



Internal Oversight Division

Reference: EVAL 2017-03

Evaluation of Program 18: IP and Global Challenges

Final Report

April 19, 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ACRONYMS	4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
1. BACKGROUND	8
2. WHAT IS BEING EVALUATED?	10
(A) EVALUATION PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES.....	10
(B) SCOPE AND METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH.....	10
(C) LIMITATIONS.....	13
3. FINDINGS	14
(A) RELEVANCE	14
(i) Program 18 meets a clear need for IP-related inputs to public policy debates	14
(ii) Work to identify and facilitate IP-related partnerships is broadly relevant.....	15
(iii) Online databases are useful in general terms but not effective in serving the purpose of the Program	16
(iv) Expected results and indicators are not well aligned to Program 18’s work	17
(B) EFFECTIVENESS.....	18
(i) Clear, effective and important contributions made to global public policy debates	18
(ii) Collaboration and matchmaking work has been effective.....	18
(iii) Effectiveness of online databases has been limited	20
(iv) Reactive communication and dissemination approach and less strategic	21
(C) EFFICIENCY.....	22
(i) Financial Resources	23
(ii) Human resources	24
(iii) Program work linkages to IP-related gaps or challenges required more clarity	26
(D) IMPACT	27
(i) Improving the quality and objectivity of IP-related public policy discourse.....	27
(ii) Establishing connections, collaborations, and partnerships	27
(iii) Building capacity for individual researchers	28
(iv) Stakeholders assess progress towards long-term impact as positive.....	28
(v) Demonstrating new operating models.....	28
(E) SUSTAINABILITY	29
(i) Current results are likely to be sustained	29
(ii) Increasing the probability of achieving longer-term results.....	29
4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	30
(A) SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM STRATEGY WITH A FIVE-YEAR STRATEGY FOR WIPO GREEN.....	30
(B) WIPO SHOULD IMPROVE THE DEPLOYMENT AND USAGE OF RESOURCES TO STABILIZE AND EXPAND PROGRAM 18’S STAFF BASE IN KEY SUBJECT AREAS	31
(C) CONSIDER STRENGTHENING THE TRILATERAL COOPERATION MODEL WITH WHO AND WTO	31
(D) STRENGTHEN THE APPROACH TO POST-COLLABORATION SUPPORT AND MONITORING	32
TABLE OF RECOMMENDATIONS	33
ANNEXES	35

LIST OF ACRONYMS

BVGH	BIO Ventures for Global Health
COP	Conference of the Parties
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
IOD	Internal Oversight Division
IP	Intellectual Property
MTSP	Medium Term Strategic Plan
NTD	Neglected tropical disease
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
PPR	Program Performance Report
P&B	Program and Budget
R&D	Research and development
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
TB	Tuberculosis
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
WHO	World Health Organization
WIPO	World Intellectual Property Organization
WTO	World Trade Organization

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. This report presents the results of an evaluation of the World Intellectual Property Organization's (WIPO's) Program 18 – IP and Global Challenges, through which WIPO engages with Intellectual Property (IP)-related global public policy debates, with a particular focus on health, climate change, and – to a lesser extent – food security. The Program's work is mainly based on three activity areas:

(a) **Trilateral Cooperation** between WIPO, the World Health Organization (WHO) and the World Trade Organization (WTO), bringing together these organizations to work on common areas of interest in the domain of health, trade, and IP;

(b) **WIPO Re:Search** which aims to catalyze the development of medical products for neglected tropical diseases (NTDs), malaria and tuberculosis through the facilitation of knowledge sharing and collaborations, particularly between pharmaceutical companies and researchers/institutions that are based in or focused on developing countries; and

(c) **WIPO GREEN** which aims to promote the diffusion of green technologies by facilitating connections between service providers and institutions that are seeking to develop and implement green technology, particularly within developing country contexts.

2. The evaluation aimed to assess the results delivered by Program 18 during the period 2010-2017 and to identify lessons and recommendations for strengthening current and future activity. The evaluation was conducted between October 2017 and January 2018. Evaluation findings and conclusions were derived from data gathered and triangulated both by source and by method with the main data gathering tools being interviews with internal and external stakeholders, online surveys targeted at Program 18 stakeholders, and review of Program 18 related documentation. The assessment was undertaken against the internationally recognised United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) and Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability.

Findings

3. **Relevance:** The Program's overarching rationale – improving the level and depth of WIPO's engagement within global public policy discussions – is still highly relevant. External stakeholders greatly value the Program's past and ongoing contributions to IP-related policy discourse. The approach to facilitating collaborations between IP asset 'providers' and 'users' has been broadly relevant, with WIPO Re:Search's partnership-focused work being particularly relevant to stakeholders¹. While survey results indicated that the databases are useful and relevant for the users, interviewed stakeholders indicated that the databases in their current form are not serving the purpose or in some cases the purpose was not clear enough.

4. The evaluation also found that Program 18's expected results and indicators (as defined within WIPO Program and Budget (P&B) documentation) often have limited relevance to the Program's overarching rationale and higher-level objectives. Crucially, these misaligned results and indicators may have had a negative influence on the program strategy, and on internal perceptions of the program.

¹ Stakeholders, as defined in the DAC/OECD Glossary, are agencies, organizations, groups, or individuals who have a direct or indirect interest in the development intervention or its evaluation. WIPO Re:Search stakeholders include members, providers, users, supporters, fellows, and fellowship hosts. WIPO GREEN stakeholders consists of partners, database users, and matchmaking event participants; for the Trilateral Cooperation, representatives from the WHO and WTO; and Program 18 donors.

5. **Effectiveness:** Program 18 has delivered clear contributions to WIPO strategic goals, with a close correlation between the relevance and effectiveness of its work: those inputs that were most relevant to WIPO's mandate and the needs and priorities of external stakeholders were also the most effective.
6. The Program was most effective when engaging with and supporting IP-related global public policy debates. Partnership, matchmaking and capacity building activities were also relatively effective, especially within WIPO Re:Search.
7. The Program's online databases contribution towards the Program's goals and objectives have been limited: the WIPO GREEN online database, in particular, was found to have only limited value for external stakeholders. Overall Program 18 has developed a very good basis of communications material but more needs to be done in order to disseminate this information to the right audiences and create a sense of inclusiveness among key external stakeholders.
8. **Efficiency:** The analysis of financial and human resources suggests that Program 18 has been efficient. Despite Program 18's challenges in recent years, including a decrease in financial and professional staff resources paralleled with a demand to meet an increased number of performance indicators and new outputs. The Program has continued to deliver significant results on its planned activities making substantial contributions to WIPO strategic goals, particularly through inputs to public policy debates.
9. While the WIPO Medium Term Strategic Plan (MDSP) 2016/21 and the P&B documents provided strategic direction in addressing IP in relation to global policy, the absence of a sufficiently detailed, cross-Program strategy and guiding 'message' for the planning of program activities may also have limited its efficiency. Although allowing WIPO Re:Search and WIPO GREEN to evolve as independent projects has had clear benefits. But, this independence, like in the case of the databases, has sometimes resulted in work that did not have a sufficiently clear link to IP-related gaps or challenges.
10. **Impact:** The evaluation validated several intermediate outcomes attributable to the Program, primarily relating to IP-related policy discourse, research capacity development, and the establishment of new partnerships/collaborations.
11. Given the lengthy Research and development (R&D) timeframes associated with, for example, 'big' results such as medical product development or novel energy technologies and considering that WIPO Re:Search has only been operational for seven years and WIPO GREEN for four years, it is understandable that broader, long-term results have not been delivered yet, as such advances would not be expected at this stage of the Program. At the same time, Program stakeholders did assess the potential for delivering longer-term impacts as being relatively positive.
12. **Sustainability:** Assuming no further decreases or instabilities within the staff team, many of Program 18's current results are likely to be sustained, particularly: its valuable contributions to public policy debates, and work to initiate IP-related partnerships and collaborations. However, it would be beneficial for Program 18 to deepen its collaborations with other WIPO business units to increase the likelihood of contributing to major longer-term sustainable results (particularly for developing countries).
13. Sustainability will be further increased if external stakeholders are better aware of WIPO's full package of support. For this to happen, the broader WIPO institution could also improve the way it communicates the message of where and how its various Programs support Member States throughout the innovation chain.