WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

Internal Oversight Division

Reference: EVAL 2017-02

Evaluation of Program 12: International Classifications and Standards

Final Report

June 27, 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ARIPO	African Regional Intellectual Property Organization
BOIP	Benelux Office for Intellectual Property
CE	Committee of Experts
CPC	Cooperative Patent Classification
DA	Development Agenda
ER	Expected Result
EUIPO	European Union Intellectual Property Office
FI	File Index
ICS	International Classification and Standards
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
IOD	Internal Oversight Division
IPC	International Patent Classification
IP	Intellectual Property
IPCCAT	IPC categorization assistance system
IPCRMS	International Patent Classification Revision Management System
IPO	Intellectual Property Office
IT	Information Technology
LOC	Locarno Classification
MGS	Madrid Goods and Services Manager
M&DC	Mark and Design Classifications
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NCL	Nice Classification
NVL	Nice, Vienna and Locarno
OAPI	African Intellectual Property Organization
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
PRC	People's Republic of China
PUB	Publication
RG	Reference Group
RMS	Revision Management System
SG	Strategic Goal
SIAD	Security and Information Assurance Division
SIPO	State Intellectual Property Office of the People's Republic of China
TDC	Transition and Developed Countries
TISCS	Technology and Innovation Support Center
VCL	Vienna Classification
WG	Working Group
WIPO	World Intellectual Property Organization

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.   The Internal Oversight Division (IOD) has conducted an evaluation of the International Classifications and Standards (ICS) Division from January through June 2017, in line with its 2017 Oversight Plan. The main objective of the evaluation was to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of Program 12 (International Classifications and Standards Division) with regard to fulfilling its mandate in classifications domain and providing evaluative insights to assist the management in making well informed decisions.

2.   The main findings, conclusions and recommendations of this evaluation can be summarized as follows:

(a)   The Program took the lead in organizing and facilitating the sessions of the Committee of Experts (CE) and International Patent Classification (IPC) Revision Working Group (WG) and was continually elaborating the digital platforms (e-forum) and Information and Communication Technology (ICT) tools to advance classifications' revision and publication schemes. Its activities addressed the needs and priorities of all beneficiary countries, were highly consistent with the national agenda and contributed to a great extent in achieving Expected Result (ER) IV.1 through facilitating access, use and dissemination of Intellectual Property (IP) information and developing an updated and globally-accepted system of international classifications.

(b)   The Program's meaningfully contributed to achieving Strategic Goal (SG) IV through creating cooperation platforms between IP Offices to enhance voluntary, technical international cooperation on classification matters. The Program's activities indirectly contributed to implementing recommendations 30 and 31 of the Development Agenda (DA).

(c)   The Program was addressing the training requests from developing countries mainly on an *ad hoc* basis and continuous offering once developed static training pattern.

(d)   No attempt appeared to have been made to mainstream gender or directly target gender issues in the Program's activities, though; the staffing praxis of the Program does address gender aspects.

(e)   The Program allocated the largest share of its budget for contractual services aimed at developing and utilizing digital and ICT information sharing tools, though, some anticipated ICT projects had been delayed or canceled due to resource limitations and external contractors' failure.

(f)   The Program did not develop a structure for monitoring and evaluation scheme to assess the satisfaction level of the training participants.

(g)   The Program team efficiently maintained discussions and communication with internal and external stakeholders, though; there is a room for further improvement with regard to online support, promotion and materials provided to the Program beneficiaries.

(h)   The national Intellectual Property Offices (IPOs) were familiar with digital solutions developed by the Program although they faced certain constraints in utilizing them at full capacity.

(i) The Program team acknowledges the importance of developing digital and ICT solutions further and any technical and functionality changes is a subject of discussion at the sessions of the CE or IPC WGs. Though, the evaluation team found no evidence about the user satisfaction surveys conducted by the Program team.

3.   The evaluation report includes seven recommendations of which three are of high priority, and these can be summarized as follows:

(a) The Program needs to take the lead in addressing the periodicity of the sessions of the CEfor Locarno and Vienna Classification.

(b) The Program should contribute to the training needs assessment exercise planned in developing a more comprehensive competency framework.

(c) The Program 12 should reshape the Program's human resource plans to staff the Marks and Design Section through starting the recruitment for the position of the Head of the Section.