

## **Program and Budget Committee**

**Twenty-Fifth Session**  
**Geneva, August 29 to September 2, 2016**

### **INTERNAL OVERSIGHT DIVISION (IOD) VALIDATION REPORT FOR THE PROGRAM PERFORMANCE REPORT (PPR) FOR 2014/15**

*prepared by the Secretariat*

1. The Validation Report on the Program Performance Report (PPR) has been prepared by the Internal Oversight Division (IOD) to provide support to ensuring the reliability and authenticity of the WIPO PPR for 2014/15 (document WO/PBC/25/7). The Validation Report provides IOD's main findings, conclusions and recommendations arising from the validation exercise.

2. The following decision paragraph is proposed.

3. *The Program and Budget Committee took note of the IOD Validation Report on the Program Performance Report for 2014/15 (document WO/PBC/25/8).*

[IOD Validation Report follows]



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ACRONYMS .....	4
LIST OF WIPO PROGRAMS, AS DEFINED IN THE 2014/15 PPR.....	5
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	6
1. INTRODUCTION.....	8
2. PPR VALIDATION OBJECTIVES.....	8
3. PPR VALIDATION SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY .....	8
4. PPR VALIDATION OBSERVATIONS.....	9
5. OVERVIEW OF THE PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK .....	16
6. PPR VALIDATION CONCLUSIONS.....	19
7. PPR VALIDATION RECOMMENDATIONS .....	19
8. SUMMARY REPORT – PPR VALIDATION SURVEY.....	21
9. FOLLOW UP ON STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS FROM PAST VALIDATION REPORTS.....	24
TABLE OF RECOMMENDATIONS .....	25

## ANNEXES

- ANNEX I – Definition of validation criteria
- ANNEX II – Random sampling meetings
- ANNEX III - Validation assessments including rating
- ANNEX IV - Validation framework

**LIST OF ACRONYMS**

<b>DPPF</b>	Department of Program Planning and Finance
<b>EPM</b>	Enterprise Performance Management
<b>ERP</b>	Enterprise Resource Planning
<b>ER</b>	Expected Result
<b>IOD</b>	Internal Oversight Division
<b>IP</b>	Intellectual Property
<b>P&amp;B</b>	Program and Budget
<b>PBC</b>	Program and Budget Committee
<b>PD</b>	Performance Data
<b>PI</b>	Performance Indicator
<b>PPBD</b>	Program Performance and Budget Division
<b>PMSDS</b>	Performance Management and Staff Development System
<b>PPR</b>	Program Performance Report
<b>RBM</b>	Results Based Management
<b>SMART</b>	Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound
<b>SMT</b>	Senior Management Team
<b>TLS</b>	Traffic Light System
<b>WIPO</b>	World Intellectual Property Organization

**LIST OF WIPO PROGRAMS, AS DEFINED IN THE 2014/15 PPR**

Program 1 – Patent Law
Program 2 – Trademarks, Industrial Designs and Geographical Indications
Program 3 – Copyright and Related Rights
Program 4 – Traditional Knowledge, Traditional Cultural Expressions and Genetic Resources
Program 5 – The PCT system
Program 6 – Madrid and Lisbon Systems
Program 7 – Arbitration, Mediation and Domain Names
Program 8 – Development Agenda Coordination
Program 9 – Africa, Arab, Asia and the Pacific, Latin America and the Caribbean Countries, Least Developed Countries
Program 10 – Cooperation with Certain Countries in Europe and Asia
Program 11 – The WIPO Academy
Program 12 – International Classifications and Standards
Program 13 – Global Databases
Program 14 – Services for Access to Information and Knowledge
Program 15 – Business Solutions for IP Offices
Program 16 – Economics and Statistics
Program 17 – Building Respect for IP
Program 18 – IP and Global Challenges
Program 19 – Communications
Program 20 – External Relations, Partnerships and External Offices
Program 21 – Executive Management
Program 22 – Program and Resource Management
Program 23 – Human Resources Management and Development
Program 24 – General Support Services
Program 25 – Information and Communication Technology
Program 26 – Internal Oversight
Program 27 – Conference and Language Services
Program 28 – Safety and Security
Program 29 – New Conference Hall
Program 30 – Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises (SMEs) and Innovation
Program 31 – The Hague System

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. The Internal Oversight Division (IOD) conducted an independent validation of the Program Performance Report (PPR) for the 2014/15 biennium, in line with its 2016 Oversight Plan. This is the fifth PPR validation exercise undertaken by IOD since 2008. The objectives of this validation were to:
  - (a) Provide an independent verification of the reliability and authenticity of information contained in the 2014/15 PPR; and
  - (b) Follow-up on the implementation status of open recommendations of the previous PPR Validation Report through documentary and other corroborative evidence.
2. The scope included an assessment of Performance Data (PD) for one randomly selected Performance Indicator (PI) from each Program as reported in the 2014/15 PPR. The validation also included general conclusions on the progress made towards improving the results framework during the biennium under review<sup>1</sup>.
3. The key positive outcomes of this validation exercise can be summarized as follows:
  - (a) Twenty-seven out of 30 Programs (90 per cent) collected and submitted relevant and valuable PD for 2014/15; representing an improvement compared with 2012/13 biennium where 25 Programs had submitted relevant and useful information;
  - (b) Twenty-three Programs (77 per cent) collected and submitted accurate and verifiable PD in comparison to 21 Programs in 2012/13; and
  - (c) The number of Programs that reported an accurate self-assessment of their Traffic Light System (TLS) increased from 21 (68 per cent) in 2012/13 to 25 (81 per cent) in 2014/15 biennium. Finally, the number of Programs whose TLS was not assessable decreased from eight in 2012/13 to six in 2014/15.
4. Further improvements could be made in the following areas:
  - (a) Seven programs lacked established reporting processes to generate timely reports of PD other than for PPR purposes;
  - (b) Data collection methods need to be enhanced for five programs. In one instance, the tool used for data gathering was not configured properly, therefore preventing data collection for several months; and
  - (c) There were two instances where the PD were not linked to PI and the corresponding Expected Result (ER), and in one instance, part of the PD reported did not have any relevance to the PI.
5. The overview of the performance framework showed that:
  - (a) PIs have been streamlined and refined over the last three biennia, with the number of indicators decreasing from 293 in 2010/11 to 286 in 2012/13 biennium, and further decreased to 269 in the 2014/15 biennium;

---

<sup>1</sup> One selected performance Indicator was discontinued during the biennium under review, hence no performance data was available to assess this indicator; as a result, 30 out of 31 indicators were assessed against the validation criteria.

- (b) There were instances where the initial baselines established in the Program and Budget (P&B) were marked “to be decided”, and remained unchanged in the ensuing Program Performance Report throughout the biennium. Furthermore, there are targets that are not well defined, and/or not measurable against the TLS.
6. IOD surveyed Program Managers, alternates, and staff responsible for reporting on program performance and on the status of Results Based Management (RBM) at WIPO. The survey results show that a large majority of Programs indicated that they were directly involved in developing their performance measures; and considered that their indicators, baselines and targets were valuable for measuring meaningful progress and achievements. Guidelines for developing Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound (SMART)<sup>2</sup> measures were also considered adequate and useful.
7. The survey also identified the following perceived opportunities: some programs consider that a majority of their PIs are still output oriented. For instance, 35 per cent of respondents indicated that at least 80 per cent of their PIs were output oriented; and 32 per cent indicated that around half of their indicators were outcome oriented. Around one third of respondents (30 per cent) have identified between one and two PIs that are not well defined or are not relevant for their program activities.
8. While IOD did not conduct a full review of all PIs to confirm (or not) the above perception, nevertheless, the survey results draws attention to the need to continuously:
- (a) Improve the quality of performance indicators; and
  - (b) Ensure that Programs have a clear understanding of RBM principles.
9. The following remarks could be made on the current status of WIPO’s results framework:
- (a) The work on developing meaningful PIs that are more outcomes oriented including clear baselines and targets, should continue so that performance results can be more effectively measured to indicate progress towards achieving the ERs;
  - (b) WIPO’s results framework will benefit further by establishing clear criteria and procedures for discontinuing indicators, and enhancing internal mechanisms to address any requests for changes in PIs; and
  - (c) Make available additional documentation on RBM principles to enhance knowledge sharing within the Organization.
10. Action has been taken on three out of five recommendations made in the validation of the 2012/13 PPR, and recommendations made in validations prior to 2012/13 have all been implemented.

---

<sup>2</sup> SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-bound.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

11. The approved P&B provides the framework for measuring program performance on an annual basis within the Organization. For this purpose, a PPR is prepared and submitted to the WIPO Program and Budget Committee (PBC) on a yearly basis. WIPO programs self-assess and report on their achievement of PIs. These are then checked and consolidated by the Program Performance and Budget Division (PPBD) to produce the PPR.

12. This is the fifth independent validation of the PPR conducted by IOD. This validation has been conducted against the individual PPRs prepared by WIPO programs as defined in the 2014/15 P&B.

13. The purpose of this validation exercise is two-fold; it aims to provide reasonable assurance to Member States and WIPO Management on the accuracy/completeness of self-assessments by Programs and also contribute to further enhancing accountability for results within the Organization.

## 2. PPR VALIDATION OBJECTIVES

14. The objectives of this validation exercise were to:

(a) Provide an independent verification of the reliability and authenticity of information contained in the 2014/15 PPR;

(b) Follow-up on the implementation status of recommendations of the previous PPR Validation Report through documentary and other corroborative evidence.

15. The validation also includes general observations and recommendations to strengthening the performance framework.

## 3. PPR VALIDATION SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

16. The scope of the validation covered an in-depth analysis of one randomly selected PI for each Program as defined in the 2014/15 PPR. The criteria used to validate PD reported in individual PPRs have been maintained unchanged for consistency purposes<sup>3</sup>. In addition, the validation assessed the accuracy of the TLS used to report on the achievement of the target set for the PI. Detailed explanation of the validation criteria is presented in Annex I of this report.

17. The validation included review of supporting documentary evidence coupled with interviews with key staff responsible for monitoring and reporting against the randomly selected PIs.

### (A) INFORMATION PRESENTED IN ADVANCE

18. As part of the preparatory work for the PPR validation exercise, the following information was circulated prior to the start of the exercise:

(a) A memorandum, dated January 29, 2016, to all Program Managers by the Director, Department of Program Planning and Finance (Controller), providing guidelines and timelines for the preparation and submission of the PPR inputs; and

---

<sup>3</sup> The criteria are; relevant and valuable; sufficient and comprehensive; efficiently collected and easily accessible; accurate and verifiable; timely; clear and transparent; and efficient and accessible.



(b) A memorandum, dated March 22, 2016, to all Program Managers by the Acting Director, IOD, informing on the key steps and dates of the independent validation exercise.

#### (B) RANDOM SAMPLING

19. The random sampling of a PI per each program was done by Senior Management Team (SMT) Members or their alternates in the presence of IOD staff. Annex II of this report provides the list of staff involved in the random selection of PI. The randomly selected performance indicators represent *circa* 11 per cent (31 out of 269 PIs) of the total number of indicators used in the 2014/15 biennium. The validation assessments for each randomly selected indicator can be found in Annex III of this report.

20. The validation team scheduled meetings to discuss the PD used for monitoring and reporting progress against the selected PIs, and performed validations based on verifiable evidence and supporting documentation.

#### (C) SURVEY ON WIPO RESULTS BASED MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK

21. As part of the PPR validation exercise, IOD surveyed<sup>4</sup> 77 Program Managers, alternates, and other persons responsible for reporting on performance, with a view to receiving their feedback on RBM at WIPO. There were 33 respondents from 21 Programs, which represents a 46 per cent (33 out of 77) response rate from 67 per cent of all Programs (21 out of 31 Programs).

#### (D) CONDUCT OF VALIDATION MEETINGS AND INDIVIDUAL PROGRAM VALIDATION ASSESSMENTS

22. IOD met with staff members responsible for reporting against the PIs to gain insight on the use of PPR information and on the implementation of recommendations from past validations.

23. The validation fieldwork took place between April 4 and May 30, 2016 and included interviews, and verifications of evidence provided by Programs.

24. The draft report which includes individual validation assessments was sent to WIPO SMT on June 8, 2016, for feedback and comments. The final report was prepared following the management comments/feedback.

#### (E) LIMITATIONS

25. The main limitation is linked to the methodology used in that validating randomly selected sample of PIs leads to findings, conclusions and recommendations which may not necessarily accurately reflect the whole Results Framework at WIPO. However, given the time constraints, random sampling was the most appropriate method to assess the quality of PD with sufficient depth.

### 4. PPR VALIDATION OBSERVATIONS

#### (A) KEY ACHIEVEMENTS

26. Some key achievements related to program performance management and RBM framework during the 2014/15 biennium can be summarized as follows:

---

<sup>4</sup> The survey report is found in Section 8 of this report.

- (a) Efforts have been continued to better align resources with organizational ER and good progress has been made to further institutionalize Results Framework at WIPO;
- (b) The number of ER has been reduced from 60 in the 2012/13 to 38 in the 2014/15 biennium to further streamline the Results Framework;
- (c) The new Enterprise Performance Management (EPM) module of the ERP system has been enhanced to help monitor and report on work plan activities and underlying PIs. Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) enabled developing tools which further improved the quality and management of performance data; and
- (d) In 2014/15 biennium, the adoption of the WIPO Risk Management Policy (OI 34/2014) and establishment of a Risk Management Group (OI 18/2014) further enhanced risk management governance at the Organization level; reporting on key risks and relevant mitigating actions improved the consistency of risk reporting at the program level.


## (B) GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

27. The results of the individual program validation assessments conducted on the randomly selected PIs and their respective PD across 31 Programs led to the following general observations.
28. A total of 30 PIs were assessed against the validation criteria since one Program's randomly selected PI was discontinued during the biennium under review. As a consequence, there was no PD available to assess against the validation criteria. However, the discontinued indicator was assessed for accuracy against the TLS
29. After validating the PD and the supporting information used to report against PIs the most significant strengths identified were:
- (a) The relevance and valuableness of PD in 90 per cent of cases;
  - (b) The accuracy and verifiability of PD in 77 per cent of cases;
  - (c) The sufficiency and comprehensiveness of PD, and timeliness in reporting PD in 73 per cent of cases; and
  - (d) The efficiency in collecting and accessing PD, as well as clarity and transparency of PD in 70 per cent of cases.
30. The validation of the PD provided for the sampled PIs identified the following opportunities for improvements:
- (a) Seven programs (23 per cent) lacked established reporting processes to generate timely reports of PD other than for PPR purposes;
  - (b) Five programs (17 per cent), needed to improve data collection methods. In one instance, the tool used for data gathering was not configured properly, therefore preventing data collection for several months;
  - (c) There were two instances where the PI and related PD were not fully linked with the corresponding ER;
  - (d) In one instance, part of the PD reported did not have any relevance to the PI, mainly because the PI needed to be better formulated; and


(e) There were three instances where the PD was considered as “partially meets” the criteria against which they were measured, while the TLS was rated as accurate. This is because the related PIs were output oriented with numerical targets; and while these targets were met, the method used to collect, verify, and timely report data, as well as clarity and transparency of data were limited or needed to be improved.

31. The need to identify an efficient method and a tool for data collection has already been noted in previous PPR Validation Reports. This is further supported by IOD’s survey which indicates that one third of respondents felt they did not have appropriate systems and tools to gather baseline information, record, monitor, and analyze performance data for reporting.


32. Comparison of validation results, with regard to quality of criteria, over the last three biennia is illustrated below. (figures 1-4)



33. The above figure compares the number of Programs that provided PD that sufficiently met the validation criteria over the last three biennia. Compared to the last biennium, the figures are stable, with a slight increase in the number of Programs that provided relevant/valuable and accurate/verifiable PDs in the 2014/15 biennium and a decrease in Programs that provided clear/transparent PD.



34. Overall, the number of Programs that provided PD that partially met the criteria has increased or remained the same when compared to the previous two biennia, except for relevant and valuable, which slightly decreased compared to last biennium.




35. The above figure compares the number of Programs that provided PD that did not meet each of the validation criteria over the last three biennia. The number of Programs decreased with only one case of sufficient/comprehensive and timely reporting for the biennium under review.

**Table A: Summary of Validation Results**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Sufficiently met the criteria</b>	<b>Partially met the criteria</b>	<b>Did not meet the criteria</b>
1. Relevant/Valuable	27 Programs (90%)	3 Programs (10%)	0 Programs (-)
2. Sufficient/ Comprehensive	22 Programs (73%)	7 Programs (23%)	1 Programs (4%)
3. Efficiently collected/ Easily accessible	21 Programs (70%)	9 Programs (30%)	0 Programs (-)
4. Accurate/Verifiable	23 Programs (77%)	7 Programs (23%)	0 Programs (-)
5. Timely Reporting	22 Programs (73%)	7 Programs (23%)	1 Programs (4%)
6. Clear/Transparent	21 Programs (70%)	9 Programs (30%)	0 Programs (-)
	<b>Accurate</b>	<b>Not Accurate</b>	<b>Not Assessable</b>
Accuracy of TLS	25 Programs (81%)	0 Programs (-)	6 Programs (19%)

36. For each criterion, table A above, shows the number and percentage of Programs that sufficiently, partially or did not meet the criterion. For instance, PD provided by 27 Programs (90 per cent) were relevant and valuable; three Programs provided PD that were partially relevant and valuable; and there were no cases where PD were not relevant and valuable.

37. The table also summarizes the number of Programs that have accurately self-assessed the achievement of their PIs against set targets through the TLS. A more detailed analysis of the TLS over the last three biennia follows below.



38. The above figure shows the evolution of the accuracy of the TLS over the last three biennia. The TLS provides five options: fully achieved, partially achieved, not achieved, not assessable<sup>5</sup>, and discontinued. The validation assessed the accuracy of the reported status of the performance indicator based on PD provided.

39. The results show that no Program inaccurately reported their TLS for the 2014/15 biennium, compared to the previous period where there were two cases. Further, the number of non-assessable TLS decreased from eight in the 2012/13 PPR to six in this reporting period.


<sup>5</sup> **Not Assessable** is applied when assessment of the performance is not feasible due to target data not having been adequately defined, when a baseline is not available or when the performance data is insufficient to determine the TLS.

TLS were non-assessable because PD were either not relevant, or not sufficient to make an assessment, or no targets were set against which to measure the PD.

(C) VALIDATION OBSERVATIONS BY CRITERIA

(i) Relevant/valuable

40. This criterion aims to identify relevance and value of the information used for reporting on PIs and ER, and overall program delivery, in particular for the purpose of measuring meaningful progress and intended success. It also assesses whether the quantification and reporting of PD includes information that covers all significant aspects of performance expressed in the PIs.




41. For the PIs sampled, 90 per cent of all Programs (27) provided PD sufficiently meeting this criterion. Three Programs partially met and none failed to meet the criterion.

42. **Examples of good practices found:** Programs 1, 4, 5, 10, 17, 19, 24 and 31 could be cited as programs that provided relevant and valuable PD and information used for effectively reporting; enabling a sound assessment of the data quality with clear linkages between PI and ER.

(ii) Sufficient/comprehensive

43. This criterion assesses the sufficiency and comprehensiveness of PD used to measure progress made against the PI, and whether the PD included all the information available to make that assessment.




44. Overall, 73 per cent of Programs (22) provided PD that was sufficient and comprehensive enough to enable an effective measurement of the selected PIs against the ERs. PD provided by 23 per cent of Programs (seven) was partial, and PD from one Program did not meet the criterion.

45. **Examples of good practices found:** Programs 10 and 18 could be cited as good examples when assessing this criterion. Their records of activities were comprehensive and sufficient for measuring progress against the PIs based on factual evidence.

(iii) Efficiently collected/easily accessible

46. This criterion assesses whether PD is efficiently collected and easily accessible, and whether appropriate systems exist to record, analyze, and report on the PD.




47. While 70 per cent of programs (21) have sufficiently met this criterion by putting in place systems to collect, analyze and report data in an effective and efficient manner, PD submitted by 30 per cent of Programs (nine) partially met the criterion.

**48. Examples of good practices found:** Programs 4, 5, 7, 15 and 24 have put in place systems to effectively and efficiently record, gather and analyze the PD.

(iv) Accurate/verifiable

49. The criterion assesses whether PD has clear supporting documentation, so that processes which produce the performance measures can be accurately validated.

50. PD and related information provided by 77 per cent of Programs (23) were accurate and verifiable through documentation, which in some cases, were also made available on WIPO's internal and external web sites. On the other hand, 23 per cent of Programs (seven) provided PD that was partially verifiable or accurate to report against the PI.




**51. Examples of good practices found:** Programs 3, 5, 7, 11, 15, 24 and 31 could be cited as good examples as PD was accurate, verifiable and used for reporting.

(v) Timely reporting

52. This criterion verifies whether data is regularly produced to track progress and timely report on the PD.

53. Timely reporting of PD and related information was noted in 73 per cent of Programs (22), which provided a basis to track their performance regularly against PIs. In 23 per cent of Programs (seven), timely reporting of PD and related information was not fully adequate to help track progress made against performance indicators, and in one case, the PD failed to meet the criteria.




**54. Examples of good practices found:** Programs 15, 17 and 24 were good examples of how timely reporting of PD can become useful if used for management and decision making purposes.

(vi) Clear/transparent

55. This criterion assesses whether PD enables users to understand and make decisions with reasonable confidence. Transparency relates to the degree information is seen as being reported in an open, clear, factual, neutral and coherent manner, based on documentary evidence.

56. While in 70 per cent of cases (20), the PD was clear and transparent, 30 per cent of Programs (nine) provided partially clear and transparent PD.




57. **Examples of good practices found:** PD was reported on the PPR in a clear and transparent manner and in some cases, information was publicly available on the Internet. Good examples of clear and transparent reporting were found in Programs 5, 7, 10, 11 and 15.

(vii) Accuracy of the Traffic Light System

58. An assessment of the accuracy of the TLS was made on the basis of whether the self-assessment ratings could be justified on the basis of information presented to support the PD used to report on the PI.

59. In 81 per cent of the cases (25 Programs), the self-reporting of the TLS was accurate. In 19 per cent of cases (six Programs), it was not possible to make an assessment of accuracy of the reported TLS mainly due to lack of relevant and complete data to support such an assessment, or the absence of a target against which to measure the PI. There were no cases where the TLS was found to be inaccurately reported.




**5. OVERVIEW OF THE PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK**

60. The quality of the PI, baseline and target is correlated to the quality and relevance of the PD provided and the primary reason why the PD may not address the PI is because the PI is not SMART<sup>6</sup>. The PIs are the main drivers by which Programs measure their contribution towards achieving ERs.

<sup>6</sup> SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound.



61. An overview of PIs for the last three biennia (2010/11, 2012/13 and 2014/15) shows that PIs have been streamlined and refined, with the number of indicators decreasing from 293 in 2010/11 to 286 in 2012/13 biennium, and further decreased to 269 in the 2014/15 biennium (Figure 5 below).



#### QUALITY OF PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

62. The survey of Program Managers, alternates, and staff responsible to report on performance indicates that some Programs consider that a majority of their PIs are output oriented. For instance, 35 per cent of respondents indicated that at least 80 per cent of their PIs were output oriented; 32 per cent indicated that around half of their indicators were outcome oriented; and 23 per cent indicated that between a quarter to a third of their indicators were input oriented.

63. While a full review of all PIs was not conducted to confirm or not this perception, it nevertheless draws attention to the need to continuously:

- (a) Ensure that Programs have a clear understanding of RBM precepts, including the difference between output and outcome indicators; and
- (b) Enhance the quality of PIs within the results framework.

64. Whereas output indicators are useful to steer program activities and are used to track immediate effects/results of these activities, they only partly contribute towards gathering the relevant information required to assess progress towards achieving ERs. Hence, continuing to develop outcome indicators would help measure medium-term results generated by outputs from Programs' activities, and provide more direct evidence to assess contribution towards the achievement of ERs.

65. Also, PIs are in many cases, part of a cluster of indicators used to assess achievement of a given ER. However, WIPO's current Results Framework does not report on combined performance of PIs to measure progress *vis-a-vis* the related ERs.

66. Finally, the survey results also show that just less than one third of respondents (30 per cent) reported to have identified between one and two PIs that are not well defined or are not relevant for their program activities. Some Programs have worked with PPBD to take appropriate measures so that PIs are better aligned/refined with ERs in the 2016/17 P&B.

#### TARGETS AND BASELINES

67. While acknowledging the improvement made to setting targets and collecting baseline data over the last three biennia, more can be done to further enhance this process. IOD noted instances where the initial baselines established in the P&B were marked "to be decided", and remained unchanged in the ensuing PPR throughout the biennium.

68. This could suggest that Programs had not identified/ developed tools/process to gather, analyze and report on relevant PD at the time when PIs were established, nor at the time when the PIs were reported in the PPR. Setting SMART indicators also requires developing an efficient and effective process/tool to capture data for baselines, which would subsequently serve to set relevant and suitable targets against which to measure the PI.
69. Some additional observations on targets are made below:
- (a) Some targets are written in “binary” (yes/no) leading to situations where the actual performance of the Program is not reflected in the TLS. For example, measuring progress is challenging with binary targets since it does not cater for a “partially achieved” status of the TLS;
  - (b) Some targets are defined for only a sub-set of activities that were envisaged under the PI, leading to lack of reporting of data for other activities undertaken by Programs; and
  - (c) Some targets are vaguely worded without a specific quantitative threshold (such as “increase over the baseline” rather than “increase of 10 per cent over the baseline).
70. Having “binary” targets and setting targets without specific thresholds can be justified in some instances; however, these cases should be few in numbers, and emphasis should be placed on ensuring that targets are specific, clear and measurable to the extent possible.
71. Lack of clarity in establishing targets and baselines can lead to ambiguity in understanding the benchmarks against which performance is measured; hence impeded appropriate measurement of PIs.

#### SUMMARY SURVEY RESULTS

72. Some of the positive feedback received through the survey were:
- (a) Thirty-two respondents (97 per cent) indicated that they had been directly involved in developing the Program’s ER/ PI/ targets and baselines.
  - (b) Further, 30 respondents (91 per cent) felt that their objectives, ERs and PIs were appropriate and relevant to the Organization’s objectives; and
  - (c) Thirty-one respondents (94 per cent) indicated that the PD was useful both as a means of accountability to Member States, and for regular monitoring of program implementation.
73. The survey results also highlighted views of respondents on areas for improvements as follows:
- (a) Eighteen respondents (55 per cent) reported not being part of an internal review for planning the 2016/17 Biennium, in order to assess monitoring systems/ tools, to ensure that PD for PIs are effectively and efficiently collected, analyzed and reported;
  - (b) Twelve respondents (36 per cent) felt that there were no useful tools available to gather monitoring information and 16 (48 per cent) reported that the collection of user feedback through surveys aimed at assessing the quality of their services is not centrally coordinated; and
  - (c) Finally, four out of ten new managers (40 per cent) who participated in the survey reported not being adequately briefed on the status of program performance measures during the handover process. A recommendation to address this issue was made in IOD’s 2012/13 PPR Validation Report.

## **6. PPR VALIDATION CONCLUSIONS**

74. Overall the validation exercise reaffirmed continuous improvements in Results Framework and performance management at WIPO. More performance data have met the assessment criteria, and the traffic light system used to record achievement has improved compared to the last validation exercise. This report includes areas where opportunities exist to further fine-tune and enhance processes and practices that would serve to enrich the results framework of the Organization. The following observations would help achieve this goal.

### **(A) ENHANCING PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND THE RESULTS FRAMEWORK**

75. The current work on developing meaningful PIs that are more outcomes oriented including baselines and targets should continue in order to ensure that performance results can be measured against relevant targets, to show progress.

76. The link between PIs and ERs can be further enhanced to show how the sum of performance results justifies progress towards, or achievement of ERs. Going forward, and given the current maturity of WIPO's results framework, the Organization would benefit from a quality/peer review of the framework that would take stock of achievements, and outline opportunities for further improvement.

### **(B) ENHANCING RBM KNOWLEDGE**

77. While there are various guidelines for Programs to use the available tools and systems for managing and reporting on their performance, knowledge of RBM can be enhanced across the Organization by sharing additional documentation that specifically addresses RBM principles.

78. The PPBD currently provides guidelines and other documentation on performance management and work planning in the EPM System; and will further compile and make available, additional resources on RBM principles and practices.

### **(C) DISCONTINUING PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**

79. PIs can be discontinued during the biennium as a result of organizational changes, modifications in business processes or external factors among others. In these cases, there is no PD available, and the TLS is set to "discontinued". While discontinuing PIs occur in rare instances, establishing formal criteria and procedure for discontinuing a PI would help further refine the performance management framework.

### **(D) MODIFYING PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**

80. Modifying a PI during the biennium can occur in rare instances where Programs are faced with monitoring and reporting on a PI that: lacks relevance, may not be efficiently measurable, or may not add value to the achievement of the related ER.

81. While acknowledging that these cases are exceptional, and such changes in PIs may impact the consistency of performance measures; nevertheless, establishing criteria for internal use by PPBD in assessing PI modification requests would enhance consistency and provide evidenced records to support and justify any decisions in that regard.

## **7. PPR VALIDATION RECOMMENDATIONS**

82. The following recommendations have been made based on:

- (a) The documentary evidence provided by the various WIPO programs;

- (b) Results of the survey conducted;
- (c) Result of the overview of the performance framework;
- (d) Consultation of previous IOD reports; and
- (e) Consultations undertaken with staff in charge of implementing the randomly selected PIs.

**Recommendation 1:** Further refine and streamline the number of indicators with no baselines or targets during the 2016 PPR exercise, in order to continuously enhance WIPO's results framework. *(For Program Managers)*


**Recommendation 2:** Establish formal criteria and procedures for discontinuing PIs within a biennium, in order to help further refine the performance management framework, and better support performance results. *(For DPPF)*

**Recommendation 3:** Develop internal procedures within PPBD to assess any requests made by Programs to modify PIs; this will provide a consistent methodology, as well as evidenced and transparent records to support and justify any decision made in this regard. *(For DPPF)*

**8. SUMMARY REPORT – PPR VALIDATION SURVEY**


**Question 1**

I have directly been involved in the development of my Program's work plan activities/ expected results (ERs) /performance indicators (PIs)/ targets and baselines.




**Question 2**

I have been provided training and coaching in the development of my Program's work plan activities/ expected results (ERs) /performance indicators (PIs)/ targets and baselines.




**Question 3**

Existing guidance on how to develop SMART performance indicators, and their linkages with expected results are adequate and useful (SMART: Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound).




**Question 4**

I have been provided useful technical assistance on monitoring and data collection tools to track progress on my Program's results framework, if and when required.




**Question 5**

My program activities, results, indicators, targets, and baselines are appropriate and relevant to what the Organization is aiming to achieve.




**Question 6**

My performance indicators, baselines and targets are valuable for the purposes of measuring meaningful progress and intended success.




**Question 7**

My individual work plan/ PMSDS is directly linked to my Program's expected results.




**Question 8.a**

My managers and I utilize performance data collected on the results and indicators on a regular basis for decision-making purposes within our sector/Program.




**Question 8.b**

My managers and I utilize performance data collected on the results and indicators on a regular basis to regularly monitor the implementation of our Program activities.




**Question 8.c**

My managers and I utilize performance data collected on the results and indicators on a regular basis for accountability to Member States.




**Question 9**

We have appropriate systems and tools to gather baseline information, record, monitor, and analyze performance data, and report.




**Question 10**

The time required to access information is proportional to its use (the gathered data can be easily accessed, and has been regularly used).




**Question 11**

The collection of user feedback through surveys aimed at assessing the quality of our services is centrally coordinated.




**Question 12**

The monitoring information and performance data for my performance indicators are available in a timely manner when required.




**Question 13**

We report on progress against the performance indicators and targets on a regular basis in Division/Program/Sector meetings.




**Question 14**

Was an internal review carried out as part of the planning cycle for the 2016/2017 Biennium, to assess monitoring systems/ tools, with a view to ensuring that performance data for your performance indicators are effectively and efficiently collected, analyzed and reported for program performance measurement?




**Question 15**

Has this produced some improvements?




**Question 16**

Have fewer and more meaningful and realistic indicators, targets and baselines been identified during this biennium to facilitate reporting to SMT?




**Question 17**

Have the assumptions and risks captured in your risk registers which could affect the achievement of results been recorded as part of the planning process for the 2016-2017 P&B?




**Question 18**

The selection of my indicators and data quality has improved since the last validation exercise.




**Question 19.a**

Indicate approximately what percentage of the performance indicators of your Program are output indicators.




**Question 19.b**

Indicate approximately what percentage of the performance indicators of your Program are outcome indicators.




**Question 19.c**

Indicate approximately what percentage of the performance indicators of your Program are input indicators.




**Question 20**

Have you identified any performance indicators that are not well defined or relevant to your Program activities?



**Question 21**

For new or transferred staff members – During the handover process, I was adequately briefed on the status of all program performance measures that I will own/manage in my new role.



## 9. FOLLOW UP ON STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS FROM PAST VALIDATION REPORTS

Fully implemented	
Partially implemented	
Not implemented	

Recommendations Contained in the Previous Validation Reports	Status at PPR 2014/15	Comments on status of implementation of recommendations
<b>[PPR 2012/13] Recommendation 1:</b> Implement a quality assurance process of the program performance framework during the 2014/15 biennium. This process will enable to take stock of progress made thus far and identify areas for further action with a view to improving the whole RBM process with outcome/impact oriented performance indicators that provide meaningful information to WIPO managers and to Member States.		The recommendation was considered as implemented as of May 2015. IOD indicated that it will perform an overview of the framework during the 2014/15 PPR validation.
<b>[PPR 2012/13] Recommendation 2:</b> Develop a procedure to ensure that the staff handover process amongst Programs includes adequate briefing and status update on all the program performance measures to be owned or managed by the incumbents.		This recommendation is still to be addressed. IOD's survey on the 2014/15 PPR and the results framework show that four out of a total of ten new managers (40 per cent) reported not being adequately briefed on the status of all program performance measures during the handover process.
<b>[PPR 2012/13] Recommendation 3:</b> Enhance Monitoring systems/ tools to ensure that PD are effectively and efficiently collected, analyzed and reported for program performance measurement. In this regard, well targeted coaching sessions with programs can be organized throughout the biennium as part of regular guidance activities.		The recommendation was considered implemented as of May 2015.
<b>[PPR 2012/13] Recommendation 4:</b> Develop a standard survey to capture Member States' feedback, to measure cross-cutting PIs. This will avoid duplicates, improve quality and relevance, and increase participation.		The recommendation was considered implemented as of March 2016.
<b>[PPR 2012/13] Recommendation 5:</b> Enhance the presentation of the approved budget and transfers by Program in the P&B, in order to improve transparency by providing information on funds transferred into and out of Programs during the biennium.		This recommendation is still to be addressed

### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

*IOD wishes to thank all relevant members of staff for their assistance, cooperation and interest during this assignment.*

Prepared by: Alain Garba, Sashidhar Boriah, and Patricia Vidal Hurtado

Reviewed and Approved by: Tuncay Efendioglu



**TABLE OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

Recommendation #	Priority	Responsible unit/manager	Deadline for implementation	Management comment and action plan
<p><b>Recommendation 1:</b> Further refine and streamline the number of indicators with no baselines or targets during the 2016 PPR exercise, in order to continuously enhance WIPO's results framework. <i>(For Program Managers)</i></p>	Medium	Program Managers	Mid-2017 (for the biennium 2016/17)	<p>PPBD will ensure that this recommendation is addressed during the baseline update exercise conducted mid-2016.</p> <p>A validation to be conducted of the PPR 2016 will form the basis of closing this recommendation. Progress will be assessed by comparing the PPR 2016 with the PPR 2014/15.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 2:</b> Establish formal criteria and procedures for discontinuing performance indicators within a biennium, in order to help further refine the performance management framework, and better support performance results. <i>(For DPPF)</i></p>	High	Director PPBD	End 2016	
<p><b>Recommendation 3:</b> Develop internal procedures within PPBD to assess any requests made by Programs to modify PIs; this will provide a consistent methodology, as well as evidenced and transparent records to support and justify any decision made in this regard. <i>(For DPPF)</i></p>	Medium	Director PPBD	End 2016	

[Annexes follow]

## ANNEX I - DEFINITION OF VALIDATION CRITERIA

In order to facilitate the validation process the validation team applied an adapted version of the “Good practice criteria for data systems” defined by the United Kingdom (UK) National Audit Office<sup>3</sup>. The PD and information used for reporting on program delivery should be:

**Relevant and valuable** to what the organization is aiming to achieve according to performance measures. The quantification and reporting shall include information that covers all significant aspects of performance expressed in the ER and performance indicators. Data collection methods, criteria and assumptions shall not be misleading. Data and assumptions that do not have an impact on the validation opinion shall not be included.

**Sufficient/comprehensive** to reveal the extent of progress made against the performance measure. PD shall include all the information that was available to make a comprehensive assessment to report against the performance measures.

**Efficiently collected/easily accessible** - Appropriate systems shall be in place to record, access, report and analyze the data required to report against the performance measures.

**Accurate and verifiable** enough for its intended use, and responsive to change with clear documentation behind it, so that the processes which produce the measure can be validated. The principle of accuracy requires reduction in bias and uncertainty as far as is practical. Accuracy and verifiability with reference to the validation is required at two levels: (1) the first relates to the accuracy and written/documented i.e. physical evidence of quantitative data and information; and (2) the second relates to accuracy and written/documented i.e. physical evidence of non-quantitative information.

**Timely**, producing information regularly enough to track progress, and quickly enough for the information to still be useful.

**Clear and transparent** is to disclose information to allow intended users to understand and to make decisions with reasonable confidence. Transparency relates to the degree to which information is seen to as being reported in an open, clear, factual, neutral and coherent manner based on documentary evidence. Information shall be recorded, compiled and analyzed in a way that will enable internal reviewers and external intended users to attest its credibility. Transparency requires, *inter alia*:

- (a) Clearly and explicitly stating and documenting all assumptions;
- (b) Clearly referencing background material;
- (c) Stating all calculations, methodologies and all information used;
- (d) Clearly identifying all changes in documentation;
- (e) Compiling and documenting information in a manner that enables independent validation;
- (f) Documenting the explanation and/or justification (e.g. choice of procedures, methodologies, parameters, information sources, key factors, sampling criteria);
- (g) Documenting the justification of selected criteria;
- (h) Documenting assumptions, references and methods such that another party can reproduce reported information; and
- (i) Documenting any external factors to the project that may affect the decisions of intended users.

A further criterion to assess reporting of performance measures includes:

**Accuracy of the Traffic Light System** - The TLS has a separate function and is not strictly part of the PD. An assessment of accuracy was made on the basis of whether the ratings could be justified on the basis of information presented in the PD reported as part of the PPR 2014/2015.

[Annex II follows]

## ANNEX II - RANDOM SAMPLING MEETINGS

Random sampling of one performance indicator per program was conducted by the WIPO Senior Management Team (SMT) Members or their alternates in the presence of IOD staff.

<b>Date</b>	<b>Program Participant</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Program(s)</b>
March 29, 2016	Mr. Matus	Deputy Director General, Development Sector	(a) Program 8 – Development Agenda Coordination (b) Program 9 – Africa, Arab, Asia and the Pacific, Latin America and the Caribbean Countries, Least Developed Countries (c) Program 11 – The WIPO Academy
March 29, 2016	Ms. Wang	Deputy Director General, Brands and Designs Sector	(a) Program 2 – Trademarks, Industrial Designs and Geographical Indications (b) Program 6 – Madrid and Lisbon Systems (c) Program 31 – The Hague System
March 30, 2016	Mr. Sandage	Deputy Director General, Patents and Technology Sector	(a) Program 1 – Patent Law (b) Program 5 – The PCT System (c) Program 7 – WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center
March 31, 2016	Mr. Getahun	Assistant Director General, Global Issues Sector	(a) Program 4 – Traditional Knowledge, Traditional Cultural Expressions and Genetic Resources (b) Program 17 – Building respect for IP (c) Program 18 – IP and Global Challenges
March 31, 2016	Mr. Tarpey	Director, Communications Division	(a) Program 19 – Communications
April 1, 2016	Mr. Takagi	Assistant Director General, Global Infrastructure Sector	(a) Program 12 – International Classifications and Standards (b) Program 13 – Global Databases (c) Program 14 – Services for Access to Information and Knowledge (d) Program 15 – Business Solutions for IP Offices
April 1, 2016	Ms. Moussa	Director, Human Resources Management Department	(a) Program 23 – Human Resources Management and Development
April 1, 2016	Mr. Fink	Chief Economist, Economics and Statistics Division	(a) Program 16 – Economics and Statistics















Date	Program Participant	Title	Program(s)
April 4, 2016	Mr. Sundaram	Assistant Director General, Administration and Management Sector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Program 22 – Program and Resource Management</li> <li>(b) Program 24 – General Support Services</li> <li>(c) Program 25 – Information and Communication Technology</li> <li>(d) Program 27 – Conference and Language Services</li> <li>(e) Program 28 – Safety And Security</li> <li>(f) Program 29 – New Conference Hall</li> </ul>
April 4, 2016	Mr. Svantner	Director, Department for Transition and Developed Countries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Program 10 – Cooperation with Certain Countries in Europe and Asia</li> <li>(b) Program 30 – Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises (SMEs) and Innovation</li> </ul>
April 6, 2016	Ms. Woods	Director, Copyright Law Division	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Program 3 – Copyright and Related Rights</li> </ul>
April 19, 2016	Mr. Prasad	Assistant Director General and Chief of Staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Program 21 – Executive Management</li> <li>(b) Program 20 – External Relations, Partnerships and External Offices</li> </ul>

[Annex III follows]

## ANNEX III - VALIDATION ASSESSMENTS INCLUDING RATING
















### Program 1 – Patent Law

**Performance Indicator (PI):** No. and % of Member States which were satisfied with the quality of legal advice related to patents, utility models, trade secrets and integrated circuits.

<b>1. Assessment of Performance Data (PD)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	Sufficiently meets criteria		
			
		Does not meet the criteria	
	<i>Criteria for PD</i>		<i>Comments/data limitations</i>
1.a.	Relevant/valuable		The PD is relevant and valuable because it seeks to gauge Member States satisfaction of the quality of legal advice provided by the Program.
1.b.	Sufficient/comprehensive		The PD is sufficient and comprehensive and is obtained through surveys conducted throughout 2014 and 2015.
1.c.	Efficiently collected/ easily accessible		The method for collecting the PD should be improved to ensure consistency and coherence.
1.d.	Accurate/verifiable		The PD is accurate and can be verified against the individual surveys filled by participants.
1.e.	Timely reporting		The PD is timely reported and the surveys are reviewed and discussed in management meetings.
1.f.	Clear/transparent		Clarity and transparency should be improved by developing an efficient and consistent method for analyzing the data.
1.g.	<b>Conclusion on PD</b>		<b>Based on the assessment of information provided, it can be concluded that the performance data sufficiently meets the criteria.</b>
<b>2. Assessment of Accuracy of the Traffic Light System (TLS)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	TLS Accurate		
			
		TLS Not Assessable	
2.a.	Accuracy of TLS		Based on the performance data provided for the selected PI, the self-assessment rating reported as “fully achieved” is accurate.
2.b.	Program Comments		No comment.















## Program 2 – Trademarks, Industrial Designs and Geographical Indications

**Performance Indicator (PI):** Agreement on a normative framework for industrial design registration and maintenance procedures

<b>1. Assessment of Performance Data (PD)</b>		
<b>Rating:</b>		
	Sufficiently meets criteria	
		
		Does not meet the criteria
	<i>Criteria for PD</i>	<i>Comments/data limitations</i>
1.a.	Relevant/valuable	 The PD conveys the decision of the WIPO General Assembly in 2015 to convene a Diplomatic Conference in the first half of 2107, subject to completion of certain discussions in the SCT sessions. This is relevant and valuable as it provides information that is directly related to the target measure defined for the PI.
1.b.	Sufficient/comprehensive	 The PD captures the decision of the forty-seventh session of WIPO General Assembly vis-à-vis the convening of a Diplomatic Conference for the adoption of a design law treaty. Progress made on the WIPO General Assembly session held in 2014 was reported in the PPR 2014.
1.c.	Efficiently collected/ easily accessible	 The PD is directly linked to decisions of the WIPO General Assembly and is thus both efficiently collected and easily accessed through public reports of the General Assembly. (Refer page 23 - <a href="http://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/govbody/en/wo_ga_47/wo_ga_47_19.pdf">http://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/govbody/en/wo_ga_47/wo_ga_47_19.pdf</a> )
1.d.	Accurate/verifiable	 The PD is accurate and verifiable through WIPO General Assembly reports available publicly. (link as above)
1.e.	Timely reporting	 The PD is reported timely through public reports of the WIPO General Assembly.
1.f.	Clear/transparent	 The PD provides the decision of the WIPO General Assembly as it relates to the PI, this information is also made available publicly through reports of the WIPO General Assembly.
1.g.	<b>Conclusion on PD</b>	 <b>Based on the assessment of information provided, it can be concluded that the performance data sufficiently meets the criteria.</b>
<b>2. Assessment of Accuracy of the Traffic Light System (TLS)</b>		
<b>Rating:</b>		
	TLS Accurate	
		
		TLS Not Assessable
2.a.	Accuracy of TLS	 Based on the performance data provided for the selected PI, the self-assessment rating reported as "Not Achieved" is accurate.
2.b.	Program Comments	 No comment.















### Program 3 – Copyright and Related Rights

**Performance Indicator (PI):** No. of governments and Collective Management Organization (CMOs) signing an agreement with WIPO to develop a new transparency, accountability and governance quality assurance standard

<b>1. Assessment of Performance Data (PD)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	Sufficiently meets criteria		Partially meets criteria
			Does not meet the criteria
	<i>Criteria for PD</i>		<i>Comments/data limitations</i>
1.a.	Relevant/valuable		The PD is relevant for the PI (number of governments and CMOs signing an agreement on TAG quality assurance standard) since it provides information on the status of agreements by both national governments and CMOs.
1.b.	Sufficient/comprehensive		The PD is sufficient to assess progress of the PI and provides additional information on new national governments, CMOs and other organizations that have indicated expression of interests regarding the TAG quality assurance standard.
1.c.	Efficiently collected/ easily accessible		The PD is efficiently collected through a direct communication with the relevant stakeholders and/or at the occasion of multi-stakeholder events. The PD is accessible through formal reporting documents
1.d.	Accurate/verifiable		The PD is accurate and reported in a manner that allows clear analysis and verification.
1.e.	Timely reporting		The PD provides updates on the increase in the number of agreements with the TAG quality assurance standard at each performance report. Internally it is reported regularly as the agreements are signed.
1.f.	Clear/transparent		The PD provides clear information directly linked to support the PI. Information is available for internal staff relevant with regard to the subject matter.
1.g.	<b>Conclusion on PD</b>		<b>Based on the assessment of information provided, it can be concluded that the performance data sufficiently meets the criteria.</b>
<b>2. Assessment of Accuracy of the Traffic Light System (TLS)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	TLS Accurate		TLS Not Accurate
			TLS Not Assessable
2.a.	Accuracy of TLS		Based on the performance data provided for the selected PI, self-assessment rating reported as “fully achieved” is accurate.
2.b.	Program Comments		No Comment.

## Program 4 – Traditional Knowledge (TK), Traditional Cultural Expressions (TCEs) and Genetic Resources (GRs)















**Performance Indicator (PI):** % of participants in WIPO activities who report enhanced capacity to understand and use IP principles, systems and tools for the protection of TK and TCEs, and for management of the interface between IP and GRs.

<b>1. Assessment of Performance Data (PD)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	Sufficiently meets criteria		Partially meets criteria
			Does not meet the criteria
	<i>Criteria for PD</i>		<i>Comments/data limitations</i>
1.a.	Relevant/valuable		The PD provided is relevant to inform on what WIPO seeks as expected result. The PD is valuable as the main two items of the performance indicator are directly measured by beneficiaries through a survey question and thus allows a sound assessment of the performance measurement.
1.b.	Sufficient/comprehensive		The nature of the PD allows the measurement of progress towards the performance measure when the survey question incorporates the two components of the PI. Yet, in some cases the survey question is only enquiring on one aspect of the PI and thus the PI is covered partially.
1.c.	Efficiently collected/ easily accessible		The tool used to record on the PI is inherited in the regular practice of monitoring activities that are relevant to the subject matter and thus enables an easy analysis and reporting on the performance measure.
1.d.	Accurate/verifiable		The PD is collected and organized in a manner that allows clear analysis and verification.
1.e.	Timely reporting		The PD is collected after each activity and thus allows participants to provide relevant information of the subject matter, which thus enables using the feedback to reorient activities.
1.f.	Clear/transparent		The PD is organized in a clear and transparent manner and allows internal reviewers to assess it.
1.g.	<b>Conclusion on PD</b>		<b>Based on the assessment of information provided, it can be concluded that the performance data sufficiently meets the criteria.</b>
<b>2. Assessment of Accuracy of the Traffic Light System (TLS)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	TLS Accurate		TLS Not Accurate
			TLS Not Assessable
2.a.	Accuracy of TLS		Based on the performance data provided for the selected PI, self-assessment rating reported as “fully achieved” is accurate.
2.b.	Program Comments		In some cases, based on requests received, individual activities may not each necessarily address all three themes of the Program’s work, namely GRs, TK and TCEs. This means that the information gathered by the surveys may not be fully comprehensive in covering the PI, only in the sense that a survey for a particular activity may not provide feedback on one or more themes not covered in that activity.


















## Program 5 – The PCT System

**Performance Indicator (PI):** Level of satisfaction of Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) users with user-focused information and training services.

<b>1. Assessment of Performance Data (PD)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	Sufficiently meets criteria		Partially meets criteria
	Does not meet the criteria		
	<i>Criteria for PD</i>		<i>Comments/data limitations</i>
1.a.	Relevant/valuable		The PD is in the form of a survey administered to users of the PCT system, with a view to gauging their satisfaction with the training and information provided by the PCT. The PD is relevant to support the PI as it provides data to measure perception of users of the PCT. It is valuable to help determine the achievement of the PI and ultimately the related Expected Result.
1.b.	Sufficient/comprehensive		The PD is sufficient and comprehensive and is the result of a survey to gauge the evolution of user satisfaction over the last 6 years.
1.c.	Efficiently collected/ easily accessible		The PD is collected through a survey and can be easily accessible for verification. A survey report and spreadsheet has been developed to capture relevant survey results and comments.
1.d.	Accurate/verifiable		The PD was accurately recorded and was verified through reconciling the survey report, the spreadsheet of the results and the reported data for the PPR.
1.e.	Timely reporting		The PD is timely reported and a summary is made available to the PCT Working Group.
1.f.	Clear/transparent		The PD is clear and transparent and available to compare with the survey report. the Report to the PCT working Group is available on the Public Website: <a href="http://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/pct/en/pct_wg_9/pct_wg_9_11.pdf">http://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/pct/en/pct_wg_9/pct_wg_9_11.pdf</a>
1.g.	<b>Conclusion on PD</b>		<b>Based on the assessment of information provided, it can be concluded that the performance data sufficiently meets the criteria.</b>
<b>2. Assessment of Accuracy of the Traffic Light System (TLS)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	TLS Accurate		TLS Not Accurate
	TLS Not Assessable		
2.a.	Accuracy of TLS		Based on the performance data provided for the selected PI, the self-assessment rating reported as “fully achieved” is accurate.
2.b.	Program Comments		















## Program 6 – Madrid and Lisbon Systems

**Performance Indicator (PI):** Refinement of the electronic International Register of the Lisbon System.

<b>1. Assessment of Performance Data (PD)</b>		
<b>Rating:</b>		
	Sufficiently meets criteria	
		
		Does not meet the criteria
	<i>Criteria for PD</i>	<i>Comments/data limitations</i>
1.a.	Relevant/valuable	 The PD is relevant and valuable to what the Program is seeking to achieve as it indicates whether the target of implementing an electronic interface that links the International Register and Lisbon Express database on the WIPO website was achieved.
1.b.	Sufficient/comprehensive	 The PD is sufficient and comprehensive to show that the target of the PI was achieved
1.c.	Efficiently collected/ easily accessible	 The PD is efficiently collected and easily accessible on the WIPO website. <a href="http://www.wipo.int/lisbon/en/">http://www.wipo.int/lisbon/en/</a>
1.d.	Accurate/verifiable	 The PD is accurate and verifiable on the WIPO website. <a href="http://www.wipo.int/ipdl/en/search/lisbon/search-struct.jsp">http://www.wipo.int/ipdl/en/search/lisbon/search-struct.jsp</a>
1.e.	Timely reporting	 The PD is reported timely and the progress was monitored during the implementation.
1.f.	Clear/transparent	 The PD is clear and transparent , and can be verified on the WIPO website
1.g.	<b>Conclusion on PD</b>	 <b>Based on the assessment of information provided, it can be concluded that the performance data sufficiently meets the criteria.</b>
<b>2. Assessment of Accuracy of the Traffic Light System (TLS)</b>		
<b>Rating:</b>		
	TLS Accurate	
		
		TLS Not Assessable
2.a.	Accuracy of TLS	 Based on the performance data provided for the selected PI, the self-assessment rating reported as "fully achieved" is accurate.
2.b.	Program Comments	 No comment.















## Program 7 – Arbitration, Mediation and Domain Names

**Performance Indicator (PI):** No. of country code top-level domains (ccTLD) administrators with WIPO assisted design or administration of intellectual property protection mechanisms in accordance with international standards.

<b>1. Assessment of Performance Data (PD)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	Sufficiently meets criteria		Partially meets criteria
	Does not meet the criteria		
	<i>Criteria for PD</i>		<i>Comments/data limitations</i>
1.a.	Relevant/valuable		The PD is relevant and valuable to the extent it provides a direct measure of the number of new ccTLD administrators with WIPO administered intellectual property mechanisms against the targeted number.  Although the PI also includes WIPO assisted design of intellectual property dispute resolution mechanisms, this is not clearly reflected in the defined performance target, which focuses on “new administrators”. Hence, the performance data does not reflect the work done by the Center on design, updates and maintenance aspects of ccTLD related intellectual property mechanisms. As part of the PPR validation exercise, IOD was provided with extensive evidence of such policy related assistance provided to ccTLD administrators by the Center.
1.b.	Sufficient/comprehensive		The PD is sufficient and comprehensive as it provides all information necessary to show the progress made against the targeted performance measure.
1.c.	Efficiently collected/easily accessible		The PD is efficiently collected and easily accessible from records of communication with ccTLD administrators.
1.d.	Accurate/verifiable		The PD is accurately reported and verifiable, <i>inter alia</i> , with correspondence and/or agreements between ccTLD administrators and WIPO. Furthermore, information concerning dispute providers for ccTLDs is available on the WIPO ccTLD Database, which is accessible by the general public. ( <a href="http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/domains/cctld/">http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/domains/cctld/</a> )
1.e.	Timely reporting		The PD is reported timely and can be regularly tracked through, <i>inter alia</i> , correspondence and/or agreements with ccTLD administrators as well as the WIPO ccTLD Database.
1.f.	Clear/transparent		The PD is clear and transparent as it allows users to understand the progress made against the target.
1.g.	<b>Conclusion on PD</b>		<b>Based on the assessment of information provided, it can be concluded that the performance data sufficiently meets the criteria.</b>
<b>2. Assessment of Accuracy of the Traffic Light System (TLS)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	TLS Accurate		TLS Not Accurate
	TLS Not Assessable		
2.a.	Accuracy of TLS		Based on the performance data provided for the selected PI, the self-assessment rating reported as “Partially Achieved” is accurate.
2.b.	Program Comments		Based on the ccTLD-related expected results to be covered by the performance data, and as suggested by our IOD colleagues, we recognize the need for updating the wording of the defined performance target (and related performance indicator and baseline), in order to more accurately reflect the broader scope of (policy) activities undertaken towards the expected results. (Similar considerations may apply to the ‘policies’ related performance indicator under II.8.) We would be happy to make concrete suggestions to achieve such more appropriate reporting in future. Thank you.














## Program 8 – Development Agenda Coordination

**Performance Indicator (PI):** % of participants in WIPO meetings (Member States, IGOs, civil society and other stakeholders) satisfied with information received on the Development Agenda (DA) recommendations.

<b>1. Assessment of Performance Data (PD)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	Sufficiently meets criteria		Partially meets criteria
			Does not meet the criteria
	<i>Criteria for PD</i>		<i>Comments/data limitations</i>
1.a.	Relevant/valuable		The PD is partly relevant and valuable because it does not fully address the PI. Furthermore, the PI which is meant to gauge Member States, Inter-governmental organizations (IGOs), civil society, and other stakeholders' satisfaction on information received on DA recommendations, is relatively broad and would require the establishment of an efficient feedback mechanism to address the whole population of stakeholders.
1.b.	Sufficient/comprehensive		The PD is partially sufficient and comprehensive because it does not fully address the PI, and the population against which the data was calculated did not include all the stakeholders defined in the PI.
1.c.	Efficiently collected/easily accessible		Effective collection and accessibility to the performance data is limited by both the method used to collect the data and lack of completeness of data collected. This is due to the broadness of the PI and the challenge in establishing an effective method to gather feedback from all participants to the relevant meetings.
1.d.	Accurate/verifiable		Accuracy is partially verifiable since the PD provided is not complete.
1.e.	Timely reporting		The PD is not fully timely reported since the data is not complete and comprehensively collected for reporting purposes.
1.f.	Clear/transparent		Clarity and transparency is limited by the lack of completeness of data provided
1.g.	<b>Conclusion on PD</b>		<b>Based on the assessment of information provided, it can be concluded that the performance data partly meets the criteria.</b>
<b>2. Assessment of Accuracy of the Traffic Light System (TLS)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	TLS Accurate		TLS Not Accurate
			TLS Not Assessable
2.a.	Accuracy of TLS		Based on the performance data provided for the selected PI, the self-assessment rating reported as "fully achieved" cannot be assessed because both the PD and the population against which the data was compared were not complete. This is due to the broadness of the PI and the challenge in establishing an efficient method to collect feedback from stakeholders.
2.b.	Program Comments		
















**Program 9 – Africa, Arab, Asia and the Pacific, Latin America and the Caribbean Countries, Least Developed Countries**

**Performance Indicator (PI):** No. of new or strengthened cooperation mechanisms, programs or partnerships supported to promote/strengthen sub-regional or regional cooperation in IP.

<b>1. Assessment of Performance Data (PD)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	Sufficiently meets criteria		Partially meets criteria
			Does not meet the criteria
	<i>Criteria for PD</i>		<i>Comments/data limitations</i>
1.a.	Relevant/valuable		The PD is relevant and valuable because it provides data to address the different components of the PI.
1.b.	Sufficient/comprehensive		The PD is sufficient and comprehensive in addressing the PI.
1.c.	Efficiently collected/easily accessible		The method for collecting the PD should be better coordinated and improved, to ensure consistency and coherence.
1.d.	Accurate/verifiable		The absence of an effective method for collecting and reporting the PD made it difficult to verify in an efficient and timely manner.
1.e.	Timely reporting		The PD is not reported in a timely manner and coordination in collecting and reporting on the PI should be improved.
1.f.	Clear/transparent		Clarity and transparency of the PD and supporting documentation should be improved by developing an efficient and consistent method for collecting and reporting the PD.
1.g.	<b>Conclusion on PD</b>		<b>This indicator is addressed through separate PD provided by four Regional Bureaus and the Division for LDCs. Because the validation assesses PD per PI and per Program, the above assessment is made based on PD provided by each relevant unit within Program 9. Based on the assessment of information provided, it can be concluded that the overall performance data partially meets the criteria.</b>
<b>2. Assessment of Accuracy of the Traffic Light System (TLS)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	TLS Accurate		TLS Not Accurate
			TLS Not Assessable
2.a.	Accuracy of TLS		<p>Based on the performance data provided by each unit for the same randomly selected PI, the self-assessment rating reported as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Regional Bureau for Africa - "Fully Achieved"- <b>is accurate</b>;</li> <li>b) Regional Bureau for Arab Countries - "Fully Achieved"- <b>is accurate</b>;</li> <li>c) Regional Bureau for Asia Pacific - "Not Achieved"- <b>is accurate</b>, because the PD provided was not sufficient or relevant to address the PI;</li> <li>d) Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean - "Fully Achieved"- <b>is accurate</b>; and</li> <li>e) Division for Least Developed Countries - "Fully Achieved"- <b>is accurate</b></li> </ul> <p>Because the validation process assesses PD per PI and per Program, the overall assessment of the accuracy of the TLS is based on the consolidated result which would lead to the conclusion that the TLS can be accurately considered as "fully Achieved".</p>
2.b.	Program Comments		















**Program 10 – Cooperation with Certain Countries in Europe and Asia**

**Performance Indicator (PI):** No. of Universities having developed IP policies.

<b>1. Assessment of Performance Data (PD)</b>		
<b>Rating:</b>		
	Sufficiently meets criteria	 Partially meets criteria
		 Does not meet the criteria
	<i>Criteria for PD</i>	<i>Comments/data limitations</i>
1.a.	Relevant/valuable	 The PD is both relevant and valuable as it provides information on the significant aspects of the programs performance as expressed in the indicator. The PD provides valuable information to understand the higher number reported for universities in Poland.
1.b.	Sufficient/comprehensive	 The PD provides sufficient information to measure the progress made against the PI. The PD is also comprehensive as it provides all information, including extracts of relevant IP policies, laws and regulations.
1.c.	Efficiently collected/ easily accessible	 The PD is efficiently collected and easily accessible through records of correspondence with state IP authorities and reports of activities undertaken by the department.
1.d.	Accurate/verifiable	 The PD is accurate and verifiable based on information available in the form of correspondence, mission reports, policies, laws and regulations.
1.e.	Timely reporting	 The PD is reported regularly to track progress made.
1.f.	Clear/transparent	 The PD is clear and transparent as it discloses adequate information on the reasons for the relevant numbers that were reported. The supporting documentation provides factual information which can be easily understood by intended users.
1.g.	<b>Conclusion on PD</b>	 <b>Based on the assessment of information provided, it can be concluded that the performance data sufficiently meets the criteria.</b>
<b>2. Assessment of Accuracy of the Traffic Light System (TLS)</b>		
<b>Rating:</b>		
	TLS Accurate	 TLS Not Accurate
		 TLS Not Assessable
2.a.	Accuracy of TLS	 Based on the performance data provided for the selected PI, the self-assessment rating reported as “Fully Achieved” is accurate.
2.b.	Program Comments	 No Comment.















## Program 11 – The WIPO Academy

**Performance Indicator (PI):** Revised Portfolio of training courses on IP for developing countries, Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and CETs / Relevance of content of training courses to capacity building requirements of developing countries, LDCs and CETs.

<b>1. Assessment of Performance Data (PD)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	Sufficiently meets criteria		Partially meets criteria
	Does not meet the criteria		
	<i>Criteria for PD</i>		<i>Comments/data limitations</i>
1.a.	Relevant/valuable		The PD is relevant and valuable for the period under review, because it provides information on the revision and update of the WIPO Academy portfolio of courses, as well as whether the updates are aligned with training and capacity building needs of developing countries, LDCs, and CET.
1.b.	Sufficient/comprehensive		PD is comprehensive and organized in a manner to permit effective review. Information is available in the training database and documentation that supports the PI.
1.c.	Efficiently collected/ easily accessible		The PD is efficiently organized and collected and can be easily accessed. <a href="http://welc.wipo.int">http://welc.wipo.int</a>
1.d.	Accurate/verifiable		The PD is organized in a manner to verify its accuracy and measure the achievement of the PI.
1.e.	Timely reporting		The PD is effectively structured and presented in a manner to permit users to regularly track progress.
1.f.	Clear/transparent		The PD is recorded in a clear and transparent manner, supported by documentation.
1.g.	<b>Conclusion on PD</b>		<b>Based on the assessment of information provided, it can be concluded that the performance data sufficiently meets the criteria.</b>
<b>2. Assessment of Accuracy of the Traffic Light System (TLS)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	TLS Accurate		TLS Not Accurate
	TLS Not Assessable		
2.a.	Accuracy of TLS		Based on the performance data provided for the selected PI, the self-assessment rating reported as “fully achieved” is accurate.
2.b.	Program Comments		No comment.

## Program 12 – International Classifications and Standards
















Performance Indicator (PI): No. of amended and new standards adopted.

<b>1. Assessment of Performance Data (PD)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	Sufficiently meets criteria		
			
		Does not meet the criteria	
	<i>Criteria for PD</i>		<i>Comments/data limitations</i>
1.a.	Relevant/valuable		The PD is relevant and valuable as it provides the number of new standards and revisions to standards adopted as a measure against the performance indicator.
1.b.	Sufficient/comprehensive		The PD is sufficient and comprehensive as it provides all information necessary on new or revised standards to show the progress made against the performance indicator.
1.c.	Efficiently collected/ easily accessible		The PD is efficiently collected and easily accessible through records maintained which indicate the adoption or revision of standards.
1.d.	Accurate/verifiable		The PD is accurate and verifiable through records of adoption of new or revised standards. Furthermore, the information is available publicly through Part 3 of the <i>Handbook on Industrial Property Information and Documentation</i> which is available online. ( <a href="http://www.wipo.int/standards/en/part_03_standards.html">http://www.wipo.int/standards/en/part_03_standards.html</a> ).  Furthermore discussions of meetings of the Committee of WIPO Standards (CWS) are also available on the WIPO CWS web page ( <a href="http://www.wipo.int/cws/en/">http://www.wipo.int/cws/en/</a> ).
1.e.	Timely reporting		The PD is reported timely and is tracked regularly enough to provide a measure of the progress made against the PI.
1.f.	Clear/transparent		The PD is clear and transparent as it provides users enough information to understand the outcome of the work undertaken and for decision making purposes.
1.g.	<b>Conclusion on PD</b>		<b>Based on the assessment of information provided, it can be concluded that the performance data sufficiently meets the criteria.</b>
<b>2. Assessment of Accuracy of the Traffic Light System (TLS)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	TLS Accurate		
			
		TLS Not Assessable	
2.a.	Accuracy of TLS		Based on the performance data provided for the selected PI, the self-assessment rating reported as "Partially achieved" cannot be assessed as the performance target is not clearly defined. The target specifies an "increase compared to the baseline" without specifying how much this increase should be either in absolute or relative terms. Furthermore it is not clear whether the increase is cumulative from the baseline or should exceed the baseline.
2.b.	Program Comments		No Comment










**Program 13 – Global Databases**

**Performance Indicator (PI):** No. of records contained in Global Brand Databases.

<b>1. Assessment of Performance Data (PD)</b>		
<b>Rating:</b>		
	Sufficiently meets criteria	 Partially meets criteria  Does not meet the criteria
	<i>Criteria for PD</i>	<i>Comments/data limitations</i>
1.a.	Relevant/valuable	 The PD is relevant and valuable as it provides a quantitative measure of the number of records which is directly related to the target and baselines specified for the performance indicator.
1.b.	Sufficient/comprehensive	 The PD is sufficient and comprehensive as it shows the periodic progress made against the performance indicator.
1.c.	Efficiently collected/easily accessible	 The PD can be viewed in real-time through the Global Brand Database ( <a href="http://www.wipo.int/branddb/en/">http://www.wipo.int/branddb/en/</a> ). It is both easily accessible and efficiently collected.
1.d.	Accurate/verifiable	 The PD reported is accurate and verifiable from supporting records and can be verified directly through the Global Brand Database (link above).
1.e.	Timely reporting	 The PD has been tracked on a quarterly basis which shows the progress made and this frequency is useful to track progress.
1.f.	Clear/transparent	 The PD is clear and transparent as it provides break-down of the number of records into Madrid and non-Madrid which is useful for decision making purposes.
1.g.	<b>Conclusion on PD</b>	 <b>Based on the assessment of information provided, it can be concluded that the performance data sufficiently meets the criteria.</b>
<b>2. Assessment of Accuracy of the Traffic Light System (TLS)</b>		
<b>Rating:</b>		
	TLS Accurate	 TLS Not Accurate  TLS Not Assessable
2.a.	Accuracy of TLS	 Based on the performance data provided for the selected PI, the self-assessment rating reported as “Fully Achieved” is accurate.
2.b.	Program Comments	 No comment.
















**Program 14 – Services for Access to Information and Knowledge**

**Performance Indicator (PI):** % of users satisfied with the provision of value added patent information services (WPIS, ICE, patent family and legal status enquiry service)

<b>1. Assessment of Performance Data (PD)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	Sufficiently meets criteria		Partially meets criteria
	Does not meet the criteria		
	<i>Criteria for PD</i>		<i>Comments/data limitations</i>
1.a.	Relevant/valuable		The PD was not provided because the value added services were separated and transferred to different operational areas of the Organization in 2015, following a reorganization of patent information services. Furthermore, the Program indicated that no data was available in 2014 because of the challenges faced with developing an effective method to obtain feedback from third parties involved in providing the services. Consequently, an assessment of PD cannot be performed.
1.b.	Sufficient/comprehensive		
1.c.	Efficiently collected/ easily accessible		
1.d.	Accurate/verifiable		
1.e.	Timely reporting		
1.f.	Clear/transparent		
1.g.	<b>Conclusion on PD</b>		
<b>2. Assessment of Accuracy of the Traffic Light System (TLS)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	TLS Accurate		TLS Not Accurate
	TLS Not Assessable		
2.a.	Accuracy of TLS		The self-assessment rating reported as “discontinued” in the 2014/15 PPR is accurate.
2.b.	Program Comments		No Comment.















**Program 15 – Business solutions for IP Offices**

**Performance Indicator (PI):** No. of offices using WIPO infrastructure platforms

<b>1. Assessment of Performance Data (PD)</b>		
<b>Rating:</b>		
	Sufficiently meets criteria	
		
		Does not meet the criteria
	<i>Criteria for PD</i>	<i>Comments/data limitations</i>
1.a.	Relevant/valuable	 The PD provides the number of countries that use WIPO's infrastructure platforms such as WIPO DAS (Digital Access Service for transmission of priority documents) and WIPO CASE Central Access to Search and Examination dossier information). It is relevant in showing progress in terms of geographical coverage of users of the Platforms.
1.b.	Sufficient/comprehensive	 Participation letters from Countries' IP Offices were used to support the number of Countries using WIPO Infrastructure platforms. The PD is sufficient and comprehensive.
1.c.	Efficiently collected/ easily accessible	 The PD on the PI are recorded on a spreadsheet and regularly updated. Information to support the data on the shared drive. Furthermore, the list of participating Countries can be found on the WIPO internet sites: <a href="http://www.wipo.int/das/en/participating_offices.html">http://www.wipo.int/das/en/participating_offices.html</a> <a href="http://www.wipo.int/case/en/">http://www.wipo.int/case/en/</a>
1.d.	Accurate/verifiable	 The PD is based on verifiable documentation that supports the tables available on WIPO's public website.
1.e.	Timely reporting	 The PD is used for reporting and to monitor the use of WIPO infrastructure platforms.
1.f.	Clear/transparent	 The PD is recorded in a clear and transparent manner, supported by documentation, and available on WIPO's public website.
1.g.	<b>Conclusion on PD</b>	 <b>Based on the assessment of information provided, it can be concluded that the performance data sufficiently meets the criteria.</b>
<b>2. Assessment of Accuracy of the Traffic Light System (TLS)</b>		
<b>Rating:</b>		
	TLS Accurate	
		
		TLS Not Assessable
2.a.	Accuracy of TLS	 Based on the performance data provided for the selected PI, the self-assessment rating reported as "fully achieved" is accurate.
2.b.	Program Comments	 No Comment.















**Program 16 – Economics and Statistics**

**Performance Indicator (PI):** No. of visitors using IP Statistics data Center.















<b>1. Assessment of Performance Data (PD)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	Sufficiently meets criteria		Partially meets criteria
	Does not meet the criteria		
	<i>Criteria for PD</i>		<i>Comments/data limitations</i>
1.a.	Relevant/valuable		The PD is relevant and valuable as it provides a measure of the number of visitors to the IP statistics data center. The information is available both in terms of page views and the number of unique visitors.
1.b.	Sufficient/comprehensive		The PD is only partly sufficient and comprehensive. Although the data concerning the number of visitors to the IP statistics data center was tracked using external analytical tools, for a duration of about seven months within the reporting period, no data was collected by the external analytical tool due to the omission of a tracking code in the new version of the IP statistics data center.  Hence, the PD was reported based on estimation for the duration of the untracked period.
1.c.	Efficiently collected/easily accessible		The PD is efficiently collected and easily accessible using external analytical tools that are considered to be the industry standard.
1.d.	Accurate/verifiable		The PD is only partly verifiable and cannot be accurately linked back to the source data as the underlying analytical data was not collected for a duration of about seven months during the reporting period.
1.e.	Timely reporting		The PD was not produced regularly enough to detect that analytical data was not collected during a seven-month period. A more frequent reporting period could have detected the non-collection of data earlier. Hence, the PD only partly meets this criterion.
1.f.	Clear/transparent		To the extent that analytical data is available, the PD can be termed as clear and transparent in a manner that would allow users to make informed decisions. However, due to the lack of supporting data for some part of the reporting period, the PD partly meets this criterion.
1.g.	<b>Conclusion on PD</b>		<b>Based on the assessment of information provided, it can be concluded that the performance data partly meets the criteria.</b>
<b>2. Assessment of Accuracy of the Traffic Light System (TLS)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	TLS Accurate		TLS Not Accurate
	TLS Not Assessable		
2.a.	Accuracy of TLS		Although, the PD is not fully supported by underlying data for some part of the reporting period, the period for which sufficient and reliable data exists indicates that the target of a 10% increase in the number of visitors was still met.  Hence, based on the performance data provided for the selected PI, the self-assessment rating reported as "Fully Achieved" is accurate.
2.b.	Program Comments		No Comment

**Program 17 – Building Respect for IP**

**Performance Indicator (PI):** No. of countries participating in WIPO Awards Program.















<b>1. Assessment of Performance Data (PD)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	Sufficiently meets criteria		Partially meets criteria
	Does not meet the criteria		
	<i>Criteria for PD</i>		<i>Comments/data limitations</i>
1.a.	Relevant/valuable		The PD provides information directly linked with the performance indicator.
1.b.	Sufficient/comprehensive		The data provides information on the number of countries that participate and receive awards as part of the WIPO Awards Program. At such, a trend can be calculated from the PD in order to assess progress of the PI.
1.c.	Efficiently collected/easily accessible		The PD is easily accessible and efficiently collected since it is a compilation of the participant and awarded countries of the WIPO Awards Program.
1.d.	Accurate/verifiable		The PD is verifiable from the supporting data. The reported PD needs to be updated.
1.e.	Timely reporting		The PD timely reports on the performance measure with a continuous track of progress of the PI.
1.f.	Clear/transparent		The PD is clear and based on available information and supporting documents.
1.g.	<b>Conclusion on PD</b>		<b>Based on the assessment of information provided, it can be concluded that the performance data sufficiently meets the criteria.</b>
<b>2. Assessment of Accuracy of the Traffic Light System (TLS)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	TLS Accurate		TLS Not Accurate
	TLS Not Assessable		
2.a.	Accuracy of TLS		Based on the performance data provided for the selected PI, self-assessment rating reported as “fully achieved” is accurate.
2.b.	Program Comments		No Comment.

**Program 18 – IP and Global Challenges**  
**Performance Indicator (PI): No. of WIPO GREEN Members**

<b>1. Assessment of Performance Data (PD)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	Sufficiently meets criteria		Partially meets criteria
	Does not meet the criteria		
	<i>Criteria for PD</i>		<i>Comments/data limitations</i>
1.a.	Relevant/valuable		The PD provides information directly targeting the PI on the number of new members of the WIPO Green.
1.b.	Sufficient/comprehensive		The PD provides all information that is required for the PI, and distinguishes it by partners, users and uploads to the WIPO Green Website.
1.c.	Efficiently collected/ easily accessible		The PD is collected through signed agreements between the new partners and WIPO. The PD is accessible to the public audience through the WIPO Public Website at <a href="https://www3.wipo.int/wipogreen/en/network/">https://www3.wipo.int/wipogreen/en/network/</a>
1.d.	Accurate/verifiable		The PD is accurate and can be verified through the official signed memberships.
1.e.	Timely reporting		The PD sources reports on progress towards the target and the PI as the new memberships with the WIPO Green are signed.
1.f.	Clear/transparent		The PD provides clear information on the growth of membership. Detailed information on partners and users is published on the WIPO Green Public Website.
1.g.	<b>Conclusion on PD</b>		<b>Based on the assessment of information provided, it can be concluded that the performance data sufficiently meets the criteria.</b>
<b>2. Assessment of Accuracy of the Traffic Light System (TLS)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	TLS Accurate		TLS Not Accurate
	TLS Not Assessable		
2.a.	Accuracy of TLS		Based on the performance data provided for the selected PI, self-assessment rating reported as “fully achieved” is accurate.
2.b.	Program Comments		No Comment.















**Program 19 – Communications**

**Performance Indicator:** Service Standards targets as defined on WIPO website.

<b>1. Assessment of Performance Data (PD)</b>		
<b>Rating:</b>		
	Sufficiently meets criteria	 Partially meets criteria
		 Does not meet the criteria
	<i>Criteria for PD</i>	<i>Comments/data limitations</i>
1.a.	Relevant/valuable	 The PD is relevant and valuable because it gauges the customer services center's capacity to: (1) address customer enquiries and customer complaints in a timely manner.
1.b.	Sufficient/comprehensive	 Because data to support ticket processing for 2015 was based on an extrapolation, the PD is considered to be partly sufficient and comprehensive.
1.c.	Efficiently collected/easily accessible	 The PD is partly efficiently collected and accessible because data to support ticket processing for 2015 was based on an extrapolation. The tool used to report on the PD did not provide reliable information.
1.d.	Accurate/verifiable	 The PD to support ticket processing for 2015 was based on an extrapolation; hence it is only partly accurate and verifiable.
1.e.	Timely reporting	 The PD is not fully timely reported because data to support ticket processing for 2015 was based on an extrapolation.
1.f.	Clear/transparent	 Clarity and transparency of the PD was impacted by the fact that data to support ticket processing for 2015 was based on an extrapolation.
1.g.	<b>Conclusion on PD</b>	 <b>Based on the assessment of information provided, it can be concluded that the performance data partially meets the criteria.</b>
<b>2. Assessment of Accuracy of the Traffic Light System (TLS)</b>		
<b>Rating:</b>		
	TLS Accurate	 TLS Not Accurate
		 TLS Not Assessable
2.a.	Accuracy of TLS	 Based on the performance data provided for the selected PI, the self-assessment rating reported as "fully achieved" cannot be assessed due to lack of complete data to support the figure reported in the PPR.
2.b.	Program Comments	Due to some unexpected technical issues in the software application used to extract the data related to ticket processing, Program 19 was not able in 2015 to produce the expected performance data. The Program plans to fix such issues, or, should that not be possible, to find an alternative relevant and measurable performance data.

**Program 20 – External Relations, Partnerships and External Offices**















**Performance Indicator (PI):** % of policy makers, government officials, IP practitioners and participants in targeted workshops with enhanced understanding of CMOs and how to effectively use IP for development.

<b>1. Assessment of Performance Data (PD)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	Sufficiently meets criteria		Partially meets criteria
			Does not meet the criteria
	<i>Criteria for PD</i>		<i>Comments/data limitations</i>
1.a.	Relevant/valuable		The PD is partially relevant and valuable as it provides a measure of the number of workshops conducted by the three WIPO external offices (i.e. WIPO Brazil Office, WIPO Japan Office and WIPO Singapore Office) and specifically the number of policy makers, government officials and IP practitioners in those workshops.  However, the PD is limited in allowing an assessment of participants' enhanced understanding of the subject matter discussed in the workshops. This is mainly due to the way the PI has been formulated.
1.b.	Sufficient/comprehensive		The PD is partly sufficient and comprehensive to the extent that it provides data on the number of workshops conducted and the nature of participants.
1.c.	Efficiently collected/easily accessible		The PD partly meets this criterion, as the reported data is efficiently collected and easily accessible. However, as mentioned above, the data cannot support an assessment of participants' enhanced understanding of the subject matter discussed in the workshops.
1.d.	Accurate/verifiable		The PD is accurate and verifiable to the extent it has been reported. However, it partly meets this criterion, as the data cannot support an assessment of participants' enhanced understanding of the subject matter discussed in the workshops.
1.e.	Timely reporting		The PD partly meets this criterion as it is reported timely to the extent that it is available.
1.f.	Clear/transparent		The PD partly meets this criterion as it is clear and transparent to the extent that it is available.
1.g.	<b>Conclusion on PD</b>		<b>Based on the assessment of information provided, it can be concluded that the performance data partially meets the criteria.</b>
<b>2. Assessment of Accuracy of the Traffic Light System (TLS)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	TLS Accurate		TLS Not Accurate
			TLS Not Assessable
2.a.	Accuracy of TLS		Based on the performance data provided for the selected PI, the self-assessment rating reported as "Fully achieved" cannot be assessed. This is due to limitations in gathering data which would be able to fully support an assessment of the PI as it is presently worded.
2.b.	Program Comments		No Comment.

















## Program 21 – Executive Management

**Performance Indicator (PI):** % of adherence and other WIPO Treaty-related actions by Member States processed in a timely manner.

<b>1. Assessment of Performance Data (PD)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	Sufficiently meets criteria		
		Partially meets criteria	
			
		Does not meet the criteria	
	<i>Criteria for PD</i>		<i>Comments/data limitations</i>
1.a.	Relevant/valuable		The PD submitted for the PI was found relevant and valuable because it provides data to help measure productivity and efficiency of the Office of Legal Counsel (OLC).
1.b.	Sufficient/comprehensive		The PD is partially comprehensive, because the documentation to support the PD was incomplete. The PD included estimates of the time needed to process adherences and declarations. However, these estimates are not supported by sufficient evidence.
1.c.	Efficiently collected/ easily accessible		PD is partially accessible and efficient collection is hampered by incomplete supporting documentation made available.
1.d.	Accurate/verifiable		PD is partially accurate and verifiable because of incomplete supporting documentation available to confirm the data reported for the PI.
1.e.	Timely reporting		Based on the PD provided, it can be concluded that the PD was only partially timely reported.
1.f.	Clear/transparent		Transparency and clarity of the PD were limited due to incomplete supporting documentation.
1.g.	<b>Conclusion on PD</b>		<b>Based on the assessment of information provided, it can be concluded that the performance data partially meets the criteria.</b>
<b>2. Assessment of Accuracy of the Traffic Light System (TLS)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	TLS Accurate		
		TLS Not Accurate	
			
		TLS Not Assessable	
2.a.	Accuracy of TLS		Based on the performance data provided for the selected PI, the self-assessment rating reported as “fully achieved” is not assessable due to lack of sufficient supporting documentation to confirm the data reported for the PI.
2.b.	Program Comments		No Comment.








## Program 22 – Program and Resource Management

**Performance Indicator (PI):** Return on invested funds in line with benchmarks established by the Investment Advisory Committee.

<b>1. Assessment of Performance Data (PD)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	Sufficiently meets criteria		
			
		Does not meet the criteria	
	<i>Criteria for PD</i>		<i>Comments/data limitations</i>
1.a.	Relevant/valuable		The PD is relevant and valuable because it provides data to verify that investments are in line with the Organization's investment risk appetite and performance criteria, as set by the Investment Advisory Committee.
1.b.	Sufficient/comprehensive		The PD is sufficient and comprehensive, and statements exist from third party to support the data on returns on investments. The PD can be reconciled against investment benchmarks set by the Investment Advisory Committee.
1.c.	Efficiently collected/ easily accessible		Collection and access can be improved by developing a spreadsheet to regularly record the PD.
1.d.	Accurate/verifiable		The PD is accurate and verifiable against relevant supporting documentation.
1.e.	Timely reporting		The PD is reported to the Advisory Committee on Investments for monitoring and management decision making; however, the PD can be better presented through the use of a spreadsheet.
1.f.	Clear/transparent		The PD is clear, and transparent and a third party confirmation of the accuracy of the data is available.
1.g.	<b>Conclusion on PD</b>		<b>Based on the assessment of information provided, it can be concluded that the performance data sufficiently meets the criteria.</b>
<b>2. Assessment of Accuracy of the Traffic Light System (TLS)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	TLS Accurate		
			
		TLS Not Assessable	
2.a.	Accuracy of TLS		Based on the performance data provided for the selected PI, the self-assessment rating reported as "fully achieved" is accurate
2.b.	Program Comments		We accept the comments that collection of and access to the data could be improved. This work will be addressed by the Treasury Expert who will be joining the Finance Division soon.















**Program 23 – Human Resources Management and Development**

**Performance Indicator (PI):** % of organizational units with existing workforce plans linked to annual work-plans

<b>1. Assessment of Performance Data (PD)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	Sufficiently meets criteria		Partially meets criteria
	Does not meet the criteria		
	<i>Criteria for PD</i>		<i>Comments/data limitations</i>
1.a.	Relevant/valuable		The PD presented concerns workforce action plans as opposed to workforce plans that are usually prepared prior to the biennium as part of the program and budget preparation process.  The PD is relevant and valuable to the extent that it provides detailed information on the actions that have been agreed to address planned activities and these are also linked to the relevant PIs.
1.b.	Sufficient/comprehensive		The PD provides sufficient detail on the linkage of workforce related issues to planned actions. Although, it does comprehensively show the direct link to the annual work plan of the organizational unit, it was explained by the Human Resources Management Department (HRMD) that although the link between the workforce action plans and work plans are not one-to-one, the purpose of having managers look at their workforce in the context of planned activities was covered.
1.c.	Efficiently collected/easily accessible		The PD is both efficiently collected and easily accessible based on detailed plans that have been uploaded to the EPM system and which are also maintained by the HR Planning Section.
1.d.	Accurate/verifiable		The PD is accurately reported based on the understanding that it relates to workforce action plans and can be verified with the underlying action plans.
1.e.	Timely reporting		The PD is tracked through a workforce action plan status table, which shows the status of workforce action planning for each organizational unit. This provides adequate information to understand the current status of workforce action planning.
1.f.	Clear/transparent		The PD is clear as it allows users to understand the progress made in the completion of workforce action plans. As explained by HRMD, the purpose of this PI was to increase the maturity level of workforce planning in the context of the planned activities to be undertaken by organizational units. The PD shows transparently the linkage between issues, strategies and action plans although this may not have a direct one-to-one reference with the annual workplans.
1.g.	<b>Conclusion on PD</b>		<b>Based on the assessment of information provided, it can be concluded that the performance data sufficiently meets the criteria.</b>
<b>2. Assessment of Accuracy of the Traffic Light System (TLS)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	TLS Accurate		TLS Not Accurate
	TLS Not Assessable		
2.a.	Accuracy of TLS		Based on the performance data provided for the selected PI, the self-assessment rating reported as "Fully Achieved" is accurate.
2.b.	Program Comments		No Comment.

**Program 24 – General Support Services**

**Performance Indicator (PI):** Average ticket cost (TMC and UNDP tickets)

<b>1. Assessment of Performance Data (PD)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	Sufficiently meets criteria		Partially meets criteria
	Does not meet the criteria		
	<i>Criteria for PD</i>		<i>Comments/data limitations</i>
1.a.	Relevant/valuable		The PD is relevant and valuable as it provides a direct measure of the reduction in the average ticket cost on an annual basis as compared to the baseline.
1.b.	Sufficient/comprehensive		<p>The PD is sufficient and comprehensive, which is supported by detailed information on the break-up of travel costs. This allows for monitoring, on a monthly basis, of the performance against the target set.</p> <p>It may be noted that although the PI specifies only Travel Management Company (TMC) and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) tickets, the PD calculation includes the cost of reimbursed tickets. However, this inclusion does not materially alter the reported PD.</p>
1.c.	Efficiently collected/easily accessible		The PD is efficiently collected and easily accessible from reports provided by the TMC and from the AIMS financial system for UNDP tickets.
1.d.	Accurate/verifiable		<p>The PD is accurately reported and is verifiable with monthly reports provided by the TMC and with the AIMS financial system for UNDP tickets.</p> <p>Based on an initial verification of TMC costs from the AIMS financial system, IOD found that the TMC costs were higher by about 10% compared with the reported PD. However, the Travel and Mission Support Section (TMS), subsequently explained to IOD that they rely only on the TMC report for the purposes of monitoring the PD as this is directly linked to invoices sent by the TMC. Furthermore, TMS also explained that they have also found that the AIMS report was not reliable and hence there is a reliance on the TMC report. It would be advisable for the Procurement and Travel Division to identify the reasons for the differences between the report generated from AIMS and that of the TMC and to make changes, if required, to ensure more accurate reporting from AIMS.</p>
1.e.	Timely reporting		The PD is reported timely on a quarterly basis through activity and statistical activity reports of TMS. This frequency is sufficient to monitor regular progress against the performance indicator.
1.f.	Clear/transparent		The PD is clear and transparent as it allows users to understand the progress made against the target. The detailed information is also available at a level that allows for different kinds of analysis to be performed on travel costs.
1.g.	<b>Conclusion on PD</b>		<b>Based on the assessment of information provided, it can be concluded that the performance data sufficiently meets the criteria.</b>
<b>2. Assessment of Accuracy of the Traffic Light System (TLS)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	TLS Accurate		TLS Not Accurate
	TLS Not Assessable		
2.a.	Accuracy of TLS		Based on the performance data provided for the selected PI, the self-assessment rating reported as "Fully Achieved" is accurate.
2.b.	Program Comments		No Comment.

**Program 25 – Information and Communication Technology (ICT)**  
**Performance Indicator (PI): ICT Service Continuity of critical systems**

**1. Assessment of Performance Data (PD)**

**Rating:**



Sufficiently meets criteria



Partially meets criteria



Does not meet the criteria

	<i>Criteria for PD</i>		<i>Comments/data limitations</i>
1.a.	Relevant/valuable		The PD is relevant and valuable as it provides useful information on the measures undertaken to ensure the service continuity of critical ICT systems. The detailed report on the failover tests provides valuable information on the nature of the tests carried out and their results.
1.b.	Sufficient/comprehensive		The PD is sufficient as it provides adequate information on the services and systems that were within the scope of the service continuity project and is also comprehensive in that the end-project-report and report on the failover tests provide detailed information on the results of the exercise.
1.c.	Efficiently collected/ easily accessible		The PD is both efficiently collected and easily accessible through reports maintained by the Information and Communication Technology Department (ICTD).
1.d.	Accurate/verifiable		The PD report is accurately reported and verifiable based on the results of tests undertaken.
1.e.	Timely reporting		The PD was reported in a timely manner after the conclusion of the tests that were undertaken.
1.f.	Clear/transparent		The PD is clear and transparent as it allows users of the information to understand the scope of the project, the objectives and the conclusions drawn from the tests that were conducted.
1.g.	<b>Conclusion on PD</b>		<b>Based on the assessment of information provided, it can be concluded that the performance data sufficiently meets the criteria.</b>

**2. Assessment of Accuracy of the Traffic Light System (TLS)**

**Rating:**



TLS Accurate



TLS Not Accurate

















TLS Not Assessable















2.a.	Accuracy of TLS		Based on the performance data provided for the selected PI, the self-assessment rating reported as "Fully Achieved" is accurate.
2.b.	Program Comments		No Comment.

## Program 26 – Internal Oversight

**Performance Indicator (PI):** (a) Timely and qualitative completion of oversight reports; (b) Number of audits & evaluations completed as per oversight work plan; (c) Number of complaints/reports of possible misconduct handled.















<b>1. Assessment of Performance Data (PD)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	Sufficiently meets criteria		Partially meets criteria
	Does not meet the criteria		
	<i>Criteria for PD</i>		<i>Comments/data limitations</i>
1.a.	Relevant/valuable		The PD provides substantive information regarding all oversight work captured in the PI, which directly provides essential information to measure progress towards the expected result.
1.b.	Sufficient/comprehensive		The PD provides detailed information of investigation, audit and evaluation performance of activities. Yet, the following aspects are noted: - The reported PD concerning PI point (a) is not complete. Whereas the PD supporting documents incorporates information on the completion of audit and evaluation reports, only information regarding investigation reports is provided. - The overall PD for PI point (a) relates only to timeliness and no information is provided regarding the qualitative aspect. The PD could thus be expanded with the information identified in the supporting data on resource allocation for the various assignments as well as on the status of recommendations, which would enable an efficient assessment of progress towards achievement of the expected result.
1.c.	Efficiently collected/easily accessible		The PD is collected as the conduct of oversight work is done. The information is found on the share drive. There is also available for the general public at the WIPO Public website (an example follows): <a href="http://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/govbody/en/wo_pbc_24/wo_pbc_24_6.pdf">http://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/govbody/en/wo_pbc_24/wo_pbc_24_6.pdf</a>
1.d.	Accurate/verifiable		The PD is based on supporting documents that provide reliable information for the PD.
1.e.	Timely reporting		There is a quarterly reporting on the PI at the Independent Advisory Oversight Committee (IAOC) and an annual reporting of the Director IOD to the WIPO General Assembly. These processes enable the program to respond to accountability obligations and to reorient the work plan whenever necessary.
1.f.	Clear/transparent		PD is reported clearly to stakeholders so that sound decisions can be made. The PD is provided in a transparent and factual manner and all staff from the Division can steer their performance based on this data.
1.g.	<b>Conclusion on PD</b>		<b>Based on the assessment of information provided, it can be concluded that the performance data sufficiently meets the criteria.</b>
<b>2. Assessment of Accuracy of the Traffic Light System (TLS)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	TLS Accurate		TLS Not Accurate
	TLS Not Assessable		
2.a.	Accuracy of TLS		Based on the performance data provided for the selected PI, self-assessment rating reported as "fully achieved" is accurate.
2.b.	Program Comments		No Comment.

**Program 27 – Conference and Language Services**  
**Performance Indicator (PI):** Reduction in printing costs (per page)

<b>1. Assessment of Performance Data (PD)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	Sufficiently meets criteria		Partially meets criteria
	Does not meet the criteria		
	<i>Criteria for PD</i>		<i>Comments/data limitations</i>
1.a.	Relevant/valuable		The PD is relevant and valuable to as it provides direct measure of the printing cost per page which can be related to the PI and target. The underlying data provides an indication of the cost break-up by component.
1.b.	Sufficient/comprehensive		The PD is comprehensive as it provides all information necessary to make a comprehensive assessment of the data used to report against the PI. The performance data provides sufficient detail on the direct and indirect costs used to calculate the printing costs per page.  The PD does not however take into account indirect costs such as electricity and depreciation as these cannot be individually attributed to the printing plant.
1.c.	Efficiently collected/ easily accessible		The PD is efficiently collected and easily accessible from AIMS ERP system as well as from the printing machines.
1.d.	Accurate/verifiable		The PD is accurately reported and verifiable with financial data in the AIMS system and with data from the printing machines.
1.e.	Timely reporting		The PD is reported timely and can be regularly tracked through internal statistical reports from the print shop.
1.f.	Clear/transparent		The PD is clear and transparent as it allows users to understand the detailed cost breakup of printing costs and allows for decision making.
1.g.	<b>Conclusion on PD</b>		<b>Based on the assessment of information provided, it can be concluded that the performance data sufficiently meets the criteria.</b>
<b>2. Assessment of Accuracy of the Traffic Light System (TLS)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	TLS Accurate		TLS Not Accurate
	TLS Not Assessable		
2.a.	Accuracy of TLS		Based on the performance data provided for the selected PI, the self-assessment rating reported as "Fully Achieved" is accurate.
2.b.	Program Comments		No Comment.

## Program 28 – Safety and Security















**Performance Indicator:** % of timely requests for safety and security assistance at conferences or events held in or outside of Geneva.

<b>1. Assessment of Performance Data</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	Sufficiently meets criteria		Partially meets criteria
			Does not meet the criteria
	<i>Criteria for PD</i>		<i>Comments/data limitations</i>
1.a.	Relevant/valuable		<p>The PI is understood by Safety and Security Coordination Services (SSCS) to relate to timely servicing of requests received for safety and security assistance at conferences or events held in or outside of Geneva.</p> <p>Typically, the servicing of requests for safety and security assistance is met through requisitions for additional resources from the external security contractors (these are also known as surge support requisitions). The PD contains information on a list of surge support requests, which are linked to invoices from the external security contractor. However, as this information was not systematically tracked during the reporting period, it cannot be determined whether the list is complete. Furthermore, the compilation of the data does not report on the timeliness of servicing the requests for assistance. Hence, the PD only partially meets this criterion.</p> <p>PD also provides information about the number of audits of external conferences/ meetings that were completed during the biennium; however, this information is not directly relevant to the defined PI.</p>
1.b.	Sufficient/comprehensive		As mentioned above, the PD was not systematically tracked during the reporting period and it cannot be determined whether the list of requests received is complete and whether all requests received required surge support. The PD does not meet this criterion.
1.c.	Efficiently collected/ easily accessible		The underlying information related to surge support requests is available in the form of requisitions and invoices. However, this was not efficiently collected during the reporting period as a systematic tracking mechanism for support requests was not in place. The process has been streamlined in the current biennium through a tracking spreadsheet for events and conferences. The PD only partially meets this criterion.
1.d.	Accurate/verifiable		The PD (to the extent it has been compiled), can be directly verified with underlying data. However, the underlying data does not contain information on the timeliness of servicing the request and hence the accuracy cannot be determined. The PD partially meets this criterion.
1.e.	Timely reporting		As mentioned above, the PD was not systematically tracked during the reporting period and hence cannot be considered as having been produced regularly enough to track progress.
1.f.	Clear/transparent		The PD provides information that is partially clear insofar as it relates to the list of surge support requests that are linked to invoices. However no additional information on the nature of the event/ conference and the timeliness of the request is available. The PD partially meets this criterion.
1.g.	<b>Conclusion on PD</b>		<b>Based on the assessment of information provided, it can be concluded that the performance data partially meets the criteria.</b>
<b>2. Assessment of Accuracy of the Traffic Light System (TLS)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	TLS Accurate		TLS Not Accurate
			TLS Not Assessable
2.a.	Accuracy of TLS		As mentioned above, it cannot be concluded on a review of the data whether the list of requests for assistance is complete. Furthermore, there is no information available on the timeliness of servicing requests. Hence, IOD cannot make an assessment on the accuracy of the TLS.
2.b.	Program Comments		No Comment.

















**Program 29 – New Conference Hall**

**Performance Indicator (PI):** Completion of UN H-MOSS peripheral security measures for the new conference hall















<b>1. Assessment of Performance Data (PD)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	Sufficiently meets criteria		Partially meets criteria
	Does not meet the criteria		
	<i>Criteria for PD</i>		<i>Comments/data limitations</i>
1.a.	Relevant/valuable		The PD is relevant and valuable as it provides evidence of the work completed against the planned measures.
1.b.	Sufficient/comprehensive		The PD provides sufficient and comprehensive information to show the extent of work completed.
1.c.	Efficiently collected/easily accessible		The PD partially meets this criterion as the records of project plans are contained in multiple documents due to changes in the plans over several years. Hence, without a tracking mechanism it is time consuming to refer to multiple documents.
1.d.	Accurate/verifiable		The PD is verifiable and accurately reported through supporting documentation.
1.e.	Timely reporting		The PD is reported timely through periodic reports to Member States.
1.f.	Clear/transparent		The PD partially meets this criterion as the clarity in the linkage between the reference documents can be improved.
1.g.	<b>Conclusion on PD</b>		<b>Based on the assessment of information provided, it can be concluded that the performance data fully meets the criteria.</b>
<b>2. Assessment of Accuracy of the Traffic Light System (TLS)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	TLS Accurate		TLS Not Accurate
	TLS Not Assessable		
2.a.	Accuracy of TLS		Based on the performance data provided for the selected PI, the self-assessment rating reported as "Fully Achieved" is accurate.
2.b.	Program Comments		No Comment.

**Program 30 – Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises (SMEs) and Innovation**  
**Performance Indicator (PI):** No. of downloads of topical SME material and guidelines

<b>1. Assessment of Performance Data (PD)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	Sufficiently meets criteria		Partially meets criteria
	Does not meet the criteria		
	<i>Criteria for PD</i>		<i>Comments/data limitations</i>
1.a.	Relevant/valuable		The PD directly reports valuable information on the PI since it indicates the number of downloads and page views on selected SMEs materials and guidelines.
1.b.	Sufficient/comprehensive		The PD provides sufficient information to measure progress of the PI.
1.c.	Efficiently collected/ easily accessible		The PD is collected by the WIPO Web Communications and reported to the Program on a yearly basis.
1.d.	Accurate/verifiable		The information can be verifiable and is accurate based on the supporting documentation.
1.e.	Timely reporting		Reporting on the PI is done on a regular basis at each program performance report and provides real-time reporting on the status of downloads and page views.
1.f.	Clear/transparent		The PD is clear and the information remains accessible to the relevant stakeholders within the program.
1.g.	<b>Conclusion on PD</b>		<b>Based on the assessment of information provided, it can be concluded that the performance data sufficiently meets the criteria.</b>
<b>2. Assessment of Accuracy of the Traffic Light System (TLS)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	TLS Accurate		TLS Not Accurate
	TLS Not Assessable		
2.a.	Accuracy of TLS		Due to the lack of a target for the performance indicator, self-assessment rating reported as "not assessable" is accurate.
2.b.	Program Comments		No Comment.

**Program 31 – The Hague System**

**Performance Indicator (PI): Membership of the Geneva (1999) Act**

<b>1. Assessment of Performance Data (PD)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	Sufficiently meets criteria		
		Partially meets criteria	
			
		Does not meet the criteria	
	<i>Criteria for PD</i>		<i>Comments/data limitations</i>
1.a.	Relevant/valuable		The PD is relevant and valuable as it identifies the number of new contracting parties to the Hague Agreement (Geneva 1999 Act), and is linked to the potential growth, and increased activities of the Program.
1.b.	Sufficient/comprehensive		The PD is sufficient and comprehensive, and covers all aspects of the PI. Supporting evidence for the PD is complete.
1.c.	Efficiently collected/easily accessible		The PD is efficiently collected and information on the PD is easily collected and available on the WIPO website. <a href="http://www.wipo.int/treaties/en/ShowResults.jsp?lang=en&amp;treaty_id=9">http://www.wipo.int/treaties/en/ShowResults.jsp?lang=en&amp;treaty_id=9</a>
1.d.	Accurate/verifiable		The PD is accurate and supporting evidence is easily verifiable against information reported on the WIPO website.
1.e.	Timely reporting		The PD is timely reported , and influences strategy and decision making.
1.f.	Clear/transparent		The PD is clear and transparent and can be verified on the WIPO Website.
1.g.	<b>Conclusion on PD</b>		<b>Based on the assessment of information provided, it can be concluded that the performance data fully meets the criteria.</b>
<b>2. Assessment of Accuracy of the Traffic Light System (TLS)</b>			
<b>Rating:</b>			
	TLS Accurate		
		TLS Not Accurate	
			
		TLS Not Assessable	
2.a.	Accuracy of TLS		Based on the performance data provided for the selected PI, the self-assessment rating reported as “partially achieved” is accurate.
2.b.	Program Comments		No Comment.

[Annex IV follows]

**ANNEX IV - VALIDATION FRAMEWORK**

<b>Program</b>	<b>Expected Result</b>	<b>Performance indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Performance Data</b>
Program 1 – Patent Law	I.2 Tailored and balanced IP legislative, regulatory and policy frameworks	No. and % of Member States which were satisfied with the quality of legal advice related to patents, utility models, trade secrets and integrated circuits	Updated Baseline end 2013: 9 respondents (90%), based on survey conducted by IOD in 2013	90%	9 respondents reported on average a 94% satisfaction rate (Africa-3; Arab-1; Asia and the Pacific-2; Certain Countries in Europe and Asia-2; Latin America and the Caribbean-1)
Program 2 – Trademarks, Industrial Designs and Geographical indications	I.1 Enhanced cooperation among Member States on development of balanced international normative frameworks for IP and agreement on specific topics on which international instruments are agreed	Agreement on a normative framework for industrial design registration and maintenance procedures	Updated Baseline end 2013: No normative framework for industrial design registration procedures	Adoption of a Design Law Treaty by a possible Diplomatic Conference	Decision by the WIPO General Assembly to convene a Diplomatic Conference for the adoption of a Design Law Treaty at the end of the first half of 2017, only if the discussions on technical assistance and disclosure have been completed during the thirty-fourth and thirty-fifth sessions of the SCT.
Program 3 – Copyright and Related Rights	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	No. of governments and CMOs signing an agreement with WIPO to develop a new transparency, accountability and governance quality assurance standard	n/a	Four governments and six CMOs	14 national governments (Bangladesh, Cambodia, the Gambia, Indonesia, Jordan, Liberia, Malaysia, Mauritius, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Philippines, Sri Lanka, Trinidad and Tobago) and 63 CMOs signed an expression of interest in the TAG project

Program	Expected Result	Performance indicator	Baseline	Target	Performance Data
Program 4 – Traditional Knowledge, Traditional Cultural Expressions and Genetic Resources	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	% of participants in WIPO activities which report enhanced capacity to understand and use IP principles, systems and tools for the protection of TK and TCEs, and for management of the interface between IP and GRs	Updated Baseline end 2013: 95% (79 out of 83) of participants reported positively (feedback questionnaire used in five activities organized by the TK Division in 2012/13)	80%	92% (370 out of 398) of participants reported positively (feedback questionnaire used in fifteen activities organized by the TK Division in 2014/-2015)
Program 5 – The PCT System	II.1 Increased use of the PCT route for filing international patent applications	Level of satisfaction of PCT users with user-focused information and training services	2009 level of user PCT satisfaction with PCT user information and training services	Maintain or increase 2009 level of PCT user satisfaction	Overall PCT user satisfaction with WIPO-provided PCT services increased 11% since 2009, to 89%.
Program 6 – Madrid and Lisbon Systems	II.7 Improved productivity and service quality of Madrid & Lisbon operations	Refinement of the electronic International Register of the Lisbon system	Updated Baseline end 2013: IT applications for an electronic International Register in use since the Summer 2013	Electronic system linking International Register and Lisbon Express database on the WIPO website	Electronic interface linking the International Register and Lisbon Express database on the WIPO website was completed and deployed in 2014
Program 7 – Arbitration, Mediation and Domain Names	II.9 Effective intellectual property protection in the gTLDs and the ccTLDs	No. of ccTLD administrators with WIPO assisted design or administration of intellectual property protection mechanisms in accordance with international standards	Updated Baseline end 2013: 70 ccTLD administrators (cumulative per end 2013)	Four new administrators	In 2014/15, 2 two new ccTLD administrators (.GC, .VG) (; 71 cumulative following one discontinuation)
Program 8 – Development Agenda Coordination	III.5 Enhanced understanding of the DA by Member States, IGOs, civil society and other stakeholders	% of participants in WIPO meetings (Member States, IGOs, civil society and other stakeholders) satisfied with information received on the DA recommendations	N/A	80%	78.57%

Program	Expected Result	Performance indicator	Baseline	Target	Performance Data
<p>Program 9 – Africa, Arab, Asia and the Pacific, Latin America and the Caribbean Countries, Least Developed Countries</p>	<p>III.4 Strengthened cooperation mechanisms and programs tailored to the needs of developing countries and LDCs</p>	<p>No. of new or strengthened cooperation mechanisms, programs or partnerships supported to promote/strengthen sub-regional or regional cooperation in IP</p>	<p>Africa (3) Arab (2) Asia and the Pacific (4) Latin America and the Caribbean (3) 2 LDCs included in the above regional breakdown Appropriate Technology Projects in 3 LDCs</p>	<p>Africa (2) Arab (1) Asia and the Pacific (4) Latin America and the Caribbean (7) 4 LDCs included in the above regional breakdown Additional appropriate technology in at least 4 LDCs</p>	<p>Africa (2): (i) MoU signed with “l’Organisation Internationale de la Francophonie” (OIF) in May 2014; (ii) African Union /WIPO cooperation under the Dakar Declaration on Intellectual Property for Africa</p> <p>Arab (1): (i) MoU signed with the Emirates Intellectual Property Association (EIPA), UAE, on October 2015.</p> <p>Asia and the Pacific (1): (i) Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN);</p> <p>Latin America and the Caribbean: 6 ongoing projects</p> <p>4 of the organizations in the above regional breakdown include LDCs</p> <p>As part of Phase II of the DA Project on Capacity Building in the Use of Appropriate Technology Specific Technical and Scientific Information as a Solution for Identified Development Challenges, MoUs were signed with four LDCs (Ethiopia, Rwanda, United Republic of Tanzania and Uganda), and by the end of 2015, implementation of the project had begun in three LDCs (Ethiopia, Rwanda, and United Republic of Tanzania).</p>

Program	Expected Result	Performance indicator	Baseline	Target	Performance Data
Program 10 – Cooperation with Certain Countries in Europe and Asia	III.1 National innovation and IP strategies and plans consistent with national development objectives	No. of Universities having developed IP policies	tbd	30 additional Universities	436 (Poland 434; Russian Federation 1; Uzbekistan 1)  A Law on Higher Education was adopted by Poland on October 1, 2014, which made it compulsory for all higher educational institutions to have in place an up-to-date IP policy by March 31, 2015.  Universities in Estonia, Lithuania and Slovakia were in the process of developing IP policies in 2014/15.
Program 11 – The WIPO Academy	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	Revised Portfolio of training courses on IP for developing countries, LDCs and CETs / Relevance of content of training courses to capacity building requirements of developing countries, LDCs and CETs	Portfolio not revised on a global basis since establishment of Academy	Revised Portfolio available by end of biennium	The revision of the portfolio of training courses was completed in 2015. The portfolio of training courses was revised based on the findings of the survey on training needs conducted in 2015.
Program 12 – International Classifications and Standards	IV.1 Updated and globally accepted system of international classifications and WIPO standards to facilitate access, use and dissemination of IP information among stakeholders in the world	No. of amended and new standards adopted	Updated Baseline end 2013: One new Standard adopted and two amended in 2012. One Standard and the Glossary amended in 2013.	Increase compared to baseline	One new Standard informally adopted and one revised informally (2014)  No formal adoption of new Standards. Two Standards revised (2015)
Program 13 – Global Databases	IV.3 Broad geographical coverage of the content and use of WIPO Global IP Databases	No. of records contained in Global Brand Databases	Updated Baseline end 2013: 12,000,000	20,000,000	24,500,000 (cumulative)

Program	Expected Result	Performance indicator	Baseline	Target	Performance Data
Program 14 – Services for Access to Information and Knowledge	IV.2 Enhanced access to, and use of, IP information by IP institutions and the public to promote innovation and creativity	% of users satisfied with the provision of value added patent information services (WPIS, ICE, patent family and legal status enquiry service)	Updated Baseline end 2013: No satisfaction surveys for WPIS and ICE were conducted. Discussions with donor offices on how to evaluate and retrieve feedback for the work carried out are under way.	75%	This indicator is discontinued due to the reorganization of patent information services.
Program 15 – Business Solutions for IP Offices	IV.4 Enhanced technical and knowledge infrastructure for IP Offices and other IP institutions leading to better services (cheaper, faster, higher quality) to their stakeholders	No. of offices using WIPO infrastructure platforms	Updated Baseline end 2013: Asia and the Pacific (5): China, Mongolia, Republic of Korea , Singapore, Viet Nam Other (11): Australia, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Israel, Japan, New Zealand, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States of America (16 cumulative)	25 (by regional breakdown)	9 additional Offices in 2014/15: 7 additional Offices in Asia and the Pacific (12 cumulative): Brunei Darussalam, , India, Indonesia, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Malaysia, , Philippines, Thailand, 1 additional Office in Latin America and the Caribbean (1 cumulative): Chile 1 additional Office in Other countries (17 cumulative): the International Bureau (25 Offices cumulative)
Program 16 – Economics and Statistics	V.1 Wider and better use of WIPO IP statistical information	No. of visitors using IP Statistics data Center	Updated Baseline end 2013: In 2013, the WIPO Statistics Data Center was used by 23,496 unique visitors (1,958 per month) who viewed 162,463 pages	10% increase in number of users, over 2012/13	In 2014/15, the WIPO Statistics Data Center was used by an estimated 51,383 unique visitors (2,141 per month) who viewed an estimated 608,277 pages[1]



Program	Expected Result	Performance indicator	Baseline	Target	Performance Data
Program 17 – Building respect for IP	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	No. of countries participating in WIPO Awards Program	Updated Baseline end 2013: 42 in 2013	40 per year	In 2014/15, a total of 54 different countries participated in the WIPO Awards Program:  - (the number for the biennium is less than the addition of the number of countries for each year of the biennium, since some countries got awards both in 2014 and 2015). 40 in 2014: Africa (5); Arab (3); Asia and the Pacific (10); Certain Countries in Europe and Asia (8); Latin America and the Caribbean (7); Other (7)  - 43 in 2015: Africa (1); Arab (4); Asia and the Pacific (8); Certain Countries in Europe and Asia (15); Latin America and the Caribbean (9); Other (6)
Program 18 – IP and Global Challenges	VII.2 IP-based platforms and tools are used for knowledge transfer, technology adaptation and diffusion from developed to developing countries, particularly least developed countries, to address global challenges	No. of WIPO GREEN Members	Updated Baseline end 2013: 36 Partners, 160 users, 830 uploads	10 new partners	- 29 new partners (total 65) - 330 new users (490 total) - 1,351 new uploads (2,181 total )
Program 19 – Communications	VIII.2 Improved service orientation and responsiveness to inquiries	Service Standards targets as defined on WIPO website	Not baselined	Defined Target: Customer Service Center standards: (i) 90% of tickets processed within 1 day  (ii) 90% of complaints processed within 8 working hours	(i) 92% of tickets processed within 1 day  (ii) 100% of complaints processed within 8 working hours

Program	Expected Result	Performance indicator	Baseline	Target	Performance Data
Program 20 – External Relations, Partnerships and External Offices	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	% of policy makers, government officials, IP practitioners and participants in targeted workshops with enhanced understanding of CMOs and how to effectively use IP for development	n/a (WBO) n/a (WJO) 60% (WSO)	75% (WBO) 75% (WJO) > 70% (WSO)	75% (WBO) 100% (WJO) 100% (WSO)
Program 21 – Executive Management	VIII.3 Effective engagement with Member States	% of adherence and other WIPO Treaty-related actions by Member States processed in a timely manner	Updated Baseline end 2013: 98% of notifications of adherence and other treaty related actions processed within three days.	90 % processed within three days	90% of notifications of adherence and other treaty related actions processed within three days.
Program 22 – Program and Resource Management	IX.2 A smooth functioning Secretariat with a well-managed and appropriately skilled workforce which is effectively delivering results	Return on invested funds in line with benchmarks established by the Investment Advisory Committee	Return on invested funds in line with the benchmark established by the IAC in 2012/13	Return on invested funds in line with the benchmark established by IAC in 2014/15	This was achieved during the biennium. Investments continued to be with Swiss authorities, in line with the benchmark established in 2014/15.  New benchmarks are to be established by the IAC following the introduction of a new investment policy in autumn 2015.
Program 23 – Human Resources Management and Development	IX.2 A smooth functioning Secretariat with a well-managed and appropriately skilled workforce which is effectively delivering results	% of organizational units with existing workforce plans linked to annual work-plans	Updated Baseline end 2013: 0 (zero)	70%	90%
Program 24 – General Support Services	IX.1 Effective, efficient, quality and customer-oriented support services both to internal clients and to external stakeholders	Average ticket cost (TMC and UNDP tickets)	Updated Baseline end 2013: 2013=1,728 Swiss francs	Reduced average ticket cost	1,598 Swiss francs (2014) 1,481 Swiss francs (2015)

Program	Expected Result	Performance indicator	Baseline	Target	Performance Data
Program 25 – Information and Communication Technology	IX.1 Effective, efficient, quality and customer-oriented support services both to internal clients and to external stakeholders	ICT Service Continuity of critical systems	Updated Baseline end 2013: 2 closely linked Data Centers established; server infrastructure and network architecture Centers partially developed to support the 2 centers; 38 core ICT services were assessed and suitable measures implemented for mitigating risks and ensuring their enhanced availability.	Critical systems can be recovered in a timely manner without data loss in the event of localized major disruptions	Server, Storage, Backup and Network Infrastructure extended between the two Data Centers; over 50 Core ICT services (12 additional in 2014/15) were assessed and suitable measures implemented for service continuity.  ICT Service Continuity capability validated in 2015 through successful 1-day Disaster Recovery (DR) test; PCT Failover exercise was completed in 30 minutes
Program 26 – IOD	IX.8 Improved accountability, organizational learning, value for money, stewardship, internal control and corporate governance through assistance from effective and independent oversight	EFFICIENCY: (a) Timely and qualitative completion of oversight reports; (b) Number of audits & evaluations completed as per oversight work-plan; (c) Number of complaints/reports of possible misconduct handled	Updated Baseline end 2013: (a) Investigations completed on average in 3 months;  (b) 7 audits and 2 evaluations;  (c) 19 investigations;  (d) all work done in accordance with standards	(a) Investigations completed in six months on average, audits and evaluations in 5 months;  (b) 12 audits and six evaluations completed;  (c) At least 15 investigations closed;  (d) compliance with standards	In 2014/15:  (a) Investigations open and closed during the period were generally completed within less than five months;  (b) 13 audit reports, seven evaluation reports, and the validation of the PPR 2012/13 completed;  (c) 43 investigations closed over the period;  (d) General compliance with the standards confirmed by the EQAs of the three functions.
Program 27 – Conference and Language Services	IX.1 Effective, efficient, quality and customer-oriented support services both to internal clients and to external stakeholders	Reduction in printing costs (per page)	Updated Baseline end 2013: 0.20 Swiss francs average cost per page in 2013	Defined target: 5% reduction in the average cost per page	0.15 Swiss francs average cost per page in both 2014[2] and 2015 (25% reduction).

Program	Expected Result	Performance indicator	Baseline	Target	Performance Data
Program 28 – Safety And Security	IX.4 An environmentally and socially responsible Organization in which WIPO staff, delegates, visitors and information and physical assets are safe and secure	% of timely requests for safety & security assistance at conferences or events held in or outside of Geneva	<p>Updated Baseline end 2013: During the biennium, a total of seven audits of external conferences/meetings were completed with assistance from the respective country offices of UN DSS and complied with all UN safety/security management system standards:</p> <p>- three (2012) - four (2013)</p> <p>In addition, audits were completed for two external events managed directly by WIPO. (100% of all requests were responded to in a timely manner).</p> <p>In 2012, there were two audits undertaken of External Office premises (Singapore and Tokyo).</p>	80% or more	<p>In 2014 and 2015, all requests (100%) for safety and security assistance for external and Geneva based conferences and events were met.</p> <p>In 2014/15, safety and security assessment audits were completed for all WIPO External Offices, with over 90 per cent of the audit recommendations closed by the end of the biennium.</p>
Program 29 – New Conference Hall	IX.4 An environmentally and socially responsible Organization in which WIPO staff, delegates, visitors and information and physical assets are safe and secure	Completion of UN H-MOSS peripheral security measures for the new conference hall	n/a	Completion of peripheral UN H-MOSS measures by end-2015	The security perimeter in front of the new WIPO Conference Hall on the AB Building side, as well as the anti-blast wall on the Route de Ferney side was completed in August 2014. All other security measures required for the completion of the project were completed by the end of 2015.

Program	Expected Result	Performance indicator	Baseline	Target	Performance Data
Program 30 – Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises (SMEs) and Innovation	III.6 Increased capacity of SMEs to successfully use IP to support innovation	No. of downloads of topical SME material and guidelines	Updated Baseline end 2013: No. of downloads: 77,617 (2013)  No. of page views: 1,210,803 (2013)	tbd	2014: No. of downloads: 70,559 (-9% as compared to 2013) No. of page views of the SME web page: 821,150 (-32% as compared to 2013) 2015: No. of downloads: 71,867 (+2% as compared to 2014) No. of page views of the SME web page: 960,196 (+17% as compared to 2014)
Program 31 – The Hague System	II.4 Wider and better use of the Hague system, including by developing countries and LDCs	Membership of the Geneva (1999) Act	Updated Baseline end 2013: 46 Contracting Parties (end 2013)	58 Contracting Parties	50 Contracting Parties to the Geneva Act (end 2015)

[End of Annex IV and of document]