| | Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ | | PI | nysical [*] | Γargets | | | | Ph | ysical Acco | mplishment | s | | Variance | As | sessmei Variand | | Reasons for Variance | Steering Measures / Remarks |
|-----|---|------|--------|----------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----------------|-------------|------------|-----------------|--------------------------|----------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------|---|--|
| | Performance Indicator | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Q1 | Q2 | 1st Semester | QЗ | Q4 | 2nd Semester | Annual | variance | Major (> +/- 30%) | Minor ("<" or "=" +/- 30%) | Full targe Achieved | | Steering measures / Remarks |
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | | (9) | (10) | | (11)=(12)+(13)+(14)+(15) | | | | (12)=(11)-(| 6) (13) | (19) |
| POO | DR, VULNERABLE AND MARGINALIZED CITIZE | NS A | RE EM | POWE | RED A | ND WITH | i IMPRO | VED QUA | LITY OF L | IFE | | | | • | • | • | | • | |
| ORG | GANIZATIONAL OUTCOME 1: WELLBEING OF F | POOR | R FAMI | LIES I | MPRO | VED | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Outcome Indicators | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.1 | Percentage of Pantawid households with improved | _ | Ι. | | T . | T . | l . | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ | | | | | The result of the SWDI Administration is not yet final, since there are duplicate entries |
| | wellbeing | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | | | that needs to be validated. However, as to accomplishment of SWDI forms and |
| | a. 1. Survival in Previous Year | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | assessed cc,cthe field office has accomplished 89.93% of the target which is 174,621 as of December 31, 2019. |
| | a.2. Survival to Subsistence | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | 174,021 as of Becomber 51, 2015. |
| | b.1. Subsistence in Previous Year | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | |
| | b.2. Subsistence to Self-Sufficiency | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | |
| | c.1. Survival in Previous Year | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | 1 | |
| | c.2. Survival to Self-Sufficiency | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | 1 | |
| 1.2 | Percentage compliance of Pantawid Pamilya households on school enrolment of children | - | - | - | - | NT | - | - | - | - | 96.24% | 96.24% | 96.24% | - | | | | | The program has no target for compliance rate but the average compliance rate for education from Period 1-4 of 2019. |
| 1.3 | Percentage of Pantawid Pamilya children not attending school that returned to school | - | - | - | - | 23.0% | | 19.46% | 19.46% | 60.26% | 44.75% | 44.75% | 44.75% | 21.75% | | | | The accomplishment achieved more than the expected target due to the strategies and activities done from the Regional Program Management Office, Rovincial, Cluster and City/Municipal | Strengthen partnership with partners on education, coordination with advisory committe members to discuss issues and |
| | Total Number of Pantawid Pamilya Children Not Attending School in Previous SY and Non-Compliant for At least 3 Months | - | - | - | - | | | 33,209 | 33,209 | 33,209 | 33,209 | 33,209 | 33,209 | | | | | Operations Office, such as, case management, Bata Balik Eskwela Campaign, facility visits, partners consultation and Regional/Provincial/City/Municipal Advisory committee meeting. | concerns and policy recommendation and the conduct of case management. |
| | Number of Pantawid Pamilya Children Who Returned to School in Current SY and Compliant for At Least 8 Months | - | - | - | - | | | 6,464 | 6,464 | 20,012 | 14,862 | 14,862 | 14,862 | | | | | | |
| 1.4 | Percentage compliance of Pantawid Pamilya households on availment of health services | - | - | - | - | NT | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| | No. of Pantawid Pamilya households availing key health services | - | - | - | - | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| 1.5 | Percentage of Pantawid Pamilya households not availing key health services that availed key health services | - | - | - | - | 26.0% | 0% | 17.8% | 17.8% | 19.3% | 36.9% | 36.9% | 36.9% | 10.9% | | | | The accomplishment achieved more than the expected target due to the strategies and activities done from the Regional Program Management Office, Rovincial, Cluster and City/Municipal | coordination with advisory committe members to discuss issues and concerns and policy |
| | Total No.of Pantawid Pamilya Non-Compliant to At Least 1 Health Conditions | - | - | - | - | | 0 | 2,628 | 2,628 | 2,628 | 2,628 | 2,628 | 2,628 | | | | | Operations Office, such as, case management, facility visits, partners consultation and Regional/Provincial/City/Municipal Advisory committee meeting. | recommendation and the conduct of case management. |
| | No.of Pantawid Pamilya Households Turned Compliant to Health Conditions | - | - | - | - | | 0 | 467 | 467 | 508 | 970 | 970 | 970 | | | | | | |
| 1.6 | Percentage of SLP households earning from microenterprises | 0% | 0% | 70% | 30% | 100% | - | - | - | - | - | 11.15% | 11.15% | -88.85% | | | | Implementation timeline under MC 12 is 1 year but the RPMO were able to implement and furnover projects to 379 Households as result of teamwork and augmentation of IPDO to help fastract the activities. Allotment of funds was released late (June 2019) because signing of GAA was delayed which causes the late implementation of current | The RPMO targeted that the remaining MD projects are to be implemented on or before March 31, 2020. Funds for these projects |
| | Total Number of SLP Households Assisted through Microenterprise Development Track | - | - | - | - | 2,833 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,351 | 48 | 3399 | 3399 | 566 | | | | targets. Additionally, the SLP RPMO encountered difficulties in complying documents pertaining to additional documentary requirements specifically on land titles and certificates for the proposed project sites. Some of the projects sites has no land titles for subdivided lots, others are for processing to DENR, LGUs and other agencies. | were already turned over to SLPAs last November-December 2019 which results to delayed implementation and is targeted for 2020. |
| | No. of SLP Households that Gained from Microenterprise | - | - | - | - | 2,833 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 379 | 379 | 379 | -2,454 | | | | Furthermore, the current management has to implement 1, 178 projects in 2019 with a total of 49 implementing PDOs. This also causes overloading of caseloads per implementing and monitoring PDOs. | 2020. |
| 1.7 | Percentage of SLP households gainfully employed | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 100% | 100.00% | -99.33% | | | | As per POAF (Participants Qualifications Assessment Forms), the results show that majority are qualified to pursue MD instead of EF. Furthermore, the Regional/Provincial/City/Municipal Livelihood Asset Market MAP (LAMM) gathered by PDO shows less employment opportunities in the target areas or the job qualifications does not meet the profiling of the beneficiaries. | |
| | Total No.of SLP Households Assisted through Employment Facilitation Track | 0 | 0 | 0 | 150 | 150 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | -149 | | | | -For other beneficiaries, they prefer to select MD than EF even though they are MD qualified. This is because for EF track, beneficiaries will be forced to leave their home to grab the employment opportunity which is mostly outside their hometown. While on MD track, they will develop their microenterprise project within their locality. There will be no need to leave their hometown. | |

| | | _ | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | HPMES FORM 4-4A-4B |
|-----|---|---------|--------------|------------|---------|---------|---------|-----------------|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------|---------|----------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|--|---|
| | Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ | | Physica | l Targets | | | | Phy | sical Acco | mplishments | 5 | | | Ass | sessment Variance | | Barrana San Maritana | Shared Manager (Barredo |
| | Performance Indicator | Q1 | Q2 Q | 3 Q4 | Total | Q1 | Q2 | 1st Semester | Q3 | Q4 | 2nd Semester | Annual | Variance | Major (> +/- 30%) | Minor ("<" or "=" +/- 30%) | Full target Achieved | Reasons for Variance | Steering Measures / Remarks |
| | No.of SLP Households with 1 Adult Member Gainfully Employed | 0 | 0 0 | 150 | 150 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | -149 | | | | | |
| 1.8 | Percentage of households that report better access to services | - | | - | NT | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | |
| | Output Indicators | | | | | | • | | | | | | | | • | | | |
| 1.1 | Number of Pantawid households provided with conditional cash grants | 187,404 | 187,404 187, | 404 187,40 | 187,404 | 164,291 | 168,665 | 168,665 | 169,838 | 170,212 | 170,212 | 170,212 | -17,192 | 0 | | | The new set of identified potential households were registered under Set 9- Household for Replacement for RCCT with 15,256 potential households and Validation of Endorsed IP Poor Families for MCCT with 15,825, to meet the | As of December 31, 2019, the field office has a total active household of 187,952, of which RCCT has 171,107 and MCCT has |
| | a. Regular CCT | 176,676 | 176,676 176, | 676 176,67 | 176,676 | 164,291 | 159,009 | 159,009 | 160,193 | 160,606 | 160,606 | 160,606 | -16,070 | | | | 187,404 In line with this, RCCT approval of newly registered households was on December 23 while MCCT was on December 26, 2019. Thus, the target is 90.83% achieved from P5 (Oct-Nov) 2018-P4 (Aug-Sept) 2019, per set OPC target. | 16,845. |
| | b. Modified CCT | 10,728 | 10,728 10,7 | 728 10,728 | 10,728 | 0 | 9656 | 9656 | 9,646 | 9,606 | 9,606 | 9,606 | -1,122 | | | | | |
| 1.2 | Percentage of Pantawid Pamilya-related grievances resolved within established time protocol | - | | - | 86.25% | 99.62% | 95.07% | 95.07% | 95.42% | 95.51% | 95.51% | 95.51% | 9.26% | | | | There is a 9.26% increase of the target. | Continue and strengthen the strategies employed for the timely resolution of grievances filed. |
| | Total No. grievances received | - | | - | - | 3,171 | - | - | 38,578 | 41,357 | 41,357 | 41,357 | - | | | | | |
| | No. of Pantawid Pamilya-related grievances resolved within established time protocol | - | | - | - | 3,159 | - | - | 36810 | 39502 | 39502 | 39502 | - | | | | | |
| 1.3 | Number of SLP households assisted through the Microenterprise Development and Employment Facilitation Tracks | 0 | 0 20 | 19 964 | 2,983 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,352 | 48 | 3,400 | 3,400 | 417 | | | | Physical target were already served in the 3rd quarter and the financial were fully utilized As per POAF (Participan Qualifications Assessment Forms), the results show hangointy are qualified to pursue MD instead of EF. Furthermore, the Regional/Provincial/ClyfiNunicipal Livelinood Asset Marter MAP (LAMM) gathered by PDO shows less employment opportunities in the target areas or the job qualifications does not meet the profiling of the beneficiaries. | |
| | Number of SLP households assisted through the Microenterprise Development Track | 0 | 0 1,4 | 1,417 | 2,833 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,351 | 48 | 3,399 | 3,399 | 566 | | | | For other beneficiaries, they prefer to select MD than EF even though they are MD qualified. This is because for EF track, beneficiaries will be forced to leave their home to grab the employment opportunity which is mostly outside their hometown. While or MD track, they will develop their microenterprise project within their locality. There will be no need to leave their hometown. | |
| | Number of SLP households assisted through Employment Facilitation Track | 0 | 0 5 | 100 | 150 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | -149 | | | | | |
| 1.4 | Number of communities implementing KC-NCDDP | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a. Region | 1 | 1 1 | . 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | V | | |
| | b. Province | 3 | 3 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | | | | V | | |
| | c. Municipality | 6 | 6 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | | | | V | | |
| | d. Barangay | 102 | 102 10 | 102 | 102 | 102 | 102 | 102 | 102 | 102 | 102 | 102 | | | | V | | |
| 1.5 | Number of KC-NCDDP sub-projects completed in accordance with technical plans and schedule | - | - 4. | 2 - | 42 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 33 | 8 | 41 | 45 | 3 | | | | The NPMO provided 5th Call from Savings for additional 3 Sub- Projects | |
| 1.6 | Number of households that benefitted from completed KC-NCDDP sub-projects or Households benefitting from sub-projects | - | - 31,: | 150 - | 31,150 | 0 | 680 | 680 | 11,180 | 18,823 | 30,003 | 30,683 | -467 | | | | Decrease number of Household is due to MIBF-PRA. During the conceptualization of project, the community targetted the entire barangay household which include the direct and inferte beneficiaries but in actual accounting of beneficiaries, only the direct beneficiaries were accounted as reflected in the completion report. | |
| 1.7 | Percentage of completed KC-NCDDP projects that have satisfactory or better sustainability evaluation rating | - | | | 100% | | | | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 0% | | | Ŋ | | |
| | Total Number of KC-NCDDP projects | | | | | 0 | | | 33 | 12 | | 45 | | | | | | |
| 1.8 | Percentage of women volunteers trained on CDD | | 50 | % | | | | | 70% (26,557 female , 11,506male) | 70% (1466 Felame, 435 male) | | | | | | Y | | |
| | Total number of CDD women volunteers | | 26,5 | 557 | | | | | 26,557 | 1,466 | | | | | | | | |
| | No. of women volunteers trained on CDD | | 26,5 | 557 | | | | | 26,557 | 1,466 | | | | | | | | |

| | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | | | TPMES FURM 4-4A-4B |
|----|--|------------------|----|----|-----------|--------|-------|----|-----|-----------------|------------|-------------|-----------------|--------|----------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|
| | Objective/ Program/ Sub-Prog | ıram/ | | Ph | nysical T | argets | | | | Phy | sical Acco | mplishments | • | | Variance | | essmen Variance | | Reasons for Variance | Steering Measures / Remarks |
| | Performance Indicator | | Q1 | Q2 | QЗ | Q4 | Total | Q1 | Q2 | 1st Semester | Q3 | Q4 | 2nd Semester | Annual | variance | Major (> +/- 30%) | Minor ("<" or "=" +/- 30%) | Full target Achieved | Reasons for Variance | Steering Measures / Remarks |
| 1 | .9 Percentage of paid labor jobs created by projects are accessed by women | / KC-NCDDP | | | 25% | | | | | | 28% | 30%% | | | | | | V | | |
| | Total number of paid labor jobs | | | | 7,984 | | | | | | 8829 | 1407 | | | | | | | | |
| | No. number of paid labor jobs accessed | l by women | | | 7,984 | | | | | | 8829 | 422 | | | | | | | | |
| 1. | Percentage of registered KC-NCDDP grie satisfactorily resolved in line with the GF | evances RS | | | 100% | | | | | | 100% | 100% | | | | | | N | | |
| | Total number of registered grievances | | | | 5,555 | | | | | | 5555 | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| | No. registered grievances satisfactorily r with the GRS | resolved in line | | | 5,555 | | | | | | 5555 | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| 1. | 11 Number of communities implementing KC-NC | CDDP | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a. CADT | | 6 | | | 6 | 6 | 1 | 1 | | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 0 | | | V | | |
| | b. Province | | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 0 | | | V | | |
| | c. Municipality | | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 0 | | | Ŋ | | |
| | d. Barangay | | 77 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 0 | | | Ŋ | | |
| | 12 Number of PAMANA IP CDD sub-projects | | - | - | - | - | 52 | 0 | 15 | 15 | 19 | 15 | 34 | 49 | -3 | | ∠ | | For Kasapa II, the foreman was killed due to clan war. This causes delay of project implementation. For Brgy, Padiay, Sibagat Sub-Project, the Brgy, Captain was killed. Implementation of SP was temporanly suspended becuase of signatories issues. For Brgy, Caman-onan, Gigaguit, the contractor pulled out thier services. | -On-going Sub-Project Implementation, to be completed before the end of June 2020. -For Camam-onan, instead of contractor, they opted to continue the implementation through community works. |
| 1. | Number of IP Households that benefitted sub-projects | d from completed | - | - | - | - | 9,594 | 0 | 680 | 680 | 2,071 | 4,899 | 7,650 | 8,330 | -1,264 | | | | Decrease number of actual household beause the community targetted the entire barangay household which include the direct and indirect beneficiaries but in actual accounting of beneficiaries, only the direct beneficiaries were accounted as reflected in the completion report. | |

| | | | | OBLIG | ATION | | | | | DISBURS | | HPMES FORM | 7 77 75 |
|---|---------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ Performance Indicator | Allocated Budget | | | Amount | ATION | | Percent Utilization | | | Amount | JEHEN! | | Percent Utilization |
| renormance indicator | Budget | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Total | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Total |
| POOR, VULNERABLE AND MARGINALIZED (| CITIZENS ARE EM | POWERED ANI | D WITH IMPRO | OVED QUALIT | Y OF LIFE | , | | | | , | | • | , |
| ORGANIZATIONAL OUTCOME 1: WELLBEIN | G OF POOR FAMI | LIES IMPROVE | :D | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Regular CCT | - | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00% | 595,298,000.00 | 596,144,600.00 | 295,296,000.00 | 2,357,729,100.00 | 3,844,467,700.0 | - |
| Modified CCT | - | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00% | 31,541,100.00 | 30,574,000.00 | 50,612,200.00 | 96,434,300.00 | 209,161,600.00 | - |
| Other MOOE | 100,225,349.52 | 23,443,396.12 | 48,562,919.46 | 24,676,840.49 | 3,258,797.45 | 99,941,953.52 | 99.72% | 18,479,283.90 | 13,373,749.07 | 24,676,840.49 | 30,029,564.80 | 86,559,438.26 | 86.61% |
| Sustainable Livelihood Program | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Microenterprise Developmnet Track | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 54,525,281.00 | 0.00 | 54,525,281.00 | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 54,525,281.00 | 54,525,281.00 | |
| Employment FAcilitation Track | 61,776,262.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5,000.00 | 0.00 | 5,000.00 | 100.00% | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5,000.00 | 0.00 | 5,000.00 | 99.87% |
| Community Mobilization Fund | | 0.00 | 7,245,981.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7,245,981.00 | | 0.00 | 4,850.00 | 3,163,285.00 | 3,995,582.00 | 7,163,717.00 | |
| Other MOOE | 81,167,796.68 | 4,040,549.57 | 16,779,336.20 | 57,306,766.18 | 3,010,742.73 | 81,137,394.68 | 100.00% | 3,825,354.62 | 4,980,610.93 | 5,303,756.92 | 64,515,962.53 | 78,625,685.00 | 96.90% |
| KALAHI-CIDSS NCDDP | 175,320,546.32 | 29,048,786.54 | 94,084,844.36 | 43,613,245.18 | 8,573,670.24 | 175,320,546.32 | 100.00% | 13,023,987.67 | 40,021,174.32 | 62,670,931.63 | 29,947,406.14 | 145,663,499.76 | 83.08% |

| | | | F | Physical T | argets | | | | | | | | | | | Physica | I Accom | plishme | nts | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|--|----------|--------|------------------------------|------------------------------|----------|---------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|----------|-----------|----------|---------|---------|--|---------------------|------------------------|---------------|---|--|--------|--------|--------|--------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| | Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ Performance Indicator | | | | | | | Q1 | | | Q2 | | 15 | st Semest | er | | Q3 | | | Q4 | | 2nd Seme | ester | | Total | | Variance | | sment iriance | Reasons for Variance | Steering Measures / Remarks |
| | | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | м | F | т | м | F | т | м | F | т | м | F | т | м | F | т | M F | т | м | F | т | | | | | |
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | | (7) | | | (8) | | | (9) | | | (10) | | · | (11) | | (12) | | | | (13) | (14)=(13)-(6 | Major (>+/- 30% "= deviati 3 | tinor Full target "+/- 10% d | (14) | (19) |
| POOR, | VULNERABLE AND MARGINALIZED CITIZENS | S ARE EI | MPOWER | ED AND | WITH IMP | ROVED QU | ALITY O | F LIFE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 00) 10 | evias j | • | • |
| ORGA | IZATIONAL OUTCOME 2: RIGHTS OF THE PO | OR AND | THE VU | LNERABL | E SECTOR | S PROMOT | ED AND | PROTEC | TED | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A. RES | IDENTIAL AND NON-RESIDENTIAL CARE SU | 3-PROGI | RAM | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | OUTCOME INDICATORS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.1 | Percentage of clients in residential and non-residential care facilities rehabilitated | 30.00% | 30.00% | 30.00% | 30.00% | 30.00% | 55.41% | 36.00% | 46.46% | 71.01% | 35.71% | 60.82% | - | - | - | 81.08% | 24.32% | 52.70% | 63.70%4 | 5.65% 29. | .09% | | T - | 56.36% | 45.45% | 52.73% | 22.73% | | | Effectivity of the rehabilitate programs and services. Cooperation of clients on the agree rehabilitation plan. | |
| | No. of Clients Rehabilitated | | | | | | 41 | 9 | 46 | 49 | 10 | 59 | - | - | - | 30 | 9 | 39 | 11 | 21 | 32 | | - | 62 | 25 | 87 | | | | Teliabilitation plan. | |
| | Residential Care Facilities | | | | | | 41 | 9 | 46 | 49 | 10 | 59 | - | - | - | 30 | 9 | 39 | 11 | 21 | 32 | | - | 62 | 25 | 87 | | | | | |
| | a. RRCY | | | | | | 41 | 0 | 37 | 49 | 0 | 49 | - | - | - | 30 | 0 | 30 | 11 | 0 | 11 | | T - | 62 | 0 | 62 | | \Box | | | |
| | b. Home for Girls | | | | | | 0 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 10 | 10 | - | - | - | 0 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 21 | 21 | | - | 0 | 25 | 25 | | | | | |
| l | Non-Residential Care Facilities | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| | OUTPUT INDICATORS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.2 | Number of Clients Served | | | | | | 74 | 25 | 99 | 69 | 28 | 97 | - | - | - | 37 | 37 | 74 | 64 | 46 1 | 110 | | T - | 110 | 55 | 165 | | | | | |
| | Residential Care Facilities | 95 | 97 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 74 | 25 | 99 | 69 | 28 | 97 | - | - | - | 37 | 37 | 74 | 64 | | 110 | | ١. | 110 | 55 | 165 | | + | | | |
| | a. RRCY | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 74 | 0 | 74 | 69 | 0 | 69 | - | - | - | 37 | 0 | 37 | 64 | 0 | 64 | | - | 110 | 0 | 110 | | | | Served clients depends on the referrals from the court and LSWDO | immediate issuance of court order of committing |
| | b. Home for Girls | 25 | 27 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 0 | 25 | 25 | 0 | 28 | 28 | - | - | - | 0 | 37 | 37 | 0 | 46 | 46 | | | 0 | 55 | 55 | | | | Court and ESWDO | |
| | Non-Residential Care Facilities | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | _ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | | П | | | No non-residential care facilities in the region |
| 2.3 | ALOS of clients in residential facilities | | | | | , | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ╁ | | | |
| | a. RRCY | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 360 | 74 | 0 | 74 | 80 | 0 | 80 | - | - | - | 62 | 0 | 62 | 76 | 0 : | 76 | | - | | | | | | | | |
| | b. Home for Girls | 80 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 320 | 0 | - 1 | 531 | 0 | 391 | 391 | _ | - | _ | 0 | 249 | 249 | | 92.50 29 | | | +_ | 0 | 251 | 251 | | ++ | | | |
| 2.4 | Percentage of facilities with standard client-staff ratio | | | | 00 | 320 | | 331 | 551 | 0 | 331 | 331 | | | | ŭ | 2.15 | 2.15 | | 52.50 25 | 2.50 | | | | 231 | 231 | | | | | |
| | a. RRCY | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Number of Facilities with Standard Client-Social | | | | | | 1:15 | | 1:15 | | | | _ | | _ | | | | 1:13 - | 1.1 | 13 | | l _ | 1:15 | 0 | 1:15 | | | | | |
| | Worker Ratio Number of Facilities with Standard | | | | | | 1:20 | | 1:20 | | | | _ | - | _ | | | | 1:20 - | | 20 | | + - | 1:19 | 0 | | | + | | | |
| | Client-Houseparent Ratio b. Home for Girls | | | | | | 1:20 | +- | 1.20 | | | | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | | | | 1.20 | 1:2 | 20 | | +- | 1:19 | 0 | 1:19 | - | + | | | |
| | Number of Facilities with Standard Client-Social | | | | | | | 1:20 | 1:20 | | 1:12 | 1:12 | _ | - | _ | | 1:13 | 1:13 | | :13 1:: | 13 | | - | 0 | 1.12 | 1.12 | - | ++ | | | |
| | Worker Ratio Number of Facilities with Standard | | | | | | - | | | - | | | - | - | - | - | | | | | | | + - | | 1:13 | 1:13 | | + | | | |
| . | Client-Houseparent Ratio | | | | | | | 1:20 | 1:20 | - | 1:20 | 1:20 | | | | | 1:20 | 1:20 | - | :15 1:2 | 20 | - - | 1 - | 0 | 1:15 | 1:15 | | | | | |
| 8. Sup | plementary Feeding Sub-Program | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | OUTCOME INDICATORS Percentage of malnourished children in CDCs and SNPs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | I | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.5 | Percentage of malnourished children in CDCs and SNPs with improved nutritional status | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | NA - on- | | NA | - on- | | NA - on- | | | | | | | | |
| | a. Severely underweight to Underweight | 10% | 10% | 10% | 10% | 10% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45% | 55% | | 45.00% | - | | 0 | 0 | going feeding | 0 | 0 go fee | oing eding | 0 0 | going feeding | . 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| | b. Underweight to Normal | 80% | 80% | 80% | 80% | 80% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45% | 55% | | 45.00% | - | | 0 | _ | NA - on- going feeding NA - on- | 0 | n fee | eding | 0 0 | NA - on- going feeding NA - on- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | | | |
| | c. Overweight to Normal | 20% | 20% | 20% | 20% | 20% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69% | 31% | 21% | 69.00% | 31.00% | 21.00% | 0 | 0 | going feeding | 0 | 0 go | oing eding | 0 0 | going feeding | 69.00% | 31.00% | 21.00% | 1.00% | | | | |
| 2.6 | Percentage of children in CDCs and SNPs with sustained normal nutritional status (over total children served) Number of children in CDCs and SNPs with normal nutritional | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | status (Upon weigh-in, before feeding) | | | 39276 | 32,329 | 71,605 | | | | | | | | | | 13,746 | 25,530 | 39,276 | | | ,329 2! | | 71,605 | 25,061 | 46,544 | 71,605 | | ᆜ | | | |
| | Number of children in CDCs and SNPs with sustained normal nutritional status (After feeding) | | | NA - on- going feeding | NA - on- going feeding | | | | | | | | | | | | | NA - on- going feeding | NA - on- N going | A - on- NA going go | oing | NA - NA - on- on- going going feeding | NA - on- going feeding | | | | | | | | |

| Conting of Horizonta Ministra Signature Conting of Horizonta S | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | HPMES FORM 4-4A-4B |
|--|---|----------|------------|-----------|-------------|------------|----------|--------|---------|--------|--------|---------|--------|----------|---------|----------|---------|---------|----------|--------|---------------------|-----------|----------|----------------|--------|---------|----------|--|-------------------|--|---|
| Paris Pari | | | P | hysical T | argets | | | | | | | | | | | Physica | I Accom | plishme | nts | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Paris | Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ Performance Indicator | 01 | 02 | 03 | 04 | Total | | Q1 | | | Q2 | | 1 | st Semes | ter | | Q3 | | | Q4 | | 2nd Seme | ester | | Total | | Variance | Asses of Va | ssment ariance | Reasons for Variance | Steering Measures / Remarks |
| Paris Pari | | ` | | | • | | м | F | т | м | F | т | М | F | т | м | F | т | м | F | т м | F | т | М | F | т | | | | | |
| 1 | OUTPUT INDICATORS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Property Ministration Prop | 2.7 Number of children in CDCs and SNPs provided with supplementary feeding | 75,791 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75,791 | 35,952 | 43,942 | 79,894 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35,952 | 43,942 | 79,894 | 14,613 | 27,139 | 41,752 | 12,058 | 22,394 | 34,452 26,67 | 1 49,533 | 3 76,204 | 1 | | | | | | 8th cycle implementation). The 9th cycle starts June 1, 2019 to May 31, 2020. The actual number of children for the 9th cycle of 76,204 exceeds the target number of children of 75,791 | |
| 1 | C. Social Welfare for Senior Citizens Sub-Program | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Maria and the continent of the contine | OUTCOME INDICATORS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Maria and the continent of the contine | 2.8 Percentage of beneficiaries using social pension to augment daily living subsistence and medical needs | | 90-100% | | 90-100% | 90-100% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 18.44% | 14.63% | 33.07% | 18.44% | 14.63% | 33.07% | 22.19% | 44.08% | 66.27% | 1.98% | 1.37% | 3.35% 24.17 | % 45.45% | 69.62% | 42.61% | 60.08% | 102.69% | 2.69% | | | Variance occured due to the delisted beneficiaries which was being replaced, hence | |
| Properties Pro | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 6,510 | 7,318 | 13,828 35,54 | 2 64,968 | 3 100,51 | 0 59,662 | 84,112 | 143,774 | 3,774 | | | the possibility that the listed one beneficiary | |
| Continue | Number of beneficiaries using social pension to augment daily living subsistence and medical needs | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24,120 | 19,144 | 43,264 | 24,120 | 19,144 | 43,264 | 29,032 | 57,650 | 86,682 | 6,510 | 7,318 | 13,828 35,54 | 2 64,968 | 3 100,51 | 0 59,662 | 84,112 | 143,774 | 3,774 | | | beneficiaries which was being replaced, hence | |
| 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | the possibility that the listed one beneficiary | |
| 14. Note 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | 2.9 Number of senior citizens who received social pension within the | 140,000 | 140,000 | 140,000 | 140,000 | 140.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24,120 | 19,144 | 43,264 | 24.120 | 19,144 | 43.264 | 29,032 | 57,650 | 86,682 | 6510 | 7318 | 13828 35.54 | 2 64.968 | 3 100.51 | 0 59.662 | 84.112 | 143.774 | 3774 | ΙпΙ | | | |
| Control Cont | quarter | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | | | 4 | 5 | | | | | _ | _ | | | 5 | 0 | 4 | | | | | | | | - | | | |
| Section Conting Name Conting N | | <u> </u> | | | in Cuinin 6 | | | | , | | | - | | | | | | | <u> </u> | _ | · - | | | | 13 | 10 | | | | | |
| Note Continue Co | | Comm | unities in | Need or | in Crisis S | sub-Progra | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Section Sect | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Paris Pari | (AICS) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | | | | | | | |
| 1.1 Progression of the conting of th | 2.11 Percentage of clients who rated protective services provided as satisfactory or better (AICS) | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 31.00% | 69.00% | 100.00% | 30.00% | 70.00% | 100.00% | 29.14% | 70.86% | 100.00% | 28.79% | 71.21% | 100.00% | 33.23 | 66.77% | 100.009 31.70 | 68.24% | 6 100.00 | % | | 100.00% | | | | | |
| UNIFULINOCATIONS 1 | Minors Traveling Abroad | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | | | | | | 1. Advances affort through Social Media Card. Brochure, cond. |
| 1. 1 1. | Percentage of clients who rated protective services provided as satisfactory or better (Minors Travelling Abroad) | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 33.05% | 66.94% | 100%% | 25.18% | 74.82% | 100.00% | 28.85% | 71.15% | 100.00% | 52.50% | 47.50% | 100.00% | 59.37% | 40.62% | 100.009 27.87 | 79 72.129 | % 100%° | 28.47 % | 71.53% | 100.00% | | | | | communication to LGUs for guidance in handling MTA cases and radio guesting as initiated by the office known as " Ikaw ug ang DSWD Kuyog sa Kabag ohan. |
| Proper Properties Assessment | OUTPUT INDICATORS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | _ | | | | | | | |
| Reference of the content of the co | 2.13 Number of beneficiaries served through AICS | | | | | 33,000 | 2,943 | 7,671 | 10,614 | 2,833 | 6,636 | 9,469 | 5,776 | 14,307 | 20,083 | 3,369 | 7,921 | 11,290 | 6,804 | 16,378 | 23,182 10,17 | 24,299 | 34,472 | 15,949 | 38,606 | 54,555 | 21,555 | | | | |
| L. B. David Austractica A. M. M. A. M. M. A. M. | 7, | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| C. Educational Apparatures AMA AMA AMA AMA AMA AMA AMA A | | | | - | | | <u> </u> | | | - | - | | | | | <u> </u> | | | | | | | | <u> </u> | | | | | | | |
| 4. Transportation Assistance ANA ANA ANA ANA ANA ANA ANA ANA ANA A | b. Burial Assistance | | | ANA | ANA | ANA | 405 | 1,096 | 1,501 | 390 | 1,019 | 1,409 | 795 | 2115 | 2,910 | 464 | 1,123 | 1,587 | 525 | 1,408 | 1,933 989 | 2,531 | 3,520 | 1,784 | 4,646 | 6,430 | | | | | |
| E. Flood Assistance ANA ANA ANA ANA ANA ANA ANA ANA ANA AN | c. Educational Assistance | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | 13 | 44 | 57 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 15 | 49 | 64 | 12 | 34 | 46 | 2,037 | 6,336 | 8,373 2,04 | 9 6,370 | 8,419 | 2,064 | 6,419 | 8,483 | | | | | |
| F. Non-Frond Assistance ANA ANA ANA ANA ANA ANA ANA ANA ANA AN | d. Transportation Assistance | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | 44 | 110 | 154 | 27 | 71 | 98 | 71 | 181 | 252 | 59 | 125 | 184 | 47 | 113 | 160 106 | 238 | 344 | 177 | 419 | 596 | | | | | |
| G. Other Clash Assistance ANA ANA ANA ANA ANA ANA ANA A | e. Food Assistance | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | 126 | 259 | 385 | 212 | 229 | 441 | 338 | 488 | 826 | 132 | 224 | 356 | 200 | 303 | 503 332 | 527 | 859 | 670 | 1,015 | 1,685 | | | | | |
| h. Cash h. Psychosocial h. Psy | f. Non-Food Assistance | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| h. Psychosocial ANA ANA ANA ANA ANA ANA ANA ANA ANA AN | g. Other Cash Assistance | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 36 | 43 | 7 | 36 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 36 | 43 | | | | | |
| I. Referral ANA AN | h. Cash | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 120 | 186 | 306 | 239 | 361 | 600 359 | 547 | 906 | 359 | 547 | 906 | | П | | | |
| Client Category Family Head and Other Needy Adult (FHONA) 2388 6346 8734 2314 5,509 7,823 4,702 11,855 16,557 2,695 6,478 9,173 5,559 14,333 19,892 8,254 20,811 29,065 12,956 32,666 45,622 Women in Especially Difficult Circumstances (WEDC) 0 0 0 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 4 5 9 0 4 4 4 9 13 5 10 15 Youth in Need of Special Protection (YMSP) 0 1 1 1 4 5 1 5 6 0 2 2 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 1 7 7 8 | h. Psychosocial | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6,804 | 16,378 | 23,182 6,80 | 4 16,378 | 23,182 | 6,804 | 16,378 | 23,182 | | | | | |
| Family Head and Other Needy Adult (FHONA) 238 6346 8734 2314 5,509 7,823 4,702 11,855 16,557 2,695 6,478 9,173 5,559 14,333 19,892 8,254 20,811 29,065 12,956 32,666 45,622 Women in Especially Difficult Circumstances (WEDC) 0 6 6 0 0 12 12 12 0 1 1 0 2 2 0 0 3 3 0 15 15 Children in Need of Special Protection (CNSP) 0 0 1 1 1 2 1 5 6 0 2 2 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 1 7 8 0 0 15 Vouth in Need of Special Protection (YMSP) | i. Referral | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,478 | 5,228 | 7,706 2,47 | 8 5,228 | 7,706 | 2,478 | 5,228 | 7,706 | | | | | |
| Women in Especially Difficult Circumstances (WEDC) 0 6 6 0 12 12 0 1 1 0 2 2 0 3 3 0 15 | Client Category | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Children in Need of Special Protection (CNSP) 0 0 0 1 1 2 1 1 2 4 5 9 0 4 4 4 9 13 5 10 15 Youth in Need of Special Protection (YNSP) 0 1 1 1 4 5 1 5 6 0 2 2 0 0 0 0 2 2 1 7 8 | Family Head and Other Needy Adult (FHONA) | | | | | | 2388 | 6346 | 8734 | 2314 | 5,509 | 7,823 | 4,702 | 11,855 | 16,557 | 2,695 | 6,478 | 9,173 | 5,559 | 14,333 | 19,892 8,25 | 4 20,811 | 29,06 | 12,956 | 32,666 | 45,622 | | Ш | | | |
| Youth in Need of Special Protection (YNSP) 0 1 1 1 4 5 1 5 6 0 2 2 0 0 0 0 2 2 1 7 8 | Women in Especially Difficult Circumstances (WEDC) | | | | | | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 12 | 12 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 15 | 15 | | | | | |
| | Children in Need of Special Protection (CNSP) | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 0 | 4 | 4 4 | 9 | 13 | 5 | 10 | 15 | | | | | |
| Senior Citizen (SC) 508 1274 1782 479 1,076 1,555 987 2,350 3,337 610 1,379 1,989 1,078 1,984 3,062 1,688 3,363 5,051 2,675 5,713 8,388 | Youth in Need of Special Protection (YNSP) | | | | | | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 8 | | | | | |
| | Senior Citizen (SC) | | | | | | 508 | 1274 | 1782 | 479 | 1,076 | 1,555 | 987 | 2,350 | 3,337 | 610 | 1,379 | 1,989 | 1,078 | 1,984 | 3,062 1,68 | 3,363 | 5,051 | 2,675 | 5,713 | 8,388 | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | HPMES FORM 4-4A-4B |
|----------|--|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------|--------|--------|---------|--------|--------|---------|--------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|--------|--------|---------|--------|---------|---------|--------|---------|---------|----------|------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | P | hysical T | argets | | | | | | | | | | | Physic | al Accor | nplishme | ents | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| , | Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ Performance Indicator | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | | Q1 | | | Q2 | | 1 | st Semes | ter | | Q3 | | | Q4 | | 21 | nd Seme | ster | | Total | | Variance | | sment riance | Reasons for Variance | Steering Measures / Remarks |
| | | | | | | | М | F | т | М | F | т | М | F | т | М | F | т | М | F | т | М | F | т | М | F | Т | | <u>.</u> | | | |
| | Persons With Disability (PWD) | | | | | | 38 | 44 | 82 | 34 | 40 | 74 | 72 | 84 | 156 | 38 | 55 | 93 | 32 | 50 | 82 | 70 | 105 | 175 | 142 | 189 | 331 | | | | | |
| | Persons Living with HIV-AIDS (PLHIV) | | | | | | 9 | 0 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 0 | 13 | 22 | 1 | 23 | 135 | 5 | 140 | 157 | 6 | 163 | 170 | 6 | 176 | | | | | |
| Yakap I | Bayan Framework of Intervention | | | | | | | | | | | | | • | | • | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.14 | lumber of persons who used drugs availed the Yakap Bayan Program | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 40 | 12 | 5 | 17 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 16 | 5 | 21 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 23 | 10 | 33 | 29 | 10 | 39 | 45 | 15 | 60 | 20 | | | More LGUs are informed of the assistance for PWUDs and DOH also refers the PWUDs for assistance | constant advocacy activities on the Yakap Bayan Program; lobbying with LGU for the conduct of orientation on Yakap Bayan |
| Minors | Traveling Abroad | | | | | | | | | | | | | | • | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | · | | |
| 2.15 | lumber of minors traveling abroad issued with travel learance | 40 | | 40 | | 80 | 50 | 71 | 121 | 58 | 81 | 139 | 108 | 152 | 260 | 42 | 38 | 80 | 57 | 39 | 96 | 99 | 77 | 176 | 207 | 229 | 436 | 356 | | 0 | | |
| Retaine | d Services | | | • | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.17 | Number of CNSP and WEDC assisted | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 80 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 10 | 17 | 6 | 13 | 19 | 13 | 23 | 36 | 13 | 48 | 63 | -17 | | J 0 | Most of the WEDC and CNSP Cases are managed by the LGUs which were not reported to the Field Office | Constant follow-up with LGUs re submission of reports for data banking |
| Uncon | litional Cash Transfer Program (UCT) | | ' | | | _ | | | | | | | ' | ' | • | | | | • | | | | | | ' | | • | | | <u> </u> | | |
| 2.18 | Number of poor beneficiaries covered by Jnconditional Cash Transfer (UCT) grants | NT | NT | NT | 247,115 | 247,115 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34,863 | 3,792 | 38,214 | 34,863 | 3,792 | 38,214 | 34,863 | 3,792 | 38,214 | -208,901 | . 🗷 [| | The payroll was downloaded to the UCT-RPMO last week of September 2019 and proceeded directly to the conduct of actual payout last October 2019. a total of 38, 214 Helw sus paid as per scheduled pay-out date up to November 30 2019 with a percentage of completion of 45%. With the prioritization of the UCT 2018 Social | -Continued coordination with the LBP for the schedule of the 2019 UCT Lishtahanan Payout |
| | a. UCT Listahanan | - | - | - | 79,836 | 79,836 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34,393 | 1,911 | 38,214 | 34,393 | 1,911 | 38,214 | 34,393 | 1,911 | 38,214 | -41,622 | | | Pension for the remaining unpaid benes which was finalized last | |
| | o. UCT Social Pension | | | | N/A | N/A | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | The remaining unpaid HHs for the 2019 UCT Listahanan will be catered in the 1st quarter of 2020 LCT_PDMO already submitted the clean list for LCT_Social | -Continued follow-up with the UCT-NPMO for the status of the 2019 UCT Socpen Payroll generation, |
| 1 - | :. UCT Pantawid | | | - | 167,279 | 167,279 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | <u> </u> | | 167,050 | | | | | | | 33,880 | | 169,401 | 2,122 | + | | October 29, 2019. The lists werer based on the SOCPEN database for the paid benes as of the 1st semester of 2019 | which as per their email as of december 2019, they disclosed that they are targeting for the 80% |
| | nce to Communities in Need (ACN) | | | | 107,275 | 107,279 | - | L | 0 | | | 0 | | | | 33,410 | 133,040 | 107,030 | 470 | 1,001 | 2,331 | 33,000 | 133,321 | 105,401 | 33,880 | 133,321 | 109,401 | 2,122 | 101. | | process by the UCT-NPMO. | completion of the payroll generation. |
| ASSISTA | ice to communities in Need (ACN) | | | | | Т | | | | | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | + | | The physical target from the WFP is composed of | |
| 2.19 | construction/ Repair of Day Care Center and Senior Citizen center through Assistance to Communities in Need | | | 98 | | 98 | | | | | | | | | | - | - | 60 | - | - | 68 | | | | - | - | 68 | 24 | | | 98 projects however, due to no downloading of funds there are 6 projects that are not yet downloded of funds. Thus, there is a total of 92 projects to be completed. In addition, most of the not yet completed projects are still ongoing for construction and procurement process. | Constant follow-up to the LGUs through visitation, letters and phone calls. |
| Adoptio | n and Foster Care | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.20 | Number of children served through Alternative Family Care Program | 8 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 43 | 2 | 8 | 10 | 7 | 4 | 11 | 9 | 12 | 21 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 15 | 22 | 11 | 17 | 28 | 20 | 29 | 49 | 6 | 2 (| 0 0 | Difficulty to secure Birth Certificate from PSA due to DSA requirement; return of dossiers from CO; delayed compliance of PAPs of documents for | Stringent review of dossier before submission to CO; constant follow-up with PAPs re submission of required documents; follow-up request to CO |
| | 3.1 Number of Children Placed Out for Domestic Adoption Issued with CDCCLAA | 2 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 15 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 5 | 5 | 10 | -5 | | <u> </u> | Datum of decision fellowing comment from CO. | Requested the CO for copy of the Data Sharing Agreement and complied with comments from CO |
| | 3.1 Number of Children Placed Out for Domestic Adoption Issued with PAPA/ACA | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 11 | 4 | | | | Send out letters to PAPs re submission of documents for issuance of ACA/PAPA; regular meeting with staff re: compliance of OPC Targets |
| [| 3.2 Children Placed Out for Foster Care | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 21 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 9 | 5 | 8 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 13 | 5 | 9 | 14 | 10 | 17 | 27 | 6 | | | Social Workers commitment to achieve targets; availability of RCWSG for matching conference | Regular case conference to fast track the movement of cases; coordination with RCWSG on availability for Matching Conference; |
| | 3.3 Children Endorsed for Inter-country Adoption | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | Availability of cases for inter-country adoption; prompt submission of required documents | constant follow up with PAPs on the requirements and coordination with LGU |
| E. Socia | I Welfare for Distressed Overseas Filipinos | and Tra | fficked P | ersons S | ub-Progra | am | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | OUTCOME INDICATORS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.21 | Percentage of assisted individuals who are reintegrated to their amilies and communities | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a. Trafficked Persons | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 40.00% | 60.00% | 100.00% | 13.33% | 60.00% | 73.33% | 20.00% | 100.00% | 95.00% | 0.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 68.00% | 60.00% | 100.00% | 37.78% | 84.44% | 100.00% | 32.30% | 81.53% | 100.00% | | | | | |
| | b. Distressed Overseas Filipinos and Families | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 22.50% | 77.50% | 100.00% | 4.00% | 96.00% | 100.00% | 22.00% | 78.00% | 100.00% | 2.00% | 98.00% | 100.00% | 7.00% | 93.00% | 100.00% | 21.00% | 79.00% | 100.00% | 27.50% | 72.50% | 100.00% | | | | ISSO catered more than 300 OFW clients since Dubai, UAE and Saudi Arabia have offered amnesty program to undocumented and distresed workers | |
| | OUTPUT INDICATORS | | | | | • | | | | | | | • | | <u> </u> | | | | | | | | | | | | ' | | | | | |
| 2.22 | lumber of trafficked persons provided with social welfare ervices | 13 | 15 | 15 | 22 | 65 | 8 | 5 | 13 | 7 | 4 | 11 | 15 | 9 | 24 | 0 | 23 | 23 | 46 | 15 | 32 | 17 | 38 | 55 | 32 | 47 | 79 | 14 | | 2 0 | | |
| | a. Adults | 2 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 22 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 8 | 2 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 13 | 16 | 3 | 14 | 17 | 11 | 16 | 27 | | | | | |
| | b. Children | 7 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 24 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 6 | 9 | 15 | | | | | |
| | c. Youth | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 19 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 17 | 17 | 34 | 2 | 14 | 12 | 19 | 31 | 15 | 22 | 37 | | | | | |
| | d. PWDs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| | e. Senior Citizens | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | - | - | | | | | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | - | | | - | | | | | | | • | |

| | | | Physical | Tavasta | | | | | | | | | | | Dhusis | ! ^ | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | HPMES FORM 4-4A-4E |
|--|-----|-----|----------|---------|-------|----|---------|----|---|---------|----|-----|---------|-----------|--------|-----------|----------|------|---------|-----|---------|----------|-----|----|------------|-----|----------|----------|---------|---|-----------------------------|
| Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ | | | Physical | Targets | | | | | | | | Τ. | | | Pnysic | cal Accom | npiisnme | ents | | | _ | | . | | | | | Asse | ssment | | |
| Performance Indicator | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | M | Q1 F | т | м | Q2 F | т | M 1 | st Seme | ster T | м | Q3 F | т | м | Q4 F | т | 21 M | nd Semes | ter | м | Total F | т | Variance | | ariance | Reasons for Variance | Steering Measures / Remarks |
| Number of distressed and undocumented overseas Filipinos provided with social welfare services | 75 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 300 | 16 | 60 | 76 | 4 | 62 | 66 | 20 | 122 | 142 | 1 | 53 | 54 | 14 | 109 | 123 | 15 | 162 | 177 | 35 | 284 | 319 | | | | Dubai and Saudi Arabia has ongoing mass repatriation to problematic and undocumented | |
| MALAYSIA | | | | | ANA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 5 | | | | OFWs | |
| SAUDI ARABIA | | | | | ANA | 9 | 24 | 33 | 3 | 19 | 22 | 12 | 43 | 55 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 10 | 50 | 60 | 10 | 54 | 64 | 22 | 97 | 119 | | H | | | |
| QATAR | | | + | | ANA | 5 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 8 | 6 | 8 | 14 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 11 | 12 | 1 | 14 | 15 | 7 | 22 | 29 | | \vdash | | | |
| HONG KONG | | | | | ANA | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 14 | 14 | | H | | | |
| DUBAI,UAE | | | | | ANA | 2 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 2 | 17 | 19 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 1 | 17 | 18 | 1 | 28 | 29 | 3 | 45 | 48 | | H | | | |
| KUWAIT | | | | | | | _ | 24 | | 20 | | | 43 | 44 | + | 9 | 9 | | 23 | 24 | | | | | | 77 | | H | | | |
| | | | | | ANA | 1 | 23 | | 0 | | 20 | 1 | | _ | 0 | _ | | 1 | | | 1 | 32 | 33 | 2 | 75 | | | Н | | | |
| OTHER COUNTRIES | | | | | ANA | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 10 | 11 | 2 | 13 | 15 | | H | | | |
| OFWs FAMILY MEMBER IN PHILIPPINES | | | | | ANA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| a. ADULTS | 75 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 300 | 18 | 61 | 79 | 4 | 60 | 64 | 22 | 121 | 143 | 0 | 42 | 42 | 14 | 109 | 123 | 14 | 0 | 14 | 36 | 121 | 157 | | | | | |
| MALAYSIA | | | | | | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | | Ш | | | |
| SAUDI ARABIA | | | | | | 9 | 24 | 33 | 3 | 19 | 22 | 12 | 43 | 55 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 43 | 55 | | Ш | | | |
| QATAR | | | | | | 5 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 8 | 6 | 8 | 14 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 14 | | Ш | | | |
| HONG KONG | | | | | | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | | Ш | | | |
| DUBAI,UAE | | | | | | 2 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 2 | 17 | 19 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 17 | 19 | | Ш | | | |
| KUWAIT | | | | | | 1 | 23 | 24 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 1 | 43 | 44 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 43 | 44 | | | | | |
| OTHER COUNTRIES | | | | | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | | | | | |
| OFWs FAMILY MEMBER IN PHILIPPINES | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| b. CHILDREN | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| MALAYSIA | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| SAUDI ARABIA | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| QATAR | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | П | | | |
| HONG KONG | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | П | | | |
| DUBAI,UAE | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | \Box | | | |
| KUWAIT | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| OTHER COUNTRIES | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | \Box | | | |
| OFWs FAMILY MEMBER IN PHILIPPINES | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | \vdash | | | |
| c. YOUTH | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| MALAYSIA | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| SAUDI ARABIA | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | П | | | |
| QATAR | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | П | | | |
| HONG KONG | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | Ħ | | | |
| DUBAI,UAE | 1 | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | H | | | |
| KUWAIT | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | \Box | | | |
| OTHER COUNTRIES | 1 | | + | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | \vdash | | | |
| OFWs FAMILY MEMBER IN PHILIPPINES | 1 | | + | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | \vdash | | | |

| | | | Physic | ical Tar | gets | | | | | | | | | | | Physic | cal Accor | mplishm | ents | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|--------|------------|------|-------|---|----|---|---|----|---|---|---------|------|--------|-----------|---------|------|----|---|---|----------|-----|---|-------|---|----------|--------------------|------|----------------------|----------------------------|
| Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ Performance Indicator | | | | | | | | Q1 | | | Q2 | | 1 | st Seme | ster | | Q3 | | | Q4 | | 2 | nd Semes | ter | | Total | | Variance | Assessi of Vari | ment | Reasons for Variance | Steering Measures / Remark |
| | Q1 | Q2 | Q | J 3 | Q4 | Total | м | F | т | м | F | т | м | F | т | м | F | т | м | F | т | м | F | т | м | F | т | | | | | |
| d. PWDs | ANA | ANA | AA. | NA | ANA | ANA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| MALAYSIA | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| SAUDI ARABIA | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| QATAR | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| HONG KONG | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| DUBAI,UAE | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| KUWAIT | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| OTHER COUNTRIES | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| OFWs FAMILY MEMBER IN PHILIPPINES | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| e. SENIOR CITIZENS | ANA | ANA | AA. | NA | ANA | ANA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| MALAYSIA | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| SAUDI ARABIA | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| QATAR | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| HONG KONG | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| DUBAI,UAE | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| KUWAIT | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| OTHER COUNTRIES | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| OFWS FAMILY MEMBER IN PHILIPPINES | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |

| | | | | OBLIGA | TION | | | | | DISBURS | SEMENT | | |
|---|---------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ Performance Indicator | Allocated Budget | | | Amount | | | Utilization Rate | | | Amount | | | Utilization Rate |
| i ciroimanee indicator | Dauget | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Total | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Total |
| POOR, VULNERABLE AND MARGINALIZED CI | ITIZENS ARE EM | IPOWERED AN | D WITH IMPRO | OVED QUALITY | OF LIFE | | | | | | | | |
| ORGANIZATIONAL OUTCOME 2: RIGHTS OF | THE POOR AND | THE VULNERA | BLE SECTORS | PROMOTED AN | ID PROTECTE | | | | | | | | |
| A. RESIDENTIAL AND NON-RESIDENTIAL CA | RE SUB-PROGR | АМ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Residential and Non-Residential Care Facilities | 14,264,000.00 | 1,640,458.94 | 6,296,469.57 | 3,595,613.05 | 2,731,458.44 | 14,264,000.00 | 100.00% | 560,183.52 | 3,648,420.87 | 4,796,442.32 | 3,536,231.79 | 12,541,278.50 | 87.92% |
| Other MOOE | 13,526,000.00 | 1,797,559.88 | 8,627,760.84 | 568,029.59 | 2,532,649.69 | 13,526,000.00 | 100.00% | 1,588,635.89 | 2,708,356.42 | 1,400,657.00 | 4,425,535.66 | 10,123,184.97 | 74.84% |
| B. Supplementary Feeding Sub-Program | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Supplementary Feeding Program | 136,424,000.00 | 0.00 | 122,147,617.11 | -36,382,862.00 | 43,230,966.30 | 128,995,721.41 | 94.56% | 0.00 | 0.00 | 8,568,759.98 | 48,744,061.03 | 57,312,821.01 | 44.43% |
| Other MOOE | 4,093,000.00 | 655,654.40 | 1,530,266.15 | 235,059.08 | 1,672,020.37 | 4,093,000.00 | 100.00% | 623,060.09 | 702,888.48 | 997,399.15 | 1,097,071.35 | 3,420,419.07 | 83.57% |
| C. Social Welfare for Senior Citizens Sub-Pro | ogram | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Social Pension for Indigent Senior Citizens | 840,000,000.00 | 28,290,000.00 | 716,802,000.00 | | 94,908,000.00 | 840,000,000.00 | 100.00% | 28,290,000.00 | 200,154,000.00 | 492,105,000.00 | 119,451,000.00 | 840,000,000.00 | 100.00% |
| Implementation of Centenarians Act of 2016 | 1,500,000.00 | 500,000.00 | 400,000.00 | 400,000.00 | 200,000.00 | 1,500,000.00 | 100.00% | 500,000.00 | 400,000.00 | 400,000.00 | 200,000.00 | 1,500,000.00 | 100.00% |
| Other MOOE | 21,726,218.64 | 4,145,497.81 | 11,704,597.40 | 3,249,389.57 | 1,525,182.70 | 20,624,667.48 | 94.93% | 2,413,821.27 | 4,564,118.32 | 10,371,332.36 | 2,289,357.44 | 19,638,629.39 | 95.22% |
| D. Protective Program for Individuals, Famil | lies and Commu | nities in Need | or in Crisis Sul | b-Program | | | | | | | | | |
| Persons With Disability (PWD) | 100,000.00 | 0.00 | 91,500.00 | 3,200.00 | 5,300.00 | 100,000.00 | 100.00% | 0.00 | 0.00 | 94,700.00 | 5,300.00 | 100,000.00 | 100.00% |
| Community-based | 8,121,000.00 | 75,000.00 | 812,405.63 | 258,479.95 | 6,975,114.42 | 8,121,000.00 | 100.00% | 0.00 | 824,041.88 | 212,272.45 | 5,987,371.11 | 7,023,685.44 | 86.49% |
| Unconditional Cash Transfer Program (UCT) | 10,082,219.80 | 755,830.47 | 2,145,720.00 | 1,068,463.00 | 4,574,450.73 | 8,544,464.20 | 84.75% | 0.00 | 956,825.45 | 1,107,035.88 | 3,300,627.61 | 5,364,488.94 | 62.78% |
| Assistance to Individuals in Crisis Situation (AICS) | 263,658,928.12 | 28,313,621.91 | 31,388,381.38 | 68,607,457.63 | 119,929,546.91 | 248,239,007.83 | 94.15% | 21,265,552.33 | 33,286,785.16 | 26,744,623.69 | 95,616,148.80 | 176,913,109.98 | 71.27% |
| Alternative Family Care Program | 3,852,000.00 | 472,000.00 | 538,000.00 | 850,000.00 | 1,784,000.00 | 3,644,000.00 | 94.60% | 472,000.00 | 538,000.00 | 850,000.00 | 1,588,510.00 | 3,448,510.00 | 94.64% |
| Other MOOE | 21,451,931.58 | 2,210,622.10 | 11,722,986.69 | 2,255,047.12 | 5,263,275.67 | 21,451,931.58 | 100.00% | 2,083,064.35 | 3,391,358.67 | 3,684,220.98 | 11,909,151.59 | 21,067,795.59 | 98.21% |
| E. Social Welfare for Distressed Overseas Fil | lipinos and Traf | ficked Persons | Sub-Program | | | | | | | | | | |
| Recovery and Reintegration Program For Traffic Persons (RRPTP) | 609,000.00 | 30,334.98 | 94,000.00 | 97,300.00 | 387,365.02 | 609,000.00 | 100.00% | 30,334.98 | 94,000.00 | 97,300.00 | 226,400.00 | 448,034.98 | 73.57% |

| | | | | OBLIG | ATION | | | | | DISBURS | SEMENT | | |
|--|---------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|---------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|---------------------|
| Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ Performance Indicator | Allocated Budget | | | Amount | | | Utilization Rate | | | Amount | | | Utilization Rate |
| renormance indicator | Buuget | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Total | Q1 | Q2 | QЗ | Q4 | Total | Total |
| POOR, VULNERABLE AND MARGINALIZED C | ITIZENS ARE EM | IPOWERED AN | D WITH IMPR | OVED QUALIT | Y OF LIFE | | | | | | | | |
| ORGANIZATIONAL OUTCOME 2: RIGHTS OF | THE POOR AND | THE VULNERA | BLE SECTORS | PROMOTED A | ND PROTECTE | D | | | | | | | |
| Services to Overseas Filipinos and their Familes (International Social Services Office - ISSO) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Other MOOE | 1,929,234.20 | 129,537.08 | 1,361,474.39 | 263,858.02 | 174364.71 | 1,929,234.20 | 100.00% | 114,234.75 | 148,299.27 | 116,457.74 | 945,822.56 | 1,324,814.32 | 68.67% |

| | | | Phy | sical | Target | s | | | | | | | | Physical | Accomp | lishmer | nts | | | | | | ļ , | Annual T | otal | | | | | |
|-----|--|--------|--------|-------|----------|---------|--------------|---------|--------|---------|---------|-----------------|-----------|----------|--------|---------|-------|------------|---------|--------|---------|----------|--------|------------|---------------------------|---------------|---|---|--|---|
| | Objective/Program/Sub-Program/ Performance Indicator | | | Г | | 1 | | Q1 | | | Q2 | | 1st Sen | nester | | Q3 | | Q | 1 | 2 | nd Seme | ester | 1 1 | -iiiiuui i | ota. | Variance | | ssment o | Reasons for Variance | Steering Measures/ Remarks |
| | | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male F | emale | Total M | ale Fema | le Total | Male I | emale T | otal | Male Fema | e Total | Male | Female | e Total | Male | Female | Total | | | | | 1 |
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | | (7) | | | (8) | | (9 |) | Γ | (9) | | (1 |)) | | (11) | | | | (11)=(7)+(8) +(9)+(10) | (12)=(11)-(6) | Major (>+/- 30% deviatio n) | Minor ("<" Ful or targ 30% Achi deviation d | at at (13) | (19) |
| POO | R, VULNERABLE AND MARGINALIZED CITIZI | ENS AF | RE EMP | POWE | ERED A | ID WIT | H IMPR | OVED | QUALI | TY OF L | .IFE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ORG | ANIZATIONAL OUTCOME 3: IMMEDIATE REL | IEF AN | ND EAR | RLY R | RECOVE | RY OF D | ISAST | ER VICT | TIMS/S | SURVI | ORS E | NSURE | D | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Outcome Indicators | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.1 | Percentage of disaster-affected households assisted to early recovery stage | 80% | ANA | 80% | 6 80% | 80% | | - | 100% | - | | 0% | - | 100% | - | 98 | 3.32% | - | 99.68% | , | - | 99.54% | • | - | 99.56% | 19.56% | | | - Double entry of list of beneficiaries - Beneficiaries were not present during the scheduled payout | Coordinate with concerned LGUs to communicate the beneficiarie in order for the beneficiaries to claim assistance upon the scheduled payout for the future implementation of ESA/CFW |
| | No. of Households in Early Recovery Stage | 157 | 0 | 297 | 2,516 | 2,970 |) | - | 157 | - | | 0 | - | 157 | - | : | 297 | - | 2,516 | | - | 2,813 | | - | 2,970 | 0 | | | | |
| | No. of households provided with early recovery services | 157 | 0 | 297 | 2,516 | 2,970 | 84 | 73 | 157 | 0 | 0 | 0 8 | 34 73 | 157 | 125 | 167 | 292 | 1,536 972 | 2,508 | 1,661 | 1,139 | 2,800 | 1,745 | 1,212 | 2,957 | -13 | | | | |
| | Output Indicators | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Number of trained DSWD QRT members ready for deployment on disaster response | 40 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 130 | 13 | 27 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 : | 13 27 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 40 | -90 | | | Activity was not conducted due to conflict of schedules and some activites were dependent on the modules from the Centra Office | Activity to be conducted this 1st Quarter 2020 |
| 3.2 | Number of LGUs with prepositioned relief goods | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | - | N/A | N/A | N/A | Α . | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/s | 1 4 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 1 | N/A | N/A | N | I/A | N/A | N/A | | |) | No prepositioning of relief goods to the LGUs as per memorandum from the Secretary. However the FO prepositioned the relief goods to rented warehouses in |
| 3.3 | lumber of poor households that received cash-for-work or CCAM | 873 | 15,894 | 15,89 | 98 15,89 | 48,56 | 3 483 | 390 | 873 | 1,148 | 1,398 | 2,546 1, | 631 1,78 | 8 3,419 | 6,968 | 7,244 | 4,212 | 3,770 19,4 | 33,224 | 20,738 | 26,69 | 8 47,436 | 22,369 | 28,486 | 50,855 | 2,292 | | | Funds for additional beneficiaries were downloaded by the Central Office, which is not accounted as part of the divisions annual target with a total beneficiaires of 48563. | |
| | lumber of LGUs provided with augmention on disaster esponse services | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | | - | 10 | 3 | | 3 | - | 13 | - | | 7 | - | 0 | | - | 7 | - | 20 | 20 | 0 | | | 1 | |
| 3.5 | Number of internally displaced households provided with disaster response services | ANA | ANA | ANA | A ANA | ANA | 896 | 596 | 1,492 | 2,604 | 1,737 4 | 4,341 3, | 499 2,334 | 5,833 | 1411 | 942 2 | ,353 | - | 0 | 1411 | 942 | 2,353 | 5,806 | 2,380 | 8,186 | 0 | | | 1 | |
| | Number of households with damaged houses provided with early recovery services | 157 | ANA | 297 | 2,516 | 2,970 | 84 | 73 | 157 | - | | - 8 | 34 73 | 157 | 125 | 167 | 292 | 1536 972 | 2,508 | 1661 | 1139 | 2,800 | 1,745 | 1,212 | 2,957 | -13 | | | - Double entry of list of beneficiaries - Beneficiaries were not present during the scheduled payout | Coordinate with concerned LGUs to communicate the beneficiarie in order for the beneficiaries to claim assistance upon the scheduled payout for the future implementation of ESA/CFW |
| | a. Emergency Shelter Assistance | | | | | | | | | | | | • | | | | | | • | | | | | | | • | | | · | • |
| | Fire Incident in Bislig City | 157 | - | 297 | 7 - | 297 | 84 | 73 | 157 | | | 8 | 34 73 | 157 | 125 | 167 | 292 | = | | 125 | 167 | 292 | 209 | 240 | 449 | -5 | | | - Double entry of list of beneficiaries - Beneficiaries were not present during the scheduled payout | Coordinate with concerned LGUs to communicate the beneficiarie in order for the beneficiaries to claim assistance upon the scheduled payout for the future implementation of ESA/CFW |
| | Fire Incident in Butuan City | - | - | - | 33 | 33 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | - | 25 9 | 34 | 25 | 9 | 34 | 25 | 9 | 34 | 1 | | | There was an increase of 1 beneficiary vs. the actual number of beneficiary submitted by the LGU upon the submission of funding proposal for ESA to fire affected families. | |
| | Fire Incident in San Francisco, ADS | - | - | - | 12 | 12 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | - | 8 4 | 12 | 8 | 4 | 12 | 8 | 4 | 12 | 0 | | | 1 | |
| | 5.5 Magnitude Earthquake | - | - | - | 2,471 | 2,471 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | - | 1503 959 | 2,462 | 1503 | 959 | 2,462 | 1503 | 959 | 2,462 | -9 | | | - Double entry of list of beneficiaries - Beneficiaries were not present during the scheduled payout | Coordinate with concerned LGUs to communicate the beneficiarie in order for the beneficiaries to claim assistance upon the scheduled payout for the future implementation of ESA/CFW |
| | o. Cash for Work | | | | | | | | | • | • | • | | | | • | | • | | | | | | | | _ | | - | | |
| | Fire Incident in Bislig City | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - | 0 | | - | 0 | | - | 0 | 0 | | | | No Cash-for-Work component is provided for the Emergency Shelter Assistance in the Fire Incident in Bislic City |
| | 5.5 Magnitude Earthquake | - | - | - | 2,471 | 2,471 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | - | 1503 959 | 2,462 | 1503 | 959 | 2,462 | 1503 | 959 | 2,462 | -9 | | | - Double entry of list of beneficiaries - Beneficiaries were not present during the scheduled payout | Coordinate with concerned LGUs to communicate the beneficiaries in order for the beneficiaries to claim assistance upon the scheduled payout for the future implementation of ESA/CFW |

| | | | | OBLIGA | ATION | | | | | DISBUI | RSEMENT | | |
|--|---------------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|------------------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|------------------------|
| Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ Performance Indicator | Allocated Budget | | | Amount | | | Percent Utilization | | | Amount | | | Percent Utilization |
| | | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Total | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Total |
| POOR, VULNERABLE AND MARGINALIZED C | ITIZENS ARE EM | POWERED AN | D WITH IMPR | OVED QUALIT | Y OF LIFE | | | | | | | | |
| ORGANIZATIONAL OUTCOME 3: IMMEDIATE | RELIEF AND EA | RLY RECOVER | Y OF DISASTE | RVICTIMS/SU | JRVIVORS EN | SURED | | | | | | | |
| DISASTER RESPONSE AND MANAGEMENT PI | ROGRAM | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Disaster Response and Rehabilitation Program | 133,107,712.69 | 4,910,242.27 | 15,867,012.59 | 35,494,640.16 | 76,451,307.03 | 132,723,202.05 | 99.71% | 3,185,658.30 | 11,059,173.30 | 34,985,135.13 | 78,641,347.87 | 127,871,314.60 | 96.34% |
| National Resource Operation | 1,721,200.00 | 301,200.00 | 0.00 | 474,142.77 | 766,140.24 | 1,541,483.01 | 89.56% | 0.00 | 0.00 | 398,842.77 | 168,824.42 | 567,667.19 | 36.83% |
| Quick Response Fund | 57,392,504.22 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 8,852,088.52 | 45,123,535.03 | 53,975,623.55 | 94.05% | | | 4,333,203.25 | 37,284,853.79 | 41,618,057.04 | 77.11% |
| Implementation and monitoring of Payapa at Masaganang Pamayanan (PAMANA) Program- Peace and Development Fund | 35,643,857.57 | 9,005,539.74 | 0.00 | 17,555,773.46 | 9,082,544.37 | 35,643,857.57 | 100.00% | 8,059,794.10 | 399,208.00 | 3,039,509.73 | 14,070,609.05 | 25,569,120.88 | 71.73% |

| | | | Phy | ysical T | 「argets | | | | Physical | Accom | plishm | ents | | | | essmer | | | III PLOTORITY TA |
|-------|---|--------|--------|----------|---------|---------|-------|-------|----------|--------|--------|-------|---------|----------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|--|-------------------|
| | Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ Performance Indicator | - | | 1 | 1 | | | | 1st | | | 2nd | | Variance | | /arianc | Full | Reasons for Variance | Steering Measures |
| | | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Q1 | Q2 | Sem | Q3 | Q4 | Sem | Total | | Major (>+/- 30% deviation | Minor ("<" or "=" +/- 30% | target Achieved | | |
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14) | (15) | (16) | (17) | (18) | (19) |
| POOF | , VULNERABLE AND MARGINALIZED CITIZEN | S ARE | EMPO | WERE | D AND | WITH I | MPRO | VED Q | UALITY | OF LIF | E | | | | | | | | |
| DRGA | NIZATIONAL OUTCOME 4: CONTINUING COM | IPLIAN | ICE OF | SOCI | AL WE | LFARE A | ND DE | VELO | PMENT A | GENC | ES TO | STAND | ARDS IN | THE DEI | LIVERY | OF SO | CIAL | WELFARE SERVICES ENSURED | |
| Socia | l Welfare and Development Agencies Regulat | ory Pr | ogran | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Outcome Indicators | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.1 | Percentage of SWAs, SWDAs and service providers with sustained compliance to social welfare and development standards | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 50.0% | 9.4% | 21.9% | 31.3% | 18.8% | 59.4% | 28.1% | 59.4% | 9.4% | 0 | | | More SWDAs have been monitored for the 4th Quarter since there has been a policy change. TA has to be provided to SWDAs in complying for the renewal of their RLA. | |
| | Total Number of SWDAs | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 0 | | | | | |
| | Total No. of SWDAS with sustained compliance to SWD standards | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 16 | 3 | 7 | 10 | 6 | 3 | 9 | 19 | 3 | | | | | |
| | a. Registered and Licensed SWAs | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 4 | | | | More SWDAs have been monitored for the 4th Quarter since there has been a policy change. TA has to be provided to SWDAs in complying for the renewal of their RLA. | |
| | b. Accredited SWDAs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | b.1 Level 1 Accreditation | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 12 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 13 | 1 | | | | More SWDAs have been monitored for the 4th Quarter since there has been a policy change. TA has to be provided to SWDAs in complying for the renewal of their RLA. | |
| | b.2 Level 2 Accreditation | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | | | | |
| | b.3 Level 3 Accreditation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| | c. Accredited Service Providers | | | | | 10 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 10 | 0 | | | ✓ | | |
| | Output Indicators | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.1 | Number of SWAs and SWDAs registered, licensed and accredited | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | With the strengthened measures to promote the regulatory sevices of the Department, more SWDAs/SWAs applied for RL. | |
| | a. Registered and Licensed SWAs | ANA | ANA | ANA | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | | | | | |
| | b. Registered Auxiliary SWDAs | ANA | 1 | ANA | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | | | | | |
| | c. Accredited SWAs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | c.1 Level 1 Accreditation (Pre-assessment) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1.1 DSWD-Operated Residential Facilities | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| | 1.2 LGU-Managed Facilities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | | | | | |
| | 1.3 Private SWAs | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | -1 | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | HPMES FORM 4-4A-4B |
|-----|---|------|----------|---------|---------|--------|----|------|------------|-------|--------|------------|-------|----------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|---|--------------------|
| | Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ | | Phy | sical T | argets | | | | Physical | Accom | plishm | ents | | Variance | ١ ١ | essmen /arianc | | Reasons for Variance | Steering Measures |
| | Performance Indicator | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Q1 | Q2 | 1st Sem | Q3 | Q4 | 2nd Sem | Total | Variance | Major (>+/- 30% deviation | Minor ("<" or "=" +/- 30% | Full target Achieved | Reasons for Variance | Steering measures |
| | c.2 Level 2 Accreditation (Pre-assessment) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2.1 DSWD-Operated Residential Facilities | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| | 2.2 LGU-Managed Facilities | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | o | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| | 2.3 Private SWAs | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | | | | | |
| | c.3 Level 3 Accreditation (Pre-assessment) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 3.1 DSWD-Operated Residential Facilities | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| | 3.2 LGU-Managed Facilities | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| | 3.3 Private SWAs | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| 4.2 | Number of CSOs accredited | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a. Implementing Partner CSOs (Validated) | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | Not Applicable | |
| | b. Beneficiary Partner CSOs Accredited | ANA | ANA | 50 | 100 | 150 | 32 | 2 | 34 | 155 | 29 | 184 | 218 | 68 | ✓ | | | More Beneficiary CSOs organized by SLP applied for accreditation. | |
| 4.3 | Number of service providers accredited | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | With the strengthened measures to promote the regulatory sevices of the Department, more SPs applied for accreditation. | |
| | a. SWMCCs | No | t Applic | able to | Field O | ffices | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | b. PMCs | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 8 | 1 | 9 | 12 | 13 | 25 | 34 | 24 | ✓ | | | | |
| | c. DCWs(ECCD Services) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 250 | ANA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 268 | 310 | 310 | 310 | | | ~ | | |
| 4.4 | Percentage of SWDAs with RLA certificates issued within 30 working days upon receipt of compliant application | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 0% | 100% | 100% | 0% | 100% | | 100% | 100% | | | Z | | |
| | Total no. of complianct application received | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | | | | | |
| | No. of SWDAs with RLA certificates issued within 30 working days upon receipt of compliant application | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | | | | | |
| 4.5 | Percentage of detected violations/complaints acted upon within 7 working days | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | | | | | |
| | Total no. of violations/complaints detected | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| | No. of detected violations/complaints acted upon within 7 working days | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |

| | | | | OBLI | GATION | | | | | DISBU | RSEMENT | | |
|--|---------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------------------|
| Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ | Allocated | | | Amount | | | Percent Utilization | | | Amount | | | Percent Utilization |
| Performance Indicator | Budget | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Total | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Total |
| POOR, VULNERABLE AND MARGINALIZED C | ITIZENS ARE I | MPOWERE | D AND WI | TH IMPROV | ED QUALI | TY OF LIFE | | | | | | | |
| ORGANIZATIONAL OUTCOME 4: CONTINUIN | IG COMPLIAN | CE OF SOCI | AL WELFAI | RE AND DE | VELOPMEN | T AGENCIES T | O STANDAR | DS IN THE | DELIVERY | OF SOCIA | L WELFARE | SERVICES | ENSURED |
| SOCIAL WELFARE AND DEVELOPMENT AGEN | ICIES REGULA | TORY PRO | GRAM | | | | | | | | | | |
| Standards-setting, Licensing, Accreditation and Monitoring Services | 1,171,515.92 | 135,503.15 | 586,021.36 | 296,787.67 | 153,203.74 | 1,171,515.92 | 100.00% | 130,763.15 | 225,402.36 | 212,241.17 | 279,921.73 | 848,328.41 | 72.41% |

| Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ | | Phy | /sica | l Targe | ets | | | | | | | | Physic | al Accomp | olishmen | ts | | | | | | Assessm Varia | nce | Reasons for Variance/ | |
|--|----------|---------|-------|---------|------------|------------|---------|---------|----------|-------|-----------|---------|--------|-----------|----------|--|----------------|-------------|----------|--------|----------|---|--------------------------------|--|-------------------|
| Performance Indicator | Q1 | . Q2 | | Q3 Q | 24 To | tal | Q1 | | Q | 2 | 1st Se | mester | | Q3 | | Q4 | 21 | nd Semester | | Annual | Variance | Major Mino (>+/- ("<' 30% or "= deviati +/- on) 30% | Full target Achiev ed | Other Remarks | Steering Measures |
| POOR, VULNERABLE AND MARGINALIZED CITIZEN | IS AR | E EMP | owe | ERED A | ND W | тн імі | ROVE | QUALI | TY OF LI | FE | • | | | | | | | | | | | 0.1) 30 % | | | |
| ORGANIZATIONAL OUTCOME 5: DELIVERY OF SOC | IAL V | WELFA | RE A | AND DE | VELO | PMENT | PROGR | AMS BY | LOCAL G | OVERN | MENT UNI | TS THRO | UGH LC | CAL SOC | IAL WEL | FARE AN | ID DEVELO | PMENT OFF | ICES IMP | ROVED | | | | | |
| Outcome Indicators | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5.1 Percentage of LSWDOs with improved functionality | - | - | | - | - N | т | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | No Target | |
| Baseline Result: (with Regional disaggregation) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | The indicators under OO5 specifically "5.1 Percentage of LSWDOs with improved | |
| a. Low "Minimum level not achieved" | - | - | | - | - | | | | | | | | | | | | 4 | | | | | | | functionality" is not consistent with the Assessment | |
| a.1. Province | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | | | | | | | Guide/Manual. For the year 2019 is the LSWDO Service Delivery | |
| a.2. City | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | | | | | | | Assessment and Competency Assessment using the | |
| a.3. Municipality | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 4 | | | | | | | enhanced tool. Kindly refer the baseline result re: LSWDO SDA/CNA of | |
| b. Level 1 "Enhanced Service Delivery" | - | - | | - | - | | | | | | | | | | | | 60 | | | | | | | the LGU with their corresponding levels (Low, | |
| b.1. Province | | | | | | | | | | | \dagger | | | | | | 3 | | | | | | | Level 1, Level 2, and Level 3). There are 76 LGUs out of 78 participated the | |
| b.2. City | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | | | | | | assessment/validation (PLGU- 5, CSWDO-5 and MSWDO- 66), remaining two (2) LGUs | |
| b.3. Municipality | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 54 | | | | | | | are Butuan City and Tagana- an, Surigao del Norte. | |
| c. Level 2 "Better Service Delivery" | - | - | | - | - | | | | | | | | | | | | 12 | | | | | | | | |
| c.1. Province | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2 | | | | | | | | |
| c.2. City | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2 | | | | | | | | |
| c.3. Municipality | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 8 | | | | | | | | |
| d. Level 3 "Improved Service Delivery" | - | | | _ | - | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| d.1. Province | | | | | | | | | | | + | | | | | | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| d.2. City | | | | | | | | | | | + + | | | | | | 0 | | | | | | | - | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | + | | | | | | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| d.3. Municipality | | | - | | | - | | | | | ++ | | | | | | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| a. Partially-Functional to Functional | | | | | (no | of (DO) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a.1. Province | | | | | LOW | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a.2 City a.3 Municipality | 1 | + | + | _ | | | - | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | + | | |
| b. Functional to Fully-Functional | \vdash | + | + | + | (no | of | | | | | | | - | | | \perp | | + + | _ | | | \vdash | + | | |
| b.1. Province | 1 | | + | + | LSW | (DO) | | | | | | | - | | | | - | + + | | | | \vdash | + | | |
| b.2 City | 1 | | + | | | 1 | | + + | | | + + | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | + | _ | + | -+ | - | - | + | + + | | | + + | | - | | | | | + + | + - | | _ | \vdash | + | | |
| b.3 Municipality c. Partially-Functional to Fully-Functional | \vdash | + | + | + | (pr | of | | | | | \perp | | - | - - | | $\perp \perp$ | | + + | - | | | \vdash | + | | |
| | 1 | \perp | | | (no LSW | (DO) | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ļ | |
| c.1. Province | 1 | _ | | | | _ | \perp | \perp | _ | | \perp | | - | | | \perp | | \perp | | | | | | | |
| c.2 City | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| c.3 Municipality | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | - | - - | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ПРИ | ES FORM 4-4A-4 |
|------|--|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------|----------|--------|-------|-------|-------|------|--------|--------|-------|--------|------|-------|-------|------|--------|-------|--------|-----------------|--------|-----------------------|----------|----------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|-------------------|
| | Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ | | Phys | ical Ta | rgets | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | V | ssmei ariand | ce | Reasons for Variance/ | | | | | | | |
| | Performance Indicator | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | | Q1 | | | Q2 | | 1st | Semes | ter | | QЗ | | | Q4 | | 2n | nd Sem | ester | | Annu | al | Variance | Major (>+/- 30% deviati | Minor ("<" or "=" +/- 30% | Full target Achiev ed | Other Remarks | Steering Measures |
| POOR | , VULNERABLE AND MARGINALIZED CITIZEN | S ARE | ЕМРО | WERE | D AND | WITH | I IMPR | OVED | QUAL | TY OF | LIFE | | | | | | | | | | | • | | | | | | • | _ 0/ | 30 % | | | |
| ORGA | NIZATIONAL OUTCOME 5: DELIVERY OF SOC | TAI WE | I FAR | FAND | DEVE | ПОРМІ | FNT DE | ROGRAN | MS RV | LOCAL | ı GOV | FRNM | FNT II | NTTS ' | THROU | GH I O | CALS | SOCIA | I WFI | FARE | AND DE | VFLOP | MENT | OFFIC | FS TMI | PROVE | <u> </u> | | | | | | |
| | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0.12 | | | | T | 1 | T | | T | | - T | 1 | | | | 1 | |
| | Assessment Result: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a. Partially-Functional to Functional (PF to F) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Total (a.1-a.3) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a.1 Province | | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | | | - | ' | | • | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| | a.2 City | | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a.3 Municipality | | | | | t | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | b. Functional to Fully-Functional | | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| | Total (a.1-a.3)) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | |
| | b.1 Province | | | | | | - | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | b.2 City | | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | b.3 Municipality | | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. | c. Partially-Functional to Fully-Functional (PF to FF) | | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Total (a.1-a.3)) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | c.1 Province | | | | | | \vdash | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | |
| | c.2 City | | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | c.3 Municipality | | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | , , | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | _ | | | | | | | | _ | · | |
| | Output Indicators | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5.1 | Number of learning and development interventions provided to LGUs (through LSWDOs) | 1 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 7 | | 3 | | | 2 | | | 5 | | | 2 | | | 2 | | | 4 | | | 9 | | 2 | | Z | | | |
| 5.2 | Percentage of LGUs provided with technical assistance | 70% of 78 LGUs | 70% of 78 LGUs | 70% of 78 LGUs | 70% of 78 LGUs | 70% | 78 | 64 | 82% | 78 | 69 | 88% | - | - | 85% | 78 | 74 | 95% | 78 | 78 | 100% | - | - | 95% | 78 | 78 | 100.00% | 30.00% | | Z | | LGU initiated learning & development intervention, DSWD acted as Resource Person | |
| 5.3 | Percentage of LGUs provided with resource augmentation | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| 5.4 | Percentage of LGUs that rated TA provided as satisfactory or better | 80% | 80% | 80% | 80% | 80% | 148 | 148 1 | 100% | 119 | 119 | 100% | 267 | 267 | 100% | 180 | 180 | 100% | 114 | 114 | 100% | 294 | 294 | 100% | 561 | 561 | 100.00% | 20% | | | | LGU initiated learning & development intervention, DSWD acted as Resource Person | |
| 5.5 | Percentage of LGUs that rated RA provided as satisfactory or better | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | | |

| | | | | OBLIG | ATION | | | | | DISE | BURSEMEN | Т | |
|---|---------------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|------------------------|---------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------------------|
| Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ Performance Indicator | Allocated Budget | | | Amount | | | Percent Utilization | | | Amour | nt | | Percent Utilization |
| | | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Total | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Total |
| POOR, VULNERABLE AND MARGINALIZED | CITIZENS ARE | EMPOWERE | D AND WI | TH IMPRO | VED QUAL | ITY OF LIFE | | | | | | | |
| ORGANIZATIONAL OUTCOME 5: DELIVERY | OF SOCIAL W | ELFARE AND | DEVELOP | MENT PRO | GRAMS BY | LOCAL GO | VERNMENT L | JNITS ' | ГНROUGH | LOCAL SO | CIAL WEL | FARE AND D | EVELOPME |
| Social Welfare and Development Technica | ıl Assistance aı | nd Resource | Augment | ation Prog | ram | | | | | | | | |
| Provision of Technical / Advisory Assistance and other Related Support Services | 541,000.00 | 105,300.00 | 309,990.00 | 114,714.43 | 10,995.57 | 541,000.00 | 100.0% | 0.00 | 48,228.00 | 97,786.43 | 121,985.57 | 268,000.00 | 49.5% |
| Provision of Capability Training Programs | 732,118.00 | 20,000.00 | 28,838.00 | 268,663.00 | 414,617.00 | 732,118.00 | 100.0% | 0.00 | 58,788.00 | 203,430.00 | 285,657.00 | 547,875.00 | 74.8% |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | PMES FORM 4-4A-4I |
|-------|--|-----|-----|----------------|-----|-------|-----|-----|-----------------|-----------|------|-----------------|------------------------------|---------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| | Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ | | F | Physical Targe | ets | | | | A | ccomplisi | ment | | | Variance | | essmen | | Reasons for Variance | Steering Measures / |
| | Performance Indicator | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Q1 | Q2 | 1st Semester | Q3 | Q4 | 2nd Semester | Total | a rance | `` | Varianc | е | Reasons for Variance | Remarks |
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | | | | | | | (11)=(12)+(13)+ (14)+(15) | (12)=(11)-(6) | Major (>+/- 30% deviation | Minor ("<" or "=" +/- 30% | Full target Achieved | (13) | (19) |
| SUPF | ORT TO OPERATIONS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Polic | y Development & Plans Section | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6.1 | Number of SWD legislative or executive issuances prepared for executive/legislative approval | - | - | - | - | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | - | | | | | Not Applicable |
| 6.2 | Number of agency policies approved and disseminated | - | - | - | - | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | - | | | | | Not Applicable |
| 6.3 | Number of agency plans formulated and disseminated | - | - | - | - | ANA | 0 | 0 | ANA | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | - | 0 | | | | |
| | a. Medium-term Plans | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | - | | | | | |
| | b. Annual Plans | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | - | | | | | |
| 6.4 | Number of researches completed | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | | | | | |
| 6.5 | Number of position papers prepared | - | - | - | - | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | - | | | | | Not Applicable |
| Socia | I Technology Section | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6.6 | Number of social technologies formulated | - | - | - | - | NT | | | N/A | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | 6.6.1.Number of new concepts of models of interventions responding to emerging needs | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | | | | | |
| | 6.6.2. Number of new designs formulated | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | | | | | |
| | 6.6.3. Number of models of intervention pilot tested | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | | | | | |
| | 6.6.4. Number of models of intervention evaluated | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | | | | | |
| 6.7 | Number of SWD programs and services enhanced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 6.7.1. Number of concepts on the enhancement of an existing program/service | - | - | - | - | NT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | | | | | No Target |
| | 6.7.2. Number of designs of enhanced programs/services formulated | - | - | - | - | NT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | | | | | No Target |
| | 6.7.3. Number of enhanced models pilot tested | - | - | - | - | NT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | | | | | No Target |
| | 6.7.4. Number of enhanced models evaluated | - | - | - | - | NT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | | | | | No Target |
| 6.8 | Percentage of intermediaries adopting completed social technologies | | | | | 60% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | | | | | | |
| | Total no. of intermediaries implemented/pilot-tested social technologies | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | No. of intermediaries adopting completed social technologies | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6.9 | Number of intermediaries replicating completed social technologies | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | | | | | |
| 6.10 | Number of completed social technologies promoted | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

HPMFS FORM 4-4A-4R

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | . HP | MES FORM 4-4A-4B |
|-------|--|-------------|--------|----------------|-----|---------|----|----|-----------------|------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------------|---------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------|---|---------------------|
| | Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ | | | Physical Targe | ts | | | | | Accomplish | nment | | | Variance | | essmer | | Reasons for Variance | Steering Measures / |
| | Performance Indicator | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Q1 | Q2 | 1st Semester | Q3 | Q4 | 2nd Semester | Total | Variance | | /ariand | | Reasons for Variance | Remarks |
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | | | | | | | (11)=(12)+(13)+ (14)+(15) | (12)=(11)-(6) | Major (>+/- 30% deviation | Minor ("<" or "=" +/- 30% | Full target Achieved | (13) | (19) |
| | 6.10.1. Number of ST portfolio | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 6.10.2. Percentage of LGUs reached through social marketing activities | | | | | 50% | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Total no. of LGUs targeted | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | No. of LGUs reached through social marketing activities | | | | 42 | 42 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 64 | 65 | 67 | 25 | > | | 0 | The accomplishment exceeds more than 36% of the target LGUs reached through social marketing activities. One of the initiatives done by the office was to include the discussion of some completed social technologies during the 2019 2nd semester Social Welfare and Development Forum wherein the participants were LSWDOs, representatives from NGAs, CSOs and academe. Maximizing the activity has helped a lot, thus exceeding to the target set for FO Caraga. | |
| Natio | nal Household Targeting System for Poverty | Reduction | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6.11 | Percentage of intermediaries utilizing Listahanan results for social welfare and development initiatives | - | - | - | - | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 100% | 100% | 0% | | | | | |
| | Total No.of Intermediaries | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | - | | | | | |
| | No. of Intermediaries with MOA on Data Sharing | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | - | | | | | |
| 6.12 | No. of requests for statistical data granted | - | - | - | - | ANA | - | - | - | 4 | 0 | 4 | 4 | - | | | | | |
| 6.13 | No. of name-matching requests granted | - | - | - | - | ANA | - | - | - | 18 | 17 | 35 | 35 | - | | | | | |
| 6.14 | No. of requests for List of Poor Households generated | - | - | - | - | ANA | - | - | - | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | - | | | | | |
| 6.15 | Number of households assessed to determine poverty status | 0 | 0 | 519,881 | 0 | 519,881 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 493,512 | 493,512 | 493,512 | -26,369 | | | | There are barangays that the actual number of households are less than the computed number of households by the CO | |
| 6.16 | Number of households assessed for special validation for the UCT Program | 0 | 3,687 | 0 | 0 | 3,687 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -3,687 | | | | No directives received by the office to conduct special validation | |
| Info | mation and Communications Technology Ma | nagement Se | ection | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6.17 | Number of computer networks maintained | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | | | | | |
| 6.18 | Percentage of functional information systems deployed and maintained | - | - | - | - | ANA | 0% | | | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | - | | | | | |
| | Total No.of Functional Information Systems | - | - | - | - | | | | | 17 | 25 | 25 | 25 | - | | | | | |
| | No. of Information Systems Deployed and Maintained | - | - | - | - | | | | | 17 | 25 | 25 | 25 | - | | | | | |
| 6.19 | Percentage of users trained on ICT applications, tools and products | - | - | - | - | ANA | 0% | 0% | | 54% | 100% | 100% | 100% | - | | | | | |
| | Total no.of Target Users | - | - | - | - | | | | | 39 | 157 | 157 | 157 | - | | | | | |
| | No. of Users Trained | - | - | - | - | | | | | 21 | 157 | 157 | 157 | - | | | | | |

| | | | | Physical Targe | • | | | | Δ. | ccomplish | | | | | | | | П | PMES FORM 4-4A-4B |
|-------|---|-----|--------|----------------|-----|-------|-------|------|----------|-----------|------|----------|------------------------------|---------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| | Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ Performance Indicator | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Q1 | Q2 | 1st | Q3 | Q4 | 2nd | Total | Variance | | essmen Varianc | | Reasons for Variance | Steering Measures / Remarks |
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | 4- | Q- | Semester | Ų | 4- | Semester | (11)=(12)+(13)+ (14)+(15) | (12)=(11)-(6) | Major (> +/- 30% | Minor ("<" or "=" +/- | Full target Achieved | (13) | (19) |
| c 20 | Percentage of service support and technical assistance | (2) | (3) | - | (3) | | 1000/ | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 1000/ | | | deviation | 30% | | (13) | (19) |
| 6.20 | requests acted upon | - | - | | - | 100% | 100% | | | | | 100% | 100% | 0% | | | | | |
| | No.of TA and Support Service Requests Acted Upon | - | - | - | - | - | 19 | 134 | 134 | 69 | 39 | 108 | 147 | - | | | | _ | |
| | Total No.of TA and Support Service Requests REceived | - | - | - | - | - | 19 | 134 | 134 | 69 | 39 | 108 | 147 | - | | | | | |
| 6.21 | Number of databases maintained | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | | | | | |
| 6.22 | Number of functional websites developed and maintained | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | | | | | |
| Inter | nal Audit Section | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6.23 | Percentage of audit recommendations complied with | | | | | 100% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | | | | | |
| | No.of Audit Recommendations | | | | | 33 | 33 | 33 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 0 | | | | | Based on the review and evaluation of the IAS-CO, the FO was able to comply with all the |
| | Total No.of Audit Recommendations Complied | | | | | 33 | 19 | 14 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 0 | | | | | audit recommendations as of the 2nd Quarter submission and before the end of the one (1) year monitoring period |
| 6.24 | Percentage of integrity management measures implemented | | | | | 52% | 96% | 93% | 94% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 97% | 45% | V | | | | |
| | No.of Integrity Measures Identified | 23 | 28 | 34 | 31 | 116 | 23 | 28 | 51 | 34 | 31 | 65 | 116 | 0 | | | | | |
| | Total No.of Integrity Measures Implemented | - | - | - | - | - | 22 | 26 | 48 | 34 | 31 | 65 | 113 | 3 | | | | Some of the proposed activities are not applicable due to change in policy, program guidelines and no budgetary allocation. | |
| Socia | Il Marketing Section | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6.25 | Percentage of stakeholders informed on DSWD programs and services | - | - | - | - | 85% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | As per timeline from the Social Marketing Service, conduct of KAP Survey is on January 2020 | KAP Survey scheduled on January 20, 2020 |
| 6.26 | Number of social marketing activities conducted | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a. Information caravans | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 9 | 7 | | ✓ | | | |
| | b. Issuance of press releases | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 36 | 13 | 26 | 39 | 31 | 41 | 72 | 111 | 75 | | Z | | | |
| | c. Communication campaigns | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 55 | 4 | 59 | 24 | 50 | 74 | 133 | 130 | | | | | |
| 6.27 | Number of IEC materials developed | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 5 | 25 | 30 | 29 | 25 | 54 | 84 | 76 | | | | | |
| Knov | vledge Management | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6.28 | Number of knowledge products on social welfare and development services developed | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | ☑ | | | | |
| 6.29 | Number of knowledge sharing sessions conducted | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 0 | | | | | -SWD Forum -SWD LNET |
| Reso | urce Generation and Management | | Not Ap | plicable | | | | | | | | • | | | | | | | |
| 6.30 | Number of TAF-funded activities/projects completed | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| 6.31 | Amount of grants accessed to support TAF-funded activities and projects | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | | |

| | Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ | | Р | hysical Target | ts | | | | A | ccomplish | ment | | | | Ass | essmen | rt of | | Steering Measures / |
|-----|---|-----|-----|----------------|-----|-------|-----|-----|-----------------|-----------|------|-----------------|------------------------------|---------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| | Performance Indicator | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Q1 | Q2 | 1st Semester | QЗ | Q4 | 2nd Semester | Total | Variance | | Varianc | | Reasons for Variance | Remarks |
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | | | | | | | (11)=(12)+(13)+ (14)+(15) | (12)=(11)-(6) | Major (>+/- 30% deviation | Minor ("<" or "=" +/- 30% | Full target Achieved | (13) | (19) |
| Cor | nvergence | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Number of C/MAPs that are fully implemented | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | Number of Convergence Initiatives that are fully implemented | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| 6.3 | 2 Number of fully functional C/MATs by EO | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | Number of fully functional PATs | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | Number of URPMT Meetings | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | Number of C/MATs with developed and implemented Convergence Initiative | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| 6.3 | Number of documented Convergence Initiatives per province | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| 6.3 | 4 Number of C/MATs with updated CMAP | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | | |

| | | | | OBLI | GATION | | | | | DISB | URSEMENT | | |
|--|---------------------|--------------|------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|------------------------|------------|------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|------------------------|
| Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ Performance Indicator | Allocated Budget | | | Amount | | | Percent Utilization | | | Amoun | t | | Percent Utilization |
| i criorinance indicacor | Duaget | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Total | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Total |
| SUPPORT TO OPERATION | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Policy Development & Planning Section | 187,481.92 | 6,540.00 | 14,017.51 | 31,267.47 | 135,656.94 | 187,481.92 | 100.00% | 6,540.00 | 14,017.51 | 31,267.47 | 90,914.94 | 142,739.92 | 76.14% |
| Social Technology Development | 2,763,557.00 | 161,176.84 | 407,838.16 | 1,173,947.00 | 798,678.65 | 2,541,640.65 | 91.97% | 26,823.36 | 220,780.48 | 326,890.96 | 1,148,339.00 | 1,722,833.80 | 67.78% |
| National Household Targeting System for Poverty Reduction | 67,485,467.00 | 192,200.00 | 223,800.00 | 8,868,534.64 | 57,782,873.36 | 67,067,408.00 | 99.38% | 152,447.62 | 172,061.37 | 1,261,649.87 | 43,794,117.11 | 45,380,275.97 | 67.66% |
| Information and Communications Technology Management | 8,317,291.34 | 1,383,864.52 | 535,622.96 | 2,059,277.56 | 4,338,526.30 | 8,317,291.34 | 100.00% | 17,730.52 | 356,474.96 | 1,597,348.15 | 4,301,291.97 | 6,272,845.60 | 75.42% |
| Internal Audit Section | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Social Marketing Section | N/A | 221,560.00 | 454,200.00 | 373,900.00 | 465,935.07 | 1,515,595.07 | - | 191,560.00 | 454,200.00 | 6,650.00 | _ | 652,410.00 | 43.05% |
| Knowledge Management | 21,000.00 | 5,250.00 | 5250 | 5250 | 5,250.00 | 21,000.00 | 100.00% | 0.00 | 5,250.00 | 5,250.00 | 0.00 | 10,500.00 | 50.00% |

| | | | PH | YSICAL 1 | TARGET | | PHYSICAL ACCOMPLISHMENT | | | | | | | | | | | | HPMES FORM 4-4A-4B |
|---|--|------|------|----------|--------|-------|-------------------------|--------|--------------|------|------------------|------------------|------------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|---|--|
| Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ Performance Indicator | | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Q1 | Q2 | 1st Semester | Q3 | Q4 | 2nd Semester | Total | Variance | | essmen /ariance | | Reasons for Variance | Steering Measures / Remarks |
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | | | | | | | (11)=(12)+(13)+(14)+ (15) | (12)=(11)-(6) | Major (>+/- 30% deviation) | Minor ("<" or "=" +/- 30% deviation) | Full target Achieved | (13) | (19) |
| GENE | RAL ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT SERVI | | | • | 1 | 1 | | - | 1 | | | | | | • | | | | |
| Huma | nn Resource and Development | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7.1 | Percentage of permanent positions filled-up within timeline | 90% | 90% | 90% | 90% | 90% | 100% | 0% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 10% | | ✓ | | All permanent prositions were filled- up within timeline | |
| | No. of Positions Filled up within Timeline | | | | | | 5 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 12 | | | | | | |
| | Male | | | | | | 3 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 5 | | | | | | |
| | Female | | | | | | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 7 | | | | | | |
| | Total no. of Positions with Request for Posting | | | | | | 5 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 12 | | | | | | |
| | Male | | | | | | 3 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 7 | | | | | | |
| | Female | | | | | | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 5 | | | | | | |
| 7.2 | Percentage of regular staff provided with at least 1 learning and development intervention | 20% | 20% | 30% | 30% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 0% | 0 | | | | |
| | No.of Staff Provided with Learning and Development Interventions | 11 | 25 | 24 | 15 | 75 | 11 | 25 | 36 | 24 | 15 | 39 | 75 | | | | | | |
| | Male | 3 | 10 | 9 | 5 | 27 | 3 | 10 | 13 | 9 | 5 | 14 | 27 | | | | | | |
| | Female | 8 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 48 | 8 | 15 | 23 | 15 | 10 | 25 | 48 | | | | | | |
| | Total No. of Regular Staff | 11 | 25 | 24 | 15 | 75 | 11 | 25 | 36 | 24 | 15 | 39 | 75 | | | | | | |
| | Male | 3 | 10 | 9 | 5 | 27 | 3 | 10 | 13 | 9 | 5 | 14 | 27 | | | | | | |
| | Female | 8 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 48 | 8 | 15 | 23 | 15 | 10 | 25 | 48 | | | | | | |
| 7.3 | Percentage of staff provided with compensation/benefits within timeline | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 99.77% | 95.32% | 95% | 98% | 98% | 98% | 98% | -2% | | | 0 | 31 (Kalahi), 1 (regular staff), 1 (SLP staff), 10 (Pantawid MOA staff), 10 (Centers, GASS, TARA, Convergence, SLP) not yet cleared as of 12/31/19; 68 unclaimed payroll due to clearance concerns in the 1st-3rd quarter was already released and claimed | Inform staff of the lacking requirements for last salary claims; Follow-up concerned personnel for the clearance of the resigned staff |
| | Total No. of staff | 1305 | 1218 | 1226 | 2214 | 5963 | 1305 | 1218 | 1218 | 1226 | 2214 | 3440 | 5963 | | | | | | |
| | No.of Staff Receiving Salary and Benefits on Time | 1305 | 1218 | 1226 | 1968 | 5717 | 1302 | 1161 | 1161 | 1196 | 2170 | 3366 | 5829 | | | | | | |
| Legal | Services | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7.4 | Percentage of disciplinary cases resolved within timeline | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | | 100% | 100% | | | | | | |
| | Total No.of Disciplinary Cases Resolved within Timeline | | | | | | 4 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 13 | | | | | | |
| | 7.4.1 Number of disciplinary cases initiated | | | | | | 4 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 13 | | | | | | |
| | 7.4.2 Number of complaints resolved | | | | | | 4 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 13 | | | | | | |
| 7.5 | Percentage of litigated cases resolved in favor of the Department or Department Personnel | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | | | | | 11.11% | 11.11% | 11.11% | | | | | | eight (8) cases are for resolution at the level of prosecutor |
| | No. of Litigated Cases Resolved with Favorable Outcome | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | |
| | Total No.of Litigated Cases Resolved | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 9 | | | | | | |
| | 7.5.1 Number of hearings attended | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | |
| | 7.5.2 Number of preliminmary investigations and/or case conferences attended | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 out of 9 cases | 1 out of 9 cases | 1 out of 9 cases | | | | | | |

| Private Priv | Steering Measures / Remarks |
|--|-----------------------------|
| 7.6 Processings of response for logical assistance Acceptance and Response for logical assistance and Response for logical | (19) |
| No. of Legal Assistance Requests Addressed 1 | |
| Trace No. of agest Assistance Requests 1 | |
| 7.6.1 Number of rection logical approached to clienties | |
| 7.6.2 Number of Tas provided to clients | |
| Administrative Services 7.7 Number of facilities repaired/enewated 0 5 0 5 10 4 5 9 3 2 5 14 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | |
| 7.7 Number of facilities repaired/rerovated 0 5 0 5 10 4 5 9 3 2 5 14 4 0 0 6 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | |
| 7.8 Percentage of real properties titled | |
| No. of Real Properties with Title | |
| Total No. of DSWD-owned Real Properties Company of the Company | |
| Total No. of DSWD-owned Real Properties Number of vehicles maintained and managed 4 0 3 0 7 7 9 9 9 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 | |
| 7.10 Percentage of records digitized 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 100% 100% 100% 100% 0% 0% 0% 0% 100% 100% 100% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 100% 100% 100% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 100% 100% 100% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% | |
| Percentage of records digitized 10% 10% 10% 100% 100% 0% | |
| Number of records digitized Number of records digitized Number of records identified for digitization Number of records disposed Number of | |
| Number of records identified for digitization | |
| Percentage of records disposed 100% 100% 100% 100% 0% 0% 0% 100% 100% 0% 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 15 | |
| Number of records disposed 15 0 0 0 15 15 15 Number of records identified for disposal 15 0 0 0 0 15 15 15 | |
| Number of records identified for disposal 15 0 0 0 0 15 15 15 15 15 Financial Management | |
| Financial Management | |
| | |
| 7.11 Percentage of hydret utilized: | |
| 7.11 referringe of product united. | |
| a. Actual Obligations Over Actual Allotment Incurred 96-100% 96-100% 96-100% 96-100% 96-100% 96-100% 83.76% 68.25% 71.70% 98.40% 98.40% 98.40% □ □ □ | |
| Total Actual Obligation Incurred 180,659,796.29 1,426,395,524.38 1426395524 1,683,102,500.60 2,273,485,181.05 2,273,485,181.05 2,273,485,181.05 | |
| Total Actual Annual Allotment Received 215,695,313.26 2,089,920,335.94 2089920336 2,347,535,397.25 2,310,388,143.01 2,310,388,143.01 2,310,388,143.01 | |
| b. Actual Disbursements over Actual Obligations Incurred 99-100% 99-10 | |
| Total Actual Disbursement 358,714,444.22 441,552,232.23 800,266,676.45 752,413,140.93 767,465,720.95 1,519,878,861.88 2,320,145,538.33 | |
| Total Actual Annual Obligation Incurred 180,659,796.29 1,426,395,524.38 1,607,055,320.67 1,683,102,500.60 2,273,485,181.05 3,956,587,681.65 5,563,643,002.32 | |
| 7.12 Percentage of cash advance liquidated | |
| a. Advances to officers and employees 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 75.95% 69.62% 71.41% 115.20% 100% 112.88% 100.00% 0.00% □ □ | |
| Total Amount Liquidated 422,436.31 979,856.04 1,402,292.35 2,109,057.18 2,811,418.55 4,920,475.73 6,322,768.08 | |
| Total Cash Advance Processed 556,195.95 1,407,514.15 1,963,710.10 1,830,816.66 2,528,241.32 4,359,057.98 6,322,768.08 | |

| | HPMES FO | | | | | | | | | | | | | HPMES FORM 4-4A-4B | | | | | |
|-------|--|------|------|----------|--------|---------|-------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|----------------------|--|
| | | | PHY | YSICAL 1 | TARGET | | PHYSICAL ACCOMPLISHMENT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ Performance Indicator | | | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Q1 | Q2 | 1st Semester | Q3 | Q4 | 2nd Semester | Total | Variance | | sessmen Variance | | Reasons for Variance | Steering Measures / Remarks |
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | | | | | | | (11)=(12)+(13)+(14)+ (15) | (12)=(11)-(6) | Major (>+/- 30% deviation) | Minor ("<" or "=" +/- 30% deviation) | Full target Achieved | (13) | (19) |
| | b. Advances to SDOs: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | b.1 Current Year | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 9.28% | 82.73% | 57.45% | 93.89% | 93.89% | 116.19% | 100.00% | 0.00% | | | | | |
| | Total Amount Liquidated | | | | | | 10,822,898.68 | 183,883,411.40 | 194,706,310.08 | 655,015,032.77 | 380,010,624.36 | 1,035,025,657.13 | 1,229,731,967.21 | | | | | | |
| | Total Cash Advance Processed | | | | | | 116,676,675.68 | 222,257,308.66 | 338,933,984.34 | 566,113,868.52 | 324,684,114.35 | 890,797,982.87 | 1,229,731,967.21 | | | | | | |
| | b.2 Prior Years | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | | | | | |
| | Total Amount Liquidated | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | |
| | Total Cash Advance Processed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | |
| | c. Inter-agency transferred funds | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | c.1 Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | | | | | |
| | Total Amount Liquidated | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | o | 0 | | | | | | |
| | Total Cash Advance Processed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | |
| | c.2 Prior Years | | | | | 90-100% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | | | | _ | | |
| | Total Amount Liquidated | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | |
| | Total Cash Advance Processed | | | | | | 20,000,000 | 20,000,000 | 20,000,000 | 20,000,000 | 0 | 20,000,000 | 20,000,000 | | | | | | |
| 7.13 | Percentage of AOM responded within timeline | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | | | | | | | 100% | | | 0 | | | |
| | No.of AOM Responded withinTimeline | | | | | | - | - | - | - | - | - | 20 | | | | | | |
| | Total No.of AOM Received | | | | | | - | - | - | - | - | - | 20 | | | | | | |
| 7.14 | Percentage of NS/ND complied within timeline | 100% | | | | 100% | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | No. of Notice of Suspension/Notice of Disallowances Responded within Timeline | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | |
| | No. of Notice of Suspension/Notice of Disallowances Received | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | |
| Procu | rement Services | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7.15 | Percentage of procurement projects completed in accordance with applicable rules and regulations | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 65.51% | 86.57% | 75.51% | 58.94% | 426.42% | 179.17% | 119.53% | 19.53% | | | | | |
| | Total No.of PR Received | 294 | 290 | 337 | 302 | 1223 | 461 | 417 | 878 | 436 | 212 | 648 | 1526 | | | | | | |
| | No.of PR Processes Awarded and Contracted on Time | 294 | 290 | 337 | 302 | 1223 | 302 | 361 | 663 | 257 | 904 | 1161 | 1824 | | | | | | |
| 7.16 | Percentage compliance with reportorial requirements from oversight agencies | ANA | 2% | ANA | 2% | | 0% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 0% | | 0 | | | |
| | Total No.of Reports Required by Oversight Agencies | | | | | | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 5 | - | | | | | to AO25 *APP- NON CSE posted to DBM - PS portal *Semestral Procurement Monitoring report. *Indicative ADB for CSE posted to page 1 |
| | No.of Reports Required by Oversight Agencies | | | | | | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 5 | - | | | | | *Indicative APP for CSE posted to agency Website *Justifcation to AO25 |

HPMES FORM 4-4A-4B

| | | | | OBLIG | ATION | | | DISBURSEMENT | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|--------------|--------------|------------|------------|--------------|------------------------|--------------|------------------------|------------|------------|--------------|--------|--|--|
| Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ Performance Indicator | Alloted Budget | | | Amount | | | Percent Utilization | | Percent Utilization | | | | | | |
| renormance indicator | Buuget | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Total | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Total | | |
| GENERAL ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT | 4,712,180.00 | 1,787,083.90 | 1,869,424.29 | 352,191.64 | 703,480.17 | 4,712,180.00 | 100.00% | 1,003,485.46 | 1,431,640.01 | 915,160.76 | 728,125.91 | 4,078,412.14 | 86.55% | | |
| Human Resource and Development | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | |
| Legal Services | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | |
| Administrative Services | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | |
| Financial Management | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | |
| Procurement Services | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | |

Prepared by: Reviewed by: Noted by: Approved by:

JERARD T. MATILDOASUNCION S. FLAUTARAMIL M. TACULODMITA CHUCHI GUPANA-LIMStatistician IAO V / Budget OfficerAO V / OIC - Chief, PPDRegional Director