



Global Targets Local Benefits

Setting the Sustainable Development Agenda for
the Seas of East Asia beyond 2015

16-21 November 2015

Session 2

Accelerating Actions for Sustainable Development
and Climate Change

Workshop 2

**Application of Knowledge Management
in Scaling up Public and Private Sector
Investments in a Blue Economy**

CO-CONVENING AGENCY:



Chair: **Ms. Melanie King**
Senior Advisor
Capturing Coral Reef and Related
Ecosystem Services (CCRES)



Hosted by the Government of Viet Nam

Organized by PEMSEA, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE), Viet Nam Administration of
Seas and Islands, and the City Government of Da Nang and supported by GEF and UNDP.

The East Asian Seas Congress 2015
Global Targets, Local Benefits: Setting the Sustainable Development Agenda for the
Seas of East Asia beyond 2015
Da Nang, Viet Nam, 16-12 November 2015

Session 2: Accelerating Actions for Sustainable Development and Climate Change

**Workshop 2: Application of Knowledge Management in
Scaling up Public and Private Sector Investments in a Blue Economy**

17 November 2015

Co-convening Agency:
Capturing Coral Reef and Related Ecosystem Services (CCRES)

Chair:
Ms. Melanie King, Senior Advisor, CCRES

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. The 5th East Asian Seas (EAS) Congress, co-organized by the Partnerships in Environmental Management for the Seas of East Asia (PEMSEA), Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE), Viet Nam Administration of Seas and Islands, and the City Government of Da Nang, was held at the Furama Resort in Da Nang, Viet Nam from 16 to 21 November 2015. Carrying the theme “Global Targets, Local Benefits: Setting the Sustainable Development Agenda for the Seas of East Asia beyond 2015,” the EAS Congress 2015 addressed the new opportunities for the ocean economy of East Asia, the range of partnerships that have developed and are required in order to realize the full potential of a blue economy, and the progress and achievements in governance of regional/subregional seas within the framework of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA).
- 1.2. The EAS Congress 2015 featured Fifth Ministerial Forum, the International Conference on Sustainable Ocean and Coastal Development, the Fourth EAS Youth Forum, the PEMSEA Network of Local Governments for Sustainable Coastal Development (PNLG), an Environmental Exhibition and many other special events.
- 1.3. Three major sessions comprised the International Conference: (1) A Decade of Partnerships in Sustainable Development of the Seas of East Asia: Synergies and Achievements; (2) Accelerating Actions for Sustainable Development and Climate Change and (3) From Vision to Reality: Aligning the Global Agenda with Local Benefits.

- 1.4. The workshop aims to: (a) review the application and benefits derived from transference and effective use of good Knowledge Management (KM) practices and platforms in various projects; (b) identify the potential use of such innovations in other projects and by other sectors; (c) determine how a regional KM platform can serve to improve access to, and scale up investments in, good practices; (d) develop 'Best Practice Guidelines' for regional KM in a blue economy based on the collective input and group discussions; and (e) capture the discussed KM ideas, processes and products using a visual storytelling approach.
- 1.5. Workshop chair, Ms. Melanie King, Capturing Coral Reef and Related Ecosystem Services (CCRES) provided a brief welcome and introduction to the workshop. She shared that CCRES provides technical assistance that seeks to unlock new income streams for the region. By looking at knowledge products and assisting local communities to attract investments, the end result is scaling up and replicating good practices. She explained that KM is the collective process of collecting information, capturing knowledge and open communication, and connecting people and community. She then asked participants to locate themselves in the matrix of types of KM managers: Sharer, Broker, Builder and Enabler. She stressed the two crucial questions to think about during the workshop: How can KM partnership investment be scaled up in the blue economy?; and How can PPPs enhance KM networks and uptake of KM?
- 1.6. Dr. Sara Farley, Co-Founder and Chief Operating Officer, Global Knowledge Initiative (GKI), in her Keynote address explained the role of models for collaboration, skills for collaborative innovation, network metrics, incentives for sustained partnerships, and training network facilitators and managers in averting global crises in oceans. She discussed what has gone wrong with knowledge partnerships and common pitfalls that have made them less effective, specifically challenges in forming partnership, maintaining partnership, and effectiveness of partnerships to deliver on outcomes and performance outputs.
- 1.7. She shared five design principles aggregated by GKI to spark and maintain outcomes of knowledge partnerships for the blue economy. The first is "Challenge is King", clarifying what piece of challenge of solve, breaking down a complex challenge to reveal and address its specific pieces. The second principle is "System in Motion", as partnerships do not exist in isolation but in systems. She emphasized that systems are complex and dynamic, with sets of actors, interactors, outputs and outcomes within a boundary. She added that the broader context of an innovation system can range from global, regional or sectoral. The third principle is "Reimagine Capacity Building", creating conditions to learn together in a partnership and a shared vocabulary and set of skills. The fourth principle is "Manage Purpose Driven Networks", as co-owned networks need network facilitators who have skills to facilitate complex issues. The last principle is "Capitalizing on Feedback Loops," through the establishment of measurement and evaluation frameworks. Demonstrating these principles in action, she shared GKI's experience with its Learning and Innovation Network for Knowledge Solutions (LINK) program in Rwanda. The program spurred an active international research network involving private sector, government research institutions and universities aimed at uncovering the cause of a taste defect that threatens specialty coffee, the country's most valuable export crop.
- 1.8. A question and answer session with the keynote speaker was facilitated by the workshop chair. Dr. Farley asked the audience how these design principles can be used to collectively build a knowledge-based blue economy. Dr. Taufiq Alimi asked if these design principles can be applied despite existing challenges and motivations of sectors in a specific context of a country. Dr. Farley replied that challenge maps are crucial to identify challenges that exist in a

mosaic of other challenges. Adaptive management component considers the changing challenge map as well as new actions and actors coming in.

- 1.9. Dr. Serafin Talisayon asked whose problem is the focus of these processes and whose perspective should be taken? He also asked what is the best practice to identify and train facilitators, who have been identified as very important actors? Dr. Farley answered that there is a higher probability of optimizing problem solving if people closer to the problem can provide answers. Focus needs to be on iterative and inclusive problem framing. In the act of problem framing, there is convergence that requires intention and participation. On the topic of facilitations, she explained that facilitators are both born and made. Individuals who are big thinkers, young and on the rise, have political power, and already embedded and trying to make changes but have no training in facilitation are in the ideal position to be developed as facilitators.
- 1.10. Dr. Farley replied to the question “what are possible incentives to join a collaboration network? She answered that aside from money that we need to look beyond money. Alternative incentives can be access to critical resources that unleash innovations in knowledge partnerships like technology, human resources, and infrastructure. These resources must be inventoried whether they are available and needed as well as who in the network has access and use these resources.
- 1.11. When asked: “how a community’s sociocultural values can be taken into consideration during decisionmaking?”, Dr. Farley answered that the sociocultural dimension in a system should be acknowledged. Embedded traditional values, whether implicit or explicit, are acknowledged and honored in systems analysis and values map.
- 1.12. Dr. Farley also replied to the questions: What to do when a network is made up of different individuals that may have different and competing objectives. Is there a way to encourage people to check their interests at the door and work together as a team? Dr. Farley stressed that people want to be heard and respected, including their interests. Challenge mapping will show how differing interests are related. Iterative visualization helps in relating and eventually converging motivators that helps bring together communities.

2. PART 1: SESSION INTRODUCTION TO BUILDING THE CASE FOR KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT

- 2.1. Session Facilitator, Mr. Mark Paterson, Currie Communications, introduced the next set of presentations that stressed the importance of creating a business case and discussing benefits of KM platforms.
- 2.2. Dr. Taufiq Alimi, RARE Indonesia, discussed how KM is crucial for NGOs in creating sustainable and measured impacts. The objective of an NGO is to create impact at an efficient way, as it has limited resources. He explained that KM helps NGOs in designing the measurement of impacts, recording the baseline data and impact data, among others. KM facilitates capacity building from lessons based on experience. Continuous learning and documentation allows NGOs to transfer its knowledge to others and therefore will help replication and scaling of programs. He listed and explained the factors that influence the design of an effective KM System (KMS): management, resources, environment and program. An effective KMS can clearly define how information and knowledge is acquired, processed, transferred/communicated, learned, and internalized/institutionalized. To start a KMS, it is

crucial to invest in people, reshape management to be adaptive and receptive and redesign the program to incorporate the system.

- 2.3. Highlighting the role of knowledge management for environment and natural resources in government, Mr. Edwin Domingo, Foreign-assisted and Special Projects Service, Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR), presented the different knowledge products and tools that DENR has been using to aid in the development, gathering of data, analysis and dissemination of information. These management information systems aim to design and implement activities that use geographic information systems (GIS) technology to meet spatial analysis, planning, monitoring and evaluation of projects. The outputs of these systems will inform major stakeholders of the current situation and provide science-based information for critical decisionmaking. Involving stakeholders like the local community is particularly important in the Philippine context because national projects cannot be implemented without the endorsement of the local government and indigenous people.
- 2.4. One example discussed is the Philippines “Wealth Accounting and Valuation of Ecosystem Services” (Phil-WAVES) project. The project gathers information on the changes of ecological indicators. Another is the Integrated Information Management System (IIMS) that establishes and maintains a database on coastal resource and river basin management. There have been successful pilots conducted that highlight the importance of KM. It has been observed that the communities acknowledge the gravity of environmental issues when they see empirical evidence or visualizations from these tools. Some of the challenges of these projects include gathering data and gaining interests of people. In the pilot site of Laguna Lake, the policy issues include siltation, flooding and overpopulation. Different data and indicators for these policy issues were gathered from different government agencies. Collected data identified policy implications. The feedback loop was an iterative process that starts with validating the working thesis with the community, considering their feedback and eventually gaining consensus.
- 2.5. Dr. Sheila Vergara, ASEAN Center for Biodiversity shared the experience of setting up and maintaining the ASEAN Clearing House Mechanism (CHM). There was demand for a one-stop shop that provides freely shared data and tools that are concise and easy to understand. CHM takes available information from different sources and formats and integrates it into an interoperable common format database on species and protected areas.
- 2.6. The CHM is a regional platform that integrates biodiversity information, experiences, best practices and lessons learned across the ASEAN member states. The availability of this information contributes to ASEAN member states policy development and decisionmaking related to biodiversity conservation as well as reporting on commitments on agreements. Eight out of ten ASEAN countries have set up their national CHM, with the support of ACB. Data can be submitted to ACB that will be formatted to match their database. Other knowledge products in development include applications, e-libraries and the ASEAN heritage parks app.
- 2.7. A panel discussion on how end users use, source and package their knowledge across projects and regions in the EAS region and beyond was conducted.
- 2.8. The representative from the Bogor Agricultural University asked about the role of local government in KM and key factors in sustaining projects. Dr. Alimi replied that in the region, the power to manage people and resources mainly rests on the local level. Known for its bottom up approach, RARE has developed institutional capacity at the local level through

training that takes the context and limitations of infrastructure into consideration. Dr. Farley stressed that the role of local government is essential and its absence will give an incomplete analysis of a challenge's context. She recalled the experience of LINK in Rwanda where the local community was involved at the start, reinforcing their co-ownership of the knowledge partnership. Eng. Arnel De Mesa, Philippine Rural Development Project, shared that his project has always involved local governments from the beginning of the process, from project identification to implementation, and required them to provide equity, whether cash or non-cash.

- 2.9. Dr. Talisayon asked how to capacitate local communities and indigenous people for knowledge partnership and products. A big challenge for these communities is: there is no internet access and many knowledge products must be adapted and made relevant to their concerns before they are understood. Dr. Delfin Ganapin, UNDP/GEF Small Grants Programme, shared that grassroots communities have different cultures and needs. From their experience, indigenous communities prefer that local leaders communicate the action plan instead of outsiders. In terms of the capacity development, these communities benefit more from learning on their own terms than imposing external conditions. Indigenous people also have their own context in terms of understanding and making the right decisions. Dr. Ganapin recommended that organizations who want to work with them must accept their pace and put adaptive measures in place. Another possibility is to encourage successful communities to link with each other through south-to-south site visits. These communities can also create video proposals that will be translated by partner organizations.
- 2.10. Dr. Alimi shared his organization's efforts to make MPAs relevant to the cultural norms of the indigenous people of Papua. There is a need to translate messages into local wisdom and use their existing historical knowledge. Considering the limitations of communities with low literacy, information was disseminated through radio stations. In Kalimantan, aside from using the radio, information was shared through local leaders and religious institutions.
- 2.11. A participant from Timor-Leste asked about the importance of involving women and gender equality in the knowledge-sharing process. Dr. Farley replied that an equal playing field must be established through smart techniques. This includes using anonymous written responses in discussions or setting the tone that all comments are considered equal when everyone gets to write their perspectives in challenge mapping. Ms. Janet Chen, Guandong Agricultural Pollution Control Project, China, shared that they are placing emphasis on women in their capacity-building efforts. Dr. Alimi recounted that his organization has reached out to the women in the community through their children and cooking competitions. Dr. Ganapin emphasized that it is not enough to separate men and women to address power relations that have been in place for many years. Gender equality and women empowerment goes hand in hand and there is a need to implement a process of empowerment before consultation.
- 2.12. The panelists were asked for advice on how KM can be used to resolve complex problems that require collaboration of different sectors that have their own agenda and priorities. The panelists replied that establishing knowledge partnerships is crucial to address complex problems and involve uninterested actors that are part of the system. Presenting a case aligned with their strategic goals is needed to engage powerful but uninterested actors.

3. PART 2: CRITICAL FACTORS FOR SUCCESSFUL KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT

- 3.1. Dr. Sara Farley introduced the second session. While the previous case studies discussed the “what and who” of knowledge partnerships for the blue economy, the second session focused on “the how and the critical success factors for effective knowledge management”. She stated the three questions to keep in mind during the session: (1) What are the essential challenges in formulating KM and knowledge partnerships?; (2) What are the characteristics of effective Knowledge Partnerships?; (3) What are the roles needed to achieve effective Knowledge Partnerships?
- 3.2. Ms. Monique Sumampouw, WWF-Malaysia Marine Program shared lessons learned from Marine Spatial Planning (MSP) implementation in various levels of government and from other aspects of stakeholder participation in Indonesia and Malaysia. She gave an overview of the objectives, targets, outputs and scope of the five project sites in the two countries. She discussed the different lessons learned from the implementation in each site. Building on the learning process from Terrestrial Planning, MSP brings together multiple users of the ocean to make informed and coordinated decisions about how to use marine resources sustainably and reduce conflict. Through the planning and mapping process of a marine ecosystem, the intended results of MSP is a more coordinated and sustainable approach to how oceans are used. The approach ensures that marine resources and services are utilized within environmental limits that safeguard ecosystem health and biodiversity. As highlighted in the five sites, Ms. Sumampouw emphasized that MSP is not an instant process and implementation must be adapted to the context of each site. Imminent issues such as overpopulation and disasters have pushed for the need for MSP. She stressed the importance of the involvement and being acceptable to all relevant stakeholders and interested parties, particularly the political will of decisionmakers, for better and effective implementation.
- 3.3. Dr. Russell Richards, CCRES, discussed how “Systems Thinking” and “Community-based system dynamics” can be used to engage with community members and to elicit their knowledge about the socioecological systems within which they operate. He gave an overview of the four levels of systems thinking, which facilitates understanding of the different components of system. He then presented the Socio-Ecological Systems App for Mental Model Elicitation (SESAMME), an iPad mapping application that was developed to aid the process of knowledge elicitation and sharing. It has a “drag and drop” interface that uses various icons representing activities to plot, purposely avoiding reliance on text. He provided a brief walkthrough of populating a map. It started with adding activities, which include uses of the area and resources, in the map, then adding its past, present and future trends. Resources and its state and trends are also inputted then linked to the activities. Pressures that impact these trends and possible decisions that can be made to address them are also included in the map. He presented how SESAMME has been used in El Nido, the Philippines and Selayar, Indonesia. He noted that there has been fantastic response in focus group discussions introducing the application in the two cases. Mapping and linking the different structures of a system through the application can contribute to decisionmaking and implementation to address the multi-faced challenges in these areas. The application will undergo further development.
- 3.4. Dr. Tundi Agardy, Marine Ecosystem Services Program, talked about the types of knowledge needed for effective ecosystem-based management (EBM) in the region. The types she listed include people’s needs and aspiration, spatial dimension, problems that needs to solve, health and functioning of the ecosystems, governance and feasibility of integrated management and choice of indicators. Actions on land and the atmosphere impact the sea as

well, affecting marine management. EBM rests on five main principles: (1) recognizing connections of ecological indicators and human well-being and the environment; (2) taking an ecosystem services approach, and applying a human perspective on the ecology; (3) addressing cumulative impacts simultaneously in these systems across sectors and usages; (4) managing for multiple uses to reduce conflict by understanding the problem and tailoring solutions to the unique context; and (5) embracing change, learning and adapting, not only the environment but human needs and capacity to respond to change as well. KM for EBM must focus on ecosystems and humans, thereby promoting sustainable development of the blue economy. Both the ecological and social aspect of knowledge must find its way into planning processes and policies. Conservation is the basis for sustainably growing a blue economy. Knowledge can steer management towards effectiveness while the lack of knowledge prevents EBM. In the region, because there is a high willingness to partner and capacity, the chances of promoting uptake is very high.

- 3.5. Ms. Loreta Sollestre, Provincial Government-Environment and Natural Resources Office (PG-ENRO), Batangas, Philippines, shared the State of the Coasts (SOC) of the Batangas Province and how it was used to implement ICM in the area. She explained that the SOC reporting system assessed the progress of local government towards their sustainable development targets in implementing ICM, triggering planning and management actions. The first SOC provided a baseline of the impact of ICM in the province. The report also noted positive developments as well as gaps in the province, particularly in various governance aspects. In response to the key recommendations to improve governance, some undertaken actions include integrating the Strategic Environmental Management Plan in the fiscal plans, adopting a multisectoral organization structure and built sustainable financial mechanism. To address sustainable development indicators, the province has engaged in different climate change initiatives, resulting in the provincial adaptation management plan that cover specific measure of rehabilitating mangroves. Other initiatives to reverse environmental degradation include a seasonal closure of fishing areas, solid waste management plan and improvement of water quality. The province is currently gathering data to develop and update the SOC. Their experience has shown that collaboration and information sharing among different sectors is key in the development of an SOC.
- 3.6. Dr. Serafin Talisayon and Mr. Renato Cardinal, PEMSEA, launched the beta version of the Seas of East Asia (SEA) Knowledge Bank (<http://seaknowledgebank.net>), PEMSEA's KM Platform. Mr. Cardinal provided an overview of PEMSEA's KM Project. He shared that the objective of the project is to promote cross-project learning and synergy, leverage investments and serve as a regional KM platform. Dr. Talisayon gave a walkthrough of the features of the SEAKnowledge Bank, which provides a system for capturing and sharing knowledge, good practices and lessons learned from projects. It also features KM tools and products such as the online SOC reporting system, discussion forums, support websites for ICM communities of practice, directories of experts and service providers in ICM, replication-oriented knowledge products and services and access to various services that include certification programs, training courses, study tours and meetings in ICM. Through these tools and services, the platform also aims to enhance the capacities of central and local governments for developing investments projects and a means to assist local governments present themselves as investable opportunities with investment-ready ICM project profiles and connect them to interested groups. To facilitate these linkages, a unique section of the SEAKnowledge Bank is dedicated to helping interested investors identify project profiles that match their interests or specialization, understand national and regional laws and regulation and identify opportunities to meet local government officials.

- 3.7. The panel discussion in the second session highlighted the ideal conditions for the uptake of KM products, services, networks and platforms are and identification of opportunities and linkages for hands on learning across projects, sectors and regions.
- 3.8. Dr. Richards was asked about what surprised him most about learning about user preferences. He noted how engaged the users were with SESAMME. Even communities from remote areas people embraced the use of the application because it made them feel that they contributed to coastal management. The users appreciated that the platform enables them to share their perspective.
- 3.9. Mr. Christian Severin, GEF, asked how the details of the map can be made explainable around the world. He also inquired who is considered as the owner of the map and if the maps are regularly updated. Dr. Richards explained that the CCRES project addresses specific objectives. This includes community-based system dynamics, which facilitates understanding the map from a systems perspective. The community first works with a diagnostic tool that extracts the information to be mapped. This information is then validated against scientific literature with the community before it is updated to the map. The information elicited from the community is presented to the local government to confirm how the current policy addresses the situation. The map is a CCRES project but the information on it can be shared.
- 3.10. Dr. Alimi asked how CCRESS deals with situations when the target audience of their projects does not use Apple products. Dr. Richard shared that CCRESS provides Apple products to their country partners. CCRESS's point of contact is trained to use the device and application before it is introduced to the community. Dr. Alimi also asked how differences of opinion on activities in the map are reconciled. Dr. Richard explained that focus group discussions held during the population of the map usually resolve these points of contention right away.
- 3.11. Dr. Farley asked the panelists how to address challenges on setting and meeting success points. For EBM programs, Dr. Agardy explained that the system was designed to include periodic assessments of specific ecological objectives at the regional level. These objectives are aspirational and quantitative. These indicators as well as a period of monitoring and reporting are decided on based on a consensus reached by the member states. Dr. Agardy observed that countries involved in the Mediterranean EBM project prefer a standardized, transparent and collective measurement system. She warned that voluntary reporting of various indicators presents an opportunity to exaggerate claims of progress. A standardized system and agreed on the measurement system can address this.
- 3.12. Dr. Ganapin noted that SDGs collectively emphasize that development must be inclusive. From the SGP experience, there is frequently a gap in realizing the local benefits at the grassroots level, particularly with indigenous people. A facilitated system can serve as a bridge to create partnerships with organizations that are already working with the grass root and local beneficiaries.
- 3.13. Dr. Talisayon noted the need to analyze the flow of knowledge to determine hindrances and bridges to facilitate the coverage of benefits. A platform that enables systems to reach the communities, facilitating knowledge from the tools and benefits from investments will reach them.
- 3.14. Ms. Sumampouw discussed that the gap at the community level must be taken into consideration when designing initiatives. She shared her experience conducting fish mapping with a community. While they understood the resources and trends to add to the map, they

could not discuss climate change adaptation and the impact of climate change because it is so far removed from their knowledge. It was only when climate change was reframed as a food security issue that the community engaged in active participation. Reframing and adjusting the conversation is needed to implement the process and the reach outcomes.

- 3.15. Dr. Talisayon added that aside from the uses of the SOC discussed by Ms. Sollestre, the tool can also identify investment gaps. The collaborative and participatory tool can be used to involve local communities on what needs to be done in terms of investment gaps. Dr. Praparsiri Barnette, Department of Aquatic Sciences, Faculty of Science, Burapha University (Representative of Chonburi Province, Thailand) shared that when the SOC is applied to the provincial level that has many municipalities, like the Chonburi province with 99 municipalities, data collection is very complicated. With the SEAKnowledge Bank and ICM Learning Centers, universities in the local area can address these challenges. Working at the local level to educate the local community and government can be challenging. It is easier in cases where politicians are interested, but sometimes the local community need to convince their politicians.
- 3.16. Dr. Ario Damar, Center for Coastal and Marine Resources Studies, Bogor Agricultural University, shared the challenge of ensuring that knowledge and tools of ICM are transferred into the areas that need it. Forming a local ICM learning network facilitates the transfer of ICM knowledge to local people. The main challenge is involving local government to learn alongside the local community. PEMSEA's initiatives help address these issues. The development of the SEAKnowledge Bank makes the knowledge available while the ICM Learning Center network promotes learning among learning centers.
- 3.17. Dr. Mario Tilman, National University of Timor-Leste, stressed the need to integrate scientifically based information and tools with the community's traditional knowledge optimize the benefits of ICM. Aside from making these tools available, the communities must be guided in its application. Coastal communities trust their traditional laws can be effectively adopted in the sustainable development of their coastal resources.
- 3.18. Dr. Farley asked the panelists to identify the critical success factors for the uptake knowledge products and partnerships. Mr. Sumampouw mentioned the continuous approach to engage with main stakeholders and the presence of political will. Dr. Agardy noted the provision of knowledge and the need to discuss creating demand. Dr. Richards maintained the need to recognize the community as a great source of knowledge to address problems and not to solely rely on decisionmakers to fix these issues. Dr. Barnette said that engaging in investment for the blue economy presents challenges. She observed that in Thailand, the private sector is happy to support these initiatives but prefer projects related to conservation, rather than addressing pollution. Dr. Tilman explained that Timor-Leste is just starting in this area and welcomed cooperation with PEMSEA country members. Ms. Sollestre shared that seeing results of the SOC in Batangas awakened their mayors and governor. The SOC influenced leaders to act on the environmental situation of the province particularly waste management, and allot more budget for coastal management. Dr. Talisayon stressed that knowledge creates benefits only when it is used to produce development results. When knowledge is only documented, shared or downloaded, no value is created. The best example of knowledge creating value is when many useful decisions were made by the government as a result of the SOC in Batangas. Dr. Damar added that the region is going in the right decision as the necessary networks are already in place. The remaining question is how to optimally utilize the networks and tools to improve the quality of ecosystems and local communities.

4. PART 3: STRATEGY FOR OPTIMIZING KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT

- 4.1. Mr. Paterson facilitated breakout groups that discussed the challenges, criteria and roles in building knowledge partnerships. The results of each breakout session can be found in Annex 2.
- 4.2. Dr. Farley facilitated the group that discussed challenges in maintaining knowledge partnerships and assuring that they deliver results. The groups discussed how to involve and engage diverse stakeholders, particularly those who wield influence. There was significant interest in defining training needs of Knowledge Managers, developing successful case studies of KPs and reconciling cultural difference.
- 4.3. Dr. Talisayon discussed the criteria to maintain knowledge partnership identified by the breakout group. These criteria can be categorized under incentive, simple, transparency, participatory, use and users, sharing freely and public and private funds. There must be a clear return of investment in project proposals.
- 4.4. Mr. Paterson shared the results of the discussion on the roles that organizations must fill in knowledge partnership. Partnership involves a team working together. Participants listed agencies and organization that have different strengths that fit into the roles of Enabler, Broker, Sharer and Builder. Some organizations fit multiple roles to scale up investments.
- 4.5. Mr. Severin facilitated the final panel discussion of the workshop that focused on how Knowledge Partnerships can be scaled in different contexts and how to transfer the lessons to the global perspectives. Dr. Sarah Farley began by saying that Knowledge Partnerships can be used in different aspects as it is exceedingly rich and multisectoral. Dr. Agardy challenged this and asked how to link integrated cross-sectoral partnerships further to encompass the rest of the marine and coastal sector. She emphasized the need to link existing knowledge platforms with one another. Ms. King stressed that when projects are planned in silos, advanced planning in advance is most likely to be already behind. To effectively scale up, planning must be at the local site looking not only at the coastal area in isolation but also its interaction with land. The funding process must also be taken into consideration as scaling up cannot be achieved when projects is delayed.
- 4.6. Mr. Severin asked the panelists how to link knowledge partnerships to results based management. Dr. Agardy emphasized that knowledge management is not different from results-based management as you can't have results without the effective use of knowledge. Ms. King stressed that value is created when knowledge management can be linked to resource-based management by moving away from ticking boxes to measuring impact. While it is difficult to measure impact, change cannot be created without measuring this. Knowledge management can play an important role in this as it is about people and impact. Dr. Farley added that by shifting the focus on effectiveness and outcomes, knowledge partnerships bring inclusivity and efficiency into results-based management since the KM approach places more emphasis on the people involved in the project.
- 4.7. Dr. Talisayon stressed that knowledge is knowledge because it enables action. To facilitate action, it is critical to identify stakeholders to carry out specific actions that will yield specific results. Identifying the resources that stakeholders need to produce these outcomes is also as crucial. A knowledge platform must be a mix of human and technical components. PEMSEA's

SEAKnowledge Bank is not only web-based but extends to knowledge products and services that have a face-to-face component.

- 4.8. Mr. Severin then asked the panelists about good incentives to encourage joining knowledge partnerships or community practice. Dr. Agardy mentioned highlighting the risk reduction benefit of these networks. When the involved institutions are invested in seeing an outcome, collectively sharing information becomes the basis of management decisions or allocation of funding as a way to reduce the risk. Dr. Talisayon added that an appropriate matching of demand and supply will result in benefits to motivate actors. This matching process creates a self-incentivized mechanism.
- 4.9. The panelists were asked how to maintain and sustain motivation to participate in a shared knowledge platform. Building on the previous answer on risk reduction, Dr. Farley added the importance of reputational risk. There have been instances where universities and researchers go into local areas but communities do not see the results of the studies they have participated in. For knowledge partnerships, a sense of equity must be created among all partners. The onus on development organizations is to create an equitable playing field for co-created value from knowledge transfer and exchange, not exploitation.
- 4.10. Mr. Severin noted that organizations are afraid of sharing failures. Dr. Talisayon explained the importance of sharing seemingly small matters as these can be critical between failure and success. He shared an example of the Solution Exchange in India, where members of a knowledge network can ask a workplace problem by posting it with the group. Members who have encountered similar challenges then share their solutions that are compiled into a consolidated reply to be disseminated to rest of the network. This exchange has been replicated in other countries. PEMSEA will use this model on the SEAKnowledge Bank and the PEMSEA Network of Learning Centers (PNLC). By connecting supply and demand, members are kept involved as they can rely on the network for solutions. Another way to keep similar networks active is implement an award system, as suggested by Mr. Damar. Solutions that have been replicated frequently gets recognized.

5. PART 4: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- 5.1. The following conclusions and recommendations were generated from the presentations and discussions of the workshop.
- 5.2. **Conclusions**
- **Development of KM should involve the stakeholders** and potential users of the product and services. There is a need to understand the problems and the needs before moving forward. KM tools and systems must be adapted and made relevant to local coastal communities by incorporating cultural and traditional knowledge.
 - **Buy in for the success of KM:** The success and sustainability of a KM program is highly dependent on the buy in and political will of influential and key people. The best way to share and experience knowledge is by including your audience and potential users in the development and implementation of the KM program (have to be inclusive, demand driven).

- **Mechanism for sharing:** There are many mechanisms and media for sharing knowledge, but the challenge is how to optimize and better utilize such networks, tools and information. In order to maximize the benefits of a multitude of knowledge platforms, it would be important to link them, while at the same time, assessing, identifying and/or integrating best practices and other available information on innovative approaches, experiences and policies from the different networks.
- **More coordinated effort for KM needed.** It was emphasized that knowledge partnerships and platforms are about people and capacity building, which contribute to the optimization and improved utilization of knowledge. There was a consensus on the need to pull together the available tools and platforms in the region to function as a cohesive network. If knowledge products and services can be shared across networks, it will help improve the cost efficiency and effectiveness of projects and facilitate further investments in projects.

5.3. Recommendations

- Organizations and projects in the region are encouraged to share the generated knowledge products and services and tools; and agree to coordinate and link the platforms for KM improve the uptake of KM services by potential users.
- Sharing of successful knowledge tools, products, services, are crucial to scale up investments for blue economy. CCRES and PEMSEA should coordinate the development and consolidation of a guideline for a successful knowledge management.
- PEMSEA, with support of the World Bank, CCRES and other international organizations, should take the lead to facilitate coordination of available KM tools and platforms generated by several projects and organizations in the region in order to improve the implementation of sustainable development programs in the region and optimize the potential of, and improve uptake of investments.

Annex 1 Workshop Program

DATE/TIME	ACTIVITY/PRESENTATION	
17 November 2015, 1030-1800		
1030 - 1040	Chair's Welcome and Introduction to the Workshop	Chair: Ms. Melanie King, Capturing Coral Reef and Related Ecosystem Services (CCRES)
1040 - 1110	Keynote – Building True Blue Knowledge Partnerships, Design Insights from the Global Knowledge Initiative	Dr. Sara Farley, Global Knowledge Initiative
1110 – 1120	Question and Answer session with the Keynote Speaker	Facilitator: Ms. Melanie King, CCRES
Part 1: Building the Case for Knowledge Management		
1120 – 1125	Part 1: Session Introduction to Building the Case for Knowledge	Facilitator: Mr. Mark Paterson, Currie Communications
1125 – 1135	Nongovernmental Organization Case Study: Knowledge Management for NGO	Dr. Taufiq Alimi, RARE Indonesia
1135 – 1145	Government Case Study: Knowledge Management for Environment and Natural Resources	Mr. Edwin Domingo, Foreign-assisted and Special Projects Service, Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR), Philippines
1145 – 1155	Regional Project case study: The ASEAN Clearing House Mechanism	Dr. Sheila Vergara, ASEAN Center for Biodiversity
	How end users use knowledge, what their sources of knowledge are and how they package their knowledge across projects and regions in the EAS region as well as to other regions	Panel members: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Taufiq Alimi, RARE Indonesia • Mr. Edwin Domingo, Foreign-assisted and Special Projects Service, DENR, Philippines • Dr. Shiela Vergara, ASEAN Center for Biodiversity • Dr. Sara Farley, Global Knowledge Initiative • Dr. Delfin Ganapin, UNDP/GEF SGP • Janet Chen, Guandong Agricultural Pollution Control Project, China • Engr. Arnel V. De Mesa, Philippine Rural Development Project, Philippines
Part 2: Critical Factors for Successful Knowledge Management		
1400 – 1405	Part 2: Session Introduction to the Critical Success Factors for Knowledge Management	Facilitator: Dr. Sara Farley, Global Knowledge Initiative
1405 – 1415	Marine Spatial Planning: A Lesson Learned from the Experiences in Indonesia and Malaysia as Coral Triangle Member Countries	Ms. Monique Sumampouw, WWF-Malaysia Marine Program

1415 – 1425	Using Systems Thinking and “Smart Technology” to Facilitate Social Learning with Communities	Dr. Russell Richards, CCRES
1425 – 1435	EBM Knowledge Management: What Do We Need to Know to Manage?	Dr. Tundi Agardy, Marine Ecosystem Services Program
1435 – 1445	“What Gets Measured Gets Managed,” the Application of the State of the Coasts (SOC) Tool in Managing the ICM of Batangas Province, Philippines	Ms. Loreta Sollestre, Provincial Government-Environment and Natural Resources Office (PG-ENRO), Batangas, Philippines
1445 – 1515	Seas of East Asia (SEA) Knowledge Bank: Presentation and Interaction with a Beta Version of a KM Platform on Coastal and Ocean Governance and Management at the Local, National and Regional Levels	Dr. Serafin Talisayon , PEMSEA, and Mr. Renato Cardinal, PEMSEA
1515 – 1545	Panel discussion: The ideal conditions for uptake of KM products, services, networks and platforms are and identification of opportunities and linkages for hands on learning across projects, sectors and regions	<p>Panelists:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ms. Monique Sumampouw, WWF-Malaysia Marine Program • Dr. Russell Richards, CCRES • Dr. Tundi Agardy, Marine Ecosystem Services Program • Ms. Loreta Sollestre, PG-ENRO, Batangas, Philippines • Dr. Serafin Talisayon, PEMSEA • Mr. Renato C. Cardinal, PEMSEA • Dr. Mario Tilman, National University of Timor-Leste • Dr. Praparsiri Barnette, Department of Aquatic Sciences Faculty of Science Burapha University • Ario Damar, Center for Coastal and Marine Resources Studies Bogor Agricultural University
Part 3: Strategy for Optimizing Knowledge Management		
1545 – 1600	<p>Part 3: Session Introduction to the Strategy for Optimizing Knowledge Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breakout groups • Panel Discussion • Next steps <p>Bringing It Together – with Breakout Groups</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key messages from the Workshop • Identify gaps • Potential synergies and collaborations • Interests and participation in next steps 	Facilitator: Mr. Mark Paterson, Currie Communications
1700 – 1715	Bringing It Together – with Breakout Groups (continuation of discussion)	
1700 – 1715	<p>Reporting Back Session</p> <p>Breakout Groups Reporting</p>	

1715 – 1745	<p>Bringing It Together – What Have We Learnt about Knowledge Management?</p> <p>What have we learnt about applying KM in scaling up partnership investments in a blue economy? The panel will also focus on the key learnings and experiences of the KM Workshop regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Best practice • Platforms • Hands on learning • Visual storytelling – key learnings, synergies and gaps 	<p>Facilitator: Mr. Christian Severin, GEF</p> <p>Panel members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Sara Farley, Global Knowledge Initiative • Dr. Tundi Agardy, Marine Ecosystem Services Program • Ms. Melanie King, CCRES • Dr. Serafin Talisayon, PEMSEA • Dr. Sue Pillans, CCRES
1745 – 1755	<p>Workshop Wrap up: Where to from here?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Best practice guidelines • Journal paper • Community of Practice • Who, what, where and how? • The KM story from today 	Mr. Mark Paterson, Currie Communications
1755 – 1800	Closing Comments	Ms. Melanie King, CCRES

Annex 2: Breakout Session Output

Challenges

HMW = How might we...							
▲ WHY				▼ What's stopping us			
HMW maintain knowledge partnerships	HMW assure capacity of knowledge managers	HMW assure knowledge partnerships deliver results	HMW engage stakeholders who wield the most influence in knowledge partnerships?	HMW include diverse stakeholders (local, women, indigenous, etc.) in knowledge partnerships	HMW engage users in knowledge partnerships	HMW reconcile different timelines for knowledge partnerships?	HMW assure knowledge partnerships adapt as we learn
HMW ensure that perceived benefit of staying in partnership > leaving partnership	HMW overcome the limitation of skill?	HMW set realistic goals/results?	HMW include diverse stakeholders, how might we elicit the political interest in		HMW allow women time to participate in knowledge partnerships	HMW reconcile different cultures and management styles	HMW track uptake of knowledge to learn and adapt
HMW be able to create incentives to provide to partners	HMW set consensus to eliminate ego sectoral	HME equip partners with adequate resources	HMW overcome fear of knowledge sharing?		HMW engage with difficult to talk to investor	HMW reconcile different cultures and many style to manage	HMW develop case study for knowledge for partnership
HMW assume that enough budget is provided	HMW ensure that we have properly identified training needs for capacity building	HMW combine the technological with local knowledge	HMW clarify the usefulness of KPS?		HMW overcome language limitation	HMW reconcile different capacity building in a management	HMW identify successful case studies
HMW create ownership of knowledge shared and knowledge partnerships	HMW transfer/keep skills to sustain KMS with partners	HMW develop a simple KM so that everyone can be on board	HMW communicate objectives of knowledge partnerships?		HMW include diverse stakeholders: language limitation, low capacity	HMW deliver the message in a short time	HMW used the knowledge shared effectively
			HMW establish good baselines on the level of awareness		HMW be able to identify the right stakeholders	HMW deliver the message in a short time	HMW use social networks for adaptive learning
			HMW encourage stakeholder to share their expertise and resource for ICM program		HMW share information that can be understood across stakeholder groups	HMW align timelines	

Criteria

Standard ICM metrics observed, SOC (Sheila)	Incentive	Simple	Transparency	Participatory	Use and users	Sharing freely	Funds Public and Private
investment regulation	KM has to meet public interests and commercial ones (Taufiq)	It should be simple - avoid fancy designs (de Mesa Phils)	Anti-corruption	It should be dynamic (everyone can participate) for effective participation	A clear or specific stakeholders target end users (Noreievill Espana)	Knowledge should be shared and used effectively (Dina)	Commitment to share company's revenue to support conservation (Mario Cabral - TL)
create the link inter-connectivity on infrastructure (Mario Cabral)	incentive mechanism	Should be simple sharing mechanism	transparency of process	Knowledge flows horizontally and vertically		Information is shared freely (Sheila)	Provision of enough budget (Susan)
Need to develop infrastructure to facilitate the movement and transportation	incentives			**promote facilitate facilitate mutual learning		Collaborated and diverse knowledge (sharing of expertise)	Availability of Funding
Identification of innovative scalable technologies and methodologies (Chris Severin)	long last engagement with voluntary			**knowledge flow continues (Yuelai Lu)			
Prepare spatial planning in integrated of all sector (Lince)	defined incentives for sharing motivation			Effective KM is an active collaboration supported by level of social organization ex COP, Networks of Practice			
Clear ROI for investing in partnering and implementing ICM (Taufiq)	benefit of ICM			Encourage the participation of the prominent network plan			
Clear goal (Ario)	Incentives/ benefits of sharing knowledge articulated			**effective engagement with all the relevant stakeholders			
	encouragement for involvement			**public awareness of the important of the KM in relation to the blue economy			
				Transcending or reaching wide scale of stakeholders			

Roles

Enabler	Broker	Sharer	Builder
1. Delivery of bulletins 2. technical training 3. technical advice 4. site training	LGUs	NGOs	Ministry of agriculture and fisheries TL
Aid agency, external projects/programs (e.g. GIZ)	WB	Social media specialist	Capacity building center
Governments/Funders	Private sector	NGO on media	Academe/universities
Media propaganda (website, newspaper)	Consulting company	private sectors	Department of agriculture
DENR - EMB, solid waste management	ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity, Brokers biodiversity information through the ASEAN clearing house mechanism	Facebook and other social apps	Local government units
Extension into rural area	UNDP Phil, Integrated sustainable development team	local and international/regional media outlets	
SESAMME	Environmental NGOs	Participating LGUs	DENR Philippines Biodiversity Management Bureau
Development Academy of the Philippines (DAP)	Development institutions/agencies (e.g. GIZ)	Centers of excellence on coastal and marine (academe) e.g. Silliman University, UP MERF	Universities
university systems modelling group (training/mentoring)	ANSA-EAP	National government agencies	Programmer in private company
practitioner in local government	Chamber of commerce/business groups		ACB Builds (e-library, apps, database structures)
Relevant training provider institutions	Rare indonesia	Data information	key local people
	Coordinating ministry for economic affairs of Timor Leste	local media	learning center in Timor Leste
		LGU	Ministry of education
		PEMSEA	Universities and research institution
		GIZ	Research and development institutions