

Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP)

Nineteenth Session
Geneva, May 15 to 19, 2017

EVALUATION REPORT OF THE PROJECT ON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY (IP) AND DESIGN MANAGEMENT FOR BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT IN DEVELOPING AND LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES (LDCs)

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

1. The Annex to the document contains an independent Evaluation Report of the Project on *Intellectual Property (IP) and Design Management for Business Development in Developing and Least Developed Countries (LDCs)*, undertaken by Mr. Daniel Keller, Consultant, EvalCo Sàrl, Leubringen, Switzerland.

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.....	2
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	3
1. INTRODUCTION.....	6
(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	9
2. FINDINGS AND ASSESSMENT	9
(A) PROJECT PREPARATION AND MANAGEMENT	9
(i) Project preparation	9
(ii) Use of project planning tools (at the planning stage).....	10
(iii) Project Management.....	11
(B) RELEVANCE	12
(i) Policy relevance	12
(ii) Relevance to beneficiaries.....	13
(C) EFFECTIVENESS.....	13
(i) Project inception	13
(ii) Kick-off events in Argentina and Morocco.....	14
(iii) Selection of companies.....	14
(iv) Preparation of tools.....	14
(v) Project launch events training of national experts	14
(vi) Direct support to companies	14
(vii) Project closing events and awards.....	15
(viii) Awareness raising internationally.....	15
(ix) Initial outcomes observed	15
(x) Impact.....	15
(D) EFFICIENCY.....	16
(i) Financial implementation	16
(ii) Assessment of approach	16
(iii) Assessment of quality of outputs	16
(iv) Synergies with other activities conducted by the Secretariat.....	16
(E) LIKELIHOOD OF SUSTAINABILITY OF RESULTS	17
(F) GENDER.....	17
3. CONCLUSIONS.....	18
4. RECOMMENDATIONS	19

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
IP	Intellectual Property
IPR(s)	Intellectual Property Rights
LDCs	Least Developed Countries
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
RBM	Results-based management
SMART (indicators)	Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound
SME(s)	Small- and Medium-Sized Enterprises
ToRs	Terms of Reference (of this evaluation)
UN	United Nations
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
WIPO	World Intellectual Property Organization

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This independent final evaluation covered the “Pilot Project on Intellectual Property (IP) and Design Management for Business Development in Developing and Least Developed Countries (LDCs)” (Project Code: DA_04_10_02).

The evaluation work was conducted from November 15, 2016 and May 30, 2017 by Daniel P. Keller, Senior Evaluator, Evilard/Leubringen in close coordination with the Development Agenda Coordination Division (DACD) and resulted in the following conclusions:

Conclusion 1 on project preparation and relevance: The Project prepared by the Secretariat addresses the promotion of the strategic use and protection of industrial designs by SMEs in an appropriate way. Excellent preparation in close cooperation with key stakeholders in the two beneficiary countries led to a high degree of relevance.

The Secretariat did a good job in translating the relatively open proposal submitted by the Republic of Korea into a clearly formulated project concept, which aligns well to WIPO’s mandate and the DA recommendations it intends to address. Project objectives are fully aligned to the needs of key beneficiaries (IP Offices and companies). The Project targeted those countries, industries and sectors for which designs are relevant.

Objectives are clearly defined, although the separation between deliverables of the Secretariat and their use (outcomes) is not always clear. Indicators for each objective are defined, but not all of them are specific, measurable, ambitious, relevant and time-bound.

The implementation plan and budgets are ambitious, but realistic. The sequencing of activities is logical and enabling to the achievement of objectives. The implementation structure, which featured Steering Committees (for strategic management) and project teams (for operational management) in each beneficiary country is conducive to the achievement of objectives.

WIPO’s standard templates for planning, monitoring and reporting do not use the logical framework tool, which has become the key instrument for the management of technical cooperation projects. Detailed guidelines on project cycle management are not available, but would be useful.

Conclusion 2 on management, efficiency and effectiveness: Project management was highly satisfactory. The Secretariat delivered all outputs timely and in good quality. Resources were used economically. The Project provided good value for money.

The Project was well managed. The set-up of a local implementation structure (project Steering Committees, project teams) in the two beneficiary countries was instrumental. A key success factor was also the recruitment of a full-time Project Officer with a technical cooperation background and sound project management skills. Management was flexible and responsive to the needs of beneficiaries.

The evaluation endorses the project completion report. Most planned outputs were delivered timely and all in good quality. It would be too early to assess broader outcomes. Nevertheless, the Project seems to have created a high visibility and demonstration effect within key stakeholders in the two beneficiary countries. The two IP Offices highlighted a closer link to key IP users through the project, including through networking at different events. Awareness raising seems to have been successful to inform right holders on the benefits of obtaining protection for their designs through registration. Both countries report increased design and trademark registrations.

Besides some visibility and interest generated through events in Geneva, achieving the intended broader outcomes at the international level (replication and upscaling) would require significant additional efforts through a second project phase.

Funds were used economically. Comparing deliverables with the rather tight budget, the Project provided good value for money, even though financial figures do not account the significant in-kind contributions of national stakeholders as inputs.

Conclusion 3 on sustainability of results: Activities in Morocco under OMPIC are ongoing beyond the project. Argentina plans to continue activities to promote the valorization of IPRs. Generating and maintaining benefits at the international level requires a follow-up phase.

An attempt assessing the likelihood of longer-term sustainability of results at the country level would be premature, as a continuation of benefits depends largely on a follow-up by the respective IP Offices. Following upon their commitments during the selection process, both IP Offices expressed their willingness to continue similar activities geared towards promoting designs as a tool to add value to products. Activities in Morocco under the lead of OMPIC are currently ongoing.

The likelihood of maintaining the limited benefits at the international level (interest and visibility) is low without a follow-up intervention. An expansion of this overall successful pilot to more, especially less advanced countries if possible also from other regions, would provide the necessary additional experience to draw conclusions on how the Secretariat could continue the strengthening of IP Offices to provide further similar support to companies on a longer-term.

Conclusion 4 on mainstreaming gender: While project implementation took gender issues actively into account, this was not done following a clear WIPO methodology. Gender equality is a priority for WIPO, but there is no guidance to project managers on how to mainstream gender into DA projects.

Project management undertook significant efforts to address gender aspects. The evaluation found no indication whatsoever of insufficient involvement of women into the project. The Project tried actively to live up to WIPO's commitment to gender equality, although not from the beginning. Gender mainstreaming activities followed an approach developed by the Project during implementation. Consistent mainstreaming of gender issues in all DA Projects requires clear guidelines and training for all project managers.

RECOMMENDATIONS

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

Recommendation 1 (from conclusions 2 and 3) to the WIPO Secretariat on proposing a phase 2 of the Project to the CDIP to gain additional experience and in case of a broader interest, prepare for an upscaling and replication of the approach.

- (a) Propose a second project phase to the CDIP to pilot the approach in additional countries from different regions. Tailor the approach to specific country needs, where appropriate.
- (b) Involve the bureaus in determining possible new target countries.
- (c) While maintaining the commitment of national counterparts as a key selection criteria, ensure a balanced selection of beneficiary countries at different stages of IP system development.
- (d) Consider using the Project's experts in the new beneficiary countries where appropriate.
- (e) Support the IP Offices of Argentina and Morocco to assess wider project outcomes.

- (f) If the mid-term review of a phase II shows positive results, develop a detailed strategy on how to ensure replication of similar projects in other countries.

Recommendation 3 (from conclusion 2) to the WIPO Secretariat on systematically assessing management input needed for new DA projects and where appropriate, ensure support for day-to-day implementation of projects.

For new projects, the Secretariat should systematically assess management input needed versus the workload of project managers. Where appropriate, the Secretariat should budget for the recruitment of a Project Officer who is responsible for day-to-day project management.

To complement the technical expertise of the Project Manager, the Project Officer should primarily be a proven development specialist with field experience and excellent project management skills.

Ensure that the delegation of management responsibilities to externally recruited temporary staff does not lead to the loss of organizational know-how.

Recommendation 4 (from conclusions 1 and 2) to the WIPO Secretariat to propose a DA project to the CDIP which aims at the development of specific tools for the planning and implementation of DA Projects, including the mainstreaming of gender.

To ensure the consistent application of good practices in DA projects, the WIPO Secretariat should consider proposing a new DA project to the CDIP that specifically focuses on the development and introduction of project management tools for DA projects.

Deliverables should inter alia include:

- (a) The identification of existing good practices in planning and monitoring (including tools) within the UN family.
- (b) Building upon what already exists, develop a tool kit for the design and monitoring of DA projects (including on how to mainstream gender related aspects into all DA projects).
- (c) The tool kit must include clear processes and responsibilities for implementation. The logical framework should be the basis of planning, monitoring and evaluation (project cycle management). While building upon existing good practices in other organizations, the tool kit must be tailored to WIPO's specific technical cooperation activities.
- (d) Develop short training courses in project cycle management for new Project Managers (using the tool kit).
- (e) Pilot these documents and the course. If successful, consider applying them for all technical cooperation projects/programs across the organization.

1. INTRODUCTION

1. This independent final evaluation commissioned by the Secretariat covers the “Pilot Project on Intellectual Property (IP) and Design Management for Business Development in Developing and Least Developed Countries (LDCs)” (Project Code: DA_04_10_02, “the Project”) under the Development Agenda (DA).

2. Guided by the Terms of Reference (ToRs) dated October 26, 2016 (Appendix II), the work was undertaken between November 15, 2016 and May 30, 2017 by an independent evaluator¹ in close coordination with the Development Agenda Coordination Division (DACD).

(A) PROJECT BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION

3. Adopted by the 12th session of the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP) in Geneva (November 18-21, 2013)², the Project was prepared by the Secretariat based on a proposal submitted by the Republic of Korea at the 11th session of the CDIP³. The planned project duration was 24 months starting from January 1, 2014.

4. Preparatory activities started in April 2014, after the recruitment of the Project Officer. Following a systematic selection process, Argentina and Morocco were selected as beneficiary countries. The delivery of technical assistance to companies started in late 2014 and ended in December 2016⁴. A mid-term self-evaluation⁵ was conducted in the second half of 2015.

5. Within the broader objectives of DA Recommendations 4⁶ and 10⁷, the Project promoted the strategic use and protection of industrial designs by Small- and Medium-Sized Enterprises (SMEs) in two target countries. Further upscaling and replication of this approach aimed at addressing challenges of developing countries and LDCs to valorize their industrial designs.

6. Design characteristics play an important role in creating prestige and recognition for products, thus increasing value addition and market demand. Designs are also an excellent way for companies to gain a comparative advantage through differentiation.

7. The key challenges identified during project preparation were on the one hand a low public awareness. Companies are unaware on how to capitalize on the benefits of their designs. The second challenge was the still weak capacity of IP Offices, courts and enforcement agencies.

8. Key elements of the intervention strategy were to raise awareness, demonstrate benefits and enhance practical knowledge among SMEs on how to protect and manage their design rights⁸, while in parallel enhancing capacities of IP institutions to support companies in protecting their designs.

¹ Daniel P. Keller, Evillard/Leubringen, Switzerland. The evaluator is independent and has never been involved into the preparation or implementation of this or any other project implemented by the Secretariat.

² CDIP 12/6, October 23, 2013.

³ CDIP 11/7, April 10, 2013.

⁴ S completion report in CDIP 18/2 Annex VII, Appendix 1, page 11.

⁵ See Brands and Design Sector, Law and Legislative Advice Division, Mid-Term Evaluation Report

⁶ To place regular emphasis on the needs of SMEs and institutions dealing with specific research and cultural industries and assist Member States, at their request, in setting up national strategies in the field of IP.

⁷ 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.

⁸ Either through industrial design registration or where not appropriate by proposing alternative ways of IP protection.

9. The core methodological approach of capacity building at company level was to pilot an entire design protection process from application to registration.⁹ Technical assistance included awareness raising (both at the national level as well as among participants of the CDIP), the development of training tools, training activities and direct support to companies. Moreover, both beneficiary countries received support in drafting a national design protection strategy and an outreach plan. Regulatory and institutional constraints to design were only marginally covered.

10. Operationally, the Project was coordinated by a full-time Project Officer with a technical cooperation background who was specifically recruited to support project implementation. She was supervised by the Director of the Brands and Design Sector who was formally the Project Manager. To build national capacities and ensure sustainability, the Secretariat worked primarily through the two national IP Offices¹⁰.

11. Target beneficiaries included mainly the governments of Argentina and Morocco and the private sector (creators, design users and local service providers supporting them).

12. Beyond a national long-term impact in the beneficiary countries, the Project's aim was a replication of similar initiatives in other Member States. A roadmap for this beyond creating visibility for the Project's achievements was not defined.

13. The 16th CDIP Meeting granted a project extension until May 14, 2016, to complete remaining activities and to ensure the contribution of the Project Officer to this final evaluation (see CDIP 16/2, Annex II, p. 6). During the extension phase, the Secretariat provided additional technical assistance to both pilot countries including for their exit strategies and closing events.

14. As reported by the Secretariat to the CDIP and validated by the evaluator in January 2017, all planned activities have been fully delivered. Section 2.C on effectiveness below provides a detailed assessment.

15. This final evaluation experienced delays as the expert originally appointed by the Secretariat decided to terminate her contract.

16. The approved overall project budget was 487,000 Swiss francs (CHF), 250,000 of which for non-personnel costs and 237,000 Swiss francs for personnel costs (mainly for the Project Officer). As per July 15, 2016, the Project reported a budget utilization rate of 86%¹¹.

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

(i) Scope

17. The evaluation covers the period from January 1, 2014 to December 31, 2016 plus the preparation time. Relevant subsequent developments until the end of the field mission in January 2017 are included as contextual information.

(ii) Key purpose

18. The main purpose of this evaluation given by the ToRs was to assess whether the Project provided the right type of support to achieve its key objectives in the right way, mainly to draw lessons learned for possible further WIPO activities.

⁹ As summarized from CDIP 12/2, amended by the evaluator based on CDIP 16/2 Annex II and CDIP 18/2 Annex VII.

¹⁰ The National Institute of Industrial Property (INPI) in Argentina and the Moroccan Industrial and Commercial Property Office (OMPIC).

¹¹ See CDIP 18/2 Annex VII page 11, which are the last figures available to the evaluator.

19. 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 support to SMEs in capitalizing on designs and IPRs in general.
- (b) To provide an evidence-based assessment of the Project to support the CDIP's decision making process.

20. Since the Project ended without a specific roadmap for the way forward, the evaluator explored specifically whether follow up activities are needed to achieve the wider objectives, either through a phase II or the incorporation of activities into relevant WIPO Programs.

(iii) Methodology

21. The evaluation is guided by the ToRs and WIPO's Evaluation Policy¹², which applies the general principles of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards for Evaluation (latest version: June 2016). The UNEG methodological framework refers to 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).¹³

22. The ToRs requested an assessment of project quality, including its design and management. In line with the ToRs and applying standard evaluation practices, the assessment was conducted based on the following five criteria¹⁴:

- (a) Project preparation and management¹⁵: The degree to which project preparation and management followed good practices, including applying tools of results-based management (RBM).
- (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.

23. Beyond the four criteria, the evaluator was requested to assess the degree to which gender aspects were mainstreamed into project preparation and implementation.

24. The evaluation combined different data collection tools to ensure an evidence-based qualitative and quantitative assessment. The mix applied included desk studies, individual interviews and direct observation. Key aspects of the methodology included a triangulation of data and an assessment of their plausibility. The list of persons interviewed and documents consulted are presented in Appendixes III and IV to this report.

¹² WIPO, Revised Evaluation Policy (Second Edition 2016/2020), February 19, 2016.

¹³ DAC Guidelines and Reference Series, Quality Standards for Development Evaluation, OECD-DAC, OECD 2010.

¹⁴ The ToRs only requested an assessment of effectiveness and sustainability.

¹⁵ These aspects are sometimes also assessed under the criteria of efficiency.

25. While maintaining his independence, the evaluator applied a participatory evaluation approach by seeking the views of representatives of all key project stakeholder groups.
26. 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 buy-in on key findings, conclusions and recommendations.
27. The evaluator worked freely and without interference. All stakeholders interviewed were ready to openly share their views. Information obtained during data collection was comprehensive, consistent and clear.
28. The Secretariat facilitated the evaluation process including through collecting the necessary documents and arranging interviews.
29. The presentation of the evaluation report at the 19th session of the CDIP in May 2017 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

30. Experience shows that it takes time before capacity building, through its use by beneficiaries, translates into measurable effects. For example, the process of registering an industrial design following the Project's assistance may take more than one year. It is thus not yet possible to measure the effects of design registrations on company performance.
31. Even less would it be plausible to assume a contribution of project deliverables to broader socio-economic changes observed in the two beneficiary countries or even beyond. An attempt to assess wider outcomes of even impact would thus be premature. The evaluation however did explore more direct outcomes to which the Project contributed to.
32. Fact finding was limited to desk study of documents provided by the Secretariat and on interviewing those actors who directly participated in project activities. This included the two beneficiary IP Offices, the Secretariat, a sample of national experts who provided support to SMEs and a small sample of SMEs. Within the Secretariat, the evaluator conducted in-depth discussions with the DACD, the project team, functional sections that provided specific input, and the WIPO Programs the Project aimed at creating synergies with. No visits to the two beneficiary countries were conducted.
33. The findings and assessment in chapter 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

34. The relatively open proposal submitted by the Republic of Korea was translated into a specific, clearly formulated project concept, which aligns well to WIPO's mandate and the DA recommendations it intends to address.

35. The project design includes clear deliverables and a strategy towards achieving objectives at the national level. The planned implementation plan was ambitious, but realistic. The Project was adequately budgeted. Activities are sequenced logically and enabling to the achievement of objectives.

36. The Secretariat proposed a conducive implementation structure, which featured Steering Committees (and project teams for operational level) in each beneficiary country. A public-private platform (Advisory Board in Argentina or National Steering Committee in Morocco) was also created in each country involving ministries, professional associations, chambers of commerce, schools and universities. A project charter was signed in each country to ensure the involvement of all key national stakeholders to achieve common goals.

37. The assessment of management input at the design stage identified the need to obtain support of a full-time Project Officer, which was a pivotal success factor for the Project.

38. The Project was operationalized during an inception phase. Work undertaken included the recruitment of a Project Officer, the selection of beneficiary countries and detailed planning. The design of a national design protection strategy and an outreach plan in the two countries served at the same time as a preparatory activity.

39. Not included into the project document is a clear strategy for the way forward, thus the planned replication of the pilot approach to expand benefits beyond the two pilot beneficiary countries. The development of an exit strategy for WIPO at the national level was originally not planned, but added during implementation.

(ii) Use of project planning tools (at the planning stage)

40. Detailed written guidelines on how to apply RBM standards in planning and monitoring are not available. The project document CDIP/12/6 follows WIPO's standard templates for project preparation and reporting, which do not apply the logical framework approach. Logical frameworks are now commonly used as a tool for the planning, monitoring and evaluations of development assistance projects, including within the UN System.

41. Project objectives at output level¹⁶ are reasonably clear, although some of the "outputs" defined would rather be considered as "outcomes". Output and outcome¹⁷ levels are partially mixed. The filing of applications for industrial design protection by participating businesses (not be the Secretariat) is an effect of support provided and not a project deliverable. Similarly, outreach to international markets (evidenced by participation in trade fairs not funded by the Project) would be an outcome of project activities (awareness raising, trainings, etc.) and not a deliverable (output). The project document outlines the broader positive changes to which the Project is expected to contribute (overall development objectives, impact level).¹⁸

42. Good RBM practice requires linking objectives at all levels to indicators, which should be specific, measurable, ambitious, relevant and time-bound (SMART). Means of verification should be defined and budgeted for if data collection requires resources.

43. Most output and outcome indicators were appropriately selected and applied. The performance indicator for "business development of SMEs" in participating countries (a planned

¹⁶ 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).

¹⁷ 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).

¹⁸ 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).

outcome) intends to measure turnover of those SMEs using design protection prior and after the project. Turnover alone does not reflect business success and is not an indicator of higher value through design protection. High volume sales of low value added products may also lead to higher sales. The increase of profitability of businesses would be a more appropriate indicator to measure an increase of value added to projects through designs. Financial figures of SMEs are usually difficult to obtain, as many companies prefer not to disclose financial figures if they are not legally required.

44. Identifying assumptions and risks (including defining mitigation strategies) is also part of a sound project preparation. Assumptions and risks should identify the external factors that are relevant for translating outputs into outcomes and outcomes into impact¹⁹.

45. The Project document does not include risks and assumptions for the whole project, but refers to a risk analysis and mitigation plan to be undertaken in the detailed planning of each component. This was subsequently done and included into the "Project Scope Statement Report"²⁰ (see 2.A.iii below).

46. WIPO's standard templates for project planning were adequately applied. But these forms do not include logical frameworks, which have become the standard tool and are now widely used by almost all development actors in technical cooperation.

47. The use of a good logical framework is not a guarantee for the success of a Project. But it allows to identify possible flaws in the project logic (results chain), which otherwise may be overlooked. This means that a project may be approved and funds disbursed, prior to discovering fundamental logical shortcomings. Few poorly planned projects assessed by the evaluator led to the expected results.

48. It should be highlighted that during project implementation, a logical framework was developed for both countries covered in close cooperation with the national stakeholders. This logical framework was used for internal monitoring and the mid-term evaluation.

49. Consistent and correct application of RBM within the portfolio of DA projects requires clear guidelines against which quality of project documents and reports are checked.

(iii) Project Management

50. Project management was highly satisfactory. Instrumental were:

(a) The recruitment of a technical cooperation specialist as a full-time Project Officer to support the Project Manager in the day-to-day project implementation. The flip-side of delegating most day-to-day management to a temporary Project Officer is that after her departure, WIPO risks to forfeit parts of the knowledge gained.

(b) The establishment of Project Steering Committees (strategic level) and dedicated project teams (operational level) at the level of the beneficiary IP Offices, which both provided significant input to project implementation.

(c) A thorough inception phase to operationalize the Project, resulting in a clear agreement on a "Project Scope Statement Report"²¹ between the Secretariat and Lead

¹⁹ 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).

²⁰ See also risk analysis in CDIP 16/2 Annex II, page 6.

²¹ Other documents prepared during the inception phase included for each country a design protection strategy, an outreach strategy and an exit strategy. The design protection strategy and the outreach strategy are planned project outputs.

Agencies' Project Steering Committees. The Project Statement Report included specific responsibilities of all parties involved.

(d) Detailed operational planning, which was regularly updated in close coordination between the Secretariat and the beneficiary IP Offices.

(e) The selection of the right national experts (two national teams of eight experts specialized in design and IP to further develop diagnostic and training tools and to design tailor-made design protection strategies for companies).

51. Rather than merely presenting a mid-term implementation report using the "traffic light system" provided in WIPO's reporting template, the project team conducted a comprehensive internal mid-term review, which is in-depth and of high quality. The work done is as extensive, thorough and methodologically sound as it would be expected from an external evaluator. Most useful are the lessons learned identified. Conducting this type of in-depth reviews requires expertise in "project cycle management" and time, which few project managers working full-time in other functions within the Secretariat would have.

52. Reporting to the DACD (internal) and CDIP (Member States) was comprehensive, accurate and clear.

53. All beneficiaries interviewed highlighted the good cooperation with the Secretariat and project management, including the responsiveness of the project team to their needs.

(B) RELEVANCE

54. 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

55. Strategic policy relevance for Member States is evidenced by the CDIP's approval of the Project through consensus. The Project aimed at demonstrating the benefits from assisting right owners to protect and valorize their designs. The idea was not a comprehensive support to the development of the design sector, which would be beyond WIPO's mandate.

56. Project objectives are well aligned with DA Recommendation 4, which emphasizes on tailoring WIPO's technical cooperation to the needs of SMEs. The support to awareness training and capacity building activities through the two national IP Offices responds well to DA Recommendation 10, which emphasizes on the strengthening of national IP institutions.

57. Project objectives were coherent with WIPO's Strategic Goals and Programs²².

(a) The Project contributes to Result III.2 of the Program and Budget 2014 – 2015, which calls for enhanced human resource capabilities able to deal with the broad range of requirements for the effective use of IP for development in developing countries, LDCs and countries with economies in transition.

(b) Expected results at the output level link primarily into the objectives of Program 2²³, which hosted the Project. The Project's demonstration effect promoted an enabling environment for the brand and design industry.

²² See Program and Budget 2014/2015, applicable at the time the Project was designed.

²³ Program 2: Trademarks, industrial designs and geographical indications. Program 2 "(...)" will endeavor to produce outcomes, which will allow WIPO to advance a balanced evolution of the international framework for brands and

[Footnote continued on next page]

(c) Although to a lesser degree, the Project potentially also contributes to the objectives of Program 9²⁴ (IP strategies might include “design strategies”), Program 30²⁵ (through the development of training material that also targets SMEs) and Program 31²⁶ (by encouraging right holders of two developing countries to consider international registrations of their designs).

(d) The aspects of possible legal and institutional constraints to the use of designs as IPRs might have been relevant, but was not covered.

(ii) Relevance to beneficiaries

58. Generally, designs are of high and increasing relevance to companies as a tool for value addition and differentiation. International IP statistics show a trend to more applications and registrations. The Project responded timely to this trend.

59. All national stakeholders interviewed confirmed WIPO’s assistance fully met their needs. Generally, the Project targeted those countries, industries and sectors for which designs are relevant. Designs were less relevant than other types of IPRs (e.g., patents) for agricultural machine producers, which is one of the key industries identified and covered in Argentina.

60. High relevance is also evidenced by a strong ownership of the two IP Offices (and other national stakeholders), reflected inter alia by their substantial in-kind contributions. All national stakeholders interviewed expressed a high degree of enthusiasm and a strong dedication. Their ownership and commitment were instrumental to the achievement of results.

61. Designed as a pilot intervention, this Project was only a first step towards achieving the expected broader outcomes beyond Argentina and Morocco. Its practical relevance to other Member States was therefore limited to the insights that were generated and shared. Upscaling through replication in other countries would need substantial additional support.

(C) EFFECTIVENESS

62. Due to the limitations explained above, the evaluation primarily assessed planned against expected results at the output level. Overall, the evaluator endorses the results reported in the final report presented to the 18th session of the CDIP. All planned outputs have been delivered, most of them timely and all in good quality. The evaluator validated the delivery of the following main outputs through desk study of progress reports, the review of material produced, internal project surveys, the internal mid-term review report and interviews:

(i) Project inception

63. After initial preparatory work (recruitments, selection of the two pilot countries and setting up the project management structure, see section 2.A above), the Secretariat drafted the following four documents:

(a) A national design protection strategy for Argentina and Morocco.

[Footnote continued from previous page]

designs and enable the establishment of a legal environment that responds to the specific needs and requirements of Member States’ brand and design industries. (...).”

²⁴ Program 9: Africa, Arab, Asia and the Pacific, Latin America and the Caribbean Countries, LDCs. Main activity are country-specific national IP strategies designed in the context of national development plans.

²⁵ Program 30: Small- and Medium Sized Enterprises (SMEs) and Innovation. The Program will act as the dedicated central reference point within WIPO for SME related IP issues. Its main activities are to develop SME-related material to guide the training and capacity building activities targeting primarily SMEs support institutions and other intermediaries.

²⁶ Program 31: The Hague System (design registration).

(b) An outreach plan, used as the basis for the selection of beneficiary companies. The plan identified the industrial sectors of strategic socio-economic importance.

(c) An exit strategy, which includes the mainstreaming of assistance provided by the Project into relevant national institutions (beyond the IP Offices also business associations).

(d) Feasibility studies for each of the countries based on a needs assessment among approximately 2,000 companies (through a survey²⁷).

(ii) Kick-off events in Argentina and Morocco

64. An international symposium on the protection of Industrial Designs was organized by the Project in Buenos Aires on September 3 and 4, 2014. In Morocco, the Project was presented to designers and potential beneficiary companies on October 15-16, 2014 and to a roundtable of different ministries, schools, business associations and other stakeholders. These events were instrumental to create visibility, inform the interested public and ensure political support.

(iii) Selection of companies

65. Through a rigorous process with well-defined selection criteria, 42 companies in Argentina and 26 in Morocco were selected to benefit from direct support through project experts. Information on the companies was retrieved through application forms.

(iv) Preparation of tools

66. The Project prepared the tool “5 Steps Strategic Design Protection”, which was used as material for direct support to companies, which covers: (1) the company and its business strategy; (2) the company’s portfolio of industrial designs; (3) IP strategy with a focus on design protection for business development; and (4) gender and diversity. During their practical application, pre-diagnostic and diagnostic tools were further improved with the assistance of national experts.

(v) Project launch events training of national experts

67. A launch event combined with capacity building for national experts took place with about 70 participants, on April 7, 2015, in Buenos Aires and on March 31/April 1, 2014 in Casablanca.

68. On October 27, 2015, another capacity building conference took place in Casablanca and was perceived as very important by Moroccan authorities.

(vi) Direct support to companies

69. Using the tool kits developed (see above), national project experts provided direct support to beneficiary SMEs. Topics covered included pre-diagnostic and diagnostic interviews, design portfolio analysis, advise on a tailor-made design protection strategy for their business development, tailor-made on-site awareness raising and capacity building meetings. Assistance also touched upon managerial aspects relevant to the implementation of the design strategy.²⁸

²⁷ 94 respondents in Argentina and 249 in Morocco. The response rate of around 15% overall is in line with what can typically be expected.

²⁸ See also brochure on the pilot project « Unlocking countries’ design potential », page 6, http://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/sct/en/sct_34_side_event/sct_34_side_event_brochure.pdf and as confirmed by the interviews of national experts.

70. An internal survey conducted by the Secretariat concluded that beneficiary companies were highly satisfied with the support received. This was also confirmed by stakeholder interviews conducted by the evaluator.

(vii) Project closing events and awards

71. A “DiseñAr” closing event took place on November 26, 2015, in Buenos Aires, followed by the awarding of a WIPO Enterprise Trophy – “Design Thinking Prize”. In Morocco, the closing event took place on May 17, 2016, during the “Casablanca IP Week”, and was followed by the awarding of the Africa Design Award.

(viii) Awareness raising internationally

72. A design exhibition Argentina – Morocco, “Unlocking countries potential in design – Investing in nation-wide innovation through design and in the strategic use of design rights” was opened on November 16, 2016 in Geneva.

73. In November 2016, an intercountry knowledge sharing workshop (with both countries’ project teams), a design exhibition and a side event to the 34th session of the Standing Committee on the Law of Trademarks, Industrial Designs and Geographical Indications (SCT) were organized by the Project.

74. The Secretariat, Argentina and Morocco delegations and country project teams presented the pilot project and both countries’ case studies to Member States at a lunch-time side event to the 34th session of the SCT, on November 17, 2016.

75. Besides the benefits of creating “visibility” and “awareness”, participants appreciated the exchange with their colleagues from the second beneficiary country.

(ix) Initial outcomes observed

76. The Project seems to have created a high visibility and demonstration effect within key stakeholders in the two beneficiary countries. The two IP Offices highlighted a closer link to key IP users through the project, including through networking at different events. Awareness raising seems to have been successful to inform right holders on the benefits of obtaining protection for their designs through registration.

77. During the Project, registration of designs in both countries increased between 2015 and 2016. For 2016, Argentina reported 45 registrations versus 40 in 2015, while the number in Morocco is 119 registrations versus 77. In Argentina, trade mark registrations increased from 29 to 41 (figures for Morocco were not yet available).²⁹ Data of two years are inconclusive enough to show a clear trend. But they may indicate that awareness raising and support by the Project motivated the companies to protect their designs.

(x) Impact

78. It was too early to assess results at the impact level.

²⁹ Source: interviews with IP Offices

(D) EFFICIENCY

(i) Financial implementation

79. Based on the last official financial report as per end of August, 2016 (CDIP 18/2, Annex VII, page 11), 86% of the total budget of CHF 487,000 (including CHF 237,000 for personnel costs and CHF 250,000 for non-personnel costs) was disbursed.

80. The Project reported total expenditures per budget lines and total expenditures per activity. A financial report linking expenditures to individual budget lines was not available. It is thus not possible to analyze funds disbursed by category of costs and per output in detail.

81. Comparing total costs (inputs) to outputs delivered with publicized financial data of other DA projects indicates an efficient fund use by the Secretariat. It should however be noted that the project inputs (resources used) would be substantially higher than reported if the significant in-kind contributions by the two beneficiary IP Offices, which are not reflected in financial reports, were accounted for.

82. The project budget was tight. Anecdotic evidence suggests that funds were economically used. International travel for example was limited to a minimum, inter alia by using video conferencing. The strengthening of an extensive use of local expertise is not only financially efficient, but also contributes to sustainability of results.

(ii) Assessment of approach

83. For a first-time pilot intervention with a desired demonstration effect, the approach discussed in Chapter 2.A was appropriate. Supporting SMEs with a track-record in creating and/or using designs in commercializing them as opposed to working with SMEs with no prior experience was the right choice. The same applies to the selection of countries with strong IP Offices and a high absorption capacity. In terms of technical input by the Secretariat, the combination of IP with commercial expertise was important.

84. While the Project allowed to pilot a model that is applicable for more advanced countries, it is not possible to draw conclusions on what approach would be appropriate for less advanced developing countries, LDCs and countries in transition. Piloting a similar or adapted intervention in a wider range of countries would be needed, prior to taking a decision on whether to mainstream support to the commercialization of designs and if, in what form.

(iii) Assessment of quality of outputs

85. As confirmed by an in-depth desk review and expert interviews all deliverables were of high quality. The overwhelmingly positive feed-back evidenced by the Secretariat's internal evaluation was validated through interviews of a sample of beneficiaries. All in-country events (kick-off meetings, launching events, capacity buildings, closing events) and the events in Geneva were well organized.

86. WIPO's contribution went beyond technical and financial input. Its reputation as an international organization and its credibility increased the interest of key stakeholders, including at the policy level.

(iv) Synergies with other activities conducted by the Secretariat

87. The evaluation found neither considerable synergies nor overlaps with other activities of the Secretariat. No other entity within the WIPO provides capacity building specifically in the field of valorizing protected designs.

(E) LIKELIHOOD OF SUSTAINABILITY OF RESULTS

88. An attempt assessing the likelihood of sustainability of results at the country level would be premature, as a continuation of benefits depends largely on a follow-up by the respective IP Offices. Following upon their commitments during the selection process, both IP Offices expressed their willingness to continue similar activities geared towards promoting designs as a tool to add value to products. In Morocco, the IP Office and one expert confirmed that support to SMEs to commercialize design through protected IPRs was currently ongoing. A national follow-up project was presented in different exhibitions. New companies and designers will benefit from support in 2017. The IP Office reportedly uses famous designers for testimonials. Furthermore, the General Confederation of Moroccan Enterprises and the Association of Moroccan exporters will conduct follow-up activities under an agreement with OMPIC.

89. Despite some budget constraints, the IP Office of Argentina seems to conduct some awareness raising activities, mainly with universities.

90. Due to no clear roadmap for follow-up at the international level, interest and visibility outside the two beneficiary countries are unlikely to sustain without a systematic follow-up by the Secretariat.

91. An expansion of this overall successful pilot to more, especially less advanced countries if possible also from other regions, would provide the necessary additional experience to draw conclusions on how the Secretariat could continue the strengthening of IP Offices to provide further similar support to companies. By the end of a follow-up phase, data on broader outcomes in the two pilot countries, e.g. at the company level (if any), should become available.

92. A replication in other countries would furthermore allow WIPO to capitalize on existing expertise by using the national experts trained in other countries. The benefits of considerable investments in the development of methodology and tools would be expanded beyond only two countries. Besides efficiency gains, a wider “outreach” would increase chances of creating and maintaining benefits on a larger scale.

93. Additional experience would provide CDIP members with the necessary insight whether there is a broader interest to receive similar support from the Secretariat. Furthermore, the approach could be further fine-tuned. This would enable the CDIP to take a well-informed decision on whether to later mainstream similar activities into one of the existing Programs.

(F) GENDER

94. Equality of gender is a priority to WIPO³⁰. Specific guidelines on how to mainstream gender into the preparation and implementation of DA projects are not yet available.

95. At the core of gender mainstreaming into technical assistance is to define gender-related objectives based on a gender analysis at the design stage and then to monitor them, which was not yet done. Gender mainstreaming must be systematic and goes beyond ad hoc actions such as selecting female experts and seminar participants.

96. Most of the Project managers are neither development nor gender specialists. They need specific practical guidance on how to apply WIPO’s general policy in development work.

97. Project management was sensitive on the gender dimension of the Project. Important steps were undertaken to address gender aspects. This included inter alia an analysis of the number of women in beneficiary companies, which resulted in interesting findings on beneficiary

³⁰ As summarized in Instruction No. 47/2014 dated August 5, 2014.

companies. In Morocco, the Association of Women Heads of Companies was part of the Steering Committee.

98. The evaluation found no indication whatsoever of insufficient involvement of women into the project. The Project tried actively to live up to WIPO's commitment to gender equality, although not from the beginning.

99. Consistent mainstreaming of gender issues in DA Projects requires clear guidelines and training for all project managers.

3. CONCLUSIONS

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

Conclusion 1 on project preparation and relevance: The Project prepared by the Secretariat addresses the promotion of the strategic use and protection of industrial designs by SMEs in an appropriate way. Excellent preparation in close cooperation with key stakeholders in the two beneficiary countries led to a high degree of relevance.

101. The Secretariat did a good job in translating the relatively open proposal submitted by the Republic of Korea into a clearly formulated project concept, which aligns well to WIPO's mandate and the DA recommendations it intends to address. Project objectives are fully aligned to the needs of key beneficiaries (IP Offices and companies). The Project targeted those countries, industries and sectors for which designs are relevant.

102. Objectives are clearly defined, although the separation between deliverables of the Secretariat and their use (outcomes) is not always clear. Indicators for each objective are defined, but not all of them are specific, measurable, ambitious, relevant and time-bound.

103. The implementation plan and budgets are ambitious, but realistic. The sequencing of activities is logical and enabling to the achievement of objectives. The implementation structure, which featured Steering Committees (for strategic management) and project teams (for operational management) in each beneficiary country is conducive to the achievement of objectives.

104. WIPO's standard templates for planning, monitoring and reporting do not use the logical framework tool, which has become the key instrument for the management of technical cooperation projects. Detailed guidelines on project cycle management are not available, but would be useful.

Conclusion 2 on management, efficiency and effectiveness: Project management was highly satisfactory. The Secretariat delivered all outputs timely and in good quality. Resources were used economically. The Project provided good value for money.

105. The Project was well managed. The set-up of a local implementation structure (Advisory Board / National Steering Committee, project Steering Committees, project teams) in the two beneficiary countries was instrumental. A key success factor was also the recruitment of a full-time Project Officer with a technical cooperation background and sound project management skills. Management was flexible and responsive to the needs of beneficiaries.

106. The evaluation endorses the project completion report. Most planned outputs were delivered timely and all in good quality. It would be too early to assess broader outcomes. Nevertheless, the Project seems to have created a high visibility and demonstration effect within key stakeholders in the two beneficiary countries. The two IP Offices highlighted a closer link to

key IP users through the project, including through networking at different events. Awareness raising seems to have been successful to inform right holders on the benefits of obtaining protection for their designs through registration. Both countries report increased design and trademark registrations.

107. Besides some visibility and interest generated through events in Geneva, achieving the intended broader outcomes at the international level (replication and upscaling) would require significant additional efforts through a second project phase.

108. Funds were used economically. Comparing deliverables with the rather tight budget, the Project provided good value for money, even though financial figures do not account the significant in-kind contributions of national stakeholders as inputs.

Conclusion 3 on sustainability of results: Activities in Morocco under OMPIC are ongoing beyond the project. Argentina plans to continue activities to promote the valorization of IPRs. Generating and maintaining benefits at the international level requires a follow-up phase.

109. An attempt assessing the likelihood of longer-term sustainability of results at the country level would be premature, as a continuation of benefits depends largely on a follow-up by the respective IP Offices. Following upon their commitments during the selection process, both IP Offices expressed their willingness to continue similar activities geared towards promoting designs as a tool to add value to products. Activities in Morocco under the lead of OMPIC are currently ongoing.

110. The likelihood of maintaining the limited benefits at the international level (interest and visibility) is low without a follow-up intervention. An expansion of this overall successful pilot to more, especially less advanced countries if possible also from other regions, would provide the necessary additional experience to draw conclusions on how the Secretariat could continue the strengthening of IP Offices to provide further similar support to companies on a longer-term.

Conclusion 4 on mainstreaming gender: While project implementation took gender issues actively into account, this was done not following a clear WIPO methodology. Gender equality is a priority for WIPO, but there is no guidance to project managers on how to mainstream gender into DA projects.

111. Project management undertook significant efforts to address gender aspects. The evaluation found no indication whatsoever of insufficient involvement of women into the project.

112. The Project tried actively to live up to WIPO's commitment to gender equality, although not systematically and from the beginning.

113. Consistent mainstreaming of gender issues in DA Projects requires clear guidelines and training for all project managers.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

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

Recommendation 1 (from conclusions 2 and 3) to the WIPO Secretariat on proposing a phase 2 of the Project to the CDIP to gain additional experience and in case of a broader interest, prepare for an upscaling and replication of the approach.

- (a) Propose a second project phase (a) to the CDIP to pilot the approach in additional countries from different regions. Tailor the approach to specific country needs, where appropriate.

- (b) Involve the Bureaus in determining possible new target countries.
- (c) While maintaining the commitment of national counterparts as a key selection criteria, ensure a balanced selection of beneficiary countries at different stages of IP system development.
- (d) Consider using the Project's experts in the new beneficiary countries where appropriate.
- (e) Support the IP Offices of Argentina and Morocco to assess wider project outcomes.
- (f) If the mid-term review of a phase 2 shows positive results, develop a detailed strategy on how to ensure replication of similar projects in other countries.

Recommendation 3 (from conclusion 2) to the WIPO Secretariat on systematically assessing management input needed for new DA projects and where appropriate, ensure support for day-to-day implementation of projects.

115. For new projects, the Secretariat should systematically assess management input needed versus the workload of project managers. Where appropriate, the Secretariat should budget for the recruitment of a Project Officer who is responsible for day-to-day project management.

116. To complement the technical expertise of the Project Manager, the Project Officer should primarily be a proven development specialist with field experience and excellent project management skills.

117. Ensure that the delegation of management responsibilities to externally recruited temporary staff does not lead to the loss of organizational know-how.

Recommendation 4 (from conclusions 1 and 2) to the WIPO Secretariat to propose a DA project to the CDIP which aims at the development of specific tools for the planning and implementation of DA Projects, including the mainstreaming of gender.

118. To ensure the consistent application of good practices in DA projects, the WIPO Secretariat should consider proposing a new DA project to the CDIP that specifically focuses on the development and introduction of project management tools for DA projects.

119. Deliverables should *inter alia* include:

- (a) The identification of existing good practices in planning and monitoring (including tools) within the UN family.
- (b) Building upon what already exists, develop a tool kit for the design and monitoring of DA projects (including on how to mainstream gender related aspects into all DA projects).
- (c) The tool kit must include clear processes and responsibilities for implementation. The logical framework should be the basis of planning, monitoring and evaluation (project cycle management). While building upon existing good practices in other organizations, the tool kit must be tailored to WIPO's specific technical cooperation activities.
- (d) Develop short training courses in project cycle management for new Project Managers (using the tool kit).
- (e) Pilot these documents and the course. If successful, consider applying them for all technical cooperation projects/programs across the organization.

LIST OF APPENDIXES

Appendix I	Project document
Appendix II	Terms of reference
Appendix III	List of persons interviewed
Appendix IV	List of documents

[Appendixes follow]

APPENDIX I: PROJECT DOCUMENT

The Project Document CDIP/12/6 is available at:

http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=252504

[Appendix II follows]

APPENDIX II: TERMS OF REFERENCE

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Title of Assignment:	Project Evaluation: Intellectual Property (IP) and Design Management for Business Development in Developing and Least Developed Countries (LDCs)
Name of unit/sector:	Development Agenda Coordination Division (DACD), Development Sector
Place of Assignment:	Evilard (Leubringen), Switzerland
Expected places of travel (if applicable):	During the assignment, you will undertake two missions to WIPO Headquarters, Geneva, Switzerland (dates to be determined)
Expected duration of assignment:	From November 15, 2016 to May 30, 2017

1. Objective of the assignment

The present document represents the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the evaluation of the Development Agenda (DA) *Project on Intellectual Property (IP) and Design Management for Business Development in Developing and Least Developed Countries (LDCs)*, implementing the DA Recommendations 4 and 10.

The project was based on a proposal presented by the Republic of Korea at the eleventh session of the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP) contained in document CDIP/11/7 and approved by the Committee during its twelfth session, held in Geneva in November 2013. The project aimed at supporting small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), which actively create and commercialize designs, in the active use of the IP system and the development of strategies that encouraged investment in design. Through close cooperation with lead agencies in the participating countries, the project aimed to promote the strategic use of intellectual property rights (IPRs), in particular, industrial design rights by SMEs in two selected countries (Argentina and Morocco) and thereby encouraging a pro-active approach to design protection in domestic and export markets.

The project was implemented under the supervision of the Project Manager, Mr. Marcus Höpperger, Director, Law and Legislative Advice Division, Brands and Designs Sector.

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

The main objective of this evaluation is two-fold:

- (a) Learning from experiences during the 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
- (b) 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) Contributing to the business development of SMEs in participating countries by encouraging investment in design through the strategic use of IPRs, in particular the proactive use of appropriate design protection mechanisms that were neglected so far; and
- (b) Improving the capacities of national design institutions, including IP Offices, to encourage the strategic use of the IP system for design producing businesses, thus leading to an increased use of available design protection mechanisms.

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 WIPO 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 effectiveness and usefulness of the project in reinforcement of the national IPR design protection mechanism strategy and its use by SMEs in the two selected countries;
- (b) The usefulness and effectiveness of the project in improving the capacities of national design institutions, including IP Offices; and
- (c) The usefulness and effectiveness of the project in encouraging the strategic use of the IP system for design producing businesses, thus leading to an increased use of available design protection mechanisms.

Sustainability

The likelihood of the continuation of the work on IP and Design Management for Business Development in Developing and LDCs.

Implementation of Development Agenda (DA) Recommendations

The extent to which the DA Recommendations 4 and 10 have been implemented through this project.

The project time frame considered for this evaluation is 24 months. 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 above-mentioned 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 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) Stakeholders' 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; and
 - (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 November 15, 2016, and be finalized on April 15, 2017. The reporting language will be English.

3. Reporting

The Consultant will be under the supervision of the Director of the DACD. In addition, the evaluator shall:

- (a) Work closely with the DACD, the Project Manager and the Law and Legislative Advice Division, Brands and Designs Sector. He 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 projects, namely the Project on Enhancing South-South Cooperation on IP and Development among Developing Countries and LDCs (document CDIP/7/6), the Project on Intellectual Property and Socio-Economic Development (document CDIP/5/7 Rev.), the Project on Open Collaborative Projects and IP Based Models (CDIP6/6/Rev.) and, the Project on Intellectual Property and Technology Transfer: Common Challenges – Building Solutions (CDIP/16/3).

5. Duration of contract and payment

The contract will start on November 15, 2016, and will end in May 30, 2017. During this period, the following schedule should be followed:

The inception report should be submitted to WIPO by December 15, 2016. WIPO's feedback shall be communicated to you by December 20, 2016. The draft evaluation report shall be submitted to WIPO by January 15, 2017. Factual corrections on the draft will be provided to the evaluator by January 20, 2017. The final evaluation report shall be submitted by February 15, 2017. The final version of the evaluation report containing a management response in an annex shall be submitted to the nineteenth session of the CDIP, to be held in April-May 2017. You will be required to present the evaluation report during that CDIP session.

[End of Appendix II]

APPENDIX III: LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED [DACD TO CHECK, PLEASE]

No.	Name and function
1.	Ms. Naima Benharbit El Alami, <i>chef de Service marketing et relations internationales</i> , OMPIC, Morocco
2.	Lic. Maria Eugenia Barroso, <i>Jefe de Unidad – Relaciones Institucionales e Internacionales</i> , INPI, Argentina
3.	Mr. Diego Domma, Local Expert, Argentina
4.	Mr. Matthew Forno, Senior Counsellor, Information and Promotion Division, Madrid Registry, Brands and Designs Sector, WIPO
5.	Mr. Marina Foschi, Legal Officer, Design and Geographical Indication Law Section, Law and Legislative Advice Division, Brands and Designs Sector, WIPO
6.	Mr. George Ghandour, Senior Program Manager, Development Agenda Coordination Division, Development Sector, WIPO
7.	Mr. Oswaldo Girones Jorda, Counsellor, Regional bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean, Development Sector
8.	Mr. Marcus Höpperger, former Director, Law and Legislative Advice Division, Brands and Designs Sector, WIPO
9.	Mr. Abid Kabadi, Local Expert, Morocco
10.	Mr. Hicham Lahlou, Local Expert, Morocco
11.	Mr. Mario Matus, Deputy Director General, Development Sector, WIPO
12.	Ms. Kaori Saito, Gender and Diversity Specialist, Human Resources Management Department, WIPO
13.	Mr. M'Hamed Sidi el Khir, Counsellor, Regional Bureau for Arab Countries, Development Sector, WIPO
14.	Ms. Maria Zarraga, former Project Officer, Law and Legislative Advice Division, Brands and Designs Sector, WIPO

[Appendix IV follows]

APPENDIX IV: LIST OF DOCUMENTS

Evaluation documents

- WIPO, Revised Evaluation Policy (Second Edition 2016/2020), February 19, 2016.
- DAC Guidelines and Reference Series, Quality Standards for Development Evaluation, OECD-DAC, OECD 2010.
- United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards for Evaluation (latest version: June 2016).

WIPO Programmatic Documents

- The 45 Adopted Recommendations under the WIPO Development Agenda by the General Assembly of WIPO Member States, 2007.
- Program and Budget for the 2014/2015 Biennium, approved by the Assemblies of the Member States of WIPO on December 12, 2013.

Project planning and reporting

- Project proposal, prepared by the Republic of Korea, CDIP/11/7, Annex, page 2
- Project Document, CDIP 12/6
- Progress Report, CDIP 14/2, Annex VI, August 28, 2014
- Progress Report, CDIP 16/2, Annex II, August 13, 2015
- Progress Report, CDIP 17/2, page 18 (iv)
- Completion Report, CDIP 18/2, Annex VII, August 15, 2016
- Internal Project Self-Evaluation Report (November 2015)

Project outputs

Project preparation

- The national design protection strategy for Argentina
- The national design protection strategy for Morocco
- The outreach plan for Argentina
- The outreach plan for Morocco
- The feasibility study for Argentina
- The feasibility study for Morocco
- Summary of the preparatory survey among companies in Argentina
- Summary of the preparatory survey among companies in Morocco

- The exit strategy for Argentina
- The exit strategy for Morocco

Kick-off events

- Agenda/program kick-off event in Argentina
- Agenda/program kick-off event in Morocco
- Agenda/program capacity building conference in Casablanca (October 27, 2015)

Selection of SMEs

- Report on the selection of companies

Training material

- The tool “5 Steps Strategic Design Protection”

Promotional material

- Brochure “Unlocking Countries’ Design Potential WIPO Pilot Project on Intellectual Property and Design Management for Business Development”
- Video Argentina on the DiseñAr program:
<http://www.inpi.gov.ar/index.php?Id=323&criterio=1>
- Video Morocco on the Namadij program: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Xtzeu6yp_Xs
- Flyer on the DiseñAr program
- Flyer on the Namadij program

Closing events and case studies

- Agenda of closing event in Argentina
- Agenda of closing event in Morocco

Case studies presented case studies to Member States at a lunch-time side event to the 34th session of the SCT, on November 17, 2017.

[End of Appendix IV and of document]