



25 June 2019

ATTY. ENGELBERT C. CARONAN, JR.
President

DEVELOPMENT ACADEMY OF THE PHILIPPINES
DAP Building, San Miguel Avenue
Ortigas Center, Pasay City



**RE: APPEAL ON THE GCG'S EVALUATION OF
DAP'S 2017 PERFORMANCE SCORECARD**

Dear Pres. Caronan,

This refers to your letter dated 28 May 2019,¹ appealing the "GCG's evaluation of [DAP]'s performance based on the submitted performance scorecard for 2017 and the subsequent disqualification from entitlement to the PBB." In the same letter, DAP "[reiterated] its prior contention that much of the shortfall in the accomplishment of Academy's targets was an offshoot of the management during that time." Moreover, it was presented that the priorities and immediate actions of DAP's previous Management in 2017 included the (i) replacement of key officers; (ii) dissolution of key management structures; and (iii) [imposition] of a restrictive management style, which according to DAP, "disrupted the usual processes of project development and contracting which resulted in delays and the cancellation of a significant number of projects being negotiated..., compromising in the process the DAP's ability to meet much of its commitments contained in its scorecard." In addition, DAP stated that "[s]ince 2013, it has consistently attained its annual commitments - a testament to the professional staff's passion to deliver what it has promised as well as an understanding of the various elements of the Performance System and the processes required."

We wish to emphasize that under GCG Memorandum Circular (M.C.) No. 2013-02, as amended,² the Performance Evaluation System (PES) for the GOCC Sector is meant to enhance the focus of GOCCs in looking past the constraints of existing resources and to facilitate the planning and achievement of *breakthrough results* and performance,³ such that the strategic measures in its Performance Scorecard must relate to outcomes that are within the control or influence of the GOCC. The annual targets of GOCCs, as provided in the same Circular, is also anchored on the President's Social Contract, the Medium-term Philippine Development Plan (PDP), applicable sector-specific development plans and programs consistent with the GOCC's Supervising Agency, and/or other development plans from other relevant Government Agencies.

¹ Officially received by the Governance Commission on 07 June 2019.

² Performance Evaluation System (PES) for the GOCC Sector, dated 24 June 2014.

³ Sec. 3(u), Republic Act No. 10149.

✓

The Governance Commission notes that since 2013, DAP had consistently attained its annual commitments and that in 2017, as an offshoot, major effects on DAP's programs were then felt with the appointment of a new President. Note, however, that the President of the Academy is its Chief Executive Officer who exercises general supervision and authority over the regular course of business, affairs, and property of the GOCC, and over its employees and officers. It thus bears emphasis that, as the head of Management, the actions of the President are not external to the Academy. As the performance of the GOCC is inextricably linked to the performance of its officers and employees, such is ultimately deemed to be within its control.

In view thereof, the Governance Commission is constrained to DENY the appeal of DAP on the evaluation of its 2017 Performance Scorecard.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION AND GUIDANCE.

Very truly yours,

SAMUEL G. DAGPIN, JR.
Chairman


MICHAEL P. CLORIBEL
Commissioner


MARITES C. DORAL
Commissioner