

Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP)

Nineteenth Session
Geneva, May 15 to 19, 2017

REPORT

adopted by the Committee

1. The 19th session of the CDIP was held from May 15 to 19, 2017.
2. The following States were represented: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Djibouti, Estonia, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Holy See, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Lithuania, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe (95).
3. The following intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) took part as observers: African Intellectual Property Organization (OAPI), African Regional Intellectual Property Organization (ARIPO), European Free Trade Association (EFTA), European Patent Organization (EPO), European Public Law Organization (EPLO), European Union (EU), Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), *Organisation internationale de la Francophonie (OIF)*, Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC), Patent Office of the Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf (GCC Patent Office), South Centre (SC), West African Economic and Monetary Union (WAEMU), World Health Organization (WHO) and World Trade Organization (WTO) (14).

4. Representatives of the following non-governmental organizations (NGOs) took part as observers: *Asociación Argentina de Intérpretes (AADI)*, *Association internationale pour la protection de la propriété intellectuelle (AIPPI)*, *Centre international d'investissement (CII)*, Chamber of Commerce and Industry of the Russian Federation (CCIRF), *Comité consultatif mondial des amis (CCMA)*, CropLife International, European Law Students' Association (ELSA International), International Federation of Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Associations (IFPMA), Innovation Insights, International Video Federation (IVF), *Médecins sans frontières (MSF)*, Medicines Patent Pool Foundation (MPP) and Traditions for Tomorrow (13).
5. Ambassador Walid Doudech, Permanent Representative of Tunisia, chaired the session. Mr. Igor Moldovan, Counsellor of the Director General of the State Agency on Intellectual Property of the Republic of Moldova acted as the Vice-Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 1: OPENING OF THE SESSION

6. The Deputy Director General (Mr. Mario Matus) opened the Nineteenth Session of the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP). He turned to agenda item 2 and invited delegations to propose nominations for the Chair and Vice-Chairs.

AGENDA ITEM 2: ELECTION OF OFFICERS

7. The Delegation of Senegal, speaking on behalf of the African Group, proposed His Excellency Ambassador Walid Doudech of Tunisia as Chair.
8. The Delegation of Georgia, speaking on behalf of the Central European and Baltic States (CEBS) proposed Mr. Igor Moldovan as a Vice-Chair.
9. The Delegation of Colombia, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported the proposals.
10. Ambassador Walid Doudech of Tunisia was elected as Chair and Mr. Igor Moldovan as a Vice-Chair, given that there were no objections from the floor.
11. The Chair welcomed delegations to the session. He hoped that every effort would be made to achieve consensus in the work of the CDIP. He noted that intellectual property (IP) was rapidly developing in different social, economic and cultural areas. The Director General's Report on Implementation of the Development Agenda (DA) linked WIPO's work to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The Chair looked forward to working with delegations to resolve all issues through negotiations. He believed this would help to strengthen international cooperation in the area of IP and support development. The work program for the session was made available to delegations. It could be reviewed during the session. The Chair's summary would also be prepared in the course of the session.
12. The Deputy Director General (Mr. Matus) recalled that the first Roundtable on Technical Assistance and Capacity Building was held on May 12. A factual report would be presented to the Committee at the next session. The agenda for this session included the Report on the Recommendations of the Independent Review of the Implementation of the DA Recommendations, the Director General's Report on Implementation of the DA, the WIPO General Assembly (GA) Decision on CDIP Related Matters, the Evaluation Report of the Project on IP and Design Management for Business Development in Developing and Least Developed Countries (LDCs), the implementation of the Spanish proposal on WIPO's technical assistance in the area of cooperation for development, discussions on the possible Improvements of WIPO Technical Assistance Webpage, the Proposal of the African Group Concerning the Biennial Organization of an International Conference on Intellectual Property and Development and the

Progress Report on New WIPO Activities Related to Using Copyright to Promote Access to Information and Creative Content. He expected discussions during the session would be fruitful.

AGENDA ITEM 3: ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

13. The Chair invited the Committee to consider the draft Agenda (document CDIP/19/1 Prov. 2) for the session.

14. The Delegation of Brazil proposed a specific agenda item to discuss the Report on WIPO's Contribution to the Implementation of SDGs. It understood that agenda items 6 (Monitor, assess, discuss, report on the implementation of all DA Recommendations and consideration of the Director General's Report on the Implementation of the DA) and 7 (Consideration of work program for implementation of adopted recommendations) did not refer to the implementation of SDGs. The inclusion of a specific item would enable focused discussions to be held on the subject. It would also assist in enhancing transparency on the discussions.

15. The Delegation of Indonesia supported the proposal by the Delegation of Brazil.

16. The Delegation of the United States of America was not in a position to support the inclusion of a standing agenda item on SDGs at this time. It was agreed in the last session that during the first session of the year, "the Secretariat will present an annual report to the Committee, containing information on WIPO's contribution to the implementation of SDGs and its associated targets". This was stated in the Chair's summary. Thus, in the first session of the year, the Committee would be discussing SDGs and WIPO's role in implementing them. Therefore, it was not necessary to include a standing agenda item on this topic.

17. The Delegation of Japan, speaking on behalf of Group B, stated that it was not in a position to support the proposal by the Delegation of Brazil.

18. The Delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran supported the proposal by the Delegation of Brazil.

19. The Delegation of Nigeria supported the proposal by the Delegation of Brazil.

20. The Delegation of Georgia, speaking on behalf of CEBS, associated itself with the statements made by the Delegation of the United States of America and Group B. It was not in a position to support the inclusion of the proposed agenda item.

21. The Delegation of China supported the proposal by the Delegation of Brazil.

22. The Delegation of South Africa supported the proposal by The Delegation of Brazil.

23. The Delegation of Brazil clarified that it was not requesting for a standing agenda item as mentioned by the Delegation of the United States of America. It was only requesting for an agenda item to be added to discuss the report.

24. The Delegation of the United States of America sought additional clarifications from the Delegation of Brazil as agenda item 7 included two documents (documents CDIP/19/6 and CDIP/18/4) concerning the SDGs. According to the work program for this session, they would be discussed separately on Tuesday and Wednesday, respectively.

25. The Delegation of Malaysia supported the proposal by the Delegation of Brazil and urged other delegations to do so.
26. The Delegation of Latvia supported the interventions by CEBS, Group B and the Delegation of the United States of America. As highlighted by the Delegation of the United States of America, the agenda already included two points under agenda item 7 to discuss the SDGs. The Delegation did not support the proposal as it did not see the need for an additional agenda item.
27. The Delegation of Japan, speaking on behalf of Group B, referred to paragraph 7 of the Chair's summary for CDIP 18 which included the following, "The Committee will continue its discussion on the way to address this subject in its future sessions". Thus, the Group sought clarification on the relationship between the agreed summary and the proposal by the Delegation of Brazil.
28. The Delegation of Pakistan supported the proposal by the Delegation of Brazil.
29. The Delegation of Tunisia supported the principle of including the SDGs as an agenda item for this session. It hoped that the Delegation of Brazil could provide additional clarification with regard to the proposal.
30. The Delegation of Egypt stated that it would be useful for the Delegation of Brazil to provide further clarifications on its proposal to enlighten the debate. It expected flexibility would prevail on the very first day of work in order for consensus to be reached in the interest of all delegations.
31. The Delegation of Indonesia also sought further clarifications from the Delegation of Brazil. It understood that the tentative work program already included timeslots to discuss documents CDIP/19/6 and CDIP/18/4. The Delegation also understood that the Delegation of Brazil was not asking for a permanent standing agenda item but rather a separate agenda item to enable a more focused discussion on the subject. Paragraph 7.1 of the Chair's summary for CDIP/18 included the following, "The Committee will continue its discussion on the way to address this subject in its future sessions, including the request for establishing a permanent agenda item". The agenda for this session only included the two documents. A separate but not standing agenda item on the implementation of SDGs and WIPO's contribution was a good idea. The Delegation did not see any reason to oppose it.
32. The Delegation of Brazil agreed with the Delegation of Indonesia. The idea was to clarify the discussion. Agenda item 6 was to monitor, assess, discuss, report on the implementation of all DA Recommendations. Agenda item 7 was on the work program for implementation of adopted recommendations. The Report on WIPO's Contribution to the Implementation of SDGs concerned the third pillar, namely; IP and development-related issues. It should not be a problem to create a separate agenda item, and to include the report under the item as the Committee was going to discuss it. It would help to add clarity and a sense of purpose to the discussions.
33. The Delegation of Zimbabwe supported the statement made by the Delegation of Brazil.
34. The Chair noted that views differed on the proposal by the Delegation of Brazil. Perhaps the Committee could return to this issue in the future. He suggested that the proposed agenda be adopted in order for the Committee to begin work. It was adopted given that there were no objections from the floor.

AGENDA ITEM 4: ADOPTION OF THE DRAFT REPORT OF THE EIGHTEENTH SESSION OF THE CDIP

Consideration of document CDIP/18/11 Prov. – Draft Report

35. The Secretariat (Mr. Baloch) stated that the Draft Report of the eighteenth session of the Committee was made available on January 19, 2017. The Secretariat had received one correction from the Delegation of China concerning paragraph 329. The Delegation would like the word “welcomed” to be included before the words “joint proposal” in the last sentence of the paragraph. If approved by the Committee, it would be incorporated at the time when the final report is published.

36. The Chair invited the Committee to adopt the report with the amendment proposed by the Delegation of China. It was adopted given that there were no objections from the floor.

AGENDA ITEM 5: GENERAL STATEMENTS

37. The Chair opened the floor for general statements.

38. The Delegation of Senegal, speaking on behalf of the African Group, hoped that the Committee would achieve tangible results on pending issues concerning the GA decision on CDIP-related matters and transfer of technology. This was important for the implementation of the CDIP’s mandate and would help to ensure that the global IP system was more balanced. The Group referred to the Director General’s Report on Implementation of the DA (document CDIP/19/2) and the 34 projects carried out thus far. A consistent and coordinated approach was required to optimize results, as highlighted in the Report on the Recommendations of the Independent Review (document CDIP/19/3). The Coordination Mechanisms were urgently required in this regard. The Committee needed to focus and allocate adequate time to discuss this issue during the session. The Group welcomed the Roundtable on Technical Assistance and Capacity Building held on May 12, 2017. Like other UN agencies, WIPO needed to ensure that its work was in line with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the SDGs. The SDGs were universal and indivisible. The collective engagement of the international community was required to transform the world. They must be approached in a holistic manner. WIPO needed to play a major role in achieving the 17 SDGs. Report on WIPO’s Contribution to the Implementation of SDGs and its Associated Targets (document CDIP/19/6) showed how WIPO was involved in various platforms and fora dealing with this issue. The Group welcomed the Director General’s initiatives to appoint a representative for the SDGs and publish an annual report on this issue. The Group supported the proposal by the Delegation of Brazil to include a standing agenda item on the SDGs. It also reiterated its support for the proposal by the Delegation of South Africa on IP management and transfer of technology. The Group echoed the favorable comments on the International Conference on IP and Development held in April 2016. The Group proposed that it be organized on a biennial basis and sought the support of all Member States in this regard. The Group assured the Chair of its active and constructive participation during the session.

39. The Delegation of Indonesia, speaking on behalf of the Asia and the Pacific Group, welcomed the recommendations of the Report on the Independent Review of the Implementation of the DA Recommendations (document CDIP/18/7). The recommendations called for improvement in WIPO’s performance and work on implementation of the DA. A process was set out to take action on the recommendations. Implementation of the DA was a long-term process. The DA Recommendations were part of the process. In this context, the Group recalled the 2010 WIPO GA decision which stated that upon consideration of the review, the CDIP might decide on a possible further review. Moreover, the Group encouraged Member States to provide submissions on the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the report

on the Independent Review. The Committee should allow Member States to provide further submissions and suggestions based on the Report. The Group took note of the Evaluation Report of the Project on IP and Design Management for Business Development in Developing and Least Developing Countries and the Progress Report on New WIPO Activities Related to Using Copyright to Promote Access to Information and Creative Content. With regard to the progress report, Recommendation 10 of the Independent Review stated that it should include information on human and financial resources allocated to the activities and projects reported therein. The Independent Review also found that DA projects were effectively implemented when activities had been included in collaboration with national IP offices. Implementation was less efficient when other national agencies were involved. Assertions in the progress report must be read in light of the findings of the Independent Review. The Group also took note of the Director General's Report on Implementation of the DA (document CDIP/19/2) and the Report on WIPO's Contribution to the SDGs and its Associated Targets (document CDIP/19/6). With regard to the former, the Group recalled that the DA was adopted to instill balance in the IP system and not focus predominantly on the positive role of IP but on the implications of IP protection for developing countries. With regard to the Report on WIPO's Contribution to the SDGs and its Associated Targets, the Group looked forward to obtaining further details and clarification of WIPO's contribution to the SDGs and its associated targets during the session. The SDGs were universal and indivisible in nature. Therefore, shortlisting specific SDGs as relevant to WIPO's work would not facilitate a holistic approach to address the objectives of the Goals. The proposal by the Delegation of Brazil to include a CDIP standing agenda item on the implementation of the SDGs was discussed in the last session. The proposal should be carefully considered by the Committee. The Group also took note of the proposal by the African Group on the International Conference and IP and Development and looked forward to the discussion during the session. With regard to document CDIP/19/5 on South-South Cooperation, the Group stated that the focus of South-South Cooperation activities in WIPO should be on promoting the full use of IP flexibilities in order to address development goals. There should also be more activities on the sharing of South-South experiences on the protection of genetic resources (GRs), traditional knowledge (TK) and traditional cultural expressions (TCEs). Technical assistance was an important area for its members. The delivery of technical assistance must be timely, efficient and coherent in order for it to be effective. An institutional mechanism was required to avoid duplication and ensure optimal allocation of resources. The Group hoped that discussions on the External Review of WIPO Technical Assistance in the Area of Cooperation for Development would bring uniformity, better organization and clarity to existing processes and practices. The Group appealed to all regional groups and Member States to work towards resolving issues related to the WIPO GA Decision on CDIP related matters, including the Coordination Mechanisms which were essential to the implementation of DA Recommendations, particularly in respect of the Program and budget committee (PBC) and the Committee on WIPO Standards (CWS). The Group hoped that the matter would be resolved and pave the way for the smooth functioning of other WIPO committees. Its members would make interventions during the discussion on specific agenda items. It looked forward to contributing to the proceedings in the Committee and wished a productive session.

40. The Delegation of Georgia, speaking on behalf of CEBS, reiterated the importance of the Roundtable on Technical Assistance and Capacity Building held on May 12, 2017. The Group acknowledged the use of existing tools and methodologies. It also attached great importance to the continuous efforts to improve the delivery of technical assistance through different projects which undoubtedly enhanced the mainstreaming of the DA in the work of the Organization. The Group welcomed the report on the recommendations contained in the Independent Review and looked forward to discussing some of the recommendations with great interest. The Group referred to the Delegation of South Africa for putting forward the proposal on Project on IP Management and Transfer of Technology and the revised proposal put forward by the delegations of the Delegation of the United States of America, Australia, and Canada on

activities related to technology transfer. The time allocated for the session should be used in a pragmatic and efficient manner to cover all agenda items. The Group assured the Chair of its constructive and positive engagement in the discussions during the session.

41. The Delegation of Colombia, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, hoped the Committee would be able to achieve progress during the session. The Group referred to the Roundtable on Capacity Building and Technical Assistance. It facilitated the sharing of experiences, tools and methodologies, and was part of the discussions on WIPO technical assistance in the area of cooperation for development, as agreed in the last session of the CDIP. Such activities should be held regularly as the area was constantly evolving. The Group highlighted a few issues, in particular, the implementation of the DA. It welcomed the report of the Director General for 2016 which provided an overview of progress achieved in the implementation of the DA in all sectors of the Organization. The Group hoped WIPO would continue to allocate resources to meet the needs and priorities of Member States. The SDGs were also very important. The Group looked forward to the discussions on the Report on WIPO's Contribution to the Implementation of SDGs and its Associated Targets. This was an important report. The Group referred to the presentation by the Director General during the information session on February 9. It fully agreed with the reference made during his presentation on the universality of the 17 SDGs. They were integrated and indivisible in nature and concerned all UN Member States. The 2030 Agenda required the coordination of efforts to implement the three aspects of sustainable development. The CDIP was the ideal forum for WIPO to present and share with Member States its contributions to the process. The Group welcomed the annual report which it understood would be presented by Mr. Ridha Bouabid, the Representative of the Director General on the SDGs who was recently appointed to coordinate this subject internally and externally. As agreed, the report should cover the activities and initiatives undertaken individually by the Organization; the activities undertaken by the Organization as part of the UN System; and the assistance provided by WIPO to Member States upon their request. The Group hoped to interact with Mr. Bouabid in a smooth and continuous manner with the view to exchanging ideas on all those areas, and with the aim to submit requests for assistance. It was important to continue and follow up on the discussions in the Committee. There were connections between the objectives of the DA and the SDGs. The Group was also interested in all the work and activities on technical assistance, South-South cooperation and technology transfer. It supported all efforts to improve the technical assistance webpage as it allowed adequate access for potential users, individuals or entities. It looked forward to discussing the suggestions by the Secretariat in this regard. Another issue that deserved special attention was the decision of the WIPO GA to allow the CDIP to continue the discussion on the implementation of its mandate and the implementation of the Coordination Mechanisms and to report back and make recommendations to the GA on the two matters this year. The Group would like the Committee to discuss the options presented in Appendix II of the Summary by the Chair for CDIP/17. The Group reiterated the importance of continuing work on the implementation of the Committee's mandate. Efforts must be made to move forward in the implementation of the third pillar, namely, to examine IP and development related issues. The Group hoped the Committee would be able to make progress during this session, and assured the Chair of its commitment to achieve positive results.

42. The Delegation of China noted that the implementation of DA Recommendations had advanced smoothly since the last session due to the joint efforts by WIPO and its Member States. The implementation of projects had provided tangible benefits to developing countries, LDCs and countries in transition. The CDIP had achieved good progress in the past few sessions on technical assistance, implementation of DA Recommendations and the Independent Review. The Roundtable on Technical Assistance and Capacity Building was a success. During the Roundtable, Member States and WIPO officials held interesting discussions on needs assessment; planning and design; implementation; and monitoring and evaluation of technical assistance activities. The Delegation was confident that the discussions

would contribute to improving technical assistance and capacity building activities in the future. In this session, the CDIP would continue to discuss the recommendations contained in the report on the Independent Review. The Delegation hoped that Member States would continue to demonstrate flexibility, openness, inclusiveness and cooperation in order to accelerate activities related to the DA. The UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and its SDGs provided important guidance to WIPO's DA and future activities. Therefore, they were of great significance. WIPO continued to play a unique role in the implementation of SDGs and their targets. China took the implementation of SDGs seriously. Green development was a vision for development that China had held for a long time. Recently, the country increased its focus on sustainable development in policymaking and other areas. It was ready to strengthen cooperation with all relevant parties in order to jointly achieve progress in the implementation of SDGs. Four months ago, Chinese president Xi Jinping highlighted that global affairs should be jointly governed by all countries, and the result of development should also be shared by all of them. As the WIPO DA was one of the most important outcomes of discussions on development in the area of IP, China would continue to support activities related to the DA and contribute its fair share to the implementation and further development of the international IP regime. The Delegation would work with other Member States and participate actively in the discussions in the plenary and the informal consultations during the session. It hoped that fruitful results could be achieved in the discussions on all agenda items.

43. The Delegation of Japan, speaking on behalf of Group B, took note of the Roundtable on Technical Assistance and Capacity Building: Sharing Experiences, Tools and Methodologies held on May 12. Reserving the right to make further comments under each agenda item, the Group underscored the wide array of topics to be addressed during the session. The Group assured the Chair that he could count on the constructive spirit and support of its members during the session.

44. The Delegation of Nigeria aligned itself with the statement by the African Group. It noted that the CDIP was a WIPO platform for monitoring and evaluating the Organization's implementation of the DA Recommendations and issues related to IP and development. The Delegation hoped the session would bring closure to some longstanding agenda items, such as full implementation of the CDIP's mandate, the Coordination Mechanisms, and the WIPO Project on IP and Technology Transfer: Common Challenges, Building Solutions (document CDIP/6/4 Rev). It counted on the flexibility and political will of Member States to make clear and practical recommendations to the 2017 session of the GA on some of those issues. The Roundtable on Technical Assistance and Capacity Building held on May 12 provided helpful information on the experiences of Member States, clarity on WIPO engagement mechanisms in the field and useful ideas for the future. It looked forward to the Secretariat's presentation of the report of that event at the next session and the discussion it may elicit. The Delegation remained concerned at the lack of progress on the normative agenda. It recalled the 2030 Global Agenda and the SDGs adopted by the UNGA. The 17 Strategic Goals were driven by collaboration and partnerships to ensure that people on the planet lived in peace and prosperity. In that context, the Delegation looked forward to the Committee's discussion on the SDGs and reiterated its support for the Delegation of Brazil's proposal for a permanent CDIP agenda item on the SDGs. It looked forward to the presentation of the Director General's Report on Implementation of the DA (document CDIP/19/2). The new documents to be discussed during the session focused on facilitating access to information, growth and development. The Delegation counted on the good faith, flexible and constructive engagement of Member States and stakeholders to advance the work of the Committee. It strongly supported the African Group's proposal to convene an international conference on IP and development on a biennial basis. The Conference held in April 2016 shed light on the relevance of such platforms to enhance engagement between stakeholders, including idea generation and needs matching. It was a matter of self-preservation for WIPO and its Member States to find a balance between the competing interests of its diverse membership. The Delegation looked forward to the reports

and proposals to be considered during the session. It hoped that the discussion on South Africa's revised proposal on IP management and technology transfer would be concluded during the session. The Delegation looked forward to continuing its cooperation with WIPO on areas of common interest. It would speak on specific agenda items and was committed to work towards a successful session.

45. The Delegation of Sri Lanka aligned itself with the statement made by the Delegation of Indonesia on behalf of the Asia and the Pacific Group. The Delegation noted the Report of the Director General on Implementation of the DA. It welcomed the Committee's initiative to continue discussions on creating linkages between the SDGs and the implementation of the WIPO DA. It looked forward to continued discussions on this issue during this session. WIPO should adopt an IP-oriented approach towards development in increasing the capacity of developing countries to meet their development goals through technical assistance provided in the development and implementation of national IP and innovation policies and strategies. The IP system played a key role in supporting innovation and technology, essential components of sustainable development. Following the Director General's visit to Sri Lanka in November 2013, the country was implementing a ten-point action plan in cooperation with WIPO. It appreciated the cooperation extended by WIPO in developing and supporting the implementation of the action plan which could serve as a model for countries similarly placed as Sri Lanka. Last year, Sri Lanka was selected for the first time as one of the four pilot countries to participate in the CDIP Project on IP, Tourism and Culture: Supporting Development Objectives and Promoting Cultural Heritage in Egypt and Other Developing Countries. The project was launched in the country through a WIPO mission in May 2016. It generated interest and enthusiasm among stakeholders, and promoted awareness of the role of IP in tourism-related economic activities in the country. The Delegation had taken note of the CDIP report which presented the overall progress achieved in the project implemented in Sri Lanka, Ecuador, Egypt and Namibia. It further referred to the significant developments of the project in Sri Lanka including the establishment of a National Steering Committee to oversee the implementation at the national level; the appointment of the Sri Lanka Tourism Development Authority (SLTDA) as the coordinating agency; the signature of a cooperation agreement between SLTDA and WIPO; the selection of a national consultant to undertake a comprehensive study on the relationship between IP and tourism in Sri Lanka. It also mentioned the visit of the Director of the WIPO's Special Projects and South-South Cooperation to Sri Lanka in May 2017 to assess the ongoing implementation of the project. As part of the future activities under the project, Sri Lanka looked forward to contributing to the development of teaching materials on IP related to tourism and promoting the inclusion of specialized curricula in tourism management schools and national IP academies. Areas such as Ayurveda, eco-tourism and agro-tourism may be considered for further cooperation through the project. The Delegation took note of the report prepared by the Secretariat on the mapping of South-South cooperation activities within WIPO. The Delegation informed the Committee of the activities carried out by the G-15 to promote South-South cooperation in the field of IP in recent years. Under the leadership of Sri Lanka as the current chair of the G-15, two international seminars were held with the cooperation of WIPO, in Algeria and Colombo in April 2016 and 2017 respectively. They contributed to enhancing capacities and transferring expertise among the G-15 member countries, especially in the area of IP rights associated with TK. The seminar held in Constantine, Algeria offered a unique opportunity for the member countries of the G-15 to share country experiences in dealing with IP related to TK. It paved the way for a follow-up seminar which was held in Sri Lanka focused on national policy drafting on TK for G-15 countries. This was followed by a national workshop on TK where a national policy on TK and TCEs was discussed among national stakeholders with the participation of WIPO experts. The Delegation looked forward to fruitful deliberations during the session.

46. The Delegation of Saudi Arabia stated that it had benefited from WIPO technical assistance in several fields, including publication. WIPO assisted the Saudi Patent Office to publish patents based on WIPO standards. It also obtained full programs in Arabic. The Saudi Patent Office (SPO) succeeded in publishing patents in Arabic with the help of automated translation. This also facilitated data exchange with other offices. The government gave a lot of attention to education and training. It underlined that the human element was the main pillar of sustainable development. Therefore, the Delegation wished to submit a proposal on examining the possibility of establishing guidelines to develop educational curricula on IP for Arab countries in light of the DA.

47. The Delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran associated itself with the statement made by the Delegation of Indonesia on behalf of the Asia and the Pacific Group. The Delegation attached great importance to the work of the CDIP as the specialized committee in WIPO on issues related to development. Development applied to all countries. It was a continuous process of improving the conditions to enable the production and dissemination of knowledge, taking into account national characteristics and objectives. Countries faced the necessity of constantly adapting IP procedures and policies to address a dynamic and changing environment in the struggle to enjoy the benefits of innovation and creativity while reducing their negative effects. The Delegation took note of the Director General's Report on Implementation of the DA (document CDIP/19/2). It was an undisputed fact that development considerations formed an integral part of WIPO's work. The effective implementation of the DA, including the mainstreaming of its recommendations into WIPO's substantive programs, was a key priority to be pursued by all. The DA needed to be constantly mainstreamed into all of WIPO's activities and committees. In this regard, all WIPO bodies should take into account DA recommendations in their activities, particularly in their policymaking decisions. The PBC and the CWS should be considered as relevant WIPO bodies to report on the implementation of DA Recommendations. The Delegation also took note of document CDIP/19/6 on WIPO's Contribution to the Implementation of SDGs and its Associated Targets. It was important for WIPO to remain engaged with other relevant international organizations to help realize the SDGs. As highlighted in the report of the Director General, WIPO's contribution to the implementation of the SDGs was not restricted to specific goals. The Organization could actually play a role in the implementation of all 17 SDGs. The Delegation reiterated its position on the necessity to include a standing agenda item on the implementation of SDGs in future sessions. Technology transfer was essential for socio-economic development, particularly in critical areas such as education, health, social protection and job creation, climate change and environmental protection. It was also a pre-requisite to allow developing countries to develop necessary capacities to fulfill their obligations. This was essential for inclusive development. A main purpose of an IP system was technology dissemination. There was a need to establish mechanisms in different IP fields to provide a framework for optimizing technology transfer at the international level. On South-South cooperation, the Delegation hoped the CDIP would go beyond the listing of possible projects and establish guidelines on how such cooperation should be undertaken.

48. The Delegation of Brazil stated that it was ready to engage in the discussions during the session in a constructive and positive spirit. Since its establishment, the CDIP had played an important role in increasing the understanding of Member States on IP and development issues. Providing an open and frank environment, the Committee had proved to be a useful forum for exchanging views on the international IP system and the DA. The WIPO DA resulted from the perception that more must be done to overcome obstacles in the dissemination of IP benefits. Despite progress, many challenges remained in building an inclusive, balanced and development-oriented IP system. The CDIP could also add significant value to the implementation of the SDGs. The Committee could play a special role in discussing how IP rights could assist international society and meet the goals of the SDGs. The Delegation had proposed the inclusion of a permanent agenda item in the CDIP to facilitate the discussion and

to instill more transparency within WIPO. Technical assistance and capacity building activities should always be development-oriented and demand-driven. The Committee could help to strengthen technical cooperation to empower developing countries and LDCs to use the IP system as a contributing factor for achieving their development goals and increasing their levels of innovation in the global economy. In this context, technical assistance should focus on implementing national IP strategies and exploring flexibilities contained in the international IP system. This would help countries to respect the international legal framework and preserve policy space to make national IP systems more effective. An inclusive, balanced and development-oriented IP system could create incentives for innovation and creativity, thus contributing to long-term economic growth. Failure to attain this objective could lead to the loss of the current IP system, as increasingly observed in the area of international trade. The Delegation hoped for fruitful discussions during the session in order to agree on a balanced and effective work program for the CDIP.

49. The Delegation of Tunisia aligned itself with the statement made by the Delegation of Senegal on behalf of the African Group. Given its increasing impact on economic development and creativity, IP had an important place in Tunisia's development strategy. The Delegation highlighted some activities. The fourth regional meeting on copyright in Arab countries was held in Tunisia in March 2017. A meeting concerning the Regional Workshop on the Outcome of Technology Transfer Office (TTO) Project in Tunisia would be held on May 2017. Other activities included a meeting on trademarks and an event which would provide an opportunity for young inventors to exhibit their inventions. Certain activities would be organized in close cooperation with the WIPO Academy. The Delegation encouraged the CDIP to approve the project proposed by the Delegation of South Africa on IP management and transfer of technology. It welcomed the revised project proposal by the Delegation of South Africa. The Delegation emphasized the importance of strengthening WIPO's contribution to the implementation of the SDGs. It welcomed efforts made by the DG in this regard. The Delegation supported the proposal by the African Group on the organization of a biennial international conference on IP and development to optimize the contribution of IP to development, particularly in LDCs and developing countries.

50. The Delegation of Morocco stated that development was a universal concept. WIPO was paying due attention to the issue of IP and development following the adoption of the DA. Morocco was fully committed to meeting all challenges in the area of IP and development. It was committed to projects in this area, not only as a beneficiary, but also as a country that contributed to projects in order to promote development. The Delegation referred to the Director General's Report on Implementation of the DA (document CDIP/19/2) and the appointment of the Representative of the Director General on the SDGs in March 2017 to coordinate this subject internally and externally. This would strengthen WIPO's contribution to the SDGs. The Delegation also referred to the Roundtable on Technical Assistance and Capacity Building held on May 12. It provided an opportunity for Member States and WIPO officials to share existing practices, tools and methodologies in this regard. The Delegation supported the African Group's proposal to hold a biennial international conference on IP and development. It hoped for tangible results during the session.

51. The Delegation of Indonesia associated itself with the statement delivered on behalf of the Asia and the Pacific Group. In today's increasingly integrated world, the SDGs must be conceived as a truly global agenda with shared responsibilities for all countries based on a strong commitment to engage in collective action which engaged developed and developing countries. WIPO was in a position to build on the strength of the current global partnership for development and go beyond its current framework to ensure that the global IP system worked for the benefit of investment and innovation, and assist Member States in their development. WIPO's contribution to the attainment of the SDGs would benefit all countries and the global economy. Accordingly, the Delegation supported the proposal by the Delegation of Brazil to

include a standing agenda item on the implementation of SDGs in the CDIP. One of WIPO's Strategic Goals was to facilitate the use of IP for development. As a specialized agency of the UN, WIPO had a mission to develop a balanced and accessible international IP system that rewarded creativity, stimulated innovation and contributed to economic development. In that regard, the mainstreaming of development elements into WIPO committees should not be seen as a one-off event. It was an ongoing and long-term process which required collective and consistent implementation. Furthermore, efforts to mainstream development elements should go beyond replicating WIPO programs and activities in a development package. It should also lead to real results in the contribution of IP to economic development, especially for developing countries. Therefore, the Delegation supported all efforts to review the implementation of the DA Recommendations. Further action and follow-up was required to implement the recommendations contained in the Report on the Independent Review of the Implementation of the DA Recommendations (document CDIP/18/7). The Delegation also referred to the 2010 WIPO GA decision which stated that upon consideration of the review, the CDIP may decide on a possible further review. Technical assistance was an important area for developing countries and LDCs. The delivery of technical assistance must be timely, efficient and coherent in order for it to be effective. There was a need to devise an institutional mechanism for optimal channelization of resources. The Delegation expected that discussions on the External Review of WIPO Technical Assistance in the Area of Cooperation for Development would bring uniformity, better organization and clarity to existing processes and practices. It fully supported the proposal by the African Group on the biennial organization of an international conference on IP and Development. This would be useful for Member States as well as those interested in exploring how to effectively build a balanced international IP system. Moreover, it stressed on the importance of South-South Cooperation and hoped the CDIP would establish guidelines on how it should be conducted. The Delegation also supported further discussions on promoting the full use of IP flexibilities, and the sharing of experiences on the protection of GRs, TK and TCEs among developing countries. Finally, the Delegation looked forward to contributing and hoped for a fruitful and productive session.

52. The Delegation of Malta, speaking on behalf of the EU and its member states, welcomed the Report on the Recommendations of the Independent Review (document CDIP/19/3). The EU and its member states could support a number of recommendations. However, some other recommendations required further discussion. The EU and its member states referred to the Report on WIPO's Contribution to the Implementation of the SDGs and its Associated Targets (CDIP/19/6). They were strongly committed to the SDGs. WIPO should focus on the SDGs and targets which were of greatest relevance to the Organization's work and its mandate as defined in Article 3 of the WIPO Convention. The EU and the member states were firmly committed to contribute to the work of the Committee in a positive and cooperative spirit and to fully engage in the discussions.

53. The Delegation of Uganda fully aligned itself with the statements made by the Delegation of Senegal on behalf of the African Group. The Delegation made preliminary comments on some agenda items. It referred to the Director General's Report on Implementation of the DA (document CDIP/19/2). The report correctly indicated that WIPO bodies continued to promote IP protection and enforcement, and also contributed to the DA. Uganda was a beneficiary of many WIPO projects on a bilateral basis. Nevertheless, it would also like the Secretariat to further study and reflect on certain elements in subsequent reports, including the negative implications of IP enforcement and its effects on developing countries and LDCs, and measures the Secretariat was putting in place to ensure a balance in the development of IP systems. With regard to the Report on the Recommendations of the Independent Review (document CDIP/19/3), the Delegation noted that the discussions on the Independent Review at the end of the last session were not included therein and requested the Secretariat to look into it. The Delegation also requested the Secretariat to submit proposals on how it intended to improve links between the DA Recommendations and the Expected Results in the Program and Budget.

There was a need to expand the Coordination Mechanism to other existing bodies. The Delegation referred to the report on WIPO's Contribution to the SDGs and its Associated Targets (document CDIP/19/6) and requested the Secretariat to provide more information on the work it does in partnership with other UN agencies. Member States could benefit from the information. In its next report, the Secretariat should also indicate what kind of assistance was available to Member States in relation to the SDGs. In addition, it stated that Uganda was currently revising its copyright and trademark legislation. It was also preparing TK legislation. Uganda recently concluded the validation of its national IP policy. A successful IP expo was recently held in Uganda gathering many young innovators in the areas of health, engineering, ICT, education and other SDG-related areas. The Delegation looked forward to further engagement on the agenda items for this session.

54. The Delegation of the Republic of Korea recognized the good progress achieved in the implementation of DA Recommendations in the last few years. The importance of implementing IP-related projects to promote balanced growth among developed and developing countries was undeniable. The implementation of the DA did not end when projects were completed. In addition to cost-effective projects to support developing countries, there was also a need to undertake follow-up measures in order to successfully carry out such projects in the long run and to ensure future sustainable growth. The IP divide between developed countries and LDCs was becoming more evident in the imminent era of the Fourth Industrial Revolution. Bridging this divide among Member States was important. It was imperative for WIPO and its Member States to cooperate and share best practices and experiences in order to tackle this issue effectively. In this regard, the Republic of Korea was carrying out several projects, such as “One Village One Brand” to help developing countries to create their own brands and carry out branding strategies for their agricultural products; and appropriate technology development to assist developing countries to build IP capacity through the process of conducting a prior search of technological fields suitable for them and devising region-specific appropriate technologies that enhance quality of life for people. This year the Republic of Korea was planning to develop coconut oil extractors with Sri Lanka and agricultural product driers with Uganda. Last April, the aforementioned activities and their positive effects were presented at the Heads of IP offices conference co-hosted by Korean Intellectual Property Office (KIPO) and WIPO. With the purpose of sharing knowledge and experiences on IP administration and leadership in the IP field, fruitful discussions were held on the future direction of improvements in IP. The Delegation looked forward to constructively discuss such concerns during the session.

55. The Delegation of Cuba stated that the WIPO DA was a fundamental policy of the Organization and its Member States. There was a need to implement the Coordination Mechanisms and modalities for monitoring and evaluation throughout the Organization. The project-based approach of the DA needed to be mainstreamed into all WIPO activities. The Delegation welcomed the African Group's proposal for a biennial international conference on IP and development. In addition, it supported the proposal for a separate permanent CDIP agenda item on the implementation of the SDGs.

56. The Delegation of Pakistan aligned itself with the statement by the Asia and the Pacific Group. The CDIP was a very important WIPO Committee. Progress in the CDIP, effective implementation and continued importance of the DA as well as its mainstreaming into all organs of WIPO was crucial. The Delegation had engaged positively in CDIP sessions. It hoped long outstanding issues, including the Coordination Mechanisms, would be resolved at this session. In its view, the PBC and CWS should be part of the Coordination Mechanisms. A standing agenda item on IP and development should also be included in line with WIPO's GA decisions. The Delegation had carefully noted the Secretariat's Report on the Recommendations of the Independent Review (document CDIP/18/7). The report highlighted positive aspects of the DA. However, in order to be truly beneficial, Member States should be allowed to continue to provide suggestions based on the Independent Review. The Secretariat should improve links

between DA Recommendations and the Expected Results in the Program and Budget. In addition, Recommendation 9 of the Independent Review focused on the recruitment of experts that were knowledgeable about the socio-economic conditions of the recipient countries. The Delegation enquired as to whether there was a mechanism in WIPO to train existing staff to undertake needs assessments for Member States from an IP for development perspective. Furthermore, Member States agreed to work towards the full implementation of the SDGs. WIPO, like other multilateral institutions, should strive to position itself to support Member States in an optimum manner. The Delegation referred to the Secretariat's Report on WIPO's Contribution to the Implementation of SDGs and its Associated Targets (document CDIP/19/6) and look forward to further information in this respect. It supported the proposal by the Delegation of Brazil on the inclusion of a CDIP standing agenda item on implementation of SDGs. Technology transfer was another important area. Technology transfer was a necessary pre-requisite to allow developing countries to develop the necessary capacities to fulfill their obligations and roles. An institutional mechanism should be devised to avoid duplication and ensure optimal channelization of resources. The only way to progress in the global interconnected world of today was to understand that global problems could only be resolved through global efforts that were sensitive to the diverse needs of all members. The Delegation looked forward to making progress in this session.

57. The Delegation of South Africa aligned itself with the statement made by the Delegation of Senegal on behalf of the African Group. The Delegation referred to the 2017 World IP Day theme, "Innovation – Improving Lives". Innovation and new knowledge were estimated to contribute between 50 and 80 per cent to a country's economic growth. A combination of economic and social prosperity was required to achieve a prosperous society. Innovation alone was not the answer in striving for a prosperous society. However, it was a significant and vital catalyst as a balanced IP system played an important part in the process. Although many of the UN SDGs were relevant to WIPO, it is worth noting that SDG 9 suggested that without technology and innovation, industrialization, and therefore development would not occur. Hence, the discussions in this session were essential. In this regard, WIPO was vested with the responsibility to deal with IP in its broadest context. The Delegation stated that the Roundtable on Technical Assistance and Capacity Building made it clear that technical assistance and capacity building provided by WIPO should not be limited to projects. In this regard, it continued to support the operationalization of the third pillar of the CDIP's mandate and the request for a standing agenda item to deal with the interaction between IP and development. It also supported the African Group's proposal for a biennial conference on IP and development. The Delegation wished progress would be achieved on its proposal for a Project on IP Management and Transfer of Technology. Its implementation would contribute positively towards improving the tools and capacity building for technology transfer. It looked forward to broad support in this regard.

58. The Delegation of Mauritania stated that IP should be in conformity with sustainable development. It hoped delegations would demonstrate flexibility in the discussions during the session. It highlighted that development itself is a precondition for sustainable development.

59. The Delegation of Costa Rica supported the statement by GRULAC and highlighted the importance of the CDIP's work. It recognized the efforts by WIPO and its Member States to implement the DA and to mainstream it throughout the work of the Organization. This had a positive impact on the use of IP as a tool for development. Costa Rica was selected as a pilot country for the Project on Cooperation on Development and Intellectual Property Rights Education and Professional Training with Judicial Training Institutions in Developing and Least Developed Countries. The main objective of the project was to build capacity for the delivery of efficient and effective national IPR education and training programs for judges, including creation of self-learning / reference 'IPR Toolkits for Judges'. The project aimed at enhancing the understanding and application of substantive IP law by judges through development of

coherent and logical thinking and critical analysis skills to enable them to resolve disputes in courts and tribunals. The Delegation referred to the agenda for the session and highlighted some items, including the Director General's Report on Implementation of the DA (document CDIP/19/2); Report on the Recommendations of the Independent Review (document CDIP/19/3); and the Report on WIPO's Contribution to the Implementation of SDGs and its Associated Targets (document CDIP/19/6).

60. The Delegation of Cameroon hoped progress would be achieved during the session.

61. The Delegation of Japan informed the Committee that its government had made annual voluntary contributions to WIPO for programs involving development cooperation in the field of IP rights. This year, Japan was going to donate 5.9 million Swiss francs, as it did last year. In making effective use of the Japan Funds, Japan had implemented a variety of assistance activities for developing countries in Asia and Africa. These included welcoming more than 1,800 trainees from 57 countries and four regions since 1996, holding various workshops and seminars, and sending more than 300 of their own experts to 35 countries since 1987. Also, through the Japan Funds, Japan had been assisting WIPO to advance the initiative on enhancement of technical and knowledge infrastructure. The assistance activities included, for example, moving from paper to digital filling of applications digitally and improving IT infrastructure at IP offices. In addition, in the field of copyright, Japan had so far welcomed more than 340 trainees from 27 countries in the Asia and Pacific region. The Japan Funds also supported the development of the culture and content industry by establishing copyright systems and developing human resources in various countries. Japan's cooperative and assistance activities for developing and emerging countries, under the support of the Japan Funds, had a long history with many outstanding achievements. The 30th anniversary would be commemorated this fiscal year. The Japan Funds-In-Trust (FIT) for Africa and LDCs was established by the Japanese government in 2008, following the adoption of the WIPO DA. It would mark its 10th anniversary in fiscal year 2018. In celebrating the 30th anniversary, the Japan Patent Office (JPO) and WIPO planned to hold a high-level forum in Tokyo in February 2018. Top-level officials from around 40 IP offices would be invited to attend. Going forward, the Japanese government, in cooperation with WIPO, was committed to further improving its cooperative initiatives to ensure that the Japan Funds were used even more efficiently and effectively.

AGENDA ITEM 6: MONITOR, ASSESS, DISCUSS, REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ALL DEVELOPMENT AGENDA RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONSIDERATION OF THE DIRECTOR GENERAL'S REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DEVELOPMENT AGENDA

Consideration of document CDIP/19/2 – Director General's Report on Implementation of the Development Agenda

62. The Chair invited the Secretariat to present the Director General's Report on Implementation of the DA.

63. The Deputy Director General (Mr. Matus) introduced the report. The report was structured in two parts. Part I provided highlights of the implementation and mainstreaming of the DA into WIPO's regular program activities and the work of other WIPO bodies. Part II described the key developments in the implementation of ongoing DA projects. The report contained 3 annexes. They provided an overview of the status of implementation of the 45 DA Recommendations; DA projects that were under implementation in 2016; and completed and evaluated DA projects, together with some key recommendations made by external evaluators. The report highlighted several important issues. For the 2016/2017, WIPO allocated approximately 21 per cent of the budget to development-related activities. Eighteen DA projects were mainstreamed into WIPO's

program activities. The report also referred to the issues of SDGs, transfer of technology, the Independent Review of the Implementation of the DA Recommendations, and the Mechanism for updating the Database on Flexibilities which was agreed and implemented. The report also referred to technical assistance. As discussed during the Roundtable on Technical Assistance and Capacity Building, WIPO technical assistance was demand driven and guided by several principles, including neutrality, transparency, accountability and the need for it to be development-oriented. The report also referred to WIPO's cooperation with the UN system and other IGOs. WIPO continued working with the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the World Health Organization (WHO). The Secretariat was also closely involved in providing support to the UNFCCC in the implementation of the Technology Mechanism of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) (i.e., the Technology Executive Committee (TEC) and the Climate Technology Center and Network (CTCN). The Secretariat participated in meetings of the TEC and CTCN and also participated as an observer in COP 22. Efforts were made to promote the participation of developing country IP offices in the global network of IP office economists coordinated by WIPO, including through a meeting of economic research units of Latin American IP offices in Mexico in October 2016. Part II of the report was on DA projects. By the end of 2016, Member States had approved 34 projects, implementing 34 recommendations. The estimated financial resources approved to date for the implementation of these projects amounted to 30,108,792 Swiss francs. By the end of 2016, 27 projects had been evaluated and their evaluation reports discussed by the Committee. At the end of 2016, six projects were still under implementation. Four of them were initiated in 2016 and included the following. First, the project on IP, Tourism and Culture: Supporting Development Objectives and Promoting Cultural Heritage in Egypt and Other Developing Countries. The countries participating in the pilot project included Egypt, Ecuador, Namibia and Sri Lanka. Second, the Project on the Use of Information in the Public Domain for Economic Development. Third, Cooperation on Development and IP Rights Education and Professional Training with Judicial Training Institutions in Developing and Least Developed Countries. The countries participating in the pilot project included Costa Rica, Lebanon, Nepal and Nigeria. Fourth, Strengthening and Development of the Audiovisual Sector in Burkina Faso and Certain African Countries – Phase II. The countries participating in the project included Burkina Faso, Kenya, Senegal, Morocco and Cote d'Ivoire.

64. The Delegation of China noted that Member States had approved 34 projects, implementing 34 of the 45 DA Recommendations. Eighteen projects had been mainstreamed. The report provided a high-level overview of the activities undertaken by WIPO in 2016 for the implementation of the DA. The Delegation made some comments on the report. First, relevant Chinese institutions had strengthened their cooperation with the WIPO Academy. A training session on IP management and IP commercialization was held in Beijing in October 2016 by the China IP Training Center (CIPTC) in cooperation with the WIPO Academy. This was the first time WIPO held such training outside developed countries for the benefit of developing countries. Fifteen participants from 14 Asian and European countries participated in the training. With the cooperation of the WIPO Academy, WIPO distance learning courses were launched on the CIPTC platform in 2016. Shanghai University and the WIPO Academy jointly launched a new master's degree program. Second, WIPO and the Chinese government jointly organized in Shanghai an International Conference on Building Respect for IP - Stimulating Innovation and Creativity. Around 300 delegates from 55 countries participated in the two-day Conference. The Conference addressed wide-ranging issues such as IP strategies, IP awareness-raising, IP commercialization, IP protection on the Internet and dispute settlement. China was willing to work together with WIPO and its Member States to further promote capacity building and awareness-raising. The Delegation noted that the Director-General's report also mentioned the discussions in the PCT Working Group on the training of substantive patent examiners. The Delegation stated that the State Intellectual Property Office of China (SIPO), as a donor office, was willing to provide such training to developing countries, LDCs and countries in transition. At the request of WIPO, SIPO had submitted relevant information on its

training activities, and was willing to maintain communication with the Secretariat on this subject. The WIPO DA had undoubtedly contributed to advancing work on IP in developing countries. It had also promoted multilateralism and dialogue.

65. The Delegation of Senegal, speaking on behalf of the African Group, noted that 21 per cent of WIPO's budget was devoted to development activities. Many African countries were project beneficiaries. The Group took note of the tools for promoting innovation and creativity, for example, WIPO Re:Search which had 107 members, and WIPO GREEN which had 24 partners and more than 100 matches. Global and inter-governmental partners should be actively sought. Sufficient resources should be mobilized to meet current challenges. This also applied to WIPO Match. The Secretariat should make the best use of its resources and improve coordination. It should make the best use of existing tools and platforms in WIPO to implement the 45 DA Recommendations. The Delegation urged WIPO to maintain transparency and neutrality in its accounts.

66. The Delegation of the Russian Federation welcomed the Secretariat's work on the DA and its implementation. Implementation of the DA was an integral part of WIPO's work. Training activities were undertaken with various Member States, including the Russian Federation. It was important to continue working on developing national IP strategies, particularly on policies for research and educational institutions.

67. The Delegation of Argentina took note of the progress achieved by the Secretariat in implementing and mainstreaming the DA Recommendations into the work of the Organization. Thirty-four projects had been approved. More than 30 million Swiss francs had been approved for the implementation of these projects. It welcomed the technical assistance and capacity building activities provided by WIPO to developing countries, including Argentina. Those activities were essential to enable countries to use IP as a tool for development and support innovation. It hoped development would continue to be a priority for WIPO, and reflected in the budget for the next biennium. It would continue to support WIPO's efforts to implement the DA Recommendations in order to meet the objective of mainstreaming development into the work of the Organization.

68. The Delegation of Indonesia referred to the report and noted further developments in the implementation of the DA by WIPO. These included an approved revised definition for "development expenditure", integration of the DA in the "Overview of Progress" in the Program Performance Report, the work of the Accessible Books Consortium, WIPO GREEN, WIPO Re:Search, the Inventor Assistance Program, and capacity building activities for Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) on IP management. The Delegation urged WIPO to continue its work on implementing the DA Recommendations. Paragraph 15 of the report highlighted WIPO's cooperation with the UN system and other IGOs. The Delegation noted that it included activities undertaken in 2015 and 2016. In CDIP 17, some Member States had highlighted WIPO's cooperation with the UN High-Level Panel on Access to Medicines. WIPO's contribution to the High-Level Panel was not reflected in the report. The report of the High-Level Panel included a list of experts. WIPO was included in the list. The Delegation sought clarification from the Secretariat regarding its involvement.

69. The Delegation of Georgia, speaking on behalf of CEBS, underlined the progress in the implementation of projects. It also highlighted the work of the WIPO Academy in capacity building and raising public awareness - a key element in promoting IP education. The Delegation believed WIPO efforts would lead to the development of a balanced IP system to enable innovation for the benefit of all.

70. The Delegation of Malta, speaking on behalf of the EU and its member states, noted that the Secretariat had consistently worked on the implementation of the DA Recommendations

following their adoption ten years ago. The Director General's Report indicated that significant work had been carried out by the Secretariat. Within the framework of the CDIP, 34 projects had been approved with a budget of over 30 million Swiss francs devoted to their implementation. The EU and its member states highlighted some other activities. First, the involvement of the Secretariat in a number of key international initiatives such as the UN Inter-Agency Task Team on Science, Technology and Innovation for the SDGs, the UNFCCC Technology Mechanism, and the WIPO-WTO-WHO trilateral cooperation. The initiatives were very broad. It was essential that the importance and relevance of IP was taken on board in these discussions. Second, the work done by WIPO Re:Search. It had 107 members and facilitated 107 collaborations. The WIPO GREEN platform had 74 partners and facilitated more than 100 connections. The EU and its member states also highlighted the work done by the WIPO Academy and the Inventor Assistance Program. They welcomed WIPO's efforts to achieve the goals for the preceding year as set out by the Member States.

71. The Delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran took note of the Director General's Report. The report highlighted the main activities undertaken by WIPO for the implementation of the DA in 2016. The implementation and mainstreaming of DA Recommendations within the Program and Budget had progressed in the past years. The Delegation highlighted the role of the WIPO Academy in providing technical assistance and capacity building. There were considerable achievements in the implementation of the DA Recommendations. Nevertheless, there were still shortcomings that needed to be addressed in the future. For instance, there should be more programs on IP-related flexibilities, access to knowledge and transfer of technology. The DA needed to be constantly mainstreamed into all WIPO activities and committees. In this regard, all WIPO bodies should take due account of the DA Recommendations in their activities, particularly in their policymaking decisions.

72. The Delegation of Japan, speaking on behalf of Group B, believed the comprehensive report demonstrated WIPO's continued commitment to the effective implementation of the DA Recommendations. The Group welcomed the summary of the projects designed and delivered for developing countries and LDCs in order to empower them to use the IP system for development and economic growth. WIPO should continue to lead in the development of a balanced and effective international IP system that would enable innovation and creativity for the benefit of all. It recalled its objective of promoting the protection of IP throughout the world and the need for integrating development considerations within its work for Member States to use IP as a tool for development.

73. The Delegation of Chile highlighted WIPO's cooperation with the UN system and other IGOs. WIPO's participation in the Internet Governance Forum was important. The trilateral work on public health by WIPO, WTO and the WHO was going on for several years. The Delegation hoped the trilateral cooperation would continue. An inter-disciplinary approach which brought together the expertise of different organizations provided countries with a better understanding of the challenges facing development and the implementation of a balanced IP system. In this regard, a seminar on public health, IP and international trade was held in Chile last week with support from WIPO, WHO, and the Pan American Health Organization. The implementation of the DA was also a national undertaking. WIPO's support was important in this regard. It should continue to support countries in their efforts to develop policies that took into account all important development considerations.

74. The Delegation of Turkey aligned itself with the statement made by the Delegation of Japan on behalf of Group B. IP education and training was important. IP was an important area in view of its impact on various policy fields. It was continuously and rapidly evolving. In this regard, improving and strengthening human resource capacity was necessary in order to implement and run IP systems in line with relevant development objectives. A new master's program was recently launched in Ankara, Turkey, in cooperation with WIPO. It was operational

since the beginning of this year and focused on patent and design laws. The program would be offered in every academic year from September to June. In the first year, the program brought together 19 international and national students from Cameroon, Egypt, Georgia, India, Indonesia, Pakistan, Peru, Turkey and Vietnam. More information on the program was available on the WIPO and Ankara University websites.

75. The Delegation of the United States of America supported the statement made by the Delegation of Japan on behalf Group B. The report demonstrated WIPO's continued commitment to the DA Recommendations. Over the years, WIPO had made great progress in implementing DA Recommendations. The Delegation's overall impression was that the activities carried out in 2016 had a significant impact on IP and development in the beneficiary countries. WIPO's activities in these areas were truly impressive in their scope and reach. The Delegation supported WIPO's active and continued engagement in UN activities, in particular, its work on the SDGs that were related to the mandate and strategic objectives of the Organization, particularly innovation-related activities. At the same time, efforts undertaken by WIPO and the governments of Member States could and should be complemented by working alongside and in partnership with nongovernmental sectors, including industry, academia, and philanthropic organizations. WIPO Match had an important role to play in this regard. It had yet to live to its full potential. WIPO should raise the profile of this project and place WIPO Match on the same level as WIPO's other multi-stakeholder platforms in terms of visibility and priority. The Delegation was confident that the number of successful matches and partnerships incubated under WIPO Match would escalate once a wider network was established when the platform was improved and promoted. The United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) hoped to undertake additional promotional events for WIPO Match this year to attract additional US stakeholders to the platform. The Delegation looked forward to future reports from the Director General and hoped that the launch of several WIPO Match projects would be included.

76. The Delegation of Mexico recognized the commitment by WIPO to incorporate the DA Recommendations in its activities. It supported the approach to the projects devoted to specific goals, follow-up initiatives, accountability, assessment of results, and the multiplying effect of projects. As mentioned during the Roundtable on Technical Assistance and Capacity Building, it was important to work on improving coordination and the planning of projects. This was necessary to achieve success in the implementation of the DA Recommendations.

77. The Delegation of Nigeria supported the statement made by the Delegation of Senegal on behalf of the African Group. As indicated in the report, a number of developing countries and LDCs had benefited from the listed projects. Nigeria was one of the pilot countries for the implementation of the project on training with judicial institutions. Capacity building on IP was important for various sectors in Nigeria. The implementation of the aforementioned project in Nigeria was at the stage of a needs assessment mission. This would be undertaken a fortnight from now. Nigeria would fully cooperate with WIPO in bringing the implementation of the project to a successful conclusion. The project was important in view of its direct impact on meaningful IP protection, and consequently, its relevance to national development efforts. The Delegation referred to the Committee's efforts to make technical assistance and capacity building more accessible to Member States. Activities such as the Roundtable on Technical Assistance and Capacity Building were essential in strengthening the implementation of the various DA projects, and in enhancing transparency and a shared understanding of the processes.

78. The Delegation of Canada welcomed the numerous and diverse programs offered by the WIPO Academy. The 150th anniversary of Canada coincided with 20 years of cooperation with the Academy. The Canadian Intellectual Property Office (CIPO) conducted an annual program in cooperation with the Academy. The last program took place two weeks ago in Ottawa. The

Academy continued to diversify and improve its training programs. CIPO decided to offer a workshop in French for the first time. It continued to identify appropriate training courses.

79. The Delegation of Brazil considered that given the importance of the Director General's Report, more detailed information could be provided to improve its content. The Delegation referred to several parts in the report, including those on WIPO's participation in the technical discussions and UN inter-agency processes involved in the implementation of 2030 Agenda and SDGs, WIPO's work with WTO and WHO, and WIPO's support to the UNFCCC. It was not clear how WIPO contributed to those activities. The Delegation stated that the next report should focus on the value added through WIPO's participation in such activities.

80. The Delegation of the Republic of Korea referred to the completion of the two projects proposed by Korea: the Project on IP and Design Management for Business Development in Developing and Least Developed Countries and the Project on Capacity-Building in the Use of Appropriate Technology-specific Technical and Scientific Information as a Solution for Identified Development Challenges – Phase II. In addition, the Republic of Korea continued to follow up through supporting appropriate technology competitions in close cooperation with WIPO. Last year, appropriate technology competitions were successfully held in the Dominican Republic, Mongolia and Thailand. In the Dominican Republic, 83 region-specific inventions were submitted. Most of them were pertinent to technologies with solutions addressing local problems and conditions, such as a water management system with submersible pumps or an oven for industrial cooking of cassava bread that used denaturalized alcohol as fuel extracted from waste. This year, the Republic of Korea and WIPO supported El Salvador, Costa Rica and Panama to hold appropriate technology competitions. The Delegation would continue to proactively take part in the discussions on the DA and try to make proposals that would contribute to building IP capacity in developing countries and LDCs.

81. The Delegation of Japan noted that the Director General's Report provided a comprehensive overview of the DA in terms of its implementation status. Improving IP systems would drive self-sustained economic development and contribute to creating innovation. In this context, development activities, including technical assistance and capacity building, were very important. Japan had provided various types of assistance through the WIPO/Japan FIT, as mentioned in the previous agenda item. The Japan FIT activities included organizing regional, sub-regional and national seminars, workshops, training courses, expert advisory missions, long-term fellowship programs, and translating selected WIPO materials. Through these activities, Japan had supported a number of WIPO-administered projects and activities, sharing its experience in terms of using IP to create wealth, enhance competitiveness and develop the economy. The project to support the branding of a Kenyan local product called Taita Baskets was an example of a successful assistance activity. These were the hand-woven baskets mentioned in the Director General's Report. After conducting several workshops that included training, an association of basket weavers was set up to maintain quality standards for the baskets and a collective mark was registered at the Kenya Industrial Property Institute in April this year. The basket weavers learned how they could leverage the IP system to protect and promote their products through this project. The Director General's Report mentioned the mainstreamed DA projects. Among those projects, Japan particularly supported WIPO Green and WIPO Re:Search, which the WIPO Japan Office had been promoting by holding various seminars and workshops. The Delegation highlighted the Secretariat's work to revamp the WIPO Match platform. Japanese IP users were also looking this project with keen interest and positive expectations. Japan was looking forward to WIPO implementing the DA with a focus on promoting IP protection, while keeping in mind the Organization's objectives, as stipulated in Article 3 of the WIPO Convention.

82. The Delegation of Tunisia welcomed the progress achieved in implementing the DA. The Delegation highlighted the work done by the WIPO Academy and welcomed the fruitful

collaboration with its industrial property office to launch a summer school on IP and the first distance learning course with the national IP Academy. It also highlighted the assistance provided by the Regional Bureau for Arab Countries in implementing a number of projects and programs, such as the Regional Workshop on TTO to be held in Tunis. The Delegation also highlighted the assistance provided by other WIPO sectors, including the organization of a regional meeting for copyright offices in Arab countries, and the Industrial Property Automation System (IPAS).

83. The Delegation of Malaysia noted that the report provided an overview of the situation in WIPO. The Delegation recognized the numerous projects that WIPO had undertaken. It hoped that future reports could include a qualitative analysis of the projects and the contribution of all WIPO bodies to the implementation of the DA Recommendations. The Delegation also noted that the Director General's Report did not holistically or comprehensively address WIPO's participation in the UN High-Level Panel on Access to Medicines and related initiatives. Some other delegations had also raised this point. This matter could be taken up at a relevant committee or at future CDIP sessions whereby the Secretariat could also elaborate further on its engagement with other UN bodies. The Delegation reiterated that the DA was adopted to bring about a balance between the protection of IP and the promotion of development. Striking such a balance was important. WIPO could play a greater role in this pursuit by continuing to work with Member States towards a balanced and development-oriented IP system.

84. The Delegation of Pakistan referred to WIPO's development activities highlighted in the Director General's Report. It would like to know the extent to which the training provided was development-oriented, for instance in the case of the WIPO Academy. The Delegation was also keen to explore the mechanisms used to prioritize WIPO's training programs in terms of cost-sharing with Member States, especially considering the development goals of developing countries.

85. The Delegation of Georgia acknowledged the use of existing tools and methodologies used for undertaking needs assessment and examining requests for the delivery of technical assistance. The Delegation highlighted the continuous efforts by the Secretariat, including the Department for Transition and Developed Countries and the WIPO Academy, to support countries that needed assistance in capacity building. It helped countries to recognize the important role of IP in social, economic and cultural development. Georgia was implementing a project in cooperation with the WIPO Academy on start-up IP academies and a professional development course on the protection of geographical indications. The Delegation highlighted the approach taken by WIPO to involve stakeholders in the implementation process, and the strategies used in the project implementation lifecycle. Activities were continuously improving through regular evaluation and assessment of the projects.

86. The Delegation of Egypt referred to WIPO's cooperation with the UN system and other IGOs. WIPO had a strong role to play in respect of the SDGs, particularly as a member of the Science, Technology and Innovation (STI) team, getting involved in the processes and participating in various conferences that have taken place throughout the reporting period. The Delegation would like more information to be provided on the qualitative aspects of WIPO's contributions to these activities in order for Member States to assess their development-oriented nature, the mainstreaming of the development perspective, and the coordination and synchronization with other processes within the UN system. A good way to follow up on DA projects would be to focus on the multiplier effect of projects to maximize the benefits for other developing countries. However, the discussion should not focus only on the idea of projects, or be project-oriented. It should be more policy-oriented. The report includes various references on WIPO initiatives to mainstream the DA into its activities and work. There should also be more qualitative reporting in this regard. More information was needed on the utilization of tools created by WIPO, including their impact on beneficiaries. Egypt had engaged with WIPO on

various DA projects, including the Pilot Project for the Establishment of “Start-Up” National IP Academies. The implementation of the project in Egypt had a successful outcome. WIPO's assistance was beneficial in this regard. However, one of the reasons for the success was national ownership of the project itself. National IP experts were very involved in the design and implementation of the programs and curricula prepared for the purposes of the national IP academy. Recently, Egypt also began engaging with WIPO on the Project on IP, Tourism and Culture: Supporting Development Objectives and Promoting Cultural Heritage in Egypt and Other Developing Countries. WIPO has conducted field missions and a Steering Committee for implementation was established. The focus was on the valorization, through IP tools, of Egyptian culture and tradition for tourism purposes and promotion. The Delegation hoped other Member States would also benefit from the experience gained through implementation of the project in Egypt.

87. The Delegation of Ecuador supported the statement made by the Delegation of Colombia on behalf of GRULAC. A fair and balanced IP system was a key tool for promoting social, economic and cultural development. The Delegation welcomed the Director General's report and recognized the efforts made by WIPO to implement the DA Recommendations. Ecuador was a beneficiary of WIPO technical assistance. Work was being done with the WIPO Academy. Ecuador was also selected as a pilot country for the Project on IP, Tourism and Culture: Supporting Development Objectives and Promoting Cultural Heritage in Egypt and Other Developing Countries. The Delegation was convinced on the positive results of the project. The Delegation reiterated its willingness to actively participate in any process for the successful implementation of the DA.

88. The Chair invited the Secretariat to respond to the comments from the floor.

89. The Secretariat (Mr. Matus) took note of all the observations. The Secretariat referred to WIPO's cooperation with the UN system and other IGOs and stated that it took note of the suggestion to include more precise information in future reports. With regard to projects, as WIPO was a demand-driven Organization, it was the responsibility of Member States to request for more projects. The issue of how WIPO measured the impact of its activities, particularly on technical assistance, was also raised at the Roundtable on Technical Assistance and Capacity Building. The discussion on this issue would continue. The Kirkpatrick model for measuring the effectiveness of training was mentioned during the Roundtable. The model included four levels, namely; reaction, learning, behavior and results. The first level was on how participants reacted to the training. The second level looked at what the participants learned from the training. This was done in some activities by the Academy. The third level looked at the extent to which the participants utilized what they learned. The fourth level was the most complicated as it looked at results, the impact of the training on the country, organization or participant. Although it was difficult to implement, the intention was to move ahead in that area.

90. The Secretariat (Mr. Krattiger) referred to the question raised by the Delegation of Indonesia on the High Level Panel on Access to Medicines. WIPO was invited by the High-Level Panel as one of nine IGOs (WTO, WHO, UN International Children's Emergency Fund, Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, Joint UN Programme on HIV and AIDS, UN Industrial Development Organization, UN Conference on Trade and Development and UN Development Programme) requested to nominate an expert in the field of public health. The nine experts were part of the Advisory Committee which also included 13 individuals from MSF, universities and companies with expertise in the topic that the High-Level Panel was examining. The names of those experts were all on the website of the High-Level Panel. WIPO provided inputs in terms of a factual presentation of the Organization's activities that were broadly related to the question that the High-Level Panel was looking at. A public document was available on the said website. It could also be made available to the Committee. The factual document was around ten pages with annexes on the Global Challenges Program, WIPO Re:Search, trilateral

cooperation, the DA, IP-TAD, WIPO Match, Roster of Consultants, commissioned studies, legislative advice, patent landscape reports related to global health issues, and economics and IP. That was the extent of WIPO's factual inputs to the High-Level Panel.

91. The Delegation of Indonesia referred to WIPO's contribution in the High-Level Panel. The initiatives undertaken by the Global Challenges Division were also highlighted in the Director General's Report, particularly in paragraphs 17, 18, 19 and 20, on the Accessible Books Consortium (ABC), WIPO Re:Search, WIPO GREEN and the Inventor Assistance Program (IAP). Through these initiatives, WIPO could contribute significantly to addressing global challenges without being constrained by a mandate. Within these initiatives, WIPO could build an ecosystem that involved all stakeholders and actors, and helped to ensure that IP was part of the solutions for various global challenges. The Delegation agreed with the Delegation of the United States of America that WIPO Match should also be a priority in line with WIPO Re:Search, WIPO GREEN, ABC and IAP. There was a lot of potential for all these programs to help WIPO contribute to development issues through IP.

92. The Chair concluded the discussion and invited the Committee to take note of the report. This was agreed given that there were no objections from the floor.

Consideration of document CDIP/19/4 – Evaluation Report of the Project on IP and Design Management for Business Development in Developing and Least Developed Countries (LDCs)

93. The Chair invited the Consultant, Mr. Daniel Keller, to introduce the report.

94. The Consultant (Mr. Keller) presented the highlights of the report. The objective of the evaluation was to assess whether the project provided the right type of support to achieve its key objectives in the right way. Mainly to draw lessons learned for possible further WIPO activities. The evaluation was guided by the Terms of Reference (ToRs) and WIPO's Evaluation Policy, which applied the general principles of the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards for Evaluation. The criteria used to conduct the assessment included relevance (the extent to which project objectives were consistent with beneficiaries' requirements), efficiency (how efficiently inputs were converted into results), effectiveness (the extent to which objectives were achieved / expected to be achieved) and sustainability (likelihood of project benefits to continue after assistance was completed). The evaluation combined different data collection tools to ensure an evidence-based qualitative and quantitative assessment. The mix applied included desk studies, individual interviews and direct observation. Field visits were not conducted. Key aspects of the methodology included a triangulation of data and an assessment of their plausibility. The main limitations of the evaluation included the following. First, it took time before capacity building, through its use by beneficiaries, translated into measurable effects. For example, the process of registering an industrial design following the assistance may take more than one year. Thus, it was not yet possible to measure the effects of design registrations on company performance. Second, fact finding was limited to desk study of documents provided by the Secretariat and on interviewing those who directly participated in project activities. This included the two beneficiary IP offices, the Secretariat, a sample of national experts who provided support to SMEs and a small sample of SMEs. The project was designed by the Secretariat based on a proposal by the Republic of Korea. The main development objective of the project was to stimulate local innovation, particularly in developing countries and LDCs. The planned duration of the project was two years. It was extended by one year and ended in December 2016. It was relatively small compared with other DA projects. The budget was around half a million Swiss francs. Following a systematic selection process, Argentina and Morocco were selected as pilot countries. The project aimed to replicate similar initiatives in other countries. However, a roadmap had not yet been defined. Key elements of the intervention strategy were to raise awareness, demonstrate benefits and enhance practical knowledge among SMEs on how to

protect and manage their design rights, while in parallel, enhancing the capacities of IP institutions to support companies in protecting their designs. The core methodological approach of capacity building at company level was to pilot an entire design protection process from application to registration. Technical assistance included awareness raising, the development of training tools, training activities and direct support to companies. The beneficiary countries received support in drafting a national design protection strategy and an outreach plan. Regulatory and institutional constraints to design were only marginally covered. The conclusions of the evaluation included the following. First, the project prepared by the Secretariat addressed the promotion of the strategic use and protection of industrial designs by SMEs in an appropriate way. Excellent preparation in close cooperation with key stakeholders in the two beneficiary countries led to a high degree of relevance. However, there was room for improvement in the results-based management framework. Efforts were made to develop such a framework towards the end of the project. Second, project management was highly satisfactory. The Secretariat delivered all outputs in a timely manner and in good quality. Resources were used economically. The project provided good value for money. A key success factor was the recruitment of a full-time Project Officer with a technical cooperation background and sound project management skills. This was the difference compared with some other DA projects. The evaluation endorsed the project completion report. Awareness raising seemed to be successful in informing right holders of the benefits of obtaining protection for their designs through registration. Both countries report increased design and trademark registrations. This was highlighted as an important outcome by both IP offices. Third, with regard to the sustainability of results, it was premature to assess the likelihood of longer-term sustainability of results at the country level as a continuation of benefits depended largely on a follow-up by the respective IP offices. Activities in Morocco under OMPIC were ongoing beyond the project. Argentina planned to continue activities to promote the valorization of IPRs. Generating and maintaining benefits at the international level required a follow-up phase. Fourth, although project implementation took gender issues actively into account, this was not done following a clear WIPO methodology. Gender equality was a priority for WIPO, but there was no guidance to project managers on how to mainstream gender into DA projects. The report included recommendations based on the conclusions of the evaluation. First, the Secretariat should propose a Phase II to the CDIP to gain additional experience and in case of a broader interest, prepare for an upscaling and replication of the approach. This should be done by involving the bureaus in determining possible new target countries. A balanced selection of beneficiary countries at different stages of IP system development should be ensured. The involvement of project experts from the pilot countries should be considered, where appropriate, to transfer know-how gained from the project to other countries. The Secretariat should support the IP offices in Argentina and Morocco to assess wider project outcomes. If the mid-term review of the Phase II indicated positive results, a detailed strategy should be developed to ensure replication of similar projects in other countries. Second, the Secretariat should systematically assess management input needed for new DA projects. Where appropriate, the Secretariat should budget for the recruitment of a Project Officer to be responsible for day-to-day project management. To complement the technical expertise of the Project Manager, the Project Officer should primarily be a proven development specialist with field experience and excellent project management skills. The Secretariat should ensure that the delegation of management responsibilities to externally recruited temporary staff did not lead to the loss of organizational know-how. Lastly, to ensure the consistent application of good practices in DA projects, the Secretariat should propose a new project to the CDIP aimed at the development of specific tools for the planning and implementation of DA projects, including the mainstreaming of gender.

95. The Delegation of Japan, speaking on behalf of Group B, stated that the report served as a good basis for further discussion. The evaluation concluded that the project was clearly defined and formulated. It was also well-planned and managed. These were key factors for ownership by partner countries and likely sustainable outcomes. The project had utilized its

budget economically. The planning phase was important for the achievement of project goals. The Group generally supported Phase II of the project and looked forward to reviewing the project document.

96. The Delegation of Malta, speaking on behalf of the EU and its member states, welcomed the external evaluation. The use of designs could be a powerful tool for adding value to a product, raising market demand and increasing the economic returns for designers in all countries. The sustainability of the results was important. They were glad that the activities in Morocco were ongoing beyond the project and Argentina planned to continue activities to promote the valorization of IPRs. The EU and its member states looked forward to discussing the project proposal for the Phase II of this project.

97. The Delegation of Indonesia welcomed the report, including the conclusions and recommendations contained therein. The report indicated that the project had achieved its objective in promoting the strategic use and protection of industrial designs as a means. The Delegation supported a Phase II and further replication of the project to include other developing countries and LDCs. The Delegation referred to the first recommendation in the report. It was stated that the approach to replication in the Phase II of the project should be tailored to specific country needs. It was also mentioned that the same experts should be used in those other countries. In this regard, the Delegation would like to ensure that the experts would take into account the need to tailor the approach to specific country needs. The Delegation referred to the second and third recommendations, and enquired as to whether it would be preferable to introduce general administrative reform in WIPO projects in order to systematically address management input and put in place a methodology to mainstream gender aspects instead of proposing a specific DA project to address this issue.

98. The Delegation of Georgia, speaking on behalf of CEBS, welcomed the evaluation report. The project could assist designers to raise market demand and guarantee returns through the use of designs. It looked forward to further discussions on the issue.

99. The Delegation of Morocco provided further information on the implementation of the project in Morocco. Twenty-six companies were selected from the 226 that responded to a survey by the IP Office. The companies showed a lot of interest in promoting their designs in various sectors. Following the project, the companies benefited from assistance related to design law, developing a strategy to commercialize their designs, personalized assistance on registration procedures and the protection of their industrial property rights. The companies benefitted from free online learning programs by the IP office. They also received classroom training. Two companies involved in the pilot phase received a certificate from Moroccan IP Academy. The training took place over three months (two modules a month) and covered all areas of industrial property. Design applications increased after the pilot phase was over. The IP office decided to launch a Phase II with a second survey to select a second group of companies to benefit from the direct support provided by national and international experts and to make companies aware of the need for an industrial property strategy to protect their designs. Morocco was willing to share its experience in this area.

100. The Delegation of Argentina welcomed the conclusions of the report. Argentina was one of the two pilot countries that participated in the project and found it to be very satisfactory. Designs helped businesses to add value to their products and make them stand out. WIPO's assistance fully covered the needs of the interested parties. The Delegation hoped the Argentinian experience and the recommendations in the evaluation report would be the basis for future work.

101. The Delegation of the Russian Federation was very satisfied with the quality of the project. The project was important. It aimed at facilitating the strategic use of industrial designs by

SMEs. The report included important conclusions that deserved attention. First and foremost, it was important to follow up on the implementation of the project and the results achieved. Second, more experience was needed in order to draw conclusions on how the Secretariat and the Organization as a whole could continue to assist IP offices in this area. The evaluation of the project and experience gained would make it possible to adopt a decision in the future on how this kind of activity could be continued. In this regard, the Delegation welcomed the carrying out of the second stage of this project.

102. The Delegation of the United States of America stated that it had supported the project from the very beginning as beneficial for both design creators and national IP offices. It was happy to learn that the project was overall successful and met the expectations of the beneficiaries. The Delegation noted that one of the recommendations suggested a Phase II for the project. If Phase II was proposed and approved by the Committee, the Delegation hoped that it would equip other national IP offices with the necessary information to implement design protection strategies in their countries. The Delegation also noted that despite the overall successful implementation and management of the project, the Evaluator made two valuable observations. One, WIPO's standard templates for planning, monitoring and reporting did not use the logical framework tool which had become the key instrument for the management of technical cooperation projects. Detailed guidelines on project cycle management were not available but would be useful. Two, there were no clear WIPO guidelines and training for project managers on gender issues. Thus, the Evaluator suggested that the Committee proposed a DA project which aimed at the development of specific tools for the planning and implementation of DA projects, including the mainstreaming of gender. The Delegation sought clarification from the Secretariat on one question before the Committee made any decision on this recommendation. It would like to know what type of initiatives or training opportunities were offered by WIPO to project managers that may address these observations.

103. The Delegation of China believed the project was well planned and project management was especially satisfactory. The project was highly relevant and catered to the needs of Member States. Designs and trademark registrations increased in Morocco and Argentina, the two beneficiary countries, during the project. All parties involved found the project satisfying. The Delegation also noted that the project adopted various resource-saving approaches to effectively improve its investment output ratio and took into account gender equality issues. Although a logical framework was not included at the planning stage, during its implementation, a logical framework was developed and used for internal monitoring and a midterm evaluation which demonstrated that WIPO's DA projects could be adjusted during development and implementation. The report pointed out that designs were less relevant than patents for agricultural machine producers in Argentina. Nonetheless, broadly speaking, enhancing design protection was in line with the long-term demands and interests of SMEs and micro-enterprises in developing countries. Best practices and experiences from the projects should be taken into account by WIPO. Phase II of the project could be conducted to extend its implementation to other developing countries.

104. The Delegation of Turkey aligned itself with the statement made by the Delegation of Japan on behalf of Group B. The Delegation highlighted a few points concerning the recommendations. Recommendation 1(c) on ensuring a balanced selection of beneficiary countries at different stages of IP system development while maintaining the commitment of national counterparts as a key selection criterion was important. The Delegation referred to Recommendation 3 and stated that the Secretariat could propose a new DA project specifically designed for the development and introduction of project management tools for DA projects. To this end, as stated in paragraphs (b) and (c) of the recommendation, preparing a toolkit that included clear processes and responsibilities for implementation and tailoring it for specific technical cooperation activities, would greatly help in obtaining better results which could also be used for future beneficiaries of the same project. This would also be in line with one of the

Independent Review recommendations. As mentioned in Recommendation 8 of the Independent Review, future work related to the development of new projects should *inter alia* be modular and customizable.

105. The Delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran took note of the conclusions and recommendations contained in the report. Most of the project's objectives had been accomplished. The Delegation supported the expansion of the project through its replication in other countries as Phase II.

106. The Delegation of Japan found the recommendations in the evaluation report to be useful. It supported the results of the project because raising awareness on the importance of protecting designs based on design strategies in developing countries and LDCs led to self-sustaining economic development in developing countries that use such designs. The report stated that the activities in Morocco under OMPIC were ongoing beyond the project. The Delegation hoped that the experiences obtained from the project would be shared by the Member States and similar activities would be conducted in other developing countries and LDCs based on their own initiatives in the future.

107. The Delegation of Brazil noted that the assessment criteria included sustainability. However, as mentioned by the Evaluator, given the short-term time period, it was not possible to assess the sustainability of the project. Thus, the Delegation sought clarification on this paradox. The Delegation also noted that visits were not made to the beneficiary countries. Thus, it would like the Evaluator to provide further information on the questions and tools used to evaluate through video conferences, and whether virtual tools had the same effect as local visits.

108. The Delegation of Senegal supported all the recommendations in the report. It also supported going ahead with Phase II of the project.

109. The Chair invited the Secretariat to respond to the comments from the floor.

110. The Secretariat (Mr. Baloch) referred to the comments by the Delegation of Indonesia. There were two points. One was better integration of gender aspects. WIPO was making serious efforts to be more responsive and do as much as it could on gender. There was a gender coordinator within the Organization and she was consulted on potential possibilities for promoting more gender representation. Thus, efforts could be made whenever there was scope to do so. The second point which was also addressed by some other delegations pertained to project management. The Secretariat recalled that when a project-based methodology for DA projects was introduced, there was a bit of a reaction. The Organization had been able to develop projects, or at least some time bound activities, with clear objectives, clear requirements for evaluation and a clear budget. It had been trying to do more and more of that. It could try to make technical assistance and other DA-related activities more project-oriented. Some staff had project management training. When a DA project was approved, the Development Agenda Coordination Division went to the substantive divisions to identify the best possible person who had knowledge of the subject. That colleague may not be necessarily trained as a project manager. The standard project-based methodologies did not necessarily apply to a project to be implemented by WIPO in the field of IP. These projects needed a different approach. The Secretariat referred to the question by the Delegation of the United States of America. The Human Resource Management Department in WIPO, especially the section that dealt with staff training, conducted a two-day project management course for beginners. There was also a week-long advanced course. The training was not compulsory. The Delegation of Turkey highlighted the use of a toolkit. That may be a good option as standard project management courses tended to be too heavy for technical assistance projects. Thus, there could be a solution where colleagues from the substantive areas selected to

implement the DA project or any other project would familiarize themselves with the needs of implementing a project. The Secretariat noted that many delegations supported the recommendation on a Phase II. The Secretariat sought some flexibility in that regard. As mentioned, the Project Manager had moved on to another position. Some matters needed to be clarified, including whether this was already foreseen to be part of the regular WIPO activities. The latter approach may be a good option as a pilot project could only be done in two to three countries. However, if it was done as a regular Program and Budget activity, there would be a multiplier effect. Perhaps more countries could be included. The relevant colleague was not in the office that day. The Secretariat requested for some flexibility to reflect and would report back to the Member States on the way forward.

111. The Evaluator (Mr. Keller) referred to the comment by the Delegation of Indonesia on the use of existing experts and tailoring the approach to the specific needs of countries. The idea was to share experiences between the pilot countries and other countries. This should not negatively affect the needs orientation of a new project. The Evaluator referred to the question of whether the results-based management tool should be addressed organization-wide or in the form of a DA project. Based on the experience of other organizations, the tool should be for specific projects, not an organization-wide system. The idea was to develop a tool for project managers to plan, monitor, assess and evaluate those projects. The Evaluator referred to the question by the Delegation of Brazil on sustainability. The assessment of sustainability was usually limited in the case of small projects because at the time of the evaluation, there may not be strong evidence as to whether the results were likely to be maintained. Thus, only initial observations and a preliminary opinion could be provided on that. In the report, the preliminary opinion was that follow-up was needed. The Consultant referred to the question from the Delegation of Brazil on field missions. Evaluations were subject to budget limitations. Personal observations and more company interviews would yield more insight. However, there was also the question of whether the benefits of field visits were justified by the higher costs.

112. The Chair invited the Committee to conclude this item by taking note of the report and recommending the extension of the project to a Phase II with a certain degree of flexibility for the Secretariat on the modalities for doing so. This was agreed given that there were no objections from the floor.

AGENDA ITEM 7: CONSIDERATION OF WORK PROGRAM FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF ADOPTED RECOMMENDATIONS

[Discussions on the Joint Proposal by the Delegations of the United States of America, Australia and Canada on Activities Related to Technology Transfer \(Annex I of document CDIP/18/6 Rev.\)](#)

113. The Secretariat (Mr. Czajkowski) provided an update on the implementation of the Joint Proposal by the Delegations of the United States of America, Australia and Canada. With regard to the first item of the joint proposal, the Secretariat had revised and updated the WIPO webpage on supporting technology and knowledge transfer. It included links to a broad range of WIPO initiatives on knowledge and technology transfer programs, resources, projects and initiatives, as well as links to multi-stakeholder platforms such as WIPO GREEN, WIPO Re:Search and the dispute resolution services provided by the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center. The expanded webpage was easily accessed through the WIPO patents home page. The DA portal on technology transfer and open collaboration containing IP asset management support for universities and resources produced within the Project on IP and Technology Transfer: Common Challenges – Building Solutions was also updated and improved. It could be accessed from the WIPO DA home page. Overall, the changes made to the aforementioned were expected to make them much more intuitive and user-friendly. With regard to the second item of the joint proposal, the Secretariat would prepare an overview of the activities planned by

each WIPO sector to promote their activities related to technology transfer, particularly in respect of promoting those activities to policymakers, practitioners and research institutes so as to ensure a broader understanding of the issues. The overview was foreseen to be provided to the CDIP for the next session in November 2017. With regard to the third item of the joint proposal, the Secretariat continued to monitor and actively engage in various international fora and conferences on technology transfer. The Secretariat would also prepare an overview of those in which WIPO had participated during the 2016/2017. It was foreseen to be provided to the CDIP for the next session. With regard to the fourth item, the Secretariat was exploring possible actions to promote usage of the web forum established under the project on IP and Technology Transfer: Common Challenges – Building Solutions. It had added a link to the forum from the aforementioned WIPO webpage on supporting technology and knowledge transfer. With regard to the sixth item of the joint proposal, the Secretariat continued to work with interested Member States to identify concrete and practical projects that delivered tangible outcomes for Member States with the goal to promote international technology transfer, build capacity in LDCs, developing countries and economies in transition so as to enable more effective technology transfer and improve collaboration between technology transfer participants. The Secretariat would also prepare an overview of the DA Cluster C recommendations, addressed by specific technology transfer-related services and activities to facilitate a gap analysis. It was also foreseen to be provided to the CDIP for the next session.

114. The Delegation of the United States of America looked forward to reviewing the three reports to be provided by the Secretariat before the next CDIP session. The Delegation referred to Item 5 of the joint proposal which was not approved in the last session. That item dealt with gathering information on existing market based approaches and platforms to facilitate technology transfer and technology commercialization. The Delegation believed a study by WIPO on existing national and international platforms and other approaches to facilitate technology licensing would be useful for Member States and other stakeholders, and would inform WIPO's work in this area. It could be supplemented by contributions from Member States, including case studies describing possible success stories. That would be useful for other Member States who may want to explore the possibilities of creating national or regional technology licensing platforms.

115. The Delegation of Georgia, speaking on behalf of CEBS, supported the joint proposal. The technology transfer services provided by WIPO covered a wide range of activities, including enabling a legal framework for transfer of technology, establishing structures for technology transfer, capacity building and a multitude of tools facilitating technology transfer. A majority of the items were discussed in the last session. The Group looked forward to further exploring Item 5 and its possible implications.

116. The Delegation of Japan, speaking on behalf of Group B, recalled that the Committee agreed to move forward on Items 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6, as amended in the proposal. The Group looked forward to discussing and approving Item 5, which as a first step, could include a study by WIPO on existing national and international platforms on technology transfer.

117. The Delegation of Canada looked forward to the Secretariat's overviews at the next session. The Delegation believed Item 5 in the joint proposal and the proposed study would demonstrate the value of establishing technology transfer platforms.

118. The Delegation of Malta, speaking on behalf of the EU and its member states, had supported the joint proposal. Thus, the EU and its member states were satisfied that the Committee decided to move forward on Items 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 in the last session. They referred to Item 5 in the joint proposal. It contained a proposal for WIPO to investigate taking up a market based approach to facilitate innovation and commercialization by providing a means for public sector patent holders to signal their licensing intent and promote their key areas of

technology within a single platform. As part of investigating activities in this area, WIPO should consider utilizing existing platforms and collaborate with Member States that had similar systems in place such as Australia's Source IP platform. For instance, the Secretariat should invite submissions from those Member States on national practices and experiences in the development of market based approaches and platforms on technology transfer, to inform WIPO's work in this area. The EU and its member states would like further discussions on this matter and its possible implications.

119. The Delegation of Indonesia understood that the Secretariat had done a lot of activities at an analytical level. These would soon be translated into more concrete activities that would contribute to practical improvements in accessing knowledge on technology transfer. Indonesia would be happy to be a part of those activities. The Delegation referred to Item 5 in the joint proposal. A market based approach to facilitate innovation and commercialization was a good mechanism. However, it would only be useful if a definition for "technology transfer" was agreed. Without this, the initiative would limit possible future work on technology transfer. The Delegation looked forward to more constructive discussions to implement Item 5 of the joint proposal with the view that a definition for technology transfer could be agreed.

120. The Delegation of Mexico stated that its country was interested in identifying such models for technology transfer. It was also interested in identifying what was mentioned by the Delegation of Indonesia.

121. The Chair invited the Secretariat to respond to the comments from the floor.

122. The Secretariat (Mr. Czajkowski) noted that the Committee had yet to decide on Item 5. It was still open for further discussion. Thus, the Secretariat could not move further on this item.

123. The Chair observed that Item 5 would need to be taken up in more depth. The proponents of the joint proposal had pointed out the merits and would like to know more about best practices. For some delegations, the issue of technology transfer needed to be looked at in more depth in order for an agreement to be reached on the concept of technology transfer. It required more discussion on all its aspects. Therefore, he proposed that a compilation of the proposals could be provided for the next session.

124. The Delegation of the United States of America would like to know if there would be a study or a compilation of Member States' experiences or whether this item would be left entirely for discussion at the next session. The Delegation would like to know whether the Committee could agree to a study by the Secretariat on national and international experiences as well as contributions by Member States who would like to share their success stories. Some countries such as South Africa, Chile, Denmark, Japan and Australia had national platforms. They differed in certain aspects. Thus, a study and compilation of experiences would be useful. The Committee did not need to agree on this item, but perhaps it could agree to the study. The Delegation believed the study did not require the Committee to agree on a definition for "technology transfer" which was a very difficult thing to do. Perhaps the study could be done as a first step.

125. The Chair stated that the Committee would not be suspending work on this item. The Delegation of the United States of America had provided the Committee with an additional proposal on how the Secretariat could intervene on this matter and it was left to the Committee to decide.

126. The Delegation of Indonesia referred to the statement made by the Delegation of the United States of America. The Delegation was interested in the study. However, a decision on

the study should be discussed more carefully. The language should reflect the objective and limitations of the study, and how the study would affect future discussions.

127. The Chair proposed the following. Member States could provide their viewpoints. The Secretariat could undertake a study on this subject, taking into account the viewpoints put forward by Member States as a way forward.

128. The Secretariat (Mr. Czajkowski) stated that it could propose and carry out a study on the existing platforms. Their features and characteristics could be described in the study. That could provide a starting point for further discussions.

129. The Delegation of Egypt understood that a mapping exercise of existing platforms on technology transfer would be undertaken based on inputs from Member States, and it would be made available for future discussions on the joint proposal in the Committee. The preparation of a draft decision paragraph would assist the Committee to reach an agreement in this regard.

130. The Chair stated that a draft paragraph could be provided by the Secretariat in the afternoon or at the end of the session within the Chair's Summary.

131. The Delegation of Indonesia believed it would be better for the Committee to see the language as soon as possible in order for an agreement to be reached on the study.

132. The Delegation of the Russian Federation had listened to the discussion. It supported such a study. It would be useful for future discussions on the proposals under this item.

133. The Chair stated that a text would be drafted and provided to the Committee.

134. The Chair resumed the session after a coffee break. He informed the Committee that a draft text was prepared as follows, "With regard to Item 5 of the Joint Proposal, the Secretariat will carry out, as a first step, a mapping exercise of all existing national and international platforms as regards the services facilitating technology transfer for the next session of the CDIP".

135. The Delegation of India had some concerns on the use of the term "technology transfer" as there was no agreement on the definition of "technology transfer". The Delegation proposed that the words "facilitating technology transfer" be replaced with the words "facilitation mechanism".

136. The Chair believed the text reflected the discussions on the matter. The amendment proposed by the Delegation of India may lead to more lengthy discussions. Other amendments may also be proposed. Thus, he proposed that the discussion in the Committee on this item be concluded for that moment. The various groups could negotiate to see whether a final understanding could be reached on this item. A final text would be made available before the end of the session. This was agreed given that there were no objections from the floor.

Consideration of document CDIP/19/6 – Report on WIPO's Contribution to the Implementation of SDGs and its Associated Targets

137. The Representative of the Director General for the SDGs (Mr. Bouabid) introduced the Report on WIPO's Contribution to the Implementation of SDGs and its Associated Targets. The document was a continuation of discussions initiated at the 15th session of CDIP, on how WIPO would support Member States to fulfill the objectives of the post-2015 development agenda. In this context, the Committee considered at its 16th, 17th and 18th sessions, a series of documents on "WIPO and the Post-2015 Development Agenda" (document CDIP/16/8), "Mapping of WIPO

Activities Related to the SDGs Implementation” (document CDIP/17/8) and the “Compilation of Member State Inputs on SDGs relevant to WIPO’s Work” (document CDIP/18/4), respectively. At the 18th session of CDIP, the Committee requested the Secretariat to present an annual report to the Committee, at its first session of the year, containing information on WIPO’s contribution to the implementation of the SDGs and its associated targets on the activities and initiatives undertaken individually by the Organization; the activities undertaken by the Organization as part of the UN System; and the assistance provided by WIPO to Member States upon their request. The report was divided into those three parts. The Secretariat referred to the activities undertaken by the Organization as part of the UN system. The report recalled WIPO’s engagement in the preparatory processes for 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda. It also included updates in terms of the Organization’s participation in the work carried out under the UN system following the 2015 UN Summit, particularly within three specific structures, namely, the Technology Facilitation Mechanism, the High-level Political Forum on Sustainable Development, and the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on SDG Indicators. The report also included an Annex. It contained the presentation on WIPO and the SDGs by the Director General on February 9, 2017. The presentation was a contribution to the discussions in the CDIP. It provided information on WIPO’s role and contributions, either individually or in partnership with other stakeholders, to the implementation of the SDGs. It included information on WIPO’s contributions to SDG 9, particularly in relation to the innovation ecosystem. It also provided information on the links between innovation and other SDGs. The third part of the report was on assistance provided by WIPO to Member States upon their request. At the time of the preparation of the document, the Secretariat had not received any request from Member States seeking assistance related to the attainment of the SDGs. The Secretariat informed the Committee that WIPO was supporting the second annual Multi-stakeholder Forum on Science, Technology and Innovation for the SDGs that was currently taking place in New York, under the theme Science, Technology and Innovation for a Changing World – Focus on SDGs 1, 2, 3, 5, 9, and 14. WIPO was working in close cooperation with the UN system and other stakeholders in contributing to the implementation of the SDGs.

138. The Delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran took note of the report. WIPO remained engaged with other international organizations in a wide and diversified manner to help realize the SDGs. As a specialized agency of the UN, WIPO should support the implementation of these objectives. As highlighted in the report of the Director General, WIPO’s contributions to the implementation of SDGs were not restricted to specific goals. It should play a role in the implementation of all 17 SDGs. The Delegation expected a more substantial report on WIPO’s contribution to the implementation of SDGs. With regard to the assistance provided by WIPO to Member States, more information was required on how assistance could be requested and provided.

139. The Delegation of Colombia, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, reiterated that the Committee was the ideal forum for WIPO to present and share with Member States its contributions to the process of implementing SDGs. These would continue to be a key element in the work of the Committee and the Organization. The Group welcomed the annual report. It took into account the decisions of previous CDIP sessions. The Group hoped to interact with Mr. Bouabid continuously and smoothly with a view to exchanging ideas on all areas covered and, in particular, to formulate requests for assistance for Member States. In the discussions, the Committee must take into account paragraph 5 of resolution A/RES/70/1 of the UN General Assembly, which stated that the 2030 Agenda was applicable to all countries, keeping in mind different national realities, capacities and levels of development, and respecting national policies and priorities. The SDGs were universal and indivisible goals which targeted developed and developing countries alike. There were several fronts on which the Organization could and should contribute to implementing the SDGs. The Group was aware of the role and impact of innovation on several SDGs. The Group underlined the universal, integrated and indivisible nature of the 17 SDGs and the importance of WIPO’s work. In this regard, the Group referred to

its contribution, as recorded in the document containing the inputs of Member States on the SDGs relevant to WIPO's work (document CDIP/18/4). The link between the different SDGs and various relevant aspects of IP requires substantial involvement of the Organization in the implementation process. That is why the GRULAC believes that we must continue discussions as Member States of WIPO, in order to identify those aspects in which IP is a relevant factor to implement the SDGs and therefore determine the specific work WIPO will develop on its progress".

140. The Delegation of Indonesia took note of the report. It also noted that the representative of the Director General on the SDGs was recruited to coordinate this subject internally and externally. It would like to know more about how this would be done. The Delegation referred to the Director General's presentation to the ambassadors and permanent representatives on the subject of WIPO and the SDGs. It welcomed the presentation. Most of the activities listed in the presentation predated the SDGs. Thus, the Delegation would like to know whether WIPO was taking a business-as-usual approach to all its programs in the implementation of the SDGs or if there was any upscaling of existing programs to ensure that they interfaced with the SDGs contextually and contributed more to their implementation. With regard to activities undertaken by the Organization as part of the UN system, the Delegation noted that WIPO, as a specialized agency of the UN, was contributing to many UN activities and initiatives in this area. The report also stated that WIPO provided factual information on the role of the IP system. The Delegation would like to know what kind of factual information was provided by WIPO in those activities. With regard to the assistance provided by WIPO to Member States, the Delegation aligned itself with the statement made by the Delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran. Indonesia was interested to request WIPO's assistance in implementing the SDGs in relation to the Organization's mandate. However, more information was required on the kind of assistance WIPO could offer in relation to the SDGs.

141. The Delegation of Chile supported the statement made by the Delegation of Colombia on behalf of GRULAC. The links between the different SDGs and important aspects of a balanced IP system required substantive involvement by the Organization in the implementation process and it required guidance from Member States. The Delegation referred to two important elements. With regard to Goal 9 on industry, innovation and infrastructure, it was important to achieve sustainable development and empower communities. Thus, the Delegation supported initiatives that contributed in a specific way to improve the management and effective use of IP. It highlighted the work done by WIPO to support IT solutions for industrial property offices. Similar efforts could also be undertaken for copyright offices. The innovation value chain for industrial property was not necessarily the same as that for copyright. For example, it may be that the creation of IP in this area preceded funding. Such characteristics made the work of offices that registered copyright and related rights extremely challenging and deserved consideration in the work of the Organization. They deserved to be considered in projects that may be approved by the Committee. An efficient, flexible, and transparent registration system was of benefit to right holders and users. It reduced the possibility of infringement and provided legal certainty for the works and creations that belonged in the public domain and contributed to the general well-being of society. The Delegation referred to Goal 5 on achieving gender equality and empowering all women and girls. This was an important issue. Last year, the Economics and Statistics division produced a document on Identifying the Gender of PCT Inventors (Economic Research Working Paper No. 33). It identified the gender of inventors in international patent applications and included 182 countries. The results suggested there was a gender imbalance in PCT applications, although the proportion of women inventors was improving over time. Their participation differed substantially across countries, technological fields and sectors. More progress was achieved in academic institutions. The study did not identify reasons for the disparities, nor did it propose possible solutions. It was limited to the PCT system. Thus, other IP areas were not analyzed. However, it was a good contribution. The Delegation continued to support work on this subject. The active involvement of women

was important for growing and strengthening IP systems. It hoped to work on specific proposals with delegations interested in this area, and to develop this subject in the Committee. The report on WIPO's contribution to the implementation of SDGs was useful as a compilation of the Organization's work in this regard. However, there were still many issues to be examined by WIPO and its Member States. WIPO's work should not be restricted to SDG 9. The SDGs should be implemented in a holistic way. There were other SDGs in respect of which WIPO could emphasize its work. For example, SDG 3B, SDG 8.9 and SDG 17.6. WIPO's contribution to the SDGs should take into account the integrated and indivisible nature of the Goals. That was the basis on which they should be discussed. This was important in analyzing WIPO's contribution to the implementation of the SDGs and the CDIP was a good forum to do so.

142. The Delegation of Senegal, speaking on behalf of the African Group, noted that the report provided an overview of WIPO's contribution to the implementation of the SDGs. The Group welcomed WIPO's efforts in this regard. The activities and initiatives undertaken individually by the Organization were important. The Secretariat should strengthen WIPO's role in the implementation of SDGs. Targeted programs that took into consideration all the links to the implementation of the Goals must be put in place. Priority should also be given to the development of a framework for WIPO to provide assistance to Member States in relation to the SDGs. This was necessary in order for Member States to request for such assistance. The SDGs provided a platform for the international community to transform the world. Thus, they needed to be considered holistically. Innovation was an important tool for the implementation of the SDGs. More detailed information on WIPO's contribution to the implementation of the SDGs should be provided in future reports.

143. The Delegation of China noted that in the past few years WIPO actively participated in the implementation of UN SDGs and was following up on the efforts this year. This included the Director General's briefing to the ambassadors and permanent representatives in Geneva in February. Similar to the appointment of David Nabarro as the Special Advisor to the UN Secretary-General on the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, a representative of the Director General on the SDGs was appointed to coordinate this subject internally and externally. WIPO also actively participated in the Technology Facilitation Mechanism, the High-level Political Forum on Sustainable Development, and the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on SDG Indicators. The Delegation also noted that WIPO would be hosting a matchmaking forum on water technologies. WIPO GREEN and WIPO Re:Search, two important platforms to address global challenges, would also be expanded and improved. These concrete initiatives with UN features and unique WIPO characteristics would bring WIPO's work on implementation to a new level. The implementation of SDGs and its targets was important. SIPO, the Chinese IP authority, was preparing policy documents on priority patent examination. Patent applications involving technologies related to energy conservation, environmental protection, new materials, new energy vehicles and other key areas of national interest could be granted priority examination or re-examination. An emphasis on green technologies and relevant industries when devising IP policies could effectively facilitate the implementation of SDGs and its targets.

144. The Delegation of Georgia, speaking on behalf of CEBS, supported the activities of WIPO that were linked to the implementation of SDGs. These were important activities. WIPO should focus on those areas which were within the remit of its competence and where it could add value to the implementation process.

145. The Delegation of Egypt stated that the UN Sustainable Development Agenda was adopted to define the responsibility of countries in implementing SDGs. UN agencies should play a catalyzing role in the activities undertaken. WIPO was a specialized UN Agency. It had a clear and well-defined DA. The Organization should take the initiative for implementation. That included programs and initiatives directed towards developing countries and LDCs. Furthermore, WIPO played an important role in giving priority to the SDGs. This was repeated

several times at the GA and by the Director General himself. Recently, the Director General organized an information meeting for ambassadors and permanent representatives on WIPO's role in implementing the SDGs. There was also a presentation on the participation of WIPO in the transfer of technologies. The Delegation took note of the annual report on WIPO's contribution to the SDGs. The Director General's Report on Implementation of the DA included a section on WIPO's participation in the implementation of the SDGs. The current report did not include more detailed information on what WIPO was actually doing at the various meetings. Member States should be informed about the contents of the contributions by WIPO at these meetings. With regard to SDG 4 on quality education, the report referred to copyright as the principal mechanism for financing cultural production. The Delegation sought clarification on the aim of this reference. The Delegation noted that the report concentrated on existing WIPO initiatives. Initiatives could be developed to focus on the implementation of SDGs, particularly in the context of the WIPO DA.

146. The Delegation of Malta, speaking on behalf of the EU and its member states, informed the Committee that its intervention covered documents CDIP/19/6 and CDIP/18/4. The EU and its member states noted that document CDIP/19/6 demonstrated, in a very thorough way, the Secretariat's investment in the SDGs implementation process. They believed that WIPO, as the multicultural organization addressing IP, had very specific knowledge to contribute to the wider SDGs' discussions. The EU and its member states were strongly committed to the SDGs. The SDGs were as important and relevant to developed countries as they were to developing countries. In 2016, the EU and its member states had again consolidated their place as to the world's leading donor of efficient development assistance worth 75.5 billion euros. They supported the WIPO activities mentioned in document CDIP/19/6, given that they were linked to the fulfillment of the targets of the SDGs. The EU and its member states also took note of the recruitment of a representative of the Director General on the SDGs to coordinate the subject internally and externally. The EU and its member states welcomed the agreement reached at the last CDIP meeting to provide an annual report to Member States. This provided Member States with ample opportunities to discuss SDGs. Therefore, a separate agenda item was not necessary. In order for WIPO's support to be more centric and more effective, WIPO needed to focus on those SDGs and targets which were of the greatest relevance to its work and mandate to promote the protection of IP throughout the world through cooperation among states and, where appropriate, in collaboration with other international bodies and organizations. WIPO's work was most relevant to the implementation of SDG 9 and SDG 17. The overall achievement of the SDGs depended primarily on states. The EU and its member states remained open to examining individual proposals on relevant SDGs in the future, as required on an *ad hoc* basis.

147. The Delegation of Uganda aligned itself with the statement made by the Delegation of Senegal on behalf of the African Group. The report highlighted WIPO's activities, including those pre-dating formal adoption of the SDGs as well as partnerships with other UN agencies. The report did not provide details on WIPO's inputs in respect of partnerships with other UN agencies. The Delegation echoed the request by the delegations of the Islamic Republic of Iran and Indonesia for the Secretariat to provide more details in this regard. It also suggested that the Secretariat linked its activities in relation to the SDGs to the WIPO committees that were already established to enable Member States to monitor how they were done in the respective committees to ensure alignment and harmonization. In the next report, the Secretariat should indicate the kind of assistance WIPO could provide to Member States in relation to the SDGs.

148. The Delegation of Tunisia underlined the importance of WIPO's contribution to the implementation of the SDGs. In addition to the existing programs, further initiatives could be developed to focus on the realization of the SDGs. Further information was required on the assistance offered by WIPO to Member States in relation to the SDGs.

149. The Delegation of Nigeria highlighted the appointment of a representative of the Director General on SDGs to coordinate the subject internally and externally. It welcomed the activities undertaken by the Organization as part of the UN system. The Delegation shared the view of some other delegations that the programs mentioned in the report, to a large extent, pre-dated the adoption of the SDGs. The Delegation would like to see results that could be measured. The Director General's presentation included a section on the innovation ecosystem. It referred to cost-effectiveness, transactional efficiency and simplicity in the operation of the IP system internationally. This suggested everyone would be able to use the system. The Delegation understood that Member States played a primary role in the implementation of the SDGs. However, the SDGs were adopted for universal application. The mechanism was based on partnerships for people and the planet, and for peace and prosperity. Thus, there must be a level of partnership in order to cooperate and advance. The Delegation would like to know more about the information shared by WIPO in its participation in inter-agency meetings, including the ideas provided and how it supported inter-agency work on facilitating the implementation of SDGs. The Delegation noted that WIPO had not received any request from Member States for assistance in implementing the SDGs. It may be that Member States did not know how to do so. The Delegation would like to know more on how Member States could seek support from the Secretariat for implementation of the SDGs, and whether such assistance would be under the regular technical assistance and capacity building support provided by the Secretariat. It would also need to report on the assistance provided to Member States in the implementation of SDGs. In this regard, the Delegation would like to know how much information would be provided, taking into consideration the need to reflect implementation of the SDGs and the preference of many Member States to keep details confidential. The Delegation referred to the suggestion by the Delegation of Uganda for the Secretariat to link its activities in relation to the SDGs to the WIPO committees in order for Member States to monitor the Secretariat's contributions to the implementation of the SDGs. The presentation by the Director General highlighted important elements of the SDGs. The Organization saw them through the prism of innovation. However, the Delegation preferred to see more direct links beyond identifying SDG 9 as the common thread linking other SDGs. As highlighted in the Director General's presentation, the SDGs and their targets were universal. They were integrated and indivisible.

150. The Delegation of Brazil took note of the report. It was a first step in the right direction of bringing SDGs to the center of the discussions in the CDIP. The Delegation made some comments on the report. First, WIPO had to add value to the implementation of SDGs. The Delegation believed many of the activities mentioned in the report did not add value, like for example, the briefing provided by the Director General on WIPO and the SDGs. More details were required on the nature of the Secretariat's contribution to inter-agency work. There was a difference between the mere attendance of a WIPO official at a workshop and making a contribution to its work. Thus, a more detailed report was important. As mentioned by the Delegation of Indonesia and others, the report included initiatives that existed before the adoption of the SDGs. They were not specific to the implementation of the SDGs. The Delegation enquired as to whether the Committee would be discussing proposals on how to implement the SDGs. The Delegation noted that the Secretariat had not received any requests from Member States for assistance related to the attainment of the SDGs. Member States needed to know more about what assistance WIPO could offer in this regard. On the question of whether the Committee should discuss all of the 17 SDGs, the Delegation was aware that countries had different positions. Brazil's position in this regard was well known. The Delegation noted it was stated in the Annex to the report that innovation in practice contributed directly to achieving zero hunger as well as good health and well-being. Innovation was a major contribution but other elements were also required in this regard. The way it was written gave the impression that it was all about innovation. Perhaps it should be framed in a different way. In the medium or long term, innovation contributed to good health and clean water. However, in the short-term, no hunger and good health were required in order for people to be able to

innovate and develop IP systems. Thus, the opposite was also true. That was not clear in the report and was something that should be carefully looked at.

151. The Delegation of the Russian Federation stated that the report indicated that WIPO was doing comprehensive work in this area. The Organization was undertaking activities and initiatives independently. These included the briefing organized by the Director General on WIPO's contribution to the SDGs. In addition, WIPO was actively participating in activities in the UN system, including in the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on SDG Indicators. The Delegation supported the continuation of WIPO's work in this area.

152. The Delegation of Ecuador aligned itself with the statement made by the Delegation of Colombia on behalf of GRULAC. It recognized the activities undertaken by the Organization as part of the UN system. The adoption of the 2030 Agenda meant that the international community committed itself to achieving the SDGs. Thus, the work undertaken by Member States and specialized UN agencies in the implementation of the SDGs was important. As a specialized agency of the UN, WIPO should continue its efforts to contribute to the implementation of the SDGs, taking into account the integrated, indivisible and comprehensive nature of the goals and targets. The Delegation would like to know how to go about requesting for technical assistance from WIPO in relation to the SDGs.

153. The Delegation of Japan, speaking on behalf of Group B, noted that the report contained WIPO's contribution to the implementation of the SDGs and its associated targets through the activities and initiatives undertaken individually by the Organization, and the activities undertaken by the Organization as part of the UN System. The Group also noted that there had not been any request from Member States seeking assistance related to the attainment of the SDGs. The adoption of the SDGs by the UN Summit on Sustainable Development was a milestone. The Group supported the SDGs. Thus, it welcomed this opportunity to discuss how IP was contributing to the realization of the SDGs.

154. The Chair invited the Representative of the Director General on SDGs to respond to the comments from the floor.

155. The Representative of the Director General on SDGs (Mr. Bouabid) reiterated that a report would be issued on an annual basis. He had taken note of the suggestions to improve future reports and future work on this subject. With regard to the comment by the Delegation of Brazil on the need to add value, he noted that the Secretariat needed to provide substantive information on its contributions. It was not just a question of listing the activities and stating that the Secretariat participated in them. The contributions also needed to be described in future reports. This was a legitimate point. With regard to the Organization's contribution to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, many activities were ongoing. Although they may not be categorized under a particular SDG, they did come under the heading of the 2030 Agenda. He understood that Member States wanted to make the most of WIPO's expertise. What was on offer should be easy to access and understand. The Secretariat was working on it. It could consider a more proactive approach that would go beyond noting down requests for assistance under a particular SDG. In terms of reporting, the Secretariat could provide more specific information on the request while respecting the need for confidentiality. With regard to the question put forward by the Delegation of Indonesia on whether the Organization was taking a business as usual approach to the implementation of programs and activities after the adoption of the 2030 Agenda, he stated that the Organization needed to take into account the specificities of the 2030 Agenda and changes to the international environment. The 2030 Agenda itself was based on the outcomes and the achievements of the international community over the last few decades, in particular, the period beginning from the Rio summit to the 2015 summit. The Director General was working to ensure that the SDGs were taken into account by all the WIPO committees. The Secretariat

would provide the Committee with updates. The international environment in 2017 was not the same as in 2015. There would be changes in the run up to 2030. These could affect the implementation of the SDGs. For example, developments in artificial intelligence could affect many areas. Some of the targets in the 2030 Agenda were at the local level. Thus, the question was how to think globally and act locally because it was at the local level that the results would be verified and evaluated in 2030. He reiterated that more information would be provided on the content of WIPO's contributions to international activities in future reports. WIPO was actively involved in international discussions. It provided information on the role of the IP system. The Organization also provided information on its programs and activities and how they could contribute to the implementation of the SDGs. WIPO was involved in the preparations of the second annual Multi-stakeholder Forum on Science, Technology and Innovation for the SDGs that was taking place in New York. It contributed to the program and the selection of speakers. It also contributed to the concept note and issues related to innovation, science and technology. WIPO, ITU and the World Bank were also organizing a side event on the role of innovation in achieving the SDGs. He referred to the issue raised by the Delegation of Chile on SDG 5. Progress was being made on gender issues and efforts were ongoing within the Organization. A meeting would be held in WIPO on June 1. Studies had been conducted on the interaction between innovation and gender issues, particularly by the Lisbon Polytechnic School on Women in Science and Technology. The Secretariat was looking at innovation and gender equality. It did not expect to come up with generic solutions, but with practical observations to help national administrations and international organizations such as WIPO to achieve progress on this issue. He referred to the question raised by the Delegation of Egypt on copyright and SDG 4 on quality education. He needed to obtain information from colleagues before getting back to the Delegation on this matter. He hoped to interact with Member States in a fluid manner. An approach should be established to enable Member States to be regularly informed of progress in the implementation of activities and initiatives.

156. The Chair concluded the discussion and invited the Committee to take note of the report. The Committee took note of the report given that there were no objections from the floor.

Discussions on the way to address SDGs in future CDIP sessions

157. The Chair invited the Secretariat to introduce the subject.

158. The Secretariat (Mr. Baloch) recalled that document CDIP/18/4 was considered in the last CDIP session. It contained a compilation of inputs from Member States on SDGs relevant to WIPO's work. During the discussion, some delegations proposed that there should be a permanent CDIP agenda item dedicated to the implementation of SDGs. This was reflected in the Chair's Summary. The Committee also decided to continue its discussion on the way to address this subject in its future sessions, including the request for establishing a permanent agenda item. Accordingly, document CDIP/18/4 was put forward for discussions on the way to address SDGs in future CDIP sessions.

159. The Delegation of Brazil recalled its proposal to include a permanent CDIP agenda item on the implementation of SDGs. The Delegation put forward some questions to guide the discussion. First, what was the relationship between development and technical assistance? The Delegation believed the latter was only one variable in a much broader equation. Technical assistance was a tool that Member States could use to improve social and economic welfare in their respective countries. Development was a much more comprehensive and complex concept that involved a broad range of elements such as economic growth, social justice and environmental sustainability. There was another dimension to this topic. Most of WIPO's technical assistance envisaged the enhancement of a country's capabilities to improve its national IP system. Brazil was undoubtedly in favor of that. However, it also believed that

technical assistance should focus on increasing the ability of Member States, especially LDCs, to explore the flexibilities contained in the international IP legal framework. Second, was the CDIP the most appropriate WIPO forum to discuss the implementation of SDGs? The Delegation believed it was. The Committee's mandate involved the discussion of IP and development issues. The CDIP could be used to discuss the SDGs in a comprehensive and crosscutting manner without prejudice to the activities or discussions that required the participation of other WIPO committees or bodies. The CDIP could meaningfully assist by discussing how to implement the SDGs with concrete projects regarding technical assistance, and by working as a think tank inside WIPO to develop a roadmap with concrete suggestions on crosscutting initiatives regarding SDGs to be implemented by WIPO's organs. Third, should WIPO contribute to the implementation of all SDGs or only some? In its view, the 17 SDGs were universal, integrated and indivisible. This integrated approach was the lynchpin of the 2030 Agenda. Thus, the Committee needed to discuss all the SDGs. Discussing SDGs individually would be the same as discussing a half concept of development. For instance, it would not make any sense to discuss economic growth without also discussing social justice. The Delegation further referred to the statement of the Evaluator of the Project on IP and Design Management who highlighted the challenge of ensuring gender equality in the implementation of projects. SDG 5 was on gender equality. Therefore this issue should be discussed in the CDIP. On SDG 3, WIPO had a concrete and direct responsibility in respect of ensuring healthy lives through access to medicines. Although WIPO had carried out activities and studies in the past, more could be done to fully realize its potential contribution to this SDG. For instance, WIPO could help countries to combat hepatitis through the elaboration of a patent landscape report on the main medicines used for treating this disease. In the area of copyright, an ongoing discussion in WIPO was linked to the SDGs and the relationship between copyright and access to education resources. This subject was included under SDG 4 on ensuring inclusive and equitable quality education and promoting life-long learning opportunities for all. The discussions in the SCCR on exceptions and limitations for libraries, archives as well as research and educational institutions could contribute to this matter. The entry into force of the Marrakech Treaty also fell directly under that goal. The WIPO Academy could also be involved in this debate and implementation. Fourth, what were the benefits of a standing agenda item? This question was raised by many delegations. The Delegation believed a standing agenda item would help Member States and the Secretariat to increase ownership of the implementation process. It would also provide an opportunity for WIPO to periodically report to Member States on its actions concerning the implementation of SDGs. For instance, the Committee had just considered a report on WIPO's contribution to the implementation of SDGs. The report did not meet the expectations of many Member States. The inclusion of a standing agenda item would bring more clarity and transparency to the discussions. It would allow the subject to be treated in a comprehensive, periodic and continuous manner. It would provide an opportunity for Member States to discuss topics concerning the SDGs and present specific proposals. Discussions on development sometimes became very abstract. Thus, a standing agenda item would work as a beacon to concentrate efforts on initiatives that really added value. A standing agenda item would also prevent overlapping and duplication of work, particularly as the DA was intertwined with the SDGs. The Director General's Report on Implementation of the DA and the Report on WIPO's Contribution to the Implementation of SDGs and its Associated Targets mentioned the same initiatives as examples of efforts to implement those agendas. The DA and SDGs did not always coincide. The standing agenda item would help to separate them. By adopting a standard item on the implementation of SDGs, Member States would be sending an important message that the CDIP and WIPO, as a UN specialized agency, were doing their part to fulfill the General Assembly's recommendations, a small and symbolic diplomatic gesture with important political consequences. The proposed standing agenda item was presented at the 17th and 18th sessions of CDIP. It was supported by numerous countries, reflecting the desire of a substantial number of Member States which should be taken into account.

160. The Delegation of Senegal, speaking on behalf of the African Group, reiterated that WIPO had a fundamental role to play in achieving the SDGs. The Millennium Development Goals were not attained in many countries. Thus, stakeholders worldwide needed to be more involved in achieving the SDGs. The appointment of a representative of the Director General on SDGs reflected the importance attached by the Organization to the 2030 Agenda. It was important for the CDIP to discuss IP and development-related issues in-depth. This was a pillar of the Committee's mandate. The Committee required an agenda item to discuss the implementation of SDGs. Therefore, the Group continued to support the proposal by the Delegation of Brazil for a standing agenda item on WIPO's contribution to the implementation of SDGs at the international level.

161. The Delegation of Georgia, speaking on behalf of CEBS, reiterated that document CDIP/19/6 reflected the efforts invested by the Secretariat in the SDG implementation process. The Group attached importance to Agenda 2030 and the SDGs. Agenda 2030 and its 17 SDGs were integral. Each goal was directly or indirectly linked to other goals. However, the Group believed WIPO should focus on the areas that clearly fell within the remit of its competence and where it could add value to the implementation process.

162. The Delegation of Malta, speaking on behalf of the EU and its member states, reiterated that document CDIP/19/6 demonstrated, in a very thorough way, the Secretariat's investment in the SDG implementation process. WIPO, as a multicultural organization addressing IP, had very specific knowledge to contribute to the wider SDG decisions. The EU and its member states welcomed the agreement reached at the last CDIP session to provide Member States with an annual report. This provided Member States with ample opportunity to discuss SDGs. Therefore, a separate agenda item was not necessary. In order for WIPO's support to be more centric and effective, WIPO needed to focus on those SDGs and targets which were of the greatest relevance to its work and mandate to promote the protection of IP throughout the world through cooperation among states and, where appropriate, in collaboration with other international bodies and organizations. Although the EU and its member states continued to believe that the work of WIPO was most relevant to the implementation of SDG 9 and SDG 17, they remained open to examining individual proposals on relevant SDGs in the future, as required on an *ad hoc* basis. The EU and its member states reiterated that the overall achievement of SDGs depended primarily on states.

163. The Delegation of Japan, speaking on behalf of Group B, referred to the proposal by the Delegation of Brazil on creating a standing agenda item on the SDGs. Nothing prevented the CDIP from comprehensively discussing SDGs under the existing agenda items. The CDIP had been doing so since the issue was first raised. The Group reiterated that it was not in a position to support the proposal as the Committee had already approved, by consensus, after intense discussions, a process to consider an annual report on the matter. Therefore, the Group supported following the approved process for discussing the SDGs.

164. The Delegation of China believed the SDGs were important universal goals formulated by the UN family to meet common development challenges in the next 15 years. IP, as an important driving force for innovation, could play a unique role in the implementation of SDGs. It was only fit and proper for WIPO, as one of the 16 UN specialized agencies, to actively engage in the SDGs implementation process. The CDIP was the most important WIPO platform to discuss development issues. The DA Recommendations were being mainstreamed into WIPO's work. Discussing SDG issues in this Committee was appropriate and could serve as a beacon for others. Given the long-term nature of SDGs, it was both rational and necessary to include a standing agenda item on this issue in the Committee. Nevertheless, the Delegation remained open to discussing other ways to strengthen SDG discussions.

165. The Delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran stressed that the SDGs were negotiated and agreed by all UN Member States. WIPO, as a specialized UN Agency, should contribute to the implementation of SDGs. The CDIP was a specialized Committee on IP and development matters. Establishing a standing agenda item was the most rational way to address the issue of WIPO's contribution to the implementation of SDGs. It would not create new obligations or commitments for Member States. It would merely provide a platform to address this issue. The Delegation did not believe that the agreed agenda item provided comprehensive platform for this purpose as it only included an annual report by the Secretariat on WIPO's contribution to the implementation of SDGs. Views differed on the number of SDGs that should be implemented by WIPO. A platform was required for Member States to discuss such issues. Thus, it was necessary to establish a standing agenda item to address the issue of WIPO's contribution to the implementation of SDGs.

166. The Delegation of Indonesia, speaking on behalf of the Asia and the Pacific Group, reiterated that the SDGs were universal and indivisible in nature. Therefore, a holistic approach to address the realization of the SDGs was required. The proposal by the Delegation of Brazil was discussed in the last CDIP session. The Group urged the Committee to carefully consider the proposal by the Delegation of Brazil to include a CDIP standing agenda item on the implementation of the SDGs. The Delegation, speaking in its national capacity, understood the positions of other Member States and regional groups. All UN Member States had committed to the implementation of the SDGs. The UN system, including the specialized agencies of the UN, had a role in the implementation of SDGs by Member States. The Delegation understood this concept. The inclusion of an agenda item on SDGs did not mean that Member States were passing on their commitment to implement the goals to WIPO. There was no intention to do so. It was just to ensure that WIPO played a positive role in facilitating the implementation of SDGs by Member States. Thus, there should be a more positive and constructive approach to discussing these issues. The Delegation saw a lot of merit in the proposal. There should be discussion on this matter.

167. The Delegation of Uganda supported the proposal by the Delegation of Brazil on a standing agenda on the SDGs as the discussions should not be limited to the report on WIPO's contribution to the implementation of the SDGs and its associated targets. There should be broader discussions on the SDGs.

168. The Chair took note of the discussion. He noted there was no agreement on the proposal by the Delegation of Brazil. The proposal was not supported by some delegations. He recommended that the discussion be continued on this subject.

169. The Delegation of Indonesia would like the language in the Chair's Summary to reflect the support expressed by some delegations in respect of the proposal by the Delegation of Brazil.

170. The Chair reiterated that he had taken note of the discussion. It was clear there was no agreement on the proposal by the Delegation of Brazil. Some delegations did not support the proposal. Therefore, the Committee could conclude by stating that it would continue the discussion on this item. This was agreed given that there were no objections from the floor.

Consideration of document CDIP/19/11 – Project on Intellectual Property Management and Transfer of Technology: Promoting the Effective Use of Intellectual Property in Developing Countries, Least Developed Countries and Countries with Economies in Transition Proposed by South Africa

171. The Chair invited the Delegation of South Africa to introduce the proposal.

172. The Delegation of South Africa recalled that following WIPO's mapping of activities related to technology transfer, it was decided at CDIP/17 that interested Member States should submit proposals for discussion at CDIP/18. In that session, the Committee, in principle, supported the proposal and agreed to further consider it at this session based on a revised document. In line with the decision, South Africa revised the document to incorporate inputs from Member States. The Secretariat also assigned an appropriate budget to enhance the implementation of this project. The Delegation reiterated that innovation was a critical pre-requisite as nations strived towards a prosperous society regardless of their developmental status. IP had the potential to contribute to the promotion of technological innovation and to the transfer and dissemination of technology, and thereby to increase social and economic welfare. However, it had become clear that all players along the innovation value chain did not have an adequate understanding of IP and the associated rights. Thus, the project aimed to undertake four very critical activities. First, to develop a methodology and a toolkit for assessing training needs. Second, to prepare a detailed mapping of technology value chains in the pilot countries to determine training outcomes to be achieved. Third, assess training needs among elements of the technology value chains using the methodology and the toolkit, and establish training plans for the pilot countries to address these needs. Fourth, provide training through a number of modalities, including workshops, on-the-job training, internships and South-South cooperation. The results of the training activities would be evaluated to refine the methodology and toolkit. The Delegation shared some updates with the Committee in respect of the proposal. Some Member States were concerned that the capacity building activities were not clear enough. These activities were submitted in the revised document that South Africa provided more than two months before this session. Clarity had subsequently been provided in paragraph 2.3.4 of document CDIP/19/11. This was shared with delegations through their regional coordinators. These activities were mentioned above. The Delegation was comfortable with the current text. It believed the implementation of the proposed project would contribute positively towards improving the tools and on-the-ground capacity for technology transfer. It looked forward to broad support and final approval in order for implementation to begin.

173. The Secretariat (Mr. Czajkowski) provided additional information concerning the project. The project addressed the challenge of a shortage of required skills in IP management and in the transfer of technologies for key role players such as funders, developers, managers and users of IP involved in the innovation value chain. This would be done through implementing skills development activities based on the comprehensive capacity building needs assessment methodology to be established, piloted and eventually refined within the framework of the project. This methodology was also expected to enhance the effectiveness of a range of capacity building activities carried out by WIPO. In particular, the methodology would allow the needs of the key actors within the innovation value chain to be more effectively identified and addressed. In order to achieve this, the project delivery strategy included the following activities. First, developing a methodology and a toolkit (including surveys, interview templates, profile templates) for assessing training needs in areas related to technology transfer and commercialization to enable a better targeting of training activities in terms of audience, subject matter, and delivery. Second, preparing a detailed mapping of innovation value chains in four pilot countries, including their elements (funders, developers, managers, and users of IP and associated support institutions such as TISCs) and the relationships between them, to determine training outcomes to be achieved. Third, assessing the training needs among the key role players of the innovation value chains using the methodology and toolkit, and establishing training plans for the four pilot countries to address these needs. Then in a second substantial capacity building phase, carrying out capacity building activities to implement the training plans established for the four pilot countries, including as appropriate, online and on-site activities, distance learning, and participation in educational programs. In particular, the capacity building activities were intended to include practical training workshops on effective technology commercialization and IP management, targeting the key role players mentioned, as well as to look into possibilities of on-the-job training opportunities and internships. Moreover,

possible partnerships with IP management organizations, universities and other institutions with the relevant capabilities would also be explored, including possible South-South Corporation, so as to maximize knowledge transfer, impact and the sustainability of these activities in the longer term. The results of the training activities would be evaluated to refine the methodology and toolkit. The resources required to implement the project would include a dedicated project officer to ensure effective and efficient implementation of the project, an expert for developing the methodology and toolkit, four country experts for mapping the innovation value chains in the four countries (including South Africa), a training needs assessment expert, and an expert to evaluate and refine the methodology and toolkit. Partnerships with IP management organizations, universities and other institutions with relevant capabilities may also be used to leverage the resources mobilized for this project.

174. The Delegation of the United States of America referred to the delivery strategy described in the presentation under paragraph 2.3.4. A number of activities were mentioned in this regard. The Delegation was aware that the language was included in a text that was informally circulated. It would like a revised document that included the activities mentioned in the presentation and looked forward to reviewing the document.

175. The Delegation of Senegal, speaking on behalf of the African Group, noted that the proposal included a delivery strategy that comprised a range of activities to be undertaken within a defined timeline for key players in the innovation value chain. Training and capacity building activities were particularly important. The proposed budget and implementation framework were realistic in view of the expected outcomes. Therefore, the Group supported the proposal.

176. The Delegation of the Russian Federation believed the project was necessary. Such measures were required in order to strengthen innovation capacities in developing countries, LDCs and countries with economies in transition through the effective use of IP as a tool for social and economic growth. The Delegation had listened carefully to the additional information provided by the Secretariat. It would certainly be interested in the evaluation of this project. Taking into account the interest in this project, it would be necessary to exchange experiences and best practices with those who were not included in the pilot project in order for the benefits to be extended to other Member States. The Delegation supported the project proposed in document CDIP/19/11.

177. The Delegation of Algeria fully supported the statement made by the Delegation of Senegal on behalf of the African Group. The transfer of technology was an effective and essential tool for development and the achievement of essential social and economic goals. It required adequate capacity on the ground. Therefore, the Delegation supported the project proposed by the Delegation of South Africa.

178. The Delegation of Malta, speaking on behalf of the EU and its member states, noted that a revised proposal had been drawn up. It looked forward to constructive engagement on this basis.

179. The Delegation of Chile stated that the proposal by the Delegation of South Africa would help to establish a framework for improved targeting of capacity building activities in the field of technology transfer, and create capacity in IP management and transfer of technologies amongst the key role players. Therefore, the Delegation supported the approval of the project. It was a concrete tool to support development. Chile was interested to be selected as a pilot country for the project. A formal request would be submitted in this regard.

180. The Delegation of Georgia, speaking on behalf of CEBS, took note of the document put forward by the Delegation of South Africa. The Group looked forward to constructively engage

in the discussions and would listen carefully to the positions of other Member States on the project.

181. The Delegation of Uganda supported the proposal by the Delegation of South Africa. It also associated itself with the statement made by the Delegation of Senegal on behalf of the African Group. The Delegation upheld the use of technology transfer in transforming IP in LDCs and developing countries. It looked forward to benefiting from this proposal.

182. The Delegation of China noted that many new elements had been incorporated in the revised proposal, including cooperation with other stakeholders, risk and mitigation strategies, review and evaluation, detailed budget allocation and an implementation timeframe. These elements would help in the successful implementation of the project. Technology transfer was very important. Strengthening WIPO's activities in this area would help developing countries, countries with economies in transition and LDCs to effectively use IP to promote social and economic development. Therefore, the Delegation supported the approval of the proposed project.

183. The Delegation of Namibia aligned itself with the statement made by the Delegation of Senegal on behalf of the African Group. Namibia had adopted a prosperity plan in which it had declared war against poverty. The proposed project would help in the achievement of that objective.

184. The Delegation of Tunisia welcomed the revised project proposal by the Delegation of South Africa. The Delegation highlighted its importance in terms of the expected impact on key players. The Industrial Property Office had provided inputs based on Tunisia's experience in implementing a pilot project in cooperation with WIPO. It involved the creation of four technology transfer offices. In this regard, the Delegation expressed Tunisia's interest in participating in the pilot project in order to build on its experience and to further develop transfer of technology activities for the benefit of its economy. The Delegation reiterated its full support for the project.

185. The Delegation of Indonesia, speaking on behalf of the Asia and the Pacific Group, believed the project would be useful for funders, developers, managers and users of IP in terms of raising awareness, training and skills development, in the field of IP management and transfer of technology. Thus, the Group supported the revised project proposal by the Delegation of South Africa. The Delegation, speaking in its national capacity, also supported the revised project. Indonesia was interested to participate in the project.

186. The Delegation of Ecuador expressed its interest in the project as it contained elements that touched upon the needs of developing countries, LDCs and countries with economies in transition. In terms of policies for improving and promoting innovation, Ecuador was making efforts to establish policies to support the science and technology sector, and promote economic and social development. The project proposed by the Delegation of South Africa was a useful tool for achieving these objectives. The Delegation supported the project and expressed Ecuador's interest to participate in the pilot project.

187. The Delegation of Brazil supported the proposal.

188. The Delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran noted that the proposal sought to enhance the capacity of actors involved in the innovation value chain in developing countries, LDCs and the countries with economies in transition to utilize and manage their IP system. The Delegation favored the approval of the proposal and looked forward to its implementation.

189. The Delegation of Egypt fully supported the project proposal and urged other Member States to do so.

190. The Delegation of Nigeria aligned itself with the statement made by the Delegation of Senegal on behalf of the African Group. It was conscious of the importance of this project in terms of the development needs of developing countries, LDCs and countries in transition. Therefore, the Delegation supported the proposal.

191. The Delegation of Burkina Faso noted that the project aimed to promote the effective use of IP and any associated IP rights as a tool for socio-economic development. This was important for countries like Burkina Faso. Africa faced numerous challenges. This was a possible solution for some of its problems. A lot of research and development was carried out in African countries. However, there was a huge gap between research and development and effective use of the results. Anything that could help to bridge that gap would be of value to them. Therefore, the Delegation supported the project proposal.

192. The Delegation of Colombia supported the proposal.

193. The Delegation of the Republic of Korea supported the proposal and expected more details to be provided during the session.

194. The Delegation of Morocco supported the proposal in view of its objectives and positive impact on all stakeholders.

195. The Delegation of Cuba supported the proposal.

196. The Delegation of Senegal also supported the proposal.

197. The Delegation of Lesotho stated that the discussion on technology transfer was pertinent. The current discussion was important, not only in the Committee, but also within other international organizations such as the WTO. The amendment to the TRIPS Agreement to address the public health concern had recently entered into force. This reaffirmed the belief that a development-oriented agenda could complement IP policies effectively and breed tangible, socio-economic and development-oriented results towards the attainment of the SDGs. The Delegation supported the proposal. Its implementation would benefit key players such as funders, managers of IP, developers and users, and SMEs. This would translate into inclusive economies given the pivotal role of SMEs in the innovation value chain. The Delegation took note of the intended delivery strategy. It had a commonality with Lesotho's intended and envisaged path towards developing a vibrant and inclusive IP sector in the economy. The Delegation supported the proposal and looked forward to a constructive discussion on this subject. Lesotho was committed to the TISC program, and aspired to be one of the four countries that would benefit from the proposed project.

198. The Delegation of Mauritania, speaking on behalf of the LDCs, stressed that they were in dire need of all forms of assistance. Technical assistance was urgently required. They also required access to affordable medicines and new technologies. Their populations represented one eighth of the world's population. Many suffered from poverty and deprivation. Illiteracy was very high. Four hundred fifty millions of their inhabitants lived below the poverty line. Therefore, the proposal by the Delegation of South Africa was relevant to their needs. Thus, they fully supported the project.

199. The Delegation of Benin fully supported the proposal. It would contribute to supporting the efforts of developing countries, particularly LDCs, in promoting the use of IP in various development sectors.

200. The Delegation of Cameroon associated itself with the statement made by the Delegation of Senegal on behalf of the African Group, and fully supported the proposal.

201. The Delegation of Japan, speaking on behalf of Group B, supported the project proposal and looked forward to the inclusion of additional information on the delivery strategy in the project document, as mentioned by the Delegation of the United States of America.

202. The Chair invited the Secretariat to respond to the comments from the floor.

203. The Secretariat (Mr. Czajkowski) referred to the request by the Delegation of the United States of America and Group B, and showed the Committee a text to expedite proceedings. The text included all the activities mentioned in the Secretariat's presentation. Paragraph 2.3.4 of the proposal originally only included the following, "Carrying out training activities to implement the training plans established for the four pilot countries, including as appropriate, on-site activities, distance learning, and participation in educational programs". The following was added in the revised text, "These capacity building activities would include practical training workshops on effective technology commercialization and IP management targeting the key role players, and possibly on-the-job training opportunities and internships. Opportunities for partnerships with IP management organizations, universities and other institutions with relevant capabilities will be explored with South-South cooperation as one means to maximize knowledge transfer, impact and longer term sustainability of these activities".

204. The Chair enquired as to whether the Committee could approve the project on the basis of the additional information provided by the Secretariat. It was approved given that there were no objections from the floor.

Consideration of document CDIP/19/7 – Proposal of the African Group Concerning the Biennial Organization of an International Conference on Intellectual Property and Development

205. The Chair invited the Delegation of Senegal to introduce the Proposal of the African Group Concerning the Biennial Organization of an International Conference on Intellectual Property and Development contained in document CDIP/19/7.

206. The Delegation of Senegal, speaking on behalf of the African Group, introduced the proposal. The Group recalled that an International Conference on IP and Development was organized in Geneva in April 2016. The organization of the Conference showed there was political will to create a parallel framework to discuss IP and development issues outside the committees. The Conference was convened in accordance with a decision taken at CDIP/14. A decision had been originally taken at CDIP/11. The decision included guidance for the Secretariat on the substantive and logistical aspects of the Conference and, *inter alia*, requested the Secretariat to prepare a factual report, summarizing the main discussions at the Conference. Its proposal was supported and driven by the highly positive outcomes of the Conference, as reflected in the Report contained in document CDIP/18/3 and the positive comments by Member States. The proposal sought to institutionalize the holding of an international conference on IP and development during each WIPO budget cycle within the framework of the DA. The organizational and logistical arrangements for the implementation of the proposal took into account those approved by Member States for the Conference organized in April 2016. The agreed terms of reference would be generally reused. Thus, the title of the conference would be "International Conference on IP and Development". The sub-title of the conference must flow from matters connected to IP and development and the practical ramifications. It should be approved during the first session of the CDIP in the first year of WIPO's budget biennium. The conference would be held every two years at WIPO headquarters in Geneva or in another country suggested by Member States. The duration of the conference would be two to three days. It should take place in the first half of the second

year of the WIPO budget biennium. The topics of the conference would focus on the theme of the sub-title agreed by Member States during the first session of the CDIP in the first year of WIPO's biennium. The Secretariat would be invited to plan the program for the conference and to draft the content for each theme in informal consultation with the group coordinators. The final program of the conference would be presented during the second session of the CDIP in the first year of the biennium for its information. Each session would include a moderator and three presenters for guided discussions, taking into account matters raised by the participants with the moderator and their observations before and during sessions. The working languages would be the six official languages of the UN. Simultaneous interpretation would be provided in these six languages. The Secretariat would be requested to select presenters based on geographical balance, appropriate expertise, and representation. Member States would be invited to submit names of possible presenters. The conference would be open to Member States, IGOs, NGOs and civil society. Participants may register online in advance or in person at the venue. A factual report would be produced by the Secretariat summarizing the main discussions at the conference. It would be presented to the CDIP at its last session in the second year of the WIPO biennium. A webpage containing detailed information on the conference would be created on WIPO's website. It would be used to freely make available all conference documentation, including the program, written versions of presentations, audio and video files recording the conference proceedings, and the report. The webpage would also be used to provide access to a live web cast of the proceedings. For the first conference, the following was proposed. The sub-title of the conference would be on the theme, "How to make use of the IP system". The Secretariat would draft the program in consultation with Member States. It could be discussed during the second session of the CDIP in 2018. The conference would be organized in the first half of 2019 at a venue to be chosen by Member States. The factual report would be presented at the second session of the CDIP in 2019. The Group hoped its proposal would be supported by all delegations.

207. The Delegation of Algeria supported the statement by the Delegation of Senegal on behalf of the African Group. The organization of a biennial international conference on IP and development would be beneficial, particularly for LDCs and Developing Countries. The discussions at the conference could benefit these countries, particularly in terms of exchanging experiences and best practices in the field of development. Thus, the Delegation supported the proposal.

208. The Delegation of Uganda referred to the sub-theme, "How to make use of the IP system", and stated that it was very timely. The topics should aim at exploring the ways in which IP could be effectively appreciated and managed in the entire IP value chain, including identification, generation, protection, commercialization, utilization, exploitation and enforcement of IP. The cost of using IP systems not effectively, and the benefits that occurred from the use of IP systems should also be explored. The Delegation supported the proposal and invited the Committee to approve the proposal.

209. The Delegation of Morocco stated that the proposal would help to institutionalize discussions on this issue. It would also assist the Organization to implement the SDGs. The Delegation supported the proposal because it would bring together experts, the private sector, NGOs and others to discuss IP and development issues and important conclusions would be drawn. The Delegation invited Member States to take part in the initiative because it was a collective initiative and would assist in the implementation of SDGs.

210. The Delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran supported the proposal and the terms of reference contained therein. It was drafted in a mature way. As the subtitle of the conference was subject to ratification by the CDIP, issues in the area of IP and development as well as the priorities and concerns of Member States could be considered and addressed during the

international conference. The Delegation hoped the proposal would be approved in the current session.

211. The Delegation of Colombia, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported the proposal by the African Group. The Group recognized the contribution of such conferences to discussions on IP and development issues. In the last session, the Group had expressed its interest in the continuation of the conference. The Committee recognized the important results of the Conference held on April 7 and 8, 2016. The proposal by the African Group, “seeks to institutionalize the holding of an international conference on intellectual property and development during each WIPO budget cycle, incorporating it into the parallel program of the organization, within the framework of the DA and following on from the seminars organized”. Accordingly, adoption of the proposal would be a step in the right direction. It would also contribute to the implementation of the Committee’s mandate.

212. The Delegation of Lesotho supported the proposal. The proposed conference would provide a platform wherein the work of the Committee would be even further realized. Furthermore, it would provide a stage for key players and practitioners to share experiences in the quest to achieve tangible developments in the field of IP. Thus, it would be of immense benefit to members. The Delegation also took note of the proposed webpage through which information to all conference documentation would be made freely available, including access to a live webcast of the proceedings. This was necessary for information dissemination.

213. The Delegation of Indonesia, speaking on behalf of the Asia and the Pacific Group, noted that the proposal was supported and driven by the highly positive outcomes of the Conference organized on the same topic in Geneva on April 7 and 8, 2016, as evidenced by the report in document CDIP/18/3, and by the positive comments of Member States for the organization of the said conference. If adopted, it would institutionalize the holding of an international conference on IP and development during the WIPO budget cycle. It would be incorporated into the parallel program of the Organization, within the framework of the DA and following on from the seminars organized. Therefore, the Group fully supported the proposal and invited the Committee to approve it in this session.

214. The Delegation of Brazil supported the proposal. The biennial conference was important to refresh ideas in the Committee. It would put delegations in contact with experts working on the various topics, and help the Committee to know what was going on in the world in terms of development and IP. Hence, these conferences were important and they would assist the Committee to come with new ideas and projects.

215. The Delegation of Nigeria aligned itself with the position of the African Group. The proposal was timely as the CDIP’s mandate was getting increasingly important in defining the strategic role of WIPO in the UN system in the context of development issues. In addition to strengthening the mechanism for shared understanding of issues concerning the interplay between IP and development, a conference of this nature would facilitate a convergence of views on critical items in the Committee’s agenda. The Committee would also benefit from the broad-based inputs of a wider array of experts. This would transcend the composition of the Committee. The details of the proposed methodology for implementation provided a good basis for positive consideration of the proposal by Member States. Consequently, the Delegation supported the proposal and urged the Committee to approve it.

216. The Delegation of Tunisia believed the proposal would help improve exchanges between Member States on issues linked to IP and development, and strengthen international cooperation in this regard. The conference would also allow delegations to deepen their understanding and move discussions forward on issues of common interest. Hence, the

Delegation fully supported the proposal and hoped other members would also do so in order for the proposal to be approved in this session.

217. The Delegation of Malta, speaking on behalf of the EU and its member states, recalled that the International Conference on IP and Development held in April of 2016 focused on social, economic and cultural aspects of the role of IP for development. At the same time, it addressed the current and future challenges of IP systems. The Conference emphasized the application and exploitation of IP in different areas, and the necessity for raising awareness on IP. It demonstrated that each state was capable of designing its own IP regime in compliance with national conditions and specificities. The EU and its member states were supportive of organizing a conference on IP and development, where there was a need and interest to be met. At this stage, they were not convinced of the need to hold a new conference, and to bind the Organization to holding a perpetual series of biennial conferences.

218. The Delegation of Namibia supported the proposal on holding a conference biennially.

219. The Delegation of Georgia, speaking on behalf of CEBS, was interested to discuss the proposal in more depth. The Group underlined that it would be in a position of supporting the organization of the conference on IP and development after carefully studying and considering the merit, objective and terms of reference for organizing the conference. That said, the Group looked forward to hearing more on the benefits of organizing such a conference on a regular basis and would constructively engage in discussions on any specific proposal for a conference.

220. The Delegation of Chile supported the statement made by the Delegation of Colombia on behalf of GRULAC. Hence, the Delegation believed this initiative would provide an excellent opportunity to promote exchanges and to learn from the experiences of Member States with regard to best practices and success stories in using IP to promote development.

221. The Delegation of Burkina Faso had looked carefully at the content of the proposal. It found the proposal useful. The Delegation fully supported the proposal and the African Group's statement in this regard.

222. The Delegation of Egypt fully supported the proposal and urged other Member States to also do so. It took into account the need to balance exclusive rights with considerations that must be taken onboard in development strategies. The African Group had revised the project to take into account the needs of Africa on one hand, and budgetary and financial considerations on the other.

223. The Delegation of Japan, speaking on behalf of Group B, noted that the proposal lacked budgetary information. The current proposal also did not contain elements such as merit, objectives, terms of reference, venue, program, topics and speakers that would be subject to approval by Member States. The Group recalled that it took the Committee five years to negotiate the details of the 2016 International Conference on IP and Development. What was supposed to be a rather simple process, after the Committee agreed on the terms of reference of the conference, turned out to be slow and painful negotiations on previously agreed elements. The CDIP was a good platform to discuss these topics. There was no reason why issues pertaining to IP and development could not be discussed during CDIP meetings. The Group did not support the current proposal for a perpetual biennial conference. In general, any such event should happen during the CDIP week, not in addition to the ten days allocated to the Committee each year. There should not be significant financial implications. It should also not exceed the human resource capacity of the Secretariat. With that understanding, the Group noted that the African Group proposal suggested that the next conference should be on how the IP system worked. The Group would like to hear about the benefits of organizing a conference on this theme, including its objective and the needs it aimed to address. A discussion on the

current proposal should help the Committee to assess whether a conference was indeed the most suitable means to address the needs of Member States, or whether it may be more effective to present information on how the IP system worked in the CDIP's regular meetings.

224. The Delegation of Cameroon stated that the conference would provide an opportunity to look more carefully at IP and development issues. The Delegation fully supported the proposal.

225. The Delegation of Indonesia supported the proposal. It saw the benefits of the International Conference held last year. These would be extended through adoption of the proposal by the African Group. The Delegation took note of the comments made by other Member States and regional groups on the proposal. The proposal should be supported for several reasons. It would add value to CDIP proceedings. The international conference would provide a platform for Member States and other stakeholders to promote exchanges, share experiences, strengthen cooperation and build an international IP system that would be of benefit to all. It would provide a platform to address topics that were difficult to address in the CDIP itself such as how IP drove economic growth and competitiveness, how IP helped to generate practical solutions to global challenges and how a balanced IP system encouraged innovation that was critical for economic development. The conference would provide a platform to discuss how a balanced IP system could contribute to development and economic growth. Therefore, the Delegation fully supported the proposal.

226. The Delegation of South Africa aligned itself with the statement made by the Delegation of Senegal on behalf of the African Group. As noted by some other delegations, the proposal was based on the recognition of the utility of the International Conference on IP and Development organized in April 2016. Many developing countries were currently formulating or reviewing their IP policies. A biennial WIPO conference on IP and development would offer an opportunity for a regular reflection on how the IP system could best assist developing countries and LDCs to achieve their wider developmental objectives. Therefore, the idea of a regular conference on IP and development would be of assistance to WIPO and the Committee in particular.

227. The Delegation of the United Arab Emirates supported the statement made by the Delegation of Indonesia on behalf of the Asia and the Pacific Group. The Delegation attended the Conference in April 2016 and noted the positive outcomes. It facilitated discussions on issues related to IP and development with the participation of experts and other interested parties. The convening of a biennial conference would help Member States to review challenges and developments in the field of IP.

228. The Delegation of Senegal supported the statement it made on behalf of the African Group. The initiative would provide a useful opportunity for Member States and other stakeholders to learn more about IP and development issues, and the impact would be positive.

229. The Delegation of Pakistan fully supported the proposal. The biennial conference would be a step in the right direction to link IP and development. The sharing of best practices on IP and development should be included in the proposed theme on how to make use of the system. This would help participants to build on the strengths offered by best practices and pave the way to chalk out a clear plan for achieving the objectives set out in the context of IP and development.

230. The Delegation of Mauritania supported the proposal.

231. The Delegation of the United States of America fully supported the statement made by the Delegation of Japan on behalf of Group B. It always welcomed a good productive discussion on the important role of IP in economic and social development. However, it seemed unnecessary

to hold a two to three-day standalone event every two years to discuss the same topics that were discussed for five days, twice a year, during the CDIP sessions. Resources, both monetary and human, would not be well spent. However, it could consider half a day or a one day long discussions during CDIP meetings where speakers could be invited to address certain topics. For example, the WTO had organized a series of productive exchanges on IP and innovation. Some of the topics mentioned by the Delegation of Indonesia could be considered. Member States could submit topics of interest and the Secretariat would select speakers, preferably with practical, real world IP experience to address the topics. A discussion by Member States could follow such presentations. This type of exchange would be more beneficial, productive and efficient.

232. The Delegation of Belarus aligned itself with the views expressed by the Delegation of the United States of America and Group B. It was important to look at two aspects. It was clear the Conference organized last year was successful. However, in the last CDIP session, a lot of time was spent discussing the list of speakers. It was important to assess the efforts required to organize such a conference and how effective it would be.

233. The Delegation of the Czech Republic supported the statements made by Group B, CEBS, the EU and its member states, and the Delegation of the United States of America. The proposal looked rather ambitious. A detailed framework for the conference was proposed. However, there was no information on the content and objective of the event. The Delegation agreed with the statements made by the delegations of Indonesia and Brazil that the CDIP could benefit from such an event in terms of further work as the Committee needed to follow the development of these issues around the world. Therefore, a one day international forum could be organized during the CDIP sessions. The Delegation would like to discuss this with the proponents of the proposal. The event should be devoted to a debate among academic experts. A high level political event would not be beneficial for the future work of the Committee. The event should concentrate on one topic, and not all the socio-economic aspects of IP and development. For example, problems concerning the implementation of SDGs or other related matters.

234. The Chair noted that some delegations spoke in favor of the proposal. Other delegations expressed a different view. Some had raised questions and made counter proposals. Thus, the Committee was not in a position to take a decision. A consensus solution may be possible. There was still time to hold informal consultations to explore that possibility. The Secretariat would inform delegations of the time and place for the consultations on this issue in due course. Meanwhile, he encouraged delegations to try and find common ground and a consensus solution in order for a decision to be adopted by the end of this session.

Consideration of document CDIP/12/5 and CDIP/1/10 – WIPO General Assembly Decision on CDIP Related Matters

235. The Chair recalled that the WIPO GA had approved the request to allow the CDIP to continue the discussion on the “implementation of the CDIP mandate” and the “implementation of the Coordination Mechanisms” during CDIP/18 and CDIP/19 and to report back and make recommendations on the two matters to the GA this year. He had requested delegations to come up with new ideas and proposals in order to achieve progress on this issue, which should be finalized and closed. However, a consensus solution was required before it could be closed. He understood from his consultations with the regional groups that they were all ready to adopt a constructive approach in the discussion on these two issues. He counted on their cooperation and flexibility in this regard.

236. The Delegation of Colombia, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, reiterated the need for the Committee to discuss the options contained in Appendix II of the Chair's Summary for CDIP/17. Last year, the WIPO GA approved the Committee's request to continue discussing the "implementation of the CDIP mandate" and the "implementation of the Coordination Mechanisms" in CDIP/18 and CDIP/19 and to report back and make recommendations on the two matters to the GA this year. Appendix II of the said document was of value as it contained the positions and proposals of groups and countries resulting from many hours of debate and discussion. The Group reiterated its commitment to reach a common understanding on this item in the CDIP. In order for a decision to be made, all regional groups must make a collective effort to be flexible. A proposal by the Chair on this matter would be a way to take a step forward. The Group assured the Chair of its support in these matters and looked forward to his initiatives and proposals in this regard.

237. The Delegation of Indonesia, speaking on behalf of the Asia and the Pacific Group, recalled that the CDIP was established by the WIPO GA with a mandate to develop a work-program for implementing the 45 adopted 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. The Committee had done very well with regard to the first pillar. Some work still needed to be done to ensure that the second pillar was fully operational. However, there was an urgent need for all Member States and Regional Groups to come to a solution on how the Committee should address and implement the third pillar of its mandate. The Group reiterated its position and appealed to all Regional Groups and Member States to work towards a solution in respect of the WIPO GA decision on CDIP related matters, including the Coordination Mechanism, an essential element in the implementation of DARs. The Group took note of Appendix II of the Chair's Summary of the CDIP/17. This was one of the few documents that the Committee had as the basis for further discussion. The Group was ready to be constructive and to present solutions on this matter in order for the Committee to close this agenda item with a solution that would satisfy all delegations.

238. The Delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran recalled that in 2007, the WIPO GA adopted 45 recommendations of the DA and established the CDIP to implement these recommendations. The mandate given to the CDIP contained three pillars. After ten years, it was essential for the Committee to review its activities with regard to the fulfillment of its mandate. With regard to the first pillar, the Committee had developed a work program for implementing the DARs. The Director General also prepared an annual report on implementation of the DARs. The implementation of the second pillar had not been addressed adequately by the Committee. The Delegation reiterated its concerns with regard to the Coordination Mechanism. Member States had yet to come up with a resolution on the bodies that should form part of the Coordination Mechanism. The DA should be an integral part of the work of all WIPO committees. The CWS and PBC were important committees for the realization of DA goals. The Delegation hoped this issue would be settled in a proper manner in order for the Coordination Mechanism to be fully operational. It was regrettable that Member States were unable to resolve longstanding issues, including the Coordination Mechanism and the third pillar of the CDIP's mandate. The implementation of the third pillar of the mandate should be fulfilled through a new CDIP agenda item to allow discussion on important links between IP and development. It was important for the Committee to focus on the implementation of DARs in their entirety. These issues were highlighted in the Independent Review of the Implementation of the DARs. Recommendation 2 of the Independent Review was on the importance of resolving outstanding issues related to the Committee's mandate and the implementation of the Coordination Mechanism. After ten years of discussing DARs in the CDIP, Member States should introduce a higher level of debate to address the mandate of the Committee by establishing a new agenda item on CDIP and development. The Delegation assured the Chair of its constructive engagement to facilitate a fruitful outcome.

239. The Delegation of Senegal, speaking on behalf of the African Group, recalled that its position had been repeated on many occasions in the Committee. The Group remained flexible and welcomed any initiative with a view to producing a satisfactory outcome for all Member States. It was prepared to be involved in any process that would deal with this matter in a positive manner in order for a solution to be found.

240. The Delegation of Malta, speaking on behalf of the EU and its member states, believed that the CDIP was addressing a broad range of development-related issues. Thus, it had fully delivered on its mandate to discuss IP and development. The discussions in this session included the DG's Report, an evaluation report, a progress report, a new project proposal on technology transfer, as well as WIPO's contribution to the implementation of SDGs. The CDIP was the primary and most relevant body to deal with these issues. On the Coordination Mechanism, the EU and its member states reiterated their position with regard to the meaning of the term "relevant WIPO bodies". Not all WIPO bodies were relevant for the purpose of the Coordination Mechanism. A standing agenda item on the DA was not needed in order for the Committee to deal with IP and development issues, and the implementation of the DA within WIPO bodies.

241. The Delegation of Japan, speaking on behalf of Group B, noted that the Committee had been discussing specific issues on IP and development in the last 17 sessions. The Independent Review should assist the Committee to close this matter. In particular, Recommendation 2 was clear that the CDIP should resolve outstanding issues related to the mandate of the Committee and the implementation of the Coordination Mechanism. The review covered the CDIP's mandate and Coordination Mechanism in Finding 4, which confirmed that the CDIP had been playing a central role in implementing and monitoring the DARs. In addition, conclusion 2 stated that the principles and objectives of the DA had been guiding the work of WIPO through discussions undertaken in the CDIP and other WIPO bodies. Conclusion 3 stated that the CDIP played an efficient role in the implementation and monitoring of the DARs. The review was clear that further expansion of the Coordination Mechanism to other relevant bodies was neither helpful nor necessary to fulfill the DARs. The Group strongly supported the call to end further discussions on the Coordination Mechanism and an additional agenda item on the CDIP. These were now redundant. The Committee should heed the call in the final paragraph of Finding 4 of the Independent Review and devote adequate time to discuss the sustainability of the completed and mainstreamed projects.

242. The Delegation of Georgia, speaking on behalf of CEBS, recalled that the Committee had been discussing issues related to IP and development in the last 17 sessions in line with its given mandate. With regard to the proposal to include an additional CDIP standing agenda item, the Group had difficulty in identifying how this could add value as the Committee was discussing relevant issues concerning IP and development. The existing agenda items allowed for different discussions to take place on a wide range of topics related to IP and development. The Coordination Mechanism was discussed in many CDIP sessions. The views of Member States differed on the definition of the term "relevant WIPO bodies". In its view, not all WIPO bodies were relevant for the Coordination Mechanism. The relevant WIPO bodies were already reporting on their development-oriented activities. The Committee's role was to address IP and development. Therefore, the Group would like to see the value of discussing the new proposed agenda item. It preferred to avoid spending time on the same discussion.

243. The Delegation of Indonesia referred to the value of a standing agenda item on IP and development, the third pillar of the Committee's mandate. Recommendation 1 of the Independent Review stated that the CDIP should introduce a higher level of debate. The Delegation agreed that the Committee could discuss IP and development. However, the inclusion of a standing agenda item on the third pillar of the CDIP's mandate would enable the Committee to hold a higher level of debate to address emerging needs and WIPO's work on

issues related to IP rights and development. The Committee had the potential to facilitate an exchange of strategies and best practices by Member States to address IP and development concerns, including how IP could actually contribute to development and economic growth, as seen in most developed countries today. Without this agenda item, the Committee would just be discussing reports on implementation of the DARs. Thus, significant value would be added and the Committee would reach its full potential as a platform for Member States to actually discuss how IP could really contribute to development. The Delegation believed there was room for a solution that would satisfy all members. More time should be given to discussing this item in order for a solution to be found in this session.

244. The Delegation of Brazil noted that delegations were reiterating known positions. A lot of time had been spent on why a permanent agenda item would add value to the discussions in the CDIP. The Delegation suggested that the Chair could gather the representatives of the Regional Groups, and the main interested parties for informal consultations. Perhaps a compromise could be found in an informal setting.

245. The Delegation of Egypt believed informal consultations were required to find a solution. The Delegation was flexible in order for a compromise to be reached that would satisfy all parties.

246. The Chair noted the need for further consultations to take place on this issue. He referred to the suggestion by the delegations of Indonesia and Brazil for specific proposals to be provided by the Chair and stated that it was his intention to do so. He would propose a text on the two items in an attempt to find a solution. Informal consultations would be held on Friday after the agenda for this session was completed. The Secretariat would inform the Committee of the time and place for the consultations. That would be the final attempt to find a solution. He urged delegations to propose texts to support his efforts. He counted on their constructive spirit and flexibility to move forward on this subject. The decision on this item would be postponed until Friday. The Secretariat would distribute the Chair's text tomorrow for consideration by Member States. The text would serve as the basis for the informal consultations on Friday. This was agreed given that there were no objections from the floor.

Consideration of documents CDIP/19/3 and CDIP/18/7 – Report on the Recommendations of the Independent Review of the Implementation of the Development Agenda Recommendations.

247. The Chair invited the Secretariat to introduce the subject.

248. The Secretariat (Mr. Baloch) informed the Committee that the documents under consideration were CDIP/18/7 and CDIP/19/3. The former contained the report of the Independent Review of the DA. The 2010 GA adopted the "Coordination Mechanism and Monitoring, Assessing and Reporting Modalities, approved by the Committee 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 report was considered by the Committee in its previous session. A decision which included two elements was taken. First, it requested the Secretariat to provide a response to the recommendations addressed to it in the report. Second, it invited Member States to provide written contributions on any of the recommendations contained in the report. Annex I of document CDIP/19/3 contained the Secretariat's response. It addressed Recommendations 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12. In its response, the Secretariat provided background information and assessed the feasibility of implementing each of those recommendations. Some of them were addressed to the Secretariat and Member States. In those cases, Member States had to discuss their own response. Annex II of the document contained a contribution provided by the Delegation of Turkey on behalf of Group B.

249. The Delegation of Indonesia, speaking on behalf of the Asia and the Pacific Group, welcomed the recommendations in the report of the Independent Review. The recommendations called for improvements in WIPO's performance and work on implementation of the DA. A process was set out to take action on the recommendations. Implementation of the DA was a long term process. The DA Recommendations were part of that process. In this context, the Group recalled the 2010 GA decision which stated that upon consideration of the review, the CDIP may decide on a possible further review. The Group urged Member States to make further submissions on the findings, conclusions, and recommendations contained in the report of the Independent Review. The Committee should allow for this.

250. The Delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran took note of the Secretariat's Report on the Recommendations of the Independent Review. The recommendations included in the report on the Independent Review provided an appropriate basis, among others, to address the work of WIPO and the CDIP in implementing the DA Recommendations. As implementation of the DA Recommendations was a long term process, it was essential to conduct future reviews on a regular basis. The Delegation noted that document CDIP/19/3 only contained inputs from the Secretariat and Group B. It should not be considered as inputs from all stakeholders. It hoped to see submissions by other stakeholders with regard to the Independent Review. Recommendation 3 stated the following; "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". The Delegation would like the Secretariat to provide more information on how the role of the Development Agenda Coordination Division (DACD) could be strengthened in this regard. Recommendation 5 stated *inter alia* the following; "WIPO should consider linking DARs to Expected Results contained in the Program and Budget, wherever it is possible". In its response, the Secretariat stated the following; "in the Secretariat's view, the approach currently in place satisfies the intent behind this recommendation". The Delegation stated that it was important for the Secretariat to submit concrete proposals on how to improve links between the DARs and the Expected Results in the Program and Budget. In this regard, it highlighted the following from Conclusion 6 of the Independent Review; "DARs have not been directly linked to Expected Results in the RBM framework which has created a deficit in the DARs implementation". The Delegation referred to Group B's comments on Recommendation 2 and its support for the call to end further discussion on the Coordination Mechanism. The Delegation believed the report did not mention that the discussion should be ended. Conclusion 2 of the report acknowledged the following; "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". In this regard, Recommendation 2 stated the following; "Member States should take measures to resolve the outstanding issues related to the mandate of the Committee and the implementation of the Coordination Mechanism".

251. The Delegation of China believed the Independent Review was an important step in the implementation of the "Coordination Mechanism and Monitoring, Assessing and Reporting Modalities". The report of the Independent Review included 12 recommendations. The Delegation reiterated its views on the recommendations. It agreed with Recommendation 1. With the adoption of the 2030 Agenda, the WIPO DA had entered a new era. The Organization was facing new emerging issues such as its interface with the SDGs and further facilitation of technology transfer. Therefore, it was necessary to introduce a higher level debate in the CDIP. In addition, broader and higher level debates were required due to the important and comprehensive nature of the issues. The Delegation was in favor of inviting experts from capitals in order for the debates to be more specialized. Second, the Delegation also supported Recommendation 3. The Independent Review was a successful example of the implementation of the "Coordination Mechanism and Monitoring, Assessing and Reporting Modalities". WIPO should continue to ensure effective coordination, monitoring, reporting, evaluation and mainstreaming of the implementation of the DA Recommendations. The role of the DACD in

coordinating DA implementation was also crucial and should be strengthened. Third, the Delegation was in favor of Recommendation 4. It had repeatedly underscored the links between SDG targets and IP, especially with regard to WIPO's work. The Organization should strengthen its role in the implementation of SDGs. This view was gradually becoming important in the CDIP. Other UN development agencies had unique expertise in implementing SDGs. Apart from independent work, WIPO could also invite other agencies to share their expertise and experiences to support the implementation of DA Recommendations and in advancing the implementation of the SDGs. Fourth, the Delegation reiterated its support for Recommendations 6, 8 and 9. Due to the highly specialized nature of IP, it was necessary to enhance the participation of national-based experts in the work of the CDIP. Modularizing the development of new projects would help to carry them forward. Enhanced collaboration with other UN agencies in respect of project implementation was also required. WIPO should recruit more local IP experts to facilitate domestic coordination and the sustainability of projects in beneficiary countries. Fifth, the Delegation generally welcomed Recommendation 7. It hoped that the Secretariat would submit proposals with estimated costs for establishing a database of the lessons learned and best practices identified in the course of implementing DA projects. Sixth, the Delegation strongly supported Recommendation 12 on strengthening information dissemination. The Delegation made some suggestions in this regard. First, WIPO's senior management could visit interested Member States and local seminars on the DA could be organized to remind the public that apart from the IP services provided under the PCT, Madrid and Hague systems, WIPO was also involved in facilitating development and had carried out a substantial amount of work in this regard. Second, managers of relevant WIPO departments could publish articles in important national publications in interested Member States to introduce the history and relevant work of the DA. Third, more project outcomes could be translated into the six official UN languages. The Delegation was confident that the role and impact of the WIPO DA would be enhanced through the joint efforts of the Secretariat and Member States.

252. The Delegation of Georgia, speaking on behalf of CEBS, noted that implementation of the DA implementation was largely consistent with the expectations of Member States and other beneficiaries. The Group supported the Secretariat's response to recommendations 3, 7, 8, 9 and 10. It looked forward to discussing the other recommendations and to hearing the views of other Member States.

253. The Delegation of Senegal, speaking on behalf of the African Group, took note of the documents under consideration. The Committee's mandate and the WIPO GA decision on this matter should be kept in mind. Therefore, the Group would like to extend the debate to a broader forum that should be open to other stakeholders. This would enable the Committee to obtain more information on the issues.

254. The Delegation of Malta, speaking on behalf of the EU and its member states, noted and supported the comments submitted by Group B. With regard to Recommendation 5 which stated that WIPO should consider linking DA Recommendations to Expected Results contained in the Program and Budget, the EU and its member states agreed with the Secretariat's response that on the basis of the existing Program and Budget, Program Performance Reports and the revised Medium Term Strategic Plan (MTSP), WIPO already had the necessary tools to monitor the integration of the DA Recommendations into its work. With regard to Recommendation 11, the EU and its member states shared the Secretariat's view that the approach currently in place satisfied the intent behind this recommendation. They agreed with Group B that systematic approval of each recommendation in the evaluation reports was unduly burdensome. In relation to Recommendation 3, the EU and its member states supported the importance of continuing to ensure effective coordination, monitoring, reporting and evaluation of the implementation of the DARs. They also supported the Secretariat's response which stated that the implementation of this recommendation was ongoing. On Recommendation 7, the EU and its member states fully supported the formulation of new project proposals based on

national needs, and sharing lessons learned and best practices from successfully implemented DA projects and activities. They looked forward to discussing the best way forward in this regard, noting that there could be some weaknesses and costs in the database approach. The EU and its member states supported the Secretariat's response in relation to Recommendations 8, 9 and 10. With regard to Recommendation 12 and the dissemination of information, they believed this was covered under Recommendations 6 and 7.

255. The Delegation of Japan, speaking on behalf of Group B, recalled that in the last session, the Committee took note of the Report contained in document CDIP/18/7 and acknowledged that the recommendations contained therein were addressed to different actors involved in the implementation of the DA, namely, Member States, the Committee and the Secretariat. The Committee agreed on the need to continue considering those recommendations. Accordingly, the Committee requested the Secretariat to provide at its next session a report on the recommendations addressed to it. It was also decided that Member States should provide to the Secretariat written contributions on any of the recommendations contained in the Report by February 28, 2017. In this regard, the Group submitted its written contribution in a timely manner. This was contained in Annex II of document CDIP/19/3. The Group reiterated that the implementation of the DA Recommendations had been largely consistent with the expectations of Member States, stakeholders and other intended beneficiaries, and the thematic project-based approach was a useful modality to speed-up the implementation of the DA Recommendations. The Group believed the Independent Review had reviewed the CDIP's mandate to conduct its review. It was content that the Secretariat had identified appropriate recommendations to take forward and agreed that there were elements where WIPO already satisfied the intent of the recommendation. The Group looked forward to discussing elements of the recommendations addressed to the CDIP as well as those directed to Member States. It noted the Secretariat's commitment to further ensure the implementation of Recommendations 3, 8, 9 and 10. The Group invited Member States to share their views at this session on how they intended to implement recommendations directed to Member States, in particular, Recommendation 6 which encouraged Member States to enhance coordination between Geneva based missions and IP offices; Recommendation 7 which encouraged Member States to propose new projects; and Recommendation 12 which encouraged Member States to find ways to better disseminate information on the DA and its implementation.

256. The Delegation of Chile valued the Secretariat's Report on the Recommendations of the Independent Review. The Delegation referred to Recommendation 5 and stated that it was important to keep in mind that the DA should be taken into account in all of WIPO's work, and not only the work of certain committees or bodies. Therefore, the Delegation supported any measures to ensure that development was effectively integrated throughout the Organization's work. With regard to Recommendation 7, it was important for the Secretariat to play an active role in identifying successful projects and establishing a reporting mechanism on lessons learned and best practices. The proposed database could be considered in discussions on possible improvements to the technical assistance webpage. With regard to Recommendation 12, a table could be included on the same webpage to provide information on developments in the implementation of the DA. The Secretariat could also provide two summaries per year on activities related to the DA.

257. The Chair invited the Secretariat to respond to the questions from the floor.

258. The Secretariat (Mr. Baloch) noted there were only a few questions addressed to the Secretariat. These would be addressed at a later stage, perhaps by the Deputy Director General, Mr. Mario Matus. Meanwhile, the Secretariat informed the Committee that it was requested by the Chair to update him on how to proceed with this document. The Secretariat had briefed the Chair on what had been done so far, and what could be done from now on. The Secretariat recalled that in the last session, the Committee considered the Report of the

Independent Review. It contained 12 recommendations. At that time, delegations did not want to go through each recommendation. Some observed that the Secretariat may already be contributing to some recommendations. Hence, the Secretariat was requested to provide a response to recommendations that were addressed to it. The Committee also told the Secretariat not to start implementing any of the recommendations until such time when the Committee had gone through the recommendations and ascertained their status. The requested documentation was on the table. The Secretariat looked forward to the Committee's decisions on each recommendation in order to proceed.

259. The Chair proposed going through the recommendations one by one to determine the way forward on each of them. He began with Recommendation 1.

260. The Delegation of Japan, speaking on behalf of Group B, referred to its comments in Annex II of document CDIP/19/3. The Group supported an exchange of strategies and best practices among Member States on their experiences in addressing IP and development issues. Such sharing sessions should be conducted during Committee meetings, on a regular basis, as determined by Member States. The Group understood "a higher level debate" to mean an increased focus on experiences in addressing IP and development issues at the Committee level. It believed that such debate would be most useful if conducted with the participation of experts from capitals with direct knowledge and involvement in such emerging issues.

261. The Delegation of Indonesia stated that it usually highlighted Recommendation 1 in discussions concerning the GA decision on CDIP related matters. The Delegation referred to the following in Recommendation 1, "a higher level debate to address emerging needs and to discuss the work of the Organization on new emerging issues related to IPRs". This was closely related to the third pillar of the mandate given to the Committee by the GA. Thus, in order to fulfill Recommendation 1, there should be a solution to ensure that the third pillar of the Committee's mandate would be addressed accordingly.

262. The Chair enquired as to whether the Committee accepted the additional element put forward by the Delegation of Indonesia in respect of Recommendation 1.

263. The Delegation of the United States of America was not clear as to what the Committee was adopting. If the Committee was adopting the third pillar of the CDIP's mandate as part of Recommendation 1, the Delegation stated that it was not ready to do so. That was an issue the Committee should be discussing separately. The Delegation pointed out that in the last session it had requested Mr. Gupta, one of the reviewers who presented the report, to clarify what was meant by the term "higher level debate". The reviewer stated that it referred to discussions within the CDIP on emerging issues in IP and development. The Committee could refer to the transcript for the last session in this regard. He did not mean anything other than discussing the issues in the CDIP. The Committee had been doing so for ten years.

264. The Chair understood there was no agreement on this recommendation. Recommendation 1 would be considered in the informal consultations. He turned to Recommendation 2.

265. The Delegation of Indonesia agreed with Recommendation 2. On Recommendation 1, the Delegation clarified that it just wanted to put on record how it read the term "higher level debate" in Recommendation 1. Thus, it was not in the position to not accept Recommendation 1.

266. The Chair noted that the Delegation of Indonesia had not suggested any changes to Recommendation 1. Thus, he enquired as to whether the Committee could adopt Recommendation 1.

267. The Delegation of the United States of America underlined the need for a common understanding of a recommendation before it could be adopted. There did not appear to be a common understanding of the term “higher level debate” in Recommendation 1. The adoption of this recommendation could be put on hold until such an understanding was reached.

268. The Chair returned to Recommendation 2.

269. The Delegation of Japan, speaking on behalf of Group B, strongly supported the recommendation that outstanding issues related to the mandate of the Committee and the implementation of the Coordination Mechanism must be resolved. The report covered the CDIP’s mandate and Coordination Mechanism in Finding 4. In addition, Conclusion 2 contended that “the principles and objectives of the DA have been guiding the work of WIPO through CDIP and other WIPO bodies”. Conclusion 3 stated that the CDIP played an efficient role in the implementation and monitoring of the DARs. The Group believed the report was clear that further expansion of the Coordination Mechanism to other bodies was neither helpful nor necessary to fulfill the DA Recommendations. It strongly supported the call to end further discussions on the Coordination Mechanism and heed the call in the final paragraph of Finding 4 to devote adequate time to discuss the sustainability of completed and mainstreamed projects.

270. The Delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran referred to Recommendation 2 and stated that the Coordination Mechanism was not adequately addressed in previous CDIP sessions. The third pillar of the Committee’s mandate was also not touched upon. Hence, the Delegation supported the approval of Recommendation 2 and looked forward to its implementation in future sessions.

271. The Delegation of Brazil highlighted that views continued to differ. Therefore, a decision should not be adopted as yet.

272. The Chair stated that Recommendation 2 would be discussed in the informal consultations. He turned to Recommendation 3.

273. The Delegation of Japan, speaking on behalf of Group B, referred to its comments in Annex II of document CDIP/19/3. The Group noted the importance of continuing to ensure effective coordination, monitoring, reporting and evaluation of the implementation of the DA Recommendations and encouraged the Secretariat to continue its efforts in this respect. It also noted that these issues seemed to be also addressed in Recommendations 6 and 7.

274. The Delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran took note of the Secretariat’s comments on Recommendation 3. The Delegation referred to the last sentence of Recommendation 3 stating that “The role of the DACD in coordinating the DA implementation should be strengthened”. It would like the Secretariat to provide more information on how this would be addressed.

275. The Secretariat (Mr. Matus) explained that WIPO was a single organization and the DACD was a focal point for DA issues. There was a minimum number of staff in the Division. When there was a new activity to deal with, the Division checked to see which other areas of the organization could offer assistance. For instance, when a new project was approved by the CDIP, the Division checked if there were internal resources to assist in implementation. If not, an expert would be recruited to assist in that regard. This was an ongoing practice.

276. The Chair enquired as to whether the Committee could approve Recommendation 3. It was approved given that there were no objections from the floor. He turned to Recommendation 4.

277. The Delegation of Japan, speaking on behalf of Group B, referred to its comments in Annex II of document CDIP/19/3. The Group stated that Recommendation 4 covered the work already underway in the CDIP. In particular, and subsequent to the publication of the Report contained in document CDIP/18/7, the Group highlighted that the CDIP was able to agree, after many years of discussions, that the Secretariat would provide an annual report on its activities regarding the SDGs. The Group believed this approach would move the Committee forward on this important issue. It also noted that this recommendation overlapped with Recommendation 1.

278. The Chair enquired as to whether Group B could support Recommendation 4.

279. The Delegation of Japan, speaking on behalf of Group B, stated that it could.

280. The Chair stated that Recommendation 4 was adopted given there were no objections from the floor. He turned to Recommendation 5.

281. The Delegation of Japan, speaking on behalf of Group B, referred to its comments in Annex II of document CDIP/19/3. The Group did not support Recommendation 5 as DA Recommendations provided strategic guidance, a guidance that was already systematically integrated in WIPO's work. They did not provide measurable results that would be required to give consideration to the viability of such a recommendation within the results-based management system. The Group noted from Finding 7 that the DA Recommendations and their principles were already mostly integrated into the Program and Budget cycle. In addition, Finding 7 underlined that the Program Performance Report already contained a section under each program outlining the role and contribution to the implementation of the DA, and the DA was mainstreamed and integrated into the Overview of Progress. In particular, the Group noted in Finding 10 that "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". The Group noted that the report did identify specific shortcomings in the 2010 to 2015 MTSP. However, the 2016 to 2020 MTSP did integrate DA strategies, challenges and opportunities under Strategic Objectives III, V and VI. Thus, the shortcomings identified in the 2010 to 2015 MTSP had been addressed. Therefore, the Group believed the findings and the latest MTSP made it clear that Member States already had the necessary tools to systematically monitor the integration of the DA Recommendations in WIPO's work, including programming and strategic planning, as outlined above.

282. The Delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran noted that the Committee was discussing the recommendations one by one. Some would be adopted and others would be open for further discussion. However, some Member States had earlier requested for delegations to be given the opportunity to submit further contributions in respect of the recommendations. Clarification was sought in this regard.

283. The Chair stated that Member States would still be able to provide contributions. However, the adopted recommendations would remain adopted. The Committee had not finished with the consideration of the other recommendations. Outstanding recommendations would be considered during the informal consultations.

284. The Delegation of Senegal, speaking on behalf of the African Group, inquired what would happen to the Report of the Independent Review if the Committee only adopted some recommendations. The Group also wanted to know how this would affect the work of the Committee in the future.

285. The Chair stated that the answer could only be provided after all the recommendations were reviewed. The views of all delegations were required on the recommendations. Although some recommendations were not adopted, that did not mean they would never be adopted. Consultations would be held to find solutions. If solutions were not found, the Committee would decide on how to deal with those recommendations.

286. The Delegation of Senegal, speaking on behalf of the African Group, took note of the Chair's explanation and believed it would be preferable to provide Member States with a further opportunity to submit written contributions in respect of the recommendations. So far, only one regional group had provided written comments.

287. The Chair stated that delegations were invited to submit written contributions. A deadline was fixed. Delegations knew this item was on the Agenda. Thus, they were all supposed to be prepared for the discussion. Nevertheless, he would not object if Member States agreed to a new deadline. However, if some believed a deadline had been set and delegations were there to discuss the recommendations and make their positions known, the Committee should do so.

288. The Delegation of Indonesia, speaking on behalf of the Asia and the Pacific Group, understood the Chair's explanation. The Group knew this item was on the Agenda. Thus, in its general statement at the opening of the session and in its intervention at the beginning of this agenda item, the Group had urged Member States to make further submissions on the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the Report of the Independent Review. In that regard, the Committee should allow the opportunity for Member States to provide further submissions and suggestions based on the Report.

289. The Delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran hoped that all the recommendations would be adopted by the end of the week. The Delegation would like to know what would be the future strategy for implementation. It was not clear how the adopted recommendations would be implemented in the future. The Delegation also sought clarification on what would be done with recommendations that could not be adopted.

290. The Chair stated that it was up to Member States to decide on these matters. It was not up to him or the Secretariat to do so. He was there to facilitate work. If they could not find a solution, the Committee would need to report to the GA that it could not reach agreement on these matters. The Assembly would then decide on what to do. He had already outlined his procedure for examining the recommendations.

291. The Delegation of Japan, speaking on behalf of Group B, pointed out that the extension of the deadline could create a bad custom in the Organization. If the extension was approved, everything could be delayed. Therefore, the Group could not support the extension of the deadline.

292. The Chair enquired as to whether the Committee would like to continue examining the recommendations in this manner. If not, the Committee would defer the matter to the GA. He was open to other suggestions on this matter.

293. The Delegation of Indonesia made a proposal based on the understanding that the adopted recommendations would be implemented by the Secretariat, the CDIP or Member States. It could be stated that the adopted recommendations would be implemented and further reports would be made. For outstanding recommendations, an opportunity would be provided for Member States for their further submissions.

294. The Chair stated that was one option. It could be discussed later. At that moment, the Committee did not know which recommendations would not be approved. Hence, it should

continue going through the recommendations. Recommendation 5 would be subject to informal consultations.

295. The Delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran had no problems with the adoption of all or some of the recommendations. However, consultations were required among Member States on how adopted recommendations would be implemented.

296. The Chair reiterated that these matters would be dealt with when the Committee finished examining all the recommendations. Informal consultations would be held to try to find solutions to recommendations that could not be approved by the Committee. It would then meet again in a plenary session to see how matters could be taken forward. All options would be examined, including the option proposed by the Delegation of Indonesia. The Chair then invited the Committee to consider Recommendation 6.

297. The Delegation of Japan, speaking on behalf of Group B, referred to its comments in Annex II of document CDIP/19/3. The Group supported adopting modalities to ensure regular voluntary reporting by Member States on actions taken at the national level to implement DA Recommendations. It also welcomed the call for increased participation of capital-based experts in order to benefit from their practical experience and expertise.

298. The Delegation of Indonesia also supported Recommendation 6.

299. The Chair stated that Recommendation 6 was adopted given that there were no further observations from the floor. He turned to Recommendation 7.

300. The Delegation of Japan, speaking on behalf of Group B, supported the encouragement for Member States to formulate new project proposals for the consideration by the Committee and attributed great importance to the fact that these be based on national needs. The Group also welcomed the sharing of experiences by beneficiary countries on lessons learned and best practices from the implementation of DA projects. The Group welcomed a discussion by the CDIP on the best format for systematizing such reporting, noting that the database format had shown in the past to carry some weaknesses and significant costs.

301. The Delegation of Indonesia took note of the submission by the Secretariat on Recommendation 7. It also noted that a database on lessons learned and best practices identified in the course of implementing DA projects did not exist. The Delegation looked forward to the Committee deciding on the preceding part of this recommendation.

302. The Chair stated that the recommendation would be put on hold. He turned to Recommendation 8.

303. The Delegation of Japan, speaking on behalf of Group B, noted the importance of duly taking into account absorption capacities and the level of expertise of project beneficiaries at every stage of the process, from the consideration of the project proposal to the implementation of the project.

304. The Chair stated that Recommendation 8 was approved given that there were no further observations from the floor. He turned to Recommendation 9.

305. The Delegation of Japan, speaking on behalf of Group B, fully supported merit based recruitment by WIPO. The Group also fully supported the second part of the recommendation which was addressed to Member States. However, it noted that this element did not require any action from the Committee and should be addressed at the national level.

306. The Delegation of Indonesia noted that Recommendation 9 consisted of two parts. The first part was on the recruitment of experts that were very well versed and knowledgeable about the socio-economic conditions of the recipient countries. The second part stated that beneficiary countries should ensure a high degree of internal coordination. The Delegation referred to the comment by Group B that an element did not require any action by the Committee and should be addressed at the national level. It would like to know which aspect of Recommendation 9 was applicable in this regard.

307. The Delegation of the United States of America provided some clarification for the Delegation of Indonesia as its position was the same as Group B. The first part of Recommendation 9 stated that WIPO should pay more attention to recruiting experts. The Delegation could support merit based recruitment by WIPO. The second part of Recommendation 9 was addressed to beneficiary countries. They were encouraged to ensure a high degree of internal coordination amongst its various organs. That part of the recommendation should be addressed at the national level.

308. The Delegation of Indonesia took note of the clarification and stated that it was in a position to agree on Recommendation 9.

309. The Chair stated that Recommendation 9 was adopted given that there were no observations from the floor. He turned to Recommendation 10.

310. The Delegation of Japan, speaking on behalf of Group B, generally supported transparency when reporting the use of project resources. However, with respect to Recommendation 10, it was not clear what additional information would be required to achieve this goal. On the second part of the recommendation, the Group underscored that the assessment of the adequate workload for a project manager needed to be made on a case by case basis by competent staff within the Secretariat.

311. The Secretariat (Mr. Baloch) noted that the recommendation required progress reports to include detailed information on the utilization of financial and human resources related to the DA projects. As mentioned in document CDIP/19/3, detailed financial information could be included in the subsequent progress reports to be considered by the Committee. The financial details could be broken down. The same could be done in respect of the staff or personnel resources deployed to an activity or project.

312. The Delegation of the United States of America noted that the second part of the recommendation dealt with "not assigning the same project manager to multiple projects". The Delegation was aware that this was sometimes not possible. Hence, the Delegation proposed that the words "whenever possible" be added to the recommendation. That would be satisfactory as the current recommendation seemed rather rigid and it may not be possible to achieve that goal.

313. The Delegation of Indonesia took note of the comments by the Secretariat. The Delegation referred to the comments by Group B and the Delegation of the United States of America on the second part of Recommendation 10. The Delegation believed DA projects had not been simultaneously assigned to the same project manager thus far. Hence, the Delegation did not see why the incorporation of the words "whenever possible" would provide greater comfort. Perhaps further clarification could be provided by the Secretariat in this regard.

314. The Secretariat (Mr. Baloch) understood that the Delegation of the United States of America, wanted to provide some flexibility for the Secretariat. As explained in the Secretariat's response to Recommendation 10, simultaneous assignment of the same project manager to more than one project occurred in the beginning of DA implementation and at the time of the

third session of CDIP, when a large number of projects were adopted. Due to the high demand for expertise in certain areas, in some cases, a project manager was assigned more than one project. This was no longer the situation. Nonetheless, perhaps it could be given the flexibility as a situation may arise in the future with similar constraints. This would be preferable. However, it was up to the Committee to decide.

315. The Delegation of Indonesia understood the Secretariat's preference for flexibility to be provided. The Delegation pointed out that in its response, the Secretariat had stated that it could ensure the implementation of this recommendation in the future. Nonetheless, the Delegation could go along with the incorporation of the words "whenever possible".

316. The Chair stated that Recommendation 10 was adopted with the amendment proposed by the Delegation of the United States of America given that there were no objections from the floor.

317. The Chair resumed discussions on the recommendations of the Independent Review. He turned to Recommendation 11.

318. The Delegation of Japan, speaking on behalf of Group B, did not support this recommendation as it was unduly burdensome and counterproductive. The Group continued to support the established and useful practice in the Committee when project evaluation reports were discussed by Member States. Member States provided their views with respect to the evaluation outcomes and let the Secretariat decide on the best and most practical way to take the outcomes and recommendations into consideration. They did not approve evaluation recommendations one by one. Discussing and approving evaluation recommendations one by one would lead to prolonged and inefficient discussions. This would complicate and/or impede the work of the Committee. It would also delay any possible improvements since Member States may not agree on the exact wording of the recommendations.

319. The Delegation of Senegal, speaking on behalf of the African Group, agreed with Recommendation 11. With regard to the procedure for discussing document CDIP/18/7, the Group noted that many delegations were in favor of the procedure. The Group would leave it to other delegations to decide on the best way to deal with this document.

320. The Chair noted there was no agreement on Recommendation 11. Hence, it would be dealt with in the informal consultations to be held in the afternoon. He turned to Recommendation 12.

321. The Delegation of Japan, speaking on behalf of Group B, was open to explore means to better disseminate information about the DA and its implementation. However, it noted that the Recommendation was covered by action to be taken under Recommendations 6 and 7.

322. The Delegation of Brazil stated that the proposal by the African Group was a good way to disseminate information.

323. The Chair stated that Recommendation 12 was approved given that there were no objections from the floor. The Committee had completed its examination of the 12 Recommendations in the report of the Independent Review. Recommendations 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 12 were approved by the Committee. Recommendations 1, 2, 5 and 11 would be taken up in the informal consultations. The Chair turned to the question previously raised by some delegations on the implementation of approved recommendations and how to deal with those that were not approved. The approved recommendations included those that were addressed to the Secretariat and/or Member States/CDIP. For those that were addressed to the Secretariat, the Committee could request the Secretariat to provide a document on how it was

going to implement those recommendations. With regard to the recommendations concerning Member States, Member States would be required to provide information on how they intended to implement them. The recommendations that concerned the Committee would require discussion. It may not be possible to discuss each of them. However, in forthcoming sessions in 2017 and 2018, the Committee could look at how those could be implemented. All the recommendations that were not approved would be taken up in the informal consultations. Subsequently, Member States would be able to provide their views on how to deal with recommendations that could not be approved in the consultations. They would also be able to do that in respect of the implementation of adopted recommendations. The Chair hoped his proposal on the way forward addressed the concerns expressed by Member States.

324. The Delegation of Colombia, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, referred to the ongoing discussion on the recommendations of the Independent Review. The Group noted with interest the comments and contributions by Member States and regional groups in this regard. Document CDIP/19/3 included the written contribution of one regional group. The comments contained therein were reiterated in the discussion. Some recommendations were endorsed by the Committee, one was modified and others required further discussion. In this regard, the Group urged Member States to submit contributions within a reasonable period in respect of the recommendations that still required approval in order for them to be considered in the next CDIP session.

325. The Delegation of Egypt referred to ongoing discussions and the Chair's proposal on the way forward. The Delegation believed Member States should also be given more time to provide formal submissions on how to move forward on the recommendations. This could be done in a manner that was similar to the submission of written contributions on the recommendations in the report of the Independent Review. The recommendations were not fully discussed by the Committee. The report and its recommendations merited substantive discussions within the Committee.

326. The Chair stated that his proposal was intended to also address the concerns expressed by the Delegation of Egypt. A process had been initiated. Delegations had been given the opportunity to share their views and understanding of the recommendations. Only some delegations had done so. The Chair repeated his proposal on the way forward, and clarified that delegations would still be able to express their views on all the recommendations in the next CDIP session. The discussion was not closed. In the intercession, delegations could submit written contributions on all the recommendations, regardless of whether or not they were approved. The Chair believed there would be time to return to this issue later. However, he believed it would be hard to adopt a more consensual approach than what he had proposed.

327. The Delegation of Indonesia welcomed the adoption of some recommendations in the report of the Independent Review. What mattered now was how those recommendations would be implemented. The Delegation was glad that the discussion on the implementation of adopted recommendations was not closed. It would engage constructively and provide further submissions in the implementation of those recommendations. It was also ready to work constructively with other delegations to discuss recommendations that were not adopted.

328. The Delegation of Egypt suggested that the proposed procedure be formalized in a document. The Committee could then discuss the language to see if it reflected how Member States would like to go forward with the report and its recommendations.

329. The Delegation of Brazil supported the statement made by the Delegation of Indonesia. Member States should be given the opportunity to participate in the formulation of the implementation process. It was important for Member States to be given time to submit proposals.

330. The Delegation of the United States of America referred to the implementation of adopted recommendations. The Delegation believed the Committee should give a certain degree of flexibility to the Secretariat that would take into account the findings and conclusions of the report as well as comments made by Member States. Member States may not agree on how to implement certain recommendations. The Secretariat should be given a degree of flexibility to find the best way to do so. Member States could not, and should not, control the entire process. They should trust the Secretariat to find the best way, taking into account what was said in the report and the submissions by Member States. Of course, for those recommendations that were addressed to Member States, Member States would find the best way to implement those. It was up to them to figure out how to do so. The Secretariat should be given some trust by the Committee in respect of the recommendations that were directed to the Secretariat.

331. The Chair brought the discussion to a close and informed the Committee that it would be resumed after the informal consultations.

Consideration of document CDIP/19/5 – Mapping of South-South Cooperation Activities within World Intellectual Property Organization

332. The Chair invited the Secretariat to introduce the subject.

333. The Secretariat (Mr. Di Pietro) presented document CDIP/19/5, “Mapping of South-South Cooperation Activities within WIPO”. The document provided an overview of the IP-related activities undertaken by the Secretariat in the context of South-South Cooperation (SSC) covering the period 2014-2016. In line with the definition of SSC provided within the UN system, and following the comments made by Member States during the 17th session of the CDIP, the Secretariat reviewed and identified those development-related activities which facilitated mutually beneficial exchanges of knowledge and experience among developing countries and LDCs, and promoted innovation, creativity and the effective use of the IP system for economic, technological, social and cultural development. The mapping presented in the Appendix of the document contained a list of activities where both beneficiary and provider country/ies were developing countries or LDCs, and where all or the majority of speakers / experts attending the event, were from a developing country or LDCs. Excluded from the mapping were activities that took place: (a) at WIPO Headquarters in Geneva; (b) in relation to countries with economies in transition; (c) with funding from developed countries, including under Funds-in-Trust from developed countries; and (d) with the involvement of only one country (national activities with national participants and speakers). The report integrated the information from document CDIP/17/4, which included data and expenditure information available as at October 31, 2015, on activities undertaken in the 2014/15 biennium. It provided additional data available for the remainder of 2015 and 2016, therefore covering the three-year period 2014-2016. A total of 148 activities were identified for the three-year period. All the activities included in the document resulted from requests by Member States and responded to the criteria of SSC. For the purpose of this mapping exercise, activities were grouped into nine types of technical assistance. Within each grouping, they were further listed by chronological order. The list in the Appendix provided categories of grouping by type or nature of the activity as follows: (a) IP Forum - Policy Dialogue; (b) National IP Strategies and Policies; (c) Development of a legal IP Framework; (d) Awareness and training on IP Administration; (e) Building respect on IP; (f) Higher Education; (g) Training on IP Management; (h) Automation systems for IP rights administrations; (i) IP policies and projects for certain economic / productive sectors; and (j) Global Registrations Systems. In addition, for each activity listed in the Appendix, the following information was provided: (a) Title; (b) Date; (c) IP Field; (d) Objective; (e) Expected result; (f) Place / Venue / Host Country; (g) Beneficiary country/ies; (h) Region(s); (i) Number of participants; (j) Language(s) used; and (k) Cost. The UN Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) recommended that “[t]he legislative and

governing bodies of the United Nations system organizations should request the Executive Heads to apportion a specific percentage – not less than 0.5 per cent – of core budget resources for the promotion of SSC in their respective areas of competence, in consultation with program countries”. The total expenditure entailed in carrying out these SSC activities amounted to 4,808,000 Swiss francs for the biennium 2014/15. This amount included 4,166,000 Swiss francs from the regular budget and 642,000 Swiss francs from the Funds-in-Trust administered and implemented by WIPO. This represented 2.1 per cent of the total non-personnel expenditure in the biennium, including Funds-in-Trust expenditure. As regards 2016, the expenditure of SSC activities amounted to 1,376,000 Swiss francs. This amount included 1,149,000 Swiss francs from regular budget and 227,000 Swiss francs from the Funds-in-Trust administered and implemented by WIPO. This represented 1.2 per cent of the total non-personnel expenditure in 2016, including Funds-in-Trust expenditure. The Secretariat also informed the Committee of some other activities undertaken last year. The Secretariat had produced a SSC leaflet. Although it was currently only available in English, it would soon be available in six official languages. The SSC webpage had been updated and improved. It was available in six official languages. WIPO participated in the meetings organized by the High-Level Committee on SSC at the UN in New York and the Global South-South Development Expo organized by the UN in Dubai last year. A SSC activity for implementation of the Marrakech Treaty was also organized last year, following a request by a group of Latin American countries.

334. The Delegation of Senegal, speaking on behalf of the African Group, took note of the document and its Annex. It provided an overview of activities undertaken by the Secretariat in the context of SSC for the period 2014-2016. It included numerous activities in important areas for developing countries and LDCs. Therefore, the Group welcomed WIPO’s efforts and encouraged the Organization to intensify and diversify their activities to ensure even greater results. The Group noted that very few African countries were involved in the projects. Therefore, the Group suggested there should be a trans-regional approach to enhance the sharing of experiences and best practices, and improve implementation of the outcomes. There should be more emphasis on programs related to the creation of infrastructure and promoting creativity. The Group invited developing countries that were relatively more developed to be more involved in SSC.

335. The Delegation of China was of the view that SSC was a process whereby developing countries facing common challenges pursued their development through cooperation in the areas of economy, technology and trade. This was an important means for developing countries to pursue their development independently and autonomously. IP, as an important means to promote development, could play a significant role in SSC. From 2014 to 2016, WIPO, as the most important multilateral organization in the area of IP, had played a significant role in South-South IP Cooperation as indicated in the 148 activities listed in the document. The expenditure details were also included in the document. The Delegation highlighted two events organized by WIPO in Beijing in July 2016. This included the High-Level Conference on IP for Countries Along the “Belt and Road”, and the annual Heads of IP Office Conference (HIPOC) for Countries in South Asia, Southeast Asia, Mongolia and Iran. This event fell within the scope of SSC and should be listed in the document. The event promoted an exchange of views and mutual learning among the countries concerned. It upgraded SSC in the region to a new level. The event, including air tickets for all participants, site fees and translation fees was funded by WIPO and China’s Funds-in-Trust. China, as the host country, provided further amounts to support the logistics. The Delegation hoped the Secretariat would include this activity in the annex and list the related costs.

336. The Delegation of Tunisia aligned itself with the statement made by the Delegation of Senegal on behalf of the African Group. The Delegation took note of the document. It reflects the WIPO’s efforts in fostering SSC. The document included 148 activities undertaken during

the period 2014-2016. It did not provide Member States with statistics on the activities undertaken in each year/region/country. Such figures could assist Member States and the Secretariat to shape future work in this regard. The Delegation noted that the expenditure on SSC activities amounted to 4,808,000 Swiss francs for the biennium 2014/15. In 2016, the expenditure on SSC activities amounted to 1,376,000 Swiss francs. Thus, to reach the amount spent in the previous biennium, the expenditure in 2017 should double what was spent in 2016. The Delegation sought clarification from the Secretariat in order to better understand the differences in terms of budget allocation.

337. The Delegation of Colombia, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, referred to its general statement and again noted that the suggestions put forward by delegations were incorporated into the document.

338. The Delegation of Spain noted that the Annex to the document included a list of activities carried out by WIPO. The host countries and beneficiary countries were developing countries and LDCs. The majority of the experts were also from developing countries. The list did not include activities carried out with financing from developed countries through their Funds-in-Trust. Hence, the Delegation would like activities that were partially funded through Spain's Funds-in-Trust to be excluded from the list.

339. The Delegation of Brazil underlined the importance of SSC. These countries faced common challenges and should try to find common solutions for those issues. The Marrakech Treaty was an example. Currently, the majority of the parties to the agreement were developing countries. The majority of visually impaired persons were in developing countries. Hence, the Delegation encouraged the Secretariat to continue its work in this area. The Delegation noted there were no activities on the protection of traditional knowledge and genetic resources. These should be included in future activities. The document referred to the UN JIU recommendation that at least 0.5 per cent of core budget resources should be apportioned for the promotion of SSC. The Delegation would like to know if there was a definition for the term "core budget resources", and whether it included Funds-in-Trust or only covered the Organization's budget. The Delegation encouraged WIPO to continue its work on SSC.

340. The Delegation of Malta, speaking on behalf of the EU and its member states, stated that it was interesting to learn more about the various activities highlighted in the document. They noted the information provided on the 148 activities that were identified. WIPO had exceeded the targeted share of the budget which according to the UN JIU should be allocated to the promotion of SSC. SSC was above all, a positive and fruitful cooperation initiative among peoples and countries of the South. It was initiated, organized and managed by governments in developing countries, and organizations such as WIPO could play a supporting role. The EU and its member states hoped the mapping exercise was useful for policymakers in Member States, and would enhance the use of the IP Technical Assistance Database (IP-TAD) and WIPO's South-South IP technical assistance webpage.

341. The Delegation of Georgia, speaking on behalf of CEBS, believed WIPO could play an important supportive role in establishing SSC. The Group took note of the document and the information provided on the 148 identified activities.

342. The Delegation of Japan, speaking on behalf of Group B, supported SSC on common challenges and experiences to promote economic development between developing countries and LDCs. Traditional North-South Cooperation was also important. Trilateral cooperation was also beneficial for learning from all parties involved.

343. The Delegation of Indonesia reiterated that it attached great importance to SSC. The Delegation noted that the activities included flexibilities in the patent system, in addition to

expediting patent examination and the use of the PCT. Activities in the area of copyright included activities on collective management organizations as well as exceptions and limitations. SSC was not just about cooperation between developing countries. It was also a platform for developing countries to share experiences on addressing common challenges. In the context of the IP system, the common challenges faced by developing countries included how to make full use of IP flexibilities. The Delegation looked forward to seeing more activities on how to assist developing countries to find the right balance in IP policies to ensure that public goals and development objectives could be fulfilled while ensuring that the use of the IP system contributes to economic growth.

344. The Delegation of Ecuador recognized the efforts made by WIPO to promote SSC. The mapping exercise was important. It provided an overview of SSC activities and helped to identify areas which required more attention. The activities were useful for beneficiary countries. The Delegation would like more activities to be conducted in important areas such as the protection of traditional knowledge and genetic resources. SSC was an effective mechanism for developing countries to share knowledge, experiences and capabilities. WIPO should take into account the development needs of countries in its future work in this area.

345. The Delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran took note of the report. SSC was an appropriate platform for developing countries and LDCs to share their experiences on IP related matters. The Delegation looked forward to seeing more cross-regional activities among developing countries and LDCs. It also hoped to see more activities in other areas of IP, particularly in relation to exceptions and limitations as well as flexibilities in the IP system. Most developing countries and LDCs had challenges in the area of flexibilities.

346. The Chair invited the Secretariat to respond to the comments from the floor.

347. The Secretariat (Mr. Di Pietro) referred to the request by the Delegation of China and stated that the activity would be included in the document. On the suggestion by the Delegation of Tunisia, the Secretariat stated that it would provide information on activities organized by year / region / country in next year's report. The Secretariat agreed to the request by the Delegation of Spain to exclude activities that were partially financed through Spain's Funds-in-Trust. The Secretariat referred to the question raised by the Delegation of Brazil on core budget resources and stated that it included the total funds allocated for activities for non-personnel resources. This included budgetary resources and non-budgetary resources from the Funds-in-Trust of developing countries. The Secretariat noted that the guidelines of the UN JIU did not include a definition for "core budgetary resources". In relation to the comment made by the Delegation of Tunisia, the Secretariat underlined that all the activities organized under the SSC were expressly requested by Member States. Therefore, the number of activities and amount of funds devoted by the Organization to these activities varied, depending on requests put forward by Member States. The same applied to the fields covered in the activities. These were selected by Member States. For 2017, the Secretariat planned to organize several SSC activities in the second half of the year. The financial information for 2017 was provisional.

348. The Chair concluded the discussion given that there were no further observations from the floor. The Committee took note of the document.

AGENDA ITEM 6 (i): WIPO TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE IN THE AREA OF COOPERATION FOR DEVELOPMENT

Consideration of document CDIP/19/10 – Possible Improvements of WIPO Technical Assistance Webpage

349. The Chair invited the Secretariat to introduce the subject.

350. The Secretariat (Mr. Di Pietro) presented document CDIP/19/10, "Possible Improvements of WIPO Technical Assistance Webpage". The document addressed the request by the CDIP for the Secretariat "to reflect and report on possible improvements of WIPO's webpage section devoted to communicating WIPO's activities on technical assistance". It briefly described the structure of the current WIPO website which was developed in 2013. It was based on the requirements of Member States, public-private stakeholders, the academic community, IP practitioners, development agencies, potential donors, civil society and the public at large. The focus was on ease of navigation and accessibility rather than mirroring the organizational structure of WIPO. Under this architecture, most of the information related to what could be considered as technical assistance and capacity building resided under the heading of "Cooperation", with three sub-headings, namely, "Development", "Global Cooperation" and "Cooperation With". WIPO's technical assistance and capacity building activities were embedded across the web presence of the Organization and was available for users from different points of access. The following conclusions could be drawn from this: First, as information related to technical assistance and capacity building was spread across, some users may find it difficult to navigate through each section and to get a holistic view of the work undertaken by WIPO. Second, although work on technical assistance and capacity building was highlighted in some sections, it was less visible in other sections. In some cases, work related to technical assistance was not presented in a separate space or with a separate title. Third, DA projects related to technical assistance and capacity building were embedded in the content of the DA webpage, or in other sections of the WIPO website. Hence, users may not be able to distinguish the outputs of DA projects related to technical assistance and capacity building from the outputs of other DA projects. In view of the foregoing, the Secretariat proposed the following: First, as a matter of principle, any measures to improve accessibility of information related to technical assistance and capacity building should not drastically modify the existing, well-functioning web presence of WIPO. Second, the thematic nature of the web-architecture that avoided a mere mirroring of the organizational structure of WIPO should be preserved. This would, *inter alia*, ensure the existing functional updating mechanism for the various webpages. Third, a new section entitled "Technical Assistance and Capacity Building" should be created under the main heading "Cooperation", sub-heading "Development", encapsulating all WIPO technical assistance activities. This should be done by providing linkages to the relevant sections across the Organization's website rather than duplicating information. Fourth, the section should cluster technical assistance and capacity building activities based on eight categories which would contain the information already included under the existing sections. These categories were indicative in nature and would be subject to further refinement by the Secretariat at a later stage in the process. They included the following: (i) DA; (ii) IP Training; (iii) Legislative and Policy Advice; (iv) Support for IP offices; (v) IP Strategies; (vi) Platforms and Databases; (vii) Seminars and Workshops; and (viii) Raising Awareness. The Secretariat expected the proposed approach would provide users with easier and faster access to relevant information on the webpage. The final objective was to provide a single point of entry to the information related to technical assistance and capacity building.

351. The Delegation of Indonesia had studied the document and listened carefully to the presentation. The Delegation noted that the Secretariat suggested mainstreaming information on technical assistance and capacity building that was already available on WIPO webpages in order for it to be easily accessible to users. A balanced IP system was important. It was also important to ensure that a working IP legal system would support economic growth. It was also important to make full use of IP flexibilities wherever possible to support economic growth. The Secretariat proposed to cluster technical assistance and capacity building activities into eight categories. These included platforms and databases. The Delegation proposed that a link be created in respect of flexibilities in the IP System. The information was already available on the WIPO website. This would not require the creation of new page on WIPO's website. This

subject could be included in one of the categories in the drop-down menu under technical assistance.

352. The Delegation of China agreed with the general analysis in the document on the current WIPO website which corresponded to the latest trend in web architecture to focus on ease of navigation and access. The feedback received from Chinese stakeholders on the new website was generally quite positive. The Delegation agreed in principle with the proposed way forward to improve accessibility to WIPO's technical assistance and capacity building activities on the website. Concentrating all relevant information would make it easier and faster for users to access information. However, in the proposed solution, the titles of the new eight categories were often the same as those in the existing webpage. For example, currently, the DA was on the third level section under the sub-heading "Development" and the heading "Cooperation". In the proposed solution, a new third level section on "Technical Assistance and Capacity Building" would be created under the heading "Cooperation" and sub-heading "Development". The DA would appear on the fourth level under the new section. The Secretariat did not explain why the same titles were in different locations and what their relationship was. The Delegation enquired as to whether the sub-heading "Development" could be changed directly to "Technical Assistance and Capacity Building" since the new section included all the content in the original development section. Currently, the proposed solution could be confusing. The same could be said on the other subsections. The Delegation sought clarification from the Secretariat in this regard.

353. The Delegation of Tunisia agreed with the findings in the document and endorsed the proposals by the Secretariat, especially in respect of the creation of a new section entitled, "Technical Assistance and Capacity Building". The eight suggested categories to be clustered under this section would enable users to access relevant information. In this regard, the Delegation supported the suggestion by the Delegation of Indonesia to include an additional category on flexibilities in the IP system.

354. The Delegation of Brazil had carefully studied the document and the suggestions seemed very reasonable. The Delegation underlined the importance of technical assistance. It was not a coincidence that it was part of cluster A in the DA. The proposed changes would make the webpage easier to access as mentioned by the Delegation of China. It was very important to ensure that stakeholders would be provided with timely access to all the information. The Delegation supported the suggestion by the Delegation of Indonesia on flexibilities. This was an important aspect of the IP system.

355. The Delegation of Japan, speaking on behalf of Group B, stated that the approach proposed by the Secretariat with respect to possible improvements to the WIPO technical assistance webpage was reasonable. The Group supported it. The webpage should be improved for user accessibility.

356. The Delegation of Chile considered efforts to improve accessibility to information on WIPO technical assistance to be very important. The Delegation supported the creation of a new section entitled "Technical Assistance and Capacity Building" under the main heading "Cooperation" and sub-heading "Development". It would include all WIPO technical assistance activities. There were many divisions in WIPO. Thus, the Delegation believed it would be useful to make available the contact details for the various divisions in the Secretariat. In line with the recommendation in the report of the Independent Review, the Delegation also proposed that a database on lessons learned and best practices be established. This could be included on the webpage. There could also be information on developments concerning the implementation of the DA. It would be useful for the Secretariat to provide a document on improvements to the webpage before the next CDIP session in order for Member States to provide suggestions and recommendations in this regard.

357. The Delegation of Malta, speaking on behalf of the EU and its member states, noted that information on technical assistance was spread across the WIPO website making it difficult to find all the relevant information. Therefore, the Group supported the proposal by the Secretariat to create a new section entitled, "Technical Assistance and Capacity Building", within the current framework of the website. This would preserve the current thematic nature of the website.

358. The Delegation of Georgia, speaking on behalf of CEBS, supported the proposal by the Secretariat to create a new section on "Technical Assistance and Capacity Building".

359. The Delegation of South Africa stated that a consolidated webpage for users to access information on technical assistance and capacity building would be useful. The Delegation referred to the section entitled, "About IP". It enquired as to whether that section would be amended. WIPO was an international authority on IP and definitions for IP. WIPO was an acronym for World Intellectual Property Organization, not World IP Rights Organization. IP needed to be interpreted in the broadest context when providing advice to Member States. The current website began with an introduction that talked about IP as a creation of the mind but all the focus was on IP rights. A clearer distinction should be made on those two specific aspects. The definition of IP should also be broader. It should reflect other forms of IP such as trade secrets which were becoming increasingly popular and a useful form of IP.

360. The Delegation of the Russian Federation supported the proposal by the Secretariat as it was in the right direction.

361. The Delegation of Egypt requested the Secretariat to go through the current webpage and explain how it would be improved. As it stood, the DA and other items were included under the sub-heading "Development" and the heading "Cooperation". It was not clear whether this would be replaced with technical assistance or if those items would include links to technical assistance. The Delegation noted that paragraph 8 (d) of the document stated the following, "The section should cluster Technical Assistance and Capacity Building activities based upon eight categories which will contain the information already included under the existing sections". The Delegation referred to the comments made by the Delegation of South Africa. The home page mainly focused on IP rights. Cooperation activities, IP and development, and others were discussed later. The structure should be more balanced in this regard.

362. The Chair invited the Secretariat to respond to the comments from the floor.

363. The Secretariat (Mr. Di Pietro) took on board the comments. With regard to the question raised by the Delegation of Egypt, the Secretariat stated that the eight categories were indicative. There would be internal discussions. Further categories and sub-categories may be included in order for information to be more easily accessible.

364. The Chair suggested that the Committee could conclude by stating that it took note of the document and requested the Secretariat to implement the proposed improvements, taking into account the observations made by delegations, and report to the Committee in the next session. This was agreed given that there were no objections from the floor.

Presentation by the Secretariat on the Peer Review procedure for studies commissioned by WIPO that are used in technical assistance

365. The Secretariat (Mr. Fink) made a presentation on the peer review procedure for studies commissioned by WIPO that are used in technical assistance. The Economics and Statistics Division undertook studies requested by the CDIP and other committees as well as Secretariat reports such as the World IP Report which was published on a biannual basis. All the studies and reports were peer-reviewed. The peer review processes were not necessarily uniform. For

relatively simple descriptive studies, a relatively light peer review process may be applied. That may only consist of a single peer reviewer. For more elaborate studies such as stakeholder assessments that involved assertions of causality, two more peer reviewers may be engaged. For the World IP Report, at least two peer reviewers looked at the content of the report. Peer reviewers were selected on the basis of their expertise and independence. They should not hold any stake in the outcome of the study. The peer reviewers were paid an honorarium that was proportionate to the time required to complete the peer review. They were requested to review the content of a study according to a number of criteria. There were standard terms of reference. The peer reviewers were requested to comment on whether the study was useful, clearly presented, scientifically or technically accurate, based on reliable data, appropriated grounded in the prior art, reflected state-of-the-art techniques in addressing a particular question, employed a sound methodology given the problem at hand, and suitable for the intended target audience. In principle, these were the criteria peer reviewers were requested to comment on. Peer review may happen at a relatively early stage of the study. For example, if the study involved a survey, it may be a good idea for peer reviewers to comment on the survey instrument to avoid deficiencies in the survey. So far, the peer reviewers had provided very constructive comments that were taken into account in the final version of the study without any disagreement. A peer review process could be more contentious when there was serious disagreement among the peer reviewers on the content and the authors may not necessarily agree with the peer reviewers. In these cases, the Secretariat's primary role would be to mediate and to look for ways to resolve such disagreements in a way that they could be objectively reflected in a study. Sometimes, such disagreements could not be resolved. In this case, it was important for the study to reflect the disagreements. So far, there had not been any major disagreements. The above was a summary of the peer review processes in the Economics and Statistics Division. Publication proposals submitted to WIPO's Publication Board were also subject to a peer review process. The Publication Board did not peer review proposals. It made sure the proponent had a credible peer review process in place in order for the quality of the product to be guaranteed. This involved all types of WIPO publications. Going forward, the Economics and Statistics Division would work with CDIP colleagues and make sure that these types of peer review processes were broadly applied to studies used in technical assistance, as requested by Member States.

366. The Delegation of Brazil believed the peer reviewers could be more open and frank in their observations. The Delegation sought the Secretariat's views on that.

367. The Secretariat (Mr. Fink) opined that it may depend on the nature of the topic. Some topics were more contentious than others. The Secretariat did not necessarily deal with very contentious topics. The peer review processes were generally open and transparent in the sense that the identity of the authors was disclosed to the peer reviewers and vice versa. It may be that peer reviewers would be more critical if they remained anonymous. However, it would be problematic to move to an anonymous peer review process. Furthermore, transparency and openness were generally good principles for an IGO to adopt. The anonymity of peer reviewers in academic and scientific journal publications was also a contentious topic. Some tended to be quite critical of that.

368. The Delegation of the United States of America found the information provided by the Secretariat to be extremely helpful. The existing process seemed to be a promising approach. The Delegation was interested to see it implemented in respect of some CDIP projects as well as in relation to technical assistance elsewhere.

AGENDA ITEM 6: MONITOR, ASSESS, DISCUSS, REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ALL DEVELOPMENT AGENDA RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONSIDERATION OF THE DIRECTOR GENERAL'S REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DEVELOPMENT AGENDA (RESUMED)

Consideration of document CDIP/19/8 – Progress Report on New WIPO Activities Related to Using Copyright to Promote Access to Information and Creative Content

369. The Chair invited the Secretariat to introduce document CDIP/19/8, “Progress Report on New WIPO Activities Related to Using Copyright to Promote Access to Information and Creative Content”

370. The Secretariat (Mr. Lanteri) presented the document. It contained a progress report for the period from June 2015 to February 2017 on New WIPO Activities Related to Using Copyright to Promote Access to Information and Creative Content, described in document CDIP/13/11. At its 14th session, the Committee had taken certain decisions with regard to the implementation of the activities contained in that document. Member States agreed on the implementation of four of the six activities. Decision on the remaining two was postponed. The Secretariat provided an overview of progress in the implementation of approved activities. Activity 2 was on the applicability of open licensing to education and research resources produced by international organizations. Meaningful progress was achieved within WIPO and beyond. The WIPO Open Access policy was launched in November 2016. As a result, new publications and some existing ones were now released under a Creative Commons license. The terms of use of the website were in line with WIPO's Open Access Policy. Most of the content shared by WIPO on user-generated content platforms such as Flickr and YouTube were also made available under a Creative Commons license. WIPO facilitated the exchange of experiences and best practices with IGOs through an online platform and through meetings at the Frankfurt Book Fair, WIPO headquarters in Geneva and the London Book Fair. Activity 3 was on the development of a training module on licensing and open source software development. The WIPO Academy was currently running the second pilot of the eLearning course on Software Licensing Including Open Source (DL511) with over 250 participants from various sectors, including the public sector and academia. Hard copies of the material would be prepared when the pilot was completed. Activity 4 was on integrating open source licensing in WIPO copyright related courses and training programs. The subject was integrated into several activities. For example, a thematic workshop on “Software Licensing: Navigating a Sea of Options” was organized in the context of the WSIS Forum in Geneva in 2016. It was also included in the WIPO-University of Geneva Summer School on IP in 2016. Activity 5 was on the development of model copyright policies and legal provisions for different copyright approaches to public sector information (PSI). Following the guidance of the Committee, the Secretariat had arranged for the preparation of a comprehensive survey of national approaches to PSI. It would be used as background material to address requests for legal advice on matters related to copyright and PSI. The Secretariat turned to the activities that were not approved during CDIP/14. Activity 1 was a Pilot Project on Providing Legal and Technical Support for the Creation of Databases to Make Education and Research Resources Available on an Open Access Basis. It had not been possible to identify voluntary beneficiary countries for preparation of the full implementation plan to be presented for the Committee's approval. Activity 6 was an International Conference for LDCs on Copyright and the Management of PSI. During the 14th session of CDIP, some Member States stated that the organization of the conference was premature. The Committee decided to consider it once progress was made on the other activities. On the way forward, the Secretariat proposed that the implementation of Activities 2 and 4 should be continued by incorporating them into the regular activities of the Organization. On Activity 1, the Secretariat could re-invite Member States to voluntarily participate in the pilot project. On Activity 6, the Secretariat sought guidance of the Committee on the organization of the proposed conference.

371. The Delegation of Brazil supported the initiatives that were still pending. Activity 1 would provide an opportunity for WIPO and its Member States as well as other stakeholders to learn lessons and gain experience on strategies and approaches to open access with respect to education and research resources. With regard to Activity 6, the Delegation believed the conference could be held.

372. The Delegation of Japan, speaking on behalf of Group B, noted that all the project phases were delivered on schedule and within the allocated budget. On Activity 6, the Group stated that in order to take full advantage of such a conference, interested LDCs would need to be in a position to implement new provisions or policies on PSI. The Group would like to better understand the situation in LDCs in respect of the management of PSI before the Committee decided on this activity. It would like to know the following: First, what problems could be solved by the conference? Second, what was the gap that would be addressed through the event? Third, could the gap be addressed through country specific demand-driven assistance that was tailored to the specific needs of Member States? The Group also wanted to better understand the financial implications of this activity.

373. The Delegation of Indonesia took note of the document. The Delegation supported, in principle, the organization of an International Conference for LDCs on Copyright and the Management of PSI. On Activity 2, the Delegation noted that WIPO was taking action to adopt open licenses for the work it produced, and it welcomed that. On Activity 1, the Delegation stated that Indonesia was interested to participate in the Pilot Project on Providing Legal and Technical Support for the Creation of Databases to Make Education and Research Resources Available on an Open Access Basis.

374. The Delegation of Chile highlighted the adoption of WIPO's open access policy in November 2016, and the exchange of experiences and best practices with other IGOs. It was surprised that some organizations had yet to adopt an open access policy to facilitate access to their work. It was important to include PSI in training activities. WIPO should also continue to develop model copyright policies and legal provisions for different copyright approaches to PSI. It looked forward to the completion of an informational document for WIPO internal use on copyright policies and legal provisions for different copyright approaches to PSI. The Delegation urged WIPO to continue its work in this area.

375. The Delegation of Malta, speaking on behalf of the EU and its member states, referred to Activity 2. In principle, the EU and its member states could agree to the way forward proposed by the Secretariat, namely, the Secretariat may continue to facilitate the implementation process of the copyright policies of IGOs who desired to implement an open access policy and to use the new Creative Commons IGO licenses. They would like more information on the possible budgetary implications, if any. On Activity 4, the EU and its member states were, in principle, in a position to endorse the way forward proposed by the Secretariat, namely, the Secretariat may continue to integrate the subject of open source licensing in WIPO copyright related courses and training programs. It was important that awareness and understanding of open source software through balanced and objective treatment of advantages and disadvantages, including the consequence of using open source software in relation to security issues and maintenance, was continued. However, the EU and its member states required more information on possible budgetary implications with regard to Activity 4. If Activity 6 was agreed, the EU and its member states believed it should focus on LDCs that were most ready to implement any policy on the subject. However, the EU and its member states required further clarification on the exact scope of the activity and the budgetary implications before they could be in a position to endorse it.

376. The Delegation of Georgia, speaking on behalf of CEBS, took note of the document. On Activity 6, the Group would like to better understand the details of the organization of the

proposed conference. The Group required further clarification on the scope and possible budgetary implications.

377. The Delegation of Uganda stated that the use of copyright to access information and creative content was important for developing countries as it promoted, among others, education and the knowledge economy. Uganda's law on copyright and neighboring rights included some elements on access to information. Some project activities could be useful in implementing them. Uganda was also making efforts to revise and improve the aforementioned law to take into consideration some issues related to access to information among others. Therefore, the Delegation supported the activities proposed by the Secretariat, particularly with regard to the organization of an International Conference for LDCs on Copyright and the Management of PSI. The conference would help to enhance efforts taken to raise awareness of copyright in LDCs and issues related to public sector information. The Delegation requested the Secretariat to provide more information on financial and human resources, expected timelines, and the modalities of the conference. The Delegation urged other delegations to approve some of the elements that had been put forward.

378. The Delegation of China believed that the Secretariat's efforts were important for using copyright to promote access to information. The Delegation agreed, in principle, with the Progress Report on New WIPO Activities Related to Using Copyright to Promote Access to Information and Creative Content. It hoped that all parties would be flexible, open and cooperative in the implementation of the activities. Under the guidance of the Chair, the Delegation would continue to actively participate to ensure fruitful discussions in the continued implementation of the DA.

379. The Chair invited the Secretariat to respond to the comments from the floor.

380. The Secretariat (Mr. Lanteri) took note of all the comments and suggestions. The Secretariat referred to Activity 6 and provided some background information on PSI. Governments and public institutions produced large amounts of information and data. This was referred to as PSI. Access and reuse of that material was relevant for citizens and others as it could be essential for educational research and commercial purposes. The growth of ICTs and broadband penetration made PSI more accessible within countries and globally. Many countries already had online portals to disseminate such information. In principle, PSI such as research reports and databases may be protected by copyright and therefore could not be reused freely. Clarity on the conditions for reuse of PSI was an essential feature of any well-functioning system. WIPO facilitated a study in this area. The results, presented to the CDIP in 2011, confirmed that countries approached PSI in different ways - from considering PSI as information in the public domain to granting full protection. Many countries protected PSI as creative work but provided open access through licensing, for instance, through open repositories or Creative Common licenses. The purpose of the international conference was to provide information. It would provide a forum for exchanging information on current practices implemented by Member States. A further objective was to raise awareness on why copyright was an important element to be taken into account when shaping policies on PSI. Member States could access many studies on this topic, including the study that was prepared in the context of the CDIP. However, a global conference could help to build awareness on these issues. On the question of whether country-specific technical assistance activities could be a better way to achieve the same objectives, the Secretariat believed the two approaches were complementary. If the CDIP agreed to convene the conference, country-specific technical activities would still be needed to address the requests of Member States. Based on its experience, some understanding was required to trigger a specific request for assistance. The conference could help to facilitate this. The budgetary implications were detailed in document CDIP/13/11 and discussed in the Committee. As mentioned in the document, the estimated cost of the conference was 167,000 Swiss francs. This was roughly half the cost of organizing a

SCCR meeting. The venue and countries had not been selected. These matters would be discussed in the CDIP. LDCs were mentioned in the document, "Feasibility Assessment on Possible New WIPO Activities Related to Using Copyright to Promote Access to Information and Creative Content", prepared by an external consultant. It was discussed during the 11th session of CDIP and no modifications were made to the beneficiaries of the conference. Thus, they only included LDCs. Nevertheless, the Secretariat believed the conference would also benefit developed and developing countries. The beneficiaries of the conference could also include non-LDCs, although this would affect the budget for the conference.

381. The Chair closed the discussion given there were no further observations from the floor. He enquired as to whether the Committee could take note of the document, encourage the Secretariat to continue its activities in this area, and approve the organization of an international conference for LDCs.

382. The Delegation of the United States of America needed to consult its capital-based copyright experts before approving the conference. Thus, it would like the decision to be postponed to the following morning.

383. The Chair agreed to the request.

384. The Chair resumed the discussion. He returned to Activity 6 on the proposed international conference for LDCs and enquired as to whether the Delegation of the United States of America was ready to provide a response.

385. The Delegation of the United States of America stated that it could support Activity 6.

386. The Chair stated that the organization of the conference was approved given that there were no further observations from the floor.

AGENDA ITEM 8: FUTURE WORK

387. The Secretariat (Mr. Baloch) read out a list of work for the next session, as follows: (i) Progress report on implementation of DA Recommendations and projects. This was presented to the autumn sessions of the CDIP; (ii) Draft Report for 19th session of CDIP; (iii) Studies and other outputs from ongoing projects such as Phase II of the Project on Socio-Economic Development implemented by the Office of the Chief Economist; (iv) Description of the Contribution of the Relevant WIPO Bodies to the Implementation of the Respective DARs; (v) Reports on some decisions taken in relation to the Spanish proposal on WIPO technical assistance in the area of cooperation for development; (vi) Report on some points in the Joint Proposal by the Delegations of the United States of America, Australia and Canada on Activities Related to Technology Transfer. Some decisions were taken in this regard. The Secretariat recalled that the CDIP had just approved point 5 of the Joint Proposal; (vii) Discussions on the way to address SDGs in future CDIP sessions, including the request for establishing a permanent agenda item; (viii) Proposal of the African Group Concerning the Biennial Organization of an International Conference on Intellectual Property and Development; (ix) WIPO GA Decision on CDIP Related Matters. The decision taken in the informal consultations would be adopted in the plenary. It would be forwarded to the GA for approval. The Secretariat would report back to the Committee in this regard; (x) The introduction of an agenda item on IP and development. This was subject to approval by the GA. It would be up to delegations to discuss that matter further; (xi) Annual report on measures to ensure better dissemination of information contained in the Database on Flexibilities. This was in accordance with the decision taken at 18th session of CDIP; (xii) Presentation and side event by the Delegation of China on a study on green patents; and (xiii) Report on the Recommendations of

the Independent Review of the Implementation of the DA Recommendations (documents CDIP/18/7 and CDIP/19/3). The Committee had approved certain recommendations. Some remained open and others were somewhere in between the two categories. The draft Summary by the Chair would shortly be distributed. It included details on the way forward in respect of approved recommendations and those that may be approved in the next session. Subject to the approval of the Summary, the Secretariat may also produce a document seeking the Committee's guidance on the implementation of some recommendations.

388. The Delegation of Indonesia clarified that the Committee had approved an activity in respect of point 5 of the Joint Proposal by the Delegations of the United States of America, Australia and Canada on Activities Related to Technology Transfer.

389. The Secretariat (Mr. Baloch) stated that the Delegation of Indonesia was correct.

390. The Chair stated that the future work presented by the Secretariat and amended by the Delegation of Indonesia was approved, given that there were no further observations from the floor.

AGENDA ITEM 9: SUMMARY BY THE CHAIR

391. The Chair invited the Committee to consider the draft summary. He underlined that the discussion on each item would not be re-opened. The Committee would merely check each paragraph to ensure that it reflected the discussion that took place on the issue. He turned to paragraph 1.

392. The Delegation of Canada noted that the reference to May 20 should be replaced with May 19.

393. The Delegation of China made the same observation.

394. The Chair confirmed the correction. Paragraph 1 was adopted with the said amendment. Paragraphs 2 and 3 were also adopted given that there were no observations from the floor. The Chair then turned to paragraph 4.

395. The Delegation of Canada noted that the word "nineteenth" should be replaced with the word "eighteenth".

396. The Chair agreed with the correction. Paragraph 4 was adopted with the said amendment. Paragraphs 5 and 6.1 were also adopted given that there were no observations from the floor. The Chair turned to paragraph 6.2.

397. The Delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran proposed the addition of the following, "The Committee requested the Secretariat to report back to the next session concerning its decision of implementation of the Phase II".

398. The Chair stated that paragraph 6.2 was adopted with the amendment proposed by the Delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran given that there were no observations from the floor. He turned to paragraph 6.3.

399. The Delegation of Chile recalled that some delegations had congratulated WIPO on the report. Thus, it proposed that the words "and welcomed" be included in the last sentence before the words "the information contained in the document and approved the way forward proposed therein".

400. The Delegation of the United States of America proposed that the second sentence of paragraph 6.3 be amended to read as follows, "The Committee took note of the information contained in the document and approved Activity 6 proposed therein".

401. The Secretariat (Mr. Baloch) referred to the proposal by the Delegation of the United States of America and recalled that the Committee had discussed the way forward mentioned on page 5 of the Annex to document CDIP/19/8. At that time, the way forward for activities 1, 2, and 4 was adopted. The Delegation of the United States of America needed some time to consult its capital and the way forward for Activity 6 was adopted today. That was why the paragraph referred to the way forward and did not name the activities individually.

402. The Delegation of Brazil referred to the clarification provided by the Secretariat and stated that the other activities were also agreed.

403. The Chair stated that paragraph 6.2 was adopted with the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Chile given that there were no objections from the floor. Paragraphs 7.1 and 7.2 were also adopted given that there no observations from the floor. He turned to paragraph 8.1.

404. The Delegation of the United States of America referred to Roman numeral (ii) in the first paragraph of 8.1 and recalled that Member States decided to continue the discussion. Member States had discussed those recommendations in the informal consultations.

405. The Chair agreed with the Delegation of the United States of America.

406. The Delegation of the United States of America referred to the second paragraph of 8.1 and sought clarification on the text. The Delegation believed the only thing discussed was to continue discussions. It did not include the detailed steps mentioned in that paragraph.

407. The Delegation of Egypt believed the second paragraph of 8.1 reflected what the Chair mentioned at the end of the informal consultations. The Secretariat would report on the adopted recommendations addressed to it. For those that were addressed to Member States, Member States would provide feedback or proposals on how they saw the way forward in terms of implementation. The Delegation referred to the language used in the second paragraph of 8.1. The Delegation believed the word "implemented" under Roman numeral (i) should be replaced in with the word "adopted". The Delegation would like to know how the Secretariat would "seek clarifications on how to proceed concerning recommendations that need decisions by Member States". The Delegation believed this referred to the recommendations that were deferred for further discussion. These would need decisions. The Delegation noted that the last section of the paragraph referred to "the CDIP and Member States". It understood that they were one and the same as the CDIP was made up of Member States. The Delegation sought clarification on the Committee's role in relation to "define reporting and reviewing process".

408. The Chair recalled that some delegations wanted to know how recommendations would be dealt with. For approved recommendations, he had made it clear that it would depend on whether a recommendation was addressed to the Secretariat, Member States or the CDIP. The summary was drafted on that basis. It should be kept in mind that there were recommendations addressed to Member States, and recommendations that were addressed to the Committee as a whole. For recommendations that were directed to Member States, it would be up to the Member States to make the necessary contributions. Those addressed to the Committee as a whole would be discussed in the next session. The Chair suggested that language be added to clarify what was expected of Member States and what was expected of the Committee.

409. The Delegation of Egypt stated that it would be guided by the Chair as the summary should reflect the discussion during the informal consultations. It would examine the language

that would be presented in this regard. Separately, the Delegation referred to the use of the terms “adopted” and “approved”. The terms used in the paragraph should be harmonized.

410. The Chair believed the term “adopted” should be used in relation to the Committee. They would later be “approved” by the GA. He was unsure of the legal situation and sought the assistance of the Delegation of Egypt in harmonizing the language.

411. The Delegation of Egypt agreed with the Chair’s suggestion to use the term “adopted” in relation to the Committee.

412. The Chair stated that would be done.

413. The Delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran referred to Roman numeral (iii) in paragraph 1 of 8.1, “to adopt recommendations 1 and 2 to be addressed at the next session of the Committee”. The Delegation sought clarification on whether the recommendations were adopted or if adoption would be addressed in the next session.

414. The Chair stated that those recommendations were adopted and would be considered in the next session. This was his understanding of the results of the negotiations in the informal meeting on this matter.

415. The Delegation of Switzerland referred to the language in the second paragraph of 8.1. It noted the clarifications provided. As mentioned by the Delegation of Egypt the word “implemented” should be replaced with the word “adopted” under Roman numeral (i). The Delegation understood that would be done. The last section of the paragraph referred to the CDIP and Member States. It did not understand what they were supposed to do. The Delegation would like a little more time to analyze Roman numerals (iii) and (iv) in that section. Perhaps the Committee could continue with the rest of the document and return to this paragraph later.

416. The Chair provided some clarifications. Recommendation 2 was addressed to Member States. It was adopted and Member States could make contributions. This would be considered in the next session. That was his understanding of the outcome of the informal consultations. Recommendation 1 would require follow up. The Committee, Member States and the Secretariat could make contributions in this regard. The Committee, Member States and the Secretariat would need to do some work prior to the next session when these would be discussed.

417. The Delegation of Switzerland noted that the Chair referred to Roman numeral (iii) on Recommendations 1 and 2. Its concerns were on the second paragraph of 8.1, in particular, “(iii) define reporting and reviewing process; and (iv) review progress”. These were directed at the CDIP and Member States, and not just Recommendations 1 and 2. The Delegation understood that a review or follow up would be undertaken. Some recommendations were addressed to the Secretariat, and some to the Committee and / or Member States. The Delegation was still not clear on what was implied in terms of future work or follow-up in respect of the recommendations.

418. The Chair referred to Roman numeral (ii). Member States decided to continue the discussion on Recommendations 5 and 11 in the next session because there was no agreement. There was one group which could not agree to those recommendations. That was why the decision was taken to continue the discussion. That was also why they were separated from the other recommendations.

419. The Delegation of Egypt referred to the comment made by the Delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran on Roman numeral (iii) in the first paragraph of 8.1, “to adopt recommendations 1 and 2 to be addressed at the next session of the Committee”, and noted the nuance in the language. The Delegation reiterated its request for clarification on Roman numeral (iii), “define reporting and reviewing process”. It believed this was also raised by the Delegation of Switzerland.

420. The Chair referred to Roman numeral (iii) and reiterated that the adopted recommendations were addressed to different entities, namely, Member States, the CDIP and the Secretariat. The Committee would need to address Recommendation 2 in the next session. Member States could start working immediately on the recommendations that were addressed to them. The Secretariat could do the same in respect of the recommendations that were directed to it. The Chair turned to paragraph 8.2 given that there were no further observations from the floor.

421. The Delegation of Indonesia recalled it had taken the floor in the discussion on document CDIP/19/5. The Delegation proposed the inclusion of the following, “Taking into account observations made by delegations, the Secretariat was requested to report back to the Committee”.

422. The Chair stated that the Committee decided to take note of the report. It did not approve the contents of the report.

423. The Delegation of Indonesia would like to know whether South-South Cooperation would be discussed in the next session if the Committee merely took note of the report and did not approve the content.

424. The Secretariat (Mr. Baloch) believed the question concerned the nature of future documentation. The Committee was provided with a mapping of WIPO's activities at the 18th session of CDIP. The Secretariat provided a revised mapping in this session. It could continue to keep producing mappings, but these took quite a bit of time and effort to produce. The Secretariat was interested to know how the Committee would like to look at this issue in its next session. If it was a matter of mapping activities, this could be done on a periodical basis, perhaps once a year or even longer because not much would change in six months. However, if the intention behind the request was something different, the Secretariat would remain guided by Member States.

425. The Chair recalled that the Committee decided on take note of the report. This took place after the discussion in which different points of views were expressed. This was the outcome of the discussion on this matter.

426. The Delegation of Indonesia stated that it could agree with the language of paragraph 8.2 following the clarification provided by the Secretariat. The Delegation or a regional group may prepare a proposal for the Secretariat because they also wanted a roadmap to mainstream South-South Cooperation. Hence, they may come up with something on South-South Cooperation for the next session.

427. The Delegation of China recalled that it had pointed out a minor mistake in this document. The Delegation would like this to be reflected in the language.

428. The Chair sought clarification on the amendment sought by the Delegation of China.

429. The Delegation of China stated that an event organized in China last year was not reflected in the document.

430. The Chair stated that it would be mentioned in the report for this session, not in the Chair's Summary.

431. The Delegation of the United States of America enquired as to whether the Committee was adopting the original text on paragraph 8.2.

432. The Chair stated that no changes would be made to the text. The Committee was not going to re-open the discussion on this issue. The text reflected the decision that was taken on this issue. The Secretariat provided some clarifications on future work. Paragraph 8.2 was adopted given that there were no objections from the floor. The Chair turned to paragraph 8.3.

433. The Delegation of Brazil proposed that the words, "for improvement of future reports" be included in the last sentence after the words, "took note of the suggestions".

434. The Chair stated that would not be a problem as it was more of a cosmetic issue.

435. The Delegation of Chile recalled that suggestions were also made with regard to future work on the SDGs. This should also be reflected in the sentence.

436. The Chair believed that was reflected in the proposal by the Delegation of Brazil.

437. The Delegation of Brazil stated that its proposal was different as it concerned future reports. The suggestion by the Delegation of Chile was on future work. The Delegation supported the suggestion.

438. The Delegation of Egypt requested the Chair to read out the final text.

439. The Chair requested the Delegation of Chile to do so.

440. The Delegation of Chile suggested the following, "and took note of the suggestions for improvements for future reports and future work on this subject".

441. The Chair stated that paragraph 8.3 was adopted with the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Chile given that there were no objections from the floor. Paragraphs 8.4 and 8.5 were also adopted given that there were no observations from the floor. He turned to paragraph 8.6.

442. The Delegation of Indonesia wanted to put on record its understanding that paragraph (iv) of the decision to be appended to the Chair's Summary referred to the conclusion of the discussions on the way the Committee implemented its mandate, and should not be interpreted as the conclusion of the implementation of the mandates.

443. The Chair shared the same understanding. Paragraph 8.6 was adopted given that there were no objections from the floor. Paragraphs 8.7 and 8.8 were also adopted given that there were no observations from the floor. The Chair noted that the remaining paragraphs, namely, paragraphs 9, 10, and 11, were usually included in a summary. He sought the Secretariat's guidance on those paragraphs. Delegations that would like to make final statements could submit their statements to the Secretariat and it would be reflected in the report for this session. They did not need to present them in the room.

444. The Delegation of the United States of America would like to return to the second part of paragraph 8.1. The Chair had earlier noted that more language could be added to enhance clarity. Some discussion ensued but it was not clear whether complete clarity was reached on

this point. The Delegation would like the Chair to share what he had in mind for clarifying this part of paragraph 8.1.

445. The Chair believed he had clarified the matter after the interventions by the delegations of Switzerland and Egypt. He would like to know what was not clear for the Delegation of the United States of America.

446. The Delegation of the United States of America recalled that the Chair noted that he would be adding some text. The Delegation would like to know whether the Chair planned to do that in writing, and if so, whether it could be made available.

447. The Chair understood the request. He assured the Delegation of the United States of America that his clarifications would be reflected in a faithful manner in the revised text. The Secretariat's Report on the Recommendations of the Independent Review included a box listing all the recommendations. It stated the party / parties (Member States / CDIP / Secretariat) to whom each recommendation was addressed to. This could be used to revise the second paragraph of 8.1.

448. The Delegation of the United States of America stated that the Chair's clarification was helpful. It was familiar with the chart mentioned by the Chair.

449. The Chair enquired as to whether the Secretariat would like to make any clarifications with regard to the summary.

450. The Secretariat (Mr. Baloch) referred to paragraphs 9, 10 and 11. The square brackets around them would be removed after the Chair's approval and with his consent. The Secretariat hoped to make the summary available on the CDIP or the DA section of the WIPO website by Monday afternoon.

451. The Chair and the Member States thanked everyone for their participation and work during the session.

[Annex follows]

**LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS/
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

I. ÉTATS/STATES

(dans l'ordre alphabétique des noms français des États)/(in the alphabetical order of the names in French of the States)

AFGHANISTAN

Khan Rasol QARLOQ, Director, Afghanistan Central Business Registry and Intellectual Property, Ministry of Commerce and Industries (MoCI), Kabul

AFRIQUE DU SUD/SOUTH AFRICA

Kerry Lyn FAUL (Ms.), Head, National Intellectual Property Management Office (NIPMO), Pretoria

Batho Rufus MOLAPO, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

ALGÉRIE/ALGERIA

Sami BENCHIKH LEHOCINE, directeur général, Office national des droits d'auteur et droits voisins (ONDA), Ministère de la culture, Alger

Fayssal ALLEK, premier secrétaire, Mission permanente, Genève

ALLEMAGNE/GERMANY

Carl-Christian ZWICKEL, Staff Counsel, Federal Ministry of Justice and Consumer Protection, Berlin

ANGOLA

Alberto Samy GUIMARÃES, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

ARABIE SAOUDITE/SAUDI ARABIA

Fahad ALHARBI, Director, Administrative Support Department, Saudi Patent Office, King Abdullaziz City for Science and Technology (KACST), Riyadh

Rami ALHAZMI, Judge, Commercial Cases, Saudi Patent Office, King Abdullaziz City for Science and Technology (KACST), Riyadh

Mohammed ALMOQBEL, Judge, Commercial Cases, Saudi Patent Office, King Abdullaziz City for Science and Technology (KACST), Riyadh

Salem ALMUTAIRI, Translator, General Directorate of Copyright, Ministry of Culture and Information, Riyadh

ARGENTINE/ARGENTINA

Betina Carla FABBIETTI (Sra.), Secretaria de Embajada, Dirección Nacional de Negociaciones Económicas Multilaterales, Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores y Culto, Buenos Aires

María Inés RODRÍGUEZ (Sra.), Consejera, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

AUSTRALIE/AUSTRALIA

David SIMMONS, Assistant Director, International Policy and Cooperation, IP Australia, Canberra

AUTRICHE/AUSTRIA

Johannes WERNER, Head, Department of International Relations, Austrian Patent Office, Vienna

BAHAMAS

Bernadette BUTLER (Ms.), Minister Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

BARBADE/BARBADOS

Bentley GIBBS, Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva

Dwaine INNIS, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

BÉLARUS/BELARUS

Ivan SIMANOUSKI, Head, International Cooperation Division, National Center of Intellectual Property (NCIP), Minsk

BÉNIN/BENIN

Eloi LAOUROU, ambassadeur, représentant permanent, Mission permanente, Genève

Rosalie HOUNKANNON (Mme), directrice générale, Agence nationale de la propriété industrielle (ANaPI), Ministère de l'industrie, du commerce et de l'artisanat, Cotonou

Seth Simidélé TEBE, premier secrétaire, Mission permanente, Genève

BHOUTAN/BHUTAN

Kinley WANGCHUK, Minister Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

Tshering SAMDRUP, Intellectual Property Officer, Patent Examiner, Department of Intellectual Property, Ministry of Economic Affairs, Thimphu

BOSNIE-HERZÉGOVINE/BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Josip MERDŽO, Director, Institute for Intellectual Property of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Mostar

Mirjana STOLICA (Ms.), Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

BRÉSIL/BRAZIL

Fernando SOUZA, IP Researcher, Brazilian National Institute of Industrial Property (INPI), Ministry of Industry, Foreign Trade and Services, Rio de Janeiro

Caue OLIVEIRA FANHA, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission to the World Trade Organization (WTO), Geneva

Samo GONÇALVES, Third Secretary, Permanent Mission to the World Trade Organization (WTO), Geneva

BRUNÉI DARUSSALAM/BRUNEI DARUSSALAM

Mohammad Yusri YAHYA, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

BURKINA FASO

Mahamadi TASSEMBEDO, chef, Département des études, de la formation et du partenariat, Centre national de la propriété industrielle (CNPI), Ministère du commerce, de l'industrie et de l'artisanat, Ouagadougou

CAMBODGE/CAMBODIA

OP Rady, Director, Department of Intellectual Property, Ministry of Commerce, Phnom Penh

CAMEROUN/CAMEROON

Aboubakar ADAMOU, sous-directeur, Département de la propriété industrielle, Direction du développement technologique et de la propriété industrielle, Ministère des mines, de l'industrie et du développement technologique (MINMIDT), Yaoundé

CANADA

Saïda AOUIDIDI (Ms.), Senior Policy Analyst, Policy, Planning, International Affairs and Research Office, Gatineau

Sylvie LAROSE (Ms.), Senior Trade Policy Officer, Global Affairs Canada, Ottawa

Frédérique DELAPRÉE (Ms.), First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

CHILI/CHILE

Alejandra NAVEA (Sra.), Asesora Legal, Dirección General de Relaciones Económicas Internacionales, Departamento de Propiedad Intelectual, Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores, Santiago

Marcela PAIVA (Sra.), Consejera, Misión Permanente ante la Organización Mundial del Comercio (OMC), Ginebra

CHINE/CHINA

ZHANG Youli, Division Director, General Affairs Division, National Copyright Administration of China (NCAC), Beijing

DONG Gang, Deputy Division Director, International Cooperation Department, State Intellectual Property Office of China (SIPO), Beijing

ZHONG Yan, Officer, International Cooperation Department, State Intellectual Property Office of China (SIPO), Beijing

COLOMBIE/COLOMBIA

Beatriz LONDOÑO SOTO (Sra.), Embajadora, Representante Permanente, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

Juan Carlos GONZÁLEZ, Embajador, Representante Permanente Adjunto ante la OMPI, Misión Permanente ante la Organización Mundial del Comercio (OMC), Ginebra

Juan CAMILO SARETZKI FORERO, Consejero, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

Manuel Andrés CHACON, Consejero Comercial, Misión Permanente ante la Organización Mundial del Comercio (OMC), Ginebra

Daniela Carolina PÉREZ MAHECHA (Sra.), Pasante de derecho, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

COSTA RICA

Luis Amado JIMÉNEZ SANCHO, Director General, Registro Nacional de Costa Rica, Dirección de Propiedad Industrial y Dirección de Derechos de Autor y Conexos, San José

CUBA

María de los Ángeles SÁNCHEZ TORRES (Sra.), Directora General, Oficina Cubana de la Propiedad Industrial, La Habana

DANEMARK/DENMARK

Mette Wiuff KORSHOLM (Ms.), Legal Adviser, Danish Patent and Trademark Office, Ministry of Industry, Business and Financial Affairs, Taastrup

DJIBOUTI

Kadra AHMED HASSAN (Mme), ambassadeur, représentant permanent, Mission permanente, Genève

Ouloufa ISMAIL ABDO (Mme), directrice, Office djiboutien de la propriété industrielle et commerciale, Ministère délégué auprès du Ministère de l'économie et des finances chargé du commerce, des petites et moyennes entreprises (PMEs), de l'artisanat, du tourisme et de la formalisation, Djibouti

Houssein Mohamed NAGAT (Mme), chef de service, Office de la propriété industrielle et commerciale (ODPIC), Djibouti

Djama Mahamoud ALI, conseiller, Mission permanente, Genève

ÉGYPTE/EGYPT

Heba MOSTAFA RIZK (Ms.), Director, Innovation and Technology Unit, Multilateral Affairs and International Security Sector, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Cairo

Mohanad ABDELGAWAD, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

ÉMIRATS ARABES UNIS/UNITED ARAB EMIRATES

Shaima AL-AKEL (Ms.), International Organizations Executive, Permanent Mission to the World Trade Organization (WTO), Geneva

ÉQUATEUR/ECUADOR

Pablo ESCOBAR, Primer Secretario, Misión Permanente ante la Organización Mundial del Comercio (OMC), Ginebra

Ñusta MALDONADO (Sra.), Tercera Secretaria, Misión Permanente ante la Organización Mundial del Comercio (OMC), Ginebra

ESPAGNE/SPAIN

Eduardo ASENSIO LEYVA, Subdirector Adjunto, Subdirección General de Propiedad Intelectual, Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte, Madrid

María José CARDENAL MUÑOZ (Sra.), Vocal Asesor, Sección Segunda Comisión Propiedad Intelectual, Subdirección General de Propiedad Intelectual, Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte, Madrid

Ana María URRECHA ESPLUGA (Sra.), Consejera Técnica, Departamento de Coordinación Jurídica y Relaciones Internacionales, Oficina Española de Patentes y Marcas (OEPM), Ministerio de Industria, Energía y Turismo, Madrid

Oriol ESCALAS, Consejero, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

ESTONIE/ESTONIA

Martin JÕGI, IP Advisor, Private Law Division, Ministry of Justice, Tallinn

Evelin SIMER (Ms.), Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

ÉTATS-UNIS D'AMÉRIQUE/UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Theodore ALLEGRA, Deputy Permanent Representative, Chargé d'affaires a.i., Permanent Mission, Geneva

Marina LAMM (Ms.), Attorney Advisor, Office of Policy and International Affairs, United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), Department of Commerce, Alexandria, Virginia

Robert WALLER, Minister Counsellor, Multilateral Economic and Political Affairs, Permanent Mission, Geneva

Yasmine FULENA (Ms.), Intellectual Property Advisor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

Deborah LASHLEY-JOHNSON (Ms.), Intellectual Property Attaché, Permanent Mission, Geneva

Kristine SCHLEGELMILCH (Ms.), Intellectual Property Attaché, Permanent Mission, Geneva

EX-RÉPUBLIQUE YOUGOSLAVE DE MACÉDOINE/THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

Natasha ZDRAVKOVSKA KOLOVSKA (Ms.), Deputy Head, General Department, State Office of Industrial Property, Skopje

Defrime AMATI BEKJIROVA (Ms.), Advisor, Trademark Department, State Office of Industrial Property, Skopje

FÉDÉRATION DE RUSSIE/RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Elena KULIKOVA (Ms.), Head of Division, Legal Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Moscow

Galina MIKHEEVA (Ms.), Head, Multilateral Cooperation Division, International Cooperation Department, Federal Service for Intellectual Property (ROSPATENT), Moscow

FRANCE

Francis GUENON, conseiller, Mission permanente, Genève

GÉORGIE/GEORGIA

Ana GOBECHIA (Ms.), Advisor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

GHANA

Alexander Grant NTRAKWA, Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva

Joseph OWUSU-ANSAH, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

GRÈCE/GREECE

Rhea TSITSANI (Ms.), First Counsellor (Economic and Commercial Affairs), Permanent Mission, Geneva

Christina VALASSOPOULOU (Ms.), First Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

GUATEMALA

Flor de María GARCÍA DÍAZ (Sra.), Consejera, Misión Permanente ante la Organización Mundial del Comercio (OMC), Ginebra

INDE/INDIA

Virander PAUL, Ambassador, Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva

Sumit SETH, First Secretary (Economic Affairs), Permanent Mission, Geneva

INDONÉSIE/INDONESIA

Razilu RAZILU, Executive Secretary, Directorate General of Intellectual Property, Ministry of Law and Human Rights, Jakarta

Adi DZULFUAT, Deputy Director, Trade Disputes and Intellectual Property, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Jakarta

Ari Juliano GEMA, Deputy Chairman, Intellectual Property Rights Facilitation and Regulation, Indonesia Agency for Creative Economy, Jakarta

Muhammad FAUZY, Head, Subdirector Intellectual Property Rights Advocacy, Intellectual Property Rights Facilitation and Regulation, Indonesia Agency for Creative Economy, Jakarta

Surahno SURAHNO, Head, General Affairs Division, Directorate General of Intellectual Property, Ministry of Law and Human Rights, Jakarta

Erry PRASETYO, Third Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

IRAN (RÉPUBLIQUE ISLAMIQUE D')/IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)

Mahmoud ESFAHANI NEJAD, Deputy Director General, Legal and International Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tehran

Reza DEGHANI, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

ISRAËL/ISRAEL

Yehudit Galilee METZER (Ms.), Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

Dan ZAFRIR (Ms.), Advisor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

ITALIE/ITALY

Matteo EVANGELISTA, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

Mattia MORALE, Intern, Permanent Mission, Geneva

JAPON/JAPAN

Tatsuo TAKESHIGE, Director, International Policy Division, Japan Patent Office, Tokyo

Hiroki UEJIMA, Deputy Director, International Policy Division, Japan Patent Office, Tokyo

Ryo KASAHARA, Assistant Director, International Policy Division, Japan Patent Office, Tokyo

Ryoei CHIJIWA, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

Kenji SAITO, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

Rina ISHII, Administrative Officer, International Policy Division, Japan Patent Office, Tokyo

KAZAKHSTAN

Gaziz SEITZHANOV, Third Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

KIRGHIZISTAN/KYRGYZSTAN

Samat BAIZAKOV, Deputy Chairman, State Service of Intellectual Property and Innovation, Bishkek

KOWEÏT/KUWAIT

Abdulaziz TAQI, Commercial Attaché, Permanent Mission, Geneva

LESOTHO

Seeeng Iris MOTIKOE (Ms.), First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

LETTONIE/LATVIA

Liene GRIKE (Ms.), Advisor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

LITUANIE/LITHUANIA

Renata RINKAUSKIENE (Ms.), Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

MALTE/MALTA

Michelle BONELLO (Ms.), Director, Commerce Department, Ministry of Economy, Investment and Small Business, Valletta

Hubert FARUGIA, Technical Attaché, Permanent Mission, Geneva

MAROC/MOROCCO

Hassan BOUKILI, représentant permanent adjoint, chargé d'affaires, Mission permanente, Genève

Ilham BENNANI (Mme), chef, Département de l'innovation technologique, Office marocain de la propriété industrielle et commerciale, Ministère de l'industrie, du commerce, de l'investissement et de l'économie numérique, Casablanca

Khalid DAHBI, conseiller, Mission permanente, Genève

MAURITANIE/MAURITANIA

Mohamed Elmoctar SIDI AHMED, conseiller du Ministre, Cellule du droit d'auteur, Ministère de la culture, Nouakchott

MEXIQUE/MEXICO

Jorge LOMONACO, Embajador, Representante Permanente, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

Juan Raúl HEREDIA ACOSTA, Embajador, Representante Permanente Alterno, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

Mónica VILLELA GROBET (Sra.), Directora General Adjunta, Servicios de Apoyo, Instituto Mexicano de la Propiedad Industrial (IMPI), Secretaría de Economía, Ciudad de México

Laura Cristina SÁNCHEZ VILLICAÑA (Sra.), Especialista en Propiedad Industrial, Instituto Mexicano de la Propiedad Industrial (IMPI), Secretaría de Economía, Ciudad de México

María del Pilar ESCOBAR BAUTISTA (Sra.), Consejera, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

MYANMAR

Moe Moe THWE (Ms.), Director, Intellectual Property Department, Ministry of Education, Nay Pyi Taw

NAMIBIE/NAMIBIA

Tileinge S. ANDIMA, Chief Executive Officer, Intellectual Property Department, Business and Intellectual Property Authority (BIPA), Windhoek

Ainna Vilengi KAUNDU (Ms.), Executive, Intellectual Property Department, Business and Intellectual Property Authority (BIPA), Windhoek

NICARAGUA

Hernán ESTRADA ROMÁN, Embajador, Representante Permanente, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

Nohelia Carolina VARGAS IDÍQUEZ (Sra.), Primera Secretaria, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

NIGÉRIA/NIGERIA

Michael Okon AKPAN, Head, Regulatory Department, Nigerian Copyright Commission (NCC), Abuja

Chichi UMESI (Ms.), Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

OMAN

Mohammed AL BALUSHI, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

UGANDA/UGANDA

Mercy Kyomugasho KAINOBWISHO (Ms.), Director, Department of Intellectual Property, Uganda Registration Services Bureau (URSB), Kampala

George Tebagana, Third Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

PAKISTAN

Farukh Akhter AMIL, Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva

Aamar Aftab Qureshi, Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva

Mariam Saeed (Ms.), First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

Bilal Akram Shah, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

Zunaira Latif (Ms.), Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

PARAGUAY

Roberto Recalde, Segundo Secretario, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

Cristina Raquel Pereira Farina (Sra.), Attaché, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

PÉROU/PERU

Cristobal Melgar, Minister Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

PHILIPPINES

Lolibeth Medrano (Ms.), Director III, Bureau of Patents, Intellectual Property Office of the Philippines, Taguig City

POLOGNE/POLAND

Wojciech Piatkowski, Minister Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

PORTUGAL

João Pina de Moraes, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

RÉPUBLIQUE DE CORÉE/REPUBLIC OF KOREA

CHOI Yooyoung (Ms.), Assistant Director, Multilateral Affairs Division, Korean Intellectual Property Office (KIPO), Daejeon

JUNG Dae Soon, Counsellor, IP attaché, Permanent Mission, Geneva

RÉPUBLIQUE DE MOLDOVA/REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA

Marin CEBOTARI, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

Igor MOLDOVAN, Counsellor of Director General, State Agency on Intellectual Property, Chisinau

RÉPUBLIQUE DOMINICAINE/DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Ysset ROMÁN (Sra.), Ministro Consejero, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

Ained TORRES LIRANZO (Sra.), Analista de Información Tecnológica, Centro de Apoyo a la Tecnología e Innovación (CATI), Oficina Nacional de la Propiedad Industrial (ONAPI), Ministerio de Industria, Comercio y Mipymes, Santo Domingo

RÉPUBLIQUE POPULAIRE DÉMOCRATIQUE DE CORÉE/DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF KOREA

JONG Myong Hak, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

RÉPUBLIQUE TCHÈQUE/CZECH REPUBLIC

Evžen MARTÍNEK, Lawyer, International Department, Industrial Property Office of the Czech Republic, Prague

ROUMANIE/ROMANIA

Adriana ALDESCU (Ms.), Director General a.i., Romanian State Office for Inventions and Trademarks (OSIM), Bucharest

Cristian-Nicolae FLORESCU, Head, International Relations Department, Romanian Copyright Office (ORDA), Bucharest

Rafael-Nicolae CHIBEA, Expert, Economic Department, Romanian State Office for Inventions and Trademarks (OSIM), Bucharest

Eugenia NICOLAE (Ms.), Expert, Databases and Information Systems Division, Informational and Technical Support Department, Romanian State Office for Inventions and Trademarks (OSIM), Bucharest

ROYAUME-UNI/UNITED KINGDOM

Francis ROODT, International Policy Directorate, UK Intellectual Property Office (UK IPO), London

SAINT-SIÈGE/HOLY SEE

Carlo Maria MARENGHI, attaché, Mission permanente, Genève

SÉNÉGAL/SENEGAL

Makhtar DIA, directeur général, Agence sénégalaise pour la propriété industrielle et l'innovation technologique (ASPIT), Ministère de l'industrie et des mines, Dakar

Lamine Ka MBAYE, premier secrétaire, Mission permanente, Genève

SEYCHELLES

Cecille KALEBI (Ms.), Director General of Culture, Department of Culture, Ministry of Youth, Sports and Culture, Mahé

Sybil Jones LABROSSE (Ms.), Director, Office of the Registrar of Copyrights, Department of Culture, Ministry of Youth, Sports and Culture, Mahé

SLOVAQUIE/SLOVAKIA

Anton FRIC, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

SRI LANKA

Mohamed Aboobacker THAJUDEEN, Additional Secretary, Small and Medium-Sized Enterprise and Textile Industry Development, Ministry of Industry and Commerce, Colombo

SUÈDE/SWEDEN

Gabriel PINO, Director, International Cooperation, Technical Assistance, Legal and International Affairs Department, Swedish Patent and Registration Office (PRV), Ministry of Enterprise and Innovation, Stockholm

Patrick ANDERSSON, Senior Advisor for International Affairs, Legal and International Affairs Department, Swedish Patent and Registration Office (PRV), Ministry of Enterprise and Innovation, Stockholm

SUISSE/SWITZERLAND

Olga ALLEMANN (Mme), coordinateur de projet, Division du droit et des affaires internationales, Institut fédéral de la propriété intellectuelle (IPI), Berne

Reynald VEILLARD, conseiller, Mission permanente, Genève

Alebe LINHARES MESQUITA, stagiaire international, Division du droit et des affaires internationales, Institut fédéral de la propriété intellectuelle (IPI), Berne

TCHAD/CHAD

Adjji MALLAYE, Second Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

THAÏLANDE/THAILAND

Sunanta KANGVALKULKIJ (Ms.), Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission to the World Trade Organization (WTO), Geneva

Usana BERANANDA (Ms.), Minister, Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission to the World Trade Organization (WTO), Geneva

Navarat TANKAMALAS (Ms.), Minister Counsellor, Permanent Mission to the World Trade Organization (WTO), Geneva

Suwannarat RADCHARAK (Ms.), Trade Officer, Department of Intellectual Property (DIP), Ministry of Commerce, Nonthaburi

TOGO

Ousmane Afo SALIFOU, deuxième conseiller, Mission permanente, Genève

TUNISIE/TUNISIA

Walid DOUDECH, ambassadeur, représentant permanent, Mission permanente, Genève

Nasreddine NAOUALI, conseiller, Mission permanente, Genève

Nadia HAJEJ AKARI EP BEN HAMIDA (Mme), chef, Service de coopération internationale et des relations publiques, Ministère des affaires culturelles, Tunis

TURQUIE/TURKEY

Ismail GÜMÜŞ, Senior Expert, European Union and External Affairs Department, Turkish Patent and Trademark Office, Ankara

UKRAINE

Yurii KUCHYNSKYI, Head, Department of Public Relations and Protocol Events Department, State Intellectual Property Service (SIPS), Ukrainian Intellectual Property Institute (Ukrpatent), Ministry of Economic Development and Trade of Ukraine, Kyiv

Mariia VASYLENKO (Ms.), Head, Department of Methodology of the Law Intellectual Property, State Intellectual Property Service (SIPS), State Enterprise, Ministry of Economic Development and Trade of Ukraine, Kyiv

URUGUAY

Juan BARBOZA, Consejero, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

VENEZUELA (RÉPUBLIQUE BOLIVARIENNE DU)/VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)

Genoveva CAMPOS DE MAZZONE (Sra.), Consejero, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

VIET NAM

NGUYEN Duc Dung, Director, International Cooperation Division, National Office of Intellectual Property (NOIP), Ministry of Science and Technology, Hanoi

YÉMEN/YEMEN

Mohammed FAKHER, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

ZAMBIE/ZAMBIA

Margret Mary Lungu KAEMBA (Ms.), Minister Counsellor, Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva

ZIMBABWE

Taonga MUSHAYAVANHU, Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva

Willie MUSHAYI, Deputy Registrar, Zimbabwe Intellectual Property Office (ZIPO), Ministry of Justice, Legal and Parliamentary Affairs, Harare

Rhoda Tafadzwa NGARANDE (Ms.), Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

II. ORGANISATIONS INTERNATIONALES INTERGOUVERNEMENTALES/
INTERNATIONAL INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

ASSOCIATION EUROPÉENNE DE LIBRE-ÉCHANGE (AELE)/EUROPEAN FREE TRADE
ASSOCIATION (EFTA)

Ogmundur MAGNUSSON, Officer, Trade Relations Division, Geneva

CENTRE SUD (CS)/SOUTH CENTRE (SC)

Viviana MUNOZ TELLEZ (Ms.), Coordinator, Development, Innovation and Intellectual Property Programme (DIIP), Geneva

Nirmalya SYAM, Program Officer, Development, Innovation and Intellectual Property Programme (DIIP), Geneva

Sanaz JAVADI (Ms.), Intern, Development, Innovation and Intellectual Property Programme (DIIP), Geneva

OFFICE DES BREVETS DU CONSEIL DE COOPÉRATION DES ÉTATS ARABES DU GOLFE
(CCG)/PATENT OFFICE OF THE COOPERATION COUNCIL FOR THE ARAB STATES OF
THE GULF (GCC PATENT OFFICE)

Fatma AL RAHBI (Ms.), Department of Operational Support, Riyadh

Maha ALSHEIKH (Ms.), Third Secretary, Legal Department, Riyadh

ORGANISATION AFRICAINE DE LA PROPRIÉTÉ INTELLECTUELLE (OAPI)/AFRICAN
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION (OAPI)

Jean-Pierre William AKPLOGAN, chargé des Études, du financement et du suivi des projets de valorisation, Yaoundé

ORGANISATION DE COOPÉRATION ISLAMIQUE (OCI)/ORGANIZATION OF ISLAMIC
COOPERATION (OIC)

Halim GRABUS, Counsellor, Geneva

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ALIMENTATION ET L'AGRICULTURE
(FAO)/FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS (FAO)

Ahmad MUKHTAR, Economist, Geneva

ORGANISATION EUROPÉENNE DE DROIT PUBLIC (EPLO)/EUROPEAN PUBLIC LAW
ORGANIZATION(EPLO)

George PAPADATOS, Permanent Observer, Geneva

ORGANISATION EUROPÉENNE DES BREVETS (OEB)/EUROPEAN PATENT ORGANISATION (EPO)

Alessia VOLPE (Ms.), Coordinator, International Cooperation, Munich

ORGANISATION INTERNATIONALE DE LA FRANCOPHONIE (OIF)

Lorick Stephane MOUBACKA MOUBACKA, assistant de coopération pour les Affaires économiques et de développement, Genève

ORGANISATION MONDIALE DE LA SANTÉ (OMS)/WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION (WHO)

Peter BEYER, Senior Advisor, Essential Medicines and Health Products, Geneva

ORGANISATION MONDIALE DU COMMERCE (OMC)/WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION (WTO)

WU Xiaoping (Ms.), Counsellor, Intellectual Property Division, Geneva

ORGANISATION RÉGIONALE AFRICAINE DE LA PROPRIÉTÉ INTELLECTUELLE (ARIPO)/AFRICAN REGIONAL INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION (ARIPO)

Christopher KIIGE, Director, Intellectual Property, Harare

UNION ÉCONOMIQUE ET MONÉTAIRE OUEST-AFRICAINE (UEMOA)/WEST AFRICAN ECONOMIC AND MONETARY UNION (WAEMU)

Iba Mar OULARE, délégué permanent, Délégation permanente, Genève

Koffi GNAKADJA, conseiller, Délégation permanente, Genève

UNION EUROPÉENNE (UE)/EUROPEAN UNION (EU)

Oliver HALL-ALLEN, First Counsellor, Delegation of the European Union to the United Nations Office in Geneva

Anne VON ZUKOWSKI (Ms.), Political Officer, Internal Market, Industry, Entrepreneurship and Small and Medium Sized Enterprises (SMEs), Brussels

Michele EVANGELISTA, Intern, Delegation of the European Union to the United Nations Office in Geneva

III. ORGANISATIONS INTERNATIONALES NON GOUVERNEMENTALES/
INTERNATIONAL NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

Asociación Argentina de Intérpretes (AADI)

Susana RINALDI (Sra.), Directora, Relaciones Internacionales, Vicepresidencia, Buenos Aires
Jorge BERRETA, Asesor Legal, Departamento Legal, Buenos Aires
Inés RINALDI (Sra.), Asesora, Relaciones Internacionales, Buenos Aires

Association européenne des étudiants en droit (ELSA International)/European Law Students' Association (ELSA International)

Ymane GLAOUA (Ms.), Head of Delegation, Brussels
Ugur Sarper BOZ, Delegate, Brussels
Katarzyna UMERLE (Ms.), Delegate, Brussels
Melike Nureşan YARDIMCI (Ms.), Delegate, Brussels

Association internationale pour la protection de la propriété intellectuelle (AIPPI)/International Association for the Protection of Intellectual Property (AIPPI)

Reinhard OERTLI, Observer, Zurich

Centre international d'investissement (CII)

Andrei GENERALOV, President, Geneva
Olga GENERALOVA-KUTUZOVA (Ms.), General Secretary, Geneva
Sergey LESIN, Member of the Board, Moscow
Alexander SAYTBURKHANOV, Member of the Board, Tver, Russian Federation
Tatiana ARSENEVA (Ms.), Advisor, Tver, Russian Federation

Chamber of Commerce and Industry of the Russian Federation (CCIRF)

Elena KOLOKOLOVA (Ms.), Representative, Geneva

Comité consultatif mondial des amis (CCMA)/Friends World Committee for Consultation (FWCC)

Susan BRAGDON (Ms.), Programme Representative, Geneva
Nora MEIER (Ms.), Programme Assistant, Geneva

CropLife International/CropLife International (CROPLIFE)

Tatjana SACHSE (Ms.), Legal adviser, Geneva

Fédération internationale de la vidéo (IFV)/International Video Federation (IVF)

Benoit MULLER, consultant, Genève
Marie ARBACHE (Mme.), stagiaire, Genève

Fédération internationale de l'industrie du médicament (FIIM)/International Federation of Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Associations (IFPMA)

Grega KUMER, Head of Office, Geneva

Innovation Insights

Ania JEDRUSIK (Ms.), Policy Advisor, Geneva

Médecins sans frontières (MSF)

HU Yuanqiong (Ms.), Senior Legal and Policy Advisor, Geneva

Medicines Patent Pool Foundation (MPP)
Esteban BURRONE, Head of Policy, Geneva
Erika DUENAS (Ms.), Advocacy Officer, Geneva

Traditions pour Demain/Traditions for Tomorrow
Diego GRADIS, président exécutif, Rolle
Christiane GRADIS (Mme), vice-présidente, Rolle

IV. BUREAU/OFFICERS

Président/Chair: Walid DOUDECH (Tunisie/Tunisia)

Vice-Président/Vice Chair: Igor MOLDOVAN (République de Moldova/Republic of Moldova)

Secrétaire/Secretary: Irfan BALOCH (OMPI/WIPO)

V. SECRETARIAT DE L'ORGANISATION MONDIALE DE LA PROPRIÉTÉ INTELLECTUELLE (OMPI)/SECRETARIAT OF THE WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION (WIPO)

Francis GURRY, directeur général/Director General

Mario MATUS, vice-directeur général/Deputy Director General

Irfan BALOCH, secrétaire du Comité du développement et de la propriété intellectuelle (CDIP) et directeur, Division de la coordination du Plan d'action pour le développement/Secretary to the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP) and Director, Development Agenda Coordination Division

Georges GHANDOUR, administrateur principal de programme, Division de la coordination du Plan d'action pour le développement/Senior Program Officer, Development Agenda Coordination Division

Mihaela CERBARI (Mme/Ms.), administratrice adjointe chargée de l'appui au programme, Division de la coordination du Plan d'action pour le développement/Associate Program Support Officer, Development Agenda Coordination Division

Maria Daniela LIZARZABURU AGUILAR (Mme/Ms.), administratrice adjointe chargée de l'appui au programme, Division de la coordination du Plan d'action pour le développement/Associate Program Support Officer, Development Agenda Coordination Division

[End of Annex and of document]