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Introduction

The New-Knowledge based global economy reveals distinctive challenges to companies, regions, national governments (e.g., Teece, 2000b, Statistics Canada, 2005), and international organizations (e.g., Roelandt & den Hertog, 1999). Also, the emergence of global networks and communications and the Internet presents strategic opportunities and threats both to entrepreneurs and to companies (e.g., Tapscott and Williams, 2006).

Recently, an immense interest proliferation has been seen in the topics of knowledge and knowledge management (KM) in the academic literature (e.g., Kluge et al., 2001, Ruggles, 1998). Knowledge in the new economy is seen as the most important asset (e.g., Lytras et al. 2008). Notwithstanding this “hype,” the need for a better understanding of managing knowledge and knowledge management as a strategic elements is more acute than ever (e.g. Davenport and Grover, 2001; Gilmour, 2003, Soo et al. 2002).

The research prism presented here is similar to Bierly and Chakrabarti’s (1996) (which is a rare example of an experiential study of KM strategies) and Pitt and Clarke’s (1999) methodologies, which suggests that knowledge strategies will be an imperative area of strategic choices that companies will have to make in order to succeed. The taxonomy proposed below is based on the CEEP typology described in earlier research. The findings of our earlier research (Russ et al. 2005, 2006a, 2006b, 2008) indicate that four of the six dimensions might be of most importance and will be used for the taxonomies developed below.

Background

Numerous empirically based (descriptive) and theoretically based (prescriptive) taxonomies of business and/or generic strategies were proposed by academics (see examples of reviews at White, 1986; Parnell, 1997, Raisch, 2004). For example, Porter (1985) used two dimensions of the competitive advantage (price and value) and the scope of the market (whole versus niche), to define three prescriptive (generic) business strategies: cost leadership, differentiation, and focus (niche), that was later extended (e.g., Wright, 1987). Another example was used in describing international business strategies, while using the price sensitivity and customer responsiveness dimensions (Bartlett and Goshall, 1989) to define four prescriptive strategies: international, global, multi-domestic, and transnational, that were later validated (e.g., Leong and Tan, 1993) and improved (e.g., Harzing, 2000). One of the most frequently used descriptive business strategies was developed by Miles and Snow (1978) that identified four business strategies: defenders, prospectors, analyzers, and reactors, that were also later validated (e.g., Parnell and Wright, 1993) and extended (e.g., Wright et al., 1990).

A few typologies and/or taxonomies of KM strategies were also studied recently by academics.
Bierly and Chakrabarti (1996) identified four basic strategic dilemmas that companies have regarding their knowledge base. The four dilemmas in their typology are: external versus internal learning; radical versus incremental learning; the speed of learning and the breath of their knowledge base. Bierly and Chakrabarti (1996) operationalized this typology within the pharmaceutical industry by using five dimensional spaces as measured by: R&D intensity, science linkage, knowledge dispersion, technology cycle time and learning radicalness. Their descriptive taxonomy was comprised of four generic KM strategies: the explorers, exploiters, loners, and innovators.

Pitt and Clarke (1999) proposed six dilemmas regarding companies’ knowledge base when facing decisions regarding their innovation strategies. They proposed the following typology: exploitation of their current product markets and technology base versus exploration of new innovation domain; incremental innovation versus discontinuity; tight control of the process versus flexibility; internal development of the innovation versus acquisition from external sources; individual autonomy versus collective responsibility; and creativity in the process versus procedural and formalized disciplined process.

Earl (2001) identified a descriptive KM strategy taxonomy comprised of seven, what he called, schools: three technocratic schools of: systems, cartographic, and engineering; one economic school: commercial and three behavioral schools: organizational, spatial and strategic. For his taxonomy he used the following attributes: focus, aim, unit, critical success factors, principal IT contribution, and philosophy.

**KM Strategy taxonomies**

Based on our previous research, we identified six taxonomies, each based on two strategic dilemmas.

**Codification-Tacitness and Exploration-Exploitation Strategies**

Our earliest research (Russ et al. 2005) suggested that Codification-Tacitness and Exploration-Exploitation strategic dilemmas might be of the most importance. Four alternative strategies that companies can use when managing their KM assets (see Figure 1 below) were proposed within Taxonomy A. As part of this and later research (Russ et al. 2006a and 2006b) we were also able to relate outcome effectiveness to the strategies identified. Only in the case of this taxonomy, do we have definite conclusions.
Figure 1

*Taxonomy A*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exploitation</th>
<th>Structured Utilization</th>
<th>Intuitive Utilization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td>Structured Innovation</td>
<td>Intuitive Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Russ et al. 2005

Type I companies employ the Structured Utilization strategy. Those companies concentrate on exploiting their currently existing knowledge while also codifying that knowledge. “Structured Utilizers” use codification and exploitation strategies concentrating on codification of knowledge when sustaining their new product development efforts to improve their existing products, and servicing their existing clients to achieve higher process effectiveness. Such a strategy choice results in lower (within Taxonomy A) product effectiveness than the exploration alternative (Type III has a higher product effectiveness than type I ) and in higher process effectiveness than the tacitness alternative (Type I has a higher process effectiveness than type II), based on our research results.

Type II companies employ the Intuitive Utilization strategy. Intuitive Utilization companies concentrate on exploiting their currently existing knowledge while maintaining this knowledge as tacit. The “Intuitive Utilizers” use tacitness and exploitation strategies focused on keeping the knowledge tacit, concentrating on sustaining their new product development to improve their present products, and servicing their existing markets. Such a strategy choice results in lower (within Taxonomy A) product effectiveness than the exploration alternative (Type IV has a higher product effectiveness than type II) and in lower (within Taxonomy A) process effectiveness than the codification alternative (Type I has a higher process effectiveness than type II). This seems to be the least effective strategy (out of the four mentioned here) based on our research results.
Type III companies employ the Structured Innovation strategy. Structured Innovation companies concentrate on exploring new knowledge to the extent that it is feasible while codifying this knowledge. The “Structured Innovators” use codification and exploration strategies that concentrate on codification of new knowledge as sustaining new innovative product development and/or servicing new markets to attain higher process and product effectiveness. Such a strategy choice results in higher (within Taxonomy A) product effectiveness than the exploitation alternative (Type III has a higher product effectiveness than type I) and higher (within Taxonomy A) process effectiveness than the tacitness alternative (Type III has a higher process effectiveness than type IV). Out of the four mentioned here this seems to be the most effective strategy, based on our research results.

Type IV companies employ the Intuitive Innovation strategy. Those companies concentrate on exploring new knowledge as much as they can while maintaining this knowledge tacit. The “Intuitive Innovators” use tacitness and exploration strategies that concentrate on developing new innovative products and/or servicing new markets while keeping their knowledge tacit. Such a strategy choice results in higher (within Taxonomy A) product effectiveness than the exploitation alternative (Type IV has a higher product effectiveness than type II) and in lower (within Taxonomy A) process effectiveness than the codification alternative (Type III has a higher process effectiveness than type IV), based on our research results.

**Exploration-Exploitation and External Acquisition-Internal Development Strategies**

Our research findings (Russ et al. 2006a and 2006b) suggest that the combination of the Exploration-Exploitation and that of the External Acquisition-Internal Development dimensions is also significant, (see Taxonomy B in Figure 2 below). **Figure 2**

**Taxonomy B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exploitation</th>
<th>Exploration</th>
<th>Exploitation</th>
<th>Exploration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Utilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Russ et al. 2006a
Type A companies employ the External Utilization strategy. External Utilization companies concentrate on exploiting their currently existing knowledge while focusing on their core activities and using knowledge and capabilities from the outside to the extent that it is feasible for everything else. The “External Utilizers” employ external acquisition and exploitation strategies concentrating on their core capabilities to enhance their existing products and servicing their existing markets while concentrating on developing close relationships with external constituencies. This seems to be the least effective, in terms of product effectiveness, strategy (out of the four mentioned here- Taxonomy B), based on our research results. This might suggest that outsourcing strategies might not be the most effective strategy when “product based outcomes” are the focus of the strategy. However, this may not prevent this strategy from being the most appropriate with regard to process efficiencies.

Type B companies employ the Internal Utilization strategy. Internal Utilization companies concentrate on exploiting their currently existing knowledge while focusing on developing most of the knowledge they need internally. The “Internal Utilizers” employ internal development and exploitation strategies concentrating on developing internally the knowledge they need to improve their existing products and servicing existing markets while concentrating on developing close relationships within the company.

Type C companies employ the External Innovation strategy. External Innovation companies concentrate on exploring new knowledge focusing on their core activities while acquiring the rest of the knowledge from external sources. The “External Innovators” employ external acquisition and exploration strategies that concentrate on supporting new innovative product development and/or servicing new markets while centering their attention on developing close relationships with external constituencies.

Type D companies employ the Internal Innovation strategy. Internal Innovation companies concentrate on exploring new knowledge to the extent that it is feasible while developing most of the knowledge they need internally. The “Internal Innovators” employ internal development and exploration strategies that concentrate on internally embracing the new knowledge needed to support new innovative product development and/or servicing new markets to achieve higher product effectiveness. This seems to be the most effective strategy (out of the four mentioned here-Taxonomy B), based on our research results.

**Codification-Tacitness and External Acquisition-Internal Development Strategies**

The outcomes results based on our earlier research (Russ et al. 2006a, and 2006b) also suggest that the combination of the Codification-Tacitness and that of External Acquisition-Internal Development dimensions might be of importance (see Taxonomy C in Figure 3 below).
Type (1) companies employ the External Codification strategy. External Codification companies concentrate on codifying their core activities and using knowledge and capabilities from the outside to the extent that it is feasible for everything else. The “External Codifiers” employ external acquisition and codification strategies concentrating on their core capabilities to improve their products and servicing their markets.

Type (2) companies employ the Internal Codification strategy. Internal Codification companies concentrate on codifying most of their knowledge as much as possible while developing most of the knowledge they need internally. The “Internal Codifiers” employ internal development and codification strategies that concentrate on internally embracing the new knowledge needed to support new product development and/or servicing their markets to achieve higher product effectiveness. This seems to be the most effective strategy (out of the four mentioned here—Taxonomy C), based on our research results.

Type (3) companies employ the External Tacitness strategy. External Tacitness companies concentrate on maintaining their core capabilities knowledge tacit and using knowledge and capabilities from the outside as much as possible for everything else. The “External Intuitive” use external acquisition and tacitness strategies concentrating on their core capabilities to improve their products and servicing their markets while centering their attention on developing close relationships with external constituencies. This seems to be the least effective strategy (out of the four mentioned here—Taxonomy C), based on our research results.
Type (4) companies employ the Internal Tacitness strategy. Internal Tacitness companies concentrate on maintaining their knowledge tacit as much as they can while developing most of the knowledge they need internally. The “Internal Intuitive” use internal development and tacitness strategies that focus on embracing internally the knowledge needed to support new product development and/or servicing their markets while focusing on developing close relationships within the company.

Our recent study (Russ et al. 2008) suggested that the Product-Process dilemma might also be of significance. Below we describe the feasible taxonomies resulting from the combination of this dilemma with the other three dilemmas used above.

*Product-Process and External Acquisition-Internal Development Strategies*

The next taxonomy describes a combination of the Product-Process and that of External Acquisition-Internal Development dimensions (see Taxonomy D in Figure 4 below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Acquisition</th>
<th>Internal Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Product</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>α</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>γ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>δ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type (α) companies employ the External Product strategy. External Product companies concentrate their core activities on developing and managing their product strategies externally, and using all other needed knowledge and capabilities from the outside to the extent that it is feasible for everything else. The “External Product” companies employ external acquisition to improve and or develop their new products concentrating on their core capabilities to service their markets while making sure that their reward system is consistent and supporting such activities.
Type (β) companies employ the Internal Product strategy. Internal Product companies concentrate on developing most of their product knowledge they need internally, while using as little as possible of all other needed knowledge and capabilities from the outside for everything else. The “Internal Product” companies concentrate their core capabilities on internal development to improve and or develop their new products and use external partners to develop and serve their markets, while making sure that their reward system is consistent and supporting such activities.

Type (γ) companies employ the External Process strategy. External Process companies concentrate on maintaining their products and focusing their core capabilities knowledge on process improvement by using knowledge and capabilities from the outside as much as possible. The “External Process” companies use external acquisition and process improvement strategies concentrating on their core capabilities to improve their processes and servicing their markets while centering their attention on developing close relationships with external constituencies and while making sure that their reward system is consistent and supporting such activities.

Type (δ) companies employ the Internal Process strategy. Internal Process companies concentrate on improving the process knowledge they need internally, while using as little as possible of all other needed knowledge and capabilities from the outside for everything else. The “Internal Process” companies use internal development that focus on embracing internally the knowledge needed to support new process development and/or servicing their markets while focusing on developing close relationships within the company, while making sure that their reward system is consistent and supporting such activities.

Product-Process and Codification-Tacitness Strategies

The next taxonomy describes a combination of the Product-Process and that of Codification-Tacitness dimensions (see Taxonomy E in Figure 5 below).
Figure 5

Taxonomy E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Codification</th>
<th>Tacitness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Product</td>
<td>Codified</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Codified</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type (8) companies employ the Codified Product strategy. Codified Product companies concentrate on codifying their knowledge of product development and management focusing on their core capabilities to improve their products and servicing their markets. Codified Product companies sustain their process development efforts to improve their products and servicing of their clients to achieve higher product effectiveness by using the most appropriate source of knowledge and using the appropriate IT systems to support their core capabilities as needed.

Type (2) companies employ the Tacit Product strategy. Tacit Product companies concentrate on maintaining their knowledge of product development and management as tacit, focusing on their core capabilities to improve their products, and servicing their markets. Tacit Product companies sustain their process development efforts to improve their products and the servicing of their clients to achieve higher process effectiveness by using the most appropriate source of knowledge and using the appropriate IT systems to support their core capabilities as needed.

Type (6) companies employ the Codified Process strategy. Codified Process companies concentrate on codifying most of their process knowledge as much as possible. The Codified Process companies employ codification strategies that concentrate on internally embracing the most appropriate source of knowledge and using the appropriate IT systems to support their core capabilities that will result in higher process effectiveness.

Type (7) companies employ the Tacit Process strategy. Tacit Process companies concentrate on maintaining and developing their process knowledge tacit as much as they can. The Tacit Process companies use tacitness strategies that focus on embracing internally the knowledge and the use of the appropriate IT systems to support process development and/or servicing their markets while focusing on developing close relationships within the company.
**Product-Process and Exploration-Exploitation Strategies**

The next taxonomy describes a combination of the Product-Process and that of Exploration -Exploitation dimensions (see Taxonomy F in Figure 6 below).

**Figure 6**

*Taxonomy F*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exploitation</th>
<th>Exploration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Product</td>
<td>Product Utilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Process Utilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ت</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type (١) companies employ the Product Utilization strategy. Product Utilization companies concentrate on exploiting their currently existing product knowledge while servicing their existing and/or new markets. The Product Utilization companies employ existing and/or new processes concentrating on their core capabilities to enhance their product strategies and focusing on their core activities and using knowledge and capabilities to the extent that it is feasible for everything else.

Type (٢) companies employ the Product Innovation strategy. Product Innovation companies concentrate on exploring new knowledge focusing on new product development activities while utilizing their existing knowledge for the non core activities. The Product Innovation companies employ product and exploration strategies that concentrate on supporting new innovative product development and/or servicing new markets while centering their attention on delivering those products to their customers.
Type (ativos) companies employ the Process Utilization strategy. The Process Utilization companies employ process and exploitation strategies concentrating on utilizing their currently existing process knowledge while also focusing on improving their process strategies and servicing existing markets.

Type (ativos) companies employ the Process Innovation strategy. Process Innovation companies concentrate on exploring new process knowledge to the extent that it is feasible. The Process Innovation companies employ internal and/or external resources for development of new processes to service their markets while improving on their process strategies.

**KM Strategy Framework**

If the six C³EEP strategic dilemmas describe above are combined with the KM strategic levers and outcomes measures as were identified in our earlier research (e.g., Russ et al. 2005, 2006a, 2006b), a possible framework for KM strategy emerges (see Table 1 below). The levers that were found to be of significance in regards to the strategic dilemmas as well as the outcome indicators in our earlier research are marked with an “X” under each strategic dilemma.
Table 1 – KM Strategy Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KM Levers/Outcomes</th>
<th>Codification versus Tacitness</th>
<th>Complementary versus Destroying</th>
<th>Concealment versus Transparency</th>
<th>External Acquisition versus Internal Development</th>
<th>Exploration versus Exploitation</th>
<th>Product/Service versus Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Product/Service Development-strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Product developed in the last two years-weight</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market-Scope</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processes-Capabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees utilization</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The role of IT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of IT and Data</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Russ et al. 2006a
Conclusions

This framework should provide KM practitioners, as well as academic researchers with guidelines regarding where to focus their attention, and where to focus resource allocation when considering alternative business and KM strategies (e.g., Pitt and Clarke, 1999).

For example, companies that utilize Codification strategy and are investing intensely in IS technology are advised to verify/ensure that their reward systems and employee utilization strategy (as well as culture) are aligned (e.g., Bartol and Srivastava, 2002; Cowan et al. 2000; David et al. 1992). Companies are advised not to forget the need to balance this internal focus with the need to develop appropriate new products as part of the appropriate Exploration strategy (e.g., Baker and Sinkula, 1999; Connell et al. 2001; Miner et al. 2001; Shoham and Fiegenbaum, 1999).

Our research findings also suggest that the Codification strategy is more appropriate when the company’s focus is on process effectiveness as a major outcome while the “Exploration-Codification-Internal Development” strategy is more appropriate when the focus is on product effectiveness as a major outcome. A plausible explanation for this might be that process codification might make it easier to measure and manage when focusing on process effectiveness as a critical success indicator (e.g., Davenport, 1993), while for success in New Product Development, identifying new customers and exploring new needs is more pertinent (e.g., Smith and Reinertsen, 1998).

Future trends

Our own research as well as others (e.g., Miller et al. 2007) would suggest that companies are using a combination of the six taxonomies mentioned above, and that there are synergies between some of them more than others. For example, the “Internal-Codifier-Innovator” (“2” * “III” using our taxonomies notation) strategy (in our research, Russ et al., 2006a), seems to be the most effective in terms of product and process effectiveness, on the other hand, the “External-Intuitive-Utilizer” (“3” * “II” using our taxonomies notation) strategy seems to be the least effective strategy. Or, as Miller et al. (2007) found within manufacturing firms that product strategies and exploration strategy together with focus on radical innovation seem to work hand in hand as well as process strategies and exploitation strategy with focus on incremental innovation; which in our taxonomy translates into Product- Innovator- Destroyer and Process-Utilizer-Complementer. Questions of interest can be raised here. Will some industries provide a more fruitful environment for different combinations than others? If different sized companies, will they have a tendency to use or avoid specific strategies and combinations of strategies? Also, what different key success indicators aspired by the companies might be supported by different combinations of strategies? For example, outcomes of profitability and earnings, might show different results (e.g., Russ et al. 2005).

There are two additional dimensions of the C³EEP typology that were not used yet for KM strategy taxonomies (Complementary-Destroying and Concealment-Transparent). We would suspect, that these two dilemmas will become more and more important due to recent ICT trends.
(e.g., Russ et al. 2008). The question raised here is, which of the nine plausible combinations that the two dilemmas are adding in combination with the previously mentioned four are of more importance (if there is any difference in importance)? We must also, keep in mind the relevancy of industry and company size.

As mentioned in our earlier research, we would like to remind the reader, that there is a crucial need to incorporate the aspects of organizational culture and the technology aspects of KBS in each KM strategy discussion, which unfortunately is rarely done (see a rare recent example in Im and Rai, 2008).

Key Terms

KM strategy prescriptive Taxonomy
The classification of the types of KM strategies in the context of business strategy at the corporate, strategic business unit, functional and operational level of analysis, prescribed by researchers based on theoretical studies resulting first in typology.

KM strategy descriptive Taxonomy
The classification of the types of KM strategies in the context of business strategy at the corporate, strategic business unit, functional and operational level of analysis, described by researchers, based on study findings and the typology interpreted by them.

Organizational KM strategy
The strategy (the mission, visions, goals and the game plans of achieving them) the organization has in regards to its knowledge base and its ties to its capabilities, competencies and business strategies resulting in value to its constituencies.

Organizational Knowledge-Base
Consists of knowledge embedded in systems, software resulting in structural knowledge (capital), in processes, relations, etc., resulting in social knowledge (capital), in people as tacit knowledge, resulting in human knowledge (capital), and in patents, brands, etc, resulting in Intellectual property. This is the lowest layer of what the organization is (in a knowledge based perspective) supporting capabilities, competencies, sustainable competitive advantage resulting in value (e.g. profits, etc.).

KM strategy levers
Organizational, technological and human resources means and arrangements put in place that will allow to improve the effectiveness of KM strategy and/or systems by multiplying their effectiveness and also by proving a mechanism for adjustment when and where needed.

Process effectiveness as an outcome
Setting up the right targets for how the organization creates and delivers its product/service to its customers. Specifically, the indicators used were: increase in productivity, work conditions improvements, and decrease of complaints by customers, reduction of costs and ability to meet deadlines.
Product effectiveness as an outcome

Setting up the right targets of what products/services the organization creates and delivers to its customers. Specifically, the indicators used were: increase in number of customized products/services, variety and number of new products/services offered.
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