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**Acronyms**

Apps Applications

CDIP Committee on Development and Intellectual Property

DA Development Agenda

DAC Development Assistance Committee of the OECD

DACD Development Agenda Coordination Division

ICT Information and Communication Technologies

IP Intellectual Property

MAs Mobile Applications

OECD Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development

TOR Terms of Reference

WIPO World Intellectual Property Organization

**INTRODUCTION**

**Background and Context**

1. The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) is the global forum for intellectual property (IP) services, policy, information, and cooperation whose mission is to lead the development of a balanced and effective international IP system that enables innovation and creativity for the benefit of all. WIPO works with partners, to promote the protection of IP throughout the world through cooperation among States and, where appropriate, in collaboration with any other international organization ([art 3 WIPO Convention](https://wipolex.wipo.int/en/text/283854)).
2. The project on [Enhancing the Use of IP for Mobile Apps in the Software Sector](https://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=416005%20) wasapproved during the 22nd session of the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP), held in Geneva, in November 2018. The aim of the project was to enhance the use of IP in the software sector to support economic growth in the three beneficiary countries (the Philippines, Kenya, and Trinidad and Tobago) by providing tools that could also be used in other countries. Through its activities and deliverables, the project aimed at building software sector stakeholders’ knowledge and expertise on when and how to use various IP tools in support of developing and commercializing mobile applications; and at creating linkages among beneficiary countries and within each country between IP offices, Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) hubs, research institutions and industry.
3. The project was articulated in the following phases:
4. Development of a scoping study that assessed the situation in each of the participating countries and inform project activities, deliverables, and targets.
5. Development of a WIPO publication on IP and Mobile Applications.
6. Delivery of capacity-building activities on IP commercialization, key contracts in the mobile applications sector, and mediation and arbitration in the software sector.
7. Development of basic awareness raising material targeting computer science students at secondary schools, universities, and other research institutions in beneficiary countries.
8. Fostering the exchange of knowledge and experience among software sector stakeholders on the use of IP.
9. Conducting mentoring programs connecting experienced business leaders and specialized lawyers volunteering to assist software start-ups in the beneficiary countries.
10. Development of an IP toolbox.
11. Delivery of an online platform to foster international exchanges of IP knowledge and good practices in the software sector.
12. Delivery of other workshops, coordination meetings, and video conferences.

**Purpose of the Evaluation**

1. WIPO considers evaluation an integral part of the Organization learning and accountability process. Provisions are made to deliver a mix of evaluation products including independent evaluations (program evaluations, strategic evaluations, thematic evaluations, geographical evaluation and project-level and process evaluations), internal audits and investigations[[1]](#footnote-2). WIPO’s Evaluation Policy has a strong focus on accountability and utility for the purpose of organizational learning and planning for all stakeholders and partners in the project. The current evaluation hopes to bring food for thought to the WIPO staff involved and responsible for the implementation of the project on Enhancing the use of IP for Mobile Applications in the Software Sector (also known as the DA Project on IP and Mobile Apps).
2. The evaluation of the Development Agenda Project on IP and Mobile Apps goal is two-fold:
3. Learning from experiences during project implementation: what worked well and what did not work well for the benefit of continuing activities in the 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
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1. Providing evidence-based evaluative information to support the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property’s (CDIP) decision-making process.

**SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY**

1. The evaluation scope covers activities and results delivered during the period from 1 January 2019 to the end of December 2021. The evaluation covers project design and management, coordination, coherence, implementation, project activities and results achieved, contribution to Member States’ needs and resources and means to address them. This evaluation covers the three beneficiary countries of the project (the Philippines, Kenya, and Trinidad and Tobago).
2. This evaluation was carried out using the OECD/DAC Principles for Evaluation of Development Assistance[[2]](#footnote-3). The DAC model establishes six criteria to evaluate an intervention in development cooperation -relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability-, though in this evaluation it has been only used: relevance, effectiveness and sustainability. These criteria provide a normative framework used to determine the merit or worth of an intervention (policy, strategy, program, project, or activity)[[3]](#footnote-4). Such a model focuses primarily on program inputs and results (as opposed to processes), has been widely accepted for development assistance evaluation, and is established as a standard model.
3. This evaluation used desk review as method, complemented by interviews with key informants: project management; relevant staff in WIPO; country focal points; experts that contributed to the project (developers, academia, entrepreneurs) and direct project beneficiaries. The analysis triangulated and synthesized the results, which were commented upon by the Senior Counsellor and the Associate Program Officer of the Development Agenda Coordination Division (DACD), managed, and then finalized into this report. The approach was based on a mix of analytical frameworks.
4. During the inception phase and following an initial desk review, the evaluator constructed and proposed a set of evaluation questions to WIPO, which were approved and are presented in Table 1.

|  |
| --- |
| ***Table 1 – Evaluation questions*** |
| ***Criteria*** | **Evaluation questions** |
| **Project design and management** | Does the initial project document serve as a guide for project implementation? |
| Were the project monitoring, self -evaluation and reporting tools useful and adequate to provide the project team and key stakeholders with relevant information for decision-making purposes? |
| To what extent other entities within the Secretariat have contributed and enabled an effective and efficient project implementation? |
| To what extent the risks identified in the initial project document have been materialized or have been mitigated? |
| Has the project the ability to respond to emerging trends, technologies and other external forces? |
| Was the project design logical and coherent? * 1. Are/Were the objectives of the projects clear, realistic, and likely to be achieved within the established time schedule and with the allocated resources (including human resources)?
	2. How relevant are/were projects indicators and means of verification?
	3. Are/Were the expectations of the roles, capacity, and commitment of stakeholders realistic and likely to be achieved?
 |
| **Effectiveness** | To what extent has the project been effective in training researchers, developers, and entrepreneurs on three range of available IP tools?How can such tools be used to support related endeavors? |
| Has the project been able to raise awareness among entrepreneurs, financial institutions, venture capitalists and other investors on using IP as an asset and collaboration tool by furthering the exchange of knowledge and experience? |
| To what extent are the tools and procedures developed in the context of the project effective and useful to protect IP rights in mobile applications, including mediation and arbitration? |
| Have all project activities achieved their intended outcome?(Were there any barriers identified / overcome during implementation / unintended outcomes) |
| Were projects’ outputs delivered in terms of quality and quantity; have they been delivered in a timely manner? |
| **Sustainability** | What is the likelihood of continued use of the tools developed in the project to ensure continuous use of the IP system as an effective tool for socio-economic development? |
| What is the level of involvement of the beneficiary countries in the design and implementation of the project activities?  |
| Assess the design and implementation of the project’s sustainability strategy.  |
| Identify potential good practices and models of intervention that could inform future projects, especially those that the national partners could incorporate into national policies and implementation. |

1. The above-mentioned evaluation questions functioned as a structure guide to the evaluation process and ensured consistency in questioning throughout all evaluation tools. On this basis an evaluation matrix was developed with key evaluation tools, data sources and data collection methods. The evaluation matrix can be found in Appendix 1 to this document.
2. To strengthen the credibility and usefulness of evaluation results, to ensure data accuracy and facilitate its interpretation, the evaluation used a mix of data sources collected through multiple methods and techniques. **Primary data** was collected through meetings, discussions and interviews that involved direct contact with the respondents. It facilitated deeper understanding of the DA Project on IP and Mobile Apps, the observed changes and the factors that contributed to change. Collection of data through interviews was carried out in a confidential manner. **Secondary data** was documentary evidence that had direct relevance for the purposes of the evaluation and that had been produced by WIPO, or stakeholders for purposes other than those of the evaluation.
3. All interviews were conducted online through different platforms. A total of 25 (32% women and 68% men) persons were interviewed.

*Table 2: Details of KII during the interview phase*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Key informant interviews** | **Women** | **Men** |
| WIPO Staff | 1 | 6 |
| Focal points for DA Project on Technology Transfer | 2 | 3 |
| External stakeholders (experts and project beneficiaries) | 4 | 5 |
| Permanent Missions | 1 | 3 |
| Total | 8 | 17 |
| 25 |

1. All key informant interviews (KII) were purposely selected based on their experience and level of involvement and participation in the design process of the Strategic Plan evaluated, on their work related to strategic planning and results-based management, on the decision-making process and on their membership in a division or section relevant to the evaluation process underway. The possibility of considering a bias in the selection of KII was mitigated by asking respondents the same question in different ways and probing the responses to triangulate the consistency of the answers.

**Limitations**

1. In the inception report several assumptions were made on potential limitations during the evaluation. The planning assumed 1) availability of relevant key informants willing to openly express their views and thoughts, and to do so more or less within the available timeslot; 2) knowledge of the context and project activities (longer presence); 3) interviewees had good access to internet. When and where needed, it was foreseen to allocate additional interviews and focus groups’ time, and embark on follow-up interviews (if feasible) to pre-empt some of these possible limitations.
2. Only three of the planned interviews could not be carried out for reasons beyond the evaluator's control, which were related to the fact that the interviewees were not available at the proposed times or were on leave. However, these gaps were used to carry out six additional interviews, which were not originally planned and which, thanks to the support of the national focal points from Kenya and Trinidad and Tobago, were able to be carried out. Internet connectivity failed in a few cases and alternative solutions were sought on other dates or with other platforms to connect.

**Quality assurance and ethical considerations**

1. The key aspect of quality assurance was carried out through the Senior Counsellor and the Associate Program Officer of the Development Agenda Coordination Division (DACD). The quality assurance principles that were applied to this evaluation were as follows: (i) the evaluation of the DA Project on Intellectual Property and Mobile Applications should be relevant and responsive to WIPO's expressed requirements; (ii) all deliverables should be of high quality; (iii) this evaluation must be conducted at a sufficiently high level of quality so that the results and recommendations can be reliably used for their intended purpose; (iv) it must also inform future programming; and (v) it must be transparent and meet all WIPO accountability requirements. To further enhance the quality and credibility of this evaluation, it was also commented on by the Director of the DACD in particular to verify accuracy of facts presented and validity of interpretations of evidence.
2. The evaluator paid attention to protection of respondent’s privacy and received oral consent from all interviewees. This was achieved by explaining the purpose of gathering information, its use, users, and assured respondents of their privacy.

**FINDINGS**

1. This chapter describes the findings and observations, generated through the evaluation methodology described previously, in a comprehensive yet concise manner. All findings presented have been triangulated through the various interviews and sessions, presenting the views of multiple stakeholders. The chapter is divided into three sections, which are: 1) project’s design and management; 2) effectiveness and 3) sustainability.

**Design and Management of the project**

1. **Background on the design**. Enhancing the Use of IP for Mobile Apps in the Software Sector project was developed in an ever-changing world landscape. The app industry has seen an immense growth in the past ten years and has no end in sight. The mobile app market is the fastest growing segment in the mobile industries. Innovation and growth in ICT, but also across diverse economic sectors, such as banking and agriculture, increasingly rely on smart mobile applications. In addition, software sector stakeholders often lack information and knowledge on which IP tools are available and how to take advantage of them.
2. **Design process.** Participation is the word that defines the elaboration process of this project. The intervention designed to enhance the use of IP in the software sector to support economic growth in the three beneficiary countries (the Philippines, Kenya, and Trinidad and Tobago), was based on the precise knowledge of the project’s topic by Kenya (the country promoting this project) and on the various stages in which in-house experts, representatives of Member States, relevant communities, and relevant audiences participated by providing knowledge and experience, and by raising awareness before the final document of the project was approved. The evaluation was informed that the design process was well-executed, with an overwhelming consensus by Member States on the merits of the proposal and with constructive discussions that helped to refine and further strengthen the project.
3. **Appropriateness of the initial project document**. The initial project document was considered relevant to the sector at the time of its development, as there was more and more interest in technology in mobile apps and software, anticipating some key areas and including training, raising awareness, mediation and arbitration for software entrepreneurs, lawyers, and officials as key issues to focus on. The topic was addressed for the first time in WIPO, and developing countries showed a high interest in it. The geographical reach has also been considered quite unique but also challenging, making it necessary to use innovation and creativity to the fullest.
4. Throughout these three years of project implementation, numerous changes of various kinds have occurred in the international panorama that have altered the initial context to which the project was responding. Far from remaining static in its initial plan, the project management has shown a high sensitivity and capacity to understand and adapt to new events and circumstances and has demonstrated a high capacity to react on numerous occasions.
5. The main internal change to be highlighted is that the Project Manager had to combine the management of this project along with other ongoing work and responsibilities, which resulted in heavier workload and greater challenges. Positive collaboration and contributions from other entities within the Secretariat were very valuable and helped in reacting very positively by interacting actively, providing advice, logistical support and participating in the organization of events. The cooperation with WIPO Regional Divisions was relatively good.
6. Among the most relevant external changes that the KIIs highlighted during the interviews, the following stood out: 1) the development and maturity of the entire app development industry; 2) the growth of open-source software, 3) the blurring of the boundaries between the creative sectors, 4) the Covid-19 pandemic, 5) the move to a digital format in the business sectors, and 6) what is being considered a mobile revolution of tremendous importance in some countries in Africa and in Latin America. As a result, WIPO project management was deprived of the opportunity to interact directly s with developers, companies, universities, hubs, etc. Likewise, the project did not have the opportunity to attract major investors from the outside, nor work with international financial institutions, due to the difficult circumstances worldwide. Nevertheless, the project’s management has reacted very positively to all of these challenges by searching for new alternatives, by making some adjustments in the calendar, and by increasing the number of tools and deliverables developed. Project management stuck to the original document as much as possible, making small adjustments as the project went along.
7. As a monitoring mechanisms to identify such changes, the beneficial and rewarding partnership with governments and the commitment, engagement and excellent work carried out by the national focal points in the three beneficiary countries stood out. Likewise, the direct and permanent contact with practitioners and experts coming from the universities and scientific hubs have been a fundamental part of the system for monitoring changes.
8. Despite the changes that have occurred in the context, regular activities have not been set aside in response to these changes. None of the sources of information reviewed show that the responses to external and internal changes have led to the abandonment of the regular activities programmed; on the contrary, unplanned activities have been carried out, such as the development and organization of extra workshops, webinars, tools, and meetings to discuss future actions.
9. **Achievements**. Countless advances have been achieved or promoted by WIPO in the three implementing countries during this period. Some of them are tangible and were included in the logical framework of the project, such as the many practical tools done for developers, entrepreneurs or lawyers, the tools on practical management of IP, financing, commercialization, as well as tools to raise awareness and obtaining knowledge on IP. There are other achievements that cannot be counted but have been identified by most interviewees as major successes, namely:
	1. The fact that developers have started to think about IP as an option to protect their interests and generate income streams, when at the beginning of the project they ignored everything related to IP and were mainly interested in selling their products, but without making real use of IP.
	2. The project has broadened the horizons of all the developers, lawyers, entrepreneurs, and researchers who have participated in it, more precisely, those who were in the mentoring program, allowing them to easily interact with each other and with potential partners.
	3. This project has also generated interest among app developers to represent their interests in the business in an organized way. Even though none of the participating countries have yet succeeded, a movement has been reported to create app associations in the implementing countries to defend the interests of app developers, help them better lobby for their interests, have a more regulated environment and be better represented in internationals forums.
10. **Key success factors and main hindering factors.** Numerous factors emerged from the interviews as determining or influencing the achievement of the objectives. The evaluation has analyzed and structured the main factors that have been observed and have had a marked character on the performance and results of the project during the study period. In a very simplified but sufficiently representative manner, the following factors can be cited as the most relevant. A distinction has been made between external factors belonging to the context and those that form an internal part of WIPO:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **POSITIVE ASPECTS** | **HINDERING FACTORS** |
| **EXTERNAL** | Relevance of WIPO's mandate in the implementing countries.Willingness of public and private actors to move forward to IP.Existing interest among the different stakeholders in the topic.Unique programming. | Complexity of some of the issues of the WIPO mandate.Lack of professional staff assigned to the project by the government.Geographical reach with different time zones.Poor internet connectivity. |
| **INTERNAL** | Humane and professional project team. Adopted strategies (inclusive, articulating alliances).Created important collaborative closeness with local authorities and other actors (copyrights offices, patents offices, etc.).Flexibility, capacity to adapt to the context and external situation. | Limited financial resources.Limited human resources.Limited timing.Missing cultural approach. |

1. The WIPO project team is composed of excellent professionals who combine commitment, technical skills, and strategic vision. According to informants, the Project Manager is charismatic, committed, and articulate; he paid special attention to the changes in the context of project implementation, and to the priorities of beneficiaries; he demonstrated integrity, objectivity, and professionalism, and he has been always present in the project implementation. He is considered to be available to discuss any matters, and with a very satisfactory management style. All these factors meant that, according to the key stakeholders consulted, WIPO's mandate is taken to important levels, thanks to the level of commitment of the Organization’s leadership and its clear focus on managing for results.
2. Regarding the obstacles identified, one of the most significant has been the limited time and funds available, given the great interest from stakeholders and the commitment of the national focal points. This limits the impact and sustainability of the project, as no matter how successful the strategies are, the processes need resources to carry them out on a relevant scale and, on the other hand, overburden the staff. It seems that the project could have had a much greater impact if it had a longer duration and thus more funding. Another obstacle was the change of the national focal point in the Philippines at the beginning of the project, which meant an initial loss of time and synergies that was later compensated by the commitment and excellent work of the replacement.
3. **Some programmatic risks** were identified in the initial project document. Low acceptance and relatively low interest from the country communities were considered as potential risks, although no mitigation measures or justification was provided. Measures and consequences of external factors like a Covid-19 pandemic were not foreseen nor even ever imagined. Proper use of resources and a readjustment of the travel budget were key to overcoming unforeseen events and to the success of the project.
4. **Emerging trends and technologies**. Technology is moving very rapidly, and WIPO is aware of this fact. According to interviewees, all the tools developed within the framework of this project took into account the latest developments and emerging trends, and reflected how IP-based solutions worked in the different specific creative sectors.
5. **Project monitoring, self-evaluation, and reporting tools.** In general, the indicators mentioned in the logical framework of the project are insufficient to show the achievements for each of the products and are not representative of the achievements pursued and attained. After reviewing the documentation and based on the interviews conducted, the evaluation has not found anything like a monitoring tool or something different from a normal email exchange and regular monthly online meetings with the national focal points. It has been reported by different interviewees that the response from the focal points was quite good, dedicating resources to the implementation of the project, despite the difficulties that working in three different time zones creates in organizing meetings with all three, and sometimes the need to also get the US mobile app association on board, since it is based in the West Coast of the US. Active and efficient interaction with these huge time differences was a real challenge.

**Effectiveness**

1. According to the developers, entrepreneurs, and training researchers interviewed, the IP tools available and created within the framework of the project are considered practical, easy to use, and a good starting point and reference for both newcomers and those who are already familiar with the subject matter. Overall, the tools, materials, and training modules were considered very useful outcomes. However, comments were made by the interviewees about the lack of a local perspective in the development of all of them, which they considered too global or European. Project beneficiaries missed countries’ cultural approaches**.** A set of country-specific case studies would have made it easier to ground and internalize the information. In the case of the Philippines, it was reported that there were puns in the app ecosystem that could have been used and the impact of these products would have been higher. Likewise, in the case of Kenya, the project beneficiaries missed designs and examples closer to their culture, as well as the participation of local experts as speakers in workshops and webinars.
2. Although there was a good baseline education that was provided to stakeholders and beneficiaries, and it has been possible to raise awareness among the developers and entrepreneur sector, it has been a bit of a challenge with the financial institutions, ventures capitals and other investors. Neither the national focal points nor the WIPO Project Manager were successful in establishing collaborations with them. The impossibility of traveling and the obligation to do everything online made this task very difficult, where face-to-face and closer interaction is required.
3. Since April 2020, all tools and resource materials can be found on the [WIPO webpage of the project](https://www.wipo.int/ip-development/en/agenda/ip_mobile_apps/). By mid-January 2022, the website had had a total of 9453 visitors and 17,922 downloads, demonstrating the success of the tools, learning resources, research, and infographics.The first eight months of this website had an average of 47 downloads per month, starting to increase exponentially in December 2020, and reaching its peak one year after its launch in April 2021, with 642 downloads between April 18 and May 2, 2021.
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1. The tool which registered the highest numbers of visitors (a total of 3381 by the end of the project) was the “*Handbook on Key Contracts for Mobile Applications – a Developer’s Perspective*”. However, “*the Scoping Study”* was the one with most downloads from the website, that is 4742, followed by the “*WIPO Guide on Alternative Resolution for Mobile Applications Disputes*” with 1475 downloads, and the “*IP Toolbox for Mobile Applications Developers*” with 1241 downloads.
2. The data in the graph below show that the project has had a greater scope than the three countries in which it has been implemented, with the USA as the country with the highest number of visitors to the website (1.6K). It is important to note that, technically, the numbers registered for the USA include visitors from the entire Caribbean region, and hence – Trinidad and Tobago. This is followed by India (930,000) and the Philippines (889,000). Visitors from Kenya appear in seventh place with 288,000.
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**Sustainability**

1. In general, the changes pursued by WIPO's mandate are long-term changes that involve knowledge, invention, creativity, and changes in practices at various levels. That is why their sustainability over time will only be assured when such knowledge, creativity and changes are acquired and consolidated. In the meantime, there will only be progress or at best small-scale changes, but not at the level of most of the target population of each action.
2. Tools and materials that are available on the WIPO website will need to be updated over time. Interviewees do not consider that these changes will be radical or in the very short term, making the likelihood of continued use of the tools developed in the project – high.
3. Some project national focal points have already received an expressed interest from stakeholders to explore collaborations that will enable them to protect their IP/assets while promoting the industry to the world; others have expressed their interest in creating a local app association (Philippines and Trinidad and Tobago). These actions will help to ensure that there is a continuity in the initial gains and inroads made on the project. At the same time, it is necessary to ensure the continuity of raising awareness and knowledge dissemination through local IP offices and through the commitment and interest of Member States, as it is necessary to continue supporting local communities of entrepreneurs and developers.

**MAIN CONCLUSIONS and LESSONS LEARNT**

1. The evaluation found unanimous recognition of WIPO's work among the stakeholders consulted. WIPO is considered a valuable actor in terms of the strategic role it plays in raising awareness and providing training in everything related to IP: on the one hand, as an ally of governments, to support and accompany them in the knowledge of the subject; on the other hand, as a motivating entity of the civil society, supporting and strengthening it in its function of fostering innovation and creativity, recognizing the right of the inventor and creator to obtain legal protection and economic reward for his work, as well as to enrich society through knowledge, technologies, etc. and promoting industrial activity by providing access to technology and investment and motivating fair trade. The discourse of the interviewed stakeholders (national focal points in the implementing countries, experts, developers, entrepreneurs, etc.) is rich and forceful in their highly positive opinion of the work developed by this project.
2. The implementation of this project has brought significant contribution in an area which generates increasing interest among Member States and among different stakeholders. The project's adaptation to the changes in the context of its implementation, was agile. It reacted in an accurate and timely manner to make its work as relevant and as adapted to the changing context as possible. There were even examples where the project management was able to take advantage of changes as new opportunities, rather than setbacks in their initial plans. The fact that the Project Manager had the flexibility to adapt the project once it started its implementation to the new reality, and was able to count on practitioners and other former application developers who could advise directly from a business approach point of view, was very positive.
3. Project management has been effective in achieving the expected outputs and contributing to the achievement of outcomes. The evaluation found that the project has obtained exceptional results on providing educational material and raising awareness around a topic that many developers did not think about at an early stage of a mobile app development. Clearly this project has equipped and emboldened entrepreneurs and developers in all matters relating to intellectual protection. It has brought order and some structure to the industry in the three countries of implementation, bringing the importance of IP protection to the forefront, although it has not succeeded in eliminating the individualism that is typical of the sector. Thus, there is a need to look at ways of making developers and entrepreneurs understand the importance of coming together and forming one umbrella body (app association) and leave individualism aside. It was an ambitious project that achieved all deliverables and went above and beyond, leaving different stakeholders wanting more.
4. With respect to the tools provided for measuring and monitoring achievements, measuring their year-to-year evolution is difficult due to the established mechanisms and indicators. In general, the indicators are insufficient to show the achievements for each of the products and are not representative of the achievements pursued and attained. There are also difficulties in establishing the contribution to results according to the project matrix. However, at the level of actual implementation, the achievements found evidence a more nurtured action than what is reflected in the documents.
5. In general, the collaborative and open working style of the Project Manager and DACD members has favoured a climate of trust and mutual cooperation between the parties, which has facilitated effective coordination to support and reinforce the processes of change in the face of internal and contextual circumstances. This working style, together with the commitment and professionalism of the various focal points in the countries of implementation, has been a success thanks to the work of everyone involved. In this regard, it is necessary that the national focal points continue to support the dissemination of the tools developed within the framework of the project and the training modules, as the achievements and progress made could be partially compromised.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. This document presents several recommendations which have been carefully studied throughout the entire evaluation process. These ideas were constructed based on inputs from the consulted stakeholders, who were systematically asked where WIPO could improve and what were their recommendations for the future. The most relevant ideas regarding the evaluated project as well as other ideas contributed by the evaluation are presented below.
	1. Coordination, by default, is an ongoing process and requires dedicated and full-time staff or having sufficient WIPO project staff so as not to have to rely on other divisions/sections.
	2. Not only horizontal analysis should be envisaged in the initial project, but also a vertical analysis. It should also include an adequate risk assessment, mitigation measures and a sustainability strategy.
	3. Invite consultants and experts from all three regions to work on some deliverables to get a balanced representation in workshops and webinars and a cultural approach to the deliverables.
	4. Support IP related government programs to strengthen collaboration with the financial institutions, app developers and the app community and help them get in touch with international financial institutions.
	5. Include targets and traceable indicators that enable WIPO to seek accountability and a good monitoring and reporting system.
	6. From the very beginning of the project, have a reliable communication strategy that is able to raise awareness and disseminate information as well as the project achievements. Include a communication model using high-tech tools that adjusts to the level of the audience and stakeholders.
	7. Advocate for continued awareness of the project tools for future generations.
	8. Promote, together with government offices and focal points, the creation of app associations in each of the countries where the project has been developed.
	9. Mainstream the project implementation methodology and results into the regular work of WIPO.

[Appendixes are attached separately (in English only)]

1. <https://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/oversight/iaod/> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. DAC – Development Assistance Committee; formed by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm [↑](#footnote-ref-4)