WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP)

Twentieth Session
Geneva, November 27 to December 1, 2017

REPORT ON THE ROUNDTABLE ON TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND CAPACITY BUILDING: SHARING EXPERIENCES, TOOLS AND METHODOLOGIES

prepared by the Secretariat

1.   The Roundtable on Technical Assistance and Capacity Building: Sharing Experiences, Tools and Methodologies was held on May 12, 2017, at the WIPO Headquarters in Geneva.

2.   It is recalled that, in the context on the External Review of the WIPO Technical Assistance in the Area of Cooperation for Development, the eighteenth session of the CDIP decided to implement a six-point proposal contained in the Appendix I of the Summary by the Chair of the seventeenth session. The Roundtable was convened in pursuance to paragraph 1 of the said proposal. The underlying objective of the decision was to enhance the delivery of WIPO Technical Assistance.

3.   The Annex to this document contains the report on the Roundtable comprising the summaries of the presentations made by WIPO contributors and highlights of discussions under each of the themes.

4.   The CDIP is invited to take note of the information contained in the Annex to the present document.

[Annex follows]

INTRODUCTION

1.   The Roundtable on Technical Assistance and Capacity Building: Sharing Experiences, Tools and Methodologies (hereafter, the Roundtable) was organized preceding the work of the nineteenth session of the Committee on Intellectual Property and Development (CDIP) and held on May 12, 2017, at the WIPO Headquarters.[1]

2.   The main objective of the Roundtable was to provide Member States a platform to share their experiences, tools and methodologies regarding Technical Assistance (TA). Member States had also expressed strong interest in listening to WIPO's perspective on the delivery of TA.

3.   The Roundtable was structured around the following four themes:

   i.   Needs Assessment;
   ii.   Planning and Design;
   iii. Implementation; and
   iv.   Monitoring and Evaluation.

4.   Each theme was addressed by WIPO Officials from different sectors / divisions involved with providing TA and was guided by a facilitator who ensured a free exchange of views during the debate. Interested Member States addressed the themes by sharing experiences from their perspective and by engaging in an interactive conversation.

5.   The Roundtable was open to Member States only. A link for webcasting was made available for the benefit of interested government institutions (Ministries, IP Offices, Permanent Missions) for them to interact during the discussions.

6.   The working languages of the Roundtable were English, French, Spanish, Russian, Chinese and Arabic with simultaneous interpretation provided throughout the meeting.

7.   The Roundtable registered some 60 participants from governmental institutions and over 30 Geneva-based missions. The Member State participants included the 26 WIPO financed delegates to the nineteenth session of the CDIP held from May 15 to 19, 2017.

8.   At the end of the Roundtable, participants were given a questionnaire to provide their feedback, of which 33 participants responded to the questionnaire. An average of 76 per cent of respondents were overall satisfied with the Roundtable and 64 per cent found it useful.

9.   The Program and the presentations delivered during the Roundtable have been made available through the Development Agenda (DA) webpage, at: http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/details.jsp?meeting_id=43186

10.   The videos-on-demand containing full presentations and deliberations have been made available at: http://www.wipo.int/webcasting/en/index.jsp.

---

[1] According to the decision adopted by the Committee (paragraph 1 of Appendix I of Summary by the Chair of the nineteenth session), it was initially foreseen to organize a one-day seminar. In consultations with Member States, it was decided that a roundtable would be a more suitable format for participants to engage in discussions.

DELIBERATIONS

OPENING

11.   The Roundtable was opened by Mr. Mario Matus, Deputy Director General, Development Sector of WIPO. In his opening remarks, he mentioned that WIPO provided TA in countries with different level of development. These activities were rendered in the form of: (i) organizing capacity building activities; (ii) supporting IP offices in their operations; (iii) providing legislative and policy advice; and (iv) elaborating National IP strategies. He also recalled the three WIPO TA-related documents: (a) the Manual of Delivery of WIPO TA; (b) WIPO Development Tools and Services; and (c) the WIPO DA. He further referred to the WIPO TA guiding principles mentioned in DA Cluster A, which underlined that WIPO TA activities shall be demand-driven, development-oriented and transparent. In this regard, he highlighted that the Organization devoted around 21 per cent of its budget to development oriented activities. He concluded by emphasizing that the Roundtable was a useful opportunity for Member States to share their experiences and practices in the field of TA and encouraged their active participation.

Theme 1 – Sharing Experiences, Tools and Methodologies in the Field of Needs Assessment of TA Activities

12.   Mr. Irfan Baloch, Director, Development Agenda Coordination Division, introduced the WIPO contributors under the Theme 1 on Sharing Experience, Tools and Methodologies in the field of Needs Assessment of TA Activities. He highlighted that needs assessment was one of the most important phases in the TA delivery process, as it served to identify the gap between the actual condition of a country and the desired condition it aimed to reach. In addition, he emphasized the fact that the Roundtable was organized at the Member State's request and therefore Member States participation was strongly encouraged.

13.   Mr. Walid Abdelnasser, Director, Regional Bureau for Arab Countries, identified five main sources for the needs assessment undertaken in the Arab Countries, namely:
(i) regular bilateral consultations with relevant national IP authorities; (ii) national work plans communicated to the Regional Bureau by the country requesting TA; (iii) databases available within the beneficiary countries themselves and within WIPO; (iv) baseline survey questionnaires; and (v) regular regional coordination meetings with the authorities dealing with IP policies. He also highlighted the development-oriented nature of TA and that it responded to the beneficiary's specific needs. He also identified the main challenges and constrains in the needs assessment phase such as: (i) lack of technical knowledge among some IP stakeholders; (ii) difficulties in coordinating the work due to the high level of turnover of senior management staff; (iii) potential security and political challenges; and (iv) lack of coordination between the multiple authorities dealing with IP issues. To overcome these challenges and to ensure the sustainability and cooperation for TA activities, there was a need for (a) profound understanding of the social, cultural, economic, legal and political background of each country, sub-region, and region; (b) awareness-raising activities among stakeholders on the relevance of IP for their economic, technological and social development objectives; (c) institutional memory and policy continuity in national IP authorities; and (d) fruitful collaboration with the Permanent Missions in Geneva. In concluding, he mentioned that the need assessment process continued to be driven by the principles of neutrality and impartiality and based on an integrated approach to ensure its coherence in various IP sectors.

14.   Mr. William Meredith, Director, IP Office Business Solutions Division, informed that WIPO provided support to the IP offices to implement and improve their structure, legislation and processes. He further specified that the Organization worked with more than 80 countries around the world which, despite their similarities, had different volumes of work and specific challenges. He underlined that to overcome those challenges three key elements had been taken into consideration: (i) projects were collaborative following a partnership model formalized through cooperation agreements; (ii) projects were resource-intensive, complex and risky as they influence the entire business of an IP office; (iii) the relationship was based on a long-term support model which included providing TA after a project is completed. As regards the methodology to assess the feasibility of a TA activity, he highlighted the following aspects: (a) demand and needs, usually very similar for all IP offices including the need to have a registry, to have automation and to provide services to their stakeholders; (b) fundamental prerequisites lacking in several cases, such as the existence of an IP law or the need to update it; (c) resources, which represented a real challenge especially in small developing countries, and the constraints to get those resources to execute the activity; and (d) strategies and approach, which involve an assessment of the current state of the national IP registration system to identify the line of action and the steps to follow. Finally, he pointed out how the assessment phase impacted the next phases of the TA delivery to the IP Office.

15.   Ms. Michele Woods, Director, Copyright Law Division, explained that in this phase, the Copyright and Creative Industries Sector worked in close collaboration with Regional Bureaus to include the copyright field in the process of designing national IP strategies. This was essential to avoid any duplication of efforts and to ensure that the needs assessment and ultimately the TA provided would be effective and sustainable. She mentioned that since WIPO TA was demand-driven, there was a close interaction between the Organization and both national Copyright offices and the Geneva-based representatives. She stressed out the importance of Member States to own the strategies and take the lead on their implementation. While addressing the specific area of legislative assistance, she highlighted that the process was generally confidential, at the request of Member States and tied to a strategic plan based on their informed choices. She further identified the following common elements of the entire TA delivery process : (i) reception of a request from a national authority; (ii) assessment to agree on goals; (iii) agreement on parameters and timeline; (iv) holding of interim consultations to ensure the consistency of the work with the initial needs assessment and no variation of strategy due to institutional changes; (v) provision of the draft advice which might include undertaking a new needs assessment; and (vi) continuous communication to ensure an understanding on the goals, expected results and timeline.

16.   Member State representatives highlighted their experiences in the TA needs assessment phase, particularly those undertaken in cooperation with WIPO. They also pointed out the importance of communication and coordination both internally and amongst different IP related institutions and stakeholders. Their main proposals were the following: (i) the creation of an Intranet portal containing contact details of WIPO officials and Geneva-based missions; (ii) the establishment of a facilitated mechanism to update the yearly plans and timetables; (iii) the improvement of WIPO databases' accessibility and availability in all United Nations (UN) languages; (iv) the establishment of world ranking on countries' performance as evidence of their success in TA utilization. Furthermore, they raise a number of questions to WIPO contributors on: (i) the existing assessment criteria to approve TA projects; (ii) the sustainability of TA activities taking into consideration the risk of institutional discontinuity; (ii) how WIPO enhanced its capacity to ensure that the TA programs were country-specific; (iii) whether WIPO worked closely with other UN agencies while undertaking needs assessment for a particular country project; (iv) how the successful case studies could be shared when implementing other TA activities.

17.   WIPO contributors replied to the observations by Member State representatives. They underlined the challenges as to the coordination with multitude of national IP authorities / stakeholders. In this respect, they pointed out that working with IP national committees or IP focal points from the Geneva-based missions mitigate those issues. They further highlighted WIPO's work with other international organizations worldwide and the huge potential to combine resources among them to deliver a comprehensive TA. Finally, they stated that country needs were taken into account in bilateral consultations between WIPO and the recipient country during the needs assessment phase.

Theme 2 – Sharing Experiences, Tools and Methodologies in the Field of Planning and Design of TA Activities

18.   Ms. Alexandra Grazioli, Director of the Lisbon Registry, introduced WIPO contributors under the Theme 2 on Planning and Design of TA Activities.

19.   Mr. David Muls, Senior Director, Law and Legislative Advice Division, Brands and Design Sector, pointed out that for a legislative advice to be successful it must be delivered in a nimble and interactive way and, it must be responsive to the real local needs. Moreover, he mentioned that once a request was received, an initial dialogue was initiated to understand the context in which legislative advice was to be provided. It was important to identify priorities together with the beneficiary country in order to meet their exact requirements. He reiterated that legislative advice was confidential, neutral and consistent with the international legal framework. The main output was a document structured in three parts: (i) fundamental policy choices and strategic decisions; (ii) compliance with minimum standards; and (iii) detailed comments and language coherence. In concluding, he mentioned a number of risks and challenges when delivering legislative advice, namely: (i) insufficiently close interaction and dialogue with the requesting country at an early stage of the process; (ii) lack of coordination between the relevant divisions, the Missions, the IP Offices and all other relevant actors due to frequent rotation of staff; (iii) language difficulties, as translations did not always reflect the original language of legislative texts; (iv) promptness for responding to requests; and (v) lack of feedback from beneficiary countries.

20.   Mr. Andrew Ong, Director, Regional Bureau for Asia and the Pacific, underlined that TA was mainly delivered using a project-based approach and reiterated its demand-driven nature. He further mentioned that demand-driven was different from request-driven. He explained that a request was always followed by communication with the beneficiary country and its stakeholders to define priorities and available resources. Furthermore, cumulative outcomes were a bigger priority rather than outputs. Therefore, the approach used was to provide training to less people but with a wider spectrum of skills. The Bureau used the Results Based Management (RBM) framework with performance indicators anchored in the country's priorities. Mutual accountability and involvement of stakeholders from the beginning was needed to make countries own and champion the initiatives. The most important challenge was to avoid duplications and work together with clear goals shared with countries and stakeholders. Providing TA was not just a matter of providing seminars, knowledge and skills, but also of facilitating the linkage between different institutions and stakeholders, so as to ensure an integral and clear government approach in terms of what IP could do in benefit of the country.

21.   Mr. Anatole Krattiger, Director, Global Challenges Division, shared the experience of WIPO in planning and designing the creation of two multi-stakeholder platforms under the area of IP and Global Challenges. WIPO Re:Search, aimed at leveraging IP assets from

companies and educational institutions in order to boost research into the fight against neglected tropical diseases, malaria and tuberculosis. At present, it has 125 members, mainly research-based institutions, and has established 113 collaborations. Those collaborations were focused on licensing and sharing know-how, providing unpublished scientific data, receiving fellows from developing country institutions, producing dissemination material and trainings for IP managers. He underlined some key elements for the success of the platform: (a) a responsive approach to catalyze collaborations vis-à-vis partners' current research activities and types of IP for their improvement; (b) the mandatory requirement for partners to commit to established guiding principles, including minimum licensing terms. WIPO Green was a multi-sector and multi-stakeholder consortium. It had 80 partner organizations from some 50 countries coming from the entire climate change or green technology value chain. It served as an interactive marketplace to connect those who owned green technologies, ideas and services to offer and those who were looking for creative and innovative solutions. He further pointed out that partners have to agree on a charter containing key principles including the following: (i) transparency in the marketplace; (ii) partnerships to achieve synergies and foster technology transfer; (iii) comprehensive understanding of needs for effective deployment of green technology; (iv) IP rights as a policy tool to encourage innovation, and (iv) the freely enter into a contract produced the sustained deployment and uptake of technologies. Finally, he highlighted the World Health Organization (WHO), WIPO and the World Trade Organization (WTO) Trilateral Cooperation on Public Health, IP and Trade and the study published as a result of it.

22.   Member State representatives shared their own experiences in planning and designing training programs. Others required about the WIPO tools and methodologies to introduce a development dimension in its TA activities. Moreover, there was a request for further information on: (i) the dissemination of the content of the WIPO Database on Flexibilities; (ii) the dissemination of WIPO Re:Search and WIPO Green in Latin American countries; (iii) the possibility to benefit from WIPO legislative assistance in developing countries to prevent counterfeiting of industrial designs.

23.   WIPO contributors addressed the comments and stated that the use of flexibilities and other similar tools were important in TA activities. A key factor was also the mutual accountability during a changing process within a country. With regards to dissemination of information to relevant institutions and individuals, they sought Member States support. In addition, they highlighted two important pillars against counterfeiting: an efficient domestic protection system and, a monitoring mechanism for infringement cases in foreign markets.

Theme 3 – Sharing Experiences, Tools and Methodologies in the Field of Implementation of TA Activities

24.   Mr. Sherif Saadallah, Executive Director, WIPO Academy, introduced WIPO contributors under the Theme 3 on the Implementation of TA Activities.

25.   Mr. Wend Wendland, Director, Traditional Knowledge Division, addressed the implementation of TA activities in the areas of genetic resources (GRs), traditional knowledge (TK) and traditional cultural expressions (TCEs). These activities have two fundamental aims: a more effective and strategic use of existing IP systems in the three above areas; and, the provision of neutral information on ongoing negotiations on new "sui generis" options. They mainly consist in: (a) facilitating the development of national policies / strategies / laws; (b) providing accurate and up-to-date information, explaining existing policy and legislative choices; (c) providing training on selected topics, generally through practical guides and multi-stakeholder interactive workshops. He listed some principles which the Division adhered to for the implementation of those activities: (i) to be

member-state driven; (ii) to be needs-responsive; (iii) to consider the absorptive capacity of beneficiaries; (iv) to be transparent; (v) to ensure the impact and sustainability of the assistance provided; (vi) to integrate TK, TCEs or GRs into national innovation and / or IP policies; (vii) not to prescribe any model law as no international legal instrument exists as a point of reference; (viii) to include indigenous peoples and local communities with the government's involvement of governmental relevant sectors; (ix) to follow three "P concepts": to encourage "partnerships" both internally and externally; to place "people" at the core of the activities; and to be "practical" in nature rather than hypothetical.

26.   Ms. Beatriz Amorim-Borher, Director, Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean, referred to the principles mentioned in Cluster A of the DA, namely, that TA was demand-driven, development oriented and transparent. The implementation of projects was a joint work between Member States and WIPO, which helped in structuring the activities, offered know-how and specialization. New available technological tools and applications were very useful in facilitating the communication and frequent interaction with stakeholders. Sustainable cooperation was another important aspect. She concluded by mentioning that there was no "one-size-fits-all" model and the TA implementation varied depending on the direction in which a country wished to go.

27.   Mr. Kiflé Shenkoru, Director, Division for Least-Developed Countries (LDCs), listed the methodologies used in the transfer of appropriate technology and explained its implementation process: (i) submission of an application by the beneficiary countries; (ii) review of the application and identification of partner national institutions; (iii) signature of a partnership agreement between the beneficiary country and WIPO establishing their role and responsibilities; (iv) establishment of a National Expert Group (NEG); (v) selection of a Chair of NEG; (vi) appointment of a national and international experts to assist the NEG; (vii) assessment of need areas; (viii) preparation of the technology search request in the identified need area; (ix) technology search report handled and distributed to technology donor Member States; (x) preparation of Terms of Reference for the Technology Landscape Report; (xi) preparation of the Technology Landscape Report, and its approval; (xii) preparation of a Business Plan for the implementation of appropriate technology. He explained that once these steps were implemented, an evaluation process was initiated to make sure the implementation was done properly from both sides: the beneficiary and the donor. An impact analyses was conducted periodically by WIPO. The final major impact analysis was undertaken at the end of the application.

28.   A number of Member State representatives highlighted the fruitful cooperation between WIPO and national IP Offices. Member States who were beneficiaries of WIPO projects shared their experience and highlighted the importance of the direct involvement of their national institutions. Moreover, they enquired about the tools used by the Traditional Knowledge Division to: (i) assess the needs of TA recipients; (ii) identify their absorptive capacity; (iii) work with indigenous communities, in coordination with governments. Other queries were related to the tools used to measure the sustainability of the WIPO TA activities; the use of the Database of Flexibilities in the context of technology transfer activities for LDCs; and how planning and design worked at a multilateral level in demand-driven regional projects. Some Member State representatives also shared their lessons learned in the implementation of TA activities. Others mentioned the importance of raising awareness and building capacities in developing and LDCs. A suggestion was made on focusing on fostering youth capacitates in the innovation chain.

29.   WIPO contributors addressed the comments made by Member State representatives. They mentioned that the evolution of demands from isolated requests for basic IP knowledge to advanced training on broader cross-cutting issues were an indication of sustainability. They also listed a number of tools in the implementation of TA activities by the Traditional

Knowledge Division, such as: (i) continuing dialogue; (ii) a high level buy-in from the Government; (iii) clarity as to expectations; (iv) clarity as to the respective contributions of WIPO and the Government; (v) a realistic implementation plan; and (vi) a passionate focal point. They also highlighted a series of actions as part of the WIPO's outreach campaign for indigenous communities. Finally, they underlined a number of WIPO Academy tools addressed to children and youth.

Theme 4 – Sharing Experiences, Tools and Methodologies in the Field of Monitoring and Evaluating Technical Assistance Activities

30.   Ms. Maya Catherina Bachner, Director of the Program Performance and Budget Division, explained that monitoring was a continuing function for tracking the progress in the implementation of activities towards achieving the results or set objectives. It allowed addressing issues or problems identified during the implementation process. On the other hand, evaluation captured information at certain points of the implementation life-cycle measuring performance and impact. WIPO used two different evaluation tools: self-evaluations and independent evaluations. Both monitoring and evaluation were used to inform decision-makers on how to enhance effectiveness of activities and projects and draw lessons which could be applied in the implementation of future projects. She further shared how WIPO was measuring the effectiveness of capacity building activities. Often pre-tests and post-tests were done to assess whether learning has been enhanced during the capacity building activities. These activities were measured following three main indicators: reaction, learning, and behavior. It was important to triangulate the results of the data collection by requesting not only participants but also their supervisors for feedback on the actual use of the enhanced skills. For awareness-raising and promotion activities, WIPO only measured reaction since it was difficult to measure actual awareness enhancement. She encouraged Member States to share any practices in this regard.

31.   Mr. Ken-Ichiro Natsume, Director, Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) International Cooperation Division, introduced and elaborated on the tools for monitoring and evaluation of PCT activities. First, the office surveys for all the PCT Member States, seeking feedback on trainings, legal assistance, technical (IT) cooperation, PCT applications processing. The survey was carried out on a biennial basis and sent to IP Offices to be responded online. The results were reported to Member States. Forty per cent of PCT Member States had responded to the most recent survey, with a satisfactory rate of around 96 per cent. The feedback obtained served as a performance indicator for the yearly Program Performance Reports (PPRs) and as a basis for improvement. Second, the user surveys for PCT users, which sought feedback on information resources, training and PCT applications processing. In response to the most recent survey, sent to some 10,000 users, 10 per cent had replied, with a satisfactory rate of 89 per cent. More than 1,000 free text comments had been received. The result was reported back to Member States and other stakeholders. Third, questionnaires handed out to participants of specific events seeking feedback on issues such as relevancy, quality and utility of its content. Fourth, reporting on all PCT TA activities to each session of the PCT Working Group, listing information on all PCT-related TA activities for developing countries as well as the work plan covering future activities. This was an open, interactive and transparent process during which Member States were able to make observations or specific requests. Furthermore, he highlighted a number of further measures to evaluate performance prior, at the end and sometime after the training event, respectively: (a) initial assessment tests to measure the level of knowledge of participants and to tailor the training contents; (b) evaluation test to determine if participants could move forward to the next level; (c) follow-up questions to assess if participants were using the knowledge acquired in their daily work. In the latter case, the feedback collection process was a real challenge if participants were surveyed a long time after the activity took place. Finally, he

referred to the "training for trainers" approach, which had been successfully implemented so as to ensure the continuity of the institutional memory within an IP Office.

32.   Ms. Joyce Banya, Senior Counsellor, Regional Bureau for Africa, listed the monitoring and evaluation tools and methodologies used in the African region: (i) a framework based on national IP strategies / development plans including specific country needs;
(ii) questionnaires circulated to participants after TA activities; (iii) follow-up discussions with Member States, including Geneva-based missions, IP Offices and national-based stakeholders; (iv) the roster of consultants to obtain feedback from the international and national experts involved in TA activities; (v) reports / feedback from participants following TA programs. Moreover, the evaluations of the implementation of a national IP strategy were generally undertaken after 5 years. There could be a request to review the IP strategy already in place in order to identify eventual gaps. The revised strategy and the questionnaire results served to improve the TA delivery and replicate successful implementation aspects. She finally referred to the challenges in obtaining data and information on how Member States were using the knowledge acquired, particularly when there was a high staff turnover in IP offices. To overcome those challenges, the Regional Bureau: (a) encouraged Member States to ensure certain degree of institutional continuity; (b) tried to use the expertise of former participants in further TA activities; (c) worked closely with other relevant WIPO divisions, particularly those which were able gather statistics more easily.

33.   Mr. Andrew Czajkowski, Head, Innovation and Technology Support Section (ITSS), mentioned the mechanisms used for monitoring and evaluation in the framework of: (i) the Program and Budget; (ii) the DA projects; and (iii) the National TISCs Projects. First, the Program and Budget provided an implementation strategy and a Results framework which contained measurable indicators. In addition, the annual PPR looked at the performance data status of various indicators from the RBM framework and gave an overview of the budget utilization. Another mechanism used in this context was the *ad hoc* independent evaluations. It included findings related to budget utilization, relevance of activities, efficiency, and sustainability, as well as conclusions and recommendations. Second, the DA projects were based on a project document which contained its delivery strategy (including objectives, outputs and indicators). Similarly, a Progress Report was presented annually to the CDIP. Independent evaluations were undertaken at the end of each project, generally including findings on the four abovementioned elements, and also conclusions and recommendations. Third, the National TISCs Projects were based on a service-legal agreement between WIPO and the beneficiary, and a project document, containing an activity schedule and a plan of action. A logical framework was used to monitor the objectives, outcomes and outputs according to their indicators. In addition, a Monitoring Report was annually received from the national partner. One of the main challenges in the process of monitoring and evaluation was the high turnover of direct beneficiaries of TA activities. Participant self-evaluations and seminar evaluations were made after the activities to assure they fitted their needs. A progress and needs assessment questionnaire was sent to all National TISCs and the real situation on the ground was analyzed based on their replies. He concluded by noting that the TISC Program had defined three levels of sustainability: institutionalizing a TISC; starting its operations; providing value-added services.

34.   Member State representatives shared their experience on the monitoring and evaluation of TA activities and made the following observations. First, that a flat index for monitoring and evaluation might not serve the best interest of all the countries, taking into consideration their different level of development. Second, that a useful practice to measure the success of a TA activity was to link it with the changes the participants made in their institutions. Third, that implementing national IP strategies in isolation from a country's

development strategy made it difficult to measure how it contributed to other national development activities. They also raised the following questions: (i) how to encourage final beneficiaries to spread the gained knowledge; (ii) how WIPO measured results for activities limited in time when the impact could be observed only beyond their duration; (iii) how WIPO addressed the Development Agenda 2030 and incorporates the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) indicators; (iv) whether the TA donor could predict the exact budget needed before its delivery; (v) whether an approach similar to the TISCs was possible to implement in a Copyright Office; (vi) how WIPO evaluated the real impact of a TA activity on the ground; (vii) whether benchmarking was used as a tool to measure TA success; (viii) how WIPO assessed the sustainability of TA activities, which might be quantitatively but not qualitatively measurable.

35.   Some of these observations were addressed during the presentations of WIPO contributors. In addition, WIPO contributors mentioned that the TISCs approach could be applied to any field and any office or activity. They also pointed out that the implementation of an overarching national IP strategy involved multi-sector key partners gathered in a steering committee. This Committee identified and brought onboard existing stand-alone policies in place that dealt with innovation, science and technology. They also underlined that the agreed SDG indicators and targets constituted a global framework for monitoring and evaluating the progress made by Member States and contributing Organizations.

Wrap-up session

36.   Mr. Mario Matus, Deputy Director General, Development Sector of WIPO, concluded the roundtable. He stated that Member States seemed to be generally satisfied with the way WIPO has been delivering TA activities. He highlighted some ideas to make the delivery of TA more efficient and sustainable: (i) the importance of internal coordination within the recipient country but also its close collaboration with WIPO; (ii) the need to improve the way to provide the contact information of different WIPO divisions to Member States; (iii) the importance of interaction amongst various IP stakeholders; (iv) the importance of raising awareness on issues related to IP and development, particularly in LDCs; and (v) the need to develop programs to engage youth in IP related-issues. With these observations, Mr. Matus declared the Roundtable concluded.

[End of Annex and of document]