Republika ng Pilipinas PAMBANSANG PALGASIWAAN NG PATUBIG (National Irrigation Administration) Gusaling AFC, Quezon Memorial Circle Diliman, Lungsod ng Quezon

MC # 13 , s. 1973

#### LEMORANDUM CIRCULAR

TO

THE ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR, ALL DEPARTMENT HEADS AND STAFFS, REGIONAL TRRIGATION ENGINEERS, PROVINCIAL TRRIGATION ENGINEERS, TRRIGATION SUPERINTENDENTS, AND ALL OTHERS CONCERNED National Trrigation Administration

SUBJECT :

### Revised Criteria in Determining the Priority Ratings of National and Communal Irrigation Projects Proposed for Construction

In order to establish a uniform system of determining priorities in programming national and communal irrigation projects for construction, there is herewith attached:

- 1. Criteria in Determining the Pricrity Matings of National Irrigation Projects
- 2. Criteria in Determining the Priority Ratings of Communal Irrigation Projects

These have been adopted for the purpose of rating proposed national and communal irrigation projects to be programmed for construction. These revised criteria supersedes the previous priority ratings presently in use in the NTA.

National and communal irrigation projects which have been found to be feasible, should therefore be programmed for construction in accordance with the above-stated criteria taking into consideration the overall program, as well as the sectoral or regional development programs in the different regions.

Please be guided accordingly.

ALAREDO L. JUINIO Administrator 3/5/73

Attachments: Harch 2, 1973

		<u>in Determin</u>	
Priority	<u>Ratings</u> of	<u>f National I</u>	rrigation Projects

	<u>Project Priority Rating</u>	
Fac	tors	<u>Points</u>
Α.	<ol> <li>2. Land suitability to Rice and Corn-</li> <li>3. Drainage Conditions</li> </ol>	- 12 - 12 - 8
	4. Available Rainful for Wet Season Crop	- 8
Β.	<u>Economic Feasibility:</u> 5. Benefit Cost Ratio	- 40
С,	Institutional Policies: 6. Land Reform	- 15 - <u>5</u> -100

Types of Priority Classification:

No. of Points	Category
90-100	Excellent
80- 89	Very Good
70- 79	Good
60 <b>- 69</b>	Fair
Below 60	Deferrable

Note: Projects below 60 but above 50 in total number of points are deferrable, which rating may improve upon further investigation and new favorable factors are found.

## Project Priority Rating

A. Technical Feasibility (40)

REALER BEL

1.	Irrigation	Intensity	(12	points)	<u>Points</u>
	1.0 - 1.1				12
	1.2 - 1.3				11
	1.4 - 1.5				9
	1.6 - 1.7				7
	1.8 - 2.0				5
	2.1 and abo	ve			3

Irrigation intensity is the ratio of wet season irrigable area to the dry season irrigable area based on the available river discharge.

# 2. Land Suitability to Rice and Corn (12 points)

## Point Distribution

Percentage of the Area

	Class I	Class II	Class III	Class IV
90% - 100%	12	8.	4	O
70% - 89%	8	6	3	0
50% - 69%	6	4	2	0
30% - 49%	4	2	1.5	0
11% - 29%	2	1.5	1	0

To get the number of points, add the corresponding points for each portion of the area under each soil class. Example: For an area having 70% Class I and 30% Class III, the total points would be 8 ± 1.5 or 9.5 points.

	Class I - Highly suitable Class II - Moderately suitab Class III - Suitable Class IV - Excessive specifi	
З.	<u>Drainage Conditions (8) points</u>	<u>Points</u>
	Excellent	8
	Good	6
e	Fair	4
	Poor	2

		¥	$\bigcirc$	
• • • •	and the second sec	Rainf <b>q</b> ll for Wet Intensity for fo		· ·
	30 inches	and above	8	
	31" - 35"		6	
	36" - 40"			
	' 4 <b>1" -</b> 45"	<b></b>	4	
	45" - 50"	1986 6004 5000 1988 6000 9040 9040	3	
	50" above	50"	<b></b> 2	
в.	Economic Feas:	<u>ibility (40</u> )		
	5. Benefit -	Cost Ratio (40	points)	<u>Points</u>
	1.0 - 1.5			20
	1.6 - 2.0			24
¢	2.1 - 2.5			27
	2.6 - 3.0			30
	3.1 - 3.5		·	32
	3.6 - 4.0			34
	4.1 - 4.5		2	36
	4.6 - 5.0		s.	38
	Above 5.0			40
C. Inst	itutional Pol:	icies (20)		
	6. Land Refor			
		in Land Reform A	rea	15
	Outs	ide Land Reform	Area	5
	7. Number of	Irrigation Syst (5 points)	ems in the F	rovince
	Three ou	r more		O
	Two syst	tems		1
	One syst			B
	None			5

/huiv

# CRITERIA IN DETERMINING THE PRIORITY RATINGS OF COMMUNAL IRRIGATION PROJECT/ SYSTEMS

۰,

. .

	Factors	<u>Points</u>
1.	Land Reform	15
2.	Cooperation of Farmers	20
З.	Benefit-Cost Ratio	20
4.	Nature of Project	15
5.	Crop Raised	10
6.	Sufficiency of Funds	10
7.	Socio-Economic Conditions	5
8.	Status of Water Rights	5
Dis	tribution of Points. Total	100
1.	Land Reform (15 points)	
	(a) Within La <sub>n</sub> d Reform Area	15
	(b) Outside Land Reform Area	5
2.	Cooperation of Farmers (20 points	)
	(a) Free Labor (100%) (Percentage pf Free Labor x	15 15)
	(b) Free Right-of-Way Not Free	5 <b>0</b>
З.	Benefit-Cost Ratio	
	3 and below	8
	3.10 - 6.00	12
	6.10 - 9.00	16
	Above 9.00	20
4.	Nature of Project	
	(a) Rehabilitation	15
	(b) Completion	10
	(c) New	5
5.	<u>Crops Raised (10 points)</u>	
	(a) Area to be devoted to rice	10
	(b) Other Crops	5
		5

6.	<u>Sufficiency of Funds (10 points)</u>		
			<u>Points</u>
	(a)	Sufficient Funds	10
	(Ь)	Sufficient to Construct Utile Portion	5
	(c)	Not Sufficient	0
7.	<u>Soci</u>	o-Economic Conditions (5 points)	)
	(a)	Poor	5
	(ь)	Fair	3
8.	Stat	us of Water Rights (5 points)	
	(a)	With Water Rights	5
	(b)	No Water Rights	0