



**Internal Oversight Division**

Reference: IA 2015-04

**Audit Report**

Audit of Staff Performance Management

March 3, 2016



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>LIST OF ACRONYMS</b> .....  | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b> .....   | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>BACKGROUND</b> .....  | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>AUDIT OBJECTIVES</b> .....  | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>AUDIT SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY</b> .....                                 | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>AUDIT RESULTS - ACHIEVEMENTS</b> .....                                | <b>10</b> |
| <b>AUDIT OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b> .....                      | <b>10</b> |
| A. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK .....                                | 11        |
| (i) Enhancing WIPO's Competency Model .....                              | 11        |
| (ii) Reviewing the Performance of the PMSDS.....                         | 11        |
| (iii) Risk Management.....   | 12        |
| B. PLANNING AND SETTING OBJECTIVES .....                                 | 12        |
| (i) Linking Staff Objectives to the Organization's Expected Results..... | 12        |
| (ii) Integrating Work Plans.....   | 13        |
| (iii) Performance Standards .....  | 13        |
| C. EVALUATING STAFF PERFORMANCE .....                                    | 14        |
| (i) Staff Evaluation Methodology.....                                    | 14        |
| (ii) Interim Staff Performance Review.....                               | 14        |
| D. TRAINING AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT .....                                  | 15        |
| (i) Training and Developing Competencies.....                            | 15        |
| (ii) Professional Development Initiatives.....                           | 16        |
| E. CONFLICT RESOLUTION .....   | 17        |
| (iv) Mediation through the Ombudsperson .....                            | 17        |
| (v) Rebuttal of Performance Appraisals.....                              | 17        |
| F. RESULT OF THE SURVEY ON STAFF PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT .....            | 18        |
| G. COMMENTS FROM THE WIPO STAFF COUNCIL.....                             | 20        |
| <b>TABLE OF RECOMMENDATIONS</b> .....                                    | <b>22</b> |
| <b>LIST OF ANNEXES</b> .....   | <b>25</b> |

**LIST OF ACRONYMS**

|              |   |
|--------------|---|
| <b>DG</b>    | Director General                                    |
| <b>ERP</b>   | Enterprise Resource Planning                        |
| <b>EPMO</b>  | (ERP) - Project Management Office                   |
| <b>HRMD</b>  | Human Resources Management Department               |
| <b>IIA</b>   | Institute of Internal Auditors                      |
| <b>ICSC</b>  | International Civil Service Commission              |
| <b>IOD</b>   | Internal Oversight Division                         |
| <b>IP</b>    | Intellectual Property                               |
| <b>IT</b>    | Information Technology                              |
| <b>OLC</b>   | Office of the Legal Counsel                         |
| <b>OLF</b>   | Organizational Learning Framework                   |
| <b>PMSDS</b> | Performance Management and Staff Development System |
| <b>RRP</b>   | Rewards and Recognition Program                     |
| <b>SRR</b>   | Staff Regulations and rules                         |
| <b>SRP</b>   | Strategic Realignment Program                       |
| <b>UN</b>    | United Nations                                      |
| <b>UNOPS</b> | United Nations Office for Project Services          |
| <b>TDB</b>   | Training Database                                   |
| <b>WIPO</b>  | World Intellectual Property Organization            |

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. The Human Resource Management Department (HRMD) has taken considerable measures to improve WIPO's Performance Management and Staff Development System (PMSDS) since its implementation in 2009. The system has been enhanced and refined over the years to include a planning phase that links individual objectives to organizational performance, a four level rating scale, performance improvement plans, and training and development. Likewise, PMSDS guidelines and handbooks have been updated to reflect the current processes. Furthermore, the PMSDS has been linked to the WIPO rewards and recognition program, the learning and development policy, the performance rebuttal procedures, as well as to administrative consequences as established in WIPO's Staff Regulations and Rules, and related office instructions.
2. While acknowledging what has been achieved so far, more can be done to further enhance the existing system and practices. For instance better aligning recruitment, performance management, staff development and training activities would help ensure that, staff members have the appropriate skillsets and competencies for their posts, and HRMD efficiently manages changes in roles and competencies to address evolving business needs. A better alignment can be achieved through the planned integration of PMSDS, and the Training Database (TDB) into the Organization's Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) solution.
3. The current link between Individual staff objectives and the Organization's expected results in the PMSDS is not achieving its intended effect because staff members cannot relate their efforts directly to WIPO's expected results. This is because these high levels expected results are not translated into Program level activities that could be better linked to staff objectives. Therefore, aligning individual staff objectives with Program/work plan activities in the PMSDS would help provide more clarity on how staff efforts support organizational expected results.
4. Developing performance standards for generic roles that are common across the organization, such as administrative assistants and secretaries, would enhance efficiency and consistency of the performance management process. Likewise, introducing additional performance evaluation methods, such as self-assessments and two way assessments and 360 degrees evaluations would improve the overall fairness and credibility of the performance evaluation process. Also, making mid-term performance reviews mandatory for cases of underperformance would serve to better monitor and track performance expectation, provide early warning signals for potential challenges, and improve the effectiveness of the system.
5. Finally, there has been no dedicated organizational-wide survey for the performance management system since its implementation in 2009. Implementing feedback and review mechanisms that would ensure that the staff performance management system is functioning in an efficient and effective manner would help enhance the credibility and effectiveness of the system.