

Strategy /		Physical Targets						Physical Accomplishments						Assessment of		Reasons for Variance/ Other Remarks (13)		Steering Measures (19)
		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Total		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Total	Variance (12)=(1)-(6)					
Strategic Focus 1: Increase capacity of LGUs to improve the delivery of social protection and social welfare services																		
ORGANIZATIONAL OUTCOME 5: DELIVERY OF SOCIAL WELFARE AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS BY LOCAL GOVERNMENT UNITS THROUGH LOCAL SOCIAL WELFARE AND DEVELOPMENT OFFICES IMPROVED																		
Outcome																		
5.1 Percentage of LSWDOs with improved functionality						Percent 2019-2020		#DIV/0!					#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	Total (11)=(7)+(9)+(10)			
Baseline Results:																		
a. Level 1					48	48									4 LSWDOs 66.67%	15 LSWDOs 22.06%	#N/A	
a.1 Province					1	1									0%	0%		
a.2 City					46	46									66.67%	22.06%		
a.3 Municipality					10	10									33.33%	66.16%	#N/A	
b. Level 2																		
b.1 Province					1	1									0%	5.88%		
b.2 City					2	2									61.25%	61.41%		
b.3 Municipality					1	1									33.33%	33.33%		
c. Level 3															0	0	#N/A	
c.1 Province															0%	0%		
c.2 City															12.90%	11.17%		
c.3 Municipality															1.61%	1.41%		
d. Below Service Delivery					4	4									9.67%	8.82%	48%	
e.1 Province															0%	0%		
e.2 City															0%	0%		
e.3 Municipality					4	4									0%	0%		
Assessment Result:																		
a. Level 1					4	4									12 LSWDOs 12 LSWDOs	Improved from PF to F	20.34%	
a.1 Province															0	0	0.00%	
a.2 City															0	0	0.00%	
a.3 Municipality					4	4									12	12	20.34%	
b. Level 2					48	48									39 LSWDOs 39 LSWDOs	Improved from F to FF	66.16%	
b.1 Province					1	1									4	4	6.78%	
b.2 City					1	1									1	1	1.69%	
b.3 Municipality					46	46									34	34	57.63%	
c. Level 3					11	11									8 LSWDOs 8 LSWDOs	Improved from PF to	13.56%	
c.1 Province					1	1									1	1	1.69%	
c.2 City					7	7									1	1	1.69%	
c.3 Municipality					3	3									6	6	10.17%	
Below Service Delivery																		
c.1 Province															Total from PF to	Improved from PF to	0%	
c.2 City															0	0	0%	
c.3 Municipality															0	0	0%	
Total Indicators																		
															0	0	0%	
Based on the SDCA 2022, no priority LGU remained at low level and were already improved to Level 1 and 2 respectively																		

Strategy /	Physical Targets						Physical Accomplishments						Assessment of Variance				Reasons for Variance/ Other Remarks (13)	Steering Measures (15)
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Total	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Total	Variance (12)=(1)-(6)	Full						
												Major	Minor	Target Achieved				
(1)																		
5.2	Number of LGUs assessed in terms of their functionally level along delivery of social protection	63	63	63	63	63										Target Fully Achieved. The TRA program assessed and validated a total of 68 (107.94%) LGUs out of 63 targeted LGUs for the Service Capacity Delivery Assessment (SCDA) through the assistance of Regional Monitoring Team (RMT).	As a strategy and as a recommendation of the Regional Director, a clustered service delivery assessment was conducted in order to efficiently utilize and maximize the available resources and schedule of the Regional Monitoring Team and the participants.	
	Province	5	5	5	5	5				62	68	5				(+)		
	City	2	2	2	2	2	0			5	5	0						
	Municipality	56	56	56	56	56	0			2	2	0						
5.3	Percentage of LGUs provided with technical assistance																	
	Percentage (i.e., 100% etc)	25%	20%	20%	20%	85%				118%	118%	0						
	Absolute Value (actual served vs. Target)	10	10	10	8	38				77	77						Further, for the LSWDOs that have stable internet connection, in the area, an online assessment took place	
5.4	Number of LGUs provided with technical assistance using digital platforms along social protection																	
	Percentage (i.e., 100% etc)																	
	Absolute Value (actual served vs. Target)	10	10	10	8	38	100%				148%	148%	1					
5.5	Percentage of LGUs provided with resource augmentation						42				57	57	19					
	Percentage (i.e., 100% etc)					80%	60.26%				86%	86%						
	Absolute Value (actual served vs. Target)						47				63	63						
5.6	Percentage of LGUs that rated TA provided as satisfactory or better																	
	Percentage (i.e., 100% etc)					100%	100%				85%	85%						
	Absolute Value (actual served vs. Target)						42				66	66						
5.7	Percentage of LGUs that rated RA provided as satisfactory or better					100%												
	Percentage (i.e., 100% etc)					100%	100%				100%	100%						
	Absolute Value (actual served vs. Target)						32				42	42						

Prepared By:

RAFAEL L. GACA
Statistician I - PDPS

Reviewed By:

EDITHA B. OCAMPO
Planning Officer I/PPD-OC Chief

Approved By:

LEONARDO C. REYNOSO, CESO III
Regional Director