

Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP)

Thirty-Sixth Session
Geneva, May 4 to 8, 2026

EVALUATION REPORT OF THE PROJECT ON EMPOWERING SMALL BUSINESSES THROUGH IP: DEVELOPING STRATEGIES FOR SUPPORTING GEOGRAPHICAL INDICATIONS OR COLLECTIVE MARKS IN THE POST-REGISTRATION PERIOD

prepared by Mr. Daniel P. Keller, Independent Evaluator, Evilard/Leubringen, Switzerland

1. The Annex to this document contains an external independent Evaluation Report of the Development Agenda (DA) Project on Empowering Small Businesses Through IP: Developing Strategies for Supporting Geographical Indications or Collective Marks in the Post-Registration Period undertaken by Mr. Daniel P. Keller, Independent Evaluator, based in Evilard/Leubringen, Switzerland.

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

[Annex follows]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	i
LIST OF ACRONYMS	ii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
I. Introduction	2
II. Summary of Evaluation Methodology	2
III. Summary of key findings and conclusions.....	2
IV. Recommendations.....	4
V. Lessons Learned	4
DETAILED REPORT	5
I. Introduction	5
II. Project Description.....	5
III. Evaluation Methodology and Limitations	6
IV. Findings and Conclusions.....	7
V. Recommendations.....	10
VI. Lessons Learned	10
APPENDICES	11
APPENDIX 1: LIST OF DOCUMENTS	
APPENDIX 2: LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED	
APPENDIX 3: INCEPTION REPORT	

LIST OF ACRONYMS

BSOs	Business Support Organizations
CDIP	Committee on Development and Intellectual Property
CIRAD	French Agricultural Research Centre for International Development
DA	Development Agenda
DACD	Development Agenda Coordination Division (WIPO)
GI	Geographical Indication
IP	Intellectual property
ITC	International Trade Center
MSME(s)	Micro, Small and Medium Sized Enterprise(s)
RNDS	Regional and National Development Sector (WIPO)
SME(s)	Small and Medium Sized Enterprise(s)
ToR	Terms of Reference
WIPO	World Intellectual Property Organization

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

1. This evaluation report covers the independent evaluation of the Development Agenda (DA) project on [Empowering Small Businesses Through IP: Developing Strategies for Supporting Geographical Indications or Collective Marks in the Post-registration Period](#), hereinafter referred to as “the project”, which was carried out in Algeria, Brazil, Pakistan, and Uganda. Its aim was to develop capacity-building tools and initiatives to empower users or right holders of geographical indications (GIs) or collective/certification marks to effectively use their intellectual property (IP) right post-registration.

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

2. Commissioned by the Secretariat, the evaluation was undertaken by an independent evaluator¹ in accordance with the Terms of Reference (ToR) dated September 26, 2025 and [WIPO's Evaluation Manual](#). The purpose of the evaluation was to support organizational learning on the project implementation and inform the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP) in its decision-making.

3. While maintaining his independence, the evaluator applied a participatory approach methodology. Data collected through desk study (*Appendix 1*) and semi-structured individual video interviews (*Appendix 2*) was triangulated to assess the plausibility and robustness of the results obtained.

SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Project design (findings and conclusion 1)

4. The project was designed based on a well-founded analysis of the post-registration challenges to be addressed. The implementation strategy was clearly explained, well-sequenced, and generally appropriate for achieving the project's objectives.

5. Activities and implementation schedules were defined in detail prior to the selection of the beneficiary countries. Activities in all countries were expected to be implemented in parallel. This left limited flexibility to adapt the support to each country's unique starting point and pace of advancement.

6. Knowledge sharing among participating countries in the form of south-south cooperation was not incorporated into the project framework, which could have stimulated peer-to-peer learning opportunities for all beneficiaries. Particularly Brazil's extensive experience in supporting producers' associations and MSMEs could have significantly enriched the initiative.

7. The project's planning and monitoring framework would not fully meet the current standards defined in [WIPO's Guidebook for Preparation, Implementation and Evaluation of Development Agenda Projects](#). The Project was however designed before these new tools and templates for successful DA proposals were introduced.

Project management (findings and conclusion 2)

8. Overall, the project was managed well. All stakeholders highlighted the excellent work of the management team and their high level of enthusiasm and commitment to the project. The

¹ Daniel P. Keller (Co-Director, EvalCo Sàrl, Evillard/Leubringen, Switzerland).

support of the national focal points and the national consultants was also instrumental in successfully rolling out WIPO's support.

9. The success of GIs requires a functioning ecosystem with multiple stakeholders (including but not limited in the fields of IP, quality control, trade promotion). During preparation, an analysis was performed in each country. National steering committees that brought all relevant authorities to the table were pivotal to ensuring coordination among different government agencies responsible for different elements of successfully using GIs. The early enrollment of and coordination among different government agencies and other stakeholders was essential.

10. Given that enhancing market access was a priority for the beneficiaries, stronger involvement of private sector institutions like the chambers of commerce, that could have supported the commercialization of products, would have been desirable.

11. None of the risks identified caused any significant negative impact on the achievement of the planned result. It was not possible to conclude whether this was because mitigation measures were taken or because the adverse event described in the risk analysis did not occur.

Effectiveness (findings and conclusion 3)

12. As confirmed by the annual progress reports submitted to the CDIP², which were selectively validated through stakeholder interviews, all planned support was provided in good quality.

13. Interviewees confirmed increased awareness of the potential benefits and the role of GIs or collective/certification marks in improving market access for local products while safeguarding common quality standards and traditional methods of production.

14. Participants also reported having improved knowledge and skills relevant to the collective management of their GI or collective/certification marks. According to the interviews, the control and certification schemes, internal governance, and the marketing and branding of their products have also improved. It was not possible to verify this through other sources.

15. In conclusion, the planned objectives as per the Project Document were fully achieved.

Sustainability (findings and conclusion 4)

16. Assessing the likelihood of sustaining the results achieved in the beneficiary countries would be premature, as their continuation will largely depend on the follow-up support offered by the respective authorities. However, according to the interviews, follow-up activities are planned in the beneficiary countries.

17. Except in Brazil where WIPO worked systematically with SEBRAE that is providing support to MSME's, WIPO's assistance to the producer organizations was directly provided by WIPO consultants. A systematic strengthening of organizations that could continue to provide support to small producers and communities beyond the project timeline was not planned.

Implementation of DA Recommendations (findings and conclusions 5)

18. Also evidenced by its approval by the CDIP through consensus, the project responded well to the DA recommendations 1, 4, 10 and 11, which it was expected to address. Specifically, it responded to recommendation 4 that places emphasis on the needs of SMEs.

² Progress Report: [CDIP/35/3](#), ANNEX III, September 16, 2025 (latest progress report available).

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1 to WIPO (based on conclusion 1)

19. WIPO should incorporate flexibilities into the design of DA projects that will allow beneficiary countries to adapt the support offered to local needs identified during the inception phase. This approach will enable tailor-made and country-specific support that is needed to achieve the project objectives more efficiently.

Recommendation 2 (based on conclusion 1)

20. The CDIP should consider integrating south-south cooperation into new DA projects³. This will allow at least one beneficiary country, that is willing and able to transfer project-specific know-how to others, to do so.

Recommendation 3 (based on conclusion 1)

21. The CDIP should consider complementing direct technical assistance by WIPO (micro-level) to small producers and communities with systematically strengthening institutions (meso-level) that provide business support to small producers and communities. This approach would increase the chances that the support will be scaled up and continue to be available beyond WIPO's direct involvement. The partner institutions to be strengthened should be selected based on their institutional capacities and their relevant track-record in supporting small producers and communities.

LESSONS LEARNED

22. Assisting small producers and communities in successfully protecting, controlling and using GIs or collective/certification marks requires holistic support and coaching, that addresses bottlenecks beyond IP aspects. Support in commercial and business-related areas is particularly important.

23. Coordination and cooperation with all relevant authorities (inter alia authorities in IP, agriculture, tourism, quality control, trade) is essential.

24. A country-specific stakeholder analysis undertaken at the outset is essential to identifying the full range of actors and clarifying their respective roles. A good practice observed was the establishment of national steering committees that brought these stakeholders together. This proved pivotal in ensuring coordinated action across agencies responsible for different elements of the effective use of the respective IP rights.

³ South-South cooperation refers to cooperation between fellow developing and least developed countries. Triangular cooperation includes a developed country or an institution, which supports South-South initiatives. See also WIPO Cooperation Hub: https://www.wipo.int/cooperation/en/south_south/ (retrieved on February 17, 2026)

DETAILED REPORT

INTRODUCTION

25. This report covers the independent evaluation of the Development Agenda (DA) project on [Empowering Small Businesses Through IP: Developing Strategies for Supporting Geographical Indications or Collective Marks in the Post-registration Period](#) (Project Code DA_1_4_10_11_01) hereinafter referred to as “the project”.

26. The project was proposed by Brazil and adopted in November 2021 during the twenty-seventh session of the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP) and was designed to address DA Recommendations 1, 4, 10, and 11⁴.

27. The project’s expected duration was 36 months. After preparatory work between January and December 2022, the actual project implementation started in November 2022 and ended in December 2025. The beneficiary countries were Algeria, Brazil, Pakistan and Uganda.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

28. Small producers in developing countries increasingly use geographical indications (GIs) or collective/certification marks to protect and market the unique qualities of their local products. When a product’s origin is tied to distinctive characteristics or higher quality, that reputation can help communities access better markets, earn higher incomes, and support rural development. This can also motivate producers to agree on shared quality standards and preserve traditional production methods, helping sustain local culture and heritage⁵.

29. While a GI or collective/certification mark gives producers legal recognition and protection, it does not automatically guarantee economic benefits. The success of a GI or collective/certification mark depends largely on how it is used after registration⁶.

30. The main purpose of the project was to develop capacity building tools and initiatives to empower users or right holders of GIs or collective/certification marks from developing countries in the post-registration period to effectively use their GI or collective/certification mark.

31. To achieve this objective, a comprehensive sequence of activities was designed to strengthen the collective management of GIs or collective/certification marks in the beneficiary countries. The activities included:

- a) Conducting an analysis of country contexts and detailed country-level project plans.
- b) Conducting a series of information events to raise awareness of the benefits of collective quality-scheme management for quality products linked to origin.
- c) Developing studies on post-registration challenges for each beneficiary country, validated by the project management team and national coordinators.
- d) Selecting one GI in each beneficiary country to receive targeted support, including reinforcement of producer groups, quality control mechanisms, and commercialization strategies.
- e) Developing training materials on the collective management of GIs and related quality schemes and providing capacity building support to authorities, local, rural

⁴ See: The 45 Adopted Recommendations under the WIPO Development Agenda by the General Assembly of WIPO Member States, 2007

⁵ Project Document [CDIP/27/7](#), 2.1 Introduction to the issue

⁶ *ibid*

development actors, and selected producer groups, with particular attention to strengthening internal governance.

- f) Supporting the design and implementation of cost-effective control and certification systems, and preparing branding and commercialization strategies to support participating producers and producer groups.
- g) Carrying out awareness-raising initiatives highlighting the role of collective management in fostering local development through preservation of cultural heritage, and traditions, complemented by the development and dissemination of communication materials.
- h) Preparation of a global study on post-registration challenges.
- i) Organization of a workshop on “Supporting GIs in the Post-Registration Period” held in November 2025 in Geneva, Switzerland to exchange experiences and lessons learned among the beneficiary countries and producers.

32. By 31 December 2025, 83 per cent of the overall budget of 592,300 Swiss francs (CHF), all non-personnel costs, were committed or spent.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY AND LIMITATIONS

33. The evaluation was guided by the Terms of Reference (ToR) dated September 26, 2025, and by WIPO's Evaluation Manual⁷. It was carried out between December 1, 2025, and May 8, 2026, by an external evaluator⁸, in coordination with the Development Agenda Coordination Division (DACD)⁹ and the Project Manager¹⁰. Its scope covered the entire project duration.

34. The evaluation balanced the objectives of providing evidence-based evaluative information to support the CDIP in its decision-making process and promote organizational learning.

35. While maintaining his independence, the evaluator applied a participatory approach, which is expected to contribute to organizational learning. Different evaluation tools were combined to ensure an evidence-based qualitative and quantitative assessment. This methodological mix included document review (*Appendix 1*) and semi-structured interviews (*Appendix 2*). The data collected was then triangulated and the plausibility of the results obtained assessed. Conclusions and recommendations were deduced from the evaluation findings.

36. The main evaluative steps included a kick-off meeting, desk review of relevant project related documentation, the operationalization of the ToR through the inception report (*Appendix 3*), interviews with key informants selected by the project team, the submission of a draft report to the DACD for factual verification, integration of comments received, submission of the final report, and its presentation to the thirty-sixth session of the CDIP in May 2026.

37. In terms of limitations, data collection through desk study of reports and video calls with the management of producers' associations did not provide comprehensive insights on the situation on the ground.

⁷ WIPO, Evaluation Manual, IOD/EM/2019, April 4, 2019.

⁸ Daniel P. Keller (Senior Evaluator, Evilard/Leubringen, Switzerland). The Evaluator is independent. He was not involved into the preparation or implementation of the Project.

⁹ Development Agenda Coordination Division (DACD), Regional and National Development Sector (RNDS), World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO).

¹⁰ Ms. Alexandra Grazioli, Director of the Lisbon Registry, Brands and Designs Sector, WIPO.

38. The findings and assessment below should be interpreted in consideration that these constraints limit the scope and depth of the evaluation, especially in relation to the assessment of results at the producers' level. Nevertheless, findings were comprehensive, consistent and clear.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Project Design (findings and conclusions 1)

39. The project document included a good analysis of the post-registration challenges to be addressed. The implementation strategy, including sequencing of support, was clearly spelled out and generally adequate for working towards the intended objectives.

40. Specific activities, budget allocations, and timelines were defined in great detail before the selection of the beneficiary countries. It was planned that the same activities would be implemented in all countries in parallel¹¹, even though starting points and absorption capacities of selected countries could differ significantly. Adjusting the content and pace of support to each country was only marginally possible.

41. Knowledge transfer among the beneficiary countries as a form of south-south cooperation¹² was not incorporated into the project framework. Some beneficiary countries, such as Brazil, could have shared experiences in supporting producers' associations using GIs, including through a public-funded program implemented by the non-governmental organization, Sebrae¹³. This might have been a missed opportunity which could have stimulated peer-to-peer learning opportunities for all beneficiaries.

42. Capacity building activities for producers, national or local authorities and other interested stakeholders were directly provided through WIPO. This direct support limited the potential for scaling and continuation of support to small producers in the beneficiary countries.

43. Where they exist, strengthening national institutions¹⁴ that would provide ongoing support to right holders or users of GIs¹⁵ would be more efficient and sustainable. To do so, WIPO could, for example, contract its support in DA projects to qualified national institutions, while in parallel training and coaching these institutions.

44. Apart from efficiency and sustainability considerations, these national institutions that serve communities are often better positioned than WIPO in addressing the many post-registration challenges outside the IP domain, especially those relating to quality control and commercial aspects.

45. Not related to this project, WIPO already cooperates with International Trade Center (ITC) in supporting Business Support Organizations (BSOs) to integrate IP advice and solutions into their service portfolio for businesses, enabling them to use the IP system effectively in developing their competitive strategies.

46. Furthermore, complementing the direct, micro-level capacity building approach with the strengthening of public and private institutions approach that support small producers and

¹¹ As per GANTT Chart in the Project Document [CDIP/ 27/7](#)

¹² South-South cooperation refers to cooperation between fellow developing and least developed countries. Triangular cooperation includes a developed country or an institution, which supports South-South initiatives. See also WIPO Cooperation Hub: https://www.wipo.int/cooperation/en/south_south/ (retrieved on February 17, 2026)

¹³ Brazilian Micro and Small Business Support Service (Sebrae) is a private, non-profit, and public-interest organization created in 1972 to promote the competitiveness and sustainable development of small businesses and encourage entrepreneurship. Sebrae provided some capacity building under the project.

¹⁴ Often referred to as Business Support Organizations (BSOs), which provide knowledge, services, and networks to help businesses. Typical BSOs are sector associations and chambers of commerce.

¹⁵ An example of such an institution mandated by the Brazilian government is Sebrae.

communities at the meso-level would further align with the spirit of DA Recommendation 11, which explicitly calls for reinforcing local institutions' capacity.

47. The project's planning and monitoring framework would not fully meet the current standards defined in [WIPO's Guidebook for Preparation, Implementation and Evaluation of Development Agenda Projects](#). While the expected *outputs* (deliverables) are spelled out, the expected *outcomes* remain unclear. Outcomes would be the changes in behavior, practice, performance, or systems that the outputs are expected to generate. Awareness, knowledge, skills, or confidence among beneficiaries however, which the Project Document refers to as "outcomes", are typical indicators for successful capacity building and do not describe the benefits generated by capacity building. It should however be noted that the project was designed before the introduction of the Guidebook, which was thus not applicable.

48. The risks and mitigation measures outlined in the project document were generally adequate. However, the risk analysis could be made more useful for informed decision making by assessing the likelihood in which potential threats occur and the degree of their possible impact on the achievement of results separately.

49. A phase-out strategy, which would spell out how to ensure a continuation of project benefits (sustainability) beyond WIPO's support, was not articulated.

50. Although the project was designed before WIPO introduced its new templates for DA proposals, utilizing the correct use of WIPO's new template would have addressed the above shortcomings.

Project Management (findings and conclusions 2)

51. The Project was well managed. The stakeholders interviewed highlighted the excellent work of the project management team and their high level of enthusiasm and commitment. The national focal points and national consultants played a critical role in rolling out WIPO's support and in responding to country-specific needs during implementation.

52. Providing on-site support in rural areas to local actors proved to be challenging. Working with them required substantial day-to-day support and coaching, which was mostly provided through national consultants. The nature of these small activities across the four beneficiary countries highlighted the importance of flexible implementation arrangements within WIPO's administrative framework.

53. The success of GIs requires strengthening an entire ecosystem with multiple stakeholders (including but not limited to the fields of IP, agriculture, tourism, quality control, trade promotion). National steering committees were pivotal to ensuring coordination among different government agencies responsible for different elements of successfully using the GIs. The early enrollment of and coordination among different government agencies was also essential. Moreover, the involvement of private sector institutions like chambers of commerce was important as they support the commercialization of products.

54. None of the risks identified in *paragraph 2.4* of the project document had a negative impact on the project. It was, however, not possible to conclude whether this was due to the mitigation measures implemented or because the adverse events described in the risk analysis did not occur.

55. The collaboration with national or other international development actors, such as the cooperation with the French Agricultural Research Centre for International Development (CIRAD) during the launch of the GI in May, 2025 in Uganda, was a good way to create synergies, to complement the project implementation, and to ensure a follow-up beyond the limited scope of the Project.

56. Some synergies also emerged with the DA Project: [Intellectual Property and Unlocking the Potential of Non-Agricultural GIs for the Empowerment of Local Communities and Preservation or Revival of Local Arts and Traditions](#) (DA_01_04_11_34_35_37_1) that was also implemented with support from the Brands and Designs Sector.

Effectiveness (findings and conclusions 3)

57. As confirmed by the project reports which were selectively validated through stakeholder interviews, WIPO provided all planned support in good quality. The positive feedback on the project activities was evidenced by the Secretariat's internal evaluation, which was also validated through interviews with a sample of beneficiaries.

58. Interviewees confirmed that the planned objectives¹⁶ had been achieved:

- a) Their awareness of the potential benefits of GIs or collective/certification marks in improving market access for local products while safeguarding common quality standards and traditional methods of production had increased.
- b) They had better knowledge and skills relevant to collective management of their GI or collective/certification marks.

59. The three representatives of producers' associations who were interviewed stated that the association's control and certification schemes, internal governance, and the commercialization of their products had improved. It was not possible to validate this through other sources.

60. Moreover, the project generated evidence-based insight into post-registration challenges with recommendations on how to address them¹⁷. These can be used to inform policy making as well as for enhancing and complementing WIPO's regular support to Member States.

61. Among the unexpected positive project outcomes observed in the beneficiary countries were: improved coordination among government agencies; political awareness and support provided by national governments for GIs; and, better public awareness about GIs in the countries in general.

62. Moreover, one association reported sales to a buyer in Switzerland following the workshop held at WIPO headquarters in Geneva in November 2025.

Sustainability (findings and conclusions 4)

63. Assessing the likelihood of sustaining results in beneficiary countries would be premature, as the continuation of benefits will depend largely on follow-up support by the respective authorities. According to interviews, follow-up activities are planned in all countries.

64. However, since support to the producer organizations was directly provided by WIPO consultants (see findings and conclusion 1), it remains uncertain whether similar assistance can continue to be provided and be scaled up more broadly.

65. The outputs generated by the project have been published and will continue to be available in the Catalogue of DA Projects.

¹⁶ As per Indicators of Successful Completion (Output Indicators) and Indicators of success (outcome indicators) defined in paragraph 3.2. of the Project Document.

¹⁷ Chapter 3 of the Study on Strategies for Supporting Geographical Indications in the Post Registration Period.

Implementation of the DA (findings and conclusions 5)

66. The Project responded well to the DA recommendations 1, 4, 10 and 11¹⁸ which it was expected to address. It responded particularly well to DA recommendation 4¹⁹, which calls for tailoring of WIPO's technical cooperation to the needs of SMEs, including small producers and communities, who were the primary beneficiaries of the project activities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1: based on findings and conclusion 1

67. WIPO should incorporate flexibilities into the design of DA projects that will allow beneficiary countries to adapt the support offered to local needs identified during the inception phase. This approach will enable tailor-made and country-specific support that is needed to achieve the project objectives more efficiently.

Recommendation 2: based on findings and conclusion 1

68. The CDIP should consider integrating south-south cooperation into new DA projects. This will allow at least one beneficiary country, that is willing and able to transfer project-specific know-how to others, to do so.

Recommendation 3: based on findings and conclusion 1

69. The CDIP should consider complementing direct technical assistance by WIPO (micro-level) to small producers and communities with systematically strengthening institutions (meso-level) that provide business support to them. This approach would increase the chances that support will be scaled up and continue to be available beyond WIPO's direct involvement. The partner institutions to be strengthened should be selected based on their institutional capacities and their relevant track-record in supporting small producers and communities.

LESSONS LEARNED

70. Assisting small producers and communities in successfully protecting, controlling and using GIs or collective/certification marks requires holistic support and coaching, that addresses bottlenecks beyond IP aspects. Support in commercial and business-related areas is particularly important.

71. Coordination and cooperation with all relevant authorities (inter alia authorities in IP, agriculture, tourism, quality control, trade) is essential.

72. A country-specific stakeholder analysis undertaken at the outset is essential to identifying the full range of actors and clarifying their respective roles. A good practice observed was the establishment of national steering committees that brought these stakeholders together. This proved pivotal in ensuring coordinated action across agencies responsible for different elements of the effective use of the respective IP rights.

[End of Annex, Appendices follow]

¹⁸ See: The 45 Adopted Recommendations under the WIPO Development Agenda by the General Assembly of WIPO Member States, 2007.

¹⁹ Recommendation 4: Place particular emphasis on the needs of SMEs and institutions dealing with scientific research and cultural industries and assist Member States, at their request, in setting up appropriate national strategies in the field of IP.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I: LIST OF DOCUMENTS

i. Project document and progress report

- Project Document : [CDIP/27/7](#) Revised Project Proposal by Brazil on Empowering Small Businesses Through IP: Developing Strategies for Supporting Geographical Indications or Collective Marks in the Post Registration Period.
- Progress Report: [CDIP/29/2](#), ANNEX IX, September 5, 2022.
- Progress Report: [CDIP/31/3](#), ANNEX VI, September 6, 2023.
- Progress Report: [CDIP/33/3](#), ANNEX IV, October 4, 2024.
- Progress Report: [CDIP/35/3](#), ANNEX III, September 16, 2025 (latest progress report).

ii. Project outputs

a. Beneficiary countries

- Algérie: WIPO, étude finale, rapport cadre législatif et institutionnel national pour la protection des IG en Algérie – Deglet Nour de Tolga, produit pilote, réalisé par M. MESSAK Mohamed Ridha et M. KHERAIFIA Nourreddine, Consultants (y compris sommaire de 5-pages), avril 2024.
- Algérie: WIPO, plan d'action, réalisé par M. MESSAK Mohamed Ridha, Agro-économiste, expert en chaînes de valeur, Consultant national de l'OMPI, juin 2025.
- Algérie: WIPO, various awareness raising and promotion materials.
- Brazil: WIPO, Study on the challenges faced by local producers that are users or owners of a GI, to effectively use their IPRs in the post-registration period, Carlos Tarrasón Collado (including 5-page summary), December 20, 2023.
- Brazil: WIPO, the Geographical Indication System, 1-page summary.
- Brazil: WIPO, various information, promotion and training materials.
- Pakistan: WIPO, Pakistan National Study, Challenges faced by users of Sindhri Mango GI, to effectively use their IPRs in the post-registration period, prepared by: Nadia Shah and Noor Asfia, 2023 (including 5-page summary).
- Pakistan: WIPO, Initial survey on the Geographical Indication system, May 29, 2023.
- Pakistan: WIPO, Action Plan for "Sindhri Mango" GI Implementation.
- Pakistan: WIPO, various information, promotion and training materials.
- Uganda: WIPO, The Republic of Uganda National Study, challenges faced by users of Rwenzori Mountains of the Moon GI, to effectively use their IPRs in the post-registration period, prepared by: Arthur Mpeirwe, 2023 (including 5-page summary).
- Uganda: WIPO, Strategic Action Plan for Rwenzori Mountains of the Moon Coffee GI.
- Uganda: WIPO, Rwenzori Mountains of the Moon Coffee, Final Report, Luis Fernando Samper- 4.0 Brands, Consultant, May 2025.
- Uganda: Branding and Commercialization Activities for "Rwenzori Mountains of the Moon Coffee" GI Producer Group, Ms. Linda Kisembo, November 2025.
- Uganda: WIPO, various information, promotion and training materials.

b. Global level

- Study on Strategies for Supporting, Geographical Indications in the Post Registration Period, prepared by Prof. Giovanni Belletti and Prof. Andrea Marescotti.
- Various material relating to the WIPO Workshop: Supporting Geographical Indications in the Post-Registration Period, November 2025.

iii. WIPO Programmatic Documents

- WIPO, The 45 Adopted Recommendations under the WIPO Development Agenda by the General Assembly of WIPO Member States, 2007.

iv. Other Documents

- WIPO, Evaluation Manual, IOD/EM/2019, April 4, 2019.
- WIPO, Guidebook for preparation, implementation and evaluation of DA projects.
- Sebrae, Presentation, "I am Sebrae Minas", provided by Sebrae.

[Appendix II follows]

APPENDIX II: LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

Name	Function	Contact
WIPO (internal)		
Ms. Alexandra GRAZIOLI	Director, Lisbon Registry. Brands and Designs Sector, WIPO, Project Manager	
Ms. Ozden ILHAN	Fellow, Lisbon Registry, Project Support	
Ms. Mary HAYRAPETYAN	Program Officer, DACD	
Algérie		
M. Lotfi BOUDJEDAR	Institut national Algérien de la Propriété Industrielle (INAPI) Directeur, Direction des brevets	
Mme. Hanane BOUDERBALI	Institut national Algérien de la Propriété Industrielle (INAPI), Cheffe de service Promotion et innovations, Coordinatrice nationale	
Brazil		
Ms. Danielle Fantini Lima SANTOS	SEBRAE (national and regional offices)	
Mr. Carlos TARRASÓN	National consultant	
Pakistan		
Mr. Ali Qayyum RAJA	Director (Geographical Indications) TPO-Pakistan, IP Office, Pakistan National coordinator	
Mr. Khushbakht ASIF	Asst. Director GI, IP Office Pakistan	
Mr. Rashid GILLANI,	Assistant Manager, Pakistan Trade Development Agency, registrant of the selected GI	
Mr. Mahmood Nawaz SHAH	President of the Board Sindh Abadgar	
Uganda		
Apolot Scovia JULIET	Uganda Registration Services Bureau Current national coordinator and assisting with project from inception	
Mr. Serapio MAGAMBO	Director of Rwenzori Geographical Indications Association	
Mr. Masereka EPHRAIM	Coffee Producer, Member of Rwenzori Geographical Indications Association	

[Appendix III follows]

APPENDIX III: INCEPTION REPORT

INTRODUCTION

This independent final evaluation (“the Evaluation”) will cover the Development Agenda (DA) project on *Empowering Small Businesses Through IP: Developing Strategies for Supporting Geographical Indications or Collective Marks in the Post-registration Period* (Project Code DA_1_4_10_11_01), hereinafter referred to as “the Project.”

The Evaluation is guided by the Terms of Reference (ToR) dated September 26, 2025. The evaluation work will be carried out between December 1, 2025, and May 8, 2026, by an external evaluator (“the Evaluator”)²⁰, who will coordinate closely with the Development Agenda Coordination Division (DACD)²¹ and the Project Manager, Ms. Alexandra Grazioli, Director of the Lisbon Registry, Brands and Designs Sector. The purpose of this inception report is to translate the ToR into an operational plan for conducting the Evaluation.

PROJECT UNDER EVALUATION

a. Project background and summary

The Project was proposed by Brazil and adopted in November 2021 during the twenty-seventh session of the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP)²². Its expected duration was 36 months. The project was designed to address DA Recommendations²³ 1, 4, 10, and 11.

With its “phase zero” (preparation), implementation starting in January 2022. Actual implementation of activities started in November 2022 and ended in December 2025. The overall budget was 592,300 Swiss francs (CHF), all of which were non-personnel costs.

b. Challenges to be addressed by the Project and objectives

Small producers in developing countries increasingly use geographical indications (GIs) and collective or certification marks to protect and market the unique qualities of their local products. When a product’s origin is tied to distinctive characteristics or higher quality, that reputation can help communities access better markets, earn higher incomes, and support rural development. These Intellectual Property (IP) tools also motivate producers to agree on shared quality standards and preserve traditional production methods, helping sustain local culture and heritage.

While a GI or collective/certification mark gives producers legal recognition and protection, it does not automatically guarantee market success, product quality, or economic benefits. Those outcomes depend on what happens after registration.²⁴

²⁰ Daniel P. Keller (Senior Evaluator, Evillard/Leubringen, Switzerland). The Evaluator is independent. He was not involved in the preparation or implementation of the Project.

²¹ Development Agenda Coordination Division (DACD), Regional and National Development Sector (RNDS), World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO).

²² CDIP/27/7, Revised Project Proposal by Brazil on Empowering Small Businesses Through IP: Developing Strategies for Supporting Geographical Indications or Collective Marks in the Post Registration Period.

²³ See: The 45 Adopted Recommendations under the WIPO Development Agenda by the General Assembly of WIPO Member States, 2007

²⁴ Problem analysis quoted from the Project Document CDIP/27/7

The purpose of the project was to develop capacity building tools and initiatives to empower users or right holders of GIs or collective/certification marks from developing countries in the post-registration period to effectively use their GI or collective/certification mark.

The Project was implemented in Algeria, Brazil, Pakistan and Uganda.

c. Main deliverables and expected outcome

Expected main deliverables included:

- Preparing country-level project plans in each beneficiary country.
- Organization of information events to highlight the potential benefits of collective management of quality schemes for products protected by GIs or collective/certification marks, in each beneficiary country.
- Preparation of studies on post-registration challenges, followed by validation by the WIPO Project Management Team and the national coordinator in each beneficiary country.
- Selection of one GI or collective/certification mark in each beneficiary country for which producer groups, quality-control schemes, and commercialization strategies will be strengthened.
- Development of strategies, guides, and training materials related to the collective management of GIs or collective/certification marks and their associated quality schemes.
- Delivery of workshops and training activities for relevant authorities and local actors involved in rural and local development initiatives, focusing on collective management of quality schemes for origin products protected by GIs or collective/certification marks.
- Delivery of workshops and training activities for selected producer groups on collective management of quality schemes for origin products, including strengthening internal governance structures.
- Organization of activities supporting the development and implementation of cost-effective control and certification systems, as appropriate, with selected producer groups in each beneficiary country.
- Preparation of branding and commercialization strategies for selected GIs or collective/certification marks in each beneficiary country, along with activities to support their implementation.
- Implementation of awareness-raising activities on the benefits of collective management of GIs or collective/certification marks for local development and the preservation of traditions and culture, including the production of awareness-raising materials.

The expected main **outcomes²⁵ of the deliverables** were:

- Increased awareness among stakeholders about the benefits of GIs or collective/certification marks.
- Stronger capacity to manage GIs or collective/certification marks.
- Small local businesses make better use of their GIs or collective/certification marks.

The project was implemented in three phases:

- Phase 1: Studies on the challenges faced by local producers in the post-registration period (four national studies in each of the beneficiary countries and one global study)
- Phase 2: Development of strategies, tools and initiatives to address the challenges identified in Phase 1.
- Phase 3: Implementation of the geographical indication or collective/certification mark development strategies and tools, building on the results of Phase 2.

THE EVALUATION

a. Objectives, scope, and methodology²⁶

The main evaluation objective, as described in the ToRs, is two-fold:

- 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
- 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) Increasing awareness among national and regional authorities and relevant stakeholders about the potential benefits of the role of GIs or collective/certification marks among local producers as an IP tool to improve market access for local products while safeguarding common quality standards and traditional methods of production.
- b) Increasing capacity of the local participants on the collective management of GIs and collective/certification marks and related quality schemes.
- c) Further empowering small local businesses (users or right holders of GIs or collective/certification marks) to make the best use of their IP right, by the establishment of control and certification schemes, by strengthening the internal governance of

²⁵ While the Project Document provides detailed success indicators for the deliverables (outputs), it does not articulate the positive changes these outputs are expected to generate (outcomes). Indicators such as increased awareness, knowledge, skills, or confidence among beneficiaries demonstrate that capacity-building activities have achieved their immediate objectives, but they do not constitute outcomes. Outcomes should capture the behavioral, institutional, or systemic changes that result from these enhanced capacities. Typical outcomes would for example be improved governance structure of producers' associations, improvements in the quality control system or more effective marketing.

²⁶ Terms of Reference (ToR) dated September 26, 2025.

producers' groups that use or own a GI or collective/certification mark and by the development of commercialization strategies.

An assessment of whether the Project objective as per 3.2 of the Project Document has been achieved is not required.

b. Scope

The Evaluation will cover the entire implementation period starting November 2022 until the end of December 2025²⁷. To ensure consistency among the different findings obtained through different information sources, findings will be included until the end of the data collection phase February 20, 2026.

Subsequent developments will not be accounted for.

Additionally, the focus of the Evaluation will not be on assessing individual activities or deliverables but rather on evaluating the project as a whole and its contribution in assessing the needs of Member States and identifying the resources or the means to address those needs. The Evaluation will also assess the project's evolution over time and its performance including project design, project management, coordination, coherence, implementation and results achieved.

c. Methodology of the evaluation

The evaluation methodology is aimed at balancing the needs for learning and accountability. To this end, the Evaluation should provide for active involvement in the evaluation process of those with a stake in the project: project team, senior managers, Member States and national intellectual property (IP) offices.

In line with its purpose, the Evaluation will balance organizational learning with the need to ensure the Secretariat's accountability to Member States. While maintaining full independence, the Evaluator will use a participatory approach that incorporates the perspectives of all stakeholder groups. Engaging key stakeholders throughout the process and building alignment around the findings, conclusions, and recommendations will strengthen organizational learning.

The Evaluation is designed to support continuous improvement. It will generate clear, actionable (in the context of DA Projects) recommendations and distill lessons learned. Recommendations will generally be formulated in a way that they are SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-bound)²⁸.

Particularly, the evaluation methodology will consist of the following:

1. Desk review of relevant project related documentation including the project framework (initial project document and study), progress reports, monitoring information, and other relevant reports and documents.
2. Interviews with the WIPO Secretariat (Project Manager, DACD, other entities contributing to the project, etc.); and

²⁷ As per briefing with the Project Manager, finalization is expected in December 2025.

²⁸ Evaluation reports may also include soft recommendations or suggestions: These could include suggestions for systemic improvements or lessons to guide further work. See WIPO, Evaluation Manual, IOD/EM/2019, April 4, 2019, paragraph 95.

3. Stakeholder interviews at a beneficiary-country level.

d. Data collection and analysis

In line with the specific objectives/evaluative questions, data collection and the analysis of contextual factors will be limited to desk study of documents relating to the Project (project documents, progress reports, project outputs, beneficiary surveys conducted during the Project implementation) and to semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders who were directly involved in project implementation. No field visits are planned.

Different evaluation tools will be combined to ensure an evidence-based qualitative and quantitative assessment. The Evaluator will cross-validate data and assess the plausibility of the results obtained. The methodological mix will include document review, semi-structured individual interviews, and semi-structured interviews of focal groups. Desk study will include the analysis of existing beneficiary surveys conducted by the Project (mentioned in the progress report and already provided by the Project Manager, see [Annex I](#)). The internal surveys will be validated through in-depth interviews. To ensure organizational learning and in the spirit of a participative evaluation process, the structure of interviews will be as open as possible. Guiding questions will guide a free exchange of opinions. Discussions will also allow an iterative approach, whereas new findings are integrated into evaluative questions and subsequently validated.

Wherever possible, conclusions and recommendations will be based on evaluation findings (deductive reasoning). Exceptionally, inductive reasoning may be used where evaluation findings are insufficient for drawing conclusions and deductive reasoning is not possible. If inductive reasoning is used, it will be clearly explained. Where necessary, the evaluator might expand the list of documents to be consulted and persons to be interviewed through an iterative approach.

e. Evaluative framework and questions

The methodological framework will be guided by WIPO's Evaluation Manual²⁹. The specific, key evaluative questions are provided in [Annex III](#) of this inception report.

f. Evaluative steps and deadlines

In operationalizing the ToR, the following evaluative steps are planned:

- Kick-off with the DACD team and the Project Team: December 9, 2025 (OK)
- Briefing with the Project Team: December 15, 2025 (OK)
- Desk study, submission of Draft Inception Report: January 9, 2026 (OK)
- Feedback to Draft Inception Report by DACD: January 16, 2026 (OK)
- Submit revised Inception Report: January 16, 2026 (OK)
- Schedule interviews³⁰ with external stakeholders: January 16, 2026

²⁹ WIPO, Evaluation Manual, IOD/EM/2019, April 4, 2019.

³⁰ See tentative list in Annex II as per input provided by the Project Manager. Semi-structured in-depth interviews with internal and external key stakeholders including a sample of direct beneficiaries (by video call). Interviews might be conducted individually or through focal group discussions.

- Interviews with external stakeholders completed: February 20, 2026.
- Validation and clarifications with the Project Team: before February 20, 2026.
- Submission of Draft Evaluation Report to the DACD: February 20, 2026
- Factual corrections on the draft will be provided by February 25, 2026.
- The final evaluation report shall be submitted by February 27, 2026.
- Presentation to the CDIP: between 4 – 8 May 2026.

[Annexes I, II, and III follow]

Annex I: Tentative list of Documents

1. Project document and progress report

- Project Document: [CDIP/27/7](#), Revised Project Proposal by Brazil on Empowering small businesses through IP: developing strategies for supporting geographical indications or collective marks in the post registration period.
- Progress Report: [CDIP/29/2](#), ANNEX IX, September 5, 2022
- Progress Report: [CDIP/31/3](#), ANNEX VI, September 6, 2023
- Progress Report: [CDIP/33/3](#), ANNEX IV, October 4, 2024
- Progress Report: [CDIP/35/3](#), ANNEX III, September 16, 2025 (latest progress report available).

2. Project outputs

a. Beneficiary countries

- Algérie: WIPO, étude finale, rapport cadre législatif et institutionnel national pour la protection des IG en Algérie – Deglet Nour de Tolga, produit pilote, réalisé par M. MESSAK Mohamed Ridha et M. KHERAIFIA Nourreddine, Consultants (y compris sommaire de 5-pages), avril 2024.
- Algérie: WIPO, plan d'action, réalisé par M. MESSAK Mohamed Ridha, Agro-économiste, expert en chaînes de valeur, Consultant national de l'OMPI, juin 2025
- Algérie: WIPO, various awareness raising and promotion materials
- Brazil: WIPO, Study on the challenges faced by local producers that are users or owners of a GI, to effectively use their IPRs in the post-registration period, Carlos Tarrasón Collado (including 5-page summary), December 20, 2023
- Brazil: WIPO, the Geographical Indication System, 1-page summary
- Brazil: WIPO, various information, promotion and training materials.
- Pakistan: WIPO, Pakistan National Study, Challenges faced by users of Sindhri Mango GI, to effectively use their IPRs in the post-registration period, prepared by: Nadia Shah and Noor Asfia, 2023 (including 5-page summary)
- Pakistan: WIPO, Initial survey on the Geographical Indication system, May 29, 2023
- Pakistan: WIPO, Action Plan for "Sindhri Mango" GI Implementation
- Pakistan: WIPO, various information, promotion and training materials.
- Uganda: WIPO, The Republic of Uganda National Study, challenges faced by users of Rwenzori Mountains of the Moon GI, to effectively use their IPRs in the post-registration period, prepared by: Arthur Mpeirwe, 2023 (including 5-page summary)
- Uganda: WIPO, Strategic Action Plan for Rwenzori Mountains of the Moon Coffee GI
- Uganda: WIPO, Rwenzori Mountains of the Moon Coffee, Final Report, Luis Fernando Samper- 4.0 Brands, Consultant, May 2025
- Uganda: Branding and Commercialization Activities for "Rwenzori Mountains of the Moon Coffee" GI Producer Group, Ms. Lindah Kisembo, November 2025.

- Uganda: WIPO, various information, promotion and training materials.
- b. Global level
 - Study on Strategies for Supporting, Geographical Indications in the Post Registration Period, prepared by Prof. Giovanni Belletti and Prof. Andrea Marescotti
 - Various material relating to the WIPO Workshop: Supporting Geographical Indications in the Post-Registration Period, November 2025

WIPO Programmatic Documents

- WIPO, The 45 Adopted Recommendations under the WIPO Development Agenda by the General Assembly of WIPO Member States, 2007.

Other Documents

- WIPO, Evaluation Manual, IOD/EM/2019, April 4, 2019.

[Annex II follows]

Annex II: Tentative meeting list

Name	Function Contact
WIPO (internal) – as provided by the Project Manager	
Ms. Alexandra GRAZIOLI	Director, Lisbon Registry, Brands and Designs Sector, WIPO, Project Manager
Ms. Ozden ILHAN	Fellow, Lisbon Registry, Project Support
Ms. Mary HAYRAPETYAN	Program Officer, Development Agenda Coordination Division
External stakeholders Algeria (all French speaking)	
M. Lotfi BOUDJEDAR	Institut national Algérien de la Propriété Industrielle (INAPI) Directeur, Direction des brevets
Mme. Hanane BOUDERBALI	Institut national Algérien de la Propriété Industrielle (INAPI) Cheffe de service Promotion et innovations Coordinatrice nationale
M. Achour Ziane MOSBAH	Association de la Valorisation des Produits Deglet Nour de Tolga, President
M. Abdel-Basset DJELLAB	Association de la Valorisation des Produits Deglet Nour de Tolga, Membre
External stakeholders Brazil (English*)	
Mr. Bruno ROHDE	INPI
Mr. Henry PFEIFFER LOPES	Division of Intellectual Property of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs National Coordinator
Ms. Danielle Fantini Lima Santos	SEBRAE (National and Regional offices)
Mr. Hélio César Oliveira CODEANM*	GI-Association President *He speaks only Portuguese
Mr. Carlos TARRASÓN	National consultant
External stakeholders Pakistan	
Mr. Ali Qayyum Raja	Director (Geographical Indications) TPO-Pakistan, IPO, Pakistan National coordinator assisting with project from inception
Mr. Khushbakht ASIF	Asst. Director GI, IPO-Pakistan
Mr. Rashid GILLANI	Assistant Manager

Name	Function Contact
	Pakistan Trade Development Agency* *TDAP is the registrant of the selected GI
Mr. Mahmood Nawaz SHAH	President of the Board, Sindh Abadgar
External stakeholders (Uganda)	
Mr. Gilbert Agaba	Director Intellectual Property, Uganda Registration Services Bureau, Former National Coordinator
Apolot Scovia JULIET	Uganda Registration Services Bureau Current national coordinator and assisting with project from inception
Mr. Serapio MAGAMBO	Director of Rwenzori Geographical Indications Association
Mr. Masereka EPHRAIM	Coffee Producer, Member of Rwenzori Geographical Indications Association

[Annex III follows]

Annex III: Evaluative Framework

Evaluation criteria	Line of Enquiry (as ToR)	Performance Assessment Indicators	Specific Evaluation Questions
<p><u>Project design and management</u></p>	<p>1. The appropriateness of the initial project document as a guide for project implementation and assessment of results achieved.</p>	<p>Assessment against standards outlined in WIPO's Guidebook for preparation, implementation and evaluation of Development Agenda projects.</p>	<p>Flexibility of the designs to address challenges in countries with significant different socio-economic situations, legal framework and administrative systems. Based on desk study (paragraph 4 of the Project Document), the same activities are scheduled to be implemented in parallel in all countries.</p> <p>Has this caused challenges and how could these be addressed?</p> <p>Check with Project Manager and National Focal Points in each of the countries.</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>Assessment against standards outlined in WIPO's Guidebook for preparation, implementation and evaluation of Development Agenda projects.</p>	<p>Desk study</p> <p>Were the project monitoring, self-evaluation and reporting tools and analysis useful and adequate to provide the project team and key stakeholders with relevant information for decision-making purposes?</p>
	<p>3. The extent to which other entities within the Secretariat contributed to and enabled effective and efficient project implementation.</p>	<p>Implementing Sector: Brands and Designs.</p>	<p>As per progress reports, no other sectors have been involved.</p> <p>Have there been any synergies with other DA Projects?</p>

Evaluation criteria	Line of Enquiry (as ToR)	Performance Assessment Indicators	Specific Evaluation Questions
	4. The extent to which the risks identified in the initial project document have materialized or been mitigated.	Occurrence and/or mitigation of risks (see risk analysis in paragraph 2.4 of the Project Document).	Have any of the threats mentioned in this list occurred? If so, how did it impact the achievement of objectives?
	5. The project's ability to respond to emerging trends, technologies and other external forces.	Level of ability to respond to emerging trends, technologies and other external forces	Have any changes in the project context occurred since it started and if so, how did management respond to them?

Evaluation criteria	Line of Enquiry (as ToR)	Performance Assessment Indicators	Specific Evaluation Questions
<p><u>Effectiveness</u></p>	<p>1. The effectiveness of the project in increasing awareness among national and regional authorities and relevant stakeholders about the potential benefits of the role of GIs or collective/certification marks among local producers as an IP tool to improve market access for local products while safeguarding common quality standards and traditional methods of production.</p>	<p>See output and outcome indicators in paragraph 3.2 of the project document. Target: 80% of the participants confirm that their awareness has improved.</p>	<p>Has their awareness improved?</p>
	<p>2. The effectiveness of the project in increasing capacity of the local participants on the collective management of geographical indications and collective/certification marks and related quality schemes</p>	<p>See output and outcome indicators in paragraph 3.2 of the project document. Target: 80% of the participants confirm the increase in their capacities.</p>	<p>Has their governance, management and marketing capacity improved?</p>
	<p>3. The effectiveness of the project in further empowering small local businesses (users or right holders of geographical indications or collective/certification marks) to make the best use of their IP right, in particular by the</p>	<p>See output and outcome indicators in paragraph 3.2 of the project document. Target: 80% of the participants confirm their empowerment.</p>	<p>Are they better equipped to use their IPRs? Are there any other positive changes following participation in the project (e.g. positive impact on the business)? Are there any unexpected negative changes observed?</p>

Evaluation criteria	Line of Enquiry (as ToR)	Performance Assessment Indicators	Specific Evaluation Questions
	<p>establishment of control and certification schemes, by strengthening the internal governance of producers groups that use or own a geographical indication or collective/certification mark and by the development of commercialization strategies.</p>		
<p><u>Sustainability</u></p>	<p>1. The likelihood of the continuous utilization of the project's outputs by beneficiary countries and stakeholders.</p>	<p>Likelihood of occurrence of follow-on activities, support and assistance</p>	<p>Are there any planned follow-on activities? Who will continue to provide support to the producers after the project ends? How will the emerging ecosystem that assists producers in using their GIs be anchored within national institutions to ensure continuity and long-term sustainability?</p>
<p><u>Implementation of DA Recommendations</u></p>	<p>1. The extent to which the DA Recommendations 1, 4, 10, and 11 have been implemented through this project.</p>	<p>Relevance of project objectives to the respective DA recommendations.</p>	<p>Desk assessment only. Have the DA recommendations 1,4, 10 and 11 been implemented through this project?</p>

[End of Appendix III and of document]