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**Module 8 Questions:**

**Q1:** In the context of enhancing use of knowledge from M&E, describe the key steps to developing M&E knowledge products. (10 mrks) ,

knowledge is the utilization of information, combined with the potential of people’s skills, technical competencies, insights, thoughts, commitment and motivations. Knowledge management, on the other hand, is the assembly of the processes that govern the creation, dissemination, and utilization of information.

Knowledge management can also be referred to as the management of ‘intellectual assets’ that highlights unique resources and sources, as well as critical roles and possible challenges which hinder knowledge flow to the end user. Knowledge management is about managing the processes of developing, preserving, using, and sharing knowledge to add value to the organization.

Currently, many public entities in the public sphere are dedicating resources to knowledge management efforts. Organizations want to leverage knowledge to advance their business strategies.

Knowledge management efforts normally focus on organizational objectives such as improving performance, creating a competitive advantage, innovations, sharing of lessons learned, integration and continuous improvement. Knowledge management is also an enabler of organizational learning in that it facilitates learning through the practical use of the knowledge.

Organizational learning, on the other hand, takes place when an organization uses the knowledge generated to improve performance and create a competitive advantage in the market.

Knowledge is also important to initiate new innovations, share lessons learned with its key stakeholders, undertake integration and continuous improvement efforts. In simple terms, learning is about the organization making use of the knowledge generated to improve and perform better.

On this front, the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) field has recently become a key contributor to knowledge management and organization learning. Information generated from M&E processes is instrumental in creating knowledge that enhances organizational learning.

Monitoring and evaluation can only play a significant role if measures to enhance organizational learning are put in place.

Organization learning can only be enhanced when there is regular exchange of information, reporting, use of the knowledge generated, learning sessions and the information from M&E processes is fed back into the learning process for improvement.

Organizations need to focus on learning from M&E processes to make a meaningful contribution to the achievement of results, accountability and innovation for better results and impact from their work.

The two most direct ways of using knowledge gained from M&E processes is to inform on-going and future planning and programmes development, as well as scaling up or replication of programmes.

It is important that lessons learnt through M&E processes are shared among key stakeholders so that they are incorporate or replicate into new programmes and projects when they are being developed.

This way, organizational knowledge will help promote organizational learning. This occurs when learning is incorporated into planning and development of new programmes and projects or other organizational development processes.

Finally, the use of knowledge (learning) is as important as the generation of knowledge. Therefore, a good M&E system ensures that knowledge and information are generated and disseminated to the right audience.

M&E is of little value if it does not lead to improvements in agencies’ work to reduce risk. M&E reports are potentially very useful documents. They enable practical lessons to be learned and applied within and across programmes and regions. They feed into strategic planning by providing a basis for discussion about better practice and policy change. They also contribute to institutional memory, which is important in organizations that suffer from rapid staff turnover. Good-quality presentation is essential here: no matter how good the evidence and analysis they contain, reports will not inform and influence if they are not well written and presented.

Evaluation should be embedded within an organization’s systems and regular practice to ensure that learning takes place. Many agencies are poor at absorbing the lessons from evaluations, with the result that the same problems recur. Too often, the review or evaluation report is filed away to be acted upon later, but then forgotten amidst the pressure of work. Many organizations have poor information storage and retrieval systems, making it very difficult to find documents, and feedback mechanisms are weak. Few staff have enough time to reflect on the lessons from individual projects, and fewer still are able to consider what can be learnt from several projects and countries. Overwork and pressures of work, which are common among staff in DRR agencies, prevent clear thinking and innovation. Knowledge management and learning systems need to be given higher priority and more resources in most organizations. Plans for sharing and using results and findings, in the field and across the organization, should be built into the evaluation process from the start. These should be based on consultations with potential users of the evaluations.

Transparency in M&E is a key element in making operational agencies more accountable. Evaluation processes should be as open as possible, and their results should be made widely available, particularly to project stakeholders (who should also be consulted before reports are submitted, for clarification and confirmation). However, there is still much to be done here. The widespread failure to share and publish DRR evaluations means that practitioners are unable to learn lessons from each other and so are frequently reinventing the wheel. It also runs counter to the principle of accountability that agencies claim to follow. There is a reluctance to document mistakes and share their lessons. In some cases, joint reviews by agencies could be carried out to encourage mutual learning, knowledge sharing and transparency. Participatory M&E creates a sense of ‘ownership’ of the final product among stakeholders, which greatly increases the likelihood that lessons will be noted and acted upon.

**Q2:** Describe 5 keyways by which M&E knowledge may be shared with critical stakeholders. (10 mrks)

Who are the Monitoring and Evaluation Stakeholders? All the groups that have a role and an interest in the objectives and implementation of development activities are the stakeholders in the monitoring and evaluation process. The key stakeholders are: target groups or those sectors of the population targeted to benefit ultimately from the results of programmes and projects; direct beneficiaries, usually institutions and/or individuals who are the direct recipients of technical cooperation aimed at strengthening their capacity to undertake development tasks that are directed at specific target groups; those who are responsible for ensuring that the results are produced as planned: programme managers and staff of the Government (under the national execution modality) or of the United Nations executing agencies; those who are accountable for the resources that they provide to the programmes and projects: national policy-makers and budget authorities, UNDP, donors and other development partners. Several associated parties could also be added to the list: external consultants, suppliers and other persons or organizations providing inputs to the programmes or projects; and other institutions (private-sector entities, CSOs) in the programme or project environment that may also be affected by or interested in the results of the programmes or projects. Why Should Stakeholders Be Involved in Monitoring and Evaluation? The involvement of stakeholders in appropriate monitoring actions and evaluation exercises furthers the objective of promoting participatory development. Stakeholders have the right and the responsibility to know what is happening in the programme or project, which aspects need corrective action, what the results are, and which lessons can be learned and shared with one another, but they should not simply be recipients of monitoring and evaluation reports. One effective way for stakeholders to contribute to the achievement of programme or project objectives is to be directly involved in the monitoring and evaluation process - in the formulation of critical questions and in the collection and analysis of data. This enables them to participate directly in the assessment of the relevance, performance and success of the programme or project and in recommending how to improve the quality of current and future interventions.

How Do You Involve Stakeholders in Monitoring and Evaluation? The first step is to identify the key stakeholders who in some significant way are affected by, or involved in, the programme or project during its lifetime and beyond. The second is to provide for mechanisms that will allow stakeholders to interact with each other in a meaningful way not only in monitoring and evaluation but earlier, starting at the pre-formulation stage and continuing during formulation and implementation. For instance, the active participation of stakeholders in the selection of indicators is emphasized (see chapter 12). Field visits and stakeholder meetings are monitoring actions that are aimed at actively involving stakeholders (see chapter nine). Participatory evaluation, as a methodology, allows stakeholders to be the question-makers and not simply the objects or targets of evaluations. Participatory Evaluation Participatory evaluation is an evaluation approach or methodology that has evolved from such earlier approaches and schools of thought as participatory action research, rapid rural appraisal (RRA) and participatory learning and action (PLA), farming systems research, self-evaluation and beneficiary assessment. Its main characteristics are presented in box 9. BOX 9. PARTICIPATORY EVALUATION

Purpose/Function To help to build the capacity of stakeholders to reflect, analyze and act To contribute to the development and feedback of lessons learned that can lead to corrective actions To help to ensure accountability to stakeholders Selection Criteria/Timing Projects or programmes that have a clearly identified group of end-users and beneficiaries Timing: usually mid-term but also towards or at the end; ex-post, too, but since not all stakeholders may be involved after project completion, the level of participation may vary con-side ably Focus Relevance, performance and success, specific elements of which depend on the timing and scope of the evaluation

The process itself, to involve stakeholders actively and directly in the evaluation

Agents/Participants Project or programme stakeholders, Participatory evaluation facilitator acting as a catalyst or stimulator, managing but not directing the evaluation Outputs Depend on the scope and timing of the evaluation

Generally, these should include stakeholder views as reflected in the analysis of issues and in recommendations to resolve them

Some of the commonly used knowledge dissemination mechanisms in M&E include the use of reports - printed and soft copies - shared on Internet sites; or through e-mails, meetings, Sharing

* 95. Knowledge is shared internally among ADB staff and externally with DMC clients and other stakeholders by way of the following modes:
* dissemination through publications, web, external relations, and networking;
* (ii) discussions such as through CoPs and various other forums (both real and virtual) including seminars, workshops, and meetings with clients and other development partners; and
* (iii) learning and mentoring. Knowledge sharing includes unilateral (e.g., dissemination), bilateral (e.g., meetings with clients), and multilateral approaches (e.g., South-South dialogue).

* 96. ADB recognizes that knowledge sharing is important, as it is in this stage that knowledge is refined and enriched. Since the adoption of the KM framework and the establishment of the KM Center in 2004, ADB has undertaken several key initiatives to build a supportive organizational culture, enhance ADB staff’s knowledge exchange through CoPs, and expand knowledge dissemination to and sharing with external stakeholders. These include
* (i) adoption of the Public Communications Policy to guide ADB dissemination of knowledge and information;
* (ii) establishment of CoPs to help generate and share knowledge within ADB;
* (iii) formation of regional knowledge hubs to disseminate knowledge in DMCs in key areas of operational relevance;
* (iv) significant investments in IT and related infrastructure including the installation of C-Cube, a KM tool that enables staff to share and disseminate information and knowledge as well as secure knowledge sharing with external stakeholders;
* (v) conduct of numerous eminent speakers’ forums, training courses, and brown-bag seminars;
* (vi) exploring ways to better disseminate ADB’s knowledge products;
* (vii) formulation of operational plans in 2009 including operational plans for knowledge sharing; and
* (viii) establishment of the Knowledge Sharing Program and more recently, the KSSC, to mainstream and scale up knowledge sharing—through KPS—as a distinct ADB business line to address capacity gaps in DMCs (Appendix 13, Table A13.1 for key knowledge sharing initiatives in 2004– 2011).

* 97. Well-functioning CoPs are central to enriching and sharing knowledge within ADB such that staff’s participation is encouraged and recognized. The CoPs aimed to reward those who generate and share useful knowledge and engage in partnerships and enhance their contributions to ADB. During the KMAP 2009–2011 implementation (Appendix 13, Table A13.2), the value of CoPs was generally enhanced. They produced many KPS and conducted an increasing number of knowledges sharing events (Appendix 9, Table A9.4). In the past 2.5 years, a total of 418 sector/thematic seminars and events were hosted by the CoPs, of which a relatively greater number were on environment (25%), finance (14%), water (11%), and education (11%) (Appendix 13, Table A13.3). To some extent, CoPs have been transferring tacit knowledge among ADB staff and partners. Discussions of projects and business plans within the CoP context is a good illustration of how tacit knowledge can be socially constructed, through an informal process allowing staff to gain a broader perspective and understanding of various projects and good practices. CoPs provide strategic directions for ADB's sector/thematic operations and advice on staff competencies, skills mix distribution, and innovative initiatives; and host brown bag seminars and other information exchanges for example on various energy sector issues. As good practice, a CoP assumes that a staff member, after years of experience, has developed a wealth of expertise at his/her fingertips, e.g., in the form of strategic outlook, extensive networks, privileged contacts in the field, tactical information on project implementation, and so on. With
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membership from the regional departments, CoPs are thus a relevant and efficient platform to capture and disseminate such tacit knowledge throughout the network.

* 98. Much tacit knowledge at ADB is not shared for many reasons. First, the existing corporate systems put in place for capturing knowledge do not allow harnessing the value of tacit experience at ADB. In addition, no matter how well they are designed, such existing systems, databases, or registries cannot fully capture tacit knowledge, a great part of it being socially and informally constructed. Second, tacit knowledge is mostly unshared because there are few staff incentives to share it (and make it explicit); it stays an advantage for some staff, and people do not find reasons to give away such advantage unless incentivized to do so. Third, and more commonly, staff are unaware of the tacit dimensions of their own knowledge and thus unable to share and codify it. In summary, much of the richness of ADB derived from the tacit dimensions of the knowledge is not captured and too often remains possessed by specific groups. Harnessing this knowledge can provide a valuable comparative advantage to ADB. That is why this SES recommends developing an approach for searching, exploring, and selecting such tacit knowledge, with a goal to codify it to the extent possible and share it with the larger community.
* 102. ADB’s annual flagship publications draw the most efforts in media outreach and launch activities. For example, the 2011 Asian Development Outlook (ADO, ADB’s flagship economic report), which focused on the growing importance of South–South economic links, was covered in more than 650 news articles and news analyses when it was released in April. The popularity of the ADO is confirmed by the results of the DMC perceptions survey, wherein most of the respondent government officials (22 of 25) claimed that they were familiar with this publication, and three of them cited having read it within the past year. Other publications that relatively more of the DMC respondents are at least “somewhat familiar with” are
* ADB Annual Report (24 of 25),
* (ii) ETSW reports (23 of 24), and
* (iii) periodic reports such as the Asia Economic Monitor and Country Economic Bulletin (21of 22
* 104. Perceptions of ADB staff and DMC clients about knowledge sharing. The timeliness of production and sharing of ADB’s KPS is key to their usefulness. Many of the ADB staff survey respondents (48%) and DMC government officials (60%) agree/strongly agree with the statement that ADB’s KPS are produced and shared with country stakeholders in a timely manner (Table A8.1, Appendix 8, and Table A10.1, Appendix 10, respectively). A major stumbling block to the generation and sharing of knowledge cited by at least 30% of ADB staff is lack of time to share due to regular work demands. It was also acknowledged that, given the lead time required to develop knowledge products, timely dissemination and sharing might really be difficult. Notwithstanding the obstacles in knowledge generation and sharing, the majority of ADB staff (68%) and DMC survey respondents (60%) perceived as enough or somewhat sufficient the attention and effort given by ADB in sharing knowledge. Moreover, CoPs were seen by the majority of the ADB staff (73%) as well as DMC government officials (71%) as contributing significantly to knowledge sharing (Appendix 8, Table A8.6 and Appendix 10, para 16, respectively). Suggestions to improve dissemination and sharing of ADB’s knowledge products raised by ADB staff in the perceptions survey include better coordination and organization of all dissemination initiatives, improved publications program, use of modern communication and IT systems, and getting staff to be more involved in the process through the conduct of various knowledge forums. A DMC official meanwhile opined that, while ADB generates knowledge products that are of good quality, it needs to create a platform for more open discussion with government officials and the community.

* 105. Knowledge sharing results were mixed, with substantial increases in KPS downloads, web hits, and publication sales, but indications are that most activities are for disseminating KPS rather than for proactively sharing them. Moreover, there seems to be insufficient sharing of tacit knowledge, including knowledge embedded in ADB’s operations. Looking forward, the increasing shift to mobile devices and hand-held readers (such as tablets and similar devices) means that ADB will have to adapt its publications dissemination practices beyond just providing the PDF format so that they can be easily downloaded and used by mobile devices. Use
* 106. KPS and knowledge solutions are used both internally and externally by a wide range of knowledge stakeholders. Internally, the main stakeholders are operations department staff, especially regional department staff, but almost every department makes use in some way or other of KPS. Externally, the main stakeholders include DMC clients, development partners, academia, NGOs, the private sector, think tanks, and the media.

* 107. Given the number of different stakeholders and the wide range of KPS offered by ADB, determining the extent to which ADB’s KPS and knowledge solutions have been used and especially how they have been applied to solving development challenges is not straightforward. ADB does not have a system of tracking the use of its KPS. In this assessment we have used a combination of case studies assessment, perception surveys, and key informant interviews. Therefore, it is a broad assessment of KPS utilization.

* 115. More than half of ADB staff (at least 57%) were able to access and use knowledge efficiently to meet client needs and felt that ADB’s KPS improved the quality of its operations and in promoting development effectiveness (Table A8.7, Appendix 8). At least 10% expressed disagreement, and a few raised issues including: (i) difficulty in accessing stored knowledge, (ii) cumbersome systems, and (iii) very weak link between knowledge generation and operations. Meanwhile, close to half (47%) of respondents agreed that overall ADB produces and disseminates knowledge in ways that have immediate impact and catalytic force, while 21% disagreed. A respondent remarked that in general communications in ADB, including the dissemination of knowledge, are not targeted to their key audiences and are not directed at changing behavior.

**workshops, and conferences.**

The media too has also emerged as a powerful partner in sharing organizational knowledge, including results, findings, recommendations and lessons learnt. The media plays a critical role in disseminating knowledge and ensuring access to key information on development. That why it is essential all sectors of the create partnerships with the media to increase access to and use of organizational knowledge and learning in public entities.

knowledge is the utilization of information, combined with the potential of people’s skills, technical competencies, insights, thoughts, commitment and motivations. Knowledge management, on the other hand, is the assembly of the processes that govern the creation, dissemination, and utilization of information.

Simply put, knowledge is the utilization of information, combined with the potential of people’s skills, technical competencies, insights, thoughts, commitment and motivations. Knowledge management, on the other hand, is the assembly of the processes that govern the creation, dissemination, and utilization of information.

Knowledge management can also be referred to as the management of ‘intellectual assets’ that highlights unique resources and sources, as well as critical roles and possible challenges which hinder knowledge flow to the end user. Knowledge management is about managing the processes of developing, preserving, using, and sharing knowledge to add value to the organization.

Currently, many public entities in the public sphere are dedicating resources to knowledge management efforts. Organizations want to leverage knowledge to advance their business strategies.

Knowledge management efforts normally focus on organizational objectives such as improving performance, creating a competitive advantage, innovations, sharing of lessons learned, integration and continuous improvement. Knowledge management is also an enabler of organizational learning in that it facilitates learning through the practical use of the knowledge.

Organizational learning, on the other hand, takes place when an organization uses the knowledge generated to improve performance and create a competitive advantage in the market.

Knowledge is also important to initiate new innovations, share lessons learned with its key stakeholders, undertake integration and continuous improvement efforts. In simple terms, learning is about the organization making use of the knowledge generated to improve and perform better.

On this front, the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) field has recently become a key contributor to knowledge management and organization learning. Information generated from M&E processes is instrumental in creating knowledge that enhances organizational learning.

Monitoring and evaluation can only play a significant role if measures to enhance organizational learning are put in place.

Organization learning can only be enhanced when there is regular exchange of information, reporting, use of the knowledge generated, learning sessions and the information from M&E processes is fed back into the learning process for improvement.

Organizations need to focus on learning from M&E processes to make a meaningful contribution to the achievement of results, accountability and innovation for better results and impact from their work.

The two most direct ways of using knowledge gained from M&E processes is to inform on-going and future planning and programmes development, as well as scaling up or replication of programmes.

It is important that lessons learnt through M&E processes are shared among key stakeholders so that they are incorporate or replicate into new programmes and projects when they are being developed.

This way, organizational knowledge will help promote organizational learning. This occurs when learning is incorporated into planning and development of new programmes and projects or other organizational development processes.

Finally, the use of knowledge (learning) is as important as the generation of knowledge. Therefore, a good M&E system ensures that knowledge and information are generated and disseminated to the right audience.

M&E is of little value if it does not lead to improvements in agencies’ work to reduce risk. M&E reports are potentially very useful documents. They enable practical lessons to be learned and applied within and across programmes and regions. They feed into strategic planning by providing a basis for discussion about better practice and policy change. They also contribute to institutional memory, which is important in organizations that suffer from rapid staff turnover. Good-quality presentation is essential here: no matter how good the evidence and analysis they contain, reports will not inform and influence if they are not well written and presented.

Evaluation should be embedded within an organization’s systems and regular practice to ensure that learning takes place. Many agencies are poor at absorbing the lessons from evaluations, with the result that the same problems recur. Too often, the review or evaluation report is filed away to be acted upon later, but then forgotten amidst the pressure of work. Many organizations have poor information storage and retrieval systems, making it very difficult to find documents, and feedback mechanisms are weak. Few staff have enough time to reflect on the lessons from individual projects, and fewer still can consider what can be learnt from several projects and countries. Overwork and pressures of work, which are common among staff in DRR agencies, prevent clear thinking and innovation. Knowledge management and learning systems need to be given higher priority and more resources in most organizations. Plans for sharing and using results and findings, in the field and across the organization, should be built into the evaluation process from the start. These should be based on consultations with potential users of the evaluations.

Transparency in M&E is a key element in making operational agencies more accountable. Evaluation processes should be as open as possible, and their results should be made widely available, particularly to project stakeholders (who should also be consulted before reports are submitted, for clarification and confirmation). However, there is still much to be done here. The widespread failure to share and publish DRR evaluations means that practitioners are unable to learn lessons from each other and so are frequently reinventing the wheel. It also runs counter to the principle of accountability that agencies claim to follow. There is a reluctance to document mistakes and share their lessons. In some cases, joint reviews by agencies could be carried out to encourage mutual learning, knowledge sharing and transparency. Participatory M&E creates a sense of ‘ownership’ of the final product among stakeholders, which greatly increases the likelihood that lessons will be noted and acted upon.
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