



***Review Body on Higher Remuneration
in the Public Sector
7th Floor
Lansdowne House
Lansdowne Road
Dublin 4***

**GUIDELINES FOR WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS
DEALING WITH THE SEVENTH GENERAL REVIEW**

**Review Body on Higher Remuneration in the Public Sector
An Comhlacht Athbhreithnithe Árdtuarastal san Earnaíl Phoiblí**

INTRODUCTION

General Review

1. The Government has asked the Review Body to carry out a general review of the levels of remuneration of the posts covered by its terms of reference and to report thereon in the second half of 2007. The Review Body has already carried out an interim review. The report on the interim review (Report No. 40, dated 27 June 2005) is available on the website of the Review Body – www.reviewbody.gov.ie.

Submissions to the Review Body.

2. The Review Body relies in the first instance on its own research and written evidence. The written submissions received by the Review Body are an important source of views for it in examining the levels of remuneration appropriate to top public sector posts. They also provide interested parties with an opportunity to respond to previous Review Body recommendations and to suggest changes in the remuneration of those covered by the terms of reference. It is of critical importance that those making written submissions ensure that the submissions are complete i.e. that they deal with all the issues that are considered relevant.
3. A full list of those who make submissions will be included in the Review Body's report unless any of the parties concerned specifically request anonymity. The Review Body may also wish to include in its report quotes from submissions, but these will not be attributed without the consent of the parties concerned.

Oral Hearings

4. It is not feasible or necessary to hold oral hearings with all those who make submissions. The Review Body may, at its discretion, seek oral hearings with some representative groups of those covered by its terms of reference or from certain individuals or organisations but this will be done only where the Review Body considers that such hearings are necessary to its examination.

TOPIC HEADINGS

Written submissions should be concise and structured, and should follow the sequence of the topic headings outlined below. These headings have been drafted on the basis that each submission will be concerned primarily with a particular post or group of posts¹. If, however, you have any specific comments or proposals to offer in relation to posts other than your own, please do so. It is not necessary for all submissions to cover every topic.

¹ Referred to subsequently throughout the guidelines as “your post”.

Nature of the post to which the submission relates

5. The nature of the post to which the submission relates should be described. The description should cover the following:
 - The demands of the post and the requirements, where relevant, in relation to leadership skills, analytical skills, communication skills, strategic capabilities and necessary qualifications,
 - any special features attaching to the post
 - the resources managed
 - the outputs required
 - the level of accountability
 - any other factors considered relevant.

Changes in the nature of posts

6. It is probable that there will be changes in the nature, duties and responsibilities of all the posts covered by the Review Body's terms of reference during the period since the 6th general review as a result of factors such as new legislation, developments at EU level, financial pressures, and an increased emphasis on personal responsibility and accountability. However, the Review Body has stated in previous reports that change is a normal feature of most jobs and does not, in itself, justify reward. Please indicate whether there have been changes in relation to your **post which you consider to be more onerous in the extent of their impact than in the case of other posts**. If you believe that this has been the case, please identify the main factors which have given rise to these changes, indicate exactly what impact these have had on your job and explain why you believe that your post is markedly different in terms of change from the generality of other Review Body posts.

Levels of Remuneration

7. Please indicate what level of remuneration you consider should apply now to your post relative to the rates of remuneration which you consider would be appropriate for a selected number of other posts within the Review Body's remit (i.e. please rate a number of other posts which you regard as relevant comparators by reference to a benchmark rate of 100 for your post). If the relative rate being proposed by you differs from that which emerged from the report on the last general review (Report No.38, dated 25 September 2000) or the report on higher posts in third level educational institutions (Report No.39, dated 5 March 2001), please indicate whether this is because you disagreed with the results of the previous review (in which case you should provide supporting evidence for your view) or you consider that the revised rate is warranted on the basis of the changes in your job which you have already outlined.
8. Please give some indication of the general level of increase (or range of increases) which you consider would be appropriate now for posts covered by the Review Body's remit **on the assumption that the relative rates for the various jobs which were recommended in Report No. 38 or 39 were broadly correct at those times** and outline briefly any supporting arguments and evidence which you think are relevant. Please address this issue even if you disagreed with the relative rates recommended in Report No 38 or 39 (it will assist the Review Body in considering whether increases might be warranted in respect of the period since Report No 38 or 39).

9. If you wish to include any views on the rate of remuneration recommended in Report No 38 or 39 for your post, please do so. If you disagree with that rate, please provide supporting evidence to justify your views.
10. Please indicate, having regard to all of the foregoing, what level of remuneration would, in your view, be appropriate for your post in current terms.

Public Service superannuation arrangements

11. In its recent interim review (Report No. 40, dated 27 June 2005), the Review Body drew attention to the relevance of superannuation arrangements in the public service as a component of overall remuneration. The Review Body intends to take account of these arrangements in making comparisons with levels of remuneration in the private sector. Please give your views on the extent to which the value of the public service superannuation arrangements are superior to private sector arrangements.

Performance-related awards

12. In Report No. 38, the Review Body recommended a system of performance-related awards for certain posts. Please give your views on the approach recommended by the Review Body. In particular, please indicate:
 - (a) in the event that a scheme of performance-related awards is already in operation for your post, whether you consider it should continue to apply: if so, please specify what changes, if any, should be made in the format and design of the scheme, and
 - (b) in the event that performance-related awards do not apply to your post, whether you believe that such arrangements should now be introduced: if so, please set out your detailed proposals in regard to scheme design, nature and level of payments, etc. - please ensure that these proposals address any specific difficulties which were identified in previous Review Body reports in regard to the application of performance-related awards to your post.

Other aspects of remuneration structure

13. In Reports No 38 and 39 the Review Body recommended a number of changes in the manner in which some groups within its terms of reference should be categorised for remuneration purposes which resulted in changes in the positions of these groups relative to others. To the extent that it is relevant to your post, please outline your views on these recommendations. If you disagree with any aspect of the classification recommended please specify what changes you would propose and why.

Tenure

14. Security of employment and, in particular, the tenure of office arrangements for various posts within the Review Body's remit was a significant issue during previous general reviews. Please outline any recommendations you have on the value which should be placed on security of tenure and how this factor should be taken into account by the Review Body in dealing with the remuneration of the posts concerned.

Non-salary benefits

15. Please outline any views you have on how the Review Body should deal with any non salary benefits in so far as they are relevant to the remuneration of your post (for example the treatment of company cars).

Efficiency and effectiveness

16. The Review Body will have regard to the desirability of encouraging a high level of efficiency and effectiveness in the public sector as well as maintaining competitiveness and ensuring value for money. Please outline how your proposals would contribute to further development in these areas and comment on the cost implications of what you propose..

Non-structured section of submission

17. Please include any further information, comments, views or suggestions which you think would be of assistance to the Review Body.

Priorities

18. Please indicate which of the various aspects raised in your submission regarding the rate of remuneration for your post should, in your view, be accorded particular weight by the Review Body during this review and give reasons for your choice.

January 2006