| | | | Pi | hysical T | argets | | | | Р | hysical Acco | omplishments | | | | As | sessmen Variance | | | |
|-----|---|-------|-------|-----------|--------|---------|----------|---------|-----------|--------------|--------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------|---------------------|----------------------------|--|---|
| | Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ Performance Indicator | | | | | T.4.1 | - A | | 1st | | | 2nd | | Variance | Major | Minor | Full Target Achieved | Reasons for Variance | Steering Measures / Remarks |
| | | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Q1 | Q2 | Semester | Q3 | Q4 | Semester | Annual | | (> +/- 30%) | (≤ +/- 30%) | 0% | | |
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14) | (15) | (16) | (17) | (18) | (19) |
| POO | OR, VULNERABLE AND MARGINALIZED CITIZI | NS AF | RE EM | POWE | RED AI | ND WITH | IMPRO | VED QUA | LITY OF L | IFE | | | | | | | | | |
| ORG | GANIZATIONAL OUTCOME 1: WELLBEING OF | POOR | FAMI | LIES II | MPRO\ | /ED | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PRO | OMOTIVE SOCIAL WELFARE PROGRAM | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Outcome Indicators | | | | | | <u> </u> | | T | | | I | | T | | | | T | - 2019 SWDI forms not yet encoded. |
| 1.1 | Percentage of Pantawid households with improved wellbeing | - | - | - | - | NT | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | There was no directive on the conduct of SWDI for 2020 | - Complete the encoding of SWDI forms by end of January 2021. |
| | a. 1. Survival in Previous Year | - | - | - | - | - | - | 53 | 53 | 95 | 467 | 467 | 467 | | | | | | |
| | a.2. Survival to Subsistence | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| | b.1. Subsistence in Previous Year | - | - | - | - | - | - | 53,361 | 53,361 | 79,388 | 94,387 | 94,387 | 94,387 | | | | | | |
| | b.2. Subsistence to Self-Sufficiency | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| | c.1. Self-sufficient in Previous Year | - | - | - | - | - | - | 40,958 | 40,958 | 61,311 | 67,809 | 67,809 | 67,809 | | | | | | |
| | c.2. Survival to Self-Sufficiency | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| 1.2 | Percentage compliance of Pantawid Pamilya households on school enrolment of children | - | - | - | - | NT | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | 0 | | | | SY 2020-2021 has just commenced last October 2020. Thus, the turn-out will be available by end of January or February 2021 for reporting of Period 5 (October-November) Compliance Verification System Turn-out. |
| 1.3 | Percentage of Pantawid Pamilya children not attending school that returned to school | - | - | - | - | NT | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | 0 | 0 | | | Target for this indicator has been removed from OPC based on the memorandum from the National Program Manager of Pantawid dated May 22, 2020, with subject: Revised FY 2020 FC-OPC for Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program No list provided from NPMO as baseline data for monitoring. |
| | Total Number of Pantawid Pamilya Children Not Attending School in Previous SY and Non-Compliant for At least 3 Months | | | | | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | Since, there baseline data from NPMO, the FO cannot identify the non-compliant households for monitoring. |
| | Number of Pantawid Pamilya Children Who Returned to School in Current SY and Compliant for At Least 8 Months | | | | | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | The FO cannot identify the non-compliant households that turned compliant. |
| 1.4 | Percentage compliance of Pantawid Pamilya households on availment of health services | - | - | - | - | NT | - | - | - | - | 99.62% | 99.62% | 99.62% | | 0 | _ | | The 100% Compliance rate on health was not achieved due to the top following reasons: - The name of health center was not updated because the monitored children were enrolled to other health facility and; - No one to accompany the child for health center visit. | The Municipal Links will validate reasons for non-compliant households and provide interventions in relation to case management implementation of the program. |
| | No. of Pantawid Pamilya households availing key health services | | | | | | - | - | - | - | 18,267 | 18,267 | 18,267 | | | | | | |
| 1.5 | Percentage of Pantawid Pamilya households not availing key health services that availed key health services | - | - | - | - | NT | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | 0 | | | Target for this indicator has been removed from OPC based on the memorandum from the National Program Manager of Pantawid dated May 22, 2020, with subject: Revised FY 2020 FO-OPC for Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program -No list provided from NPMO as baseline data for monitoring. |
| | Total No. of Pantawid Pamilya Non-Compliant to At Least 1 Health Conditions | | | | | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | Since, there baseline data from NPMO, the FO cannot identify the non-compliant households for monitoring. |
| | No.of Pantawid Pamilya Households Turned Compliant to Health Conditions | | | | | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | The FO cannot identify the non-compliant households that turned compliant. |

| | | | Ph | ysical T | argets | | | | Pi | nysical Acco | mplishments | | | | | sessment Variance | | | HPMES FORM 4B |
|-----|--|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|----------|--------------|-------------|----------|---------|----------|-----------------|----------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| | Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ Performance Indicator | | 02 | 03 | 04 | Total | 04 | Q2 | 1st | 07 | 04 | 2nd | Ammund | Variance | Major | Minor | Full Target Achieved | Reasons for Variance | Steering Measures / Remarks |
| | | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Q1 | Q2 | Semester | Q3 | Q4 | Semester | Annual | | (> +/- 30%) | (≤+/- 30%) | 0% | | |
| 1.6 | Percentage of SLP households earning from microenterprises | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 30.2% | -% | 103.5% | 99.9% | -0.08% | | | | Two (2) Qualified Participants were not served due to transfer of residency in marawi city and double entry / wrong spelling in Participant's surname. | |
| | Total Number of SLP Households Assisted through Microenterprise Development Track | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 91 | 91 | 2,524 | 0 | 2,524 | 2,615 | | | | | | |
| | No. of SLP Households that Gained from Microenterprise | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 762 | 1,851 | 2,613 | 2,613 | | | | | | |
| 1.7 | Percentage of SLP households gainfully employed | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0% | 0% | 0.00% | | | | | No SLP Participants assisted thruogh Employment Facilitation Track |
| | Total No.of SLP Households Assisted through Employment Facilitation Track | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | |
| | No.of SLP Households with 1 Adult Member Gainfully Employed | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | |
| 1.8 | Percentage increase in access to major KC-NCDDP investments in KC-NCDDP municipalities | - | - | - | - | ANA | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | This Indicator will be adminstered thru KC-NCDDP Outcome Survey. |
| | Output Indicators | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.1 | Number of Pantawid households provided with conditional cash grants | 170,352 (90% of 189,279) | (90% of | 170,352 (90% of 189,279) | 170,352 (90% of 189,279) | 170,352 | 181,412 | 173,183 | 173,183 | 176,071 | 176,992 | 176,992 | 176,992 | 6,640 | 0 | | 0 | | The program already achieved above the 90% of the annual target. This is the result of the timely download/release of cash grants and compliance of beneficiaries to program conditionalities. |
| | a. Regular CCT | 160,575 (90% of 178,416) | (90% of | 160,575 (90% of 178,416) | 160,575 (90% of 178,416) | 160,575 | 168,775 | 163,729 | 163,729 | 165,317 | 165,580 | 165,580 | 165,580 | | | | | | |
| | b. Modified CCT | 9,777 (90% of 10,863) | 9,777 (90% of 10,863) | 9,777 (90% of 10,863) | 9,777 (90% of 10,863) | 9,777 | 12,638 | 9,454 | 9,454 | 10,754 | 11,412 | 11,412 | 11,412 | | | | | | |
| 1.2 | Percentage of Pantawid Pamilya-related grievances resolved within established time protocol | > 88% | > 88% | > 88% | > 88% | > 88% | 95.57% | 95.67% | 95.67% | 95.81% | 95.79% | 95.79% | 95.79% | 7.79% | | | | | The program has reached the target. The Grievance officers processed and took appropriate action in a timely manner. |
| | Accumulated No. of Program-related grievances resolved | - | - | - | - | - | 43,481 | 46,276 | 46,276 | 48,943 | 51,249 | 51,249 | 51,249 | | | | | | |
| | Accumulated no. of Program-related grievances resolved within Time Protocol | - | - | - | - | - | 41,554 | 44,270 | 44,270 | 46,890 | 49,090 | 49,090 | 49,090 | | | | | | |
| 1.3 | Number of SLP households assisted through the Microenterprise Development Track | | | | | | 0 | 91 | 91 | 2,300 | 0 | 2,300 | | | | | | The average cost allocation per Household for both MD and EF Modalities is Php 24,131 in which such per captia allocation was not fully availed by the target program participants. The common modality utilized in | The SLP was able to serve 2615 participants since most of the proposals being processed is individual participants instead of group. Considering the pandemic and government restrictions, the activities |
| | Number of FR provided with livelihood settlements grants (EO 70) | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 204 | 0 | 204 | | | | | | the program is the Seed Capital Fund (SCF) which is Php 15,000.00. Hence, the SLP RPMO needs to increase the number of beneficiaries served to fully | and timeline required to process the individual proposals is much easier than group proposals. |
| | Number of households in the Conflict and Vulnerable areas provided with community grants (EO 70) | 0 | 0 | 2,192 | 0 | 2,192 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 20 | 2,615 | 423 | | | | utilized the funds. | |
| 1.4 | Number of SLP households assisted through Employment Facilitation Track | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | No SLP Participants were assisted thru Employment Facilitation Track since Majority of the Participants are more qualified in Microenterprise Track; Limited employment opportunities due to pandemic. |
| 1.5 | Number of communities implementing KC-NCDDP | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a. Region | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | | | \checkmark | | |
| | b. Province | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | | | Z | | |
| | c. Municipality | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 0 | | | Z | | |
| | d. Barangay | 0 | 138 | 152 | 152 | 152 | 0 | 138 | 138 | 152 | 152 | 152 | 152 | 0 | | | ~ | | |
| 1.6 | Number of KC-NCDDP sub-projects completed in accordance with technical plans and schedule | 0 | 0 | 32 | 170 | 202 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 178 | 202 | 202 | 0 | | | | | |

| | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | • | HPMES FORM 4B |
|-----|--|-----|-----|----------|--------|--------|-----|------|----------|--------------|-------------|----------|----------|----------|-----------------|---------------------|----------------------------|---|---|
| | | | Ph | ysical T | argets | | | | PI | hysical Acco | mplishments | | | | | sessmen Variance | | | |
| | Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ Performance Indicator | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Q1 | Q2 | 1st | Q3 | 04 | 2nd | Annual | Variance | Major | Minor | Full Target Achieved | Reasons for Variance | Steering Measures / Remarks |
| | | Ų. | Q2 | QJ | Ų* | Total | Q: | Q2 | Semester | ŲJ | Ÿ | Semester | Ailliuai | | (> +/- 30%) | (≤ +/- 30%) | 0% | | |
| 1.7 | Number of households that benefited from completed KC-NCDDP sub-projects or Households benefitting from sub-projects | 0 | 0 | 6,335 | 44,273 | 50,608 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6,838 | 44,431 | 51,269 | 51,269 | 661 | | | | - Identification of Target beneficiaries was based on the Rapid Assessment Tool (RAT). Thus, there is an increase actual householdind/viduals benefitled the COVID Facilities/Cuarantine Facilities due to Bails Probinsiya Program and Local Transmisson. Conduct of Rapid Assessment for COVID 19 only captures data on Person's Ander Invitigation (PUI) and persons under Monitoring (PUM's) | |
| 1.8 | Percentage of Pantawid Pamilya community members employed in KC-NCDDP sub-projects | - | - | 20% | 20% | 20% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22% | 23.40% | 23.40% | 23.40% | 3.40% | | | | I there is an increase of 3.40% of 4 Ps on board for labor employment under DROMIP implementation. They were supported by SAP in April-May but such support was still not enough for their family needs, thus they were on board for the Cash for Work due to the assessment of Social Welfare Development Office. | |
| | Total No. of Community Workers in KC-NCDDP sub- projects | 0 | 0 | TBD | 5,154 | 5,154 | 0 | 0 | 0 | TBD | 5,154 | 5,154 | 5,154 | | | | | | |
| | Total No. of Community Workers in KC-NCDDP sub- projects who are Pantawid Beneficiaries | 0 | 0 | TBD | 1,043 | 1,043 | 0 | 0 | 0 | TBD | 1,206 | 1,206 | 1,206 | | | | | | |
| | Percentage of women volunteers trained on CDD | - | - | 100% | 100% | 100% | -% | -% | -% | 100.00% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 0% | | | | | |
| | Total number of CDD women volunteers | 0 | 0 | 683 | 852 | 1,535 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 683 | 852 | 1,535 | 1,535 | | | | | | |
| | No. of women volunteers trained on CDD | 0 | 0 | 683 | 852 | 1,535 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 683 | 852 | 1,535 | 1,535 | | | | | | |
| | Percentage of paid labor jobs created by KC-NCDDP projects are accessed by women | - | - | - | | 25% | 0 | 0 | 0 | TBD | 47% | 47% | 47% | 22% | | | | During pandemic, women were given equal access and opportunity for labor employment. | |
| | Total number of paid labor jobs | 0 | 0 | TBD | 5,154 | 5,154 | 0 | 0 | 0 | TBD | 5,154 | 5,154 | 5,154 | 0 | | | | | |
| | No. number of paid labor jobs accessed by women | 0 | 0 | TBD | 2,427 | 2,427 | 0 | 0 | 0 | TBD | 2,427 | 2,427 | 2,427 | 0 | | | | | |
| | Percentage of registered KC-NCDDP grievances satisfactorily resolved in line with the GRS | | | 100% | 100% | 100% | 0% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 0% | | | | | |
| | Total number of registered grievances | - | - | 10 | 10 | 20 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 0 | | | | | |
| | No. registered grievances satisfactorily resolved in line with the GRS | - | - | 10 | 10 | 20 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 0 | | | | | |
| | Number of PAMANA IP CDD sub-projects completed | 1 | 0 | 1 | 71 | 73 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 19 | 20 | 21 | -52 | | | | Late downloading of Grant Funds. The grants were downloaded only between September and December 2020. Out of 72 Subprojects, only 48 RFRs were dowloaded (10 RFRs in September, 14 RFRs in | All remaining Sub-Projects will be implemented in 2021. |
| | Number of IP Households that benefitted from completed sub-projects | 213 | TBD | 127 | 21780 | 22,120 | 213 | 0 | 213 | 127 | 4,397 | 4,737 | 4,737 | -17,383 | | | | November, 24 RFRs in December); - Re-do of Procurement process due to delay of grant downloading; - ACTs compliance to findings in the Request for Fund Release (RFRs) document was hampered due to pending travel restrictions; - For IP-CDD 2020, The original target for OPC are 10 SPs only including 2 Spill-Overs. Hence, All 10 SPs are completed according to technical plans. | |

HPMES FORM 4B

| | | | | OBLIGAT | ION | | | | | DISBURSEM | IENT | _ | |
|--|----------------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|--------------------------|------------------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|------------------------|
| Program/Activity/Project | Allocated Budget* | | | Amount | | | Percent Utilization | | | Amount | | | Percent Utilization |
| | Duaget | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Total | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Total |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) = (3)+(4)+(5)+(6) | (8)=(7)/(2) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14)=(13)/(7) |
| POOR, VULNERABLE AND MARGINALIZED CITI | ZENS ARE EMPOWE | RED AND WITH I | MPROVED QUAI | LITY OF LIFE | | | | | | | | | |
| ORGANIZATIONAL OUTCOME 1: WELLBEING O | F POOR FAMILIES I | MPROVED | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PROMOTIVE SOCIAL WELFARE PROGRAM | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| I. Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program | 101,501,407.00 | 49,689,927.20 | 9,088,363.95 | 30,372,856.80 | 12,350,259.05 | 101,501,407.00 | 100.0% | 17,151,486.78 | 19,838,129.87 | 32,138,597.90 | 17,825,341.94 | 86,953,556.49 | 85.7% |
| MOOE (Current Allotment) | 79,211,318.00 | 26,884,489.56 | 10,590,483.23 | 30,052,655.30 | 11,683,689.91 | 79,211,318.00 | 100.0% | 11,995,158.45 | 5,549,687.92 | 31,037,578.90 | 17,432,191.10 | 66,014,616.37 | 83.3% |
| Subsidies - (Regular CCT)** | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | -% | 1,169,745,600.00 | 762,371,200.00 | 918,651,200.00 | 480,312,250.00 | 3,331,080,250.00 | -% |
| Subsidies - (Modified CCT)** | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | -% | 61,531,600.00 | 36,507,400.00 | 66,757,800.00 | 41,685,300.00 | 206,482,100.00 | -% |
| MOOE (Continuing Allotment) | 22,290,089.00 | 22,805,437.64 | -1,502,119.28 | 320,201.50 | 666,569.14 | 22,290,089.00 | 100.0% | 5,156,328.33 | 14,288,441.95 | 1,101,019.00 | 393,150.84 | 20,938,940.12 | 93.9% |
| II. Sustainable Livelihood Program | 149,453,467.66 | 12,103,777.47 | 7,632,006.61 | 37,621,233.29 | 41,064,168.29 | 98,421,185.66 | 65.9% | 1,745,262.17 | 5,834,475.02 | 43,916,616.39 | 28,311,445.08 | 79,807,798.66 | 81.1% |
| MOOE (Current Allotment) | 149,249,565.66 | 11,905,377.47 | 7,626,504.61 | 37,621,233.29 | 41,064,168.29 | 98,217,283.66 | 65.8% | 1,720,362.17 | 5,834,475.02 | 43,780,114.39 | 28,297,652.11 | 79,632,603.69 | 81.1% |
| MOOE (Continuing Allotment) | 203,902.00 | 198,400.00 | 5,502.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 203,902.00 | 100.0% | 24,900.00 | 0.00 | 136,502.00 | 13,792.97 | 175,194.97 | 85.9% |
| III. KALAHI-CIDSS NCDDP | 146,825,541.00 | 24,557,019.00 | 3,504,238.49 | 112,101,636.62 | 247,846.86 | 140,410,740.97 | 95.6% | 5,207,634.89 | 8,329,110.16 | 73,550,804.37 | 40,851,448.68 | 127,938,998.10 | 91.1% |
| MOOE (Current Allotment) | 119,067,229.00 | 6,248,978.00 | 1,049,876.49 | 105,105,727.62 | 247,846.86 | 112,652,428.97 | 94.6% | 2,388,824.68 | 495,900.93 | 59,618,115.21 | 37,677,845.28 | 100,180,686.10 | 88.9% |
| MOOE (Continuing Allotment) | 27,758,312.00 | 18,308,041.00 | 2,454,362.00 | 6,995,909.00 | 0.00 | 27,758,312.00 | 100.0% | 2,818,810.21 | 7,833,209.23 | 13,932,689.16 | 3,173,603.40 | 27,758,312.00 | 100.0% |

^{*} Adjusted Total Allotments

^{**} Amount of Grants Paid (P5 of 2019 to P4 of 2020)

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Acc | essme | nt of | i | HPMES FORM 4B |
|----------|---|---------|----------|------------|---------|----------|----------|----------|---------|---------|-------|---------|---------|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--------|--------------------|-----------|---------|-------------|--------|----------|----------|-----------------|----------------|----------------------------|--|---|
| | | | Pl | hysical Ta | argets | | | | | | | | | | | Physica | I Accom | plishme | nts | | | | | | | | _ | | Varian | ce | _ | |
| | Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ Performance Indicator | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | | Q1 | | | Q2 | | 1s | t Semest | er | | Q3 | | | Q4 | | 2nd Se | mester | | Total | | Variance | Major | Minor | Full Target Achieved | Reasons for Variance | Steering Measures / Remarks |
| | | , | | | | | м | F | т | М | F | т | М | F | т | М | F | т | м | F | т 1 | M F | т | м | F | т | | (> +/- 30%) | (≤ +/- 30%) | 0% | | |
| _ | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | | (7) | | | (8) | | | (9) | | | (10) | | | (11) | | (1 | 2) | | (13) | | (14) | (15) | (16) | (17) | (18) | (19) |
| <u> </u> | VULNERABLE AND MARGINALIZED CITIZENS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ORGA | IZATIONAL OUTCOME 2: RIGHTS OF THE PO | OR AND | THE VULN | NERABLE | SECTORS | PROMOTED | AND PR | ОТЕСТЕ | D | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PROT | CTIVE SOCIAL WELFARE PROGRAM | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A. RES | IDENTIAL AND NON-RESIDENTIAL CARE SU | B-PROGR | AM | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | OUTCOME INDICATORS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.1 | Percentage of clients in residential and non-residential care facilities rehabilitated | 30.0% | 30.0% | 30.0% | 30.0% | 30.0% | 40.0% | 40.0% | 40.0% | 17.3% | 17.6% | 17.4% | 56.7% | 48.6% | 53.6% | 59.02% | 57.14% | 58.33% | 7.41% | 67.74% | 29.41% 19. | 35% 63.16 | 36.00 | % 69.9% | 60.0% | 66.1% | 36.1% | | | | | |
| | No. of Clients Rehabilitated | | | | | | 24 | 12 | 36 | 9 | 6 | 15 | 34 | 18 | 52 | 36 | 20 | 56 | 4 | 21 | 25 1 | 24 | 36 | 51 | 27 | 78 | | | | | | |
| | a. Residential Care Facilities | 12 | 12 | 15 | 15 | 54 | 24 | 12 | 36 | 9 | 6 | 15 | 34 | 18 | 52 | 36 | 20 | 56 | 4 | 21 | 25 1 | .2 24 | 36 | 51 | 27 | 78 | | | | | | |
| | a.2 RRCY | 6 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 26 | 24 | 0 | 24 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 34 | 0 | 34 | 36 | 0 | 36 | 4 | 0 | 4 1 | .2 0 | 12 | 51 | 0 | 51 | | | | | The target was already achieved since the first semester of 2020. Thus, it affects the performance in the 2nd semester because those residents not assessed as rehabilitated are newly admitted in the center. | Cooperation of CICLs in their rehabilitation and on track case management of cases by SOcial Workers. |
| | a.7 Home for Girls | 6 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 28 | 0 | 12 | 12 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 18 | 18 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 0 | 21 | 21 | 0 24 | 1 24 | 0 | 27 | 27 | | | | | Ten (10) residents with improved social functioning are still in in the facility. They had to stay in the center due to the following reasons: either, court hearing is still on going, incapability of the family to provide safety and protection, LGU has no identified family for client's reintegration, and/or PCAR was not yet forwarded. | Close coordination of Case Managers with referring LGUs, conduct family dialogues was made through phone call or teleconference to prepare both clients and their family for the eventual family reintegration. Currently served clients are recommended for continues stay until they are ready to be reunited with their family and community. |
| | b. Non-Residential Care Facilities | 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 | | | | | | |
| | OUTPUT INDICATORS | | | | | ' | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | • | |
| 2.1 | Number of Clients Served in Residential Care Facilities | 90 | 86 | 96 | 38 | 135 | 60 | 30 | 90 | 52 | 34 | 86 | 60 | 37 | 97 | 61 | 35 | 96 | 54 | 31 | 85 6 | 52 38 | 100 | 73 | 45 | 118 | -17 | | | | | |
| | | E0. | E1 | 60 | 0 | 85 | E0. | 0 | E0. | 51 | 0 | E1 | 59 | 0 | FO | 60 | 0 | 60 | 53 | 0 | 53 6 | 61 0 | 61 | 72 | 0 | 72 | -13 | Ī., | | | the variance is attributed to the restrictions imposed along COVID-19 pandemic. The LGUs have postponed | -Adherence to the protocols imposed |
| | a. RRCY | 59 | 51 | 60 | U | 85 | 59 | U | 59 | 51 | U | 51 | 29 | Ů | 59 | 60 | U | 60 | 53 | Ů | 55 | 0 | 61 | /2 | | /2 | -13 | Ľ | | | the variance is attributed to the restrictions imposed along COVID-19 pandemic. The LGUs have postponed the referral of CICLs to RRCV. The courts have also made various postponements. Thus, issuance of court orders for the transfer of CICLs is delayed. HFG has targeted 50 cases to be served during | -Target is based on bed capacity |
| | b. Home for Girls | 31 | 35 | 36 | 38 | 50 | 1 | 30 | 31 | 1 | 34 | 35 | 1 | 37 | 38 | 1 | 35 | 36 | 1 | 31 | 32 | 1 38 | 39 | 1 | 45 | 46 | -4 | | | | the year. With the pandemic and the stringent guidelines issued by the DSWD Secretary on the admission of clients, the regional office observed the reduction of 60% in bed capacity at a given time. | -Strict screening of referrals has been observed. -Target is based on bed capacity |
| 2.2 | Number of Clients Served in Non-Residential Care Facilities | 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 | A N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | | | |
| 2.3 | ALOS of clients in Residential facilities | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Admission-based: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a. RRCY | - | - | - | - | - | 576.0 | - | 576.0 | 576.0 | - | 576.0 | 1,137.0 | 0.0 | 1,137.0 | 290 | - | 289 | 4235 | | 4235 53 | 6.4 - | 536. | 4 867.7 | - | 867.7 | | | | | | |
| | Total Admissions | - | - | - | - | - | 8 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 15 | 0 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 1 1 | .6 0 | 16 | 20 | 0 | 20 | | | | | | |
| | Client Days of Care | - | - | - | - | - | 4,613.0 | 0.0 | 4,613.0 | 4,482.0 | 0.0 | 4,482.0 | 9,051.0 | 0.0 | 9,051.0 | 4,348.0 | 0.0 | 4,348.0 | 4,235.0 | 0.0 | 4,235.0 8,5 | 83.0 0.0 | 8,583 | .0 17,354.0 | 0.0 | 17,354.0 | | | | | | |
| 1 | b. Home for Girls | _ | - | - | - | - | 91.0 | 459.0 | 397.7 | - | 350.7 | 363.6 | - | 331.87 | 331.87 | | 919.00 | 949.67 | 0 | 840.7 | 871.0 | - 90 | 0 930. | 5 0 | 493.62 | 510.95 | | | | | | |
| 1 | Total Admissions | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 7 | 7 | - | 12 | 12 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | - 6 | 6 | 0 | 21 | 21 | | | | | | |
| 1 | Client Days of Care | - | - | - | - | - | 91 | 2,295 | 2,386 | 90 | 2,455 | 2,545 | 181 | 4,806 | 4,987 | 92 | 2,757 | 2849 | 91 | 2522 | 2613 1 | 83 5,40 | 00 5,58 | 3 364 | 10366 | 10730 | | | | | | |
| 1 | Discharge-based | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | | | _ | | | |
| 1 | a. RRCY | | | _ | _ | _ | 568.3 | | 568.3 | 546.7 | _ | 546.7 | - | - | - | 475 | 0 | 475 | 591.7 | . 1 | 591.7 39 | 9.1 - | 399. | 1 589.64 | T | 589.64 | | | | | | |
| 1 | - | | | <u> </u> | | - | 4 | <u> </u> | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | _ | | + | - | + | \vdash | \vdash | | | |
| | Total no. of discharge clients | | | - | - | | <u> </u> | 0 | | 6 | 0 | 6 | 10.0 | | 10.0 | 15 | 0 | 15 | 10 | 0 | | 28 0 | _ | | 0 | 28 | | - | - | | | |
| | Total Discharge Days | - | - | - | - | - | 2,273 | 0 | 2,273 | 3,280 | 0 | 3,280 | 5,705.0 | - | 5,705.0 | 4,276 | 0 | 4276 | 5917 | 0 | | 174 0 | | | | 16510 | | | | | | |
| 1 | b. Home for Girls | - | - | - | - | - | ļ - | 1 | 1 | - | 979 | 979 | 0 | 450.14 | 450.14 | - | 656 | 656 | | - | | - 389 | | _ | 412.5 | 412.50 | - | _ | - | | | |
| 1 | Total no. of discharge clients | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 6 | - 13 | _ | | 20 | 20 | | _ | 1 | | | |
| | Total Discharge Days | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 1,958 | 1958 | 0 | 3,151.0 | 3,151.0 | 0 | 3,936 | 3936 | 0 | 1900 | 1900 | 5,06 | 5,06 | 0 0 | 8250 | 8250 | | | L | L | | |
| 2.4 | Percentage of facilities with standard client-staff ratio | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a. Client-Social Worker Ratio | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | - | - | 100% | - | - | 100% | - | - | 100% | - | - | 100% | - | - | 100% | - - | 100 | /6 - | - | 100% | 0% | | | | | HFG: 1:18 RRCY: 1:17 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | HPMES FORM 4E |
|-------|--|--------|---------|------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--------|--------|---------|---------|--------|----------|----------|---------|---------|----------|---------|---------|-------------------------|--------|----------|-------------------|---------|---------|---------|----------|----------|--------|----------------------------|--|---|
| | | | PI | nysical Ta | rgets | | | | | | | | | | | Physica | I Accom | nplishme | nts | | | | | | | | | | | Varian | ce | _ | |
| | Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ Performance Indicator | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | | Q1 | | | Q2 | | 1s | t Semest | er | | QЗ | | | Q4 | | 2n | d Semest | ter | | Total | | Variance | Major | Minor | Full Target Achieved | Reasons for Variance | Steering Measures / Remarks |
| | | | | | , i | | М | F | т | М | F | т | М | F | т | м | F | т | м | F | т | м | F | т | М | F | т | | _ | 30%) | 0% | | |
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | | (7) | | | (8) | | | (9) | I _ | | (10) | Τ. | | (11) | | | (12) | _ | | (13) | Ι. | (14) | (15) | (16) | (17) | (18) | (19) |
| | Total No. of Facilities No. of Facilities with Appropriate Client-Social | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | - | ļ - | 2 | | - | 2 | - | - | 2 | - | - | 2 | _ | - | 2 | - | - | 2 | - | - | 2 | | | | | | |
| | Woker Ratio | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | - | - | 2 | - | - | 2 | - | - | 2 | - | - | 2 | - | - | 2 | - | - | 2 | - | - | 2 | | | | | | HFG: 1:18 |
| | b. Client-House Parent Ratio | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | - | - | 100% | - | - | 100% | - | - | 100% | - | - | 100% | - | - | 100% | - | - | 100% | - | - | 100% | 0% | | | | | RRCY: 1:17 |
| | Total No. of Facilities | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | - | - | 2 | - | - | 2 | - | - | 2 | - | - | 2 | - | - | 2 | - | - | 2 | - | - | 2 | | | | | | |
| | No. of Facilities with Appropriate Client-Houseparent Ratio | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | - | - | 2 | - | - | 2 | - | - | 2 | - | - | 2 | - | - | 2 | - | - | 2 | - | - | 2 | | | | | | |
| 2.5 | Percentage of Facilities compliant with the National Building Code | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | - | - | 100% | - | - | 100% | - | - | 100% | - | - | 100% | - | - | 100% | - | - | 100% | - | - | 100% | 0% | | | | | |
| | Total No, of Facilities | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | - | - | 2 | | - | 2 | - | - | 2 | | - | 2 | | - | 2 | | - | 2 | | - | 2 | | | | | | |
| | No. of Facilities Compliant with National Building Code | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | - | - | 2 | - | - | 2 | - | - | 2 | - | - | 2 | - | - | 2 | - | - | 2 | - | - | 2 | | | | | | |
| B. Su | plementary Feeding Sub-Program | | | | | | • | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | · | | | | | • | | | | | |
| | OUTCOME INDICATORS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.2 | Percentage of malnourished children in CDCs and SNPs with improved nutritional status | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 9th Cycle Implementation: (SY 2019 - 2020) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Children were directly supervised by the | |
| | a. Severely underweight to Underweight | 20% | 20% | 20% | 20% | 20% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 137 | 255 | 73% | 145 | 270 | 78% (415/534) | 145 | 270 | 78% (415/534) | 145 | 270 | 78% | 53.00% | | | | parents to eat the hot meal. | Food allocation was delivered direct to the |
| | b. Underweight to Normal | 80% | 80% | 80% | 80% | 80% | _ | | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ | | _ | 909 | 1690 | 72% | 910 | 1689 | 72% | 910 | 1689 | 72% (2599/3614 | 010 | 1689 | 72% | -8.00% | 1- | | | Unmet target is due to feeding activity was stopped in the middle of implementation to 35 LGUS due to | household for the mother to cook and feed the child at home since children were not advised to go out from their home |
| | b. Orderweight to Normal | 80% | 8076 | 80% | 80% | 3070 | | _ | - | | | | _ | | _ | 909 | 1090 | 7270 | 910 | 1009 | (2599/3 614) | 910 | 1009 |) | 910 | 1009 | 72-76 | -8.00% | ╨ | | | declaration of ECQ and only resumed last | |
| i | c. Overweight to Normal | - | - | - | - | NT | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 29 | 54 | 18% (83/451) | 29 | 54 | 18% (83/451) | 29 | 54 | 18% | | | | | | |
| | 10th Cycle Implementation: (SY 2020-2021) | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a. Severely underweight to Underweight | 20% | 20% | 20% | 20% | 20% | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | TBD | TBD | TBD | | | | | | |
| | b. Underweight to Normal | 80% | 80% | 80% | 80% | 80% | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | _ | | | | | _ | - | _ | TBD | TBD | TBD | | | | | | |
| | | | **** | | | | ., | 1,4 | .,, | | ., | | , | , | , | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Ļ | | | | |
| | c. Overweight to Normal | - | - | - | - | NT | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | TBD | TBD | TBD | | | | | | |
| 2.3 | Percentage of children in CDCs and SNPs with sustained normal nutritional status (9th Cycle) | - | - | - | - | NT | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 73.42% | - | - | 73.42% | - | - | 73.42% | | | | | | |
| | Number of children in CDCs and SNPs with normal nutritional status (Upon weigh-in, before feeding) | - | - | - | - | NT | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 26,671 | 49,533 | 76,204 | 26,671 | 49,533 | 76,204 | 26,671 | 49,533 | 76,204 | | | | | | |
| | Number of children in CDCs and SNPs with sustained normal nutritional status (After feeding) | - | - | - | - | NT | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 19,581 | 36,365 | 55,946 | 19,581 | 36,365 | 55,946 | 19,581 | 36,365 | 55,946 | | | | | | |
| | OUTPUT INDICATORS | | | | | • | • | | | | | | | | • | | | | • | | • | | | | | | | • | | | | | |
| 2.6 | Number of children in CDCs and SNPs provided with | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | supplementary feeding | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a. 9th Cycle Implementation (SY 2019-2020) | - | - | 75,791 | - | 75,791 | 22,862 | 53,342 | 76,204 | 22,862 | 53,342 | 76,204 | 22,862 | 53,342 | 76,204 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 22,862 | 53,342 | 76,204 | 413 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \vdash | | | LGUs were having difficulties to explore more beneficiaries in the community due | The equivalent budget of the variance was procured for an extention of 20 feeding days. |
| | b. 10 Cycle Implementation (SY 2020-2021) | | | | | 75.704 | | | | | | | | | | | 705 | 74.054 | 25.444 | 46.600 | 74 000 | 25.44 | 45.500 | 74 000 | | | | | | | | to declaration of ECQ/MGCQ brought about bu Covid 19 pandemic. Declaration of granular lockdowns to some barangays due to high incidence of covid local | |
| | b. 10 Cycle Implementation (SY 2020-2021) | - | - | - | - | 75,791 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 26,526 | 44,725 | /1,251 | 25,141 | 46,692 | /1,833 | 25,141 | 46,692 | /1,833 | 25,141 | 46,692 | 71,833 | 3,958 | | | | transmission and strict compliance of health safety protocols made more | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | difficult to explore additional beneficiaries as well. | |
| 2.7 | Number of children served through BangUn Program | 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 | | | | | | |
| C. So | al Welfare for Senior Citizens Sub-Program | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | OUTCOME INDICATORS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.4 | Percentage of senior citizen using social pension to augment | | 100.0% | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 16.7104 | 22 4404 | 39.14% | 19 80% | 30 22% | 50 11% | 36 60% | 52 660/- | 89 269/- | 28 520/ | 38 05% | 66.57% | 12 0404 | 17.64% | 29.67% | 40.56% | 55.69% | 96.25% | 41 600/ | 57 220/ | 98.92% | -1.08% | To | | | | |
| 2.4 | daily living subsistence and medical needs | | | | | | | | | | | 55.1170 | | | 09.2076 | 20.5270 | | | | | | | | | 71.0570 | | | -1.05% | Ľ | | | | |
| | Total number of Social Pension Beneficaries | - | 170,000 | - | 170,000 | 170,000 | - | 170,000 | _ | | 170,000 | | | 170,000 | | | 170,000 | _ | | 170,000 | | - | 170,000 | | | 170,000 | | | - | _ | | | Total Number of beneficiaries served including |
| 1 | Number of beneficiaries using Grants to augment daily living subsistence and medical expenses | - | 170,000 | - | 170,000 | 170,000 | 28,402 | 38,142 | 66,544 | 33,810 | 51,381 | 85,191 | 62,212 | 89,523 | 151,735 | 48,489 | 64,687 | 113,176 | 20,463 | 29,980 | 50,443 | 68,952 | 94,667 | 163,619 | 70,875 | 97,288 | 168,163 | | | | | | replacements (1st & 2nd semester per head count) |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | HPMES FORM 4B |
|--------|---|-----------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|----------|---------|---------|---------|-------------|----------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------|----------|---------|----------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------------------|--|--|
| | | | Pi | hysical Ta | argets | | | | | | | | | | | Physica | l Accom | plishme | nts | | | | | | | | | | essme Varian | | | |
| | Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ Performance Indicator | | | | | | | Q1 | | | Q2 | | 15 | t Semes | ter | | QЗ | | Q4 | | | 2nd Sem | ester | | Total | | Variance | Major | Minor | Full Target Achieved | Reasons for Variance | Steering Measures / Remarks |
| | | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | м | F | т | м | F | т | м | F | т | м | F | т | M F | т | м | F | т | м | F | т | | (> +/- 30%) | (±+/- 30%) | 0% | | |
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | 1 | (7) | | | (8) | | | (9) | | | (10) | | (11 | .) | \perp | (12) | | | (13) | | (14) | (15) | (16) | (17) | (18) | (19) |
| | OUTPUT INDICATORS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.8 | Number of senior citizens who received social pension within the semester | 153,000 | 17,000 | 153,000 | 17,000 | 170,000 | 28,402 | 38,142 | 66,544 | 33,810 | 51,381 | 85,191 | 62,212 | 89,523 | 151,735 | 48,489 | 64,687 | 113,176 | 20,463 29,9 | 50,44 | 43 68,95 | 94,66 | 7 163,619 | 70,875 | 97,288 1 | 168,163 | -1,837 | | | | Variance due to unpaid beneficiaries during the second semester and special pay-out because they were lockdown/out of town to other areas due to COVID-19. Further, the number of wallisted senior citizens submitted by the Local Government Units within the region is insufficient to cover the entire approved budget. | Another round of pay-out will be conducted this first quarter of 2021 for the unpaid beneficiaries last December 2020. |
| 2.9 | Number of centenarians provided with cash gift | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 2 4 | 6 | 5 | 9 | 14 | 9 | 14 | 23 | 7 | | | | Due to increase number of applicants during the second quarter of 2020 | Adddtional fund augmentation was requested from the Central Office |
| D. Pro | otective Program to Individuals and Families i | n Especia | Illy Diffic | ult Circur | nstances S | Sub-Progra | m | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | |
| | OUTCOME INDICATORS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | tance to Individuals in Crisis Situation | | | | | | Т | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (AICS | Percentage of clients who rated protective services | 90% | 90% | 90% | 90% | 90% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% 100 | 0% 1009 | % 100 | % 100 | % 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 10% | | | | | |
| | provided as satisfactory or better (AICS) OUTPUT INDICATORS | | | | | | 1 -30 /3 | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | 200 | 100 | 100 | | 200 / | | | | 1 | | | | | |
| 2.40 | | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | | 2 702 | 0.471 | 12.254 | 2.600 | 4.360 | 6.060 | 6 202 | 42.040 | 10 222 | 2 272 | 6 020 | 0.403 | 6 201 10 5 | 07 16 00 | 20 0 67 | 4 46 63 | 7 25 201 | 46.053 | 20.457 | 45 534 | | | | | | Unduplicated no. of beneficiaries served |
| 2.10 | Number of beneficiaries served through AICS Type of Assistance | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | 3,783 | 8,471 | 12,254 | 2,600 | 4,369 | 6,969 | 6,383 | 12,840 | 19,223 | 3,3/3 | 6,030 | 9,403 | 6,301 10,5 | 97 16,89 | 9,67 | 4 16,62 | 7 26,301 | 16,057 | 29,467 | 45,524 | | | | | | (Headcount) |
| | a. Medical Assistance | - | - | - | - | _ | 2,575 | 6,147 | 8,722 | 1,742 | 3,307 | 5,049 | 4,317 | 9,454 | 13,771 | 1,783 | 3,907 | 5,690 | 1,696 3,68 | 31 5,37 | 7 3,47 | 9 7,588 | 11,067 | 7,796 | 17,042 | 24,838 | | | | | | |
| | b. Burial Assistance | - | - | | - | - | 414 | 1,097 | 1,511 | 317 | 649 | 966 | 731 | 1,746 | 2,477 | 374 | 891 | 1,265 | 418 90 | 8 1,326 | 6 792 | 1,799 | 2,591 | 1,523 | 3,545 | 5,068 | | | | | | |
| | c. Educational Assistance | - | | | - | _ | 137 | 216 | 353 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 137 | 218 | 355 | 8 | 15 | 23 | 342 40 | 6 748 | 350 | 421 | | 487 | | 1,126 | | | | | | |
| | d. Transportation Assistance | - | - | | - | _ | 47 | 89 | 136 | 18 | 14 | 32 | 65 | 103 | 168 | 43 | 38 | 81 | 10 22 | _ | _ | + | 113 | 118 | 163 | 281 | | | | | | |
| | e. Food Assistance | | | | | _ | 189 | 340 | 529 | 203 | 196 | 399 | 392 | 536 | 928 | 267 | 366 | 633 | 273 46 | _ | _ | _ | _ | 932 | | 2,295 | | | | | | |
| | f. Non-Food Assistance | | | | | _ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 101 | 28 | 129 | 0 0 | | 0 | | 0 | 101 | 28 | 129 | | | | | | |
| | q. Other Cash Assistance | | | | | | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 0 | _ | 0 | _ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | - | | - | | 421 | | 1,003 | | | | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | h. Cash | - | - | - | - | | 1 | 582 | | 320 | 201 | 521 | 741 | 783 | 1,524 | 898 | 813 | 1,711 | | 19 8,68 | | | _ | | | 11,916 | | | | | | |
| | i. Psychosocial | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,372 | 6,029 | 9,401 | 0 0 | _ | 0 | + | 0 | 3,372 | <u> </u> | 9,401 | | | | | | |
| | j. Referral | - | - | - | - | _ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,532 | 4,604 | 7,136 | 0 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,532 | 4,604 | 7,136 | | | | | | |
| | Client Category Family Head and Other Needy Adult (FHONA) | - | - | - | - | _ | 3,089 | 7,060 | 10,149 | 2,273 | 3,906 | 6,179 | 5,362 | 10,966 | 16,328 | 2,837 | 5,208 | 8,045 | 4,489 8,21 | 16 12,70 | 7,01 | 1 11,62 | 2 18,633 | 12,688 | 24,390 | 37,078 | | | | | | |
| | Women in Especially Difficult Circumstances (WEDC) | _ | - | - | - | _ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 4 | | | | | | |
| | Children in Need of Special Protection (CNSP) | _ | - | - | _ | _ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 2 | - | | + | 4 | 0 | 4 | 4 | | | | | | |
| | Youth in Need of Special Protection (YNSP) | | - | - | _ | _ | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 0 | _ | | - | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | | | | | | |
| | Senior Citizen (SC) | | | | | | 622 | 1,362 | 1,984 | 286 | 441 | 727 | 908 | 1,803 | | 433 | 776 | 1,209 | 791 1,47 | | | + | + | 2,132 | | 6,181 | | | | | | |
| | Persons With Disability (PWD) | | <u> </u> | | | - | 33 | 45 | 78 | 16 | 20 | 36 | 49 | 65 | 114 | 23 | 31 | 54 | 975 90 | _ | + | _ | _ | 1,047 | <u> </u> | 2,049 | | \vdash | | | | |
| | , | | _ | - | | - | 38 | | 41 | | | 26 | 63 | | 67 | 79 | | | 44 4 | | | | 138 | ' | | | | | | | | |
| 2.41 | Persons Living with HIV-AIDS (PLHIV) | | - | - | - | | | 3 205 | | 25 | 1 100 | | | 4 | | | 11 | 90 | | | | | | 186 | 19 | 205 | | | | | | |
| 2.11 | | - | - | - | | NT | 2,375 | 2,395 | 4,770 | 1,188 | 1,198 | 2,386 | 3,563 | 3,593 | 7,156 | 279 | 283 | 562 | 215 29 | 9 514 | _ | 582 | | 4,057 | 4,175 | 8,232 | | | | | | |
| | a. Adults | - | - | - | - | - | ļ . | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | <u> </u> | - | - | - | | - | - | +- | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | |
| | b. Children | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2,385 | | - | | | | 3,578 | _ | 83 | 166 | | _ | 128 | + | | | 1,911 | | | - | | | | |
| | c. Youth | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - | | - | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| | d. PWDs | - | - | - | - | - | ļ · | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| | e. Senior Citizens | - | - | - | - | - | 1,178 | 1,207 | 2,385 | 589 | 604 | 1,193 | 1,767 | 1,811 | 3,578 | 196 | 200 | 396 | 170 25 | 3 423 | 366 | 453 | 819 | 2,133 | 2,264 | 4,397 | | | | | | |
| 2.12 | Number of clients served through community-based services | 3 | 85 | 5 | 82 | 175 | 48 | 54 | 102 | 80 | 89 | 169 | 128 | 143 | 271 | 24 | 12 | 36 | 20 89 | 109 | 44 | 101 | 145 | 172 | 244 | 416 | 241 | | | | | |
| | a. Adults | - | - | - | - | - | 28 | 34 | 62 | 71 | 86 | 157 | 99 | 120 | 219 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 77 | 88 | 11 | 77 | 88 | 110 | 197 | 307 | | | | | | |

| | | | Pi | nysical Ta | argets | | | | | | | | | | | Physica | I Accom | plishme | nts | | | | | | | | | | | essme | | | HPMES FORM 4B |
|---------|--|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|---------|----------|------|--------|------|------|---------|--------|----------|---------|---------|---------|----------|--------|---------------|---------|------|----------|---------|-------|-------|---------|----------|--------------|----------------|----------------|---|---|
| | Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ | | | | | | | Q1 | | | Q2 | | 1s | t Semest | | - | Q3 | <u> </u> | | Q4 | | 2nd | d Semest | er | | Total | | Variance | | Varian | Full Target | Reasons for Variance | Steering Measures / Remarks |
| | Performance Indicator | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | м | F | т | м | F | т | м | F | т | м | F. | т | м | F | т | м | F | т | м | F | т | 1 | (>+/- | (≤ +/- 30%) | Achieved | | 3 , |
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | | (7) | | | (8) | - | | (9) | | | (10) | - | | (11) | - | | (12) | - | •• | (13) | | (14) | (15) | (16) | | (18) | (19) |
| | b. Children | - | - | - | - | - | 7 | 7 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 7 | 15 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 12 | 11 | 23 | | | | | | |
| | c. Youth | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | | | | | | |
| | d. PWDs | - | - | - | - | - | 10 | 5 | 15 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 6 | 18 | 14 | 6 | 20 | 7 | 8 | 15 | 21 | 14 | 35 | 33 | 20 | 53 | | | | | Strengthened advocacy campaign through the conduct of Mobile provision of assistive devices to Persons with Disabilty | |
| | e. Senior Citizens | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 8 | 9 | 6 | 2 | 8 | 7 | 10 | 17 | 6 | 4 | 10 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 31 | | | | | assistive devices to reisulis with disability | |
| 2.13 | Number of clients served through the Comprehensive Program for Street Children, Street Families and Badjaus | 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 | | <u> </u> | | | | |
| | on and Foster Care | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.14 | Number of children served through Alternative Family Care Program | - | - | - | - | 108 | 40 | 51 | 91 | 42 | 52 | 94 | 43 | 55 | 98 | 25 | 43 | 68 | 34 | 45 | 79 | 34 | 48 | 82 | 53 | 63 | 116 | 8 | | | | more children endorsed and issued with CDCLAA and more children placed out for | |
| | 3.1 Children Placed Out for Domestic Adoption Issued with CDCCLAA | - | - | - | - | 11 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 13 | 2 | \dagger | | | foster care more children endorsed for issuance of CDCLAA; pending cases were already | |
| | 3.2 Number of Children Placed Out for Domestic | - | - | - | - | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 3 | 7 | 10 | 5 | 6 | 11 | 1 | | | | issued with CDCLAA more children were declared legally available for adoption | |
| 1 1 | Adoption Issued with PAPA/ACA 3.3 Children Placed Out for Foster Care | _ | - | _ | _ | 87 | 39 | 48 | 87 | 39 | 48 | 87 | 39 | 48 | 87 | 25 | 40 | 65 | 28 | 40 | 68 | 28 | 40 | 68 | 43 | 48 | 91 | 4 | ╁ | | | More children needing foster care after | |
| | 3.4 Children Endorsed for Inter-country Adoption | | - | - | _ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | +- | - | | being abandoned/ neglected Availability of child for inter-country | |
| Minor | Traveling Abroad | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | • | | | | | | _ | | | | | | adoption | |
| | Number of minors traveling abroad issued with travel clearance | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 200 | 32 | 28 | 60 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 33 | 30 | 63 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 37 | 35 | 72 | -128 | | | | Issuance of Travel Clearances continue to decrease due to CoVid Pandemic which is | Continue MTA Advocacy |
| | | 50 | |] 30 | 50 | 200 | 32 | 20 | 00 | - | | | 33 | | 05 | 2 | - | 7 | | | | - | | | 3, | 33 | /2 | 0 | | | | beyond control | Containe PITA Advocacy |
| | ditional Cash Transfer Program (UCT) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | No. of UCT beneficiaries served (FY 2019 Grants) | 5,382 | 223,419 | 140,000 | 38,212 | 407,013 | TBD | TBD | 4101 | TBD | TBD | 214040 | TBD | TBD | 218141 | 0 | 0 | 0 | TBD | TBD - | 47,552 | TBD | TBD | 47,552 | TBD | TBD | 265,693 | -141,320 | | | | | |
| | a. UCT Listahanan | 5,382 | 36,240 | 0 | 38,212 | 79,834 | TBD | TBD | 4,101 | TBD | TBD | 33,289 | TBD | TBD | 37,390 | 0 | 0 | 0 | TBD | TBD | 35,352 | TBD | TBD | 35,352 | TBD | TBD | 72,742 | -7,092 | | | | Deceased beneficiaries and other special cases that the authorized representative cannot present complete requirements | - Subject for Cash Carding - Sex Disaggregation data still to be determined |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Only 7 municipalities were paid thru OTC. The other 7 municipalities are sibject for | -Subject for Cash Carding and OTC - Sex Disaggregation data still to be determined |
| | b. UCT Social Pension | 0 | 0 | 140,000 | 0 | 140,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | TBD | TBD | 12,200 | тво | TBD | 12,200 | TBD | TBD | 12,200 | -127,800 | | | | pay out this 1st semester 2021. THe other 41 municipalities are still waiting for payroll download and 18 left municipalities | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | are agreed to be paid thru cash card | |
| | c. UCT Pantawid Pamilya | 0 | 187,179 | 0 | 0 | 187,179 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 180,751 | 0 | 0 | 180,751 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | TBD | TBD | 180,751 | -6,428 | 10 | | | Changing of CC to EMV Cash Cards | Follow up NPMO regarding the unpaid beneficiaries |
| | No. of UCT beneficiaries served (FY 2020 Grants) | 0 | 0 | 150,000 | 257,600 | 407,600 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | TBD | TBD 1 | 187,766 | тво | TBD 1 | 187,766 | TBD | TBD | 187,766 | -219,834 | | | | | |
| | a. UCT Listahanan | 0 | 0 | 50,000 | 29,834 | 79,834 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -79,834 | | | | 56,245 subject for validation and 51,812 | Subject for Cash Carding |
| | | | | | | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | \rightarrow | | - | - | | | | | | +- | - | | are for cash card opening On going coordination with UCT NPMO for | Subject for Cash Carding and OTC |
| | b. UCT Social Pension | 0 | 0 | 100,000 | 40,000 | 140,000 | <u> </u> | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -140,000 | + | | | pay outs and CC distribution | |
| | c. UCT Pantawid Pamilya | 0 | 0 | 0 | 187,766 | 187,766 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | TBD | TBD 1 | 187,766 | TBD | TBD 1 | 187,766 | TBD | TBD | 187,766 | 0 | | | | | |
| E. Soci | al Welfare for Distressed Overseas Filipinos | and Traff | icked Per | sons Sub | o-Program | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | OUTCOME INDICATORS Percentage of secleted includingly who are reintegrated to their | | | | | | ı | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | T | | | | |
| 2.6 | Percentage of assisted individuals who are reintegrated to their families and communities | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | These are OSEC cases. Hence, these minors are admitted to shelter facilities for | |
| | a. Trafficked Persons | 95.0% | 95.0% | 95.0% | 95.0% | 95.0% | 100.0% | | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | | | | 33.33% | | 37.50% | 100% | 100% | | | | 94.7% | 75.0% | | -14.4% | | | | minors are admitted to shelter facilities for protective custody and rehabilitation. | |
| | Total No. of Trafficked Persons Assisted | - | - | - | - | - | 9 | 17 | 26 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 24 | 33 | 7 | 12 | 19 | 3 | 12 | 15 | 10 | 24 | 34 | 19 | 48 | 67 | | <u> </u> | | | | |
| | No. of Trafficked Persons Reintegrated | - | - | - | - | - | 9 | 17 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 17 | 26 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 15 | 23 | 9 | 19 | 28 | 18 | 36 | 54 | | | | | | |
| | b. Distressed Overseas and Undocumented Filipinos | 95.0% | 95.0% | 95.0% | 95.0% | 95.0% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 5.0% | | | | All catered distressed and undocumented OFs were assisted and reintegrated. | |
| 1 | Total No. of Distressed and Undocumented Filipinos Assisted | - | - | - | - | - | 17 | 98 | 115 | 273 | 170 | 443 | 290 | 268 | 558 | 85 | 71 | 156 | 43 | | | 128 | 127 | 255 | 418 | 395 | 813 | | $oxed{oxed}$ | | | | |
| | No. of Distressed and Undocumented Overseas Filipinos Reintegrated | - | - | - | - | - | 17 | 98 | 115 | 273 | 170 | 443 | 290 | 268 | 558 | 85 | 71 | 156 | 43 | 56 | 99 | 128 | 127 | 255 | 418 | 395 | 813 | | | | | | |
| | OUTPUT INDICATORS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.16 | Number of trafficked persons provided with social welfare services | 5 | 15 | 20 | 25 | 65 | 9 | 17 | 26 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 24 | 33 | 7 | 12 | 19 | 2 | 13 | 15 | 9 | 25 | 34 | 18 | 49 | 67 | 2 | | | | | |
|] | a. Adults | - | - | - | - | - | 8 | 8 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 16 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 11 | 13 | 3 | 13 | 16 | 11 | 21 | 32 | | | | | | |
| | b. Children | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 6 | 10 | 16 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 12 | 18 | 6 | 21 | 27 | | | | | | |

| | | Р | hysical T | argets | | | | | | | | | | | Physic | al Accom | nplishm | ents | | | | | | | | | | | sessmo Variar | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----------|--------|-------|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----------|-----|--------|----------|---------|------|------|----|-----|----------|------|-----|-------|-----|---------|--------|------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ Performance Indicator | | | T | | | | Q1 | | | Q2 | | 1: | st Semes | ter | | Q3 | | | Q4 | | 2 | nd Semes | ster | | Total | | Varianc | e Majo | r Mino | Full Target Achieved | 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 | м | F | т | м | F | т | | (>+/- | - (±+/- 30%) | 0% | | |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | | (7) | _ | | (8) | _ | | (9) | | | (10) | _ | | (11) | | | (12) | | | (13) | | (14) | (15) | (16) | (17) | (18) | (19) |
| c. Youth | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 8 | | | | | | |
| d. PWDs | - | - | - | - | - | 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 | | | | | | |
| 2.17 Number of distressed and undocumented overseas Filipinos provided with social welfare services | 75 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 300 | 17 | 98 | 115 | 273 | 170 | 443 | 290 | 268 | 558 | 85 | 71 | 156 | 43 | 56 | 99 | 128 | 127 | 255 | 418 | 395 | 813 | 513 | | | | The influx number of repatriated OFs due to COVID-19 pandemic. | |
| MALAYSIA | - | - | - | - | - | 7 | 0 | 7 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 8 | | | | | | During 2nd quarter, majority of the clients served are Returning Overseas |
| SAUDI ARABIA | - | - | - | - | - | 8 | 41 | 49 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6 | 3 | 9 | 11 | 14 | 25 | 17 | 17 | 34 | 14 | 44 | 58 | | | | | | - Filipinos (ROFs) provided with meals and family food packs upon their reintegration at the region. Their |
| QATAR | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 13 | 14 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 7 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 11 | 2 | 20 | 22 | | | | | | country of origin overseas is cannot be identified due to limited clients' information filled-up on the distribution |
| HONG KONG | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 8 | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 8 | | | | | | sheets. |
| UNITED ARAB EMIRATES | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 8 | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | ١. | 4 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 11 | 10 | 6 | 16 | 4 | 9 | 13 | | | | | | - |
| KUWAIT | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 20 | 20 | - | - | - | - | - | ١. | 2 | 12 | 14 | 2 | 14 | 16 | 4 | 26 | 30 | 2 | 32 | 34 | | | | | | - |
| OTHER COUNTRIES | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 8 | 9 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 71 | 48 | 119 | 23 | 19 | 42 | 94 | 67 | 161 | 72 | 56 | 128 | | | | 1 | | |
| OFWS FAMILY MEMBER IN PHILIPPINES | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | - |
| a. ADULTS | 75 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 300 | 17 | 98 | 115 | 273 | 170 | 443 | 290 | 268 | 558 | 85 | 71 | 156 | 43 | 56 | 99 | 128 | 127 | 255 | 418 | 395 | 813 | 513 | | | | The influx number of repatriated OFs due to COVID-19 pandemic. | |
| MALAYSIA | - | - | - | - | - | 7 | 0 | 7 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 8 | | | | | | During 2nd quarter, majority of the clients served are Returning Overseas |
| SAUDI ARABIA | - | - | - | - | - | 8 | 41 | 49 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6 | 3 | 9 | 11 | 14 | 25 | 17 | 17 | 34 | 14 | 44 | 58 | | | | | | Filipinos (ROFs) provided with meals and family food packs upon their reintegration at the region. Their |
| QATAR | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 13 | 14 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 7 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 11 | 2 | 20 | 22 | | | | | | country of origin overseas is cannot be identified due to limited clients' information filled-up on the distribution |
| HONG KONG | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 8 | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 8 | | | | | | sheets. |
| UNITED ARAB EMIRATES | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 8 | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 11 | 10 | 6 | 16 | 4 | 9 | 13 | | | | | | |
| KUWAIT | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 20 | 20 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 12 | 14 | 2 | 14 | 16 | 4 | 26 | 30 | 2 | 32 | 34 | | | | | | |
| OTHER COUNTRIES | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 8 | 9 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 71 | 48 | 119 | 23 | 19 | 42 | 94 | 67 | 161 | 72 | 56 | 128 | | | | | | |
| OFWs FAMILY MEMBER IN PHILIPPINES | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | |
| b. CHILDREN | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ANA | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | |
| с. ҮОИТН | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ANA | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | |
| d. PWDs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ANA | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | |
| e. SENIOR CITIZENS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ANA | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | НРМ | ES FORM 4E |
|--|---------------------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| | Allessa | | | OBLIGATIO | ON | | Percent | | | DISBURS | EMENT | | Percent |
| Program/Activity/Project | Allocated Budget | | | Amount | | | Utilization | | | Amount | | | Utilization |
| | (2) | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Total | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Total |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) = (3)+(4)+(5)+(6) | (8)=(7)/(2) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14)=(13)/(7) |
| POOR, VULNERABLE AND MARGINALIZED CI | ITIZENS ARE EMPO | WERED AND WIT | H IMPROVED QUA | TITY OF LIFE | | | | | | | | | |
| ORGANIZATIONAL OUTCOME 2: RIGHTS OF | THE POOR AND TH | E VULNERABLE S | ECTORS PROMOTE | D AND PROTECTE | D | | | | | | | | |
| PROTECTIVE SOCIAL WELFARE PROGRAM | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| I. RESIDENTIAL AND NON-RESIDENTIAL CA | RE SUB-PROGRAM | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Provision of Services to Centers and Institutions | 76,146,084.90 | 10,480,819.90 | 40,192,091.82 | 19,183,541.17 | 6,289,632.01 | 76,146,084.90 | 100.0% | 3,151,770.99 | 10,510,628.96 | 16,478,278.63 | 24,499,229.03 | 54,639,907.61 | 71.8% |
| MOOE (Current Allotment) | 30,645,204.00 | 10,466,759.90 | 5,322,095.65 | 11,898,963.31 | 2,957,385.14 | 30,645,204.00 | 100.0% | 3,149,710.99 | 6,980,865.76 | 9,295,871.81 | 7,450,999.51 | 26,877,448.07 | 87.7% |
| Capital Outlays (Current Allotment) | 45,488,880.90 | 2,060.00 | 34,869,996.17 | 7,284,577.86 | 3,332,246.87 | 45,488,880.90 | 100.0% | 2,060.00 | 3,529,763.20 | 7,170,406.82 | 17,048,229.52 | 27,750,459.54 | 61.0% |
| MOOE (Continuing Allotment) | 12,000.00 | 12,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 12,000.00 | 100.0% | 0.00 | 0.00 | 12,000.00 | 0.00 | 12,000.00 | 100.0% |
| II. SUPPLEMENTARY FEEDING SUB-PROGRA | M | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Supplementary Feeding Program | 148,962,978.59 | 83,606,107.10 | 35,377,998.07 | 10,487,657.66 | 17,563,352.82 | 147,035,115.65 | 98.7% | 2,177,764.13 | 4,011,312.47 | 35,554,535.19 | 55,462,159.36 | 97,205,771.15 | 66.1% |
| MOOE (Current Allotment) | 142,089,700.00 | 81,816,992.92 | 30,324,775.26 | 10,456,716.06 | 17,563,352.82 | 140,161,837.06 | 98.6% | 967,068.70 | 427,717.16 | 35,518,193.59 | 55,431,217.76 | 92,344,197.21 | 65.9% |
| MOOE (Continuing Allotment) | 6,873,278.59 | 1,789,114.18 | 5,053,222.81 | 30,941.60 | 0.00 | 6,873,278.59 | 100.0% | 1,210,695.43 | 3,583,595.31 | 36,341.60 | 30,941.60 | 4,861,573.94 | 70.7% |
| III. SOCIAL WELFARE FOR SENIOR CITIZENS | S SUB-PROGRAM | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A. Social Pension for Indigent Senior Citizens | 1,042,032,184.16 | 332,177,353.94 | 176,033,018.04 | 409,523,745.04 | 117,329,035.49 | 1,035,063,152.51 | 99.3% | 259,154,158.35 | 219,501,713.52 | 433,770,787.75 | 86,231,689.66 | 998,658,349.28 | 96.5% |
| MOOE (Current Allotment) | 1,041,033,900.00 | 331,189,070.59 | 176,023,018.04 | 409,523,745.04 | 117,329,035.49 | 1,034,064,869.16 | 99.3% | 258,214,675.00 | 219,501,713.52 | 433,743,287.75 | 86,231,689.66 | 997,691,365.93 | 96.5% |
| MOOE (Continuing Allotment) | 998,284.16 | 988,283.35 | 10,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 998,283.35 | 100.0% | 939,483.35 | 0.00 | 27,500.00 | 0.00 | 966,983.35 | 96.9% |
| B. Implementation of R.A. No. 10868 or the Centenarians Act of 2016 | 2,407,921.72 | 653,331.00 | 650,314.78 | 631,952.97 | 472,322.97 | 2,407,921.72 | 100.0% | 526,158.50 | 640,407.78 | 431,260.60 | 687,335.73 | 2,285,162.61 | 94.9% |
| MOOE (Current Allotment) | 2,306,000.00 | 650,331.00 | 650,314.78 | 533,031.25 | 472,322.97 | 2,306,000.00 | 100.0% | 526,158.50 | 640,407.78 | 427,371.60 | 621,447.09 | 2,215,384.97 | 96.1% |
| MOOE (Continuing Allotment) | 101,921.72 | 3,000.00 | 0.00 | 98,921.72 | 0.00 | 101,921.72 | 100.0% | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3,889.00 | 65,888.64 | 69,777.64 | 68.5% |
| IV. PROTECTIVE PROGRAMS FOR INDIVIDUALS, | FAMILIES AND COM | MUNITIES IN NEE | D OR IN CRISIS SUE | B-PROGRAM | | | | | | | | | |
| A. Protective Services for Individuals and Families in especially difficult circumstances | 2,220,834,537.17 | 59,463,874.81 | 1,578,692,176.43 | 291,592,769.49 | 250,622,749.28 | 2,180,371,570.01 | 98.2% | 24,669,420.74 | 1,586,140,301.08 | 297,580,131.86 | 212,760,283.49 | 2,121,150,137.17 | 97.3% |
| Assistance to Individuals in Crisis Situation (AICS) | 329,587,138.29 | 55,622,632.01 | 19,374,430.17 | 36,906,228.69 | 182,299,751.30 | 294,203,042.17 | 89.3% | 22,660,675.64 | 25,407,472.73 | 43,969,595.48 | 144,320,667.13 | 236,358,410.98 | 80.3% |
| MOOE (Current Allotment) | 301,167,965.00 | 35,563,458.72 | 19,296,750.17 | 34,904,928.69 | 176,018,731.30 | 265,783,868.88 | 88.3% | 22,660,675.64 | 25,407,472.73 | 41,566,665.24 | 122,646,654.50 | 212,281,468.11 | 79.9% |
| MOOE (Continuing Allotment) | 28,419,173.29 | 20,059,173.29 | 77,680.00 | 2,001,300.00 | 6,281,020.00 | 28,419,173.29 | 100.0% | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2,402,930.24 | 21,674,012.63 | 24,076,942.87 | 84.7% |
| 2. Alternative Family Care Program | 7,743,644.00 | 2,617,922.00 | 713,790.21 | 2,905,392.79 | 1,485,779.00 | 7,722,884.00 | 99.7% | 1,491,994.85 | 2,093,833.23 | 2,604,249.08 | 1,289,304.28 | 7,479,381.44 | 96.8% |
| MOOE (Current Allotment) | 7,535,644.00 | 2,409,922.00 | 713,790.21 | 2,905,392.79 | 1,485,779.00 | 7,514,884.00 | 99.7% | 1,491,994.85 | 1,885,833.23 | 2,604,249.08 | 1,289,304.28 | 7,271,381.44 | 96.8% |
| MOOE (Continuing Allotment) | 208,000.00 | 208,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 208,000.00 | 100.0% | 0.00 | 208,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 208,000.00 | 100.0% |

HPMES FORM 4B

| | | | | OBLIGATI | ON | | | | | DISBURS | EMENT | | |
|---|----------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------|--------------------------|------------------------|--------------|------------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|------------------------|
| Program/Activity/Project | Allocated Budget | | | Amount | | | Percent Utilization | | | Amount | | | Percent Utilization |
| | Dauget | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Total | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Total |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) = (3)+(4)+(5)+(6) | (8)=(7)/(2) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14)=(13)/(7) |
| POOR, VULNERABLE AND MARGINALIZED C | ITIZENS ARE EMPO | WERED AND WIT | H IMPROVED QUA | ALITY OF LIFE | | | | | | | | | |
| ORGANIZATIONAL OUTCOME 2: RIGHTS OF | THE POOR AND TH | E VULNERABLE SI | ECTORS PROMOTE | D AND PROTECTE | D | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Community-based | 6,863,448.48 | 1,223,320.80 | 860,278.01 | 2,904,764.65 | 1,709,873.98 | 6,698,237.44 | 97.6% | 516,750.25 | 1,457,076.76 | 2,074,356.30 | 1,949,963.32 | 5,998,146.63 | 89.5% |
| MOOE (Current Allotment) | 6,863,448.48 | 1,223,320.80 | 860,278.01 | 2,904,764.65 | 1,709,873.98 | 6,698,237.44 | 97.6% | 516,750.25 | 1,457,076.76 | 2,074,356.30 | 1,949,963.32 | 5,998,146.63 | 89.5% |
| 4. Social Amelioration Program | 1,876,640,306.40 | 0.00 | 1,557,743,678.04 | 248,876,383.36 | 65,127,345.00 | 1,871,747,406.40 | 99.74% | 0.00 | 1,557,181,918.36 | 248,931,931.00 | 65,200,348.76 | 1,871,314,198.12 | 99.98% |
| MOOE (Current Allotment) - Admin Cost | 2,387,356.40 | 0.00 | 1,267,878.04 | 322,783.36 | 796,695.00 | 2,387,356.40 | 100.0% | 0.00 | 706,118.36 | 378,331.00 | 869,698.76 | 1,954,148.12 | 81.9% |
| MOOE (Current Allotment) - Subsidies/Grants | 1,874,252,950.00 | 0.00 | 1,556,475,800.00 | 248,553,600.00 | 64,330,650.00 | 1,869,360,050.00 | 99.7% | 0.00 | 1,556,475,800.00 | 248,553,600.00 | 64,330,650.00 | 1,869,360,050.00 | 100.0% |
| B. Assistance to Persons with Disability and Older Persons | 614,950.00 | 87,500.00 | 57,675.00 | 125,066.00 | 319,149.00 | 589,390.00 | 95.8% | 20,000.00 | 55,175.00 | 167,991.00 | 169,415.00 | 412,581.00 | 70.0% |
| MOOE (Current Allotment) | 600,200.00 | 87,500.00 | 57,675.00 | 110,316.00 | 319,149.00 | 574,640.00 | 95.7% | 20,000.00 | 55,175.00 | 167,991.00 | 162,772.00 | 405,938.00 | 70.6% |
| MOOE (Continuing Allotment) | 14,750.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 14,750.00 | 0.00 | 14,750.00 | 100.0% | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 6,643.00 | 6,643.00 | 45.0% |
| C. Tax Reform Cash Transfer Project | 13,928,657.01 | 2,967,712.97 | 27,779.07 | 4,217,728.50 | 6,715,436.47 | 13,928,657.01 | 100.0% | 1,079,201.26 | 896,478.36 | 3,310,285.44 | 3,679,405.69 | 8,965,370.75 | 64.4% |
| MOOE (Current Allotment) | 12,390,901.41 | 1,558,428.00 | 215,619.06 | 3,901,417.88 | 6,715,436.47 | 12,390,901.41 | 100.0% | 326,590.41 | 586,935.17 | 2,849,683.88 | 3,664,405.69 | 7,427,615.15 | 59.9% |
| MOOE (Continuing Allotment) | 1,537,755.60 | 1,409,284.97 | -187,839.99 | 316,310.62 | 0.00 | 1,537,755.60 | 100.0% | 752,610.85 | 309,543.19 | 460,601.56 | 15,000.00 | 1,537,755.60 | 100.0% |
| V. Social Welfare for Distressed Overseas Fi | lipinos and Traffick | ed Persons Sub-l | Program | | | | | | | | | | |
| A. Recovery and Reintegration Program For Traffick Persons (RRPTP) | 1,492,024.00 | 517,669.13 | 47,010.87 | 608,472.00 | 318,872.00 | 1,492,024.00 | 100.0% | 132,194.58 | 148,885.82 | 494,829.55 | 430,211.95 | 1,206,121.90 | 80.8% |
| MOOE (Current Allotment) | 1,486,024.00 | 511,669.13 | 47,010.87 | 608,472.00 | 318,872.00 | 1,486,024.00 | 100.0% | 132,194.58 | 142,885.82 | 494,829.55 | 430,211.95 | 1,200,121.90 | 80.8% |
| MOOE (Continuing Allotment) | 6,000.00 | 6,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 6,000.00 | 100.0% | 0.00 | 6,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 6,000.00 | 100.0% |
| B. Services to Distressed Overseas Filipinos (International Social Services Office - ISSO) | 421,322.00 | 53,972.05 | 91,593.00 | 255,666.95 | 20,090.00 | 421,322.00 | 100.0% | 48,572.05 | 96,993.00 | 107,074.50 | 158,592.45 | 411,232.00 | 97.6% |
| MOOE (Current Allotment) | 421,322.00 | 53,972.05 | 91,593.00 | 255,666.95 | 20,090.00 | 421,322.00 | 100.0% | 48,572.05 | 96,993.00 | 107,074.50 | 158,592.45 | 411,232.00 | 97.6% |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

^{*} Adjusted Total Allotments

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | HPMES FORM |
|--|-------|-------|------------|-------------|--------------|--------|-------|-----------|---------|------|-----------|------------------|--------|---------|--------|------|--------|--------|------|---------|--------|--------|----------|---------|----------|---------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | Phy | sical Targ | ets | | | | | | | PI | hysical <i>F</i> | Accomp | lishmer | its | | | | | | | Anı | nual To | ntal . | | Assess Vari | ment o | f | |
| Objective/Program/Sub-Program/ Performance Indicator | | Q2 | | 4 Tota | | Q1 | | QZ | | 1 | Lst Semes | ster | | Q3 | | | Q4 | | 2n | d Semes | ter | 1 ~"" | iiuai it | | Variance | Major Min | or Full Tar Achiev | Reasons for Variance | Steering Measures/ Remarks |
| | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 Q | 4 10ta | | Female | Total | Male Fema | e Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male F | emale | Total | | (>+/- 30%) (5+ 30%) | /- i) 0% | | |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) (5 | 6) (6) | | (7) | | (8) | | | (9) | | | (10) | | | (11) | | | (12) | | | (13) | | (14) | (15) (16 | i) (17 | (18) | (19) |
| POOR, VULNERABLE AND MARGINALIZED CITIZENS ARE | EMPC | OWERE | ED AND W | /ITH IM | PROVE | D QUAL | ITY O | FLIFE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ORGANIZATIONAL OUTCOME 3: IMMEDIATE RELIEF AND EARL | LY RE | COVER | Y OF DISA | ASTER VI | ICTIMS/ | SURVI | ORS E | NSURED | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DISASTER RESPONSE AND MANAGEMENT PROGRAM | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome Indicators | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.1 Percentage of disaster-affected households assisted to early recovery stage | ANA | ANA | ANA AN | IA AN | Α . | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | | 0 | 0% | 0 |) | 0% | (| 0 | 0.00% | 0 |) | 0.00% | - | | -% | | 0 0 | | No ESA for | for 2020 |
| No. of Households in Early Recovery Stage | 0 | 0 | ANA AN | IA AN | A | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 |) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |) | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | | | | |
| No. of households provided with early recovery services | 0 | 0 | ANA AN | IA AN | A 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| Output Indicators | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.1 Number of DSWD QRT trained for deployment on disaster response | 0 | 175 | 0 0 | 175 | 5 115 | 154 | 269 | 0 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 100 | 150 | 50 | 100 | 150 | 165 | 254 | 419 | 244 | | | However, these includes activites were the participants are LGU staff. minimum in | the conduct of IDCB Activities but in accordance n health protocol. |
| 3.2 Number of LGUs with prepositioned relief goods | 0 | 0 | 0 (| 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 |) | 0 | (| 0 | 0 | 0 |) | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | | | | ositioning of welfare goods to LGUs as per indum from the Secretary. However, the FO have oned goods in rented warehouses in strategic are |
| 3.3 Number of poor households that received cash-for-work for CCAM | 0 | 0 | 22,500 47, | 70,0 | 79 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10,291 | 12,209 | 22,500 | | | 46,545 | | | 69,045 | 10,291 | 2,209 | 69,045 | -1,034 | | | Considering that the program implementation was delayed due to COVID-19 pandemic, payout for the remaining municipalities will be conducted on the 1st Quarter of 2021 due time constraints and the unavailability of the SDOs since the FO is also implementing other programs with payout modalities. | ck the implementation for the 2021 program ntation. |
| 3.4 Number of LGUs provided with augmention on disaster response services | ANA | ANA | ANA AN | IA AN | A | 3 | 3 | 19 | 19 | : | 22 | 22 | 0 | , | 12 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 |) | 27 | 0 | | 49 | | | ı 🛮 🗷 | | |
| 3.5 Number of internally displaced households provided with disaster response services | ANA | ANA | ANA AN | IA ANA | A TBD | TBD | 426 | TBD TBD | 49,536 | TBD | TBD | 49,962 | TBD | TBD | 33,595 | TBD | TBD | 35,338 | TBD | TBD | 68,933 | TBD | TBD | 118,895 | | | | SDD is still completed | till to be determined since the LGUs have not yet and the submission of Relief Distribution Sheets. |
| 3.6 Number of households with damaged houses provided with early recovery services | ANA | ANA | ANA AN | IA AN | A 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | No ESA for | for 2020 |
| a. Emergency Shelter Assistance | | • | | <u>'</u> | | | · | <u> </u> | • | • | | | | · | | | | | | • | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. Cash for Work | | • | | | | | | | | • | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| | | | | | | | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

HPMES FORM 4B

| | | | | OBLIGATI | ON | | | | | DISBURSEN | 1ENT | | |
|---|----------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------|
| Program/Activity/Project | Allocated Budget* | | | Amount | | | Percent Utilization | | | Amount | | | Percent Utilization |
| | | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Total | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Total |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) = (3)+(4)+(5)+(6) | (8)=(7)/(2) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14)=(13)/(7) |
| POOR, VULNERABLE AND MARGINALIZED C | ITIZENS ARE EMPO | WERED AND WIT | H IMPROVED QU | ALITY OF LIFE | | | | | | | | | |
| ORGANIZATIONAL OUTCOME 3: IMMEDIATE | RELIEF AND EARL | Y RECOVERY OF D | DISASTERVICTIM | S/SURVIVORS EN | SURED | | | | | | | | |
| DISASTER RESPONSE AND MANAGEMENT PROGRAM | 354,089,013.24 | 42,594,581.02 | 42,122,796.39 | 105,077,737.76 | 161,432,208.24 | 351,227,323.41 | 99.19% | 10,662,236.86 | 37,673,180.13 | 95,994,488.23 | 150,996,818.57 | 295,326,723.79 | 84.08% |
| I. Disaster Response and Rehabilitation Program | 207,456,796.19 | 14,326,671.59 | 19,318,711.26 | 48,946,822.82 | 123,985,225.44 | 206,577,431.11 | 99.6% | 3,219,192.45 | 5,229,852.93 | 70,105,566.45 | 110,482,639.41 | 189,037,251.24 | 91.51% |
| MOOE (Current Allotment) | 198,763,437.55 | 7,667,310.74 | 19,023,011.47 | 48,446,822.82 | 122,746,927.44 | 197,884,072.47 | 99.6% | 2,042,649.42 | 2,326,829.06 | 68,139,236.46 | 108,479,717.80 | 180,988,432.74 | 91.46% |
| MOOE (Continuing Allotment) | 8,693,358.64 | 6,659,360.85 | 295,699.79 | 500,000.00 | 1,238,298.00 | 8,693,358.64 | 100.0% | 1,176,543.03 | 2,903,023.87 | 1,966,329.99 | 2,002,921.61 | 8,048,818.50 | 92.59% |
| II. Quick Response Fund (QRF) | 41,870,337.87 | 5,623,169.62 | 22,730,975.40 | 3,515,875.20 | 9,317,992.90 | 41,188,013.12 | 98.4% | 194,375.00 | 21,367,811.62 | 7,679,094.39 | 6,248,353.89 | 35,489,634.90 | 86.16% |
| MOOE (Current Allotment) | 35,976,057.20 | 2,382,827.92 | 22,638,036.43 | 3,515,875.20 | 7,418,884.25 | 35,955,623.80 | 99.9% | 0.00 | 18,319,825.95 | 7,588,186.00 | 5,809,013.34 | 31,717,025.29 | 88.21% |
| MOOE (Continuing Allotment) | 5,894,280.67 | 3,240,341.70 | 92,938.97 | 0.00 | 1,899,108.65 | 5,232,389.32 | 88.8% | 194,375.00 | 3,047,985.67 | 90,908.39 | 439,340.55 | 3,772,609.61 | 72.10% |
| III. National Resource Operation (NRO) | 179,716.99 | 106,607.26 | 73,109.73 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 179,716.99 | 100.0% | 57,617.26 | 0.00 | 105,769.73 | 16,330.00 | 179,716.99 | 100.00% |
| MOOE (Continuing Allotment) | 179,716.99 | 106,607.26 | 73,109.73 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 179,716.99 | 100.0% | 57,617.26 | 0.00 | 105,769.73 | 16,330.00 | 179,716.99 | 100.00% |
| IV. Implementation and Monitoring of Payapa at Masaganang Pamayanan (PAMANA) Program - Peace and Development Fund | 104,582,162.19 | 22,538,132.55 | 0.00 | 52,615,039.74 | 28,128,989.90 | 103,282,162.19 | 98.8% | 7,191,052.15 | 11,075,515.58 | 18,104,057.66 | 34,249,495.27 | 70,620,120.66 | 68.38% |
| MOOE (Current Allotment) | 82,044,029.64 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 52,615,039.74 | 28,128,989.90 | 80,744,029.64 | 98.4% | 0.00 | 0.00 | 13,835,931.35 | 34,248,576.76 | 48,084,508.11 | 59.55% |
| MOOE (Continuing Allotment) | 22,538,132.55 | 22,538,132.55 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 22,538,132.55 | 100.0% | 7,191,052.15 | 11,075,515.58 | 4,268,126.31 | 918.51 | 22,535,612.55 | 99.99% |

^{*} Adjusted Total Allotments

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | TIPMES I OKIN |
|--|--------|--------|----------|---------|---------|------|-----|---------|---------|---------|------|--------|----------|-----------------|-------------------|----------------------------|--|-----------------------------|
| | | Phy | ysical 1 | Targets | | | | Physica | l Accom | plishme | ents | | | | essmer /arianc | | | |
| Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ Performance Indicator | | | | | | | | 1st | | | 2nd | | Variance | Major | Minor | Full Target Achieved | Reasons for Variance | Steering Measures / Remarks |
| i cromunec indicator | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Q1 | Q2 | Sem | Q3 | Q4 | Sem | Total | | (> +/- 30%) | (≤ +/- 30%) | 0% | | |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14) | (15) | (16) | (17) | (18) | (19) |
| OOR, VULNERABLE AND MARGINALIZED CITE GANIZATIONAL OUTCOME 4: CONTINUING CON | 4PLIAI | NCE OF | SOCI | AL WE | LFARE A | | | | | | | RDS IN | THE DELI | VERY (| OF SOC | IAL W | ELFARE SERVICES ENSURED | |
| Outcome Indicators | LES RE | IGULA | IORI | PROG | IKAM | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percentage of SWAs, SWDAs and service providers with sustained compliance to social welfare and development standards | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Registered and Licensed SWAs | 0% | 0% | 17% | 8% | 25% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 42% | 0% | 42% | 42% | 17% | | | | The relatively higher accomplishment of the monitoring for sustained compliance of SWDAS were the result of the collaborative effort of the Standards Section Staff to conduct the monitoring despite the travel restrictions brough about by the COVID 19 pandemic. | |
| Total No. of of Registered and Licensed SWAs | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | | | | | | |
| No. of Registered and Licensed SWAs with Sustained Compiance | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 5 | | | | | | |
| b. Accredited SWDAs | | | • | | • | | | | | | • | | | | • | | | |
| b.1 Level 1 Accreditation | -% | -% | 17% | 33% | 50% | 17% | 0 | 17% | 67% | 0% | 67% | 83.3% | 33% | | | | The higher accomplishment was due to the collaborative effort of the standards section staff to conduct monitoring despite the COVID 19 restrictions. Social distancing was observed during the monitoring proper (Monitored Butuan City Area only) | |
| Total No. of Accredited SWDAs - Level 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 6 | | | | | | |
| No, of Accredited SWDAs - Level 1 with sustained compliance | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 5 | | | | | | |
| b.2 Level 2 Accreditation | -% | -% | -% | 67% | 67% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 100% | 100% | 33% | | | | The higher accomplishment was due to the collaborative effort of the standards section staff to conduct monitoring despite the COVID 19 restrictions. Social distancing was observed during the monitoring proper (Monitored Butuan City Area only) | |
| Total No. of Accredited SWDAs - Level 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | | | | | | |
| No, of Accredited SWDAs - Level 2 with sustained compliance | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | | | | | | |
| b.3 Level 3 Accreditation | -% | -% | -% | -% | 0% | -% | -% | -% | -% | -% | -% | -% | | | | | | |
| Total No. of Accredited SWDAs - Level 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | |
| No, of Accredited SWDAs - Level 3 with sustained compliance | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | |
| c. Accredited Service Providers | -% | -% | -% | -% | -% | 100% | -% | 100% | -% | -% | -% | 100% | | | | | | |
| Total No. of Accredited Service Providers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | | | | | |
| No. of Accredited Service Providers with Sustained Compliance | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | | | | | |

| | | | Phy | sical T | argets | | | | Physica | l Accon | nplishm | ents | | | | essmer /arianc | | | прмез гокм 46 |
|-----|--|-----|-----|---------|--------|-------|----|----|---------|---------|---------|------|-------|----------|-----------------|-------------------|----|--|-----------------------------|
| | Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ Performance Indicator | | | | | | | | 1st | | | 2nd | | Variance | | | | Reasons for Variance | Steering Measures / Remarks |
| | | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Q1 | Q2 | Sem | Q3 | Q4 | Sem | Total | | (> +/- 30%) | (≤ +/- 30%) | 0% | | |
| | Output Indicators | | | | | - | • | | - | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.1 | Number of SWAs and SWDAs registered, licensed and accredited | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a. Registered and Licensed SWAs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | | | | The variance resulted to a higher accomplishment compared to the target were due to the continuous follow-up and provision of TA of the Standards Section on the RLA requirements despite the COVID 19 restrictions. | |
| | b. Registered Auxiliary SWDAs | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | | | | The variance resulted to a higher accomplishment compared to the target were due to the continuous follow-up and provision of TA of the Standards Section on the RLA requirements despite the COVID 19 restrictions. | |
| | c. Accredited SWDAs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | c.1 Level 1 Accreditation (Pre-assessment) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| | 1.1 DSWD-Operated Residential Facilities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| | 1.2 LGU-Managed Facilities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| | 1.3 Private SWAs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| | c.2 Level 2 Accreditation (Pre-assessment) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| | 2.1 DSWD-Operated Residential Facilities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| | 2.2 LGU-Managed Facilities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| | 2.3 Private SWAs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| | c.3 Level 3 Accreditation (Pre-assessment) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| | 3.1 DSWD-Operated Residential Facilities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| | 3.2 LGU-Managed Facilities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| | 3.3 Private SWAs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | o | 0 | | | | | | |
| | b. Beneficiary Partner CSOs Accredited | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | | | | | Accredited per basis of SLP MC NO. 22 series of 2018 pending approval of the enhanced MC NO. 17 series of 2017 | |
| 4.3 | Number of service providers accredited | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a. SWMCCs | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | | | | | |
| | b. PMCs | 5 | 0 | ANA | ANA | 5 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 13 | 8 | ✓ | | | Targets for 2nd semester were already changed and approved to "ANA" per USEC Gudmalin's approval on the letter of request | |

| | | | Phy | sical T | argets | | | | Physica | l Accor | nplishme | ents | | | | essmei /ariand | | | |
|-----|---|------|------|---------|--------|-------|------|----|---------|---------|----------|------|-------|----------|-----------------|-------------------|----------------------------|--|-----------------------------|
| | Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ Performance Indicator | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Q1 | Q2 | 1st | Q3 | Q4 | 2nd | Total | Variance | Major | Minor | Full Target Achieved | Reasons for Variance | Steering Measures / Remarks |
| | | 41 | Q2 | Q3 | QT | Total | Q1 | Q2 | Sem | ŲS | ۲۷ | Sem | Total | | (> +/- 30%) | (≤ +/- 30%) | | | |
| | c. DCWs(ECCD Services) | 263 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 263 | 298 | 14 | 312 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 312 | 49 | | | | CDWs/CDCs assessed last quarter of 2019 that were held in abeyance due to lacking requirements were complied as of 1st and 2nd Quarter of 2020 | |
| 4.4 | Percentage of SWDAs with RLA certificates issued within 30 working days upon receipt of compliant application | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | -% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 0% | | | | | |
| | Total no. of compliant application received | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 3 | | | | | |
| | No. of SWDAs with RLA certificates issued within 30 working days upon receipt of compliant application | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 3 | | | | | |
| 4.5 | Percentage of detected violations/complaints acted upon within 7 working days | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | -% | -% | -% | -% | -% | -% | -% | -% | | | | | |
| | 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 | | | | | |

HPMES FORM 4B

| | | | | OBLI | GATION | | | | | DISBURS | EMENT | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|----------|----------|-----------|---------|--------------------------|------------------------|-----|--------|---------|-------|------|------------------------|
| Program/Activity/Project | Allocated | | | Amount | | | Percent Utilization | | | Amount | | | Percent Utilization |
| riogram, Activity, Project | Budget* | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Total | Q1 | Amount | | | | |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) = (3)+(4)+(5)+(6) | (8)=(7)/(2) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14)=(13)/(7) |
| DOOD VIII NEDARI E AND MARGINALIZED C | TTTZENS ADE I | MDOWEDED | AND WITH | 1 TMDDOVE | OUALITY | OFITEE | | | | • | , | | |

ORGANIZATIONAL OUTCOME 4: CONTINUING COMPLIANCE OF SOCIAL WELFARE AND DEVELOPMENT AGENCIES TO STANDARDS IN THE DELIVERY OF SOCIAL WELFARE SERVICES ENSURED

SOCIAL WELFARE AND DEVELOPMENT AGENCIES REGULATORY PROGRAM

| Standards-setting, Licensing, Accreditation and Monitoring Services | 671,398.00 | 294,616.00 | 41,918.00 | 135,974.00 | 198,890.00 | 671,398.00 | 100.0% | 96,867.35 | 115,678.14 | 78,029.51 | 26,922.18 | 317,497.18 | 47.3% |
|--|------------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|--------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-------|
| MOOE (Current Allotment) | 671,398.00 | 294,616.00 | 41,918.00 | 135,974.00 | 198,890.00 | 671,398.00 | 100.0% | 96,867.35 | 115,678.14 | 78,029.51 | 26,922.18 | 317,497.18 | 47.3% |

^{*} Adjusted Total Allotments

| | Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ | | PHYS | (2020 | ARGETS | | | | | | | | | PHYS | | CCOMPLI (2020) | SHMEN | ITS | | | | | | | | Variance | Va | sment of | Reasons for Variance/ | Steering Measures |
|------|--|----------------|----------------|--------------------------|----------------|-----------------|--------|-----------|--------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------------------|--------|-------|----------|--------|---------|------|------|-------|-----|----------|------------------------------------|---|--|-------------------|
| | Performance Indicator | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | | Q1 | | Q2 | | 15 | Semes | ter | | Q3 | | Q4 | | 2nd 9 | Semeste | r | An | inual | | • | Major (> +/- 30% deviati | ≤ +/- 30%) Ful targ Achi ec | II Other Remarks jet iev d | Steering Heastres |
| POOR | , VULNERABLE AND MARGINALIZED CITIZEN | S ARE | EMPOW | ERED A | ND WIT | H IMPRO | OVED Q | UALITY (| OF LIF | ! | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ORGA | NIZATIONAL OUTCOME 5: DELIVERY OF SOCI | AL WE | LFARE | AND DE | VELOP | IENT PR | OGRAM | IS BY LOC | AL GO | VERNME | NT UN | ITS T | IROUG | H LOC | AL SOC | CIAL WELF | ARE AI | ND DE | VELOPMEI | NT OFF | ICES I | MPRO | /ED | | | | | | | |
| | Outcome Indicators | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5.1 | Percentage of LSWDOs with improved functionality | - | - | - | - | NT | - | 9 | 6 - | - | -% | - | - | -% | - | % | - | - | -% | - | - | -% | - | - | -% | | | |) | |
| | a. Enhance Service Delivery (Level 1) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 1 | | 0 | | | 1 | | | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 | | • | 1 | | 1 | | | | |
| | a.1 Province | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | | | | |
| | a.2 City | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | | | | |
| | a.3 Municipality | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 1 | | 0 | | | 1 | | | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 1 | | 1 | | | Municpality of Taga-naan, Surigao del Norte was already conducted the service delivery validation | |
| | b. Better Service Delivery (Level 2) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | | | | |
| | b.1 Province | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | | | | |
| | b.2 City | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | | | | |
| | b.3 Municipality | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | | | | |
| | c. Improved Service Delivery (Level 3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | | | | |
| | c.1 Province | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | | | | |
| | c.2 City | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | | | | |
| | c.3 Municipality | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | | | | |
| | d. Low Service Delivery (Low) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | | | | |
| | d.1 Province | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | | | | |
| | d.2 City | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | | | | |
| | d.3 Municipality | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | | | | |
| | Output Indicators | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5.1 | Number of learning and development interventions provided to LGUs (through LSWDOs) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | | 1 | | 0 | | | 1 | | | 0 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 2 | | -2 | | | LDI Activties were hampered due to Covid 19 Pandemi | |
| 5.2 | Percentage of LGUs provided with technical assistance | 27% (21/77) | 26% (20/77) | 23% (18/77) | 23% (18/77) | 100% (77/77) | 77 | 21 27.: | 3% 7 | 7 20 | 26.0% | 77 | 41 | 53% | 77 | 18 23% | 77 | 18 | 23% | 77 | 36 4 | 7% | 77 7 | 77 1 | 00% | 0% | | | 3 | |
| 5.3 | Percentage of LGUs provided with resource augmentation | NT | NT | 100% (73/73 MLGUs) | ANA | 100% (73/73) | N/A | N/A N/ | A N/ | A N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 73 | 73 100% | 6 73 | 73 | 100% | 73 | 73 10 | 00% | 73 7 | 73 1 | 00% | 0% | | | 1 | |
| 5.4 | Percentage of LGUs that rated TA provided as satisfactory or better | 80% | 80% | 80% | 80% | 80% | 21 | 21 100 | % 2 | 20 | 100% | 41 | 41 | 100% | 18 | 18 100% | 6 18 | 18 | 100% | 36 | 36 10 | 00% | 77 7 | 77 1 | 00% | 20% | | | TA and RA | |
| 5.5 | Percentage of LGUs that rated RA provided as satisfactory or better | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80% | 80% | N/A | N/A N/ | A N/ | A N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 73 | 73 100% | 6 73 | 73 | 100% | 73 | 73 10 | 00% | 73 7 | 73 1 | 00% | 20% | | | The Field Office has been responsive to the request of the LSWDOs especially provisions of TA and RA | |

HPMES FORM 4B

| | | | | OBLIGAT | TION | | | | | DISBURSI | EMENT | | |
|---|----------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------------------|------------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|------------------------|
| Program/Activity/Project | Allocated Budget* | | | Amount | | | Percent Utilization | | | Amount | | | Percent Utilization |
| | | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Total | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Total |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) = (3)+(4)+(5)+(6) | (8)=(7)/(2) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14)=(13)/(7) |
| POOR, VULNERABLE AND MARGINALIZED CITIZEN | IS ARE EMPOWE | RED AND WIT | H IMPROVED Q | UALITY OF LIF | E | | | | | | | | |
| ORGANIZATIONAL OUTCOME 5: DELIVERY OF SOC | IAL WELFARE A | ND DEVELOPM | IENT PROGRAM | S BY LOCAL GO | OVERNMENT UN | NITS THROUGH | LOCAL SO | CIAL WELFAR | E AND DEVELO | PMENT OFFIC | ES IMPROVE | | _ |
| SOCIAL WELFARE AND DEVELOPMENT TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND RESOURCE AUGMENTATION PROGRAM | 5,440,518.00 | 1,793,366.33 | 235,649.13 | 1,018,162.60 | 2,268,181.94 | 5,315,360.00 | 97.70% | 547,306.59 | 382,090.85 | 883,435.20 | 1,586,993.72 | 3,399,826.36 | 63.96% |
| A. Provision of Technical / Advisory Assistance and other Related Support Services | 5,258,518.00 | 1,700,966.33 | 235,649.13 | 990,162.60 | 2,206,581.94 | 5,133,360.00 | 97.6% | 547,306.59 | 382,090.85 | 875,935.20 | 1,586,993.72 | 3,392,326.36 | 66.1% |
| MOOE (Current Allotment) | 5,258,518.00 | 1,700,966.33 | 235,649.13 | 990,162.60 | 2,206,581.94 | 5,133,360.00 | 97.6% | 547,306.59 | 382,090.85 | 875,935.20 | 1,586,993.72 | 3,392,326.36 | 66.1% |
| B. Provision of Capability Training Programs | 182,000.00 | 92,400.00 | 0.00 | 28,000.00 | 61,600.00 | 182,000.00 | 100.0% | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7,500.00 | 0.00 | 7,500.00 | 4.1% |
| MOOE (Current Allotment) | 182,000.00 | 92,400.00 | 0.00 | 28,000.00 | 61,600.00 | 182,000.00 | 100.0% | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7,500.00 | 0.00 | 7,500.00 | 4.1% |

^{*} Adjusted Total Allotments

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | HPMES FORM 4B | | | |
|-------|---|-----|-----|----------------|-----|-------|-----|-----|-----------------|-----------|-------|----------|-------|----------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | Physical Targe | ts | | | | | Accomplis | hment | | | | | essmen Variance | | | |
| | Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ Performance Indicator | | | | | | | | 1-4 | | | 2nd | | Variance | | | Full Target Achieved | Reasons for Variance | Steering Measures / Remarks |
| | Performance Indicator | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Q1 | Q2 | 1st Semester | Q3 | Q4 | Semester | Total | | (> +/- 30%) | (≤ +/- 30%) | Achieved 0% | | |
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (09) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14) | (15) | (16) | (17) | (18) | (19) |
| SUF | PORT TO OPERATIONS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Polic | and Plan Development | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6.1 | Number of SWD legislative or executive issuances prepared for executive/legislative approval | NT | NT | NT | NT | NT | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | | | Not Applicable for Field Office |
| 6.2 | Number of agency policies approved and disseminated | NT | NT | NT | NT | NT | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | | | Not Applicable for Field Office |
| 6.3 | Number of agency plans formulated and disseminated | 1 | - | 1 | - | ANA | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | | | | | | |
| | a. Medium-term Plans | 1 | - | - | - | ANA | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | | | | | 1 Medium-term Plan - Risk Treatment Plan |
| | b. Annual Plans | - | - | 1 | - | ANA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | | | | | | 2 Annual Plans Submitted: - FY 2021 Work and Financial Plan (HPMES 3) - Annual Perforamance Measures (HPMES 2) |
| 6.4 | Number of researches completed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | | | 1 target research was removed and will not be push through due to discontinuance of activities under Centrally Managed Fund (CMF) based on memorandum from PDPB dated 21 May 2020 |
| 6.5 | Number of position papers prepared | NT | NT | NT | NT | NT | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | | | Not Applicable for Field Office |
| Soci | l Technology Development | | | | | | | • | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6.6 | Number of social technologies formulated | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | | | Not Applicable Indicator for Field Office |
| | 6.6.1.Number of new concepts of models of interventions responding to emerging needs | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| | 6.6.2. Number of new designs formulated | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| | 6.6.3. Number of models of intervention pilot tested | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| | 6.6.4. Number of models of intervention evaluated | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| 6.7 | Number of SWD programs and services enhanced | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | | | Not Applicable Indicator for Field Office |
| | 6.7.1. Number of concepts on the enhancement of an existing program/service | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| | 6.7.2. Number of designs of enhanced programs/services formulated | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| | 6.7.3. Number of enhanced models pilot tested | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| | 6.7.4. Number of enhanced models evaluated | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| 6.8 | Percentage of intermediaries adopting completed social technologies | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | | | Not Applicable Indicator for Field Office |
| | 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 | 1 | 1 | 1 | -1 | | _ | | Only one (1) LGU (Veruela, ADS) was able to forged MOA with DSWD on the replication of completed Social Technology which is the Home Care Support Services for Senior Citizens. Other Municipalities decided to forge MOA with DSWD or the 1st quarter of 2021 since they prioritized funding the activities in relation to COVID-19 response. | Target for this indicator was adjusted into two (2) instead of four (4) as approved by Social Technology Bureau. |
| | No. of LGUs reached through social Marketing Activities | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 19 | 0 | 19 | 22 | 2 | | | | | Target for this indicator was adjusted into twenty (20) instead of 47 as approved by Social Technology Bureau. Orientation on completed social technologies was condcuted on Sept. 10, 2020 due to postponement brought by current pandemic. |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | HPMES FORM 4B |
|------|--|-------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|------|------|-----------------|----------|--------|-----------------|-------|----------|-----------------|---------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| | | | P | hysical Target | ts | | | | | ccomplis | shment | | | | Asse \ | essment Variance | of | | |
| | Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ Performance Indicator | | | | | | | | 1-4 | | | 24 | | Variance | Major | Minor | Full Target Achieved | Reasons for Variance | Steering Measures / Remarks |
| | r errormance indicator | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Q1 | Q2 | 1st Semester | Q3 | Q4 | 2nd Semester | Total | | (> +/- 30%) | (≤ +/- 30%) | 0% | | |
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (09) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14) | (15) | (16) | (17) | (18) | (19) |
| | No. of FO-initiated social technology implemented | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | o | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | o | 0 | 0 | | | | | Activities in relation to Pamilya sa Gugma and PRESTIGE will not be conducted due to pandemic. Training expense for the said activities has been withdrawn. |
| | nal Household Targeting System for Poverty | Reduction | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6.10 | Percentage of intermediaries utilizing Listahanan results for social welfare and development initiatives | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| | Total No.of Intermediaries | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | |
| | No. of Intermediaries with MOA on Data Sharing | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | |
| 6.11 | No. of requests for List of Poor Households generated | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | |
| 6.12 | Number of households assessed to determine poverty status | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | | | |
| | No. of requests for statistical data granted | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | 5 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 9 | | | | | | |
| | No. of name-matching requests granted | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | 29 | 5 | 34 | 11 | 17 | 28 | 62 | | | | | | |
| | Number of households assessed for special validation for the UCT Program | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | | | |
| Info | mation and Communications Technology | Manageme | nt | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6.13 | Number of interconnected computer networks maintained | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| 6.14 | Percentage of functional information systems deployed and maintained | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | | | Not Applicable Indicator for Field Office |
| | Total No.of Functional Information Systems | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | ı | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| | No. of Information Systems Deployed and Maintained | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| 6.15 | Percentage of users trained on ICT applications, tools and products | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | | | Not Applicable Indicator for Field Office |
| | Total no.of Target Users | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| | No. of Users Trained | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| 6.16 | Percentage of technica assistance and support services requests acted upon | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | -% | -% | -% | -% | -% | -% | -% | | | | | | |
| | No.of TA and Support Service Requests Acted Upon | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| L | Total No.of TA and Support Service Requests Received | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| | Functional ICT Business Solutions and Servicecs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Number of information systems supporting the core programs and support services of the Department maintained | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 2 | | | | 2 Additional Information System | |
| | Number of information systems developed and/or enhanced | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 0 | | | Z | | |
| | Purposive data management for information sharing | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Percentage of mission critical databases managed and maintained | 25 (95%) | 25 (95%) | 25 (95%) | 25 (95%) | 25 (95%) | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 5% | | | | | |
| | Resilient ICT infrastructure | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | F | Physical Targe | ts | | | | , | Accomplis | hment | | | | | essmen /arianc | | | HPMES FORM 4E |
|-------|---|------|------|----------------|------|-------|---------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------|----------|-----------------|-------------------|----------------|---|-----------------------------|
| | Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ | | | | | | | | | - | | | | Variance | | | Full Target | Reasons for Variance | Steering Measures / Remarks |
| | Performance Indicator | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Q1 | Q2 | 1st Semester | Q3 | Q4 | 2nd Semester | Total | | (> +/- 30%) | (≤ +/- 30%) | Achieved 0% | | |
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (09) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14) | (15) | (16) | (17) | (18) | (19) |
| | Percentage uptime of DSWD applications | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 96% | 97% | 97% | 98% | 97% | 98% | 97% | 2% | | \blacksquare | | | |
| | Number of disaster recovery sites and backup solutions for DSWD applications maintained | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | | | V | | |
| | Reliable network and communications services | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Percentage uptime for Field Offices | 92% | 92% | 92% | 92% | 92% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 96% | 95% | 96% | 95% | 3% | | ✓ | | | |
| | Number of DSWD Sub- Regional Sites connected to the DSWD Enterprise Network | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 2 | N | | | 2 Additional Sub-Regional Sites conntected: HFG and SWAD ADS | |
| | Secure digital identity and transactions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Percentage of information systems developed subjected to vulnerability assessment and patched accordingly | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | | | V | | |
| | Percentage of end points secured | 25% | 50% | 75% | 100% | 100% | | 606/637 95.13% | | | 480/637 75.35% | | 480/637 75.35% | 157 | | | | The Central Office procured new anti-virus software and there is a need to remove the old and install the new one. But due to the pandemic and travel restrictions, the RICTMS and other program staff were unable to install the security to desktop/laptop assigned at the POOs, MOOs, SWAD, and other sites. | |
| | Responsive ICT support services | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Percentage of Technical Assistance (TA) requests responded and resolved within the set Service Level Agreement (SLA)/timeline | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 93.23% | 95.42% | - | 96.64% | 100.0% | - | 100.0% | 0.0% | | ✓ | | | |
| | Number of centralized web portal for ICT technical assistance, resolution of issues, business intelligence dashboard for ICT resources, services and monitoring developed | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | | | | | |
| | ICT policies and plans developed and maintained | | | | | | | | • | | • | | | | | | | | |
| | Number of ICT policies developed and maintained | - | - | - | - | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | | | V | | |
| | ICT capability building for DSWD end-users | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Number of ICT capability building conducted | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 0 | | | Z | | |
| | Percentage of target participants trained on ICT applications, tools and products | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 0% | | | Ŋ | | |
| Inter | nal Audit | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6.17 | Percentage of audit recommendations complied with | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| | No.of Audit Recommendations | - | - | - | - | ANA | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | | | |
| | Total No. of Audit Recommendations Complied | - | - | - | - | ANA | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | | | |
| 6.18 | Percentage of integrity management measures implemented | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | 100.00% | 50.00% | 83.33% | 67.86% | 83.33% | 83.33% | 83.33% | | | | | | |
| | No.of Integrity Measures Identified | - | - | - | - | ANA | 20 | 24 | 24 | 28 | 30 | 30 | 30 | | | | | | |
| | Total No.of Integrity Measures Implemented | - | - | - | - | ANA | 20 | 12 | 20 | 19 | 25 | 25 | 25 | | | | | | |
| Socia | Il Marketing | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6.19 | Percentage of stakeholders informed on DSWD programs and services | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a. KAP | - | - | - | - | 100% | - | - | - | - | - | 100% | 100% | 0% | | | ✓ | | |

| | | | P | hysical Targe | ts | | | | | Accomplis | hment | | | | | essmen Varianc | | | HPMES FORM 4B |
|------|---|-----|-----|---------------|-----|-------|--------|--------|-----------------|-----------|--------|-----------------|--------|----------|------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|--|-----------------------------|
| | Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ Performance Indicator | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Q1 | Q2 | 1st Semester | Q3 | Q4 | 2nd Semester | Total | Variance | Major (>+/- 30%) | Minor (≤ +/- 30%) | Full Target Achieved | Reasons for Variance | Steering Measures / Remarks |
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (09) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14) | (15) | (16) | (17) | (18) | (19) |
| | b. FB Analytics | 20% | 20% | 20% | 20% | 20% | 43.03% | 35.28% | 39.29% | 29.42% | 46.80% | 38.11% | 38.70% | 18.70% | | | 0 | | |
| 6.20 | Number of social marketing activities conducted | | | | | | | • | • | | • | | | | | • | | | |
| | a. Information caravans | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 11 | 7 | ✓ | | | With the influx of support from the management, the FO was able to hire anough SMS staff to help in achieving the OPC targets, even surpassing targets by miles. | |
| | b. Issuance of press releases | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 60 | 42 | 30 | 72 | 61 | 47 | 108 | 180 | 120 | ✓ | | | With the influx of support from the management, the FO was able to hire anough SMS staff to help in achieving the OPC targets, even surpassing targets by miles. | |
| | c. Communication campaigns | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 12 | 41 | 21 | 62 | 29 | 35 | 67 | 126 | 114 | ✓ | | | With the influx of support from the management, the FO was able to hire anough SMS staff to help in achieving the OPC targets, even surpassing targets by miles. | |
| 6.21 | Number of IEC materials developed | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 17 | 41 | 58 | 32 | 30 | 62 | 120 | 100 | ✓ | | | With the influx of support from the management, the FO was able to hire anough SMS staff to help in achieving the OPC targets, even surpassing targets by miles. | |
| Knov | rledge Management | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6.22 | Number of knowledge products on social welfare and development services developed | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | | | | | |
| | Number of knowledge sharing sessions conducted | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 0 | | | ✓ | | |
| Reso | urce Generation and Management | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6.24 | 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 | | | | | | Not Applicable |
| 6.25 | 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 | | | | | | Not Applicable |
| Conv | ergence | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 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 | | | | | | Not Applicable |
| | 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 | | | | | | Not Applicable |
| | 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 | | | | | | Not Applicable |

HPMES FORM 4B

| | | | | OBLIGAT | TON | | | | | DISBURS | EMENT | | FORM 4B |
|---|----------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|--------------------------|------------------------|------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|------------------------|
| Program/Activity/Project | Allocated Budget* | | | Amount | 1014 | | Percent Utilization | | | Amount | DEMENT. | | Percent Utilization |
| | Buuget | Q1 | Q2 | QЗ | Q4 | Total | Total | Q1 | Q2 | QЗ | Q4 | Total | Total |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) = (3)+(4)+(5)+(6) | (8)=(7)/(2) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (9)=(13)/(7) |
| SUPPORT TO OPERATIONS | 33,351,393.17 | 5,095,185.11 | 2,265,901.30 | 15,550,282.93 | 10,440,023.83 | 33,351,393.17 | 100.00% | 548,384.41 | 1,152,321.05 | 4,363,470.63 | 14,998,792.48 | 21,062,968.57 | 63.15% |
| I. Formulation and Development of Policies and Plans | 536,700.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 24,080.00 | 512,620.00 | 536,700.00 | 100.00% | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3,080.00 | 12,433.00 | 15,513.00 | 2.89% |
| MOOE (Current Allotment) | 536,700.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 24,080.00 | 512,620.00 | 536,700.00 | 100.00% | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3,080.00 | 12,433.00 | 15,513.00 | 2.89% |
| II. Social Technology Development and Enhancement | 872,970.71 | 294,290.90 | 93,140.00 | 266,289.81 | 219,250.00 | 872,970.71 | 100.00% | 13,207.90 | 80,451.57 | 61,338.66 | 316,512.67 | 471,510.80 | 54.01% |
| MOOE (Current Allotment) | 622,126.00 | 161,163.00 | 68,808.00 | 172,905.00 | 219,250.00 | 622,126.00 | 100.00% | 0.00 | 59,451.57 | 61,338.66 | 254,195.86 | 374,986.09 | 60.27% |
| MOOE (Continuing Allotment) | 250,844.71 | 133,127.90 | 24,332.00 | 93,384.81 | 0.00 | 250,844.71 | 100.00% | 13,207.90 | 21,000.00 | 0.00 | 62,316.81 | 96,524.71 | 38.48% |
| III. National Household Targeting System for Poverty Reduction (NHTS-PR) | 23,083,810.46 | 429,271.21 | 686,271.30 | 12,613,802.79 | 9,354,465.16 | 23,083,810.46 | 100.00% | 203,948.76 | 584,984.75 | 1,855,914.66 | 11,930,178.32 | 14,575,026.49 | 63.14% |
| MOOE (Current Allotment) | 712,800.00 | 321,251.21 | 96,071.30 | 37,192.29 | 258,285.20 | 712,800.00 | 100.00% | 203,948.76 | 74,484.75 | 77,607.29 | 291,852.27 | 647,893.07 | 90.89% |
| MOOE (Continuing Allotment) | 22,347,738.46 | 108,020.00 | 590,200.00 | 12,576,610.50 | 9,072,907.96 | 22,347,738.46 | 100.00% | 0.00 | 510,500.00 | 1,778,307.37 | 11,615,126.05 | 13,903,933.42 | 62.22% |
| Capital Outlay (Continuing Allotment) | 23,272.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 23,272.00 | 23,272.00 | 100.00% | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 23,200.00 | 23,200.00 | 99.69% |
| IV. Information and Communications Technology Service Management | 8,857,912.00 | 4,371,623.00 | 1,486,490.00 | 2,646,110.33 | 353,688.67 | 8,857,912.00 | 100.00% | 331,227.75 | 486,884.73 | 2,443,137.31 | 2,739,668.49 | 6,000,918.28 | 67.75% |
| MOOE (Current Allotment) | 4,567,760.00 | 117,971.00 | 1,486,490.00 | 2,646,110.33 | 317,188.67 | 4,567,760.00 | 100.00% | 35,308.00 | 57,058.00 | 1,424,827.98 | 1,697,262.67 | 3,214,456.65 | 70.37% |
| MOOE (Continuing Allotment) | 4,290,152.00 | 4,253,652.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 36,500.00 | 4,290,152.00 | 100.00% | 295,919.75 | 429,826.73 | 1,018,309.33 | 1,042,405.82 | 2,786,461.63 | 64.95% |

^{*} Adjusted Total Allotments

| | | PH | YSICAL | TARGET | | | | PHYS | SICAL ACCOMPL | ISHMENT | | | | Assessi | ment of \ | /ariance | | HPMES FORM 4B |
|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|--------------|---------------|---------|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|--|---|
| Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ Performance Indicator | | | | Т | | | | | | | | | Variance | Major | Minor | Full Target | Reasons for Variance | Steering Measures / Remarks |
| r crismance indicator | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Q1 | Q2 | 1st Semester | Q3 | Q4 | 2nd Semester | Total | | (> +/- 30%) | (≤ +/- 30%) | Achieved 0% | | |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (09) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14) | (15) | (16) | (17) | (18) | (19) |
| GENERAL ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT SERV | ICES | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Human Resource and Development | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7.1 Percentage of permanent positions filled-up within timeline | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100.0% | 0.0% | | | | | |
| No. of Positions Filled up within Timeline | 0 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 12 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 12 | | | | | | |
| Male | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | О | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | | | | | | |
| Female | 0 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 9 | | | | | | |
| Total no. of Positions with Request for Posting | 0 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 12 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 12 | | | | | | |
| 7.2 Percentage of regular staff provided with at least 1 learning and development intervention | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.0% | 0.0% | | | | | |
| No.of Staff Provided with Learning and Development Interventions | 15 | 23 | 28 | 13 | 79 | 33 | 7 | 40 | 30 | 13 | 43 | 83 | | | | | | |
| Male | 5 | 8 | 10 | 5 | 28 | 12 | 2 | 14 | 11 | 5 | 16 | 30 | | | | | | |
| Female | 10 | 15 | 18 | 8 | 51 | 21 | 5 | 26 | 19 | 8 | 27 | 53 | | | | | | |
| Total No. of Regular Staff | 15 | 23 | 28 | 13 | 79 | 33 | 7 | 40 | 30 | 13 | 43 | 83 | | | | | | |
| Male | 5 | 8 | 10 | 5 | 28 | 12 | 2 | 14 | 11 | 5 | 16 | 30 | | | | | | |
| Female | 10 | 15 | 18 | 8 | 51 | 21 | 5 | 26 | 19 | 8 | 27 | 53 | | | | | | |
| 7.3 Percentage of staff provided with compensation/benefits within timeline | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 99.29% | 99.06% | 99.32% | 94.68% | 75.81% | 76.26% | 76.52% | -23.5% | | | | 425 Staff have not yet submitted their clearance, DTR and Accomplishment report for the processing of their last salary claims for CY 2020 | Informed the concerned program supervisor, Admin staff in-charge and staff concerned of the delay in their salary and encouraged them to hasten the processing of their regional clearance for CY |
| Total No. of staff | 1,263 | 1,276 | 1,391 | 1,724 | 1,859 | 1,263 | 1,276 | 1,315 | 1,391 | 1,724 | 1,761 | 1,810 | | | | | , | 2020 |
| No.of Staff Receiving Salary and Benefits on Time | 1,263 | 1,276 | 1,391 | 1,724 | 1,859 | 1,254 | 1,264 | 1,306 | 1,317 | 1,307 | 1,343 | 1,385 | | | | | | |
| Legal Services | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <u> </u> | |
| 7.4 Percentage of disciplinary cases resolved within timeline | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | _ | | | | |
| Total No. of Disciplinary Cases Resolved | | | | | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| No.of Disciplinary Cases Resolved within Timeline | | | | | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| 7.4.1 Number of disciplinary cases initiated | | | | | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| 7.4.2 Number of disciplinary cases/complaints resolved | | | | | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| 7.5 Percentage of litigated cases resolved in favor of the Department or Department Personnel | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| No. of Litigated Cases Resolved with Favorable Outcome | | | | | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| Total No.of Litigated Cases Resolved | | | | | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| 7.5.1 Number of hearings attended | | | | | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| 7.5.2 Number of preliminmary investigations and/or case conferences attended | | | | | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| 7.6 Percentage of requests for legal assistance addressed | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| No. of Legal Assistance Requests Addressed | | | | | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| Total No.of Legal Assistance Requests | | | | | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| 7.6.1 Number of written legal opinions provided | | | | | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| 7.6.2 Number of TAs provided to clients | 1 | | | | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| | 1 | | 1 | | | I | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | HPMES FORM 4B |
|---------------|---|------|------|--------|--------|----------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|----------|----------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| ١, | Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ | | PH | YSICAL | TARGET | | | | PHY | SICAL ACCOMPL | ISHMENT | | | | Assess | ment of V | | | |
| , | Performance Indicator | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Q1 | Q2 | 1st Semester | Q3 | Q4 | 2nd Semester | Total | Variance | Major (>+/- | Minor (≤ +/- 30%) | Full Target Achieved | Reasons for Variance | Steering Measures / Remarks |
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (09) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14) | (15) | (16) | (17) | (18) | (19) |
| Adminis | strative Services | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7.7 N | umber of facilities repaired/renovated | 0 | 0 | 9 | 7 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 7 | 16 | 16 | 0 | _ | | | | |
| 7.8 P | ercentage of real properties titled | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | ANA | -% | -% | -% | -% | -% | -% | -% | | | | | | |
| N | o.of Real Properties with Title | - | - | - | - | ANA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | |
| Т | otal No.of DSWD-owned Real Properties | - | - | - | - | ANA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | |
| 7.9 N | umber of vehicles maintained and managed | 0 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 9 | 0 | | | | | -Unduplicated number of vehicles maintained and managed -4 vehicles were repaired twice within the year (Toyota SJS254, Toyota SEP275, JMC SKC 762 & Isuzu SKD254) |
| 7.10 P | ercentage of records digitized/disposed: | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| a | . Percentage of records digitized | 10% | 20% | 20% | 20% | 70% | 100% | -% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 30% | 0 | | | 30% variance due to Actual Documents Recieved from Central Office, LGUs & other National Government Agencies were digitized according to plan. | |
| | Number of records digitized | - | - | - | - | - | 2,505 | 0 | 2,505 | 1,220 | 1,650 | 2,870 | 5,375 | | | | | | |
| | Number of records identified for digitization | - | - | - | - | - | 2,505 | 0 | 2,505 | 1,220 | 1,650 | 2,870 | 5,375 | | | | | | |
| b | . Percentage of records disposed | - | - | - | 100% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | -% | -% | -% | 0% | -100% | | 0 | | No Approval from NAP | |
| | Number of records disposed | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | |
| | Number of records identified for disposal | - | - | - | - | - | 15 | 10 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | | | | | | |
| Financia | al Management | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7.11 P | ercentage of budget utilized: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a | . Actual Obligations Over Actual Allotment Incurred | - | - | - | - | 96%-100% | 32.84% | 69.52% | 69.52% | 87.27% | 97.67% | 97.67% | 97.67% | 1.67% | | | | | |
| | Total Actual Obligation Incurred | | | | | | 694,451,908.39 | 2,664,494,910.36 | 2,664,494,910.36 | 3,772,499,721.54 | 4,562,596,198.83 | 4,562,596,198.83 | 4,562,596,198.83 | | | | | | Composition of total allotment: Fund 101 Current and Continuing Fund 102 Current and Continuing |
| | Total Actual Annual Allotment Received | | | | | | 2,114,724,181.01 | 3,832,679,635.15 | 3,832,679,635.15 | 4,322,742,924.11 | 4,671,426,923.72 | 4,671,426,923.72 | 4,671,426,923.72 | | | | | | Automatic Appropriations Trust Fund (RJJWC) |
| b Ir | . Actual Disbursements over Actual Obligations ncurred | - | - | - | - | 96%-100% | 57.99% | 88.94% | 88.94% | 89.91% | 89.11% | 89.11% | 89.11% | -6.89% | | | | | |
| | Total Actual Disbursement | | | | | | 402,688,384.22 | 2,369,738,941.94 | 2,369,738,941.94 | 3,391,821,098.74 | 4,065,932,301.85 | 4,065,932,301.85 | 4,065,932,301.85 | | | | | | |
| | Total Actual Annual Obligation Incurred | | | | | | 694,451,908.39 | 2,664,494,910.36 | 2,664,494,910.36 | 3,772,499,721.54 | 4,562,596,198.83 | 4,562,596,198.83 | 4,562,596,198.83 | | | | | | |
| 7.12 P | ercentage of cash advance liquidated | | • | • | • | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a | . Advances to officers and employees | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 73.5% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.0% | 0.0% | | 0 | ✓ | | |
| | Total Amount Liquidated | | | | | | 192,520.15 | 69,529.45 | 262,049.60 | 0.00 | 34,600.88 | 34,600.88 | 296,650.48 | | | | | | |
| | Total Cash Advance Processed | | | | | | 262,049.60 | 0.00 | 262,049.60 | 19,950.00 | 14,650.88 | 34,600.88 | 296,650.48 | | | | | | |
| b. | . Advances to SDOs: | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | b.1 Current Year | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 76.8% | 74.00% | 91.00% | 85.00% | 91.00% | 95.61% | 97.4% | -2.6% | | | | | |
| | Total Amount Liquidated | | | | | | 212,503,276.44 | 78,214,926.43 | 290,718,202.87 | 776,148,170.50 | 415,152,255.65 | 1,191,300,426.15 | 1,482,018,629.02 | | | | | | |
| | Total Cash Advance Processed | | | | | | 276,754,427.44 | 41,844,905.43 | 318,599,332.87 | 887,273,665.14 | 315,641,974.79 | 1,202,915,639.93 | 1,521,514,972.80 | | | | | | |
| | b.2 Prior Years | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | -% | -% | -% | -% | -% | -% | -% | | | | | | |
| | Total Amount Liquidated | | | | | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | | | | |
| | Total Cash Advance Processed | | | | | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | | | | |

| | | | PHY | YSICAL T | ARGET | | | | PHYS | ICAL ACCOMPL | ISHMENT | | | | Assess | ment of \ | Variance | | HPMES FORM 4B |
|-------|--|------|------|----------|-------|-------|---------------|--------|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------|-----------------|----------------|----------------------------|----------------------|---|
| | Objective/ Program/ Sub-Program/ Performance Indicator | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Q1 | Q2 | 1st Semester | Q3 | Q4 | 2nd Semester | Total | Variance | Major | Minor | Full Target Achieved | Reasons for Variance | Steering Measures / Remarks |
| | | Q1 | Q2 | ŲS | Q4 | Iotai | Q1 | Q2 | 1st semester | ŲS | Q4 | 2nd Semester | Total | | (> +/- 30%) | (≤ +/- 30%) | 0% | | |
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (09) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14) | (15) | (16) | (17) | (18) | (19) |
| | c. Inter-agency transferred funds | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | c.1 Current Year | 50% | 50% | 50% | 50% | 50% | -% | -% | -% | -% | -% | -% | -% | | | | | | |
| | Total Amount Liquidated | | | | | | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | | | | |
| | Total Cash Advance Processed | | | | | | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | | | | |
| | c.2 Prior Years | 75% | 75% | 75% | 75% | 75% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.0% | 25.0% | | | | | |
| | Total Amount Liquidated | | | | | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 20,002,747.59 | 20,002,747.59 | 20,002,747.59 | | | | | | |
| | Total Cash Advance Processed | | | | | | 20,002,747.59 | 0.00 | 20,002,747.59 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | 20,002,747.59 | | | | | | |
| 7.13 | Percentage of AOM responded within timeline | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100.0% | 0% | | | | | |
| | No.of AOM Responded withinTimeline | | | | | | 12 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 13 | | | | | | |
| | Total No.of AOM Received | | | | | | 12 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 13 | | | | | | |
| 7.14 | Percentage of NS/ND complied within timeline | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | -% | -% | -% | -% | -% | -% | -% | | | | | | |
| | No. of Notice of Suspension/Notice of Disallowances Responded within Timeline | 0 | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | |
| | No. of Notice of Suspension/Notice of Disallowances Received | 0 | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | |
| Procu | rement Services | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7.15 | Percentage of procurement projects completed in accordance with applicable rules and regulations | - | - | - | 80.0% | 80.0% | 94.9% | 82.09% | 91.88% | 80.33% | 87.16% | 84.08% | 87.15% | 7.15% | | | | | |
| | Total No.of PR Received | - | - | - | - | - | 661 | 201 | 862 | 600 | 732 | 1332 | 2194 | | | | | | |
| | No. of PR Processes Awarded and Contracted on Time | - | - | - | - | - | 627 | 165 | 792 | 482 | 638 | 1120 | 1912 | | | | | | |
| 7.16 | Percentage compliance with reportorial requirements from oversight agencies | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | -% | 100.00% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100.0% | 0% | 0 | | | | |
| | Total No.of Reports Required by Oversight Agencies | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 1 | 10 | 14 | | | | | | Submitted Certificate of Compliance of Early Procurement Activities (EPA) |
| | No.of Reports Required by Oversight Agencies | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 1 | 10 | 14 | | | | | | |

HPMES FORM 4B

| | | | | OBLIGA | ATION | | | | | DISBURS | EMENT | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|------------|--------------|--------------|--------------------------|------------------------|--------------|------------|------------|--------------|--------------|------------------------|
| Program/Activity/Project | Allocated Budget | | | Amount | | | Percent Utilization | | | Amount | | | Percent Utilization |
| | Duuget | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Total | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Total |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) = (3)+(4)+(5)+(6) | (8)=(7)/(2) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14)=(13)/(7) |
| GENERAL ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General Management and Supervision | 6,690,199.00 | 2,639,035.10 | 104,197.17 | 1,458,261.08 | 2,389,965.30 | 6,591,458.65 | 98.52% | 1,368,817.50 | 429,308.35 | 931,723.33 | 1,971,116.94 | 4,700,966.12 | 71.32% |
| MOOE (Current Allotment) | 6,690,199.00 | 2,639,035.10 | 104,197.17 | 1,458,261.08 | 2,389,965.30 | 6,591,458.65 | 98.52% | 1,368,817.50 | 429,308.35 | 931,723.33 | 1,971,116.94 | 4,700,966.12 | 71.32% |

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

JERARD T. MATILDOASUNCION S. FLAUTAALDIE MAE A. ANDOYRAMEL F. JAMENStatistician IAO V, Budget OfficerSWO IV, OIC - Chief, PPDOIC - Regional Director

| | | | | OBLIGATION | NOITA | | | | - | DISBURSEMENT | MENT | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------|--|------------|--------------|--------------|--|------------------------|---|------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------------------|
| Program/Activity/Project | Allocated | | | Amount | | | Percent Utilization | | | Amount | | | Percent Utilization |
| | 200 | 10 | Q2 | Q3 | 24 | Total | Total | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total | Total |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) = (3)+(4)+(5)+(6) | (8)=(7)/(2) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14)=(13)/(7 |
| GENERAL ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General Management and Supervision | 6,690,199.00 | 2,639,035.10 | 104,197.17 | 1,458,261.08 | 2,389,965.30 | 6,690,199.00 2,639,035.10 104,197.17 1,458,261.08 2,389,965.30 6,591,458.65 98.52% | | 1,368,817.50 429,308.35 931,723.33 1,971,116.94 4,700,966.12 71.32% | 429,308.35 | 931,723.33 | 1,971,116.94 | 4,700,966.12 | 71.32% |
| MODE (Current Allotment) | 6,690,199.00 | 2,639,035.10 104,197.17 1,458,261.08 2,389,965.30 6,591,458.65 | 104,197.17 | 1,458,261.08 | 2,389,965.30 | 6,591,458.65 | 98.52% | 1,368,817.50 | 429,308.35 | 931,723.33 | 1,971,116.94 | 4,700,966.12 | 71.32% |

Prepared by:

JERARD T. MATILDO Statistician I

AO V, Budget Officer

Noted by:

Reviewed by:

Approved by:

SWOTY, OTCL Chief, PAD

RAMEL F JAMEN
OIC - Regional Director