

Preliminary LGU Fiscal Sustainability Scorecard<sup>1</sup>

NAME OF CITY			INCOME CLASSIFICATION					
NAGA CITY (CAMARINES SUR)			2					
Key Result Area	Indicator	Max Score	2012*		2013		2014	
			Rating	Score	Rating	Score	Rating	Score
1. Revenue Generation Capacity (70 points)	1.1 Regular income level <sup>2</sup>	10	Fair	6	Fair	6	Good	8
	1.2 Local revenue level <sup>3</sup>	15	Very Good	15	Very Good	15	Very Good	15
	1.3 Local revenue growth	20	9.4%	10	11.8%	15	21.6%	20
	1.4 Dependence on locally sourced income <sup>4</sup>	10	Very Good 51.1%	10	Very Good 51.9%	10	Very Good 53.8%	10
	1.5 Dependence on IRA	10	Very Low 48.5%	10	Very Low 48.0%	10	Very Low 45.9%	10
	1.6 Dependence on Other Shares from National Tax Collection	5	Low 0.3%	5	Low 0.1%	5	Low 0.3%	5
2. Local Collection Growth (10 points)	2.1 Tax Revenues	5	6.4%	3	14.1%	4	13.5%	4
	2.1.1 Real property tax (Basic)		-0.2%		5.0%		15.2%	
	2.1.2 Tax on Business		8.9%		13.8%		9.3%	
	2.1.3 Other Taxes		8.3%		46.3%		40.0%	
	2.2 Non-Tax Revenues	5	16.2%	4	7.0%	3	39.6%	5
	2.2.1 Regulatory Fees		-1.0%		-0.9%		13.1%	
	2.2.2 User/Service Charges		14.1%		25.0%		59.0%	
2.2.3 Econ. Enterprise	23.5%			7.6%		45.1%		
3. Expenditure Management (20 points)	3.1 Total Expenditure Per Capita <sup>5</sup>	5	Fair	3	Fair	3	Fair	3
	3.2 Use of IRA for Local Development Projects <sup>6</sup>	5	Failed 13.4%	0	Failed 17.2%	0	Failed 11.5%	0
	3.3 Limitation on Expenditure for Personal Services <sup>7</sup>	5	Failed 50.0%	0	Failed 50.1%	0	Failed 48.2%	0
	3.4 Limitation on Debt Service <sup>8</sup>	5	Passed 7.4%	5	Passed 6.7%	5	Passed 5.2%	5
<b>SUB-TOTAL: QUANTITATIVE INDICATORS (90%)</b>		<b>90</b>	<b>63.9</b>	<b>pts.</b>	<b>68.4</b>	<b>pts.</b>	<b>76.5</b>	<b>pts.</b>
4. Submission of Timely and Accurate Statement of Receipts and Expenditures per DO 8-2011	4	Non-Compliant	2	Non-Compliant	2	Non-Compliant	2	
5. Regular Updating of Schedule of Market Values and Conduct of General Revision of Property Assessment per Sec. 219 of the Local Government Code and DOF-DILG Joint Memorandum Circular No. 2010-01	3	Compliant (SMV is 2 years old.)	3	Compliant (SMV is 3 years old.)	3	Due (SMV is 4 years old.)	0	
6. Submission of Timely and Accurate Quarterly Report on Real Property Assessment (QRRPA)	3	Incomplete	1.5	Complete	3	Complete	3	
<b>SUB-TOTAL: QUALITATIVE INDICATORS (10%)</b>		<b>10</b>	<b>6.5</b>	<b>pts.</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>pts.</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>pts.</b>
<b>OVERALL SCORE<sup>9</sup></b>		<b>100</b>	<b>70.4</b>	<b>pts.</b>	<b>76.4</b>	<b>pts.</b>	<b>81.5</b>	<b>pts.</b>
<b>OVERALL RATING</b>			<b>B</b> Very Good	<b>B</b> Very Good	<b>A</b> Excellent			

DATA SOURCES: LGU Treasurer's Electronic Statement of Receipts and Expenditures (BLGF run date of July 15, 2015), LGU Assessor's Quarterly Reports on Real Property Assessment, and approved LGU Schedule of Market Values

<sup>1</sup> Rating scheme for KRAs 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5 and 1.6 was based on performance according to income classification in relation to average performance of LGUs within the same income classification. NI = Needs Improvement

<sup>2</sup> Total regular income is the sum of locally sourced income (excluding SEF), current year's IRA + other shares from national tax collection. Other income/receipts were not considered due to reporting errors.

<sup>3</sup> Total revenues collected from real property tax (basic), business tax, other taxes, regulatory fees, user charges, and income from economic enterprise.

<sup>4</sup> % share of local revenues (excluding Other Receipts) to total regular income

<sup>5</sup> Based on 2010 Census, with 1.82% projected annual growth for FY2012, FY2013 and FY2014.

<sup>6</sup> At least 20% of IRA should be utilized for local development projects (LGC Sec. 287)

<sup>7</sup> Not to exceed 45% of the annual regular income realized in the next preceding fiscal year for 1st - 3rd income class LGUs or 55% for 4th or lower income class LGUs (LGC Sec. 325a)

<sup>8</sup> Expenditures for debt servicing not to exceed 20% of the regular income for the fiscal year (LGC Sec. 324a)

<sup>9</sup> Based on the weighted score for all quantitative (KRAs 1, 2 & 3) and qualitative (KRAs 4, 5 & 6) indicators: 100% = 90% Quantitative KRAs + 10% Qualitative KRAs

\* Re-computed based on the latest 2012 report per BLGF run date of July 15, 2015.

## Annex A - Detailed Report

LGU Name: NAGA CITY (CAMARINES SUR)

Income Class: 2

FY Covered: 2012-2014

2010 Population

174,931

Indicator/Item	2012*	+/- YoY	2013	+/- YoY	2014	+/- YoY
<b>1 Regular Income</b>	<b>615,583,768</b>	<b>-2.3%</b>	<b>678,516,596</b>	<b>10.2%</b>	<b>796,045,317</b>	<b>17.3%</b>
Locally Sourced Income	314,848,753	9.4%	352,043,880	11.8%	428,087,777	21.6%
% Share to Regular Income	51.1%		51.9%		53.8%	
Internal Revenue Allotment (Current)	298,805,068	-12.4%	325,508,915	8.9%	365,294,554	12.2%
% Share to Regular Income	48.5%		48.0%		45.9%	
Other Shares from Nat'l Tax Collection	1,929,947	51.9%	963,801	-50.1%	2,662,986	176.3%
% Share to Regular Income	0.3%		0.1%		0.3%	
<b>2 Local Revenue</b>	<b>314,848,753</b>	<b>9.4%</b>	<b>352,043,880</b>	<b>11.8%</b>	<b>428,087,777</b>	<b>21.6%</b>
Tax Revenues	213,269,981	6.4%	243,318,843	14.1%	276,284,790	13.5%
<i>Real property tax (Basic)</i>	52,503,415	-0.2%	55,146,103	5.0%	63,514,634	15.2%
<i>Tax on Business</i>	144,830,978	8.9%	164,855,324	13.8%	180,114,139	9.3%
<i>Other Taxes</i>	15,935,588	8.3%	23,317,416	46.3%	32,656,017	40.0%
Non-tax Revenues	101,578,772	16.2%	108,725,037	7.0%	151,802,987	39.6%
<i>Regulatory Fees</i>	22,930,356	-1.0%	22,724,714	-0.9%	25,699,708	13.1%
<i>User/Service Charges</i>	7,811,113	14.1%	9,765,457	25.0%	15,524,159	59.0%
<i>Income from Econ. Enterprise</i>	70,837,302	23.5%	76,234,866	7.6%	110,579,120	45.1%
<b>3 Internal Revenue Allotment - Current</b>	<b>298,805,068</b>	<b>-12.4%</b>	<b>325,508,915</b>	<b>8.9%</b>	<b>365,294,554</b>	<b>12.2%</b>
<b>4 Other Shares from Nat'l Tax Collection</b>	<b>1,929,947</b>	<b>51.9%</b>	<b>963,801</b>	<b>-50.1%</b>	<b>2,662,986</b>	<b>176.3%</b>
Share from Economic Zone	-	N/A	-	N/A	-	N/A
Share from EVAT	-	N/A	-	N/A	-	N/A
Share from National Wealth	-	N/A	-	N/A	-	N/A
Share from PAGCOR/PCSO/Lotto	1,929,947	51.9%	963,801	-50.1%	2,662,986	176.3%
Share from Tobacco Excise Tax	-	N/A	-	N/A	-	N/A
<b>5 Total Expenditures (with SEF)</b>	<b>681,975,679</b>	<b>8.1%</b>	<b>751,200,415</b>	<b>10.2%</b>	<b>769,160,895</b>	<b>2.4%</b>
General Public Services	226,279,744	-6.4%	220,356,788	-2.6%	242,382,508	10.0%
<i>per Capita</i>	1,248		1,193		1,289	
Economic Services	177,342,816	29.8%	242,403,840	36.7%	197,420,415	-18.6%
<i>per Capita</i>	978		1,313		1,050	
Social Services	60,680,071	-12.4%	70,451,117	16.1%	113,207,191	60.7%
<i>per Capita</i>	335		382		602	
Education	80,507,768	3.6%	82,064,655	1.9%	91,930,241	12.0%
<i>per Capita</i>	444		444		489	
Health	79,877,287	11.3%	85,712,093	7.3%	68,734,261	-19.8%
<i>per Capita</i>	440		464		366	
Labor	0	-	0	-	9,185,497	-
<i>per Capita</i>	0		0		49	
Housing	11,452,328	177.2%	4,588,598	-59.9%	4,944,553	7.8%
<i>per Capita</i>	63		25		26	
Debt Service	45,835,665	55.5%	45,623,326	-0.5%	41,356,229	-9.4%
<b>6 Total Expenditures per Capita</b>	<b>3,760</b>		<b>4,068</b>		<b>4,091</b>	
<i>Population/Projected Population</i>	181,356		184,657		188,018	
<b>7 Utilization of IRA for Local Devt. Projects</b>	<b>13.4%</b>		<b>17.2%</b>		<b>11.5%</b>	
20% Expenditure	40,069,979		55,834,618		41,910,059	
<b>8 Personal Services (PS)</b>	<b>285,313,761</b>		<b>315,784,722</b>		<b>296,723,810</b>	
PS-to-Total Expenditures Ratio	50.0%		50.1%		48.2%	
<b>9 Total Debt Service</b>	<b>45,835,665</b>		<b>45,623,326</b>		<b>41,356,229</b>	
Debt-to-Regular Income Ratio	7.4%		6.7%		5.2%	

**Notes on Rating System Used in the Preliminary Scorecard:**

Regular Income and Locally Sourced Income were assessed according to Income Class, with the following scale.

Very Good = 50% higher than the average value  
 Good = 25% higher than the average value  
 Fair = Average  
 Needs Improvement = 25% lower than the average value  
 Poor = 50% lower than the average value

(Dependence on locally sourced income was assessed using the same scale but on per LGU type basis.)

IRA Dependence was assessed according to LGU Type

Very Low = Less than 50%  
 Low = Greater than 50% but less than 60%  
 Fair = Average dependence for municipalities: 60%-70%  
 High = Greater than 70% but less than 80%  
 Very High = Greater than 80%

Total Expenditure per Capita was assessed according to LGU Type

Very High = 50% higher than the average value  
 High = 25% higher than the average value  
 Fair = Average  
 Low = 25% lower than the average value  
 Very Low = 50% lower than the average value

Use of IRA for Local Dev't Projects: PASSED = Ratio is greater than or equal to 20%; else, FAILED

Limitation on PS Expenditure:

PASSED : &lt;=45% for 1st - 3rd Class LGUs, &lt;=55% for 4th to lower income class LGUs; else, FAILED

Debt Service Ratio:

PASSED : Expenditures for debt servicing is less than or equal to 20% of Regular Income; else, FAILED

\* Re-computed based on the latest 2012 report per BLGF run date of July 15, 2015.