

Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP)

Sixteenth Session
Geneva, November 9 to 13, 2015

COOPERATION ON DEVELOPMENT AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL TRAINING WITH JUDICIAL TRAINING INSTITUTIONS IN DEVELOPING AND LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES

prepared by the Secretariat

1. The Annex to this document contains a revised thematic project proposal on the *Cooperation on Development and Intellectual Property Rights Education and Professional Training with Judicial Training Institutions in Developing and Least Developed Countries*. This project addresses WIPO's Development Agenda Recommendations 3, 10 and 45. The estimated cost for the project amounts to 500,000 Swiss francs, all related to non-personnel costs.

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

[Annex follows]

DEVELOPMENT AGENDA RECOMMENDATIONS 3, 10 and 45

PROJECT DOCUMENT

1. SUMMARY	
<u>Project Code</u>	DA_3_10_45_01
<u>Title</u>	<i>Cooperation on Development and Intellectual Property Rights Education and Professional Training with Judicial Training Institutions in Developing and Least Developed Countries</i>
<u>Development Agenda Recommendation(s)</u>	<p><i>Recommendation 3:</i> Increase human and financial allocation for technical assistance programs in WIPO for promoting, <i>inter alia</i>, a development-oriented intellectual property culture, with an emphasis on introducing intellectual property at different academic levels and on generating greater public awareness on intellectual property.</p> <p><i>Recommendation 10:</i> To assist Member States to develop and improve national intellectual property institutional capacity through further development of infrastructure and other facilities with a view to making national intellectual property institutions more efficient and promote fair balance between intellectual property protection and the public interest. This technical assistance should also be extended to sub-regional and regional organizations dealing with intellectual property.</p> <p><i>Recommendation 45:</i> To approach intellectual property enforcement in the context of broader societal interests and especially development-oriented concerns, with a view that “the protection and enforcement of intellectual property rights should contribute to the promotion of technological innovation and to the transfer and dissemination of technology, to the mutual advantage of producers and users of technological knowledge and in a manner conducive to social and economic welfare, and to a balance of rights and obligations”, in accordance with Article 7 of the TRIPS Agreement.</p>
<u>Brief Description of Project</u>	<p>Taking into consideration the national intellectual property rights (IPR) policy and strategy, and keeping in view the public interest, the main objective of the project is to build capacity for delivery of efficient and effective national IPR education and training programs for judges¹, including creation of self-learning/reference ‘IPR Toolkits for Judges’. More specifically, the project aims at enhancing the understanding of substantive IPR law and application of such IPR knowledge by judges through development of coherent and logical thinking and critical analysis skills to enable the making of fair, efficient, well-informed and well-reasoned arguments and decisions concerning IPR disputes in IPR courts and tribunals.</p>

¹ In this context, judges include magistrates, prosecutors and other members of the judiciary.

Selection of pilot judicial training institutions:

Four pilot judicial training institutions to be selected, ideally one from each region (Africa, Asia and the Pacific, Latin America and the Caribbean and the Arab region), including an LDC, and representing diverse judicial traditions and backgrounds.

The IPR education and training programs, including the self-learning/reference IPR Toolkits for Judges, would be tailored to the identified gaps, articulated needs, available learning infrastructure and absorptive capacities and preferred learning styles of the members of the respective judicial systems of the selected pilot developing and least developed countries.

While implementing the project activities in the selected pilot developing and least developed countries, the following will be kept in view:

- (a) relevant IPR laws/frameworks/agreements;
- (b) relevant IPR policies and strategies;
- (c) judicial training gaps, needs and priorities as articulated in their national economic development frameworks; and
- (d) developmental considerations and public interest.

The project will be implemented through existing national judicial training institutions.

As and when practicable, the project will use, as such or after adaptation/translation to the local context, existing IPR education, training and learning content of WIPO or of contributing institutions of Member States, be it on paper or in electronic form.

Main project components:

- A. Selection of four pilot judicial training institutions;
- B. Assessment of IPR education and training needs of the judicial system in the selected pilot countries to determine the nature and scope of modular IPR education and training content and self-learning/reference "IPR Toolkits for Judges" to be developed;
- C. Fact-finding survey on ongoing IPR training initiatives for the judiciary in developing and least developed countries as well as in the developed countries to learn, amongst other things, from good practices in IPR training of the judiciary;
- D. Based on B and C above, develop tailored and modular IPR education and training content for (a) initial/induction IPR training and (b) in-service IPR training, keeping in view the preferred mode(s) of training delivery (face-to-face, blended or online) tailored to the identified gaps, expressed needs and

	<p>key priorities of the selected country. The education and training content will include a self-learning/reference “IPR Toolkits for Judges,” one for each of the selected pilot institutions. These could include paper-based and electronic IPR content, such as IPR laws and policies, flexibilities in the IP system, landmark IPR court decisions, and other content as may be agreed during the needs assessment phase of the project and based on applicable good practices.</p> <p>E. Based on B, C and D, testing of the IPR education and training content, including the “IPR Toolkit for Judges” by delivering education and training programs and obtaining feedback to make improvements, if needed, to the learning objectives of the IPR education and training courses, curriculum design, content creation, mode(s) of delivery, and methods for assessment/evaluation of learning outcomes of IPR education and training courses;</p> <p>F. Foster networking and partnerships amongst national judicial training institutions for regular sharing of experiences to learn from one another about their IPR training initiatives and outcomes. Amongst other things, this may involve the creation of one or more online professional ‘communities of practice’ on IPR issues for social/networked peer-to-peer learning amongst magistrates, judges and prosecutors; and</p> <p>G. Assistance for the acquisition of reference books and manuals to build up the library of the beneficiary judiciary training institution.</p>
<u>Implementing Program(s)</u>	Program 11
<u>Links to other related Program(s)/ DA Project(s)</u>	The Project is also linked to the following Programs: Program 9, 10 and 17.
<u>Links to Expected Results in the Program and Budget</u>	Expected Result III.2 Enhanced human resource capacities able to deal with the broad range of requirements for the effective use of IP for development in developing countries, LDCs and countries with economies in transition.
<u>Project Duration</u>	<i>24 months</i>
<u>Project Budget</u>	Total non-personnel costs: 500,000 Swiss francs

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1. Context

Judicial education and training is crucial for raising the professional competence of judges. At the same time, it serves the institutional needs for the judiciary to consolidate its independence by demonstrating its accountability for performance enhancement. Above all, it improves access to justice by providing an effective dispute settlement environment.

Yet, for various reasons, only in recent decades, formal judicial education and training have emerged as an important new means worldwide to develop judicial competence and improve the quality of justice and performance of courts. By now, a very large number of countries, worldwide, have in place national institutions to educate and train newly recruited judges (initial or induction training) and provide on-going professional training of serving judges. The structure and authority of these institutions vary from formal state judicial schools under the executive branch to bodies within the judicial branch or to less formal entities established by judicial associations.

The IPR legal framework and system is very specialized and complex; so are IPR disputes, especially those involving complex technologies, the ICT environment or cross-border trade. Moreover, the increasing awareness of the economic benefits derived from effective use of IPRs has led to greater recourse to judicial settlement of IP disputes. For this challenge of number and complexity, the vast majority of judicial officers in most developing and least developed countries are not well prepared as many of them were not taught IPR laws during their university law degree programs.

Over the years, from the requests received by WIPO and the *ad hoc* IPR training services provided by WIPO for the judiciary in developing and least developed countries, it would be reasonable to surmise that judges would greatly benefit from specialized training in the area of IPR laws for effectively adjudicating IPR disputes and judiciously contemplating development considerations and public interest in their decisions and recommendations. Becoming conversant with the flexibilities inherent to the IP systems and those provided for by national laws and regulations, judges will be more inclined to settle disputes with the public interest and development issues in mind.

Moreover, poor or inadequate knowledge of IPR laws or of the scope of granted/registered IP rights represents a serious drawback to effective judicial dispute resolution of IPR cases. This affects the consistency and predictability of IPR case outcomes, which in turn have serious repercussions on the business environment of a particular country. Consistency in IPR dispute outcomes provides assurance to businesses that their investments in innovative and risky ventures will be protected, allowing them to better plan their business strategy. Conversely, inordinate delays or absence of consistency in IPR dispute resolution discourages investment in innovative and creative business or in risky research and development (R&D) endeavors.

The project intends to respond to these needs mainly through the development of structured and practical judicial educational and training programs on IPRs.

As the IPR laws are an ever-changing area of law, IPR training of the judiciary should be an ongoing exercise. The project seeks to prepare the ground for continuous delivery and improvement of IPR formal training programs. It also seeks to foster peer-to-peer learning and self-directed learning during the project period and afterwards.

It is underlined that the project intends to accommodate the specific learning needs and learning styles of judges, while preserving their judicial independence and impartiality.

2.2. Objectives

Addressing Development Agenda Recommendations 3, 10 and 45, the project aims to achieve the following objectives:

To provide technical and professional assistance to judicial training institutions to enhance capacity and skills of magistrates, judges and prosecutors, etc. in developing and least developed countries to adjudicate efficiently and effectively IPR disputes in such a way as to ensure coherence with the identified developmental needs and priorities of the concerned country.

Thus, in line with *DA Recommendation 3*, the project seeks to create a development-oriented IP culture in the judiciary that encourages local innovation and creativity as well as improves the environment for international collaboration, technology transfer and investment.

Further, in line with *DA Recommendation 10*, the project seeks to make national IP dispute settlement institutions more efficient and promote fair balance between IPR protection and the public interest.

Furthermore, in line with *DA Recommendation 45*, the project seeks to build the technical capacity, and influence the attitude and behavior, of the judiciary so as to inculcate a development orientation for creating a balanced, efficient and effective IPR dispute settlement system that supports local talent, innovation and creativity while incentivizing, rewarding and protecting, in an equitable, fair and balanced manner, the rights and interests of all IPR holders, IPR users and the public interest.

2.3. Delivery Strategy

A. *Fact-finding survey*

A general fact-finding survey on IPR training institutions and other training initiatives existing worldwide for the judiciary will be undertaken to learn, amongst other things, about existing practices in IPR education and training of the judiciary.

This will be done through a targeted survey questionnaire and by a study of readily available literature and reports, internally in WIPO and externally worldwide.

The survey is expected to provide:

1. an overview of ongoing IPR education and training services of national judicial training institutions and other similar institutions; and
2. an overview of the IP content, IP curricula, modes of delivery and of assessment/evaluation of results achieved so as to learn from good practices and successful implementations, when available.

B. Selection of pilot countries

Four pilot countries will be selected, ideally one from each region (Africa, Asia and the Pacific, Latin America and the Caribbean and the Arab region), including an LDC, and representing diverse judicial traditions and backgrounds.

Interested Member States should submit to the WIPO Secretariat written well-formulated requests prepared by the judicial training institution and/or the relevant national authority. At a minimum, the request should include:

- (a) A brief description of the number and nature of IP disputes before different levels of national IP-related dispute settlement system.
- (b) A brief description of the nature and structure of the national court system; in particular, whether the general court system of the pilot country deals with the IPR disputes or whether specialized IPR courts, tribunals, divisions, etc. have been created.
- (c) A brief description of the satisfaction with, and challenges faced by, the current IPR dispute settlement system.
- (d) A brief description of the training philosophy, training methodologies employed, training infrastructure of the national judicial training institution, including extent of reliance on e-learning platforms, for education and training purposes, including any recent survey, evaluation or assessment of emerging training needs in general, and, on IPRs, in particular, of the judicial officers, such as judges, magistrates, prosecutors, support staff, etc.

The selection of four pilot institutions will rely on the following main criteria:

1. Explicit national commitment (for example, in an approved national IPR policy and strategy) and formally identified and significant need for IPR education and training of the judiciary.
2. Regional distribution (one per region), including an LDC. Ability to dedicate human resources to ensure continuity of the project after its conclusion.
3. Availability of a *pro bono* champion for promoting IPR education and training for the judiciary.
4. Level of preparedness for effective delivery of education and training programs on IPRs and especially availability of physical and ICT infrastructural facilities.
5. Demonstrated ability or potential for (a) multiplier effect in the relevant country and (b) quality assurance and continuous improvement of IPR education and training in both substance and use of effective tools, techniques and methods, based on empirical evidence of success in achieving learning objectives and learning outcomes.
6. Confirmation that a significant number of magistrates, judges or prosecutors will follow the IPR education and training course every year in one or more tailor-made IPR courses and that trained magistrates, judges, prosecutors and other members of the judiciary will be deployed to adjudicate IPR disputes in specialized IP divisions of general courts, in specialized IP courts/tribunals and the like.

C. Assessment of IPR education and training needs

An assessment of IPR education and training needs of the judicial system in selected pilot countries to determine the nature and scope of modular IPR education and training content and self-learning/reference “IPR Toolkits for Judges” will be developed.

The project will rely on the active participation of judicial training institutions and all relevant national authorities involved in building capacities for the judiciary. It will also give utmost importance to prior consultations with relevant institutions in order to better understand the national training needs and jointly agree on the actions to be taken.

The assessment will involve structured consultation with relevant stakeholders in the efficient and effective functioning of the IPR dispute resolution system in a country to determine the nature and scope of IPR education and training, the mode of delivery, the methodology of assessment/evaluation of IPR education and training outcomes.

D. Development of content

Content will be aligned to the specific needs of judges. With WIPO’s assistance, the judicial training institutions will decide on the content that needs to be developed. More specifically, WIPO will assist beneficiary countries:

1. assess the beneficiary country’s IP regime against its international commitments so that judges better comprehend and appreciate their own regime in the context of the international framework;
2. identify the specific national training needs on IP that correspond to their national development goals;
3. define learning objectives and learning outcomes in line with those development goals; and
4. decide on the content and training methodology which contribute in the attainment of those development goals.

The specific topics to be covered in the training program will be determined according to this process by the beneficiary countries.

Knowing that training of judges is based on substantive and procedural provisions in national IP laws, the project will incorporate in the training program development-oriented topics including flexibilities in the national IP laws.

Tailored and modular IPR education and training content will be developed for (a) initial/induction IPR training and (b) in-service IPR training, keeping in view the preferred mode(s) of training delivery (face-to-face, blended or online) tailored to the identified gaps, expressed needs and key priorities of the selected country. The education and training content will include a self-learning/reference “IPR Toolkits for Judges,” one for each of the selected pilot institutions. These could include paper-based and electronic IPR content, such as IPR laws and policies, flexibilities in the IP system, landmark IPR court decisions, and other content as may be agreed during the needs assessment phase of the project and based on applicable good practices in this regard from elsewhere.

The nature and scope of the educational and training content for each selected pilot institution would be determined by taking into account:

- (a) Results/findings of the relevant needs assessment exercise;
- (b) Good practices for IPR education and training of other existing judicial education and training institutions, worldwide; and
- (c) Developmental considerations and public interest.

E. Delivering education and training programs

Based on B, C and D, testing of the IPR education and training content, including the “IPR Toolkit for Judges” by delivering education and training programs and obtaining feedback to make improvements, if needed, to the learning objectives of the IPR education and training courses, curriculum design, content creation, mode(s) of delivery, and methods for assessment/evaluation of learning outcomes of IPR education and training courses.

The IPR educational and training courses will be developed in consultation with national stakeholders and in coordination with the beneficiary judicial training institution, keeping in view the specific learning outcomes expected, the availability of trainers, the national training environment and available technological and other infrastructural resources. Based on specific identified needs for IPR education and training, which would be articulated in the form of Learning Objectives and Learning Outcomes, the process of curriculum design and instructional strategy will be undertaken in partnership with the IPR champion and a consultative group at each of the pilot institutions.

The content of IP education and training courses will be in a number of discrete self-contained modules; most modules will deal with IPRs but some modules or activities may have to respond to the needs of participants who require assistance to make effective use of diverse features of e-learning platforms.

The discrete modules will be combined in various permutations and combinations to design courses of varying duration and length, depending on desired Learning Objectives and Learning Outcomes. The courses may have a defined start and end date or may be self-paced, depending on local preferences.

Accordingly, based on specified objective and measurable learning objectives and outcomes, a set of modules from amongst the modules created during the project, will be brought together in a logical manner to design tailored IPR education and training courses for induction IPR education and in-service IPR training that would be specific to a particular judicial training institution given its contexts. Therefore, at this stage, it is unwise and in fact impossible to define the final nature and scope of the IPR courses and the type of curriculum design, instructional design and assessment methodology suitable for a particular IPR context, particular learning styles, particular training facilities and particular institutional contexts. Overall, however, the focus would be on self-directed study, self-reflection and self-assessment. Priority will be given to learning in small groups by promoting peer-to-peer interaction, group discussions amongst peers and ‘learning by doing’ through moot courts, simulations/games, case study discussion, case law discussion, etc.

Much less reliance, if any, would be placed on class-room style didactic lecturing or presentations. However, when a teacher, instructor or facilitator is needed, the project will rely on national/sub-regional/regional human resources, preferably judges and reputed IPR professors. If and when necessary, the WIPO Academy will assist in making resource persons available from outside the country, sub-region or region.

Initially, generic IPR modules will be created. These would be on different types of IPRs and on different aspects of IPRs relevant to effective and consistent settlement of IPR disputes.

To achieve efficiency, effectiveness and relevance, the generic IPR modules will be adapted to respond to the identified/assessed learning styles, learning needs, institutional and national policies and priorities; thus, the generic modules would be tailored to specific IPR laws, IPR policies and strategies, national development priorities, relevant landmark IPR cases, preferred learning styles of magistrates, judges, prosecutors, etc.

Next, the modules would be translated into relevant language(s), if and when needed.

This proposed IPR Toolkit for Judges would be an integral part of the self-paced, self-learning process. The nature and scope of the IPR toolkit for Judges will vary from one institution to another, depending on its specific needs and ready availability of relevant IPR content in the language used. The IPR Toolkit for Judges may also comprise printed content, e-learning content fixed on medium (USB stick CD-ROM, etc.) if internet access is not available (or is not reliable or fast) at the homes of the participants.

The existing WIPO e-Learning Center of the WIPO Academy will host the IPR education and training content.

Training modality (on-site, on-line, or a combination of both) and duration will be agreed upon with the beneficiary judicial training institutes on a case-by-case basis, taking into account their preferences.

F. Networking and partnerships

The project will support the establishment of networks and partnerships among the judicial training institutions to facilitate contacts and exchange of information and experience amongst them in IP-related case law, successful pedagogical approaches and other relevant information to improve the cost-effectiveness of IPR education and training modalities and their coordination, monitoring, and above all, quality assurance and continuous improvement based on feedback from participants and good practices elsewhere, worldwide.

G. Access to reference books

Support the acquisition of reference books and manuals to build up the library of the beneficiary judiciary training institution may be included in the IPR toolkit, as may be deemed necessary.

Project sustainability

Judicial training institutions are expected to become self-reliant in running the training programs and activities once established and finalized by the end of the 2016-2017 biennium. The WIPO Secretariat may continue to provide supplementary assistance beyond the biennium in case of a substantive need provided that the additional resources would not prevent other potential institutions from receiving needed assistance.

Even after the project is over, WIPO will continue to support, if needed, the many 'professional communities of practice' created under the pilot project to ensure continued peer-to-peer learning and self-directed and self-paced learning by the participants in their own time.

IPR Toolkits for Judges, including publications, will become important tools that Judicial Training Institutions can use for training purposes and judges for the adjudication activities.

Cooperation mechanisms:

In implementing the project, the WIPO Secretariat will:

- (a) Seek synergies with other WIPO programs and, where appropriate, with relevant national authorities and institutions, programs, projects and initiatives so as to prevent duplication and encourage reuse of existing content and educational and training materials;
- (b) Coordinate in various ways, including by establishing periodic requirement frameworks, in partnership with the participating judicial training institutions in this pilot project to reduce risks and otherwise ensure cost-effectiveness in reaching the desired outcomes;
- (c) Take into account the preferences of the selected pilot institutions for the identification and selection of national, regional or international expert(s) who will assist in developing or revising IP modules, curriculum design, instructional design, assessment methodologies and, where appropriate, provide advice on topics and teaching/learning tools, techniques and methods. The expert(s) should be a judge with demonstrated experience in handling IP-related cases or a professional with a rich academic and legal background related to IP;
- (d) Ensure that a coordination mechanism is created for monitoring and review of the progress of the project in each pilot institution. For regular contact amongst the four projects and the WIPO secretariat a focal person will be designated in each institution/secretariat participating in the project; and
- (e) Enter into a formal memorandum of understanding (MOU) with each of the four selected pilot institutions that would be tailored to their respective circumstances and particular needs.

2.4. Risks and Mitigation Strategies

In the course of the project implementation, the following risks may be envisaged:

- (a) Difficulties to organize continuous training for a busy judiciary. A key mitigation measure to counter such risks is to ensure having the full engagement and endorsement of the judicial training institution and/or the relevant authorities at all phases of the project;
- (b) Conditions in a selected pilot country may impede the project, in which case due discussions should be pursued. Should such discussions be unsuccessful, the project in the country may be suspended or postponed; and
- (c) The use of Information and Communication Technology (ICTs) may face limitations that exist in developing and least developed countries, such as absence or low-speed Internet. A key mitigation measure to counter this high risk would be to ensure the print-publishing of the Judges IP Toolkit.

3. REVIEW AND EVALUATION

3.1. Project Review Schedule

- (a) Each component of the project, as outlined in 2.3 above, will be regularly monitored for progress against agreed milestones/time table and identification and elimination/mitigation of known and emerging risks and use of emerging opportunities for synergies to improve cost-effectiveness and quality of its components/deliverables.
- (b) A yearly (or mid-term) progress *cum* self-evaluation report will be presented for the consideration of the CDIP.

3.2 Independent Evaluation of the Project

In addition to the self-evaluation by each participating judicial institution and evaluation by WIPO, an independent evaluation of the project will be undertaken and its report submitted to the CDIP.

<i>Project Outputs</i>	<i>Indicators of Successful Completion (Output Indicators)</i>
A mapping of IPR training institutions and other training initiatives for the judiciary existing worldwide	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mapping completed; and - Preliminary analysis made.
Customized IP training modules for judges and magistrates for each pilot project.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Modules completed and endorsed by the relevant national or regional authorities. - At least one training session (on-line, blended or on-site) organized in cooperation with each beneficiary training institution based on the newly developed modules, curricula and training technique for achieving the desired learning outcomes.
A group of judges, including potential trainer(s), trained based on the developed modules	Beneficiaries completed the training session
A network connecting judicial training institutions established.	At least two judicial training institutions indicated their wish to establish contacts and cooperate more closely in the area of specialized training.

<i>Project Objective(s)</i>	<i>Indicator(s) of Success in Achieving Project Objective (Outcome Indicators)</i>
<p>Enhanced capacity and skills of magistrates, judges and prosecutors in developing and least developed countries to adjudicate efficiently and effectively IP disputes in cohesion with the identified developmental needs and priorities of the country.</p>	<p>At least 50% of beneficiary judges, magistrates and prosecutors report they acquired new skills for adjudicating efficiently and effectively IP disputes.</p>
<p>A development-oriented IP culture in the judiciary that encourages local innovation and creativity as well as improves the environment for international collaboration, technology transfer and investment.</p>	<p>At least 50% of beneficiary judges, magistrates and prosecutors acknowledge the relationship between effective and efficient adjudication and local innovation and creativity.</p>
<p>More efficient national IP dispute settlement institutions and fair balance between IPR protection and the public interest.</p>	<p>At least 50% of beneficiary judges, magistrates and prosecutors acknowledge the correlation between adjudication and public interest.</p> <p>At least 50% of beneficiary judges, magistrates and prosecutors indicate the training has improved their dispute settlement skills.</p>
<p>A development orientation among the judiciary for creating a balanced, efficient and effective IPR dispute settlement system that supports local talent, innovation and creativity while incentivizing, rewarding and protecting, in an equitable, fair and balanced manner, the rights and interests of all IPR holders, IPR users and the public interest.</p>	<p>At least 50% of beneficiary judges, magistrates and prosecutors acknowledge the importance of balance between the rights and interests of IPR holders, IPR users and the public interest.</p>

4. IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE

Output	Quarters (From April 2016 to March 2018)							
	2nd	3rd	4th	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	1st
Undertaking a mapping on IPR training institutions and other training initiatives for the judiciary existing worldwide	x	x	x					
Selecting four pilot countries <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Signing of cooperation agreements and agreeing on work plans - Designating potential trainers - Designating national champions and focal points 		x	x					
Selecting resource persons for the four pilot projects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establishing terms of reference - Signing contracts 		x	x					
Conducting needs-assessment missions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evaluating needs - preparing reports 			x	x	x			
Developing training modules for the judiciary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Develop generic modules for the judiciary - Meetings with the judicial training institutions and relevant stakeholders to agree on substantive training needs, cooperation methods and expected results - Developing IPR Toolkits for Judges / customized training modules 			x	x	x	x	x	x
Develop the existing WIPO e-Learning Center <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establishing a forum - Providing electronic access to learning materials 			x	x	x	x	x	
IPR Toolkit for Judges					x	x	x	

Output	Quarters (From April 2016 to March 2018)							
Providing manuals and reference books					x	x	x	x
Organizing, testing and evaluating training courses						x	x	x
Establishing networks among judicial training institutions					x	x	x	x
Final evaluation report								x

5. TOTAL NON-PERSONNEL RESOURCES BY OUTPUTS (*Swiss francs*)

Output	2016	2017	Total
Undertaking a mapping on IPR training institutions and other training initiatives for the judiciary existing worldwide	10 000		10 000
Selecting four pilot countries - Pilot country selection - Trainers and focal points designation - Establishment of agreement and elaboration and approval on work plans	20 000		20 000
Selecting resource persons for the four pilot projects - Terms of reference developing - ICS contracts establishing	120 000		120 000
Conducting needs-assessment missions - Evaluating needs - Preparing reports	20 000	20 000	40 000
Developing generic and customized training modules for the judiciary - modules developing - adapting modules to e-learning training	20 000	50 000	70 000
Develop the existing WIPO e-Learning Center - Establishing a forum - Providing electronic access to learning materials	60 000		60 000
IPR Toolkit for Judges		20 000	20 000
Providing manuals and reference books		80 000	80 000
Organizing, testing and evaluating training courses - Two-day to three-day training sessions		60 000	60 000

Output	2016	2017	Total
- On-line training session			
Establishing networks among judicial training institutions		10 000	10 000
Self-evaluation of the project		-	-
Independent evaluation of the project		10 000	10 000
Total	250 000	250 000	500 000

6. NON-PERSONNEL RESOURCES BY COST CATEGORY (*Swiss francs*)

Output	<i>Travel and Fellowships</i>		<i>Contractual Services</i>			Total
	Staff Missions	Third-party Travel	Publishing	Individual Contractual Services	Other Contractual Services	
Undertaking a mapping on IPR training institutions and other training initiatives for the judiciary existing worldwide					10 000	10 000
Selecting four pilot countries <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pilot country selection - Trainers and focal points designation - Establishment of agreement and elaboration and approval on work plans 	20 000					20 000
Selecting resource persons for the four pilot projects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Terms of reference developing - ICS contracts establishing 				120 000		120 000

Output	<i>Travel and Fellowships</i>		<i>Contractual Services</i>			Total
	Staff Missions	Third-party Travel	Publishing	Individual Contractual Services	Other Contractual Services	
Conducting needs-assessment missions - Evaluating needs - Preparing reports	20 000	20 000				40 000
Developing generic and customized training modules for the judiciary - modules developing - adapting modules to e-learning training		20 000	20 000	30 000		70 000
Develop the existing WIPO e-Learning Center - Establishing a forum - Providing electronic access to learning materials			30 000	30 000		60 000
IPR Toolkit for Judges			20 000			20 000
Providing manuals and reference books					80 000	80 000

Output	Travel and Fellowships		Contractual Services			Total
	Staff Missions	Third-party Travel	Publishing	Individual Contractual Services	Other Contractual Services	
Organizing, testing and evaluating training courses - Two-day to three-day training sessions - On-line training session	20 000	20 000			20 000	60 000
Establishing networks among judicial training institutions					10 000	10 000
Self-evaluation of the project						-
Independent evaluation of the project				10 000		10 000
Total	60 000	60 000	70 000	190 000	120 000	500 000

[End of Annex and of document]