

Office of the President
PHILIPPINE COMMISSION ON WOMEN

GUIDELINES ON THE
2017
PERFORMANCE-BASED BONUS
(PBB)

I. POLICY FRAMEWORK/LEGAL BASES

The following laws and policies, issued by the responsible government instrumentalities since 2013 up to the present, shall serve as the legal bases for the 2016 Performance-Based Bonus (PBB) Guidelines of the Philippine Commission on Women (PCW):

- A. Republic Act (RA) No. 9485, otherwise known as the Anti-Red Tape Act (ARTA) of 2007, and its Implementing Rules and Regulations under Civil Service Commission (CSC) Memorandum Circular (MC) No. 12, s. 2008;
- B. Administrative Order (AO) No. 25, s. 2011 – Creation of an Inter-Agency Task Force (IATF) and Establishment of the Results-Based Performance Management System (RBPMS);
- C. Executive Order (EO) No. 80, s. 2012 – Adoption of a Performance-Based Incentive System (PBIS) for Government Employees;
- D. CSC MC No. 6, s. 2012 – Guidelines on the Establishment and Implementation of the Agency Strategic Performance Management System (SPMS);
- E. CSC-Department of Budget and Management (DBM) Joint Circular (JC) No. 1, s. 2012 – Rules and Regulations on the Grant of Step Increments Due to Meritorious Performance and Length of Service;
- F. Government Procurement Policy Board (GPPB) Resolution No. 10-2012, s. 2012 – Adoption of the Agency Performance Compliance and Performance Indicators (APCPI) System;
- G. Commission on Audit (COA) Resolution No. 2014-003, s. 2014 – Guidelines on the Submission of Financial Reports;
- H. CSC MC No. 3, s. 2015 – Guidelines on the Submission of the Statement of Assets, Liabilities, and Net Worth of Government Personnel;
- I. Administrative Order (AO) No. 46, s. 2015 – Guidelines on the Submission of the Annual Procurement Program (APP);
- J. EO No. 201, s. 2016 – Directing the IATF on the Harmonization of National Government Performance Monitoring, Information, and Reporting System created under AO No. 25, s. 2011, to prescribe the conditions on eligibility and procedures for the grant of the enhanced PBB, including the ranking system to recognize the difference in levels of performance (government personnel who play a greater role and carry a heavier responsibility in attaining performance targets and delivering results);
- K. Republic Act (RA) No. 10924 or the 2017 General Appropriations Act (GAA);
- L. IATF MC No. 2017-01, s. 2017 – Guidelines on the Grant of the Performance-Based Bonus (PBB) for Fiscal Year 2017 under EO Nos. 80 and 201;
- M. DBM Budget Circular No. 2017-2, s. 2017 – Rules and Regulations on the Grant of the Mid-Year Bonus for FY 2017 and Years Thereafter;

- N. CSC MC No. 14, s. 2017 – Validation Guidelines on Citizen’s Charter Compliance for the 2017 Performance-Based Bonus; and
- O. Government Quality Management Committee (GQMC) MC No. 2017-1, s. 2017 – Guidelines on the Validation of the ISO 9001 QMS Certification or ISO-Aligned QMS Documents as a Requirement for the Grant of the FY 2017 Performance-Based Bonus.

II. OBJECTIVES

- A. To ensure alignment of the PCW’s 2017 targets to its approved Organizational Performance Indicator Framework (OPIF) and to the government’s RBPMS which is being refocused under the Duterte Administration to promote good governance practices, link budget with outcomes and outputs, strengthen performance management and monitoring in the government, and speed up the streamlining of agency front line services;
- B. To implement the CSC-approved PCW SPMS;
- C. To measure, assess, and link the PCW’s performance as an organization to those of its delivery units and that of the individual employee to the delivery unit where s/he belongs to;
- D. To improve the PCW’s service delivery by linking the grant of incentives to actual organizational and individual performance and recognizing and rewarding exemplary performance;
- E. To cultivate and instill a culture of teamwork among the PCW personnel and a sense of responsibility and accountability that would motivate a higher level of performance from them; and
- F. To ensure accomplishment of committed targets by the PCW’s delivery units and personnel.

Handwritten signatures and initials on the right margin:
 RFP
 Abund
 Jh.
 Emp
 sub
 Jm
 Jh

III. KEY FEATURES

- A. Linkage to the 2017 Performance-Informed Budget approved by the Congress indicating the 2017 performance indicators, measures, and targets for the Organizational Outcome (OO) and Major Final Outputs (MFOs) for the PCW in the 2017 GAA;
- B. Adoption of the good governance conditions;
- C. Implementation of the SPMS to serve as the basis for the performance assessment of first- and second-level employees; and
- D. Adoption of a two-step (organization first before individual) system of setting measures and targets and performance assessment. However, the principle of “forced-ranking” shall only be applicable to the result of the assessment of the level of performance of the organization’s delivery units to determine the appropriate incentive award.

IV. TYPES AND RATES OF PERFORMANCE-BASED INCENTIVES

- A. Performance-Based Bonus (PBB) – based on the performance ranking of the delivery unit where the individual employee belongs to and her/his latest monthly basic salary as of December 31, 2017, with the percentage entitlement as follows:

Handwritten signatures and initials at the bottom:
 Jh
 Jm
 Jh
 3 of 26

Performance Category	PBB as a %age of the Monthly Basic Salary
Best Bureau/Office/Delivery Unit (10%)	65%
Better Bureau/Office/Delivery Unit (25%)	57.50%
Good Bureau/Office/Delivery Unit (65%)	50%

- B. Mid-Year Bonus of 1-Month Salary – based on the individual employee’s performance for the immediately preceding rating period (2nd semester of 2016) and her/his monthly salary as of May 15, 2017, in accordance with Budget Circular No. 2017-2, s. 2017; and
- C. Productivity Enhancement Incentive of =P=5,000.00 – for the purpose of improving the productivity of qualified government employees to be given across-the-board not earlier than December 15, 2017.

V. COVERAGE

A. Delivery Units:

Should there be no change from the previous years’ practice in the Office of the President, the following divisions/projects/units (D/P/Us) within PCW shall be considered as the delivery units for the purposes of performance planning and assessment and “forced-ranking”:

1. Office of the Executive Director (OED);
2. Policy Development, Planning, Monitoring, and Evaluation Division (PDPMED);
3. Technical Services and Regional Coordination Division (TSRCD);
4. Sectoral Coordination Division (SCD);
5. Corporate Affairs and Information Resource Management Division (CAIRMD);
6. Administrative and Finance Division (AFD); and
7. GREAT Women Project 2 (GWP2) Project Management Office (PMO); and

- B. All officials and employees of eligible delivery units holding regular plantilla positions and occupying positions in the DBM-approved contractual staffing pattern for the GWP2 PMO.

VI. UNIFIED PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT GROUP (PMG) COMPOSITION FOR THE PBIS AND SPMS

- | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| CECILE B. GUTIERREZ | - | Chairperson
(PBB Focal Person) |
| LOLITA E. ETRATA | - | Member
(PBB Spokesperson) |
| NHARLEEN S. MILLAR | - | Member |
| JOSEPHINE KHALEEN M. SASUMAN | - | Member |
| MA. REBECCA RAFAELA R. BAYLOSIS | - | Member |
| KAREN G. DAGNALAN | - | Member
(EA Representative) |
| ROBERT MATTHEW C. ROMERO | - | Member |

Handwritten signatures and initials on the right margin:
 RTR
 Mhambh
 Y. N.
 Amp
 Amb
 Sp
 Amp

Handwritten signatures at the bottom of the page:
 W
 M
 J

PAMELA C. SUSARA	-	Member
MARIA C. TASONG	-	Member
EMORIE M. PAPASIN	-	Member
MARIA THERESA E. CAASI	-	Member and Secretariat, SPMS
RAMIL P. SANTOS	-	Secretariat, PBIS

- A. Ms. Gutierrez, as the PCW's PBB Focal Person, shall oversee the implementation of the SPMS, PBIS, and the annual PBB guidelines issued by the IATF and the PCW;
- B. Ms. Etrata, as the PBB Spokesperson, and Ms. Caasi, as the SPMS Secretary, shall be responsible for orienting and disseminating information about the PCW 2017 PBB and SPMS guidelines to all employees;
- C. Ms. Sasuman, Ms. Tasong, and Ms. Baylosis shall ensure that the Transparency Seal is updated regularly and in accordance with the guidelines under Annex 7 of the IATF MC No. 2017-01, s. 2017;
- D. Ms. Millar, Mr. Romero, Ms. Dagnalan, and Ms. Papasin shall ensure that the Citizen's Charter is updated regularly and the ARTA provisions in relation to the Citizen's Charter are complied with;
- E. Ms. Etrata and Ms. Caasi shall ensure compliance with the PhilGEPS posting requirements and liquidation of cash advances;
- F. Ms. Caasi shall ensure compliance by all officials and employees with the required submission and review of the Statement of Assets, Liabilities, and Net Worth (SALN) and their eventual submission to the respective SALN repository agencies as prescribed under CSC MC No. 3, s. 2015;
- G. Ms. Tasong and Mr. Santos shall ensure that all the necessary reports/forms and certifications for submission to the IATF are prepared and submitted within the prescribed deadlines and accordingly posted in the PCW website's Transparency Seal;
- H. All employees whose functions/responsibilities are directly or indirectly related to the good governance concerns shall discharge their respective functions/responsibilities appropriately and provide all necessary assistance and support services to the PMG to ensure the agency's compliance with the governance conditions; and
- I. The following designated "Shepherds" shall be responsible for assisting and reviewing the reports of the unit assigned to her/him and to whom issues/clarifications emanating from the units shall have to be raised first:
 1. CAIRMD Representative (Mr. Robert Matthew C. Romero) – for AFD;
 2. TSRCD Representative (Ms. Nharleen S. Millar) – for SCD;
 3. SCD Representative (Ms. Josephine Khaleen M. Sasuman) – for PDPMED;
 4. PDPMED Representative (Ms. Rebecca Rafaela R. Baylosis) – for GWP2 PMO;
 5. AFD Representative (Ms. Lolita E. Etrata) – for CAIRMD;
 6. EA Representative, (Ms. Karen Dagnalan) – for OED; and
 7. GWP2 PMO Representative (Ms. Pamela C. Susara) – for TSRCD.

For
 Submit
 J.
 Emp
 mb
 Jm
 Jm

rw

sm

leg

VII. ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR THE AGENCY

- A. Achieved **100%** accomplishment rate of the following: (1) each of the Congress-approved 2017 performance indicators and targets for the Organizational Outcome (OO) and Major Final Outputs (MFOs) under the Operations that are indicated under the Performance-Informed Budget of the 2017 GAA; and (2) targets submitted to the IATF, DBM, and the OP under the Support to Operations (STO) and the General Administration and Support Services (GASS).

The PCW's 2017 targets are contained in Part VIII – 2017 PERFORMANCE TARGETS of these guidelines. The organizational performance in the achievement of targets shall be closely monitored through the use of the quarterly agency accountability reports uploaded in the DBM's Unified Reporting System (URS);

- B. Satisfied **100%** of the good governance conditions (GGCs) set for 2017 by the IATF based on the performance drivers of the RBPMS, as indicated in Part IX – GOOD GOVERNANCE CONDITIONS of these guidelines;
- C. Has an approved PCW system of assessing and ranking its delivery units and assessing individual employees as contained in Part X – ELIGIBILITY OF DELIVERY UNITS AND INDIVIDUAL EMPLOYEES and Part XI – PCW 2017 PBB AND SPMS PROCESSES of these guidelines;
- D. Conducted an orientation for the purpose of disseminating the PCW system of assessment and ranking to all PCW officers and employees;
- E. Submitted the FY 2017 accomplishments using Forms A, A-1, and 1.0 to the IATF **NLT January 31, 2018**;
- F. Used the PCW SPMS approved by the CSC in rating the performance of the first- and second-level employees; and
- G. Used the Career Executive Service Performance Evaluation System (CESPES) in rating the performance of the Career Executive Service Officials.

Note: Assessment of the agency compliance with the performance targets, good governance conditions, and other PBB requirements shall be conducted starting October 1, 2017.

VIII. 2017 PERFORMANCE TARGETS

A. Organizational Outcome

Level of gender-responsiveness of selected National Government Agencies (NGAs) improved by at least one level in any of the entry points using the GMEF tool – **20 key implementing agencies.**

B. Operations

- 1. MFO 1: Policy Services on Gender and Development (GAD):
 - a. Number of GAD policies developed and issued or updated and disseminated – **Seven (7)**;
 - b. Percentage of stakeholders who rate the policies as good or better – **Sixty-five percent (65%)**; and

[Handwritten signatures and initials in the right margin]

[Handwritten signatures and initials at the bottom of the page]

- c. Percentage of GAD policies updated, issued, and disseminated in the last 3 years – **Fifty percent (50%)**.

2. MFO 2: GAD Technical Advisory Services:

- a. Number of technical assistance (TA) provided – **Three hundred ninety (390)**;
- b. Percentage of stakeholders who rate the technical advisory as good or better – **One hundred percent (100%)**; and
- c. Percentage of requests for technical support responded to within 15 days – **One hundred percent (100%)**.

C. Support to Operations (STO)

- 1. ISO-aligned Quality Management System (QMS) documented for at least one (1) core process, posted in the Transparency Seal, and submitted to the GQMC **NLT December 31, 2017**, composed of the following:
 - a. Approved Quality Operations Manual on Gender and Development Plan and Budget (GPB) Review and Endorsement, including the Procedures, Work Instructions, and Forms; and
 - b. Certification of the Executive Director on the conduct of the Internal Quality Audit and Minutes of the FY 2017 Management Review.

The deadline for the validation of the documentation is **NLT January 31, 2018**.

- 2. STO targets identified in accordance with the priorities of PCW submitted to the IATF, OP, and the DBM as follows:
 - a. Mandated gender equality and women empowerment (GEWE) reports submitted on time, as follows:
 - i. MCW Assessment Report – **Submitted NLT December 31, 2017**;
 - ii. Comparative Report on the Compliance of NGAs to the GAD Budget Policy for FYs 2016-2018 – **Submitted NLT July 31, 2017**; and
 - iii. GMEF Assessment Reports on additional priority agencies – **Submitted NLT December 31, 2017**; and
 - b. Gender Mainstreaming Monitoring System (GMMS) maintained; and
- 3. Developed and uploaded in the PCW website the Freedom of Information (FOI) Manual **NLT October 1, 2017**.

D. General Administration and Support Services (GASS)

- 1. Achieved the Budget Utilization Rates (BUR) as follows:
 - a. Obligations BUR computed as obligations against all allotments issued for FY 2017, including those released under the “GAA as the allotment order” policy for maintenance and other operating expenses (MOOE) and capital outlays (CO) – **100%**; and

Handwritten signature

Submitted

Handwritten signature

Handwritten signature

Emp

Handwritten signature

Handwritten signature

Handwritten signature

Handwritten signature

Handwritten signature

- b. Disbursements BUR measured by the ratio of total disbursements (cash and non-cash, excluding personnel services) to total obligations for MOOE and CO in FY 2017 – **98%**;
 2. Complied with the Public Financial Management (PFM) reporting requirements of the COA and DBM, as follows:
 - a. Budget and Financial Accountability Reports (BFARs) submitted online using the DBM's URS **NLT 30 days after the end of each quarter** for the following reports, as provided in COA-DBM-DOF JC No. 2014-1 dated July 4, 2014:
 - FY 2017 FAR No. 1 – Statement of Appropriations, Allotments, Obligations, Disbursements, and Balances (SAAOBDB);
 - FY 2017 Summary Report on Disbursements; and
 - FY 2017 BAR No. 1 – Quarterly Physical Report of Operations/Physical Plan;
 - b. Submitted the Report on Ageing of Cash Advances (with **November 15, 2017 as the cut-off date**) directly to the COA Resident Auditor **NLT November 30, 2017**, and the verified report by the Resident Auditor to the COA-Head Office afterwards;
 - c. Submitted the 2016 Financial Reports per COA Resolution No. 2014-003 directly to the COA Resident Auditor **NLT March 31, 2017** as follows:
 - Statement of Financial Position;
 - Statement of Financial Performance;
 - Statement of Changes in Net Assets/Equity;
 - Statement of Cash Flows;
 - Statement of Comparison of Budget and Actual Amounts; and
 - Notes to the Financial Statements;
3. Complied with the required implementation of at least 30% of the audit recommendations;
4. Adopted the APCPI System per GPPB Resolution No. 10-2012 by submitting the 2016 APCPI results, complete with the following accomplished forms/annexes to the GPPB-Technical Support Office (TSO) **NLT March 31, 2017**:
 - Annex A or the Self-Assessment Form;
 - Annex B or the Consolidated Procurement Monitoring Report;
 - Annex D or the Procurement Capacity Development Action Plan; and
 - Questionnaire;
5. Submitted the FY 2017 Annual Procurement Plan – Non Common-Use Supplies and Equipment (APP-NonCSE) to the GPPB-TSO **NLT April 2017** in the format prescribed under GPPB Circular No. 07-2015 and the 2018 Annual Procurement Plan – Common Use Supplies and Equipment (APP-CSE) to the DBM-Procurement Service **NLT November 30, 2017** in the prescribed format under the guidelines to be issued by DBM through a separate circular letter;

Kor

Admuth

[Signature]

[Signature]

Dmp

mb

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

6. Complied with the requirements of the Transparency Seal per RA No. 9485 (ARTA) by updating the posting of the Status of Notices in the PhilGEPS for all transactions covering the period November 16, 2016 to November 15, 2017 **NLT December 1, 2017**. (Notes: Failed or cancelled bid status should still be updated in the system. If the agency is unable to update the system or post the BAC Resolution, Notices of Award/Bid Results, Actual Approved/Awarded Contracts and Notices to Proceed/Purchase Orders for transactions above One Million Pesos (=P=1,000,000.00) in the system due to factors that are outside of the control of the agency, the agency should submit a report to or inform GPPB/TSO and submit a letter of explanation using the template on Annex 6 of IATF MC No. 2017-01, s. 2017, addressed to the IATF **NLT December 1, 2017**. Acceptance of the explanation/reasons shall be subject to the recommendation of the GPPB/TSO);
7. Submitted and posted in the Transparency Seal the Certificate of Compliance for agencies with no frontline services, such as PCW, per CSC MC No. 14, s. 2017. CSC validation shall be complemented by the reports on the feedback and complaints from citizens gathered by the OP, CSC, and PCOO from the 8888 and FOI portals. A negative report will determine the eligibility to the PBB.

IX. GOOD GOVERNANCE CONDITIONS

- A. Complied with the provisions of the ARTA;
- B. Maintained/updated the Transparency Seal (TS) complying with the TS Guidelines contained in Annex 7 of IATF MC No. 2017-01, s. 2017. The TS should be accessible by clicking on the TS logo on the home page in the PCW's website (www.pcw.gov.ph) containing the following documents:
 1. Agency's mandates and functions, vision, mission, and list of its officials with their respective positions, designations, and contact information;
 2. Budget and Financial Accountability Reports:
 - FY 2013-FY 2017 Financial Accountability Report (FAR) No. 1 – SAAOBDB;
 - FY 2013-FY 2017 Summary Report on Disbursements;
 - FY 2013-FY 2017 Budget Accountability Report (BAR) No. 1 – Quarterly Physical Report of Operations/Physical Plan;
 - FY 2013-FY 2017 FAR No. 5 – Quarterly Report on Revenue and Other Receipts; and
 - FY 2013-FY 2017 – Financial Plan (Detailed Statement of Current Year's Obligations, Disbursements, and Unpaid Obligations);
 3. DBM-approved budget and corresponding targets for 2017;
 4. Projects, Programs, and Activities, Beneficiaries, and Status of Implementation (only for 2017 – indicate if not applicable or else zero rating will be given). Since this is not applicable to PCW, the pertinent form shall still be posted but the phrase "not applicable" shall have to be indicated;
 5. Annual Procurements Plans (APP):
 - a. FY 2017 APP–Non-CSE in the format prescribed under GPPB Circular No. 07-2015 which should be posted **NLT April 2017**; and
















- b. FY 2018 APP–CSE in accordance with the guidelines to be issued by DBM through a separate circular letter;
- 6. System of Ranking the Delivery Units which is contained in Part X of these guidelines and should be posted and disseminated to the employees **NLT October 1, 2017**;
- 7. PCW Quality and Operations Manual on GPB Review and Endorsement to be uploaded **NLT December 31, 2017** and/or ISO-aligned QMS documents, pursuant to GQMC MC No. 2017-1, s. 2017, dated June 23, 2017;
- 8. Freedom to Information (FOI) Manual to be uploaded **NLT October 1, 2017** for validation by the Presidential Communications Operations Office (PCOO).

The PMG members charged with the responsibility to ensure that the Transparency Seal meets the requirements by the IATF shall have to be guided by the specifications contained in Annex 7 of the IATF MC No. 2017-01, s. 2017.

- C. Maintained/Updated the posting of all Invitations to Bid and awarded contracts in the Philippine Government Electronic Procurement System (PhilGEPS) for transactions from November 16, 2016 to November 15, 2017 **NLT December 1, 2016**;
- D. Complied with President Duterte’s twin directives on improving all frontline services consistent with the ARTA and to cut down processing time of the delivery of services per CSC MC No. 14, s. 2016) as follows:
 - 1. Maintained/Updated the Citizen’s Charter reflecting the enhanced service standards; and
 - 2. Self-assessment and reporting of improvements made by the agency to implement the provisions of CSC MC No. 14, s. 2016; and
- E. Developed and posted in the PCW TS the agency’s FOI Manual pursuant to the provisions of EO No. 2, s. 2016.

X. ELIGIBILITY OF DELIVERY UNITS AND INDIVIDUAL EMPLOYEES

A. Eligibility and Ranking of Delivery Units

- 1. In accordance with the PCW SPMS which adopts the following table of the CSC-prescribed 5-point rating scale, a delivery unit for it to be eligible shall have garnered an average numerical rating of not less than **3** which is the lowest figure in the range that is equivalent to the adjectival rating of “Satisfactory”:

RATINGS	
NUMERICAL RANGE	ADJECTIVAL
5.00	Outstanding
4.00-4.99	Very Satisfactory
3.00-3.99	Satisfactory
2.00-2.99	Unsatisfactory
1.00-1.99	Poor

Handwritten signatures and initials on the right margin:
 Top: *Red*
 Middle: *Blue*
 Lower: *Black*
 Bottom: *Emp*, *mb*, *Mr*, *Chief*, *Log*

Handwritten initials: *zkr*, *mm*

2. If all of PCW's seven (7) delivery units are found eligible, "forced-ranking" shall be undertaken according to the following categories:

<u>Ranking</u>	<u>Performance Category</u>
Top 10%	Best (1 delivery unit)
Next 25%	Better (2 delivery units)
Next 65%	Good (4 delivery units)

Note: The number of delivery units entitled in each ranking level (after application of the percentages) may vary based on the actual number of eligible delivery units (e.g., if one unit is disqualified for a reason [such as not meeting the average numerical rating of 3], then the universe shall be reduced from 7 delivery units to only 6 delivery units, and so on and so forth).

B. Eligibility of Individual Officers and Employees

1. For the PCW Executive Director, in her capacity as the Head of the Agency, her eligibility shall be dependent on the performance of PCW as an agency. If found eligible, her rate shall be equivalent to 65% of her monthly basic salary as of December 31, 2017;
2. Covers only those officers and employees belonging to the eligible delivery units. There shall no longer be a ranking to be done for individual officers and employees within a delivery unit;
3. The first- or second-level employees shall have received an average numerical rating of not less than 3 which is the lowest figure in the range that is equivalent to the adjectival rating of "Satisfactory" under the PCW SPMS;
4. For third-level officers, such as the Deputy Executive Directors for Operations and Management Services, they shall have received a rating of at least "Satisfactory" under the Career Executive Service Performance Evaluation System (CESPES);
5. The ex-officio PCW Chairperson and Commissioners shall not be entitled;
6. An employee who has rendered at least nine (9) months of service for 2017 and with a rating of at least "Satisfactory" shall be entitled to the full incentive amount of the performance category garnered by the delivery unit which s/he belongs to;
7. An employee who is newly-hired, retired, resigned, on rehabilitation/maternity/paternity/scholarship/study/sabbatical/vacation or sick leave (with or without pay) and has rendered a minimum of three (3) months but less than nine (9) months of service in 2017, and has garnered a rating of at least "Satisfactory" shall be entitled on a pro-rata basis corresponding to the actual length of service rendered, as follows:

KTY

mburles

[Signature]

[Signature]

Emp

mb

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

Length of Service	% of PBB
8 months but less than 9 months	90%
7 months but less than 8 months	80%
6 months but less than 7 months	70%
5 months but less than 6 months	60%
4 months but less than 5 months	50%
3 months but less than 4 months	40%

The valid reasons for an employee who does not meet the nine-month actual service requirement to be considered for PBB on a pro-rata basis are as follows:

- a. Being a newly-hired employee;
 - b. Retirement;
 - c. Resignation;
 - d. Maternity/Paternity leave;
 - e. Vacation or Sick Leave with or without pay; and
 - f. Scholarship/Study leave;
8. Those employees who failed to discharge their respective responsibilities/functions/assignments and who also failed to prepare and submit the prescribed reports that are required under the PBB and PBB-related issuances shall not be eligible. These include, but are not limited to, those who:
- a. Failed to submit the COA Annual Financial Reports and Statements to include Financial Statements (FS) and Annual Financial Reports as prescribed in COA Resolution No. 2014-003 dated January 14, 2014 and COA Circular No. 2015-002 dated March 9, 2015;
 - b. Failed to comply with the required minimum 30% implementation of the prior years' audit recommendations;
 - c. Failed to comply with the QMS ISO-alignment specified in IATF MC No. 2017-01 and GQMC MC No. 2017-1;
 - d. Failed to post and disseminate the system of ranking the performance of delivery units;
 - e. Including the Executive Director and the Chairperson and Secretariat of the Bids and Awards Committee (BAC), failed to submit the following:
 - i. FY 2017 APP–Non-CSE to the GPPB **NLT April 30, 2017** in the format prescribed under GPPB Circular No. 07-2015;
 - ii. FY 2018 APP–CSE to the DBM Procurement Service **NLT November 30, 2017**;
 - iii. Results of the FY 2016 APCPI System, per GPPB Resolution No. 10-2012, complete with the: (a) APCPI – Self-Assessment Form; (b) APCPI – Consolidated Procurement Monitoring Report; (c) APCPI – Procurement Capacity Development Action Plan; and (d) the Questionnaire **NLT March 31, 2017**.

[Handwritten signatures and initials in blue and black ink, including 'RAN', 'Admuth', 'J.', 'Emp', 'mb', 'Apr', 'dlt', and 'Jog']

9. Those employees under the following circumstances shall not be eligible:
 - a. On vacation (with or without pay), sick (with or without pay), or study leave for the entire year 2017;
 - b. Found guilty of an administrative and/or criminal case by final and executory judgment in FY 2017 by the Executive Director, except if the penalty meted out is only a reprimand;
 - c. Failed to submit the 2016 Statement of Assets, Liabilities, and Net Worth (SALN) as prescribed in the rules provided under CSC MC No. 3, s. 2015);
 - d. Failed to liquidate a cash advance/s received in FY 2017 within the reglementary period, as prescribed under RA 6713, COA Circular No. 97-001 dated February 10, 1997 and reiterated in COA Circular No. 2009-002 dated May 18, 2009; and
 - e. Failed to submit the complete SPMS Forms;
10. An officer/employee who transferred from one government agency to another shall be rated by the agency where s/he served the longest. If equal months were served for each agency, s/he shall be included in the recipient agency; and
11. For the purpose of determining where an employee who transferred thru promotion/reassignment shall belong to because of the organizational "forced-ranking" prescription under the PBB guidelines, the following rules shall apply:
 - a. To the D/P/U where s/he spent a majority of her/his working time during the year; and
 - b. In case of equal time, to the D/P/U where s/he transferred to effective July 1, 2017.

KAN

Abmichy

Y. K.

Emp

emb

Shw

del

XI. PCW 2017 PBB AND SPMS PROCESSES

A. Rating Periods:

1. Both the delivery unit and the individual employee shall be assessed for the 1st semester (January-June 2017) and 2nd semester (July-December 2017); and
2. However, if there is a need for a shorter or longer period, the minimum appraisal period is at least ninety (90) calendar days or three (3) months while the maximum shall not be longer than one (1) calendar year (e.g., for employees on probation basis, 3rd-level officers covered by the CESPES, etc.).

- B. The following five-point rating scale, 5 being the highest and 1 being the lowest, for setting the performance measures and targets during the performance planning process and for determining the actual accomplishments versus the targets during the performance assessment process, for both the delivery unit and the individual employee, shall be adopted:**

W/r

[Signature]

[Signature]

Efficiency	The extent to which time or resources is used for the intended task or purpose. It measures whether or not targets are accomplished with a minimum amount or quantity of waste, expense or unnecessary effort.
Timeliness	Measures whether or not the deliverables were done on time based on the requirements of the law and/or the clients/stakeholders. Time-related performance indicators evaluate such things as project/activity/output completion deadlines, time management skills, and other time-sensitive expectations.

2. The two-step planning process shall be adopted as follows:

a. Step 1 – Setting the performance measures and targets for the Division/Project/Unit (D/P/U):

i. Division Chiefs/Project Manager/Unit Heads (DC/PM/UH) to propose to the ManCom and the PMG, for joint review during the scheduled Mid-Year Performance Assessment (MYPA) covering the 1st semester and the Year-End Performance Assessment (YEPA) covering the 2nd semester, of the following reports of their respective units:

- 2017 Work and Financial Plan (WFP) detailing the activities to be undertaken and the budget needed for each activity using the WFP Form (Annex A); and
- 1st semester and 2nd semester performance measures, targets, budget, and responsible personnel to be summarized in the Division/Project/Unit Performance Commitment and Review (DPUPCR) Form (Annex B);

ii. ManCom and PMG, thru the designated PMG Shepherds, to jointly review the proposals and endorse the final periodic WFP and DPUPCR to the Executive Director (ED) for approval; and

b. Step 2 – Setting the performance measures and targets for the individual employee:

i. DC/PM/UH to cascade down the approved Division/Project/Unit (D/P/U) measures and targets to serve as the bases for setting the individual employee targets; and

ii. The individual measures and targets mutually-agreed upon between the DC/PM/UH and the employee shall be prepared and approved by the Executive Director using the Individual Performance Commitment and Review (IPCR) Form (Annex C); and

3. The 1st semester and 2nd semester final measures and targets using the DPUPCR and IPCR Forms shall be submitted on the respective dates agreed upon.

[Handwritten signature]

[Handwritten signature]

[Handwritten signature]

[Handwritten signature]

[Handwritten signature]

[Handwritten signature]

[Handwritten signature] *[Handwritten signature]*

[Handwritten signature]

The DPUPCR Forms shall be submitted to the Office of the PMG Focal Person, thru the designated PMG Shepherds, while the IPCR Forms shall be submitted to the Human Resource Management and Development Section (HRMDS), Administrative and Finance Division (AFD).

D. Performance Assessment

1. Corresponding to the planning process, the two-step process in assessing actual performance vis-à-vis the set measures and targets shall likewise be adopted as follows:

a. Step 1 – D/P/U Organizational Performance:

- i. The basis for assessment shall be the Accomplishment Report (AR) vis-à-vis the approved WFP and the actual accomplishments vis-à-vis the approved measures and targets as indicated in the completely filled-out DPUPCR Form for the 1st and 2nd semesters, respectively;
- ii. The AR and the DPUPCR of the D/P/U for a particular semester shall be presented by the DC/PM/UH to the ManCom and the PMG for joint review by both bodies. However, for rating and for ranking purposes, only the DPUPCR Form will be used. The AR Form (Annex D) shall be used for the purpose of validation and for preparing the PCW's consolidated accomplishment report;
- iii. The schedules of the performance assessment shall be calendared not later than one month after the end of each semester. However, for the 2017 2nd semester, in order for PCW to be able to meet the set deadline on January 31, 2018, the 2nd semester performance assessment shall be undertaken on December 2017 and the final AR and DPUPCR Forms shall be submitted to the Office of the PMG Focal Person, thru the designated PMG Shepherds, on or before January 15, 2018;
- iv. Assessment shall be jointly done by the ManCom and the PMG and validation of reported accomplishments shall be done by the PMG, thru the designated PMG Shepherds. In case a discrepancy/discrepancies is/are discovered upon validation, the PMG shall determine the accurate rating and require the DC/PM/UH to explain the reason for the discrepancy/ies;
- v. In case of intervening assignment/s given to the D/P/U, the Executive Director (as negotiated between the ED and the DC/PM/UH and as validated by the PMG) may award a bonus rating of up to a maximum of .5 point (which is the equivalent of 10% of the 5-point rating scale) to be added to the semestral rating before computing the annual average rating;
- vi. The actual accomplishments as rated in the DPUPCR Form shall have a weight of **80%** while compliance to administrative rules and regulations shall have a weight of **20%**. The specific administrative rules and regulations to be measured shall be the observance of the lead times set for:

Handwritten signature

Handwritten signature

Handwritten signature

Handwritten signature

Handwritten signature

Handwritten signature

Handwritten signature

Handwritten signature

Handwritten signature

Handwritten signature

Handwritten signature

- vi. The average ratings of all the personnel within the D/P/U shall not be higher than the average rating garnered by the D/P/U;
- 2. The performance rating garnered for each performance indicator shall be indicated in the appropriate RATINGS column in the DPUPCR and IPCR Forms;
- 3. For both the delivery unit and individual levels, in case there is more than one item to consider in the assessment, the average rating shall always be computed to arrive at the final semestral and annual ratings;
- 4. The delivery units' performance ratings shall be jointly reviewed by the ManCom and the PMG and validated by the PMG, thru the designated PMG Shepherds. Their recommendations on the ranking of the delivery units shall be submitted to the Executive Director for approval;
- 5. The DC/PM/UH shall prepare the final DPUPCR Form and submit this to the PMG **NLT August 31, 2017** for the 1st semester and **NLT January 15, 2018** for the 2nd semester, respectively; and
- 6. The individual employee shall likewise finalize her/his IPCR Form and submit this to HRMDS, AFD not later than the set deadline;
- E. An employee who shall be on prolonged official travel, approved leave of absence, and/or attending training or scholarship programs at the time of the assessment schedule and who has already met the required minimum rating period of 90 days shall submit her/his IPCR Form before s/he leaves the office; and
- F. An employee who shall be on prolonged official travel, scholarship or training covering an entire semestral rating period shall use the performance rating obtained in the immediately preceding or succeeding rating period during the year (e.g., if the travel, scholarship or training happens during the 1st Semester, then the 2nd Semester rating period shall be used and vice-versa).

XII. EFFECTS OF NON-COMPLIANCE TO THE 2017 PBB GUIDELINES PER IATF MC NO. 2017-01, S. 2017

- A. Disqualification for the 2017 PBB for inability to comply with all the good governance conditions in 2017;
- B. Disqualification from the PBB in the succeeding year and/or filing of the appropriate administrative case by the CSC or Ombudsman in case/s of misrepresentation in the submitted reports for the PBB, commission of fraud in the payment of the PBB, and/or violation of the provisions of the MC No. 2017-01, s. 2017; and
- C. Being investigated, being issued a warning, and/or withholding of the PBB payment for the succeeding year in case it was found out that a unit has evenly distributed the PBB among its staff members in 2016.

[Handwritten signature]

[Handwritten signature]

[Handwritten signature]

[Handwritten signature]

[Handwritten signature]

[Handwritten signature]

[Handwritten signature]

[Handwritten signature]

[Handwritten signature]

XIII. EMPLOYEE SANCTIONS

- A. An employee who shall neither perform the duties and responsibilities nor comply with the provisions specified hereto, unless justified and duly accepted by the PMG, the ManCom, and the Executive Director, with corresponding factual evidences and supporting documents, shall be:
 - 1. Disqualified for the PBB and other performance-based personnel actions, such as promotion, training or scholarship grants, and incentives; and
 - 2. Subjected to administrative sanction for violation of reasonable rules and regulations and simple neglect of duty.

XIV. COMPLAINTS AND APPEALS MECHANISM

- A. Any complaint and/or appeal on the initial performance assessment of the D/P/U shall have to be raised and immediately settled by the PMG and the ManCom during the performance assessment activity called for the purpose. The performance assessment of the D/P/U as agreed upon during this session shall be final and not appealable; and
- B. An employee who feels aggrieved or dissatisfied with the individual performance rating given to her/him by the DC/PM/UH may raise an appeal with the PMG **NLT October 31, 2017** for the 1st Semester and **NLT January 5, 2018** for the 2nd Semester. However, s/he shall not be allowed to protest the performance ratings of other co-employees. The ratings obtained by others may only be used as basis or reference for comparison in appealing one's individual performance rating. The PMG shall decide on the employee appeal within five (5) working days to ensure sufficient time for action and decision before the January 31, 2018 deadline set for submission of the required forms on the physical accomplishments to the IATF.

XV. These PCW 2017 PBB guidelines for the PCW are issued in addition to the applicable and pertinent provisions embodied in the 2013-2016 PBB guidelines issued by the PCW. However, all other provisions inconsistent with these guidelines are hereby superseded and/or amended accordingly.

XVI. These guidelines shall take effect immediately upon its issuance covering the 2017 performance and issued for compliance of all PCW personnel.

Handwritten signature

Handwritten signature

Handwritten signature

Handwritten signature

Handwritten signature

Handwritten signature

Handwritten signature

Handwritten signature

Handwritten signature

Handwritten signature

Handwritten initials/signatures

FORM I

Division: _____

2016 Work and Financial Plan

MFO/PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	ACTIVITIES	TARGET	PERSONS INVOLVED	BUDGET (In Thousand Pesos)
A. 1.	1.1 1.2			Sub-total:
2.	2.1 2.2			Sub-total:
3.	3.1 3.2			Sub-total:
B. 1	1.1 1.2			Sub-total:
2.	2.1 2.2			Sub-total:
3.	3.1 3.2			Sub-total:
				TOTAL

Handwritten mark

Handwritten signatures and initials

FORM I-A

Division: _____

MFO/Performance Indicators:

Activity:

2016 Work and Financial Plan

Breakdown of the Budget per Activity from Form I

MAINTENANCE AND OPERATING EXPENDITURES	AMOUNT (In Thousand Pesos)	FUNDING SOURCE	REMARKS/BASIS FOR COMPUTATION
Traveling			
Training and scholarship			
Supplies and materials			
Utility expenses			
Advertising			
Communication			
Printing and binding			
Rent			
Subscription			
Professional services			
Repair and maintenance			
Other maintenance and operating expenses			
Capital/equipment outlay			
Total (In thousand Pesos)			

Handwritten mark

Handwritten mark

Handwritten signatures

Handwritten signature

Handwritten signature

Handwritten signature

Handwritten signature

DIVISION/PROJECT/UNIT PERFORMANCE COMMITMENT AND REVIEW (DPUPCR) FORM

Annex B

Name of Division:

I, _____, commit to deliver and agree to be rated on the attainment of the following targets in accordance with the indicated measures for the period July 1 - December 31, 2016.

Signature of Division Chief
Date: _____

APPROVED BY:	
Name:	EMMELINE L. VERZOSA
Position:	Executive Director/SPMS Champion

5- Outstanding
4- Very Satisfactory
3-Satisfactory
2-Unsatisfactory
1- Poor

MAJOR FINAL OUPUT	SUCCESS INDICATORS (Targets + Measures) (NOTE: Please add rows for success indicators if necessary)	Alloted Budget	Individual/s Accountable	Actual Accomplishments	RATINGS				Remarks
					Q	E	T	Ave	
MFO1:									
					Final Rating				
					Final Average				
					Rating				

Final Rating by:
Position:
Date:

Handwritten signatures and initials: [Signature], [Signature], [Signature], [Signature], [Signature], [Signature], [Signature], [Signature], [Signature], [Signature]

INDIVIDUAL PERFORMANCE COMMITMENT AND REVIEW (IPCR) FORM

I, _____ commit to deliver and agree to be rated on the attainment of the following targets in accordance with the indicated measures for the period July 1-December 31, 2016.

Signature _____
Date: _____

APPROVED BY:	
Name:	EMMELINE L. VERZOSA
Position:	Executive Director/SPMS Champion

- 5- Outstanding
- 4- Very Satisfactory
- 3-Satisfactory
- 2-Unsatisfactory
- 1- Poor

MAJOR FINAL OUPUT	SUCCESS INDICATORS (Targets + Measures) (NOTE: Please add rows for success indicators if necessary)	Actual Accomplishment	RATING				Remarks
			Q	E	T	Ave	
MFO1:							
MFO2:							
			Total Rating				
			Final Average Rating				

Rater's Comments and Recommendation for Development Purposes or Rewards/Promotion

The above rating has been discussed between the Rater and the Ratee.

Name and Signature of Ratee:	
Position:	
Date:	

Final Rating by the Division Chief/Project Manager/Unit Head :		
Position:		
Date:		

EM

EM

RAV *nmull* *22* *AA* *Emp* *emb* *Y*

25 of 26
obj

FORM II

Division/Project/Unit: _____

**2016 Year-End Performance Assessment and 2016 Work and Financial Planning Exercise
December _____, 2016**

**ACCOMPLISHMENT REPORT
2nd Semester 2016**

(1) MFO/Performance Indicators/Activities	(2) TARGET	(3) ACCOMPLISHMENTS		(4) BUDGET (in '000)		REMARK
		ACTUAL (3a)	RATE (3b)	ALLOCATED FY 2016 (4a)	UTILIZED As of 15 December 2016 (4b)	
OTHER MAJOR/ NOTABLE PROGRAMS						

[Handwritten signature]

[Handwritten signature]

[Handwritten signature]

[Handwritten signature]

[Handwritten signature]

[Handwritten signature]

[Handwritten signature]

[Handwritten signature]

Prepared/Endorsed by:



CECILE B. GUTIERREZ
PMG Chairperson/PBB Focal Person


NHARLEEN SANTOS-MILLAR
PMG Member/Alternate PBB Focal Person


LOLITA E. ETRATA
PMG Member/PBB Spokesperson


JOSEPHINE KHALEEN M. SASUMAN
PMG Member


PAMELA C. SUSARA
PMG Member


MARIA THERESA E. CAASI
PMG Member and SPMS Secretariat


MARIA C. TASONG
PMG Member


MA. REBECCA RAFAELA R. BAYLOSIS
PMG Member


ROBERT MATTHEW C. ROMERO
PMG Member


EMORIE M. PAPANIN
PMG Member





KAREN G. DAGÑALAN
PMG Member (Employees' Association Representative)



RAMIL P. SANTOS
PMG Secretariat

Approved by:



EMMELINE L. VERZOSA
Executive Director