



HR DELIVERY

Making Sure HR Delivers

HR DELIVERY WORKSHOP SERIES

Gulf Reward Benchmarking

An introduction to salary and reward benchmarking in the Gulf

Learn how to frame a credible salary and reward comparison across Gulf contexts. Practise matching roles, checking survey definitions and normalising fictional package data, while identifying uncertainty and the country-specific review needed before decisions.



01 DAY

Introductory taster

IN-HOUSE

Your people. Your context.

PRACTICAL

Explore, discuss and apply

A PRACTICAL STARTING POINT

Understand the topic. Try it in practice.

Benchmarking can mislead when familiar titles hide different responsibilities or package figures use different definitions. This introductory workshop examines how to frame a relevant comparison in Gulf contexts, check data quality and explain uncertainty, using fictional datasets rather than current market rates or individual salary recommendations for implementation.

Introduce a disciplined sequence for a small benchmarking enquiry: define the decision, match the work, inspect sources and compare like with like. Participants practise documenting assumptions and interpreting a fictional range, then identify the specialist review needed for country-specific decisions.

WHO IS IT FOR?

HR professionals, reward newcomers, recruiters and finance partners involved in salary comparisons for Gulf operations. Basic numerical confidence is useful; no survey subscription or advanced statistical background is required.

BY THE END OF THE DAY, PARTICIPANTS CAN:

- 01 Frame the comparison**
 Define a benchmarking question with a clear population, relevant geography, reference period and reward components linked to the decision.
- 02 Match the actual work**
 Compare role responsibilities, scope and level to a survey description, recording match strengths and gaps beyond the job title.
- 03 Inspect source quality**
 Identify survey coverage, sample, date, component definitions and methodology questions that affect the usefulness of a proposed market comparison.
- 04 Normalise fictional packages**
 Prepare a like-for-like comparison of fictional reward packages using stated assumptions for components, reference periods and supplied currency conversion rates.
- 05 Interpret ranges cautiously**
 Explain what a percentile or range describes in a supplied dataset and why it does not determine an individual salary.
- 06 Document decision limits**
 Draft a benchmarking note that separates evidence, assumptions and uncertainty, identifying internal fairness, affordability and qualified country review needs.

A useful first application

An introduction to benchmarking principles using fictional data. No current Gulf pay rates, salary recommendations or country legal conclusions are supplied; implementation requires verified sources and qualified local review.

THE FRAMEWORK / WORKSHOP FOCUS

Reward Decisions Model

The Reward Decisions Model connects Purpose, Value, Position, Mix, Movement and Stewardship. Six workshop focus questions apply those choices to benchmarking, with particular attention to role matching and comparable external evidence.



SIX QUESTIONS TO EXPLORE IN THE WORKSHOP

01 Purpose

Which reward decision needs market evidence, for which employee population?

02 Value

Does the proposed comparator match the responsibilities and scope of work?

03 Position

Which market, date and survey coverage make the comparison relevant?

04 Mix

Are the components, currencies and reference periods genuinely comparable here?

05 Movement

How might evidence inform options without automatically prescribing pay movement?

06 Stewardship

What assumptions, approvals and qualified country review must accompany interpretation?

These are workshop focus questions within the existing six-choice model, not a separate market methodology. Gulf countries and employment arrangements must be reviewed individually; fictional comparisons cannot establish current market rates or compliant employment terms.

[Explore the full model >](#)



LEARN BY DOING

Explore. Challenge. Make the ideas useful.

Short explanations lead into lively exercises, paired discussion and small-group challenges. Participants test ideas, share experience and build a draft together. The tone is engaging and enjoyable, with time to reflect and connect learning to real work.

01 Match beyond the title

Pairs compare three fictional jobs with similar titles but different scope, choose the strongest survey match and record remaining uncertainty rather than force a perfect match.

02 Audit the survey extract

Groups inspect fictional survey extracts with differing dates, populations and component definitions, flag weak comparisons and decide which source questions must be answered before interpretation can proceed.

03 Build a comparable package

Participants convert supplied fictional package figures to a common annual basis using stated rates, keep excluded elements visible and explain how assumptions change the resulting comparison.

04 Defend a benchmarking note

Groups present a short market evidence note to a mock reward committee, challenge percentile-driven conclusions and revise the note to include internal value, affordability and country review needs.

DIAGNOSE BEFORE YOU ACT

Evidence > shared feedback > agreed priorities

Use selected diagnostic prompts to distinguish known facts from assumptions. Discuss the findings and agree their meaning before proposing a solution. Feedback is part of diagnosis, not an afterthought.

ONE CASE, DEVELOPED THROUGH THE DAY

A regional services company wants one salary benchmark for procurement managers in three Gulf locations. Its spreadsheet combines monthly base pay, annual cash and packages including benefits. The jobs differ in purchasing authority, survey dates vary and a director proposes applying the same percentile to every employee immediately.

Groups define a defensible comparison, identify role and package mismatches and prepare a qualified evidence note showing which conclusions are possible and what requires further verification or country review.

THE FACILITATOR WILL

Invite different perspectives.

Make assumptions visible.

Welcome constructive debate.

Capture practical learning.



SAMPLE WORKSHOP AGENDA

A working day, with room to think.

09:00-16:30 | Six hours of facilitated learning, plus lunch and breaks. The agenda, emphasis and timings are always agreed with the client, including local scheduling needs.

09:00-09:20	What question is benchmarking for? Clarify the intended reward decision and distinguish a market comparison from an automatic recommendation about an individual employee's salary.
09:20-10:15	Connect the reward decisions Use the six model choices to frame the population, geography, role scope and components for a manageable benchmarking enquiry.
10:15-10:30	Break
10:30-11:30	Match work beyond job titles Compare fictional roles and survey descriptions, record match quality and explain when differences in responsibility make a comparator weak.
11:30-12:30	Inspect the source and range Audit survey extracts for date, coverage and definitions, then practise describing a percentile without treating it as policy.
12:30-13:30	Lunch
13:30-14:30	Compare fictional reward packages Normalise package components using supplied assumptions and conversion rates, retaining exclusions and testing how inconsistent definitions can distort a comparison.
14:30-14:45	Break
14:45-15:30	Interpret evidence in context Consider internal job value, affordability and reward purpose alongside the comparison, identifying uncertainty and matters requiring qualified country review.
15:30-16:10	Present a benchmarking note Explain the case findings to a peer reward committee, challenge overconfident conclusions and refine the recommendation for further investigation.
16:10-16:30	Plan a responsible enquiry Choose one benchmarking question, list the sources and expertise needed and agree a practical next step with the appropriate owner.

Move from a market question to matched work, comparable data and a carefully qualified evidence note.

FROM THE SESSION TO YOUR DESK

Useful models. Practical working records.

The day combines reference materials with drafts developed in the exercises. Each has a clear use beyond the workshop; the work reflects the evidence and perspectives available in the room.

01 Benchmarking enquiry brief

A draft brief defining the decision, population, geography, reference period and reward components, with prompts linking the enquiry to the wider Reward Decisions Model.

Agree the comparison scope before collecting external salary figures.

02 Role matching worksheet

A completed fictional match record comparing responsibilities, scope and level, with reasons for the selected comparator and visible gaps that could weaken its relevance.

Check job content before accepting a familiar survey title.

03 Survey quality checklist

A practical checklist covering survey date, sample coverage, methodology and reward definitions, supported by case examples of missing information and questions for a data provider.

Review whether a source can support the intended comparison.

04 Package comparison example

A worked comparison using fictional amounts, supplied conversion rates and a common reference period, documenting included components, exclusions and the sensitivity of conclusions to assumptions.

Make comparison assumptions visible before discussing the resulting figures.

05 Qualified evidence note

A case-based note separating findings, weak matches and uncertainty, with prompts on percentiles, internal fairness, affordability and the country-specific expertise needed before implementation decisions.

Explain what the evidence supports and what remains uncertain.

06 Source and review plan

A focused follow-up plan identifying the proposed data sources, information permissions, internal owners and qualified reviewers required to investigate one real benchmarking question responsibly after the workshop.

Organise a small enquiry with the right evidence owners.

CONTINUE EXPLORING

Continue with the models, diagnostic manuals and development resources on the HR Delivery website. Workshop exercises provide a first application; a full organisational diagnostic or implementation assignment can be agreed separately.

[Open the framework >](#)

[Explore diagnostic resources >](#)



MAKE THE LEARNING COUNT

A better conversation. A practical next step.

Participants can scope one benchmarking enquiry and check available sources with the reward owner. Any real analysis should use authorised data, explicit definitions and verified assumptions, with qualified review for each relevant country before recommendations affect employee terms.

YOUR FIRST 30 DAYS

01

Days 1-7

Agree the enquiry scope

Discuss one benchmarking question with the reward owner. Confirm the roles, locations, decision purpose and components, then identify authorised sources and the country expertise needed to frame the work properly.

02

Days 8-21

Check matches and definitions

Review role information against potential comparators and inspect source documentation. Record weak matches, differing definitions and unanswered questions before attempting a real comparison or requesting additional data from authorised providers.

03

Days 22-30

Review the evidence limits

Prepare a short evidence note with the reward owner, making assumptions and limitations visible. Agree any further analysis and qualified country review before presenting options for an authorised reward decision.

Follow-through is participant-led. Additional facilitation, a full diagnostic or specialist support can be agreed separately.

AVAILABLE IN-HOUSE

Shaped around your organisation

The client and facilitator agree the in-house day and relevant Gulf contexts. Participants may bring anonymised role descriptions and survey definitions they are authorised to share; fictional data and supplied calculation assumptions support all numerical exercises.

PLAN YOUR IN-HOUSE WORKSHOP

Talk to Dr Phillip Welsh

drphillip@hr.delivery

+974 7226 1481

Discuss your workshop



www.hr.delivery