



Internal Audit and Oversight Division

EVALUATION SECTION

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Project Evaluation:

Technology Innovation Support Centers (TISCs)

2009- 2011

December 22, 2011

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Project Evaluation: Technology Innovation Support Center (TISCs) 2009-2011

Type of exercise:	Project Evaluation
Evaluation Period:	2009-2011
Evaluation Manager:	Mr. Claude Hilfiker
Section:	Evaluation Section
Division:	Internal Audit and Oversight Division
External expert:	To be selected
Evaluation Start Date:	1st February 2012
Evaluation Completion Date:	31st May 2012

Terms of Reference

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	PROJECT BACKGROUND.....	4
II.	REASONS FOR THE EVALUATION	4
III.	SCOPE AND FOCUS	6
IV.	EVALUATION PROCESS, METHODS, APPROACH AND DELIVERABLES.....	8
V.	EVALUATION DISSEMINATION AND COMMUNICATION.....	11
VI.	LEARNING RESOURCE GROUP AND QUALITY ASSURANCE	12
VII.	EXISTING INFORMATION SOURCES	12
VIII.	EXTERNAL EXPERT SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE	12
IX.	ACCOUNTABILITIES AND MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS.....	13
X.	HOW TO APPLY FOR THIS ASSIGNMENT AND CONTRACTUAL ISSUES.....	14
ANNEXES		
	ANNEX 1: RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CONSULTANT	16
	ANNEX 2: SAMPLE INCEPTION REPORTING FORMAT	17
	ANNEX 3: SAMPLE EVALUATION REPORT	20
	ANNEX 4: IAOD EVALUATION SECTION CODE OF CONDUCT FOR EVALUATION CONSULTANTS	23
	ANNEX 5: IAOD EVALUATION SECTION CODE OF CONDUCT – EVALUATION CONSULTANTS AGREEMENT FORM	27
	ANNEX 6: OUTLINE OF A SAMPLE WORKPLAN.....	28
	ANNEX 7: WIPO INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS AND USERS OF THE EVALUATION	29

Terms of Reference

I. PROJECT BACKGROUND

The present document represents the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the evaluation of a specific Development Agenda Project under the Learning Evaluation Series. The present TOR outlines the reasons for the evaluation, the scope and methodologies for conducting the evaluation of this particular Development Agenda project.

During the first session of the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP), held in Geneva, in March 2008, member States of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) approved the working document CDIP/1/3¹ containing 45 recommendations for the implementation of WIPO's Development Agenda. The General Assemblies of WIPO subsequently adopted these recommendations.² The list of Development Agenda Recommendations can be found under the following link: <http://www.wipo.int/ip-development/en/agenda/recommendations.html>

Implementation of the TISCs, which is financed by the Development Agenda, started in April 2009. The aims of the TISCs are to:

- Carry out and take into consideration the results of a needs analysis and database review study;
- Provide access to specialized patent and non-patent databases for use by intellectual property offices and the public;
- Enable and support effective use of these databases by assisting countries in establishing local support in the form of Technology and Innovation Support Centers together with a corresponding network; and
- Provide training and awareness raising support for the staff of these centers and IPOs, as well as the general public.

All the above elements are implemented by the Innovation and Technology Support Section (ITSS).

II. REASONS FOR THE EVALUATION**RATIONALE**

One of the functions of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) is to offer legal and technical assistance in the field of intellectual property rights (IPRs) to all its member States. This also includes access to and use of patent information in order to contribute to the promotion of innovation and creativity for the economic, social and cultural development in developing countries. Patent information is increasingly available via easily accessible services that are delivered over the Internet either free-of-charge or as commercial fee-paying services. However, coverage and accessibility of patent data in developing and least developed countries (LDCs) is particularly limited. In view of these limitations and in line with WIPO's mandate, TISCs was created aiming to facilitate access

¹ <http://www.wipo.int/ip-development/en/agenda/recommendations.html>

² A/43/16

Terms of Reference

to technological knowledge and use of patent information for users in developing countries, especially LDCs, and their regional and sub-regional IP organizations.. The complete project framework will be provided on request to interested external experts.

Initial assessment missions under the TISCs were undertaken from mid 2009 to early 2010, while the first training events and launch of national TISCs networks started in May 2010. It is now nearly 20 months since this initial launch, when an assessment and evaluation of the outcome and usefulness of the training, as well as the actual situation regarding the national implementation and training approach, should be carried out. The total budget estimated for both projects is of Sfr 1.879.00.

By the end of 2011, assessment missions have been carried out in 41 countries in preparation for the establishment or development of TISCs in these countries. Within the framework of these assessment missions, information has been gathered from intellectual property offices (IPOs) and local stakeholders on national priorities relating to technology and innovation support and capacity building needs. Additionally, these missions have been combined with initial half-day training and awareness-raising activities.

Service Level Agreements (SLAs), which define respective responsibilities of WIPO and its national partners, in most cases the national IP Offices, in implementing the TISC project, have been signed to date by 29 countries.

By the end of 2011, initial or first training events on access and use of free-of-charge patent and non-patent databases, and which are considered as launching a national TISC network, have been carried out in 21 countries. Second training events on specific types of patent searches and more advanced practical exercises have been carried out in 6 countries.

.The evaluation will be undertaken and financed by the IAOD Evaluation Section and be part of its "Learning Evaluation Series".

This project evaluation is expected to start on 1st February 2012 and be finalized on 31st May 2012. In terms of methodology, the evaluation will follow guidance issued by the Evaluation Section, in a phased approach. The reporting language will be English.

OBJECTIVES

This evaluation is intended to be a participative evaluation. It should provide for active involvement in the evaluation process of those with a stake in the projects: partners, customers (beneficiaries), and any other interested parties.

The main objective of this evaluation is three fold:

- i. Learning from the existing experiences in order to improve future performance i.e. what worked well and did not work so well for the benefit of an eventual Phase II of the project or other similar future projects This includes assessing the existing project design framework, project management including monitoring and reporting tools, as well as measuring and reporting on the results achieved to date and indicate adjustments that may be required to ensure the successful implementation of the project;
- ii. Provide evidence based evaluative information to contribute to the decision making process of the CDIP and needs for information. The recommendations resulting from the evaluation report will be used to enhance the existing project framework and

Terms of Reference

implementation in order to seek further funding for an eventual project continuation Phase II of the project to be presented to the CDIP in May 2012.

III. SCOPE AND FOCUS

The project time frame is 3 years (2009-2011). The focus shall not be on assessing individual activities but rather to evaluate the project as a whole and its contribution to reducing the knowledge gap between developed and developing countries (specially LDCs), its evolution over time, its performance including project design, project management, achieved results, coordination, coherence, implementation and strategic role.

Overall the evaluation should assess:

Project design and management:

- (a) The appropriateness of the initial project document as a guide for project implementation and assessment of results achieved;
- (b) The project monitoring, self-evaluation and reporting tools and analyze whether they were useful and adequate to provide the project team and key stakeholders with relevant information for decision-making purposes;
- (c) The extent to which other entities within the Secretariat has contributed and enabled an effective and efficient project implementation;
- (d) The extent to which the risks identified in the initial project document have materialized or been mitigated;
- (e) The project's ability to respond to emerging trends, technologies and other external forces;

Effectiveness

- (f) The effectiveness of the project in achieving its main objectives, namely:
 - Increase availability of technological knowledge in developing countries, especially LDCs;
 - Increase the capacity of IP Offices, including regional and sub-regional organizations to carry out more effective patent searches by identifying known prior art and limiting the scope of granted patents where necessary;
 - Increase the capacity of IPOs to effectively disseminate this knowledge nationally/regionally and internationally; and
 - Increase awareness of the benefits of intellectual property rights, and patent information in particular.

Terms of Reference

- (g) The use by the project of the needs analysis for the selection of beneficiary countries for establishment of TISCs;
- (h) The effectiveness of training provided by the project for the management of TISCs;
- (i) The effectiveness of technical and innovation support and services (aRD, ASPI) provided by the project for the establishment of the TISCs;
- (j) The usefulness of the broader awareness raising events organized for a wider range of stakeholders (including IP Offices);
- (k) The use of the TISCs services (including access to specialized databases) in the countries where TISCs have been established and the extent to which the services meet stakeholders' needs;
- (l) The effectiveness of national TISC networks, in countries where more than one TISC has been established, their participation in the network and the nature and extent of exchange of information.

Only if possible sustainability

- (m) The likelihood for continued functioning of the TISCs after the completion of the project, including commitment and engagement by key national stakeholders (such as, for example, national IP offices, universities or chambers of commerce) and transfer of responsibilities and knowledge from the project to project stakeholders;

Lessons learned and Good Practices:

Identify key lessons in each of the above-mentioned areas of focus and on positioning that can provide a useful basis for strengthening the projects and its support to its stakeholders and for improving the effectiveness of the projects in the future. Present good practices at the project level for learning and replication. Draw lessons from unintended results.

Although gender mainstreaming has not been factor as part of the original project framework, all WIPO evaluations are required to consider and report on gender issues during the process. Therefore, whenever possible tools applied in this evaluation should factor gender concepts and make use of those during the analysis.

The evaluation results will be useful to: a) improve the project implementation approach, particularly with regard to assessing whether the national IP office is the most appropriate national institution for this role; b) the IP Offices' selection and coordination of national TISCs; c) the effectiveness of training, including the selection of training subjects and areas most useful for local users; d) improve internal WIPO coordination; among others. In addition to the above, it is expected from the evaluation to also analyze the possibilities of partnering with other national and international organizations, perhaps even possibly outsourcing, some of these external activities.

Terms of Reference

Evaluation questions:

Based on the scope above, the external expert will develop an evaluation question matrix, which will serve as the basis of the evaluation process.

Overall, the questions should aim at highlighting: a) the key lessons from the project implementation; b) its performance (effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, effectiveness, sustainability); c) the external environment issues and trends affecting the project performance; d) the institutional environment in which the project is being implemented; and the major capacity issues affecting the project performance which could inform future strategic and operational decisions.

IV. EVALUATION PROCESS, METHODS, APPROACH AND DELIVERABLES

Evaluability assessment

The Evaluation Section and the project team will provide the external expert with all in house existing relevant documentation required for this evaluation. Project frameworks are available and monitoring systems have been put in place. Sufficient relevant information is available in house. There is high interest by the project team to learn from this evaluation and use the results of the evaluation for informing its various stakeholders specially the CDIP on the progress achieved so far and, if necessary, improving project implementation.

Methodology

The evaluation methodology proposed, as part of this exercise should be aimed at balancing the needs for learning and accountability. It should provide for active involvement in the evaluation process of those with a stake in the project: project team, senior managers, national IP offices.

The external expert in consultation and collaboration with the project team and the ADG for Global Infrastructure Sector, the Evaluation Section and the Learning Resource Group will design the evaluation methodology and tools. The WIPO Independent Evaluation Guidelines should be used as a main reference document when developing the methodology. The evaluation will use a mix of the following methodologies:

- Demonstrate impartiality and lack of biases by relying on a cross-section of information sources (e.g. stakeholder groups, including beneficiaries, etc.) and using a mixed methodology (quantitative, qualitative, participatory) to ensure triangulation of information through a variety of means. The sampling technique to impartially select field visits sites and stakeholders to be interviewed should be specified.
- Employ a variety of methodologies aimed to address the various stakeholders' needs including methodologies like the most and least significant change methodology, empowerment evaluation methods among others combined with a mix of data collection tools including:
 - desk reviews of relevant project related documentation including project framework, progress reports, monitoring information, mission reports and other relevant documents including previous studies on TISCs; The External expert will review in house available documentation as well as overall project framework. The team will also consider select project documents and

Terms of Reference

programs support documents as well as any reports from monitoring and evaluation. Statistical data will be assessed where useful.

- stakeholder interviews and focus group interviews;
 - surveys of key users/clients;
 - telephone/video conferences with intellectual property organizations, government ministries/institutions, research institutions, civil society organizations, civil society and private sector representatives, UN agencies, bilateral donors, and beneficiaries. The external expert should envisage visits to project/field sites as required.
- Allow for aggregation of findings related to groups of activities across the various portfolio operations by ensuring that the focus is put on how groups of main activities across operations have contributed together to their respective goals.

This project evaluation is expected to start on 1st February 2012 and be finalized on 31st May 2012. In terms of methodology; the evaluation will follow guidance issued by the Evaluation Section, in a phased approach. The reporting language will be English. The external expert should work according to the plan provided below in Table 1:

Table 1: Phases and deliverables

	Main phases of the evaluation	
Timeframe	Phase	Main Deliverables
November to January 2012	Phase 1—Design Phase—drafting TORs, preparing budget, publishing TORs, selecting and hiring the external expert.	<u>Evaluation Section Deliverables:</u> TORs Consultant's contract
9 to 13 February 2012	Phase 2—Inception Phase - briefing in Geneva—It will be the opportunity for the Evaluation Section to brief the external expert on the approach and for the external expert to meet the project team, ADG of the Global Infrastructure Sector and LRG to discuss further the ToRs.	External Expert Deliverables: D1: Working sessions with key stakeholders D2: Questionnaires for preliminary interviews.
16-30 February 2012	Phase 3—An inception report—the main objective of the inception report is to ensure the external expert has a good understanding of the scope of work in the TORs and to develop a coherent methodology for the evaluation and presented it according to the report template in Annex 2.	External Expert Deliverables: D3: An inception report which contains a description of the evaluation methodology and methodological approach, data collection tools (including the surveys for users and stakeholders), data analysis methods, key stakeholders to be interviewed, evaluation questions, performance criteria, issues to be studied, work plan summary of activities, timescales, reports and other deliverables including an evaluation questions matrix D4: Maximum 2 pages executive summary

Terms of Reference

1-29 March 2012	Phase 4—Data collection —The data collection tools and methods should be designed by the external expert will be the basis for extensive data gathering from the project stakeholders and users.	<p>External Expert Deliverables:</p> <p>D5: Power point presentation of preliminary findings of the key stakeholders. The comments made by key stakeholders should inform the draft report and contribute to the formulation of recommendations for the final evaluation report.</p> <p>D6: Working sessions with key stakeholders.</p>
01- 23 April 2012	Phase 5—Evaluation report—the data will be analyzed and presented according to the template provided in Annex 3. The executive summary of the evaluation report will be the core of the report to be presented to the project team as well as to the ADG of the Global Infrastructure Sector. The final report will be then, if desired by the project managers be presented to various stakeholders in a formal presentation.	<p>External Expert Deliverables:</p> <p>D7: Draft evaluation report with actionable recommendations deriving from the findings and conclusions, which should be delivered with adequate time to allow stakeholder discussion of the findings and formulation of recommendations.</p> <p>D8: Final evaluation report which should be structured as proposed in Annex 3. The final evaluation report should include a maximum of 2 pages executive summary and the management response to the recommendations and the management matrix.</p> <p>D9: Power point presentation of the evaluation results to be presented to key WIPO stakeholders and delivered in time to the CDIP meeting in May 2012.</p> <p>D10: A synthesis version of the evaluation report which should included the key findings conclusions and recommendations as well as the key lessons learned to be presented to the CDIP in May 2012 and shared with external stakeholders like the national IP offices.</p>
24 - 31 April 2012	Phase 6: Follow-up of management response	<p>External Expert Deliverables:</p> <p>D11: Management Response matrix which should be included as part of the evaluation report</p>
May 2012	Final presentation of the evaluation report to the CDIP meeting in May 2012	<p>D12: Prepare a presentation for the CDIP meeting in May 2012</p>

Further responsibilities of the consultant can be found in Annex 1 of this TORs.

Terms of Reference

V. EVALUATION DISSEMINATION AND COMMUNICATION

Evaluation contributes to knowledge building and organizational improvement. Therefore, evaluation findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned will be presented in a manner that is easily understood by target audiences.

Evaluation findings and lessons drawn from this project evaluation will be accessible to target audiences and the public in a user-friendly way.

All evaluation products will be in English.

Initial findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation will be shared with key stakeholders during debriefing sessions or electronically at the end of the data collection phase. This early feedback is important to verify the initial findings of the external experts with stakeholders give stakeholders the opportunity to clarify issues, validate recommendations and ensure a transparent evaluation process. The draft evaluation report will be circulated to the primary stakeholders for factual corrections.

The evaluation report will be presented to the CDIP in May 2012 and will be posted on the Internet and briefs disseminated. The Evaluation Section might envisage undertaking a workshop after the evaluation has been completed to discuss the conclusions and recommendations and determine follow-up actions with the project team and WIPO partners. However, this is subject to availability of funds.

Once the evaluation is completed, the Evaluation Section will ensure dissemination of lessons through various means such as inclusion in the annual evaluation report, and through presentations made in relevant meetings. Lessons will be incorporated into Evaluation Section system for sharing lessons.

Stakeholders and users

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.

The Evaluation Terms of Reference and reports will be easily consultable and available to key stakeholders and be public documents.

The primary users of this evaluation are the project team and the ADG for Global Infrastructure, the DACD and the CDIP. Secondary users include the National IP Offices.

WIPO recognizes that evaluation has a number of important stakeholders with a range of perspectives and expectations. Some of the stakeholders³ have been included in Annex 7 of these TORs.

³ The stakeholder list can only be used as a reference. The stakeholder list will be further elaborated and it is one of tasks that will need to be undertaken as part of the evaluation inception phase.

Terms of Reference

VI. QUALITY ASSURANCE

The Evaluation Manager from the Evaluation Section will not only be part of the evaluation team but will follow the independent evaluation process at regular intervals. The Evaluation Section Quality Assurance System is based on the UNEG norms and standards, the WIPO Independent Evaluation Guideline and good practice of the international evaluation community. The evaluation manager will conduct the first level of quality assurance, while the Director, IAOD will conduct the second level review. This quality assurance process does not interfere with the views and independence of the evaluation team, but ensures the report provides the necessary evidence in a clear and convincing way and draws its conclusions on that basis.

The external expert will be required to ensure the quality of data (validity, consistency and accuracy) throughout the analytical reporting phases (inception report and final evaluation report).

VII. EXISTING INFORMATION SOURCES

- WIPO Evaluation Policy and Independent Evaluation Guidelines which should be used as the primary guidance documents for this evaluation

- Project related information: Project frameworks, monitoring reports, existing project outputs; mission reports, progress reports and monitoring information where available

Strategic documentation: Medium Term Strategic Plans for WIPO; Program and Budget Documents; Program Performance Reports; Country profile information; WIPO Financial Rules and Regulations; WIPO's paper on Millennium Development Goals and WIPO; information available in the Development Sector System; in house available statistics

- Evaluation Section documentation: the evaluation will use the UNEG norms and standards for evaluation;

The External expert will also be provided with access to required WIPO systems and networks.

VIII. EXTERNAL EXPERT SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE

In order to uphold the evaluation independence in line with the WIPO Evaluation Policy, the evaluation will be conducted by the Evaluation Section with the support of an external expert, who should be identified through a transparent selection process. The external expert will not have been significantly involved in direct work with WIPO, or have other conflicts of interest. Please see in Annex 4 - the WIPO Evaluation Section Code of Conduct for Consultants. All consultants will have to sign the Evaluation Section Code of Conduct – Evaluation Consultants Agreement Form that is available in Annex 5.

The external expert should have extensive knowledge, and experience in applying qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods. Overall, this evaluation will require the external expert to fulfill the following requirements:

- Evaluation expert with strong experience in development assistance and capacity building.
- Experience in program and project cycle management in the development assistance, capacity building area.

Terms of Reference

- Some familiarity with intellectual property, innovation and technology would be desirable.
- Ability to conceptualize complex evaluations and to design an optimal approach and methodology
- Strong skills in analyzing databases and surveys and ability to conceptualize the evaluation and to understand the strategic implications of findings.
- Process management skills such as facilitation skills;
- Good communication, writing and report presentation skills;
- Knowledge of the role of the UN and its programming is desirable as well as gender knowledge;
- English writing skills;

IX. ACCOUNTABILITIES AND MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

The Evaluation Section will manage the evaluation and ensure coordination and liaison with concerned departments and programs in WIPO. Mr. Claude Hilfiker, Head of the Evaluation Section will be the Evaluation Manager and will lead the evaluation process in collaboration with the project team and the ADG for Global Infrastructure Sector. Weekly meetings are foreseen with the external expert to follow up on the evaluation process.

As the Evaluation Manager, he is responsible in collaboration with the project managers selecting and contracting the external expert; preparing and managing the budget; organizing the team briefing in WIPO; conducting the first level quality assurance of the evaluation products. He will also be the main interlocutor between the external expert, and WIPO counterparts to ensure a smooth implementation process. The Evaluation Manager will take a lead role in dialogue and stakeholder meetings on the findings and recommendations support the external expert in liaison with the key partners and in discussions with the team.

According to the WIPO Financial Rules and Regulations, WIPO program managers are expected to provide information necessary to the evaluation; be available to the external expert to discuss when required their activities, its performance and results; facilitate the external expert contacts with stakeholders in the selected countries; and assisting when required in setting up meetings. Relevant WIPO staff are expected to be available for interviews/meetings with the external expert and to comment on the various reports throughout the evaluation process.

To ensure the independence of the evaluation the Evaluation Section will conduct this evaluation with the support of an external expert. However, for increasing the learning purpose of the evaluation, the Evaluation Section encourages the external expert to consult the project team and the ADG for Global Infrastructure Sector at all stages of the evaluation process. WIPO senior managers, program and administration staff will not be part of the evaluation nor participate in meetings where their presence could bias the responses of the stakeholders.

The External expert is responsible for preparing and providing all expected products mentioned in Section XI of this TORs (presentations, draft and final inception report and draft and final evaluation report). The external expert is also responsible for the

Terms of Reference

dissemination of all methodological tools such as surveys, but WIPO Evaluation Section in collaboration with the project team and the ADG for Global Infrastructure Sector will facilitate this process to the extent possible by providing contact information such as email addresses and phone numbers.

X. HOW TO APPLY FOR THIS ASSIGNMENT AND CONTRACTUAL ISSUES

Interested external experts applying for this assignment should not have been significantly involved in direct work with WIPO nor have other conflicts of interest (see Annex 4 – WIPO Evaluation Code of Conduct). The external expert undertaking this evaluation will act impartially and respect the code of conduct of the evaluation profession.

The Evaluation Section is providing for this assignment a total of a maximum of 35 working days.

Externals experts interested in applying for this assignment will need to provide the evaluation section with the following:

1. A two pages technical proposal including a workplan with time allocation for each task and expected output.
2. Consultants CVs indicating your daily consultancy fee.
3. The signed Agreement to abide by the IAOD Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System
4. Three working references

Please note that only applications fulfilling the above requested application requirements will be considered for the selection process.

The selected expert will be required to **submit two examples of evaluation reports** recently completed when responding to the Terms of Reference.

Interested external experts can sent their applications via e-mail to the following address evaluation@wipo.int. **Deadline for the applications is 15th January 2011.**

Prepared by:

Julia Flores Marfetán
Senior Evaluator
Internal Audit and Oversight Division (IAOD)
World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)
34, Chemin des Colombettes
1211 Geneva - Switzerland
Tel.: +4122 338 7093
Fax: +4122 338 8770
E-mail: julia.flores@wipo.int
<http://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/oversight/evaluation/>

Terms of Reference

ANNEXES

Terms of Reference

ANNEX 1: RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CONSULTANT

Among other tasks the external expert will:

- (a) Prepare a short inception report (see more details of the requirements for the inception report in Section IV of the TORs)
- (b) Prepare inception, draft and final evaluation reports as well as presentations in power point.
- (c) Prepare evaluation questions matrix.
- (d) Prepare questionnaires for the undertaking of surveys.
- (e) Gather and analyze data from surveys and consultations as well as necessary background documentation for validation purposes.
- (f) Make the necessary logistic arrangements including arrangements for setting up meetings for interviews/consultations with key stakeholders including WIPO staff members.
- (g) Prepare agenda for consultation meetings and interviews.
- (h) Report to the Evaluation Section on the process on a weekly basis.
- (i) Report to the Learning Resource Group.
- (j) Identify the various stakeholders and the different types of users for the services
- (k) Review relevant project related documentation including the project framework, progress reports, monitoring information, mission reports and other relevant documents including previous studies on TISCs.
- (l) Prepare a well-sounded evaluation report including executive summary based on the findings identified through the mix of qualitative and quantitative research methods.
- (m) Triangulate and validate findings based on existing documentation.
- (n) Edit the final version of the report and present it in well written English for publication purposes.
- (o) Prepare a synthesis version of the evaluation report, which should include the key findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned to be presented to key WIPO policy makers.

Further details on the tasks and deliverables can be found in “section IV Evaluation process, methods, approach and deliverables” of the ToRs.

Terms of Reference

ANNEX 2: SAMPLE INCEPTION REPORTING FORMAT**Title page [Inception Report]**

[Name of the evaluation exercise as listed in the TORs; date; name and organizations of the evaluators; name of WIPO staff contact point for the evaluation (the evaluation manager); table of contents]

1. Objectives and scope of the evaluation.

[As stated on the TORs, with changes if agreed among the relevant stakeholders.]

[The team may choose to elaborate on the scope of the evaluation. The scope determines the boundaries of the evaluation, tailoring the objectives and evaluation criteria to the given situation. It should also make the coverage of the evaluation explicit (time period, phase in implementation, geographic area, and the dimensions of the network of actors being examined, i.e. a single organization or all stakeholders.) The limits of the evaluation should also be acknowledged within the scope.]

2. Description of proposed methodology

[While the TORs and the Note on a Proposed Evaluation Approach have outlined the methodology directions envisaged, the consultant should use the Inception Report to make any adjustments deemed necessary after the initial part of the exercise.]

[The objectives and scope of the evaluation are critical references to judge whether the methodology selected and resources allocated are adequate. They are also the critical reference against which the findings/conclusions and recommendations will be compared.]

2.1 Methodological approach

[Please describe briefly the overall methodological approach envisaged, for example inductive and/or deductive. Please provide details on preferred approaches, e.g. focus on processes, outputs and/or objectives; inter- and/or intra-organizational; participatory- and/or accountability-oriented; etc.]

2.2 Data Collection Tools

[Please describe the suggested methodologies to identify information sources and collect information during the evaluation. Examples could include informal and formal surveys, direct and participatory observation, community interviews, focus groups, expert opinion, case studies, and literature search.]

2.3 Organization of the review/evaluation

[Please describe how the review/evaluation is organized, e.g. who manages the process, who will be consulted, provide assistance, and if a core learning groups is constituted]

Terms of Reference

2.4 Key informants and Agencies

[Please provide names of agencies and other actors, who you consider to be key informants for this evaluation.]

2.5 Key evaluation questions

[Evaluations are often oriented by key evaluation questions. These add more detail to the objectives and contribute to defining the scope.]

2.6 Performance criteria

[Please describe how to measure the key issues, which performance indicators may be most useful.]

3. Issues to be studied

[This section is where the Inception Report primarily distinguishes itself from the TORs and the Note on a Proposed Evaluation Approach. The key issues of the evaluation are addressed in the TORs. The Inception Report should build on these and elaborate where possible to reflect the finding of the first initial period of the assignment. The sets of issues identified through the initial part of the evaluation and elaborated on in the Inception Report should serve as the parameters for interviews and analysis upon which the final report will be based.]

[In terms of structure, this section should be organized according to the subject headings by which the key issues are grouped in the TORs, with changes as deemed necessary. Where appropriate the evaluation criteria specified in the TORs (e.g. timeliness, appropriateness, relevance, efficiency and effectiveness) should be represented by sub-headings.]

6. Workplan

[As stated on the TORs, with changes as agreed among the relevant stakeholders. The workplan should include the list of activities, timescales, workshops, reports and other deliverables]

7. Timetable

[As stated on the TORs, with changes as agreed among the relevant stakeholders]

8. Reporting

[As stated on the TORs, with changes as agreed among the relevant stakeholders]

9. Action points

Terms of Reference

[Please list any points of action, like revision of the TORs, additional national consultant required, etc.]

ANNEX: EVALUATION MATRIX

[A matrix on the key issues with associated indicators and research tools has proved very useful in past evaluations and may be included as a tool for easy reference.]

Table 4: Evaluation Matrix

Key issues	Performance indicators	Data collection tools and key informants

Terms of Reference

ANNEX 3: SAMPLE EVALUATION REPORT

(Note: The Synthesis report for the whole comparative evaluation will closely follow a similar outline, with some additional elements to capture relevant results, and selective reference to evaluation results on country specific questions, outside the common template.). The evaluation report should not exceed 40 pages. Information backing up the report should be provided in the annexes.

Title Page

The Evaluation Section title page should include the date of publication, the name of the authors responsible for the report and a clear reference to the commissioning Organization. A reference where the document can be found once published should be added as well.

Preface

This should be prepared by the IAOD Evaluation Section

Contents page

Indicating the sections and annexes for easy reference

Acronyms and abbreviations

These are usually explained in full on the first occasion they are used in the report in order to assist the reader

Acknowledgements

Thanking those that have contributed to the exercise

Executive summary

Should be as brief as possible and should include a summarized version of the key findings, conclusions, recommendations and key lessons. The executive summary should not exceed 2 pages.

Main report body

The main report should be presented in the user-friendliest form allowing easy reading and interpretation of data. The external expert should make use wherever possible of sophisticated presentation techniques like diagrams, statistics and avoid the use of jargon.

1. Introduction

Should include the following:

- The purpose, scope and focus of the evaluation
 - Any limitations of the evaluation design gained in retrospect
 - The policy context of the activity
 - The activity's size in terms of budget in relation to the overall WIPO's budget
 - A brief description of the activity, its logic and assumptions
 - An explanation of the structure of the report
 - Introduction to the team
2. **Methodology** (how the evaluation has been undertaken)
- Phases in data collection (desk study, field visits)
 - Reasons for the selection of the activity, or the countries or case studies chosen
 - How information is collected (primary data collection, secondary data collection)

Terms of Reference

- Challenges encountered during the undertaking of the exercise like for instances key stakeholders not available for participating in the exercise or documentation not reliable or available

3. Findings on the Common Evaluation Questions

The external expert will need to report based on the evidence found through primary and secondary data the following:

- What happened? and why?
- What results were achieved in relation to those intended?
- What was the positive or negative, intended or unintended impact?
- What have been the effects on end beneficiaries?

4. Conclusions (justified and arising logically from the findings)

Summary of achievements against the initial activity logic model

- Summary of problems encountered and the reasons for this
- Overall effect end beneficiaries and cross cutting issues
- Why things happened as they did, questioning the assumptions, design, implementation, management, etc.

5. Key Lessons

Lessons that may have implications for future work arising from the evaluation questions

6. Recommendations around the Common Evaluation Questions

A short number, succinctly expressed, and addressed to those with the means and responsibilities for implementing them

7. Management Response on the Recommendations

ANNEXES

Annex 1: Terms of Reference for Program Level Evaluation

Annex 2: Timetable and detailed evaluation work plan

Annex 3: External expert profile

Annex 4: List of Interviewees (by location, titles, gender specific, include interview time)

Annex 5: Evaluation Tools (questionnaires etc)

Annex 6: Collated stakeholder feedback on findings, conclusions and recommendations

Terms of Reference

Annex 7: Reports of country visits and case studies, which formed part of the independent evaluation and have been drawn upon to produce the main report

Annex 7: Sources/bibliography (in full, including secondary sources)

Annex 8: Other appendices/annexes

Terms of Reference:

ANNEX 4: IAOD EVALUATION SECTION CODE OF CONDUCT FOR EVALUATION CONSULTANTS

Adapted by the IAOD Evaluation Section from the UNEG Code of Conduct and Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation.

To promote the trust and confidence in evaluation within WIPO, evaluation consultants working for the IAOD Evaluation Section are required to commit themselves in writing to the Code of Conduct for Evaluation specifically to the following obligations:

Independence

Evaluation in the United Nations systems should be demonstrably free of bias. To this end, evaluation consultants managed by the IAOD Evaluation Section are recruited for their ability to exercise independent judgment. Evaluation consultants working for the Section shall ensure that they are not unduly influenced by the views or statements of any party, that independence of judgment is maintained and evaluation findings and recommendations are consistent, verified and independently presented.

Impartiality

Evaluation consultants working for the IAOD Evaluation Section shall operate in an impartial and unbiased manner at all stages of the evaluation and give a comprehensive and balanced presentation of strengths and weaknesses of the activity or organizational unit being evaluated, taking due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders. Evaluators shall guard against distortion in their reporting caused by their personal views and feelings.

Credibility

Evaluation consultants working for the IAOD Evaluation Section should prepare their reports based on reliable data and observations and ensure that reports show evidence of consistency and dependability in data, findings, judgments and lessons learned; appropriately reflecting the quality of the methodology, procedures and analysis used to collect and interpret data. They shall endeavor to ensure that each evaluation is accurate, relevant, and timely and provides a clear, concise and balanced presentation of the evidence, findings, issues, conclusions and recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest

Evaluation consultants working for the IAOD Evaluation Section shall avoid as far as possible conflict of interest so that the credibility of the evaluation process and product shall not be undermined. Conflicts of interest may arise at the level of the IAOD Evaluation Section, or at that of individual staff members or consultants. Conflicts of interest should be disclosed and dealt with openly and honestly.

Evaluation consultants working for the IAOD Evaluation Section are required to disclose in writing any past experience, of themselves, their immediate family, close friends or associates, which may give rise to a potential conflict of interest and to deal honestly in resolving any conflict of interest which may arise.

Terms of Reference:

Evaluation consultants working for the IAOD Evaluation Section shall not have had any responsibility for the design, implementation or supervision of any of the activities that they are evaluating.

Honesty and Integrity

Evaluation consultants working for the IAOD Evaluation Section shall:

- a. Accurately represent their level of skills and knowledge and work only within the limits of their professional training and abilities in evaluation, declining assignments for which they do not have the skills and experience to successfully complete.
- b. Negotiate honestly the costs, tasks to be undertaken, limitations of methodology, scope of results likely to be obtained, and uses of data resulting from the evaluation.
- c. Accurately present their procedures, data and findings, including ensuring that the evaluation findings are not biased to make it more likely that the evaluator receives further commissions from the Client.

Accountability

Evaluation consultants working for the IAOD Evaluation Section are accountable for the completion of the evaluation as agreed with the Client in the TORs.

Obligations to participants

Evaluation consultants working for the IAOD Evaluation Section shall:

- a. Respect people's right to provide information in confidence and make participants aware of the scope and limits of confidentiality. Evaluators must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source so that the relevant individuals are protected from reprisals.
- b. Respect differences in culture, local customs, religious beliefs and practices, personal interaction, gender roles, disability, age and ethnicity, and be mindful of the potential implications of these differences when planning, carrying out and reporting one evaluations, while using evaluation instruments appropriate to the cultural setting
- c. Keep disruption to a minimum while needed information is obtained, providing the maximum notice to individuals or institutions they wish to engage in the evaluation, optimizing demands on their time, and respecting people's right to privacy.

Rights

In including individuals or groups in the evaluation, Evaluation consultants working for the IAOD Evaluation Section shall ensure:

- a. Right to Self-Determination. Prospective participants should be treated as autonomous agents and must be given the time and information to decide whether or not they wish to participate and be able to make an independent decision without any pressure or fear of penalty for not participating.

Terms of Reference:

- b. Fair Representation. Evaluators shall select participants fairly in relation to the aims of the evaluation, not simply because of their availability, or because it is relatively easy to secure their participation. Care shall be taken to ensure that relatively powerless, 'hidden', or otherwise excluded groups are represented.
- c. Compliance with codes for vulnerable groups. Where the evaluation involves the participation of members of vulnerable groups, evaluators must be aware of and comply with legal codes (whether international or national) governing, for example, interviewing children and young people.
- d. Redress. Stakeholders receive sufficient information to know a) how to seek redress for any perceived disadvantage suffered from the evaluation or any projects it covers, and b) how to register a complaint concerning the conduct of an Implementing or Executing Agency.

Confidentiality

Evaluation consultants working for the IAOD Evaluation Section shall respect people's right to provide information in confidence and make participants aware of the scope and limits of confidentiality. Evaluation consultants working for the IAOD Evaluation Section must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source so that the relevant individuals are protected from reprisals.

Avoidance of Harm

Evaluation consultants working for the IAOD Evaluation Section shall seek to: minimize risks to, and burdens on, those participating in the evaluation; and seek to maximize the benefits and reduce any unnecessary harms that might occur from negative or critical evaluation, without compromising the integrity of the evaluation.

Accuracy, Completeness and Reliability

Evaluation consultants working for the IAOD Evaluation Section have an obligation to ensure that evaluation reports and presentations are accurate, complete and reliable. In the evaluation process and in the production of evaluation products, evaluation consultants working for the IAOD Evaluation Section shall:

- a. Carry out thorough inquiries, systematically employing appropriate methods and techniques to the highest technical standards, validating information using multiple measures and sources to guard against bias, and ensuring errors are corrected.
- b. Describe the purposes and content of object of the evaluation (program, activity, strategy) clearly and accurately.
- c. Present openly the values, assumptions, theories, methods, results, and analyses that significantly affect the evaluation, from its initial conceptualization to the eventual use of findings.
- d. Examine the context in enough detail so its likely influences can be identified (for example

Terms of Reference:

geographic location, timing, political and social climate, economic conditions).

- e. Describe the methodology, procedures and information sources of the evaluation in enough detail so they can be identified and assessed.
- f. Make a complete and fair assessment of the object of the evaluation, recording of strengths and weaknesses so that strengths can be built upon and problem areas addressed.
- g. Provide an estimate of the reliability of information gathered and the replicability of results (i.e. how likely is it that the evaluation repeated in the same way would yield the same result?).
- h. Explicitly justify judgments, findings and conclusions and show their underlying rationale so that stakeholders can assess them.
- i. Ensure all recommendations are based on the evaluation findings only, not on their or other parties' biases.

Transparency

Evaluation consultants working for the IAOD Evaluation Section shall:

- a. Clearly communicate to stakeholders the purpose of the evaluation, the criteria applied and the intended use of findings.
- b. Ensure that stakeholders have a say in shaping the evaluation.
- c. Ensure that all documents are readily available to an understood by stakeholders.

Terms of Reference:

ANNEX 5: IAOD EVALUATION SECTION CODE OF CONDUCT – EVALUATION CONSULTANTS AGREEMENT FORM



To be signed by all consultants as individuals (not by or on behalf of a consultancy company) before a contract can be issued.

Agreement to abide by the IAOD Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant:

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant):

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the IAOD Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System.

Signed at (place) on (date)

Signature:

Terms of Reference:

ANNEX 6: OUTLINE OF A SAMPLE WORKPLAN

Table 2: WORKPLAN

Workplan			
Evaluation Phases	January	February	March
Design Phase	Days required for each task		
Drafting TORs			
Preparing budget			
selecting and hiring consultants			
Inception phase			
Briefing external expert in Geneva (3 days briefing, 2 days to on-site team work)			
Inception report			
Data collection phase			
Data gathering			
External expert presentation of preliminary findings in Geneva			
Evaluation report phase			
Analysis of data and report preparation			
Comments gathering			
External expert report presentation			
Follow up phase			
External expert leader and team member - management response and implementation of recommendations			
Total number of days			

Terms of Reference:

ANNEX 7: WIPO INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS AND USERS OF THE EVALUATION

WIPO Internal and External Stakeholders and Users of the Evaluation	
Internal Stakeholders	Interest in the evaluation
WIPO's Global Infrastructure Sector; Global Information Service and Innovation and Technology Support Section	Primary stakeholder of this evaluation. Responsible for planning and operations implementation, it has a direct stake in the evaluation and together with senior management will be primary users of its results in the TISC context, if necessary, and readjust advocacy, analytical work, programming and implementation as appropriate.
WIPO's Senior Management concerned with cooperate technology support policies and strategies	Presentation of the evaluation results will inform Senior Management about the performance and outcome of WIPO's TISCs from 2009 to 2011. Both have an interest in learning from the evaluation results.
External Stakeholders	
WIPO 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. Therefore, they will have a strong interest in finding and results of this evaluation.
Beneficiaries	Beneficiaries of TISC have supported activities for whom the success or failure of TISC activities has the most direct and long- lasting implications: R&D Institution, Inventors, IP students, researchers, academics
Government	National IP Offices Africa <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benin: National Industrial Property Center (CENAPI), Ministry of Industry and Commerce - Burundi: Ministry of Trade, Industry and Tourism - Central African Republic: National Industrial Property Service, Directorate of Industrial Development and Handicraft, Ministry of Industry, Commerce, SME-SMI - Congo, Republic: National Industrial Property Unit, Directorate General of Industry, Ministry of Industrial Development and Promotion of Private Sector - Cameroon: Directorate of Technological Development and Industrial Property, Ministry of Industry, Mines and Technological Development - Democratic Republic of Congo: Directorate of Industrial Property Secretariat for industry and small and medium enterprises (IPMEA), Ministry of Industry and SMEs - Ethiopia: Ethiopian Intellectual Property Office (EIPO) - Ghana: Registrar General's Department, Ministry of Justice - Kenya: Kenya Industrial Property Institute (KIPI), Ministry of Trade and Industry - Madagascar: Malagasy Industrial Property Office, Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry

Terms of Reference:

WIPO Internal and External Stakeholders and Users of the Evaluation

- Mozambique: Industrial Property Institute (IPI), Ministry of Industry and Commerce
- Niger: Directorate of Industrial Development, Ministry of Commerce and the Private Sector
- Nigeria: Federal Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Registry of Trademarks, Patents and Designs
- Rwanda: Rwanda Developments Board (RDB), Office of the Registrar General
- Senegal: **INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY AGENCY**, Ministry of Industry and Handicrafts, Industrial Property
- Swaziland: Ministry of Commerce Industry and Trade, Intellectual Property Office
- Tanzania: Ministry of Industry and Trade, Business Registrations and Licensing Agency (BRELA)
- Togo: National Institute for Industrial Property and Technology (INPIT), Ministry of Trade, Industry, Transport and Development of the Free Zone
- Uganda: Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs, Uganda Registration Services Bureau (URSB)
- Zambia: Patents and Companies Registration Agency (PACRA), Ministry of Commerce, Trade and Industry
- Zimbabwe: Zimbabwe Intellectual Property Office (ZIPO), Ministry of Justice, Legal and Parliamentary Affairs

Arab Region

- Algeria: Algerian National Institute of Industrial Property (INAPI)
- Egypt: Egyptian Patent Office, Academy of Scientific Research and Technology (ASRT), Ministry of Scientific Research
- Jordan: Industrial Property Protection Directorate, Ministry of Industry and Trade
- Kuwait: Ministry of Trade and Industry, Trademarks and Patents Department
- Morocco: Moroccan Industrial and Commercial Property Office
- Oman: Intellectual Property Department, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Directorate General of Commerce
- Saudi Arabia: General Directorate of Industrial Property, King Abdul-Aziz City for Science and Technology (KACST)
- Syria: Ministry of Economy and Trade, Directorate of Commercial and Industrial Property Protection (DCIP)
- Tunisia: National Institute for Standardization and Industrial Property (INNORPI), Ministry of Industry and Technology

Asia & Pacific

- Bangladesh: Department of Patents, Designs and Trademarks Ministry of Industries
- Bhutan: Industrial Property Division, Ministry of Economic Affairs
- Cambodia: Intellectual Property Department, Ministry of Commerce
- Myanmar: Industrial Property Office, Ministry of Science and Technology
- Pakistan: Intellectual Property Organization of Pakistan (IPO-Pakistan)
- Papua New Guinea: Ministry of Trade and Industry, Investment Promotion Authority (IPA), Intellectual Property Office of Papua New Guinea (IPOPNG)
- Philippines: Intellectual Property Office of Philippines (IPOPHL)
- Sri Lanka: National Intellectual Property Office of Sri Lanka

Terms of Reference:

WIPO Internal and External Stakeholders and Users of the Evaluation	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Viet Nam: National Office of Intellectual Property (NOIP), Ministry of Science, Technology and the Environment <p>Certain European and Asian Countries</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Georgia: National Intellectual Property Center (Sakpatenti) - Kazakhstan: Committee for Intellectual Property Rights, Ministry of Justice Republic of Kazakhstan - Kyrgyzstan: State Intellectual Property Service of the Kyrgyz Republic (Kyrgyzpatent) - Russian Federation: Federal Service for Intellectual Property, Patents and Trademarks (ROSPATENT) - Tajikistan: National Center for Patents and Information (NCPI) - Uzbekistan: Agency on Intellectual Property of the Republic of Uzbekistan <p>Latin America and Caribbean</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Costa Rica: Registro de la Propiedad Industrial, Registro Nacional, Ministerio de Justicia y Paz - Cuba: Cuban Industrial Property Office, Ministry of Science, Technology and the Environment - Ecuador: Ecuadorian Institute of Intellectual Property, National Directory of Industrial Property - Dominican Republic: National Office of Industrial Property, State Secretariat for Industry and Commerce - Guatemala: Registry of Intellectual Property, Ministry of Economic Affairs - Honduras: Directorate General of Intellectual Property - Panama: Directorate General of the Industrial Property Registry, Ministry of Commerce and Industries - Uruguay: National Directorate of Industrial Property, Ministry of Industry, Energy and Mining
User groups	<p>People who use the resource or services of TISC</p> <p>Industry Raw material extraction industries (Mining, Agriculture) Refining- , Construction- , and Manufacturing industries (refine metals, produce furniture, or pack farm products) Service and Distribution industries (teachers, managers and other service providers) Knowledge industry (research, design and development) Non Profit industry (encompassing nonprofit activities)</p> <p>Small and Medium Sized Enterprises Small Sized Enterprises (small enterprise is an enterprise where the investment in equipment is more than 200 000 CHF, but does not exceed 400 000 CHF) Medium Sized Enterprise (Medium sized Enterprises (medium enterprise is an enterprise where the investment in equipment is more than 400 000 CHF but does not exceed 900 000 CHF)</p>
Cooperating partners	<p>UN Organizations</p> <p>Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)</p>

Terms of Reference:

WIPO Internal and External Stakeholders and Users of the Evaluation

United National Environment Programme (UNEP)
World Health Organization (WHO)

Intergovernmental Organizations

Intellectual Property

African Intellectual Property Organization (OAPI)
African Regional Intellectual Property Organization (ARIPO)
Eurasian Patent Organization (EAPO)
European Patent Organization (EPO)
Patent Office of the Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf (GCC Patent Office)

Other intergovernmental Organizations (Regional)

African Union (AU)

SME partners

SME Focal Points in national governments

National ministries, departments and other government-owned/funded agencies or institutions responsible for supporting science and technology based institutions or projects such as science parks, technology parks, research parks, and technology incubators/accelerators

National ministries responsible for particular sectors such as biotechnology, informational technology, cultural industries, agriculture, forests, higher education, commerce or for cross sectoral issues such as competitiveness or innovation

National chambers of commerce, and associations of industry and trade including sectoral chambers and associations

National level specialized banking and financing institutions for the SMEs sector whether in the public, private or co-operative sectors

State, provincial, and local Government authorities responsible for providing support to SMEs

Chamber of Commerce and Associations of Industry at the state, provincial and local/city levels

Science and technology universities, Government funded research and development centres or institutions that commercialize publicly funded research results or assist SMEs in solving their technology problems through contract research, consultancy services

Innovation development/relay centres, testing centres, technology demonstration centres

Technology transfer, licensing, commercialization and management networks, offices, institutions or firms

Science parks, technology parks, and research parks whether public, semi-public or private

Incubators or accelerators for business and technology

Small business consulting firms, including small business consultants, advisors or counsellors in the public or private sector worldwide

University departments or other institutions that provide teaching or training in business, creativity, innovation management, technology management, entrepreneurship, new product development and related aspects

Government, private, or university economic and social research departments, centers, and institutions that undertake research on SME matters

Specialized institutions for providing training and capacity building of owners and managers of SMEs

National associations of inventors, patent and/or trademark agents/attorneys/owners

Terms of Reference:

WIPO Internal and External Stakeholders and Users of the Evaluation	
	<p>Law firms having a focus on IP matters, especially those which cater primarily or significantly to SME clients</p> <p>IP management and consultancy firms</p> <p>Institutions or firms publishing SME journals, magazines, etc whether by traditional or electronic means</p>
<p>Non- governmental organizations (NGOs), civil society organizations, and other organizations that are engaged in TISC/ WIPO assisted support</p>	<p>International NGOs</p> <p>African Agricultural Technology Foundation (AATF)</p>
<p>Universities and R&D Institutions</p>	<p>University in the Countries</p> <p>Research Institutes in the Country</p>
<p>Other partners</p>	<p>Other collaboration partners working jointly with WIPO on TISC</p>
<p>International stakeholders</p>	
<p>Co- Financiers</p>	<p>That supplements WIPO's resources in TISC</p>