Summary and final IKME evaluation report

Background
IKM Emergent has presented Chris Mowles of Red Kite Partners, UK, and Anita Gurumurthy of ICT4Change, India, with the challenge of evaluating the programme. The process is innovative in that uses a complexity perspective, examining the patterning of themes, paradoxes and power relationships within the programme and between programme participants and other actors in the development domain. It is based on the understanding that evaluation means making judgements of value about the emerging understanding of programme participants as the programme develops. It was started in 2008 and was completed in December 2011.

1   Introduction

This is the fifth and final report in summary form, following a series of evaluative reports commenting on the development of the Information and Knowledge Management Emergent (IKME) research programme. The fourth and most substantive report was completed in January 2011, at least 18 months before the end of the programme and was intended as a contribution to thinking for programme participants. This summary report is intended as short overview of the main findings of the fourth report and will also comment on a few further developments which have evolved during the year since the last one.

IKME is a five year research programme, which brings together a loose coalition of information and knowledge management (IKM) practitioners, academics and activists to carry out research to develop a critique of and a challenge to some of the dominant ways of conceptualising, producing and using knowledge. It has done so by focusing on three key areas of the IKM domain: the creation and content of knowledge, the tools and processes through which content is handled, and the organisational context in which it is managed, discussed and used. It is around these three areas that three Working Groups have coalesced and have developed programmes of work. However, as the programme has progressed, new and different themes have arisen and been pursued, and the work taking place outside the working groups has become as substantial as that originating from within. Many of the latter pertain to very nascent areas in the Knowledge Management for Development (KM4D) domain which might nevertheless herald significant changes in the field of development knowledge in the coming years. Identifying and engaging with threads of inquiry which are still emerging have brought value to the body of work in the IKME programme

2   On Evaluative Method

The evaluators have taken an adaptive, and evolutionary approach to the evaluation of the IKME programme. Rather than starting out with a model of evaluation to be 'applied' to the evaluation of the programme, each involvement with working groups and project holders has suggested a different intervention from the evaluators, which has been discussed and negotiated with the project holders and working groups concerned. In this sense, the evaluation shares the programme's starting assumptions that knowledge, in this case evaluative knowledge, is produced in contested, local contexts, where history, relationships, and power are central to understanding what emerges and how it emerges.

The evaluators have broadly favoured phenomenological and interpretive methods and have tried to encourage interpretation and reflection in groups and fora, and with project holders. In some cases, project holders have needed no encouragement from evaluators but have been working highly reflexively anyway and just needed to be given the opportunity to articulate this. Additionally, their observations and reflections on the evaluation process has itself been helpful to the evaluators to reflect on what they are doing, and have provided many ideas about what might be appropriate and illuminating. Evaluators have also used more structured methods, such as questionnaires, have undertaken field visits in the North and the South, and have undertaken a quantitative analysis of the usage of the IKME website. Additionally, they have commissioned a respected figure in the field to write a critical appraisal of the some of the documentary output of the programme, as well as to review the web products. So while privileging qualitative methods, evaluators have not relied exclusively on these, but have tried to take up methods most helpful for and illuminating of the situations into which they were trying to enquire.

By writing and disseminating evaluative reports throughout the course of the programme, writing observations and comments for the programme's blogs, and joining discussion in programme meetings and working groups, the evaluators have tried to develop systematic observations to contribute to what they have assumed is a self-critical community of enquirers. They have sought a dialectical engagement whereby they are helping to form, but at the same time are being formed by, the development in thinking in the programme. We have assumed that knowledge is practised by people in groups, constraining and enabling each other and negotiating their relationships of power. In some of our reporting and observations we have drawn attention to these processes. We have also spent a small amount of time as evaluators drawing attention to our own differences without trying in any way to resolve them, except in finding a way to write reports which enables us to agree on what it is we are saying.

In a programme which anticipates funding projects which have not been pre-planned, or even imagined, in the initial start-up documentation, there is little point in understanding evaluation as an assessment of whether the programme has fulfilled its original objectives or not, except in the broadest sense of accepting that the programme directors planned to be surprised. Rather, we have come to understand the evaluative undertaking as being about encouraging project holders and programme directors to continue to articulate in retrospect what they have come to value in a complex and continuously evolving programme. Amid this complexity, we have asked them to identify patterns, ways of working, products which have emerged in the course of discussion, and negotiation in the programme over what it is people thought they were trying to achieve. We have attempted to do this systematically and in a variety of different fora and through different media: conversation, participation in groups, blogging, writing, structured questioning. Working in this way has not been without its own shortcomings.

It is the evaluators' view, that the benefits of a developmental evaluation have outweighed the disadvantages: it has enabled a much more thorough understanding of what the programme participants have tried to achieve, it has rendered the evaluation much less threatening in many ways, and it has certainly been helpful to the process of the evaluation as far as the evaluators are concerned.

3 The Working Groups

Working Group 1 (WG1) was concerned with the production of local knowledge, and undertook three case studies in Brazil, Costa Rica and Sri Lanka. Each case study produced generalisable insights into the contextual, emergent and temporal production of knowledge in their own way. The group has made a significant contribution to discussions about social development method. The working group has also elaborated the important concept of *traducture*, how paying attention to the ways and means of translation can make local knowledges more visible. The premature collapse of the working group in year 3 also provides relevant insights into the importance of power, affect and questions of identity in local knowledge production.

During the last year, Michael David and Kemly Camacho have collaborated on writing a book together relating local knowledges to issues of identity and agency, and building on many facets of local knowledge/local content work in the programme. Dan Baron Cohen has published a book and CD together with UNESCO on the results of his pedagogical work with community animators.

Working Group 2 (WG1) has experimented with a variety of technology-based methods to privilege Southern knowledge: by developing technological platforms which index and sort information to bring up Southern produced knowledge first; by visualising Southern data; by reflecting upon the emerging digitally mediated knowledge ecologies and their gatekeepers; and by bringing together information workers and knowledge experts in the South to better share and articulate what was important to them. These initiatives are serious examples of programme participants being encouraged to address knowledge and technology asymmetries which were identified in the programme's inception documents. What is generalisable from the work of participants in WG2 is that it is possible to develop different technological tools, platforms and ways of working, which recognise the architectures of power in the new knowledge spaces and give greater voice to Southern perspectives. Owing to the essentially technical nature of some of these initiatives, their connection to the overall goals of the programme was not always clear to every member of the group. Also some project holders in the group felt inter alia, that it was indeed difficult to impact mainstream technology structures and practices, especially within the constraints of limited time and resources.

During the last year members of WG2 have produced a Working Paper on technology, especially ICT and development in the context of Web 3 technologies, the ideas from which were trialled in two sessions at the 2011 General Conference of the European Association of Development Research and Training Institutes (EADI) and the Development Studies Association (DSA) in York, UK, and also with the UN Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) at the Second Agricultural Knowledge Share Fair , held at the International Fund for Agriculture (IFAD) in Rome, Italy. These initiatives were originally explored at an Oxford workshop in 2010 and the various pilot programmes. This paper, which will be published in 2011, brings together the programme's political and strategic analyses about the connections between information, technology and development with an interest in trying to shape the development of new technologies in a development friendly way.

Working Group 3 (WG3) was responsible for reviewing the way that knowledge is currently managed, disseminated and evaluated in development organisations. It commissioned a number of working papers, and the programme director responsible for this working group was also in charge of the programme's communication strategy and products, which we take to mean the workshops, blog

posts, events and newsletters co-written with the other programme director. The papers produced are rich and diverse, and many of them of substance. WG3 members were the most harmonious and ably demonstrated the importance of bringing together academics and practitioners, North and South, experienced and less experienced. Their achievements include co-hosting conference in Namibia, developing a Francophone forum for the discussion of KM4D, and the funding of the practitioner journal, *Knowledge Management for Development Journal*, which enabled the production of two special editions highlighting the ideas of IKME.

The evaluators have undertaken a critical assessment of the IKME Working Papers taken as a whole, those commissioned or written by WG3 and those emerging from elsewhere. Since programme coherence has become a theme for the evaluators, the assessment of the working papers is undertaken to gauge the extent to which the working papers themselves constitute a coherent statement about IKME ideas.

The implications of IKM´s perspectives and findings for the practice of information and knowledge management in development organisations will be further developed in a final workshop on practice-based change in February 2012. The workshop is being organised with the involvement of programme managers from CARE and will explore practical accountable ways of working which remain open to multiple knowledges, emergence and the reflective practice of stakeholders. It will build on a strand of investigating the evaluation of knowledge work – that led up to and extends beyond the work of Valerie Brown, Ewen Le Borgne and Simon Hearn – and also some preparatory work carried out within IKM by Hannah Beardon and Daniel Guijarro which was carried out at the EADI/DSA York conference and can be found at: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-8u3xIfQNTU .

In addition, an expert consultation 'The state of the art on knowledge integration across boundaries' being held on 23-24 January 2012 by IKM and Hivos on the thorny problem of working cross-domain with practitioners, policymakers and researchers. It will be sharing some of the thinking arising from the IKME programme in this area, and is being supported by a think piece 'Like a bridge over troubled waters: dialogues of policy, practitioner and academic knowledges' written by Wenny Ho. This latter paper looks at cross-domain work in agriculture, health and technology and innovation sectors, and integrates the thinking from previous work on this subject. The think piece is completed and will be launched at the same time as the workshop.

The two directors of the IKME programme have begun a book on the experiences of the IKME programme which will deal with questions of emergence within the context of wider informational developments in the international development domain.

4   Governance and Management

The report assesses the governance and management arrangements for the programme and concludes that IKME has recruited a substantive group of people onto its Steering Committee who have contributed to a highly reflective and discussive environment in broad support of the themes of the programme. It would be hard to stress enough the original and unusual nature of this achievement given how common it is for trustee groups to get lost in the detail, and to understand what they are doing solely in disciplinary terms. In engaging EADI as the contract holder with the Dutch government, the programme found an efficient and professional organisation to administer the projects. The programme directors have engaged with EADI consistently and professionally to manage a complex set of contracting arrangements. Ways of commissioning the work have allowed

for novelty to arise within a negotiated engagement with people inside and outside the programme. At the same time, working this way, combined with the ambitious diversity of projects, provokes strong questions of identity among the programme participants.

The management of IKME has had the task of aggregating and synthesising the whole from the disparate parts of the programme. This task has been undertaken through various methods – meetings, workshops, newsletters, blogs etc. The difficulties of geography, resources and individual niches and styles of work may have inhibited the degree to which project holders experienced a common sense of identity. Despite a shared understanding of the overarching focus on the multiplicity of knowledges, not all project holders were tuned into the rich diversity of the collective and its interdependencies. This last lap of the programme seeks to focus its energies to address some of these issues, investing in documentation and generation of written material for reinterpreting the meaning of the programme as it has evolved.

5   Conclusions

In conclusion, the evaluators consider the programme to be uniquely imaginative, bold and creative, both in content and process. It has persisted with ways of working which are reflective and discussive to an unusual degree, and has modelled the very subject of the programme's research – that development is a contested and negotiated undertaking that emerges through the contestation and negotiation between critically engaged participants.

The programme has reversed the polarity of many development initiatives, being a coherent programme in search of funding, rather than proscribed funding which is in search of hired hands. The quality of relationships between a committed group of people, who have nonetheless been able to engage other people in productive relationships, has been central to the programme's achievements.

 These achievements arise from good planning, but also in being responsive to emerging possibilities and being prepared to work through the complexity of negotiating about what we mean by what we say. Some of the reflexive and reflective methods modelled in the programme and some of the products are of extremely high quality.

In remaining adaptive, the programme directors have often been able to identify and engage with what may be significant early technological developments and to begin to frame them critically by identifying participants in the programme, and then drawing in others from outside into the conversation. In this way the programme continues to widen the ripples of its engagement in the development domain.

Programme participants have produced a wide range of products, both tangible and intangible, which are widely viewed by participants in the programme, and many outside, to be influential and persuasive. The programme is likely to continue to influence the sector with the varied threads of its alternative discourse whether it continues in a phase 2 or not. The IKME programme, and the ideas which its project holders advocate, is currently widely viewed as substantial and influential in the domain of KM4D.

The practice-based change work and plans for IKM 2, bringing together ideas and proposals to continue the work in a second phase, are both initiatives which involve IKM participants proposing to

continue to work together beyond the life of this IKM programme. One might conclude from this that the space offered by IKM has allowed others to (re)create networks through which to move on to new work with other communities. There are a variety of plans to bring out books, continue networking initiatives and develop thinking, although not necessarily branded as IKME. Nonetheless, the IKME initiative has directly inspired these initiatives.

At the same time, these unique ways of working have thrown up their own problems. The programme directors have adopted a decentred approach to leading the programme, partly through choice and partly through necessity, since they have been keen to keep management costs appropriately low. In such a diverse group, and because of the nature of the engagement with many project holders being very short term, there is bound to be a varied commitment to and understanding of, the programme's broader objectives. Some programme participants have sometimes found it difficult to locate themselves and their contribution in relation to the programme's mission.

Perhaps, in addition to the newsletters, resource allocation for more regular collective meetings, even for parts of the collective, to enable participants to struggle with questions of meaning which are central to experiencing oneself as part of a community engaged in a common task, may have helped. How the community of projects adds up to multiple knowledges and emergence still needs to be explored in the remaining period through a variety of means which the programme directors are already undertaking. Further, some of the generative programme tensions could have been further explored, such as that between academics and practitioners and some other predictable divides, drawing on the rich resource of the community of enquirers as its own local knowledge community.

<div align="right">

Chris Mowles and Anita Gurumurthy
December 2011

</div>

IKM published outputs

IKM has produced a wide range of publications which are largely designed for a professional readership. These include Working Papers and Background Papers published on the IKM website but also include work published in cooperation with other agencies. IKM also supports a number of websites and weblogs. It has also supported the *Knowledge Management for Development Journal* for the years 2009-2011.

IKM Working Papers
The IKM Working Paper Series is available on the IKM website[1]. Summaries[2] giving an indication of the key arguments and conclusions of each paper are also available in English, French and Spanish.

Julie E. Ferguson, Kingo Mchombu and Sarah Cummings (2008) Meta-review and scoping study of the management of knowledge for development. *IKM Working Paper* No. 1, April 2008, 45pp.

D. Wickremasinghe (2008) Communicating Information and Knowledge Management: Challenges and Approaches. *IKM Working Paper* No. 2. April 2008.

Serafin D. Talisayon (2009) Monitoring and evaluation in knowledge management for development. *IKM Working Paper* No. 3, July 2009, 50pp.

Laxmi P. Pant (2009) Learning networks for bridging knowledge divides in international development: approaches and initiatives. *IKM Working Paper* No. 4, August 2009, 39pp.

Harry Jones (2009) State of the art literature review on the link between knowledge and policy in development. Joint *ODI-IKM Working Paper* No. 5, August 2009, 37pp.

Stephen Kirimi and Eliud Wakwabubi (2009) Learning from promoting and using participation: The case of International Development Organizations in Kenya. Joint *PAMFORK-IKM Working Paper* No. 6, October 2009, 44pp.

Hannah Beardon and Kate Newman (2009) How wide are the ripples? The management and use of information generated from participatory processes in international non-governmental development organizations. *IKM Working Paper* No. 7, October 2009, 29pp.

Paula Zirschky (2009) Knowledge management and multiple knowledges: A multi-case study within the Netherlands. *IKM Working Paper* No. 8, November 2009, 26pp.

Adnan Rafiq and Nazish Rafiq (2010) Good planning or benign imposition? Innovation, emergence and risk in developmental research: Learning from ICTD. Final Draft Report. JBS-IKM-BDDG Workshop 17-18 September 2009. *IKM Working Paper* No. 9, January 2010, 29pp.

Julian Jenkins (2010) 'Things can be other than they are'. Understanding the limitations of current management thinking and knowledge practice for work in the development sector. *IKM Working Paper* No. 10, July 2010, 28 pp.

Robin Mansell (2010) Power and interests in developing knowledge societies: exogenous and endogenous discourses in contention. *IKM Working Paper* No. 11, August 2010, 37pp.

---

[1] http://wiki.ikmemergent.net/index.php/Documents#Working_Papers
[2] http://wiki.ikmemergent.net/index.php/Documents#IKM_Summaries

Simon Hearn, Ewen Le Borgne and Valerie A. Brown (2011) Monitoring and evaluating development as a knowledge industry: ideas in current practice. *IKM Working Paper* No. 12*,* August 2011, 26pp.

Ewen Le Borgne, Valerie A. Brown and Simon Hearn (2011) Monitoring and evaluating development as a knowledge ecology: ideas for new collective practices. *IKM Working Paper* No. 13, August 2011, 29pp.

Mike Powell, Tim Davies and Keisha Taylor (2011), ICT for or against development? An introduction to the ongoing case of Web 3.0, *IKM Working Paper* No. 14 – in press

Rob Vincent (2011), Insights from Complexity Theory for the evaluation of development action: recognising the two 'faces' of complexity. *IKM Working Paper* No. 15 – in press

Sebastiao Darlan Mendonça Ferreira (2012) Evolution and Future of the Knowledge Commons: Emerging Opportunities and Challenges for Less Developed Societies. IKM Working Paper No. 16 – in press

IKM Background Paper series
Sarah Cummings (2008) IKM Emergent Communications Strategy, *IKM Background Paper*, December 2008, 45pp.

Joitske Hulsebosch, Mark Turpin and Sibrenne Wagenaar (2009) Monitoring and evaluating knowledge management strategies, *IKM Background Paper*, October 2009, 44pp.

M.J.R. David (2010) Storycasting on Telradio: A discussion paper. *IKM Background Paper*, January 2010. 12pp.

IKM work published in cooperation with other agencies
Vozes de campo with Dan Baron (2011) Colheita em Tempos de seca:as de vida por communidadessustentáveis/ Harvest in Times of Drought: cultivating pedagogies of life for sustainable communities. Transformance Institute, Maraba, Brazil, September 2011, Bi-lingual monograph and CD, 248pp

Kate Newman, Hannah Beardon and Holly Ashley (eds) (2011) How wide are the ripples? From local participation to international organisational learning, International Institute for Environment and Development, London, September 2011, Special Issue Participatory Learning and Action no 63, 186 pp

Knowledge for Development in Africa (2009), Centre for Technical Assistance, Wageningen, with IKM Emergent and the University of Namibia, Conference Report, 50pp

Digital Story Telling (2008), IT for Change, Bangalore with IKM Emergent, Conference Report, 21pp

Kemly Camacho and Natalia Vargas, (2010), Mi Comunidad Vista desde Mis Ojos, Sula Batsu, San José, Costa Rica, 43pp

Wenny Ho (2011) Like a bridge over troubled waters: dialogues of policy, practitioner and academic knowledges. The Hague, Hivos; Bonn, IKM Emergent

IKM On-Line

In addition to its main website[3] and the workspaces area on that which contains original material on some of the thematic areas on which IKM has worked, there are sub-divisions of the site which have been made available to individual participants to develop their own work in detail

farmafripedia.ikmemergent.net
linkedinfo.ikmemergent.net
digitalstory.ikmemergent.net

The blog, The Giraffe[4], serves as a more open discussion space for knowledge management issues raised by the programme.

Knowledge Management for Development Journal
IKM has supported the *Knowledge Management for Development Journal*[5] both as an outlet for some of the material it has generated and as a space for examination of knowledge management. Its outputs are listed below. Articles and special issues marked with an asterisk have been produced within the context of the IKM programme.

2009, volume 5, Issue 1
Special Issue on Collaborative learning and organisational knowledge management*
Head office attitudes towards inter-organisational learning in Irish non-governmental organisations (Caroline Forsyth and Malcolm MacLachlan)
Organisational energy and other meta-learning: case studies of knowledge management implementation in nine Asian countries (Serafin Talisayon)
The tip of the iceberg: tentative first steps in cross-organisational comparison of knowledge management in development organisations* (Ewen Le Borgne and Sarah Cummings)
Swiss roots with multi-cultural and multi-linguistic branches: the challenges of sharing and building on knowledge at Intercooperation (Jane Carter, Pascale Aubert, Arjumand Nizami, Alain Cuvelier, Julia Randimbisoa, Lorena Mancero)
Knowledge integration for development: the Hivos approach (Josine Stremmelaar)
Revisiting the Eastern Indonesia Knowledge Exchange (BaKTI) (Petrarca Karetji)

2009, Volume 5, Issue 2
The new enlightenment: a potential objective for the KM4Dev community (Sebastiao Mendonça Ferreira)
Evaluating knowledge sharing in research: the International Farmers' Conference organized at ICARDA (Alessandra Galié, Bernhard Hack, Nadia Manning-Thomas, Andrea Pape-Christiansen, Stefania Grando and Salvatore Ceccarelli)
The human factor in knowledge management for development: using theories from social psychology to investigate the predictors of knowledge behaviour in development organisations (Johan Lammers)
Lessons learned about design, monitoring and evaluation process definition and information

---

[3] www.ikmemergent.net
[4] Thegiraffe.wordpress.com
[5] Available at http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/titles/19474199.asp

management for international development programmes (Brian A. Nejmeh and Bernard Vicary)
The promise of positive deviants: bridging divides between scientific research and local practices in smallholder agriculture (Laxmi Prasad Pant and Helen Hambly Odame)
Believing in the human capacity to respond to HIV and malaria: sharing experiences on a human level for global impact (Gaston Schmitz and Philip Forth)
On producing and sharing knowledge across boundaries: experiences from the interfaces of an international development research network (Claudia Zingerli, Claudia Michel and Annika Salmi)

2009, Volume 5, Issue 3
Special Issue on Learning for the water sector: quenching the thirst for knowledge and bridging the banks?*
Attitudes and actions of participants in multi-stakeholder processes and platforms (Samyuktha Varma, Alexandra Evans, Carmen da Silva Wells and K. Jinapala)
Knowledge sharing, information management, communication and IT within WASHCost (Jaap Pels)
Looking back to move forward in strength: monitoring of water system sustainability (Kate Fogelberg)
From world cafés to road shows: using a mix of knowledge sharing approaches to improve wastewater use in urban agriculture (Philip Amoah, Pay Drechsel, Tonya Schuetz, Gordana Kranjac-Berisavjevic and Nadia Manning-Thomas)
Contributions of knowledge networks and communities of practice to the water and sanitation sector in developing countries (Bertha Camacho)
Challenges of inter-sectoral monitoring of developments in the provision of water and sanitation services in Nigeria (Abraham Onugba)

2010, Volume 6, Issue 1
Knowledge management for development communities: balancing in the thin divide between tacit and codified knowledge (Alfonso Acuna)
Knowledge networks and capacity building in the water, sanitation and hygiene sector in Southeast Asia and the Pacific (Iftikhar Hussain, Juliet Willetts, Naomi Carrard and Farooq Khan)
Digital activism in the Middle East: mapping issue networks in Egypt, Iran, Syria and Tunisia (Fieke Jansen)
From research to policy and practice: a logic model to measure the impact of knowledge management for health programs (Tara M. Sullivan, Saori Ohkubo, Ward Rinehart and J. Douglas Storey)
Using semantics to reveal knowledge divides in Dutch development cooperation: the case of the Millennium Development Goals* (Iina Hellsten and Sarah Cummings)
Changing organisational culture – an overwhelming challenge? (Manuel Flury)
Communities and networks in support of knowledge sharing. Part 1 (Nancy White)

2010, Volume 6, Issue 2
Exploring the effectiveness of development research with a monitoring and learning approach (Claudia Michel, Eva Heim, Karl Herweg and Thomas Breu)
Multiple knowledges, multiple languages: are the limits of my language the limits of my world?* (Valerie A. Brown)
Progress to date of the IKM Emergent Research Programme: synthesis, understandings and lessons learned* (Mike Powell and Sarah Cummings)

A Knowledge Share Fair and a KM4Dev meeting in Colombia, May 2010: involving people in a rich environment of dialogue on agriculture and knowledge management in Latin America and the Caribbean (Simone Staiger-Rivas, Gauri Salokhe, John Smith, Tania Jordan, and Viviana Palmieri)
Communities and networks in support of knowledge sharing. Part 2 (Nancy White)
Dialogue of the four musketeers* (Sarah Cummings)

2010, Volume 6, Issue 3
Knowledge management for sustainable development in the web 2.0 era: the Triangle of Dichotomies (Alexander Voccia)
Enriching indigenous knowledge: an alternative paradigm for empowerment (Mansoor Shahvali)
Seeing the social capital in agricultural innovation systems: using SNA to visualise bonding and bridging ties in rural communities (Louise Clark)
A house for knowledge: using metaphors to guide knowledge sharing and learning in development organisations (Bernike Pasveer)
A knowledge journey: the story of the Hivos' Knowledge Programme (Josine Stremmelaar, Remko Berkhout)
Is it actually possible to measure knowledge sharing?* (Louise Clark and Sarah Cummings)
KM4Dev, communities of practice, engagement to enlightenment? An interview with Lucie Lamoureux (Ewen Le Borgne)

2011, Volume 7, Issue 1
Special Issue on Beyond the conventional boundaries of knowledge management: navigating the emergent pathways of learning and innovation for international development
Unfolding the challenges of delegating research services for innovation and entrepreneurship in smallholder agriculture (Laxmi Prasad Pant and Krishna Prasad Pant)
Tacit knowledge and innovation capacity: evidence from the Indian livestock sector
(Rasheed Sulaiman V, Laxmi Thummuru, Andy Hall and Jeroen Dijkman)
Knowledge and innovation management in the policy debate on biofuel sustainability in Mozambique: what roles for researchers? (Marc Schut, Cees Leeuwis, Annemarie van Paassen, Anna Lerner)
Knowledge management for pro-poor innovation: the Papa Andina case (Douglas Horton, Graham Thiele, Rolando Oros, Jorge Andrade-Piedra, Claudio Velasco and André Devaux)
Beyond knowledge brokering: an exploratory study on innovation intermediaries in an evolving smallholder agricultural system in Kenya (Catherine W. Kilelu, Laurens Klerkx, Cees Leeuwis and Andy Hall)
Making innovation systems work in practice: experiences in integrating innovation, social learning and knowledge in innovation platforms (Hlamalani Ngwenya and Jürgen Hagmann)
Development knowledge ecology: metaphors and meanings* (Sarah Cummings, Mike Powell and Jaap Pels