

## **Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP)**

**Fifteenth Session**  
**Geneva, April 20 to 24, 2015**

### **EVALUATION REPORT FOR THE PROJECT ON OPEN COLLABORATIVE PROJECTS AND IP-BASED MODELS**

*prepared by Mr. Daniel Keller, Consultant, Leubringen, Switzerland*

1. The Annex to the document contains an external independent Evaluation Report for the Project on Open Collaborative Projects and IP-Based Models, undertaken by Mr. Daniel Keller, Consultant, Leubringen, Switzerland.

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

[Annex follows]

<b>LIST OF ACRONYMS</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>6</b>
(A) PROJECT BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION .....	6
(B) SCOPE, PURPOSE, METHODOLOGY AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS EVALUATION..	7
(i) Scope .....	7
(ii) Key purpose .....	7
(iii) Methodology .....	8
(iv) Main limitations to this evaluation .....	8
<b>2. FINDINGS AND ASSESSMENT</b> .....	<b>9</b>
(A) PROJECT PREPARATION AND MANAGEMENT .....	9
(i) Project preparation .....	9
(ii) Use of project planning tools.....	9
(iii) Project Management.....	11
(B) RELEVANCE .....	11
(i) Policy relevance .....	11
(C) EFFECTIVENESS.....	12
(i) Output 1: Taxonomy-Analytical Study .....	12
(ii) Output 2: Open-ended Meetings with Member States.....	12
(iii) In-depth evaluation study .....	13
(iv) Expert meeting .....	13
(vi) Initial outcomes observed .....	14
(vii) Impact.....	14
(D) EFFICIENCY.....	14
(i) Financial implementation .....	14
(ii) Assessment of approach .....	14
(iii) Assessment of quality of outputs .....	14
(iv) Synergies with other activities conducted by the Secretariat.....	15
(E) LIKELIHOOD OF SUSTAINABILITY OF RESULTS .....	15
<b>3. CONCLUSIONS</b> .....	<b>16</b>
<b>4. RECOMMENDATIONS</b> .....	<b>17</b>
<b>LIST OF APPENDIXES</b> .....	<b>19</b>

## LIST OF ACRONYMS

<b>CDIP</b>	Committee on Development and Intellectual Property
<b>CHF</b>	Swiss Francs
<b>DA</b>	Development Agenda
<b>DAC</b>	Development Assistance Committee (of the OECD)
<b>DACD</b>	Development Agenda Coordination Division
<b>IP</b>	Intellectual Property
<b>IPR(s)</b>	Intellectual Property Rights
<b>LDCs</b>	Least Developed Countries
<b>OECD</b>	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
<b>SMART (indicators)</b>	Specific, Measurable, Ambitious, Relevant and Time-bound
<b>TISCs</b>	Technology and Information Support Centers
<b>ToRs</b>	Terms of Reference (of this evaluation)
<b>UN</b>	United Nations
<b>WIPO</b>	World Intellectual Property Organization

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This independent final evaluation commissioned by the Secretariat covers the “Project on Open Collaborative Projects and IP-Based Models” (Project Code: DA\_36, “the Project”) under the Development Agenda (DA). The Project was approved by the 6<sup>th</sup> session of the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP) in November 2010. Project objectives were framed by the DA Recommendation 36 (Cluster D), which calls for exchanging experiences on Open Collaborative Projects such as the Human Genome Project, as well as on intellectual property (IP) models. Deliverables included two studies, an open-ended meeting with Member States, an expert meeting, the establishment of an interactive platform and the incorporation of resulting recommendations into relevant WIPO programs after approval by Member States. The work on the platform is still ongoing. The Project started on January 1, 2011 and formally ended on June 30, 2014, following a non-cost extension of 12 months approved by the 12<sup>th</sup> session of the CDIP. According to the final progress report presented to the 14<sup>th</sup> session of the CDIP, 27% of the total budget of 895,000 Swiss francs was spent.

The evaluation work was conducted from December 10, 2014 to April 24, 2015 by an independent evaluator in close coordination with the Development Agenda Coordination Division (DACD) and resulted in the following conclusions:

### **Conclusion 1 on relevance: Strengthening the use of Open Collaborative Projects and IP based models continues to be of high relevance**

Open Collaborative Projects offer opportunities for exchanging intellectual assets worldwide on a voluntary basis in mutual benefit, regardless of a possible North-South divide. This is of high interest for both the developing and the developed world. Through sharing the insight gained on models used, WIPO’s work provides a unique value added to foster new North-South partnerships. The model of Open Collaboration is applicable beyond what is commonly understood as “innovation” and extends also to creative industries. Open Collaborative Projects are an effective tool to enhance the “valorization” of intellectual assets, including but not limited to IP in the public domain. In this sense, project objectives are highly relevant to facilitating the use of IP for development, which is an international priority reflected in Strategic Goal III of the Program and Budget for the Biennium 2014/2015. The conclusions of the Project are potentially relevant for WIPO’s work in many fields, including promoting innovation, capacity building for IP service providers, training, the cooperation with universities, and policy advice.

### **Conclusion 2 on project preparation and management: The Project addresses DA Recommendation 36 in a creative and appropriate way. Activities were well organized. The application of standard project planning and monitoring tools was however weak. The project was significantly over budgeted and implemented at a slow pace.**

The Secretariat translated the relatively open DA Recommendation 36 into a clearly articulated delivery strategy and methodology. The type and planned sequencing of activities was conducive to achieving objectives. Researching on the use of open collaborative models, identifying good practices, and subsequently offering a platform for discussing results and sharing experiences among experts and other key stakeholders, is an appropriate way to foster the exchange of experience. Those activities that had been completed were well prepared and organized.

The application of standard tools for result-based management in project planning and monitoring was however weak. Progress reports list activities rather than comparing achieved against planned results using specific, measurable, ambitious, relevant and time-bound (“SMART”) indicators. Assumptions and risks were neither identified nor monitored. Due to a lack of a realistic and detailed cost calculation, the Project was significantly over budgeted. Inaccurate budgeting blocks resources, which would otherwise be available to generate benefits

for Member States. Furthermore, there is a risk that projects are “perpetuated” for the sole reason that resources are still available. A budget and financial report presenting type of costs for each objective is not available.

Project implementation advanced slowly. The originally planned 30 months should have been sufficient to implement the limited number of activities. Even after the CDIP granted a project extension, no measures were taken to accelerate implementation. Delays are costly and cause a loss of momentum. If not explainable by the impact of unforeseeable external factors, implementation delays erode the confidence of Member States into the Secretariat’s project implementation capability.

**Conclusion 3: Outputs were of high quality, but not all of them were delivered. The Secretariat generally made economic use of resources. Without a follow-up, initial promising results are likely to be lost.**

The Project did not reach all of its planned objectives. Through the delivery of four out of six planned outputs, the Project contributed to the identification of successful Open Collaborative Projects, in particular in developing countries, to deriving best practices from them and to discussing the results within a limited audience. The not yet completed Interactive Platform (Output 5) is pivotal for sharing good practices with a wider audience and to make practical tools to support open innovation available. Due to the delays in completing the platform, WIPO’s work in the field of Open Collaboration risks to lose momentum. No steps have been taken towards an integration of project results into WIPO’s existing Program activities. The wording of “output” 6 indicates that Member States would expect a specific proposal of the Secretariat. Without a follow-up, the Project’s reach remains limited and initial promising results are likely to be lost.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

### **Recommendation 1 (from conclusion 3) to the WIPO Secretariat on finalizing the interactive platform (planned output 5 of the Project)**

- (a) Complete a beta version of the interactive platform;
- (b) Test-run the interactive platform and obtain feed-back from users;
- (c) Integrate the feed-back from users;
- (d) Present a final version of the platform to the 17<sup>th</sup> session of the CDIP in November 2015;  
and
- (e) Assign a clear responsibility and allocate resources to maintain and update the interactive platform regularly.

### **Recommendation 2 (from conclusions 1 and 3) to the WIPO Secretariat on preparing a proposal to the CDIP on how to facilitate Open Innovation through WIPO’s existing Programs (planned Output 6 of the Project)**

- (a) Continuing identifying, collecting and sharing best practices in the field of Open Collaborative Projects (studies);
- (b) Offer practical capacity building (including tool kits) tailored to specific target users;
- (c) Offer capacity building to IP and/or innovation service providers in developing countries, such as for example IP Offices, Technology Transfer Centers etc.;
- (d) Support specific open collaborative pilot projects in developing countries; and
- (e) Advise Member States in creating an enabling environment for open collaboration in their IP policies.

**Recommendation 3 (from conclusion 3) to the WIPO Secretariat on strengthening WIPO's presence in open collaboration conferences and fora**

A regular presence and visibility of WIPO in international conferences on Open Innovation (including but not limited to events organized by other UN organization) may help WIPO to position itself as a "competence center" in the field of Open Collaborative Projects, to create visibility and to benefit from additional experience of a wide array of conference participants.

**Recommendation 4 (from conclusion 2): To the Secretariat on ensuring the application of planning and monitoring tools in project cycle management**

- (a) Strengthen the quality control of new projects submitted to the CDIP in regards to proper application of WIPO's existing project tools for project cycle management;
- (b) Strengthen the quality control of progress reports submitted to the CDIP to ensure that WIPO's existing project tools for project cycle management are properly applied;
- (c) Consider introducing the logical framework as a basis for project cycle management;
- (d) Consider the introduction of compulsory courses for future project managers on project cycle management; and
- (e) Ensure regular coaching of project managers on a demand basis.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

1. This independent final evaluation commissioned by the Secretariat covers the “Project on Open Collaborative Projects and IP-Based Models” (Project Code: DA\_36, “the Project”) under the Development Agenda (DA) and is guided by the Terms of Reference (ToRs) dated December 9, 2014 (Appendix 2). An inception report operationalized the ToRs.

2. The work was undertaken between December 10, 2014 and April 24, 2015 by an independent external evaluator<sup>1</sup> in close coordination with the Development Agenda Coordination Division (DACD).

### (A) PROJECT BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION

3. The Project was adopted by the 6<sup>th</sup> session of the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP) in Geneva (November 22 to 26, 2010). The first thematic project proposal of the Secretariat (CDIP 6\_6 dated October 10, 2010) underwent minor amendments during this session (see CDIP 6\_6\_rev, November 26, 2010).

4. Project objectives are framed by the DA Recommendation 36 (Cluster D), which calls specifically for exchanging experiences on Open Collaborative Projects such as the Human Genome Project as well as on intellectual property (IP) models.

5. Open Collaborative Projects intend to bring into play innovative solutions from a wide range of inventors and problem-solvers through the sharing of best practices among several entities. Open collaborative innovation may be defined as an exchange of knowledge between an organization or community and its environment. It may be promoted through a variety of arrangements, such as licensing of IP, subcontracting, R&D collaborative contracts, joint ventures and patent pools, Internet-enabled trends that foster customer driven innovation include crowd-sourcing, ideas competitions etc.<sup>2</sup>

6. Open Collaborative Projects and IP-based models are not a purpose in itself, but one of many tools to stimulate innovation and facilitate the valorization of IP, including but not limited to IP in the public domain.

7. The Project’s approach<sup>3</sup> was to research on and present successful Open Collaborative Projects and IP-based models, in particular in developing countries. Through a web-based “interactive platform” (web-forum), the Project intended to facilitate the sharing of best practices and experiences and making IP tools and online training kits from WIPO available.

8. Target beneficiaries included: Governments, universities and research institutions, the private sector, international organizations, intergovernmental organizations, non-governmental organizations, and independent individuals forming the network.

9. The following outputs (deliverables) were planned:

(a) Output 1: A Taxonomy-Analytical Study with the aim of mapping, clustering, analyzing and correlating different open collaborative initiatives and the respective IP models they are based on;

(b) Output 2: An Open-ended Meeting with Member States for a constructive debate on the essence, logic and stages of the approach of Open Collaborative Projects;

---

<sup>1</sup> Daniel P. Keller (EvalCo GmbH/Sàrl, Evillard/Leubringen, Switzerland). The evaluator is independent and has not been involved into the preparation or implementation of the Project.

<sup>2</sup> Summarized from CDIP\_6\_6\_rev., page 2

<sup>3</sup> The delivery strategy is described in detail in section 2.3 of CDIP\_6\_6\_rev. (pages 5 an 6)

(c) Output 3: An experts meeting to exchange best practices on existing Open Collaborative Projects;

(d) Output 4: An in-depth evaluation study establishing pros and cons of existing Open Collaborative Projects by extracting inherent IP models for successful open collaborative environments;

(e) Output 5: The establishment of an interactive platform for exchange of experiences consisting of two components: a web site informing on the studies and proposing possible IP tools, and a web forum for receiving feedback from/on experiences in Open Collaborative Projects and IP-based models;

(f) Output 6: The incorporation of resulting recommendations into relevant WIPO programs after approval by Member States.

10. At the outcome level<sup>4</sup>, the Project aimed at contributing to the stimulation of local innovation, in particular in developing countries. Project-specific impact objectives<sup>5</sup> were not defined.

11. According to the final progress report submitted to the CDIP<sup>6</sup>, which was updated and validated through interviews in January 2015, Outputs 1 – 4 have been fully delivered, as it will be described in more detail in section 2.C below (assessment of effectiveness). By the time of the evaluation, the Project Manager was in the process of completing Output 5 (Interactive Platform), while no work had been undertaken on Output 6. The reported budget utilization rate per August 31, 2014 was 27%.

## (B) SCOPE, PURPOSE, METHODOLOGY AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS EVALUATION

### (i) Scope

12. According to the ToRs, the evaluation covered the period from January 1, 2011 to August 31, 2014. Relevant subsequent developments were taken into account until the end of the field mission in January 2015.

### (ii) Key purpose

13. The main purpose of this evaluation given by the ToRs was to assess whether the Project as a whole provided the right type of support to achieve its key objectives in the right way, with the main purpose to draw lessons learned for possible further WIPO activities. Future WIPO activities might in particular refer to the originally envisaged incorporation of activities into relevant WIPO programs (Output 6), which will require formal approval by the Member States.

14. Balancing the need for organizational learning with the purpose of ensuring accountability of the Secretariat towards the Member States, the specific evaluation objectives were two-fold:

(a) To ensure learning from experiences during the Project's implementation, what worked well and what did not work well for the benefit of continuing activities in the field of Open Collaborative Projects and IP-Based Models.

(b) To provide an evidence-based assessment to support the CDIP's decision making process.

---

<sup>4</sup> Outcomes are results generated by the use of the project's deliverables (outputs).

<sup>5</sup> Impact refers to positive and negative, intended and non-intended, directly and indirectly, long term effects produced by a development intervention.

<sup>6</sup> The last implementation report available and presented to the Member States is dated August 28, 2014 (CDIP\_14\_2, Annex III).



(iii) Methodology

15. The evaluation framework is provided by WIPO's Evaluation Policy<sup>7</sup>, which reflects the key principles of the evaluation criteria and quality standards issued by the Development Assistance Committee of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD-DAC)<sup>8</sup>. The ToRs requested an assessment of project quality, including its design and management. In line with the ToRs and standard evaluation practices, the assessment was conducted based on the following five criteria<sup>9</sup>:

- (a) Project preparation and management: Did project preparation and management followed good practices, including applying the tools of results-based management?
- (b) Relevance: The extent to which project objectives were consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, the Member Countries' needs, global priorities and policies.
- (c) Efficiency: How efficiently inputs (e.g. funds, expertise, and time) were converted into results. The evaluation mainly looked at the Project's approach.
- (d) Effectiveness: The extent to which objectives were achieved or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.
- (e) Sustainability: The likelihood of continuation of project benefits after the assistance has been completed.

16. The evaluation combined different evaluation tools to ensure an evidence-based qualitative and quantitative assessment. A particular emphasis was placed on cross-validating data and on assessing the plausibility of results obtained. The methodological mix included desk studies, individual interviews and direct observation. The list of persons interviewed and documents consulted are presented in Appendixes 3 and 4 to this report.

17. While maintaining his independence, the evaluator applied a participatory evaluation approach by seeking the views of representatives of all key project stakeholders. The evaluation process itself was designed in a way to facilitate organizational learning. The evaluator attempted to enroll WIPO staff members into the process and where possible to obtain their alignment on key findings, conclusions and recommendations.

18. The Secretariat supported the evaluation process actively. The evaluator was able to work freely and without interference. Factual information obtained during data collection was clear, comprehensive and consistent.

19. The presentation of the evaluation report at the 15<sup>th</sup> session of the CDIP in April 2014 aims at ensuring the dissemination of information, providing input to the CDIP's decision making process, and contributing to the accountability of WIPO towards its Member States.

(iv) Main limitations to this evaluation

20. Experience shows that it takes time, before the content of studies and the conclusions of conferences, through their use, translate into measurable effects. The planned "interactive platform" as a tool to reach a wider public is not yet operational. It is not plausible to assume sufficient causality between the Project's outputs and changes observed. An attempt to assess their outcomes of even broader impact would thus be premature.

---

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

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

<sup>9</sup> The ToRs only requested an assessment of effectiveness and sustainability

21. For the same reason, the evaluator focused in his fact finding on desk study and those actors who were directly involved into activities, including the Secretariat, experts who drafted the studies, and conference participants.

22. A consolidated financial report that links expenditures to budget lines and results for the whole duration of the Project was not available. A detailed analysis of financial efficiency, which would require information types of expenditures for each of the outputs, was thus not possible.

23. The findings and assessment in section 2 below should be read in considering that these constraints necessarily limited the scope and depth of the evaluation.

## **2. FINDINGS AND ASSESSMENT**

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

### **(A) PROJECT PREPARATION AND MANAGEMENT**

#### **(i) Project preparation**

24. The Secretariat did a good job in translating the relatively open DA Recommendation 36 into a clearly articulated delivery strategy and methodology, which outlines the following three step approach:

(a) To map existing paradigmatic open collaborative initiatives and their relations with IP models through a taxonomy-analytical study.

(b) To exchange of views and best practices from Member States and experts, an evaluation study will evaluate pros and cons of existing projects and identify lessons learned (two meetings).

(c) The creation of an “Interactive Platform on Open Collaborative Projects and IP-Based Models” to allow for a broad exchange and dissemination of technical information and experiences with all stakeholders.

(d) The integration of findings and conclusions into WIPO’s activities.

25. The sequencing of activities was appropriate and conducive to achieving objectives.

26. The Project was significantly over budgeted. The basis for the cost calculation is not clear. Comparing the activities with the budget, it is rather obvious that it would never be possible to disburse the entire budget without compromising on project efficiency. Over budgeting blocks resources that could otherwise be spent for the benefits of Member States. Furthermore, there is a risk that projects are “perpetuated” for the sole reason that resources are still available. The evaluator received confirmation that the budgeting process within the Secretariat has been improved in a way to prevent significant errors in financial forecasting.

#### **(ii) Use of project planning tools**

27. The application of standard tools for result-based management was weak. The project document does not include a logical framework, which are commonly used as a tool for project planning, monitoring and evaluations of development assistance projects.

28. Objectives at output level<sup>10</sup> are reasonably clear, although some of the “outputs” defined would rather be considered as “outcomes”. Output and outcome levels are partially mixed (e.g. consensus of Member States is not an output). Objectives at outcome level<sup>11</sup> were only defined for the interactive platform. Without an in-depth analysis of the project document it is not possible to clearly understand the intervention theory (causal chain), especially for those who are not specialized in the field.

29. The project document does also not clearly outline the broader positive changes to which the Project is expected to contribute (overall development objectives, impact level).<sup>12</sup>

30. Good practice in result-based planning and monitoring requires linking objectives at all levels to indicators, which should be specific, measurable, relevant and time-bound (SMART). Means of verification should be defined and budgeted for if data collection requires resources.

31. Most indicators defined in the project document do not fulfill one or several of these requirements, for example:

(a) “(...) 60% positive feedback on the project process from participants (on the evaluation questionnaires) (...)” as an indicator does not say anything on the achievement of the output they intend to measure (open ended meeting with Member States).

(b) The generation of more open collaborative projects through the use of the platform or increased demand for WIPO training (is not achievable within the duration of the Project; there is an insufficient causal link between project outputs and training demand);

(c) Although theoretically measurable, retrieving the information needed to assess some outcomes, such as the number of collaborative projects, would possibly require extensive data collection (surveys), for which no resources were budgeted.

32. Risks and assumptions for each of the objectives were not identified at the planning stage (with the exception of “Output 6”). Assumptions and risks should refer to external factors that are relevant for translating outputs into outcomes and outcomes into impact<sup>13</sup>. In order to help project managers to focus more closely on monitoring those risks that need to be controlled in order to achieve objectives, they should also be categorized according to the likelihood they materialize and the potential degree of negative impact. Identifying assumptions and risks (including defining mitigation strategies) is also part of a sound project preparation.

33. Overall, the application of standard project planning tools at the design stage was weak. As a result of this, reporting was mainly “activity based” rather than comparing planned with achieved results using “SMART” indicators.

34. Ensuring a proper project planning and monitoring requires compulsory training for project managers as well as a stringent quality control of project documents and progress reports.

---

<sup>10</sup> 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).

<sup>11</sup> 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).

<sup>12</sup> 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).

<sup>13</sup> 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)

(iii) Project Management

35. As discussed in more details under the assessment of effectiveness and efficiency below, those activities that had been completed were well prepared and organized.

36. Project implementation in general however advanced at a slow pace. Even after the first project extension, no measures were taken to accelerate implementation. In 2014, the responsibility for the Project was, together with the Project Manager, relocated from the former Innovation and Technology Transfer Sector<sup>14</sup> to the Patents and Technology Sector (PCT Business Development Division). Allocating the Project to a division with little expertise in the field further weakened its technical supervision.

37. More than four years after the Project's start, the finalization of its key output (interactive platform) is still ongoing. The originally planned 30 months and even more the extended project duration of 42 months (until June 2014) should have been sufficient to commission two studies, organize two meetings in Geneva and to establish a web-based interactive platform. Unless caused by the impact of unforeseeable factors beyond WIPO's control, delaying project implementation erodes the confidence of Member States into the Secretariat's project implementation capability.

38. Delays reduce project efficiency, because some of the running costs of projects are generally fixed and incur regardless of whether any benefits are generated. Furthermore, slow implementation may also cause a loss of project relevance and momentum, a problem that was raised by several of the stakeholders interviewed.

(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

39. Policy relevance for Member States at the macro level is evidenced by the CDIP's approval of the Project through consensus.<sup>15</sup>

40. Recommendation 36 of the DA to which the Project aims at responding is located in Cluster D (Assessment, Evaluation and Impact Studies). Stimulating innovation as the expected project outcome is however equally relevant to many of the DA recommendations located in Cluster C.

41. Project objectives were well aligned with WIPO's Strategic Goals and Programs. Expected results at the output level link primarily into the objectives of Program 16 (Strategic Goal V: economic studies and statistics on the impact of IP). The enhanced use of practical tools for open innovation was a specific objective of Program 18 under the Program and Budget for the 2010/2011 Biennium. The Program and Budget for the Biennium 2014/2015 still promotes the application of open innovation structures to address Global Challenges (Program 18)<sup>16</sup>, while no resources are allocated anymore under the current Program 16.

---

<sup>14</sup> Now: SMEs and Entrepreneurship Division, Department for Transition and Developed Countries (TDC)

<sup>15</sup> Comments of Member States to a first technical proposal prepared by the Secretariat were taken up and integrated into the approved version of the Project document.

<sup>16</sup> See paragraph 18.5: "(...) the core element of the Program's strategy rests on the development, implementation and sustainability of multi-stakeholder platforms that facilitate effective collaborative networks and technology transfer relevant to health and climate change. Initiatives will build on partnerships and collaborations using open innovation structures, networked innovation, and other forms of partnerships to accelerate their impact. (...)"

42. The relevance of Open Collaborative Projects goes beyond their application in addressing Global Challenges through open innovation. Their potential key benefit extends more broadly to serving as a tool to enhance the valorization of intellectual assets for the benefit of development, including but not limited to IP in the public domain. In this sense, the Project was also relevant to the objectives of Strategic Goal III (facilitating the use of IP for development) of the current Program and Budget.

43. Open Collaborative Projects offer opportunities for exchanging intellectual assets worldwide on a voluntary basis in mutual benefit, regardless from a possible North-South divide. This potentially benefits stakeholders from both the developing and the developed world.

44. Moreover, the model of Open Collaboration is applicable beyond what is commonly understood as “innovation” and extends also to creative industries.

45. The sample of conference participants interviewed by the evaluator confirmed that their expectations were met and that the studies presented were of use for them.

46. Many of them however also emphasized that the four initial activities of the Project were only a first step into the right direction. Beyond the limited scope of the Project, more practical, targeted support to fostering open innovation would be needed.

### (C) EFFECTIVENESS

47. Due to the limitations explained above, this section primarily compares planned against expected results at the output level.

48. The delivery of the following main outputs reported by the Project were validated through desk study and interviews:

#### (i) Output 1: Taxonomy-Analytical Study

49. Based on a thorough review of existing relevant studies and literature on open innovation, the Study<sup>17</sup> mapped, clustered, analyzed and correlated different open collaborative initiatives and the respective IP models they are based on.

50. The study, which was presented in the 8<sup>th</sup> session of the CDIP, also identified emerging initial conditions and IP models for successful open collaborative initiatives.

51. Comments from Member States during and after the 8<sup>th</sup> session of the CDIP (see also CDIP 8/9 page 26 - 27) were taken into account for a revised version.

#### (ii) Output 2: Open-ended Meetings with Member States

52. Two Open-ended Meetings with Member States were organized.

53. An informal side event of the 9<sup>th</sup> session of the CDIP was held on May 11, 2012 included the following presentations:

- (a) General Overview of the Taxonomy-Analytical Study for the Project on Open Collaborative Projects and IP-Based Models (project);

---

<sup>17</sup> Taxonomy-Analytical Study for the project on open collaborative projects and IP-based models (CDIP/8/INF/7), October 31, 2011, commissioned by the Secretariat and prepared by Dr. Linus Dahlander, Assistant Professor, Stanford University / European School of Management and Technology (ESMT), Berlin; Dr. David Gann, Professor and Head of Innovation and Entrepreneurship, Imperial College Business School, London; and Dr. Gerard George, Professor and Director, Rajiv Gandhi Centre, Imperial College Business School, London.

- (b) Roadmap for the Development Agenda Project on Open-Collaborative Projects and IP-Based Models (Secretariat);
- (c) Promoting Innovation and Access through Open Collaborative Models (Bolivia); the Work of the WHO Consultative Expert Working Group on Research and Development and their Recommendation for a Binding R&D Treaty (South Center, Geneva);
- (d) Open Innovation Networks: Success Stories such as Ache in Brazil (MER, University of Geneva);
- (e) Discussion on the Essence, Logic and Approach of the Development Agenda Project on Open-Collaborative Projects and IP-Based Models (Secretariat).

54. Moreover, a formal WIPO Meeting on June 18, 2012 was attended by about 20 participants with Delegates from 7 countries' Permanent Missions to the United Nations Office in Geneva as well as 3 NGOs. The meeting focused on obtaining feedback of Member States on the Project and to agree on the way forward.

(iii) In-depth evaluation study

55. The aim of commissioning an in-depth evaluation study was to identify pros and cons of existing projects and identify the lessons learned for each open collaborative initiative.

56. The study<sup>18</sup> illustrates with seven examples that open innovation is already very advanced in the developing world. It identifies specific success factors for open innovation through a well-researched taxonomy analysis of three specific projects. The report also provides specific recommendations on how WIPO could broaden its service for organizations in developing countries to incorporate open innovation.

(iv) Expert meeting

57. In order to highlight the best practices in open collaborative projects for both public and private organizations, a Global Conference was organized. According to the program, the conference held on 22 and 23 January 2014 featured 17 speakers from developed and developing countries as well as roundtable discussions on open innovation. 200 participants attended.

58. The diversity of background and experiences of speakers, in particular the inclusion of creative industries, which would normally not be associated with open collaborative projects, broadened the perspectives of participants. On the other hand, some participants interviewed would have wished a more in-depth discussion of fields directly relevant to them.

(v) Interactive Platform

59. At the time of the evaluation, the platform was still in the process of being developed. The evaluator received a presentation on the structure of the platform, which looked promising. It was however premature to see how the final result might look like.

60. A study on "Global Knowledge Flows"<sup>19</sup> for incorporation into the Interactive Platform was prepared. Besides its comprehensiveness, a particularly remarkable feature of the report is an

---

<sup>18</sup> In-Depth Evaluation Study for the Project on Open Collaborative Projects and IP-Based Models (CDIP 14/INF/14, September 19, 2014), commissioned by the Secretariat, prepared by Prof. Ellen Enkel, Head of the Dr. Manfred Bischoff Institute of Innovation Management of the Airbus Group, Chair of Innovation Management, Zeppelin University, Friedrichshafen, Germany

<sup>19</sup> Report on "Global Knowledge Flows" (CDIP 14/INF/13), commissioned by the Secretariat and prepared by Community Systems Foundation, New York, USA.

excellent visualization of knowledge flows through maps. It is planned to “animate” the maps on the interactive platform and to update them regularly.

61. Keeping the interactive platform “alive” and up to date will require allocating specific responsibilities and resources within the Secretariat.

(vi) Initial outcomes observed

62. Apart from raising interest among the part of a relatively small audience that were not already familiar with the topic, no particular positive or negatives outcomes were observed. Before the interactive platform is operationalized, the reach of the Project remains limited. Clearly, a follow-up will be needed in order to generate tangible effects.

(vii) Impact

63. At this time, it was too early to assess results at the impact level.

(D) EFFICIENCY

(i) Financial implementation

64. Based on the last official financial report as per end of August, 2014 (CDIP 14/2 Annex III, page 5), 27% of the total budget of 895,000 Swiss francs (including 161,000 Swiss francs for personnel costs and 734,000 Swiss francs for non-personnel costs) was disbursed. Despite repeated requests of the evaluator, a consolidated financial report that links expenditures to budget lines for the whole duration of the Project was not available<sup>20</sup>. It is thus not possible to analyze funds disbursed by category of costs and per output in order to assess financial efficiency. Relating total costs to outputs delivered and a comparison with publically available financial figures of other DA projects indicates that the Secretariat generally made economic use of resources.

(ii) Assessment of approach

65. For a first time activity in the field of Open Collaborative Projects, the Project’s approach, discussed in more detail in section 2.A above proved to be appropriate in practice. Priorities at this stage were rightly set on research, collection of good practices, validation of findings, awareness raising and publicizing (not completed).

(iii) Assessment of quality of outputs

66. An in-depth desk review complemented by expert interviews concluded that the three studies produced under the Project are of good quality.

67. The overwhelmingly positive feed-back on the conferences and the expert meeting evidenced by the Secretariat’s internal evaluation was validated through interviews of a sample of conference participants.

68. Accordingly, the benefit of the conferences was to provide a platform for sharing of good practices among a variety of stakeholders through presenting practical examples of different models of open collaboration from a variety of industries. The de-politicized context of the discussions and the fact that no attempt was made to advocate for a particular model were mentioned as a particular benefit.

---

<sup>20</sup> The evaluator received a report according budget lines and a report for the year 2014 per output, but not according to budget lines.

(iv) Synergies with other activities conducted by the Secretariat

69. The Project complemented in particular different WIPO activities responding to different DA recommendations under Cluster C (Technology Transfer, Information and Communication Technologies and Access to Knowledge).

70. The use some studies conducted under DA\_16\_20\_01 (CDIP/4/3)<sup>21</sup> and DA\_16\_20\_02 (CDIP/6/5)<sup>22</sup> as an input to studies conducted under the Project resulted in some, although rather limited, synergies.

71. Another example of seizing the opportunity for synergies among different DA-Projects is the (planned) integration of the study results on “Global Knowledge Flows”<sup>23</sup> (Output 5) into the portal on Innovation and Technology Transfer Support Structure for National Institutions<sup>24</sup>.

72. The evaluation found no overlaps with other activities of the Secretariat.

(E) LIKELIHOOD OF SUSTAINABILITY OF RESULTS

73. It would be premature to attempt assessing the likelihood of sustainability of results. Without any further activities, the initial results achieved are likely to be forfeited. The interactive platform under establishment in particular will need regular updating and maintenance, should it not lose its relevance within a fast evolving environment.

74. Incorporation of “resulting recommendations” into relevant WIPO Programs after approval of the Member States was a project objective (“output” 6). Member States might have deliberately chosen the wording “incorporation into relevant WIPO Programs”, since “Open Collaborative Projects” as such are a tool and not a service that could be “mainstreamed”.

75. The wording of “output” 6 calls for a proposal of the Secretariat on how to promote Open Collaboration and IP based models within WIPO’s existing Programs, possibly in the view of preparing the Program and Budget for the Biennium 2016/2017. All stakeholders interviewed highlighted the need for practical support (tools that provide guidance to companies, institutions, inventors, etc. on how to enter into open collaboration) and to provide Member States with advice on how to establish an enabling policy framework for open collaboration. Tools already exist and there is no need to reinvent them. One option that might be worthwhile exploring is to organize an “open competition” to develop the tool.

76. Discussions with stakeholders also highlighted the fact that many larger companies and universities from developed countries have their own IP strategies, and are not familiar with the way to enter into Open Collaborative Projects with actors in developing countries. Through sharing the insight gained on models used in developing countries with them, WIPO could provide a unique value added to foster new North-South partnerships.

77. It would exceed the scope of this evaluation to outline the way forward in detail. Looking at existing WIPO Programs and consolidating different opinions of stakeholders interviewed, Programs through which open collaboration might be promoted include the IP Academy (Program 11), Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises (Program 30 including support to Member States in drafting IP strategies), and also Program 14 under Strategic Goal IV (Services for Access to Information and Knowledge), in particular through the Technology and Information Support Centers (TISCs).

---

<sup>21</sup> Project on intellectual property and the public domain

<sup>22</sup> Project on patents and the public domain

<sup>23</sup> Commissioned to an expert team from the Community Systems Foundation (CSF), cdip\_14\_inf\_13

<sup>24</sup> Established under a project for DA Recommendation 10 (Innovation and Technology Transfer Support Structure for National Institutions) and the project on “Intellectual Property and Technology Transfer: Common Challenges – Building Solutions” (DA\_19\_25\_26\_28\_01, progress report in CDIP\_14 Annex II).



### 3. CONCLUSIONS

78. The findings and assessment above leads to the following conclusions:

**Conclusion 1 on relevance: Strengthening the use of Open Collaborative Projects and IP based models continues to be of high relevance**

79. Open Collaborative Projects offer opportunities for exchanging intellectual assets worldwide on a voluntary basis in mutual benefit, regardless of a possible North-South divide. This is of high interest for both the developing and the developed world.

80. Through sharing the insight gained on models used, WIPO's work provides a unique value added to foster new North-South partnerships. The model of Open Collaboration is applicable beyond what is commonly understood as "innovation" and extends also to creative industries. Open Collaborative Projects are an effective tool to enhance the "valorization" of intellectual assets, including but not limited to IP in the public domain.

81. In this sense, project objectives are highly relevant to facilitating the use of IP for development, which is an international priority reflected in Strategic Goal III of the Program and Budget for the Biennium 2014/2015. The conclusions of the Project are potentially relevant for WIPO's work in many fields, including promoting innovation, capacity building for IP service providers, training, the cooperation with universities, and policy advice.

**Conclusion 2 on project preparation and management: The Project addresses DA Recommendation 36 in a creative and appropriate way. Activities were well organized. The application of standard project planning and monitoring tools was however weak. The project was significantly over budgeted and implemented at a slow pace.**

82. The Secretariat translated the relatively open DA Recommendation 36 into a clearly articulated delivery strategy and methodology. The type and planned sequencing of activities was conducive to achieving objectives. Researching on the use of open collaborative models, identifying good practices and subsequently offering a platform for discussing results and sharing experiences among experts and other key stakeholders is an appropriate way to foster the exchange of experience. Those activities that had been completed were well prepared and organized.

83. The application of standard tools for result-based management in project planning and monitoring was however weak. Progress reports list activities rather than comparing achieved against planned results using specific, measurable, ambitious, relevant and time-bound ("SMART") indicators. Assumptions and risks were neither identified nor monitored. Due to a lack of a realistic and detailed cost calculation, the Project was significantly over budgeted. Inaccurate budgeting blocks resources, which would otherwise be available to generate benefits for Member States. Furthermore, there is a risk that projects are "perpetuated" for the sole reason that resources are still available. A budget and financial report presenting type of costs for each objective is not available.

84. Project implementation advanced slowly. The originally planned 30 months should have been sufficient to implement the limited number of activities. Even after the CDIP granted a project extension, no measures were taken to accelerate implementation. Delays are costly and cause a loss of momentum. If not explainable by the impact of unforeseeable external factors, implementation delays erode the confidence of Member States into the Secretariat's project implementation capability.

**Conclusion 3: Outputs were of high quality, but not all of them were delivered. The Secretariat generally made economic use of resources. Without a follow-up, initial promising results are likely to be lost.**

85. The Project did not reach all of its planned objectives. Through the delivery of four out of six planned outputs, the Project contributed to the identification of successful Open Collaborative Projects, in particular in developing countries, to deriving best practices from them and to discussing the results within a limited audience.

86. The not yet completed Interactive Platform (Output 5) is pivotal for sharing good practices with a wider audience and to make practical tools to support open innovation available.

87. Due to the delays in completing the platform, WIPO's work in the field of Open Collaboration risks to lose momentum. No steps have been taken towards an integration of project results into WIPO's existing Program activities.

88. The wording of "output" 6 indicates that Member States would expect a specific proposal of the Secretariat. Without a follow-up, the Project's reach remains limited and initial promising results are likely to be lost.

#### **4. RECOMMENDATIONS**

89. From the conclusions above, the evaluation derives the following recommendations:

##### **Recommendation 1 (from conclusion 3) to the WIPO Secretariat on finalizing the interactive platform (planned Output 5 of the Project)**

- (a) Complete a beta version of the interactive platform
- (b) Test-run the interactive platform and obtain feed-back from users
- (c) Integrate the feed-back from users and
- (d) Present a final version of the platform to the 17<sup>th</sup> session of the CDIP in November 2015
- (e) Assign a clear responsibility and allocate resources to maintain and update the interactive platform regularly.

##### **Recommendation 2 (from conclusions 1 and 3) to the WIPO Secretariat on preparing a proposal to the CDIP on how to facilitate Open Innovation through WIPO's existing Programs (planned Output 6 of the Project)**

- (a) Continuing identifying, collecting and sharing best practices in the field of Open Collaborative Projects (studies)
- (b) Offer practical capacity building (including tool kits) tailored to specific target users
- (c) Offer capacity building to IP and/or innovation service providers in developing countries, such as for example IP Offices, Technology Transfer Centers etc.
- (d) Support specific open collaborative pilot projects in developing countries, and
- (e) Advise Member States in creating an enabling environment for open collaboration in their IP policies.

**Recommendation 3 (from conclusion 3) to the WIPO Secretariat on strengthening WIPO's presence in open collaboration conferences and fora:**

90. A regular presence and visibility of WIPO in international conferences on Open Innovation (including but not limited to events organized by other UN organization may help WIPO to position itself as a "competence center" in the field of Open Collaborative Projects, to create visibility and to benefit from additional experience of a wide array of conference participants.

**Recommendation 4 (from conclusion 2) to the WIPO Secretariat on ensuring the application of planning and monitoring tools in project cycle management:**

91. The WIPO Secretariat should strengthen the quality control of new projects and progress reports submitted to the CDIP in regards to proper application of WIPO's existing project tools for project cycle management are properly applied.

92. Consideration might be given to introduce the logical framework as a basis for project cycle management.

93. Explore the possibility to introduce compulsory courses for future project managers on project cycle management.

94. Ensure regular coaching of project managers on a demand basis.

[Appendixes follow]

## LIST OF APPENDIXES

<b>Appendix 1</b>	Terms of reference
<b>Appendix 2</b>	List of persons interviewed
<b>Appendix 3</b>	List of documents <sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> The Project document CDIP/6/6 Rev. is available at:  
[http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc\\_details.jsp?doc\\_id=149209](http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=149209)

APPENDIX I: TERMS OF REFERENCE

**TERMS OF REFERENCE**

<b>Title of Assignment:</b>	<b>Project Evaluation: Project on Open Collaborative Projects and IP Based Models</b>
<b>Name of unit/sector:</b>	<b>Development Agenda Coordination Division (DACD)/ Development Sector</b>
<b>Place of Assignment:</b>	<b>Evaluator's place of residence/duty</b>
<b>Expected places of travel (if applicable):</b>	<b>During your assignment, you will undertake two missions to WIPO Headquarters, Geneva, Switzerland (date to be determined)</b>
<b>Expected duration of assignment:</b>	<b>From December 15, 2014, to April 20, 2015</b>

**1. Objective of the assignment**

The present document represents the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the evaluation of the Development Agenda Project on Open Collaborative Projects and IP Based Models, approved during the sixth session of the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP), held in Geneva, in November 2010. The project document for this project is contained in document CDIP/6/6 Rev. The project implementation started in January 2011 and was completed in July 2014. The project consists of activities aimed at developing an Interactive Platform for the exchange of experiences on open collaborative projects, such as the Human Genome Project, in developed and developing countries, as well as intellectual property (IP) models.

The project was implemented under the supervision of the Project Manager, Mr. Ali Jazairy, Senior Counsellor, PCT International Cooperation Division.

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.

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

- (a) Establishing an interactive platform for the broadest possible exchange of experiences on open collaborative projects and IP-based models; and
- (b) Exchanging information, experiences and existing best practices and in enhancing the understanding of potential uses of IP models/procedures in order to stimulate local innovation.

To this end, the evaluation, in particular, will focus on assessing the following key evaluation questions:

#### Project Design and Management:

- (a) The appropriateness of the initial project document as a guide for project implementation and assessment of results achieved;
- (b) 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;
- (c) the extent to which other entities within the Secretariat have contributed and enabled an effective and efficient project implementation;
- (d) the extent to which the risks identified in the initial project document have materialized or been mitigated; and
- (e) the project's ability to respond to emerging trends, technologies and other external forces.

#### Effectiveness:

- (a) The usefulness of the project in establishing an Interactive Platform for the broadest possible exchange of experiences on open collaborative projects and IP-based models.
- (b) the effectiveness of the project in exchanging best practices for public ventures and for private firms experiences; and
- (c) the effectiveness of the project in describing the IP models and procedures that these open collaborative projects are based on and discuss the benefits and challenges of each of them.

#### Sustainability

The likelihood for continued work on Open Collaborative Projects and IP-Based Models in WIPO and its Member States.

#### Implementation of Development Agenda (DA) Recommendations

The extent to which the DA Recommendation 36 has been implemented through this project.

In addition, the project time frame considered for this evaluation is 42 months (January 2011 – July 2014). 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, its evolution over time, its performance including project design, project management, coordination, coherence, implementation and results achieved.

In pursuance to the abovementioned objective, the evaluation methodology is aimed at balancing the needs for learning and accountability. To this end, the evaluation should provide for active involvement in the evaluation process of those with a stake in the project: project team, senior managers, Member States and national intellectual property (IP) offices.

The external evaluation expert 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:

- (a) 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.
- (b) interviews at the WIPO Secretariat (project team, other substantive entities contributing to the project, etc.); and
- (c) stakeholder interviews.

## **2. Deliverables/services**

The evaluator will deliver:

- (a) 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;
- (b) draft evaluation report with actionable recommendations deriving from the findings and conclusions;
- (c) final evaluation report which includes an executive summary and structured as follows:
  - (i) description of the evaluation methodology used;
  - (ii) summary of key evidence-based findings centered on the key evaluation questions;
  - (iii) conclusions drawn based on the findings;
  - (iv) recommendations emanating from the conclusions and lessons learned.
- (d) comprehensive executive summary of the final evaluation report.

This project evaluation is expected to start on December 15, 2014, and be finalized on April 20, 2015. The reporting language will be English.

### **3. Reporting**

The Consultant will be under the supervision of the Director of the Development Agenda Coordination Division (DACD). In addition, the evaluator shall:

- (a) Work closely with the Development Agenda Coordination Division (DACD), the Project Manager and the PCT International Cooperation Division. You shall also coordinate with the relevant Program Managers in WIPO as required; and
- (b) ensure the quality of data (validity, consistency and accuracy) throughout the analytical reporting phases (inception report and final evaluation report).

### **4. Profile**

Mr. Daniel Keller has extensive experience in preparing, managing and evaluating projects, and in conducting institutional assessments both in the public and private sectors. Mr. Keller also has a previous experience with WIPO, he conducted evaluation reports on completed Development Agenda Project, namely the Project on Enhancing South-South Cooperation on IP and Development among Developing Countries and LDCs (document CDIP/7/6), and the Project on Intellectual Property and Socio-Economic Development (document CDIP/5/7 Rev.)

### **5. Duration of contract and payment**

The contract will start on December 15, 2014 and will finish in April 20, 2015. During this period, the following schedule should be followed:

The inception report should be submitted to WIPO by January 15, 2015. WIPO's feedback shall be communicated to you by January 20, 2015. The draft evaluation report shall be submitted to WIPO by February 15, 2015. Factual corrections on the draft will be provided to you by February 20, 2015. The final evaluation report shall be submitted by March 1, 2015. The final version of the evaluation report containing a management response in an annex shall be considered by the fifteenth session of the CDIP, to be held from April 20 to 24, 2015. You will be required to present the evaluation report during that CDIP session.

[Appendix II follows]



APPENDIX II: LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

No.	Name and function
1.	<b>Mr. Ahmed Abdel Latif</b> , International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development (ICTSD)
2.	<b>Mrs. Maya Katharina Bachner</b> , Acting Director and Head, Program Management and Performance Resource Planning, Program Management and Performance Division, Administration and Management Sector
3.	<b>Mr. Irfan Baloch</b> , Director, DACD, Development Sector
4.	<b>Ms. Elen Enkel, Professor</b> , Dr. Manfred Bischoff Institute for Innovation Management, Airbus Group, Author of Evaluation Study
5.	<b>Mr. Joseph Fometeu</b> , Professor, University of Ngaoundéré, Cameroon (reference person who did not participate in the Project)
6.	<b>Mr. George Ghandour</b> , Senior Program Manager, DACD, Development Sector
7.	<b>Mr. Gary Goldman</b> , Community Systems Foundation, New York, NY, USA, co-author, Report on “Global Knowledge Flows”
8.	<b>Mr. Ali Jazairy</b> , Senior Counsellor, PCT International Cooperation Division, Patents and Technology Sector (Project Manager)
9.	<b>Ms. Sarah R. Lofti</b> , writer-director and independent filmmaker
10.	<b>Mr. Claus Matthes</b> , Director, PCT Business Development Division, Patents and Technology Sector
11.	<b>Mr. Matthew Rainey</b> , Director, SMEs and Entrepreneurship Support Division, Department for Transition and Developed Countries (TCD)
12.	<b>Mr. John Sandage</b> , Deputy Director General, Patents and Technology Sector
13.	<b>Mr. Richard Wilder, Associate General Counsel</b> , Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, Speaker of Expert Meeting
14.	<b>Mr. Sacha Wunsch-Vincent</b> , Senior Economic Officer, Economics Section, Economics and Statistics Division

[Appendix III follows]

## APPENDIX III: LIST OF DOCUMENTS

### **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
- DAC Guidelines and Reference Series, Quality Standards for Development Evaluation, OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC), OECD 2010.
- UNEG, Standards for Evaluation in the UN System, April 2005 (last updated on 18 June 2014)

### **WIPO programmatic documents**

- The 45 Adopted Recommendations under the WIPO Development Agenda by the General Assembly of WIPO Member States, 2007
- Medium Term Strategic Plan 2010-15: (Document A/48/3, September 16, 2010)
- WIPO Program and Budget for the Biennium 2010/2011, approved by the Assemblies of the Member States of WIPO on October 1, 2009
- WIPO Program and Budget for the Biennium 2012/2013, approved by the Assemblies of the Member States of WIPO on September 29, 2011
- WIPO Program and Budget for the Biennium 2014/2015, approved by the Assemblies of the Member States of WIPO on December 12, 2013

### **Project documents and reports**

- Project Document (first version): Project proposal on “Open Collaborative Projects and IP-Based Models”, CDIP/6/6, October 11, 2010
- Project Document: Revised project proposal on “Open Collaborative Projects and IP-Based Models”, CDIP/6/6 Rev, November 26, 2010
- Progress report, CDIP 12/2 Annex VII (pages 59 – 68), including a revised timeline for implementation, September 12, 2013
- Latest progress report, CDIP 14/2 Annex III (pages 18 -26), August 28, 2014
- Financial statements of the project (unofficial, detailing expenditures per output)
- Participant feedback received on outputs 2 and 4 (questionnaires, not summarized) and emails

### **Project Outputs:**

#### **Output 1: Taxonomy-Analytical Study**

- **Taxonomy-Analytical Study** for the project on open collaborative projects and IP-based models (CDIP/8/INF/7), October 31, 2011, commissioned by the Secretariat and prepared by Dr. Linus Dahlander, Assistant Professor, Stanford University / European School of Management and Technology (ESMT), Berlin; Dr. David Gann, Professor and Head of

Innovation and Entrepreneurship, Imperial College Business School, London; and Dr. Gerard George, Professor and Director, Rajiv Gandhi Centre, Imperial College Business School, London.

- **Revised Taxonomy-Analytical Study** for the project on open collaborative projects and IP-based models (CDIP/8/INF/7), April 23, 2013, idem

#### **Output 2: Open-Ended Meeting with Member States**

- Program, Open-Ended Meeting with Member States in the Framework of the Development Agenda Project on Open Collaborative Projects and IP-Based Models (Rec. 36) on June 18, 2012, including presentations on General Overview of the Taxonomy-Analytical Study for the Project on Open Collaborative Projects and IP-Based Models (project); Roadmap for the Development Agenda Project on Open-Collaborative Projects and IP-Based Models (Secretariat); Promoting Innovation and Access through Open Collaborative Models (Bolivia); the Work of the WHO Consultative Expert Working Group on Research and Development and their Recommendation for a Binding R&D Treaty (South Center, Geneva); Open Innovation Networks: Success Stories such as Ache in Brazil (MER, University of Geneva); Discussion on the Essence, Logic and Approach of the Development Agenda Project on Open-Collaborative Projects and IP-Based Models (Secretariat).

#### **Output 3: In-Depth Evaluation Study**

- In-Depth Evaluation Study for the Project on Open Collaborative Projects and IP-Based Models (CDIP 14/INF/14, September 19, 2014), commissioned by the Secretariat, prepared by Prof. Ellen Enkel, Head of the Dr. Manfred Bischoff Institute of Innovation Management of the Airbus Group, Chair of Innovation Management, Zeppelin University, Friedrichshafen, Germany

#### **Output 4: Expert Meeting**

- Meeting program, WIPO Conference on Open Innovation: Collaborative Projects and the Future of Knowledge (meeting code: WIPO/INN/GE/14), January 22 – 23, 2014
- News feature on WIPO Conference on Open Innovation: Collaborative Projects and the Future of Knowledge [http://www.wipo.int/pressroom/en/stories/collaborative\\_innovation.html](http://www.wipo.int/pressroom/en/stories/collaborative_innovation.html)
- Article in IP Watch on WIPO Conference on Open Innovation: Collaborative Projects and the Future of Knowledge, January 29, 2014 (retrieved on January 10, 2014 from: <http://www.ip-watch.org/2014/01/29/at-wipo-global-experts-share-experiences-on-open-collaboration>)

#### **Output 5: Interactive Platform (platform content)**

- Report on “Global Knowledge Flows” (CDIP 14/INF/13), commissioned by the Secretariat and prepared by Mr. Harry Goldman, Mr. Kris Oswald, Ms. Adriana Valdez Young, Ms. Becky Band Jain, Mr. Alexandre Toureh, Mr. John Toner, Mr. Gaurav Sharma, Ms. Irene Inouye, Ms. Haya Shaat, Mr. Jitesh Dhoot and Mr. Vikesh Ojh, Community Systems Foundation, New York, USA.  
[http://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/mdocs/en/cdip\\_14/cdip\\_14\\_inf\\_13.pdf](http://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/mdocs/en/cdip_14/cdip_14_inf_13.pdf)
- Draft version of Interactive Platform (screen shots) of <http://www-ocmstest.wipo.int/innovation> [not publically accessible at the time of the evaluation]

[End of Appendix III and of document]