

## **Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP)**

**Thirty-Second Session**  
**Geneva, April 29 to May 3, 2024**

EVALUATION REPORT OF THE PROJECT ON THE REGISTRATION OF THE COLLECTIVE  
MARKS OF LOCAL ENTERPRISES AS A CROSS-CUTTING ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT  
ISSUE

*prepared by Dr. Glenn O'Neil, Founder, Owl RE, Evaluation Consultancy, Geneva*

The Annex to this document contains an external independent Evaluation Report on the Project "Registration of the Collective Marks of Local Enterprises as a Cross-Cutting Economic Development Issue", undertaken by Dr. Glenn O'Neil, Founder, Owl RE, Geneva.

*The CDIP is invited to take note of the information contained in the Annex to this document.*

[Annex follows]

## Table of contents

Executive summary	2
I. Introduction	6
II. Description of the project	6
III. Overview of evaluation criteria and methodology	6
IV. Key findings	7
A. Project Design and Management	7
B. Effectiveness of the project	9
C. Sustainability	12
D. Implementation of Development Agenda (DA) Recommendations	13
V. Conclusions and recommendations	13

### Appendixes

Appendix I: Persons interviewed/consulted

Appendix II: Documents consulted

Appendix III: Inception report

### List of acronyms used

CDIP	Committee on Development and Intellectual Property
DA	Development Agenda
DACD	Development Agenda Coordination Division
IP	Intellectual Property
RNDS	Regional and National Development Sector
SMEs	Small and medium enterprises
WIPO	World Intellectual Property Organization

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. This report is an independent evaluation of the Development Agenda (DA) Project on the Registration of the Collective Marks of Local Enterprises as a Cross-Cutting Economic Development Issue ([DA 1 4 10 01](#)). The project duration was from January 2021 – February 2024.
2. The project aimed to develop a supporting and bolstering system to facilitate the registration of the collective marks of local enterprises as a cross-cutting economic development issues. The project was implemented in four countries: The Plurinational State of Bolivia (the Member State who put forward the project proposal), Brazil, the Philippines and Tunisia. Key project outputs included identifying associations appropriate to use a collective mark, providing awareness raising, training and capacity building for both associations and national IP offices, and registering and launching the collective marks.
3. The aim of this evaluation was to learn from experiences during project implementation. This included assessing the project management and design including monitoring and reporting tools, as well as measuring and reporting on the results achieved to date and assessing the likelihood of sustainability. The evaluation utilized a combination of methods including a document review and interviews with six staff of the WIPO Secretariat (in-person and telephone) and telephone interviews with 14 stakeholders in all four beneficiary countries.

### Project design and management

4. **Finding 1:** The project proposal document provided a description of the delivery strategy, activities, output and schedule, budget and monitoring indicators. It also contained a clear rationale for the project. The main deliverables of the project were those that were foreseen in the proposal document. An aspect that needed consequent adjustment was the timeline and the consequent project extension (due mainly to the COVID-19 pandemic and changes within governments of the beneficiary countries), which were not possible to foresee when the project proposal was approved in November 2019.
5. **Finding 2:** The project monitoring tools were appropriate for reporting to Member States at the CDIP on the overall progress of the project. The Secretariat presented four Progress Reports to the CDIP. For each country, it proved useful and necessary to create a country-level plan. The project's objectives had three indicators set at the outcome level, for one of which it was too early to report on and it would be important to evaluate in the future.
6. **Finding 3:** The activities of this project were managed by the Development Agenda Coordination Division (DACD) with the support of other entities within the Secretariat, notably the Division for Arab Countries, the Division for Asia and Pacific, the Division for Latin America and the Caribbean, the Department for Trademarks, Industrial Designs and Geographical Indications of the Brands and Designs Sector and the News and Media Division.
7. **Finding 4:** Within the project, coordination between the DACD staff and the different project stakeholders was reported as efficient and effective. Although DACD staff could benefit from the cross-learning of working across the countries, there were no opportunities for country-level stakeholders to benefit from the experiences and learnings of the other countries. The WIPO purchasing and procurement rules did not seem to be adaptable for country and local level activities, which created some obstacles and were time-consuming for the DACD staff to resolve.
8. **Findings 5-6:** The initial project document identified three risks for the project. The project documentation described a mitigation response and only one of these risks materialized to some extent; there were some challenges for the beneficiary associations to fully utilize the

collected marks given their varying levels of capacity. External forces that the project had to respond and adapt to were the COVID-19 pandemic and some changes to governments in the beneficiary countries, as described above. These external forces did not have a major impact on the project, aside from delaying its completion and extending the project by 14 months.

### ***Effectiveness***

9. **Findings 7-8:** The outputs as foreseen by the Project Proposal were all developed and launched successfully during the project's implementation. In all four beneficiary countries, associations were selected whose members produced products that could potentially benefit from a collective mark. These products included: Honey in Bolivia; cassava flour and derived products, honey, nuts and oils in Brazil; nuts, pastries, handicrafts, fashion accessories and cosmetic products from the Pili tree in the Philippines; and honey, honey-derived products, essential oils, soap and other products in Tunisia.

10. **Findings 9-11:** In all four beneficiary countries, the collective mark was developed, registered and launched with logos designed by local designers. The collective marks were all registered with their respective national IP offices and public launches held between April 2022 to February 2024. All countries benefited from capacity building and awareness-raising activities. However, the success of the beneficiary associations in bringing their products to market under the collective mark has varied to date.

### ***Sustainability***

11. **Findings 12-14:** As the project's outputs were all achieved successfully, this increased the likelihood of the continuation of the benefits of the project for the beneficiary countries, with examples seen where products have already been brought to market under the collective marks and were consequently contributing to economic development of local enterprises. Sustainability was supported by the involvement of economic development actors within the project.

12. **Findings 15-16:** Sustainability was also impacted by the nature of the collective marks that are required to be managed by an association; it was not always easy for small enterprises to work in a collective manner. The maturity of the beneficiary associations influenced their abilities to manage the collective marks. All associations needed to take additional steps to fully benefit from the collective marks, such as internal organization, developing product specifications or compliance measures, in addition to promotion and marketing efforts.

13. **Findings 17-18:** The project lacked an exit and/or handover strategy to increase the likelihood of its ongoing benefits. Further, there were no action plans or road maps available from the national IP offices that set out concretely how they planned to use the capacity and resources provided by the project to increase their promotion and usage of collective marks.

### ***Implementation of Development Agenda (DA) Recommendations***

14. **Findings 19-21:** This project has made a contribution to achieving DA recommendation 1, focused on WIPO's technical assistance being demand driven and transparent and DA recommendation 4, focused on the needs of small-medium enterprises (SMEs), considering that project's activities were focused on the economic development of community-based enterprises through their collective associations. The project also directly responds to recommendation 10, as it contained a component to build the capacity of the national IP offices in the four beneficiary countries.

## Conclusions and recommendations

15. **Conclusion 1 (Ref: Findings 1-11; 19-21).** The project has successfully delivered all the project's outputs in the four beneficiary countries. This has supported the project in contributing to the DA recommendations and to progressing towards achieving its objective of developing a supporting and bolstering a system to facilitate the registration of the collective marks of local enterprises for cross-cutting economic development. Positive examples have already been seen of this through beneficiary associations bringing to market products under the collective mark as described above.
16. **Conclusion 2 (Ref: Findings 1-6).** The project was efficiently and effectively managed by the DACD, considering some of the challenges of managing the project across four countries as described above. The project could have benefited from simpler and adapted purchasing and procurement rules for country-level activities, in addition to providing opportunities for exchange between country-level project stakeholders.
17. **Conclusion 3 (Ref: Findings 12-18).** The likelihood of success for the project's objectives will depend upon a number of aspects. Firstly, the beneficiary associations must have the capacity to use and manage the collective mark. Secondly, the beneficiary association must have the capacity and support to promote and market their products under the collective mark. Economic development actors were well placed to provide this support. Finally, the national IP offices needed to have plans in place to build on the project's benefits to promote further the use of collective marks in their countries. In all these areas, the beneficiary countries still have progress to be made and would need further support from Member States, WIPO and in-country stakeholders, as reflected in the following recommendations.
18. **Recommendation 1 (Ref: Conclusion 2, Findings 1-6).** To facilitate the implementation of future DA projects, the DACD are encouraged to discuss with the Central Services Division an adaption of purchasing and procurement rules for country-level activities, while respecting WIPO's existing oversight and regulatory framework.
19. **Recommendation 2 (Ref: Conclusion 2, Findings 1-6).** For future similar DA projects with multiple country implementation, Member States and the DACD are encouraged within their project design to include (and budget) activities for learning-exchanges between country-level stakeholders, such as facilitated online webinars between countries.
20. **Recommendation 3 (Ref: Conclusion 1 and 3, Findings 1-18).** For future DA projects that aim to contribute to economic development at the country-level, Member States and the DACD are encouraged to include economic development actors at the country (or provincial) level within the project team (and stakeholders) and/or within the project design.
21. **Recommendation 4 (Ref: Conclusion 3, Findings 12-18).** For future DA projects that aim to build the capacity of local enterprises, associations and/or national IP offices, Member States and the DACD are encouraged to include in project proposals activities (and budgets) for hand-over and follow-up plans.
22. **Recommendation 5 (Ref: Conclusion 3, Findings 12-18).** To ensure that the benefits of the project are sustained, it is suggested that the beneficiary countries consider and undertake a targeted set of activities, including the following proposed activities:
- (a) Support to the beneficiary associations in building their internal organization capacity to manage the collective marks.

- (b) Support to the beneficiary associations to strengthen their regulatory guidelines and specifications in order to be able to market a full range of products under the collective marks.
- (c) Support to the beneficiary associations to market and promote products under the collective marks in collaboration with national (or provincial) economic development actors.
- (d) Support to the national IP offices to put in place action plans / road maps to actively promote the use of collective marks in their countries
- (e) Include the monitoring of the outcome indicator of the original project proposal (i.e. *Additional collective marks have been registered within five years from the completion of the project in each beneficiary country*).

## I. INTRODUCTION

23. This report is an independent evaluation of the Development Agenda (DA) Project on the Registration of the Collective Marks of Local Enterprises as a Cross-Cutting Economic Development Issue ([DA 1.4.10.01](#)). The project was approved during the 24<sup>th</sup> session of the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP) (document [CDIP/24/9](#)) of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), held in Geneva, from November 18 to 22, 2019. Initially, the project was approved for a period of 24 months. However, the CDIP, at its 26<sup>th</sup>, 29<sup>th</sup> and 31<sup>st</sup> sessions, approved extensions for a maximum combined period of 18 months; resulting in a project duration of 38 months: January 2021 – February 2024.

## II. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

24. **Objectives:** The project aimed to develop a supporting and bolstering system to facilitate the registration of the collective marks of local enterprises as a cross-cutting economic development issue, by:

- a) Formulating an awareness-raising, information and dissemination strategy on the advantages, opportunities and benefits of the registration of collective marks as the intellectual property of small community enterprises.
- b) Contributing to the strengthening of an institutional structure to support the identification, development and registration of collective marks.

25. **Beneficiary countries:** The project was implemented in four countries: The Plurinational State of Bolivia (the Member State who put forward the project proposal), Brazil, the Philippines and Tunisia.

26. **Outputs:** The project document set out the following 13 outputs (summarized):
- (a) Three beneficiary countries selected (and the Plurinational State of Bolivia)
- In all four beneficiary countries:*
- (b) Country-level project plans approved
  - (c) Scoping studies carried out
  - (d) Information events held
  - (e) Products/associations selected
  - (f) Workshops with associations' members held
  - (g) Regulations of use of the collective mark drafted and adopted
  - (h) Logos for the collective mark designed
  - (i) Collective marks registered
  - (j) Events to launch the collective marks held
  - (k) Practical guide on collective marks developed
  - (l) Training activities for IP offices carried out
  - (m) Awareness raising material produced

27. Within WIPO, this project has been managed by the Development Agenda Coordination Division (DACD), Regional and National Development Sector (RNDS).

## III. OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION CRITERIA AND METHODOLOGY

28. The aim of the evaluation was to assess the project's performance, including project design and management, coordination, coherence, implementation and results achieved. The evaluation also aimed to provide evidence-based evaluation information to support the decision-making process as a mainstream program of WIPO.

29. The evaluation was organized around 11 evaluation questions split into four areas: Project Design and Management, Effectiveness, Sustainability and Implementation of DA Recommendations. These questions are responded to directly in the section “Key findings” below.

30. The evaluation utilized a combination of methods. In addition to a review of all relevant documentation, project outputs and available monitoring data, interviews were conducted with six staff of the WIPO Secretariat (in-person and telephone) and telephone interviews with 14 project stakeholders in all four beneficiary countries. Evaluation consultants Patricia Goldschmid and Anita Leutgeb carried out stakeholder interviews in Spanish and Portuguese respectively for the evaluation.

#### IV. KEY FINDINGS

31. This section is organized on the basis of the four evaluation areas. Each evaluation question is answered directly under the headings of each area.

##### A. Project Design and Management

###### *Appropriateness of the initial project document as a guide for project implementation and assessment of results achieved.*

32. **Finding 1:** The project proposal document provided a description of the delivery strategy, activities, output and schedule, budget and monitoring indicators. It also contained a clear rationale for the project. The project document was found to be sufficient in guiding the overall implementation and assessment of progress. Ultimately, the main deliverables of the project were those that were foreseen in the proposal document. An aspect that needed consequent adjustment was the timeline and the consequent project extension (due mainly to the COVID-19 pandemic and changes within governments of the beneficiary countries), which were not possible to foresee when the project proposal was approved in November 2019.

###### *The project monitoring, self-evaluation and reporting tools and analysis of whether they were useful and adequate to provide the project team and key stakeholders with relevant information for decision-making purposes.*

33. **Finding 2:** The project monitoring tools were appropriate for reporting to Member States at the CDIP on the overall progress of the project. Several observations were made about the reporting and analysis tools:

- (a) The Secretariat presented four Progress Report to Member States at the CDIP (at its 26<sup>th</sup>, 29<sup>th</sup>, 30<sup>th</sup>, 31<sup>st</sup> Sessions). The CDIP was kept up to date on the progress of the project in the four beneficiary countries and were presented key results, such as the designed logos of the collective marks and the global promotional video.
- (b) For each country, it proved useful and necessary to create a country-level plan (as foreseen also in the project proposal). For project implementation, a country-level team was also established comprising of a focal point from the national IP office, and national consultant(s) (either in-country or with country expertise) contracted by WIPO. In Brazil, the team was complemented by representatives of SEBRAE, the Brazilian micro and small business support service and the IP Division of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs; in Bolivia, the team was complemented by representatives of the EMPODERAR (“empowerment”) program of the Ministry of Rural Development and Land; in the Philippines, the Department of Trade and Industry supported the team; in Tunisia, the national



team was complemented by an international consultant with expertise in collective marks, IP and business development

- (c) The project's objectives had three indicators set at the outcome level of which for one it was too early to report on "*Additional collective marks have been registered within five years from the completion of the project in each beneficiary country*" (impact assessment). This indicator would be important to evaluate in the future to assess the long-term success of the project (see Conclusions and Recommendations below).

*The extent to which other entities within the Secretariat have contributed and enabled an effective and efficient project implementation.*

34. **Finding 3:** The activities of this project were managed by the DACD with the support of other entities within the Secretariat. The regional divisions provided support to the project within their regions; the Division for Arab Countries, the Division for Asia and Pacific and the Division for Latin America and the Caribbean. Staff of the Department for Trademarks, Industrial Designs and Geographical Indications of the Brands and Designs Sector supported the project with expert advice on collective marks. The News and Media Division supported the project with technical assistance for video editing. Overall, the coordination and support of these other entities within the Secretariat supported an efficient implementation of the project.

35. **Finding 4:** Within the project, coordination between the DACD staff and the different project stakeholders was reported as efficient and effective; interviewees were very positive on the commitment and support provided by the DACD staff to in-country project teams, particularly given the challenges and delays faced as described below. Several observations were made on project management:

- a) The project was essentially implementing the same (or very similar) activities in all four beneficiary countries. Although DACD staff could benefit from the cross-learning of working across the countries, there were no opportunities for country-level stakeholders to benefit from the experiences and learnings of the other countries.
- b) The project required WIPO to implement activities in the four countries at the local level, such as organizing launch events and training workshops with the support of the national consultants and other team members. However, the WIPO purchasing and procurement rules did not seem to be adaptable for country and local level activities, which created some obstacles and were time-consuming for the DACD staff to resolve.

*The extent to which the risks identified in the initial project document have materialized or been mitigated.*

36. **Finding 5:** The initial project document identified three risks for the project. The project documentation described a mitigation response as listed below. These risks did not pose major barriers although risk 3 did create some challenges as described in the following table:

<b>Identified risk and mitigation response</b>	<b>Analysis</b>
Risk 1: <i>Resistance by some producer associations to change when collective mark registration begins.</i>	This risk did not materialise significantly; on the contrary, WIPO staff and stakeholders reported that in the beneficiary countries, associations and producers were welcoming to the collective mark registration and wished to be involved.

<p>Mitigation 1: Conduct high-impact information and awareness-raising drives on the comparative advantages of using collective marks.</p>	
<p>Risk 2: <i>Possible conflicts within community associations, which could delay action to launch the collective mark incubation process.</i></p> <p>Mitigation 2: Initiate action to build local authorities' and producers' awareness of the effects of organizational weakness on the formulation of productive ideas by their associates.</p>	<p>This risk did not materialise significantly; there were some internal issues to be resolved where the associations were established for the project (e.g. Tunisia) or needed further development (e.g. Brazil and Bolivia). The project teams in each country worked closely with each association to resolve any internal issues.</p>
<p>Risk 3: <i>Limited institutional capacity of beneficiary groups to develop, register and benefit from the collective mark.</i></p> <p>Mitigation 3: Undertaking of institutional assessment of the potential beneficiary groups prior to selection.</p>	<p>This risk did materialise to some extent in the capacity of the beneficiary groups to benefit from the collective marks. Although in all countries the beneficiary associations developed and registered collective marks, there were challenges to fully benefit from the collective marks to date as described below (see Effectiveness below).</p>

Table 1: Risks, mitigation and analysis

*The project's ability to respond to emerging trends, technologies and other external forces.*

37. **Finding 6:** An external force that the project had to respond and adapt to was the COVID-19 pandemic. The project was approved at the 24<sup>th</sup> session of the CDIP, held from November 9 to 13, 2019, with implementation planned for during the peak of the pandemic in 2020 and 2021. Consequently, activities had to be adapted accordingly. For example, in all four beneficiary countries, some activities, such as the information sessions and training workshops had to be reduced in size (or split into smaller groups) and/or held virtually because of the COVID-19 restrictions. Further, there were some changes to governments in the beneficiary countries, including within the national IP offices, that resulted in some delays for the project. Although these elements created additional organizational tasks, they did not have a major impact on the project, aside from delaying its completion and extending the project by 14 months.

**B. Effectiveness of the project**

*The effectiveness and usefulness of the outputs developed in the context of the project, including scoping studies on the production areas and community enterprises that could benefit from the use of collective mark; drafting and adoption of regulations on the use of the collective mark; and development of a practical guide on the development and registration of collective marks, for replication in other scenarios, and customization for each beneficiary country.*

38. **Finding 7:** The outputs as foreseen by the Project Proposal (as detailed in paragraph 4) were all developed and launched successfully during the project's implementation in the four beneficiary countries:

- a) **The scoping studies:** In each of the four beneficiary countries, a scoping study was carried out on production areas and community enterprises that could benefit from the use of a collective mark. The scoping studies were adapted to the local conditions, for example, in Bolivia, associations were asked to submit proposals with 34 indicating interest in the project. In all countries, the scoping studies were successful in supporting the selection of an association for the use of a collective mark as detailed below.

- b) **The regulations on the use of the collective mark:** In each of the four beneficiary countries, regulations on the use of the collective mark were drafted by the national consultants in consultation with the other team members and the beneficiary associations. In all countries, the regulations were adopted by the beneficiary associations. In some countries, additional drafting and legal assistance was provided by the project; for example, in Bolivia the project supported the association in modifying their by-laws and regulations and in Tunisia, their product specifications. According to interviewees, the regulations were sufficient to facilitate and enable the use of the collective mark, although more product specifications and guidelines were still required, in order to ensure product quality and meet the regulatory requirements.
- c) **Practical guide on the development and registration of collective marks:** In each of the four countries, a practical guide was produced on the development and registration of collective marks, in addition to a leaflet summarizing the guides' content (some two pages). The content of each guide was customized to the needs of each country, translated into local languages and published by the national IP offices in association with WIPO and other national partners. According to interviewees, the guides were seen as being informative and of use for the further promotion of collective marks in the countries. However, for the interviewees, the guides would still need to be part of larger marketing and awareness-raising efforts of national IP offices to encourage the use of collective marks by other associations.

*The effectiveness of the project in identifying the potential products that could benefit from a collective mark and selection of the final product.*

39. **Finding 8:** In all four beneficiary countries, associations were selected whose members produced products that could potentially benefit from a collective mark:

- (a) In Bolivia, honey from the Asociación Regional de Apicultores del Chaco Chuquisaqueño (ARACH) representing 42 beekeeping association from some 1,200 families.
- (b) In Brazil, cassava flour and derived products, honey, nuts and oils from the Associação dos Produtores Agroextrativistas da Floresta Nacional de Tefé e Entorno representing 420 producers of local communities in the Tefé National Forest of the Amazon region.
- (c) In the Philippines, nuts, pastries, handicrafts, fashion accessories and cosmetic products from the Pili tree of the association Orgullo Kan Bicol (OKB) representing more than 500 producers of the Bicol region of Luzon Island.
- (d) In Tunisia, honey, honey-derived products, essential oils, soap and other products of the Association de Producteurs pour la Promotion des Produits de Ghardimaou representing 100 producers from the Jendouba Governorate of north-west Tunisia.

40. **Finding 9:** Although the project was successful in all four countries in identifying the associations and their products that could benefit from a collective mark, their success in bringing their products to market under the collective mark has varied to date. In Brazil, several producers have marketed their products using the collective mark in their local Amazon region. However, they still aim for broader distribution within the country and possibly abroad. In the

Philippines, three producers had marketed products using the collective mark for the Philippines market, with ambitions for further expansion and possible export markets. In Bolivia, the collective mark was launched in February 2024 and marketing efforts were still in preparation as of early 2024. In Tunisia, the products had not yet been marketed under the collective mark as of early 2024. According to interviewees, this is because the benefiting association was newly established (by the project in 2021) and did not yet have the capacity to bring products to market under the collective mark. Their needs in securing continuity of the project's benefits are discussed below under Sustainability.

*The effectiveness of the project in developing, registering, and launching the collective mark.*

41. **Finding 10:** In all four beneficiary countries, the collective mark was developed, registered and launched. For all these collective marks, logos were designed by local designers with the copyright transferred to the beneficiary associations by WIPO. The collective marks were all registered with their respective national IP offices and public launches held between April 2022 to February 2024, as reported on the public WIPO webpage for the project: <https://www.wipo.int/collective-marks/en/>). According to interviewees, the public launches provided extra visibility to collective marks and the project, creating potential interest as described below.

*The effectiveness of the project in delivering capacity building and awareness-raising activities.*

42. **Finding 11:** In all four beneficiary countries, capacity building and awareness-raising activities were carried out as part of the project implementation:

- (a) **Capacity building:** The capacity building activities carried out were two-fold: training workshops were held in all four countries for the members of the beneficiary associations in addition to training workshops for staff of national IP offices. According to interviewees, the workshops were very useful and informative for both members of the associations and national IP offices; for the latter WIPO reported in their Project Completion Report that an average of 90% of participants rated the trainings as useful or very useful to acquire more knowledge and skills on the development, registration and use of collective marks. A limitation highlighted was that neither of these capacity building activities were accompanied by any documented follow-up activities or plans; in the case of the beneficiary associations, for example, what support was further needed to bring their capacity to a sufficient level to manage a collective mark, and for national IP offices, what were their plans to further promote the use of collective marks in their respective countries.
- (b) **Awareness-raising:** The main awareness-raising activities in all countries included information sessions to inform potential beneficiary associations about the benefits of collective marks and the launch events as described above. In addition, promotional videos were produced for each country in addition to a global video and four short videos (1 minute each) for the project (available on the project webpage: <https://www.wipo.int/collective-marks/en/>). According to interviewees, the awareness-raising has attracted additional interest in the project and collective marks. For example, in Bolivia, following the public events, several associations have expressed an interest to develop a collective mark.

## C. Sustainability

### *The likelihood of the continuation of work on the use of the registration of the collective marks of local enterprises as a cross-cutting economic development issue.*

43. **Finding 12:** As described under Effectiveness, the project's outputs were all achieved successfully. Therefore, this increased the likelihood of the continuation of the benefits of the project for the beneficiary countries. The project has supported the four beneficiary associations in building their capacity and they now have the main elements in place to benefit from the collective marks. There were already examples seen where products have been brought to market under the collective marks as described above.

44. **Finding 13:** Interviewees provided evidence of the collective marks contributing to economic development of the local enterprises. For example, in Bolivia, the beneficiary association had reached an agreement with the *Empresa Boliviana de Alimentos (EBA)*, a state company that ensures product quality control and distributes and exports food products. In Brazil, the beneficiary association had reportedly secured additional government funding for the local enterprises of the association. In the Philippines, new opportunities were being explored by the beneficiary association with the trade fairs of the Department of Trade and Industry to display and market their products. In Tunisia, the local enterprises were exploring possibilities to establish and/or access commercial outlets to market their products.

45. **Finding 14:** Sustainability was supported by the involvement of economic development actors within the project; such actors could indeed play an important role in providing the much-needed support to small and medium enterprises (SMEs) and associations in the beneficiary countries.

46. **Finding 15:** Sustainability was also impacted by the nature of the collective marks, considering that they are required to be managed by an association. Interviewees reported that it was not always easy for small enterprises to work in a collective manner; this was facilitated where an association had existed for many years. In some beneficiary countries, where the association had to be established and/or reinforced by the project, there were challenges reported in encouraging entrepreneurs to work together for a common good.

47. **Finding 16:** The maturity of the beneficiary association influenced their ability to manage the collective mark and the likelihood of its ongoing benefits. The management of a collective mark required internal organization of the association that was not yet fully in place in all four beneficiary associations. For the management of the collective marks, all beneficiary associations were reported as still needing to take additional steps, such as developing product specifications and/or putting in place compliance measures for food or other regulatory rules; this was necessary to be able to market a full range of products under the collective marks, according to interviewees.

48. **Finding 17:** The project lacked an exit and/or handover strategy to increase the likelihood of its ongoing benefits. In both Brazil and Tunisia, the feedback from stakeholders was that they felt the beneficiary associations required follow-up and support, and consequently the project's achievements were at risk of being reduced. The Philippines benefited from the follow-up of a staff member of the national IP office who was based in the same region (Bicol) as the beneficiary association. In Bolivia as the collective mark was launched in February 2024, it was too early to determine any follow-up needs. Extra follow-up and support was mainly needed in two areas according to interviewees: the internal organization and capacity of the associations and the marketing and promotion of products under the collective marks.

49. **Finding 18:** An objective of the project was “*strengthening of an institutional structure to support the identification, development and registration of collective marks*”, described under Effectiveness, the project was successful in producing the collective mark guidelines for the national IP offices and training their staff. Further, the national IP offices reported that it had prompted internal reflection on how to further promote the usage of collective marks. However, there were no action plans or road maps available from the national IP offices that set out concretely how they planned to use the capacity and resources provided by the project to increase their promotion and usage of collective marks.

#### **D. Implementation of Development Agenda (DA) Recommendations**

##### *The extent to which the DA Recommendations 1 4, and 10 have been implemented through this project*

50. **Finding 19:** DA recommendation 1 is focused on WIPO’s technical assistance being demand driven development-driven and transparent. The project has made a contribution to this recommendation considering that project’s activities were focused on the economic development of community-based enterprises through their collective associations. Further, the project adapted its approach and activities to be country-specific as proposed in DA recommendation 1.

51. **Finding 20:** DA recommendation 4 is focused on the needs of SMEs and institutions dealing with scientific research and cultural industries. In all countries, the project supported small community-based enterprises as described above. Further, the enterprises, associations and products all have strong cultural connections within their local communities.

52. **Finding 21:** DA recommendation 10 is focused on developing and improving national intellectual property institutional capacity. The project has made a contribution to this DA recommendation considering its activities to support national IP offices in the development of their capacities to understand, promote and manage collective marks.

#### **V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

53. **Conclusion 1 (Ref: Findings 1-11; 19-21).** The project has successfully delivered all the project’s outputs in the four beneficiary countries. This has supported the project in contributing to the DA recommendations and to progressing towards achieving its objective of developing a supporting and bolstering a system to facilitate the registration of the collective marks of local enterprises for cross-cutting economic development. Positive examples have already been seen of this through beneficiary associations bringing to market products under the collective mark as described above.

54. **Conclusion 2 (Ref: Findings 1-6).** The project was efficiently and effectively managed by the DACD, considering some of the challenges of managing the project across four countries as described above. The project could have benefited from simpler and adapted purchasing and procurement rules for country-level activities, in addition to providing opportunities for exchange between country-level project stakeholders.

55. **Conclusion 3 (Ref: Findings 12-18).** The likelihood of success for the project’s objectives will depend upon a number of aspects. Firstly, the beneficiary associations must have the capacity to use and manage the collective mark. Secondly, the beneficiary association must have the capacity and support to promote and market their products under the collective mark. Economic development actors were well placed to provide this support. Finally, the national IP offices needed to have plans in place to build on the project’s benefits to promote

further the use of collective marks in their countries. In all these areas, the beneficiary countries still have progress to be made and would need further support from Member States, WIPO and in-country stakeholders, as reflected in the following recommendations.

56. **Recommendation 1 (Ref: Conclusion 2, Findings 1-6).** To facilitate the implementation of future DA projects, DACD are encouraged to discuss with the Central Services Division an adaption of purchasing and procurement rules for country-level activities, while respecting WIPO's existing oversight and regulatory framework.
57. **Recommendation 2 (Ref: Conclusion 2, Findings 1-6).** For future similar DA projects with multiple country implementation, Member States and the DACD are encouraged within their project design to include (and budget) activities for learning-exchanges between country-level stakeholders, such as facilitated online webinars between countries.
58. **Recommendation 3 (Ref: Conclusion 1 and 3, Findings 1-18).** For future DA projects that aim to contribute to economic development at the country-level, Member States and the DACD are encouraged to include economic development actors at the country (or provincial) level within the project team (and stakeholders) and/or within the project design.
59. **Recommendation 4 (Ref: Conclusion 3, Findings 12-18).** For future DA projects that aim to build the capacity of local enterprises, associations and/or national IP offices, Member States and the DACD are encouraged to include in project proposals activities (and budgets) for hand-over and follow-up plans.
60. **Recommendation 5 (Ref: Conclusion 3, Findings 12-18).** To ensure that the benefits of the project are sustained, it is suggested that the beneficiary countries consider and undertake a targeted set of activities, including the following proposed activities:
- (a) Support to the beneficiary associations in building their internal organization capacity to manage the collective marks.
  - (b) Support to the beneficiary associations to strengthen their regulatory guidelines and specifications in order to be able to market a full range of products under the collective marks.
  - (c) Support to the beneficiary associations to market and promote products under the collective marks in collaboration with national (or provincial) economic development actors.
  - (d) Support to the national IP offices to put in place action plans / road maps to actively promote the use of collective marks in their countries.
  - (e) Include the monitoring of the outcome indicator of the original project proposal (i.e. *Additional collective marks have been registered within five years from the completion of the project in each beneficiary country*).

[Appendix I follows]

## **APPENDIX I: PERSONS INTERVIEWED/CONSULTED**

### **WIPO Staff:**

Mr. Andrew Ong, Director, Division for Asia and the Pacific, RNDS

Mr. M'Hamed Sidi El Khir, Senior Counsellor, Division for Arab Countries, RNDS

Mr. Georges Ghandour, Senior Counsellor, DACD, RNDS

Ms. Mary Hayrapetyan, Associate Program Officer, DACD, RNDS

Ms. Christina Martinez Limon, (former) Associate Program Officer, DACD, RNDS

Ms. Jessyca Van Weelde, Associate Program Officer, DACD, RNDS

### **External:**

#### ***Plurinational State of Bolivia***

Ms. Patricia Gamboa, international consultant, Peru

Ms. Yhosimia Panique, national legal consultant

Mr. Nelson Yarby, Director of the Regional Agricultural Service, EMPODERA program, Ministry of Rural Development and Land

#### ***Brazil***

Mr. Anselmo Buss, national consultant

Mr. Henri Lopes, IP Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Mr. Bruno Rohde, Coordination of International Relations, national IP Office (INPI)

Mr. Leonardo dos Reis Santana, IP Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

#### ***The Philippines***

Mr. Aldrin Mendoza, national consultant

Ms. Nona Nicerio, BIKOL association

Mr. Niño Torre, national IP office (IPOP HL)

#### ***Tunisia***

Ms. Audrey Aubard, international consultant, France

Ms. Wafa Ben Hamida, national consultant



Ms Zeineb Letaief, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Tunisia, Geneva

Ms. Intissar Mersni, president, APROG association

[Appendix II follows]

## **APPENDIX II: DOCUMENTS CONSULTED**

WIPO (2019), CDIP, *Revised Project Proposal for the Registration of the Collective Marks of Local Enterprises as a Cross-Cutting Economic Development Issue submitted by the Plurinational State of Bolivia*, CDIP/24/9.

WIPO (2021-2023), CDIP, 26<sup>th</sup>, 29<sup>th</sup>, 30<sup>th</sup>, 31<sup>st</sup> Sessions. *Progress Reports*.

WIPO (2024), CDIP, 32<sup>nd</sup> Session, *Completion Report of Project for the Registration of the Collective Marks of Local Enterprises as a Cross-Cutting Economic Development Issue*, CDIP/32/10.

WIPO & National IP Office (Bolivia, Brazil, the Philippines and Tunisia) (2022-23), *Guidelines and leaflet for usage of collective marks* (various).

WIPO Project webpage on collective marks: <https://www.wipo.int/collective-marks/en/index.html>

[Appendix III follows]

## **APPENDIX III: INCEPTION REPORT**

### **1. Introduction**

This document is an inception report for the evaluation of the DA project on the Registration of the Collective Marks of Local Enterprises as a Cross-Cutting Economic Development Issue. This document outlines the purpose, objectives, strategy, methodology and work plan of the evaluation. The final report will be based on this inception report, pending approval from WIPO.

### **2. Purpose and Objectives**

The main purpose of this evaluation is to assess implementation of the project and its overall performance. This will feed into the decision-making process of the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP).

The main objective of this evaluation is two-fold:

1. Learning from experiences during project implementation: what worked well and what did not work well for the benefit of continuing activities in this field. This includes assessing the project design framework, project management, including monitoring and reporting tools, as well as measuring and reporting on the results achieved to date and assessing the likelihood of sustainability of results achieved; and
2. Providing evidence-based evaluative information to support the CDIP's decision-making process.

In particular, the evaluation will assess the extent to which the project has been instrumental in:

- (a) Identification of potential products that could benefit from a collective mark and selection of the final product.
- (b) Development, registration, and launch of the collective mark.
- (c) Delivery of capacity building and awareness-raising activities.

### **3. Evaluation Strategy**

- The evaluation will take a participatory approach and involve all relevant stakeholders in the different steps of the evaluation, as far as feasible.
- The information and data will be gathered from multiple sources using different research methods in order to be able to triangulate and cross-reference the results drawn.
- The evaluation will find a balance between questions of project design ("what worked") and questions of effectiveness ("what was achieved"). This will directly support meeting the above-mentioned objectives.

#### 4. Evaluation Framework

Theme and questions	Proposed indicators	Data collection tools	Sources of information
<b>Project design and management</b>			
1. Appropriateness of the initial project document as a guide for project implementation and assessment of results achieved.	Use of project document to guide implementation and assessment of results achieved	Document review Interviews	WIPO staff External stakeholders
2. The project monitoring, self-evaluation and reporting tools and analysis of whether they were useful and adequate to provide the project team and key stakeholders with relevant information for decision-making purposes.	Level of usefulness of monitoring and reporting tools	Document review Interviews	WIPO staff External stakeholders
3. The extent to which other entities within the WIPO Secretariat have contributed and enabled an effective and efficient project implementation.	Number of WIPO entities involved in the project and their contribution	Document review Interviews	WIPO staff External stakeholders
4. The extent to which the risks identified in the initial project document have materialized or been mitigated.	Type of risks encountered during project implementation and how they were addressed	Document review Interviews	WIPO staff External stakeholders
5. The project's ability to respond to emerging trends, technologies and other external forces.	Level of ability of the project to respond to external forces	Document review Interviews	WIPO staff External stakeholders
<b>Effectiveness</b>			
1. The effectiveness and usefulness of the outputs developed in the context of the project, including scoping studies on the production areas and community enterprises that could benefit from the use of collective mark; drafting and adoption of regulations on the use of the collective mark; and development of a practical guide on the development and registration of collective marks, for replication in other scenarios, and customization for each beneficiary country.	Extent of effectiveness and usefulness of the outputs developed in the context of the project	Document review Interviews	WIPO staff External stakeholders
2. The effectiveness of the project in identifying the potential products that could benefit from a collective mark and selection of the final product.	Extent of effectiveness of the project in identifying potential products	Document review Interviews	WIPO staff External stakeholders

3. The effectiveness of the project in developing, registering, and launching the collective mark.	Extent of effectiveness of the project in developing, registering and launching the collective mark	Document review Interviews	WIPO staff External stakeholders
4. The effectiveness of the project in delivering capacity building and awareness-raising activities.	Extent of effectiveness of the project in delivering capacity building and awareness-raising activities	Document review Interviews	WIPO staff External stakeholders
<b>Sustainability</b>			
1. The likelihood of the continuation of work on the use of the registration of the collective marks of local enterprises as a cross-cutting economic development issue.	Likelihood of continued use of the registration of the collective marks of local enterprises	Document review Interviews	WIPO staff External stakeholders
<b>Implementation of Development Agenda (DA) Recommendations</b>			
1. The extent to which the DA Recommendations 1, 4 and 10 have been implemented through this project.	Extent to which recommendations have been implemented	Document review Interviews	WIPO staff External stakeholders

The research tools will be used across the different themes and questions. The following table provides further information on these tools and how they will be deployed.

<b>Tool</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Information source</b>
<i>Interviews – internal</i>	Some 9 semi-structured interviews	<i>By telephone &amp; in-person:</i> WIPO Secretariat staff, including: - Development Agenda Coordination Division (DACD), CDIP Secretariat - Regional and National Development Sector
<i>Interviews – external</i>	Some 15-25 semi-structured interviews	<i>By telephone &amp; in-person:</i> - stakeholder in each of the four countries: - Government representatives - Group Coordinators
<i>Document review</i>	Review of main documentation	WIPO documentation including internal/external reports/publications, guides, videos and tools produced.

The list of persons to be interviewed is detailed further in the annex.

**Data analysis methods:** The quantitative and qualitative data collected will be analyzed and compiled using comparative and statistical methods where appropriate. The data will be correlated and organized to respond to the evaluation questions. These findings will then be used to inform the conclusions and recommendations proposed.

## 5. Work Plan and Timetable

The proposed milestones and timelines are as shown here below:

Milestones/Deliverables	Key dates
Work starts	4 January 2024
Submission of inception report to WIPO	25 January 2024
Feedback from WIPO on inception report	29 January 2024
Submission of final inception report to WIPO	31 January 2024
Submission of draft report to WIPO	1 March 2024
Factual corrections from WIPO on draft report	5 March 2024
Submission of final report to WIPO	7 March 2024
Presentation of evaluation report at the CDIP	29 April – 3 May 2024

## 6. Key Assumptions and Risks

It is assumed that the project team and the Development Agenda Coordination Division (DACD) will assist the consultant in: identifying and accessing all key documents; informing key stakeholders about the evaluation; making necessary introductions; providing contact information and facilitating interviews as required; and providing consolidated timely feedback on deliverables. It is also assumed that the interviews to be undertaken will be successful and language will not be a barrier (the consultant speaks English and French). It is also assumed that the people to be interviewed will be available and willing to provide the required information.

[End of Appendix III and of document]