E

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP)

Twelfth Session
Geneva, November 18 to 21, 2013

EVALUATION REPORT OF THE PROJECT ON ENHANCEMENT OF WIPO'S
RESULTS-BASED MANAGEMENT (RBM) FRAMEWORK TO SUPPORT THE
MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

prepared by Mr. Glenn O'Neil, Founder, Owl RE, Evaluation Consultancy, Geneva

1.   The Annex to this document contains an external independent "Evaluation Report of the Project on Enhancement of WIPO's Results-Based Management (RBM) Framework to Support the Monitoring and Evaluation of Development Activities" undertaken by Glenn O'Neil, Founder, Owl RE, Evaluation Consultancy, 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

CDIP	Committee on Development and Intellectual Property
DA	Development Agenda
DACD	Development Agenda Coordination Division
DS	Development Sector
ERP	Enterprise Resource Platform
IAOD	Internal Audit and Oversight Division
PMPS	Program Management and Performance Section
PPR	Program Performance Report
RBM	Results-Based Management
SRP	Strategic Realignment Program
WIPO	World Intellectual Property Organization

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.   This report is an independent evaluation of the Development Agenda (DA) Project related to WIPO Development Agenda Recommendations 33, 38 and 41: Enhancement of WIPO's Results-Based Management (RBM) Framework to Support the Monitoring and Evaluation of Development Activities (DA_33_38_41_01). The project was approved during the 4ᵗʰ session of the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP) in November 2009. The project implementation started in January 2010 and was completed in April 2013. The project contained two inter-related components: the improving and strengthening of the RBM framework with a development focus and an external review of WIPO's technical assistance activities in the area of cooperation for development.

2.   The aim of the evaluation was to assess the project's performance including project design, project management, coordination, coherence, implementation and results achieved. The evaluation also aimed to provide evidence-based evaluation information to support the CDIP's decision-making process. The evaluation utilized a combination of methods including a document review and interviews with 11 staff at the WIPO Secretariat.

KEY FINDINGS

A.   Project design and management

3.   *Findings 1-2:* The project document was assessed as being sufficient for the launching of the two components of the project. This initial document described the objectives and implementation steps. However, the evaluation noted some challenges in interaction with other projects and description of all activities to be carried out, such as the extent and nature of these activities and how they complemented other planned actions. The reporting tools were adequate and useful in providing information on the general progress of the project.

4.   *Finding 3:* For both components, collaboration was assessed as being sufficient to enable an effective and efficient project implementation.

5.   *Findings 4-5:* Most of the risks described in the project documentation were taken into consideration in the project implementation and their potential impact minimalized. Emerging trends, technologies and other external forces were taken into consideration where appropriate.

B.   Effectiveness

6.   Finding 6-7: The RBM framework is essentially the main planning and monitoring system of WIPO. Since the project's launch in 2010, this evaluation found that WIPO's RBM framework has been strengthened significantly, as follows: Expected results have been consolidated directly under the nine Strategic Goals and consolidated from 140 in 2010/11 to 60 in 2012/13; Improvements have been made to the performance indicators, baselines and targets including for development activities; an increased level of ownership of WIPO staff has been seen; and the budget presentation has been adapted from program-focused to results-based.

7.   Finding 8-9: Improvements to the development focus of the RBM framework can be summarized as follows: The move to mainstreaming development in WIPO's activities; establishment of links between DA projects and expected results; the inclusion in the RBM framework of the development share of the budget for each expected result and the relationship between activities and DA projects explained in the Program and Budget. This project complemented an initiative of WIPO's Strategic Realignment Program (SRP) to strengthen the

RBM approach. Consequently, the above successes could be considered as shared between this project and the SRP initiative.

8.   *Finding 10:* This project set out to contribute to improve Program Performance Reports (PPR) and their development focus. The PPR was improved notably by refining the section per program on the implementation of the DA and the changes made to indicators, baselines and targets. Another aim of the project was to create frameworks at country-level to monitor WIPO's contribution to IP development linked to the collection of performance data as part of the PPR. Progress was made in defining the methodology of the country-level framework and integrating this within the WIPO country plan model. However, no pilots were carried out as the country plans are yet to be implemented completely.

9.   *Finding 11:* In addition to the progress of the project described, several challenges to the RBM component were found, notably: The monitoring and evaluation culture is still under development within WIPO; the move towards outcome measurement meant that WIPO programs had to monitor indicators that often relied on collaboration from their beneficiaries or other external stakeholders ; the RBM framework has been used more as a reporting tool rather than a management tool although this is changing positively; and the training workshops carried out in 2010 were appreciated by WIPO staff and there was now a need for further training and coaching of staff, particularly those assuming new responsibilities.

10.   *Finding 12-14:* An initiative stemming from this project was the systematic evaluation of all DA projects. By the end of 2012, independent evaluation reports for twelve completed DA projects were presented for consideration to the CDIP. A procedure for the carrying out of these evaluations was established. These evaluations have ensured that an external assessment has been provided on the effectiveness of the DA projects. These evaluations have led to an examination of the projects' progress towards their objectives at the CDIP sessions. Consequently, such discussions have allowed Member States to take decisions on the DA projects, such as their continuation, completion, mainstreaming within existing WIPO activities or incited requests for further information or assessment. The independent evaluations go through a quality assurance process but there is no publically available tracking of the follow up of the evaluations. Given that 14 evaluations will have been completed by end of 2013, it may be useful to carry out a meta-evaluation of these evaluations with the aim of learning more from this extensive body of evaluation for future reference.

11.   *Finding 15-17:* The Review component of the project comprised an external review of WIPO's technical Assistance in the area of Cooperation for Development. A procedure for carrying out the External Review was established. The External Review was delivered to the 8th session of the CDIP in November 2011. An ad-hoc working group composed of Member States to consider the report was established. The WIPO Management Response to the Executive Review was presented at the 9th session and discussions on the report continued at the 10th and 11th sessions of the CDIP. This evaluation found that the process of conducting the External Review was appropriate, given that the process was transparent and led to the contracting of two recognised external experts on IP and development that produced a comprehensive report for the CDIP's consideration. It is outside the scope of this evaluation to consider the findings and recommendations of the External Review. However, it was noted that there was a considerable debate around the estimated 89 principal recommendations and 396 measures in terms of their priority, redundancy and relevance.

12.   *Finding 18-20:* The project combined modifying existing monitoring and evaluation activities and introducing and/or supporting new monitoring and evaluation initiatives. In their totality, this evaluation found that these modifications and initiatives have improved and strengthened WIPO's capacity for monitoring and evaluation but also due to other initiatives, notably the SRP and the reinforcement of the Internal Audit and Oversight Division (IAOD). As a consequence, this produced a better quality of information. Member States are best placed to

judge to what extent this better quality of information has led to improvements in their coordination and decision-making.

C.   Sustainability

13.   *Finding 21:* The likelihood of sustaining results for the RBM component is high. Indeed, the improvements made to the RBM framework have been integrated within the process for future budget and program cycles, provided that the Program Management and Performance Section (PMPS) continues the necessary support for the relevant WIPO program managers and staff. The fact that the External Review has been taken into consideration seriously by the CDIP is an indication of its utility.

D.   Implementation of Development Agenda (DA) Recommendations

14.   *Finding 22:* This evaluation has found that the project has responded to the desired outcomes of DA recommendations 33, 38 and 41.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

15.   *Conclusion 1 (Ref: Findings 1-2).* The project was structured clearly in two distinct but related components. However, clarity was lacking on the links to other monitoring and evaluation tools or activities mentioned in the project documentation.

16.   *Conclusion 2 (Ref: Findings 6-11).* With the RBM component, the evaluation found that significant progress had been made to strengthen the RBM framework and its development focus through this project. This evaluation sees the main challenges ahead in the ability of an increasing number of WIPO programs to further sharpen their indicators and utilize them for monitoring in addition to reporting. With the move towards outcome measurement, programs will increasingly rely on external stakeholders, including national IP offices, to support them in the collection of monitoring data. Ideally, this would be part of data collection of national RBM frameworks linked to national IP strategies.

17.   *Conclusion 3 (Ref: Finding 10).* The project was not able to complete all aspects of the country level development assessment frameworks, given their reliance on the implementation of country plans. However, it only makes sense to advance this aspect as part of the country plans and not separately.

18.   *Conclusion 4 (Ref: Findings 12-14).* The carrying out of independent evaluations of the DA projects has contributed to WIPO's capacity to assess the impact of its development-orientated activities. The longer term impact of development activities would be further understood by considering how the evaluations' recommendations are followed up and implemented (or not).

19.   *Conclusion 5 (Ref: Findings 15-17).* The completion of the External Review was a key part of this project and a direct response to DA 41. The success of this component will also depend upon the ability of Member States and WIPO to find consensus on the report's considerable number of recommendations and measures. In retrospect, it may have been appropriate to provide the external experts with guidance on structure and categorization of recommendations to facilitate such a process.

20.   *Conclusion 6 (Ref: Finding 21).* The sustainability of the RBM component is dependent upon the continued support services provided by PMPS and is reliant on the necessary budget and resources being available to mainstream this component within the regular activities of this

section. The continued success of the RBM component is also dependent upon the support of the top management at WIPO and Member States.

21.   *Conclusion 7 (Ref: Finding 21).* With the main activity for the Review component being the consideration of its recommendations and consequent follow up, sustainability for this initiative is largely dependent upon Member States (as described above). It will only be possible to determine to what extent the Review has impacted on more effective and efficient technical assistance in cooperation for development in the longer term.

22.   *Recommendation 1 (Ref: Conclusion 1, Findings 1-2).* For future projects of this nature containing related but not core activities, it is recommended to provide further descriptions of planned activities and links to other initiatives in the project documentation.

23.   *Recommendation 2 (Ref: Conclusion 2, Findings 6-11).* It is recommended to encourage PMPS to continue its efforts to strengthen the RBM framework and its development focus and to carry out a new series of RBM workshops; and for national IP offices and other stakeholders to partner with WIPO in the collection of necessary monitoring data within the context of the country plans linked to national IP plans.

24.   *Recommendation 3 (Ref: Conclusion 3, Finding 10).* It is recommended that the implementation of the WIPO country plans incorporating the country level development assessment frameworks is accelerated by the Development Sector (DS) and that the PMPS provides the necessary guidance as needed.

25.   *Recommendation 4 (Conclusion 4, Findings 12-14).* It is recommended that a meta-evaluation be undertaken by the Development Agenda Coordination Division (DACD) on the DA project evaluations that have been undertaken to date (on the methodologies and methods used, validity of results, clarity of recommendations, etc.); also a transparent tracking of the consequences and implementation of these evaluations findings and recommendations be created by DACD.

26.   *Recommendation 5 (Ref: Conclusion 6-7, Finding 21).* It is recommended that this project be considered as completed without the necessity of a phase II, on the basis that a) for the RBM component, ongoing activities will be integrated within the services of the PMPS and the necessary resources will be provided, and b) for the Review component, the follow-up and implementation of the External Review's findings and recommendations is the responsibility of the CDIP with the support of the DACD.

INTRODUCTION

27.   This report is an independent evaluation of the Development Agenda (DA) Project related to WIPO Development Agenda Recommendations 33, 38 and 41: Enhancement of WIPO's Results-Based Management (RBM) Framework to Support the Monitoring and Evaluation of Development Activities (DA_33_38_41_01). The project was approved during the 4th session of the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP) in November 2009. The project implementation started in January 2010 and was completed in April 2013.

28.   The main purpose of the project was to improve and strengthen WIPO's capacity for self-evaluation, to support independent evaluation and to provide better quality management information to Member States to support their coordination and decision making, in particular, as it relates to the development impact of its activities and the implementation of the DA.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

29.   The project document set out three specific objectives for this project:

(a)   Adapt and strengthen WIPO's existing RBM framework to ensure that there is a strong focus across all relevant Programs on the impact of the Organization's activities on development, including technical assistance, and provide additional management tools to support the specific needs as they relate to the 45 Recommendations, and the reporting needs of the CDIP (DA Recommendations 33 and 41);

(b)   To contribute to a monitoring and evaluation culture, in particular as this relates to the development impact of all relevant Programs, within the Organization, and the systematic collection and use of performance information to ensure accountability, and support informed decision making by the Organization and its stakeholders. (DA Recommendation 33); and

(c)   Increase the capacity and ability for independent and objective evaluations of the development impact of WIPO's activities (DA Recommendation 38).

30.   These three objectives were supported by two inter-dependent components:

(a)   RBM component: The first component was the design, development and establishment of a coherent RBM framework, to support the monitoring and evaluation of the impact of the Organization's activities on development, as well as the implementation of the DA Recommendations, and the strengthening of capacity for objective development impact assessments of the Organization's activities.

(b)   Review component: The second component was the External Review of WIPO's technical assistance activities in the area of cooperation for development.

31. *Delivery strategy:* The project document described the following steps of the delivery strategy:

(a)   The RBM component consisted of the following key steps: Determining how to strengthen the existing RBM framework; redeveloping the framework, including consultation with Member States, staff and external experts; and capacity building involving training and awareness raising amongst staff.

(b)   The Review component consisted of the following key steps: Preparation of Terms of Reference for the Review; contracting of external experts to carry out the Review; the

carrying out of the Review; and the presentation of the Review and its recommendations to Member States.

32.   *Achievements:* The main achievements of the project can be summarized as follows:

(a)   The implementation of a revised RBM framework across all WIPO's programs with an appropriate development focus.

(b)   The completion of the Review of WIPO's technical assistance and its presentation to Member States for consideration.

OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION CRITERIA AND METHODOLOGY

33.   The aim of the evaluation was to assess the project's performance in terms of project design, project management, coordination, coherence, implementation and results achieved. The evaluation also aimed to provide evidence-based evaluation information to support the CDIP's decision-making process.

34.   The evaluation was organized around ten evaluation questions split into four themes: Project design and management, Effectiveness, Sustainability and Implementation of DA Recommendations. These questions are responded to directly in the section "Key findings" below.

35.   A combination of methods has been utilized for the evaluation. In addition to a review of all relevant documentation, interviews were conducted with 11 staff at the WIPO Secretariat in Geneva. A list of the persons interviewed is enclosed in Appendix I. A list of the documents consulted is enclosed in Appendix II. The inception report which guided this evaluation is enclosed in Appendix III.

KEY FINDINGS

36.   This section is outlined on the basis of the four evaluation areas. Each evaluation question is answered directly under the headings of each area.

A.   Project design and management

Appropriateness of the initial project document for the implementation and assessment of results.

37. *Finding 1:* The initial project document was assessed as being sufficient for the launching of the two components of the project. This initial document described the objectives and implementation steps. However, the evaluation points out the following challenges:

(a)   *Interaction with other projects:* The RBM component focused on strengthening and improving the RBM framework with an appropriate development focus. In parallel, an initiative was underway as part of WIPO's 2010-2015 Strategic Realignment Program (SRP) to strengthen the RBM approach, which is referred to in the project documentation. This had the advantage of enabling to multiply the impact on the RBM framework, but it was difficult to separate what was done as part of the project under evaluation and the SRP initiative.

(b)   *Description of project activities*: The project documentation described accurately the main activities anticipated for both components, namely the strengthening of the RBM framework and the carrying out of an External Review. However, within the project documentation, several other monitoring and evaluation tools were mentioned as part of the project indicators, such as the DA project evaluations, the Program Performance Reports (PPRs) and the country level development assessment frameworks. Insufficient guidance was provided as to the activities that would be carried out in regard to these tools and links to parallel initiatives, such as the extent and nature of the activities and how they complemented other planned activities on the same tools.

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.

38.   *Finding 2:* The reporting tools were adequate and useful in providing information on the general progress of the project for the project team and key stakeholders, as seen in the updates given to the CDIP through the Progress Reports in 2010, 2011 and 2012. Specifically, the evaluation observed:

(a)   Both components had defined steps within the project document that were followed by the Program Management and Performance Section (PMPS). This in turn facilitated the ability of interested stakeholders to follow progress with the project.

(b)   As mentioned above, the project included the implementation or improvement of various monitoring and evaluation tools that were linked but not necessarily driven by this project. In this regard, progress on these tools was reported, although it was challenging to determine the precise contribution of this project to the assessed progress.

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

39.   *Finding 3:* For both components, collaboration with other entities within the Secretariat was essential to the successful implementation of the project. Collaboration with the Development Sector (DS)*,* the Development Agenda Coordination Division (DACD) and the Internal Audit and Oversight Division (IAOD) was particularly essential to the project's success. Their collaboration was assessed as positive and facilitated a successful project completion. Both components were also reliant on a broader collaboration from all Sectors within the Secretariat; for the participation in interviews as part of the Review component and for participation in training workshops for the RBM component and consequent follow-up work. Based on the monitoring data and feedback from the PMPS, the collaboration within the Secretariat was found to be very satisfactory for both components.

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

40.   *Finding 4:* Most of the risks that were envisaged during the implementation of the project did not occur or were minimized. The project document identified seven risks with the project:

(a)   The rapid introduction of a too sophisticated monitoring and evaluation system without sufficient training and resources, or the embedding of an evaluation culture would risk generating too much resistance and the system would quickly become obsolete and seen as adding no value to managers or to Member States (RBM component): The project was aware of this risk and sought gradual changes to the RBM framework,

although challenges were seen in some managers' view of the framework as a reporting obligation rather than a management tool as detailed below.

(b)   All stakeholders, in particular at country level, for the country level assessment frameworks, must be closely involved in the design and development phases to ensure shared ownership (RBM component): This risk did not occur as the country level frameworks did not advance as anticipated.

(c)   Close coordination, in particular with the CDS and the DACD is critical to ensuring that complimentary initiatives support one another (RBM component): As mentioned above, collaboration with these entities was positive. Complimentarity was found with other initiatives although in some aspects, as described in Finding 1 the links between this project and other initiatives were not always explicit.

(d)   The framework must be designed to address the needs for greater accountability, coordination and improved capacity for decision making as expressed by Member States (RBM component): This risk was taken into account in the modifications to the RBM framework, although only Member States are in a position to judge whether the framework has improved their capacity for decision making.

(e)   In order to ensure that the review directly addresses the issues of greatest interest to Member States, they will be consulted on drafts prepared by the Project Managers. There is a risk that this process might lead to the Terms of Reference (TORs) becoming too broad and difficult to manage. This may result in a poorer quality review report (Review component): The TORs for the External Review were as precise as possible considering the broad nature of the Review, i.e. a macro level assessment of WIPO's technical assistance for development. The Review report did not suffer from any quality issues (according to WIPO's Management Response).

(f)   The external experts need to be credible and independent and have the required skills to meet the TORs of this component of the project (Review component): The project considered this risk in the final selection of the external experts, selecting two experts knowledgeable in IP and development and sufficiently independent from WIPO.

(g)   The cooperation of Program Managers will be essential. The openness of their cooperation will rely upon all actors, including Member States, to view the exercise as a constructive learning opportunity, rather than an exercise in accountability (Review component): As far as this evaluation is aware, this risk did not occur, given the positive collaboration of both WIPO Program Managers and Member States in their participation in the External Review.

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

41.   *Finding 5:* In implementing the RBM component, the project had to be aware of best practices in this field and how other organisations have implemented similar RBM systems and tools. The project was supported in this regard through the use of external RBM experts. The RBM component was also reliant on a technological component, the enterprise resource platform (ERP) to provide an automated system for entering monitoring data. This has been set-up for the workplan component and is planned to be extended to the overall framework. In implementing the Review component, the progress towards completing the Review was largely dependent upon stakeholders, such as Member States and Civil Society Organisations, in responding to interviews requests and a survey (for Member States). Although some delays were experienced, these were not considered insurmountable for the project.

B.   Effectiveness

The effectiveness of the project in adapting and strengthening WIPO's existing RBM framework and in providing management tools to support the specific needs as they relate to the 45 DA Recommendations, and the reporting needs of the CDIP.

42.   *Finding 6:* The project's RBM component focused on adapting and strengthening the existing RBM framework with an appropriate development focus. This framework is essentially the main planning and monitoring system of WIPO that includes a Results Frameworks at global level and one for the 29 programs of WIPO, as featured in the biennial Program and Budget, linked to the Medium-Term Strategic Plan, annual workplans and PPR for reporting performance to Member States and other stakeholders.

43.   *Finding 7:* Since the project's launch in early 2010, this evaluation found that WIPO's RBM framework has been strengthened significantly. This finding is supported by the project's own reporting to the CDIP (Progress Reports), the 10 WIPO managers interviewed, the Validation Report on the PPR (2010-11) of the IAOD and the findings of the 2011 External Review of WIPO Technical Assistance (the Review component of this project). The strengthening of the RBM system can be summarized as follows:

(a)   Expected results that were previously linked to individual programs with some duplication have been consolidated directly under the nine Strategic Goals in the 2012/13 Program and Budget;

(b)   The streamlining of the number of global expected results was consolidated from 140 in 2010/11 to 60 in 2012/13, a reduction of 57% making performance tracking less cumbersome for both the WIPO secretariat and Member States;

(c)   Improvements have been made to the different elements of the RBM framework in 2012/13, notably, the performance indicators, baselines and targets, including for development activities, which in turn make measurement more feasible;

(d)   An increased level of ownership of WIPO staff of the RBM framework has been seen, as illustrated by the increase in sense of ownership of WIPO staff from 34% to 69% - 2008/9 to 2010/11 (selection of staff interviewed as part of the IAOD Validation Report);

(e)   The budget presentation has been adapted from program-focused to results-based in 2012/13 (i.e. budget allocation by expected results rather than activities).

44.   *Finding 8:* In addition to strengthening the RBM framework in general, a key aim of the RBM component was to improve its Development focus. In addition to the general progress described in the previous paragraph, the following improvements to the development focus of the RBM framework can be summarized as follows:

(a)   The move to mainstreaming Development in WIPO's activities as illustrated in the 2012/13 framework where Development is represented as both its own Strategic Goal and integrated within the other nine Goals;

(b)   The establishment of links between DA projects and Expected results in the 2012/13 Program and Budget.

(c)   The inclusion in the 2012/13 RBM framework of the Development share of the budget for each Expected result based on a formula that was assessed as being appropriate by the 2011 External Review;

(d)   A greater effort to link WIPO's activities to the implementation of the DA, as seen in the program descriptions in the 2012/13 Program and Budget where the relationship between activities and DA projects and recommendations are explained, compared to the previous biennium where recommendations were listed per program without any explanation.

45.   *Finding 9:* As noted above, this project complemented an initiative of WIPO's SRP to strengthen the RBM approach. Consequently, the above successes could be considered as shared between this project and the SRP initiative.

46.   *Finding 10:* In addition to the RBM framework, the project included the modification or creation of additional management tools. The main tools covered were as follows (the evaluation of DA projects is discussed under Findings 12-14 and the External Review is discussed under Findings 15-17):

(a)   PPR: This project set out to contribute to an improved PPR and its Development focus. The 2010/11 IAOD Validation Report of the PPR found that the quality of the PPR had improved from 2010 onwards given the above-mentioned changes to the RBM framework and its further integration of development aspects, notably by improving the section per program on the implementation of the DA and the changes made to indicators, baselines and targets.

(b)   Country-level development assessment frameworks: An aim of the project was to create frameworks at the country-level to monitor WIPO's contribution to IP development with a project indicator set for six pilot countries. Progress was made by PMPS in defining the methodology of the country-level framework and integrating this within the WIPO country plan model. However, no pilots were carried out as the country plans are yet to be implemented completely. As part of awareness-raising activities on RBM, PMPS carried out three regional workshops for national IP offices (two in Asia and one in West Africa) with representatives from some 32 countries. An additional 18 countries are planned to be reached in 2013 with a workshop for East Africa. Although not replacing a country-level framework and plan, the workshops supported national IP offices in their own implementation of RBM systems.

47.   *Finding 11:* In addition to the progress in the project described in the previous paragraphs, several challenges to the project's effectiveness were found by this evaluation, notably:

(a)   The monitoring and evaluation culture is still under development within WIPO and staff sometimes struggle to see the relevance of management tools such as the RBM framework, PPR and DA project evaluations.

(b)   The strengthening of the RBM framework resulted in a marked shift from measuring "outputs" to measuring "outcomes", which is recommended as best practice in RBM (see the UN Joint Inspection Unit study on RBM (2004)). However, the move towards outcome measurement meant that WIPO programs had to monitor indicators that often relied on collaboration from their beneficiaries (e.g. surveying of training participants) or other external stakeholders. In addition, in describing outcome level indicators, the other possible influences on achieving progress were not uniformly stated or considered alongside indicators.

(c)   The RBM framework has been used by WIPO staff more of as a reporting tool rather than as a management tool for activities although this is changing positively: The perception that information reported is used for decision-making purposes increased

from 21% to 55% in 2008/9 to 2010/11 (selection of staff interviewed as part of the IAOD Validation Report).

(d)   Part of the activities carried out for the RBM component included training workshops by PMPS for WIPO staff: 10 workshops were organized for a total of 110 participants in 2010. These workshops were appreciated by WIPO staff (according to PMPS reporting and the small sample of participants interviewed for this evaluation). However, given that nearly three years have passed since these workshops, there was a need for further training and coaching of staff, particularly for those assuming new responsibilities.

The effectiveness of the project in increasing the capacity and ability for independent and objective evaluations of the Development impact of WIPO's activities.

48.   *Finding 12:* An initiative stemming from this project was the systematic evaluation of all DA projects (although it was not budgeted from this project). To date, the Member States have approved 27 projects implementing 31 DA Recommendations. By the end of 2012, independent evaluation reports for twelve completed DA projects were presented for consideration to the CDIP. In addition, two more evaluation reports will be presented at the 12th session of the CDIP in November 2013. The DACD with the support of PMPS and IAOD established a procedure for the carrying out of these evaluations which included the drafting of a Terms of Reference, consulting with internal stakeholders, selecting and contracting of external evaluation consultants, carrying out the evaluation and presenting findings to the CDIP.

49.   *Finding 13:* The carrying out of these evaluations has ensured that an external assessment has been provided on the effectiveness of the DA projects. These evaluations have led to an examination of the projects' progress towards their objectives through the reports' presentation and discussion amongst Member States at the CDIP sessions. Consequently, such discussions have allowed Member States to take decisions on the DA projects, such as their continuation, completion, mainstreaming within existing WIPO activities or incited requests for further information or assessment. The official reports of the CDIP sessions during which these evaluations were discussed (the 9th session, document 9/17 and the 10th session, document 10/18) attest to this.

50.   *Finding 14:* The independent evaluations go through a quality assurance process led by DACD with the support of the relevant WIPO services. Given that 14 evaluations will have been completed by end of 2013, it may be useful to carry out a meta-evaluation of these evaluations with the aim of learning more from this extensive body of evaluation for future reference. In addition, there is no publically available tracking on the follow up of the evaluations, in terms of recommendations to be considered, projects to be extended, those completed, etc. The Director General's Annual Report on implementation of the DA provides some information on the follow up of the recommendations of the DA projects, but it is incomplete.

51.   *Finding 15:* The Review component of the project is composed of an external review of WIPO's technical Assistance in the Area of Cooperation for Development ("External Review"). PMPS and DACD established a procedure for carrying out the External Review, which included the drafting of a Terms or Reference, consulting with Member States, contracting of external experts, carrying out of the External Review and presentation of findings to the CDIP. The External Review was conducted by Dr. Carolyn Deere Birkbeck and Dr. Santiago Roca with their report delivered to the 8th session of the CDIP in November 2011. An ad-hoc working group composed of Member States to consider the report was established at the 8th session. The WIPO Management Response to the Executive Review was presented at the 9th session of the CDIP in May 2012. Discussion on the report continued in the 10th and 11th sessions of the CDIP.

52.   *Finding 16:* This evaluation found that the process of conducting the External Review was appropriate, given that the process was transparent and led to the contracting of two recognised external experts on IP and development who produced a comprehensive report for CDIP's consideration. This was confirmed by WIPO's Management Response which stated "the report is very thorough and contains detailed analysis and many recommendations (p. 5)".

53.   *Finding 17:* It is outside of the scope of this evaluation to consider the findings and recommendations of the External Review. However, an examination of the Management Response, the reports of the relevant CDIP sessions and the report of the ad-hoc working group indicates that there was considerable debate around the estimated 89 principal recommendations and 396 measures (estimates from WIPO) in terms of their priority, redundancy and relevance.

The usefulness of the project in improving and strengthening WIPO's capacity for monitoring and evaluation and in providing better quality management information to Member States to support their coordination and decision making.

54.   *Finding 18:* The project combined modifying existing monitoring and evaluation activities (i.e. RBM framework, WIPO's Program and Budget, PPR) and introducing and/or supporting new monitoring and evaluation initiatives (i.e. evaluations of DA projects, the External Review and country-level assessment framework).   In their totality, this evaluation found that these modifications and initiatives have improved and strengthened WIPO's capacity for monitoring and evaluation, as described above in detail.

55.   *Finding 19:* On the basis of improved and strengthened monitoring and evaluation, this evaluation found that the quality of monitoring and performance data has improved incrementally from 2010 with this project's implementation. The improvements seen are not only due to this project but also to other initiatives, notably the SRP and the reinforcement of IAOD in WIPO in terms of staff and budget in the past three years.

56.   *Finding 20:* With an increase in the quality of monitoring and evaluation data, this has provided a better quality of management information. Member States are best placed to judge to what extent this better quality of information has led to improvements in their coordination and decision-making.

C.   Sustainability

The likelihood for sustaining results achieved to date and further developing WIPO's RBM framework including for development related activities.

57.   *Finding 21:* The likelihood for sustaining results for the RBM component is high given that the improvements made to the RBM framework have been integrated within the process for future budget and program cycles, provided that PMPS continue the necessary support for the relevant WIPO program managers and staff. The fact that the External Review has been taken into consideration seriously by the CDIP is an indication of its utility.

D.   Implementation of Development Agenda (DA) Recommendations

The extent to which the DA Recommendations 33, 38 and 41 have been implemented through this project.

58.   *Finding 22:* This evaluation has found that the project has responded to these recommendations as following:

(a)   *DA Recommendation 33:* This recommendation requested WIPO to develop an effective yearly review and evaluation mechanism for all development-orientated activities. As detailed in this report, it was found that the project has responded well to this recommendation through the strengthening of the RBM framework and the mainstreaming of development within it.

(b)   *DA Recommendation 38:* This recommendation focused on strengthening WIPO's capacity to perform objective assessments of its impact on development. This recommendation has been implemented mainly through the systematic evaluation of all DA projects and the mainstreaming of development assessment within the RBM framework and the broader Program and Budget. This evaluation found that both these activities have contributed significantly to the implementation of this recommendation.

(c)   DA Recommendation 41: This recommendation requested WIPO to conduct a review of current WIPO technical assistance activities in the areas of cooperation for development. This was directly responded to by the Review component of the project and successfully completed.

CONCLUSIONS

A.   Project design and management

59.   *Conclusion 1 (Ref: Findings 1-2).* The project was structured clearly in two distinct but related components. However, clarity was lacking on the links to other monitoring and evaluation tools mentioned in the project documentation.

B.   Project Effectiveness

60.   *Conclusion 2 (Ref: Findings 6-11).* With the RBM component, the evaluation found that significant progress had been made to strengthening the RBM framework and its development focus through this project. This evaluation assesses the main challenges ahead in the ability of WIPO programs to further sharpen their indicators and utilize them for monitoring in addition to reporting. With the move towards outcome measurement, programs will increasingly rely on external stakeholders, including national IP offices to support them in the collection of monitoring data. Ideally, this would be part of data collection of national RBM frameworks linked to national IP strategies.

61.   *Conclusion 3 (Ref: Finding 10).* The project was not able to complete all aspects on the country level development assessment frameworks given their reliance on the implementation of country plans. However, it only makes sense to advance this aspect as part of the country plans and not separately..

62.   *Conclusion 4 (Ref: Findings 12-14).* The carrying out of independent evaluations of the DA projects has contributed to WIPO's capacity to assess the impact of its development-orientated activities. The longer term impact of development activities would be further understood by considering how the evaluations' recommendations are followed up and implemented (or not).

63.   *Conclusion 5 (Ref: Findings 15-17).* The completion of the External Review was a key part of this project and a direct response to DA 41. The success of this component will also depend upon the ability of Member States and WIPO to find consensus on the report's substantial number of recommendations and measures. In retrospect, it may have been appropriate to provide the external experts with guidance on structure and categorization of recommendations to facilitate such a process.

C.   Sustainability

64.   Conclusion 6 (Ref: Finding 21). The sustainability of the RBM component is dependent upon the continued support services provided by PMPS and is reliant on the necessary budget and resources being available to mainstream this component within the regular activities of this section. The continued success of the RBM component is also dependent upon the support of the top management at WIPO and Member States.

65.   *Conclusion 7 (Ref: Finding 21).* With the main activity for the Review component being the consideration of its recommendations and consequent follow up, sustainability for this initiative is largely dependent upon Member States (as described above). It will only be possible to determine to what extent the Review has impacted on more effective and efficient technical assistance of cooperation for development in the longer term.

RECOMMENDATIONS

66.   *Recommendation 1 (Ref: Conclusion 1, Findings 1-2).* For future projects of this nature containing related but not core activities, it is recommended to provide further descriptions of planned activities and links to other initiatives in the project documentation.

67.   *Recommendation 2 (Ref: Conclusion 2, Findings 6-11).* It is recommended to encourage PMPS to continue its efforts to strengthen the RBM framework and its development focus and to carry out a new series of RBM workshops; and for national IP offices and other stakeholders to partner with WIPO in the collection of necessary monitoring data within the context of the country plans linked to national IP plans.

68.   *Recommendation 3 (Ref: Conclusion 3, Finding 10).* It is recommended that the implementation of the WIPO country plans incorporating the country level development assessment frameworks is accelerated by the Development Sector (DS) and that the PMPS provides the necessary guidance as needed.

69.   *Recommendation 4 (Conclusion 4, Findings 12-14).* It is recommended that a meta-evaluation be undertaken by DACD on the DA project evaluations that have been undertaken to date (on the methodologies and methods used, validity of results, clarity of recommendations, etc.); a transparent tracking of the consequences and implementation of these evaluations findings and recommendations be created by DACD.

70.   *Recommendation 5 (Ref: Conclusion 6-7, Finding 21).* It is recommended that this project be considered as completed without the necessity of a phase II, on the basis that a) for the RBM component, ongoing activities will be integrated within the services of the PMPS and the necessary resources will be provided and b) for the Review component, the follow-up and implementation of the External Review's findings and recommendations is the responsibility of the CDIP with the support of the DACD.

[Appendixes follow]

APPENDIX I: PERSONS INTERVIEWED/CONSULTED

WIPO STAFF

Geoffrey Onyeama, Deputy Director General, Development Sector

Ranjana Abeysekera, Director, Regional Bureau for Asia and Pacific, Development Sector

Gao Hang, Director, Copyright Development Division, Culture and Creative Industries Sector

Dalila Hamou, Director, Regional Bureau for Arab Countries, Development Sector

Marcus Höpperger, Director, Law and Legislative Advice Division, Brands and Design Sector

Thierry Rajaobelina, Director, Internal Audit and Oversight Division

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

Maya Bachner, Acting Head, Program Management and Performance Sector, Administration and Management Sector

Joyce Claire Banya, Senior Advisor, Regional Bureau for Africa, Department for Africa and Special Projects, Development Sector

Mansur Raza, Deputy Director, Regional Bureau for Asia and Pacific, Development Sector

Wend Wendland, Deputy Director, Global Issues (Traditional Knowledge) Division, Head of the Traditional Creativity and Cultural Expressions Section

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

[Appendix II follows]

APPENDIX II: DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

1.   CDIP/4/8 Rev (2009), Project Document, Enhancement of WIPO's Results Based Management (RBM) Framework to Support the Monitoring and Evaluation of the Impact of the Organization's Activities on Development.

2. CDIP/6/2 (2010). Progress Reports on Development Agenda Projects.

3. CDIP/8/2 (2011). Progress Reports on Development Agenda Projects.

4. CDIP/ 9/14 (2012), Management Response to the External Review of WIPO Technical Assistance in the Area of Cooperation for Development.

5. CDIP/9/15 (2012). Report of the Ad Hoc Working Group on an External Review of WIPO Technical Assistance in the Area of Cooperation for Development.

6. CDIP/9/17 (2012), Report – CDIP Ninth Session, Geneva, May 7 to 11, 2012.

7. CDIP/10/2 (2012). Progress Reports on Development Agenda Projects.

8. CDIP/10/18 (2012), Report – CDIP Tenth Session, Geneva, November 12 to 16, 2012.

9. CDIP/11/2 (2013), Director General's Report on Implementation of the Development Agenda.

10. (2010), The Development Agenda and the WIPO RBM Framework – A Review of the Linkages in the Program & Budget 2010/11 and the MTSP 2010/15.

11. IAOD A/48/21 (2010), IAOD Validation Report on the PPR for 2008-9.

12. IAOD A/50/5 (2012), IAOD Validation Report on the PPR for 2010-11.

13. WIPO (2008), Revised Program and Budget for the 2008/9 Biennium

.

14. WIPO (2009), Program and Budget for the 20010/11 Biennium.

15. WIPO (2010), RBM Workshop 2010, Summary Report.

16. WIPO (2009), Program and Budget for the 20012/13 Biennium.

17. WIPO (2012), Taking the Initiative: WIPO Strategic Realignment Program.

18. Deere Birkbeck, C. & Roca, S. (2011), An External Review of WIPO Technical Assistance in the Area of Cooperation for Development.

19. Ortiz, E. F., Kuyama, S., Munch, W. & Guangting, T. (2004), Implementation of Results-Based Management in the United Nations Organizations Part I, Series on Managing for Results in the United Nations System, JIU, Geneva.

APPENDIX III: INCEPTION REPORT

1. Introduction

This document is an inception report for the evaluation of the Development Agenda Project on Enhancement of WIPO's Results-Based Management (RBM) Framework to Support the Monitoring and Evaluation of Development Activities. 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 WIPO.

2. Purpose and Objectives

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

In particular, this evaluation will assess the extent to which the project has contributed to:

1. Adapting and strengthening WIPO's existing RBM framework to ensure that there is a strong focus across all relevant Programs on the impact of the Organization's activities on development, including technical assistance, and providing additional management tools to support the specific needs as they relate to the 45 Recommendations, and the reporting needs of the CDIP (DA Recommendations 33 and 41);
2. Contributing to a monitoring and evaluation culture, in particular as this relates to the development impact of all relevant Programs, within the Organization, and the systematic collection and use of performance information to ensure accountability, and support informed decision making by the Organization and its stakeholders. (DA Recommendation 33); and
3. Increasing the capacity and ability for independent and objective evaluations of the development impact of WIPO's activities (DA Recommendation 38).
4.

3. 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.

4. Evaluation Framework

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.	Modifications required during the implementation of the project	Document review Interviews	PMPS and DACD

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.	Level of usefulness of monitoring and reporting tools	Document review Interviews	PMPS and DACD
3. The extent to which other entities within the Secretariat have contributed and enabled an effective and efficient project implementation.	Number of WIPO units involved in the project and their contribution	Document review Interviews	PMPS, DACD and other WIPO staff
4. The extent to which the risks identified in the initial project document have materialized or been mitigated.	Type of risks encountered during project implementation and how they were addressed	Document review Interviews	PMPS
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	PMPS
Effectiveness			
1. The usefulness of the project in improving and strengthening WIPO's capacity for monitoring and evaluation and in providing better quality management information to Member States to support their coordination and decision making.	Extent to effectiveness and usefulness of the project for monitoring, evaluation and quality management	Document review Interviews	PMPS Member States
2. The effectiveness of the project in adapting and strengthening WIPO's existing RBM framework and in providing management tools to support the specific needs as they relate to the 45 DA Recommendations, and the reporting needs of the CDIP.	Extent of; strengthening RBM framework; supporting needs of DA and CDIP	Document review Interviews	PMPS WIPO staff Member States
3. The effectiveness of the project in increasing the capacity and ability for independent and objective evaluations of the development impact of WIPO's activities.	Extent to increasing evaluation capacity	Document review Interviews	PMPS IAOD team

Sustainability			
1. The likelihood for sustaining results achieved to date and further developing WIPO's RBM framework including for development related activities.	Likelihood of sustained results and developing RBM framework	Document review Interviews	PMPS Member States
Implementation of Development Agenda (DA) Recommendations			
2. The extent to which the DA Recommendations 33, 38 and 41 have been implemented through this project.	Extent to which recommendations have been implemented	Document review Interviews	PMPS Member States

4.1 Evaluation 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
Interviews	Some 15 semi-structured interviews	*By telephone & in-person:* WIPO Secretariat staff (10): PMPS DACD IAOD Other WIPO staff (TBD) -Member states (5) (preferably those representatives who have followed RBM developments at WIPO)
Document review	Review of main documentation	WIPO documentation (publically available and relevant internal documents)

The exact staff and Member State representatives to be interviewed will be determined jointly with WIPO.

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

4. Work Plan and Timetable

The proposed milestones and timelines are as shown here below:

Milestones/Deliverables	Key dates
Work starts	1 July 2013
Submission of inception report to WIPO	8 July 2013
Feedback from WIPO on inception report	15 July 2013
Submission of final inception report to WIPO	17 July 20134
Submission of draft report to WIPO	30 August 2013
Factual corrections from WIPO on draft report	7 September 2013
Submission of final report to WIPO	15 September 2013
Presentation of evaluation report at the CDIP	18-22 November 2013

5. Key Assumptions and Risks

It is assumed that the project team and the DACD will assist the consultant in identifying and accessing all key documents; informing key stakeholders about the evaluation, making necessary introductions, providing contact information and facilitating interviews as required; and providing consolidated timely feedback on deliverables. It is also assumed that the interviews to be undertaken will be successful and language will not be barriers. It is also assumed that the people to be interviewed will be available and willing to provide the required information.

APPENDIX III: TERMS OF REFERENCE

PROJECT EVALUATION: Project on Enhancement of WIPO's Results-Based Management (RBM) Framework to Support the Monitoring and Evaluation of Development Activities

From July 1 to November 22, 2013

Mr. Glenn O' Neil
Consultant

TERMS OF REFERENCE

I.   PROJECT BACKROUND

The present document represents the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the evaluation of the Development Agenda Project on Enhancement of WIPO's Results-Based Management (RBM) Framework to Support the Monitoring and Evaluation of Development Activities, approved during the fourth session of the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP), in November 2009. The project document for this project is contained in document CDIP/4/8 Rev. The project implementation started in January 2010 and was completed in April 2013. The project is composed of two inter-dependent components:

1.   The design, development and establishment of a coherent results-based framework, to support the monitoring and evaluation of the impact of the Organization's activities on development, as well as the implementation of the Development Agenda Recommendations, and the strengthening of capacity for objective development impact assessments of the Organization's activities; and

2.   The review of WIPO's technical assistance activities in the area of cooperation for development.
The above project components were implemented under the supervision of the Project Manager, Ms. Maya Bachner, Head, Program Management and Performance Section (PMPS).

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.   Provide 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 28 months (January 2010 - April 2013). The focus shall not be on assessing individual activities but rather to evaluate the project as a whole.

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

1.   Adapting and strengthening WIPO's existing RBM framework to ensure that there is a strong focus across all relevant Programs on the impact of the Organization's activities on development, including technical assistance, and providing additional management tools to support the specific needs as they relate to the 45 Recommendations, and the reporting needs of the CDIP (DA Recommendations 33 and 41);

2.   Contributing to a monitoring and evaluation culture, in particular as this relates to the development impact of all relevant Programs, within the Organization, and the systematic collection and use of performance information to ensure accountability, and support informed decision making by the Organization and its stakeholders. (DA Recommendation 33); and

3.   Increasing the capacity and ability for independent and objective evaluations of the development impact of WIPO's activities (DA Recommendation 38).

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 improving and strengthening WIPO' s capacity for monitoring and evaluation and in providing better quality management information to Member States to support their coordination and decision making;

2.   the effectiveness of the project in adapting and strengthening WIPO's existing RBM framework and in providing management tools to support the specific needs as they relate to the 45 DA Recommendations, and the reporting needs of the CDIP; and

3.   The effectiveness of the project in increasing the capacity and ability for independent and objective evaluations of the development impact of WIPO's activities.

Sustainability

The likelihood for sustaining results achieved to date and further developing WIPO's Results-Based Management (RBM) framework including for development related activities.

Implementation of Development Agenda (DA) Recommendations

The extent to which the DA Recommendations 33, 38 and 41 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.

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 July 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) and the Program Management and Performance Section (PMPS). He 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 July 8, 2013. WIPO's feedback shall be communicated to you by July 15, 2013. The draft evaluation report shall be submitted to WIPO by August 15, 2013. Factual corrections on the draft will be provided to you by August 30, 2013. The final evaluation report shall be submitted by September 15, 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 III and of document]