

Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP)

Fifteenth Session
Geneva, April 20 to 24, 2015

REPORT ON THE WIPO EXPERT FORUM ON INTERNATIONAL TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER

prepared by the Secretariat

1. The Annex to this document contains a report on the *WIPO Expert Forum on International Technology Transfer*, held in Geneva from February 16 to 18, 2015, as part of the Development Agenda Project on Intellectual Property and Technology Transfer: Common Challenges – Building Solutions (CDIP/6/4 Rev.¹).

2. *The CDIP is invited to consider and approve the content of this document.*

[Annex follows]

¹ http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=156582

Table of contents

BACKGROUND.....	2
FACTUAL REPORT	2
KEYNOTE PRESENTATIONS.....	3
MAIN SESSIONS	4
Session 1: Analytic Studies on International Technology Transfer.....	4
Session 2: Measures for Promoting International Technology Transfer: Challenges and Solutions.....	7
Session 3: Review and Closing: Thoughts for Consideration by WIPO's Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP)	10
FEEDBACK.....	11

BACKGROUND

1. The Project on Intellectual Property and Technology Transfer: “Common Challenges - Building Solutions”, approved by the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP) at its sixth session, held in November 2010, envisaged the following project deliverables:

- (a) the organization of five regional technology transfer consultation meetings;
- (b) the elaboration of six peer-reviewed analytic studies;
- (c) the drafting of a concept paper on building solutions as the basis for discussion at the International Expert Forum, to be submitted to the CDIP for approval;
- (d) the organization of an International Expert Forum in the form of an international conference;
- (e) the preparation and provision of materials, modules, teaching tools and other instruments resulting from recommendations adopted at the High-Level International Expert Forum;
- (f) the creation of a Web Forum; and
- (g) the incorporation of any outcome resulting from the above activities into the WIPO programs, after consideration by the CDIP and any possible recommendation by the Committee to the General Assembly.

2. Following the organization of five regional technology transfer consultation meetings, the elaboration of six peer-reviewed analytic studies and the approval by the CDIP of a Concept Paper, the Expert Forum on International Technology Transfer envisaged under the Project was held at WIPO’s headquarters in Geneva from February 16 to 18, 2015.

3. This factual report summarizes the discussions held at the Forum and sets out the “Expert Thoughts” which the CDIP is invited to consider and approve with a view to incorporating work towards implementing those “Expert Thoughts” into WIPO work programs.

FACTUAL REPORT

4. As had been approved by the CDIP at its fourteenth session (CDIP/14/8 Rev. 2²), the Expert Forum on International Technology Transfer took the form of an international conference, aimed at initiating discussions on how, within WIPO’s mandate, to further facilitate access to knowledge and technology for developing countries and LDCs, including in emerging areas, as well as other areas of special interest for developing countries, taking into account recommendations 19, 25, 26 and 28 (food, agriculture, climate change). Drawing, *inter alia*, on the outcomes of the five regional technology transfer consultation meetings, the six peer-reviewed studies and the experience of global Experts in the area of transfer of intellectual property rights in academia and industry, the Forum provided a framework for an open dialogue among Experts from both developed and developing countries knowledgeable in public and private sector technology transfer and for debates on technology transfer supportive IP-related policies by developed countries.

² http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=290583

5. All of the presentations given during the event are available on the conference website³. In addition, videos-on-demand for all three days are also available on the WIPO webcast website⁴.
6. The event was attended by some 130 participants⁵. During the entire three days of the event, discussions were webcasted via the WIPO website.

KEYNOTE PRESENTATIONS

7. Following a welcome address by Mr. John Sandage, Deputy Director General, Patents and Technology Sector, the event started with two keynote presentations, providing high-level perspectives on international technology transfer from both developed and developing countries⁶.
8. In her keynote presentation on “International Technology Transfer: High-Level Perspective from Developed Countries”, Ms. Sherry Knowles, Principal, Knowles Intellectual Property Strategies, LLC, Atlanta, Georgia, United States of America, focused on the actions that could be taken, including by WIPO and the private sector, to foster international technology transfer. She encouraged “self-identification,” that is, the identification of specific needs via a “clearing-house”, which would connect requestors with corporations through a routing database, as the key to ensure effective international technology transfer. In addition, evidence from recent experiments in pharmaceutical companies suggested that *knowledge* pools were more attractive to developing countries than *patent* pools. For this reason, the development of a capacity-building tool kit on knowhow licensing by WIPO would be of enormous value. She further suggested that large corporations, which aimed at expanding corporate social responsibility (CSR) reports, should include technology transfer to developing countries to such CSR reports and proposed that WIPO, to encourage such actions, could provide awards to model corporations with exemplary CSR reports.
9. In his keynote presentation on “International Technology Transfer: High-Level Perspective from Developing Countries”, Mr. McLean Sibanda, Chief Executive Officer (CEO), Innovation Hub, Pretoria, South Africa, focused on WIPO’s role in bridging the technology transfer divide. He, in particular, referred to a three-pronged approach for developing countries: building human capital; expanding national innovation systems; and developing a balanced IP system. Referring to the example of Africa, which generated less than 1% of the global patent output, Mr. Sibanda expressed the view that the disparity in the global share of IP creation, ownership and commercialization was untenable, and that there was thus the need for WIPO to invest in human capacity development geared at promoting technology transfer. Using the example of South Korea (which had undergone a transformative mutation through technology transfer; in 1960, it had been poorer than any sub-Saharan country in Africa, with a per-capita income of 100 United States dollars half a century ago, compared to 12,000 United States dollars today), Mr. Sibanda further expressed the view that WIPO should assist in the development of science, technology and innovation (STI) ecosystems through the establishment of technology transfer offices (TTOs). Furthermore, WIPO could assist in the development of a balanced IP system, with the proviso that it served the needs of countries at all levels of development.

³ http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/details.jsp?meeting_id=35562

⁴ <http://www.wipo.int/webcasting/en/>

⁵ http://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/mdocs/en/wipo_inn_ge_15/wipo_inn_ge_15_inf_2_prov.pdf

⁶ http://www.wipo.int/pressroom/en/stories/int_tech_transfer.html

MAIN SESSIONS

10. The main part of the Expert Forum was divided into three (3) sessions:

(a) Session 1, entitled “Analytic Studies on International Technology Transfer,” featured presentations by the authors of the six technology transfer studies which had been carried out under the Project by international Experts, each followed by presentations by the peer-reviewers of these studies and questions and answers sessions, during which the floor was opened to all participants to ask questions.

(b) During Session 2, entitled “Measures for Promoting International Technology Transfer: Challenges and Solutions,” a Panel of 8 Experts, guided by a Moderator, discussed challenges and possible solutions to international technology transfer in respect of six different themes: capacity building; global cooperation; institutional framework; regulatory framework; innovation infrastructure; and funding/evaluation mechanisms, with extensive questions and answers sessions following the panel discussions on each of the themes.

(c) During Session 3, entitled “Review and Closing: Thoughts for Consideration by WIPO’s Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP)”, the Panelists, guided by the Moderator, agreed on a list of “Expert Thoughts” for consideration by the CDIP with a view to incorporating work towards implementing those “Expert Thoughts” into WIPO work programs.

Session 1: Analytic Studies on International Technology Transfer

11. Session 1, entitled “Analytic Studies on International Technology Transfer,” featured presentations by the authors of the six technology transfer studies which had been carried out under the Project by international Experts, each followed by presentations by the peer-reviewers of these studies and questions and answers sessions, during which the floor was opened to all participants in the Forum to ask questions.

Study “International Technology Transfer: An Analysis from the Perspective of Developing Countries”

12. The Study entitled: “International Technology Transfer: An Analysis from the Perspective of Developing Countries”⁷ was authored by Mr. Keith Maskus and Mr. Kamal Saggi and was presented by one of the authors, Mr. Kamal Saggi. In his presentation, Mr. Saggi identified the formal channels for international technology transfer to address the challenges in technology transactions. According to Mr. Saggi, there were three traditional channels: a) trade in goods and services; b) foreign direct investment; and c) intellectual property licensing, including the licensing of trade secrets. Recently, as further stated by Mr. Saggi, newer channels of international technology transfer had emerged through: d) open innovation; e) migration; and e) global innovation networks (GINs). The Study questioned whether the emergence of these newer elements of international technology transfer called for a new set of policies.

13. Mr. Saggi expressed that view that, as a result, besides multilateral policies, international technology transfer could be enhanced through these newer channels by (a) improving the chances of meaningful engagement with research networks and open innovation; (b) encouraging greater temporary mobility of skilled and entrepreneurial workers; and c) calling for an international Treaty on Access to Basic Science and Technology (ABST), enabling the creation of common pools, such as know-how pools.

⁷

http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=287165

14. The presentation of the Study was followed by a presentation of the reviewer of the Study, Mr. Walter Park. In his presentation, the reviewer focused on the global distribution of patent priority filings for developing countries (excluding China, South Korea and Taiwan (Province of China)) which, according to data from the European Patent Office, had decreased from 2.4% in 1995 to 1.6% in 2009. The reviewer expressed the view that participation in global innovation networks (GINs) should be encouraged and a Treaty on Access to Basic Science and Technology (ABST) could facilitate the diffusion of science and technology resources as well as the creation of common pools.

Study “Economics of IP and International Technology Transfer”

15. The Study entitled: “Economics of IP and International Technology Transfer”⁸ was presented by the author, Mr. A. Damodaran. In his presentation, the author focused on three issues: (a) the role of licensing in technology transfer; (b) the role of patents stemming from public-funded research; and (c) the importance of absorptive capacity and the role of intellectual migration. In the author’s view, the licensing of intellectual property was to be seen as a key tool for international technology transfer. The market for technologies was booming, but not all countries benefited from these technologies, especially least developed countries (LDCs) and several developing countries. Other channels for licensing included compulsory licensing for drugs or patent pooling for green technologies.

16. The presentation of the Study was followed by a presentation of the reviewer of the Study, Mr. Francesco Lissoni. In his presentation, the reviewer focused on patents stemming from public-funded research, and stated that public opinion’s alertness and governments’ influence in brokering deals benefited from the transparent information on the extent to which certain inventions were based on pre-existing public research or direct public funding (‘traceability principle’). Finally, on the question of absorptive capacity and intellectual migration, the reviewer further stated that there was an increasing role of migrant inventors in science and technology of developed countries. The reviewer proposed that the role of migrant inventors could be traced through patents with a Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) information on nationality, through name analysis and data linkage.

Study “Intellectual Property-Related Policies and Initiatives in Developed Countries to Promote Technology Transfer”

17. The Study entitled: “Intellectual Property-Related Policies and Initiatives in Developed Countries to Promote Technology Transfer”⁹ was presented by the author of the Study, Mr. Sisule Musungu. In his presentation, the author provided a number of recommendations on patent disclosure (clearer standards), border measures (IPR should not constrain exports, including goods-in-transit), export goods produced under compulsory licensing and provisions on licensing to ease restrictions on location of use, especially publicly-funded innovations. On the role of patent disclosure, the author stated that improving the quality of patents could be increased through better disclosure standards, the wider availability of databases and search tools, and the inclusion of post-grant inter-party reviews.

18. The presentation of the Study was followed by a presentation of the reviewer of the Study, Mr. Walter Park. In his presentation, the reviewer focused on the role of patent disclosure. While agreeing that the quality of patents varied, the reviewer argued that patents did not represent the entire product. The reviewer further stated that additional types of intellectual property such as trade secrets and know-how were also important. In fact, higher standards for trade secret protection had an impact on technology transfer.

⁸ http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=287167

⁹ http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=287217

Study “Case Studies on Cooperation and Exchange Between R&D Institutions in Developed and Developing Countries”

19. The Study entitled: “Case Studies on Cooperation and Exchange Between R&D Institutions in Developed and Developing Countries”¹⁰ was presented by the author of the Study, Mr. Bowman Heiden. In his presentation, the author provided practical examples through eight case studies. In his view, analyzing the value models and the role of IPRs from the different case studies had revealed the following conclusions: two case studies (the Gastric Cancer Research Project and the Infant Diarrhea Program) were based on the publication of knowledge for utilization in the public sphere; two case studies (the Once-a-Day HIV Medicine Project and the Late Blight Resistant Potato Project) revolved on the proprietary control of knowledge to facilitate utilization through commercial markets for humanitarian purposes; and three case studies (the Phenolic Extract Project, the Strawberry Licensing Program, and the Rubber Nano Project) relied on the proprietary control of knowledge for the purpose of commercial licensing and venture creation.

20. The presentation of the Study was followed by a presentation of the reviewer of the Study, Mr. Nikolaus Thumm. The reviewer further complemented the author’s presentation and showed evidence collected from 7000 European patents through the European research project on patent value, PATVAL, indicating that only 5% of the patents really mattered, 15% of the patents mattered a bit, but 80% of the patents were irrelevant. Hence, this would be an additional argument why IP might be used to promote openness and knowledge transfer.

Study “Policies Fostering the Participation of Businesses in Technology Transfer”

21. The Study entitled: “Policies Fostering the Participation of Businesses in Technology Transfer”¹¹ was presented by the author of the Study, Mr. Philip Mendes. In his presentation, the author provided an exhaustive overview of policies available to businesses, including taxation policies, demand-side research grants, policies facilitating access to finance, policies assisting the de-risking of R&D, government procurement policies, policies encouraging university/business engagement, policies fostering international technology transfer, and policies assisting university/industry negotiations.

22. The presentation of the Study was followed by a presentation of the reviewer of the Study, Mr. Nikolaus Thumm. The reviewer indicated that many examples in the Study were on government incentives for investments in research and development not technology transfer mechanisms specifically. He expressed the view that more R&D might transform into more technology transfer but this was not necessarily the case given that the innovation process was not a linear input/output process.

Study “Alternatives to the Patent System that are used to Support R&D Efforts, Including both Push and Pull Mechanisms, with a Special Focus on Innovation-Inducement Prizes and Open Source Development Models”

23. The Study entitled: “Alternatives to the Patent System that are used to Support R&D Efforts, Including both Push and Pull Mechanisms, with a Special Focus on Innovation-Inducement Prizes and Open Source Development Models”¹² was presented by the author of the Study, Mr. James Love. In his presentation, the author provided a comprehensive overview of alternatives to the patent system including direct government funding of research, tax policy and tax credits, mandates to fund research-based upon a percentage of product sales, and innovation inducement prizes. The author further directed the following suggestions to WIPO: (a) deepen understanding of trade related aspects of non-patent

¹⁰ http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=287221

¹¹ http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=287164

¹² http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=287218

innovation mechanisms, including grants, taxes and innovation inducement prizes; (b) explore use of non-patent financing mechanisms to address R&D, when strong patent rights lead to socially unacceptable outcomes as regards to access and affordability; (c) encourage greater transparency of the costs and benefits (and distribution of costs and benefits) for both patent and non-patent mechanisms; and (d) introduce more rigorous analysis of value of money/cost effectiveness of different mechanisms.

24. The presentation of the Study was followed by a presentation of the reviewer of the study, Mr. Dominique Foray. The reviewer focused on the following comments: (a) as patents and prizes were compared, it was not enough to limit the assessment to the obvious tension between the provision of incentives and the maximization of access to the knowledge once it has been produced; for a full comparative assessment, additional criteria would have benefited the study such as directing the inventive activities, enhancing competition, securing the whole innovation process, minimizing monitoring costs; (b) comparing patents and prizes in isolation, disconnected from the analysis of the institutions which produced and managed them, seemed self-limiting. The reviewer argued that patents had great plasticity and could serve many different functions and interests depending on the institutional nature of the patent holder. The reviewer further stated that an important research agenda should look at economic analysis of patents as embedded in a specific institution, which would provide new insight on patents in innovation, and also on the comparison between different kinds of mechanisms such as patents and prizes.

Session 2: Measures for Promoting International Technology Transfer: Challenges and Solutions

25. During Session 2, entitled “Measures for Promoting International Technology Transfer: Challenges and Solutions,” a panel of eight Experts, guided by a Moderator, discussed challenges and possible solutions to international technology transfer in respect of six different themes: capacity building; global cooperation; institutional framework; regulatory framework; innovation infrastructure; and funding/evaluation mechanisms, with extensive rounds of questions and answers by participants following the panel discussions on each of the themes.

26. These international Experts taking part in these panel discussions as well as the Moderator had been selected according to the selection criteria approved by Member States (document CDIP/14/8 Rev. 2¹³), notably with a view to seeking a balance in terms of their geographical representation (developed as well as developing countries), their affiliation (public and private sector), and their position with respect to the role of IP in technology transfer. In accordance with the terms of reference which had been consulted on with Member States during the fourteenth session of the CDIP (document CDIP/14/8 Rev. 2), Experts were invited to “make themselves familiar with the project deliverables. When identifying thoughts for inclusion in a list of suggestions and possible measures for promoting technology transfer, to be submitted to the CDIP for its consideration, Experts should start with the least common denominators between all perspectives and base such thoughts on realistic and mutually acceptable and beneficial elements as a starting point for building joint solutions.”

27. The following Experts participated in the panel discussions:

- (a) Mr. Jaroslav Burčák, Director, Technology and Innovation Center, Czech Technical University, Prague, Czech Republic;

¹³ http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=290583

- (b) Mr. Francisco Rafael Cano Betancourt, Director, Planning, Evaluation and Development, National Council for Science and Technology, Guatemala City, Guatemala;
- (c) Ms. Sherry Knowles, Principal, Knowles Intellectual Property Strategies, LLC, Atlanta, Georgia, United States of America;
- (d) Mr. Sifeddine Labeled, Director, Formation, Research, Innovation and Technology Transfer, Ministry of Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs), Algiers, Algeria;
- (e) Ms. Allison Mages, Senior Counsel, IP Procurement and Policy, General Electric Company, Representative from the Intellectual Property Owners Association, Washington, D.C., United States of America;
- (f) Mr. McLean Sibanda, Chief Executive Officer (CEO), Innovation Hub, Pretoria, South Africa;
- (g) Mr. Wenhuan Xia, Director, Business Development, Transpacific IP Group Limited, Beijing, China; and
- (h) Ms. Audrey Yap, Founding Partner and Head, IP Department, Yusarn Audrey, Singapore.

28. Ms. Alison Brimelow, Chairman, Centre for Copyright and New Business Models in the Creative Economy (CREATE), Programme Advisory Council of the UK Research Councils, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, United Kingdom, acted as the Moderator for all panel discussions during Session 2.

Session 2(a): Capacity Building

29. The first sub-session focused on the issue of capacity building. Experts pointed out that, in the context of the North-South dichotomy and the widening technological gap, one of the biggest deficiencies in the South was its human basis. People were at the center of technology transfer. For this reason, it was imperative to reinforce human capacities through systematic trainings programs covering all aspects from the idea to its commercialization, regional workshops involving policymakers, academia and the private sector, and capacity building to technology transfer office (TTO) staff. Some Experts proposed to organize yearly international technology transfer conferences in rotating host countries and where business-to-business matchmaking would be encouraged.

Session 2(b): Global Cooperation

30. The second sub-session focused on the issue of global cooperation. Experts highlighted WIPO's current efforts with the already established platforms. Building on these examples, WIPO could set up a platform that would promote information exchange on technology transfer opportunities and failures, assist in setting up technology transfer programs through exchange, mentoring and twinning of technology transfer professionals, and promote South-South cooperation via regional programs. Taking the platform concept further, one of the Experts suggested that it could evolve into a "clearing-house" portal as a marketplace crystallizing the "needs" and the "gives".

Session 2(c): Institutional Framework

31. The third sub-session focused on the issue of the institutional framework. Experts believed that institutional framework was critical but had been, until now, the poor relation of technology transfer in developing countries. To alleviate this issue, Experts proposed to disseminate best practice, while recognizing the contextual dependence, through assistance in the development of institutional policies for TTOs with guidelines and data-mining, as well as the design of programs to promote communication between universities, R&D centers and small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). Some Experts suggested that WIPO should establish a Technology Transfer Helpdesk and promote exchange programs of technology transfer professionals. Recognizing that the “Shadow of the Leader Effect” had had great impact in knowledge-based and innovation-based economies, Experts further suggested that WIPO could develop an approach to encourage thinking in that direction. One suggested approach was developing a “Global Technology Transfer Index” that would rank countries that were doing best in technology transfer.

Session 2(d): Regulatory Framework

32. The fourth sub-session focused on the issue of the regulatory framework. Experts agreed that a robust and predictable IP system was the foundation base and played an important role in facilitating technology transfer. For this reason, WIPO should assist Governments in updating their IP laws and regulations, as well as encourage accession to its PCT, Madrid and Hague Treaties. One of the Experts highlighted the phenomenal success of the Bayh-Dole Act. Since 1980, the Act had allowed universities, small businesses, or non-profit institutions to elect to pursue ownership of an invention in preference to the government. To date, the successes of the Bayh-Dole Act had been astronomical with 836 billion United States dollars added to the United States economy. As an example in 2011, 591 new drug products had been commercialized and 670 startups had been created. Certain participants highlighted the need to always look at the local realities and contextualize the needs on the ground before trying to implant an imported model framework.

Session 2(e): Innovation Infrastructure

33. The fifth sub-session focused on the issue of innovation infrastructure. Experts provided examples of programs such as GE’s Kuchenga, which meant ‘to build’ in Swahili, and was based on three pillars: empower, equip and elevate. Such programs provided hands-on experience in many countries in Africa. Experts proposed that WIPO should assist in setting up TTOs and create networks of excellence. One of the Experts described the spectacular impact of business incubators, science parks and entrepreneurship accelerators in China, and expressed the view that, taking this success into account, WIPO could conduct empirical work on their effective use of intellectual property for technology transfer.

Session 2(f): Funding/Evaluation Mechanisms

34. The sixth sub-session focused on the issue of funding/evaluation mechanisms. Experts expressed the view that funding and evaluation mechanisms were at the heart of technology transfer. Proposals made in this context included the view that WIPO could assist in setting up national evaluation mechanisms, through an IP audit tool. It could also provide a database for funding sources and assist governments in formulating incentives to fund technology transfer initiatives. Experts also agreed that future markets were within the developing world, which was an additional motivation for fostering international technology transfer.

Session 3: Review and Closing: Thoughts for Consideration by WIPO's Committee on Development of Intellectual Property (CDIP)

35. At the outset, the Moderator stated that the panel had put together a number of “thoughts” but not a program. Based on the considerations:

- (i) that the perception was that international technology transfer was effective but was yet at a low level; and
- (ii) that, in terms of the human capital, there was a deficit, as people were at the center of ideas and were the enablers of international technology transfer.

36. The Moderator introduced the following “Expert Thoughts” which had been agreed upon by all panel members to be submitted to the CDIP for consideration and approval with a view to incorporating work towards implementing those “Expert Thoughts” into WIPO work programs:

- (a) Design a technology transfer platform that would provide information on technologies that are available (“the gives”) and those that are needed (“the needs”). This could then evolve into a technology transfer matchmaking platform.
- (b) Disseminate best practice illustrating effective cases of international technology transfer, using, *inter alia*, existing WIPO platforms and success stories from the Global Innovation Index, through periodic regional events.
- (c) Set up a WIPO Technology Transfer Helpdesk, servicing the needs of Member States, to promote information exchange on technology transfer opportunities and failures, eventually evolving into a “clearing-house” for information and technologies.
- (d) Conduct empirical work on science parks, incubators and accelerators and their effective use of intellectual property for technology transfer.
- (e) Develop training materials that are case study-based to enable more effective technology transfer.
- (f) Raise awareness on the importance of an IP framework, including the accession to PCT, Madrid and Hague systems, which is a necessary but not sufficient condition for effective technology transfer.
- (g) Identify ways to use IPR from publicly-funded research for socio-economic development and implement them with local specific needs, given that ‘*one size does not fit all*’.
- (h) Continue work on international technology transfer, which was useful and should be endorsed by the CDIP.

37. In the ensuing discussions among Forum participants, WIPO was commended for organizing what was believed to have been an important event during which participants had learned a tremendous amount on the issues surrounding international technology transfer. All speakers, in particular the Panelists and the Moderator, were commended for their excellent contributions. Regarding the “Expert Thoughts”, participants thanked the Moderator for her concise summary; there were no requests for any modifications.

38. In terms of WIPO’s role to promote international technology transfer, participants expressed the view that WIPO should do more to raise awareness, to provide information on

how to locate and where to seek assistance, to disseminate best practice and, building on the successes of existing WIPO platforms, to create a new demand-driven platform (“clearing-house”) connecting “seekers” to industry, SMEs and universities, with the proviso that requests would need to be very specific. In this context, participants urged WIPO to speed up its engagement with the private sector.

39. Finally, it was emphasized that WIPO should continue working on the theme of technology transfer through an appropriate instrument and that there should be broader, more holistic approach for promoting international technology transfer, including WIPO, governments, but also a wide array of other relevant stakeholders.

40. Following the event review, the Forum ended with a closing address by Mr. Mario Matus, Deputy Director General, Development Sector.

FEEDBACK

41. After the Forum had ended, participants were invited to evaluate the event by way of responding to a questionnaire which had been handed out to all participants at the beginning of the Forum. Twenty four participants responded to the questionnaire.

42. Of those who responded:

- (a) 88% rated the organization of the event as “excellent” or “good”;
- (b) 97% rated the final program for the event as “very interesting” or “interesting”;
- (c) 96% rated the quality of the speakers and presentations as “excellent” or “good”;
- (d) 60% rated the quality of the documentation as “excellent” or “good”; and
- (e) 100% indicated that the event “fully met” or “mostly met” their expectations.

[End of Annex and of document]