

INFORMAL NOTES ON THE KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY AND ITS IMPLEMENTATION

Prepared for G Lopez by Z Ofir, December 2005

Basis for these notes: The KM Strategy Objectives, strategic areas of work and change management projects

STRATEGIC AREA OF WORK 1: Improve access to IUCN's information and knowledge

1. Upgrade the ICT infrastructure and support services
2. Improve the IUCN Intranet
3. Develop an integrated Conservation and Management Information System
4. Strengthen technology-enabled publishing
5. Transform the IUCN library system
6. Establish a 'yellow pages' of IUCN expertise, product repositories and services
7. Increase the number of multilingual products
8. Develop a tool for knowledge capture

STRATEGIC AREA OF WORK 2: Foster an organisational culture that values knowledge workers and encourages knowledge management

9. Improve human resources and management policies, approaches and performance drivers to encourage knowledge management
10. Build and share internal knowledge management capacities, tools and resources
11. Provide inspiring workspaces

STRATEGIC AREA OF WORK 3: Embed knowledge management in roles and work processes

12. Allocate and support knowledge management roles and responsibilities
13. Launch pilot initiatives based on work process analysis
14. Embed knowledge management results in programme planning, monitoring and evaluation

STRATEGIC AREA OF WORK 4: Turn action into knowledge into action – sharing and learning across organisational boundaries

15. Synthesise, capture and use good practice and policy lessons
16. Mobilise and support knowledge networks
17. Preserve institutional memory and tacit knowledge

STRATEGIC AREA OF WORK 5: Strengthen IUCN's knowledge base for greater impact

18. Safeguard a reputation for quality and cutting edge work
19. Identify and develop flagship products
20. Create value-adding knowledge products and services

STRATEGIC AREA OF WORK 6: Enhance capacities to serve and influence target audiences

21. Deepen relationships for effective communication and engagement with partners and target audiences
22. Focus on influencing strategies
23. Create deep societal and global change

OBJECTIVE 1: To provide an enabling environment with systems and capacities that support and embed knowledge management in the work of the Secretariat and Commissions	
Strategic area of work 1	Improve access to IUCN's information and knowledge
Strategic area of work 2	Foster an organisational culture that values knowledge workers and encourages knowledge management
Strategic area of work 3	Embed knowledge management in roles and work processes
OBJECTIVE 2: To strengthen knowledge creation, sharing and learning across organisational boundaries and barriers	
Strategic area of work 4	Turn action into knowledge into action – sharing and learning across organisational boundaries
OBJECTIVE 3: To strengthen IUCN's capacities to assist, empower and influence its target audiences	
Strategic area of work 5	Strengthen IUCN's knowledge base for greater impact
Strategic area of work 6	Enhance capacities to serve and influence target audiences

THE KM STRATEGY: CURRENT STATUS

1. I have completed a draft **IUCN KM Strategy** together with a companion document, **Background to the KM Strategy** (Both in the **Word Folder on my hard drive - KM Strategy Final Documents Dec 2005**). The two documents should ideally be distributed together for comment. Buy-in processes by the senior management and Commissions will be very important.

2. **Action plans** need to be developed by individuals or smaller task teams through a systematic process – I would suggest per key area of work. In some cases a specific focus on project level may be needed. I stand by the suggestions made at EMG and in the back of the strategy document, on how to spread the tasks across the organisation.

3. I am comfortable that the strategy contains the right directions for IUCN to move into. While success is born out of good implementation, I would be sad if new KM coordinators do not **build on what exists** in these two documents.

4. I have also added a set of **results / outcomes** over which help to define the strategy and make it concrete (**also in the same Word folder above**). These have been designed to show the progression over the four phases of the strategy until 2012. The results / outcomes need to be refined, and I hope each of the task teams who take responsibility for key areas of work or projects can help to define these better. However I believe they already provide a solid base on which to build.

5. There are two documents with results / outcomes in the folder: **one with the results / outcomes per key area of work, and the other with the results / outcomes per project.**

Note that for Level 5 outcomes should really not even be divided according to key areas of work – the results / outcomes of the key areas of work combine towards the final outcomes proposed for the last phase.

6. **Indicators** have been developed for the results for the first two phases of the strategy, in other words until the end of this intersessional period in 2008. These indicators **give a lot of detail about what needs to be done during implementation** – they can help people understand what should be done in practice.

7. So essentially the

- KM Strategy, its
- Background document, the
- Results / Outcomes tables and the
- Results / Outcomes with the sets of indicators for the first two phases, 2006-2008,

should be read together by whoever develops this further, and by anyone who is interested in understanding the strategy. Furthermore, a **set of Action Plans** – probably in the end in one document but according to Strategic Areas of Work and individual Change Management Projects – need to be developed and seen as an integral part of this documentation.

8. The idea is of course **not to have a lengthy, ‘heavy’ planning process** – these things seldom work well - but to have for some projects as soon as possible a much clearer idea of what needs to be done, resources etc. However lots of things can proceed without extensive planning.

9. I have **distributed the two main documents** to the senior management and to selected individuals I have worked with, with the strict comment that this is for their perusal and stimulation of their thinking and work, but that it is the product that I put on the table as I leave for further attention – so that they understand that this is not the final strategy. However it does mean that the documents have been distributed to IUCN’s management – not that this necessarily means that they will be read! If necessary I can provide you with the names of those to whom I have sent them.

10. You will find some **discrepancies between the results / indicators for 2006 and the table of preferred activities** I have sent to you earlier. The former assumes more initiatives would have been taking place. This is the ideal situation – when you take over you and your teams can decide what is doable and adjust the expected results and indicators accordingly.

11. Please also remember that the **IISD study on knowledge management**, conducted in 2004 by **Heather Creech**, may provide a lot of interesting information on her assessment of IUCN’s KM. She used much of my earlier discussions with her for her report, and also a lot of our Reviews findings, so of course the strategy and her study will have lots in common. Corli can tell you more about what was done – it was through this study that Corli’s interest in KM was stimulated.

12. I also want to propose that you and Alison read **The Green Web by Martin Holdgate** if you want to get an in-depth understanding of its history and complexity. One understands IUCN a whole lot better after reading that book. Even if there is no time to read the whole book, the last chapter is very illuminating indeed. It also highlights the fact that knowledge is at the core of IUCN's being – and how its role and contribution to conservation knowledge has shifted over the decades.

13. Please also read the **2004 Review of IUCN's Influence on Policy, Phase 1 – Description of the Policy Work, as well as the 2003 External Review of IUCN**. These documents provide a lot of information of relevance to knowledge management in IUCN.

14. I also believe we should be very aware of wherever the **Commissions leadership** should be drawn into planning and initiatives. As new people you and Alison may not always be alert to where they should be included in initiatives rather than only the Secretariat, and even if we do not serve the Commissions as a whole, we should aim to serve their leadership, for example through our Intranet facilities. They do a lot for us and the last Commissions review in 2004 pointed out that they need more support from IUCN. One of the best ways is to ensure that they benefit from improvements to ICT systems, library, publications etc. So their participation should be considered in everything we do. I have asked for a **KM contact point by each Commission**. Only Andy Alm has been appointed yet by CEC – others should follow shortly and they should be encouraged to be engaged.

15. The strategy has therefore been drawn up to emphasise that **laying the foundation for KM include usually the Secretariat and Commissions leadership**, especially also because of the One Programme initiative.

16. Two important documents to read in this regard is the literature review, **Knowledge Management and the IUCN Commissions, by Stephen Turner and the 2003 Report of the Consultative Group on Commissions**. The first document has been made available for the last Commission Chairs meeting in September 2005. It contains a very good summary of the main KM issues relevant to the Commissions and will be useful in understanding what the key concerns are that need to be addressed through the Strategy. The 2003 document was the defining document spelling out the KM issues from the Commissions' perspective.

17. Please note that I also believe very strongly that wherever it makes sense, we should stop reinventing the wheel by **studying upfront what others do and have before we embark on our own**. I therefore propose in many cases that we do studies first – these don't need to be extensive or expensive as there is usually a lot of information easily at hand. I do not want us to analyse things to death – just embark on things in a well-informed way.

18. I also believe we should try to establish **CoPs to help us in many of our KM initiatives**, keeping us on our toes, informing us etc. – for information management, testing of new technologies, KM generally, learning about CoPs, using M&E results, etc – there are so many possible variations. I have put this into my implementation comments in the strategy – but I really believe this should be driven with good animators / moderators. There are enough

people across IUCN who will be interested in fulfilling this role, especially among the younger people.

19. Please also make sure that you, Alison, Bill and new coordinator read the **results / outcomes and indicators system** as these really do give more detail on what needs to be done – in spite of the refinements that still need to be made, as I noted above.

20. Please note that throughout it is important **not only to regard KM not only in the ambit of the IUCN Programme**, but nearly all of these change management projects are also relevant to the units in Global Operations and Global Strategies – and of course to the Commissions.

RESOURCE PERSONS FOR THE STRATEGY AS A WHOLE

Internal

21. I will leave you with a list of all contact details of internal '**KM champions**' at different levels and in different parts of the organisation – those who have shown a real interest in KM – during the course of January. I need to get someone to compile this from the various records that I have. I will mention some names as I address the projects – where people may be valuable on specific aspects.

22. **Nancy MacPherson** and **Assia Alexeiva** have been doing a lot of work on helping me to develop **an M&E system** for the Knowledge Management Strategy. Assia has done tremendous groundwork in going through the literature and contacting organisations who have developed such systems. The person most informed in IUCN in this area **is Nancy who used to be IUCN's M&E specialist**. She has kept herself well informed of my work so **can be a resource person on the M&E system and its linkages with the performance assessment system**. They are certainly the **only people in IUCN with the relevant expertise to continue refining the system in terms of results and related indicators** – please use them in this capacity.

23. Just to keep in mind one important internal person - **Chucri Sayegh of the Canada Office** is a very valuable resource for information management initiatives, and he has a good insight into small Rapid Results initiatives that yield quick results – although one cannot always work in a fragmented way. He has been working **in GIS** and should be nurtured as a good KM champion in IUCN. There are many others of course, but he is a young man with great enthusiasm whom I don't want us to neglect.

External

24. **Meg Gawler** of Artemis Consulting (meg@artemis-services.com) near Geneva and **Stephen Turner of the Free University of Amsterdam** (sdturner@iafrica.com) both know IUCN exceptionally well – they have conducted a number of evaluations of aspects of the organisation. Stephen has been a team member on the IUCN External Review Team plus others. He has also worked with me somewhat on the writing of the strategy – not on the design – but this means that he did get to know it very well. These two persons can be valuable resources for studies and evaluations in this field as they know IUCN very well. Nancy has worked with them so she can provide further information.

25. An additional group who knows IUCN well and who bring not only evaluation expertise but also expertise in communities of practice, is **Charles Lusthaus** (lusthaus@universalia.com) and his team from **Universal Management Consulting** in Montreal, Canada. Charles will be on sabbatical next year and is working on strategic and evaluation aspects of communities of practice / knowledge networks. Again Nancy will be able to provide a lot of detail about how they have worked with her, and what their strengths are.

As CoPs will be a very important component of IUCN's KM work, their expertise and the fact that they know IUCN may be a very good advantage. IUCN may be able to benefit tremendously if one can get Charles to do part of his sabbatical in Gland.

26. I will also provide you with a **list of external people** who may be good resource persons on KM. They will include both practitioners in organisations such as IUCN, and more "academic" experts in knowledge management. Establishing partnerships with them, using them in a network of advisors / people who can share their experiences, and getting them to hold seminars and workshops at HQ or in regional offices could be very valuable. A number are near Geneva (see below).

27. I suggest that IUCN tries to get the advice or services of **Jan Schwaab** (Jan.Schwaab@gtz.de) from **GTZ** to help with implementation of specific KM initiatives or to provide advice or insights overall. He has great knowledge and experience to share about how to do and not to do KM. One of the first things I would do is invite him to IUCN to speak with our top and senior managers about practical KM. One of the KM change management projects (no 8 on a tool for knowledge capture) also relate to their work in this area, and he should be brought to IUCN to talk about this specifically to see if it has any promise for IUCN. I believe it has – even if we adapt it and do not use it exactly as they had done.

28. **Manuel Flury of SDC** (Manuel.Flury@deza.admin.ch), **Peter Wichmand of ILO** in Geneva (wichmand@ilo.org) and **Ben Ramalingam of ODI** in London (contact details to be provided) are three other people in our vicinity who should be drawn closer to IUCN – both have excellent experience and I believe that just as with GTZ, there is potential for partnerships / funding for joint efforts or for something that the two funders will be interested in. I have in fact included one of Peter's initiatives in our strategy - Project 15 on good practice in the hope that we will learn from what they have done and will incorporate some of their experience in our work.

29. **Prof Gilbert Probst of the University of Geneva** (gilbert.probst@hec.unige.ch) is a very famous person in KM – one of the people who developed one of the most recent theories in this area. He has a consultancy group in KM and seems to have powerful contacts. Since he is so close by he should be a good general resource person – perhaps also more on the conceptual level, where our leadership needs more depth. It could be good to establish good contact with him. We corresponded but we have not yet had a chance to get together – I wanted to invite him to IUCN of course. He also has a network of people interested in KM – the Geneva Knowledge Forum – see below.

30. There are also two people from **Bellonet / D-Groups** who are very interested in partnering with us in some or other way, and both are very dynamic and experienced – **Lucie Lamoreaux** (llamoureux@bellanet.org) and **Alison Hewitt**. We need to investigate this further. We have been corresponding but not yet with any concrete search for opportunities. My correspondence in all these cases is in the email folder on my hard drive under KM Champions- External.

31. An interesting initiative that I believe will be of great importance to IUCN is that of CGIAR, and I recommend that you establish contact with them to learn from their experiences as soon as possible. I will provide contact names in addition to the Bellanet ones above. A short description drawn from email is the following:

The Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) has just finished the first phase of a Knowledge Sharing Project in the framework of an ICT and Knowledge Management Program. The project was conducted jointly by 4 CGIAR centres (CIAT, CIFOR, CIMMYT, and IWMI), in partnership with Bellanet, and focused on 4 main areas:

- Transforming major centre events into entry points for KS
- Build a core team of KS champions
- Develop capacity in facilitation
- Build an on-line toolbox to support KS initiatives.

If you are interested in knowing more about the project, please read the magazine-style project report at http://www.ks-cgiar.org/pdf/KS_magazine.pdf.

32. If you are looking for a **wider circle of KM people outside IUCN** before I compile the list – they are all in my Outlook folders under **KM Champions – External** – and there are also ones for people internally who are interested, although there are many more than I have in this last folder.

KM NETWORKS THAT CAN HELP INFORM THE STRATEGY

Details of these are in my email folder **Listservs**.

33. The best **listserv** to belong to if anyone is generally interested in KM is **Knowledge Management for Development** - also a very good website (<http://www.km4dev.org/>). To subscribe a blank email should be sent to: subscribe-km4dev-l@lyris.bellanet.org. The traffic is not very high and the inputs are very good. If one has a query about KM it is usually very good to access this mailing list.

34. There is a group of around 28 KM coordinators who belong to the **Geneva-based KM community / listserv (ks-gva)** – mostly from UN organisations. I invited them to IUCN to come as a group for a day to share experiences in a format that allows for fast exchange of information. You may want to follow up by getting the new coordinator to take up contact with them. It will be great to arrange such a meeting – it had great support (see attached email 1). There is great potential to stimulate the group as a whole to get together and learn from one another. IUCN can easily take a leadership role in this. Currently a key person in this network is **Pieter van Rooij of ILO** (vanrooij@ilo.org) – he gets the group together occasionally. One can register through <http://www.dgroups.org/groups/ks-gva/index.cfm>. They also have a website <http://www.dgroups.org/groups/ks-gva>

35. The best listserv for learning about learning is **Pelican – Platform for Evidence-based Learning and Communications for Social Change**. They are truly excellent. Most programme people in IUCN should actually belong to this listserv and this can be promoted in Key Area of Work 4. I do not have the information on how to join with me – but it should be easy to get this.

36. See above also for the network of Prof Gilbert Probst – the **Geneva Knowledge Forum**. They work in German I believe – but it might be useful to take up contact with them – I think it consists of a number of very good organisations and companies and he is keen to take up contact with IUCN – one should use the opportunity (<http://know.unige.ch/>; <http://www.hec.unige.ch/ORGANISATION/>; <http://www.ifb.unisg.ch/core>)

37. The **KNOW network** is a web-based global community of organisations dedicated to achieving superior performance through benchmarking, networking and best practice knowledge sharing. They have very good web resources (<http://www.knowledgebusiness.com>) . It is also managed by the company that manages the MAKE awards.

38. Assia Alexeyva also belongs to several KM listservs and may be able to add to this information.

39. My list of **external contacts** can be used as a kind of network that can be drawn upon to assist IUCN as it moves forward. This list will be provided – I am getting someone to type up the details more systematically. I will limit it to about 20 or so people who could be of best use

to us. The details of individuals and my correspondence with them are currently available in my email folders **under KM Champions – External**.

40. I believe we should also take up contact with the companies on the **MAKE – Most Admired Knowledge Enterprises** (<http://www.knowledgebusiness.com>) - list of enterprises who perform best in KM. It costs a lot to join the group (if I remember correctly one can join a group from which winners are elected), but they can provide very valuable guidance – although they are almost all commercial companies. The award is managed by Rory Chase of Teleos. I believe we may be in a position to strive for this by 2012! I know that the ADB has it as a goal to get such an award over time. As far as I know of “our” type of organisations, only the World Bank has won such an award. I have the Executive Summary available in an email folder on my hard drive should anyone be interested – sent by Rory Chase.

41. An interesting fact is that the Total Return to Shareholders between 1994 and 2004 for the publicly-traded 2005 Global MAKE winners was 22.3% - nearly double that of the Fortune 500 company median – it seems as if knowledge-driven companies significantly outperform their competitors. Of course I would like to analyse this figure more carefully, but it seems well accepted wisdom that this helps to make the case for KM.

42. **GAN-Net** is an interesting group of organisations that are getting together to research and experiment with **Global Communities of Practice**. The key people engaged have very good reputations as experts in their field. They have a number of interesting projects, but I think they are struggling to get these off the ground since all involved are so busy. We wanted to become engaged to fundraise with them for some initiatives that could inform our Communities of Practice initiatives. Our Commissions are global networks after all. They are funded with a small grant by the Metanoia Foundation. I believe it will be good to stay engaged with this group to tap from their expertise and to do some joint fundraising for specific initiatives. Much of their information is on my hard drive emails under **KM Organisations – GAN-Net**. More information is on their website (www.gan-get.net). **Steve Waddell** could be a good resource person – he is keen to link up with IUCN. (swaddell@gan-net.net; swaddell@instituteofstrategicclarity.org). He is also the person who has just produced a very good book on **Societal Learning and Change** – see later.

KM RESOURCES

43. I had all my best resources from which I drew my recent knowledge, put on the **J-drive under knowledge management**. I had of course wanted to highlight them on KM web pages and some specific ones regularly in a newsletter. People can be referred to this set of resources if they quickly want some good information - they are arranged by broad interest area. Of course the fact that it is on the J-drive make them inaccessible to people outside HQ – they should be moved / linked as soon as possible to a resource on our website (part of Project 10 – developing a **KM Toolbox**).

44. You will also find good resources – most duplicated on the J-drive – on my hard drive under **KM Resources** and then the different topics. This may give quick access to some material to get a sense of what it is all about. There are also **files in my office** with printed copies of material. **Veronique** has helped me to develop this system so she will know what it is all about. You may want to keep these somewhere for quick reference.

45. There are other very good **KM websites**, and these are also listed **on the J-drive**. I don't have access to it at present but I am sure Veronique and others can do so. A main global gateway is **KnowledgeBoard** <http://www.knowledgeboard.com>. Another very good one is **BRINT** (<http://www.brint.com/km/>) by Malhotra, one of the best thinkers in KM at the moment, as well as the **KNOW Network** (<http://www.knowledgebusiness.com>). These should also be brought as part of the KM Toolbox to the attention of people who are interested. Those noted on the J-drive are all essentially portals through which a very good selection of resources can be accessed.

46. There are also around 15-20 or so **books on KM available from my old office / the library**. Some should be still with the library as they had been logging them (I hope no-one took books from my office while I was away – I saw some spaces and hope they are still in the library. Perhaps Veronique can check to make sure the library list does correspond to the books in my office.

47. You will also find organisational **information and KM strategies in my Outlook folder titled Organisations** – these could be tapped both for the strategies and the contact people.

KEY AREA OF WORK 1: ACCESS TO INFORMATION AND KNOWLEDGE

Change Management Project 1: UPGRADE THE ICT INFRASTRUCTURE AND SUPPORT SERVICES

48. I believe this is well in hand through Alison and the audit that has been conducted. Even though KM should never be driven by ICT, we will get nowhere unless our infrastructure and connectivity is upgraded to a level where people work quite easily. Money will be saved if we have standardised policies and approaches to contractors for example.

49. Remember that within this project we also have included the **communications technologies** – Skype, Blackberry, e-conferencing etc. Through Fayeze I introduced a very useful **e-conferencing system** (using computers – ideally that all staff should be able to use) that was introduced to us through **Steve Waddell** (swaddell@gan-net.net; swaddell@instituteofstrategicclarity.org) **from GAN-Net** who has been bringing together some groups to work on testing the system for a very reasonable amount of money. I introduced this system long ago to Corli who did not see it as a priority. I think it is still useful to consider it compared to other systems. I know Merja Murdoch and IMG have been working on possibilities. See email 2 for easy reference. There is more email correspondence about this matter on my hard drive Outlook, under KM Projects – e-conferencing. The benefit of this system is that it provides a space for people to work together in virtual space. They see each other if they have cameras on their computers. It may be useful to check with Steve where their test is and what their groups think the quality and usefulness of this is.

50. The reason for considering the above is that **GAN-Net** is an interesting group of organisations that are getting together to research and experiment with Global Communities of Practice. The people engaged have very good reputations. They have a number of interesting projects, but I think they are struggling to get these off the ground since all involved are so busy. They are funded with a small grant by the Metanoia Foundation. I believe it will be good to stay engaged with this group to tap from their expertise and to do some joint fundraising for specific initiatives. Much of their information is on my hard drive emails under KM Organisations – GAN-Net (www.gan-get.net) – also on email 3.

51. I wonder if Alison should try to **establish linkages with local universities and research centres** to see if we can somehow gain from their hardware and connectivity capacities. **University of Geneva** is for example as far as I know participating in the initiative to “upgrade the WWW” to be much faster. It could be well worth exploring possibilities in this regard.

Change Management Projects 2 and 3: IMPROVE THE INTRANET, and DEVELOP A CMIS FOR THE UNION

52. I look forward to the results of the audit and hopefully usability testing that will accompany all efforts to improve our Intranet and other systems into the MIS. I now call it **C/MIS or CMIS – Conservation and Management Information System** – as I believe what Alison will be designing is more than a Management Information System. I do not want people to get the wrong idea that this is just about management and operational information. However I have never seen a paper on the initiative so we might differ in our approach on what it will be in the end – and if we need to focus on the development of our Intranet / Extranet (which includes Finances and Personnel and Members interests) and see the Conservation information / public side as a separate system with linkages to the Intranet. I am sure this will be sorted out through the audit.

53. What will be critical in the meantime is to ensure that the current **Intranet gets improvements** that makes it more user-friendly – IF the CMIS is going to take a long time to develop – accompanied by “training the trainers” courses to enable people to use it. I had hoped this will not be necessary as the current Intranet is so counter-intuitive that I don’t actually want people to use it – but if we have no choice for the next year or two there is little else that can be done.

54. **It is also imperative that the IUCN Intranet name is changed from the current “Knowledge Network”.** It is not a knowledge network and we should get people used to using this term in the right way. A competition to get a new name will be most appropriate. One organisation calls theirs “Connect” – far more appropriate.

55. Here is also an area where **Rapid Results (RR) / Quick Wins / Low hanging Fruit** can be developed. Could we have a **common space on the Intranet for all PowerPoint presentations** for example, and there are many others– but then we need people to use the Intranet, and most people don’t want to. The Photo Library for example is so difficult to use unless you are really trained how to do it. Contract really good people in to develop user-friendly approaches to elements of the Intranet, and if it is done with people, they should use it. The most common complaint I have heard across the Union is that the Intranet is unfriendly and that they don’t want to use it for that reason. Those who are satisfied with it have not had any experience of good Intranets – so they don’t know what works better. An Intranet should be just like a website – no-one is trained to use a website, and the Intranet should be just as intuitive.

56. Under the **RR initiatives** above we can also consider releasing **guidelines for email etiquette**, and find small ways in which to limit the flow of emails. I have in my email folder **KM Projects – Email Etiquette** – some guidelines collected by Chucri Sayegh from Canada office. However they are too ‘heavy’ and need to be tailor-made for our purposes. Could be an interesting little project – I am sure people in IUCN will have tips on how to limit the amount of email traffic. If we had a good Intranet that everyone used, we could have easily put up

things there in centralised, organised spaces instead of sending emails and documents around all the time.

57. This should be a focus for the new CMIS – to create **central spaces around topics, themes, issues** where people know where to go to find relevant material and expertise / knowledge immediately without having to go through extensive searches.

58. It will also be important to ensure that Communications do not go off on a separate track with the **Website** development. This should be an integral part of the whole design and planning exercise. They don't need to delay their work – just always see it as part of the overall design, perhaps through the Management and Technical Committees that Alison wants to establish – if she still wants to do that. I have lost track of recent developments there.

59. Finally, a **Knowledge Network Task Force** had been established by Corli before I came to pool the funds for development of the Intranet and have a central body moving it forward. I chaired this for 3 meetings to get the Task Force to reorient their thinking about the Intranet to be more strategic. This group became dormant as Alison came, as the discussion between Corli and me and the understanding within the group was that she would take it over. We sent her all the documentation and I assume that she and Corli as the then line head for the initiative had been in discussion about this. It will be important not to let that group die without a final meeting with them to explain the whole thing and get their participation. They can form the basis for whatever group moves this forward – although not all may have been at the right level.

60. I am still convinced that we should investigate to what extent we can include **portal design in our CMIS** development. An interesting initiative in this regard is the **SURF portals of the Communities of Practice of UNDP** (have a look at their **Energy and Environment one which is based in Nepal** – still need to find the web address for you) which I had held as an example of what we should be doing. The Leverage Initiatives such as Poverty and Conservation provide a lot of scope for this approach – the communities of practice linked to portals. Silvio has been supporting the idea of portals; Oracle has good facilities in this regard. IUCN already has some portals – all developed separately and hence very resource-intensive. So there is a lot of scope for investigating better possibilities there.

61. I am sure **Silvio Olivieri** will be a great asset in this whole process, supported by the management and technical committees so that there can be check and balances in our approaches and considerations of different technologies etc. There are also other good people among the Members who can be advisors etc. such as **Jean-Louis Ecochard from TNC, Andy Alm of CEC, Tom Moritz from AMNH and others** – **Tom Hammond** has all the right names. These are essentially some of the driving forces in Conservation Commons and have known IUCN for a long time. I do worry about **new blood** sometimes, and believe we should **get people/companies engaged who are very much on the forefront of developments** on Intranets, excellent search facilities etc. The PWC / fsg initiative should provide a lot of this experience. If they fall flat for any reason, there are also the very well known **Norman Nielsen Group and others** who are renowned in the Intranet environment.

We may also approach **large development companies who may have a social conscience** w.r.t. the environment – I am sure Alison will follow this route for funding and other partnerships.

62. Again for good consultants / companies we should try to **draw from the experiences of our external networks** noted before. ILO and others have gone through the painful processes of redesigning their Intranets and it may very useful to see what they have experienced. WWF is also next door – it may be good to link up with them although I don't know how advanced their Intranet is.

63. We need to draw the **Commissions' leadership** into these efforts as soon as possible. The Commissions' communication and management systems have been shown to be inadequate in the 2004 Review of the Commissions, and we need to see if small things in the CMIS may not help them with their daily operations and management. This will get a lot of goodwill from them and may not cost all that much extra.

64. In this context we also need to take **URGENTLY a decision** on Richard Forrest and the **conservation wiki initiative**. He has to search for other work and we should not keep him hanging on a line much longer. I still believe his wiki initiative is worth trying out in order to increase the accessibility of our knowledge and popularise it perhaps – and it will not cost much. See **Tom Hammond's last email about co-resourcing this as a project also because of Conservation Commons interests. All detail on this initiative is in my Outlook folder under KM Projects – wiki for conservation**

Change Management Projects 4 and 5: TECHNOLOGY-ENABLED PUBLISHING and the IUCN LIBRARY SYSTEM

65. **Elaine and the Publications Unit** team have been very active in trying to ensure that we get to the cutting edge of technology in this publishing. This can make us much more cost-effective and increase our impact. They should be strongly supported to continue, and work with people like **Tom Moritz and his network of contacts** to establish partnerships etc that can really help. The ongoing Publications study should feed into a general upgrading of our publications approaches.

66. You may find it interesting in this context to read the **Knowledge Products Study** that was conducted in 2004 as part of the **Commissions Review**. We gave you and Alison copies right in the beginning. That study pointed out a whole lot of weaknesses in our publications that should be addressed and which are now being taken up in various ways. **Nancy MacPherson** will also have more information on this if necessary as she initiated that study.

67. I cannot see how we can possibly not have in place as soon as possible a **very good librarian** who can really take us into the modern age and develop the various libraries of IUCN into a connected “**knowledge centre**” that can truly support KM in IUCN. **To save money on this aspect or to appoint someone who is not of the right calibre and experience will be truly silly** and could be the death knell for KM in IUCN. This needs a good strategy which I hope will be driven as key component of KM during 2006.

68. Of critical and urgent importance is that we focus on developing a **very good classification system and ontology** for all our data, information and knowledge repositories – not too complex, and it should take cognisance of the new conservation paradigms. Examples of efforts to develop a classification system exist in IUCN. There is a very detailed system on paper – there is a copy in my office – devised by **Tom Moritz** in 1995, certainly a bit old. The library has their own system of course, but this certainly needs updating for our modern foci. The Commissions have another, used in the on-line classification system they have been developing. We need - as soon as possible - a **study on what exists inside, what is available outside in other organisations** in order to develop a final one as painlessly as possible.

69. We should also try to develop a classification system and ontology that can be used throughout the Union – if this is possible. The **Conservation Commons** is also working on this aspect so we should link up our efforts – Tom can provide details. **Jeff McNeely** might be a valuable person to drive or at least be engaged closely from our side. **Tom Moritz** will remain a very valuable resource in this regard. **Andy Alm**, CEC’s knowledge management focal point is also very knowledgeable on the design of ontologies so we could draw from him as well. He is a consultant however, so I am not sure to what extent he will volunteer time for this.

70. It is very important to get the classification system right not only to find information more easily, but also to help **map our resources** – knowledge products and services, expertise, etc.

– in a way that can better help us develop our strategic knowledge base. This will be very important if we have to develop our knowledge base more strategically – see Key Area of Work 5. There are a lot of **articles and presentations on mapping** if you want to understand it better. There are articles on the J-drive, in files in my office and on the Internet. Mapping is used for a number of different purposes and should be applied in our context to help us to be more strategic in what we do.

71. Note that **SSC is truly concerned about the very large amount of institutional memory** that is sitting in old documents. One of the first steps in putting an appropriate system in place will be to establish how far back one will go with digitisation, how existing documents will be mined for useful information, what documents will be selected for preservation, and how these will be made available in the best possible way for use for new knowledge creation.

Change Management Project 6: 'YELLOW PAGES'

72. The idea of a yellow pages is to support the capture of KNOWLEDGE not only information – if we can link people's expertise and experiences to projects, initiatives, topics, issues etc, we can draw from their KNOWLEDGE more easily, saving time and money and making sure their knowledge is transferred within the organisation and not lost when they leave. Of course this also needs to be enhanced by other methods of knowledge transfer, such as mentoring, exit interviews and workshops, etc. That is accommodated in another project in strategic area of work 2.

73. **SDC has developed a 'yellow pages'**, and as far as I know so has **Oracle** and many others – it is a very fashionable thing to do. It is now very common across organisations that are serious about KM. We should try to draw from their experience - especially as SDC for example is a donor of ours - and maybe we can get a good partnership that saves us the cost of reinventing the wheel ourselves.

74. We have to include our **Secretariat staff as well as Commission members**. For the latter a rudimentary system already exists, developed as part of the on-line registration system that was funded this year with a grant from Bill. The classification system they have been using quite ad hoc, put together from the systems that all Commissions have been using separately. It has therefore not been systematically designed and so will need reworking. Later **Members' areas of expertise** can be added more systematically. The current Membership Portal is moving in that direction.

75. An alternative that can be explored is instead of a formal classification system, is **text searches** where people can summarise their expertise in short format and then have good search engines to search for relevant knowledge. I am sure that together with other organisations' experiences and **Silvio Olivieri's** expertise, the best approach can be devised.

Change Management Project 7: MORE COST-EFFECTIVE TRANSLATION SERVICES

76. Alison has this well in hand through her previous experience. I only want to point out that while we need an initial focus on the three official languages, **a large bottleneck for knowledge/information accessibility is in the use of local languages**. In time this should be addressed through any means possible. Other similar organisations are also struggling with this issue and I am sure we can find **partnerships** that can help us access translation services in bulk also at local level.

77. **Partnerships** for translation, and then **aggregation of material to give bulk work** to a company that is being contracted for translation can significantly decrease costs and also help educate the **ICT translation tool** we should have for this purpose.

78. The whole area of translation should be planned more systematically and strategically – **ideally a strategy should be developed** to ensure that we know what should be translated and for what purposes to ensure the accessibility of key knowledge, especially at regional level. Translation of publications is done in a very ad hoc way, and **funding for translation of products should be motivated in proposals** from the beginning of a project – **justified as part of good knowledge management practice** of which all funders are now very aware.

Change Management Project 8: TOOL FOR KNOWELDGE CAPTURE.

79. Here I can only refer you to **Jan Schwaab (see under resource people) of GTZ to come and demonstrate the tool** that they have and which led to my inclusion of this element in our strategy. The idea is good – we may want to apply it in different ways to our contexts. Achim has good contacts with GTZ as he worked for them before, and we really should make use of that.

80. Jan is keen to **establish linkages with IUCN**. Invite him and his other GTZ colleagues over for a day and explore the potential to draw from them and their software. However then you must make sure that all the key people are there who will need to be enthused about this concept – or that need to have their thinking stimulated in this regard.

81. It will be extremely important to ensure that **Bill and his team assess** whether such a tool – adapted for our purposes and ways of working - could be useful for Programme.

82. It is also very important for IUCN to be in touch with new tools that can help to capture people's knowledge in explicit form. Apart from our publications we also need to consider etc **blogs, wikis, etc. as these are making huge inroads into conventional knowledge sharing methods**. They can be used in project management as well as for external communication. Use special **communities of practice** who can help test these and inform on new developments, so that IUCN is not left out of the loop any more when new technologies can help advance what we need to do for better knowledge management. The external expert networks in knowledge management can also be of great use in this regard.

KEY AREA OF WORK 2: AN ENABLING CULTURE FOR KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT

Change Management Project 9: HUMAN RESOURCES

83. **Diego Ruiz in HRMG** is probably the best placed to take this forward, and he needs to be drawn into KM anyway as he has done his Masters in this field. He is very interested in this and if we are serious about developing our people internally, he should be one of the first to have the opportunity to use these important skills.

84. **It is critical to pay attention to this project as soon as possible.** First of all we should **do a study** to understand what the current obstacles to KM are – could be part of the audit of our work processes and/or of a staff survey. Also needed are a literature study and contacting our networks to understand their experiences in building a culture of KM and ensuring that barriers are removed. **Without this nothing will work – the “people aspect” has been proven to be the most important for the success of KM** and we have not been good at managing our people strategically for this purpose.

85. The study can be **done per pilot unit / programme** - if not possible for the whole organisation.

86. Also - efforts need to be made to ensure that the **Commissions** do something similar. The **SSC study done on volunteerism done in 2000** paved the way for work on this, and also the **Commissions Review in 2004**. You and Alison may want to study both documents again now that you are more familiar with IUCN – and the new coordinator should do this as well. The Commissions' leadership could initiate some analysis of their processes and the cultural and other aspects that might be making them less effective in KM than they are at the moment.

Change Management Project 10: CAPACITY BUILDING, TOOLS AND RESOURCES

87. I do not want to write at this stage about the **capacity building initiatives** – there is too much to say and I would prefer either to **give my input verbally at a meeting**, perhaps on 11 Jan when I am back in Gland (I leave again on the 12th and return then on the 4th February for a much longer period) – or I can write up something later. However we **need to emphasise how important capacity building initiatives are if we are to proceed with KM.**

88. One of the critical aspects here will be to make **quick studies** – these can be quick and easy, not large exercises – of **interesting KM practices that already exist in IUCN**. WANI, Forests, SUR and others have very good experiences in specific KM issues that can be very useful to others. The idea would be to gather **case studies and good practice (or failures!)** that can inform others. In the first year I would focus very much on drawing from these experiences and making them available through a KM Toolbox and Newsletter. At the same time of course the literature and key contact organisations provide very good information and experience in this regard already.

89. I would IMMEDIATELY start **with a KM newsletter and KM Toolbox** – the latter essentially some **KM web pages on our website** – it should have been on the Intranet but I don't think anyone will use that – with all the material we think will be helpful. I would have loved to design such a site but could not find the time to do it. There are already lots of material that can go on it, and it can be a one stop site for people who want to know more.

90. There is significant material available on KM Toolboxes, their roles and content, and you will find these under **KM Resources on my hard drive and on the J-drive**. These should really be helpful. The following is also a very useful reference:

Check also the toolbox at: <http://www.ks-cgiar.org/toolbox>. It aims specifically to connect CGIAR staff who have experience in the use of KStools. Short descriptions of each tool (10 so far) are drawn from the most relevant sources, and step-by-step guidelines are provided for their use. The toolkit includes stories relating different individuals' and organizations' experiences in the use of particular tools, and offers contact information for persons who have used them and are willing to share their experience and expertise.

91. The same with a **KM Newsletter** – there is already a lot to say, and a lot of ongoing initiatives that can be highlighted. In this regard **SUR through Tamara the members' portal coordinator, the Canada office through Chucri Sayegh, the Pakistan office through Hasan Rizvi** and others will be more than prepared to contribute – I have already spoken to SUR about it but of course never got around to doing such a newsletter. I would have loved to do it – such an **electronic one** once a month can be very valuable to stimulate interest, elucidate concepts and highlight success stories. Please try to do this as soon as possible.

92. **SDC** has a very good example of an interesting knowledge management newsletter. Their details, as well as those of other relevant initiatives, can be found in the folder on my hard drive, **KM Projects – Newsletter**.

93. Corli is working with **CEC on reorienting this Commission into one that can become *the learning and capacity building instrument for IUCN***. I believe the idea is good and should be promoted, but we should be realistic. This Commission has had major problems through the years with its role in IUCN (please refer to the various Commissions Reviews to gather background information in this regard). It will take time for the right people to get into place to carry KM forward successfully – especially on a volunteer basis - to the extent that it should be done in IUCN. At present the capacity is not there yet and the Commission has an ambitious programme of work. If the gap between the plans and their implementation can be bridged, CEC can be the pivot for KM communities of practice in IUCN. Their expertise will certainly **assist any drivers of KM in the Secretariat** to do their work, and **close linkages** should be established between them.

Change Management Project 11: PROVIDING INSPIRING WORKSPACES

94. This speaks for itself. Others tell me that there are **architects who specialise in “feng shui for knowledge sharing”**, and with our new building we need to make sure that this is taken into consideration wherever possible. It will be important for someone to be a **champion / expert in this field in IUCN**, who can study the body of knowledge in the literature, and track down organisations who have this approach. I have some information – see my Outlook folder **KM Resources – Office space for sharing**. There is also a very good piece on this topic in the preface to one of the fairly recent books by one of the best KM authors, Larry Prusak – I will identify the book which is in the library / my office when I am back in Gland.

95. I also suggest that you follow this approach for other KM topics – **getting people who are interested to become champions of a specific topic in KM**. These topics will have to be quite limited in scope so that people have the time to read and follow up on experiences in that area within and outside IUCN.

Change Management Project 12: ALLOCATE AND SUPPORT KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

96. Use the work **process audit and an analysis of current position descriptions** to determine what types of KM roles should be allocated as part of existing job descriptions.

97. It will be very important to **give credit and some form of recognition** to such people, and not just pile more work on top of what they already have to do. Some will give official status and structure to what people do already. It is important to recognise that these are not necessary new roles – but the project should bring more systematic approaches to what exists already in some cases. One key factor is that such roles help people to be ‘knowledge workers’ – sought after skills in companies and organisations at this time.

98. **In my view key roles** would be (i) **knowledge management facilitators** per office / programme / unit, where key people can give a percentage of their time to help mainstream KM in their environment. Of course they will need some central coordination and training, and each group should be developed into a community of practice that can communicate, compare notes and work together on specific issues. In GTZ such a model is used, with 14 managers using 10% of their time to help with specific KM initiatives (ask Jan Schwaab for details); (ii) people per office / programme / unit who can assist with **testing and training on the IUCN Intranet**; (iii) individuals who can **champion and be resource persons in specific areas of KM work**, for example in “inspiring workspaces”, the “management of communities of practice”, or “developing knowledge workers”; (iv) **analysing, integrating and synthesising findings to identify and capture good practice** – across a specific field of work; (v) **content managers** – of the various websites and for the Intranet.

99. Lots have been written about this topic, and many models exist. It will again be important to **draw from the literature and other organisations** what their experiences in this regard are.

Change Management Project 13: LAUNCH KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT PILOT PROJECTS

100. This is a very important part of mainstreaming KM in the organisation. The idea is to **cultivate “knowledge management thinking” in component programmes and other units** in their daily work. One of the first things to do will be to develop a **KM tool – say a checklist of questions** that can help programmes and units to analyse the way in which they do their work, using a ‘knowledge lens’ – similar to analysing good project management practice, but specifically from the perspective of how knowledge flows and how knowledge products and services are managed. This tool can then be used for self-analysis. The Global Programme team and specific people in the other two directorates can facilitate such analyses with teams.

101. **Michelle Laurie**, KM officer in the Forest Programme went through such an exercise with some of her team members, but my leadership in this was not adequate so it was not done quite as it should be done – but still yielded good results from her perspective. Michelle is also someone to regard as an internal **KM champion** - she is learning very fast about many aspects of KM and she could soon be a resource person for others.

102. The idea is also to support **programmes and initiatives that are keen and sincere in having KM as integral part of their work**. Forests is very keen and so is SUR, Canada, WESCANA and parts of ARO – all moving ahead on their own steam. There are others doing elements of KM, such as WANI which has been exploring learning initiatives for example. These should be supported and their experiences highlighted to others. Nearly all regional offices have expressed a keen interest in KM. If at all possible, those moving forward with energy and innovation should be given recognition and resourced, or given other kinds of support to help them get resources for these initiatives. **The worst that can be done** is to promote KM as a change management strategy and then not promote and encourage those who engage in it.

103. Another aspect of this project is **to use the Leverage and other new initiatives and build from the beginning as many as possible good KM elements into them**, and request funding for these elements based on the idea of learning, sharing, etc. Innovative statements in proposals need to be used to ensure that donors understand the importance of building strong KM into projects. This means that those who **write proposals and raise funding should understand what good KM practices are, and how to justify them in proposals**.

104. Pilots can also be launched around **improvement of specific organisational processes**. The best example is the holding of knowledge sharing / learning workshops which has a high profile also in other organisations. The idea is that knowledge is not any more best transferred (within IUCN and to target audiences) through presentation and discussion style workshops, and that there are novel techniques that could be put to the test in IUCN. Some programmes may have experimented with such approaches, and a **quick internal survey will help to unearth successes** based on new methods of sharing and learning depending on the type of audience.

105. It goes without saying that the **Commissions** are also important in this regard. Using **Review comments and the Strategy**, they can analyse problem KM areas and determine how best to improve. It will also be important to have **a better understanding of their role as modern knowledge networks / communities of practice**, and update their management in this regard. Key issues in this regard have been pointed out in the 2004 Commissions Review and in the IISD study and it will be useful to revisit these. See also the comments under Project 16.

Change Management Project 14: EMBED KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT RESULTS IN PROGRAMME PLANNING, MONITORING AND EVALUATION

106. The **results-based planning process is one of the key performance drivers in IUCN**, and this process should therefore be a very important instrument through which to make sure that **KM becomes mainstreamed in regular work processes in IUCN**. This should be implemented **during 2006**, but will mean that critical capacity should be built in the organisation to assist programmes and units to build KM results into their activities.

107. It is very important to understand that much of knowledge management is not about the products, but about **improving work processes**. This is why **KRA 6** is so relevant to knowledge management, and should be expanded in this regard to include better defined results for the Programme and also for the broader mission of IUCN. The list of **key indicators compiled by Nancy for the performance assessment system** will be useful as pointers to what should be included in a next version of KRA6.

108. During 2006 an effort should be made by the **Global Programme Team to work with component programmes to include KM KRA 6 results in their programme planning**. Most KM results currently in place emphasise products, in other words knowledge creation, and neglect some of the other important processes. The capacity of the GPT should be built to assist with KM capacities in the programmes as it was not clear from our interactions that they understood the scope of knowledge management activities that need to be promoted in programme planning. I was also concerned when I saw that their **Terms of Reference do not include any reference at all to knowledge management**, in spite of it being a very important change management strategy. I do hope that with this Strategy in hand this important issue will be addressed.

109. In the same way the other **Directorates and Commissions should have one or more focal points for KM** who can assist the units and Commissions with their programme planning to ensure a **greater awareness and understanding of KM results**. Initiatives should also be launched to ensure that these focal points are included in coordination efforts to plan and launch KM projects, and build capacity in KM. They could be the 'KM facilitators' mentioned in project 12.

110. At the same time project and programme monitoring and evaluation systems as well as institutional reviews should have KM aspects built in to determine already at this stage how well this is done. **Alex Moiseev, responsible for M&E** in the Global Programme Team can be a valuable driver of this aspect. **Nancy MacPherson** does not have this as a responsibility, but is as said before at the moment the resource person with the best understanding of KM results and indicators.

111. It will therefore be valuable to **select some key KM results and indicators for this Strategy**, and adapt these for use in project, programme and institutional reviews as well as in the quarterly and annual reporting processes.

112. A challenge will be to focus on **meta-evaluation and other findings synthesis methods, and develop good feedback loops** so that evaluation findings really get used - and not just within that programme, but also elsewhere. Most organisations struggle with this aspect. One of the methods is to **have - and regularly track - action plans based on monitoring and evaluation findings as part of organisational accountability**. It is part of a culture of **evidence-based decision-making** that should be used across different management levels to help steer the organisation or individual programmes and units' work. This aspect is related to how to develop a learning organisation under strategic area of work 4.

KEY AREA OF WORK 4: TURN ACTION INTO KNOWLEDGE INTO ACTION – SHARING AND LEARNING ACROSS ORGANISATIONAL BOUNDARIES

Change Management Project 15: CAPTURING GOOD PRACTICE AND POLICY LESSONS

113. This should be a **major Programme initiative**, about ensuring a better flow of conservation information and knowledge **vertically and horizontally** across the organisation's programmes – gathering experiences from field practice and communicating them horizontally to inform better conservation practice, and also vertically to inform policy work.

114. Just as with GTZ and Project 8, it will be necessary to determine to what extent the **experience of ILO can be adapted for our context**. I liked very much their focus on good practice (in this case it will be in conservation of course, not good practice in KM) and then **applying the synthesis of good practice in new interventions**. This is a far more effective approach than just “lessons learnt” and I think **Bill and his team** will be crucial in seeing if this could work or be adapted for us.

115. I therefore propose that you / Bill invite **Peter Wichmand of ILO and Burt Perrin**, a consultant working for them, to come and speak to an open audience as well as to a set of selected people here to test the concept. I have **3 articles about the work they have been doing**. Two of these can be found in the **Word folder KM Resources**. The rest can be found through an “advanced search” of my emails based on their names. I cannot at present find the email folder in which I have put them. It will be very important to study these articles and speak to these two gentlemen before a decision is taken on whether this approach will be desirable in IUCN.

116. It is important to remember that this project differs from good practice capture and use in new interventions (as implemented by ILO), to **include also synthesis of policy lessons**. The method is the same – working with contextualised lessons from different sources; analysing, integrating and synthesising; and determining what is applicable as good practice, or what can be applied to policy design. The idea is also to have **appropriate information more readily available** than the mad and unsatisfying scramble that PBIA experiences when they have to gather information to inform their convention activities.

Change Management Project 16: MOBILISE AND SUPPORT COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

117. This is an extremely important arena for the future and very actively researched, as the belief is that this is how organisations will have to work in this century, perpetuated by our much increased capacity to communicate and collaborate virtually. IUCN will HAVE to become expert at understanding how networks should be used and managed to support its work.

118. The library / my office has a number of books about communities of practice, and there are also many publications available on the J-drive and in my files. There are experts on communities of practice who are very interested in working with IUCN. These included **Steve Waddell from GAN-Net** noted before, **Verna Allee** and **Bill Snyder, colleagues of Steve** and the most authoritative of all, **Etienne Wenger** who, although not resident in Switzerland, is Swiss and often comes to Geneva. These people can easily be drawn into working with IUCN as we present interesting cases of global, regional and local networks that are of great interest to these experts. Contact should be made with them to see what opportunities are on offer.

119. I have had extensive contact with Steve and Verna about their **giving a course at IUCN on aspects of CoPs**, and looking at opportunities for research in our contexts. They **should be contacted to move this forward, getting new dates**, as capacity building in CoPs should be a priority. This has also been noted as a major priority in the 2003 Report of the Consultative Group on Commissions. Their cost was to be USD 5 000, possibly with airfares although they were trying to link it to other activities.

120. Other **external courses** should also be considered. One that solicited significant interest was on **e-moderation**, in other words a course for the animators / moderators of communities of practice. All information on one such an external course can be found in the **email folder Knowledge Management Projects – E-moderation**. Those in IUCN interested in this course are also noted in the folder, and that is without contacting the Commissions. An opportunity to have such a course for people IUCN at a special price should be explored. Perhaps IUCN can **team up with others for a critical mass to lower the fees** for such courses.

121. **Tools to assist and support CoPs, among others creating collaborative work spaces**, should also be implemented as a matter of urgency in IUCN. A good system will be one of the “**Rapid Results**” initiatives so sought after at the moment. **Nancy White of the KM4Dev listserv**, another CoP expert, has made an **analysis of such recent tools** (I believe all open source), but I have not yet received the document. It will be well worth following up with her on this issue so that we can be sure to get the best available for our purpose. **Etienne Wenger** has also made such an analysis but it is somewhat outdated. The latter as well as my correspondence with Nancy can be found in the **email folder on CoPs** on my hard drive.

122. **A study that can determine what types of CoPs exist in IUCN** may be useful to help understand gaps and what we have. It could focus on specific priority areas, and see whether other types of CoPs are needed to enhance the work done by IUCN. One area that could need

attention is for example determining **what networks we have with academic and/or research institutions** (e.g. WCLN), and how these are used to inform cutting edge work – or assist in transforming IUCN findings and experiences into modules for education of future generations. Another area that needs attention is **social and economic (policy) inputs** – does CEESP provide enough expertise or are linkages with more networks needed, and are there others with which we already use instead of CEESP?

123. We have already mentioned the importance of having **CoPs for functional areas** as well and not only in areas of conservation - for example in HR, aspects of KM such as learning and CoPs, new technologies, etc.

124. IUCN also needs to identify as soon as possible a **typology to define what it means by knowledge networks or communities of practice** – otherwise this will remain a bone of contention. Heather Creech of IISD has defined one, and many others exist in the literature. For a typology of knowledge networks that I really like and propose that IUCN uses to clarify what it means, please refer to *Waddell, S. (2005). Societal learning and change. How governments, business and civil society are creating solutions to complex multi-stakeholder problems. Sheffield: Greenleaf Publishing Ltd. p 136. Available in the IUCN Library / my office.*

125. **CEC has established a working group for communities of practice**, and they could be an **important resource and expertise** base from which to develop IUCN's understanding of CoPs. Their capacity in this regard still needs to be built. Their activities in this regard should link closely with the Strategy foci.

126. **An important CEC initiative is a white paper for what they call 'New learning'** – which is about becoming a learning organisation, regarded as a very important and integral part of knowledge management. This paper is an important and good contribution to IUCN; more detailed thinking about KM. However all theories and practice of knowledge management recognise learning as part of knowledge management, as also set out in the Background document to the IUCN KM Strategy. The New Learning white paper tends to make a separation between the two concepts. **Care should therefore be taken to ensure that the "Learning" and Knowledge Management" initiatives do not become two separate initiatives**, but are developed as part of the same change management initiative within the KM Strategy.

127. This also emphasises the need still to **ensure better synergy between the Learning white paper and this KM Strategy**. We have been somewhat amiss in not making the linkages clearer. However the **KM strategy should be the overarching document** and should therefore be approved first before the Learning white paper is accepted. This care should be taken to ensure that CEC and the Learning initiative promoted by Corli through Communications **are integrated with / part of the KM Strategy**.

128. TO EMPHASISE THIS POINT perhaps in a different context: Not necessarily with reference to this particular case, but generally - in my view **duplication of work, building of**

own little fiefdoms and lack of synergy between initiatives in IUCN has been one of hallmarks of the organisation that has been very detrimental to performance. **Often competition or perhaps a measure of arrogance rather than cooperation and team spirit** have prevented IUCN from pooling resources to pull together in the same direction for the best results. It is of concern that I was not once invited by Communications to a meeting or think-tank or discussion around CEC or Learning initiatives - I always heard about them second hand or only when I asked to attend a meeting. Global Programme also from the beginning never invited me to assist them in their KM initiatives – although individual programme coordinators / directors did. IUCN cannot afford even an inkling of such attitudes – even if they are more perceived than true - to interfere with building its critical change management strategies effectively at this critical stage of its development.

129. As noted before in paragraph 53, it is imperative that the **IUCN Intranet name is changed from the current “Knowledge Network”**. It is not a knowledge network and we should get people used to using this term in the right way. A competition to get a new name will be most appropriate. One organisation calls theirs “Connect” – far more appropriate. People also like things more when they have good names, and it will be good to remember this when developing names for tools and for some of the outputs of these change management projects – or even for the projects themselves.

Change Management Project 17: PRESERVE INSTITUTIONAL MEMORY AND TACIT KNOWLEDGE

130. This links to project 5 in an attempt to ensure that with the **rapid turnover we have in staff** (Alison should have the figures now as the last ones I saw were not yet ready to be used. – they are impressively worrying), **institutional memory is not lost to the same degree as at present**. Very few attempts have been made to preserve institutional memory, both **explicit and tacit**. Old publications and documents are stacked unorganised in boxes, both in the Commissions and the Secretariat. Exit interviews are not done. This is an important management issue, and methods should be devised by **HRMG** as well as the **library system**.

131. **Project 5** addresses the **explicit knowledge** that is captured in documents and publications, and with a good classification system and digitisation a system for future work can be established fairly easily.

132. This particular project focuses on the tacit part – that which cannot be put on paper easily. HRMG should ensure that well structured exit interviews are held with staff, but this will not be enough. Just imagine what will be lost if Jeff McNeely leaves without transferring at least part of his knowledge? All staff should know that (i) they have to leave their **documents and emails systematically organised** for further use when they leave; (ii) they have to have an **exit interview** structured to address interests of **both HRMG and the professional area in which they have been working**; (iii) for key people **working sessions** should be arranged with their teams to ensure that their knowledge is transferred – this could happen over time and not just when they leave, for example in the case of Jeff and other senior people; (iv) **systematic mentoring** to transfer knowledge should become part of the culture in IUCN.

133. This approach should be **instilled in management** so that they can start applying these methods. Some training may also be needed. It will require **HRMG policies and procedures** to be established, and again emphasises the **urgency** of getting classification and digitisation systems in place through the library effort.

Change Management Project 18: SAFEGUARD A REPUTATION FOR QUALITY AND CUTTING EDGE WORK

134.. The **Publications Advisory Committee** (not sure of their exact name without my computer records) **led by Jeff and Corli** is busy with this task and should continue to drive this initiative. This is exactly where Jeff's excellent experience is very valuable. It will be important to regard their work as part of this Strategy and to help determine how it could evolve to achieve what this project sets out to do. As with the other initiatives it would be important to ensure that this is an integral part of the KM Strategy.

135.I remain convinced that the **Committee is making a mistake** in promoting only the conventional idea of peer review in their guidelines – my suggestion that they look at new approaches to peer review was brushed of the table during their first meeting. Nancy MacPherson has given them a **document with extensive detail of peer review** which should be studied and integrated into a higher level idea of what it should be. **New technologies, the role of grey literature, on-line journals and other developments** are changing this environment as well and we should be on the cutting edge of understanding their implications as well. My concern flows from the fact that I saw how the **peer review system as currently described can be very actively misused** to circumvent the whole idea - based on my experience with one of the Commissions and also to a lesser extent with one of the programme publications during my study on the Knowledge Products in 2004.

136.It will be important to **codify / identify those publications on our websites and other repositories** when they have been **peer reviewed through a credible system**. The Conservation Commons is also looking at this aspect. With the explosion in grey literature it would be important to ensure that people know which publications can be trusted without any doubt – but then the peer review system must be **described and implemented in a way that addresses my concerns in the previous point**.

137.The issue of “**cutting edge work**” in an IUCN context has been raised by my **Knowledge Products Study** done during the 2004 Review of the Commissions. It could be worthwhile to read the summary of this study to see what the comments were on this aspect. It is not clear whether IUCN sees itself as moving on the cutting edge of knowledge creation, and what it means in an IUCN context. The **Publications Advisory Committee** will tackle this aspect as well, and has considered suggesting creating a fund for cutting edge work for example.

138.It could also be useful to determine whether the **culture and expertise in IUCN** actually supports a move towards more cutting edge work. The work of CEC with WCLN should be explored for potential in this regard, as well as other networks with which IUCN is engaged.

139.The **Commissions** have been set up to be the key instruments in this regard – are they? They should be **more actively engaged by the Publications Advisory Committee** in their considerations of peer review and cutting edge promotion.

Change Management Project 19: IDENTIFY AND DEVELOP FLAGSHIP PRODUCTS

140. In my opinion this is the **most crucial and most strategically important project of the Strategy.**

141. Please read the definition of “**innovation**”, “**advanced**” and “**core**” knowledge in the Background document to this Strategy, and somehow ensure that **these concepts** – not necessarily these terms, but I could not design better ones; these are business terms – **become really considered in planning.** They bring forward very important notions around how to identify that knowledge which IUCN, and only IUCN, can provide because of what it is – and how to do that in spite of donor and other trends that might not provide opportunity to develop that knowledge which is truly needed by decision-makers, especially in **sectors outside yet important to conservation.**

142. **Bill has started to address this project through the Leverage Initiatives and establishing better “radar” capacities.** The other important aspect needed is to **ensure better analysis, integration and synthesis,** and the Leverage Initiatives can be very useful in this regard, but certainly not the only foci for this important aspect.

143. This project stems from the need for IUCN to **develop its capacities to focus on key areas where it can truly use its comparative advantage to bring about real change.** It proposes a much greater emphasis on the strategic identification of what knowledge to create – what we call “innovation” knowledge - and it proposes a much stronger effort to plan and execute activities to analyse, integrate and synthesise **using all the advantages that the Union’s unique structure provides.**

144. There is much to discuss about this project – how to make it work. I have many opinions on this but I do not think it would be useful to try to capture this on paper. Perhaps we can sometime have an informal chance to exchange views on best implementation processes. I do hope the GPT will work on this project with great interest under Bill’s very capable guidance.

145. A more immediate issue is the need to ensure that we have more flagship products to work with. I was very concerned when I saw **communications brochures mentioning SIS and PALNet for example as flagship products. If this would be the case we are in big trouble!** They have potential, yes, but it would be very unwise indeed to regard them already as such products. The **Red List and PA Categories** are probably some of the only true flagship products we have, and perhaps some of the PA management plans.

146. The point is that we need to **first of all agree on when a product should be regarded and advertised as a flagship product – draw up a simple list of criteria so that we do not run off and again market something that does not exist.** Secondly, those that have potential – WCLN, SIS, PALNet, ECOLEX (probably at this stage more a flagship product than any of the others), ECIE (a regional effort – and these should not be overlooked) etc. **need to be brought together as a matter of urgency to determine synergies in technology,**

management approaches and content. For example PALNet and WCLN should be considered in these terms, and ECOLEX and ECIE. Do a **quick study first on what the possible synergies are, then get everyone together to explore these and get to know one another.** Explore the role of the Oracle grant for each, and the interoperability approaches. Put these in the context of the KM Strategy.

147. Then the IUCN leadership should **decide whether they are truly committed to these products** and if so, every effort should be made to ensure **their strategic and technically very capable development with IUCN leadership efforts at fundraising.**

148. These types of efforts demand **major inputs from IUCN.** That is why **their identification and then subsequent leadership commitment is crucial.** We cannot continue to let Commissions and others struggle out in the cold trying to make these big products work. These are **IUCN's true footprints and legacies, those things that can really make a difference in how IUCN's value as an organisation is perceived.** They should be **developed and marketed from the beginning in a very professional manner.**

149. I predict that the **next flagship product could be what flows from the Poverty and Conservation Leverage Initiative – IF it is managed from the beginning with this in mind,** and taking cognisance of the elements highlighted in this project, as well as in projects 15, 16, 18 and 20 in particular.

Change Management Project 20: CREATE VALUE-ADDING PRODUCTS AND SERVICES

150. This is a concept that has been promoted by people like Ger Bergkamp in WANI and it was also addressed in the **2004 Knowledge Products Study** that was part of the Commissions' Review. The idea is to ensure that a programme output is not just based on say one publication for a specific target audience, but that the information and knowledge generated through the programme or initiative, are **adapted for various purposes and audiences for maximum effect, both as products and as services** such as capacity building and providing specialised advice.

151. This again emphasises the **importance of synthesis** across programmes, say, to deliver new products. Also, **working with initiatives like WCLN from the start of planning of programmes** to determine the **potential for findings and analyses that can be turned into learning or on-line modules** that can be used to train professionals or next generations. It also emphasises the importance of **understanding target audiences and how knowledge can best be packaged** to satisfy particular types of people and purposes.

152. The **role of WCLN** has not been well described in the Strategy and is an area that needs strengthening depending on how CEC's work programme develops. WCLN and PALNet – these two should be linked or integrated - can be a great instrument through which to ensure that IUCN's knowledge is used in universities and training of new generations of professionals, but it is an ambitious project for volunteers. It could be useful to **add a project to the Strategy** that addresses this aspect in particular, but I did not want to do it yet. IUCN should be clearer and more focused on **what it wants to achieve in terms of capacity building** for the future before determining how it wishes to enter this arena with full force.

153. Another aspect of this project is **the creation of products and services that can generate another income stream for IUCN**. Products can be packaged and services rendered on a more commercial basis without sacrificing what IUCN stands for – this should not be seen as “anti” what IUCN stands for as long as these are products and services that add value to IUCN's mission and remain reasonable and demanded by audiences. Universities went through the same considerations years ago. Opportunities should be explored with sensitivity, realism and a good business sense. Clearly **products such as what SIS might be able to deliver** once it is better developed, have good potential. **Subscription to the WCLN content** is another method that can be considered, for example. **Courses can be presented** to generate a profit – some examples already exist. **Advisory and consultancy services** can be sold – and this is already happening through some of the Commissions – but of course this has to be handled in a very sensitive manner to prevent misuse of IUCN's name.

154. In the end this aspect requires **circumspection and thorough planning** based on IUCN's strategic vision for itself – but this aspect cannot continue to be neglected, especially not in view of IUCN's fairly serious financial position which has been continuing over decades.

155. This also implies that IUCN should be **far more sensitive and professional in the way in which it handles its intellectual property rights and contractual issues. Basic policies and guidelines** should be developed and managers trained to be far more adept at ensuring that IUCN is not exposed legally or in terms of losing its intellectual property. This should be monitored. In my opinion intellectual capital in IUCN still remains **seriously under-valued and legal and IPR neglect can cause IUCN serious harm.** The **Office of the Legal Advisor** should be brought far more intensely into thinking and determining how to ensure that **IUCN's knowledge is appropriately protected and nurtured from a legal perspective** (More detail on what needs to be done can be given to him in person if required).

Change Management Project 21: DEEPEN RELATIONSHIPS FOR EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION AND ENGAGEMENT WITH PARTNERS AND TARGET AUDIENCES

156. **Global Programme and Communications** will and should work on this aspect as it is critical to their understanding of how to communicate with their target audiences. However it is also important for the fundraisers from the perspective of **identification of potential partners for funding**. There are very interesting anecdotes about how we have been neglecting excellent potential or existing funders (not the central fundraising unit – at programme level), or have been loath to pursue new funding environments, or have approached good potential funders in a very unconvincing and even unprofessional manner. **A better understanding and working with relationships must move to be more in our consciousness.**

157. **Shell has a system** that can be considered for this purpose, but others can be investigated depending on exactly what we want to achieve. The relationship with Shell through ARO and now with Communications could provide good opportunities for collaboration in this regard.

158. Of course the project is about more **than a system that tracks partners and other forms of relationships**. We need to be more in control of who we collaborate with and why, and exactly how to **get the most benefits out of established relationships**. Understanding what we want out of a relationship tracking system, and how to best use it is only a first, but important step. **Communications in collaboration with Programme and Donor Relations** can develop a strategy that will help establish and manage the right relationships with the right partners in the right way, with effective communication and relationship development.

159. This is an area where **hoarding of information and knowledge** could be a problem and ways to overcome this could be a problem.

160. This project also links closely to and will inform project 22 – and many others as well. Relationships are also much wider than only Programme, and the **units in the other two directorates should also be included** in planning terms of their relationships for contracts etc. How the **Commissions** will fit into this picture still needs to be determined.

Change Management Project 22: FOCUS ON INFLUENCING STRATEGIES

161. This project is **extremely important for IUCN and is being driven by Elroy Bos, as far as I know in close collaboration with Programme**. I believe that the latter is very important – in fact Global Programme should be a strong driving force for this project. In spite of repeated requests to be engaged as I have significant experience in this field, I have never been invited to any of his planning meetings so I have no idea what exactly he is doing.

162. The intent of the project has been very well described in **Heather Creech's 2004 IISD Study**, and I recommend that you **read her section of the report** to ensure that you are informed of what it should achieve.

163. The only other comment I want to add at this stage is that Elroy should **truly engage with what the literature has found in terms of how influencing takes place – and expose others in IUCN to this information as well**. I have a particularly soft spot for **policy influencing** as I believe this is where the best contributions to change can be made. The **2004 Policy Review has found that IUCN is not doing as well** as its potential should allow. People like **Diane Stone and Carol Weiss** and others, and the recent work of **IDRC and ODI** on this topic should be well understood in order to ensure that we move forward based on cutting edge information.

Change Management Project 23: CREATE DEEP SOCIETAL AND GLOBAL CHANGE

164. This project has a longer term focus and **could be a later priority**. In the beginning **examples can be sought of this Societal Learning and Change approach in IUCN** – it is in fact noted as a partner in one of the case studies in the **2005 book that forms the basis for this approach** - by Steve Waddell: *Societal learning and change. How governments, business and civil society are creating solutions to complex multi-stakeholder problems. Sheffield: Greenleaf Publishing Ltd.*

165. The **concepts proposed in this book should not be underestimated**, and link to the whole notion of how to achieve real, deep societal change, as well as to third generation knowledge management which among others includes diverse sectoral stakeholders as soon as possible in learning from collaborative work. This book is available in the IUCN Library / my office for those interested, and I would like to promote very strongly that **the GPT determine to what extent they can agree that this is how IUCN should aim to proceed in more of its projects than are currently the case**. This is really for them to investigate and explore to see if it has potential for greater application in the IUCN context.

166. **Andy Alm of CEC** attended on my behalf the **Generative Dialogue Project** which I believe is an important one with which to continue to have contact, and one that might lead to an expansion of the SLC concept. It has been initiated by the GAN-Net people in conjunction with some others. He provided a report which can be found under the relevant folder – **Organisations – GDP** on my hard drive.

167. IUCN is also an ideal organisation to **take these concepts and develop them further as part of innovation in knowledge management** once the basic systems have been streamlined.