



Internal Oversight Division

Reference: EVAL-2018-02

Evaluation Report

Evaluation of the Regional Bureau for Asia and the Pacific

December 12, 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ACRONYMS.....	4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
1. INTRODUCTION	7
(A) ASPAC BUREAU CONTEXT.....	7
2. THE EVALUATION	9
(A) EVALUATION PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVE.....	9
(B) EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY.....	9
(C) LIMITATIONS.....	10
3. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS.....	11
(A) RELEVANCE.....	11
(i) The needs of Member States	11
(ii) The mandate of the ASPAC Bureau	13
(iii) Key relevance findings	13
(iv) Relevance conclusions.....	14
(B) EFFECTIVENESS.....	14
(i) The project-based approach – a significant contribution to the achievement of WIPO goals and results	14
(ii) Formulation of National Intellectual Property Strategies (NIPS).....	16
(iii) Development of country technical assistance implementation plans.....	16
(iv) Heads of IPO conference	17
(v) IP Office diagnostics and assistance.....	17
(vi) Competency-Based and Individualized Examiners Training and Learning Management System	18
(vii) WIPO treaty accession assistance for Madrid and Hague	19
(viii) The Enabling IP Environment.....	20
(ix) IP Roving Seminars	21
(x) Key effectiveness findings.....	21
(xi) Effectiveness conclusions	22
(C) EFFICIENCY.....	22
(i) ASPAC Bureau planning, prioritization and coordination.....	22
(ii) Efficiency analysis	25
(iii) Knowledge, skills and quality of external expertise and programs	26
(iv) Funds-In-Trust and its contributors to the achievement of WIPO goals and results	27
(v) Key efficiency findings	27
(vi) Efficiency conclusions	28
(D) IMPACT.....	28
(i) IP for Development in Member States	29
(ii) IP for Development in the Region	30
(iii) Key impact findings	30
(iv) Impact conclusions	31
(E) SUSTAINABILITY	31
(F) GENDER EQUALITY	31
(G) LESSONS LEARNED	32
4. RECOMMENDATIONS	33
TABLE OF RECOMMENDATIONS.....	35
ANNEXES	36

LIST OF ACRONYMS

APEC	Asia and Pacific Economic Cooperation
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
ASPAC	Asia and the Pacific
AWGIPC	Association of Southeast Asian Nations Working Group on IP Cooperation
CTAIP	Country Technical Assistance Implementation Plan
FIT	Funds-In-Trust
HIPOC	Heads of IP Offices Conference
IOD	Internal Oversight Division
IP	Intellectual Property
IPAT	Intellectual Property Association of Thailand
IPO	Intellectual Property Office
IPOPHL	The Philippines national IP Office
ITSO	Innovation and Technology Support Office
JPO	Japan Patent Office
KIPO	Korean Intellectual Property Office
LDC	Least Developed Countries
MoUs	Memorandums of Understanding
NIPO	National Intellectual Property Office
NIPS	National Intellectual Property Strategy
PCT	The Patent Cooperation Treaty
P&B	Program and Budget
SG	Strategic Goal
TISC	Technology and Innovation Support Center
TRF	Thailand Research Fund
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
WIPO	World Intellectual Property Organization

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. This report represents the results of the evaluation of the World Intellectual Property Organization's (WIPO's) Regional Bureau for Asia and the Pacific. The evaluation was conducted between May and October of 2018. A total of 139 stakeholders were interviewed, including 82 national IP office representatives, 41 other national IP stakeholders, nine representatives of Permanent Missions and seven ASPAC Bureau representatives. The interviewees comprised 53% men and 47% women. As well as these key informant interviews, the evaluation analyzed available and relevant WIPO and ASPAC Bureau documentation. Key evaluation findings/conclusions include the following.

2. Relevance

(a) The approach and work of the Regional Bureau for Asia and the Pacific (hereinafter "ASPAC Bureau")¹ have been developed from a careful analysis of WIPO's strategic and mid-term goals. The close correlation between the activities of the ASPAC Bureau and its mandate, as well as the close correlation between its work and the defined and stated needs of Member States is indicative of the strategic relevance of the work of the ASPAC Bureau. Further, the strong indications from stakeholders of the importance of the ASPAC Bureau's work to their Intellectual Property (IP) development encourage confidence in the relevance of the ASPAC Bureau's approach.

(b) The approach and work of the ASPAC Bureau have been developed within a structured framework of delivery. This structured approach is critical to the ASPAC Bureau's approach and contributes strongly to the effectiveness of the ASPAC Bureau's work. Strong indications from stakeholders of the importance of the various projects encourage confidence that the structured approach is of value to Member States in the development of IP frameworks and systems.

3. Effectiveness

(a) It is likely that the impact of the ASPAC Bureau's contribution to WIPO's strategic goals (SG) will continue to grow, and be more visible, as more Member States move along a development path and have more time for the implementation of their National Intellectual Property Strategy (NIPS). It will be critical in the coming years for the project-focused approach to be carefully monitored and revised according to: (i) the needs of Member States; and (ii) reflections on the effectiveness of the content and structure of the projects.

(b) The structured analysis of results against plans has the potential to assist WIPO in a better analysis of the effectiveness of its inputs and achievement of results and should be a specific focus of the ASPAC Bureau's project management processes going forward. Reporting in particular can benefit from a more consistent use of the defined results framework.

(c) There are gains to be made from ensuring a close correlation of approach and collaboration between substantive sectors and the ASPAC Bureau, given the ASPAC Bureau's knowledge of national IP office strategies, details of their diagnostics and understanding of their priorities. This knowledge can add significantly to the planning and delivery of the work of the substantive sectors.

(d) The high levels of strong support for the project-based approach and work of the ASPAC Bureau indicates that consideration of this approach by other Bureaus, and WIPO generally, is needed. This development is directly in line with the *Program and Budget 2016/17* document. While there is no basis in the work of the evaluation for concluding an

¹ http://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/activities_by_unit/index.jsp?id=1008

uptake of the 10 projects across the organization, it is apparent that a detailed consideration of the structured nature of the approach, and its strategic underpinning, is warranted, to ensure WIPO is not missing an opportunity to strengthen effectiveness and efficiency of program delivery.

4. Efficiency

(a) Some strengthening of the governance of coordination and collaboration processes between the ASPAC Bureau and substantive sectors is indicated. These systems are critical for ensuring an efficient use of WIPO resources and effective results against strategic plans. Operating within defined priority areas of focus is incumbent on the other WIPO sectors, and to do so with the assistance of and in coordination with the ASPAC Bureau.

(b) Improvements are needed in reporting on the ASPAC Bureau's projects, with a specific focus on project-focused/project-specific reporting and the provision of statistics on specific activities within a project context. Reports should also describe contribution to planned activities and outputs and should analyze contribution to WIPO's strategic priorities.

(c) Some discussion across WIPO, involving ASPAC Bureau leadership and leadership of relevant substantive sectors is encouraged to develop a longer-term approach to the strategic engagement of Pacific Island states in international IP structures and conventions.

5. Impact

(a) The ASPAC Bureau has set down a number of markers of impact that can be followed in determining impact on Member States in terms of the development of IP frameworks and systems, and impact in terms of WIPO strategic goals. The markers are: (i) specific types of capacity in individuals, notable with examiners but not restricted to this group; (ii) how things are done in NIPS and Diagnostics being the notable contributors; and (iii) regional networking incorporating both technical assistance and financing but also the sharing of knowledge and practice.

6. Based on the above findings and conclusions, the evaluation makes the following recommendations:

- (1) ASPAC Bureau should build on existing project monitoring framework strengths by factoring in results based budgeting, gender elements and reporting against results based indicators.

Closing criteria: (i) A pilot monitoring report document against the result based framework including the identification of a sustainable approach for long term monitoring and evaluation reporting of the projects. (ii) Project framework includes gender indicators linked to specific activities, whenever possible. Engage WIPO's Gender and Diversity Specialist to facilitate the design and implementation of a specific gender-equality plan for the ASPAC Bureau, encompassing capacity-building for staff, focused approaches for work with National IP Offices and other national stakeholders.

- (2) The ASPAC Bureau should not increase the number of projects beyond the already existing 10 projects. Focus should continue to be on quality rather than on quantity.

Closing criteria: Number of projects have not increased in the next biennium.