

Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP)

Sixteenth Session
Geneva, November 9 to 13, 2015

EVALUATION REPORT OF THE PROJECT ON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER: COMMON CHALLENGES – BUILDING SOLUTIONS

*prepared by Mr. Daniel Keller, Consultant, Leubringen, Switzerland, and Mr. Rachid Khan,
Head, Global Innovation and IP, United States of America (USA) and Asia, Dhahran, Saudi
Arabia*

1. The Annex to the document contains an external independent Evaluation Report of the Project on *Intellectual Property and Technology Transfer: Common Challenges – Building Solutions*, undertaken by Mr. Daniel Keller, Consultant, EvalCo Sàrl, Leubringen, Switzerland, and Mr. Rachid Khan, Head, Global Innovation and IP, USA and Asia, Dhahran, Saudi Arabia.

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

[Annex follows]

TABLE OF CONTENT

INTRODUCTION	7
(A) PROJECT BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION	7
(B) SCOPE, PURPOSE, METHODOLOGY AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS EVALUATION..	9
(i) Scope	9
(ii) Key purpose	10
(iii) Methodology	10
(iv) Main limitations to this evaluation	11
2. FINDINGS AND ASSESSMENT	11
(A) PROJECT PREPARATION AND MANAGEMENT	11
(i) Project preparation	11
(ii) Use of project planning and monitoring tools	12
(iii) Project management.....	13
(B) RELEVANCE	14
(i) Policy relevance	14
(C) EFFECTIVENESS.....	14
(i) Output 1: Regional technology transfer consultation meetings.....	15
(ii) Output 2: Analytical studies	15
(iii) Output 3: Concept paper.....	17
(iv) Output 4: Training materials.....	17
(v) Output 5: International expert forum	17
(vi) Output 6: Web forum on technology transfer.....	17
(vii) Output 7: Incorporation of project results into WIPO's work	17
(viii) Initial outcomes observed in terms of "enhanced understanding"	18
(ix) Other outcomes	20
(x) Impact.....	20
(D) EFFICIENCY.....	21
(i) Financial implementation	21
(ii) Synergies with other activities conducted by the Secretariat.....	22
(E) LIKELIHOOD OF SUSTAINABILITY OF RESULTS	22
3. CONCLUSIONS	23
4. RECOMMENDATIONS	24

LIST OF ACRONYMS

CDIP	Committee on Development and Intellectual Property
CHF	Swiss Francs
DA	Development Agenda
DAC	Development Assistance Committee (of the OECD)
DACD	Development Agenda Coordination Division
FDI	Foreign-direct investment
IP	Intellectual Property
IPR(s)	Intellectual Property Rights
LDCs	Least Developed Countries
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
PME	Planning, Monitoring & Evaluation
R&D	Research & Development
SMART (indicators)	Specific, Measurable, Ambitious, Relevant and Time-bound
ToRs	Terms of Reference (of this evaluation)
TRIPS	Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights
UN	United Nations
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNEP	United Nations Environment Program
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
WBCSD	World Business Council for Sustainable Development
WHO	World Health Organization
WIPO	World Intellectual Property Organization
WTO	World Trade Organization

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This independent final evaluation commissioned by the Secretariat covers the *Project on Intellectual Property and Technology Transfer: Common Challenges - Building Solutions* (Project Code: DA_19_25_26_28, “the Project”) under the Development Agenda (DA) and is guided by the Terms of Reference (“ToRs”), dated May 14, 2015.

The work was conducted between June 1 and November 13, 2015 by two external evaluators (Mr. Daniel Keller, EvalCo Sàrl, Switzerland and Dr. Rashid Khan, Global Innovation & IP, USA and Asia), in close coordination with the Development Agenda Coordination Division (DACD).

Technology transfer is, informally defined, the process of dissemination and absorption of commercial technology. The transfer of commercial technology includes not only the sale and licensing of industrial property (excluding trademarks), but also the provision of know-how, skills, ideas and technical expertise under various forms. The introduction of a technology into a host country creates an awareness of that technology. Technology diffusion as an additional benefit of technology transfer is expected to result in spill-over effects into the economy.

The Project was adopted by the 6th session of the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP) in Geneva (November 22 to 26, 2010) in the form of an initial thematic proposal (CDIP/6/4 Rev.), which was subsequently translated into a specific project paper (CDIP/8/7).

Through five regional meetings and six peer-reviewed analytic studies, both providing input to an Expert Forum, the Project aimed at developing expert thoughts for promoting international technology transfer. This was expected to contribute to exploring new ways of establishing international intellectual property (IP) collaboration, as well as to an enhanced understanding and consensus on possible IP initiatives or policies to promote technology transfer.

The originally planned duration of the Project was 27 months (January 1, 2011 – March 31, 2013). Implementation started in January 2011 and formally ended in July 2014 (43 months), after two no cost extensions. Implementation of some activities however continued beyond this time. A draft version of the planned Web Forum was only completed at the end of June 2015 (after 54 months). Specific steps towards incorporating project outcomes into WIPO programs foreseen in the Project Document have not yet been undertaken.

Based on the last official financial report as per end of May, 2015, 76.8% of the total budget of 1,532,000 Swiss francs (including 549,000 Swiss francs for personnel costs and 983,000 Swiss francs for non-personnel costs) was disbursed.

The evaluation resulted in the following conclusions:

Conclusion 1: Project outputs were highly relevant, but some of the outputs were not delivered. Deliverables were, with some exceptions, of good quality. While significant implementation delays negatively affected project efficiency, the Secretariat generally made adequate use of resources.

The results of conferences and studies funded under the Project contributed to identifying and discussing barriers to technology transfer, to deriving good practices from case studies of successful practices and to discussing the results within a limited audience. Otherwise, the Project has not yet resulted in any tangible wider outcomes.

The planned capacity building tools have not been produced and a draft of the Web Forum was only completed one year after the Project formally ended. No steps have yet been taken towards an integration of project results into WIPO’s existing Program activities. The wording of

output 7 indicates that Member States would expect a specific proposal of the Secretariat, after the results of the international expert forum have been discussed.

Project implementation, in general, advanced at a slow pace. Project implementation took twice the time originally planned. Despite two no cost extensions, the delivery of some activities continued beyond the formal end of the Project and was only completed in June 2015. Management problems aggravated by different organizational restructurings within WIPO contributed to the delays.

Conclusion 2: Without a follow-up, it is unlikely that outputs will translate into sustainable tangible outcomes resulting in wider benefits, meaning that most of the resources allocated to the Project would be lost.

Without a follow-up in terms of using project outputs to enhance WIPO's support to technology transfer activities, the Project's reach and impact on socio-economic development would remain rather limited. Interesting initial results and the funds disbursed to generate them would be lost. Potential sustainability of results and project efficiency would remain low.

Conclusion 3: Expert views identify a number of areas where strengthening WIPO's services would realistically be able to add value in facilitating the transfer. On the other hand, it became also clear that promoting technology transfer requires a broad array of measures, many of which would not be covered by WIPO's mandate. Establishing enabling framework conditions for technology transfer requires concerted efforts within and beyond the UN system.

Technology transfer is not a service that could be "mainstreamed". Reflected by the wording of Output 7 to which Member States agreed through consensus, the incorporation of project recommendations into relevant WIPO Programs was a core objective of the Project. This may indicate that Member States expect a concrete proposal of the Secretariat, after discussing the key findings generated by the Project during the upcoming 16th session of the CDIP.

Establishing a plan for the way forward requires mapping WIPO's existing activities relating to technology transfer, to define needs based on the findings of the Project and then establish a proposal on how to enhance or complement existing services where appropriate.

The ability of developing countries to benefit from technology transfer is driven by many factors, many of which are not directly related to IP. Therefore, close cooperation with other International Organizations within and outside the UN system remains important. Through its comprehensive understanding on the topic from an IP-perspective, WIPO would be well positioned to actively contribute to an enabling framework for technology transfer, in particular through regularly participating in relevant international fora.

Conclusion 4: The application of standard project planning and monitoring tools leaves significant room for improvement. Evidence from this evaluation calls for strengthening the role of the DACD in more regularly monitoring progress and quality of DA projects and for a compulsory basic training for project managers.

The logical framework as standard tool for project planning, monitoring and evaluation was not applied. Planning and reporting focused on activities rather than on results. It should be emphasized that for all recent DA projects, the Secretariat has already undertaken significant efforts to continuously enhance result-based management.

Evaluation findings call for strengthening project supervision and quality control within the Secretariat, in particular by the DACD. Requiring a visa of the DACD on all major steps during project implementation (e.g., commissioning of services, the publication of material, etc.) and

through scheduling regular meetings with Project Managers would allow the DACD to intervene before problems occur.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1 (from conclusions 2 and 3) to the Member States and the WIPO Secretariat on establishing a proposal on how WIPO could further contribute to facilitating technology transfer:

After discussion of the project results at the upcoming 16th session of the CDIP, the Member States should consider requesting the Secretariat to map WIPO's existing services in the field of technology transfer and, taking into account the findings of the Project, how to complement and improve them.

Recommendation 2 (from conclusions 2 and 3) to the Member States and the WIPO Secretariat on the possible content of a specific proposal (provided the Member States endorse recommendation 1 above):

Based on the findings of this evaluation, the Secretariat might, in particular, consider providing support in the following intervention areas:

- (a) Continue identifying, collecting and sharing best practices in the field of technology transfer through additional case studies and documenting success stories resulting from collaboration between developing countries and developed countries. Of particular interest would be to identify the development models of recently developed countries.
- (b) Continue offering practical capacity building (including tool kits) tailored to specific target users with focus on LDCs.
- (c) Continue providing capacity building to IP and/or innovation service providers in developing countries, e.g. to IP Offices, Technology Transfer Centers, etc.
- (d) Support and document specific pilot technology transfer activities to developing countries for demonstration purposes.
- (e) Provide tailored, specific policy advice to Member States, in particular developing countries and LDCs for creating an enabling legal framework for technology transfer. This may include advice on the use of flexibilities under international agreements.
- (f) Add analytical capabilities of the Patentscope database to enhance usefulness of patent data to general users in all countries, including LDCs. Consider providing a mechanism on "data mining and the visualization of statistical IP data and evidence".
- (g) Enhance the usefulness of the Website on technology transfer in a way that it presents all WIPO activities as well as resources of WIPO and national institutions.
- (h) Advise Member States on best practices for the development of efficient innovation infrastructures and network.

Recommendation 3 (from conclusion 3) to the WIPO Secretariat for leveraging WIPO's presence in conferences and fora relating to technology transfer:

The Secretariat should strengthen its active presence in international fora and conferences on technology transfer with the objective to create visibility, to contribute its know-how and to benefit from additional experience from a wide range of conference participants.

Recommendation 4 (from conclusion 4) to the WIPO Secretariat on strengthening its project management capabilities and the quality control for DA projects:

- (a) Apply the logical framework tool for planning, monitoring and evaluation.
- (b) Introduce compulsory project management courses for Project Managers.
- (c) Consider introducing a mechanism whereas the DACD will be requested to add its "visa" for all major management decision relating to DA projects.
- (d) Schedule regular progress meetings with project managers of DA projects.

INTRODUCTION

1. This independent final evaluation commissioned by the Secretariat covers the Development Agenda (DA) *Project on Intellectual Property and Technology Transfer: Common Challenges - Building Solutions* (Project Code: DA_19_25_26_28, “the Project”), see Appendix I.
2. Guided by the Terms of Reference (ToRs) dated May 14, 2015 (Appendix I), the evaluation was conducted between June 1 and November 13, 2015 by two external, independent evaluators¹ in close coordination with the Development Agenda Coordination Division (DACD).

(A) PROJECT BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION

3. The Project was adopted by the 6th Session of the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP) in Geneva (November 22 to 26, 2010). An initial thematic proposal (CDIP/6/4 Rev.) was subsequently translated into a specific project paper (CDIP/8/7), which was approved by the 8th session of the CDIP in November 2011 and provides detailed objectives, an implementation strategy and a detailed description of all activities (CDIP/8/7). A revised version of the document (updated timeline and budget) was presented to the 9th session of the CDIP in March 2012 for information (CDIP/9/INF/4, March 13, 2012).
4. The overall budget was 1,532,000 Swiss francs (including 549,000 Swiss francs for personnel costs and 983,000 Swiss francs for non-personnel costs)². The originally planned project duration was 27 months (January 2011-March 2013). Implementation started in January 2011 and formally ended in July 2014 (43 months) after two no cost extensions approved by the CDIP³. Implementation of some activities however continued. A draft version of the planned Web Forum (output 6) was only completed at the end of June 2015 (after 54 months) and no steps towards incorporating project outcomes in WIPO’s activities (output 7) have so far been undertaken.
5. The Project was designed in response to the following DA Recommendations:
 - (a) Recommendation 19 (Cluster B): “To initiate discussions on how, within WIPO’s mandate, to further facilitate access to knowledge and technology for developing countries and LDCs to foster creativity and innovation and to strengthen such existing activities within WIPO”.
 - (b) Recommendation 25 (Cluster C): “To explore IP related policies and initiatives necessary to promote the transfer and dissemination of technology, to the benefit of developing countries and to take appropriate measures to enable developing countries to fully understand and benefit from different provisions, pertaining to flexibilities provided for in international agreements, as appropriate.”
 - (c) Recommendation 26 (Cluster C): “To encourage Member States, especially developed countries, to urge their research and scientific institutions to enhance

¹ Daniel Keller, EvalCo Sàrl, Evillard, Switzerland, Team Leader and Dr. Rashid Khan, Global Innovation & IP, USA and Asia. Both evaluators are independent and have not been involved into the preparation or implementation of the Project.

² Revised from original budget according to document (CDIP/6/4 Rev. Annex, page 9): 1,193,000 Swiss francs for non-personnel costs and 598,000 Swiss francs for personnel costs (see CDIP/9/INF/4 Annex, page 17)

³ Last extension: CDIP/12/2, Annex VI, page 7, until June 30, 2014

cooperation and exchange with research and development (R&D) institutions in developing countries, especially LDCs.”

(d) Recommendation 28 (Cluster C): “To explore supportive IP related policies and measures Member States, especially developed countries, could adopt for promoting transfer and dissemination of technology to developing countries.”

6. Informally defined, technology transfer is the process of dissemination and absorption of commercial technology. The transfer of commercial technology includes not only the sale and licensing of industrial property (excluding trade marks), but also the provision of know-how, skills, ideas and technical expertise under various forms. The introduction of a technology into a host country creates awareness of that technology.

7. Technology diffusion as an additional benefit of technology transfer is expected to result in spill-over effects into the economy as a whole.⁴

8. Technology transfer occurs both from developed and developing countries. Technology flow from some developing countries to developed countries is increasing.

9. The Project developed expert thoughts for promoting international technology transfer through five regional meetings and elaborating six peer-reviewed analytic studies, both providing input to an Expert Forum. The objective was to explore new ways of establishing international intellectual property (IP) collaboration. The expected outcome⁵ was an enhanced understanding and consensus on possible IP initiatives or policies to promote technology transfer and diffusion, benefiting socio-economic advancement, particularly of developing and Least Developed Countries (LDCs). Project-specific impact objectives were not defined⁶.

10. Main stakeholders of technology transfer identified by the Project include business entities, research institutions, researchers, governments, UN organizations, and national as well as international non-governmental organizations (NGOs).

11. The following outputs (deliverables) were planned:

(a) The development of a project paper (CDIP/8/7 and CDIP/9/INF/4) at inception to operationalize the initial project document;

(b) Output 1: The organization of five Regional Technology Transfer Consultation Meetings in different regions of the world, including in developed countries, in prior consultation with Member States in Geneva, and involving different stakeholders in the area of technology transfer, including other relevant UN organizations;

(c) Output 2: The elaboration of a number of peer-reviewed analytic studies, in cooperation with relevant UN and other international organizations, including economic studies and case studies on international technology transfer, providing input to an Expert Forum;

(d) Output 3: The drafting of a concept paper on building solutions as the basis for discussion at the Expert Forum, to be submitted to the CDIP for approval;

(e) Output 4: The preparation and provision of materials, modules, teaching tools and other instruments resulting from recommendations adopted at the Expert Forum, and

⁴ Definition summarized from paragraphs 9 and 10 of the Project Document (CDIP/6/4 Rev.)

⁵ Outcomes are results generated by the use of the project's deliverables (outputs).

⁶ Impact refers to positive and negative, intended and non-intended, directly and indirectly, long term effects produced by a development intervention.

inclusion of such results into the global WIPO capacity building framework. This may include contents and concrete country projects related to the design and development of the necessary infrastructure for IP asset management in relation to technology transfer;

(f) Output 5: The organization of an Expert Forum in the form of an international conference to initiate 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. In particular, the experts should debate on technology transfer supportive IP-related policies by developed countries;

(g) Output 6: The creation of a Web Forum on *Technology Transfer and IP: Common Challenges – Building Solutions* within the framework of the portal on Innovation and Technology Transfer Support Structure for National Institutions to be established in the context of the project for Recommendation 10 in consultation with Member States and other stakeholders, while facilitating the participation of developing countries and LDCs in such Web Forum; and

(h) Output 7: The incorporation of any outcome resulting from the above activities into the WIPO programs, after consideration and any possible recommendation by the CDIP to the General Assembly.

12. Outputs delivered are described more in detail under the assessment of effectiveness in section 2.C below. An update and validation of the final progress report to the CDIP⁷ by the evaluators through interviews concluded that all planned outputs have been completed, except:

(a) No deliverables are recorded under output 4 (producing training material, developing specific country projects);

(b) By the time of the evaluation, the Project Manager had prepared a draft version of the Web Forum (output 6), which would merge the Web Fora of the Project, the project DA_36 (Open Collaborative Projects and IP based Models) and the project DA 10_03 (Innovation and Technology Transfer Support Structure for National Institutions). A decision has not yet been taken; and

(c) No steps towards integrating project outcomes into WIPO programs have yet been undertaken (output 7).

13. The reported budget utilization rate was 68% per August 31, 2014 (CDIP/14/2 Annex II) and 76.8% by May 31, 2015 (latest financial report available to the evaluators).

(B) SCOPE, PURPOSE, METHODOLOGY AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS EVALUATION

(i) Scope

14. According to the ToRs, the evaluators were required to cover the period from January 1, 2011, to August 31, 2014. As project implementation continued afterwards, the evaluators took relevant subsequent developments until the submission of this report in July 2015 into account.

⁷ The last implementation report presented to the Member States is dated August 28, 2014 (CDIP/14/2, Annex III).

(ii) Key purpose

15. The main evaluation purpose given by the ToRs is to assess whether the Project as a whole provided the right type of support to achieve its key objectives in the right way. Within the overall purpose of ensuring the Secretariat's accountability to Member States and contribute to organizational learning, the evaluators were specifically expected to:

- (a) Provide an evidence-based assessment of the Project to support the CDIP's decision making process.
- (b) Identify lessons learned through the Project's implementation, what worked well and what did not work well for the benefit of continuing activities in the field of technology transfer. Drawing lessons learned might in particular refer to the originally envisaged incorporation of activities into relevant WIPO programs (output 7, responding to DA Recommendation 19), which will require formal approval by the Member States.

(iii) Methodology

16. The evaluation was conducted in line with WIPO's Evaluation Policy⁸, which refers to the key principles of the evaluation criteria and quality standards issued by the Development Assistance Committee of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD-DAC)⁹. According to these standard evaluation practices, the assessment of project quality is conducted based on the following four criteria¹⁰:

- (a) Relevance: The extent to which project objectives were consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, the Member Countries' needs, global priorities and policies.
- (b) Efficiency: How economically inputs (e.g. funds, expertise and time) were converted into results. The evaluation mainly looked at the Project's approach.
- (c) Effectiveness: The extent to which objectives were achieved or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.
- (d) Sustainability: The likelihood of continuation of project benefits after the assistance has been completed.

17. In addition, the evaluators were specifically asked to assess project preparation and management, thus the degree to which project preparation and management followed good practices, including in regards to applying the tools of results-based management.¹¹

18. In order to ensure an evidence-based qualitative and quantitative assessment, different evaluation tools were combined. The methodological mix applied by the evaluators included desk studies, interviews with representatives of all key stakeholder groups (individual and focal groups) and direct observation (see Appendixes II and III).

19. While maintaining independence and complying with other basic principles of WIPO's evaluation policy, the evaluators applied a participatory approach, encouraging different stakeholders to actively contribute to the evaluation. Where possible, the evaluators aimed at obtaining alignment on their key findings, conclusions and recommendations. The evaluation process itself was designed to encourage organizational learning.

⁸ WIPO, Revised Evaluation Policy, May 2010, in particular Annex I on evaluation criteria, which makes reference to the DAC Criteria of evaluating development assistance.

⁹ DAC Guidelines and Reference Series, Quality Standards for Development Evaluation, OECD-DAC, OECD 2010.

¹⁰ The ToRs only requested an assessment of effectiveness and sustainability

¹¹ These questions can be considered as a particular aspect of efficiency.

20. Factual information obtained during data collection was comprehensive and clear. Some of the findings retrieved from various sources, however, differed significantly. The evaluators addressed the challenge of inconsistency of some data through a triangulation of findings and an assessment of the plausibility of results obtained.
21. The Secretariat supported the evaluation process actively and provided extensive support in arranging meetings. The evaluators were able to work effectively and without interference.
22. The evaluators will present this report to the 16th session of the CDIP in November 2015 in order to (a) disseminate information, (b) input to the CDIP's decision making process, and (c) contributing to the accountability of WIPO towards its Member States.
- (iv) Main limitations to this evaluation
23. Experience shows that it takes time, before the content of studies and the conclusions of conferences, through their use, translate into measurable effects. The planned "Web forum" (output 6) in particular, which was designed to reach a wider audience, went online just a few days before the evaluation started. It would not be plausible to assume sufficient causality between the Project's outputs and changes observed. Attempting to assess their outcomes or even broader impact would thus be premature.
24. No field visits were conducted. Fact-finding focused on actors directly involved into the Project (the Secretariat, meeting participants, WIPO experts) only. Data collection did not include a broader range of stakeholders, as they were not directly targeted.
25. While a detailed financial report presenting expenditures by accounting periods and budget lines was available, WIPO's current reporting system for DA projects does not allocate expenditures to individual outputs. A detailed analysis of financial efficiency, which would require information on types of expenditures per output and overhead, was thus not possible.
26. The findings and assessment in section 2 below should be understood in considering that these constraints necessarily limited the scope and depth of the evaluation.

2. FINDINGS AND ASSESSMENT

This section presents the findings of the evaluation and provides an assessment of project quality according to the evaluation criteria within the limitations, as described under 1.B above.

(A) PROJECT PREPARATION AND MANAGEMENT

(i) Project preparation

27. Preparatory work for the Project within the Secretariat started in 2009. The initial proposal of the Secretariat (CDIP 6/2) established in 2010/2011 translated the relatively open DA Recommendations into an appropriate, clearly articulated delivery strategy and methodology. Member States were extensively consulted (including on the ToRs of activities) and their comments were taken into account at different stages of the preparation process. The content of the project papers (CDIP/8/4, CDIP/9/INF/4), including the sequencing and ToRs of specific activities, were negotiated in a political context.

28. In the course of preparation, the Secretariat also actively identified potential synergies with other WIPO activities. The Project was designed to complement a number of other

planned DA projects, particularly but not limited to the project DA_10 (*Innovation and Technology Transfer Support Structure for National Institutions*).

29. Based on an analysis of expected project outputs versus relating WIPO activities responding to different DA recommendations under Cluster C, the Project intended to utilize some outputs of other DA projects (in particular studies) as an input.¹²

30. Moreover, the Secretariat researched on relating initiatives of other International Organizations¹³, such as the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)¹⁴, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP), the World Health Organization (WHO), the World Trade Organization (WTO), the World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD) and others.

31. The originally planned project duration of 27 months for the delivery of project outputs (excluding the negotiation of the project paper) seems to be adequate.

32. Budget allocation was adequate, evidenced by the fact that the delivery of most activities did not result in any major over- under spending (see table 1 in section 2.C below).

(ii) Use of project planning and monitoring tools

33. As in most of the earlier DA projects, the application of standard project planning and monitoring tools leaves significant room for improvement. The same applies to reporting, which is mainly activity-based. It should be emphasized that since the time the Project was designed over five years ago, the Secretariat has undertaken significant efforts to continuously enhance project planning and monitoring.

34. Good practice for project planning, monitoring and evaluation¹⁵ is to properly apply the logical framework tool, which includes the following key features:

(a) Within a clear intervention logic, expected results are presented according to different result levels. Outputs and activities are direct deliverables provided through a project (using project resources). Outcomes are expected results generated by the use of outputs. Impact objectives are broader changes achieved as a result of expected outcomes. Thus, there must be a causal link between the different result levels either in the form of attribution or contribution (depending on the degree of causality).

(b) Progress towards achieving expected results is assessed through the use of objectively verifiable¹⁶ "SMART"¹⁷ indicators. For each of them, the means of verification (e.g. data collection through surveys or reference to statistical data) should be defined. The means of verifications should be realistic, thus take the resources available for data collection into account (e.g. extensive surveys require a specific budget). Baseline data for each indicator is collected at the onset of the Project.

¹² Mentioned are in particular the studies under the "Project on Intellectual Property and Socio-Economic Development" (CDIP/5/7) and the patent landscaping reports produced under the Project on "Developing Tools for Access to Patent Information" (CDIP/4/6).

¹³ Summarized in paragraphs 17 – 47 of CDIP/9/INF/4, section II

¹⁴ In particular also UNCTAD's Draft International Code on the Transfer of Technology ("TOT Code")

¹⁵ By all major development agencies, including NGOs, in general and within the UN system in particular

¹⁶ Indicators are measurable either through quantitative (preferable) or qualitative methods.

¹⁷ Specific, measurable, achievable, relevant for the project, and available in a timely manner (SMART)

(c) For each of the outcomes and the expected impact, specific risks and assumptions should be defined. Assumptions refer to external conditions that need to be in place to successfully translate outputs into outcomes and outcomes into impact. Risks refer to external factors (threats) that prevent project outputs from being translated into outcomes (or outcomes into impact). The degree of each risk should be assessed, weighting threats according to how severely they may affect the achievement of results and the probability the threat is likely to materialize.

(d) Monitoring reports should assess progress towards achieving results using the indicators defined in the logical framework rather than simply listing activities. Unexpected/unplanned positive/negative outcomes should be reported on as well.

35. Going a step further would be to regularly conduct an internal assessment ongoing relevance of objectives, efficiency of implementation (approach, value for money) and likelihood of sustainability of results. Such regular assessment of project quality allows a periodic review whether the right type of assistance is provided the right way and whether benefits are likely to continue after the project's end. If project quality is only looked at by an external mid-term or final evaluation, it is often too late for taking corrective action.

(iii) Project management

36. As discussed in more details under the assessment of effectiveness and efficiency below, most activities that had been completed were well organized. Significant deficiencies occurred in the process of peer-reviewing the studies (output 2), which did not follow the standard practices. The draft studies were posted on internet before they were peer-reviewed. After the peer-reviews were subsequently completed, both the final versions of the studies and the peer-reviews were published. The fact that peer-reviewers were not contracted and remunerated might have contributed to the poor quality of comments some of them provided.

37. Project implementation in general advanced at a slow pace. Implementation of some activities even continued beyond the twice extended end of the Project. The last output (Web Forum) was only completed at the end of June 2015. Delays were primarily caused by management problems, which were further aggravated by different organizational restructurings within the Secretariat. The delivery of expected outputs finally took double the time that was originally planned (54 instead of 27 months).

38. Implementation delays reduce project efficiency in several ways. They may also cause a loss of relevance and momentum. As an example, the Web Forum would have been particularly useful if it had, as originally planned, already been available at the time of the regional conferences and the International Expert Forum took place. It would have provided a valuable platform for further collection and discussion among a broader audience. The conferences and meetings would also have provided an excellent opportunity to promote the Web Forum among a broader public. Furthermore, some running costs of projects are generally fixed and incur regardless of whether any benefits are generated.

39. Unless justified by unforeseeable factors beyond WIPO's control, Member States may question the Secretariat's project implementation capacities if the delivery of a few outputs finally requires double the originally planned time.

40. Management problems in this project reveal an urgent need to strengthen project supervision and quality control within the Secretariat, in particular by the DACD. Requiring a "visa" of the DACD on all major steps during project implementation (e.g. commissioning of services, the publication of material, etc.) and through scheduling regular meetings with Project Managers would allow the DACD to intervene before problems occur.

(B) RELEVANCE

41. Relevance assesses the extent to which project objectives were consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, aligned to WIPO's policies and to global priorities.

(i) Policy relevance

42. At the macro level, policy relevance for Member States is evidenced by the CDIP's approval of both an initial project proposal and of a specific project paper through consensus. Accordingly, Member States considered the Project in the form it was finally implemented as an appropriate initial response to the DA recommendations it intended to address.¹⁸

43. High policy relevance was further validated and confirmed by extensive interviews with Representative of Member States and other key stakeholders.

44. Beyond adequately addressing relevant DA recommendations, expected project results link primarily into WIPO's programmatic objective of Program 18 (Strategic Goal VI: IP and Global Challenges)¹⁹, which calls, *inter alia*, for innovation promotion and technology transfer with an emphasis on the needs of developing countries, LDCs and countries with economies in transition. Within these broader aims, the Project contributes in particular to WIPO's programmatic objective of enhancing Member States' capacity and understanding of innovation and technology management and transfer. Document CDIP/6/4 Rev. further mentions linkages to Programs 1²⁰, 8²¹ and 9²², but these are more general.

45. The findings, conclusions and recommendations of the different outputs presented in Section 2.C also confirm the high relevance of technology transfer to key stakeholders.

(C) EFFECTIVENESS

46. The project paper²³ defines the following success indicators for the outcome level:

(a) Feedback from the CDIP on the extent to which understandings of the issues have been enhanced and project objectives have been met;

(b) Adoption and concrete use of the suggestions, recommendations and possible measures for promoting technology transfer by Member States;

¹⁸ Upon presentation of the first thematic proposal (CDIP/6/4 Rev.), the specific project paper (CDIP/8/7) with a detailed description of activities. Member States were also consulted on an updated version of this document, which was presented to the 9th session of the CDIP in March 2012 for information (CDIP/9/INF/4, March 13, 2012).

¹⁹ Create an integrated, inclusive, foresighted and empirically well-founded international approach to public policy initiatives on IP and global challenges and enhance the capacity of Member States, in particular developing countries, LDCs and countries with economies in transition in the area of innovation support and technology transfer (Program and Budget for the 2010/2011 Biennium, approved by the Assemblies of the Member States of WIPO on October 1, 2009, page 166). The link to DA Recommendation 10 is explicitly mentioned.

²⁰ Program 1: Greater awareness of the legal principles and practices, of the patent system, including the flexibilities existing in the system, and enhanced understanding and further clarification of current and emerging issues that arise in relation to patent-related matters.

²¹ Program 8: DA principles further mainstreamed into the Organization's programs and activities, including its normative work; effective implementation of the DA through concrete projects and activities

²² Program 9: National IP policies/strategies and country action plans that are in line with national development plans and priorities; enhanced capacity of IP professionals and creation of a critical mass of IP specialists/experts

²³ CDIP/9/INF/4, Paragraph 12, page 3

(c) Feedback on the contents by the users via the Web Forum and evaluation questionnaires; and

(d) Widespread use of the Web-Forum by developing countries and LDCs.

47. Considering that the key outputs, in particular the Web Forum, had only been recently completed, it would not be plausible to establish causality between the Project and any outcomes observed, with the exception of an “enhanced understanding”, which seems to refer to the publically available information generated by studies and conferences.

48. The delivery of the following main outputs reported by the Project were validated through desk study of the latest implementation report and interviews:

(i) Output 1: Regional technology transfer consultation meetings

49. The Secretariat organized the five envisaged Regional Technology Transfer Consultation Meetings: the first one in Singapore (for the Asian Region), on July 16 and 17, 2012, the second one in Algiers (for the African and Arab Region), on January 29 and 30, 2013, the third one in Istanbul (for the Transition Region), on October 24 and 25, 2013, the fourth one in Geneva (for the Developed Countries Region), on November 25 and 26, 2013, and the fifth in Monterrey (for the Latin America and Caribbean region), on December 5 and 6, 2013.

50. The positive feed-back on the conferences reported by the Secretariat’s internal evaluation (through mission reports) was validated through interviews of a sample of conference participants. A randomly selected sample of participants interviewed confirmed that the meetings were well prepared and responded to their needs.

(ii) Output 2: Analytical studies

51. The following six analytic studies were commissioned by the Secretariat, and final drafts of all six studies have been received by the end of the first week of September 2014:

(a) Economics of IP and International Technology Transfer²⁴;

(b) Intellectual Property-Related Policies and Initiatives in Developed Countries to Promote Technology Transfer²⁵;

(c) Case Studies on Cooperation and Exchange Between R&D Institutions in Developed and Developing Countries²⁶;

(d) Policies Fostering the Participation of Businesses in Technology Transfer²⁷;

(e) International Technology Transfer: An Analysis from the Perspective of Developing Countries²⁸; and

(f) Alternatives to the Patent System used to Support R&D Efforts, Including both Push and Pull Mechanisms, with a Special Focus on Innovation-Inducement Prizes and Open Source Development Models²⁹.

²⁴ http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=287167

²⁵ http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=287217

²⁶ http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=287221

²⁷ http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=287164

²⁸ http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=287165

²⁹ http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=287218

52. All six studies were peer-reviewed, although the quality of some reviews provided under an informal arrangement was mixed³⁰. Authors of the studies were provided an opportunity to incorporate suggestions from the peer-review process. Studies and peer-reviews were presented to the CDIP.

53. Generally, the studies are of good quality. The executive summaries provide detailed overviews of the respective papers. Room for improvement exists in ensuring that brief, self-explaining executive summaries present the essence of the studies in a simple language, which is also understandable to a broader public. This is of particular importance if the results of a study aim at contributing to a political discussion.

54. The distinction between IP protection and technology transfer for global public goods such as life-saving drugs and for global environmental goods such as climate and biodiversity, which is often used in literature, remained unclear to the evaluators. Both issues address urgencies for the humanity in varying degrees. Global public goods addresses the vital issues related to human health. Global environmental goods recognize the “health of the planet” under a broader perspective.

55. Some studies did not sufficiently account for the significant differences between developing countries versus the least developed countries (LDC)³¹. In contrast to many developed and developing nations, the human and structural conditions of many LDCs are extremely challenging. Abject poverty, lack of infrastructure, access to basic human needs such as water, energy, basic sanitation, and healthcare does not allow these nations to accommodate modern technologies. Due to limited absorption capacities, the concept of technology transfer may be difficult to apply in LDCs.

56. One of the recommendations derived from research³² was to extend the role of patent attorneys to include providing advice on the relevance of “existing patents to the business activities.” Patent attorneys are trained to provide a full range of possible protection or enforcement options available to the client and assist the client. Most patent attorneys are however not strategic management consultants. Businesses should thus not only rely on patent attorneys for making significant business decisions. The business owners must understand the commercial factors behind the importance of a patent, prior to and subsequent to obtaining it.

57. Multi-disciplinary expert teams, including academic researchers and practitioners, if possible, with combined field experience in both developed and developing countries, may allow for a reality check on the practical usefulness of recommendations derived from studies.

58. One study³³ focused on the inducement of innovation by rewards or prizes. The author missed the fundamental point that reward-based innovation is not necessarily an “alternative” to the IPR system. Rewards are offered simply to encourage innovation and technology transfer, which often includes IP development and transfer. Competing proposals to induce innovation for addressing new cutting edge challenges, especially those topics that face market failure, is an excellent avenue to introduce prize-based solutions and technology transfer. However, prize-based innovation often operates under an IP-based system.

³⁰ http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/details.jsp?meeting_id=32093

³¹ http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=287217

http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=287221; however, Maskus makes this distinction very clear in http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=287165.

³² http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=287167

³³ Alternatives to the Patent System 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

(iii) Output 3: Concept paper

59. A draft “concept paper” (CDIP/15/2), mainly providing the Project’s background and a summary of its deliverables was presented in an informal briefing session, to Permanent Missions of Member States in Geneva on September 1, 2014 (thus after the formal end of the Project). The concept paper did not include specific recommendations on how to incorporate project outcomes into WIPO’s work (see wording of output 7).

60. A one-day meeting with inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations and professional associations was organized in early October 2014 to present the concept paper. The Secretariat provided an oral report to the CDIP on comments received³⁴.

(iv) Output 4: Training materials

61. The Project was expected to work towards preparation and provision of materials, modules, teaching tools and other instruments resulting from recommendations adopted by the International Expert Forum (output 5).

62. No activities are reported, probably because the International Expert Forum took only place after the Project officially ended (see below).

(v) Output 5: International expert forum

63. The *International Expert Forum on Technology Transfer and IP: Common Challenges Building Solutions* was held from February 16 to 18, 2015. The report (CDIP/15/5, March 2, 2015) was noted by the 15th CDIP meeting (April 22 – 24, 2015) and is planned to be discussed at the upcoming 16th CDIP meeting (November 2015). Concerns were expressed that the expert panel did not include experts representing LDCs. Furthermore, the Forum provided “expert thoughts,” but no solid recommendations to follow-up.

64. The 24 participants who responded to a survey conducted by the Secretariat were satisfied with the organization, the quality of information provided, the quality of speakers and the usefulness of the forum. The general positive assessment was, with some exceptions, confirmed by interviews the evaluators conducted with a sample of participants from both inside and outside the Secretariat.

(vi) Output 6: Web forum on technology transfer

65. The Project Manager prepared a draft version for the Web Forum (output 6), which suggests merging the Web Fora of the Project, the project DA_36 (Open Collaborative Projects and IP-based Models) and the project DA 10_03 (Innovation and Technology Transfer Support Structure for National Institutions). A decision to operationalize the Web Forum in the proposed form has not yet been taken. Keeping a Web Forum up to date and alive will require promoting it and allocating specific responsibilities and resources within the Secretariat.

(vii) Output 7: Incorporation of project results into WIPO’s work

66. According to the last progress report, work towards incorporating any outcome resulting from the above activities into the WIPO programs will start after the International Expert Forum and will only commence after consideration by the CDIP and any possible recommendation to the General Assembly.

³⁴ See CDIP/15/5

67. Views among persons interviewed during the evaluation on whether “project results” should be understood as the conclusions of the expert forum or include those of the conferences and studies differed.

68. Many findings of the studies (see 2.C.viii below) and the views expressed at the Expert Forum (CDIP/15/5) show that the importance of capacity building, in particular, merits a follow-up through existing WIPO activities. The same applies to the access of IP users of both developed and developing countries to well structured patent information and to policy advice on creating an enabling environment for technology transfer, including but not limited to integrating TRIPS flexibilities into IP laws. Document CDIP/15/5 does neither take stock of WIPO’s current activities in the field of technology transfer nor does it translate clearly identified gaps into actionable recommendations on how to complement or enhance relating WIPO services. Both would be a necessary basis for decision-making.

69. No steps towards establishing a specific proposal to the Member States on how to incorporate project results into WIPO’s work are reported.

(viii) Initial outcomes observed in terms of “enhanced understanding”

70. This section presents a summary of key findings derived from the six studies, which aimed at contributing towards an enhanced understanding on possible IP initiatives or policies to promote transfer and diffusion of technology benefiting socio-economic advancement, particularly for the benefit of developing and Least Developed Countries (LDCs).

71. IPR policies enacted by developing economies in response to TRIPS and other international agreements have stimulated greater flows of high-technology trade, foreign-direct investment (FDI), and technology transfer via licensing across countries. They also have facilitated the technology-oriented activities within multinational enterprises in major emerging countries. Positive evidence is however almost entirely based on data pertaining to large and middle-income developing countries. This may be due to the fact that IPRs play a modest role at best in LDCs. A variety of other, non-IPR-related factors also constrain the ability of LDCs to absorb and assimilate foreign technologies.³⁵

72. Technology transfer of intellectual assets includes not only industrial property, but also know-how of manufacturing processes and regulatory approvals. These are of particular importance for international technology transfer to developing nations³⁶.

73. In terms of technological activity and human capital development, large gaps remain, not only between developed and developing countries but also among developing countries. Lumping all developing countries into the same category as commonly done is oversimplification and not justified.³⁷

74. Cross-border collaboration and the transfer of knowledge and experience rather than only the legal right to market are effective ways to foster technology transfer between developed and developing countries.

75. Absorption capacities correlate with the degree developing countries are able to benefit from spillover benefits from trade or FDI. Without adequate human capital or investments in R&D, spillovers may not materialize. Liberalization of trade and FDI needs to be accompanied

³⁵ http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=287165

³⁶ http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=287217

³⁷ http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=287165

by appropriate policies to strengthen of education, R&D and human capital development if developing countries are to take full advantage of trade or FDI.³⁸

76. A strong focus on human capital development is pivotal in enabling developing countries to benefit from international collaborations, trade or FDI. Governments of developing countries must play their part in strengthening the local education systems at all levels (from the primary to post-secondary). From an economics perspective, strengthening local education systems is a necessary pre-condition for effective international technology transfer to occur.

77. The conventional assumption is that “technology transfer from developed countries to developing countries leads, per se, to their economic and human capital development” might need to be revisited. New technologies, such as advanced medicines, educational systems, information and communication technology (ICT) may not automatically enhance the quality of life for the vast majority of people in the developing countries.³⁹ Focus of many multinational companies on transfer of non-essential luxury items to the wealthy population segments of developing countries does not improve the quality of lives for the vast majority of people. Development assistance to address socio-economic challenges of poorer communities in developing countries through technology transfer needs to be combined with other measures to foster sustainable livelihoods.⁴⁰

78. Tax incentives for R&D and technology transfer may encourage R&D in priority areas, such as fostering a particular manufacturing sector, a particular export industry or contribute to the achievement of development objectives. Most developed countries and many developing countries have specific incentives to pursue R&D and technology transfer.⁴¹ Supporting mechanisms fostering relationships between local businesses and local or global technology creators are important as well.⁴²

79. International R&D collaboration is an important channel for technology transfer from developed to developing countries. Eight case studies illustrate several different technical fields and geographical regions, providing an interesting first look at the diverse institutional challenges facing actors in R&D collaboration and technology transfer between developed and developing countries. This is one of most illustrative part of the entire project, highlighting interesting and potential breakthrough results can be possibly derived by joint reach between members of developed and developing countries, once challenges can be overcome.⁴³

80. R&D projects can utilize knowledge through both publication and proprietary control of knowledge to facilitate different utilization strategies in developed and developing countries in parallel. The understanding that IPRs play different roles depending on the utilization context is important. IPR strategies need to be designed with these different value models in mind.⁴⁴

81. The costs associated with developing, evaluating and enforcing patents can be considerable. The patent system can be of limited value for the development of products with small commercial market potential, research outcomes that cannot be successfully monetized,

³⁸ http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=287165

³⁹⁻³⁷ These inferences can be drawn from the study on “International Technology Transfer: An Analysis from the Perspective of Developing Countries,” CDIP/14/INF/7/Annex 1/Page 9; http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=287165; Intellectual Property-Related Policies and Initiatives in Developed Countries to Promote Technology Transfer: http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=287217 and other studies in the Project.

⁴⁰ http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=287217

⁴¹ http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=287164

⁴² http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=287164

⁴³ See CDIP/14/INF/9 carried out by Center for Intellectual Property, a joint center between University of Gothenburg and Chalmers University of Technology, as a collaborative effort.

⁴⁴ http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=287221

or risky developmental projects. Within the boundaries of international commitments, policy makers may use a variety of innovation inducing mechanisms to achieve goals. Combining several mechanisms can be useful to overcome the glaring shortcomings of a single particular mechanism. Various mechanisms for supporting innovation have trade related aspects, and emerging or possible global regimes of regulation. This topic has not been widely appreciated by IP professionals.⁴⁵

82. More needs to be done to enhance the disclosure of inventions and the accessibility of patent data by developing countries, including disclosure of best mode or method. This requires measures to make patent data available online and through international databases. Essential is the access of developing countries to software with analytical capabilities.⁴⁶

83. Innovation inducement prizes are a mechanism that has recently found a new constituency, as a complement to R&D-based products. These include prize contests, and ambitious proposals for systems of innovation prizes that would induce private investments in R&D. Competing proposals to induce innovation for new cutting edge challenges, especially those topics that faced considerable market failure, is an excellent avenue to introduce solutions and technology transfer, an area which has not been fully explore by IP community.⁴⁷

84. The studies also identified a number of areas where more research would be warranted.

85. The understanding of how IPR policies of developed countries affect technology transfer and whether IPR-related changes in these developed countries could enhance the transfer of technology to developing countries and LDCs is important, but remains limited. The same applies to the implications of trade secret policies, practices and laws.

86. In order to distil good practices from successful models, it would be interesting to collect cases studies on technology transfer. What were the benefits for both parties? Are there examples of success stories where developing and developing countries both benefited by joint collaborative research and development on topics of mutual interest?

(ix) Other outcomes

87. The evaluators were unable to identify any outcomes in regards to achieving the intended improved consensus among Member States on how to promote technology transfer. Beyond raising interest among a relatively limited audience (conference and web participants), the evaluators did not observe any other negative or positive outcomes.

(x) Impact

88. At this time, it was too early to assess results at the impact level.

⁴⁵ http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=287218; CDIP/14/INF/12)

⁴⁶ http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=287167. This recommendation is derived from CDIP/14/INF/7 Para 110 and 111. "Access to Specialized Patent Information" (ASPI) provided limited access to commercial databases included leading database providers. But it is not known if access is still available to LDCs. The recommendation was also suggested in http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=287217

⁴⁷ http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=287218

(D) EFFICIENCY

(i) Financial implementation

89. Based on the last official financial report as per end of May, 2015, 76.8% of the total budget of 1,532,000 Swiss francs (including 549,000 Swiss francs for personnel costs and 983,000 Swiss francs for non-personnel costs) was disbursed.

Table 1: Overview expenditures (in Swiss francs)

Budget lines	Years			Total	% of total
	2011	2012/2013	2014/2015		
Personnel resources					
<i>Temporary staff</i>	120,000	339,000	96,000	<u>555,000</u>	42.7%
Subtotal personnel resources	<u>120,000</u>	<u>339,000</u>	<u>96,000</u>	<u>555,000</u>	42.7%
Non-personnel resources					
<i>Staff missions</i>		22,000			1.9%
<i>Third party travel</i>		280,000	86,000	<u>367,000</u>	31.2%
<i>Conferences</i>		39,000	25,000	<u>64,000</u>	5.4%
<i>Publishing</i>					
<i>Individual contractual services</i>		131,000	17,000	<u>148,000</u>	12.6%
<i>Other contractual services</i>			20,000		1.7%
Subtotal non-personnel resources	<u>0</u>	<u>473,000</u>	<u>149,000</u>	<u>621,000</u>	52.8%
Total	<u>120,000</u>	<u>812,000</u>	<u>244,000</u>	<u>1,176,000</u>	100%
Disbursements in %	10.20%	69.05%	20.75%	100%	

Source: Figures provided by Secretariat on request of the evaluators

90. An analysis of expenditures according to budget lines shows no unusual patterns for a project that allocated most of its resources to the organization of meetings and to research through studies. Relating total costs to outputs delivered and a comparison with publically available financial figures of other DA projects indicates that the Secretariat generally made appropriate use of resources. Efficiency was reduced by implementation delays, which are described in section 2.A (ii) on management above.

91. A detailed assessment of efficiency at the output level was not required by the ToRs but would be relevant to the decision making process of Member States. Assessing value for money in detail would in addition require financial statements that allocate expenditures to both results and budget lines. It was thus not possible to present and assess allocation of resources to the different outputs. For all current DA projects, this information is provided by the Secretariat's new financial reporting format.

92. Comparing the significant funding to the very limited wider project benefits (outcomes), efficiency was low. Unless project results are used to generate positive changes, which require specific actions to be approved by the Member States, most of the funds would be lost without creating tangible outcomes.

(ii) Synergies with other activities conducted by the Secretariat

93. The Project complemented in particular different WIPO activities responding to different DA recommendations under Cluster C (Technology Transfer, Information and Communication Technologies and Access to Knowledge).

94. The use some studies conducted under DA_16_20_01 (CDIP/4/3)⁴⁸ and DA_16_20_02 (CDIP/6/5)⁴⁹ as an input to studies conducted under the Project resulted in some, although rather limited, synergies.

95. The evaluation found no overlaps with other activities of the Secretariat.

(E) LIKELIHOOD OF SUSTAINABILITY OF RESULTS

96. At least two key outputs (Expert Forum, Web Forum) have only been recently delivered. The CDIP noted the results of the Expert Forum in its last session without however discussing them. Ensuring a follow-up on the Project is critical to consolidate, build upon and perpetuate initial results achieved.

97. Incorporation of “resulting recommendations” into relevant WIPO Programs after endorsement of the Member States was rightly defined as a project objective (output 7). Member States might have deliberately chosen the wording “incorporation into relevant WIPO Programs”, since “technology transfer” is not a service that could be “mainstreamed”. The wording of output 7 seems to indicate that the Member States expect a proposal of the Secretariat.

98. Besides the importance of maintaining discussions among Member States, stakeholders interviewed highlighted the need to provide governments with tailored advice on how to establish an enabling policy framework for technology transfer. This would also require further research on technology transfer, particularly on good practices derived from case studies.

99. IPRs are only one, although important, factor that affects the ability of developing countries to benefit from technology transfer. Improving technology transfer requires concerted efforts in many areas that are not covered by WIPO’s mandate. Close cooperation with other International Organizations within and outside the UN system remains important. Through its comprehensive understanding on the topic from an IP-perspective, WIPO would be well positioned to contribute to an enabling framework for technology transfer. An active participation in international conferences on technology transfer would provide a good forum for this and also allow WIPO increase its visibility and standing within the international community.

100. Equally important would also be to ensure support to researchers and businesses in capitalizing on the opportunities of international technology transfer, in particular within WIPO’s existing direct and indirect support (meso level) aimed at IPR users.

101. Providing an outline on the way forward would exceed the scope of this evaluation. An appropriate way to proceed would be to conduct a mapping of existing activities and identify gaps, taking into account the results of the Project.

102. Programs through which technology transfer might be further promoted include the IP Academy (Program 11), Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises (Program 30 including support to Member States in drafting IP strategies), and also Program 14 under Strategic Goal IV

⁴⁸ Project on intellectual property and the public domain

⁴⁹ Project on patents and the public domain

(Services for Access to Information and Knowledge), in particular through the Technology and Information Support Centers (TISCs).

3. CONCLUSIONS

103. The findings and assessment above leads to the following conclusions:

Conclusion 1: Project outputs were highly relevant, but some of the outputs were not delivered. Deliverables were, with some exceptions, of good quality. While significant implementation delays negatively affected project efficiency, the Secretariat generally made adequate use of resources.

104. The results of conferences and studies funded under the Project contributed to identifying and discussing barriers to technology transfer, to deriving good practices from case studies of successful practices and to discussing the results within a limited audience. Otherwise, the Project has not yet resulted in any tangible wider outcomes.

105. The planned capacity building tools have not been produced and a draft version of the Web Forum was only completed one year after the Project formally ended. No steps have yet been taken towards an integration of project results into WIPO's existing Program activities. The wording of output 7 indicates that Member States would expect a specific proposal of the Secretariat after the results of the international expert forum have been discussed.

106. Project implementation, in general, advanced at a slow pace. Project implementation took twice the time originally planned. Despite two no cost extensions, the delivery of some activities continued beyond the formal end of the Project and was only completed in June 2015. Management problems aggravated by different organizational restructurings within WIPO contributed to the delays.

Conclusion 2: Without a follow-up, it is unlikely that outputs will translate into sustainable tangible outcomes resulting in wider benefits, meaning that most of the resources allocated to the Project would be lost.

107. Without a follow-up in terms of using project outputs to enhance WIPO's support to technology transfer activities, the Project's reach and impact on socio-economic development would remain rather limited. Interesting initial results and the funds disbursed to generate them would be lost. Potential sustainability of results and project efficiency would remain low.

Conclusion 3: Expert views identify a number of areas where strengthening WIPO's services would realistically be able to add value in facilitating the transfer. On the other hand, it became also clear that promoting technology transfer requires a broad array of measures, many of which would not be covered by WIPO's mandate. Establishing enabling framework conditions for technology transfer requires concerted efforts within and beyond the UN system.

108. Technology transfer is not a service that could be "mainstreamed". Reflected by the wording of Output 7 to which Member States agreed through consensus, incorporation of project recommendations into relevant WIPO Programs was a core objective of the Project. This may indicate that Member States expect a concrete proposal of the Secretariat, after discussing the key findings generated by the Project during the upcoming 16th session of the CDIP.

109. Establishing a plan for the way forward requires mapping WIPO's existing activities relating to technology transfer, to define needs based on the findings of the Project and then establish a proposal on how to enhance or complement existing services where appropriate.

110. The ability of developing countries to benefit from technology transfer is driven by many factors, many of which are not directly related to IP. Therefore, close cooperation with other International Organizations within and outside the UN system remains important. Through its comprehensive understanding on the topic from an IP-perspective, WIPO would be well positioned to actively contribute to an enabling framework for technology transfer, in particular through regularly participating in relevant international fora.

Conclusion 4: The application of standard project planning and monitoring tools leaves significant room for improvement. Evidence from this evaluation calls for strengthening the role of the DACD in more regularly monitoring progress and quality of DA projects and for a compulsory basic training for project managers.

111. The logical framework as standard tool for project planning, monitoring and evaluation was not applied. Planning and reporting focused on activities rather than on results. It should be emphasized that for all recent DA projects, the Secretariat has already undertaken significant efforts to continuously enhance result-based management.

112. Evaluation findings call for strengthening project supervision and quality control within the Secretariat, in particular by the DACD. Requiring a "visa" of the DACD on all major steps during project implementation (e.g. commissioning of services, the publication of material, etc.) and through scheduling regular meetings with Project Managers would allow the DACD to intervene before problems occur.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1 (from conclusions 2 and 3) to the Member States and the WIPO Secretariat on establishing a proposal on how WIPO could further contribute to facilitating technology transfer:

113. After discussion of the project results at the upcoming 16th session of the CDIP, the Member States should consider requesting the Secretariat to map WIPO's existing services in the field of technology transfer and, taking into account the findings of the Project, how to complement and improve them.

Recommendation 2 (from conclusions 2 and 3) to the Member States and the WIPO Secretariat on the possible content of a specific proposal (provided the Member States endorse recommendation 1 above):

114. Based on the findings of this evaluation, the Secretariat might, in particular, consider providing support in the following intervention areas:

- (a) Continue identifying, collecting and sharing best practices in the field of technology transfer through additional case studies and documenting success stories resulting from collaboration between developing countries and developed countries. Of particular interest would be to identify the development models of recently developed countries.
- (b) Continue offering practical capacity building (including tool kits) tailored to specific target users with focus on LDCs.
- (c) Continue providing capacity building to IP and/or innovation service providers in developing countries, e.g. to IP Offices, Technology Transfer Centers, etc.
- (d) Support and document specific pilot technology transfer activities to developing countries for demonstration purposes.
- (e) Provide tailored, specific policy advice to Member States, in particular developing countries and LDCs for creating an enabling legal framework for technology transfer. This may include advice on the use of various flexibilities under international agreements.
- (f) Add analytical capabilities of the Patentscope database to enhance usefulness of patent data to general users in all countries, including LDCs. Consider providing a mechanism on data mining and the visualization of statistical IP data and evidence.
- (g) Enhance the usefulness of the Website on technology transfer in a way that it presents all WIPO activities as well as resources of WIPO and national institutions.
- (h) Advise Member States on best practices for the development of efficient innovation infrastructures and network.

Recommendation 3 (from conclusion 3) to the WIPO Secretariat for leveraging WIPO's presence in conferences and for a relating to technology transfer:

115. The Secretariat should strengthen its active presence in international fora and conferences on technology transfer with the objective to create visibility, to contribute its know-how and to benefit from additional experience from a wide range of conference participants.

Recommendation 4 (from conclusion 4) to the WIPO Secretariat on strengthening its project management capabilities and the quality control for DA projects:

116. Apply the logical framework tool for planning, monitoring and evaluation of DA Projects.

117. Consider introducing compulsory project management courses for Project Managers.

118. Consider introducing a mechanism whereas the DACD will be requested to add its "visa" for all major management decision relating to DA projects.

119. Schedule regular progress meetings with project managers of DA projects.

LIST OF APPENDEXES

Appendix I	Terms of reference
Appendix II	List of persons interviewed
Appendix III	List of documents ⁵⁰

[Appendixes follow]

⁵⁰ The Project Document CDIP/6/4 Rev. is available at:
http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=156582

APPENDIX I: TERMS OF REFERENCE

ANNEX

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Title of Assignment:	Project Evaluation: Project on Intellectual Property and Technology Transfer: Common Challenges – Building Solutions
Name of unit/sector:	Development Agenda Coordination Division (DACD), Development Sector
Place of Assignment:	Evaluators' places of residence/duty
Expected places of travel (if applicable):	During your assignment, you will undertake two missions to WIPO Headquarters, Geneva, Switzerland (dates to be determined)
Expected duration of assignment:	From June 1, 2015, to November 13, 2015

Objective of the assignment

The present document represents the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the evaluation of the Development Agenda *Project on Intellectual Property and Technology Transfer: Common Challenges – Building Solutions (Recommendations 19, 25, 26 and 28)*, approved during the sixth session of the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP), held in Geneva, in November 2010. The project document for this project is contained in document CDIP/6/4 Rev. At its ninth session, the Committee discussed a Revised project paper with redistributed budget and updated timeline of the Project paper on *Intellectual Property and Technology Transfer: Common Challenges – Building Solutions (CDIP/9/INF/4)*, and agreed to the implementation of the Project deliverables in line with the proposed new budget and timeline. At its twelfth session, the Committee agreed on the revised timeline of the Project on Intellectual Property and Technology Transfer: Common Challenges – Building Solutions (CDIP/12/2, see pages 50-60). The project implementation started in January 2011 and was completed in July 2014 (with the Expert Forum held in February 16-18, 2015, for planning reasons). The project used a “step-by-step” approach involving accredited organizations and new partners involved in all aspects of technology transfer, and explored intellectual property-related policies and new initiatives necessary to promote the transfer and dissemination of technology, benefiting developing countries in particular, together with the establishment of international IP collaboration.

The project was implemented under the supervision of the Project Manager, Mr. Ali Jazairy, Senior Counsellor, PCT International Cooperation Division (historically, the project managers were Mr. Philippe Baechtold (2011), Mr. Matthew Rainey (2012-2013) and Mr. Ali Jazairy (2013-2015)).

This evaluation is intended to be a participative evaluation. It should provide for active involvement in the evaluation process of those with a stake in the projects: project team, partners, beneficiaries, and any other interested parties.

The main objective of this evaluation is two-fold:

1. Learning from experiences during project implementation: what worked well and what did not work well for the benefit of continuing activities in this field. This includes assessing the project design framework, project management, including monitoring and reporting tools, as well as measuring and reporting on the results achieved to date and assessing the likelihood of sustainability of results achieved; and
2. Providing evidence-based evaluative information to support the CDIP's decision-making process.

In particular, the evaluation will assess the extent to which the project has been instrumental in:

- (a) Facilitating consultative processes with Member States through five regional meetings and elaborating six peer-reviewed analytic studies, both providing input to an Expert Forum where a list of expert thoughts for promoting international technology transfer was proposed; and
- (b) Exploring new ways of establishing international IP collaboration, enhanced understanding and consensus on possible IP initiatives or policies to promote technology transfer.

To this end, the evaluation, in particular, will focus on assessing the following key evaluation questions:

Project Design and Management

- (a) The appropriateness of the initial project document as a guide for project implementation and assessment of results achieved;
- (b) the project monitoring, self-evaluation and reporting tools and analysis of whether they were useful and adequate to provide the project team and key stakeholders with relevant information for decision-making purposes;
- (c) the extent to which other entities within the Secretariat have contributed and enabled an effective and efficient project implementation;
- (d) the extent to which the risks identified in the initial project document have materialized or been mitigated; and
- (e) the project's ability to respond to emerging trends, technologies and other external forces.

Effectiveness

- (a) The effectiveness and usefulness of the project in establishing international IP collaboration in the field of technology transfer;
- (b) The usefulness of the five regional consultation meetings in consultation with Member States;
- (c) The usefulness of the Studies, case studies and analyses for Member States; and
- (d) The usefulness of the project in creating an enhanced understanding and consensus on possible IP initiatives or policies to promote technology transfer.

Sustainability

The likelihood for continued work on Intellectual Property and Technology Transfer in WIPO and its Member States.

Implementation of Development Agenda (DA) Recommendations

The extent to which the DA Recommendations 19, 25, 26 and 28 have been implemented through this project.

In addition, the project time frame considered for this evaluation is 42 months (January 2011- July 2014). The focus shall not be on assessing individual activities but rather to evaluate the project as a whole and its contribution in assessing the needs of Member States and identify the resources or the means to address those needs, its evolution over time, its performance including project design, project management, coordination, coherence, implementation and results achieved.

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

The external evaluation expert will be in charge of conducting the evaluation, in consultation and collaboration with the project team and the Development Agenda Coordination Division (DACD). The evaluation methodology will consist of the following:

- (a) Desk review of relevant project related documentation including the project framework (initial project document and study), progress reports, monitoring information, mission reports and other relevant documents.
- (b) interviews at the WIPO Secretariat (project team, other substantive entities contributing to the project, etc.); and
- (c) stakeholders interviews.

Deliverables/services

The evaluator will deliver:

- (a) An inception report which contains a description of the evaluation methodology and methodological approach, data collection tools (including eventual surveys of beneficiaries and stakeholders), data analysis methods, key stakeholders to be interviewed, additional evaluation questions, performance assessment criteria, and evaluation work plan;
- (b) draft evaluation report with actionable recommendations deriving from the findings and conclusions;
- (c) final evaluation report which includes an executive summary and structured as follows:
 - (i) description of the evaluation methodology used;
 - (ii) summary of key evidence-based findings centered on the key evaluation questions;
 - (iii) conclusions drawn based on the findings; and
 - (iv) recommendations emanating from the conclusions and lessons learned.
- (d) comprehensive executive summary of the final evaluation report.

This project evaluation is expected to start on June 1, 2015 and be finalized on August 15, 2015. The reporting language will be English.

3. Reporting

The Consultant will be under the supervision of the Director of the Development Agenda Coordination Division (DACD). In addition, the evaluator shall:

- (a) Work closely with the Development Agenda Coordination Division (DACD), the Project Manager and the PCT International Cooperation Division. You shall also coordinate with the relevant Program Managers in WIPO as required; and
- (b) ensure the quality of data (validity, consistency and accuracy) throughout the analytical reporting phases (inception report and final evaluation report).

4. Profiles

Mr. Daniel Keller has extensive experience in preparing, managing and evaluating projects, and in conducting institutional assessments both in the public and private sectors. Mr. Keller also has a previous experience with WIPO, he conducted evaluation reports on completed Development Agenda Project, namely the Project on Enhancing South-South Cooperation on IP and Development among Developing Countries and LDCs (document CDIP/7/6), the Project on Intellectual Property and Socio-Economic Development (document CDIP/5/7 Rev.), and the Project on Open Collaborative Projects and IP Based Models (CDIP6/6/Rev.).

Mr. Rashid Khan is an Intellectual Property specialist and Energy Technologist, who has experience in both upstream and downstream technology areas. He is considered an international expert in hydrocarbon processing. In his current position, Mr. Rashid Khan

provides leadership to capture, develop and commercialize Intellectual Property. He has 27 patent awards, published over 150 journal papers/presentations and authored/edited three books. He is also an editorial board member for “energy Sources.” While employed with the United States Department of Energy, he championed the development and commercialization of an upgrading process.

5. Duration of contract and payment

The contract will start on June 1, 2015 and will finish in November 13, 2015. During this period, the following schedule should be followed:

The inception report should be submitted to WIPO by June 15, 2015. WIPO’s feedback shall be communicated to you by June 20, 2015. The draft evaluation report shall be submitted to WIPO by July 20, 2015. Factual corrections on the draft will be provided to you by July 30, 2015. The final evaluation report shall be submitted by August 3, 2015. The final version of the evaluation report containing a management response in an annex shall be considered by the sixteen session of the CDIP, to be held from November 9 to 13, 2015. You will be required to present the evaluation report during that CDIP session.

[Appendix II follows]]

APPENDIX II: LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

No.	Name and function
1.	Mr. Walid Abdelnasser, Director, Regional Bureau for Arab Countries
2.	Ms. Sarah Ahlam Charikhi, Attaché, Permanent Mission of Algeria
3.	Mr. Marco Aleman, Director ad interim, Patent Law Division
4.	Ms. Olga Allemann, Project Coordinator International Cooperation, Legal and International Affairs, Swiss Federal Institute of Intellectual Property
5.	Mrs. Maya Katharina Bachner, Acting Director and Head, Program Management and Performance Resource Planning, Program Management and Performance Division, Administration and Management Sector
6.	Mr. Philippe Baechtold, Acting Director, PCT Operations Division
7.	Mr. Irfan Baloch, Director, DACD, Development Sector
8.	Ms. Fareha Bugti, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Pakistan
9.	Mr. Marcelo Di Pietro Peralta, Director of Operations, WIPO Academy
10.	Mr. Carsten Fink, Chief Economist
11.	Mr. George Ghandour, Senior Program Officer, DACD, Development Sector
12.	Mr. Ali Jazairy, Senior Counsellor, PCT International Cooperation Division, Patents and Technology Sector (Project Manager)
13.	Mr. Anatole Krattiger, Director, Global Challenges Division
14.	Mr. Grega Kumer, Senior IP Advisor, Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom
15.	Ms. Marina Lamm, Permanent Mission of the United States of America
16.	Ms. Sara Manzano Merino, Advisor, Permanent Mission of Mexico
17.	Mr. Claus Matthes, Director, PCT Business Development Division, Patents and Technology Sector
18.	Mr. Mario Matus, Deputy Director General, Development Sector
19.	Mr. Rodrigo Mendes Araujo, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of Brazil
20.	Ms. Tamara Nanayakkara, Head, Innovation Policy Section, SMEs and Entrepreneurship Support Division
21.	Ms. Livia Puscaragiu, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Romania
22.	Mr. Roberto Recalde, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of Paraguay
23.	Mr. Kifle Shenkoru, Director, Division for Least Developed Countries
24.	Mr. Juan Antonio Toledo Barazza, Senior Director, Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean
25.	Ms. Silvija Trpkovska, Senior Program Officer, Section for Central European and Baltic States and Mediterranean Countries, TDC, Department for Transition and Developed Countries (TDC)
26.	Ms. Chichi Umesi, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Nigeria

[Appendix III follows]

APPENDIX III: LIST OF DOCUMENTS

Documents relating to monitoring and evaluation

- Internal Audit and Oversight Division, Revised WIPO Evaluation Policy, May 2010
- Internal Audit and Oversight Division, Evaluation and Inspection Section, Self-Evaluation Guidelines, Version 1.1, April 2009
- DAC Guidelines and Reference Series, Quality Standards for Development Evaluation, OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC), OECD 2010.
- UNEG, Standards for Evaluation in the UN System, April 2005 (last updated on June 18, 2014)

WIPO programmatic documents

- The 45 Adopted Recommendations under the WIPO Development Agenda by the General Assembly of WIPO Member States, 2007
- Program and Budget for the 2010/2011 Biennium, approved by the Assemblies of the Member States of WIPO on October 1, 2009
- Program and Budget for the 2012/2013 Biennium, approved by the Assemblies of the Member States of WIPO on September 29, 2011
- Program and Budget for the 2014/2015 Biennium, approved by the Assemblies of the Member States of WIPO on December 12, 2013
- Medium Term Strategic Plan 2010-15: (Document A/48/3, September 16, 2010)

Project documents and reports

- Project Document Project proposal: Project on Intellectual Property and Technology Transfer: Common Challenges – Building Solutions (Recommendations 19, 25, 26 and 28), CDIP/6/4 Rev., dated November 26, 2010.
- Project paper: Project on Intellectual Property and Technology Transfer: Common Challenges – Building Solutions (Recommendations 19, 25, 26 and 28), CDIP/8/7 dated October 21, 2011.
- Project paper (revised): Project on Intellectual Property and Technology Transfer: Common Challenges – Building Solutions (Recommendations 19, 25, 26 and 28), CDIP/9/INF/4 dated March 13, 2012.
- Progress report, CDIP/8/2 Annex XV (pages 131-136), October 4, 2011
- Progress report, CDIP/10/2 Annex VIII (pages 72-79), September 27, 2012
- Progress report, CDIP/12/2 Annex VI (pages 49-58), September 12, 2013
- Latest progress report, CDIP/14/2 Annex (a) II (pages 9-17), August 28, 2014

Project Outputs

Output 1: Five Regional Technology Transfer Consultation Meetings in different regions of the world (meeting documents)

- Singapore Regional Consultation for the Asian Region:
http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/details.jsp?meeting_id=28643
- Algiers Regional Consultation for Africa and the Region:
http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/details.jsp?meeting_id=31263
- Istanbul Regional Consultation for the Transition Region:
http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/details.jsp?meeting_id=30703
- Geneva Regional Consultation for the Developed Region:
http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/details.jsp?meeting_id=31242 (including Audio by Ms. Patricia O'Brien, Ireland's Ambassador and Permanent Representative, as a background)
- Monterrey Regional Consultation for the Latin American and Caribbean Region:
http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/details.jsp?meeting_id=31243
- Meeting for NGOs and IGOs: http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/details.jsp?meeting_id=34205
(Audio introduction by Mr. Pooley on the a background on the main issues of TT)

Output 2: Studies

- Study 1: Economics of IP and International Technology Transfer:
http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=287167
- Study 2: Intellectual Property-Related Policies and Initiatives in Developed Countries to Promote Technology Transfer:
http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=287217
- Study 3: Case Studies on Cooperation and Exchange Between R&D Institutions in Developed and Developing Countries:
http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=287221
- Study 4: Policies Fostering the Participation of Businesses in Technology Transfer:
http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=287164
- Study 5: International Technology Transfer: An Analysis from the Perspective of Developing Countries: http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=287165
- Study 6: 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:
http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=287218

Output 3: Concept Paper on Building Solutions

- Recommendations submitted to the CDIP for consideration and approval:
http://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/mdocs/en/cdip_15/cdip_15_5.pdf
- Presentation by the Project Manager (slides)

Output 5: International Expert Forum on Technology Transfer

- Conference material (including website, program, biographies, press release, poster, list of participants, and selected presentation material) retrieved from http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/details.jsp?meeting_id=35562
- Selection criteria for experts (slides dated 24 November 2014) provided by the Project Manager.

Output 6: Web Forum

- Web Fora:
<https://www3.wipo.int/confluence/display/TTOC/Technology+Transfer+and+Open+Collaboration+Home>, also accessible via <http://www.wipo.int/wiki> and then click on “Technology Transfer and Open Collaboration”.

Internal documents

- Financial reports as per 30 June 2015
- Mission reports for Regional Conferences (Output 1)
- Webcast statistics

Other documents

- Integrating Intellectual Property into Innovation Policy Formulation in Serbia, prepared by the Innovation Policy Section, Innovation Division, WIPO with the Expert Support of Alfred Radauer, Senior Consultant, Technopolis Group, Austria, August 4, 2014
- Integrating Intellectual Property into Innovation Policy Formulation in Trinidad and Tobago, prepared by the Innovation Policy Section, Innovation Division, WIPO with the Expert Support of Alfred Radauer, Senior Consultant, Technopolis Group, Austria, May 5, 2015
- *Éléments de la Propriété Intellectuelle dans la Formulation de la Politique d’Innovation au Cameroun*, rapport produit pour l’Organisation Mondiale de la Propriété Intellectuelle (OMPI) par Barthélemy Nyasse, Consultant, Université de Yaoundé, Cameroun avec la collaboration d’Alfred Radauer, Consultant Principal, Technopolis Group, Austria.
- Integrating Intellectual Property into Innovation Policy Formulation in Rwanda, Report prepared by Getachew Mengistie, for the Innovation Policy Section, Innovation Division, World Intellectual Property Organization
- Integrating Intellectual Property into Innovation Policy Formulation in Sri Lanka, Report prepared by Prepared by Philip Mendes, Principal, Opteon, Australia, for the Innovation Policy Section, Innovation Division, World Intellectual Property Organization
- Evaluation Report on the Project on Capacity Building in the Use of Appropriate Technology, Specific Technical and Scientific Information as a Solution for Identified Development Challenges (Recommendations 19, 30 and 31) prepared by Professor Tom P. M. Ogada, Evaluation Consultant, T&P Innovation and Technology Management Service, Nairobi (CDIP/12/3, September 25, 2013).

[End of Appendix III and of document]