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1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background
This document provides a full report of the Expert Consultation on Knowledge Management in Agricultural and Rural Development (ARD) for the African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) Regions. The Expert Consultation took place on 10-14 September 2012 at the headquarters of the Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation (CTA). It brought together representatives of regional partner organisations of CTA as well as representatives of international development organisations such as the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), the UN Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA) and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). Other development partners involved in KM such as the Royal Tropical Institute (KIT), Wageningen University and Research Center (WUR), European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM), Global Development Network (GDN) & IKM Emergent also attended for part of the consultation.

Objectives
The Consultation aimed to do the following:

- Review and improve understanding of knowledge management (KM) in the context of regional organisations and communities;
- Describe the current landscape of successful KM interventions in ARD;
- Assess the need for, capacity to implement and requirements for integral KM practices in the context of regional organisations and communities;
- Provide advice to CTA on the types of support it should provide to regional organisations and communities;
- Discuss scenarios for interventions and make recommendations on the elaboration of a road map for KM development in ACP regions; and
- Identify/develop suitable checklists/approaches for improving KM in regional ARD groups.

Process
Prior to the Consultation, ten of the participating organisations undertook a sample KM scan to assess their own KM capacity. The aim of the scan was to raise awareness of KM issues among the regional partner organisations and also to reflect on the scan as an example of a possible KM intervention that CTA’s regional partners might consider using with their own partners. In addition, a background paper was prepared, presenting an overview of KM concepts, approaches, processes and tools such that participants to the consultation had a common starting point for their discussions.

During Day One of the Consultation, the participants introduced themselves and their priorities, and were welcomed by CTA. Participants were invited to discuss issues from the background paper and reflect on their own definitions of knowledge and knowledge management. They were then introduced to the integral KM mapping approach and practical group work was carried out to better understand how the Integral Map could help in self-analysis at organisational level. The collective results of the sample scans were presented and
discussed. On Day Two, more discussions took place on the KM scans, followed by group work the integral KM mapping process, focussing on external influences, knowledge products and services.

During the consultation, participants were also introduced to a number of KM facilitation methods, such as peer assists, chat show and open spaces. Thus, on Day 2 by peer assists were carried out with the Land Resources Division (LRD) of the Secretariat of the Pacific Commission (SPC), and Farming and Technology for Africa (FTA). The afternoon featured a chat show and more group work. Day Three of the Consultation involved a one-day public event in which KM initiatives in the health, agricultural and maritime sectors were presented as input to the deliberations on possible KM approaches. Day Four involved priority setting of areas of KM interventions at the individual, institutional/organisational, network and regional level over the short, medium and longer-term. During Day Five, the participants presented their proposed action plans at individual, institutional/organisational and regional level which they aim to implement when they have returned to their own organisations. Plans for proposed actions related to KM in 11 organisations represented at the consultation were presented. Participants also proposed action plans at regional level for East Africa, the Caribbean and Southern Africa. CTA, and the other international organisations present, aim to support the organisations in their ambitions. For CTA, this support will be taking place within the context of the 2011-2015 Strategic Plan which aims to support the KM capacity of their ACP partner organisations.

**Outputs**
The outputs of the Expert Consultation comprise:

- A background paper on KM in the development sector which provided an overview of the state-of-the-art for all participants.
- Some 10 KM sample scans of the participating organisations, a combined overall scan of such institutions and an appreciation of the value of KM scans
- Case studies of other KM approaches within and outside the development sector.
- Some 11 proposals for organisational action plans and three regional KM plans.
- A proposed approach for joint follow-up on the consultation.

**Lessons learned**
The main lessons learned from the Expert Consultation comprise:

**General observations**

1. The participants were generally of the opinion that each KM initiative should be based on a working definition of both knowledge and KM, reflecting the specific context of the initiative. However, this should be a pragmatic, evolving definition because, otherwise, the search for a definition can hinder progress.
2. Knowledge is human and is vested in individuals and groups of individuals. Thus, KM needs to have a focus on people, although processes and technology are also important.
3. There are differences between networks which are generally informal organisations and formal organisations, and KM initiatives need to recognise this.
4. It was suggested that structural differences exist between development organisations which are concerned with global public goods and multi-stakeholder processes, and businesses which have a profit
and customer-based focus, with consequences for knowledge management. This is clearly an area for further discussion.

5. Our organisations require management and processes that recognise the characteristics of knowledge intensive organisations (KIOs).

**KM concepts**

6. Use of an integral map of processes has been found valuable to conceptualise KM and formulate issues for discussions and we could apply it for our network and community activities.

7. The KM scan that the participants used in their organisations can be a valuable tool to raise awareness of KM and can be applied by the organisations’ own partner organisations. However, it needs some fine-tuning to improve its suitability for the development sector. In particular, there should be greater emphasis on the importance of external relations to organisations in development.

8. The IFAD model, showing learning supported by four pillars of information management, communications, monitoring and evaluation and innovation seemed valuable for demonstrating how information and communications management are related to KM.

9. The integration of the KM into existing ICM (information and communication management) approaches and policies is a challenge that the CTA and its partner organisations have to address.

**Planning and implementation of KM**

10. Many of the participants considered that the first stage in their implementation of KM should constitute a focus on advocacy, which should be based on stories which demonstrate the importance of knowledge and KM for development.

11. Participants considered that we need to build our knowledge and skills which are needed for KM and also to better promote KM

12. The peer assist, chat show and world café were found to be valuable knowledge sharing methods. Participants engaged with these methods and found them to be very useful sharing tools.

13. Many activities and approaches which are already being undertaken within our organisations are part of KM but have not been recognised as such.

14. KM needs to be planned with a long-term perspective but should already start with quick wins and be implemented in a phased manner
2. BACKGROUND TO THE CONSULTATION

In line with its Strategic Plan 2011-2015, the Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation (CTA) is initiating a programme of capacity strengthening and learning interventions, supporting regional organisations in the area of knowledge management (KM). This is part of the CTA’s continued commitment to support information, communication and knowledge management (ICKM) efforts within the six ACP regions, especially through regional initiatives. While some capacity strengthening resources in the area of information and communications management have been developed and are being implemented in collaboration with CTA’s partners, this Expert Consultation aims to provide the CTA with a clearer, practical framework to guide the development of its interventions on KM in ARD.

The medium-term outcome of this process is to provide ACP institutions with a framework for ICKM in the process of their becoming learning organisations with the capacity to adapt to changing environments.

OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the Expert Consultation comprise:

- Reviewing and improving understanding of KM in the context of regional organisations and communities;
- Describing the current landscape of successful KM interventions in ARD;
- Assessing the need for, capacity to implement and requirements for integral KM practices, particularly in the context of regional organisations and communities;
- Providing advice to the CTA on the types of support it should provide to regional organisations and communities;
- Discussing scenarios for interventions and make recommendations on the elaboration of an integral KM map; and
- Identifying/developing suitable checklists/approaches for improving KM in regional ARD groups.

THE PROCESS

In preparation for the Consultation, two activities were undertaken, namely (i) a KM scan of the participating ACP organisations, a process that was mirrored within CTA itself prior to the consultation and (ii) preparation of a background paper comprising an overview of KM initiatives in the development sector.

In order to define the scope of the discussions and provide a framework for the workshop, the background paper was prepared, covering KM concepts, analysis, processes and tools. During the Consultation, the regional participants had the opportunity to share their experiences and refine the issues for discussion with the subject experts and resource persons who also joined for part of the Consultation. This was designed to give the ACP partners the opportunity to learn from development partners as well as from experiences from the ACP regions, to identify the most effective way of developing their KM strategy and collaboratively address or establish partnerships to develop proposals or initiatives that will highlight KM solutions in the ACP regions.

The Consultation also included a one-day public meeting in order to share the lessons of KM in other industry sectors, private sector, education and development partners: a wider audience in general, and to encourage the development of a broader perspective both within and outside the development sector.
In the morning of the first day of the Consultation, the participants were welcomed and received a general introduction from the Director of CTA, Michael Hailu, who reviewed the background to the Consultation.

WELCOMING REMARKS

Michael Hailu, CTA

The Director of CTA, Michael Hailu, welcomed the participants to the CTA headquarters. CTA is currently undertaking the implementation of its new strategy and has brought in new people to strengthen capacity in three key areas: in support of regional policy processes, value chains development, information communication and knowledge management. One of the challenges facing work in the field of agricultural and rural development is that it is difficult to have a common understanding of KM and how it can be applied. Indeed, policy makers often advocate for the need for KM but what they mean exactly is open to interpretation.

For CTA, KM is now one of the priority areas of intervention. The CTA has already developed a number of products which are closely related to KM. These include the soon to be launched handbook on ICM strategies development, the Smart toolkit for evaluation of information projects, products and services¹, and training courses on WEB 2.0. In addition, CTA is currently integrating its knowledge bases (around 50 web sites) and is also establishing a new portal for CTA’s resources. During this week, CTA is hoping that participants of the Consultation will be able to identify intervention areas for CTA in the field of KM. However, it is always a challenge to strengthen organisations and not only individuals. CTA is concerned to establish how it can make a difference using the tools and products it provides to regional partners, farmers organisations, and policy makers. To do this, we need to be able to measure impact. Feedback on all CTA services is very welcome in this context.

For CTA, it is important that this Consultation makes it possible to link KM with the actual practice of the organisations with whom we are working. There is currently another meeting taking place at CTA on the subject of policy planning and interaction between the two groups is anticipated in the middle and at the end of the week. The Director also drew participants’ attention to a major conference that CTA is hosting on Making the connection: value chains for transforming smallholder agriculture² in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, on 6-9 November 2012.
EXPECTATIONS AND EXPERIENCES

The participants were invited to indicate their personal and institutional expectations for KM, each identifying two priorities (see Figure 1).

![Figure 1: KM priority expectations of participants](image)

The main area of interest, receiving 36 votes, was organisational KM. Within organisational KM, participants were particularly interested in knowledge retention strategies (7) and how to set up a knowledge base (7). KM capacity building was another area of priority, receiving 14 votes, and including the need for KM competencies and how to set up rewards systems that reinforce knowledge sharing. In addition to these areas of specialist interest, participants were also still interested in general information on KM (20 votes), including the evaluation of knowledge.

In the introductory exercise, participants shared their number of years of experience in KM related fields. Collectively they represented 266 years of experience (see Figure 2).

![Figure 2: Years of experience of the participants in KM and related fields](image)
This Consultation is designed to help the CTA meet one of the key outcomes of its Strategic Plan 2011-2015 namely:

Enhanced capacity in Information, Communication and Knowledge Management (ICKM) of ACP institutions to effectively engage in ARD, policy processes, value chain development and networks.

Inputs into the development of this key outcome comprise the CTA’s information needs assessments of ACP countries and regions, undertaken during 2003-2009, and ICM strategy development manuals due to be published at the end of 2012.

CTA has traditionally addressed issues on ICM and the new focus on ICKM requires some rethinking about the nature of ICM and how KM can be integrated with ICM as well as providing added value. The learning resources developed by the CTA define ICM is the process by which an organisation efficiently plans, acquires, organizes, transforms, uses, controls, communicates, disseminates and disposes of its information, communication and associated resources. ICM comprises the management of all activities and resources related to information and its communication within and outside the organisation.

ICM is important because it is the means for organisations of all types and sizes to exploit the value that information has for making informed and timely decisions and solving problems. Almost all organisational activities have informational components and depend on timely, accurate, usable, and relevant information. Indeed, information is now widely recognised as one of the critical organisational resources like finance, personnel, raw materials and equipment.

For CTA, ICKM involves the integration of several things: the knowledge in people’s heads, tools and approaches, the knowledge in the community and in the organization, the process of communication and information sharing, with an emphasis on people. Integration of knowledge in the ICKM framework does, however, call for a deeper understanding of knowledge and KM itself.
time or space. Everyone has knowledge to share and everyone has knowledge to learn. And, finally, some authors state that knowledge itself cannot be managed, only the environment within which it exists.

There is no universal definition of KM. It is a hybrid discipline and is neither a science nor an art. As Adrian Ward of Work Frontiers International noted:

> It’s not about creating an encyclopedia that captures everything that anybody ever knew; rather, it is about keeping track of those who know the recipe, and nurturing the culture and the technology that will get them talking. (Collinson and Parcell 2001)

Another definition comprises:

> KM encompasses any (social) processes and practices concerned with the creation, acquisition, capture, sharing and use of knowledge, skills and expertise, whether these are explicitly labelled as knowledge management or not. (Ferguson et al 2008)

There is a general agreement that KM is about striking the right balance among people, processes and technology.

### CTA’S APPROACH TO STRENGTHENING KM IN ACP ORGANISATIONS

CTA’s current proposed approach to interventions in strengthening ICKM capacity of ACP organisations can be clustered around three areas:

1. Promoting the development, adoption and implementation of ICKM strategies;
2. Supporting the development of capacity building resources and implementing capacity building activities among ACP institutions; and,
3. Supporting the establishment and use of platforms to support the community in coordinating and sharing experiences, including those gained through activities in ICKM.

These activities, processes and platforms link up stakeholders e.g. in research, farming and policy-making while providing reference materials, tools, approaches and fora for networking, discussions (see Figure 3).

**Figure 3: Proposed approach to developing a framework for ICKM**
CTA’S APPROACH TO THE CONSULTATION

As part of this consultation and group discussions with representatives of ACP regional organisations and networks and subject experts, the CTA is proposing a set of activities during the week (Appendix 1) which will enable participants to:

- Review and improve CTA’s understanding of KM in the context of regional organisations and communities;
- Use an integral KM map and KM scan to assess current contexts;
- Describe the landscape of KM interventions and learn from experiences from ARD and other sectors;
- Interact with KM experts on tools and approaches;
- Identify generic KM needs of organisations and networks;
- Identify opportunities for application of KM at institutional, network or regional level and at individual levels; and
- Prioritise proposed activities for CTA and its partners to help ACP institutions address KM while respecting the principle of subsidiarity.

The following activities have also been included as part of the overall process leading to the consultation:

- CTA internal ‘KM Labs’ have been convened to test the concepts and similarities between CTA and regional organisations, and to raise internal awareness of KM needs;
- Sample KM scans have been undertaken by regional organisations prior to the consultation;
- Participants from ACP regions and KM practitioners from development organisations have been brought together during this consultation to enhance the exchange of perspectives and experiences; and
- Participants will be provided with the opportunity to interact and raise awareness of KM among policymakers who are also attending a meeting in Wageningen this week.

DISCUSSION ON THE BACKGROUND PAPER AND GROUP WORK ON UNDERSTANDINGS OF KNOWLEDGE AND KM

Participants had been provided with the Background Paper based on a desk study on the application of KM in the development sector (Appendix 4). The paper introduces some of the concepts of KM and aimed to provide a common starting point to the participants at the consultation. Having the background information and given that was important to develop a common understanding of knowledge and KM, the participants broke into small groups to discuss their understanding of knowledge and Knowledge Management.

Group 1 considered that knowledge represents skills, attitudes and experience gained over time, and information is embedded as part of this. Information is also important if it contributes to decision making. There needs to be a time dimension to knowledge. KM is about managing the process of learning for improved decision-making.

Group 2 considered that knowledge is about internalising explicit and implicit experiences. There is a need for a human element to process it towards re-usability. Knowledge is nothing and everything, both at the same
time. Therefore, we need to understand that knowledge is difficult to describe. Knowledge is an inherent ability of a human being.

KM can be managed at a linear level as a process, like making a photograph. This involves looking at the product of the knowledge itself, from one point to another point. However, there is also an organic component to KM which is multidimensional. This involves learning from different factors and then using this learning.

Based on an anecdote about overhearing a story in another language, Group 3 focused its discussion on one issue: that one sort of knowledge – knowledge of languages, including vocabulary, grammar and translations – can lead to better understanding, learning and being empowered. Such knowledge brings enlightenment: things that were previously incomprehensible become understandable.

**DISCUSSIONS ON GROUPWORK**

Knowledge could not exist without people. This emphasises the importance of team work and negotiation of meanings. KM results in new understandings, learning, and creation of knowledge. It is very much linked to learning processes. KM should also make knowledge accessible, store knowledge, and facilitate joint engineering and processing.

The participants considered the importance of communication in knowledge management - knowledge cannot exist without communication: it needs some kind of external mechanism. It was also felt that knowledge is intrinsically bound to what it is to be human; for example, to what extent does a baby growing up on a desert island ever acquire knowledge?

**AN INTRODUCTION TO THE INTEGRAL KM MAP**

In preparation for this consultation, the CTA has identified a few tools that can assist in improving the analysis of KM in organisations and networks in the ACP regions. The Integral KM Map, originally developed by Co-Capacity is one of such approaches, and has been adapted for the context of the consultation. Co-Capacity has been introducing its version of the integral KM to a number of sectors with advice and consultancy: international development, healthcare, ICT development and the maritime industry. The interaction with CTA, in the preparation of the consultation has brought further refinements to the approach. This presentation provides an introduction to putting into practice integral KM, for consideration by the participants.

Knowledge management is neither a science nor an art, its all about people. Here are some typical KM questions facing individuals and organisations:

- How do you find information on the internet or at the university?
- Should you recruit an in-house specialist or buy in the expertise?
- Why did that project go wrong?
- I prefer to work with him instead of...
- Should we use web 2.0 and social media ....?

But what is knowledge? Knowledge is an individual’s ability, combining tacit knowledge gained in the form of (experience, skills and attitude) and explicit knowledge (information)

\[
\text{Knowledge} = f_n(\text{Information} \times [\text{Experience}, \text{Skills}, \text{Attitude}])
\]
In business, we manage production factors: labour, resources and raw materials, finances, and the workforce. But do we manage our knowledge? Managing knowledge adds value and contributes to the realisation of the business objectives. KM is about developing an optimised organization that enables efficient and effective knowledge processes, tacit and explicit. This is also relevant to other themes that may come up in such discussions, like the concept of the knowledge intensive organisation (KIO), innovation, organisational learning and the learning organisation.

A timeline and evolution in KM approaches could be described as follows: In the early 1990s, the focus was on information and communication technologies (ICTs), and this evolved into a focus on human resources management in the late 1990s. From the year 2000 onwards, the focus has been on the organisation. This has evolved into an integral KM approach which involves developing a balanced programme of KM interventions both to organise and facilitate knowledge processes and to organise and manage the organisation.

The integral KM map (Figure 4) has been developed based on scientific research, combines many models, and has been validated in practice. It has been adopted and adapted by Co-Capacity for different situations. Furthermore, this map forms the structure of the sample KM scan which was undertaken by the participants prior to the Consultation.

The presentation of the Integral KM map, included more detailed examples of KM within the organisation, clustered around the four components: (i) aspects of knowledge organisation (ii) knowledge processes, (iii) external factors influencing KM and (iv) management of external knowledge products and services (Appendix 3). These four clusters would also be used to guide the analysis of KM within an organisation (and applied during the consultation).

**Figure 4: Integral map of organisational KM**
GROUP WORK AND DISCUSSIONS ON THE INTEGRAL KM MAP

Following the presentation of the Integral KM map, participants were each asked to reflect on their own institutional KM context and identify strengths and weaknesses of their organisation in each of the components described in the map. Although it felt confusing at first, the process of focusing on specific aspects of KM enabled participants to describe the knowledge organisational aspects as well as the KM processes. Participants listed the various areas of strengths and weaknesses of their institutions under each component - which led to the realisation of similarities and different clusters, across regional and national ARD organisations and networks or across ACP regions.

Figure 5. Analysis of KM within ACP organisations using the KM Map approach

Participants considered that organisations generally have a lack of understanding of KM strategy. In some organisations, there is a corporate strategic plan in place or a communication strategy or an ICT strategy. Most organisations have a knowledge culture in place which supports sharing, although there are difficulties with knowledge hoarders and there may be cultures that do not facilitate knowledge sharing.

In terms of structure, some organisations were networks of networks. These networks were in contact with a variety of different networks with a variety of different content. These are informal organisations with a loose culture which allows for lots of flexibility. In most organisations, there were clearly defined structures, roles and responsibilities. The participants argued there was a need for linkages between the various organisations and networks. These linkages should involve developing a common approach and harmonisation. There was a lack of coordination between partner organisations. Structural analysis was needed to highlight the issues. Some organisations were felt to be too flat and that, in some cases, middle management is absent.

Management and governance of organisations should pay more attention to different leadership styles. There was a general lack of governance, roles were not properly defined, and there did not appear to be appropriate instruments.
In terms of staff, most of the participants felt that their organisations had access to good technical staff with appropriate knowledge and skills. They were of the opinion that there were staff conflicts related to roles and responsibilities. Many staff were ‘talking the talk’ but not ‘walking the walk’.

Organisational systems were hampered by lack of good monitoring and absence of impact assessments. On the whole, systems are ad-hoc and not predictable. On the other hand, e-mail was seen to be a useful means of communication and exchange of information and is good enough in many cases.

During the discussions, one of the participants pointed out that the integral KM map complemented the model used in one of CTA’s forthcoming books on the development of ICM strategies. This means that that there is already a whole set of tools and interventions which are relevant to this way of looking at organisations.

**GENERAL IMPRESSIONS ON INTEGRAL KM MAP APPROACH**

Participants felt the need for awareness raising on KM and for the development of organisational KM strategies. These two issues should be priorities in efforts to address KM. Culture, and particularly the need for team work as part of knowledge sharing, was also considered to be a priority. Email is recognised as still being very important in the current context in the ACP regions.

The integral KM map was found to be generally useful because it facilitated the drawing of the bigger picture and the breaking down of organisational KM into different components. It is possible that the map might be more applicable to organisations than networks, and this should be considered in more detail. Participants felt that the map provides a very useful place to start but may need some more details around certain aspects.

**THE SAMPLE KM SCANS – AN ANALYSIS ACROSS INSTITUTIONS**

In preparation for this meeting, a sample KM scan was carried out by participants of this Consultation representing 10 different regional organisations and networks. The results are based on a questionnaire survey filled in by each of the participants representing their organisation. While the aim of filling the scan was to create awareness of the tool amongst participants and for them to experience filling in the questionnaire personally, the results were nevertheless analysed as a group. This also enabled participants to see what the results of the scans look like and how they can be interpreted to determine if organisations and networks across regions could have similarities in their KM contexts. The presentation comprised a first analysis of the KM scans, based on the survey, with individual results remaining confidential, as would be the case in a real-life scenario.

The KM scan is related to the concepts described in the integral KM map which was presented earlier in the Consultation (see Figure 4) concerned namely with strategy, culture, structure, management, staff and systems of an organisation. For each part of the survey, the average score is shown based on a 1-10 scale of answers. In addition, an overview of the answers to each question is shown in a figure. Each point on the figure represents one respondent’s answer. The colours represent the answer given (dark red = strongly disagree; red = disagree; green = agree; dark green = strongly agree). In some cases, a positive answer (strongly agree) has a negative effect on the overall score. In these cases, the scores and colours are reversed.

The results of the sample KM scans grouped across organisations is provided below. The letters and numbers in brackets in the text below correspond to questions in the survey.
The aspects of knowledge organisation (within the organisation) were analysed as follows:-

**Strategy**

Some 5 of the organisations have explicit goals with respect to knowledge (H1), 7 know what knowledge they need for their strategy (H2), and 4 organisations periodically consider what knowledge they need in the future (H3). The need for efficiency hardly gets in the way of innovation (H4), and organisations invest substantially in innovation (H5). Some 7 the organisations have high quality knowledge of their market and customers (H6) and high quality knowledge about important technologies, methods and processes (H7).

In general, the long term vision does not get affected by the short-term hectic pace of everyday life (H8). Almost none of the organisations regularly update their strategy (H9). More positively, all strategies reflect the views of staff and management (H11), and almost all of them also the views of the most important stakeholders (H10). Almost all organisations have a formal advisory board or steering committee with strong influence on strategic and tactical decisions (H13), and most of them regularly (at least twice a year) influence or change internal decisions and processes (H14). The average score for strategy is 6.6.

**Culture**

Some 4 of the organisations have an internal ‘knowledge is power’ culture which makes it hard to freely share knowledge (I1). Important information is, in most organisations, spread through official channels, rather than through the grapevine or by gossip (I4). Most people work in their organisations because there is a considerable overlap between their own and the organisation’s objectives (I2). They also feel part of the team and people get along well (I3).

Not everyone is positive towards the renewal of work processes (I5). Most organisations respect externally developed knowledge (I6). Some 7 organisations will sometimes ‘reinvent the wheel’ deliberately, to understand a process themselves and learn from it (I7). In 6 of the organisations, there is more respect for the person with the greatest professional expertise, while in the other 4 there is more respect for the most senior manager (I8). Only 3 of the organisations sometimes have problems in working with partners (I9).

In most organisations, people identify themselves with their area of expertise as much as with their own organisation (I10). In 5 organisations, it is not natural for people to keep their promises (I11), and in 3 there is not enough room for criticising management (I12). The average score for culture was 6.9.

**Structure**

In most organisations, collaboration between different departments is smooth (J1) and working together in a multidisciplinary way is not a problem (J2). In 7 organisations, territoriality and competitiveness do not obstruct knowledge sharing between departments, while in 3 it does (J3). In 5 organisations, employees are not deployed where their knowledge is needed most, but rather in their own unit or department (J4). When teams are put together, attention is paid to get a correct distribution of team roles (J5).

Some 7 organisations do not have separate career paths for managers and professional specialists (J6). Most organisations do not often have drastic restructuring (J7). In 9 organisations, people are comfortable approaching each other, regardless of seniority, gender or function. In only one organisation, people are not comfortable approaching each other (J8). In most organisations, meetings are not just a mere formality but also an important part of the workflow (J9). In all organisations, organisational changes are mostly functional (J10). The average score for structure was 6.9.
Expert consultation on Knowledge management in ARD for the ACP Regions, 10-14 Sept 2012, CTA

Figure 6: Combined KM scan results for (a) strategy (b) culture

H1. Our organisation has formulated explicit objectives with respect to planning, controlling and managing knowledge.
H2. We know what knowledge we need to realise our organisational objectives.
H3. In our organisation we periodically and structurally consider the question what knowledge the organisation will need in 2 to 5 years from now.
H4. The need for efficiency does not hinder innovation in our organisation.
H5. In the interest of the future of our organisation we are making substantial investments in innovation.
H6. Our knowledge of our market and our customers is of a high quality.
H7. Our knowledge of technologies, methods, and processes that are important to us is of a high quality.
H8. The hectic pace of every day life does not hinder our long term vision.
H9. We regularly (at least once a year) update our strategy because of (external) developments in the sector.
H10. Our strategy reflects the views of most important stakeholders.
H11. Our strategy reflects the views of most of our staff and management.
H12. An organisation must have explicit objectives with respect to planning, controlling and managing knowledge.
H13. We have a formal advisory board / steering committee with strong influence on strategic and tactical decisions.
H14. Our advisory board / steering committee influences or changes internal decisions and processes on a regular basis (at least twice a year).

13. In our organisation there is no „knowledge = power“ culture, which means that everyone is prepared to share all the knowledge.
14. I work here because there is considerable overlap between the objectives of the organisation and my personal objectives.
15. I experience a sense of „being part of the team“ here. In general everyone gets on well here.
16. Most relevant information is spread through the grapevine (informal / gossip).
17. People are generally positive towards the renewal of (internal) work processes.
18. We appreciate knowledge that was developed by other departments or external partners and use this knowledge in our own work process without...
19. Sometimes we reinvent the wheel, but when we do it is deliberate because that is what we want to do (for example to learn from it, to understand the...)
20. In our organisation there is more respect for the person with the greatest professional expertise than for the most senior manager.
21. In our organisation working with (alliance) partners rarely causes problems.
22. We identify ourselves with our area of expertise as much as with our own department.
23. It is natural here that people keep their promises.
24. There is enough room for criticizing management.
Figure 7: Combined KM scan results for (a) Structure (b) Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K. Management</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K1. My manager/ immediate supervisor prefers to focus on outcomes instead of planning and controlling the work process (= throughput management).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2. My manager knows which (core) competencies we have in-house.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K3. My manager knows what goes on in our department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4. My manager supports me and encourages me in my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K5. When needed, my manager uses my knowledge for making decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K6. My manager helps me understand how my work fits within the overall objectives of the organisation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K7. My manager makes it clear to everyone who is responsible for a good result; he does not take credit for someone else’s work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K8. My manager gives me new professional challenges on a regular basis, which means I continue to learn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K9. My manager stimulates functional collaboration with others (both within and outside our department).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K10. My manager gives me opportunities to stay up-to-date with my professional literature and to periodically attend seminars and conferences in my...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K11. My manager is not afraid to distinguish between the way he manages different knowledge workers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K12. Know what my manager holds me accountable for.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K13. In our organisation the management tells us what has to be done and the staff can determine how they do things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J. Structure</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J1. Collaboration between different departments is smooth because our organisation is not...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J2. If we need to work together in a multi-disciplinary structure in our organisation, the organisational...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J3. Territoriality and competitiveness do not obstruct knowledge sharing between departments in our...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J4. Employees are deployed where their knowledge is needed most, regardless of department or unit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J5. When putting together teams we don’t just look at the required expertise, but also try to realise a...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J6. In our organisation we have two potential career paths for professionals, one for managers and one...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J7. In our organisation we don’t often have a drastic restructuring.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J8. In our organisation we are comfortable approaching each other, independent of seniority...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J9. Meetings are not just a mere formality, they are an important part of the workflow.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J10. Organisational changes are mostly functional.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Management
In the survey, management was a very high scoring category. Most managers prefer focussing on outputs instead of controlling the work process (K1) which seems to conflict with the answers that in three organisations staff cannot determine how to do things themselves (K13). Managers are aware of the competencies people have in house (K2) and know what goes on in the departments (K3). Managers are mostly supportive and encouraging (K4) and give people professional challenges (K8), as well as the opportunity to stay up-to-date in their area of expertise (K10). Managers use people’s knowledge to make decisions (K5) and make it clear to everyone who is responsible for a good result and do not take credit for someone else’s work (K7). They help people understand how their work fits within the overall objectives of the organisation (K6). Managers stimulate collaboration with others (K9). People know what they are held accountable for (K12) and managers distinguish between the ways they manage different knowledge workers (K11). For management, the average score was 7.6.

Staff
In many organisations, there is a shortage of creative and innovative people (L1) as well as internal entrepreneurs (L2). The number of thinkers and doers is not balanced in 6 organisations (L7). Even though there is an apparent lack of creative people, in 8 organisations they do rely on the creativity and improvisational skills of their staff (L13), and in 9 organisations every member of staff has unique knowledge and creativity (L14).

Most people know what they will have to learn in the coming year to be able to do their job (L3), and they have the opportunity to do new things to keep on learning (L4). When new employees are hired, 8 organisations also pay significant attention to their growth potential (L5). New employees are normally not allocated a coach or mentor (L9). Most organisations have regular performance appraisals with their employees (L8). The development of employees is an important criterion for success for the organisations (L12), and they have to continuously keep learning (L15).

In 7 organisations, if colleagues criticise each other, they will do this in a constructive way (L10). In most organisations, everyone contributes during meetings (L11). Everyone feels their work matters, that their contribution is relevant (L6). For staff, the average score was 6.5.

Systems
Most organisations consider ICTs to be the main solution for KM (M1). ICTs support collaboration process in most cases (M2) and, in 7 organisations, also support the decision-making process (M3). ICTs generally provide the information people need (M4). In more than half of the organisations, digital files are not stored systematically and recognisably (M6). Only one organisation has rules and procedures that can sometimes hinder people in their work (instead of being only functional) (M5). The average score for systems was 6.1.
Figure 8: Combined KM scan results for (a) staff (b) systems

L. Staff

1. I have enough creative and innovative people.
2. There is no shortage of internal entrepreneurs.
3. I know what I have to learn in the coming year to be able to do my primary task to satisfaction.
4. I don't have to keep doing the same things I am already good at. That's why I keep learning new things.
5. When selecting employees we pay significant attention to their growth potential.
6. My work matters: my contribution is relevant.
7. In our organisation the numbers of 'thinkers' and 'doers' are well-balanced.
8. Every employee has a regular performance appraisal.
9. New employees in our department are allocated a coach or mentor for a certain period of time.
10. If colleagues criticise each other, they do this in a constructive way.
11. During meetings, everyone contributes a little.
12. The development of our employees (as a result of which they continue to possess top-level knowledge) is an important success criterion for us.
13. We rely on the creativity, improvisational skills, and innovative capacity of our employees to be able to answer questions and solve problems for clients.
14. Every member of our staff has his own unique knowledge and creativity.
15. The employees have to continuously learn to be able to continue to do their work properly.

M. System

M1. In our organisation we consider ICT the main solution for knowledge management.
M2. ICT supports the collaboration process in our organisation.
M3. We also use ICT to support the decision-making process.
M4. ICT mainly provides the information I need for my function/task ('need to know basis').
M5. Our rules and procedures are mostly functional, they do not hinder me in my work.
M6. (Digital) files are stored systematically and recognizable. Anyone who needs certain information has no trouble finding it.
**KNOWLEDGE PROCESSES**

Given that this is a KM scan, the knowledge processes have been broken down into a number of sub-processes.

**Determining knowledge needed**

Some 6 organisations have a systematic process in place to determine the knowledge required for their strategy (A1). Not all organisations have a strategy that is clear enough to determine what knowledge they need (A2). However, most organisations do find strategic opportunities based on the knowledge they have in-house (A3). Problem-solving is also mostly done with internally available knowledge (A4), and when knowledge is not in-house it is mostly hired in the form of consultants (A5). Average score was 6.3

**Inventory of available knowledge**

Within all organisations, people can easily find the right colleague for certain questions (B4) and, in most organisations, people know what others know (B1). Less than half of the organisations have a formal database or index (who is who) to find knowledge in the organisation (B2). Even though most organisations do not operate in a very competitive market, they are not all aware of which areas they have more knowledge in-house that their main competitors (B3). Most people are aware of knowledge gaps in their organisation (B5). Average score for the availability of knowledge was 6.2.

**Development of new knowledge**

Most organisations have formal procedures for the development of knowledge (C1). In 7, spontaneous development of knowledge that is not directly needed for the strategy also occurs (C2). Some 6 organisations make choices on buying or making new knowledge on rational grounds which means that 4 organisations make these decisions on non-rational grounds (C3). Half of the organisations think about what knowledge will be needed in 5-10 years (C4). All organisations have good contact with research institutes (C5), and everyone appears to be positive towards renewing products or services (C7). In 5 organisations, some people or departments lag behind in their knowledge (C6). Average score for the development of new knowledge was 6.6.

**Making knowledge available and accessible**

Many organisations suffer from an information overflow (D4), people do not always find the most up-to-date information (D3), and 5 organisations claim their experts cannot distinguish between relevant and non-relevant knowledge (D2) which worsens the effect of an information overflow. However, knowledge is easily available in most organisations (D1), and people know whom to go to for certain questions (D6). Some 6 organisations claim that knowledge is shared between experts and non-experts in an understandable way (D5) and that they do not have a ‘find and bring’ obligation for knowledge (D7). Some 5 organisations do not have any processes to cope with possible knowledge loss when someone leaves the organisation (D9), and do not have someone responsible for content curation (D10). Average score was 5.5.
Figure 9: Combined KM scan results for (a) determining knowledge needed (b) inventory of available knowledge (c) development of new knowledge

A. Determining the required knowledge

A1. Explicitly determining the knowledge required to realise our strategy is a systematic process in our organisation.

A2. The strategy of our organisation is so clear that we can use it to determine what knowledge we need to realise this strategy.

A3. Sometimes we do things the other way round: looking at the nature and level of the available knowledge we determine what strategic...

A4. We try to solve problems we encounter with internally available knowledge.

A5. We hire external knowledge when we do not have this knowledge available in-house.

B. Inventory of available knowledge

B1. I am aware which knowledge workers in my work environment possess knowledge that is valuable to us but scarce.

B2. We have a formal index/database - automated or otherwise - where we can find which knowledge is available where in the organisation.

B3. We know in which areas we have more knowledge in-house than our main competitors.

B4. If I get a certain question from a client I am able to say which person in my work environment is the most knowledgeable to answer that particular...

B5. We are aware of the knowledge gaps within the organisation.

C. Development of new knowledge

C1. We have formal knowledge development procedures like pilots, studies, etc.

C2. In our organisation new knowledge that is not directly needed for the realisation of the current strategy is also developed spontaneously.

C3. Decisions regarding make or buy of new required knowledge are made on rational grounds.

C4. In our organisation we periodically and structurally think about the question what knowledge the organisation will need in 5 to 10 years from now.

C5. We have good contacts with research institutes in knowledge areas that are of strategic importance to us.

* C6. It sometimes happens that a certain department or group gets behind in its required knowledge and this situation can only be remedied at a relatively...

C7. In general, people here are positive towards renewing products or services.
Sharing knowledge
Spontaneous knowledge sharing happens almost everywhere (E1). In most cases, knowledge sharing does not weaken one’s own position (E2) and attention is paid to the distribution of relevant knowledge (E3). Knowledge sharing is mostly not explicitly rewarded (E4). Expensive mistakes are made in more than half of the organisations because of not having the right knowledge at the right time and place (E5). Most people do learn from each other’s mistakes (E6). In almost all organisations, relevant methodologies, experience etc. are easily shared (E7). Sharing knowledge scored an average of 6.7.

Applying knowledge
In most organisations, new knowledge is not quickly and/or spontaneously applied (F1). Knowledge workers who have not been involved in the development of knowledge are hesitant in using it (the ‘not-invented-here’ syndrome) (F2). This is also reflected in a normally healthy critical attitude towards knowledge (F3) which, unfortunately, too often becomes a resistance to applying new knowledge because people hang on to routines and habits (F4). Bringing an innovative idea into successful application is thus not always easy (F5). Average score was 5.5.

Evaluating knowledge
This is the lowest scoring category. Only 2 of the organisations systematically document errors (G1) while 4 document good practices (G2). Sharing and documenting of new insights is routine in 5 of the organisations (G3). In 6 organisations, people are not aware of what knowledge is no longer relevant (G4). Some 4 have staff that possesses knowledge that is no longer relevant (G5) and, in another 3 organisations, people who lag behind do not get training to update their knowledge (G6). The average score was 5.4.
Figure 11: Combined KM scan results for (a) knowledge sharing (b) applying knowledge (c) evaluating knowledge
Some 6 organisations regularly update and adapt their products and services to their clients’ needs (N1). Almost all services are highly appreciated (N2). Most staff is also skilled in brokering knowledge for their clients (N3) and make sure the clients only get the most relevant and recent knowledge and information (N4). Some 7 organisations make sure their information and digital content is easy accessible for clients (N5). Adoption of knowledge by clients is also facilitated by most organisations (N6). Only 4 organisations conduct monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of their services in a systematic way (N7). Five organisations use the results from M&E to adapt their services and / or organisation (N8). In only one of the organisations, failed projects and costly mistakes do not serve as an example but, instead, might be covered up (N9). In most work, improvisation is an important aspect (N10). Almost all organisations use indigenous and local knowledge, as well as scientific knowledge, to adapt their products and services (N11 & N12). The average score was 6.3.

**Figure 12: Combined KM scan results for knowledge products and surveys**
MAIN CONCLUSIONS OF SAMPLE KM SCAN ANALYSIS

In general, there is enough attention being paid to formulating KM strategies, reflecting both stakeholder and staff/management views. However, almost none of them is regularly updated. It could be that most organisations do have a clear long-term vision, but do not always translate these into regularly updated strategies.

There is enough room for innovation, and management does not try to steer the workflow too much. They rely a great deal on the creativity, improvisational skills and innovative capacity of the employees. Even so, there seems to be an imbalance between the number of ‘thinkers’ and ‘doers’ in most organisations.

There is much relative awareness on the knowledge needed to realise the KM strategies and, generally, this knowledge is also available within the organisations, although more attention might be paid to obsolete knowledge as well as the abilities of staff to distinguish between relevant and non-relevant knowledge. Most people seem to be eager to learn and change or adapt their work, so this should not be a problem.

When looking at organisational cultures, most people work at their organisations because there is a considerable overlap between their own and the organisation’s objectives. People feel their work is relevant. They feel part of the team and people get along well. A drawback at some of the organisations is the ‘knowledge is power’ culture which might make people reluctant to share knowledge, although mostly they seem to feel free to do so.

In general, management scores very high. Management seems to be trusting, supporting and motivating towards their employees. Managers are well aware of the main competencies of their staff, and make use of their knowledge in work and decisions.

When looking at ICT, the main problem seems to be that files (documents, reports etc.) are not always stored systematically and recognisably. A lot of time might be lost at finding the right and most up-to-date information within the organisations. People often suffer from an information overflow and, considering that there might be a problem with distinguishing between relevant and non-relevant information, it is possible that people use outdated information for decisions. Not every organisation has processes or rules for knowledge retention - making sure knowledge is retained when people leave the organisation. Since possible errors as well as good practices are not always well documented, and information is not easy to find, a lot of experience, valuable contacts and organisational knowledge will be lost when employees retire or change jobs.

Regarding their knowledge products and services, almost all organisations are highly appreciated by their clients. Organisations make use of local / indigenous as well as scientific knowledge to keep their services up-to-date and well adapted to their clients’ needs, even though services are not always regularly updated. Many organisations lack regular and systematic monitoring and evaluation of their work but, in most cases, staff can probably easily identify good practices and errors, and adapt their work to current needs.

DISCUSSIONS

At the end of Day 1, the general discussion focused on the scale used for the KM scan, its interpretations and how the scan instrument could be operationalised. One key difference noted between the results of the KM scan and the group work was that organisation management had been highly praised in the KM scan but was seriously criticised during group work. This might be explained if respondents to the survey were concerned about their responses being confidential and may not have expressed themselves freely. These are issues to take into consideration during implementation of KM scan. Participants were keen to use such an instrument but would have liked to review the questions, based on their contexts within their organisations.
4. DAY 2: KM SCAN ANALYSIS AND SHARING OF EXPERIENCES

After a recap of Day 1 activities, participants were reminded that the exercise had enabled them to analyse their own KM context and also enabled them to understand the situation among other organisations across the ACP. The sharing of information and knowledge acquired about each other can now lead to the identification of clusters of common objectives and activities. Thus using an analogy of travellers having used a ‘map’ to describe where they come from and where they would like to go, the focus of Day 2 would be to determine ways of measuring how well and how far we progress towards our destination.

FURTHER DISCUSSIONS OF THE KM SCAN

The participants wanted to better understand the scores generated by the scan, especially how the scale used in the questionnaire were converted into a 10 point scale because the latter is a scale which most people are familiar with.

Participants were interested to know if they could use the questionnaire themselves to analyse their own and their partners’ KM. It was proposed that ideally organisations should use the same instrument over time but also across organisations so that they could be compared and they could learn from each other. Co-Capacity has been administering the instrument through Survey monkey and would gladly be able to support any organisation. Participants concluded that if they wished to use such an instrument as a benchmark for their own and their participants’ KM, it would be necessary to agree on versions and questions beforehand. For example, versions with a 5-position scale could be used instead of the 4-position scale used this time, and the wordings of some of the questions would have to be modify to suit the kind of organisation filling in the questionnaire.

There were differences in the KM scan outcomes between the different organisations which took part. This difference did not come from one single question but was more the result of a bigger trend because of the number of questions that was in each category. However, more scans and results are needed if we are to start identifying real differences.

Some participants expressed the view that the questionnaire was difficult to fill if the respondent was part of a network, rather than being part of an organisation. It was also felt that there may be a difference between networks per se and organisations that were facilitating networks. However, the scan has also been used in a variety of types of organisations, including multinationals which may also have characteristics of a network. Given that there are many different types of networks, for example closed/registered networks and open network, as well as the differences between established networks and communities of practice, it is important to understand the structures of these networks. There may be differences between these types of networks and communities. Furthermore, in the practice of KM, participants who felt they represented networks considered they were managing environments rather than organisations. Indeed, there is so much difference between networks and organisations that there is a risk of not opening our mind to look at the differences if we take them along the same route. Some of the questions in the KM scan lack a richness that reflect the reality of the participants’ organisations as is, for example, the case with networks for whom volunteers can be very important. When you are dealing with volunteers, the stakes and motivating factors are very different.
Another participant was of the opinion that the KM scan is more suited to organisations that are private businesses. In the development sector, however, most organisations are not aiming for a profit but rather to contribute to global public goods. In that sense, development organisations are less private and less self referential. For this reason, the external reality is very important. Development organisations are accountable to ‘the world’ and not to themselves as private companies are. However, this is not totally a black-and-white issue as more and more development partnerships are public-private initiatives with the implication that the private sector becomes more involved in development. It is not yet possible to compare the results of this KM scan with the previous results from the private sector because these results have not yet been validated.

In conclusion, the participants were of the opinion that it was important to make a distinction between networks and institutions when doing the scan. Given that the participants were of the opinion that the situation for networks and organisations would be different, it was felt that further discussion should be carried among two groups: one for networks, one for organisations.

GROUP WORK ON KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTS AND SERVICES

The next stage in the consultation was to discuss the external knowledge products and services of the Integral KM map. This was carried out in group work by the two groups, namely focused on networks and organisations.

ORGANISATIONS PERSPECTIVE

The group composed of participants from organisations was of the opinion that their organisations were doing a number of things well, including information curation, farmer extension factsheets, and designing capacity building programmes. Weaknesses involved not undertaking a thorough analysis at the start of the design phase of a new product or service in order to consider the rationale for creating it, for whom it is designed and which needs it meets, and how M&E will be undertaken. It was felt that there was often too much dependence on consultants and a lack of clarity about target audience. This latter point referred to the fact that there was sometimes no effort to translate the product/service into the appropriate language for the proposed service or product.

In terms of partnerships, most participants felt that their organisations were good at involving different stakeholders but that there was a lack of tools and mechanisms for effective partnerships and that there was often a lack of agreement between organisations.

On the whole, participants felt that their organisations did not know enough about what tools to use. In terms of M&E, there was a shortage of methodologies that incorporate a multi-stakeholder view. In general, many KM challenges result from the fact that participants have to work within an organisational structure.

NETWORKS PERSPECTIVE

Participants were of the opinion that their networks were good at producing newsletters and developing tools for collaborative evaluation. It was observed, however, that there were different perspectives on this between network members and the secretariat. Networks were less good at developing materials and tools that directly benefit the farmers. It would be useful to evaluate a network collectively and then compare this to a single organisation. We should also find ways to better address the dualities of organisations and networks, for example, the duality of organisations having responsibilities towards the farmers and responsibilities within the network. It was also observed that networks work less well if more than one organisation is in charge: this leads to tension.
PEER ASSIST AS A TECHNIQUE FOR PLANNING INTERVENTIONS

As part of the Consultation, various KM tools and techniques were introduced as part of the process: one of which is the Peer Assist. A peer assist is a methodology which supports ‘learning before doing’ processes. Using the same principle as a scientific peer review, it taps into peer knowledge when undertaking a particular activity. The process of carrying out a Peer Assist was first explained using a video on YouTube but a less formal procedure was followed at the Consultation. In this context, two peer assists were undertaken to encourage peer learning among the participants and also to demonstrate the value of such a method in planning interventions of a complex nature.

PEER ASSIST A: THE CHALLENGE OF LINKING KM WITH POLICY PROCESSES AT SPC-LRD

Anju Mangal and Maria Elder-Ratutokarua, SPC-LRD

This peer assist was concerned with the example of Vanuatu which had requested support from the Secretariat of the Pacific Commission (SPC) in the development of a land use policy because of the serious land use conflict Vanuatu was facing. The Land Resources Division (LRD) of SPC has to assist Vanuatu to develop its land use policy and guidelines, and was requesting assistance from peers on what steps needed to be addressed during this process. In addition to the challenge relating to Vanuatu, the peer assist was also concerned with how the SPC-LRD could link KM and policy processes.

SPC works with 22 Pacific Island countries and territories (PICTs), providing technical and advisory services in the area of agriculture and forestry, economic development, maritime industry, social resources, and geosciences. SPC consults member countries to develop Joint Country Strategies (JCSs) which enable the SPC to consider individual country needs.

As regards the link between KM and policy processes, the peer assistees wanted to revise the SPC-LRD IKM strategy so that it can be linked to policy processes. In particular, they were questioning themselves as regards what additional knowledge assets are needed to support policy formulation and how to develop trust of their stakeholders. The link between KM and policy is needed because it will allow policymakers to take better decisions in policy formulation. Suggestions were sought on the information and knowledge needed to support developing policies and how best to interact with SPC’s member countries, linking both resources and processes that are available.

The following suggestions were provided by the group:

- Take into account the literature on the link between knowledge and policy. In particular, the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) and the European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM) have undertaken many studies of the link between policy, evidence and knowledge which might be helpful.

- Develop a 5-year plan, linking KM and policy, in a consultative manner with stakeholders and country members, taking into account where development cooperation is going to be in 2020. KM and communication should be at the core of this. Bear in mind that knowledge brokers will be key stakeholders in this process.

- Make use of windows of opportunity which are present along the ‘policy snake’, a pragmatic approach that is used by ECDPM in their efforts to influence policy.

- Given the new objectives, it is important to revise the existing KM strategy, covering two major strategic areas: support for capacity development for policy and KM.
• Try to ‘unpack’ the KM and policy processes, looking for rationale and relevance.
• Try using a variety of different tools and interventions.
• Finding opportunities to link up with other partners in the field of KM and policy.
• Concentrate on audience, rationale and tools (ART).
• It is important to consider ways of changing mindsets and how this new emphasis on KM and policy could actually make a difference to SPC-LRD’s work.

In conclusion, the peer assistees were of the opinion that the feedback from the group was relevant and the group was in agreement that it was important to link knowledge management to policy processes. KM can be used to support existing policies and develop new ones. It is also imperative to understand how KM fits in with an organisation’s objectives.

---

**PEER ASSIST B: A KM PLATFORM FOR AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND EXTENSION SYSTEMS IN MADAGASCAR**

*Andrianjafy Rasoanindrainy, Farming & Technology for Agriculture (FTA)*

This peer assist considered the sustainability of a recently established KM platform to revitalise agricultural research and extension systems. The platform currently involves 18 partners. Temporary funding has expired but the aspirations still exist. If the project is to be continued, buy in from other partners is required.

The rationale for this platform was and would be: gathering interested people together; providing a focus on common objectives; making information available that can be used by farmers; facilitating interaction and linkages; coordinating different initiatives; and providing access to technical training. The potential of kiosks for making this accessible and up-scaling is also being considered.

The group was interested to learn if there had been any reflection on issues of sustainability from the start of the platform. Instead, the approach was based on starting by doing and on a minimum of resource use, while still delivering needed services.

Suggestions for measuring success comprise the use of quantitative indicators and observation points, for example the number of communities viewing videos, and relevance and attitude changes. In order to demonstrate why partners should continue to be involved, development of a pilot project was suggested. The following suggestions and questions were also provided by the group:

• Were your objectives clear at the start?
• The objectives seem now be moulded to fit what has been achieved.
• It is important to write up and document what you have done to date.
• Keep on seeking additional support.
• Consider what can be done without funding at this stage.
• Consider the development of an application for mobile phone.
• Seek partners.
THE CHAT SHOW – EXAMPLES OF KM APPROACHES IN ORGANISATIONS

Chris Addison, CTA

The Chat Show is a technique of knowledge sharing that was also demonstrated and practically applied in the context of the Consultation. In this context, the Chat Show featured three participants introducing very different examples of their KM approaches.

EXPERIENCES FROM AN INTERNAL KM PROJECT AT ECDPM

Ivan Kulis, ECDPM

In an effort to work in a smarter way and to be more effective, ECDPM has recently started the IMAKE (Information Management and Knowledge Extension) Project which has involved moving to Google for its internal knowledge management, including Gmail and Google Documents. Management had realised that information storage, versioning, collaboration, content production in research, project management and learning were costing some 10% of the turnover. After this first identification of the problem, steps were undertaken to make intranet a more attractive platform for sharing. This ended in a process in which Google Documents, Sites, Calendar and Drive were adopted for organisational KM and information management. The results have been beyond all expectations. It has made it possible to build an agile, in-house approach with limited consultant input. For each functionality, a key person in the organisation was identified and made responsible for the development of that component.

IMAKE has demonstrated high ownership and good design. Most of the information management issues were solved in the design, and not in the final product. There was a panel group, monitoring the whole process, which tried to over-deliver, delivering more than management had requested. The panel group are now champions, driving the enthusiasm through the rest of the organization. The lessons from this experience are that it is important to focus on the people who want to change, not on the people who do not want to change; and to focus on the benefits, rather than on the change itself.

The costs are US$50.00 per user which ensures that data are not mined for advertising purposes. Ivan emphasized that Google is very secure and it is not more subject to the US Act on data access that other internet providers.

IKM EMERGENT

Mike Powell, IKM Emergent

The IKM Emergent Research Programme started with an article ‘Which knowledge, whose reality’ which criticised the way development is undertaken because, as a knowledge industry, it should be doing things differently. For example, in a knowledge industry, straightforward replication is not going to work. Nor is it possible to predict exactly what is going to happen because change processes within the complexity of development are not linear. Most procedures for undertaking projects and programmes in development do...
not take this lack of predictability and complexity into account. To contribute to development, every initiative has to take processes of emergence into account, and these cannot be anticipated. KM for development should create an environment in which emergence is acknowledged. This has implications for planning and accountability because the end-product can only be defined along the way. Management has to deal with this unpredictability and needs to be flexible.

In terms of planning for KM, this implies that it is not reasonable to plan for a predictable future. This also means that you need to understand the limitations and constraints of research. Some knowledge has a shelf-life but much is still timeless.

GDNET

Sherine Ghoniem, GDN

The Global Development Network (GDN) is an independent international organisation that allies researchers and institutes in development globally. It now has 10 years’ experience with GDNet, a network of global networks generating, accessing and sharing knowledge. It originally provided services to support research and projects, and has now moved on to find ways of maximising research results. This has included creating regional and thematic windows, including analysis, synthesis, repackaging, impact and uptake. GDNet uses analytics to monitor the lifecycle of knowledge. It is struggling to keep the community of practice (CoP) after the project phase.

Leadership of CoPs is very important and does not receive enough attention. Knowledge is often timeless and information certainly is.

IDENTIFICATION OF MAIN KM ISSUES FROM ACP PERSPECTIVE

Having been exposed to and applied the Integral KM mapping approach to assess their own institutional contexts, reflected on the experiences shared during the Peer Assist sessions and the Chat Show, participants were requested to use their insights into KM to identify the main KM issues that they considered should be addressed. The Market Place technique was used. This consisted of participants being given a limited number of sticky dots and are requested to place those on the cards containing the issues, that had been listed under each of the KM Map component, which they considered the most important to be addressed. Based on the combined views of the participants themselves through this process, the group was now able to take stock of the key issues in KM that would guide the later steps in the consultation process. The issues which were tagged with the most dots comprised:

Knowledge Organisational aspects:

- **Strategy:** ‘Need for a clear overall strategy and strategy (yearly) cycle’ & ‘A KM strategy as part of the overall strategy’
- **Culture:** ‘Creating a knowledge intensive culture’
- **Structure:** ‘Formal structure does not always fit the knowledge environment’ & ‘But we do have informal workarounds’
- **Management:** ‘Issue of management style not being suited to knowledge intensive work’ & ‘Better understanding of KM needed’
- **Staff:** ‘KM competences’ & ‘Knowledge retention strategies’
- **Systems:** ‘KM is about knowledge first, then ICT’ & ‘Storage systems for knowledge are needed’
**Knowledge Processes:**

- **Determine Knowledge needed:** ‘Systematic processes are needed’
- **Inventory of knowledge available:** ‘Processes needed to be inventoried’ & ‘Documentation of different types of knowledge’
- **Developing new knowledge:** ‘Develop internal knowledge products’
- **Making knowledge available & accessible:** ‘How to set up a knowledge base’
- **Internal knowledge sharing:** ‘Currently no reward for KS practices’
- **Application of knowledge:** ‘Capacity building on knowledge application and use is needed’
- **Evaluation of knowledge:** ‘Processes that value to knowledge’

5. **DAY 3: WIDENING THE CIRCLE OF EXPERIENCES - OTHER SECTORS & PARTNERS**

**INTRODUCTION TO ONE-DAY SEMINAR WITH OTHER SECTORAL PARTNERS**

**WELCOME**

*Krishan Bheenick, CTA*

Welcome to the Reehorst Conference centre. To follow the metaphor of this Consultation as a KM journey, on Day 1 we defined our long-term vision or destination. We were given tools to experiment with to better understand where we were and the different ways of getting to our destination. On Day 2 we shared our different pathways and means of measuring our progress. Today is the travellers’ convention where we have the opportunity to meet new people who have travelled towards other destinations and who can share their experiences with us. The sharing of experiences will take place not only with those who have joined us for today, but also the policymakers who are attending another CTA meeting. This is also an opportunity to raise the policymakers’ awareness of the importance of KM. Today, this is an opportunity to validate the stories and challenges related to the integral KM map that we have been dealing with in the first part of the week.

*Michael Hailu, CTA*

For CTA and their regional partners, many of whom are present at this Consultation, global change is leading to and increasing number of interests and actors being involved in agricultural and rural development. In CTA’s new Strategic Plan, CTA aims to respond to this challenge by adding value to activities. KM managers should play a role in making the whole development system more efficient by reducing the amount of duplication. CTA can only focus on certain areas: strengthening policy processes in the region, supporting priority value chains, capacity building in ICKM.
HEALTH: KM IN THE STEM CELL TRANSPLANT PROGRAMME, TRIASUS

Koen Beelen, Co-Capacity

In 2004, a MS Access developer got in touch with Co-Capacity to look for help in coping with problems in the stem cell transplant chain. This was not a pure ICT issue because the problems included many different elements of administrative overload including time consuming manual registration; complex authorisation procedures; lack of control over material flow; too many mistakes; inefficient or ineffective communications; and the need for copying of data.

In 2005, Co-Capacity developed Triasus in collaboration with a number of departments of the University Medical Centre Utrecht (the Pathology Laboratory, the Immunology Laboratory, the Haematology Clinical Division, and the W/KZ Children’s Hospital), Europdonor (the Dutch stem cell donor registry), and the European Group for Blood and Marrow Transplantation (EBMT). Triasus was a concept for enhancing knowledge sharing and communication to optimise haematopoietic stem cell transplant programmes. It aimed to create higher levels of quality and collaboration within and between clinical, collection and laboratory units, donor registries, logistic and R&D departments.

Triasus is a web based information management solution supporting: diagnosis, processing, selection, preservation, matching, storage, donation, distribution, procurement, treatment, testing and communication. It links the total horizontal transplant chain and is able to interface with vertically oriented systems like: hospitals, financial systems, laboratories, patients, and donors.

For the Triasus experience there are a number of lessons which are relevant for the integral KM map, based on the categories of organisations that we have been discussing at this Consultation including:

- **Strategy:** The importance of strategising and prioritising (including fine-tuning);
- **Culture:** The need to break through the individual information silos;
- **Structure:** It is important to organise experts to have regular meetings;
- **Management:** Leaders from every department need to be responsible;
- **Staff:** Consultants were needed to develop a specialised tool;
- **System:** It was important to develop a new system.
REFLEXIVE MONITORING IN ACTION: M&E FOR INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE

Barbara van Mierlo, Knowledge, Innovation, and Technology, Wageningen University

There has been a revival of system thinking in M&E, marked by the GIZ Conference ‘Systemic Approaches in Evaluation’ in January 2011. This is because of complex problem contexts, including uncertainty on causes and solutions and a lack of consensus in society on goals and values. This has led to increasing attention to a missing dimension in complex problem contexts. Institutional factors hinder, for example, the development of rainfed farming and land tenure arrangements.

Reflexive monitoring in action (RMA) involves monitoring and evaluation of processes of collective learning and social change in and around an innovation network to keep the focus on long term, ambitious aims (involving institutional change). RMA supports collective learning and change by stimulating regular reflection on activities, results and the institutional setting. RMA is a practice, with the aid of an evaluator and not merely a methodology or the application of tools. RMA is embedded in collective network activities and influences their re-adaptation. Hence, many RMA activities are carried out collectively. It involves tools for challenging the institutional setting, such as Collective System Analysis. It involves a number of steps. In step 2, barriers to institutional change are put in a matrix.

AGRICULTURAL INNOVATION SYSTEMS AND THE ROLE OF INNOVATION BROKERS

Catherine Kilelu and Laurens Klerkx, Knowledge, Innovation and Technology, Wageningen University

There are changes in views on agricultural development and innovation from linear to systemic models of innovation, involving a balance of technologies and organisational and institutional factors. The focus on ‘research’ and ‘knowledge’ (research evidence) obscures other important factors in innovation. Innovation can be seen as a process of building networks, interactive learning and negotiation.

Failures or challenges to innovation system include: infrastructural failures; capacity failures; network failures; and institutional failures (non-conducive laws, regulations, procedures, conflicting values, norms, habits of actors). Intermediaries help counteract innovation system and market failures. The innovation intermediary or knowledge broker can be defined as:

..an organisation or body that acts as an agent or broker in any aspect of the innovation process between two or more parties [...] helping to provide information about potential collaborators; brokering a transaction between two or more parties; acting as a mediator, or go-between, bodies or organisations that are already collaborating; and helping find advice, funding and support for the innovation outcomes of such collaborations. (Howells 2006)
Innovation brokers act as specialised innovation system facilitators. Innovation broker functions comprise: connecting demand and supply in knowledge infrastructure (seekers and solvers); forging linkages and help articulate visions among innovation system actors. Innovation process management (such as network facilitation) works at different system aggregation levels: national, regional, and sectoral.

Types of innovation brokers in the Netherlands and in developing countries include: innovation consultants; peer network brokers; Internet-based portals; innovation agencies; non-governmental organisations (NGOs); and networks/programmes.

The African Agriculture Technology Foundation (AATF) is an example of an innovation broker. It has the following roles: negotiating identification, access, and utilisation of proprietary agricultural technologies; managing partnerships on various dimensions; and managing knowledge and information on technologies (including technical issues, biosafety regulations etc).

Key contributions of innovation brokers comprise mediating between different ‘worlds’, increasing mutual understanding, stimulating overall agricultural innovation system interaction, focusing on broad innovation capacity building, helping induce a shift towards demand driven research and advisory services, and aiming to act relatively neutrally/impartially. Innovations can face a number of tensions relating to balancing demands from different parties with different accountabilities which may threaten neutrality/impartiality. There is also the risk of possible function ambiguity with researchers and advisors or others. Brokerage function is quite intangible, so low willingness-to-pay and attribution problems in evaluation threaten continuity.

Research on innovation brokers has led to the following lessons: some form of continuous public support for innovation brokering appears to be necessary; mandate and expectations should be well defined (what is public, what is private?); And adequate ‘soft’ evaluation criteria are needed.

**KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT AT JUMBO SHIPPING**

*Wouter van Dalen, Jumbo Shipping & Offshore*

Jumbo Shipping is a family business which is here to stay. It is a ship-owner of 12 heavy lift vessels. Since 1968, it has been setting trends as the world’s leading company in heavy lift shipping. Since 2002, it has become a new player in the offshore installation market with dynamically positioned heavy lift vessels. The Jumbo culture is that we do everything ourselves. It is a nice environment for KM experiences. It is very goal oriented which is less good for KM and means there is not much room for self-reflection. Offices are very dispersed around the world which is a bad setup for knowledge to be shared. Many people are hired on a project basis so that they bring in new knowledge but also take it away when leaving.

The maritime industry is technically conservative, taking huge financial risks, and its strategy is, to a large part, defined by assets. A vessel has a lifecycle of 25 years so you cannot easily change strategy in between.
Jumbo Shipping has many offices with its headquarters in Rotterdam, 12 vessels and field offices around the world. It has more than 120 employees located at the Rotterdam office. The company had undergone considerable growth and staff turnover has increasing considerably. In 2008, there was a change in the market: it became a buyers’ market rather than a sellers’ market. Jumbo needed to adapt to meet the conditions of the changing market, and the KM strategy was part of the adaptation.

In 2011, the KM Working Group at Jumbo decided to perform a company-wide KM scan. Based on the findings of the scan, the Working Group decided to undertake a variety of short-term and longer-term activities. The short-term actions fitted the culture of the company and provided a number of quick wins. Employees at all levels of the company were involved in interviews and workshops in order to create a critical mass. An extra step was made to bring the business strategy down to tangible items. Activities included: training of middle-management in KM; stimulating use of existing systems; adding ‘yellow pages’; efforts to further formalise staff and crew training; and the application of KM at the hiring and exit of employees.

The findings from this case study are also relevant for the participants of the Consultation. One of the main lessons is that it is important to think about the culture of the organisation, embrace it in the short term and look for change in the longer-term. It is important to look for pivot points and to seduce people to invest in KM. Start the process with visible quick wins and repeat the KM scan regularly to check on progress. Try to ensure a minimum level of communications and ICT tools to support the process.

**DISCUSSION ON KM PRACTICES PRESENTED BY OTHER SECTORAL PARTNERS**

One participant asked whether the Rapid Appraisal of Agricultural Knowledge Systems (RAAKS) approach, also developed by the same group at Wageningen University, had been incorporated into the RMA methodology. Barbara van Mierlo noted that it had been partly incorporated but that RAKKS does not include the institutional environment. The reasons for the focus on monitoring in RMA and not on evaluation is because the RMA aims to work towards institutional change which is why it also includes reflexivity.

In a multistakeholder environment, it is important to consider one’s role as a broker. Knowledge creation alone was felt to be very inefficient if it has to be done all over again every 5 years. In this context a KM approach is important to avoid duplication.

To conclude, during the Consultation we have been using the integral KM map to organise our thinking. As the experiences presented this morning have shown, KM in real life is a lot messier. This certainly relates to the fact that all presentations highlighted the importance of ‘culture’ in KM.

A quote from Jimi Hendrix was found appropriate to close this session on KM: *Knowledge speaks and wisdom listens.*
Addressing rural poverty is a challenging, complex affair. A lot of valuable knowledge is in people’s minds, or scattered all over. Lessons are learned but not documented and mistakes are repeated. Transformation and improved performance are a result of learning which comprises improvements from lessons and mistakes. There is a need to show improved performance for the target audience of the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) of 80 million people.

The KM and learning focus in Eastern and Southern Africa (ESA) is looking for performance improvement in projects. It includes regional KM learning processes involving more than 100 project staff and country officers, aiming to build capacity and working arrangements to use knowledge more effectively to improve performance, results and impact. Experiences and ideas of project staff led to the development of the integrated KM and learning system. This system has been built into design of 9 projects and influences the approach to start-up. It is designed to strengthen country programme collaboration. A knowledge management and learning system means using knowledge more effectively and that processes of continuous improvement are in place. This has the result of improving project performance and results, and integrates functions and activities.

Five interconnected functions are part of the KM and learning system: learning and adaptation; information management; monitoring and evaluation; internal and external communication; and innovation and experimentation. Learning and adaptation is at the core of the five wheel model. Usually communication and M&E are not part of the KM system, but here they are integrated.

FAO is a knowledge organisation. It has a massive agenda with many partners. Knowledge is a public good. Of the 2500 organisations registered to use AGORA, some 30% do not use it and a further 30% hardly ever use it. This demonstrates that you can train people in use but, if the organisational settings are wrong, there will be no use.
There is a sense of momentum related to the Coherence in Information for Agricultural Research for Development (CIARD) movement which aims to make agricultural research information publicly available and accessible to all. Both FAO and CTA are members of the CIARD network. FAO is also a contributor to the knowledge sharing toolkit, initiated by the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR). FAO has also been articulating commitment to open access to data/information. It is also the instigator of the Information Management Resources Kit (IMARK), online training modules, a partnership-based e-learning initiative to train individuals and support institutions and networks world-wide in the effective management of information. FAO is also involved in e-agriculture and best practices on using ICTs for agricultural and rural development. Finally, partnerships are important to create ownership with all of FAO knowledge products and services.

**KM AT THE UNECA**

*Talla Kebe, UNECA*

The eLearning platform of UNECA was introduced. The platform provides short courses around ECA's flagship publications and links to available resources on key topics and policy recommendations. The eLearning courses make it possible for professionals in African member states, regional economic communities, academia, civil society and development organisations to study from anywhere they have access to a computer and Internet connection. The self-paced learning modules allow trainees to study at their own convenience.

In general terms, there are many hierarchical and cultural issues relating to KM. It is important to work through partnerships and focal points to reach all countries. UNECA aims to help with methodologies to understand the rationale behind KM in their own country.
DISCUSSION ON KM EXPERIENCES AMONG DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS

Language issues were not raised during the presentations. Many international organisations have materials in French/English/Portuguese/Arabic but it might be equally important to include local languages on your website. It might be possible to use Google translate to do this. The FAO is currently moving to 6 languages and this is a barrier to knowledge sharing. For the FAO, automatic translation is allowed when a disclaimer is displayed but this is not possible for official documents.

Is there one take home message for an organisation wanting to develop a KM strategy? Helen Gillman argued that developing a KM strategy has to involve a process of engagement. You cannot impose solutions / models / etc. It has to be a facilitated process. Stephen Rudgard emphasised that you need to concentrate on the business case, otherwise you will end with an empty system. Talla Kebe argued that you need to start off by knowing what you want to achieve, interact with partners and customers, looking at strength and structure.

In the agricultural sector, we put in so much effort but we achieve so little. It might be that the learning is not good enough? Stephen Rudgard argued that KM originated from the private sector and was based on maintaining competitive advantage. The original model had to be adapted to development and represents a new developing paradigm. Helen Gillman disagreed with this statement about the paradigm, arguing that there is not much difference with the private sector. This is because it is not so much about partnerships, but the process in which we use knowledge which needs to improve continuously. Talla Kebe argued that there was a difference between development and the private sector but, in both cases, you need to learn how to overcome challenges and how to convince customers.

Projects in which the KM model is integrated from the beginning have only just started but IFAD is currently monitoring them to see what the implications are (for example, also on planning and finances). For Stephen Rudgard, there is a big difference between the profit and not-for-profit sectors, such as development. For development organisations, there is no shareholder value concept, although organisations do have stakeholders but no money. There is also no overtly competitive environment.

In conclusion, KM appears to be generating change for both the organisations presenting their KM strategies and their partners. In situations of limited resources, KM seemed able to make a difference. It is important to focus on the context and to let changes emerge, aiming for continuous, ongoing improvements.
OPEN SPACE SESSION – FOR MORE SHARING OF EXPERIENCES

As another example of KM approaches that can be used, an Open Space session was organised to enable additional issues of specific interest to all those participating in the one-day seminar to be addressed. Volunteers offered to hold small group discussions on topics of interest to them and participants would be free to join any session they wanted. Thus, six open space sessions were held, three each in two rounds. They comprised:

- An introduction to the Repository services provided by the Royal Tropical Institute (KIT), the Netherlands (Henk van Dam, KIT)
- Video for farmers (Andrianjafy Rasoanindrainy, FTA, and Francois Stepman)
- Filtering information to farmers (Keeley Holder, Produce Growers Ltd)
- The development knowledge ecology (Mike Powell)
- Knowledge Management for Development Journal (Ivan Kulis, ECDPM)
- Melanesian Agricultural Information System (Peter Walton)

CONCLUSIONS FROM THE ONE-DAY SEMINAR

There were a number of issues that the participants had learned about on this one-day seminar which they would like to take into the discussion for the rest of the consultation:

- KM is all about engagement
- The importance of learning in KM
- Economic costs of KM
- Importance of culture in the organisation and its implication for the tools and methods
- Need to learn as you go (and validate)
- Identify quick wins to define your starting points.
- Success stories, lessons learned are all helpful
- It is important to interpret knowledge and translate it
- How do we, as knowledge managers, understand the dialogue?
- Frameworks need to be adapted for different situations
- Time to act is now
- Organisational barriers need to be addressed in order to be able to practice KM
- How to continue after this week (form a CoP?)
- Seeking complementarities between the regions
- How can farmers contribute to our KM initiative?
- We need KM buy-in at the policy level
- How do we ‘filter’ all knowledge around to pick what we need?
- Where do we start rolling out KM?
- What ‘kind’ of networks do perform better on KM?
- What is the cultural starting point from KM?
REFRESHER AND RE-CAP

ICKM requires a minimum level of communication and information within the organization. KM does not happen in isolation but is part of all processes. The integral KM map has helped us all understand where we are.

There were a few difficulties about the terminology. Organisation is a lower level term than institution but there seems to be confusion about the difference between the two. As a group, the participants decided to use institution and organisation interchangeably.

Francois Stepman argued that many African organisations are very good in absorbing new knowledge but nothing comes out of it. It is a problem of retention of information. For example, back to office reports are not being read and action points are not being followed up. This might be because there is too much outsourcing. In another example, FARA has set up a KM strategy, developed using outcome mapping but, since the funding agency did not like it, it was never operationalised.

Many of the barriers to KM relate to cultural and management issues. Quick wins are all very well but even they need a basis of communication and vision/leadership if they are to work.

One participant argued that his organisation did not have an approach to KM like the one presented this week. They had simply started KM because of external factors, not internal factors. The integral KM map now gives the organisation a basis on where to start KM. KM should be based on real needs and not on external requirements.

The systems level is also a very important one for KM, as well as the need for integration at different levels. For your organisation, you first need to think where you stand and then start at that place. ‘Quick wins’ might be misleading and can be changed into ‘getting started’.
A REVIEW OF THE INTEGRAL KM MAP WITH NEW PARTICIPANTS

Koen Beelen, Co-Capacity

Given that there were a number of new participants, a brief introduction was provided to the integral KM map. One critical point discussed by the participants was why we need to set up a specialised KM unit, bound for failure, when KM needs to be mainstreamed and built into programmes. The KM unit should only be there to capture and disseminate the knowledge within the organisation, like back to office reports. It is possible that informal methods, like brown bag lunches, might be the best way to capture knowledge and disseminate it.

According to participants, the strategy cycle was seen as important to be able to continuously benchmark. We need to be able to measure what we do. KM strategies do not necessarily work first time. They have to be based on experience and a few failures in the beginning are not a problem. Benchmarking is important to understand what you are doing. It is good to use common sense but guidelines and frameworks are also useful. There is a strong link between KM and organisational change which often complicates the issue. This is not necessarily so if you have a breakdown of overall objectives in tangible work plans. Try to capture what you know.

If you identify KM with organisational change, managers are more likely to resist it. If you introduce it as learning, it may be better appreciated. KM is already complicated enough without gaining any unnecessary resistance. However, you need to identify your initiative as KM, otherwise it can get stuck. Try to convince managers by calculating the time people spend on finding information.

PRIORITY SETTING FOR ACTION AT DIFFERENT LEVELS

The participants were asked to identify areas of interventions that they would like to see in their context at different levels (individual, institutional/organisation, networks and sub-regional/regional) with different timelines: getting started, mid-term and long-term. These can be seen in Table 1 below.

These areas of intervention were then clustered, bearing in mind the issues raised on Day Two. These clusters were then named as themes to identify an intervention area (see Table 2).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timelines</th>
<th>Individual priorities</th>
<th>Institutional/organisational priorities</th>
<th>Networks</th>
<th>Regional/sub-regional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting started</td>
<td>• Staff more aware of KM</td>
<td>• Identify KM champions</td>
<td>• Acquire funding to complete system design (MAIS)</td>
<td>• Analysing critical points of failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Model the behaviour</td>
<td>• Improved management understanding of KM</td>
<td>• Platform for KM dialogue</td>
<td>• Setting up circle of experience mentoring programme for farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Demonstrate value of KM to all staff</td>
<td>• Building common vision</td>
<td>• Encourage communities for exchange, sharing and learning</td>
<td>• Assisting CAPAN and farmers’ organisations with their KM strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop elevator pitch</td>
<td>• Developing buy in from organisations</td>
<td>• Inter-ACP knowledge sharing on KM in agriculture through email/webiste</td>
<td>• Start thinking big; donors, regional, global bodies all in one network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Get others to realise they already have KM skills</td>
<td>• KM to facilitate advisory service delivery</td>
<td>• Developing a common mechanism for knowledge production, dissemination and sharing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Find quotable quotes</td>
<td>• Develop media to emphasise value of KM and lifelong learning</td>
<td>• Set up circle of experience mentoring programmes for farmers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Look for opportunities to demonstrate the value of KM</td>
<td>• Develop internal KM capacity</td>
<td>• Assisting CAPAN and farmers’ organisations with their KM strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Define and sensitize appropriate stakeholders</td>
<td>• Develop storytelling capacities of managers</td>
<td>• Start thinking big; donors, regional, global bodies all in one network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Requests for assistance are opportunity to introduce KM processes</td>
<td>• Develop staff KM competencies at all levels</td>
<td>• KM strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop media that emphasise value of KM and lifelong learning</td>
<td>• Identify what is not working</td>
<td>• KM strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop critical and analytical thinking skills of farmers and farmer leaders</td>
<td>• Continuous MBF feedback to support learning</td>
<td>• KM strategies defining objectives, goals, outputs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Communication workshop</td>
<td>• Put knowledge sharing incentives in place</td>
<td>• Combining KM with other initiatives in organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Update website with links to relevant sites</td>
<td>• Resource mobilisation for operationalisation of KM</td>
<td>• KM strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mobile application for farmers and farmer leaders that delivers real time information</td>
<td>• Fostering a culture of creativity &amp; experimentation</td>
<td>• KM strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Setup circle of experience mentoring programme for farmers</td>
<td>• Consolidation of existing KM processes</td>
<td>• KM strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• KM skills developed</td>
<td>• KM integration in work package deliveries</td>
<td>• What are the necessary systems to support KM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-term</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Recyling learning in organisations</td>
<td>• KM strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Update website with links to relevant sites</td>
<td>• KM strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Mobile app for farmers delivering information</td>
<td>• KM strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Resources that link knowledge and productivity</td>
<td>• KM strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Setup mentoring programme for farmers</td>
<td>• KM strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• KM strategies defining objectives, goals, outputs</td>
<td>• Exchange KM experiences and share success and failure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>• Looking good and making your colleagues look good</td>
<td>• Combining KM with other initiatives in organisation</td>
<td>• Farmers define research priorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• People are resources</td>
<td>• KM strategy operationalised</td>
<td>• Aligning strategies with capacities at regional and national level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Work satisfaction improved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Non-tangible benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: An overview of proposed interventions at different level of organisation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Text on cards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive for results</td>
<td>KM strategy as part of organisational strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies to optimise KM: defining objectives, goals and outputs</td>
<td>Assisting CAFAN and farmer organisations with their KM as part of an organisational strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing structural constraints to KM at organisational level</td>
<td>Policies, processes and procedures reviewed and updated and implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing capacity to strategise</td>
<td>Clearly annual strategy cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognising and rewarding champions and innovators</td>
<td>Aligning strategies with capacities at regional and national level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KM systems</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge retention strategies (2 cards)</td>
<td>Interpreting and valuing tacit knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure out what are the necessary systems and arrangements to support KM e.g. platforms</td>
<td>Processes to inventorise knowledge, including multiple knowledges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translating knowledge for specific audiences</td>
<td>Developing internal knowledge products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate KM into work package deliverables</td>
<td>KM systems developed and institutionalised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KM culture</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking good + making your colleagues look good</td>
<td>Creating a knowledge intensive culture (2 cards)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share KM experiences, both successes and failures</td>
<td>Avoid duplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to reward knowledge sharing practices (2 cards)</td>
<td>Organisational relevance and impact improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community of practice</td>
<td>Platform for KM dialogue established and operationalised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources for KM</td>
<td>Acquire funding to complete system design (MAIS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Annual KM scan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KM capacities</td>
<td>Develop capacity to engage with stakeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop critical and analytical thinking skills of farmers and farmer leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop lifelong learning approaches for farmers and technical staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop story telling capacity of managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Model the behaviours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quotable quotes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management understanding of KM</td>
<td>Improve management understanding of KM (3 cards)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KM is about people first, this needs awareness raising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some management styles are more appropriate for KM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developing buy-in from organisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: An overview of proposed areas of intervention
FURTHER DISCUSSIONS AROUND PROPOSED INTERVENTIONS TO PROMOTE KM IN ORGANISATIONS

Following further discussions on the proposed interventions listed by participants, additional observations were noted to help guide the implementation of these interventions:

- We have to think about our own context. We need to have an excellent understanding of our own context before we can do anything.
- Advocacy, capacity building, resources are all important to KM.
- We need to question our own capacities and build our own capacities before we advocate.
- What knowledge and skills are needed for KM? Knowledge and skills can include the ability to communicate, document and facilitate, and demonstrate understanding of the tools and methods.
- It is difficult to find good KM courses. Most of them are more focused on ICTs.
- If you wait for resources before you do something, you may have to wait forever. Look for people who are enthusiastic and who are willing to do something already.
- We are not inventing anything new. Are we landing in the middle of a giant footprint where we do not see what is already happening?
- We need to see if we can apply the integral KMmap approach to our own organisations.
- Engagement is needed before you can work on a strategy; but you do not first need a strategy before you can start undertaking KM initiatives.
- Identify the KM in current activities to get people sensitised towards KM.
- KM is about cross-fertilisation, including making others look good.
- When raising awareness, make KM tangible by emphasising the economic consequences, for example use of quantifications like “4% crop loss on a daily basis if the right practice is not used because of lack of knowledge”
- It is important to emphasise strategy at the institutional level. There are things happening already but there need to be organised approaches. ‘Resource mobilisation’ is a key factor.
- Internal reorganising is sometimes necessary to better reflect the KM initiative.
The ACP participants facilitated the final day of the Consultation, focusing on action plans, both for individual organisations and for their regions. These action plans take into account what CTA could do to help them. The action plans were presented individually, each from their own perspective, and were discussed by the group.

**MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, SOLOMON ISLANDS**

Peter Walton

In terms of his action plan, Peter was planning was not just advocating for KM in its broadest sense but looking for opportunities to embed (and demonstrate) the principles of KM within ongoing activities. He is currently assisting the Solomon Islands Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock develop its information and communication management (ICM) strategy. However, even though the ICM strategy development activity is ongoing and will, on completion, provide a comprehensive framework for ICM (and KM) for the Ministry, individual staff/departments within the Ministry perceive critical issues that they would like to see addressed now, and they often ask for his advice. In the recent past, these have included development of a department website; adoption of new technology for revision of extension materials; enhancement of ICM job descriptions; and a review of research management processes. These all represent opportunities for greater awareness of KM in a very practical way, and because they have their origins in expressed needs, there can be greater buy-in than had it been something that came from outside the organisation, or from the top down. It is envisaged that responses will be crafted in a participatory way, and thus be KM learning opportunities. And because of the scale of each initiative, they can be quick wins with demonstrable advantages within a relatively short space of time. For example, enhancement of an ICM job description, combined with a work plan, can be used for performance appraisal; which in turn can be the start of a structured capacity-building programme for the individual officer. These activities are also perfect as case studies which can be shared internally and within the KM community.
1. **Development of internal capacity on KM (Getting started at local, Secretariat level)**
   - Improve and strengthen management awareness and understanding about the KM
   - Analyze the actual internal and external environment
   - Revisit, review the previous experiences: Outcome Mapping, Results Based Management (RBM), M&E framework; all National Science Foundation (NSF) materials; strategic plan; and internal materials: IT strategy, Governance manual, communication strategy, HR manual, etc. and capitalize on them
   - Link up with relevant organizations (CTA, WUR, DGNet, IFAD, ECDPM, FAO, etc) for learning and capacity building, etc.
   - Acquire and digest relevant materials related to the topic

2. **Development and implementation of an internal/local KM strategy (short-term)**
   - Undertake the mapping exercise within the institution using the KM scan (involving all the NSFs and other Units) in collaboration with relevant organizations, for example CTA, etc.
   - Develop a regional programme in support of the stakeholders on development and implementation of KM strategies

3. **Mobilizing and supporting stakeholders on the development and implementation of KM strategies (longer-term)**
   - Link up to relevant organizations at national (FTA, NARO, etc), sub-regional (ASARECA, CARDESA, CORAF, NASRO, SACAU), regional (AFAAS, PAFFO, PANac, etc.), inter ACP (CTA) and global (GFAR, GFRAS, FAO, CIARD) levels
   - Document lessons learnt
   - Out-scaling (various NARS)
   - Assessment/Evaluation and planning

The main issues to be addressed comprise strategy development, capacity building, systems and tools for development of CoPs. A lot needs to be done. Quick Win: Making sure we bring this issue to the organization, namely advocacy.

### ZAMBIA AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE (ZARI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>Quick Wins</th>
<th>Short Term</th>
<th>Long Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Back to Office Report</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy for KM Strategy</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentorship</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repository development</td>
<td></td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to Communities of Practice</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System and Tools Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICKM Strategy Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Consolidation of current activities through a KM strategy
2. Capacity building for network member in KM and continue supporting through backstopping
3. Developing systems for agriculture knowledge in Southern Africa – Agriculture Knowledge Hub in Southern Africa
4. Developing appropriate internal and external systems for knowledge dissemination and sharing
5. Sensitizing colleagues and partners about the importance of KM

We need a strategy. I need to share what I learned. Take leadership in guiding our partners building capacity in KM and sharing. It is important to develop internal and external systems to be able to share what we are doing.

---

**NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ORGANISATION, UGANDA (NARO)**

*Sylvester Dickson Baguma*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Getting Started</th>
<th>Medium Term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>**Institutional/</td>
<td>Understanding by management of KM improved</td>
<td>Organisational Knowledge Map developed</td>
<td>Policies, processes and procedures reviewed, updated and implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational</td>
<td>Get others to realise that they have KM skills</td>
<td>Conduct annual KM scan</td>
<td>Knowledge intensive culture (for creativity and innovation) improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KM champions/patrons identified and 'commissioned'</td>
<td>KM Strategy developed and operationalised</td>
<td>Knowledge retention strategies developed and operationalised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KM system (including Kbase) developed and institutionalised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exchange experiences and share successes and failures (apply M&amp;E results)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Capacity building strengthened in KM at all levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organisational Relevancy and impact improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual</strong></td>
<td>Present a back-to-office report to DG and hold a 1-hour debriefing seminar</td>
<td>KM skills (capacity) developed</td>
<td>Number KM experts increased and appropriately deployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare elevator pitch on KM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff more aware of KM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Look for opportunities to demonstrate the value of KM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**EASTERN AFRICA FARMERS FEDERATION (EAFF)**

Marygoretti Kamau

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Quick Wins</th>
<th>Short term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| What we plan to do when we go back | • Knowledge Management Scan  
• Reporting back to the office                                                | • Linking KM to policy process                   |
| KM capacities                 | • Capacity building especially in story telling  
• Facilitator skills at program level                                         |                                                 |
| Strategy                      | • Knowledge Management strategy  
• Develop a program on how to help farmer organizations implement their action plans on Knowledge Management  
• Develop mechanisms to recycle learning in organization – to prevent erosion of knowledge at organizational level  
• Innovation platforms through learning routes methodologies                  |                                                 |
| KM systems                    | • Knowledge Management Hub  
• Communities of practice at national level especially within the technical personnel in  
• Peer learning groups at grass root level (attribute it to program activities)  
• Video4development                                                           |                                                 |

**AFRICAN FORUM FOR AGRICULTURAL ADVISORY SERVICES (AFAAS)**

Dan Kisauzi

Brief the Executive Director and recommend that AFAAS reviews CTA’s approach to KM and identifies areas (if any) where the two organisations can develop a memorandum of understanding based on AFAAS’ needs in the following generic areas to which it is committed in the work that it is doing/planning to do with (i) SDC-funded partnership with ICRA, (ii) IFAD grant and (iii) EU grant. These areas are

- AFAAS Website roll-out
- ICKM needs assessment
- Development of ICKM strategy

AFAAS needs to mainstream their thinking first. The website can be used in a distributed way having all the countries involved report through the website and also the social platform. Rolling out the website and platform is a quick win. We also need a communication and KM needs assessment. We then need to develop ICKM strategies for the countries involved. We want to develop an inventory around a knowledge base to report on innovative advisory services. CTA could help setting this up.
Andrianjafy Rasoanindrainy

Andrianjafy works for the Farming & Technology for Africa (FTA) which intervenes at different levels, with different bodies in Africa. Therefore, the mapping below is a synthesis of needs (explicitly or implicitly expressed) among African organizations and networks that have been collected by the FTA in regard with what CTA and/or other development agencies has to offer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services, solutions / Target</th>
<th>NARS-MADA</th>
<th>FARMERS-MADA</th>
<th>Indian Ocean</th>
<th>CARDESA</th>
<th>AFAAS</th>
<th>ANAFE</th>
<th>FARA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Web 2.0 training</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web tools and platforms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. Development</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. Training</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Information System</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICKM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. Strategy</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. KM web tools</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video4Dev</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPGIS</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ASSOCIATION FOR STRENGTHENING AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH IN EASTERN AND CENTRAL AFRICA (ASARECA)**

Daniel Mwesige

**Quick Wins**

- Briefing manager on proceedings of this consultation and discussion on the direction ASARECA should be taking with regard to KM in the organisation
- Management awareness on KM improved and concerted efforts made to advocate the case of KM and its usefulness to the organization
- KM Scan performed to find out where we stand and potential areas for intervention

**Short Term**

- Revisit the CKMS (communication and knowledge management strategy) with the focus on strengthening the KM aspect and paying particular attention to ways we can make this more operational
- ASARECA is looking to become a Knowledge hub for the region so there might need to be some changes to the structure to either bring new human resources on board to support the new strategy
- Resource support for operationalisation of the KM strategy and this will include ICT infrastructure investments, video production equipment, web tools/software etc.
- Better organizational awareness on importance of KM in the organisation and small interventions made to facilitate learning from each other within the organisation to facilitate knowledge retention

**Long Term**

- Communication culture fostered through the use on appropriate e-communication tools and face-to-face interactions.
Quick wins (individual/organisation)

- Economic value of KM & lifelong learning in farming (using booklets, e-format documents)
- Update CAFAN website with links to all regional & relevant extra-regional sites with
  K on production/postharvest/marketing
  K on corporate governance (including advocacy)
  Separated into important & good to know

Quick wins (network/regional)

- Workshop on KM, lifelong learning, productivity & production for farmer leaders & other technical persons
- Defining context, sharing lessons learnt & best practices on KM in agriculture with other FOs from around the world through email/website/e-newsletter/blog etc.

Short-term (individual/organization)

- Mobile application to provide real-time K to farmers and farmer leaders:
  
  Production/Postharvest/Marketing
  Corporate governance
  Push & Pull
  Dialogue

- Critical thinking & analytical thinking skills for farmers (e-format, booklet/brochure)
- Help farmers work w/ MoA/Research institutions & input suppliers to prioritise research initiatives (based on cost, time, impact etc...)
- Determine tools best suited for developing K inventory

Medium/Long term (individual/organization)

- Assisting CAFAN & FOs w/ their KM strategies as part of their organisational strategy
- Teaching farmers/farmer leaders how to be more productive using KM (through tips, tools, ICTs)
  
  Filtering information (for themselves, for others)

  Selecting recipients of knowledge (to encourage learning, developing new knowledge)

  Choosing communication mode

- Circle of experience (mentoring approach to share knowledge)
  
  3 levels: farmer level, farmer leader, agricultural experts
  
  Organisations interacting with each other

-M& E and sharing of results from effective knowledge managers at individual/organisation/network level to build momentum and set a KM trend regionally.
Quick wins include presentation on KM with staff and other stakeholders. Through peer assist, we will try to link KM to the policy process. We will try to have discussions on KM with key stakeholders. The KM scan needs to be tailor-made but we will start using it. We need to monitor and evaluate the KM platforms that we have already started using. We need to bring in the communication aspect. We need support in formulating the strategy as mentor in the process. We would like CTA to help us with KM systems. In the long term, systems for market information are required. We would like CTA to link us with others to have more funding.

**REGIONAL ACTION PLANS**

**EASTERN AFRICA**

Marygoretti Kamau

1. KM Scan (member organization and partner organizations or stakeholders)
2. Increasing awareness through lobbying and advocacy on KM (repackaging-KM events during meetings, fliers)
3. Conduct assessment for ICT infrastructure and put in place basic minimum ICT facilities to ease communication and sharing of knowledge.
4. Regional KM strategy (ASARECA, AFAAS, EAFF).
5. Support member countries to develop their KM strategies

**CARIBBEAN**

Keeley Holder

1. Update CAFAN website with links to all regional & relevant extra-regional sites (Inventory, Advocacy, Systems/Tools)
2. Workshop on KM, lifelong learning, productivity & production for farmer leaders & other technical persons (Advocacy, Culture, Management)
4. Mobile application to provide real-time K to farmers and farmer leaders (Knowledge Sharing, Available & Accessible, Systems/Tools)
5. Circle of experience (Mentoring) (Knowledge Sharing, Available & Accessible, Developing New Knowledge)
6. Defining context, sharing lessons learnt & best practices on KM in agriculture with other FOs from around the world through email/website/e-newsletter/blog etc. (Advocacy/Knowledge Sharing)
1. Capacity development in ICKM
   - For farmers organization
     • Learning from field visit between farmers
     • Experiential learning
     • Mentorship
   - ARD institutions
     • Support to Community of practice
     • System and tools development
     • Mentorship
2. ICKM strategy development
3. Advocacy
   a. Farmers organization
   b. Knowledge hub
   c. Use KM for advocacy purposes
   d. Development of repositories

CONCLUSIONS AND FINAL DISCUSSIONS

The participants considered that KM strategy should also be linked to ICM strategy at the regional and national levels. KM scans can be worked on in the near future. Knowledge hubs and regional knowledge centres (telecentres) could be developed in the longer term. Knowledge groups from different regions who could help each other on a voluntary basis would be a good idea, including working together in the organisation of workshops. These could form reference groups. KM activities could be hooked on to the Web2forDev workshops that are going to be organized in the ACP regions.

CTA’S RESPONSE TO THE PROPOSED ACTION PLANS

Krishan Bheenick, CTA

Most of the activities proposed by the participants fit into the framework of what CTA may want to support, but this is not the time to make direct commitments. As participants, you are not only here to share your views and aspirations with the CTA, but also amongst yourselves as a group and also with each other as individuals. CTA is going to be developing interventions in the area of KM, building staff and institutional capacities. However, CTA is unable to contribute to infrastructure, or to establish platforms in a broad sense. This week was designed to hear what CTA’s ACP partner organisations would need in terms of support. We also need to continue the discussion amongst ourselves. We have to see how best these requests can be packaged to fit the broad objectives of CTA’s support. However, we have to be clear that support does not always necessarily mean money: there is a lot of content already available within the CTA and we are looking at how to repackage these into knowledge products and distribute it better. CTA will be happy in contributing to the proposed community of practice. From now on, CTA will try to have KM on the programme of the regional meetings. There is also interest in advocacy support so CTA can organise side events to help in this/sending the messages, preparing the materials. We at the CTA, are ourselves at the beginning of the KM strategy development and implementation. In terms of next steps, CTA will start up the proposed community on a Dgroup and, for the rest, we will take small, we will proceed with incremental steps, together.
OTHER RESPONSES

For IFAD, there are possibilities in looking into how their regional divisions can be involved at the regional level. From the FAO, the CIARD/ICT toolkit/IMARK are there to use. There are already many resources available and we need to tap into them. For the FAO, the messages that came through are clear. We need to support these at the global level. Subsidies from the European Union are a great boon but what FAO can do at global level is providing the information resources that regions and countries can take and adapt for their own purposes. FAO does not have the money to put behind the peer groups and mentoring, but hopefully we can get some funding through the CIARD for the local/regional champions.

The representative of the PAEPARD Project commented that we have a choice of either looking upwards to our donors or looking downwards towards our clients: we should do more of the latter. We should not just scratch the surface, but really go in-depth to meet their needs. Profiling our clients so that we can provide them with timely, well-packaged information.
LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE CONSULTATION

The main lessons learned from the Expert Consultation comprise:

General observations
1. The participants were generally of the opinion that each KM initiative should be based on a working definition of both knowledge and KM, reflecting the specific context of the initiative. However, this should be a pragmatic, evolving definition because, otherwise, the search for a definition can hinder progress.
2. Knowledge is human and is vested in individuals and groups of individuals. Thus, KM needs to have a focus on people, although processes and technology are also important.
3. There are differences between networks which are generally informal organisations and formal organisations, and KM initiatives need to recognise this.
4. It was suggested that structural differences exist between development organisations which are concerned with global public goods and multi-stakeholder processes, and businesses which have a profit and customer-based focus, with consequences for knowledge management. This is clearly an area for further discussion.
5. Our organisations require management and processes that recognise the characteristics of knowledge intensive organisations (KIOs).

KM concepts
6. Use of an integral map of processes has been found valuable to conceptualise KM and formulate issues for discussions and we could apply it for our network and community activities.
7. The KM scan that the participants used in their organisations can be a valuable tool to raise awareness of KM and can be applied by the organisations’ own partner organisations. However, it needs some fine-tuning to improve its suitability for the development sector. In particular, there should be greater emphasis on the importance of external relations to organisations in development.
8. The IFAD model, showing learning supported by four pillars of information management, communications, monitoring and evaluation and innovation seemed valuable for demonstrating how information and communications management are related to KM.
9. The integration of the KM into existing ICM (information and communication management) approaches and policies is a challenge that the CTA and its partner organisations have to address.

Planning and implementation of KM
10. Many of the participants considered that the first stage in their implementation of KM should constitute a focus on advocacy, which should be based on stories which demonstrate the importance of knowledge and KM for development.
11. Participants considered that we need to build our knowledge and skills which are needed for KM and also to better promote KM
12. The peer assist, chat show and world café were found to be valuable knowledge sharing methods. Participants engaged with these methods and found them to be very useful sharing tools.
13. Many activities and approaches which are already being undertaken within our organisations are part of KM but have not been recognised as such.
14. KM needs to be planned with a long-term perspective but should already start with quick wins and be implemented in a phased manner.
APPENDIX 1: PROGRAMME OF THE CONSULTATION

Expert consultations on Knowledge Management in Agricultural and Rural Development for the ACP Regions

10-14 September 2012, CTA, Wageningen, The Netherlands

Sunday, 09 September – Arrival of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY 1</th>
<th>Monday 10 September (CTA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>Opening Session &amp; Overview of the Consultations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00 – 09:15</td>
<td>Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:15 – 09:25</td>
<td>Welcoming remarks by Michael Hailu, Director, CTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:25 – 10:10</td>
<td>Introduction of participants – Sarah Cummings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:10 – 10:30</td>
<td>Introduction to CTA’s perspective on ICKM and approach to the consultations – Krishan Bheenick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 – 11:00</td>
<td>Coffee/Tea Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>Getting started; KM concepts and the Integral KM map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 – 11:20</td>
<td>Review of expectations and Overview of the Agenda – Chris Addison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:20 – 11:45</td>
<td>Overview of KM concepts – Sarah Cummings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45 – 13:00</td>
<td>Introduction to the Integral Knowledge Management Map – Koen Beelen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00 – 14:00</td>
<td>Lunch Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 3</td>
<td>Applying the Integral KM concept map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00 – 15:30</td>
<td>Presentations and group work on mapping experiences of organisations, networks and projects to integral KM concept: -Knowledge Organisational aspects -Knowledge Processes (Products and Services; External factors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30 – 16:00</td>
<td>Coffee/Tea Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 4</td>
<td>Scan analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00 – 17:00</td>
<td>Presentation and analysis of the KM scans of regional organisations and networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00 – 17:30</td>
<td>Plenary discussion on Integral KM concept map and its use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:00</td>
<td>Bus pick up from CTA back to hotel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DAY 2 | Tuesday 11 September (CTA) |

| Session 5 | Applying the Integral KM concept map (continued) |
| 09:00 – 10:30 | Presentations and group work on mapping experiences of organisations, networks and projects to integral KM concept: -Products and Services -External factors |
| 10:30 – 11:00 | Coffee/Tea Break |
| Session 6 | Peer Assist session on KM |
| 11:00 – 13:00 | Identification of common themes and group work through Peer Assist technique (2 groups) [Madagascar National Network; SPC-Regional Organisation] |
| 13:00 – 14:00 | Lunch Break |
| Session 7 | Chat show on KM experiences |
| 14:00 – 15:30 | Sharing of experiences on KM among development partners and regional organisations (ECDPM, GDNet, IKM-Emergent) |
| 15:30 – 16:00 | Coffee/Tea Break |
| Session 8 | Showcase session and lessons learnt so far... |
| 16:00 – 17:30 | Interactive session & group work on key aspects of Knowledge Management based on results of KM mapping approach. Plenary discussion to wrap up. (bus pick up at 1800) |
**DAY 3  Wednesday 12 September (Reehorst Hotel, Ede)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:00 – 09:30</td>
<td>Registration for Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:30 – 09:45</td>
<td>Welcoming remarks by Director, CTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Session</strong></td>
<td><strong>KM perspectives from Other Industries, Research &amp; Development</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 09:45 – 11:00 | Panel discussion on KM from the Industry perspective  
Koen Beelen, Co-capacity’s experiences with KM in the Health Sector  
Barbara van Mierlo, Reflexive monitoring in action  
Catherine Kilelu, Agricultural Innovation Systems & Innovation Brokers  
Wouter van Dalen, Experiences from the Maritime industry |
| 10:30 – 11:00 | Coffee/Tea Break                                                                                   |
| **Session** | **KM perspectives from Development Partners**                                                       |
| 11:30 – 13:00 | Panel discussion on KM from the Development sector, including Agricultural Development  
Helen Gillman, IFAD’s KM experiences  
Stephen Rudgard, FAO’s KM experiences  
Talla Kebe, UNECA’s KM experiences |
| **Lunch Break** |                                                                                                       |
| **Session** | **Open Space: KM interventions in Agricultural & Rural Development (ARD)**                          |
| 14:00 – 15:30 | Open sessions on the scope of KM interventions in the area of Agricultural & Rural Development       |
| 15:30 – 16:00 | Coffee/Tea Break                                                                                   |
| **Session** | **KM interventions by CTA in ARD**                                                                   |
| 16:00 – 17:30 | Discussions on the scope of KM interventions of the CTA and Development Partners in the area of Agricultural & Rural Development  
*(Refreshments and Dinner with Policy Planning Meeting Participants at the Reehorst Hotel)* |

**DAY 4  Thursday 13 September (CTA)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:00 – 10:30</td>
<td>Group work on proposed interventions at Institutional level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 – 11:00</td>
<td>Coffee/Tea Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Session</strong></td>
<td><strong>Group work on proposed interventions</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 11:30 – 13:00 | KM requirements at Network & Organisational level  
Presentation and plenary discussions |
| 13:00 – 14:00 | Lunch Break                                                                                       |
| **Session** | **Group work on proposed interventions**                                                          |
| 14:00 – 15:30 | Prioritisation of interventions for KM at individual, institutional and regional levels  
Plenary discussions |
| 15:30 – 16:00 | Coffee/Tea Break                                                                                   |
| **Session** | **Group work on proposed interventions**                                                          |
| 16:00 – 17:30 | Elaboration of institutional action plans  
*(bus pick up at 1800)* |

**DAY 5  Friday 14 September (CTA)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 09:00 – 10:30 | Presentation of institutional and regional action plans  
Presentation of proposed interventions at institutional level  
Identification of partnerships among peer institutions at regional level |
| 10:30 – 11:00 | Coffee/Tea Break                                                                                   |
| **Session** | **Presentation of institutional and regional action plans**                                       |
| 11:30 – 13:00 | Presentation of proposed interventions at regional level  
Plenary discussions and comments from CTA & development partners |
| 13:00 – 14:00 | Lunch Break                                                                                       |
| **Session** | **Wrapping up session and closing**                                                                |
| 14:00 – 15:30 | Summary presentations of consultation to Policy Planning meeting participants  
Joint group discussions on KM issues  
Closing of meeting |
| 15:30 – 16:00 | Coffee/Tea Break                                                                                   |
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GROUP WORK

Looking at the organisational aspects (fundaments of your organisation):
1. Which organisational aspects has your organization well addressed and how has this been achieved?
2. Which organizational aspects should your organization still improve and how could this be done?

Looking at your organisation's external knowledge products & services:
1. Which products & services do your organization take pride in and how has this been achieved?
2. Which products & services still need to be improved and how could this be done?

Looking at internal knowledge processes:
1. Which knowledge processes perform well within your organization and how has this been achieved?
2. Which knowledge processes still need to be improved and how could this be done?

Looking at the influence of external factors:
1. Which external factors are well heard and acted upon within your organization and how has this been achieved?
2. Which external factors are not well heard or not acted upon and how could this be improved?
APPENDIX 4: BACKGROUND PAPER TO THE CONSULTATION

Desk study on the application of KM in the development sector

A reader prepared in the context of the Expert Consultation on Knowledge Management in Agricultural and Rural Development for the Africa, Caribbean and Pacific regions,

CTA Wageningen, 10th -14th September 2012

Contents

1 An introduction to knowledge management (KM)
2 Terminology and approaches
3 Knowledge management for Development (KM4D)
4 CTA and knowledge
5 Mapping of KM interventions
6 Some examples of KM interventions
7 Critiques of KM4D
8 Proposed scenarios for CTA interventions
9 References

Text boxes

1 What are multiple knowledges?
2 Key messages on KM4D from the Namibia Workshop
3 CTA’s Strategic Goal 3
4 Traducture
5 Practice-based change

This desk study has been prepared for the Expert Consultation on Knowledge Management which will be taking place in Wageningen, The Netherlands, on 10-14 September 2012. It provides an overview of the knowledge management for development (KM4D) field so that participants of the Expert Consultation have a common starting position at which to open the discussion and interaction, introducing some of the KM concepts, analysis, processes and tools which will be dealt with throughout the week of consultation.
1 An introduction to knowledge management (KM)

Knowledge has long being recognised as an important factor of production and, more recently, as being at the heart of innovation:

...the shift to a digital, knowledge-based economy, prompted by new goods and services, will be a powerful engine for growth, competitiveness and jobs. In addition it will be capable of improving citizens’ quality of life and the environment. (European Parliament 2000).

At the same time as a greater recognition of the role of knowledge within economies and societies, organisations have become more aware of the importance of their knowledge assets and human resources. This awareness has led to the practice and study of knowledge management (KM) which is based on the knowledge-based view of the firm.

KM is primarily concerned with the social processes and practices of knowledge creation, acquisition, capture, sharing and use of knowledge, skills and expertise, and only at a secondary level with the technological component of this – the information and communication technologies (ICTs) - which should support and enable the social processes and practices. There are many different definitions of knowledge management but the one below – taken from the UK National Health Service – is one of the clearest:

Knowledge management is essentially about facilitating the processes by which knowledge is created, shared and used in organisations. It is not about setting up a new department or getting in a new computer system. It is about making small changes to the way everyone in the organisation works.

There are many ways of looking at knowledge management and different organisations will take different approaches. Generally speaking, creating a knowledge environment usually requires changing organisational values and culture, changing people’s behaviours and work patterns, and providing people with easy access to each other and to relevant information resources.

2 Terminology and approaches

Knowledge

KM has its own key concepts and terminology. Probably the most difficult to define is knowledge itself because many commentators have different opinions, often citing different origins of the word. Knowledge is defined by the Oxford English Dictionary as (i) expertise, and skills acquired by a person through experience or education; the theoretical or practical understanding of a subject, (ii) what is known in a particular field or in total; facts and information or (iii) awareness or familiarity gained by experience of a fact or situation.

Understanding of knowledge requires some grasp of its relationship with information. It has long been the practice to distinguish between information (data arranged on meaningful patterns) and knowledge which has historically been regarded as something that is believed, true and reliable. According to Ho (2011), knowledge has an inherent dimension of continuous action: human beings continuously interpret and make sense of what happens around them. Knowledge can thus be defined as contextualized and interpreted information (Ho 2011: 13). Weggeman (1997) has defined knowledge (K) as:

\[ K = \text{information} \times f(n) \text{ (Experience, skills, attitude)} \]

Knowledge can be either tacit (in people’s heads) or explicit (codified and expressed as information in databases, documents, etc). Tacit and implicit knowledge are often used interchangeably in practice but they do have a difference in emphasis. Explicit knowledge is knowledge that has been or can be articulated, codified, stored and readily shared with others. For many, explicit knowledge basically equates to information. Implicit knowledge ‘helps individuals know what is socially and culturally appropriate in a given circumstance; it is knowledge of shared beliefs, values and expectations’ (Ramalingam 2005). In the tradition of Polanyi (1966) who first used the term of tacit knowing, tacit knowledge is the knowledge we have but use unconsciously, consisting of habits and culture that we only know sub-consciously.
A taxonomy of knowledge types has been developed by Johnson et al (2002) which is useful for considering how knowledge is used:
- **Know-what**: knowledge about facts that is very easy to codify and transfer;
- **Know-why**: theoretical and principal knowledge, like laws in nature and society, or scientific knowledge. This type of knowledge is usually considered to be codified but science also involves a tacit knowledge as well. For example reading a scientific paper does not give you enough information to replicate the methodology
- **Know-how**: knowledge of how to do something and knowledge-in-doing, also known as expertise. Know how is usually seen as tacit, although it might be possible to codify know-how.
- **Know-who**: related to knowing who knows what and who knows what to do, including social and communicative skills when reacting with others. Know-who is context dependent, and is considered to be hard to codify.

Geoff Parcell (Hearn 2010: 8-9) considers that knowledge has four components:

1. The English word ‘knowledge’ incorporates four perspectives: epistemology or the academic understanding of knowledge; technical know-how; social experience; and cunning street smarts.
2. Knowledge is more than what can be written down. For example, reading a text about how to ride a bike will not teach you how to actually ride a bike.
3. Knowledge itself can be managed, only the environment in which it exists.
4. Everyone has knowledge to share and everyone has knowledge to learn.

These different definitions all illustrate different perspectives on knowledge.

**Some other useful concepts**

*Communities of practice* (CoPs) are groups of *practitioners* developing a shared practice within a particular area of interest. They can be within an organisation and across organisational boundaries. The concept was originally coined by Etienne Wenger and Jean Lave. Within organisations, they are also termed as learning networks, thematic groups or technical clubs (Cummings & van Zee 2005: 11-12)

*Knowledge networks* are roughly the same as CoPs, having the same background in social learning but the term comes from a different intellectual tradition, that of agricultural knowledge systems and soft-systems analysis. In reality, the term is often used interchangeably with CoP (Cummings & van Zee 2005: 21-22).

*Content curation* is a ‘buzz word’ that relates to the act of discovering, gathering, and presenting digital content related to a specific subject matter (Mullan 2011: unpaginated). A content curator is not necessarily responsible for creating new content, but instead, for finding relevant content pertaining to a specific category and funnelling this information to a mash up.

*Taxonomy* is a hierarchical structure for organising a body of knowledge; it gives a framework for understanding and classifying that knowledge – how to group it and how the various groups relate to each other. In content management, the purpose of taxonomy is to organise information so that users can more easily navigate their way through it. Taxonomies can be generated either manually or automatically using a software programme (NHS Library for Health 2005: 62).

The **sharing point** is the optimum timing at which one shares a new innovation. According to Leistner (2010: 102-103), when someone is developing a new potential contribution – he is using the example of a consultant developing a computer program tool – the point at which to share with others is when the time investment needed to get a hypothetical tool to ‘near perfect’ quality far outweighs the improvements in functionality. The implication of this for KM practice is that it is a far better time investment to share before things reach a perfect state, and that this is just as valuable to the recipient. This stands in contradiction, for example, to traditional models of peer reviewed journals which are based on attaining ostensible perfection.
Making the invisible, visible
In order to understand and improve KM within organisations, analysts of KM try to conceptually divide organisations into component parts and identify knowledge processes taking place within them. One way of looking at organisations is to consider them as being made up of the following components:

1. The organisation is made up of people (the staff), management/governance, structures, culture and systems. Linked to all of these is the organisation’s strategy.
2. The organisation has a knowledge base: making knowledge available and accessible. This involves processes of capture, retention, distilling and curation.
3. Knowledge creation can be broken down into three processes: determining the knowledge needed, inventory of the knowledge available, and developing new knowledge.
4. Knowledge use involves processes of internal sharing, applying knowledge, and evaluating knowledge.
5. Every organisation has to take external factors into account, including sector developments and stakeholder views.

3 Knowledge Management for Development (KM4D)

Knowledge management is particularly relevant to the development sector because development efforts often transcend organisations, professional constituencies, and geographical boundaries, making knowledge management increasingly relevant because of its power to cross such divides. Although the efficiency argument – avoiding reinventing the wheel – is often the most commonly cited as the reason for the introduction of KM strategies within organisations, there are more fundamental arguments. Development can be seen as a series of interlinked complex problems which cannot be solved, they can only be resolved by connection between different stakeholders with different types of knowledge. In this conception, different types of knowledge, known as multiple knowledges – individual, community, local, indigenous, practice-based and scientific – need to be recognised and involved (Brown 2008).

KM4D – KM for development (KM4D) or KM approaches applied to the development sector – started to emerge approximately 15 years ago when the World Bank launched its knowledge management strategy, followed by the publication of the seminal World Development Report 1998/99, Knowledge for Development (1999). Following the introduction of KM by the World Bank, other development organisations have developed their own approaches. This group of organisations includes multilateral (for example. Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research, the UN Development Programme and the Food and Agriculture Organisation) and bilateral organisations (for example, Swiss Development Cooperation, the US Agency for International Development), as well as many non-governmental organisations.

An active, informal international knowledge community of practitioners, researchers and activists, known as Knowledge Management for Development (KM4Dev) has been in existence since 2001. KM4Dev facilitates interaction, both online and offline, between the 2000+ members, distributed throughout the world. Although called KM4Dev, Lucie Lamoureux, lead facilitator for KM4Dev for the 2001-2010 period has recently indicated that the name ‘Knowledge sharing for development’ would have been more appropriate for the community, with hindsight (Le Borgne 2010: 248).
CTA and knowledge management

CTA has long experience of knowledge for development but, for much of its history, this has been expressed as information and communication management (ICM). In the assessments of national and regional information needs undertaken from 2005 onwards, CTA’s partners were increasingly recognising the potential of KM, and particularly knowledge networks. For example, one of the recommendations of the West African needs assessment concerned:

*la capitalisation et la gestion des connaissances et des savoirs.* (Assigbley 2009: 27)

The potential of knowledge sharing networks was identified in the needs assessment for Southern Africa:

*Such networks could, inter alia: provide access to existing data and information held in individual or common databases, information collections and libraries; facilitate more efficient and extensive exchange of relevant information, ICM skills, training expertise, and knowledge within the country, the region and internationally; link institutions in consortia to provide greater leverage acquire electronic information resources; and provide a link to emerging regional information networks (e.g. SADC-AIMS) (Morris & Namponya 2010: 45-46)*

And in East Africa:

*[CTA should] Motivate partner institutions to form and/or energize national networks of agricultural information for a free circulation and spread of information and the sharing of experiences and knowledge. CTA’s contributions in this connection could include provision of e-platforms and training in support of the national and regional networks of agriculture and rural development institutes. (Assigbley & Kebede 2009:42)*

CTA’s initial interest in knowledge management was marked by the ‘Knowledge for Development: in Africa: challenges and opportunities’ international workshop which took place in Windhoek, Namibia, in November 2009 (Hearn 2009), part of a CTA Information & Knowledge for Development (Ink4Dev) week. These Ink4Dev weeks continue to be planned by CTA.

This workshop was organised in collaboration with Professor Kingo Mchombu of the University of Namibia and the IKM Emergent Research Programme. Its main purpose was to raise the profile of knowledge for development in Africa among key organisations in Southern and Eastern Africa. The key messages of this workshop can be found in Text Box 2. These points represented the participants’ alternative to World Bank’s Knowledge for Africa’s Development: Ten Priorities.
Text box 2
Key messages on KM4D from the 2009 Namibia workshop

1. Respect for knowledges
There are many kinds of knowledges. Individual, community, local, indigenous and academic knowledge are all equally important for development if is to be appropriate to local situations and local contexts. Knowledge is a public good and public interest should take precedent over intellectual property rights. Difference between information and knowledge should be clarified and acknowledged.

2. People and technologies
Knowledge management is about people and social processes. Appropriate technologies, including Information and communication technologies (ICTs), are enablers of this process. People’s education, skills and expertise need developing to help them manage knowledge.

3. Indigenous knowledge
There is an immediate need to capture indigenous knowledge and enable the owners of that knowledge to understand its value for themselves and others. Indigenous knowledge initiatives need to take into account indigenous values and protocols. Community innovations in protocols, processes and productivity need to be actively promoted.

4. Information institutions and professionals
Libraries are not just for knowledge capture but can be important for knowledge generation, but this introduces new challenges which need to be embraced. Information professionals’ skills are important for providing a structure, systematic cataloguing and thesauri, for example. New skills need to be acquired to bring about change in the communities they are serving. Information professionals also need to be involved in information literacy in the community.

5. Peer-to-peer learning
Peer-to-peer learning is an effective and appropriate way to share knowledge and experience and to learn from each other. The right environment needs to be put in place to encourage participation and empowerment and to promote the culture of learning for positive action. Relevant tools are important to make peer learning happen in different contexts and to deal with the constraints placed by hierarchies and bureaucracies.

6. Translation
There needs to be a greater understanding about the complexities of translation of language and ideas across cultures and contexts.

7. Leadership for knowledge management
There needs to be strong leadership and buy-in for KM within organisations and across the development field and leaders need to walk the talk. As part of this, KM needs to be incorporated into planning and strategy development processes and the programme cycle. Capacity and resources should be in place to implement KM strategy. SMART indicators should be put in place to measure outcomes and impact of KM/KS activities.

8. Preservation and capture of knowledge
There is a need to preserve, repackage and capture existing knowledge. Archives, libraries and other information institutions play a key role in this process.

9. Capacity building
There is a need for structured capacity development in the area of KM4D in Africa.

10. Knowledge management for Eastern and Southern Africa
There is a need for a network of knowledge management practitioners and academics in Eastern and Southern Africa.
The workshop developed an Agenda for Action at both the collective and individual level. The collective agreements comprised:

1. Continue networking: begin to share our progress through, for example, regular blogging, newsletter, journals, blogs, interest groups and case studies; and organise a follow up meeting in two years.
2. Develop tools for common use
3. Develop KM for Development in Africa curricula
4. Keep working with CTA and IKM Emergent
5. Coordinate advocacy efforts across the continent
6. Introduce a KM awards scheme for organisations in Africa
7. Develop an online course on KM for practitioners
8. Examine the South Africa example in greater detail to learn from their KM successes.

Follow up to the workshop involved the creation of an online network Knowledge Management for Development – Eastern and Southern Africa.

Based on these prior developments, Information, communication and knowledge management (ICKM) is now at the heart of CTA’s 2011-2015 Strategic Plan entitled Empowering ACP agricultural and rural communities through knowledge (CTA 2011a). Indeed, elements of knowledge management are to be found in all of CTA’s three strategic goals but KM particularly relates to Strategic Goal 3 (see Text box 3). This Expert Consultation is part of CTA’s Programme 3: Knowledge Management and Communication and is part of CTA’s efforts to strengthen ACP agricultural knowledge centres (CTA 2011b). It builds on one of CTA’s strengths:

CTA is highly experienced in supporting external parties in their knowledge development and learning. (Berndsen & Kleijsen, 2011, p. 29)

Text box 3

CTA’s Strategic Goal 3: To enhance ACP capacities in information, communication and knowledge management (ICKM) for agricultural and rural development

CTA will aim to strengthen the ICKM capacities of ACP institutions and networks to effectively engage in and promote policies, strategies, innovations and value chains that benefit rural communities. Improved ICKM for ARD should lead to better decision-making, better implementation of decisions at all levels, and ultimately improved livelihoods for rural people.

Source: CTA 2011a: 31

5 Mapping of KM interventions

Figure 1: A typology of interventions, practices and resources

In Figure 1, there is a proposed typology of KM interventions, practices and resources from the perspective of scale from holistic, system wide to those at an individual level.

Based on this typology, there could be two types of interventions by CTA and other international organisations:

a. Interventions at the systemic or institutional level which would be longer-term, concerted efforts (levels 1-3); and
b. Interventions at the organisational level, involving capacity building, training in different tools and techniques, and assistance with strategy formulation (Levels 3-5).
Table 1 below shows a number of approaches, tools and concepts worth bearing in mind when addressing particular issues in KM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Approaches, tools and concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determining need for knowledge</td>
<td>KM Scans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessing what is available</td>
<td>KM Scans, KM Maturity Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquiring new knowledge</td>
<td>KS approaches, for example the CGIAR toolkit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making accessible/available</td>
<td>CIARD pathways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing</td>
<td>KS toolkit, Share fair, Dgroups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying</td>
<td>KS Toolkit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Outcome mapping, Most Significant Change, Knowledge Management Impact Challenge (KMIC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**At Knowledge Organisation level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>IKM Emergent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Traducture(^2) (see Text box 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Structure scan, team building, team composition, strategizing team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Management/Governance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Belkin teams, Myers Briggs, knowledge matrix, competence management, performance analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Systems</td>
<td>Sharepoint, Google Apps, Yammer, Kindling, Ning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**At level of products and services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Outcome mapping, Most Significant Change, Knowledge Management Impact Challenge (KMIC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation of adoption</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External brokering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**At level of external factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector developments</th>
<th>Stakeholder analysis, Power cube</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder views</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6 Some examples of KM interventions

**The KMIC**

Knowledge Management Impact Challenge (KMIC), an initiative of the US Agency for International Development (US AID), has been a concerted effort to gain understanding of what has been happening in the area of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of knowledge management across the development knowledge system. The KMIC cycle has involved a widespread call for cases, peer review of the 47 cases by a group of experts, presentation and review at the unConference in Washington DC in May 2011 and, finally, follow up and crystallizing the learning with formal publication of Special Issue of the Knowledge Management for Development Journal for publication in 2012.

**Knowledge share fairs**

A number of Rome-based agencies, Bioversity International, CGIAR ICT-KM programme, FAO, IFAD and WFP, jointly co-organized their first Knowledge Share Fair in 2009 in order to enable their staff to showcase, recreate and invent ways to share knowledge and improve access to it. The second Knowledge Share Fair took place at IFAD Headquarters from 26 to 29 September 2011. There has also been a Share Fair for the Latin and Caribbean region on May 2010 (Staiger-Rivas et al 2010: 151), hosted at the International Centre for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT) and an AgKnowledge Share Fair held at the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI), Addis Ababa, in October 2010.
The share fairs are interactive events, providing the possibility for participants to showcase their experiences in knowledge sharing and, at the same time, learn from each other. Various formats such as market stalls and booths, along with workshops and short presentation sessions, provide opportunities for lively discussions and getting to know people.

Knowledge networks
Knowledge networks are being widely used by development organisations to stimulate knowledge sharing and exchange. A wide range of networks are employed to connect people interested in a certain theme or topic, as well as facilitating learning, creating, supporting and sharing (White 2010b: 159). Some of these networks, such as Healthcare Information for All by 2015 (HIFA2015), have thousands of members.

7 Critiques of KM4D
Approaches to KM4D have received criticism and new approaches are in the process of being developed. KM was originally derived from the business sector which means that it has, necessarily, a very organisation-based focus. This implies that the strategy adopted is an organisation-based one which does not necessarily take into account the whole development knowledge system to which development organisations should be contributing because it is global public good (Cummins et al 2010). This is contradictory because, one the one hand, KM is attractive to development because it offers potential for bridge building and cross-organisational global knowledge sharing but, on the other hand, it has an intrinsic organisational focus. Indeed, some organisations have gone outside their boundaries and tried to facilitate knowledge sharing across the development sector as a whole with institutional initiatives. One example of this is Dgroups, a collaborative platform for online communities which is supported by many development organisations, including CTA. Other examples are the Knowledge Sharing Toolkit, developed by the Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) and the Knowledge Management Impact Challenge (KMIC).

Over the 2007-2011 period, the IKM Emergent Research Programme has worked with a global network to stimulate the application of more developmental information and knowledge practices. IKM Emergent’s work on multiple knowledges, traducture and the practice-based change are summarized in Text boxes 1, 4 and 5.

Text box 4
Traducture

The introduction of the word traducture by Wangui wa Goro, coined originally in 1997 as part of her doctoral thesis where she explores issues of translating inequality (wa Goro 2005), drew attention to the inadequacy of the term translation. Traducture enabled recognition that our explorations of development issues raised could be limited by too literal an interpretation of the words used. In this context, traducture better encompasses the range of ‘translations’ as well as the science, art, technology and craft of making them. Traducture is based on conceptual frameworks of translation, which offer a variety of avenues for engaging from different standpoints, including perspectives which seek to unravel dominant discourses, particularly where they distort reality through misrepresentation, such as stereotyping or exclusion.

Source: http://thegiraffe.wordpress.com/2011/02/03/define-traducture/

8 Proposed scenarios for CTA interventions

Based on the typology above and the needs for KM interventions already expressed by CTA partners, the Expert Consultation will aim to developing a road map with three different scenarios:

a. Interventions at the systemic and institutional level in concert with other international organisations;

b. Interventions in terms of capacity building working with partner organisations; and

c. Training at the level of the individual.
Text box 5
Practice-based change

Across the international aid sector, there are a growing number of voices challenging the classic linear project model through which so much aid is delivered. These concerns are rooted in analyses of historicity and of power; of sustainability and ownership; of complexity, emergence and new models for change; as well as of actual effectiveness. The IKM Emergent programme is one of a number of recent initiatives to research these issues but the implications of its findings for development practice would benefit from further thought and discussion. ‘Development practice’ here is taken to relate to the development and management of programmes at local, regional and headquarters level. So far, the most important lessons learnt to date would appear to involve:

- Limited communication in and use of local languages
- Limited support for local knowledge processes or for making use of the output of participatory processes
- The inappropriateness of tools for programme planning, management, monitoring and evaluation which are based on predictability and dampen the potential of emergent properties.
- The challenges of accountability, both to donors and to beneficiaries, if more flexible management procedures are introduced
- The value of sharing programme information with others who may learn from it.

Source: Cummings & Powell 2010.
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