

NATIONAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION (NEA)  
Revalidated Performance Scorecard 2016

Component	Target			Submission			CGO-B Validation		Supporting Documents	Remarks																					
	Objective/Measure	Formula	Weight	2016	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating																							
<b>SO 1</b>	<b>Ensured that the ECs Provide Accessible, Quality and Reliable Service to the Consumers</b>																														
SM 1	Number of Completed and Energized Sitio Projects	Actual over target	30.00%	3,150	3,335	30.00%	<u>2,708</u>	<u>25.79%</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NEA Sitio Electrification Program (SEP) List as of 31 Dec. 2016</li> <li>Updated SEP Status</li> <li>Certificates of Final Inspection and Acceptance (CFIA)</li> </ul>	<p>During the May 2017 validation, it was observed that 691 of the reported 3,335 accomplishments were already completed from 2013 to 2015, but were reported as accomplishment only in 2016. Following is the breakdown of the 691 sitios:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>No. of Completed and Energized Sitios</th> <th>Year Reported (as validated)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2015</td> <td>675</td> <td>2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2014</td> <td>7</td> <td>2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2013</td> <td>9</td> <td>2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>TOTAL</b></td> <td><b>691</b></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>This resulted to an initial validated accomplishment of 2,644 completed and energized sitios.</p> <p>In its 8 Feb 2018 letter, NEA requested for reconsideration of additional 73 sitios completed in 2016 but were only inspected in 2017. However, as validated in the Certificates of Final Inspection and Acceptance, 9 of the reported additional 73 sitios were completed in 2017, viz:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Sitio</th> <th>Date Completed (as reported in the CFIA)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Recudo, Turda, Coron</td> <td>12 Jan 17</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mulong Bulong, Turda, Coron</td> <td>12 Jan 17</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	No. of Completed and Energized Sitios	Year Reported (as validated)	2015	675	2016	2014	7	2016	2013	9	2016	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>691</b>		Sitio	Date Completed (as reported in the CFIA)	Recudo, Turda, Coron	12 Jan 17	Mulong Bulong, Turda, Coron	12 Jan 17
Year	No. of Completed and Energized Sitios	Year Reported (as validated)																													
2015	675	2016																													
2014	7	2016																													
2013	9	2016																													
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>691</b>																														
Sitio	Date Completed (as reported in the CFIA)																														
Recudo, Turda, Coron	12 Jan 17																														
Mulong Bulong, Turda, Coron	12 Jan 17																														

STAKEHOLDER

Component			Target	Submission		CGO-B Validation		Supporting Documents	Remarks																																																												
Objective/Measure	Formula	Weight	2016	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating																																																														
									Purok 7, Nangalian, Baggao 6 Jul 17 Zone 1, Dalla, Baggao 11 May 17 Zone 5, Agaman, Baggao 4 Aug 17 Zone 6, Agaman, Baggao 4 Aug 17 Zone 7, Agaman, Baggao 4 Aug 17 Zone 7A, Mabini, Baggao 27 Jul 17 Nagragadian, Hacienda Intal, Baggao 30 Apr 17  Consequently, total final validated accomplishment is 2,708.																																																												
<b>SO 2</b>	<b>Generated Peak Performance among ECs to Ensure Competitiveness</b>																																																																				
SM 2	Percentage of ECs Adopting Balanced Scorecard System	Actual over target	7.00%	51.67% (62 ECs)	48.33% (58 ECs)	6.55%	48.33% (58 ECs)	6.55%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Board Resolutions from the 12 ECs confirming adoption of the balanced scorecard system</li> <li>Balanced Scorecards inspected during validation.</li> <li>The following are the ECs adopting the Balanced Scorecard system, viz:</li> </ul> <table border="1"> <tr><td>PALECO</td><td>PELCO I</td><td>BISELCO</td></tr> <tr><td>NEECO 2-A1</td><td>FIBECCO</td><td>MOELCI II</td></tr> <tr><td>BILECO</td><td>ZAMECO II</td><td>ANECCO</td></tr> <tr><td>NEECO 2-A2</td><td>COTELCO</td><td>SURNECO</td></tr> <tr><td>SOLECO</td><td>PELCO II</td><td>ZAMSURECO II</td></tr> <tr><td>LEYECO III</td><td>LUBELCO</td><td>FLECO</td></tr> <tr><td>ESAMELCO</td><td>TIELCO</td><td>LANECO</td></tr> <tr><td>PANELCO III</td><td>MARELCO</td><td>SIARELCO</td></tr> <tr><td>PRESCO</td><td>PENELCO</td><td>DIELCO</td></tr> <tr><td>ZANECO</td><td>ZAMCELCO</td><td>DASURECO</td></tr> <tr><td>NEECO 1</td><td>ZAMECO I</td><td>SURSECO I</td></tr> <tr><td>TARELCO I</td><td>MOELCI I</td><td>OMECCO</td></tr> <tr><td>LEYECO IV</td><td>ZAMSURECO I</td><td>AKELCO</td></tr> <tr><td>AURELCO</td><td>SOCOTECO I</td><td>ASELCO</td></tr> <tr><td>ISECO</td><td>ROMELCO</td><td>QUEZELCO II</td></tr> <tr><td>TARELCO II</td><td>BATELEC II</td><td>BATELEC I</td></tr> <tr><td>MORESCO II</td><td>INEC</td><td>ORMECCO</td></tr> <tr><td>BUSECO</td><td>DORECO</td><td>MORESCO I</td></tr> <tr><td>CAMELCO</td><td>SORECO II</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>SOCOTECO II</td><td>LUELCO</td><td></td></tr> </table>	PALECO	PELCO I	BISELCO	NEECO 2-A1	FIBECCO	MOELCI II	BILECO	ZAMECO II	ANECCO	NEECO 2-A2	COTELCO	SURNECO	SOLECO	PELCO II	ZAMSURECO II	LEYECO III	LUBELCO	FLECO	ESAMELCO	TIELCO	LANECO	PANELCO III	MARELCO	SIARELCO	PRESCO	PENELCO	DIELCO	ZANECO	ZAMCELCO	DASURECO	NEECO 1	ZAMECO I	SURSECO I	TARELCO I	MOELCI I	OMECCO	LEYECO IV	ZAMSURECO I	AKELCO	AURELCO	SOCOTECO I	ASELCO	ISECO	ROMELCO	QUEZELCO II	TARELCO II	BATELEC II	BATELEC I	MORESCO II	INEC	ORMECCO	BUSECO	DORECO	MORESCO I	CAMELCO	SORECO II		SOCOTECO II	LUELCO	
PALECO	PELCO I	BISELCO																																																																			
NEECO 2-A1	FIBECCO	MOELCI II																																																																			
BILECO	ZAMECO II	ANECCO																																																																			
NEECO 2-A2	COTELCO	SURNECO																																																																			
SOLECO	PELCO II	ZAMSURECO II																																																																			
LEYECO III	LUBELCO	FLECO																																																																			
ESAMELCO	TIELCO	LANECO																																																																			
PANELCO III	MARELCO	SIARELCO																																																																			
PRESCO	PENELCO	DIELCO																																																																			
ZANECO	ZAMCELCO	DASURECO																																																																			
NEECO 1	ZAMECO I	SURSECO I																																																																			
TARELCO I	MOELCI I	OMECCO																																																																			
LEYECO IV	ZAMSURECO I	AKELCO																																																																			
AURELCO	SOCOTECO I	ASELCO																																																																			
ISECO	ROMELCO	QUEZELCO II																																																																			
TARELCO II	BATELEC II	BATELEC I																																																																			
MORESCO II	INEC	ORMECCO																																																																			
BUSECO	DORECO	MORESCO I																																																																			
CAMELCO	SORECO II																																																																				
SOCOTECO II	LUELCO																																																																				

STAKEHOLDER	Component			Target	Submission		CGO-B Validation		Supporting Documents	Remarks											
	Objective/Measure	Formula	Weight	2016	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating													
										<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In its 8 Feb 2018 letter, NEA requested GCG to consider inclusion of DANECO and SORECO I in the list of ECs that adopted the scorecard system in 2016 on the basis that these ECs attended the Balanced Scorecard Workshop and that balanced scorecards were crafted, pending approval by their respective Board.</li> <li>Confirmation of the adoption of the balanced scorecard system and the approval of the strategy maps and balanced scorecards must be expressed through a Board Resolution.</li> <li>Absent any Board Resolution from the Boards of DANECO and SORECO, the same cannot be considered as accomplishment in 2016.</li> </ul>											
	SM 3	Programs and Projects to Improve EC Operations	Actual over target							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Board Resolutions and Operation Improvement Plans (OIPs)</li> <li>OIP Quarterly Monitoring Reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By end of 2015, there are 20 ECs classified as either Red (ailing) or Yellow (those which do not comply with any of the six financial and operational parameters and standards set by NEA). Programs and projects for improvement of these ECs were set by NEA through an Operation and Improvement Plan (OIP).</li> <li>Among the 20 ECs, 11 have existing OIPs, while 9 ECs commenced OIPs in 2016, viz:</li> </ul> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1. PELCO III</td> <td>6. MASELCO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. QUEZELCO I</td> <td>7. SORECO I</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. ALECO/ APEC</td> <td>8. SORECO II</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4. CASURECO II</td> <td>9. TISELCO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5. FICELCO</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	1. PELCO III	6. MASELCO	2. QUEZELCO I	7. SORECO I	3. ALECO/ APEC	8. SORECO II	4. CASURECO II	9. TISELCO	5. FICELCO	
1. PELCO III	6. MASELCO																				
2. QUEZELCO I	7. SORECO I																				
3. ALECO/ APEC	8. SORECO II																				
4. CASURECO II	9. TISELCO																				
5. FICELCO																					

Component				Target	Submission		CGO-B Validation		Supporting Documents	Remarks
Objective/Measure	Formula	Weight	2016	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating			
SM 4 Percentage of Milestones Completed by NEA Leading to the Restructuring of Identified Ailing ECs through Private Sector Participation (PSP)	Actual over target  a. Discussion with stakeholders, such as LGUs, business groups, civic organizations, and religious sector among others (50%)  b. Secure concurrence to undertake PSP (50%)	2.00%	100%	In Process	0.00%	In Process	0.00%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ZAMCELCO Board Resolutions:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No. 136, s. 2014</li> <li>- No. 86, s. 2015</li> </ul> </li> <li>Certificates of Appearance of NEA personnel for the 15 and 29 July 2016 Public Information and Discussion from ZAMCELCO</li> <li>Post-Activity Reports</li> <li>CASURECO III Board Resolutions:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No. 16, s. 2015 approved on 28 Mar 2015</li> <li>- No. 33, s. 2015 approved on 23 May 2015</li> <li>- Nos. 43, 44 and 45 s. 2015 approved on 20 Jun 2015</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In its 12 July 2017 letter, NEA reported 0% accomplishment for this measure, as said activities are still in process.</li> <li>On its 8 February 2018 letter, NEA appeals GCG to consider crediting 1.00% score, on the basis that the previously presented "Certificates of Appearance issued by ZAMCELCO on 15 and 26 July 2016 indicates that NEA participated in discussions with stakeholders about PSP (Public Information and Discussion on Investment Management Contract (IMC) of ZAMCELCO)".</li> <li>Nevertheless, it was gathered from subsequent submissions of post activity reports that the conduct of the discussions has no definite output (i.e., finalized Terms of Reference, etc.). Thus, it may be inferred that the conduct of discussions with stakeholders is still an on-going process. The request for reconsideration is therefore denied.</li> </ul>	

STAKEHOLDER	Component			Target	Submission		CGO-B Validation		Supporting Documents	Remarks																
	Objective/Measure	Formula	Weight	2016	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating																		
	SM 5	Number of Ailing ECs Restructured through PSP	Pass or fail	4.00%	1	In Process	0.00%	-	0.00%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Certificate of Appearance of NEA Legal Services Office's (NEA LSO) personnel during the 6 February 2016 SBAC Meeting held in CASURECO III, issued by the Deputy Administrator for NEA LSO.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It was validated by GCG in 2015 that the restructuring of CASURECO III did not push through due to pending finalization of terms of reference. In 2016, it was reported that bidding for CASURECO III's PSP is still on going.</li> </ul>															
	SM 6	Sustainability of Restructuring through PSP	Pass or fail	1.50%	100%	100%	1.50%	50%	1.50%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Report on ALECO's Remittance of Concession Fee as of 19 July 2016</li> <li>Payment Request Memorandum of ALECO's 4<sup>th</sup> Q Concession Fee</li> <li>Report on PELCO II's quarterly performance accomplishments for the year 2016 dated 16 January 2017</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Similar to 2015 accomplishment, quarterly payments of ₱2.1 Million were made by ALECO in accordance with the concession agreement. However, monthly payment of 50% of net cash flow for existing liabilities was yet impracticable due to negative cash flow in 2016.</li> <li>On the other hand, PELCO II's performance in 2016 are as follows:</li> </ul> <table border="1" style="margin-left: 20px;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>1<sup>st</sup> Q</th> <th>2<sup>nd</sup> Q</th> <th>3<sup>rd</sup> Q</th> <th>4<sup>th</sup> Q</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>System Loss</td> <td>11.45</td> <td>11.73</td> <td>11.44</td> <td>11.15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Collection Efficiency</td> <td>95.82</td> <td>95.79</td> <td>95.52</td> <td>95.43</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		1 <sup>st</sup> Q	2 <sup>nd</sup> Q	3 <sup>rd</sup> Q	4 <sup>th</sup> Q	System Loss	11.45	11.73	11.44	11.15	Collection Efficiency	95.82	95.79	95.52	95.43
												1 <sup>st</sup> Q	2 <sup>nd</sup> Q	3 <sup>rd</sup> Q	4 <sup>th</sup> Q											
	System Loss	11.45	11.73	11.44	11.15																					
	Collection Efficiency	95.82	95.79	95.52	95.43																					
	Semestral monitoring of compliance to agreements:																									
	1. ALECO																									
	Payment of concession fee consisting of:																									
a. Quarterly payment of P2.1M to residual ALECO																										
b. Monthly payment of 50% of net cash flows for existing liabilities	1.50%	100%	100%	1.50%	100%	1.50%																				
2. PELCO II																										
a. System loss should be lower than 13.10%																										
b. Collection efficiency should be higher than 90.53%																										

	Component			Target	Submission		CGO-B Validation		Supporting Documents	Remarks													
	Objective/Measure	Formula	Weight	2016	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating															
STAKEHOLDER	SM 7	Number of EC Officials and Employees Graduated from Certification/Competency Programs	Actual over target	3.00%	2,050	3,578	3.00%	3,559	3.00%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Training Folders which contain the following:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Attendance Sheets,</li> <li>- Photocopies of Certificate of Completion,</li> <li>- Training Design,</li> <li>- Training Evaluation Survey, etc.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NEA exceeded this target by 1,509 or 73.61%. Following is the tabulated number of EC officials and employees who graduated from competency programs with training certificates:</li> </ul> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Period</th> <th>No. of Participants</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1<sup>st</sup> Q</td> <td>521</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2<sup>nd</sup> Q</td> <td>1,299</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3<sup>rd</sup> Q</td> <td>779</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4<sup>th</sup> Q</td> <td>960</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>TOTAL</b></td> <td><b>3,559</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>*difference accounts for those without training certificates</p>	Period	No. of Participants	1 <sup>st</sup> Q	521	2 <sup>nd</sup> Q	1,299	3 <sup>rd</sup> Q	779	4 <sup>th</sup> Q	960	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3,559</b>
	Period	No. of Participants																					
1 <sup>st</sup> Q	521																						
2 <sup>nd</sup> Q	1,299																						
3 <sup>rd</sup> Q	779																						
4 <sup>th</sup> Q	960																						
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3,559</b>																						
	<b>Sub-total</b>			<b>52.00%</b>			<b>45.55%</b>		<b>41.34%</b>														
FINANCE	SO 3	<b>Sustained the Organization's Viability and Ensured Accountability and Transparency</b>																					
	SM 8	Amount of Regular Loans Facilitated (Php Billion)	Below Php 1B is 0%. For the amount ≥ Php 1B, 10% is proportionally distributed, i.e.  $\frac{\{(Actual\ amount\ of\ loans\ facilitated\ \ge\ PHP\ 1B)\}}{\{(Target\ amount - Php\ 0.999B) \div 10\%}}$	10.00%	1.700	1.831	10.00%	2.543	10.00%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Summary of Peso Releases for the Year 2016 as of 31 December 2016</li> <li>Schedule of loan released as of 31 December 2016 (STCF, Stand-by credit, CapEx)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NEA slightly exceeded its target by 0.65% through provision of financial assistances to its ECs in the amount of:</li> </ul> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>TYPE OF LOAN</th> <th>AMOUNT (in Million Pesos)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Short-Term Credit Facility (STCF) average</td> <td>487</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Stand-by Credit average</td> <td>399</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Capital Expenditure (Capital Projects, Modular Generator Set, Working Capital)</td> <td>1,657</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>TOTAL</b></td> <td><b>₱ 2,543</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	TYPE OF LOAN	AMOUNT (in Million Pesos)	Short-Term Credit Facility (STCF) average	487	Stand-by Credit average	399	Capital Expenditure (Capital Projects, Modular Generator Set, Working Capital)	1,657	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>₱ 2,543</b>		
TYPE OF LOAN	AMOUNT (in Million Pesos)																						
Short-Term Credit Facility (STCF) average	487																						
Stand-by Credit average	399																						
Capital Expenditure (Capital Projects, Modular Generator Set, Working Capital)	1,657																						
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>₱ 2,543</b>																						

6

Component				Target	Submission		CGO-B Validation		Supporting Documents	Remarks								
Objective/Measure	Formula	Weight	2016	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating											
SM 9	Maintain High Collection Efficiency	$\frac{\text{Total repayments}}{\text{Total amortizations due}}$	4.00%	99%	100%	4.00%	100.99%	4.00%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Report on "Status of EC Loan Repayments" (as of 31 December 2016)</li> <li>Loan Profiles (per EC per Region)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NEA's collection efficiency continuous to improve from 99.73% in 2014 to 100.99% in 2016.</li> </ul> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>TYPE OF LOAN</th> <th>AMOUNT</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Total Amortization Due</td> <td>₱ 18,667 B</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Payments</td> <td>18,852 B</td> </tr> <tr> <td>% of Coll. Efficiency</td> <td>100.99%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Collection efficiency exceeded 100% because advances made by ECs were included in the collection of receivables.</li> </ul>	TYPE OF LOAN	AMOUNT	Total Amortization Due	₱ 18,667 B	Total Payments	18,852 B	% of Coll. Efficiency	100.99%
TYPE OF LOAN	AMOUNT																	
Total Amortization Due	₱ 18,667 B																	
Total Payments	18,852 B																	
% of Coll. Efficiency	100.99%																	
<b>Sub-total</b>		<b>14.00%</b>			<b>14.00%</b>		<b>14.00%</b>											
<b>INTERNAL</b>																		
<b>SO 4</b>	<b>Continued Upgrading of Organizational Infrastructure and Enhance Operational Efficiency</b>																	
SM 10	Percentage of Sitio Electrification Projects Funded that are Fully Compliant with NEA Standards and Specifications	Actual over target	10.00%	75% of projects done as of end Sept. 2016	85.00%	10.00%	84.18%	10.00%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NEA Sitio Electrification Program (SEP) List as of 31 Dec. 2016</li> <li>Certificates of Final Inspection and Acceptance of sampled ECs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Breakdown is as follows:</li> </ul> <table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>Total sitios completed and energized from Oct 2015 to Sept 2016 (as reported in 2016) issued with Certificate of Final Inspection and Acceptance</td> <td>2,570</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total sitios completed and energized from Oct 2015 to Sept 2016 (as reported in 2016)</td> <td>3,053</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Percentage of sitio electrification projects funded that are fully compliant with NEA standards and specifications</td> <td><math>\frac{2,570}{3,053} = 84.18\%</math></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Total sitios completed and energized from Oct 2015 to Sept 2016 (as reported in 2016) issued with Certificate of Final Inspection and Acceptance	2,570	Total sitios completed and energized from Oct 2015 to Sept 2016 (as reported in 2016)	3,053	Percentage of sitio electrification projects funded that are fully compliant with NEA standards and specifications	$\frac{2,570}{3,053} = 84.18\%$		
Total sitios completed and energized from Oct 2015 to Sept 2016 (as reported in 2016) issued with Certificate of Final Inspection and Acceptance	2,570																	
Total sitios completed and energized from Oct 2015 to Sept 2016 (as reported in 2016)	3,053																	
Percentage of sitio electrification projects funded that are fully compliant with NEA standards and specifications	$\frac{2,570}{3,053} = 84.18\%$																	

INTERNAL PROCESS	Component			Target	Submission		CGO-B Validation		Supporting Documents	Remarks												
	Objective/Measure	Formula	Weight	2016	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating														
SM 11	Percentage of Sitios Completed and Energized within 150 Calendar Days from Release of Funds to ECs	<p>Below 75% is 0. For <math>\geq 75\%</math>, 10% is proportionally distributed, i.e.:</p> <p>{(Actual percentage of sitios completed and energized within 150 days from release of funds to ECs <math>\geq 75\%</math>)</p> <p>[(Target rate - 74%) <math>\div</math> 10%]}</p>	10.00%	80%	81%	10.00%	<u>57.14%</u>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NEA Sitio Electrification Program (SEP) List as of 31 Dec. 2016</li> <li>Report entitled: "SEP Accomplished in 150 days as of 31 Dec. 2015"</li> <li>Report entitled: "Summary of Electric Cooperatives Affected Projects"</li> <li>Report entitled: "SEP Accomplished in 150 days as of 31 Dec. 2015" as updated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revalidation showed that NEA accomplished 57.14% of the target, viz:</li> </ul> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Total validated sitios completed and energized</td> <td>2,708</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Less: Projects with delayed release of funds<sup>2</sup></td> <td>111</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total universe</td> <td>2,597</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Projects completed within 150 days from release of fund</td> <td>1,484</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total universe</td> <td>2,597</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Percentage of sitios completed and energized within 150 calendar days from release of funds to ECs (1,484 <math>\div</math> 2,597)</td> <td>=57.14%</td> </tr> </table> <p><sup>2</sup> Cases wherein funds were released after completion of project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The target for this measure is absolute. The target percentage of 80% already takes into account delays of whatever cause, while the target period of 150 days, an increase of 30 days from 2015 target, already considers the increasing difficulty of reaching the remaining unenergized sitios. For this reason, projects initially excluded by NEA due to "force majeure" were added back.</li> <li>With the revalidation, sitios that have been completed in prior years but reported only in 2016 have likewise been excluded for purposes of computing the validated accomplishment. The exclusion is made considering that the target period for previous years was only 120 calendar days.</li> </ul>	Total validated sitios completed and energized	2,708	Less: Projects with delayed release of funds <sup>2</sup>	111	Total universe	2,597	Projects completed within 150 days from release of fund	1,484	Total universe	2,597	Percentage of sitios completed and energized within 150 calendar days from release of funds to ECs (1,484 $\div$ 2,597)	=57.14%
Total validated sitios completed and energized	2,708																					
Less: Projects with delayed release of funds <sup>2</sup>	111																					
Total universe	2,597																					
Projects completed within 150 days from release of fund	1,484																					
Total universe	2,597																					
Percentage of sitios completed and energized within 150 calendar days from release of funds to ECs (1,484 $\div$ 2,597)	=57.14%																					



Component			Target	Submission		CGO-B Validation		Supporting Documents	Remarks																									
Objective/Measure	Formula	Weight	2016	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating																											
INTERNAL PROCESS	SM 12 Average Number of Working Days to Release Regular Loans	Pass or fail	4.00%	10	8.52	4.00%	8.52	4.00%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Report on "Average Number of Working Days for Loan Facilitated – Regular" (as of 31 December 2016)</li> <li>Summary on Loan facilitated for Short Term Loan for CY 2016</li> <li>Quarterly report on "Average Number of Working Days for Loan Facilitated – Regular" for CY 2016</li> </ul>	Breakdown is as follows: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Quarter</th> <th>No. of Transactions</th> <th>No. Of Working Days</th> <th>Ave. Working Days</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1<sup>st</sup></td> <td>33</td> <td>234.77</td> <td>7.11</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2<sup>nd</sup></td> <td>46</td> <td>320.32</td> <td>6.96</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3<sup>rd</sup></td> <td>72</td> <td>663.97</td> <td>9.22</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4<sup>th</sup></td> <td>33</td> <td>348</td> <td>10.55</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total</b></td> <td><b>184</b></td> <td><b>1,567</b></td> <td><b>8.52</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Quarter	No. of Transactions	No. Of Working Days	Ave. Working Days	1 <sup>st</sup>	33	234.77	7.11	2 <sup>nd</sup>	46	320.32	6.96	3 <sup>rd</sup>	72	663.97	9.22	4 <sup>th</sup>	33	348	10.55	<b>Total</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>1,567</b>	<b>8.52</b>
	Quarter	No. of Transactions	No. Of Working Days	Ave. Working Days																														
1 <sup>st</sup>	33	234.77	7.11																															
2 <sup>nd</sup>	46	320.32	6.96																															
3 <sup>rd</sup>	72	663.97	9.22																															
4 <sup>th</sup>	33	348	10.55																															
<b>Total</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>1,567</b>	<b>8.52</b>																															
SM 13 Average Number of Working Days to Release Calamity Loans (Natural and Armed Conflict)	Pass or fail	2.00%	6	5.38	2.00%	5.38	2.00%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Report on "Average Number of Working Days for Loan Facilitated – Calamity" (as of 31 December 2016)</li> <li>Quarterly report on "Average Number of Working Days for Loan Facilitated – Calamity" for CY 2016</li> </ul>	Breakdown is as follows: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Quarter</th> <th>No. of Transaction</th> <th>No. Of Working Days</th> <th>Ave. Working Days per Trans.</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1<sup>st</sup></td> <td>12</td> <td>62.39</td> <td>5.20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2<sup>nd</sup></td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3<sup>rd</sup></td> <td>1</td> <td>2.33</td> <td>2.33</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4<sup>th</sup></td> <td>11</td> <td>64.50</td> <td>11.88</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total</b></td> <td><b>24</b></td> <td><b>129</b></td> <td><b>5.38</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> *There were differences between GCG validation, but the amount is immaterial.	Quarter	No. of Transaction	No. Of Working Days	Ave. Working Days per Trans.	1 <sup>st</sup>	12	62.39	5.20	2 <sup>nd</sup>	0	0	0	3 <sup>rd</sup>	1	2.33	2.33	4 <sup>th</sup>	11	64.50	11.88	<b>Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>5.38</b>	
Quarter	No. of Transaction	No. Of Working Days	Ave. Working Days per Trans.																															
1 <sup>st</sup>	12	62.39	5.20																															
2 <sup>nd</sup>	0	0	0																															
3 <sup>rd</sup>	1	2.33	2.33																															
4 <sup>th</sup>	11	64.50	11.88																															
<b>Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>5.38</b>																															
<i>Sub-total</i>		<b>26.00%</b>			<b>26.00%</b>		<b>16.00%</b>																											

LEARNING AND GROWTH	Component			Target	Submission		CGO-B Validation		Supporting Documents	Remarks
	Objective/Measure	Formula	Weight	2016	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating		
	<b>SO 5</b>	<b>Enhanced Human Resources, Knowledge, Skills and Behavioral Competencies</b>								
SM 14	Implementation of ISO 9001:2008	Pass or fail	5.00%	Surveillance Audit Passed	Surveillance Audit with Upgrade to 2015 Standard Passed	5.00%	Surveillance Audit with Upgrade to 2015 Standard Passed	5.00%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ISO 9001:2015 Certification issued by TUV Rheinland dated 21 December 2016</li> </ul>	Validated with internal documents.
SM 15	Average Percentage of Required Competencies Met	Pass or fail	3.00%	Submission of Board Approved Competency Model	Board approved Competency Model submitted	3.00%	Board approved Competency Model submitted	3.00%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NEA Competency Framework/ Model for Officers and Employees</li> <li>NEA Board Resolution No. 141 issued 22 December 2016</li> </ul>	GCG officially received NEA's Board Approved Competency Framework/ Model on 28 December 2016.
<i>Sub-total</i>			<b>8.00%</b>			<b>8.00%</b>		<b>8.00%</b>		
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>100.00%</b>			<b>93.55%</b>		<b>79.34%</b>		

6