

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

### **Twentieth Session**

**Geneva, November 27 to December 1, 2017**

### **FOLLOW-UP ON THE PILOT PROJECT ON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY (IP) AND DESIGN MANAGEMENT FOR BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT IN DEVELOPING AND LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES (LDCS)**

*prepared by the Secretariat*

#### **BACKGROUND**

1. It is recalled that, following a proposal by the Republic of Korea presented to the 11<sup>th</sup> session of the CDIP held from May 13 to 17, 2013<sup>1</sup>, the Committee, at its 12<sup>th</sup> session held from November 18 to 21, 2013, approved the “Pilot Project on Intellectual Property (IP) and Design Management for Business Development in Developing and Least Developed Countries (LDCs)”<sup>2</sup>. The Project was initiated in January 2014, and, following a preparatory phase and consultations with Member States, Argentina and Morocco were selected as beneficiary countries. The delivery of technical assistance to selected companies in both these countries started in late 2014 and ended in December 2016.

2. An Evaluation Report of the Project was considered by the CDIP at its 19<sup>th</sup> session held from May 15 to 19, 2017<sup>3</sup>. The Evaluation was conducted by Mr. Daniel Keller, Consultant, EvalCo Sàrl, Leubringen, Switzerland. The Evaluation Report presented its findings and assessment regarding the following project features: (a) project preparation and management; (b) relevance; (c) effectiveness; (d) efficiency; (e) likelihood of sustainability of results; and (f) gender. The Evaluation Report also presented a number of conclusions and recommendations.

---

<sup>1</sup> See document CDIP/11/7.

<sup>2</sup> See document CDIP/12/6.

<sup>3</sup> See document CDIP/19/4.

3. After the consideration of the Evaluation Report by the CDIP, the Chair of the Committee concluded as follows in his Summary:

“The Committee took note of the [Evaluation Report]. The Committee recommended a phase II of the project. The Secretariat was allowed flexibility to assess the feasibility of implementing the activities either as phase II of the project or as part of the regular work of the Organization. The Committee requested the Secretariat to report back to the next session concerning its decision of implementation of the phase II.”<sup>4</sup>

4. The present document constitutes the report by the Secretariat, as requested by the Committee.

## GUIDING PRINCIPLES

5. In devising the follow-up on the Project, the Secretariat has been guided by the following three principles:

- (a) Need to monitor the longer-term impact of the Project;
- (b) Need to leverage the experience gained in the Project; and
- (c) Need to ensure that any expansion of the Project is realistically scalable.

### Monitoring Long-Term Impacts

6. With respect to effectiveness, the Evaluation Report states the following:

“Experience shows that it takes time before capacity building, through its use by beneficiaries, translates into measurable effects. For example, the process of registering an industrial design following the Project’s assistance may take more than one year. It is thus not yet possible to measure the effects of design registrations on company performance. Even less would it be plausible to assume a contribution of project deliverables to broader socio-economic changes observed in the two beneficiary countries or even beyond. An attempt to assess wider outcomes of even impact would thus be premature. The evaluation, however, did explore more direct outcomes to which the Project contributed to.”<sup>5</sup>

7. A budget of 487,000 Swiss francs was foreseen at the level of the Secretariat and significant efforts in each of the beneficiary countries were devoted to the project activities. To inform its decisions on the future evolution and sustainability of the Project, the Secretariat considers it necessary to monitor its impact over a longer period of time, including how successful the exit strategy has been and the extent to which progress in the countries can be sustained at the national and company levels.

8. To do so, the Secretariat would, subject to the agreement of the beneficiary countries and with their cooperation, develop, taking into account work already done during the Project, an evaluation framework designed specifically to assess the longer-term impacts of the Project. Apart from its immediate relevance to the Project itself, such impact-focused evaluation framework potentially could also find application in other areas of WIPO’s technical assistance and capacity-building work.

---

<sup>4</sup> See para. 6.2 of the Summary by the Chair of the nineteenth session of the CDIP.

<sup>5</sup> See paras. 30 and 31 of document CDIP/19/4; see also paras. 76 through 78 of the same.

### Leveraging Experience Gained

9. During the course of the Project, clear methodologies were created and adopted, and a great deal of useful documentation was developed. In this regard, the Evaluation Report concludes that “[p]roject management was highly satisfactory” and specifically suggests that “the benefits of considerable investments in the development of methodology and tools [...] be expanded beyond only two countries.”

10. In line with the Evaluation Report’s suggestion and to enhance the likelihood that the investments made in the Project in respect of the two concerned countries in the future also benefit other countries and stakeholders, the Secretariat would convert the methodologies, tools, documents and other relevant materials created during the course of the Project into a conveniently accessible standard resource set. This resource set could then serve as reference material for any party interested in replicating the Project (or parts thereof) in other countries or contexts. The envisaged standard resort set would offer guidance and reference materials for how to handle, for instance, the following Project elements:

- (a) Project monitoring and evaluation;
- (b) Change management;
- (c) Project scope statements;
- (d) Project governance structures, including:
  - (i) Lead agencies;
  - (ii) Steering committees and public private partnership platforms (including governments, associations, chambers of commerce and universities);
  - (iii) Country project coordinators; and
  - (iv) National experts.
- (e) National strategies for trademarks, industrial designs or geographical indications;
- (f) Outreach plans;
- (g) Feasibility studies and surveys;
- (h) Exit strategies;
- (i) Company selection criteria and assessment methodologies;
- (j) Promotion and awareness activities, including:
  - (i) Program names;
  - (ii) Promotional leaflets;
  - (iii) Logos and slogans;
  - (iv) Webpages;
  - (v) Videos; and
  - (vi) Media engagements.
- (k) Expert methodologies and tools covering:
  - (i) Basic industrial design information;
  - (ii) Company business strategies;
  - (iii) Company industrial design portfolios;
  - (iv) Company IP strategies for industrial designs;
  - (v) Linkages with other IP areas, including trademarks and geographical indications; and
  - (vi) Company technical assistance provided by national experts.
- (l) Capacity Building;
- (m) Knowledge sharing:
  - (i) Nationally and internationally; and
  - (ii) Cross-sectorally.
- (n) Gender and diversity issues.

11. The resource set could take the form of a Manual and/or a dedicated set of webpages (with interactive materials including video and e-learning).

### Scalability and Mainstreaming

12. One condition for the successful replication of the Project in other countries and contexts is that it be designed in a realistically scalable manner. The Secretariat would be hard pressed to replicate the exact same format of the Project in an increasing number of countries, taking into account the degree of resources and workload commitments this would require. In light of the Evaluation Report's positive assessment of various aspects of the Project, it would seem logical to incorporate those aspects into the regular capacity building and technical assistance work of the Secretariat. The development of the standard resource set derived from the Project documentation, as described above, would greatly facilitate this. Countries wishing to replicate the Project (or parts thereof) within their territories would express interest therein to the Secretariat, which would prioritize and plan follow-up on such requests, as part of its regular work. If it is decided to move forward in any particular instance, a plan modeled upon the standard resource set would be devised and executed over a defined period of time.

### IMPLEMENTATION COMPONENTS

13. Taking into account the foregoing, the following three distinct components would be implemented:

- (a) Monitoring longer-term impacts of the Project in the two beneficiary countries on the basis of an impact assessment framework specifically designed for this purpose;
- (b) The creation and making available of the standard resources set, as described in paragraphs 8 through 10 above; and
- (c) The mainstreaming of the Project activities into the regular awareness and capacity building work of the Secretariat.

14. Through these components, the implementation of the follow-up on the Project would become part of the regular work of the Secretariat.

### PROJECT SUPPORT

15. The Project was supported by a full-time Project Officer, who was responsible for its day-to-day implementation. According to the Evaluation Report, this "was a pivotal success factor for the Project." It would be highly beneficial to make use of the knowledge and experience gained by this Project Officer for the development of components (a) and (b) above and knowledge transfer to the organization through training and information sessions.

*16. The CDIP is invited to consider the information contained in this document.*

[End of document]