

**PHILIPPINE HEALTH INSURANCE CORPORATION**  
**Interim Performance Scorecard**

MFO		Target	Accomplishment		CGO-A Validation		Supporting Documents	Remarks
Indicator	Weight	2013	2013	Rating	Score	Rating		
<b>MFO 1: National Health Insurance</b>								
<b>Quantity 1:</b> Enrollment Rate	5%	85%	79%	4.6%	79%	4.6%	Regular Reporting of Presidential Priority Program	Considering that National Health Insurance coverage is a Presidential Priority Program, it should be noted that PHIC <u>missed</u> its 2013 targets for Enrollment Rate and Coverage Rate of 85% and 70%, respectively.
<b>Quantity 2:</b> Coverage Rate	20%	70%	67%	19.1%	67%	19.1%	Regular Reporting of Presidential Priority Program	<p>PHIC attributes this to two factors: <b>First</b>, the continuing cleanup of database resulting in dropping of names of members. Moreover, the target includes 567,018 households submitted by DSWD for inclusion in the NHTS program. Verification by PHIC showed errors or missing beneficiaries.</p> <p><b>Second</b>, OFW and Individually Paying member classifications largely account for the gap between enrollment rate and coverage rate. This is due to the lack of institutional mechanisms for collecting premium payments from these members. Foreign employers are not bound by Philippine laws to withhold and remit PHIC mandatory contributions, while Individually Paying members are difficult to monitor because of relaxed employment regulations in the informal sector.</p> <p>We agree with the PHIC that the coverage rate is the more significant indicator rather than enrollment rate. The enrollment rate may be removed as a performance indicator.</p>

MFO		Target	Accomplishment		CGO-A Validation		Supporting Documents	Remarks
Indicator	Weight	2013	2013	Rating	Score	Rating		
								The rating scheme of dividing the actual accomplishment by the target appears, in this case, inadequate. For instance, an 85% target for enrollment rate and an accomplishment of 79% yields a missed target of 6% which translates into 5.86 million Filipinos. For PHIC, this merely converts into a penalty of 0.4% of its overall score rating despite the fact that it not only missed its target but actually saw a fall in enrollment rate.
<b>Quantity 3:</b> % of DOH-Licensed Hospitals (Public and Private) with PHIC Engagement	20%	Not less than 95% of eligible hospitals & infirmaries	96.20%	20%	96.23%	20%	Management report from the Health Finance Policy Sector	Accomplishments on these indicators are at near-saturation point. These two indicators have a combined weight of 30%. This means that 30% of the overall score of PHIC in the future is focused on the remaining few DOH-Licensed Hospitals and LGUs without PHIC Engagement and Engaged PCB Providers compared with the combined weight of the coverage rate and enrollment rates of only 25%. Hence, more importance is given to a small area of improvement compared to a Presidential Priority Program.
<b>Quantity 4:</b> % of LGUs with Engaged Primary Care Benefit (PCB) Providers	10%	85% of qualified LGUs	93.70%	10%	93.70%	10%	Management report from the Health Finance Policy Sector	It is recommended that these indicators either be <u>excluded</u> in future Performance Agreements, or have significantly <u>lower weight</u> , with the additional weight transferred to giving more focus to Coverage Rate.  It is also recommended that PHIC map the uncovered areas and identify a strategy to engage DOH-licensed hospitals and LGUs in

MFO		Target	Accomplishment		CGO-A Validation		Supporting Documents	Remarks
Indicator	Weight	2013	2013	Rating	Score	Rating		
								the remaining areas.
<b>Quality 1:</b> Net Customer Satisfaction Survey	5%	> +85%	+78	4.6%	+78	4.6%	Social Weather Stations report	<p>The net satisfaction rating of 78% declined from 82% in FY 2012. However, the Social Weather Stations, which conducted the survey, still considers this as excellent. This is because the SWS terminology for Net Trust Ratings is excellent for +70 and above.</p> <p>The question asked from respondents is:</p> <p>“Maaari po bang pakisabi ninyo kung gaano kayo nasisiyahan o hindi nasisiyahan sa PhilHealth sa pagbibigay nila ng suporta at proteksyon sa kanilang mga miyembro at sa mga dependent ng mga ito, lalo na sa panahon ng kanilang pagkakasakit?”</p> <p>The possible responses are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lubos na nasisiyahan</li> <li>• Medyo nasisiyahan</li> <li>• Hindi tiyak kung nasisiyahan</li> <li>• Hindi medyo nasisiyahan</li> <li>• Lubos na hindi nasisiyahan</li> </ul>
<b>Quality 2:</b> % of NHTS-PR poor Families enlisted to a PCB provider	5%	50% (2.49m)	55%	5%	57%	5%	Management report from Quality Assurance Group	<p>PHIC initially reported an accomplishment of 55% (the correct figure should have been 51%, 2,646,980 enlisted members out of 5,193,805 enrolled), but revised this to 57% during CGO-A validation.</p> <p><i>Enrolled</i> members are those in the NHTS-PR</p>

MFO		Target	Accomplishment		CGO-A Validation		Supporting Documents	Remarks
Indicator	Weight	2013	2013	Rating	Score	Rating		
								<p>list submitted by DSWD. <i>Assigned</i> members are those whose names and addresses have been validated by PHIC and assigned a Primary Care Benefit (PCB) unit where they may avail of benefits. <i>Enlisted</i> members refer to those who have been contacted by local health workers and have visited their respective PCB.</p> <p>PHIC argues that "assigned" not enrolled members is the correct denominator to use on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. NHTS-PR members are highly mobile. The list provided to PHIC is based on a 2009 DSWD survey and many of those in the list have since relocated to other areas.</li> <li>2. On-going validation of the NHTS-PR list and database clean-up. Proper validation of the NHTS-PR members conducted by Local Health Insurance Officers (LHIO) is necessary prior to assignment. The validation covers those with uncertain addresses or with possible dual registration which could delay the assignment of these members to a PCB provider.</li> </ol> <p>Since the number of "actual assigned" NHTS members is 4,626,787, this yields a performance rating of 57%.</p>
<b>Timeliness:</b> Claims TAT (Good Claims)	5%	40 days	37 days	5%	39.5 days	5%	System generated report	

MFO		Target	Accomplishment		CGO-A Validation		Supporting Documents	Remarks
Indicator	Weight	2013	2013	Rating	Score	Rating		
<b>Financial 1:</b> Collection Efficiency (Employed: Private Sector)	5%	65%	65.80%	5%	64.8%	4.98%	Management report from the Office of the Actuary	Collection efficiency for the private sector is only 64.8%.
<b>Financial 2:</b> % of NBB of Sponsored Program Claims in Government Facilities	20%	7%	7%	20%	7%	20%	NBB Survey Report from Standards and Monitoring Department	The unlikely 100% accuracy of accomplishing the target of 7% considering that it is based on a survey is due to the fact that PHIC already knew the results of the NBB survey <u>prior</u> to the date of the PAN. The survey was conducted 10-22 June 2013.  The weight of the indicator is not commensurate to the importance and effectiveness of the program. While we recognize the constraints facing the NBB program, the 7% compliance rate three years after it was launched in 2011 calls for a rethinking.
<b>Subtotal</b>	95%			93.30%		93.28%		
<b>GASS</b>								
QMS Implementation	5%	Manualization of 4 Core Processes (LHIO)	100%	5%	100%	5%	Approval of Manual of Procedures and Work Instructions (MOPI) on the Implementation of Policies/Systems/Plans/ Programs for Core Processes in Local Health Insurance Offices (LHIO) (dated January 8, 2014)	
<b>Subtotal</b>	5%			5%		5%		
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>			<b>98.30%</b>		<b>98.28%</b>		