



Ministry of Public Service and Labour,
Government of Rwanda

Comparative Study for Salaries in Public and Pri- vate Sectors

Final Report

October 2007 (amended January 2008)

Ramboll Management
Norregade 7A
DK-1165 Copenhagen K
Denmark

Phone: +45 3397 8200
www.ramboll-management.com

Table of contents

Executive Summary	3
1. Background and Overview	4
1.1 The Assignment	4
1.2 Scope of the assignment	4
1.3 Challenges	4
1.4 The methodology	5
2. The Leaving Survey	6
2.1 Introduction	6
2.1.1 Leaving rates	6
2.1.2 Transfer from one state body to another	7
2.2 The methodology	7
2.3 The findings	9
2.3.1 Leavers from state institutions	9
2.3.2 Leavers from state institutions captured by the questionnaire/interview process	10
2.4 Overview	13
3. Comparative study of salary levels in the public and private sectors	15
3.1 The methodology	15
3.1.1 The representativity of selected organisations	15
3.1.2 The representativity of selected positions	15
3.1.3 The comparability of selected positions	15
3.1.4 Pay data	15
3.1.5 Pay management	16
3.2 The process	16
3.2.1 Data collection	16
3.2.2 Codification and validity check	16
3.2.3 Qualitative and quantitative analyses	17
3.3 The assumptions	17
3.3.1 Quantitative analyses	17
3.3.2 Qualitative management	17
3.4 The findings	18
3.4.1 Pay reform	18
3.4.2 Internal competition versus external competition	18
3.4.3 "Reward is not just about salary"	18
3.4.4 Salary comparison: differences and nuances	18
3.4.5 Top salaries	24
4. Recommendations	25
4.1 On salaries	25
4.1.1 Recommendation 1: "Make the pay reform come true"	25
4.1.2 Recommendation 2: "Re-visit internal competition phenomenon"	25
4.1.3 Recommendation 3: "Compare need for salary increase"	25
4.1.4 Recommendation 4: "Develop Benefits allocation"	26

4.1.5	Recommendation 5: "Gradually introduce variable pay system"	26
4.1.6	Recommendation 6: "Re-visit Statutory vs. Contractual pay disparity"	26
4.1.7	Recommendation 7: "Address cautiously the Cost of Living problem"	27
4.1.8	Recommendation 8: "Address cautiously scarcity problems"	27
4.1.9	Recommendation 9: "Enhance professionalism of HRM staff"	27
4.1.10	Recommendation 10: "Pay attention to (very) low salary levels"	27
4.2	On other retention favourable actions	28
5.	Conclusions	29
	ANNEX 1 – List of participants/comparators	31
	ANNEX 2 – List of benchmark positions with definitions	33
	ANNEX 3 – Job evaluation grid	41
	ANNEX 4 – Salary management data collection check list	46
	ANNEX 5 – Salary data comparison by benchmark (type of) positions	48
	ANNEX 6 – Benefits comparison	67
	ANNEX 7 – Destinations and fields of specialisation of public service leavers	78
	ANNEX 8 – Leavers for 2004-2007 and staff numbers 2007	82
	ANNEX 9 – Movement of staff (leavers) from ministries and other organisation to the public sector, the private sector and NGOs	83

Executive Summary

The purpose of this project was to (a) increase understanding of why people leave the public service for the private sector and (b) make recommendations on the salary structure of the Rwandan civil service, in order to stem the flow of people leaving the public sector for the private sector.

The research undertaken for the project revealed several important issues. The first is that gross salary levels (with some exceptions in specific areas) were more or less on the same levels in both the public and private sectors. The greatest difference lay in the amount of non-salary benefits offered (health insurance and sick pay, life insurance, housing allowances, and other "terms and conditions of employment"). These non-salary benefits were higher in the private sector.

Another issue is that although most leaving rates fell within a normal range (with some exceptions for particular government bodies and ministries), it was noted that those leaving often were people with the following skills: finance, audit accounting, IT, and HR Management).

Interviews were conducted with individuals about their reasons for leaving public sector jobs for the private sector. 44 people were interviewed and the reasons why they left can be broadly divided into (a) terms and conditions (b) poor management of various sorts, and (c) lack of career prospects and promotion opportunities.

The project made some recommendations on actions to stem the flow of people leaving the public sector (Chapter 2) and about salary levels (Chapter 3). However, the data made available to the consultants was limited and it would be unwise to assume that mitigating the root cause of the problem will necessarily, in and of itself, stop high leaving rates where they occur.

1. Background and Overview

1.1 The Assignment

The assignment was (a) to try and establish what reasons employees had for leaving the public sector and migrating to the private sector; (b) to provide the Rwandan Government with information on how current public sector salaries compared with comparable jobs in the private sector; and (c) to make recommendations about how this situation could, if necessary, be remedied.

The project was requested to look at the question of salary indexation as a means of retaining people in the public sector, and to train MIFOTRA and other staff members in the methodology of the salary comparison exercise. The project required the experts to (a) establish the leaving rate for the public sector over the past 4 years and (b) find out by questionnaire/interview what the reasons were for civil and public servants leaving to join the private sector.

Recommendations for further action were also requested, including whether (or not) the base salary as a whole should be raised by 0%, 10% or 15%, and what other actions might be taken to encourage people to remain in the public sector.

1.2 Scope of the assignment

It was decided to do a short and selective piece of work which Ramboll Management hopes will answer at least the basic questions – why do people leave and what needs to be done, if anything, in addition to retain them? In order better to understand the approach of Ramboll Management, a brief description of our initial deliberations is helpful. It would be incorrect to conclude that pay is the only factor which motivates people to leave the civil service. As shown below, there is a mix of factors, some of which are pay, some are other benefits (health insurance, pension, leave and so on) and some are more purely motivational – good management, clear objectives, humane supervision, strong team working, and opportunities for career advancement (which is itself predicated on a consistent, transparent, and objective performance management system). Comparing the pay rates for comparable jobs in the public and private sectors thus became much more complex when all the factors promoting good retention rates were considered.

Against this background, the project focus was determined by the initial findings about pay rates which indicated that benchmark posts in the civil service actually competed better against their private sector equivalents than expected. So clearly something else is drawing people from the civil service. Furthermore, as records are not kept centrally on annual leaving rates, it has been impossible to establish the “natural” leaving rate and make meaningful comparisons. We have had to rely on the assumption of our counterparts that leaving rates are too high.

1.3 Challenges

This exercise was a big undertaking for the project team as contacts had to be established with each individual institution, requests for information sent either by hand, messenger or by personal visit, and then substantial follow-up efforts were made to extract relevant information.

Against this background, the project was under-funded to be able to meet project goals, and maybe too many assumptions were made about the availability of information.

There was also a question of time. Although the ToR provided for 90 consultancy days, this allocation had to be distributed so that a viable team could work together and support each other. There was a request from the beneficiary that the final report be available at the end of September. This constrained the way in which the experts had to work – and in

trying to meet that request, all available expert days were allocated. This in turn meant that no days were available for presentation of the final report and the validation seminar.

There was also the question of the logistical effort needed to make the salary comparisons and interview the leavers. It was rather time-consuming, and involved multiple meetings at multiple locations throughout three weeks. In addition, although it was intended that questionnaires should be issued to as many people as possible, even if there was no time to interview them, the lack of capacity to follow up meant that no questionnaires were returned unless the person concerned was interviewed as well.

1.4 The methodology

In total, 38 private sector firms were approached for salary information to perform the comparator exercise. Of this number, 30 provided this information, as well as offering considerable discussion time to ensure that comparisons were accurate. 30 state institutions were asked for information on leavers, and 20 provided it. 46 leavers filled in the questionnaire and 44 were interviewed. All in all, this provided sufficient information to give at least a snapshot of what is happening within the public service. It must, however, be said that of necessity, the sample of leavers was a tiny one – but any more extensive exercise will also need more funding and support from the requesting organisation.

Recommendations on both salary questions and other actions to support retention of public sector employees are provided in detail in the following Final Report.

2. The Leaving Survey

2.1 Introduction

The ToR required the project to (a) establish how many people had left the civil and public service for work in other sectors over the period 2004-2007 and (b) what were the reasons for their departure. These ToR did NOT specify whether these leavers had been voluntary or involuntary (as a result of the 2004 restructuring of the public sector, or as a result of dismissal or other reasons), or whether they had been transfers to other parts of the public sector. In fact, ministries and other state bodies did not necessarily have information distinguishing between voluntary and involuntary leaving. It was therefore partly left to the questionnaire and interview process to discover whether those interviewed (a very small sample) left voluntarily or involuntarily.

There were also no available *centrally held* statistics about leavers (how many, when and why). This is important because

- Only centrally held and defined statistics can be reasonably assumed to be accurate and consistent and
- In a normal labour market, a more or less constant staff turnover is inevitable, as some people leave and others are hired to replace them. This is true unless the organisation concerned is deliberately down-sizing, in which case some leavers will not be replaced though some will, depending on the nature of and relative responsibility attached to each post.

This is a decision which is usually taken by the operational and HR management of the body in question, and will vary markedly from case to case).

To take a simple example, a courier firm will probably need to replace drivers and mechanics who leave, but may not need to replace management positions. In the private sector, these decisions are normally governed by the "bottom line" – that is, the end of year profit/loss balance, or by the changing human resource needs of the company as it expands or contracts.

In the public sector, the position is not so clear and will depend to a very large extent on the overall objectives of the body in question.

Another example is that a vehicle licensing authority will need sufficient clerk/administrators to process applications and check that legal requirements are met, but fewer upper management posts, while the Supreme Court administration will need a number of top level lawyers and other legal specialists.

Although figures held individually by ministries and other bodies may in themselves be useful for that ministry or body, this does not contribute to the overall picture of leavers, and whether the rates are normal or not. *Therefore, a centrally held body of information on these matters is essential – to ensure both consistency and thoroughness.*

2.1.1 Leaving rates

There is no established "natural" leaving rate for the public sector. This level needs to be determined quickly because without it, it is impossible to say with statistical certainty whether leaving rates are higher than they should be. *It is recommended that HR Departments in all public bodies be asked to record information about every leaver: what job did they take after this one and the reason (if known), and to relay this information on an annual basis to MIFOTRA and/or the National Statistics Board.* Assuming that headcounts are up to date, this will provide a snapshot of how many people are actually employed in the state sector in relation to leaving rates. Over time, this should enable the state sector to establish with certainty whether leaving rates are too high. At present, the evidence is anecdotal and impressionistic, which is not to say that it is inaccurate.

It has been an assumption throughout this exercise that leaving rates are too high, and this is the basis on which the survey was prepared. However, it is interesting that there is spot evidence that the situation may not be quite as simple as all that. First, the developing Rwandan economy is naturally going to pull people into the private sector. There are more opportunities for small and large firms, particularly in the fields of banking, IT, insurance and communications. On the other hand, there is some evidence to suggest that the traffic is not all one way. One small IT firm said that they were losing IT staff TO the public sector for two reasons: the work was less challenging and the salary was more stable. It is of course impossible to extrapolate from such a small amount of evidence, but it does indicate that the picture may not be as straightforward as has been assumed.

2.1.2 *Transfer from one state body to another*

Another factor playing into crude leaving rates is the rate of transfer from one state body to another. Some ministries, such as MINALOC, have established centres and other bodies within the Ministry itself, for the administration of externally funded development programmes. The ministries are thus, perhaps for good management reasons, establishing small labour market competitions within their own jurisdictions. How widespread this is cannot be ascertained within the parameters of this project. But there is clear potential for a distortion of the internal state sector labour market. These developments need to be watched carefully. There is a risk that better-paid and better-resourced centres will pull good staff from the "conventional" ministries, thus leaving those bodies with the less qualified and less capable. Information about job transfers is therefore essential. State bodies should be asked to make an annual account of leavers as well as their destinations, and perhaps also an account of the previous job held by new staff, in order to provide greater understanding of the flow within, to and from state sectors.

The reports we received from ministries and other bodies indicated that labour market mobility between ministries and other state bodies was not necessarily related to the phenomena described above. Transfers were not totally captured by the survey because (a) the information on leavers was not entirely disaggregated between moves to the private sector and moves between state bodies and (b) because the information we obtained on individual leavers came more often than not from the private sector. Thus transfers to other jobs in the public sector, whether through resignation and reapplication or through level transfer, were not captured.

What was captured by the questionnaire/interview process, however, was movement towards the private sector. However, if a level transfer takes place within the public sector, there is no net loss to the public sector, and it is a question whether such moves should be counted. Indeed, ease of transfer to gain wider experience is one of the positive aspects of the internal labour market and promotes opportunities for career progression (see below, section 3.3.2). This does however reinforce the need to quickly establish a "natural" leaving rate which should also capture internal transfers. In one case, the institution returning figures for leavers made a distinction between those transferring to other posts, and those resigning and then becoming re-employed in another state institution. The significance of this distinction is difficult to evaluate but sometimes in cases of resignation and then re-employment, the individual has applied for a higher post (promotion).

The table in Annex 7 shows the information we obtained from state bodies about leavers. Some bodies did not keep this data and some did not respond. In the time available for the project, it was difficult to follow up on bodies which did not provide information. Thus it is uncertain whether the data is complete or not.

2.2 **The methodology**

In formal surveys of this type, a population is first established (for instance, of public service leavers), and then either a proportion of the population is surveyed (for example, only those leavers who left for the private sector) or, if resources allow, the whole population is surveyed. There are well-established surveying techniques, including sampling, which are recognised as statistically valid. However, in this case, the delay to the project start and the restricted timetable meant that these techniques were not available. Instead, the project had to try as hard as possible to identify leavers (in itself a difficult task) and then to contact them to see whether they would be prepared to answer a questionnaire and be

interviewed. This process was in itself time-consuming, and posed a challenge to the project which was only partly met. This was “partly”, because there was no method of checking whether the leaving data received from ministries and other bodies was accurate and up to date, and no *consistent* distinctions were made between those who left because of restructuring (that is, involuntarily), those who transferred to other parts of the state sector whether through resignation/re-employment or direct transfer, those who left for private business and self-employment, and those who simply disappeared or emigrated.

In addition, it was difficult to get access to identified leavers. As *demandeurs*, the project experts could not force private sector firms or NGOs into releasing information on staff that had come to them from the state sector (although most did so generously). It also proved almost impossible to issue questionnaires in advance of interview. The project was simply not resourced to sustain a time-consuming effort to issue questionnaires and to receive them back in advance. It is quite clear that those responsible for the framing of the ToR and the allocation of resources did not understand the level of engagement required to carry out the process, never mind the evaluative work. Almost all contacts, including the distribution of ministerial letters and the receipt of information in response, had to be done by hand, by email or by personal visit. Even with the deployment of an additional administrator, it was still extremely difficult.

It is also axiomatic that the results of such surveys are only valid if the respondents do so voluntarily. There were several cases where it was clear that potential respondents either did not want to, or refused to provide the requested information. This is less important if the population being surveyed is large enough, and enough time is allowed to cover the gaps by adding population as others drop out. But this was not possible in this case.

Therefore, the methodology was that leavers where possible, were individually identified, contacted, and asked to fill in a questionnaire or be interviewed. Some ministries (e.g. MINAFFET) did not provide contacts for all their leavers. The two-way process (information from state bodies and information on people joining the private sector from state bodies) was however sufficient to enable the completion of 46 questionnaires and the interview of 44 individuals (one was on leave when the interviews were arranged). Of these, 3 were in fact involuntary leavers (redundancies as a result of the 2004 reforms), 2 were leavers who had held elected office and left for political reasons (mayors) and 1 left because of relocation. Although the project team tried to issue and receive back questionnaires from people who were not interviewed, this also proved difficult, as by and large the questionnaires had to be issued individually. In addition, the majority of interviewees preferred to complete the questionnaire at the time of interview. This is not in itself a problem but it indicates that if further exercises of this nature are to be undertaken, the assumption should be that either questionnaires be filled in during the interview, or that the survey should be conducted by interview only (which is more time-consuming and also demands a high degree of consistency in questions asked and responses recorded). Although questionnaires were also issued by email, it was clear that the vast majority of respondents did not wish to reply by this means. The difference is that if the questionnaire answers are made available to the interviewer in advance, much time can be saved instead of asking routine questions.

It was clear in some cases that the persons answering the questionnaires had not read the instructions carefully. If this exercise or other similar exercises are repeated, the questionnaires should be simplified – in particular, ranking should be dispensed with, and closed questions (yes/no answers) should be used.

After receipt of questionnaires and interviews, the responses were ranked generally, either as (a) main reason for leaving is “salary” and (b) main reason for leaving is “other factors”. Within those parameters, the questionnaires and interviews allowed a more subtle interpretation. The expert involved looked in more detail at the questionnaire responses and the interview responses and adjusted for qualitative data received.

2.3 The findings

2.3.1 *Leavers from state institutions*

20 state institutions responded to our request for information, delivered by letter from the Minister of Labour and the Civil Service. These were

- Rwanda Revenue Authority
- PMU Global Fund
- Institute of Agricultural Sciences
- Rwanda Institute for Information Technology (RITA)
- Unity and Reconciliation Commission
- HIDA
- ONATRACOM (State transport service)
- MININFRA
- Electoral Commission
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs
- MINALOC
- Prosecution Service (Parquet General)
- Auditor General's Office
- National Tender Board
- Senate Administration
- National Bank of Rwanda
- Supreme Court
- Gasabo District Health Administration
- KIST
- Education III.

10 state institutions did not answer our request for information. These were

- Electrogaz
- City of Kigali
- Roads and Bridges Commission
- Provincial Governments (all 4)
- President's Office
- PEDERCIU
- MINEDUC
- Kigali General Hospital
- MINECOFIN
- National University of Rwanda
- Caisse Sociale du Rwanda (CSR).

Some state institutions were not asked for information. These were

- MINADEF
- MINISANTE
- MININTER
- MINICOM
- MINAGRI,

as well as many smaller institutions such as the Blood Transfusion Service, the National Reference Laboratory, the Transmissible Diseases Commission, and the state bodies in charge of coffee and tea development, as well as smaller organisations dealing with animal health and crop research.

The leaving survey therefore covered less than half of existing state bodies and institutions. If a more comprehensive survey is to be conducted in the future, many more resources will have to be allocated to the effort. The amount of work needed to capture even this amount of information was unfortunately out of proportion to the coverage. (In passing, it is worth noting that a recent survey of 166 randomly sampled individuals out of a population of 794, with 142 persons being interviewed, actually employed 12 researchers.

In the case of this project, there were 4 senior consultants and 1 consultant/administrator, dealing with an approximately similar population and two different objectives). There are approximately 93 different state bodies and institutions, small and large, in existence at the present time and being paid for from the central budget, employing approximately 40,000 people. It is not the objective of this project to make policy recommendations about the structure of the state sector. However, it is very clear indeed that the proliferation of state bodies and institutions, especially the smaller, more specialist ones, may well be ready for some rationalisation.

It is also important to note that although the returns received did include some from larger organisations (e.g. RRA), these returns did not fully compensate for the non-capture from other organisations. The problem was compounded because not all institutions broke down their returns into the requested categories – leavers for the private sector, for self-employment, and leavers for other government institutions. This again tended to undermine the accuracy and relevance of the data, particularly as it was difficult in the time and with the resources available to explain in detail to all the institutions what was needed and how the data should be presented. In the future, if a similar exercise is undertaken, it may be helpful to gather together the HR Directors of the relevant institutions at a seminar to explain what is needed and, ideally, how it should be presented.

Within these rather limited parameters, the crude leaving rates for the different institutions who replied to the letter are as in Annex 8. Also in Annex 8 is a table of staff in post as of 2007.

The more interesting and relevant part of the leavers' survey is the question – why did they leave, and what were the main factor(s) which led to their decision? The questionnaire and interview process shed a good deal of light on this aspect. It is, however, necessary to see what reasons, if any, state institutions that report leaver figures could provide for the study. In Annex 9 there is a breakdown of leavers by institution and destination. This breakdown includes transfers/change of jobs within the public sector, moves from the public sector to the private sector (including self-employment), and "unknowns" (not recorded/emigrated/left for studies).

From the available figures, it is possible to derive the following conclusions:

- The average leaving rate over 4 years *for the population surveyed* is 85 per annum
- The organisations who are best at retaining staff are ONATRACOM, the Supreme Court, the Senate Administration, HIDA and the Institute for Agricultural Sciences
- The organisations which are losing staff at a rate higher than might be considered "normal" are the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, KIST, the Unity and Reconciliation Commission, the Auditor General's Office, MININFRA and the National Tender Board.

From the information available, it is difficult to conclude with certainty whether any particular sector within the ministries is suffering from loss of staff more than another, although the questionnaire/interview process has revealed a number of trends. However, from the available figures it would be fair to say that

- The leaving rates captured by the survey are not sufficiently high to indicate a serious problem overall in the Rwandan public service
- There may be problems in particular organisations (MINAFFET, for example) or in particular sectors (accounting, legal, IT, finance) where the private sector is offering better pay, conditions or management.

This aspect will be dealt with in the next chapter.

Only MINAFFET reported a large number of people who were listed as "deserted", "put on permanent unpaid leave", and so on. This may be because of experience with staff choosing to remain abroad in connection with overseas service.

2.3.2 *Leavers from state institutions captured by the questionnaire/interview process*

46 questionnaires were filled in and 44 interviews conducted. Involuntary leavers (made redundant), and people who left their organisations for family reasons or for political rea-

sons (no expectation of being re-elected, for example) were not required to fill in the rankings but they were asked about their impressions. These were few in number relatively speaking and do not affect the gross results.

A rough breakdown of reasons given, in order of importance, is as follows:

- Salary and benefit levels – about 50% of responses
- Management problems generally (though this could be, and was in some cases, a question of individuals not “getting on” with the boss) – about 45% of responses
- Lack of career prospects and possibilities for promotion - about 40% of responses.

Note that the respondents were given the opportunity to mention and rank one *or more* factors in their reasons for leaving, which explains the percentage figures above.

Within these broad categories, however, there are some important distinctions. First, although a significant number of respondents (just about 50%) cited *salary level alone* as one of the factors which induced them to leave the public sector, it was also the case that in about 30% of those, *low or non-existent benefits* (pension, sick pay and sick leave, provided housing, provided utilities and so on) were also a factor. The difficulty of finding decent housing in Kigali was also mentioned as well as the high cost of such housing, and this was a significant disincentive for people to remain in the civil service. It is possible to deduce from these observations that basic salary is not as important a factor as the whole salary package, including benefits – from now on called “terms and conditions”. These “terms and conditions” need not cost a lot of money.

What is absolutely clear is that *the “terms and conditions” package was thought of as significantly better in the private sector than in the public* (whether or not the individuals questioned had actually quantified these factors. It is axiomatic that employees’ perceptions of their terms and conditions are usually affected not purely by economic factors but by the whole atmosphere and approach to staff management within the organisation. Please see the salary comparisons for a more detailed discussion of this issue).

About 45% of respondents cited poor management as the main reason for leaving the public sector. However, when these responses were followed up by questioning, it became clear that almost every individual had a different perception of what the management failure consisted of, ranging from absence of team-work to the inability of the employer to give the staff member sufficient autonomy to do his/her job properly. In between were reasons such as few defined objectives, poor or non-existent performance appraisal systems, a need for more challenging responsibilities, and a negative and antagonistic management style.

It is therefore not possible to identify one single type of management failure that needs remedying. *However, improvement in management, both for HR Departments and line managers, does seem to be one of the issues that could significantly reduce leaving rates.* Alternatively, it is possible to consider a range of targeted training interventions, particularly at lower and middle management levels, which would include (but not be restricted to) the following topics:

- Team working
- Communication
- Management by objectives
- Performance appraisal
- Decision making.

In fact, the question of poor or no performance appraisal systems was referred to sufficiently often in interviews for it to perhaps deserve a separate discussion. Performance appraisal on an annual, individual basis, is the essential underpinning of a system of management by objectives in which each individual public servant is aware of the overall aims and objectives of the organisation he or she works for but also has a set of personal SMART (**S**pecific, **M**easurable, **A**greed, **R**ealistic, **T**ime limited) objectives against which performance is measured throughout the year. Setting SMART objectives is a common and well-known management tool. This approach has the advantages of (a) eliminating as far as possible personal bias in terms of appraising performance and (b) also managing the

person being appraised in terms of the job objectives he/she is set throughout the year, as well as at appraisal time. This is significant because it requires personal and constant engagement between staff member and manager, and line manager and his/her boss in turn (because the appraisal has to be counter-signed by the next highest manager), where each is constantly reminded of his/her objectives and responsibilities. In fact, good performance appraisal systems, where the employee knows that the appraisal is objective and that if performance is good this will lead to the possibility of promotion, is another factor that could help to reduce leaving rates.

About 40% of respondents mentioned lack of promotion opportunities and/or a career structure. For bright, younger people, in particular, a career perspective is an important part in persuading them to remain in an organisation. There was a worrying level of disenchantment and/or cynicism about how promotion prospects, if they existed, were distributed. While patronage is certainly not an unknown factor in civil services, a reduction in the extent of patronage (nepotism) can be an important factor in helping to retain good staff. This, however, strays into areas where this project is not mandated to go, for example, the role of an ethics system and how it is enforced. It would be a big (and at this stage unwarranted) step to say that lack of an enforceable and enforced ethics system in the civil service means that bright younger people are leaving. But it is something that should be considered alongside other factors.

As commonly expressed during the interviews, however, promotion opportunities were seen as either completely lacking or inaccessible to those without personal influence of one sort or another, while the private sector held out the hope (whether fulfilled or not is impossible to say for obvious reasons) that promotion would be both available AND objectively decided on. *It is therefore worth considering whether a closer look should be taken at (a) the career structure available (or not) to middle and more junior civil servants, and (b) what could be done about this, especially in terms of more objective and fair promotion procedures.*

There are many methods by which promotion opportunities can be fairly distributed, assuming that a career structure already exists. The first is that there should pre-exist a performance appraisal scheme based on management by objectives into which can be inserted a "suited (or not) for promotion" evaluation. This ensures that if someone applies for promotion, or is considered for it, this is based as far as possible on objective criteria – and more importantly, is SEEN to be based on objective criteria. After that, there are many ways in which promotability (and if a promotion post exists at the time, promotion itself) can be determined. It can be by regular promotability marks on an annual appraisal alongside high performance marks. It can be by examination. It can be by interview. It can be by Human Evaluative Interview. Or it can be by any combination of the above. Also, it is usually the case that the individual is promoted within the organisation for which they work. In a small civil service, however, this may not always be possible. *It is worth considering whether a "suited for promotion" marking at annual appraisal should be followed by encouragement to compete for promotion posts in other ministries, if this is not already done.* As said before, this would not be a net loss to the public sector as a whole, and the opening up of promotion to other institutions would widen the range of available promotion posts and make promotion more of a realistic aspiration than the semi-fiction we are told it is at the moment.

There is, however, no point in talking about promotion if posts to which people can be promoted are lacking. Despite the 2004 restructuring, perhaps another look should be taken at the current structure of Ministry and institution posts with a view to implementing a more accessible career structure (although this project was not intended or designed to look at institutional structures, a study of how tasks and levels are allocated in a range of institutions might be enlightening). Some compression at middle management levels could bring first-step promotion within the reach of lower level staff who are capable of performing well, and thus provide an incentive for them to remain. The problem here is that unless further promotion is available to the very brightest, these people will in turn be lost to the public service.

In terms of which sectors are most "at risk" from key people leaving for the private sector, the evidence produced by the survey is limited. However, it appears that the banking and finance sectors (including audit) are drawing most staff from the public to the private sec-

tor; the second is IT; and the third is HR Management. Although most people gave the main reason as the terms and conditions, there were significant numbers (about 40%) who also cited management reasons including promotion prospects and the ability to work autonomously. This reflects the results for the whole sample. It should also be noted that this type of staff will probably be numerically superior to any other – which is why we have captured quite high numbers of leavers in these sectors. Ministries and other institutions may need to start identifying shortage skills. The table in Annex 9 provides origin and destination (where available – some respondents refused to give this information) of civil service leavers surveyed.

There is a considerable problem if the public service decides to start paying premium rates for shortage skills. First, this might set up a wage/price inflation spiral as the private and public sector compete for scarce skills. Second, the people working in the areas of the public service that do not attract premiums are at a disadvantage, and the difference might either tempt them to leave, or to acquire the newly desirable skills, or possibly both! In either case, there can be severe distortions of the labour market. Skill shortages are rarely if ever permanently solved by paying differentials, and this should be avoided if at all possible, except in certain critical areas (e.g. health care) where lack of a certain skills may mean the difference between life and death. One solution is to employ people on short-term contracts, at the market rate. This could still lead to a disparity between the permanent employee and the contract employee, assuming that the market rate is higher than the public service rate, which in the longer run is neither good for management nor for staff retention. The disincentive to work well will quickly take over, and less efficient staff will become even less efficient. All in all, it does not pay in the longer term to set up such internal/external labour market competition. The remedy is rather to increase the number of appropriately skilled people that have recently completed an education, and then give them opportunities to develop a career within the public service as a whole.

A small but significant number of interviewees said that lack of training opportunities was in part a reason for leaving the public service. However, even these small numbers (6 out of a total of 44 interviewed) made a distinction as between training that would enable them to do their job better and training funded by their institutions which would get them better formal qualifications. In some cases, of course, the training desired will be the same. There did seem, however, to be a perception that the state was obliged to provide grants for higher studies to people who worked for it. This may be a hangover from another period or another government's policy but the expectation is clearly still there. And expectations not being fulfilled is one of the major reasons why people leave a particular job or institution. While it does not appear that a major training effort to meet people's expectations would be a cost-effective contribution to a reduction in the leaving rate, training as a whole is hugely important. This could also solve some of the problems raised by the much larger group of interviewees who cited poor management as a reason for leaving.

There are two aspects to staff training: training to help staff have greater/better/more effective knowledge about what they are doing (for example, an IT person taking a course to learn about new software applications) and training in good management generally. The latter is probably the most neglected area for training, particularly in developing public services, because people find it hard to understand the benefits. However, most modern commercial companies, multinationals, and other large organisations now recognise the importance of general management training for all their staff, regardless of level. If poor management is demotivating people to the point where they are leaving the organisation, then something must be done about it. However, good management training is not a no- or low-cost solution to retention problems. Good and well-organised training delivered by successful and recognised trainers is not cheap and, above all, it cannot for that reason simply be delivered at random. First, there has to be a training needs analysis, either of a part of the public service or all of it. This is in itself a major exercise.

2.4 Overview

The main reasons for people leaving the public service are (a) terms and conditions (salary and other benefits) (b) poor management and (c) lack of career prospects or a career structure. But of course every individual has a different combination of reasons for leaving a job. But broadly speaking these are the three areas that need attention. It appears (from

the available sample) that the most vulnerable sectors to leaving are (a) finance, audit and accounting, (b) IT, and (c) HR Management (which may point to the private sector becoming more aware of the importance of good HR management for the health, and wealth, of the firm.)

On management and training (since the two cannot be separated, the overall training needs of the public sector should be examined), *the need for a thorough training needs analysis plus action on provision of training as identified by the TNA should be a priority. Especially involving good-quality management training of a general nature for people at all levels, and doing all types of jobs.*

The salary survey will recommend what, if any, changes should be made in the public sector salary structure. However, from this perspective, changes in salary will not be as important as changes in the availability of benefits such as pension (but care is needed here because of the problems surrounding the actuarial assessment of how much money is needed to fund a pension scheme in the first place), sick leave, health insurance, low cost loans and other less tangible benefits. The availability of affordable decent quality housing of an appropriate standard in Kigali is a significant issue and a particular disincentive to remaining in the public service.

Last, if improvements in career development and structure are to be made, there may be some actions which the public sector could take without necessarily restructuring the entire public service. One of these is the establishment of an objectives-based performance appraisal system which will demonstrably and openly be a tool to identify civil and public servants who are candidates for promotion. Another is the design, development, piloting, and implementation of a promotion procedure which would make promotion dependent on performance as well as knowledge and experience. Another is a study of the influence of transfer patterns on promotion.

3. Comparative study of salary levels in the public and private sectors

3.1 The methodology

In order to produce reliable, comprehensive and representative results, pay comparisons – surveys – have to meet a few but critical conditions and principles:

3.1.1 The representativity of selected organisations

The size and the nature of the sample of organisations/institutions participating in the survey are essential to ensure the credibility of findings.

Together with MIFOTRA, we have established a list of Public Sector and Private Sector bodies and companies that are diverse in terms of the nature of their activities and of a sufficient number in order to cover a broad population and meet the requirements expressed in the Terms of Reference.

In total, 31 institutions/bodies have been selected amongst the Public Sector Establishments/Ministries/Project Organisations; 38 organisations have been identified amongst various Private Sector activities, NGO's and International Agencies (see Annex 1).

3.1.2 The representativity of selected positions

It is as essential to carefully select the positions for which salaries will be compared. The various "disciplines" – types of activities - that compose an organisation must be found as well in the Public Sector institutions as in the Private Sector organisations. In this respect, typical jobs in each category have not been considered. Moreover, the notion of "benchmark" – sampling – contains its own limitation: consequently, we have restricted the number of comparable positions.

Comment

During the data collection process and the subsequent analytical process of collected data, we have slightly amended – say broadened - the list that had been agreed on in the first place in order to refine the representativity of the sample and improve the quality of findings.

Some 95 benchmark positions have been identified in 20 different disciplines.

A short description of each position has been written in order to facilitate the comparability (see also paragraph 3.1.3.) between Private and Public sectors positions (see Annex 2).

3.1.3 The comparability of selected positions

It is mandatory that jobs/positions for which a pay analysis/comparison will be conducted are indeed comparable, i.e., so that when comparing pay levels, the similarity in size/weight between jobs is ensured. For this purpose, the expert has used a simple, user-friendly, and effective job-sizing methodology that is based on universal, easy-to-understand and recognized weighting criteria (see Annex 3).

Using these conditions, jobs have been codified throughout all organisations and institutions.

In total, some 1300 positions in the Public Sector and some 1200 positions in the Private Sector have been identified and codified.

3.1.4 Pay data

Pay – reward – encompasses multiple components that have to be integrated in the comparative process and addressed in a structured way.

<p>A. <u>MONETARY PAY ELEMENTS</u> ("monetisable" elements)</p> <p>B. <u>NON-MONETARY ELEMENTS</u> *</p> <p>* Some of referred elements may be "monetised" through organization budget/cost valuation</p> <p>C. <u>PAY POLICY / SALARY MANAGEMENT</u> (Qualitative Information)</p>	<p>A.1. Base Cash (Annual)</p> <p>A.2. Variable Cash (Annual)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Premiums- Incentives- Bonuses <p>B.1. Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Retirement/Pension schemes- Health/Welfare Programs/ Insurance- Paid Time Off (vacation, holidays)- Statutory Programs (social security) <p>B.2. Perquisites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Car- Housing- Representation allowances- School fees- Fuel allowances- Canteen- Home security- ... <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Work Environment- Pay Structure/ Management- Pay Progression Principles- Career Opportunities/Evolution- Motivational Pay Management- ...
---	---

3.1.5 *Pay management*

The comparison study would not be completed if pay management, i.e., the pay policy principles and additional conditions regulating pay management, are not taken into account. A checklist has been developed for this purpose in order to facilitate the interviewing process during the data collection visit (see Annex 4).

3.2 **The process**

3.2.1 *Data collection*

Prior to practical data collection in the field, an official letter signed by the Minister of MI-FOTRA has been sent to participating organisations/institutions, explaining the purpose and objectives of the project and introducing the practical approach by the experts and the details of the required information.

The letter was followed by direct contacts by the international consultant team, defining the practical modalities of the data collection process.

3.2.2 *Codification and validity check*

As already mentioned, in order to ensure confidentiality of the data providers and to facilitate registration and analytical process, participating organisations and benchmark positions have been codified. This has been a demanding effort to the extent that all provided data have been the object of a validity check in order to avoid and eliminate inconsistent information.

3.2.3 Qualitative and quantitative analyses

Providing all preceding steps have been achieved, qualitative and quantitative analyses could be initiated:

- Qualitative: analysis of reward structures, policies and practices in all selected organisations (following abovementioned checklist)
- Quantitative: analysis of salary data.

3.3 The assumptions

3.3.1 Quantitative analyses

Work hypotheses have been developed starting from the basic salary data collated by “disciplines” – types of activities (as detailed in Annex 2) – and distributed by organisations/institutions (see Annex 5).

a)

For this purpose, *Public Sector* organisations/institutions/agencies and ministries have been put together in five (5) groups (PubSec 1,2,3,4 and 5) on the base of the applied index value (Indice) determining the level of salary. Similarity/equivalence of pay practice and ease to analytical approach are the main reasons of this grouping.

Public or semi-public organisations characterised by their specific salary practices have been treated apart from these 5 groups: BNR (PUBSEC 01), CHUK (PUBSEC 17), Electrogaz (PUBSEC 19) and Project Organisations (PROJ.).

The following table presents the distribution of public organisations in the five groups.

Table 1

PUBSEC 1 (Index 250)	PUBSEC 2 (Index 270)	PUBSEC 3 (Index 300)	PUBSEC 4 (Index 400)	PUBSEC 5 (Index 500)
Parquet Général Cour Suprême Primature Sénat Minecofin Mifotra Minicom Minaffet District	KIST UNR KIE IRST HIDA	Presirep	RITA U & R DDP NTB CEPEX	RRA CSR

All *Private Sector* organisations (PRI 01, 02, 03), NGO's and International Agencies have been treated independently (INT 01, 02, 03,...).

b)

The initial tabulation (Annex 5) refers to monthly gross (base) salary amounts.

When a range of salaries (following salary policy/practice) or different salaries are identified for the same position code, census-based minimum and maximum salary levels are mentioned.

Example: Accountancy Table: under PRI 04

ACC 03: 236.740
339.176

3.3.2 Qualitative management

All information concerning salary management policies and practices (grading and pay structures, progression and promotion, performance management process, additional

benefits and perquisites) in *Private Sector organisations* has been integrated in a comparative table (see Annex 6)

Comment

We have assumed here that these components of salary policies are inherent to Private Sector organisations and, in this respect, display differences in pay practices – and levels – between Public and Private Sectors (see next paragraph: The findings).

3.4 The findings

Multiple analyses may be carried out providing the amount and the nature of treated information which is important and rich in content. This is undoubtedly the case for this project. Without anticipating further recommendations, more in-depth “investigations” would add significant value and inspiration in order to fine-tune present results.

3.4.1 Pay reform

The Government of Rwanda has initiated a Pay Reform in 2004, encompassing new pay principles, job grading, salary structure, and calculation process (index value) – all of this described in a document: “Guidelines for fixing salaries in the Rwandan Public Sector” published in June 2004.

This document appropriately describes a modern pay policy, adapted to specificities of Public Services.

However, to our knowledge, implementation is still an issue:

- Substantial increase in salary has not brought expected motivational result; conversely, recent state reform and subsequent redundancy programme has provoked a negative effect
- Pay reform principles and practical consequences have not been applied in the same way (or have not been applied at all) in all public institutions; e.g. index values are applied in a discretionary way, by-passing the expected differentiation
- Classification methodology and implementation process are (too) slowly taking off.

3.4.2 Internal competition versus external competition

Internal competition in the public services and related transfers of staff, simply because salary levels are different – say higher – (index value differentiation) are a phenomenon that would need a more in-depth analysis of consequences, negative (valuable servants leaving a service, demotivating effect on those who have no chance to leave and being better paid) and positive (existence of an “informal” career opportunity).

3.4.3 “Reward is not just about salary”

The concept of “reward” or “remuneration” has changed over the years; other components than just salary, monetary and non-monetary, have been integrated in pay policies, mainly (nearly exclusively) in private organisations, and have generated a – *the* – gap between practices in the respective sectors.

Considering Rwandan formal regulation, inclusion of maximum 30% “benefits” - housing and transportation – in gross salary does not change much to the current situation.

Annex 6 presents the various benefits and perquisite programmes that have been identified in private organisations.

3.4.4 Salary comparison: differences and nuances

In light of the salary data collected and distributed by benchmark “disciplines”/positions in the tables presented in Annex 5, more focussed analyses have been carried out in order to refine the perception on – greater or lesser - differences between public and private sectors organisations.

Technical statement

When addressing the (in many cases) wide range of salaries identified for each benchmark position as well in public as in private sectors, there is a “statistical” need to compare the impact of referred amounts, principally the highest and lowest ones: instead of calculating an average salary (the sum of referred salary levels divided by the number of references) which is fully impacted by the extreme references, preference has been given – where number of jobs allows - to the “median” salary amount (the salary level identified in the middle of the concerned population). This allows a more realistic perception of salary practices.

How to read the following tables

Following tables show salary comparison between Public and Private sector organisations per benchmark discipline (e.g. Accountancy) and per codified position(s) (see Annex 2).

Per code, and when amount of data allows, three figures are shown: minimum recorded salary amount, median identified salary (underlined), maximum recorded salary.

When insufficient data, only most significant salary amount is shown or, in case, minimum and maximum recorded amounts.

Possible shaded figures indicate potential source for comments (below table).

ACCOUNTANCY

CODES	PUBLIC SECTOR Salary range Low – MEDIAN – High (‘000 RWF)	PRIVATE SECTOR Salary range Low – MEDIAN – High (‘000 RWF)
ACC		
01	150	192
02	152 <u>180</u> 235	170 <u>192</u> 323
03	275 <u>281</u> 424	245 <u>398</u> 451
04	449 <u>562</u> 579	386 <u>492</u> 676
05	582 <u>650</u> 669	474 <u>644</u> 997

Comments: Even though salary levels are equally competitive” in both sectors, private organisations may offer higher salary opportunities.

AUDIT

CODES	PUBLIC SECTOR	PRIVATE SECTOR
AUD		
01	-	150 200
02	281 400	280 <u>450</u> 700
03	337 700	400 <u>500</u> 1.100
04	400 770	300 <u>1.000</u> 1.400

Comments: Both sectors offer same salary levels at lowest side. Private sector competitiveness then significantly grows.

FINANCE

CODES	PUBLIC SECTOR	PRIVATE SECTOR
FIN		
01	163 650	350
02	255 337	500 644 990
03	450 485	424 550 1.100
04	281 450	420 500 946
05	400 644	700 804 1.244
06	485 770	505 650 700
07	440 580 950	600 870 4.340

Comments: Private Sector organisations offer higher salary levels throughout the range of benchmark positions.

LOGISTICS

CODES	PUBLIC SECTOR	PRIVATE SECTOR
LOG		
01	74 85 337	32 150 305
02	125 150 538	81 200 536
03	450 880	300 580 998

Comments: No specific competitive advantage for drivers (code 01) ...nor for other positions so far.

PROCUREMENT

CODES	PUBLIC SECTOR	PRIVATE SECTOR
PRO		
01	150	72 150 350
02	254 280 290	135 153 596
03	400 450 562	195 403 457
04	582 650 869	768 792
05	(950)	1.340

Comments: No specific competitive advantage between Public and Private Sectors.

COMMUNICATION

CODES	PUBLIC SECTOR	PRIVATE SECTOR
COM		
01	404	-
02	281 808	339 697
03	337 582	-
04	281 337	-
05	485 970	838

Comments: Apparently, communication professionals benefit from more career opportunities in the Public Sector where communication is well structured...and well paid.

STATISTICS

CODES	PUBLIC SECTOR	PRIVATE SECTOR
STA		
01	254 468	288
02	337 562	383 480
03		526

Comments: Employment of statisticians seems better paid in Public Sector; attractive pay.

HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

CODES	PUBLIC SECTOR	PRIVATE SECTOR
HRM		
01	150 393	170 <u>192</u> 415
02	255 <u>290</u> 562	300 <u>500</u> 790
03	337 <u>590</u> 808	263 <u>320</u> 1.387
04	485 <u>580</u> 970	331 <u>670</u> 1.700
05	950 1.165	838

Comments: The Private Sector offers a wider range of salaries than Public Sector.

ADMINISTRATION

CODES	PUBLIC SECTOR	PRIVATE SECTOR
ADM		
01	56 <u>96</u> 277	34 <u>107</u> 250
02	96 186	50 68
03	96 <u>166</u> 294	83 <u>246</u> 472
04	212 <u>281</u> 562	140 <u>250</u> 541
05	150 <u>230</u> 538	120 <u>212</u> 541
06	125 <u>150</u> 393	<u>140</u> <u>250</u> 1.045
07	233 674	-
08	485 1.134	<u>1.912</u>
09	404 808	<u>380</u> <u>750</u> 2.400

Comments: Figures show relatively similar pay levels between Public and Private Sectors. Higher pay for secretarial and managerial positions in Private Sector.

TECHNICAL & ENGINEERING

CODES	PUBLIC SECTOR	PRIVATE SECTOR
ENG		
01	96 <u>138</u> 335	67 <u>104</u> 252
02	138 <u>195</u> 462	53 <u>150</u> <u>590</u>
03	168 <u>337</u> 646	138 <u>368</u> <u>833</u>
04	-	-
05	337 <u>400</u> 488	397 <u>500</u> <u>1.200</u>
06	650 808	644 <u>870</u> <u>1.500</u>
07	881 950	600 <u>1.440</u> <u>2.480</u>
08	-	-

Comments: Private Sector offers wider ranges and higher salary levels.

INFORMATION & COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES

CODES	PUBLIC SECTOR	PRIVATE SECTOR
ICT		
01	150 592	190 472
02	230 <u>562</u> 646	170 <u>540</u> <u>992</u>
03	305 <u>404</u> 770	182 <u>550</u> <u>1.583</u>
04	485 <u>700</u> 970	365 <u>700</u> <u>1.515</u>
05	950 1.244	1.500 <u>2.100</u> <u>2.400</u>

Comments: Public and Private Sectors offer similar ranges of salaries in most ICT positions; however, private organisations provide broader and higher – salary opportunities.

LEGAL

CODES	PUBLIC SECTOR	PRIVATE SECTOR
LEG		
01	138 538	-
02	305 <u>337</u> 646	304 <u>450</u> 480
03	404 674	500 <u>608</u> 1.200
04	582 <u>880</u> 970	644 <u>700</u> 973

Comments: Both sectors offer relatively similar ranges of salary levels.

MEDICAL CARE

CODES	PUBLIC SECTOR	PRIVATE SECTOR
MED		
01	50 100	176 301
02	122 <u>233</u> 808	450 <u>549</u> 616
03	122	-
04	163 <u>237</u> 808	624 712
05	140 1.097	456 1.640
06	243	2.700 3.900
07	-	-
08	1.445	-

Comments: Overall, Private Sector pays higher.

PHARMACEUTICAL

CODES	PUBLIC SECTOR	PRIVATE SECTOR
PHA		
01	146 <u>233</u> 538	179 360
02	112 253	616 1.011

In general

According to widespread opinion, the Private Sector pays better and higher than the Public Sector; this is fairly true when considering the total reward package, including benefits and perquisites.

However, as far as Gross Base Salary is concerned, some nuances have to be considered. While the Private Sector offers higher salaries in Finance, HRM, Technical and Engineering, Medical Care and Pharmaceutical, this is less likely in other benchmarked disciplines where competition between sectors is quite large.

3.4.5 *Top salaries*

Gross base salaries at top management levels are predominantly higher in the Private Sector organisations, as shown in the following table.

Comparison has been established on the base of the following assumptions:

- Similar responsibility level
- Size of organisation/institution (staff > 300 and staff < 300).

In this respect, two categories of Top Managers have been identified:

- Top 01 (> 300 staff) & 02 (< 300 staff): CEO, COO, Managing Director in private organisations, compared to Grades E/F and G/H (Chief of Cabinet, Secretary General) in public services.
- Man(agers) 01 (> 300 staff organisations) & 02 (< 300 staff organisations): Direct reports of the latter and members of Management Team in private organisations, compared to General Director (2.II) and Director (3.II) in public services.

TOP

CODES	PUBLIC SECTOR	PRIVATE SECTOR
TOP 01	1.445 <u>1.897</u> 2.011	1.900 3.900
TOP 02	998 1660	1.301 2.072
MAN 01	669 <u>884</u> 1.216	982 <u>2.514</u> 4.340
MAN 02	485 1.058	752 <u>1.539</u> 3.600

NOTE: **PLANNING** positions have not been integrated in these tables as comparable data in the Private sector are non-existent.

4. Recommendations

4.1 On salaries

Recommendations must take into account the overall global HR Management context as all aspects involved in the management of human capital are interlinked and must be considered in order to properly and purposely develop advice and recommendations.

4.1.1 Recommendation 1: "Make the pay reform come true"

As mentioned earlier, the Pay Reform initiated in 2004 has not yet been fully implemented: job classification supported by job description process is underway; and pay structure founded on position levels, index steps from level to level, and salary progression steps (grades) within levels are not yet in place.

Foundation principles and proposed reward package including performance-related variable pay (bonus allocation) and benefits clearly reflect the current trends for a reward policy that is better adapted to new management approaches and to challenging work environments.

It is highly recommended to accelerate the reform in order to respond to major staff expectations that are highlighted in the analysis of the reasons for people to leave public organisations. The perspective of salary progression in the job – and thus not just through promotion (or resignation) – is a true motivating element for people to stay and to prove their engagement to public service.

It is also recommended that current differentiating factors (indexes) fixing pay levels between the various (types of) organisations progressively disappear, providing that a job evaluation approach takes actual differences, if any, into account (see also next recommendation).

4.1.2 Recommendation 2: "Re-visit internal competition phenomenon"

The coexistence of different indexes (250, 270, 300, 400, 500), fixing salary levels for various specific categories of public organisations, encourages moves and transfers to more favourable pay environment. In itself this phenomenon must not be considered a negative one as it is a way for employees to improve their financial resources while remaining in the public services and possibly accomplishing more interesting jobs.

However, this situation is developing a kind of a ranking between the best-paying organisations and those which pay less well, thus emptying the one structure to the benefit of the other. On a mid/long-term perspective, this has a perverse impact on organisation effectiveness and attractiveness.

It should be recommended, as yet mentioned, that this aspect be treated, through job evaluation and classification systems, as a real, appropriately regulated/structured and properly monitored career opportunity process. The move from a diversified – and somewhat complicated – system to a "unique" pay policy proposition is most advisable in order to clarify the process, not only in terms of management but also for beneficiaries.

4.1.3 Recommendation 3: "Compare need for salary increase"

As already underlined, this type of exercise – comparative study on salaries – raises a common expectation that salaries will be reviewed – meaning increased.

The Terms of Reference explicitly envisage different scenarios (0%, +10%, +15%). These hypotheses are purely arithmetic approaches, (too) simple options and, at the end of the day, possibly irresponsible.

This present study has specifically demonstrated that:

- Salary is not the only factor for retention (currently, departures)
- Other Human Resources Management tools and processes may very effectively substitute sole monetary dispositions
- The salary reforms contain encouraging elements to attract, retain, and motivate people
- Some types of jobs position themselves favourably on the salary market, some not
- Other options may be envisaged to develop attractive reward package (a.o. benefits).

This being said, attention should be paid to critical expertise and professional “families” such as Finance, Human Resources Management, Technical & Engineering, Information & Communication Technologies, Medical Care, where private sector organisations appear to be very competitive. *The first recommendation here would be to carefully (re)position those disciplines within the job grading/classification framework of the public sector, where they may be “undervalued”, which is a currently widely spread phenomenon in every organisation where these somehow “emerging” metiers are not (yet) properly recognized. The second recommendation would again turn to actual implementation of one of the fundamental principles of the Pay Reform, i.e. salary progression through “grade related scale”.*

4.1.4 Recommendation 4: “Develop Benefits allocation”

Private Sector organisations are widely calling upon benefits as a very effective reward “competitive edge” vis-à-vis the Public Sector.

By doing so, these organisations also effectively contribute to the global welfare in the country, providing their staff with palatable support to medical expenses (there are people who would not go to the doctor because they cannot afford it! Or fear that they could be exposed to additional unaffordable expenses, see also recommendation 10), life insurance, comfort dispositions after professional career (pension schemes), (far) above State legal contribution (Social Security).

Entering into these considerations imply an in-depth analysis of cost – and affordability – consequences, supported by expert studies (e.g. actuarial analyses, regulatory framework), for which this mission is not commissioned.

Recommendation 4 addresses the need to initiate studies and analyses in order to examine the feasibility of integrating progressively – and preferably in the above-mentioned priority ranking - benefits in the Public Sector reward package.

4.1.5 Recommendation 5: “Gradually introduce variable pay system”

Introduction of variable – non-recurrent – pay supplements, linked to collective and/or individual performance, is progressively developing in private organisations as an effective motivational element.

One could argue for this by saying that public services are generally non profit organisations where tangible – say quantitative – financial results are absent, waving away the possibility of introducing a “bonus/gratification linked performance system”. This is not true.

Qualitative criteria/objectives may also be measured and be practically incorporated in this kind of system (see also paragraph 2.3.2). Potential measurable parameters/objectives must be legion in the State Strategic Plan 2020.

It is recommended to initiate reflection and a tentative action plan in order to develop a performance related variable pay system (also addressed in the Pay Reform) as a motivator for staff and a strong support to achievement of State/Public Sector objectives.

This could be progressively achieved in the different “layers” of public servants, starting preferably with top management staff. An envelope of 10% of annual gross salary could be initially envisaged.

4.1.6 Recommendation 6: “Re-visit Statutory vs. Contractual pay disparity”

As in many other countries in the world, the co-existence of statutory and contractual agents and related pay disparity is a permanent source of demotivation and dissatisfaction. This situation will probably persist.

Although we do not have statistical information on how significant this phenomenon - although actual - is in Rwandan Administration, we may recommend to forcefully integrate both systems within the new Pay Reform salary scale and, by so doing, progressively erase disparities.

4.1.7 Recommendation 7: "Address cautiously the Cost of Living problem"

Adapt salary scales to the evolution of the Cost of Living: this is one topic mentioned in the Terms of Reference.

A structured official system, regularly if not permanently, adapting salary levels to the evolution of the cost of living has led Belgium – in both Public AND Private Sectors – to be the country where manpower/human capital is one of the most – not to say the most – expensive in the world. This means that investors hesitate to invest in Belgium and some of those already in place withdraw (the automotive assembling activity sector's recent turmoil is the most significant evidence today) because legal dispositions foresee a general salary increase of 2%, when there is a well predetermined Cost of Living index trigger effect. What might then happen in countries where the inflation rate is counted in thousands of percent?

It is thus strongly recommended to consider very prudently any official attempt to formalise/legalise adaptation to the cost of living. This does not mean that this aspect be eliminated; a carefully well-structured and monitored system by MINECOFIN and National Statistics Board is recommended; though review of "household basket" on the base of well-identified parameters, integration of external/internal economic criteria, time scale (every year, every two years,...) have to be considered.

4.1.8 Recommendation 8: "Address cautiously scarcity problems"

When hiring expertise or professions that are scarce in the recruitment market, temptation is to manage by exception and, inevitably, make decisions that on a long-term base may jeopardise equity in salary management and lead to frustration (when amounts of exceptions and precedents are piling up).

It is recommended, firstly to resist "inflaters" and secondly to integrate specific requests into the possibilities of the salary scale, e.g. by recruiting at a (one) higher progression grade.

4.1.9 Recommendation 9: "Enhance professionalism of HRM staff"

It is obvious – this is not a value judgment but a factual statement – that there is an evident need – and possibly aim – to professionalise Human Resources Management.

To break the image of poor management, it is critical that somewhere in the structure of public services, a "body" should centrally identify issues and needs, investigate on causes and possible remedies, propose structured and adapted solutions, establish and monitor subsequent policies, communicate and disclose information, and organise training programmes to instil human resources management principles throughout the organisation(s). This is a long lasting permanent process that needs a structure and a duly scheduled action plan.

4.1.10 Recommendation 10: "Pay attention to (very) low salary levels"

This chapter addresses a much critical issue on a much broader scale.

For the lower layers of the working and industrious population, money – and thus salary – is a daily issue. Permanent confrontation with lack of financial resources to meet elementary/alimentary needs and, nonetheless, expressed aims to improve life conditions and professional capacities are issues or challenges that have to be considered.

The establishment of a minimum salary level and supportive dispositions (e.g. educational funds dedicated to support/encourage professional promotion) are examples of measures that could be envisaged, where the State may play a prominent and rather appreciated role.

4.2 On other retention favourable actions

a). Ensure that a system is established whereby each ministry/public service body provides, on an annual basis, to MIFOTRA and the National Statistics Board (a) the numbers of people who have left the organisation (b) where they have gone to (private sector, transfer to other government body, self-employment, resignation/re-employment in the public sector, other (education, emigration, unknown).

b). A training needs analysis focusing on general management questions, and the implementation of its recommendations.

c). The setting up of a performance appraisal system based on management by objectives principles and training a wide range of public service employees in using and managing such a system.

d). The use of the performance appraisal system mentioned above to inform and manage objective promotion procedures (which will themselves need to be established, and people trained in their use).

5. Conclusions

On leavers and retention, the conclusions are that

- Leaving rates (given the very small sample) are not generally too high, if transfers and resignation/re-employment in the public sector are taken into account
- Some institutions have a higher leaving rate than others, and the reasons for this should be investigated further
- Leaving rates seem to be high in certain areas – finance, accounting, audit, IT and HR management
- Reasons for leaving are divided fairly evenly between poor terms and conditions, poor management (of various types), and lack of career prospects.

On salaries, the conclusions are that

- a) The first objective of this assignment is to provide authorities with information in terms of salary comparison between public and private sectors pay practices.

Because time allocation has been poor for such an effort, the experts have deliberately limited themselves to simple confrontation of facts and figures – mainly figures – that have revealed what stakeholders might have expected, although conclusion, if any on this aspect, does not lead to significant or dramatic and overwhelming findings in terms of difference(s) in the first place:

- Pay Reform contains all ingredients – although still improvable – of good pay governance
- Salary differences between public and private are not subject to generalised concern all along the line
- Some critical professional disciplines are underpaid as opposed to those in private organisations (Finance, ICT, HRM,...)
- Benefits constitute the gap between private and public pay practices
- Low pay levels raise primary need concerns.

On the other hand, it would have been interesting, and probably critical, to dedicate (more) time to explore the fundamentals of the Pay Reform, even if not backed up by long lasting implementation and practice, and compare them with the external pay/reward world in both quantitative (figures) and in qualitative (“technical” structure) ways. Just to look and confirm whether the reform is leading in the right direction and towards recommendations on changes, improvement, and amendments, if and where appropriate.

- b) The intermediary conclusions and recommendations, thus, are that:

- No general – and blindly applied – increase of salaries should occur
- Close attention should be paid to some critical professional disciplines in terms of fair (re)positioning in the “scale of values” – classification – of jobs, and, consequently, salary scale
- Benefits – primarily those in direct relationship with welfare, e.g. medical coverage and pension schemes - should be progressively introduced
- Stimulating variable pay incentives might be envisaged in order to motivate and retain critical layers of public administration population, e.g. upper and middle management levels
- Internal pay differences should disappear in favour of better positioning in the new pay system, if justified
- Low salary levels be selectively reviewed
- Last but not least, the Pay Reform should undergo a final technical check and be the object of a well structured and tightly scheduled implementation plan.

On retention actions other than salary/benefits, the following is suggested:

- A complete and comprehensive database of leavers from the public sector (including leavers (with their fields of specialisation) for the private sector, transfers,

leavers who resign and are re-employed, and leavers who have been made redundant) should be started and kept for at least three years. Without this, any conclusions about the overall leaving rate will remain anecdotal

- An effort to improve general HR management at all levels
- Institutionalisation of performance appraisal based on management by objectives principles
- Institutionalisation of performance-based promotion procedures which should be transparent and open.

ANNEX 1 – List of participants/comparators

PUBLIC ESTABLISHMENTS	BNR CSR AGO RRA RITA Unité & Réconciliation Droits de l'Homme NTB CEPEX Presirep KIST UNR KIE IRST Parquet Général Court Suprême Minecofin Primature Sénat Minicom Minaffet Mifotra District GASABO Primary School Teachers/ Secondary School Teachers Hospital (CHK – KIGABAGA) HIDA Electrogaz	
PROJECTS	Education III Global Funds Projects Institutional Support to Directorate of Roads & Bridges Pedercieu	Mineduc Minisanité Mininfra Minaloc
PRIVATE SECTOR	BCR BK Cogebanque UBP Fair Construction Strabag Roko Novotel Serena Hotel Bralirwa Total Kobil Stippag Sonarwa Soras MTN Rwandacel Rwandatel Intersec K/K Security Deloitte & Touch Onatracom SDV Compulec MFI NewTimes Teledis	Bank Bank Bank Bank Construction Construction Construction Horeca Horeca Industry + Retail Industry + Retail Industry + Retail Industry + ... Insurance Insurance Telecom Telecom Security Security Advise Transportation Transportation IT IT Media/Press Media/Press

	King Fayçal Hospital	Health
INTERNATIONAL & DIPLOMATIC INSTITUTIONS	SNV	NGO
	Care International	NGO
	Oxfam UK	NGO
	World Vision	NGO
	British Embassy	Diplomatic Corps
	Dutch Embassy	Diplomatic Corps
	American Embassy	Diplomatic Corps
	UNDP	UN agency
	WHO	UN agency
	UNHCR	UN agency

ANNEX 2 – List of benchmark positions with definitions

GENERIC

Type of Activity	Positions	Description
Accounting		
ACC 01	Teller	In charge of simple tasks: collecting and registering in coming and outgoing documents; checking figures through basic arithmetic functions. Use of calculator.
ACC 02	Bookkeeper	In charge of basic accounting processes and principles, achieving primary writing activities.
ACC 03	Accountant	In charge of accounting operations following accounting plan principles with some room for interpretation.
ACC 04	Expert Accountant	In charge of accounting operations diverse by nature and somewhat complex in content requiring interpretation capabilities and thorough knowledge of accounting practices.
ACC 05	Chief Accountant	Same as level above completed by supervisory role on accounting team and backed up by thorough command of accounting theories and principles.
Audit		
AUD 01	Junior Auditor	In charge of auditing operations that are simple by nature and content. Strict application of rules and procedures.
AUD 02	Auditor (seasoned)	In charge of diverse auditing operations that are complex by nature and possibly covering wide administrative domains. Room for interpretation and selection of appropriate solutions.
AUD 03	Senior Auditor	In charge of critical auditing operations that are complex in nature and content backed up by wide experience in various administrative and operational domains as well as by in depth knowledge of auditing mechanisms and principles.
AUD 04	Head Audit	Same as level above completed by supervisory role on Auditors' team. Possibly in charge of sensitive matters.
Finance		
FIN 01	Financial Analyst	In charge of specific assignments in various financial domains requiring analytical and interpretative capacities in identifying issues and ways to solutions.
FIN 02	Financial Advisor	In charge of multi faceted and critical assignments encompassing clear identification of issues and challenges, wide interpretative skills and recognised capacity to lead to appropriate solutions.
FIN 03	Controller	In charge of budgeting operations integrating es-

Type of Activity	Positions	Description
FIN 04	Treasurer	<p>establishment of forecasts, achievement of all budget phases and techniques and implementation of follow up/monitoring and correction procedures. Wide knowledge and experience of budgeting practices and state of the art. Broad analytical and interpretative skills.</p> <p>In charge of financial resources and monetary flows/operations integrating establishment of treasury forecasts and timetables and implementation of monitoring procedures. Knowledge of cash management practices requiring analytical and interpretative skills.</p>
FIN 05	Finance Manager	In charge of global financial department encompassing all abovementioned operations and activities and integrating leadership and coordinative skills together with analytical and interpretative capacities impacting on organisation's activities and mid/long term perspectives.
FIN 06		<i>Dependent on organisation scope and size, two different levels may be identified.</i>
Logistics		
LOG 01	Driver	In charge of carrying people or goods in optimum conditions in terms of time and safety. <i>This definition is worth for drivers being employed in other services/departments of organisations.</i>
LOG 02	Transport Specialist	In charge of planning/scheduling logistic activities, providing administrative and procedural support to internal/external workforces, negotiating transport contracts with external suppliers, caring for service and cost effectiveness.
LOG 03		<i>Dependent on organisation scope and size, a <u>Supervisory level</u> may be identified.</i>
Procurement		
PRO 01	Administrative Assistant	In charge of administrative tasks with regard to procurement activities, requiring a basic practical knowledge of somewhat diversified procedures under close supervision.
PRO 02	Purchaser	In charge of ensuring basic acquisition of goods and/or services within well defined procedures and supply schedule. Some room for interpretation and adapted solutions.
PRO 03	Buyer	In charge of acquiring goods and/or services that are considered critical for the organisation and its purposes. This encompasses identification of appropriate material/service, selection of best suppliers, negotiations at best conditions and final contracting, requiring compliance with procedural and financial constraints and optimisation skills all along the process.
PRO 04	Procurement Offi-	<i>Dependent on size and scope of organisations to-</i>

Type of Activity	Positions	Description
PRO 05	cer/Mgr	<i>gether with complexity of material/goods, two levels of Buyers may be envisaged.</i> Same attributions than previous level completed by supervisory and coordinative role. <i>Same comments as above.</i>
Planning		
PLA 01	Planning Assistant	In charge of administrative tasks with regard to planning activities (technical operations, engineering related activities, sales & marketing, Administration) requiring a basic practical knowledge of somewhat diversified procedures under close supervision.
PLA 02	Planner/Planning Officer	In charge of planning activities from identification/forecasting of needs and constraints to full scheduling of activities in specific department or service, requiring significant coordinative – and somehow negotiating – skills and anticipative capacity.
PLA 03		<i>Dependent on size and scope of organisation, a <u>Supervisory level</u> may be identified.</i>
Communication		
COM 01	Communication Agent	In charge of administrative tasks with regard to communication/PR activities requiring a seasoned knowledge of somewhat diversified practices and professional codes.
COM 02	PR/Communication Officer	In charge of coordinating and organizing communication and/or PR activities integrating financial dimension, care for image and solid knowledge of professional practices, requiring initiative, negotiating skills with possible suppliers, common sense and cautious approach.
Statistics		
STA 01	Statistic Assistant	In charge of administration and treatment of qualitative/quantitative information/data requiring practical knowledge of statistical rules and principles, analytical skills and capacity to issue valuable results under supervision.
STA 02	Statistician	In charge of issuing optimal translation of situations, trends, phenomena and quantitative data related to organisation whether from internal origins or from external environment (economic, social, technical, financial, political,...) requiring thorough knowledge of statistical science and laws, strong extrapolative and analytical capacities in issuing understandable and valuable information.
HR Management		
HRM 01	Salary Admin. Agent	In charge of collecting and treating individual salary information under appropriate format and following procedures, rules and legal prescriptions under close supervision.

Type of Activity	Positions	Description
HRM 02	Salary Admin. Officer/Mgr	In charge of supervision of all salary operations. Coordinative role based on thorough expertise of legal and procedural framework and on accurate treatment of facts and figures together with demonstrated communication skills. <i>Dependent of size and scope of organization, two levels may be considered.</i>
HRM 03	HR Advisor	In charge of providing advise and operational services on specific aspects of HR management (recruitment, training and development, organisation,...). Position requiring a high degree of analytical/interpretative skills and careful identification of issues leading to pertinent and realistic solutions.
HRM 04	HR Manager	In charge of leading and supervising all HR management activities and processes requiring thorough knowledge and experience in the field together with high degree of anticipation competencies, analytical and negotiation skills . <i>Dependent on size and scope of organisation, two levels may be considered.</i>
HRM 05		
Legal		
<i>On many aspects, legal advisory environment relates to expert/specialist activities, whether in an "operational" organisation context or as "independent" workforce. Both are considered here and in the "expert" list.</i>		
LEG 01	Legal Advisor I (Junior/Assistant)	First "entry" level in expertise career path. In charge of administrative activities with regard to situations implying regulatory/legal implications. Clear identification of issues and analytical skills are required. Close supervision.
LEG 02	Legal Advisor II (seasoned expert)	Second level in career path. In charge of matters related to specific legal domain(s) requiring thorough knowledge and expertise, analytical skills and capacity to select appropriate approaches and solutions.
LEG 03	Legal Advisor III (Senior Expert)	Third level in career path. In charge of critical and complex matters in specific and/or wider (e.g; international) legal domains requiring in depth knowledge and experience as well as strong analytical, interpretative and communication skills.
Administration		
ADM 01	Administrative Agent	In charge of somewhat diversified administrative tasks requiring order, simple selective skills and strict compliance to work instructions/processes and procedures under close supervision.
ADM 02	Copy Room Agent	In charge of reprography tasks requiring good working skills in using equipment under strict instructions and schedule.
ADM 03	Courier	In charge of collecting and dispatching mail and circulating documents under strict instructions and

Type of Activity	Positions	Description
ADM 04	Typist	scheduling. In charge of typing tasks under strict instructions and close supervision.
ADM 05	Assistant Secretary	In charge of somewhat diverse secretarial activities supportive of a specific service/sector.
ADM 06	Secretary	In charge of diversified secretarial activities supportive of large services/departments.
Technical operations/ Engineering		
<i>In many ways, <u>engineering</u> activities may relate whether to operational/"in the field" domains or to specific expertise and advisory activities; both aspects are addressed here.</i>		
ENG 01	Technician I (Assistant)	This level considers positions that need a basic apprenticeship background in technical domains: electricity, mechanics, electronics. In charge of simple technical tasks based on strict instructions, working practices and under close supervision.
ENG 02	Technician II	This level requires technical educational background in specific abovementioned domain. In charge of achieving technical tasks on the base of good professional skills under instructions and close supervision.
ENG 03	Head Technicians	In charge of planning, organising and controlling team work and technical activities requiring practical analytical, interpretative and human relations skills.
ENG 04	Draughtsman	In charge of drafting plans and documents using specific equipment. Demonstrated knowledge and experience in domain.
ENG 05	Engineer I	In charge of projects limited in size requiring analytical, interpretative skills, planning capacities and ability to propose and implement realistic solutions following procedures, working best practices and under close supervision.
ENG 06	Engineer II	In charge of large diversified projects requiring solid analytical interpretative and integrative skills and thorough knowledge and experience in technical domain(s) under broad supervision.
ENG 07	Head Engineering	Supervisory role integrating demonstrated skills in planning, organising and controlling engineering activities that are diverse in content and wide in size and scope.
ENG 08		<i>Dependent on the latter and considering position in organisation, one higher level (<u>Engineering Director</u>) may be identified.</i>

EXPERT/SPECIALIST

Type of Activity	Positions	Description
Medical Care		
MED 01	Nurse Assistant	No specialized educational background. Work essentially based on good care practices based on strict procedures and under qualified nurse's supervision.
MED 02	Nurse	Specialized educational background. In charge of caring for and help patients through specific well defined tasks within defined procedures and under medical instructions and close supervision.
MED 03	Head Nurses	In charge of planning, organizing and controlling day to day nursing activities within defined procedures and under medical instructions and broad supervision.
MED 04	Medical Doctor	Commonly designated "Generalist" exercising medical acts through diagnostic, preventive, curative advice and prescription, usually at home, in clinics and Health Centers.
MED 05	Medical Specialist	Commonly designated "Specialist" exercising medical – and possibly surgery - acts in a specialised domain through diagnostic, preventive, curative advice and prescription and also through surgery interventions in hospital environment.
MED 06	Head Medical Department/Registrar	Supervision and organisation of a specific department in hospital environment. Planning, leadership and communication skills required.
MED 07	Director Hospital	Supervision and organisation of an hospital unit, encompassing administrative, legal, financial and resources responsibilities and requiring organisational, leadership, interpretative and human relations skills.
MED 08	Director Teaching Hospital	Same as level above on wider scale and broader diversity of activities and with educational/pedagogic vocation.
Pharmacy		
PHA 01	Assistant Pharmacist (also "Laborantin")	In charge of basic pharmaceutical acts and of preparatory work of specific medications under magisterial prescriptions within strict instructions and under close supervision.
PHA 02	Pharmacist	In charge of diversified pharmaceutical acts requiring in depth knowledge and experience of professional practices and medical care environment.
PHA 03	Head Pharmacists	Where required by organisation. Supervisory and organisational role.
Legal		

<i>See comments in the "Generic" scale.</i>		
LEG 01	Lawyer I (Junior/Assistant Lawyer)	See description in "Generic" list
LEG 02	Lawyer II (Seasoned Expert)	Id.
LEG 03	Lawyer III (Senior Expert)	Id.
Agronomy		
<i>See also comments for "Engineering" positions in "Generic" scale.</i>		
AGR 01	Agronomic Engineer Assistant	In charge of supportive activities in various projects/ research processes requiring high level educational background and some experience in research and project environment.
AGR 02	Agronomic Engineer I	In charge of specific (research) projects limited in size and scope requiring analytical, interpretative skills, organisational capacities and ability to propose realistic solutions within professional practices and principles.
AGR 03	Agronomic Engineer II	In charge of large scale and diversified (research) projects requiring solid analytical, interpretative and integrative skills and thorough knowledge and experience in agronomic domain.
AGR 04		<i>Dependent on size and scope of organization a supervisory level (Head Agronomic Department) may be considered.</i>
ICT		
<i>IT positions may be considered as well in an operational –say "Generic" role as in an "Expertise" role. This aspect has to be integrated while positioning jobs.</i>		
ICT 01	IT Assistant	In charge of simple IT activities/operations requiring practical knowledge and good apprenticeship of basic IT processes and techniques under strict instructions and close supervision.
ICT 02	IT Specialist I	Professional educational background. In charge of specific IT activities: programming, installation, maintenance and operative use of IT equipment/devices.
ICT 03	IT Specialist II	Professional educational background. In charge of a wide range of IT activities and sophisticated hard- and software resources. Thorough knowledge and experience in the field.
ICT 04	Head IT	Supervisory role requiring planning, organisation, controlling and human relations skills as well as an in depth knowledge of IT quickly evolving environment.
ICT 05		<i>Dependent on size and scope of organisation, an additional supervisory role may be identified.</i>
Education		
EDU 01	Teacher I ("Educator")	Secondary School educational level. Knowledge of basic pedagogic principles and practices are required.
EDU 02	Teacher II (Primary school)	Specific educational background. Good knowledge of global educational package and pedagogic principles/practices

EDU 03	Teacher III (Secondary school)	Specific educational background in specialised domain. In depth knowledge of specialty and pedagogic principles/practices.
EDU 04	Director Primary School	Supervisory and organisational role encompassing "technical" (educational), financial and resources management responsibilities.
EDU 05	Director Secondary School	Same as previous level on broader and more diversified scale.
EDU 06	Professor (University)	University degree and in depth knowledge and expertise in a specialized domain.
EDU 07	Director University (Recteur) or equivalent education institution	Supervisory and organisational role encompassing educational, financial and resources management responsibilities and skills. Anticipative and responsive capacity vis à vis social/demographic evolution. "Authority" in dealing with governmental institutions on education perspectives and resources.
Architecture/Urbanism		
<i>Same scaling process as for Engineers may be used here.</i>		
ARC 01	Architect I/ Urbanist I	See Engineer I
ARC 02	Architect II/ Urbanist II	See Engineer II
ARC 03	Head Architects	See Head Engineering
ARC 04		<i>Additional position "Director Architecture/Urbanism Department" may be considered.</i>
Others		
<i>Other expertise domains may be considered: Seismology, Demography, Meteorology, Geography,...</i>		
<i>They will be integrated in the Survey if and when suitable and under same approach as yet listed specialties.</i>		
OTH...		

ANNEX 3 – Job evaluation grid

CODE NR:	JOB TITLE:		DEPARTMENT:	
KNOWLEDGE, ABILITIES EXPERIENCE	PRACTICE 1 2 3 4 5	THEORY 6 7 8 9 10	GLOBAL SCOPE 11 12 13 14 15	
INTERRELATION	INFORMATION 1 2 3 4 5	MOTIVATION 6 7 8 9 10	INFLUENCE 11 12 13 14 15	
COMPLEXITY & CREATIVE THINKING	APPLICATION 1 2 3 4 5	INTERPRETATION 6 7 8 9 10	CONCEPTION 11 12 13 14 15	
DECISION MAKING	COMPLIANCE 1 2 3 4 5	CHOICE/OPTION 6 7 8 9 10	OPTIMISATION 11 12 13 14 15	
RESPONSIBILITY SCOPE	EXECUTION 1 2 3 4 5	LEADERSHIP 6 7 8 9 10	ORGANISATION 11 12 13 14 15	
ACCOUNTABILITY SCOPE	OPERATION 1 2 3 4 5	TACTIC 6 7 8 9 10	STRATEGY 11 12 13 14 15	
RESOURCES SCOPE	NONE	MEDIUM 1 2 3 4	VAST 5 6 7 8	
TOTAL POINTS				

Rwanda Job Evaluation Method

PRINCIPLES

The Job Evaluation Methodology is based on the following principles:

- 1) A series of objective parameters/criteria that can be identified – and measured – in every job, in every type of activity, in every economic sector, all over the world.
- 2) A capacity to differentiate between the importance of each criteria in various jobs through a measurement scale integrating various well-defined levels and points per level.

This is how the following “evaluation grid” is constructed; as such, it has been used extensively and successfully in both the Romanian and Albanian Public – and Private – Sectors.

EXPLANATION

The Evaluation grid components are:

a) Seven objective parameters/criteria:

- KNOWLEDGE, ABILITIES, EXPERIENCE:
The total of knowledge, capacities/capabilities, and experience that have been

acquired through education, practice in the field, training and development programmes and that are necessary to perform a job in a satisfactory way.

- INTERRELATION:
The capacity necessary to obtain results in the job through the quality of relationship with others within the domain of activity.
- COMPLEXITY & CREATIVE THINKING:
The ability to identify, analyse, and appropriately solve problems met when performing the job, taking into account that problems develop different degrees of complexity and that solutions are more or less available.
- DECISION MAKING:
The extent to which the organisation, its functioning modes, and management processes allow for decision making capacity in the job.
- RESPONSIBILITY SCOPE:
The necessary capacity needed in the job to plan, organize, and control dedicated activities and/or – when appropriate – those of subordinate positions.
- ACCOUNTABILITY SCOPE:
The results that are expected from the job and that are measured in terms of impact on the organisation's overall results and degree of influence on dedicated resources.
- RESOURCES SCOPE dedicated to the job (headcounts, operating costs, budget,...).

b) A point scale (15 points) subdivided in three levels

Most positions in an organisation are divided into three types:

- Those mostly performing practical tasks in the field and, overall, designated as "execution" jobs; this is the "PRACTICE" level.
- Those jobs that are referring to "theoretical" concepts, mostly acquired through higher education; this is the "THEORY" level.
- Those positions that embrace broad domains of the organisation, not to mention the whole organisation; this is the "GLOBAL SCOPE" level.

The other levels mentioned in the grid are deducted, criterion by criterion, from this primary distinction that affects the first parameter (KNOWLEDGE).

The point scale branches out into 15 different point echelons (five possibilities per level) that allow for some subjective judgement, depending on the complexity and diversity of the organisations, departments, services, and job content.

The following examples are purely explanatory and not reflecting a general evaluation pattern.

		JOB EVALUATION GRID				
CODE NR:	JOB TITLE: CASHIER				DEPARTMENT:	
KNOWLEDGE, ABILITIES EXPERIENCE	PRACTICE 1 2 3 4 5		THEORY 6 7 8 9 10		GLOBAL SCOPE 11 12 13 14 15 4	
INTERRELATION	INFORMATION 1 2 3 4 5		MOTIVATION 6 7 8 9 10		INFLUENCE 11 12 13 14 15 3	
COMPLEXITY&CREATIVE THINKING	APPLICATION 1 2 3 4 5		INTERPRETATION 6 7 8 9 10		CONCEPTION 11 12 13 14 15 4	
DECISION MAKING	COMPLIANCE 1 2 3 4 5		CHOICE/OPTION 6 7 8 9 10		OPTIMISATION 11 12 13 14 15 4	
RESPONSIBILITY SCOPE	EXECUTION 1 2 3 4 5		LEADERSHIP 6 7 8 9 10		ORGANISATION 11 12 13 14 15 4	
ACCOUNTABILITY SCOPE	OPERATION 1 2 3 4 5		TACTIC 6 7 8 9 10		STRATEGY 11 12 13 14 15 4	
RESOURCES SCOPE	NONE		MEDIUM 1 2 3 4		VAST 5 6 7 8 1	

TOTAL POINTS: 24

**JOB EVALUATION
GRID**

CODE NR:	JOB TITLE: DRIVER		DEPARTMENT:	
KNOWLEDGE, ABILITIES EXPERIENCE	PRACTICE 1 2 3 4 5	THEORY 6 7 8 9 10	GLOBAL SCOPE 11 12 13 14 15	3
INTERRELATION	INFORMATION 1 2 3 4 5	MOTIVATION 6 7 8 9 10	INFLUENCE 11 12 13 14 15	3
COMPLEXITY&CREATIVE THINKING	APPLICATION 1 2 3 4 5	INTERPRETATION 6 7 8 9 10	CONCEPTION 11 12 13 14 15	3
DECISION MAKING	COMPLIANCE 1 2 3 4 5	CHOICE/OPTION 6 7 8 9 10	OPTIMISATION 11 12 13 14 15	3
RESPONSIBILITY SCOPE	EXECUTION 1 2 3 4 5	LEADERSHIP 6 7 8 9 10	ORGANISATION 11 12 13 14 15	2
ACCOUNTABILITY SCOPE	OPERATION 1 2 3 4 5	TACTIC 6 7 8 9 10	STRATEGY 11 12 13 14 15	2
RESOURCES SCOPE	NONE	MEDIUM 1 2 3 4	VAST 5 6 7 8	0

TOTAL POINTS: 16

**JOB EVALUATION
GRID**

CODE NR:	JOB TITLE: GENERAL DIRECTOR		DEPARTMENT:	
KNOWLEDGE, ABILITIES EXPERIENCE	PRACTICE 1 2 3 4 5	THEORY 6 7 8 9 10	GLOBAL SCOPE 11 12 13 14 15	14
INTERRELATION	INFORMATION 1 2 3 4 5	MOTIVATION 6 7 8 9 10	INFLUENCE 11 12 13 14 15	13
COMPLEXITY&CREATIVE THINKING	APPLICATION 1 2 3 4 5	INTERPRETATION 6 7 8 9 10	CONCEPTION 11 12 13 14 15	13
DECISION MAKING	COMPLIANCE 1 2 3 4 5	CHOICE/OPTION 6 7 8 9 10	OPTIMISATION 11 12 13 14 15	12
RESPONSIBILITY SCOPE	EXECUTION 1 2 3 4 5	LEADERSHIP 6 7 8 9 10	ORGANISATION 11 12 13 14 15	12
ACCOUNTABILITY SCOPE	OPERATION 1 2 3 4 5	TACTIC 6 7 8 9 10	STRATEGY 11 12 13 14 15	12
RESOURCES SCOPE	NONE	MEDIUM 1 2 3 4	VAST 5 6 7 8	6

TOTAL POINTS: 82

ANNEX 4 – Salary management data collection check list

ORGANISATION CODE :

Salary structure

1) Grading Structure : YES/NO

If YES : short description of basic principles (Job Descriptions, Job Evaluation method,...)

2) Salary structure principles: YES/NO

If YES: short description of basic principles (number of grades, salary references, span of salaries in grades, progression principles,...)

Base salary

3) Contractual conditions:

Entry level: YES/NO

Annual base: month x 12: YES/NO
x 13: YES/NO
x....

Progression: Age: YES/NO
Seniority: YES/NO
Other (Describe):

4) Performance related pay system: YES/NO

If YES: short description of basic principles (objective setting, measurement criteria, levels,...)

5) Promotion system: Short description of promotion working processes (when does it occur, how does it happen, what are the salary consequences, how do they apply,...)

Variable pay (bonusses, premiums, non recurrent pay complements)

List and describe:

- 1) _____
- 2) _____
- 3) _____

Benefits

List and describe (mention any differentiation amongst beneficiaries – e.g. between managers and other categories -):

- 1) _____
- 2) _____
- 3) _____
- 4) _____

Perquisites

List and describe (mention any differentiation amongst beneficiaries)

- 1) _____
- 2) _____
- 3) _____
- 4) _____
- 5) _____

Miscellaneous

Comments

ANNEX 5 – Salary data comparison by benchmark (type of) positions

GENERIC

Accountancy

BASE SALARY - accountancy

CODES	PUBSEC 1	PUBSEC 2	PUBSEC 3	PUBSEC 4	PUBSEC 5	PUBSEC 01	PUBSEC 17	PUBSEC 19	PROJ	PRI 01	PRI 02	PRI 03	PRI 04	PRI 07	PRI 08	PRI 09	PRI 10	PRI 11
ACC01	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	150.000	-	-	190.361	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ACC02	-	180.068	-	-	-	-	125.679	290.000	-	350.000	392.499	250.000	236.740 339.176	150.000	158.000	166.010	176.709	297.399
ACC03	281.090	281.090	-	449.744	467.893	-	254.893	400.000	269.291	-	503.123	451.000	403.904	-	208.000	200.000	415.349	398.660
ACC04	337.096	-	-	-	562.180	-	-	-	596.796	500.000	744.666	600.000	561.067	-	320.000	422.720	485.089	470.922
ACC05	669.938	-	582.314	-	-	-	305.679	650.000	869.355	-	1.306.471	-	698.501	-	404.000	-	644.452	839.787

CODES	PRI 14	PRI 15	PRI 16	PRI 17	PRI 18	PRI 19	PRI 20	PRI 21	PRI 23	PRI 24	PRI 25	PRI 26	PRI 27	INT 01	INT 02	INT 03	INT 04	INT 07
ACC01	-	91.206	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ACC02	171.277	170.274	531.000	418.000	-	-	-	150.000	192.408	250.000	-	123.000	179.283	-	-	-	372.869	-
ACC03	304.865	297.528	792.000	547.000	-	-	210.000	254.000	245.254	-	-	176.000	-	-	-	-	541.406	418.844
ACC04	354.595	304.000	855.000	764.000	-	-	-	396.500	-	-	-	-	669.231	-	-	354.334	697.087	631.557
ACC05	518.172	456.000	1.720.000	997.000	425.194	-	-	-	-	600.000	-	-	-	-	-	474.142	1.084.721	-

ACC01: Teller
 ACC02: Bookkeeper/Cashier
 ACC03: Accountant
 ACC04: Expert accountant
 ACC05: Chief accountant

Audit

BASE SALARY - audit

CODES	PUBSEC 1	PUBSEC 2	PUBSEC 3	PUBSEC 4	PUBSEC 5	PUBSEC 01	PUBSEC 17	PUBSEC 19	PROJ	PRI 01	PRI 02	PRI 03	PRI 04	PRI 07	PRI 08	PRI 09	PRI 10	PRI 11
AUD01	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
AUD02	281.090	281.090	-	-	-	-	305.679	400.000	-	350.000	768.356	450.000	458.311	-	-	-	549.119	-
AUD03	337.096	-	-	449.744	562.180	701.146	-	-	-	500.000	858.257	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
AUD04	485.262	404.444	-	-	808.888	773.391	-	-	-	700.000	968.348	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

CODES	PRI 14	PRI 15	PRI 16	PRI 17	PRI 18	PRI 19	PRI 20	PRI 21	PRI 23	PRI 24	PRI 25	PRI 26	PRI 27	INT 01	INT 02	INT 03	INT 04
AUD01	-	-	-	-	-	-	150.000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
AUD02	280.000	-	-	-	-	-	200.000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	697.087
AUD03	-	-	1.096.363	-	-	-	300.000	396.500	-	-	-	-	804.694	-	-	-	-
AUD04	522.000	304.175	1.347.931	-	-	-	450.000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.084.721
							650.000										
							800.000										
							900.000										

AUD01: Junior auditor
 AUD02: Auditor (seasoned)
 AUD03: Senior auditor
 AUD04: Head audit

Finance

BASE SALARY - finance

CODES	PUBSEC 1	PUBSEC 2	PUBSEC 3	PUBSEC 4	PUBSEC 5	PUBSEC 01	PUBSEC 17	PUBSEC 19	PROJ	PRI 01	PRI 02	PRI 03	PRI 04	PRI 07	PRI 08	PRI 09	PRI 10	PRI 11
FIN01	-	-	-	-	-	646.602	163.286	-		350.000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FIN02	337.096	-	-	-	-		254.893	-		500.000	588.453	-	-	-	-	-	644.452	
FIN03	485.262	-	-	449.744	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	424.409	-	549.119	
FIN04	281.090	281.090	-	449.744	-	-	-	-		500.000	-	450.000	497.321	-	-	-	-	
FIN05	404.444	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	850.413	-	1.244.970	-	824.394	-	711.082	
FIN06	485.262	-	-	-	-	773.391	-	-		700.000	-	-	-	-	-	-	644.452	
FIN07	485.262	485.262	582.314	776.419	970.523		440.036	950.000	708.367	800.000	1.372.157	600.000	1.220.330	-	-	-	-	871.660
FIN08	-	-	-	-	1.164.770	1.244.680	-	-	1.058.064	-	2.114.073	-	-	-	-	-	932.701	

CODES	PRI 14	PRI 15	PRI 16	PRI 17	PRI 18	PRI 19	PRI 20	PRI 21	PRI 23	PRI 24	PRI 25	PRI 26	PRI 27	INT 01	INT 02	INT 03	INT 04	INT 07
FIN01																		
FIN02			990.234														697.087	749.589
FIN03			1.110.260															1.092.765
FIN04			946.586	418.139														
FIN05																		
FIN06	505.152																	
FIN07	800.000		4.340.364	2.482.163	982.769			684.500	419.023	600.000				1.771.212	615.049		1.084.721	
FIN08																		

FIN01: Financial analyst
FIN02: Financial advisor
FIN03: Expert analyst/Head analysts
FIN04: Credit administrator
FIN05: Controller
FIN06: Treasurer
FIN07: Finance Manager I
FIN08: Finance Manager II

Logistics

BASE SALARY - Logistics

CODES	PUBSEC 1	PUBSEC 2	PUBSEC 3	PUBSEC 4	PUBSEC 5	PUBSEC 01	PUBSEC 17	PUBSEC 19	PROJ	PRI 01	PRI 02	PRI 03	PRI 04	PRI 07	PRI 08	PRI 09	PRI 10	PRI 11	PRI 14
LOG01	81.881	81.881	337.308		277.191	240.551	74.250	85.000	111.653	120.000	260.743	125.000	318.151	32.200	72.743	127.532	75.055	186.768	142.979
	180.068	138.596				393.392		100.000	167.420		317.575				73.111		176.709	277.762	183.830
LOG02	180.068	138.596			467.893	538.370	125.679	150.000		120.000				81.406		158.110	415.349	324.100	
	281.090	281.090					254.893			250.000				103.688			644.452		
LOG03			582.314	449.744		646.602				350.000							838.668	579.560	
						881.749													

CODES	PRI 15	PRI 16	PRI 17	PRI 18	PRI 19	PRI 20	PRI 21	PRI 23	PRI 24	PRI 25	PRI 26	PRI 27	INT 01	INT 02	INT 03	INT 04	INT 05
LOG01	63.744	206.918	185.710	65.000		125.000	88.500	81.967	100.000		65.000		175.431		158.250	250.580	199.199
		305.507									70.000				300.768		
LOG02	130.668	536.302	252.372				254.000	200.254					130.919		255.172	372.869	
		627.719											179.283				
LOG03	297.528	792.188	768.672				684.500						300.659			541.406	
		998.184															

LOG01: Driver --> Driver VIP

LOG02: Stock Controller --> Transport/Logistics specialist

LOG03: Head of Logistics/Transport

Procurement

BASE SALARY - Procurement

CODES	PUBSEC 1	PUBSEC 2	PUBSEC 3	PUBSEC 4	PUBSEC 5	PUBSEC 01	PUBSEC 17	PUBSEC 19	PROJ	PRI 01	PRI 02	PRI 03	PRI 04	PRI 07	PRI 08	PRI 09	PRI 10	PRI 11
PRO01								150.000		350.000			190.822		72.743	158.110	75.055	
PRO02	281.090	281.090				462.788	254.893	290.000									134.524	
PRO03				449.744	562.180			400.000					457.279		195.520	229.234	415.349	
PRO04			582.314		674.191	646.602		650.000	869.355						200.330			
PRO05								950.000										

PRI 14	PRI 15	PRI 16	PRI 17	PRI 18	PRI 19	PRI 20	PRI 21	PRI 23	PRI 24	PRI 25	PRI 26	PRI 27	INT 01	INT 02	INT 03	INT 04	INT 07
--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

						150.000											
153.191																596.864	880.716
			403.263														
	792.188	768.672															
	1.343.304																

- PRO01: Administrative assistant
- PRO02: Purchaser
- PRO03: Buyer
- PRO04: Procurement Officer/Manager
- PRO05: Director

Planning

BASE SALARY - Planning

CODES	PUBSEC 1	PUBSEC 2	PUBSEC 3	PUBSEC 4	PUBSEC 5	PUBSEC 01	PUBSEC 17	PUBSEC 19	PROJ	PRI 01	PRI 02	PRI 03	PRI 04	PRI 07	PRI 08	PRI 09	PRI 10	PRI 11	PRI 14	PRI 15	
PLA01	281.090																				
PLA02	337.096	337.096		539.353	674.191			305.679													
PLA03	485.262	485.262			970.523																
					1.164.770																

PRI 16	PRI 17	PRI 18	PRI 19	PRI 20	PRI 21	PRI 23	PRI 24	PRI 25	PRI 26	PRI 27	INT 01	INT 02	INT 03	INT 04
--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

992.188

PLA01: Planning assistant
 PLA02: Planner/Planning Officer
 PLA03: Director

Communication

BASE SALARY - Communication

CODES	PUBSEC 1	PUBSEC 2	PUBSEC 3	PUBSEC 4	PUBSEC 5	PUBSEC 01	PUBSEC 17	PUBSEC 19	PROJ	PRI 01	PRI 02	PRI 03	PRI 04	PRI 07	PRI 08	PRI 09	PRI 10	PRI 11	PRI 14	PRI 15	
COM01			404.515			462.788															
COM02	281.090	281.090	803.925	449.744	808.888	646.602											339.249				
COM03	337.096		582.314	449.744	562.180																
COM04	337.096		582.314	449.744																	
COM05	485.262	281.090	337.308																		
COM05	485.262					970.523															838.868

CODES	PRI 16	PRI 17	PRI 18	PRI 19	PRI 20	PRI 21	PRI 23	PRI 24	PRI 25	PRI 26	PRI 27	INT 01	INT 02	INT 03	INT 04	INT 05
COM01																
COM02															541.406	
COM03															697.087	
COM04																
COM05																

COM01: Communication agent
 COM02: PR Officer Media relations
 COM03: Translator/Interpreter
 COM04: Journalist/Cameraman
 COM05: Commmunication Manager

Statistics

N/A

Human Resources Management

BASE SALARY - Human Resources Management

CODES	PUBSEC 1	PUBSEC 2	PUBSEC 3	PUBSEC 4	PUBSEC 5	PUBSEC 01	PUBSEC 17	PUBSEC 19	PROJ	PRI 01	PRI 02	PRI 03	PRI 04	PRI 07	PRI 08	PRI 09	PRI 10
HRM01						393.392 538.370	212.143	150.000				200.000					415.349
HRM02	281.090	281.090		449.744	562.180		254.893	290.000		500.000							549.119
HRM03	337.096	337.096			808.888	592.639 701.146				500.000				263.848			644.452
HRM04	485.262	485.262	582.314	776.419	970.523	954.425				800.000		600.000			331.100	1.100.000	644.452
HRM05					1.164.570	1.244.680		950.000									838.868

CODES	PRI 11	PRI 14	PRI 15	PRI 16	PRI 17	PRI 18	PRI 19	PRI 20	PRI 21	PRI 23	PRI 24	PRI 25	PRI 26	PRI 27	INT 01	INT 02	INT 03	INT 04	INT 07
HRM01		192.553 174.468	170.274																
HRM02		332.973	297.528	790.234	547.412								150.000	357.792	516.407			697.087	
HRM03	519.091		304.175	998.184 1.387.800															749.589 1.092.765
HRM04		587.424	456.263	1.750.000	997.524	382.931			475.500		600.000			669.232			1.037.370	1.084.721	
HRM05																			

HRM01: HRM agent (salary admin., training & development, recruitment,...)
 HRM02: HRM officer (idem)
 HRM03: HR advisor
 HRM04: HR Manager (small organisation)
 HRM05: HR Manager (large organisation)

Legal

BASE SALARY - legal

CODES	PUBSEC 1	PUBSEC 2	PUBSEC 3	PUBSEC 4	PUBSEC 5	PUBSEC 01	PUBSEC 17	PUBSEC 19	PROJ	PRI 01	PRI 02	PRI 03	PRI 04	PRI 07	PRI 08	PRI 09	PRI 10	PRI 11	PRI 14
LEG01	138.596					538.370													
LEG02	337.096 281.090	337.096				646.602	305.679					450.000	479.131						309.189
LEG03	485.262 404.444			539.353	674.191					500.000	608.813								
LEG04	884.318		582.314	776.419	970.523	773.391 1.134.985				700.000	973.388	750.000 900.000					644.452		

CODES	PRI 15	PRI 16	PRI 17	PRI 18	PRI 19	PRI 20	PRI 21	PRI 23	PRI 24	PRI 25	PRI 26	PRI 27	INT 01	INT 02	INT 03	INT 04	INT 07
LEG01																	
LEG02	304.175											462.000					
LEG03																1.253.611	
LEG04																1.914.450	

LEG01: Legal advisor I (junior)
 LEG02: Legal advisor II (seasoned)
 LEG03: Legal advisor III (senior)
 LEG04: Head

Administration

BASE SALARY - administration

CODES	PUBSEC 1	PUBSEC 2	PUBSEC 3	PUBSEC 4	PUBSEC 5	PUBSEC 01	PUBSEC 17	PUBSEC 19	PROJ	PRI 01	PRI 02	PRI 03	PRI 04	PRI 07	PRI 08	PRI 09	PRI 10	PRI 11
ADM01					277.191	186.299	96.429	150.000	56.141	120.000		80.000	107.000		54.000	121.000	75.055	88.551
ADM02						240.151			69.278			100.000	163.000		81.000	240.000		145.950
ADM03		106.339	166.315	170.143	277.191	294.639	96.429	150.000	294.950	250.000		125.000	246.529		91.500	158.000	83.246	298.383
ADM04	233.946	281.090	337.096	374.314	467.893	393.392			268.966	350.000		230.000			157.369			
ADM05	281.090	337.096		449.744	562.180	335.445	212.143					200.000	356.979			266.270		
ADM06	233.946	281.090			360.136	335.445	163.286	150.000		250.000			212.328					134.524
ADM07	281.090				467.893	538.370	254.893											
ADM08	138.596		280.736	221.753	288.109	393.392	125.679	150.000	239.748	350.000	1.045.143	200.000			174.000			339.249
ADM09	180.068			288.109	538.370				313.742	500.000					255.000			
ADM01	485.262	233.946		449.744	674.191													
ADM02	669.938	337.096				1.134.985												
ADM03		485.262	582.314															
ADM04			803.925															
ADM05					808.888		440.036				2.128.456		687.674		380.000	750.000		1.176.811
ADM06															452.000			

CODES	PRI 14	PRI 15	PRI 16	CODES	PRI 17	PRI 18	PRI 19	PRI 20	PRI 21	PRI 23	PRI 24	PRI 25	PRI 26	PRI 27	INT 01	INT 02	INT 03	INT 04	INT 05	INT 07
ADM01	120.000	50.496	145.775	ADM01	185.710	38.296				42.000			34.500				173.662	250.580	134.937	
ADM02		68.712		ADM02																
ADM03	192.553	115.000	472.788	ADM03	252.372				150.000				80.000	98.169			288.388	250.580	288.800	109.450
ADM04	200.000	170.000		ADM04	250.000					330.000	150.000				204.623			541.406	418.844	156.769
ADM05	120.000	140.000		ADM05	250.000													372.869	631.557	
ADM06	309.189	180.000		ADM06	250.000	141.776												541.406		
ADM07	162.000	140.000		ADM07											669.232				407.076	361.169
ADM08	182.000	200.000		ADM08																541.434
ADM09			1.912.144	ADM09																
ADM01	505.152	456.000	952.347	ADM09	2.482.000					600.000				1.771.212						

ADM01: Planton
ADM02: Cleaner
ADM03: Receptionist/Standardist/Janitor
ADM04: Administrative assistant
ADM05: Archivist
ADM06: Secretary
ADM07: Personal secretary to...
ADM08: Administrative Manager

Technical operations/engineering

BASE SALARY - engineering

CODES	PUBSEC 1	PUBSEC 2	PUBSEC 3	PUBSEC 4	PUBSEC 5	PUBSEC 01	PUBSEC 17	PUBSEC 19	PROJ	PRI 01	PRI 02	PRI 03	PRI 04	PRI 07	PRI 08	PRI 09	PRI 10
ENG01		138.596				335.445	96.429	100.000	167.420					27.000	60.596	90.000	75.055
														>105.375			>98.575
ENG02		138.596				462.788	212.143	155.000	195.433	350.000	378.941			53.000	122.000	115.000	110.370
		>233.946				592.639								>146.000	>182.000	>200.000	>176.709
ENG03		337.096				646.602	305.679	168.000						194.750	422.000	250.000	212.291
								>290.000									>415.349
ENG04																	110.370
ENG05	337.096	337.096			674.191			400.000	488.117	500.000							485.089
																	>549.119
ENG06					808.888			650.000								870.000	644.452
																	>711;082
ENG07						881.749		950.000									
ENG08						1.244.680											

CODES	PRI 11	PRI 14	PRI 15	PRI 16	PRI 17	PRI 18	PRI 19	PRI 20	PRI 21	PRI 23	PRI 24	PRI 25	PRI 26	PRI 27	INT 01	INT 02	INT 03	INT 04	INT 05
ENG01	176.252				252.372				88.500	165.499	180.000		104.000						
										>200.254									
ENG02	219.831	184.043		590.000	418.139	103.306			150.000	301.743	200.000								
						>135180													
ENG03	368.874			833.750	547.412				330.000	419.023			138.000						407.076
ENG04																			
ENG05	397.296			992.188	764.916														
	>438.164			>1.198.172															
ENG06				1.556.208	997.524														
ENG07	1.497.592			1.955.321	2.482.163						600.000							1.445.295	
ENG08																			

ENG01: Assistant technician
ENG02: Technician
ENG03: Head technicians
ENG04: Draughtsman
ENG05: Engineer I
ENG06: Engineer II
ENG07: Head engineering

EXPERT/SPECIALIST

Medical Care

BASE SALARY medical care

CODES	PUBSEC 1	PUBSEC 2	PUBSEC 3	PUBSEC 4	PUBSEC 5	PUBSEC 01	PUBSEC 17	PUBSEC 19	PROJ	PRI 01	PRI 02	PRI 03	PRI 04	PRI 07	PRI 08	PRI 09	PRI 10	PRI 11
MED01							50.271				301.726						176.709	
MED02		233.946	582.314		277.191		>101.957 122.000 >211.243	150.000								450.000	549.116	
MED03							122.271											
MED04		337.096				808.888	168.814 >202.500										711.082	
MED05			1.097.316				140.657 >291.000											
MED06						1.134.986	243.000											
MED07																		
MED08							1.445.976											

CODES	PRI 14	PRI 15	PRI 16	PRI 17	PRI 18	PRI 19	PRI 20	PRI 21	PRI 23	PRI 24	PRI 25	PRI 26	PRI 27	INT 01	INT 02	INT 03	INT 04	INT 07
MED01													288.863 >360.542					
MED02													616.256					
MED03													3.610.795					
MED04													624.486					
MED05		456.263											1.640.827					1.253.610
MED06													2.668.181 >3.940.908					1.914.450
MED07																		
MED08																		

MED01: Nurse assistant
MED02: Nurse
MED03: Head nurses
MED04: Medical doctor
MED05: Medical specialist
MED06: Head medical department/Registrar
MED07: Director hospital
MED08: Director teaching hospital

Pharmacy

BASE SALARY - pharmacy

CODES	PUBSEC 1	PUBSEC 2	PUBSEC 3	PUBSEC 4	PUBSEC 5	PUBSEC 01	PUBSEC 17	PUBSEC 19	PROJ	PRI 01	PRI 02	PRI 03	PRI 04	PRI 07	PRI 08	PRI 09	PRI 10
PHA01		233.946				538.370	146.700										
PHA02						646.602	>211.243										
PHA03							122.271	>253.543									

CODES	PRI 11	PRI 14	PRI 15	PRI 16	PRI 17	PRI 18	PRI 19	PRI 20	PRI 21	PRI 23	PRI 24	PRI 25	PRI 26	PRI 27	INT 01	INT 02	INT 03	INT 04
PHA01																		179.283
PHA02																		>360.975
PHA03																		616.256
																		>1.011.683

PHA01: Assistant pharmacist/Laboratory assistant
 PHA02: Pharmacist
 PHA03: Head

Legal

N/A

Agronomy

N/A

ICT

BASE SALARY - ICT

CODES	PUBSEC 1	PUBSEC 2	PUBSEC 3	PUBSEC 4	PUBSEC 5	PUBSEC 01	PUBSEC 17	PUBSEC 19	PROJ	PRI 01	PRI 02	PRI 03	PRI 04	PRI 07	PRI 08	PRI 09	PRI 10	PRI 11	
ICT01					467.893	592.639		150.000											190.822
																			>420.500
ICT02	233.496	233.946			562.180	646.602		290.000			675.744	600.000							418.000
																			>611.300
ICT03	337.096	337.096	404.515	539.353	674.191	773.391	305.679	400.000	709.699	500.000	995.564								418.000
																			>688.600
ICT04	485.262	485.262	582.314	776.419	970.523	701.146		650.000		700.000	1.148.232	900.000							364.962
						954.425													711.082
ICT05					1.164.770	1.244.680		950.000			2.155.511								

CODES	PRI 14	PRI 15	PRI 16	PRI 17	PRI 18	PRI 19	PRI 20	PRI 21	PRI 23	PRI 24	PRI 25	PRI 26	PRI 27	INT 01	INT 02	INT 03	INT 04	INT 05	
ICT01			472.788	418.139					192.408										
ICT02	220.264	170.274	992.188	547.412					261.133								697.087		
ICT03	307.027	297.528	1.583.277	768.672				475.500											
ICT04	562.368	456.263	1.515.100	997.524												386.593	1.084.721	407.076	
ICT05			1.542.900	2.482.163															
			>2.746.147																

ICT01: IT assistant
 ICT02: IT specialist I
 ICT03: IT specialist II
 ICT04: Head
 ICT05: Director

Education

N/A

Architecture/Urbanism

N/A

ANNEX 6 – Benefits comparison

MIFOTRA SALARY COMPARISON/QUALITATIVE INFORMATION

Or-ganisa-tion	Grading structure	Salary struc-ture	Base salary	13 th month	Variable pay: bonus; premiums, non-recurrent pay complements	Salary progres-sion	Performance related pay sys-tem	Promotion sys-tem	Benefits
PRI 01	Yes 6 grades	Yes Mini mid maxi	Package without allowances	13 th month	Yes employee of the month 150 000 Fr	Yes	Yes based on performance ap-praisal	Yes in case of vacancy, internal advert	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mileage: 300 Fr/km • Medical care 100 % • Complementary pension combined with Life insurance • Loans at 6% • Funerary expenses
PRI 02	Yes	No	Basic + allowances for trans-port and housing Other allowances: Position allowance: Chef de Division 100 000 Fr Chef de Département: 75 000 Fr Chef de Sce: 50.000 Fr Gérant Adjoint: 70 000 Fr Prime de Caisse: 35 000 Driver: 26 300 Nurse 35 100 Guard 16 100 Tellers/ Compteurs: 16 100 Fr	13 th month	Bonus of 2,5 to 3 additional months for all employees. Prime de Fidelité : 10 years seniority: 1 month salary, 30 Years: 3 months salary	Salary progression based on seniority and performance 4% + 1°/oo		Promotion based on seniority and per-formance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funerary: 300 000 Fr (employee's death) • 100 000 Fr (beneficiary death) • Secondment allowance: 30 000 Fr • Frais de representation: MD 500 000 Fr • Fondé de Pouvoir 100 000 Fr • Medical care 100% • Complementary pension 8% net salary (5% Employer, 3% Employee) • Children allowance 1000 Fr spouse • 500 Fr child • Wedding: 30 000 Fr • Loans at 5% managers and 3,5 % • Lower staff • End career allowance (not prime de fi-delité): • 10 – 15 years: 1 month salary, 30 years: 6 months salary

Or- ganisa- tion	Grading structure	Salary struc- ture	Base salary	13 th month	Variable pay: bonus; premiums, non-recurrent pay complements	Salary progres- sion	Performance related pay sys- tem	Promotion sys- tem	Benefits
PRI 03	Yes	No		13 th month based on perfor- mance	Bonus if company's per- formance: percentage of monthly salary Special bonus foe cert. positions e.g. Directors	Yes a salary pro- gression system exists based on grading structure, performance and market trends	Yes objectives setting + quarterly evaluation+ annual appraisal		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funerary 50 000 Fr + expenses for em- ployees and beneficiaries • months salary in case of death of em- ployee • Wedding 50 000 Fr • Birth 30 000 Fr • Loans Long Term 9 % Short Term 3% • Medicare 100 % • Pharmacy 85 % • Glasses, prosthesis 100 % • Directors: Mileage, fuel, home guards and domestics • Phone calls for some functions • Free lunch
PRI 04	YES		Basic +4% annual increase	13 th month for all employees based on company's perfor- mance	Prime de rendement: bonus based on performance	Annual salary progression of 4% calculated on gross salary	Yes , increment of 4% of basic if appraisal Excellent, 3% Very Good and 2% Good Performance sys- tem is based on objectives setting and performance appraisal	Promotion based on seniority in case of vacancy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prime de fidélité: 5 years seniority: 1 month salary • 10 years : 2 months • 20 years : 4 months 30 years: 6 months • Loans: interest rate ½ of clients rate • No interest on salary advance • Telephone expenses at the work • Medicare: 80% include glasses and medicines • Glasses frames: 25 000 Fr • Wedding 30 000 Fr • Birth 20 000 Fr • Funerary expenses + 3 months salary, Life insurance

Or- ganisa- tion	Grading structure	Salary struc- ture	Base salary	13 th month	Variable pay: bonus; premiums, non-recurrent pay complements	Salary progres- sion	Performance related pay sys- tem	Promotion sys- tem	Benefits
PRI 07	No		Salary can be negotiated for some positions	13 th Month from 70% to 100 % based on perform- ance	Over time is double paid				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medical allowances is 100% is paid by employer
PRI 08	Yes to be finalized				<p>Bonuses vary with job grade and individual progression: 20% Chef de Service and 10% execution staff</p> <p>Employee of the month: 1 month salary reward</p> <p>Prime de service: 5% of turnover</p>		<p>Yes Performance sys- tem based on objectives</p> <p>Bonus based on performance</p>	<p>Yes, promotion in classes from lower to higher position (tradi- tional)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medical insurance 100% by Soras • Collective accident insurance is 100% paid by employer • 50 000Fr is paid on death and funerary and premium is paid by Soras • Pension premium covered by Soras • 1 Free meal/day • Phone calls with different limits • Transport for night shift
PRI 09	Yes Distinction between managers classes and Non- managers classes		Mini to Maxi for management positions and depending on performance	Basic + allowances for trans- port and housing	A system exists for some non-management positions e.g. Chargé de that allows an extra monthly increment of 5%		Yes performance is related on vision and mission for Head of Depart- ments	Yes, promotion in grades over the years for non management staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medical care • Up to 500 000 Fr/year • And 150 000 Fr per child (max 4 children) • Accident on duty: salary is 100% paid by employer on the period of 6 months • Recuperation over 40hrs /week • Staff restaurant
PRI 10	Yes Hay metho- dology	Yes	Mini to Maxi 12 years progres- sion to reach the maxi based on performance	13 th One moth salary Leave allo-	Bonus up to 30% of basic salary based on performance	Salary progression based on perfor- mance	Performance sys- tem based on objectives	Promotion in grades over the years or in case of vacancy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medicare 100% for employees and de- pendants Eye glasses for employees • Pension scheme combined with life insur- ance 6% Employer 4 % Employee

Or- ganisa- tion	Grading structure	Salary struc- ture	Base salary	13 th month	Variable pay: bonus; premiums, non-recurrent pay complements	Salary progres- sion	Performance related pay sys- tem	Promotion sys- tem	Benefits
				wance one month salary				Career manage- ment/path	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loans for vehicles and houses from banks but company pay 6% of interest (16 to 17 %) Phone calls paid for 150 managers Fidelity allowance paid after 10 and 20 years of continuous employment End career allowance minimum 3 months salary and max 8 months salary Funeral expenses for employee and de- pendents + 300 000 Fr additional funeral allowance paid by the complementary pension/life insurance Company car + fuel for Mgt Team and limited managers Leasing cars scheme for managers to be introduced soon Mgt Team: guards at residence, domes- tics, DSTV? School fees, etc Training as attractive and development element: 100 000 Euros per year for en- tire company staff
PRI 11	Yes based on education and experience	Basic salary + housing and transport allo- wances			<p>Bonus of 50% to 100% of net salary based on per- formance appraisal</p> <p>Loans to purchase com- pany's stock, after 5 years employee pays back but</p>	<p>Yes salary progres- sion each 2 or 3 years: for all em- ployees min 15%</p> <p>Individual progres- sion based on performance from</p>	<p>Yes performance system based on objective setting and end year appraisal</p>	<p>Yes promotion in grades and in case of vacancy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Medical care is provided to the employees and their families 90%, those who have eye problems are provided with eye glasses (frames up to 20 000 Fr) Mediplan insurance is being introduced soon Company car + fuel for Directors and

Or- ganisa- tion	Grading structure	Salary struc- ture	Base salary	13 th month	Variable pay: bonus; premiums, non-recurrent pay complements	Salary progres- sion	Performance related pay sys- tem	Promotion sys- tem	Benefits
					earns interests up to 100 % of the loan amount	15% to 25% Automatic yearly progression of 4%			Inspecteurs de station • 30 days vacation (no distinction based on seniority or grade)
PRI 14	Yes 10 classes	Yes mini - maxi		13 TH based on perfor- mance	Bonus: prime de bilan paid in April or May which is a percentage of the monthly salary (107% in 2006; 110 % in 2005 Prime de fidélité 10 years seniority: 1 month salary; 1 additional month salary each 5 years End career allowance mini- mum 6 x monthly salary	Yes salary progres- sion based on inflation rate de- termined by the company but not beyond 2%	Yes performance system exists with performance indica- tors and rates	Yes promotion in case of vacancy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mileage • Fuel for certain functions • Telephone budget • For loans (house and car): the Company recommend employee to the bank and pays 50% of the interests • Education: Company pays 50% in case of success • Medicare: 100% including HIV/ARV • Canteen allowance • Death: funerary expenses paid 100% by company • Wedding: 1 month salary • Birth: 40 000 Fr • Discount of 50 % on various insurance contracts • Complementary pension
PRI 15				13 TH	Fidelity of 10, 15 & 20 years is paid 1 month salary	Yes salary progres- sion based on performance ap- praisal 4% incre- ment if 75% perfor- mance and 4 % increment if 80%	Yes performance system exists	Yes, promotion depends appraisal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pension scheme 50% Employer 50% Employee • Assurance responsabilité familiale • Discount of 20% on every insurance subscribed by the employee • Mediplan scheme • Wedding 20 000Fr

Or- ganisa- tion	Grading structure	Salary struc- ture	Base salary	13 th month	Variable pay: bonus; premiums, non-recurrent pay complements	Salary progres- sion	Performance related pay sys- tem	Promotion sys- tem	Benefits
						Performance			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birth 20 000Fr • cafeteria 500 Fr • Funerary expenses • Telephone allowance for directors • MD & Deputy: company car, guards, etc
PRI 16	Yes 5 classes and 3 sub classes of each class	Yes Mini mid maxi		13 th	Bonus same rate for all employees depending on company's results	Yes salary progres- sion based on performance appraisal	Yes performance system based on objectives setting and appraisal	Promotion based on performance and in case of vacancy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pension scheme 60% paid by the employer and 40% by staff • Life insurance 100% is paid by the company • Medical insurance (RAMA) 85% is paid by employer • Oracle Med in case of emergency transfer 500 \$ US per day for employee + dependents • 50% of sports activities is paid by employer • Education 50% of fees • Funerary assistance and 50% of school fees • 50% of cafeteria • Mobile phone is provided to employee with calls for 50 000 Fr up to 100 000 Fr depending on grades • Wedding assistance of 100,000 Fr
PRI 17	Yes, job profile designed internally and job evaluation by int'l specialist	Package but for taxation purpose brake into Basic + allowances	Mini - Maxi	13 th paid traditionally but is now chan-	New system consists in quarterly paying a bonus calculated on basis of company's performance and	Salary progression based on perfor- mance and aligned to the market	Performance sys- tem based on objectives setting and appraisal YET	Career mgt perfor- mance based but career paths yet to be defined	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medical scheme CORAR that covers everything • Free phone calls for managers, • No company car but fuel for managers

Or- ganisa- tion	Grading structure	Salary struc- ture	Base salary	13 th month	Variable pay: bonus; premiums, non-recurrent pay complements	Salary progres- sion	Performance related pay sys- tem	Promotion sys- tem	Benefits
				ging into a bonus system	budgeted according to the result forecast		TO BE APPROVED		and some employees who holds commer- cial and technical positions
PRI 18	No but the organi- sation chart esta- blishes position levels	Basic + allo- wances	YES base on seniority	13 th	No	Salary progres- sion: 4% yearly automatically + based on com- pany's results (rate defined by the Board)		No career planning but promotion in case of vacancy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medical insurance RAMA employer pays 50% and for guards Mutuelle scheme is paid 100% • Directors are given cars for work, • Eye glasses are provides by company • Meals are free • Funeral expenses + allowance of 50 000 Fr • In case of employee's death: 3 to 6 Months salary • Insurance for work hazards combined with life insurance
PRI 19	No but the organi- sation chart esta- blishes positions levels	Yes, based on the structure of the organi- sation, the importance of the position which deter- mines the corre- sponding salary	Salary is subject to the nego- tiation between the employee and employer after the proba- tion period	No	Bonus at year end for Christ- mas gifts	Salary progression which rate is de- cided by Headquar- ters, can vary from 10% to 15%		Yes, it depends on performance and vacancy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 250,000 Fr medical care for managers • 150,000 medical care for staff (mutuelle de sante for guards) • Loans for acquisition of cars and equip- ments • Managers who own cars get mileage, fuel for professional use • 10,000 Fr is provided when one member of family is dead and 20 000 Fr is pro- vided for the funerary when an employee is dead • And 3 month salary is provided to de- pendents,

Or- ganisa- tion	Grading structure	Salary struc- ture	Base salary	13 th month	Variable pay: bonus; premiums, non-recurrent pay complements	Salary progres- sion	Performance related pay sys- tem	Promotion sys- tem	Benefits
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Managers are given 30 calendar days that is 18 working days for leave
PRI 20	Yes 12 classes	Basic + allo- wances		13 th ½ in July and ½ in Decem- ber	Profit share for Partners (1 person)		Appraisal system exists based on criteria like techni- cal knowledge, teamwork, motiva- tion, quality of work, quickness in execution of work	Career progression exists and depends on appraisal and seniority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Medical insurance Mediplan employer pays 50%, Loans to employees for purchasing cars, Fuel for equivalent of 40,000 Fr per month, telephone allowances of 20 000 Fr, Party or trip every year for all staff Funeral expenses Gifts in the event of marriage and birth
PRI 23	No, grades or categories but different levels of jobs and salaries exist depending on the scarcity of the particular profiles in the labour market Job also paid ac- cording to the level of education expe- rience seniority of particular employee	Basic + allo- wances for transport and housing			Bonus of 40 % to 60% depending on the company's results	Salary progression 4% yearly Additional increase of 10% to 20 % is applied each 2 to 3 years	No appraisal system	No career	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employer provides 85 % for medical care and 15% is paid by employee, Salary advance is provided to an employee for equivalent of 4 months salary Employees are recommended to banks for loans to purchase their own cars or houses, Funeral expenses + exceptional scholarship can be granted to 2 children in case of employees death Wedding: 100 000 Fr to 150 000 Fr allow- ance
PRI24	No but organi- sation's structure establishes a few	Package no allo- wances	No	No	Variable pay: incentives system to encourage per- formance and motivation: up	Salary progression based on perfor- mance	Appraisal system is based on objective setting, systems for	Promotion in case of vacancy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Salary advance in case of events like birth, wedding, death: up to 6 months salary + employer's contribution up to

Or- ganisa- tion	Grading structure	Salary struc- ture	Base salary	13 th month	Variable pay: bonus; premiums, non-recurrent pay complements	Salary progres- sion	Performance related pay sys- tem	Promotion sys- tem	Benefits
	levels of jobs				to 20 % of the salary for Technicians and Sales Team		measuring producti- vity, efficiency, cost control and report- ing system		<p>100 000 Fr</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mediplan scheme extended to entire family 90 % • Training locally by experienced staff from sister companies or from manufacturers, training visits to sister companies, • Motorcycles are available for professional and private use to technicians and some other staff, those who want can get them at credit • Company cars + fuel available for 3 Heads of Departments
PRI 25	No job grading	Traditionally there was no salary structure, employees used to negotiate individually. A process of harmonization is in progress but not yet com- pleted			Variable pay: incentive existed were suppressed and are being reintroduced very soon	No		Not yet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medical scheme (RAMA) • Communication allowance subscription to MTN up to certain amount, Transport: al- lowances to use company cars for both professional and private use, beneficiaries are journalist, marketing staff and those who are deployed in the field • Two days is given to employees who lost relative, • Company guarantees bank loans to pur- chase vehicle or home equipment/ furni- ture
PRI 26		Depends on qualification and the market				Salary progression 4% yearly Additional increase of 10% to 20 % is	Appraisal system exists based on objectives setting		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mediplan insurance employer pays 90% Funeral expenses

Or- ganisa- tion	Grading structure	Salary struc- ture	Base salary	13 th month	Variable pay: bonus; premiums, non-recurrent pay complements	Salary progres- sion	Performance related pay sys- tem	Promotion sys- tem	Benefits
						applied depending on appraisal			
PRI 27	Yes they are cate- gorized according academic qualifica- tion and experience					No		No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responsibility an allowance 100 000 Fr Doctors 40 000 Fr and 20 000 Fr for other staff • Overtime/night duty allowance • Employer provides 80% for medical scheme and employee pays 20%, trans- portation is provided during night time only
PRI 28	Yes Job description, job ranking based on a compare-son between jobs	Basic + housing + transport	Entry level salary and then progression	13 th	-	-	No	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Energy allowance fixed sum in addition to monthly salary • Loans from banks on recommendation of the company • RAMA medicare • Communication paid for certain functions
INT 01	Yes 12 classes	Range with 10 steps		13 th		Salary progression yearly: COLA Automatic	Performance sys- tem exists but it does not have any influence on the salary	Employees apply for the vacancies and they compete also (internal recruitment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pension scheme: 5% is paid by employer • Medicare 95% is paid by employer • School fees 180 000 Fr per child in high school and 100 000 Fr in primary school • Overtime: 20% basic salary • Representation allowance: 25 % basic salary per month for Mgt Team • Birth 50,000 Fr Wedding 50,000 Fr Death 200, 000 Fr, Annual leave 30 days, also 25% is given for requisition
INT 02	Yes		Entry salary that progresses year after year	13 th 60% of the		Salary progression of 4% above gov-		In case of vacancies employees/ candi-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medicare with CORAR 90 % employer • Assistance to the retired employees

Or- ganisa- tion	Grading structure	Salary struc- ture	Base salary	13 th month	Variable pay: bonus; premiums, non-recurrent pay complements	Salary progres- sion	Performance related pay sys- tem	Promotion sys- tem	Benefits
				monthly salary		ernment policy plus % for the perform- ance, also variables depends on senior- ity		dates compete but senior managers may be chosen without competi- tion	equivalent to 7,000 Fr In case of death 10 x (7,000 Fr x 12) 15,000 for phone calls • Use of company car for managers
INT 03	Yes 6 classes and sub- levels	There is stan- dard job descrip- tion and job evaluation mini- maxi		13 th con- tractual			Objectives a aligned to strategy	Competition if vacancy Secondment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medical coverage 100% for employee and dependents • Optical and dental 75% • Life insurance 100%, • Cars are provided for professional use only • Sabbatical leave • 10 days for study leave
INT 04	Yes, 6 grades job description	Basic + allow- ances for trans- port housing and vacation after 1 year in service	Entry salary mini then pro- gression within the grade every 3 years				Objective aligned to strategy, perfor- mance appraisal: 3 levels of measure- ment impact on salary	In case of vacancy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medicare: AAR 100 % • On retirement employee is paid 6 month of his salary, Life insurance is paid in SONARWA 100% by employer • Phone calls up to 80 000 Fr for Directors and 30 000 Fr for managers • Full use of company car for Directors in the 40 Km around. • Funeral expenses up to 50 000 Fr

ANNEX 7 – Destinations and fields of specialisation of public service leavers

From	To	Specialism	Notes
Rwandatel (when still a state company)	Own business	Communications Technology	
Customs and Excise	BCR	Customs fiscal officer	
Rwanda Revenue Authority	Self-employed	Audit	
Auditor General's Office	BCR	Audit	
Rwanda Investment Authority	Private banking	Accountant	
Kanombe District	UBPR	Not specified	
Supreme Court Administration	ROKO Construction	Human Resources	Made redundant
National Tender Board	ASSETIP	Civil Engineering	
Rwanda Revenue Authority	Bank of Kigali	Accountant	
District Mayor	SORAS	Not specified	Left because no re-election in prospect
Health Centre worker	SORAS	Not specified	
MIFOTRA	SORAS	Not specified	
MINALOC	SORAS	Not specified	
KIST	Own business	IT – business process re-engineering	On contract
MIFOTRA	CDF	Administration	Made redundant
MINALOC	CDF	Senior secretary	Made redundant
MINEDUC/KHI	Self-employed	Health Administration	
Ministry of Transport	Rwandatel	Driver	Left because of accident
Supreme Court	Rwandatel	Driver	Made redundant
KIST	Rwandatel	IT	
Caisse Sociale	Rwandatel	IT	
National Examination Council	Intersec	Auditor	
Institute for Management Training	UNHCR	Project management	
Rwanda Revenue Authority	Bralirwa	Human Resources Management	

From	To	Specialism	Notes
KIST/KHI	Bralirwa	IT	
University Hospital Butare	Bralirwa	Nursing	Moved for family reasons
Nyamata District	Bralirwa	Not specified	
KIST	MIFOTRA	Project management	Transfer
Lectureship	Rwandair		
KIST	Rwandatel		
Agricultural Service	W/IRDP	Agricultural Development	
Not specified	World Bank	Admin/Finance	
Electrogaz	African Development Bank		
Auditor General's Office	COGEBANK	Audit	
Good Governance Programme	CSR		Transfer
OAG/TRAC	African Development Bank		
National University of Rwanda	Simtel	IT	
DG RAMA	CORAR	Senior Admin	
Gacaca	Self-employed	Social Agency	
National University of Rwanda	DABA Network		
Higher Education	Not specified	Senior Admin	
Administrative (not specified)	Not specified	Admin	
HR (not specified)	Not specified	Training and Recruitment	
HR (not specified)	Intrahealth	Personnel Officer	
District Administration (Burgmeister)	KK Security	Personnel Officer	
KIST	CEPEX	Public relations	
KIST	HE National Council	VRAC	
KIST	Burundi	English	Emigration
KIST	CSR	Audio visual	Transfer
KIST	SFB	Quality Assurance	Transfer
KIST	Electrogaz	ICT	

From	To	Specialism	Notes
KIST	France	French	Emigration
KIST	RITA	E-documentation	
KIST	MININFRA		
KIST	UK	Civil Engineering	Emigration
KIST	HIDA	Public relations	Transfer
KIST	RALGA	Management	Transfer
KIST	MINECOFIN	FPGS	Transfer
KIST	Fair Construction	Civil engineering	Private sector
KIST	OCIR Tea	VRAC	Transfer
KIST	MINEDUC	IT	Transfer
KIST	RURA	Clinic	
KIST	BRD	Finance	
KIST	Canada	Finance	Emigration
KIST	SONARWA	Library	Private sector
KIST	MINICOM	Audio visual	
KIST	Vice Mayor	Physics	Elected office
KIST	MINENFRA	Electrical	
KIST	USA	Public relations	Emigration
KIST	RITA	Assistant Lecturer	
KIST	SFB	English	
KIST	NUR	VRAC	
KIST	High School	Public relations	
KIST	RITA	TA	
KIST	MinENFRA	Civil engineering	
KIST	ULK	Senior Lecturer	
KIST	RURA	Civil engineering	
KIST	Presidency	Marketing	
KIST	MINEDUC	CITT	
KIST	Electrogaz	Administration/HR	
KIST	Terracom	ICT	

From	To	Specialism	Notes
KIST	Uganda	Academics	Emigration
KIST	UK	Management	
KIST	HIDA	ICT	
KIST	Privatisation	ICT	
KIST	CEPEX	Workshop	
KIST	RITA	TBIF	
KIST	RITA	Administration	
KIST	USA	Administration	
KIST	BNR	FPGS	
Education III	EDIKO Construction		
Education III	Private sector		
Education III	Roads Fund		
Education III	MINECOFIN		
Education III	France		
Education III	Electrogaz		
Education III	Ghana		Studies

ANNEX 8 – Leavers for 2004-2007 and staff numbers 2007

Institution	Leavers 2004-2007
Unity and Reconciliation Commission	17
HIDA	3
ONATRACOM	6
MININFRA	27
Electoral Commission	7
Ministry of Foreign Affairs	43
MINALOC	19
Auditor General's Office	51
National Tender Board	29
National Bank of Rwanda	17
Gasebo Health District	3
Prosecution Service	22
Rwanda Revenue Authority	53
PMU Global Fund	9
Institute of Agricultural Sciences	14
RITA	17
Senate Administration	5
KIST	115
Education III	7
Supreme Court	1
Total	465

Compare this with the total employed as at 2007:

Institution	Number employed 2007
Unity and Reconciliation Commission	33
HIDA	26
ONATRACOM	226
MININFRA	37
Electoral Commission	26
Ministry of Foreign Affairs (at home)	52
MINALOC	45
Auditor General's Office	89
National Tender Board	49
National Bank of Rwanda	n/a
Gasebo Health District	n/a
Prosecution Service	200 (admin 62)
Rwanda Revenue Authority	845
PMU Global Fund	n/a
Institute of Agricultural Sciences	246
RITA	54
Senate Administration	67
Supreme Court	83
KIST	467
Education III	n/a
Total	3058

Note: this is a small sample, but it is nevertheless fairly representative of different types and sizes of institutions.

ANNEX 9 – Movement of staff (leavers) from ministries and other organisation to the public sector, the private sector and NGOs

Unity and Reconciliation Commission	Public Sector	Private Sector and NGOS	Other
To Ministry of Agriculture	3		
To Prime Ministers' Office	1		
To RRA	1		
To Western Province	1		
To Electrogaz	1		
To SWAA Rwanda	1		
To RDRC	1		
To National University	1		
To private sector or emigrated		7	
Total	10	7	

HIDA	Public Sector	Private Sector and NGOS	Other
To Minsante	1		
To private sector		2 (consultant and King Faysal Hospital)	
Total	1	2	

ONATRACOM	Public Sector	Private Sector and NGOS	Other
To Nyaruguru District	1		
To RRA	1		
		4 (projects – unspecified)	
Total	2	4	

MININFRA	Public Sector	Private Sector and NGOS	Other
To Mineduc	3		
To MIFOTRA	1		
To MINDEF	2		
To CNLS	2		
To REMA	1		
To Electrogaz	1		
To University of Busego	1		
To BAD	1		
To private sector		9 (including drivers and consultants)	
Other (unknown)			5
Total	12	9	5

Electoral Commission	Public Sector	Private Sector and NGOs	Other
To MINECOFIN	1		
To Parliament (elected)	1		
To private sector		2 (MTN and self-employed)	
Other (unknown)			3
Total	2	2	3

Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Public Sector	Private Sector and NGOs	Other
To MINICOM	2		
To elected office (Senator)	2		
To MININTER	1		
To MINIJUST	1		
To MINAGRI	1		
To Unity and Reconciliation	1		
To Presirep	1		
To Auditor General	1		
To CAMERWA	1		
To MIFOTRA	1		
To Rwanda National Bank	1		
To State Counsellor	1		
To SFB	1		
To private sector and other		28 (including retirement, long term leave, "desertion")	
Total	15	28	

MINALOC	Public Sector	Private Sector and NGOs	Other
To CDF	2	1 (World Bank)	1 (unknown)
To CSR	2	2 (Private Business)	
To Rwanda Revenue Authority	2		
To Kicukuro District	1		
To Rwanagana District	1		
To Nyarugenge District	2		
To KIE	1		
To KIST	1		
To PADBL	1		
To KIE	1		
To MIGEPROF/CNF	1		
Total	15	3	1

Auditor General	Public Sector	Private Sector and NGOs	Other
To BRD	3	4 (private banking)	3 (study abroad)
To BNR	3	2 (insurance)	1 (unknown)
To Global Fund	1	1 (MTN)	
To RIEPA	1	1 (UNDP)	
To RDRCIU	1	1 (World Bank)	
To TRAC	1	1 (Private health care)	

To MINALOC	1	1 (GARSEC)	
To RITA	1	1 (RUJUNGIRO)	
To RSSP	1		
To PDRCIU	1		
To MINECOFIN	1		
To OCIR THE	1		
To MININFRA	1		
Total	17	12	4

National Tender Board	Public Sector	Private Sector and NGOs	Other
Electrogaz	4	4 self employed	6 (unknown, emigrated)
RITA	2	2 to World Bank	
MININT	1	1 to UNDP	
MINAGRI	1	1 to ASSETIP	
HIDA	1	1 to RSSP	
MINECOFIN	1	1 to COMESA	
MAP	1	1 consultant	
Total	11	11	6

National Bank of Rwanda	Public Sector	Private Sector and NGOs	Other
CSR	2	1 (NEPAD)	6 (unknown)
ORTPN	1	1 (UNDP)	
High Court	1	1 (Rwanda Development Bank)	
MINECOFIN	1	1 (African Development Bank) 1 World Bank Resident Mission	
Total	5	5	6

Gasebo Health District	Public Sector	Private Sector and NGOs	Other
		1 (private transport sector) 1 (self-employed)	1 (to USA)
Total		2	1

Parquet	Public Sector	Private Sector and NGOs	Other
RRA	3	2 (Lawyer private practice)	4 (unknown)
MINECOFIN	1	1 (BNP)	
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT	1	1 (Accountancy Private Practice)	
Kigali City	1	1 (MTN)	
President's Commission	1	1 (King Faysal Hospital)	
MINJUST	1		
Parliament	1		
Land Commission	1		
Supreme Court	1		
Total	11	6	4

Rwanda Revenue Authority	Public Sector	Private Sector and NGOs	Other
MINECOFIN	6	22 (own business)	
CSR	3	1 (UN Mission Sudan – African Union)	
MINAFFET	2	1 (ICTR Arusha)	
HIDA	2		
BNR	2		
RURA	2		
MINICOM	2		
RIAM	1		
MAGERWA	1		
Western Region (Mayor)	1		
Kigali General Hospital	1		
Privatisation Unit	1		
CNLS	1		
CDF	1		
OCIR	1		
Southern Province (Governor)	1		
Western Region	1		
Total	29	24	

PMU Global Fund	Public Sector	Private Sector and NGOs	Other
CNLS	2	1 (Inyange Industries)	11 (unknown)
MINSANTE	1	1 (World Health Organisation)	
MAGERWA	1	1 (Bancor)	
CCM Rwanda	1		
Auditor General	1		
Total	6	3	11

Agricultural Research Institute	Public Sector	Private Sector and NGOs	Other
CSR	4	1 (Canadian Development Haiti)	2 (unknown)
OCIR THE	2	1 (NGO Send a Cow)	
OAG	2		
RHODA	1		
MINAGRI	1		
Total	10	2	2

RITA	Public Sector	Private Sector and NGOs	Other
CSR	2	2 (MTN)	3 (unknown)
National University	1	2 (private business)	
RURA	1	1 (ICM)	
MINSANTE	1	1 (UNDP)	
Demobilisation Commission	1	1 (DfID)	
National Bank of Rwanda	1		
Total	7	7	3

KIST	Public Sector	Private sector and NGOs	Other
CSR	2	2 (Electrogaz)	1 (Burundi)
RITA	5	1 (Private School)	1 (France)
CEPEX	2	2 (Construction)	1 (UK)
MINEDUC	2	1 (Terracom)	1 (USA)
MININFRA	3		1 (Uganda)
MINECOFIN	1	Plus 68 not reported	1 (Canada)
MIFOTRA	1		
SFB	2		
HE National Council	1		
HIDA	2		
RURA	2		
BNR	1		
RALGA	1		
OCIR Yea	1		
BRD	1		
ULK	1		
NUR	1		
Presidence	1		
MINICOM	1		
Privatisation	1		
Total	32	77	6

Education III	Public Sector	Private Sector and NGOs	Other
Road Fund	1	1 (construction)	1 (health)
MINECOFIN	1	1 (not specified)	1 (n/a)
			1 (study)
Total	2	2	3

Note: these tables do not differentiate between direct level transfers, and resignations where the person then applied for and got another public sector job (whether on promotion or not)