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Objective/Purpose of the Assignment

To assess the ADB’s Knowledge Management Implementation Framework by determining ADB staff perceptions of the ADB Knowledge Management (KM) implementation process. The findings are compared against the results of the past seven annual (2005-2011) electronic surveys 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 and report on trends.

Detailed Tasks

1. Review the revised MAKE survey instrument for use.
2. Analyze data.
4. Make recommendations based on the data findings.

Output/Reporting Requirements

Survey and 2011 Survey of ADB-Hosted Communities of Practice reports. Other documentation consulted includes the collection of ADB KM reports and case studies published under the series title Knowledge Solutions. This Report on ADB KM trends also will assist ADB in establishing a new set of KM goals for the years beginning in 2013.
Executive Summary

In May 2005, Teleos conducted the first in a planned series of electronic surveys of Asian Development Bank staff to determine their perceptions regarding the ADB Knowledge Management (KM) Implementation Framework. This Report compares the 2012 data findings against the 2005-2011 results and highlights KM trends in ADB. For the fourth consecutive year the ADB Average Total Score has increased. This year the All ADB Staff Average Total Score was 55.46 (out of a maximum of 80 points), compared to 52.81 in the 2011 KM Survey (a 5% improvement).

Based on eight annual KM Surveys, it would appear that ADB has transitioned into Stage 4 of the five-stage MAKE Knowledge Management Implementation Model. This view is supported by the fact that ADB’s All Staff Average Total Score has improved steadily since the 2008 KM Survey. The ADB also is recognized for its progress in transforming itself into a leading Asian learning organization. The ADB is commended for its long-term support in this effort. The 2012 Asian MAKE panel of experts has confirmed this by recognizing ADB as a 2012 Asian MAKE Winner.

ADB also should be commended in its efforts to create a holistic KM Implementation Framework. All too often organizations stress improvements in one or two MAKE knowledge performance dimensions, which results in an unbalanced approach and often leads to a dysfunctional knowledge culture and collaborative knowledge-sharing environment. In the case of ADB, its KM Implementation Framework encompasses all eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions, resulting in a well-balanced, holistic knowledge-driven organization.

The findings of this year’s KM Survey were benchmarked against the eight recognized MAKE (Most Admired Knowledge Enterprises) knowledge performance dimensions to determine ‘high-level’ KM trends at the ADB.

2012 KM Survey Trends

Trend 1

Teleos has observed that organizations move through recognizable stages during a KM implementation process (see Section 4.5). Based on this year’s ADB KM Survey as well as the results of previous MAKE studies, it appears that the ADB has made the transition between Stage 3 and Stage 4 of the five-stage MAKE Knowledge Management Implementation Model. Typical of this transition phase is a growing, although incorrect perception by management and staff of diminishing returns from KM investments (simple knowledge processes have been improved, but more complex knowledge processes have not been examined), and the general impression that the organization’s knowledge ‘problems’ have been solved. However, this is perhaps the most critical stage of a Knowledge Management Implementation Plan. Staff complacency must be challenged.
with a new set of ambitious goals and objectives to inculcate knowledge sharing and collaboration into all organizational processes and procedures. Besides improving internal knowledge capabilities and processes, external partners and stakeholders need to become more integrated into the organization’s knowledge processes in order to create a transparent, ‘boundary-less’ enterprise.

Successfully moving from one KM stage to another is critical to becoming a Most Admired Knowledge Enterprise. To avoid falling into the trap of complacency and self-belief that the ADB has transformed itself into a “world-class” knowledge organization, ADB should ensure the completion of all outstanding goals found in the Enhancing Knowledge Management under Strategy 2020: Plan of Action for 2009-2011 document, and prepare a new set of KM goals for the years beginning 2012. The 2010 Learning for Change Survey and 2011 Survey of ADB-Hosted Communities of Practice reports provide evidence that ADB has made substantial progress in becoming a learning organization based on team-working through Communities of Practice (CoP).

However, there is still considerable work for ADB to do in improving its knowledge capabilities, especially with regards to its International Staff, ‘back office’ operations, and expanding knowledge-driven co-operation with partners and external stakeholders. The 2011 KM Survey reveals that there are opportunities for improvement across the entire organization – in the range of 15%-25% for most knowledge processes.

**Recommendation 1**

*ADB should ensure that the KM Implementation Framework continues to be aligned to the organization’s current Vision, Mission and Goals. ADB should review the Enhancing Knowledge Management under Strategy 2020: Plan of Action for 2009-2011 document and prepare a new KM Plan of Action (for years beginning 2012) that is aligned to Stage 4 (Inculcation) of the MAKE KM Implementation Model. These new KM ‘stretch’ goals should be designed to support the four identified ADB pillars: (i) sharpening the knowledge focus in all ADB operations, (ii) promoting and empowering communities of practice for knowledge capture and sharing, (iii) strengthening external knowledge partnerships to develop and disseminate knowledge, and (iv) scaling up staff development programs to improve technical skills and manage knowledge. ADB should focus especially on: (iii) strengthening external knowledge partnerships to develop and disseminate knowledge. And, gaining the full support of the International Staff continues to be a critical concern and should be addressed as a matter of urgency.*

**Trend 2**

Over the first three ADB KM Surveys (2005-2007), there was substantial improvement in the eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions. However, with the exception of organizational learning, the 2008 ADB KM Survey revealed a decline in organizational knowledge capabilities, especially in knowledge-driven culture; knowledge leadership;
creation, access and use of knowledge products; and successfully working with external stakeholders.

Considerable progress has been made since the adoption of Enhancing Knowledge Management under Strategy 2020: Plan of Action for 2009-2011. The 2011 ADB KM Survey (supported by other surveys such as the 2010 Learning for Change Survey and 2011 Survey of ADB-Hosted Communities of Practice), reveals that ADB, faced with many structural and human resources challenges and working within global economic uncertainties, is improving its knowledge capabilities in all eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions. Several ‘barriers’ identified in last year’s KM Survey, especially lack of progress in becoming a learning organization and improved knowledge sharing and collaboration (Communities of Practice) have apparently been addressed. ADB is moving closer to its goal of becoming a best practice learning organization.

ADB should be commended in its efforts to create a holistic KM Implementation Framework. All too often organizations stress improvements in one or two MAKE knowledge performance dimensions, which results in an unbalanced approach and often leads to a dysfunctional knowledge culture and collaborative knowledge-sharing environment. In the case of ADB, its KM Implementation Framework encompasses all eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions, resulting in a well-balanced, holistic knowledge-driven organization.

**Recommendation 2**

*When organizations such as ADB reach a certain point in their Knowledge Management ‘maturity,’ it becomes increasingly difficult to maintain the rate of knowledge creation, use and re-use. This is a new challenge for ADB and requires a new set of KM programs and initiatives to maintain the rate of knowledge-driven organizational change so that all groups in the ADB see continuing benefits from the ADB KM Implementation Plan.*

**Trend 3**

The National Officers continue to be ‘realistic’ and supportive in their assessment of ADB’s KM Implementation Framework; a majority of NO’s is working to ensure the success of ADB KM initiatives. They understand that a successful ADB KM implementation process will take a number of years to yield substantial positive benefits for the organization. It also requires constant managerial attention and support.

However, 8% of the National Officers (compared to 15% in the 2010 KM Survey) gave the ADB’s KM Implementation Framework a Total Score of less than 40 points. This sizable number of NO’s who appear to be “resistant to change” continues to be a concern. After seven years of KM Implementation, Teleos would expect that the number of NO’s resistant to change would be in the 3%-5% range. The fact that there remains a minority of National Officers who do not believe in and/or fully support the ADB KM implementation process should be viewed as a continuing concern. This group of NO’s
is still large enough to impede the successful implementation of KM within the ADB, especially in Departments and/or RM/FOs with large numbers of International Staff.

**Recommendation 3**

*The ADB should review its ‘KM Plan of Action’ for 2012 onwards and create new KM programs and initiatives to re-engage / re-energize the NO’s in the KM implementation process. Obtaining National Officer ‘buy-in’ to ADB’s KM Implementation Plan should be a priority goal.*

**Trend 4**

International Staff have become slightly more positive of ADB’s KM Implementation Framework. However, when taking into account the support provided by ADB KM programs targeted at this functional group, there still appears to be widespread misunderstandings and/or even opposition to the ADB KM Implementation Plan. These misunderstanding and/or opposition is typical of key knowledge workers in the early stages of the KM implementation process, but after seven years of ADB KM implementation efforts a more positive view is expected from this group.

In this year’s KM Survey, 28% of the International Staff (101 individuals) gave the ADB’s KM implementation process a score of less than 40 points. In the 2010 KM Survey, 36% of the International Staff (107 individuals) gave the ADB’s KM implementation process a score of less than 40 points.

Over the past few years there has been a slight improvement in PO’s perceptions regarding how effective is the ADB is at implementing the organization’s KM Implementation Plan. However, at this point in time PO’s should be fully supporting ADB’s efforts.

**Recommendation 4**

*The challenge for ADB is to work with International Staff to demonstrate the value of the KM Implementation Framework. The International 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. It is recommended that ADB conduct a study of International Staff to determine the ‘barriers’ to their full participation in the ADB KM Implementation Plan. It also is recommended that ADB consider requiring International Staff to demonstrate at the recruitment stage a willingness to actively support ADB’s KM Implementation Plan. By including questions during the recruiting stage about the willingness of the potential experts to participate in knowledge creation, sharing and use, it may be possible for ADB to select those individuals who will support and expand KM efforts, thereby driving ADB’s KM Implementation Plan forward.*
**Trend 5**

Administrative Staff continue to be very supportive of the ADB’s KM Implementation Framework. The AS’s perception of ADB’s KM implementation process has improved during the past two years after remaining unchanged during the 2008 and 2009 KM Surveys.

In the 2009 KM Survey one of the recommendations was that ADB review KM initiatives directed towards Administrative Staff and establish a new program of KM initiatives, especially in the area of ‘Enhanced Staff Learning and Development,’ to more deeply inculcate the change process within this key knowledge group. This recommendation has produced positive results (a conclusion supported by the 2010 Learning for Change Survey); the AS’s views concerning ADB’s ability to successfully develop and sustain a learning and sharing culture has increased by 0.12 points (7.64 – up from 7.52) – an 1.6% improvement.

However, creating a learning organization is not the same thing as ‘developing staff intellectual growth,’ which has the lowest AS average score in this year’s KM Survey. ‘Staff intellectual capital growth’ includes providing staff with support in career development and expanding personal skills and capabilities outside of the current job requirements.

**Recommendation 5**

The challenge for ADB is to support AS’s by encouraging the integration of knowledge management in all work practices, and continuing to develop Administrative Staff intellectual growth especially in the areas of career development and personal skills and capabilities development. In addition, helping AS’s to manage ADB knowledge assets in an effective and cost-efficient way should be included in the ‘KM Plan of Action’ for 2012 onwards.

**Trend 6**

Most ADB Departments are now supporting the KM Implementation Framework. However some Departments see no need to change, while there remain a few Departments (especially those in ‘back office’ areas) that do not believe that change is possible. Successful KM implementation is not guaranteed, even in those ADB Departments currently registering improvements in their average Total Scores (as revealed by the fact that several Departments which were supportive of the ADB KM Implementation Framework last year are now less supportive).
**Recommendation 6**

It is recommended that the ADB examine how to encourage Departments to embrace change. It also is important that ADB examine those Departments where perceptions of the KM Implementation Framework have become less positive in order to understand the reasons why. If left unchecked, it is possible that those Departments may act as barriers to successful KM implementation throughout ADB.

**Trend 7**

Regional Missions / Field Offices (RM/FOs), when compared to ADB Headquarters Departments and Staff, tend to rely more on information and computer technology (ICT) collaboration methods to access ADB knowledge resources and knowledge assets. This ‘dependence’ on shared knowledge resources results in RM/FOs Staff being more critical of knowledge assets availability and the quality of knowledge content. In some ways, RM/FOs’ requirements are more like those of external partners and stakeholders than internal ADB Departments.

**Recommendation 7**

ADB should attempt to identify possible KM best practices at RM/FOs with high scores and transfer their best practices to RM/FOs with low scores in order to improve the knowledge capabilities at all ADB RM/FOs. The ADB also must decide whether additional resources should be allocated to RM/FOs to provide them with what they perceive as the required levels of ITC knowledge sharing and collaboration support to achieve their goals and objective.

**Trend 8**

The 2011 Asian MAKE panel of experts recognized the Asian Development Bank for its progress in transforming itself into a leading Asian knowledge-driven organization. The ADB is commended for its long-term support which has resulted in the ADB being named a 2011 Asian MAKE Winner. The ADB should use this recognition to promote its KM Implementation Plan, both to its internal Staff as well as partners and stakeholders.

**Recommendation 8**

The ADB should benchmark other Asian MAKE leaders in order to identify best practice knowledge processes. Where appropriate, the ADB should transfer these best practices (customized to ADB requirements) to improve ADB’s knowledge capabilities. The emphasis for ADB is to accelerate the rate of knowledge-driven organizational change so that all Departments and RM/FOs continue to derive benefits from the ADB KM Implementation Plan.
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1.0 Background

Teleos has conducted seven previous electronic surveys of ADB staff to determine their perceptions regarding the ADB Knowledge Management (KM) Implementation Framework:

- The first electronic survey was conducted in May 2005.
- The second electronic survey was conducted in July-August 2006.
- The third electronic survey was conducted in September-October 2007.
- The fourth electronic survey was conducted in October-November 2008.
- The fifth electronic survey was conducted in September-October 2009.
- The sixth electronic survey was conducted in November 2010.
- The seventh electronic survey was conducted October-November 2011.

This Report compares the 2012 data findings against the 2005-2011 results and highlights KM trends in ADB. The findings were benchmarked against the eight recognized Most Admired Knowledge Enterprises (MAKE) 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 and KM Implementation Framework. It is based on the MAKE framework consisting of eight knowledge performance dimensions (see Section 2: Enterprise Assessment Tool and Appendix A – MAKE Framework).

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 and KM Implementation Framework is when compared across internal Departments and Regional Missions / Field Offices (RM/FOs) 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 eight annual electronic survey was conducted between December 5, 2012 and January 18, 2013. This Report compares the 2012 data findings against the 2005-2011 results and highlights KM trends in ADB.
2.0 Enterprise Assessment Tool

Teleos has created a customized Enterprise MAKE Assessment tool for use by ADB staff. The Knowledge Management Center (KM Center) re-formatted the questions to “ADB language/customs” for the second electronic survey (2006) in order to increase the response rate and detail of responses. In the 2007 electronic survey, the questions were further refined to increase response rate and detail. The same question set has been used since then (2007-2012 electronic surveys) to facilitate the comparability of the results. 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 2012 electronic survey the question to ADB staff read: “How well does your department embrace and perform in a knowledge-driven culture, such as conducting regular meetings and brainstorming sessions, sharing documents to staff within and among departments, etc.?”

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

In the 2012 electronic survey the question to ADB staff read: “How effective is the Management in encouraging and sustaining the practice of knowledge management, such as incorporating KM as an activity in PDP, implementing incentive mechanisms, etc.?”

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

In the 2012 electronic survey the question to ADB staff read: “What is your view of ADB knowledge products (publications, newsletters) in terms of value added, accessibility, relevance, quality, etc.?”

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

In the 2012 electronic survey the question to ADB staff read: “How effective is ADB in developing staff intellectual growth and managing knowledge assets?”

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

In the 2012 electronic survey the question to ADB staff read: “How ADB values staff’s knowledge contributions in sustaining a knowledge-driven environment through development of knowledge databases, participation in communities of practices, etc.?”
D6. **Ability to create and sustain a learning organization.**

In the 2012 electronic survey the question to ADB staff 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 2012 electronic survey the question to ADB staff read: “How successful is ADB in working with external stakeholders (i.e., DMCs and external networks) in knowledge-sharing and development activities?”

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

In the 2012 electronic survey the question to ADB staff read: “How successful is ADB in adopting, incorporating, and applying lessons learned and experiences in its daily operations and sharing them within ADB and other stakeholders?”

As noted above, the question set for the 2007 electronic survey was refined (except for Question D6) by the KM Center to gain more accurate responses from the participants. However, by modifying the question set an additional degree of uncertainty (statistical error) was introduced. The question set for the 2007-2012 electronic surveys is the same and is not subject to the same possible degree of uncertainty noted between the 2005 and 2006 surveys and the 2007-2012 surveys. This will be discussed further in the Data Analysis section.
3.0 Data Collection

The 2005 electronic survey was conducted using Teleos’ secure Web site. For the 2006-2012 KM Surveys, the ADB KM Center (and now the ADB Knowledge Sharing and Services 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.

By the end of this year’s survey period (December 5, 2012 to January 17, 2013), a total of 426 ADB staff had completed the 2012 KM Survey. According to data supplied by the ADB Knowledge Sharing and Services Center, the total ADB staffing strength at the time of this year’s KM Survey was 2,904 individuals. Thus, the response rate as a percentage of total ADB staffing strength was 14.7%.

The number of participants for each of the eight KM Surveys is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This year’s response rate was 48% less than the 2011 KM Survey (813 participants from a total ADB staffing strength of 2,976 individuals – a response rate of 27.3%). Participation in the 2012 KM Survey and staff response rate was the lowest since the 2009 KM Survey.

According to the ADB Knowledge Sharing and Services Center, the reasons for this low response rate are:

- The 2011 KM Survey ran the whole month of November 2011. In contrast, the 2012 KM Survey was launched and ran from December 5, 2012, which coincided with the vacation period of many ADB staff, to January 17, 2013, when ADB staff attendance returns to normal.

- The process for promoting the 2012 KM Survey was almost similar to previous years, with online notices, meetings with heads of departments, and other formal methods utilized. However, given that many ADB staff were already on vacation or...
winding up work to go for the holiday break, the ADB Knowledge Sharing and Services Center was unable to take more informal approaches, e.g., direct promotion to colleagues, informal chats on the survey to engage staff, etc.

The Teleos Enterprise MAKE Assessment is based on the Delphi methodology. To minimize statistical variations for perception studies like the MAKE Assessment, it is critical that the group of participants remains relatively constant over time. Within the ADB there is moderate annual staff movement – individuals joining/leaving the organization, as well as individuals changing departments and/or job functions. This is especially true of the ADB International Staff. The number of respondents in this year’s study was lower (426 compared to 813 last year), which has contributed to greater statistical variability. In the case of the 2012 KM Survey, Teleos estimates that the statistical error is ±0.27 for each of the MAKE knowledge performance dimensional averages, or ±2.16 for the Average Total Score (the statistical error for the 2011 KM Survey was ±0.18).

Although the 2012 KM Survey response rate provides a statistically valid data set for analysis, it does have implications for interpreting the results. For example, the All ADB Staff Average Total Score for the 2012 KM Survey is 55.46. When statistical uncertainty is included, the 2012 All ADB Staff Average Total Score ranges from 53.30 to 57.62. In other words, there is an 8% range of uncertainty in this year’s scores. Unless noted, this statistical uncertainty is valid for all of the data analysis.

4.0 Data Analysis
4.1 Data Analysis of All ADB Staff

A total of 426 complete and useable 2012 KM Survey forms were received. In comparison, a total of 813 useable 2011 KM Survey forms were received. According to information supplied by the ADB Knowledge Sharing and Services Center, the total ADB staffing strength at the time of this year’s survey was 2,904 individuals. Therefore, 14.7% of All ADB staff (in 26 departments) participated in the 2012 KM Survey (in the 2011 KM Survey respondents represented 37 departments). The decline in the number of participants (and the departments they represent) in the 2012 KM Survey provides increased statistical variance in this year’s results when compared to previous KM Surveys.

The 426 ADB staff participating in this year’s KM Survey are divided into the following functions (2011 KM Survey responses in parentheses):

- National Officers: 119 (185)
- International Staff: 171 (360)
- Administrative Staff: 131 (268)
- Non-Bank Staff: 5 (0)

The number of National Officers (NO) participating in the 2012 KM Survey was 36% lower than in last year’s assessment (185 NO respondents). When compared to the 2011 KM Survey, the number of Independent Staff (IS) participating in this year’s assessment decreased by 53%, while the of number of responding Administrative Staff (AS) decreased by 29%. This year 5 Non-Bank Staff participated in the KM Study.

Table 1 compares the results of the 2005-2012 KM Surveys for all of the participating ADB staff. As noted above, the question set in the 2006 and 2007 KM Surveys was slightly modified to accommodate the ADB’s “language/customs.” This could slightly affect the comparison of average scores between the 2005 and 2006 KM Surveys and the 2007 and following KM Surveys. The results of the 2007-2012 KM Surveys are fully comparable.

The Average Total Score for the 2012 KM Survey is 55.46 and indicates a positive change when compared to the Average Total Score of the 2011 KM Survey. When comparing the Average Total Scores in Table 1, the ADB staff in the 2012 KM Survey ranked the organization 5.0% higher as a ‘raw’ score than in the 2011 KM Survey. This overall increase is typical of an organization in its seventh or eight year of the KM implementation process and of ADB’s size and complexity.

---
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Analysis of All ADB Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year/Dimension</th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>D2</th>
<th>D3</th>
<th>D4</th>
<th>D5</th>
<th>D6</th>
<th>D7</th>
<th>D8</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012 (426)</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>55.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 (813)</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>52.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 (637)</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>49.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 (518)</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>47.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 (203)</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>44.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 (132)</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>46.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 (125)</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>43.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 (66)</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>39.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Comparison of the average of all ADB staff responses for the 2005-2012 KM Surveys for the eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions (see Section 2).

Figure 1 is a visual representation comparing All ADB Staff responses for the 2009-2012 KM Surveys. A gradual improvement in ADB staff towards the KM Implementation Plan is observed over this time period.

Figure 1: Visual representation comparing All ADB Staff responses for the 2009-2012 KM Surveys.
ADB appears to be successfully building upon its KM implementation foundation as indicted by moderate improvements across all eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions:

D1. How well does your department embrace and perform in a knowledge-driven culture, such as conducting regular meetings and brainstorming sessions, sharing documents to staff within and among departments, etc.?

The ‘raw’ score for this dimension increased by 4.8% (7.00 – up from 6.68). National Officers (NO), International Staff (IS) and Administrative Staff (AS) all have a more positive view. This is a moderate movement upwards and signals an improvement in creating a more open, trust-based culture within ADB (see Section 4.2).

D2. How effective is the Management in encouraging and sustaining the practice of knowledge management, such as incorporating KM as an activity in PDP, implementing incentive mechanisms, etc.?

The ‘raw’ score for this dimension increased by 5.0% (6.88 – up from 6.55). National Officers (NO), International Staff (IS) and Administrative Staff (AS) all have a more positive view and signals a moderate improvement in the ADB staff’s confidence in ADB’s support and communication of the organization-wide KM implementation process (see Section 4.2).

D3. What is your view of ADB knowledge products (publications, newsletters) in terms of value added, accessibility, relevance, quality, etc.?

The ‘raw’ score for this dimension increased by 3.6% (7.11 – up from 6.86). National Officers (NO), International Staff (IS) and Administrative Staff (AS) all have a slightly more positive view. This dimension has the second highest ‘raw’ score for any of the eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions. The slight movement upwards could be due to a number of reasons, including a greater ability to locate ADB knowledge products, being able to find the right ADB knowledge product when needed, the IT system’s ability to retrieve the needed ADB knowledge products, etc.

Since one of ADB’s main ‘product’ is knowledge, the continuing improvement in this knowledge performance dimension is a positive development.

D4. How effective is ADB in developing staff intellectual growth and managing knowledge assets?

The ‘raw’ score for this dimension increased by 5.7% (6.66 – up from 6.30). National Officers (NO), International Staff (IS) and Administrative Staff (AS) all have a more positive view. Based on hundreds of MAKE Assessments, this knowledge performance dimension typically has the lowest organizational ‘raw’ score. This is the case for ADB as well. That said, this knowledge performance dimension has witnessed improvement over the eight annual studies, indicating that the ADB staff,
especially the Administrative Staff (AS), have an increasingly positive view. Although the International Staff (IS) indicate that developing staff intellectual growth and managing knowledge assets is a high priority, they gave this MAKE knowledge performance dimension their lowest average ‘raw’ score. This gap indicates that there are opportunities for improvements in this dimension.

D5. How ADB values staff’s knowledge contributions in sustaining a knowledge-driven environment through development of knowledge databases, participation in communities of practices, etc.?

The ‘raw’ score for this dimension increased by 6.2% (7.07 – up from 6.66). National Officers (NO), International Staff (IS) and Administrative Staff (AS) all have a more positive view. This is the third highest ‘raw’ score for any of the eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions, and also the highest score in this dimension over the past eight annual KM Surveys. This ‘raw’ score is especially important since this MAKE knowledge performance dimension was highlighted as a Critical Success Factor at the very beginning of the KM implementation process and continues to be stressed in the Enhancing Knowledge Management under Strategy 2020: Plan of Action for 2009-2011 (Final Report as of August 2012) document.

D6. How successful is ADB in developing and sustaining a learning and sharing culture?

The ‘raw’ score for this dimension increased by 4.7% (7.12 – up from 6.80). The National Officers (+2.2%), International Staff (+8.3%) and Administrative Staff (1.8%) all reported that the ADB has made progress in this MAKE knowledge performance dimension. The overall moderate movement signals a continuing improvement in the staff’s opinion, especially the IS, of ADB as a learning and collaborative organization. ADB Staff indicate positive benefits from ADB Communities of Practices (CoPs) and enhanced staff learning and skills development.

D7. How successful is ADB in working with external stakeholders (i.e., DMCs and external networks) in knowledge-sharing and development activities?

The ‘raw’ score for this dimension increased by 4.8% (6.77 – up from 6.46). This is a moderate movement upwards, and represents the highest ‘raw’ score in this MAKE knowledge performance dimension for the eight KM Surveys. National Officers (NO), International Staff (IS) and Administrative Staff (AS) have increasingly positive views regarding the ability of ADB to work with external stakeholders. Since this is the second lowest score for any of the eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions, it would appear that there are still barriers to achieving timely collaboration and communication between the ADB and the organization’s external stakeholders. The goals and objectives of the ‘Pillar’ External Knowledge Partnerships are Strengthened are outlined in Enhancing Knowledge Management.

D8. How successful is ADB in adopting, incorporating, and applying lessons learned and experiences in its daily operations and sharing them within ADB and other stakeholders?

The ‘raw’ score for this dimension increased by 5.2% (6.84 – up from 6.50). National Officers (NO), International Staff (IS) and Administrative Staff (AS) have a more positive view. Overall, there is a moderate improvement in this dimension and signals that ADB continues make steady progress towards creating a holistic organizational environment that supports and optimizes ADB’s knowledge capabilities.

When compared with the 2011 KM Survey, this year’s ADB KM Survey reveals that ADB, faced with many structural and human resources challenges and working within global economic uncertainties, has continued to improved its knowledge capabilities in all eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions. Several ‘barriers’ identified in last year’s KM Survey, especially slow progress in Dimension 2 (Effectiveness by management in encouraging and sustaining the practice of knowledge management), Dimension 4 (Effective in developing staff intellectual growth and managing knowledge assets), Dimension 6 (Becoming a learning organization), and Dimension 8 (Adopting, incorporating, and applying lessons learned and experiences in its daily operations and sharing them within ADB and other stakeholders) appear to have been addressed with positive results.

ADB has moved closer to becoming a holistic, enterprise-wide knowledge-driven organization. However, there still continues to be opportunities for ADB to improve, in especially in Dimension 2 (Effectiveness by management in encouraging and sustaining the practice of knowledge management), Dimension 4 (Effective in developing staff intellectual growth and managing knowledge assets), Dimension 7 (Working with external stakeholders (i.e., DMCs and external networks) in knowledge-sharing and development activities), and Dimension 8 (Adopting, incorporating, and applying lessons learned and experiences in its daily operations and sharing them within ADB and other stakeholders).

An analysis of All ADB Staff responses also reveals that there is a difference in views between the more positive National Officers (NO) and Administrative Staff (AS), compared to the less positive views of the International Staff (IS). The same observation holds true for the ADB Departments and RM/FOs. These differences in views will be examined in more detail in Sections 4.2 and 4.3.

4.2 Data Analysis of ADB All Staff by Function
Tables 2-4 show the 2012 ADB All Staff responses by job function (NO, IS, AS – the Non-Bank Staff were not included due to the low number of responses), comparing this year’s results to those of the 2005-2011 KM Surveys.

The Average Total Score for All ADB Staff participating in this Enterprise Assessment was 55.46. The 2012 Average Total Score for each of the functions was: National Officers (58.10), International Staff (48.73) and Administrative Staff (61.54). (The Average Total Score for the five Non-bank Staff was 63.80.)

The perceptions of the National Officers, International Staff and Administrative Staff towards ADB’s KM implementation Framework have become more ‘positive.’ The ADB Administrative Staff have the highest average score, indicating a continuing ‘enthusiasm’ about the benefits of KM with regards to their jobs and the organization.

There continue to be ‘pockets’ of dissatisfaction with ADB’s KM implementation Framework within the NO and IS groups. The Average Total Scores hide the fact that 7% of National Officers and 26% of International Staff now are moderate to very ‘skeptical’ regarding the benefits of KM implementation. The percentage of ‘skeptics’ found in the 2011 KM Survey were, respectively, NO’s (8%) and IS’s (28%). On the other hand, only 2% of the Administrative Staff were dissatisfied this year, compared to 5% of the AS in the 2011 KM Survey. This percentage of dissatisfied AS staff is within that normally found in any organization and indicates that the AS appear to be fully supporting the ADB KM Implementation Framework effort.

The data analysis by job function will be analyzed in greater detail in the following sections.

4.2.1 National Officers

Table 2 compares the National Officers’ responses for the eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions in the 2005-2012 KM Studies.

The NO’s 2012 Average Total Score increased by 1.79 points (3.2%), and indicates a slight positive change in perceptions year-on-year. The NO’s Average Total Score increased by 3.79 points (7.2%) between the 2010 and 2011 KM Surveys.

In this year’s KM Survey, the National Officers’ Average Total Score is 2.64 points higher (4.8%) than the All ADB Staff average. In the 2011 KM Survey, the National Officers’ Average Total Score was 3.50 points higher (6.6%) than the All ADB Staff average Total Score.

The National Officers’ 2012 scores improved in all eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions. Figure 2 is a visual representation comparing the NO’s views of ADB’s knowledge performance (blue line) against the ‘perfect’ MAKE knowledge-driven
organizations (outside black line). The consistency in the NO’s scores (ranging from 7.10 to 7.44) reflects a holistic view of ADB’s KM implementation efforts.

**Analysis**

An analysis of the data reveals that National Officers are ‘optimistic’ in their assessment of ADB’s KM Implementation Framework and a majority of NOs now are working to ensure the success of KM initiatives. They understand that a successful ADB KM implementation process will take a number of years to yield substantial positive benefits for the organization. It also requires constant managerial attention and support.

However, 7% of the National Officers (compared to 8% in the 2011 KM Survey) gave the ADB’s KM Implementation Framework an Average Total Score of less than 40 points. The continuing decline in “resistance to change” is encouraging and indicates an improvement during the past year. The number of National Officers who do not believe in and/or fully support the ADB KM implementation process has declined below the 10% threshold at which resistance to organizational transformation can become an enterprise-wide danger. The group of supportive NOs now is large enough to drive the successful implementation of KM within the ADB. That said, ADB should continue to seek ways to continue to encourage NO’s to support the KM Implementation Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year/Dimension</th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>D2</th>
<th>D3</th>
<th>D4</th>
<th>D5</th>
<th>D6</th>
<th>D7</th>
<th>D8</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012 All ADB Staff</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>55.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>58.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>56.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>52.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>47.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>48.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>45.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>51.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2: Analysis of National Officers’ responses for the eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions (see Section 2.0).*
4.2.2 International Staff

Table 3 compares the International Staff’s responses for the eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions in the 2005-2012 KM Surveys.

The International Staff’s Average Total Score has improved by 2.78 points (6.1%) between the 2011 and 2012 KM Surveys, which represents a moderate positive change in perceptions year-on-year. The IS’s Average Total Score increased by 2.95 points (6.9%) between the 2010 and 2011 KM Surveys. The International Staff’s perceptions of ADB’s knowledge management implementation efforts are now the most positive since the KM Implementation Framework was announced in 2005.

In this year’s KM Survey, the International Staff’s Average Total Score is 6.73 points lower (-12.1%) than the All ADB Staff Average Total Score. In the 2011 KM Survey, the International Staff’s Average Total Score was 6.86 points lower (-13.0%) than the All ADB Staff average, indicating no year-on-year change in the gap between IS Average Total Score and All ADB Staff Average Total Score.

The International Staff’s 2012 Average Total Score improved in all eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions. Figure 3 is a visual representation comparing the IS’s views of ADB’s knowledge performance (blue line) against the ‘perfect’ MAKE

Figure 2: Visual representation comparing National Officers’ views of ADB’s knowledge performance (blue line) against the ‘perfect’ MAKE knowledge-driven organization (outside black line).
knowledge-driven organizations (outside black line). There is a consistency in the IS’s scores (ranging from 5.70 to 6.40) and reflects a holistic view of ADB’s KM implementation efforts (although at a much lower level than found with NO’s and AS’s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year/Dimension</th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>D2</th>
<th>D3</th>
<th>D4</th>
<th>D5</th>
<th>D6</th>
<th>D7</th>
<th>D8</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012 All Staff</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>55.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>48.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>45.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>43.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>41.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>34.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>40.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>37.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>35.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Analysis of International Staff’s responses for the eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions (see Section 2.0).
Over the past year, IS’s perceptions of ADB’s KM Implementation Framework have improved in two critical MAKE knowledge performance dimensions:

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

The ‘raw’ score for this dimension increased by 6.7% (6.24 – up from 5.85). In previous KM Studies the IS’s rating indicates a more stringent and measured response concerning ADB’s ability to create and sustain an enterprise knowledge-driven culture. This is the highest score in this dimension since the 2007 KM Survey. This is especially important since this MAKE knowledge performance dimension was highlighted as a Critical Success Factor at the very beginning of the KM implementation process.

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

The ‘raw’ score for this dimension increased by 7.3% (6.29 – up from 5.86). This is the highest score in this dimension over the past eight annual KM Surveys. It signals that the IS’s are gaining confidence in the ADB’s enterprise-wide collaborative knowledge-sharing environment and capabilities.
On the other hand, IS’s continue to have a low opinion in two critical MAKE knowledge performance dimensions:

**D4. How effective is ADB in developing staff intellectual growth and managing knowledge assets?**

The ‘raw’ score for this dimension increased by 6.7% (5.70 – up from 5.34). The IS’s have given their lowest ‘raw’ score to this knowledge performance dimension. In comparison, this year the NO’s rated this knowledge performance dimension at 7.13, while the AS’s were even more positive with an average score of 7.44. This suggests that there exists scope for improving this dimension by according it top priority.

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

The ‘raw’ score for this dimension increased by 4.7% (5.77 – up from 5.51). The IS’s have given their second lowest ‘raw’ score to this MAKE knowledge performance dimension. In previous KM Studies the IS’s have been less positive concerning ADB’s ability to manage client knowledge to create value and enterprise intellectual capital. This MAKE knowledge performance dimension is critical to ADB’s goals as it demonstrates that ADB is delivering value-for-money knowledge-based products and services to its external clients.

**Analysis**

An analysis of the data reveals that during the past year the International Staff have become more positive of ADB’s KM Implementation Framework. However, there still appears to be widespread misunderstandings about the ADB KM Implementation Framework and implementation process. This misunderstanding is typical of key knowledge workers in the early stages of KM implementation, but after eight years of ADB KM implementation efforts a more positive view would be expected from this group.

In this year’s KM Survey, 26% of the International Staff (45 individuals) gave the ADB’s KM implementation process a score of less than 40 points. In the 2011 KM Survey, 28% of the International Staff (101 individuals) gave the ADB’s KM implementation process a score of less than 40 points. As noted above, the IS’s view this year appear more positive, but there is still a considerable number of IS who appear not to support nor find value in the ADB Knowledge Management Implementation efforts.

In order to verify this fact, the percentage of International Staff giving the ADB KM implementation process an average score of less than 20 points was examined. An overall average score of less than 20 points would indicate some dissatisfaction with the ADB KM implementation process. In the 2012 KM study, 3 of the 171 International Staff (2%) participating in the KM Survey gave the ADB’s KM implementation process a score of less than 20 points. In the 2011 KM study, 16 of the 360 International Staff (4%)
participating in the KM Survey gave the ADB’s KM implementation process a score of less than 20 points. It appears that the core group of International Staff who do not believe in and/or fully support the ADB KM Implementation Framework is gradually declining and their ability to impede the successful implementation of KM within the ADB is diminishing. The ADB appears to be slowly reducing the core IS ‘reluctance’ to support the ADB KM Implementation Framework, but the fact that 26% of this functional group continues to be less supportive should be a cause of concern.

International Staff recognize that a KM implementation process can help them in their activities and enable them to improve their own skills and competencies. The IS scores in this year’s KM Survey would indicate that some of the concern is being surmounted, especially in the areas such as creating a supportive organizational knowledge-driven culture, creation of knowledge-based products/services/solution, collaboration and organizational learning.

While the ADB should continue to seek the most experienced experts to provide specialist services, ADB should consider requiring that these experts demonstrate at the recruitment stage a willingness to actively support ADB’s KM Implementation Plan. By including questions during the recruiting stage about the willingness of the potential experts to participate in knowledge creation, sharing and use, it may be possible for ADB to select those individuals who will support and expand KM efforts, thereby driving ADB’s KM Implementation Plan forward with a resultant increase in the IS’s Average Total Score.

ADB should consider this developing a specific approach and initiative(s) to improve IS support as a high priority.

**4.2.3 Administrative Staff**

Table 4 compares the Administrative Staff’s responses for the eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions in the 2005-2012 KM Studies.

The Administrative Staff’s Average Total Score increased by 1.98 points (3.3%) between the 2011 and 2012 KM Surveys. The Administrative Staff’s Average Total Score increased by 1.25 points (2.1%) between the 2010 and 2011 KM Surveys. This year’s Administrative Staff’s Average Total Score is now the most positive since the KM Implementation Framework was announced in 2005.

The changes in the Administrative Staff’s 2012 scores in the eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions indicate a moderate improvement between the 2011 and 2012 KM Surveys. Figure 4 is a visual representation comparing the AS’s views of ADB’s knowledge performance (blue line) against the ‘perfect’ MAKE knowledge-driven organizations (outside black line). The consistency in the AS’s scores (ranging from 7.44 to 7.80) reflects a holistic view of ADB’s KM implementation efforts.
Analysis of Administrative Staff’s Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year/Dimension</th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>D2</th>
<th>D3</th>
<th>D4</th>
<th>D5</th>
<th>D6</th>
<th>D7</th>
<th>D8</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012 All ADB Staff</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>55.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>61.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>59.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>58.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>55.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>55.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>7.66</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>56.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>41.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Analysis of Administrative Staff’s responses for the eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions (see Section 2.0).

In this year’s electronic KM Survey, the Administrative Staff’s Average Total Score is 6.75 points higher (11.0%) than the All ADB Staff average Total Score. In the 2011 KM Survey, the Administrative Staff’s Average Total Score was 6.75 points higher (12.8%) than the All ADB Staff Average Total Score.

Analysis

An analysis of the data reveals that Administrative Staff continue to be very supportive of the ADB’s KM Implementation Framework. The Administrative Staff’s perception of ADB’s KM implementation process continues to improve year-on-year, although at a slower rate. The Administrative Staff’s perceptions of ADB’s knowledge management implementation efforts are now the most positive since the KM Implementation Framework was announced in 2005.

Teleos research indicates that Administrative Staff are one of the first groups 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 Framework, 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 continue to have a very positive view of the ADB’s KM Implementation Framework, and are, in general, very supportive of current KM initiatives. The Fourth Pillar statement in Enhancing Knowledge Management under Strategy 2020: Plan of Action for 2009-2011 (Final Report as of August 2012) stresses enhancing staff learning and skills development. This goal is reinforced in The Asian Development Bank (ADB) – Becoming a Stronger Knowledge Institution (Knowledge Management Plan Draft June 22, 2012) document in Section VII: Empowering and Resourcing High-Quality Knowledge Solutions. The positive views of the AS demonstrate the value of continuing these stated ADB goals.

Only 3 out of 131 of the Administrative Staff (2%) – compared to 14 out of 268 AS (5%) in the 2011 KM Survey – gave the ADB’s KM Implementation Framework an Average Total Score of less than 40 points. This percentage of dissatisfied staff is within that normally found in any organization and indicates that the AS are fully supporting the ADB KM Implementation Framework effort. The 2012 KM Survey reveals that AS’s particularly value ADB’s ability to:

D3: develop and deliver knowledge-based projects/services.

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

Figure 4: Visual representation comparing Administrative Staff’s views of ADB’s knowledge performance (blue line) against the ‘perfect’ MAKE knowledge-driven organization (outside black line).
D6 create and sustain a learning organization.

Summary

Figure 5 is a visual representation comparing the National Officers’ (blue line), International Staff’s (red line) and Administrative Staff’s (green line) views of ADB’s knowledge performance against the ‘perfect’ MAKE knowledge-driven organization (outside black line).

![ADB Staff Comparison Diagram](image)

Figure 5: Visual representation comparing the National Officers’ (blue line), International Staff’s (red line) and Administrative Staff’s (green line) views of ADB’s knowledge performance against the ‘perfect’ MAKE knowledge-driven organizations (outside black line).

Figure 5 clearly shows that perceptions of National Officers, Administrative Staff and International Staff are moderately positive in a descending order.

The long-term goal of the ADB KM Implementation Framework is to move all of ADB Staff’s perceptions towards the outer (black line) boundary, which represents the ‘perfect’ knowledge-driven organization. As shown in Figure 5, improvement opportunities exist in all eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions for all ADB staff functions. It is not sufficient for ADB to simply become a collaborative or learning organization – it must become a World-Class Knowledge Institution. To achieve this goal, ADB should emphasize KM programs that are designed to improve collaboration with external clients and partners, as well as staff by expanding intellectual growth and managing knowledge assets to ensure that all ADB staff can improve their knowledge skills, competencies and capabilities.
ADB should be commended in its efforts to create a holistic KM Implementation Framework. All too often organizations stress improvements in one or two MAKE knowledge performance dimensions, which results in an unbalanced approach and often leads to a dysfunctional knowledge culture and collaborative knowledge-sharing environment. In the case of ADB, it is apparent from Figure 5 that the KM Implementation Framework encompasses all eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions, resulting in a well-balanced, holistic knowledge-driven organization. It also is apparent from Figure 5 that the National Officers, International Staff and Administrative Staff are improving their knowledge capabilities at different rates. The challenge for ADB is to devise KM programs and initiatives that meet the needs of these three distinct groups of knowledge workers as ADB seeks to create a stronger Knowledge Institution.

4.3 Data Analysis of ADB Participants by Departments and RM/FOs

4.3.1 Data Analysis of ADB Participants by Departments

Table 5 shows the Average Total Scores of 2012 ADB KM Survey participants by Departments. A total of 14.7% of All ADB staff (in 26 departments) participated in the 2012 KM Survey (in the 2011 KM Survey respondents represented 37 departments). The decline in the number of participants (and the departments they represent) in the 2012 KM Survey provides increased statistical variance in this year’s results when compared to previous KM Surveys. The sampling size for some Departments was very small; therefore, the uncertainty value for each knowledge performance dimension in this year’s analysis by Departments is ±0.72.

Another way to analyze the data is to examine those Departments with the greatest deviation from the All ADB Staff Average Total Score (see Table 6 which examines those Departments which had a minimum of five respondents in both the 2011 and 2012 KM Surveys). This year it was possible to analyze 13 departments, compared to 19 Departments analyzed in the 2011 KM Survey. The 32% decline in Departments analyzed is due to the lower response rate in the 2012 KM Survey.

The total number of 2012 KM Survey respondents who were affiliated with these 13 Departments was 313, representing 73% of all respondents (in the 2011 KM Survey, respondents who were affiliated with reporting Departments totaled 761, representing 94% of all respondents). The analysis of this data provides insights into the perceptions of All ADB Staff with regards to the organization’s KM Implementation Framework.
### Analysis of ADB Staff by Departments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept/Dimension</th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>D2</th>
<th>D3</th>
<th>D4</th>
<th>D5</th>
<th>D6</th>
<th>D7</th>
<th>D8</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORM (1–1.72%)</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>76.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OREI (1–2.38%)</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>69.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSO (2–NA)</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>67.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD (17–17.35%)</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td>66.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAG (1–3.13%)</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>66.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAS (22–14.77%)</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>8.09</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>65.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTL (5–2.98%)</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Bank Staff (5)</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>63.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARO (2–40.0%)</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>61.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAI (20–100%)</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>7.55</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>60.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OGC (3–4.55%)</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>59.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DER (10–17.86%)</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>58.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSFMD (18–20.41%)</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>58.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARD (46–43.4%)</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>56.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPMS (10–6.67%)</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>55.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All ADB Staff (426)</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>55.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERD (63–17.65%)</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>55.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCO (3–7.89%)</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>55.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERD (11–16.18%)</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPD (13–25.49%)</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>54.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWRD (19–6.07%)</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>53.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IED (4–7.84%)</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>53.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIST (42–34.71%)</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>52.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSDD (43–28.29%)</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>50.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERO (1–20.0%)</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>49.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARD (18–4.73%)</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>46.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARD (31–16.85%)</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>45.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Analysis of All ADB staff (by department) average scores for the eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions (see Section 2) arranged in descending order. The number in parenthesis is total number of responses as well as the percentage of the total number of staff from the Department.
### Analysis of ADB Departments
(Minimum of Five Responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012 KM Survey Department (No. of Responses)</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>2011 KM Survey Department (No. of Responses)</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSOD (15)</td>
<td>56.60</td>
<td>PSOD (6)</td>
<td>46.50</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTL (5)</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>CTL (39)</td>
<td>54.72</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD (17)</td>
<td>66.12</td>
<td>TD (41)</td>
<td>60.10</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAS (22)</td>
<td>65.82</td>
<td>OAS (62)</td>
<td>60.34</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DER (10)</td>
<td>58.30</td>
<td>DER (8)</td>
<td>53.50</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERD (63)</td>
<td>55.38</td>
<td>SERD (176)</td>
<td>50.98</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARD (46)</td>
<td>56.52</td>
<td>PARD (36)</td>
<td>53.33</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSDD (43)</td>
<td>50.91</td>
<td>RSDD (85)</td>
<td>49.40</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWRD (19)</td>
<td>53.47</td>
<td>CWRD (108)</td>
<td>53.14</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPD (13)</td>
<td>54.85</td>
<td>SPD (28)</td>
<td>54.82</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERD (11)</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>ERD (9)</td>
<td>55.44</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARD (31)</td>
<td>45.58</td>
<td>EARD (37)</td>
<td>48.08</td>
<td>-5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARD (18)</td>
<td>46.78</td>
<td>SARD (51)</td>
<td>51.65</td>
<td>-9.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 6: Analysis of selected ADB Department responses for the eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions (percentage change between the 2011 and 2012 KM Surveys).*

Figure 6 is a visual representation of the change in Department perceptions between the 2011 and 2012 KM Surveys.

Between the 2011 and 2012 KM Surveys, CTL, DER, OAS, PARD, PSOD, SERD and TD had a more positive view (> 5%) of the ADB’s KM Implementation Framework. Between the 2011 and 2012 KM Surveys, EARD and SARD had a less positive view (> -5%) of the ADB’s KM Implementation Framework.

As a point of reference, between the 2010 and 2011 KM Surveys, CTL, CWRD, ERD, IED, OAG, OAS, OREI, PARD and TD had a more positive view (> 5%) of the ADB’s KM Implementation Framework. Between the 2010 and 2011 KM Surveys, OCO and OGC had a less positive view (> -5%) of the ADB’s KM Implementation Framework.
It is important to remember that perceptions of the ADB KM Implementation Framework can be affected by changes in personnel and leadership, reorganization of a Department, or changes in the number of respondents. And, Departments that are the focus of improvement efforts often report more positive views, while Departments that are not the focus of improvement efforts often report less positive views (the Hawthorne effect).

When considering action steps, the ADB is faced with two separate Departmental issues:

• Departments with low perceptions of the ADB KM Implementation Framework, including EARD and SARD. Organizational issues, if any, and implementation issues should be addressed.

• Departments with year-on-year declines in perceptions of the ADB KM Implementation Framework, including EARD and SARD. Discussions should be undertaken to understand the trend and plan activities in support for the KM Implementation Framework.

This year’s KM Study also reveals that ADB’s ‘back office’ departments have become more positive with respect to ADB’s KM implementation process. Knowledge creation, sharing and re-use are critical to these Departments and it appears that these ‘back office’ activities now perceive that they are gaining benefit from the KM implementation process.
When organizations such as ADB reach a certain point in their Knowledge Management 'maturity,' it becomes increasingly difficult to maintain the rate of knowledge transfer and conversion. This is a new challenge for ADB and requires a new set of KM programs and initiatives to maintain the rate of knowledge-driven organizational change so that all Departments see continuing benefits from the ADB KM Implementation Plan.

It also is important that ADB examine those Departments where perceptions of the KM Implementation Framework have undergone change (positive and negative) in order to understand the reasons why.

4.3.2 Data Analysis of ADB Participants by RM/FOs

Table 7 shows the average scores of 2012 ADB KM Survey participants by RM/FOs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RM/FOs/Dimension</th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>D2</th>
<th>D3</th>
<th>D4</th>
<th>D5</th>
<th>D6</th>
<th>D7</th>
<th>D8</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRM (1)</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>71.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRM (1)</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>67.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNRM (6)</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>64.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARR (1)</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>64.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TJRM (1)</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>64.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARM (5)</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>61.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRM (4)</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>58.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRM (2)</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>56.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFRM (2)</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>55.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All ADB Staff (426)</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>55.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VRM (7)</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>52.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INRM (4)</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>48.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNRM (8)</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>47.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLRM (3)</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRM (6)</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>44.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRM (2)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>36.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TKRM (1)</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>34.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Analysis of ADB Staff (by RM/FOs) average scores for the eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions (see Section 2.0) arranged in descending order. The number in parenthesis is total number of responses from each Mission.

The KM Study has examined the RM/FOs’ views of the ADB KM Implementation Framework since 2010. It should be noted that the sampling size for some RM/FOs was
very small; therefore, the uncertainty value for each MAKE knowledge performance dimension is ±0.54.

No response was recorded from the following RM/FOs for this year’s survey: Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz, Nepal, Philippines, Pacific Liaison and Coordination Office, PRC, Special Office in Timor-Leste, Pacific Sub-regional Office (Suva, Fiji) and Uzbekistan.

Figure 7 is a visual representation of the change in RM/FOs perceptions between the 2011 and 20112 KM Surveys.

Figure 7: Visual representation of the change in RM/FOs perceptions between the 2011 and 2012 KM Surveys.

Another way to analyze the data is to examine those RM/FOs with the greatest deviation from the All ADB Staff Average Total Score (see Table 8).  The analysis of this data provides insights into the perceptions of RM/FOs with regards to the organization’s KM Implementation Framework.

Between the 2010 and 2011 KM Surveys, ARRM, CARM, MNRM, SLRM, TJRM, TRM and VRM had a more positive view (> 5%) of the ADB’s KM Implementation Framework.  Between the 2010 and 2011 KM Surveys, INRM, IRM, PRM and TKRM had a less positive view (> -5%) of the ADB’s KM Implementation Framework.  However, ADB should be careful when attempting to reach any conclusions from these numbers.  The response rate for the RM/FOs is very low and all it takes is the views of a single individual to affect the results (both positively and negatively).
### Analysis of ADB RM/FOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012 KM Survey RM/FOs (No. of Responses)</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>2011 KM Survey RM/FOs (No. of Responses)</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRM (1)</td>
<td>67.00</td>
<td>TRM (9)</td>
<td>45.78</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNRM (8)</td>
<td>47.13</td>
<td>MNRM (2)</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TJRM (1)</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>TJRM (9)</td>
<td>53.67</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLRM (3)</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>SLRM (2)</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VRM (7)</td>
<td>52.86</td>
<td>VRM (21)</td>
<td>47.24</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARRM (1)</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>ARRM (2)</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARM (5)</td>
<td>61.00</td>
<td>CARM (11)</td>
<td>56.55</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRM (1)</td>
<td>71.00</td>
<td>GRM (2)</td>
<td>68.01</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNRM (6)</td>
<td>64.50</td>
<td>PNRM (3)</td>
<td>62.66</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRM (2)</td>
<td>56.50</td>
<td>NRM (3)</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRM (4)</td>
<td>58.50</td>
<td>LRM (13)</td>
<td>57.69</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFRM (2)</td>
<td>55.50</td>
<td>AFRM (8)</td>
<td>57.39</td>
<td>-3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRM (6)</td>
<td>44.83</td>
<td>IRM (19)</td>
<td>51.74</td>
<td>-13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INRM (4)</td>
<td>48.25</td>
<td>INRM (6)</td>
<td>59.49</td>
<td>-18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRM (2)</td>
<td>36.50</td>
<td>PRM (13)</td>
<td>55.15</td>
<td>-33.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TKRM (1)</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>TKRM (1)</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>-46.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Analysis of responses of ADB RM/FOs for the eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions (percentage change between the 2011 and 2012 KM Surveys). Only those ADB RM/FOs providing data for both the 2011 and 2012 KM Surveys are analyzed in this Table.

It is important to remember that perceptions of the ADB KM Implementation Framework can be affected by changes in personnel and leadership, reorganization of a Mission, or changes in the number of respondents.

When considering action steps, the ADB is faced with two separate RM/FOs issues:
• RM/FOs with low perceptions of the ADB KM Implementation Framework, including INRM, IRM, MNRM, PRM, SLRM and TKTRM. Organizational issues, if any, and implementation issues should be addressed.

• RM/FOs with year-on-year declines in perceptions of the ADB KM Implementation Framework, including, INRM, IRM, PRM and TKRM. Discussions should be undertaken to understand the trend and plan activities in support for the KM Implementation Framework.

As might be expected, there also appears to be a ‘distance’ factor which affects perceptions of the RM/FOs staff. As a general rule, operating units situated at a distance from the organization’s headquarters and associated ‘back office operations’ rely more on information and computer technology (ICT) collaboration methods to access knowledge resources and learning services. This ‘dependence’ on shared knowledge resources results in non-headquarters staff being more concerned regarding knowledge resource availability and the quality of knowledge content. The RM/FOs responses from the 2012 KM Survey would support this general observation. The RM/FOs had less positive perceptions than the All ADB Staff in the following knowledge dimensions:

D1. **ADB’s ability to create and sustain an enterprise knowledge-driven culture.**

D3. **ADB knowledge products (publications, newsletters) in terms of value added, accessibility, relevance, quality, etc.?**

D7. **ADB’s success in working with external stakeholders (i.e., DMCs and external networks) in knowledge-sharing and development activities?**

Based on hundreds of MAKE assessments, Teleos reports that operating units located at a distance from the headquarters usually demand greater levels of access (both quality and quantity of knowledge content) to knowledge assets. They also require greater levels of communications and support in the training and use of knowledge tools and techniques. The ADB must decide whether additional resources should be allocated to RM/FOs to provide them with what they perceive as the required levels of knowledge sharing and collaboration to achieve their goals and objective.

4.4 **Data Analysis of ADB vs. MAKE Leaders**

4.4.1 **Asian MAKE Studies – Expert Panel Scores**

Table 9 shows ADB’s actual Average Total Scores given by the Asian MAKE panel of experts for the 2010-2012 Asian MAKE Studies. The Asian MAKE Average Total Scores by knowledge performance dimension are determined by an Asian MAKE expert panel consisting of Asian-based business leaders (Global Fortune 500 companies) and internationally recognized knowledge management / intellectual capital / innovation /
organizational learning experts. The sampling error for each knowledge dimension is ±0.09.

### Analysis of ADB Average Scores by Asian MAKE Panel of Experts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey/Dimension</th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>D2</th>
<th>D3</th>
<th>D4</th>
<th>D5</th>
<th>D6</th>
<th>D7</th>
<th>D8</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012 MAKE Study (23)</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>65.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 MAKE Study (17)</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>63.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 MAKE Study (23)</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>55.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Average scores for ADB for each of the eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions (see Section 2.0) from the 2010-2012 Asian MAKE panel of experts (the number in parentheses is ADB’s position ranking for each Asian MAKE study, and the maximum score for the eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions is 80).

Table 9 reveals that the 2011 Asian MAKE panel of experts recognized ADB’s KM Implementation Framework progress with a 13.1% improvement is the organization’s Asian MAKE Average Total Score. Between the 2011 and 2012 Asian MAKE studies the panel of experts continued to recognize improvements with an additional 3.7% improvement. While ADB improved in all eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions between the 2011 and 2012 Asian MAKE studies, it should be noted that there was very small changes in the Average Total Scores for knowledge creation (Dimension 3: ADB knowledge products) and (Dimension 5) collaboration and knowledge sharing. This indicates that other organizations are improving in these areas faster than ADB and that the ADB should examine its processes for creating ADB knowledge products, as well as examining its IT-enabled knowledge sharing and collaboration technologies to determine if they need to be upgraded.

### 4.4.2 2012 Asian and Global MAKE Studies – Expert Panel Scores

ADB was both a 2012 Asian MAKE Winner and a 2012 Global MAKE Finalist. Table 10 provides an analysis of the views of the 2012 All ADB Staff Average Total Score versus the actual scores for ADB by the 2012 Asian MAKE and 2012 Global MAKE panels of experts.

The Asian MAKE study compares organizations headquartered in Asia. When compared to Asian-headquartered organizations, the Asian MAKE panel of experts were slightly
more positive that the ADB All Staff with regards to ADB’s knowledge capabilities and processes. Based on the 2012 Asian MAKE study, ADB was recognized as a knowledge-driven leader within the Asian region.

Analysis of ADB – ADB Staff vs. MAKE Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey/Dimension</th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>D2</th>
<th>D3</th>
<th>D4</th>
<th>D5</th>
<th>D6</th>
<th>D7</th>
<th>D8</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All ADB Staff</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>55.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian MAKE Experts</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>61.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global MAKE Experts</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>8.51</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>58.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Analysis of All ADB Staff responses for the eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions (see Section 2.0) compared to the 2012 Asian MAKE and 2012 Global MAKE panels of experts in each knowledge performance dimension.

The Global MAKE study compares organizations headquartered anywhere in the world. As a result, the larger Global MAKE panel of experts tends to be more critical when it comes to benchmarking organizations. When comparing all organization in the world, the Global MAKE panel of experts tended to agree with the ADB All Staff with regards to ADB’s knowledge capabilities and processes. The ADB All Staff Average Total Score was 55.46, and the 2012 Global MAKE panel of experts gave ADB a score of 58.85.

The most important difference between the perceptions of the ADB All Staff and the 2012 Global MAKE panel of experts was in knowledge performance dimension D3: Ability to develop and deliver knowledge-based projects/services. The 2012 Global MAKE panel of experts (as well as the Asian MAKE panel of experts) indicated that ADB was more successful that the All ADB Staff responses in creating and delivering new knowledge products and services. It is only natural that ADB staff are occasionally frustrated when they can not locate the specific knowledge required to complete a task, and therefore are perhaps more critical of ADB’s processes for creating and delivering these knowledge products/services. However, when viewed objectively by independent experts, ADB’s knowledge creation and delivery processes are considered best practice among its regional and global peers.

The Asian and Global MAKE panels of experts are in agreement that ADB’s ‘strengths’ are its ability to:
• develop and deliver client knowledge-based projects/services (Dimension 3).

• ability to create an enterprise-wide collaborative knowledge-sharing environment (Dimension 5).

• develop and sustain a learning and sharing culture (Dimension 6).

With the exception of Dimension 6, these same ADB 'strengths' were highlighted in the 2011 KM Survey. Within the past year the MAKE panels of experts have recognized ADB’s efforts to create a learning organization.

The Asian and Global MAKE panels of experts are in agreement that that ADB’s 'weaknesses' are its ability to:

• manage and maximize the value of enterprise intellectual capital (Dimension 4).

• work with external stakeholders in knowledge-sharing and development activities (Dimension 7).

• adopt, incorporate, and apply lessons learned and experiences in its daily operations and sharing them within ADB and other stakeholders (Dimension 8).

This year the MAKE panels of experts indicate that when compared to both regional and global MAKE leaders, ADB needs to do more work in managing and protecting its intellectual capital (Dimension 3). ADB’s ability to work with external stakeholders (Dimension 7) and ADB’s ability to adopt, incorporate and apply lessons learned and experiences in its daily operations and sharing them within ADB and other stakeholders (Dimension 8) are considered 'foundation' knowledge performance dimensions and are showing a trend towards higher average scores at this point in ADB’s KM implementation process. ADB should be commended for improvements in these MAKE knowledge performance dimensions. However, these areas should be examined in the next annual KM review to determine how further progress can be made.

4.4.3 2012 Asian and Global MAKE Studies – MAKE Leaders Scores

Table 11 provides an analysis of the views of the 2012 All ADB Staff Average Total Score versus scores for the 2012 Asian Most Admired Knowledge Enterprises (MAKE) Leaders and 2012 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 Average Total Score.

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

### Analysis of ADB Staff vs. MAKE Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey/Dimension</th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>D2</th>
<th>D3</th>
<th>D4</th>
<th>D5</th>
<th>D6</th>
<th>D7</th>
<th>D8</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All ADB Staff</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>55.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Asian MAKE Leaders</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>65.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Global MAKE Leaders</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>8.31</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>66.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 11: Analysis of All ADB Staff responses for the eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions (see Section 2.0) compared to the 2012 Asian MAKE Leaders and 2012 Global MAKE Leaders in each knowledge performance dimension.*

It is Teleos’ experience that when an organization’s own staff completes a KM Survey, they do not always have the objectivity or external knowledge of best practice knowledge-driven organizations. Therefore, the sampling error for All ADB Staff per knowledge performance dimension is ±0.27.

An analysis of Table 11 suggests that there are opportunities for ADB to further improve its knowledge processes and capabilities – in the region of 15% to 20%.

#### 4.4.4 2012 Asian MAKE Benchmarks

Besides ADB (ranked in 23rd place), three other non-commercial organizations were recognized as 2012 Asian MAKE Winners: Singapore Armed Forces (ranked in 3rd place), Hong Kong Productivity Council (ranked in 6th place), and the Korea Water Resources Corporation (ranked in 15th place). The Singapore Armed Forces, Hong Kong Productivity Council and Korea Water Resources Corporation operate in an environment similar to that of the ADB and could serve as useful benchmarks. Table 12 compares ADB’s Average Total Scores to those of the three non-commercial 2012 Asian MAKE Winners.
## Analysis of ADB vs. Selected 2011 Asian MAKE Winners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey/Dimension</th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>D2</th>
<th>D3</th>
<th>D4</th>
<th>D5</th>
<th>D6</th>
<th>D7</th>
<th>D8</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singapore Armed Forces</td>
<td>8.97</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>70.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong Productivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>8.76</td>
<td>8.97</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>8.96</td>
<td>8.76</td>
<td>8.96</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>68.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea Water Resources</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>7.99</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>64.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADB</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>61.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Analysis of All ADB Staff responses for the eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions (see Section 2.0) compared to the 2012 Asian MAKE panel of experts average scores for selected non-commercial 2012 Asian MAKE Winners in each knowledge performance dimension.

When compared to the three non-commercial 2012 Asian MAKE Winners in Table 12, ADB has opportunities for improving its knowledge-driven processes and capabilities in all MAKE knowledge performance dimensions – in most cases by at least 10%. Only in the MAKE knowledge performance Dimension 3 (develop and deliver client knowledge-based projects/services) does ADB equal or surpass the other three non-commercial 2012 Asian MAKE Winners.

### 2012 Asian MAKE Winner – Singapore Armed Forces (Singapore)

The Singapore Armed Forces (SAF) is part of the Singapore Ministry of Defense. The SAF consists of the Singapore Army, the Republic of Singapore Air Force, and the Republic of Singapore Navy. The SAF protects the interests, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Singapore from external threats. The SAF has an active strength of more than 70,000 personnel and is capable of mobilizing over 350,000 reservists. The SAF has an annual budget of US $ 10.1 billion (5.1% of Singapore’s GDP).

The 2012 Asian MAKE panel has recognized the Singapore Armed Forces for transforming enterprise knowledge into stakeholder value (1st place). The Singapore Armed Forces is a three-time Asian MAKE Winner (including 2010 Overall Asian MAKE Winner).

### 2012 Asian MAKE Winner – Hong Kong Productivity Centre (Hong Kong, SAR, China)
The Hong Kong Productivity Council (HKPC) is a multi-disciplinary organization established by statute in 1967. HKPC’s mission is to promote productivity excellence through the provision of integrated support across the value chain of Hong Kong firms, in order to achieve a more effective utilization of resources, to enhance the value-added content of products and services, and to increase international competitiveness.

The 2012 Asian MAKE panel has recognized the Hong Kong Productivity Council for developing knowledge workers through senior management leadership. This is the first time that the Hong Kong Productivity Council has been recognized as an Asian MAKE Winner.

**2012 Asian MAKE Winner – Korea Water Resources Corporation (S. Korea)**

Korea Water Resources Corporation (K-water) is a public enterprise that was founded for the principal purpose of improving public welfare through water supply and water quality improvement by way of construction and management of water and wastewater systems. K-water has annual sales approaching US $2 billion (fiscal year ending December 31, 2010) and employs over 3,900 people.

The 2012 Asian MAKE panel has recognized Korea Water Resources Corporation (K-water) for maximizing enterprise intellectual capital. K-water is a five-time Asian MAKE Winner.

Figure 8 is a Visual representation comparing the 2012 Asian MAKE scores for Singapore Armed Forces (blue line), Hong Kong Productivity Council (red line), and Korea Water Resources Corporation (green line), and Asian Development Bank (purple line) against the ‘perfect’ MAKE knowledge-driven organizations (outside black line).

These 2012 Asian MAKE Winners could serve as valuable benchmarking partners as the ADB seeks to improve and refine its KM strategy and implementation process.
4.5 MAKE Knowledge Management Implementation Model

Most Admired Knowledge Enterprises (MAKE) researchers have identified that an organizational knowledge-driven strategy implementation goes through five stages:

Stage 1: Pre-implementation (up to 1 year)
Stage 2: Implementation (1-3 years)
Stage 3: Reinvigoration (4-6 years)
Stage 4: Inculcation (7-9 years)
Stage 5: Holistic (10+ years)

Based on ADB’s complex and decentralized organizational structure, non-commercial status and extensive use of external partners and consultants, the task of implementing a KM Strategy is perhaps more difficult, requiring the addition of an extra one or two years to each of the MAKE KM Implementation Model stages.

The first stage involves the planning and launch of the knowledge strategy. During the next three stages – after approximately three, six and nine years – organizations encounter significant implementation barriers. Senior managers and key knowledge

Figure 8: Visual representation comparing the 2012 Asian MAKE scores for Singapore Armed Forces (blue line), Hong Kong Productivity Council (red line) and Korea Water Resources Corporation (green line), and Asian Development Bank (purple line) against the ‘perfect’ MAKE knowledge-driven organizations (outside black line).
management (KM) core team members move to new positions. Employees become complacent – even lose interest in KM activities. There also are growing demands to measure the benefits of the knowledge-driven strategy.

At the end of each stage it is important to take stock of the accomplishments (and failures). It also is important to set new goals and objectives to revitalize the KM effort.

Based on eight annual KM Surveys, ADB is now in Stage 4 (Inculcation). This view is supported by the fact that ADB’s All Staff Average Total Score has improved steadily since the 2008 KM Survey. The 2012 Asian MAKE panel of experts has confirmed this by recognizing ADB as a 2012 Asian MAKE Winner.

**Stages 3-5: Reinvigoration, Inculcation and Holistic**

Based on the study of hundreds of MAKE leaders, the ADB is now in Stage 4 of the MAKE Knowledge Management Implementation Model, which is focused on Inculcation. Goals and objectives described in *Enhancing Knowledge Management under Strategy 2020: Plan of Action for 2009-2011* (Final Report as of August 2012) and *The Asian Development Bank (ADB) – Becoming a Stronger Knowledge Institution (Knowledge Management Plan Draft June 22, 2012)* need to be implemented. ADB should continue to challenge the organization to drive the KM Implementation Framework forward in order to improve the effectiveness and efficiencies of its knowledge capabilities and processes (opportunities exist for 15%-20% improvements).

Within two or three years the ADB KM Implementation Framework effort will hit the ‘final barrier’ – Stage 5 (Holistic) – which is perhaps the most difficult implementation stage. It is here that an organization either successfully embeds the knowledge-driven strategy within the enterprise, or the strategy will ‘plateau’ or actually be ‘rejected’ and the organization will focus on a new ‘miracle cure’ to drive the enterprise.

MAKE research reveals that for non-profit and public sector organizations it usually takes more than 10 years of continuous culture change to firmly embed a knowledge strategy within an organization. At this point in time the organization finally thinks ‘knowledge’ and all of its activities are built around knowledge-driven processes. Organizations reaching this stage are often recognized as Global MAKE leaders, and tend to excel in almost anything they do.
5.0 Recommendations

5.1 KM Implementation Framework Stretch Goals

Teleos has observed that organizations move through recognizable stages during a KM implementation process (see Section 4.5). Based on this year’s ADB KM Survey as well as the results of previous MAKE studies, it appears that the ADB is now in late Stage 4 of the five-stage MAKE Knowledge Management Implementation Model. Typical of this Stage are changes in senior management leadership, changes in the core KM team, perceived diminishing returns from some KM investments (simple knowledge processes have been improved, but more complex knowledge processes have not been examined), and there is a general impression by many managers and staff that the organization’s knowledge ‘problems’ have been solved.

Successfully moving from Stage 4 to Stage 5 is critical to becoming a Most Admired Knowledge Enterprise. To avoid falling into the trap of complacency in the belief that the ADB has transformed itself into a “world-class” knowledge organization, ADB should ensure the completion of all outstanding goals found in the Enhancing Knowledge Management under Strategy 2020: Plan of Action for 2009-2011 (Final Report as of August 2012) and The Asian Development Bank (ADB) – Becoming a Stronger Knowledge Institution (Knowledge Management Plan Draft June 22, 2012) documents, and prepare a new set of KM goals for the years beginning 2013. The 2012 KM Survey reveals that there is still much work for ADB to do in improving its knowledge capabilities, and that there are opportunities for improvement across the entire organization. It is estimated that the ADB is operating at about 80% of its potential with regards to its knowledge capabilities and processes. Thus, there are many opportunities to improve the organization’s knowledge-driven capabilities in order to reduce operating costs and improve delivery of knowledge products to its clients/partners.

*ADB should ensure that the KM Implementation Framework continues to be aligned to the organization’s evolving Vision, Mission and Goals. ADB should review the Enhancing Knowledge Management under Strategy 2020: Plan of Action for 2009-2011 document and prepare a new KM Plan of Action (for years beginning 2013) that is aligned to Stage 4 (Inculcation) and Stage 5 (Holistic) of the MAKE KM Implementation Model. These new KM ‘stretch’ goals should be designed to support the four identified pillars:*

(i) sharpening the knowledge focus in all ADB operations.

(ii) promoting and empowering communities of practice for knowledge capture and sharing.

(iii) strengthening external knowledge partnerships to develop and disseminate knowledge.
(iv) enhancing staff learning and skills development

5.2 Organizational Knowledge Capabilities

Over the first three ADB KM Surveys (2005-2007), there was substantial improvement in the eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions. However, with the exception of organizational learning, the 2008 KM Survey revealed a decline in organizational knowledge capabilities, especially in knowledge-driven culture; knowledge leadership; creation, access and use of knowledge products; and successfully working with external stakeholders.

Considerable progress has been made since the adoption of Enhancing Knowledge Management under Strategy 2020: Plan of Action for 2009-2011. The 2010 ADB KM Survey (supported by other surveys such as the 2010 Learning for Change Survey), revealed that ADB, faced with many structural and human resources challenges and working within global economic uncertainties, was improving its knowledge capabilities in all eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions. Several ‘barriers’ were identified in the 2010 KM Survey, especially ADB’s slow progress in becoming a learning organization. As a results of the 2010 KM Survey findings, ADB commissioned and published the 2011 Survey of ADB-Hosted Communities of Practice. Its recommendations were incorporated into the KM Implementation Framework effort.

The results of the 2011 KM Survey reveal that ADB has made progress across all eight knowledge performance dimensions. ADB’s recognition as a 2011 Asian MAKE Winner and 2011 Global MAKE Finalist, repeated again in the 2012 MAKE studies, demonstrates that ADB’s knowledge-driven improvements have been noticed by experts in the fields of Knowledge Management, Intellectual Capital Management and Organizational Learning.

ADB should be commended in its efforts to create a holistic KM Implementation Framework. All too often organizations stress improvements in one or two MAKE knowledge performance dimensions, which results in an unbalanced approach and often leads to a dysfunctional knowledge culture and collaborative knowledge-sharing environment. In the case of ADB, its KM Implementation Framework encompasses all eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions, resulting in a well-balanced, holistic knowledge-driven organization.

The National Officers, International Staff and Administrative Staff are improving their knowledge capabilities at different rates. The continuing challenge for ADB is to continue to devise new KM programs and initiatives that meet the needs of these three distinct groups of knowledge workers, especially the International Staff, while at the same time moving the entire enterprise forwards towards becoming a leading knowledge-driven organization.

While ADB improved in all eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions between the 2011 and 2012 Asian MAKE studies, it should be noted that there was
very small changes in the Average Total Scores for knowledge creation (Dimension 3: ADB knowledge products) and (Dimension 5) collaboration and knowledge sharing. This indicates that other organizations are improving in these areas faster than ADB and that the ADB should examine its processes for creating ADB knowledge products, as well as examining its IT-enabled knowledge sharing and collaboration technologies to determine if they need to be upgraded.

When organizations such as ADB reach a certain point in their Knowledge Management ‘maturity,’ it becomes increasingly difficult to maintain the rate of knowledge transfer and conversion. This is a new challenge for ADB and requires a new set of KM programs and initiatives to maintain the rate of knowledge-driven organizational change so that all Departments see continuing benefits from the ADB KM Implementation Plan.

5.3 ADB Departments

Section 4.3 provides responses by individual ADB Departments. Most ADB Departments are now supporting the KM Implementation Framework; however some Departments see no need to change, while there remain a few Departments (especially those in ‘back office’ areas which are skeptical that any change is possible. Successful KM implementation is not guaranteed, even in those ADB Departments currently registering improvements in their Average Total Scores (as revealed by the fact that several Departments which were supportive of the ADB KM Implementation Framework last year are now less supportive).

It is recommended that the ADB examine how to encourage Departments to embrace change. This is especially true where departments have had changes in senior management or organizational structure. It also is important that ADB examine those Departments where perceptions of the KM Implementation Framework have become less positive in order to understand the reasons why. If left unchecked, it is possible that those Departments may act as barriers to successful KM implementation throughout ADB. The ADB should consider establishing a specific education/training KM initiative to assist newly appointed department senior managers.

5.4 ADB RM/FOs

The number of ADB RM/FOs participating in the 2012 KM Study as well as the number of Mission staff, declined from the 2011 KM Study. As a result, this year’s results are slightly less reliable than in previous studies. A majority of ADB RM/FOs has a positive perception of the ADB KM Implementation Plan. RM/FOs with large numbers of National Officers and Administrative Staff had higher KM Survey Average Total Scores, while those RM/FOs with large numbers of International Staff had lower KM Survey Average Total Scores.
As might be expected, there also appears to be a ‘distance’ factor which affects perceptions of the RM/FOs staff. As a general rule, operating units situated at a distance from the organization’s headquarters and associated ‘back office operations’ rely more on information and computer technology (ICT) collaboration methods to access knowledge resources and learning services. This ‘dependence’ on shared knowledge resources results in non-headquarters staff being more critical of knowledge resource availability and the quality of knowledge content. The RM/FOs’ responses from the 2012 KM Survey would support this general observation. The RM/FOs had less positive perceptions than the All ADB Staff in the following knowledge dimensions:

D1. ADB’s ability to create and sustain an enterprise knowledge-driven culture.

D3. ADB knowledge products (publications, newsletters) in terms of value added, accessibility, relevance, quality, etc.?

D7. ADB’s success in working with external stakeholders (i.e., DMCs and external networks) in knowledge-sharing and development activities?

Based on hundreds of MAKE assessments, Teleos reports that operating units located at a distance from the headquarters usually demand greater levels of access (both quality and quantity of knowledge content) to knowledge assets. They also require greater levels of communications and support in the training and use of knowledge tools and techniques. The ADB must decide whether additional resources should be allocated to RM/FOs to provide them with what they perceive as the required levels of knowledge sharing and collaboration to achieve their goals and objective.

ADB should attempt to identify possible KM best practices at RM/FOs with high scores and transfer to these best practices to RM/FOs with low scores to improve the knowledge capabilities at all ADB RM/FOs. The ADB also must decide whether additional resources should be allocated to RM/FOs to provide them with what they perceive as the required levels of knowledge sharing and collaboration to achieve their goals and objective.

5.5 Benchmark Asian MAKE Leaders

The 2012 Asian MAKE panel of experts recognized the Asian Development Bank for its progress in transforming itself into a leading Asian knowledge-driven organization. The ADB is commended for its long-term support which has resulted in the ADB being named a 2012 Asian MAKE Winner. The ADB should use this recognition to promote its KM Implementation Plan, both to its internal Staff as well as partners and stakeholders.

The ADB should benchmark other Asian MAKE leaders in order to identify best practice knowledge processes. Where appropriate, the ADB should transfer these best practices (customized to ADB requirements) to improve ADB’s knowledge...
capabilities. The emphasis for ADB is to accelerate the rate of knowledge-driven organizational change so that all Departments and RM/FOs continue to derive benefits from the ADB KM Implementation Plan.

5.6 2013 KM Study

It is recommended that if a 2013 KM Study is conducted that it not take place at the end of the year when large numbers of staff are on holiday or away from the ADB. This year’s KM Study response rate was lower than the 2011 KM Study. Besides a decline in the quality of the results, it is most likely that valuable learning points were missed due to the lack of data, especially from some Departments and RM/FOs. These learning points would have provided for a more accurate formulation of KM programs and initiatives for the period through 2020.

Submitted on February 19, 2013, by:

Rory Chase
Managing Director
Teleos
Appendix 1: MAKE Framework

This Knowledge Management Assessment is based on the Most Admired Knowledge Enterprises (MAKE) Framework. Teleos developed a framework of eight knowledge performance dimensions which are the visible drivers of the knowledge-driven enterprise:

• Creating an enterprise knowledge-driven culture.
• developing knowledge workers through senior management leadership.
• delivering knowledge-based products/services/solutions.
• maximizing enterprise intellectual capital.
• creating an environment for collaborative knowledge sharing.
• creating a learning organization.
• delivering value based on stakeholder knowledge.
• transforming enterprise knowledge into stakeholder value.

Each of these eight knowledge performance dimensions is made up of dozens of knowledge processes and sub-processes. Taken together, they serve as the ‘engine’ of the knowledge-driven enterprise. The following Figure shows the relationship among the eight MAKE knowledge performance dimensions.

The eight knowledge performance dimensions which form the MAKE framework are found in all world-class enterprises. They are seen as key drivers in creating wealth in knowledge-intensive organizations. Listed below are the major processes which form the foundation of the eight knowledge performance dimensions.

Creating an enterprise knowledge-driven culture

The key drivers of this knowledge performance dimension include:

• Developing and deploying a knowledge-driven enterprise vision and strategy.
• Determining enterprise core competencies (knowledge assets).
• Designing a knowledge-driven enterprise structure and relationships between enterprise units.
• Developing and managing enterprise knowledge values.
• Developing and managing enterprise knowledge behaviors.
• Developing and managing enterprise knowledge systems/processes.
• Creating and managing a knowledge-based human resources strategy.

**Developing knowledge workers through senior management leadership**

The key drivers of this knowledge performance dimension include:

• Developing and deploying an enterprise management style that encourages the acquisition, sharing and application of knowledge for enterprise value creation.
• Providing financial and non-financial enterprise support for managing knowledge.
• Encouraging and supporting an enterprise knowledge strategy and approach.
• Developing and training knowledge leaders.
• Recognizing/rewarding knowledge leaders.

Perhaps the key knowledge performance attribute in this knowledge performance dimension is the chief executive officer’s support. This support involves articulating a clear vision for the organization, including how it is going to become and then grow as a knowledge-driven enterprise.

**Delivering knowledge-based products/services/solutions**

The key drivers of this knowledge performance dimension include:

• Developing and deploying an enterprise knowledge creation and innovation strategy.
• Developing and training the workforce in idea generation and innovation.
• Involving customers and suppliers in the development of knowledge-based goods and services.
• Increasing/expanding enterprise knowledge.
• Managing the transfer of knowledge and ideas to ‘points of action.’
• Recognizing/rewarding innovators.
• Managing the production and/or service of knowledge-based goods and services.

• Measuring value created from knowledge creation and innovation.

Visionary companies create an environment of ‘discomfort’ to stimulate change and improvement – before their customers/clients demand it of them. Best practice innovative organizations display the following characteristics:

• Employees are allowed free time to be creative.

• Functional barriers are removed and ‘silo’ mentalities discouraged.

• Employees are allowed to take risks and to make mistakes.

• Organizations create reward systems which encourage innovation.

• Networks and communities of practice are encouraged.

• Customers are integrated into the creative process – problems are looked at from the customers’ perspective.

• The innovation process is under continuous review and improvement.

**Maximizing enterprise intellectual capital**

The key drivers of this knowledge performance dimension include:

• Developing and deploying an enterprise intellectual capital strategy.

• Developing and training the enterprise workforce in intellectual capital concepts and tools.

• Developing tools and techniques to manage and measure intellectual capital.

• Managing and expanding intellectual capital.

• Protecting knowledge assets.

• Recognizing/rewarding employees for increasing enterprise intellectual capital.

**Creating an environment for collaborative knowledge sharing**

The key drivers of this knowledge performance dimension include:
• Developing and managing the capture, categorization and use of knowledge.
• Mapping knowledge resources throughout the organization.
• Converting individual tacit into enterprise explicit knowledge.
• Creating systematic mechanisms for sharing existing internal and external knowledge and best practices.
• Providing information technology platforms for knowledge sharing.
• Developing communities of practice.
• Effectiveness in identifying and accessing internal and external expertise.
• Establishing knowledge-based reward and recognition systems.

Creating a learning organization

The key drivers of this knowledge performance dimension include:

• Developing a knowledge-driven enterprise learning strategy.
• Developing collaboration/partnerships for accelerated learning.
• Developing and/or acquiring learning methodologies, tools and techniques.
• Converting individual tacit into enterprise explicit knowledge.
• Developing communities of practice.
• Learning by doing.
• Coaching and mentoring.
• Developing an organizational learning infrastructure, e.g., corporate intranet for the internal and external exchange of learning experiences.
• Moving from individual learning to organizational learning.

Most knowledge enterprises understand that to grow and prosper in the 21st century, they will have to innovate, develop new knowledge and create maximum value for their customers and shareholders. To establish this environment of creativity and innovation, a growing number of firms are transforming themselves into learning organizations.
Delivering value based on stakeholder knowledge

The key drivers of this knowledge performance dimension include:

- Developing and deploying an enterprise knowledge-driven stakeholder value strategy.

- Creating and managing stakeholder value profiles and maps.

- Creating stakeholder value chains.

- Developing and/or acquiring tools and techniques to collect and gain value from stakeholder knowledge.

- Developing and managing stakeholder databases.

- Developing tools and techniques to extract value from stakeholder knowledge.

- Measuring changes in the stakeholder value chain.

The knowledge economy has changed the goal posts in terms of winning stakeholders and retaining their loyalty. It is now possible to market to stakeholders on a global scale and to know more about their needs, wants and desires than ever before. On the other hand, stakeholders are becoming more discerning – they are knowledgeable about what they want, how much they will pay for it, and from whom they will purchase it.

Transforming enterprise knowledge into stakeholder value

The key drivers of this knowledge performance dimension include:

- Developing and deploying an enterprise knowledge-driven strategy for increasing stakeholder value.

- Mapping and developing knowledge value chains.

- Managing and measuring knowledge value chains.

- Measuring changes in enterprise stakeholder value.

- Communicating/reporting on knowledge-based value creation.

Organizations have discovered that this knowledge performance dimension, along with 'Maximizing the Value of an Enterprise’s Intellectual Capital,' are the most difficult to manage at a strategic level. The concept of knowledge-based stakeholder value is hard
to grasp, and tools and techniques are lacking to make it visible within the enterprise as well as to external stakeholders.

Part of the difficulty is that most companies are still operating with industrial age financial and accounting systems. Attempting to measure and manage knowledge processes that create stakeholder value – especially those activities that focus on long-term value generation – are still beyond the grasp of most organizations.
Appendix 2: Abbreviations

Staff Categories

AS    Administrative Staff
IS    International Staff
NO    National Officer

Departments

BOD    Board of Directors
BPMS   Budget, Personnel, and Management Systems Department
CRPN   Compliance Review Panel
CTL    Controller’s Department
CWRD   Central and West Asia Department
DER    Department of External Relations
EARD   East Asia Department
ERD    Economics and Research Department
ERO    European Representative Office
IED    Independent Evaluation Department
JRO    Japanese Representative Office
NARO   North American Representative Office
OAG    Office of the Auditor General
OAI    Office of Anticorruption and Integrity
OAS    Office of Administrative Services
OCO    Office of Cofinancing Operations
OCRNP  Office of the Compliance Review Panel
OGC    Office of the General Counsel
OIST   Office of Information Systems and Technology
OOMP   Office of the Ombudsman
OPR    Office of the President
OREI   Office of Regional Economic Integration
ORM    Office of Risk Management
OSFMD  Operations Services and Financial Management Department
OSPF   Office of the Special Project Facilitator
PARD   Pacific Department
PSOD   Private Sector Operations Department
RSDD   Regional and Sustainable Development Department
SARD   South Asia Department
SEC    Office of the Secretary
SERD   Southeast Asia Department
SPD    Strategy and Policy Department
TD  Treasury Department
VPAC  Office of the Vice-President (Admin & Corporate Management)
VPFR  Office of the Vice-President (Finance & Risk Management)
VPKM  Office of the Vice-Pres. Knowledge Mgmt. & Sustainable Dev.
VPO1  Office of the Vice-President (Operations 1)
VPO2  Office of the Vice-President (Operations 2)
VPPC  Office of the Vice-Pres. (Private Sector & Cofinancing Ops)

Resident Missions and Field (Country) Offices

AFRM  Afghanistan Resident Mission
ARRM  Armenia Resident Mission
AZRM  Azerbaijan Resident Mission
BRM  Bangladesh Resident Mission
CARM  Cambodia Resident Mission
GRM  Georgia Resident Mission
INRM  India Resident Mission
IRM  Indonesia Resident Mission
KARM  Kazakhstan Resident Mission
KYRM  Kyrgyz Resident Mission
LRM  Lao Resident Mission
MNRM  Mongolia Resident Mission
NRM  Nepal Resident Mission
PHCO  Philippines Country Office
PLCO  Pacific Liaison and Coordination Office in Sydney, Australia
PNRM  Papua New Guinea Resident Mission
PRCM  PRC Resident Mission
PRM  Pakistan Resident Mission
SLRM  Sri Lanka Resident Mission
SOTL  Special Office in Timor-Leste
SPSO  Pacific Subregional Office in Suva, Fiji
TJRM  Tajikistan Resident Mission
TKRM  Turkmenistan Resident Mission
TRM  Thailand Resident Mission
URM  Uzbekistan Resident Mission
VRM  Viet Nam Resident Mission
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