

Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP)

Tenth Session

Geneva, November 12 to 16, 2012

EVALUATION REPORT OF THE PROJECT ON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT MATCHMAKING DATABASE (IP-DMD)

prepared by Ms. Lois Austin, Consultant, London

1. The Annex to this document contains an external independent evaluation report of the Project on Intellectual Property Development Matchmaking Database (IP-DMD) (CDIP/3/INF/2) undertaken by Ms. Lois Austin, an independent evaluator based in London.

2. *The CDIP is invited to take note of the information contained in the Annex to this document.*

[Annex follows]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary

Acronyms and Abbreviations

1. Introduction
2. Project Background
3. Evaluation Purpose and Objectives
4. Methodology
5. Key Findings
 - 5.1 Project Management and Design
 - 5.2 Effectiveness
 - 5.3 Sustainability
6. Conclusions
7. Recommendations

Annexes

- Annex 1 Evaluation Terms of Reference
- Annex 2 Evaluation Inception Report
- Annex 3 Key stakeholders interviewed
- Annex 4 Documentation reviewed

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document sets out the Final Evaluation Report for the project evaluation of the Intellectual Property Development Matchmaking Database (IP-DMD).

The evaluation has been undertaken by an independent consultant applying the following methodology:

- (a) Interviews with key stakeholders;
- (b) Key document review; and
- (c) Incorporation of feedback into the final evaluation report.

The IP-DMD included the following elements:

Development of a database and software to establish an effective interactive process for assessing the IP-related development needs of countries	Setting up a matchmaking and clearing house mechanism
Establishing collaborative mechanisms for regular collection of information on potential donors and partners, as well as their available funds and expertise for WIPO to match with specific needs of Member States.	

A number of technical project outputs (expected results) were included in the original documentation as well some broader project objectives.

KEY FINDINGS

The evaluation focused on three key areas as follows:

1. Project design and management;
2. Project effectiveness; and
3. Sustainability of the project.

Findings are presented within each of these three areas.

1. Project design and management

The original project document sets out in broad terms the requirements of Development Agenda Recommendation 9 and this has been supplemented in more detailed and practical project documentation drafted by the project team. What has remained lacking in both the official and the supplementary documentation is a coordinated plan of action which includes the involvement and responsibility of all relevant WIPO Sectors with associated timelines for undertaking tasks. Although inputs have been sought by the project team (and in general, advice from other Sectors has been taken on board), this lack of clear strategy for inclusion

from the outset has resulted in the creation of a database which is now up and running but for which responsibilities remain unclear.

The Project Director in charge of the implementation of IP-DMD was an information communication technology expert and this, with the support of a dedicated two-person project team, has been key insuring that the technical level project outputs have been successfully achieved. The fact that the same Project Director and team were also responsible for the implementation of two other Development Agenda Recommendations allowed for a cost effective approach as it ensured utilisation of similar approaches across the three recommendations. The only question mark which remains around this approach is how well anchored the project is in existing WIPO business processes in terms of WIPO's results framework, regular budget and strategic goals.

From a technical perspective, the utilisation of the Rapid Applications Development approach has allowed for the system to be developed in different phases and facilitated inputs from both internal and external stakeholders at different stages of implementation. The latest internet based technologies and open source software already licensed to WIPO as well as the use of existing WIPO computer hardware platforms have been used to build the system ensuring cost-effectiveness and efficiency.

2. Effectiveness

At the time of writing the database had not seen frequent use by either requestors or donors with a total of six requests and six offers existing on the database. Although the database was launched for use in mid-2011 no concrete steps have yet been taken to raise awareness of the database either within the Secretariat, the WIPO bureaus, with Member States, donors or the private sector. Plans to address this are however in place with the production of an explanatory leaflet and planned attendance by the system administrators at regional meetings.

The two existing system administrators are responsible for undertaking due diligence and checking information that is put into the database before sending it to the concerned Sector or Division for clearance and then publication on the database. This essential step is currently manageable but it remains to be seen whether this team of two administrators will have the capacity to continue this task if and when the database becomes more heavily populated. This issue is connected to the lack of clear workflow processes for supporting the database.

Although reporting requirements are set out in project support documentation it remains unclear both from that documentation and from discussions held during this evaluation as to what information will be monitored and how any information gathered will be used and reported on.

Due to the lack of current usage of the database it is not possible at this stage to give an assessment of the overall usefulness of the database by for example measuring success against the project objectives which include:

- (a) Institutional documented knowledge of IP-related needs of Member States.
- (b) Ability to match activities or projects with potential donors.
- (c) Information on potential donors or partners and the resources or expertise available.

- (d) Transparency of technical assistance needs and progress made in addressing those needs.

What is lacking is an overall strategy which provides a clear overview of how the database fits into WIPO's resource mobilisation process.

3 Sustainability

With the database currently having limited use it is too early to say how well it will continue to be used in the future by donors, the Secretariat and Member States. Some of the stakeholders spoken to during this evaluation remain concerned that unless the database is more strongly anchored into WIPO's structured business processes, finance, administration and resource mobilisation systems and strategies and without a clear and agreed workflow process the database will not be used by the Secretariat sufficiently and will not receive sufficient support and maintenance from key Sectors.

Conclusions

It is recognised that the development of the database to date has primarily focused on technical design and development. This has been achieved and the result is a useable database that has been created by a dedicated and specialised team with inputs from other entities within WIPO. The database itself is functional and stable and is able to retrieve and store information relating to the IP-related needs of Member States for use by WIPO and other parties.

The next stage of the process (and perhaps a stage which should have been included in initial thinking and original project plans of action and timeframes) is to ensure that the database can fulfill the project objectives of actually documenting IP-related needs of Member States (on a broad scale); matching activities or projects with potential donors; providing information on potential donors or partners and the resources or expertise available; and providing information on the status of activities or projects. In order to complete this next and crucial step the database needs to be used actively by internal and external users and this is only likely to happen once critical promotional work is completed.

Overview of recommendations

A number of recommendations are proposed both for taking forward the current IP-DMD project and for future similar projects. An overview is provided below:

<i>Recommendations for the current IP-DMD</i>	
<i>Recommendation 1</i>	<p>Lines of responsibility and workflow processes need immediate clarification. This includes stating the roles of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The Internet Services Division; (b) The Global Issues Sector; (c) The Regional Bureaus; and (d) The Special Projects team.
<i>Recommendation 2</i>	<p>Promotion work needs to start as soon as possible both internally and externally with the project team attending regional meetings, so that Member States and other interested parties are aware of the tool's existence.</p>
<i>Recommendation 3</i>	<p>WIPO needs to leverage its contacts with donors to seek support for project requests on the database. This needs to be undertaken in a pre-agreed and coordinated way with the relevant Sectors.</p>
<i>Recommendation 4</i>	<p>Following this, identification of country priorities needs to take place in order to design suitable projects to be uploaded on the database.</p>
<i>Recommendation 5</i>	<p>The database needs to be more securely anchored in to WIPO's results framework, regular budget and strategic goals to ensure that any funds channelled through the database are visible as results achieved.</p>
<i>Recommendation 6</i>	<p>Targets for the database should be agreed for example on the number and types of donors and requests expected and number of partnerships created.</p>
<i>Recommendations for future projects</i>	
<i>Recommendation 7</i>	<p>Work on future projects should start with an agreed workflow process in place which clarifies roles and responsibilities and linkages with standard WIPO strategies and processes.</p>
<i>Recommendation 8</i>	<p>Future technical special projects should involve discussion and cooperation at management and development level with the Internet Services Division in order to improve coherence with external contractors/companies and to ensure compatibility with WIPO standards and to enable ongoing maintenance and support.</p>

<i>Recommendation 9</i>	Future projects should have clear promotion and awareness-raising strategies from the outset.
<i>Recommendation 10</i>	Monitoring and reporting requirements should be included as part of the implementation plan of future projects.

In order to get the database up and running a significant amount of work has been required from the project team. The end result is a functioning and stable database with the capability of matchmaking requests for support and offer of assistance as envisaged in Development Agenda Recommendation 9. In order to capitalise on the work already undertaken, immediate work on promoting the database and supporting its use by Member States, donors and other entities needs to be undertaken.

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

CDIP	Committee on Development and Intellectual Property
DA 9	Development Agenda Recommendation 9
DB	Database
IP-DMD	Intellectual Property – Development Matchmaking Database
WIPO	World Intellectual Property Organisation

1. INTRODUCTION

This document is the Final Report for the evaluation of the Development Agenda Project related to WIPO Development Agenda Recommendation 9: the Development of an IP Development Matchmaking Database (IP-DMD).

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND

The IP-DMD was approved during the third session of the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP) held in Geneva in April 2008. Project implementation started in April 2009 and was due for completion in August 2011. The project included the following elements:

- (a) Development of a database and software to establish an effective interactive process for assessing the IP-related development needs of countries;
- (b) Setting up a matchmaking and clearing house mechanism; and
- (c) Establishing collaborative mechanisms for regular collection of information on potential donors and partners, as well as their available funds and expertise for WIPO to match with specific needs of Member States.

The project was implemented under the supervision of the Project Director of the Technical Assistance Database Projects. The database is currently supervised by the Special Projects Division within the Development Sector.

3. EVALUATION PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

The evaluation focused on assessing the project as a whole rather than on individual activities. The evaluation concentrated on the project's contribution to assessing the needs of Member States and identifying the resources or the means to address those needs, its evolution over time, its performance including project design, project management, coordination, coherence, implementation and results achieved.

The evaluation's objectives were twofold:

- (a) **Learning from experiences** during project implementation: what worked well and what did not work for the benefit of continuing activities in this field. This included:
 - (i) Assessing the project design framework;
 - (ii) Project management including monitoring and reporting tools;
 - (iii) Measuring and reporting on the results achieved to date; and
 - (iv) Assessing the likelihood of sustainability of results achieved.
- (b) **Providing evidence-based evaluation information** to support CDIP's decision-making process.

4. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The evaluation was undertaken by an independent consultant and was participatory in nature. Information was gathered from the following sources:

- (a) Stakeholder interviews: interviews were held with the project team and senior WIPO managers, including two Regional Bureaus.¹
- (b) Documentary review: key internal and external project documentation was reviewed and examined to identify data relating to performance, project design, project management, results and implementation.²

Data collected was analysed and a draft evaluation report written which was submitted to WIPO on August 15, 2012. Comments and any factual corrections provided by the WIPO Secretariat were included as appropriate in order to produce the Final Evaluation Report.

As part of the evaluation the consultant is required to present the Final Evaluation Report during the tenth session of the CDIP to be held from November 12 – 16, 2012.

Constraints and limitations

Contact was made with all WIPO Regional Bureaus and a number of Member State representatives in order to try and ensure the inclusion of their views in this evaluation. Unfortunately no Member State representatives were available during the time of the evaluation and only two Regional Bureaus were available for interview.

5. KEY FINDINGS

This section is organized on the basis of the three evaluation areas – project design and management, effectiveness and sustainability. Each evaluation question is answered directly under the headings of each area.

5.2 PROJECT DESIGN AND MANAGEMENT

Appropriateness of project documentation

The original project documentation is helpful in setting out in broad terms the requirements of Development Agenda Recommendation 9.³ The Recommendation proposes the following:

“Develop a database and software to support the CDIP proposal to establish an effective interactive process for assessing the IP-related development needs of countries....and setting up match-making and clearing house mechanisms....To establish collaborative mechanisms for regular collection of information on potential donors and partners, as well as their available funds and expertise for WIPO to match with specific needs of Member States.”

¹ See Annex 3

² See Annex 4

³ CDIP/3/INF/2 Annex IV Development Agenda Recommendation No. 9, Project Document

There are some gaps in the original project document (or in the thinking around the scope of the project) which may have resulted in a hindrance of smooth project running over time through limiting the project purely to the development of a computer system and database without including the mechanism for internal WIPO workflow processes delineating roles and responsibilities within the project and the collection of data about the IP development needs of Member States. This was possibly due to the assumption that the latter would be undertaken as part of normal programme activities within WIPO. This separation of responsibilities has resulted in the creation of a database which has not sufficiently included inputs from those directly in contact with the Member States (the Regional Bureaus) resulting in lack of clarity around how well used the system will be.

The project document has been supplemented by more working level documentation which sets out the system overview and development strategy which provides more detail in terms of how it is envisaged that the system will operate.⁴

In terms of measuring project outputs the project document is sufficient to allow for measurement in this area. However, there is a lack of detail relating to the project's outcome indicators as there is no indication of for example, planned actual numbers of Member State profiles in the system over a given period of time or types and numbers of matches expected and completed. Such indicators would be useful in order to measure whether or not the project is a success and its objectives achieved.

Needs identification

There remain some questions relating to the starting process for the identification of the actual need for a matchmaking database and some entities within the WIPO secretariat are concerned that the database has been created without firstly ensuring that there was an adequately identified need for it which would then ensure its future use. WIPO has an existing Customer Services Unit which receives requests and enquiries and it is unclear whether the database will duplicate or enhance this existing channel.

Contribution of entities within the WIPO Secretariat

The IP-DMD has been developed by a three-person dedicated technical project team within the Development Section. Throughout the project implementation the project team has consulted and cooperated with other entities within the Secretariat including:

- (a) The Information and Communication Technology Department (ICTD) in the areas of security, deployment of the internet/intranet webpage;
- (b) The Department of External Relations in the setting up of an internal mechanism within WIPO to ensure that incoming needs/offers be internally reviewed and comply with WIPO's policy and financial rules and obligations;
- (c) The Communications Division for assistance with ensuring that the database was in line with WIPO webpage standards and for creation of a leaflet to promote the IP-DMD; and
- (d) The Traditional Knowledge Division which populated the first two needs of the IP-DMD;

⁴ *System Overview and Use of Data – Version 0.1*

- (e) The Innovation and Technology Support Section who posted a need on IT support for technology and innovation centres.

There is the impression however that the DB has been developed as a stand-alone project by a team which does not have clear linkages with other essential sectors of WIPO. This carries a number of potential risks which include for example:

- (a) From a **technical** perspective, the database itself was designed by the special projects team. Within WIPO the norm is to use a specified project management methodology (Prince 2) which was not used in this case with technical support provided throughout the development process (and onwards) by the Internet Services Division. The IP-DMD team used an off-shore company to develop the DB, a company which is also used by the Internet Services Division and the creation of dual counterparts within the company has not necessarily been the most efficient or coherent approach.
- (b) Insufficient anchoring in WIPO's standard **business systems** resulting in potential lack of visibility of results achieved.
- (c) Lack of connection to current **resource mobilisation strategies** possibly leading to duplication of effort or incoherent approaches towards donors. This could include overlaps between the database and WIPO's integrated Enterprise Resource Planning System (ERP). In future it would be important to ensure that there were no significant ongoing ERP projects in order to avoid potential overlap.
- (d) Lack of connection with **existing national IP plans and strategies**.

A key element that appears to be lacking is an overall strategy for resource mobilisation which includes the database and its envisaged and potential use.

A positive step was ensuring that the Project Director in charge of implementation of IP-DMD had expertise in information communication technology as this has been a critical part of ensuring that the project outputs have been completed.

Initial identified risks

The risks identified in the original project document are felt to be relevant. There is a need for WIPO to understand the capacity building requirements of Member States. The challenge is that at a global level, different countries and indeed different regions can have widely differing IP development needs. The lack of internal coordinated synergy and an existing cultural silo approach does not necessarily allow for a unified database which will be able to respond to the range of needs potentially presented. As a new system, IP-DMD needs to be promoted, accepted and used by all Member States and WIPO only has a certain amount of control of these areas. In order to try and address this, it is planned that the Director General will send a circular to all Member States to encourage them to make full use of the new facility. A leaflet has also been created to ensure promotion and the possibility of the project team briefing regional constituencies during regional meetings and events organised by the Bureaus and the Development Division is under discussion.

A risk that was not identified in the original project document was the setting up of an internal mechanism within WIPO to receive incoming needs and offers and the system for internally reviewing them in order that they comply with WIPO's policy and financial rules and regulations and the potential for confusion over internal WIPO roles and responsibilities in

this regard. A memo on the respective roles and responsibilities of IP-DMD and other WIPO Units has been sent to the Director General for his approval in order to address this. Clarification is also needed on whether existing teams such as the Regional Bureaus will have the capacity to deal with the additional work that may be asked of them if the database becomes well-used.

There also remain gaps in terms of process. If for example a request for assistance from Country X appears on the database but WIPO has no remaining resources for that country for that year, does the request remain on the database for another donor to respond to or does WIPO have a responsibility to actively help in ensuring a positive response?

Responsiveness to emerging trends

The latest internet based technologies and open source software already licenced to WIPO as well as use of existing WIPO computer hardware platforms have been used to build the system.

The system has been built using Rapid Applications Development (RAD) which means that the system has been prototyped and built in different phases. This approach has allowed for the opportunity for feedback in an interactive manner on a working example. The IP-DMD has been developed in two stages with an internal version being the first stage and the external version being the second stage. Following the release of both stages feedback was collected in order to modify those areas which needed change. The third stage, which has allowed for amendments to overcome technical bugs, was due to be operational at the time of writing this evaluation. Releasing the database in different stages in order to incorporate feedback is considered by this evaluation to be an effective way of working and of including other sectors within the Secretariat.

Involvement of Member States

With regard to involvement of the Member States in the project, a presentation of the “pilot project” of the IP-DMD was made to all the Member States during a CDIP session which was followed up by extensive consultations with interested Member States. The Delegation of the United States of America has taken a very active role here.

Project timeframe

It was envisaged that the project would be completed by the end of August 2010. There were however significant but understandable delays in implementation due to the fact that the project team was also responsible for implementing DA Recommendation 6 the completion of which was essential prior to embarking on DA Recommendation 9. This resulted in a 12 month delay in the implementation of the matchmaking database project. The CDIP were made aware of this delay in November 2009.⁵ The revised completion date was August 2011 and although the database was opened for use at this date there remained significant work throughout 2011 with inputs from other WIPO sectors in order to ensure that it fitted with WIPO standards.

⁵ The project was due to start in April 2009.

5.2 EFFECTIVENESS

Use of the database

At the time of this evaluation the database had not seen frequent use by either requestors or donors.⁶ The database was launched for use in mid-2011 but due to lack of testing, at the time of this evaluation there had been few concrete steps taken to “market” and raise awareness of the DB either within the Secretariat, with WIPO bureaus or with Member States, donors or the private sector. Although plans are in place for communicating about the existence of the database through distribution of an explanatory leaflet and through attendance at regional meetings, there remains a lack of planning around who potential target audiences/users might be beyond Member States themselves and a lack of plan of action for awareness-raising.

The database is currently managed by two system administrators who were part of the team that was responsible for implementing the project. The two administrators are responsible for undertaking due diligence and checking information that is put into the database before sending it on to the concerned section or division for clearance before the request or offer is approved and published on the externally viewable database. This process appears essential in order to check the suitability of information being uploaded onto a publicly available WIPO database and is currently manageable due to the relatively small number of offers and requests on the database.⁷ It remains unclear how this caseload will be managed and the time it will take to clear offers if and when the database is more densely populated.

In addition, when an individual or entity is registered in the IP-DMD by filling in the template for a request or offer then they are issued with a protected ID and password. This allows them to access the IP-DMD and amend their request or offer. Once an amendment has been made the system administrator is notified and has to go through the process of checking changes made to the request in order to ensure once again that WIPO requirements are met. It remains unclear how light or heavy the workload in this regard will be.

The project is designed to respond to the IP needs of those countries covered by the Development Agenda. This does however exclude a number of countries with for example extremely low GDPs. Although it is likely that such countries will be able to use the DB, having not been involved in the design and not being a clear target of the database it remains unclear whether they will use it thereby potentially excluding a large number of transition countries with whom WIPO works.

Monitoring and use of data

The *System Overview and User Requirements Documents* outline expected reporting requirements which themselves will need to be preceded by some form of monitoring. However, with the lack of clear workflow processes these monitoring and reporting systems are yet to be firmly put in place.

Without these systems having been established from the outset it is not possible to say what data will be monitored and how it will be used.

⁶ On 13 July 2012 there six requests and six offers on the database.

⁷ *Ibid*

Usefulness of the database

The database used the existing UN database Globalhand as a model but has gone well beyond what Globalhand can offer in that it can actually match offers and requests (albeit manually at the moment) and can be used by the private sector. In this way the database and its potential for use are significant as it is offering a service that Member States have stated is required and in a way that is not yet possible for any other branch of the UN family.

The risk of non-use of the database or of longevity of use has been discussed and is largely dependent on ensuring that potential users are made aware of its existence and ensuring that the database is clearly located within WIPO with clear roles and responsibilities surrounding it.

In principle therefore the database should prove to be an extremely useful tool for holding IP-related information and requirements on an almost global level and for linking those in need of support to those who can offer it. It is simply too early to tell at this stage however the full potential of the database until it is more heavily populated.

5.3 SUSTAINABILITY

Continued use of the database by donors, the Secretariat and Member States

With the database currently only having limited use and limited population, it is difficult to say how it will continue to be used by donors, the Secretariat and Member States. However, in order to try and ensure that the database will be used as planned a number of steps need to be taken to anchor it within on-going and standard WIPO systems and processes.

Some of those spoken to as part of this evaluation expressed concern that the database is “stand-alone” and is insufficiently anchored into WIPO’s structured business processes or main finance and administration systems. In addition, although consultation has taken place with a range of entities within the secretariat there remains a lack of agreed workflow processes to ensure that all those Sectors which should be involved are clear of their involvement both now and in the future. The risk associated with these issues is that in the long term the database may not be used by the Secretariat and will not receive sufficient maintenance and support from key Sectors to ensure continued usage by donors and Member States.

The database is the means to an end – matching donors with those in need of support – but currently there is some concern that the creation of the database has been translated as an end in itself.

6. CONCLUSIONS

The need and idea for creating a matchmaking database has come from the Member States themselves and there is little doubt that the idea itself is a good one.

It is acknowledged that to date, the development of the database has primarily focused on technical design and development. This has been achieved. Now that the system is available for use there is a real need for engagement of all relevant Sectors within the Secretariat to encourage continued use.

In spite of limited involvement of all the relevant Sectors within the WIPO secretariat the process of designing and establishing the database appears to have gone smoothly. What

remains a challenge is identifying the most appropriate institutional location for the database now that it has been created.

The current risk is the database becomes an end in itself. There now needs to be a period of consolidated promotion of the database and continual follow up with on-going active matching of requests and offers.

<i>Project elements</i>	<i>Evaluation conclusions</i>
(a) Development of a database and software to establish an effective interactive process for assessing the IP-related development needs of countries;	<p>The database and software have been developed and are functional. According to the project's self-evaluation⁸ the system is completely stable.</p> <p>The database is able to store and retrieve data accurately and is available at least 99.9% seven days a week.</p> <p>The database is able to store information relating to the IP needs of Member States for use by WIPO and other parties. However, to establish a complete overview of such needs requires that the system is used by Member States and at this point in time, perhaps due to lack of promotion, the database is only being used by a very small number of Member States and donors.</p>
(b) Setting up a matchmaking and clearing house mechanism; and	<p>Manual matchmaking is currently available. In the earliest stages this may be the most appropriate approach to matchmaking until WIPO gains a better understanding of needs and offers. However, if the database is used to its full potential the workload involved in the clearing house and matchmaking roles may be significant and the workflow processes to support increased useage remain unclear.</p>
(c) Establishing collaborative mechanisms for regular collection of information on potential donors and partners, as well as their available funds and expertise for WIPO to match with specific needs of Member States.	<p>The facility to collect data is in place and operating well.</p>

From a technical perspective, DA Recommendation 9 has been fully met. What remains to be seen though is how well the database will be populated in order to meet the requirements as set out above and the project objectives. Whist the project outputs as outlined in the original project documentation have been achieved, it remains too early to assess whether

⁸ CDIP/8/2 Annex II

the project objectives have been met as the database has not yet been sufficiently marketed and disseminated. The database is therefore not sufficiently populated to evaluate the institutional documented knowledge of IP-related needs of Member States; whether the database is successfully able to match activities or projects; information on potential donors or partners and the resources and expertise available; and transparency of technical assistance needs and progress made in addressing those needs as set out in the project's objectives.

There are varying opinions between the WIPO Divisions as to whether the database should have been more heavily promoted and Member States encouraged to populate it and then amendments made as required as opposed to ensuring that the system works technically and then promoting it more forcefully. This is combined with a lack of clarity throughout implementation as to who was responsible for engaging with Member States and working in a hands-on way to ensure that the database is both populated and used.

Outside the pure technical development of the database there has been some lack of clarity about where responsibilities lay.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE IP-DMD

Recommendation 1

Lines of responsibility and workflow processes for the project need immediate clarification. This includes the following:

- (a) Stating the role of the Internet Services Division with regard to their role for the operational responsibility of the database (e.g. provision of technical maintenance of the database).
- (b) Stating the role of the Global Issues Sector and agreeing on how the IP-DMD could deliver on some aspects of WIPO's mobilisation strategy (which is currently under review and revision) as well as how the Global Issues Sector can be involved in ensuring relevant donor information is put into the database.
- (c) Stating the role and responsibilities of the Regional Bureaus.
- (d) Stating the role and responsibilities of the project team.
- (e) Ensuring the inclusion of the IP-DMD within WIPO's resource mobilisation strategy.

Finally, agreement needs to be made and formalised as to where responsibility for the database ultimately resides in order that the relevant Divisions can work in line with this.

Recommendation 2

Active work in order to publicise the existence of the database needs to take place both internally within WIPO and externally with other potential users. This promotion work needs to start as soon as possible with cooperation with the Regional Bureaus being essential to ensure that the special projects team can attend regional meetings to promote the database

and encourage heads of office to upload relevant projects onto it. A broader strategy for promotion work for IP-DMD needs to be linked to the overall strategy of the database.

Recommendation 3

Once project requests have been uploaded onto the DB, WIPO needs to leverage its contacts with donors to seek support for those projects. This needs to be undertaken in a pre-agreed coordinated way with the database project team, the Extra Resources Mobilisation Sector, The Intergovernmental Organisation and Partnerships Section and the Regional Bureaus. This could be supported through for example, the holding of workshops where donors and those seeking funding could be introduced in order to facilitate matches.

Recommendation 4

WIPO Regional Bureaus need to take concrete and coordinated steps with the office in charge of the database (currently the Special Projects Team within the Development Sector) to identify country priorities and work together to design suitable projects in collaboration and cooperation with the countries themselves or different sectors within the country. The IP-DMD should not create a parallel process which duplicates existing processes for formulating national strategies and country plans but the database should be linked into these.

Recommendation 5

To avoid the continuation of parallel systems, the database needs to be more firmly anchored into WIPO's results framework and be more strongly linked into the regular budget and strategic goals in order that any funds that are channelled through the database can be visible as a result achieved by the organisation. This in turn needs to be included in WIPO's resource mobilisation strategy including ensuring that there are no overlaps with the ERP system.

Recommendation 6

In order to be able to measure the success of the database in future (beyond its technical capability), targets should be agreed and included within project documentation. This could for example include targets on the numbers and types of donors and requestors included in the database and the number of partnerships created. A clear instruction on which Division/Sector is responsible for achieving those results needs to be formulated.

A monitoring plan needs to be established to ensure that necessary data is regularly captured and used.

Regular internal consultations need to take place to report on progress of the database and analyse key areas of interest e.g. why some parts of the world are using it more than others.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE PROJECTS

Recommendation 7

Work on future projects should start with an agreed workflow process in place in order that the relevant WIPO secretariat Sectors are clear about their roles and responsibilities from the outset. The workflow process needs to include clarity around technical inputs and responsibilities, communication and promotion activities, linkages with WIPO business approaches and linkages with resource mobilisation processes and needs to be connected to a plan of action for each sector involved with a clear associated timeline.

Recommendation 8

Future technical special projects should involve discussion and cooperation at management and development level with the Internet Services Division in order to improve coherence with external contractors/companies and to ensure compatibility with WIPO standards and to enable ongoing maintenance and support.

Recommendation 9

Future projects should have a clear promotion and awareness-raising strategy included from the beginning.

Recommendation 10

Future projects should include monitoring and reporting requirements from the outset.

[End of Annex and of document]