

STUDY GROUPS: REPORT BACK

Chair: Nachman Oron
ICA Vice Chair

1 Knowledge Management
Hugo Agius-Muscat
Malta

2 Biometrics
Uzy Berlinsky
Israel

Nachman Oron Vice Chair ICA. This year we had activities in four study groups. One of them you will be hearing tomorrow from Hans Werner Ksica, Austria on Security, this was at last accomplished in July and was very well done. We started two study Groups, one on '**Knowledge Management**' and another on '**Biometrics**'. We now have to consider how we continue with these, what has been done so far, what there is to survey. Some of you have already been contacted by telephone when we collected information. May I ask our friend Hugo Agius-Muscat from Malta with Head of Knowledge Management and Communications in the Prime Ministers office in Malta to come and give us a presentation on his findings.

Hugo Agius-Muscat, Malta. Thank you Nachman for the introduction.

This is a study group in gestation. The first idea for the study group came at last year's conference. There did not seem to be much response at the time which had taken me by surprise and I was interested in the subject and my gut feeling is that there are pockets of growth in many governments in this area. The problem is actually identifying them and bringing them together and it is interesting that I found more enthusiasm for the study group outside the actual core of ICA than within it.

My agenda this morning which will be brief because of constraints of time is quickly telling you about the study group, an overview of the survey findings and the renewed call for participation.

The study group on Knowledge Management is actually a knowledge management exercise in itself because the intention is to share knowledge about what is happening in knowledge management, specifically in government administrations and this thing from the private sector where the activity is now very strong as a guide to policy making, first speaking for myself I am more on the policy making side now rather than purely the technology side and I think that information like this is important guide to people actually formulating policy for their own governments in this field. A number of study domains were identified the former activity as regards policy and strategy formulation organisation and measures which governments are taking prefer their knowledge management, whether specific budgeting is being allocated, whether there are systems and specific software applications in place as further collaboration, electronic records management enterprise content management and for the acquisition and sharing and transfer of knowledge. And finally, we also looked at Matrix and whether they are measures of success of care initiatives which are emerging. Interest was expressed by six countries. More strongly by some rather than others. See them up on the

screen. Coming to the survey now. The survey was intended to be a sensitive rather than specific tool, in fact it was not quantitative but rather semi politiative and started exploring the domains which are within the study group remit.

We received 10 completed survey questionnaires from countries and one also from the European Commission. I can see people around the room who have contributed and thank them very much for their efforts. The slide shows the countries apart from the European Commission which gave in their responses. I also received useful pointers from the UK, Paul Weller although not in the questionnaire format which have been useful for me.

Now going to responses. One of the first questions was on a definition of Knowledge Management and this already confirms that different countries look at it very differently. There were obviously common elements in the different definitions, I will not actually be reading through these. I've captured a lot of information on the slides so that people who would like to go further can actually have a look at the pathway which will be published on the ICA website shortly. Multidisciplinary is certainly a feature that came in several definitions. The definitions varied a lot from pure data to a human aspect of project management. The Canadian definition which is, I gather, specific to the inter-department forum of KM is the longest, most complex semantically means of like an admissions statement, but very interesting if you actually analyse it because it encompasses a lot of what that form is trying to achieve.

Ours is more of a systems oriented definition. The Dutch one is interesting because it actually looks at attributes like experience skills and attitudes. The Norwegian one is very very sharp. The right information at the right time to the right people at the right cost. And again, Singapore, some similarities to the Australian definition, again emphasises the multidisciplinary approach, the collaboration approach. Some countries said they didn't have a formal definition and a list of terms which are akin to Knowledge Management. Moving on to the formal strategies, a number of countries did state that they did have a formal strategy. Five of these are in the public domain. Unfortunately, some of them are not in English, so they are a bit inaccessible. There are common elements in these. Not surprisingly ECM was high up on the list, so was ERM, which is growing in importance across governments. Corporate data architecture standard as well, which is the semantics of Knowledge Management yet need more definition and the corporate data architecture standards will play an important role in this, I am sure. E-learning came rather far down on the list. A little surprising, I must say.

Now I asked about the lead responsibility for Knowledge Management initiatives and government. More as a proxy measure of whether governments feel they should be appointing a person, a lead person in charge of Knowledge Management. And a few years, Gartner came out with the concept of Chief Knowledge Officer, and this concept has been developed to differing extents by different governments. But there is no consistency in the names or titles, or the allocation of responsibility in different governments. I asked about budgets. I was not too hopeful in this domain, but two countries actually gave specific figures. Most clear were Singapore who calculated a percentage of their total city budget and gave me an annual estimate of \$154 million. Norway as well gave an estimate for their project over 7 months. I will try to annualise to \$1.2million there. Others have budgets but they are down at the department delivers, so it was difficult for the respondents to aggregate them. The others either, do not have a specific budget or it is not at the corporate level so the information was not collected.

Now I asked about software because, even though much of Knowledge Management is human especially on the tacit side of the equation. The capturing of that knowledge does come back to software.

A lot of the software is touching on the less structured. So I asked about emailing in Canada for example. Various enterprises in this area, Microsoft Exchange and Outlook, and Lotus and Lotus Mail dominated the picture. I asked about software elsewhere; again Lotus and Microsoft products came up but then a number of interesting products also were mentioned which I am exploring from different countries.

Instant messaging. I was interested to hear the keynote speaker mention it, because it is very much on the interface with tacit knowledge, but from the response I received, governments do not seem to be exploring the software side of instant messaging and the products like MS Messenger and ICQ. Norway interestingly mentioned the cellphone. Also mentioned UMS but not more than that so, this is an area which has not yet been explored by government. Software for library of services also threw up a number of interesting products. Many of which I knew very little about previously. One interest one particularly is ALEF which is used in Israel, but I also discovered in the course of this conference is it is also in use in Austria. You can see the list there. Intercom by the way is a product I discovered from Austria is also in use in Germany and Switzerland in integrated document management system. The European Commission has its own development products that are widely in use within the European Commission.

Moving on to Directory Services. Perhaps in my question I was not clear enough, I was asking about Enterprise Directory. But the answers were not what one might expect. Active Directory by Microsoft is perhaps a bit less sinuous than I would have thought would have been at this point in time considering the profusion of Microsoft systems.

Moving on asking about software for electronic records management which would seem to be critical for governments. You have Microsoft and Lotus products. There are specific products in countries like Canada based on NDS. No real surprises here.

We also asked about software for Enterprise Content Management and also now we moving to systems where acquisition of knowledge for its storage and for its sharing. I will really run through these, as I told you, my intention was not to present the actual detail but only to give you a flavour of what the sort of information that the web collected to the study group survey. To whet your appetite if you wish and see if there are other countries which may be interested in taking an active part in the study group. I also received specific information came from Canada for which I thank them. In the case of internal transfer of knowledge and competencies information I identified three clear domains; training, documentation and meetings. No great surprises but it was interesting to see the spread of information across the three domains. Measurement of success of knowledge management is thin on the ground. Offers were made by Norway and Singapore. Singapore was the more specific and it really will become important to measure the success of these initiatives if they are going to succeed in the business planning cycle.

Coming to the end, I would like to renew the call for participation, the study group has not yet met. Would have liked to meet just before the meeting here in Tallin, but coming here proved difficult for those who expressed interest possibly partly because they were not ICA delegates. It is proposed to set up a meeting either in a hub city in the sense that it is somewhat easier to meet in a city such as London or perhaps in Malta, there is an interest in that. If there are potential participants, or contributors please do get in touch. Thank you for your attention. I would like to finish by thanking Nachman, and his people, for his encouragement who had me chasing up participants in the survey.

Nachman Oro, Israel. Thank you very much Hugo Agius-Muscat for the interesting presentation. It was short and quick but that's time which leaves me about five minutes to talk about the Biometric Study Group.

Biometric Study Group was to be presented here by Uzy Berlinsky who is Chairing this study group. Uzy is the Director Inspector General in the Prime Ministers Office in Israel and he is chairing the IT Security Council which has much to do with Biometrics. The title is Biometrics in Government Present and Future. I will not go into the detail because it will be all in one week on the website. Again, we used the technique of survey and telephone polling and the results are only Singapore is fully comfortable with the use of technology. The technologies they are using are fingerprints. All respondents replied to governments are planning to implement Biometrics in the near or later future, but other respondents replied that they will be interested in the implementation of Biometrics in the future. There was a question on what can we now reliably depend upon from each of the available biometric technologies and the general feeling is that we are, we can depend on fingerprints, the others are still only on its start. Another question was about the end users and the organisational preference. Whilst from the organisational point of view, retina, iris scan, fingerprints and head geometry seem to be the most reliable products. The survey reveal that end user most prefer fingerprints, iris scan, face or voice recognition as well as signatures. There was a question on the savings reached by convenient factors. In Austria the first priority should be simplicity of use. In Finland in internal use there is no need to remember passwords, and the external use of technology provides travel security. Norway indicates that the area of border crossing, using, does not disturb the traveller. Singapore, the manpower saving in that there would be no need to deploy security officers to check and verify so it is saving in manpower.

The United Kingdom does not think that there is much saving in this, and the United States sorted time in more accurate records keeping. What is presently not accomplished by the horizon for available for Biometrics are... the question was answered by Austria. Fingerprints, Finland, common standards, reliable equipment and the integration of system. Hungary talked about high security systems, Norway for authentication and ID, Singapore; ear shape, hand geometry, line scan in the back of the hand, or beneath the palm. That's some future reasons.

The use of Biometrics is already a major influence in an organisation like the European Union as well as in Singapore. The use of Biometrics is already a major influence in administration or something about future Biometric technologies, you will have the chance to read it. And the summary is that there is evidence that the use of biometrics is increasing somewhat. Overall the respondents felt that increased correct identification of people with the appropriate safeguard in place, justifies the option of biometrics identification programme. Now the big question is whether or not we should continue with this study group. It depends very much on your interest. But there is some feeling that may be it is too early to go further in depth to these technologies. If there will be more interest the study group will continue and will meet, otherwise we will move onto some other subjects that your the international representative recommended on Monday. I would like to indicate one more accomplishment of work done by Benny Raab, Israel on e-Government services. It is accomplished, it is printed, those countries who would like to have report, please ask Benny and he will get it. The report will also be on the website. Thank you very much.