

Republika ng Pilipinas
PAMBANSANG PANGASIWAAN NG PATUBIG
(National Irrigation Administration)
Lungsod ng Quezon

MC No. 045 s. 1938

MEMORANDUM CIRCULAR

TO : THE ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATORS/LEADS OF DEPARTMENTS AND
STAFFS/REGIONAL IRRIGATION MANAGERS/OPERATION MANAGERS/
IRRIGATION SUPERINTENDENTS/PROVINCIAL IRRIGATION
ENGINEERS AND ALL OTHERS CONCERNED

SUBJECT : Standard Rating Form for Provincial Irrigation Engineers

For your guidance and compliance, attached is a copy of the Performance Evaluation Standard for Provincial Irrigation Engineers. It shall be used for rating the annual performance of PIEs. This standard was developed in consultation with the PIEs, the Chief Regional Engineers and with the Regional Irrigation Managers and appropriate officials of the sector in charge of communal development. The factors are self-explanatory and the instructions on how to rate are indicated on the rating sheet. For your convenience, however, the attached form has been duly filled to serve as sample.

In accordance with the approved organization, the PIE is directly under the Regional Irrigation Manager who is assisted by his regional staff. In conformity with this organization, the PIE's rating shall be coursed thru the appropriate divisions for initial evaluation of the PIE's performance with respect to the specific activities under their area of supervision, before the RIM finally signs the accomplished rating form. The Division Manager concerned shall initial below the RIM's signature.

This standard rating form shall be used effective calendar year 1938 and every calendar year thereafter. It shall be accomplished in 3 copies to be distributed as follows: original-ratee; 1 copy-regional file; 1 copy central office, attention: PRMD. All previous issuances regarding rating of PIEs performance which are contrary to the attached standard are hereby repealed.

Please be guided accordingly.

(SGD.) FEDERICO W. ALDAY, JR.
Administrator

signed 11-7-38

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION
FOR
PROVINCIAL IRRIGATION ENGINEER
CY 1988

Name: Juan dela Cruz Point Rating: 69.6 Adjective Rating: Satisfactory

Region/Province: _____

Activities or Program for the Year	Output Target	Accomp- lishment	Points Earned
I. PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING - 25 points			
1. Feasibility reports submitted vs. program for the year (Target outputs: NIA CIP F1-2, F1-3A, F1-3B 2/ text tables)			7
a) Quantity submitted vs. no. required	2.5	5 reports	5
Below 70% submtd. vs. program	0.5		
71 - 80% " " " "	1.0		
81 - 90% " " " "	1.5		
91 - 99% " " " "	2.0		
100% " " " "	2.5		
b) Quality & acceptability of reports submtd.	2.5		
A report is of good quality if it contains sufficient relevant data called for, such that recipient of the report can have a clear picture of the proposed project. A report is acceptable if data are supported by computation/documents/etc. to convince recipient of their reasonableness.			
Below 75% acceptable	0.5		
75 - 80% " " " "	1.0		
81 - 85% " " " "	1.5		
86 - 90% " " " "	2.0		
Above 90% " " " "	2.5		
c) Timeliness of reports submtd	2		
Below 75% submtd. w/in deadline.	0.5		
75 - 80% " " " "	0.75		
81 - 85% " " " "	1.0		
86 - 90% " " " "	1.5		
Above 90% " " " "	2.0		
2. Detailed engineering reports submtd. vs. program			7
(Target outputs per proj.: Data on dam-site survey, canal location survey, and parcellary map survey)			
a) Quantity submtd. vs. program	2.5	5	5
Below 70% submtd. vs. prog.	0.5		
71 - 80% " " " "	1.0		
81 - 90% " " " "	1.5		
91 - 99% " " " "	2.0		
100% " " " "	2.5		
b) Quality & acceptability of reports submtd.	2.5		
Reports are of good quality if they contain the required data sufficient to enable the designer to form a good picture of the project area and to design the corresponding structures/facilities consistent w/ accepted engineering principles. They are acceptable if topo data presented observe established criteria for dam/intake canals located and the topo map reflects all necessary			

Activities or Program for the Year	Output Target	Accomp- lishment	Points Earned
information such as residential areas and the like			
Below 75% acceptable			0.5
76 -- 80% "			1.0
81 -- 85% "	5	3	0.5
86 -- 90% "			1.5
Above 90% "			2.0
c) Timeliness of data submtd.	2		
Below 75% submtd. w/in deadline. . .			0.5
76 -- 80% " " "			0.75
81 -- 85% " " "	5	3	0.5
86 -- 90% " " "			1.0
Above 90% " " "			1.5
3. POW submtd. vs. program for the year			2.0
(Target output: POWs for investigation, measure- ment, agro-economic survey, topo, detailed survey and parcellary mapping etc.)	5	5	2
a) Quantity of reports submtd. vs. program	2		
Below 75% submtd. vs. program			0.5
76 -- 80% " " "			0.75
81 -- 90% " " "			1.0
91 -- 99% " " "			1.5
100% " " "			2.0
b) Acceptability of POW	2		
A POW is acceptable if it adheres to pre- scribed standards and work outputs especially unit costs. Any deviations therefrom should be w/in tolerable limits or if beyond such limits are properly justified with facts and figures.	5	4	.75
Below 75% acceptable.			0.5
76 -- 80% "			0.75
81 -- 85% "			1.0
86 -- 90% "			1.5
Above 90% "			2.0
c) Timelines of POW submitted	1		
Below 75% submtd. w/in deadline			0.6
76 -- 80% " " "	5	3	.6
81 -- 85% " " "			0.7
86 -- 90% " " "			0.8
Above 90% " " "			0.9
4. MOA signed vs. target	4		
None signed			0
Less than 50% signed	5	5	4.0
51 -- 70% signed.			.2
71 -- 90% signed.			.3
More than 90% signed			.4
5. Personal attendance at final and pre-construction meetings w/ Ia, as shown in time sheet signed by IAs.	2		
Attended less than 75% of meetings	10	7	.5
75 -- 80% of meetings			0.75
81 -- 85% "			1.0
86 -- 90% "			1.5
Above 90% "			2.0

Activities or Program for the Year

Output : Accomplishment : Points
Target : Earned

II. PROJECT CONSTRUCTION 25 points

1. Overall physical status of projects	6	:	:	:	:
Below 60%	1	:	:	:	:
61 - 70%	2	:	:	:	:
71 - 80%	3	:	100%	82%	4
81 - 90%	4	:	:	:	:
Above 90%	6	:	:	:	:
2. Overall financial status of projects	4	:	:	:	:
Overrun above 12%	1	:	within	over	:
Overrun 12% or below	2	:	budget	run	2
Project w/in budget	4	:	:	10%	:
3. Equity generation	5	:	:	:	:
(Actual collection vs. target)		:	:	:	:
Below 60%	1	:	:	:	:
61 - 70%	2	:	P500,000	:	:
71 - 80%	3	:	:	P420,000	4
81 - 90%	4	:	:	:	:
Above 90%	5	:	:	:	:
4. IAs participation	3	:	:	:	:
(No. of man-days that IA members actually worked in the construction of projects, as evidenced by payrolls)		:	:	:	:
Below 40%	0.5	:	5,200	3,000	2
40 - 49% participation	1.5	:	Man-	Man-	:
50 - 59%	2.0	:	days	days	:
60 - 70%	2.5	:	:	:	:
Above 70%	3.0	:	:	:	:
5. Turnover/acceptance of completed projects w/in the period from July of previous yr. to June of current yr., including phased projects, provided that chargeable costs have been reconciled	7	:	:	:	:
a) Area actually turned over/restored vs. program	4	:	750	570	3
Below 60%	0.5	:	has.	has.	:
61 - 70%	1.0	:	:	:	:
71 - 80%	2.5	:	:	:	:
81 - 90%	3.0	:	:	:	:
Above 90%	4.0	:	:	:	:
b) Number of projects completed and turned over including phased projects vs. program	3	:	:	:	:
Below 60%	0.5	:	:	:	:
60 - 70%	1.5	:	:	:	:
71 - 80%	2.0	:	5	5	3
81 - 90%	2.5	:	:	:	:
Above 90%	3.0	:	:	:	:

Activities or Program for the Year	Output Target	Accomp. Lishment	Points Earned
------------------------------------	------------------	---------------------	------------------

III. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE - - - 20 points

1. Communal system15

a) Number of operating systems (in part or in full vs. no. constructed by NIA	5	25	22	4
Below 60%	1			
60 - 70%	2			
71 - 80%	3			
81 - 90%	4			
Above 90%	5			

b) Area actually irrigated vs. programmed for the year	5			
Below 60%	1	3,750	3,800	4
60 - 70%	2	has	has	
71 - 80%	3			
81 - 90%	4			
Above 90%	5			

c) Actually irrigated vs. service area	5			
Below 60%	1	4,000	3,200	3
60 - 70%	2	has	has	
71 - 80%	3			
81 - 90%	4			
Above 90%	5			

2. Equipmt. operation, excluding those earmarked for disposal, based on the relation.

<u>A1</u> where A1 is no. of operable equipmt. A1 + A2 and A2 is no. shut down for repairs.	5			
Below 60%	1	20	15	3
60 - 70%	2			
71 - 80%	3			
81 - 90%	4			
Above 90%	5			

IV. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT - - - 25 points

1.1. Viability index based on the relation:

Income	12	Income	Total	
Expense		from	exp.	
Below 0.8	5	all		
0.80 - 0.95	6	sources		
0.96 - 1.10	7			9
1.11 - 1.25	8			
1.26 - 1.40	9	P1.57m	P1.2m	
1.41 - 1.50	10			
1.51 - 1.60	11			
Above 1.60	12			

Activities or Program for the Year

Output : Accomplishment : Points
Target : Earned

2. Collection efficiency based on the relation

Actual collection 13
Target collection

a) Pumps	4	P.25M		
Below 60%	0.5			
60 - 70%	1.0		P.2M	2
71 - 80%	2.0			
81 - 90%	3.0			
Above 90%	4.0			

b) CIS amortization:	9			
Below 60%	5			
60 - 70%	6	P650,000	P570,000	8
71 - 80%	7			
81 - 90%	8			
Above 90%	9			

V. ADMINISTRATIVE ASPECTS. 5

General office presentability which is characterized by cleanliness and neatness of office and compound; stocks properly stored; no unsightly papers; broken down chairs and office equipment neatly stacked; shutdown equipment or construction materials not scattered; etc. Rate using scale of 1 to 5.

5 pts: 3 3

Total 100 69.6

Schedule of Rating

Poor	Below 45 pts.
Fair	45 to 60 pts.
Satisfactory	61 to 80 pts.
Very Satisfactory	81 to 94 pts.
Outstanding	Above 94 pts.

Summary

	Max. Pts.	Pts. Earned
I	25	15.6
II	25	18
III	20	14
IV	25	19
V	5	3
Total	100	69.6

Ratee:

Rated by:

signature
Provincial Irrigation Engineer

signature
Regional Irrigation Manager

Initials:

Manager, Eng'g. Division
Manager, IDD
Manager, F & MD
Manager, Adm. Services
Manager, EMD