

## NATIONAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION (NEA) 2017 Validated Performance Scorecard

Component			Target	GOCC Submission		GCG Validation		Supporting Documents	Remarks																																																					
Objective/Measure	Formula	Weight	2017	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating																																																							
<b>SO 1</b>	<b>To contribute to the country's aim of sustainable rural development through total electrification in rural areas</b>																																																													
SM 1	Number of completed and energized sitio projects	Total actual completed and energized sitio projects	30.00%	2,410	1,079	13.43%	1,048	13.05%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Report on 2017 SEP Projects and Certificate of Final Inspection and Acceptance (CFIA)</li> <li>CY 2017 Business Intelligence Reports from Electric Cooperatives</li> <li>CFIAs</li> </ul>																																																					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For 2017, NEA reported 1,079 sitios completed in 2017. GCG validation, however, showed that NEA's actual accomplishment for 2017 is 1,048 only. Summary of reported vis-à-vis validated accomplishment is shown in the table below:</li> </ul>																																																														
<table border="1" style="border-collapse: collapse; width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Regions</th> <th style="text-align: center;">As reported by NEA</th> <th style="text-align: center;">As validated by GCG</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">CAR</td><td style="text-align: center;">52</td><td style="text-align: center;">53</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">I</td><td style="text-align: center;">30</td><td style="text-align: center;">26</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">II</td><td style="text-align: center;">76</td><td style="text-align: center;">59</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">III</td><td style="text-align: center;">54</td><td style="text-align: center;">49</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">IV-A</td><td style="text-align: center;">24</td><td style="text-align: center;">24</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">IV-B</td><td style="text-align: center;">81</td><td style="text-align: center;">81</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">V</td><td style="text-align: center;">76</td><td style="text-align: center;">76</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">VI</td><td style="text-align: center;">109</td><td style="text-align: center;">106</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">VII</td><td style="text-align: center;">244</td><td style="text-align: center;">243</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">VIII</td><td style="text-align: center;">31</td><td style="text-align: center;">31</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">IX</td><td style="text-align: center;">25</td><td style="text-align: center;">25</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">X</td><td style="text-align: center;">63</td><td style="text-align: center;">61</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">XI</td><td style="text-align: center;">69</td><td style="text-align: center;">67</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">XII</td><td style="text-align: center;">75</td><td style="text-align: center;">75</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">ARMM</td><td style="text-align: center;">16</td><td style="text-align: center;">16</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">CARAGA</td><td style="text-align: center;">54</td><td style="text-align: center;">56</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;"><b>TOTAL</b></td><td style="text-align: center;"><b>1,079</b></td><td style="text-align: center;"><b>1,048</b></td></tr> </tbody> </table>									Regions	As reported by NEA	As validated by GCG	CAR	52	53	I	30	26	II	76	59	III	54	49	IV-A	24	24	IV-B	81	81	V	76	76	VI	109	106	VII	244	243	VIII	31	31	IX	25	25	X	63	61	XI	69	67	XII	75	75	ARMM	16	16	CARAGA	54	56	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,079</b>	<b>1,048</b>
Regions	As reported by NEA	As validated by GCG																																																												
CAR	52	53																																																												
I	30	26																																																												
II	76	59																																																												
III	54	49																																																												
IV-A	24	24																																																												
IV-B	81	81																																																												
V	76	76																																																												
VI	109	106																																																												
VII	244	243																																																												
VIII	31	31																																																												
IX	25	25																																																												
X	63	61																																																												
XI	69	67																																																												
XII	75	75																																																												
ARMM	16	16																																																												
CARAGA	54	56																																																												
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,079</b>	<b>1,048</b>																																																												

Component			Target	GOCC Submission		GCG Validation		Supporting Documents	Remarks																																																																																				
Objective/Measure	Formula	Weight	2017	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating																																																																																						
SO 2	To ensure that the Electric Cooperative provide accessible, adequate, quality, and reliable service to the customers																																																																																												
SM 2	Percentage of ECs adopting Performance Scorecard Model	<u>ECs adopting performance scorecard</u> Total number of ECs	5.00%	80% (97/121 ECs)	70% (84/121 ECs)	4.35%	69.42% (84/121 ECs)	4.33%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The following are the ECs adopting the Balanced Scorecard system, viz:</li> </ul> <table border="1"> <tr><td>AKELCO</td><td>ILECO II</td><td>PELCO I</td></tr> <tr><td>ANECO</td><td>INEC</td><td>PELCO II</td></tr> <tr><td>ASELCO</td><td>ISECO</td><td>PELCO III</td></tr> <tr><td>AURELCO</td><td>LANECO</td><td>PENELCO</td></tr> <tr><td>BANELCO</td><td>LEYECO II</td><td>PRESCO</td></tr> <tr><td>BATELEC I</td><td>LEYECO III</td><td>PROSIELCO</td></tr> <tr><td>BATELEC II</td><td>LEYECO IV</td><td>QUEZELCO II</td></tr> <tr><td>BILECO</td><td>LEYECO V</td><td>ROMELCO</td></tr> <tr><td>BISELCO</td><td>LUBELCO</td><td>SAMELCO I</td></tr> <tr><td>BOHECO I</td><td>LUELCO</td><td>SAMELCO II</td></tr> <tr><td>BOHECO II</td><td>MAGELCO</td><td>SIARELCO</td></tr> <tr><td>BUSECO</td><td>MARELCO</td><td>SOCOTECO I</td></tr> <tr><td>CAMELCO</td><td>MOELCI I</td><td>SOCOTECO II</td></tr> <tr><td>CAPELCO</td><td>MOELCI II</td><td>SOLECO</td></tr> <tr><td>CEBECO I</td><td>MORESCO I</td><td>SORECO II</td></tr> <tr><td>CEBECO II</td><td>MORESCO II</td><td>SUKELCO</td></tr> <tr><td>CEBECO III</td><td>NEECO 1</td><td>SURNECO</td></tr> <tr><td>CELCO</td><td>NEECO 2-A1</td><td>SURSECO I</td></tr> <tr><td>CENECO</td><td>NEECO 2-A2</td><td>SURSECO II</td></tr> <tr><td>COTELCO</td><td>NOCECO</td><td>TARELCO I</td></tr> <tr><td>COTELCO-PPAMA</td><td>NONECO</td><td>TARELCO II</td></tr> <tr><td>DASURECO</td><td>NORECO I</td><td>TIELCO</td></tr> <tr><td>DIELCO</td><td>NORECO II</td><td>ZAMCELCO</td></tr> <tr><td>DORECO</td><td>NORSAMELCO</td><td>ZAMECO I</td></tr> <tr><td>DORELCO</td><td>OMECO</td><td>ZAMECO II</td></tr> <tr><td>ESAMELCO</td><td>ORMECO</td><td>ZAMSURECO I</td></tr> <tr><td>FIBECO</td><td>PALECO</td><td>ZAMSURECO II</td></tr> <tr><td>FLECO</td><td>PANELCO III</td><td>ZANECO</td></tr> </table> <p>ECs in bold indicates those that adopted the balanced scorecard system beginning 2017.</p>	AKELCO	ILECO II	PELCO I	ANECO	INEC	PELCO II	ASELCO	ISECO	PELCO III	AURELCO	LANECO	PENELCO	BANELCO	LEYECO II	PRESCO	BATELEC I	LEYECO III	PROSIELCO	BATELEC II	LEYECO IV	QUEZELCO II	BILECO	LEYECO V	ROMELCO	BISELCO	LUBELCO	SAMELCO I	BOHECO I	LUELCO	SAMELCO II	BOHECO II	MAGELCO	SIARELCO	BUSECO	MARELCO	SOCOTECO I	CAMELCO	MOELCI I	SOCOTECO II	CAPELCO	MOELCI II	SOLECO	CEBECO I	MORESCO I	SORECO II	CEBECO II	MORESCO II	SUKELCO	CEBECO III	NEECO 1	SURNECO	CELCO	NEECO 2-A1	SURSECO I	CENECO	NEECO 2-A2	SURSECO II	COTELCO	NOCECO	TARELCO I	COTELCO-PPAMA	NONECO	TARELCO II	DASURECO	NORECO I	TIELCO	DIELCO	NORECO II	ZAMCELCO	DORECO	NORSAMELCO	ZAMECO I	DORELCO	OMECO	ZAMECO II	ESAMELCO	ORMECO	ZAMSURECO I	FIBECO	PALECO	ZAMSURECO II	FLECO	PANELCO III	ZANECO
AKELCO	ILECO II	PELCO I																																																																																											
ANECO	INEC	PELCO II																																																																																											
ASELCO	ISECO	PELCO III																																																																																											
AURELCO	LANECO	PENELCO																																																																																											
BANELCO	LEYECO II	PRESCO																																																																																											
BATELEC I	LEYECO III	PROSIELCO																																																																																											
BATELEC II	LEYECO IV	QUEZELCO II																																																																																											
BILECO	LEYECO V	ROMELCO																																																																																											
BISELCO	LUBELCO	SAMELCO I																																																																																											
BOHECO I	LUELCO	SAMELCO II																																																																																											
BOHECO II	MAGELCO	SIARELCO																																																																																											
BUSECO	MARELCO	SOCOTECO I																																																																																											
CAMELCO	MOELCI I	SOCOTECO II																																																																																											
CAPELCO	MOELCI II	SOLECO																																																																																											
CEBECO I	MORESCO I	SORECO II																																																																																											
CEBECO II	MORESCO II	SUKELCO																																																																																											
CEBECO III	NEECO 1	SURNECO																																																																																											
CELCO	NEECO 2-A1	SURSECO I																																																																																											
CENECO	NEECO 2-A2	SURSECO II																																																																																											
COTELCO	NOCECO	TARELCO I																																																																																											
COTELCO-PPAMA	NONECO	TARELCO II																																																																																											
DASURECO	NORECO I	TIELCO																																																																																											
DIELCO	NORECO II	ZAMCELCO																																																																																											
DORECO	NORSAMELCO	ZAMECO I																																																																																											
DORELCO	OMECO	ZAMECO II																																																																																											
ESAMELCO	ORMECO	ZAMSURECO I																																																																																											
FIBECO	PALECO	ZAMSURECO II																																																																																											
FLECO	PANELCO III	ZANECO																																																																																											

Validated Performance Scorecard 2017 (Annex A)

Component			Target	GOCC Submission		GCG Validation		Supporting Documents	Remarks													
Objective/Measure	Formula	Weight	2017	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating															
SM 3	Improved EC Overall Performance Rating from "B" or "C" to at least "A" Rating	Number of improved ECs over Total number of ECs under "B" and "C"	10.00%	13 ECs	12 ECs	9.23%	12 ECs	9.23%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NEA Memorandum No. 2017-008 dated 3 May 2017</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In its Memorandum No. 2017-008 dated 3 May 2017, NEA reported improvement of 12 ECs from "B" and "C" Rating to "A" Rating.</li> </ul>												
SM 4	Satisfaction rating based on a survey conducted by a third party	Third Party survey results	5.00%	Satisfied or its equivalent	4 (Moderately Satisfied)	5.00%	4.0 or 80% (Moderately Satisfied)	5.00%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NEA's Customer Satisfaction Survey 2017 dated 19 October 2017 prepared by Contact-Asia Services, Inc. (CASI)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CASI reported that NEA received a "Moderately Satisfied" level of satisfaction from the respondents.</li> </ul>												
SM 5	Number of EC official and employees graduated from certification/competency program	Absolute Number	5.00%	2,100	3,211	5.00%	2,755	5.00%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EC Summary of Trainings CY 2017</li> <li>CY 2017 Comprehensive Training Plan</li> <li>Training Needs Assessment</li> <li>Course Outline of Training</li> <li>Copies of Attendance Sheets and Certificates</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NEA exceeded its target by 655 or 31.19%. Based on the attendance sheets submitted, following is the tabulated number of EC Officials and employees who completed the training period and qualified for graduation from competency programs and trainings:</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>503</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2<sup>nd</sup> Q</td> <td>528</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3<sup>rd</sup> Q</td> <td>830</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4<sup>th</sup> Q</td> <td>894</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>TOTAL</b></td> <td><b>2,755</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Period	No. of Participants	1 <sup>st</sup> Q	503	2 <sup>nd</sup> Q	528	3 <sup>rd</sup> Q	830	4 <sup>th</sup> Q	894	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,755</b>
Period	No. of Participants																					
1 <sup>st</sup> Q	503																					
2 <sup>nd</sup> Q	528																					
3 <sup>rd</sup> Q	830																					
4 <sup>th</sup> Q	894																					
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,755</b>																					
<b>Sub-total</b>		<b>55.00%</b>				<b>37.01%</b>		<b>36.61%</b>														

Component			Target	GOCC Submission		GCG Validation		Supporting Documents	Remarks																
Objective/Measure	Formula	Weight	2017	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating																		
<b>SO 3 To sustain the organization's viability and ensure accountability and transparency</b>																									
SM 6	Amount of loans facilitated (PHP Billion)	Below Php 1B is 0%. For the amount ≥ Php 1B, 10% is proportionally distributed, i.e.  $\frac{\{(Actual\ amount\ of\ loans\ facilitated\ \ge\ PHP\ 1B)\}}{\{(Target\ amount\ -\ Php\ 0.999B)\} \div 10\%}} \times 100$	8.00%	1.700	1.792	8.00%	2,255.27	8.00%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Certified True Copies of Checks Released</li> <li>• Summary of Peso Release for 2017</li> <li>• Summary of Loan Facilitated for 2017</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Following is the table representing the breakdown of the validated accomplishment:</li> </ul> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Loan Type</th> <th>As Reported</th> <th>As Validated</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Regular Loan</td> <td>1,600.00</td> <td>1,599.45</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Short Term Credit Facility (STCF)</td> <td>55.00</td> <td>386.27</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Stand-By Credit (SCF)</td> <td>137.00</td> <td>269.55</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>TOTAL</b></td> <td><b>1,792.00</b></td> <td><b>2,255.27</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The ₱0.47 Billion difference between the reported and validated amount was due to the manner of computing STCF and SCF loans. NEA used the total average STCF and SCF amount while the CGO-B validated is the total amount of STCF and SCF facilitated.</p>	Loan Type	As Reported	As Validated	Regular Loan	1,600.00	1,599.45	Short Term Credit Facility (STCF)	55.00	386.27	Stand-By Credit (SCF)	137.00	269.55	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,792.00</b>	<b>2,255.27</b>
Loan Type	As Reported	As Validated																							
Regular Loan	1,600.00	1,599.45																							
Short Term Credit Facility (STCF)	55.00	386.27																							
Stand-By Credit (SCF)	137.00	269.55																							
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,792.00</b>	<b>2,255.27</b>																							
SM 7	High Collection Efficiency (%)	$\frac{\sum amount\ collected}{\sum amortization\ due}$	7.00%	100%	100%	7.00%	100%	7.00%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Status of EC Loan Repayments</li> <li>• Sample Amortization Schedule</li> <li>• Amortizations Due vs. Actual Collection for FY 2017</li> </ul>	<p>The formula for this indicator is total amount of collection (including advance payments) divided by total amount of amortizations due. As such, total collections (₱20.69 Billion) covered all the amortizations due (₱20.39) as of 2017.</p>															
<b>Sub-total</b>			<b>15.00%</b>			<b>15.00%</b>		<b>15.00%</b>																	

FINANCE



Component		Target	GOCC Submission		GCG Validation		Supporting Documents	Remarks								
Objective/Measure	Formula	2017	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating										
SO 4	To guarantee efficient and effective assistance to the Electric Cooperatives															
SM 8	Percentage of sitio electrification projects funded that are fully compliant with NEA Standards and Specifications	$\frac{\text{Total compliant projects}}{\text{Total funded projects}}$	8.00%	80%	88%	8.00%	60.15%	6.02%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Report on 2017 SEP Projects and Certificate of Final Inspection and Acceptance (CFIA)</li> <li>CY 2017 Business Intelligence Reports from Electric Cooperative</li> <li>CFIAs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Breakdown is as follows:</li> </ul> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Total sitios completed from Oct. 2016 to Dec. 2016 (as validated)</td> <td>287</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total sitios completed from Jan. 2017 to Sept. 2017 (as validated)</td> <td>122</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total sitios completed from Oct. 2016 to Sept. 2017 (as validated)</b></td> <td><b>409</b></td> </tr> </table>	Total sitios completed from Oct. 2016 to Dec. 2016 (as validated)	287	Total sitios completed from Jan. 2017 to Sept. 2017 (as validated)	122	<b>Total sitios completed from Oct. 2016 to Sept. 2017 (as validated)</b>	<b>409</b>
										Total sitios completed from Oct. 2016 to Dec. 2016 (as validated)	287					
Total sitios completed from Jan. 2017 to Sept. 2017 (as validated)	122															
<b>Total sitios completed from Oct. 2016 to Sept. 2017 (as validated)</b>	<b>409</b>															
<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Total inspected sitios completed from Oct. 2016 to Dec. 2016 (with CFIA issued)</td> <td>131</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total inspected sitios completed from Jan. 2017 to Sept. 2017 (with CFIA issued)</td> <td>115</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total inspected sitios completed from Oct. 2016 to Sept. 2017 (with CFIA issued)</b></td> <td><b>246</b></td> </tr> </table>	Total inspected sitios completed from Oct. 2016 to Dec. 2016 (with CFIA issued)	131	Total inspected sitios completed from Jan. 2017 to Sept. 2017 (with CFIA issued)	115	<b>Total inspected sitios completed from Oct. 2016 to Sept. 2017 (with CFIA issued)</b>	<b>246</b>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Percentage of sitio electrification projects funded that are fully compliant with NEA standards and specifications</td> <td> <math display="block">\frac{246}{409} = 60.15\%</math> </td> </tr> </table>	Percentage of sitio electrification projects funded that are fully compliant with NEA standards and specifications	$\frac{246}{409} = 60.15\%$							
Total inspected sitios completed from Oct. 2016 to Dec. 2016 (with CFIA issued)	131															
Total inspected sitios completed from Jan. 2017 to Sept. 2017 (with CFIA issued)	115															
<b>Total inspected sitios completed from Oct. 2016 to Sept. 2017 (with CFIA issued)</b>	<b>246</b>															
Percentage of sitio electrification projects funded that are fully compliant with NEA standards and specifications	$\frac{246}{409} = 60.15\%$															
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For 2017, NEA reported an accomplishment of 88%. Based on CGO-B's validation, however, NEA's accomplishment for the measure is only 60.15% after excluding sitios completed in prior years.</li> </ul>																

INTERNAL PROCESS

Objective/Measure	Component		Weight	Target	GOCC Submission		GCG Validation		Supporting Documents	Remarks												
	Formula			2017	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating														
SM 9	Percentage of sitios completed and energized within 180 calendar days from release of funds to ECs	$\frac{\text{Actual percentage of sitios completed and energized within 180 days from release of funds to ECs}}{[\text{Target rate}]} \times 100$	6.00%	80%	88%	6.00%	89.28%	6.00%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Report on 2017 SEP Projects and Certificate of Final Inspection and Acceptance (CFIA)</li> <li>CY 2017 Business Intelligence Reports from Electric Cooperative</li> <li>CFIAs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Validation of internal documents show that NEA accomplished 89.28% of the target, as shown:                             <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Total sitios completed in 2017</td> <td>1,048</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Less: Projects with delayed release of funds<sup>2</sup></td> <td>162</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total universe</td> <td>886</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Projects completed within 150 days from release of fund</td> <td>791</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total universe</td> <td>886</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Percentage of sitios completed and energized within 150 calendar days from release of funds to ECs</td> <td><math>\frac{791}{886} = 89.28\%</math></td> </tr> </table> </li> </ul> <p><sup>2</sup> It was observed that there were cases where funds were released during/after completion of project. For validation purposes, GCG excluded these 162 cases from the total universe.</p>	Total sitios completed in 2017	1,048	Less: Projects with delayed release of funds <sup>2</sup>	162	Total universe	886	Projects completed within 150 days from release of fund	791	Total universe	886	Percentage of sitios completed and energized within 150 calendar days from release of funds to ECs	$\frac{791}{886} = 89.28\%$
Total sitios completed in 2017	1,048																					
Less: Projects with delayed release of funds <sup>2</sup>	162																					
Total universe	886																					
Projects completed within 150 days from release of fund	791																					
Total universe	886																					
Percentage of sitios completed and energized within 150 calendar days from release of funds to ECs	$\frac{791}{886} = 89.28\%$																					
SM 10	Percentage of regular loans released within prescribed processing periods																					
SM 10a	Regular-Term Loans within 24 days	$\frac{\text{Loans released within period}}{\text{Total loans applications}}$	2.00%	100%	100%	2.00%	100%	2.00%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Computation of working days per loan application</li> <li>Date of Request</li> <li>Date of Check</li> </ul>	Breakdown is as follows: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>NEA</th> <th>As validated</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Total Loan Applications (w/ complete docs.)</td> <td>127</td> <td>126</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Loans released within 24 days</td> <td>127</td> <td>126</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Accomplishment</td> <td>100%</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		NEA	As validated	Total Loan Applications (w/ complete docs.)	127	126	Loans released within 24 days	127	126	Accomplishment	100%	100%
	NEA	As validated																				
Total Loan Applications (w/ complete docs.)	127	126																				
Loans released within 24 days	127	126																				
Accomplishment	100%	100%																				
SM 10b	Short-Term Loans within 13 days	$\frac{\text{Loans released within period}}{\text{Total loans applications}}$	2.00%	100%	100%	2.00%	100%	2.00%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Computation of working days per loan application</li> <li>Date of Request</li> <li>Date of Check</li> </ul>	Breakdown is as follows: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>NEA</th> <th>As validated</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Total Loan Applications (w/ complete docs.)</td> <td>23</td> <td>23</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Loans released within 13 days</td> <td>23</td> <td>23</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Accomplishment</td> <td>100%</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		NEA	As validated	Total Loan Applications (w/ complete docs.)	23	23	Loans released within 13 days	23	23	Accomplishment	100%	100%
	NEA	As validated																				
Total Loan Applications (w/ complete docs.)	23	23																				
Loans released within 13 days	23	23																				
Accomplishment	100%	100%																				

INTERNAL PROCESS

Component			Target	GOCC Submission		GCG Validation		Supporting Documents	Remarks								
Objective/Measure	Formula	Weight	2017	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating										
SM 11	Percentage of calamity loans released within 6 days	$\frac{\text{Loans released within period}}{\text{Total loans applications}}$	(2.00%)	65%	89.47	2.00%	45%	Excluded	<p>Breakdown is as follows:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>As validated</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Total Loan Applications (w/ complete docs.)</td> <td>20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Loans released within 6 days</td> <td>9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Accomplishment</td> <td>45%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Submitted accomplishment indicated a revised target period of 7 days. NEA argued that it could no longer maintain the 6-day period because it can no longer continue its practice of approving vouchers and signing checks simultaneously due to the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>strict compliance of NEA's Departmental Procedures Manual- procedure details shows that checks are only prepared after approval and signature of the disbursement voucher;</li> <li>compliance to Commission on Audit-Audit Observation Memorandum (COA-AOM) No. 2016-16 dated 28 March 2016- it was observed by COA that "[NEA's] process flow on the processing and release of subsidy fund revealed that checks are prepared first and signed by the authorized signatories/officials of NEA, before routing the clearance from [Acceleration Total Electrification Office] and [Account Servicing Division] for completion of documentary requirements..."</li> </ol> <p>Measure is excluded due to change in circumstances beyond the control of NEA.</p>		As validated	Total Loan Applications (w/ complete docs.)	20	Loans released within 6 days	9	Accomplishment	45%
	As validated																
Total Loan Applications (w/ complete docs.)	20																
Loans released within 6 days	9																
Accomplishment	45%																
		<i>Sub-total</i>	<b>18.00%</b>			<b>20.00%</b>		<b>16.01%</b>									

	Component			Target	GOCC Submission		GCG Validation		Supporting Documents	Remarks
	Objective/Measure	Formula	Weight	2017	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating		
LEARNING AND GROWTH	SO 5	Enhanced Human Resources, Knowledge, Skills and Behavioral Competencies								
	SM 12	QMS ISO Certification	Maintained ISO Certification	5.00%	Surveillance Audit Passed	Surveillance Audit Passed	5.00%	Surveillance Audit Passed	5.00%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ISO 9001:2015 Certification issued by TUV Rheinland dated 18 December 2017</li> </ul> Validated with internal document.
	SM 13	Percentage of employees with required competencies met	All or Nothing	5.00%	Established Baseline	Established Baseline 40 out of 40 (100%)	5.00%	Established Baseline 40 out of 40 (100%)	5.00%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Baseline Assessment Report covering the 40 out of 40 profiled employees.</li> <li>Tally table</li> </ul> Based on the Board-approved Competency Framework, there are four required competencies identified, Core, Organizational, Leadership, and Technical.  Based on the submission, 40 out of 40 profiled employees met the four required competencies. The respondents were composed of executive/ middle management.
	<i>Sub-total</i>			10.00%			10.00%		10.00%	
	<b>TOTAL</b>			98.00%			82.01%		77.63%	

NEA Validated Score:  $\frac{77.63}{98.00} = 79.21\%$