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## ABBREVIATIONS

| ADB | - | Asian Development Bank |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| NSAS | - | national staff and administrative staff |
| US | - | United States |
| WBG | - | World Bank Group |

## GLOSSARY

| average salary increase | - The average percentage increase comprising salary structure adjustment and merit increase, to be applied to staff pay at the time of the annual salary review (effective 1 January). Individual staff's salary increases are based on performance. |
| :---: | :---: |
| comparatio | - The ratio of actual salaries (total payroll) to the salary range midpoints for the same number and mix of staff. A 100\% comparatio indicates that pay is aligned with ADB's midpoints. |
| market positioning | - The positioning of an organization's compensation policy within the market. ADB's compensation policy is to pay at the 75th percentile of the market comparators. |
| market reference point | - The market value in annual remuneration of the grade level that serves as the reference point for constructing the salary scale and for adjusting the salary scale and pay every year. |
| merit increase | - The component enabling staff to progress through the salary range mainly based on their performance. |
| midpoint | - At ADB, the midpoint of the salary scale for each grade level is aligned with the market reference point (75th percentile of market comparators). |
| payroll | - The sum of actual staff salaries paid over a defined period (usually a month or a year) for the total number of staff in a grade level, a category of staff (administrative staff, national staff, international staff), or a whole office. |
| salary dilution | - The effect that leads to a lower comparatio at the end of the year than at the start of the year. This results from changes in the staff mix (new hires, departures, promotions). Salary dilution within the year occurs because staff who depart have generally a higher salary than new hires or promoted staff. |
| salary scale or range | - Each grade level has a salary range, which is defined in terms of a minimum, a midpoint, and a maximum within which the salaries of staff at each grade level are administered. The minimum and maximum are equidistant to the midpoint. |

salary structure - The full set of salary ranges.
salary structure - The average percentage adjustment applied to the current salary adjustment structure midpoints to align with the market. This will be equal to the budget request when the adjustment is an increase and the merit increase is fully funded by salary dilution.

## NOTE

In this report, "\$" refers to United States dollars, unless otherwise stated.
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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This paper presents to the Board of Directors of the Asian Development Bank (ADB) the results of the annual review of compensation for international, national, and administrative staff at headquarters, 31 field offices ${ }^{1}$, and 11 Pacific country offices. It seeks the Board's approval for (i) the proposed 2020 salary structures; and (ii) the corresponding average salary increases for all staff categories, including the salary structure adjustment and merit increase.

ADB aims to provide a remuneration package that is competitive to enable the bank to continue attracting and retaining the best talent, consistent with its development mission and in line with international trends. The annual review of ADB's compensation is important for ensuring that the organization continues to support talent acquisition, staff mobility, and the retention of skilled staff.

It is critical that ADB has the human capital needed to support the vision, objectives, and key operational priorities of Strategy 2030. In the Work Program and Budget Framework, 2020-2022, the key drivers of ADB's staffing requirements include (i) supporting the continued expansion of private sector operations; (ii) bridging the skills gap in the seven operational priority areas; (iii) continuing support to sovereign operations with a focus on small island developing states and countries classified as fragile and conflict-affected situations in the Pacific; (iv) investing in key support functions; and (v) strengthening field offices. Ensuring ADB's ability to attract new staff, as well as retain and motivate current staff, will be a key aspect of human resource management. This will be done in the context of ADB's continuing efforts to strengthen performance management and increase productivity, while also promoting effective and efficient use of its budget and staffing resources.

Every 5 years ADB conducts a comprehensive review of compensation and benefits and the 2020 review is underway and will conclude in 2020. As part of the 2020 review, the detailed work to establish the most appropriate comparator groups, as well as the associated methodologies for setting salaries, and related benchmarking, has not yet been completed. Therefore, the salary proposals in this paper follow the general approach established by the 2015 review with the aim of keeping pace with increases in salary levels in the market so that ADB may remain competitive. The proposals are as follows:
(i) For international staff, provide a 2.2\% salary structure adjustment and an additional merit increase of $1.0 \%$, which results in an average salary increase of $3.2 \%$ in United States (US) dollar for 2020. The salary structure adjustment of 2.2\% is based on the salary structure adjustment of the World Bank Group, effective 1 July 2019. As the merit increase will be funded by the estimated salary dilution, the total budget impact of the international staff salary increase for 2020 is equal to the salary structure adjustment of 2.2\% (Table 3).
(ii) For national staff and administrative staff (NSAS) at headquarters, provide a 3.9\% salary structure adjustment and an additional merit increase of $2.3 \%$, which results in an average salary increase of $6.2 \%$ (in Philippine peso) for 2020. As the merit increase will be funded by the estimated salary dilution, the total budget impact of

[^0]the NSAS headquarters staff salary increase for 2020 is equal to the salary structure adjustment of $3.9 \%$ in Philippine peso, and $7.1 \%$ in US dollar equivalent (Table 3). ${ }^{2}$
(iii) For NSAS in field offices, provide an average of $1.0 \%$ salary structure adjustment and an additional average merit increase of $2.8 \%$, which results in an average salary increase of $3.8 \%$ (in US dollar equivalent) for 2020. As the merit increase will be funded by the estimated salary dilution, the total budget impact of the NSAS field offices staff salary increase for 2020 is equal to the salary structure adjustment of $1.0 \%$ in US dollar equivalent (Table 3).

If approved by the Board of Directors, the proposed salary structures for all staff categories would become effective on 1 January 2020.

[^1]
## I. INTRODUCTION

1. Strategy 2030 sets the long-term strategic goals of the Asian Development Bank (ADB) over the next decade. ${ }^{1}$ With the implementation of Strategy 2030 underway, it is critical for ADB to ensure that the bank has the human capital needed to support its vision, objectives, and key operational priorities. Ensuring ADB's ability to attract new staff, as well as retain and motivate current staff, will be a key aspect of human resource management. This will be done in the context of ADB's continuing efforts to strengthen performance management, invest in training and development, and increase accountability and empowerment of managers and staff. In addition, key business processes will be further streamlined including through automation. Employment and consultant contract types will be reviewed to meet the workload and ever-changing skills demand.
2. The market competitiveness of ADB's compensation package will help the organization recruit high-caliber and experienced professionals as well as retain and motivate existing talented staff. The annual compensation review assesses the competitiveness of ADB's salaries. The regular comprehensive review of compensation and benefits, conducted every 5 years, started in 2019 and will conclude in 2020. The salary proposals outlined in this paper aim to (i) maintain the value of the compensation package needed to support ADB's objectives and (ii) allow ADB to remain an active player in the labor markets where the bank recruits from. Currently, about 53\% of ADB's international staff recruits are from the private sector and $23 \%$ are from other international organizations.
3. This paper describes ADB's approach to compensation and benefits, explains the factors driving the need for competitive pay, and proposes salary budgets and new salary structures. The proposals are made as ADB pursues wider human resources reforms, including strengthening the performance management system, increasing staff mobility, and enhancing leadership capabilities.

## II. ADB COMPENSATION POLICY AND PRINCIPLES

4. ADB aims to provide a competitive remuneration package to continue attracting and retaining the best talent, consistent with its development mission and in line with international trends. To support this overarching goal, ADB has established the following key principles in its compensation system: ${ }^{2}$
(i) Salaries are designed to (a) attract and retain highly qualified and competent staff, and (b) motivate them to achieve the highest standards of performance.
(ii) Salaries are maintained at levels competitive with those prevailing in comparator organizations and with due regard to the duty station concerned.
(iii) ADB systematically evaluates the relative weight of each position in the salary structure; determines the equitable remuneration for similar responsibilities internally and externally; and rewards staff according to performance, salary relativity, and other relevant factors.
(iv) Salaries are administered in a manner that is both equitable and transparent to all staff.
[^2]
## III. COMPENSATION METHODOLOGY

5. ADB's compensation methodology is reviewed every 5 years. The last comprehensive compensation and benefits review was conducted in 2015 and the next review started in 2019 and will conclude in 2020. ADB follows the principle of market-driven compensation for all staff. Salaries are positioned at the 75th percentile of the defined market for each category of staff. The market reference used for salary comparisons for each category of staff is as follows:
(i) For international staff, the market is international, based on the structure adjustment of the World Bank Group (WBG) as a proxy for the international market. Appendix 1 (Figure A1.1) provides information on ADB's recruitment sources.
(ii) For national staff and administrative staff (NSAS) in headquarters, the market is local. Salaries are compared with those of 20 companies and international organizations in the Philippines.
(iii) For NSAS in field offices, the market is local. WBG data is used together with survey data from local public and private sector organizations provided by Birches Group and Willis Towers Watson.
6. Figure 1 shows how the 75th percentile target is derived from comparators and how this is used to develop each salary range.

Figure 1: Illustration of ADB's Compensation Methodology


ADB = Asian Development Bank, IS = international staff, MRP = market reference point.
Note: This market position of 75th percentile is used to develop the MRP (midpoint of each salary range).
Source: Asian Development Bank.
7. Under the market-based compensation system, annual salary adjustments are linked to the market movement of salaries. Cost of living indexes may be reflected in the market movement of salaries in the global or local markets, which are primarily influenced by labor market conditions (e.g., supply versus demand for specific skills, economic growth, and other domestic and global economic factors).

## A. Salary Structures Framework and Comparatios

8. ADB creates salary ranges to reflect market pay levels and uses them to (i) make informed decisions (such as starting salaries for new hires and salary increases during the annual salary review process) and (ii) assess the market competitiveness of ADB staff salaries. A salary structure comprises salary ranges corresponding to each grade within each staff category and reflects ADB's desired market positioning. ADB has a salary structure for international staff expressed in United States (US) dollar; a salary structure for NSAS in headquarters expressed in Philippine peso; and a salary structure for NSAS in each field office expressed in local currencies or US dollar.
9. The comparatio is expressed for an individual (or across the organization as a whole) as the ratio of actual salary to the relevant salary range midpoint. A 100\% comparatio indicates that the actual salary is fully aligned with ADB's midpoint. When midpoints reflect the market, comparatios can be considered a measure of market competitiveness. Historically, ADB's comparatio has been below $100 \%$. Table 1 and Appendix 1 (Table A1.1) give the historical comparatio movement for international staff. Figure 2 explains the concept of comparatios.

Figure 2: Illustration of the Comparatio Concept


CR = comparatio, IS = international staff.
Note: A 100\% comparatio indicates that pay is aligned with ADB's midpoints.
Source: Asian Development Bank.

## B. Salary Increase Methodology

10. The competitive positioning of salaries preserves ADB's ability to attract, retain, and motivate staff of the caliber required to conduct its operations and meet client needs. The annual review assesses market pay levels to decide on (i) the salary structure adjustment percentage to ensure that ADB's salary range midpoints continue to reflect the desired market position (para. 11); and (ii) the merit increase percentage to ensure that ADB enables high-performing staff to progress through their salary ranges over time as they develop their skills and capabilities (para. 12).

## C. Salary Structure Adjustment

11. As the market levels of pay move over time, the salary structures need to be adjusted to remain reflective of the market. Benchmarking studies are conducted each year and based on the outcomes of this analysis, adjustments usually need to be applied to bring the salary structure in line with the market at each review. Salary structure adjustment refers to the average percentage adjustment applied to the current salary structure midpoints to align with the market. If the review supports a revision of the salary structure, appropriate recommendations and a corresponding budget request are made to provide funding to increase staff salaries in line with the movement of the salary structures.

## D. Merit Increase

12. Staff should typically progress through their salary range over time as they become more proficient and valuable to the organization. The speed at which staff move through their salary range is mainly based on their performance. The merit increase component enables this salary progression. For 2020, this component will be funded by savings from the estimated salary dilution during the year. Salary dilution occurs when staff who leave the organization have higher salaries than the newly promoted staff or new hires who replace them, because the exiting staff will have progressed through their salary range over time. Salary dilution has an impact on the comparatio and the competitiveness of an organization in relation to the market, while creating savings during the year (Figure 3).

Figure 3: Illustration of Salary Dilution
Comparatio goes down through the year


IS = international staff, MAX = maximum, MIN = minimum.
Note: Average salary at each grade goes down during the year as staff who separate generally have a higher average salary than new hires or newly promoted staff. As this happens, the average comparatio goes down and the salary dilution savings go up.
Source: Asian Development Bank.

## E. Total Average Salary Increase

13. The sum of the salary structure adjustment and merit increase (paras. 11 and 12) equals the total average salary increase, which is important for two reasons: (i) this is the overall budget
available during the annual pay review for managers to allocate to staff based on their performance; and (ii) this determines whether the funding will result in one of three scenarios:
a) improve the market competitiveness of staff salaries (increase in comparatio),
b) maintain the market competitiveness of staff salaries (no change to comparatio), or
c) reduce the market competitiveness of staff salaries (reduction in comparatio).

The proposals for 2020 are set to broadly maintain the market competitiveness of salaries for the three staff categories (paras.15-31).
14. The total average salary increase is funded by a combination of a budget request and savings. Historically, a budget request has been made relating to the salary structure adjustments, whereas the merit increase has been funded wholly or partially through savings from salary dilution. The 2020 comprehensive review of compensation and benefits will report on the competitiveness of ADB's package and make recommendations including appropriate comparator groups and the compensation methodology.

## F. Application of the Salary Increase Methodology to the Three Staff Categories

## 1. International Staff

15. This year's proposal uses the WBG salary structure increase as the proposed salary structure adjustment and adopts a merit increase equivalent to the estimated salary dilution within ADB.
16. A salary structure adjustment of $2.2 \%$ is proposed, equal to the structure adjustment component of the WBG average salary increase implemented in July 2019 for 2019-2020 (known in the WBG as FY20). This proposal recognizes that the WBG is a principal comparator for ADB as set out in the 2010 and 2015 comprehensive compensation and benefits reviews. It also addresses ADB's key objective to maintain the competitiveness of its salary to attract and retain talent.
17. The WBG's FY20 salary review represents the first year of the WBG's 3-year compensation cycle for FY20-22. The FY20 outcome is based on the full application of the revised headquarters compensation methodology approved by the WBG board in 2018 in the context of its 2018 capital increase. ${ }^{3}$ To measure the market, the WBG adopted an updated range of market data sources to cover the public and private sectors. The WBG's salary structure adjustment of 2.2\% (effective 1 July 2019) is equal to the International Monetary Fund's projected US consumer price index movement of $2.2 \%$ for FY20. ${ }^{4}$
18. ADB proposes a merit increase of $1.0 \%$ for 2020 which will be funded by savings from the expected salary dilution ${ }^{5}$. The proposed salary structure adjustment of $2.2 \%$ combined with the merit increase component of $1.0 \%$ results in an average salary increase of $3.2 \%$. This is expected to maintain the comparatio at the same level as of 1 January 2019.

[^3]19. Market benchmarks for Hong Kong, China; Singapore; and Tokyo, Japan, were procured to check for comparability. For roles comparable to those at ADB, the average salary increases have been $4.0 \%$ for Hong Kong, China; $4.0 \%$ for Singapore; and 2.5\% for Tokyo, Japan. These benchmarks show that the proposed average salary increase of $3.2 \%$ is broadly in line with the average market movement in these locations and also with the latest average salary increases in comparable international financial institutions.
20. As part of ADB's comprehensive review of its compensation and benefits for 2020, the detailed work on establishing the most appropriate comparator groups and the associated methodologies for setting salaries is underway. Any changes to the comparator groups and associated methodologies will be agreed upon in 2020 for implementation starting in 2021.
21. Table 1 shows the progression of the international staff comparatio from 2015 to 2020. Appendix 1 (Table A1.4) shows the proposed salary structure adjustment, the average salary increase, and the resulting estimated comparatio before and after the salary increase.

Table 1: Historical Comparatio for International Staff, 2015-2020

|  |  | Overall Actual Comparatio (\%) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Confirmed Staff <br> (number) | as of 1 January | as of 31 December |
| 2015 | 963 | 93.9 | 92.8 |
| 2016 | 979 | 94.9 | 94.1 |
| 2017 | 963 | 96.0 | 94.6 |
| 2018 | 942 | 96.1 | 94.7 |
| 2019 | 1,030 | 96.4 | $95.0-95.2^{\mathrm{a}}$ |
| 2020 | 1,145 | $96.4^{\mathrm{b}}$ |  |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Estimated comparatio by 31 December 2019. A range is provided because the final comparatio will depend on actual staff movements.
b Estimated comparatio on 1 January 2020 based on the ADB midpoints developed using the methodology described in paras. 15-18.
Source: Asian Development Bank.

## 2. National Staff and Administrative Staff at Headquarters

22. For NSAS at headquarters, Willis Towers Watson conducted a survey on ADB's behalf in August 2019, in accordance with the Board-approved methodology. The group of 20 comparators in the survey broadly represents one-third public sector and two-thirds private sector companies in the Philippines (Appendix 1, Table A1.15). Of the sample organizations, $45 \%$ are large (more than 2,000 staff), $45 \%$ are medium-sized (500-2,000 staff), and $10 \%$ are small (less than 500 staff).
23. Benchmarking of the 20 comparators shows that ADB's salary range midpoints require an increase of $3.9 \%$ on average to reflect the desired market position for 2020. The Philippine economy grew at $4.8 \%^{6}$ in 2019 with inflation at $2.6 \%^{7}$.

[^4]24. Based on the survey results, the proposed average salary structure adjustment for NSAS at headquarters is $3.9 \%$ (in Philippine peso). The salary structure for NSAS in headquarters is expressed in gross salaries (Appendix 2, Table A2.2).
25. The proposed merit increase of $2.3 \%$ (in Philippine peso) is funded by savings from the expected salary dilution. The estimated salary dilution by the end of 2019 is $2.7 \%-2.9 \%$. The proposed average salary increase of $6.2 \%$ (in Philippine peso) maintains the comparatio at the same level as of 1 January 2019.
26. Appendix 1 (Table A1.2) shows the salary structure adjustment, average salary increase, and inflation rate at headquarters from 2015 to 2020.
27. Appendix 1 (Table A1.4) shows the proposed salary structure adjustment, the proposed average salary increase, and the resulting estimated comparatio before and after the salary increase.

## 3. National Staff and Administrative Staff in Field Offices

28. For NSAS in field offices, ADB's salary structure midpoints are adjusted by reflecting the overall market movement in each of the duty station locations. The sources of data used to determine market movements include the WBG structure adjustments and the market data supplied by established survey companies (Birches Group and Willis Towers Watson).
29. Based on the survey results, the proposed salary structure adjustments across the field offices result in an average salary structure adjustment of $1.0 \%$ (in US dollar) for 2020. The various currencies are converted to US dollars based on the Bloomberg forecast exchange rates as of 8 October 2019. The resulting salary structures effective 1 January 2020 for field offices are in Appendix 2 (Tables A2.3-A2.44). The salary structures for NSAS in field offices are based on net salaries (net of income tax), except for Japan, Singapore, and the US, where the salary structures are expressed in gross salaries.
30. The historical average salary structure adjustments and average salary increases for each field office from 2018 to 2019 are in Appendix 1 (Table A1.3) along with the proposed figures for 2020. Appendix 1 (Table A1.5) shows the proposed average salary increase, salary structure adjustment, and the resulting estimated comparatios before and after the salary increase for each field office for 2020.
31. The proposed average salary increase of $3.8 \%$ (in US dollar) will maintain the comparatio at broadly the same level as of 1 January 2019 (Appendix 1, Table A1.4).

## G. Implementation of Salary Increases-The Annual Salary Review

32. The average salary increase and the actual distribution of performance ratings determine the salary increase matrix for each staff category and location.
33. The salary increase given to an individual staff is based on the performance rating and is delivered as a percentage of the midpoint of the salary range for the respective grade level. An individual staff does not receive an automatic increase equal to the salary structure adjustment or a minimum cost-of-living increase. Staff with the lowest performance rating will not receive any salary increase, and their individual salary may be lower than the minimum salary for their grade level.
34. Salary increase matrices are linked to staff performance ratings (4, 3, 2 and 1):
(i) Staff with the highest rating (4) will receive a fixed increase percentage above the average salary increase to reward extraordinary achievements. The number of 4 ratings is capped at a maximum of $10 \%$ of staff.
(ii) For staff with a 3 rating, managers will have the flexibility to award salary increases within a guideline range, providing the opportunity to differentiate based on performance.
(iii) For staff with a 2 rating, managers will have the flexibility to award salary increases within a guideline range (which will be positioned lower than the range for a 3 rating), providing the opportunity to differentiate based on performance.
(iv) Staff with the lowest rating (1) will not receive a salary increase.
35. In 2019, 564 supervisors made recommendations on salary increases for 2,895 staff based on the salary increase matrices. The salary review process by the supervisors was done online through the myCareer platform. The salary review process strengthened the link between work plans, performance, and salary increase.

## IV. FACTORS DRIVING THE NEED FOR COMPETITIVE PAY

## A. The Business Context

36. Strategy 2030 outlines the long-term strategic goals of ADB. The four key areas are (i) supporting the continued expansion of private sector operations, (ii) bridging the skills gap in the seven operational priority areas, ${ }^{8}$ (iii) continuing support to sovereign operations with a focus on small island developing states and countries classified as fragile and conflict-afflicted situations in the Pacific with a rebalancing of the workforce, and (iv) investing in key support functions.
37. Gross additional staff requirements over the next 3 years (2020-2022) are 284 positions (183 international staff and 101 national staff). Taking into account optimization efforts, which will offset most of these needs, ADB expects to recruit 40 new positions (31 international staff and 9 national staff) in 2020 and an additional 80 new positions throughout 2021-2022.
38. ADB's ability to attract talent and experts from a wide range of global sources and to retain existing high-caliber staff is fundamental to meeting the commitments of the Work Program and Budget Framework, 2020-2022 ${ }^{9}$. ADB needs to hire experts with advanced knowledge in specialized fields, especially those supporting the seven operational priorities and the expansion of private sector operations. This will require specialized skills, international and/or national experience, and proficiencies in the markets and sectors where ADB competes for talent. In addition to attracting new staff, maintaining high levels of staff engagement is more important than ever as ADB implements Strategy 2030. This will be done in the context of ADB's continuing efforts to strengthen performance management and increase productivity, while also promoting effective and efficient use of its budget and staffing resources. Business processes will be

[^5]modernized and simplified, including to take into account information technology reforms. Learning programs will be further enhanced to strengthen the skills of staff.

## B. Challenges and Opportunities in Recruiting New Staff

39. ADB's competitiveness within its target recruitment markets continues to be a core challenge. Offering competitive salaries and benefits remains one important factor in attracting new hires and retaining staff.
40. During the Work Program and Budget Framework period, ADB will continue to improve human resource management to help achieve the goals of Strategy 2030. A human resource framework for Strategy 2030 will be prepared which will set out the medium-term priorities for human resource management. This will build on ongoing reform initiatives and draw on business needs derived from Strategy 2030. The aim will be to strengthen talent management to better support ADB's knowledge work, innovation, digital capacities, and One ADB approaches.
41. While the recruitment outcomes in 2018 and 2019 have been strong, challenges remain in attracting and recruiting for some of the highly skilled areas, such as expanding private sector operations. Attracting quality staff and retaining existing staff will require ADB to be competitive with multilateral development banks, other international organizations, and the private sector in terms of compensation and benefits.
42. To scale up and diversify private sector operations in new and frontier markets, as envisaged by Strategy 2030, more investment and risk management specialists are needed, but recruitment has been challenging. Likewise, recruitment of experts in information systems and technology continues to be difficult. External labor markets for these specialized skills, both local and international, remain highly competitive. ADB will continue to intensify its outreach efforts, including through exploring additional channels for recruitment and increasing the use of online platforms. ADB is strengthening its efforts to promote the bank's image as an attractive employer and to reach out to a wider and more diverse group of potential candidates.

## V. BUDGETARY IMPACT

43. The proposed salary increase for 2020 from salary structure adjustments is estimated at $\$ 8.0$ million, which includes $\$ 4.4$ million for international staff, $\$ 3.4$ million for NSAS at headquarters, and $\$ 0.3$ million for NSAS in field offices. Table 2 shows the total estimated cost of the 2019 and 2020 increase in the salary budget by staff category.

Table 2: Budget Impact of Salary Structure Adjustments

| (\$ million) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2019 |  |  |  | 2020 |  |  |  |
| Item | IS | $\begin{gathered} \text { HQ } \\ \text { NSAS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FO } \\ \text { NSAS } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Total | IS | $\begin{gathered} \text { HQ } \\ \text { NSAS } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FO } \\ \text { NSAS } \end{gathered}$ | Total |
| Salary Increases | 3.3 | 0.1 | 1.3 | 4.7 | 4.4 | $3.4{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 0.3 | 8.0 |
| Salary-Related Benefits ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 2.0 |

$\mathrm{FO}=$ field office, $\mathrm{HQ}=$ headquarters, $\mathrm{IS}=$ international staff, $\mathrm{NSAS}=$ national staff and administrative staff. Note: Numbers may not sum precisely because of rounding.
a The assumptions for Philippine peso to United States dollar exchange rate used in Asian Development Bank's budget is based on the Bloomberg full-year forecast median rate. The assumptions used in the 2019 budget was $\mp 53.80$ to $\$ 1$ while the Philippine peso is forecasted to be $₹ 52.20$ to $\$ 1$ in 2020 based on the Bloomberg full-year forecast median rate as of 8 October 2019. The structure adjustment of $3.9 \%$ for NSAS at headquarters represents an increase equivalent to $P 100.5$ million.
b Includes staff retirement plan and insurance benefits (Group Life Insurance Plan, Accidental Death and Disability Insurance, and Workers' Compensation Insurance).
Source: Asian Development Bank.
44. The $\$ 8.0$ million for salary increases represents $1.1 \%$ of the proposed 2020 budget, while the $\$ 2.0$ million for salary-related benefits represents $0.3 \%$. Salaries and benefits are expected to represent $62.1 \%$ of the proposed 2020 internal administrative expenses budget. Table 3 shows the total salary increase in 2020 resulting from salary structure adjustments.

Table 3: Salary Structure Adjustment and Salary Increase

| Staff Category | 2019 Salary <br> Budget <br> $(\$$ million $)$ | 2020 Structure <br> Adjustment <br> $(\%)$ | 2020 Salary <br> Increase due to <br> Structure <br> Adjustment <br> $(\$$ million $)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| International Staff | 198.4 | 2.2 | 4.4 |
| NSAS at headquarters | 47.9 | $7.1^{\mathrm{a}}$ | $3.4^{\mathrm{a}}$ |
| NSAS in field offices | 27.2 | 1.0 | 0.3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 7 3 . 5}$ |  | $\mathbf{8 . 0}$ |
|  | (P million) |  | (P million) |
| NSAS at headquarters | $\mathbf{2 , 5 7 6 . 5}$ | 3.9 | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 5}$ |
| NSAS |  |  |  |

NSAS = national staff and administrative staff.
${ }^{\text {a }}$ The increase in US dollar equivalent is a combination of the proposed structure adjustment and the year-on-year exchange rate movement between US dollar and Philippine peso.
Note: Numbers may not sum precisely because of rounding.
Source: Asian Development Bank.

## VI. RECOMMENDATION

45. The President recommends that the Board approve the following effective 1 January 2020:
(i) the salary structure for international staff (Appendix 2, Table A2.1): an average salary increase of $3.2 \%$ (in US dollar), which includes a salary structure adjustment of $2.2 \%$ and a merit increase of $1.0 \%$;
(ii) the salary structure for NSAS at headquarters (Appendix 2, Table A2.2): an average salary increase of $6.2 \%$ (in Philippine peso), which includes a salary structure adjustment of $3.9 \%$ and a merit increase of $2.3 \%$; and
(iii) the salary structures for NSAS in field offices (Appendix 2, Tables A2.3-A2.44): an average salary increase of $3.8 \%$ (in US dollar equivalent), which includes a salary structure adjustment of $1.0 \%$ and a merit increase of $2.8 \%$.
46. Upon approval of the recommendation in para. 45, the cost of the proposals will be reflected in the 2020 budget, which will be considered by the Board on 13 December 2019.

## SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

## A. Compensation Trends

Table A1.1: International Staff-Historical Comparatio, 2015-2020

| Year | Structure Adjustment <br> (\%) | Average Salary Increase <br> (\%) | Confirmed Staff <br> (No.) | as of 1 January |  |  | as of 31 December |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Average Salary (\$) | Weighted Midpoints of Salary Structure <br> (\$) | Overall <br> Actual/ Target Comparatio (\%) | Average Salary (\$) | Weighted Midpoints of Salary Structure <br> (\$) | Overall Actual Comparatio (\%) |
| 2015 | 2.3 | 4.0 | 963 | 155,716 | 165,856 | 93.9 | 154,186 | 166,198 | 92.8 |
| 2016 | 2.4 | 4.7 | 979 | 161,451 | 170,128 | 94.9 | 159,155 | 169,065 | 94.1 |
| 2017 | 2.5 | 4.8 | 963 | 166,355 | 173,308 | 96.0 | 161,268 | 170,561 | 94.6 |
| 2018 | 2.2 | 3.9 | 942 | 172,146 | 179,042 | 96.1 | 168,103 | 177,540 | 94.7 |
| 2019 | 1.8 | 3.6 | 1,030 | 174,021 | 180,593 | 96.4 | 169,679 | 178,261 | 95.0-95.2 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| 2020 | 2.2 | 3.2 | 1,145 | 175,705 | 182,185 | $96.4{ }^{\text {b }}$ |  |  |  |

a Estimated comparatio by 31 December 2019. A range is provided because the final comparatio will depend on the actual staff movements.
b Estimated comparatio on 1 January 2020 based on the ADB midpoints developed using the methodology described in paras. 15-18 of the main text.
Source: Asian Development Bank.

Table A1.2: National Staff and Administrative Staff at Headquarters
—Structure Adjustment and Salary Increase, 2015-2020

|  | Structure <br> Adjustment $^{\text {a }}$ <br> $(\%)$ | Average <br> Salary <br> Increase $^{\text {a }}$ <br> $(\%)$ | Philippines <br> Inflation Rate $^{\mathbf{b}}$ | Philippines <br> Growth Rate of $_{\text {per capita GDP }^{\mathbf{c}}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | 4.5 | 7.6 | 0.7 | $(\%)$ |
| 2015 | 4.0 | 7.0 | 1.3 | 4.9 |
| 2016 | 5.6 | 7.4 | 2.9 | 4.5 |
| 2017 | 4.2 | 6.7 | 5.2 | 5.0 |
| 2018 | 5.4 | 8.0 | 2.6 | 4.5 |
| 2019 | 3.9 | 6.2 | 3.0 | 4.8 |
| $2020^{\text {d }}$ |  |  | 4.8 |  |

GDP = gross domestic product.
a In Philippine peso.
b ADB 2019. Asian Development Outlook 2019 Update. Manila. Inflation is not a determinant of ADB salaries, which are market-based.
c ADB 2019. Asian Development Outlook 2019. Manila.
${ }^{\text {d }}$ Inflation rate and growth rate of per capita GDP are forecasts.
Source: Asian Development Bank.

Table A1.3: National Staff and Administrative Staff in Field Offices
-Structure Adjustment and Salary Increase, 2018-2020

| Regional Department/Field Office Location |  | 2018 |  | 2019 |  | 2020 |  | Salary Currency |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Average Annual Structure Adjustment (\%) | Average <br> Annual Salary Increase (\%) | Average Annual Structure Adjustment (\%) | Average Annual Salary Increase (\%) | Proposed Average Annual Structure Adjustment (\%) | Proposed <br> Average Annual Salary Increase (\%) |  |
| Central West Asia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Afghanistan | 3.6 | 5.4 | 10.3 | 12.4 | 1.9 | 4.3 | \$ |
| 2 | Azerbaijan | $53.0{ }^{\text {a }}$ | $30.6{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 1.8 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.2 | \$ |
| 3 | Kazakhstan | 0.0 | 4.5 | 3.4 | 8.0 | 0.0 | 2.5 | \$ |
| 4 | Kyrgyz Republic | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.4 | 6.0 | 0.5 | 2.3 | \$ |
| 5 | Tajikistan | 1.7 | 2.0 | 4.1 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 2.9 | \$ |
| 6 | Turkmenistan | 6.2 | 6.0 | 5.5 | 5.5 | 3.2 | 3.2 | \$ |
| 7 | Uzbekistan | 13.3 | 13.0 | 1.0 | 5.7 | 0.8 | 3.1 | \$ |
| 8 | Armenia | 1.4 | 2.0 | 2.8 | 5.8 | 0.3 | 4.6 | AMD |
| 9 | Georgia | 3.7 | 3.6 | 4.7 | 7.1 | 2.1 | 2.1 | GEL |
| 10 | Pakistan | 8.6 | 11.5 | 6.5 | 11.2 | 4.0 | 5.9 | PRe |
| East Asia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | Mongolia | 3.5 | 3.2 | 3.1 | 6.1 | 0.6 | 3.6 | \$ |
| 12 | PRC | 4.4 | 7.2 | 3.5 | 5.9 | 0.6 | 3.1 | CNY |
| Pacific |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | Australia | 5.2 | 5.2 | 2.3 | 2.5 | 0.2 | 2.1 | A\$ |
| 14 | Fiji | 12.9 | 12.3 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 2.8 | 5.6 | F\$ |
| 15 | PNG | 4.3 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 2.0 | K |
| Pacific Country Offices |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 | Samoa | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 1.6 | ST |
| 17 | Solomon Islands | 0.0 | 7.5 | 11.0 | 6.1 | 0.0 | 2.0 | SI\$ |
| 18 | Tonga | 0.7 | 2.0 | 5.9 | 2.0 | 3.6 | 1.7 | T\$ |
| 19 | Vanuatu | 6.2 | 6.2 | 0.5 | 2.0 | 2.6 | 2.0 | Vt |
| South Asia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 | Bangladesh | 4.6 | 8.1 | 5.6 | 8.0 | 0.8 | 6.2 | Tk |
| 21 | Bhutan | 39.9 | 32.9 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 2.4 | 3.4 | Nu |
| 22 | India | 10.4 | 12.6 | 8.7 | 10.1 | 0.5 | 4.3 | ₹ |
| 23 | Nepal | 14.5 | 16.2 | 3.4 | 4.5 | 1.8 | 6.3 | NRe |
| 24 | Sri Lanka | 4.7 | 6.4 | 6.0 | 9.2 | 0.8 | 5.2 | SLRe |
| Southeast Asia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 | Cambodia | 4.4 | 4.3 | 4.6 | 5.8 | 2.0 | 5.0 | \$ |
| 26 | Lao PDR | 14.1 | 13.4 | 4.4 | 6.0 | 0.0 | 2.4 | \$ |
| 27 | Myanmar | 10.4 | 6.5 | 5.8 | 3.9 | 0.7 | 3.9 | \$ |
| 28 | Timor-Leste | 2.8 | 2.9 | 10.9 | 10.9 | 2.1 | 2.1 | \$ |
| 29 | Viet Nam | 2.8 | 6.2 | 4.1 | 8.8 | 0.6 | 3.2 | \$ |
| 30 | Indonesia | 5.3 | 6.2 | 4.0 | 8.3 | 0.6 | 4.4 | Rp |
| 31 | Thailand | 3.8 | 4.8 | 2.2 | 4.8 | 0.0 | 2.1 | B |
| Representative Offices |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32 | US | 4.2 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 1.9 | \$ |
| 33 | Germany | 0.5 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | $€$ |
| 34 | Japan | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | $¥$ |
| Total/Average(in \$) |  | 6.5 | 8.0 | 4.6 | 7.0 | 1.0 | 3.8 |  |

Lao PDR = Lao People's Democratic Republic, PNG = Papua New Guinea PRC = People's Republic of China.
Notes:

1. Field offices in blue font are those with salary currency in US dollar.
2. Seven of the Pacific country offices and ADB Singapore office currently do not have any confirmed staff.
a The structure adjustment and salary increase in 2018 were based on Azerbaijan manat. Effective 2 January 2018, Azerbaijan's salary currency was converted from Azerbaijan manat to United States dollar.
Source: Asian Development Bank.

Table A1.4: Proposed 2020 Average Salary Increase and Estimated Comparatio

| Staff <br> Category | Confirmed Staff ${ }^{\text {a }}$ (number) | Structure Adjustment <br> (\%) | Merit Increase <br> (\%) | Proposed Average Salary Increase <br> (\%) | Estimated Comparatio by 31 <br> December 2019 <br> (\%) | Estimated Comparatio after Average Salary Increase <br> (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| IS ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 1,145 | 2.2 | 1.0 | 3.2 | 95.0-95.2 | 96.4 |
| NSAS HQ ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 1,426 | 3.9 | 2.3 | 6.2 | 92.2-92.4 | 95.1 |
| NSAS FOb | 625 | 1.0 | 2.8 | 3.8 | 92.9 | 95.6 |

FO = field office, HQ = headquarters, IS = international staff, NSAS = national staff and administrative staff.
Notes:

1. The structure adjustments are representative of the market movements; the merit increases provide for pay progression within the salary ranges; and the proposed average salary increases reward for performance and help improve the comparatio for each staff category.
2. Comparatios should be assessed by comparing the same date in corresponding years (because of the impact of salary dilution). When comparing 1 January 2019 to 1 January 2020, the movements for the three staff categories are:
International Staff 96.4\%-96.4\%
NSAS in headquarters $\quad 95.1 \%-95.1 \%$ NSAS in field offices
95.3\%-95.6\%
${ }^{a}$ Estimated number of confirmed staff by 1 January 2020.
${ }^{\text {b }}$ In United States dollar.
c In Philippine peso.
Source: Asian Development Bank.

Table A1.5: National Staff and Administrative Staff in Field Offices, 2020

|  | Regional Department/Field Office Location | Confirmed Staff ${ }^{\text {a }}$ (No.) | Proposed Structure Adjustment (\%) | Proposed Average Salary Increase (\%) | Estimated Comparatio by 31 December 2019 (\%) | Estimated Comparatio after Salary Increase (\%) | Salary Currency | Exchange Rate ${ }^{b}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Central West Asia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Afghanistan | 24 | 1.9 | 4.3 | 93.9 | 96.0 | \$ | 1.00 |
| 2 | Azerbaijan | 9 | 2.1 | 2.2 | 97.8 | 97.8 | \$ | 1.00 |
| 3 | Kazakhstan | 12 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 92.7 | 95.0 | \$ | 1.00 |
| 4 | Kyrgyz Republic | 13 | 0.5 | 2.3 | 94.3 | 96.0 | \$ | 1.00 |
| 5 | Tajikistan | 15 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 93.3 | 96.0 | \$ | 1.00 |
| 6 | Turkmenistan | 4 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 99.5 | 99.5 | \$ | 1.00 |
| 7 | Uzbekistan | 19 | 0.8 | 3.1 | 93.9 | 96.0 | \$ | 1.00 |
| 8 | Armenia | 8 | 0.3 | 4.6 | 91.1 | 95.0 | AMD | 477.00 |
| 9 | Georgia | 14 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 96.5 | 96.6 | GEL | 2.97 |
| 10 | Pakistan | 43 | 4.0 | 5.9 | 94.3 | 96.0 | PRe | 156.35 |
| East Asia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | Mongolia | 25 | 0.6 | 3.6 | 93.2 | 96.0 | \$ | 1.00 |
| 12 | PRC | 57 | 0.6 | 3.1 | 92.6 | 95.0 | CNY | 7.16 |
| Pacific |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | Australia | 15 | 0.2 | 2.1 | 95.2 | 97.0 | A\$ | 1.43 |
| 14 | Fiji | 15 | 2.8 | 5.6 | 93.5 | 96.0 | F\$ | 2.20 |
| 15 | PNG | 14 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 97.7 | 99.7 | K | 3.40 |
| Pacific Country Offices ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 | Samoa | 1 | 0.0 | 1.6 |  |  | ST | 2.62 |
| 17 | Solomon Islands | 1 | 0.0 | 2.0 |  |  | SI\$ | 8.25 |
| 18 | Tonga | 1 | 3.6 | 1.7 |  |  | T\$ | 2.31 |
| 19 | Vanuatu | 1 | 2.6 | 2.0 |  |  | Vt | 117.00 |
| South Asia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 | Bangladesh | 46 | 0.8 | 6.2 | 90.1 | 95.0 | Tk | 84.56 |
| 21 | Bhutan | 3 | 2.4 | 3.4 | 95.1 | 96.0 | Nu | 71.08 |
| 22 | India | 67 | 0.5 | 4.3 | 89.5 | 93.0 | $₹$ | 71.80 |
| 23 | Nepal | 38 | 1.8 | 6.3 | 91.0 | 95.0 | NRe | 113.42 |
| 24 | Sri Lanka | 31 | 0.8 | 5.2 | 91.0 | 95.0 | SLRe | 181.00 |
| Southeast Asia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 | Cambodia | 27 | 2.0 | 5.0 | 92.2 | 95.0 | \$ | 1.00 |
| 26 | Lao PDR | 20 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 92.8 | 95.0 | \$ | 1.00 |
| 27 | Myanmar | 5 | 0.7 | 3.9 | 92.1 | 95.0 | \$ | 1.00 |
| 28 | Timor-Leste | 7 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 97.1 | 97.1 | \$ | 1.00 |
| 29 | Viet Nam | 47 | 0.6 | 3.2 | 92.6 | 95.0 | \$ | 1.00 |
| 30 | Indonesia | 27 | 0.6 | 4.4 | 89.5 | 93.0 | Rp | 14,150.00 |
| 31 | Thailand | 10 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 95.9 | 97.9 | B | 31.10 |
| Representative Offices |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32 | US | 2 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 104.7 | 106.7 | \$ | 1.00 |
| 33 | Germany | 2 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 86.8 | 89.4 | $€$ | 0.87 |
| 34 | Japan | 2 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 133.1 | 135.1 | $¥$ | 104.00 |
|  | Total/Average (in \$) | 625 | 1.0 | 3.8 | 92.9 | 95.6 |  |  |

Lao PDR = Lao People's Democratic Republic, PNG = Papua New Guinea, PRC = People’s Republic of China.
Note:

1. Field offices in blue font are those with salary currency in US dollar.
2. Seven of the Pacific country offices and ADB Singapore office currently do not have any confirmed staff.
${ }^{\text {a }}$ Estimated number of confirmed staff by 1 January 2020.
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Based on the Bloomberg's full-year forecast exchange rate as of 8 October 2019.
${ }^{\text {c }}$ Comparatio values for field offices with only one staff are not shown for purposes of maintaining confidentiality. Source: Asian Development Bank.

## B. Staff Recruitment

## 1. International Staff

Table A1.6: International Staff—Recruitment Pressures

| Year | Proportion of 1st choice <br> external candidates not <br> secured | Proportion of vacancies <br> where advertisement <br> period was extended |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2018 | $7.0 \%$ | $16.8 \%$ |
| 2019 | $12.3 \%$ | $18.5 \%$ |
| (to 30 Sep) | Source: Asian Development Bank's Human Resources Management Information System. |  |

Table A1.7: International Staff—Recruitment by Level

| Level |  | Number of Staff Recruited ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | $\begin{gathered} 2019 \\ \text { (to } 30 \mathrm{Sed} \text { ) } \end{gathered}$ |
| IS1 | All Staff | 10 | 8 | 11 | 24 | 1 |
|  | Women | 7 | 4 | 7 | 11 | 1 |
| IS2 | All Staff | 8 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 5 |
|  | Women | 2 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 2 |
| IS3 | All Staff | 19 | 20 | 21 | 25 | 10 |
|  | Women | 6 | 12 | 9 | 14 | 8 |
| IS4 | All Staff | 47 | 27 | 62 | 59 | 22 |
|  | Women | 18 | 4 | 25 | 26 | 8 |
| IS5 | All Staff | 12 | 16 | 28 | 29 | 15 |
|  | Women | 1 | 3 | 12 | 10 | 8 |
| IS6 | All Staff | 1 | 3 | 7 | 14 | 2 |
|  | Women | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| IS7 | All Staff | 6 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 2 |
|  | Women | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| IS8 | All Staff | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
|  | Women | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| IS9 | All Staff | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 0 |
|  | Women | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| IS10 | All Staff | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
|  | Women | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | All Staff | 108 | 84 | 146 | 168 | 57 |
|  | Women | 38 | 26 | 60 | 73 | 27 |

IS = international staff.
${ }^{\text {a }}$ Includes all candidates who accepted offers made during the year.
Source: Asian Development Bank's Human Resources Management Information System.

Figure A1.1: International Staff-Sources of Recruitment


Notes:

1. In addition to staff recruited from outside ADB, the number of ADB national staff hired into international staff positions is shown.
2. Internal hires (international staff hired into a different international staff role) are not included.

Source: Asian Development Bank's Human Resources Management Information System.

## 2. National Staff and Administrative Staff (Headquarters)

Table A1.8: National Staff and Administrative Staff at Headquarters —Recruitment Pressures

| Year | Proportion of 1st choice <br> external candidates not <br> secured | Proportion of vacancies <br> where advertisement <br> period was extended |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2018 | $7.9 \%$ | $8.2 \%$ |
| 2019 | $9.5 \%$ | $10.4 \%$ |
| (to 30 Sep) | Source: Asian Development Bank's Human Resources Management Information System. |  |

Table A1.9: National Staff and Administrative Staff at Headquarters -Recruitment by Level

| Staff Category | Level |  | Number of Staff Recruited ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | $\begin{gathered} 2019 \\ \text { (to } 30 \text { Sep) } \end{gathered}$ |
| Administrative Staff | AS1 | All Staff | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Women | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | AS2 | All Staff | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Women | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | AS3 | All Staff | 7 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
|  |  | Women | 4 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
|  | AS4 | All Staff | 57 | 23 | 19 | 58 | 37 |
|  |  | Women | 42 | 17 | 16 | 57 | 33 |
|  | AS5 | All Staff | 6 | 6 | 11 | 16 | 9 |
|  |  | Women | 6 | 4 | 10 | 11 | 6 |
|  | AS6 | All Staff | 10 | 9 | 10 | 15 | 8 |
|  |  | Women | 5 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 3 |
|  | AS7 | All Staff | 5 | 7 | 13 | 10 | 6 |
|  |  | Women | 4 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 5 |
| National Staff | NS1 | All Staff | 5 | 5 | 20 | 16 | 11 |
|  |  | Women | 3 | 5 | 16 | 10 | 7 |
|  | NS2 | All Staff | 6 | 3 | 6 | 13 | 4 |
|  |  | Women | 4 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 4 |
|  | NS3 | All Staff | 6 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 6 |
|  |  | Women | 4 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 |
|  | NS4 | All Staff | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
|  |  | Women | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
|  | NS5 | All Staff | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
|  |  | Women | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
|  | NS6 | All Staff | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Women | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | NS7 | All Staff | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Women | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total |  | All Staff | 107 | 57 | 87 | 141 | 82 |
|  |  | Women | 75 | 43 | 66 | 111 | 63 |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Includes all candidates who accepted offers made during the year.
Source: Asian Development Bank's Human Resources Management Information System.

Figure A1.2: National Staff and Administrative Staff at Headquarters -Sources of Recruitment


[^6]3. National Staff and Administrative Staff (Field Offices)

Table A1.10: National Staff and Administrative Staff in Field Offices -Recruitment Pressures

| Year | Proportion of 1st choice <br> external candidates not <br> secured | Proportion of vacancies <br> where advertisement <br> period was extended |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2018 | $2.6 \%$ | $16.2 \%$ |
| 20 | (to Sep) | $3.8 \%$ |

Table A1.11: National Staff and Administrative Staff in Field Offices -Recruitment by Level

| Staff Category | Level |  | Number of Staff Recruited ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | $\begin{gathered} 2019 \\ \text { (to } 30 \text { Sep) } \end{gathered}$ |
| Administrative Staff | AS1 | All Staff | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Women | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | AS2 | All Staff | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Women | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | AS3 | All Staff | 2 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
|  |  | Women | 2 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
|  | AS4 | All Staff | 5 | 5 | 11 | 15 | 9 |
|  |  | Women | 4 | 2 | 7 | 12 | 8 |
|  | AS5 | All Staff | 1 | 3 | 4 | 9 | 11 |
|  |  | Women | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 9 |
|  | AS6 | All Staff | 14 | 13 | 16 | 17 | 15 |
|  |  | Women | 7 | 10 | 8 | 8 | 6 |
|  | AS7 | All Staff | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 |
|  |  | Women | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| National Staff | NS1 | All Staff | 3 | 4 | 8 | 14 | 11 |
|  |  | Women | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
|  | NS2 | All Staff | 7 | 13 | 9 | 6 | 11 |
|  |  | Women | 0 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 |
|  | NS3 | All Staff | 12 | 9 | 6 | 9 | 4 |
|  |  | Women | 3 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 3 |
|  | NS4 | All Staff | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
|  |  | Women | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
|  | NS5 | All Staff | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 6 |
|  |  | Women | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
|  | NS6 | All Staff | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Women | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | NS7 | All Staff Women | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total |  | All Staff | 45 | 58 | 60 | 76 | 73 |
|  |  | Women | 19 | 37 | 30 | 39 | 38 |

[^7]Source: Asian Development Bank's Human Resources Management Information System.

Figure A1.3: National Staff and Administrative Staff in Field Offices -Sources of Recruitment


## Note:

Internal hires (national staff and administrative staff hired into a different national staff and administrative staff role) are not included.
Source: Asian Development Bank's Human Resources Management Information System.

## C. Staff Retention

## 1. International Staff

Table A1.12: International Staff-Termination Rates

| Year | No. of Staff as of 1 January |  | Voluntary Resignations |  |  |  | Other Terminations |  |  |  | Total Terminations |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Count |  | Rates (\%) |  | Count |  | Rates (\%) |  | Count |  | Rates (\%) |  |
|  | All Staft Women |  | All Staff Women |  | All Staff | Women | All Staff | Women | All Staff | Women | All Staff | Women | All Staff Women |  |
| 2015 | 1,050 | 365 | 33 | 20 | 3.1 | 5.5 | 38 | 11 | 3.6 | 3.0 | 71 | 31 | 6.8 | 8.5 |
| 2016 | 1,078 | 368 | 36 | 13 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 50 | 16 | 4.6 | 4.3 | 86 | 29 | 8.0 | 7.9 |
| 2017 | 1,078 | 369 | 30 | 13 | 2.8 | 3.5 | 74 | 14 | 6.9 | 3.8 | 104 | 27 | 9.6 | 7.3 |
| 2018 | 1,112 | 393 | 39 | 16 | 3.5 | 4.1 | 17 | 6 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 56 | 22 | 5.0 | 5.6 |
| 2019 | 1,217 | 444 | 36 | 19 | 3.0 | 4.3 | 20 | 2 | 1.6 | 0.5 | 56 | 21 | 4.6 | 4.7 |
| (to 30 Sep ) | 1,217 | 444 | 36 | 19 | 3.0 | 4.3 | 20 | 2 | 1.6 | 0.5 | 56 | 2 | 4.6 | 4.7 |

## Notes:

1. Voluntary resignation rate refers to the number of staff who left the organization voluntarily over the previous 12 months, expressed as a proportion of the total number of staff at the start of that period (1 January).
2. Other termination rate refers to the number of staff who left the organization for other reasons over the previous 12 months, expressed as a proportion of the total number of staff at the start of that period (1January). These include:
(i) change in appointment category (e.g., from International Staff to Management);
(ii) other reasons (e.g., death, ill health);
(iii) interest of good administration (e.g., mutually agreed separation, early separation program);
(iv) performance reasons (e.g., non-confirmation of appointment, misconduct);
(v) fixed-term contract termination; and
(vi) retirement (e.g., normal, early, incapacity).

Source: Asian Development Bank's Human Resources Management Information System.

Figure A1.4: International Staff-Reasons for Termination


Source: Asian Development Bank's Human Resources Management Information System.

## 2. National Staff and Administrative Staff (Headquarters)

Table A1.13: National Staff and Administrative Staff at Headquarters-Termination Rates


## Notes:

1. Voluntary resignation rate refers to the number of staff who left the organization voluntarily over the previous 12 months, expressed as a proportion of the total number of staff at the start of that period (1 January).
2. Other termination rate refers to the number of staff who left the organization for other reasons over the previous 12 months, expressed as a proportion of the total number of staff at the start of that period (1January). These include:
(i) change in appointment category (e.g., from National Staff to International Staff);
(ii) other reasons (e.g., death, ill health);
(iii) interest of good administration (e.g., mutually agreed separation, early separation program);
(iv) performance reasons (e.g., non-confirmation of appointment, misconduct);
(v) fixed-term contract termination; and
(vi) retirement (e.g., normal, early, incapacity).

Source: Asian Development Bank's Human Resources Management Information System.

Figure A1.5: National Staff and Administrative Staff at Headquarters -Reasons for Terminations


Source: Asian Development Bank's Human Resources Management Information System.

## 3. National Staff and Administrative Staff (Field Offices)

Table A1.14: National Staff and Administrative Staff in Field Offices-Termination Rates

| Year | No. of Staff as of$\qquad$ |  | Voluntary Resignations |  |  |  | Other Terminations |  |  |  | Total Terminations |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Count |  | Rates (\%) |  | Count |  | Rates (\%) |  | Count |  | Rates (\%) |  |
|  | All Staff | Women | All Staff | Wom | All Staff | Women | All Staff | Won | All Staff | Women | All Staff | Wom | All Staf | Women |
| 2015 | 567 | 283 | 19 | 8 | 3.4 | 2.8 | 12 | 4 | 2.1 | 1.4 | 31 | 12 | 5.5 | 4.2 |
| 2016 | 578 | 289 | 18 | 8 | 3.1 | 2.8 | २2 | 2 | 3.8 | 0.7 | 40 | 10 | 6.9 | 3.5 |
| 2017 | 599 | 318 | 21 | 9 | 3.5 | 2.8 | 26 | 14 | 4.3 | 4.4 | 47 | 23 | 7.8 | 7.2 |
| 2018 | 608 | 323 | 11 | 9 | 1.8 | 2.8 | 10 | 4 | 1.6 | 1.2 | 21 | 13 | 3.5 | 4.0 |
| $\begin{gathered} 2019 \\ \text { (to } 30 \text { Sep) } \end{gathered}$ | 660 | 346 | 16 | 7 | 2.4 | 2.0 | 9 | 4 | 1.4 | 1.2 | 25 | 11 | 3.8 | 3.2 |

## Notes:

1. Voluntary resignation rate refers to the number of staff who left the organization voluntarily over the previous 12 months, expressed as a proportion of the total number of staff at the start of that period (1 January).
2. Other termination rate refers to the number of staff who left the organization for other reasons over the previous 12 months, expressed as a proportion of the total number of staff at the start of that period (1January). These include:
(i) change in appointment category (e.g., from National Staff to International Staff);
(ii) other reasons (e.g., death, ill health);
(iii) interest of good administration (e.g., mutually agreed separation, early separation program);
(iv) performance reasons (e.g., non-confirmation of appointment, misconduct);
(v) fixed-term contract termination; and
(vi) retirement (e.g., normal, early, incapacity).

Source: Asian Development Bank's Human Resources Management Information System.

Figure A1.6: National Staff and Administrative Staff in Field Offices -Reasons for Terminations


Source: Asian Development Bank's Human Resources Management Information System.
D. Comparator Information

Table A1.15: List of Comparators for Salary Review

## A. International Staff World Bank Group

B. National Staff and Administrative Staff (Headquarters)

| No. | Company Name | Line of Business | Headquarters | Total No. of Staff in the Philippines |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | ABS-CBN International | Media | Philippines | >2,000 |
| 2 | Accenture | High tech | Ireland | >2,000 |
| 3 | Citibank, N.A. | Finance | United States | >500 |
| 4 | Coca-Cola Beverages Philippines, Inc. | Consumer | United States | >2,000 |
| 5 | Embassy of the United States of America | Embassy | United States | >500 |
| 6 | Energy Development Corporation | Energy | Philippines | >500 |
| 7 | Globe Telecommunications* | High tech | Philippines | >2,000 |
| 8 | Hongkong and Shanghai Banking Corporation Ltd. | Finance | United Kingdom | >500 |
| 9 | International Rice Research Institute | International organization | Philippines | >500 |
| 10 | Manila Electric Company | Energy | Philippines | >2,000 |
| 11 | National Power Corporation | Energy | Philippines | >500 |
| 12 | Nestle Philippines, Inc. | Consumer | Switzerland | >2,000 |
| 13 | Philippine Long Distance Telephone Company / SMART Communications | High tech | Philippines | >2,000 |
| 14 | Pilipinas Shell Petroleum Corporation* | Energy | Netherlands | >500 |
| 15 | San Miguel Corporation | Consumer | Philippines | >2,000 |
| 16 | Sun Life of Canada (Philippines), Inc. | Finance | Canada | >500 |
| 17 | Unilever Philippines, Inc. | Consumer | United Kingdom | >500 |
| 18 | United Laboratories | Pharmaceutical | Philippines | >2,000 |
| 19 | World Bank Office, Manila | International organization | International | <500 |
| 20 | World Health Organization | International organization | International | <500 |

## C. National Staff and Administrative Staff (Field Offices) <br> 1 World Bank Group <br> 2 Local comparator organizations (a mix of private and public sector organizations) ${ }^{\text {a }}$

[^8]
## PROPOSED SALARY STRUCTURES EFFECTIVE 1 JANUARY 2020

(unless otherwise stated, the structures reflect net salaries)

Table A2.1: International Staff (\$ per year)

| ADB <br> Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| IS1 | 87,600 | 96,400 | 105,100 |
| IS2 | 96,700 | 111,200 | 125,700 |
| IS3 | 107,300 | 126,100 | 144,900 |
| IS4 | 125,400 | 147,300 | 169,300 |
| IS5 | 140,400 | 168,500 | 196,600 |
| IS6 | 165,400 | 198,500 | 231,600 |
| IS7 | 190,500 | 228,600 | 266,700 |
| IS8 | 222,200 | 266,600 | 311,100 |
| IS9 | 254,000 | 304,800 | 355,600 |
| IS10 | 273,000 | 327,600 | 382,200 |

$\overline{\text { ADB }}$ = Asian Development Bank, IS = international staff.
Source: Asian Development Bank.

Table A2.2: National Staff and Administrative Staff at Headquarters ${ }^{\text {a }}$
(P per year)

| ADB <br> Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 480,200 | 624,300 | 768,300 |
| AS2 | 539,500 | 701,300 | 863,200 |
| AS3 | 684,500 | 906,900 | $1,129,400$ |
| AS4 | 730,800 | 968,300 | $1,205,800$ |
| AS5 | 983,700 | $1,328,000$ | $1,672,300$ |
| AS6 | $1,188,400$ | $1,604,400$ | $2,020,300$ |
| AS7 | $1,299,900$ | $1,787,400$ | $2,274,800$ |
| National Staff |  |  |  |
| NS1 | $1,484,700$ | $2,041,500$ | $2,598,200$ |
| NS2 | $1,834,400$ | $2,522,300$ | $3,210,200$ |
| NS3 | $2,036,400$ | $2,851,000$ | $3,665,500$ |
| NS4 | $2,342,900$ | $3,280,000$ | $4,217,200$ |
| NS5 | $3,089,900$ | $4,325,900$ | $5,561,800$ |
| NS6 | $3,764,300$ | $5,270,000$ | $6,775,700$ |

ADB = Asian Development Bank, AS = administrative staff, NS = national staff.
${ }^{\text {a }}$ Salary structure reflects gross salaries.
Source: Asian Development Bank.

## A. Central and West Asia

Table A2.3: Afghanistan Resident Mission
(\$ per year)

| $\begin{array}{c}\text { ADB } \\ \text { Level }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Minimum }\end{array}$ | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Administrative |  | Staff |  |$]$

ADB = Asian Development Bank, AS = administrative staff, NS = national staff. Source: Asian Development Bank.

## Table A2.4: Armenia Resident Mission

(AMD per year)

| ADB <br> Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 4,452,000 | 5,787,000 | 7,123,000 |
| AS2 | 5,045,000 | 6,558,000 | 8,072,000 |
| AS3 | 5,580,000 | 7,394,000 | 9,207,000 |
| AS4 | 6,038,000 | 8,001,000 | 9,963,000 |
| AS5 | 7,300,000 | 9,855,000 | 12,410,000 |
| AS6 | 8,210,000 | 11,083,000 | 13,957,000 |
| AS7 | 9,489,000 | 13,047,000 | 16,606,000 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 10,941,000 | 15,044,000 | 19,147,000 |
| NS2 | 12,395,000 | 17,043,000 | 21,691,000 |
| NS3 | 16,011,000 | 22,416,000 | 28,820,000 |
| NS4 | 17,615,000 | 24,661,000 | 31,707,000 |
| NS5 | 22,726,000 | 31,816,000 | 40,907,000 |
| NS6 | 23,719,000 | 33,206,000 | 42,694,000 |
| NS7 | 27,195,000 | 38,073,000 | 48,951,000 |

$\overline{\text { ADB }}=$ Asian Development Bank, AS = administrative staff, NS = national staff. Source: Asian Development Bank.

## Table A2.5: Azerbaijan Resident Mission

(\$ per year)

| ADB Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 15,500 | 20,100 | 24,800 |
| AS2 | 16,900 | 22,000 | 27,000 |
| AS3 | 18,900 | 25,000 | 31,200 |
| AS4 | 19,900 | 26,400 | 32,800 |
| AS5 | 23,100 | 31,200 | 39,300 |
| AS6 | 24,500 | 33,100 | 41,700 |
| AS7 | 30,500 | 42,000 | 53,400 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 36,400 | 50,000 | 63,700 |
| NS2 | 42,600 | 58,600 | 74,600 |
| NS3 | 46,700 | 65,400 | 84,100 |
| NS4 | 48,900 | 68,400 | 88,000 |
| NS5 | 61,000 | 85,400 | 109,800 |
| NS6 | 69,100 | 96,800 | 124,400 |
| NS7 | 76,500 | 107,100 | 137,700 |

$\overline{\text { ADB }}=$ Asian Development Bank, AS = administrative staff, NS = national staff. Source: Asian Development Bank.

Table A2.6: Georgia Resident Mission
(GEL per year)

| ADB <br> Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 27,500 | 35,700 | 44,000 |
| AS2 | 30,600 | 39,800 | 49,000 |
| AS3 | 33,700 | 44,600 | 55,600 |
| AS4 | 38,100 | 50,500 | 62,900 |
| AS5 | 42,400 | 57,200 | 72,100 |
| AS6 | 45,400 | 61,300 | 77,200 |
| AS7 | 52,100 | 71,700 | 91,200 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 59,900 | 82,400 | 104,800 |
| NS2 | 70,500 | 96,900 | 123,400 |
| NS3 | 91,600 | 128,300 | 164,900 |
| NS4 | 108,400 | 151,800 | 195,100 |
| NS5 | 133,600 | 187,100 | 240,500 |
| NS6 | 143,500 | 200,900 | 258,300 |
| NS7 | 155,000 | 217,000 | 279,000 |

ADB = Asian Development Bank, AS = administrative staff, NS = national staff. Source: Asian Development Bank.

## Table A2.7: Kazakhstan Resident Mission (\$ per year)

| ADB <br> Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 11,800 | 15,400 | 19,000 |
| AS2 | 13,200 | 17,200 | 21,100 |
| AS3 | 14,300 | 19,000 | 23,600 |
| AS4 | 15,900 | 21,100 | 26,200 |
| AS5 | 17,500 | 23,600 | 29,800 |
| AS6 | 20,100 | 27,100 | 34,200 |
| AS7 | 24,000 | 33,000 | 42,000 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 27,800 | 38,100 | 48,600 |
| NS2 | 32,400 | 44,500 | 56,700 |
| NS3 | 44,200 | 61,900 | 79,600 |
| NS4 | 51,800 | 72,600 | 93,300 |
| NS5 | 65,600 | 91,900 | 118,100 |
| NS6 | 77,100 | 108,000 | 138,800 |
| NS7 | 84,800 | 118,800 | 152,700 |

Table A2.8: Kyrgyz Republic Resident Mission
(\$ per year)

| ADB Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 10,400 | 13,500 | 16,600 |
| AS2 | 11,400 | 14,800 | 18,200 |
| AS3 | 12,400 | 16,400 | 20,500 |
| AS4 | 13,500 | 17,900 | 22,300 |
| AS5 | 14,100 | 19,000 | 24,000 |
| AS6 | 15,600 | 21,000 | 26,500 |
| AS7 | 17,500 | 24,100 | 30,600 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 20,200 | 27,800 | 35,400 |
| NS2 | 22,800 | 31,300 | 39,900 |
| NS3 | 26,500 | 37,100 | 47,700 |
| NS4 | 28,900 | 40,400 | 52,000 |
| NS5 | 34,400 | 48,200 | 61,900 |
| NS6 | 39,100 | 54,800 | 70,400 |
| NS7 | 43,000 | 60,200 | 77,400 |

ADB = Asian Development Bank, AS = administrative staff, NS = national staff. Source: Asian Development Bank.

## Table A2.9: Pakistan Resident Mission <br> (PRe per year)

| ADB <br> Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 889,000 | 1,156,000 | 1,422,000 |
| AS2 | 924,000 | 1,201,000 | 1,478,000 |
| AS3 | 1,140,000 | 1,510,000 | 1,881,000 |
| AS4 | 1,283,000 | 1,700,000 | 2,117,000 |
| AS5 | 1,816,000 | 2,452,000 | 3,087,000 |
| AS6 | 1,932,000 | 2,608,000 | 3,284,000 |
| AS7 | 2,687,000 | 3,695,000 | 4,702,000 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 3,542,000 | 4,870,000 | 6,199,000 |
| NS2 | 4,310,000 | 5,926,000 | 7,543,000 |
| NS3 | 5,945,000 | 8,323,000 | 10,701,000 |
| NS4 | 6,489,000 | 9,085,000 | 11,680,000 |
| NS5 | 9,044,000 | 12,661,000 | 16,279,000 |
| NS6 | 9,419,000 | 13,187,000 | 16,954,000 |
| NS7 | 10,719,000 | 15,006,000 | 19,294,000 |

ADB = Asian Development Bank, AS = administrative staff, NS = national staff. Source: Asian Development Bank.

## Table A2.10: Tajikistan Resident Mission

(\$ per year)

| ADB <br> Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 8,800 | 11,400 | 14,100 |
| AS2 | 9,800 | 12,700 | 15,700 |
| AS3 | 11,200 | 14,900 | 18,500 |
| AS4 | 12,800 | 17,000 | 21,100 |
| AS5 | 14,200 | 19,200 | 24,100 |
| AS6 | 15,600 | 21,100 | 26,500 |
| AS7 | 18,500 | 25,400 | 32,400 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 21,000 | 28,900 | 36,800 |
| NS2 | 23,900 | 32,800 | 41,800 |
| NS3 | 28,600 | 40,000 | 51,500 |
| NS4 | 32,400 | 45,400 | 58,300 |
| NS5 | 36,600 | 51,300 | 65,900 |
| NS6 | 38,600 | 54,000 | 69,500 |
| NS7 | 42,400 | 59,400 | 76,300 |

Table A2.11: Turkmenistan Resident Mission (\$ per year)

| ADB <br> Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 10,800 | 14,100 | 17,300 |
| AS2 | 12,200 | 15,900 | 19,500 |
| AS3 | 13,600 | 18,000 | 22,400 |
| AS4 | 15,200 | 20,200 | 25,100 |
| AS5 | 16,700 | 22,500 | 28,400 |
| AS6 | 17,900 | 24,100 | 30,400 |
| AS7 | 20,500 | 28,200 | 35,900 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 24,300 | 33,400 | 42,500 |
| NS2 | 28,600 | 39,300 | 50,100 |
| NS3 | 36,300 | 50,800 | 65,300 |
| NS4 | 41,300 | 57,800 | 74,300 |
| NS5 | 50,900 | 71,300 | 91,600 |
| NS6 | 51,800 | 72,500 | 93,200 |
| NS7 | 56,900 | 79,700 | 102,400 |

ADB = Asian Development Bank, AS = administrative staff, NS = national staff. Source: Asian Development Bank.

Table A2.12: Uzbekistan Resident Mission
(\$ per year)

| ADB <br> Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 9,600 | 12,500 | 15,400 |
| AS2 | 10,000 | 13,000 | 16,000 |
| AS3 | 12,100 | 16,000 | 20,000 |
| AS4 | 13,100 | 17,400 | 21,600 |
| AS5 | 14,700 | 19,800 | 25,000 |
| AS6 | 15,600 | 21,100 | 26,500 |
| AS7 | 18,800 | 25,900 | 32,900 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 22,500 | 30,900 | 39,400 |
| NS2 | 25,500 | 35,100 | 44,600 |
| NS3 | 33,200 | 46,500 | 59,800 |
| NS4 | 39,500 | 55,300 | 71,100 |
| NS5 | 46,600 | 65,200 | 83,900 |
| NS6 | 49,600 | 69,400 | 89,300 |
| NS7 | 54,700 | 76,600 | 98,500 |

ADB = Asian Development Bank, AS = administrative staff, NS = national staff. Source: Asian Development Bank.

## B. East Asia

Table A2.13: People's Republic of China Resident Mission
(CNY per year)

| ADB <br> Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Administrative |  | Staff |  |

ADB = Asian Development Bank, $\mathrm{AS}=$ administrative staff, $\mathrm{NS}=$ national staff. Source: Asian Development Bank.

Table A2.14: Mongolia Resident Mission
(\$ per year)

| ADB <br> Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 10,000 | 13,000 | 16,000 |
| AS2 | 10,800 | 14,100 | 17,300 |
| AS3 | 12,800 | 16,900 | 21,100 |
| AS4 | 13,400 | 17,700 | 22,100 |
| AS5 | 16,700 | 22,600 | 28,400 |
| AS6 | 18,700 | 25,200 | 31,800 |
| AS7 | 20,900 | 28,800 | 36,600 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 25,500 | 35,000 | 44,600 |
| NS2 | 28,900 | 39,800 | 50,600 |
| NS3 | 35,000 | 49,000 | 63,000 |
| NS4 | 38,100 | 53,400 | 68,600 |
| NS5 | 53,500 | 74,900 | 96,300 |
| NS6 | 57,500 | 80,500 | 103,500 |
| NS7 | 60,000 | 84,000 | 108,000 |

## C. Pacific

Table A2.15: Pacific Liaison and Coordination Office
(A\$ per year)

| ADB <br> Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |

$\overline{\mathrm{ADB}}=$ Asian Development Bank, AS = administrative staff, NS = national staff. Source: Asian Development Bank.

Table A2.16: Pacific Subregional Office in Suva, Fiji
(F\$ per year)

| ADB Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 21,500 | 28,000 | 34,400 |
| AS2 | 21,900 | 28,500 | 35,000 |
| AS3 | 28,200 | 37,400 | 46,500 |
| AS4 | 30,100 | 39,900 | 49,700 |
| AS5 | 34,600 | 46,700 | 58,800 |
| AS6 | 36,300 | 49,000 | 61,700 |
| AS7 | 42,300 | 58,100 | 74,000 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 53,400 | 73,400 | 93,500 |
| NS2 | 61,100 | 84,000 | 106,900 |
| NS3 | 78,700 | 110,200 | 141,700 |
| NS4 | 85,900 | 120,200 | 154,600 |
| NS5 | 103,400 | 144,700 | 186,100 |
| NS6 | 110,400 | 154,500 | 198,700 |
| NS7 | 126,700 | 177,400 | 228,100 |

ADB = Asian Development Bank, AS = administrative staff, NS = national staff. Source: Asian Development Bank.

Table A2.17: Papua New Guinea Resident Mission
(K per year)

| ADB <br> Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 25,600 | 33,300 | 41,000 |
| AS2 | 27,500 | 35,700 | 44,000 |
| AS3 | 32,500 | 43,100 | 53,600 |
| AS4 | 34,800 | 46,100 | 57,400 |
| AS5 | 42,700 | 57,600 | 72,600 |
| AS6 | 46,600 | 62,900 | 79,200 |
| AS7 | 58,000 | 79,800 | 101,500 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 70,500 | 97,000 | 123,400 |
| NS2 | 83,100 | 114,200 | 145,400 |
| NS3 | 112,900 | 158,100 | 203,200 |
| NS4 | 125,100 | 175,100 | 225,200 |
| NS5 | 159,600 | 223,400 | 287,300 |
| NS6 | 169,000 | 236,600 | 304,200 |
| NS7 | 173,100 | 242,300 | 311,600 |

ADB = Asian Development Bank, AS = administrative staff, NS = national staff. Source: Asian Development Bank.

## D. Pacific Country Offices

Table A2.18: Samoa Pacific Country Office
(ST per year)

| ADB <br> Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 14,900 | 19,400 | 23,800 |
| AS2 | 17,100 | 22,200 | 27,400 |
| AS3 | 18,900 | 25,000 | 31,200 |
| AS4 | 21,700 | 28,700 | 35,800 |
| AS5 | 25,400 | 34,300 | 43,200 |
| AS6 | 28,500 | 38,500 | 48,500 |
| AS7 | 36,100 | 49,700 | 63,200 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 42,100 | 57,900 | 73,700 |
| NS2 | 48,800 | 67,100 | 85,400 |
| NS3 | 62,400 | 87,400 | 112,300 |
| NS4 | 72,500 | 101,500 | 130,500 |
| NS5 | 89,600 | 125,400 | 161,300 |
| NS6 | 103,200 | 144,500 | 185,800 |
| NS7 | 113,600 | 159,000 | 204,500 |

$\overline{\text { ADB }}=$ Asian Development Bank, $\mathrm{AS}=$ administrative staff, $\mathrm{NS}=$ national staff. Source: Asian Development Bank.

Table A2.19: Solomon Islands Pacific Country Office (SI\$ per year)

| ADB <br> Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |

ADB = Asian Development Bank, AS = administrative staff, NS = national staff. Source: Asian Development Bank.

## Table A2.20: Tonga Pacific Country Office

(T\$ per year)

| ADB <br> Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 10,100 | 13,100 | 16,200 |
| AS2 | 11,000 | 14,300 | 17,600 |
| AS3 | 13,000 | 17,200 | 21,500 |
| AS4 | 13,700 | 18,200 | 22,600 |
| AS5 | 15,300 | 20,700 | 26,000 |
| AS6 | 17,000 | 22,900 | 28,900 |
| AS7 | 19,600 | 26,900 | 34,300 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 22,000 | 30,300 | 38,500 |
| NS2 | 23,800 | 32,700 | 41,700 |
| NS3 | 30,000 | 42,000 | 54,000 |
| NS4 | 32,600 | 45,600 | 58,700 |
| NS5 | 43,600 | 61,000 | 78,500 |
| NS6 | 44,400 | 62,200 | 79,900 |
| NS7 | 48,900 | 68,400 | 88,000 |

$\overline{\mathrm{ADB}}=$ Asian Development Bank, AS = administrative staff, NS = national staff. Source: Asian Development Bank.

Table A2.21: Vanuatu Pacific Country Office
(Vt per year)

| ADB <br> Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |
| AS1 |  | $1,145,000$ | $1,488,000$ |
| AS2 | $1,378,000$ | $1,791,000$ | $1,832,000$ |
| AS3 | $1,687,000$ | $2,235,000$ | $2,784,000$ |
| AS4 | $1,965,000$ | $2,604,000$ | $3,242,000$ |
| AS5 | $2,201,000$ | $2,971,000$ | $3,742,000$ |
| AS6 | $2,565,000$ | $3,463,000$ | $4,361,000$ |
| AS7 | $3,113,000$ | $4,281,000$ | $5,448,000$ |
| National Staff |  |  |  |
| NS1 | $4,057,000$ | $5,578,000$ | $7,100,000$ |
| NS2 | $4,397,000$ | $6,046,000$ | $7,695,000$ |
| NS3 | $5,119,000$ | $7,167,000$ | $9,214,000$ |
| NS4 | $5,781,000$ | $8,093,000$ | $10,406,000$ |
| NS5 | $6,706,000$ | $9,389,000$ | $12,071,000$ |
| NS6 | $6,744,000$ | $9,442,000$ | $12,139,000$ |
| NS7 | $7,419,000$ | $10,386,000$ | $13,354,000$ |

ADB = Asian Development Bank, AS = administrative staff, NS = national staff. Source: Asian Development Bank.

Table A2.22: Cook Islands Pacific Country Office
(NZ\$ per year)

| ADB <br> Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 13,500 | 17,500 | 21,600 |
| AS2 | 15,400 | 20,000 | 24,600 |
| AS3 | 15,500 | 20,500 | 25,600 |
| AS4 | 17,400 | 23,000 | 28,700 |
| AS5 | 18,900 | 25,500 | 32,100 |
| AS6 | 24,100 | 32,500 | 41,000 |
| AS7 | 29,900 | 41,100 | 52,300 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 39,900 | 54,900 | 69,800 |
| NS2 | 49,900 | 68,600 | 87,300 |
| NS3 | 51,900 | 72,600 | 93,400 |
| NS4 | 54,000 | 75,600 | 97,200 |
| NS5 | 56,100 | 78,500 | 101,000 |
| NS6 | 58,900 | 82,500 | 106,000 |
| NS7 | 64,800 | 90,800 | 116,600 |

$\overline{\text { ADB }}$ = Asian Development Bank, AS = administrative staff, NS = national staff. Source: Asian Development Bank.

Table A2.23: Federated States of Micronesia Pacific Country Office (\$ per year)

| ADB <br> Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Administrative Staff |  | St |  |
| AS1 |  | 8,000 | 10,400 |
| AS2 | 9,100 | 11,800 | 12,800 |
| AS3 | 10,300 | 13,700 | 14,600 |
| AS4 | 11,500 | 15,300 | 19,000 |
| AS5 | 13,000 | 17,500 | 22,100 |
| AS6 | 14,200 | 19,200 | 24,100 |
| AS7 | 15,700 | 21,600 | 27,500 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 20,100 | 27,600 | 35,200 |
| NS2 | 23,900 | 32,800 | 41,800 |
| NS3 | 27,400 | 38,300 | 49,300 |
| NS4 | 30,700 | 43,000 | 55,300 |
| NS5 | 33,800 | 47,300 | 60,800 |
| NS6 | 37,300 | 52,200 | 67,100 |
| NS7 | 41,500 | 58,100 | 74,700 |

ADB = Asian Development Bank, AS = administrative staff, NS = national staff. Source: Asian Development Bank.

Table A2.24: Kiribati Pacific Country Office
(A\$ per year)

| ADB <br> Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 8,000 | 10,400 | 12,800 |
| AS2 | 8,800 | 11,400 | 14,100 |
| AS3 | 9,700 | 12,900 | 16,000 |
| AS4 | 10,800 | 14,300 | 17,800 |
| AS5 | 11,800 | 15,900 | 20,100 |
| AS6 | 13,500 | 18,200 | 23,000 |
| AS7 | 15,300 | 21,100 | 26,800 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 16,700 | 22,900 | 29,200 |
| NS2 | 18,000 | 24,800 | 31,500 |
| NS3 | 21,100 | 29,500 | 38,000 |
| NS4 | 21,600 | 30,200 | 38,900 |
| NS5 | 23,600 | 33,100 | 42,500 |
| NS6 | 25,900 | 36,300 | 46,600 |
| NS7 | 28,500 | 39,900 | 51,300 |

ADB = Asian Development Bank, AS = administrative staff, NS = national staff.
Source: Asian Development Bank.

Table A2.25: Nauru Pacific Country Office
(A\$ per year)

| ADB <br> Level | Minimum |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |$\quad$ Midpoint $\quad$ Maximum

ADB = Asian Development Bank, AS = administrative staff, NS = national staff. Source: Asian Development Bank.

Table A2.26: Palau Pacific Country Office (\$ per year)

| ADB Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 9,100 | 11,800 | 14,600 |
| AS2 | 9,700 | 12,600 | 15,500 |
| AS3 | 10,500 | 13,900 | 17,300 |
| AS4 | 11,600 | 15,400 | 19,100 |
| AS5 | 13,300 | 18,000 | 22,600 |
| AS6 | 14,800 | 20,000 | 25,200 |
| AS7 | 16,100 | 22,200 | 28,200 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 17,700 | 24,400 | 31,000 |
| NS2 | 19,400 | 26,700 | 34,000 |
| NS3 | 21,900 | 30,600 | 39,400 |
| NS4 | 25,600 | 35,800 | 46,100 |
| NS5 | 29,200 | 40,900 | 52,600 |
| NS6 | 38,200 | 53,500 | 68,800 |
| NS7 | 44,400 | 62,200 | 79,900 |

ADB = Asian Development Bank, AS = administrative staff, NS = national staff. Source: Asian Development Bank.

Table A2.27: Republic of Marshall Islands Pacific Country Office (\$ per year)

| ADB <br> Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 9,500 | 12,300 | 15,200 |
| AS2 | 10,800 | 14,000 | 17,300 |
| AS3 | 11,800 | 15,700 | 19,500 |
| AS4 | 12,800 | 17,000 | 21,100 |
| AS5 | 14,000 | 18,900 | 23,800 |
| AS6 | 17,500 | 23,600 | 29,800 |
| AS7 | 21,200 | 29,100 | 37,100 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 24,700 | 34,000 | 43,200 |
| NS2 | 26,700 | 36,700 | 46,700 |
| NS3 | 31,900 | 44,700 | 57,400 |
| NS4 | 37,700 | 52,800 | 67,900 |
| NS5 | 44,100 | 61,800 | 79,400 |
| NS6 | 50,900 | 71,200 | 91,600 |
| NS7 | 59,600 | 83,500 | 107,300 |

ADB = Asian Development Bank, AS = administrative staff, NS = national staff. Source: Asian Development Bank.

# Table A2.28: Tuvalu Pacific Country Office <br> (A\$ per year) 

| ADB <br> Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 5,600 | 7,300 | 9,000 |
| AS2 | 6,500 | 8,500 | 10,400 |
| AS3 | 7,300 | 9,700 | 12,000 |
| AS4 | 8,200 | 10,800 | 13,500 |
| AS5 | 8,700 | 11,800 | 14,800 |
| AS6 | 9,600 | 13,000 | 16,300 |
| AS7 | 10,300 | 14,200 | 18,000 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 11,200 | 15,400 | 19,600 |
| NS2 | 12,100 | 16,600 | 21,200 |
| NS3 | 13,400 | 18,800 | 24,100 |
| NS4 | 15,000 | 21,000 | 27,000 |
| NS5 | 17,700 | 24,800 | 31,900 |
| NS6 | 20,400 | 28,600 | 36,700 |
| NS7 | 22,500 | 31,500 | 40,500 |

ADB = Asian Development Bank, AS = administrative staff, NS = national staff. Source: Asian Development Bank.
E. South Asia

Table A2.29: Bangladesh Resident Mission
(Tk per year)

| ADB <br> Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 682,000 | 886,000 | 1,091,000 |
| AS2 | 692,000 | 899,000 | 1,107,000 |
| AS3 | 894,000 | 1,185,000 | 1,475,000 |
| AS4 | 1,022,000 | 1,354,000 | 1,686,000 |
| AS5 | 1,156,000 | 1,560,000 | 1,965,000 |
| AS6 | 1,236,000 | 1,668,000 | 2,101,000 |
| AS7 | 1,703,000 | 2,342,000 | 2,980,000 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 2,219,000 | 3,051,000 | 3,883,000 |
| NS2 | 2,805,000 | 3,857,000 | 4,909,000 |
| NS3 | 3,671,000 | 5,139,000 | 6,608,000 |
| NS4 | 4,718,000 | 6,605,000 | 8,492,000 |
| NS5 | 5,774,000 | 8,084,000 | 10,393,000 |
| NS6 | 6,091,000 | 8,527,000 | 10,964,000 |
| NS7 | 6,484,000 | 9,077,000 | 11,671,000 |

ADB = Asian Development Bank, AS = administrative staff, NS = national staff. Source: Asian Development Bank.

Table A2.30: Bhutan Resident Mission
(Nu per year)

| ADB <br> Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Administrative |  | Staff |  |

ADB = Asian Development Bank, AS = administrative staff, NS = national staff. Source: Asian Development Bank.

## Table A2.31: India Resident Mission

(₹ per year)

| ADB <br> Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |
| AS1 |  | 445,000 | 579,000 |
| AS2 | 534,000 | 694,000 | 712,000 |
| AS3 | 615,000 | 815,000 | $1,015,000$ |
| AS4 | 684,000 | 906,000 | $1,129,000$ |
| AS5 | 876,000 | $1,183,000$ | $1,489,000$ |
| AS6 | $1,063,000$ | $1,435,000$ | $1,807,000$ |
| AS7 | $1,246,000$ | $1,713,000$ | $2,181,000$ |
| National Staff |  |  |  |
| NS1 | $1,559,000$ | $2,143,000$ | $2,728,000$ |
| NS2 | $1,889,000$ | $2,598,000$ | $3,306,000$ |
| NS3 | $2,882,000$ | $4,035,000$ | $5,188,000$ |
| NS4 | $3,572,000$ | $5,001,000$ | $6,430,000$ |
| NS5 | $5,324,000$ | $7,453,000$ | $9,583,000$ |
| NS6 | $5,717,000$ | $8,004,000$ | $10,291,000$ |
| NS7 | $6,219,000$ | $8,707,000$ | $11,194,000$ |

ADB = Asian Development Bank, AS = administrative staff, NS = national staff. Source: Asian Development Bank.

## Table A2.32: Nepal Resident Mission

(NRe per year)

| ADB <br> Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 892,000 | 1,159,000 | 1,427,000 |
| AS2 | 915,000 | 1,189,000 | 1,464,000 |
| AS3 | 1,090,000 | 1,444,000 | 1,799,000 |
| AS4 | 1,171,000 | 1,552,000 | 1,932,000 |
| AS5 | 1,332,000 | 1,798,000 | 2,264,000 |
| AS6 | 1,407,000 | 1,900,000 | 2,392,000 |
| AS7 | 1,695,000 | 2,331,000 | 2,966,000 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 2,052,000 | 2,822,000 | 3,591,000 |
| NS2 | 2,297,000 | 3,158,000 | 4,020,000 |
| NS3 | 3,094,000 | 4,332,000 | 5,569,000 |
| NS4 | 3,595,000 | 5,033,000 | 6,471,000 |
| NS5 | 4,235,000 | 5,929,000 | 7,623,000 |
| NS6 | 4,293,000 | 6,010,000 | 7,727,000 |
| NS7 | 4,526,000 | 6,337,000 | 8,147,000 |

 Source: Asian Development Bank.

Table A2.33: Sri Lanka Resident Mission
(SLRe per year)

| ADB <br> Level | Minimum |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |$\quad$ Midpoint $\quad$ Maximum

ADB = Asian Development Bank, AS = administrative staff, NS = national staff. Source: Asian Development Bank.

## F. Southeast Asia

| Table A2.34: Cambodia Resident Mission <br> (\$ per year) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ADB <br> Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 8,400 | 10,900 | 13,400 |
| AS2 | 9,500 | 12,400 | 15,200 |
| AS3 | 10,600 | 14,100 | 17,500 |
| AS4 | 12,100 | 16,000 | 20,000 |
| AS5 | 13,400 | 18,100 | 22,800 |
| AS6 | 14,700 | 19,900 | 25,000 |
| AS7 | 19,800 | 27,200 | 34,700 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 23,800 | 32,700 | 41,700 |
| NS2 | 29,100 | 40,000 | 50,900 |
| NS3 | 38,900 | 54,500 | 70,000 |
| NS4 | 44,100 | 61,700 | 79,400 |
| NS5 | 58,100 | 81,400 | 104,600 |
| NS6 | 59,500 | 83,300 | 107,100 |
| NS7 | 64,300 | 90,000 | 115,700 |

ADB = Asian Development Bank, AS = administrative staff, NS = national staff. Source: Asian Development Bank.

## Table A2.35: Indonesia Resident Mission <br> (Rp per year)

| ADB Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 112,203,000 | 145,864,000 | 179,525,000 |
| AS2 | 132,553,000 | 172,319,000 | 212,085,000 |
| AS3 | 152,392,000 | 201,919,000 | 251,447,000 |
| AS4 | 170,678,000 | 226,149,000 | 281,619,000 |
| AS5 | 215,060,000 | 290,331,000 | 365,602,000 |
| AS6 | 236,409,000 | 319,152,000 | 401,895,000 |
| AS7 | 300,735,000 | 413,510,000 | 526,286,000 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 354,422,000 | 487,330,000 | 620,239,000 |
| NS2 | 413,448,000 | 568,491,000 | 723,534,000 |
| NS3 | 654,440,000 | 916,216,000 | 1,177,992,000 |
| NS4 | 753,130,000 | 1,054,382,000 | 1,355,634,000 |
| NS5 | 1,114,600,000 | 1,560,440,000 | 2,006,280,000 |
| NS6 | 1,268,526,000 | 1,775,937,000 | 2,283,347,000 |
| NS7 | 1,376,011,000 | 1,926,416,000 | 2,476,820,000 |

 Source: Asian Development Bank.

Table A2.36: Lao People's Democratic Republic Resident Mission (\$ per year)

| ADB <br> Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Administrative |  | Staff |  |
| AS1 | 7,100 | 9,200 | 11,400 |
| AS2 | 8,100 | 10,500 | 13,000 |
| AS3 | 9,200 | 12,200 | 15,200 |
| AS4 | 10,500 | 13,900 | 17,300 |
| AS5 | 11,500 | 15,500 | 19,600 |
| AS6 | 13,700 | 18,500 | 23,300 |
| AS7 | 15,300 | 21,000 | 26,800 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 18,200 | 25,000 | 31,900 |
| NS2 | 21,800 | 30,000 | 38,200 |
| NS3 | 29,300 | 41,000 | 52,700 |
| NS4 | 39,000 | 54,600 | 70,200 |
| NS5 | 50,100 | 70,200 | 90,200 |
| NS6 | 52,400 | 73,300 | 94,300 |
| NS7 | 57,100 | 80,000 | 102,800 |

ADB = Asian Development Bank, AS = administrative staff, NS = national staff. Source: Asian Development Bank.

# Table A2.37: Myanmar Resident Mission 

(\$ per year)

| ADB <br> Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |
| AS1 |  | 8,300 | 10,800 |
| AS2 | 8,800 | 11,400 | 13,300 |
| AS3 | 11,500 | 15,200 | 19,100 |
| AS4 | 12,800 | 17,000 | 21,100 |
| AS5 | 14,800 | 20,000 | 25,200 |
| AS6 | 16,300 | 22,000 | 27,700 |
| AS7 | 18,700 | 25,700 | 32,700 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 20,700 | 28,400 | 36,200 |
| NS2 | 22,700 | 31,200 | 39,700 |
| NS3 | 33,500 | 46,900 | 60,300 |
| NS4 | 41,100 | 57,500 | 74,000 |
| NS5 | 49,100 | 68,700 | 88,400 |
| NS6 | 52,100 | 73,000 | 93,800 |
| NS7 | 59,900 | 83,800 | 107,800 |

$\overline{\mathrm{ADB}}=$ Asian Development Bank, AS = administrative staff, NS = national staff. Source: Asian Development Bank.

Table A2.38: Thailand Resident Mission
(B per year)

| ADB <br> Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 378,000 | 492,000 | 605,000 |
| AS2 | 405,000 | 527,000 | 648,000 |
| AS3 | 540,000 | 716,000 | 891,000 |
| AS4 | 671,000 | 889,000 | 1,107,000 |
| AS5 | 790,000 | 1,067,000 | 1,343,000 |
| AS6 | 893,000 | 1,205,000 | 1,518,000 |
| AS7 | 1,020,000 | 1,402,000 | 1,785,000 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 1,224,000 | 1,683,000 | 2,142,000 |
| NS2 | 1,484,000 | 2,041,000 | 2,597,000 |
| NS3 | 2,411,000 | 3,376,000 | 4,340,000 |
| NS4 | 3,031,000 | 4,244,000 | 5,456,000 |
| NS5 | 3,449,000 | 4,829,000 | 6,208,000 |
| NS6 | 3,972,000 | 5,561,000 | 7,150,000 |
| NS7 | 4,369,000 | 6,117,000 | 7,864,000 |

$\overline{\mathrm{ADB}}=$ Asian Development Bank, AS = administrative staff, NS = national staff. Source: Asian Development Bank.

Table A2.39: Timor-Leste Resident Mission
(\$ per year)

| ADB <br> Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |
| AS1 |  | 5,900 | 7,700 |
| AS2 | 6,700 | 8,700 | 9,400 |
| AS3 | 7,700 | 10,200 | 12,700 |
| AS4 | 9,100 | 12,100 | 15,000 |
| AS5 | 11,400 | 15,400 | 19,400 |
| AS6 | 12,400 | 16,800 | 21,100 |
| AS7 | 16,100 | 22,100 | 28,200 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 19,800 | 27,200 | 34,700 |
| NS2 | 22,800 | 31,400 | 39,900 |
| NS3 | 28,100 | 39,300 | 50,600 |
| NS4 | 30,100 | 42,100 | 54,200 |
| NS5 | 39,700 | 55,600 | 71,500 |
| NS6 | 42,600 | 59,600 | 76,700 |
| NS7 | 49,500 | 69,300 | 89,100 |
| ADB $=$ Asian Development Bank, AS $=$ administrative staff, NS $=$ national staff. |  |  |  |
| Source: Asian Development Bank. |  |  |  |

Table A2.40: Viet Nam Resident Mission
(\$ per year)

| ADB <br> Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 10,800 | 14,100 | 17,300 |
| AS2 | 12,200 | 15,800 | 19,500 |
| AS3 | 13,300 | 17,600 | 21,900 |
| AS4 | 14,400 | 19,100 | 23,800 |
| AS5 | 16,600 | 22,400 | 28,200 |
| AS6 | 18,800 | 25,400 | 32,000 |
| AS7 | 23,900 | 32,900 | 41,800 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 30,000 | 41,300 | 52,500 |
| NS2 | 36,900 | 50,700 | 64,600 |
| NS3 | 53,400 | 74,800 | 96,100 |
| NS4 | 59,600 | 83,500 | 107,300 |
| NS5 | 88,600 | 124,100 | 159,500 |
| NS6 | 96,000 | 134,400 | 172,800 |
| NS7 | 105,600 | 147,800 | 190,100 |

$\overline{\mathrm{ADB}}=$ Asian Development Bank, AS = administrative staff, NS = national staff. Source: Asian Development Bank.
G. Private Sector Operations

## Table A2.41 ADB Singapore Office ${ }^{\text {a }}$

(S\$ per year)

| ADB <br> Level | Minimum |  | Midpoint |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | | Maximum |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |

ADB = Asian Development Bank, AS = administrative staff, NS = national staff.
${ }^{\text {a }}$ Salary structure reflects gross salaries.
Source: Asian Development Bank.

## H. Representative Offices

Table A2.42: European Representative Office
(€ per year)

| ADB Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |
| AS4 | 31,200 | 41,300 | 51,500 |
| AS5 | 33,400 | 45,100 | 56,800 |
| AS6 | 38,600 | 52,100 | 65,600 |
| AS7 | 42,300 | 58,100 | 74,000 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 48,000 | 66,000 | 84,000 |
| NS2 | 53,700 | 73,800 | 94,000 |
| NS3 | 68,600 | 96,100 | 123,500 |

ADB = Asian Development Bank, AS = administrative staff, NS = national staff. Source: Asian Development Bank.

Table A2.43: Japan Representative Office ${ }^{\text {a }}$
( $¥$ per year)

| ADB Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |
| AS4 | 4,165,000 | 5,676,000 | 6,872,000 |
| AS5 | 4,226,000 | 5,705,000 | 7,184,000 |
| AS6 | 4,475,000 | 6,041,000 | 7,608,000 |
| AS7 | 5,661,000 | 7,784,000 | 9,907,000 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 6,415,000 | 8,820,000 | 11,226,000 |
| NS2 | 7,168,000 | 9,856,000 | 12,544,000 |
| NS3 | 9,554,000 | 13,375,000 | 17,197,000 |

$\overline{\mathrm{ADB}}=$ Asian Development Bank, AS = administrative staff, NS = national staff. a Salary structure reflects gross salaries.
Source: Asian Development Bank.

Table A2.44: North American Representative Office ${ }^{\text {a }}$
(\$ per year)

| ADB <br> Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Administrative |  | Staff |  |
| AS4 | 42,800 | 56,700 | 70,600 |
| AS5 | 48,700 | 65,800 | 82,800 |
| AS6 | 54,600 | 73,700 | 92,800 |
| AS7 | 60,000 | 82,500 | 105,000 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 71,300 | 98,100 | 124,800 |
| NS2 | 82,700 | 113,700 | 144,700 |
| NS3 | 107,400 | 150,300 | 193,300 |

$\overline{\mathrm{ADB}}=$ Asian Development Bank, AS = administrative staff, NS = national staff.
${ }^{\text {a }}$ Salary structure reflects gross salaries.
Source: Asian Development Bank.


[^0]:    1 Includes ADB representative offices in Germany, Japan, the United States and the ADB Singapore Office. Philippines Country Office is included as part of the headquarters and excluded from the field offices, for purposes of this paper.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ The increase in US dollar equivalent is a combination of the proposed structure adjustment and the impact of year-on-year exchange rate movement between US dollar and Philippine peso. Further details are in Tables 2 and 3.

[^2]:    ${ }^{1}$ ADB. 2018. Strategy 2030: Achieving a Prosperous, Inclusive, Resilient, and Sustainable Asia and the Pacific. Manila.
    ${ }^{2}$ ADB. 2017. Salary Administration. Administrative Orders. AO 3.01. Manila.

[^3]:    3 The World Bank Group. 2018. 2018 Review of Staff Compensation for the World Bank Group and Awards Allocation. Washington, DC.
    4 The World Bank Group. 2019. 2019 Review of Staff Compensation for the World Bank Group and Awards Allocation. Washington, DC.
    5 The salary dilution by the end of 2019 is estimated to be between $1.2 \%$ and $1.4 \%$. This is a narrower range compared to the estimated range of salary dilution for 2018 of $1.1 \%$ to $2.1 \%$. The actual dilution in 2018 was $1.4 \%$.

[^4]:    ${ }^{6}$ Growth rate of per capita gross domestic product. ADB. 2019. Asian Development Outlook 2019. Manila.
    ${ }^{7}$ ADB. 2019. Asian Development Outlook 2019 Update. Manila.

[^5]:    ${ }^{8}$ Include (i) addressing remaining poverty and reducing inequalities; (ii) accelerating progress in gender equality; (iii) tackling climate change, building climate and disaster resilience, and enhancing environmental sustainability; (iv) making cities more livable; (v) promoting rural development and food security; (vi) strengthening governance and institutional capacity; and (viii) fostering regional cooperation and integration.
    ${ }^{9}$ ADB. 2019. Work Program and Budget Framework, 2020-2022. Manila.

[^6]:    Note:
    Internal hires (national staff and administrative staff hired into a different national staff and administrative staff role) are not included.
    Source: Asian Development Bank's Human Resources Management Information System.

[^7]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Includes all candidates who accepted offers made during the year.

[^8]:    $>=$ greater than, < = less than.

    * New Comparators for 2020. Globe Telecommunicaitons replaced Hewlett Packard; Pilipinas Shell replaced Ayala Corporation.
    a The Asian Development Bank has acquired local comparator organization data through survey providers Birches Group and Willis Towers Watson.
    Source: Asian Development Bank; Willis Towers Watson’s Survey Report.

