



**Internal Oversight Division**

Reference: EVAL 2019-03

**Evaluation Report**

Evaluation of Program 17

Capacity Strengthening on Building Respect for Intellectual Property

March 31, 2020



**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**LIST OF ACRONYMS..... 5**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY..... 6**

**1. INTRODUCTION..... 8**

    (A) PURPOSE..... 8

    (B) SCOPE ..... 8

**2. APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY ..... 9**

**3. EVALUATION FINDINGS ..... 9**

    (A) RELEVANCE OF OUTPUT III.2 OF THE PROGRAM BUILDING RESPECT FOR IP .. 9

    (B) EFFECTIVENESS OF OUTPUT III.2 OF THE PROGRAM BUILDING RESPECT FOR IP 13

    (C) EFFICIENCY OF OUTPUT III.2 OF THE PROGRAM BUILDING RESPECT FOR IP 15

    (D) IMPACT ..... 18

**ANNEXES..... 22**

# Evaluation of Program 17

## Building Respect for IP

### Expected Result III.2

The evaluation of Building Respect for Intellectual Property, Program 17, focused on expected result III.2 “Enhanced human resource capacities able to deal with the broad range of requirements for the effective use of IP for development in developing countries, least developed countries, and countries with economies in transition”.

#### What are the conclusions and Recommendations of the Evaluation?



#### Conclusion 1 & 2

The relevance of expected result III.2 is unquestionable and the effectiveness is well established with minor adjustments to improve in the delivery of seminars and workshops including emerging good practices and lessons.



#### Recommendation 1



Program 17 should strengthen the processes, through which the relevance and effectiveness of capacity building activities are assessed by revising key performance indicators and the post-workshop evaluation questionnaire.

#### Recommendation 2



Program 17 should fine-tune the seminar/workshop delivery method with a focus on its relevance to context and participants.

#### Conclusions 3 & 4

There is an efficient use of inputs and operational activities by coordinating internally and externally, benefiting from synergies with Bureaus. There are examples that contribute to intermediate and potential long-term effects of the delivery of expected result III.2.



84%

Have applied the learning into their work

**LIST OF ACRONYMS**

<b>ACE</b>	Advisory Committee on Enforcement
<b>BRIP</b>	Building Respect for Intellectual Property
<b>ERS</b>	Extreme Response Style
<b>IOD</b>	Internal Oversight Division
<b>IP</b>	Intellectual Property
<b>LDC</b>	Least Developed Countries
<b>LE</b>	Law Enforcement
<b>MS</b>	Member States
<b>WIPO</b>	World Intellectual Property Organization

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. This report presents the results of the evaluation of the World Intellectual Property Organization's (WIPO) Building Respect for Intellectual Property (BRIP), Program 17, for the expected result III.2 "Enhanced human resource capacities able to deal with the broad range of requirements for the effective use of IP for development in developing countries, least developed countries (LDCs) and countries with economies in transition". The assessment was conducted between October 2019 and January 2020. The Internal Oversight Division (IOD) has applied a participatory approach and assured, whenever appropriate, the inclusion of internal and external stakeholders during all phases of the evaluation process. Key evaluation findings and conclusions include the following:

2. There is an increasing appreciation among Advisory Committee on Enforcement (ACE) Member States (MS) that tackling Intellectual Property (IP) crime is worthy of greater emphasis and resources and that capacity building activities are one method of helping address relevant enforcement issues and challenges. An indicator of the relevance of the BRIP capacity building activities lies in the number of MS requests for these activities, where demand outstrips the resources of Program 17 to deliver all the requests.

3. The performance indicators linked to the usefulness and relevance of the expected result used different descriptive/categorical variables in the baseline versus the ones used in the target. Although this has subsequently been addressed at an organizational level (2018) the terminology continued to be used in the post-seminar/workshop evaluation questionnaires. Overall, the workshop/seminar material is broadly relevant and useful to most participants (over 85 per cent) of the Program 17 capacity building activities.

4. The structure and division of time within the workshops and seminars is generally quite good. An appreciable number of participants have suggested that more time should be allowed to encourage and develop 'informal networks' among the participants. Another request was for more discussions in smaller groups during the seminars/workshops. This could also be used to promote the informal networks.

5. The success of the current capacity building activities relies heavily upon the relationships built between the WIPO Regional Bureaus and Program 17 staff. This is crucial for two key reasons. Firstly, close communication is required to ensure that capacity building requests are directed through the appropriate Regional Bureaus. Secondly, the roles and responsibilities of the Regional Bureaus and Program 17 staff in delivering those activities are agreed and well understood. It is to the credit of those involved that this relationship appears strong. In general, the professionalism and dedication of Program 17 staff is often highlighted both in-house and by external partners.

6. Another aspect is the effectiveness of the selection of (i) the type of capacity building activity to provide; (ii) the type of participants to invite; and (iii) the country that will receive/host the activity. The BRIP Program 17 capacity building workshops and seminars are run at national, sub-regional or regional levels for (mainly) Law Enforcement (LE) officials, prosecutors and judges. The selection of which type of training to conduct and the type of participants to invite is done in collaboration with the beneficiaries, relevant WIPO Regional Bureaus and Program 17 staff. This process for determining the best workshop type and whom to invite appears to work well. Program 17 selects the countries to deliver training through a consultation process with the Regional Bureaus and MS. The current use of the criteria to prioritize some countries over others appears to be working well. The process and use of the criteria is contingent to the context and adapts according to its development.

7. Overall, the effectiveness of Program 17 in the delivery of output III.2 is well established. Minor adjustments could be made to increase the potential effectiveness in the delivery of

seminars/workshops including considering emerging good practices and lessons learned identified during the evaluation. The current process to prioritize which countries receive what type of capacity building assistance is based on a demand method which in turn limits to accommodate all the demands in a systematic and comprehensive manner.

8. The activities themselves are efficiently run. Communication and coordination of Program 17 staff works exceptionally well with both internal and external partners and stakeholders, thus increasing economic efficiency, bringing synergies and ensuring smooth delivery of capacity building activities. The model of running back-to-back workshops has gained traction over the period this evaluation covers, and there appears to be real benefit in this approach. It allows for time and money resources to be more efficiently utilized but also provides WIPO staff with a longer time 'in-country/in-region' to develop closer working relationships with national partners.

9. Program 17 builds good relationships with national partners, which help overcome barriers to the potential application of the capacity building learning thereby improving the likelihood of positive impact. There appears to be positive impact at an individual participant level, which then translates into multiplied impacts as the learning is cascaded by those participants to their peers.

10. The evaluation of Program 17 identified examples that contribute to intermediate and potential long-term effects (impact) of the delivery of output III.2. The qualitative evidence from past participants has highlighted national impact in areas of awareness raising, legal improvements and cascaded training for LE officials, prosecutors and judges. Moreover, the evaluation identified good practice examples including the development of tailored training manuals, which are then used as the basis for workshops and seminars on tackling IP within the national environment. There may be merit however, in considering other capacity building approaches, which could complement the seminars and workshops such as WIPO academy E-Learning and/or the use of Program 17 mentors in-country.

### **Recommendations**

1. Program 17 should strengthen the processes, through which the relevance and effectiveness of capacity building activities are assessed by revising key performance indicators and the post-workshop evaluation questionnaire, and focus analysis of their contents. Program 17 should work with PPBD on the proposed questionnaire to create a Program 17 specific and complementary questionnaire.
2. Program 17 should fine-tune the seminar/workshop delivery method with a focus on its relevance to context and participants.