

EBAP/13/63  
Correction 2

August 28, 2013

To: Members of the Executive Board  
From: The Secretary  
Subject: **FY 2013 Diversity and Inclusion Annual Report**

The attached corrections to EBAP/13/63 (6/17/13) have been provided by the staff:

#### **Factual Errors Not Affecting the Presentation of Staff's Analysis or Views**

**Page 5, third bullet, line 6:** for "so for individuals who feel excluded, inclusion offers multiple points" read "so for individuals who are seeking to be included, inclusion offers multiple points"

**Page 8, paragraph 10, line 2:** for "Middle East is the only region that has already attained the benchmark" read "The Middle East is the only region that has already attained the B-Level benchmark"

#### **Typographical Errors**

**Page 5, fourth bullet, line 6:** for "as important assets and provide their managers and their individual contributors" read "as important assets and provide their managers and individual contributors"

**Page 6, paragraph 1, line 4:** for "In Section IV, following up on issues raised at the Executive Board's discussion of last year's Annual Diversity Report, we provide a broader understanding" read "Following up on issues raised at the Executive Board's discussion of last year's Annual Diversity Report, Section IV provides a broader understanding"

**Page 7, footnote 8:** for "on a number of alternative quantitative measures (such as number of" read "on a number of additional quantitative measures (including number of"

**Page 20, paragraph 27, line 1:** for "including the 5th Annual Diversity Conference" read "including the Fifth Annual Diversity Conference"

**Box 3:** "As of April 30, 2013" added

**Page 21, bullet 9:** for “allows employees f to express interest” read “allows employees to express interest”

**Page 34, Annex II, footnote 1:** footnote added to read “Excludes OED and IEO.” Subsequent footnotes renumbered.

**Page 38, Annex III (Transition Countries):** Updated to add “Total” column

**Page 41, Annex IV, footnote 1:** footnote added to read “Excludes OED and IEO.” Subsequent footnotes renumbered.

**Page 43, Annex VI:** Updated to reflect lack of A1-A8 Fund economists – added “n.a.” to A1-A8 economist columns.

**Page 47, Annex X:** for “Five Year History; Recruitment” read “Five Year History: Recruitment”

**Page 48, Annex XI:** Updated to reflect lack of A1-A8 Fund economists – added “n.a.” to A1-A8 economist columns.

Questions may be referred to Ms. Paul, HRD (ext. 36309).

This document will shortly be posted on the extranet, a secure website for Executive Directors and member country authorities.

Att: (12)

Other Distribution:  
Department Heads

## FOREWORD

- In its early years, the Fund's diversity strategy focused on assessing the climate and building awareness of the business case for diversity. Next came the infrastructure and accountability through the development of the diversity goals, scorecard and the departmental Diversity Reference Groups. In the past two years, the Diversity Office has worked across the Fund to integrate the goals and accountability into the operations of the Fund and to expand the focus on inclusion while maintaining the emphasis on progress towards the benchmarks.
- Diversity, (i.e. the demographic composition of the Fund and the equitable treatment of all employees), remains the key focus of the diversity strategy. Inclusion, a necessary complement to diversity, is more intangible; it is the process through which the benefits of having an internationally diverse staff are realized. In an inclusive workplace, multiple perspectives (such as professional, cultural, ideological) can be shared and given a fair hearing and employees can interact in authentic ways without the need to mask aspects of their identity.
- Here at the Fund, inclusion obviously goes well beyond creating a work environment free from harassment, discrimination or bias. It is about ensuring that the work environment is hospitable and supportive of everyone, and that the wide spectrum of differences that employees bring are effectively managed to foster an "intellectually open atmosphere that seeks diverse views to develop the best solutions." Inclusion engages everyone and benefits everyone, so for individuals who ~~are seeking to be included~~ ~~feel excluded~~, inclusion offers multiple points of connection from how one manages teams across lines of differences (such as culture, grade, and generation), to using one's cultural knowledge and skills in interacting effectively in a multicultural environment.
- One of the questions raised about inclusion is, "how will we know when we are truly inclusive?" Institutions that are most effective at being inclusive have three things in common: 1) they have gone well beyond the "diversity" versus "quality" debate and have crafted effective approaches to source and develop talent across the entire spectrum of their target groups for all levels of their institutions; 2) they view their diversity and the cultural knowledge of their employees as important assets and provide their managers and ~~their~~ individual contributors with the training and support needed to manage and interact with both competence and respect in today's global workplace; 3) they create environments in which their employees are expected to draw on their experiences (cultural, professional and other) to help find innovative solutions to their work. In doing so, they bring their whole selves to the job, not downplaying or denying aspects of their identity in order to fit in.
- In the coming year as we continue our work of strengthening diversity and inclusion in the Fund, the diversity strategy will focus on three broad areas: 1) increasing demographic (regional and gender) diversity while recognizing that the current diversity benchmarks and timeline will need to re-visited; 2) integrating diversity into the institutional culture, operations and policies of the Fund, and 3) continuing the process of becoming more inclusive.

**PAMELA PAUL**, Diversity Advisor

## I. INTRODUCTION

**1. This paper reports on developments in the Fund’s diversity strategy in FY 2013** and discusses a number of issues related to the future of the diversity agenda. Following the introduction, Section II describes recent changes in Fund staff composition, including the history, purpose, and operation of the Fund’s diversity benchmarks and other aspects of diversity demographics in the past year. Section III takes up issues related to the management of diversity and inclusion. ~~In Section IV, following up on issues raised at the Executive Board’s discussion of last year’s Annual Diversity Report, Section IV~~we provides a broader understanding of the multicultural environment of the Fund in two areas: dual nationalities and educational backgrounds. In Section V we set out some broad conclusions and recommendations for further development of the diversity agenda.

**2. Diversity is inherent to the Fund**, a multinational, multicultural institution with a mandate to recruit personnel “on as wide a geographical basis as possible” (subject to the paramount importance of securing the highest standards of efficiency and of technical competence).<sup>5</sup> In her most recent Global Policy Agenda, the Managing Director spoke on the importance of making progress in increasing the diversity of staff as “a key component of the Fund’s legitimacy”.<sup>6</sup> In addition, in establishing the enhanced diversity action plan in 2003, Management noted that the Fund’s commitment is founded on the clear business case for diversity: improved institutional quality and performance.<sup>7</sup> Staff diversity helps the Fund to serve its member countries more effectively. It enriches the work environment, enhances responsiveness to change, and increases innovation and problem-solving capacity. A diverse work environment also increases the attractiveness of the institution as an employer of choice.

**3. The Fund has become noticeably more diverse and inclusive in recent years.** The share of staff from underrepresented regions in senior positions and the representation of women in the professional and managerial grades have increased. In addition, measures have been taken to help foster a work environment that is inclusive i.e., hospitable and supportive of all staff, in which different perspectives can be shared and given a fair hearing. Even so, as discussed further below, there is much left to be done and a sustained effort to strengthen diversity and inclusion remains necessary.

## II. CHANGES IN IMF STAFF COMPOSITION

### A. Diversity Benchmarks: Historical Context

**4. An explicit effort to strengthen diversity in the Fund was adopted** in the mid-1990s, with actions that included the appointment of a Special Advisor on Diversity in 1995 and issuance of

---

<sup>5</sup> Article XII, Section 4 (d).

<sup>6</sup> Managing Director’s Global Policy Agenda, April 2013.

<sup>7</sup> See “The Role of Diversity in the Fund’s Human Resource Strategy,” (SM/03/194, 5/28/03).

an Action Plan to Promote Staff Diversity and Address Discrimination in 1996. Beginning in 2003, following the report of an internal Task Force on Diversity Benchmarks, the Fund established a set of indicators or benchmarks to help guide central recruitment efforts. These benchmarks also provided a device to measure progress over time and compared to other organizations, in promoting geographical and gender balance. The Task Force considered a number of indicators, but concluded that financial quotas were broadly suitable overall to determine the geographic representation of staff. The only exception was Africa, where the Task Force recommended a higher-than-quota share of representation of eight percent.<sup>8</sup>

**5. The benchmarks adopted in 2003 covered:** the share of staff from underrepresented regions and country groups (Africa, Transition Countries, Middle East, and all Developing and Transition Countries combined); and the share of women in total B-level staff, with sub-benchmarks for economists and specialized career streams (Box 1).<sup>9</sup>

#### Box 1. The 2003 Quantitative Indicators to Measure Progress in Diversity

##### **Geographic Indicators (A9-A15)**

- Africa—8 percent
- Middle East—8 percent
- European Transition Countries—8 percent
- Developing Countries—40 percent

##### **Gender Indicators (B-level)**

- Women at B level—20 percent
- Women Economists at B level—15 percent — 20 percent
- Women Specialized Career Streams at B level—35 percent —40 percent

**6. In late 2008, the Diversity Council decided to recommit to these benchmarks** for the period 2009-2014. At the same time, based on recommendations of a Working Group appointed by Management, they approved extending the benchmarks in two ways: first, by adopting a new benchmark on the share of East Asian staff in professional levels (A9-B5); and second, by setting benchmarks on the share of B-level staff from each of the underrepresented country groupings (Africa, East Asia, Middle East, and transition countries). The Working Group proposed that the benchmark for East Asian staff—at that time the most underrepresented region in the Fund relative to quota—be set at 12 percent for the period to 2014.<sup>10</sup>

**7. With regard to staff at the B-level,** the 2008 Working Group further proposed that benchmarks be set for each of the regional groupings: Africa —six percent; East Asia — seven

<sup>8</sup> The higher-than-quota indicator for Africa was based on a number of ~~additional~~ alternative quantitative measures (such as including number of Fund arrangements, share of staff days in area and functional departments spent on Africa) as well as the desirability of having a critical mass of staff of sub-Saharan origin. The offset to the above quota share for Africa was distributed broadly proportionately across the other regions.

<sup>9</sup> The Developing Countries benchmark was surpassed in 2006 and the benchmark is no longer tracked.

<sup>10</sup> The Working Group considered this an interim benchmark, given that it appeared unrealistic in that timeframe to achieve a representation of 15 percent, which would be closer to the region's financial quota in the Fund.

percent, the Middle East — five percent, and Transition Countries — four percent. As with the indicator for East Asian staff (A9-B5), these benchmarks were considered interim standards for practical considerations in light of then-projected hiring, retention, and promotion trends.

**8. One further change was made to the diversity benchmarks in 2011**, with adoption of a revised benchmark for representation of women at the B-level. In late 2010, the initial 2003 gender benchmarks were surpassed and Management reconvened the Diversity Benchmark Working Group to make recommendations on how new gender benchmarks should be set to guide policies in the years ahead. On the basis of a detailed analysis of historic and projected demographic trends, the Working Group proposed that the range for each indicator be increased by five to ten percentage points, to encourage more ambitious efforts overall. Accordingly, the revised B-level gender benchmarks for the period to CY2014 became: 25-30 percent for all B-level women, 20-25 percent for B-level economists, and 40-45 percent for B-level SCS. The current diversity benchmarks are set out in Table A.

**9. Overall, progress has been made on most of the diversity benchmarks though uneven across regions and grades** (see Table A and Figure 1). In the case of Transition Countries, the benchmark for all staff has been surpassed, and the share of East Asian staff is closing in on its 2014 benchmark. For Africa, progress has been quite limited (6.8 percent) for FY 2013 compared to 5.4 in 2003, when the original indicator was set, and remains below the benchmark of eight percent. The overall share of Middle Eastern staff (A9-B5) has proved the hardest to move, being 4.5 percent at the end of FY 2012, not much different from the 4.4 percent that prevailed in 2003, and compared to the benchmark of eight percent. In some cases, but not all, it has been difficult to make sustained headway at the B-level, while marked shifts have been seen at the A9-A15 levels. In other categories, the reverse has been true. In addition, the issues that impact hiring and retention trends vary both across region and between region and gender.

**10. The disaggregated benchmarks for B-level staff from underrepresented regions show mixed progress.** The Middle East is the only region that has already attained the B-Level benchmark—5.4 percent at end-FY 2013 compared to the five percent benchmark. Efforts to sustain the progress made on this target will require, among other things, close monitoring of conversion rates of staff hired through the B-level Diversity Hiring Initiative. Transition countries, in contrast to their representation in the A-level professional grades, are currently only halfway toward the B-level benchmark. The share of East Asian staff at the most senior levels has increased fairly steadily over the years, but, at nearly six percent, is still somewhat below the benchmark of seven percent. The share of B-level staff from Africa has fluctuated, and is still short of its benchmark, but has been on an upward trend over the longer term. The largest share of B-level staff (40.8 percent) is European, excluding Transition Countries, and the US and Canada make up the second largest share at 24 percent.

## B. Communications, Outreach, and Learning

**25. Inclusion has measureable beneficial outcomes**, some of them as a result of the refinement and intensifying of long-standing sound human resource (HR) practices, as well as more recent initiatives. Examples of these expected outcomes are:

- Developing a common language – through training and dialogue, everyone becomes comfortable acknowledging and speaking about differences and about their cultural backgrounds even as they interact effectively.
- Ensuring that managers and supervisors have the awareness and skills to promptly address issues that undermine the quality of the workplace interactions.
- Having a workplace expectation that all employees treat each other with civility and respect.
- Increasing staff motivation and morale by having a work environment that is hospitable and supportive.

**26. These outcomes will be realized through an ongoing process of communications and learning/training.** In FY 2013, for example, the Diversity Office briefed senior staff in each department on recent updates to the diversity strategy, including the revised Diversity and Inclusion Statement and changes in the Diversity Scorecard. These briefings included the departmental Diversity Reference Groups (DRGs). The Office also held a variety of workshops focused on different facets of diversity and inclusion. Some examples:

- Personal Advisory Board sessions designed to provide participants with the tools to proactively assess their career goals and select a cadre of professionals inside and outside the Fund to mentor and guide them toward achieving those goals.
- “Generations Training” aimed at enhancing understanding and communication across the four distinct generations in the Fund’s workplace<sup>18</sup>;
- “Inclusive Communications Training” focused on the skills needed to build successful relationships in the workplace in ways in which intercultural collaboration contributes to becoming a high-performing organization that serves globally diverse stakeholders;
- “Diversity & Inclusion” training to provide a broad understanding of key aspects of diversity, inclusion, culture, and cultural competence; and to allow participants to practice effective skills for working well in a multicultural environment.

---

<sup>18</sup> As noted in the Supplement to the *2011 Diversity Annual Report* (EBM/12/70, June 18, 2012), the four generations in the workplace are: Generation Y (1981-2002), Generation X (1965-1980), Baby Boomers (1946-1964), and Traditionalists (1927-1945).

**27. The Diversity Office also sponsored major Fund-wide events**, including the ~~Fifth~~<sup>5th</sup> Annual Diversity Conference, for which this year's theme was "Inclusion: Benefits to the Fund and to Each Individual." One of the keynote speakers, Andres Tapia, emphasized a "globalist" view of diversity and inclusion in which the definition of these terms is tailored to the specific country/regional/organizational context. The Diversity Office also co-sponsored in cooperation with the HR Department in the World Bank a special event in celebration of International Women's Day in March 2013 at which the Managing Director spoke.

**28. The Diversity Council advanced measures to strengthen progress towards diversity goals.**<sup>19</sup> The Council is the main body for shaping and promulgating the diversity policy in the Fund. In FY 2013, the Council: 1) considered actions to narrow the gap to the 2014 Diversity Benchmarks; 2) reviewed and revised the mission and goals of the Council; 3) reviewed and revised the Diversity Goals; 4) endorsed a list of best practices for managing diversity in departments; 5) approved a recommendation from the DRG Chairs to develop recommendations for Management's consideration for a study on salary equity and career progression, by gender and nationality, in line with the study of career progression done in 2007<sup>20</sup>; and 6) recommended that a recognition program be developed to acknowledge the efforts of mid-level managers in advancing the diversity and inclusion agenda.

### Box 3. Diversity Council Members

As of April 30, 2013

- Nemat Shafik, Chair, *ex-officio* 1/
- Mark Plant, *ex-officio* 1/
- Pamela Paul, *ex-officio* 1/
- Masood Ahmed
- Frank Harnischfeger
- Dora Metodieva Iakova
- Michel Lazare
- Jianhai Lin
- Armida San José
- Antoinette Sayeh
- Abdelhak Senhadji
- Rhoda Weeks-Brown
- Sweta Saxena (SAC Principal Representative) 2/
- Chris Lane (SAC Alternate Representative) 2/

1/ Ex-officio members are permanent.

2/ Representative for the Chair of the Staff Association Committee.

**29. The Diversity Reference Groups continue to be key and active communication resources within each department.** In recent years, Departments, often working in conjunction with their respective DRGs, have undertaken a variety of actions to promote diversity and inclusion, with particular attention to transparency of assignment, selection, and promotion processes. Also, individual DRGs have undertaken their own initiatives to ensure that both new and current staff are kept aware of diversity and inclusion. A number of these best practices at the "grassroots" level are highlighted in Box 4 and Box 5. The Diversity Office will be working with departments and the DRGs in the year ahead to identify and further promulgate such best practices throughout the Fund.

<sup>19</sup> The Diversity Council is chaired by Deputy Managing Director Nemat Shafik.

<sup>20</sup> IMF Diversity Annual Report 2008

#### **Box 4. Departmental Actions and the Work of the Diversity Reference Groups (DRGs)**

Departments and their respective DRGs, have taken actions to promote diversity and inclusion. Examples include:

##### **Transparency: Sharing Data on Performance**

- AFR, APD, EUR, EXR, FAD, ICD, MCD, TGS and WHD post aggregated APR results by various diversity dimensions. MCD also posts promotions.
- APD gives their DRG access to the diversity composite in their (anonymous) SAMs for analysis and communication to their staff.

##### **Equal Access to Opportunity**

- AFR posts criteria and selections for special assignments and reviews selection data for trends and equity.
- MCD advertises all vacancies for desks assignment, special projects, and one-off country assignments and circulates post-selection data (number of candidates, of which number from underrepresented groups, makeup of the panel, and demographics of the selected candidate) to all employees.
- MCM announces department-wide all FSAP mission assignments for both mission chiefs and mission members and has created a new website that allows staff to express interest in upcoming FSAP missions.
- STA advertises high profile assignments and provides information to staff on the outcomes of job postings.
- TGS posts all positions for mobility.
- APD informs all staff about new working groups being formed and solicits interest in participation.
- FAD developed a web-based departmental vacancy tool that announces all fiscal economist assignments and allows employees to express interest in the positions.
- EUR advertises all vacancies and one-off assignments, and publishes the name of selected candidates.

##### **Accountability**

- FAD instituted the Accountability Framework at the divisional level, which, among other things, has heightened division chiefs' attention to divisional diversity indicators.

##### **Mentoring and Support**

- ICD has a systematic mentoring program for new staff and holds regular informal meetings with the Front Office open to all staff.
- LEG has a "Diversity Contact Person," (outside of the DRG) as a resource to their employees who wish to discuss diversity-related matters on a confidential basis. The Diversity Contact person explains Fund-wide diversity values and department-specific diversity values based on LEG's Diversity Guidelines.
- MCM holds individual Career Guidance Discussions with all employees, their managers and the SPM to explore career opportunities and constraints for a 3-5 year time frame to help to better assign work and develop staff skills.
- TGS has an Employee Engagement initiative on which the Diversity & Workplace Reference Group DWRG is represented and plays an active role.
- STA convenes HQ events for resident statistical advisors in the RTACs to interact more with HQ staff.

### Box 5. DRG Best Practices

Some DRGs have developed their own set of actions. For example:

- APD DRG: Proactively pairs new staff—especially those from underrepresented groups—with mentors. Also, contributes to quarterly newsletters of the department and presents at departmental retreats on pertinent diversity issues with the support of APD management. In cooperation with APD management, conducted a Diversity Survey in 2012.
- EUR DRG: Distributes diversity profile of the department every six months; implements a mentoring program for new staff and has led diversity related discussions for all EUR employees.
- FAD DRG: Provides the diversity profile of the department and each division to Front Office and Division Chiefs every six months. To better leverage work experiences outside the Fund, mid-career economists are invited to share their experiences in periodic, informal presentations for department staff. In addition, instituted of the accountability frameworks at the divisional level, which, among other things, has heightened attention to diversity matters.
- FIN DRG: Revamped its website to facilitate engagement, communications, and share best practices. Includes introduction to FINDRG in on-boarding documents. FIN DRG also circulates DRG Chairs meeting minutes on diversity initiatives and activities to the department.
- ICD DRG: Briefs new employees on the Diversity Strategy, role of the DRGs, and informs them of the zero tolerance policy towards harassment, bullying, and intimidation and provides information on informal and formal dispute resolution channels available to them. Staff transferring from within the Fund are informed about the role of the ICD DRG and asked about best practices from their former departments.
- MCM DRG: Asks all MCM managers provide 3-5 names of potential hires from underrepresented regions; makes periodic presentations at senior staff meetings; circulates minutes and resources to all staff to promote communication and awareness of diversity and inclusion.
- SPR DRG: Arranges meetings and workshops to discuss and promote diversity and work-life balance issues; includes a discussion on diversity and inclusion to new SPR employees as part of the on-boarding process.
- STA DRG: Presents diversity awareness-raising workshops, on topics including generational labor economics and best practices in managing in an intergenerational organization; provides briefings to new staff on DRG's work and diversity issues, and reports on DRG activities at departmental meetings and retreats.
- In 2013, WHD DRG won a Fund-wide award for their exceptional contribution to the Fund's diversity agenda. Initiatives included: Creating an informal women's network and having presentations on topics of interests; conducting discussions on flexible work arrangements, harassment and bullying, and the US election results' implications for diversity. Prepared and conducted a departmental survey on harassment and bullying, and organized a town hall meeting to discuss the results with the department, Ethics and Diversity Advisors.

### Annex I. Staff Nationality 1/

By Region, Gender, Career Stream and Grade grouping (As of April 30, 2013)

Region	Economists						Specialized Career Streams										Total Staff									
	A9-A15		B1-B5		A9-B5		A1-A8		A9-A15		B1-B5		A9-B5		Total		A1-A8		A9-A15		B1-B5		A9-B5		Total	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Africa	81	7.4	12	4.5	93	6.8	54	11.8	44	6.9	4	6.3	48	6.9	102	8.8	54	11.8	125	7.2	16	4.8	141	6.8	195	7.7
Asia	200	18.3	40	14.9	240	17.6	101	22.1	138	21.7	10	15.6	148	21.2	249	21.5	101	22.1	338	19.5	50	15.0	388	18.8	489	19.4
Australia & New Zealand	19	1.7	7	2.6	26	1.9	3	0.7	10	1.6	1	1.6	11	1.6	14	1.2	3	0.7	29	1.7	8	2.4	37	1.8	40	1.6
India	32	2.9	15	5.6	47	3.4	23	5.0	46	7.2	4	6.3	50	7.2	73	6.3	23	5.0	78	4.5	19	5.7	97	4.7	120	4.8
East Asia	139	12.7	14	5.2	153	11.2	66	14.4	75	11.8	5	7.8	80	11.4	146	12.6	66	14.4	214	12.4	19	5.7	233	11.3	299	11.9
Japan	40	3.7	9	3.3	49	3.6	3	0.7	8	1.3	0	0.0	8	1.1	11	1.0	3	0.7	48	2.8	9	2.7	57	2.8	60	2.4
Other Asia	10	0.9	4	1.5	14	1.0	9	2.0	7	1.1	0	0.0	7	1.0	16	1.4	9	2.0	17	1.0	4	1.2	21	1.0	30	1.2
Europe	469	42.9	123	45.7	592	43.4	72	15.8	150	23.6	20	31.3	170	24.3	242	20.9	72	15.8	619	35.8	143	42.9	762	37.0	834	33.1
U.K.	36	3.3	26	9.7	62	4.5	23	5.0	26	4.1	10	15.6	36	5.2	59	5.1	23	5.0	62	3.6	36	10.8	98	4.8	121	4.8
Transition Countries	122	11.2	7	2.6	129	9.5	17	3.7	43	6.8	0	0.0	43	6.2	60	5.2	17	3.7	165	9.5	7	2.1	172	8.3	189	7.5
Other Europe	311	28.4	90	33.5	401	29.4	32	7.0	81	12.8	10	15.6	91	13.0	123	10.6	32	7.0	392	22.7	100	30.0	492	23.9	524	20.8
Middle East	49	4.5	16	5.9	65	4.8	15	3.3	26	4.1	2	3.1	28	4.0	43	3.7	15	3.3	75	4.3	18	5.4	93	4.5	108	4.3
Saudi-Arabia	3	0.3	1	0.4	4	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	3.1	2	0.3	2	0.2	0	0.0	3	0.2	3	0.9	6	0.3	6	0.2
Other Arab countries	32	2.9	12	4.5	44	3.2	12	2.6	20	3.1	0	0.0	20	2.9	32	2.8	12	2.6	52	3.0	12	3.6	64	3.1	76	3.0
Other Middle East	14	1.3	3	1.1	17	1.2	3	0.7	6	0.9	0	0.0	6	0.9	9	0.8	3	0.7	20	1.2	3	0.9	23	1.1	26	1.0
USA & Canada	147	13.4	56	20.8	203	14.9	132	28.9	219	34.5	24	37.5	243	34.8	375	32.4	132	28.9	366	21.2	80	24.0	446	21.6	578	22.9
USA	112	10.2	48	17.8	160	11.7	128	28.0	197	31.0	22	34.4	219	31.3	347	30.0	128	28.0	309	17.9	70	21.0	379	18.4	507	20.1
Canada	35	3.2	8	3.0	43	3.2	4	0.9	22	3.5	2	3.1	24	3.4	28	2.4	4	0.9	57	3.3	10	3.0	67	3.2	71	2.8
Other Western Hemisphere	148	13.5	77	8.7	170	12.5	83	18.2	58	9.1	4	6.3	62	8.9	145	12.5	83	18.2	206	11.9	26	7.8	232	11.3	315	12.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,094</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>269</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>1,363</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>457</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>635</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>699</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>1,156</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>457</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>1,729</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>333</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>2,062</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>2,519</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Women	322	29.4	51	19.0	373	27.4	391	85.6	333	52.4	22	34.4	355	50.8	746	64.5	391	85.6	655	37.9	73	21.9	728	35.3	1119	44.4
Men	772	70.6	218	81.0	990	72.6	66	14.4	302	47.6	42	65.6	344	49.2	410	35.5	66	14.4	1074	62.1	260	78.1	1334	64.7	1400	55.6

Source: PeopleSoft HRMS, Report ID: DAR\_007

1/ Excludes OED and IEO.

**Annex II. Nationality of Contractual Employees 1/ 2/**  
By Region, Gender, Career Stream and Grade Grouping (As of April 30, 2013)

Region	Economists				Specialized Career Streams						Total					
	Professional		Support		Professional		Support		Total		Professional		Support		Total	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Africa	2	6.3	n.a.	n.a.	19	6.2	15	4.9	34	5.6	21	6.2	15	4.9	36	5.6
Asia	2	6.3	n.a.	n.a.	52	17.0	56	18.3	108	17.6	54	16.0	56	18.3	110	17.1
Australia & New Zealand	0	0.0	n.a.	n.a.	10	3.3	2	0.7	12	2.0	10	3.0	2	0.7	12	1.9
India	0	0.0	n.a.	n.a.	8	2.6	8	2.6	16	2.6	8	2.4	8	2.6	16	2.5
East Asia	2	6.3	n.a.	n.a.	34	11.1	42	13.7	76	12.4	36	10.7	42	13.7	78	12.1
Japan	2	6.3	n.a.	n.a.	4	1.3	4	1.3	8	1.3	6	1.8	4	1.3	10	1.6
Other Asia	0	0.0	n.a.	n.a.	0	0.0	4	1.3	4	0.7	0	0.0	4	1.3	4	0.6
Europe	20	62.5	n.a.	n.a.	90	29.4	28	9.2	118	19.3	110	32.5	28	9.2	138	21.4
U.K.	3	9.4	n.a.	n.a.	11	3.6	4	1.3	15	2.5	14	4.1	4	1.3	18	2.8
Transition Countries	6	18.8	n.a.	n.a.	29	9.5	14	4.6	43	7.0	35	10.4	14	4.6	49	7.6
Other Europe	11	34.4	n.a.	n.a.	50	16.3	10	3.3	60	9.8	61	18.0	10	3.3	71	11.0
Middle East	0	0.0	n.a.	n.a.	11	3.6	16	5.2	27	4.4	11	3.3	16	5.2	27	4.2
Saudi-Arabia	0	0.0	n.a.	n.a.	4	1.3	2	0.7	6	1.0	4	1.2	2	0.7	6	0.9
Other Arab countries	0	0.0	n.a.	n.a.	6	2.0	10	3.3	16	2.6	6	1.8	10	3.3	16	2.5
Other Middle East	0	0.0	n.a.	n.a.	1	0.3	4	1.3	5	0.8	1	0.3	4	1.3	5	0.8
USA & Canada	2	6.3	n.a.	n.a.	108	35.3	159	52.0	267	43.6	110	32.5	159	52.0	269	41.8
USA	1	3.1	n.a.	n.a.	96	31.4	156	51.0	252	41.2	97	28.7	156	51.0	253	39.3
Canada	1	3.1	n.a.	n.a.	12	3.9	3	1.0	15	2.5	13	3.8	3	1.0	16	2.5
Other Western Hemisphere	6	18.8	n.a.	n.a.	26	8.5	32	10.5	58	9.5	32	9.5	32	10.5	64	9.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>n.a.</b>	<b>n.a.</b>	<b>306</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>306</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>612</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>338</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>306</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>644</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Women	7	21.9	n.a.	n.a.	121	39.5	189	61.8	310	50.7	128	37.9	189	61.8	317	49.2
Men	25	78.1	n.a.	n.a.	185	60.5	117	38.2	302	49.3	210	62.1	117	38.2	327	50.8

Source: PeopleSoft HRMS, Report ID: DAR\_007

1/ Excludes OED and IEO.

2/ Does not include 180 Fund Technical Assistance Officers.

**Annex III. Nationality Distribution List – Staff and Contractual Employees 1/**  
(As of April 20, 2013)

Country	Staff						Contractual				Total	
	A1-A8		A9-A15		B1-B5		Professional		Support			
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Albania	0	0.0	4	0.2	0	0.0	1	0.3	1	0.3	6	0.2
Armenia	1	0.2	12	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3	14	0.4
Aruba	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Austria	1	0.2	7	0.4	3	0.9	2	0.5	0	0.0	13	0.4
Azerbaijan	0	0.0	4	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	0.1
Belarus	3	0.7	4	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3	8	0.2
Belgium	3	0.7	22	1.3	7	2.1	5	1.3	0	0.0	37	1.2
Bosnia-Herze	0	0.0	1	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.0
Bulgaria	1	0.2	16	0.9	2	0.6	1	0.3	4	1.3	24	0.7
Croatia	1	0.2	4	0.2	0	0.0	2	0.5	0	0.0	7	0.2
Curacao	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Cyprus	0	0.0	6	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	0.2
Czech Rep.	2	0.4	13	0.8	1	0.3	2	0.5	0	0.0	18	0.6
Denmark	0	0.0	12	0.7	2	0.6	1	0.3	0	0.0	15	0.5
Estonia	1	0.2	4	0.2	0	0.0	1	0.3	0	0.0	6	0.2
Finland	0	0.0	3	0.2	1	0.3	2	0.5	2	0.6	8	0.2
France	8	1.8	79	4.6	15	4.5	21	5.5	2	0.6	125	3.9
Georgia	0	0.0	6	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	0.2
Germany	2	0.4	71	4.1	24	7.2	10	2.6	4	1.3	111	3.5
Greece	0	0.0	6	0.3	5	1.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	11	0.3
Hungary	0	0.0	4	0.2	0	0.0	3	0.8	2	0.6	9	0.3
Iceland	0	0.0	3	0.2	0	0.0	2	0.5	0	0.0	5	0.2
Ireland	4	0.9	11	0.6	3	0.9	5	1.3	0	0.0	23	0.7
Israel	0	0.0	3	0.2	0	0.0	1	0.3	0	0.0	4	0.1
Italy	5	1.1	53	3.1	18	5.4	8	2.1	0	0.0	84	2.6
Kazakhstan	0	0.0	4	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	0.1
Kosovo	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Kyrgyz Rep.	0	0.0	2	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.1
Latvia	0	0.0	3	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	0.1
Lithuania	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Luxembourg	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Macedonia	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Malta	0	0.0	3	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	0.1
Moldova	1	0.2	6	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	0.2
Mongolia	1	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3	1	0.3	3	0.1
Montenegro	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Netherlands	1	0.2	23	1.3	11	3.3	3	0.8	0	0.0	38	1.2
Nethr Antil	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Norway	0	0.0	7	0.4	1	0.3	1	0.3	0	0.0	9	0.3
Poland	4	0.9	18	1.0	2	0.6	3	0.8	1	0.3	28	0.9
Portugal	1	0.2	7	0.4	0	0.0	1	0.3	0	0.0	9	0.3
Romania	0	0.0	13	0.8	0	0.0	6	1.6	1	0.3	20	0.6
Russia	2	0.4	33	1.9	0	0.0	12	3.1	1	0.3	48	1.5
San Marino	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Serbia	1	0.2	1	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.1
Sint Maarten	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Slovak Rep.	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3	3	0.8	0	0.0	4	0.1
Slovenia	0	0.0	1	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.0
Spain	3	0.7	31	1.8	5	1.5	9	2.3	1	0.3	49	1.5
Sweden	1	0.2	9	0.5	1	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	11	0.3
Switzerland	0	0.0	9	0.5	1	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	10	0.3
Tajikistan	0	0.0	2	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.1
Turkey	2	0.4	27	1.6	3	0.9	2	0.5	2	0.6	36	1.1
Turkmenistan	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
U.K.	23	5.1	62	3.6	36	10.8	16	4.2	3	0.9	140	4.4
Ukraine	0	0.0	7	0.4	1	0.3	3	0.8	2	0.6	13	0.4
Uzbekistan	0	0.0	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.3	0	0.0	2	0.1
<b>EUR</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>15.8</b>	<b>617</b>	<b>35.7</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>43.1</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>33.3</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>9.2</b>	<b>989</b>	<b>30.8</b>

Source: PeopleSoft HRMS, Report ID: EMP\_INFO

1/ Excludes OED and IEO. Does not include Technical Assistance Officers (contractual)

Annex III. Nationality Distribution List – Staff and Contractual Employees 1/ (As of April 20, 2013)												
Country	Staff						Contractual				Total	
	A1-A8		A9-A15		B1-B5		Professional		Support		No.	Percent
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent		
Albania	0	0.0	4	0.2	0	0.0	1	0.3	1	0.3	6	0.2
Armenia	1	0.2	12	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3	14	0.4
Azerbaijan	0	0.0	4	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	0.1
Belarus	3	0.7	4	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3	8	0.2
Bosnia-Herze	0	0.0	1	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.0
Bulgaria	1	0.2	16	0.9	2	0.6	1	0.3	4	1.3	24	0.7
Croatia	1	0.2	4	0.2	0	0.0	2	0.5	0	0.0	7	0.2
Czech Rep.	2	0.4	13	0.8	1	0.3	2	0.5	0	0.0	18	0.6
Estonia	1	0.2	4	0.2	0	0.0	1	0.3	0	0.0	6	0.2
Georgia	0	0.0	6	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	0.2
Hungary	0	0.0	4	0.2	0	0.0	3	0.8	2	0.6	9	0.3
Kazakhstan	0	0.0	4	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	0.1
Kosovo	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Kyrgyz Rep.	0	0.0	2	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.1
Latvia	0	0.0	3	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	0.1
Lithuania	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Macedonia	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Moldova	1	0.2	6	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	0.2
Mongolia	1	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3	1	0.3	3	0.1
Montenegro	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Poland	4	0.9	18	1.0	2	0.6	3	0.8	1	0.3	28	0.9
Romania	0	0.0	13	0.8	0	0.0	6	1.6	1	0.3	20	0.6
Russia	2	0.4	33	1.9	0	0.0	12	3.1	1	0.3	48	1.5
Serbia	1	0.2	1	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.1
Slovak Rep.	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3	3	0.8	0	0.0	4	0.1
Slovenia	0	0.0	1	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.0
Tajikistan	0	0.0	2	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.1
Turkmenistan	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Ukraine	0	0.0	7	0.4	1	0.3	3	0.8	2	0.6	13	0.4
Uzbekistan	0	0.0	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.3	0	0.0	2	0.1
<b>Transition Countries</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>9.4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>10.2</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>7.5</b>

Source: PeopleSoft HRMS, Report ID: EMP\_INFO

1/ Excludes OED and IEO. Does not include Technical Assistance Officers (contractual)

**Annex IV. Distribution of Pipeline Grade A09-B05, Share of Grade by Region and Gender 1/2/**

(As of April 30, 2013)

Grade	Africa		Asia		East Asia		Europe		UK		Middle East		Arab Countries		USA & Canada		Other WH		All Fund		Women		Men	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
<b>Economists</b>																								
A11	8	8.6	27	11.3	23	15.0	37	6.3	3	4.8	8	12.3	5	10.4	9	4.4	14	8.2	103	7.6	41	11.0	62	6.3
A12	10	10.8	27	11.3	24	15.7	51	8.6	1	1.6	8	12.3	6	12.5	8	3.9	6	3.5	110	8.1	48	12.9	62	6.3
A13	12	12.9	33	13.8	28	18.3	58	9.8	1	1.6	7	10.8	5	10.4	16	7.9	20	11.8	146	10.7	43	11.5	103	10.4
A14	37	39.8	86	35.8	55	35.9	227	38.3	19	30.6	20	30.8	15	31.3	76	37.4	80	47.1	526	38.6	134	35.9	392	39.6
A15	14	15.1	27	11.3	9	5.9	96	16.2	12	19.4	6	9.2	4	8.3	38	18.7	28	16.5	209	15.3	56	15.0	153	15.5
B01	2	2.2	3	1.3	2	1.3	17	2.9	3	4.8	5	7.7	4	8.3	10	4.9	1	0.6	38	2.8	9	2.4	29	2.9
B02	5	5.4	13	5.4	7	4.6	43	7.3	5	8.1	6	9.2	6	12.5	28	13.8	9	5.3	104	7.6	24	6.4	80	8.1
B03	2	2.2	13	5.4	3	2.0	27	4.6	6	9.7	3	4.6	3	6.3	11	5.4	7	4.1	63	4.6	9	2.4	54	5.5
B04	2	2.2	7	2.9	2	1.3	31	5.2	10	16.1	2	3.1	0	0.0	6	3.0	3	1.8	51	3.7	7	1.9	44	4.4
B05	1	1.1	4	1.7	0	0.0	5	0.8	2	3.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.5	2	1.2	13	1.0	2	0.5	11	1.1
<b>Total 2/</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>592</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>1,363</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>373</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>990</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Specialized Career Streams</b>																								
A09	4	8.3	15	10.1	10	12.5	16	9.4	3	8.3	2	7.1	2	9.1	24	9.9	4	6.5	65	9.3	50	14.1	15	4.4
A10	5	10.4	17	11.5	15	18.8	19	11.2	5	13.9	4	14.3	4	18.2	30	12.3	15	24.2	90	12.9	57	16.1	33	9.6
A11	11	22.9	27	18.2	9	11.3	21	12.4	0	0.0	6	21.4	2	9.1	40	16.5	15	24.2	120	17.2	67	18.9	53	15.4
A12	9	18.8	39	26.4	22	27.5	26	15.3	7	19.4	6	21.4	5	22.7	45	18.5	8	12.9	133	19.0	63	17.7	70	20.3
A13	9	18.8	23	15.5	13	16.3	24	14.1	6	16.7	5	17.9	4	18.2	36	14.8	9	14.5	106	15.2	50	14.1	56	16.3
A14	6	12.5	10	6.8	5	6.3	34	20.0	5	13.9	2	7.1	2	9.1	30	12.3	5	8.1	87	12.4	37	10.4	50	14.5
A15	0	0.0	7	4.7	1	1.3	10	5.9	0	0.0	1	3.6	1	4.5	14	5.8	2	3.2	34	4.9	9	2.5	25	7.3
B01	1	2.1	4	2.7	2	2.5	2	1.2	1	2.8	1	3.6	1	4.5	2	0.8	2	3.2	12	1.7	7	2.0	5	1.5
B02	1	2.1	4	2.7	1	1.3	7	4.1	3	8.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	11	4.5	1	1.6	24	3.4	6	1.7	18	5.2
B03	1	2.1	1	0.7	1	1.3	3	1.8	0	0.0	1	3.6	1	4.5	6	2.5	0	0.0	12	1.7	5	1.4	7	2.0
B04	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	2.9	4	11.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.4	1	1.6	8	1.1	3	0.8	5	1.5
B05	0	0.0	1	0.7	1	1.3	3	1.8	2	5.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	1.6	0	0.0	8	1.1	1	0.3	7	2.0
<b>Total 2/</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>699</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>344</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Source: PeopleSoft HRMS, Report ID: DAR\_017

1/ Excludes OED and IEO.

2/ Totals are staff in grades A09-B05

**Annex V. Distribution of Pipeline Grade A09-B05, Share of Region and Gender by Grade**  
(As of April 30, 2013)

Grade	Africa		Asia		East Asia		Europe		UK		Middle East		Arab Countries		USA & Canada		Other WH		All Fund		Women		Men	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
<b>Economists</b>																								
A11	8	7.8	27	26.2	23	22.3	37	35.9	3	2.9	8	7.8	5	4.9	9	8.7	14	13.6	103	100.0	41	39.8	62	60.2
A12	10	9.1	27	24.5	24	21.8	51	46.4	1	0.9	8	7.3	6	5.5	8	7.3	6	5.5	110	100.0	48	43.6	62	56.4
A13	12	8.2	33	22.6	28	19.2	58	39.7	1	0.7	7	4.8	5	3.4	16	11.0	20	13.7	146	100.0	43	29.5	103	70.5
A14	37	7.0	86	16.3	55	10.5	227	43.2	19	3.6	20	3.8	15	2.9	76	14.4	80	15.2	526	100.0	134	25.5	392	74.5
A15	14	6.7	27	12.9	9	4.3	96	45.9	12	5.7	6	2.9	4	1.9	38	18.2	28	13.4	209	100.0	56	26.8	153	73.2
B01	2	5.3	3	7.9	2	5.3	17	44.7	3	7.9	5	13.2	4	10.5	10	26.3	1	2.6	38	100.0	9	23.7	29	76.3
B02	5	4.8	13	12.5	7	6.7	43	41.3	5	4.8	6	5.8	6	5.8	28	26.9	9	8.7	104	100.0	24	23.1	80	76.9
B03	2	3.2	13	20.6	3	4.8	27	42.9	6	9.5	3	4.8	3	4.8	11	17.5	7	11.1	63	100.0	9	14.3	54	85.7
B04	2	3.9	7	13.7	2	3.9	31	60.8	10	19.6	2	3.9	0	0.0	6	11.8	3	5.9	51	100.0	7	13.7	44	86.3
B05	1	7.7	4	30.8	0	0.0	5	38.5	2	15.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	7.7	2	15.4	13	100.0	2	15.4	11	84.6
<b>Total 1/</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>6.8</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>17.6</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>11.2</b>	<b>592</b>	<b>43.4</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>14.9</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>1,363</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>373</b>	<b>27.4</b>	<b>990</b>	<b>72.6</b>
<b>Specialized Career Streams</b>																								
A09	4	6.2	15	23.1	10	15.4	16	24.6	3	4.6	2	3.1	2	3.1	24	36.9	4	6.2	65	100.0	50	76.9	15	23.1
A10	5	5.6	17	18.9	15	16.7	19	21.1	5	5.6	4	4.4	4	4.4	30	33.3	15	16.7	90	100.0	57	63.3	33	36.7
A11	11	9.2	27	22.5	9	7.5	21	17.5	0	0.0	6	5.0	2	1.7	40	33.3	15	12.5	120	100.0	67	55.8	53	44.2
A12	9	6.8	39	29.3	22	16.5	26	19.5	7	5.3	6	4.5	5	3.8	45	33.8	8	6.0	133	100.0	63	47.4	70	52.6
A13	9	8.5	23	21.7	13	12.3	24	22.6	6	5.7	5	4.7	4	3.8	36	34.0	9	8.5	106	100.0	50	47.2	56	52.8
A14	6	6.9	10	11.5	5	5.7	34	39.1	5	5.7	2	2.3	2	2.3	30	34.5	5	5.7	87	100.0	37	42.5	50	57.5
A15	0	0.0	7	20.6	1	2.9	10	29.4	0	0.0	1	2.9	1	2.9	14	41.2	2	5.9	34	100.0	9	26.5	25	73.5
B01	1	8.3	4	33.3	2	16.7	2	16.7	1	8.3	1	8.3	1	8.3	2	16.7	2	16.7	12	100.0	7	58.3	5	41.7
B02	1	4.2	4	16.7	1	4.2	7	29.2	3	12.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	11	45.8	1	4.2	24	100.0	6	25.0	18	75.0
B03	1	8.3	1	8.3	1	8.3	3	25.0	0	0.0	1	8.3	1	8.3	6	50.0	0	0.0	12	100.0	5	41.7	7	58.3
B04	1	12.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	62.5	4	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	12.5	1	12.5	8	100.0	3	37.5	5	62.5
B05	0	0.0	1	12.5	1	12.5	3	37.5	2	25.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	50.0	0	0.0	8	100.0	1	12.5	7	87.5
<b>Total 1/</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>6.9</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>21.2</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>11.4</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>24.3</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>34.8</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>8.9</b>	<b>699</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>50.8</b>	<b>344</b>	<b>49.2</b>

Source: PeopleSoft HRMS, Report ID: DAR\_017

1/ Totals are staff in grades A09-B05

### Annex VI. Share of Women and Men by Career Stream and Grade Grouping 1/

(As of April 30, for each fiscal year)

	A1-A8				A9-A15				B1-B5				Total				
	Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	
<b>Economists</b>																	
2013	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	322	29.4	772	70.6	51	19.0	218	81.0	373	27.4	990	72.6	
2012	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	306	28.1	784	71.9	44	17.5	208	82.5	350	26.1	992	73.9	
2011	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	293	27.4	775	72.6	43	17.6	202	82.4	336	25.6	977	74.4	
2010	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	278	27.3	741	72.7	41	16.2	212	83.8	319	25.1	953	74.9	
2009	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	261	27.1	703	72.9	36	13.7	227	86.3	297	24.2	930	75.8	
2008	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	262	26.0	746	74.0	33	11.8	247	88.2	295	22.9	993	77.1	
2007	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	259	25.5	757	74.5	33	11.5	255	88.5	292	22.4	1,012	77.6	
<b>Specialized Career Streams</b>																	
2013	391	85.6	66	14.4	333	52.4	302	47.6	22	34.4	42	65.6	746	64.5	410	35.5	
2012	400	85.8	66	14.2	317	51.3	301	48.7	23	33.8	45	66.2	740	64.2	412	35.8	
2011	405	86.0	66	14.0	302	51.9	280	48.1	25	34.7	47	65.3	732	65.1	393	34.9	
2010	419	85.9	69	14.1	294	52.5	266	47.5	23	35.4	42	64.6	736	66.1	377	33.9	
2009	496	87.2	73	12.8	295	53.2	259	46.8	22	34.9	41	65.1	813	68.5	373	31.5	
2008	558	87.7	78	12.3	314	53.1	277	46.9	22	31.9	47	68.1	894	69.0	402	31.0	
2007	589	87.1	87	12.9	320	52.1	294	47.9	25	35.7	45	64.3	934	68.7	426	31.3	
<b>Total</b>																	
2013	391	85.6	66	14.4	655	37.9	1,074	62.1	73	21.9	260	78.1	1,119	44.4	1,400	55.6	
2012	400	85.8	66	14.2	623	36.5	1,085	63.5	67	20.9	253	79.1	1,090	43.7	1,404	56.3	
2011	405	86.0	66	14.0	595	36.1	1,055	63.9	68	21.5	249	78.5	1,068	43.8	1,370	56.2	
2010	419	85.9	69	14.1	572	36.2	1,007	63.8	64	20.1	254	79.9	1,055	44.2	1,330	55.8	
2009	496	87.2	73	12.8	556	36.6	962	63.4	58	17.8	268	82.2	1,110	46.0	1,303	54.0	
2008	558	87.7	78	12.3	576	36.0	1,023	64.0	55	15.8	294	84.2	1,189	46.0	1,395	54.0	
2007	589	87.1	87	12.9	579	35.5	1,051	64.5	58	16.2	300	83.8	1,226	46.0	1,438	54.0	

Source: PeopleSoft HRMS, Report ID: DAR\_8N9

1/ Excludes OED and IEO

### Annex VII. Distribution of A9-B5 Staff by Region by Department

(In Percent, As of April 30, 2013)

Dept	A9-A15 Staff						B1-B5 Staff						Total A9-B5 Staff					
	Africa	Asia	Europe	Middle East	USA and Canada	Other WHD	Africa	Asia	Europe	Middle East	USA and Canada	Other WHD	Africa	Asia	Europe	Middle East	USA and Canada	Other WHD
<b>Area Departments</b>																		
AFR	20.6	11.6	38.1	2.6	14.2	12.9	9.4	0.0	59.4	0.0	15.6	15.6	18.7	9.6	41.7	2.1	14.4	13.4
APD 1/	2.6	47.4	34.6	3.8	7.7	3.8	0.0	37.5	33.3	0.0	25.0	4.2	2.0	45.1	34.3	2.9	11.8	3.9
EUR 2/	2.6	18.6	56.4	3.8	12.2	6.4	2.9	17.1	60.0	2.9	17.1	0.0	2.6	18.3	57.1	3.7	13.1	5.2
MCD	6.4	7.4	47.9	18.1	9.6	10.6	8.3	0.0	37.5	29.2	16.7	8.3	6.8	5.9	45.8	20.3	11.0	10.2
WHD	8.0	8.0	26.1	0.0	17.0	40.9	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	6.5	6.5	30.6	0.0	18.5	38.0
<b>Functional Departments: TA</b>																		
FAD	7.5	15.8	45.0	3.3	11.7	16.7	4.8	14.3	47.6	4.8	23.8	4.8	7.1	15.6	45.4	3.5	13.5	14.9
ICD 3/	3.2	20.6	39.7	6.3	15.9	14.3	0.0	21.4	35.7	14.3	14.3	14.3	2.6	20.8	39.0	6.5	14.3	14.3
LEG	1.9	15.1	39.6	7.5	22.6	13.2	11.1	11.1	22.2	0.0	44.4	11.1	3.2	14.5	37.1	6.5	25.8	14.3
MCM	3.6	18.8	41.2	3.6	19.4	13.3	0.0	22.6	45.2	3.2	19.4	9.7	3.1	19.4	41.8	3.6	19.4	12.8
STA	7.8	26.5	28.4	1.0	21.6	14.7	0.0	18.2	36.4	0.0	36.4	9.1	7.1	25.7	29.2	0.9	23.0	14.2
<b>Functional Departments: Non-TA</b>																		
EXR	10.0	13.3	28.3	5.0	31.7	11.7	8.3	25.0	41.7	0.0	25.0	0.0	9.7	15.3	30.6	4.2	30.6	9.7
FIN	10.5	22.4	32.9	1.3	22.4	10.5	16.7	8.3	58.3	0.0	16.7	0.0	11.4	20.5	36.4	1.1	21.6	9.1
RES	0.0	27.3	33.8	6.5	16.9	15.6	0.0	13.3	33.3	0.0	53.3	0.0	0.0	25.0	33.7	5.4	22.8	13.0
SPR 4/	8.7	27.0	34.8	4.3	18.3	7.0	9.1	27.3	36.4	9.1	9.1	9.1	8.8	27.0	35.0	5.1	16.8	7.3
<b>Support Departments</b>																		
HRD	9.1	11.4	36.4	4.5	29.5	9.1	0.0	11.1	33.3	11.1	33.3	11.1	7.5	11.3	35.8	5.7	30.2	9.4
OMD 5/	6.9	27.6	31.0	0.0	34.5	0.0	6.7	6.7	40.0	6.7	40.0	0.0	6.8	20.5	34.1	2.3	36.4	0.0
SEC	3.7	25.9	25.9	0.0	33.3	11.1	0.0	14.3	28.6	14.3	28.6	14.3	2.9	23.5	26.5	2.9	32.4	11.8
TGS	7.5	19.9	17.3	4.4	45.6	5.3	10.5	21.1	26.3	5.3	31.6	5.3	7.8	20.0	18.0	4.5	44.5	5.3
<b>Total Fund</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>19.5</b>	<b>35.8</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>21.2</b>	<b>11.9</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>15.4</b>	<b>42.6</b>	<b>5.3</b>	<b>23.7</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>6.8</b>	<b>18.9</b>	<b>36.9</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>21.6</b>	<b>11.4</b>

Source: PeopleSoft HRMS, Report ID: DAR\_004

1/ APD Includes OAP.

2/ EUR Includes EUO.

3/ ICD Includes CEF, JVI and STI.

4/ SPR Includes UNO.

5/ OMD Includes DMD,INV,OBP,and

### Annex X. Five Year History: Recruitment by Region, Gender, Career Stream, and Grade Grouping

Between 05/01/2007 – 04/30/2013

Region	Economists				Specialized Career Streams				Total			
	A9-A15		B1-B5		A9-A15		B1-B5		A9-A15		B1-B5	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Africa	32	6.5	3	7.3	25	11.0	2	11.8	57	8.0	5	8.6
Asia	115	23.5	15	36.6	59	26.0	2	11.8	174	24.3	17	29.3
East Asia	96	19.6	15	36.6	39	17.2	2	11.8	135	18.9	17	29.3
Europe	195	39.9	15	36.6	62	27.3	4	23.5	257	35.9	19	32.8
U.K	19	3.9	0	0.0	15	6.6	0	0.0	34	4.7	0	0.0
European Transition Countries	59	12.1	2	4.9	16	7.0	0	0.0	75	10.5	2	3.4
Middle East	30	6.1	1	2.4	12	5.3	2	11.8	42	5.9	3	5.2
Arab countries	23	4.7	1	2.4	11	4.8	2	11.8	34	4.7	3	5.2
USA & Canada	57	11.7	3	7.3	54	23.8	6	35.3	111	15.5	9	15.5
Other Western Hemisphere	60	12.3	4	9.8	15	6.6	1	5.9	75	10.5	5	8.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>489</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>227</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>716</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Women	145	29.7	6	14.6	99	43.6	8	47.1	244	34.1	14	24.1
Men	344	70.3	35	85.4	128	56.4	9	52.9	472	65.9	44	75.9

Source: PeopleSoft HRMS, Report ID: DAR\_011

<b>Annex XI. Staff Promoted by Region, Career Stream, and Grade Grouping</b>												
For Years 2012-2013 (As of April 30)												
Region	A1-A8			A9-A12			A13-A15			B1-B5		
	No.	Total 1/	% 2/	No.	Total	Percent	No.	Total	Percent	No.	Total	Percent
<b>Economists</b>												
Africa	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	5	18	27.8	4	63	6.3	3	12	25.0
Asia	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	9	54	16.7	21	146	14.4	5	40	12.5
East Asia	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	8	47	17.0	14	92	15.2	1	14	7.1
Europe	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	27	88	30.7	59	381	15.5	26	123	21.1
U.K	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	1	4	25.0	6	32	18.8	4	26	15.4
Middle East	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	2	16	12.5	4	33	12.1	4	16	25.0
Arab Countries	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0	11	0.0	2	24	8.3	3	13	23.1
USA & Canada	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	2	17	11.8	13	130	10.0	9	56	16.1
Other Western Hemisphere	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	5	20	25.0	14	128	10.9	4	22	18.2
Total	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	50	213	23.5	115	881	13.1	51	269	19.0
Women	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	23	89	25.8	45	233	19.3	8	51	15.7
Men	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	27	124	21.8	70	648	10.8	43	218	19.7
<b>Specialized Career Streams</b>												
Africa	7	54	13.0	6	29	20.7	2	15	13.3	2	4	50.0
Asia	9	101	8.9	18	98	18.4	12	40	30.0	4	10	40.0
East Asia	8	66	12.1	11	56	19.6	4	19	21.1	3	5	60.0
Europe	3	72	4.2	15	82	18.3	7	68	10.3	4	20	20.0
U.K	1	23	4.3	3	15	20.0	1	11	9.1	1	10	10.0
Middle East	1	15	6.7	2	18	11.1	1	8	12.5	0	2	0.0
Arab Countries	1	12	8.3	2	13	15.4	1	7	14.3	0	2	0.0
USA & Canada	18	132	13.6	14	139	10.1	13	80	16.3	6	24	25.0
Other Western Hemisphere	10	83	12.0	5	42	11.9	1	16	6.3	1	4	25.0
Total	48	457	10.5	60	408	14.7	36	227	15.9	17	64	26.6
Women	41	391	10.5	46	237	19.4	15	96	15.6	7	22	31.8
Men	7	66	10.6	14	171	8.2	21	131	16.0	10	42	23.8
<b>Economists &amp; Specialized Career Streams</b>												
Africa	7	54	13.0	11	47	23.4	6	78	7.7	5	16	31.3
Asia	9	101	8.9	27	152	17.8	33	186	17.7	9	50	18.0
East Asia	8	66	12.1	19	103	18.4	18	111	16.2	4	19	21.1
Europe	3	72	4.2	42	170	24.7	66	449	14.7	30	143	21.0
U.K	1	23	4.3	4	19	21.1	7	43	16.3	5	36	13.9
Middle East	1	15	6.7	4	34	11.8	5	41	12.2	4	18	22.2
Arab Countries	1	12	8.3	2	24	8.3	3	31	9.7	3	15	20.0
USA & Canada	18	132	13.6	16	156	10.3	26	210	12.4	15	80	18.8
Other Western Hemisphere	10	83	12.0	10	62	16.1	15	144	10.4	5	26	19.2
Total	48	457	10.5	110	621	17.7	151	1,108	13.6	68	333	20.4
Women	41	391	10.5	69	326	21.2	60	329	18.2	15	73	20.5
Men	7	66	10.6	41	295	13.9	91	779	11.7	53	260	20.4
Source: PeopleSoft HRMS, Report ID: DAR_016												
1/ Total number of staff from each region at each grade group as of 4/30/2013												
2/ percent of staff promoted of total from that region												