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KM among ICN members

- Questionnaire for Effective Knowledge Management
- 27 responses from 26 jurisdictions
- Different ‘types’ of authorities from a wide representation
Agencies' answers

- Honduras’ Commission for the Defense and Promotion of the Competition
- Indonesian Competition Authority (KPPU)
- Irish Competition Authority (TCA)
- Japan Fair Trade Commission (JFTC)
- Korean Fair Trade Commission (KFTC)
- Mexico’s Federal Competition Commission (CFC)
- Netherlands Competition Authority (NMa)
- New Zealand’s Commerce Commission (NZCC)
- Pakistan’s Competition Commission (CCP)
- Poland’s Office of Competition and Consumer Protection (Urząd Ochrony Konkurencji i Konsumentów)
- Portuguese Competition Authority (Autoridade da Concorrência)
- Romanian Competition Council (Consiliul Concurentei)
- Russia’s Federal Antimonopoly Service (FAS)
- Singapore’s Competition Commission (CCS)
- South Africa’s Competition Commission (CCSA)
- Spain’s Competition Commission (CNC)
- Swedish Competition Authority (Konkurrensverket)
- United Kingdom Office of Fair Trade (OFT)
- United States Federal Trade Commission (FTC)

- Australian Competition and Consumer Commission (ACCC)
- Brazil (Secretariat of Economic Law of the Ministry of Justice (SDE))
- Secretariat for Economic Monitoring of the Ministry of Finance (SEAE)
- Bulgarian Commission on Protection of Competition (CPC)
- Chile’s National Economic Prosecutor’s Office (FNE)
- Egyptian Competition Authority (ECA)
- European Union Directorate General for Competition (DG-Competition)
- French Competition Authority (Autorité de la Concurrence)
Next steps…

NOW

BOS

BOS1
Sharing agencies’ experiences on different stages of KM implementation

BOS2
Tacit knowledge
(From former head of agencies’ perspective)

Last days of June

Circulating a Final Report for questionnaire responses

July – December 2012

Drafting collectively the Chapter

January – March

Circulating the Draft Chapter

ICN 2012

Validating the final Chapter 3
“Knowledge is the combination of data and information, to which is added expert opinion, skills, and experience, to result in a valuable asset, which can be used to aid decision making process.”
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• Shared understanding of KM

- Sharing and disseminating knowledge outside the agency: 58%
- Knowledge retrieval: 73%
- Storing, sharing, disseminating and applying knowledge within the agency to achieve its objectives: 92%
- Disseminating knowledge within the agency: 93%
- Knowledge sharing: 93%
- Content management: 93%

* Other: 15%
Explicit versus Tacit Knowledge

Explicit: Information that has been fully, clearly and precisely expressed and is documented in standard written form for use anywhere within the organization.

Tacit: Bulk of what an individual knows, include professional insights, judgment, rules of thumb, intuition and subtle issues known only by relevant experts
Effective Knowledge Management

Accomplishes the agency’s objectives by structuring people, technology and knowledge contents

Considers:

• *Creation, codification, storage and dissemination of knowledge*

• *Sharing knowledge as a way to promote learning and innovation*

• *Technological tools + organizational culture and routines*
Some KM approaches (non excluding)

- Create knowledge repositories
- Improve knowledge access
- Enhance knowledge-sharing environment (friendly culture)
- Considers a technical and organizational supporting infrastructure
- Multiple channels for knowledge transfer
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Does your agency have an organisational-wide active, ongoing KM system or elements of such a system, to preserve institutional memory for future use?

- Yes, working on that (but in an early phase) 72.7%
- No, but there are plans to introduce KMS in a near future 9.1%
- No, and no plans for KMS 9.1%
- 9.1%
Do you consider that your agency has an effective KM system?

- No: 19.0%
- Yes: 38.1%
- To some extent: 42.9%

Elements which best describe why you consider your agency has an effective KM system:

- **Easy access:** employees can easily consult necessary knowledge in a categorized database, just by typing-in of a search query.

- **Immediate dissemination** of new legislation, guidelines and "precedents" among the agency staff via Intranet

- **Higher coordination and integration** (synergies) among the staff

- **Enhance allocation of human resources and better overall results**
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Does your agency have a transparent strategy for KM within the organisation?

No = 12 (44%)
Yes = 15 (56%)
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Does your agency have a system of recognition for staff who shares their knowledge (for example rewards, competition, and internal publicity)?

No = 12 (57%)
Yes = 9 (43%)
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Does your agency have a map of existing knowledge or KM data base?

- No = 9 (47.4%)
- Yes = 10 (52.6%)
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Does your agency have written policies/procedures for KM system/practices?

No = 11 (52%)
Yes = 10 (43%)
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Is there an internal policy regarding the [preparation and/or dissemination of] materials prepared for participating in seminars externally or internally?

- No = 13 (48.1%)
- Yes = 14 (51.9%)
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Does your agency use any metrics to assess value-added and/or effectiveness of the KM system and KM practices, or to justify its costs?

- Yes = 3 (14.3%)
- No = 19 (85.7%)
Why it is important?

- **Better performance**
  - High standard and high quality outcomes
  - Better quality of decisions
  - Reduces knowledge shortcoming
  - Avoids potential pitfalls stemming from unrealistic assumptions

Saves / optimises resources

- Minimises costs of ‘brain-drain’
- Efficiencies (avoiding duplicities)
- Improves staff allocation (skills-competences-experience)
- Allows defining better working teams
- Reduces time for newcomers to become self-sufficient
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• Benefits experienced or expected

If KM system has been in place in your organisation for more than one year, what are the major returns on investment that you can see?

- Better quality of decisions
- Staff empowerment
- Less training cost per employee
- Better performance
- Faster case lifecycle
- New people become self-sufficient more quickly
- Efficiencies (less double work)
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• Concerning on organizational culture

• Cultural receptivity toward KM

Overall, how would you rate your agency’s cultural receptivity to KM practices? Is knowledge-sharing more common than knowledge-hoarding?

76.2% believe the staff is moving between a slight and a very high receptivity toward KM practices.
Main challenges…?

Technological tools
1. Strong and reliable software
2. Scope of the storage: Down to earth

Practices and organisational culture
1. Testing KM system application
2. Incentives for feeding the system

Tacit knowledge
1. Retaining key public servants

External and internal threats
1. Confidentiality issues
2. Security issues
Allow that each person excels at work, developing her or his best skills