E

Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP)

Tenth Session
Geneva, November 12 to 16, 2012

EVALUATION REPORT OF THE PROJECT ON INNOVATION AND TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER SUPPORT STRUCTURE FOR NATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

prepared by Ms. Catherine Monagle, Chambésy, Switzerland

1.   The Annex to this document contains an external independent "Evaluation Report of the Project on Innovation and Technology Transfer Support Structure for National Institutions", undertaken by Ms. Catherine Monagle, Chambésy, Switzerland.

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

[Annex follows]

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report sets out the results of the independent, external evaluation of the WIPO Development Agenda Recommendation 10 Project "Innovation and Technology Transfer Support Structure for National Institutions". Recall that WIPO Development Agenda Recommendation 10 is *'to assist Member States to develop and improve national intellectual property institutional capacity through further development of infrastructure and other facilities with a view to making national intellectual property institutions more efficient and promote fair balance between intellectual property protection and the public interest. This technical assistance should also be extended to sub-regional and regional organizations dealing with intellectual property'.*[1]

The evaluation sought not to assess individual activities but rather, where possible, to consider the project as a whole and in particular its contribution in stimulating local innovation in developing countries and in improving the necessary infrastructure and professional skills for the effective use of the intellectual property system in the area of innovation and technology transfer, its evolution over time, its performance including project design, project management, coordination, coherence, implementation and results achieved.

The objectives of the evaluation were to:

(a)   Learn from experiences during project implementation: what worked well and what did not work well for the benefit of continuing activities in this field. This included assessing, where possible: the project design framework; project management including monitoring and reporting tools as well as measuring and reporting on the results achieved to date; and, assessing the likelihood of sustainability of results achieved; and,

(b)   To provide evidence-based evaluative information to support the CDIP's decision-making process.

The official start date for the project was April 2009. The project was formally completed in April 2012. The evaluation took place between July and September 2012. The evaluation uses the approved project document set out in CDIP/3/INF/2 Annex VII as a key basis from which to assess project delivery.As set out in that project document, project outputs, in summary, were to include:

(a)   A project paper.

(b)   Establishment of a digital portal.

(c)   Development of materials and tools for inclusion in the digital portal including contents on IP management practical skills and IP asset management in innovation and technology transfer, alongside inclusion of existing tools.

(d)   In situ testing of material and tools relevant to innovation and technology transfer support, including through seminars; and

(e)   Developing a web forum of WIPO trainees who had participated in such activities.

---

[1]As adopted by the 18th Ordinary Session of the WIPO General Assembly.

The evaluation was conducted through a combination of: desk review of relevant project related documentation including the project document, progress reports and project self-evaluations, budget expenditure reports, project deliverables, and other relevant documents including reports of previous sessions of the CDIP at which the project was discussed; further information gathering through discussions with the project team; and, semi-structured interviews with stakeholders including use of a questionnaire distributed in advance. Interviews took place either in person or by telephone.

The evaluation report is structured around questions within four key areas, namely: project design and management; effectiveness; sustainability, and contribution to implementation of the relevant Development Agenda recommendations. Key findings in each of these areas are set out, accompanied by conclusions and lessons learned. The conclusions reached are as follows:

On Project Design and Management

1.   Project documents are tools that play a critically important role in ensuring that expectations are clear, timelines are realistic, and outputs measurable. This is particularly important when projects are long, and personnel are likely to change over the course of the project, as was the case in this instance. Greater specificity in regards to certain deliverables may have been useful. It is important particularly that the number, focus and format of outputs, as well as their expected timeline for delivery are sufficiently specific to guide implementation, provide clarity to staff, and to facilitate proper measurement and evaluation of project delivery.

2.   While it is important that project expectations are clear and measurable, and that performance is measured against project plans established at the initiation of a project, it is also important that the Secretariat has the flexibility and is encourages to respond strategically to emerging opportunities and trends, including to explore deviations from an original project delivery strategy where warranted.

On Effectiveness

The timing of the final evaluation prior to external delivery of the digital portal limited the extent to which it could meaningfully consider certain questions relating to the effectiveness of the project, particularly in regards to project objectives. Nevertheless, the following conclusions were observed.

3.   The six month delay in the start of the project had implications throughout the project lifecycle, and in particular meant that work towards delivery of key outputs was ongoing past the formal completion of the project in April 2012. However, at the point the evaluation was conducted, most outputs had or were soon to be delivered. Budget expenditure at the time of evaluation was also near complete.

4.   The value of country and regional based activities was acknowledged. It was broadly perceived that the various in situ training seminars and workshops supported: increasing the expertise of member states in using the patent system for protecting inventions and marketing inventions; creating better awareness of the uses of the patent system at different stages of innovation: and, improving infrastructure for technology transfer in developing countries.

5.   The online delivery of content on innovation and technology transfer is likewise expected to further support the above objectives, with support for materials to be free of charge and openly accessible.

6.   The emphasis of the project in using an online delivery mechanism was seen to have both advantages and disadvantages for users. One concern with the emphasis on online delivery was that in some contexts the infrastructure that facilitates access by users to online technologies is not yet present or affordable. However, it was also observed that it is appropriate to continue to support an online delivery focus in the expectation that access to internet technology and infrastructure will continue to improve over time. In addition, even with a global online delivery mechanism, continued tailoring of materials to national and regional context was encouraged.

7.   The value of any online delivery mechanism to users is dependent on the creation of relevant and current materials that can be included in such a mechanism.

8.   That the initial project document was not very prescriptive as to the number and nature of new modules, materials and tools to be developed within the project means that it is difficult to measure whether achievements in this area represent effective project delivery. Note that even when those materials developed and currently in draft form are finalised, there will still be on-going needs for further development of content, particularly content that takes into account specific regional, sectoral and national needs.

On Sustainability

9.   As there is no current on-going commitment to ensure the on-going development and maintenance of the digital portal there is a real risk to the sustainability of the project as a whole, and in particular the dissemination of work that has already been completed. If Member States wish to ensure the value of work already completed is not lost, and that this work can be further built upon over time, options to ensure sustainability might be considered. Sustainability is referred to here in the sense of ensuring that developing and least developed Member States have digital access to up to date, relevant and useful materials on innovation and technology transfer.

10.   Options to ensure sustainability might include: a) continued investment into maintenance and further development of the digital portal; b) integration of the contents of the digital portal and any new materials developed within the WIPO website and accessible through the website's general search facilities; and c) encompassing both options a) and b) These options are set out further below.

Option A - Continued investment into maintenance and further development of the digital portal.

Digital portals are only as useful as their content, currency and the degree to which they are user friendly. To ensure the relevance and utility of the digital portal over the long term would require ongoing focus and resources, including to maintain the technology, to monitor user experience and feedback; and, where desired, to update materials, commission new materials, and promote engagement with the portal contents at country and regional levels. Maintenance and development of such a portal would require a sustained commitment over the life of the portal

Option B - Integration of the contents of the digital portal and any new materials into the WIPO website, accessible through the website's general search facilities.

By nature, innovation and technology transfer are multifaceted areas, with links to content and subjects across many of WIPO's areas of focus. In this way, there are advantages to ensuring that materials relevant to innovation and technology transfer are coherently integrated within WIPO's broader online search facilities.

The upcoming redesign of WIPO's website is expected to place user experience firmly at the centre of focus, and will have an enhanced capacity to support the needs of users seeking materials on innovation and technology transfer. Integration of portal materials in the WIPO website may have several advantages, including through streamline technological support needs, ensuring materials on innovation and technology transfer are easily accessible by users over the long term, and facilitating ongoing tracking of use and user experience. If accompanied by an orientation web page or pages on innovation and technology transfer, the specific focus on these areas could also be maintained. Such an approach may facilitate efficiencies within the Secretariat, potentially freeing up substantive divisions to focus on content creation as and when provided for with the work program. This is likely to represent a less resource intensive option than maintenance of a stand-alone portal.

Option C – Encompassing both options A and B

A further option may be to maintain a digital portal, but ensure its contents are also accessible through the general search facilities of the WIPO website. This would have the advantages of both options above, but may be the most resource intensive.

On Implementation of the Development Agenda Recommendations

11.   There was broad acknowledgement of the importance of technology transfer in developing and least developing countries and the value of supporting national institutions to this end. There was also acknowledgement that needs in this area are substantial, ongoing, often require tailoring to local context, and change over time.

12.   In the context of centralized digital delivery of materials, such as through a portal, it was emphasized that the need for being attuned and responsive to country level needs remains. To this end, it was observed that the engagement of regional bureaus and WIPO national offices in delivery of projects of this kind is valuable. In particular, it was contended that Regional Bureaus and national offices are well placed to both facilitate and promote engagement with the online materials offered, and to provide feedback at central level in regards to user experience, local delivery context, and needs expressed by users in Member States and at sub-regional and regional levels.

13.   Given the emphasis of the project on the needs of academic and research institutions, national IP offices, and other public entities it was largely felt that the project was consistent with the Development Agenda recommendation10 focus on supporting national institutions to promote a fair balance between intellectual property protection and the public interest. At the same time, there was awareness that in certain development contexts, innovation and technology transfer support for other sectors, such as small and medium enterprise, can make an important contribution to development overall.

The terms of reference for the evaluation further required that actionable recommendations to the CDIP be developed, based on the evaluation's findings and conclusions. Without seeking to prejudge the CDIP's consideration of those findings and conclusions, those actions recommended to the CDIP are as follows:

1.   In furtherance of Development Agenda Recommendation 10, and in support of project efficiency and sustainability, that the CDIP: acknowledge the value of country level activities to support national institutions in the area of innovation and technology transfer; and, consider how best to identify and support ongoing needs for the updating of existing materials and the creation of new content that supports national institutions in the area of innovation and technology transfer, noting that content creation that responds to user needs is not only valuable in and of itself, but that it supports country level activities and ensures the relevance of online delivery mechanisms aiming to disseminate such materials.

2.   In the interests of sustainability, that the CDIP, request the Secretariat to further explore and report back on the feasibility of options for providing ongoing, online, free and open access to materials and resources relevant to innovation and technology transfer. These options should include but might not be limited to those outlined in this report. A preferred option should be identified. In particular, the Secretariat could be asked to:

        (a)   Consider whether it would be appropriate and feasible to integrate the contents of the project's digital portal within the planned new WIPO website structure, consistent with the principles and organization of materials informing that new structure. This should include consideration of whether, over the long term, such integration would best be in addition to or as an alternative to maintenance of a stand-alone portal, taking into account both efficiency and user needs.

        (b)   Explore how best to ensure that materials relevant to innovation and technology transfer are easily accessible through search terms relating to innovation and technology transfer and other terms as appropriate, considering the needs and interests of users from academic and research institutions in Developing and Least Developed Countries, and other stakeholder groups.

        (c)   Explore the feasibility of integrating into whatever online delivery mechanism is maintained (whether a stand-alone portal, the WIPO website or both), and where not already provided for, mechanisms to track and obtain ongoing feedback from users as to their usage patterns, user experience, and user needs.

3.   In the interests of project effectiveness and efficiency, and in particular as a way of amplifying the relevance and reach of current and any future materials developed on innovation and technology transfer, that the CDIP encourage the Secretariat to:

        (a)   Consider, in carrying out its ongoing programs of work, the ways in which the WIPO Regional Bureaus and WIPO National Offices can best be harnessed as partners towards bringing the availability of online materials to the attention of national stakeholders, and in providing feedback on user experience to the Secretariat and Member States.

1.   INTRODUCTION

This report sets out the results of the independent, external evaluation of the WIPO Development Agenda Recommendation 10 Project "Innovation and Technology Transfer Support Structure for National Institutions". The project is described in WIPO document CDIP/3/INF2[2]. The evaluation process was agreed between the external evaluator and the Development Agenda Coordination Division of the WIPO Secretariat, and is set out in the approved evaluation inception report dated 18 July 2012. The evaluation took place between mid-July to mid-September 2012.

This Report includes an executive summary, and is set out in the following parts:

   (a)   An introduction detailing the purpose and scope of the evaluation. (Part 1)

   (b)   Evaluation findings. (Part 2)

   (c)   Conclusions and lessons learned. (Part 3)

   (d)   Recommendations. (Part 4)

Appendixes to this report provide additional information regarding the evaluation process, and include:

   (a)   Summary of evaluation results.(Appendix I)

   (b)   The evaluation matrix. (Appendix II)

   (c)   The list of key documents consulted during the evaluation. (Appendix III)

   (d)   The interview guide questionnaire used to collect data from key informants. (Appendix IV)

1.1   PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The objective of the evaluation was to:

   (a)   Learn from experiences during project implementation: what worked well and what did not work well for the benefit of continuing activities in this field. This included assessing, where possible: the project design framework; project management including monitoring and reporting tools as well as measuring and reporting on the results achieved to date; and, assessing the likelihood of sustainability of results achieved.

   (b)   To provide evidence-based evaluative information to support the CDIP's decision-making process.

The focus of the evaluation was not to be on assessing individual activities but rather evaluating the project as a whole and its contribution in stimulating local innovation in developing countries and in improving the necessary infrastructure and professional skills for the effective use of the intellectual property system in the area of innovation and technology

---

[2]CDIP/3/INF/2, See Annex IV, Project DA_10_03.

transfer, its evolution over time, its performance including project design, project management, coordination, coherence, implementation and results achieved. In particular the evaluation was to assess, where possible, the extent to which the project had been instrumental in:

(a)   Assisting developing countries in setting up and improving mechanisms for stimulating and enhancing local innovation and technology transfer from the public sector, including technology transfer offices at public research institutions;

(b)   Enhance the understanding of the potential uses of the patent system for development and growth; and

(c)   Facilitating the availability of the tools, guides and models relating to IP infrastructure and management by creating a one-stop-shop on WIPO's website.

The project time frame considered for this evaluation was 36 months (April 2009 – April 2012), however as implementation was in fact ongoing past April 2012, activities up to mid-September 2012 were considered.

1.2   EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The evaluation was an independent external evaluation.
The evaluation methodology consisted of the following:

(i)   Desk review of relevant project related documentation including the project framework (initial project document and study), progress reports, monitoring information, budget expenditure reports, project deliverables, and other relevant documents including reports of previous sessions of the CDIP at which the project was discussed. The list of documents reviewed is included as Appendix III.

(ii)   Informal discussions with the project team members and managers; and

(iii)   Semi-structured interviews, including use of a questionnaire distributed to in advance. Interviews took place either in person or by telephone.

During the evaluation design stage other evaluation tools, including an online survey and broader stakeholder focus group were considered. Due to the limited time available for the evaluation however, along with the nature of the project deliverables, and the actual timing of delivery, such methods were determined to neither feasible nor useful as part of the current evaluation. In conducting the evaluation, all key project documents were referred to, including progress reports. The two scheduled project self-evaluations, both of which were presented to and considered by the CDIP [3] were also referred to. These did not, however, inform the evaluation findings, with all findings being based on independent observations and fact finding conducted over the course of the evaluation.

The evaluation methodology was aimed at balancing the needs for learning and accountability. To this end the evaluation was to be participatory, with involvement in the evaluation process of those with a stake in the project. Although it was intended that the evaluation be inclusive of the views of project beneficiaries, it was found over the course of the evaluation that key deliverables were to be made available outside the WIPO Secretariat only following the conclusion of the external evaluation. This precluded inclusion of the views

---

[3]CDIP/8/2, see Annex VI p.4, and CDIP6/2, see Annex VII p.3.

of these future beneficiaries within the evaluation. Evaluation recommendations therefore include a focus as to how ongoing feedback including the views of these additional future stakeholders can be factored into decision making and program delivery over time.

Even without the input of such future beneficiaries, the depth, detail and range of stakeholder perspectives represented in the available information (including CDIP reports, project documents, self-evaluation reports and budgetary records), alongside the valuable perspectives shared by those with a direct knowledge and experience of the project, ensured that the evaluation was able to gather all information and views that could reasonably be gathered at the time the evaluation was conducted, and sufficient to form a complete picture of the project. Specifically, the evaluation focused on evaluating the project against performance criteria in key areas. The findings of this report are likewise structured these key areas.

1.3   KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluation assessed questions in each of the following areas: project design and management; project effectiveness; sustainability, and implementation of Development Agenda Recommendations. Specific questions the evaluation sought to assess are set out below.

1.3.1 Project Design and Management

(a)   The appropriateness of the initial project document as a guide for project implementation and assessment of results achieved;

(b)   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;

(c)   The extent to which other entities within the Secretariat have contributed and enabled an effective and efficient project implementation;

(d)   The extent to which the risks identified in the initial project document have materialized or been mitigated; and

(e)   The project's ability to respond to emerging trends, technologies and other external forces.

1.3.2 Effectiveness

(a)   The effectiveness of the project in delivering proposed projects outputs and effectiveness in delivering outputs supportive of project objectives.

(b)   The effectiveness and usefulness of the project in increasing expertise of Member States in using the patent system for protecting inventions and marketing inventions;

(c)   The usefulness of the project in creating better awareness of the uses of the patent system at different stages of innovation;

(d)   The usefulness of the project in improving infrastructure for technology transfer in developing countries; and

(e)   The actual use of the training materials both externally (by Member States) and internally within the Secretariat.

1.3.3 Sustainability

(a)   The likelihood for continued work on Technology Transfer Support Structure for National Institutions by WIPO and its Member States.

1.3.4 Implementation of Development Agenda (DA) Recommendations

(a)   The extent to which the DA Recommendation 10 has been implemented through this project.

(b)   The extent to which the project has supported implementation of the project to implement DA Recommendation 8.

1.4   PERFORMANCE CRITERIA

Taking into account both the defined scope and purpose of the evaluation, and the objectives of the project, pperformance indicators were developed for each of the key evaluation questions. These are described below and also set out in the evaluation matrix in Appendix II. Given the purpose and scope of the evaluation, and the need to reflect on how and why the project unfolded as it did, these indicators focus on a mix of indicators focused on process, outputs and impact.

1.4.1   Project Design and Management

(a)   The appropriateness of the initial project document as a guide for project implementation and assessment of results achieved;

- Degree to which project document outlined a realistic and achievable project plan.

- Degree to which proposed process and outputs closely related to project objectives.

- Degree to which project document incorporated a meaningful monitoring and evaluation strategy.

(b)   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;

- Degree to which project monitoring, self-evaluation and reporting tools were:

  - timely

  - accurate

  - useful and used by stakeholders

- were of appropriate length and depth, given relative size, focus and complexity of project.

- facilitated an accurate and up to date understanding of project progress, any emerging risks and how those risks were being managed.

(c)   The extent to which other entities within the Secretariat have contributed and enabled an effective and efficient project implementation;

- In relation to other entities within Secretariat

  -     number of Divisions contributing;

  -     level of staff contributing;

  -     nature of contribution;

  -     timeliness of Contribution; and

  -     impact of contribution on project implementation, outputs and impact.

(d)   The extent to which the risks identified in the initial project document have materialized or been mitigated;

- Extent to which risks identified in the project document materialised.

- Extent to which any risks that actually materialised had not been identified in the project document.

- Extent to which any risks that emerged were mitigated.

- Extent to which any mitigation actions taken reflected the mitigation strategies in project document, and if not, why not.

(e)   The project's ability to respond to emerging trends, technologies and other external forces.

- Extent to which project team was cognisant of emerging trends during life of project, including though exposure to information sources including relevant new publications, materials, and access to experts.

- Extent to which project team took into account new information in project implementation.

- Extent to which project direction and outputs were adjusted during implementation given new information.

1.4.2   Effectiveness

(a)   The effectiveness of the project in delivering proposed projects outputs and effectiveness in delivering outputs supportive of project objectives.

- Degree to which proposed project outputs were delivered.

- Degree to which actual project outputs supported project objectives.

(b)   The effectiveness and usefulness of the project in increasing expertise of Member States in using the patent system for protecting inventions and marketing inventions.

- Demonstrated extent and type of use of project tools by Member States.

- Extent to which Member States perceived their expertise had increased through use of project tools.

(c)   The usefulness of the project in creating better awareness of the uses of the patent system at different stages of innovation.

- Perceived level of awareness of uses of the patent system at different stages of innovation.

- Extent to which Stakeholders perceived their awareness had increased through project participation or use of project tools.

(d)   The usefulness of the project in improving infrastructure for technology transfer in developing countries.

- Extent to which Stakeholders perceived the project had improved infrastructure for technology transfer in developing countries.

- Extent to which examples could be cited by stakeholders of direct or indirect impact of project on technology transfer in developing countries.

(e)   The actual use of the training materials both externally (by Member States) and internally within the Secretariat.

- Number of times training materials used by Member States and internally within the Secretariat.

- Type of use of training materials by Member States and internally within the Secretariat.

- Extent to which Member State participants and Secretariat staff would continue to use training materials.

- Extent to which stakeholders would not use or not continue to use training materials.

1.4.3   Sustainability

(a)   The likelihood for continued work on Technology Transfer Support Structure for National Institutions by WIPO and its Member States.

- Extent of work being currently continued by Member States and WIPO.

- Extent of work in planning phase by Member States and WIPO.

- Perceptions of likely future work in Member States and WIPO.

- Perceptions as to contribution of project to actual, planned and likely future work by Member States and WIPO.

1.4.4 Implementation of Development Agenda Recommendations

(f)   The extent to which DA Recommendation 10 has been implemented through this project.

- Perceptions as to relationship of project to DA Recommendation 10.

- Perceptions as to remaining gaps in implementation of DA Recommendation 10.

- Perceptions as to future actions needed to implement DA Recommendation 10.

(g)   The extent to which the project has supported implementation of complementary DA Recommendation 8.

- Perceptions as to relationship of project to WIPO project for implementation of DA Recommendation 8.

- Perceptions as to extent to which project has complemented project for implementation of DA Recommendation 8.

2.   KEY FINDINGS

2.1   PROJECT DESIGN AND MANAGEMENT

(a)   The appropriateness of the initial project document as a guide for project implementation and assessment of results achieved.

The project document (CDIP/3/INF/2) outlined a project plan, identifying objectives, project outputs, a delivery strategy including identification of risks, project review schedule, project self-evaluation framework, implementation timeline and budget. The project document on the whole identified a clear set of project deliverables. Project implementation may have been supported by a more detailed description of certain deliverables, particularly in regards to number, type and focus of activities, materials and tools. Note however that many of these deliverables were further described in the project paper (itself a project output).

The proposed process and outputs were consistent with the project objectives. The project self-evaluation framework within the project document aligned project outputs and objectives alongside output and outcome indicators. On the whole, this framework appeared to represent a meaningful and measurable monitoring and evaluation strategy. Certain indicators could have been more tightly and measurably defined in a way that may have better supported project monitoring and evaluation. For example, a date for having the portal operational was not identified, the number of training modules in each category was not identified, and there was lack of clarify around the number and nature of other tools and materials to be developed. A project review schedule involving two monitoring reports (one at six and a second at

18 months) were provided for, along with a final self-evaluation report with the potential for an additional independent evaluation.

(b)   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.

Project summaries and self-evaluations were presented to the 4th, 6th and 8th sessions of the CDIP. On the whole, these summaries and evaluations were concise and informative for users, in a format that was clear. They were of appropriate length and depth, given the relative size, focus and complexity of the project, and appear to have facilitated an accurate and up to date understanding of the project progress. As the project was late in starting, the earlier two summaries had little progress to report, although this in itself was able to be communicated through the self-evaluation reports.

(c)   The extent to which other entities within the Secretariat have contributed and enabled an effective and efficient project implementation.

A good level of coordination was reported among the relevant divisions. Coordination spanned levels, from professional to managerial staff. Greater collaboration in the early stages of the project may have further enhanced collaboration in a way that contributed to the coherence of the project approach. In particular, early collaboration with the communications division may have enabled the development of the portal to be further integrated into plans for the review of the WIPO website.

(d)   The extent to which the risks identified in the initial project document have materialized or been mitigated.

The project document identified the risks of a) ensuring the contents developed are suitable to the different contexts in which they may be used, and b) long term project sustainability. Both of these risks were perceived to be real and on-going risks inherent in the project approach. Other risks not identified in the project approach that did materialise included the risk to the project start date, owing in part to a human resourcing delay issue. In particular, risks associated with personnel allocations tied to other as yet unapproved projects had not been identified.

The risks relating to ensuring the contents developed are suitable to the different contexts was noted in the project document as being something that will be managed through on-going consultations with stakeholders, testing of tools in different contexts and adaptation of materials as necessary. As the portal has not yet been made available to external stakeholders, it is too early to consider how that risk will be managed and whether it will be effective should it materialise.

Long term sustainability is a risk that has emerged, and will be considered elsewhere in this evaluation report.

(e)   The project's ability to respond to emerging trends, technologies and other external forces.

Project implementation has largely reflected the project document. The project document was presented to the 3rd CDIP session in 2009.

More recently, and as part of the Strategic Realignment Program, the Communications Divisions has embarked on a project to review and restructure the WIPO website[4], with a view to making the material more focused on user needs, and less around the organizational structure of the Secretariat. Given these changes, the advantages of a resource intensive one stop portal for innovation and technology transfer over the long term are less clear, as the revised WIPO website will have an enhanced capacity to connect users with relevant materials, including in these content areas. Given this review and restructure, consideration as to whether the strategy from this point on could be altered in light of opportunities arising, and in support of long term sustainability and efficiency, may be warranted.

2.2   EFFECTIVENESS

(a)   The effectiveness of the project in delivering proposed projects outputs and effectiveness in delivering outputs supportive of project objectives.

The project formally started in April 2009. A six month delay was experienced, and the project's actual start was in September 2009. This delayed start had a cascading effect on the delivery of outputs. While the project was formally completed in April 2012, delivery was on-going at the time of the evaluation.

This delay also had implications for the expenditure of funds. As of November 2011, the budget expenditure was 10.1%. By August 2012 the expenditure rate was reported in discussions between the project manager and the evaluator as having reached 91.4%, with the last official report dated June 7 2012 recording an expenditure rate of 81.2%.

As reported in the project summary presented to WIPO at the 8th CDIP in November 2011, the following outputs had by that point been delivered:

- The project paper.

- Existing training tools had been tested in *in situ* seminars and events, including the following:

    (i)   WIPO Assessment mission for the establishment of a technology transfer office in Algeria in March 2011.

    (ii)   Sub-regional workshop on successful technology licensing in Costa Rica in October 2011.

    (iii)   WIPO national seminar on innovation in Serbia in October 2011.

    (iv)   Advanced successful technology licensing workshop in Cuba in October 2011.

    (v)   A technology transfer office circle in France in October 2011.

- A prototype version of the digital portal was presented to Member States by the Secretariat at the 8th CDIP.

---

[4] See, WIPO, 2012. Taking the Initiative, WIPO Strategic Realignment Program. Geneva.at p.5.

- Documents included within the draft digital portal encompassed a mix of:

    (i)   Material a number of years old and available for purchase: i.e. IP Audit tool; IP Asset development and management: a key strategy for economic growth; Exchanging value Negotiating Technology Licencing Agreements: A training manual; WIPO Patent Drafting Manual.

    (ii)   Material available already on the WIPO website, and free of charge, including material available through the WIPO University Initiative page:i.e. Successful Technology Licensing booklet.

    (iii)   In draft form, awaiting approval prior to external publishing, (with work on some elements progressed also subsequent to the 8th session of the CDIP in November 2011): i.e. Patent Drafting Exercise Book; Practical Guide for Valuing Intangible Assets in Research Institutions; IP Valuation Manual for Academic Institutions; Trademark Licensing Guide; Guide on the Strategic Management of Open Innovation Networks.

Outputs identified in the project document that had not been delivered in full at the time of the evaluation were:

- Availability of the portal to users outside the Secretariat was not yet provided, owing partially to the need for the newly developed materials to be approved prior to external launch.

- Delivery of a Web Forum Network for trainees, noting this output isexpected to be linked to the digital portal.

    It was reported to the evaluator in August 2012 that the digital portal is expected to be made available externally in coming months.

(b)   The effectiveness and usefulness of the project in increasing expertise of Member States in using the patent system for protecting inventions and marketing inventions.

It was broadly perceived that the various in situ training seminars and workshops supported increasing the expertise of member states in using the patent system for protecting inventions and marketing inventions. Owing to the stage of delivery at the time of the evaluation, the evaluation could not meaningfully consider the extent to which the digital portal was effective and useful in increasing the expertise of Member States in using the patent system for protecting and marketing inventions.

(c)   The usefulness of the project in creating better awareness of the uses of the patent system at different stages of innovation.

It was broadly perceived that the various in situ training seminars and workshops supported better awareness of the uses of the patent system at different stages of innovation. Owing to the stage of delivery at the time of the evaluation, the evaluation could not meaningfully consider the extent to which the digital portal was effective and useful in creating better awareness of the uses of the patent system at different stages of innovation, or whether new content developed for inclusion within the digital portal was effective and useful in creating this awareness.

(d)   The usefulness of the project in improving infrastructure for technology transfer in developing countries.

It was broadly perceived that the various in situ training seminars and workshops supported improvement of infrastructure for technology transfer in developing countries. Owing to the stage of delivery at the time of the evaluation, the evaluation could not meaningfully consider the extent to which the digital portal was useful in improving infrastructure for technology transfer in developing countries.

(e)   The actual use of the training materials both externally (by Member States) and internally within the Secretariat.

Training materials relevant to innovation and technology transfer support for national institutions were used by Secretariat staff in the delivery of more than 13 in situ seminars and workshops globally, including those project seminars and workshops described above.

2.3   SUSTAINABILITY

(a)   The likelihood for continued work on Technology Transfer Support Structure for National Institutions by WIPO and its Member States.

With the formal completion of the project there is no current on-going commitment to ensure the on-going development and maintenance of the digital portal. This represents a risk to the sustainability of the project as a whole, and in particular the dissemination of work that has already been completed. Possible ways in which sustainability might be supported are identified in discussion of conclusions and lessons learned.

2.4   IMPLEMENTATION OF DEVELOPMENT AGENDA RECOMMENDATIONS

(a)   The extent to which the DA Recommendation 10 has been implemented through this project.

The project was perceived as having contributed to implementation of DA Recommendations 10, being *'To assist Member States to develop and improve national intellectual property capacity through further development of infrastructure and other facilities with a view to making national intellectual property institutions more efficient and promote fair balance between intellectual property protection and the public interest. This technical assistance should also be extended to sub-regional and regional organizations dealing with intellectual property'.* The in situ seminars and workshops were particularly viewed as having contributed to implementation of DA Recommendation 10, with the expectation that external delivery of the digital portal will further contribute.

It was widely *recognised* that there is always more that can be done to support innovation and technology transfer in developing countries, including through support for national institutions.

Specific *suggestions* included:

     (i)   Depending on demand, expanding the focus outwards from public academic and research institutions and national intellectual property office to look at the needs of other public agencies and small and medium enterprises.

(ii)   Depending on demand, expanding the geographic and regional focus of activities, or providing activities in on topics that had not yet been covered.

(iii)   Further tailoring existing and/or future materials to the needs of specific sectors or country groups, again, depending on demand.

(b)   The extent to which the project has supported implementation of the project to implement DA Recommendation 8.

Recall that Development Agenda Recommendation 8 requests WIPO *'to develop agreements with research institutions and with private enterprises with a view to facilitating the national offices of developing countries, especially LDCs, as well as their regional and sub-regional intellectual property organizations to access specialized databases for the purposes of patent searches'.*[5]   It was perceived that the project in support of Development Agenda Recommendation 8 on specialised databases access and support was broadly complementary to the DA 10 project on innovation and technology transfer support structure for national institutions. In particular, activities held under the auspice of the innovation and technology transfer support project were described as having alerted users to the existence of specialised materials and databases, resulting in the identification of users who seek access to such database access support.

3.   CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNT

Drawing from the findings described above, the following key conclusions and lessons learned can be observed.

On Project Design and Management

1.   Project documents are tools that play a critically important role in ensuring that expectations are clear, timelines are realistic, and outputs measurable. This is particularly important when projects are long, and personnel are likely to change over the course of the project, as was the case in this instance. Greater specificity in regards to certain deliverables may have been useful. It is important particularly that the number, focus and format of outputs, as well as their expected timeline for delivery are sufficiently specific to guide implementation, provide clarity to staff, and to facilitate proper measurement and evaluation of project delivery.

2.   While it is important that project expectations are clear and measurable, and that performance is measured against project plans established at the initiation of a project, it is also important that the Secretariat has the flexibility and is encourages to respond strategically to emerging opportunities and trends, including to explore deviations from an original project delivery strategy where warranted.

On Effectiveness

The timing of the final evaluation prior to external delivery of the digital portal limited the extent to which it could meaningfully consider certain questions relating to the effectiveness of the project, particularly in regards to project objectives. Nevertheless, the following conclusions were observed.

---
[5]As adopted by the 18th Ordinary Session of the WIPO General Assembly.

3.   The six month delay in the start of the project had implications throughout the project lifecycle, and in particular meant that work towards delivery of key outputs was ongoing past the formal completion of the project in April 2012. However, at the point the evaluation was conducted, most outputs had or were soon to be delivered. Budget expenditure at the time of evaluation was also near complete.

4.   The value of country and regional based activities was acknowledged. It was broadly perceived that the various in situ training seminars and workshops supported: increasing the expertise of member states in using the patent system for protecting inventions and marketing inventions; creating better awareness of the uses of the patent system at different stages of innovation: and, improving infrastructure for technology transfer in developing countries.

5.   The online delivery of content on innovation and technology transfer is likewise expected to further support the above objectives, with support for materials to be free of charge and openly accessible.

6.   The emphasis of the project in using an online delivery mechanism was seen to have both advantages and disadvantages for users. One concern with the emphasis on online delivery was that in some contexts the infrastructure that facilitates access by users to online technologies is not yet present or affordable. However, it was also observed that it is appropriate to continue to support an online delivery focus in the expectation that access to internet technology and infrastructure will continue to improve over time. In addition, even with a global online delivery mechanism, continued tailoring of materials to national and regional context was encouraged.

7.   The value of any online delivery mechanism to users is dependent on the creation of relevant and current materials that can be included in such a mechanism.

8.   That the initial project document was not very prescriptive as to the number and nature of new modules, materials and tools to be developed within the project means that it is not possible to measure whether achievements in this area represent effective project delivery. Note that even when those materials developed and currently in draft form are finalised, there will still be on-going needs for further development of content, particularly content that takes into account specific regional, sectoral and national needs.

On Sustainability

9.   As there is no current on-going commitment to ensure the on-going development and maintenance of the digital portal there is a real risk to the sustainability of the project as a whole, and in particular the dissemination of work that has already been completed. If Member States wish to ensure the value of work already completed is not lost, and that this work can be further built upon over time, options to ensure sustainability might be considered. Sustainability is referred to here in the sense of ensuring that developing and least developed Member States have digital access to up to date, relevant and useful materials on innovation and technology transfer.

10.   Options to ensure sustainability might include: a) continued investment into maintenance and further development of the digital portal; b) integration of the contents of the digital portal and any new materials developed within the WIPO website and accessible through the website's general search facilities; and c) encompassing both options a) and b). These options are set out further below.

Option A- continued investment into maintenance and further development of the digital portal.

Digital portals are only as useful as their content, currency and the degree to which they are user friendly. To ensure the relevance and utility of the digital portal over the long term would require ongoing focus and resources, including to maintain the technology, to monitor user experience and feedback, and, where desired, to update materials, commission new materials, and promote engagement with the portal contents at country and regional levels. Maintenance and development of such a portal would require a sustained commitment over the life of the portal

Option B - integration of the contents of the digital portal and any new materials into the WIPO website, accessible through the website's general search facilities.

By nature, innovation and technology transfer are multifaceted areas, with links to content and subjects across many of WIPO's areas of focus. In this way, there are advantages to ensuring that materials relevant to innovation and technology transfer are coherently integrated within WIPO's broader online search facilities.

The upcoming redesign of WIPO's website is expected to place user experience firmly at the centre of focus, and will have an enhanced capacity to support the needs of users seeking materials on innovation and technology transfer. Integration of portal materials in the WIPO website may have several advantages, including through streamline technological support needs, ensuring materials on innovation and technology transfer are easily accessible by users over the long term, and facilitating ongoing tracking of use and user experience. If accompanied by an orientation web page or pages on innovation and technology transfer, the specific focus on these areas could also be maintained. Such an approach may facilitate efficiencies within the Secretariat, potentially freeing up substantive divisions to focus on content creation as and when provided for with the work program. This is likely to represent a less resource intensive option than maintenance of a stand-alone portal.

Option C - both options A and B

A further option may be to maintain a digital portal, but ensure its contents are also accessible through the general search facilities of the WIPO website. This would have the advantages of both options above, but may be the most resource intensive.

On Implementation of the Development Agenda Recommendations

11.   There was broad acknowledgement of the importance of technology transfer in developing and least developing countries and the value of supporting national institutions to this end. There was also acknowledgement that needs in this area are substantial, ongoing, often require tailoring to local context, and change over time.

12.   In the context of centralized digital delivery of materials, such as through a portal, it was emphasized that the need for being attuned and responsive to country level needs remains. To this end, it was observed that the engagement of regional bureaus and WIPO national offices in delivery of projects of this kind is valuable. In particular, it was contended that Regional Bureaus and national offices are well placed to both facilitate and promote engagement with the online materials offered, and to provide feedback at central level in regards to user experience, local delivery context, and needs expressed by users in Member States and at sub-regional and regional levels.

13.   Given the emphasis of the project on the needs of academic and research institutions, national IP offices, and other public entities it was largely felt that the project was consistent with the Development Agenda Recommendation 10 focus on supporting national institutions to promote a fair balance between intellectual property protection and the public interest. At the same time, there was awareness that in certain development contexts, innovation and technology transfer support for other sectors, such as small and medium enterprise, can make an important contribution to development overall.

4.   RECOMMENDATIONS

The terms of reference for the evaluation further required that actionable recommendations to the CDIP be developed, based on the evaluation's findings and conclusions. Without seeking to prejudge the CDIP's consideration of those findings and conclusions, those actions recommended to the CDIP are as follows:

1.   In furtherance of Development Agenda Recommendation 10, and in support of project efficiency and sustainability, that the CDIP: acknowledge the value of country level activities to support national institutions in the area of innovation and technology transfer; and, consider how best to identify and support ongoing needs for the updating of existing materials and the creation of new content that supports national institutions in the area of innovation and technology transfer, noting that content creation that responds to user needs is not only valuable in and of itself, but that it supports country level activities and ensures the relevance of online delivery mechanisms aiming to disseminate such materials.

2.   In the interests of sustainability, that the CDIP, request the Secretariat to further explore and report back on the feasibility of options for providing ongoing, online, free and open access to materials and resources relevant to innovation and technology transfer. These options should include but might not be limited to those outlined in this report. A preferred option should be identified. In particular, the Secretariat could be asked to:

(a)   Consider whether it would be appropriate and feasible to integrate the contents of the project's digital portal within the planned new WIPO website structure, consistent with the principles and organization of materials informing that new structure. This should include consideration of whether, over the long term, such integration would best be in addition to or as an alternative to maintenance of a stand-alone portal, taking into account both efficiency and user needs.

(b)   Explore how best to ensure that materials relevant to innovation and technology transfer are easily accessible through search terms relating to innovation and technology transfer and other terms as appropriate, considering the needs and interests of users from academic and research institutions in Developing and Least Developed Countries, and other stakeholder groups.

(c)   Explore the feasibility of integrating into whatever online delivery mechanism is maintained (whether a stand-alone portal, the WIPO website or both), and where not already provided for, mechanisms to track and obtain ongoing feedback from users as to their usage patterns, user experience, and user needs.

3.   In the interests of project effectiveness and efficiency, and in particular as a way of amplifying the relevance and reach of current and any future materials developed on innovation and technology transfer, that the CDIP encourage the Secretariat to:

(a)   Consider, in carrying out its ongoing programs of work, the ways in which the WIPO Regional Bureaus and WIPO National Offices can best be harnessed as partners towards bringing the availability of online materials to the attention of national stakeholders, and in providing feedback on user experience to the Secretariat and Member States.

[Appendix I follows]

APPENDIX I: EVALUATION RESULTS BASED ON THE EVALUATION MATRIX

EVALUATION MATRIX		
<u>Key Evaluation Questions</u>	<u>Performance Indicators</u>	<u>Evaluation Results</u>
Project Design and Management		
1. The appropriateness of the initial project document as a guide for project implementation and assessment of results achieved.	• Degree to which project document outlined a realistic and achievable project plan. • Degree to which proposed process and outputs closely related to project objectives. • Degree to which project document incorporated a meaningful monitoring and evaluation strategy.	• The project document (CDIP/3/INF/2) outlined a project plan, identifying objectives, project outputs, a delivery strategy including identification of risks, project review schedule, project self-evaluation framework, implementation timeline and budget. The project document on the whole identified a clear set of project deliverables. Project implementation may have been supported by a more detailed description of certain deliverables, particularly in regards to number, type and focus of activities, materials and tools. Note however that many of these deliverables were further described in the project paper (itself a project output). • The proposed process and outputs were consistent with the project objectives. • The project self-evaluation framework within the project document aligned project outputs and objectives alongside output and outcome indicators. On the whole, this framework appeared to represent a meaningful and measurable monitoring and evaluation strategy. Certain indicators could have been more tightly and measurably defined in a way that may have better supported project monitoring and evaluation. For example, a date for having the portal operational was not identified, the number of training modules in each category was not identified, and there was lack of clarity concerning the number and nature of tools and materials to be developed. A project review schedule involving two monitoring reports (one at six and a second at 18 months) were provided for, along with a final self-evaluation report with the potential for an additional independent evaluation.

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.	• Degree to which project monitoring, self-evaluation and reporting tools were: a) timely b) accurate c) useful and used by stakeholders d) were of appropriate length and depth, given relative size, focus and complexity of project. e) facilitated an accurate and up to date understanding of project progress, any emerging risks and how those risks were being managed.	• Project summaries and self-evaluations were presented to the 4th, 6th and 8th sessions of the CDIP. • On the whole, these summaries and evaluations were concise and informative for users, in a format that was clear. They were of appropriate length and depth, given the relative size, focus and complexity of the project, and appear to have facilitated an accurate and up to date understanding of the project progress. • As the project was late in starting, the earlier two summaries had little progress to report, although this in itself was able to be communicated through the self-evaluation reports.
3. The extent to which other entities within the Secretariat have contributed and enabled an effective and efficient project implementation.	• In relation to other entities within Secretariat: a) number of Divisions contributing; b) level of staff contributing; c) nature of contribution; d) timeliness of Contribution; e) impact of contribution on	• A good level of coordination was reported among the relevant divisions. Coordination spanned levels, from professional to managerial staff. • Greater collaboration in the early stages of the project may have further enhanced collaboration in a way that contributed to the coherence of the project approach. In particular, early collaboration with the communications division may have enabled the development of the portal to be further integrated into plans for the review of the WIPO website.

	project implementation, outputs and impact.	
4. The extent to which the risks identified in the initial project document have materialized or been mitigated.	- Extent to which risks identified in the project document materialised. - Extent to which any risks that actually materialised had not been identified in the project document. - Extent to which any risks that emerged were mitigated, - Extent to which any mitigation actions taken reflected the mitigation strategies in project document, and if not, why not.	- The project document identified the risks of a) ensuring the contents developed are suitable to the different contexts in which they may be used, and b) long term project sustainability. - Both of these risks were perceived to be real and on-going risks inherent in the project approach. - Other risks not identified in the project approach that materialised included the risk to the project start date, owing in part to a human resource issue. In particular, risks associated with personnel allocations tied to other as yet unapproved projects had not been identified. - The risks relating to ensuring the contents developed are suitable to the different contexts was noted in the project document as being something that will be managed through on-going consultations with stakeholders, testing of tools in different contexts and adaptation of materials as necessary. As the portal has not yet been made available to external stakeholders, it is too early to consider how that risk will be managed and whether it will be effective should it materialise. - Long term sustainability is a risk that has emerged, and will be considered elsewhere in the evaluation report.
5. The project's ability to respond to emerging trends, technologies and other external forces.	Extent to which project team was cognisant of emerging trends during life of project, including though exposure to information sources including relevant new publications, materials, and access to experts.	- Project implementation has largely reflected the project document. The project document was presented to the 3rd CDIP session in 2009. - More recently, and as part of the Strategic Realignment Program, the Communications Divisions has embarked on a project to review and restructure the WIPO website, with a view to making the material more focused on user needs, and less around the organisational structure of the Secretariat. - Given these changes, the advantages of a one stop portal for innovation and technology transfer over the long term are less clear, as the revised WIPO

	• Extent to which project team took into account new information in project implementation. • Extent to which project direction and outputs were adjusted during implementation given new information.	website will have an enhanced capacity to connect users with relevant materials. • In light of opportunities arising through this restructure, consideration as to whether the delivery strategy from this point could be altered to take advantage of these opportunities would be appropriate.
Effectiveness		

6. The effectiveness of the project in delivering proposed projects outputs and effectiveness in delivering outputs supportive of project objectives.	• Degree to which proposed project outputs were delivered.
	
	• Degree to which actual project outputs supported project objectives.
		• The project formally was due to start in April 2009. A six month delay was experienced, and the project's actual start was September 2009.
		
		• This delayed start had a cascading effect on the delivery of outputs, and, accordingly, delayed also the expenditure of funds. As of November 2011, the budget expenditure was 10.1%. By August 2012 the expenditure rate was reported in discussions between the project manager and the evaluator as having reached 91.4%, with the last official report dated June 7, 2012 recording an expenditure rate of 81.2%.
		
		• As reported in the project summary presented to WIPO at the 8th CDIP in November 2011, the following outputs had by then been delivered:
		   o The project paper.
		   o Training tools had been tested in the in situ seminars and events, including the following:
		      ▪ WIPO Assessment mission for the establishment of a technology transfer office in Algeria in March 2011.
		      ▪ Sub-regional workshop on successful technology licensing in Costa Rica in October 2011.
		      ▪ WIPO national seminar on innovation in Serbia in October 2011.
		      ▪ Advanced successful technology licensing

		workshop in Cuba in October 2011.
		▪ A technology transfer office circle in France in October 2011.
		o A prototype version of the digital portal was presented to Member States by the Secretariat at the 8th CDIP.
		• Documents included within the draft digital portal encompassed a mix of: (a) material a number of years old and available for purchase: i.e. IP Audit tool; IP Asset development and management: a key strategy for economic growth; Exchanging value Negotiating Technology Licencing Agreements: A training manual; WIPO Patent Drafting Manual. (b) material available already on the WIPO website, and free of charge, including material available through the WIPO University Initiative page: i.e. Successful Technology Licensing booklet. (c) in draft form, awaiting approval prior to external publishing, (with work on some elements progressed also subsequent to the 8th session of the CDIP in November 2011): i.e. Patent Drafting Exercise Book; Practical Guide for Valuing Intangible Assets in Research Institutions; IP Valuation Manual for Academic Institutions; Trademark Licensing Guide; Guide on the Strategic Management of Open Innovation Networks. • Outputs identified in the project document that had not been delivered in full at the time of the evaluation were: o Availability of the portal to users outside the Secretariat was not yet provided, owing partially to the need for new materials to be approved prior to external launch. o Establishment of Web Forum Network for trainees, noting this output is linked to the digital portal. It was reported to the evaluator that these remaining steps are to be completed in the short term.

7. The effectiveness and usefulness of the project in increasing expertise of Member States in using the patent system for protecting inventions and marketing inventions.	• Demonstrated extent and type of use of project tools by Member States.	• It was broadly perceived that the various in situ training seminars and workshops supported increasing the expertise of member states in using the patent system for protecting inventions and marketing inventions. • Owing to the stage of delivery at the time of the evaluation, the evaluation could not meaningfully consider the extent to which the digital portal was effective and useful in increasing the expertise of Member States in using the patent system for protecting and marketing inventions.
8. The usefulness of the project in creating better awareness of the uses of the patent system at different stages of innovation.	• Perceived level of awareness of uses of the patent system at different stages of innovation.	• It was broadly perceived that the various in situ training seminars and workshops supported better awareness of the uses of the patent system at different stages of innovation. • Owing to the stage of delivery at the time of the evaluation, the evaluation could not meaningfully consider the extent to which the digital portal was effective and useful in creating better awareness of the uses of the patent system at different stages of innovation, or whether new content developed for inclusion within the digital portal was effective and useful in creating this awareness.
9. The usefulness of the project in improving infrastructure for technology transfer in developing countries.	• Extent to which the project was perceived as having contributed to improvement of infrastructure for technology transfer in developing countries.	• It was broadly perceived that the various in situ training seminars and workshops supported improvement of infrastructure for technology transfer in developing countries. • Owing to the stage of delivery at the time of the evaluation, the evaluation could not meaningfully consider the extent to which the digital portal was useful in improving infrastructure for technology transfer in developing countries.
10. The actual use of the training materials both externally (by Member States) and internally within the Secretariat.	• Number of times training materials used by Member States and internally within the Secretariat.	• Training materials were used by Secretariat staff in the delivery of more than 13 in situ seminars and workshops globally, including those project seminars and workshops described above.

	• Type of use of training materials by Member States and internally within the Secretariat.	
Sustainability		
11. The likelihood for continued work on Technology Transfer Support Structure for National Institutions by WIPO and its Member States.	• Extent of work being currently continued by Member States and WIPO. • Extent of work in planning phase by Member States and WIPO. • Perceptions of likely future work in Member States and WIPO. • Perceptions as to contribution of project to actual, planned and likely future work by Member States and WIPO.	• With the formal completion of the project there is no current on-going commitment to ensure the on-going development and maintenance of the digital portal This represents a risk to the sustainability of the project as a whole, and in particular the dissemination of work that has already been completed.
Implementation of Development Agenda Recommendations		
12. The extent to which DA Recommendation 10 has been implemented through this project.	• Perceptions as to relationship of project to DA Recommendation 10. • Perceptions as to remaining gaps in implementation of DA Recommendation 10. • Perceptions as to future actions needed to implement DA Recommendation 10.	• The project was perceived as having contributed to implementation of DA Recommendation 10, being *'To assist Member States to develop and improve national intellectual property capacity through further development of infrastructure and other facilities with a view to making national intellectual property institutions more efficient and promote fair balance between intellectual property protection and the public interest. This technical assistance should also be extended to sub-regional and regional organizations dealing with intellectual property'.* The in situ seminars and workshops were

		particularly viewed as having contributed to implementation of DA Recommendation 10, with the expectation that external delivery of the digital portal will further contribute.
		• It was widely recognised that there is always more that can be done to support innovation and technology transfer in developing countries, including support for national institutions to this end.

		• Specific suggestions included:
		  o depending on demand, expanding the focus outwards from public academic and research institutions and national intellectual property office to look at the needs of other public agencies and small and medium enterprises.
		  o depending on demand, expanding the geographic and regional focus of activities, or providing activities in on topics that had not yet been covered, depending on demand.
		  o Further tailoring existing and/or future materials to the needs of specific sectors or country groups, again, depending on demand.

13. The extent to which the project has supported implementation of complementary DA Recommendation 8.	• Perceptions as to relationship of project to WIPO project for implementation of DA Recommendation 8. • Perceptions as to extent to which project has complemented project for implementation of DA Recommendation 8.	• Note that Development Agenda Recommendation 8 requests WIPO 'to develop agreements with research institutions and with private enterprises with a view to facilitating the national offices of developing countries, especially LDCs, as well as their regional and sub-regional intellectual property organizations to access specialized databases for the purposes of patent searches'. It was perceived that the project in support of Development Agenda Recommendation 8 on specialised databases access and support was broadly complementary to the DA 10 project on innovation and technology transfer support

		structure for national institutions. In particular, activities held under the auspice of the innovation and technology transfer support project have alerted users to the existence of specialised materials and databases, resulting in the identification of users who seek access to such database access support.

[Appendix II follows]

APPENDIX II: VALUATION MATRIX

EVALUATION MATRIX			
<u>Key Evaluation Questions</u>	<u>Performance Indicators</u>	<u>Data Collection Tools</u>	<u>Potential Sources of Information</u>
Project Design and Management			
1. The appropriateness of the initial project document as a guide for project implementation and assessment of results achieved.	• Degree to which project document outlined a realistic and achievable project plan. • Degree to which proposed process and outputs closely related to project objectives. • Degree to which project document incorporated a meaningful monitoring and evaluation strategy.	• Desk review of initial project document and other project documents including self-evaluation report.	• Project Team (Informal Discussions) • WIPO Senior Managers (Within semi-structured interviews)
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.	• Degree to which project monitoring, self-evaluation and reporting tools were: a) timely b) accurate c) useful and used by stakeholders d) were of appropriate length and depth, given relative size, focus and complexity of	• Desk review of project documents • Semi-structured interviews	• Project Team (Informal Discussions) • WIPO Senior Managers (Within semi-structured interviews) • Member States • National Intellectual Property Offices and other national institutions

	project.		
	e) facilitated an accurate and up to date understanding of project progress, any emerging risks and how those risks were being managed.		
3. The extent to which other entities within the Secretariat have contributed and enabled an effective and efficient project implementation.	• In relation to other entities within Secretariat a) number of Divisions contributing; b) level of staff contributing; c) nature of contribution; d) timeliness of Contribution; e) impact of contribution on project implementation, outputs and impact.	• Semi-structured interviews	Project Team WIPO Senior Managers and staff, such as: Development Agenda Coordination Division (DACD) Innovation Division Program Management and Performance Section (PMPS) Communications Division
4. The extent to which the risks identified in the initial project document have materialized or been mitigated.	• Extent to which risks identified in the project document materialised. • Extent to which any risks that actually materialised had not been identified in the project document. • Extent to which any risks that emerged were	• Desk review of project documents • Informal discussions • Semi-structured interviews	• Project Team (Informal Discussions) • WIPO Senior Managers (Within semi-structured interviews)

	mitigated, • Extent to which any mitigation actions taken reflected the mitigation strategies in project document, and if not, why not.		
5. The project's ability to respond to emerging trends, technologies and other external forces.	• Extent to which project team was cognisant of emerging trends during life of project, including though exposure to information sources including relevant new publications, materials, and access to experts. • Extent to which project team took into account new information in project implementation. • Extent to which project direction and outputs were adjusted during implementation given new information.	• Desk review of project documents and other materials as provided by Member States and other stakeholders, as well as academic literature and other reports. • Semi-structured interviews	• Project Team (Informal Discussions) • WIPO Senior Managers (Within semi-structured interviews) • Direct project beneficiaries • Member States • National Intellectual Property Offices • Civil society representatives • Private sector representatives

Effectiveness			
6. The effectiveness of the project in delivering proposed projects outputs and effectiveness in delivering outputs supportive of project objectives.	• Degree to which proposed project outputs were delivered. • Degree to which actual project outputs supported project objectives.	• Desk review • Semi-structured interviews	• Project Team (Informal Discussions) • WIPO Senior Managers (Within semi-structured interviews) • External Stakeholders • Direct project beneficiaries • Member States • National Intellectual Property Offices
7. The effectiveness and usefulness of the project in increasing expertise of Member States in using the patent system for protecting inventions and marketing inventions.	• Demonstrated extent and type of use of project tools by Member States.	• Desk review including any use statistics able to be provided by Member States and Project Team. • Semi-structured interviews	• Project Team (Informal Discussions) • WIPO Senior Managers (Within semi-structured interviews) • Direct project beneficiaries • Member States • National Intellectual Property Offices
8. The usefulness of the project in creating better awareness of the uses of the patent system at different stages of innovation.	• Perceived level of awareness of uses of the patent system at different stages of innovation.	• Semi-structured interviews	• Project Team (Informal Discussions) • WIPO Senior Managers (Within semi-structured interviews) • Direct project beneficiaries • Member States • National Intellectual Property Offices • Private sector representatives

9. The usefulness of the project in improving infrastructure for technology transfer in developing countries.	• Extent to which the project had contributed to improving infrastructure for technology transfer in developing countries.	• Semi-structured interviews	• Project Team (Informal Discussions) • WIPO Senior Managers (Within semi-structured interviews) • External Stakeholders • Direct project beneficiaries • Member States • National Intellectual Property Offices
10. The actual use of the training materials both externally (by Member States) and internally within the Secretariat.	• Number of times training materials used by Member States and internally within the Secretariat. • Type of use of training materials by Member States and internally within the Secretariat.	• Desk review, including any statistics of use able to be provided by Secretariat. • Informal interviews • Semi-structured interviews.	• Project Team (Informal Discussions) • WIPO Senior Managers (Within semi-structured interviews) • Direct project beneficiaries • Member States • National Intellectual Property Offices
Sustainability			
11. The likelihood for continued work on Technology Transfer Support Structure for National Institutions by WIPO and its Member States.	• Extent of work being currently continued by Member States and WIPO. • Extent of work in planning phase by Member States and WIPO. • Perceptions of likely future work in Member States and WIPO.	• Desk review • Informal interviews • Semi-structured interviews.	• Project Team (Informal Discussions) • WIPO Senior Managers (Within semi-structured interviews) • Member States

	• Perceptions as to contribution of project to actual, planned and likely future work by Member States and WIPO.		
Implementation of Development Agenda Recommendations			
12. The extent to which DA Recommendation 10 has been implemented through this project.	• Perceptions as to relationship of project to DA Recommendation 10. • Perceptions as to remaining gaps in implementation of DA Recommendation 10. • Perceptions as to future actions needed to implement DA Recommendation 10.	• Desk review • Informal interviews • Semi-structured interviews.	• Project Team (Informal Discussions) • WIPO Senior Managers (Within semi-structured interviews) • Direct project beneficiaries • Member States • National Intellectual Property Offices • Civil society representatives • Private sector representatives
13. The extent to which the project has supported implementation of complementary DA Recommendation 8.	• Perceptions as to relationship of project to WIPO project for implementation of DA Recommendation 8. • Perceptions as to extent to which project has complemented project for implementation of DA Recommendation 8.	• Desk review • Informal interviews • Semi-structured interviews.	• Project Team (Informal Discussions) • WIPO Senior Managers (Within semi-structured interviews)

[Appendix III follows]

APPENDIX III: LIST OF KEY DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

1.   Project Document titled "Project Paper on Innovation and Technology Transfer Support Structure for National Institutions (Recommendation 10);
document CDIP/3/INF/2/STUDY/VII/INF/1, dated October 15, 2010;

2.   Progress Reports on Development Agenda Projects, document CDIP/8/2, dated October 4, 2011;

3.   Progress Reports on Development Agenda Projects, document CDIP/6/2, dated October 1, 2010;

4.   Document titled "Project Documents for Implementation of Recommendations 2,5,8,9 and 10", document CDIP/3/INF/2, dated March 30, 2009;

5.   Report of the Eighth Session of the CDIP, Geneva, November 14 to 18, 2011, document CDIP/8/9, dated May 11, 2012;

6.   Presentation by the Secretariat titled Digital Portal DA Project on Rec.10, Presented at the Eighth Session of the CDIP, Geneva, November 14 to 18, 2011;

7.   Prototype Digital Portal prepared under the auspices of the WIPO Development Agenda Project on Innovation and Technology Transfer Support Structure for National Institutions, accessed at WIPO Headquarters, Geneva, August 2012;

8.   Website of the World Intellectual Property Organization;

9.   WIPO, 2012, *Taking the Initiative, WIPO Strategic Realignment Program*. Geneva;

10.   Human Resource Requirements for Development Agenda Projects Traffic Light System 2009, provided to evaluator by Secretariat for purpose of the evaluation;

11.   Overall Allocation Expenditures Development Agenda Project Innovation and Technology Transfer Support, dated June 7, 2012, provided to evaluator by Secretariat for purpose of the evaluation; and

12.   Report of the 18th Ordinary Session of the WIPO General Assembly (WO/GA/34/16).

                                        [Appendix IV follows]

APPENDIX IV: INTERVIEW GUIDE/QUESTIONNAIRE

EXTERNAL EVALUATION OF THE WIPO DEVELOPMENT AGENDA PROJECT ON INNOVATION AND TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER SUPPORT STRUCTURE FOR NATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

GUIDE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

THE INTERVIEW PROCESS

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this interview as part of the independent evaluation of the WIPO Development Agenda Project on Innovation and Technology Transfer Support Structure for National Institutions. Your contribution of time and insight is appreciated.

This evaluation will provide valuable feedback about the project to the WIPO Secretariat and WIPO's Committee on Trade and Development. The evaluation is geared towards generating actionable recommendations that can be taken into account in the future work of WIPO.

The findings of the evaluation will be presented by the consultant during the tenth Session of the CDIP to be held from November 12 to 16, 2012.

Interviews will be semi-structured, and are expected to take approximately 30 – 40 minutes. Although guide questions will be used, as set out below, you are also welcome to use the opportunity to impart any other views or information you feel it would be useful for us to take in account.

With your consent, interviews may be recorded, and quotes used, although the source of the quote would never be identified. Whether or not you would be comfortable with either the recording of the interview and/or the use of quotes will be confirmed during your interview.

PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

The purpose of the evaluation is to consider the impact of project as a whole, as well to evaluate the project against number of key performance indicators relating to project design and delivery.

More broadly, and consistent with Development Agenda Recommendation 10, the evaluation also seeks to consider the contribution of the project to stimulating local innovation in developing countries, and the project's contribution to improving necessary infrastructure and professional skills for the effective use of the intellectual property system in the area of innovation and technology transfer. In considering these questions the evaluation will particularly seek to assess the extent to which the project has been instrumental in:

- assisting developing countries to set up and improve mechanisms for stimulating and enhancing local innovation and technology transfer from the public sector, including technology transfer offices at public research institutions;

- enhancing understanding of the potential uses of the patent system for development and growth; and

- facilitating the availability of the tools, guides and models relating to IP infrastructure and management by creating a one-stop-shop on WIPO's website.

GUIDE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

The following questions may be asked during your interview, and are provided to you in advance so you have a chance to reflect prior to the interview. There will also be opportunity for your own general reflections or any particular points you wish to make that are not covered here.

If any of the questions are not relevant to your experience with the project or your area of expertise you may note to the interviewer that you are not able to speak on those issues.

Evaluation Question	Corresponding Interview Questions
Your Involvement with the Project	
• General	• Where are you based, and what is your current position? • How were you involved in this project? • Do you have any on-going responsibilities relevant to this project?
Project Design and Management	
• 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.	If applicable to your role, to what extent did you feel the project monitoring, self evaluation and reporting tools were: a) timely? b) accurate? c) useful and used by stakeholders? d) of appropriate length and depth, given the relative size, focus and complexity of project? e) facilitated an accurate and up to date understanding of project progress, any emerging risks and how those risks were being managed?
• The extent to which other entities within the Secretariat have contributed, and enabled effective and efficient project implementation.	• In relation to other entities within Secretariat: a) How many WIPO Divisions contributed to the project? b) What was the professional level of staff contributing? c) What was the nature of their contribution? d) Was the contribution of other divisions timely?

	e) How would you describe the impact of any contribution by other divisions on project implementation, outputs and impact?
• The extent to which the risks identified in the initial project document have materialized or been mitigated.	• Did any of the risks identified in the project document materialise? • Had any risks that materialised not been identified in the project document? • Thinking of any risks that emerged, would you say they were mitigated? If not, why not? If so, how, and to what extent? • Did any mitigation actions taken reflect the mitigation strategies in project document? If not, why not?
• The project's ability to respond to emerging trends, technologies and other external forces.	• To what degree was the project team cognisant of emerging trends during the life of project? How was new information accessed? I.e. though exposure to information sources including relevant new publications, materials, access to experts, other? • Can you think of any examples where the project team took into account new information in project implementation? • Were there any points at which project direction and outputs were adjusted during implementation, given new information? • Looking back, was there any relevant new information that was not accessed in a timely manner and so not taken into account in project implementation when it otherwise might have been?
Effectiveness	
• The effectiveness of the project in delivering proposed projects outputs and effectiveness in delivering outputs supportive of project objectives.	• To the best of your knowledge, were all of the proposed project outputs were fully delivered? If not, why not? • Do you feel the project deliverables were supportive of the project objectives? If not, why not?
• The effectiveness and usefulness of the project in increasing expertise of Member States in using the patent system for	• Can you describe the extent and type of use of project tools by the Member State you represent (if applicable)? • Are you aware of the extent to which Member States in general have used any project tools?

protecting inventions and marketing inventions.	• If you represent a Member State, do you feel the expertise of individuals or organisations in your country has increased through use of project tools? If so, how, and to what extent?
• The usefulness of the project in creating better awareness of the uses of the patent system at different stages of innovation;	• In your Member State, do you feel the level of awareness of uses of the patent system at different stages of innovation improved? If so, whose level of awareness has improved, and to what extent? Is there any data on this issue available? • In your view, how much of any improvement in awareness is attributable to project participation or use of project tools?
• The usefulness of the project in improving infrastructure for technology transfer in developing countries.	• In your view, to what extent has the project improved infrastructure for technology transfer in the Member State you represent, or in other developing countries? • Can you provide any examples of the impact of the project on technology transfer in your country or other developing countries, (whether direct or indirect)?
• The actual use of the training materials both externally (by Member States) and internally within the Secretariat.	• Do you have any data or knowledge relating to the number of times training materials resulting from the project were used in your Member State (by any stakeholder type), in other Member States, or within the Secretariat (as applicable)? If so, please describe. • To the best of your knowledge, how were the training materials by Member States and/or within the WIPO Secretariat? • To what degree do you expect that these training materials will continue to be used in your Member State, or within the WIPO Secretariat (as applicable)? • Which stakeholders do you expect will continue to use the training materials, and why? • Are there any stakeholders you do not expect will continue to use the training materials?
Sustainability	
• The likelihood for continued work on Technology Transfer Support Structure for National Institutions	• To the best of your knowledge, is there any follow up work <u>currently</u> being undertaken by Member States or within the WIPO Secretariat? • To the best of your knowledge, is there any related

by WIPO and its Member States.	follow on work being <u>planned</u> by Member States or the WIPO Secretariat?
Implementation of Development Agenda Recommendations	
• The extent to which DA Recommendation 10 has been implemented through this project.	• Development Agenda Recommendation 10 is *"To assist Member States to develop and improve national intellectual property institutional capacity through further development of infrastructure and other facilities with a view to making national intellectual property institutions more efficient and promote fair balance between intellectual property protection and the public interest. This technical assistance should also be extended to sub-regional and regional organizations dealing with intellectual property.'* • In your view, has the project contributed to implementation of this DA Recommendation 10? • In your view, has the project helped to make national intellectual property institutions more efficient? Why or why not? • In your view, has the project promoted a fair balance between intellectual property protection and the public interest? Why or why not? • Keeping in mind any other CDIP projects focused on DA Recommendation 10 that you are aware of, do you feel there are remaining gaps in implementation of DA Recommendation 10? If so, what are they, and in your view, how would they best be addressed? • Thinking back to when the project was first developed, can you think of any alternate interventions that might have been a better use of available resources? If so, what were they, and why in your view would they have been a better choice? • Of all the remaining actions that, in your view, are needed to implement DA Recommendation 10, what would you identify as the top few priorities? Why?
• The extent to which the project has supported implementation of complementary DA Recommendation 8.	• Development Agenda Recommendation 8 requests WIPO *'to develop agreements with research institutions and with private enterprises with a view to facilitating the national offices of developing countries, especially LDCs, as well as their regional and sub-regional intellectual property organizations to access specialized databases for the purposes of patent searches.'* Do you feel this

	project has contributed to delivering on Recommendation 8? If so, how? • Are you aware of, or have been involved in the Development Agenda Recommendation 8 Project DA 08 01, a project focused on specialised databases access and support? If so, do you feel the two projects have been complementary? If so, how? Can you think of any ways in which they could have been more complementary?
Other	
• Other insights and recommendations.	• If you were involved in delivering the project, what would you do differently next time round? • Are there any recommendations you would like to make to the CDIP given your experience with this project? • Is there anything else that you would like to add?

[End of Appendix IV and of document]