Problem Pit Stop Sessions

Building Flexible Teams
Led by: Kieron Champion, Partner, Fireman & company
Email: Kieron.Champion@fireman.company

- Inflexible teams create a higher risk of irrelevance for those teams and individuals within them. Businesses expect teams/individuals to have or develop an ability to deal with change and ambiguity.
- Transferable skills- if KM teams (and individuals) contain a greater number of transferable skills that is often acknowledged/accepted, and these can often be put to use as the team and its priorities 'flex'.
- Remit and scope of the role is changing quickly - and as a result there is a need to develop skills and expertise at speed but also across a wider range of disciplines and topics. Not all team members need to have the same depth of understanding across all topics but the team must contain requisite expertise/experience.
- Flexible teams should be empowered to say 'no'. Flexibility does not equal saying yes and taking on all tasks or requests. Teams/individuals should understand their priorities, goals and objectives and remain focused on higher-value and agreed activities rather than diluting focus and business impact.
- It is not always necessary or appropriate for any one business team to contain all the skills and competencies. Working alongside other teams and individuals allows teams to flex and bring in the required expertise as necessary.
- Multi-disciplinary teams that collaborate effectively also provide excellent opportunities for teams/individuals to be exposed to new ideas and learning opportunities. In addition, multi-disciplinary teams provide forums for knowledge sharing, problem solving, and leveraging existing skills. Flexible teams are excellent environments for cross-pollination of ideas and innovative solutions.
- The increased demands on teams/individuals and the rapidly evolving landscapes in which they work can create anxiety and stress. That needs to be managed effectively and individuals given the skills and coping strategies required. It can also result in defensive responses to opportunities or changed demands.
- It is important to develop a team that contains the right blend of skills and expertise - that is able to flex and meet changing business demands/needs. Knowledge leaders should look to identify the skills that are required and either develop those skills or develop business cases to recruit/acquire them from outside of the KM program or firm.
- Increasingly, KM leads and KM professionals need to have enhanced/sophisticated 'soft' business skills/acumen - beyond core KM competencies or detailed knowledge of the law. Skills such as coaching, speaking, evangelising, persuading, etc. are crucial to ensure the KM value

proposition is heard and understood. The rapidly evolving landscape for KM demands KM professionals have the skills and confidence to act as advocates and internal champions for retaining a seat at the 'top table'.

- Training is a critical enabler of versatile/flexible teams - continuous professional development and lifelong learning within a role can not only improve employee morale and retention but is essential for a KM team/individuals to obtaining and retaining the skills necessary to adapt, remain relevant, and offer the best service possible.
- Finding the time for teams/individuals to complete training, work in multi-disciplinary teams, pursue opportunities to work beyond their core responsibilities is a constant challenge - but doing so is considered vital by knowledge leads who understand that flexible teams are best placed to adapt to new and emerging opportunities (and threats) for KM.

A Knowledge Sharing Culture
Facilitator: Joe Campbell, Practice Lead, Search and AI, Fireman & Company
Email: Joe.Campbell@fireman.company

Challenges to Knowledge Sharing:

- People get busy and don't share.
- Don't want to be questioned on what they have done.
- Knowledge getting more siloed.
- Podcast and video from Business Development and Marketing is not knowledge-focused or controlled.

Strategic Importance & Alignment:

- Force to have a seat at the strategic table.
- You need a knowledge value proposition before starting a knowledge-sharing culture.
- Easy to hang hat on knowledge value proposition based on business objectives.
- Look through knowledge lens to understand the business objectives.
- Knowledge Management & Process Improvement:
- We don't need more process but better process.
- Knowledge sharing is not just documents.
- Separate Knowhow from the person.
- Dialog between knowledge lawyer and "pure" lawyer; it's everyone's responsibility.
- Thought leadership needs to be captured.
- Adding knowledge into thought leadership for appraisal.

Motivation & Recognition:

- KPI for knowledge sharing is ignored; Pro Bono more important.
- Some practical solutions: bonus, link to partnership, feeding back to supervisor.
- No bonus if not hit knowledge content.
- Turn Knowledge more about how it can help me and promote me than a burden.
- Opportunity for associates to be seen by partners, Knowhow nuggets on the intranet.
- Involvement & Contribution:
- Business development, thought leadership, people who want to be partners, should have something to say.
- Gamification, leaderboard?
- Link content and leading to profitability.

General discussion was that creating a knowledge-sharing culture in an organization faces several challenges, including individuals' reluctance to share, the siloing of information, and the lack of focus on knowledge in various business developments. It's crucial for knowledge sharing to have a strategic importance with a clear value proposition aligned with business objectives. Improving existing processes, rather than adding more, can facilitate better knowledge management, emphasizing that knowledge isn't just about documents but also includes tacit expertise and know-how.

Moreover, motivating and recognizing contributions is vital. Practical solutions like bonuses, opportunities for visibility, or even gamification can encourage sharing. It's also important to integrate knowledge-sharing metrics into appraisals and potentially tie them to bonuses. Furthermore, there should be opportunities for all levels within the organization, especially those seeking leadership roles, to contribute to and benefit from knowledge sharing, thereby linking it directly to personal growth and organizational profitability.

Getting a seat at the strategic table

Facilitators: Matthew Healey and Victor Effiom, Business development directors, Searchflow
Email: matthew.healey@searchflow.co.uk and victor.effiom@searchflow.co.uk

- To get a seat at the strategic table you need to have buy in from the senior management team
- You have to have engagement with the board/senior leadership team
- You have to showcase Strategic decision making skills
- They mentioned how there are Head of Knowledge lawyers but not often a Chief of Knowledge Lawyers
- Implementing something like Digital/legal tech has helped gain a seat at the strategic table

- Some felt that it all depended on the view of the SLT as to who gets the seat at the strategic table
- Felt that knowledge lawyers should have a seat as Knowledge is the primary asset of a law firm
- Implementing change in the firm can also gain a seat at the table
- Gaining a seat at the table can just be down to 'luck'
- It can depend on the firms outlook as to who gets a seat at the table
- Can also come down to – strategy/timings/politics or influence in the area you work in

Building Versatile Knowledge Teams

- Feel that most of the time there are multiple people undertaking same projects/doing the same role
- Knowledge management covers so many basis so can cause time constraints
- A versatile team needs to understand who is doing what and what is each individuals roles
- Everyone's understanding of versatility is different
- The table also felt that 'Siloed Teams' does not work and a business has to be more unified
- Versatile teams need to have agility and people need to be able to move to where the business needs them.

Creating a knowledge sharing culture

Facilitator: Dan Wales, Head of Growth, Orgaimi
Email: dwales@orgaimi.com

- Several said that behaviour/mindset/dynamic of giving people tools/knowledge to share has to come from the top down and has to have real, tangible value.
- How important is it to have a strategic seat at the table/challenges of exerting influence on exec/ops boards? KM function has to work with multidisciplinary teams, with leadership, and with lower levels.
- Being on the ops board not necessarily desirable all the time — it can detract from actually getting work done — but it's important to have their ear when required, seems to be the overall consensus.
- Confidence in this increases when they know there is someone who has the nuance/experience at the table to spot a KM opportunity (sometimes missed/realised too late to be useful).

- However, one person left a larger firm to join a smaller board specifically to get a 'seat at the table', says it broadened out the scope/impact of the KM strategy.
- Essential to articulate behaviour/expectations/values/mission statement, and constantly reinforce/link what KM does for the firm's strategic values/business benefits. There is an ongoing question about encouraging buy-in from fee earners who are focused on billable hours.
- One person said they keep telling new trainees that clients will expect them to have/access knowledge of the firm, not just their part of the work.
- One person said when communicating KM's importance they focus on 1. Articulating outcomes not task oriented 2. Use high power words ('enable' not 'help') especially useful when talking to leaders/global practice leaders 3. Crystallise /repetition of value it provides 4. Active engagement not 'support function'
- One person said they took 7 strategic aims the firm has and looked to identify KM contributions to them, to articulate the value of KM
- What are the backgrounds of KM practitioners (most are knowledge lawyers), what is more important knowledge of the law or business of the law (both), though practice lawyers and lawyers in specialist practices is helpful.
- Question of how much is being brought into KM function over time — legal knowledge, skills, tech, pricing — has meant that in recent years KM people are becoming specialised. One said there's a lot of research to be done on Q of specialism vs versatility in KM individuals/teams. It's more about the team's footprint being versatile, and support people in their various specialisms and help them grow. You also have to bring in new people, some without KM background, to keep up with new tech for instance (Generative AI is very important to KM, helping to break down data silos, create data structures), or to have new blood to challenge each other. So there's an argument to be made for the 'versatile' KM person who can work across KM, coders, MBD, etc — part of the culture/project management challenge is having to build a new interdisciplinary team every 18 months for a particular project (having versatile people/teams would help)

Building your knowledge value proposition

Facilitators: Jenni Tellyn, Consultant and Melanie Farquharson, Director, 3Kites
Emails: melanie.farquharson@3kites.com and jenni.tellyn@3kites.com

- Getting people to recognise the time needed for things and the value that time can deliver. Need to focus time on where there are demonstrable benefits. Partly about getting credit for what you do, partly aligning with strategic investment.
- Getting the management bubble to recognise things beyond their own immediate priorities.
- Not forgetting the BAU at the end of the shiny new projects.

- It always helps if you can align with what clients want, especially if it's related to PROFITABLE client service delivery.
- Sometimes it's aspiration raising when management don't realise what they could have.
- Structural problems. Knowledge Board can provide a comms window to report on what's being delivered, but still difficult if no C-suite person for knowledge.
- Having a Knowledge Board is a double edged sword - ultimately what you need is a seat on the top table. Then you can be a bit more agile.
- Everyone has a struggle with the metrics. K team Time recording - mixture as to whether the PSLs record time. Good to have the stats on what the PSL team are doing. It can also be useful to have the metrics on what people are enquiring about. Useful to identify where there's a gap between what the partners want the team to be doing and what they are actually doing. Useful if it's client specific so you can ID the value added cost. Lots of people measuring value add for specific clients. Some firms just reporting chargeable time for clients which helps to pull through to pricing.
- If you want to get value from the huge NQ salaries…they need the knowledge to support them.
- How do you get Knowledge to feature in the pillars of the overall firm strategy. Find things the partners value, pain points etc, fix those. It's a long journey.
- More and more clients wanting to work collaboratively with K, so working with pricing people. Can be v different US vs UK.
- Valuing the outputs. Offerings for clients - but they don't want to pay realistic numbers.
- Write off data (providing reasons for write-off) can be very valuable - where is time being wasted and can K improve the situation.
- Data from e.g. Contract Express usage. To show upwards trends (hopefully). Do your own assessment of how much time the PSLs think would be saved by using the automated precedents - so you have an amount of time you can free up. But you have to be able to show that that time can be/is being reused profitably. Always get into the argument about 'what if we don't have lots of other work to do anyway…'
- Most of what we do is long term investment, not so easy to show the impact as compared to a quick high of contributing to a specific pitch etc.
- Remind the partners that law firms are K businesses and remind them that it's not easy to get it right. But it's the same old points about lawyers doing higher value stuff, client expectations, efficiency, impact on bottom line. Have to keep reminding the partners, but it's not a quick fix. It's quite complicated. You have to persevere.
- GenAI giving an opportunity to be seen as on top of the sexy stuff.
- Other industries, incl auditors, have an R&D functions. K is a bit like an R&D function. LN had a group that was allowed to try things and fail, got some investment.

- There is talk of splitting knowledge and innovation in some firms, but important to resist that. We bring the context. Esp for Gen AI - have to have knowledge and innovation together. E.g. LN AI generated content is going to be the vanilla starting point in future - what can we add in terms of value on top of that.
- If you say, what does HR do, everyone will come up with a fairly standard answer, but for K it can vary a lot. Edges are quite fuzzy.
- Chief Execs/Managing Partners fed up with hearing the word Knowledge - do we have a better term? Carol talking about legal and regulatory knowledge to get the focus. NOT black letter law. Sometimes you're working on tools, which are not black letter law. 'Intellectual capital' ?
- Important not to be doing the things we shouldn't be doing. We're often good short-term fixers. Some things have to drop off the list.

Creating a knowledge sharing culture
Facilitators: Dave Wilson, Managing Director and Rob Taylor, Product Manager, Tiger Eye Blueprint
Emails: dwilson@tigereyeconsulting.com and robt@tigereyeconsulting.com

What does it mean to you?

- Collating and collaborating expert knowledge across the business
- Creating a consistent culture across all areas of a company, especially after a merger
- Making it as easy as possible to access and contribute to knowledge
- Sharing the knowledge to help drive the business

How to create the culture?

- Incentivise knowledge creation and sharing through bonus and performance review
- Improve systems for knowledge storage, make it easier to access and use
- Remove any barriers for users of the knowledge
- Be involved and seen company wide as knowledge leaders, share knowledge and training
- Help educate teams to create the knowledge
- Information and direction need to be clear at the company level – knowledge program needs to be aligned to the wider business goals
- More centralised teams to help people work wider and share more

KM Tech Troubles

Facilitators: Dave Wilson, Managing Director and Rob Taylor, Product Manager, Tiger Eye Blueprint
Emails: dwilson@tigereyeconsulting.com and robt@tigereyeconsulting.com

Day to day tech troubles:

- Getting people engaged in the tech and ensuring they use the tech properly
- Difficulty with people self-searching using the designated platform and instead contacting people for the information
- People having knowledge of different systems depending on what the tech was when they joined
- People being remote/working in isolation and not necessarily checking in, asking for help or raising risks

Enabling Know How internally:

- Recognise and value contributions of everyone
- Build a general community and be present across the business
- Aligning yourself with a process and teams to have multiple touchpoints
- Requires a strong knowledge culture

Practical application of Generative AI and large language models

Joe Campbell: Practice Lead, Search and AI, Fireman & Company
Email: Joe.Campbell@fireman.company

Usage and Governance:

- Used Claude successfully, does give legal advice, guardrails set in place.
- Many firms had banned ChatGPT, many felt this was a bad idea as people would use it anyway and lost visibility on how they are using it.
- Much better to have it in place but guard-railed and see how the lawyers are using it.

Education and Understanding:

- A lot of discussion on Education on AI, GenAI, Co-Pilot. Not many people know the difference which leads to it being banned.
- Data Management and Strategy:
- Get house in order, first data strategy, data warehouse.
- However, data is separate from Knowledge Management which could be an issue.

Strategic Integration and Opportunities:

- Need a seat at the AI steering group.
- Overall, many felt this was a perfect opportunity for Knowledge Management as the gatekeepers of good marked-up content which the Generative AI and LLMs desperately need.
- A good opportunity to push and fund Knowledge Management initiatives as the IT group are attracted to the AI technology.

Overall the group felt the practical application of Generative AI and large language models presents both challenges and opportunities in professional settings, particularly in legal or knowledge-intensive firms. There is a critical balance to be struck in the usage and governance of these tools; while some organizations have banned tools like ChatGPT due to concerns over misuse, there's a consensus that better results can be achieved through regulated use, allowing visibility into how professionals are utilizing them.

Education and understanding of these technologies are lacking, leading to premature or uninformed decisions like outright bans. Thus, there's a significant need for education regarding the distinctions and capabilities of various AI tools.

In terms of data management, the importance of a solid data strategy is paramount before these technologies can be effectively implemented. However, a potential disconnect between data management and knowledge management could hinder this integration.

Strategically, there's a strong belief that these advancements present a golden opportunity for Knowledge Management departments. They are seen as the gatekeepers of the quality content that generative AI and LLMs require, highlighting the potential to reinforce and fund KM initiatives, given IT departments' attraction to these new technologies. Additionally, there's an emphasis on the need for KM's representation in AI steering groups to ensure alignment with broader organizational strategies.

Practical Applications of Gen AI and Large Language

1. Feel that Gen AI should currently only be used in a 'Safe Environment'
2. The table felt that a cautious approach should be taken when looking at Gen AI
3. They all agreed that there are well known risks associated with Gen AI
4. Concern in the costs associated with taking up AI
5. Felt that there could be a lot of change with AI and could cause issues
6. Most agreed on the table that Lawyers are keen to hold off currently
7. They do have clients asking 'How they are using AI in their firms'
8. They also mentioned about AI still needing a Human Touch and felt that it would be a long time before AI could be trusted

9. Question over how AI could affect ne trainee solicitors training – would this be cutting corners.
10. Will AI – de-skill lawyers
11. Felt that ChatGPT could be good to use to sense check or get a good starting ground but would still need human intervention
12. AI might impact junior lawyers coming through the ranks in firms as could be used to cut corners
13. Assumption that Gen AI will work in the future but not sure it is ready in reality
14. Hopeful that the work would be less prescriptive with the use of Gen AI
15. They all agreed that Integration means different things across different firms – so integrating with AI could be different to each law firm.

AI Use Cases

Facilitators: Jenni Tellyn, Consultant and Melanie Farquharson, Director, 3Kites
Emails: melanie.farquharson@3kites.com and jenni.tellyn@3kites.com

- Big clients will come to the law firm with the TR/LN generated answer and ask the law firm what value they can add. Will have to bring our differentiating K to the table. Will be more about tapping into the firm's experience. Lifts client expectations.
- Law firms will have to assess and verify the answers. Will have to be more sophisticated. Will still have a role because client want our PI cover.
- Difference from Wikipedia - the LN/TR generated content will be proper legal advice.
- Big question of how junior lawyers learn to do the sophisticated bit.
- Ability to use the tools will be important for all lawyers.
- Given that AI is still making big hallucinations/mistakes we need to sometimes go right back to the original sources. But in the long run, the AI will get there.
- Still a gap for the lawyer as the bridge between the law and the client. Practical side.
- Do we need to make sure we've got people with really good prompt engineering skills to do a better job than the clients can do in searching the sources? Or will that become less important as the AI learns?
- Differing views about whether firms need to provide training sessions on prompting.
- It isn't it just like having a conversation with a human being. Depends on the tool and the use case as to whether the prompt is complicated or not.
- There is a "Readability score" in MS Word already which rates the complexity of the content in a Word document (the higher the score, the more complex the text). Some firms said they aim for a readaability score of 60%. They use the feature as a good way of getting lawyers to write to be read by clients for thought leadership/client facing articles.

- Some firms are using LLMs to suggest in the prompt "rewrite this draft article to score X% readability score" to enhance the quality of client-facing writing.
- If dealing with clients who don't have in house teams they won't have LN/Practical Law as their starting point.
- For now Gen AI is expensive in a way that clients aren't going to be able to afford. Even now not all clients invest in Practical Law, so will there be a long time when they won't have access to the AI enabled content.
- Lawyers bring judgement - and market practice - and persuading your clients to "calm down".
- New legal spaces like renewal energy. There won't be much in the underlying content to help you.
- For using e.g. Harvey you've got to know what questions you need to ask. Ability to ask questions across a massive data set is very exciting. Quite a high level of expertise needed to know what questions to ask it.
- For quite a while AI is going to be more expensive and require more human input than we realise.
- Client briefings etc. Review of the consultation doc, analysing trends. Will be no excuse for not having a view on things - as opposed to just providing a summary.
- Internal efficiency is going to be one of the big early transformations. Getting all the meetings automatically transcribed and get the AI to pull out the actions. Also turning a transaction review meeting and turning that into a summary for the K system.
- Who is drafting the limitation of liability provisions for the Gen AI tools?
- How good is the GenAI at recognising language differences e.g. between US and UK concept of bankruptcy?
- Creating slides/graphics. Turning words into pictures. Or even take this contract and turn it into a series of pictures. When the input becomes pictures will the LLMs still work. Could it create a video training session. Lot of time wasted on creating videos/graphics at the moment.

A fit for purpose intranet

Facilitators: Jenni Tellyn, Consultant and Melanie Farquharson, Director, 3Kites
Emails: melanie.farquharson@3kites.com and jenni.tellyn@3kites.com

We kicked off the discussion with a controversial statement: Do you even need an intranet anymore?! With the rise of MS Teams and the challenge of keeping an "all singing, all dancing" intranet up to date so it feels like a place fee earners and staff want to visit, some firms have scaled theirs right back. Despite the views of some IT teams which firms said were against the idea, the consensus of the Knowledge Leaders was that there is still a place for a "fit for purpose" intranet and we highlighted these aspects to assist with ensuring it is:

- Nail down its purpose - it could be a hub, launchpad or digital gateway to key firm applications and provide a good platform for knowledge sharing (not just on the legal side). It can be the "face of an organisation" and help to project the culture of the firm if it's done well.
- Good governance is key - it is important to nail down who owns the intranet and each bit of content and is accountable for its accuracy and freshness. Many firms have a centralised governance model of curating content with editors in different teams taking responsibility after editor training and following page templates.
- Bring the intranet to where lawyers work - we hear time and again about the fatigue being experienced by lawyers struggling to have the headspace to deal with the constant system upgrades and replacements. And the resulting adoption challenges mean that firms are thinking carefully about trying to make the intranet a place which genuinely helps their people do their day to day work. Several are implementing "digital workplaces", exposing the intranet content in Microsoft Teams where lawyers are increasingly working and sharing knowledge in some firms.
- A one stop shop? - We weren't sure that a "fit for purpose" intranet necessarily involved having "everything" accessible from it as that can be overwhelming to navigate but there was a feeling that especially junior lawyers were increasingly asking to do their work from one place.
- What goes where? - It felt important to nail down which types of content should be stored where in the firms myriad systems. This helps to ensure the intranet doesn't get cluttered, to enable users to trust that they have found "the source of truth" for a document/data point and to avoid confusion and the proliferation of silos springing up in MS Teams, the DMS, and other systems which then require multiple searches to be undertaken.
- Ensure the platform meets your security needs - some firms are levering SharePoint for their intranet and knowledge system content (with an eye on using Viva Topics to aggregate content) and some are keen to keep document content in their DMS as SharePoint security feels "scary" and the interaction of the DMS with the wall security is better understood at some firms.
- Knowledge submission has to be as easy as possible - and some firms using digital workplace tools such as Clear People's Atlas have found the ability to bake taxonomy tags into workspaces and to inherit tags from folders to easily tag know-how submissions and upload content is helpful in this effort.
- Grade your "crown jewels"/curated content for users - some firms had made conscious decisions to only post the "good stuff" on their revamped intranet (to reinforce the users' trust in the quality of the content) and we discussed how to decide what is "good". "Gold" content might be forms/precedents which have gone through a rigorous approval process and "Silver" badges may be deployed for content which is "as good as it can be" before partner/manager review.
- Taxonomy may still be worth doing - AI won't alleviate the need to do this exercise of agreeing the tags and indeed AI-assisted platforms and search engines make the underlying tagging of content even more important to allow the systems to accurately aggregate content for users. Some firms had used the Practical Law taxonomy as a starting point for their legal taxonomy and others

had used SALI (especially where they do a significant amount of US governed work). Some found that having an external perspective on what the taxonomy could be was helpful in cutting through the politics agreeing a taxonomy can throw up.

In common with our experience at 3Kites, lots of firms are in the thick of or considering embarking on an intranet revamp project as the focus on enabling effective collaboration continues.

CHATHAM HOUSE KM CONFESSIONS

Facilitators: Jenni Tellyn, Consultant and Melanie Farquharson, Director, 3Kites
Emails: melanie.farquharson@3kites.com and jenni.tellyn@3kites.com

Is knowledge sharing doomed to fail? (Cos lawyers are inherently averse to sharing). Depends on your incentive structure. Even when it forms part of your appraisal it depends how it's handled by the appraiser. Important to stick close to HR on this - not just for appraisals, but also for promotions.

Does IT have too much influence over what tech is chosen? - Yes. KM need to be consulted and involved. IT think about how techies use tech, rather than how lawyers use tech.

What if you have some teams who won't share with others? Leave them to it. But if we're going to implement GenAI we need to be able to get our hands around all the content. They'll be left out.

Client portals are a complete waste of time. Matter-related pmes could be useful. But just general relevant knowledge ?? Takes time, though it might help to cement the relationship. Important to automate the process of content management. Do people actually use them, even though they say they want them?

Too much legal tech is becoming a hindrance rather than a help. Too many products are only useful for very narrow things. Hard for lawyers to know what to use for what, so they don't use any of them. Sometimes partners get approached by a tech company and start an email chain which results in a huge waste of time. And it turns out we have the tool already! Useful to have a central log of which suppliers we've dealt with.

People don't appreciate how much time it takes to create knowledge. True. Need to tell them!

Centralising knowledge so it's all in one repository - need to design it so it works for all teams. People are worried about colleagues in other practices dabbling in their area. Needs to be a function to link people across the practice. When people are dabbling there's a much bigger professional/risk issue. But difficult if you're in a firm which is very much about eat what you kill.

Locking down matters in DMS has pushed people towards using the KM repository.

How can we motivate PSLs without a career/salary structure? By introducing one. Important that if there's a bonus structure that applies to PSLs too. Also non-financial motivations. Important that promotions are based on key attributes, rather than just being a good PSL. So important that people are focused on high value work. If you want a title/kudos, do you go back to fee earning/become Counsel? There is a lot more flexibility in being a FE nowadays than there used to be. (But query does that downgrade KM roles????)

Facilitators: Dave Wilson, Managing Director and Rob Taylor, Product Manager, Tiger Eye Blueprint
Emails: dwilson@tigereyeconsulting.com and robt@tigereyeconsulting.com

Centralising know-how is hard i.e. ensuring/convincing people that all know-how is collected and made available from the designated repository. How do you make this happen seamlessly and cohesively?

- Make sure there is a carrot incentive to share know-how
- One thing to get the knowledge in a central place – another challenge is keeping it up to date / removing duplication and rationalising the data

How do we ensure knowledge is used right and we avoid a potential dumping ground?

- Potential for the expectation that knowledge will do it all leading to a failure to maintain the documents
- Needs the right mindset to correctly use the knowledge system and build it in the right way
- Ensure people are spending appropriate time on building the knowledge
- Encourage people to create the knowledge which can then be reviewed so they take responsibility for the knowledge
- Clear knowledge champions can help steer the right behaviours

How do we motivate PSL's without a clear structure for career and salary progression, particularly when hybrid working makes a frontline role more attractive?

- Flexibility and work/life balance was an initial draw but may have been watered down
- Potential removal of partner PSL's due to difficulties in demonstrating revenue generation
- Making sure the have a viable interest in the success of the business
- Ensure partners are leading from the top and demonstrating the benefits of KM