The EU Pay Transparency Directive: What It Means For Internationally Mobile Employees

The EU Pay Transparency Directive (Directive (EU) 2023/970) is becoming one of the most consequential regulatory developments affecting global mobility and international HR in Europe over the coming years. While much of the public discussion has focused on gender pay gaps and domestic workforce practices, the implications for internationally mobile employees are potentially far broader and more complex.

At its core, the Directive establishes minimum EU standards intended to increase transparency around pay structures, strengthen equal pay enforcement, and improve employees' access to information regarding compensation and career progression. However, for organisations managing international assignees, localised employees, commuters, and globally mobile talent in general, implementation will raise practical questions that extend well beyond traditional compensation governance.

International mobility inherently creates differentiated employment conditions. Employees move between countries, tax systems, payroll structures, labour markets, and compensation philosophies. As a result, mobile employees frequently receive pay packages that differ materially from those of local peers. Historically, many of these differences were accepted as a normal consequence of mobility. Under the new framework, organisations may increasingly need to explain, document, and justify such differences in a more structured and transparent manner.

Importantly, however, the Directive should not be interpreted as creating a fully harmonised European pay regime. It establishes minimum standards, but Member States retain significant discretion when transposing the rules into national law. Definitions, thresholds, reporting obligations, enforcement mechanisms, remedies, and procedural requirements may differ materially between jurisdictions. Employers should therefore avoid assuming that one single EU-wide approach will automatically satisfy all local requirements.

For mobility and HR teams, the Directive is best understood not as a narrow legal compliance exercise, but rather as part of a broader shift toward more evidence-based and transparent pay governance.

> One of the most important aspects of the Directive is that it changes the philosophy underlying pay governance itself

A Shift From Pay Secrecy To Pay Justification

One of the most important aspects of the Directive is that it changes the philosophy underlying pay governance itself.

Historically, many organisations operated with relatively limited pay transparency. Compensation decisions often relied on managerial discretion, historical precedent, individual negotiation, or market practice. While equal pay obligations did already exist under EU law, employers were not always required to explain pay differences in a detailed or accessible manner.

The Directive changes this dynamic significantly. Employees and job applicants will increasingly gain rights to information regarding pay levels, pay ranges, and the criteria used to determine pay and progression. Employers may also face obligations to demonstrate that compensation structures rely on objective and gender-neutral criteria.

Another important development concerns the burden of proof. Under the Directive, where an employee establishes facts from which discrimination may be presumed, the burden may shift to the employer to demonstrate that no unlawful discrimination occurred. In practice, this means organisations will increasingly need to maintain robust documentation supporting compensation decisions.

For global mobility programmes, this is particularly relevant because international assignments routinely involve differentiated pay approaches and reward package elements: housing support, mobility premiums, hardship allowances, tax equalisation, schooling assistance, localisation offsets, and cost-of-living adjustments.

The Directive does not prohibit differentiated treatment. Nor does it require uniform compensation across countries or employee populations. However, employers may increasingly need to demonstrate that differences are objectively justified, proportionate, consistently applied, and unrelated to discriminatory criteria. This distinction is important because some commentary surrounding the Directive risks oversimplifying its implications.

Why Mobile Employees Create Additional Complexity

International mobility introduces structural complexity because mobile employees often sit simultaneously between multiple legal, tax, and compensation systems.

An employee may remain employed by a home-country entity while physically working elsewhere. Another may transition onto a local contract but retain legacy expatriate benefits. Others may operate under regional or global compensation structures that are partially disconnected from local market positioning. As a result, determining how the Directive applies to mobile employees is rarely straightforward.

In many cases, applicability will depend on a combination of factors, including: the employing legal entity, payroll arrangements, habitual place of work, posted-worker status, social-security affiliation, contractual structure, and national implementation rules.

This is an area where organisations should be careful not to adopt overly broad assumptions. For example, it may be tempting to maintain that the Directive applies automatically whenever an employee is employed by an EU entity. While this may often be relevant, actual obligations will depend on how Member States transpose the Directive and how local labour courts interpret the employment relationship in practice.

Similarly, employees working partly outside the EU should not automatically be assumed to fall outside scope. Certain secondment structures, posted-worker arrangements, or host-country employment relationships could still create obligations depending on national implementation.

The safest approach is therefore not categorical inclusion or exclusion, but rather fact-specific legal assessment supported by local counsel where necessary.

Mobility Programmes Will Need Stronger Pay Narratives

One of the less visible, but potentially most important, consequences of the Directive is that mobility programmes may increasingly require coherent and defensible "pay narratives".

Historically, many mobility policies evolved incrementally over time. Benefits were added to address operational realities, business pressures, market competitiveness, or legacy practices. In some organisations, significant discretion also existed at managerial or regional level.

Under a more transparent framework, however, organisations may need to explain not only what mobile employees receive, but why they receive it. For example, housing support may be linked to temporary relocation obligations. Tax equalisation may reflect the objective of maintaining tax neutrality during assignments. Hardship allowances may compensate for objectively assessed living-condition differentials. Mobility premiums may relate to assignment-related disruption or retention considerations.

This becomes increasingly important because transparency tends to increase employee comparison across populations and jurisdictions. Once compensation structures become more visible, employees may compare outcomes not only internally but internationally.

Mobility teams should therefore anticipate greater scrutiny regarding assignment design, localisation practices, allowance structures, and legacy expatriate arrangements.

Segmentation Can Help - But It Must Be Defensible

Many organisations are already considering segmentation approaches to manage comparability challenges between different mobility populations.

From an analytical perspective, segmentation may often be appropriate. Home-based expatriates, localised employees, commuters, and permanent transfers may operate under fundamentally different assumptions regarding cost structures, assignment purpose, and employment conditions.

> Employers should avoid any suggestion that segmentation can be used simply to remove mobile populations from broader pay-equity analysis or reporting obligations

However, segmentation also creates potential risk if poorly designed. Employers should avoid any suggestion that segmentation can be used simply to remove mobile populations from broader pay-equity analysis or reporting obligations. Regulators and courts are unlikely to accept structures that appear designed primarily to avoid scrutiny or obscure unjustified disparities.

A more defensible approach is to treat segmentation as an analytical methodology intended to ensure meaningful comparisons between genuinely distinct employee groups. Where segmentation is used, organisations should ensure that the methodology is transparent, comparator groups are coherent, distinctions are objectively justified, and governance processes are documented consistently.

The stronger the underlying governance framework, the easier segmentation becomes to explain and defend. Documentation and governance become strategically important. Perhaps the most immediate operational implication of the Directive concerns documentation quality.

Previously, many mobility decisions relied heavily on institutional knowledge or historical practice. Experienced mobility professionals understood why certain allowances existed or why exceptions had been approved. Yet such reasoning was not always documented in ways that would withstand detailed regulatory or legal scrutiny. The Directive changes this environment materially.

Organisations may increasingly need auditable evidence supporting compensation decisions, including benchmark methodologies, job evaluation outcomes, assignment rationales, approval workflows, market positioning logic, and explanations for differentiated treatment.

This is particularly important because documentation gaps can create risk even where underlying decisions were objectively reasonable.

Data governance also becomes more sensitive in the mobility context. Transparency obligations must still be balanced against GDPR requirements, national privacy rules, confidentiality obligations, collective bargaining agreements, and employee-relations considerations. Organisations should therefore avoid assuming that pay transparency automatically requires unrestricted disclosure of individualised compensation information. In practice, national implementation rules may permit or require aggregated or anonymised disclosures in certain circumstances.

Close coordination between mobility, legal, compensation, employee-relations, and data-protection teams will therefore become increasingly important.

Beyond Compliance

Although much of the discussion surrounding the Directive focuses understandably on legal compliance, its implications are broader than regulation alone.

In many organisations, mobility policies evolved over decades through successive business decisions, local practices, and operational exceptions. The result is often a highly complex ecosystem that may not always reflect a fully coherent compensation philosophy. The Directive creates pressure, but also an opportunity, to revisit these structures more strategically.

Organisations that respond proactively may use this moment to strengthen governance frameworks, improve policy consistency, modernise job evaluation methodologies, clarify compensation principles, and reinforce alignment between mobility and broader talent strategies. The objective should not be rigid standardisation. International mobility will always require differentiated approaches because mobility itself creates additional complexity and cost.

Ultimately, the EU Pay Transparency Directive signals a broader transition away from opaque compensation structures toward more evidence-based and transparent pay governance. For global mobility teams, this means that assignment management increasingly becomes not only an operational discipline, but also a governance discipline. In a more transparent environment, governance quality may become just as important as policy design itself.

Please register for the Reward Conference https://www.mercer.com/insights/events/global-hr-conferences/european-rewards-conference/.

OLIVIER MEIER
E: Olivier.meier@mercer.com
mobilityexchange.mercer.com

LUCYE PROVERA
Fair Pay Leader, Mercer
https://www.mercer.com/solutions/talent-and-rewards/global-pay-transparency/

2026 EUROPEAN REWARDS CONFERENCE

Join us 8-9 October 2026 in Cascais, Portugal for "Beyond compensation and benefits: The rewards ecosystem of the future" - a focused conference turning trends like GenAI, transparency, and geopolitics into practical steps for fair, trusted rewards.