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# 1. Introduction

This document is an inception report for the evaluation of the project Intellectual Property (IP) Management and Transfer of Technology: Promoting the Effective Use of IP in Developing Countries, Least Developed Countries and Countries with Economies in Transition. This document outlines the purpose, objectives, strategy, methodology and work plan of the evaluation. The final report will be based on this inception report, pending approval from WIPO.

# 2. Purpose and Objectives

The main purpose of this evaluation is to assess implementation of the project and its overall performance. This will feed into the decision-making process of the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP).

The main objective of this evaluation is two-fold:

1. Learning from experience during project implementation: what worked well and what did not work well for the benefit of continued activities in the field. This includes assessing the project design framework, project management, including monitoring and reporting tools, as well as measuring and reporting on results achieved to date and assessing the likelihood of sustainability of results achieved.
2. Providing evidence-based evaluation information to support CDIP’s decision-making process.

In particular, the evaluation will assess the extent to which the project has been successful in

(a) Establishing a framework for more effectively targeting capacity building activities in the field of technology transfer; and

(b) Creating capacity in IP management and transfer of technologies amongst the key role players in the categories of funders, developers, managers, and users of IP.

# 3. Evaluation Strategy

* The evaluation will take a participatory approach and involve all relevant stakeholders in the different steps of the evaluation, as far as feasible.
* The information and data will be gathered from multiple sources using different research methods in order to be able to triangulate and cross-reference the results drawn.
* The evaluation will find a balance between questions of project design (“what worked?”) and questions of effectiveness (“what was achieved?”). Moreover, it will include questions on the likelihood of sustainability of the results achieved. This will directly support meeting the above-mentioned objectives.

# 4. Evaluation Framework

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Theme and questions** | **Proposed indicators** | **Data collection tools** | **Sources of information** |
| **Project design and management**  |
| 1. Appropriateness of the initial project document as a guide for project implementation and assessment of results achieved. | Modifications required during the implementation of the project  | Document reviewInterviews | WIPO staffExternal stakeholders |
| 2. The project monitoring, self-evaluation and reporting tools and analysis of whether they were useful and adequate to provide the project team and key stakeholders with relevant information for decision-making purposes. | Level of usefulness of monitoring and reporting tools | Document reviewInterviews | WIPO staffExternal stakeholders |
| 3. The extent to which other entities within the Secretariat have contributed and enabled an effective and efficient project implementation.  | Number of WIPO units involved in the project and their contribution | Document reviewInterviews | WIPO staffExternal stakeholders |
| 4. The extent to which the risks identified in the initial project document have materialized or been mitigated.  | Type of risks encountered during project implementation and how they were addressed | Document reviewInterviews | WIPO staffExternal stakeholders |
| 5. The project’s ability to respond to emerging trends, technologies and other external forces.  | Level of ability of the project to respond to emerging trends, technologies and external factors | Document reviewInterviews | WIPO staffExternal stakeholders |
| **Effectiveness**  |
| 1. The implementation process by which project results were achieved | Planned vs. actual activities implemented; strategies, tools developed/used for achieving results;Barriers, facilitators, challenges, lessons learned  | Document reviewInterviews | WIPO staffExternal stakeholders |
| 2. The effectiveness and usefulness of the project in promoting the effective use of IP and any associated IP rights as a tool for socio-economic development in beneficiary countries, and in particular, the use of IP developed following public investment in research and/or development. | Level of effectiveness and usefulness of the project’s promotion activities on IP and associated IP rights for socio-economic development | Document reviewInterviews | WIPO staffExternal stakeholders |
| 3. The effectiveness and usefulness of the project in establishing a framework for more effectively targeted capacity building activities in the field of technology transfer. | Level of effectiveness and usefulness of the capacity building framework  | Document reviewInterviews | WIPO staffExternal stakeholders |
| 4. The effectiveness and usefulness of the project in creating capacities in IP management and transfer of technologies amongst the key role players in the categories of funders, developers, managers, and users of IP. | Level of effectiveness and usefulness of the project in creating capacities in IP management and transfer of technologies | Document reviewInterviews | WIPO staffExternal stakeholders  |
| **Sustainability** |
| 1. The likelihood of continuation of the use of tools developed in the project to ensure continuous use of the IP system as an effective tool for socio-economic development. | Likelihood of continuation of tools developed  | Document reviewInterviews | WIPO staffExternal stakeholders |
| **Implementation of Development Agenda (DA) Recommendations**  |
| 2. The extent to which the DA Recommendations 1, 10, 12, 23, 25, 31, and 40 have been implemented through this project.  | Extent to which DA recommendations have been implemented | Document reviewInterviews | WIPO staffExternal stakeholders  |

### 4.1 Evaluation Tools

The research tools will be used across the different themes and questions. The following table provides further information on these tools and how they will be deployed.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Tool** | **Description** | **Information source** |
| *Interviews – internal*  | Some 10 semi-structured interviews and/or small group discussions | *By video call:*WIPO Secretariat staff, including: - Innovation and Knowledge Infrastructure Department/Technology and Innovation Support Division- TISC Development section- DA Coordination Division- Program Performance and Budget Division- Division for LDCs- Regional Bureaus (Asia & Pacific, Latin America, Africa) |
| *Interviews – external*  | Some 10 semi-structured interviews and/or small group discussions | *By video or phone call:*- Focal points in the 4 pilot countries: Chile, Rwanda, South Africa, Indonesia  |
| *Document review* | Review of main documentation  | WIPO documentation including internal/external reports/publications, in particular the TNA manual and toolkit, TNA reports, IVC mappings, training plans.  |

The list of persons to be interviewed will be agreed upon jointly with WIPO.

The interview questions (see the Annex for a list of topics to be covered) will be slightly adapted according to the interview partner and his/her involvement in the project. The advantages of semi-structured interviews are to prepare questions beforehand that help guide the conversation and keep the respondents on topic. Moreover they allow for open-ended responses from participants for more in-depth information.

**Data analysis methods**: The data collected will be analyzed and compiled using comparative methods. The data will be correlated and organized to respond to the evaluation questions. These findings will then be used to inform the conclusions and recommendations proposed.

# 5. Work Plan and Timetable

The proposed milestones and timelines are as shown here below:

| **Milestones/Deliverables** | **Key dates**  |
| --- | --- |
| Work starts | 05 January 2021 |
| Submission of inception report to WIPO | 25 January 2021 |
| Feedback from WIPO on inception report | 29 January 2021 |
| Submission of final inception report to WIPO | 5 February 2021 |
| Submission of draft report to WIPO | 26 February 2021 |
| Factual corrections from WIPO on draft report | 5 March 2021 |
| Submission of final report to WIPO | 22 March 2021 |
| Presentation of evaluation report at the CDIP | To be defined |

# 6. Key Assumptions and Risks

It is assumed that the project team and the Development Agenda Coordination Division (DACD) will assist the consultant in identifying and accessing all key documents; informing key stakeholders about the evaluation, making necessary introductions, providing contact information and facilitating interviews as required; and providing consolidated timely feedback on deliverables. It is also assumed that the interviews to be undertaken will be successful and language and technical issues (e.g. poor connection) will not be a barrier. It is also assumed that the people to be interviewed will be available and willing to provide the required information.

# 7. Annex

**Topics to be covered during semi-structured interviews:**

*Project design, management, and coordination*

appropriateness of monitoring, self-evaluation and reporting tools

risk management

coordination with and within WIPO

*Effectiveness and usefulness:*

what worked well/less well (in particular concerning the capacity building framework, IVC mapping and TNA process)

most significant results achieved

contribution of the project to capacity development of IP management and TT in the IVC

contribution of the project to understanding of IVCs, training needs, and means for addressing training needs (in the pilot countries)

*Sustainability:*

factors that contribute to the sustainability of the action, plans for re-using/expanding on created tools

*Contribution of the project to the implementation of DA recommendations*

*Learnings:*

key lessons learned

suggestions for improvements for similar projects

As mentioned above, according to the interview partner’s involvement in the project, the topics covered will slightly vary.
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