

Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP)

Thirteenth Session
Geneva, May 19 to 23, 2014

EVALUATION REPORT ON THE PROJECT ON ENHANCING SOUTH-SOUTH COOPERATION ON IP AND DEVELOPMENT AMONG DEVELOPING COUNTRIES AND LDCS

*prepared by Mr. Sisule F. Musungu, Consultant, Nairobi, Kenya and Mr. Daniel Keller,
Consultant, Hanoi, Viet Nam*

1. The Annex to this document contains an external independent Evaluation Report on the Project on Enhancing South-South Cooperation on IP and Development among Developing Countries and LDCs, undertaken by Mr. Sisule F. Musungu, Consultant, Nairobi, Kenya and Mr. Daniel Keller, Consultant, Hanoi, Viet Nam.

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

[Annex follows]

TABLE OF CONTENT

LIST OF ACRONYMS.....	3
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	4
1. BACKGROUND.....	8
(A) PROJECT BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION	8
(B) PURPOSE, METHODOLOGY AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS EVALUATION.....	9
(i) Key purpose and methodology	10
(ii) Main limitations to this evaluation	10
2. FINDINGS AND ASSESSMENT	11
(A) PROJECT PREPARATION AND MANAGEMENT	11
(i) Project identification.....	11
(ii) Use of project planning tools.....	11
(iii) Project Management.....	13
(B) RELEVANCE	13
(i) Policy relevance	13
(ii) Relevance to target groups.....	15
(C) EFFECTIVENESS.....	15
(i) Annual Conferences and Inter-Regional Meetings.....	15
(ii) Webpage on South-South cooperation and web-based tools.....	15
(iii) Appointment of a focal point on South-South Cooperation at the Secretariat.....	16
(iv) Unexpected negative and positive effects.....	16
(D) EFFICIENCY.....	16
(E) LIKELIHOOD OF SUSTAINABILITY OF RESULTS	18
3. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	21
LIST OF APPENDIXES (AVAILABLE IN THE FULL VERSION OF THE REPORT)	23

LIST OF ACRONYMS

CDIP	Committee on Development and Intellectual Property
CHF	Swiss francs
DA	Development Agenda
DAC	Development Assistance Committee (of the OECD)
DACD	Development Agenda Coordination Division
GRTKF	Genetic Resources, Traditional Knowledge and Folklore
IP	Intellectual Property
IP-TAD	Intellectual Property Technical Assistance Database
IP-DMD	Intellectual Property Development Matchmaking Database
JIU	Joint Inspection Unit
LDCs	Least Developed Countries
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
SMART	Specific, Measurable, Ambitious, Relevant and Time-bound
ToRs	Terms of Reference (of this evaluation)
UN	United Nations
UNOSSC	The United Nations Office for South-South Cooperation
WIPO	World Intellectual Property Organization

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report covers the independent final evaluation of the Development Agenda (DA) project on “Enhancing South-South Cooperation on IP and Development among Developing Countries and LDCs” (Project Code: DA_1_10_11_13_19_25_32_01) (“the Project”).

Adopted by the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP) in November 2011, the Project aimed at enhancing South-South cooperation on intellectual property (IP) and development among developing countries and Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and to develop means to channel the efforts of different actors to promote South-South cooperation in the field of IP. Project implementation started in January 2012 and ended in December 2013 (24 months), with a project budget of CHF 957,460 (CHF 755,460 for non-personnel costs and CHF 202,000 for personnel costs). The main outputs included the organization of two inter-regional and two annual conferences, the establishment of web-based information, networking and exchange tools as well as the appointment of a focal point for South-South cooperation within the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) Secretariat.

This evaluation was guided by the Terms of Reference (ToRs) dated 18 December 2013 and conducted according to WIPO’s evaluation guidelines by two external evaluators¹ in close coordination with the Development Agenda Coordination Division (DACD).

MAIN CONCLUSIONS

The findings and assessment of the evaluation resulted in the following conclusions:

Conclusion 1: The Project was timely and of high relevance to international priorities, Member States, and the direct beneficiaries.

Complementing North-South cooperation, South-South cooperation and trilateral North-South-South cooperation are widely considered as a parallel channel to delivering technical assistance to developing countries and LDCs, providing an effective instrument to capitalize on experience that is especially useful in the light of particular challenges developing countries and LDCs face in using IP systems for their socio-economic development. Applying South-South for know-how transfer and capacity building responds to a priority of the UN Agenda. This is reflected by two specific recommendations of the UN’s Joint Inspection Unit (JIU). While within WIPO, South-South cooperation had been applied before, it was for the first time addressed by a specific project bringing needed focus and highlighting the importance of the issue within the Organization.

All stakeholders inside and outside WIPO highlighted high relevance of the conferences as such and the topics covered. The web-based tools are potentially highly relevant as well, although due to the fact that they had only been recently completed, a validation through obtaining user feed-back was not possible.

Conclusion 2: Shortcomings in the project logic are partially a result of negotiating specific outputs in the framework of the CDIP and subsequently aligning them to different DA recommendations. The application of standard project planning tools at the design stage leaves room for improvement, including applying result-based budgeting.

¹ Mr. Sisule F. Musungu (Nairobi, Kenya) and Daniel P. Keller (Hanoi, Viet Nam); both evaluators are independent and have not been involved in the preparation or implementation of the Project.

Partially due to the need to agree on an acceptable compromise, project deliverables were negotiated by Member States in the framework of the CDIP rather than determined based on what would be needed to achieve expected outcomes and meet the objectives of the membership. Expected outcomes were determined after defining a list of specific activities, linking them to existing DA recommendations. As a result, the causal link (contribution or attribution) between outputs and outcomes is weak. The preparation process might also explain why the Project's outcome objectives are clearly unachievable within the given timeframe.

At all result levels, the Project document does neither define assumptions nor risks (including mitigation measures). Applying the means of verification for the outcome indicators would require significant resources that were not budgeted for.

Conclusion 3: Project management performed well. The delivery and quality of outputs was regularly monitored. Resources were used economically. The Project generally provided the right type of support in the right way and achieved its objectives at the output level. It was too early to assess project outcomes.

Evidenced by the timely delivery of most outputs in good quality, while using resources economically, the Project was well managed. Management made significant efforts to use well designed surveys for a systematic monitoring of quality of the conferences. Retrieving user feedback on the web-based tools, which only became operational at the end of 2013 following the completion of the WIPO website redesign process, was not possible. While it is too early to assess outcomes of conferences and the web-based tools, the Project created momentum and raised awareness on the potential of South-South Cooperation in the field of IP.

Absorbing 63% of the total budget, the conferences were the right initial approach to provide visibility and strengthen awareness on South-South cooperation, both internally within WIPO and externally. Participants confirmed the high quality of conferences, but regretted that limited time was available to discuss the broad array of topics (defined by Member States at the project approval stage) more in-depth. Scheduling the conferences as back-to-back meetings to other WIPO events contributed to cost savings. The flip-side of this concept was that not all participants had the necessary technical know-how to fully benefit from all presentations made.

All web-based tools, for which only 3.9% of the total budget was spent, are on-line, functioning and fully meet the needs for information exchange. They are of significant potential value added for users and a highly efficient approach to promote information exchange and access to knowledge. The key limitation of the South-South expert database is that – as in WIPO's Roster of Consultants- only previous WIPO Consultants are included. Moreover, WIPO does not assess their prior performance. Without systematically documenting the prior track-record of consultants, it is thus challenging for WIPO staff to suggest or select appropriate experts for assignments. Fine-tuning the tools based on users' feed-back, promoting them among users and feeding the databases with information would allow for greatly enhancing the web-based tools and ensure that they are widely known and used. This would require continued work.

The Project also actively participated in different South-South events organized within the UN framework, including in high-level South-South conferences. Furthermore, informal links with other organizations were maintained, in particular the UNOSSC.

Conclusion 4: Long-term sustainability of initial results observed by the evaluators requires mainstreaming of South-South cooperation into all WIPO activities and a dedicated coordination and support function. Sustainability of web-based tools as a platform for information exchange requires that they be fine-tuned based on feedback and to promote them among potential users.

Initial positive outcomes (as far as they were already evident) will only be sustainable if South-South Cooperation is mainstreamed into all WIPO activities and coordinated by a dedicated

function within WIPO who is also responsible to ensure linkages to the UN level South-South cooperation activities and initiatives. Sustainability of the web-based tools could be greatly enhanced through systematically promoting them among potential users.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1: To the Member States and WIPO Secretariat on mainstreaming South-South cooperation as a regular part of WIPO activities

- (a) It is recommended that the Secretariat prepares, for the consideration by the Member States, a roadmap for the mainstreaming of South-South cooperation as a delivery strategy to complement existing approaches; and
- (b) Consider establishing a dedicated coordination function, which will also coordinate with other organizations inside and outside the UN system and a formalization of the cooperation with UNOSSC.

Recommendation 2: To CDIP on a project extension (from Conclusions 1, 3 and 4)

- (a) Approve an extension of the Project by one year in order to:
 - Fine-tune all web-based tools based on user-feedback, promoting them among potential users and maintaining them (including collecting information for the databases);
 - Mapping of existing South-South activities within WIPO, studying good practices within other UN organizations;
 - Continue to actively participate in different UN initiatives relating to South-South cooperation and triangular cooperation;
- (b) Approve the use of remaining project funds (if any) and additional funding for maintaining the existing personnel resources for the extension period.

Recommendation 3: To the Member States, Project Managers, the DACD and Resource Planning, Program Management and Performance Division on project planning

- (a) Quality control of projects at the design stage should be strengthened in a way that ensures that existing project planning tools are properly applied.
- (b) For new projects, the proper application of the logical framework tool would be one way to ensure that basic quality requirements serving the need to project cycle management are met.
- (c) In designing projects, one impact objective and a limited number of outcome objectives should be broken down into specific outputs. All of them should be linked to objectively verifiable output-, outcome- and impact indicators that are specific, measurable, ambitious, relevant and time-bound ("SMART"). Where monitoring and/or self-assessment of results by projects requires significant resources (e.g. comprehensive studies), they need to be factored into the budget.
- (d) Besides identifying risks and the way of mitigating them, risks should be rated according to the degree of their potential negative impact on achieving results and the likelihood they materialize. Project documents should include assumptions (external conditions that need to be in place to achieve objectives).
- (e) As a basis for internal result-based financial monitoring, project documents should include a result-based budget that allocates expenditures according to budget lines (e.g. travel) to each of the expected outputs and to project management cost (overhead).

Recommendation 4: To the CDIP and Project Managers and DACD and to Sectors involved into technical capacity building on organization of conferences

- (a) In order to cater to the need of participants with expertise in specific fields relating to IP, conferences should focus on a limited number of topics that are closely linked to each other (e.g. Geographical Indications combined with trade marks).
- (b) When organizing conferences as back-to-back meetings with the General Assembly of Member States or the CDIP meetings, the advantage of cost savings should be carefully weighed against the disadvantage of not reaching the right participants.

Recommendation 5: To the CDIP and Project Managers and DACD on the Roster of Consultants

- (a) Consider the inclusion of experts who have not worked for WIPO before but have the needed expertise into the Roster of Consultants;
- (b) Systematically rate the performance of external consultants and make the relevant information available to all staff members.

1. BACKGROUND

1. This report covers the final evaluation of the Development Agenda (DA) project on “Enhancing South-South Cooperation on IP and Development among Developing Countries and LDCs (Project Code: DA_1_10_11_13_19_25_32_01) (“the Project”).²

(A) PROJECT BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION

2. The Project with a total budget CHF 957,460 (of which CHF 755,460 was for non-personnel costs and CHF 202,000 for personnel costs), was adopted during the resumed Seventh Session of the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP) in Geneva in November 2011. The planned duration was 24 months, starting in January 2012.

3. The Project was primarily formulated to optimize the results from the implementation of certain recommendations of the Development Agenda³ (DA) in two ways: firstly, by complementing and reinforcing other projects already developed for Recommendations 10, 19, 25, and 32⁴ and secondly, by directly responding to Recommendations 1, 11, and 13⁵. The specific DA areas of intervention the Project aimed to link into are mentioned in the project document.

4. The Project’s key purpose (development objective) was to enhance South-South cooperation on IP and development among developing countries and Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and to develop means to channel the efforts of different actors to promote South-South cooperation in the field of intellectual property (IP).

5. In particular, through fostering South-South cooperation, the Project intended to contribute to:

- (a) A better understanding of IP and its potential contribution to the socio-economic development of developing countries and LDCs;
- (b) Identifying of priorities and special needs of developing countries and LDCs in the area of IP and development, including norm-setting at the national, regional, and international levels;
- (c) Better-informed socio-economic context-sensitive decision-making on IP policies at the national and regional levels in the South;
- (d) Better protection of domestic creations and fostering innovation in developing countries and LDCs;
- (e) Promotion of the transfer and dissemination of technology;

² The Project document is available on http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=164186.

³ The DA was formally established in October 2007. Its purpose is to mainstream socio-economic development into all activities of WIPO and to keep development at the core of the IP system. In order to enhance the development dimension of WIPO’s activities, a set of 45 recommendations was adopted. The list of DA Recommendations is available on <http://www.wipo.int/ip-development/en/agenda/recommendations.html>

⁴ Recommendation 10: IP institutional capacity building; Recommendations 19 and 25: facilitating access and dissemination of knowledge and technology, and the use of IP flexibilities and Recommendation 32 relates to the understanding of the link between IP and competition policies.

⁵ Recommendations 1 and 13: call for development-oriented IP technical and legal assistance; Recommendation 11: relates to support to domestic innovation capacity building.

- (f) Enhanced infrastructure and capacity for developing countries and LDCs to make the most effective use of IP for development, bearing in mind their socio-economic conditions, and their different levels of development;
 - (g) Increased capacity of developing countries and LDCs to share their knowledge and experience in the area of IP and Development, and
 - (h) Increase the use in WIPO technical assistance and capacity building activities of resource persons and experience sharing from developing countries and LDCs⁶.
6. Planned outputs included two inter-regional meetings, two annual conferences, the development of web-based tools for networking and knowledge sharing, and the appointment of a WIPO focal point for South-South cooperation.
7. Between January 2012 and December 2013, the Project delivered the following outputs:
- (a) The organization of two Interregional Meetings: The First Inter-Regional Meeting in Brazil (August 2012) on South-South cooperation on IP Governance; Genetic Resources, Traditional Knowledge and Folklore (GRTKF); and Copyright and Related Rights. The second meeting on South-South cooperation on Patents, Trademarks, Geographical Indications, Industrial Designs and Enforcement in Egypt (May 2013);
 - (b) The organization of two Annual Conferences in Geneva (the first in September 2012 and the second in November 2013) on South-South cooperation on IP and Development targeting representatives from developing countries and LDCs, in addition to a number of other interested Member States, inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations (NGOs);
 - (c) The establishment of a dedicated page on the WIPO Website to South-South cooperation on IP and Development;
 - (d) Adding new functionalities on South-South cooperation to the IP Technical Assistance Database (IP-TAD) and the Development Matchmaking Database (IP-DMD);
 - (e) Creation of a platform for a virtual network among South-South institutions;
 - (f) Appointment of a Focal Point on South-South cooperation in the WIPO Secretariat with the main task to act as the designated UN System focal point to coordinate with UN system-wide activities, in particular with the United Nations Office for South-South Cooperation (UNOSSC).
8. The Global Infrastructure Sector (Services for Access to Knowledge and Information Division) coordinated the management and implementation of the Project in collaboration with the Development Agenda Coordination Division (DACD) and other sectors of WIPO.

(B) PURPOSE, METHODOLOGY AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS EVALUATION

9. WIPO's Evaluation Policy⁷, which is aligned to the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC) evaluation criteria and quality standards⁸, provided the overall framework for this evaluation.

⁶ While the project document defined this as an output, it is not a deliverable and thus rather an expected outcome.

⁷ WIPO, Revised Evaluation Policy, May 2010, in particular Annex 1 on evaluation criteria, which makes reference to the DAC Criteria of evaluating development assistance.

⁸ DAC Guidelines and Reference Series, Quality Standards for Development Evaluation, OECD-DAC, OECD 2010.

10. The evaluation was coordinated by the DACD and undertaken between 10 January and 30 March 2014 by a team of two external consultants.⁹ It was guided by an inception report approved by the DACD on 13 January 2014, which operationalized the Terms of Reference (ToRs) dated 18 December 2013.

11. Evaluations are a snapshot in time. The evaluation covers the period from 1 January 2012 to 31 December 2013. Subsequent developments were not taken into account.

(i) Key purpose and methodology

12. The key purpose of this evaluation was to assess whether the Project as a whole provided the right type of support in the right way to achieve its objectives. The ToRs call for drawing lessons learned for possible furthering WIPO support to promote South-South cooperation, in order to provide input to the decision making of the CDIP. Moreover, the evaluation will ensure accountability of WIPO towards its Member States.

13. The assessment was conducted based on four main evaluation criteria:

(a) **Relevance:** The extent to which project objectives were consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, member countries' needs, global priorities and policies.

(b) **Efficiency:** How efficiently (in terms of "value for money") inputs (e.g. funds, expertise, and time) were converted into results.

(c) **Effectiveness:** The extent to which objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.

(d) **Sustainability:** The likelihood of continuation of project benefits after the assistance has been completed.

14. In line with its purpose, the emphasis of this particular evaluation was on organizational learning. The interactive and participatory evaluation process itself was designed to contribute to continuous improvement of WIPO's services.

15. Different evaluation tools were combined to ensure an evidence-based qualitative and quantitative assessment. Particular emphasis was given to cross-validation of data and an assessment of plausibility of the results obtained. In this regard, it is important to note that during the implementation, the Project team administered several event evaluation questionnaires. The methodological mix included desk studies, individual interviews, interviews of focal groups and direct observation. The analysis of contextual factors was complemented through literature review.

16. Discussions with key stakeholders were in general open and constructive. All persons interviewed openly shared information and exchanged views. The evaluators were able to work freely and without interference. All WIPO staff members supported the evaluation process actively and provided access to all relevant information. Overall, factual information obtained has been comprehensive, consistent and clear.

(ii) Main limitations to this evaluation

17. The web-based tools developed under the Project (the development of a WIPO Web page on South-South Cooperation, the addition of new functionalities on South-South Cooperation to the IP-TAD and the IP-DMD, and the platform for virtual networking among South-South

⁹ Mr Sisule F. Musungu (Nairobi, Kenya) and Daniel P. Keller (Hanoi, Viet Nam); both evaluators are independent and have not been involved into the preparation or implementation of the Project.

institutions) were still in the process of being fine-tuned at the time of the evaluation to be fully in line with the new WIPO website redesign process completed at the end of 2013. Statistics on their use were therefore not yet available. An assessment of the use of those functionalities (outcome level) or even wider intended/unintended effects (impact level) was not possible.

18. Moreover, translating conferences (outputs) into specific outcomes in the context of the Project objectives will need time beyond the limited duration of the Project. An attempt to assess their outcomes or even broader impact would thus be premature.

19. Fact finding focused on actors directly involved into the Project (different sections of WIPO, key direct beneficiaries and organizations WIPO has cooperated with) and did not include a broader range of stakeholders, such as IP users in developing countries, as they were not directly targeted.

20. The limitations highlighted above necessarily limited the scope and depth of the evaluation. Consequently, the findings and assessment that follows in section 2 below should be read keeping the limitations of the evaluation in mind.

2. FINDINGS AND ASSESSMENT

This section presents the findings of the evaluation and provides an assessment of the Project against the evaluation criteria.

(A) PROJECT PREPARATION AND MANAGEMENT

(i) Project identification

21. Responding to a proposal of the African Group for consideration by the Seventh Session of the CDIP, held in May 2 to 6, 2011, the Project was designed to optimize the results from the implementation of certain recommendations of the WIPO DA by developing means to channel South-South cooperation efforts in the field of IP and development. The proposal aimed at contributing to use South-South cooperation as a tool to foster capacities of developing countries and LDCs to share their knowledge and experiences.

22. Based on a review of the project document and the CDIP discussions leading to the adoption of the Project, it can be concluded that the Member States reached a common understanding on the Project's general aim to mainstream South-South cooperation within WIPO. Views on how to achieve this however seem to have differed. Detailed outputs were therefore negotiated in a political context, rather than by defining expected outcomes and identifying the outputs required to achieve them most efficiently.

23. The Project directly addresses DA recommendations on development-oriented IP technical and legal assistance (Recommendations 1, 13) and to domestic innovation capacity-building (Recommendation 11). On the other hand, it was formulated to reinforce DA projects on facilitating access and dissemination of knowledge and technology, the use of IP flexibilities (Recommendations 19, 25), understanding the link between IP and competition policies (recommendation 32) and institutional capacity-building (Recommendation 10).

(ii) Use of project planning tools

24. The standard template for DA projects was not used for this Project. For this reason, the Project document does not include a logical framework. Logical frameworks as a basis for project planning, monitoring and evaluations of development assistance projects are now used by almost all development agencies and are a generally acknowledged good practice for result-based project management.

25. The project document defines objectives at the output and outcome levels. However, the evaluation found that output and outcome levels were not always clearly separated. For example, “Increase the use in WIPO technical assistance and capacity building activities of resource persons and experience sharing from developing countries and LDCs” would rather be an expected outcome than a direct deliverable.

26. The causal link (contribution or attribution) between outputs and outcomes was also found to be weak for this Project. It is not clear, which of the planned outcomes are expected to be achieved through which outputs. Rather than first setting objectives at the outcome and impact levels, expected outcomes were determined after defining the list of specific activities requested by the Member States, probably by aligning them to a number of DA objectives the Project refers to.

27. Expected outputs¹⁰ and outcomes¹¹ are linked to performance indicators. Most of the Project output indicators were found to be specific, measurable, relevant and time-bound (SMART). In contrast, most outcome indicators are neither time-bound (achievable within the duration of the project), nor relevant (providing evidence for achieving the expected outcome). While most of them are theoretically measurable through the foreseen means of verification, retrieving the information needed to assess outcomes would require extensive surveys, for which no resources were budgeted.

28. Further, objectives at the impact level were not defined¹². Setting objectives at the impact level would have been important to explain the wider benefits to beneficiaries and provide a basis for a possible impact assessment at a later stage. Since it is primarily the broader socio-economic impact that ultimately matters, explaining the wider longer-term benefits to which projects aim to contribute to would be important.

29. Moreover, the evaluation found no evidence that risks and assumptions for each of the objectives were identified at the planning stage. Assumptions and risks refer to external factors that are relevant for translating outputs into outcomes and outcomes into impact¹³. Categorizing risks according to the likelihood they materialize and the potential degree of negative impact would help project managers to focus more closely on monitoring those risks that need to be controlled in order to achieve objectives. All of this is also part of the logical framework approach and considered as a good practice in project design.

30. The clear delivery strategy outlined in the Project document explains the different steps of implementation. In general, the sequencing of activities was found to be appropriate and conducive to achieving objectives. The expected timeline of implementation was translated into a Gantt chart.

31. In retrospect, the planned project duration of 24 months for delivering all outputs was not commensurate with the limited personnel resources allocated to the Project¹⁴. Particularly, not sufficient time was allocated for piloting the web-based tools, promoting them among users, obtaining users' feed-back and fine-tuning the tools to cater to users' requirements. It also appears rather unlikely that organizing four conferences would have been possible without the

¹⁰ Output: The products, capital goods and services, which result from a development intervention; may also include changes resulting from the intervention, which are relevant to the achievement of outcomes (OECD, Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management, 2010).

¹¹ Outcome: The likely or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention's outputs (OECD, Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management, 2010).

¹² Impact: Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended (OECD, Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management, 2010).

¹³ Hypotheses about factors or risks, which could affect the progress or success of a development intervention (OECD, Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management, 2010)

¹⁴ One WIPO staff member only recruited in May 2012, one not fully allocated to the Project

active logistical- and some financial support of hosting countries (for details on this point, please refer to the assessment of efficiency in Section D). The project duration seems to have been determined to fit into the regular biannual budget cycles rather than based on a realistic estimate of time needed to deliver all outputs in the required quality.

32. Financial planning based on the standard DA project template was rudimentary and not in line with result-based management principles. Presenting each budget item according to budget lines and outcomes would have allowed the WIPO Secretariat and Member States to compare budgets against expenditures in detail, which is needed for assessing efficiency of implementation. Analyzing detailed result-based budgets against detailed result-based financial reports, which the Project management did prepare (see below), would also have provided Project managers with detailed information as a basis for accurate budgeting for similar future interventions. Furthermore, WIPO would have the necessary data to benchmark efficiency of projects internally and with similar initiatives of other development actors.

(iii) Project Management

33. The evaluation found that the Project was well managed. This is foremost evidenced by the timely delivery of all outputs in the expected quality (see detailed assessment of outputs in section C Effectiveness), despite the very limited personnel resources. Besides detailed and accurate reports, management also monitored the quality of outputs, which is evidenced through comprehensive surveys for each of the conferences.

34. Progress reports and stakeholder interviews indicate responsiveness and flexibility of project management to suggestions received by the Project's beneficiaries. Accordingly, most of the participants' feed-back of the first inter-regional meeting seems to have been taken up for the second inter-regional meeting. Another example relates to the adjustments with respect to the annual conferences. The first conference was organized to coincide with WIPO's General Assembly. Recognizing that the participants of the General Assembly are not necessarily the appropriate target audience for the topics covered, the second annual conference was scheduled around the CDIP meeting.

35. Beyond strictly adhering to the delivery of required outputs, project management also actively identified and exploited new cooperation opportunities to expand the reach of the Project. WIPO's participation in selected other South-South activities organized within the UN System (such as the UN South-South Stakeholders' and High-level Development Cooperation Meetings and the Global South-South Development Expo). This evidences management's efforts to create synergies and complementarities within the UN system.

(B) RELEVANCE

Relevance assesses the extent to which project objectives were consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, member countries' needs, global priorities and WIPO's policies.

(i) Policy relevance

36. While clearly not aimed at substituting North-South Cooperation, South-South cooperation and trilateral North-South-South cooperation is widely considered as a parallel channel to delivering technical assistance to developing countries and LDCs. Promoting South-South cooperation and triangular cooperation is a way to capitalize on experience that is particularly useful in the light of specific challenges developing countries and LDCs face in using IP systems for their socio-economic development¹⁵.

¹⁵ Example: Case study "Promoting the Use of Intellectual Property in Vietnam as a Tool to Foster Trade Successful Technical Assistance to Middle - Income Countries offers a Potential for Triangular Cooperation with Least

[Footnote continued on next page]

37. The WIPO Secretariat has been applying what can be considered South-South cooperation approaches to promote exchanges among developing countries for a long time. This is for example reflected by the work of the Regional Bureaus in the Development Sector. Regional and inter-regional meetings bringing together primarily developing countries and LDCs have also been organized before, including in the context of norm-setting activities. However, the evaluation found that these previous activities were not necessarily seen as South-South cooperation activities or approaches. These activities and initiatives were therefore not strategically conceptualized and implemented with the aim of channeling and enhancing South-South cooperation efforts in the field of IP and development, as envisaged by the Project.

38. Consequently, although it can be said that South-South cooperation was not new to WIPO at the time of commencing the Project, the Project marked the first time that South-South cooperation was systematically addressed in WIPO. The dedicated Project was therefore critical. During the evaluation, it was found that the Project's relevance was accounted for by various reasons. In addition to providing an opportunity for WIPO to systematically use South-South cooperation as a development assistance delivery strategy, the Project was catalytic in helping both the Secretariat and the Member States to appreciate the value of South-South cooperation in the area of IP. In addition, the Project also helped to refine the understanding of South-South cooperation in this field beyond the political connotations.

39. In effect, notwithstanding the Project's background and the shortcomings relating to the planning of the Project in terms of the linkages between the objectives, expected outcomes/results and the implemented activities and outputs, the Project was found to be highly relevant in policy terms.

40. Relevance to Member States at the macro policy level is evidenced by the fact that the Project was approved by the CDIP through consensus. Project objectives at the outcome level are well aligned with WIPO's policies, reflected by the Strategic Goals and Programs.¹⁶ As it is obvious from the Project document, the Project was also relevant in the context of the Development Agenda, as it sought to address a number of recommendations directly and indirectly.

41. South-South cooperation is also highly relevant to the UN and its member states. Project objectives respond to two specific recommendations of the United Nations Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) to governing bodies, which aim at strengthening South-South cooperation within the UN system. The JIU in particular recommended the establishment of a dedicated structure for South-South cooperation and to allocate specific resources to South-South cooperation.¹⁷

[Footnote continued from previous page]

Developed Countries", submitted by the Swiss State Secretariat for Economic Affairs, published on <http://www.oecd.org/aidfortrade/46827679.pdf>

¹⁶ These include various programs under Strategic Goal I (Balanced evolution of the international normative framework for IP); Strategic Goal III (Facilitating the use of IP for development); and Strategic Goal VII (Addressing IP in relation to Global Policy issues).

¹⁷ See WO/PBC/21/16 Annex, pages 4 and 5, referring to recommendations JIU/REP/2011/3 South-South and Triangular Cooperation in the United Nations System. Specifically: recommendation 3: "the legislative bodies of United Nations system organizations should request the Executive Heads to establish identifiable and dedicated structures, mechanisms and focal points tasked with developing agency-specific corporate policy and support strategy, and ensure coordination organizations"; and recommendation 9: "the legislative and governing bodies of the United Nations system should request the Executive Heads to apportion a specific percentage – not less than 0.5 per cent – of core budget resources for the promotion of South-South cooperation in their respective areas of competence, in consultation with programme countries; and to agree with donor countries to use a specific portion of extra budgetary resources to finance SSC and triangular cooperation initiatives on South-South and triangular cooperation within their respective organizations and inter-agencies, through the reallocation of the necessary staff and resources for this purpose, as appropriate."

(ii) Relevance to target groups

42. Conferences: Surveys conducted by the Project¹⁸ and validated by the evaluators through in-depth interviews with selected participants confirmed the high relevance of the conferences as such and the topics that were covered.

43. Web-based tools: The web-based tools are potentially highly relevant, but as they were only available at the end of the Project, it was not possible to validate this with a broader range of beneficiaries who have used the tool in practice.

(C) EFFECTIVENESS

44. This section compares planned against expected results. The evaluators validated reported results and assessed them against key performance indicators defined in the Project document. As mentioned under limitations in section 1 (B) above, expected outcomes could not be evaluated at this stage. Short-term effects of the conferences were measured through participants' surveys. Outcome data, which is for instance required to assess the longer-term effects of the conferences or the web-based tools, was not yet available at the time of the evaluation.

45. Overall, due to the weaknesses in project planning already identified in section A above, the wider objectives of the Project were not achieved. Indeed, the planned and implemented activities were unlikely to achieve these objectives within the Project's timeframe. Nevertheless, the Project recorded important achievements in the context of the broad goal of mainstreaming South-South cooperation in WIPO activities. Below we summarize these achievements with respect to the various main activities.

(i) Annual Conferences and Inter-regional meetings

46. The interregional meetings and the annual conferences were effective in catalyzing interest and providing a platform for South-South engagement on IP matters. Conference participants, through the surveys carried out by the Project team and the interviews carried out for the evaluation, confirmed that these events were eye opening and useful in enhancing their appreciation of the topics discussed and the value of South-South cooperation. This was the case notwithstanding the few highlighted shortcomings such as there being too many topics and some participants in the annual conferences not being the right people for the events.

(ii) Webpage on South-South cooperation and web-based tools

47. As already noted in the background section, the Project resulted into the establishment of a dedicated WIPO webpage on South-South cooperation, addition of functionalities to address South-South related needs on IP-TAD and IP-DMD and a platform for a virtual South-South network of institutions. Constrained by the Organization's overall website redesign process launched in January 2013 and completed in November 2013, the development of the webpage and web-based tools only became operational at the end of the Project and statistics on their use and user-feedback were therefore not available by the time of this evaluation. Assessing their quality however, they have the potential to become useful information tools that will support continued work on South-South cooperation.

48. It should be noted that the redesign of the WIPO website that was completed in late 2013 will also be helpful in ensuring the accessibility and use of the South-South webpage and the web-based tools.

¹⁸See summary of participant evaluations in the reports established for each of the conferences.

(iii) Appointment of a focal point on South-South Cooperation at the Secretariat

49. The Project Manager also ensured the role of a focal point on South-South cooperation during the duration of the Project. The existence of an ad hoc focal point played a key role in helping to ensure WIPO's engagement with South-South cooperation activities in the UN family, including in particular with UNOSSC. Throughout the Project's implementation, the Project team also ensured active internal coordination with other sectors on specific issues related to South-South cooperation and the dissemination of information related to the project. A Project dedicated to South-South cooperation and an ad hoc focal point that ensured coordination both internally and externally on issues related to South-South cooperation was effective in not only promoting South-South cooperation approaches in the field of IP within WIPO, but also within the UN family.

(iv) Unexpected negative and positive effects

50. The Project's key benefit at the outcome level was to raise awareness of South-South cooperation and triangular cooperation both within WIPO and a broader range of stakeholders. Interviewees clearly expressed the expectation that South-South cooperation is now mainstreamed in all of WIPO's technical cooperation activities rather than only through a project, which is necessarily limited in its time and scope.

51. The evaluation did not reveal any negative project outcomes.

(D) EFFICIENCY

52. Based on the official financial reports as per end of December 31, 2013, around 63.5% or CHF 607,755 of the CHF 957,460 allocated to the Project (including personnel costs) had been disbursed. Table 2 presents an analysis of expenditures according to different budget lines.

Table 2: Expenditures according to outputs and budget lines (in CHF)

Project Outputs + Overhead	Budget lines							Total	% of total
	Personnel costs	Staff Travel	Third-party travel ¹⁹	Conference related expenses	Experts honoraria	Contractual Services			
Conferences		27,683	287,668	62,734	6,064			384,149	63,2%
1 st Interregional Meeting (Brazil)		20,623	123,013	34,470 ²⁰	1,372			179,478	29.5%
1 st Annual Conference (Geneva)			47,341	10,498	1,315			59,154	9.7%
2 nd Interregional Meeting (Cairo)		7,060	107,065	6,300	3,377			123,802	20.4%
2 nd Annual Conference (Geneva)			10,249	11,466				21,715	3.6%
Web-based outputs						23,712		23,712	3,9%
Webpage South-South ²¹									0%
South-South Functionalities						23,712		23,712	3.9%
UNOSSC events		15,894						15,894	2,6%
Personnel costs	184,000							184,000	30,3%
Temporary professional P2 100%	184,000							184,000	30.3%
Total	184,000	43,577	287,668	62,734	6,064	23,712		607,755	100%
% of total expenditures	30.3%	7.2%	47.3%	10.3%	1%	3.9%		100%	

Source: Information provided by the Project (unofficial figures) and analysis by evaluators

53. The detailed managerial analysis of costs by the evaluators shows that around two thirds of the expenditures related to the organization of conferences and annual meetings. Of the conference costs, around half of the Project's total disbursements were spent on travel costs (flight tickets, DSAs, terminal expenses). Comparing the numbers of non-WIPO presenters with the number of other conference participants suggest that most travel expenditures relate to funding the participation of delegates from developing countries and LDCs in the conferences. This is also confirmed by the detailed transaction lists for the years 2012/2013, which are included into the program management reports.

54. Based on an explicit request by the Member States, the organization of annual conferences in conjunction with other WIPO meetings in Geneva contributed to cost savings. It is however questionable whether this approach really enhanced efficiency of the Project, because delegates of the CDIP meeting and the General Assembly might not always have the necessary in-depth expertise on the topics discussed. For WIPO contributions to the inter-regional meetings, video-conferencing was used, rather than fielding staff. This innovative approach contributed to significant cost savings.

55. Despite efforts to reduce expenditures, the organization of conferences is an expensive tool of capacity building. Nevertheless, considering the need to create an initial momentum towards achieving the Project's objectives, conferences were an appropriate way to raise awareness on South-South cooperation both inside and outside WIPO and to enroll a wide array of stakeholders into the concept of South-South cooperation.

¹⁹ Third-party travel includes participants DSAs and speakers travel expenses

²⁰ Note: WIPO financed a lump sum contribution for conference-related expenses in exchange for the financing, by Brazil, of four international speakers

²¹ No cost: activity was carried out in-house

56. Although the web-based tools (website, databases) are likely to provide a significant long-term value added as a resource and networking tool, only 3.9% of the budget was disbursed for their development. The main reason was that most of them were developed by the Secretariat internally, which also provides evidence for WIPO's efforts to use resources economically.

57. Considering the amount of work involved into preparing four conferences, developing the web-based platform and tools, and ensuring coordination and an active engagement with UN system-wide South-South cooperation activities, the personnel resources (one full-time P2 position, resulting 30.3% of the total disbursements) were used efficiently.

58. Due to the lack of a detailed result-based budget in the project document²², which was established by the Secretariat using the standard template for DA projects, a direct comparison between budget and expenditures per category and per output was not possible. Expenditures per budget line and for the Project as a whole however were lower than budgeted (see above).

(E) LIKELIHOOD OF SUSTAINABILITY OF RESULTS

59. Sustainability assesses the likelihood of continuation of project benefits after the assistance has been completed. The vast majority of those interviewed confirmed that South-South cooperation on IP matters in WIPO was of value and there was a need to continue and strengthen this approach in order to mainstream it into WIPO's work.

60. At the same time, however, it was evident that continuing the work on South-South cooperation through interregional seminars and annual conferences, while initially useful as a catalyzer, would not be the right vehicle for a long-term institutionalization of the concept.

61. The web-based tools have the potential to deliver sustainable value to WIPO stakeholders, but only if sufficient resources are made available to continuously promote and maintain them.

62. Overall, a standalone and time-bound project is not sufficient to mainstream South-South cooperation in a way that it is likely to become an integral part of WIPO's delivery strategy. Institutionalizing South-South cooperation across all WIPO activities requires furthermore a dedicated function within WIPO, which also acts as a focal point in coordinating efforts with other actors inside and outside the UN system.

²² See budget in section 5 of the Project Document, table 1 and 2, which presents details of non-personnel cost only according to staff missions, third-party travel and experts' honoraria (contractual services).

3. CONCLUSIONS

63. Based on the findings and assessment above, the evaluation draws the following conclusions:

Conclusion 1: The Project was timely and of high relevance to international priorities, Member States, and the direct beneficiaries.

64. Complementing North-South Cooperation, South-South cooperation and trilateral North-South-South cooperation are widely considered as a parallel channel to delivering technical assistance to developing countries and LDCs, providing an effective instrument to capitalize on experience that is especially useful in the light of particular challenges developing countries and LDCs face in using IP systems for their socio-economic development.

65. Applying South-South for know-how transfer and capacity building responds to a priority of the UN Agenda. This is reflected by two specific recommendations of the UN's Joint Inspection Unit. While within WIPO, South-South cooperation had been applied before, it was for the first time addressed by a specific project bringing needed focus and highlighting the importance of the issue within the organization.

66. Conferences participants confirmed that the topics covered were of high relevance for them and useful for their work. All stakeholders inside and outside WIPO highlighted the potentially high relevance of the web-based tools as means to foster exchange of expertise.

Conclusion 2: Shortcomings in the project logic are partially a result of negotiating specific outputs in the framework of the CDIP and subsequently aligning them to different DA recommendations. The application of standard project planning tools at the design stage leaves room for improvement, including applying result-based budgeting.

67. The Project was identified based on a proposal submitted by the African Group. While Member States seem to have reached a common understanding on the Project's general aim (to mainstream South-South cooperation within WIPO), views on how to achieve this differed. Partially due to the need to agree on an acceptable compromise, project deliverables were negotiated by Member States in the framework of the CDIP rather than determined based on what would be needed to achieve expected outcomes and meet the objectives of the membership. Expected outcomes were determined after defining a list of specific activities, probably in an attempt to link them to existing DA recommendations.

68. As a result, the causal link (contribution or attribution) between outputs and outcomes is weak. The preparation process might also explain why the Project's outcome objectives are clearly unachievable within the given timeframe.

69. At all result levels, the Project document does neither define assumptions nor risks (including mitigation measures). Applying the means of verification for the outcome indicators would require significant resources that were not budgeted for.

Conclusion 3: Project management performed well. The delivery and quality of outputs was regularly monitored. Resources were used economically. The Project generally provided the right type of support in the right way and achieved its objectives at the output level. It was too early to assess project outcomes.

70. Evidenced by the timely delivery of most outputs in good quality, the Project was well managed. Management made significant efforts to use well designed surveys for a systematic monitoring of quality of the conferences. Retrieving user feedback on the web-based tools,

which only became operational at the end of 2013 following the completion of the WIPO website redesign process, was not possible.

71. The Project delivered all its outputs on time and in good quality, while using resources economically. Examples include the use of web-conferencing instead of staff travel, the in-house design of the South-South Webpage, and the organization of conferences back-to-back with other WIPO's General Assembly in 2012 and the CDIP meeting in 2013.

72. While it is too early to assess outcomes of conferences and the web-based tools, the Project created momentum and raised awareness on the potential of South-South Cooperation in the field of IP.

73. While absorbing 63% of the total budget, the conferences were the right initial approach to provide visibility and strengthen awareness on South-South cooperation, both internally within WIPO and externally. Participants confirmed the high quality of conferences, but regretted that limited time was available to discuss the broad array of topics (defined by Member States at the project approval stage) more in-depth. Scheduling the conferences as back-to-back meetings to other WIPO events contributed to cost savings. The flip-side of this concept was that not all participants had the necessary technical know-how to fully benefit from all presentations made.

74. All web-based tools, for which only 3.9% of the total budget was spent, are on-line, functioning and fully meet the needs for information exchange. They are of significant potential value added for users and a highly efficient approach to promote information exchange and access to knowledge.

75. The key limitation of the South-South expert database is that – as in WIPO's Roster of Consultants - only previous WIPO Consultants are included. Moreover, WIPO does not assess their prior performance. Without systematically documenting the prior track-record of consultants, it is thus challenging for WIPO staff to suggest or select appropriate experts for assignments. Fine-tuning the tools based on users' feed-back, promoting them among users and feeding the databases with information would allow for greatly enhancing the web-based tools and ensure that they are widely known and used. This would require continued work.

76. The Project actively participated in different events organized within the UN framework, including the high-level South-South conferences. Furthermore, informal links with other organizations were maintained, in particular the UNOSSC.

77. While not applying result-based budgeting, management monitored expenditures both according to outputs and project budget lines, which would be a good practice for all DA projects.

Conclusion 4: Long-term sustainability of initial results observed by the evaluators requires mainstreaming of South-South cooperation into all WIPO activities and a dedicated coordination and support function. Sustainability of web-based tools as a platform for information exchange requires that they be fine-tuned based on feedback and to promote them among potential users.

78. Initial positive outcomes (as far as they were already evident) will only be sustainable if South-South Cooperation is mainstreamed into all WIPO activities and coordinated by a dedicated function within WIPO who is also responsible to ensure linkages to the UN level South-South cooperation activities and initiatives.

79. Sustainability of the web-based tools could be greatly enhanced through systematically promoting them among potential users.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

80. The evaluation, based on the findings and conclusions above and taking into account the overall objective of the Development Agenda, makes the following recommendations directed at the various WIPO stakeholders.

Recommendation 1: To the Member States and WIPO Secretariat on mainstreaming South-South cooperation as a regular part of WIPO activities (from Conclusion 1 and 4)

81. There is no doubt that South-South cooperation as a delivery strategy is well recognized within the UN system and that the Project has highlighted its potential within WIPO. In this regard, WIPO should build on the momentum generated by the Project. For this reason it is recommended that the Secretariat prepare, for the consideration of the Member States, a roadmap for the mainstreaming of South-South cooperation as a delivery strategy to complement existing approaches.

82. Successfully mainstreaming South-South cooperation within WIPO will require establishing a dedicated coordination function, which will also coordinate with other organizations inside and outside the UN system and a formalization of the cooperation with UNOSSC.

Recommendation 2: To the CDIP on a project extension (from Conclusions 1, 3 and 4)

83. In the context of the above-mentioned recommendation 1 and taking into account the fact that the web-based tools have just come online and the need to complement and fine-tune them, the evaluation recommends that the CDIP approves an extension of the Project by one year. The implementation of this recommendation will require the use of remaining project funds (if any) and additional funding for maintaining the existing personnel resources for the extension period.

84. Work to be undertaken during the Project extension phase (if approved) should, as noted above, include:

- (a) The fine-tuning all web-based tools based on user-feedback, promoting them among potential users and maintaining them (including collecting information for the databases).
- (b) The mapping of existing South-South activities within WIPO, studying good practices within other UN organizations.

85. During the extension phase (if approved), it is also recommended that WIPO continue to actively participating in different UN initiatives relating to South-South cooperation and triangular cooperation.

Recommendation 3: To the Member States, Project Managers, the DACD and Resource Planning, Program Management and Performance Division on project planning (from Conclusion 2):

86. Quality control of projects at the design stage should be strengthened in a way to ensure that existing project planning tools are properly applied.

87. For new projects, the proper application of the logical framework tool would be one way to ensure that basic quality requirements serving the need to project cycle management are met.

88. In designing projects, one impact objective and a limited number of outcome objectives should be broken down into specific outputs. All of them should be linked to objectively verifiable output-, outcome- and impact indicators that are specific, measurable, ambitious, relevant and

time-bound (“SMART”). Where monitoring and/or self-assessment of results by projects requires significant resources (e.g. comprehensive studies), they need to be included into the budget.

89. Besides identifying risks and the way of mitigating them, risks should be rated according to the degree of their potential negative impact on achieving results and the likelihood they materialize. Project documents should include assumptions (external conditions that need to be in place to achieve objectives).

90. As a basis for internal result-based financial monitoring, project documents should include a result-based budget that allocates expenditures according to budget lines (e.g. travel) to each of the expected outputs and to project management cost (overhead).

Recommendation 4: To the CDIP, Project Managers, the DACD and to Sectors involved into technical capacity building on organization of conferences (from Conclusion 3)

91. In order to cater to the need of participants with expertise in specific fields relating to IP, conferences should focus on a limited number of topics that are closely linked to each other (e.g. Geographical Indications combined with trade marks).

92. In regards to organizing conferences as back-to-back meetings with the General Assembly of Member States or the CDIP meetings, the advantage of cost savings should be carefully weighed against the disadvantage of not reaching the right participants.

Recommendation 5: To the CDIP, Project Managers and the DACD on the Roster of Consultants (from Conclusion 3):

In order to enhance the participation of experts on South-South cooperation or with expertise on developing countries and LDCs, there is need to consider the inclusion of experts who have not worked for WIPO before but have the needed expertise. The current approach, which captures only experts who have previously worked for or participated in WIPO activities, is limiting. In addition, to enable WIPO to recommend and/or recruit the right experts for capacity building activities, WIPO should systematically rate the performance of external consultants and make the relevant information available to all staff members.

LIST OF APPENDIXES

Appendix 1	Project document
Appendix 2	Terms of Reference
Appendix 3	List of persons met
Appendix 4	List of documents

APPENDIX 1: PROJECT DOCUMENT

E



CDIP/7/6
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH
DATE: APRIL 13, 2011

Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP)

Seventh Session

Geneva, May 2 to 6, 2011

PROJECT PROPOSAL FROM THE AFRICAN GROUP ON ENHANCING SOUTH-SOUTH COOPERATION ON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY (IP) AND DEVELOPMENT AMONG DEVELOPING COUNTRIES AND LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES

3. By way of a communication dated April 13, 2011, addressed to the Secretariat, the Permanent Mission of South Africa in its capacity as the Coordinator of the African Group, has submitted a project proposal entitled "Project on Enhancing South-South Cooperation on IP and Development among Developing Countries and LDCs", on behalf of the African Group, for consideration by the Seventh Session of the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP).
4. The above-mentioned communication from South Africa together with its enclosures are contained in the Annex to this document.
5. *The CDIP is invited to take note of the information contained in the Annex to this document.*

[Annex follows]



**PERMANENT MISSION OF SOUTH AFRICA TO
THE UNITED NATIONS AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS**

Ref. 424/2011

The Permanent Mission of the Republic of South Africa to the United Nations Office in Geneva and other International Organisations in Switzerland presents its compliments to the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organisation, and has the honour to inform that South Africa in its capacity as the Coordinator of the African Group, submits on behalf of the African Group, the document entitled "*Project on Enhancing South-South Cooperation on IP and Development among Developing Countries and LDCs*" for the consideration of the seventh session of the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP) scheduled to take place in Geneva, from 2 to 6 May 2011.

The Permanent Mission of South Africa avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organisation the assurances of its highest consideration.



Geneva, 13 April 2011

International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organisation

**DEVELOPMENT AGENDA RECOMMENDATIONS 1_10_11_13_19_25_32
PROJECT ON ENHANCING SOUTH-SOUTH COOPERATION ON IP AND DEVELOPMENT
AMONG DEVELOPING COUNTRIES AND LDCS**

5. 1. SUMMARY	
Project Code:	DA_1_10_11_13_19_25_32_01
Title:	Project on Enhancing South-South Cooperation on IP and Development among Developing Countries and LDCs
Development Agenda Recommendation(s) :	<p>1, 10, 11, 13, 19, 25, 32</p> <p>Cluster A: Technical Assistance and Capacity Building:</p> <p>Recommendation 1: WIPO technical assistance shall be, inter alia, development-oriented, demand-driven and transparent, taking into account the priorities and the special needs of developing countries, especially LDCs, as well as the different levels of development of Member States and activities should include time frames for completion. In this regard, design, delivery mechanisms and evaluation processes of technical assistance programs should be country specific.</p> <p>Recommendation 10: To assist Member States to develop and improve national intellectual property institutional capacity through further development of infrastructure and other facilities with a view to making national intellectual property institutions more efficient and promote fair balance between intellectual property protection and the public interest. This technical assistance should also be extended to sub-regional and regional organizations dealing with intellectual property.</p> <p>Recommendation 11: To assist Member States to strengthen national capacity for protection of domestic creations, innovations and inventions and to support development of national scientific and technological infrastructure, where appropriate, in accordance with WIPO's mandate.</p> <p>Recommendation 13: WIPO's legislative assistance shall be, inter alia, development-oriented and demand-driven, taking into account the priorities and the special needs of developing countries, especially LDCs, as well as the different levels of development of Member States and activities should include time frames for completion.</p> <p>Cluster B: Norm-Setting, Flexibilities, Public Policy and Public Domain:</p> <p>Recommendation 19: To initiate discussions on how, within WIPO's mandate, to further facilitate access to knowledge and technology for developing countries and LDCs to foster creativity and innovation and to strengthen such existing activities within WIPO.</p> <p>Cluster C: Technology Transfer, Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) and Access to Knowledge:</p>

	<p>Recommendation 25: To explore intellectual property -related policies and initiatives necessary to promote the transfer and dissemination of technology, to the benefit of developing countries and to take appropriate measures to enable developing countries to fully understand and benefit from different provisions, pertaining to flexibilities provided for in international agreements, as appropriate.</p> <p>Recommendation 32: To have within WIPO opportunity for exchange of national and regional experiences and information on the links between IPRs and competition policies.</p>
<p>Brief Description of Project:</p>	<p>This project relates to optimizing the results from the implementation of certain recommendations of the WIPO Development Agenda. To this end, this project completes and reinforces, on the one hand the projects already developed for recommendations 10, 19, 25, and 32, and on the other hand effectuates recommendations 1, 11, and 13.</p> <p>To attain these objectives, this project aims to develop means to channel the efforts of different actors to promote South-South Cooperation in the area of intellectual property. The project aims to achieve tangible results in the following areas in developing countries and the LDCs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) promoting development-oriented IP technical and legal assistance (recommendations 1, 13); (b) IP institutional capacity building (recommendation 10); (c) domestic innovation capacity building (recommendation 11); (d) facilitating access and dissemination of knowledge and technology, and the use of IP flexibilities (recommendations 19, 25); and (e) Understanding the link between IP and competition policies (recommendation 32).
<p>Implementing Program(s):</p>	<p>Program 9</p>
<p>Links to other related Programs/DA Projects:</p>	<p>Links to WIPO programs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5,6,7, 8, 11, 14, 15, 16, 18, 30. Links to DA projects: DA_05_01, DA_08_01, DA_09_01, DA_10_05, DA_7_23_32_01 and DA_35_37_01, DA_19_25_26_28_01.</p>
<p>Links to Expected Results in the Program and Budget:</p>	<p>National IP policies/strategies and country action plans that are in line with national development plans and priorities. (All Bureaus)</p> <p>Enhanced capacity of IP professionals and creation of a critical mass of IP specialists/experts. (All Bureaus)</p> <p>Modernized service-oriented IP administrations with strengthened infrastructure. (All Bureaus)</p> <p>National IP Legislation consistent with national development objectives as well with international IP treaties and agreements, where applicable, while taking into account available flexibilities for public policy.</p>

	<p>New or strengthened sub-regional IP cooperation programs.</p> <p>Enhanced institutional capacity of universities, R&D centers and other private sector stakeholders in order to effectively manage IP. Greater awareness of the legal principles and practices, of the patent system, including the flexibilities existing in the system, and enhanced understanding and further clarification of current and emerging issues that arise in relation to patent-related matters.</p> <p>Increased awareness and capacity of Member States in copyright and related rights.</p> <p>Enhanced capacity at the regional, national and community levels to make use of IP principles and systems for the protection of TK and TCEs, and for management of the relationship between IP and genetic resources, for the economic and cultural benefit of communities and other TK and TCE holders and their countries.</p>
Project Duration:	24 months (first stage)
Project Budget²³:	<p>Non Personnel Costs: 755,460 Swiss francs</p> <p>Personal Costs: 202,000 Swiss francs (including the appointment of a Focal Point for South-South Cooperation in the WIPO Secretariat)</p>

²³ As provided by the WIPO Secretariat

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1. Introduction

Developing countries, including LDCs, are increasingly using IP as a tool for economic development. In recent years, this has included innovative means of deploying IP in a balanced manner, conscious of their particular socio-economic conditions, while taking into account their different levels of development. As such, an independent body of knowledge and experience on the strategic use of IP for development has sprung up in the South. This project attempts to harvest and exchange this valuable knowledge and experience about IP and Development through enhancing cooperation in this area among developing countries and LDCs.

The project thus relates to specific DA recommendations in the areas of promoting development-oriented IP technical and legal assistance (1, 13), IP institutional capacity building (10), domestic innovation capacity building (11), facilitating access and dissemination of knowledge and technology, and the use of IP flexibilities (19, 25), and understanding the link between IP and competition policies (32).

The project is suggested under the consideration that South-South cooperation can play an important role in achieving the objectives described under the relevant DA recommendations above.

South-South cooperation is one stream of the broader avenues of cooperation, which runs in parallel to and is not a substitute for North-South Cooperation. Furthermore, the intersection of these two streams, the field of trilateral North-South-South cooperation should continue to be promoted in parallel. For this current project, South-South cooperation is particularly useful to achieving pro-development IP systems in developing countries and LDCs given the particular circumstances and challenges developing countries and LDCs face, and the ability to share information and promote understanding of the practical initiatives that developing countries and LDCs can and have utilized to link IP as a tool to broader public policies and development goals.

WIPO can undertake specific activities to promote South-South cooperation in the areas described. This project suggests some activities in that direction.

2.2. Objectives

The objectives of this project are to contribute to the following:

- (a) Better understanding of IP and its potential contribution to development in the developing countries and LDCs;
- (b) Identifying of priorities and special needs of developing countries and LDCs in the area of IP and development including norm-setting at the national, regional, and international levels.;
- (c) Better-informed socio-economic context-sensitive decision-making on IP policies at the national and regional levels in the South;
- (d) Better protection of domestic creations and fostering innovation in developing countries and LDCs;
- (e) Promotion of the transfer and dissemination of technology;

- (f) Enhanced infrastructure and capacity for developing countries and LDCs to make the most effective use of IP for development bearing in mind their socio-economic conditions, and their different levels of development; and
- (g) Increased capacity of developing countries and LDCs to share their knowledge and experience in the area of IP and Development.

2.3. Delivery Strategy

The WIPO Secretariat, through establishing a South-South cooperation focal point, would undertake the following:

- (a) The Project will entail the organization of three-days inter-regional meetings among developing countries and LDCs to foster the sharing of national experiences, including historical experiences, and information on the process of design of national IP policy and legislation, and its implementation, and use of IP flexibilities. This will include the organization of a one-day Annual WIPO Inter-Regional Conference on South-South Cooperation on IP and Development to be held in Geneva immediately before the General Assembly. These meetings should also include participants from regional and international governmental organizations of developing countries. These meetings will be as follows:
 - (i) Spring 2012: First inter-regional meeting to discuss IP Governance; GRTKF; and Copyright and Related Rights;
 - (ii) September 2012: First Annual Conference to review the outcomes of the First inter-regional meeting, and provide guidance to the upcoming meetings;
 - (iii) Spring 2013: Second inter-regional meeting to discuss Patents; Trademarks, Industrial Designs, and Geographical Indications; and Enforcement; and
 - (iv) September 2013: Second Annual Conference to review the outcomes of the Second inter-regional meeting, and discuss the future of the Project on South-South Cooperation.
- (b) Support and assist developing countries and LDCs to provide training and capacity building activities to other developing countries and LDCs, including in the training of patent examiners, and other IP officials, judiciary, competition authorities, sharing of information among IP offices. This support and assistance will be initially made through introducing new functionalities in the existing WIPO IP Development Matchmaking Database (IP-DMD) to enable matchmaking on needs and offers of developing countries and LDCs²⁴.
- (c) Increase the use in WIPO technical assistance and capacity building activities of resource persons and experience sharing from developing countries and LDCs. Better coordinate the work on South-South Cooperation with WIPO's regional Bureaus.
- (d) Dedicate a page on the WIPO website to South-South Cooperation on IP and Development.²⁵ The purpose of this dedicated page will be to present

²⁴ These functionalities will be added upon the completion and review of the IP Development Matchmaking Database (IP-DMD)

²⁵ A good example in this regard is the UNEP dedicated page, to be found at the following address:
<http://www.unep.org/south-south-cooperation/>.

a one stop facility of all developing countries including LDCs and WIPO activities in the area of South-South Cooperation on IP.

- (e) Establishment of an interactive web portal/virtual network among IP offices, universities, public research institutions, and civil society organizations in developing countries and LDCs, to foster the building of institutional linkages and collaborative research projects, and enhance access to knowledge, and the transfer of technology. This would be part of the dedicated web page. The initial information to populate this network will be provided through a questionnaire that the Secretariat will circulate to developing countries and LDCs Member States.
- (f) The Secretariat will appoint a Focal Point on South-South Cooperation and establish links and coordinate with the UNDP Special Unit for South-South Cooperation, as the designated UN System focal point for such cooperation. The designated Focal point will follow-up on the abovementioned activities and coordinate with UN system-wide activities on South-South Cooperation.

3. REVIEW AND EVALUATION

3.1. Project Review Schedule

- (a) A mid term review will be undertaken after one year; and
- (b) An evaluation will be conducted upon completion of the first stage of the project offering and assessment of the project achievements.

3.2. Project Self-Evaluation

Project Outputs	Indicators of Successful Completion (Output Indicators)
Annual Conferences and Inter-regional meetings	Level of attendance. Feedback from participants through a questionnaire.
South-South Training and Capacity Building activities	New functionalities introduced in the WIPO IP Technical Assistance Database (IP-TAD) and IP Development Matchmaking Database (IP-DMD). Statistics on the use of the matchmaking feature and number of exchange visits/missions among developing countries and LDCs.
Increase the use in WIPO technical assistance and capacity building activities of resource persons and experience sharing from developing countries and LDCs	Annual periodic reports and review of the WIPO roster of consultants to identify the increase in the use of consultants from developing countries and LDCs.
WIPO Webpage on South-South cooperation	Webpage in place. Feedback from users and statistics on the use of the webpage.

Interactive web portal/virtual network	Interactive web portal/virtual network in place. Feedback from users and statistics on the use of the virtual network as well as qualitative assessment to be sought from participants and output in the form of collaborative interaction.
Focal Point on South-South Cooperation	Appointment of a Focal Point on South-South Cooperation in the WIPO Secretariat Periodic reports to be submitted by the Focal Point to Member States.
Project Objectives	Indicators of Success in Achieving Project Objective (Outcome Indicators)
<p>(a) Better understanding of IP and its potential contribution to development in the developing countries and LDCs;</p> <p>(b) Identifying of priorities and special needs of developing countries and LDCs in the area of IP and development including norm-setting at the national, regional, and international levels.;</p> <p>(c) Better-informed socio-economic context-sensitive decision-making on IP policies at the national and regional levels in the South;</p> <p>(d) Better protection of domestic creations and fostering innovation in developing countries and LDCs;</p> <p>(e) Promotion of the transfer and dissemination of technology;</p> <p>(f) Enhanced infrastructure and capacity for developing</p>	<p>Impact in Member States practices including in the design of national IP policy and legislation, and its implementation, and use of IP flexibilities. (Survey questionnaire)</p> <p>(a) Statistics on the use of the matchmaking feature;</p> <p>(b) Statistics and Feedbacks on the use of the webpage;</p> <p>(c) Statistics and Feedbacks use of the virtual network; and</p> <p>(d) Statistics on the use of consultants from developing countries and LDCs.</p>

<p>countries and LDCs to make the most effective use of IP for development bearing in mind their socio-economic conditions, and their different levels of development; and</p> <p>(g) Increased capacity of developing countries and LDCs to share their knowledge and experience in the area of IP and Development.</p>	
--	--

4. IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE

ACTIVITY	QUARTERS							
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
1. Inter-regional meetings								
1.1 First inter-regional meeting		X						
1.2 Second inter-regional meeting						X		
2. Inter-Regional Conference on South-South cooperation on IP and Development.								
2.1 First Annual Inter-Regional Conference			X					
2.2 Second Annual Inter-Regional Conference							X	
3. New functionalities in IP-TAD and IP-DMD								
3.1 Introducing new functionalities on South -South cooperation in IP-TAD and IP-DMD	X	X						
4. WIPO Webpage on South-South cooperation								
4.1 Launching of a WIPO website on South-South cooperation		X						
5. Interactive Platform								
5.1 Creation of a Platform for a virtual network among South-South institutions					X			
6. Appointment of a Focal Point on South-South Cooperation in the WIPO	X							
7. Finalization of the Project (first stage)								X
REVIEW SCHEDULE				X				X

5. BUDGET²⁶

Non-personnel resources

Table 1 – Project Budget by Cost Category and Year

Cost Category	Budget (Swiss Francs)			
	Year 1	Year 2	Year N	Total
<i>Travel and Fellowships</i>				
Staff Missions	24,300	21,370		45,670
Third-party Travel	247,500	232,290		479,790
Fellowships				
<i>Contractual Services</i>	60,000	70,000		130,000
Conferences	40,000	40,000		80,000
Experts' Honoraria	10,000	10,000		20,000
Publishing				
Others				
<i>Equipment and Supplies</i>				
Equipment				
Supplies and Materials				
TOTAL	381,800	373,660		755,460

Personnel resources, where applicable

Table 2 – Project Budget by Program and Year

Cost Category	Budget (Swiss Francs)			
	Year 1	Year 2	Year N	Total
Program 9				
SLC P2 100%	101,000	101,000		202,000
TOTAL	101,000	101,000		202,000

[Appendix II follows]

²⁶ As provided by the WIPO Secretariat.

APPENDIX 2: TERMS OF REFERENCE

PROJECT EVALUATION: PROJECT ON ENHANCING SOUTH-SOUTH COOPERATION ON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY (IP) AND DEVELOPMENT AMONG DEVELOPING COUNTRIES AND LEAST-DEVELOPED COUNTRIES (LDCS)

Geneva, Switzerland
From January 7 to May 30, 2014

TERMS OF REFERENCE

I. PROJECT BACKGROUND

The present document represents the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the evaluation of the *Development Agenda Project on Enhancing South-South Cooperation on Intellectual Property (IP) and Development among Developing Countries and Least-Developed Countries (LDCs)*, approved during the resumed seventh session of the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP), held in Geneva, in November 2011. The project document for this project is contained in document CDIP/7/6. The project implementation started in January 2012 and was completed in December 2013. The project aims to develop means to channel the efforts of different actors to promote South-South Cooperation in the area of intellectual property. Activities undertaken in the context of this project are described in the project document (CDIP/7/6).

The project was implemented under the supervision of the Project Manager, Mr. Alejandro Roca Campaña, Senior Director, Access to Information and Knowledge Division.

II. OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

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

The main objective of this evaluation is two-fold:

1. Learning from experiences during project implementation: what worked well and what did not work well for the benefit of continuing activities in this field. This includes assessing the project design framework, project management, including monitoring and reporting tools, as well as measuring and reporting on the results achieved to date and assessing the likelihood of sustainability of results achieved; and
2. providing evidence-based evaluative information to support the CDIP's decision-making process.

III. SCOPE AND FOCUS

The project time frame considered for this evaluation is 23 months (January 2012 – November 2013). The focus shall not be on assessing individual activities but rather to evaluate the project as a whole and its contribution in assessing the needs of Member States and identify

the resources or the means to address those needs. The evaluation will also assess the project's evolution over time and its performance including project design, project management, coordination, coherence, implementation and results achieved.

In particular, the evaluation will assess the extent to which the project has been instrumental in enhancing South-South cooperation on IP and development among developing countries and LDCs and in developing means to channel the efforts of different actors to promote South-South cooperation in the area of IP.

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 contributing to a better understanding of IP and its potential contribution to development in the developing countries and LDCs and in identifying priorities and special needs of developing countries and LDCs in the area of IP and development including norm-setting at the national, regional and international levels, to be addressed in the framework of enhanced South-South cooperation;
2. the usefulness of the project in contributing to better-informed socio-economic context-sensitive decision-making on IP policies at the national and regional levels in the South;
3. the effectiveness of the project in contributing to better protection of domestic creations, in fostering innovation in developing countries and LDCs, promoting transfer and dissemination of technology and enhancing the infrastructure and capacity of developing countries and LDCs to make the most effective use of IP for development; and
4. the effectiveness of the project in increasing capacity of developing countries and LDCs to share their knowledge and experience in the area of IP and Development.

Sustainability

The likelihood for continued work on South-South Cooperation on IP and Development among Developing Countries and LDCs in WIPO and its Member States.

Implementation of Development Agenda (DA) Recommendations

The extent to which the DA Recommendations addressed by the project have 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 IP offices.

You will be in charge of conducting the evaluation, in consultation and collaboration with the project team and the Development Agenda Coordination Division (DACD). The evaluation methodology will consist of the following:

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

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 January 7, 2014 and be finalized on March 30, 2014. The reporting language will be English.

VI. ACCOUNTABILITY AND RESPONSIBILITIES

You shall:

1. Be responsible for delivering the evaluation report to WIPO as described above in accordance with other details provided in this document;
2. work closely with the DACD, the Development Sector and the Project Manager. You shall also coordinate with the relevant Program Managers in WIPO as required; and

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 January 20, 2014. WIPO's feedback shall be communicated to you by January 28, 2014. The draft evaluation report shall be submitted to WIPO by February 28, 2014. Factual corrections on the draft will be provided to you by March 5, 2014. The final evaluation report shall be submitted by March 20, 2014. The final version of the evaluation report containing a management response in an annex shall be considered by the thirteenth session of the CDIP, to be held in May 2014. You will be required to present the evaluation report during that CDIP session.

[Appendix III follows]

APPENDIX 3: LIST OF PERSONS MET/INTERVIEWED

No.	Name and function
1.	Mr. Ahmed Abdel Latif Senior Programme Manager, Programme on Innovation, Technology and Intellectual Property, International Centre for Trade and Development (ICTSD), Geneva, Switzerland
2.	Mr. Maged Al-Sherbiny President, Academy of Scientific Research and Technology (ASRT), Ministry of Scientific Research, Cairo, Egypt
3.	Ms. Maya Bachner Acting Director and Head, Program Management and Performance, Resource Planning, Program Management and Performance Division, Administration and Management Sector, WIPO, Geneva, Switzerland
4.	Mr. Irfan Baloch Director, DACD, Development Sector, WIPO, Geneva, Switzerland
5.	Ms. Yesim Baykal Senior Program Officer, Climate Change and Food Security, Global Issues Sector, WIPO, Geneva, Switzerland
6.	Ms. Lilyclaire Bellamy Deputy Director, Jamaica IP Office, Kingston, Jamaica
7.	Ms. Beatriz Amorim Pascoa Borher Deputy Director, WIPO Brazil Office, Global Infrastructure Sector, WIPO, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
8.	Mr. Alejandro Roca Campaña Senior Director, Access to Information and Knowledge Division, Global Infrastructure Sector, WIPO, Geneva, Switzerland
9.	Ms. Carole Croella Senior Counsellor, Copyright Law Division, Culture and Creative Industries Sector, WIPO, Geneva, Switzerland
10.	H.E. Mr. Mohamed Siad Doualeh Ambassador, Permanent Representative of Djibouti to the UN, Geneva, Switzerland
11.	Mr. Adel Ewida Acting President, Egyptian Patent Office, Cairo, Egypt
12.	Mr. Mihaly Fiscor Chairman, Central and Eastern European Copyright Alliance (CEECA), Hungary
13.	Mr. Joseph Fometeu Professor, University of Ngaoundere, Cameroon
14.	Mr. Georges Ghandour Senior Program Officer, DACD, Development Sector, WIPO, Geneva, Switzerland
15.	Ms. Dalila Hamou Director, Regional Bureau for Arab Countries, Development Sector, WIPO, Geneva, Switzerland
16.	Mr. Marcus Höpperger Director, Law and Legislative Advice Division, Brands and Designs Sector, WIPO, Geneva, Switzerland
17.	Mr. Kingsley Kalusha Consultant, UNOSSC, Shanghai, China

18.	Mr. Mathias Kende Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of Belgium to the UN, Geneva, Switzerland
19.	Mr. Grega Kumer Senior IP Adviser, Specialized Agencies Team, Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom to the UN, Geneva, Switzerland
20.	Ms. Teresa Liu Chief, Knowledge Management and Technology Exchange UNOSSC, New York, USA
21.	Mr. Rodrigo Mendes Araujo First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Brazil to the UN, Geneva, Switzerland
22.	Ms. Nathalie Montillot Assistant Project Officer, Access to Information and Knowledge Division, Global Infrastructure Sector, WIPO, Geneva, Switzerland
23.	Mr. Herman Ntchacho Director, Department for Africa and Special Projects, Development Sector, WIPO, Geneva, Switzerland
24.	Mr. Geoffrey Onyeama Deputy Director General, Development Sector, WIPO, Geneva, Switzerland
25.	Mr. Joseph Panakal Project User Coordinator, Special Projects Division, Department for Africa and Special Projects, Development Sector, WIPO, Geneva, Switzerland
26.	Ms. Natasha Pinheiro Agostini Secretary, IP Division, Ministry of External Relations, Brazil
27.	Mr. Martin Senftleben Professor, VU University of Amsterdam, Senior Consultant, Bird & Bird LLP, The Netherlands
28.	Mr. McLean Sibanda Chief Executive Officer, The Innovation Hub, Pretoria, South Africa
29.	Mr. Francisco Simplicio Assistant Director, Programmes and Funds Management, UNOSSC, New York, USA
30.	Mr. Yoshiyuki Takagi Assistant Director General, Global Infrastructure Sector, WIPO, Geneva, Switzerland
31.	Mr. John Tarpey Director, Communications Division, Global Issues Sector, WIPO
32.	Mr. Xavier Vermandele Senior Legal Counsellor, Capacity Building and Technical Assistance, Building Respect for IP Division, Global Issues Sector, WIPO, Geneva, Switzerland
33.	Mr. Wend Wendland Director, Traditional Knowledge Division, Department for Traditional Knowledge and Global Challenges, Global Issues Sector, WIPO, Geneva, Switzerland
34.	Mr. Mokhtar Warida Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Egypt to the UN, Geneva, Switzerland
35.	Mr. Bajoe Wiwobo Project Manager, Special Projects Division, Department for Africa and Special Projects, Development Sector, WIPO, Geneva, Switzerland

36.	Ms. Michelle Woods Director, Copyright Law Division, Culture and Creative Industries Sector, WIPO, Geneva, Switzerland
-----	---

[Appendix IV follows]

APPENDIX 4: LIST OF DOCUMENTS

WIPO documents relating to monitoring & evaluation

- Internal Audit and Oversight Division, Revised WIPO Evaluation Policy, May 2010
- Internal Audit and Oversight Division, Evaluation and Inspection Section, Self-Evaluation Guidelines, Version 1.1, April 2009

WIPO programmatic documents

- The 45 Adopted Recommendations under the WIPO Development Agenda by the General Assembly of WIPO Member States, 2007
- “What WIPO is Doing on MDG 4, 5 and 6”, retrieved from WIPO-Website

Reports of WIPO meetings

- Documents of WIPO’s General Assembly in 2011, 2012 and 2013 (including statements of Member States relating to the CDIP and the DA)
- Reports on the 10th, 11th and 12th CDIP Sessions

Project documents and reports

- **Project Document:** Project on Enhancing South-South Cooperation on IP and Development among Developing Countries and LDCs (Project Code: DA_1_10_11_13_19_25_32_01)
- **Progress Report 2012:** Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP), Progress Report Project on Enhancing South-South Cooperation on IP and Development Among Developing Countries and LDCs, 27 September 2012 (CDIP/10/2 Annex XI)
- **Progress Report 2013:** Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP), Progress Report Project on “Enhancing South-South Cooperation on IP and Development among Developing Countries and LDCs”, 12 September 2013, prepared by the Secretariat (CDIP 12/2).
- **Report:** First Annual Conference on South-South Cooperation on Intellectual Property (IP) and Development, Conference, Geneva, September 28, 2012, prepared by the Secretariat, document WIPO/SSC/GE/12/3, 11 October 2012
- **Summary of the Report:** First Annual Conference on South-South Cooperation on Intellectual Property (IP) and Development, Conference, Geneva, September 28, 2012, prepared by the Secretariat, document WIPO/SSC/GE/12/4, 31 October 2012
- **Report:** Second Annual Conference on South-South Cooperation on Intellectual Property (IP) and Development, Conference, Geneva, November 22, 2013, prepared by the Secretariat, document,, WIPO/SSC/GE/12/3, 20 December 2013
- **Report:** First Interregional Meeting on South-South Cooperation on IP Governance; Genetic Resources, Traditional Knowledge and Folklore (GRTKF); and Copyright and Related Rights, Brasilia, August 8 to 10, 2013, prepared by the Secretariat, Document WIPO/GRTKF/BRA/12/1 17 September 2012.
- **Summary of the Report:** First Interregional Meeting on South-South Cooperation on IP Governance; Genetic Resources, Traditional Knowledge and Folklore (GRTKF); and

Copyright and Related Rights, Brasilia, August 8 to 10, 2013, prepared by the Secretariat, Document WIPO/GRTKF/BRA/12/2 18 September 2012.

- **Report:** Second WIPO Inter-Regional Meeting on South-South Cooperation on Patents, Trademarks, Geographical Indications, Industrial Designs and Enforcement Inter-Regional Meeting, Cairo, Arab Republic of Egypt, May 6 to 8, 2013, prepared by the Secretariat, Document WIPO/SSC/CAI/13/2, 5 July 2013
- **Summary of the Report:** Second WIPO Inter-Regional Meeting on South-South Cooperation on Patents, Trademarks, Geographical Indications, Industrial Designs and Enforcement Inter-Regional Meeting, Cairo, Arab Republic of Egypt, May 6 to 8, 2013, prepared by the Secretariat, Document WIPO/SSC/CAI/13/3, 1 August 2013
- **Evaluation of First Interregional Meeting on South-South Cooperation,** Geneva, September 28, 2012, presented by Alejandro Roca Campaña, Senior Director
- **Evaluation of Second Interregional Meeting on South-South Cooperation,** Geneva 22 November 2013, presented by Alejandro Roca Campaña, Senior Director

Internal Documents

- **Internal Memorandum (Mission Report),** Participation in the 17th session of the High-level Committee on South-South Cooperation, New York, May 22 to 25, 2012, by Ms. Nathalie Montillot.
- **Internal Memorandum (Mission Report),** WIPO First Inter-Regional Meeting on South-South Cooperation on IP Governance, Genetic Resources, Traditional Knowledge and Folklore (GRTKF), and Copyright and Related Rights, Brasilia, August 8 to 10, 2012
- **Internal Memorandum (Mission Report),** Second WIPO Inter-Regional Meeting on South-South Cooperation on Patents, Trademarks, Geographical Indications, Industrial Designs and Enforcement, Cairo, May 6 to 8, 2013
- **Internal Memorandum (Mission Report),** Participation in the United Nations South-South Stakeholders' and High-level Development Cooperation Meeting, and fifth Global South-South Development Expo, Vienna, Austria, November 21 to 22, 2012, by Mr. Alejandro Roca Campaña and Ms. Nathalie Montillot, 12 December 2012
- **Internal Memorandum (Mission Report),** Participation in the sixth Global South-south Development Expo 2013 in Nairobi, Kenya, from October 28 to November 1, 2013 (by Mrs. Yesim Baykal and Ms. Nathalie Montillot), 15 November 2013
- **Detailed list of tasks conducted by the Project** (EXCEL file)
- **Evaluation form and analysis of participant's survey:** WIPO First Interregional Meeting on South-South Cooperation on IP Governance; GRTKF; and Copyright and Related Rights, Brasilia, August 8 to 10, 2012
- **Evaluation form and analysis of participants' survey:** First Annual Conference on South-South Cooperation on Intellectual Property (IP) and Development, Geneva, September 28, 2012
- **Evaluation form and analysis of participant survey:** Second Inter-Regional Meeting on South-South Cooperation, Cairo, 6 – 8 May 2013
- **Evaluation form:** Second WIPO Annual Conference on South-South Cooperation on Intellectual Property (IP) and Development organized in Geneva on November 22, 2013

Project Outputs

- Selected conference material (presentations), First WIPO Interregional Meeting on South-South Cooperation on Intellectual Property (IP) Governance; Genetic Resources, Traditional Knowledge and Folklore (GRTKF); and Copyright and Related Rights, Brasilia, August 8 to 10, 2012, published in section “other related documents” on: http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/details.jsp?meeting_id=26522 (retrieved on 12 January 2014)
- Selected conference material (presentations): Second WIPO Interregional Meeting on South-South Cooperation on Patents, Trademarks, Geographical Indications, Industrial Designs and Enforcement, Cairo, Egypt - May 6 to 8, 2013, published in section “other related documents”: http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/details.jsp?meeting_id=28982 (retrieved on 12 January 2014)
- Selected conference material (presentations): Second WIPO Annual Conference on South-South Cooperation on IP and Development, Geneva, November 22, 2013, published in section “other related documents”: http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/details.jsp?meeting_id=30462
- WIPO Website on South-South Cooperation, developed under the Project: http://www.wipo.int/cooperation/en/south_south/ (including sections “Resources”, subsections “Roster of Consultants”, “Technical Assistance”, “Matchmaking platform” and “IP Case Studies”)
- **Questionnaires sent to Member States (developing countries) to populate the South-South webpage** (e-survey accessible on the South-South webpage)

Other reference documents

- **Financial reports:** Program Management Reports (detailed transactions listing for Year 1 and Year 2)
- **JIU Recommendations** related to South-South cooperation addressed to the legislative bodies (WO/PBC/21/16, Annex page 4)
- **Draft Report of the Program and Budget Committee, Twenty-First Session**, Geneva, September 9 to 13, 2013 [WO/PBC/21/22 PROV., November 29, 2013]: reference in particular to the following sections: item 7, pp. 57 to 64 and item 13, pp. 102-103
- **Case study:** “Promoting the Use of Intellectual Property in Vietnam as a Tool to Foster Trade Successful Technical Assistance to Middle-Income Countries offers a Potential for Triangular Cooperation with Least Developed Countries”, submitted by the Swiss State Secretariat for Economic Affairs, published on <http://www.oecd.org/aidfortrade/46827679.pdf>
- Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management, DAC-OECD, 2010
- United Nations, Sixty-sixth session, Agenda item 140, Joint Inspection Unit, South-South and triangular cooperation in the United Nations system, Note by the Secretary-General A/66/717/Add dated 29 February 2012

[End of Annex IV and of document]