GURREN
Compensation

Tick-Tock: Why Delaying on Gender Pay Equity Will Bite Employers

For years, gender pay gap reporting in Ireland has been treated as a compliance chore: publish the numbers, add a narrative, move on. Too many employers have filed it beside annual reports, sustainability statements and other corporate hygiene tasks. That mindset is now dangerous.

That era is officially over.

With the future transposition of the EU Pay Transparency Directive into Irish national law, the issue is shifting from reputational discomfort to formal legal and financial exposure. This is no longer a gentle nudge toward equality. It is a structural re-engineering of corporate liability, and it introduces a legal risk that should command the attention of every CEO, CFO and HR Director.

If you are waiting for the Irish government to publish the final domestic legislation before you act, you are already behind. The Directive creates a much tougher legal environment in which poor documentation, opaque job structures and unexplained pay differences will work against the employer.

The uncomfortable truth is this: the employers most exposed are not necessarily those with the largest headline gender pay gaps. They are the employers that cannot explain their pay decisions when challenged. If your pay ranges, job levels, performance criteria and starting salaries are poorly documented, the Directive will not create your risk. It will simply expose it.

The Inversion of Justice: The Shifted Burden of Proof

In conventional pay equity disputes, the employee bears the burden of proving wrongdoing. If an employee claims they are underpaid relative to a another gender doing equal work, they must build the case.

The EU Pay Transparency Directive turns this principle completely on its head.

Under the new rules, if an employer has not complied with the transparency and reporting obligations set out in the Directive, **the burden of proof shifts entirely to the employer**.

Let that sink in. In a gender pay equity claim, your organisation may find itself defending a presumption it could have avoided: unless you can prove, with evidence, that the pay difference is justified by objective, gender-neutral factors, the legal position may move sharply against you.

If for example a female senior executive or female software engineer brings a claim stating she is paid less than her male counterparts doing work of equal value, you cannot simply rely on vague assertions of "market rates" or "negotiation skills". If your job architecture is opaque, or if your pay structures lack objective, gender-neutral criteria, your legal defence may become significantly harder to sustain.

To defend your organisation, you will have to prove—with robust, data-driven evidence—that the pay differential is justified by objective factors such as qualifications, tenure, measurable performance or other gender-neutral criteria. If you lack the formal structures to prove this, your defence will be materially weaker.

The High Financial Stakes of Inaction

For CFOs, this is not a soft HR issue; it is an unquantified liability that may not yet be visible on the risk register. The Directive bans pay secrecy clauses and gives employees a statutory right to request information on average pay levels, broken down by gender, for categories of workers performing the same work or work of equal value.

When employees gain visibility into average male and female pay for comparable groups, pay equity questions will not remain hypothetical. They will become specific, data-led and personal: Why is this group paid more? Why do some colleague enter the salary range higher? Why does this bonus pattern repeat year after year? The factors at stake include

1. **Full Back Pay and Compensation:** Courts will have the power to award full back pay, including bonuses, benefits, and allowances, stretching back over years.
2. **No Upper Limit on Awards:** Unlike standard unfair dismissal claims capped at two years' salary, pay discrimination claims carry no such ceiling.
3. **Collective Action and Group Claim Risks:** If one employee successfully establishes a pay equity concern, it can create a roadmap for other employees in the same “work of equal value” category. One claim can quickly become many, turning a single pay anomaly into a much wider financial and reputational exposure.
4. **Mandatory Joint Pay Assessments:** If your gender pay gap is/exceeds 5% in any category of workers doing the same work or work of equal value, and the gap cannot be justified by objective, gender-neutral criteria, you may be required to conduct a Joint Pay Assessment in cooperation with workers’ representatives. That process will force uncomfortable questions about grading, performance, starting pay, allowances and managerial discretion into the open.

The Operational Nightmare for CEOs and HR Directors

For CEOs and HR Directors, the operational disruption will be profound. "Work of equal value" does not mean identical job titles. It means jobs that require similar skills, effort, responsibility, and working conditions.

For example, an organization might find that a male-dominated IT support role is legally deemed to be of equal value to a female-dominated customer service supervisory role. If the IT role pays 15% more, and you cannot prove a gender-neutral justification, you may have an unjustifiable pay gap.

Furthermore, the Directive gives trade unions and equality bodies the right to initiate claims on behalf of employees. You may no longer be dealing only with internal HR grievances; you may be facing well-resourced third parties with a mandate to test the new rules and a strong incentive to make early cases count.

The Strategy for Survival: Prepare Now or Pay Later

Transposition of the directive into Irish law is inevitable and the preparation window is much shorter than it looks. Pay architecture, job evaluation, data cleansing, manager training and remediation budgets take time. Building a legally defensible compensation framework requires months of deep analytical work. Employers that wait for the final Irish regulations before starting will be trying to build the evidence base after employees already have the right to ask for it.

To insulate your business against pay equity claims, you must take four immediate steps:

1. Execute a Rigorous "Equal Value" Job Evaluation

Do not look at job titles; look at job components. You must map your entire organization into clear, objective job families and grades based on skill, effort, responsibility and working conditions. If you do not define what "equal value" means in your business, a WRC adjudicator will define it for you.

2. Conduct a Comprehensive Pay Equity Audit Under Legal Privilege

You must uncover your pay gaps before your employees do. Run a comprehensive regression analysis across your payroll to identify unexplained gender pay differences within the same job grades. Crucially, conduct this audit under legal privilege so that the initial findings are protected from disclosure while you fix the gaps.

3. Build a Defensible, Gender-Neutral Pay Architecture

Develop clear, transparent pay ranges for every role. Ensure that entry points, merit increases, and bonus allocations are governed by strict, documented policies. Eliminate managerial "discretion" that cannot be backed up by objective data.

4. Train Managers on the Death of "Salary History"

The Directive explicitly prohibits asking job candidates about their salary history. Train your talent acquisition teams and hiring managers immediately. Pay must be determined by the value of the role and the candidate's objective capability, not what they were paid at their previous company.

Conclusion: Remediation is Cheaper than Litigation

The EU Pay Transparency Directive removes the shield of corporate secrecy and strips employers of the comfort of vague explanations. After transposition, a single employee with a spreadsheet, a comparator and a question your organisation cannot answer could trigger a much wider review of your pay practices.

As a CEO, CFO or HR Director, you have a choice. You can act now, investing the time and resources to align your pay structures, eliminate anomalies and build a compliant, defensible framework. Or you can wait until employees, representatives or regulators ask the questions first, and then try to explain decisions that should already have been documented.

In the new era of pay transparency, preparation is not best practice. It is your only viable defence. The clock is ticking. The employers that act now will control the narrative, the data and the remediation plan. The employers that wait will be explaining their pay decisions under pressure, in public, and on someone else's timetable.