

**LBP INSURANCE BROKERAGE, INC.**  
**VALIDATED 2016 PERFORMANCE SCORECARD**

	Component					LIBI Submission		GCG Validation		Supporting Document	Remarks
	Objective/Measure		Formula	Wt.	Rating System	2016 Target	Actual	Rating	Score		
FINANCIAL	SO 1	Ensure Sustainable Financial Growth									
	SM 1	EBITDA Margin	Absolute Percentage	35%	Actual/Target x Weight	75%	71%	33.13%	70.55%	32.92%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>COA Annual Audit Report</li></ul> <p>As a matter of policy, request for the renegotiation of targets may be considered if the achievement of such targets is no longer feasible due to substantial changes in circumstances that could not be foreseen at the time the targets were agreed upon. However, adjustments of targets such that targets are decreased to an acceptable or achievable level is not acceptable.</p> <p>While the reasons cited above by LIBI is understandable, the same cannot be considered valid for purposes of reducing the target EBITDA margin. Justifications such as the 2016 national election, implementation of LIBI's business strategy to reduce premium rates, and increasing</p>

Component						LIBI Submission		GCG Validation		Supporting Document	Remarks
Objective/Measure		Formula	Wt.	Rating System	2016 Target	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating		
											<p>involvement of international insurance brokers which rendered negative effects in LIBI's overall performance in 2016 are all anticipated and foreseeable events and part of normal course of business. To consider and accept these justifications to lower down the target would be tantamount to recognizing even the inefficiency of LIBI's Board and Management. The Board and Management of GOCCs are primarily held responsible to ensure that risk management systems are properly placed to identify, address, and mitigate risks inherent in the conduct of business and strategies employed.</p> <p>The GCG agrees that the Bangladesh Bank heist was a completely unforeseen event. However, the failure of LIBI to realize its EBITDA Margin target cannot be directly attributed to the decrease in its foreign exchange (FX) trading income. Noticeably, the</p>

Component						LIBI Submission		GCG Validation		Supporting Document	Remarks
Objective/Measure		Formula	Wt.	Rating System	2016 Target	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating		
											<p>income from FX trading have been in the decline such that, as communicated to GCG during the 2017 TPM, the Board decided to cease its FX operations starting 2017.</p> <p>Lastly, the ability of LIBI to realize its EBITDA Margin target is not solely dependent on its ability to raise or increase its revenue. As a measure, the EBITDA Margin is arrived at by dividing the EBITDA with revenue, while EBITDA reflects the operating profit of LIBI. Hence, EBITDA Margin is influenced by revenue and operating expenses of the company. While LIBI is unable to hit its revenue targets, it is but wise to maintain its operating expenses at the very minimum. Thereby ensuring that costs incurred are within the limits of the company's ability to generate income. In view of the foregoing, the request to reduce the target is <b>DENIED</b>.</p>

	Component					LIBI Submission		GCG Validation		Supporting Document	Remarks	
	Objective/Measure		Formula	Wt.	Rating System	2016 Target	Actual	Rating	Score			Rating
		Sub-total		35%				33.13%		32.92%		
CUSTOMERS / STAKEHOLDERS	SO 2	Improve Service Delivery										
	SM 2	Customer Satisfaction Survey	85% of respondents rated LIBI "Very Good"	10%	All or Nothing	85% of respondents rated LIBI Very Good	90.70%	10%	90.70%	10%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Survey Tally and Result</li><li>• Copy of the Survey Questionnaire</li></ul>	In 2016, 90.70% or 117 out of 129 respondents rated LIBI at least "Very Good" to "Excellent". LIBI's clients are more satisfied in 2016 with the significant increase by 32.35% in the number of customers who rated LIBI "Very Good". There were also more respondents in 2016 with 129 from 44 in 2015, which means more clients transacted with LIBI in 2016.
	SO 3	Offer Competitive FX Rates										
	SM 3	Accredited Counterparty for FX rate canvassing	Absolute Figure	5%	Actual/Target x Weight	6 (additional 1)	None	0%	None	0%	None	In 2016, LIBI was not able to accredit any counterparty and requested to transfer the weight of 5% to SM 2 Customer Satisfaction Survey. As explained in SM 1, requests for renegotiation may only be considered if the achievement of target is no longer feasible due to unforeseen circumstances. However, the factors presented by LIBI are not due to unforeseeable

Component						LIBI Submission		GCG Validation		Supporting Document	Remarks
Objective/Measure		Formula	Wt.	Rating System	2016 Target	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating		
											circumstances but rather as an effect of the delay in the process. Given that the 2016 targets were set before the start of 2016, processing time should have been accounted for by LIBI in order to ensure the achievement of the target. In view of this, the request to delete the measure and target is <b>DENIED</b> .
SO 4	Provide Wider Market Reach for Bancassurance Products for Agricultural Development										
SM 4	Number of Products with Improved Market Access	No. of products developed and sold	10%	50% = products developed 50% = products sold	2	2	10%	2	10%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Copy of Policy on Brown Water Craft</li> <li>• Copy of Policy on High Value Commercial Crop Insurance</li> <li>• Letter to Philippine First Insurance</li> </ul>	LIBI introduced and sold two (2) products with improved market access, the policy on Brown Water Craft and the policy on High-Value Commercial Crop Insurance.
SO 5	Provide Wider Market Reach for Bancassurance Products for Financial Viability										
SM 5	Number of New Products Offered	No. of products developed and sold	10%	50% = products developed	2	2	10%	1	5%	• Copy of policies on parametric	LIBI offered one new product which is the Parametric Insurance for

	Component					LIBI Submission		GCG Validation		Supporting Document	Remarks
	Objective/Measure		Formula	Wt.	Rating System	2016 Target	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating	
					50% = products sold						farmers. The product was sold to two (2) clients both amounting to P25,000.00. The rating is only 5% percent since the accomplishment should be 2 products each sold to a client.
	Sub-total			35%				30%		25%	
INTERNAL PROCESS	SO 6 Improve Efficiency and Quality of Insurance Process										
	SM 6	Average Number of Days to Process Insurance Coverage	Average TAT of every transaction	5%	$(1 - [(A - T) / T]) \times \text{Weight}$	5 working days	7 working days	3%	Full TAT cannot be determined based on submitted supporting documents	0%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>List of Transactions</li><li>Process Workflow for issuance of Quotation and Policy</li></ul> <p>LIBI reported an average processing time of 7.71 working days per transaction covering total of 12,645 insurance coverages. Applications were received from 04 January to 11 October 2016 and processed from 06 January 2016 to 25 July 2017.</p> <p>LIBI requested to revise the target from "5 working days" to "5 working days within LIBI's control". In its letter, LIBI presented a process workflow on issuance of quotation and policy which includes the intervention of insurance companies in the process.</p> <p>This measure aims to determine LIBI's average</p>

Component						LIBI Submission		GCG Validation		Supporting Document	Remarks
Objective/Measure		Formula	Wt.	Rating System	2016 Target	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating		
											<p>TAT and capture its efficiency in processing transactions from receipt of requests to the time the documents are delivered to Lending Units.</p> <p>LIBI derives its value through the efficient delivery of service – which is the facilitation of insurance coverage of clients. Hence, while it is understandable that the entire process does not rest within the organization alone, the business, being an insurance broker relies on the efficient facilitation and processing of application. Thus, to limit the computation of the processing time within the organization alone defeats the purpose of the measure which aims to capture efficiency of LIBI. In view of this, the request to revise the target is <b><u>DENIED</u></b>.</p> <p>In the evaluation of the reported score, GCG found that the submitted supporting documents does not indicate the dates</p>

1

	Component					LIBI Submission		GCG Validation		Supporting Document	Remarks
	Objective/Measure		Formula	Wt.	Rating System	2016 Target	Actual	Rating	Score		
											<p>when the request for quotation and policy was forwarded to and received from insurance companies. Hence, the full processing time of the transactions cannot be determined.</p> <p>GCG requested for the documents that includes the dates of intervention by insurance companies. However, LIBI failed to submit the requested documents. In view of this, LIBI's rating for this measure is 0%.</p>
	SO 7	Enhance Existing Processes Comparable with the Industry									
	SM 7	Preparation for ISO/GQMSS Certification for Quality Service	Actual Accomplishment vs. Work Program	10%	All or Nothing	Conduct of Internal Quality Audit (IQA) based on Manuals	`Note: With renegotiated from Conduct of Internal Quality Manual Audit to Preparation of Risk Management Manual	10%	LIBI was not able to conduct IQA based on manuals.	0%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Copy of Risk Management Manual</li><li>• Memorandum approving the Risk Mgt. Manual</li><li>• LIBI ISO-QMS Roadmap</li></ul> <p>As reported, LIBI was not able to conduct the IQA in 2016. Per representation, a requisite for the conduct of Internal Quality Audit (IQA) is Internal Quality Audit Training. LIBI wanted to avail of the services of Development Academy of the Philippines (DAP) for the conduct of the IQA training. However, a minimum of 20 participants is required in order for DAP to conduct the training. In order to fill the required number, LIBI</p>

✓

Component						LIBI Submission		GCG Validation		Supporting Document	Remarks
Objective/Measure		Formula	Wt.	Rating System	2016 Target	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating		
											<p>planned to undertake the IQA training with the other LandBank subsidiaries. However, given the difficulty in finding available schedules with the other subsidiaries, the IQA training was not pursued.</p> <p>LIBI requested to replace the target of "Conduct of IQA" to "Preparation of Risk Management Manual". Review of the supporting document shows that the manual is patterned after the requirement of the Central Bank and Insurance Commission on the institution of risk management system within their supervised sectors.</p> <p>Considering that the measure pertains to the preparation for the attainment of ISO Certification, the proposed replacement of the measure is <b>NOT ACCEPTABLE</b>. However, given that the circumstances of LIBI are not within their full control, the measure and</p>

	Component					LIBI Submission		GCG Validation		Supporting Document	Remarks
	Objective/Measure	Formula	Wt.	Rating System	2016 Target	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating		
											corresponding weight is hereby <b>REMOVED</b> .
	<b>Sub-total</b>		<b>15%</b>				<b>13%</b>		<b>0%</b>		
<b>LEARNING AND GROWTH</b>	<b>SO 8</b>	<b>Develop Strategic Skills &amp; Competence of Officers and Staff</b>									
	SM 8	Competency Level of the Organization	Actual Number of Personnel Trained/Total No. of Personnel	10%	All or Nothing	Board Approved Competency Framework	Approved Competency Framework	10%	Approved Competency Framework	10%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Copy of Competency Framework</li> <li>• Memorandum approving the Competency Framework</li> <li>• Minutes of the Board Meeting</li> </ul> <p>In 2016, LIBI was able to develop a competency framework and was approved by the Board under Board Resolution No. 2016-011-037. LIBI's competency framework is composed of core and general technical competencies related to performance of roles, technical knowledge application and performance objective accomplishment.</p>
	<b>SO 9</b>	<b>Enhanced IT Infrastructure</b>									
	SM 9	Improvement of Existing Computer System	Actual Accomplishment vs. Work Program	5%	All or Nothing	Develop Transaction Tracking Systems	Note: With Renegotiated from Develop Transaction Tracking Systems to Upgrading of IIBS from Version 3.3 to Version 4.0	5%	<b>Upgrading of IIBS from Version 3.3 to Version 4.0</b>	5%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IIBS Profile</li> <li>• IIBS 4.0 Project Workplan and Timeline</li> </ul> <p>LIBI was not able to develop Transaction Tracking System. In the same letter dated 06 December 2016, LIBI requested to revise the target from Develop Transaction Tracking System to Upgrading of IIBS from Version 3.3 to Version 4.0. Per representation, the IIBS version 3.3 is developed using the Oracle/Reports 6i which is already</p>

Component						LIBI Submission		GCG Validation		Supporting Document	Remarks
Objective/Measure		Formula	Wt.	Rating System	2016 Target	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating		
											declared by Oracle as “End-of-Support” (EDS). This means that Oracle will no longer develop any upgrade nor technical patches for this technology platform leaving LIBI with an obsolete technology and exposing LIBI to high risk exposure that will result to financial loss. The current database platform of IIBS version 3.3 is Oracle 11g Standard Edition One (SE1) which was also declared as “End-of-Life” (EOL) and will eventually be declared as EOS. IIBS version 4.0 is the latest version and a prerequisite to develop a Transaction Tracking System. The justifications presented is deemed reasonable and valid, hence, the request is <b>ACCEPTED</b> .
		Sub-total		15%			15%		15%		
		Total		100%			91.13%		72.92% out of 90%		
									81.02%		

✓