

Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP)

Thirty-Sixth Session
Geneva, May 4 to 8, 2026

EVALUATION REPORT OF THE PROJECT ON SYSTEMATIZATION OF STATISTICAL DATA AND THE DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION OF A METHODOLOGY FOR DEVELOPING IMPACT ASSESSMENTS ON THE USE OF THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY SYSTEM

prepared by Ms. Anita Leutgeb, Director, evaluation & research FOR DEVELOPMENT, Vienna, Austria

1. The Annex to this document contains an external independent Evaluation Report of the Development Agenda (DA) Project on “Systematization of Statistical Data and the Design and Implementation of a Methodology for Developing Impact Assessments on the Use of the Intellectual Property System”, undertaken by Ms. Anita Leutgeb, Director, evaluation & research FOR DEVELOPMENT, based in Vienna, Austria.

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

[Annex follows]

Table of contents

Executive summary	2
I. Introduction	5
II. Description of the project	5
III. Overview of evaluation criteria and methodology	5
IV. Key findings	6
A. Project Design and Management	6
B. Effectiveness of the project	8
C. Sustainability	10
D. Implementation of Development Agenda (DA) Recommendations	11
V. Conclusions	11

Appendices:

Appendix I: Persons interviewed/consulted

Appendix II: Documents consulted

Appendix III: Inception report

List of acronyms used

CDIP	Committee on Development and Intellectual Property
DA	Development Agenda
DACD	Development Agenda Coordination Division
IP	Intellectual Property
LDCs	Least Developed Countries
OAPI	Organisation Africaine de la Propriété Intellectuelle
SMEs	Small and medium-sized enterprises
WIPO	World Intellectual Property Organization

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. This report is an independent evaluation of the Development Agenda (DA) Project (DA_1_4_10_35_37_01) on [Systematization of Statistical Data and the Design and Implementation of a Methodology for Developing Impact Assessments on the Use of the Intellectual Property System](#). The project started with preparations in January 2022, with the implementation starting in June 2022. The project was completed in December 2025. It had an initial duration of 36 months and an extension of 4 months agreed at the thirty-third session of the Committee of Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP), without budgetary implications. The project was implemented in the four pilot countries of Bhutan, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, and Indonesia.
2. The project aimed at developing a methodology to build the human and technical capacity of relevant Member State entities for the economic assessment of IP and related policies at the national level. A first proposal of the project was presented by El Salvador to the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP) at the Twenty-Fifth Session (Nov 9-12, 2020). That proposal was then revised and further elaborated in collaboration with the WIPO Innovation Economy Section, Department for Economics and Data Analytics, IP and Innovation Ecosystems Sector. The final project proposal was validated by the CDIP at its Twenty-Sixth Session ([CDIP/26/4](#)).
3. The aim of this evaluation was to learn from experiences during project implementation. This included assessing project management and design 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. The evaluation results should provide evidence-based evaluative information to support the CDIP's decision-making process.
4. The evaluation utilized a combination of methods. In addition to a review of all relevant documentation, online interviews were conducted with ten WIPO staff members, five focal points of beneficiary countries and national IP Office staff, the representative of the Permanent Mission of El Salvador, and three training participants from two of the pilot countries.

Key findings

Project design and management

5. **Findings 1-3:** The project was guided by a clear and logically structured design, with defined objectives, deliverables and sequencing from data assessment to analytical outputs and capacity building. Selection of additional pilot countries during implementation introduced some uncertainty regarding timing and data readiness, affecting early sequencing. The technical ambition of the project proved demanding in contexts with varying absorptive capacity. While institutions were able to use analytical outputs, full replication of advanced components required sustained engagement. Outcome-level change was not systematically tracked beyond deliverable-based indicators.
6. **Finding 4-7:** Project monitoring and reporting mechanisms were adequate and supported adaptive management. Progress reports and structured self-assessments facilitated transparency and informed methodological refinements. Coordination within the Secretariat functioned effectively, with regional divisions supporting engagement with national counterparts. Key risks, particularly related to data quality and country onboarding, partially materialized but were mitigated through iterative methodological adjustments and timeline extensions. Overall, the project demonstrated flexibility in responding to technical challenges while maintaining its strategic objectives.

Effectiveness

7. **Findings 8-9, 12-13, 15:** The project was technically effective in organizing and systematizing national IP data and in developing a structured methodology for impact assessment. Data ingestion, harmonization and enrichment processes improved the usability and analytical value of national databases across pilot countries. The methodology was progressively refined (from versions 1.0 to 3.0) based on implementation experience and aligned with international best practices. Country studies generated structured analyses on sectoral patterns, applicant profiles, geographic distribution and gender participation, providing a stronger empirical basis for IP and innovation policy discussions.

8. **Findings 10-11, 14:** Capacity-building activities were perceived as highly relevant and strengthened interpretative and analytical skills related to IP data use. Approximately 109 participants from IP offices, government agencies, academia and the private sector took part in trainings. Participants reported improved understanding of innovation indicators and policy-relevant analysis, including gender-disaggregated analysis, which several stakeholders described as particularly valuable for policy reflection. While institutions were generally able to use and interpret analytical outputs, full independent execution of advanced technical components required sustained programming and data management expertise that was not uniformly available across countries.

Sustainability

9. **Findings 16-18:** The project established structural conditions that support continued accessibility and potential scaling of its outputs. The methodology and country studies are being consolidated for public availability through WIPO's dedicated platform, enhancing transparency and reference value for Member States. There is evidence that analytical results are informing IP and innovation policy discussions in pilot countries. However, sustained application and periodic updating of analyses depend on continued institutional commitment and technical capacity within national authorities. Variations in staffing structures and technical expertise indicate that long-term sustainability will depend on continued institutional prioritization at the national level, complemented where appropriate by targeted follow-up technical engagement.

Implementation of Development Agenda (DA) Recommendations

10. **Findings 19-21:** The project substantively implemented the relevant Development Agenda Recommendations by combining demand-driven technical assistance (DA 1), institutional capacity strengthening (DA 10), and empirical analysis to support development-oriented IP policymaking (DA 4, 35 and 37). By enabling beneficiary countries to systematize and analyze IP and related economic data, the project contributed to more effective use of IP systems and evidence-based policy formulation. The integration of gender-disaggregated analysis and innovation indicators further reinforced its alignment with development-focused objectives.

Conclusions and recommendations

11. **Conclusion 1 (Ref: Findings 8-9, 12-13).** The project achieved its core technical objectives by developing and validating a structured methodological framework for systematizing and analyzing IP and innovation data across four pilot countries. Through iterative implementation cycles, the methodology was refined and consolidated into a robust analytical system aligned with international best practices. The resulting framework provides a

replicable technical foundation that can be adapted by other Member States seeking to strengthen evidence-based IP and innovation policymaking.

12. **Conclusion 2 (Ref: Findings 10-11, 17).** The project achieved meaningful gains in interpretative and analytical capacity among national stakeholders; however, full independent execution of the methodology and its advanced technical components remain contingent on the consolidation of longer-term technical capabilities. Innovation and gender-disaggregated analysis were frequently described by stakeholders as particularly valuable for policy reflection. At the same time, implementation experience demonstrated that advanced components of the methodological workflow – particularly those related to data ingestion, harmonization and coding-based processing – exceeded the technical expertise available in some institutions. Continued application and updating of the methodology therefore hinge on both sustained institutional prioritization at the national level and effective operationalization of follow-up technical support mechanisms at WIPO.

13. **Conclusion 3 (Ref: Findings 14-15, 18).** The project established structural conditions that support continued accessibility and broader uptake of its outputs beyond the pilot countries. The public availability of the methodology and country studies through WIPO's "[Impact and Utilization of the IP System](#)" platform enhances transparency, visibility and prospects for broader utilization. The modular structure of the methodological and technical framework and its compatibility with regional IP systems, including Organisation Africaine de la Propriété Intellectuelle (OAPI), further support potential replication in diverse institutional contexts. The extent to which these scaling pathways translate into sustained use will depend on national institutional engagement and effective follow-up support mechanisms.

14. **Conclusion 4 (Ref: Findings 19-21).** The project implemented the relevant Development Agenda Recommendations in a substantive manner by combining demand-driven assistance, institutional capacity strengthening, and empirical analysis to support development-oriented IP policymaking.

15. **Recommendation 1 (Ref: Conclusion 2-3, Findings 10-11, 17-18).** Strengthen sustainability through targeted follow-up technical support and clear communication of available support modalities. Building on the follow-up actions envisaged in the completion report, WIPO should consolidate and operationalize mechanisms to support continued application and updating of the methodological workflow. This could include periodic technical clinics, facilitated peer exchange sessions among pilot countries to increase mutual learning. Clear communication to pilot countries regarding the types of follow-up support available – including provision of updated indicator datasets and technical feedback on draft analyses – would further strengthen sustainability and uptake.

16. **Recommendation 2 (Ref: Conclusion 1, Findings 12-13).** Enhance strategic dissemination through concise policy-oriented outputs. WIPO may consider complementing the technical country studies – where appropriate – with concise executive summaries or policy-oriented briefs highlighting key findings and strategic implications. Such formats could facilitate engagement at senior decision-making levels and support integration of analytical insights into national IP and innovation policy processes.

17. **Recommendation 3 (Ref: Conclusion 2-3, Findings 1-2, 17).** Incorporate structured readiness considerations in future highly technical projects. For future initiatives involving complex data engineering and methodological transfer, WIPO may consider incorporating structured readiness assessments at the outset to clarify minimum data availability, technical capacity, and institutional commitment. Clear articulation of expectations could help align technical ambition with national absorptive capacity.

I. INTRODUCTION

18. This report is an independent evaluation of the DA Project (DA_1_4_10_35_37_01) on [Systematization of Statistical Data and the Design and Implementation of a Methodology for Developing Impact Assessments on the Use of the Intellectual Property System](#). The project was approved during the 26th session of the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP) (document [CDIP/26/4](#)), held in Geneva, in July 2021. The project started with preparations in January 2022, with the implementation starting in June 2022. The project was completed in December 2025. During CDIP/33, a 4-month extension was granted, making the total duration of 40 months, without any budgetary implications. The total project budget was 499,300 Swiss Francs. The project was implemented in the four pilot countries of Bhutan, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, and Indonesia. Within WIPO, this project has been managed by the IP and Innovation Ecosystems Sector. In the case of Côte d'Ivoire, implementation involved coordination with the national IP office (OAPI), while IP filing data were obtained from the Organisation Africaine de la Propriété Intellectuelle (OAPI), the regional IP organization for West and Central Africa responsible for centralized examination and data management for its Member States.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

19. Objectives: The project aimed to build capacity among those managing IP-related databases so they can translate data into reliable evidence for empirical studies. To achieve this, the aim was to create synergies between the data contained in the IP databases and other relevant statistical data and economic data which was assumed to be translated into empirical data helping to monitor the use of IP at the national level. This was intended to be achieved through the following four main workstreams:

- 1) Organizing and systematizing existing IP-related data in the databases of the relevant IP office and complementary statistical and economic data held by other national entities and/or other sources of statistical or economic performance data held in other State agencies;
- 2) Building the capacity of relevant officials through trainings to develop empirical studies on the use of the IP system;
- 3) Designing a methodology for developing empirical studies on the use of the IP system that will help, inter alia, to support the design and/or implementation of policies on the matter, drawing on international best practices; and
- 4) Exploring and utilizing virtual modalities to carry out activities relating to items 1-3 (as mentioned above), in order to be prepared for any scenario in the context of the global pandemic, and enhance implementation, transferability, and resilience of project outputs.¹

III. OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION CRITERIA AND METHODOLOGY

20. The aim of the evaluation was to learn from experience gained during project implementation, assess the project's performance, including project design and management, coordination, coherence, implementation, and results achieved. The evaluation also aimed to

¹ N.b. Workstreams were created during the 2020-2022 global Covid-19 pandemic.

provide evidence-based evaluation information to support the decision-making process of the CDIP.

21. The evaluation was organized around ten evaluation questions split into four foci: Project Design and Management, Effectiveness, Sustainability and Implementation of Development Agenda Recommendations. These questions are responded to in the section “Key findings” below.

22. The evaluation utilized a combination of methods. In addition to a review of all relevant documentation, online interviews were conducted with ten WIPO staff members, five focal points of beneficiary countries and national IP Office staff, the representative of the Permanent Mission of El Salvador, and three training participants from two of the pilot countries.

IV. KEY FINDINGS

23. This section is organized on the basis of the four evaluation areas, outlined in the Terms of Reference for this evaluation. Each evaluation question is answered directly under the headings of each area.

A. Project Design and Management

Appropriateness of the initial project document as a guide for project implementation and assessment of results achieved.

24. **Finding 1:** The initial project document provided a clear and structured framework for implementation, with defined objectives, a logical sequencing of activities, and identifiable deliverables. The project proposal articulated the objective of strengthening national capacity to systematize IP data and develop methodologies for impact assessment. It outlined key deliverables, including the assessment and consolidation of national IP and related data, development of a methodological framework, preparation of economic analyses, and delivery of trainings. The sequencing from data assessment to analytical outputs and capacity building was logically structured and provided a workable roadmap for implementation. While El Salvador was clearly identified from the outset as the proposing Member State and first pilot country, the remaining beneficiary countries were to be selected during implementation. The proposal established selection criteria for additional countries; however, this approach entailed some uncertainty regarding timing, the level of data readiness, which influenced the sequencing of early implementation activities.

25. **Finding 2:** The level of technical ambition in the initial design proved demanding in practice, particularly in light of varying national absorptive capacity. While the project design envisaged progressive internalization of advanced data engineering and economic analysis components, implementation experience of the project showed that capacity levels, data readiness, and institutional conditions differed significantly across countries. In practice, beneficiary institutions were generally able to use and interpret analytical outputs, while independent replication of the more technical components required higher levels of specialized skills and sustained engagement beyond the original timeframe.

26. **Finding 3:** The project design included defined deliverables and completion indicators; however, outcome-level change was not systematically articulated or tracked. The proposal contained a table of outputs and indicators of successful completion, primarily focused on deliverables such as country selection, database development, methodological testing, and trainings. While these provided a basis for monitoring implementation progress, the design did not include clearly defined outcome-level indicators capturing expected institutional or behavioural change such as improved use of IP data in policy processes or institutionalization of

the methodology. As a result, assessment of longer-term capacity strengthening relied largely on qualitative evidence rather than predefined measurable targets.

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.

27. **Finding 4:** Project monitoring and reporting mechanisms were adequate and supported adaptive management. The project monitoring tools were appropriate for reporting to Member States at the CDIP on overall progress, notably through the standardized Project Progress Reports. These reports included a structured self-assessment through the traffic light system, provided transparent updates on implementation status, delays, and challenges. Adjustments to timelines, sequencing, and technical approaches were documented and justified. Implementation challenges documented in progress reporting – particularly relating to data quality and ingestion issues in early pilot countries – informed subsequent methodological refinements and adjustments to timelines.

The extent to which other entities within the Secretariat have contributed and enabled effective and efficient project implementation.

28. **Finding 5:** Coordination within the Secretariat supported effective project implementation, with regional divisions playing a facilitating role, although their involvement was not systematically embedded from the outset. Project team members reported smooth collaboration within the Innovation Economy Section and with other relevant technical units. Internal communication and problem-solving were described as constructive and responsive, particularly in addressing data-related challenges. Progress reporting indicated that the Development Agenda Coordination Division (DACD) also supported outreach to interested Member States, facilitating broader visibility of the project within CDIP discussions. Interviews with staff from the Division for Asia and the Pacific and the Division for Latin America and the Caribbean suggest that they facilitated engagement with national counterparts and provided contextual understanding. At the same time, their involvement was not formally structured at the beginning of the project and evolved during implementation, reflecting an adaptive rather than pre-defined coordination model.

The extent to which the risks identified in the initial project document have materialized or been mitigated.

29. **Finding 6:** Key risks identified in the project document partially materialized, particularly regarding data quality, country onboarding and team continuity, but were mitigated through adaptive measures without compromising delivery of outputs. Data completeness and quality challenges required additional time for ingestion and harmonization, particularly in early pilot countries. In addition, the identification and onboarding of beneficiary countries required sustained coordination efforts. During implementation, the departure of a team member posed a risk to continuity; this was addressed through recruitment of a replacement fellow and a no-cost extension of the project timeline. These measures allowed the Secretariat to maintain technical quality and complete all planned deliverables. No critical risk ultimately undermined the viability or objectives of the project.

The project's ability to respond to emerging trends, technologies and other external forces.

30. **Finding 7:** The project demonstrated flexibility in responding to technical and contextual challenges encountered during implementation. In practice, implementation was affected primarily by data-related challenges rather than external disruptions. Variations in national data structure, completeness, and formatting required additional time for ingestion, harmonization, and quality verification, particularly in early pilot countries. These challenges led to

methodological refinements, adjustments in timelines and training delivery, and a no-cost extension of the project. While delivery modalities incorporated virtual elements as initially envisaged, interviews indicate that the pandemic itself did not constitute a major constraint as it was no longer a major factor during project implementation. Overall, the project adapted to evolving technical and institutional conditions while maintaining its original objectives.

B. Effectiveness of the project

The effectiveness of the project in organizing and systematizing existing data in the databases of the relevant IP office, as well as data from surveys held by other national entities and/or other sources of statistical or economic performance data held in other State agencies.

31. **Finding 8:** The project was effective in assessing, structuring, and consolidating national IP data, significantly improving its usability for analytical and policy purposes. Across pilot countries, the project supported the ingestion, harmonization, and quality verification of national IP datasets, including comparison with international data sources. Data coverage gaps and inconsistencies were systematically identified and addressed through standardized cleaning and consolidation processes. National counterparts consistently reported that, prior to the project, available data were fragmented or underutilized. Following implementation, structured databases and analytical outputs enabled clearer identification of sectoral trends, applicant profiles, and innovation patterns, thereby enhancing the practical usability of national IP data for analysis and reporting.

32. **Finding 9:** Stakeholders perceived substantial improvements in their ability to interpret and use IP-related data, although the degree of independent technical handling varied. Interviews with national counterparts in El Salvador, Indonesia, and Côte d'Ivoire, as well as feedback from training surveys, indicate that participants gained a clearer understanding of how IP data could inform strategic planning, policy briefs, and innovation analysis. In El Salvador, counterparts reported that project outputs were timely and informed the development and implementation of the national IP strategy and related planning processes. At the same time, more advanced components of the system – particularly those involving data ingestion, harmonization, and coding-based processing – required specialized statistical and programming skills that were not consistently available within national IP offices.

The effectiveness of the project in drawing on best practices to build the capacity of relevant officials, providing them with the training they need to develop these types of empirical studies.

33. **Finding 10:** The trainings were perceived as highly relevant and useful by participants, contributing to improved understanding of how IP data can inform economic analysis and policy development. Based on available attendance information across the four pilot countries plus Cameroon in connection with the regional role of OAPI, approximately 109 participants took part in project-related trainings. In addition to national IP offices and OAPI, participants included representatives from other government agencies, academia, and the private sector. Pre-training responses, for example in Indonesia, indicate that participants expected to strengthen their understanding of innovation economics, IP-based policy design, and the use of indicators and visualizations to support national economic and innovation strategies. Training evaluation surveys subsequently indicate high levels of participant satisfaction and perceived relevance to professional responsibilities. Respondents particularly valued the practical examples, the introduction to innovation indicators, and the linkage between IP data and policy analysis. Several participants highlighted the inclusion of gender-related analysis as especially valuable, noting that gender-disaggregated insights are increasingly requested by decision-makers. Overall, the project strengthened interpretative and analytical capacity of relevant officials related to IP data use.

34. **Finding 11:** While the trainings strengthened analytical understanding and interpretative skills, full independent execution of the more advanced empirical and technical components of the methodology developed was not consistently achieved within the project timeframe. The three-day training sessions combined methodological foundations on IP systems and innovation ecosystems with data analysis techniques and interpretation of indicators, linking empirical results to policy discussions. While participants strengthened their understanding of innovation indicators and policy-relevant analysis, absorption of the more technical data-processing components – particularly those related to data ingestion, harmonization, and coding-based processing in Python – remained uneven. For many participants, programming-based elements were new and required more sustained hands-on practice than the training schedule allowed. Several partner institutions indicated during interviews that continued engagement or collaboration with external technical actors may be necessary to sustain the full methodological workflow, reinforcing the importance of structured follow-up support mechanisms.

The effectiveness of the project in drawing on best practices to adopt a methodology for developing empirical studies on IP that will help, inter alia, to support the design and/or implementation of policies on the matter, using the most up-to-date and relevant data possible.

35. **Finding 12:** The project successfully developed and tested a structured and technically robust methodology for organizing and analysing IP data in line with international best practices. Documentation and internal interviews confirm that the methodology was designed drawing on international experience, including technical reports, academic literature on IP and innovation indicators, and consultation with external experts and relevant WIPO units. The framework was implemented and progressively refined across four pilot countries, with lessons from successive implementation cycles informing its consolidation. The final version integrates systematized database architecture and standardized indicator datasets supported by a modular Python-based toolset. Its modular structure allows key components – including data ingestion, enrichment and indicator computation – to be adapted and updated in line with national data conditions. The system standardized data ingestion, harmonization and indicator generation through automated processes, standardized variables and quality checks, strengthening rigor and comparability across countries. Methodological refinements were applied retroactively to earlier pilot datasets to ensure analytical consistency.

36. **Finding 13:** The methodology demonstrated policy relevance and practical applicability in pilot countries by generating structured analytical outputs to inform IP policy development and implementation. For each pilot country, five thematic studies were prepared covering: (i) IP Systems; (ii) Innovation Ecosystems; (iii) Gender; (iv) Subnational Ecosystems; and (v) Innovation Capabilities, designed to support evidence-based policy discussions. For example, the studies examined the utilization and impact of the IP system, sectoral distribution of IP filings, applicant profiling (domestic versus foreign), geographic concentration of innovation activity, gender-disaggregated analysis of inventorship, and selected innovation complexity indicators. The draft studies served as core training materials and were subject to internal and external validation processes involving national stakeholders. They are being finalized for publication on WIPO's "Impact and Utilization of the IP System" platform. Interviews indicate that the analyses strengthened policy discussions and strategic reflection within partner institutions, particularly in areas such as innovation capability development and gender participation in innovation. In El Salvador and Indonesia, stakeholders reported that the analytical findings informed national IP strategy development and implementation.

The effectiveness of the project in exploring the possibility of carrying out the activities relating to items 1-3 above via a virtual platform, in order to be prepared for any scenario in the current context of the global pandemic, and enhance the transferability of the project outputs, in terms of methodology and data bases, to other Member States.

37. **Finding 14:** The project effectively utilized virtual delivery modalities for implementation, although in-person engagement was perceived as more conducive to deeper technical learning in some contexts. Virtual workshops and remote collaboration were successfully used for training, data validation, and methodological discussions across pilot countries. Interviews indicate that the pandemic itself did not constitute a major implementation constraint as it was largely over by the time of project implementation. Participants generally reported that virtual sessions were functional and informative. However, some stakeholders – notably in Côte d'Ivoire – indicated that in-person training might have facilitated more intensive hands-on practice, closer interaction, and fewer connectivity-related disruptions. While virtual training delivery enabled continuity and cross-country comparability, its effectiveness for advanced technical components was perceived by some interviewees as somewhat limited compared to in-person engagement.

38. **Finding 15:** The project established the foundations for methodological transferability to other Member States, although scaling beyond pilot countries remains prospective. The standardized structure of the methodology, its iterative refinement, and its documentation in publicly available versions support potential replication in additional contexts. The consolidation of outputs through WIPO's "Impact and Utilization of the IP System" platform enhances accessibility and visibility. While the project demonstrated that the system can be adapted to diverse national data environments, evidence of actual transfer beyond the four pilot countries remains limited at this stage. Transferability potential is therefore established in principle, with broader uptake likely to depend on future demand and continued technical support of WIPO.

C. Sustainability

Likelihood of the continuous utilization of project outputs by beneficiary countries and stakeholders upon the completion of the project.

39. **Finding 16:** There is a reasonable likelihood that beneficiary countries will continue to utilize the analytical outputs generated through the project, particularly for strategic and reporting purposes. National counterparts indicated continued interest in using analytical reports and structured datasets to inform strategic planning, institutional reporting, and discussions on innovation performance. In El Salvador and Indonesia, outputs were linked to national IP strategy development and implementation. Several stakeholders also referred to the relevance of IP indicators for positioning within broader innovation benchmarking frameworks, including WIPO's Global Innovation Index. These factors suggest that the analytical insights generated are likely to retain policy relevance beyond the project timeframe.

40. **Finding 17:** The sustainability of the full methodological workflow depends on continued institutional commitment and the consolidation of technical capacity within beneficiary countries. The project established durable structural assets, including systematized country databases, standardized indicator datasets, a modular Python-based toolkit, and publicly accessible documentation, providing a foundation for continued analytical work beyond the project cycle. While the analytical outputs are likely to remain useful, updating the reports with more recent data requires technical handling of data ingestion, harmonization and coding-based processes. Several interviewees noted that, at the time of evaluation, the analyses were based on data available during implementation and that producing updated studies independently would require additional hands-on experience and dedicated staff time. In some contexts, institutions indicated that outsourcing technical tasks to external providers may be necessary. The Secretariat has signaled its intention to support continuity through provision of updated indicator datasets, technical feedback on draft reports and continued knowledge-sharing initiatives. Long-term sustainability therefore remains closely linked to institutional prioritization and allocation of appropriate technical resources at the national level.

41. **Finding 18:** The project created favorable conditions for scaling and wider uptake beyond the initial pilot countries. The methodological framework, thematic studies and training materials are being made publicly accessible through WIPO's "Impact and Utilization of the IP System" platform in three of the official UN languages (English, French and Spanish), enabling broader access and potential use by Member States. The modular design of the technical toolkit and its compatibility with regional IP systems, including OAPI, enhance its applicability in diverse institutional contexts. In addition to the four national training courses carried out during the project lifetime, an international online training for technical experts is scheduled for April 2026, extending knowledge transfer beyond the pilot countries. The completion report also highlights opportunities for South–South cooperation, where pilot countries may share their experience with other developing countries and LDCs.

D. Implementation of Development Agenda (DA) Recommendations

The extent to which the DA Recommendations 1, 4, 10, 35, and 37 have been implemented through the project.

This evaluation has found that the project has responded to these recommendations as follows:

42. **Finding 19:** The project substantively implemented DA Recommendation 1 by responding to a Member State demand and addressing national development priorities through tailored technical assistance. The project contributed to the implementation of this recommendation considering it originated from a Member State proposal and was implemented in close coordination with beneficiary countries. Country selection was guided by defined criteria, and implementation was adapted to national data environments and institutional contexts. Interviews confirmed that pilot countries perceived the intervention as demand-driven and aligned with their development priorities, particularly in strengthening evidence-based IP policymaking and analytical capacity.

43. **Finding 20:** The project contributed to the implementation of DA Recommendations 4 and 10 by strengthening institutional capacity and facilitating access to technical knowledge and data resources. Through the development of structured databases, methodological tools, and targeted trainings, the project enhanced the ability of national IP offices to organize and analyse IP-related data. The public availability of methodological documentation and country studies through WIPO's "Impact and Utilization of the IP System" platform further supports access to technical knowledge and promotes broader dissemination among Member States.

44. **Finding 21:** The project aligns with DA Recommendations 35 and 37 by supporting empirical research and evidence-based policymaking on IP and development. The methodology developed under the project enabled the generation of empirical studies examining IP activity, innovation patterns, sectoral specialization, and gender-disaggregated participation. National counterparts reported that these analyses informed policy discussions and strategic planning processes. By strengthening the analytical basis for understanding the relationship between IP and economic performance, the project contributed to integrating development considerations into IP policymaking.

V. CONCLUSIONS

45. **Conclusion 1 (Ref: Findings 8-9, 12-13).** The project achieved its core technical objectives by developing and validating a structured methodological framework for systematizing and analyzing IP and innovation data across the four pilot countries. Through iterative implementation cycles, the methodology was refined and consolidated into a robust analytical system aligned with international best practices. The resulting framework provides a replicable technical foundation that can be adapted by other Member States seeking to strengthen evidence-based IP and innovation policymaking.

46. **Conclusion 2 (Ref: Findings 10-11, 17).** The project achieved meaningful gains in interpretative and analytical capacity among national stakeholders; however, full independent execution of the methodology and its advanced technical components remain contingent on the consolidation of longer-term technical capabilities. Innovation and gender-disaggregated analysis were frequently described by stakeholders as particularly valuable for policy reflection. At the same time, implementation experience demonstrated that advanced components of the methodological workflow – particularly those related to data ingestion, harmonization and coding-based processing – exceeded the technical expertise available in some institutions. Continued application and updating of the methodology therefore hinge on both sustained institutional prioritization at the national level and effective operationalization of follow-up technical support mechanisms at WIPO.

47. **Conclusion 3 (Ref: Findings 14-15, 18).** The project established structural conditions that support continued accessibility and broader uptake of its outputs beyond the pilot countries. The public availability of the methodology and country studies through WIPO's "Impact and Utilization of the IP System" platform enhances transparency, visibility and prospects for broader utilization. The modular structure of the methodological and technical framework and its compatibility with regional IP systems, including OAPI, further support potential replication in diverse institutional contexts. The extent to which these scaling pathways translate into sustained use will depend on national institutional engagement and effective follow-up support mechanisms.

48. **Conclusion 4 (Ref: Findings 19-21).** The project implemented the relevant DA Recommendations in a substantive manner by combining demand-driven assistance, institutional capacity strengthening, and empirical analysis to support development-oriented IP policymaking.

49. **Recommendation 1 (Ref: Conclusion 2-3, Findings 10-11, 17-18).** Strengthen sustainability through targeted follow-up technical support and clear communication of available support modalities. Building on the follow-up actions envisaged in the completion report, WIPO should consolidate and operationalize mechanisms to support continued application and updating of the methodological workflow. This could include periodic technical clinics, facilitated peer exchange sessions among pilot countries to increase mutual learning. Clear communication to pilot countries regarding the types of follow-up support available – including provision of updated indicator datasets and technical feedback on draft analyses – would further strengthen sustainability and uptake.

50. **Recommendation 2 (Ref: Conclusion 1, Findings 12-13).** Enhance strategic dissemination through concise policy-oriented outputs. WIPO may consider complementing the technical country studies, where appropriate, with concise executive summaries or policy-oriented briefs highlighting key findings and strategic implications. Such formats could facilitate engagement at senior decision-making levels and support integration of analytical insights into national IP and innovation policy processes.

51. **Recommendation 3 (Ref: Conclusion 2-3, Findings 1-2, 17).** Incorporate structured readiness considerations in future highly technical projects. For future initiatives involving complex data engineering and methodological transfer, WIPO may consider incorporating structured readiness assessments at the outset to clarify minimum data availability, technical capacity, and institutional commitment. Clear articulation of expectations could help align technical ambition with national absorptive capacity.

[End of Annex, Appendices follow]

APPENDIX I: PERSONS INTERVIEWED/CONSULTED

I. Beneficiary Countries Focal Points and National IP Office Staff:

- **Mr. Paul Assande**, Directeur général de l'Office ivoirien de la propriété intellectuelle, Office Ivoirien de la Propriété Intellectuelle, Côte d'Ivoire.
- **Ms. Melvy Elizabeth Cortez Vanegas**, Jefa de Asesores del Registro de Propiedad Intelectual, Centro Nacional de Registros (CNR), El Salvador.
- **Ms. Laura Pacheco**, Directora de Inteligencia y Política Económica, Directorate of Intelligence and Economic Policy of the Ministry of Economy, El Salvador.
- **Mr. Mohammad Irvan**, IP Analyst, Directorate General of Intellectual Property (DGIP), Indonesia.
- **Ms. Nnoko Magui**, Director of prospective and OAPI cooperation, Organisation Africaine de la Propriété Intellectuelle (OAPI), Cameroon.

II. WIPO Staff:

- **Mr. Julio Raffo**, Head, Innovation Economy Section, WIPO, Switzerland.
- **Mr. Clement Sternberger**, former Project Fellow, Innovation Economy Section, WIPO, Switzerland (no longer with WIPO).
- **Ms. Maria de las Mercedes Menéndez**, Fellow, Innovation Economy Section, WIPO, Switzerland.
- **Mr. Federico Moscatelli**, Consultant, Innovation Economy Section, WIPO, Switzerland.
- **Ms. Carlotta Nani**, Fellow, Innovation Economy Section, WIPO, Switzerland.
- **Ms. Intan Hamdan-Livramento**, Senior Economist, Innovation Economy Section, WIPO, Switzerland.
- **Mr. Sergio Martinez-Cotto**, Consultant, Innovation Economy Section, WIPO, Switzerland.
- **Mr. David Simmons**, Counsellor, Division for Asia and the Pacific, WIPO, Switzerland.
- **Mr. Victor Guizar Lopez**, Counsellor, Division for Latin America and the Caribbean, WIPO, Switzerland.
- **Ms. Mary Hayrapetyan**, Programme Officer, Development Agenda Coordination Division, WIPO, Switzerland.

III. External Officers from Permanent Missions:

- **Ms. Coralia Osegueda**, Consejera, Mission Permanent El Salvador (OMC & OMPI), Switzerland.

IV. Participants in the trainings:

- **Mr. Théodore Soun'gouan**, Directeur du système d'information de l'OIPI, Office Ivoirien de la propriété intellectuelle (OIPI), Côte d'Ivoire.
- **Mr. Landry Kouassi**, Responsable du service informatique, Office Ivoirien de la propriété intellectuelle (OIPI), Côte d'Ivoire.
- **Ms. Maharani Apsari**, IP Analyst, Directorate General of Intellectual Property (DGIP), Indonesia.

[Appendix II follows]

APPENDIX II: DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

1. Project Document: [CDIP/26/4](#)
2. Project Progress Reports:
 - a. [CDIP/29/2](#), Annex VIII, discussion at the CDIP available at: [WIPO Webcast – Committee on Development and Intellectual Property Twenty Ninth Session - CDIP 29 Day 1 Afternoon](#), from 1:54:56.
 - b. [CDIP/31/3](#), Annex V, discussion at the CDIP available at: [WIPO Webcast – Committee on Development and Intellectual Property Thirty First Session - CDIP 31 Day 1 Afternoon](#), from 2:38:50.
 - c. [CDIP/33/3](#), Annex III, discussion at the CDIP available at: [WIPO Webcast – Committee on Development and Intellectual Property Thirty Third Session - CDIP 33 Day 1 Afternoon](#), from 2:02:02.
 - d. [CDIP/35/3](#), Annex II, discussion at the CDIP available at: [WIPO Webcast – Committee on Development and Intellectual Property Thirty Fifth Session - CDIP 35 Day 2 Morning](#), from 1:56:15.
3. Project Completion Report ([CDIP/36/10](#)).
4. Project outputs:
 - Systematization of Standardization, Enrichment and Economic Analysis of Intellectual Property and Innovation Data to Support Policy Design ([Version 1.0](#))
 - Systematization of Standardization, Enrichment and Economic Analysis of Intellectual Property and Innovation Data to Support Policy Design ([Version 2.0](#))
 - [Studies on Impact and Utilization of the Intellectual Property System: A CDIP Project Initiative](#) (five thematic reports for each country)
5. Event/training documentation: Feedback survey results for each pilot country

[Appendix III follows]

APPENDIX III: INCEPTION REPORT

1. INTRODUCTION

This document constitutes the inception report for the evaluation of the Development Agenda (DA) Project on [Development of the Systematization of Statistical Data and the Design and Implementation of a Methodology for Developing Impact Assessments in the Use of the Intellectual Property System](#). The project was proposed by El Salvador and approved by the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP) at its twenty-sixth session. The project was implemented from January 2022 to December 2025.

This inception report outlines the purpose, objectives, strategy, methodology and work plan of the evaluation. It serves as the reference document guiding the evaluation process and provides the basis for the final evaluation report, subject to approval by WIPO.

2. PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

The main purpose of this evaluation is to assess the implementation of the project and its overall performance and to provide evidence-based evaluative information to support the decision-making process of the CDIP.

The main objective of this evaluation is two-fold:

1. Learning from experiences during project implementation: what worked well and what did not work well for the benefit of future and ongoing activities in this field. This includes an assessment of the project design framework, project management arrangements, monitoring and reporting tools, results achieved to date and the likelihood of sustainability of those results.
2. Accountability and decision-making support 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) Organizing and systematizing existing IP-related in the databases of the relevant IP office and complementary statistical and economic data held by other national entities and/or other sources of statistical or economic performance data held in other State agencies;
- (b) Building the capacity of relevant officials through trainings to develop empirical studies on the use of the IP system;
- (c) Designing a methodology for developing empirical studies on the use of the IP system that will help, inter alia, to support the design and/or implementation of policies on the matter, drawing on international best practices; and
- (d) Exploring and utilizing virtual modalities to carry out activities relating to items 1-3 (as mentioned above), in order to be prepared for any scenario in the current context of the global pandemic, and enhance implementation, transferability, and resilience of project outputs.

3. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

The evaluator will consult and coordinate with the project team and the Development Agenda Coordination Division (DACD) throughout the evaluation process. The evaluation will adopt a participatory approach and, as far as feasible, involve key stakeholders, including WIPO staff, project partners, and beneficiary-country stakeholders.

The evaluation aims at balancing both the needs for learning and accountability. In line with the Terms of Reference (ToR), the focus of this evaluation will not be assessing individual activities or deliverables in isolation but rather on evaluating the project as a whole, and its contribution in addressing the needs of Member States.

The evaluation methodology will combine qualitative data collection and analysis methods including:

- (a) A desk review of relevant project documentation (project proposal, progress reports, publications, and other relevant documents);
- (b) Semi-structured interviews with selected WIPO Secretariat staff, project managers, and other entities contributing to the project; and
- (c) Semi-structured interviews with stakeholders at a beneficiary-country level.

4. EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

The evaluation framework is structured around the main evaluation criteria outlined in the ToR: Project Design and Management, Effectiveness, Sustainability, and Implementation of Development Agenda Recommendations. The table below presents the key evaluation questions, proposed indicators, data collection tools, and sources of information.

Theme and questions	Proposed indicators	Data collection tools	Sources of information
Project design and Management			
1. Appropriateness of the initial project document as a guide for project implementation and assessment of results achieved.	Extent to which the initial project document provided a clear implementation roadmap; Clarity and coherence of the intervention logic; Modifications required during the implementation of the project.	Document review and Interviews	WIPO staff, project documentation
2. Adequacy and usefulness of project monitoring, self-evaluation and reporting tools to provide the project team and key stakeholders with relevant information for decision-making purposes.	Perceived level of usefulness of monitoring and reporting tools; Evidence of adaptive management.	Document review and Interviews	WIPO staff; project documentation

3. Contribution of other WIPO entities for effective and efficient project implementation.	Number and type of WIPO units involved in the project and their contribution; Perceived added value of contributions from other WIPO units.	Document review and Interviews	WIPO staff, project documentation
4. Extent to which the risks identified in the initial project document have materialized or been mitigated.	Types of risks materialized vs. mitigated; adequacy of mitigation strategies.	Document review and Interviews	WIPO staff, project documentation
5. The project's ability to respond to emerging trends, technologies and other external forces.	Examples of adaptive responses to external changes (e.g. pandemic-related constraints); perceived flexibility of project design.	Document review and Interviews	WIPO staff, project documentation
Effectiveness			
1. The effectiveness of the project in organizing and systematizing existing data in the databases of the relevant IP office, as well as data from surveys held by other national entities and/or other sources of statistical or economic performance data held in other State agencies.	Level of effectiveness in assessing, structuring, consolidating and making data usable for analysis; Stakeholder perceptions of data improvements.	Document review and Interviews	WIPO staff, beneficiary stakeholders, project documentation
2. The effectiveness of the project in drawing on best practices to build the capacity of relevant officials, providing them with the training they need to develop these types of empirical studies.	Perceived usefulness of trainings; reported improvements in skills and knowledge.	Document review and Interviews	WIPO staff, beneficiary stakeholders, project documentation
3. The effectiveness of the project in drawing on best practices to adopt a methodology for developing empirical studies on IP that will help, inter alia, to support the design and/or implementation of policies on the matter, using the most up-to-date and relevant data possible.	Existence, quality, and perceived applicability of the methodology; alignment with international best practices.	Document review and Interviews	WIPO staff, beneficiary stakeholders, project documentation

4. The effectiveness of the project in exploring the possibility of carrying out the activities relating to items 1-3 above via a virtual platform, in order to be prepared for any scenario in the current context of the global pandemic, and enhance the transferability of the project outputs, in terms of methodology and data bases, to other Member States.	Level of effectiveness of virtual delivery in implementation and transferability to other Member States.	Document review and Interviews	WIPO staff, beneficiary stakeholders, project documentation
Sustainability			
Likelihood of the continuous utilization of project outputs by beneficiary countries and stakeholders upon the completion of the project.	Extent to which key stakeholders express intent, demonstrate planning, or have taken preparatory steps to continue using and supporting project outputs (methodologies, databases or skills) after project completion.	Document review and Interviews	WIPO staff, beneficiary stakeholders, project documentation
DA Recommendations			
The extent to which the DA Recommendations 1, 4, 10, 35, and 37 have been implemented through the project.	Alignment of project activities and results with DA recommendations	Document review and Interviews	WIPO staff, beneficiary stakeholders, project documentation

4.1. Data Collection Tools

The data collection tools will be applied across the different evaluation themes and questions. The table below summarizes the main tools and their intended use.

Tool	Description	Information source
<i>Interviews – internal</i>	Some 6 semi-structured virtual interviews	WIPO staff, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Development Agenda Coordination Division – Budget and Risk Management Division – Innovation Economy Section
<i>Interviews – external</i>	Some 12 semi-structured virtual interviews	Beneficiary country focal points, national IP offices, and other relevant stakeholders

<i>Document review</i>	Review of key project-related documentation	WIPO project documentation including internal/external reports and publications, training materials, feedback reports on workshops/trainings/events other relevant reports, documents, websites
------------------------	---	---

The final list of interviewees will be agreed upon jointly with WIPO. Interview guides will be adapted to the role and level of involvement of each interview partner (see Annex 2 for a draft list of topics to be covered).

a. Data analysis methods:

The evaluation will primarily rely on qualitative data gathered through semi-structured key informant interviews and document analysis. This data will be analyzed using qualitative content analysis, a method that enables systematic coding and interpretation of textual information to identify recurring themes, patterns, and insights. The analyzed data will be organized and triangulated to ensure validity and to directly address the evaluation questions. The findings derived from this process will serve as the foundation for drawing conclusions and formulating actionable recommendations.

5. WORK PLAN AND TIMETABLE

The proposed milestones and timelines are as shown here below:

Milestones/Deliverables	Key dates
Work starts	5 January 2026
Submission of inception report to WIPO	20 January 2026
Feedback from WIPO on inception report	23 January 2026
Submission of final inception report to WIPO	30 January 2026
Submission of draft report to WIPO	20 February 2026
Factual corrections from WIPO on draft report	27 February 2026
Submission of final report to WIPO	10 March 2026
Presentation of evaluation report at the CDIP	4-8 May 2026

6. KEY ASSUMPTIONS AND RISKS

It is assumed that the project team and the Development Agenda Coordination Division (DACD) will assist the consultant in identifying and accessing all key documents; informing key stakeholders about the evaluation; making necessary introductions; providing contact information and facilitating interviews as required; and providing consolidated timely feedback on deliverables. It is also assumed that the interviews to be undertaken will be successful and language will not be a barrier (the consultant speaks (among other languages) - English, French, Portuguese). It is also assumed that the interviewees will be available and willing to provide the required information and that communication will be smooth and not hampered by low bandwidth, power cuts, etc.

Potential risks include limited availability of stakeholders, delays in accessing documentation, or technical constraints affecting virtual interviews. These risks will be mitigated through early planning, flexible scheduling, and close coordination with WIPO.

ANNEX I: DRAFT LIST OF INTERVIEWEES

Below is a draft list of persons to be interviewed for this evaluation. This list will be adjusted in collaboration with WIPO.

I. Beneficiary Countries Focal Points:

- **Ms. Dema Ninda**, Senior Intellectual Property Officer, DoMCIIP (MoICE), Bhutan.
- **Mr. Paul Assande**, Directeur général de l'Office ivoirien de la propriété intellectuelle, Office Ivoirien de la Propriété Intellectuelle, Côte d'Ivoire.
- **Ms. Melvy Elizabeth Cortez Vanegas**, Jefa de Asesores del Registro de Propiedad Intelectual, Centro Nacional de Registros (CNR), El Salvador.
- **Ms. Marchienda Werdany**, Directorate General of Intellectual Property, DGIP, Indonesia.

II. WIPO Colleagues:

- **Mr. Julio Raffo**, Head, Innovation Economy Section, WIPO, Switzerland.
- **Mr. Clement Sternberger**, former Project Fellow, Innovation Economy Section, WIPO, Switzerland (no longer at WIPO).
- **Ms. Maria de las Mercedes Menéndez**, Fellow, Innovation Economy Section, WIPO, Switzerland.
- **Mr. Federico Moscatelli**, Consultant, Innovation Economy Section, WIPO, Switzerland.
- **Ms. Carlotta Nani**, Fellow, Innovation Economy Section, WIPO, Switzerland.
- **Ms. Intan Hamdan-Livramento**, Senior Economist, Innovation Economy Section, WIPO, Switzerland.
- **Mr. Sergio Martinez-Cotto**, Consultant, Innovation Economy Section, WIPO, Switzerland.
- **Mr. Ye Min Than**, Senior Program Officer, Division for Asia and the Pacific, WIPO, Switzerland.
- **Ms. Loretta Asiedu**, Director, Division for Africa, WIPO, Switzerland.
- **Mr. Rwaka Emmanuel Rugomboka**, Counsellor, Division for Africa, WIPO, Switzerland.
- **Mr. David Simmons**, Counsellor, Division for Asia and the Pacific, WIPO, Switzerland.
- **Mr. Victor Guizar Lopez**, Counsellor, Division for Latin America and the Caribbean, WIPO, Switzerland.

III. External Officers from Missions:

- **Ms. Coralia Osegueda**, Consejera, Mission Permanent El Salvador (OMC & OMPI), Switzerland.

IV. Participants in the trainings:

- **Mr. Binod Pradhan**, Chief Information and Media Officer, Department of Media, Creative Industry and Intellectual Property, Bhutan.
- **Mr. Yao Casimir Brou**, Responsable du Bureau Central des Programmes de Recherche Partenariale, Institut National Polytechnique Félix Houphouët-Boigny (INP-HB), Côte d'Ivoire.
- **Ms. Windyaswara Habibah Afianti**, IP Analyst, Directorate General of Intellectual Property (DGIP), Indonesia.
- **Mr. Julio Alberto Rivas Cuéllar**, Líder de Tecnología de Información, Banco Central de Reserva de El Salvador, El Salvador.
- **Ms. Zara Moctar Ali**, Économiste, OAPI, Cameroon.

ANNEX 2: TOPICS TO BE COVERED DURING SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS

Project design, management, coordination:

- appropriateness of monitoring, self-evaluation and reporting tools
- risk occurrence and management
- coordination within WIPO and with external stakeholders

Effectiveness:

- what worked well/less well, enabling factors, challenges during implementation most significant results/changes achieved

Sustainability:

- factors that contribute to the sustainability of the action, plans for re-using/expanding on created tools, training materials, support mechanisms, etc.

Contribution of the project to the implementation of the DA Recommendations

Learnings and Best practices:

- key lessons learned
- suggestions for improvements for similar projects

As mentioned above, according to the interview partner's involvement in the project, the topics covered will slightly vary.

[End of Appendix III and of document]