

**NATIONAL POWER CORPORATION (NPC)
Performance Scorecard**

Objective/Measure	Component	Target	Submission		GCG Validation		Supporting Documents	Remarks																						
	Formula	Weight	2015	Actual	Rating	Score			Rating																					
SO 1 Provided Efficient Operation of Generation Assets in Missionary Areas																														
CUSTOMER/STAKEHOLDER	SM 1	Quality 1: Percentage of Readiness of Existing Plants (Equivalent Availability Factor)	$\frac{\sum[\text{Dependable Cap} \times (\text{Period Hours} - \text{Outage Hours})] + \sum[\text{Rated Cap} \times (\text{Period Hours} - \text{Deactivated Shutdown Hours})]}{\sum[\text{Dependable Cap} \times (\text{Period Hours} - \text{Outage Hours})] + \sum[\text{Rated Cap} \times (\text{Period Hours} - \text{Deactivated Shutdown Hours})]}$	4%	66.280%	67.567%	4.00%	67.567%	4.00%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of SPUG Plant Performance CY2015 signed by VP E.A.Veloso, Jr., SPUG dated 03 Mar 2016 Onsite validation of the NPC database. <p>Equivalent Availability Factor (EAF) is the percentage of time the generation units are available to produce electricity over a certain period including the derating due to equipment deterioration.</p> <p>Forced Outage Rate (FOR) is the ratio of a generating unit's forced outage hours over the sum of its forced outage hours and operating hours (sum of forced outage hours and operating hours).</p> <p>Net Heat Rate (NHR) is ratio of heat utilized to produce electrical energy expressed in BTU/kWh.</p> <p>Below is the summary of SPUG operations:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>EAF (%)</th> <th>FOR (%)</th> <th>NHR (BTU / kWh)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Luzon</td> <td>71.194</td> <td>0.221</td> <td>10,346</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Visayas</td> <td>66.405</td> <td>0.118</td> <td>11,956</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mindanao</td> <td>61.588</td> <td>0.011</td> <td>11,070</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ave.</td> <td>67.567</td> <td>0.142</td> <td>10,699</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>For NPC SPUG plants, all plant maintenance activities were completed in an aggregate of 1,225 days as compared with the total scheduled maintenance period of 1,336 calendar days.</p>		EAF (%)	FOR (%)	NHR (BTU / kWh)	Luzon	71.194	0.221	10,346	Visayas	66.405	0.118	11,956	Mindanao	61.588	0.011	11,070	Ave.	67.567	0.142	10,699
		EAF (%)	FOR (%)	NHR (BTU / kWh)																										
	Luzon	71.194	0.221	10,346																										
	Visayas	66.405	0.118	11,956																										
Mindanao	61.588	0.011	11,070																											
Ave.	67.567	0.142	10,699																											
SM 2	Quality 2: Percentage of Unexpected Power Interruption (Forced Outage Rate)	$\frac{\sum(\text{Forced Outage Hours})}{\sum(\text{Operating Hours} + \text{Forced Outage Hours})}$	4%	0.274%	0.142%	4.00%	0.142%	4.00%																						
SM 3	Quality 3: Plant Operation Efficiency (Net Heat Rate)	$\frac{\sum(\text{Diesel Fuel Consumption} \times \text{Ave Diesel Fuel Heating Value}) + \sum(\text{Bunker Fuel Consumption} \times \text{Ave Bunker Fuel Heating Value})}{\sum(\text{Net Generation})}$	4%	10,937	10,699	4.00%	10,699	4.00%																						
SM 4	Quality 4: Plant Maintenance Efficiency	$\frac{\sum \text{Planned Maintenance Days}}{\sum \text{Actual Maintenance Days}}$	2%	100%	109.06%	2.00%	109.06%	2.00%																						

Component		Target	Submission	GCG Validation		Supporting Documents	Remarks																																	
Objective/Measure	Formula	Weight	2015	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating																																	
SO 2 Increased Power Generations in Missionary Areas Pursuant to the Approved Budget																																								
SM 5a	Quality 1a: Completed Capacity Additions – Lease	$\Sigma(\text{Nameplate Ratings of Leased Generation Capacity})$	5%	29.90	37.50	3.73%	37.50	3.73%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring of Programs, Projects and Activities for CY2014-2015 as of 22 Dec 2015 Memorandum re Commercial Operations of New Generating Sets dated 11 Jan 2016 	<p>Actual capacity additions through lease agreement reached to 48.30MW in 2015, however, only 37.50MW was identified to be within the controls of the management, as follows:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>SPUG</th> <th>in MW</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Boac</td><td>4.00</td></tr> <tr><td>Tablas</td><td>1.80</td></tr> <tr><td>Ticao</td><td>1.00</td></tr> <tr><td>Basco DPP</td><td>1.10</td></tr> <tr><td>San Jose SS</td><td>4.00</td></tr> <tr><td>El Nido DPP</td><td>1.00</td></tr> <tr><td>Taytay DPP</td><td>0.60</td></tr> <tr><td>Pulanglupa</td><td>6.00</td></tr> <tr><td>Jolo/Sulu</td><td>6.00</td></tr> <tr><td>Kalamansig</td><td>1.00</td></tr> <tr><td>Dinagat</td><td>2.00</td></tr> <tr><td>Basilan</td><td>3.50</td></tr> <tr><td>Bongao</td><td>1.50</td></tr> <tr><td>Total</td><td>37.50</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Nevertheless, NPC still exceeded committed limit by 25.42%.</p>	SPUG	in MW	Boac	4.00	Tablas	1.80	Ticao	1.00	Basco DPP	1.10	San Jose SS	4.00	El Nido DPP	1.00	Taytay DPP	0.60	Pulanglupa	6.00	Jolo/Sulu	6.00	Kalamansig	1.00	Dinagat	2.00	Basilan	3.50	Bongao	1.50	Total	37.50
SPUG	in MW																																							
Boac	4.00																																							
Tablas	1.80																																							
Ticao	1.00																																							
Basco DPP	1.10																																							
San Jose SS	4.00																																							
El Nido DPP	1.00																																							
Taytay DPP	0.60																																							
Pulanglupa	6.00																																							
Jolo/Sulu	6.00																																							
Kalamansig	1.00																																							
Dinagat	2.00																																							
Basilan	3.50																																							
Bongao	1.50																																							
Total	37.50																																							
SM 5b	Quantity 1b: Completed Capacity Additions – Commissioned	Actual Completed Capacity Addition	5%	27.40	0.90	0.16%	0.90	0.16%	<p>Commissioned capacity additions junked in 2015 due to unexpected rise in the capacity additions under lease.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>SPUG</th> <th>in MW</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Rizal DPP</td><td>0.30</td></tr> <tr><td>Ticao DPP</td><td>0.30</td></tr> <tr><td>Burias DPP</td><td>0.30</td></tr> <tr><td>Total</td><td>0.90</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>NPC fell short by 96.72% of the committed target.</p>	SPUG	in MW	Rizal DPP	0.30	Ticao DPP	0.30	Burias DPP	0.30	Total	0.90																					
SPUG	in MW																																							
Rizal DPP	0.30																																							
Ticao DPP	0.30																																							
Burias DPP	0.30																																							
Total	0.90																																							

Component		Target	Submission	GCG Validation		Supporting Documents	Remarks																							
Objective/Measure	Formula	Weight	2015	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating																							
SM 6	Quantity 2: Transmission Line	Actual Completed Transmission Lines	5%	123.11	86.91	3.53%	86.91	3.53%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of Accomplished Performance Targets for 2015 by Project Management Department Certificates of Project Accomplishment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to SLDCC (100.00% Puerto Prinsesa-Roxas 138 kV Steel Tower) to DMCI (96.81% Mobo-Cataingan "1" and "2" 69 kV Schedule 1) to PDI (87.14% Mobo-Cataingan "1" and "2" 69 kV Schedule 2) to SLDCC (85.19% Codon-Virac TLP 69 kV Steel Poles) 	<p>Accomplishment is composed of the ff:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Mobo-Arroyo "3" - 10.83 km. Mobo-Cataingan "1" and "2" 69 kV - Sched 1 - 32.29 km. Mobo-Cataingan "1" and "2" 69 kV - Sched 2 - 24.99 km. Puerto Princesa - Roxas 138 kV (Palawan) - 5.00 km. Codon - Virac 69 kV (Catanduanes) - 13.80 km. <p>Actual completed T/L is only 70.60% of the target. Reasons for the delay include ROW issues, contractor's delay, and peace and order situation in the area.</p>																				
SM 7	Quantity 3: Substation Facilities	Actual Completed Substations	0%	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None <p>No target and weight for 2015.</p>																					
SO 3	Contributed to Efficient Operation of Generation Assets in the Main Grids																													
SM 8	Quality 5: Percentage of Readiness of Existing Power Plants (Availability Factor) ²	$\frac{\sum(\text{Available Hours}) + \sum(\text{Period Hours})}{\dots}$	3%	89.50%	88.81%	2.98%	88.81%	2.98%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of Actual Performance 2015 signed by Mgr. R.L Abergas, Corplan Monitoring Report by Mindanao Generations CY2015 and <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Plant</th> <th>Wt. (%)</th> <th>AF (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>PB 104</td> <td>3.16</td> <td>93.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agus 1 & 2</td> <td>25.64</td> <td>92.83</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agus 4 & 5</td> <td>21.01</td> <td>93.62</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agus 6 & 7</td> <td>25.05</td> <td>88.73</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pulangi IV</td> <td>25.15</td> <td>80.14</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>100%</td> <td>88.81</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Actual AF rate is a weighted average, based on allocated rated capacity per plant, itemized below:</p>	Plant	Wt. (%)	AF (%)	PB 104	3.16	93.75	Agus 1 & 2	25.64	92.83	Agus 4 & 5	21.01	93.62	Agus 6 & 7	25.05	88.73	Pulangi IV	25.15	80.14	Total	100%	88.81
Plant	Wt. (%)	AF (%)																												
PB 104	3.16	93.75																												
Agus 1 & 2	25.64	92.83																												
Agus 4 & 5	21.01	93.62																												
Agus 6 & 7	25.05	88.73																												
Pulangi IV	25.15	80.14																												
Total	100%	88.81																												

Component		Target	Submission		GCG Validation		Supporting Documents	Remarks																																	
Objective/Measure	Formula	Weight	2015	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating																																		
SM 9	Quality 6: Unexpected Power Interruption (Forced Outage Rate) ²	Actual Forced Outage Hour	4%	24	14.53	4.00%	14.53	4.00%	PB104 signed by VP D.C.Corpuz, MinGen • PB104 Results of Performance vs. Targets CY2015 signed by Plant Mgr. I.C.Dongallo, PB104 • Monthly Operational Reports Actual unexpected power interruption is only 60.54% of the target.																																
SM 10	Quality 7: Plant Operation Efficiency (Net Heat Rate) ²	$\frac{\sum(\text{Bunker Fuel Consumption} \times \text{Ave Bunker Fuel Heating Value}) + \sum(\text{Net Generation})}{\text{Net Generation}}$	2%	9,220	8,967.23	2.00%	8,967.23	2.00%		NHR for main grid measures efficiency applicable to Power Barge (PB) 104. The lesser NHR means the more electricity generated per volume of fuel consumption. For 2015, NHR of PB 104 is 8,967.23 BTU/kWh, lower by 2.82% than the target limit.																															
SM 11	Quality 8: Plant Maintenance Efficiency	$\frac{\sum \text{Planned Maintenance Days} + \sum \text{Actual Maintenance Days}}{\text{Planned Maintenance Days}}$	2%	100%	125.80%	2.00%	125.80%	2.00%		Actual PME is as follows:																															
									<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Plant</th> <th>FOR</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>PB 104</td> <td>0.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agus 1 & 2</td> <td>17.85</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agus 4 & 5</td> <td>0.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agus 6 & 7</td> <td>15.57</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pulangi IV</td> <td>271.77</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>305.190</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No. of Units</td> <td>21</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ave. FOR per Unit</td> <td>14.53</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Plant</th> <th>PME (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>PB 104</td> <td>128.95</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agus 1 & 2</td> <td>132.71</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agus 4 & 5</td> <td>200.68</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agus 6 & 7</td> <td>105.39</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pulangi IV</td> <td>110.78</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>125.80</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Plant	FOR	PB 104	0.00	Agus 1 & 2	17.85	Agus 4 & 5	0.00	Agus 6 & 7	15.57	Pulangi IV	271.77	Total	305.190	No. of Units	21	Ave. FOR per Unit	14.53	Plant	PME (%)	PB 104	128.95	Agus 1 & 2	132.71	Agus 4 & 5	200.68	Agus 6 & 7	105.39	Pulangi IV	110.78	Total	125.80
Plant	FOR																																								
PB 104	0.00																																								
Agus 1 & 2	17.85																																								
Agus 4 & 5	0.00																																								
Agus 6 & 7	15.57																																								
Pulangi IV	271.77																																								
Total	305.190																																								
No. of Units	21																																								
Ave. FOR per Unit	14.53																																								
Plant	PME (%)																																								
PB 104	128.95																																								
Agus 1 & 2	132.71																																								
Agus 4 & 5	200.68																																								
Agus 6 & 7	105.39																																								
Pulangi IV	110.78																																								
Total	125.80																																								

Component		Target	Submission	GCG Validation		Supporting Documents	Remarks																																	
Objective/Measure	Formula	Weight	2015	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating																																	
SO 4 To Contribute to Sustainable Hydro and Geothermal Plant Operations and Support Climate Change Mitigation																																								
SM 12	Quantity 4: Reforestation of Open Areas	Actual Areas Reforested	5%	670	1,026.06	5.00%	1,026.06	5.00%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring Report of Performance Targets CY2015 by Watershed Management Department signed by Mgr. E.A.Umali, WMD Supporting Documents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Memorandum of Agreement Accomplishment Reports Photo Documentation Maps LGU Certifications 	Breakdown of rehabilitated area is as follows: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Areas</th> <th>Total Area</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>North Luzon</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td> Angat</td> <td>105.76</td> </tr> <tr> <td> Upper Agno River</td> <td>107.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td> San Roque</td> <td>50.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td> Pantabangan</td> <td>80.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>South Luzon</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td> Caliraya-Lumot</td> <td>53.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td> Makiling-Banahaw</td> <td>15.53</td> </tr> <tr> <td> Buhi-Barit</td> <td>86.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td> Tiwi</td> <td>76.76</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mindanao</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td> Pulangi</td> <td>110.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td> Lake Lanao</td> <td>342.01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>1,026.06</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Areas	Total Area	North Luzon		Angat	105.76	Upper Agno River	107.00	San Roque	50.00	Pantabangan	80.00	South Luzon		Caliraya-Lumot	53.00	Makiling-Banahaw	15.53	Buhi-Barit	86.00	Tiwi	76.76	Mindanao		Pulangi	110.00	Lake Lanao	342.01	TOTAL	1,026.06
Areas	Total Area																																							
North Luzon																																								
Angat	105.76																																							
Upper Agno River	107.00																																							
San Roque	50.00																																							
Pantabangan	80.00																																							
South Luzon																																								
Caliraya-Lumot	53.00																																							
Makiling-Banahaw	15.53																																							
Buhi-Barit	86.00																																							
Tiwi	76.76																																							
Mindanao																																								
Pulangi	110.00																																							
Lake Lanao	342.01																																							
TOTAL	1,026.06																																							
SM 13	Timeliness 1: Eco-Tourism Development for NPC-Managed Watersheds	Based on ManCom/President's approval	2.5%	<p><u>Plan Development:</u> San Roque, Upper Agno River</p> <p><u>Implementation/Execution:</u> Caliraya-Lumot</p> <p><u>Operation:</u> Angat</p>	Completed	Caliraya-Lumot Watershed Eco-Park was launched and CLW Eco-Center was established and inaugurated last 4 Dec 2015	Completed	Caliraya-Lumot Watershed Eco-Park was launched and CLW Eco-Center was established and inaugurated last 4 Dec 2015	2.50%	2.50%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NPC Ecotourism Management Plan for Upper and Lower Agno Watersheds Activity Report (Opening/Blessing of Caliraya-Lumot Watershed Eco-center and Ecopark) Project Profile (Angat Initiative: Saving the Angat Watershed through Public Education Saving the Philippine Eagle (Eco- 	Validated with internal documents																												

Component		Target		Submission		GCG Validation		Supporting Documents	Remarks	
Objective/Measure	Formula	Weight	2015	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating			
				installed signages at Manalo & Tariktik Trails and established bambusele um and nursery genebank. Registered at least 3,000 visitors.		installed signages at Manalo & Tariktik Trails and established bambusele um and nursery genebank. Registered at least 3,000 visitors.		Tourism Development)) • Progress Report (Landscaping of AREP View deck)		
SO 5 Ensure the integrity and Safety of Dams and Mitigate the Effects of Flooding Through the Conduct of IEC with the LGUs at the Target Areas Downstream										
SM 14	Quantity 5: Number of Dam Integrity Inspections	Actual Dam Inspections	2%	10	18	2.00%	18	2.00%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Semi-Annual Inspection / Assessment Reports, viz: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ambuklao HPP - Binga HPP - San Roque HPP - Angat HPP - Caliraya and Lumot Dams / Dykes • Oversight Committee Inspection Reports, prepared by NPC and PSALM, viz: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Amlan HPP - Barit HPP - Cawayan HPP - Loboc HPP - 	Validated with internal documents

Component			Target	Submission		GCG Validation		Supporting Documents	Remarks																			
Objective/Measure	Formula	Weight	2015	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating																					
SM 15a	Quantity 6: Percentage of target IECLHU at Angat, Ambuklao-Binga, San Roque, and Caliraya-Lumot dams ³	(No. of actual IEC/LGU sessions) + (Target No. of IEC/LGU sessions)	2.5%	100%	244%	2.50%	244%	2.50%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of conducted IEC Post-Evaluation Feedback for Dams Reports on the Conduct of Informatin and Education Campaign, viz: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ambuklao and Binga Dam San Roque Dam Angat Dam Caliraya Dam 	For 2015, 22 IEC/LGU Sessions were conducted, viz: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Area</th> <th>Inclusive Dates</th> <th>No. of sessions</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Caliraya, Laguna</td> <td>25-27 May</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Angat, Bulacan</td> <td>12-27 May</td> <td>12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>San Roque, Pangasinan</td> <td>7-15 May</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ambuklao-Binga, Benguet</td> <td>16-18 June</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Total</td> <td>22</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> The actual IEC sessions exceeded the target by 144%.	Area	Inclusive Dates	No. of sessions	Caliraya, Laguna	25-27 May	3	Angat, Bulacan	12-27 May	12	San Roque, Pangasinan	7-15 May	4	Ambuklao-Binga, Benguet	16-18 June	3	Total		22
Area	Inclusive Dates	No. of sessions																										
Caliraya, Laguna	25-27 May	3																										
Angat, Bulacan	12-27 May	12																										
San Roque, Pangasinan	7-15 May	4																										
Ambuklao-Binga, Benguet	16-18 June	3																										
Total		22																										
SM 15b	Quality 9: IEC Post-Evaluation Feedback for dams	Σ Participants' Ratings + No. of Participants	1%	3.50	4.79	1.00%	4.77	1.00%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Raw Data of IEC Post-Evaluation Feedback for Dams Breakdown of IEC Post-Evaluation Feedback is as follows: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Area</th> <th>Participant's Rating</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Caliraya-Lumot</td> <td>4.72</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Angat</td> <td>4.92</td> </tr> <tr> <td>San Roque</td> <td>4.86</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ambuklao-Binga</td> <td>4.59</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Average</td> <td>4.77</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Area	Participant's Rating	Caliraya-Lumot	4.72	Angat	4.92	San Roque	4.86	Ambuklao-Binga	4.59	Average	4.77							
Area	Participant's Rating																											
Caliraya-Lumot	4.72																											
Angat	4.92																											
San Roque	4.86																											
Ambuklao-Binga	4.59																											
Average	4.77																											
SO 6 Ensure Customer/Stakeholder Satisfaction																												
SM 16	Quality 10: Customer/Stakeholder Satisfaction	Σ Respondents' Ratings + No. of Respondents	2%	Satisfactory level	3.98	2.00%	3.98	2.00%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NPC Customer/Stakeholder Satisfaction Survey (2015) prepared by Associated Resources for Management and Development, Inc. (ARMDEV) The survey for NPC's performance is divided into 5 service areas with respective ratings as presented below: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Service Area</th> <th>Overall Customer Satisfaction %</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Missionary Electrification</td> <td>3.85</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Main Grid</td> <td>3.86</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Watershed</td> <td>4.15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dam</td> <td>3.89</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Corporate</td> <td>4.17</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total OSCR</td> <td>3.98</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Service Area	Overall Customer Satisfaction %	Missionary Electrification	3.85	Main Grid	3.86	Watershed	4.15	Dam	3.89	Corporate	4.17	Total OSCR	3.98					
Service Area	Overall Customer Satisfaction %																											
Missionary Electrification	3.85																											
Main Grid	3.86																											
Watershed	4.15																											
Dam	3.89																											
Corporate	4.17																											
Total OSCR	3.98																											
Sub-total		55%			47.40%		47.40%																					

Objective/Measure	Component		Target	Submission		GCG Validation		Supporting Documents	Remarks																		
	Formula	Weight	2015	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating																				
SO 7: Exercise Fiscal Prudence to Optimize Use of Resources																											
FINANCIAL	SM 17	Quality 1: Fixed Cost Efficiency in the Missionary Areas	$\frac{\sum[PS + MOOE] + \sum(\text{Gross Generation})}{\sum(\text{Gross Generation})}$	3%	4.25	5.42	2.17%	5.42	2.17%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fixed Cost Efficiency in the Missionary Areas CY 2015 SPUG Generation Mix CY 2014 and 2015 Computation of Fixed Cost and MOE in the Missionary Areas CY 2015 <table border="1"> <tr><td colspan="2">Fixed cost efficiency of SPUGs:</td></tr> <tr><td>Gross Generation, GWH (in millions)</td><td>405</td></tr> <tr><td>Fixed Costs (in millions)</td><td>2,196</td></tr> <tr><td>Fixed Costs, P/kWh</td><td>5.42</td></tr> </table>	Fixed cost efficiency of SPUGs:		Gross Generation, GWH (in millions)	405	Fixed Costs (in millions)	2,196	Fixed Costs, P/kWh	5.42									
	Fixed cost efficiency of SPUGs:																										
	Gross Generation, GWH (in millions)	405																									
Fixed Costs (in millions)	2,196																										
Fixed Costs, P/kWh	5.42																										
SM 18	Quality 2: Fixed Cost Efficiency in the Main Grids: ² Hydro Plants (Agus-Pulangi) Power Barges (PB 101, 102 and 104) ⁴	$\frac{\sum[PS + MOOE] + \sum(\text{Energy Sales})}{\sum(\text{Energy Sales})}$	6%	0.23 10.12	0.24 7.26	2.87% 3.00%	0.24 7.26	2.87% 3.00%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fixed Cost Efficiency in the Main Grids CY 2015 Mindanao Generation Production Cost For the period ending Dec. 25, 2015 <table border="1"> <tr><td colspan="2">Fixed cost efficiency in the main grid:</td></tr> <tr><td colspan="2">Agus/Pulangi</td></tr> <tr><td>Energy Sales, GWH (in millions)</td><td>3,293</td></tr> <tr><td>Fixed Costs (in millions)</td><td>802</td></tr> <tr><td>Fixed Cost Efficiency, P/kWh</td><td>0.24</td></tr> <tr><td colspan="2">PB 104</td></tr> <tr><td>Energy Sales, GWH (in millions)</td><td>23</td></tr> <tr><td>Fixed Costs (in millions)</td><td>167</td></tr> <tr><td>Fixed Cost Efficiency, P/kWh</td><td>7.26</td></tr> </table>	Fixed cost efficiency in the main grid:		Agus/Pulangi		Energy Sales, GWH (in millions)	3,293	Fixed Costs (in millions)	802	Fixed Cost Efficiency, P/kWh	0.24	PB 104		Energy Sales, GWH (in millions)	23	Fixed Costs (in millions)	167	Fixed Cost Efficiency, P/kWh	7.26
Fixed cost efficiency in the main grid:																											
Agus/Pulangi																											
Energy Sales, GWH (in millions)	3,293																										
Fixed Costs (in millions)	802																										
Fixed Cost Efficiency, P/kWh	0.24																										
PB 104																											
Energy Sales, GWH (in millions)	23																										
Fixed Costs (in millions)	167																										
Fixed Cost Efficiency, P/kWh	7.26																										
SM 19	Quality 3: OMA Budget Utilization Efficiency ^{5 & 6}	$\frac{\sum(\text{Miscellaneous OMA Budget}) + \sum(\text{Energy Sales})}{\sum(\text{Energy Sales})}$	4%	0.08	0.08	4.00%	0.08	4.00%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> OMA Budget Utilization Efficiency Rate CY 2015 Budget Utilization Report-Dec. 25, 2015 Mindanao Generation Production Cost For the period ending Dec. 25, 2015 <table border="1"> <tr><td colspan="2">OMA budget utilization efficiency:</td></tr> <tr><td>Miscellaneous OMA Budget</td><td>272,199</td></tr> <tr><td>Energy Sales</td><td>3,316,406</td></tr> <tr><td>OMA Budget Utilization Efficiency, P/kWh</td><td>0.08</td></tr> </table>	OMA budget utilization efficiency:		Miscellaneous OMA Budget	272,199	Energy Sales	3,316,406	OMA Budget Utilization Efficiency, P/kWh	0.08										
OMA budget utilization efficiency:																											
Miscellaneous OMA Budget	272,199																										
Energy Sales	3,316,406																										
OMA Budget Utilization Efficiency, P/kWh	0.08																										

Component		Target	Submission		GCG Validation		Supporting Documents	Remarks																	
Objective/Measure	Formula	Weight	2015	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating																		
SO 8 Ensure adequate fund sources for sustainability and improve corporate liquidity																									
SM 20a	Quality 4a: Collection Efficiency with BASULTA Customers	Total Collections + Total Accounts Receivable	5%	49.65%	49.45%	4.98%	49.45%	4.98%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •SPUG Power Receivables and Collection Efficiency as of December 2015 <table border="1"> <tr> <td colspan="2">Coll. % excluding BASULTA</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Coll.</td> <td>1,771.16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total AR</td> <td>1,798.67</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Collection %</td> <td>98.47%</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Coll. % including BASULTA</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Coll.</td> <td>1,828.16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total AR</td> <td>3,697.01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Collection %</td> <td>49.45%</td> </tr> </table>	Coll. % excluding BASULTA		Total Coll.	1,771.16	Total AR	1,798.67	Collection %	98.47%	Coll. % including BASULTA		Total Coll.	1,828.16	Total AR	3,697.01	Collection %	49.45%
Coll. % excluding BASULTA																									
Total Coll.	1,771.16																								
Total AR	1,798.67																								
Collection %	98.47%																								
Coll. % including BASULTA																									
Total Coll.	1,828.16																								
Total AR	3,697.01																								
Collection %	49.45%																								
SM 20b	Quality 4b: Collection Efficiency without BASULTA Customers	Total Collections (excluding BASULTA) + Total Accounts Receivable (excluding BASULTA)	5%	96.52%	98.47%	5.00%	98.47%	5.00%																	
SM 21	Financial 2: EBITDAS Margin with UCME?	EBITDAS + (Total Revenue/Income)	18%	8%	32%	18.00%	32%	18.00%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EBITDAS Margin with UCME – Actual CY 2015 • SPUG Generation Mix FY 2014 and 2015 • SPUG Energy Sales FY 2014 and 2015 <table border="1"> <tr> <td colspan="2"><i>(in Millions)</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>EBITDAS</td> <td>4,116</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Revenue/ Income</td> <td>12,854</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EBITDAS Margin w/ UCME</td> <td>32%</td> </tr> </table>	<i>(in Millions)</i>		EBITDAS	4,116	Total Revenue/ Income	12,854	EBITDAS Margin w/ UCME	32%								
<i>(in Millions)</i>																									
EBITDAS	4,116																								
Total Revenue/ Income	12,854																								
EBITDAS Margin w/ UCME	32%																								
SO 9 Secure the Unregistered Lots under OMA in Support of the Disposal of Assets																									
SM 22	Quantity 1: Filed Applications for Titling / Issuance of Decrees / Titles of Unregistered Lots under OMA	No. of Lots with Filed Applications for Titling/Issuances of Decrees/Titles	1%	20	36	1.00%	36	1.00%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Office of the Legal Counsel Land and Land Rights Department Accomplishment Report for CY2015 signed by VP M.P.Ridulme, OLC 																

	Component			Target	Submission		GCG Validation		Supporting Documents	Remarks																
	Objective/Measure	Formula	Weight	2015	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating																		
SO 10 Secure the Unregistered Lots under Non-OMA in Support of Operations																										
	SM 23	Quantity 2: Filed Applications for Titling / Issuance of Decrees / Titles of Unregistered Lots under Non-OMA	No. of Lots with Filed Applications for Titling/ Issuance of Decrees/Titles	1%	20	16	0.80%	16	0.80%	• Office of the Legal Counsel Land and Land Rights Department Accomplishment Report for CY2015 signed by VP M.P.Ridulme, OLC	Validated with internal documents															
Sub-total				43%			41.82%		41.82%																	
SO 11 Ensure Employee Productivity and Competency																										
LEARNING AND GROWTH	SM 24	Quantity 3: No. of officials/staff trained per relevant programs	$\Sigma(\text{Actual No. of Personnel Trained} \times \text{Actual No. of Programs Implemented}) + \Sigma(\text{Target No. of Personnel} \times \text{Target No. of Programs})$	2%			2%		2%	• NPC Training and Development Division Performance Evaluation System Annual Monitoring Report	Number of personnel trained is summarized below:															
		Managerial			90%	100%		100%			<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Target</th> <th>Actual Validated</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Managerial</td> <td>248</td> <td>274</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Supervisory</td> <td>1,090</td> <td>1,136</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rank & File</td> <td>853</td> <td>1,295</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>2,191</td> <td>2,705</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Target	Actual Validated	Managerial	248	274	Supervisory	1,090	1,136	Rank & File	853	1,295	TOTAL	2,191	2,705
		Target	Actual Validated																							
	Managerial	248	274																							
	Supervisory	1,090	1,136																							
Rank & File	853	1,295																								
TOTAL	2,191	2,705																								
	Supervisory			90%	100%		100%																			
	Rank and File			90%	100%		100%																			
Sub-total				2%			2.00%		2.00%																	
TOTAL				100%			91.22%		91.22%																	