

## **Guide**

**For the development & implementation  
of a gender-neutral  
Job Classification and Evaluation System**

## Table of Contents

Foreword	3
1. Introduction	4
2. Reference Framework – Directive (EU) 2023/970	4
3. Job classification and evaluation: key definitions	6
3.2 What is the situation in Greece?	10
3.3 Why is it necessary for an enterprise to implement a job classification and evaluation system?	14
3.4 What does ‘gender-neutral’ job evaluation mean?	16
4. What stages does the design and development of a gender-neutral job classification and evaluation system include?	18
5. What elements determine the successful implementation of the system	37
Sources-References	39



This Project is co-funded by the European Union

## Foreword

This Guide serves as a reference framework on the issue of gender-neutral job classification and job evaluation, and aims to support Greek businesses in meeting the obligations that will arise from the transposition of Directive (EU) 2023/970. Specifically, it provides a concise overview of the reference framework, the key concepts, the methodological approaches, and the steps required to implement the process in practice, thereby contributing to businesses' initial preparedness.

In particular, the situation is as follows:

Greek businesses—which are predominantly micro to small enterprises (up to 50 employees)—have little to no experience in this area, which also entails, among other things, technical requirements.

The obligations introduced by the European Directive apply to all businesses regardless of their size. Job classification and job evaluation are directly linked to determining and ensuring pay transparency, as they enable comparison and the identification of what constitutes work of “equal value”.

The publication of an official relevant guide by EIGE is expected (the European Directive also makes reference to this), which will include methodological adaptations depending on company size.

Therefore, the present Guide:

- a) is based on the mapping of Good Practices carried out within the framework of this project and synthesises data and approaches from countries that have implemented good practices;
- b) can be updated once the official EIGE guide is published;
- c) aims to provide basic support to businesses, with an emphasis on micro and small enterprises, given that larger companies typically have relevant know-how and already apply comparable systems. The key requirement—and the new challenge—is to assess to what extent the job classification systems they use are gender-neutral. From this perspective, the Guide may also support larger enterprises.

### 1. Introduction

This Guide is addressed to employers, owners of micro and small enterprises, HR and/or finance staff, and management. It can be used as a standalone reference framework and is complemented by the topic-related checklists that have been developed so that each company can carry out a form of self-assessment (depending on its size), as well as by the practical implementation tool. Finally, it enriches the training material developed within the project, specifically for employers.

As regards gender-neutral job classification and job evaluation systems:



This Project is co-funded by the European Union

The development and adaptation of a job classification and comparison/evaluation system is a complex issue, both technically and operationally. The prevailing practice is to develop such a system jointly with social partners and employee representatives, sometimes with the support of the competent international organisation, the ILO ([A Step-by-Step Guide](#)). Many countries also develop standard tools and accompanying guides so that each organisation and each business receives the necessary support to establish an internal system of this kind

## 2. Reference Framework – Directive (EU) 2023/970


Directive (EU) 2023/970 on pay transparency strengthens the principle of equal pay for work of equal value, making job evaluation and job classification systems a central tool for enterprise compliance.

How, however, is this Directive specifically linked to job evaluation:

 It requires the use of gender-neutral job evaluation criteria.

The Directive requires employers to have pay structures that ensure equal pay for women and men performing the same work or work of equal value. The value of work must be determined on the basis of objective and gender-neutral criteria, which obligatorily include four factors:

- Skills/knowledge/competences (regardless of the way they were acquired, e.g. formal education or experience)
- Effort (both physical and mental/psychological)
- Responsibility (for people, financial resources, equipment or information)
- Working conditions (physical environment, risks and organisational factors).

 It provides for employees' access to the criteria for pay and career progression.

According to Article 6 of the Directive, employers are required to make easily accessible to employees the criteria used to determine pay levels and pay progression. Systematic job evaluation provides the necessary framework (grades and scales) so that this information is transparent and understandable.

 It provides employees with the right to information.


Article 7 of the Directive grants employees the right to request and receive, in writing, information on their individual pay level, as well as on the average pay levels, broken down by sex, for categories of workers performing the same work or work of equal value. The classification of jobs into groups of equal value is a prerequisite for enabling the employer to provide these comparative data.




This Project is co-funded by the European Union

 It provides for reporting obligations and joint pay assessment.

Enterprises with more than 100 employees are required to submit reports on the gender pay gap. If the report reveals a difference of at least 5% in the average pay level in any category of workers that is not justified by objective factors, the employer is required to carry out a joint pay assessment in cooperation with employee representatives and therefore to document the pay system.

 It addresses the undervaluation of work predominantly [J1] performed by women.

The Directive aims to uncover indirect discrimination, whereby occupations dominated by women are paid less despite requiring a similar level of complexity or effort to male-dominated occupations. The use of analytical job evaluation systems helps to identify “invisible” skills (such as emotional effort or conflict management), ensuring that these are fairly reflected in the pay structure.

 It ensures compliance and reduces the risk of legal sanctions.

The existence of a job evaluation system based on the principles of the Directive enables the employer to demonstrate to the competent authorities, trade unions or courts that pay decisions are substantiated and free from bias, thereby reducing the risk of legal challenges.

### 3. Job classification and evaluation: key definitions

Objective job evaluation through gender-neutral criteria constitutes a systematic process aimed at determining the relative value of jobs based on their content and not on the **characteristics of the individual** holding them. This approach is essential for the implementation of the principle of **equal pay for work of equal value**, as it intervenes in the long-standing undervaluation of female-dominated occupations.

Achieving this objectivity is based on the following structural elements:

**Use of analytical job evaluation methods:** these are the most appropriate for ensuring gender neutrality. Unlike non-analytical methods, they do not rely on subjective judgement or impressions. Instead, they break the job down into specific factors and sub-factors, allowing details to emerge that would be lost in an overall comparison. These factors include:

- **Emotional effort:** the energy required to manage the emotions of others (e.g. in hospitals or customer service) and to maintain composure under stressful conditions.
- **Mental effort:** the need to coordinate multiple tasks (multitasking) and to make decisions under pressure.



This Project is co-funded by the European Union

- **Fine manual dexterity:** recognition of the precision required in tasks such as administering injections or typing, which is often undervalued compared to physical strength.

**Use of evaluation criteria** that:

- are common to both women and men, without differentiation depending on who performs the job;
- make visible skills that are traditionally considered “naturally female traits” and are often undervalued (e.g. communication skills, emotional effort, ability to manage multiple tasks – “multitasking”);
- do not favour stereotypically male characteristics (e.g. physical strength over fine manual dexterity).

**Objective data collection** for job descriptions through standardised questionnaires and interviews with employees themselves, using gender-neutral language without references to sex. In order to bring out “invisible” skills, specialised tools are used:

- Questionnaires and interviews: employees are asked to describe their daily tasks in detail, revealing the complexity of their duties (e.g. a secretary’s responsibility for the company’s image or a nurse’s responsibility for patient safety).
- Recording tools that highlight the multidimensional nature of jobs: recognising the wide range of duties in positions considered “low-skilled”, highlighting their complex character.

**Recognition and redefinition of skills** as **professional qualifications** in female-dominated sectors (such as education, health, care and administrative services), in order to make visible job requirements that have traditionally been undervalued or mistakenly regarded as innate traits. Modern evaluation systems define these skills as **technical competences** acquired through education and experience (e.g. instead of the term “polite”, the term “ability to communicate with professionalism and empathy” or “conflict mediation skills” is used).

**Fair weighting and scoring of criteria** that reflect the real needs of the enterprise (and not the existing hierarchy):

- the score progression between levels of each criterion should follow an arithmetic and not a geometric progression, which tends to disproportionately widen gaps in favour of higher-level (often male-dominated) positions;
- assigning numerical weight to factors and designing the system so that social skills (soft skills) and responsibility for people carry equal weight to technical knowledge or responsibility for financial resources. This prevents the automatic concentration of female-dominated jobs in the lower pay grades.

**Use of gender-neutral language:** Job descriptions should avoid gender stereotypes and focus on objective criteria, describing what is done and not how the individual does it. The use of action verbs helps to avoid associating the job with the gender of the job holder.



This Project is co-funded by the European Union

### 3.1 What is a job classification and evaluation system?

A job classification and evaluation system concerns the grouping of jobs into categories based on common duties, skills and qualifications. It is a process used to determine the relative value of different jobs within an organisation, an enterprise or, more specifically, within a sector. This process focuses on the requirements of the job itself and not on the individual characteristics or the performance of the person holding the job.

The key elements and objectives of such systems, according to the relevant sources, include:

- **Objective criteria (or factors):** The evaluation is based on specific factors, most commonly skills, responsibility, effort (mental and physical) and working conditions. These factors are often broken down into sub-factors for greater accuracy and detail.
- **Analytical versus non-analytical methods:** Analytical methods (such as point-factor methods) break down the job into components and assign numerical values, offering greater objectivity and transparency. Non-analytical methods compare jobs as a whole (e.g. ranking) without a detailed analysis of their content, which may allow subjective bias to enter the process.
- **Creation of hierarchy and classification:** Through evaluation, jobs are placed in a hierarchical structure. Classification is the process of grouping jobs with similar relative value into grades or pay categories.
- **Equal pay for work of equal value:** The central objective is to ensure that jobs considered to be of “equal value” on the basis of evaluation are remunerated equally, regardless of whether they are held by a man or a woman.
- **Gender neutrality:** Modern systems must be gender-neutral, avoiding criteria that favour stereotypically male or female skills, in order to correct the historical undervaluation of female-dominated occupations.

Beyond determining pay policy, job evaluation also contributes to improving human resources management, as it provides a clear picture of job duties, facilitating recruitment, training, career planning and the improvement of health and safety conditions. Such systems must be dynamic and regularly updated so as not to become obsolete due to organisational or technological changes[J2] .

There are multiple approaches and methodologies for job classification and evaluation; however, the internationally recognised reference standard is the ILO Guide.



This Project is co-funded by the European Union

The table below presents a classification of the different systems.

### Overview of Job Evaluation Systems

QUOI ? COMMENT ?	A. Plusieurs caractéristiques "critères"	B. Fonction totale	C. Une caractéristique de fonction
1. Evaluer ou peser les fonctions à l'aide d'une échelle (de points)	Systèmes de points analytiques, par ex. ATC, Hay, ORBA, USB		Méthode de durée dans le temps, par ex. Elliot Jacques
2. Comparer les fonctions entre elles et les classer		Classer les fonctions p.ex. - par comparaison, - par comparaison par paires, - par ranking	Classer selon une caractéristique de fonction, par ex. exigences de formation
3. Comparer les fonctions en rassemblant de façon ordonnée des fonctions de référence ou selon une subdivision par classe préétablie		Estimation du niveau de la fonction, par ex. FNM	Méthode des liens de décision, par ex. Paterson

Source: Classification des fonctions sexuellement neutre, Belgique

It is noted that, on the basis of Directive (EU) 2023/970, the use of analytical job classification and evaluation systems is recommended, as they enable detailed and more objective comparisons between job positions, thereby allowing a better determination of the value of work and a more evidence-based—and ultimately fair—design of pay structures. Analytical systems are based on the identification of individual criteria and sub-criteria (or sub-factors) and the assignment of specific weights, as illustrated indicatively in the example below.

☞ Example of analytical weighting of factors/sub-factors: Spain's job classification and evaluation system



This Project is co-funded by the European Union

CATEGORY	WEIGHT (%)	GROUP	WEIGHT WITHIN CATEGORY (%)	FACTOR	WEIGHT WITHIN GROUP (%)	SUB-FACTOR	WEIGHT WITHIN FACTOR (%)	
A) NATURE OF FUNCTIONS OR TASKS	40	POLIVALENCE	30	A. 1) POLYVALENCE OR BROAD DEFINITION OF OBLIGATIONS				
					TOTAL	100		
		EFFORTS	24	A. 2) PHYSICAL EFFORT	30	A.2.1) Continuous standing and forced postures		20
						A.2.2) Repetitive movements		20
						A.2.3) Visual effort		20
						A.2.4) Hearing effort		20
						A.2.5) Other types of physical exertion		20
					TOTAL		100	
				A. 3) MENTAL EFFORT	35			
				A. 4) EMOTIONAL EFFORT	35			
			TOTAL A2+A3+A4	100				

### 3.2 What is the situation in Greece?

In Greece, there is no single, comprehensive and institutionally established job classification system at national level, as exists in other countries (e.g. Canada, USA, Spain). Instead, a variety of systems are in place, and job classification is implemented through a combination of institutional, statistical and administrative tools, primarily for purposes related to labour market monitoring, the determination of pay scales, or issues of vocational training and qualification certification.

The national authority responsible is ELSTAT – the Hellenic Statistical Authority, which is aligned with the ISCO-08 (International Standard Classification of Occupations) system of the International Labour Organization (ILO).



This Project is co-funded by the European Union

## Hellenic Statistical Authority

### Classifications- Occupations

ESCO	ISCO-08 (International Standard Classification of Occupations)	STEP (Statistical Classification of Occupations – Greece)
<p>ESCO (European Skills, Competences, Qualifications and Occupations)</p> <p>What it is: The European classification of skills, competences, qualifications and occupations. It was developed by the European Commission (DG Employment) as part of the Europe 2020 strategy.</p> <p><u>Purpose:</u> To create a common language for skills, occupations and qualifications throughout the EU. It links the labour market with education and training.</p> <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Defines approximately 3,000 occupations</li> <li>• Links each occupation with skills and competences</li> <li>• Is aligned with ISCO-08 but has a more detailed and multidimensional structure (skills-qualifications)</li> </ul>	<p>What it is: The international statistical classification of occupations developed by the International Labour Organization (ILO).</p> <p><u>Purpose:</u></p> <p>To provide internationally comparable statistical data on occupations (e.g. population censuses, labour force surveys).</p> <p><u>Structure:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10 major groups</li> <li>• 43 sub-major groups</li> <li>• 130 minor groups</li> <li>• 436 unit groups</li> </ul>	<p>What it is: The national adaptations of ISCO for Greece, issued by ELSTAT (or previously by ESYE).</p> <p><u>Purpose:</u></p> <p>To record occupations as they are applied in the Greek labour market, while maintaining compatibility with the international ISCO standard.</p> <p><u>Use:</u> Greek statistical service, public employment policies (DYPA, ELSTAT), population censuses.</p>

At European level, Eurostat follows the **International Standard Classification of Occupations 2008 (ISCO-08)** for the classification of occupations/occupational groups in its statistical analyses (e.g. EU Labour Force Survey).



This Project is co-funded by the European Union

## Example of an occupation description according to ESCO



### European Skills, Competences, Qualifications and Occupations (ESCO)

11 - Chief executives, senior officials and legislators	+
12 - Administrative and commercial managers	+
13 - Production and specialised services managers	+
14 - Hospitality, retail and other services managers	-
141 - Hotel and restaurant managers	-
1411 - Hotel managers	+
1412 - Restaurant managers	+
142 - Retail and wholesale trade managers	+
143 - Other services managers	+
2 - Professionals	+
3 - Technicians and associate professionals	+
4 - Clerical support workers	+
5 - Service and sales workers	+
6 - Skilled agricultural, forestry and fishery workers	+
7 - Craft and related trades workers	+
8 - Plant and machine operators and assemblers	+
9 - Elementary occupations	+

### Hotel managers

#### Concept overview

#### Description

Hotel managers plan, organize and direct the operations of hotels, motels and similar establishments to provide guest accommodation and other services.

Tasks include -

- (a) directing and overseeing reservation, reception, room service and housekeeping activities;
- (b) supervising security arrangements and garden and property maintenance;
- (c) planning and supervising bar, restaurant, function and conference activities;
- (d) observing liquor, gaming and other laws and regulations;
- (e) assessing and reviewing customer satisfaction;
- (f) overseeing accounting and purchasing activities;
- (g) undertaking budgeting for the establishment;
- (h) controlling selection, training and supervision of staff;
- (i) ensuring compliance with occupational health and safety regulations;
- (j) providing guests with local tourism information, and arranging tours and transportation.

Examples of the occupations classified here:

- Hotel manager
- Motel manager
- Youth hostel manager

Some related occupations classified elsewhere:

- Bed and breakfast operator - 5152

Notes

Operators of small establishments, such as some bed and breakfast establishments and small guest houses that provide accommodation and limited meal services to clients effectively as paying guests in private households, and for whom the management and supervision of staff is not a significant component of the work, are classified in Unit Group 5152: Domestic Housekeepers.

Chief executive officers and specialized managers of hotel management companies or hotel chains are classified in the relevant unit group in Sub-major Groups 11 and 12.

#### ISCO-08 code

1411

In addition, in Greece the National Qualifications Framework (NQF) links occupations with qualification levels (1-8), in accordance with the European Qualifications Framework (EQF). It is used for mapping professional qualifications and education titles to specific professional activities and for unifying training



This Project is co-funded by the European Union

and skills certification. Although it is not a job classification and evaluation system in the strict sense, it functions as a reference system for **professional roles** and **levels of competence**.

Furthermore, the Public Employment Service (DYPA) appears to use internal job classification systems (ISCO-08) for matching unemployed persons with job vacancies, developing career guidance tools, and recording skills and professional profiles.

Finally, sectoral and enterprise-level Collective Labour Agreements often include job categorisations (e.g. worker, technician, supervisor, administrative employee, etc.) linked to pay scales. Although these do not constitute a standardised job classification system, in practice they function as a regulatory classification tool within specific sectors.



#### Key points:

- ★ Greece does not have a national, mandatory job classification system.
- ★ Each enterprise may apply its own method of job classification and evaluation, provided that it incorporates the requirements of Directive (EU) 2023/970 and is able to provide the necessary documentation, particularly with regard to pay for work of equal value.
- ★ Understanding the dimension of “job evaluation based on objective and gender-neutral criteria” is of critical importance and requires training of the staff involved.
- ★ Enterprises, especially small ones, can draw information and available data for job classification and occupational profiles from the above-mentioned competent national authorities and services.

---

### 3.3 Why is it necessary for an enterprise to implement a job classification and evaluation system?

Job classification and evaluation constitute fundamental tools for modern human resources management, as they enable an enterprise to determine the objective relative value of each job based on its content and not on the personal characteristics of the employee.

The main reasons why an enterprise needs to implement such systems are the following:



This Project is co-funded by the European Union

- ❖ Ensuring equal pay and pay transparency. The central objective is the implementation of the principle of “**equal pay for work of equal value**”.
- ❖ **Through job evaluation, the enterprise can:**
- ❖ Compare jobs with different content (e.g. a nurse and a technician) and determine whether they have the same value for the organisation;
- ❖ Identify and correct pay gaps, particularly in female-dominated occupations that have historically been undervalued.
- ❖ Create a transparent pay structure based on objective criteria (skills, responsibility, effort and working conditions), strengthening employees’ sense of fairness.
- ❖ The implementation of such systems helps enterprises comply with European and national legislation (such as the Pay Transparency Directive (EU) 2023/970). In this way, legal risk is reduced, as are the chances of legal action for pay discrimination, which can be extremely costly.
- ❖ The enterprise is able to demonstrate to authorities and trade unions that pay levels are determined objectively, based on evidence.
- ❖ Job evaluation provides detailed knowledge of the requirements of each role, facilitating recruitment (job descriptions, appropriate staffing), training and staff development (identification of skills gaps, design of training programmes).
- ❖ It supports the analysis of the organisational structure and improves work processes (e.g. identification of overlapping duties or positions with insufficient workload).
- ❖ It facilitates the rational allocation of the pay budget.
- ❖ It supports adaptation to technological changes by revising job requirements in light of new conditions.
- ❖ It improves the internal climate and employee satisfaction and contributes to talent attraction, as the enterprise is presented as a fair and reliable employer.

### 3.4 What does ‘gender-neutral’ job evaluation mean?

Objective job evaluation through gender-neutral criteria constitutes a systematic process aimed at determining the relative value of jobs based on their content and not on the **characteristics of the individual** holding them. This approach is essential for the implementation of the principle of **equal pay for work of equal value**, as it intervenes in the long-standing undervaluation of female-dominated occupations.

Achieving this objectivity is based on the following structural elements:

**Use of analytical job evaluation methods:** these are the most appropriate for ensuring gender neutrality. Unlike non-analytical methods, they do not rely on subjective judgement or impressions. Instead, they



This Project is co-funded by the European Union

break the job down into specific factors and sub-factors, allowing details to emerge that would be lost in an overall comparison. These factors include:

- **Emotional effort:** the energy required to manage the emotions of others (e.g. in hospitals or customer service) and to maintain composure under stressful conditions.
- **Mental effort:** the need to coordinate multiple tasks (multitasking) and to make decisions under pressure.
- **Fine manual dexterity:** recognition of the precision required in tasks such as administering injections or typing, which is often undervalued compared to physical strength.

**Use of evaluation criteria** that:

- are common to both women and men, without differentiation depending on who performs the job;
- make visible skills that are traditionally considered “naturally female traits” and are often undervalued (e.g. communication skills, emotional effort, ability to manage multiple tasks – “multitasking”);
- do not favour stereotypically male characteristics (e.g. physical strength over fine manual dexterity).

**Objective data collection** for job descriptions through standardised questionnaires and interviews with employees themselves, using gender-neutral language without references to sex. In order to bring out “invisible” skills, specialised tools are used:

- Questionnaires and interviews: employees are asked to describe their daily tasks in detail, revealing the complexity of their duties (e.g. a secretary’s responsibility for the company’s image or a nurse’s responsibility for patient safety).
- Recording tools that highlight the multidimensional nature of jobs: recognising the wide range of duties in positions considered “low-skilled”, highlighting their complex character.

**Recognition and redefinition of skills** as **professional qualifications** in female-dominated sectors (such as education, health, care and administrative services), in order to make visible job requirements that have traditionally been undervalued or mistakenly regarded as innate traits. Modern evaluation systems define these skills as **technical competences** acquired through education and experience (e.g. instead of the term “polite”, the term “ability to communicate with professionalism and empathy” or “conflict mediation skills” is used).

**Fair weighting and scoring of criteria** that reflect the real needs of the enterprise (and not the existing hierarchy):

- the score progression between levels of each criterion should follow an arithmetic and not a geometric progression, which tends to disproportionately widen gaps in favour of higher-level (often male-dominated) positions;
- assigning numerical weight to factors and designing the system so that social skills (soft skills) and responsibility for people carry equal weight to technical knowledge or responsibility for financial resources. This prevents the automatic concentration of female-dominated jobs in the lower pay grades.



This Project is co-funded by the European Union

**Use of gender-neutral language:** Job descriptions should avoid gender stereotypes and focus on objective criteria, describing what is done and not how the individual does it. The use of action verbs helps to avoid associating the job with the gender of the job holder.

## 4. What stages does the design and development of a gender-neutral job classification and evaluation system include?

Implementing a fair and gender-neutral job classification system is a structured process which, according to most manuals, typically unfolds in **seven (7) main stages**. Most guides developed for the implementation of such a system at international and European level converge on the core elements of each individual stage, regardless of how they structure and present the relevant directions/guidelines.

A systematic approach is an essential prerequisite for limiting bias and ensuring that the results are accepted by employees.

As mentioned in the introduction, this Guide provides a general reference framework that initially supports understanding the multiple dimensions of the topic and gradually familiarising users with the basic concepts.

For the preparation stage, it is recommended that companies first complete a checklist, which also functions as a form of self-assessment regarding their level of readiness in matters of job classification and evaluation, based on objective and gender-neutral criteria.

 ⇒ Checklist 1 (for micro-enterprises with up to 9 employees)  
⇒ Checklist 2 (for enterprises with 10+ employees)

For the purposes of designing and implementing in practice a job classification and evaluation system, each enterprise is expected—depending on its size—to consult the practical implementation guide for the seven (7) stages described below.

These stages are as follows:

**1st Preparation and introduction of the procedure**

**2nd Recording and selection of the jobs to be compared**

**3rd Job description and analysis**



This Project is co-funded by the European Union

#### 4th Job evaluation and scoring

#### 5th Job classification and ranking

#### 6th Development and adjustment of pay structures

#### 7th Implementation, monitoring and updating

The process of job classification and evaluation is a particularly complex undertaking that requires a methodical approach to ensure objectivity and pay equity. The success of the system depends on adopting specific good practices and avoiding common mistakes at each stage, in line with international and European practice.



See the stages in detail, in combination with:

- a) stage-specific checklists from the International Labour Organization (ILO) manual, for better preparation and deeper engagement with the methodology
- b) a record of “good” and “bad” practices that you can refer to in order to support you during the implementation phase.

### Stage 1 – Preparation and introduction of the process

As this is a complex and demanding undertaking, it is essential for preparation to be carried out in an organised manner so as to ensure the conditions for success from the outset. The initial stage includes defining the objectives, the time schedule and the allocation of the resources required for the process. The main steps are as follows:

**Establishment of an evaluation committee:** This should consist of representatives of management and employees, ensuring balanced gender representation.

**Involvement of social partners:** The involvement of trade unions or employee representatives from the outset enhances transparency and the legitimacy of the process. The European Directive also places particular emphasis on this element.

**Communication strategy:** Organised communication with employees is required regarding the purpose of the process, in order to build trust and avoid fears that the evaluation concerns individual performance.

 [ILO](#) checklist for Stage 1 (pp. 14–15)



This Project is co-funded by the European Union

- ⊘ Do not initiate the process without fully informing employees: this generates resistance due to fears and concerns about pay reductions.
- ⊘ Do not allow job evaluation to turn into staff performance evaluation.
- ✓ Ensure that at least 50% of the members of the evaluation committee are women and that employees from different departments and hierarchical levels are included.
- ✓ Inform staff in good time that the evaluation concerns the job and not individual performance.
- ✓ Provide training for committee members on identifying gender stereotypes and on the job evaluation methodology.
- ✓ Involve employee representatives or trade unions from the outset, especially where a collective labour agreement exists.

## Stage 2 – Recording and selection of jobs for comparison

At this stage, a complete inventory of all jobs within the enterprise is created.

- Identification of male-dominated and female-dominated jobs: An analysis is conducted to determine in which jobs men or women are numerically predominant, using criteria such as the number of individuals holding the job, the 'historical' evolution of the job and the stereotypes associated with it.

## Stage 3 – Description and analysis of jobs

At this stage, detailed information is collected on the content of each job, ideally through questionnaires, interviews with employees, or observation in the workplace.



This Project is co-funded by the European Union

**Creation of job profiles:** Job descriptions must be gender-neutral and uniform, focusing on the actual requirements and content of the job rather than on the characteristics of the individual holding the position. In order to be effective, descriptions must be clear, consistent and highlight requirements in terms of skills, effort, responsibility and working conditions, including the “invisible” aspects of work that are often undervalued.

### Examples of titles and job descriptions

	Initial	After review
<b>Use of gender-neutral job titles to avoid stereotypes</b>	Waiter / Waitress →	Service Staff
	Chambermaid →	Cleaning Staff
	Executive Secretary →	Executive Assistant
	Salesman →	Sales Representative
<b>Focus on behaviours rather than personal characteristics</b>	<p><i>“We are looking for a dynamic and decisive professional who asserts authority over the team and makes quick decisions under pressure” (IT Project Manager).</i></p> <p><i>Adjectives describing personality are replaced by measurable professional skills.</i></p>	<p><i>“The position requires budget and risk management, as well as facilitation of communication among stakeholders. The ability to make well-documented decisions under tight deadlines is required.”</i></p>
<b>Descriptions that reflect complexity in jobs often considered low-skilled (e.g.</b>	Skills	Excellent command of language for drafting and editing texts, adaptation of communication style according to the audience.
	Effort	Continuous mental concentration for managing multiple communication channels simultaneously and strict



This Project is co-funded by the European Union

secretarial positions)		adherence to deadlines.
	Responsibility	Protection of confidential information (e.g. payroll, strategic plans).
Descriptions focusing on real requirements rather than general terms such as “care”	Emotional effort	Ability to regulate emotions and maintain professionalism when interacting with patients in crisis situations or with their families.
	Physical effort	Physical stamina required for lifting or transferring patients with limited mobility (comparable to lifting weights in technical occupations).
	Skills	Fine manual dexterity requiring precision (e.g. administering injections).
Common structure in job descriptions ensures equality – practical recommendations	Use of action verbs	(e.g. “Designs”, “Implements”, “Coordinates”, “Analyses”)
	Avoidance of demeaning language	(words such as “simple tasks”, “routine” should be avoided as they often demean female-dominated positions)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same level of detail for female-dominated and male-dominated jobs</li> </ul>	Roles that are predominantly held by women should be described in the same level of detail as male-dominated roles, so that critical duties are not overlooked.
	Positive wording focusing on what is required rather than what is not required	Instead of stating what the position does not require, it should state what is required (e.g., knowledge of quality standards rather than “no degree required”).

 [ILO checklist for Stages 2 & 3 \(pp. 40 & 55\)](#)



This Project is co-funded by the European Union

### Stages 2 & 3: Recording-comparison & Description-analysis of job positions

- ⊗ Do not evaluate a job solely on the basis of its title or outdated descriptions that may not reflect current requirements.
- ⊗ Do not use demeaning language such as “simple”, “routine” or “general” that tends to undervalue job requirements.
- ⊗ Avoid gendered job titles such as “cleaning lady” or “policeman”; use neutral terminology (e.g. “cleaning staff”, “security personnel”).
- ⊗ Do not underestimate physical effort in jobs such as nursing or cleaning.
- ✓ Include all jobs, including part-time and temporary positions.
- ✓ Use questionnaires covering all four core factors: skills, responsibility, effort and working conditions.
- ✓ Include examples from female-dominated occupations, such as emotional effort, multitasking, communication and organizational skills, to put forward / bring into light “invisible” skills.
- ✓ Cross-check information through interviews to clarify unclear points and validate job descriptions with employees themselves.

### Stage 4 - Evaluation and scoring of jobs

This stage constitutes the purely technical component of the process, during which the relative value of each job is determined on the basis of objective factors. The distinct phases involved are analysed below.

- Selection of criteria

Weighting: the relevant weighting of each criterion for the enterprise is determined  
Scoring: scores are assigned to each job position based on the level of difficulty or complexity of each criterion.

#### ☒ Selection of criteria (or factors)

Four main factors are used: skills/knowledge (also referred to as qualifications), responsibility, effort and working conditions. Where appropriate, Directive (EU) 2023/970 provides for the use of any other factor deemed relevant to the specific job or position. In all cases, such factors must be applied in an objective



This Project is co-funded by the European Union

and gender-neutral manner, excluding any direct or indirect discrimination on grounds of sex. In particular, **relevant non-technical skills must not be undervalued**.

Most analytical job evaluation methods use **four core factors**, which are considered necessary and sufficient for evaluating all jobs within an organisation, regardless of the economic sector. These factors are further broken down into **sub-factors** (typically 10 to 16 in total) in order to capture the specific characteristics of each job.

In small enterprises and organisations, the process may be simplified by using a total of **seven to eight** sub-factors. It is critical that sub-factors are clearly defined and do not overlap, in order to ensure the reliability of the evaluation.

## 📌 Weighting

The relative weight of each criterion for the enterprise is determined.

Weighting defines how much each factor contributes to the final result and must reflect the values, priorities and strategic objectives of the enterprise.

🔑 **Important:** weighting should be carried out only after job profiles have been completed, in order to avoid the intentional favouring of specific skills to the benefit of certain jobs.

### Weighting steps:

- **Rank the four main factors** (Qualifications, Responsibility, Effort, Working Conditions) in order of importance.
- **Assign percentages (%)** to each main factor. According to the ILO approach, the distribution is as follows:

Qualifications:	32%
Responsibility:	39%
Effort:	19%
Working Conditions:	10%

- **Rank and weight the sub-factors** within each main factor (see *example weighting grid from the ILO manual*)



This Project is co-funded by the European Union

## Factors & Sub-factors System<sup>1</sup>

Factors / Criteria	Sub-factors (sub-criteria)
<b>Skills (knowledge/qualifications)</b> (the knowledge and skills required to perform the job, acquired either through formal education or through experience)	<b>Professional knowledge:</b> refers to the level of formal education (degrees) and the required experience or training (the depth and breadth of the knowledge required).
	<b>Interpersonal skills:</b> the ability to exchange information, demonstrate politeness, and handle difficult communication situations (required for collaboration with others, providing advice, or motivating people, e.g., social workers or teachers).
	<b>Communication skills: foreign language proficiency, drafting texts, or customer service.</b>
	<b>Physical/manual skills:</b> dexterity, accuracy, speed, and coordination in using tools or equipment (e.g., typing, administering injections).
	<b>Problem-solving:</b> the complexity of problems that arise and the judgement required to find solutions.
	<b>Planning and organisational skills:</b> relates to task scheduling and resource management.
<b>Effort</b> (refers to the difficulty, fatigue, and intensity caused by carrying out the duties)	<b>Mental effort:</b> intensity of concentration, alertness, complexity of information, duration of mental work, and mental fatigue from processing data or making decisions.
	<b>Physical effort:</b> frequency and intensity of physical movements, lifting, or maintaining awkward working postures; fatigue from repetitive motions.
	<b>Emotional &amp; psychosocial effort:</b> emotion management and flexibility when interacting with vulnerable groups, patients, or aggressive customers (often overlooked but critical) in roles requiring contact with patients, people in distress, or aggressive customers, etc.
	<b>Responsibility for people:</b> providing information, guidance, or safety; supervision, training, care, or the wellbeing of others (e.g., patients, children).
	<b>Responsibility for human resources:</b> scheduling/rostering, staff management, HR policy development

<sup>1</sup> Πηγή: ILO, *Classification de fonctions sexuellement neutre Classification de fonctions sexuellement neutre Mode d'emploi, Belgique*



This Project is co-funded by the European Union

<b>Responsibility</b> (includes duties that have a direct impact on organisational goals, profitability, and safety)	<b>Financial responsibility:</b> managing resources and budgets, collections and payments, bookkeeping, financial planning.
	<b>Responsibility for confidential information:</b> access to and management of sensitive data (e.g., payroll, customer profiles, health data); accuracy and compliance with data protection regulations (e.g., GDPR).
	<b>Responsibility for material resources/goods:</b> use, maintenance, protection, and planning of needs for material resources and company machinery/equipment
	<b>Organisation and coordination:</b> responsibility for planning and overseeing work quality.
<b>Working conditions</b> (concerns the environment in which the work is performed)	<b>Physical environment:</b> exposure to noise, dust, hazardous chemicals, infectious diseases, or adverse temperatures.
	<b>Psychological conditions:</b> frequent interruptions, lack of privacy, unpredictable work schedules, risk of harassment, verbal or physical violence, work-related stress.
	<b>Organisational environment:</b> working hours (shifts, night work), availability of rest breaks, and requirements for commuting/travel.

## Weighting

The relative weight of each criterion for the enterprise is determined.

Weighting defines how much each factor contributes to the final result and must reflect the values, priorities and strategic objectives of the enterprise.

🔑 Important: weighting should be carried out only after job profiles have been completed, in order to avoid the intentional favouring of specific skills to the benefit of certain jobs.

### Weighting steps:

- Rank the four main factors (Qualifications, Responsibility, Effort, Working Conditions) in order of importance.



This Project is co-funded by the European Union

• **Assign percentages (%)** to each main factor. According to the ILO approach, the distribution is as follows:

- Qualifications: 32%
- Responsibility: 39%
- Effort: 19%
- Working Conditions: 10%

**Rank and weight** the sub-factors within each main factor (see example weighting grid from the ILO manual).

Table 7.1 Example of a weighting grid

Factors	Weighting	Number of points
<b>Qualifications</b>	32%	320
Job knowledge	12%	120
Communication	10%	100
Physical skills	10%	100
<b>Effort</b>	19%	190
Emotional effort	5%	50
Mental effort	8%	80
Physical effort	6%	60
<b>Responsibility</b>	39%	390
For people	12%	120
For products	12%	120
Financial	15%	150
<b>Working conditions</b>	10%	100
Physical environment	5%	50
Psychological climate	5%	50
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1000 POINTS</b>

🔗 Check whether the average weighting of “female” sub-factors (e.g. communication) is unjustifiably lower than that of “male” sub-factors (e.g. use of equipment).



This Project is co-funded by the European Union

## 📄 Scoring

Weighting and scoring constitute the final phases of evaluation, through which the numerical relative value of each job is determined. This process includes defining the relative importance of each criterion and allocating points (scores) to the individual levels.

The scoring **steps** are as follows:

- **Level matching:** selection of the level (e.g. Level 3 for Interpersonal Skills) based on the job description.
- **Conversion into points/scores:** application of weighting (in analytical methods, scores are multiplied by the weighting of each factor to generate points, for instance if Skills are assigned a weight of 32%, Level 5 gives more points than Level 5 in Working Conditions assigned a weight of 10%).
- **Aggregation:** the sum of points across all sub-factors constitutes the final score of the job.

When a sub-factor (e.g. responsibility for material resources) is assigned a total weight of 120 points, these points are not allocated as a single block. Instead, they are distributed progressively across the levels that describe increasing intensity or complexity.

If a job does not require a particular sub-factor at all, it may receive 0 points. Typically, however, Level 1 receives a small proportion (e.g. 10%) of the total points assigned to the sub-factor.

### What this means in practice:

- Each sub-factor is broken down into discrete levels (e.g. Level 1 to Level 5).
- Each level corresponds to a specific number of points.
- The highest level receives the maximum number of points.
- Lower levels receive proportionally fewer points, according to the designed scale.
- Not all jobs exhibit the same intensity for the same sub-factor.
- Two jobs may share the same sub-factor but at different levels.
- Each score is based on a level description, not on subjective judgement.



This Project is co-funded by the European Union

**EXAMPLE: 2 positions – Retail sector (Sales & Store Management)**

**Sub-factor: Responsibility for decision-making**

Total weight of the sub-factor: 120 points

The sub-factor is defined across **5 levels**, which describe an increasing degree of autonomy and the impact of decisions.

Level	Level description	Points
1	Work performed under strict instructions, with no substantive decision-making	20
2	Routine decisions within predefined rules	45
3	Autonomous decisions for day-to-day operations	70
4	Complex decisions impacting the store's operations	95
5	Strategic decisions with financial and organisational impact	120

**Position 1: Retail Store Sales Assistant (Sales Associate)**

Sub-factor analysis

- Follows specific sales procedures.
- Makes limited routine decisions (e.g., customer service, simple product exchanges/returns).
- Has no responsibility for targets, pricing, or staff organisation.

**Position 2: Store Manager**

Sub-factor analysis

Makes decisions regarding:

- staff allocation/scheduling
- inventory management
- handling complaints

These decisions affect:

- the store's performance



This Project is co-funded by the European Union

<p><b>Classification</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Level: Level 2</li> <li>● Points awarded: 45</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● the customer experience</li> <li>● achievement of financial targets</li> </ul> <p><b>Classification</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Level: Level 4</li> <li>● Points awarded: 95</li> </ul>
<p><b>Classification</b></p> <p><b>Level: 2</b></p> <p><b>Points awarded: 45</b></p>	<p><b>Classification</b></p> <p><b>Level: Level 4</b></p> <p><b>Points awarded: 95</b></p>

- The same sub-factor is evaluated for both roles.
- The difference is not qualitative but quantitative.
- The score derives from the level, not from the job title.

The overall/relative value of a position results from the sum of the points across all levels that correspond to its profile.

The total score (derived from the sub-factors) enables the organisation to rank positions within a hierarchy and group those of similar value, ensuring equal pay for work of equal value.

 **[ILO checklist for Stage 4 \(pp. 66 & 88\)](#)**

- ⊘ The scoring must not be influenced by the employee’s current pay (an evaluation independent of their current salary).
- ⊘ Don’t let the status of a role or a high qualification (e.g., a degree) skew the score across all other factors (halo effect).
- ⊘ Take care not to score the same requirement under two different sub-factors (e.g., using machinery as both “knowledge” and “manual skill”).



This Project is co-funded by the European Union

- ⊗ Don't rate only on the basis of the "visible" aspects of a job, overlooking duties that are equally demanding but less obvious in day-to-day work.
- ⊗ Don't reinforce the tendency to assign mid-range scores to all roles and all factors: this eliminates the ability to differentiate between roles.
- ✓ Evaluate all roles for one factor at a time (e.g., "responsibility") to ensure internal consistency.
- ✓ Rely exclusively on the four established factors: skills, effort, responsibility, and working conditions—objective, gender-neutral criteria.
- ✓ Assess roles in a random order for each sub-factor.
- ✓ Consistently prefer equal intervals between levels to avoid widening pay gaps: arithmetic (not geometric) progression
- ✓ Encourage discussion within the committee and avoid the dominance of a single viewpoint: consensus-based decision-making.

## Stage 5 - Classification and ranking of jobs

Following scoring, jobs are ranked hierarchically in descending order, from the job with the highest number of points to the one with the lowest.

**Creation of grades:** Jobs are grouped according to the range of their scores; jobs with similar scores are grouped into pay grades or categories. There are various approaches to defining grades (e.g. pairwise comparison or based on the overall point scale).

**Bias check:** it is examined whether female-dominated jobs have systematically been clustered in lower grades, and corrective actions are taken if undervaluation of their skills is identified.

Jobs that accumulate similar scores are grouped into **pay grades/structures**. A range (e.g. 50 or 65 points) allows jobs with small differences in scores to be considered **of equal value** and to be remunerated equally, even if they belong to different departments, thereby simplifying the pay system.

It is critical to ensure that female-dominated jobs are not systematically positioned at the upper limit of a range, in order to avoid the artificial reduction of pay adjustments.

## Stage 6 - Design and adjustment of pay structures

The results of job classification are translated into monetary values.



This Project is co-funded by the European Union

For each grade, a pay range is defined, which usually includes:

- **Midpoint:** the central value of the grade corresponding to full proficiency.
- **Minimum and maximum limits:** These allow the employee to progress in pay within the same grade based on experience or performance, without changing grade. A recommended range is between 20% and 40% around the midpoint.

**Identification of pay gaps:** Current pay levels are compared with the evaluated value of jobs.

**Pay adjustments:** If it is found that jobs of equal value are remunerated differently, adjustments must be made to achieve equal pay for work of equal value.

 [ILO Check list for stages 5 & 6 \(p: 90\)](#)

### Stages 5 & 6 - Classification, ranking & design/adjustment of pay structures

- ⊘ Avoid setting grade boundaries in a way that systematically pushes female-dominated jobs into lower scales (artificial boundaries).
- ⊘ Do not assign high weight to factors solely because they appear in managerial positions, ignoring the requirements of support roles (overvaluation of hierarchy)
- ✓ Jobs with similar overall scores should be placed in the same pay grade.
- ✓ Jobs with similar should be equally remunerated, regardless of whether they are held mainly by women or men.
- ✓ Criteria weighting (weight of factors) should reflect the values and strategic goals of the enterprise
- ✓ Check whether “male” factors (e.g. “use of equipment”) are disproportionately assigned higher weight than “female” factors (e.g. “conflict management”)
- ✓ If it is established that female-dominated positions are undervalued in relation to their scoring, their salary should be adjusted upwards to become equal to the respective male-dominated positions.

### Stage 7 - Implementation, monitoring and updating

The classification system is not static and requires continuous updating.

**Appeals procedure:** employees must have the right to challenge the classification of their position through a clear and transparent process.



This Project is co-funded by the European Union

**Regular review:** the system should be reviewed periodically (e.g. every 3–5 years) or whenever new job positions are created, to ensure it remains up to date, transparent, and fair.

- ⊘ Avoid a one-off approach: job evaluation is not a task done only once, as roles evolve with technology and organisational change.
- ⊘ Do not conceal the results: a lack of transparency in pay criteria breaches the institutional framework and current guidance on pay transparency.
- ✓ Update job titles so they do not imply gender.
- ✓ Schedule a full review of the system every 3 to 5 years, or whenever new roles are created.
- ✓ Establish a clear appeal procedure for employees who disagree with their job grading/classification.

Implementation tool for micro-enterprises  
(Annex I)

Implementation tool for enterprises with 10 or more employees  
(Annex II)



This Project is co-funded by the European Union

## 5. What elements determine the successful implementation of the system

The successful implementation of a job classification and evaluation system depends on a combination of technical and organisational factors, as well as on the level of participation of all stakeholders involved.

The key elements that determine success are:

- **Management commitment and social dialogue:** Full commitment from management is essential, as it sets the strategic objectives and provides the necessary resources. At the same time, the participation of employees and trade unions is critical for the system's legitimacy and for acceptance of its outcomes.
- **Representative composition of evaluation committees/teams:** Committees should reflect the organisation's structure, ensuring balanced gender representation and the participation of women—especially from sectors where women are numerically predominant—so that the requirements of their roles are properly recognised.
- **Systematic and transparent procedures:** The use of formal, standardised procedures at every stage (communication, job description, evaluation, appeals) minimises misunderstandings and safeguards objectivity.
- **Communication strategy and trust-building:** Continuous and clear information must be provided to all stakeholders about the purpose of the project. It is crucial that employees understand that the job is being evaluated—not their individual performance—and that the process is not intended to reduce wages.
- **Training and expertise:** Members of evaluation committees—and, where applicable, job analysts—must have appropriate technical training and be sensitised to gender equality issues, so they can identify concealed mechanisms of discrimination.
- **Use of analytical and gender-neutral criteria:** Success depends on choosing an analytical method that uses objective, gender-neutral criteria (skills, responsibility, effort, working conditions), avoiding gendered stereotypes.
- **Monitoring and updating:** The system is dynamic. Regular review is required (e.g. every 3–5 years), or immediate intervention when new roles are created or when existing roles change due to technological developments.
- **Adequate resources:** The organisation must have the necessary financial and human resources, as well as sufficient time, to complete the project properly—something that may take one to two years, especially in large organisations.

### Guidelines for micro-enterprises

👉 A more flexible—yet equally structured—implementation process for the steps.



This Project is co-funded by the European Union

- ☞ Even in small teams: it is critical to describe positions based on the **actual duties** rather than the *individual* who holds the position (roles are often “multi-dimensional”).
- ☞ Use of **simplified evaluation methods**: the *pair-comparison method*, which is intuitive, quick, and low-cost, without requiring extensive expertise.
- ☞ Strengthening participation: involving employees in describing their roles (via questionnaires or discussions) ensures that important aspects of their work are not overlooked.
- ☞ Ensuring follow-up and the right to appeal: employees must have the right to challenge the evaluation of their position through a clear internal procedure.
- ☞ Updating and review: regular re-assessment of the evaluation (every 3-5 years) or whenever work organisation changes significantly (e.g., introduction of new technology), plus a review of results to identify any patterns of discrimination (e.g., if female-dominated roles are systematically clustered in lower grades), followed by corrective actions where needed.



This Project is co-funded by the European Union

## Sources-References

AIHR Academy to Innovate, [Job evaluation](#)

Glind, I. van de, Mulder, R., Akkerman, A., van der Biezen, M., Bootsma, J., Finnema, E., Heerma van Voss, L., Mouter, N., van Rooij, J., & van de Ven, G. (2024). Mapping the Literature on Job Evaluation: A Scoping Review. *Compensation & Benefits Review*, 57(1), 24-46.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/08863687241279592> (Original work published 2025)

ILO (2009) Promoting Equity. *Gender – Neutral job evaluation for equal pay. A step-by-step Guide*.

Available at: <https://www.ilo.org/publications/promoting-equity-gender-neutral-job-evaluation-equal-pay-step-step-guide>

ILO (2023), [A Review of Wage Setting through Collective Bargaining](#), Geneva

Institut pour l'Egalité des Femmes et des Hommes, [Classification de fonctions sexuellement neutre. Mode d'emploi](#), Belgique, Available at:

Institut pour l'Egalité des Femmes et des Hommes, *Check-list Non-sexisme dans l'évaluation et la classification des fonctions*, Belgique Available at:

<https://acrobat.adobe.com/id/urn:aaid:sc:EU:5a180ad2-93e8-4457-b503-89df0699a099>

[Job Evaluation Tool. User Guide](#) (2022), Ministerio de Trabajo y Economía Social, Ministerio de Igualdad, Spain.

Le Défenseur des droits, [Guide pour une évaluation non Discriminante des emplois à prédominance féminine](#), France

Martin Oelz Shauna Olney Manuela Tomei, (2013), [Equal Pay. An Introductory Guide](#), ILO, Geneva

Pay Equity Office (2022), Pay Equity Solution for Small Business, Do-It-Yourself Kit, Ontario, Canada.

Pillinger, J. (2021) *Pay transparency and role of gender-neutral job evaluation and job classification in the public services*. EPSU, ETUI. Available at: <https://www.epsu.org/article/pay-transparency-and-role-gender-neutral-job-evaluation-and-job-classification-public>

Stig Blomskog (2015), [An evaluation of the weighting method in a gender-neutral job evaluation tool recommended by the International Labor Office \(ILO\)](#). PESO Research Report



This Project is co-funded by the European Union

[The Value of work and gender equality – Guide to applying a methodology for assessing the value of work free from gender bias](#) (2008), Confederação geral dos trabalhadores portugueses - intersindical nacional (Cgtp-in), Portugal

Trusaic, [Employer's Guide to strategic Pay Transparency](#)

In Greek

**COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION** of 29 October 2009 on the use of the International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO-08)

Annex I

Annex II



This Project is co-funded by the European Union

## ANNEX I

### “Step-by-step implementation tool for very small enterprises (up to 10 employees)”

Very small and small enterprises are mainly characterised by informal structures, multiple roles per individual, and usually undocumented pay practices.

The approach followed is simplified in terms of the requirements of the different stages, but remains structured.

#### **EXAMPLE: Café–Restaurant business (8 employees)**

##### **Stage 1: Preparation and introduction of the process**

There is no need for a large team or an external consultant. A two-person team (e.g. the owner and an employee with a good overview of the entire business) is sufficient to ensure exchange of views and reduce subjectivity. Where possible, both genders should be represented.

- Explain from the outset that the evaluation concerns the role, not the individual employee’s performance.
- Clarify that the objective is to ensure fair pay and that the process will not lead to salary reductions.

##### **Stage 2: Mapping and selection of positions for comparison**

- Create a list of all roles/positions (not a list of employees).
- Even if two individuals have the same job title, assess whether they actually perform the same work.

##### **Stage 3: Job description and analysis**

- As you are familiar with all roles, information can be collected through short, informal discussions or during regular team meetings.

- Ask employees to describe their actual daily work, what they do in practice (core duties), and what is required to perform the job properly.

#### Job Positions:

1. Store Manager
2. Cook
3. Kitchen Assistant
4. Barista
5. Waiter/Waitress
6. Cashier
7. Cleaning staff
8. Delivery staff

#### **Stage 4: Job evaluation and scoring**

In very small and small enterprises, the following two approaches can be applied:

- a) **Pairwise comparison:** the simplest method. Each position is compared with every other position in pairs. For each pair, decide which position has higher overall requirements and assign it one point. At the end, sum the points to obtain the ranking.
- b) **Graduated factor comparison:** use a short list of 5 to a maximum of 8 sub-factors. Positions are compared directly against a predefined list of criteria and levels. Levels can be up to three (low/medium/high). At least one sub-factor should be selected from each of the four main criteria groups: Skills, Responsibility, Effort, and Working Conditions.

➤ **No weighting of factors is applied.**

#### Total Job Value Calculation:

For each position:

- Score each factor (1–3)
- Calculate the total (**min 4 – max 12**)

#### Job Categories:

*Total points    Category*

4–6 points: Category A – Basic

7–9 points: Category B – Intermediate

10–12 points: Category C – Advanced

Categories may be linked to base salary, pay ranges, allowances, or supplements.

**Main criteria considered:**

Skills:

- technical skills
- social and communication skills
- coordination, multitasking
- experience and training (formal or informal)

Responsibility:

- responsibility for money
- responsibility for people's safety
- service quality
- equipment, food, processes

Effort:

- physical strain
- mental alertness
- emotional intensity
- simultaneous handling of multiple demands/customers

Working conditions:

- noise, temperature
- standing work
- working hours (evenings, weekends)

### Example – Waiter/Waitress position:

Factor Level	Description
--------------	-------------

Skills: Level 2 –	customer service, order memory, communication
-------------------	---

Responsibility: Level 2 –	customer satisfaction, correct orders
---------------------------	---------------------------------------

Effort: Level 3 –	standing work, time pressure, emotional labour
-------------------	--

Conditions: Level 2 –	noise, shifts
-----------------------	---------------

Based on the criteria and the assessment of the ranking level, proceed with scoring each position.

Position	Skills	Responsibility	Effort	Working Conditions	Total / Category
Store Manager	3	3	3	2	11 / C
Cook	3	2	2	3	10 / C
Barista	2	2	2	2	8 / B
Cashier	2	2	2	1	7 / B
Waiter/Waitress	2	2	3	2	9 / B
Delivery Driver	2	2	1	3	8 / B
Kitchen Assistant	1	1	1	3	6 / A
Cleaning Staff	1	2	3	3	9 / B

### Stage 6: Design and adjustment of the pay structure

- For a small enterprise, 2 to 4 pay grades are sufficient, grouping positions with similar total scores.
- Use a consistent progression between grades (e.g. 1.10–1.15) to keep the system comprehensible

For each category (A/B/C), define:

- **min:** entry point for new employees or limited experience
- **mid:** target/standard pay for full role proficiency
- **max:** high proficiency/endurance/multiple duties (without changing category)

**Key principle:** the category determines the pay scale; individual progression occurs within the same scale.

**Additional remuneration may include:**

- Position/responsibility allowance (e.g. cashier's desk, orders etc.)
- Multiple-role allowance (when a position applies to 2 roles, e.g. barista + cashier's desk)
- Pay supplements (variable elements) according to legislation (night work, Sundays, holidays, delivery) (per delivery hour or per shift)

**IMPORTANT:** Share the results with staff.

## ANNEX II

### “Step-by-step implementation tool for enterprises with 10+ employees”

This tool can be adapted for medium-sized and large enterprises with appropriate adjustments:

- ✓ level of job analysis and description (the larger an enterprise the higher the differentiation among roles/positions)
- ✓ number of sub-factors used
- ✓ weighting method to be applied
- ✓ pay structure definition

#### **EXAMPLE:**

**A medium-sized enterprise in the manufacturing sector (120 employees)**

#### **Stage 1: Preparation and introduction of the process**

- Establish a project team / evaluation team: ideally consisting of HR staff and staff from other representative departments (e.g., finance, production, etc.), as well as an employee representative.
- Define the scope and the categories of data to be collected.
- Define the methodology: an analytical method using objective, gender-neutral criteria.
- Apply gender-neutrality rules:
  - The job is evaluated, not the person.
  - The four core criteria are used (skills, responsibility, working conditions, effort).
  - Avoid stereotypical “indicators” (e.g., “men’s work”, “heavy work” without quantification).

#### **Stage 2: Mapping and selection of jobs for comparison**

**Objective:** full mapping of job roles.

#### Examples of job families

- Production: Line Operator, Machine Setter, Shift Supervisor
- Quality: Quality Inspector, Quality Engineer
- Maintenance: Maintenance Technician, Shift Electrician
- Logistics: Warehouse Worker, Forklift Operator, Warehouse Supervisor
- Administration: Procurement Officer, Accounting/Payroll, HR

- Select the roles for initial comparison. Typically, these are roles that are common in the organisation, representative of different levels, stable over time (their content does not change constantly), and have clear job descriptions.

### **Indicative list of roles**

1. Production Line Operator
2. Production Shift Supervisor
3. Maintenance Technician (Mechanical)
4. Shift Electrician
5. Quality Inspector (QC)
6. Quality Engineer
7. Warehouse Worker
8. Forklift Operator
9. Procurement Officer
10. Process Engineer

► It is recommended to create, in an Excel file, a job register (job inventory & job families), ideally also categorised into levels depending on specialisation (e.g., Technician Levels 1–3).

### **Stage 3: Job description and analysis**

**Objective:** collect standardised job descriptions so that the evaluation is based on the same type and format of data. You may use the organisation’s chart, conduct interviews with employees, or observe day-to-day work execution.

► For consistent descriptions across all roles, you can use a job description form with the following indicative fields:

- Job purpose (1–2 sentences)
- Key responsibilities (5–8 bullet points)
- Required knowledge/skills (formal qualifications, certifications)
- Level of autonomy / supervision
- Scope of responsibility (cost, quality, safety, people)
- Internal/external collaborations
- Working conditions (shifts, noise, temperature)
- Effort requirements (mental/physical) with objective indicators (e.g., weight, duration of standing)

### **Example of two roles (brief)**

- **Quality Inspector (QC):** sampling, instrument measurements, recording in ERP/QMS, stopping the line in case of non-conformance, collaboration with production.

- **Maintenance Technician:** preventive/corrective maintenance, fault diagnosis, record keeping, on-call shift.

#### Stage 4: Job evaluation and scoring

At this stage you will define **the sub-factors** to be considered for the evaluation, as well as the levels. Note that the selected sub-factors should be aligned with the objectives and strategy of each company.

In this example, the following sub-factors are selected:

1. Knowledge & technical expertise
2. Problem solving & complexity
3. Responsibility for quality/safety/compliance
4. Responsibility for resources / impact on results
5. Communication & coordination
6. Autonomy / decision-making
7. Effort (mental + physical, documented)
8. Working conditions (shifts, noise, thermal loads, etc.)

Regarding levels, a **4-level scale** is recommended for all criteria/sub-criteria:

- **Level (1):** basic/standardised, low complexity
- **Level (2):** operational, variety of cases, guidance available
- **Level (3):** complex, frequent judgement/diagnosis, significant consequences
- **Level (4):** very complex/critical, high risk or responsibility, strong initiative

The weighting for the above sub-factors is proposed as follows:

Criterion (gender-neutral)	Description	Weight %
1. Knowledge & Technical Expertise	Education/certifications/technical knowledge required by the role	20
2. Problem-Solving & Complexity	Troubleshooting, variability, judgement	15
3. Quality/Safety/Compliance Responsibility	Consequences of error, risk exposure	15
4. Responsibility for Resources & Operational Impact	Cost implications, equipment/assets	15
5. Autonomy & Decision-Making	Scope of decisions without approval	10
6. Communication & Coordination	Collaboration, guidance/coordination	10
7. Effort (Mental + Physical)	Documented intensity/frequency	10
8. Working Conditions	Shifts, environment, on-call duties	5
<b>Total</b>		<b>.../100</b>

## Scoring Model

You define the maximum total number of points = 1,000.

- Max points per criterion = Weight% × 10  
(e.g. 20% → 200 max points)
- Score level = 1 to 4 (E1–E4)
- Weighted points for the criterion = (score level / 4) × Max Points

Final position score = sum of the weighted points (0–1,000).

Based on the above scoring method, use the table below to score each job position.

See an indicative evaluation of two positions:

### Maintenance Technician

- Criterion 1 (20%, 200 max): Level 3 → (3/4) \* 200 = 150
- Criterion 2 (15%, 150 max): Level 4 → 150
- Criterion 3 (15%, 150 max): Level 3 → 112.5
- ... and so on.
- At the end, you sum the scores to obtain the total score, e.g. 735/1000.

### Position: Procurement Officer Level Assessment & Justification

Criterion	Level	Weighted points	Justification
Knowledge & Technical Expertise	E3	150	ERP, purchasing procedures, contracts, cost estimation
Problem Solving	E3	112.5	material shortages, supplier changes, delays
Quality/Compliance	E2	75	adherence to policies, approvals, audit
Resources & Impact	E3	112.5	impact on cost, production availability
Autonomy	E3	75	supplier selection within the defined framework
Communication & Coordination	E4	100	production, warehouse, finance, suppliers
Effort	E3	75	high mental load, multitasking
Working Conditions	E1	12.5	office-based, stable working hours

**Total (Procurement Officer): 712.5 / 1,000**

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Level</b>	<b>Weighted Points</b>	<b>Justification</b>
Knowledge & Technical Specialisation	E3	150	mechanical/electrical engineering, diagnostics
Problem Solving	E4	150	immediate fault diagnosis under pressure
Quality / Compliance	E3	112.5	safety, critical interventions
Resources & Impact	E4	150	downtime, production loss
Autonomy	E3	75	decisions for immediate intervention
Communication & Coordination	E2	50	mainly within shift
Effort	E4	100	physical + mental intensity
Working Conditions	E4	50	shifts, noise, heat

**Total – Maintenance Technician: 787.5 / 1,000**

### **Comparative Conclusion**

**Position | Total score**

Procurement Officer | **712.5**

Maintenance Technician | **787.5**

Interpretation of the result:

- The two positions are of comparable value, but not of equal value.
- The Maintenance Technician scores higher not because it is a “technical” or “male” job, but due to:
  - a higher level of operational risk

### **5th stage: Job classification and grading**

Based on the job scores you obtain, you can create a practical grading scheme—for example, a five-level structure—where jobs are placed into grades according to the score they received (0–1,000).

- Grade A: 0–549 points
- Grade B: 550–649 points

Grade C: 650–749 points

- Grade D: 750–849 points
- Grade E: 850–1,000 points

From the comparative evaluation of the two positions above, the following results emerge:

- **Procurement Officer: 712.5 → Grade C**
- **Maintenance Technician: 787.5 → Grade D**

Grades are “locked in” only after you have evaluated all benchmark jobs, so that the groupings emerge in a “natural” way.

### **Stage 6: Designing and adjusting the pay structure**

Next, for each grade you will create a pay band/scale by defining a central reference salary (midpoint).

This salary represents the typical pay for an employee who “fits” the role, and it can be based on market rates and/or the internal value of the role.

You then decide how much lower (min) and how much higher (max) pay can be, relative to the midpoint. Therefore, within the same grade there is not a single salary, but a salary range.

Based on a simple rule of thumb:

- Min  $\approx$  15% below Mid
- Max  $\approx$  15% above Mid

If Mid = €1,000 gross/month:

- using 0.85–1.15:
  - Min = €850
  - Max = €1,150

Therefore, once you have defined a band (min–mid–max), you place each employee based on a rule such as:

- Compa-ratio = (Actual salary) / (Mid)
  - e.g.,  $900/1000 = 0.90$  → the employee is at 90% of the midpoint.
- Range penetration: how far the employee has progressed within the band from min towards max (1).

Using the above approach, you assign all employees to the defined pay scales through a documented, objective, and gender-neutral process, which you can communicate in detail to your organisation’s staff.

**IMPORTANT:** Set regular intervals to monitor and review the system you have implemented, to avoid creating new gender pay gaps and discrimination.

**For further elaboration:**

The design of salary grades, with defined midpoints and salary ranges (band spreads), is an established practice in the international literature on compensation/reward management. It enables a consistent and transparent linkage between the “value of the role” and a structured pay range that accommodates different levels of experience/performance within the same grade (Milkovich, Newman & Gerhart; Armstrong, 2013). Placing employees within the range using indicators such as the compa-ratio supports monitoring internal equity, standardised pay progression, and limiting ad hoc deviations. The grounding of grades relies on systematic job evaluation methods (e.g., [Hay](#)), which translate the requirements/responsibilities of roles into comparable grades, strengthening fairness and neutrality (e.g., with respect to gender) in organisations that seek accountability and a coherent compensation policy.