



Internal Oversight Division

Reference: EVAL 2019-01

Evaluation Report

Evaluation of the Regional Bureau for Africa

July 20, 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ACRONYMS	3
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
1. INTRODUCTION	7
(A) AFRICA CONTEXT	7
(B) CONTEXT OF THE REGIONAL BUREAU	7
(C) EVALUATION PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES.....	8
(D) EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY	9
(E) LIMITATIONS AND MITIGATION MEASURES.....	10
2. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	10
(A) RELEVANCE	10
(i) Alignment, contextualization, and responsiveness.....	11
(B) EFFICIENCY	15
(i) Prioritization	17
(ii) Timeliness of Results	20
(iii) Efficient utilization of resources.....	21
(iv) The efficiency of processes and potential alternatives to enhance the efficient utilization of resources	24
(C) EFFECTIVENESS AND IMPACT	31
(i) Degree of achievement of strategic goals and expected results	32
(ii) Awareness-raising	33
(iii) Capacity Building	33
(iv) National Intellectual Property Strategy (NIPS)	35
(v) Alliances and synergies maximized results.....	36
(vi) Knowledge Management	37
(D) SUSTAINABILITY.....	37
ANNEXES	42

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ARIPO	African Regional Intellectual Property Organization
DAC	Development Assistant Committee
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
FIT	Fund-In-Trust
GII	Global Innovation Index
ICS	Individual Contractor Services
IOD	Internal Oversight Division
IP	Intellectual Property
IPAS	The Industrial Property Automation System
LDCs	Least Developed Countries
NIPS	National Intellectual Property Strategy
OAPI	African Intellectual Property Organization
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
PCT	The Patent Cooperation Treaty
SME	Small and Medium-Sized Enterprise
TISC	Technology and Innovation Support Centers
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
WAO	WIPO-ARIPO- OAPI
WIPO	World Intellectual Property Organization

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. The Regional Bureau for Africa (the Bureau) has the mandate to coordinate, develop, and provide technical assistance to 45 countries in the African region in furtherance of Intellectual Property (IP) policy normative frameworks.
2. The Internal Oversight Division (IOD) included in its 2019 Oversight Plan the evaluation of the Bureau after a comprehensive risk analysis carried out through relevance, impact, oversight coverage, and strategic priorities of the World Intellectual Property Organization's (WIPO) management and the Member States.
3. The purpose of this evaluation is formative and is oriented to learning and program improvement. The intention is to assess the bureau processes, implementation effectiveness, and efficiency to improve the quality of implementation modalities. The evaluation strives to understand what works and what does not within the Bureau and the contributions of the program towards WIPO's advancement of development agenda priorities.
4. The evaluation follows the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Evaluation Standards and WIPO Evaluation Manual Guidelines. The evaluation used mixed methods of data collection analysis. The evaluation team consulted a total of 273 internal and external stakeholders, either via interviews, working sessions, or surveys.
5. In the course of the evaluation, three different surveys were administered to WIPO staff, IP offices and other stakeholders at country level and Permanent Missions. In addition, the evaluation team conducted an extensive desk review and visited six countries representing different sub-regions in Africa (Senegal, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Zambia, Zimbabwe, and Mozambique). The evaluation team triangulated the data and information gathered during the evaluation by source and method. The result of the analysis is summarized in this Executive Summary under each evaluation criteria.
6. **Relevance:** When analyzing the evidence under the relevance criteria, the evaluation found that overall, the Bureau interventions responded to the needs of national counterparts, and the results and activities were coherent with the national priorities and context. The planning process was participatory, based on the knowledge that the Bureau has on the region.
7. The planning process comes from the countries' initiative, and it is considered useful due to the bottom-up and top-down processes. However, the application of a more in-depth needs analysis would further strengthen existing planning practices. Moreover, the criteria for prioritizing activities is not entirely clear to some countries, and the work plan process requires further clarification and organization.
8. **Efficiency:** The Bureau investment priorities between 2014 and 2018 evolved according to the countries' IP maturity levels and their needs. Although collaboration between WIPO and countries in the region works very well, the assistance provided and available resources are undoubtedly insufficient to reduce the innovation divide in regards to knowledge transfer, research, market sophistication, and technical infrastructure. The Bureau has made significant efforts to deliver its results, but the challenges they must overcome in the countries coupled with internal organizational challenges affected the timely delivery of outcomes. Moreover, limited monitoring capacity and tools within the Bureau affect the appropriate use and reporting of performance measures.
9. The evaluation found evidence on challenges with the planning process, for example, when WIPO planned activities in countries that are not ready to absorb the specific type of activities offered or do not have a National Intellectual Property Strategy (NIPS) in place. On other occasions, programs initiate operations in the countries without prior context analysis.

Some Member States reported that at times some WIPO programs planned activities on their own without knowledge of the Bureau. However, before implementation, those activities got canceled without any clarification. Between 2014 and 2019, the Bureau had to cancel and postpone 23 per cent of its planned activities.

10. **Effectiveness:** Evidence collected during the evaluation revealed that there is satisfaction with the delivery of the Bureau. Key partners across countries widely recognize the Bureau's work. It has shown its role in bringing together a multitude of parties around essential issues and achieving results around capacity building, technical assistance, development of IP strategies, and public policy. The analysis shows that the Bureau has developed comparative strengths and substantial value-add in its role, facilitating the development of a broad range of interventions and support to assist the African countries for IP development better. In spite of the good results achieved, there is a room for improvement. In the last four years, the Bureau managed to deliver 363 activities. This represents an 81 per cent of the total of its performance indicators with 77 per cent of the planned activities implemented. This is a significant achievement considering the challenges within the organization, in the region, and the limited resources available.

11. The Bureau made significant progress in sustainability and more specifically raising awareness with key stakeholders, building capacities, influencing public policy and institutions including the forging of strong alliances with regional IP offices and institutions. These efforts are considered crucial for the likelihood of continuation of effects of the Bureau's interventions through time. In spite of the progress, some important threats to sustainability exist and require the attention of the Bureau to tackle them in a systematic manner.

Recommendations

1. The Bureau should further strengthen the existing planning process by:
 - (a) Implementing a more rigorous design and a clear, detailed theory of change that describes accurately the causality chain that will achieve the expected results;
 - (b) Moving towards the implementation of projects including collaboration with additional key stakeholders in the IP ecosystem, such as, inventors, innovation labs, Small and Medium-Sized Enterprise (SMEs), and researchers;
 - (c) Providing more hands-on training on IP utilization. Projects should be aimed at demonstrating the value of IP through the IP value chain, including technology transfer; and
 - (d) Preparing more detailed action plans with the Permanent Missions, national-level vital stakeholders, and WIPO relevant sectors.

(Priority: Medium)
2. The Bureau, in collaboration with the Human Resources Department, should assess human resources needs within the Bureau and assist the Bureau in decreasing current levels of staff absences.

(Priority: High)
3. The Bureau, with the support of the Procurement Department, should identify the critical issues for late TA and solutions to reduce the delays.

(Priority: Medium)
4. The Bureau, in collaboration with the relevant WIPO divisions, should identify alternatives for increasing the investment for the region based on challenges found at the regional level and the number of countries being served to develop projects with greater scope

(Priority: Medium)

5. The Bureau should commit a sufficient percentage¹ of its resources to monitoring activities, including capacity building of staff to automate monitoring practices.

(Priority: Medium)

6. The Bureau should develop a knowledge management strategy that includes:
 - (a) Key actors, supply, and demand of knowledge in the region, a bank of good practices, and a network of experts available to countries;
 - (b) A system to exchange information among internal and external stakeholders; and
 - (c) Disseminate information after the implementation of capacity building activities.

(Priority: Medium)

7. The Bureau, in collaboration with the national and regional IP offices, should explore the development of sustainability strategies at the national and regional levels as part of their project management processes. The strategies should include options for mobilizing both financial and staffing resources, partnership strategies with the definition of institutional roles, and establishing exit strategies after each biennium

(Priority: Medium)

¹ As recommended in OECD DAC Handbook on Security System Reform © OECD 2011, Page 33