

**BASES CONVERSION AND DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
2016 Performance Scorecard Evaluation**

	Performance Measure					BCDA Submission		GCG Evaluation		Supporting Documents	GCG Remarks	
	Objectives/Measures	Formula	Weight	Rating Scale	Targets	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating			
SOCIAL IMPACT/SHAREHOLDERS	SO 1	Develop the Baselands into World-Class Economic Centers										
	SM 1	BCDA Economic Zones Area disposed according to Board-Approved Master Plan	Area in hectares	10%	Actual / Target x Weight	300 Hectares	318 Hectares	10.00%	318.46 Hectares	10.00%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract of Lease w/ Equinet Support Inc. (ESI) dtd 21 July 2016; Joint Venture Agreement w/ FILINVEST Land, Inc. (FLI) dtd 08 January 2016; and MOA with Technological University of the Philippines (TUP) dtd 18 January 2016. 	In 2016, BCDA disposed of 318.46 hectares (has.) and exceeded the target of 300 has. Bulk of the actual disposition pertains to the privatization of the 288-hectare area in the Clark Green City through the formation of a joint venture corporation (JVC) between BCDA and FILINVEST Land, Inc. The JVC will serve as the industrial/mixed-use developer of the property.
	SM 2	Actual Investment by BCDA in Economic Zones	Total amount in Million Peso	10%	Actual / Target x Weight	₱ 500 Million	₱632 Million	10.00%	₱632 Million	10.00%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quarterly Summary of Actual Investment in BCDA Economic Zones for 2016 	The investment of BCDA in its ecozones amounted to ₱632 Million in 2016, with this BCDA exceeded its target by 26%. Among its ecozones, CDC received the highest investment from BCDA with ₱212 Million followed by JHMC with ₱110 Million.

Performance Measure					BCDA Submission		GCG Evaluation		Supporting Documents	GCG Remarks	
Objectives/Measures	Formula	Weight	Rating Scale	Targets	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating			
SO 2	Optimize the Benefits of the Country from the Conversion and Development of the Baselands										
SM 3	Total Remittance to the National Government	Total amount in Billion Peso	10%	Actual / Target x Weight	₱ 3.00 Billion	₱ 4 Billion	10.00%	₱ 4 Billion	10.00%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of Remittances to National Government BTr Official Receipt No. 8204015 	BCDA remitted a total of ₱4 Billion in 2016, which is 33% more than the ₱3 Billion target. Of the total remittance, ₱3.47 Billion or about 87% pertains to the remittance to NG of asset disposition proceeds. BCDA also remitted dividends and guarantee fees amounting to ₱88 Million and ₱371 Million, respectively.
SM 4	Average Stakeholder Satisfaction Survey	Based on result of third party satisfaction survey	10%	Actual / Target x Weight	+5% from the 2015 actual (93.51%)	98.50%	10.00%	93.53%	10.00%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Third Party Satisfaction Survey Final Report dtd January 2017 prepared by ENGAGE 	The survey for 2016 was conducted to 137 respondents thru Computer-Assisted-Telephone-Interview (CATI) methodology. The survey instrument covered 6 areas of satisfaction, with 2 indicators for each area. A general average rating of 93.53% was derived based on the rating of all areas of satisfaction. This indicates that satisfaction with BCDA's services is generally high, particularly in the Overall Satisfaction area for which BCDA obtained the highest rating (97.40%) among the 6 areas. The general average of 93.53% was adopted by GCG as the accomplishment for 2016, instead of BCDA's reported accomplishment which pertains only to the

		Performance Measure				BCDA Submission		GCG Evaluation		Supporting Documents	GCG Remarks
		Objectives/Measures	Formula	Weight	Rating Scale	Targets	Actual	Rating	Score		
											rating for one (1) out of twelve (12) indicators. Nonetheless, this exceeds the 2016 target of 93.51% (2015 actual of 88.51% + 5%). BCDA requested for renegotiation to revise the target to 90%. However, the request is considered moot given that BCDA already outperformed the target.
		Sub-total		40%			40.00%		40.00%		
FINANCIAL	SO 3	Achieve Best Value from the Disposition of Lands									
	SM 5	Cash Proceeds from Business Contracts in BCDA Economic Zones	Total amount in Billion Peso	12.50%	Actual / Target x Weight	₱ 1.80 billion	₱ 2.2 Billion	12.50%	₱ 2.2 Billion	12.50%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quarterly Summary of Cash Proceeds from Business Contracts in BCDA Economic Zones 2016 COA Audited Financial Statements of CDC, JHMC, and PPMC

		Performance Measure				BCDA Submission		GCG Evaluation		Supporting Documents	GCG Remarks
		Objectives/Measures	Formula	Weight	Rating Scale	Targets	Actual	Rating	Score		
	SM 6	Cash proceeds from regular accounts	Total amount in Billion Peso	12.50%	Actual / Target x Weight	₱ 2.70 Billion	₱ 3.6 Billion	12.50%	₱ 3.67 Billion	12.50%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quarterly Summary of Cash Proceeds from Regular accounts 2016 COA Audited Financial Statements of BCDA <p>In 2016, total cash proceeds from regular accounts amounted to ₱3.67 Billion. The highest of the proceeds, amounting to ₱1.93 Billion, is from the joint venture projects of BCDA which represents 53% of the total collections. BCDA also received ₱862.81 Million in concession fee income from the SCTEX Project.</p> <p>With this, BCDA surpassed its target cash proceeds of ₱2.70 Billion by about 33%.</p>
	Sub-total			25%				25.00%		25.00%	
	SO 4	Strengthen and Streamline Project Management Processes									
INTERNAL BUSINESS PROCESS	SM 7	Adherence to BCDA Contract Checklist	Percentage of contracts that are compliant with the BCDA Checklist	5%	Actual / Target x Weight	90%	100%	5.00%	100%	5.00%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BCDA - SAPMD (Subsidiaries, Affiliates & Projects Monitoring Department) Report on the Status of Newly Executed Contracts for FY 2016 <p>The measure aims to determine the degree of BCDA's compliance with its checklist on the items and criteria that must be satisfied by certain provisions in the contract and terms of reference (TOR), as applicable.</p> <p>For 2016, BCDA-SAPMD processed 11 contracts, comprised of 2 joint venture agreements, 2 contracts of lease, and 7 MOAs. The report of BCDA shows that all 11 contracts were found compliant on 8 out of the 23 sub-items; while the other</p>

Performance Measure					BCDA Submission		GCG Evaluation		Supporting Documents	GCG Remarks	
Objectives/Measures	Formula	Weight	Rating Scale	Targets	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating			
											items were either complied with and/or not applicable depending on the type of contract. The supporting document shows that no contract was rendered non-compliant in any of the items in the checklist, hence BCDA exceeded the target of 90% and is given the full rating of 5%.
SM 8	Reduce average turn-around-time to prepare contracts	Number of working days	5%	(1 – (Actual – Target) / Target) x Weight	5 working days	7.55 days	5.00%	5.5 days	4.45%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of Contracts Drafted in 2016 	<p>BCDA requested to renegotiate the target to extend the period to 10 days from the initial target of five (5) days, and to exclude complex contracts. Per BCDA, <u>complex contracts</u> refer to agreements that require detailed technical specifications, rigorous negotiations and several levels of approval. Examples are Joint Venture Agreements, Contracts of Lease Business Operation Agreements, and Construction Contracts.</p> <p>The GCG acknowledges that complex contracts require lengthier time to prepare and review, hence the request to exclude complex contracts is accepted. As such, the TAT for three (3) complex contracts (Contracts of Lease) were excluded in the</p>

Performance Measure					BCDA Submission		GCG Evaluation		Supporting Documents	GCG Remarks	
Objectives/Measures	Formula	Weight	Rating Scale	Targets	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating			
										computation. However, the target average TAT for simple contracts shall remain at 5 working days. Based on the computation, the average TAT is at 5.5 working days considering the 10 simple contracts drafted in 2016.	
SO 5	Efficient Coordination with Subsidiaries										
SM 9	Implementation of the Computerized Accounting System (CAS)	Roll out system to subsidiaries	5%	Actual / Target x Weight	2 subsidiaries (CDC and 1 other subsidiary)	CDC only = 2.5% and 9.92 working days average TAT for Finance Services Group to act on Subsidiaries budget-related request = 2.5%	5.00%	1 subsidiary only (CDC)	2.50%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Certification on Project Completion dtd 25 November 2016 • CDC Certification of System Deployment dtd 21 November 2016 • BCDA Resolution No. BCDA-BC-2016-041 dtd 4 October 2016 on the failure of bidding • Certification on Failed Bidding dtd 21 December 2016 • Chronology of Events 	<p>For 2016, the procurement for the consultancy services to implement CAS to JHMC, PPMC, and BCDA was conducted between September to October 2016; however, failure of bidding was declared because no bid was received. Thus, the target to implement the system to another subsidiary was not met.</p> <p>BCDA requested to renegotiate the target, citing the failure of bidding as the reason for the delay. BCDA proposed to revise the target to "CDC only" and reduction of weight from 5% to 2.5%. It also proposed the addition of a new measure – "Turnaround time for Finance Group to Act on Subsidiaries Budget-Related Requests" with a target of 10 days and weight of 2.5%.</p>

Performance Measure					BCDA Submission		GCG Evaluation		Supporting Documents	GCG Remarks
Objectives/Measures	Formula	Weight	Rating Scale	Targets	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating		
										<p>Based on the revised Terms of Reference for the project per BCDA internal memorandum dated 05 July 2016, the project duration is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Six (6) months for BCDA implementation commencing from the date stipulated in the NTP. • Six (6) months for the JHMC and PPMC implementation, to be reckoned from the date of project turnover of the BCDA implementation. <p>With this, it can be inferred that, even with a successful bidding last 03 October 2016, BCDA may not be able to complete the project implementation for the subsidiaries.</p> <p>In a letter dated 8 March 2017, BCDA presented a revised chronology of events showing that it could have met the target by frontloading the implementation for the subsidiary rather than implementing to BCDA first. Further, the 6-month timeline was intended as a series implementation, i.e., three (3) months for JHMC and then another three (3)</p>

Performance Measure					BCDA Submission		GCG Evaluation		Supporting Documents	GCG Remarks	
Objectives/Measures	Formula	Weight	Rating Scale	Targets	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating			
											<p>months for PPMC. It was also stated that the actual implementation time, even without fast tracking, would probably be less than three (3) months since the standard processes shared by BCDA and its subsidiaries had previously been done by the consultant for the CDC implementation. Even with the additional documentation and justification, the GCG denies the request of BCDA to revise the target to its actual accomplishment and corresponding reduction in weight. The negotiation of BCDA's 2016 targets, like the other GOCCs, was within the context and assumption of the upcoming national elections. In carrying out its mandate, GOCCs are expected to consider risks inherent in its business operations. The request to renegotiate the target is not acceptable as it shows lack of foresight and inability to practice risk management which is expected of GOCCs. Taking into account BCDA's representation that the entire project duration will not take six months or even three months, the conduct of</p>

Performance Measure					BCDA Submission		GCG Evaluation		Supporting Documents	GCG Remarks
Objectives/Measures	Formula	Weight	Rating Scale	Targets	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating		
										<p>bidding at the last quarter of 2016 is already considered late since there is a limited window of opportunity to re-bid and implement the system within the same year. Given the procurement process in the country, the three-month window for BCDA to implement the program is short.</p> <p>In addition, GCG finds BCDA's representations for the renegotiation inconsistent with that of the justification they presented during the TWG meeting. BCDA's refusal to target the project implementation in 2017, even for the second time of its inclusion as a target in the scorecard, does not support its position that the project may have pushed through if not for the failure of bidding. In view of the foregoing, request to renegotiate the target and corresponding weight is DENIED. BCDA is given a 2.5% rating, for its accomplishment in CDC.</p>
Sub-total										
		15%						15.00%		11.95%

	Performance Measure					BCDA Submission		GCG Evaluation		Supporting Documents	GCG Remarks	
	Objectives/Measures	Formula	Weight	Rating Scale	Targets	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating			
LEARNING AND GROWTH	SO 6	Develop a Quality Management System (ISO 9001:2008) for All Processes										
	SM 10	ISO Certification for all processes	Milestone achieved	4%	All or Nothing	Passed Surveillance Audit	Certificate Issued	4.00%	Passed Surveillance Audit	4.00%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Copy of ISO Certification from TUV Rheinland 	In 2016, BCDA passed the surveillance audit and was granted with an ISO re-certification by TUV Rheinland for having established and applied a quality management system for the provision of conversion and development services for land and assets under its jurisdiction.
	SO 7	Optimize the Use of Information Technology										
	SM 11	Implementation of the ICT Plan	Number of processes automated	4%	Actual / Target x Weight	6 processes	6 processes	4.00%	6 processes	4.00%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Office Order No. 021 on the Policy Guidelines on Intranet eForms dtd 21 December 2016 	BCDA automated six (6) processes and developed the following eForms: (1) Board Materials Request Form, (2) Meeting Highlights Form, (3) Borrower's Form, (4) Official Business Slip Form, (5) Manual Attendance Log Form, and (6) Vehicle Request Form. These eForms are integrated into the BCDA Intranet where other applications and processes may be accessed by BCDA employees.

Performance Measure					BCDA Submission		GCG Evaluation		Supporting Documents	GCG Remarks	
Objectives/Measures	Formula	Weight	Rating Scale	Targets	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating			
SM 12	Establishment of the EZ Biz	Based on agreed milestone	4%	Actual / Target x Weight	Operational for JHMC and PPMC by end of 2016	Operational Merchant Registry Module	4.00%		<i>Weight removed</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BCDA Office Order No. 020 dtd 19 December 2016 on the Roll – Out of Merchant Registry System User Acceptance Test Report from Asiagate Networks, Inc. and Briefer on the Merchant Registry System Chronology of Events on the ezBiz Project Secretary's Certificate on Board Resolution No. 2018-06-083 dtd 13 June 2018 	<p>The ezBiz is a system which can facilitate and streamline processes for the business registration of new investors for the BCDA Group.</p> <p>It was implemented to CDC in 2015, hence the target for 2016 was to implement the system to JHMC and PPMC. However, the target was not attained by BCDA. Per BCDA, the individual consultant's contract was not signed prior to the end of term of its former PCEO since, per R.A. No. 9184, the individual consultant is co-terminus with the approving authority. Further, the implementation was put on hold to ensure that new leadership of BCDA and subsidiaries are given the time to assess the system prior to its roll out. As such, BCDA requested to renegotiate the target to replace it with "Implementation of the Merchant Registry Module in the BCDA Intranet" which was made live in November 2016.</p> <p>Additional documents provided by BCDA showed that the procurement of the consultant for the project started as early as the last</p>

Performance Measure					BCDA Submission		GCG Evaluation		Supporting Documents	GCG Remarks
Objectives/Measures		Formula	Weight	Rating Scale	Targets	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating	
										<p>quarter of 2015. In fact, the consultant for the project was given the Notice of Award on 07 December 2015. Drafting, review, and revisions of the contract ensued and eventually on 05 July 2016 BCDA received the consultant-signed contract. It was then endorsed to the previous BCDA PCEO for signature, but the latter did not sign the contract to allow the next BCDA Administration to decide whether the project would be pursued. According to BCDA, the new BCDA leadership allegedly prioritized the upgrade of connectivity, systems, and technical support to ensure the efficient operations of its internal organization.</p> <p>The GCG requested for a document which provides for the instruction to defer the implementation of ezBiz and/or the change in priority, but only a copy of email exchanges between BCDA and the Consultant from 28 September 2016 to 14 February 2017 was provided. The said document was not able to satisfy the requirement since it does not reflect an explicit instruction from the BCDA</p>

Performance Measure					BCDA Submission		GCG Evaluation		Supporting Documents	GCG Remarks
Objectives/Measures		Formula	Weight	Rating Scale	Targets	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating	
										<p>Board to BCDA Management to abandon the ezBiz project in 2016.</p> <p>To further attest to the cancellation of ezBiz as a measure, BCDA submitted through letter dated 31 May 2018 a copy of the following: (1) 2016 Performance Agreement between BCDA and GCG, and (2) Secretary Certificate on Board Resolution No. 2016-09-170 dated 19 December 2016 approving the request for renegotiation and the revised 2016 BCDA scorecard. However, it was noted that the said Board Resolution is merely a blanket approval for the request for renegotiation. Subsequently, BCDA, in its letter dated 14 June 2018 submitted Secretary's Certificate on Board Resolution No. 2018-06-083 dated 13 June 2018 affirming the Board's previous decision to cancel the ezBiz and replace it with the Merchant Registry Module in the 2016 BCDA Performance Scorecard. The GCG finds that the foregoing document substantiates the justification provided and, hereby REMOVES SM 12 from</p>

Performance Measure					BCDA Submission		GCG Evaluation		Supporting Documents	GCG Remarks	
Objectives/Measures	Formula	Weight	Rating Scale	Targets	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating			
										BCDA's 2016 Performance Scorecard given the attendant circumstances explained and justified by BCDA. SM12's weight shall be subtracted from the total weight of the performance scorecard.	
SO 8	Establish a Competency-Based Framework for BCDA Personnel										
SM 13	Establishment of a Competency-Based Framework Model	Based on agreed milestone	4%	All or Nothing	Complete Phase 2, Phase 3, and Baseline Setting	100% Posted at PHILGEPS Website	4.00%	Phase 2, Phase 3, and Baseline Setting were not completed	0.00%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BAC Resolution No. BC-2016-064 dtd 22 December 2016 on the Procurement of Consultancy Services for the Establishment of Competency-Based HR System • BAC-C Resolution No. BC-2017-011 dated 16 March 2017 Declaring Failed Bidding • BCDA Internal Memoranda dated 6 December 	<p>The establishment of a Competency-Based Framework (Phase 1) was BCDA's target for 2015, which was endorsed to the Office of the PCEO on 22 March 2016. Subsequently, in its 2016 scorecard, the target is to complete Phase 2 and 3 (development of competency tables, matrix, position profiles, and assessment tools), and to establish competency baseline. However, the target was not met since only the TOR, BAC approval, and posting at PHILGEPS website were finalized in 2016.</p> <p>BCDA requested to renegotiate to revise the target to Procurement of Consultant for Phases 2 and 3. It cited change in leadership, election ban, and the reorganization as the reasons for the delay in</p>

Performance Measure					BCDA Submission		GCG Evaluation		Supporting Documents	GCG Remarks	
Objectives/Measures		Formula	Weight	Rating Scale	Targets	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating		
										2016 and 26 January 2017 on the Term of Reference (TOR) and Revised TOR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Print-out of PHILGEPS posting (published 29 December 2016) • Chronology of Events 	the completion of the project. Based on the chronology of events provided by BCDA, the procurement activities for the consultant for the implementation of the Phase 1 started in December 2015 with the hiring of a consultant through the BMHI last 01 January 2016. On 22 March 2016, the Phase 1 (Competency-Based Framework and Catalogue) was endorsed to the BCDA PCEO and a final report was submitted by the consultant on 19 April 2016. In June 2016, BCDA requested for proposals for Phase 2 and Phase 3 implementation. A proposal was received by BCDA in September 2016 which showed that the implementation of Phase 2 and 3 would take 17 weeks or roughly 5 months, not counting the time (2 to 3 months) for the procurement activities. Along with this, BCDA started the implementation of its GCG-approved reorganization starting February 2016. Thus, early retirement from service of a substantial number of personnel, abolition of key positions, and other issues regarding

Performance Measure					BCDA Submission		GCG Evaluation		Supporting Documents	GCG Remarks
Objectives/Measures		Formula	Weight	Rating Scale	Targets	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating	
										<p>the restructuring affected the scheduling and conduct of the relevant surveys and interviews which caused the delay in meeting the target for the said competency. BCDA also prioritized matters regarding the personnel retirement, uncertainties with the tenures of incumbents, the election ban on hiring, and all the other major issues concerning the BCDA restructuring.</p> <p>At the onset, reasons cited above as the cause of failure to achieve target are not acceptable. From the chronology of events, the cause stems from the late start of the project itself. Originally, the whole project should have been started in 2015 and completed in 2016, giving BCDA two years to complete the whole project.</p> <p>Commencement of Phases 2 and 3 which was in June 2016 was also late. The practice of risk management principles is incumbent upon GOCCs to ensure the efficient and timely delivery of services. Hence, to allow the practice of renegotiating a target due to GOCCs' inability to foresee events</p>

Performance Measure					BCDA Submission		GCG Evaluation		Supporting Documents	GCG Remarks	
Objectives/Measures	Formula	Weight	Rating Scale	Targets	Actual	Rating	Score	Rating			
										and allow it to persist overtime sets a bad precedent. In view of this, the request to renegotiate is <u>DENIED</u> .	
SM 14	Development of Integrity Management Plan and BCDA Code of Conduct	Based on agreed milestone	4%	All or Nothing	Establish Baseline	Baseline Requirements Established	4.00%	Established Baseline	4.00%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BCDA Integrity Management Scorecard (Baseline Data 2016 signed by the Officer-in-Charge for the Corporate Services Group) 	This measure involves the implementation of the BCDA Code of Conduct which was approved by the BCDA Board in 2015. BCDA monitors the implementation and adherence to the Code of Conduct through its Integrity Management Scorecard. For the first year of implementation, BCDA established baseline data for the various measures relating to institutional leadership, HR management and development, financial procurement and asset management, external stakeholder management, and internal reporting and investigation.
	Sub-total		20%				20.00%		12.00%		
	TOTAL		100%						88.95% out of 96.00%		
	VALIDATED RATING								92.66%		