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HISTORY OF GLOBAL IMPACT MEASUREMENT AT PCI

Global Impact Measurement System
- First Attempt

Transition
- Lessons Learned

Project Information Management System Approach
- PCI's Approach Now

Year:
- 2008
- 2009
- 2010
- 2011
- 2012
- 2013
- 2014
- 2015
- 2016
- 2017
Goals

1. Aggregate data across PCI’s diverse set of projects
2. Track unduplicated beneficiaries and service intensity
3. Cost/beneficiary analysis at the activity level
4. Assess staff LOE per output
ATTEMPT 1 – GLOBAL IMPACT MEASUREMENT SYSTEM (GIMS)
ATTEMPT 1 – GLOBAL IMPACT MEASUREMENT SYSTEM (GIMS)

- Technology Failure
- Too Complex
- Duplicate Work
- Didn’t improve project level data management
NEED STILL EXISTS

- Technical specialists request data across programs
- Executives need org wide reporting
- Biz development still needs aggregate data for proposals
- Ongoing projects struggle with data management
- New projects start up and HQ is not providing effective support

TRANSITION 2014-2016
Context is Changing Rapidly

- Cloud services didn’t exist in 2008
- SaaS wasn’t an acronym
- No “Off the shelf” SaaS for iNGOs/Aid Organizations
- Connectivity getting better
**Assessment in Fall 2016**

How they manage data, what challenges they have, and what support they want from HQ

| We are using everything to manage data | Connectivity still an issue, cloud not an option everywhere | Org wide reporting is not a priority for field teams | Field teams want better support from HQ |
Assessment in Fall 2016

3 Simple Truths

We need to be more coordinated about what technology we use to manage project results data.

If we can’t effectively manage data at the project level, then we can’t aggregate globally.

Our diverse set of projects will require different data architectures, thus likely different systems.
Committee approach to getting better at project data management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 Principles</th>
<th>1. One-Size Does Not Fit All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Rent Before Buy, Buy Before Build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Standards Based Approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 Core Responsibilities</th>
<th>1. Governance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Pre-vetted Software Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Technical Assistance and Capacity Building</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request and Approval Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approve of large purchases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure systems meet minimum standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide system budgeting process in proposals and project start-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support system deployment with additional funds as needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Governance – Approval Process

1. Project Charter
2. Form Project Team
3. Requirements Gathering
4. Determine Budget
5. Solicit Vendor

- NO
- YES

Internal review

Advise on alternative solutions

Approve Request

Approve Req’s and Vendor

Build, Design, Test, Train, Deploy

Hand over to project team

NO

YES

Monitoring, Learning and knowledge management
Menu of Technology Options
Minimum Standards – MoScOw System
Must Have, Should Have, Could Have
Technical Assistance & Capacity Building

- SOP for database development process
- Best Practices for working with technology vendors and managing implementation
- Internal requirements gathering guide
- Readiness Assessment

Tools, templates, training curriculum and guides for staff
Citations

- Planning an Information System Project – A Toolkit for Public Health Managers (WHO and PATH)
- Back Office IT Guide (Nethope)
- DHIS2 Quick Start Guide (Logical Outcomes)
- Idealware
- NTEN