



## **Internal Oversight Division**

Reference: EVAL 2014-01

## **Evaluation Report**

Strategic Goal VI: International Cooperation on Building Respect for Intellectual Property

October 16, 2014

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Strategic Goal VI is one of WIPO's nine strategic goals, which were adopted by the Member States in 2009 and aim at supporting WIPO in achieving its mandate within an evolving external environment. It calls for creating an enabling environment that promotes respect for intellectual property (IP) in a sustainable way and strengthens the capacity of Member States for the effective enforcement of IP rights (IPRs) in the interest of socio-economic development and consumer protection. The key purpose of this evaluation was to assess whether WIPO, mainly through Program 17, addressed comprehensively and effectively the key objectives of Strategic Goal VI and the relevance of activities developed.

## PROCESS AND METHODOLOGY

The findings and conclusions of this evaluation were obtained after a thorough analysis of an abundant documentation proactively provided by the Program and through semi-structured interviews and meetings with around 40 internal and external key stakeholders. The Program staff was associated from the beginning in the design and data collection phase of the evaluation. It is to be noted that the constructive spirit of Program managers and staff contributed significantly to the successful and timely completion of this evaluation in an iterative and participatory approach: this is a clear lesson learned from this evaluation.

## CONCLUSIONS

Conclusions presented in this report were validated in consultation with Program 17 for their accuracy and appropriateness:

**Conclusion 1: WIPO's support towards achieving the objectives of Strategic Goal VI was generally considered well managed.**

Most of the internal and external stakeholders interviewed commended the excellent cooperation with management and staff of Program 17. Specifically mentioned were quality, responsiveness and service orientation. Clearer definitions of the logical links between outputs and their contribution to expected results, e.g. by using the logical framework tool at the level of contributing Programs, would help to provide greater clarity over achieved outcomes.

**Conclusion 2: Despite some progress, the proper application of Results Based Management (RBM) principles by WIPO both in designing and monitoring the activities under Strategic Goal VI leaves room for further improvement.**

The application of RBM principles in Program management, including the definition and use of Key Performance Indicators has improved and is available for rather broadly defined outcome objectives. As for all WIPO Strategic Objectives and Programs, specific output targets are not defined. Specific output targets linked to SMART indicators would however be important to measure direct deliverables of WIPO, rather than only broader changes generated by them.

All activities delivered under Program 17 and reported to the Advisory Committee on Enforcement (ACE) contributed to building respect for IP as defined in Strategic Goal VI. Funds spent for legislative advice and capacity building were attributed to Strategic Goals I and III. WIPO's work towards Strategic Goal VI benefitted from significant resources from the

Development Sector and Funds-in-Trust (FIT), which are not accounted for under Strategic Goal VI. In the future, disbursement of all Programs should be tagged in such way that they can be attributed to the corresponding strategic goal and accounted for the purpose which they served (in this case “Building Respect for Intellectual Property”).

**Conclusion 3: The Secretariat provided the right type of high quality and relevant support towards the achievement of Strategic Goal VI.**

Strategic Goal VI remained highly relevant to Member States and was addressed through the right types of support, which combined facilitation of policy dialogue within the framework of the ACE meeting, legislative advice, capacity building, and awareness-raising.

The ACE meeting was perceived as a useful platform for exchanging views and information on practices in building respect for IP.

Activities were well tailored to the specific needs of target beneficiaries. Despite limited financial and personnel resources, the Secretariat delivered planned activities and responded timely and in good quality to the requests of Member States.

**Conclusion 4: WIPO’s support to Strategic Goal VI achieved its planned objectives.**

Planned results as defined in Program and Budget were achieved or in some cases exceeded (e.g. number of countries receiving legislative assistance in 2012-2013). Despite the lack of a formal coordination mechanism, activities within the framework of Strategic Goal VI complemented services provided by other sectors of the Secretariat. Where several Programs are involved into specific projects (e.g. legislative advice, awareness raising, capacity building), clear coordination mechanisms should be defined within the Secretariat, notably with the Bureaus.

**Conclusion 5: Technical assistance was generally delivered efficiently and incorporated the core principles of Development Agenda (DA) Recommendation 45**

The approach to training has gradually shifted from direct delivery to building institutional training capacities in beneficiary countries (such as for instance judicial academies, police training schools). Where feasible, this approach should be furthered as it is not only more cost effective (wider reach), but also likely to contribute to sustainability of results.

A key value added of WIPO was recognized in its input to awareness raising strategies.

Existing and new Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs) with other organizations should if possible define specific areas of collaboration, Programs or projects with clearly formulated targets.

**Conclusion 6: Initial although not yet systematic steps towards enhancing sustainability at the level of Member States were taken.**

Examples of activities include: (a) the shift from direct capacity building to strengthening training institutions, (b) supporting Member States to build their own strategies, notably in the field of awareness raising, and (c) assisting Member States to prepare and implement their own Programs on building respect for IP. In the future, it is suggested to further reinforce the approach to (a) institutionalize capacity building on building respect for IP through building capacities of specialized training institutions (i.e. specialized schools and academies), (b) providing Member States with advice on awareness raising strategies and the design of own Programs on building respect for IP, (c) conduct capacity building for legislative drafters in the

implementation of Part III of the TRIPS Agreement – Enforcement of Intellectual Property Rights.

Overall, the evaluation is of the opinion that the work of the Secretariat under Strategic Goal VI was efficient, effective and relevant and that the improvements made over the evaluation period (2010-2014) are sufficiently addressing the few challenges identified by the contributing Programs on an ongoing basis.

Based on the above conclusions and observations, there are no recommendations formulated for improvements which are specific to Program 17 or other contributing Programs. Suggested enhancements mentioned above are to the attention of the whole Organization. They were mentioned in previous oversight reports<sup>1</sup> and specific recommendations were formulated to address these.

---

<sup>1</sup> IOD validations of Program performance Reports (VALID 2014-01), Kenya and Thailand Country portfolio Evaluations (EVAL 2012-01 and EVAL 2013-02), Results Based Management Audit (IA 2013-05).