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## Asian Development Bank

## ABBREVIATIONS

| ADB | - | Asian Development Bank |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| NSAS | - | national staff and administrative staff |
| MRP | - | market reference point |
| STA | - | short-term assignment |
| US | - | United States |
| WBG | - | World Bank Group |
| WPBF | - | work program and budget framework |

## GLOSSARY

average salary increase
comparatio
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
merit increase
midpoint
payroll
salary dilution

- The average percentage increase comprising salary structure adjustment and merit increase, to be applied to staff pay at the time of the review (January 1). Individual salary increases for staff are based on performance.
- 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 reference
- 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.

The component enabling staff to progress through the salary range mainly based on their performance.

- At ADB, the midpoint of the salary scale for each grade level is aligned with the market reference point ( $75^{\text {th }}$ percentile of market comparators).
- 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 employees (administrative staff, national staff, international staff), or a whole office.
- Expresses 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 - Each grade level has a salary scale or range, which is defined in range
salary structure - The full set of salary scales or ranges.
salary structure - The average percentage adjustment applied to the current salary
salary structure $\quad-\quad$ The average percentage adjustment applied to the current salary
adjustment
structure midpoints to align with the market. This will be equal to terms of a minimum, a midpoint, and a maximum within which the salaries of staff at that grade level are administered. The minimum and maximum are equidistant to the midpoint. the budget request when the adjustment is an increase and the merit increase is fully funded by salary dilution.
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In this report, "\$" refers to United States dollars, unless otherwise stated.
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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This paper presents to the Asian Development Bank (ADB) Board of Directors the results of the annual review of compensation for international, national, and administrative staff at headquarters, 30 field offices, and 11 Pacific country offices. ${ }^{1}$ This paper seeks the Board's approval for (i) the proposed 2019 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 it to continue attracting and retaining the best talent, consistent with its development mission and in line with international trends. ADB's compensation policy and methodology, which was approved by the Board in the comprehensive compensation and benefits review in 2015, is a market-based approach. 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 working at ADB.

Strategy 2030 highlights the need to enhance the workforce through recruiting experts in priority areas, strengthening country presence and building technical capacity in the resident missions. Obtaining the right skills mix across sector and thematic groups will be critical as ADB continues to scale up its operations. ADB's ability to continue attracting skilled and talented individuals is of paramount importance. In addition to attracting new staff, maintaining high levels of staff engagement is more important than ever as ADB embarks on the implementation of Strategy 2030. This will be done in the context of continuing efforts to strengthen performance management and increase productivity while also ensuring effective and efficient use of its budget and staffing resources.

The following proposals are aimed at keeping pace with increases in salary levels in the market to maintain competitiveness while recognizing the developments with respect to salary levels of the World Bank Group (WBG) which is a principal comparator for ADB:
(i) For international staff, provide a $1.8 \%$ salary structure adjustment and an additional merit increase of $1.8 \%$, which results in an average salary increase of $3.6 \%$ (in US dollars) for 2019. The salary structure adjustment of $1.8 \%$ is proposed based on a combination of (i) the $2.6 \%$ increase of market salary movement as calculated by ADB using WBG's methodology (para. 16) and (ii) the capped salary structure adjustment at WBG of $1.1 \%$ this year. As the merit increase is fully funded by salary dilution, the total budget impact of the international staff salary increase for 2019 is equal to the structure adjustment of $1.8 \%$ (Table 4).
(ii) For national staff and administrative staff (NSAS) at headquarters, provide a 5.4\% salary structure adjustment and an additional merit increase of $2.6 \%$ which results in an average salary increase of $8.0 \%$ for 2019 (in Philippine pesos). As the merit increase is fully funded by salary dilution, the total budget impact of the NSAS HQ staff salary increase for 2019 is equal to the structure adjustment of $5.4 \%$ in Philippine peso terms, and $0.1 \%$ in US dollar terms (Table 4).
(iii) For NSAS in field offices, provide an average 4.6\% salary structure adjustment and an additional average merit increase of $2.4 \%$ which results in an average salary increase of $7.0 \%$ for 2019 (in US dollar equivalent). As the merit increase is fully

[^0]funded by salary dilution, the total budget impact of the NSAS field offices staff salary increase for 2019 is equal to the structure adjustment of $4.6 \%$ in US dollar terms (Table 4).

If approved by the Board of Directors, the proposed salary structures for all staff categories would become effective on 1 January 2019.

## I. INTRODUCTION

1. In support of Strategy 2030, ADB will need to expand its talent pool by hiring experts in priority areas, strengthening country presence, and building technical capacity in the resident missions. Obtaining the right skills mix across sector and thematic groups will be important, as will be the building of policy dialogue and project implementation skills. Fostering collaboration, knowledge sharing, and innovation across the entire workforce will be fundamental if ADB is to succeed in delivering the Strategy 2030 goals.
2. The market competitiveness of ADB's compensation package will help ADB recruit highcaliber and experienced professionals as well as retaining existing talented staff. The annual review of compensation focuses on assessing the competitiveness of ADB's salaries. The salary proposals outlined in this paper are designed 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 it is recruiting. Currently, about 50.0\% of ADB's international staff recruits are from the private sector and $25.0 \%$ are from other international financial institutions. The average market salary increases in Hong Kong, China and Singapore have been procured as a check for comparability.
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 in the context of wider human resources reforms, including to strengthen the performance management system, increase staff mobility and enhance leadership capabilities.

## II. ADB COMPENSATION POLICY AND PRINCIPLES

4. ADB has established clear principles and policies governing how compensation is managed.
5. 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 ${ }^{1}$ :
(i) Salaries are designed to (a) attract and retain highly qualified and competent staff members 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 members 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.
[^1]
## III. COMPENSATION METHODOLOGY

6. ADB's compensation methodology is reviewed every 5 years. The last comprehensive compensation and benefits review was conducted in 2015 and the next review is scheduled to commence in 2019 and 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. The World Bank Group (WBG) market reference points act as the proxy for this global market, as agreed and reaffirmed by the Board in the 2010 and 2015 comprehensive reviews of compensation and benefits, respectively. ${ }^{2}$ Historically the WBG has used a market composition with a representation of two-thirds private sector and one-third public sector, which broadly reflects where ADB has recruited from. This has allowed ADB to remain market competitive. ${ }^{3}$ Appendix 1, Figure A1.2 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 Manila.
(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.
7. Figure 1 describes how the 75 th 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 75 th percentile is used to develop the MRP (midpoint of each salary range). The minimum and maximum for each salary range is set based on an agreed spread (see Appendix 2).
Source: Asian Development Bank.

[^2]8. Under the market-based compensation system, annual salary adjustments are linked to the market movement of salaries rather than linked to the cost of living or consumer price index movements. These other 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

9. ADB creates salary ranges to (i) reflect market pay levels and uses them to make informed decisions (such as starting salaries for new hires, salary increases during the annual salary review process) and (ii) assess the market competitiveness of ADB 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 US dollars, a salary structure for NSAS in headquarters expressed in Philippine pesos, and a salary structure for NSAS in each field office expressed in local currencies or US dollars.
10. Comparatio is expressed for an individual (or across the organization as a whole) as a 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) 1 give the historical comparatio movement for international staff, while 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

11. 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 reflect the desired market position (para. 12); 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. 13).

## C. Salary Structure Adjustment

12. 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 bring staff salaries in line with the movement of the salary structure.

## D. Merit Increase

13. Employees should also typically progress through their salary range over time as they become more proficient and valuable to the organization. The speed at which employees move through their salary range is mainly based on their performance. The merit increase component enables this salary progression. For 2019, this component will be fully funded by savings from the estimated salary dilution during the year. Salary dilution occurs when staff who leave the organization usually 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

14. The sum of the salary structure adjustment and merit increase (paras. 12 and 13) 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 (with individual salary increases driven by individual performance levels); (ii) this determines whether the funding will result in one of three scenarios:
(i) improve the market competitiveness of staff salaries (increase in comparatio);
(ii) maintain the market competitiveness of staff salaries (no change to comparatio); or
(iii) reduce the market competitiveness of staff salaries (reduction in comparatio).

The proposals are set to broadly maintain the market competitiveness of salaries for the three staff categories (paras.16-29).
15. 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. In the 2010 comprehensive review, the Board approved the strategy to reach a comparatio target of $100 \%$ by 2015 for international staff. This target has not been achieved because of financial constraints in the budgets approved. For ADB to reach a $100 \%$ comparatio, the merit increase will need to be greater than savings from salary dilution, requiring a budget request greater than the salary structure adjustment.

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

## 1. International Staff (IS)

16. For the period July 2018 to June 2019, instead of applying the market-based methodology to determine its MRPs as in previous years, the WBG adopted a structure adjustment of $1.1 \%$ as agreed between WBG management and shareholders in its 2018 capital increase discussions. ${ }^{4}$ Based on ADB's calculation, the MRPs would have increased by $2.6 \%$ for July 2018 to June 2019 if the WBG's methodology for determining MRPs (as set out in the 2016 Review of Staff Compensation for the World Bank Group) ${ }^{5}$ had been applied for this period. Movement in the MRPs based on this methodology is derived from data from a combination of public sector and private sector organizations:
(i) one-third weight of $1.9 \%$, being the public sector salary movement (based on the US Civil service as published by the US government's office of personnel management for 2018), and
(ii) two-thirds weight of $3.0 \%$, being the private sector salary movement (based on the 2018 forecast from the US annual salary budget surveys for US private sector companies by Willis Towers Watson, WorldatWork and Aon Hewitt).

For ADB's 2019 salaries, it is proposed to adopt an approach that reflects the two key parameters in setting salary structures as approved and reaffirmed in the 2010 and 2015 comprehensive compensation and benefits reviews, respectively:
(i) adopting a market-based approach and aligning ADB's salary midpoints at the $75^{\text {th }}$ percentile of the market; and
(ii) recognizing WBG as a principal comparator and using WBG MRPs as a proxy for the international market.

A salary structure adjustment of $1.8 \%$ is proposed, based on a combination of (i) the $2.6 \%$ increase reflecting the market salary movement as calculated by ADB using WBG's methodology that has been in place until July 2018 as described above and (ii) the capped structure adjustment at WBG of $1.1 \%$ this year.
17. It is proposed that the merit increase is equivalent to the expected salary dilution for the year ahead, that is $1.8 \%$. The proposed structure adjustment of $1.8 \%$ combined with the merit increase component of $1.8 \%$ results in an average salary increase of $3.6 \%$. This achieves a similar comparatio as of 1 January 2018.

Table 1 and Appendix 1 (Table A1.1) show the progression of the international staff comparatio from 2014 to 2019.

[^3]Table 1: Historical Comparatio Information for International Staff, 2014-2019

|  |  | Overall Actual Comparatio (\%) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Confirmed Staff <br> (number) | as of 1 January | as of 31 December |
| 2014 | 959 | 93.3 | 92.3 |
| 2015 | 963 | 93.9 | 92.8 |
| 2016 | 979 | 94.9 | 94.1 |
| 2017 | 963 | 96.0 | 94.6 |
| 2018 | 942 | 96.1 | $94.0-95.0^{\mathrm{a}}$ |
| 2019 | 1,047 | $96.7^{\mathrm{b}}$ |  |

${ }^{a}$ Estimated comparatio by 31 December 2018. A range is provided because the final comparatio will depend on actual staff movements.
b Estimated comparatio on 1 January 2019 based on the ADB midpoints developed using the methodology described in para. 16, which reflects that the salary structure adjustments do not fully align with MRP growth.
Source: Asian Development Bank.
18. Appendix 1 (Table A1.1) shows the proposed salary structure adjustment, the average salary increase, and the resulting comparatio before and after the salary increase.
19. For 2019, market benchmarks for Hong Kong, China and Singapore 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; and $4.0 \%$ for Singapore. The analysis shows that the proposed average salary increase of $3.6 \%$ is broadly in line with these Asian financial hubs.

## 2. National Staff and Administrative Staff at Headquarters

20. For NSAS at headquarters, Willis Towers Watson conducted a customized survey on ADB's behalf in August 2018 in accordance with the Board approved methodology. The group of 20 comparators broadly represents one-third public sector and two-thirds private sector companies in the Philippines (Appendix 1, Table A1.12). The sample consists of $40 \%$ large organizations (more than 2,000 staff), $40 \%$ medium-sized organizations (500-2,000 staff) and $20 \%$ small organizations (less than 500 staff).
21. The Philippine economy grew at a rate of $5.1 \%{ }^{6}$ in 2018 with inflation at $5.0 \%{ }^{7}$. Benchmarking of the 20 comparators show that ADB's salary range midpoints require an increase of $5.4 \%$ on average to reflect the desired market position for 2019.
22. Based on the survey results, the proposed average salary structure adjustment for NSAS at headquarters is $5.4 \%$ (in Philippine peso). The salary structure for NSAS in headquarters is expressed in gross salaries (Appendix 2, Table A2.2).
23. In the 2015 comprehensive compensation and benefits review, the comparatio target was set at $97 \%$ for NSAS at headquarters. This target has not been met, and the projected comparatio at the end of 2018 is $92.9 \%$. The proposed merit increase of $2.6 \%$ (in Philippine peso) is funded by savings from salary dilution. The proposed average salary increase of $8.0 \%$ (in Philippine peso) maintains the comparatio at almost the same level as in 2018.

[^4]24. Appendix 1, Table A1.2 shows the salary structure adjustment, average salary increase, and inflation rate at headquarters from 2014 to 2019.
25. Appendix 1, Table A1.4 shows the proposed salary structure adjustment, the proposed average salary increase, and the resulting comparatio before and after the salary increase.

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

26. 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).
27. Based on the survey data analysis, the proposed salary structure adjustments across the field offices result in an average structure adjustment of $4.6 \%$ (in US dollars) for 2019.The various currencies are converted to US dollars based on the Bloomberg exchange rates as of 5 October 2018. The resulting salary structures effective 1 January 2019 for field offices are in Appendix 2, Tables A2.3-A2.43. The salary structures for NSAS in field offices are based on net salaries (net of income tax), except for Japan and the US where the salary structures are expressed in gross salaries.
28. The average salary structure adjustment and average salary increase for each field office from 2017 to 2019 are in Appendix 1, Table A1.3. The proposed average salary increase, salary structure adjustment, and the comparatio targets for each field office for 2019 are in Appendix 1, Table A1.5.
29. The proposed average salary increase of $7.0 \%$ (in US dollars) will maintain the comparatio at broadly the same level (96.0\%) as of January 2019 (Appendix 1, Table A1.5) The comparatio was at $96.5 \%$ in January 2018.

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

30. The average salary increase, and the actual distribution of performance ratings will determine the salary increase matrix for each staff category and location. 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 salary increase, and their individual salary can be lower than the minimum salary for their grade level.
31. Salary increase matrices will be linked to staff performance ratings (4, 3, 2 and 1 ) under the 2018 performance review.
(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 salary increase.

The allocation of the salary increase budget using the salary increase matrix will ensure that adequate funding is available to differentiate based on performance and the ratings distribution.

## IV. FACTORS DRIVING THE NEED FOR COMPETITIVE PAY

## A. The Business Context

32. In support of Strategy 2030 and the Work Program and Budget Framework (WPBF) 20192021, ADB will need to expand its talent pool by hiring experts in priority areas, strengthening country presence, and building technical capacity in the resident missions. To support the operational priorities under Strategy 2030, the overall additional staff requirement in 2019 is 135 (105 international and national staff and 30 administrative staff). The optimization efforts are expected to offset the gross requirements by 50 ( 30 international and national staff; 20 administrative staff). As a result, ADB plans to recruit 85 new positions ( 50 international staff, 25 national staff, and 10 administrative staff) in 2019 and an additional 115 new positions during 2020-2021.
33. ADB's ability to attract talent and experts from a wide range of global sources and retain existing high-caliber staff is fundamental to meeting the WPBF 2019-2021 commitments. ADB needs to hire experts with advanced knowledge in specialized fields, including private sector operations, health and education, climate change mitigation and adaptation, infrastructure, railways and urban transport, and advanced technologies. This will require specialized skill sets, international experience, and proficiency that are in great demand 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 embarks on the implementation of Strategy 2030. This will be done in the context of ADB's continuing efforts in strengthening performance management and increasing productivity, while also ensuring effective and efficient use of its budget and staffing resources.

## B. Challenges and Opportunities in Recruiting New Staff

34. ADB's competitiveness within its target group of potential employees continues to be a core challenge. Offering competitive salary and benefits remains critical for attracting new hires and retaining staff.
35. Scaling up of operations following Strategy 2030 will require ADB to substantially expand its workforce, with WPBF 2019-2021 estimating a need for 200 additional positions during the 3year period. Additional positions (together with the positions vacated through the regular turnover) will allow ADB to recruit staff with (i) expertise in new priority areas, (ii) sound competencies focusing on a collaboration, innovation, and knowledge sharing, and (iii) the ability to capitalize on new information technologies.
36. While the recruitment outcomes in 2017 and 2018 have been strong, challenges remain in attracting and recruiting for some of the highly skilled areas, including for the experts' pool.

Given this background, recruitment is expected to be challenging in the new areas. 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.
37. Information systems and technology has been a difficult area for staff recruitment. External labor markets for this specialized area, both local and international, remain highly competitive. To support ADB's Digital Agenda 2030, there will be a need for concerted outreach measures.
38. To support the scaling up and diversification of private sector operations in new and frontier markets as envisaged by Strategy 2030 and the consequent increased need for investment and risk management specialists, ADB will intensify its outreach efforts in the private sector.
39. ADB is strengthening its activities online to promote its image as an attractive employer and to reach out to a wider and more diverse group of potential candidates.

## v. OTHER DEVELOPMENTS

40. Gender pay gap study. As part of ADB's 17-point action plan to increase gender equality, a gender pay gap study was conducted by consultancy firm Willis Towers Watson in 2018 to assess whether any gender-based unexplained pay gaps exist in ADB's starting salaries, salary progression, current salary, performance ratings, and promotions over the period of 10-year period years (2007-2017). The key findings of the study are as follows:
(i) No significant unexplained gender pay gaps across ADB ${ }^{8}$ :
(ii) Analysis of the key variables that contribute to pay gaps:
(a) Hiring levels: a higher proportion of men than women are hired in senior levels across all staff categories
(b) Performance ratings: no gender-based differences in performance ratings
(c) Promotions: no gender-based differences in career progression (promotions)

Based on Willis Towers Watson's predictive model where job levels were not factored in, the unexplained pay gaps were all below $5 \%$ (Table 2).

Table 2: Unexplained Pay Gaps

| Staff Category | Unexplained Pay Gap (\%) ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| All International Staff | 3.36 |
| HQ national staff | 2.76 |
| HQ administrative staff | 3.64 |

${ }^{2}$ Positive percentage means pay gap is in favor of men.
Source: Asian Development Bank 2018 Gender Pay Gap Report.
The Economic Research and Regional Cooperation Department also conducted a supplementary analysis using a different methodology to determine if there are any unexplained pay gaps in the international staff population and the results concurred with the findings of the Willis Towers Watson study.

[^5]41. Staff mobility. ADB promotes staff mobility to strengthen opportunities for career development for staff and to enhance collaboration and knowledge sharing between departments. Under the mobility framework, the rotation program and the short-term assignment (STA) program provide opportunities for staff at headquarters and in resident missions to broaden their skills and experiences in different locations, functions, and departments. ADB will continue to strengthen and expand mobility across departments and resident missions. ADB estimates about 60 staff will participate in STAs in 2019, of which $50 \%$ will entail an assignment at a different duty station. To support geographic assignments, ADB will provide STA mobility package to support temporary living and travel expenses of staff. ADB will also provide staff consultant resources to cover staff on STAs of long durations (above 6 months). To further support career management, ADB will provide career coaching services for staff.
42. Performance Management. The new performance review framework implemented in 2018 has a stronger link between ADB objectives and individual work plans, as well as more frequent feedback. The 360-degree assessment for international staff in management roles (IS7IS10) adopted in 2017 is helping strengthen leadership. Salary increases are based on individual performance.

## VI. BUDGETARY IMPACT

43. The proposed salary increase for 2019 due to salary structure adjustments is estimated at $\$ 4.7$ million, which includes $\$ 3.3$ million for international staff, $\$ 0.1$ million for NSAS at headquarters, and $\$ 1.3$ million for NSAS in field offices. Table 3 shows the total estimated cost of the 2018 and 2019 increase in the salary budget by staff category.

Table 3: Budget Impact of Salary Structure Adjustments (\$ million)

| Item | 2018 |  |  |  | 2019 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | IS | $\begin{gathered} \text { HQ } \\ \text { NSAS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FO } \\ \text { NSAS } \end{gathered}$ | Total | IS | $\begin{gathered} \text { HQ } \\ \text { NSAS } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FO } \\ & \text { NSAS } \end{aligned}$ | Total |
| Salary Increases | 3.9 | (1.5) ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 1.6 | 4.0 | 3.3 | $0.1^{\text {a }}$ | 1.3 | 4.7 |
| Salary-Related Benefits ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 1.0 | (0.4) | 0.4 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 1.1 |

( ) = negative, $\mathrm{FO}=$ field office, $\mathrm{HQ}=$ headquarters, $\mathrm{IS}=$ international staff, NSAS = national staff and administrative staff.
Note: Numbers may not sum precisely because of rounding.
${ }^{\text {a }}$ The Philippine peso to US dollar exchange rate used in Asian Development Bank's budget is based on the Bloomberg full-year forecasted median rate. In the 2018 budget, the exchange rate was $\mp 51.10$ to $\$ 1$, which is forecasted to be P53.80 to $\$ 1$ in 2019. The structure adjustment of $5.4 \%$ for NSAS at headquarters represents an increase equivalent to P 130.5 million.
${ }^{\text {b }}$ Includes staff retirement plan and insurance benefits.
Source: Asian Development Bank.
44. The $\$ 4.7$ million for salary increases represents $0.7 \%$ of the proposed 2019 budget, while the $\$ 1.1$ million for salary-related benefits represents $0.2 \%$. Salaries and benefits are expected to represent $62.4 \%$ of the proposed 2019 internal administrative expenses budget. Table 4 shows the total salary increase in 2019 resulting from salary structure adjustments.

Table 4: Salary Structure Adjustment and Salary Increase

| Staff Category | 2018 Salary <br> Budget <br> $(\$$ million $)$ | 2019 Structure <br> Adjustment <br> $(\%)$ | 2019 Salary <br> Incease due to <br> Structure <br> Adjustment <br> (\$ million) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| International Staff | 184.2 | $1.8 \%$ | 3.3 |
| NSAS at headquarters | 47.3 | $0.1 \%$ | 0.1 |
| NSAS in field offices | 27.4 | $4.6 \%$ | 1.3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 5 8 . 9}$ |  | 4.7 |
|  | (P million) |  | (P million) |
| NSAS at headquarters | $2,417.4$ | $5.4 \%$ | 130.5 |

FO = field office, $\mathrm{HQ}=$ headquarters, IS = international staff, NSAS = national staff and administrative staff.
Note: Numbers may not sum precisely because of rounding.
Source: Asian Development Bank.

## VII. RECOMMENDATION

45. The President recommends that the Board approve the following effective 1 January 2019:
(i) the salary structure for international staff (Appendix 2, Table A2.1): an average salary increase of $3.6 \%$ (in US dollars), which includes a salary structure adjustment of $1.8 \%$ and an additional merit increase of $1.8 \%$;
(ii) the salary structure for NSAS at headquarters (Appendix 2, Table A2.2): an average salary increase of $8.0 \%$ (in Philippine pesos), which includes a salary structure adjustment of $5.4 \%$ and an additional merit increase of $2.6 \%$; and
(iii) the salary structures for NSAS in field offices (Appendix 2, Tables A2.3-A2.43): an average salary increase of $7.0 \%$ (in US dollar equivalent), which includes a salary structure adjustment of $4.6 \%$ and an additional merit increase of $2.4 \%$.
46. Upon approval of the recommendation in para. 45 the cost of the proposals will be reflected in the 2019 budget which will be considered by the Board on 14 December 2018.

## SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

## A. Compensation Trends

Table A1.1: International Staff—Historical Comparatio, 2014-2019

| 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 (\%) |
| 2014 | 2 | 3.1 | 959 | 150,478 | 161,201 | 93.3 | 149,645 | 162,084 | 92.3 |
| 2015 | 2.3 | 4 | 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 | 166,025 | 175,765 | $94.0-95.0{ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| 2019 | 1.8 | 3.6 | 1,047 | 173,024 | 178,913 | $96.7{ }^{\text {b }}$ |  |  |  |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Estimated comparatio by 31 December 2018. A range is provided because the final comparatio will depend on the actual staff movements.
b Estimated comparatio on 1 January 2019 based on the ADB midpoints developed using the methodology described in para. 16 of the main text, which reflects that the salary structure adjustments do not fully align with MRP growth. Source: Asian Development Bank.

## Table A1.2: National Staff and Administrative Staff at Headquarters -Structure Adjustment and Salary Increase, 2014-2019

| Year | Structure Adjustment ${ }^{\text {a }}$ <br> (\%) | Average Salary Increase ${ }^{\text {a }}$ (\%) | Philippines Inflation Rate ${ }^{\text {b }}$ <br> (\%) | Philippines Growth Rate of per capita GDP ${ }^{\text {c }}$ <br> (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2014 | 4.0 | 7.6 | 3.6 | 4.4 |
| 2015 | 4.5 | 7.6 | 0.7 | 4.9 |
| 2016 | 4.0 | 7.0 | 1.3 | 4.6 |
| 2017 | 5.6 | 7.4 | 2.9 | 5.0 |
| 2018 | 4.2 | 6.7 | 5.0 | 5.1 |
| 2019 | 5.4 | 8.0 | 4.0 | 5.2 |

[^6]Table A1.3: National Staff and Administrative Staff in Field Offices
-Structure Adjustment and Salary Increase, 2017-2019

| Regional <br> Department/Field Office Location | 2017 |  | 2018 |  | 2019 |  | Salary Currency |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average Annual Structure Adjustment (\%) | Average Annual Salary Increase (\%) | Average Annual Structure Adjustment (\%) | Average Annual Salary Increase (\%) | Average Annual Structure Adjustment (\%) | Average Annual Salary Increase (\%) |  |
| Central West Asia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Afghanistan | 6.3 | 8.1 | 3.6 | 5.4 | 10.3 | 12.4 | \$ |
| Azerbaijan | 8.8 | 9.4 | 53.0 | 30.6 | 1.8 | 2.1 | $\$^{\text {a }}$ |
| Kazakhstan | 0.0 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 3.4 | 8.0 | \$ |
| Kyrgyz Republic | 6.8 | 6.8 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.4 | 6.0 | \$ |
| Tajikistan | 4.3 | 5.3 | 1.7 | 2.0 | 4.1 | 4.4 | \$ |
| Turkmenistan | 2.7 | 2.0 | 6.2 | 6.0 | 5.5 | 5.5 | \$ |
| Uzbekistan | 9.6 | 8.1 | 13.3 | 13.0 | 1.0 | 5.7 | \$ |
| Armenia | 4.2 | 5.3 | 1.4 | 2.0 | 2.8 | 5.8 | AMD |
| Georgia | 5.4 | 6.7 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 4.7 | 7.1 | GEL |
| Pakistan | 17.6 | 17.6 | 8.6 | 11.5 | 6.5 | 11.2 | PRs |
| East Asia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mongolia | 6.8 | 6.8 | 3.5 | 3.2 | 3.1 | 6.1 | \$ |
| PRC | 8.2 | 10.9 | 4.4 | 7.2 | 3.5 | 5.9 | CNY |
| Pacific |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Timor-Leste | 4.8 | 4.8 | 2.8 | 2.9 | 10.9 | 10.9 | \$ |
| Australia | 6.9 | 5.6 | 5.2 | 5.2 | 2.3 | 2.5 | A\$ |
| Fiji | 8.1 | 6.7 | 12.9 | 12.3 | 4.4 | 4.4 | F\$ |
| PNG | 9.1 | 9.6 | 4.3 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 3.9 | K |
| Pacific Country Offices ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Samoa | 1.5 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | ST |
| Solomon Islands | 8.2 | 13.2 | 0.0 | 7.5 | 11.0 | 6.1 | SI\$ |
| Tonga | 7.8 | 2.0 | 0.7 | 2.0 | 5.9 | 2.0 | T\$ |
| Vanuatu | 9.8 | 2.0 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 0.5 | 2.0 | Vt |
| South Asia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bangladesh | 5.8 | 9.4 | 4.6 | 8.1 | 5.6 | 8.0 | Tk |
| Bhutan | 19.3 | 6.0 | 39.9 | 32.9 | 4.1 | 4.1 | Nu |
| India | 7.2 | 10.0 | 10.4 | 12.6 | 8.7 | 10.1 | ₹ |
| Nepal | 10.6 | 12.7 | 14.5 | 16.2 | 3.4 | 4.5 | NRs |
| Sri Lanka | 6.8 | 8.9 | 4.7 | 6.4 | 6.0 | 9.2 | SLRs |
| Southeast Asia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cambodia | 8.9 | 7.8 | 4.4 | 4.3 | 4.6 | 5.8 | \$ |
| Lao PDR | 7.0 | 7.8 | 14.1 | 13.4 | 4.4 | 6.0 | \$ |
| Myanmar | 7.8 | 2.0 | 10.4 | 6.5 | 5.8 | 3.9 | \$ |
| Viet Nam | 4.4 | 6.2 | 2.8 | 6.2 | 4.1 | 8.8 | \$ |
| Indonesia | 7.3 | 8.4 | 5.3 | 6.2 | 4.0 | 8.3 | Rp |
| Thailand | 4.8 | 5.4 | 3.8 | 4.8 | 2.2 | 4.8 | B |
| Representative Offices |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| US | 2.8 | 3.8 | 4.2 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 2.0 | \$ |
| Germany | 2.9 | 2.0 | 0.5 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | $€$ |
| Japan | 3.4 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | $¥$ |
| Total/Average (in USD) | 7.4 | 8.8 | 6.5 | 8.0 | 4.6 | 7.0 |  |

Lao PDR = Lao People's Democratic Republic, PNG = Papua New Guinea PRC = People's Republic of China.
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 (AZN) to US Dollar (USD).
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ The additional seven Pacific Country Offices do not currently have any confirmed staff.

Table A1.4: Proposed 2019 Average Salary Increase and Estimated Comparatio

| Staff Category | Confirmed Staff (number) | Structure Adjustment (\%) | Merit Increase (\%) | Proposed Average Salary Increase (\%) | Estimated Comparatio by 31 December 2018 (\%) | Estimated Comparatio after Average Salary Increase (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| IS ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 1,047 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 3.6 | 94.0-95.0 | 96.7 |
| NSAS HQ ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 1,339 | 5.4 | 2.6 | 8.0 | 92.9 | 95.8 |
| NSAS FO ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 588 | 4.6 | 2.4 | 7.0 | 93.8 | 96.0 |

FO=field office, $\mathrm{HQ}=$ headquarters, IS=international staff, NSAS=national staff and administrative staff.
a In United States dollars.
b In Philippine pesos.
Notes:

1. The structure adjustments are representative of the market movements, the merit increases reward for performance and provide for pay progression within the salary ranges, and the proposed average salary increases help improve the comparatio for each staff category.
2. Comparatios should be assessed by comparing the same date in corresponding years (due to the impact of salary dilution). When comparing 1 January 2018 versus 1 January 2019 the movements for the three staff categories are:

International staff NSAS in headquarters 96.1\%-96.7\% NSAS in field offices
Source: Asian Development Bank.

Table A1.5: National Staff and Administrative Staff in Field Offices, 2019

| Regional <br> Department/Field Office Location | Confirmed Staff (No.) | Structure Adjustment (\%) | Proposed Average Salary Increase (\%) | Estimated Comparatio by 31 December 2018 (\%) | Estimated Comparatio after Salary Increase (\%) | Salary Currency | Exchange Rate ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Central West Asia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Afghanistan | 17 | 10.3 | 12.4 | 94.0 | 96.0 | \$ | 1.00 |
| Azerbaijan | 8 | 1.8 | 2.1 | 97.1 | 97.4 | \$ | 1.00 |
| Kazakhstan | 10 | 3.4 | 8.0 | 90.9 | 95.0 | \$ | 1.00 |
| Kyrgyz Republic | 12 | 3.4 | 6.0 | 92.5 | 95.0 | \$ | 1.00 |
| Tajikistan | 15 | 4.1 | 4.4 | 95.8 | 96.0 | \$ | 1.00 |
| Turkmenistan | 4 | 5.5 | 5.5 | 99.9 | 99.9 | \$ | 1.00 |
| Uzbekistan | 16 | 1.0 | 5.7 | 90.8 | 95.0 | \$ | 1.00 |
| Armenia | 6 | 2.8 | 5.8 | 93.3 | 96.0 | AMD | 485.00 |
| Georgia | 8 | 4.7 | 7.1 | 93.6 | 96.0 | GEL | 2.62 |
| Pakistan | 38 | 6.5 | 11.2 | 90.7 | 95.0 | PRs | 123.13 |
| East Asia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mongolia | 21 | 3.1 | 6.1 | 93.3 | 96.0 | \$ | 1.00 |
| PRC | 56 | 3.5 | 5.9 | 93.8 | 96.0 | CNY | 6.70 |
| Pacific |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Timor-Leste | 6 | 10.9 | 10.9 | 96.0 | 96.0 | \$ | 1.00 |
| Australia | 11 | 2.3 | 2.5 | 95.8 | 96.0 | A\$ | 1.33 |
| Fiji | 15 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 96.3 | 96.3 | F\$ | 2.16 |
| PNG | 12 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 98.4 | 98.4 | K | 3.36 |
| Pacific Country Offices ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Samoa | 1 | 0.0 | 2.0 |  |  | ST | 2.59 |
| Solomon Islands | 1 | 11.0 | 6.1 |  |  | SI\$ | 7.81 |
| Tonga | 1 | 5.9 | 2.0 |  |  | T\$ | 2.26 |
| Vanuatu | 1 | 0.5 | 2.0 |  |  | Vt | 114.00 |
| South Asia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bangladesh | 46 | 5.6 | 8.0 | 92.7 | 95.0 | Tk | 83.93 |
| Bhutan | 2 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 97.3 | 97.3 | Nu | 73.79 |
| India | 61 | 8.7 | 10.1 | 94.8 | 96.0 | ₹ | 70.00 |
| Nepal | 39 | 3.4 | 4.5 | 95.0 | 96.0 | NRs | 117.90 |
| Sri Lanka | 30 | 6.0 | 9.2 | 92.2 | 95.0 | SLRs | 170.00 |
| Southeast Asia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cambodia | 28 | 4.6 | 5.8 | 94.9 | 96.0 | \$ | 1.00 |
| Lao PDR | 21 | 4.4 | 6.0 | 94.4 | 96.0 | \$ | 1.00 |
| Myanmar | 8 | 5.8 | 3.9 | 96.4 | 96.4 | \$ | 1.00 |
| Viet Nam | 49 | 4.1 | 8.8 | 90.8 | 95.0 | \$ | 1.00 |
| Indonesia | 28 | 4.0 | 8.3 | 91.3 | 95.0 | Rp | 14,600.00 |
| Thailand | 9 | 2.2 | 4.8 | 92.6 | 95.0 | B | 32.20 |
| Representative Offices |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| US | 3 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 98.5 | 100.4 | \$ | 1.00 |
| Germany | 2 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 84.4 | 86.9 | $€$ | 0.81 |
| Japan | 3 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 119.2 | 121.5 | $¥$ | 106.00 |
| Total/Average (in USD) | 588 | 4.6 | 7.0 | 93.8 | 96.0 |  |  |

[^7]
## B. Staff Recruitment

## 1. International Staff

Figure A1.1: International Staff-Acceptance Rates


## Notes:

1. Number of offers refers to the number of written offers made to candidates following the completion of the recruitment process.
2. Acceptance rate refers to the number of recruited candidates expressed as a percentage of the total number of offers.
3. 2018 data only includes figures where the recruitment process has been completed.

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

Table A1.6: International Staff—Recruitment by Level

| Level |  | Number of Staff Recruited ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | $\begin{gathered} 2018 \\ \text { (to } 30 \text { Sep) } \end{gathered}$ |
| IS1 | All Staff | 4 | 10 | 8 | 11 | 1 |
|  | Women | 2 | 7 | 4 | 7 | 0 |
| IS2 | All Staff | 4 | 8 | 2 | 9 | 4 |
|  | Women | 1 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 3 |
| IS3 | All Staff | 12 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 17 |
|  | Women | 6 | 6 | 12 | 9 | 10 |
| IS4 | All Staff | 26 | 47 | 27 | 62 | 28 |
|  | Women | 8 | 18 | 4 | 25 | 13 |
| IS5 | All Staff | 7 | 12 | 16 | 28 | 11 |
|  | Women | 2 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 2 |
| IS6 | All Staff | 4 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 9 |
|  | Women | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| IS7 | All Staff | 5 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 4 |
|  | Women | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| IS8 | All Staff | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | Women | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| IS9 | All Staff | 0 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 |
|  | Women | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| IS10 | All Staff | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
|  | Women | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | All Staff | 65 | 108 | 84 | 146 | 78 |
|  | Women | 20 | 38 | 26 | 60 | 31 |

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 A1.2: 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 Manaqement Information Svstem.

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

Figure A1.3: National Staff and Administrative Staff at Headquarters-Acceptance Rates


Notes:

1. Number of offers refers to the number of written offers made to candidates following the completion of the recruitment process.
2. Acceptance rate refers to the number of recruited candidates expressed as a percentage of the total number of offers.
3. 2018 data only includes figures where the recruitment process has been completed.

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

| Staff Category | Level |  | Number of Staff Recruited ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | $\begin{gathered} 2018 \\ \text { (to } 30 \text { Sep) } \end{gathered}$ |
| 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 | 5 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 0 |
|  |  | Women | 5 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
|  | AS4 | All Staff | 60 | 57 | 23 | 19 | 39 |
|  |  | Women | 53 | 42 | 17 | 16 | 39 |
|  | AS5 | All Staff | 5 | 6 | 6 | 11 | 13 |
|  |  | Women | 3 | 6 | 4 | 10 | 9 |
|  | AS6 | All Staff | 5 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
|  |  | Women | 2 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 6 |
|  | AS7 | All Staff | 3 | 5 | 7 | 13 | 7 |
|  |  | Women | 3 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 7 |
| National Staff | NS1 | All Staff | 10 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 10 |
|  |  | Women | 8 | 3 | 5 | 16 | 7 |
|  | NS2 | All Staff | 5 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 9 |
|  |  | Women | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 8 |
|  | NS3 | All Staff | 1 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 5 |
|  |  | Women | 0 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|  | NS4 | All Staff | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
|  |  | Women | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
|  | NS5 | All Staff | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
|  |  | Women | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | 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 | 95 | 107 | 57 | 87 | 97 |
|  |  | Women | 79 | 75 | 43 | 66 | 78 |

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

Figure A1.4: National Staff and Administrative Staff at Headquarters -Sources of Recruitment


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

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

Figure A1.5: National Staff and Administrative Staff in Field Offices-Acceptance Rates


## Notes:

1. Number of offers refers to the number of written offers made to candidates following the completion of the recruitment process.
2. Acceptance rate refers to the number of recruited candidates expressed as a percentage of the total number of offers.
3. 2018 data only includes figures where the recruitment process has been completed.

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

Table A1.8: National Staff and Administrative Staff in Field Offices—Recruitment by Level

| Staff Category | Level |  | Number of Staff Recruited ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | $\begin{gathered} 2018 \\ \text { (to } 30 \text { Sep) } \end{gathered}$ |
| 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 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Women | 2 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
|  | AS4 | All Staff | 5 | 5 | 5 | 11 | 11 |
|  |  | Women | 5 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 9 |
|  | AS5 | All Staff | 5 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
|  |  | Women | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
|  | AS6 | All Staff | 6 | 14 | 13 | 16 | 13 |
|  |  | Women | 3 | 7 | 10 | 8 | 5 |
|  | AS7 | All Staff | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
|  |  | Women | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| National Staff | NS1 | All Staff | 5 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 10 |
|  |  | Women | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
|  | NS2 | All Staff | 7 | 7 | 13 | 9 | 5 |
|  |  | Women | 3 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 3 |
|  | NS3 | All Staff | 5 | 12 | 9 | 6 | 5 |
|  |  | Women | 1 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 1 |
|  | NS4 | All Staff | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
|  |  | Women | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | NS5 | All Staff | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
|  |  | Women | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
|  | NS6 | All Staff | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Women | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
|  | NS7 | All Staff Women | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total |  | All Staff | 40 | 45 | 58 | 60 | 50 |
|  |  | Women | 20 | 19 | 37 | 30 | 26 |

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

Figure A1.6: National Staff and Administrative Staff in Field Offices -Sources of Recruitment


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

## C. Staff Retention

## 1. International Staff

Table A1.9: International Staff-Termination Rates

| Year | No. of Staff as of <br> 1 January |  | Voluntary Resignations |  |  |  | Other Terminations |  |  |  | Total Terminations |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Count |  | Rates (\%) |  | Count |  | Rates (\%) |  | Count |  | Rates (\%) |  |
|  | All Staff Women All Staff Women All Staff Women |  |  |  |  |  | All Staff Women All Staff Women |  |  |  | All Staff Women All Staff Women |  |  |  |
| 2014 | 1,059 | 369 | 32 | 9 | 3.0 | 2.4 | 41 | 14 | 3.9 | 3.8 | 73 | 23 | 6.9 | 6.2 |
| 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 |
| $\begin{gathered} 2018 \\ \text { (to } 30 \mathrm{Sep} \text { ) } \end{gathered}$ | 1,136 | 400 | 33 | 12 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 13 | 3 | 1.1 | 0.8 | 46 | 15 | 4.0 | 3.8 |

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) retirement (e.g., normal, early, incapacity);
(ii) expiration of fixed-term contract;
(iii) interest of good administration (e.g. mutually agreed separation, early separation program);
(iv) performance reasons (e.g., non-confirmation of appointment, misconduct);
(v) change in appointment category; and
(vi) other reasons (e.g., death, ill health).

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

Figure A1.7: International Staff—Reasons for Termination


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

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

Table A1.10: National Staff and Administrative Staff at Headquarters-Termination Rates

| Year | No. of Staff as of 1 January |  | Voluntary Resignations |  |  |  | Other Terminations |  |  |  |  | Total Terminations |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Count |  | Rates |  | Count |  | Rates |  |  | Count |  | Rates (\%) |  |
|  | All Staff Women All Staff Women All Staff Women All Staff Women All Staff Women All Staff Women All Staff Women |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 | 1,336 | 1,084 | 59 | 48 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 15 | 1 | 1.1 |  | 1.0 | 74 | 59 | 5.5 | 5.4 |
| 2015 | 1,349 | 1,095 | 27 | 24 | 2.0 | 2.2 | 20 | 14 | 1.5 |  | 1.3 | 47 | 38 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| 2016 | 1,416 | 1,138 | 49 | 43 | 3.5 | 3.8 | 46 | 32 | 3.2 |  | 2.8 | 95 | 75 | 6.7 | 6.6 |
| 2017 | 1,383 | 1,109 | 40 | 33 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 36 | 25 | 2.6 |  | 2.3 | 76 | 58 | 5.5 | 5.2 |
| $\begin{array}{r} 2018 \\ \text { (to } 30 \mathrm{Sep}) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 1,387 | 1,111 | 32 | 25 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 5 | 3 | 0.4 |  | 0.3 | 37 | 28 | 2.7 | 2.5 |

## 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) retirement (e.g., normal, early, incapacity);
(ii) expiration of fixed-term contract;
(iii) interest of good administration (e.g. mutually agreed separation, early separation program);
(iv) performance reasons (e.g., non-confirmation of appointment, misconduct);
(v) change in appointment category; and
(vi) other reasons (e.g., death, ill health).

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

Figure A1.8: 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 A1.11: National Staff and Administrative Staff in Field Offices-Termination Rates

| Year | No. of Staff as of <br> 1 January |  | Voluntary Resignations |  |  |  | Other Terminations |  |  |  | Total Terminations |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Count |  | Rates (\%) |  | Count |  | Rates (\%) |  | Count |  | Rates (\%) |  |
|  | All Staff Women All Staff Women All Staff Women |  |  |  |  |  | All Staff Women All Staff |  |  | Women | All Staff Women All Staff Women |  |  |  |
| 2014 | 550 | 272 | 15 | 6 | 2.7 | 2.2 | 8 | 3 | 1.5 | 1.1 | 23 | 9 | 4.2 | 3.3 |
| 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 | 22 | 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 |
| $\begin{gathered} 2018 \\ \text { (to } 30 \text { Sep) } \end{gathered}$ | 604 | 321 | 7 | 6 | 1.2 | 1.9 | 9 | 4 | 1.5 | 1.2 | 16 | 10 | 2.6 | 3.1 |

## 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) retirement (e.g., normal, early, incapacity);
(ii) expiration of fixed-term contract;
(iii) interest of good administration (e.g. mutually agreed separation, early separation program);
(iv) performance reasons (e.g., non-confirmation of appointment, misconduct);
(v) change in appointment category; and
(vi) other reasons (e.g., death, ill health).

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

Figure A1.9: 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 A1.12: List of Comparators for Salary Review

| A. | International Staff |  | World Bank Group |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| B. | National Staff and Administrative Staff (Headquarters) |  |  |  |
| No. | Company Name | Line of <br> Business | Headquarters | Total <br> No. of <br> Staff |
| 1 |  | ABS-CBN International | Media | Philippines |
| 2 | Accenture | High Tech | Ireland | $>2,000$ |
| 3 | Ayala Corporation | Holding | Philippines | $>2,000$ |
|  |  | Company |  |  |
| 4 | Citibank, N.A. | Finance | United States | $>500$ |
| 5 | Coca-Cola FEMSA | Consumer | Mexico | $>2,000$ |
| 6 | Energy Development Corporation | Energy |  | $>500$ |
| 7 | Hewlett-Packard (HP) | High Tech | United States | $<500$ |
| 8 | HSBC Limited | Finance | United Kingdom | $>500$ |
| 9 | International Rice Research Institute | Supranational | 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 | High Tech | Philippines | $>2,000$ |
| 14 | Company / SMART Communications |  |  |  |
| 15 | San Miguel Corporation | Consumer | Philippines | $>2,000$ |
| 16 | Unilever Philippines, Inc. | Consumer | Philippines | $>500$ |
| 17 | United Laboratories, Inc. | Pharmaceutical | Philippines | $>2,000$ |
| 18 | United States Embassy | Embassy | United States | $>500$ |
| 19 | World Bank, Manila Office | Supranational | International | $<500$ |
| 20 | World Health Organization | Supranational | 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) a

$>=$ greater than, < = less than.
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.

## PROPOSED SALARY STRUCTURES EFFECTIVE 1 JANUARY 2019

(unless otherwise stated, the structures reflect net salaries)

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

| ADB <br> Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum | Range Spread <br> $(\%)$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| IS1 | 85,700 | 94,300 | 102,800 | 20 |
| IS2 | 94,600 | 108,800 | 123,000 | 30 |
| IS3 | 105,000 | 123,400 | 141,800 | 35 |
| IS4 | 122,600 | 144,100 | 165,500 | 35 |
| IS5 | 137,400 | 164,900 | 192,400 | 40 |
| IS6 | 161,800 | 194,200 | 226,500 | 40 |
| IS7 | 186,400 | 223,700 | 261,000 | 40 |
| IS8 | 217,400 | 260,900 | 304,400 | 40 |
| IS9 | 248,500 | 298,200 | 347,900 | 40 |
| IS10 | 267,100 | 320,500 | 373,900 | 40 |

Source: Asian Development Bank.

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

| ADB <br> Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum | RangeSpread <br> $(\%)$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 480,200 | 624,300 | 768,300 | 60 |
| AS2 | 539,500 | 701,300 | 863,200 | 60 |
| AS3 | 641,000 | 849,300 | $1,057,700$ | 65 |
| AS4 | 711,000 | 942,100 | $1,173,200$ | 65 |
| AS5 | 936,400 | $1,264,100$ | $1,591,900$ | 70 |
| AS6 | $1,133,500$ | $1,530,200$ | $1,927,000$ | 70 |
| AS7 | $1,280,700$ | $1,761,000$ | $2,241,200$ | 75 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |  |
| NS1 | $1,442,200$ | $1,983,000$ | $2,523,900$ | 75 |
| NS2 | $1,736,400$ | $2,387,600$ | $3,038,700$ | 75 |
| NS3 | $1,950,000$ | $2,730,000$ | $3,510,000$ | 80 |
| NS4 | $2,323,100$ | $3,252,300$ | $4,181,600$ | 80 |
| NS5 | $2,904,400$ | $4,066,100$ | $5,227,900$ | 80 |
| NS6 | $3,598,000$ | $5,037,200$ | $6,476,400$ | 80 |

$\overline{\mathrm{ADB}}=$ Asian Development Bank, $\mathrm{AS}=$ administrative staff, $\mathrm{NS}=$ 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)

| Level | Minimum |  | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | \(\left.\begin{array}{c}Range Spread <br>

(\%)\end{array}\right]\)
$\overline{A D B}=$ Asian Development Bank, $A S=$ administrative staff, $N S=$ national staff. Source: Asian Development Bank.

Table A2.4: Armenia Resident Mission
(AMD per year)

| Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum | Range Spread <br> $(\%)$ |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |  |
| AS1 | $4,452,000$ | $5,787,000$ | $7,123,000$ | 60 |
| AS2 | $5,045,000$ | $6,558,000$ | $8,072,000$ | 60 |
| AS3 | $5,580,000$ | $7,394,000$ | $9,207,000$ | 65 |
| AS4 | $6,038,000$ | $8,001,000$ | $9,963,000$ | 65 |
| AS5 | $7,300,000$ | $9,855,000$ | $12,410,000$ | 70 |
| AS6 | $8,210,000$ | $11,083,000$ | $13,957,000$ | 70 |
| AS7 | $9,489,000$ | $13,047,000$ | $16,606,000$ | 75 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |  |
| NS1 | $10,941,000$ | $15,044,000$ | $19,147,000$ | 75 |
| NS2 | $12,395,000$ | $17,043,000$ | $21,691,000$ | 75 |
| NS3 | $16,008,000$ | $2,411,000$ | $28,814,000$ | 80 |
| NS4 | $17,615,000$ | $24,661,000$ | $31,707,000$ | 80 |
| NS5 | $22,390,000$ | $31,346,000$ | $40,302,000$ | 80 |
| NS6 | $23,719,000$ | $33,206,000$ | $42,694,000$ | 80 |
| NS7 | $27,195,000$ | $38,073,000$ | $48,951,000$ | 80 |

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

Table A2.5: Azerbaijan Resident Mission
(\$ per year)

| Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum | Range Spread <br> (\%) |
| :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 15,500 | 20,100 | 24,800 | 60 |
| AS2 | 16,900 | 22,000 | 27,000 | 60 |
| AS3 | 18,900 | 25,000 | 31,200 | 65 |
| AS4 | 19,900 | 26,400 | 32,800 | 65 |
| AS5 | 23,100 | 31,200 | 39,300 | 70 |
| AS6 | 24,500 | 33,100 | 41,700 | 70 |
| AS7 | 30,500 | 42,000 | 53,400 | 75 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 36,400 | 50,000 | 63,700 | 75 |
| NS2 | 42,600 | 58,600 | 74,600 | 75 |
| NS3 | 45,000 | 63,000 | 81,000 | 80 |
| NS4 | 47,100 | 66,000 | 84,800 | 80 |
| NS5 | 59,300 | 83,000 | 106,700 | 80 |
| NS6 | 69,100 | 96,800 | 124,400 | 80 |
| NS7 | 76,500 | 107,100 | 137,700 | 80 |

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

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

| Level | Minimum |  | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | | Range Spread |
| :---: |
| $(\%)$ |

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

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

| Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum | Range Spread (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 11,800 | 15,400 | 19,000 | 60 |
| AS2 | 13,200 | 17,200 | 21,100 | 60 |
| AS3 | 14,300 | 19,000 | 23,600 | 65 |
| AS4 | 15,900 | 21,100 | 26,200 | 65 |
| AS5 | 17,500 | 23,600 | 29,800 | 70 |
| AS6 | 20,100 | 27,100 | 34,200 | 70 |
| AS7 | 24,000 | 33,000 | 42,000 | 75 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 27,800 | 38,100 | 48,600 | 75 |
| NS2 | 32,400 | 44,500 | 56,700 | 75 |
| NS3 | 44,200 | 61,900 | 79,600 | 80 |
| NS4 | 51,800 | 72,600 | 93,300 | 80 |
| NS5 | 65,000 | 91,000 | 117,000 | 80 |
| NS6 | 77,100 | 108,000 | 138,800 | 80 |
| NS7 | 84,800 | 118,800 | 152,700 | 80 |

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

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

| Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum | Range Spread <br> $(\%)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 10,400 | 13,500 | 16,600 | 60 |
| AS2 | 11,400 | 14,800 | 18,200 | 60 |
| AS3 | 12,400 | 16,400 | 20,500 | 65 |
| AS4 | 13,500 | 17,900 | 22,300 | 65 |
| AS5 | 14,100 | 19,000 | 24,000 | 70 |
| AS6 | 15,600 | 21,000 | 26,500 | 70 |
| AS7 | 17,500 | 24,100 | 30,600 | 75 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 20,200 | 27,800 | 35,400 | 75 |
| NS2 | 22,800 | 31,300 | 39,900 | 75 |
| NS3 | 2,900 | 36,200 | 46,600 | 80 |
| NS4 | 28,900 | 40,400 | 52,000 | 80 |
| NS5 | 34,400 | 48,200 | 61,900 | 80 |
| NS6 | 39,100 | 54,800 | 70,400 | 80 |
| NS7 | 43,000 | 60,200 | 77,400 | 80 |

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

## Table A2.9: Pakistan Resident Mission

(PRs per year)

| Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum | Range Spread <br> $(\%)$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 785,000 | $1,021,000$ | $1,256,000$ | 60 |
| AS2 | 924,000 | $1,201,000$ | $1,478,000$ | 60 |
| AS3 | $1,095,000$ | $1,451,000$ | $1,807,000$ | 65 |
| AS4 | $1,283,000$ | $1,700,000$ | $2,117,000$ | 65 |
| AS5 | $1,656,000$ | $2,236,000$ | $2,815,000$ | 70 |
| AS6 | $1,932,000$ | $2,608,000$ | $3,284,000$ | 70 |
| AS7 | $2,409,000$ | $3,312,000$ | $4,216,000$ | 75 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |  |
| NS1 | $3,268,000$ | $4,493,000$ | $5,719,000$ | 75 |
| NS2 | $4,012,000$ | $5,517,000$ | $7,021,000$ | 75 |
| NS3 | $5,561,000$ | $7,785,000$ | $10,010,000$ | 80 |
| NS4 | $6,489,000$ | $9,085,000$ | $11,680,000$ | 80 |
| NS5 | $8,541,000$ | $11,957,000$ | $15,374,000$ | 80 |
| NS6 | $9,419,000$ | $13,187,000$ | $16,954,000$ | 80 |
| NS7 | $10,719,000$ | $15,006,000$ | $19,294,000$ | 80 |

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

Table A2.10: Tajikistan Resident Mission (\$ per year)

| Level | Minimum |  | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | | Range Spread |
| :---: |
| $(\%)$ |

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

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

| Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum | Range Spread <br> (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 10,600 | 13,800 | 17,000 | 60 |
| AS2 | 12,200 | 15,900 | 19,500 | 60 |
| AS3 | 13,600 | 18,000 | 22,400 | 65 |
| AS4 | 15,200 | 20,200 | 25,100 | 65 |
| AS5 | 16,600 | 22,400 | 28,200 | 70 |
| AS6 | 17,900 | 24,100 | 30,400 | 70 |
| AS7 | 20,300 | 27,900 | 35,500 | 75 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 24,300 | 33,400 | 42,500 | 75 |
| NS2 | 27,300 | 37,600 | 47,800 | 75 |
| NS3 | 35,600 | 49,900 | 64,100 | 80 |
| NS4 | 40,000 | 56,000 | 72,000 | 80 |
| NS5 | 49,200 | 68,900 | 88,600 | 80 |
| NS6 | 51,600 | 72,200 | 92,900 | 80 |
| NS7 | 56,700 | 79,400 | 102,100 | 80 |

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

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

| Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum | Range Spread <br> $(\%)$ |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 9,600 | 12,500 | 15,400 | 60 |
| AS2 | 10,000 | 13,000 | 16,000 | 60 |
| AS3 | 11,900 | 15,800 | 19,600 | 65 |
| AS4 | 13,100 | 17,400 | 21,600 | 65 |
| AS5 | 14,400 | 19,400 | 24,500 | 70 |
| AS6 | 15,600 | 21,100 | 26,500 | 70 |
| AS7 | 18,700 | 25,700 | 32,700 | 75 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 22,100 | 30,400 | 38,700 | 75 |
| NS2 | 25,500 | 35,100 | 44,600 | 75 |
| NS3 | 32,600 | 45,700 | 58,700 | 80 |
| NS4 | 39,500 | 55,300 | 71,100 | 80 |
| NS5 | 46,600 | 65,200 | 83,900 | 80 |
| NS6 | 49,600 | 69,400 | 89,300 | 80 |
| NS7 | 54,600 | 76,400 | 98,300 | 80 |

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)

| Level | Minimum |  | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | | Range Spread |
| :---: |
| $(\%)$ |

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

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

| Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum | Range Spread <br> $(\%)$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 9,700 | 12,600 | 15,500 | 60 |
| AS2 | 10,800 | 14,100 | 17,300 | 60 |
| AS3 | 12,300 | 16,300 | 20,300 | 65 |
| AS4 | 13,400 | 17,700 | 22,100 | 65 |
| AS5 | 16,700 | 22,600 | 28,400 | 70 |
| AS6 | 18,700 | 25,200 | 31,800 | 70 |
| AS7 | 20,700 | 28,500 | 36,200 | 75 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 25,400 | 34,900 | 44,500 | 75 |
| NS2 | 28,900 | 39,800 | 50,600 | 75 |
| NS3 | 34,900 | 48,900 | 62,800 | 80 |
| NS4 | 38,100 | 53,400 | 68,600 | 80 |
| NS5 | 52,700 | 73,800 | 94,900 | 80 |
| NS6 | 55,800 | 78,100 | 100,400 | 80 |
| NS7 | 60,000 | 84,000 | 108,000 | 80 |

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

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

| Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum | Range Spread <br> (\%) |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 37,600 | 48,900 | 60,200 | 60 |
| AS2 | 38,200 | 49,600 | 61,100 | 60 |
| AS3 | 45,200 | 59,900 | 74,600 | 65 |
| AS4 | 49,700 | 65,800 | 82,000 | 65 |
| AS5 | 52,400 | 70,800 | 89,100 | 70 |
| AS6 | 57,200 | 77,200 | 97,200 | 70 |
| AS7 | 64,200 | 88,300 | 112,400 | 75 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 71,100 | 97,800 | 124,400 | 75 |
| NS2 | 80,100 | 110,100 | 140,200 | 75 |
| NS3 | 96,100 | 134,600 | 173,000 | 80 |
| NS4 | 101,100 | 14,600 | 182,000 | 80 |
| NS5 | 118,700 | 166,200 | 213,700 | 80 |
| NS6 | 125,200 | 175,300 | 225,400 | 80 |
| NS7 | 137,800 | 192,900 | 248,000 | 80 |

$\overline{\text { ADB }}$ = 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)

| Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum | Range Spread <br> $(\%)$ |
| :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 20,500 | 26,600 | 32,800 | 60 |
| AS2 | 21,600 | 28,100 | 34,600 | 60 |
| AS3 | 26,900 | 35,700 | 44,400 | 65 |
| AS4 | 28,800 | 38,100 | 47,500 | 65 |
| AS5 | 32,900 | 44,400 | 55,900 | 70 |
| AS6 | 35,000 | 47,200 | 59,500 | 70 |
| AS7 | 40,700 | 56,000 | 71,200 | 75 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 51,600 | 71,000 | 90,300 | 75 |
| NS2 | 59,400 | 81,700 | 104,000 | 75 |
| NS3 | 78,700 | 110,200 | 141,700 | 80 |
| NS4 | 85,900 | 120,200 | 154,600 | 80 |
| NS5 | 101,900 | 142,600 | 183,400 | 80 |
| NS6 | 110,400 | 154,500 | 198,700 | 80 |
| NS7 | 126,700 | 177,400 | 228,100 | 80 |

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)

| Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum | Range Spread <br> (\%) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 24,700 | 32,100 | 39,500 | 60 |
| AS2 | 27,500 | 35,700 | 44,000 | 60 |
| AS3 | 32,000 | 42,400 | 52,800 | 65 |
| AS4 | 34,800 | 46,100 | 57,400 | 65 |
| AS5 | 42,700 | 57,600 | 72,600 | 70 |
| AS6 | 46,600 | 62,900 | 79,200 | 70 |
| AS7 | 58,000 | 79,800 | 101,500 | 75 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 70,500 | 97,000 | 123,400 | 75 |
| NS2 | 83,100 | 114,200 | 145,400 | 75 |
| NS3 | 112,900 | 158,100 | 203,200 | 80 |
| NS4 | 125,100 | 175,100 | 225,200 | 80 |
| NS5 | 159,100 | 222,700 | 286,400 | 80 |
| NS6 | 169,000 | 236,600 | 304,200 | 80 |
| NS7 | 172,700 | 241,800 | 310,900 | 80 |

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

Table A2.18: Timor-Leste Resident Mission (\$ per year)

| Level | Minimum |  | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | \(\left.\begin{array}{c}Range Spread <br>

(\%)\end{array}\right]\)

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

## D. Pacific Country Offices

## Table A2.19: Pacific Country Office in Samoa

(ST per year)

| Level | Minimum |  | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | | Range Spread |
| :---: |
| (\%) |

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

Table A2.20: Pacific Country Office in Solomon Islands (SI\$ per year)

| Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum | Range Spread <br> $(\%)$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 53,800 | 69,900 | 86,100 | 60 |
| AS2 | 58,400 | 75,900 | 93,400 | 60 |
| AS3 | 63,000 | 83,500 | 104,000 | 65 |
| AS4 | 67,500 | 89,500 | 111,400 | 65 |
| AS5 | 72,000 | 97,200 | 122,400 | 70 |
| AS6 | 75,200 | 101,500 | 127,800 | 70 |
| AS7 | 87,000 | 119,600 | 152,300 | 75 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 95,700 | 131,600 | 167,500 | 75 |
| NS2 | 103,600 | 142,400 | 181,300 | 75 |
| NS3 | 111,800 | 156,500 | 201,200 | 80 |
| NS4 | 121,800 | 170,500 | 219,200 | 80 |
| NS5 | 142,800 | 199,900 | 257,000 | 80 |
| NS6 | 163,800 | 229,300 | 294,800 | 80 |
| NS7 | 180,100 | 252,200 | 324,200 | 80 |

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

Table A2.21: Pacific Country Office in Tonga
(T\$ per year)

| Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum | Range Spread <br> $(\%)$ |
| :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 10,100 | 13,100 | 16,200 | 60 |
| AS2 | 11,000 | 14,300 | 17,600 | 60 |
| AS3 | 12,700 | 16,800 | 21,000 | 65 |
| AS4 | 13,700 | 18,200 | 22,600 | 65 |
| AS5 | 15,100 | 20,400 | 25,700 | 70 |
| AS6 | 17,000 | 22,900 | 28,900 | 70 |
| AS7 | 19,100 | 26,300 | 33,400 | 75 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 21,700 | 29,800 | 38,000 | 75 |
| NS2 | 23,500 | 32,300 | 41,100 | 75 |
| NS3 | 29,800 | 41,700 | 53,600 | 80 |
| NS4 | 32,600 | 45,600 | 58,700 | 80 |
| NS5 | 42,100 | 58,900 | 75,800 | 80 |
| NS6 | 44,400 | 62,200 | 79,900 | 80 |
| NS7 | 48,900 | 68,400 | 88,000 | 80 |

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

Table A2.22: Pacific Country Office in Vanuatu
(Vt per year)

| Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum | Range Spread <br> $(\%)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |  |
| AS1 | $1,128,000$ | $1,467,000$ | $1,805,000$ | 60 |
| AS2 | $1,378,000$ | $1,791,000$ | $2,205,000$ | 60 |
| AS3 | $1,687,000$ | $2,235,000$ | $2,784,000$ | 65 |
| AS4 | $1,965,000$ | $2,604,000$ | $3,242,000$ | 65 |
| AS5 | $2,201,000$ | $2,971,000$ | $3,742,000$ | 70 |
| AS6 | $2,565,000$ | $3,463,000$ | $4,361,000$ | 70 |
| AS7 | $3,113,000$ | $4,281,000$ | $5,448,000$ | 75 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |  |
| NS1 | $4,025,000$ | $5,535,000$ | $7,044,000$ | 75 |
| NS2 | $4,397,000$ | $6,046,000$ | $7,695,000$ | 75 |
| NS3 | $5,031,000$ | $7,044,000$ | $9,056,000$ | 80 |
| NS4 | $5,781,000$ | $8,093,000$ | $10,406,000$ | 80 |
| NS5 | $6,536,000$ | $9,150,000$ | $11,765,000$ | 80 |
| NS6 | $6,744,000$ | $9,442,000$ | $12,139,000$ | 80 |
| NS7 | $7,419,000$ | $10,386,000$ | $13,354,000$ | 80 |

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

Table A2.23: Pacific Country Office in Cook Islands
(NZ\$ per year)

| Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum | Range Spread <br> $(\%)$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 13,500 | 17,500 | 21,600 | 60 |
| AS2 | 15,400 | 20,000 | 24,600 | 60 |
| AS3 | 15,500 | 20,500 | 25,600 | 65 |
| AS4 | 17,400 | 23,000 | 28,700 | 65 |
| AS5 | 18,900 | 25,500 | 32,100 | 70 |
| AS6 | 24,100 | 32,500 | 41,000 | 70 |
| AS7 | 29,900 | 41,100 | 52,300 | 75 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 39,900 | 54,900 | 69,800 | 75 |
| NS2 | 49,900 | 68,600 | 87,300 | 75 |
| NS3 | 51,900 | 72,600 | 93,400 | 80 |
| NS4 | 54,000 | 75,600 | 97,200 | 80 |
| NS5 | 56,100 | 78,500 | 101,000 | 80 |
| NS6 | 58,900 | 82,500 | 106,000 | 80 |
| NS7 | 64,800 | 90,800 | 116,600 | 80 |

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

Table A2.24: Pacific Country Office in the Federated States of Micronesia (\$ per year)

| Level | Minimum |  | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | \(\left.\begin{array}{c}Range Spread <br>

(\%)\end{array}\right]\)

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

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

| Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum | Range Spread <br> $(\%)$ |
| :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 7,800 | 10,100 | 12,500 | 60 |
| AS2 | 8,800 | 11,400 | 14,100 | 60 |
| AS3 | 9,700 | 12,800 | 16,000 | 65 |
| AS4 | 10,800 | 14,300 | 17,800 | 65 |
| AS5 | 11,600 | 15,700 | 19,700 | 70 |
| AS6 | 13,500 | 18,200 | 23,000 | 70 |
| AS7 | 15,300 | 21,000 | 26,800 | 75 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 16,100 | 22,100 | 28,200 | 75 |
| NS2 | 17,300 | 23,800 | 30,300 | 75 |
| NS3 | 20,100 | 28,200 | 36,200 | 80 |
| NS4 | 21,600 | 30,200 | 38,900 | 80 |
| NS5 | 23,400 | 32,800 | 42,100 | 80 |
| NS6 | 25,300 | 35,400 | 45,500 | 80 |
| NS7 | 27,900 | 39,000 | 50,200 | 80 |

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

Table A2.26: Pacific Country Office in Nauru (A\$ per year)

| Level | Minimum |  | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | \(\left.\begin{array}{c}Range Spread <br>

(\%)\end{array}\right]\)

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

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

| Level | Minimum |  | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | | Range Spread |
| :---: |
| $(\%)$ |

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

Table A2.28: Pacific Country Office in Palau

| Level | Minimum |  | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | | Range Spread |
| :---: |
| $(\%)$ |

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

Table A2.29: Pacific Country Office in Tuvalu
(A\$ per year)

| Level |  | Minimum |  | Midpoint |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Administrative Staff |  | Maximum | Range Spread <br> (\%) |  |
| AS1 | 5,500 |  |  |  |
| AS2 | 6,500 | 7,200 | 8,800 | 60 |
| AS3 | 7,200 | 8,400 | 10,400 | 60 |
| AS4 | 8,100 | 9,600 | 11,900 | 65 |
| AS5 | 8,700 | 10,700 | 13,400 | 65 |
| AS6 | 9,600 | 11,700 | 14,800 | 70 |
| AS7 | 10,200 | 14,900 | 16,300 | 70 |
| National Staff |  |  | 17,900 | 75 |
| NS1 | 11,100 | 15,300 |  |  |
| NS2 | 12,000 | 19,500 | 21,000 | 75 |
| NS3 | 13,400 | 18,700 | 24,100 | 75 |
| NS4 | 14,900 | 20,800 | 26,800 | 80 |
| NS5 | 17,600 | 24,600 | 31,700 | 80 |
| NS6 | 20,300 | 28,400 | 36,500 | 80 |
| NS7 | 22,300 | 31,200 | 40,100 | 80 |

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

## E. South Asia

Table A2.30: Bangladesh Resident Mission (Tk per year)

| Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum | Range Spread <br> $(\%)$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 658,000 | 856,000 | $1,053,000$ | 60 |
| AS2 | 692,000 | 899,000 | $1,107,000$ | 60 |
| AS3 | 868,000 | $1,150,000$ | $1,432,000$ | 65 |
| AS4 | $1,022,000$ | $1,354,000$ | $1,686,000$ | 65 |
| AS5 | $1,154,000$ | $1,558,000$ | $1,962,000$ | 70 |
| AS6 | $1,236,000$ | $1,668,000$ | $2,101,000$ | 70 |
| AS7 | $1,656,000$ | $2,277,000$ | $2,898,000$ | 75 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |  |
| NS1 | $2,172,000$ | $2,987,000$ | $3,801,000$ | 75 |
| NS2 | $2,805,000$ | $3,857,000$ | $4,909,000$ | 75 |
| NS3 | $3,662,000$ | $5,127,000$ | $6,592,000$ | 80 |
| NS4 | $4,718,000$ | $6,605,000$ | $8,492,000$ | 80 |
| NS5 | $5,774,000$ | $8,084,000$ | $10,393,000$ | 80 |
| NS6 | $5,934,000$ | $8,307,000$ | $10,681,000$ | 80 |
| NS7 | $6,451,000$ | $9,032,000$ | $11,612,000$ | 80 |

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

## Table A2.31: Bhutan Resident Mission

(Nu per year)

| Level |  | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | \(\left.\begin{array}{c}Range Spread <br>

(\%)\end{array}\right]\)
 Source: Asian Development Bank.

Table A2.32: India Resident Mission
(₹ per year)

| Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum | Range Spread <br> $(\%)$ |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 445,000 | 579,000 | 712,000 | 60 |
| AS2 | 534,000 | 694,000 | 854,000 | 60 |
| AS3 | 615,000 | 815,000 | $1,015,000$ | 65 |
| AS4 | 684,000 | 906,000 | $1,129,000$ | 65 |
| AS5 | 876,000 | $1,183,000$ | $1,489,000$ | 70 |
| AS6 | $1,063,000$ | $1,435,000$ | $1,807,000$ | 70 |
| AS7 | $1,246,000$ | $1,713,000$ | $2,181,000$ | 75 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |  |
| NS1 | $1,559,000$ | $2,143,000$ | $2,728,000$ | 75 |
| NS2 | $1,889,000$ | $2,598,000$ | $3,306,000$ | 75 |
| NS3 | $2,879,000$ | $4,031,000$ | $5,182,000$ | 80 |
| NS4 | $3,572,000$ | $5,001,000$ | $6,430,000$ | 80 |
| NS5 | $5,230,000$ | $7,322,000$ | $9,414,000$ | 80 |
| NS6 | $5,717,000$ | $8,004,000$ | $10,291,000$ | 80 |
| NS7 | $6,219,000$ | $8,707,000$ | $11,194,000$ | 80 |

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

Table A2.33: Nepal Resident Mission
(NRs per year)

| Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum | Range Spread <br> $(\%)$ |
| :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 853,000 | $1,109,000$ | $1,365,000$ | 60 |
| AS2 | 915,000 | $1,189,000$ | $1,464,000$ | 60 |
| AS3 | $1,039,000$ | $1,377,000$ | $1,714,000$ | 65 |
| AS4 | $1,171,000$ | $1,552,000$ | $1,932,000$ | 65 |
| AS5 | $1,279,000$ | $1,726,000$ | $2,174,000$ | 70 |
| AS6 | $1,407,000$ | $1,900,000$ | $2,392,000$ | 70 |
| AS7 | $1,662,000$ | $2,285,000$ | $2,909,000$ | 75 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |  |
| NS1 | $2,026,000$ | $2,786,000$ | $3,546,000$ | 75 |
| NS2 | $2,254,000$ | $3,099,000$ | $3,945,000$ | 75 |
| NS3 | $2,968,000$ | $4,155,000$ | $5,342,000$ | 80 |
| NS4 | $3,595,000$ | $5,033,000$ | $6,471,000$ | 80 |
| NS5 | $4,222,000$ | $5,911,000$ | $7,600,000$ | 80 |
| NS6 | $4,266,000$ | $5,973,000$ | $7,679,000$ | 80 |
| NS7 | $4,526,000$ | $6,337,000$ | $8,147,000$ | 80 |

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

## Table A2.34: Sri Lanka Resident Mission

 (SLRs per year)| Level |  |  |  |  |  | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum | Range Spread <br> $(\%)$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AS1 | $1,078,000$ | $1,401,000$ | $1,725,000$ | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |
| AS2 | $1,251,000$ | $1,626,000$ | $2,002,000$ | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |
| AS3 | $1,441,000$ | $1,909,000$ | $2,378,000$ | 65 |  |  |  |  |  |
| AS4 | $1,596,000$ | $2,115,000$ | $2,633,000$ | 65 |  |  |  |  |  |
| AS5 | $1,898,000$ | $2,562,000$ | $3,227,000$ | 70 |  |  |  |  |  |
| AS6 | $2,238,000$ | $3,021,000$ | $3,805,000$ | 70 |  |  |  |  |  |
| AS7 | $2,679,000$ | $3,684,000$ | $4,688,000$ | 75 |  |  |  |  |  |
| National Staff |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NS1 | $3,278,000$ | $4,507,000$ | $5,737,000$ | 75 |  |  |  |  |  |
| NS2 | $3,958,000$ | $5,442,000$ | $6,927,000$ | 75 |  |  |  |  |  |
| NS3 | $5,397,000$ | $7,556,000$ | $9,715,000$ | 80 |  |  |  |  |  |
| NS4 | $6,433,000$ | $9,006,000$ | $11,579,000$ | 80 |  |  |  |  |  |
| NS5 | $9,910,000$ | $13,874,000$ | $17,838,000$ | 80 |  |  |  |  |  |
| NS6 | $10,449,000$ | $14,628,000$ | $18,808,000$ | 80 |  |  |  |  |  |
| NS5 | $11,274,000$ | $15,783,000$ | $20,293,000$ | 80 |  |  |  |  |  |

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

Table A2.35: Cambodia Resident Mission
(\$ per year)

| Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum | Range Spread <br> $(\%)$ |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 8,400 | 10,900 | 13,400 | 60 |
| AS2 | 9,500 | 12,400 | 15,200 | 60 |
| AS3 | 10,400 | 13,800 | 17,200 | 65 |
| AS4 | 12,000 | 15,900 | 19,800 | 65 |
| AS5 | 13,300 | 17,900 | 22,600 | 70 |
| AS6 | 14,700 | 19,900 | 25,000 | 70 |
| AS7 | 19,100 | 26,300 | 33,400 | 75 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 23,100 | 31,700 | 40,400 | 75 |
| NS2 | 29,100 | 40,000 | 50,900 | 75 |
| NS3 | 37,900 | 53,000 | 68,200 | 80 |
| NS4 | 42,900 | 60,000 | 77,200 | 80 |
| NS5 | 57,600 | 80,700 | 103,700 | 80 |
| NS6 | 58,400 | 81,700 | 105,100 | 80 |
| NS7 | 63,900 | 89,500 | 115,000 | 80 |

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

Table A2.36: Indonesia Resident Mission
(Rp per year)

| Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum | Range Spread <br> $(\%)$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |  |
| AS1 | $109,785,000$ | $142,720,000$ | $175,656,000$ | 60 |
| AS2 | $132,553,000$ | $172,31,000$ | $212,085,000$ | 60 |
| AS3 | $152,392,000$ | $201,919,000$ | $251,447,000$ | 65 |
| AS4 | $170,678,000$ | $226,149,000$ | $281,619,000$ | 65 |
| AS5 | $213,251,000$ | $287,889,000$ | $362,527,000$ | 70 |
| AS6 | $236,409,000$ | $319,152,000$ | $401,895,000$ | 70 |
| AS7 | $296,921,000$ | $408,266,000$ | $519,612,000$ | 75 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |  |
| NS1 | $354,422,000$ | $487,330,000$ | $620,239,000$ | 75 |
| NS2 | $413,448,000$ | $568,491,000$ | $723,534,000$ | 75 |
| NS3 | $645,987,000$ | $904,382,000$ | $1,162,777,000$ | 80 |
| NS4 | $753,130,000$ | $1,054,382,000$ | $1,355,634,000$ | 80 |
| NS5 | $1,106,564,000$ | $1,549,189,000$ | $1,991,815,000$ | 80 |
| NS6 | $1,268,526,000$ | $1,775,937,000$ | $2,283,347,000$ | 80 |
| NS7 | $1,376,011,000$ | $1,926,416,000$ | $2,476,820,000$ | 80 |

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

Table A2.37: Lao People's Democratic Republic Resident Mission (\$ per year)

| Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum | Range Spread <br> $(\%)$ |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 7,100 | 9,200 | 11,400 | 60 |
| AS2 | 8,100 | 10,500 | 13,000 | 60 |
| AS3 | 9,200 | 12,200 | 15,200 | 65 |
| AS4 | 10,500 | 13,900 | 17,300 | 65 |
| AS5 | 11,500 | 15,500 | 19,600 | 70 |
| AS6 | 13,700 | 18,500 | 23,300 | 70 |
| AS7 | 15,300 | 21,000 | 26,800 | 75 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 18,200 | 25,000 | 31,900 | 75 |
| NS2 | 21,800 | 30,000 | 38,200 | 75 |
| NS3 | 29,200 | 40,900 | 52,600 | 80 |
| NS4 | 39,000 | 54,600 | 70,200 | 80 |
| NS5 | 48,800 | 68,300 | 87,800 | 80 |
| NS6 | 52,400 | 73,300 | 94,300 | 80 |
| NS7 | 57,100 | 80,000 | 102,800 | 80 |

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

Table A2.38: Myanmar Resident Mission
(\$ per year)

| Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum | Range Spread <br> $(\%)$ |
| :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 8,100 | 10,500 | 13,000 | 60 |
| AS2 | 8,800 | 11,400 | 14,100 | 60 |
| AS3 | 11,100 | 14,700 | 18,300 | 65 |
| AS4 | 12,800 | 17,000 | 21,100 | 65 |
| AS5 | 14,400 | 19,500 | 24,500 | 70 |
| AS6 | 16,300 | 22,000 | 27,700 | 70 |
| AS7 | 18,500 | 25,400 | 32,400 | 75 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 20,400 | 28,000 | 35,700 | 75 |
| NS2 | 22,300 | 30,700 | 39,000 | 75 |
| NS3 | 33,200 | 46,500 | 59,800 | 80 |
| NS4 | 41,100 | 57,500 | 74,000 | 80 |
| NS5 | 48,900 | 68,500 | 88,000 | 80 |
| NS6 | 52,100 | 73,000 | 93,800 | 80 |
| NS7 | 57,600 | 80,700 | 103,700 | 80 |

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

Table A2.39: Thailand Resident Mission
(B per year)

| Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum | Range Spread <br> (\%) |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |  |
| AS1 | 378,000 | 492,000 | 605,000 | 60 |
| AS2 | 405,000 | 527,000 | 648,000 | 60 |
| AS3 | 540,000 | 716,000 | 891,000 | 65 |
| AS4 | 671,000 | 889,000 | $1,107,000$ | 65 |
| AS5 | 790,000 | $1,067,000$ | $1,343,000$ | 70 |
| AS6 | 893,000 | $1,205,000$ | $1,518,000$ | 70 |
| AS7 | $1,020,000$ | $1,402,000$ | $1,785,000$ | 75 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |  |
| NS1 | $1,224,000$ | $1,683,000$ | $2,142,000$ | 75 |
| NS2 | $1,484,000$ | $2,041,000$ | $2,597,000$ | 75 |
| NS3 | $2,411,000$ | $3,376,000$ | $4,340,000$ | 80 |
| NS4 | $3,031,000$ | $4,244,000$ | $5,456,000$ | 80 |
| NS5 | $3,449,000$ | $4,829,000$ | $6,208,000$ | 80 |
| NS6 | $3,972,000$ | $5,561,000$ | $7,150,000$ | 80 |
| NS7 | $4,369,000$ | $6,117,000$ | $7,864,000$ | 80 |

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

## Table A2.40: Viet Nam Resident Mission

(\$ per year)

| Level | Minimum |  | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | \(\left.\begin{array}{c}Range Spread <br>

(\%)\end{array}\right]\)

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

## G. Representative Offices

Table A2.41: European Representative Office
( $€$ per year)

| Level | Minimum |  | Midpoint | Maximum |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | \(\left.\begin{array}{c}Range Spread <br>

(\%)\end{array}\right]\)

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

Table A2.42: Japan Representative Office ${ }^{\text {a }}$
( $¥$ per year)

| Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum | Range Spread <br> (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |  |
| AS4 | $4,165,000$ | $5,676,000$ | $6,872,000$ | 65 |
| AS5 | $4,226,000$ | $5,705,000$ | $7,184,000$ | 70 |
| AS6 | $4,475,000$ | $6,041,000$ | $7,608,000$ | 70 |
| AS7 | $5,661,000$ | $7,784,000$ | $9,907,000$ | 75 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |  |
| NS1 | $6,415,000$ | $8,820,000$ | $11,226,000$ | 75 |
| NS2 | $7,168,000$ | $9,856,000$ | $12,544,000$ | 75 |
| NS3 | $9,554,000$ | $13,375,000$ | $17,197,000$ | 80 |

AS = administrative staff, NS = national staff.
a Salary structure reflects gross salaries.
Source: Asian Development Bank.

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

| Level | Minimum | Midpoint | Maximum | Range Spread <br> $(\%)$ |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Administrative Staff |  |  |  |  |
| AS4 | 42,800 | 56,700 | 70,600 | 65 |
| AS5 | 48,700 | 65,800 | 82,800 | 70 |
| AS6 | 54,600 | 73,700 | 92,800 | 70 |
| AS7 | 60,000 | 82,500 | 105,000 | 75 |
| National Staff |  |  |  |  |
| NS1 | 71,300 | 98,100 | 124,800 | 75 |
| NS2 | 82,700 | 113,700 | 144,700 | 75 |
| NS3 | 107,400 | 150,300 | 193,300 | 80 |

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


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Philippines Country Office is included as part of the headquarters and excluded from the field offices, for purposes of this paper.

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ ADB. 2017. Salary Administration. Administrative Orders. AO 3.01. Manila.

[^2]:    ${ }^{2}$ ADB. 2010. 2010 Comprehensive Review of Salaries and Benefits for Professional Staff. Manila.; ADB. 2015. 2015 Comprehensive Review of Salary and Benefits for International Staff, National Staff, and Administrative Staff. Manila.
    ${ }^{3}$ See paragraph 16 on page 6 , relating to recent developments to WBG methodology.

[^3]:    ${ }^{4}$ The World Bank Group. 2018. 2018 Review of Staff Compensation for the World Bank Group and Awards Allocation. Washington DC.
    ${ }^{5}$ Until July 2018, WBG methodology has been to conduct a comprehensive market review every 3 years, and in the intervening years update salary structures according to projected salary increase data provided by WBG market data sources. If that cycle had continued, 2018 would have been an intervening year in which the methodology last published in the '2016 Review of Staff Compensation for the World Bank Group' paper (14 June 2016) would have been applicable.

[^4]:    ${ }^{6}$ Growth Rate of per capita gross domestic product. ADB. 2018. Asian Development Outlook 2018. Manila.
    ${ }^{7}$ ADB. 2018. Asian Development Outlook 2018 Update. Manila.

[^5]:    ${ }^{8}$ Based on a regression model that controls for certain explained factors around pay (performance, service, job level etc.). The unexplained pay gaps are then calculated, and "significant" is defined as gaps exceeding $5 \%$.

[^6]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ In Philippine peso.
    ${ }^{\text {b }}$ ADB. 2018. Asian Development Outlook 2018 Update. Manila. (Please note that inflation is not a determinant of ADB salaries, which are market-based.)
    ${ }^{\text {c }}$ ADB. 2018. Asian Development Outlook 2018. Manila.
    Source: Asian Development Bank.

[^7]:    Lao PDR = Lao People's Democratic Republic, PNG = Papua New Guinea, PRC = People's Republic of China.
    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Based on the Bloomberg's full year forecasted median exchange rate as of 5 October 2018.
    ${ }^{\text {b }}$ Comparatio values for field offices with only one staff are not shown for purposes of confidentiality. The additional seven Pacific Country Offices do not currently have any confirmed staff.
    Source: Asian Development Bank.

