

Knowledge Management Study

AUDIT TRAIL

Stakeholder comments on the draft approach paper circulated in February 2017

15 March, 2017

From	Comment	Response and Action Taken
GEF Secretariat	(Para 3): Please provide reference to the Council document/decision where this endorsement was provided in May 2004.	Added.
	(Para 3): The chronological order in this statement seems to be inaccurate. The date for the Council document GEF/C.22/6 is November 2003. So, this business plan cannot be “as a result” of an endorsement in 2004.	Amended.
GEF Secretariat	(Para 5): Reference? GEF/C.39/6/Rev.1	Added.
GEF Secretariat	(Para 5): Reference? GEF/C.40/Inf.03	Added.
GEF Secretariat	(Para 6): Here, it may be useful to mention that while a comprehensive KM strategy has not been fully put in place or implemented, the GEF has continued to finance KM relevant projects and initiatives. You may want to include a paragraph on GEF financed knowledge and learning projects and GEF projects that have specific KM objectives or components as well as knowledge products (publications, research, patents, videos, websites, etc.) “produced by GEF projects”. A simple web search (on key words: learning, knowledge, research, etc.) will reveal a list of KM relevant projects that have been financed by the GEF to date in various focal areas (other than IW: Learn). For example: 1. Adaptation Learning Mechanism: Learning by Doing; 2. Knowledge Base for Lessons Learned and Best Practices in the Management of Coral Reefs; 3. Distance Learning and Information Sharing Tool for the Benguela Coastal Areas (DLIST-Benguela);	Part of these will be captured in the meta-analysis of country-portfolio evaluations, the rest can be looked at in the document review. A number of OPS6 ongoing studies are looking at KM and will also be a source of information. However, projects only focusing on KM are more an exception than the rule and cannot be the focus of this study. No changes made.

	4. Development of Best Practices and Dissemination of Lessons Learned for Dealing with the Global Problem of Alien Species that Threaten Biological Diversity; 5. International Assessment of Agricultural Science and Technology for Development (IAASTD) 6. ETC.	
GEF Secretariat	(Para 6): You may also wish to include a discussion of GEF Secretariat publications to date – as key knowledge products, especially reviewing coverage and quality of those that provide portfolio level analysis in various focal areas.	We will look into these. Added a specific indicator under Question A in the Evaluation Matrix (Annex A).
GEF Secretariat	(Para 8.): (Proposed modifications – the underlined text). i. A series of knowledge assessments and surveys, including: 1) a GEF Knowledge Assets Assessment in the context of the GEF project cycle, conducted jointly with the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN); 2) a partnership-wide KM Audit; 3) <u>KM Country Surveys, reaching out to key counterparts during GEF Expanded Constituency Workshops (ECWs)</u>; and 4) an Internal KM Survey, reaching out to the entire Secretariat. The results of these studies are being included in the KM Roadmap for the GEF, currently under development in the context of the preparations for GEF-7. ii. Three KM pilot initiatives, including: 1) a study on capturing lessons learned and best practices from completed GEF projects based on agency reports and terminal evaluations, followed by the inclusion of a function for entering the resulting information in PMIS; 2) an “Ask the Expert” online tool, designed to create a comprehensive knowledge base on GEF operations; 3) the inclusion in GEF Expanded Constituency Workshops (ECWs) of a “GEF Knowledge Day” <u>with field visits and learning stations, targeting recipient country stakeholders, which</u>	Thank you for these useful additions (the underlined text). Accepted.

	<u>have been implemented at 13 ECWs throughout 2016 and will be implemented in 13 ECWs in 2017.</u> iii. Several new GEF knowledge products, including videos and publications <u>as well as a GEF Art of Knowledge Exchange Guidebook and regional workshop series, targeting wide audiences including recipient countries.</u> iv. KM focused Brown Bag Lunches (BBLs) and seminars, inviting GEF partners and external organizations to share their KM experiences and insights. v. A renewed focus on information technology: inclusion of KM in the redesign of the GEF website (open for public) and creation of a GEF Intranet (internal for the GEF Secretariat); <u>developing a GEF document management system</u>; and ongoing work on redesigning PMIS as a new GEF online platform that improves the availability and accessibility of project-level information and knowledge, <u>as a basis for developing a larger GEF Knowledge and Learning Platform.</u>	
GEF Secretariat	Purpose and Objectives (Para 9): Do you mean the GEF partnership or the GEF Secretariat, here? Or both? Please specify.	GEF partnership. The objective has been specified.
GEF Secretariat	Purpose and Objectives (Para 9): “, as well as the barriers to and opportunities for successful implementation”	Accepted.
GEF Secretariat	Purpose and Objectives (Para 9): It will be helpful to explain why the study is only covering KM in the GEF from 2009 to present because the main action the Council took in support of KM in the GEF was in May 2004 when it endorsed KM as a corporate-level task and supported its launched with a budget of \$0.49 million. In this situation, we would have expected the study period to cover 2004 to date. Alternatively, the study could cover the	We use existing evaluative evidence to cover for pre-2009. GEF-5 KM initiative was the first significant GEF-wide initiative. No changes made.

	period from 2014 to date because there have been past studies on KM before 2014, specifically in various GEF's Overall Performance Studies (OPS-3), OPS-4 (2009) and OPS-5 (2014), and we can use the current study to build on the results of this previous work.	
GEF Secretariat	Scope and Key Questions (Para 10): Here, it is important to look at beyond the GEF Secretariat. Many GEF agencies and other GEF partners (even countries) have separate KM initiatives, products and systems/platforms in place that can and do contribute to GEF KM goals across the GEF partnership.	Indeed, this is what the study will do. No changes made.
GEF Secretariat	Scope and Key Questions (Para 10): “ii. What KM systems/platforms have been established by the GEF Secretariat and/or by key GEF partners such as GEF agencies, IEO and STAP (i.e. for knowledge creation/customization/dissemination, collaborative work – joint efforts; portfolio management; networking, staffing and human resource management; processes to collect, analyze, manage and exchange information on lessons learned, best practices and the results of R&D, innovation and technology development; and in support of communications/public relations/fund raising) and to what extent have such systems facilitated effective management and sharing of knowledge to mainstream and upscale of results within the GEF partnership, in relation to its corporate mandate of achieving global environmental benefits?”	Thanks for these additions. Most of it is already captured in the data gathering tools for the study. Mind that we will not be able to fully capture all the dimensions you are suggesting. No changes made.
GEF Secretariat	Scope and Key Questions (Para 10, ii): Here, it would be important to understand the connection to the countries (both recipient and donors) and facilitation of uptake and learning from the GEF experience in the countries.	That's not the focus of this question. We want to see if and where GEF lessons have been used beyond the partnership boundaries. No changes made.
GEF Secretariat	Scope and Key Questions (Para 10): “How effective have GEF financed knowledge and learning projects and projects with key KM relevant components been to date in various focal areas?”	See responses regarding KM-relevant projects (Para 6). No changes made.

GEF Secretariat	Scope and Key Questions (Para 10, iii): Here, what do you mean by GEF? GEF Secretariat? Or the GEF partnership? Or both? If it is GEF Secretariat, then you may want to compare with similar international secretariats. If you refer to the Partnership, then you need to compare with similar global/multilateral Partnerships.	The focus of the study is the GEF Partnership. The benchmarking component of the study looks at similar publically funded multilateral partnerships. No changes made.
GEF Secretariat	Annex 1.A: Here, it is important to look at beyond the GEF Secretariat. Many GEF agencies and other partners have KM initiatives, products and systems/platforms in place that contribute to GEF KM goals across the GEF partnership.	The focus of the study is the GEF partnership. No changes made.
GEF Secretariat	Annex 1. B: Here, it would be important to look at GEF funding to date for specific knowledge and learning projects and/or GEF projects with key KM relevant components.	That would be useful but very difficult to isolate especially when KM is just a project component. And as noted above, there are very few 100% KM-focused projects. No changes made.
GEF Secretariat	Annex 1.C: Here, what do you mean by GEF? GEF Secretariat? Or the GEF partnership? If it is GEF Secretariat, then you may want to compare with similar international secretariats. If you refer to the Partnership, then you need to compare with similar global/multilateral Partnerships.	Please see above. No changes made.