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BACKGROUND & METHODS

The aim is to provide a synthesis of the main issues highlighted through organisational learning on international project management experience, identifying key lessons for future projects and processes in MSF as well as prospective restructuring. The analysis is based on a review of 9 MSF evaluations or reviews concerning transversal (across sections and departments) projects, processes or structures in MSF, covering the period 2011 (earliest report found) to 2016 (including reports finalised in Aug 2016).

Criteria for inclusion:
- Not part of core (field) MSF operations
- Meets the criteria for Evaluation or Review (focus on objectivity and independence)
- Focusing on an institutional transversal (across department and or section) process, project or structure
- (Of the 9 analysed, 7 have been managed by an MSF evaluation unit.)

These 9 processes took place between 2011 to now (Mid 2016) with 4 happening in 2014. No real trend other than up until end 2013 there was only 1 that could be could, and in the 3 years following 8 can be found. It does appear like there is an increase in regularity of international non-operational project evaluation in MSF. 9 Evaluations/Reviews were included in the analysis based on above criteria. Note, one was dropped because the subject (a collaboration with MSF and Unitaid) did not meet the third criteria and learning would not be relevant.

Following an initial review and redaction of documents, about 6 recurrent themes were identified. A simple scoring system was used to quantify the ‘evidence strength’ on different themes, to give an indication of the relative depth of coverage on a given topic across the reports.

While the highly diverse nature of the material ruled out any statistically valid process of meta-analysis, and only tentative conclusions could be reached concerning the overall implementation of transversal projects and processes in MSF, some clear common themes emerge.

Disclaimer! There is not anything vastly new coming out of this analysis, and almost all seems quite logical, especially if you have experience in implementing this type of work in MSF. What is interesting is that the same mistakes/problems appear to recur, and also the relationship or “interdependence” they have with each other. This is explained further in the findings.

Evaluations/reviews included:

1. Innovation Fund Review (Sep 2011)
2. Sanou Training Review (Jan 2013)
3. OCA Strategic Plan Retrospect (Feb 2014)
4. Symphony Project Evaluation (Mar 2014)
5. Innovation Project Evaluation (Jul 2014)
7. Epicor Post mortem (Mar 2015)
8. Accompanying and Organisational Transformation (May 2016)
### FINDINGS

#### RECURRING ISSUES

Below is an extrapolation of the recurring issues from the set of reports:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th>Emphasis on <strong>sound planning</strong>: coherent, consistent, concise vision, strategy, objectives and action plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occurring in 8/9 of the sample (STR, IPE, KPE, SPR, SPE, EPM*, ACR*) *with strong emphasis/focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The implementation of Sanou MSF could be made more efficient with dedicated resources and proper planning at headquarters and mission level (STR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During the interviews conducted for this evaluation, it was observed that almost all participants were able to formulate clearly what needs to be done by the institution or the team in order to make this project work. However, only a few were able to tell how it could be achieved. (IPE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are three sets of objectives outlined in different project documents which do not correspond to each other. These objectives are much broader and less specific than the identified needs. (KPE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Process: “to include less priorities, adding a clear road map/tactical/implementation strategy”, “need to better organize and plan the different phases of the conception and overall planning” (SPR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The scope of the project was not clearly enough defined nor well enough understood by the different stakeholders. (SPE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lacking functional objectives lead to unclear project scope from the start: No documented detailed project objectives, and thus no agreement between ‘walk in the woods vision’ and middle management beliefs. Immature project management and governance can not correct existing issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No detailed roles &amp; responsibilities, including roles of supplier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Very generic project planning, thus follow-up impossible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No real KPIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No real risk management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No real project reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(EPM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop a formal articulation of the AC’s overall mission, vision, role and strategies through a “Strategic Framework” that can serve as a constitutive document. This must reflect the views of all relevant platforms (the SC, the ExCom, the IB), owned by them, and communicated to the wider movement at all levels. (ACR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adhering to “project management” standards by using protocols and MoUs that concretely spell out the practical realities for AC-OC collaborative dossiers: projected timeframes; exit/handover strategies, implications of “lead” and support” roles, integration of MLE frameworks and strengthening documentation to leverage learning, and identification of good practices. (ACR)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2. **Project messaging:**

Information sharing, reporting and dissemination

Occurring in 7/9 of the sample (IFR, IPE, KPE, SPR, SPE, EPM, ACR)

- Insufficient attention is given to clear communication, guidance and follow up (IFR)

- The interviewees (both external and internal) also mentioned a lack of clarity on the overall process of innovation. (IPE)

- There is some confusion around the scope of the project. A lack of clarity and consistency in the titles of project processes and documents has contributed to this. (KPE)

- Content: “The clarification of the intended achievements and a clear implementing plan on “How is it going to be achieved” has emerged as a top priority for the next SP. (SPR)

- The scope of the project was not clearly enough defined nor well enough understood by the different stakeholders. (SPE)

- Lacking functional objectives lead to unclear project scope from the start: No documented detailed project objectives, and thus no agreement between ‘walk in the woods vision’ and middle management beliefs (EPM)

- Develop a formal articulation of the AC’s overall mission, vision, role and strategies through a “Strategic Framework” that can serve as a constitutive document. This must reflect the views of all relevant platforms (the SC, the ExCom, the IB), owned by them, and communicated to the wider movement at all levels. (ACR)

### 3. **Project buy-in:**

Governance structure, steering committee and champions

Occurring in 6/9 of the sample (IPE, KPE, SPE*, EPM, AOT, ACR)

*with strong emphasis/ focus

- Lack of strategic commitment to the innovation project from OCs (IPE)

- The process of developing and implementing the project sought to involve stakeholders. However, some stakeholders reported that this was not genuine participation as decisions had already been made and their concerns were not listened to. Stakeholder perceptions differ markedly depending on individual role and location. (KPE)

- The Symphony programme lacked a clear validated project governance structure. The governance structure did not enable a well-managed project and coherent decision making. The Symphony programme was not owned by a platform or individual that was accountable to the organisation. There has been lacked the right competencies and experience in the steering committee and programme board to support the project. (SPE)

- No functional champions staffed on team, which is a good indicator of (un)willingness to change.

- Immature project management and governance can not correct existing issues
  - No detailed roles & responsibilities, including roles of supplier (EPM)

- As the result, ownership of the project and obtaining to buy-in the change by the managers and their teams was not succeeded. The project was
| 4. Appropriate project resources: both in quantity and quality Occurring in 6/9 of the sample (STR, IPE, KPE, EPM, AOT, ACR) | The implementation of Sanou MSF could be made more efficient with dedicated resources and proper planning at headquarters and mission level (STR)

lack of strategic commitment to the innovation project from OCs (IPE)

The OOPS platform will continue to need dedicated resources if it is to remain relevant and useful. (KPE)

Staffing and governance not coherent with project size: Recruited program leader has questionable profile: too thin experience, too adaptable to MSF ‘we can’ culture and lack of transformational experience (EPM)

In addition, no need assessment was done for the change management competencies concerning the HR Director and the managers. (AOT)

Intensify and dedicate resources for internal communication through a multi-pronged strategy that responds to the needs of MSF staff at different levels. This could include dynamic webinars, Google groups, and “immersion visits” for AC staff in field sites. MSF must take responsibility for the effective integration of the AC within the movement. (ACR) |

| 5. Change management component: importance of proper appreciation of it and use of the methodologies Occurring in 4/9 of the sample (IPE, KPE*, EPM, AOT) *with strong emphasis/ focus | organizational culture and mindsets blocking the system-wide innovation process (IPE)

The process of developing and implementing the project sought to involve stakeholders. However, some stakeholders reported that this was not genuine participation as decisions had already been made and their concerns were not listened to. Stakeholder perceptions differ markedly depending on individual role and location. (KPE)

No functional champions staffed on team, which is a good indicator of (un)willingness to change (EPM)

In addition, no need assessment was done for the change management competencies concerning the HR Director and the managers (AOT) |

| 6. Complexity of MSF structure and decision making: importance of proper appreciation of it and incorporating into project structure and planning | The fund has created an important space to discuss innovation among operational and medical directors. However, beyond this platform the movement has not benefited much from new knowledge generated in the projects funded (IFR)

complexity of the organization and decision-making processes (IPE) |
The governance structure did not enable a well-managed project and coherent decision making. The Symphony programme was not owned by a platform or individual that was accountable to the organisation. (SPE)

Governance and accountability structures of the AC are marked by a challenging mix of autonomy (in its reporting structures and mandated role as MSF’s advocacy tool with the external world), dependence (on the OCs for funding), and ownership of the OCs over the AC (which can inhibit its functioning, as seen in the gag order relating to the TB trials). Other challenges include:

1) Longstanding consensus that the SC, the very hub of the AC’s governance, has failed to deliver due to several reasons: senior OC representatives with too many competing priorities; their dual identities as OC and SC representatives (whose interest do they represent, especially when there’s a conflict?); and the difficulty of achieving consensus among OCs, with the AC caught in the crossfire.

2) Lack of role clarity on governance and accountability systems, thanks to insufficient documented protocols for collaborative working. For example, there is little clarity on accountability for the AC’s governance: though the International Board (IB) is mandated with oversight for international platforms, the Terms of Reference (TOR) do not explicitly state its role with regard to the AC. Issues rarely get escalated up to the IB for resolution. Weak management practices, such as non-application of accountability mechanisms, further exacerbate the situation. (ACR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occurring in 4/9 of the sample (IFR, IPE, SPE, ACR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The governance structure did not enable a well-managed project and coherent decision making. The Symphony programme was not owned by a platform or individual that was accountable to the organisation. (SPE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance and accountability structures of the AC are marked by a challenging mix of autonomy (in its reporting structures and mandated role as MSF’s advocacy tool with the external world), dependence (on the OCs for funding), and ownership of the OCs over the AC (which can inhibit its functioning, as seen in the gag order relating to the TB trials). Other challenges include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Longstanding consensus that the SC, the very hub of the AC’s governance, has failed to deliver due to several reasons: senior OC representatives with too many competing priorities; their dual identities as OC and SC representatives (whose interest do they represent, especially when there’s a conflict?); and the difficulty of achieving consensus among OCs, with the AC caught in the crossfire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Lack of role clarity on governance and accountability systems, thanks to insufficient documented protocols for collaborative working. For example, there is little clarity on accountability for the AC’s governance: though the International Board (IB) is mandated with oversight for international platforms, the Terms of Reference (TOR) do not explicitly state its role with regard to the AC. Issues rarely get escalated up to the IB for resolution. Weak management practices, such as non-application of accountability mechanisms, further exacerbate the situation. (ACR)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## INTERDEPENDENCIES

1. **Emphasis on sound planning: coherent, consistent, concise vision, strategy, objectives and action plan**
   Occurring in 7/9 of the sample (STR, IPE, KPE, SPR, SPE, EPM*) *with strong emphasis/ focus

2. **Project messaging: information sharing, reporting and dissemination**
   Occurring in 7/9 of the sample (IFR, IPE, KPE, SPE)

3. **Project buy-in: governance structure, steering committee and champions**
   Occurring in 6/9 of the sample (IPE, KPE, SPE*, EPM, AOT) *with strong emphasis/ focus

4. **Appropriate project resources: both in quantity and quality**
   Occurring in 6/9 of the sample (STR, IPE, KPE, EPM)

5. **Change management component: importance of proper appreciation of it and use of the methodologies**
   Occurring in 4/9 of the sample (IPE, KPE*, EPM, AOT) *with strong emphasis/ focus

6. **Complexity of MSF structure and decision making: importance of proper appreciation of it and incorporating into project structure and planning**
   Occurring in 4/9 of the sample (IFR, IPE, SPE)

The table above illustrates how the different components are interlinked. Said another way, if one aspect is poorly addressed in a project it is likely to negatively affect another aspect, or that prioritising only one aspect is not sufficient for success. An example is that, a project that has put emphasis on achieving real buyin, will, all things being equal, have a greater chance of getting the resources needed for achieving its objectives. Another example is how
chances for success will be improved by allowing for change management methodologies at the planning stage, i.e. “sound planning”.

So, one can draw from this that the overall success of a project is dependent on an approach that has considered and included thinking behind all 6 of the components.
CONCLUSIONS

Below are the top 6 priorities (lessons identified) in international project management in MSF, deduced from the extrapolation above:

Ensure **sound planning** including a project vision, strategy, objectives and action plan that is clear, coherent, concise (internal)

This appears to be a case of not getting the basics right; multiple objectives or poorly formulated, objectives are there but no strategy for achievement. These are some of the seemingly endemic issues preventing sound planning of projects, which greatly compromises the ability to succeed almost before you've started. One direct consequence is then not being able to show success because there are no benchmarks in place.

So, 7/9 of the reports highlight as a priority, the need for sound planning, which corresponds to

- having an agreed vision,
- strategy (roadmap),
- specific objective and
- subsequent action plan.

Additionally, in order to be effective, these components should all be

- **concisely formulated** (easy to relate to),
- **clearly formulated** (easy to understand), and
- **coherent to each other** (easy to follow).

These are requirements for the planning but also necessary for “Project Messaging (#2)” & “Project Buy in (#3)”.

**Avoid confusion with consistent project messaging** to your stakeholders about your project, what it aims to achieve and how, and the relevance to MSF/ the people who you are communicating to

The second, but equally important focus area based on the analysis was around effective project messaging. 7/9 of the reports highlight some element of confusion reported by the stakeholders as to the scope of the project or how it was working. It therefore appears to be a condition for success of your project that it is well understood at a broad level in MSF. Effectiveness is dependent on:

- after agreeing on the vision, strategy and objective(s) that are clear, concise and coherent,
- the next priority is to communicate this to your stakeholders, explaining the relevance to them (as stakeholders & target audience).
- Lastly, (and here comes the 4th “c”) it is important to be consistent. This part is linked to achieving and maintaining buy in for your project (#3) and is part of change management theory (#5)

Note, there is no indication of what channels are best (internet/ intranet/ email etc).

Last point on messaging, which is also linked to buy-in is that one of the reports made strong mention of the importance of showing success at interim milestones.

**Achieve project buy-in**, reflected by an efficient governance structure (not bureaucratic), steering committee (that has enough time to dedicate) and project champions

...all appearing to be indicators (or pre-requisites?) for achieving the necessary level of buy-in of your project.

6/9 of the reports cite meaningful buy in for your project (in some way) as a prerequisite for success in MSF. Of the 6 priorities, this is the one with the most interdependency to the others. Project buy in, in the form of motivated project champions and/ or an efficient (non-bureaucratic) governance structure, is linked to achieving appropriate resources (#4), is a positive indicator of, and enabler of change management (#5). A steering committee also appears to be part of achieving project buy in, however it should be considered if those on the steering committee will realistically have
the time to dedicate to your project. Recognising the necessity for project buy in is also recognising the complexity of the MSF structure and decision making (#6).

**Ensure appropriate project resources, both in quantity and quality**

Clearly, transversal projects that do not have enough FTEs and budget to carry out a project plan will struggle to achieve their objectives and be of limited value to MSF (6/9 of the reports). As mentioned, achieving project buy in (#3) at the right levels in MSF should enable appropriate resources to become available. Also important appears to be the type of human resource (2/9 of the reports), as a lack of experience in change management methodologies is an example of a problem with achieving the objectives set by the project.

**Don’t ignore change management**

Change management is prioritised by 4/9 of the reports, with the main lesson being that change management needs to be recognised as important to the success of a project that has an influence (most likely involving change) across departments and or sections. The subsequent lesson is that change management methodologies should be built into the project design. Naturally, an appreciation of change management will improve your planning (#1) and sound planning involves change management methodologies.

**Recognise the complexity of MSF**

Similarly, 4/9 of the reports highlight the importance of appreciating the relative complexity of the MSF structure and its decision making, and then to make allowance for this in the project design, specifically relating to governance (part of #3) and effective messaging to the project stakeholders (#2). Similar to above, an appreciation of MSF’s complexity will improve your planning (#1) and sound planning strategies to account for the complex structure and decision making in MSF.

**In short...**

1. **Ensure sound planning**
2. **Avoid confusion with effective project messaging**
3. **Achieve project buy-in**
4. **Ensure appropriate project resources**
5. **incorporate change management**
6. **Account for complexity of MSF**
Transversal Analysis of International Project Evaluations in MSF –, by Stockholm Evaluation Unit
## ANNEXES

### REDACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Name</th>
<th>Weaknesses (learning that can be replicated)</th>
<th>Strengths (learning that can be replicated)</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Impact?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innovation Fund Review</td>
<td><strong>Reporting and dissemination of results are the weakest parts</strong> of the International fund. The fund has created an important space to discuss innovation among operational and medical directors. However, beyond this platform the movement has not benefited much from new knowledge generated in the projects funded.</td>
<td>Regarding the funding process, the selection and implementation phases are running well. Interviewees are satisfied with the current decision-making platform. The unbureaucratic nature of the fund management is highly appreciated and fits the reality in the field.</td>
<td>1. <strong>Invest in communication</strong>&lt;br&gt;♀ Implement a specific International Fund website for general information, application requirements and reporting of project outcomes&lt;br&gt;2. <strong>Provide sufficient capacity for management and follow up</strong></td>
<td>There is unanimous agreement that the fund is of added value to MSF and it shall continue in future, though it has not reached all of its objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sep 2011)</td>
<td><strong>Insufficient attention is given to clear communication, guidance and follow up</strong> throughout the funding process. The information flow through operational and medical directors has limitations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanou Training Review</td>
<td>The implementation of Sanou MSF could be made more efficient with dedicated resources and proper planning at headquarters and mission level. <em>(appropriate resources)</em></td>
<td>International staff input into the training is important for its success <em>(importance of involving the right people)</em></td>
<td>4. <strong>Make available adequate resources</strong> in missions for coordinating Sanou MSF&lt;br&gt;4. <strong>Provide a Sanou lead in HQ</strong> to support missions and liaise with all departments involved in Sanou MSF. <em>(integrated facilitation)</em>&lt;br&gt;5. <strong>Develop a central implementation plan for Sanou MSF</strong>, describing the timescale for missions’ roll out, centrally supported development and required resources.&lt;br&gt;5. <strong>Document the analysis of identified needs</strong> and how defined objectives will meet these</td>
<td>Positive impacts of Sanou MSF include improved operational efficiency, greater community acceptance, improved security for MSF, more active engagement in the Association, better staff retention and improved relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Jan 2013)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**MSF Transversal Analysis of International Project Evaluations in MSF --, by Stockholm Evaluation Unit**
| Innovation Project Evaluation (July 2014) | lack of strategic commitment to the innovation project from OCs; |
| | - complexity of the organization and decision-making processes; |
| | - organizational culture and mindsets blocking the system-wide innovation process |
| | lack of strategic alignment between the MSF Sweden Innovation Project and the operational centres |
| | many MSF interviewees suggested making the process of problem-setting less laborious in terms of methodological and theoretical standards (less academic, more pragmatic, and results-oriented). |
| | Lack of tangible outcomes or success stories were considered as a major handicap for the project. |
| | The interviewees (both external and internal) also mentioned a lack of clarity on the overall process of innovation. |
| | During the interviews conducted for this evaluation, it was observed that almost all participants were able to formulate clearly what needs to be done by the institution or the team in order to make this project work. However, only a few were able to tell |
| | needs as part of developing new programmes and initiatives as this helps implementation and follow-up. |
| | * Ensure that Sanou MSF is fully integrated into other HR and training initiatives including the on-going development of the PPD. |
| | The IP team is advised to adopt other approaches allowing a greater sense of ownership and participation of all involved parties. |
| | - Considering past experience, MSF Sweden would need to support a process of internal integration or a greater synergy of IP within its existing structure. |
| | (buyin from OC as well as full support of an MSF champion (such as your GD) |
| | the team needs to develop a more concise and clear communication message about the project and its added value; |
| | make sure to show tangible outcomes |
| Added value: | Even though it is difficult to determine the relative value of IP in quantitative terms, many people interviewed saw potential in the future of this project and described how they comprehended the added value of IP. |
| Kitsch Project Evaluation (Dec 2014) KPE | Learning points for future MSF transversal projects
1. Ensure the objectives are SMART (Specific, Measureable, Achievable, Realistic and Time bound). This will help ensure the objectives relate clearly to the identified needs and enable any evaluation to measure to what extent they have been met.
2. Ensure the project design and objectives reflect that different project outcomes may have impacts of varying significance.
3. Ensure the project documents sufficiently explain the assumptions and causal pathways behind the project, for example how an intended change will impact on operational efficiency.
4. Consider to what extent having a participative and inclusive process is a factor for the success of the project. It is very important that if staff are invited to participate, their input is actually recognised in some way and they receive feedback on it. If the key elements of a change are not up for negotiation, asking people to participate in the process is probably counter-productive.
5. Change often makes people defensive, which can lead to passive resistance and internal conflict. Trying to impose a system rarely works. It is usually more effective to focus on common ground, common goals and a |

There is some confusion around the scope of the project. A lack of clarity and consistency in the titles of project processes and documents has contributed to this. There are three sets of objectives outlined in different project documents which do not correspond to each other. These objectives are much broader and less specific than the identified needs.

The process of developing and implementing the project sought to involve stakeholders. However, some stakeholders reported that this was not genuine participation as decisions had already been made and their concerns were not listened to. Stakeholder perceptions differ markedly depending on individual role and location.

The KITSCH project has also led to some conflict within different groups of staff in OCB HQ with resistance and polarization of views.

It is important that changes to the way the briefing and debriefing circuits operate are properly recorded and communicated to all involved. The OOPS platform will continue to need dedicated resources if it is to remain relevant and useful.
| OCA strategic plan Retrospect (Feb 2014) SPR | Problem: SP strategic direction and intended audience | Process: “to include less priorities, adding a clear road map/tactical/implementation strategy”, “need to better organize and plan the different phases of the conception and overall planning, leaving enough time for the formulation and cross-check/quality assurance for the final SP version”

**Strategic direction improvement and intended audience clarification:** “the Departmental objectives should always be aligned with the Aspirational and strategic Operational-Medical Objectives and Priorities”, “agree on boundaries

| willingness to compromise where necessary.  
6. Do not underestimate how important it is to communicate skillfully, consistently and continuously at all levels of the organization in order to convince people why and how they need to change some of their working practices and culture.  
7. Improve information management across the organization (roles, responsibilities and technology).  
8. Only collect data that is likely to be reliable and useful for decision-making. Use existing tried and tested data as baselines where possible, rather than generating new data.  
9. Consider if it is useful to badge a change process with a project name. This may contribute to resistance and make it more difficult to institutionalize the project. |
### Symphony Project Evaluation (March 2014)

#### Governance:
1. The Symphony programme lacked a clear validated project governance structure.
2. The governance structure did not enable a well-managed project and coherent decision making.
3. The Symphony programme was not owned by a platform or individual that was accountable to the organisation. There has been lacked the right competencies and experience in the steering committee and programme board to support the project.

#### Decision making:
4. The scope of the project was not clearly enough defined nor well enough understood by the different stakeholders.

### Not in scope
1. A project the size and scope of Symphony requires a governance structure with an agreed validation system.
2. A recognised project management system with defined processes and phases aimed at achieving best practices should be implemented.
3. An individual or platform should be designated as owner and accountable for the project outcomes.
4. The scope of a project should be defined in detail for what is included but more importantly what is not.
5. It is important to have clear requirements developed and approved.

Content: “The clarification of the intended achievements and a clear implementing plan on “How is it going to be achieved” has emerged as a top priority for the next SP. “The usefulness of the intervention criteria to realign the operational portfolio and its contribution to create a distinction with other MSF section is clear and for the next SP should keep a section on this” and “planning ahead the resources needed to make priorities happening” should be also prioritized.”

Between strategy and road map/tactics/steps for implementation”, “to define strategic and operational/medical goals, stating outcomes to go for” and “to define clear goals as well as the steps to the Aspirational part. The link between the first and second part should be clear”.
5. The best practice for selecting a vendor or application was not fully implemented.

prior to the selection of a vendor or system. If the required expertise does not exist in MSF, external advice should be sought.

6. Requirements should be divided into three sections: ‘knockout criteria’, ‘must have’ and ‘nice to have’.

7. Validation processes for decision making within a project are important to ensure a clear and traceable decision log and a ‘Go/No Go’ system.

8. Contracts of a large size and duration must be certified by experienced legal advisors.

During the initiation phase of a project, a risk assessment should be undertaken by the programme manager involving every stakeholder.

A quality assurance role is implemented and linked to the programme board.

The requirements of the organisation should be fully developed by the stakeholders, in as detailed format as possible prior to sending a request for information or proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epicor Post mortem (Mar 2015)</th>
<th>Lacking functional objectives lead to unclear project scope from the start.</th>
<th>Recommendation 1 (quick win) : implement a standard project methodology, and ensure it brings the right value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPM</td>
<td>• No documented detailed project objectives, and thus no agreement between</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
‘walk in the woods vision’ and middle management beliefs (cfr project scope vs purpose)

**Staffing and governance not coherent with project size**

- Recruited program leader has questionable profile: too thin experience, too adaptable to MSF ‘we can’ culture and lack of transformational experience
- No functional champions staffed on team, which is a good indicator of (un)willingness to change (cfr MSF Supply).

**Nor management, IT or functional departments question strategic orientation**

- No second challenging of coherence business strategy & IT architecture decision (is frequent), even not when HR needs are descoped. (HR.net)
- Moreover no coherence between (informal ?) IT strategic objective of cleaning up architecture and selected package (motley/heteroclite solution)

**Immature project management and governance can not correct existing issues**

- No detailed roles & responsibilities, including roles of supplier
- Very generic project planning, thus follow-up impossible
- No real KPIs
- No real risk management
- No real project reporting

**Recommendation 3**: develop an organization capable of defining its requirements (the demand side)…
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unitaid Collaboration</th>
<th>REMOVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose:** MSF should develop a common definition and purpose of advocacy (a text) based on the three notions of: 1) facilitating operations; 2) speaking out to improve the situation of populations in danger; and 3) influencing policy and practices to support these two. Such a definition and purpose should be shared widely in the movement and its importance explained.

**Coordination:** MSF should strengthen its global advocacy coordination set-up using existing resources and possibly some additions

**M&E and learning:** MSF should develop the following resources (as a start):  
- A standard template for advocacy strategies including a monitoring and evaluation element (with a “how to use” guide);
- A collection of best practices for field/operational advocacy collected from staff globally;
- Minimum standards and criteria for what is expected in advocacy across the movement;
- An online discussion forum for advocacy staff (and others) to exchange and share examples, practices, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accompanying and Organisational</th>
<th>On the other hand, the PM did not ask for revision of her job description, so she was directly involved with lots of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A point that I have not seen in the lectures was sharing facts and figures concerning the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformation (May 2016) AOT</td>
<td>tasks which could have been delegated. In addition, no need assessment was done for the change management competencies concerning the HR Director and the managers. As the result, ownership of the project and obtaining to buy-in the change by the managers and their teams was not succeeded. The project was implemented on D day with good quality but with low actors’ involvement. Project team accomplished the changes under a task force group with long days of hard work. Nonetheless, the stakeholders were identified by the PM, the impact and influences were not properly analyzed in the real case. cycle with the stakeholders after transferring phase. It can be used as a stimulator to increase the motivation of the staff toward a smooth integration. For example, preparing a report by the PM and HR Director to give an overview on the practical results since beginning of the project. It contained number of international staff paid in new system, number of in person briefing made for international staff in HQ, number of complicated cases to treat for payment, number of exceptions made to the new regulations, number of turnover of HR staff, number of hours of trainings held, number of absenteeism among the HR staff, and to end number of cries and smiles since beginning of the project! To thanks all the stakeholders for their collaboration, patience and participation during the change process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Access Campaign Review (Aug 2017) ACR | Develop a formal articulation of the AC’s overall mission, vision, role and strategies through a “Strategic Framework” that can serve as a constitutive document. This must reflect the views of all relevant platforms (the SC, the ExCom, the IB), owned by them, and communicated to the wider movement at all levels. Governance and accountability must begin
at the highest levels through an **MoU** among all OCs, clearly charting the way forward in terms of **roles, responsibilities, terms and conditions for their effective engagement** with the AC. Appropriate governance and accountability systems must be stated explicitly, understood and applied.