph 12 below.

² See document EB91/1993/REC/1, Part 1, Annex 3.

14. Annex 1 sets out the state of representation of countries as at 31 December 2002 according to the above groupings, based on 1450 posts associated with population, contribution and membership data before updating (see paragraph 17 below). The “A” grouping is subdivided into unrepresented and underrepresented countries. The table shows that **46** countries are unrepresented, **13** countries are underrepresented, **62** countries are below the midpoint of their range, **46** countries are at or above the midpoint of their range, and **27** countries are above the maximum of their range. Almost all unrepresented countries are developing countries; most of the underrepresented countries are developed countries; countries both below and above the midpoint of their range are preponderantly developing countries; and most countries above the maximum are developing countries.

II. POSSIBLE AMENDMENTS TO WHO’S FORMULA

15. The following observations may be useful in considering the issue of equitable geographical representation in WHO:

(a) the information contained in paragraph 14 above, does not indicate a clear pattern of imbalance in representation between developed and developing countries across the various groupings;

(b) the minimum range of 1 to 8 is currently applicable to most countries (154) irrespective of their contributions or population; a very large number of countries would remain in the minimum range whatever formula is used;

(c) any modification to the formula emphasizing the population factor should aim at increasing the desirable ranges of a number of developing countries and countries in transition, which otherwise would remain at or close to the minimum range;

(d) as indicated in paragraph 5 above, WHO is the only organization that includes both regular budget posts and posts financed from extrabudgetary sources in the calculation of the number of posts to be used for the purposes of geographical representation, even though the contribution factor is based on assessed contributions to the regular budget alone.

Updating

16. The number of posts to be taken into account for geographical representation purposes has been reviewed, bearing in mind the considerations contained in paragraph 11 above. The current total of posts used for the purposes of geographical representation is 1580: 1030 posts under the regular budget and 550 posts financed from extrabudgetary resources (or a ratio of 65% to 35%).

17. Data concerning membership, contributions, and population should be updated to incorporate the latest information available as follows:

(a) membership: there are currently 194 Members and Associate Members, including the newest Member, Timor-Leste;

(b) contributions: the latest United Nations scale of assessment (2003) suitably modified to account for WHO membership (including Associate Members) should be used; which is in fact the proposed WHO scale of assessment for 2004-2005;¹

(c) population: figures are taken from the same source as that used by the United Nations, namely, estimated demographic data issued by the United Nations Population Division for 2001; total population for WHO Members and Associate Members stands at 6 119 661 000.

18. On the basis of these updated figures, the following main elements of WHO's current formula would be amended as follows, with examples of computations of ranges given in Annex 2.

(a) membership factor: 40% of 1580 equals 632 posts or 3.25773 posts per Member or Associate Member;

(b) contribution factor: 55% of 1580, or 869 posts, equivalent to 8.69 posts per 1% of contribution;

(c) population factor: 5% of 1580, or 79 posts, represents 0.01291 posts per one million population.

Options

19. Three options are discussed below, the relevant data are shown in Annex 3, as option one, two and three respectively.

20. The first option to be considered for implementation would therefore be to continue to apply the current formula using updated data as outlined in paragraphs 16 to 18 above. That option does not appear to have a significant impact on the representation of developing countries.

21. A second option would be to modify two of the weights in the current formula: retaining the membership factor at 40% while reducing the contribution factor from 55% to 50% and doubling the population factor from 5% to 10%. On the whole, this option appears to have a rather limited impact on the geographical representation of most developing countries and countries in transition, and would thus not seem to meet the concerns expressed in resolution WHA55.24.

22. A third option, designed to take better account of the population element, would be to maintain the current weights of formula while focusing on the upper limit of the desirable range, which would be modulated according to varying population levels. This would have the dual effect of reducing the upper limit of the range for most countries with less than one million population, while increasing the upper limit of the range for more populated countries. The current practice, set out in paragraph 9(f) above, has a single factor to define the upper limit of the minimum range, applicable in all cases (0.51852% of all posts used for the purposes of geographical representation, i.e. 1580). Under this option it would be replaced by gradually rising factors associated to population levels as follows:

¹ The scale of assessment used is that used in document A56/INF.DOC./3, Annex, column 10, i.e. without adjustment for Afghanistan and Argentina.

Up to 1 million	0.379% of 1580 or an upper limit of 6
Over 1 million and up to 25 million	0.506% of 1580 or an upper limit of 8
Over 25 million and up to 50 million	0.632% of 1580 or an upper limit of 10
Over 50 million and up to 100 million	0.759% of 1580 or an upper limit of 12
Over 100 million	0.886% of 1580 or an upper limit of 14

23. Under current arrangements, the minimum range (1-8) is applicable to 154 countries (see paragraph 15(b) above). Under this option, 43 countries would be at the new minimum range (1-6) and 90 countries would remain in a 1-8 range. The modified upper limit of ranges under this option would be applicable as follows:

10 as upper limit of range: **10 countries:** Algeria, Colombia, Kenya, Morocco, Myanmar, Peru, Sudan, Ukraine, United Republic of Tanzania, Uzbekistan.

12 as upper limit of range: **8 countries:** Democratic Republic of Congo, Egypt, Ethiopia, Iran (Islamic Republic), Philippines, Thailand, Turkey and Viet Nam.

14 as upper limit of range: **4 countries:** Bangladesh, Indonesia, Nigeria and Pakistan.

This option appears to reflect a more balanced set of desirable ranges for Member States.

24. None of these options would, however, remove the conceptual and technical inconsistency inherent to the current approach, i.e. using a scale of contributions related to the regular budget, while taking into account all posts (those funded under the regular budget and those funded from extrabudgetary resources). A possible approach to address this inconsistency was submitted to the Executive Board at its 111th session.¹ It used the regular budget scale of assessment for contribution purposes, but related it solely to regular-budget funded posts, which would then be the only ones taken into account for the purposes of geographical representation.

III. STEPS TAKEN TO INCREASE DIVERSITY IN WHO

25. A strategy is being put in place to widen the recruitment net and tap applicants from unrepresented and underrepresented countries, including women, through a number of new tools. Such tools include an electronic recruitment system, a targeted recruitment network, and an integrated rostering system.

26. An electronic recruitment system was launched in December 2002 to complement existing, more traditional ways, of applying to WHO. WHO's vacancy notice, used to announce employment opportunities, has been reformatted to make it more understandable and attractive visually, which should make it easier to review the opportunities available for long-term and temporary employment. Candidates are able to search and apply on line for vacancies according to job title, functions and office location. This mechanism broadens access to information on job opportunities and simplifies application procedures; consequently, it is expected to attract applicants from a wider range of

¹ Document EB111/35, Annex 3, option 2.

countries. The response has been most encouraging, with over 11 000 applicants during the first three months of operation. Naturally, as not all applicants have access to the Internet, the traditional way of applying through mail or fax will remain in place for the next few years.

27. WHO is creating rosters for selected occupational groups, which will help to identify qualified candidates for both fixed-term appointments and temporary assignments. It is intended to retain the applications of candidates assessed as suitable for particular areas of work for up to two years. Furthermore, those who have been short-listed for given positions, more particularly candidates from unrepresented and underrepresented countries, and women, will be placed on a priority roster for similar positions and automatically retained as potential candidates when new posts are advertised.

28. A targeted recruitment network is currently being incorporated into the electronic recruitment system. It is a database designed to increase the diversity of the WHO workforce by reaching a wider range of candidates globally for possible work with the Organization. The system is aimed at enhancing the dissemination of WHO vacancy notices.

29. A major element of the network will be a recruitment drive, currently at the planning stage, which will make it possible to target professional associations or institutions, particularly those located in unrepresented or underrepresented countries, relevant to a particular field of work. It is intended in the first instance to send vacancy notices electronically to all WHO collaborating centres. Member States, especially those which are unrepresented, underrepresented or below the midpoint of their range, will be requested to provide addresses of institutions or professional associations, including nongovernmental organizations, which they consider would be valuable potential sources of recruitment. This initiative will be supplemented by recruitment missions targeted to unrepresented and underrepresented countries. These missions will pre-screen potential candidates and also help to raise the visibility of WHO as an employer among such major sources of potential applicants as institutes, universities and others.

30. More temporary assignments will be advertised, focusing on those for 11 months, whether short term or term-limited. Particular attention will be paid to ensuring that geographical considerations are taken into account when proceeding with short-term recruitment, as experience has shown that some 25% to 30% of appointments are through conversion of temporary staff.

IV. ACTION BY THE HEALTH ASSEMBLY

31. In summary, it might be timely for the Health Assembly to approve the updating of the various elements of WHO's formula for establishing desirable ranges to assure equitable geographical representation of staff, as set out in paragraphs 16 and 17 above, and to consider selecting the option contained in paragraph 22.

32. It would also be useful for the Health Assembly to consider introducing a measurement tool in the form of a target in order to ensure that proper attention is placed by all concerned within the Secretariat, on recruitment from countries that are unrepresented, underrepresented or below the midpoint of their range. It may be appropriate to set defined targets as regards recruitment from countries in the A and B1 groupings for all posts, whether financed under the regular budget or from extrabudgetary resources.

33. The Health Assembly may therefore wish to consider the following draft resolution:

The Fifty-sixth World Health Assembly,

Having considered the report by the Director-General on representation of developing countries in the Secretariat,¹

1. APPROVES the updating of the various elements of the WHO formula contained therein;
2. SELECTS the option designed to take better account of the population element;
3. SETS a target of 60% of all vacancies arising over the next two years in the professional and higher graded categories, irrespective of their source of funding, for the appointment of nationals of unrepresented and underrepresented countries and those below the midpoint of their desirable range within the geographical representation parameters;
4. REQUESTS the Director-General:
 - (1) to give preference to candidates from developing countries and countries in transition, while ensuring that the target is equally achieved at higher graded levels and at headquarters;
 - (2) to report to the Fifty-ninth World Health Assembly on geographical representation and recruitment of staff in the professional and higher graded categories.

¹ Document A56/40.

ANNEX 1

REPRESENTATION OF COUNTRIES AS AT 31 DECEMBER 2002

(Ranges, calculated on the basis of 1450 posts, are indicated in brackets)

Unrepresented countries (A – total 46 countries)

Andorra (1-8)	Marshall Islands (1-8)	San Marino (1-8)
Antigua and Barbuda (1-8)	Micronesia (Federated States of) (1-8)	Sao Tome and Principe (1-8)
Azerbaijan (1-8)	Monaco (1-8)	Singapore (1-8)
Belarus (1-8)	Nauru (1-8)	Swaziland (1-8)
Belize (1-8)	Niue (1-8)	Tajikistan (1-8)
Bosnia and Herzegovina (1-8)	Oman (1-8)	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (1-8)
Brunei Darussalam (1-8)	Palau (1-8)	Timor-Leste (1-8)
Cambodia (1-8)	Papua New Guinea (1-8)	Tokelau ^a (1-8)
Comoros (1-8)	Puerto Rico ^a (1-8)	Tonga (1-8)
Cook Islands (1-8)	Qatar (1-8)	Turkmenistan (1-8)
Cyprus (1-8)	Republic of Moldova (1-8)	Tuvalu (1-8)
Dominica (1-8)	Saint Kitts and Nevis (1-8)	United Arab Emirates (1-8)
Grenada (1-8)	Saint Lucia (1-8)	Uzbekistan (1-8)
Kazakhstan (1-8)	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (1-8)	Vanuatu (1-8)
Kiribati (1-8)	Samoa (1-8)	
Kyrgyzstan (1-8)		
Luxembourg (1-8)		

Underrepresented countries (A – total 13 countries)

Argentina (9-15)	Japan (141-191)	Spain (20-28)
Austria (7-14)	Mexico (9-15)	Ukraine (2-8)
China (22-31)	Portugal (3-10)	United States of America (174-237)
Germany (69-94)	Republic of Korea (8-15)	
Italy (39-54)	Saudi Arabia (5-11)	

Countries below midpoint of range (B1: total 62 countries)

Afghanistan (1-8)	Chad (1-8)	Greece (3-9)
Albania (1-8)	Costa Rica (1-8)	Guatemala (1-8)
Armenia (1-8)	Croatia (1-8)	Guinea-Bissau (1-8)
Bahamas (1-8)	Czech Republic (1-8)	Haiti (1-8)
Bahrain (1-8)	Democratic People's Republic of Korea (1-8)	Honduras (1-8)
Barbados (1-8)	Djibouti (1-8)	Hungary (1-8)
Bhutan (1-8)	Equatorial Guinea (1-8)	Iceland (1-8)
Botswana (1-8)	Eritrea (1-8)	Iraq (1-8)
Bulgaria (1-8)	Estonia (1-8)	Israel (3-9)
Burundi (1-8)	Fiji (1-8)	Jamaica (1-8)
Cape Verde (1-8)	Gabon (1-8)	Kuwait (1-8)
Central African Republic (1-8)	Georgia (1-8)	Lao People's Democratic Republic (1-8)

^a Associate Member.

Latvia (1-8)	Nicaragua (1-8)	Suriname (1-8)
Lesotho (1-8)	Norway (5-11)	Sweden (9-15)
Liberia (1-8)	Paraguay (1-8)	Switzerland (10-16)
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya (1-8)	Poland (2-8)	Trinidad and Tobago (1-8)
Lithuania (1-8)	Romania (1-8)	Turkey (4-10)
Maldives (1-8)	Seychelles (1-8)	Viet Nam (1-8)
Malta (1-8)	Slovakia (1-8)	Yemen (1-8)
Mongolia (1-8)	Slovenia (1-8)	Yugoslavia (1-8) ^a
Namibia (1-8)	Solomon Islands (1-8)	

**Countries at or above midpoint of range, including those at maximum of their range
(B2: total 46 countries)**

Algeria (1-8)	Iran (Islamic Republic of) (2-8)	Sierra Leone (1-8)
Angola (1-8)	Jordan (1-8)	Somalia (1-8)
Bangladesh (2-8)	Lebanon (1-8)	South Africa (3-9)
Benin (1-8)	Madagascar (1-8)	Sri Lanka (1-8)
Bolivia (1-8)	Malawi (1-8)	Sudan (1-8)
Chile (1-8)	Malaysia (2-8)	Syrian Arab Republic (1-8)
Cuba (1-8)	Mali (1-8)	Thailand (2-8)
Denmark (5-12)	Mauritania (1-8)	Togo (1-8)
Dominican Republic (1-8)	Mauritius (1-8)	Uganda (1-8)
Ecuador (1-8)	Morocco (1-8)	United Republic of Tanzania (1-8)
El Salvador (1-8)	Mozambique (1-8)	Uruguay (1-8)
Finland (4-10)	Niger (1-8)	Venezuela (1-8)
Gambia (1-8)	Pakistan (2-8)	Zambia (1-8)
Guinea (1-8)	Panama (1-8)	Zimbabwe (1-8)
Guyana (1-8)	Peru (1-8)	
Indonesia (4-10)	Rwanda (1-8)	

Countries above maximum of range (C – total 27 countries)

Australia (12-18)	Egypt (1-8)	Nigeria (1-8)
Belgium (9-15)	Ethiopia (1-8)	Philippines (1-8)
Brazil (14-20)	France (46-64)	Russian Federation (10-16)
Burkina Faso (1-8)	Ghana (1-8)	Senegal (1-8)
Cameroon (1-8)	India (14-21)	Tunisia (1-8)
Canada (21-29)	Ireland (2-8)	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (37-51)
Colombia (1-8)	Kenya (1-8)	
Congo (1-8)	Myanmar (1-8)	
Côte d'Ivoire (1-8)	Nepal (1-8)	
Democratic Republic of the Congo (1-8)	Netherlands (13-19)	
	New Zealand (2-8)	

^a The name of Yugoslavia changed to Serbia and Montenegro as from 4 February 2003.

ANNEX 2

SAMPLE CALCULATIONS OF DESIRABLE RANGES

A. A country contributing 0.01%, with 187 000 population

Membership factor		3.0208333
Contribution factor (7.975 x 0.01)		0.0797500
Population factor (0.012328 x 0.187)		0.0023053
15% of midpoint is therefore less than 2.5781	Midpoint	3.1028886
Upper limit: add 2.5781 (= 5.6809886, i.e. less than 8)	(Minimum)	8
Lower limit: subtract 2.5781 (= 0.5247886, i.e. less than 1)		1

Range is therefore **1-8**

B. A country contributing 0.21%, with 42 793 000 population

Membership factor		3.0208333
Contribution factor (7.975 x 0.21)		1.6747500
Population factor (0.012328 x 42.793)		0.5275521
15% of midpoint is therefore less than 2.5781	Midpoint	5.2231354
Upper limit: add 2.5781 (= 7.8012354)	Round up to	8
Lower limit: subtract 2.5781 (= 2.6450354)	Round down to	2

Range is therefore **2-8**

C. A country contributing 0.46%, with 880 560 000 population

Membership factor		3.0208333
Contribution factor (7.975 x 0.46)		3.6685000
Population factor (0.012328 x 880.56)		10.8555437
15% of midpoint is therefore less than 2.5781	Midpoint	17.5448770
Upper limit: add 2.6317316 (= 20.1766086)	Round up to	21
Lower limit: subtract 2.6317316 (= 14.9131454)	Round down to	14

Range is therefore **14-21**

COMPUTATION OF DESIRABLE RANGES BASED ON THREE OPTIONS

	BASIC DATA			OPTIONS								
	Population (1000)	Contribution based on WHO 2004-2005 proposed scale of assessment	Total number of staff (all sources of funds)	Option 1 Current formula updated			Option 2 Changes in weight for population and contribution			Option 3 Minimum upper range modulated to account for population		
				Lower limit	Upper limit	Status	Lower limit	Upper limit	Status	Lower limit	Upper limit	Status
Member States and Associate Members				RANGE			RANGE			RANGE		
				Lower limit	Upper limit	Status	Lower limit	Upper limit	Status	Lower limit	Upper limit	Status
AFGHANISTAN	22,474	0.0089	2	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1
ALBANIA	3,145	0.003	1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1
ALGERIA	30,841	0.0689	7	1	8	B2	1	8	B2	1	10	B2
ANDORRA	90	0.0039	0	1	8	A	1	8	A	1	6	A
ANGOLA	13,527	0.002	4	1	8	B2	1	8	B2	1	8	B2
ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA	65	0.002	0	1	8	A	1	8	A	1	6	A
ARGENTINA	37,488	1.1305	5	10	17	A	10	16	A	10	17	A
ARMENIA	3,788	0.002	2	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1
AUSTRALIA	19,338	1.6009	20	14	21	B2	13	20	B2	14	21	B2
AUSTRIA	8,075	0.9318	5	8	15	A	8	14	A	8	15	A
AZERBAIJAN	8,096	0.0039	0	1	8	A	1	8	A	1	8	A
BAHAMAS	308	0.0118	1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	6	B1
BAHRAIN	652	0.0177	2	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	6	B1
BANGLADESH	140,369	0.0098	7	2	8	B2	4	10	B2	2	14	B1
BARBADOS	268	0.0089	1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	6	B1
BELARUS	10,147	0.0187	0	1	8	A	1	8	A	1	8	A
BELGIUM	10,264	1.1109	25	10	16	C	9	16	C	10	16	C
BELIZE	231	0.001	0	1	8	A	1	8	A	1	6	A
BENIN	6,446	0.002	4	1	8	B2	1	8	B2	1	8	B2
BHUTAN	2,141	0.001	1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1
BOLIVIA	8,516	0.0079	5	1	8	B2	1	8	B2	1	8	B2
BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA	4,067	0.0039	0	1	8	A	1	8	A	1	8	A
BOTSWANA	1,554	0.0098	2	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1
BRAZIL	172,559	2.3516	31	22	30	C	22	31	C	22	30	C
BRUNEI DARUSSALAM	335	0.0325	0	1	8	A	1	8	A	1	6	A
BULGARIA	7,867	0.0128	1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1
BURKINA FASO	11,856	0.002	9	1	8	C	1	8	C	1	8	C

	Population (1000)	Contribution based on WHO 2004-2005 proposed scale of assessment	Total number of staff (all sources of funds)	Option 1 Current formula updated			Option 2 Changes in weight for population and contribution			Option 3 Minimum upper range modulated to account for population		
				RANGE		Status	RANGE		Status	RANGE		Status
				Lower limit	Upper limit		Lower limit	Upper limit		Lower limit	Upper limit	
Member States and Associate Members												
BURUNDI	6,502	0.001	3	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1
CAMBODIA	13,441	0.002	0	1	8	A	1	8	A	1	8	A
CAMEROON	15,203	0.0089	10	1	8	C	1	8	C	1	8	C
CANADA	31,015	2.5169	41	21	30	C	20	28	C	21	30	C
CAPE VERDE	437	0.001	2	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	6	B1
CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC	3,782	0.001	3	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1
CHAD	8,135	0.001	3	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1
CHILE	15,402	0.2086	6	2	9	B2	2	9	B2	2	9	B2
CHINA	1,284,972	1.5074	14	28	38	A	41	56	A	28	38	A
COLOMBIA	42,803	0.1978	9	2	9	B2	3	9	B2	2	10	B2
COMOROS	727	0.001	0	1	8	A	1	8	A	1	6	A
CONGO	3,110	0.001	12	1	8	C	1	8	C	1	8	C
COOK ISLANDS	20	0.001	0	1	8	A	1	8	A	1	6	A
COSTA RICA	4,112	0.0197	2	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1
COTE D'IVOIRE	16,349	0.0089	9	1	8	C	1	8	C	1	8	C
CROATIA	4,655	0.0384	2	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1
CUBA	11,237	0.0295	6	1	8	B2	1	8	B2	1	8	B2
CYPRUS	790	0.0374	0	1	8	A	1	8	A	1	6	A
CZECH REPUBLIC	10,260	0.1997	3	2	8	B1	2	8	B1	2	8	B1
DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO	52,522	0.0039	9	1	8	C	1	8	C	1	12	B2
DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF KOREA	22,428	0.0089	1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1
DENMARK	5,333	0.737	11	6	13	B2	6	13	B2	6	13	B2
DJIBOUTI	644	0.001	2	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	6	B1
DOMINICA	71	0.001	0	1	8	A	1	8	A	1	6	A
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	8,507	0.0226	5	1	8	B2	1	8	B2	1	8	B2
ECUADOR	12,880	0.0246	4	1	8	B2	1	8	B2	1	8	B2
EGYPT	69,080	0.0797	12	2	8	C	2	9	C	2	12	B2
EL SALVADOR	6,400	0.0177	5	1	8	B2	1	8	B2	1	8	B2

	Population (1000)	Contribution based on WHO 2004-2005 proposed scale of assessment	Total number of staff (all sources of funds)	Option 1 Current formula updated			Option 2 Changes in weight for population and contribution			Option 3 Minimum upper range modulated to account for population		
				RANGE			RANGE			RANGE		
				Lower limit	Upper limit	Status	Lower limit	Upper limit	Status	Lower limit	Upper limit	Status
Member States and Associate Members												
EQUATORIAL GUINEA	470	0.001	2	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	6	B1
ERITREA	3,816	0.001	2	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1
ESTONIA	1,377	0.0098	1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1
ETHIOPIA	64,459	0.0039	12	1	8	C	2	8	C	1	12	B2
FIJI	823	0.0039	3	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	6	B1
FINLAND	5,178	0.5136	9	4	11	B2	4	11	B2	4	11	B2
FRANCE	59,453	6.3621	71	50	69	C	46	64	C	50	69	C
GABON	1,262	0.0138	1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1
GAMBIA	1,337	0.001	7	1	8	B2	1	8	B2	1	8	B2
GEORGIA	5,239	0.0049	1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1
GERMANY	82,007	9.612	40	74	102	A	69	94	A	74	102	A
GHANA	19,734	0.0049	15	1	8	C	1	8	C	1	8	C
GREECE	10,623	0.5303	4	5	11	B1	4	11	B1	5	11	A
GRENADA	94	0.001	0	1	8	A	1	8	A	1	6	A
GUATEMALA	11,687	0.0266	2	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1
GUINEA	8,274	0.003	4	1	8	B2	1	8	B2	1	8	B2
GUINEA-BISSAU	1,227	0.001	2	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1
GUYANA	763	0.001	4	1	8	B2	1	8	B2	1	6	B2
HAITI	8,270	0.002	1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1
HONDURAS	6,575	0.0049	1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1
HUNGARY	9,917	0.1181	1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1
ICELAND	281	0.0325	1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	6	B1
INDIA	1,025,096	0.3355	30	16	23	C	27	38	B2	16	23	C
INDONESIA	214,840	0.1968	9	4	11	B2	7	14	B1	4	14	B2
IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)	71,369	0.2676	6	3	10	B2	4	11	B1	3	12	B1
IRAQ	23,584	0.1338	2	1	8	B1	2	8	B1	1	8	B1
IRELAND	3,841	0.2893	13	3	9	C	2	9	C	3	9	C
ISRAEL	6,172	0.4083	3	4	10	A	3	10	B1	4	10	A
ITALY	57,503	4.9834	37	40	55	A	37	51	B1	40	55	A

	Population (1000)	Contribution based on WHO 2004-2005 proposed scale of assessment	Total number of staff (all sources of funds)	Option 1 Current formula updated			Option 2 Changes in weight for population and contribution			Option 3 Minimum upper range modulated to account for population		
				RANGE			RANGE			RANGE		
				Lower limit	Upper limit	Status	Lower limit	Upper limit	Status	Lower limit	Upper limit	Status
Member States and Associate Members												
JAMAICA	2,598	0.0039	2	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1
JAPAN	127,335	19.2022	39	146	198	A	134	182	A	146	198	A
JORDAN	5,051	0.0079	7	1	8	B2	1	8	B2	1	8	B2
KAZAKHSTAN	16,095	0.0275	0	1	8	A	1	8	A	1	8	A
KENYA	31,293	0.0079	12	1	8	C	1	8	C	1	10	C
KIRIBATI	84	0.001	0	1	8	A	1	8	A	1	6	A
KUWAIT	1,971	0.1446	1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1
KYRGYZSTAN	4,986	0.001	0	1	8	A	1	8	A	1	8	A
LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC	5,403	0.001	1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1
LATVIA	2,406	0.0098	1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1
LEBANON	3,556	0.0118	7	1	8	B2	1	8	B2	1	8	B2
LESOTHO	2,057	0.001	1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1
LIBERIA	3,108	0.001	2	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1
LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA	5,408	0.0659	2	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1
LITHUANIA	3,689	0.0167	2	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1
LUXEMBOURG	442	0.0787	0	1	8	A	1	8	A	1	7	A
MADAGASCAR	16,437	0.003	4	1	8	B2	1	8	B2	1	8	B2
MALAWI	11,572	0.002	4	1	8	B2	1	8	B2	1	8	B2
MALAYSIA	22,633	0.2312	6	2	9	B2	2	9	B2	2	9	B2
MALDIVES	300	0.001	3	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	6	B2
MALI	11,677	0.002	8	1	8	B2	1	8	B2	1	8	B2
MALTA	392	0.0148	2	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	6	B1
MARSHALL ISLANDS	52	0.001	0	1	8	A	1	8	A	1	6	A
MAURITANIA	2,747	0.001	5	1	8	B2	1	8	B2	1	8	B2
MAURITIUS	1,171	0.0108	5	1	8	B2	1	8	B2	1	8	B2
MEXICO	100,368	1.0685	6	11	17	A	11	18	A	11	17	A
MICRONESIA (FEDERATED STATES OF)	126	0.001	0	1	8	A	1	8	A	1	6	A
MONACO	34	0.0039	0	1	8	A	1	8	A	1	6	A
MONGOLIA	2,559	0.001	1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1

	Population (1000)	Contribution based on WHO 2004-2005 proposed scale of assessment	Total number of staff (all sources of funds)	Option 1 Current formula updated			Option 2 Changes in weight for population and contribution			Option 3 Minimum upper range modulated to account for population		
				RANGE		Status	RANGE		Status	RANGE		Status
				Lower limit	Upper limit		Lower limit	Upper limit		Lower limit	Upper limit	
Member States and Associate Members												
MOROCCO	30,430	0.0433	4	1	8	B2	1	8	B2	1	10	B1
MOZAMBIQUE	18,644	0.001	4	1	8	B2	1	8	B2	1	8	B2
MYANMAR	48,364	0.0098	11	1	8	C	1	8	C	1	10	C
NAMIBIA	1,788	0.0069	1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1
NAURU	13	0.001	0	1	8	A	1	8	A	1	6	A
NEPAL	23,593	0.0039	9	1	8	C	1	8	C	1	8	C
NETHERLANDS	15,930	1.7101	33	15	22	C	14	20	C	15	22	C
NEW ZEALAND	3,808	0.2371	9	2	9	B2	2	9	B2	2	9	C
NICARAGUA	5,208	0.001	2	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1
NIGER	11,227	0.001	6	1	8	B2	1	8	B2	1	8	B2
NIGERIA	116,929	0.0669	14	2	9	C	3	10	C	2	14	B2
NIUE	2	0.001	0	1	8	A	1	8	A	1	6	A
NORWAY	4,488	0.6356	7	6	12	B1	5	12	B1	6	12	B1
OMAN	2,622	0.06	0	1	8	A	1	8	A	1	8	A
PAKISTAN	144,971	0.06	7	2	9	B2	4	11	B2	2	14	B1
PALAU	20	0.001	0	1	8	A	1	8	A	1	6	A
PANAMA	2,899	0.0177	6	1	8	B2	1	8	B2	1	8	B2
PAPUA NEW GUINEA	4,920	0.0059	0	1	8	A	1	8	A	1	8	A
PARAGUAY	5,636	0.0157	1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1
PERU	26,093	0.1161	4	1	8	B2	2	8	B1	1	10	B1
PHILIPPINES	77,131	0.0984	18	2	8	C	3	9	C	2	12	C
POLAND	38,577	0.3719	4	4	10	B1	4	11	B1	4	10	B1
PORTUGAL	10,033	0.4546	1	4	11	A	4	10	A	4	11	A
PUERTO RICO	3,952	0.001	0	1	8	A	1	8	A	1	8	A
QATAR	575	0.0334	0	1	8	A	1	8	A	1	6	A
REPUBLIC OF KOREA	47,069	1.8213	6	16	23	A	16	22	A	16	23	A
REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA	4,285	0.002	0	1	8	A	1	8	A	1	8	A
ROMANIA	22,388	0.0571	2	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1
RUSSIAN FEDERATION	144,664	1.1807	21	12	19	C	13	20	C	12	19	C

	Population (1000)	Contribution based on WHO 2004-2005 proposed scale of assessment	Total number of staff (all sources of funds)	Option 1 Current formula updated			Option 2 Changes in weight for population and contribution			Option 3 Minimum upper range modulated to account for population		
				RANGE		Status	RANGE		Status	RANGE		Status
				Lower limit	Upper limit		Lower limit	Upper limit		Lower limit	Upper limit	
Member States and Associate Members												
RWANDA	7,949	0.001	7	1	8	B2	1	8	B2	1	8	B2
SAINT KITTS AND NEVIS	38	0.001	0	1	8	A	1	8	A	1	6	A
SAINT LUCIA	149	0.002	0	1	8	A	1	8	A	1	6	A
SAINT VINCENT AND THE GRENADINES	114	0.001	0	1	8	A	1	8	A	1	6	A
SAMOA	159	0.001	0	1	8	A	1	8	A	1	6	A
SAN MARINO	27	0.002	0	1	8	A	1	8	A	1	6	A
SAO TOME AND PRINCIPE	140	0.001	0	1	8	A	1	8	A	1	6	A
SAUDI ARABIA	21,028	0.5451	1	5	12	A	5	11	A	5	12	A
SENEGAL	9,662	0.0049	12	1	8	C	1	8	C	1	8	C
SERBIA AND MONTENEGRO ^a	10,538	0.0197	2	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1
SEYCHELLES	81	0.002	1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	6	B1
SIERRA LEONE	4,587	0.001	5	1	8	B2	1	8	B2	1	8	B2
SINGAPORE	4,108	0.3867	0	3	10	A	3	10	A	3	10	A
SLOVAKIA	5,403	0.0423	1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1
SLOVENIA	1,985	0.0797	2	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1
SOLOMON ISLANDS	463	0.001	1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	6	B1
SOMALIA	9,157	0.001	4	1	8	B2	1	8	B2	1	8	B2
SOUTH AFRICA	43,792	0.4014	7	4	11	B2	4	11	B2	4	11	B2
SPAIN	39,921	2.4783	15	21	30	A	20	28	A	21	30	A
SRI LANKA	19,104	0.0157	7	1	8	B2	1	8	B2	1	8	B2
SUDAN	31,809	0.0059	8	1	8	B2	1	8	B2	1	10	B2
SURINAME	419	0.002	1	1	8	B1	1	8	B1	1	6	B1
SWAZILAND	938	0.002	0	1	8	A	1	8	A	1	6	A
SWEDEN	8,833	1.0103	10	9	15	B1	8	15	B1	9	15	B1
SWITZERLAND	7,170	1.2535	10	11	18	B1	10	17	B1	11	18	A
SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC	16,610	0.0787	6	1	8	B2	1	8	B2	1	8	B2
TAJIKISTAN	6,135	0.001	0	1	8	A	1	8	A	1	8	A
THAILAND	63,584	0.2893	8	3	10	B2	4	10	B2	3	12	B2

