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# **Executive Summary**

Following a number of discussions in the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP) over a number of years on potential approaches to support Member States in sharing information on technical assistance, at its twenty-third session in 2019 the CDIP requested the WIPO Secretariat to develop a platform to hold regional webinars on this topic.

This evaluation aims to consider the relevance and effectiveness of the webinars as well as the sustainability of the approach. The Development Agenda Coordination Division (DACD) was responsible for administering the eight webinars, which were held in each of the six official UN languages[[1]](#footnote-1) in the latter half of 2019. All regions were covered by the webinars. The DACD received support from other WIPO entities to implement the webinars including the Regional Bureaus; the Department for Transition and Developed Countries; WIPO External Offices (mainly the WIPO Office in China); the Publications Division; the Information and Communication Technology Department; and the News and Media Division.

The first webinar was held in September 2019 and the last one in mid-December 2019.

This evaluation has been undertaken by an independent consultant using qualitative data collection methodologies. A total of 28 semi-structured interviews were undertaken with WIPO staff; the experts engaged to prepare and deliver the webinars; and representatives of Member States. Relevant documentation was also reviewed. The evaluation was not tasked with assessing the outcome of the substantive topics/discussions covered in the webinars.

**Relevance**

When assessing relevance, the evaluation took into consideration the appropriateness of the webinar methodology and structure, as well as the approach taken by the Secretariat in organising the webinars. Levels of participation, engagement and the ability of the webinars to respond to the needs of Member States was also taken into account.

Setting up and holding eight webinars in six different languages in a six-month timeframe was ambitious. However, this was successfully achieved, and the webinars were attended by a total of 470 people. The preparatory work and support provided by the Secretariat such as reviewing the inputs of the experts engaged to deliver the webinars and conducting software pre-testing was an important factor in the webinars’ success.

Engaging high-calibre experts to deliver the webinars provided an important opportunity to hold discussions that went beyond theory and focused on practical examples and experiences – something that was valued by participants. Tailoring the content of the webinars and ensuring that they were held in different languages was also an important factor in their success.

Numbers of participants varied for each webinar with some drawing the expected number (approximately 40-50% of those who had registered) and others drawing less. For those webinars with lower than expected participation rates this was considered to be due to unreliable internet connection; webinars being held during the working day and during a busy period at the end of the year. Levels of engagement in all webinars were high, with participants submitting questions to the experts and to WIPO. Where there was insufficient time to respond to all questions, they were responded to in writing after each webinar.

**Effectiveness**

The evaluation has looked at effectiveness in terms of how useful the webinars were to facilitate the sharing of experience in relation to technical assistance and the effectiveness of contributions from WIPO entities as well as other stakeholders.

All those spoken to for this evaluation, as well as all those who responded to post-webinar satisfaction surveys, found to be an effective means for information and experience-sharing. However, their one-off nature prevents any ongoing exchange and discussion on the topics covered. They were however a cost-efficient means of presenting and discussing a topic across a number of countries within a given region (or more than one region) in a way that WIPO country missions do not.

Only minor software issues were faced during webinar implementation and this was only for a small number of the webinars, highlighting that this means of sharing information is effective.

A number of different entities within the WIPO Secretariat were involved in setting up and delivering the webinars. With DACD taking a lead role there was also significant involvement from the Regional Bureaus, all of which were responsive to requests for support from the DACD in terms of reaching out to Member States to promote the webinars and collaborating on the content of each webinar. The Bureaus also participated in the webinars. The WIPO Office in China played a similar supporting role for the Chinese webinar.

Outside WIPO, the involvement of the Member States was important as they were a primary channel for promoting the webinars. The webinars were promoted broadly through a range of different channels and this was successful in reaching a diverse range of stakeholders.

**Sustainability**

In this evaluation sustainability is taken to mean the likelihood of using the webinars in the future as a tool to share methodologies and practices on technical assistance by both Member States and WIPO.

As noted above, the webinars were a successful way to share and exchange information on technical assistance. They were however, a pilot, designed to be one-off events and directly replicating the approach adopted in terms of frequency and content of the webinars, would not be sustainable. With clear direction from the CDIP in relation to target audience and webinar objectives however, future webinars, scheduled at sufficiently spaced intervals and with an adapted content would be an option for the future in order to facilitate the sharing of information in relation to technical assistance.

**Recommendations**

Based on the evaluation findings a set of six recommendations are proposed for consideration by WIPO and the Member States.

### **Recommendation 1** Webinar objectives and target audience

The objectives of any future webinars need to be clearly defined by Member States in order to ensure that they respond to needs. Using Member State objectives as a starting point, it is then recommended that the DACD and the Regional Bureaus jointly propose discussion topics to the Member States. Having clearly agreed objectives and topics would then assist WIPO in defining key target audiences – something which was absent from the pilot webinars.

### **Recommendation 2** Progression of information

As one-off initiatives, the webinars provided the opportunity to share information on technical assistance in multiple languages and on multiple topics. In future, it would be valuable to consider a more progressive approach that takes into consideration building on the information shared in previous related webinars. This would allow for more meaningful learning opportunities for participants.

This approach would require an increased engagement with the Member States at the start of each calendar year in order to schedule the webinars at the most optimal time, allowing for sufficient planning and advertisement of the webinars to potential participants.

### **Recommendation 3** Technical limitations

There are technical limitations to information-sharing via webinars and although this approach is considered cost-effective and can benefit multiple countries within a region, webinars should be considered only as one way of delivering technical assistance. Webinars should be a complementary activity to more traditional approaches such as WIPO in-country missions.

### **Recommendation 4** Webinar promotion and dissemination

In future, if similar webinars are to be held, a greater involvement of the Member States in terms of reaching out to national IP offices and potential webinar audiences for promotion and dissemination purposes may help to ensure increased numbers of participants.

### **Recommendation 5** Timeframe and resources

In future, if similar webinars are to be held, having a dedicated P2 level human resources to manage the webinars would be important. In addition, it will be necessary to ensure sufficient time is given to setting up the webinars and to advertising them, thereby increasing the potential number of webinar attendees.

### **Recommendation 6** Increased information-sharing

It was necessary for experts to respond to questions in writing after each webinar, as there was insufficient time to respond to all the questions posed during the webinar itself. Whilst this was positive as it ensured that all participant questions were addressed, it was limited in that other participants did not see those questions and answers and therefore did not benefit. In future, sharing written post-webinar responses with all participants (perhaps via the webpage) would benefit all those interested.

In addition, if WIPO is aiming to continue dialogue with those who participated in the webinars as well as newcomers, it will be necessary to create an ongoing knowledge-sharing platform in order to build and strengthen the network of those involved. Proposals for this are covered above in Recommendation 1 – Webinar Objectives, and Recommendation 2 – Progression of Information.

# Introduction and background

At its eighteenth session, held at the end of 2016, the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP) approved a proposal, which *inter alia*, requested to establish a “web forum for sharing ideas, practices and experiences”. Further discussion at subsequent CDIPs, which focused on the potential for different ways of supporting Member States to share information in relation to technical assistance, resulted, during the twenty-third session of the CDIP in May 2019, in the Committee requesting the WIPO Secretariat to develop a platform to hold webinars for specific regions for an initial period of six months. It was agreed that the platform would be administered by WIPO staff and that its usefulness would be assessed with a decision taken as to its continuation, modification or closure.[[2]](#footnote-2)

In July 2019, the Secretariat established a web page dedicated to the webinars and linked to the Development Agenda Coordination Division (DACD) web page. This provided information about upcoming webinars; registration and participation information; and information on how to join the webinars.

The webinars were administered by the DACD in close coordination with other WIPO Divisions/Sectors including the Regional Bureaus; the Department for Transition and Developed Countries; WIPO External Offices (mainly the WIPO Office in China); the Publications Division; the Information and Communication Technology Department; and the News and Media Division.

Covering different topics which had been selected in consultation with the Member States, through Regional Group Coordinators, a total of eight webinars were held, one in each of the six official UN languages with two additional ones held in English in order to also cover Anglophone Africa and Caribbean countries. The first webinar was held in September 2019 and the last one in mid-December 2019.

# Evaluation purpose, objectives and scope

The main objective of this evaluation of the webinars on technical assistance is two-fold:

* To learn from experiences gained during implementation of the pilot webinars, focusing on what worked well and what did not work well, for the benefit of continuing such activities. This includes assessing three main criteria:
  1. The **relevance** of the webinars i.e.
     + The appropriateness and relevance of the methodology, structure and approach taken by the Secretariat in organizing and running the webinars;
     + Participation during the webinars; and
     + The webinars’ ability to respond to the needs of Member States.
  2. The **effectiveness** of the webinars i.e.
     + The usefulness of the webinar as an experience-sharing platform;
     + Contributions from Secretariat entities during the webinar implementation;
     + The promotion of the webinars; and
     + Contributions from other stakeholders to webinar implementation.
  3. The **sustainability** of the approach i.e.
* The likelihood of using the webinars in the future as a tool to share methodologies and practices on technical assistance by both Member States and WIPO;
* To provide evidence-based information to support the CDIP’s decision-making process.

The evaluation was not tasked with assessing the outcome of the substantive topics/discussions discussed during the webinars.

# Evaluation methodology

The methodological approach adopted for this evaluation was focused on the collection of qualitative data, using iterative and comparative processes throughout.

The evaluation was participatory in nature, allowing for the involvement of relevant stakeholders including WIPO Secretariat staff; the WIPO China Office; the independent experts who were engaged to prepare and deliver the webinars; and Member State representatives. In addition, satisfaction survey data provided by webinar participants was assessed. A total of 28 semi-structured interviews were undertaken and available documentation was reviewed.

The timeframe considered for this evaluation is May – December 2019.

The evaluator consulted closely with the DACD project team throughout the implementation of the evaluation.

# Evaluation findings

Evaluation findings are presented in line with the three main evaluation criteria from the evaluation Terms of Reference (ToR) – relevance, effectiveness and sustainability.

## Relevance

When considering relevance, the evaluation has looked at the appropriateness of the methodology, structure and approach taken by the Secretariat in organising and running the webinars; the levels of participation and engagement in the webinars; and the ability of the webinars to respond to the needs of Member States.

**Key Finding 1 Engaging high-calibre independent experts to organise and deliver each of the eight webinars was an appropriate approach, providing the opportunity to go beyond theoretical discussions on technical assistance and ensuring that presentations were based on real and practical examples.**

**Key Finding 2 Following a standard structure for the webinars and ensuring that they were time-limited helped to ensure positive levels of engagement in the topics discussed.**

**Key Finding 3 Holding language-based as opposed to entirely regional-based webinars helped to ensure that webinar discussions were free flowing.**

**Key Finding 4 In spite of the fact that setting-up and holding eight webinars in a six-month timeframe was ambitious, the DACD was successful in achieving this.**

**Key Finding 5 The preparatory support, such as reviewing expert presentations and conducting software pre-testing, provided by WIPO in the lead-up to each of the webinars, was a critical factor in the webinars’ success.**

**Key Finding 6 Numbers of participants varied for each webinar, with some webinars drawing the expected number of participants but others drawing fewer. For those with lower participant levels this is considered to be due to a range of factors including unreliable internet connection; webinars being held during the working day; webinars being held during a busy period at the end of the year; and webinars being held very close together.**

**Key Finding 7 The webinars were successful in meeting Member State needs, both in terms of language and tailored content. Member States represented the largest webinar participant stakeholder group.**

#### 4.1.1 Methodology, structure and approach

WIPO engaged eight independent experts, one to deliver each of the webinars. The experts all signed up to very similar ToRs, which helped to ensure that a coherent approach was adopted across the webinars. The experts were tasked with:

* Defining the content of the presentations
* Identifying the target audience in the region
* Promoting the webinar to the identified target audience in order to increase visibility and maximise participation
* Preparation of a completion report after the event

The experts worked closely with the DACD team responsible for implementing the pilot webinars and were all able to successfully fulfil their tasks and services. Following each event, the experts prepared and submitted individual webinar completion reports, providing a summary of their presentations; analysing the level of participation during the webinar; detailing lessons learned and identifying good practices.

Each webinar, which was held live, with video recordings made available via WIPO’s website on a dedicated webpage after each event, aimed to share experiences, tools and methodologies regarding technical assistance and capacity building. Providing the option for participants and non-participants to watch the webinars on WIPO’s website after the event was important particularly as some of the webinars suffered connectivity issues during the live broadcasts but also as a way of reaching a larger audience. A total of 181 people have watched the webinars this way.[[3]](#footnote-3) The webpage also contained information on the webinars and the power point presentations given by the experts.

Lasting for 60-90 minutes, each webinar followed the same structure, which included:

* Introductory remarks from a WIPO representative
* A presentation by the expert
* Question and answer (Q&A) session
* Remarks from a guest commentator (in some of the webinars but not all)
* Conclusion

Feedback from all those interviewed highlights that using this standard webinar format was appropriate and allowed for naturally flowing discussions. The majority of those spoken to stressed the importance of involving non-WIPO experts in the webinars as they were able to motivate participants’ interest in the topics under discussion through their real life experience, going beyond theoretical discussions. Some were of the opinion that there would be no need to engage experts in the future as WIPO’s own staff could give presentations and respond to questions on technical assistance. However, it was also pointed out that the experts were able to provide an objectively analytical follow-up report, which would be more difficult for WIPO staff to do due to ongoing workloads.

Some of the webinars, for example the Arabic webinar, involved a guest commentator who contributed to the discussion and supported the experts in answering some of the questions posed.

Using a language-based as opposed to completely regional-based approach was considered as important by those spoken to as it helped to ensure that webinar discussions flowed easily.

Holding eight webinars within a six-month timeframe was ambitious. Although the DACD did manage to do this, it necessitated holding a number of the webinars very close to each other and may have had a negative impact on numbers participating.

A key factor in the successful implementation of the webinars was the important preparatory work that was undertaken in advance of each webinar, heavily supported by WIPO. The role of the Regional Bureaus and the WIPO China Office in finding and engaging the experts; the support provided by DACD and the Regional Bureaus to the experts in terms of preparing their presentations; and the pre-webinar technical testing all ensured that the webinars ran as planned. Having WIPO staff attending the webinars was also critical in terms of introducing WIPO and the topic to be covered, moderating the Q&A session and summing up at the end.

Another factor that contributed to the success of the webinars was the calibre of the experts, each of whom was well-versed on the topic of technical assistance and able to respond to questions posed during the Q&A session.

From a technical perspective, all the webinars ran as planned with only the Arabic and French webinars suffering from connectivity difficulties. In the case of the Arabic one, there were difficulties in having the video and audio of the guest commentator on at the same time, hence she provided comments only via audio and some of the submitted questions had to be re-sent.

#### 4.1.2 Participation and engagement

Table 1 below provides an overview of the number of individuals who registered for the webinars and the actual number of attendees.

***Table 1 Webinar participation***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Language** | **Number of individuals registered** | **Number of webinar attendees** | **Post-webinar online views[[4]](#footnote-4)** |
| **Arabic** | 161 | 77 | 31 |
| **Russian** | 159 | 56 | 12 |
| **Spanish** | 273 | 92 | Information not available |
| **English (Caribbean)** | 209 | 58 | 13 |
| **English (Africa)** | 98 | 32 | 14 |
| **English (Asia and the Pacific)** | 155 | 67 | 33 |
| **French (Africa)** | 91 | 26 | 21 |
| **Chinese** | 535 | 62 | 71 |

The total number of participants in all the webinars was 470. For most of the webinars, the number of attendees was in line with expectations, with WIPO counting on an attendance rate of 40-50% of those who actually registered. For a first webinar on the topic of technical assistance, most of those spoken with felt that attendance was satisfactory. However, for the Chinese; French; and English-speaking (Africa) webinars, numbers were lower than expected. Anecdotal evidence highlights that the lower-than-expected attendance for the French webinar may have been as a result of connectivity problems – something which would need to be taken into consideration for similar future webinars. For China, the fact that the webinar fell at the end of the year (mid-December) – a busy period –, as well as during the working day, may also have had a negative impact on the final number of attendees.

During the webinars, the levels of engagement from participants varied, with the main opportunity for engagement being provided through the Q&A session. Questions could only be seen by the WIPO administrator and the expert but not the other participants. Whilst this allowed WIPO to cluster questions on the same topic and avoid duplication it did limit the ability of participants to see what issues were of interest to other participants. It was also not possible within the time given for the experts to respond to all questions, so written follow-up responses were provided after the webinar but only directly to the questioner and not to all participants. The English-speaking webinar in Africa adopted a more participatory approach by posing questions during the presentations, which allowed participants to provide written responses, or connected questions during the webinar.

#### 4.1.3 Responsiveness to Member State needs

A concern in relation to the Member States’ initial 2016 request for the establishment of a web forum to facilitate their sharing of experience, ideas and information in relation to technical assistance, was the need for a moderator to keep the forum alive, combined with potential language barriers which would prevent a real exchange of information. Research by the DACD also showed that data from other web forums showed that usage tends to be low. The development and implementation of the pilot webinars, approved by the CDIP in 2019, was therefore an alternative approach by WIPO to support Member States in sharing and exchanging methodologies and practices on technical assistance.

In order to ensure that topics were relevant for Member States, the DACD selected the topics and experts in consultation with the Member States and in collaboration with the WIPO Regional Bureaus, the Department for Transition and Developed Countries, and/or WIPO External Offices. Attention was paid to specific regional needs and interests. Whilst some of the topics were broad, others were more focused on a specific issue. This flexibility in terms of webinar themes was important to ensure that different regional requirements were met. The only shortcoming of this approach was that it did not allow for a comparison across the regions and a more global sharing of information on issues, which may be of equal interest.

***Table 2 Webinar topics and dates***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Title** | **Date** | **Language** |
| I | How to benefit from new tools and methodologies for effective technical assistance in the Arab Region | September 18, 2019 | Arabic |
| II | Technical assistance: opportunities for professional development | October 25, 2019 | Russian |
| III | Intellectual property, exports and foreign investment: how can WIPO technical assistance facilitate synergies? | November 14, 2019 | Spanish |
| IV | Intellectual property, exports and foreign investment: how can WIPO technical assistance facilitate synergies? | November 28, 2019 | English  (Caribbean) |
| V | The role of technical assistance in IP and innovation for business competitiveness in Africa | December 10, 2019 | English  (Africa) |
| VI | Strategic application of WIPO’s technical assistance to accelerate innovation-driven development | December 11, 2019 | English  (Asia Pacific) |
| VII | The role of technical assistance in IP and innovation for business competitiveness in Africa | December 16, 2019 | French  (Africa) |
| VIII | What is the role that technical assistance plays in formulating and implementing an effective IP strategy? | December 17, 2019 | Chinese |

There was consensus among those spoken to that the webinars have provided Member States with a space to discuss technical assistance and to share relevant information. The table below, which shows the breakdown of participants by stakeholder group, highlights that Member States (represented in columns 3 and 4) were indeed the most highly represented group of webinar participants – an indication that the content of the webinars was appropriately targeted and therefore responsive to Member State needs.

***Table 3 Participant stakeholder groups[[5]](#footnote-5)***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Webinar** | **Organizations [[6]](#footnote-6)** | **Geneva-based**  **Delegates[[7]](#footnote-7)** | **Government[[8]](#footnote-8)** | **Private Sector** | **Academia** | **Others** | **Total** |
| ARABIC | 8 | 10 | 48 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 77 |
| RUSSIAN | 5 | 1 | 13 | 10 | 22 | 5 | 56 |
| SPANISH | 4 | 4 | 21 | 42 | 18 | 3 | 92 |
| ENGLISH (CARIBBEAN) | 10 | 1 | 12 | 22 | 9 | 4 | 58 |
| ENGLISH (AFRICA) | 3 | 0 | 9 | 12 | 4 | 4 | 32 |
| ENGLISH (ASPAC) | 12 | 2 | 18 | 13 | 19 | 3 | 67 |
| FRENCH (AFRICA) | 4 | 0 | 11 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 26 |
| CHINESE | Information not available | | | | | |  |
| **TOTAL** | **46** | **18** | **132** | **106** | **82** | **24** |  |

Another indicator of the extent to which the webinars were responsive to Member State needs is the levels of satisfaction expressed by participants in the post-webinar satisfaction surveys. For example, of those who responded to the survey, some 90% of participants were satisfied or extremely satisfied with the webinar. The majority of participants who responded to the surveys also considered the webinar to be an appropriate means for discussing IP and would recommend future webinars on the topic.

## Effectiveness

The evaluation has looked at effectiveness in terms of how useful the webinars were to facilitate the sharing of experiences in relation to technical assistance and the effectiveness of contributions from WIPO entities as well as other stakeholders. The effectiveness of approaches used to promote the webinars has also been considered.

**Key Finding 8 The webinars were an effective means for information and experience-sharing although their one-off nature prevents ongoing exchange and discussion.**

**Key Finding 9 A blanket approach to promoting the webinars through a range of different channels was adopted. Whilst this was successful in reaching a broad range of stakeholders, pitching presentations and discussions to a diverse audience was challenging.**

#### Usefulness of webinars an experience-sharing platform

The mainly positive levels of attendance and interaction have been cited by most of those spoken to as an indication of how useful the webinars were in responding to participant needs. However, in terms of sustainability and ongoing information-sharing on technical assistance, there would be a need for follow-up webinars or the development of a platform to allow for a continued dialogue on the topic.

A number of those spoken to highlighted that using webinars as a means to reach out to Member States and share information on a specific topic was cost-efficient. This was also a break with the more traditional methods adopted to delivering support in relation to technical assistance which has typically been through short presentations during missions to different countries. One advantage of the webinars highlighted by stakeholders is that they provided an opportunity to share information on technical assistance with a number of countries within a region (or more than one region) in a way which country missions do not.

From a technical/software perspective, only minor technical issues were faced during webinar implementation (with the French webinar being the most impacted), highlighting that using webinars as a means to share and exchange information and experiences is considered to be effective. This is also linked to the structure of the webinars (discussed above) which allowed for participants to put forward questions to the experts and to WIPO staff, enhancing opportunities for experience-sharing. Limitations to experience-sharing have been noted above under *4.1.2 – Participation and engagement* as it was not possible for the experts to respond to all questions during the short Q&A sessions meaning that their post-webinar emailed responses were only seen by the individual asking the question and not by the other participants.

#### Contributions from WIPO entities

Setting up and implementing the eight webinars required the involvement of different entities within the WIPO Secretariat. Central to this was the role played by the Regional Bureaus, all of which were responsive to requests for support from the DACD in terms of reaching out to Member States to promote the webinars as well as collaborating on the content of each webinar. The Bureaus also participated in the webinars. The WIPO China Office played a similar supporting role for the Chinese webinar.

Other WIPO entities, including the Department for Transition and Developed Countries; the Publications Division; the Information and Communication Technology Department; and the News and Media Division, assisted in promoting and disseminating the webinars.

#### Contributions from non-WIPO stakeholders

Outside WIPO the involvement of the Regional Group Coordinators was important as they were a primary channel to reach out to potential participants, advertising and marketing the webinars. In future, closer engagement and increased responsiveness from the Member States, possibly through Regional Group Coordinators, would be important to ensure increased numbers of participants.

WIPO relied upon the *gotowebinar* software to launch the webinars. Due to initial technical/software related difficulties during the testing period, WIPO also contracted a premium support provided by that same software company to ensure the smooth-running of each webinar. This allowed the DACD staff to familiarise themselves with the management of the platform.

The involvement of experts to implement the webinars has already been mentioned under section *4.1.1 – Methodology, structure and approach*, above.

#### Promotion of the webinars

The webinars were promoted in a number of different ways including via the Regional Bureaus who in turn shared the information with the Member State National IP offices. The webinar experts also disseminated the upcoming webinars with their own networks and they were also promoted through the WIPO newsletter via email and on the WIPO website. In some cases, social media was also used as a means to promote the upcoming webinars. As noted above, the Regional Group Coordinators were also relied upon to publicize the webinars.

The broad approach (as opposed to specifically targeted approach) to webinar promotion through a range of different channels resulted in a diverse group of stakeholders attending each of the webinars.

## Sustainability

In this evaluation, sustainability is taken to mean the likelihood of using the webinars in the future as a tool to share methodologies and practices on technical assistance by both, Member States and WIPO.

**Key Finding 10 The webinars were a successful way to share and exchange information on technical assistance. However, directly replicating the approach adopted in terms of frequency and content of webinars is not sustainable.**

**Key Finding 11 With clear direction from the CDIP in relation to target audience and webinar objectives, scheduled webinars at sufficiently spaced time intervals and with an adapted content would be an option for the future ongoing sharing of information in relation to technical assistance.**

#### Future webinars on technical assistance

The webinars on technical assistance were set-up as pilot, designed as one-off events with a view to testing their viability for the future. There are mixed views from those who were most engaged in the webinars as to the potential for their replication. The majority of those spoken to highlighted that the webinars were an effective means of conveying information on technical assistance. If there is an interest from Member States to continue to share and receive information and experience in relation to technical assistance then there is a need to hold similar webinars in a more progressive way, with one webinar building on the information shared in the preceding webinar.

Implementing eight webinars in six languages in six months was ambitious but it was achieved. Consideration needs to be given to ensuring adequate human resources required if future webinars are to be held. In addition, there are limits to the level and amount of discussion that further webinars on technical assistance can generate. Whilst there are numerous substantive topics that relate to technical assistance these are likely to go beyond the mandate of the DACD and Regional Bureaus.

Member States spoken to for this evaluation stressed the importance of having the webinars in different languages and the positive impact this had in terms of sustainability.

# Conclusions and recommendations

As requested by the CDIP, WIPO was successful in organising and delivering a series of eight webinars on technical assistance in the six official UN languages within a six-month timeframe. Holding this number of webinars in such a tight timeframe was however logistically complex and challenging for the DACD implementation team.

From the outset, there was a lack of clarity in relation to the topics to be covered in the webinars, as well as the webinar goals and target audience. The involvement of different WIPO entities including the Regional Bureaus, the WIPO China Office and the DACD was critical in coordinating with Member States to agree on topics for discussion. It was then possible for WIPO to engage with a group of experienced and well-qualified experts who were responsible for preparing and delivering the webinars.

WIPO Secretariat support and support from the WIPO China Office to the experts in advance of the webinars was a critical factor contributing to their success. This entailed reviewing the experts’ presentations; briefing them on the implementation process; supporting them during the live webinars; and carrying out pre-webinar technical tests and rehearsals.

Participation levels in most of the webinars was as expected although some of the webinars were not attended by as many people as anticipated. Anecdotal evidence suggests that reasons for this may have included insufficient pre-webinar dissemination and internet connection difficulties as well as the timing of the webinars.

The webinar format worked well, allowing sufficient time for experts to present and share information on a complex topic and respond to related questions from attendees without being overly long.

In the future, if the need to hold more webinars on technical assistance is identified, it would be important to have clarity in relation to the webinar goals and who the webinars are targeting. Scheduling future webinars at appropriately spaced intervals and ensuring concerted but targeted promotion campaigns would help in reaching increased numbers of participants.

Based on the evaluation findings a set of six recommendations are proposed for consideration by WIPO and the Member States.

### **Recommendation 1** Webinar objectives and target audience

The objectives of any future webinars need to be clearly defined by Member States in order to ensure that they respond to needs. Using Member State objectives as a starting point, it is then recommended that the DACD and the Regional Bureaus jointly propose discussion topics to the Member States. Having clearly agreed objectives and topics would then assist WIPO in defining key target audiences – something which was absent from the pilot webinars.

### **Recommendation 2** Progression of information

As one-off initiatives, the webinars provided the opportunity to share information on technical assistance in multiple languages and on multiple topics. In future, it would be valuable to consider a more progressive approach that takes into consideration building on the information shared in previous related webinars. This would allow for more meaningful learning opportunities for participants.

This approach would require an increased engagement with the Member States at the start of each calendar year in order to schedule the webinars at the most optimal time, allowing for sufficient planning and advertisement of the webinars to potential participants.

### **Recommendation 3** Technical limitations

There are technical limitations to information-sharing via webinars and although this approach is considered cost-effective and can benefit multiple countries within a region, webinars should be considered only as one way of delivering technical assistance. Webinars should be a complementary activity to more traditional approaches such as WIPO in-country missions.

### **Recommendation 4** Webinar promotion and dissemination

In future, if similar webinars are to be held, a greater involvement of the Member States in terms of reaching out to national IP offices and potential webinar audiences for promotion and dissemination purposes may help to ensure increased numbers of participants.

### **Recommendation 5** Timeframe and resources

In future, if similar webinars are to be held, having a dedicated P2 level human resources to manage the webinars would be important. In addition, it will be necessary to ensure sufficient time is given to setting up the webinars and to advertising them, thereby increasing the potential number of webinar attendees.

### **Recommendation 6** Increased information-sharing

It was necessary for experts to respond to questions in writing after each webinar as there was insufficient time to respond to all the questions posed during the webinar itself. Whilst this was positive as it ensured that all participant questions were addressed, it was limited in that other participants did not see those questions and answers and therefore did not benefit. In future, sharing written post-webinar responses with all participants (perhaps via the webpage) would benefit all those interested.

In addition, if WIPO is aiming to continue dialogue with those who participated in the webinars as well as newcomers, it will be necessary to create an ongoing knowledge-sharing platform in order to build and strengthen the network of those involved. Proposals for this are covered above in Recommendation 1 – Webinar Objectives and Recommendation 2 – Progression of Information.

[End of Annex, Appendices follow]

# Appendix I List of persons interviewed

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Person interviewed** | **Role** |
|  | Ms Shaima Al-Akel | International Organizations Executive - Office of the United Arab Emirates to the World Trade Organization (WTO), Geneva |
|  | Mr Mohammed Al Balushi | First Secretary - Permanent Mission of Oman |
|  | Ms Beatriz Amorim-Borher | Director – WIPO Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean |
|  | Ms Catalina Atehortúa García | Expert |
|  | Mr Irfan Baloch | Director - WIPO DACD |
|  | Ms Mihaela Cerbari | Associate Program Officer - WIPO DACD |
|  | Ms. María del Pilar Escobar Bautista | Counsellor - Permanent Mission of Mexico |
|  | Mr. Pierre El Khoury | Expert |
|  | Mr. Xiaoqing Feng | Expert |
|  | Mr. Georges Ghandour | Senior Counsellor – WIPO DACD |
|  | Mr. Stanley Kowalski | Expert |
|  | Mr. Francisco Lima-Mena | Counsellor – WIPO Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean |
|  | Mr. Barthelemy Nyasse | Expert |
|  | Mr. Ashley Rohan Parasram | Expert |
|  | Mr. Paul Regis | Counsellor Caribbean Section – WIPO Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean |
|  | Mr. McLean Sibanda | Expert |
|  | Mr. David Simmons | Counsellor – WIPO Regional Bureau for Asia and the Pacific |
|  | Ms. Yi Wang | Senior Counsellor – WIPO Office in China |
|  | Ms. Junqin Zhang | Counsellor – WIPO Office in China |
|  | Ms. Galina Mikheeva | Head of the International Department – Rospatent |
|  | Ms. Maria Ryazanova | First Secretary – Permanent Mission of the Russian Federation to Geneva |
|  | Mr. Yves Ngoubeyou | Counsellor – WIPO Regional Bureau for Africa |
|  | Mr. Ilya Gribkov | Section for Caucasian, Central Asian and Eastern European Countries |
|  | Ms. Cristina Martinez Limon | Associate Program Officer – WIPO DACD |
|  | Mr. Gaziz Seitzhanov | Third Secretary - Permanent Mission of Kazakhstan to Geneva |
|  | Mr. Seymur Mardaliyev | Councillor – Permanent Mission of Azerbaijan to Geneva |
|  | Mr. Walid Abdelnasser | Director ­- Regional Bureau for Arab Countries |
|  | Ms. Dina Ibrahim | Associate Program Officer - Regional Bureau for Arab Countries |

[End of Appendix I, Appendix II follows]

# Appendix II List of key documents reviewed

Key documents reviewed included:

* Concept note of the CDIP Webinar for CACEEC Region
* Expert Terms of Reference
* Feasibility of establishing a web-forum on technical assistance (CDIP/22/3)
* Prototype of a web-forum on technical assistance (CDIP/23/9)
* Report on the webinars on technical assistance (prepared for the 25th session of the CDIP – May 2020)
* Webinar completion reports for all webinars

[End of Appendix II, Appendix III follows]

# Appendix III Breakdown of webinar participants by country[[9]](#footnote-9)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ARABIC** | **RUSSIAN** | **SPANISH** | **ENGLISH (CARIBBEAN)** | **ENGLISH (AFRICA)** | **ENGLISH (ASIA/PACIFIC)** | **FRENCH (AFRICA)** |
| UAE (18) | Russia (47) | Mexico (16) | Spain (4) | Portugal (6) | Sri Lanka (10) | Morocco (7) |
| Saudi Arabia (10) | Kazakhstan (2) | Panama (8) | Italy (3) | Kenya (4) | Thailand (10) | Cameroon (4) |
| Oman (10) | Switzerland (2) | Dominican Republic (8) | Switzerland (3) | Sri Lanka (2) | Philippines (5) | Mali (4) |
| Sudan (8) | Ukraine (2) | Colombia (7) | Brazil (3) | Algeria (2) | Spain (4) | Côte d'Ivoire (3) |
| Kuwait (6) | Armenia (1) | Cuba (7) | Algeria (2) | Ghana (2) | Switzerland (3) | Switzerland (2) |
| Switzerland (5) | Belarus (1) | El Salvador (6) | Trinidad and Tobago (2) | South Africa (2) | Vietnam (2) | Niger (1) |
| Iraq (4) |  | Uruguay (6) | Netherlands (2) | Switzerland (2) | Brunei Darussalam (2) | Benin (1) |
| Egypt (4) |  | Argentina (5) | India (2) | Belgium (1) | Egypt (2) | US (1) |
| Algeria (2) |  | Spain (3) | Russia (1) | Botswana (1) | Indonesia (2) | DRC (1) |
| Bahrain (2) |  | Guatemala (3) | Barbados (1) | Malawi (1) | UK (2) | Algeria (1) |
| Mauritania (1) |  | Ecuador (3) | Rwanda (1) | Norway (1) | Belgium (1) |  |
| Moldova (1) |  | Chile (3) | Ghana (1) | Republic of Korea (1) | México (1) |  |
| Syria (1) |  | Nicaragua (2) | Chile (1) | Spain (1) | Ghana (1) |  |
| Tunisia (1) |  | Venezuela (2) | Germany (1) | India (1) | Singapore (1) |  |
| Djibouti (1) |  | Peru (2) | Grenada (1) | Egypt (1) | India (1) |  |
| Jordan (1) |  | Brazil (2) | Japan (1) | Tunisia (1) | Saudi Arabia (1) |  |
|  |  | Portugal (1) | Armenia (1) | Uganda (1) | Republic of Korea (1) |  |
|  |  | England (1) | Dominica (1) | Zimbabwe (1) | Turkey (1) |  |
|  |  | Switzerland (1) | Ethiopia (1) |  | Myanmar (1) |  |
|  |  | Costa Rica (1) | Greece (1) |  | Australia (1) |  |
|  |  |  | Slovenia (1) |  | Peru (1) |  |
|  |  |  | Indonesia (1) |  | Norway (1) |  |
|  |  |  | Brunei Darussalam (1) |  | Uganda (1) |  |
|  |  |  | Thailand (1) |  | Zimbabwe (1) |  |
|  |  |  | Romania (1) |  | Malaysia (1) |  |
|  |  |  | UK (1) |  | North Macedonia (1) |  |
|  |  |  | Guyana (1) |  | Botswana (1) |  |
|  |  |  | St. Lucia (1) |  | Oman (1) |  |
|  |  |  | North Macedonia (1) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Nigeria (1) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Costa Rica (1) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Colombia (1) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Belgium (1) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Paraguay (1) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Namibia (1) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | St. Kitts and Nevis (1) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Poland (1) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Oman (1) |  |  |  |
| **16** | **6** | **20** | **38** | **18** | **28** | **10** |

[End of Appendix III and of document]

1. The webinars were held in Arabic, Chinese, English (x3 webinars), French, Russian and Spanish [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Document CDIP/23/9 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. As at 12 February 2020. N.B. This does not include anyone who has watched the webinar held in Spanish as technical issues have prevented access to that data. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. As at 12 February 2020 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Table 3 was developed based on the information provided by participants at the registration. Information might be not 100% accurate, as this field was not mandatory to fill in for all webinars. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. International, regional and national organizations. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. This indicates Member State representatives based in Geneva [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. This indicates Member State representatives based in their own countries [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. The numbers contained in Appendix III are based on the information provided by the participants when registered for the webinars. The field “Country” was not mandatory to fill in for all webinars therefore, this numbers might not be 100% accurate. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)