

1. DISPUTE

- 1.1** This dispute concerns a claim by S.I.P.T.U., on behalf of Mr. Noel Rogers who is employed by the Irish Times Limited, that he is entitled to the same rate of remuneration as that paid to two named female comparators in terms of Section 3(c) of the Anti-Discrimination (Pay) Act, 1974. Details of the claimant and the comparators are listed in Appendix A.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1** The Irish Times Limited was established in 1859 and it publishes the Irish Times and the Irish Field. Mr. Rogers is employed as an Analyst/Programmer earning an annual salary of £25,923.
- 2.2** The two named female comparators both work as Commercial Systems Support Executives and each earn an annual salary of £21,828 plus a bonus of £8,500. The Union argues that the claimant performs 'like work' with that performed by both named female comparators and he is, therefore, entitled to the same rate of pay. On 21st May, 1996 a claim under Section 3(c) of the Anti-Discrimination (Pay) Act, 1974 was submitted by S.I.P.T.U., on behalf of Mr. Rogers, to an Equality Officer for investigation and recommendation.

3. SUMMARY OF UNION'S CASE

- 3.1** According to the Union there are three separate Information Technology (I.T.) Departments within the Irish Times as follows:

The Editorial Systems Team - Est. 1991
The Commercial Systems Team - Est. 1992

The Union says that the Editorial and Commercial System teams were originally set up as temporary situations with the intention of their ultimate integration into the main I.T. Services Department. The Union states that the claimant sought and was refused jobs in both these teams on the basis that they were temporary teams and the work would ultimately be accommodated within the main I.T. Department.

- 3.2** The Union states that the claimant works in the I.T. Services Department as an analyst/programmer earning an annual salary of £26,000. The two female comparators, who are the same grade, work in the Commercial Systems Team and have an annual salary of £31,000 each.
- 3.3** According to the Union the claimant is professionally qualified as an Analyst/Programmer (3rd Level). He can perform analyst work, programming and system support work and do so in all three areas of I.T. operations. The Union contends that the two female comparators are not professionally qualified and are confined to systems support work in their own area.
- 3.4** The Union argues that the claimant has an entire range of responsibilities in excess of systems support which is more onerous and more skilled than that pertaining to the jobs performed by the named comparators. The Union says that neither of the comparators could perform the duties of the claimant whereas, in reverse, the claimant can and regularly does perform the work of the comparators.
- 3.5** The Union states that the claimant is a professional in

the broader I.T. area while the comparators have grown up with the particular system. The Union says that the comparators would not have any I.T. experience outside of their own area and would have a very limited knowledge of the broader I.T. system. According to the Union the claimant, in contrast, would be fully interchangeable with I.T. specialists in any other organisation.

3.6 The Union is satisfied that the comparators have a good working knowledge of their own system and can provide support for most of the difficulties that may arise. However, the Union says that the more complex issues have to be referred to the professionals in I.T. Systems Department including the claimant.

3.7 The Union states that, when the Commercial System was originally introduced, it was the expressed intention to have it fully integrated and supported from the I.T. Services Department and staff were so advised at the time. Because the team was only to be temporary the claimant was prevented from applying for a job in the team. The Union says that the predecessor of the Commercial Team was called 'Class' and this was serviced and supported by the I.T. Systems Team.

3.8 The Union says that the claimant must be able to support three systems whereas the comparators only support one system. On this basis the Union contends that the jobs must be deemed to be equal. The Union states that the claimant's role is even much more sophisticated and must, therefore, be acknowledged as operating well in excess of Clause 3(c) of the 1974 Pay Act. The Union says that, as the claimant is male and the comparators are female, the fact that the claimant is denied access to jobs in the Commercial Systems Team is a case of

discrimination under the 1974 Act.

4. SUMMARY OF THE COMPANY'S CASE

4.1 The Company says that the claimant is employed by it as an Analyst/Programmer with an annual salary of £25,923. The two female comparators are employed as Commercial Systems support executives and have a basic annual salary of £21,828 plus a bonus of £8,500 per annum. The Company rejects the Union's contention that the claimant is performing 'like work' with each of the named comparators under Section 3(c) of the 1974 Act. The Company says that there are grounds other than sex to justify the higher levels of remuneration to the comparators.

4.2 The Company examined the work performed by the claimant and that performed by the comparators and it set out its findings under the headings of skill, responsibility, mental effort and working conditions as follows:

Skill

To perform the job of the claimant one requires a diploma in information technology or experience in the general commercial computing environment. The Company says that there is a reasonable amount of judgement and initiative involved in the job. However the claimant is closely supervised and he can consult the I.T. manager should problems arise.

The Company says that the comparators, in order to perform their jobs, must be computer literate and have significant exposure to newspaper advertising and sales production. The Company states that the comparators require excellent communication skills as they need to

be able to deal with users in a pressurised environment. Furthermore they must solve problems rapidly due to time pressures. The Company says that the comparators are not closely supervised and must prioritise their own work. They must also have excellent training skills to train users to required levels.

On this basis the Company says that there is a greater skill involved in the job of the comparators.

Responsibility

According to the Company the claimant has some support duties but, in the main, they are not in the areas of newspaper production. The Company says that the systems which the claimant supports include management information systems, accounts and billing systems. Errors which may be made will be picked up by others and the impact will not be as great as in the case of the comparators.

The Company says that the comparators have responsibility for supporting all advertisement sales personnel who can be dealing with customers when problems arise. There can be upwards of 60 staff on the system at any time, any one of whom can call the systems team for assistance. The Company contends that the claimant does not have this responsibility. The Company states that the comparators are responsible for ensuring that all advertisements are processed through the various system functions including accounts functions, within deadlines. Failure to resolve problems can result in the loss of advertisements and consequent loss of revenue. The Company says that the comparators have full responsibility for formal primary and follow up training for system users whereas the claimant's training involvement is usually of an informal nature.

The Company says that a mistake or delay in error resolution by the comparators could have serious implications for the production of the newspaper and resultant revenue loss.

The Company contends that there is a greater responsibility involved in the comparators' jobs.

Mental Effort

The Company claims that the comparators perform their jobs in a very pressurised environment. The jobs often involve intense bursts of concentration to solve time critical issues. The Company is satisfied that this is not a usual feature of the claimant's job. The Company says that the comparators often have to deal with a number of issues simultaneously while the claimant usually deals with one issue at a time. The Company contends that the comparators work on their own during time critical periods while the claimant works in a team environment with management support usually available. The Company also says that the comparators are working to tight deadlines which create a greater intensity of mental effort.

Accordingly, the Company argues that there is a greater mental effort involved in the job performed by the comparators.

Working Conditions

The Company says that the claimant usually works normal office hours while the comparators cover the requirements of the job without additional payment even when these go beyond normal office hours. The comparators also cover for holidays, illness and other work requirements without additional compensation for working the extra hours involved. The Company,

therefore, contends that the coverage requirements of the systems team are greater than those required of the claimant.

On this basis the Company is satisfied that the working conditions are more demanding for the comparators' jobs.

In conclusion the Company states that there are significantly greater skills, responsibility, mental effort and more demanding working conditions in relation to the comparators' jobs than there is for the claimant's job. The Company is, therefore, satisfied that the comparators' jobs are higher value jobs and thus justify the higher rates of pay.

4.3 The Company argues that grounds other than sex exist to justify the higher levels of pay for the named comparators. In showing this the Company details background information which is set out in Appendix B.

4.4 In conclusion the Company does not accept that the jobs of the claimant and the named comparators involve 'like work' as defined by Section 3(c) of the 1974 Act. It says that the jobs of the comparators are significantly more demanding than the claimant's job, hence the higher rate of pay. The Company asks that, as 'like work' does not exist between the jobs of the claimant and the named comparators, the Equality Officer reject this claim.

5. CONCLUSIONS OF THE EQUALITY OFFICER

5.1 In making my recommendation in this case I have taken into account all of the submissions, both written and oral, made to me by the parties and also the work inspections which I carried out on the work performed by the claimant and each of the named comparators. Both the

Union and the Company included job descriptions for the claimant and the comparators in their submissions. These are attached as Appendix C.

5.2 The issue for consideration in this case is whether or not 'like work' exists between the work performed by the claimant and that performed by the comparators within the meaning of Section 3(a), Section 3(b) and Section 3(c) of the 1974 Act. The matter of whether or not the claimant is able to undertake the work carried out by the comparators is not relevant to this case.

5.3 The two female comparators are assigned to the Commercial Systems Team and they both earn an annual salary of £21,828 plus an annual bonus of £8,500. This brings their salaries to £30,328 per annum. The Company says that the two female comparators are performing 'like work' with each other. As they are earning the same annual salary I am satisfied that they are performing 'like work' with each other. The claimant is attached to the I.T. Services Department earning an annual salary of £25,923. For the purposes of this investigation I intend to compare the work performed by the claimant with that performed by the comparator Ms. Mary Sheridan.

5.4 Section 3(a) of the Act states that two persons shall be regarded as employed on "like work" where:

"both perform the same work under the same or similar conditions, or where each is in every respect interchangeable with the other in relation to the work".

The claimant is employed as an analyst/programmer in the I.T. Services Department in the organisation. His responsibilities include, inter alia, analysing the requirements for new systems, supporting existing

systems, writing BASIC programs and the training of users. The named comparator is employed as a Commercial Systems Support Executive. Prior to her appointment to this position the named comparator worked in the advertising area and is very familiar with the procedures. This knowledge has proved essential in enabling her perform her work as a Commercial Systems Support Executive. The named comparator is responsible for providing computer support and maintenance to the advertising area which comprises seven distinct areas within the Company. She is responsible for monitoring the inputting of advertisements into the system and ensuring that they are all published in the daily newspaper. It is her responsibility to train staff charged with inputting advertising details into the system. As both the Union and the Company submitted the same job description for the named comparators I have accepted it as an agreed job description. Following my examination of the work of the claimant (job description set out in Appendix D) and that of the named comparator (see job description in Appendix E) I find that the claimant is not interchangeable with the named comparator in relation to the work and I am, therefore, satisfied that they do not perform "like work" in terms of Section 3(a) of the Act.

5.5 Section 3(c) of the Act states that two persons shall be regarded as being employed on like work:

"where the work performed by one is equal in value to that performed by the other in terms of the demands it makes in relation to such matters as skill, physical or mental effort, responsibility and working conditions".

In examining the claim under Section 3(c) of the Act, I have taken account of every aspect of the work performed

by the claimant and the named comparator in relation to skill, physical and mental effort, responsibility and working conditions.

5.6 Skill:

While the claimant and the named comparator work on different computer technologies (i.e. hardware and software platforms) I am satisfied that they both require similar type skills to perform their tasks. The claimant however has acquired the additional skills needed to undertake tasks associated with the various communication mechanisms within the field of computer technology. He also undertakes analysis to define the requirements of a new computer system or modifications to an existing system where required. The claimant needs to have good communication skills. Both the claimant and the comparator are required to give training courses to users. Training courses given by the claimant are generally given informally on a one-to-one basis. In contrast many of the training courses given by the named comparator are given to groups of users in a formal training setting. I consider that greater skill is required of the named comparator in giving training courses than is required of the claimant. The process involved in accepting, inputting, validating, publishing and charging for advertisements in the newspaper is complex and requires a lot of interaction by the named comparator throughout the various stages. I consider that the named comparator needs to have a very good understanding of the entire process to ensure that advertisements are published, customers are satisfied and a correct billing system is invoked. Furthermore she needs to be a good communicator.

Having balanced the skill level required of the

claimant (in relation to computer communications and systems analysis) and that required of the named comparator (in terms of the advertising process) I find that the demands made on the named comparator, in relation to skill, are greater than those made on the claimant.

5.7 Physical Effort:

Both the claimant and the named comparator may need to go from one area to another when there are computer problems which they have to resolve. Furthermore in solving problems they may have to move Personal Computers in order to access the cables connected to the back of them. In relation to resolving communications errors the claimant may need to follow telephone lines and computer cables from one point to another. The named comparator needs to go from her office to the Caseroom on a daily basis to check the advertisements as they are published.

I consider that the demands made on the claimant, in terms of physical effort, are equal to those made on the named comparator.

5.8 Mental Effort:

Both the claimant and the named comparator must trace computer problems when they occur. The claimant has the added task of establishing the cause of problems with communications equipment and telephone lines. Furthermore the claimant must ensure that, when specifying a new system, he correctly encompasses user requirements. The named comparator must concentrate her efforts to ensure that all advertisement requests are accepted and printed. Furthermore she is constantly working to time pressures inasmuch as various tasks must

be completed by certain times during the day. Should this not happen it results in a delay in the printing of the newspaper.

Having balanced the level of mental effort required of the claimant against that required of the named comparator I am satisfied that the demands made on her (named comparator), in relation to mental effort, are higher than those made on him (claimant).

5.9 Responsibility:

Both the claimant and the named comparator are responsible for the provision of support on computer systems. They are also responsible for maintaining these systems and ensuring that they are functioning properly. The claimant has responsibility for the communications systems including the networks, telephone links, EIRPAC, etc. He is also responsible for any system analysis he undertakes and the onus is on him to provide a system which meets user requirements. The named comparator is responsible for ensuring that advertisements are published when required and that these advertisements are then charged to the customer. Should an advertisement be cancelled the named comparator must ensure that Accounts are notified so that customers are not charged in error.

I find that the demands made on the claimant, in terms of responsibility are equal to those made on the named comparator.

5.10 Working Conditions:

Both the claimant and the named comparator work in an office environment. The named comparator is required to

remain in the office until such time as the advertisements are printed so that she can check that all the advertisements are correct before numerous copies of the paper are printed. This could be anywhere from 6.30p.m. to mid-night. The named comparator is scheduled to work on the later shift every second week and, where necessary, she has to cover for annual leave and sick leave. Furthermore, the named comparator must work every second Saturday and every second Bank Holiday. In contrast the claimant's working day starts at 8.45a.m. and finishes at 6.10p.m. daily.

I consider that the demands made on the named comparator, in terms of working conditions, are greater than those made on the claimant.

5.11 In summary, based on the foregoing I find that the demands made on the claimant, in terms of physical effort and responsibility, are equal to those made on the named comparator. However, I consider that the demands made on the named comparator, in relation to skill, mental effort and working conditions, are greater than those made on the claimant.

5.12 Section 3(b) of the Act states that two persons shall be regarded as employed on "like work" where:

"the work performed by one is of a similar nature to that performed by the other and any differences between the work performed or the conditions under which it is performed by each occur only infrequently or are of small importance in relation to work as a whole".

I have already stated that I consider the work undertaken by the comparator to be significantly more demanding than that undertaken by the claimant. I am satisfied that the on-going differences already outlined

between the work performed by the named comparator and that performed by the claimant and also the greater demands placed on her by her work constitute valid reasons for a difference in remuneration in terms of Section 3(b) of the Act.

5.13 Based on the foregoing I find that the claimant does not perform 'like work' with the named comparator within the meaning of Section 3(a), 3(b) and 3(c) of the Anti-Discrimination (Pay) Act, 1974. As I have already found that Ms. Sheridan is doing 'like work' with the other named comparator (Ms. Murphy) I am satisfied that the claimant does not perform 'like work' with Ms. Murphy in terms of Section 3 of the Act.

5.14 Notwithstanding this finding I consider that there are grounds other than sex in terms of Section 2(3) of the Act for the difference in remuneration between the claimant and the named comparators. I note from my findings in Recommendation EP05/1997 that the claimant is working in the I.T. Services Department with a female colleague who is also earning the same annual rate of pay as the claimant. Had I found that the claimant was doing 'like work' with the named comparators in terms of Section 3 of the Act then the claimant's female colleague would also be doing 'like work' with the named female comparators. In such a situation the difference in remuneration could not have been attributable to sex. A similar scenario as this arose in the case of the Steel Company of Ireland and Ms. Denise Wilton (DEP971) and the Labour Court agreed with the Equality Officer's findings that there were grounds other than sex for the payment of the different rates of remuneration. I also note the Company's argument that the pay rates for staff in the I.T. Services Department and the Commercial Systems team were agreed upon prior to recruitment to

the areas. Hence these rates applied whether male or female staff were recruited.

6. RECOMMENDATION

- 6.1** In view of my conclusions above that Mr. Noel Rogers does not perform "like work" with that performed by either of the two named female comparators in terms of Section 3(a), Section 3(b) and Section 3(c) of the Anti-Discrimination (Pay) Act, 1974, I find that he does not have any entitlement to the same rate of remuneration as that paid by the Irish Times Limited to the two named comparators.

Gerardine Coyle
Equality Officer

30th June, 1997

APPENDIX A

Details of the
Claimant
and the
Comparators

CLAIMANT:

Mr. Noel Rogers	-	Salary	£28,544
-----------------	---	--------	---------

COMPARATORS:

Ms. Ann Marie Murphy	-	Salary	£21,828	Plus Bonus
£8,500				

Ms. Mary Sheridan	-	Salary	£21,828	Plus Bonus
£8,500				

APPENDIX B

Extract from the
Company's submission
on the issue of
Grounds other than Sex

GROUND'S OTHER THAN SEX

Background:

- 1973 - The Irish Times purchased its first computer system (an IBM System Three) for accounts purpose exclusively. The computer was staff by clerical union (then ITGWU) personnel.
- 1974 - A Computer Department was set up to centralise computer services including production and commercial computer systems. The new department required a staff of 4 programmer/analysts. At the outset a mix of skills and experience was necessary. Composition skills were essential for the running of the then production systems and commercial experience was necessary for the new accounts systems.

Recruitment was by way of open competition which included computer aptitude testing. 2 men and 2 women were successful in their applications.

Both ITGWU and IPU claimed the new post of programmer/analyst should be represented by their respective unions. It was decided that each union would represent half the programmers. It was further agreed that there would be a single rate for the job. This rate was linked to the Caseroom rate at the time and was considerably higher than the then clerical rates. This link still remains today.

Caseroom employees were exclusively male at the time when the ordinal rate was struck for the analyst/programmer job. Males and females were employed from the start in that job. Therefore the rate of pay for that job is a unisex one. The rate of pay for the software development co-ordinator job is linked to that of analyst/programmer. As the analyst/programmer pay rate is a unisex one and the software development co-ordinator rate is linked to that, then by implication, the software co-ordinator rate must also be a unisex rate.

- 1991 - An editorial systems team was set up to facilitate, maintain and develop an ATEX editorial system. This team is an integral part of the editorial production process. Recruitment to the team was by way of open competition which included aptitude tests. Selection was based on aptitude, skills and experience and four staff were selected.

Prior to the recruitment of the team a rate for team members was agreed. The rate (C2) was set in context

of NUJ rate as the work was almost exclusively concerned with editorial production. There has been a unisex rate for journalist since at least the mid 60's.

- 1995** - In March 1995 the Union (by letter) sought to have analyst/programmer rates brought up to editorial systems rates. The Company replied (by letter) in April, 1995 agreeing to meet the Union on the matter. In the letter the Company set out the basis on which the advertising systems team rates were agreed and the reasons why it could not concede the Union claim.

At a meeting on 29th November, 1995 the Union claimed that the difference in pay rates was due to the fact that the systems teams were "on call". This idea was rejected by the Company as being erroneous in fact and then explained the differences between the jobs and the history of how rates were arrived at. The Union also claimed that programmers were precluded from applying for the systems team positions. The Company rejected this. At this meeting the Company said that there may be scope for amending rates should the Computer Department be re-organised. This did not happen.

- 1996** - In May, 1996 the matter was referred by the Union to the L.R.C. under the Anti-Discrimination (Pay) Act, 1974. At no time prior to the referral did the Union mention that their members were being discriminated against on grounds of sex.

This supports the Company's argument that having failed to get an increase in pay under normal industrial relations channels, S.I.P.T.U. is now using Equal Pay Legislation in an effort to achieve the same end. If the issue was one of discrimination as alleged then surely the Union representing the claimant would have seen this from the start. The fact that it did not, suggest that even S.I.P.T.U. itself believe that the claim has no substance.

Furthermore the I.P.U. which represents half of the analyst/programmers staff has not made any claim, which again supports the Company's argument that this case has no merit.

APPENDIX C

Job Descriptions
submitted by
the Union and the Company

INITIAL JOB DESCRIPTION

FOR THE POST OF

ANALYST/PROGRAMMER

FROM THE

UNION

SECOND JOB DESCRIPTION

**FOR THE POST OF
ANALYST/PROGRAMMER**

**FROM THE
UNION**

JOB DESCRIPTION
FOR THE POST OF
ANALYST/PROGRAMMER
FROM THE
COMPANY

APPENDIX D

Equality Officer's
Job Description
for
Mr. Rogers

Name: Mr. Noel Rogers

Title: Analyst/Programmer

Organisation: Irish Times Limited

Salary: £25,923 per annum

Hours of Work: 32 Hour week over 5 days.
Coverage from 8.45a.m. to 6.10p.m.¹

Duties:

ANALYSIS

The claimant undertakes an analysis on foot of a request for a new system or extensive changes to an existing system. The stages to an analysis include the following:

- Establishing User Requirements:

This encompasses a familiarisation exercise on the work of the area and an examination of the business practices in the area to determine if work procedures could be improved upon before computerising the area. Where a computer system is currently functioning in the area it is necessary to examine it in order to determine what features must be transferred from it to a new computer system.

- Design of a New System:

This encompasses an examination of software packages to establish which one best suits the development of the proposed system. The appropriate hardware platform is selected. The database is designed i.e. how the information is going to be stored. Input screens are designed, reports are set up and backup cycles determined.

- User Testing:

This encompasses the testing of the prototype screens and reports (developed by the claimant) by the users of the proposed system. Having examined the prototypes the users advise the

¹ There must be one of five persons present throughout this period.

claimant of any amendments or additions required and these are encompassed into the designs.

- Implementation:

This encompasses the setting up of the hardware infrastructure, installing all the necessary software, setting up levels of access/user profiles for each user of the proposed system, notifying operations staff to include the proposed system in the nightly backup cycle and, where necessary, writing the programs to enable existing data to be imported into the proposed system.

- Training:

This encompasses hands-on training on a one-to-one basis in the user department.

- Maintenance:

This encompasses changes/enhancements of certain features of the system as identified by the user.

PROGRAMMING

The claimant writes programs as and when required. These programs/routines are required as interfaces between the Digital Alpha and the comms system and they are generally written in the 'DEC BASIC' Programming Language.

DATABASE ADMINISTRATION

The claimant is responsible for database administration on all (Advertising, Contributors and Circulation Statistics) databases with the exception of the Racing Services database. This covers data integrity, the size and capacity of data stored, database design and index maintenance i.e. deletion of index to cope with the highs and lows of processing. The claimant developed the Circulation Statistics Database, the requirement for which was identified by the User Department. He also wrote the user reports.

SUPPORT

The claimant can provide support on all the commercial and

editorial systems in the organisation. The amount of support that is required on the various systems varies. However, the claimant would be the first port of call on the following systems:

- Ledger Advertising System
- Casual Advertising System
- Sundries Account System
- Circulation Account System
- Newspaper Publication Sales System
- Purchases System
- Contributors System
- Cheque Production System
- Payroll System
- General Ledger System
- Library System
- Executive Information Systems (Client/Server)
- Customer Service Database (Teleads)
- Main Frame Word Processing
- Remote user setup and support
- Electronic Fund Management System²
- Comm-Sys

The claimant is familiar with and can provide support on the following operating systems:

- DOS
- Microsoft Windows 3.11
- Microsoft Windows 95
- Unix
- VMS
- Novell Netware 4.1
- Novell Lite
- Novell Personal
- Digital Pathworks

The claimant provides telephone support on a daily basis on problems which may arise on any of the systems. He has been involved in both hardware and software up-grades for example with the introduction of the Digital Alpha the claimant, in consultation with an external consultancy group, was involved in the porting of the VAX application to the Alpha.

DATA COMMUNICATIONS

² Only involved in Direct Debiting

The claimant is the main point of contact for Mercury communications. Mercury has communication centres around the world and a reporter rings the local number (if an account with Mercury is established) and forwards the mailbox through Mercury to I.T. Services. Should there be difficulty forwarding information to a mailbox address then the claimant must examine both the hardware and the software and possibly he would have to contact EIRPAC (Ireland's Packet Switching Network). The claimant also supports the network communications system in the organisation. He setup and maintains Digital Pathworks which is Digital's proprietary network information system which allows the Digital Alpha to operate as a network server. At the server end the claimant installed Pathworks and configured it to run as a Local Area Network (LAN) Manager. He also configured the transport protocols. At the client end the claimant configured the Personal Computer (PC) by installing the network card and loading and configuring the required communications software e.g. Pathways. He loaded the desired protocol e.g. Novell IPX/SPX, TCP/IP or DECNET. Depending on user requirements and the servers that needed to be accessed the claimant may need to load all three protocols. When difficulties arise especially with Digital Pathworks the claimant is the first point of contact.

RESEARCH

The claimant evaluates products to determine if they would prove beneficial to the operation of the organisation. He does this by reading all the literature on the product, sometimes organising a demonstration of the product and, if possible, getting an evaluation copy of the product. If he considers the product to be useful he makes a case for its purchase to his manager and the manager decides whether or not to purchase the product. Where it is necessary to upgrade a machine the claimant would recommend the hardware requirements.

USER GROUPS

The claimant attends the annual meetings and the annual Euro meetings of the Digital Equipment Corporation User Society (DECUS). The claimant also attends relevant seminars with the permission of the manager. He has attended a number of seminars organised by user societies for database groups.

APPENDIX E

Agreed Job Description
for the comparators
submitted by
Union and the Company