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Thank you, Mr. Chair

While we appreciate the effort to convene the Expert Forum on International Technology Transfer we would like to convey the following general points:

First, the composition of the expert group was not diverse enough to address all aspects of technology transfer. The Secretariat did not make use of the presence of authors of the studies to formulate the “expert thoughts”.

Second, the expert panels were structured to discuss specific issues viz. capacity building, global cooperation, institutional framework, regulatory framework, innovation infrastructure, funding and evaluation mechanisms. However, the expert thoughts are not organised as per the above issues and only make generic suggestions. In other words the expert thoughts are merely thoughts without any relevance to capacity building, global cooperation, institutional framework, regulatory framework, innovation infrastructure, funding and evaluation mechanisms.

Third, the Secretariat’s report on the Expert Forum on International Technology does not capture comments and suggestions made by the participants of the forum.

Fourth, interventions of many experts in the panel clearly showed that there was not enough expertise in the law and policy issues related to international technology transfer. Interventions of many experts focussed on domestic issues related to technology transfer rather than international technology transfer. It is important that the Secretariat make available the transcripts of the panel discussions to the next CDIP for more informed deliberations.

Fifth, the expert thoughts assume IP protection is a facilitator for international technology transfer and fully ignore the empirical evidence of negative externalities of IP on technology transfer.

We would like to make specific comments on some of the expert thoughts.

Expert thoughts D, F and G represent an IP maximalist agenda. These thoughts are based on the above mentioned assumption that IP protection would automatically result in international technology transfer and that completely ignores the barriers that are created by IP especially patents on technology.

Further, the expert thoughts A and C assumed that match making platforms and help desks are enough to facilitate technology transfer. Similarly, expert thoughts B and E do not spell out the details recommended for compilation of best practices and success stories. These recommendations fully ignore the legal and policy measures required at the national and international level to facilitate technology transfer. These recommendations are highly inadequate to address the legal and policy bottlenecks related to international technology transfer.

In short, the expert thoughts are not adding enough value or showing a way forward to address the concerns related to international technology transfer emerging out of enhanced IP protection through various international treaties including the TRIPS and ‘TRIPS Plus’ provisions in free trade agreement (FTAs).

Against this background, we would like to make a suggestion. We request Member States to consider the recommendations made in the studies to frame the future work in the area of technology transfer.

Thank you.