



**THIRTEENTH REGULAR SESSION
FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE
Tenth Session
Denarau, Fiji
4 - 9 December 2016**

TRIANNUAL SALARY MARKET DATA REVIEW

**WCPFC13-2016-FAC10-14
14 November 2016**

Purpose

1. The purpose of this paper is to table for the Committee's consideration the outcomes of the Market Data Review Report dated March, 2016 undertaken by StrategicPay Ltd.

Introduction

2. Upon the establishment of the Secretariat, the Commission linked the professional staff employment benefits to a harmonised range of benefits of the Council of Regional Organisations in the Pacific (CROP). The adoption of the relationship to the CROP system of salaries and allowances was a compromise by the Commission between the higher UN based conditions understood to apply in other t-RFMOs and the lesser remuneration levels of CROP agencies.
3. Under Staff Regulation 19, the Secretariat is required to review professional staff salaries every three years. The survey conducted in 2010 and implemented in 2011 resulted in an increase of roughly 50% of the amount required to align with the reference employment market used in the survey. The survey in 2013 and implemented in 2014 called for a 7%-10% to be applied to Bands M-J and a 4%-5% increase be applied to Band I. A 2 % increase was approved.
4. Prior to making a recommendation on the results of this survey, FAC paper WCPFC13-2016-FAC10-14 (Job Sizing for Secretariat Staff) will need to be considered. In 2011, CROP agencies moved away from the Cullen Egan Dell (CED) Grades I-M system salary structure to a new StrategicPay SP10 system. The Commission has retained the CED Grades I-M structure. In order to keep some parity with CROP, the Commission contracted StrategicPay to review and report on professional staff salaries. StrategicPay's report is attached.

2016 Market Data Review

5. The survey details, findings and methodology are set out in the attached StrategicPay Report. The report's Executive Summary show that Commission's professional salaries for Bands I to M are below the benchmark average:

- Band M is 68.1% of the benchmark;
- Band L is 72.6% of the benchmark;
- Band K 74.3% of the benchmark;
- Band J 76.3% of the benchmark; and
- Band I is 84.4% of the benchmark.

6. A summary comparison that includes the proposed salary scales of the CROP agencies as of January 2015. Table 1 (table g in the attached report) shows that for Bands M-J, the Commission's salary scale is behind CROP agencies by roughly 17% to 33%. Table 2 show the proposed CROP salary scale as of January 2015 to align with the reference market.

Table 1

| Band | CROP equivalent January 2015 | WCPFC January 2015 | Comparatio |
|----------|------------------------------|--------------------|------------|
| M | 116,771 | 80,343 | 67% |
| L | 93,278 | 66,804 | 70% |
| K | 70,795 | 53,722 | 74% |
| J | 56,421 | 41,241 | 72% |
| I | 35,755 | 30,133 | 83% |

Table 2

| Band | Current Midpoint | Suggested Movement in WCPFC scale | Suggested Scale January 2017 | Potential CROP Scale January 2017 | Jan 2017 WCPFC Scale as % of CROP | Jan 2017 WCPFC Scale as % of Market |
|----------|------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| M | 80,343 | 20% | 96,412 | 123,777 | 78% | 83% |
| L | 66,804 | 20% | 80,165 | 98,875 | 81% | 83% |
| K | 53,722 | 20% | 64,466 | 75,043 | 86% | 83% |
| J | 41,241 | 20% | 49,489 | 59,815 | 83% | 83% |
| I | 30,133 | 10% | 33,146 | 37,900 | 88% | 90% |

7. As indicated by Table 2 above (table h in the attached report), the StrategicPay report recommends that rather than adopt the full pay increase suggested by the survey figures, a 20% increase be applied to Bands M-J and a 10% increase be applied to Band I.

Executive Director Salary Range

8. Upon the Commission's establishment in 2004 it was agreed that the salary of the Executive Director, unlike the rest of the professional staff, would be placed on the United Nations D-1 level. At the time the UN D-1 level was higher than the salaries paid for the heads of CROP agencies. Since then, the CROP agencies have moved to a new SP10 based salary structure and the salaries paid to the heads of CROP agencies were greatly increased and surpassed the UN D-1 salary range. This difference can be seen in the Job Evaluation of Secretariat Staff Positions paper (WCPFC13-2016-FAC10-10). As there has been limited movement in the UN D-1 salary scales, the range of movement for professional staff salary scales is also limited as the professional staff salary scales at the M level could significantly overlap the Executive Director's salary range if an increase is approved. It is recommended that an adjustment is also made to the ED's salary that is in line with the professional staff in order to maintain relativity within the office.

Conclusion

9. As in 2013, the current survey recommends a relatively large increase of 20% for Bands M-J that may not be financially feasible. It is suggested that an increase of 10% to be applied to Bands M-J and to the Executive Director's salary and a 5% increase be applied to Band I.

Costs

10. The costs of a 10% increase to Bands M-J and the Executive Director and a 5% increase to Band I – USD147,925.

Recommendations

11. The Committee is invited to make the appropriate recommendations to the Commission.

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC)

Market Data Review
March 2016

Prepared by:
Mike Boneham
Technical Consultant
Strategic Pay Limited

Contents

- 1 Executive Summary 3
- 2 Background 4
- 3 Job Evaluation 4
- 4 Reference Markets 4
 - 4.1 New Zealand Public Service 4
 - 4.2 Australian Public Service 5
 - 4.3 Fiji General Market 5
- 5 Market Data Analysis 6
- 6 Proposed New WCPFC Scale 8
- Appendix A: About Strategic Pay Limited 11

1 Executive Summary

This report, compiled by Strategic Pay, details the development of a midpoint scale for the I-M grades used by WCPFC, and which has been historically aligned with the CROP Agencies' scale.

Market data for Grades I-M, covering positions advertised regionally or internationally, has been sourced from:

| Country | Survey | Quartile | Operative survey date |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|
| New Zealand | Strategic Pay Central Govt Survey | Median | February 2015 |
| Australia | APS Remuneration Survey | Median | December 2014 |
| Fiji | PwC Fiji All Organisations | Upper Quartile | April 2015 |

The following table (shown as Table E, page 8) summarises the current market levels and overall average, as per CROP practice, as the basis for developing an updated scale within WCPFC:

| Grade | CED Points | | | Base Salary SDR March 2013 | | | Average | Existing Scale | Existing Scale as % of Average |
|-------|------------|----------|------|----------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------|----------------|--------------------------------|
| | Min | Midpoint | Max | NZ Public Service | Aust Public Service | Fiji General Mkt UQ | | | |
| M | 1050 | 1180 | 1310 | 157,888 | 125,208 | 70,601 | 117,899 | 80,343 | 68.1% |
| L | 840 | 945 | 1049 | 118,252 | 108,690 | 49,238 | 92,060 | 66,804 | 72.6% |
| K | 630 | 735 | 839 | 89,823 | 91,201 | 35,910 | 72,311 | 53,722 | 74.3% |
| J | 470 | 550 | 629 | 65,769 | 71,352 | 25,077 | 54,066 | 41,241 | 76.3% |
| I | 260 | 365 | 469 | 45,512 | 46,143 | 15,499 | 35,718 | 30,133 | 84.4% |

The following movement has occurred in the three reference markets since March 2010:

| Grade | Average 2010 | Average 2013 | Average 2016 | % Change Averaged Markets |
|-------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| M | 92,139 | 122,231 | 117,899 | -3.5% |
| L | 76,162 | 96,879 | 92,060 | -5.0% |
| K | 60,307 | 77,005 | 72,311 | -6.1% |
| J | 45,868 | 58,440 | 54,066 | -7.5% |
| I | 30,188 | 38,586 | 35,718 | -7.4% |

Assuming that the Commission wishes to retain a similar level of relativity to the CROP Agency scale adopted in January 2014, we recommend the following midpoints as from January 2016:

| Grade | Current Midpoint | Suggested Increase | Resulting Midpoint | Indicative Market Midpoint SDR | New Midpoint as % of Market |
|-------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| M | 80,343 | 20.00% | 96,412 | 117,899 | 81.78% |
| L | 66,804 | 20.00% | 80,165 | 92,060 | 87.08% |
| K | 53,722 | 20.00% | 64,466 | 72,311 | 89.15% |
| J | 41,241 | 20.00% | 49,489 | 54,066 | 91.53% |
| I | 30,133 | 10.00% | 33,146 | 35,718 | 92.80% |

2 Background

The Staff Regulations within the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) provide for the linkage of salary scales for Professional staff to the I-M scales formerly within use within the five agencies now constituting the CROP. While the CROP has replaced the I-M scales with a new 18 band model (11 of which are professional bands), WCPFC requires access to market reference data aligned to the former CROP format.

This report provides an analysis of the three reference markets as at March 2016 as a basis for the review of the WCPFC salary scales.

This report documents the market research process conducted by Strategic Pay, including market data from PricewaterhouseCoopers Fiji.

3 Job Evaluation

In order to align the Mercer CED points which were the basis of the CROP (and still remain the basis of the WCPFC) remuneration systems, Strategic Pay developed the following alignment between the Mercer CED job points and Strategic Pay job points. The Strategic Pay system was formerly developed by PriceWaterhouse and remains the central core of the Strategic Pay NZ and PricewaterhouseCoopers Fiji databases.

The correlation, undertaken by Strategic Pay as early as 2004 and still in use today, is as follows:

| Grade | Mercer CED points (at band midpoint) | Strategic Pay/PwC Fiji points |
|-------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| M | 1180 | 1214 |
| L | 945 | 975 |
| K | 735 | 798 |
| J | 550 | 629 |
| I | 365 | 457 |

This alignment is as per our earlier reports.

4 Reference Markets

4.1 New Zealand Public Service

Data on the New Zealand public service is based on the Strategic Pay database, and in particular the February 2015 Central Government survey, released in April and published annually. This covers 39 State Sector organisations, primarily Government departments and ministries/agencies, and a sample of 40,053 employees. This survey is now a pre-eminent source of data on Central Government remuneration levels. It uses stratified sampling and extensive screening to avoid the skewing of data by large organisations with multiple jobholders in the same job family.

4.2 Australian Public Service

Benchmarking of Australian data is dependent on Australian public service (APS) rates using publicly available information, based on the annual APS Remuneration Survey.

Australian public service remuneration is related to a series of banded remuneration scales, three at SES level and nine non-SES classifications, including a graduate classification. The salary levels for SES and non-SES employees are benchmarked annually both within the public service and compared with the private sector in research commissioned annually by the Department of Employment and Workplace Relations. Research of this data has identified that the SES and non-SES scales have Mercer “work value” (Mercer CED) points as the point of comparison for survey purposes.

This survey is conducted annually in December. The published survey report for December 2015 has just become available and this report incorporates that data.

In 2013 it was noted that the APS medians typically move around 4-5% annually (and even higher in the past 12 months at that time) and the application of December 2012 data to a scale that becomes operative in January 2014 means that at that point the I-M scales are already lagging the market at that point.

4.3 Fiji General Market

As in earlier years, data on the Fiji All Organisations market has been sourced from the PwC Fiji database, or more particularly the April 2015 All Organisations survey.

[It should be noted that the CROP Agencies have retained the market mechanism for deriving band midpoints (i.e. the average of the NZ, Australian and Fiji markets as detailed in this report), applying the median of the Australian and New Zealand public service markets and the upper quartile of the Fiji general market (all organisations).]

5 Market Data Analysis

We are advised that the WCPFC salary scale midpoints as at 23 March 2015 are as follows:

| Grade | CED Points | | | Current Midpoint SDR |
|----------|------------|----------|------|----------------------|
| | Min | Midpoint | Max | |
| M | 1050 | 1180 | 1310 | 80,343 |
| L | 840 | 945 | 1049 | 66,804 |
| K | 630 | 735 | 839 | 53,722 |
| J | 470 | 550 | 629 | 41,241 |
| I | 260 | 365 | 469 | 30,133 |

The average SDR rates for March 2015 were:

- + Australian dollar - 1.791683 (source: http://www.imf.org/external/np/fin/data/param_rms_mth.aspx)
- + New Zealand dollar – 1.853718 (source: http://www.imf.org/external/np/fin/data/param_rms_mth.aspx)
- + Fiji dollar - 2.891845 (as supplied by Simon Clegg)

The raw market data sourced from the reference markets has been analysed to produce the following tables.

Table A: Current Scale of New Zealand Public Service, March 2013

| Grade | CED Points | | | Current Midpoint SDR | Base Salary SDR NZ Public Service | Current Midpoint of NZ Market |
|----------|------------|----------|------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | Min | Midpoint | Max | | | |
| M | 1050 | 1180 | 1310 | 80,343 | 157,888 | 50.9% |
| L | 840 | 945 | 1049 | 66,804 | 118,252 | 56.5% |
| K | 630 | 735 | 839 | 53,722 | 89,823 | 59.8% |
| J | 470 | 550 | 629 | 41,241 | 65,769 | 62.7% |
| I | 260 | 365 | 469 | 30,133 | 45,512 | 66.2% |

Table B: Current Scale of Australian Public Service, December 2012

| Grade | CED Points | | | Current Midpoint SDR | Base Salary SDR Australian Public Service | Current Midpoint of Aust Market |
|----------|------------|----------|------|----------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| | Min | Midpoint | Max | | | |
| M | 1050 | 1180 | 1310 | 80,343 | 125,208 | 64.2% |
| L | 840 | 945 | 1049 | 66,804 | 108,690 | 61.5% |
| K | 630 | 735 | 839 | 53,722 | 91,201 | 58.9% |
| J | 470 | 550 | 629 | 41,241 | 71,352 | 57.8% |
| I | 260 | 365 | 469 | 30,133 | 46,143 | 65.3% |

Table C: Current Scale of Fiji General Market, March 2013

| Grade | CED Points | | | Current Midpoint SDR | Base Salary SDR Fiji General Mkt Upper Quartile | Current Midpoint of Fiji Market |
|-------|------------|----------|------|----------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| | Min | Midpoint | Max | | | |
| M | 1050 | 1180 | 1310 | 80,343 | 70,601 | 113.8% |
| L | 840 | 945 | 1049 | 66,804 | 49,238 | 135.7% |
| K | 630 | 735 | 839 | 53,722 | 35,910 | 149.6% |
| J | 470 | 550 | 629 | 41,241 | 25,077 | 164.5% |
| I | 260 | 365 | 469 | 30,133 | 15,499 | 194.4% |

Table D: Summary Movements 2010-2013

| Grade | Base Salary SDR NZ Public Service | | | Base Salary SDR Aust Public Service | | | Base Salary SDR Fiji General Mkt UQ | | |
|-------|-----------------------------------|---------|----------|-------------------------------------|---------|----------|-------------------------------------|--------|----------|
| | 2013 | 2016 | % change | 2013 | 2016 | % change | 2013 | 2016 | % change |
| M | 157,516 | 157,888 | 0.2% | 148,404 | 125,208 | -15.6% | 60,772 | 70,601 | 16.2% |
| L | 115,987 | 118,252 | 2.0% | 128,893 | 108,690 | -15.7% | 45,756 | 49,238 | 7.6% |
| K | 88,885 | 89,823 | 1.1% | 108,547 | 91,201 | -16.0% | 33,583 | 35,910 | 6.9% |
| J | 65,303 | 65,769 | 0.7% | 85,574 | 71,352 | -16.6% | 24,443 | 25,077 | 2.6% |
| I | 44,776 | 45,512 | 1.6% | 55,338 | 46,143 | -16.6% | 15,645 | 15,499 | -0.9% |

To summarise, the following overall movement has occurred in the three reference markets since March 2013:

| Band | Average 2013 | Average 2016 | % Change Averaged Markets |
|------|--------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| M | 122,231 | 117,899 | -3.5% |
| L | 96,879 | 92,060 | -5.0% |
| K | 77,005 | 72,311 | -6.1% |
| J | 58,440 | 54,066 | -7.5% |
| I | 38,586 | 35,718 | -7.4% |

The variability in market movement is a function of

- + Impact of exchange rates, particularly Australia. In 2013 the SDR exchange rate was at an average of 1.454357 for March 2013 compared to 1.791683 in March 2015. For New Zealand and Fiji however the movements were minimal. Because of the large movement in the SDR rate the data shows negative movements over the period in question.
- + This combined with very small movements in the Australian public sector and minimal in the New Zealand public sector as well.

6 Proposed New WCPFC Scale

Remuneration practice in the CROP Agencies, both with the former grades derived from the Mercer CED system and with the new banding model developed in conjunction with Strategic Pay, has been to derive grade midpoints from the average of the three reference markets, as in Table E below:

Table E: Averaged Reference Market Rates, March 2013

| Grade | CED Points | | | Base Salary SDR March 2013 | | | Averaged Markets | Existing Scale | Existing Scale as % of Average |
|----------|------------|----------|------|----------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------|----------------|--------------------------------|
| | Min | Midpoint | Max | NZ Public Service | Aust Public Service | Fiji General Mkt UQ | | | |
| M | 1050 | 1180 | 1310 | 157,888 | 125,208 | 70,601 | 117,899 | 80,343 | 68.1% |
| L | 840 | 945 | 1049 | 118,252 | 108,690 | 49,238 | 92,060 | 66,804 | 72.6% |
| K | 630 | 735 | 839 | 89,823 | 91,201 | 35,910 | 72,311 | 53,722 | 74.3% |
| J | 470 | 550 | 629 | 65,769 | 71,352 | 25,077 | 54,066 | 41,241 | 76.3% |
| I | 260 | 365 | 469 | 45,512 | 46,143 | 15,499 | 35,718 | 30,133 | 84.4% |

Should the Commission move to adopt the above market median data as the basis for the salary scales to apply from January 2017, then the following salary scale and steps would apply:

Table F: Fully Market-Based WCPFC Professional Staff Salary Scale 2017

| Grade | Annual Salary SDR as from 1 January 2017 | | | | | | | | | Current Midpt | % Incr to move to Mkt |
|----------|--|---------|---------|---------|----------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------------|-----------------------|
| | Point 1 | Point 2 | Point 3 | Point 4 | Point 5 | Point 6 | Point 7 | Point 8 | Point 9 | | |
| M | 94,319 | 100,214 | 106,109 | 112,004 | 117,899 | 123,794 | 129,689 | 135,584 | 141,479 | 80,343 | 46.7% |
| L | 73,648 | 78,251 | 82,854 | 87,457 | 92,060 | 96,663 | 101,266 | 105,869 | 110,472 | 66,804 | 37.8% |
| K | 61,465 | 64,176 | 66,888 | 69,600 | 72,311 | 75,023 | 77,735 | 80,446 | 83,158 | 53,722 | 34.6% |
| J | 45,956 | 47,984 | 50,011 | 52,039 | 54,066 | 56,094 | 58,121 | 60,149 | 62,176 | 41,241 | 31.1% |
| I | 29,764 | 31,252 | 32,741 | 34,229 | 35,718 | 37,207 | 38,695 | 40,184 | 41,672 | 30,133 | 18.5% |

Clearly, however, there is no likelihood of the WCPFC governing body adopting movements of the level identified in the final column in Table F. The governing body must weigh up the key principles involved in making a decision on scale movement and their relative importance. For example,

- + Parity with market would suggest a new scale along the above lines – Table F
- + Parity with the CROP might suggest a modest move but still sizeable movements as in table H below
- + Affordability might mean that neither of the above principles can be achieved.

Alignment with the CROP Agencies

We note that the adoption of the current scales in January 2015 resulted in the following relativity of the Commission scale with the CROP Agency scale at that time:

Table G: Relativity of CROP and WCPFC Scales January 2015

| Band | CROP equivalent January 2015 | WCPFC January 2015 | Comparatio |
|----------|------------------------------|--------------------|------------|
| M | 116,771 | 80,343 | 67% |
| L | 93,278 | 66,804 | 70% |
| K | 70,795 | 53,722 | 74% |
| J | 56,421 | 41,241 | 72% |
| I | 35,755 | 30,133 | 83% |

The CROP Agencies undertook their Triennial Review in 2015 and as a result of some of the outcomes of that report they are reviewing the market comparators they use for their Bands. As at the time of writing this review is being conducted.

Should alignment with the CROP Agencies remain a key principle for the WCPFC Council, then the current scales would need to move significantly to achieve that goal. The following table analyses how that might look in practice:

Table H: Suggested Scale for January 2017 and Associated Relativity

| Band | Current Midpoint | Suggested Movement in WCPFC scale | Suggested Scale January 2017 | Potential CROP Scale January 2017 | Jan 2017 WCPFC Scale as % of CROP | Jan 2017 WCPFC Scale as % of Market |
|----------|------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| M | 80,343 | 20% | 96,412 | 123,777 | 78% | 83% |
| L | 66,804 | 20% | 80,165 | 98,875 | 81% | 83% |
| K | 53,722 | 20% | 64,466 | 75,043 | 86% | 83% |
| J | 41,241 | 20% | 49,489 | 59,815 | 83% | 83% |
| I | 30,133 | 10% | 33,146 | 37,900 | 88% | 90% |

Wider Implications of Scale Movement

One of the major advantages of the new CROP banding model is that changes to the band midpoints do not automatically equate to the same changes in employee pay. This is because the CROP Banding model has a band midpoint, a minimum (80% of the midpoint) and a maximum (120% of the midpoint) but no intermediate points or steps. Management has complete flexibility around where staff are paid on the scale, but the broad principle is that staff developing competence should be paid in the lower part of the range; competent staff should be paid around the middle or be moving to that point, with the top part of the range reserved for genuine high performers.

One of the implications of any scale movement along the lines proposed in Table H is that staff will not only derive the % movement indicated in the final column (e.g. 20% for most bands) but in addition may well be entitled to a point-based increment.

Strategic Pay would contend that the Commission is locked into an entitlement-focussed approach to pay with dramatic effects when the scale is moved as it probably needs to if the Commission is to retain any form of parity with the CROP Agencies, let alone with the market for positions advertised internationally.

It may well be time for the Commission to consider the following steps:

1. Have all Band I-M roles re-sized in the Strategic Pay SP10® system in the same manner as the CROP Agencies and also Vital-FSM Petrocorp
2. Develop a revised banding model – either the same as the CROP Agencies – which would mean you could potentially coat-tail directly on the annual Market Reference updates we do for them as a group, or one that gives better effect to internal relativities and career structures within the Commission, or use the standard banding model Strategic Pay have now developed for the NZ-Australia market.
3. Review and amend the current remuneration policy to bring it more into line with modern remuneration practice, with open ranges, greater Management discretion, performance-based progression in range etc.
4. Ensure that WCPFC’s current performance appraisal system is able to differentiate levels of performance and hence link to performance-based progression through the salary range
5. Transition staff across to the new bands and ranges on their existing salary and transition to the appropriate part of the pay range over time based on sustained performance and affordability.

The CROP Agencies have been progressively, and each at their own pace, addressing the latter three steps, having all moved as one to re-size the roles and develop a new banding model in 2010.

Consultant Proposal for Grade Midpoint Movements

Without wishing to pre-suppose the Commission’s view on what might be an appropriate level of movement, Table I below outlines the indicative scale based on the midpoint move suggested above in table H.

Table I: Indicative WCPFC Scale January 2017

| Band | Annual Salary SDR as from 1 January 2017 | | | | | | | | | Current Midpt | % Change Current Scale |
|----------|--|---------|---------|---------|---------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------------|------------------------|
| | Point 1 | Point 2 | Point 3 | Point 4 | Point 5 | Point 6 | Point 7 | Point 8 | Point 9 | | |
| M | 77,129 | 81,950 | 86,770 | 91,591 | 96,412 | 101,232 | 106,053 | 110,873 | 115,694 | 80,343 | 20.0% |
| L | 64,132 | 68,140 | 72,148 | 76,157 | 80,165 | 84,173 | 88,181 | 92,190 | 96,198 | 66,804 | 20.0% |
| K | 54,796 | 57,214 | 59,631 | 62,049 | 64,466 | 66,884 | 69,301 | 71,719 | 74,136 | 53,722 | 20.0% |
| J | 42,066 | 43,922 | 45,778 | 47,633 | 49,489 | 51,345 | 53,201 | 55,057 | 56,913 | 41,241 | 20.0% |
| I | 27,621 | 29,002 | 30,384 | 31,765 | 33,146 | 34,528 | 35,909 | 37,290 | 38,672 | 30,133 | 10.0% |

Appendix A: About Strategic Pay

Strategic Pay provides innovative solutions to organisations for their strategic remuneration, performance development and performance improvement needs. We help improve your overall performance by ensuring employee effort, remuneration and rewards are closely aligned with business objectives.

Deliver strategic rewards

Our experienced team work alongside you to provide a compelling proposition that attracts retains and motivates the best people.

Our adaptable solutions include:

- + Remuneration and reward strategy development
- + Executive remuneration and performance advice (including incentives)
- + Salary options using job evaluation, grades, bands or benchmarks
- + Salary review management, including processes, tools and training
- + Performance development systems, including customised design and implementation

Access New Zealand's largest remuneration data services

Strategic Pay offers an unrivalled suite of over 30 nationwide and specialist industry and sector remuneration survey reports, based on a database of more than 140,000 employees from over 1,000 organisations.

Use smart technology

We understand busy HR practitioners' needs and offer a range of smart tools to manage remuneration and survey submissions:

- + RemWise®: a remuneration tool to manage all aspects of your salary review, market data and survey submissions
- + Rem On-Demand®: online access to remuneration reports, resources and insights
- + PayCalculator: survey data at your fingertips

Drive organisation performance

Superior organisational performance is critical to delivering strategic business objectives. Speak to us today about using PLUS+ to develop a future proof strategy, an organisational model and structure that supports the strategy and the right people matched to the accountabilities best designed to deliver it in your organisation.

Build capability

Through a range of workshops and the Strategic Pay Academy we provide clients with comprehensive short courses in Remuneration, Performance Management and Organisational Performance. We also offer training programmes that can be tailored to meet your specific requirements.

Consult Nationwide

Strategic Pay is nationwide, servicing clients across all parts of New Zealand from our various locations. Our consultants regularly travel to visit clients around the country and are happy to meet wherever you are.

Find out more at www.strategicpay.co.nz