



## **REPORT ON THE EVALUATION OF EXTERNAL SUPPLIERS (Covering the Period December 2023 to May 2024)**

Prepared by: **Office of Monitoring and Evaluation (OME)**

Prepared for: **Office of the Chancellor (OC)**

**Bids and Awards Committee (BAC)**

**Supply and Purchasing Management Division (SPMD)**

**Procurement Management Division (PMD)**

Submitted on: **July 30, 2024**



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### Page Number

Executive Summary	1
Survey Objectives	1
Methodology	
Survey Respondents	2
Data Collection Procedure	2-3
Data Analysis	3
Results and Discussions	3-10
Recommendations	10-13



## Executive Summary

This survey was conducted by the Office of Monitoring and Evaluation (OME) to assess the performance of the University's external suppliers for the period of December 2023 to May 2024. The review focused on evaluating the 42 external suppliers who met the following criteria: **(1) a minimum of five (5) Purchase Orders delivered between December 1, 2023, and May 2024, and (2) ranking among the top twenty (20) suppliers by the total value of Purchase Orders.**

The list of Purchase Orders delivered during this period was generated from the University's Procurement System. A total of **six hundred forty-three (643) responses** were collected and tabulated from **fifty-one (51) Responsibility Center Heads** and **fifty-two (52) End Users** who evaluated various external suppliers.

## Survey Objectives

The objectives of this evaluation as stipulated in the Implementing Rules and Regulations (IRR) are the following:

1. To determine and apply the criteria for evaluation, selection, monitoring of performance, and evaluation of external providers based on their ability to provide products and services in accordance with requirements.
2. To assess the compliance of the external provider with the contract entered between the University and the external provider and other existing laws and regulations imposed by the State.
3. To provide pertinent data to help the top management in decision-making; whether to renew the provider's contract, and to allow or disallow their participation in the bidding process; and
4. To give recommendations to the top management solutions, based on the results of the monitoring and evaluation conducted, for the improvement of the performance of the external providers.



## Methodology

### a. Survey Respondents

The target respondents for this survey were fifty-two (52) Responsibility Center Heads and fifty-two (52) End Users who received Purchase Orders between December 1, 2023, and May 31, 2024. Among these, fifty-one (51) Responsibility Center Heads and fifty-two (52) End Users completed the external suppliers survey tool through the Google Sheet provided by the Office of Monitoring and Evaluation.

### b. Data Collection Procedure

As outlined in the Implementing Rules and Regulations (IRR) for this survey, the Supply and Procurement Management Division (SPMD) is responsible for reviewing the implementation and compliance of external providers, ensuring adherence to the terms and conditions specified in the contracts between the University and the concerned providers. In line with the Office of Monitoring and Evaluation's (OME) mandate to coordinate with relevant offices and agencies for monitoring and evaluating projects and services, the OME facilitated the survey by following these procedures:

b.1 A complete list of the University's external suppliers for the period of December 2023 to May 2024 was obtained from the University's Procurement Management System. The list of end-users, including Responsibility Center Heads who utilized the goods and supplies, as well as administrative heads and staff who facilitated the delivery of various services, was reviewed to ensure it included updated names, designations, and positions.

b.2 After finalizing the External Suppliers Evaluation Tool, the instrument was sent to the respective respondents via email. To ensure proper data collection, a memorandum order was issued to all Responsibility Center Heads, emphasizing the importance of participating in the survey, as stated in Memorandum Order No.: 2024-007-OME, dated June 13, 2024.

b.3 The survey was conducted from June 13, 2024, to July 31, 2024.

b.4 All survey responses generated from Google Sheets were downloaded to facilitate easy and accurate tabulation and processing of results using MS Office Excel.



### c. Data Analysis

Google Sheets were used to facilitate the distribution of the evaluation tool. This tool included statement indicators, allowing respondents to rate each statement with corresponding scores that best described each item/indicator.

Below is a table displaying the range of rating scores, the corresponding adjectival rating, and the descriptive remarks:

Rating Score	Adjectival Rating	Mean Value	Descriptive Remark
1	Poor	1.00-1.99	Needs major improvement in most or all areas
2	Unsatisfactory	2.00-2.99	Needs improvement in some areas
3	Satisfactory	3.00-3.99	Meets most of our expectations
4	Very Satisfactory	4.00-4.99	Meets all our expectations
5	Outstanding	5.00	Exceeds our expectations

To analyze the data, frequency counts and the mean value were employed as the statistical tools. The average responses of the respondents for each specific statement indicator were calculated using the weighted mean formula, as shown below:

$$WM = \frac{f_1 (1) + f_2 (2) + f_3 (3) + f_4 (4) + f_5 (5)}{f_1 + f_2 + f_3 + f_4 + f_5}$$

### Results and Discussions

This section of the report presents the combined ratings from end-users on their evaluation of the goods, infrastructure, and services delivered by external suppliers to various University offices during the period from December 2023 to May 2024. The results are displayed in tabular form, showing the average ratings obtained by the



identified external suppliers, followed by narrative descriptions that provide further discussion into the data.

There are three tabular presentations in this section. **Table 1** presents the average ratings of all external suppliers. **Table 2** provides the average ratings of the external suppliers who delivered at least five (5) Purchase Orders to the University's end-users. **Table 3** displays the average ratings of the Top 20 External Suppliers with the highest total Purchase Order amounts delivered during the period. Additionally, Table 4 presents the raw comments requiring action, gathered from the survey.

**Table 1. Average Rating of all Identified External Suppliers of MSU-IIT for the Period of December 2023 to May 2024**

NO.	EXTERNAL SUPPLIERS	AVERAGE RATING	
		RATING	ADJECTIVAL RATING
1	Apple Tree Resort & Hotel	5.00	Outstanding
2	BETHEL GUEST HOUSE	5.00	Outstanding
3	SCIGATE TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION	5.00	Outstanding
4	ALLCARD INC.	4.90	Very Satisfactory
5	AP PARAGON ENTERPRISES OPC	4.47	Very Satisfactory
6	Crown Paper & Stationer	4.14	Very Satisfactory
7	Dataworld Computer Center	4.70	Very Satisfactory
8	EISI TRANSFORMING LIBRARIES, ENHACIN	4.90	Very Satisfactory
9	EMRYS Industries	4.57	Very Satisfactory
10	GLYNESS FOOD CATERING SERVICES	4.70	Very Satisfactory
11	HAZRIE'S KITCHEN CATERING SERVICES	4.33	Very Satisfactory
12	HI-12 APPLIANCE MARKETING & SRVICE	4.33	Very Satisfactory
13	HTA AUTO PARTS AND ACCESSORIES	4.00	Very Satisfactory
14	Iligan Datavision Sales Center	4.26	Very Satisfactory
15	Ivory Printing & Publishing House	4.80	Very Satisfactory
16	J&K Hardware Gen. Merchandise	4.07	Very Satisfactory
17	JANGS KITCHEN FOOD AND BEVERAGE HOUS	4.31	Very Satisfactory
18	KRYPTON INT'L. RESOURCES SALES & SER	4.00	Very Satisfactory
19	LIBTECH Source Phils. Inc.	4.80	Very Satisfactory
20	M.I.C. ENGINEERING SERVICES	4.36	Very Satisfactory
21	MKD ENTERPRISES	4.32	Very Satisfactory
22	Perfect Star PC Shoppe	4.03	Very Satisfactory
23	SAVER-TECH COMPUTER SALES & SERVICES	4.44	Very Satisfactory
24	Starr Educ'l Supply & Gen. Mdse	4.13	Very Satisfactory
25	TECH NEWB COMPUTER STORE	4.35	Very Satisfactory



26	TED COMPUTER MEDIC	4.20	Very Satisfactory
27	WOODTRONICS EMPORIUM	4.41	Very Satisfactory
28	XD WONDERTECH COMPUTER SALES & SERV	4.08	Very Satisfactory
29	ZAMMI SALES CORPORATION	4.33	Very Satisfactory
30	AJR PHARMA AND MEDICAL SUPPLIES DIST	3.97	Satisfactory
31	AMIGOS CONSTRUCTION	3.00	Satisfactory
32	D2 PRINTS AND CREATIVES CORP.	3.97	Satisfactory
33	DANLI TRADING & ENGINEERING SERVICES	3.80	Satisfactory
34	EXCELL BIOMED DISTRIBUTION CORPORATI	3.60	Satisfactory
35	HIDPKS CONSTRUCTION	3.07	Satisfactory
36	INTERTEK TESTING SERVICES PHILIPPINE	3.60	Satisfactory
37	JOELMAR TRADING	3.64	Satisfactory
38	LIFELINE DIAGNOSTICS SUPPLIES, INC	3.90	Satisfactory
39	METRO COOLAIRE TRADING CORPORATION	3.50	Satisfactory
40	PRINCE VALIANT INT'L. CORP.	3.70	Satisfactory
41	RANAO TECH AND INNOVATION SOLUTIONS,	3.96	Satisfactory
42	WIZMASTER Comptr Sales & Svcs. Corp	3.82	Satisfactory

The data presented in Table 1 shows the average ratings of all external suppliers of the University during the period of December 2023 to May 2024. According to the table, only **three (3) external suppliers—Apple Tree Resort & Hotel, Bethel Guest House, and Scigate Technology Corporation—achieved an OUTSTANDING** rating of 5.0 out of the **forty-two (42)** total external suppliers listed. Meanwhile, twenty-six (26) suppliers received a **Very Satisfactory** rating, and **thirteen (13)** suppliers were rated as **Satisfactory**. Notably, for this round of evaluation, **no suppliers received Unsatisfactory or Poor ratings**, which perhaps marks an improvement compared to the previous evaluation during the 2nd Phase of FY 2023.

**Table 2. Average Ratings of External Suppliers with at least five (5) Purchase Orders or more for the Period of December 2023 to May 2024**

EXTERNAL SUPPLIERS	AVERAGE RATING		<i>Would you recommend using this FIRM/SUPPLIER again?</i>
	RATING	ADJECTIVAL RATING	
Crown Paper & Stationer	4.14	Very Satisfactory	YES
EMRYS Industries	4.57	Very Satisfactory	YES
GLYNESS FOOD CATERING SERVICES	4.70	Very Satisfactory	YES
HAZRIE'S KITCHEN CATERING SERVICES	4.33	Very Satisfactory	YES
HI-12 APPLIANCE MARKETING & SRVICE	4.33	Very Satisfactory	YES
HTA AUTO PARTS AND ACCESSORIES	4.00	Very Satisfactory	YES



Iligan Datavision Sales Center	4.26	Very Satisfactory	YES
J&K Hardware Gen. Merchandise	4.07	Very Satisfactory	YES
JANGS KITCHEN FOOD AND BEVERAGE HOUS	4.31	Very Satisfactory	YES
M.I.C. ENGINEERING SERVICES	4.36	Very Satisfactory	YES
MKD ENTERPRISES	4.32	Very Satisfactory	YES
Perfect Star PC Shoppe	4.03	Very Satisfactory	YES
Starr Educ'l Supply & Gen. Mdse	4.13	Very Satisfactory	YES
TECH NEWB COMPUTER STORE	4.35	Very Satisfactory	YES
TED COMPUTER MEDIC	4.20	Very Satisfactory	YES
XD WONDERTECH COMPUTER SALES & SERV	4.08	Very Satisfactory	YES
ZAMMI SALES CORPORATION	4.33	Very Satisfactory	YES
D2 PRINTS AND CREATIVES CORP.	3.97	Satisfactory	YES
INTERTEK TESTING SERVICES PHILIPPINE	3.60	Satisfactory	YES
JOELMAR TRADING	3.64	Satisfactory	YES
RANAO TECH AND INNOVATION SOLUTIONS,	3.96	Satisfactory	YES
WIZMASTER Comptr Sales & Svcs. Corp	3.82	Satisfactory	YES

Table 2 presents the average ratings of the twenty-two (22) external suppliers who have completed at least five (5) purchase orders delivered to the University's end users. The table shows that most of these suppliers, **a total of 22, received VERY SATISFACTORY ratings**, with **Glyness Food Catering Services** achieving the **highest rating of 4.70**. On the other hand, **five (5) suppliers received SATISFACTORY ratings**, with **Intertek Testing Services Philippines** earning the **lowest rating of 3.60**.

**Table 3. Average Ratings of Top 20 External Suppliers with the Highest Total Amount of Purchase Order Delivered for the Period of December 2023 to May 2024**

EXTERNAL SUPPLIERS	AVERAGE RATING		Would you recommend using this FIRM/SUPPLIER again?
	RATING	ADJECTIVAL RATING	
Apple Tree Resort & Hotel	5.00	Outstanding	YES
BETHEL GUEST HOUSE	5.00	Outstanding	YES
SCIGATE TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION	5.00	Outstanding	YES
ALLCARD INC.	4.90	Very Satisfactory	YES
AP PARAGON ENTERPRISES OPC	4.47	Very Satisfactory	YES
Dataworld Computer Center	4.70	Very Satisfactory	YES
EISI TRANSFORMING LIBRARIES, ENHACIN	4.90	Very Satisfactory	YES
Ivory Printing & Publishing House	4.80	Very Satisfactory	YES
KRYPTON INT'L. RESOURCES SALES & SER	4.00	Very Satisfactory	YES





LIBTECH Source Phils. Inc.	4.80	Very Satisfactory	YES
SAVER-TECH COMPUTER SALES & SERVICES	4.44	Very Satisfactory	YES
WOODTRONICS EMPORIUM	4.41	Very Satisfactory	YES
AJR PHARMA AND MEDICAL SUPPLIES DIST	3.97	Satisfactory	YES
AMIGOS CONSTRUCTION	3.00	Satisfactory	YES
DANLI TRADING & ENGINEERING SERVICES	3.80	Satisfactory	YES
EXCELL BIOMED DISTRIBUTION CORPORATI	3.60	Satisfactory	YES
HIDPKS CONSTRUCTION	3.07	Satisfactory	YES
LIFELINE DIAGNOSTICS SUPPLIES, INC	3.90	Satisfactory	YES
METRO COOLAIRE TRADING CORPORATION	3.50	Satisfactory	YES
PRINCE VALIANT INT'L. CORP.	3.70	Satisfactory	YES

Table 3 presents the average ratings of the twenty (20) external suppliers belonging to the Top 20 suppliers with the highest total amount of purchase orders delivered to the end users of the University.

As shown in the table, three (3) external suppliers received OUTSTANDING ratings, while nine (9) were rated VERY SATISFACTORY. Additionally, eight (8) external suppliers received SATISFACTORY ratings. Among all the suppliers listed in the table, Amigos Construction received the lowest rating of 3.00.

**Table 4. Raw Comments from the Survey Respondents that Need Action**

Supplier Name	Comments/Suggestions
AJR PHARMA AND MEDICAL SUPPLIES DIST	Lacking of batteries each unit (3 units per set)
Crown Paper & Stationer	Lacking supplies, wrong items delivered
EXCELL BIOMED DISTRIBUTION CORPORATI	More Suppliers for our Medical Supplies
HAZRIE'S KITCHEN CATERING SERVICES	Food is good is but serves small portions
Iligan Datavision Sales Center	Maintain open communication and promptly address any issues
Iligan Datavision Sales Center	The operating system and SSD frequently malfunction
J&K Hardware Gen. Merchandise	Maintain open communication and promptly address any issues
JOELMAR TRADING	They habitually request for change specifications, request for waiver of delivery, request for change specifications and request for extension of delivery.
JOELMAR TRADING	Poor Quality, their product is sourced out in Shopee or Lazada
MKD ENTERPRISES	Delayed on the date of delivery
Perfect Star PC Shoppe	Maintain open communication and promptly address any issues
RANAO TECH AND INNOVATION SOLUTIONS,	they should have a lifter especially when delivering heavy equipments
Starr Educ'l Supply & Gen. Mdse	Incomplete items delivered
Starr Educ'l Supply & Gen. Mdse	Some items not yet delivered/late delivery
TECH NEWB COMPUTER STORE	We've received the initial batch of requested supplies, but there's been no update on the delivery timeline for the remaining items.
TECH NEWB COMPUTER STORE	The delivered products did not meet the specifications outlined in our Purchase Request form. Rather than the desired items, we received nuts with an expiration



	date only 20 days from the delivery, coffee that does not align with our preferences, and, to compound matters, the delivery was significantly delayed.
TED COMPUTER MEDIC	Maintain open communication and promptly address any issues
WOODTRONICS EMPORIUM	Should improve their delivery logistics, some of the tables had dents during delivery.
XD WONDERTECH COMPUTER SALES & SERV	Maintain open communication and promptly address any issues

Table 4 presents the unedited comments and suggestions from the end-users and responsibility center heads. These comments highlight areas that require action. Specific issues related to each supplier have been identified to facilitate their resolution through the recommendations provided in this evaluation report. The issues primarily focus on the following aspects:

**Table 4.1 Number & Percentage of Issues by Type**

Issue	f	%
Changed good's specifications	1	3.45%
Delayed delivery of goods.	4	13.79%
Delivered damaged goods	1	3.45%
Delivered near-expiration goods	1	3.45%
Do not maintain open communication	5	17.24%
Extended delivery/ies	1	3.45%
Issues not promptly addressed	5	17.24%
Lacking/incomplete items delivered	5	17.24%
Limited Suppliers	1	3.45%
Low quality of goods delivered	2	6.90%
Waived delivery/ies	1	3.45%
Wrong/Mismatch specification delivered	2	6.90%
<b>Total:</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>100%</b>

Table 4.1 presents the number and percentage of issues categorized by type. The top concerns identified by the end-users/requesting office, each accounting for 17.24% of the total, include issues related to incomplete or missing items delivered, suppliers not maintaining open communication, and suppliers failing to promptly address procurement-related issues.



**Table 4.2 Number of Issues by Supplier**

Suppliers	No. of Issues	%
TECH NEWB COMPUTER STORE	5	17%
JOELMAR TRADING	4	14%
Iligan Datavision Sales Center	3	10%
Starr Educ'I Supply & Gen. Mdse	3	10%
Crown Paper & Stationer	2	7%
J&K Hardware Gen. Merchandise	2	7%
Perfect Star PC Shoppe	2	7%
TED COMPUTER MEDIC	2	7%
XD WONDERTECH COMPUTER SALES & SERV	2	7%
AJR PHARMA AND MEDICAL SUPPLIES DIST	1	3%
EXCELL BIOMED DISTRIBUTION CORPORATI	1	3%
MKD ENTERPRISES	1	3%
WOODTRONICS EMPORIUM	1	3%
<b>Total:</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based on Table 4.2, Tech Newb Computer Store is the supplier with the highest number of issues reported by the end-users/requesting office during the period, followed by Joelmar Trading.

**Table 4.3 Types of Issues by Supplier**

Suppliers' Issues	
<b>AJR PHARMA AND MEDICAL SUPPLIES DIST</b>	Issues not promptly addressed
Lacking/incomplete items delivered	Low quality of goods delivered
<b>Crown Paper &amp; Stationer</b>	<b>J&amp;K Hardware Gen. Merchandise</b>
Lacking/incomplete items delivered	Do not maintain open communication
Wrong/Mismatch specification delivered	Issues not promptly addressed
<b>EXCELL BIOMED DISTRIBUTION CORPORATI</b>	<b>JOELMAR TRADING</b>
Limited Suppliers	Changed good's specifications
<b>Iligan Datavision Sales Center</b>	Extended delivery/ies
Do not maintain open communication	Low quality of goods delivered
	Waived delivery/ies
	<b>MKD ENTERPRISES</b>
	Delayed delivery of goods.
	<b>Perfect Star PC Shoppe</b>



Do not maintain open communication
Issues not promptly addressed
<b>Starr Educ'I Supply &amp; Gen. Mdse</b>
Delayed delivery of goods.
Lacking/incomplete items delivered
<b>TECH NEWB COMPUTER STORE</b>
Delayed delivery of goods.
Delivered near-expiration goods
Lacking/incomplete items delivered
Wrong/Mismatch specification delivered

<b>TED COMPUTER MEDIC</b>
Do not maintain open communication
Issues not promptly addressed
<b>WOODTRONICS EMPORIUM</b>
Delivered damaged goods
<b>XD WONDERTECH COMPUTER SALES &amp; SERV</b>
Do not maintain open communication
Issues not promptly addressed

## Recommendations

Based on the results of the survey, the Office of Monitoring and Evaluation recommends the following:

Issue	Recommendation
<b><i>Changed good's specifications</i></b>	The SPMD should not accept deliveries that do not match with the expected specifications and implement a process for checking the specifications before they are accepted. The PMD should impose penalties for delivering goods that don't meet agreed specifications, subject to the compliance with the Philippine Procurement Law.
<b><i>Delayed delivery of goods.</i></b>	The SPMD should negotiate stricter delivery terms with suppliers and impose penalties on those who deliver beyond the lead time as prescribed by procurement law. Establish a tracking system for orders and proactively and consistently follow up suppliers as delivery dates approach to ensure timely delivery. Additionally, building and maintaining relationships with reliable suppliers who consistently meet deadlines would mitigate potential delays.
<b><i>Delivered damaged goods</i></b>	The SPMD should ensure/implement a thorough inspection process upon delivery of goods. For items with sensitive characteristics, require suppliers to package them securely and consider requesting additional protective measures if needed. Establish a clear return or compensation process for damaged goods, and outline these procedures in the agreements with suppliers.



<b><i>Delivered near-expiration goods</i></b>	The PMD should include in the Purchase Order a statement requiring that goods must have a specified percentage of their shelf life remaining upon delivery. Additionally, the SPMD should conduct a thorough inspection of the expiration dates upon receipt and reject any goods that do not meet the expiration requirements specified in the Purchase Order.
<b><i>Extended delivery/ies</i></b>	The PMD should require suppliers to follow delivery schedule, discourage extended deliveries, and impose penalties for the late deliveries when applicable. Analyzing the reasons for extended deliveries will help the SPMD and PMD address the issue appropriately with the supplier. Strengthening the contract terms around delivery schedules, and exploring alternative suppliers who can meet the timelines might be helpful.
<b><i>Issues not promptly addressed</i></b>	The SPMD should establish and implement a formal process for reporting and resolving issues with suppliers. This could include setting up a service level agreement (SLA) that specifies response times. Regular performance reviews with suppliers can help ensure that issues are being addressed promptly.
<b><i>Lacking/incomplete items delivered</i></b>	The SPMD should not accept deliveries from suppliers if the quantity is insufficient or incomplete. Deliveries must be made in full and not in stages. Additionally, the SPMD should thoroughly verify that the quantity listed on the delivery receipt and purchase order matches the actual quantity delivered to ensure accuracy. Furthermore, the SPMD should promptly address any incomplete deliveries with the supplier and request that the missing items be expedited.
<b><i>Limited Suppliers</i></b>	The PMD should diversify its supplier base by actively seeking out and evaluating new suppliers. This reduces the risk of relying too heavily on one or a few suppliers. Explore opportunities such as business matching exhibits, supplier forums, or supplier databases to discover potential new partners.
<b><i>Low quality of goods delivered</i></b>	During procurement, the PMD should establish clear quality standards in the contracts and enforce them rigorously. Simultaneously, the SPMD should implement a quality assurance process to inspect goods upon delivery. If a supplier consistently delivers subpar goods, consider ending the relationship and seeking alternative suppliers.



<b><i>Waived delivery/ies</i></b>	The SPMD should review agreements with suppliers to determine the reasons for any waived deliveries. If the waiver is due to a mutual agreement, ensure it is documented and does not negatively impact end-users or the requesting office. If the waiver is unilateral, address the issue with the supplier, emphasize the importance of adhering to agreed delivery schedules, and implement penalties if necessary.
Wrong/Mismatch specification delivered	The PMD should review the specifications on the purchase order form and confirm them with the requesting office or end-users. This will enhance the accuracy of order documentation and ensure clear communication with suppliers regarding specifications. Additionally, the PMD may establish a verification process prior to delivery. If mismatches occur, the SPMD should implement a prompt return and replacement process with the supplier.

Additionally, it is recommended that the Procurement Management Division and the Supply and Property Management Division to:

1. Reconfigure and enhance all Documented Procedures Manuals (DPM) related to procurement and supply management to incorporate TIME ELEMENT (lead time) in each step of the process, in coordination with the Office of Quality Assurance and Management Services (OQuaMS).
2. Ensure that the Citizen's Charter and Documented Procedure Manual for both the Procurement Management Division and the Supply and Property Management Division are maintained and updated, with processes that are consistent across both documents.

Furthermore, the Supply and Purchasing Management Division and the Procurement Management Division are **requested to submit a report detailing the actions taken based on these recommendations within thirty (30) days from the receipt of this report.**



Prepared by:

**MARK JUNE L. APORADOR, MBA, CHRA**  
*Project Development Officer III*

**ARLENE B. GIL**  
*Planning Officer III*

Reviewed and verified by:

**MELGIE A. ALAS, MMBM, PGDSDS**  
*Director, Office of Monitoring and Evaluation*