Project H

The interpretations of this item were based on the premise that the transfer of knowledge at project time can be composed of the following instruments: training, preparation of documentation, interviews, and mentoring.

The first analysis was performed comparing the results with the proposed model and then comparing the cases, i.e., compliance and coincidence of these cases to one another. Other aspects considered in this interpretation were relevant evidence and the cases’ most significant aspects. The trace model of knowledge transfer is based on the research of Nonaka&Takeuchi ([1997](http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1807-17752014000100105#B32), p. 68-69), Karhu ([2002](http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1807-17752014000100105#B20), p. 436), Fagan ([2001](http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1807-17752014000100105#B11), p. 5-26), Tsang ([2002](http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1807-17752014000100105#B47), p.835-854), Kamara et al, ([2002](http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1807-17752014000100105#B18), p. 205-211), [Landaeta (2008)](http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1807-17752014000100105" \l "B24), [Medina (2013)](http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1807-17752014000100105#B28), [Ferraresi (2012)](http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1807-17752014000100105" \l "B13), and [Galvis-Lista & Sánchez-Torres (2013)](http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1807-17752014000100105" \l "B15). In general, these authors address the process of form and tools for knowledge transfer. The evidence considered relevant to the surveyed projects, along with the items that were the most significant to those projects involved technologies that were new to the client companies at the time they were developed. In the case that follows, **d** and **e** represented projects that were innovative to the suppliers’ business customers. Companies where these projects were executed, given the “heavy reliance on technology” and development activities, are located in the strategic quadrant, according to  of . These projects were analyzed based on Blechar and involved changes in the installed and/or technical and/or application layer architecture technology environments. To different degrees, these changes represented a technological breakthrough for the companies involved.

The model of knowledge transfer was observed in all cases studying corporate customers and suppliers, although to various degrees and shapes. The following points were observed when considering the items analyzed, i.e., mapping, conversion forms, instruments of transfer, storage forms, modalities and level of knowledge transferred within the project:

1. The process of knowledge transfer must evolve if search results are compared with the proposed model, especially regarding the process of making knowledge explicit. All of the project managers that were surveyed reported that after the process of knowledge transfer, the most consistent form of knowledge was tacit. This suggests the fragility of the KM process. Although projects were documented in many cases, it was often recognized that the documentation was “just for the record.” The instrument of socialization is important, but only when it is used, the KM process becomes incomplete and businesses continue to rely solely on people to use and add to the knowledge gained.
2. Comparing the results—specifically, the model presented by —it is observed that there is one group considered as a source of knowledge and another targeted to receive new knowledge. Each of these groups has three components: people, paper and software. By comparing this model with the results of the studied cases, it is observed that the major focus is the component of people who includes only isolated examples of papers and software, as in the case of supplier B.
3. Another aspect that shows the need for a development environment for KM is one not been found in the cases studied (except for vendor B): that of a formal function administrator or an integrator of knowledge, as set forth in, p. 130-134) and Karhu, p. 430-446).
4. Evolution can also be analyzed starting from knowledge “built by the people” and progressing to knowledge “embedded in capital”, p. 20). Using this vision, it can be stated, based on all of the evidence, that the knowledge of the analyzed cases tends to merge into group knowledge “embedded in people” rather than the group’s “corporate capital” knowledge. This statement is also aligned with the statement of the item that includes KM, in which it is found that in all of the projects surveyed, the most consistent, existing, post-transfer knowledge is in the form of tacit knowledge.
5. In the cases studied, we also find that companies need to differentiate themselves by emphasizing certain PM processes in projects with innovative components versus those with known technology environments. This occurs to the extent that the project managers surveyed had a dual role, i.e., the mission to internalize new knowledge and the task of implementing the project itself, see Adherence to the model is proven to the extent that all project managers acknowledged the importance of knowledge transfer from suppliers in projects involving new technologies. There is also overlap between the processes used in knowledge transfer. However, the transfer processes used, in most cases, focus only on people using the method of socialization for converting knowledge. The evolution of the proposed model is mirrored in the process used by supplier B, which involves KM processes in its PM.