CEN

WORKSHOP

AGREEMENT

CWA 14924-5

March 2004

ICS 03.100.99

English version

European Guide to good Practice in Knowledge Management - Part 5: KM Terminology

This CEN Workshop Agreement has been drafted and approved by a Workshop of representatives of interested parties, the constitution of which is indicated in the foreword of this Workshop Agreement.

The formal process followed by the Workshop in the development of this Workshop Agreement has been endorsed by the National Members of CEN but neither the National Members of CEN nor the CEN Management Centre can be held accountable for the technical content of this CEN Workshop Agreement or possible conflicts with standards or legislation.

This CEN Workshop Agreement can in no way be held as being an official standard developed by CEN and its Members.

This CEN Workshop Agreement is publicly available as a reference document from the CEN Members National Standard Bodies.

CEN members are the national standards bodies of Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and United Kingdom.

EUROPEAN COMMITTEE FOR STANDARDIZATION
COMITÉ EUROPÉEN DE NORMALISATION
EUROPÄISCHES KOMITEE FÜR NORMUNG

Management Centre: rue de Stassart, 36   B-1050 Brussels

Ref. No.:CWA 14924-5:2004 E

Contents

Foreword

This European Guide to Good Practice in Knowledge Management (KM) has been prepared by a Project Team reporting to the CEN Workshop on Knowledge Management in the period September 2002 till September 2003. The decision to produce this Guide in the form of a CEN Workshop Agreement was taken at the Workshop's Kick-Off meeting on 2003-06-24.

Reason for this guide

This guide aims to:

  (a) Provide European readers with a practical introduction to mainstream thinking in KM;
  (b) Give an indication of some of the emerging new thinking in KM;
  (c) Stimulate interested readers to join an ongoing public discussion about KM, which will be facilitated through the European Commission's KM portal at http://www.knowledgeboard.com/

The authors have therefore produced:

  (a) A discussion document to help readers develop their plans for getting started in KM;
  (b) A synthesis of good KM practices from around Europe – from the private and public sectors and from academia;
  (c) A reflection of their own experiences in KM;
  (d) An indication of some of the new thinking in this fast evolving field.

A fast track through this guide

The guide comprises five main booklets[1], published each as a CWA part, each of which can be read separately, although we would strongly recommend readers to consider these booklets as one integrated good practice guide, which can perhaps be best read in the following order:

1. KM Framework, which sets the overall context for KM at both the organizational and personal level; (CWA 14924-1)

2. Culture and KM, which explains to readers how to create the right cultural environment for introducing KM; (CWA 14924-2)

3. Implementing KM in Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises (SMEs), which provides a project management methodology to help SMEs (and other organizations) get started in KM; (CWA 14924-3)

4. Measuring KM, which helps organizations assess their progress in KM; (CWA 14924-4)

5. KM Terminology, which summarizes the key KM terms and concepts that readers will find useful when navigating through the guide. (CWA 14924-5)

These documents are therefore intended for employees, managers, directors or anyone else involved in a KM programme, within or between European organizations. The documents combine both desk and primary research and also offer a comparison of different models and case studies.

The document has been approved by a wide range of interests, representing the Knowledge Management community. The list of experts who formally supported the CWA's contents may be obtained from the CEN/ISSS Secretariat.

---

[1] Please see Annex A for the detailed terms of reference for each Work Item of this project.

Introduction

Why KM?

As organizations strive to improve their business performance and capacity for innovation, their attention is increasingly focused on how they manage knowledge.

Experience has shown that successful KM implementations in business settings prioritize attention on soft issues - including human and cultural aspects, personal motivations, change management methodologies, new and improved business processes enabling multidisciplinary knowledge sharing, communication and collaboration - and see technology as an enabler.

Despite this, most efforts so far at addressing the challenge of KM in business environments have typically taken a "technology-push" approach, concentrating major effort on putting in place IT tools that will "solve the knowledge creation, sharing and reuse problem".

Given this, it has been the objective of this guide to investigate those soft areas related to KM which can be the subject of common approaches, good practice identification or standardization initiatives, and to situate and describe these in the wider organizational context. The overall intention has been to provide meaningful and useful guidelines to companies, and notably SMEs (see below), as to how they might align their organizations culturally and socially to take advantage of the opportunities of knowledge sharing within and beyond their organizational boundaries.

These guidelines therefore take the form of a European Guide to Good Practice in KM which describes how to implement KM successfully within an organization, and lists the benefits awaiting those organizations that are able to do it. Through its soft, culturally focused approach, the guide aims to add value to other more technology-focussed initiatives underway within companies and standardization bodies. The overall result will be a greater complementary benefit for European companies, large and small.

In short we have aimed to identify and develop good practices which can be applied to all types of European businesses, including SMEs, to ensure that these organizations can be assisted as they seek to put in place the cultural, human and environmental ecology necessary to take full advantage of their collective knowledge as they do business in the knowledge economy.

Why KM in SMEs?

Owners and managers of SMEs differ in what they term success. Survival and continuity, profit, return on capital employed, numbers of employees and customers, pride in product, skills and service, employment for family members, and enjoyable work life, are frequently mentioned criteria.

Knowledge will tend to play a more significant role whenever change, innovation and growth are being pursued in a competitive and complex field. Some identified KM routes to success have been through the following:

- Being adaptive to the business environment you are in
- Having a special group of customers; we may learn a lot from leading customers and from companies with a good innovation record
- Sticking to a small niche that others do not want to contest
- Benefiting from local monopolistic circumstances
- Addressing inertia/lack of information among the customer base
- Creating a stable technology infrastructure over a long period of time
- Maximizing the profitability of the activity
- Capable management with a good development process supporting them
- Loyal and capable workforce
- Being responsive to customers' needs and requirements.

For the SME these simple steps can provide substantial benefit:

Although extended knowledge locations and flows are obvious in larger organizations, why is a KM approach especially important in the SME? Reasons are as follows:

- Knowledge in SMEs tends to be tacit/informal/not recorded
- Know-how in SMEs may not be valued as highly as it might be
- Lack of know-how may be hard to talk about in SMEs
- Short-term approaches to knowledge gaps may work sufficiently to make change appear unnecessary
- Know-how in an SME may easily be lost or fragmented when the owner sells the business or retires.

1   Scope

This document forms booklet five of the European Guide to Good Practice in Knowledge Management (KM), which is published as a CEN Workshop agreement.

This booklet covers the core KM terminology that European private and public sector executives, particularly in small and medium size enterprises (SMEs) will need to know in order to have a proper understanding of KM.

Readers can benefit from the content of this booklet alone, but we strongly recommend that they actually read this document along with the other booklets in the guide (all of which are complementary and cross-referenced), namely:

Booklet 1 Framework

Booklet 2 Culture

Booklet 3 SME Implementation

Booklet 4 Measurement

2 Glossary of Terms

N°	TERMS
1	Best/Good Practices
2	Chief Knowledge Officer (CKO)
3	Community of Practice (CoP)
4	Core Competences
5	Customer Capital
6	Data
7	Explicit Knowledge
8	Human Capital
9	Information
10	Information Management
11	Intangible Assets
12	Intellectual Capital
13	Knowledge
14	Knowledge Audit
15	Knowledge Based Economy
16	Knowledge Management (KM)
17	KM Framework
18	KM Life Cycle
19	KM Measurement
20	KM Roles
21	KM Strategy
22	KM Tools
23	Learning Organization

N°	TERMS
24	Narrative Techniques
25	Organizational Culture
26	Organizational KM
27	Personal KM
28	Structural Capital
29	Tacit Knowledge
30	Taxonomy

3 Definitions

1. **Best/Good Practices:** KM practices that have produced outstanding results in other situations, inside or outside of a particular organization and which can be validated, codified and shared with others and recommended as models to follow.

2. **Chief Knowledge Officer (CKO):** The individual with overall leadership of KM in an organization. Typically, the CKO will articulate and champion the KM vision, provide leadership for implementing and sustaining KM initiatives, and has the ultimate responsibility for knowledge creation, sharing and application.

3. **Community of Practice (CoP):** Informal, self-organized, collaboration of people, within or between organizations, who share common practices, interests or aims. When the CoP proves useful to its members over time, they may formalize its status by adopting a group name and a regular system of interchange through enabling tools. (Other types of KM communities include Communities of Interest and Communities of Purpose).

4. **Core Competences:** The set of skills, experience and attributes recognized by an organization as critical to their success in KM. – for example: information literacy, a sharing culture etc.

5. **Customer Capital**: Refers to the value of an organization's network of satisfied clients, and their loyalty to the organization.

6. **Data:** Discrete, objective facts (numbers, symbols, figures) without context and interpretation.

7. **Explicit Knowledge:** Individual and collective knowledge that has been codified, typically in objects, words, and numbers, in the form of graphics, drawings, specifications, manuals, procedures etc. and can therefore be easily shared and understood.

8. **Human Capital:** Describes the value of the know-how and competencies of an organization's employees. An organization which systematically develops its Human Capital is more likely to become a successful learning organization (see definition 23).

9. **Information:** Is based on data, and adds value to the understanding of a subject and in context, is the basis for knowledge.

10. **Information Management:** Covers the processes of selecting, capturing, categorizing, indexing and storing information. Typically this involves active and continuous review of content stored in, or distributed through a range of tools (databases, taxonomies (see definition 30), human networks etc).

11. **Intangible Assets:** Assets that can have a great value to an organization, but which typically have no physical presence and have traditionally not been recognized from a financial perspective, except when sometimes grouped together as "goodwill" on balance sheets. Comprises assets such as reputation, brand value, monopoly rights and other non-balance sheet items such as "potential" –i.e. the capacity to generate competitive advantage in the future.

12. **Intellectual Capital:** Intellectual Capital (IC), a subset of the intangible assets (see definition 11) is commonly accepted to include three sub-categories: Human Capital, Structural Capital, Customer Capital (see definitions [8, 28 and 5 respectively). IC can include the knowledge of employees, data and information about processes, experts, products, customers and competitors; and intellectual property such as patents or regulatory licenses.

13. **Knowledge:** A set of data and information (when seen from an Information Technology point of view), and a combination of, for example know-how, experience, emotion, believes, values, ideas, intuition, curiosity, motivation, learning styles, attitude, ability to trust, ability to deal with complexity, ability to synthesize, openness, networking skills, communication skills, attitude to risk and entrepreneurial spirit to result in a valuable asset which can be used to improve the capacity to act and support decision making. Knowledge may be explicit and/or tacit (see definitions 7 and 29 respectively), individual and/or collective.

14. **Knowledge Audit:** A systematic review, typically based on questionnaires, interviews or narrative techniques, of the knowledge within an organization. Often also includes a mapping of knowledge interactions and flows within and between organizations, teams and individuals.

15. **Knowledge-Based Economy**: A recently coined term that refers to the stage of economic evolution in which knowledge is considered as the key factor of production

and competitiveness. This major change has significant implications for the strategy, operations, and structure of all types of organization, large or small, public or private, commercial, not-for-profit or academic.

16. **Knowledge Management (KM):** Planned and ongoing management of activities and processes for leveraging knowledge to enhance competitiveness through better use and creation of individual and collective knowledge resources.

17. **KM Framework:** Describes the most essential factors (assets, people, processes, tools) influencing the success or failure of a KM initiative, and their interdependent relationships. Typically, a framework is built up into a pictorial representation which serves as an *aide-memoire* for implementing KM within an organization, helping users to position individual KM initiatives with within a wider context (see also booklet 1 of this CEN guide).

18. **Knowledge Life Cycle:** Describes the principle phases of managing knowledge, such as selecting, maintaining, measuring, sharing and applying knowledge in given contexts.

19. **KM Measurement:** One of the KM life cycle phases (see definition 18) Aims to help organizations measure the value created by their KM projects, programmes and strategies. For example, measuring return on investment in KM is often possible through a range of both quantitative and qualitative techniques (see also booklet 4 of this CEN guide).

20. **KM Roles:** To implement KM successfully sometimes requires specific and clearly-defined roles. These are not always formal, but can include such roles as CKO (see definition 2), content managers, change management experts, knowledge brokers and harvesters etc.

21. **KM Strategy:** A declaration of how the organization will use KM methods, tools, processes, and practices to achieve business objectives by leveraging its content, people and processes and how KM will support the organization's overall strategy.

22. **KM Tools:** The generic sets of tools that enable implementation of KM processes. These can be either IT systems (e.g. databases, intranets, extranets, portals), or methodologies, or human networks (e.g. CoPs – see definition 3).

23. **Learning Organization:** An organization that views its future competitive advantage as based on continuous learning and use of knowledge and an ability to adapt its behaviour to changing circumstances.

24. **Narrative Techniques**: Techniques employed in the context of KM to describe complicated issues, explain events, communicate lessons learned, or bring about cultural change (see also booklet 2 of this CEN guide). Such techniques include oral story-telling, drama and some styles of written knowledge capture., which can richness to communication and carry more complex messages and sub-text than non-narrative techniques.

25. **Organizational Culture:** The way of perceiving, thinking and feeling, shared and transmitted among organizational members. Often referred to as: "the way things are done around here" (see also booklet 2 of this CEN guide).

26. **Organizational KM:** Unlike personal KM (see definition 27), which centres on the individual, organizational KM depends upon an enterprise-wide strategic decision to actively manage knowledge through a range of processes, tools and people.

27. **Personal KM:** A set of concepts, disciplines and tools for organizing often previously unstructured knowledge, to help individuals take responsibility for what they know and who they know.

28. **Structural Capital**: Describes the knowledge that has been captured and institutionalised within the structure, processes and culture of an organization. SC is a subset of explicit knowledge (see definition 7). It could include patents, copyrights, proprietary software, trademarks, trade secrets etc. It can be stored in the form of documented procedures, databases, expert systems, decision-support software and KM systems. SC is everything left at the office when the employees go home, and can clearly be regarded as an organization's property.

29. **Tacit Knowledge:** Tacit knowledge (sometimes also called implicit knowledge) consists of mental models, behaviours and perspectives, largely based on experience. This knowledge is difficult to codify, but KM techniques such as learning by doing or collaboration between communities (see definition 3) can help people to share this knowledge.

30. **Taxonomy:** An outcome from knowledge mapping and structuring processes. A taxonomy is a hierarchical classification which helps users understand how explicit knowledge can be grouped and categorized. A good taxonomy helps users of knowledge by improving their search and retrieval experiences.

4   Related websites

Readers who wish to find out more about the terms in this booklet and further KM terms are recommended to visit the following websites.

http://www.brint.com/km/

http://www.knowledgeboard.com/community/zones/fs.html

http://www.kit.nl/specials/html/km_glossary.asp#Top

http://www.knowledgepoint.com.au/starting_out/glossary.htm

http://www.metainnovation.com/researchcenter/GKEC_term_draft_Sept072001.pdf

http://www.ey.com/knowledge/glossary.htm

http://www.library.ualberta.ca/subject/knowledgemanagement/index.cfm

http://www.metainnovation.com/researchcenter/GKEC_term_draft_Sept072001.pdf.

http://jackvinson.com/archives/000051.html

http://www.tfpl.com/resources/glossary.cfm

http://www.icasit.org/km/intro/glossary.htm

http://www.centricminds.com/public/company/resources/glossary_of_terms.asp

 http://www.wolfson.ox.ac.uk/~floridi/13_term0.htm

http://www.kmtool.net/vocabulary.htm

http://sims.berkeley.edu/courses/is213/s99/Projects/P9/web_site/glossary.htm

http://www.cs.state.ny.us/successionplanning/workgroups/knowledgemanagement/terminology.html

http://www.soberit.hut.fi/wise/

http://www.nelh.nhs.uk/knowledge_management/glossary/glossary.asp

http://www.intelligentkm.com/feature/06/SideBar2.shtml

5 Appendix 1: Description of the process

The process for preparing this booklet on KM terminology began in October 2002 through a call for inputs on KnowledgeBoard (http://www.knowledgeboard.com/), which is the European Commission's public KM portal.

This led to the Project Team (PT) carrying out a first analysis of 50 terms among 324 collected from various submissions. Next step was a first telephone meeting, which resulted in a widening of our search to include existing KM glossaries in the public domain, and included:

- inputs from all over the world;

- systematic analysis of the KM terms on KnowledgeBoard, through the use of a "data mining" tool;

- systematic analysis of 1200 KM-related papers that had been published in international academic journals.

From this process, the PT arrived at a first shortlist of the 34 most widely used KM terms.

The next step was an open working meeting in Paris, on 3 December 2002, resulting in:

- a further shortlisting to 28 core terms;

- a mapping process that led to a structuring of the terms and their relationships (subordinate or core terms).

- structuring the glossary as an ontology (structured terminology);

- a first projection of the short-listed terms into four types – i.e. Asset, Tool, People and Process;

- subsequent circulation of the revised list between the PT leaders, inviting further comments.

The process was further refined through two further telephone meetings and then, on 16 January 2003, a second PT leader meeting in Brussels, where progress to date was presented and where the following next steps were agreed.

- build a questionnaire for the wider CEN workshop, which would invite their comments on the short-listed terms;

- request further inputs from the wider CEN workshop;

- collect the questionnaire results;

- analyse the results.

These steps were carried out and then a second open workshop was held in Brussels on 5 February 2003, which resulted in:

- a review and consolidation of revised glossary;

- a qualitative analysis of the responses to the questionnaire.

This was immediately followed by the next CEN wider workshop, in Brussels on 6 February 2003, where the PT:

- presented an overview of the process above and the results to date

- invited further wide contributions for the glossary

- disseminated the current list and definitions received

- decided to hold a further open workshop in April 2003.

Agreed upon some active actions for dissemination and discussion of the additional terms in the list that users had not validated by a wide majority, using the European KM forum "Theme 4 : "KM made in Europe – 30 terms for 30 countries."

This was followed by a voting process on KnowledgeBoard (http://www.knowledgeBoard.com), the results of which were used to update and consolidate the glossary.

On March 30th 2003, a second draft was circulated to the workshop, inviting comments and feedback. The editing of this incoming feedback and comments led to a third version of the glossary by the end of April.

On May 13th 2003 we obtained some additional inputs from the wider CEN workshop and from the other work items, and started to really integrate and consolidate the concepts developed in the glossary with all the other chapters of the guide (Framework, Culture etc.).
At the end of May 2003, an open online meeting, hosted by the EU's theme IV (dedicated to terminology and ontologies) was conducted. This meeting validated the approach that we had followed.

The next edition of the glossary (Version 1.0) was made ready for dissemination on 15th June 2003.

We then again collected comments from the wider workshop. These comments related to the definitions we had provided. Most of the ideas that were fed back to us were accepted and incorporated, unless the team had a good reason for not accepting them (e.g. if they were not in line with our overall process).

The next, pre-final edition of the glossary (2.0) was circulated for review by the wider workshop on 15th September and then discussed at the final wider workshop meeting on 29th September 2003.

The final version – incorporating final corrections (3.0) was brought together in mid-November. This version is now known as Booklet 5 – Terminology, in the overall CEN guide to KM good practice.

6   Appendix 2: References

Booklet 1: Framework

Heisig, P., Vorbeck, J. (2001): Benchmarking Survey Results. In: Mertins, K., Heisig, P., Vorbeck, J. (Eds.): Knowledge Management. Best Practice in Europe. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 1st. Ed., p. 97-123

Probst, G.J.B. (2002): Putting knowledge to work: Case-writing as a knowledge management and organizational learning tool. In: Davenport, Th.; Probst, G.J.B. (Eds.): Knowledge Management Case Book. Best Practices. Erlangen: Publicis and Wiley, 2nd. Edition, p. 312-323

Booklet 2: Culture

Allan, N et al (2003), Managing Culture and Knowledge: A Guide to Good Practice, PD7501, BSI Publications, London

Allan. N., (2003), The Unspoken World-how Behaviour affects KM, Business Excellence Australia, Sydney

Bloom, B. S., (1956), Taxonomy of Educational Objectives

Cross, R. & Prusak, L. (2002), ThePeople who make Organizations Go or Stop, Harvard Business Review, June 1 2002

De Long, D. & Fahey, L., (2000) Diagnóstico de las Barreras Culturales frente a la Gestión del Conocimiento, Academy of Management Exectuive Volume 14, nº 4

Gelfand. M.J. & McCuske, M. (2002) Metaphor and the Culture of Negotiation in Handbook of Cross Cultural Management ed. Gannon & Newman, Blackwell, Oxford

Hampden-Turner, C. & Trompenaars, F., (2000), Building Cross-cultural Competence, Wiley, Chichester

Janis, I., (1982) Groupthink, Houghton Mifflin, Boston

Jones, S., (1996), Developing a Learning Culture, McGraw-Hill, Maidenhead

Kelleher, D., & Levene, S., (2001), Knowledge Management: A Guide to Good Practice, PAS 2001, BSI Publications, London

Lawson, E., & Price, C., (2003), The Psychology of Change Management, MCKinsey Quarterly 2003, number 2

Luhmann, (1979), Trust & Power, Wiley, NY

Mayer, R.C., James, H. & Schooman, F.D., (1995), An Integrative Model of Organizational Trust, Academy of Management review, vol 20, i3, pp 709-734

Neuhauser, P.C. (1993), Corporate Legends and Lore, McGraw Hill, New York

Nonaka, I. & Takeuchi, H., (1995) The Knowledge-creating Company, OUP, New York

Prahalad, C.K. & Hamel, G. (1990). The core competence of the corporation. Harvard Business Review, 68, May-June, pp 79-91.

Sathe, V., (1985) Culture and Related Corporate Realities., Richmond and Irwin, Homewood, Illinois

Schein, E.H., (1985) Organizational Culture and Leadership, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco

Schein, E.H. (1999) The Corporate Culture Survival Guide, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco

Senge, P., Kleiner, A., Roberts, C, Ross, R., Roth, G. & Smith, B (1999) The Dance of Change, Nicholas Brealey, London

Wenger, E., (1998), Communities of Practice, CUP, Cambridge

Booklet 3: SME Implementation

Alfeis, Kingma (2003), Holsappel, C. (ed.): Handbook of KM. Vol. 2, Springer, Berlin, p. 443-446

APQC (1996,) American Productivity and Quality Center: KM. Consortium Benchmarking Study. Final Report. Houston 1996

BTW (2003), Bildungswerk der Thüringer Wirtschaft e.V. (Hrsg.): Wissensmanagement in Kleinunternehmen, Teil 2: Ansätze, Methoden und Instrumente. Reihe: Aus der Praxis für die Praxis. 2003

Bukowitz, Williams (1999): Bukowitz, W. R., Williams, R. L. (1999): The KM fieldbook. Financial Times Prentice Hall, London

Davenport/Prusak (2000), Davenport, T.H.; Prusak, L.: Working Knowledge – How Organizations manage what they know. Harvard Business School Press. 2000

Ehms, Langen (2002), Ehms, K., Langen. M. (2002): Holistic Development of KM with KMMM ®. Cited 01-20-2003, http://www.knowledgeboard. com/doclibrary/knowledgeboard/kmmm_article_siemens_2002

Hansen et al. (1999), Hansen, M.T., Nohria, N., Tierney, T. (1999): What's your Strategy for KM. In: Harvard Business Review, March-April, 106-116

Hofer-Alfeis, van der Spek (2003), Hofer-Alfeis, J., Spek, R. Van der (2003): The Knowledge Strategy Process – an instrument for business owners. In: NN: p. 22 – 37

IDWK (2002), Institut der deutschen Wirtschaft Köln (Hrsg.) Handlungsanleitung zur Einführung von Wissensmanagement in Kleinen und Mittleren Unternehmen. 2002

Liebowitz et al. (2000), Liebowitz, J., Rubenstein-Montano, B., McCaw, D. (2000): The Knowledge Audit. In: Knowledge and Process Management 7, (1), 3-10

Mertins et al.(2001), Mertins, K., Heisig, P., Vorbeck, J. (eds.): KM. Best Practice in Europe. Berlin, Barcelona, London, Milan, Paris 2001, 1. Edition

Mertins, Heisig et al. (2003), Mertins, K., Heisig, P., Finke, I., Ulbrich, Ch. (2003): The Fraunhofer KM Audit (FKM-Audit). In: Mertins, K.; Heisig, P.; Vorbeck, J. (Eds.): KM. Concepts and Best Practices. Berlin, Heidelberg, London, Milan, Paris: Springer-Verlag, 2nd. Edition, p. 47-56

Pfeifer et al. (2000), Pfeifer, T., Remmert, C., Lorenzi, P.(2000): Wissen verbindet - Wissensaudits als Schlüssel zum Wissensmanagement. in: Qualität und Zuverlässigkeit, issue 10/2000, p. 1275

Probst et al. (1998), Probst, G.; Raub, S.; Romhardt, K.: Wissen managen – Wie Unternehmen ihre wertvollste Resource optimal nutzen. 2. Auflage. Frankfurt am Main: Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung; Wiesbaden: Gabler, 1998

Roehl (2000), Roehl, H. (2000): Instrumente der Wissensorganisation. Perspektiven für eine differenzierende Interventionspraxis. Wiesbaden: Deutscher Universitäts-Verlag; Gabler.

v.d.Spek, Hofer- Spek, R. Van der, Hofer-Alfeis, J., Kingma, J.(2003): The Knowledge Strategy Process S. In

Weggemann (1998), Weggeman, M. (1998): Kenntnismanagement. Inrichtig en besturing van kennisintensieve organisaties. Scrptum, Schiedom German: Wissensmanagement – Der richtige Umgang mit der wichtigsten Ressource des Unternehmens. MITP-Verlag, Bonn 1999

WK (2000), Wuppertaler Kreis e.V. (Hrsg.): Wissensmanagement in mittelständischen Unternehmen – Ein Leitfaden. Dt. Wirtschaftsdienst., 2000

Booklet 4: Measurements

Armstrong, D.M. (1999) "Managing by storying around." ISBN 0-385-42709-3

Clemmons Rumizen, M. (2002) "The complete idiot's guide to KM". Madison, WI: CWL Publishing Enterprises, 2002

Damodaran, A (2001), "The Dark Side of Valuation.", Financial Times Prentice Hall; 1st edition (February 15, 2001) ISBN: 013040652X

Danish Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation (2003), "IC Statements
– The New Guideline", ISBN: 87- 91258 – 50 – 2, http:/www.vtu.dk/icaccounts

EKMF (2003), European KM Forum Report D2.2. "KM Assessment Model and Tool".
EKMF_D22_v05_2003_02_07_IAT.doc

Iske, P. and Boekhoff, T. (2001) "The value of Knowledge doesn't exist". KM Magazine, Volume 5, Issue 2, 2001

Kelleher, D, Courtney, N. (2003), PD 7502 Measurements in Knowledge Management: Guide to Good Practice, British Standards Institution, July 2003

Luehrman, T. A. (1997), "What's It Worth?: A General Manager's Guide to Valuation." Harvard Business Review, May-June 1997, pp. 132-142

Patton, M.Q. (2002). "Evaluation, KM, Best Practices, and high quality Lessons Learned". American Journal of Evaluation. Volume 22, N03, pp 329—336, 2001

Pulic, A, (2000) "An Accounting Tool for IC Management",http://www.measuring-ip.at/Papers/ham99txt.htm

Annex A:
Work Items as described in the CEN/ISSS Workshop Business Plan

Work Item I - Terminology

Scope: One of the main challenges in KM is to define clearly the terms and concepts involved. Organizations throughout Europe, and notably SMEs, would benefit greatly from a commonly accepted set of terms and definitions for KM.

Approach: Numerous definitions of key terms already exist in the published literature. This work item will therefore not choose to reinvent the wheel but rather to simply repackage those existing terms and definitions that are considered most relevant to the objectives of the Workshop. The result will be a European KM Glossary comprising 30 core terms and definitions in KM, along with their related translations into other European languages. This glossary will include terms relating to all areas covered by the Workshop – from framework, through metrics and measurement, to implementation and organizational culture. The glossary will be of significant practical relevance to SMEs as they exchange views and know-how in the domain of KM.

Deliverables: A European KM Glossary of 30 terms and definitions in KM, with translations into official languages of the European Union and EFTA.

Work Item II - Framework

Scope: Successful KM is a balancing act. While experience has shown that socio-cultural issues are often the most difficult to tackle, it is equally important to keep in mind the "bigger picture" – the wider economic, technological and structural issues facing the company as it strives to innovate faster and within which any corporate KM initiative inevitably takes place. The aim of this work item is to provide a holistic framework, capable of future evolution and adaptation, for KM implementation within and amongst organizations throughout Europe, and notably in SMEs, by referring to diverse viewpoints – for example economic, socio-technical, techno-structural and socio-organizational. The work will address issues relating to organizational performance, added value, economic and financial criteria, interactions between information systems and individuals and between information systems and the organization (missions, structure, processes and relationship networks). It will also address socio-organizational issues including legal issues, leadership, power distribution, management styles, knowledge sharing, incentive and reward systems, professional culture, ethics and values. One would hope that through consideration of such a framework, socio-culturally-driven KM efforts could be sure to achieve balanced results anchored in a rigorous and holistic analysis of the organizational context.

Approach: Many interesting and applicable frameworks exist in Europe and elsewhere. The focus of this work will be on identifying a framework (or set of frameworks), which is meaningful and practical to European business organizations, and notably to SMEs. This framework will provide a reference basis for decisions about the application of KM in a variety of business settings.

Deliverables: A European KM Framework which acts as a meaningful and practical guide to the context of KM initiatives - economic, technical, structural, socio-cultural - within the enterprise, and the interplay between these elements.

Work Item III - Measurement and Metrics

Scope: As companies focus on knowledge as a core organizational asset, a number of critical questions are raised concerning how best to measure and track organizational performance in this new knowledge paradigm, and how best to measure the impact of KM initiatives on business. These are not trivial questions. In order to start on the KM journey, business leaders need to know how applying KM might improve company performance, and how it might lead to faster and better innovation. Once a KM initiative has been launched, it is equally important to track the impact of this initiative and to find ways to measure results.

Approach: Many existing KM measurement and metrics guidelines exist in Europe and elsewhere. This work item will identify a commonly agreed set of key metrics and measurements which have demonstrated their ability to assist knowledge managers and business leaders in assessing improvements in organizational performance as a result of KM. Consideration will be given to describing what to measure, and how, why and when to measure it. Emphasis will be given to measuring results but also to measuring the process by which the results are achieved. Consideration will also be given to assisting managers (notably from SMEs) in deciding what is important to measure in their specific business settings.

Deliverables: A Guide to KM Measurement and Metrics, comprising a set of measurements and metrics which can be considered as good practices and can be applied in European organizations both strategically and operationally. The deliverable will include a Measurement Top 10 section, which will allow knowledge managers and business leaders, notably in SMEs, to kick start their measurement activities with a subset of the most widely used and generically applicable measures. The outcome of this work item should also provide assistance to help knowledge managers and business leaders to decide what is important to their business and how to measure it.

Work Item IV - Implementation in European SMEs

Scope: Throughout Europe, SMEs and SME communities are refocusing their activities to collaborate and compete through knowledge. This work item will assist SMEs and SME communities in identifying their readiness for KM, building the business case for KM, identifying and motivating key players, implementing KM successfully within and across their organizational boundaries and networks, and measuring the results of their efforts The work proposed is considered vital in stimulating take-up and broad adoption of KM practices in European SMEs.

Approach: At a generic level, the work will identify and/or develop guidelines, checklists, questions and answers, models, methodologies and tools based on common needs. It will also attempt to identify items that are partly customisable to meet specific business requirements and needs, particularly of fast-growing companies. Work will build on currently available guides to good practice, lessons learned, problem solving histories and experiences, and input provided by SME representatives. The result will be a sound, validated, easy to understand, easy to use and step-by-step guide to successful KM implementation in diverse SME environments.

Deliverables: A Guide to Successful KM Implementation in SMEs comprising (but not necessarily limited to) sections on:

- European maturity grid(s) which can be used by SMEs and SME communities to position themselves with respect to their AS IS status and TO BE targets as "knowledge-based organizations"
- Generic principles, methodologies, good practices, awareness raising and training materials designed to enable SMEs to progress on their journey to successful KM
- Measurement guidelines which will enable SME managers to assess the impact of their KM journey on the organizational competitiveness, and to understand the true impact of their KM activities on their business (taking due account of the activities in work item 3)

- A technology section addressing the specific needs of SMEs in the design of the information and communication technology infrastructure of their organizations, supply chains and communities as they move forward to implement new knowledge sharing and creation opportunities for their businesses
- A set of case studies and stories reflecting experiences and lessons learned by SMEs on the KM journey.

Work Item V - Organizational Culture

Scope: The success of any KM initiative is dependant upon an environment which motivates people to communicate, collaborate, innovate, take risks, and share and re-use knowledge. Equally important are appropriate skills, competences and behaviours. The aim of this work item is to guide people at all levels, and in all types of organizations, on how best to use themselves, and their relationships with other people, to manage knowledge well. Fundamentals like values, trust, beliefs and organizational politics dictate success or failure of KM interventions, so to add real value the KM initiative must address appropriately the existing corporate culture and sub-cultures. This means using social processes and organizational structures (including self-forming groups) that facilitate the conversion of information to knowledge, and the sharing, distribution and creation of knowledge. Other social processes like change management, managing complexity and "slow management", communities of practice/interest, organizational learning, narrative, visioning etc. that are important in KM interventions, will also be included in the work. Finally, technology impacts on culture change and can promote or frustrate KM interventions. Therefore it is proposed to address the issue of how to use technology to drive KM effectively.

Approach: Organizational Culture has already been addressed in a number of fora in European and elsewhere. The work will build on existing work to identify a set of practical guidelines to help knowledge managers and business leaders to tackle the difficult organizational and cultural issues around KM. The work will, where appropriate, be populated with short case studies, stories, lessons learned and experiences that illustrate in simple language the points being made.

Deliverables: A Guide to Organizational Culture & KM comprising (but not necessarily limited to) sections on: Achieving buy-in by Top Management, Selling KM to the Organization, KM and Organizational Learning, Change Management in Practice, Motivating Knowledge Workers and the Organization to achieve its Objectives, Relating KM Interventions to Existing Cultures, Using Communities Effectively, Using Technology to Drive KM, Effectively, identifying and developing and improving appropriate skills, competences and behaviours.

Annex B:
Bibliography

Booklet 2: Culture

Readers who wish to find out more about the Culture in the context of KM are recommended to consult the following publications:

Armutat, S. et al, (2000), Wissensmanagement erfolgreich einfuren. Stategien, Instrumente, Praxisbeispiele, Deutsche Gesellshaft fur Personelfahrung mbH, Dusseldorf

Skyrme, D.J. & Amidon, D.M., (1997), Creating the Knowledge-based Business, Business Intelligence, London

Steers. R. & Sanchez-Runde. C., (2002) Culture. Motivation & Work Behaviour in Handbook of Cross Cultural Management ed. Gannon & Newman, Blackwell, Oxford

Pheysey, D.C., (1993), Organizational Cultures Types and Transformations, Routledge, London

Goffee, R. & Jones, G. (2000), The Character of the Corporation, HarperCollins Business, London

Houston, R., (2002), The Organizational Change Audit, Cambridge Strategy Publications, Cambridge

Harris, K., (1998), Cultural Framework for KM, Gartner Group

Skyrme, D & Amidon, D., (1997) Creating the Knowledge-Based Business

Sveiby, K E. (1997), The New Organizational Wealth, Berrett-Koehler, San Francisco

Pendlebury, J. Grouard, B. & Mestin, F. (1998), The Ten Keys to Successful Change Management Wiley, Chichester

Sparrow, J. Ed (2000), Case Studies of the Development of Knowledge Management Capability in Small Firms, Knowledge Management Centre UCE, Birmingham

Booklet 4: Measurements

Readers who wish to find out more about the Measurement in the context of KM are recommended to consult the following publications and websites:

Allee, V, 1997, The Knowledge Evolution: Expanding Organizational Intelligence, Butterworth-Heinemann

Allee, V, 2002 The Future of Knowledge: Increasing Prosperity through Value Networks, Butterworth-Heinemann

Amidon, Debra M., The Innovation Superhighway: Harnessing IC for Collaborative Advantage, Butterworth Heinemann, 2002, 416 pages (ISBN: 0750675926)

Brooking, Annie, IC: Core Asset for the Third Millennium Enterprise, International Thomson Business Press, London, 1996, 204 pages, (ISBN: 1-861-520234).

Caldwell, F., Measuring the Success of Enterprise KM, Gartner Group, 13 December 2000 – http://www.gartner.com/

Caldwell, F., Weathering An Economic Downturn on KM, Gartner Group, 11 December 2000 – http://www.gartner.com/

Chatzkel, Jay, Intellectual Capital, Capstone Publishing, London, 2002,118 pages (ISBN: 1-84112-256-4)

Choo, Chun Wei, and Bontis, Nick (Editors), The Strategic Management of IC and Organizational Knowledge, Oxford University Press, 2002, 880 pages (ISBN: 019513866X)

Davidson, C., Voss, P, 2002, KM: An Introduction to Creating Competitive Advantage from IC, Tandem Press

Davis, Julie L., and Harrison, Suzanne S., Edison in the Boardroom: How Leading Companies Realize Value from Their Intellectual Assets, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 2001, 224 pages (ISBN: 0471397369).

Dixon, Nancy, Common Knowledge - How Companies Thrive by Sharing What They Know,

Harvard Business School Press, 2000

Edvinsson, Leif, and Malone, Michael, IC: Realizing Your Company's True Value by Finding Its Hidden Brainpower, Harper Business, New York, 1997

Fruin, W. Mark, Knowledge Works: Managing IC at Toshiba, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 256 pages, 1997, (ISBN: 0

Harris, K., Gartner Group, KM - What's In It For Me?, 3 August 1999 2000 – http://www.gartner.com/

Hudson, William J., IC, How to Build It, Enhance It, Use It, John Wiley, 1993.

McGovern, Gerry, Nua, Rewarding Knowledge Workers, http://www.clickZ.com, 13 September 2000

Roos, Johan et al., IC: Navigating in the New Business Landscape, Macmillan, 1997, (ISBN: 0-333-69479-1)

Skyrme, David, Measuring the Value of Knowledge: Metrics for the Knowledge-Based Business, Business Intelligence, London, 1998, (ISBN: 1-898085-39-0).

Sveiby, Karl Erik, The New Organizational Wealth: Managing & Measuring Knowledge-Based Assets, Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco, 220 pages, 1997, (ISBN: 1-57675-014-0).

Thurow, Lester C., Building Wealth: The New Rules for Individuals, Companies and Nations in a Knowledge

Tsui, Erik, KM bibliography, http://www.knowledgeboard.com/item/83938

Wright, Paul, "Reward and KM - When Saying Thank You Can Make All The Difference", KM Review, September 1998

http://www.issco.unige.ch
http://www.infomotions.com/
http://www.creatingthe21stcentury.org
http://www.undp.org/
http://infolink.schoolnet.org.za/
http://www.ucalgary.ca/
http://www.denaliassociates.com/
http://www.collaboration-tools.com/
http://www.metakm.com/
http://www.findarticles.com/
http://www.intelligentkm.com/
http://www.capsnap.co.uk/
http://www.knocom.com/
http://www.oclc.org/
http://www.icfconsulting.com/
http://www.ovum.com/
http://www.knowinc.com/
http://www.dalesoft.org.uk/
http://knowledgemanagement.ittoolbox.com/
http://www.kmtool.net/
http://www.fit.fraunhofer.de/
http://www.brint.com/
http://www.cabi.org/
http://www.strategy-software.com/
http://www.csu.edu.au/
http://www.steptwo.com.au/
http://www.valuebasedmanagement.net/methods_skandianavigator.html
http://knowledgemanagement.ittoolbox.com/
http://www.du.edu/

http://www.delphigroup.com/events/
http://www.bellanet.org/gkaims/
http://www-edc.eng.cam.ac.uk/
http://www.bus.utexas.edu/
http://www.cepro.se/
http://www.lotus.com/
http://www.inmagic.com/
http://www.pcd-innovations.com/
http://www.mriresearch.org/
http://www.ifad.org/
http://www.qinetiq.com/
http://www.mitre.org/
http://www.darwinmag.com/
http://www-wi.informatik.uni-oldenburg.de/
http://jhmcis.jhmi.edu/
http://www.avon.nhs.uk/
http://www.ogc.gov.uk/
http://www.dlib.org/
http://www.ukoln.ac.uk/
http://www.idea-group.com/
http://www.atob.com.au/
http://www.corma.net/
http://www.entopia.com/
http://www.csc.com/
http://www.isys.com.au/
http://www.mgen.com/news/press/
http://www.isiwebofknowledge.com/
http://www.navigateone.com/
http://www.ed.gov/
http://wbln0018.worldbank.org/
http://www.vaic-on.net

www.technowledgement.com

Booklet 5: Glossary

Readers who wish to find out more about the terms in this booklet and further KM terms are recommended to visit the following websites:

http://www.brint.com/km/

http://www.knowledgeboard.com/community/zones/fs.html

http://www.kit.nl/specials/html/km_glossary.asp#Top

http://www.knowledgepoint.com.au/starting_out/glossary.htm

http://www.metainnovation.com/researchcenter/GKEC_term_draft_Sept072001.pdf

http://www.ey.com/knowledge/glossary.htm

http://www.library.ualberta.ca/subject/knowledgemanagement/index.cfm

http://www.metainnovation.com/researchcenter/GKEC_term_draft_Sept072001.pdf.

http://jackvinson.com/archives/000051.html

http://www.tfpl.com/resources/glossary.cfm

http://www.icasit.org/km/intro/glossary.htm

http://www.centricminds.com/public/company/resources/glossary_of_terms.asp

 http://www.wolfson.ox.ac.uk/~floridi/13_term0.htm

http://www.kmtool.net/vocabulary.htm

http://sims.berkeley.edu/courses/is213/s99/Projects/P9/web_site/glossary.htm

http://www.cs.state.ny.us/successionplanning/workgroups/knowledgemanagement/terminology.html

http://www.soberit.hut.fi/wise/

http://www.nelh.nhs.uk/knowledge_management/glossary/glossary.asp

http://www.intelligentkm.com/feature/06/SideBar2.shtml

Annex C:
Acknowledgements

Contributor list for KM workshop as at 26.11.03

First name	Surname	Company
Sara	Albolino	IRSO
Neill	Allan	Partners in Performance
Debra	Amidon	Entovation International
Rinke	Andriessen	Emeritor
Dimitris	Apostolou	Planet Ernst & Young
Angel	Arbonies	MIK Mondragon Innovation & Knowledge
Sascha	Armutat	Deutsche Gesellschaft fuer Personalfuehrung eV
Bob	Bater	InfoPlex Associates
Markus	Bick	University of Essen
Gero	Bornefeld	Aachen University of Technology
Wim	Bouman	
Allan	Buchanan	Danish Standards
Agnes	Bradier	EC DG INFSO
Alan	Brompton	Fujitsu UK
Fabrizio	Cardinali	Giunti Interactive Labs Publishing Group
Nicholas	Champrenault	Ceram
Rory	Chase	Teleos – The KNOW Network
Daniele	Chauvel	THESEUS Institute
Kevin	Cody	The Knowledge Refinery
Camino	Correiro	Asesoria Industrial Zabala SA
Paul	Cripwell	Cripwell Associates
James	Dellow	Ernst & Young
Fanuel	Dewever	IBM Business Consulting Services
Jelte	Dijkstra	NEN
Murat	Dincman	Technische Universitaet Istanbul
Aurelie	Dudezert	Laboratoire Génie Industriel, Ecole Centrale Paris
Geert	Elemans	NICTIZ
Toby	Farmer	BSI
Wolf	Gehrisch	EIRMA Working Group
Corrine	Grenier	UTT
Michel	Grundstein	MG Conseil
Carlos	Gutierrez-Cuevas	KM-Center
Frederik	Haentjens	Siemens Business Services
Paul	Hearn	EC DG INFSO
Peter	Heisig	Fraunhofer IPK
Josef	Hofer-Alfeis	Siemens AG
Joel	Hoolandt, Van	KPMG Belgium
Gil	Horsky	Edna Pasher and Associates
Paul	Iske	KnocoM / ABN AMRO
Christoph	Jansen	Aachen University of Technology
Norbert	Jastroch	CIKM Project / MET Consult
Elisabeth	Jensen	Novo Nordisk
Anne	Jubert	EC DG INFSO
Abdul Samad (Sami)	Kazi	Technical Research Centre of Finland (VTT)
Dominic	Kelleher	PwC

First name	Surname	Company
Fran	Kelly	Verna Allee Associates
Jeroen	Kemp	Fraunhofer IAO
John	Ketchell	CEN/ISSS
Beat	Knechtli	ABB Switzerland
Thomas	Knudsen	South Denmark EU Office
Kurt	Kosanke	CIMOSA Association
Rafael	Kourmeri	Planet Ernst & Young
Sergio	Larreina	Knowledge Technologies and Knowledge Watch
Nicholas	Leck	Entopia
Manon	Leeuwen, Van	Fundecyt
Barthelemy	Longueville	Laboratoire Génie Industriel, Ecole Centrale Paris
Evelyne	Luctkens	Shell Coordination Centre
Bjoern	Ludwig	Technowledgement Consulting
Chris	Macrae	Intangibles Union
Kaz	Maekawa	Fujitsu Europe
Helen	Martin	A9 Consulting
Nadda	Matta	Laboratoire Techcico, Universite Technologie de Troyes
Jennifer	McGill	Lafarge Group
Mounib	Mekhilef	Laboratoire Génie Industriel, Ecole Centrale Paris
Graham	Millen	KDE Consultants
Sylvia	Mira-Bonnardel	Equipe Gresti Ecole Centrale Lyon
Angelika	Mittelmann	Voestalpine AG
Monica	Moso	Cluster Conocimiento
Thomas	Muehlbrandt	GOM
Tina	Noiret	Les femmes autrement
Regina	Oertel	Aachen University of Technology
Juan	Olabarri	SPRI
Annie	Olesen	A9 Consulting
Nigel	Oxbrow	TFPL
Paloma	Partela	Direccion de Internacional
Philippe	Perez	Atos Origin
Nigel	Phillips	South Bank University, London
James	Pierce	Fujitsu
Carmelina	Piparo	IDP
Marc	Pudlatz	Fraunhofer IAO
Bertrand	Quesada	KMPG Belgium
Christian	Rangen	KM Group
Wolfram	Reiser	Dr Reinold Hagen Stifung
Paul	Riches	BT Consulting
Pop	Ramsamy	Fundecyt
Ronny	Rooman	OMRON Electronics
Camille	Rosenthal-Sabroux	Lamsade Universite Paris-Dauphine
Paulo	Rossi	Business-e
Val	Samonis	SEMI On-line and University of Maryland
Anabela	Sarmento	ISCAP/IPP
Thomas	Schael	IRSO
Wolfgang	Scholl	Humboldt-Universtaet Berlin – Institut fuer Psychologie
Audran	Sevrain	Richesses Humaines Partagees
David	Skyrme	David Skyrme Associates
Michael	Stankovsky	George Washington University
Wout	Steurs	KPMG
Alexandra	Stingl	Universität Klagenfurt
Mariusz	Stroiny	KPMG Poland
Karl-Erik	Sveiby	Sveiby Knowledge Associates
Raul	Tena, de	Fundecyt
Klaus	Vaupel	EKEC
Maria Luisa	Velasco	R2R Consultores
Frithjof	Weber	BIBA - University of Bremen
Ron	Weerdmeester	IDP Consultants

First name	Surname	Company
Peter	West	Continuous Innovation
James	Westhuizen, van der	Knowhouse
Karl	Wiig	
Patricia	Wolf	Fraunhofer IAO
Michael	Wunram	BIBA
Ron	Young	Knowledge Associates
Ton	Zijlstra	I & O Research