Implementation Assessment Guidelines

International Reference Field Function Grid (IRFFG)

2020

	Document created / reviewed by:	Review date:	Approved by:	Approval date:	Distribution:
Creation	Monica Folch, Amanda Cunningham		IDRH	July 2012	HRCo, HoM
Review	IRFFGCo	2017 (DRAFT)			
Review	HR Technical Platform	September 2020	HTRP	October 2020	

Table of Contents

1. GENERAL INFORMATION 3

1.1. Function Grid 3

1.2. IRFFG General Principles 3

2. IRFFG IMPLEMENTATION 4

2.1. Roles & Responsibilities 4

2.2. Implementation scenarios at field level 5

2.4. Doing a Preliminary Risk Analysis 7

2.4.1. Item detail: Compare your Mission Function Grid with the IRFFG 7

2.4.2. Typology Table for Managing Functions Not Matching the IRFFG Standard 9

2.4.3. Item detail: Quick points on other items to assess 15

2.5. Defining an Action Plan 15

ANNEX 1. PRELIMINARY RISK ANALYSIS GUIDELINE 16

ANNEX 2. OTHER ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENTS ON IRFFG.MSF.ORG 20

ANNEX 3. SUGGESTED OTHER DOCS FROM YOUR OC 21

ACRONYMS

CMT	Coordination Management Team	IRFFG	International Reference Field Function Grid
FG	Function Grid	IRFFGCo	Intersectional IRFFG Coordinator
HRO/A	Cell Human Resources Officer/Advisor	JD	Job description
HQ	Headquarters	JP	Job profile
HRTP	HR Technical Platform	OC	Operational Center
IDRH	HR Directors Platform	TCO	Technical Content Owners

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

This document has been developed to support the implementation of the International Reference Field Function Grid (IRFFG) in the field and is particularly addressed to field HR Coordinators.

If your mission is already on the IRFFG, for the maintenance of your function grid please refer to the "IRFFG Maintenance Guidelines".

1.1. Function Grid

The International Reference Field Function Grid is the result of a professional job evaluation system used to classify all MSF field functions. Using a common set of weighting criteria with no distinction between positions held by international or national staff we evaluate all jobs to establish a credible and consistent hierarchy between them, to differentiate internal contributions, and to provide equity, coherence and transparency in managing staff.

Being the cornerstone of most HR processes, the function grid is being used to define career paths, plan for succession and continuity, design work and organization, support pay structure, and differentiate internal contributions. These are all key elements for optimizing the capacity of our staff, which is strategic to improving the quality of our operations.

1.2. IRFFG General Principles

- **Progressive alignment:** all existing MSF field function grids will have to align towards the IRFFG.
- **Comprehensive:** the IRFFG aims at including all field functions without consideration of the employee occupying each position.
- **Based on generic responsibilities:** The IRFFG is based on each function's responsibilities and requirements
- **Coherent:** All functions are scored using the same set of weighting criteria agreed by all five Operational Sections. The criteria: Know How, Problem Solving and Accountability are based on the proven methodology of the HAY Group (International Management Consultants).
- **Adaptable:** IRFFG is a tool to enhance the quality of our operations and needs to be adaptable to our needs in the Field.
- **Not directly linked to remuneration:** Function grid is not the same as a salary grid, though they are clearly linked. The levels of the function grid should not be used to increase or decrease salaries.

2. IRFFG IMPLEMENTATION

These guidelines focus on implementation of the IRFFG in the field for National Staff, with particular emphasis on the initial assessment and analysis.

If your mission is already on the IRFFG, there are separate documents concerned with update and maintenance.

2.1. Roles & Responsibilities



Intersectional Responsibilities

Intersectional IRFFG Coordinator

Working closely with the IDRH, HR Platforms and International Platforms of Support Departments, and in close cooperation with HR Technical Platform

- Responsible for the central management and development of MSF's job evaluation system (incl. policies and procedures)
- Responsible for technical content of IRFFG, including creating and scoring functions
- Ensuring adherence to international procedures
- Maintaining the centralized database /standard profiles
- Supporting the correct technical implementation of the IRFFG

MSF HR Technical Platform

Working in close cooperation with the IRFFG coordinator

- Responsible for technical content IRFFG, including creating and scoring functions
- Overseeing the correct technical implementation of the IRFFG
- Developing international policies and procedures

IDRH

- Providing international vision on IRFFG and implementation framework
- As the owner of the IRFFG, ensuring the centralized management

HR Field Platform

- Being responsible for the IRFFG implementation strategy
- Monitoring the adaptations and deviations towards the standard grid

Technical Content Owners (HQ Technical Referents/Advisors, Intersectional working groups)

- Being responsible for the validation of the technical content of the job profiles (JP)

Directors' Platforms

- Providing final validation of senior functions (Level 9 and above) that impact on the management structure in the field in their domain

Responsibilities at your HQ

HR Technical Referent

- Overseeing implementation of IRFFG in OC and providing technical support
- Scoring of new functions in OC
- Presenting new functions in his/her OC missions to the HR Technical Platform and the IRFFG Coordinator for validation
- Ensures that information of prioritized mission countries where the IRFFG is to be implemented

is shared with other OCs, at least once a year.

Since roles and responsibilities at HQ level differ from one section to the other, it will be up to each section to decide who is responsible for

- giving the final validation regarding implementation decisions
- supporting the field during implementation

Responsibilities in your Mission

HRCo

- Risk analysis (function matching, legal analysis, etc.) and preparation for IRFFG implementation
- Implementing the IRFFG (or managing its implementation) in the Mission, including administration and communication, following the instructions and support from HQ, the steps that will be developed in the next chapter and the credo of "Apply or Explain".
- Adhering to IRFFG guidelines in Mission
- Applying OC standard functions in Mission
- Ensuring JDs are based on IRFFG standard template
- Identifying potential new functions that are not in IRFFG

IRFFG Analyst / Implementer

- Supporting the mission with preparation, risk analysis and recommendations for the implementation process of the IRFFG

2.2. Implementation scenarios at field level

There are seven different scenarios:

If you are newly setting up:

1) …in a new mission country where no other MSF section is already working,
2) …in a multi-section country where one section has already implemented the IRFFG,
3) …in a multi-section country where no section is on the IRFFG and there is not a harmonized grid used by all sections,

you must implement the IRFFG.

If you are already working:

4) …as the single section in a country,
5) …in a multi section country where one section has already implemented the IRFFG,
6) …in a multi-section country where no section is on the IRFFG and there is not a harmonized grid used by all sections,

you can implement the IRFFG when your OC decides it is the right moment to do it. The opportune moment may be one that coincides with other HR revisions/changes.

If there is a harmonized grid in use by all OCs in the country:

7) …**decide together with the other OCs when is the right moment to implement the IRFFG**, whether at the same time or on a staggered timetable.



Prior to any implementation:

- In an already running mission-country, you will have to ask your OC for validation to launch such a process, as they will need to provide adequate support when transitioning from the existing Field Function Grid (FFG) to the IRFFG.
- If applicable, your OC will **inform any other OC present** in the country about your implementation plans well in advance
- A **risk analysis** will have to be carried out, including input from other OCs present in the country, in particular the learning from the previous implementation process.
- Possible new deviations to the IRFFG 2017 will be discussed with the other OCs in the Technical HR Platform, while deviations already used by the mission or other OCs in the country are followed if still relevant/justified.

There is a **commitment between OCs to share their implementation plans of the IRFFG** once a year or on an *ad hoc* basis if necessary. This will include prioritized countries and timelines. This exchange of information will be done through the HR referents in each OCs, and it will help in identifying synergies and coordination between sections.

Be aware that changing your existing FG will take time, will require an HR and legal analysis, a solid communication plan and will, probably, require several, possibly complex, administrative/ bureaucratic steps. When launching such a review process, draw up an Action Plan and ALWAYS liaise with your HR referent at HQ. A template to support you with the initial analysis is provided in Annex 1.

2.4. Doing a Preliminary Risk Analysis

The preliminary risk analysis is an assessment that will allow you to understand the challenges and opportunities linked to the implementation of the IRFFG in the mission. These include legal, social, and financial factors.

Items to be assessed

1) Comparison of existing Grid vs. IRFFG
2) Legal frame of the country to change contract conditions
3) Relevance of the existing Salary Scale
4) Social situation in the mission
5) Upcoming implementation opportunities
6) Other relevant info
7) Main conclusions

With the above, you should be able to provide a:

8) Proposal for timing for implementation
9) Estimated financial impact

The assessment should be done at mission level, led by the HRCo but involving the whole CMT. The HRCo should start by explaining the IRFFG and the implementation process to the rest of CMT and ensure that they actively participate in the discussions. The HRCo should also count on the support from the HR Officer/Advisor/Referent and will need their validation. Make sure that the analysis is done **confidentially,** to avoid creating any possible expectations / problems with the staff.

! Plan your time in advance. Be aware that this analysis will take a considerable time.

Annex 1 provides a sample preliminary risk analysis document (your OC may have their own so check with your HR referent). Work through the guideline addressing all the questions raised.

2.4.1. Item detail: Compare your Mission Function Grid with the IRFFG

1. **Extract the function grid from Homere** and check exactly which positions and titles you are using and the current levels assigned to each of them.

2. **Collect your mission JDs**, ensuring you have an overall view of all the JDs that are currently in use (you may wish to liaise with Project HR Managers) and how they align with the FG in Homere.

3. **Compare your mission function grid with the IRFFG**, identifying which functions in your Mission match with the IRFFG ones and which do not with regards to:

    a. **title** and **level**. This gives a first initial quick overview.
    b. **responsibilities.** Compare the **CONTENT** of ALL your mission's JD with the corresponding reference JP. Even when a mission job title matches with the reference job title, please cross- check that the content and level of responsibility and accountabilities also match.

    In addition, if you are dealing with a country where only the old version of the IRFFG has been implemented already and/or there are existing deviations:

    a. use the conversion table to match the old IRFFG grid in use in the country with the current IRFFG.
    b. Determine if existing deviations are still relevant.

Change in the IRFFG makes the deviation redundant:

Example: in old function grid the electrician deviated to level 5, in new IRFFG the function is already on level 5, so deviation is no longer needed. You can take the new function code for electrician without a D.

Change in the IRFFG does not affect the deviation:

Example: the midwife has been deviated to level 5 in the old grid, in the new IRFFG it is still in level 6, and the reason for the deviation still exists, then take the new function code for midwife add a D and put the function in level 5. This means you have translated the deviation into the new function code.

For those mission functions that do NOT match the reference ones, you may find this is because of one, or several reasons. For example, compared to the IRFFG, the mission's function:

- is at a higher/lower level than in the IRFFG,
- mixes 2 reference functions (e.g. Mechanic Driver)
- has a different title
- doesn't exist,
- etc.

The fact that a specific function does not exactly match the reference one does not mean it is wrong, as the context and responsibilities drafted in your Mission may significantly differ from the reference one.

In order to provide a framework to find solutions for various recurring situations, a typology table is set out in the next section giving types of mismatch with proposed solutions.

4. **See how many staff are involved, possible consequences legal and social,** and share the risk analysis with the other OCs in the country.

   It is critical that each function be carefully examined and analyzed. You should liaise closely with the HQ referent for any functions where levels of accountability differ and/or the position needs to be (re)scored.

Please bear in mind that change processes, in particular where linked to salary, are highly sensitive and our operations could be seriously jeopardized through a poorly planned and executed IRFFG implementation.

Remember! The purpose of this framework is to provide flexibility to the field when adapting the IRFFG, while ensuring **coherence** across all missions/sections and a minimum number of deviations from the IRFFG.

2.4.2. Typology Table for Managing Functions Not Matching the IRFFG Standard

REASON / REQUEST	DIFFERENCE TYPOLOGY	EXAMPLE	COMPARISON MISSION JD WITH STANDARD JP	OUTCOME IN MISSION IRFFG	OUTCOME IN NS SALARY GRID[1]	POINTS TO CONSIDER	POSSIBLE RISKS & CONSEQUENCES	TIPS AND SOLUTIONS
Function Requested at a Lower Level								
FUNCTION REQUESTED AT A LOWER LEVEL	Incomplete fulfilment of the function (individual competencies)	Sometimes the intended jobholder is someone who cannot *yet* fulfil the function entirely and needs further coaching /training etc. Because of this the Job description is sometimes adapted to these specific temporary personal conditions. **This option is wrong!**	Accountabilities for the function are the same as the reference ones. Remember that personal circumstances do not impact in describing a job position.	We keep the reference function title and we score the position at the same level as in the IRFFG.	The person will be paid accordingly.	What additional support or training will the post holder require? What opportunities are there to build competencies?	The jobholder does not manage to develop the competencies to fulfil the function up to standard	The jobholder should be developed to fulfil all accountabilities, within an agreed timeframe, with a clear development plan and indicators.
	Function upgraded in the IRFFG	"Mechanic": In the IRFFG it is currently at L5 (after the log review) when previously it was at L4	Ensure the accountabilities are the same as the reference one (not just the title). If not the same, adjust to match the reference accountabilities.	Once mission function grid is adjusted to the new levels, we score this position at the same level as in the IRFFG.	Once mission function grid is adjusted to the new levels, the person will be paid accordingly at the higher level.	If the accountabilities are not the same: What are the differences? Why?	Will the person be able to fulfil all of the responsibilities in the upgraded JD?	See above point.
	Recognition of diploma	"X without diploma". In some countries and due to a lack of technical schools/universities MSF needs to hire staff with no official/registered diploma.	The jobholder without diploma fulfils 100% of the reference function:	You can change the job title, but keep the reference Homere code and place the position at the same level as in the IRFFG	The person will be paid accordingly.	In long standing missions are there opportunities to support such job-holder(s) to gain a diploma?	Possible future risk of having both 'without diploma' and with diploma working in same mission and objection from the job-holder with the diploma	

[1] Be aware that in certain of these typology examples the consequences of re-scoring may lead to salaries being frozen as the position may have been 'over-rated' in the past

REASON / REQUEST	DIFFERENCE TYPOLOGY	EXAMPLE	COMPARISON MISSION JD WITH STANDARD JP	OUTCOME IN MISSION IRFFG	OUTCOME IN NS SALARY GRID[1]	POINTS TO CONSIDER	POSSIBLE RISKS & CONSEQUENCES	TIPS AND SOLUTIONS
		"X without diploma" cannot stay as "X"	The "function without diploma" now has to be supervised by one with diploma, or can only fulfil 80% of the function, or legally cannot hold the title and responsibilities.	Modify the job title and JD (in effect, create a new JD) and refer to the HQ referent to score it and validate the final level.	New employees will be paid accordingly. Current employees may have their salary protected or alternatively may receive new contracts and paid accordingly.[2]	Are there any future developmental opportunities to support the job-holder to gain a diploma?	The new position may be scored lower which could lead to a frozen salary. What are the implications, and how is this to be managed on an ongoing administrative basis and during any general revision of remuneration?	Consult with referents about optimising your team setup. Talk to your HR and Homere referents about the best way to manage frozen salaries for your mission.
Function Requested at a Higher Level								
FUNCTION REQUESTED AT A HIGHER LEVEL	Choice of mapping	"Doctor": in some projects doctors may be acting as activity managers, in others they may only be undertaking medical consultations.	The activity manager has a far wider scope of accountabilities than a medical doctor.	Place the jobholder in the corresponding position and level, ensuring that accountabilities correspond.	The person will be paid accordingly.	Was the upgrade of position for salary reasons due to problems recruiting this function? See the example below.	There may be resistance to the fact that the base function (and thus salary) level may be lower than before.	Explain clearly and persistently the logic and structure of the IRFFG. The PMR and/or PC might also need to be involved in passing the message. Pay attention to the responsibilities demanded, not just the diploma.

[2] Please note that freezing salaries is not always legal. And the question of new employees may need to be addressed in some countries where you cannot have a different salary for the same position.

REASON / REQUEST	DIFFERENCE TYPOLOGY	EXAMPLE	COMPARISON MISSION JD WITH STANDARD JP	OUTCOME IN MISSION IRFFG	OUTCOME IN NS SALARY GRID[1]	POINTS TO CONSIDER	POSSIBLE RISKS & CONSEQUENCES	TIPS AND SOLUTIONS
	Market demand & positioning	"Specialised Doctor": in the market, specialised doctors may be in high demand and therefore difficult to recruit, and/or may be paid much more than generalist doctors.	Accountabilities for the function are the same as the reference one	We keep the reference job title and the reference Homere code and we score the position at the same level as in the IRFFG	The function will be paid accordingly. If we need to make a difference in pay because of market supply, a function allowance can be added to the salary, if justified and validated by HQ.	Do all the specialties which fall under the generic function have the same demand/positioning, or require the same or any function allowance?	The function may be paid more than the line manager and the mission may wish to apply the same allowance to higher functions despite their market positioning.	Explain clearly the logic and structure of the IRFFG. Be transparent about why a specific function may receive an allowance (and not all functions requiring the same diploma, for example).
	Security / Administrative Context	"Liaison officer": in some countries this function tends to be very strategic for the mission as it is hard to obtain visas when expats are not welcomed by the authorities. [Often MSF has changed the title to HOM Assistant in order to upgrade the position. This is wrong!]	Accountabilities for the function are the same as the reference one	We keep the reference job title and the reference Homere code and we score the position at the same level as in the IRFFG	The person will be paid accordingly.	How will this be communicated? Who makes the final decision?	A perceived loss/lack of status will be badly received. Security or operational risk may be forcefully argued as a reason for not implementing. Will HRCo be overridden?	HR and or HoM might also need to be involved in passing the message.
	Volume/ Dimension/ Complexity	"Supply Manager": In some countries where the operations are very big, the volume of supplies to be managed can be huge because of the size of the MSF mission	Accountabilities for the function are the same as the reference one	We keep the reference job title and the reference Homere code and we score the position at the same level as in the IRFFG	The person will be paid accordingly.	Do we handle volume and complexity by adjusting the job, or adjusting the team structure?	The job holder may lose motivation or be disappointed as the pay and/or status is not increasing with operational volume. Does the HRCo run the risk of being overridden by HoM / functional Director in OC?	Consult with referents about optimising your team setup, as this is how volume and complexity is currently handled e.g. mission supply manager implies a large operation

REASON / REQUEST	DIFFERENCE TYPOLOGY	EXAMPLE	COMPARISON MISSION JD WITH STANDARD JP	OUTCOME IN MISSION IRFFG	OUTCOME IN NS SALARY GRID[1]	POINTS TO CONSIDER	POSSIBLE RISKS & CONSEQUENCES	TIPS AND SOLUTIONS
	Function downgraded in the IRFFG	"Head of Mission Assistant": In the IRFFG is at L7 and in many OC function grids was in L8 or even L9	Accountabilities for the function are the same as the reference one	We score this position at the same level as in the IRFFG	New employees will be paid accordingly. Current employees may have their salary protected (kept as is until higher remuneration e.g. due to loyalty).3	Who makes the final decision?	For a current job holder the loss of perceived status and frozen salary will be difficult and will need to be handled tactfully. Security risk may be forcefully argued as a reason for not implementing.	Suggested that given the reporting line the HoM should be involved in passing on the message.
Mission Function JD Mixing 2 Functions We will consider a combined position when the percentage of performance of both functions is >20%. **AS A GENERAL RULE: Try to avoid combined positions as much as possible. When the activities do not require a full-time person, consider part-time contracts for different employees[4] rather than mixing activities and/or responsibilities of various nature and/or level.**								
MISSION FUNCTION JD MIXING 2 FUNCTIONS	2 functions corresponding to two different levels in the function grid	"Driver (L3)-Purchaser(L5)"	2 functions already existing in the IRFFG (or created functions that have been scored)	You can keep the job title (combined title) but keep the corresponding Homere reference code (deviated) for the "lower" function (here, Driver), and score it at the same level as in the IRFFG (L3)	The salary will be pro-rated based on the % of performance of each function. e.g. 25% salary L5 and 75% L3. The lower function salary will be complemented to reach the desired remuneration.	How does MSF proceed if over 50% of performance is at higher level? Does the % dictate the level or purely the salary? Does the person fulfil each role fully, even though part-time on each?	If the % of performance of each function varies month to month, one risks a negative financial impact for the employee (or MSF).	Always use the lower level function as base, as you can always top up for the corresponding salary but not deduct! Estimate the average split over the course of a year, and use history to modify if needed.

[3] Please note that freezing salaries is not always legal. And the question of new employees may need to be addressed in some countries where you cannot have a different salary for the same position.

[4] You CANNOT have two different part-time contracts for the same employee in HOMERE. When contracting someone to fulfill two functions, clearly specify in the employee's contract that (s) he will perform both JD and attach both JD to the employment contract. To enter this combined function in HOMERE please proceed as indicated above.

REASON / REQUEST	DIFFERENCE TYPOLOGY	EXAMPLE	COMPARISON MISSION JD WITH STANDARD JP	OUTCOME IN MISSION IRFFG	OUTCOME IN NS SALARY GRID[1]	POINTS TO CONSIDER	POSSIBLE RISKS & CONSEQUENCES	TIPS AND SOLUTIONS
	Two functions corresponding to the same level in the function grid	"Watchman-Gardener"	2 functions already existing in the IRFFG (or created functions that have been scored)	You can keep the job title (combined title) but keep only one corresponding Homere reference code (deviated, usually, of the function that the employee devotes most of the time)	The person will be paid according to the level.	Does the person fulfil each role fully, even though part-time on each?		
Mission's Function Not Existing in IRFFG								
MISSION'S FUNCTION NOT EXISTING IN THE IRFFG	New function	"Dentist":	It does not correspond with any existing reference function	Liaise with your HQ referent to make all necessary steps to create a new function in the function grid. (See earlier subsection for procedure.)	The person will be paid accordingly	Is the JD well elaborated? Is it clear where the position sits in the organisation chart? These points have a direct impact on the scoring.	Scoring may not match with mission expectation.	Role of the HRCo, supported by IRFFG referent and TCO, to understand the FG, the positions and accountabilities. When in doubt contact the HR Referent.
	"False" new function	"Paediatric nurse": At a first glance it does not exist in the IRFFG, but it could fit within an already existing standard Function (in this case, Nurse).	Accountabilities and requirements for the function are the same as the reference ones. If accountabilities are not the same, then we would be talking about a new function (see above)	You can change the job title but we keep the function's reference Homere code (deviated) and we score the position at the same level as in the IRFFG	The person will be paid accordingly		Managers may be convinced that what they need is a new function.	Think of the reference JD as a framework document including main responsibilities and tasks, but without needing to go into full detail (a Nurse would be a Nurse in the Maternity ward or in any other place.

REASON / REQUEST	DIFFERENCE TYPOLOGY	EXAMPLE	COMPARISON MISSION JD WITH STANDARD JP	OUTCOME IN MISSION IRFFG	OUTCOME IN NS SALARY GRID[1]	POINTS TO CONSIDER	POSSIBLE RISKS & CONSEQUENCES	TIPS AND SOLUTIONS
Mission's Function with a Different Title to the Reference One								
Mission's function with a different title to the reference one	Context	"Physician's Assistant" vs "Clinical Officer": Certain job titles are more acceptable in a country or are linked to the diploma name given	Check contents of both JDs. If accountabilities are the same, it is the same function	You can use the mission's title if you need to, but you will use the reference Homere code for the function (deviated) and you will score it as in the IRFFG	The person will be paid accordingly	Is the title consistent with MSF Common Language? For example, there should be no 'Data Manager' at level 6!		

2.4.3. Item detail: Quick points on other items to assess

Please remember that before confirming any changes in the current mission's function grid you MUST first:

a. Check if there are any legal constraints in the national labor law regarding classification of functions.
b. Check if increasing/lowering a given Function's level will affect any other level in your Mission's function grid.
c. Check the budget impact linked to changes in the salary grid and ensure that it is validated.
    - Keep in mind that although lowering the level in the Function Grid MSF will keep the employee's current salary as it is and freeze it until its new level reaches his actual and frozen salary.
    - Take into account also impact of salary adjustments
    - Lowering the level in function grid will not only have consequences in pay but could also affect our operations (strikes, resignations, difficulties in recruitment, etc.)
    - Avoid retroactivity

A risk assessment template is included in Annex 1 of these guidelines to help you explore and analyze these areas.

2.5. Defining an Action Plan

Once the previous steps are completed, you will have a clearer picture of your Mission, as well as the possible deviations you might need to implement from the IRFFG, or the possible salary adjustments you might need to apply.

With this overview you can define an Action Plan. If you are in a multi-section country the HR referent will consult other OCs working in the country regarding the proposed Action Plan.

Please remember that as part of your Action Plan you should:

a. Finalise the **chronogram** for implementation (realistic timeline based on the analysis)
b. Finalise the **mapping** (involves discussion at HRTP level)
c. **Discuss** within OC and intersectionally and **take final decisions** on any changes to the HR package, mitigation measures, etc.
d. Finalise the **financial impact** calculation
e. Define a proper **communication plan** including information to your Staff representatives (if any) and the affected employees.
f. Ask for specific changes in the **Homere Payroll calculation** if needed (freezing or breaking down a salary + complements)
g. Introduce all necessary **amendments in Homere** (including international codification)
h. Amend the affected **contracts** & provide **reference JPs** adjusted to your mission context and specificities)

Actions concerning JD & Salary may have a significant impact on your Mission's staff. Once HQ has validated the Action Plan (including budgetary impact), please continue to be extremely careful with legal issues, administrative and bureaucratic steps, communication to all staff and bear in mind the potential impact on our operations (possible strikes, resignations, etc).

ANNEX 1. PRELIMINARY RISK ANALYSIS GUIDELINE

Please check with your HR Referent before using this Preliminary Risk Analysis Guideline, as your OC may utilize its own document. Much of the key content will be the same.

This assessment will allow you to:

1) Understand the challenges linked to the implementation of the IRFFG in the mission
2) Propose a timing to implement
3) Establish a rough estimate of the financial impact of implementation

Note: this is only a preliminary exercise to get an overview. Once implementation has been decided, complementary analysis and further work will still need to be done.

Implementation Assessment

The assessment should be done at mission level, led by the HRCo but involving the whole Coordination Management Team (CMT). The HRCo should also count on the support from the HR Officer/Advisor/Referent.

- The HRCo should start by explaining the IRFFG and the implementation process to the rest of CMT and ensure that they actively participate in the discussions.
- Work through the guideline addressing all the questions raised.
- Make sure that the analysis is done **confidentially,** to avoid creating any possible expectations / problems with the staff.
- Plan your time in advance. Be aware that this analysis will take a considerable time.

Items to be assessed

1) Comparison of existing Grid vs. IRFFG
2) Legal frame of the country to change contract conditions
3) Relevance of the existing Salary Scale
4) Social situation in the mission
5) Upcoming implementation opportunities
6) Other relevant info
7) Main conclusions
8) Proposal for timing for implementation
9) Calculation of economic impact of the IRFFG

0) BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- Mission:
- Year when mission opened:
- Headcount (please fill in the following table):

Nb of staff	**Capital**	**Project 1**	**Project 2**	**Project 3**	**Project 4**
International staff					
National staff					
Incentive staff					

- Other sections working in the country:
- Expected EoM Date of HoM and HRCo:
- Existing FG (please attach)

1) COMPARISON OF EXISTING GRID VS. IRFFG

Refer to section 2.4.1 of the Guidelines for more detail.

The expected output is the following table:



comparison IRFFG.xlsx

Click on the paperclip icon to open the attached file.

- Only look at the National Staff positions.
- Extract your current FG from Homere and compare to the IRFFG.
- Include (with the right name) those positions that appear in Homere with a different name (i.e. perhaps at the time of creation you did not have the code, so used an existing one at the same level).
- Include those positions with no clear equivalent by finding the closest one (discuss these cases with your HR Officer/Advisor/Referent).
- Where the FG in your mission follows a completely different logic (i.e. levels are defined by Law, there are many more/less levels than IRFFG, etc…) please liaise with your HR Officer/Advisor/Referent to agree on an adapted comparison table.

Main findings:

2) LEGAL FRAME OF THE COUNTRY TO CHANGE CONTRACT CONDITIONS

Consider the following questions:

- What are the legal requirements in order to modify/reduce working conditions (Salary, job description & Category/Level) of an employee?
- Is it legal to freeze salaries (i.e. Basic, Seniority, Allowances)?
- Is it possible to lower levels?
- What are the legal processes to follow if you plan to change any benefit or part of the package linked to this revision (loyalty, 13th month, additional allowances, leave days, social coverage)?

- Do you have staff representatives in the mission? If yes, do they just need to be informed or do they have to be involved in the decision-making process itself?
- Are there any other technical formalities needed to implement this change (i.e. communication to staff within a specific notice period, validation from the staff representatives or involvement / validation of the Ministry of Labour)?

- Is the consent of the employee required to change title, job description, salary & other benefits? If employees refuse, how is MSF entitled to respond?
- Does the employee's consent need to be officially documented? Or if employee does not question the change, is it considered accepted?

- Do Job Descriptions mention the function grid level of the position? Is it compulsory to mention it?
- What are the different types and templates of contracts used in the country?
- Do contracts mention the function grid level of the position? Is it compulsory to mention it?

- Can we make these changes at any time? Do we need to wait for contracts to expire? Or is it necessary to close a contract before opening a new one on the IRFFG? If so, what are the implications for severance pay (and the subsequent economic impact)?
- Does the same analysis apply if the change is implemented after the termination of a fixed term contract, thus, as from the start of the new one?

- Other relevant information?

Many of these questions (and others that may arise related to the context) are best answered by a local lawyer. Contact your legal referent for help in framing the questions.

Main findings:

3) RELEVANCE OF THE EXISTING SALARY SCALE

Consider the following questions and fill out the table below:

- How is the structure of our Salary Scale? Does it have internal coherence (reasonable increments between levels/categories…)
- When was the last salary revision done? Was it accompanied by a benchmark?
- What was the increment given? When do you plan to do the next benchmark and/or revision?
- Is there a budget allocated to a salary revision this year and if so what is its amount?

- What is the annual inflation rate in the country?
- How are our salaries positioned in the market for the lower, medium and higher positions?
- Are there some positions where we face problems in recruitment/retention due to salaries? Which ones?
- Are there already some "blue"/frozen/out of grid salaries on the mission? If yes, how many? Which positions? Why?

- Are there some obligations applying to the salary scale:
  - Do we have to respect a given legal frame?
  - Is there a staff classification structure or obligatory salary tensions to apply by level/category?
  - Is there a law/Collective Agreement including minimum salary by function/position and/or specific tax or social contribution rate per function/level/category or salary level?
- Is there a validation process to respect for revision of the salary grid (internal or external)?

- Other relevant info?

Fill out the following table to see the internal coherence of the salary grid:


salary levels.xlsx

Click on the paperclip icon to open the attached file.

Main findings:

4) SOCIAL SITUATION IN THE MISSION

Consider the following questions:

- What is the current "social" situation in the mission? Have you had any recent problems with the staff?
- What acceptance from the staff can you foresee of implementing the IRFFG now?
- Could the reduction/freezing of salaries lead to security risks? De-motivation? If so, what can be done to mitigate these risks?
- Is employees' position/level important to them (would they be against any change even if the salary is not going to decrease)? For which staff/positions the level may be a big issue?
- Is employees' position name important to them (would they be against any change even if the salary is not going to decrease)? For which staff/positions the name may be a big issue?
- What is the seniority of our employees in the mission?
- Other relevant info?

Main findings:

5) UPCOMING IMPLEMENTATION OPPORTUNITIES

Looking ahead, when would be the best time to implement the IRFFG in your mission? For example, are any of the following opportunities anticipated in the coming months?

- Other OCs implementing IRFFG? (If so, how similar is our FG to those of the other sections in the country?)
- Pending salary revision?
- Closing/opening projects?
- Will there be a downsizing of the mission? Or growth?
- Revision of working conditions?
- Other?

Main findings:

6) OTHER RELEVANT INFO

- Any other relevant information related to the implementation of the IRFFG that was not previously commented on?

7) MAIN CONCLUSIONS

Summarize the main points of the assessment.

8) PROPOSAL OF TIMING

Based on the above analysis, when would be the best time to start the process? Why?

9) CALCULATION OF ESTIMATED ECONOMIC IMPACT OF THE IRFFG

Based on this initial assessment, provide an estimate of the financial cost of implementing the IRFFG.

The calculation of the economic impact is an important element of the assessment but, due to the possible complexity of the calculation and the impact of decisions that may still need to be taken, note that it will be an initial estimation. The impact will be finalised in a second step.

ANNEX 2. OTHER ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENTS ON IRFFG.MSF.ORG

i. Job Profiles

Referent job profiles (JPs) have been developed and approved for key functions within MSF. These, with the function grid, are available at irffg.msf.org. There are currently some 280 standard referent profiles, which will cover most positions.

ii. Definitions and Common Language

Common language guideline used to organize functions into professional categories.

iii. Job Description (JD) Template

IRFFG JP/JD template with brief notes on how to complete the document.

iv. Requesting a New Function – 10 Steps

10 steps to requesting and validating a new function.

v. Function Codes Conversion Table

For when other OCs in the country are using an older version of the IRFFG.

ANNEX 3. SUGGESTED OTHER DOCS FROM YOUR OC

- OC risk analysis document (in case your OC has its own)
- OC planning tool
    - Action plan, chronogram/timeline, project management tool…
- OC financial impact simulation