monoflow

Impact Chain

A Self-Organizing Achievement Tracking System for Modern Companies

Author: Dima Chyzhevskyi

Overview

Impact Chain is a transparent, peer-reviewed system for tracking and valuing contributions within an organization. Instead of using arbitrary value assignments, team members link their achievements to previous work, creating a chain of relative impact that grows organically with the organization.

Core Principles

1. **Relative Valuation**
   - → Each achievement is valued in relation to existing work
   - → Removes the complexity of absolute value assessment
   - → Creates a connected web of contributions that shows how value builds over time
   - → No upper bounds on impact - achievements can be many times more valuable than previous work
   - → Each new impact is measured through relative comparison to 3-5 existing achievements
   - → Uses multiplier weights (e.g., 2x, 3x) rather than fixed scales

2. **Peer Review**
   - → All contributions are validated by relevant stakeholders
   - → Required voters ensure proper evaluation from technical, business, and management perspectives
   - → Optional expert input enriches the evaluation process

3. **Self-Regulation**
   - → Voter influence evolves based on their contributions and role
   - → Natural balance between different types of work emerges through collective assessment
   - → System automatically adjusts to organizational growth and changes

How It Works

Task Recording

When some work is completed, the contributor:

- → Documents the **achievement** with title and description (in specified app interface)
- → Links it to 3-5 previous achievements (own, or made by others), by which the current one can be compared.
- → Assigns initial impact ratios for each reference.
- → Provides metrics: complexity, business value, scope, innovation level, dependencies resolved (see details below)

Reference System

- → Each new task must reference 3-5 previous achievements
- → Impact ratios indicate relative value (1.0 = equal impact)
- → Default ratio of 1.1 for similar-scale achievements
- → Early tasks can reference foundational company goals

Voting Process

Required Voters (must participate):

- → Team members involved in the work (team feedback, execution level)
- → Task requesters/stakeholders (business level)
- → Executives responsible for the feature/area (management, top level)

Optional Voters:

- → Other executives
- → Domain experts matching the task's field (from other teams, or external)
- → Team members from related areas

Consensus Building

- → Each voter provides their assessment of the reference weights
- → Final value calculated as: Average(Individual Votes × Voter Indices)
- → Voter indices update automatically after each voting cycle
- → Task only approved when **all required votes** are submitted

Benefits

For Organization

- → Transparent value creation tracking
- → Self-organizing reward system
- → Clear historical record of contributions
- → Reduced management overhead in evaluation

For Teams

- → Objective feedback on impact
- → Clear connection between different work streams
- → Improved collaboration through shared evaluation
- → Recognition for non-obvious contributions

For Individuals

- → Clear tracking of personal impact
- → Fair, peer-reviewed evaluation
- → Recognition for enabling others' work
- → Growth of influence through consistent contribution

Core Evaluation Dimensions

Technical Complexity

When comparing, specify how many times more/less complex the new work is relative to referenced achievements.

Measures:

- → Implementation difficulty
- → Technical expertise required
- → System integration complexity
- → Architecture impact
- → Risk level managed

Business Value

When comparing, specify how many times more/less business value the new work adds in comparison to referenced achievements.

Measures:

- → Revenue impact (direct/indirect)
- → Cost reduction
- → Customer satisfaction improvement
- → Market position enhancement
- → Strategic alignment

Scope Impact

When comparing, specify how many times more/less complex the new work is relative to referenced achievements.

Measures:

- → Number of users affected
- → Number of systems touched
- → Geographic/market reach
- → Duration of impact
- → Organizational breadth

Innovation Level

When comparing, specify how many times more/less innovative the new work is relative to referenced achievements.

Measures:

- → Solution novelty
- → Reusability potential
- → Process improvement
- → Knowledge contribution
- → Future opportunities enabled

Dependencies & Enablement

When comparing, specify how many times more/less blockers have been mitigated relative to referenced achievements.

Measures:

- → Blockers resolved
- → Teams unblocked
- → Technical debt reduced
- → Future work enabled
- → Integration points created

Metric Application

Task Documentation Requirements

Each submission must include:

- → 3-5 references to previous achievements
- → For each reference and each dimension, a multiplier indicating relative impact
- → Brief justification for each comparison

Example: "This work was 2.5x more complex than Project A and 1.2x more valuable than Project B"

Reference Weighting Guidelines

Impact ratios should consider:

- → Relative scores across all dimensions
- → Primary dimension most relevant to comparison
- → Long-term vs. immediate impact balance

Voting Consideration Framework

Voters should evaluate:

- → Accuracy of dimension scores
- → Appropriateness of reference selections

- → Validity of impact ratio assignments
- → Overall contribution balance

Metric Usage Examples

Feature Development

Task: New Payment System

- → Technical Complexity: 2 (Complex integration)
- → Business Value: 2 (Revenue enabling)
- → Scope Impact: 1.3 (All customers, single region)
- → Innovation: 1 (Standard implementation)
- → Dependencies: 1.5 (Unblocks mobile app)

Infrastructure Improvement

Task: Database Optimization

- → Technical Complexity: 1.5 (Advanced optimization)
- → Business Value: 1.7 (Cost reduction)
- → Scope Impact: 2 (All systems)
- → Innovation: 1 (Known techniques)
- → Dependencies: 2 (System-wide performance)

Metric Evolution

Regular Review

- → Quarterly assessment of metric effectiveness
- → Adjustment of scales if needed
- → Addition of new dimensions based on organizational needs
- → Removal of redundant or unused metrics

Data Usage

The collected metrics serve to:

- → Guide future task planning
- → Identify organizational strengths
- → Highlight areas needing investment
- → Track team and individual growth
- → Inform strategic decisions

Integration with Other Systems

Metrics can feed into:

- → Performance reviews
- → Team capacity planning
- → Project prioritization
- → Resource allocation
- → Strategic planning

Example Scenario

Product Feature Development

Initial Task: Website Redesign

- → Creator: Sarah (UI/UX Lead)
- → Description: Complete website redesign with new branding

References and relative impacts:

- → Company branding guidelines (2.5x more comprehensive)
- → Original website (3x more innovative)
- → Previous UX framework (1.2x more technical complexity)

Building on Initial Work

1. **Frontend Implementation**
    - → Creator: Alex (Frontend Dev)
    - → References:
        - → Website Redesign (0.85)
        - → Previous component library (0.7)
        - → Authentication system (0.6)
    - → Required voters include Sarah (original designer)
    - → Value validated by both design and engineering teams

2. **SEO Optimization**
    - → Creator: Maria (Marketing)
    - → References:
        - → Website Redesign (0.75)
        - → Previous SEO setup (0.8)
        - → Content management system (0.7)
    - → Shows how marketing work connects to technical foundations

3. Analytics Integration
    - → Creator: Dev (Data Analyst)
    - → References:
        - → Frontend Implementation (0.8)
        - → Previous analytics (0.9)
        - → SEO Optimization (0.7)
    - → Demonstrates cross-functional impact tracking

Frequently Asked Questions

Basic Concepts

Q: Why use relative values instead of absolute metrics?
A: Relative values are easier to assess and more meaningful in context. It's simpler to say "this was about 85% as impactful as that successful feature" than to assign arbitrary point values.

Q: What if I can't find relevant tasks to reference?
A: You can reference foundational company goals or milestones. As the system grows, finding relevant references becomes easier.

Q: How do we prevent inflation over time?
A: The peer review process and required diverse references help maintain realistic valuations. The system's averaging mechanism also helps prevent gradual inflation.

Voting Process

Q: What if a required voter is unavailable?
A: The process waits for all required votes. This ensures proper validation but means organizations need clear backup voters for key roles.

Q: Can I vote on my own work?
A: No, you submit initial impact ratios, but voting is done by others to maintain objectivity.

Q: What if voters strongly disagree on impact ratios?
A: Significant disagreements trigger a discussion phase. The final value represents consensus after discussion.

Q: Why use multipliers instead of fixed scales?
A: People are better at relative comparisons than absolute scoring. Saying "this is 3 times more complex than project X" is more meaningful than assigning arbitrary scores.

Q: Is there an upper limit to impact multipliers?
A: No. Revolutionary achievements can be rated as many times more impactful than previous work. This encourages innovation and avoids artificial ceilings on value.

Q: How does the system handle very early achievements with few references?
A: Early achievements can reference company foundational goals and objectives, establishing initial baseline comparisons.

Technical Implementation

Q: How often are voter indices updated?
A: Automatically after each voting cycle completes, ensuring indices reflect recent contributions.

Q: Can we modify the system once it's running?
A: Yes, the basic framework can be enhanced based on organizational needs, but core principles (required voting, reference limits) should remain stable.

Practical Usage

Q: How do we handle long-term projects?
A: Large projects can be broken into meaningful milestones, each tracked separately but referenced together.

Q: What about maintenance work?
A: Maintenance can reference both the original feature and previous maintenance work, showing cumulative impact of system upkeep.

Q: How do we track collaborative work?
A: Multiple contributors can be listed on a single achievement, or work can be split into linked individual contributions.

Edge Cases

Q: What about completely new initiatives?
A: They can reference strategic company goals or similar initiatives in different areas, with higher impact ratios to reflect innovation.

Q: How do we handle urgent fixes?
A: Emergency work follows the same process but can have expedited voting periods. It often references both the broken feature and previous emergency responses.

Q: What about indirect contributions (mentoring, documentation)?
A: These can reference the work they enable or improve, showing their value through the success of others.

Strategic Considerations

Q: How does this affect compensation discussions?
A: While not directly tied to compensation, the system provides objective data for performance reviews and value assessment.

Q: Can this help with resource allocation?
A: Yes, by showing which types of work create the most ongoing value, it can inform project prioritization and team structure.

Q: How do we prevent gaming the system?
A: Multiple references, required diverse voters, and public tracking make manipulation difficult. Patterns of inflation or deflation become visible over time.

System Architecture Notes

The Impact Chain system is structured as a directed graph where:

- → Nodes represent achievements
- → Edges represent impact comparisons
- → Edge weights are the relative impact multipliers
- → Each new node requires `(3..5) * RC * MS` edges to existing nodes, where `RC = Reviewers Count`, `MS = Metrics Set`

This structure enables:

- → Unlimited growth potential
- → Natural emergence of impact clusters
- → Clear visualization of value chains
- → Easy identification of foundational achievements