# Questions and answers from the webinar launching the updated EU-wide guidelines on gender-neutral job evaluation and classification: step-by-step toolkit

**Questions and answers** ..... 4

Q1: Are organisations **required to use the toolkit**, and can they **continue using existing job evaluation methods**? ..... 5

Q2: Can the toolkit be **adapted or modified** for use at national and organisational level? ..... 5

Q3: How can organisations **apply the toolkit across different organisational sizes and contexts**? ..... 6

Q4: How does the toolkit guide organisations in **selecting and applying the appropriate job evaluation pathway**? ..... 6

Q5: How can organisations implement the toolkit in practice, including **timelines**, **resource implications** and **frequency of use**? ..... 7

Q6: How does the toolkit align with **national collective bargaining agreements**, and can it be applied in sectors where job classifications are defined through such agreements? ..... 8

Q7: How does the toolkit address **worker representation** in organisations where trade unions are not recognised? ..... 8

Q8: How does the toolkit support the use of **job profiles** in job evaluation? ..... 9

Q9: How does the toolkit support the objective and gender-neutral assessment of skills, including **'hard' and 'soft' skills**? ..... 9

Q10: How does the toolkit address **responsibility for human life and care-related work**? ..... 10

Q11: How does the toolkit distinguish between **effort** and **working conditions**, and support the objective assessment of **physical and emotional effort**? ..... 10

Q12: What guidance does the toolkit provide on including the factor of **working conditions** in job evaluation? ..... 11

Q13: What guidance does the toolkit provide on defining and applying **subfactors**? .. 11

Q14: How does the toolkit approach **scoring**, including point scales and consistency among evaluators? ..... 12

Q15: What guidance does the toolkit provide on **weighting factors**? ..... 12

Q16: How does the toolkit address **intersectionality**? ..... 13

Q17: What guidance does the toolkit provide on ensuring meaningful and comparable **pay comparisons** across different **working arrangements** and **pay components**? ..... 13

Q18: What guidance does the toolkit provide on the treatment of **job families, career paths and specialised roles** in gender-neutral job evaluation and classification? ..... 14

Q19: How does the toolkit address the use and role of **external classification frameworks**? ..... 14

Q20: What guidance does the toolkit provide on **managing change** and **addressing challenges** during implementation? ..... 15

**Complete list of questions and comments as submitted via Slido** ..... 16

## Questions and answers

This document provides responses to questions[1] related to **practical implementation** raised during the webinar launching the **EU-wide guidelines on gender-neutral job evaluation and classification: step-by-step toolkit**,[2] which took place on 26 March 2026.

For questions on the **Pay Transparency Directive** and related **legal aspects**, please refer to the **European Commission's Frequently Asked Questions** (FAQ) on the Pay Transparency Directive (EU) 2023/970 and related flyer.

For further reference, please consult the following **available resources**:

- PDF version of EU-wide guidelines on gender-neutral job evaluation and classification: step-by-step toolkit (comprehensive)
- Web version of the EU-wide guidelines on gender-neutral job evaluation and classification: step-by-step toolkit (shorter, interactive)
- Video tutorials for:
  - micro-organisations
  - small and medium-sized organisations
  - large organisations, and large organisation case study
- Factsheet outlining the EU-wide guidelines on gender-neutral job evaluation and classification: step-by-step toolkit
- Policy brief highlighting the key benefits of gender-neutral job evaluation and classification for employers, workers and social partners
- Webinar recording with practical walkthrough of the updated guidelines (including available tools, factor and subfactor plan, and supporting materials)
- European Commission's dedicated page 'EU action on equal pay'.

Please note that **translations of the PDF toolkit into all official European Union (EU) languages** are being prepared. They are expected to be available early 2027. The publication timeline will be announced as soon as it is confirmed.

[1] The questions listed below have been grouped for ease of reference and edited for clarity. The full set of questions received via Slido during the webinar is available on p.16.

[2] For brevity, this document refers to the EU-wide guidelines on gender-neutral job evaluation and classification: step-by-step toolkit as "the toolkit" throughout.

## Q1: Are organisations required to use the toolkit, and can they continue using existing job evaluation methods?

The toolkit is a **voluntary**, **practical resource** that supports organisations in applying the **principle of equal pay for equal work or work of equal value** through gender-neutral job evaluation and classification. It can help organisations align with EU equal pay requirements, including the **Pay Transparency Directive** (Directive (EU) 2023/970) and Article 157 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU).

However, it is **illustrative and non-binding**. Using the toolkit **does not in itself guarantee compliance**, as this depends on how it is applied in practice. It does not replace existing systems, legislation, or collective agreements, nor does it provide legal advice or interpretation of EU or national law. Organisations should consult national authorities, social partners and equality bodies for guidance on applicable legal frameworks. Please see the note for users included on p.3 of the toolkit.

The toolkit **does not certify or endorse** any specific job evaluation method or provider, including commercial systems. In practice, **the toolkit can be used to support a review of existing job evaluation and classification systems**, helping organisations examine whether they apply gender-neutral criteria consistently and whether the results may reveal patterns of gender bias or undervaluation, particularly in work typically carried out by women.

## Q2: Can the toolkit be adapted or modified for use at national and organisational level?

The toolkit **can be adapted** at national level to reflect national, organisational and labour-market contexts. Its guidance, tools and templates are voluntary, non-binding, and illustrative, and may be modified.

Employers are free to **adapt and combine elements in ways that best suit their context**, as long as they ensure that the **equal pay principle is respected** and pay structures are based on gender-neutral objective criteria, as required by EU law.

Use of the toolkit, whether adapted or not, **does not in itself guarantee legal compliance**, **nor does it replace national legislation**, **collective agreements or existing job evaluation systems**. Any national adaptations should remain consistent with EU equal pay law and national legislation.

## Q3: How can organisations apply the toolkit across different organisational sizes and contexts?

Because organisations vary in **size**, **sector** and **resources**, the toolkit offers **flexible guidance** that can be adapted to each context.

The toolkit provides **three pathways** to ensure that every organisation can implement **job evaluations free from gender bias**. It supports a wide range of organisations, from **large** ones (**standard approach**) to **small and medium-sized organisations** and **micro-organisations** (**simplified approaches**), with adjustments tailored to their specific needs and capacities. The different types of job evaluation and classification systems are described on p. 12 in the toolkit.

The toolkit is intended for **all employers** across **all sectors**. It is designed for job evaluation within **a single organisation** and provides a **gender-neutral framework** based on the **four criteria** set out in the Pay Transparency Directive: **skills**, **effort**, **responsibility** and **working conditions**. These criteria are universal and can help organisations describe and analyse jobs in a consistent way.

The toolkit can be used by **multinational organisations** to support a common, **gender-neutral job evaluation framework** across countries, while recognising that **national laws**, **collective agreements** and **institutional arrangements** differ. It therefore provides a common approach while allowing organisations to adapt implementation to local requirements.

## Q4: How does the toolkit guide organisations in selecting and applying the appropriate job evaluation pathway?

The most suitable pathway for an organisation will depend on its **size** and **characteristics**. The toolkit provides **practical guidance** on how to select the **most suitable pathway** (see p. 8 on choosing your pathway or take the quiz in the web version of the toolkit).

For a **micro-organisation** (fewer than 10 workers), the toolkit recommends using the **simplified pathway for micro-organisations** (Tool 3), which is specifically designed to be **proportionate**, **practical**, and **low-burden** while still applying the same gender-neutral principles. It guides employers through a streamlined job evaluation based on the Factor and subfactor plan.

For **small and medium-sized organisations**, Tool 4 on p.45 in the toolkit and the relevant pathway clarifies that the **pair comparison method** is suitable where the organisation has **up to 15 job roles** and does not have the capacity for a **full-scale analytical job evaluation and classification**.

If the organisation has a **large number of different job roles** (e.g. more than 15 roles), the toolkit suggests considering the **standard approach** (see p. 55 of the toolkit; for shorter and more accessible guidance, see the web version of the toolkit here).

## Q5: How can organisations implement the toolkit in practice, including timelines, resource implications and frequency of use?

The toolkit is a **voluntary**, **free-of-charge** resource offering **three tailored pathways** for organisations of different sizes. It reduces **administrative effort** by building largely on **existing job information** and providing ready-to-use templates, guidance and Excel spreadsheets. Organisations do not need to rely on external consultants, as the toolkit is designed to be implemented using their **existing capacity**.

Gender-neutral job evaluation and classification is **not a continuous full-time effort**. Work is concentrated in specific **phases** (preparation, evaluation, and follow-up). The actual duration will depend on the **organisational context**. Most of the work involves reviewing existing information, conducting structured comparisons using the provided Excel tools, and holding focused discussions among committee members. The toolkit provides the **tools**, **templates** and **guidance** needed, which **reduces complexity** and **time requirements**.

The toolkit is available in **two formats** to enhance **user-friendliness**. A web version, which provides a **simpler** and more **accessible** format for navigating the guidance, and a full PDF version, which offers **comprehensive guidance**. Both formats contain all **essential elements**, enabling users to apply the toolkit in practice.

The toolkit suggests that employers should consider re-**evaluation only when jobs change significantly** or **new roles are introduced**. New job roles need to be evaluated based on the **same criteria** as existing jobs. A **full re-evaluation** of existing jobs is only needed if jobs have changed significantly. **Regular checks** help to ensure that job evaluation and classification is **accurate** and **free of gender bias**. The

toolkit includes a **tool on tracking progress and planning follow-up actions** to support that (see **Tool 7** for further information).

The toolkit does not provide a **dedicated network group or forum**. Instead, users can rely on **publicly available guidance**, **factsheets**, **policy briefs** and **supporting materials** listed on p.4 of this document.

## Q6: How does the toolkit align with national collective bargaining agreements, and can it be applied in sectors where job classifications are defined through such agreements?

The toolkit is designed to **work alongside national collective bargaining agreements**, **not to replace them**. It explicitly recognises that **pay-setting**, **job classification** and **job evaluation** are often governed by **national law** and **collective agreements**, and that these frameworks must be **respected**.

At the same time, the toolkit makes clear that **collective agreements are not automatically free from gender bias**, and that compliance with the **principle of equal pay for work of equal value** remains a **binding obligation** under **EU law**, notably **Article 157 TFEU** and **Directive (EU) 2023/970**.

Where collective agreements do not fully ensure **equal pay for work of equal value**, the toolkit underlines that organisations may need to **go beyond the minimum standards** to comply with **EU equal pay law**. It helps organisations and **social partners** assess whether existing **job evaluation** and **pay arrangements** are based on **gender-neutral criteria** and supports **evidence-based dialogue** where gaps or gender bias are identified.

## Q7: How does the toolkit address worker representation in organisations where trade unions are not recognised?

The toolkit recognises that the extent and form of **worker representation** and **consultation** may vary between **Member States**, depending on **national law** and **practice** (see **Tool 8** in the toolkit). The toolkit acknowledges forms of worker representation, such as **works councils** or **alternative representative bodies**, as well as **direct consultation with workers** where no formal representation structures exist.

**Workers' representatives' involvement** helps ensure that the evaluation is **accurate** and builds **trust** in the process. In line with the **Pay Transparency Directive**, criteria used to assess the **value of work** need to be agreed with workers' representatives where such representatives exist. **Transparency** is essential: employers are encouraged to explain the process, share the **evaluation criteria** and the **rationale behind decisions**, and keep a **clear record** of how jobs were assessed.

## Q8: How does the toolkit support the use of job profiles in job evaluation?

The toolkit provides **practical guidance** to develop **job profiles** that describe the **core requirements and demands of a role** based on skills, responsibility, effort and working conditions (see **Tool 2**, "Gathering job information", on p.26 of the toolkit).

The analysis, as suggested in the toolkit, concerns the **job**, **not the person doing it**. This means that the job evaluation is carried out for each **job profile** in the organisation, and not for each person employed in the job (**not at the level of individual workers**). If a company has **500 service employees** performing the same job, **one job profile** and **one evaluation** would be conducted for that role, not **500 separate assessments**.

In line with guidance provided in **Tool 2**, **job profiles** are developed by the **employer** or the **job evaluation committee** using **existing documentation** and **objective evidence**, while workers may be consulted to clarify job content or verify factual accuracy (e.g., through questionnaires or interviews).

## Q9: How does the toolkit support the objective and gender-neutral assessment of skills, including 'hard' and 'soft' skills?

The toolkit **explicitly supports** evaluating **'hard' and 'soft' skills on an equal footing** by embedding them within the **Skills factor** in the **Factor and subfactor plan**. This ensures that skills often labelled as 'soft' are evaluated systematically and transparently, reducing gender-bias risks.

The toolkit does **not require workforce-wide skills tests** because job evaluation focuses on the **job itself**, not the **person performing it**. Skills such as communication, conflict resolution and multitasking are genuine job requirements and

have often been undervalued. The toolkit helps employers **recognise these demands clearly** and assess them on the same basis as 'hard' skills.

## Q10: How does the toolkit address responsibility for human life and care-related work?

The toolkit explicitly captures responsibility for human life and well-being within the subfactor **'responsibility for people'**, which covers not only **managerial responsibility for staff** but also **care**, **safety** and **well-being of others**, including **children**, **patients** or **service users**. This is designed to avoid undervaluing care-related responsibilities that are common in women-dominated sectors.

The toolkit also provides **practical guidance** and exercises to **identify and correct gender bias**, including **Tool 0**, a focus on **job content** rather than job holders or job titles, and **clear factor and subfactor definitions** with guiding questions and examples. It also highlights **mistakes to avoid**, including the risk of **undervaluing jobs traditionally done by women**.

## Q11: How does the toolkit distinguish between effort and working conditions, and support the objective assessment of physical and emotional effort?

**Effort** refers to the **demands placed on the worker** (physical, mental, emotional), while **working conditions** refer to the **environment in which the work is performed**. This distinction is essential to avoid **double counting** and to ensure that different sources of job demands are recognised appropriately. For more detailed guidance, please see the **Factor and subfactor plan**, pp. 98–100, in the toolkit.

The toolkit provides **clear guidance** for assessing **emotional effort** as a **subfactor** in the **Factor and subfactor plan**, looking at **frequency**, **intensity** and **duration** rather than individual resilience. It supports evaluators with level descriptors and examples to ensure emotional labour is recognised consistently and without gender bias. The toolkit also makes clear that **emotional effort is evaluated at the level of the job**, not the individual.

The **subfactor physical effort** assesses the **duration** and **intensity** of physical effort required to perform the job (see pp.100–101, **Factor and subfactor plan**). The toolkit highlights the need to be **cautious** when applying this subfactor to avoid **indirect discrimination**, including in jobs often done by women, such as **caregiving**

or **nursing**, which may also require **considerable physical strength and endurance**.

## Q12: What guidance does the toolkit provide on including the factor of working conditions in job evaluation?

The toolkit is designed to support the assessment of the **value of jobs** against the **four objective**, **gender-neutral criteria**: **skills**, **responsibility**, **effort**, and **working conditions**. As mentioned in the Commission's FAQs, these criteria are based on **Court of Justice of the European Union case-law** and set in **EU law** and the **Pay Transparency Directive**. All four criteria should be considered to ensure a gender-neutral evaluation and classification.

If **working conditions are similar** across all jobs (e.g. all roles are office-based with standard hours and no particular risks), the factor may result in **similar scores across jobs** or carry **limited weight** in differentiating job value.

Excluding the factor altogether can risk overlooking **less visible** or **traditionally undervalued** conditions, such as **psychosocial risks**, **violence and harassment**, **night shifts**, **irregular hours** and **weekend work**. For more details on working conditions, please see pp.101–104 in the toolkit.

## Q13: What guidance does the toolkit provide on defining and applying subfactors?

The toolkit is built around **four the criteria (factors)**: **skills**, **responsibility**, **effort**, and **working conditions**. These are defined in the **Factor and subfactor plan**, which provides a structured and **gender-neutral framework** for job evaluation. It supports **consistent** and **transparent scoring**, reduces reliance on intuition or stereotypes, and makes implicit job demands visible. Each factor can be used directly or broken down into **subfactors** for more detailed job descriptions.

The **Factor and subfactor plan** provides **default subfactors** applicable across **various sectors** and **job types**. If **additional subfactors** are needed, the toolkit provides **detailed guidance** to ensure they remain **free of gender bias**. It also cautions against **fragmentation** and **double counting**: any additional subfactor must measure a **distinct aspect of work**, be applied **consistently across all jobs**, and support **comparability** between different types of work.

## Q14: How does the toolkit approach scoring, including point scales and consistency among evaluators?

The toolkit stresses that **point values and weights are illustrative** and **not prescribed**. What matters is **internal consistency**, **transparency** and **gender-neutral application**, not the absolute number of points. The supporting **Excel worksheet** provides a **starting point** that organisations can adapt, as long as the approach remains **objective**, **proportional** and **checked for gender bias**.

The toolkit explains that the **total score** of 1,200 points is a **technical design choice**, not a legal or methodological requirement. It allows the four main factors to be **weighted proportionally** and provides **sufficient granularity** to differentiate jobs without excessive complexity.

The total score reflects **overall job value**, recognising that **different combinations of demands** can be of **equal value**. This helps ensure that jobs typically carried out by women are not penalised because their demands lie in different factors, provided that each factor is assessed **transparently** and **without gender bias**.

The toolkit recommends the use of a **job evaluation committee**, **structured scoring processes** and **calibration discussions** to resolve disagreements. The committee should discuss and consider all available evidence. The toolkit also provides guidance on how to address **group dynamics** and ensure that **all committee members participate fairly** in the discussion (see p. 62 in the toolkit).

## Q15: What guidance does the toolkit provide on weighting factors?

The **weights are provided for illustrative purposes only** and do not represent a model recommended or endorsed by EIGE or the European Commission. The toolkit provides guidance for organisations to **review and adjust weights**, if needed, to ensure balanced recognition of all job demands, including **emotional** and **psychosocial aspects**, and to do so in an **objective**, **transparent** and **gender-neutral** way.

The **default weights** in the toolkit are informed by recommended practices in gender-neutral job evaluation. **Skills** and **responsibility** factors have a **higher weight** than **effort** and **working conditions**, while also aiming to ensure that elements often present in jobs predominantly held by women, such as **soft skills** and **specific communication skills**, are **properly recognised**.

## Q16: How does the toolkit address intersectionality?

The toolkit is specifically designed to address **gender bias** and to support the implementation of the **principle of equal pay between women and men**, in line with EU law. Its scope, structure and methods are grounded in Article 157 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) and the Pay Transparency Directive, which focus on **sex-based pay discrimination** and gender-neutral job evaluation and classification.

While some principles in the toolkit, such as **objectivity**, **transparency** and a focus on **job content rather than personal characteristics**, align with broader equality objectives, the toolkit does **not claim to assess or prevent bias** related to **ethnicity**, **age**, **disability** or other grounds. Addressing these forms of discrimination requires separate frameworks and tailored guidance.

## Q17: What guidance does the toolkit provide on ensuring meaningful and comparable pay comparisons across different working arrangements and pay components?

The toolkit stresses that comparisons must be made using a **consistent unit of measurement** (e.g. annual, monthly or hourly), and employers should ensure **comparability** (for example, when jobs include part-time or complementary and variable components of pay).

The toolkit does **not prescribe a specific calculation method** (such as mandatory full-time equivalent (FTE) conversion). The toolkit recommends that **pay analysis** and **job evaluation** must cover **all workers**, including those working **part-time** or with **different working arrangements**, and that pay comparisons must be meaningful and comparable, and not distorted by factors unrelated to the value of work.

When reviewing **complementary and variable pay** such as bonuses, commissions or allowances, the toolkit provides guidance for checking that **eligibility criteria** and **allocation rules** are **objective** and **gender neutral**. It also warns that exclusions linked to maternity-related or long-term absence may indicate gender bias and risk indirect discrimination.

## Q18: What guidance does the toolkit provide on the treatment of job families, career paths and specialised roles in gender-neutral job evaluation and classification?

The toolkit requires that the **same factors and subfactors** are applied **consistently to all jobs**, regardless of job group, occupational family or level. Gender-neutral job evaluation depends on comparability across all jobs, which is only possible if the same evaluation framework is used throughout.

Jobs can be organised into different career paths or job families, but they must still be evaluated using a **common, gender-neutral framework** so that **jobs of equal value** can be compared across those job families. Job families do not in themselves demonstrate equal value unless the jobs within and across families have been assessed using the same objective and gender-neutral criteria.

**Key principle** in the toolkit is that jobs are **compared and classified based on their actual requirements and demands**. The toolkit does not require specialist skills to automatically be treated as a separate job grade, but it does require that any **pay differences** are **objectively justified through job evaluation**.

The toolkit illustrates examples with different numbers of grades depending on **organisation size** and **method**. The key requirement is not the number of groups, but that jobs are grouped using objective, gender-neutral criteria and that **jobs of equal value are classified together and remunerated accordingly**.

## Q19: How does the toolkit address the use and role of external classification frameworks?

The toolkit clarifies that the **assessment of work of equal value** should be based on the **content and demands of jobs in a specific organisation**, using **objective, gender-neutral criteria**, not on occupational labels or statistical classifications. It is designed to support job evaluation and classification at organisational level.

The toolkit is **not built as a European Skills, Competences, Qualifications and Occupations (ESCO) - based system** and does not rely on ESCO codes to assess work of equal value. Employers may use ESCO as a starting/reference point for job descriptions, but the actual **job evaluation** and the resulting **pay grades** should be based on the **four criteria**.

**International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO) codes** can be useful for **statistical reporting**, but they are **not a method for assessing work of equal value**. Relying on ISCO codes (or job titles) as a proxy for job value **risks** missing the actual skills, responsibilities, effort and working conditions required in a job, precisely the issues the toolkit is designed to address.

## Q20: What guidance does the toolkit provide on managing change and addressing challenges during implementation?

The toolkit recognises that introducing or revisiting job evaluation and pay structures can raise **questions** and **concerns**. It addresses these through **anticipation**, **transparency**, **social dialogue** and **follow-up**, including guidance on **gender bias**, **communication**, **structured safeguards** and **worker engagement**. It also distinguishes job evaluation from pay performance evaluation.

While the toolkit is **not a stand-alone change-management package**, it includes **practical guidance to support organisational change**, including step-by-step implementation pathways, guidance on communication, transparency and worker involvement, and recommendations on engaging social partners and workers throughout the process.

## Complete list of questions and comments as submitted via Slido[3]

1. what is the relation of category of worker to job level ?
2. Can Eigen tools be used freely at the national level—that is, can they be modified without restriction to suit a country's specific needs?
3. do we always have to use working conditions  what if this factor is not relevant to a company ?
4. Why does EU mandating the use of inferior GPG analysis when there are superior regression based pay equity analysis in use across many countries?
5. Will a summary of this webinar be sent to participants please?
6. Can jobs be categorized into different career paths for job evaluation (meaning they are assessed through various subfactors)?
7. Hello, will we benefit from a replay ? Would be usefull for sharing with colleagues. Thanks
8. Are concrete methodological guidelines for calculating the gender pay gap for reporting to the supervisory authority already defined? Will there be common guidelines at EU level, or will individual Member States be able to determine this themselves?
9. Share us the framework! We are eager to see it. Thanks!
10. Do you also intend for the guidelines to be used by the national courts?
11. Will we receive a recording after the webinar?
12. When can we expect the translation of the toolkit in German, please?
13. What happens if job evaluation results are disconnected from market value? How to move from job evaluation to salary ?
14. Is the (ideal) expectation for employers to use this toolkit across all roles before 7 June? How would you envision this for the larger employers?
15. Article 4(4) prohibits criteria linked to sex — yet permits physical effort, which is biologically sex-correlated. Is that criterion caught by the indirect discrimination concept, or does work-relatedness take it outside that scope altogether?
16. Is this toolkit mandatory or can instead other job evaluation methodologies (e.g. Mercer, Hay) be used?
17. Most have read the directive. The toolkit is what most are joining for?
18. How will employees with longer absences, such as maternity leave or long-term sick leave, be treated? Will employers be required to exclude such employees from gender pay gap calculations?

[3] Purely logistical or technical comments (e.g. audio quality or slides not moving) were excluded from this list, as they do not relate to the substance of the toolkit, its methodology, or its application.

19. Job evaluation is a process that can take 6-12 months in companies is big size. Can you please consider enabling a longer timeline for companies to implement, rather than focusing on June 7? Especially, that you are launching the guidelines just now, 2 months prior to go live...
20. So gender neutral job evaluation is what is referred to in the market as 'analytical' job evaluation. Classification methods are broader whole-job slotting approaches which are more open to bias.
21. What about already existing pay structures at national level which are based on objective criteria but different from the 4 listed in the directive? Are these mandatory? This might interfere with already existing pay structures
22. When can we expect translation of the toolkit in all EU languages?
23. How deep do you have to go in these four criteria? Would it be okay regarding the EU guideline to only evaluate these four criteria without sub-criteria?
24. Can you please create a catalogue of subcriteria that can be used in job evaluation?
25. I am not convinced Working Conditions are factors for job evalution size , or rather for compensation. this is tricky
26. Will remuneration need to be converted to full-time equivalent (FTE = 1) for the purposes of calculation, or will employees with lower FTE be excluded from the analysis?
27. Are companies obliged to use these guidelines?
28. How does the criteria Effort differ from Working conditions? In particular in relation to mental and psychosocial effort or the physical, psychological, and emotional environment.
29. How is the emotional impact to be evaluated objectively? This kind of stressor and it's impact may vary strongly, depending on the resilience of an individual
30. Considering that employers frequently refuse to disclose pay data during collective bargaining, to what extent will Directive (EU) 2023/970 actually empower trade unions to access relevant information and enforce pay equity in practice?
31. Recital 26 states that the four criteria may be revised in light of new guidelines. Which body is responsible for issuing those guidelines — the Commission, the Member States, or both? And what standard must a method meet to qualify as a compliant instrument under Article 4(2)?
32. Recital 26 assigns the weighting decision to the employer. Did the legislator intend any lower bound — a floor below which weighting a criterion would be impermissible regardless of justification — or is the employer's discretion limited only by the overall system not discriminating?
33. Can we adapt and modify the toolkit?

34. Working conditions are not a factor in determining job size but are better linked to additional payment allowances surely? I am speaking as someone who has worked with different job evaluation tools for 30 years
35. Why only woman are presenting? 😉
36. There are lots od other criterias to evaluate job roles gender-neutral way. Also there have been decades job evaluating systems by consultans (like HAY, IPE) and collective agreements. This is nothing new.
37. For global (or European) organizations using a standardized job evaluation system, how can we maintain consistency across countries when there are different requirements enforced by each nation?
38. What kind of company was in mind when this was designed? You've already mentioned e.g. companies that don't already have a pay structure - suggests that this was designed for smaller organisations?
39. Many job evaluation systems are already widely implemented across companies, but don't always have the mentioned criteria. In that situation, are theyf orced to launch a re-grading? Full re-grading can cost organizations millions of euros and may take up to two years or can they use their old system
40. We all know that feminized sectors are paid less across sectors, how can a company-level approach address this?
41. What about collective bargaining agreements that govern pay? Must the pay simply comply with the principle of equal pay in practice, or must the pay structure of the collective bargaining agreement itself comply with Article 4(4) Equal Pay Directive and reflect a gender-neutral job evaluation?
42. Can we consider market factors like regionality, specific qualifications, profitability, cost competition, structural conditions, and employee bargaining power? These factors often play a significant role.
43. What to do if evaluators can't agree on the scores?
44. What about specific specialist skills within a general specialism, such as special AI software skills within otherwise equal software technical jobs? Must it be a separately defined job grade and pay structure? Many employers pay these specialist roles higher in the pay structure.
45. Is the research publicly available regarding benefits of gender-neutral job evaluations Eurofound is talking about? Thx
46. How should sales roles be treated, as they may have a very different pay structure by design as more of their pay is variable based on individual results?
47. Can you please comment on whether JOB FAMILIES will be considered to be objective (in addition to levelling). This is the biggest discussion in Reward Networks currently
48. Does the toolkit integrate ESCO frame?

49. In many office-based organisations, working conditions are broadly equivalent. Factors such as shifts are paid for separately. In that case, do organisations still have to have a working conditions factor, or simply comment that all roles are considered equal in this respect?
50. Does the employer have to proof how they evaluated a job in the information to the workers? Or is it enough to report on the (possible) pay gap?
51. The four criteria sound somewhat outdated in the context of modern work, and it feels a bit surprising that there could not be other gender-neutral and objective criteria than those mentioned in the directive.
52. If an organisation has a gender neutral job classification system and pay structures, do they need to use the toolkit?
53. Who are the workers' representatives within the meaning of Article 4(4)? Based on a systematic interpretation of the Directive, in GER, only works councils (BR/GBR/KBR) seem to be meant. This would ultimately mean that grading systems can no longer be agreed with trade unions as part of CBAs…
54. Can this tool kit also be used in order to include diversity? To prevent Ethic, Age, Disability etc. bias?
55. Will the calculation be based on annual gross remuneration at the individual employee level?
56. When will the translated versions be available?
57. will this very useful webinar be accessible on EIGE's website after today? thank you!
58. Would you send the presentation by e-mail later on?
59. The results of the active poll are not suprising, as this has been a case the courts have ruled on already.
60. How do we ensure that the toolkit is in line with mandatory national collective bargaining agreements? If they do not align, how do we proceed?
61. The link to the market is missing. How to we ensure that we consider the market and hence can ensure that we can win the right candidates globally?
62. not enough detail on the 2 jobs
63. The process seems too complex and time consuming, and will impose costs on employers, have you considered that in this toolkit?
64. Is the toolkit able to work in multinational organisation to ensure one common approach in Europe and are local legal differences considered?
65. I work in an HR department in a company with 230 workers, which tool should we use?
66. We are struggling to measure emotional effort, can the toolkit help?
67. Do you warn employers in the toolkit not to use ISCO for job classification?

68. is this excercise not "evaluating jobs by job title"? without additional information about the jobs and thus not reliable at all?
69. what does the tool provide in case this assessment is biased (the HR person is not aware of the challenges, eg thinks cleaning is an easy job with any challenges?)
70. Can you explain on which scientific basis the factors have been chosen?
71. Could market price (justifyed by the market data) be a sub-criteria clasifying jobs?
72. In practice most larger organisations use already an evaluation system from one of the three global consultants (Mercer, Hay, WTW). Can you confirm that these methods are in line with the EU Requirements or do all organisations have to implement an additional classification system?
73. Is employer obligated disclose result of clasification - entire job map to employees or just employee' level?
74. Could you please share the Q&A along with the provided answers with all participants after this presentation?
75. How can this be implemented by a micro enterprise?
76. Market pricing of the role and level?
77. This looks to be a very old fashioned approach and how some of the old JE methods worked more than 30 years ago! Today, there are more modern ways of doing this and new tools like gradar, which means that you don't need to rely on the usual suspects of Hay, WTW or Mercer that are very bureaucratic!
78. Can Eigen tools be used freely at the national level—that is, can they be modified without restriction to suit a country's specific needs?
79. How do we "measure" soft skills objectively as requested by the EU directive? Do we need to test our entire workforce?
80. To what extent can employees and employee representatives rely on the EU directive as long as there is no national legislation? My employer is still arguing that there is no national law.
81. How is this job evaluation done on 4 factors different from any other job evaluation methodology WTW, Hay or Mercer? They as well look at the role, not the person and are indeed gender neutral looking at all the factors the evaluation methodology has you are presenting today
82. Pay structures typically cover base pay. How do the tools help organisations explain variable pay differences which are also dependant on specific jobs - for example sales
83. Are organisations still free to use existing job classification methods, such as Willis Towers Watson global grading?

84. Pair Comparison? This is really 80ies. This is completely unusable - and intransparent (not explicable to employees), normaly nobody uses that in organizations above 50 employees
85. So it appears clear that the whole job slotting methods where roles are slotted into a grade based on a single capsule job description (like the survey catalogues used by Radford, McLagan, WTW etc) will not be compliant under these guidelines as they are open to bias. 👍
86. What is, when in a role male employees are overpaid according to the gender-neutral job descriptions, you create ranges for new employees, and what to do then with the salary of the men?
87. Is the idea to evaluate individual job descriptions or as typically done, write more general role/job profile descriptions, that can include many jobs?
88. why do you use completely different methods for large organizations vs. small/medium organizations?
89. No one compares jobs in pairs today.... This is a brand new method, and not one I ever heard anyone dream about - and with up to 249 employees, this would require a lot of ressources to consider what jobs to "pair", and needs organizational alignment. How did you end up there?
90. Can ”standard” method be used for small organizations as well?
91. Why the total number of points should be equal to 1,200, instead of 1,000?
92. How can the tools help if the organisational already has grading and pay structures?
93. Always adapting compensation upwards will not be possible, in particular in the current economic environment. Will there be further legislation to easily reduce salaries within the EU or is a separation from the effected employees the only feasible method?
94. Just want to say that this is an impressive toolkit! The framing, textual advice and walkthroughs are good, same with the tiers based on workplace size. Love it! Great work 😊
95. Will we get the presentation slides ?
96. Regarding Tool 4 - how do I determine which 2 roles to pair together?
97. Would it be possible to classify the jobs in the company in more groups than 4 as the directive foresees in the definitions of article 3 "quartile pay bands"?
98. I dont know who you worked with on this but Paired comparison job evaluation methods are fundamentally flawed and its unbelievable that they are recommended for employers to 250 people. There are much better and more robust solutions out there! Good luck defending paired comparisons in a tribunal!

99. When will the toolkit (including the excel files) be available in non-English languages?
100. In today's job evaluation example "chef" received over 800 points out of 1200 points. If this is method is to use in big companies, is the point range enough if this kind of received so high points…?
101. Subfactors / weights will be adjusted in most companies. Will you provide a checklist (like in Pardon et al., 2010, p. 6) or tool to ensure that the factors are either really gender neutral, or if using male-leaning factors (e.g. physical effort) have female-leaning counterparts of same weight.
102. is there a network group or a forum, where we can ask questions when implementing the Tool-Kit?
103. Most common bais, in order to maintain an actual pay-structur, is pointing at the "market-explanation", hence, using an over-simplyfied interpretation of the Enderby-case
104. what do we need to make available to employees? just the criteria? all of the evaluations? anything else?
105. Are there tools that help in evaluating hard and soft skills equally?
106. Can you tell us more about tool 9?
107. Are the guidelines and tools only available in English? Are we permitted to translate the information contained therein and reuse it in our own tools?
108. Given that they are not specifically designed for classifications agreed under sectoral collective agreements, could they still be useful for sectors? Can sectors use the guidelines that correspond to the size of the majority of companies within their sector?
109. It is odd idea that employees write their own job descriptions…(video today)
110. This toolkit is very disappointing. The ambition was good but what has been developed is so old fashioned and out of touch! You could have done much better than this! I don't think this is going to help anybody and will be largely indefensible in the courts! Very disappointed!
111. What is the estimated average implementation time for each of the 3 size categories?
112. Given that is a fundamental change, will there also be change management material and tolls provided?
113. Market factors are also factors that contribute to gender based discrimination. This is very evident in jobs typically associated with women, despite their critical value on society and resilience facing global/national crisis. Does the EU directive aim to mitigate market-driven inequality?
114. Will the slides be provided online? ☺

115. How does an enterprise proceed if major inequalities arise and there's not enough money to adjust the salaries upwards?
116. Can we have this tools after the sessions?
117. is it possible to receiver the recording of this webinar?
118. When it comes to the analytical method, I think it’s important to describe the gradations rather than just presenting them as a scale, so that the specific differences are clear. Or is that actually the plan?
119. what does the new transparency approach and requirements mean for the potenctial reconsideration of the principle of proportional pay for work of proportional value?
120. Does distribution of points in Standard toolkit consider differenciation in different industries
121. There is a lot of mention of TU through out. How companies that do not recognise TU tackle employees representation ?
122. Where is that tool?
123. Does this mean equal pay for equal work for the same proffession in all EU countries?
124. How do I access the tool kit?
125. Is the assessment carried out with reference to a job profile or to an individual position? For example, if a company has 500 service employees, would one assessment be conducted, or 500?
126. When will materials be published?
127. Will the webinar recording be available?
128. Are there supporting tools or guidelines or anything about the frictions that are going to appear? For example, complaints/insensitive comments by male workers, or by employers not wanting to modify salaries
129. What strategies can organizations use to manage overpaid positions without risking escalating costs, considering that national courts are strict about salary reductions and employees may feel distressed and demotivated if their salaries are cut?
130. Can the subcriteria differ for different job groups? e.g. different for manual workers and different for management?
131. Although I think this is a well-designed toolkit, I fail to see its added value, given that gender-neutral analytical classification systems based on interviews already exist and work very well. Is the intention to use the toolkit everywhere, or only where no such analytical systems exist?
132. Ad Criteria: social responsibility / responsibility for human life (e.g. for a group of kindergarten kids) should be a own criteria, not hidden in responsibility

for people (what about teamleads in a Kindergarten? - they have both responsibilities: for kids and for employees). Gender bias risk!

133. Can the Directive and the new remuneration system lead to salaries being downgraded or reduced?

134. Hello from North Macedonia, what is the easiest way to evaluate equal gender payment in one company and get first fast results in 4 years. I am sorry that I am little late in following your webinar. Thank you

135. When will the translated toolkits be published?

136. Most EU countries didn't transfer the directive into national law. Will the EU postpone or suit all EU member states after the 7.6.2026?

137. How often do employers need to repeat this process?

138. There is still a certain degree of discretion in the process. Probably it is not eliminable. Isn't there a real risk that an organisation might adopt this system merely for show, only aiming at confirming the current pay structure?

139. What would you advise companies that are reviewing their pay systems for salaries that are deemed too high following the new neutral evaluation, do you suggest them to be reduced? Or would you suggest salaries that are too low be adjusted upwards?

140. What about the recruiting process? How EU can ensure that the directive is applied? And, in cases where gender discrimination is present, what can a candidate do? Where to appeal or report?

141. What should social partners do considering the time to transfer the directive is so very short? Are there some best practices? Should the collective agreements be analytical? They must meet the demands of small and big companies as well. Many companies rely on this logic.

142. When will the tools be made available in the languages of the member states?

143. Do we HAVE to implement this, or if we use Mercer Job Evaluation methodology, we can continue doing that? Making sure gender bias is tackled appropriately of course.

144. By calculating a total score at the end of the evaluation process, is it intended that lower scores in one criterion can be offset by higher scores in another criterion? Is that correct?

145. Have you evaluated tools that are on the market such as TRUSAIC? Will you give advice on these too?

146. When is the translation of the toolkit expected?

147. Why are effort and working conditions given less weight compared to skills and responsibility?

148. Swedish government announces intent to renegotiate the pay transparency directive. Also the government will not present any bill, reflecting legal changes due to implementation demands from the pay transparency directive. Reports of other governments taking similar countermeasures?
149. Will EIGE take over full legal liability for the presented tools and their usage?
150. Why are you not answering most voted question?
151. ISCO is a rather coarse classification. Do you recommend aganist using it or, as we have done in the past, combine it with another factor, like points calculated from your toolkit or other toolkit?
152. Organisations may need to differentiate pay for highly specialist roles within an existing grade. Generally, they will use the top of the pay range for that. Are you suggesting any role with pay differentiated skills should have a different grade.
153. Can we have the PPTs? Let me share the link to the ITCILO online course "Closing the Gender Gap: The ILO approach to Gender-Neutral Job Evaluation for Equal Pay" https://www.itcilo.org/courses/closing-gender-gap-ilo-approach-gender-neutral-job-evaluation-equal-pay
154. Please consider: six Months preparation phase is highly unrealistic for really big companies or groups with very diverse job profiles, diverse work counsils and so on...
155. A lot of organisations use an evaluation system from one of the three global consultants (Mercer, Hay, WTW). Can you confirm that these methods are in line with the EU Requirements? Working conditions are the factor that would determine job size?
156. Is it mandatory to use sub-factors as they're not explicitly foreseen in the directive? Would it be possible to change the importance of one sub-factor for different jobs?
157. The EC/Eurofound presenters say an objective system isn't good enough when the Directive requires 'objective criteria'. It can be confusing for listeners. It should be presented in a more nuanced manner, emphasizing that transparent, gender-neutral, bias-free criteria are needed for objectivity.
158. Will you follow up on the questions that are left unanswered during this session? On your website or else? Thank you
159. Two main limitations in the directive are the absence of reflecting the interaction between work demands and national ISCO-code classifications and an absence of addressing the “market-argument” as a means to preserve traditional pay-structures

160. I had high hopes, but, unfortunately, I am quite concerned about the tools presented today by EIGE and the Commission. In my view, the tools do not capture the complexity of modern pay systems as well as the variety of the actual forms of social partnership across Member States in determining pay.
161. In the video it was stated that job evaluation processes in large companies require 6 months. Implementation of Directive is in June, while toolkit (still not translated into all EU languages) is being presented today. EC should consider extending the transition period for reporting under Directive.
162. The directive also says that we can weigh the different factors. If working conditions are largely similar (e.g. office jobs), can we weigh a factor with "0" ?
163. Please answer top-voted questions!
164. I see that the toolkit also supports transparency in intersectional discrimination, correct?
165. Can we add intersectionality too?
166. Factor comparison is more analytical in nature than job comparison, which is more synthetic. why you decided to use job comparison for mid size companies ?
167. Thx a lot. Good job!!!
168. Thank you so much for setting this up. Very much appreciated!!
169. Congrats for the excellent toolkit and for the very informative webinar!
170. Thanks! Was illuminating!