Capturing, Preserving and Reusing Corporate Tacit Knowledge

A Flexible Multimodal Methodology Based on INNODARE Platform's Insight Development System, Structured Engineering Methods and AI-Enabled Enterprise Retrieval

Prof. Dr. Orhan B. Alankuş

INNODARE Innovation, Technology, R&D Platform Ltd.

Abstract

Companies lose substantial value when experienced employees retire, change positions or leave, because important knowledge is not limited to formal procedures and documents. It also includes judgement, failure recognition, practical workarounds, causal explanations, design rationale, supplier and customer experience, and contextual knowledge about when standard methods do or do not apply. Recent research confirms that knowledge loss associated with turnover, generational change and employee withdrawal remains as an important organizational risk, while digitalization and collective knowledge-transfer mechanisms are becoming increasingly important. This article proposes a lightweight and flexible methodology for capturing such knowledge without creating a large administrative burden. The core principle is to capture knowledge through structured contributions made during normal engineering, operational, project and innovation activities. INNODARE Platform's patent-pending Insight development methodology is used as a configurable capture layer in which organizations can define any subject, categories, questions, and contribution format, including text, tables, images, and other evidence. Depending on the application, the same mechanism can support lessons learned, problem solving, design reviews, supplier knowledge, customer knowledge, FMEA, HARA, process improvement and other domain-specific methods. Contributions are compiled into controlled PDF or Excel knowledge artifacts and stored in the company's existing document environment, such as SharePoint, a document-management system, QMS/PLM folders or secure file repositories. AI agents and/or chatbots then perform permission-aware retrieval, semantic search, summarization, cross-document synthesis, and expertise inference using authorship and contribution history. FMEA is presented as an important but non-exclusive knowledge-capture method because it systematically records functions, failure modes, effects, causes, controls and actions. The resulting architecture separates knowledge formation from document storage and retrieval, allowing organizations to retain their existing infrastructure while using INNODARE as a flexible knowledge-generation and intelligence layer.

Keywords: tacit knowledge; organizational knowledge; knowledge retention; knowledge transfer; INNODARE Insight; FMEA; HARA; lessons learned; multimodal knowledge capture; enterprise search; retrieval-augmented generation; expertise inference.

1. Introduction

Knowledge-intensive organizations depend on experienced people not only for what is documented, but also for what they have learned through repeated decisions, failures, experiments, customer interactions, supplier discussions and practical problem solving. When such people leave, the organization may retain drawings, procedures and reports while still losing the reasoning required to interpret and apply them. A 2024 systematic review of organizational knowledge transfer during generational change emphasizes that knowledge-loss prevention remains a major management issue and identifies digitalization and collective transfer mechanisms as important components of effective practice [1]. A 2026 systematic review of employee withdrawal and knowledge management similarly highlights the vulnerability of knowledge creation, storage, retention and application when employees disengage or exit [2]. On the other hand, knowledge retention is an important part of Industry 5.0 requirements[19].

The practical challenge is not simply how to store more information. Most medium and large companies already possess document folders, SharePoint, quality systems, PLM environments, wikis or project repositories. The more difficult challenge is how to convert valuable experience into sufficiently structured and retrievable content without imposing a documentation burden so heavy that employees do not participate. This article develops a methodology based on a simple proposition: capture knowledge as part of the work, using flexible contribution structures that fit the actual problem or process.

INNODARE Platform's Insight development methodology provides a useful foundation for this purpose because it allows organizations to define their own insight areas, categories and contribution requests; collect stakeholder input; and accept not only text but also photos and other supporting material [20]. The same logic can be used for knowledge and experience management, collaborative FMEA, HARA, problem solving, innovation, cost reduction, product development or organization-specific templates [21-24].

2. What Knowledge Should a Company Preserve?

There is no scientifically valid single number of knowledge types in an organization. Knowledge can be classified according to form, location, function, domain, criticality, lifecycle and evidence level. For practical implementation, however, companies need a manageable taxonomy that helps them determine what should be captured and how. Table 1 proposes 16 operational knowledge classes. These classes are not folders; a contribution may belong to several classes simultaneously.

#	Knowledge class	Typical content	Typical tacit component	Suitable capture approach
1	Strategic knowledge	Assumptions, priorities, trade-offs, rejected alternatives	Why one direction was preferred	Strategy review / decision rationale
2	Technical/domain knowledge	Design rules, models, parameter limits, architectures	Practical interpretation and boundary conditions	Insight template + design review
3	Process/procedural knowledge	Work sequence, setup, controls, handoffs	Shortcuts, difficult steps, local conditions	Process Insight + images/video
4	Diagnostic knowledge	Symptoms, fault isolation, troubleshooting	Weak signals and pattern recognition	Problem-solving capture
5	Failure/exception knowledge	Unusual cases, edge cases, workarounds	When normal rules stop working	Lessons learned / incident form
6	Decision/rationale knowledge	Options, criteria, selected action	Reasoning and rejected choices	Decision capture
7	Product knowledge	Features, failure modes, service issues	Experience with use and lifecycle	Product Insight / FMEA
8	Manufacturing knowledge	Process windows, tooling, yield, micro-stops	Operator and engineer know-how	Process Insight / PFMEA
9	Project knowledge	Risks, interfaces, lessons, stakeholder history	Informal dependencies and timing	Project review / closeout
10	Customer/market knowledge	Needs, objections, usage patterns, complaints	Unwritten buying and usage logic	Customer Insight + photos
11	Supplier/ecosystem knowledge	Capabilities, risks, history, negotiation context	Relationship and escalation knowledge	Supplier Insight
12	Safety/compliance knowledge	Hazards, requirements, controls, evidence	Interpretation and precedent	HARA/FMEA/compliance template
13	Problem-solving knowledge	Root causes, countermeasures, verification	What actually solved the problem	Structured problem-solving Insight
14	Innovation/experiment knowledge	Ideas, hypotheses, prototypes, failed trials	Why ideas worked or failed	Innovation Insight / experiment record
15	Relational know-who knowledge	Who has solved what and where	Informal expertise network	Authorship and contribution history
16	Capability/skill knowledge	Demonstrated skills and experience	Depth of practical competence	Inference from validated contributions

Table 1. Practical enterprise knowledge taxonomy for capture and reuse.

2.1 Knowledge should also be classified by form

- Explicit knowledge: already expressed in procedures, drawings, reports, spreadsheets, specifications or databases.
- Implicit or articulable experience: not yet documented but can be expressed when an employee is asked the right question in the right context.
- Deep tacit knowledge: embodied or perceptual know-how that may require demonstration, images, video, observation or guided practice rather than text alone.
- Multimodal knowledge: a combination of text, tables, diagrams, photographs, video, measurements or annotated evidence.

- Relational knowledge: knowledge of who has relevant experience and where related evidence can be found.

This distinction is important because a knowledge-management system should not force every contribution into prose. Industrial knowledge is often visual: a surface defect, a wear pattern, a wiring route, a tooling position, a test trace, a packaging configuration or a customer-use condition may be communicated more effectively with an annotated image than with a long paragraph. INNODARE Platform's Insight System ability to accept photos, video or audio files therefore supports a more realistic multimodal approach to corporate knowledge [20-24].

3. A Low-Burden Principle: Capture Knowledge Through Work

The central methodological principle proposed here is that knowledge retention should be embedded in activities that employees already perform. Instead of creating a separate 'knowledge documentation project' for every experienced employee, the organization creates small, contextual capture opportunities around real tasks, reviews and decisions.

Examples include recording what was learned after solving a difficult fault, adding an observation while completing a design review, documenting a new failure mode during FMEA, explaining a supplier risk when it becomes visible, or adding a photograph with a short explanation of an abnormal condition. The contribution may take only a few minutes when the system asks focused questions.

3.1 Five questions that capture a large proportion of useful experience

1. What happened or what did you observe?
2. Why is it important, unusual or difficult?
3. What do you believe caused it or influenced it?
4. What action, solution or decision worked - and what did not work?
5. When should this knowledge be used again, and what evidence or image supports it?

These questions can be modified by the company. A maintenance area may ask about symptoms and corrective actions; product development may ask about design rationale; sales may ask about customer objections; a safety team may ask about hazard, exposure and controls. The architecture remains the same while the knowledge template changes.

4. INNODARE Platform Insight Development Methodology as a Flexible Knowledge-Capture Layer

INNODARE Insight is particularly suitable as a knowledge-capture layer because its structure is intentionally configurable. Organizations can define a private Insight area, define categories as required, request contributions from selected stakeholders and collect data, text, audio, photographs and video [20,25]. The platform therefore does not need a single universal knowledge form. It can host many purpose-specific capture systems.

4.1 Examples of configurable Insight-based systems

Configurable Insight system	Typical captured knowledge	Typical evidence
Experience Capture	Short descriptions of unusual situations, practical lessons, recommendations and supporting photographs.	Text, image, short video, audio
Engineering Design Knowledge	Functions, design alternatives, assumptions, limits, rationale, drawings and test evidence.	Text, sketch, drawing, test result
Manufacturing Know-How	Process parameter observations, tooling issues, defect photos, countermeasures and process windows.	Text, photo, trend, measurement
Lessons Learned	Event, context, what happened, root cause, successful/unsuccessful actions, recommendation.	Text, attachment, timeline
Problem Solving	Problem statement, containment, causal hypotheses, root cause, countermeasure, verification, recurrence prevention.	Text, 5-Why/Ishikawa output, image, data
Customer Insight	Customer requirement, dissatisfaction, workaround, unmet need, context and visual evidence.	Text, photo/video, complaint evidence

Supplier Knowledge	Capability, quality issue, technical constraint, delivery risk, escalation experience, evidence.	Text, audit result, sample/photo
Project Knowledge	Critical decision, interface problem, risk, change, stakeholder dependency, outcome.	Text, meeting decision, schedule/risk artifact
Innovation and Experiment Knowledge	Hypothesis, trial, result, reason, next step, evidence.	Text, photo, prototype/test result
Safety Knowledge	Hazard, operational situation, effect, control, rationale and safety goal.	Structured table, rationale, evidence
FMEA	Function, failure mode, effect, cause, current control, severity/occurrence/detection or action priority, recommended action.	Structured table / Excel
HARA	Function, malfunction, operational situation, hazardous event, severity, exposure, controllability, ASIL and safety goal.	Structured table / Excel

Table 2. Examples of knowledge-capture systems that can be configured using the same Insight logic.

5. FMEA as an Important Structured Knowledge-Capture Method

Failure Mode and Effects Analysis (FMEA) should be regarded not only as a risk-analysis document but also as an important structured repository of engineering experience. It connects the intended function of a product or process with the ways it can fail, the consequences of failure, possible causes, current prevention and detection controls, and improvement actions. Because these fields are populated by cross-functional expert judgement, FMEA captures knowledge that would otherwise remain distributed among engineering, manufacturing, quality, service and supplier personnel.

Recent research reinforces this knowledge-management interpretation. Work published in 2024 examines FMEA knowledge capture and reuse through more structured representation, while recent 2024-2025 studies investigate the use of large language models to support FMEA generation and analysis under human expert supervision [8-10]. The value of AI in this context is not to replace engineering judgement, but to help structure prior knowledge, propose candidate failure relationships, detect omissions and accelerate preparation for expert review.

Within the proposed methodology, FMEA is one of several important capture tools. It is particularly appropriate when knowledge concerns failure mechanisms, product/process risk, prevention and detection. Other knowledge classes may be better captured using lessons learned, problem solving, design rationale, customer insight or free-form multimodal contributions.

6. HARA, Problem Solving and Other Structured Methods

The same principle applies to HARA and structured problem-solving methods. INNODARE already demonstrates a configurable collaborative HARA structure including system function, malfunction, operational situation, failure effect, severity, exposure, controllability, ASIL and safety goals [23]. These fields convert expert safety reasoning into a reusable artifact. Similarly, an innovative problem-solving area can capture not only the final solution but also how the problem was understood and why a particular solution was selected [22].

The scientific advantage of this approach is methodological pluralism: the organization uses a structured tool when the knowledge domain has a natural structure, and uses freer multimodal capture when the knowledge is contextual, exploratory or observational.

7. The Knowledge Artifact: PDF and Excel as Deliberate Outputs

A key architectural choice is to generate normal enterprise documents rather than requiring the organization to adopt a new proprietary repository for every captured contribution. INNODARE can compile contributions into controlled PDF reports or Excel tables. The company can then place these artifacts into its existing approved document environment.

This provides four advantages. First, documents remain accessible without dependence on a specialized user interface. Second, existing corporate version control, backup, access permissions and retention policies can be retained. Third, structured Excel is particularly suitable for FMEA, HARA, risk registers and tabular knowledge. Fourth, PDF is suitable for synthesized narrative knowledge containing images, audio and video file links, conclusions and contributor attribution.

7.1 Recommended metadata embedded in each generated artifact

- Title and knowledge subject.
- Business unit, project, product, process or system.
- Knowledge category or categories.
- Date and version.
- Contributor name(s) and role(s), subject to company policy.
- Editor/reviewer and validation status.
- Source type: experience contribution, FMEA, HARA, problem solving, lesson learned, customer insight, etc.
- Applicability or boundary conditions.
- Related documents or evidence.
- Confidentiality classification and access level.
- Review/expiry date where knowledge can become obsolete.

This metadata is important because future AI retrieval quality depends heavily on document quality, context, provenance and freshness. Recent 2026 research on GenAI-enabled knowledge management also emphasizes data quality, privacy/security, transparency, source references and use-case specificity as design principles [7].

8. Company Repository as the System of Record

The methodology deliberately separates knowledge formation from document storage. After INNODARE generates the approved PDF/Excel artifact, the company can store it in SharePoint, a document management system, QMS, PLM, engineering file system, project repository or another approved environment. This is compatible with modern enterprise AI architectures, which increasingly retrieve knowledge from existing content systems rather than forcing all knowledge into a new database.

For example, current Microsoft SharePoint agents can answer questions using sites, document libraries, folders and files while respecting the requesting user's permissions Atlassian Rovo can search across Atlassian and connected knowledge sources while preserving user-level access controls. Glean similarly provides permissions-aware enterprise search across many applications and uses relationships among content, people and activities to improve retrieval.

9. INNODARE AI Agents for Search, Synthesis and Reuse

Once the company has accumulated knowledge artifacts, INNODARE-developed agents can provide a second layer: intelligent retrieval, chatbot facility and reuse. The scientific basis for this is increasingly strong. RAG combines language models with external organizational knowledge and is now widely studied as an architecture for knowledge-intensive work [12]. Recent industrial research demonstrates RAG-based interactive knowledge management for domain-specific documents [13], while a 2026 study on lessons learned reports improved relevance and ranking compared with conventional keyword search [14].

9.1 A simple three-agent architecture

Agent	Primary task	What it should not do
Knowledge Formation Agent	Supports the Insight editor in defining questions/categories, synthesizes contributions, highlights disagreement or missing fields, and generates the controlled PDF/Excel artifact.	Approve technical content without a human owner.

Knowledge Retrieval Agent	Indexes approved company knowledge sources; answers natural-language questions; retrieves relevant passages/tables/images metadata; cites the originating document; summarizes across multiple artifacts.	Invent unsupported answers or bypass document permissions.
Chatbot and Expertise Inference Agent	Uses contributor identity, topic relevance, frequency, recency, validation/reuse and project context to identify people with demonstrated relevant contributions.	Make formal HR competency decisions from activity alone and can also answer questions from users searching the documents

Table 3. Minimal agent architecture for knowledge formation and reuse.

9.2 Retrieval should be document-grounded and traceable

The retrieval agent should return the answer together with the source artifact, page/section or worksheet where possible, date/version and contributor/reviewer information when available. This is critical because GenAI can increase speed while reducing transparency if source traceability is not preserved. Recent research on GenAI and knowledge management specifically identifies trust, verification and the changing relationship between human and machine knowledge as central concerns [3-7].

10. Inferring Expertise from Actual Contributions

A separate expert directory is not always necessary. If every approved contribution retains authorship, subject, date, category, validation status and reuse history, the organization's knowledge artifacts themselves become evidence of expertise. The system can infer that a person has demonstrated relevant experience because they repeatedly contributed validated knowledge on a topic, not merely because they selected that topic in a profile.

A practical expertise indicator can combine semantic relevance, validated contribution count, recency, project diversity and evidence of reuse. The output should remain transparent and modest: 'people with demonstrated relevant contributions' is preferable to automatically declaring somebody the organization's definitive expert.

10.1 Example transparent expertise score

For a topic T, an optional score can be calculated as:

$$\mathbf{E(T) = 0.35R + 0.25V + 0.15C + 0.15U + 0.10D}$$

- R = semantic relevance of the person's contributions to the topic.
- V = number and quality of validated contributions.
- C = recency of relevant contributions.
- U = reuse or citation of those contributions in later work.
- D = diversity of projects/products/processes in which the knowledge was demonstrated.

The weights should be configurable by the organization. For regulated or safety-critical domains, formal qualifications and authorization may be added as mandatory filters rather than inferred from contribution history.

11. Why Multimodal Capture Matters

Text-only systems systematically under-capture industrial knowledge. A defect photograph, annotated drawing, control chart, measurement trace or short video can preserve information that would take many paragraphs to describe and may still be misunderstood. Emerging industrial knowledge research increasingly uses multimodal representations that combine visual and textual information [15].

For INNODARE Insight, the implication is straightforward: every knowledge template should allow optional visual evidence when appropriate. Examples include a photograph of a crack pattern in an FMEA contribution, an annotated assembly picture in a troubleshooting lesson, a customer-use photograph in a product insight, or a screen capture of a diagnostic trace. The generated PDF can preserve both the narrative and the visual evidence in a single searchable artifact.

12. Proposed End-to-End Methodology

Step 1 - Select the knowledge domain: Choose a business-relevant domain: product, process, project, safety, supplier, customer, maintenance, innovation, etc.

Step 2 - Define the Insight capture structure: Create categories and a small number of questions matched to the knowledge type. Allow text, tables and images where useful.

Step 3 - Capture during normal work: Collect contributions during reviews, problem solving, FMEA/HARA preparation, project milestones, incidents, experiments or improvement activities.

Step 4 - Attribute and contextualize: Preserve contributor, date, project/product/process, category and applicability.

Step 5 - Synthesize: The editor and Knowledge Formation Agent group similar inputs, preserve disagreements, remove duplication and produce a coherent output.

Step 6 - Validate: Relevant owner or experts approve the artifact; critical technical or safety content remains human-controlled.

Step 7 - Generate PDF/Excel: Create a normal corporate knowledge artifact with metadata, version, evidence and authorship.

Step 8 - Store in the company repository: Upload to SharePoint, QMS, PLM, DMS, project folder or another approved system.

Step 9 - Retrieve and reuse: Employees ask natural-language questions and receive cited answers, related documents and relevant contributors.

Step 10 - Learn from use: Frequently asked unanswered questions become new Insight topics; obsolete documents are reviewed or retired.

13. Lightweight Governance

The architecture should remain simple, but simplicity must not eliminate governance. The most important controls are document approval, permission inheritance, provenance, versioning and freshness.

- Every AI answer should link back to approved source documents.
- Draft Insight contributions should be distinguished from approved knowledge artifacts.
- Obsolete knowledge should be marked, superseded or removed from retrieval scope.
- Confidential knowledge should remain within the company's approved storage and model-access policies.
- Images and videos must follow privacy, confidentiality and IP rules; INNODARE already notes GDPR-related annotation considerations for final reports [20].
- Safety, regulatory and financial decisions should remain human accountable even when AI provides supporting retrieval or synthesis.

14. Measuring Success

A knowledge-retention initiative should be evaluated by improved work, not by the number of uploaded files. The following KPIs are recommended.

KPI	Definition	Possible target	Business meaning
Contribution participation	% of targeted employees contributing useful knowledge	>60% in pilot	Capture method is acceptable
Validated knowledge yield	Approved artifacts / contributions	Track by domain	Signal-to-noise quality
Retrieval success	Questions answered with useful cited source	>85% for pilot set	Knowledge is reachable
Time to find answer	Median search-to-answer time	Reduce by 40-60%	Productivity impact

Reuse rate	Artifacts cited/reused in later work	Increasing trend	Knowledge is activated
Repeated-problem rate	Recurrence of previously solved issues	Decrease	Lessons are effective
FMEA/lessons reuse	Prior failure knowledge reused in new analysis	Increase	Engineering memory
Expert discovery	Successful identification of relevant contributors	High user acceptance	Know-who retained
Freshness	Critical artifacts reviewed on schedule	>90%	Avoid outdated knowledge
Unsupported-answer rate	AI answers lacking valid source support	Near zero for controlled use	Trust and safety

Table 4. Outcome-oriented KPIs for a knowledge-retention pilot.

15. Pilot Implementation

A practical pilot should start with one knowledge-intensive area where the organization already produces recurring technical or operational decisions. Suitable examples include manufacturing quality, maintenance troubleshooting, product validation, customer complaints, supplier quality, project lessons or functional safety.

Phase	Indicative duration	Main work	Output
1. Scope	1 week	Select domain, repository and owners	Pilot charter
2. Configure Insight	1 week	Define categories/questions; enable images/files	Capture area
3. Capture	3-4 weeks	Collect normal-work contributions; use FMEA/HARA/problem solving where relevant	Raw knowledge set
4. Synthesize & validate	2 weeks	Agent/editor synthesis; expert approval	Approved PDF/Excel artifacts
5. Store & index	1-2 weeks	Upload to company repository; create retrieval index	Searchable corpus
6. Retrieval pilot	2 weeks	Test real employee questions and expertise inference	Measured results
7. Improve	1 week	Simplify questions, tune search, set governance	Scale-ready method

Table 5. Indicative 11-13 week pilot.

16. Scientific and Technical Discussion

The proposed methodology aligns with several recent directions in knowledge-management research. First, digitalization is increasingly recognized as an important enabler of intergenerational and organizational knowledge transfer [1]. Second, GenAI is shifting knowledge management from a purely human-centered process toward machine-augmented creation, combination, retrieval and application [3-7]. Third, RAG enables language models to work with organizational knowledge stored outside their parameters and is becoming an important architecture for enterprise knowledge retrieval [12-14]. Fourth, recent research warns that knowledge systems can also reinforce obsolete practices if outdated content remains authoritative [16]; therefore, review dates and source governance are necessary even in a lightweight architecture.

The specific contribution of the INNODARE approach is the combination of flexible knowledge formation and enterprise-compatible outputs. Instead of requiring a company to reconstruct its entire information architecture, it creates knowledge artifacts in familiar formats and allows them to be stored under the company's existing governance. This reduces implementation friction while preserving the option to add semantic search, RAG or more advanced knowledge structures later.

17. Conclusions

Corporate tacit knowledge should not be treated as something that can only be captured through long expert interviews or specialist knowledge-engineering projects. A large proportion of valuable experience can be made explicit when employees are asked focused questions during real engineering, operational, project and innovation work and when they can support their explanation with tables, images, examples and evidence.

INNODARE Insight provides a flexible mechanism for creating such capture environments. The same methodology can support free-form experience collection, structured lessons learned, design rationale, customer and supplier insight, problem solving, FMEA, HARA and other company-specific systems. FMEA is particularly valuable for product and process knowledge because it systematically captures failure-related experience, but it should remain one tool in a broader portfolio rather than the organizing principle for all knowledge.

The proposed architecture is intentionally simple: configurable knowledge capture in INNODARE Platform's Insight Development Methodology; editor/AI-supported synthesis; generation of PDF or Excel artifacts; storage in the company's existing document environment; and INNODARE-developed agents for search, cited synthesis and expertise inference. Because authorship and context are retained in the documents, the system can also identify people with demonstrated relevant experience without requiring a separate expertise database.

The resulting objective is not merely to store more documents. It is to create a continuously growing, searchable organizational memory from the work the company is already doing, while keeping the capture burden low enough that experienced people will actually contribute.

References

[1] Hernandez, C. et al. (2024). Procedures for transferring organizational knowledge during generational change: A systematic review. Heliyon, 10(5), e27092. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e27092

[2] Serenko, A. et al. (2026). Employee withdrawal and knowledge management: systematic literature review. Journal of Knowledge Management. https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-12-2024-1555

[3] Research on the impact of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) on enterprise innovation performance: a knowledge management perspective. Journal of Knowledge Management, 29(7), 2025. https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-10-2024-1198

[4] Artificial knowledge generation: investigating the revolutionary role of generative AI in knowledge management. Journal of Innovation & Knowledge, 2025. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2025.100866

[5] Knowledge management in the age of generative artificial intelligence - from SECI to GRAI. VINE Journal of Information and Knowledge Management Systems, 56(1), 2026. https://doi.org/10.1108/VJIKMS-10-2024-0357

[6] Digital transformation: the role of generative AI in the evolution of knowledge management systems. Journal of Knowledge Management, online 14 Aug 2026. https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-09-2025-1398

[7] Design Principles for Integrating Generative Artificial Intelligence in Knowledge Management. Procedia Computer Science, 278, 149-158, 2026. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2026.02.449

[8] Research on structured FMEA knowledge capture and lifecycle reuse in engineering, 2024. Procedia CIRP / ScienceDirect literature on FMEA knowledge representation.

[9] Integrating Large Language Models for Improved Failure Mode and Effects Analysis (FMEA): A Framework and Case Study. Proceedings of the Design Society, 2024.

[10] AI-driven FMEA: integration of large language models for faster and more accurate risk analysis. Design Science, 2025.

[11] IBM Research / AAAI (2025). Industrial implementation of LLM-supported structured FMEA under subject-matter-expert supervision.

[12] Klesel, M., & Wittmann, H.F. (2025). Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG). Business & Information Systems Engineering, 67, 551-561. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12599-025-00945-3

[13] Chen, L.-C. et al. (2025). Application of retrieval-augmented generation for interactive industrial knowledge management via a large language model. Computer Standards & Interfaces, 94, 103995. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csi.2025.103995

[14] Improving Lessons Learned Retrieval in Project-based Organizations through Retrieval-Augmented Generation. Procedia Computer Science, 2026.

[15] Liang, X. et al. (2025). End-to-end multimodal knowledge graph construction for industrial exploded views via attention-guided expert chains. Journal of Manufacturing Systems. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmsy.2025.10.013

[16] How knowledge management systems trap dynamic organisations into outdated practices: a systematic review. Scientific African, 2025. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sciaf.2025.e02946

[17] Yang, W., Some, L., Bain, M., & Kang, B. (2025). A comprehensive survey on integrating large language models with knowledge-based methods. Knowledge-Based Systems, 318, 113503. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.knosys.2025.113503

[18] Ghali, M.-K. et al. (2025). Enhancing knowledge retrieval with in-context learning and semantic search through generative AI. Knowledge-Based Systems, 311, 113047. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.knosys.2025.113047

[19] How to transform implicit personal knowledge into explicit organizational knowledge in the era of Industry 5.0 manufacturing systems. IFAC-PapersOnLine, 58(19), 563-568, 2024. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ifacol.2024.09.272

[20] INNODARE Platform. Insight About. Accessed September 2026. https://www.innodareplatform.com/en/insight-about

[21] INNODARE Platform. Knowledge and Experience Management System (KEMS). https://www.innodareplatform.com/en/insight/knowledge-and-experience-management-system-kems

[22] INNODARE Platform. INNODARE Innovative Problem Solving Area. https://innodareplatform.com/en/insight/innodare-innovative-problem-solving-area

[23] INNODARE Platform. HARA (Hazard Analysis and Risk Assessment). https://www.innodareplatform.com/en/insight/hara-hazard-analysis-and-risk-assessment/harahazard-analysis-and-risk-assessment

[24] INNODARE Platform. Electric Vehicles Insight example - configurable text and image contribution https://www.innodareplatform.com/en/insight/innodare-insight-development/electric-vehicles

[25] INNODARE Platform. Definition and Input for Your Private Area Insight Requirement. https://www.innodareplatform.com/en/insight/-definition-and-input-for-your-private-area-insight-requirement-

Appendix A. Example Flexible Insight Templates

A.1 General Experience Capture

- Subject / problem / opportunity
- What did you observe?
- Why does it matter?
- Likely cause or explanation
- What worked / what did not work?
- Recommendation and applicability
- Image 1 / Image 2 / Image 3
- Related document or project

A.2 Engineering Design Knowledge

- Function / requirement
- Design decision
- Alternatives considered
- Why this alternative was selected
- Boundary conditions / assumptions
- Known failure or sensitivity
- Test or calculation evidence
- Drawing / image / plot

A.3 Short Lessons Learned

- Event or project phase
- What happened?
- What was expected?
- Why was there a difference?
- What should be repeated?
- What should be avoided?
- Where else is this lesson applicable?
- Evidence / photograph / attachment

Appendix B. Example Retrieval Questions

- What problems have we previously experienced with this component, and what solutions were effective?
- Show all PFMEA knowledge related to seal leakage and summarize the most common causes.
- What lessons from Project A should be considered before the next supplier nomination?
- Find photographs and explanations of this defect pattern.
- What customer complaints have been associated with this feature, and what countermeasures were used?
- Who has made validated contributions on thermal management in the last three years?
- Which previous HARA analyses include loss of steering assistance in low-speed urban operation?
- What solutions were tried for this production micro-stop, including approaches that failed?
- Which documents contradict the current recommendation and which one is newer or approved?
- What knowledge in this area has not been reviewed for more than two years?