



**INTER-AGENCY TASK FORCE ON THE HARMONIZATION OF
NATIONAL GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE MONITORING, INFORMATION AND REPORTING SYSTEMS**
(Administrative Order No. 25 S. 2011)

AO25 Technical Working Group Meeting

August 18 2015, 2:00 PM to 5:00 PM

Manansala Ballroom, 2nd Floor, Sulo Riviera Hotel, Matalino St., Diliman, Quezon City

AO 25 TWG Members

1. Undersecretary Richard E. Moya, DBM
2. Assistant Secretary Myrna S. Chua, DBM
3. Assistant Secretary Eddie M. Nuque, OP-OES
4. Director Aniceto I. Maghirang, OP-OCS
5. Assistant Secretary Guillerma E. Flores, PMS
6. Assistant Secretary Ana Maria A. Cadena, PMS
7. Director Jennifer Tan, DOF
8. Commissioner Nieves L. Osorio, CSC
9. Atty. Alan R. Cañares, Office of the Ombudsman
10. SVP Magdalena L. Mendoza, DAP
11. Ms. Giselle Durana, CESB
12. Atty. Gerald James B. Reyes, GCG
13. Dir. Helene Grace Ramos, CSC

6. Mr. Daniel Lumain, GCG
7. Ms. Rosemarie C. Marquez

AO 25 Secretariat

1. Ms. Maria Rosario A. Ablan
2. Ms. Maya Katrina Gotis
3. Mr. Emerson Labang
4. Ms. Janice Cave
5. Ms. Anna Venica Cruz
6. Ms. Settie Sahara Mutia
7. Ms. Chollim May Vocal
8. Ms. Ma. Jane Kenneth Pundato
9. Ms. Marielle Jane Tumang
10. Mr. Feliciano Pimentel III
11. Mr. Ramir Fundimera
12. Ms. Nicole Marie Chantengco
13. Ms. Nadine Victoria Malapira
14. Mr. Raymond Buan
15. Ms. Ludivina Tebelin

Validating Agencies

1. Director Alberto H. Kimpo, OP-OES
2. Ms. Venice Teodoro, LWUA
3. Ms. Agatha Bellatrix Calces, DBM
4. Ms. Elvie Balan, COA
5. Ms. Rosie Santos, COA

DBM BMBs

1. Ms. Lucena Ledesma, DBM NCR
2. Ms. Evelyn Peralta, BMB D
3. Ms. Vilma Gorospe, BMB E
4. Consuelo V. Beltran, BMB A

Other Attendees

1. Mr. Meinard Versoza, OP-OES
2. Mr. Ogie Estrella, OP-OES
3. Mr. Rey M. Sabate, CHED
4. Ms. Gertudes P. Donato, COA
5. Ms. Tienan Donabel Gabaldon, PMS

1 **1. CALL TO ORDER**

- 2 • The meeting was called to order at 1:37 PM by Usec. Richard E. Moya.

4 **2. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JULY 10 TWG MEETING**

- 5 • Usec. Moya proposed the provisional approval of the minutes of the July 10 TWG meeting.

7 **AGREEMENTS:**

- 8 • TWG members may give their comments or reactions before 5:00 PM of 20 August 2015. If
9 the Secretariat does not receive any comments from the TWG members, the minutes shall
10 be deemed as final and approved.

12 **3. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE JULY 10 TWG MEETING**

13 **3.1 IPOPHL's eligibility for FY 2015 PEI**

- 14 • Ms. Maria Rosario Ablan ran through the business arising from the June 5 TWG meeting.
- 15
- 16 • First on the list was the eligibility of the IPOPHL for the one-month salary equivalent of PEI.
17 Ms. Ablan reported that IPOPHL was already eligible for the PEI 2015 and was already
18 informed that they were already authorized to release the PEI.
- 19
- 20 • Ms. Ablan informed the body that the case of Human Rights Victim Council (HRVC) under the
21 CHR was similar to IPOPHL. Per advice of Asec. Myrna Chua, the same rule used for IPOPHL
22 would be applied to HRVC, as well.
- 23
- 24 • Usec. Moya asked for clarification whether the issue was the lack of GAA-MFO and what
25 possible resolution can be adopted in the absence of GAA-MFO.
- 26
- 27 • Ms. Ablan replied that the agency was supposed to submit the proof that they meet their
28 targets submitted it to their mother agency to be validated by the latter. In the case of
29 IPOPHL, the agency submitted its accomplishments to DTI for the validation of their report.

31 **AGREEMENTS:**

- 32 • Moving forward, Usec. Moya gave instruction to institutionalize this case and other similar
33 cases. In the absence of GAA-MFO, the agencies must submit the proof that they meet their
34 targets and accomplishments as well as secure submission of these to their mother agencies.
- 35
- 36 • Generate the list of PEI/PBB-entitled agencies that have no MFO-indicators in the GAA and
37 institutionalize the TWG decision for this case (i.e. decision on the IPOPHL).

39 **3.2 COACHING SESSIONS FOR SUCS BY CHED**

- 40 • SUCs conducted a coaching session for SUCs on 17 August 2015. Another coaching session
41 was scheduled on 1 September 2015.
- 42
- 43 • Usec. Moya put forward there was a recommendation to conduct a similar coaching session
44 that is inter-agency in nature for agencies that are perennially failing to meet their targets or
45 comply with the good governance requirements of the PBB.
- 46
- 47 • It is assumed that GCG will also do a mentoring for the GOCCs covered by RA 10149.

51 **AGREEMENTS:**

- 52 • Create an inter-agency coaching group for agencies that are perpetually not meeting their
53 PBB targets and/or complying with the GGC requirements. There would be four sessions: 1
54 for SUCs, 1 for DepEd, 1 for GOCCs covered by DBM and 1 for LWDs.
55

56 **3.3 REVISE FY 2015 GUIDELINES BASED ON TWG COMMENTS**

- 57 • The third item was the revision of the 2015 guidelines based on the TWG comment last July
58 10. Ms. Ablan reported that it was already for signature of Sec. Abad and that the
59 Secretariat was just waiting for its official release.
60
61 • Usec. Moya asked to put on record that the FY 2015 PBB Guidelines that was not yet signed
62 was transmitted for the agencies to adopt.
63

64 **AGREEMENTS:**

- 65 • The Secretariat was instructed to remind Usec. Moya to remind Sec. Abad of the guidelines.
66

67 **3.4 INFORM DEPED, ARMM-DEPED, MMDA, DOTC, DBM AND DILG TO COMPLETE SUBMISSION**
68 **AND REMEDY DEFICIENCIES**

- 69 • Ms. Ablan reported the status of the submission/deficiencies and assessment of the
70 agencies mentioned above.
71
72 • ARMM-Deped was already assessed to be compliant by the BMB-D on 28 July 2015.
73
74 • MMDA was already assessed eligible for the grant for the PBB, but the Secretariat was just
75 awaiting the signed assessment of DBM-NCR.
76
77 • DOTC was already assessed to be compliant by the PMS on 23 July 2015.
78
79 • Final assessments of Form B of DBM and DILG were just awaiting the signature and
80 clearance from Usec. Third Bagro.
81
82 • Meanwhile, DepEd was given until July 31 by the TWG to submit their accomplishment
83 report and address their deficiencies in PhilGEPS. DepEd was first informed of the deadline
84 on July 14. Another strongly worded letter was sent to DepEd on July 24 to tell them that
85 the deadline will be on July 29.
86
87 • DepEd submitted accomplishment reports on 30 July and PhilGEPS-COC on 31 July. Per
88 PhilGEPS assessment on 3 August 2015, DepEd's submission was still incomplete. On 18
89 August, the Secretariat received the findings on DepEd's PhilGEPS compliance¹. Of the COCs
90 submitted, two divisions from Region VIII were validated to be not compliant with PhilGEPS.
91
92 • Meanwhile, per BMB-B's assessment on 4 August 2015, DepEd still had to submit additional
93 supporting data.
94
95 • DepEd was informed last August 11 that it needed to remedy its PhilGEPS deficiencies and
96 submit additional requirements to BMB-B by August 14. On 13 August, DepEd requested for
97 more time since the data will come from its field units. Ms. Ablan asked if the TWG would

¹ In relation to PhilGEPS' assessment of DepEd's compliance on August 3, PhilGEPS was requested to validate DepEd even if its submission was still incomplete.

still give DepEd units a chance to submit their PhilGEPS COCs and whether the TWG would still give additional time to submit the required documents by BMB-B.

- Usec. Moya recalled that there was a similar situation in the past wherein GCG requested, in behalf of the GOCCs under them, for an extension of deadline of submission of requirements. This was turned down by the TWG. Usec. Moya then asked if there would be an issue if DepEd's request for another extension be granted. Atty. Gerald Reyes responded that since DepEd's case was special, there would be no issue on the part of GCG.
- Director Albert Kimpo mentioned that during the previous TWG meeting, he was supposed to suggest that if DepEd still failed to submit the requirements for the PBB, they could adopt the mechanism in the previous PBB cycles wherein the validation of DepEd's compliance was on a per region basis. This way, those who are diligently complying with the requirements will be rewarded ahead of others. He then asked if there was a DepEd region that has fully complied with all the requirements.
- Ms. Ablan explained that as of that day, there were 15 DepEd units that did not submit yet their PhilGEPS COCs. Those that did not submit include units from Regions 4, 12, Kalinga Apayao, Mt. Province, Capiz, Tagbilaran; and attached agencies such as National Book Development Council, National Council for Childrens Television, Philippine High School for the Arts, Early Childhood Development Center. There were also those that submitted COCs but not signed by BAC Chair and HOPE including units from Rizal, Negros Oriental, Surigao Del Sur, Tarlac and Dinagal Island. There were two DepEd units that were still deficient in PhilGEPS. And the whole DepEd still needed to comply with the additional requirements requested by BMB-B.
- Usec. Moya then asked if it would be possible to proceed with the awarding of PBB to DepEd groups (i.e., division groups) that were already assessed to be compliant with PBB.
- SVP Mendoza replied that it would be difficult because first, they have to satisfy the good governance conditions and as of that day, 17 DepEd offices have yet to remedy deficiencies in PhilGEPS. Second, assuming that those that were still not compliant with PhilGEPS would be isolated, the physical accomplishment of the entire DepEd still had to be assessed. DepEd ranked the schools within a division, but this would happen only if the division was assessed to achieve its targets.
- Usec. Moya then conceded and raised that the options then were just to extend the deadline of submission of DepEd or disqualify the agency. He asked the body if there was a creative but ethically correct way to proceed with the grant of the bonus to DepEd, so that only those DepEd units that would remain not compliant will be elevated to the AO 25 IATF and not the entire agency.
- Dir. Kimpo put forward what he learned from Sec. Bro. Armin Luistro, as of SY 2014-2015, there were about 46,624 public schools in the country, approximately 21M public school students and about 684,489 public school teachers. These are the figures that will be affected by the decision of the IATF on this matter.
- Director Aniceto Maghirang suggested having a TWG meeting with DepEd Mancom.

- 148 • SVP Mendoza said that DepEd is actually following a different timeline insofar as the

149 submission of performance accomplishment is concerned. DepEd is required to submit their

150 accomplishment report in April of the following year considering the DepEd follows the

151 School Year calendar. Thus theoretically, DepEd has still some windows of extension to

152 complete their compliance. She added that historically, DepEd's bonus is given within the

153 October to December period. In fact DepEd is always reminded of their requirements before

154 September in anticipation of the Teachers day in the said month.

155
- 156 • SVP Mendoza added that perhaps there was a need to sit down with DepEd to really pin

157 down the problem. Other than their PBB Focal Persons, the officials in other DepEd regions

158 and units should also be invited so that the TWG can isolate which DepEd units are not yet

159 compliant.

160
- 161 • Usec. Moya then pointed out that perhaps DepEd might require a different system

162 altogether. He asked the body if this should be considered for discussion or should this be

163 tackled during the next PBB cycle. If so, then the TWG just needed to agree to extend the

164 deadline for DepEd and just treat them on a per-region basis. Usec. Moya asked SVP

165 Mendoza if the conflict in the timeline of DepEd was already considered in the new

166 Guidelines.

167
- 168 • SVP Mendoza reiterated that with regard to FY 2014 PBB the timeline of DepEd was already

169 considered. DepEd's accomplishment report was scheduled to be submitted on April 2014.

170 However, for the good governance conditions, DepEd needed to follow the schedule

171 imposed on other agencies. However, in DepEd's case, they tend to observe the April

172 deadline even for the good governance conditions.

173
- 174 • In connection with suggestion of Dir. Kimpo, Usec. Moya asked if it would be practical to

175 assess DepEd on a per region basis. He also asked what was still being aggregated that

176 delayed the final assessment of DepEd.

177
- 178 • SVP Mendoza replied that the validation of DepEd is actually on a per region and division

179 bases. However, as already mentioned, the overall eligibility of the whole DepEd must first

180 be determined before the Divisions and Schools can be ranked. In any case, as in the past, it

181 was already assumed that all schools would be eligible.

182
- 183 • Asec. Nuque suggested that since it was assumed that DepEd will qualify, while waiting for

184 the rating and ranking report, perhaps a 5000-peso across the board bonus may already be

185 advanced to DepEd. Then the remaining bonus will just be granted to DepEd as top up.

186
- 187 • Usec. Moya supported the suggestion of Asec. Nuque. He recommended to draft a

188 resolution wherein it is stated that the task force is allowing the already compliant DepEd

189 units and give them the minimum Php5, 000.00 (five thousand pesos) in addition internally,

190 to allow the *remaining 17 units* to still submit their requirements. The extension of

191 addressing the issue on PHILGEPS posting would only be until the end of August and the first

192 draft is expected to be done by September 5 concurrent to the Teacher's Day.

193
- 194 • Commissioner Nieves Osorio suggested that the TWG secure first the approval of the IATF

195 Principals before the 5,000-peso across the board bonus is advanced to DepEd.

196

197

AGREEMENTS:

- Draft recommendation to the IATF allowing the grant of 5,000 Php to DepEd employees. The top-up (remaining amount of the PBB) to be granted later once DepEd submitted its rating and ranking report (Form 1.0).
- Schedule a meeting with DepEd ManCom to discuss how DepEd can comply with the requirements of the PBB. TWG members are invited but are not required to attend
- Inform DepEd that it has two weeks upon receipt of the letter to comply with the requirements

3.5 CONDUCT OF APCPI ORIENTATION

- Ms. Ablan reported that the AO25 Secretariat organized and conducted the APCPI Orientation with the GPPB last July 15. 29 TWG members from 12 member-agencies attended.

3.6 PROPOSAL ENSURING THE QUALITY OF VALIDATION/ASSESSMENT FOR FY 2015 PBB COMPLIANCE

- Part of the main agenda.

4. BUSINESS OF THE DAY

4.1 STATUS OF RELEASE OF FY 2014 PBB

- As of 18 August 2015, out of the 160 agencies qualified for PBB, only 36 received their PBB.
- For the State Universities and Colleges (SUCs), the exact number is not yet available, but the amount of PBB that was already paid out by the DBM is already included in the Php 1.8 billion released.
- Usec. Moya asked if the Secretariat received any issue with regard to the release of the PBB or if it was just awaiting the ranking of the agencies. Ms. Ablan replied that the TWG is just awaiting the ranking reports from the Departments. Usec. Moya then noted for confirmation that the TWG has already done its judgment on the eligibility of the agencies and that there are no other agencies that was still being assessed other than DepEd.

4.2 STATUS OF APPEAL FY 2014 PBB

- Ms. Ablan reported that there were 10 GOCCs under GCG that appealed to the AO 25 TWG. The TWG already sent them a letter informing them that TWG was firm in honoring the findings of the validating agencies. Thus, if they appeal to be delisted from the NC list, they would have to make the appeal to the validating/oversight agencies. She then reported the status of each agency appealing:
 - a) National Tobacco Administration was assessed to be not compliant with PhilGEPS and SALN. PhilGEPS gave NTA a chance to rectify their deficiency. NTA also visited the Office of the President to appeal about their SALN and per OP-OES, NTA was already compliant with SALN as of 18 August 2015.
 - b) Philippine Crop Insurance Corporation was assessed to be not compliant with ARTA. Nevertheless PCIC again appealed even though the Secretariat already relayed to them the decision of the TWG accepting the validation of the CSC.

- c) Mactan-Cebu International Airport Authority (MCIAA) was also assessed to be not compliant with ARTA. They were already informed of the TWG decision but was still appealing their case.
- d) The AFP Retirement and Separation Benefits System (AFPRSBS) was not compliant with Transparency Seal. However, according to DBM-OCIO, they already closed the validation for TS.
- e) LBP Resources and Development Corporation (LBRDC) was not compliant with SALN.
- f) National Dairy Authority (NDA) was not compliant with ARTA.
- g) National Irrigation Administration (NIA) was not compliant with ARTA and PhilGEPS. When the Secretariat sent feedback to NIA, there was no feedback received from NIA expressing interest to appeal again.
- h) People's Television Network, Inc. (PTNI) was not compliant with ARTA and SALN. Similar with NIA, when the Secretariat gave feedback to PTV (PTNI), the Secretariat did not receive feedback if PTNI would appeal again.
- i) Philippine Coconut Authority (PCA) was not compliant with ARTA.
- j) Sugar Regulatory Administration (SRA) was not compliant with ARTA.
- On the GOCCs that were assessed to be not compliant with ARTA, Commissioner Osorio shared that based on their agreement with GCG after the last TWG meeting, CSC conducted re-validation of ARTA Compliance of 11 GOCCs under GCG.
 - The 11 GOCCs were grouped into three. The first group included GOCCs that have not yet addressed their Citizen Charter and deficiencies and as of August 7, report no COC submission to regional offices concerned.
 - The second group included GOCCs that were requesting for reconsideration of their compliance with Citizens Charter. All six GOCCs under this group submitted their COCs beyond May 29, but attested that they submitted and/or addressed their deficiencies even prior to May 29. These GOCCs are: MCIAA, NDA, NIA, PCIC, Philippine Aerospace Development Corporation (PADC), and SRA. She noted that the CSC regional office had a miscommunication with two of these GOCCs. The CSC field office was instructed to immediately give feedback on the site once it visited the agencies and to **require submission of Certificate of Compliance within three days after visit. Said certification is proof that the office has already addressed the deficiencies.** However, it was found out by CSC that the GOCCs were **informed by GCG**, through memo or email, that CSC would revisit the GOCCs to re-validate **which is not the policy.**
 - The third group, which included PTNI and PCA, were those that submitted their COCs beyond the May 29 deadline.
 - Commissioner Osorio said that for the first group, she would leave the decision to the TWG whether they would be given an opportunity to still address their ARTA deficiencies or not. Meanwhile for the second group, she recommended to the TWG to accept the re-validated results of the CSC.

- For the third group, Dir. Helene Grace Ramos explained that based on their data PTNI complied with the Service Charter by July 13, 2015 whereas the deadline was last May. Meanwhile, PCA was indeed non-compliant with ARTA since there were still three PCA regional offices that had deficiencies in ARTA and of the three offices, only two submitted COCs. The two regional offices were already validated to be compliant with ARTA.
- For PCA, Asec. Nuque asked if there would be isolation given that there was only one regional office that was still not compliant. However, Comm. Osorio clarified that there was no isolation in ARTA.
- Reiterating the recommendations of Commissioner Osorio, Usec. Moya instructed the Secretariat to note that there was a consensus that the first group was already considered non-compliant. For the second group, Usec. Moya asked if there was any objection to the recommendation of CSC to consider them compliant. There being none, Usec. Moya then deferred to the recommendation of CSC. Meanwhile for the third group, PTNI was recommended to be compliant with ARTA while PCA was recommended to be non-compliant.
- Along the discussion of the revalidation, Commissioner Osorio raised that the consideration granted to the 7 agencies that were re-assessed as compliant will only apply in FY 2014 PBB. Going forward, the GCG and CSC will have an improved and written process on the validation of GOCCs service charter/ARTA compliance.

AGREEMENTS:

- There being no objections to the recommendations of the CSC, the TWG deferred to the CSC's validation. However, the result of the ARTA validation should not prejudice the validation of other good governance conditions.

4.3 ORIENTATION FOR THE GUIDELINES ON THE GRANT OF FY 2015 PBB

- Ms. Ablan reported that the AO 25 Secretariat conducted PBB orientations for SUCs last 13 August 2015 and for the OEOs and GOCCs covered by DBM on 18 August 2015. For the SUCs 230 individuals from 109 SUCs attended. Meanwhile 104 individuals from 50 OEOs and GOCCs attended the orientation for OEOs and GOCCs. The participation rate for SUCs was 96% (109/113) and 98% (50/51) for OEOs and GOCCs covered by DBM
- Another orientation for the departments and constitutional offices would be conducted on 20 August 2015.
- During the orientation for SUCs, a short survey was given to the participants as a way of getting feedback on the PBB implementation and process. The participants scored the questions/areas of concern with 1 for Strongly Disagree to 5 as Strongly Agree. The survey for the OEOs and GOCCs has yet to be computed since it was conducted earlier that day.
- Ms. Ablan ran through the questions/areas of concern that were asked during the survey and the average response rate of the respondents for that specific question.

- First, the participants were asked whether they agree or disagree on the PBBs contribution to their respective agencies' monitoring and organizational performance. The average response rate was 4.46. On whether the PBB contributed to the performance of the SUCs employees, the average response rate was 4.08. How the PBB contributed to SUCs serving the public got an average response rate of 4.15.
- Whether the participants agree or disagree that the IATF provides clear guidelines and directive got an average response rate of 3.9. Participants were also asked whether the PBB was fair, particularly CHED, in validating the MFOs of the SUCs/agencies, the average response rate was 4.2. For the GASS Accomplishment validation for ROs, the average response rate was 4.25; the ARTA validation by CSC got 4.25; the Report on Aging by COA got 4.25; the PhilGEPS posting, the Transparency and the SALN by OP, OMBUDSMAN and CSC all got above 4.0 average response rate;
- Participants were also asked if they agree or disagree that the RBPMS website provides accurate information, the average response rate was 3.63. On whether they agree or disagree that the RBPMS website was regularly updated, the average response was 3.49.
- On whether the AO 25 Secretariat staff can address PBB-related questions, the Secretariat got an average response rate of 4.11. Meanwhile, for same question, CHED got 3.93 and DBM ROs got 3.99. When asked if the staff were easy to contact, AO 25 got 4.13; CHED got 4.13 and DBM ROs got 4.19.
- Also during the workshop, participants were asked to group themselves and discuss what positive changes/experiences in their respective organizations, which could be attributed from the PBB implementation. They were also asked to suggest areas for improvement for the PBB.
- Among the positive changes/experiences, which they attributed to the PBB were as follows:
 - The PBB helped in the implementation of SPMS
 - There are SUCs that have PBB focal persons per campus
 - They have better MFOs and Indicators
 - Better planning and high compliance to the guidelines
 - Delivery units are more aware of the their targets
 - Monetary incentives changed the behavior of SUCs on the way they perform
 - SUCs became more performance-oriented
 - Established greater intra-delivery unit accountability
- Meanwhile for the areas of improvement, one of the suggestions from the SUCs was to increase the distribution of "better" and "best" among the delivery units and individuals to 50% of the total employees who are eligible for the grant of the PBB.

- 379 • Along this line, Usec. Moya proposed to commission a study on the improvements needed

380 to amend EO 80 to allow modifications and improvement of the rating and ranking

381 distribution scheme.

382
- 383 • SVP Mendoza mentioned that the World Bank conducted a study on the pay scale in the

384 Philippine Civil Service and one particular aspect they examined is the PBB. World Bank gave

385 some recommendations, which might be used in improving the rating and ranking scheme of

386 the PBB in the future cycles. Meanwhile, SVP Mendoza proposed to allow the AO 25

387 Secretariat consolidate first all the suggestions and reactions received on how to simplify the

388 rating and ranking process and have them presented to the TWG.

389
- 390 • Usec. Moya pointed out two things insofar as the rating and ranking process is concerned.

391 First, modifications should be finalized by 2017 cycle as this is covered by a law. Second,

392 there should be a constant coordination with OPCCB (Asec. Myrna Chua) because a new

393 compensation scheme might take into effect and as the salary of the employees increases

394 under the new pay scheme (SSL), the variable component on performance also increases.

395
- 396 • For the first point, SVP Mendoza volunteered that a minute modification may already be

397 made on the rating and ranking by 2016.

398
- 399 • Another area for improvement suggested was the early issuance of the

400 guidelines/memorandum circular.

401
- 402 • SUCs were also requesting for assistance in order to meet their performance indicators.

403 Ms. Ablan mentioned that it seemed that SUCs had a hard time computing for the rate of

404 accomplishments

405
- 406 • SUCs were also requesting to still allow them to negotiate their targets and indicators, which

407 are already reflected in the GAA because they fear that what they committed in the GAA

408 may not be attainable.

409
- 410 • In view of this and the preceding issue, Usec. Moya recommended for the SUCs to meet with

411 BMB-B and CHED to discuss with them and/or negotiate their GAA indicators and targets.

412 Whatever the recommendations of BMB-B and CHED would be will be discussed in the TWG

413 meeting. The key point to be decided by the TWG is whether they would keep whatever in

414 the GAA as it is the policy or reconsider accepting the negotiated targets and indicators of

415 the SUCs based on the unified recommendations of BMB-B and CHED.

416
- 417 • There was also a suggestion to give the agencies early feedback on the results of their

418 validation. With regard to this, Usec. Moya instructed the Secretariat to give the agencies a

419 copy of the results of the validation. And while he acknowledged that the Secretariat was

420 actually providing the agencies with the results of the validation thru letter, Usec. Moya also

421 suggested that the best possible means to provide the validation results was by posting the

422 results on the RBPMS website.

423
- 424 • Ms. Ablan continued, citing that one of improvements suggested was the standardization of

425 the performance evaluation across individuals (rating and ranking formula).

426

- SVP Mendoza said that this was in relation to another suggestion, which was to make explicit in the guidelines the merging of PMT and PMG. According to her, there were SUCs whose PMGs or PMTs could not address certain issues pertaining to performance evaluation and rating and ranking. Thus they prefer to have the restrictions and other criteria be explicitly specified in the guidelines so that they will just refer to the guidelines when making decisions.
- However, SVP Mendoza explained to the SUCs that it was not recommended to include all the rules and mechanisms in the guidelines as this would curtail the flexibility of the head of the agency in making decisions.
- Usec. Moya remarked that in an open government, transparency breaches trust. He noted that there is a trust issue within the management of the SUCs. He added that it would be better to empower the bureaucracy by giving them flexibility than have guidelines that are very restrictive but with so many exceptions. All that was needed was to empower the SUCs management.
- Per Usec. Moya, since the creation of a PMT is a requirement under the CSC policy for the establishment of SPMS, SUCs should instead write to the CSC. On the part of the AO 25 TWG, similar issues can be relayed to the CSC, but ultimately the TWG would only defer to the decision of the oversight group.
- Asec. Nuque commented that if the leadership of an SUC is hands-on, his/her logical guidance for the SUC is to merge the PMT and the PMG. For an instance, in the case of OP; the guidance of the AO 25 to create a PMG was followed. But upon the issuance of CSC's guidelines on SPMS, OP established its PMT to function as a PMG as well. In essence, the functions of the PMT as per the CSC guidelines were infused with the functions of the PMG as stated in the PBB guidelines.
- Ms. Ablan reported that the last comment was to make the amount of PBB higher than PEI. Since it was more difficult to comply with the requirements of PBB than with PEI's, the amount of PBB should be higher than the amount of PEI.
- Usec. Moya agreed to the comment. However, because the conditions for the amount of PBB should be within the provisions of EO 80, it is more convenient to make modifications and improvement on PEI. In any case, the grant of PEI has made the burden of the AO 25 TWG a lot lighter for this year. Since the amount of PEI is higher than the PBB, some of those who did not qualify for PBB but qualified for PEI did not appeal anymore, thus, reducing the number of issues that must be discussed and appeals that must be decided by the TWG.

AGREEMENTS:

- Regarding the suggestion to increase the number of best individuals, Usec. Moya instructed to commission a study on how to improve ranking and distribution of PBB in coordination with OPCCB.
- In line with the SUCs request to allow them to negotiate their GAA targets, a meeting between SUCs, CHED and BMB-B should be organized. Joint recommendations by BMB-B and CHED will be presented and discussed by the TWG.

- The Secretariat to give feedback to the agencies as soon as possible thru a formal letter. Also, all results should be posted on the RBPMS website.

4.4 PROPOSED GUIDELINES ENSURING THE QUALITY OF FY 2015 PBB VALIDATION/ASSESSMENT

Highlights of the Proposed Guidelines Ensuring the Quality of Validation/Assessment for FY 2015 PBB

- Ms. Ablan proceeded to the presentation of the proposed guidelines on the quality assurance and validation for FY 2015 PBB. Reiterating what was presented during the July 10 TWG meeting, Ms. Ablan reported that in the FY 2015 process flow, a pre-assessment of agencies compliance shall be conducted starting September 1. Then agencies should submit their GGCs starting December 1. Starting January 15 agencies will submit their accomplishment reports and the validation process will be conducted until March.
- For FY 2015 PBB, three pay-outs will be expected – 1st payout would be on February 29, 2016 based on as of January 29 NC list; 2nd payout would be on March 31, 2016 based on as of February 26 NC list; and the last would be after the 2016 national elections based on as of March 31 NC list.
- With regard to the payout, Usec. Moya also announced that there was a proposal to advance a 5,000-bonus to individuals once their agency qualified for the PBB and while the rating and ranking of the agency is still being finalized by the agency and reviewed by DBM. Once the rating and ranking report is approved, the additional bonus commensurate to the ranking of the individuals will then be released.
- In relation to the payout dates, Ms. Ablan reported that it was also one of the guiding principles for FY 2015 PBB to uphold the authority of the validating/oversight agencies to withhold PBB. Along this line, Usec. Moya suggested to also allow the oversight agencies to appeal in behalf of the agencies they are overseeing/supervising.
- Meanwhile, Atty. Reyes raised that instead of the indicating the payout dates, the ones that should be explicitly reflected are the dates of submission of the requirements.
- SVP Mendoza cleared that the deadlines of submission were already reflected in the Memorandum Circular. The schedule that was being presented was actually for the perusal of the TWG. The purpose of publishing the payout dates instead of the date of submission is to trigger the facilitation of the validation.
- SVP Mendoza explained that as early as now, the validating/oversight agencies (for SALN, financial statements, APP, Transparency Seal and ARTA) may already conduct their pre-assessment. Hence, by December 1, it will be expected that almost all agencies would already be able to comply with the Good Governance Conditions and other requirements. Nonetheless, during the validation period the validating/oversight agencies may already coordinate with the agencies the results of their validation and give them opportunity to rectify their deficiencies until before the issuance of the NC list.
- Still on the payout schedule, Comm. Osorio asked if the payout dates indicated meant the release of the SARO and NCA, to which SVP Mendoza confirmed. Comm. Osorio then suggested that DBM should then be aware of the payout dates.

- 526 • Usec. Moya noted and gave instruction to inform as well the office releasing the PBB of the

527 work plan of the TWG to ensure that they observe the payout schedule. In addition, Usec.

528 Moya raised that there should be a parallel processing of the validation of the

529 accomplishments and good governance compliance, review of the rating and ranking report,

530 and processing of payout. For the past PBB cycles, the review of the rating and ranking

531 report was contingent upon the results of assessment of the agency performance and good

532 governance compliance. This time, the oversight and validating agencies should already be

533 proactive; all documents must be processed so that when approved, DBM will just release

534 the bonus.

535
- 536 • At this point, Asec. Chua suggested that for FY 2015, the Secretariat may already issue the

537 final validation/assessment of the agencies even without the final or approved Form 1.0.

538 Usec. Moya affirmed and added that the initial 5,000 Php may already be released to the

539 individuals.

540
- 541 • Asec. Chua also suggested putting into writing the proposed guidelines ensuring the quality

542 of validation for FY 2015 PBB into writing which can be routed to the members for

543 comments. Usec. Moya then reminded everyone that the proposed guidelines for quality

544 assurance was only for the TWG members. Hence should not be released to agencies.

545
- 546 • For the validation of the Good Governance Conditions, Ms. Ablan recalled that during the

547 last TWG meeting, it was agreed to have a pre-assessment three months before the actual

548 submission of the compliance certifications.

549
- 550 • The Secretariat surveyed the oversight/validating agencies on whether they can conduct a

551 pre-assessment within the given period or not. DBM-OCIO, CSC, and GPPB confirmed that

552 they can do the pre-assessment for the Transparency Seal, ARTA, APCPI and APP,

553 respectively.

554
- 555 • Regarding PhilGEPS, since the coverage of postings that must be reflected in the certificate

556 of compliance with PhilGEPS is from January 1, 2015 to November 30, 2015, it would not be

557 possible for PhilGEPS to do a pre-assessment. Instead, they will provide a link where

558 agencies can monitor the status of their procurement postings. Also for PhilGEPS, the “first

559 come, first served” policy shall be applied.

560
- 561 • Asec. Nuque recalled that there was a suggestion in the previous TWG meeting to conduct

562 the pre-assessment earlier instead of three (3) months before December 1 since there were

563 requirements that should have been submitted in the early part of the year.

564
- 565 • SVP Mendoza clarified that the “three months prior to December 1” has already

566 commenced. She also added that the purpose of the pre-assessment was to let the

567 oversight give feedback to the agencies and allow the latter to rectify their deficiencies even

568 before the actual validation. No NC list would be issued during this period.

569
- 570 • Meanwhile, Usec. Moya asked if it would be possible to convert the forms required under

571 the FY 2015 Guidelines into web forms including the performance accomplishments. This

572 way, instead of using an excel file, agencies just have to input their report them on the

573 webforms. He asked if the TWG has the temperament, capacity and resources to do it.

574

- 575 • Ms. Ablan replied that the RBPMS website was being updated and the Secretariat was

576 already talking to a developer and looking into the possibility of allowing the validating

577 agencies to have access to the website and be able to post online the status of agency

578
- 579 • On spot-checking and independent validation of accomplishment reports, validation may be

580 conducted with the involvement of the CSOs. Ms. Ablan reported that an initial meeting

581 with the DBM CSO-Desk was held on 14 August 2015 and the primary concern was the

582 mechanics and extent of the involvement of the CSOs, especially since not all agencies have

583 budget partnership agreement (BPAs) with the CSOs. It could be remembered that in FY

584 2013, the involvement of CSOs was just limited to observer status. This time, the Secretariat

585 and the CSO-Desk are exploring how to engage the CSOs.

586
- 587 • For the local water districts, CabSec Almendras suggested during the last IATF meeting to

588 engage the UP National Engineering Center.

589
- 590 • Meanwhile for the SUCs, third party audit might involve the AACUP. During one of the

591 meetings between CHED and the TWG, they suggested that they will coordinate with the

592 AACUP about the scheduling of the AACUP validation of the indicator about the programs

593 accreditation.

594
- 595 • For the involvement of the AACUP as third party validator, Asec. Nuque noted that AACUP is

596 just for the accreditation of programs. For the SUCs, there are other important indicators

597 that also need third party monitors. Asec. Nuque believes that there should also be enough

598 attention to feedback coming from local governments in terms of whether CHED policies,

599 through SUCs, are actually compatible or helpful to developmental initiatives of the local

600 government. For him, there should also be a discussion on how to expand the third party

601 monitors for CHED, especially since CHED is a regulatory agency, there is a necessity to look

602 for an independent institution than can really provide genuine feedback that CHED can use

603 in their assessment.

604
- 605 • Director Garcia affirmed that AACUP only accredits the quality of the programs being offered

606 in the college or university. She also agreed with Asec. Nuque that third party audit for SUCs

607 should not be limited to the program offering. She believes that there is also a need to

608 evaluate the operation of the school so to improve the operation of SUCs.

609
- 610 • Usec. Moya pointed out two issues in this regard: 1) the need for an independent monitoring

611 feedback that is needed to strengthen the M&E (which is also required under an executive

612 order); and 2) the ability of the TWG to confirm the numbers validated by the

613 oversight/validating agencies are indeed correct.

614
- 615 • With the introduction of the QA guidelines, what the TWG wanted was to have confidence

616 that the ones being certified are actually valid. Usec. Moya believed that the long-term

617 solution was to marry this initiative with the Monitoring and Evaluation team present in the

618 agency.

619
- 620 • Meanwhile, as an immediate solution Usec. Moya suggested requiring the

621 validating/oversight agencies to report to the TWG in the subsequent meetings (perhaps in

622 January or February 2016) – their report may be about their learnings from their field visit,

623 back check or ocular. Validating/oversight agencies also have the option to get a third party

624 validator or do the validation themselves by actually going to the field or by partnering with

CSOs, so long as the process was part of a validating mechanism to confirm that what the agencies submit are true and valid.

- Meanwhile, on the matter of CSOs, Asec. Guillerma Flores shared that there are some CSOs that are also invited during the bidding process. However, some of them cannot participate as they are constricted by the lack of means of transportation. Also, they may have to spend time in preparing reports. For her, involving the CSOs might entail cost.
- Usec. Moya agreed and pointed out three things: first, the process of validating the accomplishments and compliances of the agencies are a government function. Second, it would not be easy to flow the money from NG to CSOs. Lastly, many CSOs were there for advocacy. So if the government can tap the CSOs and harness them based on mutually acceptable agreement, then perhaps the TWG may involve them as third party validators.
- Moving forward, other than the CSOs, third party outside of government may also be utilized. He also suggested that perhaps there should be a plantilla position in the government that will do the auditing or independent validation. He added that, to some degree the government is allowed to provide for honorarium or maybe some transportation cost, but this is to be confirmed.
- In closing, Usec. Moya said that the bigger issue and the real management organizational issue is to have a process of verification whether it is for PBB or for the regular mandate of the validating/oversight agencies. But specific to the PBB, the significant matter to be decided is that there should be some credibility on the approved validation and assessment of the agencies submissions.

AGREEMENTS:

- In addition to the two guiding principles in the guidelines ensuring the quality of validation for FY 2015 PBB, oversight agencies may also be allowed to appeal in behalf of the agencies they supervise.
- The proposed guidelines ensuring the quality of validation/assessment of the FY2015 PBB requirements should be translated to a draft for signature of the TWG Chair and for distribution to the TWG members.

4.5 SPECIAL NON-MONETARY RECOGNITION

- SVP Mendoza raised that there was a suggestion during the second cycle of the PBB to give special non-monetary recognition to the deserving institutions or individuals as far as their performance is concerned. She explained that there were two tracks that were being proposed:
 - a. Recognition for outstanding agencies that are diligently complying with the requirements of the PBB;
 - b. Recognition for the best of the best individuals.
- Usec. Moya then instructed the AO 25 Secretariat to do a concept paper on this for the review and agreement of the TWG. He also suggested for the CSC to take the lead. He also suggested that perhaps there could be an event wherein these awards could be personally

672 handed by the IATF members to the recipients. The awards may also be grouped so that the
673 Task Force members will have sections to award and recognize.

- 674
675 • Asec. Nuque also raised some suggestions as to the recognition to be awarded. These are:
 - 676 a. Recognition for outstanding agencies that are diligently complying with the
 - 677 requirements of the PBB;
 - 678 b. Recognition for the best of the best individuals.
- 679
680 • In addition to the suggestion of Asec. Nuque, Usec. Moya shared that perhaps the TWG can
681 adopt the mechanics of the OGP awards which the Philippines won last year. Perhaps, there
682 could be a mechanism wherein those who want to nominate specific programs or agencies
683 may do so. Then the TWG will just have to select a jury of credible group or search
684 committee. For the individuals, he suggested that perhaps, a PBB-related award can be
685 added in the recognitions for outstanding civil servants.
- 686
687 • Comm. Osorio responded that CSC is already in the process of completing the honor awards
688 program for this year, but they will look at it.

689
690 **AGREEMENTS:**

- 691 • Conceptualize special recognition (non-monetary) to deserving institution and individuals
692 with CSC to take the lead

693
694 **5. ADJOURNMENT**

- 695 • The meeting was adjourned at 3:48 PM.

696
697
698 Prepared by:

699
700 AO25 Technical Secretariat