

Northumbria Research Link

Citation: Dosanjh, Nawtej and Jha, Pushkar (2016) Shaping solutions from learnings in PAIs: a Blueprint. The Learning Organisation, 23 (6). pp. 387-397. ISSN 0969-6474

Published by: Emerald

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/TLO-09-2015-0052> <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/TLO-09-2015-0052>>

This version was downloaded from Northumbria Research Link:
<http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/27290/>

Northumbria University has developed Northumbria Research Link (NRL) to enable users to access the University's research output. Copyright © and moral rights for items on NRL are retained by the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. Single copies of full items can be reproduced, displayed or performed, and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided the authors, title and full bibliographic details are given, as well as a hyperlink and/or URL to the original metadata page. The content must not be changed in any way. Full items must not be sold commercially in any format or medium without formal permission of the copyright holder. The full policy is available online: <http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/policies.html>

This document may differ from the final, published version of the research and has been made available online in accordance with publisher policies. To read and/or cite from the published version of the research, please visit the publisher's website (a subscription may be required.)

www.northumbria.ac.uk/nrl





Shaping solutions from learnings in PAIs: a Blueprint

Journal:	<i>The Learning Organization</i>
Manuscript ID	TLO-09-2015-0052.R1
Manuscript Type:	Article
Keywords:	Knowledge management, Learning processes, Networking, Learning, Knowledge sharing
Note: The following files were submitted by the author for peer review, but marked to be sent in Off-Line.	
Table TLO_revised Manuscript blind_revised TLO_titlepage_revised	

Shaping solutions from learnings in PAIs: a Blueprint

STRUCTURED ABSTRACT

Purpose: The paper presents a blueprint of a portal that enables a learning interface. This is between experience sharers and solution seekers in the domain of Poverty Alleviation Interventions (PAIs). Practitioners working on PAIs are often confined to searching from within 'lessons learned' repositories, and also from within limited networks configured by aid agencies and consultancies. They do not, as of yet, have access to a comprehensive portal that explores the pool of knowledge carriers, and evaluates their efficacy in contributing to customised solutions.

Design: The paper critiques the sufficiency of existing processes for feedback generation and feed-forward thereof to support PAIs. We illustrate how the proposed internet enabled interface it can deliver to specific issues and problems across differing PAI contexts.

Findings: The SOLVER portal and its process map are configured and simulated using case vignettes present an interface environment between sharers and seekers for shaping customized solutions from past experiences for PAIs.

Originality and Value: Improving the performance of PAIs is crucial for societal goals of equitable living and access to opportunity spaces. PAIs practitioners are aware of the wealth of past experiences, but then, struggle to find a coherent and approachable portal that can churn these in response to their specific and contextual needs.

Keywords: feedback, seekers, sharers, facilitator, portal, poverty alleviation.

Article classification: General Review

Shaping solutions from learnings in PAIs: a Blueprint

Poverty alleviation interventions and performance

Performance narratives of poverty alleviation interventions remain much discussed and extensively archived. The emphasis on learning from poverty alleviation efforts to improve subsequent interventions is an omnipresent facet of policy and practice. In addition to helping improve the effective use of aid for poverty alleviation, pursuit of reducing disparity across human development indicators has always, and continues to, underpin key goals of individuals, communities, corporations and governments.

Aspirations of the relatively deprived to reduce distances with what they can see as better living conditions, and of the relatively affluent, to exist in a healthier society are symbiotic in nature. Individuals higher up on the living conditions ladder could have to contend with disparity driving the relatively deprived to forcefully acquire what systemic defects have refused them. The deprived on the other hand often stand exploited in a setting where they denied the choice to 'functionings' by compressing their capabilities set as articulated by Noble Laureate Amartya Sen (Sen, 2005). Corporations are concerned about quality of resources, the security of returns, and robustness of the market, usually compromised in an economy marked by huge disparities. For governments' inclusion of the equitability premise has become ever more fundamental in shaping policies for 'socio-economic' development to complement the agenda of GDP growth (Ortrud, 2011; Lin, 2011)¹.

Efforts towards improving the design and delivery of PAIs have been a function of constant debates and re-calibrations (Alsop et al., 2002; Saunders & Naidoo, 2009). These are oft manifested in macro level policy shifts and in aid orchestration, to ever ingenuous micro level

1
2
3 initiatives. The latter are often led in design and delivery by voluntary sector organisations
4
5 and ‘grassroots’ development practitioners with small scale networks. The larger programs,
6
7 in contrast, comprise projects with relatively complex stakeholder network of aid agencies,
8
9 governments, local bodies, technology related domain support agencies, and of course the
10
11 target beneficiary community themselves (Rafael & Boglio, 2008; Sharma, 2007). Despite
12
13 this elaborate schema and generous repository of knowledge from a legacy of such
14
15 interventions, the remarkable difficulty in seeing an intervention being successfully
16
17 replicated, or more realistically learnings thereof providing focussed solutions to problems
18
19 being faced in ongoing interventions, is rather confounding (e.g. Alvarez & Barney, 2013;
20
21 Goel & Rishi, 2012).
22
23
24

25
26 Several success stories are heralded as shining stars, but interestingly, hardly any have been
27
28 successfully taken forward in terms of matching up with the success of the first in the sequel.
29
30 Numerous examples can be listed including Grameen Bank and Bangladesh Rural
31
32 Advancement Committee (BRAC) in Bangladesh (Economist, 2012)²; Social and Health
33
34 Services Intervention in Argentina by United Nations development Fund (UNDP) (UNDP,
35
36 2014)³; Evergreen agriculture initiative in Eastern Africa (WAFC, 2014)⁴ and; Life-spring
37
38 Hospitals in South India (BCAI, 2014)⁵, among others. These are but a few of several
39
40 acclaimed interventions that can be found in listings on public portals of most aid agencies.
41
42 There are well made case for insufficiency of appropriately feeding forward - learning from
43
44 experience, of both failures and successes (Easterly, 2007; Tandler, 1989). In highlighting
45
46 issues to do with smoothening out the process and enhancing outcomes from PAIs, it is only
47
48 fair to highlight recent achievements. The 2013 Global monitoring report of the International
49
50 Monetary fund claims that “...goal of cutting extreme income poverty in half by 2015 was
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 met ahead of time in 2010. The goal of halving the proportion of people without access to
4 clean water and the goal of achieving a significant improvement in the lives of at least 100
5 million slum dwellers by 2020—were also achieved ahead of time in 2010....” (IMF, 2015)
6
7
8

9
10 Despite less than desirable levels of feed forward to inform design and delivery of PAIs, what
11 ‘has been’ achieved underlines the potential of ‘what can be’ achieved, by enhancing the
12 number of interventions that are successful. The answer to the question: How can the design
13 and delivery of PAIs be better informed? Also has an answer for: how can ‘aid effectiveness’
14 be improved?
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 22 **Feeding forward past experiences for enhancing performance** 23

24
25 Attempts at taking forward lessons from both failures and successes for design and delivery
26 of new interventions confront the much discussed *Icarus Paradox* (Miller, 1990). This
27 paradox implies that success in particular often makes for the foundations of failure when it is
28 taken to extremes. By extension, the ‘myopia’ this paradox seeks to caution us about includes
29 being aware of the failings in trying to overtly worked lessons from post-hoc analyses seen as
30 crucial for success of ‘what was’ (a superior performance) or ‘could have been’ (a lesser
31 performance). By nature, and also as per the conventional understanding of projects, PAIs
32 are very unique in context, their socio-political moorings, and in the orientation of the target
33 beneficiary community, to pin a few factors that comprise uniqueness and present barriers to
34 feeding forward lessons from prior interventions (Hess and Polednakova, 2013)⁶. There is a
35 huge dossier of experiential narratives and lessons that can be found at the click of a button,
36 in repositories of aid agencies and public sector organisations. These are indispensable as
37 references when it comes to designing new interventions. This is despite the Icarus
38 Paradox, and rightly so, because success and failures both have to be kept in perspective. It is
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 however the extremes to which they are taken in analysing performance and drawing
4
5 applicable lessons thereof, that should be of concern.
6
7

8 Momentum of a PAI is often punctuated by issues and problems that require customised
9
10 solutions. These need to be embedded in the specific context of what defines the problem
11
12 within the ambits of the intervention. Practitioner networks and the biblical ‘lessons learned’
13
14 dossiers promise solutions but exist mostly as a useful ‘search’ portal. The search outcomes
15
16 have to be churned and made sense of to yield useful inputs. These then require extensive
17
18 customising to the issue or problem at hand by practitioners facing the problem. Solutions or
19
20 a spread of solutions that align with the problem are of course useful once distilled. However,
21
22 focussed solutions to alleviate issues need to be marked with a superior value proposition.
23
24 These cannot always come from within captured lessons from repositories build on limited
25
26 networks to scope solution search.
27
28
29

30 31 **Adequacy of knowledge resources and networks in the arena** 32

33
34 There exist initiatives like the Capacity for knowledge Management in Organisations
35
36 (CKMO) of the World Bank Institute with an ‘informal advice’ component leading to
37
38 ‘potential’ technical assistance (World Bank, 2014). Knowledge from the Bank’s
39
40 interventions manifested in its experts’ experiences and lessons repositories remains a
41
42 fundamental resource here. However, the CKMO does not outline any process rubrics to
43
44 shape advice, or evidence of evaluating how suggestions have or have not worked. Initiatives
45
46 on ‘knowledge sharing for development’ of the bank are analogous to what other agencies
47
48 seem to be doing (World Bank, 2015) . For instance, the UNDP’s knowledge management
49
50 strategy recognises external networks but remains focused on a repository development and
51
52 exchange approach: “...evidence collection, analysis, knowledge capture, generation and
53
54
55

1
2
3 *exchange initiatives and engagement in policy debate, or indirectly by improving*
4 *organizational effectiveness and efficiency and fostering a culture of learning and*
5 *exchange...” (World Bank, 2014)*
6
7
8

9
10 Such initiatives seek to bring together various agencies and grassroots organisation to
11 enhance knowledge systems and create open source content for use alongside enhancing
12 capabilities to use them. The Global Development Network (GDN) seeks to ‘produce
13 structure and mobilize knowledge and networks extensively for enhancing development
14 research capacity’ (UNDP, 2014, GDN, 2014; Larson et al., 2006). The focus is once again
15 on the oft emphasised socio-technical schema to do with creation of knowledge and
16 enhancing capabilities to search and synthesise for useful outcomes, with an ever increasing
17 emphasis on networking (Coakes, 2006). However, they are not oriented towards design and
18 delivery problems that need solutions at the time- a clear gap that is worth filling to enhance
19 value from customised leveraging of knowledge and expertise.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 33 **Foundations of the ‘SOLVER’ portal**

34

35
36 There are also a few independent online portals pitched as ‘design competitions’ with a
37 collaborative interface like ‘Ashoka Changemakers’. These seek to promote novel
38 approaches for fuelling innovation in how poverty alleviation initiatives are scoped and
39 programmed. . As the most elaborate of such portals, the Changemakers’ portal brings
40 collaboration and competition in a very useful interface.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 It seeks to help frame interventions, and develop community network to support novel ideas
49 across a range of themes. A ‘fellowship’ mandate draws experts to create a global pool of
50 support for bright ideas incubated and gestated at Changemakers’ (Changemakers, 2014).
51
52
53
54
55

1
2
3 Such online portals are also not focussed on providing a link between sharers and seekers to
4 deal with 'live' problems. However, the networking premise that these have is in sync with
5 the emphasis on knowledge creation and sharing in the wider development community. A
6 highlight being – successful leveraging of the World Wide Web to reach out and connect.
7 Dropping the gap articulated into this recipe i.e. "Lack of customised solutions for live
8 problems facing ongoing interventions, and with some assurance for their quality and
9 potential impact" - gives us the foundations for SOLVER.
10
11

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19 In the proposed 'SOLVER' portal, the blueprint to which follows, sharers do not deposit
20 experiences or create broad suggestions, but attempt to provide customised solutions that are
21 evaluated in impact. Similar honing of sharer seeker interaction has been attempted in
22 knowledge management interventions by corporations. Such attempts demonstrate harnessing
23 of expertise to generate solutions, in a 'project based' way of functioning that dominates
24 contemporary working of organisations (Shenhar, Dvir, Ofer & Maltz, 2001). Of course,
25 developing such a template for informing sharing and seeking of solutions in poverty
26 alleviation initiatives needs much caution. The external plane is much wider rather than being
27 confined to a single organisation's/ a niche network's operations. The nature of stakeholders
28 is also much more heterogeneous, and so is their ability to engage with such solution
29 formulation. With these moderating aspects in mind, the paper can now present a blueprint
30 for a solution focussed and internet enabled environment labelled the 'SOLVER'.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 **Blueprint for the SOLVER portal**

47
48
49 INITIATION as in seeding of the portal for the first year will require creating an initial pool
50 of SHARERS through invitation to practitioners and/or experts. Some evaluation of profiles
51 may be required for all SHARERS including for those that apply to enrol as such. The portal
52
53
54
55

1
2
3 will need to be heavily publicised for SEEKERS to register and post queries. Anyone will be
4
5 able to register and log in as a SEEKER provided they submit valid identification scans. The
6
7 FACILLITATOR portal – as core of the operational set up will be a team recruited with
8
9 experience in development practice and oriented to work this online portal. Other set up
10
11 requirements will include a small administration and portal management team, and a
12
13 governing body of course (lead funding agencies to kind of underwrite). The table below
14
15 shows the operating process that underpins the portal
16
17
18
19

20
21
22 **Insert Table 1 about here**
23
24
25
26
27

28 The initiation part of the SOLVER portal at inception is crucial like all virtual world engines
29
30 and all initiatives that seek to evolve through networks as fundamental to their performance.
31
32 Front end configuration of the portal is the first step, and cannot be emphasized more, as
33
34 noted in the initiation note that preambles the blueprint. The operational outline - ‘A, ‘B’,
35
36 ‘C’ and the organiser block comprise a flow template marked by key components of the
37
38 process in CAPS like ‘seekers’, ‘sharers’, ‘seek note’, ‘facilitators’, ‘expert’, ‘open’ and
39
40 ‘leader boards’ that will require detailed design in embedment within the online portal (see
41
42 blueprint above). Value proposition for key players in the schema is also built in. The
43
44 incentives part is crucial as outlined in the organiser block -central to its sustainability and
45
46 quality of solutions. Resource issues in configuring the portal are also implied in the initiation
47
48 note, and will be reasonable particularly when benchmarked on the amount spend on
49
50 networking efforts in contemporary times.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 One more important differentiator is that the seekers' knowledge and requirements are
4 brought in as explicit expressions to orient sharer inputs. This transcends the gap between
5 lessons learned very specific to their contexts and solutions that are required for problems in
6 ongoing contexts. With the life span of PAIs (on an average) being considerably more than
7 more conventional understanding of projects, ambitious time slots can also be revisited in the
8 blueprint of the SOLVER portal. It could be altered to suit the 'urgency' of the seeker.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

16
17 With success on the 'leader board', sharers in particular can get biased towards their past
18 suggestions and be oriented to overtly replicate the basic premises for other solutions. This
19 also stands moderated in the SOLVER – again by bringing the seeker perspective into
20 evaluating utility, and also to some extent by maintaining the confidentiality of the sharers
21 and their rankings at the time. The latter to prevents seeker's bias in choosing the solution,
22 apart from of course the influence of 'expert' and 'open' classifications that are send out
23 along with solutions.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 **Simulating scenarios of using SOLVER**

34
35

36 The paper has discussed the utility of the SOLVER portal and presented a blueprint. The
37 portal enhances aspirations by proposing a focussed deployment of expertise and ideas to
38 shape solutions for problems that ongoing interventions face. At this point musings are likely
39 to be about if in time solutions through the SOLVER could have really enhanced the
40 effectiveness of past PAIs. To help with these musings a few simulated scenarios might be of
41 interest. These are narratives from direct experience of what actually transpired, and bring
42 into discussion the role SOLVER could have played. What may have come through as
43 lessons learned, could instead, have been pre-empted, and solved en-route the intervention to
44 enhance its performance.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

1
2
3 The first scenario is that of a reproductive and sexual health project in hilly regions in a
4 cluster in South East Asia. The awareness campaign, invariably from a successful good
5 practice template, included targeting the idea of multiple sexual partners as improper, and
6 had a rather negative impact on the community's uptake of the intervention. The reason was
7 the practice of 'polyandry' in this region with was a sensitive socio-cultural aspect to
8 confront so directly. Furthermore, as post-hoc analysis showed, even logically it seemed
9 rather weak to do so. The reason was that small land holdings in hills meant that polyandry
10 actually prevented fragmentation of land holdings. All brothers marrying the same women
11 meant no fragmentation of land, keeping it viable to practice agriculture and animal
12 husbandry. It thus prevented migration to the plains to seek new livelihoods. This could in
13 turn also enhance sexually transmitted diseases, even if, somehow, inducing a single partner
14 system reduced it on the other hand. The intervention in its life span had poor success in
15 affecting the sexual and reproductive health indicators. Considerable resources were poured
16 in to provide materials and awareness for promoting safe reproductive health sexual
17 practices. Emphasis on increasing the 'ability' of the community to engage due to access
18 issues and communication problems in hilly areas yielded less than desired results. This was
19 because most of the community was not 'willing' to engage.
20
21

22
23 It thus became a lesson learned to take forward particularly for interventions in hilly regions,
24 and for safe sexual practices. Of course this aid agency that led the intervention in
25 partnership with local government and voluntary sector organisations, will not repeat the
26 mistake in a very similar context. However, every other intervention they will be involved in
27 is likely to bring multiple issues. Though these may include this particular aspect, but it will
28 be alongside others, shaping a rather unique context.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *A SOLVER portal posting* on poor uptake of the intervention much earlier could have come
4
5 from any stakeholder in delivery system and thereby may have broken the myopic bounds.
6
7 If this issue was recognised, similar articulation from the portal would have provided
8
9 validation of its importance and consequent uptake by others. ‘Exploitation’ as drawing on
10
11 past certainties can very usefully meet ‘exploration’(March, 1991) as potentially novel
12
13 insights to consider, which the SOLVER will validate and ‘form’ as focussed solutions.
14
15

16
17 Let’s look at another scenario, very different in scoping of the problem/ issue. This is that of
18
19 a drinking water and sanitation initiative in a region that is marked by high water table, and
20
21 instances of heavy floods. An intervention on the much smaller scale relative to the one
22
23 described above was launched here by local NGOs supported by a relatively small and
24
25 independent national level funding body. The intervention managed to change behaviours
26
27 towards drinking water and sanitation over time. It also successfully introduced artefacts that
28
29 were indigenously made and promoted ecological sanitation, including during floods.
30
31

32
33 Indigenous ways of rain water harvesting and artefacts that allowed filtering of water also
34
35 showed good uptake by the community after about four years of work.
36

37
38 However, for sustainability an increase in number of trained local artisans was required.

39
40 These needed to be oriented towards making such artefacts, something that was very easily
41
42 adaptable to their key skills of pottery, masonry and bamboo craft. Resource support was of
43
44 course required for training Self Help Groups (SHGs) comprising these artisans. The goal
45
46 was to sustainably support the drinking water and sanitation initiative by creating a mutually
47
48 enabling interface with this sister micro-enterprise intervention. The NGOs partnering to
49
50 deliver this intervention were facing issues in balancing expansion of supply with demand,
51
52 and of assuring income levels to the artisans who came onboard. They tried generating seed
53
54
55

1
2
3 capital with very moderate success as plans showed the enterprise's inability to create
4
5 surpluses before four years. Funding for this sister initiative was outside the mandate of the
6
7 local funding body. The promised support for five years to run the drinking water and
8
9 sanitation campaign was also going to end soon
10

11
12 The issue is thus very specific: *Ways to support artisans, and sustain the "main intervention"*
13
14 *on drinking water and sanitation awareness for four more years. This is before surpluses*
15
16 *could kick in and these two could come together in a mutually enabling interface.*
17
18

19
20 *SOLVER portal posting* would go out to micro-enterprise specialists and also specialists in
21
22 creating hybrid multivariate interventions. Suggestions could scope solutions, for example:
23
24

25 To begin with a 'seeding pattern' can be created where a few groups of artisans are trained.
26

27 Then each member goes out as a lead to train more artisans. Initial income ($I = \text{sales} - \text{material}$
28 costs) would go towards paying significantly more to the lead artisan (say $I * 0.50$) and also
29 pay for the main intervention's support ($I * 0.10$), the rest being available for distribution
30 amongst in training artisans say, numbering five in each SHG. Each subsequent group would
31 create more trained members to become leads, and in time, support for seeking funding
32 support at the level of the SHG from banks would be a help the NGOs facilitating the
33 campaign would provide. 'Micro-level' loans would be easy to procure and will maintain
34 growth in SHG production to meet demand that was generous and something the main
35 interventions was already working on. The artisans are required to give some time to training
36 and the SHG, while they work on their routine jobs in the remaining time. Reasonable accrual
37 of income to an artisan may come as soon after he or she seeds a new group, rather than wait
38 for the whole intervention to start making surpluses. The seeding pattern can be promoted till
39 a certain stage to manage the supply and demand balance. The groups could also be helped
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

1
2
3 with management of funds and reworking what they give to the main intervention not as
4 promoters but as an agency that drives demand. This is just a small take on a more elaborate
5 outline of how the issue facing this intervention could be worked at with smaller funding
6 support to buy in artisans' involvement in a focussed manner. Of course this is just one
7 practitioner articulating here, more breakthrough and complementary suggestions could
8 combine for the 'seeker' through the portal.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

16 **Conclusions**

17
18 We posit that the SOLVER is likely to enhance the motivation of practitioners in poverty
19 alleviation initiatives by being a solution oriented port of call. It makes use of the experience
20 and knowledge in networks to with a more applied perspective. This is about specifically and
21 precisely targeting improvement in resource use and by extension aid effectiveness - as
22 against creating 'potentially' useful repositories that may or may not be successfully searched
23 for solutions, given the time and ability required to do so. Being on the virtual space means
24 that a comprehensive range of development practitioners can be brought to deliver
25 'solutions', where they can seek both esteem and monetary benefits. The uptake of SOLVER
26 that is at this point in time a concept being tabled in this paper will be contingent on how
27 policy makers and aid agencies promote it, and how the Sharers and Seekers associate with it.
28 The need to highlight and evaluate its functioning will not only amplify its reach – crucial for
29 it to act beyond localised networks, i.e. as a global network generating solutions. The attitude
30 in practice and of communities that comprise not only beneficiary communities but also other
31 stakeholder communities like aid agencies and policy makers will become more explorative.
32 This is of course while making for customization in context (solutions to specific problems)
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and within the scope of a given particular PAI design - to control for sporadicness in
4
5 suggestions that are taken forward.
6
7

8 To quote Niels Bohr (Ottavani, 2004, p. 34): "*There are trivial truths and the great truths.*
9
10 *The opposite of a trivial truth is plainly false. The opposite of a great truth is also true*". The
11
12 great truth here is that 'lessons learned' are useful for informing the performance of poverty
13
14 alleviation intervention. The opposite of this great truth is that they are not useful as
15
16 knowledge contextualised in past interventions, unless translated into solutions to problems
17
18 being faced on existing interventions. The trivial truth of course is that seeking solutions is
19
20 equally if not more important than drawing lessons – when the issue to hand is about
21
22 enhancing aid effectiveness.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

Alsop, R., Sjoblom, D. Namazie, C. and Patil, P. (2002), Community-level user groups in three world bank- aided projects: do they perform as expected? *Social development papers*, 40. World Bank Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Development (ESSD) Network, Washington D.C.

Alvarez, S.A. and Barney, J.B. (2013), “Entrepreneurial Opportunities and Poverty Alleviation”, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 38 No. 1, pp. 159-184.

BCAI (2014), Business Call to Action Initiative (BCAI) of the UNDP, available at: <http://acumen.org/investment/lifespring/> (accessed, 01 July 2015).

Changemakers (2014), Information on design and activities, available at: <http://www.changemakers.com/community/changemakers> (accessed, 13 June 2015).

Easterly, W. (2007), “Are aid agencies improving?” *Economic Policy*, Vol. 22 No. 2, pp. 633-678, pp. 36-43.

Coakes, E. (2006), “Storing and sharing knowledge: Supporting the management of knowledge made explicit in transnational organisations”, *The Learning Organisation*, Vol. 13 No. 6, pp. 36-43

Economist (2012), Path Through Fields.3rd November, available at: <http://www.economist.com/news/briefing/21565617-bangladesh-has-dysfunctional-politics-and-stunted-private-sector-yet-it-has-been-surprisingly> (accessed, 30 June 2015).

1
2
3 GDN (2014), Profile and activities, available at:

4
5 <http://www.gdn.int/html/page8.php?MID=12&SID=35> (accessed, 30 June 2015).

6
7
8 Goel, G. and Rishi, M. (2012), “ Promoting Entrepreneurship to Alleviate Poverty in India:
9 An Overview of Government Schemes, Private – Sector Programs, and Initiatives in the
10 Citizens’ Sector”, *Thunderbird International Business Review*, Vol. 50 No. 4, pp. 45-57

11
12
13
14
15 Hess, T. and Polednakova, A. (2013), “Correction of the claim for microfinance market on
16 1.5 billion clients”, *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences*, Vol 2 No.1, pp.
17 18-31

18
19
20
21
22 IMF (2015), The IMF and the Millennium Development Goals, available at:

23
24 <https://www.imf.org/external/np/exr/facts/pdf/mdg.pdf>, p. 2. (accessed, 23 April 2015).

25
26
27
28
29 Larson, B., Minten, B., & Ramy, R. (2006). Unravelling the linkages between the
30 millennium development goals for poverty, education, access to water and household
31 water use in developing countries: Evidence from Madagascar. *Journal of Development*
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Studies, Vol. 42, No. 1, pp. 22-40.

Lin, J.Y. (2011), Blog posting on development talk, available at:

<http://blogs.worldbank.org/developmenttalk/archive/201102> (accessed, 23 April 2015).

March, J.G. (1991). “Exploration and Exploitation in Organizational Learning”.

Organization Science, Vol. 2 No. 1, pp. 71–87.

Miller, D. (1990), *The Icarus Paradox*. Harper Business

1
2
3 Ortrud, L. (2011). Freedom of choice and poverty alleviation. *Review of Social Economy*,
4
5 69(4), 439-463.
6
7

8
9
10
11 Ottaviani, J. (2004) *Suspended In Language: Niels Bohr's Life, Discoveries, and The*
12
13 *Century He Shaped*. Ann Arbor, MI G.T. Labs: p. 34.
14

15
16 Rafael A. and Boglio, M. (2008) Grassroots Support Organizations and Transformative
17
18 Practices. *Journal of Community Practice*, Vol 16 No. 3, pp. 339-358.
19

20
21
22
23
24
25 Saunders, P. and Naidoo, Y. (2009). Poverty, deprivation and consistent poverty. *The*
26
27 *Economic Record*, 85, No.271, pp. 417-432.
28

29
30 Sen, A. (2005). "Human rights and capabilities", *Journal of Human Development*, Vol. 6 No.
31
32 2, pp. 151-166
33

34
35
36 Sharma, S. (2007). People vs. poverty: Powering through partnerships. *Futures*, Vol. 39
37
38 No. 4, pp. 625-631
39

40
41 Shenhar, A.J., Dvir, L., Ofer and Maltz, A.C. (2001), "Project Success: A Multidimensional
42
43 Strategic Concept", *Long range Planning*, Vol. 34 No. 6, pp. 699-725
44

45
46 Tandler, J. (1989), "What Ever Happened to Poverty Alleviation?" *World Development*, Vol.
47
48 17 No. 7, pp. 1033-1044.
49

1
2
3 UNDP (2014) UNDP's Knowledge Management Strategy, available at:

4
5 http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/ourwork/knowledge_exchange.html(accessed, 7
6
7 April 2015).

8
9
10 UNDP (2014), UNDP success stories, available at: [http://web.undp.org/comtoolkit/success-](http://web.undp.org/comtoolkit/success-stories/LAC-Argentina-povred2.shtml)
11
12 [stories/LAC-Argentina-povred2.shtml](http://web.undp.org/comtoolkit/success-stories/LAC-Argentina-povred2.shtml) (accessed, 9 April 2015).

13
14
15 WAFC (2014), World Agro Forestry Centre- African Highlands Initiative, available at
16
17 <http://worldagroforestry.org/regions/eastern-africa/our-projects/ahi> (accessed, 01 May 2015).

18
19
20
21 World Bank (2014), Knowledge Sharing for development: A learning activity, available at:
22
23 <http://go.worldbank.org/P1z3rr7y30> (accessed, 12 May 2015)

24
25
26 World Bank (2015), Capacity for knowledge Management in Organisations, available at:
27
28 <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/WBI/Resources/CKMObrief.pdf> (accessed, 23 June 2015)

29
30
31 World Bank (2015) Knowledge Sharing for development: A learning activity, available at:
32
33 <http://go.worldbank.org/P1z3rr7y30> (accessed, 22 April 2015)
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Notes

¹ Blog posting by the ex- World Bank Chief Economist, Justin Yifu Lin 2011

² Led by Mohammad Yunus, the Grameen bank intervention. Grameen Bank and Yunus received the Nobel prize (2006) and other honours like the Congressional Gold Medal (U.S, 2010). BRAC is a strong a contender for the top accolades on its transformative impact on the country's poverty levels despite macro level growth indicators being moderate.

³ Enhancing the management of public procurement in health services in Matanza, Argentina by the UNDP -partnering public sector and none governmental bodies. The project, helped refine procurement, resourcing and delivery processes. See: UNDP success stories.

⁴ World Agro forestry Centre's Initiative reached over 1 million farmers at the close of 2013, with the intent of interfacing smallholder food production with perennially maintaining green cover over farmlands.

⁵ A public sector and Acumen fund partnership for low cost maternity health services. Now part of the Business Call to Action Initiative (BCAI) of the UNDP See: LIFESPRING. Available at <http://acumen.org/investment/lifespring/> Retrieved August 12, 2014.

⁶ The issues with replicating the Grameen Bank microfinance experience are widely reported, as but one example of star legacies not being taken forward potentially due to too much focus on imitation in replication

Table 1: Blueprint of solver

A: SEEKING	B: SCOPING SOLUTIONS FROM SHARING	C: FEEDBACK & VALIDATION OF IMPACT
<p>A1. Contact the SOLVER portal by registering and logging in as SEEKER & post an outline of issues and problems within 1000 words.</p> <p>A2. A FACILLITATOR gets back with clarifications on the outline (<i>within 2 days: Cumulative 2 days</i>).</p> <p>A3. The SEEKER clarifies to finalise a SEEK NOTE and KEYWORDS that capture issues being faced (<i>within 3 days: Cumulative 5 days</i>). If unclear / not responded to then the problems posting is marked as 'exited' and requires reposting.</p> <p>A4. SEEK NOTE* is posted on open share for SHARERS. Also, individuals emails are automatically</p>	<p>B1. The FACILLITATOR team classifies the responses received as under: 'EXPERT' and 'OPEN' (A4).</p> <p>B2. The FACILLITATOR TEAM goes through SHARER notes for clarity and coherence in expression (<i>3 days of SEEKING closure for a post : cumulative time 22 days</i>) and seeks clarifications if any (<i>3 days: cumulative time 25 days</i>)</p> <p>B3. All SHARER notes are ranked on clarity and coherence and labelled</p>	<p>C1. FACILLITATOR contacts the SEEKER in 45 days to seek views on utility and evaluate how the suggestions appeal</p> <p>C2. FACILLITATOR contacts SEEKER in 120 days to seek views on utility and evaluate how the suggestions have worked/ how they met up with the promise /concerns articulated in C1.</p> <p>C3. FACILLITATOR generates feedback note and rank the utility of</p>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

<p>send out to ‘expert’ SHARERS triggered by key words.</p> <p>A5. SHARERS are asked in the communication (by email -experts and others on open portal) to respond within 1000 words within 14 days of the communication: 1. the solution; 2. rationale for the solution [what they are drawing on and why they think it will work]; 3. Assumptions made; 4. Additional information they would like to have and additional resources that their suggestion may require (<i>In that order : 14 days: Cumulative 19days</i>).</p> <p><i>*Confidentiality between sharers and seekers is important and the ‘SEEK NOTE’, and communications thereafter will be mediated by FACILLITATORS will be tailored as far as possible for this. Consultancies and individuals working their business offerings as vested</i></p>	<p>‘expert’ or ‘open’ by two FACILLITATORS to converge ranking. A maximum of 7 based on clarity and coherence are chosen. These are posted to the SEEKER as ‘shortlisted suggestions’. The SEEKER is separately send all other suggestions also as ‘other suggestions’ (<i>3 days: Cumulative time to posting solution from ‘SEEKING POINT’: 28 days</i>)</p> <p>B4. Any queries are fed back to SHARERS for clarifying and posting back via FACILLITATORS to SEEKERS. (Typical cycle 10 days from query) and typically 2</p>	<p>suggestions based on C1 and pins it to suggestions that were reflected upon.</p> <p>C4. FACILITATOR updates SHARER ratings and open vs. expert profiling. A good review on an open sharer will make him /her in the list of experts for the domain associated KEYWORDS. Poor review of an expert submission over three successive solutions will make the individual drop out of expert list for KEYWORDS.</p> <p>C5. Update “star sharers” and “value seekers”. SHARERS get scores based on utility marked by seekers and SEEKERS get scores based on feedback they provide for C1 and C2.</p>
--	--	---

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

<p><i>interest is a risk that such an approach seeks to mitigate</i></p>		<p>iterations.</p>		
--	--	--------------------	--	--



[ORGANISER BLOCK] O1: [From C4] update sharer ratings; **O2:** From D5 update “star sharers” and “value seeker” LEADER BOARDS; **O3:** Value for those who engage: Annual Meeting of top 10 : “star sharers” and “value seekers”; **O4.** Value seekers and Star Sharers get to network with key resource providers including aid agency personnel; **O5** Star Sharers get monetary awards and public recognition .

The Learning Organization