



World Food
Programme

SAVING
LIVES
CHANGING
LIVES

REVIEW OF THE KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

Regional Bureau of Nairobi 2021 – 2023

February 2024

Anoushka Boteju,
Head of Unit, Programme Cycle Management

Prepared by
Lillian Karanja
Knowledge Management Officer

February 2024

Contents

- Acknowledgements 4**
- Disclaimer 4**
- Executive Summary5**
- Introduction 8
- Review Approach and Methodology..... 10
- Review Findings and Discussion.....12
- Conclusions and Recommendations 31
- Annex 1 36
- Annex 2 37
- Acronyms..... 42

- Table 1: Stakeholders Engaged 10
- Table 2: Breakdown of RBN Units Engaged 11
- Table 3: Breakdown of Country Office Staff Engaged..... 11
- Table 4: Breakdown of All Staff Engaged 11
- Table 5 Knowledge Management Within the Country Strategic Plans of the RBN..... 25
- Table 6: Review Matrix 37

Acknowledgements

The Knowledge Management Team expresses its gratitude to the Heads of Units, Information and Knowledge Management Focal Points, unit members and the country office staff that took part in this review.

Disclaimer

The opinions expressed in this report are those of the KM Team, and do not necessarily reflect those of the World Food Programme. Responsibility for the opinions expressed in this report rests solely with the authors. Publication of this document does not imply endorsement by WFP of the opinions expressed.

Executive Summary

The World Food Programme's (WFP) Corporate Knowledge Management Strategy was endorsed in 2017 at the global level and was domesticated within the Regional Bureau of Nairobi (RBN) in 2019 making it a fairly recent organisational process. This review was conducted as a stocktaking-taking exercise to identify how well KM processes and concepts have been embedded in the organisation's functions within the RBN offices with the aim of cascading it to country offices (COs). The review had two broad aims: (1) Identify the progress and process of implementing the RBN KM strategy (2021 – 2023) based on its stated objectives and (2) Identify opportunities to embed KM within the RBN and extend KM to country office. The review questions were:

1. What is the progress and status of the four KM building blocks?
2. What is the progress in advancing the seven KM objectives?
3. What is the progress in advancing the six impact pathways of the strategy's Theory of Change?
4. How well does the KM Strategy align with broader WFP strategies?
5. What are the opportunities to embed KM at RBN and country office?

The primary audience of the report at RBN are programme managers and Heads of Units in functions that have explicit KM goals as well as all Information and Knowledge Management Focal Points (IKMFP). The primary audience at CO level are COs with a KM staff, or KM deliverables. Secondary audience include Innovation and Knowledge Management staff at WFP HQ as well as Knowledge for Action Champions across the organisation's bureaus.

Methodology

To respond to these questions, the review team applied qualitative research, specifically, inductive reasoning through content analysis. Content analysis was approached through thematic coding. Nvivo 14 was used to categorise findings and identify emerging themes. These themes were then expounded to draft the narratives. Limitations included lack of baseline data at inception stage, limiting the ability to quantify the change expected against the change attained. To reduce the subjectivity and probable bias of the derived findings the review deployed a software (NVivo 14). This enabled the process of coding and selection of themes to be explicit and accessible for secondary review.

Key Findings

Review question 1: What is the progress and status of the four Knowledge Management building blocks?

People: The RBN strategy mapped key people but its implementation unintentionally skewed to IKMFPS. The IKMFP proved to be an invaluable component of the strategy providing awareness on the unit's KM progress and spearheading change management.

Process: The process pillar of the KM strategy was not as explicit as the People and Technology pillars. While some structures and standard operating procedures for knowledge capture and sharing processes were developed, there were no clear processes around identifying knowledge, no portal for storing curated knowledge pieces and no framework to track the uptake and use of knowledge.

Technology: Under the Tech pillar, external triggers were key drivers that enabled the uptake of new tools but were not sufficient in embedding a

behaviour change for optimal uptake of diverse tech platforms and tools.

Governance: A positive governance element is that KM is considered valuable to attainment of the organisation's broader goals. However, current KM practices do not yet enable this aspiration.

Review question 2: What is the progress in advancing the 7 KM objectives?

Objective 1: The process of identifying, sharing, and building professional knowledge within WFP needs extensive initiative at individual level. At team level there is a growing culture of information sharing but it is biased to operational issues. Most of the curated knowledge is on 'hard content' such as Standard Operating Procedures (SoPs) and less on experiences. The information sharing platforms where these contents are hosted are, however, less vibrant at country level where uptake is most needed.

Objective 2: Increased programme efficiency is driven less by existence of corporate guidance, and more by the proactiveness to pull experiential learning from staff. Identification of programmatic pain points is a key trigger to that influences staff to proactively pull experiential learning from their counterparts and colleagues.

Objective 3: Despite the availability of corporate guidance, strategies and plans are updated based on information that is easiest to access. This tends to be subject matter experts. Updating of corporate tools and guidance was therefore enriched if driven by a resounding knowledge gap, followed by discussions on implementation realities by those actively implementing.

Objective 4: Engagement with government for knowledge sharing formed the core of WFP operations. However, this knowledge sharing happens informally, using personal networks and professional connections. A major gap in working with government is lack of structured processes for sharing and documenting learning.

Objective 5: Connection to subject matter experts in WFP requires extensive tacit knowledge at individual level. Frustrations around this objective could be reduced by structured processes of identifying and documenting staff with subject matter expertise. This is a potential area for WFP to explore in a systematic way.

Objective 6: There is a growing ease in building cross-functional connections and collaboration. This is generally self-emerging, i.e. not necessarily stipulated or externally demanded. It can be heightened through structured/corporate design through shared deliverables or through organisation processes that structure cross-functional engagements e.g. CSPs and Annual Country Reports.

Objective 7: WFP is considered a thought leader in humanitarian response, logistics, school meals, procurement, and emergency response, but its thought leadership is mainly for programmatic response and less advocacy oriented. WFP therefore may miss opportunities to lead in subject matters it is well versed on.

Review question 3: What is the progress in advancing the six components of the strategy's impact pathway?

Leadership and governance. See findings in review question 1.

The generation and use of experiential knowledge is mostly informed by the need to create broad awareness and sensitise staff on organisational processes for continuous improvement. Experiential knowledge sharing is not always systemic.

Enabling environment. The KM team has created an enabling environment at the RBN by: working with units for inclusion of KM in unit workplans; annual engagements with Heads of units for specific KM goals; having Terms of Reference (ToRs) for IKMFP; including KM goals in IKMFP Performance and Competency Enhancement (PACE) goals. Despite these initiatives, KM is not yet an organisation-

wide expectation, and therefore requires individual efforts to be advanced.

Capacity building was approached through bi-monthly sessions with IKMFP for Technical KM Concepts. This unintentionally created a perception that IKMFP had special capacities to handle KM activities on behalf of unit members, relegating the same to them.

Collaboration, Learning and Adaptation. There is a growing ease in sharing information characterised by self-nudging of staff. Lack of a Monitoring and Evaluation M&E system that hosts curated knowledge products and lack of a framework to track other knowledge sharing processes across the region is a drawback to knowledge curation. Lack of a clear tracking process to different knowledge and information sharing platforms has created a sense of information overload.

Enabling Systems and Technology. See the technology section review question 1.

Review Question 4: How well does the KM strategy align with broader WFP strategies?

The RBN KM strategy aimed to align with the Strategic Plan (SP) and the Common Results Framework (CRF), but this was limited by unclear guidance of what alignment entailed at a tactical level.

It was also limited by timing as the KM strategy was finalised about 1 year before the 2022 – 2025 CRF, therefore didn't include the key tenets of the SP and CRF.

Review Question 5: What are the opportunities to embed KM at RBN and country offices?

Embedding KM at the RBN will require advocacy with managers on KM to make it a managerial expectation of all staff and including KM deliverable in specific staff profiles.

At country level, KM's value addition would entail

providing structured knowledge engagement and supporting COs to consolidate knowledge. Some of the suggested approaches to knowledge sharing included: (1) Structured government-to-government exchanges; (2) provision of platforms to host lessons captured and lessons learnt, (3) facilitated engagements between WFP and WFP's cooperating partners.

In summary the strategy has influenced a culture of information sharing and seeking knowledge. At individual level, staff expressed a high need to identify efficient and effective programmatic and operational approaches. At a team level there was demonstrated evidence of breaking information sharing silos and collaborating across teams. However, there is still a level of frustration in accessing knowledge and a sense of 'too much content to wade through'. This leads staff to apply connections to identify the knowledge needed, requiring a lot of effort at individual level and tacit knowledge of whom to consult for what. Despite significant initiatives to make knowledge a transactable organisation resource, the process of identifying, locating, curating, storing, sharing and using knowledge is still not fully mainstreamed into organisational processes.

The next phase of the KM strategy will seek to mainstream knowledge-related transactions within programmatic approaches to create a predictable flow of knowledge. This will be boosted by an enabling environment that creates an expectation for KM initiatives and products. For this enabling environment to be created, there will be need for management buy-in.

Introduction

WFP's Global KM strategy was drafted following a 2016 report by the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU). The JIU report identified knowledge as a core asset of the United Nations. The UN was identified as possessing and transacting in value-based knowledge. This necessitated viewing knowledge as a strategic organisation resource requiring a minimum set of basic guidelines to enable knowledge brokering.

WFP recognises knowledge as a resource for efficient operations. The Strategic Plan 2022 – 2025 highlights unsystematic Knowledge Management as a cause for the organisation's misaligned strategic planning which risks attainment of SP goals. In 2017, a Global Corporate KM strategy was developed which was further customised by the Regional Bureau of Nairobi (RBN) to a regional KM Strategy (2021 – 2023). It was implemented with a focus on the RBN office and with minimal Country Office engagement. Based on WFP's Common Results Framework (CRF) and Strategic Plan (SP), the inefficiencies that necessitated KM as a nuanced organisation process could only be remedied through a vibrant KM culture at country level. Following a three-year pilot at the RBN, a sound understanding of what has and hasn't worked would serve as a basis of consolidating KM wins and informing what needs to be adapted. This will then inform KM adoption at country-level from a position of "learning before doing". This review highlights a broad spectrum of progress to how KM has been approached in RBN making it a vital organisation asset that is yet to fully attain operational reality.

The primary audience of the review at RBN are programme managers and Heads of Units in functions that have explicit KM goals as well as all Information and Knowledge Management Focal Points. The primary audience at CO level are COs with a KM staff, or KM deliverables. Secondary audience include Innovation and Knowledge

Management staff at WFP HQ as well as Knowledge for Action Champions across the organisation's bureaus.

1.1. Overview of The RBN KM Strategy

What is KM?

WFP RBN KM Strategy (2021- 2023) defines KM as the continual effort of generating, documenting and sharing knowledge to build capabilities (rather than just capacities) through learning processes geared towards achieving zero hunger. KM in the RBN was approached through three building blocks: People, Processes and Technology. The strategy aimed to apply six impact pathways to attain 10 outputs .

Why KM?

Knowledge is considered an organisational asset that optimises transactions. Its value is felt in what it saves the organisation. A review of the cost of not doing KM indicated employees spend 19 per cent of working hours to track information needed to complete a task (McKinsey 2012); 42% of an employee's knowledge is unique (Panopto, 2018); 69% of employees admit they could have avoided a mistake if they had access to the right people or information (Starmind, 2022). An organisational culture that handles employee's knowledge casually risks enabling repeated inefficiencies and, in some cases, organisation reputation.

Review Objectives

The review was approached as a stock-taking exercise to identify how well KM processes and concepts have been embedded in the organisation's functions within the RBN offices with the aim of cascading to country office. This requires situational awareness of WFP's country office programming environment to ensure KM

ambitions are grounded in implementation reality.

The two broad *aims* were to

1. Identify the progress and process of implementing the KM strategy based on its stated objectives.
2. Identify opportunities of extending KM initiatives with a focus on country adoption.

Objectives:

1. Identify the status progress of the four KM building blocks within the RBN.
2. Identify the status and progress in advancing the strategy's objectives within RBN.
3. Identify the status and progress in advancing the strategy's six impact pathways within the RBN .
4. Review the extent to which the strategy aligns with broader WFP strategies at global, regional and country level.
5. Identify opportunities to embed KM at RBN and its Country Offices.

2. Review Approach and Methodology

2.1 Review Methodology

Research methods:

This review applied qualitative research, specifically, inductive reasoning through content analysis. This is a process where observations are made to determine patterns leading to conclusions. The observations were derived from key informant interviews and focus group discussions which were transcribed to enable content analysis. Content analysis was approached through thematic coding. NVivo 14 was used to categorise findings and identify emerging themes. These themes were then expounded to draft the narratives.

Sampling

The review applied purposive sampling. Since its main objective was to identify the strategy's implementation progress, majority of selected respondents were based in the Regional Bureau of

Nairobi which was the focus of KM implementation at this phase. Key informants were selected, and online surveys issued through purposive sampling to selected individuals. These individuals were selected to reflect RBN's units with the aim of having all units represented. They were classified into 4 groups based on levels of engagement in KM initiatives during the strategy's implementation:

- Heads of Units
- Knowledge producers (people whom the KM team had collaborated with in developing one or more knowledge products)
- Information and Knowledge Management Focal Points
- Other unit members (people whom the KM team had not engaged for KM deliverables)

TABLE 1: STAKEHOLDERS ENGAGED

STAKEHOLDER	JUSTIFICATION	PROPOSED METHOD
Information Knowledge Management Focal Points	Are the Information and Knowledge Management change agents. Can provide a solid perspective of what is working and what is not working.	Key Informant Interviews
Heads of Unit	To extract their perception of whether KM is providing 'business value' for their units' objectives. To review the risks and assumptions stated in the strategy .	Online questionnaire
Knowledge Producers	To assess their experience in knowledge sharing before and after engagement with KM support.	Key Informant Interview
Unit members not in active contact with KM team	To assess how KM is perceived by those not in contact with the KM team but in contact with focal points and knowledge producers.	Key Informant Interview. Online questionnaire
Kenya, and Rwanda Country Office	Provide situational awareness of WFP's country office programming environment. Country selected based on inclusion of Knowledge management or knowledge sharing in their CSPs.	Key Informant Interviews
KM Team	To obtain the reviewers' perspectives	Summary statistics Focus Group Discussion

TABLE 2: BREAKDOWN OF RBN UNITS ENGAGED

RBN UNITS	NUMBER OF STAFF INTERVIEWED
Budget and Programming	3
CAM	2
Emergency Preparedness and Response	2
Evaluation	1
Food Safety and Quality	2
Food systems	1
Human Resources	2
Human Capital	2
Logistics	3
Management Services	3
Partnerships and Innovation	3
Procurement	2
Programme Cycle Management	3
Research Analysis and Monitoring	2
Risk and Compliance	1
Security	2
Social Protection and CBT	1
TEC	1
Wellness	2
Total RBN Staff Interviewed	38

TABLE 3: BREAKDOWN OF COUNTRY OFFICE STAFF ENGAGED

COUNTRY OFFICE STAFF	NUMBER INTERVIEWED
Kenya - School Meals Programme	2
Kenya - Social Protection	1
Rwanda - School Meals Programme	1
Rwanda - Social Protection	1
Total Country Office Staff Interviewed	5

TABLE 4: BREAKDOWN OF ALL STAFF ENGAGED

CATEGORY OF STAFF	NUMBER ENGAGED
Category of Staff	Number Engaged
RBN - Heads of Unit	12
RBN - Other Unit Members	13
RBN - Knowledge Producers	10
RBN - IKMFP	17
Country Office Staff	5
KM Team plus Head of Unit	5
Total Number engaged	62

2.2 Limitations, quality assurance and ethics

One of the limitations to this review was lack of baseline data at inception stage. This made it difficult to quantify the change expected versus the change attained or not attained. The qualitative review deployed a software (Nvivo 14). This enabled the process of coding and selection of themes to be explicit and accessible for secondary review. To enhance sound research ethics, all transcribed findings and survey results were coded to conceal respondents.

3. Review Findings and Discussion

3.1 Review question 1 - What is the progress and status of the four Knowledge Management Building Blocks?

People

People are the core of the KM strategy which identified 4 categories: senior managers, middle managers, knowledge workers (all WFP staff) and experts (staff with specialised knowledge). In reality, the people component translated to the KM team, the IKMFP, middle managers, and to some extent other staff, mostly at the RBN. Engagement with country staff and RBN senior managers was not well pronounced in this implementation phase.

The broad aim of the people component was increased staff capability to curate and apply knowledge for improved operations by making KM everybody's daily business. The tactical approach to attain this broad goal was Training-of-Trainer KM sessions on change management issued to IKMFPS. Over time, this gradually led to increased engagement between the KM team and IKMFP in: bi-monthly training sessions, peer-to-peer learning, KM workshops, and in supporting production and dissemination of knowledge products. There were clear terms of engagement between KM team and IKMFPS spelt out in ToRs. There seemed to be a 'missing middle' in elaborating how the sessions offered to IKMFPS would translate to improved KM culture at unit level. In retrospect, there was an assumption that training IKMFPS on KM concepts would capacitate them as unit change agents.

With time the IKMFPS were overburdened with executing KM-related work instead of being enablers of KM. In addition, engagements with middle managers, knowledge workers and experts were less pronounced, partly due to unclear guidance on how to engage them and to what end. The approach to the people component was

therefore not approached in a balanced way. IKMFPS expressed feeling caught between the KM team and their units since the pull for KM products and services should come from the units, not the KM team.

Challenges

IKMFP bi-monthly meetings were cited by some as being too frequent. Another challenge was the level of influence they have over how unit members apply KM concepts. The IKMFPS' level in their units' organigram and the implication of this on influencing change was also cited as a challenge. Initial emphasis was Information management, and this led to IKMFPS being tasked to manage their units documentation and filing. Finally, some IKMFPS expressed being required to apply KM skills but were not well trained on the same.

Successes

IKMFPS proved to be a valuable point of contact across units and provided awareness of potential knowledge pieces and information management needs. A palpable change in RBN is increased ease in knowledge sharing by different functions and units with staff intentionally sourcing and sharing knowledge and learning. In addition, most of the managers strongly agreed that they have seen value in their unit's IKMFP promoting good KM practices.

Summary:

The people component is the most critical to any KM agenda. The RBN strategy mapped key people but the focus unintentionally skewed to IKMFPS. The IKMFPS proved to be an invaluable component of the strategy providing awareness on the unit's KM progress and spearheading change management. While engagement with IKMFPS was clearly elaborated within Terms of Reference, the

same was not the case for other people identified in the strategy. The updated strategy would need to build on the successes of IKMFP engagement while balancing the KM expectation around other identified staff especially for country KM initiatives

Process

The process aspect of the strategy was not as explicit as the technology and people pillars. A possible intended outcome of process was a vibrant knowledge sharing culture. Another possible outcome was increased programme efficiency and effectiveness through knowledge sharing.

Sound approach to KM process should include providing structures for (1) identifying, (2) capturing, (3) sharing, (4) storing and (5) using knowledge. The emphasis during this phase of implementation was capturing and sharing knowledge pieces and less on identifying, storing and using knowledge. The KM team was able to develop standard operating procedures for knowledge capture and sharing for three main mediums: multi-media products ; Insight Sessions and Knowledge Cafés and the WFP Communities platform .

An emerging success is the ease among RBN staff in the use of these mediums and autonomy in knowledge sharing. A potential area of improvement would be defining structures: for identifying knowledge to share; developing a platform to host curated knowledge products and tracking the uptake and use of knowledge for programme design and adaptation. Particularly, the element around uptake and use of knowledge would require supporting a broad range of staff as it is an element beyond the sphere of control for the KM team.

Another limitation was inability to track knowledge capture and sharing processes by units with KM elements that weren't led by the KM team. Such KM actions contribute to an improved KM culture but cannot be accounted for if they are not being tracked. Finally, the process element was unclear on measuring KM's intended outputs, outcomes

and impact.

Summary

The process pillar of the KM strategy was not as explicit as the other two. Regardless, RBN's KM team developed structures and standard operating procedures around knowledge capture and sharing processes. However, there were no clear processes around identifying knowledge, no portal for storing curated knowledge pieces and no framework to track the uptake and use of knowledge.

Technology

Tech was considered an enabler to KM by providing a platform to store and access content and opportunity for staff interaction. The 2021 – 2023 KM Strategy specifically indicated:

- TEC team to map all KM tools available highlighting their strengths, weaknesses and gaps.
- Establish how to utilise existing platforms and explore establishment of an integrated KM platform.
- Promote utilisation of all KM tools and approaches.

The Tech component of KM begun with a strong focus on information management to facilitate migration from shared drives to O-365 tools through a directive from HQ to RBN which was met with apathy. A trigger that followed soon after was COVID-19 and the need to work from home.

Staff couldn't access shared drives when not in office necessitating the uptake of O-365 tools. Decommissioning of shared drives was another trigger as it was a looming threat that implied information would be lost. A key observation in this case was that Tech-related changes were enabled by external triggers. In these transitions, the KM team's role was to support staff with managing change for both early and late adopters.

Some noteworthy successes include self-motivated uptake of diverse information sharing platforms and increased understanding of which tools to use for what purpose and when to use them. However, this success is most evident at RBN. At country levels, especially at the field level offices, there is a gap in the knowledge and use of the different tech platforms.

A lingering challenge is not efficiently addressing the behaviour change elements that would help staff to optimise different tools. While external drivers can trigger change, they are less likely to make people embrace it. Another challenge is suboptimal use of tech tools to track analytics and too many tools and corporate platforms which impede rather than facilitate navigation.

Summary

The focus of the Tech pillar during this implementation phase was supporting staff with migration from shared drives to O-365 tools. External triggers were key drivers that enabled the uptake of the new tools. Next steps are around supporting optimal uptake and use of the different tech tools at RBN and more so at country level.

Governance

This component featured within the strategy as an impact pathway as opposed to a KM pillar. Updated KM theories have included governance as a fourth KM pillar.

KM's Value

The aspiration for governance as an impact pathway was a sustained management buy-in and commitment to integrate KM in all managerial and programmatic activities. To assess this, we asked managers across the RBN what their understanding of KM is and what value they perceive it to have. According to managers, the key value KM provided was a platform to internally communicate important information for organisation-wide awareness. The Insights/

Knowledge Cafés were considered a key platform in this. Secondly KM was deemed to provide opportunity to build concrete knowledge around demonstrated successes for replication. Finally, KM was deemed to add value by catalysing cross functional engagements and collaborations. In essence, KM is adding value by breaking silos and promoting dialogue and exchange.

What is KM to Managers?

A foundational element to advancing KM is how Managers perceive it. Majority of the Managers understand KM as a process of identifying and sharing applied learning. This is a progressive understanding of the KM concept. KM was also understood as a process for teams to document lessons learnt from implementation which is an equally progressive perspective. KM's value addition in internal comms was also cited, reiterating the point on breaking silos and promoting organisation-wide awareness. However, most managers indicated they were unclear of the KM needs, gaps or strengths of the functions they lead.

KM's contribution to broader WFP Goals

Majority of the managers strongly believed that sound KM practices are important in enabling WFP to attain its Strategic Planning (SP) goals. However, when asked whether their current KM practices are happening optimally to enable SP attainment, most managers partially agreed. This means KM has potential to support the organisation's broader agenda, but the current Knowledge capture and sharing practices still need to be enhanced for this alignment to be optimised.

KM's Potential Business Value

In academic literature, KM's business value begins by ascertaining organisation priorities around 4

themes:

- Operational excellence
- Meeting client needs
- Innovation
- Growth and change

The two highest ranked themes by managers were: operational excellence and Innovation. This indicates knowledge products to focus on going forward. Specifically, the highest ranked knowledge needs and services as expressed by managers included: processes that allow teams to reflect and learn from implementing experience; connection with people that understand a topic thoroughly and enhancing skills at team level to develop and share good practices.

Summary

Managers have a sound appreciation and expectation of KM in terms of promoting team reflection and promoting dialogue and exchange. KM is considered a process that can contribute to the organisation's broader goals. However, most managers felt their function's KM practices are not yet at the level to enable this aspiration, an issue that the updated strategy would need to prioritise. For KM to add business value, manager's expressed KM products and processes should enable their functions attain operational excellence and become increasingly innovative. The highest ranked knowledge needs touched on the skills for team reflections and connection with subject matter experts, both of which have a strong people element. However, most managers are not aware of their unit's KM needs, gaps and strengths.

Key findings and conclusions

- The RBN strategy mapped key people but its implementation unintentionally skewed to IKMFP.

- The IKMFP proved to be an invaluable component of the strategy providing awareness on the unit's KM progress and spearheading change management.
- While engagement with IKMFP was clearly elaborated within Terms of Reference, the same was not the case for other people identified in the strategy.
- The process pillar of the KM strategy was not as explicit as the People and Technology pillars.
- RBN team developed structures and standard operating procedures around some knowledge capture and sharing processes.
- However, there were no clear processes around identifying knowledge, no portal for storing curated knowledge pieces and no framework to track the uptake and use of knowledge.
- The focus of the Tech pillar was supporting staff to migrate from shared drives to O-365 tools.
- External triggers were key drivers that enabled the uptake of new tools but were not sufficient in embedding a behaviour change for optimal uptake and appropriate use of diverse tech platforms and tools.
- A positive governance element is that KM is considered valuable to attainment of the organisation's broader goals. However, current KM practices are not yet at the level to enable this aspiration.

3.2 Review question 2 - What is the progress in advancing the 7 KM Objectives?

Objective 1: Strengthening the evidence base for good decision-making by documenting good practice and lessons learned

Staff identify lessons to document through country engagement. At a team level, this is done by: detecting triggers that call for programmatic adaptation together with frontline workers and beneficiaries. Another way is identifying underfunded issues, implementation with a strong beneficiary focus and local adaptations to operational processes.

However, most of the documented content is from daily operation or 'hard stuff' and less on experiences. There is a strong sentiment that applied/working knowledge is falling through the crux and windows of opportunity to learn are being missed as emerging work demands and pressures overtake the chance to 'pause and reflect'. There is an expressed need for consolidating country knowledge but one of the cited challenges is creating time to document successes – this was a repeated theme.

Despite the progress on consolidating operational knowledge, there is expressed disconnect between RBN information platforms and their vibrancy at country level.

Documenting learning experiences is enabled by a leader's intentionality to inculcate a knowledge capture and sharing culture. However, regardless of the leader's approach, capturing and sharing knowledge calls for a constant push. There is a broad sentiment that this push is personality driven (i.e. at individual level) as opposed to a team or organisation level.

Summary

The process of identifying, sharing and building professional knowledge within WFP needs

extensive and intentional initiative at individual level. At team level there is a growing culture of information sharing but it is biased to operational issues. Most of the curated content is on 'hard content' such as SoPs and less on experiences. The information sharing platforms where these contents are hosted are, however, less vibrant at country level where uptake is most needed.

Objective 2: Increase efficiency and effectiveness by applying good practices and putting lessons learned into practice

KM is an organisational practice that seeks to improve efficiency and effectiveness by consolidating and transferring applied knowledge.

A few respondents cited reference to archived best practices but these were deemed broad and generic. To make documented guidance less static, some SharePoint groups include a contact list of specific subject matter experts from different WFP regions who can be reached for guidance.

Several respondents indicated a practice of COs borrowing lessons/successes from each other e.g. procurement tracker tool. It was noted that countries are pulling for information, but there is still room to do so more proactively. However, learning and exchange was more about operational information with less emphasis on implementation experiences. The latter form of learning was identified as requiring rigour to enrich existing information and efforts to generate it was identified as individually driven.

Nevertheless, when inter-country and regional-to-country exchanges occur, they tend to transfer implementation principles for performing function-related assignments. For these to translate to country successes, they are not copy and paste, rather, must be adapted to country contexts. This requires the 'recipient' country teams to demonstrate commitment to adapt their learnings.

Teams/units that have mainstreamed KM into their programmes such as Cash Based Transfer and Social Protection seemed to demonstrate programme efficiency through inter-country exchanges. Some programmes and functions are entirely focused on inter-country adoption e.g. partnerships and innovations are focused on identifying lessons and catalysing/brokering uptake in another country.

One of the drivers to improved programme efficiency is adapting approaches based on identified implementation pain points. For instance, in Ethiopia, data reconciliation between two separate information platforms was a pain point that necessitated an innovation to ensure the two platforms are aligned. Following its improvement, the system was replicated to other countries and eventually became a Standard Operating Procedure.

However, adoption of good practice can be hindered by country priorities and country context. Transfer and adoption of good practice is not just about existence of lessons but the willingness and commitment to adopt and adapt. Actual uptake and follow through was cited as a challenge to attaining programme efficiency.

Summary

Increased programme efficiency is driven less by existence of corporate guidance, and more by the proactiveness to pull experiential learning from other settings. This is usually driven at individual level and requires rigour and commitment to apply and adapt externally generated learnings to local contexts. A trigger for this form of efficiency is identification of programmatic pain points.

Objective 3: Improve policy, guidance and tools

Respondents indicated that they update/improve strategies and guidance based on knowledge/information that is easiest to access. This could be information from open platforms, literature review, or corporate guidance on WFP platforms.

In some instances, reference material, despite being readily available can be too generic needing individual guidance to fast-track uptake.

There is concurrence on availability of knowledge, the challenge is how to access and filter what is needed. To address this challenge, people were cited as the easiest reference source, particularly, known subject matter experts and communities of practice (CoPs). CoPs are deemed richer if they are cross-functional and more so, inter-organisational, including engagement with government stakeholders. However, it is not a given that stakeholder engagement, no matter how diverse, would be useful. There was a resounding sentiment of superficial or 'tick-the-box' consultations.

To update or develop guidance, CoP engagements were more meaningful when initiated from an expressed knowledge gap especially from country level. One example from the food safety quality unit was an expressed knowledge gap by CO food technologists on a food safety clause within Cooperating Partner agreement. The food technologists needed to bridge this knowledge gap for them to assist their Cooperating Partners (CPs). The consolidation of this knowledge led to updating CP guidance.

In addition to expressed knowledge needs, corporate guidance was also updated based on team reflections. This were enriched by discussions around what 'actually happens' with practitioners that are 'on the ground'. This way, updated guidance reflected implementation realities, as opposed to corporate ideals. This could be through country-to-country transfer of working experience or stakeholder engagement between regional and country teams.

Summary

Despite the availability of corporate guidance, strategies and plans are updated based on information that is easiest to access, which was usually known subject matter experts.

While communities of practice provide a potential to convene subject matter experts, they can be superficial exercises and therefore less useful. Updating or improving tools and guidance was therefore enriched if the drive for the update was a resounding knowledge gap, followed by discussions on implementation realities by those that actively implementing.

Objective 4: Enhance Sharing with Government and Partners

WFP works with governments to identify and share good practices. Most of the engagement at country level involves capacity strengthening by

providing technical assistance. “It is all we actually do” respondent, Rwanda. The challenge is around WFP’s capacity to support governments’ asks and needs. For instance, with the transition in school meals from WFP to government-led,

a key role is exchanging knowledge, lessons and experiences from other countries. It was cited that knowledge sharing between WFP and countries is robust but mostly informal using personal networks and professional connections.

There was a strong sentiment that information can be difficult to access, and respondents expressed a need for structured knowledge transfer, for instance through formally documented lessons identified and learnt.

There is also opportunity to consolidate and retool approaches in subject matter areas that WFP is considered a thought leader and market the approaches for broad uptake. This way WFP could entrench its image as the go-to agency and thought leader for selected technical approaches.

Summary

For many programmatic approaches, engagement with government for knowledge sharing formed the core of WFP operations, but happened informally, through personal professional connections. The main gap was lack of structured processes for sharing and documenting learning. Another gap was consolidating guidance for external uptake in subject matters that WFP is considered a thought leader.

Objective 5: Strengthen the connection among experts

One of the strategy’s objectives is to strengthen connection among experts for experience sharing to stimulate innovation, creativity and to validate new approaches.

Respondents indicated that building such connections is largely an individually led initiative. Identifying subject matter experts requires a lot of tacit knowledge around who should be contacted for what, and even staff that have been with WFP for several years indicated connection to subject matter experts is left to an individual’s discretion. The process of identifying subject matter experts is not yet structured or institutionalised.

A resounding sentiment from these respondents was that it takes a lot of effort to broker engagement with staff within and outside WFP who have sound understanding of a given subject matter. Some functions have addressed this challenge by assigning subject matter focal points for specific work-related tasks. The focal points are assigned to thematic areas and countries, and in such instances, there was concurrence that the assigned people/experts were reachable when needed. This indicates early signs of developing structured engagements to connect experts. It could be an issue that WFP could systemise and take to scale.

Summary

Connection to subject matter experts requires

extensive tacit knowledge at individual level. Frustrations around this objective are reduced by structured processes of identifying and documenting staff with subject matter expertise. This is a potential area for WFP to explore in a systematic way.

Objective 6: Broaden the Knowledge Base of WFP staff

This objective aims to make implicit and tacit knowledge explicit. Increased intra and inter functional collaboration enhanced this outcome.

A key finding was heightened intentionality and ease in building cross functional connections. This increasing ease in collaboration across units is generally self-emerging, i.e. not necessarily stipulated or externally demanded. Certain teams have promoted intra-unit learning with each workstream conducting a thematic sensitisation session while others have initiated inter-unit engagement culminating to joint action plans. Other units have scheduled cross-functional meetings owing to overlapping mandates, while other units have adopted job swaps and job shadowing. As a result, there is a growing culture of breaking silos and broadening staff’s knowledge base.

Implementation needs: Other units work cross-functionally based on overlapping deliverables. This type of collaboration exists across diverse units but is heightened in those that support other RBN units e.g. finance, Tech, Data, OIM and reporting, Logistics, RAM. It is also observed within programmes that have been designed to implement cross-functionally. In addition, work demands that include temporary duty to another works station were deemed very useful for broadening staff knowledge base, enabling RBN staff to identify and transfer knowledge and learning to other country settings.

Another enabler for broadened knowledge base was developing structured engagement through organisation processes. For instance, the Country Strategic Plan (CSP) was cited to have sparked a

corporate shift in collaboration. Another example was units with designated go-to persons for different subject matters. In essence, structures matter.

Summary

Broadening staff’s subject matter knowledge requires intentionality to build connections across functions. This is enhanced by shared implementation or work functions designed to address another function’s needs. It can be heightened through structured/corporate design e.g. Annual Country Reports and CSP.

Objective 7: Strengthening Global and Regional Advocacy

Global and regional advocacy is led by organisations that are subject matter experts and agencies that can provide thought leadership. One of the questions posed to respondents was: “What is WFP known for?” and “which agency do you consider a thought leader in your technical area?”

WFP was considered a thought leader in humanitarian response especially for logistics, procurement, telecommunications and food security in emergency. Specifically, for inter-agency coordination during drought responses over several years, it was noted that host governments in certain countries use WFP systems for logistics and procurement purposes at a fee. WFP’s strength in logistics has positioned it as a thought leader for technical responses that require strong logistics-related functions for efficient implementation such as Cash-Based-Transfers, famine response and school meals.

WFP’s influence is also broadening through innovative programmatic initiatives. For instance, in Tech, WFP is driving and leading a collaboration among UN agencies to negotiate for consistent network infrastructure and access to population during crisis.

For regional advocacy to be effective WFP will need to be intentional in its focus on external audiences and stakeholders. While WFP is instrumental in addressing humanitarian needs proactively, sustainable change can only be achieved if this is done in tandem with focus on influencing policy and systems change which requires different tactics including building coalitions with cooperating partners, civil society organisations, and other development actors working on a common goal of achieving food security and resilience in the region.

Partners want numbers. During crises such as the Horn of Africa crisis our Co-operating Partners look up to us for key messages and numbers

Summary

WFP is considered a thought leader in humanitarian response, logistics, school meals, procurement and emergency response, but its thought leadership is mainly for programmatic response. WFP needs to be more intentional in its focus on external audiences and stakeholders (governments and other organisations) to advance the advocacy agenda for interventions it is well-known for.

Key findings and conclusions

- The process of identifying, sharing, and building professional knowledge within WFP needs extensive and intentional initiative at individual level.
- At team level there is a growing culture of information sharing but it is biased to operational issues.
- Most of the curated content is on 'hard content' such as SoPs and less on experiences.
- The information sharing platforms where these contents are hosted are, however, less vibrant

at country level where uptake is most needed.

- Increased programme efficiency is driven less by existence of corporate guidance, and more by the proactiveness to pull experiential learning from staff. A trigger for this form of efficiency is identification of programmatic pain points.
- Strategies and plans are updated based on information that is easiest to access, which was usually known subject matter experts.
- Connection to subject matter experts requires extensive tacit knowledge at individual level.
- While communities of practice provide potential to convene subject matter experts, they can be superficial exercises and therefore less useful.
- Updating or improving tools and guidance is enriched if the drive for the update was a resounding knowledge gap, followed by discussions on implementation realities by stakeholders that are actively implementing.
- Engagement with government for knowledge sharing formed the core of WFP operations, but is informal, using personal networks and professional connections.
- A major gap in working with government is lack of structured processes for sharing and documenting learning.
- Consolidating guidance for external uptake in subject matters that WFP is considered a thought leader is also a gap.
- Access to WFP subject matter experts can be attained by a database indicating known subject matter experts specific to communities of practice - a potential area for WFP to explore in a systematic way.
- Broadening staff's subject matter knowledge requires intentionality to build connections

across functions.

- This is enhanced by shared implementation or work functions designed to address another function's needs. It can be heightened through structured/corporate design e.g. ACR and CSP.
- WFP is considered a thought leader in humanitarian response, logistics, school meals, procurement and emergency response, but its thought leadership is mainly for programmatic response.
- WFP needs to be more intentional in its focus on external audiences and stakeholders (governments and other organisations) to advance the advocacy agenda for interventions it is well-known for.

3.3 Review Question 3 - What is the progress in advancing the Six components of the Strategy's Impact Pathway?

Leadership and Governance

See the governance section of objective 1

Knowledge and Evidence Generation and Use

The aspiration of this impact pathway is the systematic and routine use of knowledge and evidence to strengthen evidence for effective programmes, improved policy and increased financing. The scope of knowledge and evidence reviewed was experiential in nature as opposed to figures, data or evaluation findings. Ascertaining how KM has contributed to uptake of evidence in updating policies, designing of programmes would require an evaluation.

Respondents have different objectives in generating and disseminating experiential evidence. Some units aimed at disseminating knowledge based on expressed or observed knowledge and implementation gaps. Where this was the trigger to knowledge sharing, there was increased RBN-

to-country knowledge sharing sessions, and with time, knowledge sharing progressed from broad to targeted audiences between knowledge "sharers" and those enquiring. In such instances, the knowledge sharing forums also diversified beyond those supported by the KM team.

Other respondents aimed at creating broad awareness. In such instances knowledge "sharers" adopted information platforms such as WFP Communities, Knowledge Cafés and Insight sessions. With time, they noticed the types of enquiries they received from staff progressed from basic to issues that enabled improved organisational systems and services. Presenters also cited increased enquiries as more staff reached out for further clarification for the subject matter presented.

"Queries are now less basic - are about issues that enable continuous improvement to systems and processes".

However, it is not yet clear whether experiential knowledge and evidence is being generated and used systematically or in a reactive manner based on emerging needs.

Summary

The generation and use of experiential knowledge is informed by expressed information needs leading to an ease in sharing knowledge and better targeting of knowledge recipients. It is also informed by the need to create broad awareness leading to better understanding of organisational processes and their continuous improvement. However, experiential knowledge sharing is not always systematic.

Enabling Environment

To ensure KM is not one person's effort, there is need for an organisation context that creates expectation for it. This is the enabling environment.

Specifically, the strategy proposed: provision of formal time for team learning is provided and KM goals are included in formal performance management especially for the Information and Knowledge Management Focal Points.

Time was anticipated as a constraint to the robust engagement of IKMFPS. To mitigate this, their terms-of-reference indicates they are to allocate 20% of their time to KM-related assignments within their functional area. Managers had mixed perspectives on whether this was a fair ask, but majority either disagreed or partially agreed. About half of the IKMFPS interviewed indicated time as a major constraint to advancing KM as actively as they would wish. This was the perspective even for IKMFPS and units that were vibrant in KM. Generally, time commitment for KM was a clear drawback.

One of the measures to creating an enabling environment was to include KM targets in staff's Performance and Capability Enhancement (PACE) goals. This way their KM actions are formally recognised, providing both recognition for their initiatives and accountability. In 2022, only 2 of 20 IKMFP included KM in their PACE goals and this went up to 7 in 2023. In addition, 6 units included KM initiatives in their 2022 unit annual workplans and this went up to 8 in 2023.

The increase was partly due to one-on-one engagement between KM team and Heads of Units at the beginning of 2023 to identify units' KM needs and agree on KM support to these units. This is a practice the RBN KM team aims to sustain to ensure KM is offered as a tailored service around unit's needs with managers and the IKMFPS.

Summary

Some initiatives to creating an enabling environment for KM include stating the time expectation for KM in the IKMFP ToR, including KM in performance goals and including KM goals in annual unit workplans. In addition, one-on-one engagement between the KM team and heads-of-

units indicate potential to create broad buy-in by designing tailored KM activities for the different units. Despite these initiatives, KM is not yet an organisation-wide expectation, and therefore requires individual efforts to be advanced.

Collaboration Learning and Adaptations

Some of the proposed initiatives under this impact pathway included:

- Monthly Knowledge Cafés at the RBN
- Strengthened partnerships for knowledge generation and exchange.
- Comprehensive M&E system in place to track implementation of KM strategy.

The RBN KM team actively promoted 3 main knowledge sharing and dissemination processes: (1) knowledge cafés and Insight sessions (2) Multi-media content and (3) WFP Communities. Knowledge Cafés/Insight sessions are a forum for broad dissemination of organisational processes, sensitising on successful programme approaches, or commemorating international days that have implication on WFP's mandate/staff. Between 2021 and 2023, over 54 Insights and Knowledge Cafés were held, attracting over 10,700 listeners in this period. About 10 multimedia products were developed between Oct 2022 and Dec 2023 (7 podcasts and 3 mini clips) attracting over 2060 listeners and viewers.

WFP Communities is an information and knowledge sharing platform that allows staff to obtain quick snippets of valuable knowledge from within and across regions. Many information and knowledge pieces such as reports, links to websites, Knowledge Café recordings, podcasts and mini clips etc can be disseminated via Communities. Between Jan – Dec 2023, the Eastern Africa Community page registered over 1,200 posts. This indicates a growing vibrancy and self-nudging by RBN staff in knowledge sharing.

In 2023, the KM team worked with 16 of RBN's 21 units to support knowledge sharing through a product or an Insight session. One of the key outcomes of this is a growing ease of knowledge and information sharing across the RBN, a theme elaborated in other sections.

A key drawback was the lack of a centralised repository to host the curated content for future reference (e.g. Insight recordings, and multi media products). This meant future access to such content requires one-on-one follow up with the knowledge producer or a KM team member.

Another drawback was lack of KM M&E system to track KM initiatives beyond those supported by the KM team such as: South-to-South Triangular Cooperation, Brown bags, Idea Space and other unit-led initiatives. Some of these were significant as they involved formalised partnerships between WFP and external agencies. This could imply valuable learning from such engagements are not being highlighted for broader organisation-wide uptake.

Summary

RBN has demonstrated innovation in developing knowledge sharing processes which have been vibrantly promoted and utilised by staff. A key yet tacit outcome is a growing ease in sharing information characterised by self-nudging of staff as they post on Communities or approach KM team for slots in Insight Sessions. A drawback to this impact pathway was: lack of an M&E system that hosts curated knowledge products; lack of a framework to track other knowledge sharing processes across the region including tracking knowledge exchange partnerships. Without clear tracking there is a sense of information overload. Tracking would enable increased awareness of the different platforms, their content, clarification of their connection and distinction to each other.

Enabling Systems and Technology

See the technology section in objective 1

Key Findings and Conclusion

- Knowledge sharing is mostly informed by the need to create broad awareness and sensitise staff on organisational processes for continuous improvement.
- Experiential knowledge sharing is not always systemic.
- The KM team has created an enabling environment at the RBN by: working with units for inclusion of KM in unit workplans; annual engagements with Heads of units for specific KM goals; having ToRs for IKMFPS; including KM goals in IKMFP PACEs. Despite these initiatives, KM is not yet an organisation-wide expectation, and therefore requires individual efforts to be advanced.
- Capacity building was approached through bi-monthly sessions with IKMFP for Technical KM Concepts. This unintentionally created a perception that IKMFP had special capacities to handle KM activities on behalf of unit members, relegating the same to them.
- Another limitation to capacity development was using training content that didn't directly connect with day-to-day work activities.
- There is a growing ease in sharing information characterised by self-nudging of staff as they post on Communities or approach KM team for slots in Insight Sessions or to develop a multimedia product.
- Lack of an M&E system that hosts curated knowledge products and lack of a framework to track other knowledge sharing processes across the region is a drawback to knowledge curation. Lack of a clear tracking process to different knowledge and information sharing platforms has created a sense of information overload.

3.4. Review Question 4 – How well does the KM Strategy Align with Broader WFP Objectives?

Strategic Plan and Common Results Framework

The Strategic Plan (SP) spells out WFP's 2030 vision as informed by SDG 2 and SDG 7. The SP has two overarching commitments and five strategic outcomes. Further, seven guiding principles and six enablers inform the organisation's strategic operations towards attaining these outcomes. The specific indicators for the SP outcomes are highlighted in the Common Results Framework (CRF). The CRF indicates what WFP aims to deliver through output and outcomes while managerial results and organisation enablers explain how they will be attained.

Is RBN KM Strategy aligned with the CRF and SP?

KM alignment can be assessed based on the extent to which KM actions contribute directly or indirectly to the outputs and outcomes of the SP and CRF. Alignment can also be judged by the SP and CRF guiding principles applied to carry out KM actions.

The SP highlights the need for a vibrant KM culture to enhance prompt uptake of evidence and enhance organisation learning. Within the CRF, evidence and learning are one of seven management results and systematic Knowledge Management is one of the key performance indicators.

In both the CRF and the SP, KM is an enabler to attainment of corporate outcomes. However, while the need for knowledge sharing is identified in the corporate vision this needs to translate

KM alignment to broader WFP goals translates to identifying KM actions that directly or indirectly contribute to SP and CRF outputs and outcomes. KM actions can also align with SP and CRF by adopting their guiding principles.

to a systematic and well nuanced approach to knowledge capture, dissemination, and utilisation. In the absence of these, KM and learning risk being perceived as abstract concepts and distant contributors to the corporate mission and vision.

For instance, knowledge needs and products can be mapped and developed using the CRF's strategic outcomes as themes. In addition KM initiatives can be advanced using SP and CRF guiding principles e.g. KM can use the SP guiding principle of being Programme Integrated to mainstream KM processes such as Peer Assists and After Action Reviews within programme cycles.

Country Capacity Strengthening and Country Strategic Plans

A key framework underpinning country operation is the Country Capacity Strengthening (CCS) Framework. The CCS essentially mandates WFP to structure operations around existing country institutions with the aim of building their capabilities in the long term. Capacity in the CCS is essentially about knowledge and skills that will support the attainment of WFP's strategic plan. One of seven principles of engagement in the CCS is learning i.e. all WFP interventions that will adopt a CCS approach should include evidence-based appraisal of actions and adapt country-level implementation based on this appraisal. The CCS principles and pathways of change are applied by country offices in their country strategic plans (CSP). Essentially, CSPs contextualise WFP's mandate (SP and CRF) to their country's context with the aim of strengthening that country's capacity.

Is RBN KM Strategy Aligned with Country Strategic Plans?

This section provides a snapshot of the alignment between the RBN KM Strategy and CSPs. With the strategy running from 2021 – 2023, it is anticipated that opportunity to influence the inclusion of KM in CSPs could be witnessed for CSPs that were initiated after 2021 when the strategy was in effect.

The KM strategy indicates its principal role in contributing to the generation of credible evidence throughout the CSP cycle. However, specific guidance on 'the what' and 'the how' were not provided in the strategy. This means there is no clear sense of what success looks like in embedding KM in CSPs.

The table below indicates how the concepts of learning, knowledge sharing and knowledge management feature within CSPs that were developed before and after the RBN KM Strategy period. Most of the CSPs include a section on WFP's lessons learned which are usually informed by findings from an evaluation. The

identified lessons vary from over-generalised recommendations to sharp/concise. This could be due to the Evaluations in reference (i.e. how the lessons learnt section was drafted) to or the CSP drafters. Going forward, concrete guidance could include reporting lessons learnt for the key tenets of the CSP i.e. each strategic outcome; selected cross-cutting priorities and selected enablers.

This section could further be enriched by reporting not just the lessons around strategic outcomes (what was achieved) but also from explicitly stating operational successes and challenges in delivering technical assistance (how it was achieved).

TABLE 5 KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT WITHIN THE COUNTRY STRATEGIC PLANS OF THE RBN

COUNTRY	VERSION	KNOWLEDGE AND LEARNING CONCEPTS	VERSION	KNOWLEDGE AND LEARNING CONCEPTS
Burundi	ICSP 2018 - 2020	•Includes a lesson learned section •Is not explicit on knowledge management. Highlights knowledge sharing under strategic goal	2024 - 2027	•Includes a lessons learned section. •Is not explicit on knowledge sharing and knowledge management.
Djibouti	ICSP 2018 - 2020		2020 - 2024	•Includes a lessons-learned section. •Is not explicit on knowledge sharing and knowledge management.
Ethiopia	ICSP 2019 - 2020	•Includes a lessons-learned section. •Is not explicit on knowledge sharing and knowledge management	2020 - 2025	•Includes a lessons-learned section. •Is not explicit on knowledge sharing and knowledge management
Kenya	2018 - 2019	•Includes a lessons-learned section. •Includes components of knowledge exchange and learning	2023 - 2027	•Includes a lessons-learned section. •Is explicit on knowledge brokering, capture, sharing and knowledge management
Rwanda	2019 - 2023	•Includes a lessons-learned section. •Includes components of knowledge exchange, evidence gathering and mapping knowledge gaps		
Somalia	ICSP 2019 - 2021	•Includes a lessons-learned section. •Is not explicit on knowledge sharing and knowledge management	2022 - 2025	•Includes a lessons-learned section. •Includes components of knowledge exchange.

COUNTRY	VERSION	KNOWLEDGE AND LEARNING CONCEPTS	VERSION	KNOWLEDGE AND LEARNING CONCEPTS
South Sudan	ICSP 2018 - 2022	•Includes a lessons learned section. •Is not explicit on knowledge sharing and knowledge management	2023 - 2025	•Includes a lessons learned section. •Is not explicit on knowledge sharing and knowledge management.
Sudan	ICSP 2017 - 2018	•Includes a lessons learned section. •Includes components of knowledge exchange and knowledge management.	2019 - 2023	•Includes a lessons-learned section. •Is not explicit on knowledge sharing and knowledge management.

Key Findings and Conclusion

- The RBN KM strategy aimed to align with the SP and the CRF, but this was limited by unclear guidance of what alignment entailed at a tactical level.
- It was also limited by timing as the KM strategy was finalised about 1 year before the 2022 - 2025 CRF.

3.5. Review Question 5 - What are the opportunities to embed KM at RBN and Country Office?

What potential opportunities exist for embedding the KM culture within the RBN?

To better understand the opportunities for embedding a KM culture at the RBN, we interviewed 17 IKMFPS to understand their experience, highlights and pain points in this role. These reflections indicate issues to adapt for KM to be better embedded at the RBN.

Some of the highlights included: a growing appreciation of KM by their colleagues as knowledge capture and sharing is increasingly considered part of daily work e.g. prompt knowledge sharing, conducting reflection sessions, disseminating content to COs, proper filing.

Some IKMFPS appreciated the opportunity to

interact with other unit FPs and learn from them, gaining a broad appreciation for the organisation's work within the region. Others indicated increased awareness of information and knowledge pieces that can be shared from their unit. One IKMFP summarised it as "exciting but challenging."

We enquired further on their challenges around five probable frustrations or any other pain points.

In person meetings are fun. And having sessions where we just share what your unit does..... goals, objectives,.. it is eye opening to learn what others are doing.

1. Frustration/Pain points to advancing KM Goals:
2. Finding time to allocate to KM. (12 responses)
3. Aligning my understanding of KM with that of my team and/or unit head.(7 responses)
4. Quantifying the KM work.(5 responses)
5. Understanding the KM concepts and when to apply them.(5 responses)
6. Garnering support from my unit members and/or unit head. (2 responses)

Others:

- Challenge of how KM is perceived - as important but not urgent.
- Challenge of lack of clarity of IKMFP role.
- Information overload.
- High staff turnover, thus needing to sensitise new colleagues afresh.
- Challenge of lacking specialised skills for advancing KM goals e.g. to summarise and package content.
- Low Influence over the unit members to advance KM ambitions.
- No functional KM at country level so it is expected from IKMFP and this was considered an 'over expectation'.
- KM not fully embraced by unit members.
- A level of ambiguity and vagueness of what is expected by KM team of the different functions.

The KM team also spotted a challenge in units which had knowledge sharing deliverables as a major output. There were elements of red tape with process flows that were not always predictable, impacting the lead time for developing content. There's also a challenge among staff of distinguishing between broad internal and external content and identifying the target audience for knowledge sharing.

To embed a culture of knowledge sharing the IKMFP suggested sensitisation and engagement with senior and middle-level managers for KM deliverables. Essentially, managers need to create an expectation for KM within their units amongst all staff and not just the IKMFPS. This way, IKMFPS will be supporting KM needs identified by their colleagues as opposed to the KM team. Rotating the IKMFP role was recommended to enable all

staff appreciate and take up KM functions. Other recommendations were to include KM deliverables in specific job profiles; working with several staff not just IKMFPS for KM deliverables; and having tailored engagement with specific units for agreed KM deliverables. IKMFPS also suggested meetings that are tailored to tactical needs e.g. how to conduct after action reviews or document lessons learnt.

Summary

The IKMFPS indicated this role as a professional stretch that was both exciting and challenging. The solutions suggested can be categorised as broadening and deepening KM initiatives. Some of the suggestions that entail broadening KM include: advocacy with managers on KM to make it a managerial expectation of all staff; including KM deliverables in specific staff profiles and making the IKMFP role rotational. The suggestions categorised as deepening KM include targeted engagement with different units for specific KM actions; and having tailored KM-related sensitisation sessions with teams or with IKMFPS e.g. on how to capture lesson learnt.

What potential opportunities exist for embedding the KM culture at the COs?

This phase of the KM roll-out was not explicit on country engagement. Due to this, the review assessed the nature of engagement between RBN and COs to determine how to design learning opportunities at CO level.

RBN and CO Interaction

Engagement between RBN and country office varied by units and functions. The most frequent were catch-up calls (quarterly or bi-monthly updates) or annual regional meetings. Some RBN staff supported COs with resources to attend international meetings or to conduct impact assessments. Other RBN staff supported COs in reviewing write-ups e.g. national policy drafts.

RBN cited that typical requests from CO involved requests for technical assistance to address incidents or gaps. These requests tended to challenge RBN to consider contextualised policies based on cultural, country and field realities. RBN indicated they learn best when they are physically in-country because some COs hesitate sharing information with the RB as they feel knowledge can be used without acknowledging/giving credit to the COs. RBN staff cited that a lot of country progress is missed until one goes to the country level. Simply put: in-country engagements hold the greatest potential to optimise reflection and learning.

What KM elements are high priority to Country Offices?

At country level, we sought to identify the KM elements that are of high priority to country office staff: The 7 KM elements and their level of priority are indicated below:

- Connecting people (high priority)
- Improved access to documents specifically through digitised reporting, monitoring and tracking (high priority)
- Retention of knowledge (high priority)
- Learning from experience (medium priority)
- Creation of best practices (high priority)
- Innovation (high priority)
- Provision of knowledge to customer-facing staff (medium priority)

CO staff indicated that there is a level of reflecting from implementation, but it is not intentional. In most cases, reflections are informal using personal networks and could be improved.

A resounding need was connecting government staff with other government staff to ensure

contextualised learning as opposed to broad and generic lessons. A KM capacity gap was the technical support for consolidating and packaging information. Another cited gap was the need for a repository to consolidate information from different countries in a simple accessible form. CO staff indicated the difficulty in accessing information on WFP's repositories. They also cited the lack of structures for knowledge transfer, with no platform to host lessons captured and lessons learnt. One proposed opportunity was packaging the evaluations done by cooperating partners as these possess potentially rich information.

CO staff cited some missed KM opportunities within piloted programmes (e.g. Home Grown School Meals and Social Protection through CBT) to draft simple and digestible joint result statements for advocacy purposes and to position WFP strongly as a thought leader with donors and other actors in the region. There is a strong sense of trying to scale-up joint programme but not getting the intended traction due to inadequately consolidating evidence desired for scalability or inadequately broadcasting the same.

CO staff cited some missed KM opportunities within piloted programmes (e.g. Home Grown School Meals and Social Protection through CBT) to draft simple and digestible joint result statements for advocacy purposes and to position WFP strongly as a thought leader with donors and other actors in the region. There is a strong sense of trying to scale-up joint programme but not getting the intended traction due to inadequately consolidating evidence desired for scalability or inadequately broadcasting the same.

What business value can KM can deliver to Countries?

We enquired the business value KM can deliver to WFP COs across 4 themes and these were categorised as follows by the CO staff interviewed

- Ensuring the WFP programmes attain operational excellence. (strong priority)
- Supporting programme teams and field offices to work with government and implementing partners. (medium priority)

There are opportunities to market WFP's approaches and use programme elements (e.g. type of geographical location reached or vulnerable populations being targeted by WFP) that are similar to another

- Developing new ways of working to improve efficiency in the country. (strong priority)
- Ensuring operations are embedded in country systems and move to scale. (strong priority)

COs strongly indicated the need for country-to-country sharing. Some of the challenges to ongoing country-to-country exchanges include limited structured engagement and theoretical as opposed to practical dialogue. Some of the suggested solutions were physical collaboration including field visits. The COs expressed that KM at country level should translate to progressing their technical functions and not burden country offices further. This means KM needs to feature in their workplans, PACEs and in briefing notes.

The two country teams interviewed indicated existence of information platforms for their work functions but these didn't possess a repository to capture lessons learnt. Some of the opportunities to consider would include: a repository for sharing knowledge and learning; generation of demand driven knowledge and tools/package for government on-boarding and off-boarding that meet government needs.

A potential challenge to KM would be the time required to support knowledge capture needs due to actual work. Another gap is the attitude to knowledge. Evidence is considered vital but knowledge is scattered across agencies, departments

When we finalise evaluation reports we validate the findings, identify lessons learnt and what worked well. That meeting with stakeholders is an opportunity - one we could capture information, experience, and lessons - at this point we can get nuggets for assisting.

We need to showcase as we implement because continuous communication builds continuous credibility

and individuals. This leads to different types of evidence being used leading to fragmented/disjointed solutions. Knowledge transfer is mostly via networks formed through social capital and officer's initiative.

Summary

In-person engagements are key for promoting knowledge sharing and lessons learnt. Knowledge sharing and learning forms a huge component of CO-level engagement. KM's value addition would be providing structured engagement and supporting COs to consolidate knowledge.

The stated needs for consolidated knowledge at country level ranged from: (1) consolidating existing WFP knowledge, especially guidance that is required for CO staff to execute duties e.g. CCS guidance; (2) consolidation and communication of WFP's implementation experience; (3) consolidation of evidence and impact of WFP's work for increased scalability. The documentation could include repackaging evaluations done by WFP' Cooperating Partners.

Some of the suggested approaches to knowledge sharing included (1) structured government-to-government exchanges; (2) provision of platforms to host lessons captured and lessons learnt, (3) Facilitated engagements between WFP and cooperating partners.

Key Findings and Conclusions

Embedding KM at the RBN will require broadening and deepening of KM activities.

- Broadening KM would entail advocacy with managers on KM to make it a managerial expectation of all staff; including KM deliverable in specific staff profiles and making the IKMFP role rotational.
- Deepening KM would entail targeted engagement with different units for specific KM actions; and developing specific sensitisation

sessions with units or with IKMFs e.g. on how to capture lesson learnt.

At country level, in-person engagements would be key for promoting knowledge sharing and lessons learnt.

- KM's value addition at CO-level would be providing structured knowledge engagement and supporting COs to consolidate knowledge.
- The stated needs for consolidated knowledge at country level ranged from: (1) consolidating existing WFP knowledge, especially guidance that is required for CO staff to execute duties e.g. CCS guidance; (2) consolidation and communication of WFP's implementation experience; (3) consolidation of evidence and impact of WFP's work for increased scalability. The documentation could include repackaging evaluations done by WFP' Cooperating Partners.
- Some of the suggested approaches to knowledge sharing included
 1. Structured government-to- government exchanges;
 2. Provision of platforms to host lessons captured and lessons learnt,
 3. Facilitated engagements between WFP and WFP's cooperating partners.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

4.1. Conclusion

What is the progress and status of the four KM building blocks within RBN?

Review Question 1: What is the progress and status of the four KM building blocks within RBN?

The people pillar mapped out four categories of people, but the strategy's implementation unintentionally skewed to IKMFs who proved to be an invaluable component as they spearheaded change management elements of KM. This pillar could have been enriched through explicit expectations of all the people identified in the strategy to ensure the demand for KM emanated from the units and not from the KM team to IKMFs. The technology pillar in this phase had a strong focus on supporting staff to migrate from shared drives to O-365 tools. External triggers (working from home and decommissioning of shared drives) enabled the uptake of new tools but were not sufficient in embedding the behaviour change required for optimal uptake and appropriate use of diverse tech platforms and tools. The process pillar of the KM strategy was not as explicit as the people and technology pillars and translated to initiating and defining knowledge capture and sharing processes (multi-media products; Knowledge Cafés and Insight sessions) and drafting the Standard Operating Procedures to elaborate the steps and processes for the same. However, there were no clear processes around identifying knowledge, no portal for storing curated knowledge pieces and no framework to track the uptake and use of knowledge. Governance wasn't approached as a pillar in the current strategy. The review therefore scoped the expectation managers had of KM and these are reflected in the recommendation section. A key reflection from managers was that KM is considered a process that can contribute to the organisation's broader goals, but most managers

felt their function's current KM practices are not yet at the level to enable this aspiration.

Review Question 2: What is the Progress in advancing the 7 KM Objectives?

Objective 1: strengthening evidence base for good decision-making by documenting lessons learnt: There is a growing culture of information sharing but it is biased to operational issues and curation of hard content e.g. SOPs and less on experiences. The information sharing platforms where the hard content is hosted are least vibrant at country-level where they are most needed.

Objective 2: Increase efficiency and effectiveness by applying good practices and putting lessons learned into practice. Increased programme efficiency is driven less by existence of corporate guidance, and more by staff's proactiveness to pull experiential learning. This is usually driven at individual level and requires rigour and commitment to identify and adapt externally generated learnings to local contexts. A trigger for this form of efficiency is identification of programmatic pain points.

Objective 3: Improved policy, guidance and tools. Strategies and plans are updated based on information that is easiest to access. Connection to subject matter experts to support updated guidance requires extensive tacit knowledge at individual level. Communities of practice provide potential avenue to convene subject matter experts but can also be superficial exercises if not managed. Policy and guidance update is enriched if approached from a resounding knowledge gap and honest discussions around implementation realities by those actively implementing.

Objective 4: Enhance Sharing with Government and Partners: Engagement with government for knowledge sharing formed the core of WFP operations, but is informal, using personal networks and professional connections. A major gap in working with government is lack of structured processes for sharing and documenting learning. Consolidating guidance for external uptake in subject matters that WFP is considered a thought leader is also a gap.

Objective 5: Strengthen the connection among experts: Connection to subject matter experts requires extensive tacit knowledge at individual level. Frustrations around this objective are reduced by structured processes of identifying and documenting WFP staff with subject matter expertise.

Objective 6: Broadening the Knowledge Base of WFP staff: Broadening staff's subject matter knowledge requires intentionality to build connections across functions and was enhanced by shared implementation. It can be heightened through structured/corporate design e.g. ACR and CSP.

Objective 7: Strengthening global and regional advocacy: WFP is considered a thought leader in humanitarian response, logistics, school meals, procurement and emergency response, but its thought leadership is mainly for programmatic response. The organisation needs different skill sets and approaches to advance an advocacy agenda for it to influence thinking and strategy across organisations and governments, even for interventions it is well-known for.

Review Question 3: What is the progress in advancing the Six components of the Strategy's Impact Pathways?

Knowledge and Evidence Generation and Use: Knowledge sharing is mostly informed by the need to create broad awareness and sensitise staff on organisational processes for continuous improvement. Experiential knowledge sharing is not always systemic.

Enabling Environment: The KM team has created an enabling environment at the RBN by working with units for inclusion of KM in unit workplans; annual engagements with Heads of units for specific KM goals; having ToRs for IKMFPS; including KM goals in IKMFPS' PACEs. Despite these initiatives, KM is not yet an organisation-wide expectation, and therefore requires individual efforts to be advanced.

Capacity Building: Capacity building was approached through bi-monthly sessions with IKMFPS for Technical KM Concepts. This unintentionally created a perception that IKMFPS had special capacities to handle KM activities on behalf of unit members, relegating excess KM tasks to them as opposed to building a unit-wide uptake of KM actions. Another limitation to capacity development was using training content that didn't directly connect with day-to-day work activities.

Collaborating Learning and Adapting: There is a growing ease in sharing information characterised by self-nudging of staff as they post on WFP Communities or approach KM team for slots in Insight Sessions or to develop a multimedia product. Lack of an M&E system that hosts curated knowledge products and lack of a framework to track other knowledge sharing processes across the region is a drawback to knowledge curation. The focus has also been on sharing on implementation progress and less on adapting programming based on learnt experiences.

Enabling systems and Technologies (See the Technology pillar).

Leadership and governance (See the governance pillar).

Review Question 4: How well does the KM Strategy Align with Broader WFP Strategies?

The RBN KM strategy aimed to align with the SP and the CRF, but this was limited by unclear guidance of what alignment entailed at a tactical level.

Objective 4: Enhance Sharing with Government and Partners: Engagement with government for knowledge sharing formed the core of WFP operations, but is informal, using personal networks and professional connections. A major gap in working with government is lack of structured processes for sharing and documenting learning. Consolidating guidance for external uptake in subject matters that WFP is considered a thought leader is also a gap.

Objective 5: Strengthen the connection among experts: Connection to subject matter experts requires extensive tacit knowledge at individual level. Frustrations around this objective are reduced by structured processes of identifying and documenting WFP staff with subject matter expertise.

Objective 6: Broadening the Knowledge Base of WFP staff: Broadening staff's subject matter knowledge requires intentionality to build connections across functions and was enhanced by shared implementation. It can be heightened through structured/corporate design e.g. ACR and CSP.

Objective 7: Strengthening global and regional advocacy: WFP is considered a thought leader in humanitarian response, logistics, school meals, procurement and emergency response, but its thought leadership is mainly for programmatic response. The organisation needs different skill sets and approaches to advance an advocacy agenda for it to influence thinking and strategy across organisations and governments, even for interventions it is well-known for.

Review Question 3: What is the progress in advancing the Six components of the Strategy's Impact Pathways?

Knowledge and Evidence Generation and Use: Knowledge sharing is mostly informed by the need to create broad awareness and sensitise staff on organisational processes for continuous improvement. Experiential knowledge sharing is not always systemic.

Enabling Environment: The KM team has created an enabling environment at the RBN by working with units for inclusion of KM in unit workplans; annual engagements with Heads of units for specific KM goals; having ToRs for IKMFPS; including KM goals in IKMFPS' PACEs. Despite these initiatives, KM is not yet an organisation-wide expectation, and therefore requires individual efforts to be advanced.

Capacity Building: Capacity building was approached through bi-monthly sessions with IKMFPS for Technical KM Concepts. This unintentionally created a perception that IKMFPS had special capacities to handle KM activities on behalf of unit members, relegating excess KM tasks to them as opposed to building a unit-wide uptake of KM actions. Another limitation to capacity development was using training content that didn't directly connect with day-to-day work activities.

Collaborating Learning and Adapting: There is a growing ease in sharing information characterised by self-nudging of staff as they post on WFP Communities or approach KM team for slots in Insight Sessions or to develop a multimedia product. Lack of an M&E system that hosts curated knowledge products and lack of a framework to track other knowledge sharing processes across the region is a drawback to knowledge curation. The focus has also been on sharing on implementation progress and less on adapting programming based on learnt experiences.

Enabling systems and Technologies (See the Technology pillar).

Leadership and governance (See the governance pillar).

Review Question 4: How well does the KM Strategy Align with Broader WFP Strategies?

The RBN KM strategy aimed to align with the SP and the CRF, but this was limited by unclear guidance of what alignment entailed at a tactical level.

It was also limited by timing as the KM strategy was finalised about 1 year before the 2022 – 2025 CRF. Several recommendations around enhancing this alignment are provided in the recommendations section.

Review Question 5: What are the opportunities to embed KM at RBN and Country Office?

Embedding KM at the RBN will require broadening and deepening of KM activities. Broadening KM will entail advocacy with managers to make it a managerial expectation of all staff, including KM deliverable in specific staff profiles and making the IKMFP role rotational. Deepening KM will entail targeted engagement with different units for specific KM actions; and developing specific sensitisation sessions with units or with IKMFP e.g. on how to capture lesson learnt.

At country level, KM's value addition would entail providing structured knowledge engagement and supporting COs to consolidate knowledge. The stated needs for at country level ranged from: (1) consolidating existing WFP knowledge, especially guidance that is required for CO staff to execute duties e.g. CCS guidance; (2) consolidation and communication of WFP's implementation experience; (3) consolidation of evidence and impact of WFP's work for increased scalability. The documentation could include repackaging evaluations done by WFP's Cooperating Partners. Some of the suggested approaches to knowledge sharing included: (1) structured government-to-government exchanges; (2) provision of platforms to host lessons captured and lessons learnt, (3) facilitated engagements between WFP and WFP's cooperating partners.

4.2. Recommendations

1. Strengthening the Four Knowledge Management Pillars

People: The updated strategy would need to build on the successes of IKMFP engagement while balancing the KM expectation around other

identified staff especially for country KM initiatives. KM activities within the region would entail *broadening engagement* through clear inclusion of other staff other than IKMFPs and *deepening engagement* through unit-specific KM priorities.

Another people component to be factored is structured processes of identifying and documenting WFP staff with subject matter expertise.

Process: Key process issues need to be considered in the updated strategy such as: a portal for storing knowledge pieces, a process of identifying knowledge pieces of high value and a framework to track the uptake and use of knowledge.

There is need to make information and knowledge sharing an organisational expectation from the current scenario of individual-level effort. KM initiatives could borrow from other WFP processes such as ACR and CSP that have embedded information sharing and collaboration into their design. This would entail breaking down different programme/operational processes and identifying the KM elements to mainstream. The updated strategy will prioritise development of a structured process to knowledge management that provides predictable cues for knowledge curation and knowledge uptake.

Technology: The updated strategy should focus on supporting optimal uptake and use of the different tech tools at RBN and more so at country level.

Governance: Several functions in WFP have KM strategies and deliverables. Future KM initiatives would seek to account for all KM activities within the region through a framework that tracks and highlights Knowledge sharing and curation activities.

2. Aligning KM with Broader WFP Strategies

To advance 'thought leadership', WFP will need to prioritise thematic areas and shift its knowledge transactions in these areas from operational

knowledge to advocacy. This will require the organisation to build advocacy-oriented knowledge and strengthen its current advocacy tactics.

The visibility and gravity of knowledge as an organisational resource could be enhanced by identifying knowledge needs and knowledge products by strategic outcomes.

In addition, alignment between KM and the SP & CRF could be enhanced by explicitly applying SP and CRF guiding principles in advancing KM initiatives. For instance, KM initiatives can be advanced through the SP guiding principle of being Programme Integrated by mainstreaming KM actions such as Peer Assists and After Action Reviews within programme cycles. It could also adopt the SP guiding principle of being country-owned by ensuring KM components are included within the policies and data platforms of the government agencies WFP works with.

3. Country-level Engagement

Cascading KM to country level would require a defined approach for internal WFP KM processes versus external – facing KM processes.

Some inward-facing suggestions include:

KM and CSP alignment. CSPs are the basis for country engagement and KM approaches can enrich CSP content. This can begin with providing concrete guidance from a KM perspective to the lessons learnt section of CSPs and reporting not just the lessons around strategic outcomes (what was achieved) but also stating operational successes and challenges in delivering technical assistance (how it was achieved).

Bridge internal knowledge silos. This could include (1) consolidating existing WFP knowledge, especially guidance that is required for CO staff to execute duties e.g. CCS guidance; (2) consolidation and communication of WFP's implementation experience; (3) consolidation of evidence and

impact of WFP's work for increased scalability.

Outward looking KM processes could entail addressing country staff learning needs such as:

1. Structured and tailored process that allow governments to learn from each other;
2. Provision of platforms to host lessons captured and lessons learnt within existing government-led information platforms and repositories,
3. Facilitated engagements between WFP and WFP's cooperating partners to embed learning processes with agencies that transact on WFP's behalf.

Annex 1

Strategy Review Terms of Reference

[Terms of Reference for the Review of the RBN 2021 – 2023 KM Strategy](#)

Annex 2

Review Matrix

[Terms of Reference for the Review of the RBN 2021 – 2023 KM Strategy](#)

Review questions	Respondents	Source of data/information
1. What is the progress and status of the four Knowledge Management Building Blocks?		
1.1 How was the people component of the KM strategy advanced? What is the status and progress of the people component of the KM Strategy?	RBN Heads of Unit; IKMFP and Knowledge Producers	Desk review documents <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - IKMFP ToRs - KILs with knowledge producers
1.2 How was the process component of the KM strategy advanced? What is the status and progress of the process component of the KM Strategy?	RBN Heads of Unit; IKMFP and Knowledge Producers	Desk review documents <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unit workplans - RBN and Global KM Strategy KILs with knowledge producers (process) KILs with FPs on: Process e.g. after-action review, lessons capture
1.3 How was the technology component of the KM strategy advanced? What is the status and progress of the technology component of the KM Strategy?	RBN Heads of Unit; IKMFP and Knowledge Producers	Desk review documents <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - IKMFP ToRs - RBN and Global KM Strategy - WFP Information & Technology Knowledge Management Strategy 2023-26
1.4 How was the governance component of the KM strategy advanced? What is the status and progress of the governance component of the KM Strategy?	RBN Heads of Unit; IKMFP and Knowledge Producers	Desk review documents <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - IKMFP ToRs - Unit workplans - WFP's KM Strategies: Global, Regional, Social Protection, Tech, Nutrition, Evaluation.

Review questions	Respondents	Source of data/information
2. What is the Progress in advancing the 7 KM Objectives?		
2.1 How has the documentation of good practices supported units/functions to strengthen the evidence base for good decision-making?	RBN Heads of Unit; IKMFP ; Knowledge producers, Other unit members	KII
2.2 How has applying good practices enabled units/function to increase efficiency and effectiveness?	RBN Heads of Unit; IKMFP ; Knowledge producers, Other unit members	KII
2.3 How have units/functions applied knowledge management processes to improve policy, guidance and tools?	RBN Heads of Unit; IKMFP ; Knowledge producers, Other unit members	KII
2.4 How have units/functions applied knowledge management practices to enhance sharing with Government and Partners?	RBN Heads of Unit; IKMFP ; Knowledge producers, Other unit members	KII
2.5 How have units/functions strengthen the connection among experts to increase knowledge sharing?	RBN Heads of Unit; IKMFP ; Knowledge producers, Other unit members	KII
2.6 How has knowledge management enabled units/functions to broaden their staff's knowledge base?	RBN Heads of Unit; IKMFP ; Knowledge producers, Other unit members	KII
2.7 How has knowledge management enabled the organization to strengthening global and regional advocacy	RBN Heads of Unit; IKMFP ; Knowledge producers, Other unit members	KII
3. What is the progress in advancing the Six components of the Strategy's Impact Pathway ¹³		

Review questions	Respondents	Source of data/information
4. How well does the KM Strategy Align with Broader WFP Strategies?		
3.1 How was the governance component of the KM strategy advanced? What is the status and progress of the governance component of the KM Strategy?	RBN Heads of Unit; IKMFP and Knowledge Producers	KII
3.2 How did the KM strategy approach knowledge and evidence generation and use? What is the status and progress in generating and using knowledge?	RBN Heads of Unit; IKMFP and Knowledge Producers	KII
3.3 How did the KM strategy approach knowledge and evidence generation and use? What is the status and progress in generating and using knowledge?	RBN Heads of Unit; IKMFP and Knowledge Producers	KII
3.4 How did the KM strategy approach create an enabling environment for knowledge sharing? What is the status and progress in creating an enabling environment for knowledge sharing?	RBN Heads of Unit; IKMFP and Knowledge Producers	KII
3.5 How did the KM strategy build capacity for knowledge sharing? What is the status and progress in build capacity for knowledge sharing?	RBN Heads of Unit; IKMFP and Knowledge Producers	KII
3.6 How did the KM strategy support a culture of collaboration, learning and adaptation?	RBN Heads of Unit; IKMFP and Knowledge Producers	KII
5. What are the opportunities to embed KM at RBN and Country Office?		
4.1 What are the broader WFP goals and objectives globally and in the region? How well does the RBN KM strategy align with these goals?	Managers Focal Points	Online Surveys to Managers Desk reviews: CRF, CCS,
4.2 What are the broader WFP goals at country level? How well does the RBN KM strategy align with these goals	Managers Focal Points	Country Strategic Plans
5.1 What potential opportunities exist for embedding the KM culture across different functions within countries?		
	CO Staff	KIIs

Review questions	Review questions	Respondents	Source of data/Information
5.2	What opportunities exist for KM at the COs to further contribute to global and regional WFP objectives?	CO Staff	Kilis
5.3	What is the business value KM can deliver to WFP COs? <i>"WFP Partner of Choice, WFP as a thought leader, KM enabling staff to be proactive rather than reactive, KM enabling replication of lessons learnt and, KM enabling effective use technology for programming"</i>	CO staff	Kilis, Desk review: WFP KM strategies; KM strategies from AfDB
5.4	What are the key KM needs at country office based on key informants?	COs	Kilis

Acronyms

ACR	Annual Country Report
CO	Country Office
CRF	Common Results Framework
CSP	Country Strategic Plan
IKMFP	Information and Knowledge Management Focal Points
KM	Knowledge Management
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
PACE	Performance and Competency Enhancement
RBN	Regional Bureau of Nairobi
SoP	Standard Operating Procedures
SP	Strategic Plan
ToR	Terms of Reference
WFP	World Food Programme

Citation

McKinsey Global Institute (2012). The Social Economy: Unlocking Value and Productivity Through Social Technologies

Panopto (2018). Workplace Knowledge and Productivity Report.

StarMind (2022). The Future of Work Report - The High Cost of Inaccessible Knowledge.

Joint Inspection Unit (2016). Knowledge Management in the United Nations System.

World Food Programme

Via Cesare Giulio Viola 68/70,
00148 Rome, Italy - T +39 06 65131

wfp.org