



December 2006

Assessment of ADB's Knowledge Management Implementation Framework

This report was prepared by consultants for the Asian Development Bank. The views expressed in this report are the views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Asian Development Bank (ADB), or its Board of Governors, or the governments they represent. ADB does not guarantee the accuracy of the data included in this paper and accepts no responsibility for any consequence of the

Asian Development Bank

Asian Development Bank

Assessment of ADB's Knowledge Management Implementation Framework

**Contract No. A10893
RSC-C60843 (UKG)**

Objective/Purpose of the Assignment

To determine ADB staff perceptions on the ADB Knowledge Management (KM) implementation process. The findings will be compared against 2005 results of the electronic survey and the eight recognized Most Admired Knowledge Enterprises (MAKE) knowledge performance dimensions to determine KM trends in ADB.

Scope of Work

To analyze an electronic survey of ADB staff perceptions on KM.

Detailed Tasks

1. Review the revised MAKE survey instrument for use.
2. Analyze data.
3. Compare data findings against the 2005 results and eight recognized MAKE knowledge performance dimensions.

Output/Reporting Requirements

Report on KM Trends in ADB.

Teleos

5 St. Julian's Avenue, Ludlow, Shropshire, United Kingdom

Tel/Fax: +44 1584 878576

E-mail: teleos@mac.com

Website: <http://knowledgebusiness.com>

1. Background

In May 2005, Teleos conducted the first in a planned series of electronic surveys of selected ADB staff to determine their perceptions regarding the ADB Knowledge Management (KM) implementation process. The findings were benchmarked against the eight recognized MAKE (Most Admired Knowledge Enterprises) knowledge performance dimensions to determine 'high-level' Knowledge Management trends at the ADB.

The Enterprise MAKE Assessment is a diagnostic tool for rapidly assessing the commitment and maturity of the Asian Development Bank's knowledge strategy. It is based on the MAKE framework consisting of eight knowledge performance dimensions (see Section 2: Enterprise Assessment Tool).

A major benefit of this diagnostic tool is that through an independent, third-party study, the Asian Development Bank can benchmark how successful its knowledge strategy is when compared across internal departments and against the world's leading knowledge-driven enterprises. A series of Enterprise MAKE Assessments will allow the ADB to monitor the progress of implementing its knowledge strategy over time.

The second electronic survey was conducted in July-August 2006. This Report compares the 2006 data findings against the 2005 results and highlights KM trends in ADB.

2. Enterprise Assessment Tool

Teleos has created a customized Enterprise MAKE Assessment tool for use by ADB staff. The Knowledge Management Center (KM Center) and KM Coordinators, in consultation with Teleos, re-formulated the questions to "ADB language/customs" for the second electronic survey in order to increase the response rate and detail of responses. Each participant was asked in absolute confidence to rate the Asian Development Bank's knowledge capabilities on a scale of 1 (poor) to 10 (excellent) against the eight MAKE knowledge performance criteria listed below.

D1. Ability to create and sustain an enterprise knowledge-driven culture.

In the 2006 electronic survey the question to ADB staff was re-formatted to read: "Does your department embrace a knowledge-driven culture, such as regular meetings, informal meetings, sharing relevant documents of staff meetings among other departments, etc.?"

Teleos

5 St. Julian's Avenue, Ludlow, Shropshire, United Kingdom

Tel/Fax: +44 1584 878576

E-mail: teleos@mac.com

Website: <http://knowledgebusiness.com>

D2. Ability to develop knowledge workers through senior management leadership.

In the 2006 electronic survey the question to ADB staff was re-formatted to read: "Does your management address knowledge management as a priority; incorporates KM as an activity in PDP?"

D3. Ability to develop and deliver knowledge-based projects/services.

In the 2006 electronic survey the question to ADB staff was re-formatted to read: "What is your view of ADB KPS outputs (publications, newsletters) in terms of value added, accessibility, relevant, quality, etc.?"

D4. Ability to manage and maximize the value of enterprise intellectual capital.

In the 2006 electronic survey the question to ADB staff was re-formatted to read: "How effective is ADB in developing staff intellectual growth?"

D5. Ability to create and sustain an enterprise-wide collaborative knowledge-sharing environment.

In the 2006 electronic survey the question to ADB staff was re-formatted to read: "Do you think that your knowledge contributions are being valued?"

D6. Ability to create and sustain a learning organization.

In the 2006 electronic survey the question to ADB staff was re-formatted to read: "How successful is ADB in developing and sustaining a learning and sharing culture?"

D7. Ability to manage client knowledge to create value and enterprise intellectual capital.

In the 2006 electronic survey the question to ADB staff was re-formatted to read: "How successful is ADB in working with external stakeholders in knowledge sharing activities? This does include DMCs and external networks."

D8. Ability to transform ADB knowledge to reduce poverty and improve clients' standard of living.

In the 2006 electronic survey the question to ADB staff was re-formatted to read: "How successful is ADB in applying lessons and experiences from operations and sharing them within ADB and with external stakeholders?"

Teleos

5 St. Julian's Avenue, Ludlow, Shropshire, United Kingdom

Tel/Fax: +44 1584 878576

E-mail: teleos@mac.com

Website: <http://knowledgebusiness.com>

As noted above, the question set for the 2006 electronic survey was re-formulated by the KM Center in consultation with the KM Coordinators to gain more accurate responses from the participants. However, by changing the question set an additional degree of uncertainty (statistical error) has been introduced. This additional degree of uncertainty may have affected some of the data analysis comparisons between the 2005 and 2006 surveys. They will be discussed in the Data Analysis section.

3. Data Collection

On July 24, 2006, the 2006 KM Survey was released to the ADB KM Coordinators. At the same time, the 2006 e-survey was announced in *ADB Today* and ADB staff were encouraged to participate. The stated goal was a 50% participation rate from each department/office. The first 3 KM Coordinators to meet this goal received a KM prize.

The 2006 e-survey was made available to participants on the ADB's intranet. The 2005 e-survey was conducted using Teleos' secure Web site. For the 2006 KM Survey, the KM Center and Teleos agreed to use ADB's intranet to encourage greater participation based on familiarity of the ADB intranet and assurance of security and confidentiality.

A total of 86 responses were received by mid-August 2006. The KM Center then sent out reminders to encourage additional responses. By the end of the survey period (August 31, 2006), a total of 127 ADB staff had completed the 2006 KM Survey. This resulted in 125 useable surveys.

For comparison, in the 2005 KM Survey, 189 ADB staff (senior to junior staff) were selected to participate in the survey. The selected staff represented a cross-section of National Officers, Professional Staff (KM Coordinators), KMAPPS Champions/Coordinators, and Other Professional Staff.

The data collection for the 2005 KM Survey was begun on May 23, 2005. Due to an initial low response rate (19 completed forms – 10%), on May 27, 2005, the survey was extended to other ADB staff via a notice in the *ADB Today*. This announcement was listed as a major article in *ADB Today* and repeated for two more days. On June 10, 2005, the RSDD Knowledge Management Center approached the original 189 stakeholders again requesting that they complete the electronic survey instrument. The data collection closed on June 22, 2005. A total of 66 completed and useable forms were received.

The response rate for the 2006 KM Survey was nearly twice that as the 2005 KM Survey

Teleos
5 St. Julian's Avenue, Ludlow, Shropshire, United Kingdom
Tel/Fax: +44 1584 878576
E-mail: teleos@mac.com
Website: <http://knowledgebusiness.com>

(125 responses compared to 66 responses –189%). This is a very encouraging indicator that ADB staff are more aware of the KM implementation process and that it is having a greater effect on individual staff members. The larger number of responses also has had the benefit of providing a more statistically valid set of data.

4. Data Analysis

4.1 Data Analysis of All ADB Staff

A total of 125 useable 2006 KM Survey forms were received. A total of 22 completed forms (17.6%) were received without name. In the 2005 KM Survey, 20 completed forms (30.3%) were received without name. This significant decline in anonymous responses is a positive development since it indicates that the ADB staff is more comfortable with the security and confidentiality provisions of the 2006 e-survey.

However, it should be noted that in Teleos' experience the number of anonymous completed forms is still slightly above average (a figure of 10% is usually expected). It would indicate that there is still some skepticism within the ADB about surveys. This could perhaps be due to a lack of 'trust,' e.g., "if I put my name on the form, then I could be 'punished' for my views" (possibility affecting pay increases and/or promotion prospects). There also could be a perception among participants that even if they spend the time to complete the form, they will not receive feedback and/or management will do nothing about the finding results.

In a few cases respondents did not supply either their job function or department. Although these responses were included in the overall ADB staff analysis, they were not included in the analysis by function/department.

Table 1 compares the results of the 2005 and 2006 KM Surveys for all of the participating ADB staff.

The comparison of results for the 2005 and 2006 KM Surveys must be put into context. The number of participants in the 2005 KM Survey was 50% smaller. Also, the proportion of KM Coordinators and KMAPPs Champions/Coordinators (individuals familiar with or involved with KM) was much higher. Statistically, this could have slightly inflated a favorable perception of the ADB's KM implementation process in the 2005 e-survey.

As noted above, the question set in the 2006 KM Survey was slightly modified to accommodate the ADB's "language/customs." This could also possibly affect the average scores.

Teleos

5 St. Julian's Avenue, Ludlow, Shropshire, United Kingdom

Tel/Fax: +44 1584 878576

E-mail: teleos@mac.com

Website: <http://knowledgebusiness.com>

Analysis of All ADB Staff

Survey	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
2006	6.14	5.34	6.05	4.70	5.74	5.02	5.34	5.19	43.52
2005	4.80	6.24	5.38	4.47	4.42	4.88	4.50	4.85	39.54

Table 1: Comparison of the average of all ADB staff responses for the 2005 and 2006 KM surveys for the eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions.

Finally, the Teleos Enterprise MAKE Assessment is based on the Delphi methodology. To minimize statistical variations, it is critical that the group of participants change very little over time. Within the ADB there is moderate staff movement – individuals joining/leaving the organization, as well as individuals changing departments and/or job functions.

These noted factors all contribute to statistical variability. In the case of the 2006 KM Study, Teleos estimates that the statistical error is ± 0.27 for each of the MAKE knowledge performance dimensional averages.

It is clear from the Total Score of the 2006 KM Survey that the ADB’s KM implementation process is having a positive affect on staff and operational performance. When comparing the Total Scores in Table 1, the ADB staff in the 2006 KM Survey ranked the organization 10% higher as a ‘raw’ number. When statistical variation is removed, the year-on-year increase is approximately 5%. This overall increase is typical of an organization in its second or third year of KM implementation and of ADB’s size and complexity.

The KM leadership knowledge performance dimension (Dimension 2) is the only category which the 2006 ADB respondents ranked lower. In the 2006 electronic survey the question to ADB staff read: “Does your management address knowledge management as a priority; incorporates KM as an activity in PDP?”

Teleos

5 St. Julian’s Avenue, Ludlow, Shropshire, United Kingdom

Tel/Fax: +44 1584 878576

E-mail: teleos@mac.com

Website: <http://knowledgebusiness.com>

The most likely explanation for the decline in the average score for this performance dimension is that the expectations of the ADB staff have exceeded reality. In other words, ADB senior executives have 'promised' significant improvements in management's commitment to KM, but in the view of ADB staff this has not been matched by observable actions. This does not mean that there have not been improvements in knowledge leadership, but it indicates that ADB officials have not 'managed' the expectations of the staff. Teleos research shows that this is a very common problem – individual expectations outpace organizational reality.

It is critical that ADB managers deal with this perceived problem quickly in order to avoid 'disillusionment' among staff. ADB managers should demonstrate by their actions that they support the KM implementation process. They should also attempt to reduce unrealistic expectations of ADB staff by clearly informing staff of any 'limits' to a KM initiative and/or the anticipated initiative outputs. Although setting KM stretch goals is an important management tool, without staff understanding how and why KM can positively benefit themselves and the organization, situations could emerge where staff become so 'disillusioned' that they reject the entire KM implementation process.

On a positive note, the average scores for creating a knowledge-driven organizational culture (Dimension 1) and an environment for enterprise-wide collaboration (Dimension 5) have increased significantly. These improved scores reflect a significant improvement within ADB and provides a solid foundation in which to set targets for the improvement of the other knowledge performance dimensions.

4.2 Data Analysis of ADB Staff by Function

The 121 ADB staff who provided job function details were:

- National Officers (17)
- Professional Staff (69)
- Administrative Staff (35)

Tables 2-4 show the ADB responses by job function and compare them with results from the 2005 KM Study.

The average overall score for the ADB staff participating in this Enterprise Assessment was 43.52. The average score for the three functions were: National Officers (45.87), Professional Staff (37.80), and Administrative Staff (53.94).

Teleos
5 St. Julian's Avenue, Ludlow, Shropshire, United Kingdom
Tel/Fax: +44 1584 878576
E-mail: teleos@mac.com
Website: <http://knowledgebusiness.com>

As can be readily seen, National Officers' perceptions of ADB's KM implementation process are 'realistic'; Professional Staff continue to be 'skeptical' of the benefits of KM; and ADB Administrative Staff are 'enthusiastic' about the benefits of KM with regards to their jobs and the organization. These observations will be analyzed in greater detail in the following sections.

National Officers

Table 2 compares the National Officers' responses for the eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions in the 2005 and 2006 KM Studies.

Analysis of National Officers' Response									
Year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
2006	6.41	5.82	5.94	4.82	6.29	5.41	5.71	5.47	45.87
2005	6.29	8.43	6.43	6.14	6.29	5.71	6.00	6.29	51.57

Table 2: Analysis of National Officers' responses for the eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions.

The National Officers' overall score declined by 5.70 points between the 2005 and 2006 KM Surveys. In this year's electronic study, the National Officers' overall score is only 2.35 points higher (5.4%) than the All ADB Staff average. In the 2005 KM Study, the National Officers' overall score was 12.03 points higher (30.4%) than the All ADB Staff average.

An analysis of the data reveals that National Officers are in general supportive of ADB's KM implementation process and are working to ensure the success of KM initiatives. However, 12 months on into the KM implementation process the National Officers' expectations have become more realistic. They are beginning to understand that a successful ADB KM implementation process will take a number of years to yield substantial positive benefits for the organization. It will also require constant managerial attention and support.

Teleos

5 St. Julian's Avenue, Ludlow, Shropshire, United Kingdom

Tel/Fax: +44 1584 878576

E-mail: teleos@mac.com

Website: <http://knowledgebusiness.com>

This new 'realistic' view is most apparent in Dimension 2 ("Does your management address knowledge management as a priority; incorporates KM as an activity in PDP?") and Dimension 4 ("How effective is ADB in developing staff intellectual growth?"). These are the two knowledge performance dimensions where National Officers must take a lead in order to ensure the success of ADB's KM implementation process.

It should be pointed out that National Officers in some departments (including DER, OED and RSDD) are very supportive of the KM implementation process and should be viewed as role models within ADB.

Professional Staff

Table 3 compares the Professional Staff's responses for the eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions in the 2005 and 2006 KM Studies.

Analysis of Professional Staff's Response									
Year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
2006	5.57	4.80	5.46	3.80	5.16	4.14	4.52	4.35	37.80
2005	4.13	5.00	5.67	4.12	4.14	4.27	3.87	3.86	35.06

Table 3: Analysis of Professional Staff's responses for the eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions.

The Professional Staff's overall score has increased by 2.74 points between the 2005 and 2006 KM Surveys, which statistically represents no change in perceptions. In this year's electronic study, the Professional Staff's overall score is 5.72 points lower (-13.1%) than the All ADB Staff average. In the 2005 KM Study, the Professional Staff's overall score was 4.48 points lower (11.3%) than the All ADB Staff average.

An analysis of the data reveals that Professional Staff continue to be skeptical of ADB's KM implementation process. They apparently are taking a "wait and see" attitude when it comes to ensuring the success of KM initiatives. This view is typical of key knowledge workers in the early stages of KM implementation. The Professional Staff includes many

Teleos
 5 St. Julian's Avenue, Ludlow, Shropshire, United Kingdom
 Tel/Fax: +44 1584 878576
 E-mail: teleos@mac.com
 Website: <http://knowledgebusiness.com>

of the key experts and knowledge workers in the organization. The early stages of KM strategy implementation can be a confusing time for these individuals.

On the one hand, these individuals have achieved positions of respect and responsibility due to their expert knowledge. A formal organizational KM implementation process can be perceived as a threat by allowing other staff members to have access to the experts' unique insights and skills. It is therefore often the case that Professional Staff will initially be less supportive of KM than, say, National Officers or Administrative Staff.

On the other hand, Professional Staff also recognize that a KM implementation process can help them in their activities and enable them to improve their own skills and competencies. Once the initial skepticism is surmounted, most Professional Staff usually become very supportive of the KM implementation process.

Even considering the ADB Professional Staff's 'skeptical' view, there are some positive findings from the 2006 e-survey. The Professional Staff have recognized that ADB is changing in both its organizational culture and collaboration with internal and external stakeholders: Dimension 1 ("Does your department embrace a knowledge-driven culture, such as regular meetings, informal meetings, sharing relevant documents of staff meetings among other departments, etc.?") and Dimension 5 ("Do you think that your knowledge contributions are being valued?").

The challenge for the ADB is to continue to work with Professional Staff to demonstrate the value of the KM implementation process. The Professional Staff need to understand that their expertise will not be less valued, but on the contrary will be more valued as the KM implementation process continues to unfold. Dimension 4 ("How effective is ADB in developing staff intellectual growth?") had the lowest score for the Professional Staff and should be a priority area for improvement during the next 12 months.

It should be pointed out that Professional Staff in some departments (including DER and RSDD) are very supportive of the KM implementation process and should be viewed as role models within ADB.

Administrative Staff

Table 4 compares the Administrative Staff's responses for the eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions in the 2005 and 2006 KM Studies.

The Administrative Staff's overall score has increased by 12.57 points between the 2005 and 2006 KM Surveys, which represents a significant positive change in perceptions. In

Teleos
5 St. Julian's Avenue, Ludlow, Shropshire, United Kingdom
Tel/Fax: +44 1584 878576
E-mail: teleos@mac.com
Website: <http://knowledgebusiness.com>

Analysis of Administrative Staff's Response

Year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
2006	7.23	6.29	7.29	6.49	6.57	6.66	6.80	6.63	53.96
2005	5.15	6.42	5.48	4.70	4.61	5.27	4.70	5.06	41.39

Table 4: Analysis of Administrative Staff's responses for the eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions.

this year's electronic study, the Administrative Staff's overall score is 10.44 points higher (24.0%) than the All ADB Staff average. In the 2005 KM Study, the Administrative Staff's overall score was 1.85 points higher (4.7%) than the All ADB Staff average.

An analysis of the data reveals that Administrative Staff are very supportive of the ADB's KM implementation process. All knowledge performance dimensions except Dimension 2 ("Does your management address knowledge management as a priority; incorporates KM as an activity in PDP?") have improved significantly during the past 12 months.

Teleos research indicates that Administrative Staff are one of the first group's to become aware of, and to receive benefits from a KM implementation process. Before the introduction of a KM implementation process, Administrative Staff often find that poorly designed work processes hinder their activities, leading to frustration and performance inefficiencies. Also, before organizational KM implementation, Administrative Staff often believe that management does not value their views on work activities, and that they lack opportunities for training and personal development.

The scores in this year's KM Survey indicate that Administrative Staff positively view the ADB's KM implementation process, and are, in general, supportive of current KM initiatives. The challenge for the ADB is to focus on National Officers and Professional Staff, but at the same time not to neglect the involvement of Administrative Staff in the KM implementation process.

It should be pointed out that Administrative Staff in some departments (such as OED) are very supportive of the KM implementation process and should be viewed as role models within ADB.

Teleos

5 St. Julian's Avenue, Ludlow, Shropshire, United Kingdom

Tel/Fax: +44 1584 878576

E-mail: teleos@mac.com

Website: <http://knowledgebusiness.com>

4.3 Data Analysis of ADB Participants by Departments

Table 5 shows the average scores of ADB participants by Department.

It should be noted that the sampling size for some Departments was quite small, therefore the sampling error for each knowledge performance dimension is ± 0.54 .

Focusing on those departments with at least five or more responses, CTL, OED, RSDD and SERD have a positive view of ADB's KM implementation process. On the other hand, CWRD, PARD and SARD have a less positive view of ADB's KM implementation process.

As noted earlier in the Report, Professional Staff tend to be more skeptical of the KM implementation process, while Administrative Staff are more positive. In general, those departments with significant numbers of Professional Staff have a lower opinion of the ADB KM implementation process. On the other hand, those departments with significant numbers of Administrative Staff have a higher opinion of the KM implementation process.

In some instances, there has been a significant shift in departmental perceptions regarding the value of the KM implementation processes. For example, in the 2005 KM Study the total score for department OED was 20.00. In this year's KM Study the figure was 49.45 – a 147% improvement. And, in the 2005 KM Study the total score for department PARD was 10.00. In this year's KM Study the figure was 37.74. RSDD and SERD showed similar gains.

On the other hand, some departments have become more skeptical, such as SARD which had a total score of 37.00 in the 2005 KM Study, but in this year's study the score declined to 30.60.

It is important that ADB management identify those departments where perceptions of the KM implementation process have improved and try to understand the reasons why, in order that these insight can be used to improve the perceptions of more skeptical departments.

It is also critical that ADB management identify those departments whose scores have declined during the past 12 months. These departments need additional support from ADB management and the KM Center. If left unchecked, these departments may act as barriers to the successful KM implementation process.

Teleos

5 St. Julian's Avenue, Ludlow, Shropshire, United Kingdom

Tel/Fax: +44 1584 878576

E-mail: teleos@mac.com

Website: <http://knowledgebusiness.com>

Analysis of ADB Staff by Departments

Department	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
All ADB Staff (125)	6.14	5.34	6.05	4.70	5.74	5.02	5.34	5.19	43.52
AFRM (1)	3.00	3.00	4.00	2.00	6.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	31.00
BPMSD (3)	5.67	5.00	6.67	5.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	5.67	46.00
COSO (1)	4.00	2.00	4.00	1.00	8.00	2.00	4.00	2.00	27.00
CTI (1)	3.00	2.00	6.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	31.00
CTL (8)	5.88	5.75	7.25	5.75	6.25	6.38	6.38	6.88	50.50
CWRD (5)	5.40	3.40	5.00	3.20	4.20	3.60	3.80	3.60	32.20
DER	6.20	5.70	5.90	5.40	6.50	5.90	6.50	5.20	47.30
EARD (9)	5.67	6.11	5.78	4.78	4.78	5.11	5.00	4.89	42.11
EATC (2)	4.00	4.00	8.00	7.00	5.00	6.00	4.50	4.50	44.00
ERD (1)	10.00	8.00	8.00	10.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	68.00
IRM (1)	6.00	5.00	7.00	5.00	6.00	7.00	5.00	5.00	46.00
JRO (2)	7.50	7.00	8.00	7.00	7.00	6.50	6.50	6.00	55.50
MNRM (1)	7.00	7.00	8.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	7.00	6.00	50.00
OAS (3)	5.33	4.33	6.00	4.33	4.67	4.67	4.67	5.00	39.00
OCO (1)	7.00	6.00	7.00	5.00	8.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	48.00
OCRP (1)	7.00	7.00	8.00	7.00	6.00	6.00	7.00	7.00	55.00
OED (11)	7.36	6.45	6.64	5.64	6.45	6.00	5.27	5.64	49.45
OGC (1)	8.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	6.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	26.00
OIST (1)	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	21.00
OPR (1)	8.00	6.00	7.00	7.00	8.00	7.00	6.00	6.00	55.00
OSec (1)	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	56.00
OSPF (1)	8.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	7.00	5.00	6.00	4.00	45.00
PARD (8)	5.75	5.00	6.25	3.25	4.63	4.00	4.25	4.63	37.74
PRCM (2)	6.00	5.50	7.00	5.50	6.50	5.00	5.00	6.50	47.00
PRM (1)	4.00	3.00	5.00	2.00	4.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	26.00
PSOD (2)	8.00	6.00	6.50	5.50	6.50	5.00	5.00	6.00	48.50
RSDD (9)	8.33	6.89	6.67	5.78	7.11	6.00	7.11	5.78	53.67
SARD (5)	3.60	3.60	4.00	3.40	5.00	3.80	4.00	3.20	30.60
SEID (1)	4.00	6.00	5.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	6.00	1.00	35.00
SERD (7)	7.47	6.00	6.86	5.57	6.29	5.71	6.43	6.29	50.71
SPD (4)	3.50	3.50	6.00	3.50	4.50	4.00	4.75	4.25	34.00

Table 5: Analysis of ADB staff (by department) responses for the eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions (number in parenthesis is total number of responses from the department).

Teleos

5 St. Julian's Avenue, Ludlow, Shropshire, United Kingdom

Tel/Fax: +44 1584 878576

E-mail: teleos@mac.com

Website: <http://knowledgebusiness.com>

4.4 Data Analysis of ADB vs. MAKE Leaders

Table 6 provides an analysis of the views of All ADB Staff versus scores for the 2006 Asian MAKE Leaders and 2006 Global MAKE Leaders. In the case of the Asian and Global MAKE Leaders, the scores by knowledge performance dimension are the average of all Winners' scores in each dimension – not the organization with the highest overall score.

Analysis of ADB Staff vs. MAKE Leaders									
Function	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
All ADB Staff	6.14	5.34	6.05	4.70	5.74	5.02	5.34	5.19	43.52
Asian MAKE Leader	7.96	8.00	8.14	7.82	7.92	7.98	7.78	7.92	63.52
Global MAKE Leader	8.31	7.96	8.32	8.08	8.15	8.09	8.06	8.16	65.13

Table 6: Analysis of All ADB Staff responses for the eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions compared to the 2006 Asian MAKE Leaders and 2006 Global MAKE Leaders in each knowledge performance dimension.

The Asian and Global MAKE scores by knowledge performance dimension are determined by a MAKE expert panel consisting of business leaders (Global Fortune 500 companies) and internationally recognized knowledge management / intellectual capital experts. The sampling error for each knowledge dimension is ± 0.09 .

It is Teleos' experience that when an organization's own staff completes an Enterprise Assessment, they do not have the objectivity or external knowledge of best practice knowledge-driven organizations. As a rule this internal group of participants tends to over-estimate their organization's knowledge capabilities. Therefore, the sampling error for All ADB Staff per knowledge performance dimension is ± 0.18 .

The ADB Staff scores indicate that ADB's 'strengths' are its ability to create an organizational knowledge-driven culture, and ability to develop and deliver knowledge-based projects/services.

Teleos
5 St. Julian's Avenue, Ludlow, Shropshire, United Kingdom
Tel/Fax: +44 1584 878576
E-mail: teleos@mac.com
Website: <http://knowledgebusiness.com>

Dimension 4 (How effective is ADB in developing staff intellectual growth?") received the lowest score in the 2006 KM Survey; ADB should develop a strategy and approach to focus on improvements in this knowledge performance dimension.

The scores in the other five knowledge dimensions are of similar numeric value, reflecting a uniform perception of ADB's performance in these areas.

The knowledge performance scores for the 2006 Asian and Global MAKE Leaders is included to allow the ADB to understand the level of commitment and best practice which are now achieved by the very best knowledge-driven organizations in the world. The MAKE Leaders should serve as benchmarks and best practices exemplars as the ADB seeks to improve its KM processes.

Teleos

5 St. Julian's Avenue, Ludlow, Shropshire, United Kingdom

Tel/Fax: +44 1584 878576

E-mail: teleos@mac.com

Website: <http://knowledgebusiness.com>

5. Recommendations

1. In the 2006 KM Survey there was a noticeable decline in the score to the question: “Does your management address knowledge management as a priority; incorporates KM as an activity in PDP?” The most likely explanation for the decline in the average score for this performance dimension is that the expectations of the ADB staff have exceeded reality. In other words, ADB senior executives have ‘promised’ significant improvements in management’s commitment to KM, but to ADB staff this has not been matched by observable actions. This does not mean that there have not been improvements in knowledge leadership, but it indicates that ADB officials has not ‘managed’ the expectations of the staff. Teleos research shows that this is a very common problem – individual expectations outpace organizational reality.

It is critical that ADB managers deal with this perceived problem quickly in order to avoid ‘disillusionment’ among staff. ADB managers should demonstrate by their actions that they support the KM implementation process. They should also attempt to reduce unrealistic expectations of ADB staff by clearly informing staff of any ‘limits’ to a KM initiative and/or the anticipated initiative outputs. Although setting KM stretch goals is an important management tool, without staff understanding how and why KM can positively benefit themselves and the organization, situations can emerge where staff become so ‘disillusioned’ that they reject the entire KM implementation process.

2. An analysis of the data reveals that National Officers are in general supportive of ADB’s KM implementation process and are working to ensure the success of KM initiatives. The National Officers are beginning to understand that a successful ADB’s KM implementation process will take a number of years to yield substantial positive benefits for the organization. It will also require constant managerial attention and support.

This new ‘realistic’ view is most apparent in Dimension 2 (“Does your management address knowledge management as a priority; incorporates KM as an activity in PDP?”) and Dimension 4 (“How effective is ADB in developing staff intellectual growth?”). These are the two knowledge performance dimensions where National Officers must take a lead in order to ensure the success of ADB’s KM implementation process.

3. Data analysis reveals that Professional Staff continue to be skeptical of ADB’s KM implementation process. They apparently are taking a “wait and see” attitude when it comes to ensuring the success of KM initiatives. This view is typical of key

Teleos

5 St. Julian’s Avenue, Ludlow, Shropshire, United Kingdom

Tel/Fax: +44 1584 878576

E-mail: teleos@mac.com

Website: <http://knowledgebusiness.com>

knowledge workers in the early stages of KM implementation. In many instances the Professional Staff consists of the key experts and knowledge workers in the organization. The early stages of KM strategy implementation can be a confusing time for these individuals.

The challenge for the ADB is to continue to work with Professional Staff to demonstrate the value of the KM implementation process. The Professional Staff need to understand that their expertise will not be less valued, but on the contrary will be more valued as the KM implementation process continues to unfold. Dimension 4 (“How effective is ADB in developing staff intellectual growth?”) had the lowest score for the Professional Staff and should be a priority area for improvement during the next 12 months.

4. The scores in this year’s KM Survey indicate that Administrative Staff positively view the ADB’s KM implementation process, and are, in general, supportive of current KM initiatives. The challenge for the ADB is to focus their efforts on National Officers and Professional Staff, but at the same time not to neglect the involvement of Administrative Staff in the KM implementation process.
5. Section 4.3 provides responses by individual ADB Departments. Some Departments are now supporting the KM implementation process, others see no need to change, while a few Departments are very skeptical that any change is possible. The ADB must pay special attention to the staff in these ‘non-participating’ Departments, otherwise they could act as focal points – indeed barriers – to the successful implementation of ADB’s knowledge strategy.
6. The ADB should use the knowledge performance scores of Asian and Global MAKE Leaders, discussed in Section 4.4, as benchmarks in its efforts to improve its knowledge capabilities.

Submitted on December 15, 2006, by:

Rory Chase
Managing Director
Teleos

Teleos
5 St. Julian’s Avenue, Ludlow, Shropshire, United Kingdom
Tel/Fax: +44 1584 878576
E-mail: teleos@mac.com
Website: <http://knowledgebusiness.com>