



Republic of the Philippines  
National Police Commission  
**PHILIPPINE NATIONAL POLICE**  
Camp Crame, Quezon City

**2014**

**GUIDELINES IN RANKING UNITS AND INDIVIDUALS FOR THE GRANT OF PERFORMANCE-BASED BONUS**

**RANKING OF PNP UNITS**

The ranking of Units of the Philippine National Police was undertaken by initially classifying its units into Frontline and Administrative Services. The classified units were then ranked based on the result of their respective Performance Governance System (PGS) Rating, Unit Performance Evaluation Rating (UPER) and on the average Individual Performance Evaluation Rating (IPER) of their respective personnel for those units with no PGS Rating and UPER, in consonance with the Guidelines in the Granting of the Performance-Based Bonus for FY 2014 as provided by the Inter-Agency Task Force on the Harmonization of the National Government Performance Monitoring, Information and Reporting Systems.

*Table 1: Ranking of PNP Units under the Frontline Services*

<b>CATEGORY</b>	<b>NUMBER OF UNITS</b>	<b>RANKING OF UNITS</b>
<b>Police Regional Offices</b> (including personnel of PRO Sub-Units and Offices)	17	PGS Rating and UPER
<b>National Operational Support Units</b> (including personnel on mission at other units/offices)	12	PGS Rating and UPER
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>29</b>	

*Table 2: Ranking of PNP Units under the Administrative Services*

<b>CATEGORY</b>	<b>NUMBER OF UNITS</b>	<b>RANKING OF UNITS</b>
<b>Command Group</b>	4	Average IPER
<b>Personal Staff &amp; Internal Affairs Service</b> (including IAS personnel assigned at PROs)	4	Average IPER
<b>Operational Directorial Staff</b> (including personnel of Task Forces under D-Staff)	5	Average IPER & PGS Rating
<b>Administrative Directorial Staff</b>	6	Average IPER & PGS Rating
<b>Directorates for Integrated Police Operations</b> (including personnel on mission to other units/offices)	5	Average IPER & PGS Rating
<b>National Administrative Support Units</b> (including personnel on mission to other units/offices)	11	PGS Rating & UPER
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>35</b>	

PNP Units having met the criteria and conditions of the Inter-Agency Task Force on the Harmonization of the National Government Performance Monitoring, Information and Reporting Systems were forced-ranked as follows:

<b>Ranking</b>	<b>Performance Category</b>
Top 10%	Best Unit
Top 25%	Better Unit
Next 65%	Good Unit

### **RANKING OF PNP PERSONNEL**

After the determination of ranking of the PNP Units in each respective category, the personnel in each unit were forced-ranked based on the result of their average Individual Performance Evaluation Rating for the CY 2014.

The force ranking of personnel belonging to the **Best** Units was done by taking the top 20% of the personnel with the highest numerical Individual Performance Evaluation Rating (IPER) as the Best Performing Personnel, the next top 35% of the personnel as the Better Performing Personnel, and the remaining 45% of the personnel as Good Performing Personnel.

The ranking of personnel belonging to the **Better** Units was done by taking the top 15% personnel with the highest numerical Individual Performance Evaluation Rating as Best Performing Personnel, the next top 30% as Better Performing Personnel and the remaining 55% as Good Performing Personnel.

The ranking of personnel belonging to the **Good** Units was done by taking the top 10% personnel with the highest numerical Individual Performance Evaluation Rating as Best Performing Personnel, the next top 25% as Better Performing Personnel and the remaining 65% as Good Performing Personnel.

Personnel who rendered a minimum of three (3) months but less than nine (9) months of service were considered eligible to the FY 2014 PBB. They were automatically rated as Good Performing Personnel and were granted PBB on a pro-rata basis corresponding to their actual length of service rendered.

*Table 3: Ranking of PNP Personnel in the Frontline Services*

<b>CATEGORY</b>	<b>NUMBER OF PERSONNEL</b>	<b>RANKING OF PERSONNEL</b>
<b>Police Regional Offices</b> (including personnel of PRO Sub-Units and Offices)	138,958	Average IPER
<b>National Operational Support Units</b> (including personnel on mission at other units/offices)	14,713	Average IPER
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>153,671</b>	

Table 4: Ranking of PNP Personnel under the Administrative Services

CATEGORY	NUMBER OF PERSONNEL	RANKING OF PERSONNEL
<b>Command Group</b>	328	Average IPER
<b>Personal Staff &amp; Internal Affairs Service</b> (including IAS personnel assigned at PROs)	740	Average IPER
<b>Operational Directorial Staff</b> (including personnel of Task Forces under D-Staff)	572	Average IPER
<b>Administrative Directorial Staff</b>	669	Average IPER
<b>Directorates for Integrated Police Operations</b> (including personnel on mission to other units/offices)	135	Average IPER
<b>National Administrative Support Units</b> (including personnel on mission to other units/offices)	5,448	Average IPER
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>7,892</b>	

As of **December 31, 2014** the number of PNP filled positions is **161,563**. This number includes retired and separated personnel who either retired, died, resigned and newly hired personnel for FY 2014. There are, however, **149,275** PNP personnel who are eligible to receive the 2014 PNP PBB, this includes those who have rendered at least three (3) months of service. On the other hand, there are **12,288** PNP Personnel who were not eligible for the grant of the PBB broken down as follows:

- a) **1,768** PNP personnel who were not able to submit their SALN;
- b) **9,362** Newly hired PNP personnel who were not able to fulfil the minimum three (3) months of service requirement; and
- c) **1,158** PNP personnel who were found guilty of criminal and/or administrative cases filed against them and meted penalty in FY 2014.