

Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP)

Eighteenth Session
Geneva, October 31 to November 4, 2016

REPORT ON THE INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DEVELOPMENT AGENDA RECOMMENDATIONS

prepared by the Secretariat

1. The 2010 General Assembly adopted the Coordination Mechanism and Monitoring, Assessing and Reporting Modalities, approved by the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP) at its Fifth session. The aforesaid Mechanism *inter alia* requested the CDIP to undertake an independent review of the implementation of the DA Recommendations. The Terms of Reference (ToR) for the independent review were approved by the Committee at its Fourteenth session, held from November 10 to 14, 2014.
2. In accordance with the ToR, a Review Team comprising: Mr. V.K. Gupta, Lead Evaluator, Mr. Pedro Roffe, IP and Development Expert, and Mr. Gift Huggins Sibanda, an IP and Technical Assistance Expert, was selected.
3. The Annex to this document contains the Report submitted by the Review Team.
4. *The CDIP is invited to consider the information contained in the Annex to this document.*

[Annex follows]

**Independent Review of the Implementation of the
Development Agenda Recommendations
(28-07-2016)**

Prepared by Review Team:

V.K. Gupta
Pedro Roffe
G.H. Sibanda

The Review Team acknowledges with profound gratitude the support and contribution of all the actors involved in the process, mainly Member States representatives in Geneva, IP offices and other national authorities that facilitated their field missions, IGO's, NGOs, Civil society representatives, WIPO Staff and all other stakeholders.

The Review Team further acknowledges that without the positive involvement of the all above mentioned actors the work of the team may not have moved forward.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. Executive Summary.....	1
B. The Independent Review.....	6
1. Introduction.....	6
a. Background.....	6
2. Purpose, objectives and scope of the Review.....	8
a. Purpose & Objectives.....	8
b. Scope of the Review.....	10
c. The CDIP.....	10
d. Other WIPO Bodies and IGOs.....	11
e. Secretariat and stakeholders in general.....	11
3. Methodology.....	12
a. Guiding principles.....	12
b. Review Questions.....	12
c. Description of the methodological tools applied in the Review.....	15
d. Main limitations.....	23
4. Findings.....	24
a. Relevance.....	24
b. Effectiveness.....	28
c. Efficiency.....	32
d. Impact	33
e. Sustainability.....	36
5. Conclusion.....	39
6. Recommendations.....	43

Annexes

Annex A	Inception Report	46
Annex B	List of Persons Interviewed	63
Annex C	Survey Questionnaire	75
Annex D	Survey response-Geneva Representatives	82
Annex E	Survey response-IP Offices	105
Annex F	Survey response-NGOs/IGOs	128
Annex G	Survey response-Other stakeholders	152
Annex H	Survey response-Public Survey	174
Annex I	Projects Completed and Evaluated	197
Annex J	Projects under implementation	198
Annex K	List of documents examined under desk review	199
Annex L	Terms of References for the Independent Review of the Implementation of the Development Agenda Recommendations	207

List of Abbreviations

ACE	Advisory Committee on Enforcement
CAG, India	Comptroller and Auditor General, India
CDIP	Committee on Development and Intellectual Property
DA	Development Agenda
DACD	Development Agenda Coordination Division
DARs	Development Agenda Recommendations
ECOSOC	Economic and Social Council
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
GA	General Assembly
ICT	Information and Communication Technologies

IGC	Intergovernmental Committee on Intellectual Property and Genetic Resources, Traditional Knowledge and Folklore
IGOs	Intergovernmental Organizations
IP	Intellectual Property
IPAS	Industrial Property Automation System
IR	Inception Report
IRT	Independent Review Team
LDCs	Least Developed Countries
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MTSP	Medium Term Strategic Plan
NGOs	Non-governmental Organizations
PCT	Patent Cooperation Treaty
PPR	Programme Performance Report
RBM	Result Based Management
SCCR	Standing Committee on Copyright and Related Rights
SCP	Standing Committee on the Law of Patents
SCT	Standing Committee on Law of Trademarks
SMEs	Small and Medium Sized Enterprises
TISC	Technology and Innovation support Centers
TCEs	Traditional Cultural Expressions
UNFCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
WIPO	World Intellectual Property Organization

WSIS	World Summit on the Information Society
WTO	World Trade Organization
WHO	World Health Organization

A. The Executive Summary

1. The 2007 World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO) General Assembly (GA) adopted the Development Agenda (DA) with a set of 45 recommendations. The recommendations were categorised into six clusters to facilitate their implementation. Further, the GA established the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP) with a mandate to: develop a work-program for implementing the 45 adopted Development Agenda Recommendations (DARs); monitor, assess, discuss and report on the implementation of all recommendations adopted; and for that purpose to coordinate with relevant WIPO bodies; and discuss IP and development-related issues as agreed by the Committee, as well as those decided by the GA.

2. In 2008, the CDIP commenced its work and in pursuance of its mandate, in 2010 the CDIP considered it necessary to establish a Coordination Mechanism. Within the context of the established Coordination Mechanism, the 2010 GA requested the CDIP to undertake an independent review of the DA. The Terms of Reference (ToRs) for the Review were adopted in 2014. The Review covers the DARs implementation from 2008 to April 2015.

3. The Independent Review Team constitutes three external reviewers,¹ and in September 2015 the Review Team presented its Inception Report to Member States. The Inception Report was generally well received by Member States. It also attracted further interventions by interested groups of Member States. In this respect, the Review Team had an opportunity to have a special meeting with the GRULAC countries and later on a teleconference at the request of Group B countries whose purpose was to share views on the expected outcomes of the Independent Review. This Independent Review Report therefore, is the product of the work carried out since May 2015 by the Review Team.

4. According to the ToRs, the Independent Review assessed in a comprehensive manner, the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of “WIPO’s work” in the implementation of the DARs. In undertaking the review, the Review Team examined the results of the activities carried out towards the implementation of the DARs with particular emphasis on how WIPO’s work in relation to DARs and its results has served the needs of Member States, stakeholders and intended beneficiaries.

¹Mr. V.K Gupta – Lead Evaluator, Mr. Pedro Roffe – IP and Development Expert, Mr. Gift Huggins Sibanda – IP and Technical Assistance Expert.

5. In reviewing WIPO's work, the Review Team examined among others: the manner and extent under which the DARs have been implemented and the extent to which they have been mainstreamed into WIPO's regular activities; the work of different WIPO bodies particularly the CDIP; the use of human and financial resources in the implementation of the DA and the sustainability of the different projects and activities adopted by the CDIP.

6. The Review was conducted in line with United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) guidelines and WIPO's Evaluation Policy (2010) and in accordance with core methodological principles that included among others: emphasis on triangulation (cross-validation) of data sources and assessment of plausibility of the results obtained; application of deductive reasoning basing conclusions and recommendations on review findings; a participatory approach that sought the active views of beneficiaries of projects and activities, and collection of a diversity of opinions, ideas and perceptions from stakeholders.

7. The review questions placed great emphasis on a participatory and inclusive process involving key stakeholders and beneficiaries targeting those that were involved in the DA negotiations and those that participated in the CDIP meetings and contributed to the DARs implementation. A mix and combination of tools have been used to ensure that evidence-based data is accumulated for a well-informed, qualitative and quantitative feedback to support the findings, conclusions and recommendations.

8. The desk review exercise focused on the analysis of relevant secondary data including documents produced in the context of the CDIP such as working documents, studies, project reports; evaluation reports; progress reports; Coordination Mechanism, Monitoring, Assessing and Reporting Modalities, to mention but a few.

9. The Review was also conducted in the form of interviews targeting WIPO officials including senior management, project managers and those that were involved in the implementation of the DA. Also interviewed were the representatives from the Permanent Missions based in Geneva, IP authorities, officials based in capitals, former CDIP Chairpersons, evaluators, industry, inter-governmental organisations (IGOs), non-governmental organisations (NGOs), private sector, and the academia.

10. Field missions were also conducted to Argentina, Egypt, Ethiopia, Moldova and Thailand. These countries were selected on the following basis: geographical balance; level of development; countries benefiting from technical assistance activities related to the DA, economic studies, and/or from national IP strategies and countries beneficiaries of WIPO support in building national capacities.

11. Structured surveys were conducted online to broaden the exercise, targeting the following stakeholders: Geneva-based representatives, national and regional IP offices, NGOs, IGOs and the public in general.

12. The Review Team was able to identify 15 findings addressing the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. Based on these findings, it has been concluded mainly that the implementation of DARs has largely been consistent with the expectations of Member States, stakeholders and other intended beneficiaries and that the thematic project-based approach was a useful modality to speed-up the implementation of the DARs. The Review Team concluded also that some work could be undertaken to improve the implementation of the DA at the Secretariat level, CDIP level, DACD level and Member States level.

Recommendations

13. Based on the findings and conclusions, the Review Team has come up with the following recommendations for the attention of the Committee:

Recommendation 1: The good progress made in the CDIP needs to be consolidated by introducing a higher level debate to address emerging needs and to discuss the work of the Organization on new emerging issues related to IPRs. The Committee should also facilitate an exchange of strategies and best practices from Member States on their experiences addressing IP and development concerns.

Recommendation 2: Member States should take measures to resolve the outstanding issues related to the mandate of the Committee and the implementation of the Coordination Mechanism.

Recommendation 3: WIPO should continue to ensure an effective coordination, monitoring, reporting, evaluation and mainstreaming of the implementation of the DARs. The role of the DACD in coordinating the DA implementation should be strengthened.

Recommendation 4: The CDIP, in implementing the DARs, should consider how best to respond to evolving circumstances and to the emerging development challenges being faced by the IP system. This should be combined with an active involvement with other UN development agencies to benefit from their expertise for the DARs implementation and in advancing the implementation of the SDGs.

Recommendation 5: WIPO should consider linking DARs to Expected Results contained in the Program and Budget, wherever it is possible. Expected Results may be modified or new Expected Results may be introduced so as to ensure the integration of DARs into WIPO's work more effectively and in a sustained manner.

Recommendation 6: Member States are encouraged to enhance coordination between Geneva-based Missions and their IP offices and other authorities in capital in order to have a coordinated approach in dealing with the CDIP and raising awareness about the benefits of the DA. Higher level participation of national based experts should be enhanced in the work of the Committee. CDIP should consider modalities related to the reporting on what has been done at the national level towards the implementation of the DARs.

Recommendation 7: Member States are encouraged, in light with their national needs, to formulate new project proposals for the consideration of the CDIP. They should consider the establishment of a reporting mechanism on the lessons learned and best practices from successfully implemented DA projects and activities. This reporting mechanism should include a periodical review of the sustainability of completed and/or mainstreamed projects, as well as the impact of these projects on the beneficiaries. WIPO should establish a database of the lessons learned and best practices identified in the course of DA projects implementation.

Recommendation 8: Future work related to the development of new projects should be modular and customizable and should consider the absorption capacity and the level of expertise of the beneficiaries. In the implementation of projects at the national level, WIPO should explore close partnerships with UN agencies and other entities to enhance the effectiveness, comprehensiveness and sustainability.

Recommendation 9: WIPO should pay more attention to recruiting experts that are very well versed and knowledgeable about the socio-economic conditions of the recipient countries. Beneficiary countries should ensure a high degree of internal coordination amongst its various organs in order to facilitate the implementation and long-term sustainability of a project.

Recommendation 10: The Secretariat's Progress Reports submitted to the CDIP should include detailed information about the utilization of financial and human resources related to the DA projects. Simultaneous assignment of the same project manager to multiple projects should be avoided.

Recommendation 11: A mechanism should be put in place to report on the agreed recommendations contained in the evaluation reports and on the

mainstreamed outcomes of the DA projects. Mainstreaming process should be aligned to the approved Expected Results.

Recommendation 12: Member States and the Secretariat should consider ways and means to better disseminate information about the DA and its implementation.

B. The Independent Review

1. Introduction and background

14. The WIPO Development Agenda seeks to ensure that development considerations form an integral part of WIPO's work. Its adoption in 2007, following several years of discussions and negotiations among Member States, constitutes an important milestone for WIPO.²

15. In 2007, WIPO's General Assembly (GA) adopted a set of 45 Development Agenda Recommendations (DARs). The DARs are categorized into six clusters dealing with: technical assistance and capacity building; norm setting, flexibilities, public policy and public domain, technology transfer; information and communication technologies (ICT) and access to knowledge; assessment, evaluation and impact studies; institutional matters, including mandate, governance and other issues.

16. The Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP) was also established by the GA with a three point mandate:

a. *“to develop a work program for implementation of the adopted recommendations;*

b. *to monitor, assess, discuss and report on the implementation of all recommendations adopted, and for that purpose it shall coordinate with relevant WIPO bodies; and*

c. *to discuss intellectual property and development related issues as agreed by the Committee, as well as those decided by the General Assembly.”*

17. In accordance with the Decision of the GA, the Committee held its first session in the first half of 2008 and has continued to meet regularly (for two five day sessions annually).³ During its first session, the Committee adopted its rules of procedure⁴ and discussed its first working document prepared by the Chair.⁵

18. The adoption of the WIPO Program and Budget for 2008/2009 included a new program entitled “Development Agenda Coordination Division” (DACD)

²See WIPO at <http://www.wipo.int/ip-development/en/agenda/>. See also Inception Report at Annex A.

³At the time of the elaboration of this Report, the Committee had held seventeen sessions.

⁴See document CDIP/1/2 on Procedural and Organizational Matters, available at: http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=92232

⁵See document CDIP/1/3 entitled “Initial Working Document for the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP)”, available at: http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=92813

with the mandate to undertake an Organization-wide coordination of the implementation of the DA process.

19. At the third session of the Committee, following requests made by delegations to “*avoid duplication of activities to implement the various Development Agenda recommendations*” and taking into account the concerns “*about the lack of information on clear objectives, timeframes and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms for the activities suggested*, the *Secretariat* proposed a thematic project-based approach to the Member States which agreed to adopt that approach on the basis of the following principles: (i) each recommendation would be discussed first in order to agree on the activities for implementation; (ii) recommendations that dealt with similar or identical activities would be brought under one theme, where possible; and (iii) implementation would be structured in the form of projects and other activities, as appropriate, with the understanding that additional activities may be proposed.

20. At the fifth session of the CDIP (2010), the Committee adopted a Coordination Mechanism and Monitoring, Assessing and Reporting Modalities (hereinafter the Coordination Mechanism), which was subsequently approved by the GA.⁶ The Coordination Mechanism, *inter alia*, requested the Organization to undertake an independent review of the implementation of the DARs. Accordingly, in 2014, the CDIP adopted the Terms of Reference (ToRs) for the Independent Review.⁷

21. On the basis of a Request for Expression of Interests, WIPO selected the Independent Review Team in May 2015. In order to coordinate the issue internally, the Organization established a Review Board. In close coordination with the Review Board and assisted by the DACD, the Independent Review has been conducted by three external reviewers.⁸ The first task of the Review Team was to prepare an Inception Report. The Inception Report was formally presented to Member States in September 2015.⁹ The Inception Report as informed by the ToRs describes the content of the Independent Review Report (herein referred to as the Report).

22. As mentioned in paragraph 5 of the Inception Report, the period of the Independent Review is from 2008 until April 2015.

⁶ See http://www.wipo.int/ip-development/en/agenda/coordination_mechanisms.html

⁷ See Annex L of this Report.

⁸ The Review Team includes VK Gupta, Lead Evaluator, Pedro Roffe, Expert on Development and Gift Sibanda, Expert on Technical Assistance. For a brief bio-data of the members of the Review Team, see http://www.wipo.int/ip-development/en/agenda/news/2015/news_0003.html

⁹ Available at <http://www.wipo.int/export/sites/www/ip-development/en/agenda/pdf/inceptionreport06082015.pdf> and at Annex A of this Report.

23. This Report is a composite of the review carried out by the Review Team. The work included reviewing of the relevant documents on DARs implementation, interviews of different stakeholders from Member States, WIPO Staff and beneficiaries of DARs implementation. With the support of the Secretariat, surveys were sent to a total of 1651 target respondents including IP offices, Geneva-based Member States representatives, IGOs and NGOs represented in the CDIP and the public in general. The Report also benefitted from the field missions conducted to the following selected countries: Thailand, Egypt, Moldova, Ethiopia and Argentina.

2. Purpose, objectives and scope of the Review

a. Purpose and objectives

24. The Independent Review was established with the view to assessing, in a comprehensive manner, the relevance, effectiveness, impact, efficiency and sustainability of “WIPO’s work” in the implementation of the DAR from 2008-April 2015.¹⁰ In undertaking the review, the Review Team examined in a comprehensive manner, the results of the activities carried out by WIPO towards the implementation of the DARs with particular emphasis on how that work and its results have served the needs of Member States, stakeholders and intended beneficiaries.

25. The DARs were adopted barely less than ten years ago and its actual implementation has been carried-out within the last eight years. Clearly, a review of this nature could not exhaustively capture the impact of the implementation that in many cases, particularly at the national level, is still a work in progress. In terms of projects such as capacity building, policy and research activities, and their spinoffs, the results are often of long-term and rarely predictable. It therefore follows that more time is needed for potential results that might stimulate changes in attitudes and approaches towards IP and development. In accordance with the DA principles, incorporating development considerations as an integral part of the Organization’s work was of priority. From this perspective, development is a long-term process with failures and successes and IP is one among many factors that influence development. It is therefore clear that this objective will not be achieved overnight.

26. Significant amount of work has been carried out with respect to the implementation of the DARs and adequate resources deployed for this purpose. It is obvious that within this limited time there are some lessons that can be learned from this process. It is also probable that there are some

¹⁰ The ToRs makes reference to the period 2008-2013. However, the term was extended, in consultations with the Secretariat, to include important activities carried out recently in the context of the CDIP.

shortcomings that can be identified. It is therefore the function of this review to take stock of the successes and shortcomings with the view to suggesting possible improvement to WIPO's performance in its future work in the implementation of the DARs.

27. The Review had its own challenges as there is a divergence of views on the manner of implementation of the DARs. Key among these is the appropriateness of the thematic project-based approach, as well as the extent of mainstreaming. With respect to the latter, there is difference of opinion with some inclined to link IP with development while others inclined to link IP to protection only. There is however, a general understanding that as the DA was developed through negotiations, as such it is understood to be a compromise. But it has evolved as a way of conciliating different perceptions, all geared towards promoting the development and protection of IP as an important contributor to the growth of countries.

28. As the nature and political sensitivity of the issues were governed by divergent positions, the Review Team thus focused on reviewing the work done by WIPO, while taking note of the surrounding debate.

29. The Review Team is also conscious of the fact that within eight years of DARs implementation, important changes have taken place in the IP world. These include emerging technologies, developments in Information Communication Technologies (ICT), and other changes outside the multilateral system in the design of new IP norms and standards on IP protection and enforcement.

30. In considering the work carried out by WIPO, the Review Team examined among others, the following:

- The manner and extent to which the DARs have transcended the activities of the CDIP and are today part and parcel of the regular programmes of activities of WIPO;
- The work of different relevant WIPO bodies;
- The use of human and financial resources in the implementation of the DARs;
- The sustainability of the different projects and activities adopted by the CDIP.

31. As stated in the ToRs, the Review in its final report is called upon to make suggestions on possible improvements to WIPO's work, including lessons learned and best practices in the implementation of the DARs.

b. Scope of the Review

32. The Review Team is cognizant of the divergence of opinions and interpretations by Member States on the coverage of “WIPO’s work”. These differences continued to take the centre stage in the meetings of the CDIP.¹¹ In a more pragmatic way, the Review Team focused mainly on activities carried out in the implementation of the DA and the synergies that have emerged among Member States, beneficiaries and stakeholders in general. This position is further elaborated in the following paragraphs.

c. The CDIP

33. The CDIP since its establishment has been the central body within WIPO entrusted with the responsibility to monitor and coordinate the implementation of the 45 DARs. At the outset, the Secretariat played a critical role in identifying the initial recommendations for immediate implementation, and subsequently, a list of activities proposed for follow-up action, including the adoption of a thematic project-based approach.

Thematic Project-Based Approach

34. An important focus of the CDIP in the initial years of DARs implementation has been on thematic project-based approach. A wide range of projects have been proposed, approved and implemented covering issues such as the public domain; competition policy; information and communication technologies; tools for access to patent information; results-based management; product branding; appropriate technology; socio-economic development (e.g., brain drain, the informal economy, tourism and culture); technology transfer; open collaboration; South-South cooperation; audio-visual sector; specialized databases ‘access; start-up national academies; design management for business development, etc.¹²

35. During the review period, the CDIP approved 31 projects with a budget of 28 million CHF, out of which 25 projects had been completed and evaluated. Fourteen projects had been integrated into WIPO’s regular Programs and Budget whereas 6 projects were under different stages of implementation.

36. Each of these projects has been reported in the CDIP meetings and self-evaluation reports prepared by Project Managers and evaluation by independent evaluators effected. These activities have also been the subject of the Review.

¹¹See particularly debates at the CDIP/13/13, May 19-24, 2014.

¹²See Annex A, Annex I and J.

Review of DARs implementation

37. The CDIP also monitors on a regular basis the implementation of each of the DARs through Progress Reports that include an account of activities by relevant sectors and divisions of the Secretariat and the Reports of the Director General on the CDIP. All these developments have been considered and taken into account in the Review exercise (see further discussion under desk review of documentation relevant to the implementation).

d. Other WIPO Bodies and IGOs

38. The Independent Review has also considered the fact that beyond the central role of the CDIP, a number of other WIPO Bodies report to the GA on their DARs related activities such as the Standing Committee on Copyright and Related Rights (SCCR), the Intergovernmental Committee on Intellectual Property and Genetic Resources, Traditional Knowledge and Folklore (IGC), the Standing Committee on the Law of Patents (SCP), the Standing Committee on the Law of Trademarks (SCT), the Advisory Committee on Enforcement (ACE) and the PCT Working Group (PCT).

39. The Review also examined the engagement of WIPO with selected international organizations and United Nations (UN) bodies including World Trade Organization (WTO), the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), UN Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), World Health Organization (WHO), Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), and the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS).

e. Secretariat and stakeholders in general

40. The Review Team examined in details the work and activities of the Secretariat, in particular the role of the DACD, in the implementation of the DARs. The Review entailed interviews, informal and dedicated meetings targeting a wide range of WIPO officials including, the management, program managers, Internal Oversight Division (IOD) as well as those involved in DARs implementation.¹³

41. To facilitate its work and to have an in-house understanding of the nature of the work related to DARs, the Review Team has been in close contact with the DACD. This interaction was extremely beneficial in ensuring that the Review Team communicates and deals with relevant members of staff who are involved in DA related issues.

¹³See Methodologies for further details.

42. In its work, the Review Team had the opportunity to establish informal as well as formal dialogues with the Review Board, as well as with different regional groupings and individual delegates in Geneva to discuss issues related to the DARs. The Review Team also had a meeting and a video conference with GRULAC and Group B countries respectively where the two groups expressed their positions on the expected outcomes of the Review vis-à-vis the Inception Report. Individual teleconference calls were also made with selected beneficiaries in the capitals targeting other stakeholders including former delegates to the CDIP, academics, NGOs and evaluators of CDIP sponsored projects. The interaction with the intended beneficiaries was complemented by field visits.

3. Methodology

a. Guiding principles

43. In its Review, the Review Team was guided by the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) guidelines and WIPO's Evaluation Policy 2010¹⁴ in accordance with core methodological principles stipulating the following:

- Emphasis on triangulation (cross-validation) of data sources and assessment of plausibility of the results obtained;
- The application of deductive reasoning basing conclusions and recommendations on review findings;
- Participatory approach, that sought the active views of stakeholders including beneficiaries of activities, seeking in the process feedback to align key findings, lessons, conclusions;
- Discussions with key stakeholders were based on the ToRs key questions and further elaborated by the reviewers to facilitate open and transparent discussions.
- Collection of diversity of opinions, ideas and perceptions that have contributed to the formulation of the recommendations made in the Report.

b. Review Questions

44. The Independent Review focused its enquiry on the following five key questions provided in the ToRs: relevance, impact, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability as reproduced in Box 1.

¹⁴ See http://www.wipo.int/export/sites/www/about-wipo/en/oversight/iaod/evaluation/pdf/evaluation_policy_2010.pdf

Box 1: Key questions to be addressed

1. Relevance: to what extent WIPO's Work and the results of its activities for the implementation of the DARs serve the needs of Member States, stakeholders and other intended beneficiaries?
2. Impact: what is the impact of WIPO's Work in the implementation of the DARs? To this end, the Review must address the actual impact of WIPO's work in the implementation of the DARs at various levels and across WIPO's bodies and programs.
3. Effectiveness: to what extent is WIPO's Work effective in the implementation of the DARs? To this end, the Review must address whether WIPO's work has been effective in achieving the outcomes in line with the DARs and also, whether the thematic project-based approach has been effective.
4. Efficiency: how efficiently has WIPO used the human and financial resources in its work directed at the implementation of the DARs?
5. Sustainability: to what extent are the results of WIPO's Work sustainable in the long term? To this end, the Review must also identify the best practices and the lessons learned from the WIPO's Work in the implementation of the DARs with the view to achieving sustainable outcomes in future.

45. The key questions reproduced in Box 1 were tailor-made to satisfy a given category of stakeholders and further elaborated for clarity and guidance in the interactions with different stakeholders (See Box 2).

Box 2: Inception report: key questions and selected indicators

Under relevance:

- i) How to measure the level of usefulness of WIPO's work in terms of benefits derived for intended beneficiaries and stakeholders in general?
- ii) How the DARs implementation has progressively impacted stakeholders and intended beneficiaries?
- iii) How to determine the level of commitment of Member States in the implementation of the DARs?
- iv) How to assess the degree of dissemination of material produced in the implementation to the DARs?

Under Impact

- i) How the implementations have progressively impacted on the functioning of WIPO as an organization and its different bodies and programs and the extent to which the DARs has changed WIPO work and culture?
- ii) The extent to which the completed DA projects are being utilized by Member States as well as intended beneficiaries for whom these projects were established as well as by other Member States and stakeholders in general.
- iii) Level of commitment of Member States in the implementation of the DARs.
- iv) The degree of dissemination and actual use of material produced in the implementation of projects.

Under Effectiveness

- i) How effective has WIPO's work been in achieving their outcomes with respect to the DARs?
- ii) Degree of effectiveness of the project based approach.
- iii) Has this project-based approach been the appropriate methodology to facilitate the implementation of the DARs?
- iv) To which extent WIPO's work has implemented the DARs and, how effective this work has been?

Under Efficiency

- i) Determining the level of human and financial resources devoted to the implementation of the DARs?
- ii) Are there means to assess the efficient use of the above resources?
- iii) To what extent the DA projects were implemented within the scheduled project budget and scheduled duration without compromising their respective deliverables and objectives.
- iv) Degree of commitment of staff to the implementation of the DARs.

Under Sustainability

- i) Number of WIPO units involved in the DARs implementation.
- ii) How viable is WIPO's work in the implementation of the DARs particularly in achieving sustainable outcomes in the future?
- iii) What type of lessons has been learnt during the implementation the DARs?
- iv) Which best practices can be identified and, which possible shortcomings can be identified?
- v) Are the mainstreamed projects integrated within the Result Based Management program (RBM) including specific budgetary allocations?

c. Description of methodological tools applied in the Review

46. The methodological principles and tools used in the Review were designed to seek answers to key questions identified in the ToRs, which were further elaborated by the Review Team. Thus, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of WIPO's work in the implementation of the DARs have been the core Review criteria.

Secondary data

Desk review of documentation relevant to the implementation

47. The desk review exercise focused on the analysis of key documents related to the implementation of the DARs. This examination included, among others, WIPO GA's relevant decisions and documentation, pertinent CDIP studies and reports namely the reports of the Committee, Chair summaries,

progress reports and DG's reports, approved projects and related evaluation reports.

48. The desk review has been an important instrument for an in-depth understanding of the relevance, impact and effectiveness of WIPO's work and activities. The Review Team had the benefit of dealing with a wide range of documents with a large coverage.

49. The secondary data that has been reviewed by the Review Team for the purposes of assessing in a comprehensive manner WIPO's work in the implementation of the DA and in order to produce useful information and findings for WIPO Member States is listed as Annex K of the Report. The desk review of documents produced in the context of the CDIP fall in the following categories: i) Background information, ii) the CDIP and its mandate; iii) The 45 DAR, including the 19 recommendations for immediate implementation; iv) Projects approved by the CDIP, submitted by Member States and the Secretariat; v) Progress Reports on the implementation of DA projects and activities; vi) DG's Reports; vii) Evaluation Reports of the completed projects; viii) Areas of flexibilities approved by the CDIP and documents developed on those flexibilities; ix) Work on the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs); x) Summary by the Chair for all the CDIP sessions; xi) Reports of the CDIP Meetings; xii) Report on the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP) and Review of the Implementation of the DARs; xiii) Program and Budget documents; xiv) Program Performance Reports; xv) Budgetary processes applied to projects proposed by the CDIP for the implementation of the DARs and xvi) Coordination Mechanism. Accordingly, Box 3 identifies the nature of documents, the organizational level of consideration, timeframe and contents.

Box 3: Documents included in desk review			
Information classification by subject	Level	Number of documents and (Timeframe)	Content
1. DA background (establishment)	IIM,PCDA and GA	11 (2004 – 2007)	Negotiating a DA for WIPO.
2. CDIP and its Mandate	GA	1 (2007)	GA decisions on DAR.
3. 45 DAR, including 19DAR for immediate implementation	IIM, PCDA and GA	1 (2004 – 2007)	45 DAR plus 6 Clusters
4. Projects approved by CDIP, submitted by member states and by the secretariat.	CDIP	32 (2008 – 2015)	DAR projects and Thematic projects
5. Progress reports of each project.	CDIP and GA	72 (2010 – 2015)	Progress report of each project.

6. Director Generals reports on DAR	CDIP and GA	6 (2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015)	The Report of the DG on the implementation of DAR
7. Self-evaluation and evaluation by projects.	CDIP and GA	26 (2010 – 2015)	Evaluation Reports
8. Areas of flexibilities approved by the CDIP and information on flexibilities	CDIP and GA	11 (2009 – 2015)	Discussions on Flexibilities
9. Work on MDGs	CDIP	12 (2009 – 2015)	MDGs as part of DAR
10. Summary by the chair for CDIP sessions.	CDIP	15 (2008 – 2015)	Summary of the CDIP deliberations
11. Reports of the CDIP meetings	CDIP	15 (2008 – 2015)	CDIP Reports
12. Reports of DA implementation considered by the GA. Report by relevant WIPO bodies in WIPO GA.	CDIP and GA	11 (2008 – 2014)	Reports by WIPO Committees on DA
13. Program and Budget	CDIP and GA	4 (2008-2009, 2010-2011, 2012-2013, 2014-2015)	DAR related programs and budget
14. Program Performance reports.	CDIP	5 (2008-2009, 2010-2011, 2012-2013)	Reports on various programs and their performance
15. Budgetary process applied and proposed by the CDIP for DARs implementation.	CDIP and GA	1 (2008-2009, 2010-2011, 2012-2013, 2014-2015)	The process proposed by the CDIP
16. Coordination mechanism and monitoring, assessing and reporting modalities.	GA	1 (2007)	Decision of the GA

Primary data

Interviews with WIPO officials and selected project managers

50. In the visits made to Geneva in May, September and November 2015, the Review Team held discussions and interviews with the relevant staff dealing with the implementation of the DARs. The coverage was broad including staff that contributed to the preparation of studies, managers and officials involved in the implementation of projects initiated in the context of the CDIP. Some meetings took place in the presence of the three members of the Review Team and others in the form of individual interviews. The focus of interviews and meetings were on the following key questions of the Review: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. The full list of people interviewed by the Review Team, including WIPO officials, is reproduced as Annex B.

51. These interviews were particularly useful in discerning important information in relation to the level of human and financial resources deployed to the implementation of the DARs, WIPO units involved in the

implementation, the influence of the DARs on WIPO's programmes and activities and the degree of effectiveness of the thematic project-based approach, etc.

Field visits

52. Field missions were considered an important source of information by Member States. As approved in the ToRs and mentioned in the Inception Report, field visits were undertaken to 5 countries, namely, Argentina, Egypt, Ethiopia, Moldova and Thailand.

53. The main criteria for the field visits selection were: (i) geographical balance; (ii) level of development (including LDCs, low-and-middle-income countries and emerging economies); (iii) countries benefiting from technical assistance activities related to the DA, as well as from economic studies, and from national IP strategies and iv) countries beneficiaries of WIPO support in building national capacities.

54. The field visits, notwithstanding its limited number, provided individual members of the Review Team with an insight on the extent of implementation of the DARs in the visited countries and above all afforded members of the Review Team to have personal contacts with the people involved in DA implementation in the respective countries and onsite visit to institutions beneficiaries of DARs.

Discussions and interviews with representatives of Member States in Geneva

55. In its visit to Geneva in September 2015, in the context of the presentation of the Inception Report, Review Team was able to meet a reasonable number of representatives of Member States; including the Coordinators of Regional Groups and Geneva-based diplomats. The highlight of discussions focused the expectations placed in the final report of the Independent Review. A number of representatives underlined the need to strictly adhere to the ToRs emphasizing the delicate character of the balance reached in the negotiation process leading to their approval.

56. In a subsequent visit to Geneva in November 2015, the Review Team had the opportunity to meet and interview delegates from different Regional Groupings. During these interviews, the Review Team was able to elicit some of the important elements relating to the implementation of the DA with particular emphasis to the Review key questions. This was also an opportunity for the Review Team to have an understanding of the expected direction that the DA could follow as well as an understanding to what extent the DARs are being implemented and the ensuing shortcomings and

successes. Problems associated with getting a consensus within the CDIP on some key issues were also highlighted.

57. The Geneva meetings as a whole greatly contributed towards the review process particularly by allowing a better understanding of varying perceptions of different groups within Member States on the implementation of the DARs. The Geneva meetings also provided a suitable platform for an appreciation of the lessons learned, the degree of dissemination and use of material produced in the implementation of projects, and the degree of effectiveness of the thematic project-based approach. A full list of representatives interviewed is contained in Annex B.

Interviews with Chair and former chair of CDIP

58. On the occasion of the first visit to Geneva in May 2015, the Review Team had the opportunity to meet the former Chairs of CDIP, Ambassador Mohamed SiadDoualeh, Permanent Representative of Djibouti and Ambassador Alberto Pedro D'Alotto, Permanent Representative of Argentina. These meetings enabled the Review Team to understand better the intricacies around the ToRs of the Independent Review and the complexities and nature of the work of CDIP, particularly with respect to the degree of effectiveness of the thematic project-based approach.

Interviews with officials from capitals and beneficiaries

59. The field visits, referred to above, was an occasion to meet officials and beneficiaries in the capitals. Furthermore, a number of interviews were carried out from Geneva via conference calls with individual capital-based officials and beneficiaries of the implementation of the recommendations. Interviews with high officials of IP offices in different regions as well as officials involved in the implementation of technical assistance projects initiated by the CDIP took place during the Review Team's visit to Geneva in November 2015. Interviewees contributed with their perceptions and experience in the implementation of the DARs.

60. These interviews constituted a complimentary tool for verification of the existing information and to better respond to the key questions before the Review Team, particularly with respect to the level of usefulness of WIPO's work in implementing the DARs, the degree of dissemination and use of material produced in the implementation of projects, the degree of effectiveness of the thematic project-based approach and the types of lessons learned in the implementation of the recommendations.¹⁵

¹⁵See also Annex B.

Interviews with IGOs, NGOs, former diplomats, evaluators, academics, industry

61. To complement information collected, through the methodological tools described above, interviews were also conducted with stakeholders such as IGOs, NGOs, former diplomats, evaluators, academics, industry, etc. The above were selected on the basis of their involvement in the CDIP deliberations, roles in external evaluations of project related to the DARs, involvement in DARs work as academicians, part played in dissemination of information of DA, and with respect to former diplomats, those active in the early phase of the negotiations of the DARs (See Annex B).

62. The following box (Box 4) summarizes the number of people interviewed during the Independent Review process, respectively with Members States, WIPO officials and others stakeholders.

Box 4: Categories of people interviewed		
Serial number	Category	Number. of persons interviewed
1	Member States (including Geneva Representatives, IP officials and people met in field visits)	124
2	WIPO officials	44
3	Other stakeholders (IGOs, NGOs, former diplomats, evaluators, academics, industry)	20
	Total	188

Collection of information through surveys

63. Structured surveys were conducted with the assistance of the WIPO Web Communications Division. The surveys/questionnaires¹⁶, seeking feedback to the key questions, were addressed to different stakeholders, namely Geneva-based representatives, national and regional IP offices, NGOs and IGOs with observer status in the CDIP and direct beneficiaries of

¹⁶ A copy of the questionnaires is available in Annex C

projects. At the same time, a survey was available to the general public with the view of making the process inclusive to the extent possible.

64. Invitations for responding to the survey were addressed to 1742 individuals in the four categories described below. An open public survey was also launched. In total, 373 responses were received to the abovementioned surveys. Excluding the public survey, the average response was of 22.2% of total target audience. In the case of the public survey, 25 individuals completed the questionnaire. For details see Box5.

Box 5 Summary of number of respondents to surveys				
Serial number	Category	Number of addressees	Addressees that completed the surveys	Percentage of completed and received surveys
1	Geneva Representatives	555	109	19.6
2	IP Offices	651	138	21.2
3	NGOs/ IGOs that were observers to the CDIP	133	27	20.3
4	Direct Beneficiaries of the projects; include a long range of actors, depending of the project (individuals, IP Office focal point for the project, representatives of associations/organizations that benefited from the projects, etc.), evaluators and Project Managers	320	99	30.9
5	Public Survey	Open	25	NA
	Total	1742	373	22.4%

65. Out of 324 respondents who expressed opinion, 78% were of the view that DARs implementation, ranging from moderate to high, met their expectations, whereas 22% respondents felt that DARs implementation did not meet their expectations. Forty-nine respondents did not express any

opinion. (See summary in Box 6). The surveys were used primarily to validate the Review Team’s findings through desk review, interviews and field missions.

Box 6 Summary of Survey Feedback on degree of satisfaction regarding implementation vis-à-vis expectations				
	Number of respondents	Percentage of respondents who agreed - ranging from high to moderate degree- that implementation has met expectations	Percentage of respondents who did not agree that implementation has met expectations	Percentage of respondents with no opinion
Geneva Representatives	109	65.7	13.6	20.7
IP Offices	138	69.3	15.8	14.8
NGOs/ IGOs that were observers to the CDIP	27	47	36.3	16.7
Direct Beneficiaries of the projects; include a long range of actors, depending of the project (individuals, IP Office focal point for the project, representatives of	99	62.8	16.3	20.9

associations/org anizations that benefited from the projects, etc.), evaluators and Project Managers				
Public Survey	25	50.7	30.5	18.2
Total	373	68.3	18.8	12.8

66. Surveys invited respondents to make suggestions on how work on the implementation was taking place and how it could be improved. Numerous suggestions were made by different stakeholders. These suggestions ranged from positive expressions of satisfaction to reservations on both the “narrow” thematic project-based approach and on technical cooperation (see Annex D, E, F, G and H for above categories of respondent respectively).

67. In brief, the Review has taken into account the guiding methodological principles, participatory and inclusivity involving key stakeholders in the implementation of the DARs. The mix and combination of tools have been used to ensure, as far as possible, evidence-based qualitative and quantitative feedback to support the findings and recommendations made herein. Key findings arrived by the Review Team give different weight to the feedback received cognizant of the need for cross-validation of data sources and assessment of plausibility of the results obtained.

d. Main limitations

68. The implementation of the DARs is work in progress and the limited time since their adoption in 2007 is rather short for effecting fundamental changes in WIPO’s work including both the Secretariat and Member States.

69. The impact of the work carried out in the context of the DARs on development of Member States, particularly in countries with weak capabilities and incipient enabling environments in support of creativity and inventiveness could not be determined within a short span of time. It would take time to translate the content of numerous studies and different activities carried out under the aegis of the CDIP into tangible and measurable outcomes. With the instruments available, the Review Team found that it was premature to assess their impact.

70. Most of the issues covered in the Review have been discussed unceasingly by Member States without being able to reach a consensus on some of them. The Review Team acknowledges these differences.

71. The wide-ranging nature of the DA and the diversity of stakeholders associated with its implementation are enormous. While a participatory and inclusive process has prevailed, it could not be possible to reach out to a very diverse set of stakeholders. This was the case particularly in field visits where it was practically impossible to visit all the beneficiaries.

72. The findings, conclusions and recommendations in the following sections should be interpreted in the light of these constraints affecting in some respect the scope and depth of the Review.

4. Findings

73. This section of the report presents the key review findings of the implementation of the DARs, respectively, on relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of WIPO's work between 2008-2015.

a. Relevance

74. This section examines to what extent WIPO's work and the result of its activities for the implementation of the DAR serves the needs of Member States, stakeholders and other intended beneficiaries.

Finding 1: The implementation of the DARs has largely been consistent with the expectations of Member States, stakeholders and other intended beneficiaries.

75. The progress in the implementation of the DARs to a large extent has been consistent with expectations of Member States, stakeholders and other intended beneficiaries. In this regard, among others, the survey shows that 78% of the respondents were of the view that the DARs implementation ranged from moderate to high and had met their expectations.

76. The DA has created expectations which are not easy to meet. The Secretariat has made significant efforts to address these expectations. The Organization took important institutional measures. These included notably the creation of the DACD to coordinate an Organization-wide implementation, the inclusion of DARs principles in the work of the Organization, the inclusion of DARs references to the activities of each WIPO Program leading to their close integration in the work of the entire Organization, the thematic project-based approach which replaced the activity-based approach that was in place during the first two sessions of the Committee held in 2008.

77. The thematic project-based approach has been a creative attempt to meet some of these expectations. It has been noticed that some projects such as those dealing with capacity building activities, access to databases, social and economic studies, and digitalization of IP applications, mini IP academies and Design Management for Business Development have been well received by Member States and other beneficiaries. However, it has been also noticed that some other projects made little impact. For example, the Evaluator of the project of the IP Development Matchmaking Database (IP-DMD), in his evaluation report presented to the tenth session of the Committee, noted that “the database had not seen frequent use by either requestors or donors with a total of six requests and six offers existing on the database”.¹⁷ In addition, it was highlighted during the interviews conducted by the Review Team that the IP Technical Assistance Database (IP-TAD) appeared to have less relevance for beneficiaries.

78. DARs have brought more awareness on IP and development issues through, *inter alia*, the studies undertaken in the context of the projects on IP and Socio-economic Development, IP and Brain Drain and IP and Informal Economy, as well as the discussion on the MDGs. The field visits have shown that some beneficiaries were not particularly aware of the DARs but understood the significance of its implications and they have an improved understanding of the complexities of the IP-development nexus. Thus, there was great interest on the DA notion and its relevance for countries but not necessarily reflecting an actual awareness on the DA debate, as discussed and perceived in Geneva.

79. In the five countries where field visits took place, beneficiaries provided positive feedback on the relevance of the activities undertaken in these countries, and there was an effective local participation in the respective projects under implementation.

Findings 2: The project based approach has been a creative approach to meet expectations of Member States in comparison with the earlier activity-based approach.

80. The political consensus reached to adopt the DA in 2007 was translated by the then Chair of the Committee into a working document to implement the approved 45 DARs. The discussion of this working document started during the first session of the Committee (April 2008). By the third session (April 2009), activities related to five DARs, namely, 2, 5, 8, 9 and 10, had been discussed and agreed upon by Member States. In order to speed-up the

¹⁷Please see document CDIP/10/3 available at: http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=217446. This evaluation report was presented to the tenth session of the Committee held in November 2012.

implementation process and to avoid duplication of activities and resources, the Secretariat proposed a new methodology of a thematic project-based approach. This methodology was based on thematic grouping of DARs and it includes a project scope, cost estimates, deliverable outcomes, timeframes and an evaluation process.

81. This grouping has resulted in a number of thematic projects discussed and agreed by the Committee to be implemented by the Secretariat with the understanding that no DAR would be exhausted by the mere completion of a project, an activity or a study.

82. The thematic project-based approach was well received by most Member States that continue to use it while proposing new work for the Committee. During the review period, seven projects were proposed by Member States using this approach, namely IP Advantage; Project on Intellectual Property and Product Branding for Business Development in Developing Countries and Least-Developed Countries (LDCs); Capacity-Building in the Use of Appropriate Technology-Specific Technical and Scientific Information as a Solution for Identified Development Challenges; Project on Enhancing South-South Cooperation on Intellectual Property (IP) and Development Among Developing Countries and Least Developed Countries; Strengthening and Development of the Audiovisual Sector in Burkina Faso and Certain African Countries; Project on Intellectual Property (IP) and Design Management for Business Development in Developing and Least Developed Countries (LDCs), and Intellectual Property; Tourism and Culture: Supporting Development Objectives and Promoting Cultural Heritage in Egypt and Other Developing Countries.

83. The above mentioned approach had led to the approval of 31 projects containing a wide range of outputs such as WIPO Methodology and Tools for the Development of National IP Strategies, IP Technical Assistance and several studies dealing with issues such as IP and Competition Policy, IP and Public Domain, IP and ICT, IP and Transfer of Technology, IP and Brain Drain and IP and Informal Economy.

84. It is important to note that 94% of people who expressed opinion in the survey felt that the thematic project-based approach had been useful in translating the DARs into actionable activities.

Finding 3: The DARs have been instrumental in instigating new work not foreseen in the past.

85. The desk review showed that during the period under review, the implementation of the DARs permitted the Organization to undertake institutional reforms to respond to the requirements set by these DARs and to

integrate development considerations into its work. In this regard, it was observed that the newly created Economics and Statistics Division, headed by a Chief Economist, ensured that “new studies undertaken by the Organization to assess the economic, social and cultural impact of the use of intellectual property systems in these States” (DAR 35) were of high quality.

86. In addition, the creation of the WIPO Ethics Office and the appointment of the Chief Ethics Officer resulted with the development of a WIPO Code of Ethics to complement the Organization’s Staff Regulations and Staff Rules, as well as the Standards of Conduct for the International Civil Service as requested by the DAR 6. This work was also supplemented with mandatory ethics training for all WIPO personnel.

87. As described in the Director General’s reports to the Committee, the Organization also reformed its capacity building activities, by assisting countries in developing country-specific IP strategies and policies aligned with national development goals, balanced and tailored IP regulatory frameworks that promoted creativity and innovation, IP institutional and technical infrastructure to support creators and innovators; and enhanced human and professional capacity to support countries in benefitting from the knowledge economy through the use of IP.

88. It was also noticed that the adoption of the DA encouraged the Organization to enhance its cooperation with other intergovernmental organizations (IGOs), particularly the WHO and the WTO. The focus of this collaboration has primarily been the interface between IP and economic, social and cultural development. A number of joint activities as part of WIPO’s trilateral cooperation with WHO and WTO, particularly for the implementation of the Global Strategy and Plan of Action on Public Health, Innovation and IP were undertaken by WIPO.

89. The Review Team noticed the creation of a Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and Industry Relations Section. This Section has contributed to maintain closer cooperation with non-governmental stakeholders through activities like workshops and seminars organized by WIPO in Geneva and abroad in which civil society representatives take part or lend expertise. WIPO organizes information sessions and side-events to the various committee meetings which allow exchanges with NGOs.

90. In connection with the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), the organization was requested by the CDIP to take the necessary steps to join the MDGs Gap Task Force and the Inter-Agency Expert Group on MDGs Indicators (IAEG). In response, WIPO became an observer in the UNDG MDGs Task Force and a member of some other Working Groups established

by the Secretary-General for the UN System Task Team (UNTT) on the Post-2015 UN Development Agenda.

91. WIPO also implemented a work program on flexibilities in the IP system in response to Member States' requests. In the context of patent-related flexibilities, the Secretariat produced a series of documents for the CDIP, which provided information on the implementation in national laws of fourteen patent-related flexibilities. It also developed a webpage on flexibilities which provides access to resources related to flexibilities produced by WIPO and related resources from other IGOs. The website also includes a database containing information about the implementation of IP flexibilities in national laws.

92. The Organization also prepared a number of studies related to IP and Public Domain, IP and Competition Policy, IP and Brain Drain, IP and Informal Economy, and IP and Technology Transfer. In addition two databases were created as an output to the DA projects on Intellectual Property Technical Assistance Database (IP-TAD) and IP Development Matchmaking Database (IP-DMD).

93. The Marrakesh Treaty adopted in 2013 recalls in its preamble "the importance of the Development Agenda recommendations, adopted in 2007 by the GA". This treaty also recognizes, in line with the DAR 15, "the need to maintain a balance between the effective protection of the rights of authors and the larger public interest, particularly education, research and access to information, and that such a balance must facilitate effective and timely access to works for the benefit of persons with visual impairments or with other print disabilities".

b. Effectiveness

94. This section examines the question to what extent was WIPO's work effective in the implementation of the DARs at various levels and across WIPO's bodies and programs.

Finding 4: CDIP has been playing a central role in implementing and monitoring the DARs with the efficient support of the Secretariat, in particular the DACD.

95. Interviews with Member State representatives and stakeholders in general were almost unanimous in acknowledging the central role played by CDIP since its establishment in 2007 in timely defining its responsibilities and initiating the implementation of the 45 DARs.

96. The analysis made during the desk review provided tangible evidence of meaningful discussions, documentations produced and the projects and activities launched during the 15 sessions of the CDIP under review.

97. CDIP is also generally appreciated as playing an important role in transcending the principles and objectives of the DA across different WIPO bodies and generally throughout the Organization.

98. The Review Team noted the appreciation expressed by Member States and different stakeholders to DACD's pivotal role in supporting the CDIP to achieve its objectives, its coordination of a large number of projects and activities undertaken by the Organization, and its support to Member States and other stakeholders.

99. Member States, former diplomats, academics and institutions associated with the work of the CDIP acknowledge the useful work undertaken by the Secretariat in facilitating the DA negotiation and implementation processes.

100. The Review Team has noticed that two issues have been discussed in the Committee for a long period of time, namely, (i) the implementation of the CDIP mandate, and (ii) the implementation of the Coordination Mechanism. These two issues, despite several decisions of the GA, were still in the agenda of the Committee at the time of the review.

101. It was also noted that the CDIP during the review period did not devote adequate attention to discuss the sustainability of the completed and mainstreamed projects.

Finding 5: Implementation of DARs has been to a reasonable extent effective as they were incorporated in various levels in WIPO's work and across WIPO's bodies and programmes.

102. WIPO's work has succeeded to a reasonable extent in conveying the message that the development dimension should be in the heart of any activity of the Organization encouraging innovation and creativity.

103. Desk review has revealed that new activities related to IP for development have been introduced in several programs of WIPO, through the budgetary planning process and budgetary cycle. The Expected Results included in the Program and Budget foresee, for example, results leading to an enhanced cooperation among Member States on development of a balanced international normative framework for IP; tailored and balanced IP legislative, regulatory and policy frameworks, national innovation and IP strategies and plans consistent with national development objectives; enhanced human resource capacities able to deal with the broad range of requirements for the effective use of IP for development in developing

countries, LDCs and countries with economies in transition; mainstreaming of the DARs in the work of WIPO; enhanced understanding of the DA by Member States, IGOs, civil society and other stakeholders; increased capacity of SMEs to successfully use IP to support innovation; enhanced access to, and use of, IP information by IP institutions and the public to promote innovation and creativity.

104. The standing committees of WIPO as well as other relevant bodies within WIPO have embraced the DARs with the focus towards development. However, there are isolated cases where issues of the DARs still lag behind. The case in point includes but not limited to the IGC.

Finding 6: Implementation of the DARs at a national level has generally been successful and effective. However, projects involving other national institutions/ministries have been less successful as compared to those delivered directly to the IP Offices.

105. The review observed that projects which directly involve national IP institutions proved to be more effective in comparison with activities and projects involving actors from other ministries and agencies. This may be due to the lack of active participation and interest of other national institutions/ministries in the subject matter which is not their core function and/or due to coordination issues at a national level.

106. It was noticed during the field missions that projects where the national absorption capacity was available, were more successful. This was the case of projects such as Specialized Databases' Access and Support, Smart IP institutions, IP Academy, Tools for Access to Patent information. It was also demonstrated that these projects were found to be more effective due to the pre-existing expertise available within Member States / beneficiaries.

107. It was also noticed during the interviews that the level of effectiveness of the implementation of the projects in a given country was directly linked to the level of development of the country. This is due to the existing human and financial resources made available by the country to support the implementation and continued sustainability of the project. In addition, the change of priorities in some countries as well as the staff retention, affected severely the effectiveness of some projects.

108. It was noticed that the level of expertise made available by the Organization has a direct effect on the success of the deliverables of the projects. In case of some projects, it was felt during the field missions that the level of expertise, knowledge of the local situation and conditions had a very strong bearing on the final outcome of the implementation in a country.

Finding 7: DARs and their principles were mostly integrated in the Program and Budget cycle. However the MTSP 2010-2015 does not include specific strategies related to the implementation of DARs.

109. The Review Team noticed that the long term sustainability of the DA implementation was ensured by the Medium Term Strategic Plan (MTSP) of WIPO for 2010-2015. The MTSP through a broad focus on development incorporated the 45 DARs in WIPO's work under the nine Strategic Goals. This focus guided the biennial Program and Budget cycle. In the revised Program and Budget in 2009, an effort was made to integrate of the DA in the work of the Organization through linkages between the DARs and the various programs of the Organization.

110. The review team observed that this approach was refined in the Program and Budget 2010/11 by enabling the Member States and the Secretariat to monitor and evaluate the progress in the DA implementation. Furthermore, the approved Programs and Budget for 2012/13 and 2014/205 mainstreamed development across Strategic Goals and all relevant programs of WIPO. The review team noted the Result Frameworks Chart, including estimated development share by result developed to identify under which results resources were devoted to development across programs. Moreover, the DA projects approved by the Committee were also mainstreamed both in terms of substance and resources, in each program and program links to the DARs were reflected in the narrative for each program.

111. The Desk Review demonstrated that in the Program Performance Report (PPR) for 2008/09 contained a section under each Program in which its role and contribution to the implementation of the DA was reported. In 2010, this section included information on the implementation of DARs as well as projects undertaken by each program.

112. It was strengthened in 2012 to take into account comments received by Member States during the discussion of the PPR 2010/11. The reporting on the DA implementation was further improved in 2015, as an assessment of the implementation of the DA was mainstreamed and integrated into the Overview of Progress in the PPR 2014.

113. However, it was also noted that the "challenges and opportunities" and "Strategies" pertaining to DARs implementation were not identified in the MTSP.

c. Efficiency

114. This section examines how efficiently WIPO has used the human and financial resources in its work directed at the implementation of the DARs.

Finding 8: DARs related projects have generally been adequately resourced although there have been issues for country level implementation.

115. Generally, projects and activities have been adequately resourced. However, the human and financial resources for some of them did not get utilized to the extent required, as it was the case for the project on IP and Technology Transfer: Common Challenges – Building Solutions, and the National IP strategies. In some areas (e.g., analytical work), human resources were considered more important than financial resources as success depended on finding competent people who could do creative work and provide answers to difficult problems.

116. Developing countries, in particular LDCs, have felt the need for higher level of financial resources than what have been allocated. They have also sometimes felt that the approval processes were complex and rigid.

117. There have been issues concerning the deployment of adequate level of human resources by the beneficiaries. For some projects, efficiency in project implementation could not be achieved to the required level due to the lack of clarity on the roles and responsibilities of the recipient countries, in particular on the commitment of resources at their end. For example in one country, the national Start-Up Academies initial activities were implemented but the country lacked necessary infrastructure for the establishment of the academy, and in another case a particular country had not been able to set up a well-equipped IP Library due to lack of resources.

118. Required efficiency levels could not be achieved for the projects which were implemented without full consideration of the needs, expectations and environment of the recipient countries.

119. Mechanisms such as IP auditing, independent evaluation at the end of recipient countries and joint review between those countries and project managers were not available for some of the projects, affecting the efficiency level in such projects.

Finding 9: Existing reporting mechanisms lack specificity, particularly with respect to actual utilization of personnel costs.

120. A project manager-wise analysis of 25 completed and evaluated DA projects listed in Annex I of this Report, with respect to allocated personnel

costs has been carried out by the Review Team. It may be seen that CHF 6.87 million were allocated in terms of personnel costs.

121. Nineteen projects accounting for 83% of the allocated personnel costs have been assigned to project managers dealing with more than one project. This resulted to a conflict in priorities. There is no feedback and reporting mechanism on actual utilization of personnel costs available, making it difficult to assess the efficiency of the personnel costs.

122. Details on utilization of financial and human resources are also not included in the Progress Reports or in the annual Report provided by the Director General.

123. The Review Team noticed shortcomings related to monitoring and follow up on the content of the Progress Reports submitted by the Secretariat. Recommendations are routinely reported to be completed. However, Progress Reports were not adequately analytical and lacked the identification of actions including details on follow up actions.

124. There has been a lack of adequate diffusion of work done and inadequate feedback from Member States. Many resources are used for activities in Geneva (high per diem). There is a lack of transparency on funds used for consultants. Impression appears to be created that some activities could have been accomplished with fewer resources.

125. There has been in some cases uneven deployment of resources, i.e. certain projects were under-budgeted while some others were over-budgeted. This discrepancy is observed where some projects were completed with a surplus while others were poorly resourced. A good example of projects which were poorly resourced and yet crucial for development include project on Technology and Innovation Support Centres (TISC) and the Industrial Property Automation System (IPAS). In cases where insufficient funds were deployed, supplementary budget had to be resourced from respective regional bureaus. Further, it was observed that in case of mainstreamed projects there is a lack of transparency related to deployment of human and financial resources post-mainstreaming.

d. Impact

126. Under this key question, the Review Team was requested to examine what was the actual impact of WIPO's work in the implementation of the DARs including WIPO's various levels and across its bodies and programs.

Finding 10: Implementation is work in progress and incumbent both on Member States and the Secretariat.

127. Implementation of the DARs is a work in progress entailing a long and sustained process. Eight years of actual implementation is a short period of time to arrive at definite conclusions on the impact of the DARs particularly in the circumstances of intended beneficiaries. This is the case, for example, with respect to the recommendation dealing with strengthening Member States domestic capacities for the protection of local creations, innovations and inventions and to support the development of national scientific and technological infrastructure (DAR 11). In conjunction, the DA deals with a wide range of IP related matters that further make an impact appraisal even more challenging at this stage.

128. As shown in this Report, there are already positive signs in the work undertaken so far towards creating the conditions for making the work associated with the DA meaningful and promising in terms of actual impact to Member States and intended beneficiaries through new approaches on capacity building activities and social and economic studies translated into policies at the national level.

129. A review of the 45 DARs clearly shows that their implementation is a shared responsibility, in partnership, between Member States, Secretariat and other stakeholders. Consequently, some of the DARs are directly addressed to the Secretariat, while some others are with wider audience. However, the implementation of some of them is a shared responsibility between the Secretariat, its Member States and other stakeholders.

130. Primary and secondary data reveal that the Secretariat, in collaboration with Member States, has been actively engaged in the implementation of the DARs by having taken, since their adoption, initiatives to put in motion their realization. The regular progress reports submitted to the CDIP provide good evidence of the involvement of the Secretariat in advancing the implementation of the DARs and opportunities to Member States to monitor and supervise this implementation. As pointed out in this Report, a limited number of countries have been active, in the period covered by the Review, in introducing proposals for projects to be implemented in the context of the CDIP. Additionally, Interviews and meetings held in the context of field visits show that while development concerns are distinctly understood in those countries and thus take active part in the implementation of relevant CDIP projects, not sufficient knowledge exists around the principles and objectives that inform the DA. This is a clear indication that the impact of the DA has still not materialized in accordance with its high expectations.

Finding 11: Since the adoption of DARs positive changes and attitudes towards development issues are gradually emerging.

131. A noticeable positive change is discernible in WIPO's work since the adoption of the DARs leading to changes in attitudes towards development issues in its capacity building activities and legislative initiatives. A manifestation of this positive change relates to the work undertaken in recent years on new initiatives and the work related to national IP strategies, economic studies, flexibilities, and exceptions and limitations.

132. Economic and social studies are unquestionably an important development in the Organization's work and since 2011 WIPO has continuously produced reports in support of economic and social studies. In particular, the Division of the Chief Economist Officer has produced publications such as the World IP Report and the Global Innovation Index in line with the DARs 35 and 37.

133. Since the adoption of the DARs, WIPO staff generally shows more openness and responsiveness to development considerations. The examples mentioned above demonstrate commitments and sensitivity in identifying and exploring the possible links and impacts between IP and development. However, in this respect, the deep, thoughtful and dispassionate discussion among Member States on these links and impacts is lacking.

Finding 12: Thematic project-based approach in DARs implementation to date shows a measure of success.

134. The Review Team noted the existence of different perceptions on the emphasis placed on the project implementation. For some, the thematic project-based is an adequate approach and for others, it is an important step in the right direction but far from sufficiency. The thematic project-based approach was a good modality, in the absence of other comparable options, to kick-start implementation of the DA.

135. Projects and activities are carried out after seeking consensus among Member States on initiatives mainly made by the Secretariat. Member states rarely make a follow up to discussions in the CDIP. However, a systematic and coordinated approach is lacking for a better understanding of the links and impacts between IP and development. The latter is consistent with the WIPO mission statement which inter-alia states "To lead to the development of a balanced and effective international IP system that enables innovation and creativity for the benefit of all."

136. An important consideration on impact of projects adopted by the CDIP, assessed principally in personal contacts with beneficiaries during field visits, points in the direction that they are in general well perceived and considered useful and constructive. The implementation, however, of a few projects, is not sufficient to pass a definitive judgment on the entire impact of the DARs. It is also perceived that efforts should be made to avoid attributing activities and projects mechanically to one or another recommendation or to activities that could have been initiated regardless of the DARs.

137. Furthermore, projects in general have responded to local needs and were adapted to national circumstances albeit in some cases, projects were slow in completion due to a lack of suitable local conditions to flourish.

138. Ownership of projects by local beneficiaries and stakeholders has been an indicator of success. This was clearly illustrated during the field visits. Ownership of projects by local partners, more flexibility on procedures followed by the Secretariat and less bureaucratic hurdles in the fluid implementation of projects remains an important factor in building mutual confidence.

139. The actual impact of projects is very much related to those that are demand driven, well formulated and with committed project managers working closely with local experts. In most of the cases examined by the Review Team this has been the trend.

140. Impact of projects and activities is affected by prevailing suspicions and skepticisms around, both, work not sufficiently prone to development and the reconciliation between development considerations, protection and enforcement of intellectual property rights. This factor is prevalent in many projects and studies under implementation by various WIPO bodies. It is also the case with respect to the impact on development for Technical Assistance provided in general by WIPO.

141. The field missions in selected countries clearly illustrated the gap with respect to the perception on IP and development. While in Geneva, IP for development was considered of great importance, in capitals knowledge and information around the DA and the work carried out under the DARs was generally absent, pointing out to the fact that not sufficient dissemination at national levels has been taking place on the important work achieved in the implementation of the DARs since 2008.

e. Sustainability

142. This section examines to what extent are the results of WIPO's work sustainable.

Finding 13: Efforts are underway to mainstream CDIP projects and activities in the regular work of the Organization.

143. Fourteen of the DA projects have been mainstreamed and have been integrated in regular programs of the Organization. It is expected that such mainstreaming would result in tangible outcomes for the Organization and its Member States. Clarity and understanding on the concept and implications of mainstreaming, however, is yet to evolve within the Secretariat and among Member States, stakeholders and intended beneficiaries.

144. The Review Team finds that information such as human and financial resources allocated to the mainstreaming of the DA projects and activities or their outcome are not available to Member States. Lack of transparency fuels legitimate concerns among Member States particularly in developing countries about the future sustainability of these activities.

145. The DA implementation has succeeded incrementally in establishing the relationships between innovation, economic development and IP. Higher level of understanding on these connections has been shown. This contributed to narrowing down gaps between differing views.

146. The Review Team noticed that the links and proper understanding between IP and development has partially influenced the DA process and implementation. The constructive involvement of developing countries including LDCs, as producers and consumers, in the discussion of the Committee has contributed to convergence of views on several issues between developed and developing countries.

Finding 14: Sustainability of the CDIP projects is due to the commitment and support of Member States, active involvement of stakeholders and beneficiaries and continued technical support by the Secretariat.

147. The Review Team has noticed that positive signs of sustainability existed where projects and activities were implemented with a long term perspective and where Member States did take pro-active steps including the provision of human and financial resources to manage the deployed projects, active engagement of stakeholders and beneficiaries, and sustained and effective technical support of the Secretariat. Good examples of sustainable activities appear to be those related to IP national strategies, patent landscaping, mini-academies and TISCs. On the other hand, it has been noted that projects such as IP and Competition policy, even if relevant work was carried out, their sustainability is being questioned. In addition, no follow-up activities were undertaken on some other successful projects such as IP

and Informal Economy and IP and Brain Drain. The Review also took note of some projects that need more and continued human and financial resources to be sustainable.

148. It was also noticed that despite independent evaluation reports discussed by the Committee on completed DA projects, no mechanism has been put in place to report on the agreed recommendations contained in these evaluation reports.

149. The Review was not able to assess the sustainability of some completed projects due to the lack of a reporting mechanism that allow to inform the CDIP on national lessons learned and shortcomings that the projects might have encountered. In addition, it was noticed that no tools were available to track and assess how the completed projects are mainstreamed in the Organization's work.

Finding 15: There has been a limited involvement of competent national institutions other than national IP offices and of relevant international development institutions in the implementation of DARs.

150. The implementation at present is a Geneva based top down process which gets extended at the national level aiming at intended beneficiaries via IP offices. High level involvement and commitment of Member States in the field has been a positive indicator of sustainability. Development involves multifaceted factors and thus a diversity of actors. There is a lack of active involvement of national institutions/ministries beyond IP offices and other development international institutions. This does raise concern on the sustainability of projects dealing with cross cutting issues.

151. At present, formal or informal mechanisms are not available for seeking the further commitment of Member States and potential beneficiaries, particularly with respect to the deployment of adequate human and financial resources during the project implementation and post project completion phases. Non-availability of such mechanisms poses a risk to the sustainability of DA projects and activities.

152. The DA has succeeded in improving the understanding of the possible linkages between innovation, economic development and intellectual property. In this respect the innovative exploration of economic and social development issues in the context of the CDIP has been a factor to popularize concepts and enhance the sustainability of the DA. Wherever there has been a shared ownership by Member States and WIPO support, DA outputs have the potential of being translated into sustainable outcomes.

5. Conclusions

153. This section presents the key conclusions of the independent review for the considerations of WIPO as it moves forward in the implementation of DARs. Drawing on the main findings, the Review Team has reached the following conclusions.

Conclusion 1 (Findings 1, 3, 5 and 11)

154. The implementation of the DARs has largely been consistent with the expectations of Member States, stakeholders and other intended beneficiaries. A noticeable general positive change is discernible in WIPO's work. Since its adoption, the DA has led to changes in addressing IP related issues to respond to development needs of stakeholders. WIPO's work has succeeded to a reasonable extent in conveying that IP has a role to play in encouraging and promoting innovation and creativity for the benefit of the society at large. However, the DA has created high expectations which may not be totally fulfilled.

Conclusion 2 (Findings 3, 4 and 5)

155. The principles and objectives of the DA have been guiding the work of the Organization through discussions undertaken in the CDIP and other WIPO bodies. The DARs, and particularly DAR 15, informed the norm-setting activities undertaken by the Organization in recent years. However, some issues related to the mandate of the Committee and the implementation of the Coordination Mechanism are still outstanding items in the work of the Committee.

Conclusion 3 (Finding 4)

156. The CDIP played an efficient role in the implementation and the monitoring of the DARs and the Secretariat was proactive in facilitating this implementation through the creation of the DACD and the effective coordination instituted within the relevant divisions concerned with the DA implementation.

Conclusion 4 (Findings 1, 3 and 5)

157. WIPO took important and effective measures to translate the political agreement on the DA into a work program for the Organization that led to the introduction of institutional reforms and to the exploration of new areas of work in the Organization that permitted Member States to benefit from a wide range of activities related to capacity building and economic studies and to improve their understanding on the relationship between IP and development.

Measures also have been undertaken to deepen the relation with some other IGOs and to involve NGOs in the work of the Organization.

Conclusion 5 (Findings 11 and 15)

158. A change of attitude is taking place in the Organization since the adoption of the DARs, particularly in providing capacity-building activities and informing legislative initiatives and policies. WIPO staff has also demonstrated more openness and responsiveness to development considerations.

Conclusion 6 (Finding 7)

159. The Organization is gradually integrating the DARs into its Programs, Results Based Management (RBM) framework and its budgetary cycle. DARs have not been directly linked to Expected Results in the RBM framework which has created a deficit in the DARs implementation. Also, the strategic framework of the Organization did not include challenges and opportunities pertaining to the DARs implementation.

Conclusion 7 (Findings 10 and 15)

160. The Geneva-based discussions on the DA and its projects and activities did not necessarily translate into concrete actions at the national level. This is mainly due to the lack of coordination between Geneva-based diplomats and national authorities and to the absence of awareness raising activities about the importance of the DA. The ownership of this process seemed to depend mainly on how this top-down process is extended to national level and the shared ownership between Member States and WIPO support.

Conclusion 8 (Findings 2, 6 and 12)

161. The thematic project-based approach introduced a relevant tool for the implementation of DARs that led to the approval of a large number of projects. This tool was utilized both by the Secretariat and Member States to propose new projects implementing several DARs. The effectiveness of these projects was directly linked to the level of development of beneficiary countries and their commitment. However, the sustainability of projects proved to be linked to the human and financial resources devoted to them by the beneficiary country.

Conclusion 9 (Findings 1, 2, 6, 10 and 12)

162. The thematic project-based approach was an innovative, useful and effective approach to implement the DARs efficiently, leading to meet some of the expectations created by the DA. However, some of the implemented projects were found to be less relevant and were not widely used by the

intended beneficiaries. The absorption capacity of a beneficiary country and the effective internal coordination between several national actors as well as the level of expertise in the subject contributed to the success of the project.

Conclusion 10 (Findings 8 and 12)

163. DA projects and activities were adequately resourced and generally successful. However, the skills and competency of the human resources devoted to the projects or activities, effective needs assessment made by the recipient countries and clarity on the respective roles of the Secretariat and the beneficiaries would finally determine the quality of the outcomes. Activities and projects prompted or requested by the beneficiary countries have demonstrated greater impact when combined with the commitment of the actors responsible for their implementation both at the Secretariat and national levels.

Conclusion 11 (Findings 3, 6 and 15)

164. In many instances, the involvement of national authorities, in particular where a DA project had cross sectorial implementation, was not always satisfactory. The practice by WIPO project managers to sign agreements with the beneficiary country authorities specifying the roles and responsibilities of the Organization and the benefiting countries was considered a useful practice.

Conclusion 12 (Finding 9)

165. Existing reporting mechanisms lack specificity particularly, on actual utilization of personnel and non-personnel costs. Further, there is an absence of feedback and reporting mechanisms on actual utilization of personnel costs. This renders it difficult to assess the efficiency of personnel costs and to make judgment on the extent to which a project has been resourced. In the case of mainstreamed projects, there is a lack of transparency related to deployment of human and financial resources post-mainstreaming. A feedback mechanism from beneficiaries to CDIP in respect of unattained objectives or need of extension of completed projects is also not available.

Conclusion 13 (Findings 8, 13 and 14)

166. The evaluations of the DA completed projects by independent external evaluators permitted Member States to take stock of the work undertaken by the Organization and beneficiaries related to their implementation. Project planning has improved and become more efficient with time, following recommendations made by evaluators during the independent reviews of completed DA projects. However, no mechanism has been put in place to permit WIPO and Member States to follow-up on the implementation of the

recommendations contained in these evaluation reports or to assess the sustainability of the activities carried out under these projects.

Conclusion 14 (Findings 13 and 14)

167. The mainstreaming of some of the DA projects permitted the Organization to successfully move forward in including the DA outcomes into its regular Programs. While some of the DA projects have been mainstreamed, the process is still work-in-progress. Clarity, better understanding and demystification of the concept and its implications are yet to evolve. The lack of available tools did not allow an effective assessment in tracking of the mainstreamed work to date. Mainstreaming decisions were taken without identifying its Expected Results.

6. Recommendations

168. The findings and conclusions in this Report open up new possibilities and opportunities for enhancing the future relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability in the implementation of DARs. The following recommendations attempt to suggest possible improvement to WIPO's performance and its work in the future implementation of the DARs.

Recommendation 1:

169. The good progress made in the CDIP needs to be consolidated by introducing a higher level debate to address emerging needs and to discuss the work of the Organization on new emerging issues related to IPRs. The Committee should also facilitate an exchange of strategies and best practices from Member States on their experiences addressing IP and development concerns.

Recommendation 2:

170. Member States should take measures to resolve the outstanding issues related to the mandate of the Committee and the implementation of the Coordination Mechanism.

Recommendation 3:

171. WIPO should continue to ensure an effective coordination, monitoring, reporting, evaluation and mainstreaming of the implementation of the DARs. The role of the DACD in coordinating the DA implementation should be strengthened.

Recommendation 4:

172. The CDIP, in implementing the DARs, should consider how best to respond to evolving circumstances and to the emerging development challenges being faced by the IP system. This should be combined with an active involvement with other UN development agencies to benefit from their expertise for the DARs implementation and in advancing the implementation of the SDGs.

Recommendation 5:

173. WIPO should consider linking DARs to Expected Results contained in the Program and Budget, wherever it is possible. Expected Results may be modified or new Expected Results may be introduced so as to ensure the integration of DARs into WIPO's work more effectively and in a sustained manner.

Recommendation 6:

174. Member States are encouraged to enhance coordination between Geneva-based Missions and their IP offices and other authorities in capital in order to have a coordinated approach in dealing with the CDIP and raising awareness about the benefits of the DA. Higher level participation of national based experts should be enhanced in the work of the Committee. CDIP should consider modalities related to the reporting on what has been done at the national level towards the implementation of the DARs.

Recommendation 7:

175. Member States are encouraged, in light with their national needs, to formulate new project proposals for the consideration of the CDIP. They should consider the establishment of a reporting mechanism on the lessons learned and best practices from successfully implemented DA projects and activities. This reporting mechanism should include a periodical review of the sustainability of completed and/or mainstreamed projects, as well as the impact of these projects on the beneficiaries. WIPO should establish a database of the lessons learned and best practices identified in the course of DA projects implementation.

Recommendation 8:

176. Future work related to the development of new projects should be modular and customizable and should consider the absorption capacity and the level of expertise of the beneficiaries. In the implementation of projects at the national level, WIPO should explore close partnerships with UN agencies

and other entities to enhance the effectiveness, comprehensiveness and sustainability.

Recommendation 9:

177. WIPO should pay more attention to recruiting experts that are very well versed and knowledgeable about the socio-economic conditions of the recipient countries. Beneficiary countries should ensure a high degree of internal coordination amongst its various organs in order to facilitate the implementation and long-term sustainability of a project.

Recommendation 10:

178. The Secretariat's Progress Reports submitted to the CDIP should include detailed information about the utilization of financial and human resources related to the DA projects. Simultaneous assignment of the same project manager to multiple projects should be avoided.

Recommendation 11:

179. A mechanism should be put in place to report on the agreed recommendations contained in the evaluation reports and on the mainstreamed outcomes of the DA projects. Mainstreaming process should be aligned to the approved Expected Results.

Recommendation 12:

180. Member States and the Secretariat should consider ways and means to better disseminate information about the DA and its implementation.

[Annexes follow]