

Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP)

Ninth Session
Geneva, May 7 to 11, 2012

PROJECT EVALUATION – DEVELOPMENT AGENDA RECOMMENDATION 2:
CONFERENCE ON “MOBILIZING RESOURCES FOR DEVELOPMENT”

prepared by Glenn O’Neil, Evaluation Consultant, Geneva

1. The Annex to this document contains an External Independent “Evaluation Report of the Project on Mobilizing Resources for Development” (CDIP/3/INF/2) undertaken by Gleen O’Neil, Founder, Owl RE, Wise Research & Evaluation, Geneva.

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

[Annex follows]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of accronyms used	2
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
KEY FINDINGS	3
<i>Project design and management</i>	3
<i>Effectiveness</i>	4
<i>Sustainability</i>	5
<i>Conclusions and recommendations</i>	6
Introduction	7
Description of the project objectives evaluated.....	7
Overview of evaluation criteria and methodology	8
Key findings	8
Project design and management	8
<i>Effectiveness</i>	10
<i>Sustainability</i>	11
CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	12
Appendix I: Persons interviewed/consulted	1
Appendix II: Documents consulted.....	1
Appendix III: Financial analysis of FITs.....	2
Appendix IV: Inception report.....	1

LIST OF ACCRONYMS USED

ADB	African Development Bank
CARICOM	Caribbean Community
CDIP	Committee on Development and Intellectual Property
CERN	European Organization for Nuclear Research
EC	European Community
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations
FIT	Funds-in-Trust
LDC	Least Developed Countries
IP	Intellectual Property
ITC	International Trade Centre
TTO	Technical Transfer Offices
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNITAR	United Nations Institute for Training and Research
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
WTO	World Trade Organization

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. This report is an independent evaluation of the Development Agenda Project related to WIPO Development Agenda Recommendation 2: Conference on “Mobilizing Resources for Development”. The project implementation started in January 2009 and was completed in November 2009 with follow-up activities continuing into 2010 and 2011. The main purpose of the project was to convene a conference that was held in November 2009. The conference aimed at providing additional extra-budgetary resources to WIPO for its work to help developing countries benefit from the Intellectual Property (IP) system and to seek to establish Fund-in-Trust (FIT) or other voluntary funds.
2. The aim of the evaluation was to learn from experiences during project implementation. This included assessing the project management and design including monitoring and reporting tools, as well as measuring and reporting on the results achieved to date and assessing the likelihood of sustainability. The evaluation utilized a combination of methods including a document review, interviews with nine staff at WIPO Secretariat and feedback from seven external stakeholders.

KEY FINDINGS

Project design and management

3. **Appropriateness of the initial project document for implementation and assessment of results.** The project document was assessed as being sufficient for implementation of the project. Although succinct, this initial document provided the required information to plan and organize the conference and was complemented by a more global Concept Paper.
4. **Adequateness and usefulness of the project monitoring, self-evaluation and reporting tools.** Given the precise nature of the project, the reporting tools were in general adequate for the project team. According to this evaluation, information was sufficient from the reporting to enable them to take decisions and advance the project.
5. **The extent to which other entities within the Secretariat have contributed and enabled an effective and efficient project implementation.** Overall, collaboration within WIPO was sufficient to support effective and efficient project implementation. For the project to be a success, the responsible Sectors required the assistance of other entities within the Secretariat. It was found that the project involved developing internally an understanding of the implications of receiving development funding from donors, mainly in terms of reporting and project management, as this was a relatively new practice for the organization.
6. **The extent to which the risks identified in the initial project document have materialized or been mitigated.** The project document detailed three risks for the project:
 - (i) *Lack of participation in the Conference in particular from the donor community:* This risk was mitigated by undertaking consultation with prospective donors including visiting key potential donors.
 - (ii) *Sufficient participation in the Conference, but no new resources available:* This risk was partially mitigated given that participation was sufficient but resources have remained limited during 2010 and 2011 with new funding secured which has been offset by changes to existing funding. Limitations to funding have largely been due to external factors outside the control of WIPO, notably the global financial crisis.

(iii) *No financial support to establish a WIPO FIT for Least Developed Countries (LDC):* This risk did materialize in that financial support has not yet been secured to establish a WIPO FIT for LDC. The alternative was foreseen that existing funding mechanisms would be used. This has occurred with select FITs increasing their focus or funding for LDC (e.g. Republic of Korea and Japan). The project has also led to a number of initiatives on how support could be provided for LDC through other modalities, such as World Bank and UN frameworks and mechanisms. Further, the pledged donation of 2 million Swiss francs in December 2011 from the Australian government to development projects will focus on LDC.

7. **The project's ability to respond to emerging trends, technologies and other external forces.** Considerable consultation was undertaken with stakeholders in the design of the conference. The project adapted its approach in several ways: By moving away from a "pledging" conference to a more awareness-raising theme; and by understanding how resource mobilization could fit into the existing mechanisms of multilateral organizations. The project could not respond to all external forces considering the limited staff resources available: 0.5 of one staff member for most of the project duration.

Effectiveness

8. **Achievement of project objectives.** The project has made progress towards achieving the two project objectives, if it is considered that the conference was the starting point for a concerted effort in extra-budgetary resource mobilization. However, it has not been possible to achieve these objectives within the set timeframe, reflecting the complexities of resource mobilization that were possibly underestimated in the project creation. Each specific objective is assessed as follows:

(i) **Objective 1- convene a conference aimed at mobilizing extra-budgetary resources for WIPO:** The project achieved the project outputs supporting this objective in that the conference was successfully prepared and organized within the planned timeline and budget (utilizing 82.5% of the set budget). Concerning the outcome indicators, two additional donors were added. Concerning funds, if funds received are only considered, the target was not met. If pledged funds and those in an advanced stage of discussion are included, that target was exceeded – an increase seen of 30%.

(ii) **Objective 2- establish FITs or other voluntary funds specifically for LDC:** The establishment of FITs or other voluntary funds within WIPO specifically for LDC was not achieved. However, select FITs have increased their focus or funding for LDC; initiatives are underway to support LDC through other modalities and mechanisms; and the pledged donation of the Australian government will focus on LDC, as detailed in paragraph 6 (iii).

9. There was an absence of indicators set for mid-term outcomes, such as changes to awareness and attitudes on IP and development. In this regard, the conference achieved significant results according to feedback from conference participants and speakers. The set indicators at the outcome level were considerably ambitious given the limited knowledge on resource mobilization within WIPO at project launch and the time needed to secure funding from donors.

10. **The increase in funds available to WIPO through FITs arrangements.** A baseline was established of the amount of income (funds received) administered in the relevant FITs. This was reported as 13,239,902 Swiss francs in 2008/9. The target was a 20% increase (2,647,980 Swiss francs) in these funds by the end of 2010/11. According to financial reporting, the funds received during this period were 11,962,239 Swiss francs indicating a decrease of 9.6%. However, if secured, pledged and funding at an advanced stage of discussion during 2010/11 is included, a 30% increase is shown: a total of 17,189,292 Swiss francs of funding.

11. **WIPO projects funded through existing external funding modalities.** The baseline was established as zero – there being no projects funded at project launch through external funding modalities. The target was to secure support for at least five projects. To date, no support has been secured. However, an understanding has been developed within WIPO of how external funding modalities function and the importance of linking into existing development frameworks, such as the UN Development Assistance Framework.

12. **The increase in number of donors to WIPO from all sources.** The baseline was established as 15 donors at 2008/9. The target was to secure any additional donors for 2010/11. Two additional donors were secured: Brazil and Mexico bringing the total number of donors in 2010/11 to 17.

13. **The establishment of WIPO Multi-Donor FIT for LDC.** The baseline was established as zero – there being no FIT LDC existing at project launch. The target was to establish a FIT LDC in excess of 1 million Swiss francs. To date, no FIT has been established as no funds have been received. However, initiatives are underway to secure more support for LDC as described in paragraph 8 (iii).

Sustainability

14. **Contribution of Conference “Follow-up” steps and results to the future work program and sustainability.** The seven “Follow-up” steps created following the conference have progressed considerably. They are paraphrased below in italics with an assessment provided:

(i) Identify projects with developing countries and develop project proposals: Follow-up has focused on several projects with one major project concretized at this stage. This project, establishing TTO in Arab countries to the value of 2.4 million Swiss francs with support of a major multilateral donor, is in an advanced stage of planning. The creation of this project illustrated successful internal collaboration but equally the significant effort and time needed for collaborative project design.

(ii) Identify partnerships with other organizations to develop joint projects: Since the 2009 conference, WIPO has increased its collaboration with multilateral organizations. It has taken time for WIPO to understand the existing mechanisms and processes that development projects can be developed within. An example of a joint project was the program 9 European Community funded project in Pakistan in collaboration with UNIDO and the International Trade Centre (ITC) (an estimated value of 1,3 million Swiss francs).

(iii) Propose an additional day on partnership and resource mobilization at the next regional Heads of IP Offices meeting in the Latin America and Caribbean region: Due to time constraints according to WIPO staff, it was not possible to organize an additional day in 2010/11 although there are provisional plans to hold similar days during three regional meetings in 2012.

(iv) Organize annual meetings of WIPO’s current donors: Two meetings have been held with current (FIT) donors in 2010 and 2011. According to WIPO staff, the meetings were a very useful exchange of information between donors and WIPO.

(v) The Secretariat will undertake an outreach program with the donor community: The WIPO Secretariat has increased its contact and work with current and potential donors since the 2009 conference. This has also coincided with the creation of the Department of External Relations which has provided more resources to focus on outreach with the donor community.

(vi) Establish a WIPO resource mobilization strategy: A Partnership and Resource mobilization strategy has been created and is currently under review within WIPO. The

strategy benefited and was largely developed based on the experience and follow up from the 2009 conference.

(vii) Develop guidelines for partnership with the private sector: Guidelines have been drafted and are scheduled to be finalized in 2012/13.

15. Overall, the work achieved through the conference has been continued and expanded upon through the “Follow-up” steps. This has also been aided by increased resources (staff) for resource mobilization, the integration of the project’s objectives within the workplan and Results Framework of Programme 20 and the forthcoming Partnership and Resource Mobilization strategy.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

16. A narrow interpretation of this project would find that it only partially achieved its objectives, given the limited changes to levels of funds received in 2010/11. Even within this interpretation, it would have to be recognized that the project was successful in raising awareness on IP and development amongst donors.

17. A broader interpretation of the project would find that the project was a key starting point for a concerted resource mobilization with new funding secured and anticipated close to 4 million Swiss francs. With this interpretation, it would have to be recognized that the “Follow-up” steps to the conference – and not the conference itself – were more important in these achievements.

18. Although it is difficult to determine precisely the contribution of the 2009 conference to resource mobilization, contributions that are identifiable include the development of a Partnership and Resource Mobilization strategy, adopting of a new approach in this area together with better internal understanding and collaboration that has shown promising initial results.

19. In retrospect, Recommendation No. 2 was perhaps too limited in its design as a project: The project focused on an activity of resource mobilization (a conference), where as it may have been more appropriate to focus on a resource mobilization strategy supported by activities, including a conference. As the organization learnt in undertaking the conference and its follow-up, resource mobilization requires a multi-pronged approach which could have been better represented in the original project concept.

20. A multi-pronged approach is reflected in the draft WIPO Partnership and Resource Mobilization strategy. This also implies that a separate multi-donor FIT for LDC may not be the most appropriate mechanism to support LDC – working with multilateral partners such as the African Development Bank (ADB), ITC and the World Trade Organization may be more appropriate and realizable in addition to encouraging existing donors to place more focus on LDC when planning the distribution of their funds.

21. A limitation identified in the project design was in recognizing internal risks and challenges. One that emerged during project implementation was the internal change needed within WIPO to undertake resource mobilization. The time and resources required were not fully considered in project design.

22. Concerning project management, WIPO displayed flexibility in undertaking a consultative process that ultimately changed the shape of the conference program. Interesting and practical insights into development and IP were shared during the conference. The conference follow-up was largely molded by the consultative process and the conference proceedings.

23. A limitation in project management identified was in the capacity to date of WIPO to develop project proposals that could be used in resource mobilization. WIPO has developed several proposals (e.g. TTO project in Arab countries) but if WIPO wants to grow resource mobilization there is a need for greater internal involvement in addition to recognizing the time and resources needed for developing project proposals.

24. Resource mobilization within WIPO has progressed considerably in the past two years and this evaluation has found that the 2009 conference and follow-up provided a solid basis for the consequent strategy. As resource mobilization is predicted to grow further in the coming years, further consideration needs to be given as to how WIPO will support and maintain a sustainable strategy.

25. The following recommendations have been formulated for consideration by the CDIP:

- (i) Recognize and support a multipronged strategy for resource mobilization that requires a minimum of a four year times pan to produce concrete results.
- (ii) Continue to monitor progress of resource mobilization through program 20 and consider a more in-depth review of efficiency and effectiveness after a four year period.
- (iii) Reconsider the appropriateness of a establishing a separate multi-donor FIT for LDC; consider alternative approaches to supporting LDC such as intensifying collaboration with multinational partners and increased support for LDC in existing FITs.
- (iv) Encourage additional support within WIPO to increase its ability to develop project proposals in order to support and boost the resource mobilization while recognizing the time and resources required.
- (v) In creating similar projects of this nature, consider the inclusion of internal risks and challenges, in addition to setting out mid-term outcomes (and indicators) that sit between outputs and longer-term outcomes.

INTRODUCTION

26. This report is an independent evaluation of the Development Agenda Project related to WIPO Development Agenda Recommendation 2: Conference on “Mobilizing Resources for Development”. The project was approved during the third session of the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP) in April 2008. The project implementation started in January 2009 and was completed in November 2009 with follow-up activities continuing into 2010 and 2011.

27. The main purpose of the project was to convene a conference that was held in November 2009. The conference aimed at providing additional extra-budgetary resources to WIPO for its work to help developing countries benefit from the Intellectual Property (IP) system and to seek to establish Fund-in-Trust (FIT) or other voluntary funds specifically for Least Developed Countries (LDC), with a high priority on Africa.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT OBJECTIVES EVALUATED

28. The project document set out the following specific objectives for this project:

- (i) **Objective 1:** To convene a conference aimed at mobilizing extra-budgetary resources to provide additional assistance to WIPO for its work to help developing countries benefit from the IP system and to identify and enable WIPO to access existing funding modalities to support its technical assistance and capacity building work.

(ii) **Objective 2:** To establish FITs or other voluntary funds within WIPO specifically for LDC.

29. This evaluation assesses these above-mentioned objectives in addition to progress on “Follow-up” steps following the conference, based on the evaluation questions described below.

OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION CRITERIA AND METHODOLOGY

30. The aim of the evaluation was to learn from experiences during project implementation: What worked well and what did not work for the benefit of the continuing activities in this field. This included 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. The evaluation also aimed to provide evidence-based evaluation information to support the CDIP’s decision-making process.

31. The evaluation was organized around eleven evaluation questions split into three themes: Project design and management, Effectiveness and Sustainability. These questions are responded to directly in the section “Key findings” below.

32. The evaluation utilized a combination of methods for this evaluation. In addition to a review of all relevant documentation, interviews were conducted with nine staff at the WIPO Secretariat in Geneva. Feedback on the project was requested from 30 external stakeholders including speakers and participants at the conference of which seven responses were received. A list of persons interviewed or consulted is found at annex 1. A list of documents consulted is found at annex 2. The inception report which guided this evaluation is found at annex 4.

KEY FINDINGS

33. This section is organized on the basis of the three evaluation areas. Each evaluation question is answered directly under the headings of each area.

Project design and management

34. **Appropriateness of the initial project document for implementation and assessment of results.** The project document was assessed as being sufficient for implementation of the project. Although succinct, this initial document provided the required information to plan and organize the conference and was complemented by a more global Concept Paper. For assessment of the results of the project, with the definition of precise project outputs and outcomes in the document, adequate information was provided for this purpose. The appropriateness of the level of the indicators, particularly at the outcome level is discussed in paragraph 41.

35. **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.** Given the precise nature of the project (i.e. the organization of a conference), the reporting tools were in general adequate for the project team. Four review points were set out for the project and three written feedbacks provided to CDIP as part of the fourth (November 2009) and sixth (November 2010) sessions of the CDIP, in addition to a more detailed oral report for the fourth session and a Conference Summary Report (see annex 1 for further details). According to this evaluation, information was sufficient from the reporting to enable WIPO management to take decisions and advance the project and “Follow-up” steps accordingly. Monitoring of this project and its “Follow-up” steps was also facilitated by the incorporation of its objectives and indicators within the performance data of

programme 20 (External Offices and Relations) from 2010 onwards, as reported in the annual Program Performance Reports.

36. The extent to which other entities within the Secretariat have contributed and enabled an effective and efficient project implementation. The project was managed by the Global Issues and Development Sectors and linked primarily to WIPO programs 9, 10, 11 and 20. Overall, collaboration within WIPO was sufficient to support effective and efficient project implementation. For the project to be a success, the responsible Sectors required the assistance of other entities within the Secretariat, in particular the relevant Sectors such as Innovation and Technology in addition to the Regional Bureaus. Collaboration with the Administrative and Management Sector was also important for financial aspects including preparation for any eventual funding received and consequent reporting and administrative requirements. It was found that the project involved developing internally an understanding of the implications and resources required in receiving development funding from bilateral and multilateral donors, mainly in terms of planning, reporting and project management, as this was a relatively new practice for the organization.

37. The extent to which the risks identified in the initial project document have materialized or been mitigated. The project document detailed three risks for the project:

(i) *Lack of participation in the Conference in particular from the donor community:* This risk was mitigated by undertaking consultation with prospective donors including visiting key potential donors such as the World Bank, DFID (UK) and USAID. At the conference, these donors were present in addition to other current or potential donor countries such as Brazil, China, France, Japan, the Netherlands, Switzerland and multilateral organizations such as the African Development Bank (ADB) and the European Commission (EC).

(ii) *Sufficient participation in the Conference, but no new resources available:* This risk was partially mitigated given that participation was sufficient but resources have remained limited during 2010 and 2011 with new funding secured which have been offset by changes to existing funding. Limitations to funding have largely been due to external factors outside the control of WIPO, especially the global financial crisis.

(iii) *No financial support to establish a WIPO FIT for LDC:* This risk did materialize in that financial support has not yet been secured to establish a WIPO FIT for LDC. However, as described in the original project document, the alternative was foreseen that existing funding mechanisms would be used. This has occurred with select donors increasing their focus and funding for LDC within existing FITs (e.g. Republic of Korea and Japan) The project has also led to a number of initiatives on how support could be provided for LDC through other modalities, such as World Bank and UN frameworks and mechanisms. Further, the pledged donation of 2 million Swiss francs in December 2011 from the Australian government to development projects will focus on LDC.

38. The project's ability to respond to emerging trends, technologies and other external forces. The project took into consideration external forces and potential risks by undertaking considerable consultation with stakeholders in the design of the conference. Through this process, the project adapted its approach in several ways: By moving away from a "pledging" conference to a more awareness-raising theme; and by learning of and understanding how resource mobilization could fit into the existing mechanisms of organizations such as the ADB, the World Bank, United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The project could not respond to all external forces considering the limited staff resources available: 0.5 of one staff member for most of the project duration.

Effectiveness

39. **Achievement of project objectives:** The project has made progress towards achieving the two project objectives, if it is considered that the conference was the starting point for a concerted effort in extra-budgetary resource mobilization. However, it has not been possible to achieve these objectives within the set timeframe, reflecting the complexities of resource mobilization that were possibly underestimated in the project creation. Each specific objective (as described in paragraph 29) is assessed as follows:

(i) **Objective 1:** The project achieved the project outputs supporting this objective in that the conference was successfully prepared and organized within the planned timeline and budget (utilizing 82.5% of the set budget). Concerning the outcome indicators, two additional donors were added. Concerning funds, if funds received are only considered, the target was not met. If pledged funds and those in an advanced stage of discussion are included, that target was exceeded – an increase seen of 30%.

(ii) **Objective 2:** The establishment of FITs or other voluntary funds within WIPO specifically for LDC was not achieved. However, select FITs have increased their focus or funding for LDC; initiatives are underway to support LDC through other modalities and mechanisms; and the pledged donation of the Australian government will focus on LDC, as detailed in paragraph 38 (iii).

40. In examination of the objectives and consequent indicators set for the project, it can be seen that indicators were set at the level of output (conference organized) and long-term outcomes (funds and donors committed). There was an absence of indicators set for mid-term outcomes, such as changes to awareness and attitudes on IP and development. In this regard, the conference achieved significant results according to feedback from conference participants and speakers. Further, the set indicators at the outcome level, as described in the next four paragraphs, were considerably ambitious given the limited knowledge on resource mobilization within WIPO at project launch and the time needed to secure funding from donors.

41. **The increase in funds available to WIPO through FITs arrangements.** As an indicator established for objective 1, a baseline was established of the amount of income (funds received) administered in the relevant FITs. This was reported as 13,239,902 Swiss francs in 2008/9. The target was a 20% increase (2,647,980 Swiss francs) in these funds by the end of the financial period of 2010/11. According to financial reporting, the funds received during this period were 11,962,239 Swiss francs indicating a decrease of 9.6%. However, if secured, pledged and funding at an advanced stage of discussion during 2010/11 is included, a 30% increase is shown: a total of 17,189,292¹ Swiss francs of funding. Further financial details are found at annex 3.

42. **WIPO projects funded through existing external funding modalities.** As an indicator established for objective 1, the baseline was established as zero – there being no projects funded at project launch through external funding modalities. The target was to secure support for at least five projects. To date, no support has been secured for projects through external funding modalities. However, an understanding has been developed within WIPO of how external funding modalities function and the importance of linking into existing development frameworks, such as the UN Development Assistance Framework.

¹ Pledged funding secured during 2010/11 that has not yet been received by WIPO comes to a total of CHF 2,827,053: CHF 2,000,000 from the Australian government and CHF 827,053 from the EC (with CHF 472, 947 having already been received of the total CHF 1,300,000). Funding at an advanced stage of discussion is CHF 2,400,000 from a major multilateral donor for the TTO project in Arab countries. See annex 3 for further details.

43. **The increase in number of donors to WIPO from all sources.** As an indicator established for objective 1, the baseline was established as 15 donors at 2008/9². The target was to secure any additional donors for 2010/11. Two additional donors were secured: Brazil and Mexico bringing the total number of donors in 2010/11 to 16. Two 2008/9 donors, Italy and Portugal did not provide new funding in 2010/11 but their FITs exist and are actively being implemented.

44. **The establishment of WIPO Multi-Donor FIT for LDC.** As an indicator established for objective 2, the baseline was established as zero – there being no FIT LDC existing at project launch. The target was to establish a FIT LDC in excess of 1 million Swiss francs. To date, no FIT has been established as no funds have been received. However, as stated in paragraph 38(iii), initiatives are underway to secure more support for LDC.

Sustainability

45. **Contribution of Conference “Follow-up” steps and results to the future work program and sustainability.** The seven “Follow-up” steps³ created following the conference have progressed considerably. Each step, paraphrased below in italics from the WIPO oral report, is assessed as follows:

(i) *Identify projects with developing countries and develop project proposals:* Follow-up has focused on several projects with one major project concretized at this stage. This project, establishing TTO in Arab countries to the value of 2.4 million Swiss francs with support of a major multilateral donor, is in an advanced stage of planning. The creation of this project illustrated successful internal collaboration for a development project (notably between External Relations, the Regional Bureau for Arab Countries and the Innovation and Technology Sector) but also highlighted the significant effort and time required for collaborative project design (currently some two years in the planning phase).

(ii) *Identify partnerships with other organizations to develop joint projects:* Since the 2009 conference, WIPO has increased its collaboration with multilateral organizations, developing Memorandum of Understandings with UNIDO, the Food and Agricultural Organization of the UN (FAO), the European Organization for Nuclear Research (CERN) and under discussion with the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR). As mentioned above, it has taken time for WIPO to understand the existing mechanisms and processes that within development projects can be developed. An example of a joint project that is now underway was the program 9 (Developing countries and LDC) EC funded project in Pakistan undertaken in collaboration with UNIDO and the International Trade Centre (ITC) (an estimated value of 1.3 million Swiss francs).

(iii) *Propose an additional day on partnership and resource mobilization at the next regional Heads of IP Offices meeting in the Latin America and Caribbean region:* Due to time constraints according to WIPO staff, it was not possible to organize an additional day in 2010/11 although there are provisional plans to hold similar days during three regional meetings in 2012.

² Australia, Christensen Fund, EC, Finland, France, Italy, Japan, Norway, Portugal, South Africa, Republic of Korea, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, USA.

³ Full text of the “Follow-up” steps can be found in the document: WIPO, (November 2009), *WIPO conference on building partnerships for mobilizing resources for development, November 5 and 6, 2009: Oral report to CDIP, Committee on Development and Intellectual Property*, page 11.

(iv) *Organize annual meetings of WIPO's current donors:* Two meetings have been held with current (FIT) donors in 2010 and 2011. According to WIPO staff, the meetings were a very useful exchange of information between donors and WIPO.

(v) *The Secretariat will undertake an outreach program with the donor community:* The WIPO Secretariat has increased its contact and work with current and potential donors since the 2009 conference. This has also coincided with the creation of the Department of External Relations which has provided more resources to focus on outreach with the donor community in addition to a resource mobilization strategy, as described in the next paragraph.

(vi) *Establish a WIPO resource mobilization strategy:* A Partnership and Resource Mobilization strategy has been created and is currently under review within WIPO. The strategy benefited and was largely developed based on the experience and follow up from the 2009 conference.

(vii) *Develop guidelines for partnership with the private sector:* Guidelines have been drafted and are scheduled to be finalized in 2012/13.

46. Overall, the work achieved through the conference has been continued and expanded upon through the "Follow-up" steps. This has also been aided by increased resources (staff) for resource mobilization, the integration of the project's objectives within the Workplan and Results Framework of Programme 20 and the forthcoming Partnership and Resource Mobilization strategy.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

47. The following conclusions and recommendations are based on the findings of this evaluation and are aimed at supporting CDIP's decision-making process.

48. A narrow interpretation of this project would find that it only partially achieved its objectives, given the limited changes to funding levels seen. Even within this interpretation, it would have to be recognized that the project was successful in raising awareness on IP and development amongst donors, even if this was not an explicitly stated objective.

49. A broader interpretation of the project would find that the project was a key starting point for a concerted resource mobilization strategy that is starting to show results with new funding secured and anticipated close to 4 million Swiss francs. With this interpretation, it would have to be recognized that the "Follow-up" steps to the conference – and not the conference itself – were more important in these achievements.

50. Although it is difficult to determine precisely the contribution of the 2009 conference to resource mobilization, contributions that are identifiable include the development of a Partnership and Resource Mobilization strategy, adopting of a new approach in this area together with better internal understanding and collaboration that has shown promising initial results.

51. In retrospect, Recommendation No. 2 was perhaps too limited in its design as a project: The project focused on an activity of resource mobilization (a conference), where as it may have been more appropriate to focus on a resource mobilization strategy supported by activities, including a conference. As the organization learnt in undertaking the conference and its follow-up, resource mobilization requires a multi-pronged approach which could have been better represented in the original project concept.

52. A multi-pronged approach is reflected in the draft WIPO Partnership and Resource Mobilization strategy: Development projects need to follow best practices of aid effectiveness including country ownership, integration with national strategies and working closely with

partners and through national and UN development planning mechanisms. This also implies that a separate multi-donor FIT for LDC may not be the most appropriate mechanism to support LDC – working with multilateral partners such as the ADB, ITC and the World Trade Organization may be more appropriate and realizable in addition to encouraging existing donors to place more focus on LDC when planning the distribution of their funds.

53. A limitation identified in the project design was in recognizing internal risks and challenges. One that emerged during project implementation was the internal change needed within WIPO to undertake resource mobilization, taking into consideration that at project launch, know-how and experience in this area was undeveloped internally. Although there were no major issues identified in collaboration between the services and sectors implied, the time and resources required were not fully considered in project design.

54. Concerning project management, WIPO displayed flexibility in undertaking a consultative process that ultimately changed the shape of the conference program. Interesting and practical insights into development and IP were shared during the conference – feedback from participants highlighted the value in being able to “showcase” their projects and challenges they faced. The conference follow-up was largely molded by the consultative process and the conference proceedings.

55. A limitation in project management identified was in the capacity to date of WIPO to develop project proposals that could be used in resource mobilization. WIPO has developed several proposals (e.g. TTO project Arab Countries) but if WIPO wants to grow resource mobilization there is a need for greater internal involvement (as substance must come from the services and geographic bureaus) in addition to recognizing the time and resources needed for developing project proposals. These points are considered in the draft WIPO Partnership and Resource Mobilization strategy.

56. Resource mobilization within WIPO has progressed considerably in the past two years and this evaluation has found that the 2009 conference and follow-up provided a solid basis for the consequent strategy. As resource mobilization is predicted to grow further in the coming years, further consideration needs to be given as to how WIPO will support and maintain a sustainable strategy. As mentioned above, this would most likely imply a greater implication of services and the geographic bureaus. Further adaptation will also be needed within WIPO in administrative and reporting aspects.

57. The following recommendations have been formulated for consideration by the CDIP:

- (i) Recognize and support a multipronged strategy for resource mobilization that requires a minimum of a four year times pan to produce concrete results.
- (ii) Continue to monitor progress of resource mobilization through program 20 and consider a more in-depth review of efficiency and effectiveness after a four year period.
- (iii) Reconsider the appropriateness of a establishing a separate multi-donor FIT for LDC; consider alternative approaches to supporting LDC such as intensifying collaboration with multinational partners and increased support for LDC in existing FITs.
- (iv) Encourage additional support within WIPO to increase its ability to develop project proposals in order to support and boost the resource mobilization while recognizing the time and resources required.
- (v) In creating similar projects of this nature, consider the inclusion of internal risks and challenges, in addition to setting out mid-term outcomes (and indicators) that sit between outputs and longer-term outcomes.

[Appendixes follow]

APPENDIX I: PERSONS INTERVIEWED/CONSULTED

WIPO staff:

Geoffrey Onyeama, Deputy Director General, Development Sector

Johannes Christian Wichard, Deputy Director General, Global Issues Sector

Philippe Favatier, Chief Financial Officer, Department of Finance, Budget and Program Management, Administration and Management Sector

Sherif Saadallah, Executive Director, Department of External Relations, Global Issues Sector

Irfan Baloch, Director, Development Agenda Coordination Division, Development Sector

Kifle Shenkoru, Director, Division for Least-Developed Countries, Development Sector

Joe Bradley, Head, Intergovernmental Organizations and Partnership Section, Department of External Relations, Global Issues Sector

Maya Bachner (Miss), Acting Head, Program Management and Performance Sector, Administration and Management Sector

Georges Ghandour, Senior Program Officer, Development Agenda Coordination Division, Development Sector

External:

Hugo Cameron, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Canada, Geneva, Switzerland*

Ronel Jordaan, Ronel Jordaan Textiles, South Africa

Tarja Koskinen-Olsson, Olsson & Koskinen Consulting, Ystad, Sweden

Henri A. Minnaar, Programme Manager, NEPAD Business Foundation, South Africa

Brian Mitchell, Executive Director, TFO Canada, Ottawa, Canada

Tom Pengelly, Managing Director, Saana Consulting Ltd, London, UK*

Edwin A. Cristancho Pinilla, Coordinator Group of Science, Technology and Innovation, Entrepreneurial Development Direction, National Planning Department, Bogotá, Colombia*

*Feedback received via email.

[Appendix II follows]

APPENDIX II: DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

WIPO (30 March 2009), *Project documents for implementation of recommendations 2, 5, 8, 9 and 10*, Committee on Development and Intellectual Property, CDIP/3/INF/2.

WIPO (23 October 2009), *Progress report on projects for implementation of recommendations 2, 5, 8, 9 and 10*, Committee on Development and Intellectual Property, CDIP/4/2.

WIPO (November 2009), *WIPO conference on building partnerships for mobilizing resources for development, November 5 and 6, 2009: Oral report to CDIP*, Committee on Development and Intellectual Property.

WIPO (1 October 2010), *Progress report on development agenda projects*, Committee on Development and Intellectual Property, CDIP/6/2.

WIPO (15 July 2011), *Program Performance Report for 2010*, Program and Budget Committee, WO/PBC/18/14.

WIPO (29 September 2011), *Program and budget for the 2012/13 biennium*.

[Appendix III follows]

APPENDIX III: FINANCIAL ANALYSIS OF FITS

Income received under Trust Funds (in Swiss francs) in 2008/09 and 2010/11

Fund Code	Description	2008/2009 CHF	2010/2011 CHF	Donor
W_IGC	Trust Fund - Accredited Indigenous and Local Communities	100,000	102,500	Australia, France, Norway, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland and the Christensen Fund
W_USA	Trust Fund - United States of America / Copyright	1,090,500	224,000	United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO)
WBGLD	Trust Fund - Bangladesh	644,234	482,278	European Community (EC)
WBRES	Trust Fund - Brazil	-	359,500	Government of Brazil
WESPA	Trust Fund - Spain	943,533	479,414	Government of Spain
WFIMO	Trust Fund - Finland / Copyright III	67,339	109,439	Finnish Ministry of Education and Culture
WFRIP	Trust Fund - France / Industrial Property	400,819	600,462	Government of France
WITIP	Trust Fund - Italy / Intellectual Property	252,499	-	Government of Italy
WJPAF	Trust Fund - Japan / Africa - LDCs	2,200,000	2,200,000	Government of Japan
WJPCR	Trust Fund - Japan / Copyright	1,171,614	1,054,453	Government of Japan
WJPIP	Trust Fund - Japan / Industrial Property	3,660,600	3,660,600	Government of Japan
WKIPO	Trust Fund - Republic of Korea / Intellectual Property	1,294,046	1,221,815	Korean Intellectual Property Office
WKRCR	Trust Fund - Republic of Korea / Copyright	447,817	512,945	Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism of the Republic of Korea
WKRED	Trust Fund - Republic of Korea / Intellectual Property Education	-	160,873	Korean Intellectual Property Office
WMEXI	Trust Fund - Mexico	-	125,313	Government of Mexico
WPAKI	Trust Fund - Pakistan	-	472,947	European Community (EC) / UNIDO
WPORT	Trust Fund - Portugal	305,551	-	National Institute of Industrial Property of Portugal
WUSEN	Trust Fund - United States of America / Enforcement of Intellectual Property Rights	116,100	195,700	United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO)
WUSSM	Trust Fund - United States of America / Small and Medium-sized Entreprises	545,250	-	United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO)
Sub-total (funds received)		13,239,902	11,962,239	
Funds pledged				
N/A	To be defined	-	2,000,000	Government of Australia
WPAKI	Trust Fund - Pakistan	-	827,053	European Community (EC) / UNIDO
Sub-total (funds received & pledged)		13,239,902	14,789,292	
Funds Advanced stage of discussion				
N/A	TTO project in Arab countries		2,400,000	Multilateral organization
Grand total (funds received, pledged & under discussion)		13,239,902	17,189,292	

Not all FITs were included in this analysis. The criteria for inclusion was funds given by a donor for projects in a third country with a development purpose. FITs excluded were those for Junior Professional Officer Programs and those that benefited their own country (e.g. country X gives funds for projects in country X).

APPENDIX IV: INCEPTION REPORT

Introduction

This document is an inception report for the evaluation of the Development Agenda Project related to WIPO Development Agenda Recommendation 2: Conference on “Mobilizing Resources for Development”. This document will outline the purpose, objectives, strategy, methodology and work plan of the evaluation. The final report will be based on this inception report, pending approval from the client.

Purpose and Objectives

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

The specific objectives of the evaluation are:

- Learning from experiences during project implementation: what worked well and what did not work for the benefit of the 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.
- Provide evidence-based evaluation information to support the CDIP’s decision-making process.

EVALUATION STRATEGY

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

Key Evaluation Questions

The following grid details the methodology to be used. The methodology is organized on the basis of three evaluation themes.

Theme and questions	Proposed indicators	Data collection tools	Sources of information
Project design and management			
1. Appropriateness of the initial project document for implementation and assessment of results	Extent of appropriateness of project document	Document review Interviews	Documentation WIPO Secretariat
2. 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	Extent of adequateness and usefulness of tools	Document review Interviews	Documentation WIPO Secretariat
3. The extent to which other entities within the Secretariat have contributed and enabled an effective and efficient project implementation	Extent of contribution of entities	Document review Interviews	WIPO Secretariat
4. The extent to which the risks identified in the initial project document have materialized or been mitigated	Extent of identified risks materializing or mitigating	Document review Interviews	Documentation WIPO Secretariat
5. The project's ability to respond to emerging trends, technologies and other external forces	Level of ability of the project to respond	Document review Interviews	Documentation WIPO Secretariat Stakeholders
Effectiveness			
1. Achievement of project objectives	Extent to objectives achieved	Document review Interviews	Documentation WIPO Secretariat Stakeholders
2. The increase in resources available to WIPO through Funds-In-Trust (FIT) arrangements	Increase in resources available	Document review Interviews	Documentation WIPO Secretariat Stakeholders
3. The increase in number of donors to WIPO from all sources	Increase in number of donors	Document review Interviews	Documentation WIPO Secretariat Stakeholders
4. The establishment of WIPO Multi-Donor FIT for least developed countries (LDC)	Extent of establishment of FIT for LDC	Document review Interviews	Documentation WIPO Secretariat Stakeholders
Sustainability			
1. Contribution of Conference "Follow-up" steps and results to the future work program and sustainability	Level of contribution of Conference	Document review Interviews	Documentation WIPO Secretariat Stakeholders

Research tools

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

Tool	Description	Information source
<i>Interviews</i>	Some 15 semi-structured interviews	<i>By telephone & in-person:</i> WIPO Secretariat (project team and other entities) Stakeholders: - Member states - National IP offices - Donor agencies - Civil society organizations
<i>Document review</i>	Review of main documentation and financial results	WIPO documentation and financial data

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

WORK PLAN

Based on the scope of the evaluation, a schedule of four weeks is planned. The key tasks and deliverables are listed for each step in addition to where client validation will be required.

Key steps	27 Feb. – 4 March	5 – 11 March	12-18 March	19 – 25 March
Creation of inception report <i>*client validation</i>				
Tool creation & desk review <i>*client validation</i>				
Data collection & analysis				
Delivery of draft report <i>*client validation</i>				
Client comments on report				
Delivery of final report <i>*client validation</i>				

DELIVERABLES

The following key deliverables are foreseen for this evaluation:

- Inception report (this document)
- Draft evaluation report
- Final evaluation report

In addition, the author will present the findings of the evaluation during the Ninth Session of the CDIP, in May 2012.

[End of Appendix IV and of document]