



REWARDS REVIEW

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

Last updated: **JANUARY 2024**

MSF's Reward Review addresses the existing, longstanding problems of rewards approaches through the development of a rewards system that provides more equity, transparency, and consistency. This enables MSF to nurture an increasingly diverse workforce with the right balance of skills for today's operational needs and tomorrow's humanitarian challenges. The Rewards Review aims to clarify reward policies and processes, evolve staff groups, and identify a common global grading system, all of which will aid in addressing inconsistencies in pay and benefits for various staff groups. The calls for change arise from differences in pay and treatment different staff groups experience and perceptions that these differences are unfair and encapsulate the privilege that a small minority of staff, namely international mobile staff (IMS) and HQ staff, enjoy.

Below is a thorough list of questions that have been raised by various staff across MSF, with current responses. You can jump directly to a specific topic by clicking on a link below or browse through each question.

- [About the project \(contents, process, timeline...\)](#)
- [On the proposed new model for Staff Groups \(segmentation\)](#)
- [About the changes in benefits included in the proposals](#)
- [On pay](#)
- [On per diem](#)
- [On jobs/functions and the new Global Grading Framework](#)
- [On Staff Engagement and Consultation](#)

Rewards Review: Frequently Asked Questions

ABOUT THE PROJECT (CONTENTS, PROCESS, TIMELINE)

Q: What exactly is Rewards Review, and what is included in this initiative?

A: The Rewards Review is a project that Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) has embarked on to review tangible rewards for the global workforce, recognizing that existing policies and practices do not match the ambition for a diverse global workforce and do not fully support our evolving operational and organizational needs. The Rewards Review has three deliverables which are:

- Development of new staff groups
- Determination of minimum standards for benefits and for pay (pay policy)
- Development of a Global Grading Framework

Q: Why does MSF think the Rewards Review is necessary?

A: MSF has been faced with widely acknowledged, longstanding problems relating to the current system of rewards, which is seen by many as obsolete and not supporting the organization in responding to its operational mandate.

These problems include differences in pay and the treatment different staff groups experience which lead to perceptions of unfairness and of the fact that a small minority of staff, namely international mobile staff (IMS) and HQ staff, enjoy privilege. These problems, which have been seen as evidence of institutional racism and discrimination in the organisation, have led MSF leaders, staff and association members to call for fundamental changes in how MSF rewards its staff, including motions passed in the International and other General Assemblies.

Q: What is the timeframe, and where are we now?

A: Over the last 5 years, MSF has been engaged in a Rewards Review to analyse and decide how best to address widely acknowledged, longstanding problems with the organisation's current system of rewards.

During 2022, the IDRH and the team developed several proposals on a new model for staff groups while also working on the key deliverables of Minimum Standards and Global Grading Framework. At the request of [Full ExCom](#) in October 2022, the team engaged with stakeholders in a thorough risk analysis to ensure the potential impacts of the proposal are understood. The full analysis was presented to Full ExCom in April 2023 for their decision.

In May 2023, [the Full ExCom](#):

- Committed to Minimum Standards for pay and benefits, and agreed on adjustments to the Living Wage methodology, with a cost impact of up to 5% of the Locally Hired Staff wage bill.
- Committed to a Global Grading Framework, ensuring jobs are graded consistently and valued fairly.
- Agreed to move from the existing model of 3 staff groups to the **proposed model for new staff groups**:
 - mobile (positions in different, multiple settings with assignments 12 months or less).
 - country-based (positions in a single specific context over more than 12 months).
- Confirmed it is the responsibility of all members to implement collective decisions on the Rewards Review.

In October 2023, [the Full ExCom](#) confirmed the implementation timeline of the outcomes of the Rewards Review. The timelines for each workstream can be found [here](#):

Workstreams	2023	2024				2025		
Biennial Salary Review Cycles			Roll-out					
Living Wage			Roll-out					
LHS attractiveness for snr positions			Roll-out					
Single mobile grid including incorporating per diem								Roll-out
Relocated Package								Roll-out
Working Hours								Roll-out
LHS and HQ Pay Policy						Roll-out		
Paid Leaves			Roll-out					
Provision for death			Roll-out					
Health care and disability coverage								Roll-out
Retirement Savings / Pension								
GGF function grid and tool		Roll-out						
IRFFG adjusted to GGF						Roll-out		
Entity functions adjusted to GGF								Roll-out

Q: Who is responsible for implementing the Rewards Review?

A: MSF’s leadership has consistently emphasized the urgency and importance of the Rewards Review and stressed that it is a collective responsibility. To this end, in October 2022 the Full ExCom confirmed through a unanimous vote that every member accepts its own responsibility for managing, implementing and allocating the needed resources to support this process and eventually agreed changes.

In May 2023 the Full ExCom confirmed it is the responsibility of all members to **implement collective decisions on the Rewards Review consistently**, and requested monitoring, evaluation, consistency and accountability mechanisms to follow up these collective decisions.

Q: How will this project improve attraction and retention of qualified and skilled staff?

A: There are several ways we believe this project will improve talent attraction and retention. The Global Grading Framework will enable positions to be better reflected in how a position is graded. The Minimum Standards on pay will explain how we benchmark salaries and what comparators we use. A set of minimum standards for core benefits (e.g. healthcare, leave, retirement savings) will enable MSF to be more competitive and attractive to staff. In addition to this, the new model for staff groups includes elements that will improve attractiveness for senior positions, stronger recognition of international experience and mobility and incentives for staying longer in coordination positions.

Q: Will the outcomes of the Rewards Review apply to all staff and entities in MSF?

A: The objective is to apply the new policies, frameworks and models that will come out of the Rewards Review to all staff working with MSF and all entities, irrespective of their nationality or status. In some contexts, it will remain difficult to provide the full package that an employee should get due to local regulations – for example when refugees or undocumented people can’t be officially contracted because of labour laws. MSF will continue to strive to provide these colleagues with the best possible package and advocate for the possibility to employ them legally.

Q: Will the Rewards Review outcomes be applied retroactively?

A: The proposed changes will not be retroactive. Once approved and implementation planning decided, the changes will begin according to the calendar and approach agreed. It is important to note that as part of the implementation

planning, specific measures for staff adversely affected by the outcomes will also be discussed over the coming year, and if approved would come into effect according to the implementation plan and approach.

Q: Is MSF engaging with other organizations and external experts?

A: The Rewards Review is informed by practices of other actions/organisations. We participate in several fora for exchanging information with other organisations.

We also have bilateral meetings with other organisations who have carried out similar ambitious projects. They have shared their experience in rolling out staff benefits and their approach to staff engagement in the development of benefits. We are also part of a network of international NGOs called Project Fair (www.project-fair.business-school.ed.ac.uk), where different NGOs exchanges experiences and challenges in relation to fairness in remuneration.

Finally, we get technical advice from HR consultancies that have worked with other sectors and organisations and know the range of policies and tools that are available and good practice. At different stages and on some deliverables, we use external consultants. For example, one of our major consultants is [Korn Ferry](#), the owner of the Hay methodology that was used to build MSF's International Field Function Grid (IRFFG).

Q: How does the Rewards Review contribute to DEI and to tackling institutional racism?

A: The Rewards Review has several different deliverables, and many aspects of the deliverables and anticipated outcomes enable increased diversity, equity, and inclusion. The Rewards Review deliverables will ensure staff doing the same job will receive the same basic salary and will remove elements of the existing rewards system that are associated with privilege such as per diem. In doing so MSF will attract new and diverse staff who may have been disadvantaged by the long-standing inequities. It will also encourage existing staff to remain with MSF, encouraging retention. The deliverables will also bring much more consistency and transparency into our rewards system. However, the Rewards Review does not address every commitment of MSF's DEI priorities. The Core ExCom Action Plan to Tackling Institutional Discrimination and Racism contains many more actions unrelated to rewards. There are HR policies unconnected to rewards that some staff perceive as inequitable and discriminatory, and these are not in scope in the Rewards Review.

Q: How will volunteers and Ministry of Health (MoH) partners affected by MSF's revised Rewards system?

A: Salaries, payments, and benefits for Volunteers and MoH partners are not in scope of the Rewards Review. We recognize how MSF rewards these two groups may be perceived as inequitable. The scope of the Rewards Review is limited to staff who are on MSF employment contracts.

Q: Have the legal implications of labor legislation across all countries been considered?

A: The Rewards Review team has been in consultation with the Legal Department within MSF to determine the legal implications of the proposals. This is expected to continue into the implementation phase and an analysis of legal impact by context will be developed.

ON THE NEW MODEL FOR STAFF GROUPS

Q: What are staff groups, and what is the purpose of having different staff groups?

A: Staff Groups (sometimes referenced as segments or segmentation) is a model that groups types of positions together for the purposes of defining how these groups receive pay and benefits. It is a model that provides consistency and

transparency in decisions on pay and benefits. Currently, there are three staff groups: internationally mobile staff (IMS), locally hired staff (LHS), and headquarters staff (HQ). These staff groups no longer reflect the reality of how MSF works or the needs of our global workforce. For example, MSF has both HQ staff and programme staff (LHS and IMS) working in the same context and in the same location, yet are rewarded very differently in the current model, reinforcing perceptions of inequity. The model for new staff groups takes into consideration these issues of inequity. The new model has been developed using strategic directions provided by the ExCom, analysis from a broad group of stakeholders, and feedback from a broad group of MSF staff.

The model will move to two new staff groups to replace the existing three. These are:

- *Country-Based* positions, defined as positions in the same context over an extended period, to be paid on a local salary grid for the country where the work happens and;
- *Mobile* positions, defined as positions that involve moving regularly during the contract period to take on different assignments and specialized positions for one-off short assignments. Mobile positions would be paid using a global salary grid, irrespective of where the person filling the position comes from, with per diem incorporated into salary.

Q: Why does the proposed model divide existing Internationally Mobile Staff into those in mobile positions and those relocating for country-based positions?

A: Some Internationally Mobile Staff stay for long periods in the same position and context, which means that their link with the hosting country is very different compared to the Internationally Mobile Staff that move from one context to the other or do short assignments. This means that different approaches to salary and benefits are needed for each group.

Q: Will there be a rotation system, so e.g. after certain years in HQ you move to Field and those in field go to HQ?

A: The Rewards Review's objective is to provide a frame that enables mobility among different staff groups and also between program/field and HQ/office structures. However, the decision on specific policies to enforce the movement between HQ and field (and vice versa) is up to different entities as it is out of scope for the project itself.

Q: What will happen in countries where both programmes (missions) and HQ/offices exist?

A: All country-based positions (formally separated into HQ positions and locally hired staff positions) will be treated in the same way. Therefore, the same salary scale would be used for staff in the same country, whether they work in programmes and office structures. Learn more about the pay policy [here](#). All positions (formally separated into HQ and Field functions) will be graded using a global framework with the same consistent approach to valuing a position's grade/level, bringing more consistency and transparency particularly in countries where both programmes and HQ offices exist. Learn more about the global grading framework [here](#).

Q: With a single salary grid for mobile staff regardless of their country of origin/residence and regardless of the country where they will work, how will this address the different costs of living in the different countries of operations?

A: The decision to integrate per diem within mobile staff's salary (equally irrespective of where mobile staff are located) means that in the future the different costs of living in the different countries of operations will not be actively addressed by MSF as it is partially the case now with per diem. This, however, is compensated for by the fact that all expenses related to accommodation will continue to be fully covered by MSF and that the future single salary grid will amply enable staff to cover their expenses related with food and leisure.

Q: Will it be more financially interesting to go for short assignments as mobile staff rather than a longer one in a country-based position?

A: The attractiveness of a longer assignment in a country-based position will be determined by the level of operational priority that MSF assigns to the context and by the experience of the individual staff, so it is impossible to determine overall in which cases short assignments will be more attractive than longer ones and vice versa. The objective of MSF is to make sure that differences in packages between mobile and country-based positions are limited not only for the objective of being equitable, but also to make sure that staff can opt for different assignments based on their operational relevance and interest rather than the financial attraction.

Q: How will MSF mitigate the potential risk that staff will prefer high-market country programme assignments versus lower-market countries if country-based position salaries will be based on the market in the country they work?

A: In contexts that are based in lower markets and are strategically essential for the organization, MSF will introduce a flexible allowance. The aim is once again to make sure that people go to work where it is more relevant for their interests and for the organization's priorities rather than for purely financial reasons.

Q: Who will determine if a position will be mobile or country-based for international staff?

A: Having mobile or country-based positions will largely be informed by operational needs of MSF and to an extent the availability of staff to fill positions. The assessments will be made by the individual OC as the needs determine.

Q: What will happen to placements in places where visas are difficult to obtain?

A: The issue of visas has been challenging for MSF and there are places where it is difficult to obtain visas or work permits. This is not expected to change with the Rewards Review, though MSF will continue with efforts to resolve diplomatic issues where possible as has been the case in the past.

Q: What happens if there are international staff working as mobile and others as country based in the same role in same country? Will this affect the principle of same job same pay?

A: Overall, MSF wants to go towards the principle of "same job same salary", although it recognizes there are factors that do not enable to reach this objective at 100%. "Same job same salary/pay" is a concept often used to advocate for equal pay for individuals who perform the same job in the same location.

MSF also needs to consider how best to ensure mixed teams, mobility, and staffing of key roles in diverse contexts. This means that although the basic salaries for the same roles in the same location will be the same, additional allowances may be paid to staff who relocate to undertake a position. Recognising that unexplained differences generate perceptions of unfairness, MSF will explain and justify any additional allowances and benefits. Current differences in remuneration between staff in the same role already exist - not only between Locally Hired and Internationally Mobile Staff, but also between Internationally Mobile Staff coming from different countries. These differences will be substantially reduced and will depend on tangible factors such as the staffs' experiences, their experience in key roles and the level of relevance that MSF assigns to different contexts.

Q: Can a staff start a position as a mobile staff with international package and automatically move to local package (relocated) staff if the time in the mission has been increased?

A: A decision on how to manage assignment extensions that would transform a position from mobile into a country-based position will be taken in the coming months when planning for implementation.

Q: Will international staff in country-based positions be paid in local currency?

A: International country-based staff from other countries will continue being paid in the currency of their contracting entity as happens now. However, their salary will be calculated based on the country where they work. For instance, a Belgian Medical Coordinator working in a country-based position in Colombia will have a Belgian contract with a salary paid in euros even if their remuneration is calculated according to the Colombian salary grid.

Q: What is the definition of “relocated positions”?

A: A relocated position is a position occupied by a staff member who relocates from another country for an extended period of time (more than 12 months) to take up a programme position. Relocated positions form part of the new staff group of “country-based” position agreed by the Full ExCom. The decision to recruit globally for a position and therefore make it a 'relocated position' will be part of the staffing strategy in a country/programme/entity. These are referred to 'relocated staff' on 'relocated positions'. The position will be paid according to the salary grid of the host country, though the remuneration will include an allowance with a specific recognition of the staff's accrued international experience with MSF. The position will come with additional benefits to enable the staff to settle in smoothly (specific expenses not yet confirmed).

Q: What happened to the indemnity period for international mobile staff?

A: MSF has removed the indemnity period for internationally mobile staff effective October 1, 2023. This was an outcome of the Rewards Review, as an opportunity to improve attraction and retention of mobile staff by ensuring they receive a salary based on the IRFFG global grid from day one of their international assignment.

Q: If salaries are increased, does this also mean volunteerism will disappear?

A: Discussions on volunteerism, what it means and whether it should be reflected in our remuneration have been ongoing for many years. By now, in general, the broadly agreed view is that volunteerism should no longer be translated into remuneration for any staff group. As a result, the 'indemnity period' has been removed from the pay policy for internationally mobile staff. However, volunteerism remains a key principle in MSF. It is often described as including elements of associative engagement in MSF, an 'activist' attitude and commitment, etc.

ON THE CHANGES IN BENEFITS

Q: Why does the proposed model provide staff relocated to country-based positions with additional benefits?

A: While aiming to go towards “same job same salary” in the same location, MSF recognizes the need to support people who are relocating to another country and wants to encourage relocation to guarantee we have mixed teams in all contexts wherever feasible. MSF recognizes that relocating to another country entails costs that are not the same of working in our own country, thus – while aiming at making sure that the base salary is the same for all people working in the same function – it includes benefits that will help cover those costs.

Q: How is the housing provision identified for mobile versus relocated staff positions?

A: Staff in mobile positions will spend a limited amount of time in the host country, so they will need support for personal logistics. Staff who relocate to take on country-based positions move for an extended period so housing costs should be at least partially covered by their salary, as for other staff from the country who are on country-based positions (as part of the principle of going towards “same job same salary”) in the same location. An installation package will help staff who relocate with the costs of finding housing & getting set up.

Finally, in all those cases where there is concern for the safety or security of accommodation, MSF will continue providing it directly for relocated staff, but they would be asked to contribute to the cost.

Q: How will this impact current packages for international mobile staff with specific packages, such as LTA 12/24 months, Vocationer, Leap. Etc.?

A: A review of the existing packages for international mobile staff will be done in 2024 in order to align them to the spirit of the Rewards Review. Additional information will be available in October 2024.

Q: What are the core benefits elements considered as part of the Rewards Review?

A: Set of minimum benefits that will be implemented for all staff regardless of their domicile or staff group. Benefits included in the scope of this work are life and disability, healthcare, leaves (paid, parenting, etc.), retirement / pension, and severance payments. Some will be based on existing benefits provided to staff with some adjustments and others will be benefits that not all staff currently receive.

Benefits not in scope of the Rewards Review include other allowances (meal or transport allowances etc), and other reward elements such as learning, training, and professional development, which continue being responsibility of OCs, missions, and entities.

Q: Healthcare: Will all staff get the same level of health insurance?

A: Healthcare and the coverage of its costs is organized very differently, depending on the context: sometimes it is covered by insurance (global or local) and sometimes it is delivered directly by MSF. As part of the core benefits, we are working with Staff Health Units to define a core package for healthcare for all staff, which will guide changes in each country. The aim is to address key differences that exist today (e.g. what is done in case of work-related situations, what services to include etc.) bearing in mind that we cannot bridge all the differences in availability, quality and legal realities of healthcare services across the world.

Q: Retirement Savings / Pension: Will all staff receive a pension/contribution to retirement savings?

A: The core benefits being reviewed as part of the Rewards Review include retirement savings. This means that MSF aims to ensure that we contribute for all staff to prepare their retirement. However, this is organized very differently depending on the country. The objective at this stage is to ensure MSF contributions are within a minimum range for all staff provided either through social systems and/or private local or global savings schemes depending on the context.

Q: Will there be a fixed retirement age?

A: Retirement age often differs per country and is generally regulated by law, and as such will vary according to contexts. While the minimum standards include minimum retirement provisions that should apply to all staff, implementation will have to be country-specific, as retirement is structured very differently depending on the country and is often highly regulated. The implementation roadmap for this topic has not yet been validated and does not have a confirmed timeline.

Q: What is the Home Child Allowance and how is it calculated with the removal of the indemnity period?

A: With the removal of the indemnity period as of October 1, 2023, the Home Child Allowance (HCA) becomes a fixed allowance, applicable for all eligible internationally mobile staff. Amounts stay at their current levels. OC-specific conditions disappear but conditions related to length of unaccompanied assignment will remain. Home Child Allowance is linked to mobile positions and is not a general family allowance. As a result, it is not part of the package provided to locally hired staff (LHS). The HCA was originally calculated based on the indemnity period because it is the same for all regardless of position. In other words, the HCA was not linked to the indemnity other than as a practical

way to calculate an allowance that was relevant and related to costs in the domicile country. However, it targets all internationally mobile staff. For the time being the amounts remain set at their current level while we develop the future single mobile grid and total package for mobile staff

ON PAY

Q: How much will salaries change?

A: We cannot provide details on how salaries and benefits might change. Decisions have still not been made on this. Also, the existing staff groups (HQ, local hired staff, internationally mobile staff) will change, so comparisons for these groups will not be valid.

Q: What is the attraction allowance? Will LHS get it?

A: This is a cash allowance that will be part of the pay package for (future) *relocated staff* (part of the *country-based* staff group). This allowance will be paid in a minority of targeted countries where local salary levels, even set attractively in the local labor market, are insufficient to make country coordination positions attractive for staff relocating, **and where this group of staff is a key component of MSF's staffing strategy in the country**. Locally hired staff on country-based positions will not receive this allowance.

Q: What are the minimum standards for pay?

A: Our existing pay approach for locally hired staff are broadly defined by a policy, the [Common Frame](#), which includes salary guidelines and policy applicable to all locations – to be adapted according to local laws and regulations. For internationally mobile staff, the pay is defined in [the IRP2 policy](#). For HQ staff, it is up to each individual entity.

The Rewards Review aims at introducing minimum standards for pay, which will ensure more consistency across different parts of the organization in how we set salary. They include MSF providing a salary that enables staff to live decently (Living Wage) and will explain the approach to setting pay relative to other employers (i.e. the labour market) and how we review and adjust pay. This includes provisions to ensure attractiveness for locally hired staff in coordinator positions.

Q: How do you define Living Wage?

A: The term living wage refers to an income that enables staff at the lower levels of the salary grid to cover the costs of everyday living in the country where they work. MSF has been developing and applying its own living wage methodology since 2017. It has been reviewed and improved as part of the Rewards Review to address concerns that starting salaries may not be sufficient in certain contexts. Going forward, MSF's living wage is defined as the necessary full-time wage to support the purchase of goods and services to provide a healthy and comfortable standard of living for the staff member in modest surroundings.

Q: Why can't we pay all staff in euros or dollars?

A: As explained above, the Rewards Review aims at introducing minimum standards for pay, which will explain the approach to setting pay relative to other employers (i.e. the labour market) how we review and adjust pay. It will also explain how we react in situations of economic turmoil, as we already do today. While salaries in some economically volatile contexts are currently set using "hard currencies" (e.g. the US dollar), there are disadvantages in doing so and this is not appropriate or feasible for many contexts, and this will continue to be the case. [The internal reference document](#) provides more details on this.

Q: How will the project minimize the big differences in salary between some staff?

A: One of the key objectives in reviewing the model for staff groups is indeed to reduce differences in the way people are remunerated by switching the focus from the individual to the position that the individual occupies. This way, we consider that we will be able to significantly reduce some of the differences that exist today between staff groups, although not all differences will disappear as they will include specific allowances for mobility or other considerations.

In general terms, we can say that:

- all mobile staff will be paid according to one single grid, differently than what happens today with IRP2.
- all staff in country-based positions will be paid according to the host country salary grid, with specific recognition of international experience to guarantee attraction for senior international profiles.

Q: So far, MSF has positioned itself in the lower half of the market. Will this change?

A: The current positioning of MSF salaries varies depending on the staff group. The Rewards Review aims at introducing a common standard for pay, which will define the approach to setting pay relative to other employers (i.e. the labour market) and the cost of living (through a what is called a 'living wage'). One of the aims of the Rewards Review is to make sure that MSF is both attractive and fair as an employer. However, this does not imply we will aim to pay at the top of the market. We are also going to continue comparing ourselves to other NGO employers.

Currently, for locally Hired Staff, the policy is currently set in the Common Frame and states that the reference for setting salaries is the median i.e. 'the middle' of the market we compare ourselves to i.e. INGOs.

For Internationally Mobile Staff, the positioning of salaries is not linked to the host location (where staff work) but to a global reference (the Global Grid) complemented by a 'top-up' in higher income countries. The positioning of the salary they receive on their home labour market varies greatly. If they are on the Global grid, the positioning is generally fairly high, but it is very low compared with the labour markets of countries with top-ups.

Under the current IRP2 policy, all internationally mobile staff get paid on a Global Grid. This means internationally mobile staff from countries with low labour markets (which tend to be in the Global South) are relatively better paid than those from countries with high labour markets (which tend to be in the Global North). We pay top-ups to those internationally mobile staff from highest labour markets to partly compensate for this.

You will find additional details in the [scenario based case studies here](#).

Q: How will we address the need to be competitive in pay for certain jobs that we have difficulties to hire (IT, etc)?

A: How we reward different specialized skills will be partially addressed through how jobs are valued (i.e., the global grading framework) but we also plan to include in the pay policy ways to address the residual position- or market-specific recruitment challenges.

The need to be competitive in pay for specific jobs and skills will be addressed through reviewing how the specific jobs are graded (learn more about the Global Grading Framework [here](#)) and – where necessary – through specific measures dealing with scarcity of skills in specific locations.

ON PER DIEM

Q: Will rewards review outcomes have an impact on taxation? For now per diem is not taxed, what happens if it is incorporated in the salary?

A: MSF's current taxation practices (to protect staff against double taxation in the assignment country, presuming that IMS are paying taxes in the home country) is exposing MSF to significant risks and needs to be reviewed regardless of the Rewards Review.

Until this comprehensive review of our taxation policy takes place, there will be no change. Tax remittances remain a personal (and legal) obligation of staff. Going forward, it is expected that the equivalent of an average per diem will be integrated into salaries. This means it will indeed be taxable, however we should keep in mind that the current Per Diem is already taxable in most countries (though it does not always need to be declared by the employer, staff are responsible to declare it).

Q: What analysis and benchmarking was done to come to the decision to incorporate per diem into salary?

A: Per diem has been consistently perceived as a "badge of privilege" that generates unjustifiable differences within MSF staff. The proposal includes a higher salary for mobile staff and an attractive package for relocated ones, so staff would not be negatively impacted. In addition, staff would be able to receive salary advances in local currency where staff are not able to access cash. Finally, when staff are away from their usual place of work or/traveling, travel allowances would be paid and would be the same for all staff in the same country. You will find additional details in the [scenario based case studies here](#).

Benchmarking is a process of collecting data from comparators to evaluate MSF's salary and benefits practices in a defined reference market, at a given moment in time. In MSF, benchmarking is generally carried out by the Intersectional Benchmarking Unit hosted by MSF Norway (in particular in programme countries).

Q: How will staff access cash when per diem is incorporated in monthly salary?

A: Once the changes are rolled out, the per diem payment for mobile staff will be incorporated into their salary. The concerns of access to cash will be addressed as part of the implementation planning with operations in order to ensure staff will be able to obtain advances in the local currency to facilitate local living costs where banking systems may be weak. This includes working with Finance departments in each OC to ensure sufficient access to cash in relevant currencies in programmes and operations around the world.

ON JOBS/FUNCTIONS AND THE NEW GLOBAL GRADING FRAMEWORK

Q: What is this Global Grading Framework?

A: When determining the worth of a job for MSF we apply criteria. To be able to do this consistently there needs to be a common understanding of the role across the organization. The Global Grading Methodology provides a Framework with generic job families in which consistent judgements (scorings) can be made.

The Global Grading framework will provide fair and consistent levels for all functions in the organization regardless of where they are located. These GGF levels will become the global standard for the organization (like the IRFFG for the field the GGF will provide a reference for the whole organization). When the organization designs global policies that refer to function levels (Global Rewards policies or Staff Group policies) the GGF levels will be used. The GGF levels will also be used as a basis to build the function grids in regional and intersectional projects.

Q: What is the implementation timeline of the Global Grading Framework?

A: The Global Grading Framework will provide the criteria and common language needed to ensure consistency in how we grade positions. For entities that do not have a grading system in place, including new regional entities, it will

provide a tool for grading positions. Every position in the organization will be linked to a generic job family and a level in the Global Grading Framework.

- **Phase 1 (2021):** After consultations with key stakeholders across MSF we defined the **design criteria** for a **Global Scoring Tool**.
- **Phase 2 (2022-2023):** **Job families are developed** with input from **Directors, platforms,** and **specialists** from across MSF. This will continue until early 2024.
- **Phase 3 (2024-2025)** Positions within the IRFFG will be adjusted to the Global Grading Framework after a full analysis of the impact between the current IRFFG positioning in comparison to the Global Grading function positioning. Any implementation of this adjustment will be determined in 2025.

Individual entity function grids will be reviewed comparatively with the Global Grading function grid, to analyse the difference and potential impact for each entity. The exact implementation timeline will defer for each entity, and will take several years to fully implement across all entities.

Q: How will the Global Grading Framework impact on the existing function Grids of the entities, including HQ and Locally Hired Staff in the missions?

A: When all functions in the organization have been matched to a GGF level a level in the GGF, it will show us the differences between entities. Based on this information relevant changes can be made. Entities can decide to phase out their 'old' scorings and align to the global standard. But they can also decide to keep their current grid/methodology and continue to translate their functions to the GGF. We hope that over time all sections will start using the global grading tool to score their functions. In 2024 we will confirm how we want to introduce the GGF and the time frame expected for entities to align.

ON STAFF ENGAGEMENT AND CONSULTATION

Q: How can I get involved in this project?

A: We have regularly engaged with staff since early 2022, through an extensive series of focus groups, town halls, and presentations. We have also engaged with MSF staff through existing platforms and working groups across all entities. Several staff communications have been provided, including video presentations, information tools, and project updates. The OCs and Sections consult staff through the already established staff representation mechanisms and associations. Please contact rewardsreview@mail.msf.org with feedback or queries.

Q: How was Focus Group feedback used?

A: Focus Group Discussions conducted in 2022 and early 2023 allowed the Rewards Review team to gather more information in this complex subject. They assisted the team in gathering in-depth knowledge and feedback on issues based on different staff contexts. Although they are smaller groups, there have been more than 70 focus group discussions in the last year, ensuring MSF staff are represented by collecting in-depth feedback that would otherwise not be possible using other approaches like surveys.

The FGDs were pivotal in testing assumptions and stress testing some of the proposals that were developed. The outcomes will inform whether the proposals proceed as they are, or if they require changes. We intend to use the outcomes to inform the project deliverables to the furthest extent possible. Participants will have the chance to validate their contribution.

END