Emergent Issues in Information and Knowledge Management and International Development

Annual Report 2011/12

Table of contents

Executive Summary

This report covers the final fourteen months of this five year programme which has explored the management and use of knowledge within the international development sector with a particular emphasis on the development of new practice. A final report on the programme as a whole is also in preparation.

The close of the programme was affected by the unexpected refusal of DGIS to grant an extension to the programme, the immediate practical implications of which are explained in this report. More general comment both on the welcome focus currently given to knowledge and development by DGIS and on the anti-developmental pitfalls of some contemporary approaches to knowledge production is made in the Context section of this report as well as in a recent IKM Discussion Document[1]

A substantial Fourth Evaluation Report and a final evaluation summary were produced during the period. The evaluators' understanding of how new knowledge is created and how programme management can support the process was different in emphasis from that of the programme management and generated rich discussion.

More generally, the report describes the successful conclusion of nearly all the sub-projects of the programme. This has lead to many substantive publications and other outputs in their own right as well as contributing to the overall narrative of the programme. Work on summative overviews of all the programme's work and their relation to wider issues of knowledges, societies and development is also well advanced, although the completion of some of it and its preparation for publication will take place under other arrangements than were originally envisaged.

---

[1]   Knowledge   Platforms   and   the   Knowledge   Letter: at   the   crossroads
http://wiki.ikmemergent.net/files/1201-dutchpolicy.pdf

Introduction

This annual report is written in compliance with paragraph 5 of the decision in respect of this programme of the Minister for Development Co-operation of the Netherlands on March 28th 2007. The report covers the fourteen months from the beginning of January 2011 to the formal end of the programme at the end of February 2012.

It starts by briefly considering how the programme relates to current trends in the production of knowledge and its use by the development sector. It then discusses the management arrangements of the programme and how these developed during the course of the year before reporting on the activities of the three programme working groups and the communications work of the programme.

Context

This part to the 2010 report concentrated on the trends towards greater emphasis on results in development assistance and some of the reasons for this emphasis given the difficult political and economic circumstances in many donor countries. Of course, no one can argue against the desirability of 'results' but there can be a lot of debate about how they are constituted. Andrew Mitchell, UK Secretary of State for International Development, made clear in one of his first speeches on coming to office[2], that he was proposing the achievement of results instead of the default focus of government departments which, he argued, was that of arguing for and then spending budgets. Similarly, when IKM talked to Martin Bauer, formerly 'Ambassador for Knowledge' within DGIS, he made clear that there was no contradiction in his view between a focus on results and a capacity to flexibly redefine what results were being created, why and how in response to changing realities and perceptions on the ground. Thus it could be argued that there is no automatic contradiction between an insistence on results and more bottom-up, iterative ways of working. Nonetheless, the experience of IKM would argue that, in practice, in the mechanisms used to justify and report on donor funding, the current focus on results has reinforced notions of development as a linear process, achieved by the realisation of quantifiable, pre-planned outputs. We do not at all suggest that quantifiable evidence should be devalued in principle. However, as we have argued

---

[2]   http://www.dfid.gov.uk/News/Speeches-and-statements/2010/Full-transparency-and-new-independent-watchdog-will-give-UK-taxpayers-value-for-money-in-aid-/

elsewhere, this simplistic approach risks placing the entire effort within an illusory realm of bureaucratic convenience which ignores the complex realities and their inevitably fluid human responses with which any real development initiative has to engage.

IKM has argued throughout that development interventions must be based on an understanding of the realities it seeks to change. More challengingly, it has argued that the 'knowledge' on which such an understanding is based cannot be derived only through conventional processes whereby 'objective' research leads to definitive 'evidence-base' conclusions. The fact is that as well as being affected by many issues of direct subjective interest - politics, power, economic benefits, levels of motivation - development realities are invariably areas of multiple knowledges and hence, as in a court of law, of evidence which can be interpreted in a variety of ways. This is so in at least two senses. First, the complex realities in which development takes place are almost invariably constituted by an amalgam of factors, knowledge of which is based on different disciplines, languages, cultures and historical and philosophic traditions. Second, if knowledge is understood to be the outcome of a person's capacity to grasp, internalise and act on sets of information, then an individual's knowledge will be constantly evolving, not least as they confront and negotiate the multiple knowledges present in any particular development context. 'Knowledge management for development' cannot attempt to offer the capture, re-assembly and re-use of tested solutions which, for example, formed the basis of the widely studied knowledge management programme within the oil company BP. Instead Knowledge management for development needs to recognise the inevitability of uncertainty and change and seek to equip organisations and communities to deal with them. IKM's task has been to explore and to make explicit how this challenge is met in the development sector and to signpost directions for improvement.

The emphasis on knowledge in the response of DGIS to the WRR report, 'Less Pretension, More Ambition' , and in particular the stress on the importance of sharing knowledge and on the need for new ways of working in the 'Knowledge Letter' submitted by Secretary of State Knapen to the Dutch Parliament on 14 November 2011, clearly forms a vital part of the context in which IKM attempts to achieve its task. However, we are concerned that, both within DGIS and more broadly across development policy makers in general, the changing and contested nature of knowledge production is not being adequately studied with the result that decisions on development research and on development knowledge management are being

taken without proper debate on the options available or on the consequences of these options. Development is not unique in this respect. Major changes in knowledge production and distribution, including in the role and function of universities, are taking place across all societies. With the possible exception of the Pirates Party in Sweden and Germany, which we understand to be concerned primarily with digital rights, these changes are taking place with very little public awareness or discussion, which is perhaps the greatest area of concern.

One aspect is the greater 'industrialisation' of knowledge production, whereby research is increasingly funded and organised in ways which privilege predictability and order over exploration, emergence or even intellectual methods in which a subsequent stage in a research process is properly modelled on the results of a former. Instead, a given set of human and other resources is supposed to produce a certain quantity of work in a certain form by a certain time. These resources are increasingly allocated on the basis of competitive bidding processes in which the agenda of the awarding body, and the perspective on that agenda by its staff, attains a dominant importance. Knowledge in these new arrangements is increasingly produced and managed for profit rather than as a contribution to social or intellectual goals. Why this is happening and its full impact on both development and on the countries which fund it forms the first section of the programme's summative book.

From IKM's immediate perspective, this trend can be seen as damaging to development for three reasons. First, it militates against research, like IKM's, which is critical of current development practice and of its dominant bodies. Whilst some might argue that this offers a better focus on the 'action' of development, on immediate results, limitations on critical thinking and debate can generally be seen as restrictive of the new thinking and innovation which all parties allegedly want to see. Second, it is by now widely recognised that knowledge sharing works best as a process of continuous interaction rather than simply the exchange of finished 'knowledge products'. In this context the level of competition currently experienced in much research bidding undermines the processes of sharing and collaboration which are the professed aim of DGIS' new knowledge policy. Whilst arguably appropriate in other sectors, the encouragement of the profit motive in development research is unlikely to contribute to notions of development knowledge as a global public good or to IKM's idea of a development knowledge ecology which can be collaboratively nurtured and shared. Finally, the concept of development knowledge as some kind of pre-defined product generated by a workforce, almost interchangeable as long as

it adheres to a limited range of acceptable qualifications, reinforces the notion of knowledge as a detached object. In our view, limiting 'development knowledge' to areas of formal research and not understanding the importance of engaging every stakeholder in the processes of knowledge creation, reflection and use demonstrates a failure to understand the actual social dynamics of knowledge societies. Without such an understanding, it is hard to see what the 'new ways of working' so encouragingly welcomed by DGIS can amount to. In particular, it seems that once again the idea that the people whose lives are supposed to be affected by development are going to be even further removed from development knowledge production - except as objects of study - than ever.

All of which, we would argue, serves to emphasise the importance of IKM, not as any sort of infallible oracle, but as one of the very few programmes promoting critical thinking and debate on these issues.

Programme Management

The most significant management event of the year was the refusal of DGIS to agree to a proposed six month extension of the programme, despite IKM management having been given both written and verbal encouragement to believe that an application for such an extension would be granted. More seriously, DGIS at the same time reneged on parts of its formal agreement to plans for the end of the programme submitted in late 2010. The damaging consequences of these decisions will be described in the appropriate sections of this report. The programme Steering Group has recently written to the Ministry asking for an explanation of these decisions. We do not currently know if they will receive a response.

At the Steering Group meeting in September 2010 at which a representative of DGIS was present, Chris Mowles and Anita Gurumurthy, IKM's evaluators, produced a draft fourth report in March 2011. This draft revealed some significant differences of opinion between the evaluators of programme and its directors as to what the programme was trying to achieve and, therefore, how it should be managed. Essentially the directors were more focused on the development of a programme of work and on creating relationships and conditions through which that programme could be delivered. The evaluators paid more attention to the contested collective identity of the programme and the extent to which this was adequately recognised by programme management and used as a generative source of new understanding

and ideas. Although at one level these differences led to a grievance on the part of the directors that their actions were being evaluated against outcomes that they were not even attempting to achieve, at another they demonstrate that even within a common commitment to value emergence and to the co-creation of knowledge, radical and possibly irreconcilable differences of approach exist. Understanding these differences and being able to explain and justify which route will be followed in any programme under design are clearly important. In this context, as well as in the ongoing feedback provided by the evaluators to the Steering Group, the directors and other participants in the course of their work over the life of the programme, the evaluation has been seen having made an important contribution to the programme and to learning from it. A final version of the fourth evaluation report was produced after further comments from the Steering Group in November 2011 and a shorter and updated final summary produced in December.

The Steering Group met in York, UK, on 23 and 24th September 2011. Apart from discussing the evaluation and thanking the evaluators for their work, the meeting focussed on progress on the two summative books, one on knowledge, society and development and one on local knowledge processes, being written to bring together and reflect on the work of the programme. The group expressed a desire to meet again in 2012 in order to contribute more to the books and to ensure the programme was brought to a proper and formal conclusion.

The general administration of the programme proceeded without any significant problems.

Programme Work

In a continuation of the process reported on in relation to 2010, the Working Groups played a less significant role in the programme than at the outset and no meetings of their members as 'Working Groups' took place in this period. Nonetheless work was still, in the main organised according to the plans that each group had sought to develop and will therefore be reported in the same format.

Working Group 1 – Dialogue, Discourses and Translation

1.1   *Local knowledge processes*

This work consists of three locally based experimental studies and a more widely

scoped process in which the notion of 'traducture', the translation of ideas and understandings across multiple boundaries, was developed and explored. All have continued across the whole life of the programme.

The book and music CD 'Colheita em tempos de seca' came out of the work of Dan Baron and Manoela de Souza with a group of trainee rural educators who were also studying for a diploma at the Federal University of Para in Brazil. It aimed to develop new pedagogical approaches, aimed at supporting self-reliance, self-development and self-belief amongst isolated rural communities facing a host of economic, social and environmental problems. The stress under which these communities live was highlighted by the murder of one of the educators, also an active community organiser, early in 2011 by hit men believed to have been hired by a local landowner. The project also revealed cultural and intellectual stresses, and related issues of status and respect, between concepts of education rooted in local realities and the more formal methodologies promoted in the pedagogic training offered by the university. As a result the work of the group was received with widespread interest in Brazil. However, the methodologies it proposes have a potentially global audience. The book was formally launched at a conference in Belem in September 2011. Presentations involving key participants in the process were then given in London, Frankfurt and Berlin.

Wangui wa Goro's continuing work on traducture, which had previously involved preparatory work on experience with local language policy in South Africa along with exploration of the idea with delegates at a number of development and translation oriented conferences, led to a three day workshop 'Lost and Found in Traducture' hosted by the King George VI and Queen Elizabeth Foundation at Cumberland Lodge Windsor. The event brought together a mix of development practitioners, people involved in language policy and education in a variety of African countries, publishers, translators and students of comparative literature, all offering their own perspective of communication across boundaries. A number of papers were developed, some by participants at the event, and further presentation and discussion took place within a panel at the EADI/DSA Conference in York. These papers are now being collected and edited with the expectation that they will be published in book form during 2012.

The extended case studies on community knowledges in Costa Rica and on Digital Story Telling in Sri Lanka and India were brought to an end, as far as IKM was concerned, with reflective final reports. In both cases some of the activities on the ground are carrying on under their own impetus. A presentation on the Costs Rica study was made at the EADI/DSA conference in September and also at the FAO/IFAD sponsored Share Fair in Rome. Using material from these studies, the authors are now working together and with others on a book about local knowledge processes, their importance to development and their generally somewhat uneasy relationship with more formal development interventions. A full draft of this was presented by the programme end. It is currently being further revised with the intention of publication during 2012.

1.2 The role of intermediaries

As knowledge is conceptualised less as a formalised and definitive object and more as a dynamic understanding of particular phenomena at a particular time, an understanding which may be mediated by role, culture and disciplinary background, so greater emphasis is given to the way connections are made between different sources of knowledge. The 'traducture' referred to above, is one form of connection, another is the role, deliberately or otherwise, played by intermediaries Exploring this has been an interest of IKM throughout. It has also been a key area of work at the Institute of Development Studies (IDS) at the University of Sussex, UK, over the life of the programme. IKM has influenced research at IDS by providing additional funds which have allowed academic and communications staff there to explore a wider range of intermediation than they had originally planned. The output of this work has been predominantly through the development of a workspace[3] on the IKM website. Its focus has changed as a result of drastic re-organisations within IDS and also because of the changing personal circumstances of researchers who have undertaken the work..

Over the last two years, the IKM-related intermediary research has been undertaken by Evangelia Berdou. Evangelia is particularly interested in the role of intermediaries in the introduction and development of new technologies, an interest which has made her work of increasing relevance to IKM's Working Group 2 with its focus on information artefacts. Evangelia also participated in a panel taking a critical look at

---

[3] http://wiki.ikmemergent.net/index.php/Workspaces:3._Intermediaries

the ICT4D field at the EADI/DSA conference in York. She then was able, despite being on maternity leave, to complete a paper on 'The blending of participatory research principles and methods with technology-driven information generation processes', which includes crowd sourcing. This will shortly be published as an IKM Working Paper.

1.3 *Links between information from participatory processes and the work of development organisations*

Previous reports have charted the progress of the 'How wide are the ripples?' work, led by Hannah Beardon and Kate Newman, which first researched the extent to which information gleaned from the use of participatory methodologies was in fact used by international NGOs . This evolved into a process of reflection and further work which culminated in a special issue of *Participatory Learning and Action Notes* on 'How wide are the ripples? From local participation to international organisational learning'[4], co-published with the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) in September 2011. The issue contained 26 articles, including contributions from a parallel process carried out in Kenya by the Participatory Methodologies Forum of Kenya (PAMFORK) a local non-governmental organisation (NGO). PAMFORK's findings of information use at local level had been incredibly similar to the study at headquarters level. Kate Newman and Stephen Kirimi from PAMFORK presented their work at a panel on local knowledges, co-organised by IKM, at the EADI/DSA conference in September. Another author, Nathan Horst, presented at the KM Impact Challenge event, hosted by USAID, in May 2011.

Working Group 2 – IKM Labs

The workspace [5], which records the work of this group, was further developed during the year with substantial contributions about issues like visualization added. Most of the new work initiated by this group has fallen into one of two strands, that of linked data and that of local content.

IKM has continued to work on issues of linked open data both as an emerging technology which may have development-friendly applications and as a case study of how the development sector acts in response to new technological possibilities.

---

[4] http://pubs.iied.org/14606IIED.html

[5] http://wiki.ikmemergent.net/index.php/Workspaces:1._Information_artefacts

The former consisted of continuing work with the Young Lives Programme in exploring the issues of them making their mass of data available in linked oipoen data format and exploring how doing so could reinforce the communication of the programme's research, including its underlying data. The process unearthed a host of technical and ethical issues, particularly around the anonymity of data, in making the data available and in how what, compared to global data sets, is still quite a modest and specialist data set can be published in a way which adds value to processes of comparison, analysis and presentation. In the process a number of 'how to' lessons were learned, which were documented on the IKM workspace[6]. In addition new on-line presentations of Young Lives data will go live in te summer of 2012, giving a practical demonstration of the work. Young Lives staff are also intending to write up their experience of the process, the work it has involved and the value it has brought to their programme.

Another issue identified at the 2010 workshop which IKM organised around linked open data and development concern issues around terminologies (where different language can be used to describe the same thing) . This links to other concerns of the programme - the links between multiple knowledges, the idea of traducture. IKM Vines, a proof of concept software tool, was further developed from its previous emphasis on including information of Southern origin to consider how different sets of terminology could be displayed and compared[7]. These issues were presented and discussed by IKM and by members of FAO's Agricultural Information Management Standards team in front of a large audience at the Knowledge ShareFair in Rome in September 2011.

IKM also explored how exactly data gets used and re-used in the development environment through a brief exploration of the use of data generated by the International Aid Transparency Initiative in the Social Life of Data project[8].

The case study aspect of linked open data work included reflections on the Young

---

[6] http://wiki.ikmemergent.net/index.php/Workspaces:1:Linked_Open_Data

[7] See http://www.hugobesemer.net/ikmsemantic/ and http://www.hugobesemer.net/ikmsemantic/

[8] http://wiki.ikmemergent.net/index.php/Workspaces:1:Linked_Open_Data#The_Social_Life_of_Open_Data

Lives Process and an attempt to explore how strategically DFID was approaching the issue of linked open data. A meeting took place involving several of the organisations who have been involved in IKM's discussions on linked open data and representatives of a number of departments of DFID who had identified its potential relevance to their work. It was clear however that DFID had no structure capable of taking an overview of how a new technology might impact on the Ministry as a whole or of how the organisation as a whole could shape the development of a new technology so that it could better meet its needs. Strong requirements for value for money and for proof of benefit made it very hard for either the organisation as a whole or for individual departments to engage with a new technology at an experimental stage even when, as in this case, the British government as a whole has formally signed up to promote it. Less formal communications indicate that the topic is similarly not approached in a holistic or strategic way within DGIS. As such these exploratory talks seemed to confirm some of the more general points made about the longstanding failure of the development sector to manage the technology it uses in a strategic and developmental way in the working paper 'ICT For or Against Development? An Introduction to the Ongoing Case of Web 3.0' that concluded this stream of work for IKM.

The Local Content work continued from its highly visible and successful involvement in the Agknowledge Africa Share Fair in Addis Ababa in September 2010. It increasingly involves the same people, who work with knowledge at local level in a number of African countries, and, very encouragingly, this group intends to seek funds to continue to work together beyond the life of the IKM programme. Key aspects of this work focus on the adaptation and use of appropriate information artefacts. The group is developing 'Farmafropedia' as a wiki based information system. Some members of the group had also been involved in IKM's work on traducture and are developing methodologies, based on traducture and on the Sense making work of Snowden and others, for knowledge work with local communities. Interesting though this work is, it should be remembered that this strand of work was based on IKM's desire to acknowledge and learn from previous development knowledge programmes. Many of the participants in this local content work had previously worked together in the Catalysing the Creation and Exchange of Local Content (CCELC) programme and related Open Knowledge Network from 2002 onwards. These initiatives had come out of the Dotforce Programme, the G8 sponsored programme aimed at preventing a 'digital divide' which followed the G8 summit in Osaka in 2000 but whose funding slipped away as such issues slipped

down the international agenda. It is hard to avoid the conclusion that, whilst some of the technologies used may have changed, the issues relating to local knowledges, and to grass roots communication remain very similar. Thus, the conclusion on the central issue from IKM's perspective of how well knowledge and in particular local knowledge is managed within the development sector is very depressing. As in 1980, 2000 or now, the facts are that if you want development you have to communicate with poor people, that a lot is known about how to do this and that there are many skilled, usually local, people capable of facilitating this process. Unfortunately these facts get regularly ignored and then need to be 'rediscovered', whilst investment in the expertise required is irregular and unreliable. Our findings then are less about exciting new methodologies at local level but about the systemic failure of development organisations to apply what they should already know.

Working Group 3: Management of Knowledge

There were four main strands to this work over the year: evaluation, issues of co-creation and connections between knowledge, practice-based change and the global knowledge ecology.

3.1   Evaluation

Earlier in the programme, scoping work revealed that most existing evaluation methods in relation to knowledge work paid little attention to many of the specific characteristics of knowledge - that it is dynamic, that it may be contested , that it resides in and is used by people who invariably interpret and adapt it. It also tended to concentrate on the mechanics of knowledge management, rather than recognising that development work as a whole is based on what knowledge is used and how. This provoked much discussion within the working group and led to an extended process in which three of its members, Valerie Brown, Ewen Leborgne and Simon Hearn developed what ended up as two working papers - one, concentrating on current practice, looking at evaluating development as a knowledge industry, the other, looking ahead to a vision of evaluation of development as a collective process contributing to a knowledge ecology. In addition, IKM, with its understandings of complexity and emergence, was also concerned about the common practice of seeing evaluation in terms of whether a pre-defined plan has been followed in a predictable manner. A separate paper was commissioned from Robin Vincent of Panos to looking at evaluation and complexity. The programme's own evaluation also contributed to these debates.

In May 2011, the case of IKM's own evaluation 'Evaluation of the IKM Emergent Research Programme: taking a complexity perspective to evaluation'[9] was submitted to the Knowledge Management Impact Challenge (KMIC), an initiative of the US Agency for International Development (USAID). The case was judged by a panel of peers to represent one of the most interesting new methodologies presented out of the 47 cases the received. As a result, IKM was invited to make a keynote speech at the Challenge's 'unConference' in Washington. The case of the IKM evaluation, seen from the directors' perspective is also being published in the KMIC Special Issue of the *Knowledge Management for Development Journal* in May 2012.

3.2   Connection between knowledges

Work with Josine Stremmelaar of HIvos on connections between the knowledge domains of development practice, policy and research continued. As part of this, Wenny Ho completed an in-depth analysis of knowledge integration in international development which was published in the think piece 'Like a bridge over troubled waters: dialogues of policy, practitioner and academic knowledges'[10] in an effort to take discussions on this subject to a more fundamental level by learning the lessons from the health, agriculture and science, technology and innovation sectors.

This think piece formed the starting point of a two-day seminar on the subject of 'The state of the art on knowledge integration across boundaries', organised with Hivos, on 23-24 January 2012. On element of this seminar was a very well attended Public Lecture by Robert Chambers of IDS. Videos from this Public Lecture and from the seminar, as well as reports and ongoing information, can be found on the new website,   Linking knowledge domains.[11] A handbook on knowledge integration is currently being written, based on the seminar discussions.

3.3   Practice-based change
A major part of IKM's plans for its final year were to think through what the

---

[9]   http://kdid.org/kmic/evaluation-ikm-emergent-research-programme-taking-complexity-perspective-evaluation

[10]   http://www.hivos.nl/dut/Hivos-Knowledge-Programme/Publications/Pubs/Like-a-Bridge-over-Troubled-Waters

[11] http://linkingknowledgedomains.wordpress.com/

implications of its thinking were for day to day practice in the management of development organisations. This work, which started after the Steering Group meeting in 2010, was given the title 'Practice based change'. As discussions progressed, it came to incorporate not only what general changes in practice IKM would like to see but also approaches where deliberate reflection on organisational and individual practice, starting with our own experiences of IKM, lead to changes in what work is done and how it is done. The work was carried out by a sub-group consisting of the programme directors, Mare Fort, Michael Drinkwater, Hannah Beardon and Daniel Guijarro. With support from Mare Fort, Michael Drinkwater was commissioned to investigate some of CARE International's recent experience of change, particularly in Nepal and Peru. Hannah Beardon and Daniel Guijarro were more interested in what people had learned from their participation within IKM. They therefore became part of the IKM installation at the EADI/DSA conference in York, interviewing a variety of the many IKM participants at the conference and visually mapping their ideas. This led to a 'reflections' paper which attracted considerable interest across the programme[12]. The plan had been to end up with a sector wide workshop on the issues raised. However a number of pressures on the participation of CARE, most notably the floods in Thailand, and the curtailment of the programme by DGIS which prevented rescheduling, led to a more internally focussed workshop, held at the Welcome Institute in London a week before the formal end of the programme. Nonetheless a number of written contributions provided input to the event and these were included in the workshop report produced by Hannah Beardon immediately afterwards[13].

3.4   Global knowledge ecology

A blog post on The Giraffe on the subject of the concept of the global knowledge ecology led to lively discussion on the Knowledge Management for Development (KM4Dev) discussion list[14] on this subject which has been written up as a Community Note. This discussion was also the starting point for a seminar at the IFAD/FAO Share Fair. Based on these interactions, we reached the conclusion that there is wide acceptance that the metaphor of the 'development knowledge ecology' can be a useful way of considering development knowledge because it gives a more holistic view of development knowledge. Metaphors can act as 'improvised lanterns' but they

---

[12] http://wiki.ikmemergent.net/files/1201-pbc-v1.pdf

[13] http://wiki.ikmemergent.net/index.php/Workspaces:9_Practice_Based_Change

[14] http://dgroups.org/Community.aspx?c=038278af-a7cd-4c4e-bed0-ac8ea0b7b57f

should be used with care. The development knowledge ecology is a social ecology and not a biological one, and it is not valueless one. As it provides a holistic view to development knowledge, it places emphasis on the coordination, cooperation, sharing, and more recognition that we are all part of an, in some ways, integrated system.

Overall

Since the Steering Group meeting in September 2010, the programme has been working on bringing the many diverse aspects of its work together into a comprehensible whole. This first involved bringing together the conclusions and completion of individual projects before moving on to the two main efforts to do the same at programme level. These efforts consist of the book on local knowledges and development being produced by Kemly Camacho and Michael David and a more general book on knowledge, society and development which is being written by Mike Powell and Sarah Cummings. This second book is highly dependent on the completion of the other work of the programme because it is pulling together and reflecting on their conclusions. DGIS' refusal of the request for an extension meant that this book has not been written as part of the programme. A detailed outline of its proposed contents, presented in graphical form, was however produced during the programme phase and the authors are committed to completing the work using their own resources. In this case, as in all others where work was not in final publishable form by the end of the programme, IKM has reserved the right to publish the material in draft form, should other plans for formal publication not bear fruit.

The programme has also continued to develop plans for an IKM2. These assume a development sector aware that it needs to work effectively in an unpredictable environment, alert to emergent factors and aware and supportive of the idea of a development knowledge ecology or commons. From this assumption, the draft programme sketches out areas in which more exploratory work is required if knowledge is to be effectively managed and used in such an environment. The further development of these proposals is, however, on hold until the final works of this stage have been published and reaction to them assessed.

Communications

With the programme coming towards its end, there has been less emphasis on making new contacts and more on presenting the work of the programme through its

publications, its web site and presentations at events. During this closing period, there has been a proliferation of diverse materials, including many videos which can be found on the LocalIKM channel[15] on Youtube.

This is the side of the programme's work which has been most affected by the refusal of the extension. An upgrade to the web site which, amongst other benefits would have improved and future proofed the innovative topic map, could not be contracted within the time available. Likewise, the substantial funds allocated for translation, editing and publications support in a 'post programme, pre-publication' period did not become available. This is particularly regrettable not only because we understand that it is not unusual in DGIS funded research for publication support funds to be spent at such a time, but in IKM's case, written approval to do so had been received early in 2011 and this guided the subsequent actions of the programme's management.

Events

Title	IKM Role	Date	Location	Organisers
Webinar: Perspectives on Monitoring and Evaluation of Knowledge Management	Valerie Brown, Ewen Le Borgne were the only speakers, presenting an overview of the programs' experiences grappling with the inherent challenges of monitoring and evaluating knowledge management	27 January	Washington DC, USA	USAID, Society for International Development
KM Impact Day	Mike Powell provided keynote lecture	6-7 May	Washington DC, USA	USAID
Emergence and Development Management	Presentation on Emergence and its implications for development to IDRC staff	9 May	Ottawa, Canada	IDRC
Lost and Found in Traducture	Many members of IKM presented cases	27-29 May	Windsor, UK	SIDENSI with IKM

---

[15] http://www.youtube.com/user/localikm?ob=0

Linked Data and Development	DFID and IKM jointly convened a meeting and led discussion on the potential implications of linked open information on development management and research	27 June	London UK	DFID
E-Books and Development	Participation in workshop considering the implications of the fast growing growth of E Books on development publishing and communication	11 July	London UK	BookAid
General Conference: Rethinking development in an age of scarcity and uncertainty	Panel : Shared values: advocating new approaches to a global development knowledge ecology Panel : New alliances: intermediaries and other institutional bridges Panel . Participatory Knowledge Building for Development: Including Voices, Changing Values Panel : How are Digital Technologies Transforming Development? Panel: Translation and Traducture Panel: From the Editor's desk	19-22 September	York, UK	EADI/DSA
2nd Global Share Fair	Parallel Sessions: 1. Development knowledge ecology: implications for global agricultural knowledge 2. Use of technology to facilitate information flow and collaboration	28-30 September	Rome, Italy	IFAD/FAO
Seminar: The state of the art on	IKM organised and facilitated.	23-24 January	Utrecht, The	IKM with Hivos

knowledge integration across boundaries			Netherlands	
Book Launch	Dan Baron and colleagues presented their book, 'Harvest in Times of Drought	24 January	London, UK	Kings Brazil Institute, University of London
Practice Based Change	Organiser	20-21 February	London, UK	IKM
Business Knowledge for Development	Organiser	3 April	Den Haag, The Netherlands	IKM with Hivos

-

Publications

IKM Working Papers

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, July 2011, 29pp.
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 July 2011, 30pp.
Robin Vincent (2012) Insights from Complexity Theory for the evaluation of development action: recognising the two faces of complexity. *IKM Working Paper* No. 14 March 2012, 47pp.
Sebastiao Darlan Mendonça Ferreira (2012) Evolution and future of the Knowledge Commons: emerging opportunities and challenges for less developed societies. IKM Working Paper No. 15 March 2012, 37pp.
Mike Powell, Tim Davies and Keisha Taylor (2012) ICT For or Against Development? An Introduction to the Ongoing Case of Web 3.0 by No 16, , March 2012   34pp

Other

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

Sarah Cummings, Mike Powell & Jaap Pels (2011) Development knowledge ecology: metaphors and meanings. *Knowledge Management for Development Journal*. 7(1): 125-135
http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/19474199.2011.593878

Patterns of Spending

The final accounts for the programme as a whole are in the process of being complied and will be discussed in the forthcoming programme report. However, it is clear that the programme has not spent the full amount originally allocated to it. In particular monies which had been allocated for the translation, editing and design of the final programme products and support for their publication and dissemination and which had been formally approved as legacy expenditure could not in fact be spent because of the as yet unexplained refusal of DGIS to honour its commitments.

The accounts for the period covered by this report show greater expenditure than had appeared in the 2011 budget for both Working Groups 1 and 2. This reflects the programme's practice of not re-budgeting unspent monies from a previous year's budget in circumstances where it is still expected that the monies will be spent. Thus, for example, the 'Lost and Found in Traducture' event and associated publications, which was delayed by the serious long term illness of its main organiser, had been largely budgeted for in the 2009 and 2010 plans, even though the money was finally spent in 2011.