World Intellectual Property Organization

Internal Memorandum



Organisation Mondiale de la Propriété Intellectuelle

Mémorandum Interne

INTERNAL AUDIT AND OVERSIGHT DIVISION

REVISED WIPO EVALUATION POLICY

The present WIPO Evaluation Policy has been reviewed after three years of implementation as required in the approved 2007 WIPO Evaluation Policy. This Evaluation Policy supersedes the previous WIPO Evaluation Policy and comes into effect upon approval by the Director General.

May 4, 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

PART ONE: POLICY FRAMEWORK FOR WIPO'S INDEPENDENT EVALUATION 1

1. EVALUATION DEFINITION 1
2. TYPES OF EVALUATIONS WITHIN WIPO 2
3. PURPOSE AND ROLE OF INDEPENDENT EVALUATION IN WIPO 3
4. INDEPENDENCE OF THE IAOD EVALUATION SECTION 4
5. EVALUATION STAKEHOLDERS 5

PART TWO: IMPLEMENTATION PROCEDURES AND ARRANGEMENTS 5

1. WORK PLANNING AND BUDGETING 5
2. INDEPENDENT EVALUATION PRODUCTS 6

PART 3: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES 9

1. ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF WIPO MEMBER STATES 9
2. ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DIRECTOR GENERAL 9
3. RESPONSIBILITIES OF PROJECT AND PROGRAM MANAGERS 9
4. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE IAOD EVALUATION SECTION 10

PART 4: REPORTING, FOLLOW UP, DISCLOSURE AND DISSEMINATION 12

1. REPORTING 12
2. FOLLOW-UP AND USE OF EVALUATION FINDINGS 12
3. DISCLOSURE AND DISSEMINATION 13

PART 5: IMPLEMENTATION AND REVIEW OF THE EVALUATION POLICY 14

1. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE POLICY 14
2. REVIEW OF THE POLICY 14

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1: EVALUATION CRITERIA 15

ANNEX 2: GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR EVALUATION 17

INTRODUCTION

1. The WIPO Evaluation Policy (hereinafter "the Policy") constitutes the framework for the evaluation function of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), and aims at strengthening existing WIPO Evaluation Guidelines for Evaluation.

2. The Policy is a follow-up to the approval by the WIPO General Assembly in September 2005 of the WIPO Internal Audit Charter, which stipulates that "evaluation…is the subject of a policy framework outside this Charter"[1]. The Policy complements the WIPO Internal Audit Charter and helps ensure that all WIPO oversight functions are governed by adequate guiding principles.

3. The Policy has been prepared in accordance with international best practice, taking due account of the Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN System adopted by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG)[2], and other international good practices.

4. The purpose of the Policy is to provide a comprehensive framework for planning and conducting independent evaluations as well as informing policy and strategic decisions with evaluation evidence that helps improve the development impact of WIPO's activities. The Policy aims to enhance the generation and use of value-added evaluative information for (i) decision-making processes concerning the improvement of present and future activities; (ii) policy formulation and review by Member States; and, (iii) management oversight by the Director General. The Policy emphasizes that evaluation is an organizational responsibility focusing on learning and accountability, and that it applies to independent evaluations conducted throughout the Organization.

5. The Policy describes: the concept and role of evaluation within WIPO; the roles and responsibilities of program and project managers and the IAOD Evaluation Section[3]; and, the prioritization, planning, management, conduct, budgeting, follow-up and use of evaluations.

6. The present Policy has been reviewed in April 2010 after three years of implementation as required in the approved 2007 WIPO Evaluation Policy. This Evaluation Policy supersedes the previous Policy and comes into effect upon approval by the Director General in fulfillment of the obligation of the Director General to establish a system for planning, conducting and using evaluation information for decision-making, as indicated in the Financial Regulations and Rules, Regulation 2.15.

PART ONE: POLICY FRAMEWORK FOR WIPO'S INDEPENDENT EVALUATION

1. EVALUATION DEFINITION

7. An evaluation is an assessment, as systematic and impartial as possible, of an activity, project, program, strategy, policy, topic, theme, sector, operational area, institutional performance etc whether financed from regular budget or extra budgetary resources[4] (hereinafter referred to collectively as "activities"). It focuses on expected and achieved accomplishments, examining the results chain, processes, contextual factors and causality, in order to understand achievements or the lack thereof. It aims at determining the relevance, impact, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of WIPO activities and contributions. Evaluation provides evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful, enabling the timely incorporation of findings, recommendations and lessons into the decision-making processes of the organizations of WIPO and its Member States[5].

[1] Document A/41/11 Annex II, page 1, footnote 1.

[2] Including the Ethical Guidelines for UN Evaluators

[3] To better distinguish the various oversight functions and activities, namely, internal audit, inspection, investigation, inspection has been created within Internal Oversight.

[4] Evaluation of extra-budgetary activities may be carried out at the request of, and in cooperation with, concerned parties.

[5] This definition draws on Regulation 7.1 of Article VIII of ST/SGB/2000/8 and from the widely accepted Principles for Evaluation of the Development Assistance Committee of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD DAC).

8. Evaluation examines processes and contextual factors to understand why, and to what extent, expected results have been achieved, and what impact they have had. Evaluation also examines unintended results.

9. Evaluation looks at whether the right things are being done and whether they are done correctly. It examines the rationale and the justification of activities. It assesses the effectiveness of achieving expected results, and it examines the efficiency of the use of inputs to achieve results. Finally, evaluation recommends and suggests better ways of achieving expected results. It looks at alternative ways, good practices and lessons learned.

10. By providing evidence-based information, evaluation is an important component for organizational knowledge building and learning. Evaluation also supports accountability and transparency.

11. Evaluation is not intended to evaluate the personal performance of individuals.

2. TYPES OF EVALUATIONS WITHIN WIPO

12. The evaluation function- distinct from monitoring[6], supervision, or quality assurance has two forms within WIPO, namely self-evaluation and independent evaluation.

(a) Self-evaluations

13. Self-evaluations are primarily conducted by: a) program managers and implementers themselves; b) by program managers and implementers with the support of external evaluators; or c) solely by external experts but financed by the program themselves. Self-evaluation processes are used to measure the achievement of results of program activities. Self-evaluations in WIPO are also represented through its Program Performance Report (PPR) which is undertaken on an annual basis by the program managers themselves. The PPR is a critically important tool to ensure accountability and transparency of WIPO work and performance. The performance indicators and expected results are validated each biennium by the IAOD Evaluation Section.

(b) Independent Evaluations

14. Independent evaluations in WIPO are those designed, conducted and managed by the IAOD Evaluation Section in accordance with international independence criteria and following UNEG evaluation principles, where possible in collaboration with development partners and when necessary with the support of external evaluators. To ensure that the evaluation function's independence, integrity and influence are protected; it is overseen by the Audit Committee. Independent Evaluations in WIPO have the following characteristics:

(a) Governance arrangements that ensure independence, quality and transparency.

(b) A systematic approach, following international evaluation principles and criteria.

(c) Usefulness for policy and decision making and for public accountability.

(d) Going beyond the immediate objectives of the activity to ask why and how it works.

(e) Including investigating the theory and assumptions behind the intended effects and checking for unintended effects.

[6] Monitoring is defined as a continuous follow-up in relation to pre-set targets and objectives. It provides records of activities and results, and signals problems to be remedied along the way. It may not be able to explain why a particular result has occurred or failed to occur.

(f) Publication.

(g) Dissemination and stakeholder discussion for learning and wider decision making.

15. The IAOD Evaluation Section is part of WIPO's Oversight functions, and also independently from other WIPO management functions to ensure impartial reporting. The IAOD Evaluation Section reports to the Director of Internal Audit and Oversight Division (hereinafter referred to as "Director, IAOD") who in turns reports directly to the Director General. The Director, IAOD also interacts directly with the Audit Committee, the Program and Budget Committee as well as the Assembly of Member States.

3. PURPOSE AND ROLE OF INDEPENDENT EVALUATION IN WIPO

16. The main purpose of the independent evaluation function at WIPO is to promote and to ensure substantive (rather than financial) accountability of the investments made, and as a basis for learning to improve the relevance and quality of future actions.

17. Within the specific context of the UN, the independent evaluation function at WIPO helps to ensure the accountability of WIPO, their managers and staff, to its Member States, as well as to national stakeholders (particularly national governments). At the same time, it supports reflection and learning by the Member States, management and staff, as well as national stakeholders, on the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, coordination, coherence and coverage of WIPO activities, so as to be able to improve on them.

18. Evaluation serves this dual purpose through the provision of reliable and credible evaluative evidence, analyses and informs Member States, the Director General, program managers, staff, and national stakeholders, on WIPO's activities and their impact. These evaluation outputs are provided in the form of evaluation reports, briefings, various information exchanges and other evaluation products; including the act of conducting or participating in the evaluation itself. In order to be of use, they have to be provided in a timely manner, in relation to the different organizations' program planning, budgeting, implementation and reporting cycles.

19. Because evaluation has to simultaneously support both accountability and learning at different levels of governance, oversight, management, and operations, the conduct of evaluation has to be carried out at these different levels within WIPO.

20. WIPO's evaluation approach has been developed following internationally accepted evaluation norms and principles.[7] It also takes into account the specific features that make WIPO different from other UN agencies since it is a fee-for services based organization, in particular, the evolving but not yet fully effective performance system of WIPO operations and WIPO supported activities, the absence of field presence and the limited resources available for activities monitoring and learning from operations. All these have implications for the independent evaluation function at WIPO. Therefore, the IAOD Evaluation Section must ground its evaluation in extensive fieldwork and generate much of the evaluation-based knowledge that WIPO required to learn from past operational experiences in order to improve future ones.

21. In addition to the above, the IAOD Evaluation Section provides guidelines and technical inputs for enhancing the capacity of WIPO operational sectors, departments, divisions, units and sections; and WIPO assisted activities to undertake self-evaluations.

[7] As set down in the UNEG Norms, Standards, Code of Conduct, Ethical Guidelines and OECD/DAC "Principles for Evaluation Development 1991 Assistance", OECD. Paris

4. INDEPENDENCE OF THE IAOD EVALUATION SECTION

22. WIPO is committed to safeguarding the independence of evaluation to reduce biases. Independence is fundamental to ensure impartiality of evaluation throughout the selection, conduct and reporting on evaluations, and therefore contribute to the credibility, quality and utility of evaluation.

23. To attain this objective, the independence of evaluation is secured by adhering to internationally accepted independence criteria:

Organizational Independence: The IAOD Evaluation Section is part of the IAOD and it performs its function independently from other WIPO Management functions to ensure impartial and independent reporting. The Director, IAOD reports directly to the Director General, the Audit Committee, the Program and Budget Committee and the General Assembly. The IAOD Evaluation Section has full discretion in establishing the evaluation work plan including the selection of subjects for evaluation, in line with the Evaluation Policy set out herein; full authority over the management of human and financial resources for evaluation; and is independent in supervising of and reporting on evaluations. The areas in which risks to the independence of evaluation exist are:

i) The planning process, where influence can bias the selection of subjects of evaluation, preventing evaluation from analyzing poor performance or directing it to highlight success stories.

ii) Funding of evaluations, which can be used to influence whether evaluations are carried out, how they are conducted and how they report their findings.

iii) Reporting of evaluations, which if not independent, can lead to censorship of evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations.

To prevent these risks from materializing, the IAOD Evaluation Section institutionalized the independence of evaluation in the following ways:

i) Independence in planning of evaluation. The IAOD Evaluation Section chooses subjects for evaluations in line with the established evaluation criteria and principles. The IAOD Evaluation Section prepares its work plan based on professional judgment, while consulting with stakeholders to ensure the utility of evaluations.

ii) Independence of funding. The funding for IAOD is approved by the General Assembly, as part of WIPO's Program and Budget Document, and is managed by the Director, IAOD.

Behavioral Independence: Evaluators (The IAOD Evaluation Section staff and externally contracted evaluation consultants) have to exercise personal integrity and behavioral independence. The evaluation reports are based on evidence and stakeholders are consulted at the various stages of the evaluation process. Behavioral independence shall not result in repercussions for staff in their career advancement or otherwise: managing or conducting evaluations that might lead to critical conclusions shall not be considered negatively in the performance assessment of staff or affect their prospects for promotion.

Protection from outside interference: The IAOD Evaluation Section is responsible for designing and executing the evaluation and evaluators results will not be subject to overruling or influence by any external authority. All evaluation reports are posted on the WIPO website and are accessible to the public. The IAOD Evaluation Section staff and externally contracted evaluation consultants will be protected against undue influence to enable them to express their opinions in an objective and impartial manner.

Avoidance of conflict of interest: IAOD will assure that the evaluators undertaking the evaluation will in no manner have an official, professional, personal or financial relation with any

WIPO program and that he/she does not have any current or previous involvement with the development oriented activities including technical assistance or the entity being evaluated at a decision making level, or in a financial management or accounting role; or seeking employment with the Organization.

5. EVALUATION STAKEHOLDERS

24. WIPO recognizes that evaluation has a number of important stakeholders with a range of perspectives and expectations. Stakeholders include:

(a) WIPO's Member States: WIPO's strategic direction, budget and activities are determined by its Member States, who meet in the Assemblies, Committees and other decision making bodies. The General Assembly, which is represented by the Member States, approves the allocation of WIPO resources with the expectation of achieving tangible and measurable impact in terms of contributing towards and Intellectual Property (IP) system, which rewards creativity, stimulates innovation and contributes to economic development while safeguarding the public interest, and does also oversee the IAOD Evaluation Section's independent evaluation work.

(b) The end-beneficiaries of WIPO's supported activities for whom the success or failure of WIPO's activities has the most direct and long-lasting implications.

(c) Stakeholders whose performance in managing WIPO-assisted operations and carrying out WIPO policies is evaluated by the IAOD Evaluation Section, namely:

i) WIPO operational sectors, divisions, sections, units, grouped under the various programs, and WIPO Senior Management concerned with coorporate level policies and strategies.

ii) Cooperating partners.

iii) Non-governmental organizations (NGOs), civil society organizations, and other organizations that are engaged in WIPO-assisted support.

(d) User groups – people who use the resources or services in an area.

(e) Interest groups – people who have an interest in, an opinion about, or who can affect the use of, a resource or service.

(f) Co-financiers that supplement WIPO's resources in particular projects.

(g) Those often excluded from the decision making process.

PART TWO: IMPLEMENTATION PROCEDURES AND ARRANGEMENTS

1. WORK PLANNING AND BUDGETING

(a) Planning of Independent Evaluations

25. Biennial Evaluation Plans will be submitted to the Director, IAOD for his/her approval. The Director, IAOD will present the plans to the Director General for comments. The Plans will indicate the independent evaluations to be carried out by the IAOD Evaluation Section during a biennium. Planning priorities will be based on risk-assessment, size and needs for evaluation. The Plans will be based on the selection of a critical mass of evaluations that, according to the Evaluation Section, is required for promoting accountability and learning in WIPO. Every Plan will include a mix of different

types of evaluation. The Director, IAOD shall received request for evaluation services from the Director General, to be included in the evaluation plans, but the Director, IAOD is free to carry out any action within the purview of his/her mandate.

26. The IAOD Evaluation Section budget builds on the Plan and will be divided into two. The Plans will also include an estimate of resources required for their implementation.

(b) Resources for Evaluation

27. The IAOD Evaluation Section will be provided with adequate human resources to enable it to perform its mandate in accordance with the WIPO Evaluation Policy. Sufficient non-staff resources will be allocated to ensure that adequate funds are available for the planning, conduct, reporting, dissemination and follow-up of evaluations in accordance with the biennial Evaluation Plan. The total budget for evaluation shall be an integral part of the WIPO biennial Program and Budget.

28. Adequate resources will also be allocated for the undertaking of evaluation capacity building and training activities.

29. The resources necessary for conducting effective self-evaluations by program and project managers will be integrated into the corresponding program and project budgets.

2. INDEPENDENT EVALUATION PRODUCTS

30. To ensure that WIPO generates knowledge and learning based on evaluative evidence that is used for better delivery to WIPO stakeholders, the IAOD Evaluation Section supports the conduction/undertaking of different types of evaluations: country, thematic, strategic and/or program evaluations; and applies a realistic and utilization-focused evaluation approach to all its independent evaluations. The different evaluations are strengthened through quality assurance mechanisms, and their results will be carefully followed up for extracting knowledge and obtaining a management response with agreed actions for improvement and learning.

31. The IAOD Evaluation Section seek to achieve best practice in all its evaluation work by setting and following principles and quality standards set by the OECD/DAC, the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) and other international evaluation bodies and networks and using internationally-agreed evaluation criteria.

(a) Strategic evaluations

32. These evaluations analyze the Organization’s performance and contribution to critical areas for greater effectiveness. These evaluations may also assess the Organization’s contribution in the achievement of the strategic results to which the Organization is accountable.

33. Strategic evaluations in WIPO analyze its contribution to critical areas for greater effectiveness and impact on developing a balance and accessible international IP system. Strategic evaluations in WIPO are considered of strategic nature as they provide knowledge on policy issues, programmatic approaches, cooperation modalities, etc. The WIPO Medium-Term Strategy, with the goals, outcomes, outputs and key performance indicators established in its results-based frameworks constitutes the overall strategic and programmatic framework of the Organization at its different levels. Strategy and policy evaluations are independent high-level assessments looking at relevance, as well as how to improve effectiveness, efficiency, and impact.

(b) Thematic evaluations

34. These evaluations are designed to assess the effectiveness of WIPO's processes and approaches and to contribute to increasing the Organization's knowledge on selected issues and subjects.

35. It involves the "*evaluation of a selection of development interventions, all of which address a specific development priority that cuts across countries, regions, and sectors"* (OECD/DAC, 2002). Generally themes are borne out of policy statements and are often termed as crosscutting issues. Themes could be developed within a defined sector (e.g.: within Infrastructure sector, one may identify as a theme, capacity building or gender). Independent thematic evaluations have proved to be useful instruments in generating specific knowledge and recommendations at the highest level of aggregation, i.e. the policy level.

36. Independent thematic evaluations address the short-term, medium-term and long-term results of a cluster of related WIPO development oriented activities including technical assistance in a given strategic thematic area or outcome in a region or within a country. They include an assessment of the effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and relevance of development-oriented activities including technical assistance against their own objectives, their combined contribution, and the contribution of external factors and actors. Thematic evaluations also examine non-intended effects of the development-oriented activities. In cases in which WIPO has in place a strategy for a country or a region, then an assessment of such a strategy is considered in this type of evaluations. Their findings will be used for strategic policy and programmatic decisions at the regional level, as well as strategic decisions.

(c) Country level evaluations

37. These evaluations provide an assessment of the performance and impact of WIPO's supported activities in countries with a large WIPO portfolio. In particular, independent country program evaluations are expected to provide information on the most essential aspects of an intervention performance and to contribute to developing strategic and operational orientation for WIPO's future activities in individual countries.

38. Country level evaluations in WIPO assess the relevance, coordination and coherence of the WIPO assistance provided to one country and its national constituents (e.g.: government institutions, private sector, communities etc). This type of evaluation is expected to generate knowledge in order to improve future assistance to the country and other national country programs. Country level evaluations are important for serving as a basis for bilateral negotiations.

(d) Program evaluations

39. These are in depth evaluations of WIPO Programs as defined and described in the WIPO Program and Budget document.

40. Overall, independent program level evaluations assess the efficiency and effectiveness of an intervention or set of interventions in achieving the intended results. They also assess the relevance and sustainability of results as contributions to medium-term and longer-term results. An independent program evaluation can be invaluable for managing for results, and serves to reinforce the accountability and learning of program managers.

41. Additionally, independent program evaluations provide a basis for the evaluation of expected results and programs, and for distilling lessons from experience for learning and sharing knowledge. Ideally, independent program level evaluations should be planned at the design stage of the program.

(e) Project-level evaluations (only for projects above Sfr 1 million)

42. This involves evaluation of an intervention designed to achieve specific objectives within specified resources and implementation schedule; the project could be part of a broader program.

43. Project evaluations are undertaken throughout the implementation cycle. The different types of project-level evaluations share the purpose of assessing implementation achievement, impact and sustainability, thus contributing to learning and ultimately to the improvement of project impact and performance.

(f) Organizational Assessments

44. These are aimed at understanding and improving performance looking at four key pillars: Effectiveness, Efficiency, Financial Sustainability and Relevance. Organizational assessments can be used as a diagnostic tool for organizations implementing an internal change or strategic planning process, or both. Organizational assessment goes beyond measuring the results of an organization's programs, products and services[8].

[8] Lusthaus C., Adrien M., Anderson C. and Carden F. 1999

PART THREE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

45. Evaluation will be an integral part of WIPO's organizational culture. There will be a firm commitment at all levels of the Organization to ensure that evaluations are effectively planned, conducted and used.

1. ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF WIPO MEMBER STATES

46. WIPO Member States set the enabling environment for independent evaluation with the approval of this Evaluation Policy. It exercises an oversight function over evaluation in that it:

(a) Provides strategic guidance to the evaluation function through the General Assembly on evaluation, with documented minutes and decisions, as appropriate.

(b) Reviews the work plan and budget as set out in WIPO's Program and Budget Document.

47. WIPO Member States are responsible for:

(a) Discussing selected evaluation reports, including annual and biennial synthesis reports, and taking decisions that guide management in its follow-up actions to the evaluation recommendations.

(b) Holding management responsible for corporate, timely and substantive management responses, and for follow-up to evaluation recommendations, including changes to policies and practices warranted by evaluation reports and lessons learned.

(c) Using evaluation findings and recommendations in its decision-making.

2. ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DIRECTOR GENERAL

48. The Director General is responsible for safeguarding the independence of the IAOD Evaluation Section by:

(a) Ensuring compliance with the Evaluation Policy set out herein, in particular that structural and institutional parameters of independence are met.

(b) Allocating adequate resources – human and financial – to ensure the evaluation function can be carried out professionally, with integrity and in line with the Evaluation Policy set out herein.

(c) Fostering a corporate culture of accountability and learning as an enabling environment for independent evaluation and the embedding of evaluation principles into management and decision-making at WIPO.

(d) Institutionalizing a mechanism to ensure that corporate, substantive management responses to evaluation recommendations are prepared and submitted at the same time as the evaluation report is discussed by the General Assembly, follow-up actions are implemented and progress on their implementation is reported annually to the General Assembly.

3. RESPONSIBILITIES OF PROJECT AND PROGRAM MANAGERS

49. Specifically, program and project managers will ensure that:

(a) WIPO activities are part of a results framework by recording baseline information at the outset, defining performance indicators and setting targets for expected results.

(b) Implementation of activities are monitored, assessed and reviewed regularly on their performance. A biennial self-evaluation report should be mandatory for all operations.

(c) The WIPO Evaluation Policy, WIPO evaluation procedures, methodologies, principles and guidelines are adhered to and applied.

(d) they are supporting independent evaluations by engaging in consultations, sharing and providing free access to the IAOD Evaluation Section staff and externally contracted evaluation consultants to all information on activities that is necessary to conduct evaluations in a comprehensive, objective and impartial manner and that they can conduct interviews as deemed necessary on activities, and facilitating the evaluation process including and participating in meetings with evaluators and giving feedback on evaluation products.

(e) That independent evaluation is kept high on the agenda and to support independent evaluation throughout WIPO.

(f) Data is reliable and consistent when measuring performance and reporting.

(g) Incentives for staff to prioritize evaluation are strengthened, including, for example, recognition in staff performance management systems and through the management chain.

(h) They will collect, showcase and where feasible reward examples of best practice.

(i) The evaluability of WIPO programs and projects is enhanced and that programs and projects are systematically evaluated.

(j) Adequate monitoring and evaluation capacity exist among their staff.

(k) Self-evaluations are conducted according to specific procedures and in compliance with WIPO evaluation policies and guidelines.

(l) Evaluation results are appropriately shared and effectively used within the Organization.

(m) Evaluation results are integrated into wider lesson learning systems in WIPO and among their stakeholders.

(n) Information and knowledge management is improved so that evidence gathered from evaluations and other sources feed into policy and programming.

(o) There is a strong management response to findings and recommendations, and that those recommendations which are accepted are followed up and reported on.

4. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE IAOD EVALUATION SECTION

50. The Director, IAOD will ensure that the IAOD Evaluation Section:

(a) Manages in an efficient and effective manner the Section by:

i) Developing an evaluation strategy.

ii) Preparing a biennial Evaluation Plan.

iii) Selecting evaluation topics that are relevant to WIPO's development effectiveness.

iv) Preparing Terms of Reference (hereinafter referred as ToRs) for each independent evaluation, in full consultation with program and project managers, and submits the ToRs to the Director, IAOD for approval.

v) Preparing Annual Evaluation Reports.

vi) Managing the IAOD Evaluation Section budget in an efficient manner.

vii) Following up evaluations, tracked by the IAOD Evaluation Section and reported in its Annual Report.

(b) Contributes to the professionalism of evaluation by:

i) Having staff with a relevant educational background, qualification and training in evaluation, as well as professional work experience, conducting evaluations.

ii) Managing the work of external evaluation consultants.

iii) Being the WIPO focal point for evaluation, exchanges information and cooperates with other UN entities and other organizations as deemed appropriate.

(c) Contributes to the enhancement of the evaluation culture by:

i) Developing, updating and publishing, on a regular basis, evaluation strategies, procedures, methodologies and guidelines applicable to the whole Organization, in line with developments and good practice both within and outside the UN System.

ii) Initiates, plans and implements evaluation awareness raising and capacity development activities internally at WIPO, and, when requested, may assist IP institutions in Member States to enhance their evaluation capacities.

(d) Conducts evaluation work in an adequate manner by:

i) Designing, conducting and managing independent evaluations in accordance with the Evaluation Plan.

ii) Reviewing and evaluating the adequacy of organizational structures, systems and processes to ensure that the results are consistent with the objectives established.

iii) Assessing and evaluating the effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, sustainability, coordination, coherence, coverage and impact of WIPO's activities, recommend and suggest better ways of achieving results, taking into account good practices and lessons learned.

iv) Assessing whether WIPO activities are producing the expected results through commissioning, carrying out and publishing independent evaluations.

v) Ensuring the quality and timeliness of evaluations produced and published by the Section.

vi) Recommending actions aimed at improving WIPO's development effectiveness and impact based on evaluation findings. This may include commissioning periodic evaluations of the overall effectiveness of WIPO's work, or of a substantial part of it, drawing on the results of more specific evaluations.

vii) Protecting the independence of the IAOD Evaluation Section evaluators and evaluation consultants contracted by the Section.

viii) Participating in key WIPO decision-making committees such as those reviewing new policies and activities, to help ensure that evaluation results and recommendations are adequately considered in WIPO's major decision-making processes.

ix) validating evaluation findings, and discussing conclusions and recommendations with the concerned program and project managers and, as appropriate, stakeholders involved in the evaluation exercise to ensure fair, factual and useful reports, prior to finalization of evaluation reports. For independent evaluations, final judgment on disputed wording will be made by the IAOD Evaluation Section.

x) Providing all evaluators with full access to existing information and data they might required for their work.

xi) Following the evaluation principles identified as part of the Policy and Independent Evaluation Guidelines.

xii) Developing and maintaining a roster of external independent evaluators suitable for independent evaluation of WIPO's activities.

xiii) Validating the data/evidence used to report against the Program Performance Report.

xiv) Reporting to the Director General any case of serious misconduct or other wrongdoing which emerges from evaluations.

(e) Contributing to the Organization's learning by:

i) Promoting and supporting best practice in development evaluation and developing appropriate and user-friendly mechanisms for the collection, publication and dissemination of lessons learned.

ii) Creating fora with internal and external stakeholders to share and discuss findings and feeding into future decision-making.

iii) Developing and maintaining a public WIPO web site dealing with evaluation.

PART 4: REPORTING, FOLLOW UP, DISCLOSURE AND DISSEMINATION

1. REPORTING

51. The draft reports of the independent evaluations carried out in the framework of the Evaluation Plan will be subject to consultation with program and project managers and their comments will be duly reflected in the report.

52. Final evaluation reports will be submitted to the Director General by the Director, IAOD.

53. An Annual Evaluation Report on the implementation of the Evaluation Plan will be prepared and will summarize all evaluation activities, lessons learned, and the progress on the implementation of agreed evaluation recommendations. The Annual Evaluation Report will be submitted to the Director General and presented to the WIPO General Assembly.

2. FOLLOW-UP AND USE OF EVALUATION FINDINGS

54. The Director, IAOD will convey completed evaluation reports and other operations and the Annual IAOD Evaluation Section Reports, simultaneously to the Director General and the Audit Committee.

55. There will be an internal mechanism to ensure that agreed recommendations are followed-up and implemented in a timely manner. Program and project managers will be responsible for the implementation of agreed evaluation recommendations.

56. The Director General will be responsible for ensuring that evaluation recommendations found feasible by the users are adopted at the operational, strategic and policy levels (as appropriate) and their implementation adequately tracked.

3. DISCLOSURE AND DISSEMINATION

57. An explicit response to evaluations, through the establishment of appropriate mechanisms for collecting, processing and disseminating evaluation results within WIPO will be developed to ensure that experience and knowledge gained from past work is documented, and that lessons learned are effectively used in managing-for-results.

58. The IAOD Evaluation Section will produce for each evaluation an evaluation summary that provides an overview of the main evaluation conclusions and recommendations, and “Insights” that contain one learning theme from the evaluation and serve to stimulate discussion among practitioners and other development specialists on some important issues.

59. The IAOD Evaluation Section will ensure that all evaluation reports are disclosed to the public at the completion of the evaluation process and disseminated widely through the print and electronic media in accordance with WIPO’s disclosure policy.

60. WIPO will professionalize the communication of its evaluation findings to increase the traction of recommendations and ensure accessibility to a wider audience. WIPO will strengthen tracking systems in support of this.

PART 5: IMPLEMENTATION AND REVIEW OF THE EVALUATION POLICY

1. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE POLICY

61. The IAOD Evaluation Section will develop a five year strategic plan and evaluation plans which will be rolled out over a two-year period, reflecting resource availability and the other demands on WIPO staff. The Evaluation Strategy will include a logic monitoring framework for the IAOD Evaluation Section.

62. Implementation of the policy will be monitored annually and progress reported as part of the IAOD Evaluation Section's annual report. A baseline assessment will be undertaken as the strategy is developed and an evaluation of the delivery against the policy undertaken after five years.

2. REVIEW OF THE POLICY

63. This Policy will be reviewed no later than three years after its adoption taking into account lessons learned from its implementation and international developments in the evaluation profession.

ANNEX 1: EVALUATION CRITERIA[9]

The DAC criteria are designed to promote compressive evaluations. For this reason, the criteria are complementary. For example, evaluation of effectiveness may show that objectives were met, but this does not necessarily mean that the objectives were appropriate for the entire target group, were met efficiently, are sustainable, or feed into impact. Similarly, an activity by one agency can achieve good coverage, but may not be coordinated with other activities. Using the DAC criteria in combination will help to ensure that an evaluation covers all areas of the activity. All the criteria applied here and its definitions can be found in the OECD/DAC (2002) Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management.

Relevance

Relevance is concerned with assessing whether the activity is in line with local needs and priorities, as well as WIPO's mandate.

Relevance is a question of usefulness or pertinence to the needs of those the program is geared to. The assessment of relevance leads to decisions whether the activity ought to continue or to be terminated. Relevance can be measure at various levels: organizational, stakeholders and program relevance. Relevance is also linked to the appropriateness of the activity.

Effectiveness

This is used to measure the extent to which the activities expected results or specific intermediate objectives have been achieved or are expected to be achieved. An activity is considered as effective when its outputs (services or products) produce the desired objectives and expected results. Assessing the effectiveness involves an analysis of the extent to which stated activity objectives are met.

Efficiency

Efficiency measures how inputs (i.e. expertise, time, budget, etc.) are converted into results; it expresses the relationship between outputs (services produced by an activity) and inputs (the resources put in place).

An activity is considered to be efficient when it uses the least costly resources, but appropriate in order to achieve the desired outputs. In general, assessing efficiency requires comparing alternative approaches which can achieve same outputs. As in the case of effectiveness, it might be easier to assess efficiency of less complex activities than for others.

Impact

Impact measures the effects of an activity; these effects or changes could be positive or negative, intended or unintended on the target groups of the activity. While effectiveness focuses on the attainment of expected results of an activity, impact is a broader consequence of an activity at social, economic, political, technical or environmental level. Impact examines the longer-term consequences of achieving or not achieving those objectives, and the issue of wider socioeconomic change.

Due to the wider scope, assessment of impact may not be relevant for all evaluations, particularly those carried out during or immediately after an activity. Changes in socioeconomic and political processes may take months and in most cases years to become apparent.

Sustainability

This is concerned with measuring whether the Organization's benefits are likely to continue after its funding has been withdrawn. This is an assessment of whether the activity is likely to be used in the future, and will be maintained. It assesses the long-term benefits of WIPO's support.

---

[9] OECD/DAC (2002) Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management.

Coverage

Evaluation of coverage involves determining who was supported by the activity; and why and also determining why certain groups were covered or not. Coverage is linked closely to effectiveness and often refers to numbers or percentages of the population to be covered by the activity.

Coherence

The needs to assess and to ensure that there is consistency within WIPO's activities and policies, as well as between WIPO policies and that of national and international policies related to IP. As assessment of coherence focuses on policy level, it should look at the policies of different actors, and whether WIPO's policies are complementary or contradictory to those of other actors. This criterion would be very useful in particular while conducting Strategy and Policy evaluations by IAOD. Evaluating coherence is of particular importance when there are a number of actors providing support, as they may have conflicting mandates and interests.

Co-ordination

It is not a formal DAC criterion but is important to consider coordination in all WIPO evaluations. Coordination is "the systematic use of policy instruments to deliver support in a cohesive and effective manner. Such instruments include strategic planning, gathering data and managing information, mobilizing resources and ensuring accountability, orchestring a functional division of labor, negotiating and maintaining a serviceable framework with host political authorities and providing leadership" (Minear et al, 1992).

Whereas coherence focuses on whether policies of different actors are in line with each other, coordination focuses more on the practical effects of actions of governments and agencies. An activity of a single institution cannot be evaluated in isolation from what others are doing, particularly as what may seem appropriate from the point of view of a single actor, may not be appropriate from the point of view of the system as a whole. Evaluating coordination includes assessing both harmonization with other aid agencies and alignment with country priorities and systems.

ANNEX 2: GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR EVALUATION

In accordance with the proposed evaluation policy, the evaluation function at WIPO will operate in line with internationally accepted principles for all its independent evaluations.

Usefulness

Proper application of the evaluation function implies that there is a clear intent to use evaluation findings. In the context of limited resources, the planning and selection of evaluation work has to be carefully done. Evaluations must be chosen and undertaken in a timely manner so that they can and do inform decision-making with relevant and timely information.

Impartiality

Impartiality is the absence of bias in due process, methodological rigor, consideration and presentation of achievements and challenges. It also implies that the views of all stakeholders are taken into account. In the event that interested parties have different views, these are to be reflected in the evaluation analysis and reporting. Impartiality increases the credibility of evaluation and reduces the bias in the data gathering, analysis, findings, conclusions and recommendations. Impartiality provides legitimacy to evaluation and reduces the potential for conflict of interest. The requirement for impartiality exists at all stages of the evaluation process, including the planning of evaluation, the formulation of mandate and scope, the selection of evaluation teams, the conduct of the evaluation and the formulation of findings and recommendations.

Independence

IAOD evaluation function has been located independently from other management functions so that it is free from undue influence and that unbiased and transparent reporting is ensured. IAOD has full discretion in submitting directly its reports for consideration at the appropriate level of decision-making pertaining to the subject of evaluation. The IAOD Evaluation Section staff have the independence to supervise and report on evaluations as well as to track follow-up of management's response resulting from evaluation. To avoid conflict of interest and undue pressure, evaluators need to be independent, implying that members of an evaluation team must not have been directly responsible for the policy-setting, design, or overall management of the subject of evaluation, nor expect to be in the near future. Evaluators must have no vested interest and have the full freedom to conduct impartially their evaluative work, without potential negative effects on their career development. They must be able to express their opinion in a free manner. The independence of the evaluation function should not impinge the access that evaluators have to information on the subject of evaluation.

Quality of Evaluation

Each evaluation should employ design, planning and implementation processes that are inherently quality oriented, covering appropriate methodologies for data-collection, analysis and interpretation. Evaluation reports must present in a complete and balanced way the evidence, findings, conclusions and recommendations. They must be brief and to the point and easy to understand. They must explain the methodology followed, highlight the methodological limitations of the evaluation, key concerns and evidenced-based findings, dissident views and consequent conclusions, recommendations and lessons. They must have an executive summary that encapsulates the essence of the information contained in the report, and facilitate dissemination and distillation of lessons.

Competencies for Evaluation

Evaluators must have the skills and competencies for conducting evaluation studies and managing externally hired evaluators.

Transparency and Consultation

Transparency and consultation with the primary stakeholders are essential features in all stages of the evaluation process. This improves the credibility and quality of the evaluation. It can facilitate consensus building and ownership of the findings, conclusions and recommendations. Evaluation Terms of Reference and reports should be available to major stakeholders and be public documents. Documentation on evaluations in easily consultable and readable form should also contribute to both transparency and legitimacy.

Evaluation Ethics

Evaluators must have personal and professional integrity. Evaluators must respect the right of institutions and individuals to provide information in confidence and ensure that sensitive data cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators must take care that those involved in evaluations have a chance to examine the statements attributed to them. Evaluators must be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs of the social and cultural environments in which they work. In light of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender inequality. Evaluations sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Also, the evaluators are not expected to evaluate the personal performance of individuals and must balance an evaluation of management functions with due consideration for this principle.

Follow up to Evaluation

Evaluation requires an explicit response by the governing authorities and management addressed by its recommendations. This may take the form of a management response, action plan and/or agreement clearly stating responsibilities and accountabilities. For all its evaluations IAOD applies a management response system to track progress in the implementation of recommendations resulting from evaluation reports. The system is also applied to recommendations resulting from validation exercises undertaken by IAOD. There should be a systematic follow-up on the implementation of the evaluation recommendations that have been accepted by management and/or the Governing Bodies. There should be a periodic report on the status of the implementation of the evaluation recommendations. This report should be presented to the Governing Bodies and the Director General.

Contribution to Knowledge Building

Evaluation contributes to knowledge building and organizational improvement. Evaluations should be conducted and evaluation findings and recommendations presented in a manner that is easily understood by target audiences. Evaluation findings and lessons drawn from evaluations should be accessible to target audiences in a user-friendly way. A repository of evaluation could be used to distil lessons that contribute to peer learning and the development of structured briefing material for the training of staff. This should be done in a way that facilitates the sharing of learning among stakeholders, within WIPO, through a clear dissemination policy and contribution to knowledge networks.