datassist

E-BOOK · PAYROLL OUTSOURCING

The Payroll Transition Playbook:

Changing Providers Without Missing a Cycle

How HR and Finance leaders plan, parallel-run, and exit a payroll provider in Turkey and MENA without a single late payslip



In This Guide

How HR and Finance leaders plan, parallel-run, and exit a payroll provider in Turkey and MENA without a single late payslip

#	SECTION	PAGE
01	Why Staying Feels Safer Than Switching	4
02	What Changed in 2026: When a Stale Provider Costs More Than a Migration	7
03	Fix, Renegotiate, or Switch: A Decision Framework	10
04	The Phased Transition Roadmap	12
05	Data Migration: What Moves and What Gets Reconciled	14
06	Parallel-Run Design: Proving the New Payroll Before You Trust It	17
07	Exit Clauses to Negotiate Before You Sign	20
08	The People Side: Employee Trust and Transition Governance	22
09	Transition Checklist: 30 Questions Before Cutover	24
10	Payroll Outsourcing: How Datassist Delivers	26

What You'll Learn

- Decide whether to fix, renegotiate, or replace your current payroll provider using five evidence-based tests.
- Sequence a phased transition so that no employee misses a payslip, a tax filing, or a social security declaration.
- Design a parallel run with reconciliation tolerances and written exit criteria.
- Negotiate the exit clauses and data-return terms that protect you before you sign, not after.
- Explain the change to employees in a way that protects trust and keeps HR out of the ticket queue.

datassist

2M+
2M+ payroll calculations per year

25+
25+ years in Turkey since 1999

500+
500+ active client engagements

ISO 27001
ISO 27001 + ISAE 3402 certified

2×
GPA Best In-Country Payroll Provider of the Year

Plan Your Payroll Transition Without Missing a Cycle

Talk to Datassist

Review your parallel-run design and exit clauses with a Turkey and MENA payroll specialist

datassist.com/en · hello@datassist.com · linkedin.com/company/datassist-hr

Why Staying Feels Safer Than Switching

Most payroll providers are not kept because they are good. They are kept because leaving looks dangerous.

HR leaders who inherit a fragmented payroll setup rarely describe it as a strategic choice. One vendor runs Turkey, another handles a Gulf country, a third produces the consolidated report, and a spreadsheet glues the three together. Each vendor was reasonable when it was chosen. Together they form a stack that no one designed and no one wants to touch.

The fear is specific: a missed salary date, a wrong deduction, a social security declaration filed late, and an employee who learns about it before HR does.

The Real Cost of a Provider You Do Not Trust

The fear of switching is rational, but it hides the cost of staying.

A provider you do not trust creates work that never appears on an invoice. Someone in HR double-checks every payslip batch. Someone in Finance rebuilds the journal entry by hand. Someone answers the same employee question for the third month because the provider's answer was wrong the first two times.

This hidden work is where the argument for staying quietly collapses. The switching cost is visible, finite, and plannable. The staying cost is invisible, recurring, and growing.

KEY FINDING

Deloitte's payroll benchmarking research covers third-party outsourcing use and the frequency of off-cycle payments, both useful signals when you assess how stable a payroll process is (Deloitte, Global Payroll Benchmarking Survey, deloitte.com).

A Composite Case: The Quiet Failure

Consider this illustrative case.

A 420-person manufacturer with a Turkey head office and two sites in MENA has used the same Turkey payroll provider for nine years. The company faces a recurring delay. The monthly close takes four extra working days because the provider delivers the payroll register as a PDF.

Corrections arrive after the bank file is already sent. Two employees were paid late last year after a transfer, and the provider answered through a ticket that took a week to close.

HR knows the provider should change. Finance agrees. Nobody has put a date on it, because the last time the company changed any vendor, payroll slipped by a cycle and the CEO heard about it from an employee.

WHAT THE TEAM SEES	WHAT IT ACTUALLY COSTS	WHO CARRIES IT
Register delivered as a PDF	Four extra working days at every close	Finance
Corrections after the bank file	Off-cycle payments and manual reversals	HR and Finance
Ticket-based support	Employee questions unanswered for days	HR
No exit plan on file	Provider holds the advantage at every renewal	Procurement

Why the Fear Is Usually About Process, Not People

Look closely at what teams fear when they imagine a switch. It is rarely the new provider's competence.

It is the unknown: what data moves, who checks it, what happens if the first payroll is wrong, and who is accountable when it is. Every one of those is a design question. A transition that answers them in writing before cutover removes most of the fear.

EXPERT TAKE

In our experience, transitions fail on unanswered questions, not on technology. The projects that go badly are the ones where nobody wrote down who signs off the first payroll, and on what evidence.

WORKED EXAMPLE

Worked Example (illustrative):

- Headcount: 420
- Extra close effort caused by manual rework: 4 working days per month
- Finance and HR time on those days: 3 people
- Hours lost per year: 4 days × 8 hours × 3 people × 12 months = 1,152 hours
- **Result: about 1,152 hours a year of avoidable work, before counting the cost of any payment error**

SECTION TAKEAWAYS

1. Teams keep weak providers because switching looks risky, but staying has a larger hidden cost.
2. The fear of switching is a set of unanswered design questions.
3. Write the answers down before you pick a date.

The next question is whether now is the right moment, and Turkey's 2026 rules give a concrete answer.

What Changed in 2026: When a Stale Provider Costs More Than a Migration

Turkey's 2026 payroll rules changed on 1 January, and a provider that did not update its calculations is already making errors.

Law No. 7566, published in Official Gazette No. 33112 on 19 December 2025, amended Law No. 5510 on social security. The changes took effect in January 2026. They matter for this guide for one reason: every rule change is a test of your provider's operational discipline.

What the Law Changed

The Gazette text amends three parameters that every Turkey payroll calculation touches.

Article 81(1)(a), employer share of the invalidity, old-age, and death premium

Before

11%

After (from January 2026)

12%

Article 81(1)(i), Treasury-supported employer premium discount

Before

four points

After (from January 2026)

two points

Article 82, earnings ceiling for social security premiums

Before

7.5 times the minimum wage

After (from January 2026)

9 times the minimum wage

The first change raises employer cost directly. The second reduces the discount that some workplaces receive on the employer premium. The third raises the maximum monthly earnings on which premiums are charged, so higher-paid employees now generate more premium.

Eligible manufacturing workplaces retain the five-point discount through 31 December 2026, under SGK guidance. Confirm the rate and eligibility for each workplace before cutover.

RISK

A provider that applied the old ceiling or the old discount in 2026 under-declared or over-declared premiums. The error does not announce itself. It surfaces in an SGK review, an audit, or an employee's pension record.

Why a Rule Change Is the Best Test of a Provider

You can learn more about a provider from how it handled January 2026 than from any sales presentation. Ask for evidence of three things:

1. **Timing.** When did the provider confirm the new parameters, and when were they live in the payroll engine?
2. **Communication.** Did you receive a written explanation of the cost impact before the first January payroll?
3. **Correction.** If an error occurred, how was it found, who found it, and how was it fixed?

A provider that cannot answer these in writing has told you something important.

Quantifying the Change for Your Own Roster

The 2026 gross minimum wage is 33,030 TRY per month. The ceiling at 9 times that figure is 297,270 TRY per month (9 × 33,030). Any employee earning above the old ceiling now produces more premium than before.

WORKED EXAMPLE

Worked Example (illustrative):

- Employee gross monthly salary: 100,000 TRY
- Employer share of the invalidity, old-age, and death premium before: 11% × 100,000 = 11,000 TRY
- After January 2026: 12% × 100,000 = 12,000 TRY
- **Increase: 1,000 TRY per month, or 12,000 TRY per year, for one employee on this one component**
- Across 400 such employees: 4,800,000 TRY per year on this component alone

The point is not the precise figure. It is that a payroll provider unable to explain this calculation on your own roster is a provider whose other calculations deserve scrutiny.

The Timing Argument

A rule change is also an opening. The new provider will recalculate your cost base under the 2026 parameters during onboarding, so you get a clean baseline instead of a patched one. A transition that starts after the year-end close and the new-year parameter updates can use the January numbers as its first reconciliation reference.

EXPERT TAKE

Avoid switching in the middle of a parameter change. Start the transition when the rules are stable, finish the parallel run before the next scheduled change, and treat any known upcoming change as a milestone on the plan.

SECTION TAKEAWAYS

1. Law No. 7566 changed the premium rate, a discount, and the ceiling from January 2026.
2. How your provider handled that change is a better test than any proposal.
3. Use stable-rule periods for cutover and use the new parameters as a reconciliation baseline.

With the case for acting established, you need a way to decide what kind of action to take.

Fix, Renegotiate, or Switch: A Decision Framework

Not every unhappy payroll relationship needs a new provider, but every one needs a decision made on evidence.

Switching is expensive and disruptive, so it should be the outcome of a test, not a mood. Use five tests and score each honestly.

The Five Tests

TEST	QUESTION	EVIDENCE TO COLLECT
Accuracy	How many corrections were needed in the last 12 payrolls?	Correction log, off-cycle payment records
Compliance	Did every statutory filing go out on time and correct?	Filing receipts, SGK correspondence
Responsiveness	How long do real questions take to resolve?	Ticket history, escalation records
Transparency	Can you see how every figure was calculated?	Sample payslip trace to rule
Change handling	How did the provider handle January 2026?	Written parameter confirmation

Score each test from one (poor) to five (strong). A total below 15 out of 25 is a strong signal to move. A total between 15 and 20 suggests a renegotiation with defined service levels. Above 20, fix the specific gaps.

What Each Outcome Looks Like

Fix. The provider is fundamentally sound but has a specific gap, such as slow support. You write the gap into a service plan with a review date.

Renegotiate. The provider is adequate but the contract is weak, for example no response-time commitment and no data-return clause. You renegotiate terms before the next renewal, and you use the threat of exit credibly because you have prepared the exit.

Switch. The provider fails accuracy or compliance. These two are not negotiable, because they put employees and the company at legal risk.

RISK

Do not let a good sales relationship outweigh a failed accuracy or compliance test. Those two tests carry legal and personal consequences that service levels cannot fix.

The Multi-Country Question

If you run payroll in Turkey and in two or more MENA countries, add a sixth consideration: whether one accountable provider can replace several. A fragmented stack multiplies every failure mode. Each additional vendor adds a handoff, a data format, and a support queue.

Consolidation carries its own risk, which is why the transition design in this guide matters. The goal is one accountable party under a single framework agreement, with country-specific engagement letters and service levels. The framework sets the relationship. The country documents set the calendar, which reflects local public holidays and your own operations, and the response and resolution times, which are classified by priority.

Treat MENA scope carefully. Turkey, Saudi Arabia, the UAE, Egypt, and Qatar are focus markets for Datassist. Wider MENA coverage, including Bahrain, Kuwait, and Oman, should be confirmed with any provider for your specific footprint.

WORKED EXAMPLE

Worked Example (illustrative):

- Accuracy: 2 (four corrections in 12 payrolls)
- Compliance: 3 (one late filing)
- Responsiveness: 2 (average ticket takes a week)
- Transparency: 2 (PDF register, no rule trace)
- Change handling: 2 (no written confirmation of January parameters)
- **Total: 11 out of 25, which signals a switch, with accuracy and responsiveness as the lead reasons**

SECTION TAKEAWAYS

1. Decide with five scored tests, not impressions.
2. Accuracy and compliance failures justify a switch regardless of other factors.
3. For multi-country stacks, aim for one accountable party under one framework.

Once the decision is made, the plan has to be built around payroll's fixed calendar.

The Phased Transition Roadmap

A payroll transition succeeds when it is planned backward from the first payroll the new provider will own.

Payroll has fixed dates. Salaries must be paid, filings must go out, and no project plan can move them. So the roadmap starts from the first live payroll and works backward. We deliberately use phases rather than fixed day counts, because the real timeline depends on your data quality, your incumbent's cooperation, and each regulator's processing time.

The Five Phases

	Purpose	Exit criterion
1. Diagnose	Map current data, contracts, and filings	Signed inventory of everything that moves
2. Design	Agree scope, calendar, and sign-off roles	Written transition plan and approval matrix
3. Build	Load data and configure rules	Test payroll matches the incumbent within tolerance
4. Prove	Run live parallel cycles	Reconciliation passes agreed criteria for consecutive cycles
5. Cut over	Move live responsibility	First live payroll signed off, incumbent exit complete

Each phase has an exit criterion, not a date. A phase ends when evidence says it ends.

Sequence by Lead Time, Not by Size

In a multi-country transition, start with the market that has the longest lead time, whatever its size.

In our experience this is often Egypt, so begin there. Run Turkey and the UAE in parallel once their setup is under way, and sequence Saudi Arabia according to the readiness of the Mudad and social security connections. The sequence is a principle, not a script. Confirm lead times for your specific case.

Protect the Fixed Dates

Build the calendar around three fixed points in every country:

1. **Pay date.** The date employees expect their salary. Nothing in the project may touch it.
2. **Bank file deadline.** The latest time the file can reach the bank for the pay date.
3. **Statutory filing dates.** Social security and tax declarations. In Turkey these include SGK declarations. For UAE covered employers, verify the Wage Protection System payment channel. For Saudi covered employers, verify Mudad wage-file submission separately from the payment process.

Mark these dates on the project plan first. Everything else fits around them.

ACTION

Create a one-page "do not touch" calendar for the full transition showing every pay date, bank file deadline, and filing date. Share it with both providers and require sign-off from both.

Define Who Signs What

Every phase gate needs a named approver. We recommend three roles:

- **Business owner (HR Director or Head of People Operations).** Owns the employee outcome and approves every gate.
- **Finance owner.** Approves reconciliation results and the journal entries.
- **Provider lead.** Presents evidence and recommends the gate decision.

WORKED EXAMPLE

Worked Example (illustrative):

- Pay date: the 28th
- Bank file deadline: the 25th
- SGK declaration: per statutory calendar
- Cut-over rule: no cut-over in a cycle where a parameter change or year-end close falls within the cycle
- **Result: the plan places the first live payroll in a quiet cycle, with parallel runs in the two cycles before it**

SECTION TAKEAWAYS

1. Plan backward from the first payroll the new provider owns.
2. End phases on evidence, not dates.
3. Protect pay dates, bank deadlines, and filing dates above all else.

The most technical phase comes next, because bad data is the most common cause of a bad first payroll.

Data Migration: What Moves and What Gets Reconciled

Payroll data is not a spreadsheet to copy. It is a history of decisions, and the new provider has to inherit the decisions, not only the numbers.

An employee record is more than a salary. It carries the allowances an employee has earned, the leave balance, the tax position for the year, and the social security history. Miss any of these and the first payroll will be wrong in a way that looks like a calculation error but is really a data error.

What Must Move

DATA GROUP	EXAMPLES	WHY IT MATTERS
Identity and employment	Names, identification numbers, hire dates, contract type	Statutory filings depend on it
Pay structure	Base salary, allowances, recurring deductions	Drives every payslip
Year-to-date balances	Cumulative tax base, cumulative earnings	Tax brackets depend on the running total
Leave and severance	Accrued leave, service dates	Final settlements depend on it
Banking details	Account numbers, payment method	Wrong data means a missed payment
Statutory history	Filing records, incentive eligibility	Supports audits and incentive claims

The year-to-date balances deserve special care. Turkish income tax is cumulative through the year, so a mid-year switch that loses the running tax base will place employees in the wrong bracket. This is a common and avoidable error.

RISK

A transition that starts mid-year without a verified year-to-date tax base will produce wrong net pay for every employee whose bracket changes. Check cumulative balances for every employee, not a sample.

The Three-Layer Reconciliation

Reconcile in three layers and do not skip any.

Layer 1: Record counts. Does the number of active employees match? Are leavers and joiners accounted for?

Layer 2: Field values. Does each employee's salary, allowance set, and bank detail match the source? Automate this comparison.

Layer 3: Calculated output. When the new provider calculates a payroll from the migrated data, does the result match the incumbent's result for the same period?

Layer 3 is the one that matters most, and it is the basis of the parallel run in the next section.

Data Return From the Incumbent

Your ability to extract data depends on a contract you may have signed years ago. Request the data early, in a documented format, and test it. A provider that is reluctant to release data tells you about the exit you are about to face.

EXPERT TAKE

Ask for the data extract in the first month of the project, not the last. If the incumbent's format is poor, you have time to negotiate a better one or to build a conversion. If you ask at the end, you have no bargaining position and no time.

Handling Data Protection

Employee payroll data is personal data. The transfer from one provider to another needs a lawful basis and a secure channel. Document how the incumbent will return or delete the data after exit, subject to applicable retention requirements.

Use a contractual commitment from each provider to comply with the data processing and privacy requirements of every country in scope, including KSA PDPL where Saudi employees are involved. Ask providers for evidence of their information security controls and any independent assurance reports that cover payroll operations.

WORKED EXAMPLE

Worked Example (illustrative):

- Active employees at incumbent: 420
- Active employees in migrated file: 418
- Difference: 2
- Investigation result: two employees on unpaid leave were excluded by the extract rule
- **Resolution: rule corrected, both employees reloaded, Layer 1 reconciliation re-run and passed**

SECTION TAKEAWAYS

1. Migrate decisions and balances, not only salaries.
2. Verify the cumulative tax base for every employee.
3. Reconcile counts, fields, and calculated output, in that order.

Data that reconciles on paper still has to produce the right pay in practice, which is what the parallel run tests.

Parallel-Run Design: Proving the New Payroll Before You Trust It

A parallel run is the only honest test of a new payroll, because it uses live data and a real deadline without live consequences.

In a parallel run, the incumbent remains the system of record and pays employees. The new provider calculates the same payroll independently from the migrated data. You compare the two results line by line. When they agree within tolerance for enough consecutive cycles, you cut over.

Design Principles

1. **Same inputs.** Both providers use the same time, attendance, and variable pay inputs for the cycle.
2. **Independent calculation.** The new provider must not copy the incumbent's result.
3. **Line-level comparison.** Compare every employee and every pay component, not totals.
4. **Written criteria.** Agree the pass criteria before the first run.
5. **Named sign-off.** The business owner and the Finance owner approve each result.

Setting Tolerances

Decide in advance what counts as a match. A rounding difference of a fraction of a lira on a net figure is not a failure. A wrong tax bracket is.

DIFFERENCE TYPE	TOLERANCE	ACTION
Rounding on net pay	Agreed minimal amount	Document, no action
Wrong component amount	Zero	Investigate and fix
Wrong tax or premium	Zero	Investigate, fix, and re-run
Wrong employee count	Zero	Stop and investigate

Agree the exact rounding tolerance with Finance in writing. The principle is that statutory amounts and employee counts have no tolerance.

How Many Cycles?

There is no universal number. The right count depends on how stable the results are. A sensible rule is to require at least two consecutive clean cycles.

One of them should include a realistic variety of events, such as new joiners, leavers, overtime, and a change in allowances. A clean run on a quiet month proves little.

ACTION

Choose at least one parallel cycle with deliberately varied events. Ask the new provider to explain every difference, including the ones that net to zero.

Classify Every Difference

Every mismatch falls into one of four classes, and the class tells you what to do.

- **Data error.** The migrated data is wrong. Fix the data and re-run.
- **Configuration error.** The rule is set up wrongly. Fix the rule and re-test related employees.
- **Incumbent error.** The incumbent calculated incorrectly. Document it. This is valuable, because it confirms your decision to leave, and it may need correction for employees.
- **Timing difference.** The two systems treat a date differently. Agree the correct treatment.

RISK

If the parallel run uncovers an incumbent error that affected employees, do not hide it in the project plan. Decide with HR and Legal how to correct it, and tell employees clearly.

The Cut-Over Gate

Cut over only when all of the following are true:

1. Reconciliation passed the written criteria for the agreed number of consecutive cycles.
2. All differences are classified and closed.
3. The bank file format is tested with the bank.
4. Statutory filing connections are tested.
5. Both owners have signed.
6. The incumbent has confirmed its exit obligations in writing.

WORKED EXAMPLE

Worked Example (illustrative):

- Cycle 1: 420 employees compared, 14 differences: 9 data errors, 4 configuration errors, 1 incumbent error
- Cycle 2: 420 employees compared, 3 differences, all timing, all closed
- Cycle 3 (varied events: 6 joiners, 4 leavers, overtime): 0 unexplained differences
- **Result: gate criteria met after the third cycle, cut-over scheduled for the next quiet cycle**

SECTION TAKEAWAYS

1. A parallel run compares independent calculations on live data.
2. Statutory amounts and employee counts get zero tolerance.
3. Cut over on written evidence, with named sign-off.

The parallel run protects you from the new provider. The contract protects you from the old one.

Exit Clauses to Negotiate Before You Sign

Your bargaining position is strongest before you sign a contract and weakest when you try to leave, so write the exit into the agreement on day one.

This applies twice. When you leave your incumbent, you rely on the exit terms you signed years ago. When you sign the new provider, you are writing the terms you will rely on later. Both deserve attention.

The Clauses That Matter

CLAUSE	WHAT TO REQUIRE	WHY
Data return	Full extract in an open, documented format on request	Prevents lock-in
Cooperation	Obligation to support the successor provider	Protects the final cycles
Notice period	A reasonable period matched to your payroll calendar	Avoids a forced mid-cycle exit
Service continuity	Defined service levels through the exit period	Prevents quality collapse
Liability	Clear responsibility for errors, including retroactive statutory exposure	Protects you after the exit
Deletion	Documented deletion of personal data after exit	Meets privacy obligations

Why Cooperation Matters Most

Cooperation is the clause that makes the others work. A provider that must cooperate with its successor will supply data, answer questions, and support the final cycles. One that does not will treat the exit as a dispute. If your incumbent contract lacks a cooperation clause, negotiate one as part of the exit settlement.

Liability and Retroactive Exposure

Payroll errors can surface years later through an SGK review or a tax audit. The contract should state who is responsible for errors that originate in a provider's calculation, including any retroactive statutory exposure. Read this clause with your legal counsel. Datassist recommends engaging qualified local advisors for country-specific contract decisions.

Contract Structure for Multi-Country Scope

For Turkey and MENA, a structure that works well is one Global Master Framework Agreement (GMFA). Each country then gets its own engagement letter and service-level schedule. The country schedules carry the local calendar and priority-classified response and resolution times. This structure also keeps the exit clean: you can wind down a single country without unwinding the whole relationship.

KEY FINDING

A contractual standard of service should not depend on any individual in-country partner. If your provider delivers part of the work through partners, ask what happens to your service level when a partner changes.

Questions to Ask at Signature

1. Can I receive a full data extract at any time, and in what format?
2. What do you do in the final cycle when I leave?
3. Who is liable for a calculation error discovered after exit?
4. How do you handle partner changes in a country I use?
5. What do you delete after exit, and how do I get proof?

WORKED EXAMPLE

Worked Example (illustrative):

- Contract clause reviewed: "Client data will be returned on termination."
- Gaps identified: no format, no timeline, no cooperation duty, no deletion proof
- Rewritten clause: data returned in an agreed open format within a defined period, cooperation with successor through the final cycle, written deletion confirmation
- **Result: four gaps closed with one clause rewrite**

SECTION TAKEAWAYS

1. Write the exit into the contract before you need it.
2. Cooperation and data return are the clauses that matter most.
3. Use one framework with country schedules so you can exit one country without exiting all.

The contract protects the company. Employees need protection too.

The People Side: Employee Trust and Transition Governance

Employees do not care which provider calculates their pay. They care that the amount is right, on time, and explained when it changes.

HR carries the employee relationship, and that relationship is the real asset at risk in a payroll transition. A single wrong payslip can undo years of trust. Plan communication with the same care as data migration.

What Employees Need to Know

Employees need three things, in plain language:

1. **What is changing.** The payslip layout and the support contact may change. The pay date will not.
2. **What is not changing.** Their pay date, their entitlements, their statutory rights.
3. **Where to go with questions.** One clear contact for the transition period.

Avoid technical detail. Do not announce a transition before you are confident of the date.

A Communication Sequence

01 After the plan is approved

Message
Managers briefed on what is changing

Channel
Manager briefing

02 Before the first live payroll

Message
Employees told of the change and the contact

Channel
Email and intranet

03 With the first payslip

Message
New payslip layout explained

Channel
Payslip note

04 After the first payroll

Message
Check-in and feedback

Channel
Short survey

Protecting Data and Privacy

Employees trust HR with salary data. Tell them in plain terms that the same privacy standards apply and that the new provider operates under contractual privacy commitments. Do not make claims you cannot support. Avoid statements about where data is stored unless your legal team has confirmed them.

Governance During the Transition

Hold a short weekly meeting with both providers and both owners. Review the plan, open issues, and the next gate. Keep a decision log. Each entry records what was decided, who decided it, and what evidence was used.

EXPERT TAKE

The decision log becomes the most valuable document in the project. When someone asks months later why a rule was set a certain way, the log answers in seconds.

The First Payroll After Cut-Over

Treat the first live payroll as an event, not a routine. Assign a dedicated contact, schedule an early check of the calculated results, and prepare a short note for employees. After payment, review the payroll against the parallel-run results and hold a lessons-learned session.

ACTION

After the first live payroll, collect every employee query for two cycles. Classify them, and fix root causes in the next cycle.

WORKED EXAMPLE

Worked Example (illustrative):

- Employees: 420
- Queries in first live cycle: 31
- Classified: 18 payslip layout, 9 allowance label, 3 genuine calculation questions, 1 bank detail
- **Result: 27 of 31 queries resolved by a payslip explainer, 3 calculation questions investigated and cleared, 1 bank detail corrected before the next cycle**

SECTION TAKEAWAYS

1. Employees care about accuracy, timing, and clarity, not provider names.
2. Communicate only what is certain, in plain language.
3. Keep a decision log and treat the first payroll as an event.

Transition Checklist: 30 Questions Before Cutover

Use this checklist at the cut-over gate. Any "no" needs an owner and a date before you proceed.

Decision and Planning (6 items)

#	CHECK	DONE
1	Five tests scored and the decision documented	☐
2	Business owner and Finance owner named	☐
3	"Do not touch" calendar shared and signed	☐
4	Phase exit criteria written	☐
5	Cut-over cycle chosen away from parameter changes and year-end	☐
6	Decision log started	☐

Data (8 items)

#	CHECK	DONE
7	Data extract received from incumbent in a documented format	☐
8	Active employee counts reconciled	☐
9	Field values reconciled for every employee	☐
10	Year-to-date tax balances verified for every employee	☐
11	Leave and service balances verified	☐
12	Bank details verified and tested	☐
13	Incentive eligibility history transferred	☐
14	Data transfer channel and privacy commitments documented	☐

Parallel Run (8 items)

#	CHECK	DONE
15	Written pass criteria agreed	☐
16	Independent calculation confirmed	☐
17	Line-level comparison completed	☐
18	At least one cycle with varied events	☐
19	Every difference classified and closed	☐
20	Incumbent errors documented and decided	☐
21	Bank file tested with the bank	☐
22	Statutory filing connections tested	☐

Contract and People (8 items)

#	CHECK	DONE
23	Incumbent exit obligations confirmed in writing	☐
24	Cooperation commitment from incumbent	☐
25	New contract includes data return and cooperation clauses	☐
26	Liability for errors defined	☐
27	Deletion proof requested from incumbent	☐
28	Managers briefed	☐
29	Employee communication approved	☐
30	First-payroll support contact assigned	☐

SECTION TAKEAWAYS

1. Use the checklist as a gate, not a formality.
2. Every "no" needs an owner and a date.
3. Sign the gate only when all 30 are answered.

Payroll Outsourcing: How Datassist Delivers

The preceding sections set out what a controlled payroll transition requires: a decision on evidence, a phased plan, reconciled data, a proven parallel run, and exit terms that protect you. Datassist's Payroll Outsourcing service is built to deliver exactly that sequence.

Section 2 showed how Law No. 7566 turned a routine parameter update into a test of provider discipline. Section 6 showed why a parallel run needs written criteria and zero tolerance on statutory amounts. Payroll Outsourcing is the operational answer to both. The same specialists who handle your calculation also handle the parameter changes, so a rule change is a planned event and not a surprise.

What Datassist Brings to Your Transition

Payroll Outsourcing covers end-to-end Turkey payroll calculation, SGK declarations, tax filings, statutory reporting, and payslip distribution. For clients with MENA operations, Datassist structures the engagement under a single GMFA with country-specific engagement letters and service levels. In-country delivery runs through a vetted partner network under Datassist's service standards and accountability.

For a transition specifically, this means:

- **Transition planning.** A written plan with phase exit criteria, a "do not touch" calendar, and named approvers, built around your payroll calendar.
- **Data migration and reconciliation.** Layered reconciliation of counts, fields, and calculated output, including verification of year-to-date tax balances.
- **Parallel run.** Independent calculation alongside your incumbent, with line-level comparison and written pass criteria.
- **Incumbent coordination.** Datassist manages the data extraction and cooperation steps with your outgoing provider.
- **Incentive review.** A review of the social security incentive position for your roster under the 2026 parameters.

How It Works

1. **Discovery and scoring.** A senior Datassist consultant reviews your current setup against the five tests in Section 3, so the decision to switch is documented. This addresses the evidence gap behind the fear of switching described in Section 1.
2. **Transition design.** Datassist writes the phased plan with you, including the sign-off matrix and cut-over rules from Section 4.
3. **Build and prove.** Data is migrated and reconciled in the three layers from Section 5. Parallel runs follow the criteria from Section 6 until the gate is met.
4. **Cut-over and stabilization.** Datassist runs the first live payroll with a dedicated contact, then moves to the monthly cycle with one named advisor as your single point of contact.