ICARDA
Science for resilient livelihoods in dry areas

IFAD
Investing in rural people

Strengthening Knowledge Management for Greater Development Effectiveness in the Near East, North Africa, Central Asia and Europe

SKiM Endline Evaluation

Final Report

CIHEAM BARI

Procasur

VT

SKiM Endline Evaluation: Final Report

Innocent Bikara, Valerio Graziano, Juliana Achang, Maurice Ndoro, Enrico Bonaiuti, Akmal Akramkhanov (18/04/2023). Endline Evaluation of the SKiM Project. ICARDA. Egypt. Strengthening Knowledge Management for Greater Development Effectiveness in the Near East, North Africa, Central Asia and Europe. Beirut, Lebanon: International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas (ICARDA).

Keywords

Evaluation, Knowledge, Knowledge Management, Management, KM, Knowledge Sharing, Sharing, Knowledge Creation, Creation, Knowledge Discovery, Discovery, Knowledge Storage, Storage, Knowledge Curation, Curation, Information, Data, Data Curation, Capacity Development, Capacity, Development, Research for Development, R4D

Prepared by

International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas (ICARDA)

Project

Strengthening Knowledge Management for Greater Development Effectiveness in the Near East, North Africa, Central Asia and Europe (SKiM)

Funded by

International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)

Report

A report is a separately published record of research findings, research still in progress, policy developments and events, or other technical findings, usually bearing a report number and sometimes a grant number assigned by the funding agency. Also, an official record of the activities of a committee or corporate entity, the proceedings of a government body, or an investigation by an agency, whether published or private, usually archived or submitted to a higher authority, voluntarily or under mandate. In a more general sense, any formal account of facts or information related to a specific event or phenomenon, sometimes given at regular intervals. *Source:* **COAR**

About ICARDA

Established in 1977, the International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas (ICARDA) is a non-profit, CGIAR Research Center that focusses on delivering innovative solutions for sustainable agricultural development in the nontropical dry areas of the developing world. We provide innovative, science-based solutions to improve the livelihoods and resilience of resource- poor smallholder farmers. We do this through strategic partnerships, linking research to development, and capacity development, and by taking into account gender equality and the role of youth in transforming the non-tropical dry areas.

Address

Dalia Building, Second Floor, Bashir El Kasser St, Verdun, Beirut, Lebanon 1108-2010. www.icarda.org

Disclaimer

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Boxes

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AETTGD	Agricultural Extension and Technology Transfer General Directorate of Sudan
CNA	Capacity Needs Assessment
ICARDA	International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas
ARC	Agricultural Research Corporation (Sudan)
AUW	Ahfad University for Women
CCU IFAD	Central Coordination Unit for IFAD Co-Financed Projects
CEN	Eastern Europe and Central Asia
CIHEAM-Bari	Centre International de Hautes Etudes Agronomiques Méditerranéennes – Bari
ENA	National School of Agriculture Meknes (Morocco)
IAV	Institut Agronomique et Vétérinaire “Hassan II”
IFAD	The International Fund for Agricultural Development
INRA	Institut National de la Recherche Agonomique
KM	Knowledge Management
MoIWR-TCBD	Ministry of Irrigation and Water Resources, Training and Capacity Building Directorate
NENA	Near East and North Africa
ONCA	Office National du Conseil Agricole
PROCASUR	POCASUR Corporation
SAUM	State Agrarian University of Moldova
SKiM	Strengthening Knowledge Management for Development Effectiveness in the Near East, Northern Africa, Central Asia and Europe
SKS	Sudanese Knowledge Society
SSTC	South-South and Triangular Cooperation
UofK	University of Khartoum
USARB	Alecu Russo State University of Bălți
VT	Virginia Tech

1. Background & Context

The multi-country project "Strengthening **Knowledge Management for Development Effectiveness in the Near East, Northern Africa, Central Asia and Europe"** was launched in June 2018 to address the challenges of systematically identifying and seeking to fill the most relevant knowledge gaps and by strengthening organizational learning across selected countries. The project was designed to target Moldova, Morocco, and Sudan (with the possibility of extending to an additional two) with differing economic situations and needs for KM, with average income per capita varying along with access to internet and knowledge management infrastructure. The organizational capacities in public institutions of relevance for this area in the NENA and the CEN regions vary broadly, and opportunities for knowledge systematization and transfer across countries remain largely untapped. SKiM was designed with **goal** to address this problem by systematically identifying and developing effective and long-term management capacities to support rural agricultural development across the three countries.

1.1 Project design

The project was designed to achieve 3 outcomes, namely:

1. Improved understanding of KM capacities of the key rural institutions in 3 (+2) target countries in the NENA and CEN region;
2. Effective learning systems established and embedded in organizational processes with strengthened human and institutional capacities to manage the systematization of good practices; and
3. Improved knowledge exchange among stakeholders based on increased adoption of good practices and knowledge transfer for increased SSTC, replication and scaling up.

To achieve project outcomes, the proposed work consists of three components/results:

Component 1: KM Capacity assessment for enhanced formulation of learning needs

Activity 1.1: Assessment of knowledge management capacity gaps and learning needs

Activity 1.2: Formulation of Approach Paper on knowledge management and communication strategy

Activity 1.3: Formulation of capacity development and innovation plans for the target countries

Activity 1.4: Regional workshop to kick-start implementation plans and Community of Practice establishment

Component 2: Capacity development and knowledge systemization

Activity 2.1: Delivery of on-demand training courses in knowledge management and capacity development best practice

Activity 2.2: Organization of at least 3 learning routes in the target countries

Component 3: Enhanced regional knowledge exchange.

Activity 3.1: Set-up and regular maintenance of online portal that builds upon previous tools and capacities

Activity 3.2: Roll-out of five knowledge symposia

Activity 3.3: Development and dissemination of knowledge products.

1.2 Project implementation arrangements

The project was led by ICARDA together with its international partners Virginia Tech, CIHEAM-Bari, PROCASUR and national partners in Moldova, Morocco, Sudan. ICARDA signed separate agreements with participating partners CIHEAM-BARI, Virginia Tech and PROCASUR, as well as implementing partners within participating countries. These separate agreements were approved by IFAD on a no-objection basis.

CIHEAM-Bari, Virginia Tech and PROCASUR supported the component work within each country. Namely, CIHEAM-Bari is contributed with Component 2 activity on training courses, Virginia Tech in Component 1 activity involving development of innovation plans, and PROCASUR in Component 2 activities on learning routes. Close interaction with IFAD country teams was of paramount importance especially in the initial phase of the project to seek the involvement of country institutions in selection and planning. In-country implementation activities were undertaken and co-led by ICARDA, especially its regional offices and in-country stakeholders.

The direct target group of this project was in-country institutions dealing with agricultural and rural solutions (Table 1). The three focus countries were Moldova, Morocco, Sudan. More specifically, primary beneficiaries include public institutions involved in IFAD and other international organization-funded project portfolios that target rural development, natural resources management and agricultural production. However, within these institutions' men and women, particularly young professionals, were also targeted.

Table 1: Project partners /target country Institutions with formalized collaborations

Project partners		**Institutions**
Implementing partners		1. CIHEAM-Bari, 2. Procasur, 3. Virginia Tech
Target Country	Moldova	1. State Agrarian University of Moldova (SAUM) 2. Research Institute of Field Crops “Selectia” 3. Institutul Pentru Dezvoltare și Inițiative Sociale IDIS “Viitorul 4. Alecu Russo State University of Bălți (USARB)
	Morocco	5. Institut Agronomique et Vétérinaire (IAV) “Hassan II” 6. National Institute for Agricultural Research (INRA) 7. Office National du Conseil Agricole (ONCA) 8. Morocco – National School of Agriculture (ENA) Meknes
	Sudan	9. Agricultural Research Corporation (ARC) Sudan

Project partners		Institutions
		10. Sudanese Knowledge Society (SKS) 11. Ministry of Irrigation and Water Resources, Training and Capacity Building Directorate (MoIWR-TCBD) 12. Ahfad University for Women (AUW) 13. Central Coordination Unit for IFAD Co-Financed Projects (CCU IFAD)

2. Evaluation Scope & Methodology

The main objective of the evaluation is to assess the impact and effectiveness of the project. The evaluation therefore doesn't examine other performance criteria such as relevance, efficiency, sustainability of benefits, gender equality, innovation, scaling up, environment and natural resource management, adaptation to climate change as these were sufficiently covered by the mid-term evaluation[1]. Most importantly, this evaluation is a realization of recommendation 3 of the mid-term evaluation (Box 1).

Box 1: Recommendation 3 of the mid-term evaluation
Progress towards the KM improvement goal could be better measured using indicators outlined in the IFAD KM strategy, rather than government KM budgets which provide limited indication of KM capability. The IFAD KM strategy proposes to measure improved capabilities using a 1-5 scale provided by survey respondents on criterion such as leadership role modelling, supporting & scaling innovation, building a high impact learning culture, learning in connected networks, using platforms, systems, and processes for sharing knowledge and learning, building internal capacity, applying evidence and experience to policy engagement & programmes, and engaging and learning with development partners. Similar domains are included in the SKiM capacity needs assessments (CNA)[2] (questionnaire), however, they were not scored at baseline. *Ross McLeod, mid-term evaluation consultant*

The CNA criteria included identification of gaps in the following dimensions: Dimension A (Policies, processes and investments; Dimension B (Technologies, systems and workflows); and Dimension C (Skills, capacities and time). This evaluation aligned the above SKiM CNA Criteria to the IFAD Knowledge Management Maturity Model narrative by domain and level (Annex 1). SKiM stakeholders' responses/gaps were scored using the IFAD KM maturity criteria and narrative. At end of project, an online questionnaire was sent to the SKiM stakeholders seeking their feedback on whether they experienced a positive change to each of the gaps elicited at baseline and provide a narrative explanation of the positive change if any. The survey was sent to all SKiM stakeholder institutions in target countries (Table 1). The survey received a 67 percent response rate. The qualitative responses were curated before subjecting them to the KM maturity scoring exercise and 63 percent of the responses were subsequently utilized (Table 2). The scoring of the responses resulted in a total of 147 pairwise (baseline-endline) ratings of the IFAD-SKiM maturity levels upon which this evaluation is based.

[1] Ross McLeod. (1/6/2021). SKiM Mid-Term Evaluation: Final Report: https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.11766/13661

[2] Bastian Mueller, Enrico Bonaiuti, Valerio Graziano, Jocelyne Jawhar, Akmal Akramkhanov. (13/11/2019). SKIM - Capacity Needs Assessment (CNA): Methods and Results: https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.11766/10436

Table 2: Categorization of qualitative responses from the curation exercise

Endline Response categorization	Count	Percentage
Usable response	58	63%
Responses is not conclusive/ incomplete	13	14%
Response describes a change, but the change described is not consistent with baseline data	9	10%
Response statement contains contradictions	11	12%
Endline response challenges baseline data	1	1%
Total responses	**92**	**100%**

Since the baseline scoring is based on gaps within the three SKiM dimensions, it is likely that the baseline KM Scores have a downward bias relative to what they would have been if the approach was to ask generic questions associated with IFAD KM maturity narrative. However, the emphasis of this evaluation is on the relative change in the KM maturity level rather than the absolute values. In addition, the approach of the endline evaluation to elicit only positive changes to the gaps elicited at baseline precluded potential negative changes in KM maturity level. However, it is counterintuitive that institutions directly benefiting from the project would experience negative growth in KM capacities. Further, there were problems with the dissimilarity of SKiM CNA dimensions along the KM growth continuum as aligned in Annex 1. As a result, 13 percent of the pairwise scoring of baselines and endline of responses to the hybrid IFAD-SKiM criteria had dissimilar SKiM KM dimensions. In such cases, intuitive interpretation of the results was placed ahead of dimension 'boundaries' and weighed against elimination of the responses from the analysis which would have a more profound negative effect on the strength of the evaluation. This evaluation's use of arithmetic means of the hybrid IFAD-SKiM KM maturity scores ranging from 1 to 5, and the associated (average) percentage changes provide insightful measures of the contribution of the SKiM project towards improved knowledge management capabilities of participating national stakeholder institutions.

3. Results

The summary of analysis results is presented in Table 3 and Table 4, whereas the detailed results are provided in Annex 2. SKiM stakeholder institutions reported improvements in 82 percent of the KM gaps reported at baseline, and an average of 129 percent growth in the KM maturity score. The endline KM maturity score averages 3.51 and according to the IFAD KM strategy, a score above 3 is desirable. Only SKS fell short of this threshold. The largest improvement in KM maturity was in the use of platforms, systems and processes for sharing knowledge and learning. This tremendous achievement can be attributed to the successful implementation of component 3 of the project. INRA, CPIU-IFAD and SELECTIA reported the largest improvements in the use of platforms, systems and processes for sharing knowledge and learning. The second-best improvement in KM capabilities was observed in building internal capacity. This can be attributed to the successful implementation of component 2 of the project. Tremendous improvement in internal capacity was evident in INRA, CPIU-IFAD and SELECTIA.

The least improvements in KM maturity level were in building a high impact learning culture and learning in connected networks. This was especially so for SELECTIA and SKS. It is worth noting that building and sustaining a learning culture that regularly use data to learn and make informed decisions requires building the infrastructure, investing in the requisite equipment and technology and building staff knowledge and skills[3]. It is evident that strides are being made in this direction by all stakeholder institutions, including SELECTIA and SKS, and the apparent underachievement in building a high impact learning culture could be a natural lag in evolution of results.

Table 3: Change in KM maturity presented by IFAD KM maturity criteria

IFAD KM maturity criteria	Baseline KM maturity score	Percent of gaps Stakeholder reported a positive change	Endline KM maturity score	Percent change in KM maturity score
1. Leadership role modelling	1.9	73%	3.5	105%
2. Supporting & scaling innovation	1.6	89%	3.5	141%
3. Building a high-impact learning culture	2.3	75%	3.2	65%
4. Learning in connected networks	2.0	79%	3.3	66%
5. Using platforms, systems and processes for sharing knowledge and learning	1.2	91%	3.3	203%
6. Building internal capacity	1.6	78%	3.7	165%
7. Applying evidence and experience to policy engagement & programmes	1.5	83%	3.3	126%
8. Engaging and learning with development partners	1.8	89%	4.0	121%
OVERALL AVERAGE	**1.69**	**82%**	**3.51**	**129%**

[3] Winkler MK, Fyffe SD. Strategies for cultivating an organizational learning culture. Washington, DC: Urban Institute. 2016 Dec 1;9: https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/86191/strategies_for_cultivating_an_organizational_learning_culture_2.pdf

Table 4: Change in KM maturity presented by Stakeholder institution

Stakeholder Institution	Baseline KM maturity score	Percent of gaps Stakeholder reported a positive change	Endline KM maturity score	Percent change in KM maturity score
UofK	1.5	95%	4	214%
ONCA	1.5	100%	4	175%
SAUM	1.7	96%	4	158%
INRA	1.6	90%	4	156%
CPIU-IFAD	1.8	100%	4	121%
AETTGD	1.7	71%	3	107%
SELECTIA	1.7	54%	3	105%
IAV HASSAN II	1.7	68%	3	91%
SKS	1.5	44%	2	81%
USARB	2.3	100%	4	77%
OVERALL AVERAGE	**1.69**	**83%**	**3.452**	**126%**

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

The evaluation has shown that the project achieved tremendous results in KM criteria directly related to the project components. IFAD and ICARDA could consider designed subsequent intervention(s) with components directly related to the eight knowledge management criteria and ensure that the KM maturity index is adopted as a measure of impact right from project onset. In addition, there are significant differences in the level of achievement of the institutional stakeholders across the KM maturity criteria, signaling the potential for peer-to-peer learning and knowledge transfer.

Annexes

Annex 1: Alignment of SKiM CNA Criteria to the IFAD KM Maturity Model dimensions & Scores

Table 5: Alignment of SKiM Criteria to the IFAD KM Maturity model dimension on Leadership role modelling

IFAD KM Maturity Level	**IFAD KM Model Narrative**	**SKiM Criteria (score)** Dimension A (Policy/process/investments) Dimension B (Technology/systems/workflows) Dimension C (Skills/capacity/time)
5	Senior managers reinforce trust, build a sharing culture and act as role models. They are open about what they don't know, and are willing to ask for help. Leaders reinforce the principle that sharing knowledge and learning is everyone's responsibility.	(C) responsibility and openness in sharing and learning (5);
4	Most leaders act as mentors and coaches to share their experiences and encourage reflection and improvement. At process level, knowledge brokers take the lead and implement efficiencies whilst engaging others. Leaders challenge to ensure that projects are using the best available knowledge and learning.	(A) Ensuring state of the art knowledge use in projects (4); (B) systematically active in enhancing processes (4); (C) actively mentoring and coaching (4);
3	Senior leaders support specific knowledge initiatives but it is not yet embedded in business processes. At process level, some initiatives are well-led and teams are brought together to learn and share knowledge but this is not the general case.	(B) knowledge sharing and learning is occasional (3); (C) knowledge initiatives are deployed occasionally (3);
2	Senior managers talk about learning being important, but don't always walk the talk. Team learning is generally kept for formal events.	(B) learning is a rare occurrence (2); (C) learning is kept for formal occasion (2);
1	There is a lack of leadership on KM processes, and as a result most people work in silos. Urgent issues almost always take precedence over learning activities.	(C) occupied with daily workload in a limited setting (1);

Table 6: Alignment of SKiM Criteria to the IFAD KM Maturity model dimension on Supporting & scaling innovation

IFAD KM Maturity Level	IFAD KM Model Narrative	SKiM Criteria (score) A (Policy/process/investments) B (Technology/systems/workflows) C (Skills/capacity/time)
5	The organization protects and values space for trying out and scaling up new approaches. There is a clear process for identifying, analysing, validating and documenting successful innovation and for rapidly sharing and using it internally and externally to IFAD.	(A) enabling environment for scaling and innovation (5); (B) efficient workflow for scaling and innovation knowledge management in place (5);
4	Other partners regularly pick up on our innovations and collaborate with us. Grants are used to allow testing of innovative ideas. Innovations are based on robust lessons and evidence. They are well documented and the learning is shared through effective platforms.	(A) scaling and innovation are frequently supported (4); (B) efficient documentation and sharing of scaling and innovation in place (4); (C) partnerships and knowledge transfer on scaling and innovation is frequent (4);
3	Innovation is generally valued, and is seen as a positive selection criterion for projects. There is growing curiosity to adapt intellectual property from outside IFAD. Most successful innovations are reviewed, and lessons are shared.	(A) innovation is a criteria for funds allocation (3); (B) innovations are often documented and lessons learned are shared (3); (C) trainings and knowledge transfer from external institution may occur (3);
2	Innovations are documented and shared, but not systematically. Sometimes people and/or projects innovate an approach from scratch when they could have adapted or reused knowledge from another team.	(B) innovations are seldom documented (2); (C) doubling efforts may occure due to lack of documention (2);
1	There is a general lack or curiosity, and a belief that ideas are rarely acted upon. Platforms for sharing and developing ideas and innovations are not widely available.	(A) innovation is uncommon and unplanned for (1); (B) workflows and platforms for documentation and collaboration are not widely available (1);

Table 7: Alignment of SKiM Criteria to the IFAD KM Maturity model dimension on Building a high-impact learning culture

IFAD KM Maturity Level	**IFAD KM Model Narrative**	**SKiM Criteria (score)** A (Policy/process/investments) B (Technology/systems/workflows) C (Skills/capacity/time)
5	A balanced picture of IFAD successes, failures and learning is communicated openly to internal and external audiences. Space and time is protected for learning within and between levels in the organization. Learning is viewed as a priority and is embedded in business processes. Incentives are aligned to seeking, applying and sharing lessons. Learning across boundaries is routine, responsive and demand driven.	(A) learning processes and communication is in place and efficient (5); (B) learning systems are in place and efficient and open (5); (C) staff is incentivized in applying lessons learned and multi-disciplinary insights (5);
4	There is a culture of sharing failures and successes transparently and proactively. Learning and sharing knowledge is valued and people are recognized for their efforts. Structured approaches to learning (such as Learning Routes) are valued and widely used in the field.	(A) learning processes and communication is in place (4); (B) documentation and sharing of scaling and innovation in place and open (4); (C) staff is incentivized in applying lessons learned (4);
3	IFAD invests some time and resources in organizational learning, but not consistently. People think about knowledge and sharing when there is need and incentive. Failures are shared beyond the team but not to external audiences.	(A) learning occurs due to active organizational efforts (3); (B) documentation and sharing of scaling and innovation in place within the organization (3); (C) staff consider sharing and applying lessons learned occasionally (3);
2	People understand the need to learn lessons and share experience, but there is limited incentive to make time. Failures are discussed and sometimes shared beyond the team.	(C) learning is an internal occasional process carried out by the staff on a need-basis (2);
1	Failure is hidden – people don't talk about it or share the lessons. Time for learning is seen as a cost.	(C) learning is discouraged and unincentivized (1);

Table 8: Alignment of SKiM Criteria to the IFAD KM Maturity model dimension on Learning in connected networks

IFAD KM Maturity Level	**IFAD KM Model Narrative**	**SKiM Criteria (score)** A (Policy/process/investments) B (Technology/systems/workflows) C (Skills/capacity/time)
5	Networks are comprehensive, open, active and provided with the resources they need. Network leadership competencies are highly valued and supported. Networks align strategically around IFAD business needs and provide projects with the state-of-the-art knowledge they need to thrive. People have full confidence and competence in sharing and collaboration tools for inter-office working.	(A) Networks are highly valued, well managed and invested in (5); (B) Networks are supported by state-of-the-art knowledge management (5); (C) Capacity is fully capable and active in networks (5);
4	Peer learning is valued; people are curious and willing to reach out. Personal and organizational networks include connections beyond our sector in order to discover new ideas and insight. CoPs, networks and other lateral mechanisms are a natural part of how we work. They enable us gain grassroots input, and to replicate and upscale processes.	(A) Networks are valued, managed and invested in (4); (B) Networks are supported by knowledge management (4); (C) Capacity is capable and active in networks (4);
3	Networking is seen as a core business practice, not just a personal choice. Most individuals build and share their networks with each other, and collaborate to strengthen and use their connections. People can easily find and join the networks they need in order to fill gaps in their knowledge and experience.	(A) Networks are in place at organizational level (3); (B) Knowledge is available and strengthens networks (3); (C) Capacity can connect with networks to further their expertise (3);
2	People will make connections beyond personal contacts but only when they can't easily find the knowledge they are seeking. Networks and CoPs are viewed as a 'part-time' activity and little time is provided.	(B) Networks lack systematic access to knowledge (2); (C) Networks collaborations are occasional and optional (2);
1	Networking is a personal choice rather than a core business practice. Networks and communities are not seen as delivery or learning tools.	(C) Networks are regarded as time-consuming (1);

Table 9: Alignment of SKiM Criteria to the IFAD KM Maturity model dimension on Using platforms, systems and processes for sharing knowledge and learning

IFAD KM Maturity Level	**IFAD KM Model Narrative**	**SKiM Criteria (score)** A (Policy/process/investments) B (Technology/systems/workflows) C (Skills/capacity/time)
5	Information management systems are fully integrated, transparent and comprehensive. They meet the diverse needs of teams, help to connect people across distances, and connect people, teams and communities to the information they need to do their work effectively and efficiently. All country programmes are actively using platforms and processes for learning, sharing and reusing knowledge which are fully connected with and complement systems and processes at HQ.	(A) Information management systems (IMS) active and fully participated at organizational level (5); (B) IMS fully operational, transparent, interoperable and efficient (5); (C) Capacity uses IMS fully for state-of-the-art knowledge management (5);
4	Systems and platforms meet IFAD's needs and the level of staff participation is high. People regularly post, extract and apply knowledge from IT systems. Knowledge feedback loops between business processes fully established and supported by systems. Research, evaluation results and lessons are easy to access and retrieve, and are used and shared by most people.	(A) IMS active and highly participated at organizational level (4); (B) IMS fully operational, accessible and interoperable (4); (C) Capacity uses IMS for knowledge management (4);
3	Strategic knowledge and learning is often captured, but is not consistently managed or distilled. IFADs structure and business processes are widely understood and well 'signposted' for newcomers. Systems/ platforms are in place that make research, evaluation results, and lessons accessible, but they are not widely known and used.	(A) IMS active at organizational level (3); (B) IMS operational and accessible (3); (C) Capacity uses IMS for specific operations only (3);
2	Platforms and other tools are in place, but for compliance purposes rather than for learning. Expertise is difficult to locate without good personal networks. Lessons are sometimes identified, but not really learned by others.	(B) IMS operational (2); (C) Capacity uses IMS sporadically and unefficiently (2);
1	Systems contain incomplete and fragmented information. Little know how is captured, and access is limited. Lack of transparency about how IFAD works. People by-pass the knowledge, research and evidence systems that are available and prefer personal contacts. IT systems do little to facilitate the creation of internal or external connections.	(B) IMS partially operational (1); (C) Capacity does not rely on IMS to carry out their duties (1);

Table 10: Alignment of SKiM Criteria to the IFAD KM Maturity model dimension on Building internal capacity

IFAD KM Maturity Level	**IFAD KM Model Narrative**	**SKiM Criteria (score)** A (Policy/process/investments) B (Technology/systems/workflows) C (Skills/capacity/time)
5	Well-functioning/diverse opportunities for peer learning and cross-level learning, e.g. Learning Routes. People use a widely range of opportunities for high-quality training (multi-language) and mobility. Capacity building includes consultants/TCI/ partner institutions in IFAD.	(A) learning initatives are routinely planned and invested in (5); (B) learning and knowledge sharing are part of the organizational workflow (5); (C) Capacity building is top-notch and involves globally reputable partners (5);
4	Staff are motivated to learn and supported with effective platforms and processes. External training available and promoted. Decentralized learning opportunities exist and up take is positive. Opportunities in place for trainees to train others, e.g. through mentorship programmes. Developed capacity is used and valued by the institution.	(A) learning initatives are planned and promoted (4); (B) learning and knowledge sharing are opportunely addressed (4); (C) Capacity building is involves reputable partners (4);
3	Training opportunities are available, but are not considered as a priority. Training is available but not accessible to everyone (based on contract type or functions). The organization will generally use the skills acquired by the trainees, but it is not yet common practice.	(A) learning initatives are available (3); (B) learning and knowledge sharing are in place but not centralized (3); (C) Capacity building opportunities are available (3);
2	Training opportunities only available in HQ. Training available but not certified/customised for our needs. There is a reluctance to leverage staff for learning opportunities, and little incentive for or recognition of informal learning.	(A) learning initatives are available for selected staff only (2); (B) learning and knowledge sharing opportunities are available but not accounted for (2); (C) Capacity building opportunities are sporadical (2);
1	Training is supply-driven and offers little innovation or external perspective. There is a ‘what's in it for me‘ mentality and little incentive to build capacity for others.	(B) learning and knowledge sharing opportunities are demand-driven (1); (C) Capacity building opportunities are regarded as time-consuming (1);

Table 11: Alignment of SKiM Criteria to the IFAD KM Maturity model dimension on Applying evidence and experience to policy engagement & programmes

IFAD KM Maturity Level	IFAD KM Model Narrative	SKiM Criteria (score) A (Policy/process/investments) B (Technology/systems/workflows) C (Skills/capacity/time)
5	There is integrated capacity across the organization to generate and use robust evidence & lessons across the portfolio. Country strategies and projects are designed and implemented using knowledge and evidence about what works best. Country Directors and CPMs have the support and access to knowledge they need to engage successfully in policy dialogue.	(A) strategies and plans are mature and fully operational at organizational level (5); (B) lessons learned and evidences collection and review are part of the organizational workflow (5); (C) staff has access to all needed information to engage successfully at policy level (5);
4	Platforms, networks and other methods are widely used in country programmes to share and develop knowledge collectively with development partners to influence policy and programmes. Tools, structures and partnerships are in place to enable IFAD to build and leverage evidence and lessons from operations. Knowledge-sharing crosses organizational & geographic boundaries.	(A) strategies and plans are fully operational at organizational level (4); (B) lessons learned and evidences collection and review are systematic (4); (C) staff has access to all needed information to engage successfully at international level (4);
3	Capacity to generate evidence exists, but is inconsistent across the organization. Systems are not leveraged to their full potential. Knowledge-sharing and learning happens mainly at regional/country level. Lessons from operations are not always shared and used across the organization.	(A) strategies and plans are operational at organizational level (3); (B) lessons learned and evidences collection and review occur (3); (C) staff has access to relevant information when engaged in their duties (3);
2	Generation and use of evidence relies on few individuals because capacity is limited across the organization. Resources and incentives are in place but are not adequate, and incentives to produce evidence are driven by reporting, compliance and accountability.	(B) lessons learned and evidences collection and review are occasional (2); (C) staff can get access to relevant information when engaged in their duties (2);
1	Capacity to generate evidence is low. Participation in a learning environment is desired but engagement is limited (resource, time, etc.). Evidence is disconnected from country and corporate-level policy dialogue.	(B) lessons learned and evidences collection and review have limited efficacy (1); (C) staff access to relevant information is limited (1);

Table 12: Alignment of SKiM Criteria to the IFAD KM Maturity model dimension on Engaging and learning with development partners

IFAD KM Maturity Level	IFAD KM Model Narrative	SKiM Criteria (score) A (Policy/process/investments) B (Technology/systems/workflows) C (Skills/capacity/time)
5	A wide range of stakeholders, including governments, other development partners and rural people, and their organizations are consulted and learning with IFAD – before, during and after - enabling us to adapt and continuously improve our projects, programmes and services. IFAD is called to lead national level thematic dialogue. Partners openly share good and bad experiences because of their mature relationship with IFAD.	(A) the organization is pivotal at its scale (international/national/local) and seeked out for learning opportunities and consultancy (5); (B) the organization has processes in place to successfully handle national consultations (5); (C) Communication enables consultations and knowledge sharing at scale (5);
4	Stakeholder involvement and consultation is embedded in most institutional processes and there is an effective use and dissemination of this knowledge. Many governments recognise IFAD as an institution with valuable knowledge. Topics of exchange are clearly priorities.	(A) the organization is seeked out for learning opportunities and consultancy (4); (B) the organization has processes in place to successfully handle multi-stakeholder consultations (4); (C) Communication enables thematic multi-stakeholder consultations (4);
3	Valuable knowledge is generated from engagement with stakeholders, and it is usually acted upon. Regular consultation processes are in place. Several governments recognise IFAD as a learning institution and could cite evidence/examples. Topics for exchange are relevant but not always completely streamlined.	(A) the organization provides learning opportunities and consultancy (3); (B) the organization has the expertise to handle multi-stakeholder consultations (3); (C) Communication enables multi-stakeholder consultations on specific themes (3);
2	Consultation processes are in place but are not institutionalised. Some governments recognise IFAD as having valuable knowledge. Knowledge is generated from stakeholder consultation, but is not always shared or applied. Regular interactions with partners but composition and willingness to share still limited.	(B) the organization has the experience to share in multi-stakeholder consultations (2); (C) Communication enables limited participation in multi-stakeholder consultations (2);
1	Ad hoc and superficial involvement of stakeholders. There is low willingness to share and interactions are sporadic. Exchanges among partners are often unfocused.	(C) Communication enables occasional participation in multi-stakeholder consultations (1);

Annex 2: Results of hybrid IFAD-SKiM KM maturity analysis presented by IFAD KM maturity Criteria

Stakeholder Institution	Baseline KM maturity score	Percent of gaps Stakeholder reported a positive change	Endline KM maturity score	Percent change in KM maturity score
1. Leadership role modelling				
INRA	2.0	80%	3.4	70%
IAV HASSAN II	1.8	80%	3.2	78%
CPIU-IFAD	2.5	100%	4.0	60%
SELECTIA	2.0	0%	2.0	0%
SAUM	1.5	100%	4.5	200%
USARB	3.0	100%	4.0	33%
AETTGD	2.0	100%	4.0	100%
SKS	1.0	0%	1.0	0%
UofK	1.0	100%	5.0	400%
Average	**1.9**	**73%**	**3.5**	**105%**
2. Supporting & scaling innovation				
INRA	1.2	83%	3.7	214%
IAV HASSAN II	1.3	67%	2.8	113%
CPIU-IFAD	1.5	100%	4.0	167%
SELECTIA	1.5	100%	4.5	200%
SAUM	1.7	100%	3.7	120%
USARB	3.0	100%	4.0	33%
AETTGD	2.0	50%	2.5	25%
SKS	1.0	100%	2.0	100%
UofK	1.0	100%	4.0	300%
Average	**1.6**	**89%**	**3.5**	**141%**
3. Building a high-impact learning culture				
INRA	2.0	100%	5.0	150%
IAV HASSAN II	2.5	0%	2.5	0%
CPIU-IFAD	2.0	100%	3.0	50%
SELECTIA	3.0	0%	3.0	0%
SAUM	3.0	100%	5.0	67%
USARB	2.0	100%	4.0	100%
SKS	2.0	0%	2.0	0%
UofK	2.0	100%	5.0	150%
Average	**2.3**	**75%**	**3.2**	**65%**
4. Learning in connected networks				
INRA	2.0	100%	3.7	83%
IAV HASSAN II	2.0	100%	4.0	100%
SELECTIA	2.0	33%	2.7	33%
SAUM	2.0	100%	3.7	83%
USARB	2.0	100%	3.0	50%
AETTGD	2.0	100%	3.5	75%
SKS	2.0	0%	2.0	0%
UofK	2.0	100%	4.0	100%
Average	**2.0**	**79%**	**3.3**	**66%**
5. Using platforms, systems and processes for sharing knowledge and learning				
INRA	1.6	60%	3.0	88%
IAV HASSAN II	1.0	60%	2.4	140%
ONCA	1.0	100%	3.5	250%
CPIU-IFAD	2.0	100%	3.0	50%

Stakeholder Institution		Baseline KM maturity score	Percent of gaps Stakeholder reported a positive change	Endline KM maturity score	Percent change in KM maturity score
	SELECTIA	1.0	100%	3.0	200%
	SAUM	1.0	100%	3.0	200%
	AETTGD	1.0	100%	3.0	200%
	SKS	1.0	100%	4.0	300%
	UofK	1.0	100%	5.0	400%
	Average	**1.2**	**91%**	**3.3**	**203%**
6. Building internal capacity					
	INRA	1.0	100%	5.0	400%
	IAV HASSAN II	1.3	67%	3.0	125%
	CPIU-IFAD	1.0	100%	4.0	300%
	SELECTIA	1.3	100%	4.0	200%
	SAUM	1.3	67%	3.7	175%
	USARB	2.0	100%	5.0	150%
	AETTGD	2.0	0%	2.0	0%
	SKS	2.0	67%	3.7	83%
	UofK	2.0	100%	3.0	50%
	Average	**1.6**	**78%**	**3.7**	**165%**
7. Applying evidence and experience to policy engagement & programmes					
	INRA	1.5	100%	3.0	100%
	IAV HASSAN II	1.3	67%	2.7	100%
	ONCA	2.0	100%	4.0	100%
	CPIU-IFAD	1.5	100%	3.0	100%
	SELECTIA	1.3	67%	3.0	125%
	SAUM	1.3	100%	4.5	238%
	USARB	2.0	100%	3.5	75%
	AETTGD	1.0	50%	3.0	200%
	UofK	1.3	67%	2.7	100%
	Average	**1.5**	**83%**	**3.3**	**126%**
8. Engaging and learning with development partners					
	INRA	1.7	100%	4.0	140%
	IAV HASSAN II	2.0	100%	3.5	75%
	SELECTIA	1.7	33%	3.0	80%
	SAUM	1.7	100%	4.7	180%
	USARB	2.0	100%	4.0	100%
	AETTGD	2.0	100%	5.0	150%
	Average	**1.8**	**89%**	**4.0**	**121%**

Strengthening Knowledge Management for Greater Development Effectiveness in the Near East, North Africa, Central Asia and Europe (SKiM) is a grant project led by ICARDA and funded by IFAD. The project also works with international partners CIHEAM-Bari, PROCASUR, Virginia Tech as well as NARS, governments, and agricultural extension services in Moldova, Morocco and Sudan.

Initiated in June 2018, the project facilitates and supports KM and capacity development activities in the three selected countries and will provide practical examples of KM best practices that will be analysed and adopted by participating institutions. Increasing the capacities of participating public institutions, by providing necessary structures and systems at the country and regional levels, will ensure that knowledge can be effectively managed for long-term growth and development.

The project website (https://mel.cgiar.org/projects/SKIM) provides background information and describes the project team, partners and stakeholders engaged. The website also shares key documents including the project proposal, and outlines the goals, objectives and impact pathway of the project, as well as additional resources and information on news and events.

ICARDA
Science for resilient livelihoods in dry areas

IFAD
Investing in rural people

CIHEAM
BARI

Procasur

VT