| c.3 Municipality | c.2 City | c.1 Province | pelow Service pelivery | c.3 Municipality | | 6.2 City | c.1 Province | G. Level 3 | b.3 Municipality | b.2 Cily | b.1 Province | b. Level 2 | a.3 Municipality | a.2 City | a.1 Province | a. Level 1 | c.3 Municipality Assessment Result: | c.2 City | d. Below Service Delivery | c.3 Municipality | c.1. Province | c. Level 3 | b.3 Municipality | b.1. Province b.2 City | c. and di | b. Level 2 | a.2 City | a.1. Province | a. Level 1 | Baseline Result: | functionality functionality | Outcome 5 1 Percentage of I SWIDGE | ORGANIZATIONAL OUTCOME 5: 1 | Strategic Focus 1: Increase capacity of LGUs to Improve the delivery of social protection and social welfare services (2) | (1) | |
|----------------------------|--|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|----------|---------------------------|------------------|---|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|--------------------------------|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | with improved | th improved | DELIVERY OF SO | city of LGUs to in | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | CIAL WELFARE | nprove the delive | (a) | } |
| | | | | 3 | - | 7 | - | ⇉ | 46 | - | - | 48 | 4 | | | 4 | 4 | | 4 | 1 | | 1 | 2 | 7 | | 10 46 | 1 | 4 | 48 | | | | AND DEVELOP | ry of social prot | (4) (5) | } |
| | | | | ш | - | 7 | _ | ⇉ | 46 | _ | | 48 | 4 | | | 4 | 4 | | 4 | _ | | 1 | N | 7 | ā | 6 6 | 1 | 1 | \$ | | t 2019-2020 | Aesoned | MENT PROGRAM | ection and socia | Total | ! T |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | IS BY LOCAL GO | l welfare service | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | #DIV/0! | OVERNMENT UN | 15 | 01 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ITS THROUGH I | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | OCAL SOCIAL V | (0) | (A) | ; |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | #DIV/0! | VELFARE AND D | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | + | | | | | | | | | | | | | EVELOPMENT (| (5) | (9) | 3 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0% | 0% | 0% | 9.67% | 1.61% | 8 LSWDOs | 61.29% | 6.45% | 69.35% | 17.74% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 11 LSWDOs | | | #DIV/0! | OFFICES IMPRO | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 5 | | | o | n | | | S | | | | /ED | | | |
| | | | | | | | | 81 | | | | 39 | | | | 12 | | | | + | | | | | | 2 | | | 4 | | | | | (10) | (10) | : |
| _ | 0 | | | 6 | | <u>.</u> | _ | 8 LSWDOs 8 LS | 34 | _ | 4 | 39 LSWDO ₅ 39 LS | 12 | 0 | 0 | 12 LSWDOs 12 LS | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0 | 33.33% | 0% | 33,33% | 66.67% | 0% | 0% | 4 LSWDOs | | | #DIV/O! | | | | |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | Total from PF to LSWDO FF | 6 | | _ | _ | 8 LSWDOs FF | 34 | _ | 4 | Improved from F to FF | 12 | 0 | 0 | Improved from PF to F | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | improved functionally | Total No. of LGUs W | | (11)-(1)-(0) | Total (11)=(7)+(8)+(9)+(10) | - |
| 0% | 0% | 0% | | 10.17% | | 1 69% | 1.69% | 0 13.56% | 57.63% | 1.69% | 6.78% | FF 66.10% | 20.34% | 0.00% | 0.00% | o F 20.34% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 8.82% | 1.47% | 8 LSWDOs | 58.82% | 5.88% | 66.18% | 22.06% | 0% | 0%0 | 15 LSWDOs | | Percent | 1 1 | | (9)*(10) | 101+1101 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | -400% | | | HVALUEI | H | | | #VALUE! | | | S IIVALUEI | | | #VALUE! | | (14)-(11)-(4) | Variance | |
| _ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Major Minor Ac | |
| improved to | remained at | Based on SI | | Bulalacao, Gloria) | (Palawan Ps | Balaraza, Sa | three (3) LS | assessed w maintained | maintained Marinduque PSWDO, Ro Romblon (Ci | Mindoro), Sa Mindoro), Cu Coron, Cuyo Española, Fa Alcantara, C | Level 2 (Oca Calapan City (Marinduque Naujan, Pina Socorro, Vic | Based on SI assessed as LSWDO has to Level 2 (I | Calintaan, N Santa Maria | Andres), and | LSWDOs h | Based on SI | | | | | region as of | this, 68 LGL | dated March | response to | same numb | was identifie | commitment | target LGU | The targets | | | | | | Achieved | |
| Level 1 and 2 respectively | remained at low level and were already | ICA 2022, no priority LGU | | iloria) | (Palawan PSWDO. Puerto Princesa Civ. | an Vicente), and four (4) | three (3) LSWDOs improved from Level 1 to Level 3 (San Jose (Occidental Mindaro). | Based on SDCA 2022, eight (8) LSWDOs assessed were at Level 3. Out of it, one (1) maintained a Level 3 score (Abra Dellog), | maintained a Level 2 (Marinduque PSWDO, Oriental Mindoro PSWDO, Romblon PSWDO, Boac, Torijos, Romblon (Capital)) | Mindoro), Sablayan, Sta. Cruz (Occidental Mindoro), Cullon, Aborlan, Brooke's Pont, Coron, Cuyo, Rizat (Palawan), Sofronie Española, Ferrol, Odiongan, Looc, Caldrava, Alcanlara, Cajidiocan, Santa Fe) and six (6) | Level 2 (Occidental Mindoro PSWDO, Calapan City, Buenavista, Mogpog, Sit. Cruz (Marinduque), Baco, Bansud, Bongaborg, (Marinduque), Baco, Ban Teodro, Naujan, Pinamalayan, Pola, San Teodro, Socorro, Victoria, Rizal (Occidental | Based on SDCA 2022, 39 LSWDOs were assessed as Level 2. Out of it, one (1) LSWDO has an improved core from Low to Level 2 (Magsaysay, Occidental Mirdoro), 32 LSWDOs improved from Level 1 to | | Andres), and nine (9) LSWDOs maintained the Level 1 score (Gasan, Puerto Gaera. | assessed as Level 1. Out of it, Ihree (3) LSWDOs have an improved score from | Based on SDCA 2022, 12 LSWDOs were | | | | | non-priority LGUs) were assessed by the region as of December 31, 2022 | this, 68 LGUs (59 priority LGUs and) | dated March 30, 2022, requesting for | response to the memo received by the regio | same number of LGUs was submitted to | was identified on a semestral basis. The | to the SDCA for 2nd serrester | target LGUs vis-a-vis to the region's | The largets stated on the Baseline and | | | | | (13) | Other Remarks | Reasons for validities |
| | | | | 1 | | | | | on Level 3. | | have the result of their previous Lev On the other hand remaining 17 LGI | Delivery. While 4 MSWDOs were able to level up to 1 and 2 from Low Level and lastly 1, one (1) PSWDO, one (1) CSWDO and two (2) MSWDOs | have improved from to Delivery to Better Ser | Level 1 to Level 2 and 3, | (1) PSWDO, one (1) CSWDO and 32 MWDOs were able to | Based on the SDCA out of the 59 assessed LGUs', 42 were able to level up. Further one | | | | | | | | 7 | | | | | | | | | | (10) | Steering Measures | |

| | | | 5.7 | | | | 5.6 | | | | 5.5 | | | | | 5.4 | | | | 5.3 | | | | | 2.2 | 3 | | Strategy |
|--|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|--|-----------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|--|---------------------------|
| Absolute Value (actual served vs. Target) | Percentage (i.e., 100% etc) | provided as satisfactory or better | Percentage of LGUs that rated RA | Absolute Value (actual served vs. Target) | Percentage (i.e., 100% etc) | provided as satisfactory or better | Percentage of LGUs that rated TA | Absolute Value (actual served vs. Target) | Percentage (i.e., 100% etc) | resource augmentation | Percentage of LGUs provided with | Absolute Value (actual served vs. Target) | Percentage (i.e., 100% etc) | social protection | assistance using digital platforms along | Number of LGUs provided with technical | Absolute Value (actual served vs. Target) | Percentage (i.e., 100% etc) | technical assistance | Percentage of LGUs provided with | Municipality | City | Province | social protection | their functionality level along delivery of | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | 10 | | | | | 10 | 25% | | | 56 | 2 | cn | | 0,5 | (2) | 5 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | 6 | | | | | 10 | 20% | | | 56 | 2 | 51 | | 53 | (3) | Q2 | Phys |
| | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | 10 | | | | | 10 | 20% | | | 56 | 2 | cn | | 53 | (4) | ස | Physical Targets |
| | | _ | | _ | 11 | | | | | | _ | 8 | | | | | 8 | 20% € | | | 56 | 2 | cn | | 0,3 | - | | Ġ |
| | | 100/8 | nn%. | | 100% | | | | 80% | | | 38 | | | _ | | 38 | 85% | | | 56 | 2 | CT | | 53 | (6) | Total | |
| 32 | 100% | | | 42 | 100% | | | 47 | 60.26% | | | 42 | 100% | | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | | | | (7) | Q1 | |
| 42 | 100.00% | | | 56 | 71.79% | | | 48 | 61.54% | | | 50 | 64% | | | | | | | | | | | | | (8) | Q2 | |
| 49 | % 100% | | | | % 85% | | | 63 | % 86% | | | | 148% | | | | 77 | 118% | | | 55 | 2 | 5 | 62 | | (9) | Q3 | Physical Accomplishments |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 6 | | | 6 | | (10) | Q4 | |
| 49 | 100% | | | 99 | 85% | | | 63 | 86% | | | 57 | 148% | | | | 77 | 118% | | | 61 | 2 | 5 | 68 | | (11)=(7)+(8)+(9)+(10) | Total | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | 19 | 1 | | | | | 0 | | | ن ن | 0 | 0 | 51 | | (12)=(11)-(6) | Variance | |
| | | | + | | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | _ | (6) | e Major | Α |
| | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Minor | Assessment of Variance |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | men en | Assı | | (+) (107 | Tare | | target Achieved | <u>q</u> |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | nembers. | Assessment (SCDA) through the assistance | he Service Capacity Delivery | (107.94%) LGUs out of 63 targeted LGUs | Target Fully Achieved. The TARA program assessed and validated a total of 68 | (13) | Reasons for Variance/ Other Remarks | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | online assessment took place | connection, in the area, an | have stable internet | Further, for the LSWDOs that | | participants. | Monitoring Team and the | schedule of the Regional | the available resources and | | service delivery : | | n As a strategy and as a | | Steering Measures | |





