

APPENDIX 3 – Performance data

Volumes 2016

European Union Trade Marks	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Year to Year	Work Programme	2016 / Work Programme
EUTM filed (direct filings)	91,976	96,111	100,336	108,551	116,512	7.33%	121,548	-4.14%
% via E-filing	95.60%	95.49%	96.52%	97.72%	98.99%	1.29%	98.00%	1.01%
% via Fast Track			1.56%	16.79%	19.96%	18.91%	29.00%	-31.17%
International Registrations filed	16,029	18,201	17,183	21,886	18,785	-14.17%	24,132	-22.16%
EUTM settled in examination	99,005	102,471	102,952	109,727	119,831	9.21%	142,268	-15.77%
Optional Nat. Searches & paid	1,515	1,238	815	792	636	-19.70%	700	-9.14%
EUTM published	98,602	106,515	109,522	120,834	126,478	4.67%	135,261	-6.49%
EUTM registered	95,642	98,082	103,763	109,309	126,004	15.27%	125,392	0.49%
Oppositions filed (no dupl)	16,644	17,017	15,666	17,217	19,123	11.07%	18,168	5.26%
% via efilling	41.32%	45.64%	58.06%	75.78%	91.28%	20.46%	81.00%	12.69%
Oppositions settled	17,021	16,775	17,542	16,615	16,634	0.11%	18,168	-8.44%
Nr.OPP Decisions	5,850	6,278	6,400	5,474	5,007	-8.53%	6,303	-20.56%
Renewal (of EUTM N-10)	20,790	28,580	27,277	26,627	29,169	9.55%	37,036	-21.24%
% Renewal (of eutm N-10)	57.25%	60.45%	57.14%	55.28%	53.10%	-3.93%	57.00%	-6.84%
Renewal (of EUTM N-20)					17,479		13,433	30.12%
% Renewal (of eutm N-20)					49.28%		38.00%	29.68%
% E-Renewal			94.86%	96.57%	97.40%	0.86%		
Cancellations filed	1,262	1,399	1,407	2,050	1,955	-4.63%	1,732	12.88%
Cancellations settled	1,034	1,372	1,339	1,404	1,779	26.71%	1,732	2.71%
N° of decisions on substance	588	881	845	862	1,141	32.37%	1,079	5.75%
Inspections filed*	9,957	10,566	9,507	7,987	6,118	-23.40%	10,714	-42.90%
EUTM records filed	48,154	51,921	55,668	58,841	86,768	47.46%	57,799	50.12%
International Applications	6,589	7,541	7,481	8,057	8,663	7.52%	8,546	1.37%
Registered Community Designs								
RCDs filed (direct filings, no duplicates)	83,135	86,852	87,535	86,328	90,708	5.07%	83,436	8.72%
% via efilling	77.88%	79.68%	85.17%	91.29%	96.55%	5.76%	94.00%	2.71%
RCD examined	83,656	87,737	89,516	86,749	92,467	6.59%	83,436	10.82%
RCD registered	78,578	83,988	85,369	82,553	88,152	6.78%	80,706	9.23%
RCD published	76,187	81,981	82,581	80,163	85,967	7.24%	77,602	10.78%
RCD deferred	9,392	9,942	11,053	10,380	11,632	12.06%	10,282	13.13%
Renewal (of rcd N-5)	32,781	36,754	33,897	36,191	37,950	4.86%	37,869	0.21%
% Renewal (of rcd N-5)	43.86%	49.65%	49.45%	50.48%	50.84%	0.72%	48.00%	5.93%
Renewal (of rcd N-10)		11,794	15,058	18,285	20,672	13.05%	19,885	3.96%
% Renewal (of rcd N-10)		29.55%	28.68%	29.67%	30.85%	3.98%	29.00%	3.86%

IRCD Filed	9,163	9,854	10,302	11,373	14,889	30.92%	14,077	5.77%
RCD recordals filed	15,753	17,269	18,810	20,150	20,125	-0.12%	21,900	-8.11%
RCD invalidity filed	344	340	392	269	507	88.48%	408	24.26%
RCD invalidity decisions	311	269	328	244	194	-20.49%	344	-43.60%
RCD invalidity closed	387	371	422	296	287	-3.04%	408	-29.66%
Appeals								
Appeals filed	2,339	2,602	3,284	2,612	2,446	-6.36%	2,750	-11.05%
Appeal decisions	2,513	2,568	2,783	2,935	2,884	-1.74%	2,800	3.00%
Appeals closed	2,547	2,587	2,855	2,961	2,897	-2.16%	2,860	1.29%
Cases lodged before GC	236	291	290	296	331	11.82%	300	10.33%
Cases lodged before CJ	42	38	34	65	48	-26.15%	50	-4.00%

*The decrease of inspections filed is due to a new front office tool rolled out in 2015 which allows users to download directly documents (self-service). During 2016 the number of downloads was 16.061 in comparison with 9.106 in 2015.

Service Charter 2016

The following tables show the performance of the Office for the last five quarters, organized in three main sections: timeliness, accessibility and quality. For each indicator there are three levels of achievement: Excellence (the objective EUIPO strives for), Compliance (this is the level of performance considered acceptable) and Actions Needed (a level at which the Office needs to take action to improve performance to the Compliance level).

Timeliness

Fast Track indicators 99% analysis

				2015-Q4		2016-Q1		2016-Q2		2016-Q3		2016-Q4	
	Excellence	Compliance	Actions Needed	MAX	AVG	MAX	AVG	MAX	AVG	MAX	AVG	MAX	AVG
EUTM publication	<3 weeks	3 to 4 weeks	>4 weeks	2.6	1.0	3.0	1.1	3.0	1.4	3.4	1.3	3.0	1.1
EUTM registration*	<17 weeks	17 to 19 weeks	>19 weeks	16.9	15.1	17.0	15.0	17.1	15.1	20.6	15.6	17.0	15.3
RCD registration	<2 working days	2 to 3 working days	>3 working days	2.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	2.0	1.0

EUTM direct filing indicators 99% analysis

				2015-Q4		2016-Q1		2016-Q2		2016-Q3		2016-Q4	
	Excellence	Compliance	Actions Needed	MAX	AVG	MAX	AVG	MAX	AVG	MAX	AVG	MAX	AVG
EUTM publication, regular track	<7 weeks	7 to 10 weeks	>10 weeks	5.1	2.6	5.9	2.7	6.0	3.1	6.1	2.9	6.4	2.6
EUTM registration, regular track	<22 weeks	22 to 25 weeks	>25 weeks	19.4	16.7	19.9	16.6	20.1	16.7	20.1	17.1	20.0	16.9
EUTM examination done, regular track	<20 days	20 to 25 days	>25 days	22.0	7.3	24.0	8.4	25.0	10.7	24.0	9.8	22.0	8.5
EUTM first action, regular track	<30 days	30 to 35 days	>35 days	29.0	10.0	29.0	11.0	30.0	14.0	31.0	12.0	35.0	12.0
EUTM AG refusal decision	<15 weeks	15 to 20 weeks	>20 weeks	16.7	6.4	15.7	6.3	13.0	5.9	18.4	6.0	37.1	9.0

EUTM: Opposition / Cancellation indicators 99% analysis

				2015-Q4		2016-Q1		2016-Q2		2016-Q3		2016-Q4	
	Excellence	Compliance	Actions Needed	MAX	AVG	MAX	AVG	MAX	AVG	MAX	AVG	MAX	AVG
EUTM opposition admissibility	<16 days	16 to 25 days	>25 days	12.0	1.0	14.0	3.0	13.0	3.0	13.0	2.0	13.0	2.0
EUTM opposition decision	<10 weeks	10 to 20 weeks	>20 weeks	14.9	6.4	15.0	8.3	19.4	11.3	25.7	13.3	27.0	14.6
EUTM cancellation decision	<10 weeks	10 to 25 weeks	>25 weeks	15.9	8.4	29.7	10.3	30.4	12.9	30.1	7.1	26.7	16.1

International Registration indicators 99% analysis

				2015-Q4		2016-Q1		2016-Q2		2016-Q3		2016-Q4	
	Excellence	Compliance	Actions Needed	MAX	AVG	MAX	AVG	MAX	AVG	MAX	AVG	MAX	AVG
IR examination	<20 days	20 to 25 days	>25 days	20.0	5.0	25.0	6.0	21.0	6.0	22.0	7.0	25.0	5.0
IR registration	<46 weeks	46 to 49 weeks	>49 weeks	45.1	43.0	44.7	34.7	44.0	36.9	44.0	38.7	45.6	34.0
IR first action	<30 days	30 to 50 days	>50 days	104.0	17.0	57.0	17.0	54.0	16.0	36.0	13.0	40.0	11.0
IR AG refusal decision	<15 weeks	15 to 20 weeks	>20 weeks	17.9	5.1	16.1	5.6	19.7	5.4	35.6	15.7	32.9	9.9

RCD indicators 99% analysis

				2015-Q4		2016-Q1		2016-Q2		2016-Q3		2016-Q4	
	Excellence	Compliance	Actions Needed	MAX	AVG	MAX	AVG	MAX	AVG	MAX	AVG	MAX	AVG
RCD examination first action	<10 working days	10 to 15 working days	>15 working days	10.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	6.0	10.0	6.0	9.0	5.0
RCD registration	<10 working days	10 to 15 working days	>15 working days	9.0	5.0	9.0	6.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	6.0	8.0	6.0
RCD invalidity decision	<10 weeks	10 to 12 weeks	>12 weeks	10.0	5.3	9.6	4.4	9.9	5.1	11.9	5.0	8.4	4.6

Appeals

				2015-Q4		2016-Q1		2016-Q2		2016-Q3		2016-Q4	
	Excellence	Compliance	Actions Needed	MAX	AVG	MAX	AVG	MAX	AVG	MAX	AVG	MAX	AVG
Appeal reception (90%)	<10 days	10 to 14 days	>14 days	3.0	1.0	3.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	4.0	1.0
Appeal decisions ex-parte (75%)	<8 months	8 to 16 months	>16 months	6.2	3.0	4.6	2.8	5.3	2.2	6.1	2.8	5.6	2.5
Appeal decisions inter-parte (75%)	<8 months	8 to 16 months	>16 months	6.6	3.4	6.7	3.7	6.7	3.1	7.2	3.7	7.0	3.5

IP Management indicators 99% analysis

				2015-Q4		2016-Q1		2016-Q2		2016-Q3		2016-Q4	
	Excellence	Compliance	Actions Needed	MAX	AVG	MAX	AVG	MAX	AVG	MAX	AVG	MAX	AVG
EUTM transfers	<10 days	10 to 14 days	>14 days	9.0	1.6	13.0	3.5	12.0	2.9	18.0	4.5	34.0	8.0
RCD transfers	<10 days	10 to 14 days	>14 days	12.0	2.9	12.0	1.2	27.0	1.4	10.0	1.4	14.0	2.0
International Applications forwarding to WIPO*	<15 days	15 to 16 days	>16 days	17.0	7.0	15.0	8.0	16.0	7.0	15.0	8.0	15.0	6.0

Finance indicator 97% analysis

				2015-Q4		2016-Q1		2016-Q2		2016-Q3		2016-Q4	
	Excellence	Compliance	Actions Needed	MAX	AVG	MAX	AVG	MAX	AVG	MAX	AVG	MAX	AVG
Average payment time	<18 days	18 to 30 days	>30 days	10.0		11.0		11.0		10.0		9.0	































Accessibility

				2015-Q4		2016-Q1		2016-Q2		2016-Q3		2016-Q4	
	Excellence	Compliance	Actions Needed	MAX	AVG	MAX	AVG	MAX	AVG	MAX	AVG	MAX	AVG
Telephone calls to EUIPO First Line	<16 seconds	16 to 20 seconds	>20 seconds	14.4	5.6	14.5	5.8	14.3	6.0	14.3	5.7	14.4	5.8
Emails answered by Information Centre	<3 days	3 days	>3 days	2.2	0.4	2.1	0.5	2.0	0.4	1.9	0.4	1.9	0.4
Complaints	<8 days	8 to 11 days	>11 days	7.0	3.9	6.8	4.4	7.0	3.2	6.0	5.0	6.0	3.0
Website availability*	>99%	99% to 98%	<98%	99.91%		100.00%		99.50%		99.76%		99.71%	

* Planned downtime is announced on EUIPO internet site 48 h in advance and is excluded outside office hours on Saturdays and Sundays

Quality of decisions (Ex post)

				2015-Q4		2016-Q1		2016-Q2		2016-Q3		2016-Q4	
	Excellence	Compliance	Actions Needed	MAX	AVG	MAX	AVG	MAX	AVG	MAX	AVG	MAX	AVG
EUTM Examination Proceedings	>95%	95% to 90%	<90%	93%		86%		91%		89%		87%	
EUTM AG Decisions	>98%	98% to 95%	<95%	99%		99%		97%		96%		94%	
	>95%	95% to 90%	<90%	94%		95%		91%		93%		95%	

Opposition proceedings	>95%	95% to 90%	<90%		89%		88%		85%		91%		92%
Opposition decisions	>95%	95% to 90%	<90%		93%		80%		96%		96%		96%
Cancellation proceedings	>95%	95% to 90%	<90%		96%		100%		96%		100%		100%
Cancellation decisions	>95%	95% to 90%	<90%		99%		97%		99%		96%		98%
RCD publications	>95%	95% to 90%	<90%		100%		85%		100%		100%		100%
RCD invalidity proceedings	>95%	95% to 90%	<90%		100%		100%		95%		100%		100%

Balanced Scorecard 2016

LoA 1 Build a dynamic and knowledgeable organisation

OB 1.1 Foster engagement in the organisation

Code	Indicator Name	Unit	Target 2016	2016
1.1.1	Staff satisfaction with internal communication	%	60.0%	66.60%
1.1.2	Staff satisfaction with the Office Reputation	%	69.5%	71.0%
1.1.3	Staff satisfaction with the Office Management	%	55.0%	56.0%
1.1.4	Days of absenteeism (Short term)	%	5.8%	3.5%
1.1.5	Days of absenteeism (Long Term: 365+1)	%	1.2%	1.1%

OB 1.2 Develop, retain and share knowledge across the organisation

Code	Indicator Name	Unit	Target 2016	2016
1.2.1	Training days per employee	training days / employee	3.60	3.64
1.2.2	Internal training satisfaction	%	66.00%	81.00%
1.2.3	Staff consider appraisal process fair	%	53.0%	54.0%
1.2.4	Examiners with a multi-tasking profile	Areas covered per examiners	1.75	1.95
1.2.5	Inter departmental mobility rate	Procedures	39.0	40.0
1.2.6	Staff ability to work in several languages	%	81.5%	75.4%
1.2.7	Former trainees contractually linked with the Office	%	3.0%	4.3%
1.2.8	Trainees indicating that the traineeship facilitated their access to employment / further studies	%	67.5%	69.0%
1.2.9	Cross departmental collaboration	%	67.5%	69.0%
1.2.10	Use of knowledge repositories	Files accesses	3,420	4,703
1.2.11	Number of hits on the e-learning platform	#	90,000	117,907

OB 1.3 Optimise a sustainable workplace

Code	Indicator Name	Unit	Target 2016	2016
1.3.1	Staff satisfaction with the workplace*	%	68.00%	81.52%
1.3.2	Infrastructure cost per on-site worker	€	16,289.00	9,697.00
1.3.3	Paper saved as result of digital strategy	tons	24.0	54.0
1.3.4	Paper consumption per on-site worker	Kg / onsite worker	46.23	24.47
1.3.5	Toner consumption per-onsite worker	Kg / onsite worker	0.16	0.20
1.3.6	Water consumption per-onsite worker	m3	12.70	10.53
1.3.7	Energy consumed (gas + electricity) per on-site worker	MWh / onsite worker	9.40	6.96
1.3.8	Quantity of renewable energy produced on-site	%	17.00%	UNDER REVISION
1.3.9	Ratio of significant security breaches	%	1.5%	100.0%

1.3.10	Time required to evacuate the premises completely	Minutes	6.9	6.0
--------	---	---------	-----	-----

LoA 2 Increase transparency and accountability

OB 2.1 Strengthen the financial management of the Office

Code	Indicator Name	Unit	Target 2016	2016
2.1.1	Budget forecast accuracy (expenditure)	%	From 95.0% To 100.0%	89.3%
2.1.2	Budget forecast accuracy (revenue)	%	From 97.0% To 120.0%	98.5%
2.1.3	Budget forecast accuracy (Carry over)	%	86.0%	87.4%
2.1.4	Product Unit Cost	€	667.0	677.0
2.1.5	Current Account and Credit/Debit Card payments	%	79.0%	79.5%

OB 2.2 Ensure swift alignment with all applicable regulations and implementing rules

Code	Indicator Name	Unit	Target 2016	2016
2.2.1	Compliance with Internal Audit recommendations	%	70.0%	89.7%
2.2.3	Observations from European Court of Auditors*	#	1	1
2.2.4	Entries in the Register of Exceptions	%	0.7%	0.3%
2.2.5	Processes implemented considering the Data Protection Officer opinion	%	70.0%	95.0%
2.2.6	Tender offers processing timeliness	%	50.0%	25.8%

OB 2.3 Strengthen prevention and detection of fraud

Code	Indicator Name	Unit	Target 2016	2016
2.3.1	Staff awareness of Anti-fraud strategy	%	63.5%	65.0%
2.3.2	Risk level of Fraud related risks (ERM)	#	13.0	11.6

OB 2.4 Ensure sustainability of the Office for the future

Code	Indicator Name	Unit	Target 2016	2016
2.4.1	Number of non-conformities in certified management systems from external audits	Non Conformities	0	5

LoA 3 Foster an effective and secure digital environment

OB 3.1 Streamline operations with advanced digital tools

Code	Indicator Name	Unit	Target 2016	2016
3.1.1	Procedures initiated and executed digitally	%	57.3%	56.4%

OB 3.2 Strengthen IT Security

Code	Indicator Name	Unit	Target 2016	2016
3.2.1	IT Security Incidents	Incidents	11.0	10.7

OB 3.3 Maintain and improve service availability of systems

Code	Indicator Name	Unit	Target 2016	2016
3.3.1	Office tools availability	%	98.00%	99.92%

OB 3.4 Ensure cost effectiveness

Code	Indicator Name	Unit	Target 2016	2016
3.4.1	IT investments in new projects and initiatives versus total IT cost	%	20.0%	29.5%
3.4.2	IT cost per IT user	€	22,700.0	17,395.8

LoA 4 Intensify network engagement

OB 4.1 Support and strengthen cooperative networks for greater convergence

Code	Indicator Name	Unit	Target 2016	2016
4.1.1	% of harmonised offices per project	%	72.0%	85.5%
4.1.2	Execution rate of European Cooperation agreements	%	71.0%	49.0%

OB 4.2 Extend reach of existing tools and databases

Code	Indicator Name	Unit	Target 2016	2016
4.2.1	Trade marks available in TM View	Trade marks	42,000,000	41,642,046
4.2.2	Designs available in DS View	Designs	9,550,000	10,318,597
4.2.3	Usage of Similarity	Visits	7,905	11,959
4.2.4	Stakeholder satisfied with EU funded projects	%	75.0%	97.0%
4.2.5	Non-EU offices implementing tools and practices	Implementations	68	72

OB 4.3 Enhance common tools and databases with new functionalities

Code	Indicator Name	Unit	Target 2016	2016
4.3.1	User satisfaction with TM View, DS View and TM Class	%	79%	82%
4.3.2	National Offices satisfaction with ECP Tools (Back Office)	%	63%	76%

OB 4.4 Create new IP tools and databases

Code	Indicator Name	Unit	Target 2016	2016
4.4.1	Usage of national court judgments database	Searches	3,900	3,781

OB 4.5 Strengthen networks of EU agencies

Code	Indicator Name	Unit	Target 2016	2016
4.5.1	Visits to landing page of EU agencies extranet	#	1,080	5,217

LoA 5 Enhance customer-driven quality services

OB 5.1 Further integrate user perspective in delivery of products and services

Code	Indicator Name	Unit	Target 2016	2016
5.1.1	Users satisfaction with the Office's decision(s) predictability	%	59.0%	68.9%
5.1.2	Users awareness of the Office's Guidelines	%	45.0%	55.3%

OB 5.2 Increase the proportion of straight-through files processed by improving predictability

Code	Indicator Name	Unit	Target 2016	2016
5.2.1	EUTMAs automatically classified	%	33.00%	40.76%

5.2.2	EUTMAs filed using Fast Track	%	25.00%	29.75%	
5.2.3	Designs filed using Fast Track	%	25.0%	28.0%	
5.2.4	EUTMAs expression automatically classified	%	77.00%	81.99%	
5.2.5	Formalities deficiency rate	%	3.6%	5.9%	
5.2.6	Classification deficiency rate	%	12.6%	16.5%	
5.2.7	AG objection rate	%	6.3%	8.8%	
5.2.8	RCD deficiency rate	%	27.0%	28.1%	

OB 5.3 Optimise team working for high-quality delivery

Code	Indicator Name	Unit	Target 2016	2016	
5.3.1	Areas of expertise in the teams	#	3.0	3.0	
5.3.2	Staff satisfaction on Teamwork	%	67.5%	69.0%	
5.3.3	Index automatic translation (at source language)	%	55.0%	66.2%	
5.3.4	Appeals confirmation rate ex-parte decisions	%	72.0%	80.0%	
5.3.5	Appeals confirmation rate inter-partes decisions	%	63.0%	68.0%	
5.3.6	General Court confirmation rate	%	75.0%	85.7%	

LoA 6 Strengthen the Intellectual Property System

OB 6.1 Contribute to harmonised implementation of the legislative reform

Code	Indicator Name	Unit	Target 2016	2016	
6.1.1	Implementation of the legislative reform in the office	%	54.0%	74.0%	

OB 6.2 Deliver evidence-based research on key areas of IP

Code	Indicator Name	Unit	Target 2016	2016	
6.2.1	Downloads of relevant papers/publications from the Observatory Website	#	480	35,384	
6.2.2	Stakeholders perception on the quality of the studies carried out by Observatory	%	70.0%	88.0%	
6.2.3	Observatory website visitors	#	4,752	5,558	

OB 6.3 Strengthen cooperation and knowledge-sharing with and among enforcement authorities

Code	Indicator Name	Unit	Target 2016	2016	
6.3.1	Studies and Reports published by Observatory	#	16	15	
6.3.2	Users satisfaction with the Enforcement Tools	%	75.0%	63.0%	
6.3.3	Enforcement Database usage by rights holders	Products	1,040	1,412	

OB 6.4 Support EU business, in particular SMEs, in protecting their IP rights

Code	Indicator Name	Unit	Target 2016	2016	
6.4.1	SME's use of Intellectual Property	%	9.0%	9.0%	
6.4.2	SME's knowledge of term 'Intellectual Property Rights'	%	24.0%	28.0%	
6.4.3	New direct filers	#	10,050	11,866	
6.4.4	External stakeholders training satisfaction	%	66.00%	85.00%	

OB 6.5 Raise awareness among citizens and decision-makers of the impact and value of IP rights

Code	Indicator Name	Unit	Target 2016	2016
6.5.1	15 to 24 year-olds that bought counterfeit products over the last 12 months	%	14.0%	12.0%
6.5.2	15 to 24 year-olds that downloaded or accessed copyright-protected content illegally over the last 12 months	%	14.0%	25.0%
6.5.3	Europeans awareness of legal offers for downloading or streaming music	%	65.0%	65.0%
6.5.4	Usage of Orphan Works Database	Searches	1,800	9,034
6.5.5	Number of works in the Orphan Works Database	#	12,000	12,974
6.5.6	Press Coverage (external communication)	Articles	522	2,403