Insights for MSF Brussels

By Across Ponds and Seas

Big picture drove KPI selection of 1, 2 & 5

KPI 1
Staff Support & Safety

KPI 2
Coherence with MSF Values

KPI 5
Agile and Clear Decisions

Average Score per Question by Project (Quantitative Only)

Project	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9
UKR-1	3.72	3.94	3.61	3.89	3.78	3.39	3.89	3.44	3.50
UKR-2	3.33	3.33	3.33	3.83	3.56	3.39	3.61	3.56	3.17
HTI-1	3.15	2.95	3.45	3.35	3.60	3.10	3.35	3.60	3.10
DRC-1	3.36	3.05	3.23	3.09	3.73	3.14	3.59	3.55	2.77
HTI-2	3.00	2.65	3.57	3.65	3.65	3.09	3.52	3.17	2.87
DRC-2	2.92	2.92	3.38	3.62	3.38	3.23	3.46	3.00	3.23
SSD-1	2.75	2.94	3.81	3.31	3.38	2.94	3.12	3.50	3.19
AFG-2	2.96	2.87	3.39	3.57	3.39	3.13	3.30	3.57	2.70
AFG-1	2.73	3.00	3.74	3.27	3.41	3.17	3.32	3.36	2.65
YEM-1	2.94	2.59	3.47	3.53	3.12	3.00	3.18	3.47	3.06
SSD-2	2.64	2.55	3.55	3.36	3.59	2.77	2.82	3.64	2.95
YEM-2	2.23	2.69	3.31	3.38	3.92	2.85	3.15	3.00	2.62

Question Code

Note: Data shown is synthetic and illustrative, not factual MSF data.

Security & Safety Driven by Gender,Location & Role

Figure 1

Insight:
MSF threshold score is 3 and o**nly 25% of projects ≥ 3.**

Ukraine is the highest for male & female
Yemen & Sth. Sudan lowest -female staff.

Figure 2

Note: Data shown is synthetic and illustrative, not factual MSF data.

Conflict + Crisis = Staff feeling unsafe

Figure 1

Figure 2

Insight: Field staff suffering in particular

Note: Data shown is synthetic and illustrative, not factual MSF data.

Project Level Coherence

Identifying Strong Practices and Areas Requiring Support

Insight:

No project met the MSF values threshold (score ≥ 4)

Top scoring project- **Ukraine** Project 1

Low scoring project- **South Sudan** Project 2.

Areas of concern:
South Sudan, Yemen & Haiti

Note: Data shown is synthetic and illustrative, not factual MSF data.

Role-based differences

in Value Coherence

Insight:

No occupation reaches the threshold (score ≥ 4)

Midwives & Admins score highest

Logisticians & WASH specialists score lowest

Note: Data shown is synthetic and illustrative, not factual MSF data.

Perspectives on decision making (gender vs position)

Analysis of KPI 5: Agile and Clear Decisions

Q21: Were decisions made in a timely and transparent manner?

KPI threshold is **4** and **0%** of projects hit the benchmark.

Only Male **Field Coordinators** average a 4+ rating

Huge disparity of opinions: **18%** vs. **80%**

Different Genders can have **completely different** experiences**:** Male vs. Female MDs avg. **3.9** vs **3.2**

Why?

Q22: How clear and effective was the decision-making process within the project?

Only 3...

Unique answers	Avg. Q21 score
Decision logs increased transparency for the team.	**3.66**
Approval thresholds were unclear during escalation.	**3.52**
Daily briefs clarified ownership and timelines.	**3.49**

Note: Data shown is synthetic and illustrative, not factual MSF data.

Perspectives on decision making (gender vs country)

Analysis of KPI 5: Agile and Clear Decisions

No country **by either gender** averages a 4+ rating

Significant disparity of opinions: **37%** vs. **75%**

Different Genders can have **completely different** experiences**:** Males vs. Females in South Sudan (**68%** vs **37%** or **3.8** vs **3.2**

Why?

Without good **qualitative** data it's **impossible** to know.

KPI 5 Insights:

- Gender is a meaningful contributor to how decision making or *leadership* are perceived across both positions and countries.
- MSF should utilize qualitative response data with these groupings to localize pain-points.
- MSF needs to employ qualitative data to understand what actually causes these issues.

Note: Data shown is synthetic and illustrative, not factual MSF data.

What if we had more realistic qualitative data?

A Methods case study of KPI 5: Agile and Clear Decisions

Generated **synthetic responses** for KPI "*Agile & Clear Decisions*. Q22"

Purpose to run **advanced analytics** that could be **applied to MSF's real data**

Case Study Insights:

- **Quant + qual alignment:** Sentiment rises steadily with Q21 scores, showing the text is a reliable performance signal.
- **Five clear decision-making profiles:** Clustering reveals distinct patterns: from fast/clear decisions to chronic delays and unclear timelines.
- **Quantified performance gaps:** Strongest cluster hits **88% ≥4**, weakest only **7%**, turning anecdotes into measurable differences.
- **Pinpoints bottlenecks:** Methods show whether breakdowns are in timeliness, ownership, escalation, or communication.

Q21 Scores Identified by Topical Theme (Cluster Analysis)

Cluster Theme	Q21 mean score (1-5)	% Q21 ≥ 4
Fast, coordinated, clearly explained decisions	**4.24**	**88%**
Generally fast but inconsistently communicated decisions	3.69	57%
Delayed answers, repeated follow-up, unclear timelines	**2.95**	**7%**
Generally timely, but delays for specific categories	3.36	53%
Uneven timeliness depending on request type	3.47	42%

Note: Data shown is synthetic and illustrative, not factual MSF data.

Visualisation and Dashboard DEMO

Note: Data shown is synthetic and illustrative, not factual MSF data.

Recommendations KPI 1

STAFF SUPPORT KPI 1:

- Raise **Safety KPI threshold** from 3 → 4.

  Out of 26 KPI measures 24 have a 4 threshold and two have a three. We think Safety of Staff could be a four.

- Increase **multiple-choice questions** from 9% → 20%.

  Multiple choice especially when “Other” option is used is effective at providing more insight on IHS EoA Staff feedback

STAFF SUPPORT KPI: Recommendations

Strengthening Staff Safety & Support

- Prioritise safety interventions in **South Sudan & Yemen**.
- Provide **hostile-environment preparedness training** for medical staff.
- Assign **experienced Coordinators, Logisticians & WASH specialists** to high-risk missions.

Note: Data shown is synthetic and illustrative, not factual MSF data.

Recommendations KPI 2 & 5

VALUES COHERENCE KPI

Strengthening Coherence With MSF Values

- Conduct **short diagnostic reviews** in low performing countries - South Sudan, Yemen, Haiti to understand context on value alignment.
- Facilitate **cross-mission learning** from **Ukraine & DRC** in effective behaviours, briefing styles and coordination methods
- Support low-scoring roles **(Logistics & WASH)** with **mentoring & onboarding i**n navigating ethical dilemmas under pressure and balancing urgency with dignity and transparency
- Embed weekly **values micro-reflection** into team meetings.

Institutionalize mixed-methods analysis by gender, role and country:

- For every mission, pair Q21 scores with coded Q22 themes and simple sentiment scores, grouped by *gender x role* and *country x gender*.
- Build a dashboard where the Country Director (CD) or Head of Mission (HoM) and coordination teams can see:
  - Where KPI is high and positive themes cluster (like our "88% cluster") to identify **good practice missions**.
  - **Where** the KPI is low *and* negative sentiment/coherent "problem" themes cluster.
- Make this part of the **annual/bi-annual management review**, not just a survey report.

Turn insights into concrete practice changes in missions:

- Where **women systematically score lower than men**, require missions to co-design action plans with female staff (e.g., safe feedback channels, women-only FGDs, leadership office hours).
- Treat the "high-performing clusters" (fast, coordinated, clearly explained decisions) as **case studies**: document what they actually do, and spread those routines through peer learning, brief guidance notes and management training.

Note: Data shown is synthetic and illustrative, not factual MSF data.

Recommendations

COMPLETION RATES & IMPROVING INSIGHT

Increasing EoA Survey Completion from 27% to 60%

- Share survey via WhatsApp, email, QR posters, office tablets.
- Provide mobile-friendly & offline versions for remote missions.
- Set automated reminders 2–3 days before EoA & on final day.
- Make qualitative questions mandatory for extreme scores (≤2 or ≥5)
- Consider more frequent shorter “pulse” surveys that feed into dashboard alert system when scores fall below an acceptable level
- Use **dashboard** to spot low-score problem areas and high-score good-practice missions; Make this part of **annual/bi-annual management reviews**, not just a survey report.

DATA PIPELINE & REPORTING

Strengthening MSF’s Data Pipeline

- Standardise survey formats + fixed question IDs.
- Automate cleaning, scoring, anomaly detection (Python).
- Use single SQL database for all missions.
- Dashboard triggers for alerts (e.g., >20% Safety <3).
- Add contextual data: security incidents, rota length, rest days.

Note: Data shown is synthetic and illustrative, not factual MSF data.

End of Presentation

Thanks!

Across Ponds and Seas

Shah Humzah Sandor Chowdhury

Anne Marie O'Callaghan

Anita Gurung

Geoffrey Thomas Widdowson

Thomas Owen May