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LIST OF INDICATORS TO ASSESS WIPO’S TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER SERVICES AND ACTIVITIES

*prepared by the Secretariat*

 The Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP) at its 21st session, while discussing the Gap Analysis of WIPO’s Existing Technology Transfer Services and Activities in Respect of the WIPO Development Agenda “Cluster C” Recommendations contained in document CDIP/21/5, decided that “interested delegations should submit to the Secretariat a list of indicators to assess the activities contained in the document for consolidation and presentation at the next session of the Committee. Member States’ input should reach the Secretariat before September 10, 2018.”

 The Annexes to this document contain the submissions on the above-mentioned subject from the Delegation of Switzerland on behalf of Group B, the Delegation of Ecuador and the Delegation of South Africa.

 *The Committee is requested to consider the information contained in the Annexes to the present document.*

[Annexes follow]

# Input received by the secretariat from the delegation of switzerland on behalf group b

**List of Indicators to Assess WIPO’s Technology Transfer Services and Activities**

**Group B Submission**

During its 21st session, the Committee discussed the document CDIP/21/5, “Gap Analysis of WIPO’s Existing Technology Transfer Services and Activities in Respect of the WIPO Development Agenda “Cluster C” Recommendations”. It was noted by the Secretariat that the document provides a general analysis, rather than a specific gap analysis of activities indicated for each of the Cluster C recommendations, since no “indicators or benchmarks have been defined so as to allow an objective gap analysis of how and by how much the activities undertaken by WIPO within specific recommendations have contributed to achieving” those recommendations. Therefore, the Committee decided that “interested delegations should submit to the Secretariat a list of indicators to assess the activities contained in the document for consolidation and presentation at the next session of the Committee.”

Good Results-Based Management (RBM) practices require linking objectives at all levels to objectively verifiable indicators, which should be **Specific**, **Measurable**, **Achievable**, **Relevant** and **Time-bound (SMART)**.

Attached as Appendix I is a non-exhaustive list of indicators which Group B would propose to assess the extent to which WIPO’s technology transfer services and activities contribute to the implementation of those “Cluster C” recommendations that relate to technology transfer.

**APPENDIX I: “Cluster C” DA Recommendations – RBM – Proposed Methodology**

| **Cluster C Recommendation** | **Performance Indicators** |
| --- | --- |
| **25.** To explore intellectual property-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. | * Number and satisfaction rating of training programs and events on IP-related policies and initiatives to promote tech transfer, as well as IP-related flexibilities, conducted in or for developing country Member States
* Usage and uptake of databases compiled by WIPO on tech transfer-related policies and flexibilities, and that are available to Member States
* Number of quality publications, studies and other resources commissioned, conducted or compiled by WIPO on tech transfer-related policies and flexibilities, that have been peer reviewed and are available to Member States
* Number of fellowships, Master’s programs, summer school courses, and distance learning courses on IP-related policies and initiatives to promote tech transfer offered, arranged or conducted by WIPO for developing country Member States
 |
| * Number/total of CDIP meetings or other WIPO committee meetings during which tech transfer-related issues or studies were formally\* discussed
* Number of UN events related to tech transfer to which WIPO participated
* Number/total and satisfaction rating of technology transfer-related projects delivered to developing countries by WIPO

\*Formally: as reflected on the meeting agenda or on the Chair’s Summary.  |
| **26.** To encourage Member States, especially developed countries, to urge their research and scientific institutions to enhance cooperation and exchange with research and development institutions in developing countries, especially LDCs. | * Number and satisfaction rating of awareness-raising and training programs or events on tech transfer, commercialization or licensing conducted in or for developing country Member States
* Number of quality publications, studies and other resources commissioned, conducted or compiled by WIPO on tech transfer, commercialization or licensing, that have been peer reviewed and are available to Member States
* Number of experts from developed countries that participated in WIPO programs related to tech transfer
 |
| * Number of partnerships entered into by research and scientific institutions that relate to tech transfer, commercialization or licensing facilitated by WIPO (through e.g. WIPO GREEN, WIPO Re:Search, WIPO Match or any other platforms)
* Usage and uptake of databases compiled by WIPO on tech transfer, commercialization or licensing, and that are available to Member States
* Number, usage and uptake of databases compiled by Member States on tech transfer, commercialization or licensing, and that have been notified to and publicized through WIPO
* Number of promotional activities conducted by WIPO to increase the usage and uptake of databases on tech transfer, commercialization or licensing
 |
| **28.** To explore supportive intellectual property-related policies and measures Member States, especially developed countries, could adopt for promoting transfer and dissemination of technology to developing countries. | * Number and satisfaction rating of training programs and events on IP-related policies and initiatives to promote tech transfer conducted in or for developed country Member States
* Usage and uptake of databases compiled by WIPO on tech transfer-related policies and initiatives, and that are available to Member States
* Number of quality publications, studies and other resources commissioned, conducted or compiled by WIPO on tech transfer-related policies and initiatives, that have been peer reviewed and are available to Member States
* Number of fellowships, Master’s programs, summer school courses, and distance learning courses on IP-related policies and initiatives to promote tech transfer offered, arranged or conducted by WIPO for developed country Member States
 |
| * Number/total of CDIP meetings or other WIPO committee meetings during which tech transfer-related issues or studies were formally\* discussed
* Number of UN events related to tech transfer to which WIPO participated

 \*Formally: as reflected on the meeting agenda or on the Chair’s Summary.  |
| **29.** To include discussions on intellectual property-related technology transfer issues within the mandate of an appropriate WIPO body. | * Number/total of CDIP meetings or other WIPO committee meetings during which tech transfer-related projects, issues or studies were formally\* discussed
* Number of UN events related to tech transfer to which WIPO participated

\*Formally: as reflected on the meeting agenda or on the Chair’s Summary.  |
| **31.** To undertake initiatives agreed by Member States, which contribute to transfer of technology to developing countries, such as requesting WIPO to facilitate better access to publicly available patent information. | * Number/total of tech transfer-related DA projects formally\* discussed and approved by CDIP
* Number/total of CDIP meetings during which tech transfer-related projects were formally\* discussed

\*Formally: as reflected on the meeting agenda or on the Chair’s Summary.  |
| * Number of TISCs in developing country Member States
* Number and satisfaction rating of training programs, events or services administered and delivered by TISCs
* Number and satisfaction rating of training programs and capacity building events conducted by WIPO for TISCs to improve their services and increase capacity of the personnel
 |

[Annex II follows]

# Input received by the secretariat from the delegation of Ecuador

# translation (Original text in Spanish)





MINISTRY
OF **EXTERNAL RELATIONS
AND HUMAN MOBILITY**



**Permanent Mission
to WTO-Geneva**

Note- 4-7- 100/2018

The Permanent Mission of Ecuador to the World Trade Organization and the other Economic Organizations in Geneva presents its compliments to the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO/Development Sector) and has the honor to refer to the decision adopted at the twenty-first session of the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property Committee, held on May 14 to 18, 2018, on the gap analysis of WIPO’s existing technology transfer services and activities in respect of the WIPO Development Agenda Cluster C recommendations contained in document CDIP/21/5.

The Permanent Mission of Ecuador to the World Trade Organization and the other Economic Organizations in Geneva transmits for information the following contributions forwarded by the National Service of Intellectual Rights.

In accordance with the gap analysis of WIPO’s existing technology transfer services and activities under the development program, it is recommended that the following indicators be included in order to evaluate activities conducted to achieve that goal:

* pre-implementation analysis of the technological status of the country or region targeted for the activity in order to increase the likelihood of success;
* short-, medium- and long-term national impact of the event;
* medium- and long-term regional impact of the event;
* utility of the service over time in the light of its territorial objective (developing or developed);
* event continuity and link to long-term implementation.

These indicators are recommended to ensure that activities match countries’ real-life circumstances and thus positively drive growth in the service of technology transfer.

The Permanent Mission of Ecuador to the World Trade Organization and the other Economic Organizations in Geneva avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the World Intellectual Property Organization the assurances of its highest consideration.

Geneva, 5 September 2018



**To the
WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION
Development Sector
Geneva**

15 Av. de Secheron, 1202 Geneva. Telephone +41 (022) 731.82.51.Fax +41 (022) 731.83.91

omcginebra@mmrree.gob.ec

#

#  [Annex III follows]

**INPUT RECEIVED BY THE SECRETARIAT FROM THE DELEGATION OF SOUTH AFRICA**

PROPOSED INDICATORS FOR USE IN THE ANALYSIS OF WIPOS EXISTING TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER SERVICES AND ACTIVITIES IN RESPECT OF THE WIPO DEVELOPMENT AGENDA CLUSTER C RECOMMENDATIONS AS PER CDIP/21/5.

1. It is recalled from the Summary of the Chair of CDIP/21 *“The Committee considered the information provided in the document.  It was decided that interested delegations should submit to the Secretariat a list of indicators to assess the activities contained in the document for consolidation and presentation at the next session of the Committee.  Member States’ input should reach the Secretariat before September 10, 2018.”*
2. The delegation of South Africa hereby submits the following inputs for consideration noting that Cluster C is titled “Cluster C: Technology Transfer, Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) and Access to Knowledge”.
3. As a general observation it is noted that, barring recommendation 26, most of the interventions for Cluster C Development Agenda Recommendations are event based. It would thus be fair to conclude that the “gap” in the services and activities of WIPO in this area do not relate to events but instead relate, including but not limited to, technical assistance, projects, partnerships and compilations.
4. Of particular importance is the notable absence of capacity development. In this regard, we remind you of South Africa’s position of technical assistance in the absence of capacity development. Without capacity development technical assistance can never be effectively deployed. An indicator has thus been crafted for each recommendation to address capacity development.

**Recommendation 24:**

To request WIPO, within its mandate, to expand the scope of its activities aimed at bridging the digital divide, in accordance with the outcomes of the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS)[[1]](#footnote-2) also taking into account the significance of the Digital Solidarity Fund (DSF).

Proposed indicator(s):

1. No. of capacity development initiatives implemented to bridge the digital divide with respect to the implementation of WIPO Standards (Outcome 4 of WSIS)
2. No. of WIPO standards that cannot be implemented by developing countries and least developed countries due to lack of infrastructure (Outcome 4 of WSIS)?
3. No. of ICT-based customisations (specialised resource) of the IP4Youth Teaching program designed to empower the youth with innovation and creativity skills for empowerment and opportunities for economic growth (Outcome 1 and 6).

**Recommendation 25:**

To explore intellectual property -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.

Proposed indicator(s):

1. Total no. of capacity development initiatives implemented within a financial year and cumulative to date to assist countries to understand the flexibilities available in international law.
2. No. of countries which have benefited from technical assistance and capacity development initiatives tailor-made to assist the specific country’s enhanced understanding of available flexibilities to promote transfer and dissemination of technology.
3. No. of countries which have incorporated specific flexibilities into their policies following WIPO-mediated technical assistance and capacity develop to facilitate transfer and dissemination of technology.
4. No. of initiatives focussed on capacity development in understanding technology transfer agreements (often model agreements) and pitfalls negotiation tactics.

**Recommendation 26:**

To encourage Member States, especially developed countries, to urge their research and scientific institutions to enhance cooperation and exchange with research and development institutions in developing countries, especially LDCs.

Proposed indicator(s):

1. No. of PCT applications where the applicants represent one or more research and development institutions from a developed and a developing country (particularly one or more LDCs).
2. No. of trainings deployed through TISCs focussed on patent analytics to identify opportunities for collaboration with other countries in areas of research and scientific endeavours.

**Recommendation 27:**

Facilitating intellectual property -related aspects of ICT for growth and development: Provide for, in an appropriate WIPO body, discussions focused on the importance of intellectual property -related aspects of ICT, and its role in economic and cultural development, with specific attention focused on assisting Member States to identify practical intellectual property -related strategies to use ICT for economic, social and cultural development.

Proposed indicator(s):

1. No. of practical technical assistance and capacity development initiatives on devising intellectual property strategies/ roadmaps for use of intellectual property and hence deployment of new knowledge for economic and /or social and/or cultural development in developing countries.
2. No. of PCT applications filed by an applicant from a developing country using the IPC Code G06Q, G06F, H04M, H04B, and H04L.

**Recommendation 28:**

To explore supportive intellectual property -related policies and measures Member States, especially developed countries, could adopt for promoting transfer and dissemination of technology to developing countries.

Proposed indicator(s):

1. No. of information sharing sessions for developing countries to indicate to developed countries the bottom up needs to receive and disseminate technology being transferred.
2. No. of best practice guides developed by WIPO, following the information sharing section, on intellectual property-related policies to be developed and implemented by developing countries to optimally promote transfer and dissemination of technology to developing countries.

**Recommendation 29:**

To include discussions on intellectual property -related technology transfer issues within the mandate of an appropriate WIPO body.

Proposed indicator(s):

1. No. of substantive[[2]](#footnote-3) discussions on the use of intellectual property (all forms) in technology transfer under the agenda item IP and Developing in the CDIP.
2. No. of substantive discussions on the use of patents in technology transfer under the agenda item transfer of technology in the SCP.
3. No. of substantive discussions on the use of designs in technology transfer under the agenda item transfer of technology in the SCT.

**Recommendation 30:**

WIPO should cooperate with other IGOs to provide to developing countries, including LDCs, upon request, advice on how to gain access to and make use of intellectual property-related information on technology, particularly in areas of special interest to the requesting parties.

Proposed indicator(s):

1. No. of commercial companies with IP searching engines who provide preferential access/ reduced cost for developing and/or least developed countries.

**Recommendation 31:**

To undertake initiatives agreed by Member States, which contribute to transfer of technology to developing countries, such as requesting WIPO to facilitate better access to publicly available patent information.

Proposed indicator(s):

1. No. of patent pools available in the areas of (i) health; (ii) climate change mitigation technologies; and (iii) water and waste remediation technologies.
2. No. of capacity development initiatives deployed in the use of information in the public domain.

**Recommendation 32:**

To have within WIPO opportunity for exchange of national and regional experiences and information on the links between IPRs and competition policies.

Proposed indicator(s):

1. No. of biennial conferences / roundtable discussions for exchange and information of IPRs and competition policies.
2. No. of case studies/ compendiums developed articulating pitfalls and challenges experienced in negotiating around IPRs and competition policies.
3. No. of country-specific annexures detailing the interface between IPR and competition policies.

[End of Annex IIIand of document]

1. Excerpt from the outcomes are as follows:

Outcome 3 - To this end, we should mainstream a gender equality perspective and use ICTs as a tool to that end;

Outcome 4 - We recognize and acknowledge that challenges on bridging the digital divide still remain unaddressed adequately and requires sustainable investments in ICT infrastructure and services, capacity building, facilitate know-how transfer, as well as to promote the transfer of technology on mutually agreed terms.

Outcome 6 - ICTs should be fully recognized as tools empowering people, and providing economic growth towards achieving development, taking into account the growing importance of relevant content, skills and an enabling environment [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Based on the recommendations of specific projects already completed within the CDIP or case studies of IP-related technology transfer experiences [↑](#footnote-ref-3)