

M&E REPORT
ON THE
ICT – KM PROGRAM
(Reporting Period: April 2005 – March 2006)

Prepared: 14 April 2006

By:

Terry Smutylo
M&E Consultant to the Program

542 Fraser Ave.
Ottawa, Ontario
Canada, K2A 2R4

Tel(613)729-6844
Fax(613)288-8993
tsmutylo@gmail.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. BACKGROUND	3
2. ASSESSMENT OF USE OF M & E BY PROGRAM MANAGEMENT.....	3
3. ASSESSMENT OF THE USE OF M&E BY PROJECT TEAMS	4
4. OVERALL PROGRAM PERFORMANCE	4
5. IMPROVING PROGRAM MANAGEMENT.....	6
5.1. Cross-Center and Cross-Project Collaboration	
5.2. Tension: System Work vs. Center Work	
5.3. Senior Leadership to Influence Organizational Culture	
5.4. Transparency in Decision-Making	
5.4. Rethink and Reconstitute the Advisory Body	
6. FUTURE DIRECTIONS,.....	8
6.1. Programming	
6.2. Planning and Consultation	
7. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	9
8. TELEPHONE INTERVIEW FINDINGS	10
9. ANALYSIS OF 2006 SURVEY RESULTS.....	14
9.1. Other Stakeholders.....	14
9.1.1. Implications of Other Stakeholders' Responses.....	16
9.2. Human Resources Managers.....	17
9.2.1. Implications of HR Managers' Responses.....	18
9.3. Directors General.....	19
9.3.1 Implications of Directors General Responses.....	20
9.4. Project Coordinators.....	21
9.4.1. Implications of Project Coordinators' Responses.....	22
ANNEXES.....	23
Annex 1- Survey Results: Other Stakeholders.	23
Annex 2- Survey Results: Human Resources Managers.	33
Annex 3- Survey Results: Directors General.....	36
Annex 4- Survey Results: Project Coordinators.....	40
Annex 5- Telephone Interview Protocols.	42

1. BACKGROUND

From its inception, the ICT – KM Program built Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) components into its activities at both the program and the project levels. March 2006 completes the second year in which these components have been in operation.

An external evaluation specialist, linked to IDRC's Evaluation Unit, was contracted to help design and facilitate implementation of M&E activities and to provide assessment information from an external perspective on the Program's performance. The approach taken by the Program's management team was guided by several principles. M & E would be used by project and program participants for both reporting on their work (accountability) and for improving the performance of their activities (learning). It was intended that the project teams would select and apply the relevant M&E tools and would gain in comfort and competence in their use. M&E would be integrated with and contribute to the management functions and reporting cycles of the program without adding heavy additional workload. While valuable as a 'reality check', externally generated and interpreted M&E information is not definitive in assessing program or project performance. It adds to and complements the information flowing to program and project teams from a variety of sources, including day-to-day management activities. Accordingly, the Program has used a modified version of the 'Center Commissioned External Review' (CCER) in which the 'external evaluator': a) works with Program participants to build capacity; and 2) generates feedback independently through surveys and interviews and reports it to the management team.

This report is based on information from several sources: an internet-based survey of people suggested by Program management; telephone interviews with a subset of those surveyed; the draft 2006 Annual Report of the Program; and the annual reports of the projects.

2. ASSESSMENT OF USE OF M & E BY PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

Based on interactions with the program management team over the past two years, I can report a strong and knowledgeable commitment to use-oriented monitoring and evaluation. Considerable resources and time were allocated to making monitoring and evaluation skills available to project personnel; and significant effort expended to create the conditions wherein projects themselves could clarify, plan, implement and revise their own M&E activities. M&E findings are utilized to alter Program activities, to modify management practices, including M&E components, and to create a baseline against which to compare future performance. The commitment to improvement through learning through M&E is evident in the way the Program conducts its workshops and in the content of its annual reports. Frank feedback from program participants was sought last year and was reported in the annual report along with the intended actions based on this feedback. The 2005 Annual Report commits Program management to addressing a number of issues and concerns. These included mobilizing and tracking senior managerial support, improving Program management, communications and technical support to projects and continuing the M&E and project reporting arrangements.

Progress on most of these commitments is reported in the 2006 Annual Report – evidence on the extent to which the Program is practicing good learning behavior.

Some of the challenges facing Program management show up again this year. More effective, perhaps different, solutions appear necessary if these concerns are to show signs of being resolved a year from now. The persistent challenges relate to: securing stronger ownership and leadership from the Directors General; balancing Center and project responsibilities; and fostering appropriate and productive cross-project and cross-center collaboration. These challenges will be discussed under ‘Improving Program Management’ below.

3. ASSESSMENT OF THE USE OF M&E BY PROJECT TEAMS

Comparing the projects’ annual reports this year with those of last year, I see marked improvement in the application of learning-oriented M&E. Although reporting on the use of monitoring and evaluation information varies greatly among the projects, one senses much greater comfort with reporting on things that did not go well, or as planned, and on the resulting changes. There is greater accuracy in applying the concepts, for example in differentiating between outputs and outcomes, and in reporting changes in partner behaviors as outcomes. In the March 2006 reports, VASAT, CSI, VLS, OLR, E-Publishing and VRCI report against planned objectives, identify areas of learning and reflection and a few include the evidence on which some of their learning is based. For a set of projects largely concerned with hard or soft ICT infrastructure, and which have very little face-to-face access to their M&E resource person, I would assess this level of progress in M&E as very good. The quality of reporting on results this year is much higher than last year and, of course, there are more results to report on this year.

The VASAT 2005-06 Annual Report cites one of its ‘lessons learned’ as: *“The capacity strengthening process is successful when it is specific to the local milieu. This is almost a necessary condition to make a partner derive advantages from new capacities.”* This learning also applies to the building of M&E capacity in the ICT-KM projects. To deepen the utility to, and competence of, the project teams the Program moved beyond providing generic tools and training by making a monitoring and evaluation resource person available to the projects on a request-as-needed basis. The variation in M&E reporting reflects the freedom the projects had to use whatever approach fit their needs and circumstances.

4. OVERALL PROGRAM PERFORMANCE

The survey results suggest that the ICT-KM Program has made significant contributions in: the creation of useful tools and systems; finding cost savings through economies of scale and system standardization; building awareness and new ways of thinking about accessing and using information; and in creating for itself, a high, positive and influential profile both inside and outside of the CGIAR. Respondents are largely knowledgeable about the Program and its initiatives and are conversant with the knowledge sharing language, concepts and initiatives of the Program.

All categories of respondents perceive significant positive, and no negative, changes in knowledge management and sharing in the CGIAR. They are able to cite many improvements, particularly in knowledge sharing and collaboration among Centers and the emergence of knowledge-related communities of practice. Like last year, over two thirds of Other Stakeholders reported this year that the Program had contributed to the improvements to a limited or significant extent. Compared with last year, double the percentage of responding Human Resources Managers give the Program credit for influencing their human resources policies and practices.¹ The Directors General singled out the following ways in which the Program contributed to the changes:

- Elevated the agenda on the issue
- Started to provide the tools and advice needed
- Raising awareness in the centers
- Piloting "technology choices"
- Bringing the IT and IM Communities of Practice together
- Vibrant communities of practice have emerged among IT managers and librarians, and GIS experts

The survey and interview findings show progress in communicating about the Program, its activities and achievements. Its communication instruments are reported as useful by all groups of respondents, with greatly increased exposure this year among the responding Human Resources Managers and Directors General. Respondents suggested some improvements, including: updating content in the newsletter and website more frequently and making them more interactive; packaging information on achievements succinctly for both informed and uninformed audiences; and seeking to reach those audiences more widely.

Directors General report being supportive of knowledge-sharing policies and initiatives and, compared with last year, and unlike the Human Resources Managers this year, cite less Program influence on their own behaviors and policies. This may imply widening ownership of these values by Directors General.

Like last year around two thirds of "Other Stakeholders" were satisfied with overall program management, program reporting and its fostering of cooperation among CG Centers. However, with regard to "opportunities to influence overall program goals and direction", a much higher proportion of responses expressed dissatisfaction this year. This may reflect a rise in expectations of involvement on the part of stakeholders after a year of increasing familiarity with, or interest in, the program.

The Program's 2005 Annual Report, in response to last year's survey, included in the 'charter of commitment' on page 25 a commitment to striking the appropriate balance

¹ In both 2005 and 2006, slightly less than half of all Human Resources Managers responded to the survey. A higher response rate is necessary to accurately profile the views of this group as a whole.

between “directive” and “supportive” approaches in managing the Program. In the survey this year, unsolicited comments on the CIO’s management style are universally complementary, mentioning her visionary, articulate and persuasive presentations and her having been effective in sensitizing and motivating Center audiences. This, along with the participatory nature of the Program’s workshops, capacity building in the weaker projects and the sense of increased ownership and responsibility on the part of project teams, all suggest that the CIO has been largely successful in finding the ‘sweet spot’ of being supportive as well as directive. It suggests that, within the office of the CIO, there is growth in the capacity to apply a broader range of tools and techniques in the ‘art’ of program management.

5. IMPROVING PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

Along with expressing satisfaction with both the management and the achievements of the Program, respondents also responded positively when asked for suggestions on how to improve the effectiveness of the Program. Several themes for improving Program management emerge. This advice is presented in summary form below, drawing on the survey results and the telephone interviews. A tabular synthesis of the interview data starts on page 10 below; and a full analysis of the 2006 survey data starts on page 14 below.

5.1. Cross-Center and Cross-Project Collaboration

On the whole, after two years, Project Coordinators, continue to be satisfied with the ways in which the Program is managed. The two areas where they reported being poorly supported by management last year continue to need attention this year: ‘linking with other projects’ and ‘cooperation within and among CG Centers’. Although survey findings point to some perceived progress in these two areas, Project Coordinators still think more collaboration may be desirable. As one survey respondent put it: *“The projects are still very much independent of each other and there is little if any cross-fertilization of ideas.”* An interviewee acknowledged some responsibility for the situation: *“My project works on common ground with others but I have not contacted them. It’s too time-intensive to do this... to complicate our already busy lives.”* A few respondents suggest that the Program could usefully do some analysis to determine where inter-project collaboration would be cost-effective and then actively create the conditions for this to develop.

5.2. Tension: System Work vs. Center Work

Data from the survey suggests that there is a widely held view that the established tendency of Centers to operate individually and independently impairs the efficiency and effectiveness of system-wide work. At least four of the 2006 project annual reports mention the difficulty of meeting the demands on staff time from system-wide initiatives while fulfilling their job responsibilities in their CGIAR Centers. At the work culture level, survey results point to importance of signals coming from the Science Council and the CG Secretariat in this regard. At the operational level, eight of the ten telephone

interviewees saw it as an ongoing management challenge. Dealing with it depends on the particular situation in each Center; and they offered the following suggestions.

- This comes from under-funding & under-staffing of projects. We need to allocate sufficient staff time and make adequate provisions for backfilling.
- Involve Center senior management in allocation of resources & project design; and increase Center responsibility for progress.
- A senior level champion alone may not be enough, one needs multiple champions at different levels in the organization.
- Change the reward systems: for example annual staff performance review should include sharing and collaboration

5.3. Senior Leadership to Influence Organizational Culture

As mentioned above, proactive, high level leadership is important to bring about the shifts in organizational culture implied by the Program's overall mandate and goals. Concerted, rather than individual efforts by Directors General are key in supporting profound change in the extent and nature of inter-Center sharing and collaboration. With their fervid support, the Program could more effectively and efficiently create the appropriate synergies among its projects and enhance the sharing of resources and competencies across Centers. According to some of the interviewees:

- The CIO needs to put more pressure at higher levels, on the DGs and Science Council. They can legitimize and build support for cross-system efforts to build system resources and help establish firmly the principle of exploiting strengths wherever they are in the CGIAR to create shared resources for all of us.
- The DGs could help bring out into open discourse some of the main contradictions between the Program's vision of a one system CGIAR and the ongoing reality of a significant number of "fiercely" independent Centers.
- Give the "executive alliance" a share in the responsibility for ICT-KM Program performance.

5.4. Transparency in Decision-Making

Transparency in making and communicating program decisions is "easy to criticize and hard to refute", according to one DG. Transparency in decision-making may mean different things to different respondents. A useful definition for the Program would be as follows. Transparency involves keeping people informed about: who makes which decisions; when are decisions made; on what criteria are they based; and when is the door open to influence decisions. Transparency can be entirely consistent with strong leadership and, ideally, it creates a harmonious balance among decisive, consultative and participatory management processes.. Some interviewees saw the transparency issue as part of the Program's "growing pains", or as related to its use of a quasi-competitive process for funding proposals. Whatever its basis, the concern is there and the Program

could usefully reexamine, clarify and communicate its decision-making criteria and processes and outcomes more widely. From the interviews come suggestions to:

- Make communications about activities brief and simple. Communicate decisions out more clearly. Let people know who is doing what and why;
- Put out a piece on options for the future and solicit feedback now regarding the formation of next phase priorities.

5.5. Rethink and Reconstitute the Advisory Body

The functions and composition of the Advisory Group are widely questioned in both the survey and the interview results. As one survey respondent said: “*Clarify the role of the Advisory Group and improve shared decision making.*” Its role and composition needs to be reassessed and brought into line with what has been learned over the past year. Its membership needs to be appropriate to that role, without conflicts of interest and able to provide strategic advice and support as needed.

6. FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The Program’s focus largely on infrastructure and knowledge sharing WITHIN the CGIAR proper in the first phase is perceived as relevant and effective. It achieved economies of scale and value for money on a number of deliverables (e.g. Virtual Library, Microsoft license). The survey findings suggest now is the time to align Program priorities more with reference to the Centers’ programs, the CGIAR research priorities and partners’ needs. Both the survey and the interviews provided suggestions for the Program concerning its future directions: on how it should find and maintain those directions through planning and consultation; and on what those programming directions should be.

6.1. Programming

There was strong support for the Program to move into direct relationships with the main science, research and outreach players in the CGIAR. This was expressed from several different perspectives.

- In the next phase the Program could move closer to the research; be more scientist oriented – raise their awareness, get their buy-in, address their needs. Involve them more directly.
- ICT-KM needs to work more with national systems, not just internally. Moving to involvement with more externally oriented outreach would be a natural evolution in the Program.
- Program needs to screen for boldly innovative technologies emerging for future application.

- Align and participate with some system-wide initiatives like the Challenge Programs.
- Focus some activities on farming community needs. Create learning systems in which different Centers collaborate to create synthesized content and deliver it to farmers.
- Link with national, regional and international external partners, using those linkages to begin serving the needs of user communities, i.e. a CG Info-Finder, a virtual library open to everyone.

6.2. Planning and Consultation

- ICT-KM Program needs a wider user support base to maintain its influence. Get away from exclusively IT-intensive approaches by using some off-the-shelf solutions which are cheap, instantly useful, build familiarity and are more appropriate for developing countries (e.g. Skype, MSN Messenger.).
- Get in touch with the Centers' research communities; seek out the knowledge-sharing demand among scientific staff. Work within the CG thematic priorities.
- The supply-driven process was good for the infrastructure phase, now Program needs to move to a process of exploration and consultation on the demand side. In other words, move from "intelligent supply" to demand-driven responsiveness;
- Systems developed with internal CGIAR needs in mind may not be appropriate for use by our national partners. We need to build our internal and external systems concurrently to ensure they work in all worlds.
- There are some subject areas particularly amenable to partnership, shared knowledge networks and collaboration. Now is the time to explore stronger integration with other international initiatives and systems.
- Sharing plans and projects when they are being formulated makes it easier to build partnerships.
- We could move from informal, interpersonal or project-oriented sharing to higher profile, formalized institutional visits and exchanges.

7. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The foregoing sections of this report have presented findings based primarily on the survey and interviews conducted for this purpose. The data support the following findings.

1. The Program is widely perceived as successful in moving the CGIAR towards an integrated knowledge management system.
2. M&E capacity in the Program and its constituent projects has been strengthened.

3. Management at the Program level is strong yet there are several areas where improvements in program management could be sought. These include: active and unanimous high level support; composition and function of the Advisory Group; transparency and communication of decision making processes; cross-system collaboration; and reconciliation of cross-system vs. Center work conflicts.
4. Stakeholders are calling for a shift in programming towards support for science, research and outreach to research users.
5. Stakeholders are calling for a shift towards more consultative and responsive program planning.

The next sections of the report present the analyzed findings of the telephone interviews and the surveys.

8. TELEPHONE INTERVIEW FINDINGS

In order to explore in more depth, some of the issues raised in the survey responses, an external evaluation consultant conducted ten telephone interviews with some of the respondents. Interviews lasted between 25 and 60 minutes and were loosely structured to a set of questions, designed specifically for each category of interviewee. Four Directors General, two Project Coordinators and four Other Stakeholders were interviewed.² These ten interviews were not intended to be in any way representative of each category of respondent. Instead, they were focused on a few knowledgeable, articulate individuals who could help give program management a better understanding of the, by necessity sometimes rather terse, survey responses. The interview findings are presented below, synthesized by idea and grouped according to seven main themes that emerged. The left column covers the seven themes and the bullets in the right column each represents an idea emerging from statements made by several interviewees, or statements made by one interviewee, which upon probing or discussion, resonated with or completed ideas partially expressed by others.

Telephone Interview Responses – all Interviewees	
Tension for staff between system-wide initiative work & job responsibilities within home Center	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definitely experienced by some, depends on the situation and the Center’s work culture. • Involve Center management in allocation of resources & project design, increase Center responsibility for progress • Senior level champion alone may not be enough, need multiple champions at different levels in the Centers.

² The interview protocols used for the interviews are attached in Annex 5.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change the reward systems: performance review should include sharing and collaboration • Comes from under-funding & under staffing of projects. Allocate sufficient staff time; provide adequate funding for backfilling staff.
<p>Transparency in planning, resource allocation and decisions in the ICT-KM Program</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ICT-KM Program has a good reputation, has done very well considering its difficult position. Transparency is easy to criticize, hard to refute. It is not a huge issue but reflects growing pains and the competitive process. • Make communications about activities brief and simple. Communicate decisions more clearly. Let people know who is doing what and why. • Put out piece on options for the future and solicit feedback, i.e. do it now with formation of next phase priorities • Rethink and reconstitute the advisory body, giving it a definite, unambiguous role and the representation appropriate to that role. • Give the “executive alliance” a share in responsibility for Program performance. • In next round of projects circulate the call for proposals widely and set out clear selection criteria • There is an inherent tension between choosing projects competitively and trying to build a coherent program. The only option is to be up front about funding the weaker proposals to fill gaps.
<p>Linking and collaboration between ICT-KM projects, and among Centers</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It’s a significant concern. We tend not to contact each other voluntarily and informally as it is too time-intensive, we already have heavy workloads. • The Program should do a comprehensive analysis on where collaboration should happen and bring the people together (i.e. like the meeting on data standards) • The Program needs a scientific person on board person to help keep the bigger CG picture in view. • CIO needs to put more pressure at higher levels – DGs, SC to

	<p>legitimize and build support for cross-system efforts to build system resources and to firmly establish the principle of exploiting strengths wherever they are in the CGIAR to create shared resources for all of us.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of ILAC / ICT-KM synergy was a big disappointment
<p>Future directions and priorities for the ICT-KM Program</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next phase needs to sustain the investment and momentum established in first phase. • The supply-driven process was good for the infrastructure phase, now the Program needs to move to a process of exploration and consultation on the demand side. Move from “intelligent supply” to demand driven responsiveness • In next phase the Program could move closer to the research; be more scientist oriented – raise their awareness, get their buy-in, address their needs. Involve them more directly in proposals? decisions? • Support a knowledge sharing networking of professionals in some CGIAR priority areas; facilitate formation of a Community of Practice to demonstrate value. • ICT-KM needs to work more with national systems, not just internally. Moving to involvement with more externally oriented outreach would be a natural evolution in the Program • ICT-KM needs to align itself, participate with some system-wide initiatives like the Challenge Programs. • Focus some activities on farming community needs. Create learning systems in which different Centers collaborate to create synthesized content and deliver it to farmers. • Program needs to screen for boldly innovative technologies emerging for future application.
<p>Balancing individual interests of Centers with the move towards an integrated knowledge-sharing system</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program is on the right track offering a platform for Centers to share in high profile projects like CGX • Need to make results achieved, benefits, products and efficiencies more evident to broaden Centers’ support for the next phase • Need to help Centers to accept KM & KS as central to their core work • CIO office is very small compared to its task. There needs to be a task force that can play a central role and provide system-

	wide leadership
Increasing and maintaining relevance to needs and interests across the CGIAR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Program’s strategic approach is relevant and working: achieving economies of scale, getting value for money on some deliverables (e.g. Virtual Library, Microsoft license) • ICT-KM Program needs a wider user support base to maintain its influence. Get away from exclusively IT-intensive approaches, use some off the shelf solutions which are more appropriate for developing countries (e.g. Skype, MSN Messenger.) • Need to get in touch with the Centers’ research communities, seek out the knowledge sharing demands among scientific staff. Work within the CG thematic priorities, communicate with leaders on the demand side (Center directors and lead researchers). • Systems developed with internal CGIAR needs in mind will not be appropriate for use by our national partners – we need to build our systems internally and externally simultaneously to ensure they work for both worlds • Some CG Centers are working heavily in national capacity building and are more interested in systems and tools useable in their national constituencies, (i.e. open source rather than commercial tools and systems)
Expanding and improving partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ICT-KM needs to link to national, regional and international external partners, using those linkages to begin serving needs of farming communities. Something like a CG Info-finder, a virtual library open to everyone. • Support some partnership-specific activities i.e. a user network. • Early sharing of plans and projects makes it easier to build partnerships. • Move from informal, interpersonal or project-oriented sharing to higher profile, formalized institutional visits and exchanges. • There are some subject areas that are particularly amenable to partnership, shared knowledge networks and collaboration. Now is the time to be proactive and explore stronger integration with other international initiatives and systems.

9. ANALYSIS OF 2006 SURVEY RESULTS

The survey this year invited 155 people in four categories to participate by going to the SurveyMonkey website and completing a questionnaire. One email plus a reminder were sent to each potential respondent. Forty-six percent responded, a fairly good response rate for surveys of this kind. To raise the percentage significantly would require considerable more effort. Here is the breakdown of the targeted respondents³:

	Invited	Responded	
Other Stakeholders	113	46	41% (19% in 2005)
Human Resources Managers	15	7	47% (40% in 2005)
Directors General	15	10	67% (80% in 2005)
Project Coordinators	12	9	75% (83% in 2005)
Total	155	72	46% (37% in 2005)

9.1. Other Stakeholders⁴

1. Sixty percent of responding ‘Other Stakeholders’ noticed significant changes related to knowledge sharing in the CGIAR over the past 12 months, slightly down from 71% last year. And, like last year, over two thirds thought that the ICT-KM Program had contributed to the changes to a limited or significant extent. Twenty-four stakeholders gave examples of positive changes. These fell mainly into three types:
 - Greater knowledge and tool sharing among Centers and with external partners;
 - Greater cross-Center collaborations; and
 - Emergence of informal ‘communities of practice’.
2. Although no questions in the survey specifically asked for it, a few respondents spontaneously mentioned constraints to sharing and collaboration inherent in CGIAR culture and prevailing incentives. For example, one respondent who cited positive changes also cautioned that:

“...many ‘signals’ in the CGIAR, particularly from the Science Council and the CG Secretariat, encourage centers and individuals within them to work more for themselves and NOT to share information or resources.”
3. Twenty-four respondents cited ways in which they perceived the Program contributing to these changes. These could be grouped into the following categories.

³ To define each category of respondent: ‘Other Stakeholders’ includes people inside and outside the CGIAR touched by the project but not directly involved in implementing it ; Human Resources Managers in CGIAR Centers; Directors General of CGIAR Centers; and Project Coordinators in the ICT-KM Program.

⁴ For aggregated answers to Other Stakeholders survey, see ANNEX 1

- By initiating projects or other direct interventions to demonstrate or create specific KS mechanisms or capabilities;
 - By increasing the knowledge and awareness of staff and senior managers;
 - By providing resources for the creation and adoption of tools, platforms or other infrastructure;
 - By disseminating information about its activities and about useful knowledge management and sharing resources available;
 - By funding and facilitating interactions among Centers through direct personal contact, convening interest groups and the building of relationships;
 - Demonstrating efficiencies of scale and cost savings through collaborative development and use of tools and systems.
4. This year 50% of responding stakeholders replied that they had not noticed any “undesirable outcomes from the Program’s work”, slightly down from 64% last year. The sixteen respondents who identified “the most significant undesirable outcomes”, commented mainly on problems with program implementation or management. The comments follow 5 basic themes, the first two of which were mentioned most frequently:
- The basis for and process of decision-making needs to be clearer to foster broad-based ownership (transparency);
 - Lack of follow-up in some initiatives;
 - Constraints stemming from inadequate human and financial resources for program management and in projects;
 - Inadequate communication of achievements;
 - Mismatch between Program and some CGIAR policies and other initiatives.
5. Like last year around two thirds were satisfied with overall program management, program reporting and its fostering of cooperation among CG Centers. However, with regard to “opportunities to influence overall program goals and direction”, a much higher proportion of responses expressed dissatisfaction this year. This may reflect a rise in expectations of involvement on the part of stakeholders after a year of increasing familiarity with the program.
6. Stakeholders suggested ways to improve various aspects of the Program. These are summarized below.

Program Management:

- More open, consultative and inclusive management
- Greater transparency, trust and shared decision-making
- Seek feedback from, and provide feedback to, Centers on progress, outcomes, needs and priorities
- Clarify the role of the Advisory Group

Program Reporting:

- More user-oriented content in reports

- More cross project fertilization
- More regular feedback on project and program activities utilizing CGXchange, E-Newsletter, presentations, etc.;
- Request feedback on progress & achievements

Fostering Collaboration (within or among Centers):

- Focus more resources on fostering inter-Center cooperation and communities of practice
- Increase high profile leadership in Centers and the Science Council towards cooperation & collaboration
- Conscious efforts to counteract countervailing CGIAR traditions of independence and autonomy

Opportunities to influence overall program goals and direction:

- Broaden leadership, ownership and participation
- Transparent decision-making
- Greater collaboration, consultation with partners.

7. This year a new question asked how to improve the Program with regard to the involvement with partners outside of the 15 CGIAR research centers. Judging by the number of suggestions, this question struck a very receptive chord. While some questioned the timing of when to orient the Program towards more external partners and when to develop proposals with partners and local institutions, all were supportive of the idea. For example:

“My sense is that the emphasis has been on in-house activities in this phase which was necessary. More needs to be done to open up to partners now.”

8. With regard to communication instruments, most responding stakeholders found the e-newsletter, website, and presentations by program participants useful.
9. The improvements suggested for the e-newsletter and the website emphasized three main themes:
- Make them less public relations oriented and more inclined towards learning and knowledge sharing;
 - Find ways to make them interactive for two-way communication;
 - Keep the content current by updating more frequently.

10. The number and content of comments on the annual report suggest that respondents were largely not familiar with it.

“I am afraid this is not widely distributed. I have never seen a copy of the annual report. Copies of the annual reports should be sent to each center library and information centers.”

11. Comments on how to improve the presentations by program participants suggest that they are well liked and could be made more widely available, to wider audiences and through the other communication instruments.

12. Suggested improvements to the way the Program communicates were few enough to present in their entirety below. Greater transparency, diversity in channels used and frank, learning-oriented content are the main themes. The comments were:

- *Regular status reports*
- *To use more KS techniques rather than the technologies*
- *More transparency - especially regarding controversial issues*
- *Improvement in all areas*
- *I believe we don't use enough and effectively current IT - e.g. conference calls/chats through SKYPE or MSN etc.*
- *More communication with staff at Centers, both by the CIO and the Project participants.*
- *More transparency, less diplomacy*
- *Need to be more popularized and more responsive to stakeholders beyond the centers*

9.1.1. Implications of the Other Stakeholders' Responses

The survey results suggest that the ICT-KM Program has a high and positive profile among people outside of it. In these responses there are some recurring concerns, including:

- High level leadership is necessary to bring about the shifts in organizational culture implied by the Program's overall mandate and goals
- Need for increased transparency in making and communicating Program decisions
- Now time for uptake of partnering opportunities within and beyond the CGIAR
- Need to improve reach and clarity in communicating Program achievements

9.2. Human Resources Managers⁵

13. Fifteen Human Resources Managers were invited to go to a URL on the internet and complete the survey. Seven completed all or some of the questions: a response rate of 47%.

14. As they did last year, all the responding Human Resources Managers report that their hiring policies and criteria include 'knowledge management and sharing behaviours'.

15. Regarding how their performance appraisal systems recognize '*knowledge management and sharing*', respondents this year present a mixed picture. Most **do not** recognize '*participation in communities of practice*'; most **do** recognize

⁵ For aggregated answers to Human Resources Managers Survey, see ANNEX 2

'participation in multi-Center initiatives'; and all (100%) recognize *'mentoring or coaching'*. The latter represents a big jump from the 30% reported last year. This suggests that, for the centers replying, mentoring became a widely acknowledged area of employee performance during 2005.

16. Like last year, close to three quarters of respondents report that it is their *'official policy to provide training or encourage procurement of such training in areas related to group process, teamwork and communication such as: facilitation techniques, virtual work practices and management, team-building, etc.'* and the same proportion report providing such training in these areas over the past twelve months⁶.
17. Like last year, over half of this year's respondents report that their Centers do not include any knowledge management and sharing statements in their official employment philosophies.
18. Respondents were asked for examples of promoting good knowledge management and sharing behaviors. Of the five who cited examples, only one included relevant knowledge sharing innovations, the rest cited long established CGIAR practices such as seminars and meetings. The single relevant, response was :

[We are] "building a group of facilitators within the center and encouraging major meetings to be facilitated. We are setting up an e-group as well as trying to establish additional training. We are recruiting based on competencies which look for evidence of capacity building and partnership. These are interview questions and form the basis for evaluation. HR is part of the group looking at internal communications processes."

19. More than the Human Resources Managers surveyed last year, this group of respondents was willing to give credit to the ICT-KM Program for influencing their human resources policies and practices. In all categories (*hiring practices, performance recognition, training and employment philosophy*) close to two thirds of respondents acknowledge Program influence.
20. Also, more respondents this year report that the Program's communication media are useful. The proportion of "Don't Know" responses was very high last year and low this year, suggesting increased exposure of Human Resources Managers to ICT-KM communication media over the past twelve months. Respondents suggested a few improvements focused mainly on including more HR content in the website, e-newsletter, annual report and program presentations.

9.2.1. Implications of the Human Resources Managers' Responses

Keeping in mind that slightly less than half of the Human Resources Managers responded to the survey and that these findings may not represent the whole group, these responses

⁶ A new question this year asked whether training had actually been provided in areas related to group process, teamwork and communication.

are still encouraging. Up to now the ICT-KM program has not engaged programmatically with Human Resources Managers. The CIO has been making presentations to them in groups and individually; but the Program has not taken on Centers as its units of focus. Rather, the focus has been on cross-center activities. To engage directly with Human Resources Units the Program could concentrate directly on policies affecting staff recruitment across all Centers or it might decide to work on a Center-specific initiative of some kind. If either of these options is explored, an important prerequisite for success will be support and ownership, far beyond the current level, by all DGs,

9.3 Directors General⁷

21. Overall, the views expressed by of the CGIAR Directors General this year differ little from their responses in the 2005 survey. The perceptions expressed by the DGs largely reflect the emphasis in the Program on investing in tools, infrastructure and sharing mechanisms rather than on directly influencing human resources policies and practices
22. Ten out of 15 DGs responded to the 2006 survey – a 67% response rate, slightly down from the 80% return rate of 2005.
23. Over three quarters of the responding DGs reported that they proactively encourage HR policies that reward KS behavior. Five of the seven examples given involved staff performance assessment criteria. This is the same result as in the 2005 survey.
24. Like last year, over three quarters of the responding DGs reported that they proactively allocated resources to tool development and use. The examples given include: support for knowledge sharing and management; use of Sharepoint sites; and involvement in several of the ICT-KM initiatives.
25. On the above two topics, HR policies and allocation of resources, about the same proportion (over three quarters) of respondents, both years, reported that the ICT-KM Program had little or no influence on their Centers' HR policies.
26. There is a drop in 2006 in the perceived influence of the program on HR policies. In 2006, 78% of DGs indicate no influence at all, whereas in 2005, 41% indicated the Program had at least some influence. (While to the contrary, Human Resources Managers report significant influence by the Program.)
27. In both years, the only place where a notable number (about a third) of responding DGs saw the Program having a “significant” influence was in relation to the “allocation of resources for tool development and use”.
28. Like last year (but in slightly lowers numbers) almost all DGs report that they promote and champion knowledge sharing and the use of tools and strategies in their

⁷ For aggregated answers to Director General Survey, see ANNEX 3

Centers and beyond. They reported recognizing individual and group knowledge sharing behaviors mainly in their public speaking and through group performance awards. Like last year, responding DGs listed a wide range of other examples of doing this. Almost all of which are linked to initiatives of the ICT-KM Program.

29. This year, DGs are much less willing to acknowledge Program influence on their recognition of KS behaviors, and more open than last year to acknowledge Program influence on their promoting the use of tools and strategies.
30. In commenting on the usefulness of Program communication instruments, all responding DGs found the ICT-KM Website to be useful – a big improvement over last year when 50% responded that they did not know. The data also suggest that most DGs are not familiar with or do not find useful, the Program’s annual report. When asked to suggest improvements, DGs were not forthcoming with helpful suggestions. “Relevance” was the (somewhat terse) suggestion repeated for all four communication instruments. What the DGs mean by this and how to respond to it is a question the CIO could pose to them.
31. When asked for suggestions on how to “maximize the overall effectiveness of the ICT-KM Program”, the responding DGs were much more forthcoming. Their comments, worth reading as made (see attached annex), cover four main themes:
 - The need for transparency in making decisions and allocating resources;
 - The need to assess and respond to the core needs and circumstances of Centers, user groups, and partners;
 - The need to counteract the established tendency of Centers to operate individually and independently; and
 - The need to clarify and rationalize the role of the “so-called” advisory group.
32. A new question added this year asked respondents to identify the most valuable contributions made by the ICT-KM Program to the CGIAR so far. The 6 DGs who answered this question identified the following:
 - Elevated the agenda on the issue
 - Started to provide the tools and advice needed
 - Raising awareness in the centers
 - Piloting "technology choices"
 - Bringing the IT and IM Communities of Practice together
 - Vibrant communities of practice have emerged among IT managers and librarians, and GIS experts

9.3.1. Implications of the DG’s responses:

The DGs have a leadership role in bringing about what is widely held to be a profound change in the extent and nature of inter Center sharing and collaboration. It might be

useful for them as a group, along with the CIO, to discuss and seek answers to several questions.

- Why was the DG response rate for this survey not 100%? What could the program do differently to get full support and cooperation from all DGs – individually and as a group?
- How could the Program better assess and respond to the Centers’ needs within the Program’s mandate?
- How could the Program make its communications relevant to DGs knowledge needs and interests and more useful to them in their work?

The responses of the DGs also imply actions in several other areas:

- Reassess and redefine the functions and composition of the Advisory Group.
- Reexamine and perhaps modify the Program’s decision-making processes.
- Bring out into open discourse some of the main contradictions between the Program’s vision of a one system CGIAR and the ongoing reality of a significant number of “fiercely” independent Centers.

9.4. Project Coordinators⁸

33. In commenting on how well have the CIO Office, staff and consultants supported their projects, Project Coordinators (PCs) this year differed little from their 2005 responses.

- Two thirds reported that relative to “timely decision-making and provision of resources”, “advice & technical support for M&E” and “obtaining senior and organizational support”, they were supported “very” or “somewhat” well.
- With regard to “linking with other projects”, over half of respondents report being supported “somewhat poorly” – a fairly strong negative response and similar to last year.
- Over two thirds of PCs were satisfied with overall program management and the program’s acknowledgement of their contributions.

34. PC level of satisfaction with the “program’s reporting requirements” is spread over the whole spectrum, from extremely satisfied to somewhat dissatisfied with a third of responses undecided or ‘neutral’.

35. The strongest level of dissatisfaction was registered in relation to “cooperation within and among CG Centers: 56% were “somewhat dissatisfied”.

36. PCs made 12 suggestions on how to maximize the overall effectiveness of the ICT-KM Program. These covered the following 5 themes, in order of decreasing frequency of mention:

- Increase inter-project synergies and collaboration
- Fix the ICT-KM Advisory Group
- Improve the sharing of resources and competencies across Centers

⁸ For aggregated answers to Project Coordinator Survey, see ANNEX 4

- Base Program priorities on assessment of ICT-KM needs of Centers and CG system priorities
 - Clarify how agreements on Program priorities and activities are arrived at
37. PCs identified what they thought were the most valuable contributions of the Program to the CGIAR. These could be grouped, in order of decreasing frequency of mention, under the following five headings.
- Initiating and facilitating shared activities with Centers working together
 - Fostering the creation of IT and IM ‘communities of practice’
 - Developing and disseminating tools & resources
 - Instilling awareness, exposure, ownership of ICT-KM in senior management
 - Introducing economies and efficiencies in ICT-KM investments

38. The Program’s positive role in sharing knowledge and resources is an underlying theme in the survey responses. The following quote illustrates some of what was mentioned:

“It has contributed to a greater awareness, within peer groups, of shared problems, often common approaches to overcoming these and the possible benefits of working together to solve them. It has also provided a platform for investment in activities and infrastructure that would be beyond the reach of individual centers but from which individual centers can gain benefits.”

9.4.1. Implications of Project Coordinators’ Responses:

This year the proportion of PCs reporting being satisfied with overall program management rose to 77% from 50% last year. However, two areas identified as requiring attention last year are still of concern. These are: linkages and exchanges among different projects/activities; and cooperation & collaboration with or among CG Centers. Overall, nothing has changed since last year in the perceptions of PCs regarding these two areas. If Program management considers these perceptions to be reliable reflections on conditions affecting program performance, strategies need to be developed and implemented. In summary, based on this year’s feedback from PCs, Program management needs to:

- Investigate how it can more appropriately create synergies among the activities of its various projects;
- Refine reporting requirements and build additional capacity so they are fully understood and embraced by Project Coordinators and their teams;
- Reconstitute and redefine the functions of the ICT-KM Advisory Group
- Improve the sharing of resources and competencies across Centers

- Find ways to define Program priorities with reference to the ICT-KM needs of Centers and CGIAR system priorities
- Clarify and communicate the participatory decision making processes whereby Program priorities and activities are arrived at.

ANNEX 1

SURVEY RESULTS: OTHER STAKEHOLDERS

1. Have you noticed any changes along these lines, over the past twelve months?		
Response	Percent	Total Responses
Yes	60.9%	28
No	17.4%	8
Don't Know	21.7%	10
Total Respondents		46

2. If yes, what is the most significant change you have noticed?	
Total Respondents	24
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. From my limited experience with the KS project, I have seen that the people who were somehow involved in the first part of the project (the four pilots, the facilitation workshops and the AGM chat show) have all been enthusiastic and have wanted to continue using the different techniques applied, or to know more about them. 2. It's a very "mixed bag." Things have gotten better in some places and worse in others. There's a general shift for people to work more with informal "communities," but many "signals" in the CGIAR, particularly from the Science Council and the CG Secretariat, encourage centers and individuals within them to work more for themselves and NOT to share information or resources. This way, they get higher marks in "performance measurement" exercises and often monetary rewards. If they're too open, they may lose out. 3. CG community very well organized, participating in several CG initiatives and Knowledge sharing. 4. Sharing information and knowledge across Centers' Training Units 5. I'm most impressed with the decentralized project leadership, requiring Center ownership as well as system ownership. 6. More data/information sharing across centers; putting things on various websites 7. More interaction between centers. 8. The changes are still somewhat limited and to my knowledge more internal than external (although this may be my perception). I believe what has been most significant is the awareness of KS within the Center with more specific actions taken to make this visible (and valued). 9. Knowledge sharing across centers where staff from one center assist other centers in implementing specific projects or share experiences 10. Collaboration (especially between IFPRI and ILRI staff) on the development of SAKSS, and software to automate analyses via development domains. 11. The establishment of the VRC 12. Sharing of more in-depth information 13. I am working in CG center only for 15 months so I can't compare the current situation with the past. However I see improving communication eg. among the training coordinators of CG centers. 14. Better information sharing and planning via D-Groups Sharing within the Center improved - little change across centers Better contact/involvement of external partners (non-CG) 15. At the workshop meeting in Leuven, members of the training community volunteered to contribute their materials to the CGLearning Resources site. 16. Sharing information and knowledge across centers and with external partners. As well as seeking 	

- knowledge from sources locally and globally. And participating in relevant communities of practice with CG staff and with external partners.
17. The recent launching of CgXchange which impressed me most
 18. Product building through knowledge sharing efforts
 19. Staff are encouraged by management to work with more partners, and the ICT KM supports this --- as yet modestly --- by offering ways to enhance such collaborations.
 20. Sharing information, expertise and knowledge across Centers. Increased concentration on documenting best practices and learning in order to create more effective institutions and institutional practices and processes. Increased participation in communities of practice. Opportunity for Centers to take leadership or coordination in specific projects; sharing of responsibilities.
 21. Center colleagues' greater awareness of the added value of having shared knowledge systems in place to better accomplish their missions.
 22. Yes, but not much. This has mostly been because ICT-KM is supporting the CSI. So this GIS/remote sensing community of practice has had very good exchange of information lately. But it could be much better, especially if ICT-KM makes sure that the centers execute what they are contracted for.
 23. Participation in relevant COPs and external partners
 24. More cross-center collaborations involving both experimentation with KM/KS approaches as well as better sharing and making visible what the CG is doing in these areas

3. To what extent do you think the ICT-KM Program has contributed to this change?		
Response	Percent	Total Responses
Not at All	12.2%	5
To a limited extent	34.1%	14
To a Significant Extent	31.7%	13
Don't Know	14.6%	6
Did Not Notice Any Change	7.3%	3
Total Respondents		41

4. Please state how the Program contributed to the change you noticed.
- Total Respondents 24
1. The Program was responsible for bringing in the different KS approaches or techniques and training (or exposing) people to them.
 2. I believe it has "raised the flag" for ICT and KM at the senior level of DG's & CG system-level decision makers. There have also been some useful interventions in specific centers. But the Program is a very small fish in a rather murky and turbulent pond (with many hungry carnivores) to have much of an impact on the organizational culture and behaviors.
 3. CGXchange initiative lets to the community share and participate.
 4. OLR ICT-KM organized two workshops, some on-line collaboration
 5. Delegation combined with funding support, followed by plentiful communications keeping everybody aware of where things stand.

6. exchange 2003 CGNET managed services IT managers conference ESBC
7. Raising awareness
8. Without the KS techniques and advocacy of the KM program (Simone, Nathan and Alison) in the planning and implementation of the CIFOR Annual Meeting, I don't believe the center would have had quite the impetus it has had in KS.
9. By facilitating interaction among centers and helping center staff to provide resource persons (as opposed to using external consultants)
10. As interim coordinator of SAKSS, my interactions with [the CIO], and appreciation of the ICT-KM vision (which closely matches my vision of SAKSS) were very helpful. In addition, two of the ICT-KM programmes match longer term SAKSS requirements
11. Increased feedback from partners and a sharing of knowledge.
12. Among some CG Centers staff an attitudinal change
13. behind these changes are enthusiastic people. If these people have resources than they can stimulate changes. And ICT-KM provided financial resources for this type of activities and networking.
14. D-Groups Improved face-to-face meetings
15. providing the funding required to gather the community members
16. By providing a common gateway to information and knowledge. e.g the CGXchange and the CGVlibrary and others.
17. Program contributed a lot to the change
18. Bringing together the right people
19. Offering infrastructure (second-level connectivity) and platforms (X-change)
20. Through the strategy and work plan of projects with specific and tangible outputs and targets and pilot initiatives to demonstrate the concepts. Dissemination of good practices, e.g., the knowledge management and sharing project.
21. By demonstrating to the whole CGIAR consortium that efficiencies of scale (including financial) were feasible and that specific knowledge tools could be developed to serve that mission.
22. ICT-KM funded the CSI group. ICT-KM also provided me with video camera for video-conferencing, although I have not used it yet.
23. Several activities required the participation from different COP (areas of expertise) and with support of the ICT-KM they were able to meet and start working together.
24. I think it is/was the primary catalyst

5. Have you noticed any undesirable outcomes from the Program's work over the last 12 months?		
Response	Percent	Total Responses
Yes	29.5%	13
No	50%	22
Don't Know	20.5%	9
Total Respondents		44

6. If yes, please identify the most significant undesirable outcomes.	
Total Respondents	16
1.	Some decision-making processes have continued to be "shadowy," reducing the credibility of the message that we should all collaborate. This has deepened cynicism in some quarters.
2.	ICT-KM generated a lot of additional work with an insufficient budget
3.	Program management and coordination can be better informed. it more or less is [the CIO] who does it all vs. a program as she does not have much staff. it good to have a technical advisor for the cg centers
4.	Perhaps the perception that the opportunities for leading ICT-KM projects were not fairly distributed across centers.
5.	Staff in some CG centers have taken up polarized (negative) positions on the ICT-KM strategy. Not because of knowledgeable insights regarding ICTs or KM, but because they are feeling threatened by other strategic activities being undertaken by the CG.
6.	More follow-through is needed on projects involving multiple partners. There is a tendency to start a big project, but the follow-up with partners has been a weakness.
7.	Lack of follow up on some initiatives
8.	I am uncertain as to whether all of the projects provided the expected outcomes
9.	Center staff put off because they do not feel ownership of the ICT-KM projects, feel left out of them, feel like they are requiring too many resources (e.g., X-change).
10.	Each Center is independent own and even though there are CG conventions (i.e. CGIAR Naming Convention) the Centers do not adhere fully
11.	delays in providing payments for services
12.	As ICT-KM has underachieved on a number of it's projects, it's not yet unequivocally identified with positive achievement. Slow rollout effectively translates to loss of credibility.
13.	I am worried that ICT-KM management is not following the CSI project with sufficient attention. If the contract/proposal is not executed, the money will be wasted.
14.	The longest existing and very well functioning Information Manager COP was weakened by an inappropriate decision to reject the Virtual Library project in the first place.
15.	I am concerned with how CGXchange is developing. Though this project has consumed the time of many dedicated and hard working people, the design is not user friendly and the content so far is of marginal use.
16.	but perhaps, is it undesirable? , a greater concentration of influence/power and greater marginalization of some groups perceived to be slow adopters...

7. How satisfied are you with the ICT-KM Program to date with regard to:						
	Extremely Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Extremely Satisfied	Don't Know/Not Applicable
Overall program management?	2% (1)	14% (6)	19% (8)	33% (14)	23% (10)	12% (5)
Program reporting?	2% (1)	14% (6)	16% (7)	28% (12)	28% (12)	12% (5)

Its fostering of cooperation & collaboration within or among CG Centers?	2% (1)	7% (3)	19% (8)	35% (15)	35% (15)	2% (1)
Your opportunities to influence overall program goals and direction?	2% (1)	21% (9)	19% (8)	19% (8)	19% (8)	21% (9)
Involvement with partners outside of the 15 CGIAR research centers?	9% (4)	19% (8)	16% (7)	19% (8)	7% (3)	30% (13)
Total Respondents						43

8. Please suggest improvements that you think should be made to the Program with regard to:

Overall program management: 63% (17)

1. More openness.
2. Limit scope of work / number of projects
3. have a good coordinator
4. more inclusive
5. Clarify the role of the Advisory Group and improve shared decision making
6. The CIO needs more authority over individual CG ICT activities.
7. Creating Greater Awareness
8. also it can be boring for the manager he/she should visit every center that is involved in some project at least once a year and present a seminar to all staff.
9. more transparency, more trust, less manipulations
10. Program management activities should be made available on CGXchange and on ICT-KM monthly newsletters.
11. Get more value for money for your products
12. Suggest the CIO seek more feedback from and provide more feedback to Centers on progress, needs and directions.
13. More transparency
14. Clearer priorities
15. The leader should have been more interested in rational and good outcomes, rather than in her own reputation and sticking to deadlines.
16. Need to be representative and interactive
17. Keep all the elements involved; multi-speed if need be

Program reporting: 59.3% (16)

1. Clarify requirements.
2. Establish proper reporting mechanism beyond sharing newsletter
3. more pro-active

4. It's fine
5. More detailed information
6. Not many people read written reports, presentations and meetings are important!
7. more cross project fertilization
8. Program reporting should equally be done on the CGXchange and in the monthly ICT-KM newsletter.
9. We do get information on what is happening but not regularly. I have no idea about the status of ICT_KM projects
10. Superb PR: could do less PR and more reality-check reporting; ground-truthing
11. Could use more public awareness and feedback to the Centers on progress and achievement--not just to the DGs but to the staff. Suggest seminars whenever possible by the CIO or by Project Coordinators.
12. More details and prototypes.
13. Need to respond to needs and for that a survey should be carried out
14. The newsletter is ill-written -- too much fluff, too little information.

Its fostering of cooperation & collaboration within or among CG Centers: 70.4% (19)

1. More resources.
2. Develop a Program-wide strategy for this.
3. Improve center Directors participation.
4. Clearer strategy & secured funding to sustain a community of practice
5. show examples
6. share good examples
7. Need to encourage inactive centers to participate more
8. Rewarding those who share
9. There always be 'leaders' and 'followers' but I think more attention shall be given to selection of right people from each and every center ...
10. The weakness is among centers - little cross linking occurring among scientists/managers. Overcoming the competitive nature of these associations (eg becoming less competitive) is key
11. more investment in this area
12. CG wide programs such as attending meetings of communities of practices should be fund centrally. This way participants from smaller CG centers will be able to participate and foster cooperation.
13. Building more on existing systems in the cg center
14. Get our feedback;
15. There are been a definite improvement within the specific areas of ICT-KM projects.
16. Focus on common needs
17. Very difficult, given CGIAR traditions for independence and autonomy bordering on anarchy
18. Information managers (librarians) are natural collaborators. They should be better supported to play their roles in fostering much needed cooperation and collaboration.
19. Not really. The whole process driving the CG centers is the SC, MTP and it seems SC is not among the bodies which consider ICT-KM processes leading to IPGs, a pity

Your opportunities to influence overall program goals and direction: 48.1% (13)

1. Transparent mechanism on decision making
2. What is my role?
3. The KM/KS 'focal point' at the center should not be limited to one person but take into account those that are interested and willing to advance the KS/KM techniques and program
4. Clarify role of AG
5. Greater collaboration with partners
6. Especially in case of KM/KS project I felt I had a chance to influence the future direction of the project. In ORL little bit less, its also due to the character of the project.
7. The system was developed by a few people in the CG and the rest was asked to join and go along
8. Minimal at the moment; IT staff are not consulting with other info providers in some centers to ensure the quality of the info they are providing to X-change, for example
9. Indirectly. This is done through participation of staff on different project teams.
10. More transparency
11. OK
12. If deadlines are more important than rational decisions,
13. I am developing a pragmatic KMD program that mixes supply & demand approaches, leads to behavioral-cultural changes, demonstrative, popularized, must produce IPGs for equitable & immediate use

Involvement with partners outside of the 15 CGIAR research centers: 74.1% (20)

1. The first phase was more internal to CGIAR but perhaps the second phase could have more opportunities for an external reach
2. State as a priority & strategy, which was not the case in Phase 1.
3. Develop additional proposals with partners and local institutions.
4. show examples
5. I think this is a good longer-term goal and am not sure that we shouldn't work on putting our own CG house in order before involving too many partners from the outside
6. Activities that involve NARS
7. What are the circumstances of the relationships with certain proprietary ICT Multinationals? Could these activities not be more transparent?
8. More open and transparent communication
9. I believe that first we need to 'clean' and 'put in order' our own houses before we involve outside partners. But again it depends on the character of the project.
10. Would have expected more cooperation from different partners
11. Apart from the NARS one is much involved with external partners
12. It is worthwhile moving away from traditional partners like FAO, and fostering new collaborations with other like-minded organizations like CTA, CBD etc.
13. don't know; I don't think I've used ICT-KM stuff to interact with partners outside CG
14. My sense is that the emphasis has been on in-house activities in this phase which was necessary. More needs to be done to open up to partners now.
15. Introduce them
16. Identify for focus a short list of strategic partners
17. fund programs that link the CGs to the NARS
18. External partners' advice can be useful but not at the expense of more knowledgeable and experienced internal specialists.
19. This is important . ICT-KM must be mentored by Internal and External CoPs

20. Keep on making visible (and sharing) what is being done.

- Other improvements: 25.9% (7)
1. Where did Tech go and why?
 2. There is not enough clarity on the CG's position now and in the longer term on Free and Open Source software, as well as the related open standards development processes.
 3. More publicity among NARS
 4. Make X-change MUCH faster because it is too slow to be useful to many people, even with good bandwidth
 5. The strategy is fine....pay more attention to execution and implementation
 6. Less self-centeredness of the leader.
 7. Carrying out convincing dialogue with SC, Donors and all those influence CG programs

9. How useful do you find the:

	Not At All Useful	Useful To A Limited Extent	Useful To a Significant Extent	Don't Know
ICT-KM Program E-Newsletter	2% (1)	37% (15)	39% (16)	22% (9)
ICT-KM Website	2% (1)	55% (23)	29% (12)	14% (6)
ICT-KM Annual Reports	10% (4)	29% (12)	22% (9)	39% (16)
Presentations by Program participants	5% (2)	13% (5)	54% (21)	28% (11)

10. What improvements would you like to see made:

- To the ICT-KM E-Newsletter: 73.7% (14)
1. More analytical reports
 2. I don't remember to get any
 3. I'd like to see it less "positive", more orientated towards exchange and ks among members.
 4. I have never received the ICT KM newsletter
 5. Less PR, more feedback from the 'field'
 6. keep up-to-date
 7. should be kept more up to date
 8. More frequent updates.
 9. More details of progress on all projects
 10. OK
 11. Provide a "print version"
 12. Be interactive and let each involved center prepare an issue that reflect its needs and worries etc
 13. Less "cute" and more information

- To the ICT-KM Website: 68.4% (13)
1. Regular updates, better accessibility
 2. More knowledge sharing environments - more transparency

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. An open space for partners to interact 4. The information often wasn't up to date 5. Making projects more visible right from the homepage. 6. Centers should be asked to provide links to ICT-KM website from their center sites. 7. It feels very far away from things that you can actually use 8. Provide an RSS feed 9. same as the E-Newsletter 10. see E-Newsletter 11. OK 12. Acceptable 13. A Portal interactive approach
<p>To the ICT-KM Annual Reports: 47.4% (9)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Better Distribution 2. As a summary of achievements it is important and useful 3. I am afraid this is not widely distributed. I have never seen a copy of the annual report. Copies of the annual reports should be sent to each center library and information centers. 4. have not received any 5. Broader distribution to Centers 6. More details and analysis 7. Does anyone have time to read them ? 8. Acceptable 9. Same as the news letter with sections responsive to each center. Integration does not come along overnight.
<p>To presentations by Program participants: 68.4% (13)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Share presentations on-line 2. More detail 3. these are needed more ! 4. Best way to get the message across 5. which presentations? 6. Presentation by program participants should be made widely available - on CGXchange, E-Newsletter, etc. 7. have not received any 8. Haven't seen any. Not everyone goes to AGM. Need to do more publicity at the Center level. Champions, etc. 9. Have some 10. Need outreach to most staff in all centers 11. Relatively few participants were presented 12. must be popularized in the centers 13. Passion outperforms gimmicks all the time. Try serious information offered with passionate commitment.
<p>To the way it communicates: 47.4% (9)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Regular status reports 2. To use more KS techniques than the ICT 3. More transparency - especially regarding controversial issues 4. Improvement in all areas

5. I believe we don't use enough and effectively current IT - e.g. conference calls/chats through SKYPE or MSN etc.
6. more transparency
7. More communication with staff at Centers, both by the CIO and the Project participants.
8. More transparency, less diplomacy
9. Need to be more popularized and more responsive to stakeholders beyond the centers

ANNEX 2

SURVEY RESULTS: HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGERS

(Number of Respondents = 7)

1. Whether hiring from within or outside of the CGIAR, to what extent do your hiring policies and criteria overtly look for strong evidence of good KM/S behaviours?		
	Response Percent	Response Total
Not At All	0%	0
To A Limited Extent	42.9%	3
To A Significant Extent	57.1%	4
Don't Know	0%	0
Total Respondents		7

2. Does your performance appraisal system overtly recognize the following good KM/S behaviours?				
	Yes	No	Don't Know	Response Total
Active Knowledge Sharing	57% (4)	43% (3)	0% (0)	7
Participation in Communities of Practice	29% (2)	71% (5)	0% (0)	7
Participation in multi-Center Initiatives	71% (5)	29% (2)	0% (0)	7
Mentoring or Coaching	100% (7)	0% (0)	0% (0)	7
Total Respondents				7

3. Is it your official policy to provide training or encourage procurement of such training in areas related to group process, teamwork and communication such as: facilitation techniques, virtual work practices and management, team-building, etc?		
	Response Percent	Response Total
Yes	71.4%	5
No	28.6%	2
Don't Know	0%	0
Total Respondents		7

4. Over the past year, has your Human Resources department provided training in areas related to group process, teamwork and communication such as: facilitation techniques, virtual work practices and management, team-building, etc?

	Response Percent	Response Total
Yes	71.4%	5
No	28.6%	2
Don't Know	0%	0
Total Respondents		7

5. If your Center has an official employment philosophy, does it include any KM/S relevant statements?

	Response Percent	Response Total
Yes	28.6%	2
No	57.1%	4
Don't Know	14.3%	1
Total Respondents		7

6. Please provide the best example in your Center of HR policy or practice promoting KM/S behaviours.

1. Requesting the short-listed candidates to present a one-hour seminar to ICATDA staff members and seek the Staff feedback
2. Requesting all ICARDA P & RA level staff members to contribute / present a seminar in the ICARDA weekly in-house seminar series.
3. Arranging for guest seminars, when possible, specially in the areas of KM & D, IPR, IPG and G&D.
4. CIFOR is building a group of facilitators within the center and encouraging major meetings to be facilitated. We are setting up an egroup as well as trying to establish additional training. We are recruiting based on competencies which look for evidence of capacity building and partnership. These are interview questions and form the basis for evaluation. HR is part of the group looking at internal communications processes.
5. We create specific platforms for dialogue, for example we have Scientist-Managers' dialogue where staff are encouraged to share information

7. To what extent do you feel the ICT-KM Program has influenced your HR policies in the following areas?				
	Not at all	To A Limited Extent	A Great Deal	Don't know
Hiring Practices	29% (2)	43% (3)	14% (1)	14% (1)
HR policies which reward KS behavior?	14% (1)	57% (4)	29% (2)	0% (0)
Types of Training Available	29% (2)	57% (4)	14% (1)	0% (0)
Employment Philosophy	43% (3)	43% (3)	14% (1)	0% (0)
Total Respondents 7				

8. How useful do you find these ICT-KM Program communication media:				
	Not At All Useful	Useful To A Limited Extent	Useful To a Significant Extent	Don't Know
ICT-KM Program E-Newsletter	0% (0)	43% (3)	57% (4)	0% (0)
ICT-KM Website	17% (1)	50% (3)	33% (2)	0% (0)
ICT-KM Annual Reports	0% (0)	50% (3)	33% (2)	17% (1)
Presentations by ICT-KM Program participants	0% (0)	0% (0)	71% (5)	29% (2)
Total Respondents 7				

9. What improvements would you like to see made:
<p>To the ICT-KM Website:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • inclusion of HR section and practices • more Case studies on applying KM in HR initiatives
<p>To the ICT-KM E-Newsletter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • include topics relevant to HR, • include HR Mgrs on mail list
<p>To the ICT-KM Annual Reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • include issues relevant to HR • include HR Mgrs on mail list
<p>To presentations by program participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increase involvement of HR in selection of topics.

ANNEX 3

SURVEY RESULTS: DIRECTORS GENERAL

(Number of Respondents = 10)

1. Over the past year have you proactively:				
	Yes	No	Don't Know	Total
Encouraged HR policies that reward KS behavior?	78% (7) 1. Revising Performance Management System 2. Teamwork is part of performance evaluation 3. KS behaviours are part of performance assessment. 4. In performance management 5. set up a new strategic HR division 6. KS is now part of the Annual Performance Evaluation of staff 7. participation in preparing online modules encouraged	22% (2)	0	9
Allocated resources to tool development & use?	78% (7) 1. Financial support for inter-center knowledge sharing 2. eNRIC project; Plumtree adoption; custom workflow applications; Sharepoint sites for MT and communities of practice; Knowledge Fair; Knowledge Center Initiative 3. Sharepoint 4. new support in the Information & knowledge management area 5. Contributed to the CGXchange project	22% (2)	0	9
Total Respondents				9

3. To what extent has the ICT-KM Program influenced:					
	Not at All	To a limited extent	To a Significant Extent	Don't Know	Response Total
HR policies which reward KS behavior?	78% (7)	11% (1)		11% (1)	9
Allocations of resources for tool devel't & use?	38% (3)	25% (2)	38% (3)	0	8

4. Over the past year have you proactively and publicly:				
	Yes	No	Don't Know	Total
Recognized individual and group KS behaviours?	<p>80% (8)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Public recognition of KM related to our SAP implementation Team awards Through (awards in) the Knowledge Fair Culture developed through institute and at our management team meetings Emphasizing publicly integration between the center's mega projects introduced group rewards for resource mobilization (shared intelligence) 	10% (1)	10% (1)	
Promoted the spread of ICT/KM tools and strategies?	<p>78% (7)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> SAP implementation, joint KS arrangement with IWMI referring to tools developed specifically by ICT/KM group? If so, No Through the Knowledge Center Initiative; through the KS in Research Pilot Project CGXchange Support strong involvement in ICT-KM projects of IPGRI staff; initiated and support ILAC Knowledge management and dissemination is now mainstreamed through the establishment of an KMD mega project in the center promoting wider use of Blogs and Wikis 	11% (1)	11% (1)	
Championed KS more broadly in the CG system?	<p>67% (6)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Support to CGXchange Launches Support cross center knowledge sharing and analysis through active participation / leadership in ICT-KM program Launching of CGXchange at AGM Support it in meetings; looking for opportunities to align ILAC and ICT-KM 	33% (3)	0	

6. To what extent has the ICT-KM Program influenced the way you:					
	Not at All	To a limited extent	To a Significant Extent	Don't Know	Total
Recognize KS behaviours	56% (5)	33% (3)	11% (1)	0% (0)	9
Promote ICT/KM tools and strategies	11% (1)	67% (6)	22% (2)	0% (0)	9
Champion KS in the CG system	38% (3)	38% (3)	25% (2)	0% (0)	8

7. How useful do you find these ICT-KM Program communication instruments:					
	Not At All Useful	Useful To A Limited Extent	Useful To a Significant Extent	Don't Know	Total
To the ICT-KM E-Newsletter	25% (2)	38% (3)	25% (2)	12% (1)	8
To the ICT-KM Website	25% (2)	75% (6)	0% (0)	0% (0)	8
To presentations by Program participants	12% (1)	25% (2)	25% (2)	38% (3)	8
To the ICT-KM Annual Reports	25% (2)	25% (2)	12% (1)	38% (3)	8
Total Respondents					8

8. What improvements would you like to see made:	
To the ICT-KM E-Newsletter	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Relevance 2. An executive summary of key messages will be quite useful
To the ICT-KM Website	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Relevance 2. I have not accessed the website, but it may not help very much because we are more interested in the products of the program 3. not easy to access always
To presentations by Program participants	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Relevance
To the ICT-KM Annual Reports	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Relevance

9. In order to maximize the overall effectiveness of the ICT-KM Program, is there anything you think needs to be added or changed in its content, components or management?

1. No
2. There is no transparency in how the projects are determined. Needs of users are not assessed nor are users consulted. The so-called advisory group is not consulted before key decisions are made or so late as to be ineffectual.
3. It needs to move down in the centers and stimulate / share activities related to direct implementation; move from an outside tickler to affecting the core business.
4. Pay more attention to the transparency of decision making
5. While the principle of doing things together, in the same manner, to promote efficiencies, ease of exchange of staff and ideas between Centers, etc. are strongly supported, there isn't much evidence of success here. Rather, it seems that individual Centers are still doing their own thing. Often these individual efforts are done with sharing the end result with others, but this does not help any, and this is often outside the knowledge of the CIO until it has become a fact. Some problems with this approach is that the systems are not designed with the needs of other Centers, and they often don't work at other Centers (due in part because of lack of common practices in the most general sense, but also because of a lack of common hardware and software platforms and applications. Project Manager, developed by CIAT, is a good example. It now exists in several flavors, which different Centers adding or modifying, alone or with the help of CIAT, to meet their own needs. This results in an unsupportable product. IITA developed a workflow software to manage the production of printed documents which they intended to install everywhere. While corporate communications and publications unit heads may know of this, the IT community does not. An attempt to install it in our Center failed because of incompatible platforms and insufficient dialogue beforehand. [The CIO] needs to get out to the Centers more, talk to different user groups, and then share this with IT managers. On the KS side, similar comments can be made. Centers are willing to do this, see the benefits of this, but still act independently or in small groups.
6. A detailed needs assessment of the centers from the ICT-KM program should be carried out. This is very much in order as preparations go for ICT-KM2. - Completing existing projects successfully and showing the products. - Advisory group deliberations made more transparent. - Science aspects is lagging in the program - Contribution to aging IT infrastructures in the centers
7. Fewer projects, more focused on knowledge sharing with partners; work only in areas where ICT-KM will bring new advantages to the Alliance.

Total Respondents 7

10. What do you think are the most valuable contributions the ICT-KM Program has made for the CGIAR so far?

1. Elevated the agenda on the issue, started to provide the tools and advice needed.
2. Little.
3. Raising awareness in the centers. Piloting "technology choices". Creating communities of practice.
4. CGXchange and the project management system
5. Getting collective action resulting in savings - Bringing the IT and IM CoPs together
6. I note that vibrant communities of practice have emerged among IT managers and librarians, and GIS experts.

Total Respondents 6

ANNEX 4

SURVEY RESULTS: PROJECT COORDINATOR

(Number of respondents = 9)

1. How well have the CIO Office, staff and consultants supported your project with regard to:					
	Very Well	Somewhat Well	Neutral, N/A	Somewhat Poorly	Very Poorly
Timely decision-making and provision of resources	22% (2)	44% (4)	11% (1)	22% (2)	0% (0)
Helping to obtain technical support	22% (2)	11% (1)	33% (3)	22% (2)	11% (1)
Linking with other projects' activities	11% (1)	22% (2)	11% (1)	56% (5)	0% (0)
Obtaining senior and organizational support	33% (3)	22% (2)	33% (3)	0% (0)	11% (1)
Providing advice & technical support for M&E	44% (4)	22% (2)	22% (2)	11% (1)	0% (0)

2. How satisfied are you with:					
	Extremely satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neutral	Somewhat dissatisfied	Extremely dissatisfied
Overall program management	33% (3)	44% (4)	11% (1)	0% (0)	11% (1)
Program reporting requirements	22% (2)	22% (2)	33% (3)	22% (2)	0% (0)
Cooperation within and among CG Centers	11% (1)	22% (2)	11% (1)	56% (5)	0% (0)
Opportunity to influence program goals & direction	22% (2)	33% (3)	11% (1)	22% (2)	11% (1)
Program's acknowledgement of your contributions	33% (3)	33% (3)	0% (0)	11% (1)	22% (2)

3. In order to maximize the overall effectiveness of the ICT-KM Program, is there anything you think needs urgently to be added or changed in its content, components or management?	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is very unclear how the priorities and activities for 2006 were arrived at and agreed. The ICT-KM advisory group doesn't seem to be active (or maybe they are just silently active). Should look at coordinating regional services along similar lines to the CG IAU. 2. Greater efforts to identify and act on possible linkages between projects in the C4D 'uberproject'. The projects are still very much independent of each other and there is little if any cross-fertilization of ideas. 3. Program still needs to focus more on supporting science based needs directly, and engaging more directly with researchers. 4. More attention and support needs to be given to the smaller projects that build up the CGXchange. 5. The advisory group is not serving a purpose. Whenever a member indicates a way to go, 	

- explanations why it is not being done the way is being suggested is given. This is a very bad approach. For this there is no need of this group.
6. More synergy and collaboration needs to be created with other relevant projects. As it is, the program seems to be more of a number of individual projects, separately managed and implemented.
 7. In-depth study of the ICT-KM requirements of the centers and the system as a whole to truly assess future program priorities.
 8. Identification of more areas where resources sharing could be made.
 9. Identification of resources and competencies across the centers that could be shared across the centers.
 10. More emphasis on standards and processes development.

4. What do you think are the most valuable contributions the ICT-KM Program has made for the CGIAR so far?

1. Increased the exposure of ICT-KM to senior management and ensured that senior managers take some ownership for the ICT-KM activities. Providing coordination for shared activities that only existed on the whim of individuals before, includes CG wide purchasing agreements
2. It has contributed to a greater awareness, within peer groups, of shared problems, often common approaches to overcoming these and the possible benefits of working together to solve them. It has also provided a platform for investment in activities and infrastructure that would be beyond the reach of individual centers but from which individual centers can gain benefits.
3. CGXchange and supporting the Consortium for Spatial Information
4. It has allowed the development of some very exciting tools that will be of great help to several CGIAR communities of practice,
5. Certainly helped to improve the IT and IM communities of practices and to glue them more.
6. Initiated a number of initiatives and projects that will have long-lasting impacts on the centers, eg AD and CGXchange projects.
7. Helped to make economies and efficiencies in the system 4. Instilled more awareness in the potentialities and impact of ICT-KM on the CGIAR.
8. Centers working together. Contacts and bonding between colleagues between centers.

ANNEX 5
TELEPHONE INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS

Telephone Interview Questions – Other Stakeholders

Purpose: This interview is to obtain information to complement the recent web-based survey of program participants and stakeholders.

1. Some people have commented on the amount of “transparency” in the ICT-KM Program’s decision-making and allocation of resources. Do you see this as a potential or current problem? Yes_____; No_____
2. Where do you think the program has the appropriate transparency and where do you think its transparency could be improved?

Appropriate:

Could be Improved:

3. Do you have any suggestions on how to improve transparency?
4. The CGIAR is a complex consortium of diverse groups and organizations, all with their own needs and interests. Are there things the ICT-KM Program could be doing to better respect, respond to and balance these needs and interests as it works towards making the CGIAR into more of an integrated knowledge-sharing “system”?
5. Do you feel that what the Program has been doing in its current activities is relevant to CG Centers and systems? Yes_____; No _____.
6. How could the Program make its activities more directly relevant to the needs and concerns of the CGIAR Centers.
7. There is an inherent tension between staff members engaged in system wide program activities versus their job responsibilities for their respective Centers. Do you see this as a concern?. Yes_____ No _____.
8. What could the program do about it in its projects and activities?
9. In its first few years, the Program focused primarily on building infrastructure. In the future, if it moves to broaden its scope, what areas do you think should be given highest priority? (Probe for scientific areas & concerns.)
10. From your perspective as an external partner, what have you learned about partnering with the ICT-KM Program, how could its partnerships be improved?

Learned:

Improvements to be made:

11. What other partnerships could the Program usefully explore?
12. In order to contribute significantly to CGIAR partnerships with national and international organizations, what tools and approaches should the program consider using?
13. Do you have any other comments or advice about the Program?

Telephone Interview Questions – Project Coordinators

Purpose: This interview is to obtain information to complement the recent web-based survey of program participants and stakeholders.

1. There is an inherent tension between staff members engaged in system wide program activities versus their job responsibilities for their respective Centers. Do you see this as a concern? Yes _____ No _____
2. What can the program do about it in its own projects?
3. Some people have commented on the amount of “transparency” in the ICT-KM Program’s decision-making and allocation of resources. Do you see this as a potential or current problem? Yes _____ No _____
4. Where do you think the program has the appropriate transparency and where do you think its transparency could be improved?

Appropriate:

Could be improved:

5. Do you have any suggestions on how to improve transparency?
6. For the past two years in our surveys, the problem of linking activities between projects and across centers has been raised. From your perspective what is the nature of this problem?
7. And what could be done about it?
8. Do you have any other comments or advice about the Program?

Telephone Interview questions – Directors General

Purpose: This interview is to obtain information to complement the recent web-based survey of program participants and stakeholders.

1. Some people have commented on the amount of “transparency” in the ICT-KM Program’s decision-making and allocation of resources. Do you see this as a potential or current problem?
Yes_____ No_____
2. Where do you think the program has the appropriate transparency and where do you think its transparency could be improved?

Appropriate:

Could be Improved:

3. Do you have any suggestions on how to improve transparency?
4. There is an inherent tension between staff members engaged in system wide program activities versus their job responsibilities for their respective Centers. Do you see this as a concern?
Yes_____ No _____
5. What can the program do about it in its projects and activities?
6. The CGIAR is a complex consortium of diverse groups and organizations, all with their own needs and interests. Are there things the ICT-KM Program could be doing to better respect, respond to and balance these needs and interests as it works towards making the CGIAR into more of an integrated knowledge-sharing “system”?
7. Do you feel that what the Program has been doing in its current activities is relevant to CG Centers and systems? Yes_____; No _____.
8. How could the Program make its activities more directly relevant to the needs and concerns of the CGIAR Centers.
9. In its first few years, the Program focused primarily on building infrastructure. In the future, if it moves to broaden its scope, what areas do you think should be given highest priority? (Probe for scientific areas & concerns.)
10. Do you have any other comments or advice about the Program?