

**APPENDIXES - PROJECT EVALUATION:**

**INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND GASTRONOMIC TOURISM IN PERU AND  
OTHER DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: PROMOTING THE DEVELOPMENT OF  
GASTRONOMIC TOURISM THROUGH INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY**

Ms. Carolina Del Campo Vara  
External Evaluator and Consultant,  
Madrid

**APPENDIX I EVALUATION MATRIX**

Original Evaluation Questions	Revised Evaluation Questions	Comments/Rationale	Evaluation Criteria	Judgement Criteria	Indicators	Sources
<b>Design and Management</b>						
The appropriateness of the initial project document as a guide for project implementation and assessment of results achieved	<i>Does the initial project document serve as a guide for project implementation and assessment of results achieved?</i>	Slight rewording	Relevance	1.1 The DA Project document ensured a proper project implementation.  1.2 The design of the DA project took into account and ensured complementarity with previous, existing and planned WIPO and Member State initiatives.	1.1.1 Intervention design included MS consultation, data-collection and analysis by WIPO, Member States and other cooperation partners. 1.1.2 Stakeholders consider that the interventions ensured complementarity with other WIPO initiatives.	Document review  Interviews
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	<i>Were the project monitoring, self-evaluation and reporting tools useful and adequate to provide the project team and key stakeholders with relevant information for</i>	Slight rewording	Relevance	2.1 The DA project document took into account the design and implementation of a monitoring and reporting system. 2.2 The project monitoring, self-evaluation and reporting tools provided relevant	2.1.1 Usefulness of project indicators and means of verification. 2.1.2 Relevance of the information from monitoring and reporting tools for decision-making purposes. 2.1.3 Intervention evaluation and monitoring mechanisms were aligned with and conducted according to	Document review  Interviews

Original Evaluation Questions	Revised Evaluation Questions	Comments/ Rationale	Evaluation Criteria	Judgement Criteria	Indicators	Sources
information for decision-making purposes	<i>decision-making purposes?</i>			information to the project team. 2.3 The DA Project's evaluation mechanisms were of adequate quality and contributed to WIPO and stakeholders' understanding of intervention outcomes, and identification of future support.	WIPO evaluation guidelines and best practices. 2.1.4 Stakeholders consider that evaluation and monitoring mechanisms were adequate, timely and of appropriate quality, and that the reports contributed to the understanding of the DA project, and to the identification of future support.	
The extent to which other entities within the WIPO Secretariat have contributed and enabled an effective and efficient project implementation	<i>To what extent other entities within the WIPO Secretariat have contributed and enabled an effective and efficient project implementation?</i>	Slight rewording	Relevance	3.1 The DA project has been assisted by other entities within the WIPO Secretariat to enable effective and efficient implementation of the project.	3.1.1 Contribution of other entities within the Secretariat in project implementation. 3.1.2 Level of engagement and participation. 3.1.3 Institutional arrangements, expectations, roles, capacity, and commitment of other WIPO entities.	Document review  Interviews
The extent to which the risks identified in the initial project document have materialized or been mitigated.	<i>To what extent the risks identified in the initial project document have been materialized or been mitigated?</i>	Slight rewording	Relevance	4.1 The DA Project included a risk management strategy.	4.1.1 Identification of risks, external factors, and assumptions. 4.1.2 Realism of risks, external factors, and assumptions. 4.1.3 Mitigation measures.	Document review  Interviews

Original Evaluation Questions	Revised Evaluation Questions	Comments/Rationale	Evaluation Criteria	Judgement Criteria	Indicators	Sources
The project's ability to respond to emerging trends, technologies, and other external forces.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Effectiveness</b>						
The effectiveness and usefulness of the outputs developed in the context of the project, including the scoping study in each pilot country, analysis of IP-related areas of the value chain of a selected culinary tradition in each pilot country, as well as the compilation of the main outputs and conclusions reached in the pilot countries	<i>To what extent the outputs of the project have been useful and effective to raise awareness about IP &amp; Gastronomic Tourism?</i>	Slight rewording	Effectiveness Sustainability	5.1 The DA Project contributed to intended and unintended positive and negative results. 5.2 The DA Project contributed to national stakeholders' capacities to address IP needs and constraints.	5.1.1 Number of relevant outputs (publications and documents) developed. 5.1.2 Stakeholders consider that the intervention has contributed to the intended results, and/or to unintended results. 5.1.3 Usefulness of the outputs of the DA project. 5.1.4 Stakeholders consider that the interventions enhanced the effectiveness of IP protection systems and contributed to coherence and complementarity.	Document review  Interviews

Original Evaluation Questions	Revised Evaluation Questions	Comments/ Rationale	Evaluation Criteria	Judgement Criteria	Indicators	Sources
The effectiveness of the project in building the capacity of economic operators involved in gastronomic tourism and of national authorities, including IP offices, to use and leverage IP tools and strategies to add value that differentiates their products and services, and to diversify their economic activities while respecting local traditions and culture	<i>Has the project been able to build the capacity of economic operators involved in the gastronomic tourism and of national authorities, including IP offices, to use and leverage IP tools and strategies to add value that differentiates their product and services, and to diversify their economic activities while respecting local traditions and culture?</i>	Slight rewording	Effectiveness Sustainability	6.1 The DA project validated the capacities, IP tools and procedures developed. 6.2 The DA project has provided useful capacity building activities to use and leverage IP tools and strategies to add value that differentiates their products and services, and to diversify their economic activities while respecting local traditions and culture.	6.1.1 Number and type of capacity-building activities supported by the interventions. 6.1.2 Number of IP tools developed. 6.1.3 Stakeholders consider that the intervention enhanced national, institutional, and professional capacities to promote and protect IP.	Document review  Interviews
The effectiveness of the project in raising awareness on the contributions that the use of IP can take to the	<i>To what extent the project has raised awareness on the contributions that the use of IP can take to the</i>	Slight rewording	Effectiveness Sustainability	a. The DA project reached the proposed number of persons to raise awareness on IP & Gastronomic Tourism.	7.1.1 Number and type of awareness raising activities, actions, documents, etc. 7.1.2 Number of new exchanges of knowledge and experience among key stakeholders	Document review  Interviews

Original Evaluation Questions	Revised Evaluation Questions	Comments/Rationale	Evaluation Criteria	Judgement Criteria	Indicators	Sources
gastronomic tourism activities.	<i>gastronomic tourism activities?</i>				Visits to the project's website	
<b>Sustainability</b>						
The likelihood of the continuation of work on the use of the IP system as an effective tool to promote culinary traditions and gastronomic tourism.	<i>To what extent has the project been effective in continuing to work on the use of IP systems as a tool to promote culinary traditions and gastronomic tourism?</i>	Slight rewording	Sustainability	8.1 The DA Project contributed to significant and sustainable changes and other effects at the national and regional levels.	8.1.1 National reports and analyses indicate changes in the relation between IP & Gastronomic Tourism over the relevant period 8.1.2 Stakeholders consider that the interventions contributed to significant and sustainable change and other effects.	Document review  Interviews
<b>WIPO Visibility</b>						
No Evaluation Questions in the Terms of Reference related to Visibility	<i>Did the intervention bring positive WIPO visibility for stakeholders and beneficiary governments, and how?</i>	This Evaluation Question will be examined at the intervention level, with the findings	Relevance Effectiveness Sustainability Added Value	9.1 The DA project ensured visibility activities at the national level, targeting the government, partner institutions, and the general public.  9.2 Visibility activities highlighted the WIPO presence in the country and its support to IP and contributed to public	7.1.1 Number, nature, and target groups of visibility activities.  7.2.1 Stakeholders consider that visibility activities highlighted the WIPO and its support to IP, and contributed to public awareness of IP and Gastronomy related issues	Document review  Interviews

Original Evaluation Questions	Revised Evaluation Questions	Comments/ Rationale	Evaluation Criteria	Judgement Criteria	Indicators	Sources
				awareness of key IP and gastronomy related issues.		
<b>WIPO Added value</b>						
No Evaluation Questions in the Terms of Reference related to WIPO added value	<i>What is the added value of this project?</i>	Since the DA Project's subject is something new in WIPO, then it is logical to address to what extent this in fact added value.	Relevance Effectiveness Sustainability Added Value	10.1 The DA project provided benefits in addition to those that would have resulted from initiatives by WIPO MS. 10.2 The DA project has contributed to the use of IP in the Gastronomic and Tourism sectors.	10.1.1 WIPO and external reports indicate that the intervention provided benefits in addition to those that would have resulted from initiatives by WIPO Member States.  10.1.2 Stakeholders consider that the interventions provided benefits in addition to those that would have resulted from initiatives by WIPO Member States.  10.2.1 WIPO and external reports indicate that the intervention provided benefits in addition to those that would have resulted from initiatives by other donors and cooperation partners.  10.2.2 Stakeholders consider that the interventions provided benefits in addition to those that would have resulted from	Document review  Interviews

Original Evaluation Questions	Revised Evaluation Questions	Comments/ Rationale	Evaluation Criteria	Judgement Criteria	Indicators	Sources
					initiatives by other donors and cooperation partners.	
<b>Lessons Learned</b>						
No Evaluation Questions in the Terms of Reference related to Lessons Learned	<i>What lessons learned and best practices can be drawn from this project (with special focus on its design and management)?</i>	Since the TORs are looking for recommendations for future actions, it is important to learn from previous experiences to avoid repeating same mistakes.	Relevance Effectiveness Sustainability Added Value	11.1 The DA Project contributed to best practices and key lessons learned. 11.2 Best practices and key lessons learned contributed, or are likely to contribute, to the effectiveness of the DA project on IP & Gastronomic Tourism at the national level.	11.1.1 Stakeholders consider that the DA Project contributed to best practices and lessons learned. 11.2.1 Stakeholders consider that best practices and lessons learned contribute to the effectiveness of the DA project on IP & Gastronomic Tourism at the national level	Document review  Interviews
<b>Implementation of the Development Agenda (DA) Recommendations</b>						
The extent to which the DA Recommendations 1, 10 and 12 have been implemented through this project	<i>To what extent have the DA Recommendations 1, 10 and 12 been implemented through this project?</i>	The DA Recommendations are key elements to be taken into consideration in the DA projects	Effectiveness Added Value	12.1 The DA Project has implemented the Recommendations 1,10 and 12	12.1.1 WIPO project related staff and MS consider that DA recommendations 1, 10 and 12 are included in the project	Document review

[Appendix II follows]



## **APPENDIX II LIST OF SELECTED INTERVIEWEES (INDICATIVE)**

### National Focal Point and relevant contributors

Mr. Adolfo Lopez Moreno, Advisor, Department of Distinctive Signs, National Institute for the Defense of Competition and Protection of Intellectual Property (INDECOPI), Peru

Ms. Karla Quevedo Alvarado, Advisor, Department of Distinctive Signs, INDECOPI, Peru

Mr. Paul Marcel Ndioro à Mamoum, Secretary General, Ministry of Tourism and Leisure (MINTOUL), Cameroon

Ms. Jacqueline Eteme Ma'A née Ongbayokolack, Head, Department for the Promotion of Cameroonian Cuisine, MINTOUL, Cameroon

Ms Marie Béatrice Nanga Nguete, Ministry of Mines and Technological Development, Cameroon

Mr. Roger Mvogo, Ministry of Economy, Planning and Land Planning, Cameroon

Ms. Yusnieza Syarmila Yusoff, Senior Director, Policy and International Affairs Division, Intellectual Property Corporation of Malaysia (MyIPO), Malaysia

Ms. Nur Mazian Binti MAT TAHIR, Assistant Director, Policy and International Affairs Division, MyIPO, Malaysia

Ms. Mouna Bendaoud, Head, International Cooperation and Partnership Service, Cooperation and Legal Affairs Department, Moroccan Industrial and Commercial Property Office (OMPIC), Morocco

### WIPO Staff

Ms. Marie Paule Rizo, Head, Policy and Legislative Advice Section, Department for Trademarks, Industrial Designs and Geographical Indications (Project Manager)

Ms. Marina Foschi, Senior Legal Officer, Policy and Legislative Advice Section, Department for Trademarks, Industrial Designs and Geographical Indications (Project Coordinator)

Ms. Noëlle Moutout, Associate Legal Officer, Policy and Legislative Advice Section, Department for Trademarks, Industrial Designs and Geographical Indications (Project Coordinator)

Mr. Irfan Baloch, Director, Development Agenda Coordination Division (DACD), (Project design, coordination and oversight)

Mr. Georges Ghandour, Senior Counsellor, DACD (Project coordination and oversight)

Ms. Mihaela Cerbari, Associate Program Officer, DACD (Project coordination and oversight)

Mr. Yves Ngoubeyou, Counsellor, Division for Africa, Regional and National Development Sector

Mr. Ye Min Than, Senior Program Officer, Division for Asia and the Pacific, Regional and National Development Sector

External Stakeholders (consultants for the Scoping studies)

Mr. Mohamed Bakir, First Secretary, Group Coordinator of African Countries, Algeria

Mr. Otto Gani, First Secretary, Group Coordinator of Asian and the Pacific Countries, Indonesia

[Appendix III follows]

## APPENDIX III DOCUMENTS CONSULTED AND DATA SOURCES

CDIP/22/14 REV., Revised Project Proposal on Intellectual Property and Gastronomic Tourism in Peru and Other Developing Countries: Promoting the Development of Gastronomic Tourism through Intellectual Property

CDIP/24/2, Annex IV (2019)

CDIP/26/2, Annex V (2021)

CDIP/29/2, Progress Reports, Annex IV (2022)

Project Webpage, available at: [www.wipo.int/ip-development/en/agenda/projects/ip-and-gastronomic-tourism.html](http://www.wipo.int/ip-development/en/agenda/projects/ip-and-gastronomic-tourism.html)

- (i) Project webpage for Peru, including scoping study (summary of the scoping study is available at CDIP/25/INF/3) and IP analysis for Peru, as well as information on Roundtable and National seminar.
- (ii) Project webpage for Cameroon, including scoping study and IP analysis (in French) for Cameroon, as well as information on Roundtable and National seminar.
- (iii) Project webpage for Malaysia, including scoping study and IP analysis for Malaysia and information on Roundtable and National seminar.
- (iv) Project webpage for Morocco, including scoping study and IP analysis (in French) for Morocco and information on Roundtable and National seminar.

News Item on the International Workshop, available at: [www.wipo.int/ip-development/en/agenda/news/2022/news\\_0008.html](http://www.wipo.int/ip-development/en/agenda/news/2022/news_0008.html)

### Project Tools

- (i) Project Work Breakdown Structure
- (ii) Questionnaires to assess the level of awareness of the participants to the awareness-raising events

WIPO (2019) Evaluation Manual

WIPO (2020) Evaluation Policy

[End of appendixes and of document]