

Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP)

Twenty-Third Session
Geneva, May 20 to 24, 2019

SECRETARIAT'S PROPOSAL ON MODALITIES AND IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES FOR THE ADOPTED RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE INDEPENDENT REVIEW AND OPTIONS AS REGARDS THE REPORTING AND REVIEWING PROCESS

prepared by the Secretariat

1. The Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP) at its twenty-second session held from November 19 to November 23, 2019, while discussing the Member States Inputs on the Modalities and Implementation Strategies of the Adopted Recommendations of the Independent Review Recommendations, decided that:

“[...] the Secretariat, using inputs received from Member States, will propose for the Committee’s consideration the “modalities and implementation strategies” for the adopted recommendations at the next CDIP session. The Secretariat will also suggest possible options as regards “reporting and reviewing process” in respect of those recommendations.”

2. This document responds to the above-mentioned request. In its first part, the document presents the Secretariat’s proposal on the modalities and implementation strategies for the adopted recommendations.¹ The proposal takes into consideration all the inputs received from the Member States. In its second part, the document presents possible options as regards the reporting and reviewing process of the implementation of those recommendations.

¹ The Committee at its nineteenth session adopted recommendations 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 12, as reflected in para. 8.1 of the Summary by the Chair. The Secretariat’s proposal addresses all those recommendations, with the exception of recommendation 2. This recommendation was addressed by the decision contained in the Appendix to the Summary by the Chair of the nineteenth session of the CDIP.

3. Annex I to this document contains a compilation of all inputs provided by Member States on the way forward on the modalities and implementation strategies of the recommendations. An attempt has been made to identify similarities and variations among those inputs to facilitate the Committee's consideration of this document.

MODALITIES AND IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

4. The Secretariat has taken into consideration inputs received from Member States, contained in documents CDIP/21/11, CDIP/22/4 Rev. and CDIP/23/3, as well as the response of the Secretariat to the recommendations of the Independent Review contained in document CDIP/19/3, in the preparation of this proposal.

5. The proposal includes 15 implementation strategies, addressing 9 recommendations. For each of the strategies, the Secretariat proposes a modality of implementation, providing a description of the actions to be undertaken for implementation.

6. In most cases, a single strategy satisfies the implementation, totally or partially, of multiple recommendations. Accordingly, the Secretariat proposes that the recommendations be implemented on the basis of crosscutting activities, where applicable. Where a single implementation strategy addresses, totally or partially, more than one recommendation, the third column of the table below clusters the relevant recommendations. For ease of reference, the recommendations are reproduced in Annex II to this document.

7. It is recalled that, at its eighteenth session, the CDIP had acknowledged that the recommendations were addressed to different actors involved in the implementation of the DA, namely, Member States, the CDIP and the Secretariat.² In this regard, where a recommendation is totally or partially addressed to the CDIP or Member States, the modalities and strategies proposed by the Secretariat attempt only to facilitate its implementation. However, for those recommendations to be fully implemented, further actions by the relevant actors might be required and it is up to those actors, i.e., the CDIP or Member States, to identify any complementary actions and undertake them.

8. In light of the above, the following modalities and implementation strategies are proposed by the Secretariat for discussion by the Committee:

Implementation Strategies	Modalities	Recommendations of the Independent Review
<p>1. Further use of the new agenda item "IP and Development" to hold high-level discussions on the work of the Organization on new emerging issues related to IP. Member States are encouraged to submit topics of discussion, which would be included in the roster of topics to be addressed under the agenda item "IP and Development". The Committee would consider, <i>inter alia</i>, how to best respond to evolving circumstances and the emerging development challenges faced</p>	<p>-When deciding the topic to be addressed under the agenda item "IP and Development" in future CDIP sessions, Member States would take into account that the debate should be "high level" and revolve around new emerging issues related to IP.</p> <p>-The Secretariat, if requested to participate by making a presentation on the topic under discussion or through other means, would ensure that the content of its presentation aims at addressing the question of how to best respond to evolving circumstances</p>	<p>1 (CDIP) 4 (CDIP) 6 (Member States and CDIP) 12 (Member States and Secretariat)</p>

² Para. 6.3 of the Summary by the Chair of the eighteenth session of the CDIP.

Implementation Strategies	Modalities	Recommendations of the Independent Review
<p>by the IP system. With a view to ensuring a more meaningful discussion, experts from capitals could be appointed by Member States to participate in the CDIP sessions. Further, leading academics, members of civil society and other UN bodies and IGOs could also be invited to participate in these discussions. This would enrich the exchange and help raise awareness about the DA.</p>	<p>and emerging development challenges faced by the IP system, taking into account the global trends on the matter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The Secretariat would share with experts from capital, appointed to participate in the discussion by Member States, the relevant information for the preparation of the session. -The Secretariat, in consultation with the Chair of the CDIP, would identify the academics, members of industry and civil society, as well as other UN bodies and IGOs who could participate in each of the discussions under the agenda item "IP and Development", depending on the issue to be addressed. It would organize their participation and share the information about participants through WIPO's website (i.e., the web page dedicated to the roster of topics to be addressed under the agenda item "IP and Development"). 	
<p>2. The three one-day International Conferences on IP and Development, which will be held on a biennial basis according to the decision of the CDIP at its twenty-second session, could also be used as <i>forum</i> of higher-level debate on emerging issues related to IP. The Conferences provide a <i>forum</i> for a more open discussion in which not only Member States but also academia, civil society and other IGOs participate and add to the debate, which will also spread information about the DA.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The Secretariat would design the program of the Conferences in a manner that complies with the requirement that the discussion be "high level" and revolve around new emerging issues related to IP. -The Secretariat would select a list of speakers for each Conference that is diverse and balanced in relation to, <i>inter alia</i>, their professional background, region, gender, etc. -The Secretariat would also disseminate information about the Conferences through its website and the use of social media to spur interest and participation by a broader audience. -The Secretariat would organize side events in the context of the Conferences, which would reinforce the high-level debates and add to the discussion from an additional perspective. 	<p>1 (CDIP) 4 (CDIP) 12 (Member States and Secretariat)</p>

Implementation Strategies	Modalities	Recommendations of the Independent Review
	<p>-The Secretariat would enhance its current activities in organizing or participating in regional events and meetings on subject matters related to the topic of discussion of the relevant Conference. The aim would be to integrate regional perspectives in the Conference.</p>	
<p>3. A sub-agenda item under the agenda item “IP and Development” could be added to the CDIP agenda for Member States to share their experiences in addressing IP and development concerns, including the implementation of DA projects, on a voluntary basis. This sub-agenda item would be a place for the exchange of strategies, lessons learnt and best practices of Member States in IP and development matters.</p>	<p>-Before each session of the CDIP, the Secretariat would invite Member States, through Regional Coordinators, to express their interest in sharing their experience on IP and development matters. -Interested Member States would be requested to suggest the topic to be addressed. If applicable, Member States’ presentations could build upon the discussions of Member States in the context of the web-forum on technical assistance.³ -The Secretariat would include the list of interested Member States and the topics of their presentations in the agenda of the session, under the new sub-agenda item. -During each session of the CDIP, the concerned Member States would make a presentation on their experiences, followed by an exchange of views in the Committee. -The Secretariat would make available the presentations made by Member States and highlights and conclusions of the session on WIPO’s website.</p>	<p>1 (CDIP) 6 (Member States and CDIP) 7 (Member States, CDIP and Secretariat)</p>
<p>4. UN agencies, other IGOs and NGOs could be invited to CDIP sessions to share their experiences in the implementation of SDGs. This would build upon WIPO’s existing approach to encourage other entities’ participation in</p>	<p>-The Secretariat would invite Member States to propose that another UN agency or IGO be invited to the CDIP to share their experiences in the implementation of SDGs. -Should the proposal be approved by the Committee, the Secretariat</p>	<p>1 (CDIP) 4 (CDIP) 12 (Member States and Secretariat)</p>

³ The CDIP, at its eighteenth session, approved a six-point proposal which, *inter alia*, requested the Secretariat to establish a web forum for sharing ideas, practices and experiences on technical assistance (para. 7.5 of the Summary by the Chair).

Implementation Strategies	Modalities	Recommendations of the Independent Review
meetings and events organized by WIPO.	would organize the participation of the concerned entity at the subsequent session of the CDIP.	
5. WIPO could enhance its current activities in engaging with other IGOs, UN agencies and NGOs (i.e., annual consultation meeting of the Director General and accredited NGOs; engagement for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda). WIPO would continue to participate in events and meetings related to IP and development matters, exchanging views and helping to raise awareness about the DA.	<p>-The Secretariat would continue to identify and participate in events and meetings organized by other UN agencies, IGOs and NGOs to discuss topics related to IP and development.</p> <p>-The Secretariat would report back to the CDIP on these activities (e.g., in the context of the Progress Reports), subject to their relevance and where appropriate.</p>	1 (CDIP) 4 (CDIP) 12 (Member States and Secretariat)
6. The Secretariat could provide the Committee with impact evaluations of selected DA completed projects.	<p>-The Secretariat would undertake an impact evaluation of a completed DA project every year.</p> <p>-The impact evaluation would assess the long-term impact of the project on the beneficiary countries, as well as its sustainability.</p> <p>-Member States would be able to submit requests in this regard.</p> <p>-The Secretariat would undertake the evaluation internally or commission it to an external evaluator.</p>	3 (Secretariat) 7 (Member States, CDIP and Secretariat)
7. The DACD could develop a database to systematically compile the main lessons learnt and best practices in the implementation of DA projects, on the basis of the evaluation reports of completed projects. The database would be available for consultation on WIPO's website.	<p>-The DACD would compile information on the lessons learnt and best practices in the implementation of DA projects through a new database or an existing database, if appropriate.</p> <p>-The information to be included in the database would be drawn from, <i>inter alia</i>, the completion and evaluation reports of completed projects.</p> <p>-Further details about the structure and functionalities of the database would be shared with Member States in a document that would be presented to the Committee.</p>	3 (Secretariat) 7 (Member States, CDIP and Secretariat) 12 (Member States and Secretariat)

Implementation Strategies	Modalities	Recommendations of the Independent Review
<p>8. The DACD could organize activities with the aim of raising awareness about the DA and that would promote the collaboration of different actors (i.e., Geneva-based delegates, representatives of IP offices, other national authorities, members of civil society and industry) on DA and CDIP-related matters.</p>	<p>-The DACD, in coordination with the Regional Bureaus, would organize activities that enhance awareness about the DA, its implementation and outputs of projects and activities.</p> <p>-The activities would require the joint input of different actors (i.e., Geneva-based delegates, representatives of IP offices, other national authorities, members of civil society and industry) on DA and CDIP-related matters.</p> <p>-Should activities be regional in nature, the DACD would work closely with the relevant Regional Coordinators.</p>	<p>3 (Secretariat) 6 (Member States and CDIP) 12 (Member States and Secretariat)</p>
<p>9. The DACD could organize briefing or training sessions, in order to ensure a more meaningful participation and engagement on DA activities, including CDIP discussions, and to respond to Member States' needs. The sessions could cover specific DA-related substantive issues (i.e., technical assistance, technology transfer) or procedural matters in relation to the CDIP (i.e., preparation of project proposals), as deemed relevant by the Secretariat or as requested by Member States.</p>	<p>-The DACD would organize briefing sessions on key DA and CDIP-related issues when deemed necessary.</p> <p>-The session would be open to the participation of all Member States.</p> <p>-The DACD would organize the sessions in collaboration with other relevant WIPO sectors. It would also use existing tools in the Organization (i.e., WIPO Match) to identify specific needs of Member States and propose activities to address them.</p> <p>-Member States would also be able to request that the Secretariat organize briefing sessions on specific topics.</p>	<p>3 (Secretariat) 7 (Member States, CDIP and Secretariat)</p>
<p>10. As a first step in the selection of the beneficiary countries of that project, the Secretariat could undertake an assessment of the absorption capacity and the level of expertise of the countries wishing to participate in a DA project. This assessment would build upon the existing approach of the Secretariat to select beneficiary countries that comply with the selection criteria included in DA project proposals, which aims to ensure</p>	<p>-As a first step in all future DA projects, the Secretariat would undertake an assessment of the absorption capacity and the level of expertise of the Member States requesting to participate in the project as beneficiary countries.</p> <p>-The project manager would work closely with the representatives of each requesting Member State in the preparation of the assessment, which would be subsequently shared with them.</p>	<p>8 (CDIP and Secretariat)</p>

Implementation Strategies	Modalities	Recommendations of the Independent Review
<p>that the beneficiary countries have the necessary absorption capacity and are able to derive long-term benefits from the project.</p>		
<p>11. Member States could identify relevant UN agencies and other entities that could be involved in the implementation of the project. The project manager would take this information into consideration when implementing a project and establish partnerships with those entities where appropriate, with a view to enhancing the effectiveness, comprehensiveness and sustainability of the project.</p>	<p>-During CDIP discussions on project proposals, Member States would identify UN agencies and other entities which, in their view, should be involved in the implementation of the project, if any.</p> <p>-The Committee would consider this information, together with the project proposal.</p> <p>-Once the project proposal is approved, the project manager would design the implementation strategy taking this information into consideration. In this regard, the project manager would review the work undertaken and studies developed by the relevant entities.</p> <p>-Where appropriate and feasible, the project manager would establish partnerships with the concerned entities.</p> <p>-Information concerning partnerships with other entities, if applicable, would be included in the Progress Reports presented annually to the Committee.</p>	<p>7 (Member States, CDIP and Secretariat) 8 (CDIP and Secretariat) 12 (Member States and Secretariat)</p>
<p>12. With a view to strengthen WIPO's practice of recruiting experts who are well versed and knowledgeable about the socio-economic conditions of the recipient countries, the Secretariat could strive to expand the Roster of Consultants.</p>	<p>-All relevant sectors of WIPO, including the Regional Bureaus and the Economics and Statistics Division, would cooperate to add new experts who are well versed and knowledgeable about the socio-economic conditions of developing countries in its Roster of Consultants.</p> <p>-Member States could provide the DACD with proposals of experts to be included in the Roster of Consultants.</p> <p>-The Secretariat would include the proposed experts in its Roster of Consultants, after assessing the suitability of the proposal.</p>	<p>9 (Member States and Secretariat)</p>

Implementation Strategies	Modalities	Recommendations of the Independent Review
<p>13. Further to the budgetary information on personnel and non-personnel costs and implementation rate of DA projects which is currently included in the Progress Reports, the Secretariat could also include detailed budgetary and actual expenditure information. Additionally, the Progress Reports could specifically indicate how the implementation strategy of DA projects is customized to the needs of each beneficiary country.</p>	<p>-The structure of the Progress Reports would be modified to: (i) include a section in which budgetary and actual expenditure information is included in the report of each ongoing DA project; and (ii) specify how the implementation strategy is being customized to the needs of each beneficiary country.</p>	<p>8 (CDIP and Secretariat) 10 (Secretariat)</p>
<p>14. The Secretariat could commit to ensure that future DA projects are not assigned to the same project manager. Should there be a simultaneous assignment of ongoing DA projects to the same project manager, the Secretariat would inform the Committee about the rationale behind such assignment.</p>	<p>-The Secretariat would make its best efforts to avoid assigning future DA projects simultaneously to the same project manager, provided that this is feasible and efficient. -Should more than one ongoing project be assigned to the same project manager, the Secretariat would present the reasons behind the multiple assignment of projects, for the Committee's consideration.</p>	<p>10 (Secretariat)</p>
<p>15. WIPO could further its existing approaches for the dissemination of information about the DA, its implementation and other development-related activities, such as: robust DA presence on WIPO's website which is regularly updated; use of social media (i.e., video clips published on youtube summarizing CDIP sessions; use of twitter); webcasting of events; WIPO's Academy training content, which integrates development-related aspects of IP; implementation of DA projects; or publications.</p>	<p>-The Secretariat would design a new Distance-Learning Course to be offered by the WIPO Academy on the DA, highlights of its implementation, main outputs, current activities, role and function of the CDIP, and the key topics under discussion, <i>inter alia</i>. The Secretariat would develop the course which, when finalized, would be included in the catalogue of Distance-Learning Courses of the WIPO Academy. -Upon the request of Member States, the DACD would organize activities that contribute to an enhanced understanding of the DA. -On the basis of the database of lessons learnt referred to in implementation strategy 7, WIPO would develop an online tool to make information and statistics</p>	<p>12 (Member States and Secretariat)</p>

Implementation Strategies	Modalities	Recommendations of the Independent Review
	<p>about DA projects (<i>inter alia</i>, the subject matter, region, date of completion or DA recommendations addressed) easier to use for interested actors.</p> <p>-WIPO would develop a series of publications on outputs and studies undertaken in the context of the DA.</p>	

OPTIONS FOR REPORTING AND REVIEWING

9. The Secretariat has taken into consideration inputs received from Member States, contained in documents CDIP/21/11 and CDIP/22/4 Rev., in the preparation of this proposal.

10. As stated in para. 7 above, some recommendations are addressed to Member States, some to the Committee and some to the Secretariat. In this regard, it is recalled that the Committee, at its nineteenth session, decided that the Secretariat would “report annually on the progress concerning the adopted recommendations addressed to it”.⁴ The Secretariat’s proposed options for reporting and reviewing primarily address the modalities and implementation strategies where the responsibility of implementation is attributed to the Secretariat. Where the responsibility of implementation is attributed to Member States or the CDIP, the reporting and reviewing would be integrated into the process proposed below to the extent that it proves adequate. With regard to actions of Member States or the Committee for which a different reporting and reviewing methodology might be necessary, the Secretariat would require guidance from the relevant actor on how to address those specific needs.

11. The reporting and reviewing is a two-stage process in determining the adequacy of implementation: (i) the first or “reporting” stage is for the Committee to stay informed of activities; and (ii) the second or “reviewing” stage is for the Committee to assess their effectiveness.

12. Therefore, the Secretariat’s proposal below includes options for (A) reporting and (B) reviewing.

A) OPTIONS FOR REPORTING

13. The following two possible options for reporting are proposed:

Option I: Relying on existing reporting instruments

14. The reporting process would be integrated into one of the reporting instruments already in place. A new section on the “implementation of the Independent Review” could be added to the Progress Reports, which are submitted to the second session of the Committee every year.

15. Additionally, the Secretariat would continue to report on all DA-related activities, including activities for the implementation of the Independent Review, through other means, as and where applicable.

⁴ Para. 8.1 of the Summary by the Chair of the nineteenth session of the CDIP.

Option II: Producing a separate reporting instrument

16. Alternatively, the Secretariat would provide the Committee, at the second session of the year, with a document specifically devoted to reporting on the progress on the implementation of the recommendations. The report would present detailed information about the actions taken in relation to the implementation strategy.

B) OPTIONS FOR REVIEWING

17. There are also two possible options for reviewing. The two options, however, are not mutually exclusive and, thus, could be implemented in tandem:

Option I: Post-activity review

18. The Secretariat would provide the Committee, at the end of the execution of each of the activities which are part of the implementation strategy, with an external evaluation report. The evaluation report would assess the implementation of the activity, provide an overview of the lessons learnt, and describe further actions to be undertaken, if any.

Option II: Post-implementation review

19. The Secretariat would present, on a periodic basis, an external review of the implementation of the recommendations. The review would assess the impact of implementation on Member States, the Committee and the Organization; whether the goals of the recommendations have been achieved; lessons learnt in the process of implementation; and room for improvement.

20. This review would be used by the Committee to reassess the merits and shortcomings of the modalities and implementation strategies.

21. *The CDIP is invited to consider the information contained in this document.*

[Annexes follow]

COMPILATION OF MEMBER STATES INPUTS ON THE WAY FORWARD ON THE MODALITIES AND IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES OF THE ADOPTED RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE INDEPENDENT REVIEW

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

Group B (first submission)	Mexico	Peru	Group B (second submission)	South Africa (first submission)	Uganda	South Africa (second submission)
Group B proposes sharing sessions on “IP and Innovation: National Innovative Strategies and the role of IP protection in fostering innovation”, as well as on other emerging issues related to IP rights. These sessions should take place under the new agenda item on “IP and Development” and occur during the Committee’s meetings. Group B believes that this series of debate would be	Regarding Recommendation 1, it is necessary to fix the practical arrangements and subject matter of the higher-level debate. It will also be necessary to identify the best time to do so. A possible time to secure high-level participation, might be the annual WIPO General Assembly. This would encourage the participation of senior authorities and, in principle, should not require additional resources. Given the natural link between the work	Peru supports the exchange of strategies and best practices from Member States on their experiences addressing IP and development concerns. Thus, provisions should be made for sharing experiences during CDIP meetings. However, this should be part of a work plan to be implemented within a specific timeframe.	The recently established Agenda Item “Intellectual Property and Development” provides a good platform for a high level debate on emerging issues and an opportunity for Member States to exchange their strategies, best practices and experiences in addressing IP and development concerns.	The African Group proposal on a biennial “International Conference on IP and Development” [CDIP19/7 bears reference here] where a higher level debate will be held with experts from capital who are users of the IP system and understand the complexities in deploying IP for development and application. The inputs from these experts will assist to inform the Committee as to how IP is advancing and what the impacts	For a higher level debate to be successful, the CDIP will need inputs not just from national delegates at WIPO or from the Secretariat, but also from leading academics, civil society and other United Nations Agencies and expert bodies such as the UN Secretary-General’s High Level Panel on Access to Medicines, the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity and	N/A

Group B (first submission)	Mexico	Peru	Group B (second submission)	South Africa (first submission)	Uganda	South Africa (second submission)
<p>useful, if conducted with the participation of experts from capitals with direct knowledge and involvement in such issues. This implementing measure would facilitate the exchange of strategies and best practices from Member States on their experiences addressing IP and development concerns.</p>	<p>of the CDIP and development, the debate could focus on identifying measures and practices to optimize the positive impact of IP on development or, more specifically, on achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The topics for discussion could focus on three main areas: (1) strengthening and protecting the IP system; (2) capacity-building for optimal use of IP; and (3) cooperation to foster innovation through research and development. The CDIP could start by considering these topics as falling under</p>			<p>are on the ground, especially with relation to hurdles that need to be overcome which are often developing context specific.</p>	<p>FAO, among others.</p> <p>Involving other UN agencies at the highest levels, could be the avenue through which a more robust development paradigm is brought into the global IP discourse at WIPO and beyond. Through these interactions, WIPO would operate, more consistently in line with the development norms informing the work of the UN generally.</p>	

Group B (first submission)	Mexico	Peru	Group B (second submission)	South Africa (first submission)	Uganda	South Africa (second submission)
	"Intellectual Property and Development".					
Similar proposals:	<p>-Group B, Mexico and Peru agree that the "higher level debate" could take place under the new agenda item IP and Development of the CDIP.</p> <p>-Group B and Mexico have proposed topics related to "IP and innovation".</p> <p>-Group B and South Africa (first submission) refer to the participation of experts from capitals.</p>					
Variant proposals:	<p>-Mexico suggests that the debate could take place within the WIPO General Assembly. It proposes three possible topics for discussion: (1) strengthening and protecting the IP system; (2) capacity-building for optimal use of IP; and (3) cooperation to foster innovation through research and development.</p> <p>-South Africa (first submission) argues that the "higher level debate" should take place in the context of the biennial conference on "IP and Development".</p> <p>-Uganda submits that a "higher level debate" would need the participation of leading academics, civil society and other United Nations Agencies and expert bodies.</p>					

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

Group B (first submission)	Mexico	Peru	Group B (second submission)	South Africa (first submission)	Uganda	South Africa (second submission)
See Appendix to CDIP/19/SUMMARY.	N/A	Peru supports the adoption of measures to resolve the outstanding issues related to the mandate of the Committee.	Resolved; See Appendix to CDIP/19/SUMMARY.	N/A	All relevant WIPO committees - the Intergovernmental Committee on Intellectual Property and Genetic Resources, Traditional Knowledge and Folklore (IGC), the Standing Committee on the Law of Patents (SCP), the Standing Committee on the Law of Trademarks, Industrial Designs and Geographical Indications (SCT), and, the Standing Committee on Copyright and Related Rights (SCCR), should comply with the decision of the General Assembly	N/A

Group B (first submission)	Mexico	Peru	Group B (second submission)	South Africa (first submission)	Uganda	South Africa (second submission)
					(GA) on the coordination mechanism. Each committee, in a session preceding the GA, should submit a report to the General Assembly indicating activities undertaken to implement relevant development agenda recommendations.	
Similar proposals:						
Variant proposals:	<p>-Group B refers to the Appendix to the Summary by the Chair of the nineteenth session of the CDIP. -Peru supports the adoption of measures to resolve the outstanding issues related to the mandate of the Committee. -Uganda submits that WIPO relevant committees (IGC, SCP, SCT and SCCR), in a session preceding the GA, should submit a report to the GA indicating the activities undertaken to implement relevant DA Recommendations.</p>					

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

Group B (first submission)	Mexico	Peru	Group B (second submission)	South Africa (first submission)	Uganda	South Africa (second submission)
Group B suggests the continuation of the Secretariat's efforts in ensuring effective coordination, monitoring, reporting and evaluation of the implementation of the DAR. Group B recognizes the valuable work undertaken by the Development Agenda Coordination Division (DACD) in facilitating the implementation of the CDIP's decisions and coordinating the reporting to the Committee. As reported by the Secretariat in the Annex of Doc. CDIP/19/3, the implementation of	While this recommendation falls within the sphere of activity of the WIPO Secretariat, Mexico reiterates its preference for an approach that involves greater coordination in the implementation of projects to meet specific objectives; the implementation of monitoring, accountability and evaluation of results; and the multiplier effect of projects. The appointment of the Representative of the Director-General for the UN SDGs should help improve WIPO's performance in	Peru agrees that it is important for WIPO to continue to ensure the effective coordination, monitoring, reporting and evaluation of the DARs.	Agree that it is important for WIPO to continue to ensure the effective coordination, monitoring, reporting and evaluation of the DARs. The DACD should continue to build on its valuable work and, where appropriate, adopt an approach that involves greater coordination in the implementation of projects to meet specific objectives; the implementation of monitoring, accountability and evaluation of results; and the multiplier effect of projects.	See point (b) under recommendation 5: In the absence of an established link between the 45 Development Agenda Recommendations and an expected result, and further in the absence of indicators that track implementation of the Development Agenda, it is impossible to assess whether the indicators reflected in the program and budget are relevant and able to track implementation of	The Independent Review does not indicate which areas of the Development Agenda Coordination Division (DACD) should be strengthened. The DACD may submit a report on its role to the CDIP, and its interface with other substantive WIPO Programs and regional bureaus to enable member states identify how it should be strengthened. The evaluation of WIPO activities should be conducted in a	The above table ⁵ is not exhaustive nor inclusive nor does it enable an assessment of whether the DARs are actually having an impact and hence there is an advancement. South Africa thus requests as follows: (a) In the absence of an established link between the 45 Development Agenda Recommendations and an expected result (even though it

⁵ The submission by South Africa includes a table in relation to Strategic Goal III (Facilitating the Use of IP for Development), which contains the Performance Indicators and Responsible Programs for Expected Result III.1: National IP strategies and plans consistent with national development objectives (available in document CDIP/23/3).

Group B (first submission)	Mexico	Peru	Group B (second submission)	South Africa (first submission)	Uganda	South Africa (second submission)
<p>Recommendation 3 is already ongoing.</p>	<p>implementing the recommendations of the DA and enhance its positive impact on actions in support of SDGs, which should be guided by the principle of complementarity.</p>			<p>the Development Agenda Recommendations . 11 years after the implementation of the Development Agenda, no indicators have been developed. South Africa will thus be submitting a request for the development of indicators for assessing the impact of the Development Agenda Recommendations at CDIP23.</p>	<p>holistic and balanced approach. WIPO's development paradigm should not only promote an understanding and protection of IP rights in accordance with international obligations but also provide an appreciation of the challenges of access to knowledge and technology in the developing world.</p> <p>Questions that should be answered include how WIPO's technical assistance contributes to development (instead of measuring the contribution of technical assistance to the</p>	<p>will now be "reported" in in the DG's report), and further in the absence of indicators that track implementation of the Development Agenda, it is impossible to assess whether the indicators reflected in the program and budget are relevant and able to track implementation of the Development Agenda Recommendations.</p> <p>11 years after the implementation of the Development Agenda, no</p>

Group B (first submission)	Mexico	Peru	Group B (second submission)	South Africa (first submission)	Uganda	South Africa (second submission)
					<p>application of international IP standards); whether technical assistance includes training on how to use the flexibilities of the international IP system; whether technical assistance provides support to help member states understand both the positive and negative impacts of IP as a policy instrument; what alternatives exist to help member states develop innovation capacity; what kind of anti-competitive activities IP rights may incur; and, how to prevent abuse of IP rights? From these questions,</p>	<p>indicators have been developed.</p> <p>REQUEST: South Africa requests that the Secretariat develop indicators for assessing the impact of the Development Agenda Recommendations. These draft indicators can be prepared for presentation to the Committee for consideration at CDIP/24.</p>

Group B (first submission)	Mexico	Peru	Group B (second submission)	South Africa (first submission)	Uganda	South Africa (second submission)
					<p>a number of quantitative indicators can be developed to measure the effect of technical assistance, including with/without and before / after scenarios.</p>	
<p>Similar proposals:</p>	<p>-Group B, Mexico and Peru agree that it is important for WIPO to continue to ensure the effective coordination, reporting and evaluation of the DARs. -Mexico proposes an approach that involves greater coordination in the implementation of projects to meet specific objectives; the implementation of monitoring, accountability and evaluation of results; and the multiplier effect of projects. This has been included in Group B's second submission.</p>					
<p>Variants proposals:</p>	<p>-Group B suggests the continuation of the Secretariat's efforts. -South Africa states that in the absence of the link between the Expected Results and DA Recommendations it is impossible to monitor the implementation of the DA Recommendations. South Africa requests that the Secretariat develop indicators for assessing the impact of the Development Agenda Recommendations. -Uganda proposes that the DACD submit a report on its role to the CDIP, and its interface with other substantive WIPO Programs and regional bureaus to enable member states identify how its role should be strengthened. -Uganda argues that the evaluation of WIPO activities should be conducted in a holistic and balanced approach, including an appreciation of the challenges of access to knowledge and technology in the developing world. Uganda proposes questions that need to be addressed in relation to technical assistance activities and the development of quantitative indicators to measure their effect.</p>					

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

Group B (first submission)	Mexico	Peru	Group B (second submission)	South Africa (first submission)	Uganda	South Africa (second submission)
<p>Group B recommends the continuation of the work already underway in the CDIP, in which the Secretariat provides an annual report on its activities regarding SDGs. This measure will move the Committee forward on this important topic.</p>	<p>Recommendation 4 points to the implicit link that should exist between the DA and the SDGs. The CDIP should take into account the views of WIPO's Director General of the direct or indirect impact of WIPO's efforts to meet the SDGs (gender equality, health, innovation, etc.). In doing so, it would facilitate the identification of ideal stakeholders and optimal channels of cooperation with other organizations of the UN system</p>	<p>Peru agrees that the Committee should continue its efforts to provide the most appropriate response to rapidly evolving circumstances and to the emerging development challenges being faced by the IP system, in close coordination with other UN agencies.</p>	<p>The CDIP should continue its work already underway to implement the DARs and advance the SDGs and, where appropriate, involve other UN development agencies.</p>	<p>See point (b) under recommendation 5⁶ and requested implementation strategy for recommendation 1 above.</p>	<p>The consolidation of informal and formal partnerships with the family of international agencies and inter-governmental processes will help WIPO identify how the Organization and the Development Agenda can contribute to the achievement of overarching UN priorities, such as the Sustainable Development Goals. WIPO could also take a more active role within the UN</p>	<p>See above for recommendation 3.</p>

⁶ In the absence of an established link between the 45 Development Agenda Recommendations and an expected result, and further in the absence of indicators that track implementation of the Development Agenda, it is impossible to assess whether the indicators reflected in the program and budget are relevant and able to track implementation of the Development Agenda Recommendations. 11 years after the implementation of the Development Agenda, no indicators have been developed. South Africa will thus be submitting a request for the development of indicators for assessing the impact of the Development Agenda Recommendations at CDIP23.

Group B (first submission)	Mexico	Peru	Group B (second submission)	South Africa (first submission)	Uganda	South Africa (second submission)
	that generally have some activity or space dedicated to supporting development and cooperation, either directly or indirectly.				system by co-convening and participating in policy debates on the global IP system and its relevance to a broad range of issues, including innovation, access to knowledge, development, trade, energy, climate, environment, agri culture, and public health.	
<p>Similar proposals:</p>	<p>-Group B and Peru agree that the CDIP should continue its ongoing efforts in the SDGs field, in close coordination with other UN agencies.</p>					

Group B (first submission)	Mexico	Peru	Group B (second submission)	South Africa (first submission)	Uganda	South Africa (second submission)
<p>Variant proposals:</p>	<p>-South Africa states that in the absence of the link between the Expected Results and DA Recommendations it is impossible to monitor the implementation of the DA Recommendations; and proposes a Biennial International Conference on IP and Development. South Africa requests that the Secretariat develop indicators for assessing the impact of the Development Agenda Recommendations.</p> <p>-Mexico suggests that WIPO should take into account the views of WIPO's Director General of the direct or indirect impact of WIPO's efforts to meet the SDGs and facilitate identification of ideal stakeholders and channels of cooperation with other UN agencies.</p> <p>-Uganda proposes that WIPO consolidates informal and formal partnerships with the family of international agencies and inter-governmental processes and takes a more active role within the UN system by co-convening and participating in policy debates.</p>					

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

Group B (first submission)	Mexico	Peru	Group B (second submission)	South Africa (first submission)	Uganda	South Africa (second submission)
<p>Group B suggests that Member States should regularly report on a voluntary basis on their actions taken at the national level to implement DARs under the new agenda item “IP and Development”. This reporting should count on and reflect an increased participation of the capital-based experts, in order to be able to benefit from their practical experience and expertise in the field.</p>	<p>Recommendation 6 directly involves Member States and indicates the need for better coordination between permanent missions in Geneva, IP offices and authorities in capitals. The interaction of permanent missions with IP offices and ministries of foreign affairs and finance and/or trade is crucial to establishing positions. There must be an authority to coordinate the views of the various national stakeholders involved with IP in a timely and substantive manner</p>	<p>Peru supports action to improve coordination with different authorities of the Member States and to increase the participation of high-level national experts in the work of the Committee. Accordingly, IP offices could work together by increasing coordination in their respective countries. Budgeting for the presence of a permanent national representative in Geneva, to improve</p>	<p>Recommendation 6 directly involves Member States and indicates the need for better coordination between permanent missions in Geneva, IP offices and authorities in capitals. Member States should consider opportunities where they could provide reports, on a voluntary basis, on their actions taken at the national level to implement the DA. Member States are encouraged to consider the active participation of capital-based experts. This would add practical perspective and pragmatic value to</p>	<p>See requested implementation strategy under recommendation 1 above.</p>	<p>While this is addressed specifically to member states, it is important to ensure that the Secretariat continues and strengthens its collaboration with Geneva-based Member States’ representatives, particularly, in planning and delivering of technical assistance and other activities.</p>	<p>See above for recommendation 3.</p>

Group B (first submission)	Mexico	Peru	Group B (second submission)	South Africa (first submission)	Uganda	South Africa (second submission)
	to achieve a consolidated position on the issues under consideration by the CDIP. The active participation of IP experts would add value and, above all, pragmatic value to the discussions.	coordination efforts and insight into the issues dealt with by the Committee, should also be considered.	the discussions, notably on topics under the new agenda item “IP and Development”.			
Similar proposals:	-Group B, Mexico, Peru and Uganda agree that this recommendation involves action by Member States. In this regard, Group B proposes that Member States’ report on a voluntary basis actions taken at the national level to implement the DA Recommendations; and Mexico and Peru point out the need for better coordination between Geneva-based missions, IP offices and authorities in capitals, as well as the participation of national experts. This has also been included in Group B’s second submission.					
Variant proposals:	-South Africa (first submission) refers to the proposed Biennial International Conference on IP and Development. -South Africa (second submission) states that in the absence of the link between the Expected Results and DA Recommendations it is impossible to monitor the implementation of the DA Recommendations. It requests that the Secretariat develop indicators for assessing the impact of the Development Agenda Recommendations. -Uganda argues that it is important to ensure that the Secretariat continues and strengthens its collaboration with Geneva-based Member States’ representatives.					

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

Group B (first submission)	Mexico	Peru	Group B (second submission)	South Africa (first submission)	Uganda	South Africa (second submission)
Group B endorses the proposal for Member States to be encouraged, in light with their national needs, to formulate new project proposals for the consideration of the CDIP. In addition, Group B proposes to strengthen the present practice of sharing information on the lessons learned and best practices from successfully implemented DA projects. However, Group B understands that the	In Mexico's view, the implementation of projects is the best way to achieve concrete results in the use of IP for development. It would be useful to have thematic areas that combine the interest of Member States with WIPO's knowledge and experience. An approach guided by the DA and the SDGs could achieve the implementation of projects that make progress. It is important for WIPO to have a database of lessons learned	Peru supports more systematic treatment of existing information on projects that have been completed and/or mainstreamed into the Committee's work, so as to gain from lessons learned and best practices identified when implementing DA projects. This would facilitate the	The implementation of projects is the best way to achieve concrete results in the use of IP for development. It would be useful to have thematic areas that combine the interest of Member States with WIPO's knowledge and experience. The present practice of sharing information on the lessons learned and best practices from successfully implemented DA projects should be strengthened. This includes, when	In order for the projects to comprehensively respond to the DAR and advance towards the achievement of the DAR and assess the impact thereof, indicators for the DAR are critical. See point (b) under recommendation 5. ⁷	Usually, a member state approaches the Secretariat for technical assistance in a particular field. The Secretariat should advise the requesting member whether such requested assistance should best be delivered in a CDIP project or a regular WIPO program.	See above for recommendation 3

⁷ In the absence of an established link between the 45 Development Agenda Recommendations and an expected result, and further in the absence of indicators that track implementation of the Development Agenda, it is impossible to assess whether the indicators reflected in the program and budget are relevant and able to track implementation of the Development Agenda Recommendations. 11 years after the implementation of the Development Agenda, no indicators have been developed. South Africa will thus be submitting a request for the development of indicators for assessing the impact of the Development Agenda Recommendations at CDIP/23.

Group B (first submission)	Mexico	Peru	Group B (second submission)	South Africa (first submission)	Uganda	South Africa (second submission)
<p>database format also proposed in Recommendation 7 has shown in the past to carry some weaknesses and significant costs. Group B would therefore appreciate further elaboration from the secretariat on how the office addresses issues identified during the evaluations and tailor WIPO's future interventions to address these in the context of specific needs identified in country.</p>	<p>and best practices identified in project implementation, as this would help identify the achievements and challenges faced by Member States in implementing these projects. The available technological tools should be used to optimize this area.</p>	<p>development of new and better projects for the CDIP's consideration.</p>	<p>appropriate, a more systematic treatment of existing information on projects that have been completed and/or mainstreamed into the Committee's work. Noting that the database format has shown to carry some weaknesses and significant costs in the past, the Secretariat should first elaborate on how the office addresses issues identified during the evaluations and tailor WIPO's future interventions to address these in the context of specific needs identified in a country.</p>		<p>CDIP projects are formulated by member states in consultation with the WIPO Secretariat. When presenting a new project to the CDIP, the Secretariat should include a statement on the suitability of the chosen modality of delivery of a technical assistance program.</p>	

Group B (first submission)	Mexico	Peru	Group B (second submission)	South Africa (first submission)	Uganda	South Africa (second submission)
Similar proposals:	<p>-Group B, Mexico and Peru agree that more systematic treatment of existing information on projects that have been completed and the lessons learnt would be useful.</p> <p>-Mexico suggests that it would be useful to have thematic areas that combine the interests of Member States with WIPO's knowledge and experience. This has been included in Group B's second submission.</p>					
Variant proposals:	<p>-While Mexico explicitly supports the idea of a database of lessons learnt and best practices in project implementation to be developed by WIPO, Group B points out that the database format has shown to carry some weaknesses and costs in the past, and therefore suggests that the Secretariat further elaborate on how it addresses issues identified during evaluation and tailor WIPO's future interventions.</p> <p>-Uganda proposes that the Secretariat advises the Member States requesting technical assistance on whether such requested assistance should best be delivered in a CDIP project or a regular WIPO program. Further, when presenting a new project to the CDIP, the Secretariat should include a statement on the suitability of the chosen modality of delivery of a technical assistance program.</p> <p>-South Africa states that in the absence of the link between the Expected Results and DA Recommendations and the development of indicators for the DA Recommendations projects will not respond to the DA Recommendations.</p>					

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

Group B (first submission)	Mexico	Peru	Group B (second submission)	South Africa (first submission)	Uganda	South Africa (second submission)
<p>Group B proposes to strengthen the already-established approach to coordinate and set up partnerships with other relevant UN agencies and other entities to enhance the effectiveness, comprehensiveness and sustainability of DA projects. In addition, the Member States proposing the project shall make sure that their proposal also indicates any UN agencies and other entities that in their perspective is relevant for the</p>	<p>With regard to Recommendation 8, we agree that the implementation of projects should seek to ensure their effectiveness, comprehensiveness and sustainability. We also consider it very important that beneficiaries should be able to replicate project results not only at national level but also through triangular cooperation activities.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Existing approaches to coordinate and set up partnerships with other relevant UN agencies and other entities should be strengthened to enhance the effectiveness, comprehensiveness and sustainability of DA projects. In addition, it is also very important that beneficiaries should be able to replicate project results not only at national level, but also through triangular cooperation activities.</p>	<p>See point (b) under recommendation 5.⁸</p> <p>The development of impact indicators will enable the tracking of country-specific projects, driven by on-the-ground needs.</p>	<p>The provision of technical assistance and capacity building should be linked to diagnostic studies that assess the needs in light of national development and poverty alleviation goals and that draw on consultative processes at the national level. The process would also involve participation of other UN agencies</p>	<p>See above for recommendation 3.</p>

⁸ In the absence of an established link between the 45 Development Agenda Recommendations and an expected result, and further in the absence of indicators that track implementation of the Development Agenda, it is impossible to assess whether the indicators reflected in the program and budget are relevant and able to track implementation of the Development Agenda Recommendations. 11 years after the implementation of the Development Agenda, no indicators have been developed. South Africa will thus be submitting a request for the development of indicators for assessing the impact of the Development Agenda Recommendations at CDIP/23.

Group B (first submission)	Mexico	Peru	Group B (second submission)	South Africa (first submission)	Uganda	South Africa (second submission)
project's implementation.					<p>working on other aspects of the country's development needs as well as stakeholders at the national level.</p> <p>Technical assistance projects should, where necessary, include a component on capacity building to enhance the absorption capacity of recipient countries.</p>	
<p>Similar proposals:</p>	<p>-Mexico argues that it is important that beneficiaries should be able to replicate project results not only at national level but also through triangular cooperation activities. This has been included in Group B's second submission.</p>					

Group B (first submission)	Mexico	Peru	Group B (second submission)	South Africa (first submission)	Uganda	South Africa (second submission)
<p>Variant proposals:</p>	<p>-Group B proposes strengthening the already-existent approach and suggests that MS proposing the project make sure that the project proposals refer to the relevant UN agencies and other entities.</p> <p>-Uganda argues that the provision of technical assistance and capacity building should be linked to needs assessment studies and involve the participation of other UN agencies. Technical assistance projects should also include a component on capacity building to enhance the absorption capacity of recipient countries.</p> <p>-South Africa states that the link between the Expected Results and DA Recommendations and the development of indicators for the DA Recommendations will help in tracking country-specific projects.</p>					

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

Group B (first submission)	Mexico	Peru	Group B (second submission)	South Africa (first submission)	Uganda	South Africa (second submission)
<p>Group B proposes to strengthen WIPO's approach of recruiting experts well versed and knowledgeable about the socio-economic conditions of the recipient countries. Therefore, project managers should, where appropriate and feasible, team up with local and international experts in future projects. As reported by the Secretariat in the Annex of Doc. CDIP/19/3, the implementation of Recommendation 9 in such manner is feasible. Group B reiterates its support for merit-based recruitment by WIPO.</p>	<p>This recommendation is relevant as it is linked to the success or failure of projects. Methodological rigor, the meeting of goals and deadlines and the professionalism of experts must be mandatory conditions in project design and implementation. Evaluation and accountability mechanisms are indispensable. As far as possible, the training given by experts should be replicated through those who benefited from it. The updating of the expert database and training with a</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>WIPO's practice of recruiting experts well versed and knowledgeable about the socioeconomic conditions of the recipient countries should be strengthened. Therefore, where appropriate and feasible, project managers should team up with local and international experts. As far as possible, the training given by experts should be replicated through those who benefited from it. The updating of the expert database and training with a multiplier effect should be taken into account by the</p>	<p>A local expert/project owner should always be deployed in any project.</p>	<p>WIPO Secretariat should strengthen its practice of recruiting experts who are well versed and knowledgeable about the socio-economic conditions of recipient countries. Experts should demonstrate capacity to replicate knowledge through beneficiaries.</p> <p>Where applicable, and depending on the reach of a particular activity / project, relevant national</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Group B (first submission)	Mexico	Peru	Group B (second submission)	South Africa (first submission)	Uganda	South Africa (second submission)
	multiplier effect should be taken into account by the Secretariat in carrying out its work.		Secretariat in carrying out its work.		departments besides the IP office may be consulted in the design and implementation of projects.	
Similar proposals:	<p>-Group B and Uganda agree that WIPO Secretariat should strengthen its practice of recruiting experts who are well versed and knowledgeable about the socio-economic conditions of recipient countries.</p> <p>-Group B, Uganda and South Africa agree that local experts should be involved in projects.</p> <p>-Mexico proposes that: (i) as far as possible, the training given by experts should be replicated through those who benefited from it; and (ii) the updating of the expert database and training with a multiplier effect should be taken into account by the Secretariat in carrying out its work. This has been included in Group B's second submission. Uganda also agrees that experts should demonstrate capacity to replicate knowledge through beneficiaries.</p>					
Variant proposals:	<p>-Mexico proposes that methodological rigor, meeting of goals and deadlines and professionalism of experts must be mandatory in project design and implementation.</p> <p>-Uganda suggests that, where applicable, experts outside the IP office may be consulted in the design and implementation of projects.</p>					

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

Group B (first submission)	Mexico	Peru	Group B (second submission)	South Africa (first submission)	Uganda	South Africa (second submission)
<p>Group B proposes that the Secretariat includes additional financial information in the subsequent Progress Reports submitted to the CDIP. Group B entrusts the Secretariat's assessment on which available financial information could be provided in order to enhance the transparency of the resources related to the DA projects. Regarding the second part of the recommendation, Group B wishes to underscore that the assessment of the adequate workload for a</p>	<p>With this recommendation, the Secretariat has an opportunity to promote transparency and accountability. The assignment of projects should be guided by elements related to efficiency and the achievement of established goals. Executive reports that are well-presented and easy to understand would be useful to better appreciate and evaluate WIPO's work.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Regarding the first part, the Secretariat should be entrusted to assess which available financial information could be provided in order to enhance the transparency of the resources related to the DA projects. Regarding the second part, the assignment of projects should be guided by elements related to efficiency and the achievement of established goals. The assessment of the adequate workload for a project manager needs to be made on a case-by-case basis by competent staff within the WIPO Secretariat. An effort should be</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>The progress reports should demonstrate efficient utilization of budgetary and human resources involved in project implementation.</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Group B (first submission)	Mexico	Peru	Group B (second submission)	South Africa (first submission)	Uganda	South Africa (second submission)
<p>project manager needs to be made on a case-by-case basis by competent staff within the WIPO Secretariat. An effort should be made to avoid assigning multiple cases to the same project manager (as suggested by the reviewers) whenever possible and practical.</p>			<p>made to avoid assigning multiple cases to the same project manager (as suggested by the reviewers) whenever possible and practical.</p>			
<p>Similar proposals:</p>	<p>-Group B proposes that the Secretariat includes additional financial information in the Progress Reports. Uganda also argues that Progress Reports should demonstrate efficient utilization of budgetary and human resources involved in project implementation. -Mexico submits that the assignment of projects should be guided by elements related to efficiency and the achievement of established goals. This has been included in Group B's second submission.</p>					
<p>Variant proposals:</p>	<p>-Group B states that the assessment of the adequate workload for a project manager needs to be made on a case-by-case basis and that assignment of multiple projects to the same manager should be avoided where possible. -Mexico suggests executive reports that are well-presented and easy to understand.</p>					

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

Group B (first submission)	Mexico	Peru	Group B (second submission)	South Africa (first submission)	Uganda	South Africa (second submission)
<p>Group B proposes to further the approaches already deployed by the Secretariat for the dissemination of information about the DA, such as the use of social media and the WIPO's webpage, the transmission of DA related events by webcasting, the maintenance of development-related aspects of IP in the WIPO Academy's training, and the support of publications related to the DA.</p>	<p>WIPO should increase its activities in the field, thus implementing a pragmatic approach that highlights the benefits of the cooperation options and tools referred to in the DA and the positive effects of IP as a catalyst for development. WIPO could have a catalogue of core projects designed to address the needs of Member States at different levels of development to enable them to establish or strengthen their IP systems. This catalogue would merely record the identification and use of WIPO's existing expertise at the service of Member States to strengthen</p>	<p>Peru supports any measure that contributes to improving awareness of the DA. The development of an action plan to measure the efficiency and impact of the means and mechanisms used could therefore be considered.</p>	<p>The approaches already deployed by the Secretariat for the dissemination of information about the DA should be advanced, for example, the use of social media and the WIPO's webpage, the transmission of DA related events by webcasting, the maintenance of development-related aspects of IP in the WIPO Academy's training and the support of publications related to the DA. The WIPO Secretariat should be entrusted to improve the tools – such as catalogues and platforms – that are already available to foster collaboration and stakeholder participation.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Strengthen existing methods deployed by the WIPO Secretariat to disseminate information about the DA.</p> <p>Another way of dissemination of information about the DA within the UN would be through WIPO's report on implementation of the DARs to Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC).</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Group B (first submission)	Mexico	Peru	Group B (second submission)	South Africa (first submission)	Uganda	South Africa (second submission)
	<p>the strategic use of intellectual property in research, business development and creative initiatives, for example. With the impact of technological developments, it would be desirable to create new platforms for the promotion and dissemination of WIPO's activities to foster collaboration and stakeholder participation (government, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, the private and public sectors and academic institutions). There could also be stronger promotion of activities among patent centers, universities, public and private research centers, micro-, small</p>					

Group B (first submission)	Mexico	Peru	Group B (second submission)	South Africa (first submission)	Uganda	South Africa (second submission)
	and medium enterprises, young people and children, to achieve concrete results regarding the implementation of the DA.					
Similar proposals:	<p>-Group B and Uganda agree to further the approaches already deployed by the Secretariat for the dissemination of information about the DA. Peru supports any measure that improves awareness about the DA. Mexico proposes that WIPO increases its activities in the field.</p> <p>-Mexico proposes the development of a catalogue of projects and the creation of new platforms for the promotion and dissemination of activities. This has been included in Group B's second submission.</p>					
Variant proposals:	<p>-Group B mentions the following already existing ways of dissemination of information about the DA: use of social media and WIPO's webpage, webcasting, WIPO Academy, publications.</p> <p>-Uganda mentions another way of dissemination of information about the DA within the UN: WIPO's report on implementation of the DARs to Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC).</p> <p>-Mexico also proposes stronger promotion of activities among patent centers, institutions of higher learning, research centers, SMEs and the general public.</p> <p>-Peru suggests consideration for the development of an action plan to measure the efficiency and impact of the means and mechanisms used to create awareness about the DA.</p>					

[Annex II follows]

ADOPTED RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE INDEPENDENT REVIEW

1. The good progress made in the CDIP needs to be consolidated by introducing a higher level debate to address emerging needs and to discuss the work of the Organization on new emerging issues related to IPRs. The Committee should also facilitate an exchange of strategies and best practices from Member States on their experiences addressing IP and development concerns.
2. Member States should take measures to resolve the outstanding issues related to the mandate of the Committee and the implementation of the Coordination Mechanism.
3. WIPO should continue to ensure an effective coordination, monitoring, reporting, evaluation and mainstreaming of the implementation of the DARs. The role of the DACD in coordinating the DA implementation should be strengthened.
4. The CDIP, in implementing the DARs, should consider how best to respond to evolving circumstances and to the emerging development challenges being faced by the IP system. This should be combined with an active involvement with other UN development agencies to benefit from their expertise for the DARs implementation and in advancing the implementation of the SDGs.
6. Member States are encouraged to enhance coordination between Geneva-based Missions and their IP offices and other authorities in capital in order to have a coordinated approach in dealing with the CDIP and raising awareness about the benefits of the DA. Higher level participation of national based experts should be enhanced in the work of the Committee. CDIP should consider modalities related to the reporting on what has been done at the national level towards the implementation of the DARs.
7. Member States are encouraged, in light with their national needs, to formulate new project proposals for the consideration of the CDIP. They should consider the establishment of a reporting mechanism on the lessons learned and best practices from successfully implemented DA projects and activities. This reporting mechanism should include a periodical review of the sustainability of completed and/or mainstreamed projects, as well as the impact of these projects on the beneficiaries. WIPO should establish a database of the lessons learned and best practices identified in the course of DA projects implementation.
8. Future work related to the development of new projects should be modular and customizable and should consider the absorption capacity and the level of expertise of the beneficiaries. In the implementation of projects at the national level, WIPO should explore close partnerships with UN agencies and other entities to enhance the effectiveness, comprehensiveness and sustainability.
9. WIPO should pay more attention to recruiting experts that are very well versed and knowledgeable about the socio-economic conditions of the recipient countries. Beneficiary countries should ensure a high degree of internal coordination amongst its various organs in order to facilitate the implementation and long-term sustainability of a project.
10. The Secretariat's Progress Reports submitted to the CDIP should include detailed information about the utilization of financial and human resources related to the DA projects. Simultaneous assignment of the same project manager to multiple projects should be avoided
12. Member States and the Secretariat should consider ways and means to better disseminate information about the DA and its implementation.

[End of Annex and of document]