

Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP)

Twelfth Session

Geneva, November 18 to 21, 2013

EVALUATION REPORT ON THE PROJECT ON CAPACITY BUILDING IN THE USE OF
APPROPRIATE TECHNOLOGY – SPECIFIC TECHNICAL AND SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION
AS A SOLUTION FOR IDENTIFIED DEVELOPMENT CHALLENGES
(RECOMMENDATIONS 19, 30 and 31)

*prepared by Professor Tom P. M. Ogada, Evaluation Consultant, T&P Innovation and
Technology Management Service, Nairobi*

1. The Annex to this document contains an external independent evaluation report on *Capacity Building in the use of Appropriate Technology – Specific Technical and Scientific Information Solutions for Identified Development Challenges* undertaken by Professor Tom P. M. Ogada, T&P Innovation and Technology Management Service, Nairobi, Kenya.

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

[Annex follows]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Table of contents	1
2. List of acronyms	1
3. Executive summary	2
4. Introduction	8
4.1. Description of the project	8
4.2. Overview of the evaluation criteria and methodology	9
5. Findings	11
5.1. Project design and management	11
5.2. Project effectiveness	15
5.3. Project sustainability	18
5.4. Implementation of the development agenda recommendations	19
6. Conclusions	20
6.1. Project design and management	20
6.2. Project effectiveness	20
6.3. Project sustainability	21
7. Recommendations	21
Appendix 1: Documents reviewed	
Appendix 2: WIPO staff interviewed	
Appendix 3: External persons interviewed	
Appendix 4: Data collection questionnaire	
Appendix 5: Evaluation (matrix) framework	

LIST OF ACCRONYMS USED

AT	Appropriate Technology
CDIP	Committee on Development and Intellectual Property
DA	Development Agenda
ICTS	Information and Communication Technologies
IMD	Infrastructure Modernization Division
IP	Intellectual Property
IPOs	Intellectual Property Offices (national)
ITC	International Trade Center
LDCs	Least Developed Countries
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
NEG	National Expert Group
PA	Partnership Agreement
SLA	Service Level Agreements
UNEP	United Nations Environmental Program
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
WHO	World Health Organization
WIPO	World Intellectual Property Organization

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND

1. This report is an independent evaluation of the project on ***Capacity Building in the use of Appropriate Technology – specific technical and scientific information as a solution for identified development challenges***. This is a Development Agenda Project related to WIPO Development Agenda Recommendations 19, 30 and 31. The project was approved during the fifth session of the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP) held in Geneva in April 2010 (CDIP/5/6). The project implementation started in January 2011 and was completed in April 2013. The project was implemented in Zambia, Bangladesh and Nepal, on a pilot basis.

2. The aim of the evaluation was to document lessons learned during the project implementation, draw conclusions and make appropriate recommendations. The evaluation focus was not to assess individual activities but rather to evaluate the project as a whole. Consequently the evaluation looked at the project's contributions in assessing the needs of the Member States, identifying the appropriate technologies to address those needs, its evolution over time, its performance including project design, project management, coordination, coherence, implementation and results achieved. The evaluation was guided by four criteria, namely; project design and management, project effectiveness, project sustainability and project's contribution to the implementation of Development Agenda Recommendations.

3. The evaluation utilized a combination of methods including a document review, interviews with WIPO staff, National Experts and Members of the National Experts Groups (NEGs) in the three countries (Bangladesh, Nepal and Zambia) where the project was implemented.

4. The evaluation came up with nine findings, five conclusions and four recommendations. These are presented here below.

KEY FINDINGS

A. Project design and management

5. **Finding 1: *The project document (PD) was found to be sufficient as a guide for implementation and assessment of the results achieved.*** The document guided the project team in realizing the key outputs including launching of the project in three countries, establishing National Expert Groups in all the three countries, identifying six areas of development needs, conducting six patent searches on appropriate technologies, preparing six landscape reports and business plans and organizing two multi-stakeholder forums in each of the participating countries. However, the project document had some shortcomings. For example, the PD did not adequately clarify the selection criteria for participating countries, their roles and obligations and the identification process of areas of development needs.

6. **Finding 2: *The tools for monitoring, self-evaluation and reporting of the project were fairly adequate and useful for providing information on the progress of its implementation.*** The project was completed in time and two Progress Reports were prepared by the project team and presented to the CDIP, where Member States gave useful inputs. However, the evaluation noted a lack of reporting by NEG's one of the major shortcomings of the tools.
7. **Finding 3: *The contributions of the other entities within the Secretariat were adequate to enable an effective and efficient project implementation.*** All the departments that were supposed to contribute to the project (the Patent Information Section, the Innovation and Technology Support Section and the Development Agenda Coordination Division) did so effectively. However, the regional bureaus' participation to the project was not adequate in view of their role in supporting the development of national IP strategies in these countries.
8. **Finding 4: *Most of the risks that were envisaged in the project document did occur and affected the implementation of the project.*** Amongst the risks, the coordination of the project and the effectiveness of NEG's, were the challenges.
9. **Finding 5: *The project took into consideration emerging trends, technologies and other external forces, given that the project itself was about identifying appropriate technologies based on existing patent information.*** Through the project, areas of needs were identified, patent searches were undertaken, patent landscape reports were prepared and used to identify the most appropriate technologies that could provide solutions to the identified development challenges. Factors that were external to the project were identified as management commitment for the project, which varied from country to country and impacted on its success and sustainability.

B. Effectiveness

10. **Finding 6: *The project was fairly effective and useful in facilitating greater use of appropriate technical and scientific information in addressing nationally identified needs for development.*** The three pilot countries were each able to formulate two areas of needs, identify appropriate technologies to address them and prepare business plans. However, the project came to an end before the business plans were implemented
11. **Finding 7: *The project was fairly effective and useful in building national institutional capacity in the use of technical and scientific information for the identified needs.*** Members of NEG's were capacity built on appropriate technology, identification of needs, preparation of patent search requests, undertaking patent searches as well as preparation of search reports, landscape reports and business plans. However, only a small group was trained and there were no strategies on how to scale this up to reach a critical mass. The PD also did not provide for regional forums for exchange of experiences.
12. **Finding 8: *The project was fairly effective in coordinating the retrieval of appropriate technical and scientific information and the provision of appropriate know-how to implement this technology in a practical and effective manner.*** As per the project document, the patent search process was initiated by a national expert, in consultation with NEG and international consultant. The search requests were then passed to WIPO experts at the Division for Least-Developed Countries for comments before being submitted to WIPO's

Patent Information Division. This procedure guaranteed the search requests' quality, which in turn enhanced the search quality and search reports.

C. Sustainability

13. Finding 9: *There is likelihood for continued work on appropriate technology and the implementation of the business plans.* This is based on the interests shown on the project by the three countries and the positive steps already undertaken by them. For example, both the Governments of Zambia and Nepal were reported to be ready to implement the business plans whereas Nepal had established an Appropriate Technology Center and a Technology Fund.

D. Implementation of Development Agenda (DA) Recommendations

14. Finding 10: This evaluation found that the project has responded to the Development Agenda Recommendations as follows:

- (i) *DA Recommendation 19:* This recommendation promotes ***the fostering of creativity and innovation of developing countries and LDCs through access to knowledge and technology and consequent WIPO activities.*** The Appropriate Technology project promoted access to knowledge and technology by three Least Developing Countries (LDCs), thereby contributing towards the realization of Development Agenda Recommendation 19.
- (ii) *DA Recommendation 30:* This recommendation promotes ***collaboration of WIPO with inter-government organizations to provide developing countries and LDCs with advice on how to gain access to and make use of IP related information on technology, particularly in areas of special interest to the beneficiary countries.*** The Appropriate Technology project enabled the three beneficiary countries to gain access to and make use of technology from European Patent Office as well as IP Offices of USA, Japan, Germany, Australia and India. In this way the project contributed towards the realization of the Development Agenda Recommendation 30.
- (iii) *DA Recommendation 31:* This recommendation ***promotes initiatives which contribute to transfer of technology to developing countries through access to publicly available patent information.*** In this Appropriate Technology project, WIPO facilitated the access of patent information available in developed countries and transfer of the same to Least Developed Countries. In this way, the project contributed towards realization of the DA Recommendation 31.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Project design and management

15. Conclusion 1: Based on the **Findings 1, 2 and 4**, the evaluation has concluded that the project document, as it is now, will require further improvement to enhance efficiency, effectiveness and clarity in project implementation. Special attentions will need to be given to:

- (a) Selection criteria (please refer to Recommendation 2, page 6-7, for more details);

- (b) Partnership Agreement (PA);
- (c) Process of identification of areas of development needs;
- (d) Strengthen the monitoring and reporting tools to assess on a continuous basis the commitment of the national teams and improve on the reporting by national experts; and
- (e) Strengthen the role of NEGs and improve on coordination.

16. Conclusion 2: Based on **Finding 3**, the evaluation has concluded that the participation of the regional bureaus in the project was important, particularly in view of exploiting the opportunities of mainstreaming the appropriate technology projects in the countries' national IP strategies.

17. Conclusion 3: Based on **Findings 1-5**, the evaluation has concluded that the project piloting phase has been fairly successful. The lessons learned can be used in future implementation of the project, in both LDCs and developing countries.

B: Project Effectiveness

18. Conclusion 4: Based on **Findings 6-8**, the evaluation has concluded that as a pilot, the project has demonstrated its potential of building capacities in the use of appropriate technical and scientific information in addressing nationally identified needs for development. However, it is too early to assess the effectiveness of the project to realize its objectives due to the following reasons:

- a. All the business plans have not been implemented. The project will need to be moved to the next level and implement the business plans in order to assess the impacts. Since the mandate of the current project is over, there is strong justification to extend it to oversee the implementation of the business plans.
- b. The number of countries involved is negligible. The project has been piloted in only three countries. It will be useful to scale it up to other LDCs based on the lessons learned from the pilot countries
- c. The number of development needs addressed and the scope is small. Some of the problems identified in the three countries may also be relevant to some developing countries. Therefore the project may also be useful to such developing countries
- d. The impact of the project in terms of capacity building for the beneficiaries (national experts and members of NEGs) was very small. There is need for further expansion of capacity building to form a critical mass in order to have a meaningful impact.

19. Conclusion 5: Based on **Finding 8**, the evaluation has concluded that the current arrangement of patent search may need to be reviewed to provide opportunity for the national experts to acquire skills on patent searches. Similarly, the mechanism for transfer of know-how during the preparation of landscape reports should be reviewed to allow for more face to face interaction between the national experts, international consultant and WIPO experts.

C. Sustainability

20. **Conclusion 6:** Based on **Finding 9**, the evaluation concluded that whereas it is too early to talk about the sustainability of the project in the pilot countries, enhancing sustainability can be achieved by the following:

- a. The implementation of the business plans. The project will not be considered completed if the business plants are not implemented. The support from WIPO (in terms of resources, lobbying, networking and promotion) may be required to make this happen.
- b. The implementing countries require institutions and organs to continue with the work on Appropriate Technology. Such efforts started by the Government of Zambia (of making NEG a permanent organ) and by Nepal (of establishing Appropriate Technology Center) should be encouraged and supported.
- c. More resources for the administration of the project at WIPO's Division for LDCs and for supporting capacity building
- d. Mainstreaming of the use of Appropriate Technology in the national IP strategies
- e. Making the National Expert Groups permanent organs

Recommendations

21. **Recommendation 1:** Based on the **conclusion 3 (drawn from Findings 1-5)**, the evaluation recommends that the CDIP approves phase II of the project. In so doing, the CDIP is invited to consider:

- a. Supporting the three pilot countries to implement their business plans,
- b. Expanding the project to new participants from LDCs, and
- c. Piloting the participation of selected developing countries in the project.

22. **Recommendation 2:** Based on **Conclusion 2 (drawn from Findings 1, 2, 4)**, the evaluation recommends that the project document should be modified by the WIPO Secretariat, to address the following:

- a. **Selection of the participating countries:** provide clear and comprehensive selection criteria to make the project more demand-driven, relevant and sustainable.
- b. **Partnership Agreement:** Introduce partnership agreement or MoU to clarify the roles and obligations of the participating countries and WIPO.
- c. **Identification of areas of needs:** Prepare a guidelines how best the process of identification should be undertaken to ensure; consultation, prioritization, ownership and proper documentation of the process.
- d. **National Expert Group:** Prepare guidelines outlining; selection criteria, composition, terms of reference, chair, allowances and incentives, coordination and legal status.

- e. **Implementation of the business plans:** Should be a mandatory part of the project and must be negotiated in the partnership agreement.
- f. **Project Duration** – The two years provided for the project should be maintained but used more efficiently.
- g. **Project areas:** The project's focus areas identified by WIPO (environment, agriculture, energy and industries) should be expanded.

23. **Recommendation 3:** Based on **Conclusion 5 (drawn from Finding 8)**, it is recommended that the WIPO Secretariat should review the arrangement for search and preparation of landscape reports as follows:

- a. Undertake search at WIPO and allow for the participation of the national experts in the patent search to acquire the necessary skills.
- b. Provide more opportunities for face-to-face interaction between the national expert, international consultant and WIPO experts during the preparation of the landscape reports.

24. **Recommendation 4:** Based on **Conclusion 6 (drawn from Finding 9)**, to enhance sustainability, it is recommended that WIPO Secretariat ensures the following:

- a. The implementation of the business plans should be part of the Partnership Agreement
- b. More resources should be put in the administration of the project at WIPO's Division for LDCs and to support capacity building of Member States.
- c. Use of the Appropriate Technology should be mainstreamed in the national IP strategies of the participating countries.
- d. National Expert Groups should be made permanent organs in the participating countries.

INTRODUCTION

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

25. This report is an independent evaluation of the project on ***Capacity Building in the use of Appropriate Technology – specific technical and scientific information as a solution for identified development challenges***. This is a Development Agenda Project related to WIPO Development Agenda Recommendations 19, 30 and 31. The project was approved during the fifth session of the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP) held in Geneva in April 2010 (CDIP/5/6). The project implementation started in July 2010 and was completed in April 2013. The project was implemented in Zambia, Nepal and Bangladesh¹.

26. Goal: The Goal of this project was to contribute to building capacity at national level in the use of appropriate technical and scientific information as appropriate technology to address the identified development challenges faced by Least Developed Countries (LDCs).

27. Objectives: The specific objectives for this project were as follows:

- a. To facilitate greater use of appropriate technical and scientific information in addressing nationally identified needs for development goals;
- b. To build national institutional capacity in the use of technical and scientific information for identified needs to contribute towards the achievement of key national development targets; and
- c. To coordinate the retrieval of the required appropriate technical and scientific information and the provision of the required appropriate know-how.

28. Delivery strategies: In order to achieve the above mentioned objectives, the project outlined the following delivery strategies:

- a. Select three pilot LDCs on the basis of requests received;
- b. Establish a national expert group (NEG) from existing stakeholders to be responsible for the implementation of the project at national level;
- c. Identify (by NEG and multi-stakeholders) the most urgent development issues where appropriate technologies could effectively contribute to improved living conditions;
- d. Prepare search request by the national expert, in consultation with NEG, international consultant and WIPO experts
- e. Undertake (by WIPO's Patent Information Division) patent search and prepare a search report

¹ The project was launched in these three countries during the first quarter of 2011. The period of July-December, 2010, was used for preparation and selection of the participating countries.

- f. Prepare patent landscape report by the national expert in consultation with the international consultant and WIPO experts
- g. Organize (by NEG) outreach programs in order to present and explain at a grass-root level the implementation of the appropriate technology;
- h. Prepare a business plan by the national expert in consultation with NEG, the international consultant and WIPO experts.
- i. Implement (by NEG) the appropriate technology identified through the project, in cooperation with relevant specialized agencies with required experience and expertise such as, WHO, FAO, UNEP and ITC;
- j. Organize (by NEG) a donors meeting in the country for funding the implementation of the appropriate technology.
- k. Prepare a report by the national expert group on the final evaluation of the implementation of the project.

OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION CRITERIA AND METHODOLOGY

29. Evaluation design: The evaluation was designed to be participatory to allow active involvement of all those with a stake in the projects: project team, national consultants and NEG as well as heads of Intellectual Property Offices (IPOs) of the participating countries.

30. Evaluation objectives:

- a. **Learning:** Provide opportunity for learning from the existing experiences in order to improve future performance i.e. what worked well or did not work so well for the benefit of future project implementation. This include assessing 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 the achieved results.
- b. **Decision:** Provide evidence based evaluative information to support the CDIP's decision-making process.

31. Scope: The project time frame for this evaluation was 28 months (January 2011 to April 2013).

32. Focus: The evaluation focus was not to assess individual activities but rather to evaluate the project as a whole. Consequently the evaluation looked at the project's contributions in assessing the needs of the Member States; identifying the appropriate technologies to address those needs, its evolution over time, its performance, including project design, project management, coordination, coherence, implementation and achievements. Specifically, the evaluation assessed the extent to which the project has been instrumental in terms of;

- a. Strengthening the national capacities of LDCs in using appropriate technologies to address major national development challenges;
- b. Improving the understanding of the use of technical and patent information for innovation and national technology acquisition; and

- c. Ensuring an effective exploitation of technical and patent information for achieving development objectives and goals.

33. Criteria: The evaluation was guided by the following criteria:

- a. Project design and management,
- b. Project effectiveness,
- c. Project sustainability, and
- d. Implementation of Development Agenda Recommendations.

34. Methodology: The following methodology was used in the evaluation process:

- a. **Desk Review:** The consultant strived to get as much information as possible by using the documents available within WIPO. These included the project document, the progress reports, landscape reports and business plans².
- b. **Interview of WIPO staff:** The consultant interviewed members of the project team and other WIPO staff that contributed to the project³.
- c. **Interview of external respondents:** The consultant also interviewed project consultants as well as selected members of the National Expert Groups from the three countries⁴.
- d. **Data collection tools:** A general data collection instrument was prepared⁵ which served as a useful interview guide for the various respondents. This instrument was based on the evaluation questions (matrix)⁶ prepared to address the terms of reference.

² Appendix 1: list of the documents reviewed.

³ Appendix 2: list of the WIPO staff interviewed.

⁴ Appendix 3: list of external respondents interviewed.

⁵ Appendix 4: data collection questionnaire used.

⁶ Appendix 5: evaluation matrix

KEY FINDINGS

35. This section is organized on the basis of the four evaluation areas (the project design and management; project effectiveness, project sustainability; and implementation of the Development Agenda Recommendations). Each evaluation question is answered directly under the headings of each area.

A. Project design and management

Appropriateness of the initial project document as a guide for implementation and assessment of achieved results.

36. Finding 1: The project document (PD) was found to be sufficient as a guide for implementation and assessment of the results achieved.

37. **Strengths:** The following achievements were realized as per the project document:

- a. Three countries were selected and participated in the projects.
- b. National Expert Groups were successfully established in all the three countries⁷.
- c. Two areas of development needs were identified in each of the three countries.
- d. Six patent search requests⁸ were prepared by the national experts.
- e. Six patent search reports⁹ were prepared by WIPO.
- f. Six landscape reports¹⁰ were prepared by the national experts.
- g. Six business plans¹¹ were prepared and approved by NEG.
- h. Two multi-stakeholder forums¹² were held in each of the three countries.

	ACTIVITY	ZAMBIA	NEPAL	BANGLADESH
1	Selection of countries	✓	✓	✓
2	Establishing the National Expert Group	✓	✓	✓
3	Establishing multi-stakeholders forum	✓	✓	✓
4	Identifying areas of urgent development needs	✓	✓	✓
5	Preparation of search request	✓	✓	✓
6	Undertaking patent search	✓	✓	✓
7	Preparation of search report	✓	✓	✓
8	Preparation of landscape report	✓	✓	✓
9	Developing business plans	✓	✓	✓
10	Organizing outreach programs	✓	✓	✓

⁷ NEG consisted of 9 members in Nepal, 11 in Zambia and 11 in Bangladesh.

⁸ The search requests contained analysis of the scope and nature of the needs in order to assist the WIPO patent information division in the identification of the most relevant patent documents.

⁹ The search reports provided a detailed picture of the technical solutions available in the patent system. Each report provided 10 to 20 possible technologies that could address the identified problems.

¹⁰ The Landscape report gave detailed analysis of the technologies provided in the search reports, that led to propose the most relevant appropriate technology for each of the identified needs.

¹¹ The business plans described how best the technologies could be commercialized.

¹² The forums were used to generally inform the stakeholders about the project and the progress done so far .

38. **Shortcomings:** The evaluation noted the following challenges and shortcomings:
- a. **Selection of the participating countries:** The participating countries were selected on the basis of expression of interests, “first-come-first-served”, and regional balancing. The evaluation found these criteria not adequate.
 - b. **Partnership Agreement:** The project document did not provide for Partnership Agreement or MoU. Consequently the roles and obligations of the participating countries and WIPO were not properly clarified.
 - c. **Identification of areas of needs:** The project document did not clearly explain the process of identifying the development needs areas. Ideally, more potential areas should have been reviewed and the final selection should have been the result of discussions, consensus and prioritization. Only one country followed this approach.
 - d. **Patent search and preparation of search reports:** There was concern by the national experts that the search process by WIPO took too long¹³ and that there was limited opportunity for capacity building of the local participants on patent search.
 - e. **Project Duration:** The two years¹⁴ provided for the project was considered inadequate by the project team and national experts.
 - f. **Project Launch:** In all the countries, the projects were launched before undertaking adequate national consultation. According to the project team, prior national consultation was required to explain the nature and type of the project; obtain feedback on how best the project can be implemented; get to know the most suitable focal points (in terms of resources, capacity and political power); and establish networks that can be used for the implementation of the project.
 - g. **Project areas:** The project focused on only limited areas (environment, agriculture, energy and industries).
 - h. **Collaboration with other UN Agencies:** The involvement of other UN Agencies in the implementation of the project was limited
 - i. **Business plans:** The implementation of the business plans was not part of the project.

Adequateness and usefulness of the project monitoring, self-evaluation and reporting tools in providing relevant information for decision-making purposes of the project team and key stakeholders.

39. **Finding 2: The tools for project’s monitoring, self-evaluation and reporting were fairly adequate and useful for providing information on the progress of implementation of the project.**

¹³ However, analysis by the evaluator showed that the patent search for the six projects took a minimum of three weeks and a maximum of 3 months. For a project of three years, this search period was reasonable.

¹⁴ Although the actual duration of the project was 34 months

40. **Achievements:** The evaluation noted the following achievements:

- a. The projects were completed in time
- b. Progress reports were prepared and presented to CDIP (CDIP/8/2 and CDIP/10/2) and useful feedbacks were received from the representatives of the Member States.

41. **Shortcomings:** However, the evaluation noted that some of the timelines and milestones were not adhered to. For example:

- c. **Launching the projects:** Although the project was approved by the CDIP in April 2010, the programs were launched in the three countries in the first quarter of 2011, following proposals regarding the selection of countries.
- d. **End of project report and independent evaluation:** The project document envisaged that an end of project report would be prepared to assess whether the project objectives had been realized and make suggestions on future actions that should be undertaken to ensure sustainability of the projects. Secondly, the national expert groups were to be encouraged to commission independent evaluations of the implementation of the project in their own countries. These had not been done by the time of the present evaluation and there was no timing indication on their undertaking¹⁵.

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

42. Finding 3: The contributions of the other entities within the Secretariat were adequate to enable an effective and efficient project implementation.

43. **Achievements:** The following entities contributed to the project implementation:

- a. The Patent Information Section coordinated the patent searches and preparation of the search reports
- b. The Division for Least-Developed Countries collaborated with the Innovation and Technology Support Section to create Technology and Innovation Support Centers (TISCs) in those countries where the Appropriate Technology project was implemented.
- c. The Development Agenda Coordination Division (DACD) provided coordination of discussion of intergovernmental group, presentation of the reports to the CDIP and follow-up on the discussions and recommendations. The DACD also organized this evaluation.

44. **Shortcomings:** The evaluation, however, noted some omissions in mobilizing synergy within the Secretariat. For example, the regional bureaus did not participate in the project.

¹⁵ There was problem in defining the end of the project, whether it is when the business plans are completed or when the business plans are successfully implemented

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

45. **Finding 4: Most of the risks that were envisaged in the project document did occur and affected the implementation of the project.**
46. **Challenges:** The evaluation noted the following challenges regarding the identified risks:
- a. **Definition of Appropriate Technology** – In all three countries, the stakeholders initially misunderstood the concept of Appropriate Technology. Therefore several meetings were required between experts and multi-stakeholders before the proper understanding of the term Appropriate Technology could be achieved¹⁶.
 - b. **Lack of focal point** – This risk was not mitigated. Lack of a clear focal point institution slowed down the process of implementation, particularly at the beginning.
 - c. **Coordination** – Coordination was a major challenge.
 - d. **Lack of resources for the organization of skills development programs and forums** – This risk remained a problem and was not adequately mitigated
 - e. **Motivation for National Expert Group (NEG)**- Although a very important organ in the implementation of the project, the following affected its effectiveness:
 - Lack of financial resources to pay sitting allowances as it is the case with most national steering committees or task forces in these countries.
 - There were difficulties in holding NEG meetings and raising quorums.
 - There was not no secretariat with staff and secretarial resources for printing, communication (emails and telephone) and documentation.
 - Most members representing government organizations were regularly replaced. Consequently, the membership of NEG kept on changing, making continuity more difficult.
 - There was no clarity on who should chair NEG and stakeholders meetings.
 - NEG set up was of very temporary nature

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

¹⁶ In all the three cases, agreements were made that AT is a technology that meets the needs of any country and it can be old or new.

47. Finding 5: The project took into consideration emerging trends, technologies and other external forces, given that the project itself was about identifying appropriate technologies based on existing patent information.

48. **Achievements:** Through the project, areas of development needs were identified, patent search undertaken, patent landscape reports were prepared and used to identify the most appropriate technologies that could provide solutions to the identified projects. Factors within the IPOs that were external to the project were identified as management commitments support for the project; they varied from country to country and impacted on its success and sustainability.

B. Effectiveness

The effectiveness and usefulness of the project in facilitating greater use of appropriate technical and scientific information in addressing nationally identified needs for development).

49. Finding 6: The project was fairly effective and useful in facilitating greater use of appropriate technical and scientific information in addressing nationally identified needs for development.

50. **Achievements:** As shown in the table below, each of the three countries that participated in the project came up with two development needs areas, which were relevant and important to them.

	Countries	Needs identified
1	Zambia	Stand-alone solar water distillation system to enhance access to clean drinking water ¹⁷
		Run-off rainwater harvesting for small scale irrigation ¹⁸
2	Nepal	Biomass briquetting for easy access to clean, green alternative fuel for cooking and space heating ¹⁹
		Post-harvest drying of cardamom to improve the living conditions of small farmers and marginalized communities through income generation ²⁰ .
3	Bangladesh	Advanced ground improvement technique by cement and lime treatment for soft, low lying and marshy land ²¹

¹⁷ The project sought an appropriate technology for drinking water purification to facilitate access to clean drinking water in Zambia. The technology needed to be simple, low-cost and easily replicable.

¹⁸ The project sought a water harvesting technology that would provide water for micro scale irrigation that can be adopted by small scale farmers in the rural areas, in Zambia..

¹⁹ The project sought a technology (methods, composition and processes) that could improve the stability of biomass briquettes against breakages as well as provide a solution for large scale charcoal production from biomass. The search provided 20 technologies from which NEG chose two

²⁰ The project sought a technology (methods, process and equipment) for drying of Cardamom that could preserve the natural purple color and produce high quality Cardamom, capable of fetching higher prices in the international market and consequently improve on the incomes of small scale farmers in Nepal. The search report provided 10 possible technologies from which two were selected.

²¹ This project sought a technology to strengthen the soft, low lying and marshy land of Bangladesh to make it possible to construct more reliable, stable, durable and safe roads. The search provided 15 technologies from which NEG shortlisted two.

	Conversion municipal wastes into land filling materials combating environmental hazards ²²
--	---

51. **Positive observations:** The evaluation made the following observations:

- a. The technologies identified were not necessarily old.
- b. There were several requests from LDCs for projects.
- c. Some of the development needs identified were relevant to some developing countries.
- d. All the six projects have been brought to the final phase, that is business plans
- e. Very positive comments were given by the member states during the presentation of the Progress Reports CDIP/8/2 and CDIP/10/2 at the eighth and tenth Sessions of the CDIP.
- f. Some of the piloting countries have expanded the project to cover other areas of needs

52. **Negative observation:** The project has come to an end without implementation of the business plans. At this stage the project has not yet solved the development challenges identified.

The effectiveness and usefulness of the project in building national institutional capacity in the use of technical and scientific information for identified needs so as to progress towards the achievement of key national development targets

53. Finding 7: The project was fairly effective and useful in building national institutional capacity in the use of technical and scientific information for the identified need.

54. **Achievements:** The evaluation made the following positive observations:

- a. The project built capacities of the national expert, members of NEG as well as members of the wider multi-stakeholder forum on the following:
 - Understanding appropriate technology
 - Identification of development needs
 - Preparation of patent search requests
 - Undertaking patent searches
 - Preparation of search reports
 - Preparation of Landscape reports
 - Preparation of Business Plans
- b. All the national experts reported that they benefited in terms of capacity building through their interaction with the international consultant and the WIPO staff.
- c. In one country, some members of the NEG are already undertaking patent searches and preparing business plans for clients for a fee.

²² This project sought technology (methods, system and equipment) that could convert municipal wastes in to a useful resource for landfills and for the design, construction and operation of a sanitary landfill. The search provided 21 technologies from which NEG selected two

55. **Shortcomings:** However, the following shortcomings were observed with respect to capacity building:

- a. The national experts indicated that the project duration was too short to allow for a meaningful capacity building program.
- b. The project did not include strategies on how the members of NEG could pass to the wider community the skills and expertise they obtained from the project.
- c. The project document also did not include regional forums for exchanging experiences by the national experts and members of the national expert group.

The effectiveness of the project in coordinating the retrieval of appropriate technical and scientific information and the provision of appropriate know-how in this technical area to implement this technology in a practical and effective manner

56. **Finding 8: The project was fairly effective in coordinating the retrieval of appropriate technical and scientific information and the provision of appropriate know-how in this technical area to implement this technology in a practical and effective manner.**

57. **Achievements and shortcomings:** The evaluation made the following observations:

- a. **Quality Search requests:** As per the project document, the search process was initiated by the national expert, in consultation with NEG and an international consultant. The search requests were then passed to WIPO experts at the Division for LDCs, for comments before being submitted to WIPO's Patent Information Division. This procedure ensured that the patent search requests were of high quality, which in turn could guarantee the quality of the search reports. However, it was learned that the actual searches were undertaken not by WIPO but by other IP offices²³. It is not clear whether this arrangement can continue, should the project expand and involve several countries. Furthermore, national experts did not participate in the patent search activity and therefore did not gain skills on this.
- b. **Preparation of landscape reports:** The search reports were made available to the national experts for preparation of the technical landscape report. Six landscape reports were prepared in consultation with the international experts and the WIPO LDC officials, mainly through emails and telephone. However, this process was found by the national experts to be slow and less effective²⁴.

²³ The search for the required appropriate technical and scientific information was completed with the cooperation of the patents offices in a number of countries, namely Switzerland, Germany, United States of America, Austria, Japan and India as well as European Patent Office.

²⁴ The national experts maintained that a face to face discussion would have enabled a more effective transfer of knowledge and know-how from the international experts and WIPO experts to the national expert and members of NEG

C. Sustainability

The likelihood for continued work on appropriate technology – specific technical and scientific information as a solution for identified development challenges for WIPO and its Member States

58. Finding 9: There is likelihood for continued work on appropriate technology and the implementation of the business plans.

The evaluation assessed the following three sustainability criteria:

- Likelihood that the business plans developed during the project would be implemented
- Likelihood that the three countries will continue with the work on Appropriate Technology
- Likelihood of WIPO and Member States continuing with this project

59. Positive observations: The evaluation made the following positive observations:

- a. There is likelihood for some of the business plans to be implemented. It was reported that the governments of Zambia²⁵ and Nepal are eagerly waiting for the submission of the reports by WIPO to them in order to start implementing the business plans. Through the implementation of the Business plan, the Government of Zambia sought to move beyond merely providing access to knowledge.
- b. There is also likelihood for the three countries to continue working on appropriate technology. For example;
 - The Government of Nepal was reported to have allocated a budget to establish an Appropriate Technology Center and a Technology Fund. The center will be used for effective search and delivery of appropriate technology information as per needs of the country and also to build capacity of the staff in managing the information search with WIPO assistance. Secondly a delegation of Nepal reported that one of the immediate spillover effect of the project was the conversion of the National Expert Group on Appropriate Technology into the National Expert Group of Nepal on Intellectual Property, whereas the Multi Stakeholder Group on Appropriate Technology was converted to National Stakeholders Committee of Nepal on Intellectual Property.
 - On the other hand, Zambia is keen to make NEG a legal body to spearhead technology management and to build capacity for appropriate technology to a wider audience in the country
- c. The project is of special interest to Member States and WIPO.

²⁵ The Zambian Delegate to CDIP 8 reported that the Ministry of Trade had expressed interest to start implementing the project as soon as possible. Both the national expert from Zambia and the Project Manager reported during the interview with the evaluator the eagerness of the Government of Zambia to implement this project. The Zambian Delegate to CDIP 8 also reported that

- The project addresses the specific needs of the beneficiary countries, as identified and expressed by them. These projects are therefore important to these countries²⁶.
- This project is part of technological capacity building which is in line with the Istanbul programs of Actions²⁷, which has been mainstreamed in WIPO and is being coordinated and implemented by the Division for Least Developing Countries.

D. Implementation of Development Agenda (DA) Recommendations

The extent to which the DA Recommendations 19, 30 and 31 have been implemented through this project.

60. Finding 12: This evaluation has found that the project has contributed towards the implementation of DA Recommendations 19, 30 and 31.

61. **DA Recommendation 19:** This recommendation promotes *the fostering of creativity and innovation of developing countries and LDCs through access to knowledge and technology and consequent WIPO activities*. The Appropriate Technology project promoted access to knowledge and technology by LDC. The realization of the objectives of the project also means that contribution towards the realization of Development Agenda Recommendation 19 was made.

62. **DA Recommendation 30:** This recommendation promotes *collaboration of WIPO with inter-government organization to provide developing countries and LDCs with advice on how to gain access to and make use of IP related information on technology, particularly in areas of special interest to the beneficiary countries*. The Appropriate Technology project enabled the three beneficiary countries to gain access to and make use of technology from the European Patent Office as well as IP Offices of USA, Japan, Germany, Australia and India. In this way the project contributed towards the realization of the Development Agenda Recommendation 30.

63. **DA Recommendation 31:** This recommendation promotes *initiatives which contribute to transfer of technology to developing countries through access to publicly available patent information*. In this Appropriate Technology Project, WIPO facilitated the access of patent information available in developed countries and the transfer of the same to developing countries. In this way, the project contributed towards realization of the DA Recommendation 31.

²⁶ This position was also confirmed with the statements given by the representatives from Zambia, Nepal and Bangladesh during the presentation of the progress reports to CDIP 8 and 10 indicated that these countries found the project useful.

²⁷ The Istanbul Plan of Actions were developed by Ministers responsible for Intellectual Property from Least Developed Countries, during a meeting which took place in Istanbul, Turkey in May 2011.

CONCLUSIONS

A. Project design and management

64. **Conclusion 1:** Based on the **Findings 1, 2 and 4**, the evaluation has concluded that the project document, as it is now, will require further improvement to enhance efficiency, effectiveness and clarity in project implementation. Special attention needs to be given to:

- a. Selection criteria
- b. Partnership agreement (PA),
- c. Process of identification of areas of development needs,
- d. Strengthen the monitoring and reporting tools to assess on a continuous basis the commitment of the national teams and improve the reporting by the national experts.
- e. Strengthen the role of NEG and improve coordination.

65. **Conclusion 2 (Ref: Finding 2):** Whereas the monitoring, assessment and reporting tools were adequate, for future implementation of this project, the tools should be improved to:

- a. Enable assessment of the level of commitment of the beneficiaries
- b. Enable assessment of the effectiveness of NEG
- c. To improve on the reporting by national experts and NEGs.

66. **Conclusion 2:** Based on **Finding 3** the evaluation has concluded that the participation of the regional bureaus in the project was insufficient, particularly in view of exploiting the opportunities of mainstreaming the appropriate technology projects in the countries' national IP strategies.

67. **Conclusion 3:** Based on **Findings 1-5**, the evaluation has concluded that the project piloting phase has been fairly successful. The lessons learned can be used in future implementation of the project, in both LDCs and developing countries.

B: Project Effectiveness

68. **Conclusion 4:** Based on **Findings 6-8**, the evaluation has concluded that as a pilot, the project has demonstrated its potential of building capacities in the use of appropriate technical and scientific information in addressing nationally identified needs for development. However it is too early to assess the effectiveness of the project to realize its objectives due to the following reasons:

- a. All the business plans have not been implemented. The project will need to implement these business plans for its impacts to be fully assessed. Since the mandate of the current project is over, there is a strong justification to extend it to oversee the implementation of the business plans.

- b. The number of countries involved is negligible. The project has been piloted in only three countries. It will be useful to scale it up to other LDCs, building on the lessons learned from the pilot countries.
- c. The number of development needs addressed and the scope is too small. Some of the problems identified in the three countries may also be relevant to several developing countries. Therefore the project may also be useful to these developing countries.
- d. The impact of the project in terms of capacity building for the beneficiaries (national experts and members of NEG) was very small. There is need for further expansion of capacity building to form a critical mass in order to have a meaningful impact.

69. **Conclusion 5:** Based on **Finding 8**, the evaluation has concluded that the current arrangement of patent search may need to be reviewed to provide opportunity for the national experts to acquire skills on patent searches. Similarly, the mechanism for transfer of know-how during the preparation of landscape reports should be reviewed to allow for more face-to-face interaction between the national experts, international consultant and WIPO experts.

C. Sustainability

70. **Conclusion 6:** Based on Finding 9, the evaluation concluded that whereas it is too early to talk about the sustainability of the project in the pilot countries, enhancing sustainability can be achieved by the following:

- a. The implementation of the business plans. The project will not be considered completed if the business plans are not implemented. The support from WIPO (in terms of resources, lobbying, networking and promotion) may be required to make this happen.
- b. The implementing countries require institutions and organs to continue with the work on Appropriate Technology. Such efforts started by the Government of Zambia (of making NEG a permanent organ) and by Nepal (of establishing Appropriate Technology Center) should be encouraged and supported.
- c. More resources for the administration of the project at WIPO's Division for LDCs and for supporting capacity building
- d. Mainstreaming of the use of Appropriate Technology in the national IP strategies
- e. Making the National Expert Groups permanent organs

Recommendations

71. **Recommendation 1:** Based on the **conclusion 3 (drawn from Findings 1-5)**, the evaluation recommends that the CDIP approves phase II of the project. In so doing, the CDIP is invited to consider:

- a. Supporting the three pilot countries to implement their business plans,
- b. Expanding the project to new participants from LDCs, and

- c. Piloting the participation of selected developing countries in the project.

72. **Recommendation 2:** Based on **Conclusion 2 (drawn from Findings 1, 2, 4)**, the evaluation recommends that the project document should be modified by the WIPO Secretariat, to address the following:

- a. **Selection of the participating countries:** provide clear and comprehensive selection criteria to make the project more demand-driven, relevant and sustainable.
- b. **Partnership Agreement:** Introduce partnership agreement or MoU to clarify the roles and obligations of the participating countries and WIPO.
- c. **Identification of areas of needs:** Prepare a guidelines how best the process of identification should be undertaken to ensure; consultation, prioritization, ownership and proper documentation of the process.
- d. **National Expert Group:** Prepare guidelines outlining; selection criteria, composition, terms of reference, chair, allowances and incentives, coordination and legal status.
- e. **Implementation of the business plans:** Should be a mandatory part of the project and must be negotiated in the partnership agreement.
- f. **Project Duration** – The two years provided for the project should be maintained but used more efficiently.
- g. **Project areas:** The project's focus areas identified by WIPO (environment, agriculture, energy and industries) should be expanded.

73. **Recommendation 3:** Based on **Conclusion 5 (drawn from Finding 8)**, it is recommended that the WIPO Secretariat should review the arrangement for search and preparation of landscape reports as follows:

- a. Undertake search at WIPO and allow for the participation of the national experts in the patent search to acquire the necessary skills.
- b. Provide opportunity for face-to-face interaction between the national expert, international consultant and WIPO experts during the preparation of the landscape reports.

74. **Recommendation 4:** Based on **Conclusion 6 (drawn from Finding 9)**, to enhance sustainability, it is recommended that WIPO Secretariat ensures the following:

- a. The implementation of the business plans should be part of the Partnership Agreement
- b. More resources should be put in the administration of the project at WIPO's Division for LDCs and to support capacity building of Member States.
- c. Use of the Appropriate Technology should be mainstreamed in the national IP strategies of the participating countries.

National Expert Groups and National Multi stake holders group should be made permanent organs in the participating countries.

APPENDIX I: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED

1. Report of the fifth session of the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property, Geneva, April 26-30, 2010 (CDIP/5/6, Project Document)
2. Progress Report on the Project on Capacity Building in the Use of Appropriate Technology-Specific Technical and Scientific Information as a Solution for Identified Development Challenges, submitted at the eighth Session of the CDIP in November 2011(CDIP/8/2, Annex XV)
3. Progress Report on Project on Capacity Building in the Use of Appropriate Technology-Specific Technical and Scientific Information as a Solution for Identified Development Challenges (Annex VI), submitted at the tenth Session of the CDIP in November 2012 (CDIP/10/2, Annex VI).
4. Inputs from the Report of the Director General on the Implementation of the Development Agenda, submitted at the ninth Session of the CDIP in May 2012, Part II (n) (CDIP/9/2).
5. Landscape Reports and Business Plans on:
 - a. Stand-alone solar water distillation system to enhance access to clean drinking water
 - b. Run-off rainwater harvesting for small scale irrigation
 - c. Biomass briquetting for easy access to clean, green alternative fuel for cooking and space heating.
 - d. Post-harvest drying of cardamom to improve the living conditions of small farmers and marginalized communities through income generation.
 - e. Advanced ground improvement technique by cement and lime treatment for soft, low lying and marshy land.
 - f. Conversion municipal wastes into land filling materials combating environmental hazards.

[Appendix II follows]

APPENDIX II: LIST OF WIPO STAFF INTERVIEWED

SN	NAME	TITLE	DEPARTMENT	CONTACT DETAILS
1	Mr. Kifle Shenkoru	Director (Project Manager)	Division for Least-Developed Countries	Kifle.shenkoru@wipo.int
2	Mrs. Joyce Banya	Project Team Manager	Division for Least-Developed Countries	Joyce.banya@wipo.int
3	Mr. Roca Campaña	Senior Director-Advisor	Global Infrastructure Sector	Alejandro.Roca@wipo.int 004122338 9029 079-2480185 (Mobile Phone)
4	Mr. Irfan Baloch	Director	Development Agenda Coordination Division,	0041 22 3389955 079-6156006 (Mobile Phone) irfan.baloch@wipo.int
5	Mr. George Ghandour	Senior Program Officer	Development Agenda Coordination Division,	george.ghandour@wipo.int 004122338 8646 079-6156036 (Mobile Phone)
6	Mr. Konrad Lutz Mailander	Head	Patent Information Section	

[Appendix III follows]

APPENDIX III: LIST OF EXTERNAL RESPONDENTS

SN	NAME	POSITION	INSTITUTION	CONTACT DETAILS
1	Prof Dr. M Kamal UDDIN	National Expert BANGLADESH	Institute of Appropriate Technology, Bangladesh University of Engineering and Technology	
2	Mr Ramesh Singh	National Expert NEPAL	Research Center for Applied Science and Technology, Nepal	
3	Mr Allan Phiri	National Expert ZAMBIA	National technology Busines Center NTBC, Zambia	
4	Mr Lyod Thole	Chairman	Patent and Companies Registration Agency	

[Annex IV follows]

APPENDIX IV: DATA COLLECTION QUESTIONNAIRE

1. BRIEF INFORMATION ON THE RESPONDENT

- a. Name:
- b. Department:

2. PROJECT DESIGN AND MANAGEMENT

2.1. *The Project Framework*

Is the project document appropriate to be used as a guide for continuing project implementation and assessment of results?

2.2. *The Project Monitoring, Self-assessment and Controlling Tools*

Were monitoring, self-assessment and controlling tools adequate to provide the project team and key stakeholders with relevant information for decision-making purposes?

2.3. *The Project Synergy*

- a. Which departments, divisions or any other units within WIPO participated or contributed to the project?
- b. What was the contribution of each of them?
- c. Are there others that could have contributed but did not? If so which and what could they have done?

2.4. *Risks/Context*

- a. There were risks that were identified in the initial project document. To what extent have they materialized or been mitigated and how has the project been able to respond to changes in the context?
- b. What other challenges did you encounter in the project design and implementation?

2.5. *Lessons learned and Best practices*

What key lessons and best practices would you draw from the project design and administration?

3. PROJECT EFFECTIVENESS

3.1. *To what extent was the project able:*

- a. To facilitate greater use of appropriate technical and scientific information in addressing nationally identified needs for development?
- b. To establish effective and all inclusive multi stakeholders policy forum?
- c. To build institutional capacity in the use of technical and scientific information for identified needs?

- d. To effectively coordinate the retrieval of appropriate technical and scientific information?
- e. To provide appropriate know-how in the technical area to implement the technology in a practical and effective manner?

4. PROJECT SUSTAINABILITY

- a. What are the contributions of the host country and institutions in the establishment of the Appropriate Technology project and provision of the necessary resources?
- b. How are the host countries using the project?
- c. Is the project addressing the specific needs of the organizations/ countries?
- d. What commitments are there to show that the activities of the project will continue after the support of WIPO?

5. IMPLEMENTATION OF DEVELOPMENT AGENDA RECOMMENDATIONS

The extent to which the DA Recommendations 19, 30 and 31 has been implemented through the project.

[Appendix V follows]

APPENDIX V: EVALUATION FRAMEWORK (MATRIX)

	Sub-Foci	Indicators	Means of verification
<i>PROJECT DESIGN AND MANAGEMENT</i>			
1a	The appropriateness of the initial project document as a guide for project implementation and assessment of results achieved	Whether or not the project document will require revision to successfully implemented the project in future	Through document review and interview with project team.
1b	Adequateness and usefulness of the project monitoring, self-evaluation and reporting tools in providing relevant information for decision-making purposes of the project team and key stakeholders.	Whether or not the project monitoring, self-evaluation and reporting tools will require revision to provide relevant information for decision-making purposes of the project team and key stakeholders.	Through document review and interview with project team.
1c	The extent to which other entities within the Secretariat have contributed and enabled an effective and efficient project implementation.	The contribution of the other entities within the Secretariat to enable effective and efficient project implementation	Through interview with project team and the related departments.
1d	The extent to which the risks identified in the initial project document have materialized or been mitigated.	Whether or not the risks identified in the initial project document have materialized or how they have been mitigated.	Through document review and interview with project team.
1e	The project's ability to respond to emerging trends, technologies and other external forces.	The extent to which the project responded to emerging trends, technologies and other external forces.	Through document review and interview with project team.
<i>EFFECTIVENESS</i>			
2a	The usefulness of the project in facilitating greater use of appropriate technical and scientific information in addressing nationally identified needs for development	Use of appropriate technical and scientific information in addressing nationally identified needs for development	Through document review and interview with project team and recipients
2b	The establishment of multi stakeholders policy forum , the effectiveness and usefulness of the project in building institutional capacity in the use of technical and scientific information for identified needs so as to progress towards the achievement of key national development targets	(g) Effective Multi stakeholders forum established (h) Institutional capacity building for use of technical and scientific information by LDC	Through document review and interview with project team, and recipients and members of multi stakeholders policy forum

2c	The effectiveness of the program in coordinating the retrieval of appropriate technical and scientific information and the provision of appropriate know-how in this technical area to implement this technology in a practical and effective manner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Coordination of retrieval of technical and scientific information (j) Provision of appropriate know-how 	Through document review and interview with project team, and recipients and members of multi stakeholders policy forum
SUSTAINABILITY			
3a	The likelihood for continued work on Appropriate Technology – Specific Technical and Scientific Information as a solution for identified development challenges for WIPO and its Member States.	Measures in place to ensure that the project can continue without support from WIPO	Through document review and interview with project team and recipients
IMPLEMENTATION OF DEVELOPMENT AGENDA (DA) RECOMMENDATIONS			
4a	The extent to which the DA recommendations 19, 30 and 31 have been implemented through this project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (k) Enhance access to knowledge and technology for developing countries and LDC, (l) Advice to developing countries and LDC on how to gain access to and make use of IP-related information on technology. (m) Contribution to technology transfer to developing countries and access to publicly available patent information 	Through document review and interview with project team and recipients

[Annex VI follows]

ANNEX VI: TERMS OF REFERENCE



PROJECT EVALUATION: Project on Capacity-Building in the Use of Appropriate Technology-Specific Technical and Scientific Information as a Solution for Identified Development Challenges

From June 1 to September 15, 2013

Mr. Tom Ogada
Consultant

TERMS OF REFERENCE

I. PROJECT BACKGROUND

The present document represents the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the evaluation of the *Development Agenda Project Capacity Building in the Use of Appropriate Technology-Specific Technical and Scientific Information as a Solution for Identified Development Challenges*, approved during the fifth session of the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP), held in Geneva, in April 2010. The project document for this project is contained in document CDIP/5/6 Rev. The project implementation started in July 2010 and was completed in April 2013. The project included the following elements:

1. Selecting three pilot Least Developed Countries (LDCs) on the basis of requests received and identifying the most urgent development issues where appropriate technologies could effectively contribute to improved living conditions;
2. establishing a national expert group from existing stakeholders;
3. drafting of appropriate technology landscapes;
4. implementing the selected appropriate technologies; and
5. organizing a national outreach program.

All the above project components were implemented under the supervision of the Project Manager, Mr. Kifle Shenkoru, Director, Division for Least Developed Countries.

II. OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

This evaluation is intended to be a participative evaluation. It should provide for active involvement in the evaluation process of those with a stake in the projects: project team, partners, beneficiaries, and any other interested parties.

The main objective of this evaluation is two-fold:

1. Learning from experiences during project implementation: what worked well and what did not work well for the benefit of continuing activities in this field. This includes assessing 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
2. Providing evidence-based evaluative information to support the CDIP's decision-making process.

III. SCOPE AND FOCUS

The project time frame considered for this evaluation is 34 months (July 2010 - April 2013). The focus shall not be on assessing individual activities but rather to evaluate the project as a whole and its contribution in assessing the needs of Member States and identify the resources or the means to address those needs, its evolution over time, its performance including project design, project management, coordination, coherence, implementation and results achieved.

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

1. Strengthening national capacity of LDCs in using appropriate technical solutions to address major national development challenges;
2. improving understanding of the use of technical and patent information for innovation and national technology capacity-building; and
3. ensuring an effective exploitation of technical and patent information for achieving development objectives and goals.

To this end, the evaluation, in particular, will focus on assessing the following key evaluation questions:

Project Design and Management

1. The appropriateness of the initial project document as a guide for project implementation and assessment of results achieved;
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;
3. the extent to which other entities within the Secretariat have contributed and enabled an effective and efficient project implementation;
4. the extent to which the risks identified in the initial project document have materialized or been mitigated; and
5. the project's ability to respond to emerging trends, technologies and other external forces.

Effectiveness

1. The usefulness of the project in facilitating greater use of appropriate technical and scientific information in addressing nationally identified needs for development;
2. the establishment of multi stakeholders policy forum, the effectiveness and usefulness of the project in building national institutional capacity in the use of technical and scientific information for identified needs so as to progress towards the achievement of key national development targets; and
3. the effectiveness of the project in coordinating the retrieval of appropriate technical and scientific information and the provision of appropriate know-how in this technical area to implement this technology in a practical and effective manner.

Sustainability

The likelihood for continued work on Appropriate Technology-Specific Technical and Scientific Information as a Solution for Identified Development Challenges for WIPO and its Member States.

Implementation of Development Agenda (DA) Recommendations

The extent to which the DA Recommendations 19, 30 and 31 has been implemented through this project.

IV. METHODOLOGY

The evaluation methodology is aimed at balancing the needs for learning and accountability. To this end, the evaluation should provide for active involvement in the evaluation process of those with a stake in the project: project team, senior managers, Member States and national intellectual property (IP) offices.

An external evaluation expert will be in charge of conducting the evaluation, in consultation and collaboration with the project team, the Development Agenda Coordination Division (DACD) and the Program Management and Performance Section (PMPS). The evaluation methodology will consist of the following:

1. Desk review of relevant project related documentation including the project framework (initial project document and study), progress reports, monitoring information, mission reports and other relevant documents.
2. interviews at the WIPO Secretariat (project team, other substantive entities contributing to the project, etc.); and
3. stakeholder interviews, including users and/or potential users of the database.

V. EVALUATION REPORT

The evaluation report shall include an executive summary and be structured as follows:

1. Description of the evaluation methodology used;
2. summary of key evidence-based findings centered on the key evaluation questions;

3. conclusions drawn based on the findings; and
4. recommendations emanating from the conclusions and lessons learned.

This project evaluation is expected to start on June 1, 2013, and be finalized on September 15, 2013. The reporting language will be English.

VI. ACCOUNTABILITY AND RESPONSIBILITIES

You shall:

1. Be responsible for delivering the evaluation report as described above in accordance with other details provided in this document.
2. work closely with the Development Agenda Coordination Division (DACD), Program Management and Performance Section (PMPS) and the Division for Least-Developed Countries. You shall also coordinate with the relevant Program Managers in WIPO as required.
3. ensure the quality of data (validity, consistency and accuracy) throughout the analytical reporting phases (inception report and final evaluation report).

VII. DELIVERABLES

You will deliver:

1. An inception report which contains a description of the evaluation methodology and methodological approach; data collection tools (including eventual surveys of beneficiaries and stakeholders); data analysis methods; key stakeholders to be interviewed; additional evaluation questions; performance assessment criteria; and evaluation work plan;
2. draft evaluation report with actionable recommendations deriving from the findings and conclusions;
3. final evaluation report; and
4. comprehensive executive summary of the final evaluation report.

VIII. TIMELINE

The inception report should be submitted to WIPO by June 15, 2013. WIPO's feedback shall be communicated to you by June 25, 2013. The draft evaluation report shall be submitted to WIPO by August 1, 2013. Factual corrections on the draft will be provided to you by August 15, 2013. The final evaluation report shall be submitted by September 1, 2013. The final version of the evaluation report containing a management response in an annex shall be considered by the twelfth session of the CDIP, to be held from November 18 to 22, 2013. You will be required to present the evaluation report during that CDIP session.

[End of Appendix VI and of document]