Republic of the Philippines
NATIONAL IRRIGATION ADMINISTRATION
(Pambansang Pangasiwaan ng Patubig)
Lungsod ng Quezon

MC No 20, s. 2007

MEMORANDUM CIRCULAR

T O : THE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR, ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATORS, DEPARTMENT MANAGERS, REGIONAL IRRIGATION MANAGERS, OPERATIONS/PROJECT MANAGERS, PROJECT ENGINEERS, IRRIGATION SUPERINTENDENTS, PROVINCIAL IRRIGATION ENGINEERS AND ALL OTHERS CONCERNED

SUBJECT : REVISED GUIDELINES ON THE EVALUATION OF FIELD UNITS FOR VIABILITY INCENTIVE GRANT AND/OR AWARDS OF RECOGNITION

To enhance and stimulate increased productivity among the various units by giving due recognition and awards for commendable performance, both physical and financial aspects, the guidelines on the evaluation of performance of field units are hereby revised. The new guidelines consider various factors and do not merely equate income to expenses, whereby those with income greater than expenses are treated as viable, but likewise consider those meeting committed targets as viable. In this context, viability refers to satisfactory physical accomplishment and financial self-sufficiency.

1.0 DEFINITION OF TERMS

1.1. **VIABILITY INCENTIVE GRANT (VIG)** – Refers to awards and/or rewards given to field offices which attained high level of physical performance and financial self-sufficiency during a given period.

1.2. **VIABILITY INDEX** – Is the ratio of income to expenses.

1.3. **UNIT** – Refers to the Regional Irrigation Office (RIO) , Provincial Irrigation Office (PIO) and National Irrigation Systems Office (NISO) . In the case of UPRIIS and MARIIS, the Head Office together with the Dam Division, and the Districts under their jurisdiction are considered units.. Partially operating projects are not considered operating unit and are therefore not entitled to VIG.

1.4. **REGION** – Covers all the units under its jurisdiction. UPRIIS and MARIIS are treated as regions.

1.5. **INCOME** – Refers to the following revenues collected by the unit during the year under evaluation for VIG.

1.5.1. Irrigation Service Fees (ISF) collected in cash and cash proceeds from the sale of ISF collection in kind (palay). This means that palay collection shall be considered income only when sold and converted to cash.

1.5.2. Pump amortizations.

1.5.3. CIS amortizations and equity contributions.

1.5.4. Equipment rental earned and collected for the use of NIA owned/acquired equipment.

Proper crediting of rental income to the field unit which owns the concerned equipment must be strictly observed in order to prevent the practice of juggling rental income among field offices. Close monitoring of this in the region must be done by the Finance and Management Division in coordination with the Equipment Management Division.

1.5.5. Gains in the sale of equipment and other NIA facilities, part of the proceeds in excess of the depreciated value (acquisition cost less accumulated depreciation per book) of the equipment sold.

1.5.6. Income derived from revenue-generating projects/activities operated by the unit.

Income from power generation shall not be considered in the computation of VIG.

1.5.7. Other incidental income like interest earnings, sale of unused office supplies and materials, waste materials, etc.

1.6. EXPENSES – Refers to the following operating expenditures incurred during the year under evaluation including VIG whether charged to COB and/or project funds.

1.6.1. Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Expenses:

1.6.1.1. Personal Services shall include salaries, wages, allowances, RATA, loyalty award, overtime, honoraria, 13th month pay, cash gift, Employees Compensation, government share, (GSIS, Pag-Ibig, Philhealth), retirement gratuity and terminal leaves for leave credits earned during the current year.

1.6.1.2. Maintenance and Other Operating Expenses (MOOE) shall include TEV, supplies & materials, water, electricity, fuel and oil, collection expenses, power for irrigation pumps repair and maintenance of equipments, furniture and fixtures, etc., communication, IA share and remuneration, contractual services (Such as janitorial services, labor contract, etc.), insurance and registration of building and vehicles, 10% discount on ISF, loss on sale of palay, manpower development, rent, subscription expense, motorcycle allowances, taxes, freight, advertising, auditing services, bank charges and miscellaneous expenses.

1.6.2. Regular maintenance and minor repair of irrigation system facilities including canals and associated structures excluding rehabilitation and restoration expenses for damages caused by natural calamities.

1.6.3. Residual expenses in the operation of dams.

In case of UPRIIS and MARIIS, residual expenses in the operation of the dams shall be shared among the various units under them. The O&M expenses on the dam operation shall be allocated between power and irrigation components. The expenses on the irrigation component shall be shared proportionately among the districts based on their service areas. Expenses incurred in the operation and maintenance of power-generation facilities shall be excluded in the computation of VIG.

1.6.4. Expenses incurred in operating revenue generating projects/activities except those incurred for the operation and maintenance of power generation facilities.

1.6.5. Losses and expenses incurred in the storage, handling and hauling of collection in-kind (palay) shall be added to the operating expenses of the unit.

1.6.6. Expenses for MOOE charged to project funds used in the operation and maintenance of the field unit shall be considered as part of its O&M expenses.

1.6.7. Share of the operating unit of DRD in the RIO's operating expenses shall be considered as expense of the operating unit in the computation of the VIG.

Formula: Share in the Regional&Dam Expenses = $\frac{\text{NISO or PIO PS}}{\sum \text{ NISO \&PIO PS}} \times \text{RIO/DAM EXP}$

Share of NISO # 1 in the Regional & Dam Expenses:

Where: NISO # 1 PS = P6,608,063.05
$\sum$ of NISO PS = P57,531,251.76
$\sum$ of PIOs PS = P15,804,080.95
RIO&Dam Expenses (Net of Income, if any) = P20,704,730,.06

$$= \frac{\text{NISO \#1 PS}}{\sum \text{ NISO and PIO PS}} \times \text{RIO/Dam Expenses}$$

$$= \frac{6,608,063.05}{57,531,251,76+15,804,080.95} \times 20,704,730,.06$$

$$= .09010749397 \times 20,704,730.06$$

$$= 1,865,651.34$$

1.6.8. VIG incurred for the year shall be considered part of the expenses for same year computed as follows.

VIG = A x N

Where A = Performance Rating Factor (Par. 3.1)
N- Net Income (Par. 1.7)

1.7 NET income refers to the excess of Total Income (Par.1.5) less Total Expenses (Par. 1.6)

$$N\ (NISO\ \#\ 1) = \frac{\text{Total Income} - \text{Total Expenses}}{1 + A}$$

Where: TI = P15,969,392.90

TE = P12,989,965.33 (P11,124,313.99+ 1,865,651.34)

A = Performance Rating Factor VS = 25%

$$N = \frac{15,969,392.90 - (11,124,313.99 + 1,865,651.34)}{1.25}$$

$$N = \frac{15,969,392.90 - 12,989,965.33}{1.25}$$

$$N = \frac{2,979,427.57}{1.25}$$

N = 2,383,542.05

VIG (NISO # 1) = A x N
= 25% x 2,383,542.05
= P595,885.51

2.0. LEVELS AND CRITERIA FOR VIG

Viable units shall be classified into three categories as follows:

2.1. Financially viable – Units whose incomes are greater than expenses or with viability index of more than 1.0.

2.2. Physically viable – Units which attained satisfactory level in its physical performance shall be considered physically viable. The criteria and mechanics for the evaluation of physical performance of the different units defined in the following annexes:

ANNEX A – For NISOs
ANNEX B - For PIOs
ANNEX C - For Region
ANNEX D - For Integrated Irrigation systems

2.3. Financially and physically viable – These are the units which meet the criteria both for financial and physical viability.

3.0. AWARDS FOR VIABILITY

3.1. The amount of VIG to be given to financially and physically viable units shall be based on the following Performance Rating Table

PERFORMANCE RATING TABLE

PERFORMANCE		PERFORMANCE RATING FACTOR
PHYSICAL RATING	POINTS	VIG %
Q- Outstanding	> 90	30%
VS- Very Satisfactory	81-90	25%
S- Satisfactory	71-80	20%
F – Fair	60-70	15%
US - Unsatisfactory	< -60	n

Units with at least F Physical performance but with Viability Index = 1 shall be given citation.

3.2. Citation, recognition and special awards shall also be given to viable units as additional incentives.

4.0 DISTRIBUTION OF VIG

The Viability Incentive Grant (VIG) shall be used strictly for office improvement, collection intensification, study tour, training and field visitation. It may also be used for the purchase of equipment/furniture provided that it is included in the approved Current Operating Budget (COB).

5.0. REPORTING

5.1. The RIM/OM shall submit to the Assistant Administrator for S.O.E.M., Attention: The Manager, Systems Management Department, Physical performance report (PPR) for field offices in accordance with the attached Annexes A, B, C & D for evaluation of their claims of VIG.

5.2. The Physical Performance Evaluation of Systems Management Department will be forwarded to the Treasury Department for final evaluation of the VIG.

5.3. The RIM/OM shall submit to the Assistant Administrator for Finance and Management, Attention, The Manager, Treasury Department, Quarterly Statement of Income and Expenses (QSIE) (Form A) for all the units for evaluation of financial viability. The year end (Fourth quarter) statement must be duly certified by the Finance and Management Division Manager or Project Accountant, approved by the RIM and duly verified by the COA Auditor/Representative.

5.4 The Physical Performance Report and Statement of Income and Expenses must be submitted to Central Office not later than March 31 of the following year.

6.0 SANCTIONS

The RIM/OM shall be held responsible for any deviation from this revised MC. Viable field offices that fail to meet the prescribed requirements within three months from the year under evaluation shall be deprived of the VIG.

This MC supersedes all existing Memorandum Circulars inconsistent herewith and shall take effect starting calendar year 2006 viability performance evaluation.

Please be guided accordingly.

MARCELINO V. TUGAOEN, JR.
OIC - Administrator

Date: April 04, 2007

VIABLE REGION
CALENDAR YEAR 2006

SAMPLE COMPUTATION ONLY

RESPONSIBILITY CENTER (1)	TOTAL INCOME (2)	TOTAL EXPENSES PS (3)	MOOE (4)	TOTAL (5)	NET INCOME (6)	NISO/PIO SHARE IN RIO EXP. (7)	TOTAL EXPENSES (8)	NET INCOME/ (LOSS) (9)	PERF. RATIN FACTOR (10)	NET INCOME NET OF VIG (11)	VIABILITY INCEN-TIVE GRANT (12)	SHARING FO 90% (13)	SHARING RO 10% (14)	VIABILITY INDEX (15)
1. Regional Office	663,027.49	19,231,715.23	2,136,042.32	21,367,757.55	(20,704,730.06)		663,027.49	0.00						
Systems:														
1. NISO1	15,969,392.80	6,608,063.05	4,516,250.94	11,124,313.99	4,845,078.91	1,865,651.34	12,989,965.33	2,979,427.57	VS - 25%	2,383,542.06	595,885.51	536,296.96	59,588.55	1.23
2. NISO2	9,503,463.71	4,453,514.60	2,256,810.66	6,710,325.26	2,793,138.45	1,257,358.69	7,967,683.95	1,535,779.76	VS - 25%	1,228,623.81	307,155.95	276,440.36	30,715.60	1.19
3. NISO3	191,627.15	188,091.52	139,243.57	327,335.09	(135,707.94)	53,103.79	380,438.88	(188,811.73)		(188,811.73)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.50
4. NISO4	12,742,615.71	4,313,778.98	5,109,935.27	9,423,714.25	3,318,901.46	1,217,907.19	10,641,621.44	2,100,994.27	VS - 25%	1,680,795.41	420,198.85	378,178.97	42,019.89	1.20
5. NISO5	3,992,094.87	3,718,483.56	927,498.65	4,645,982.21	(653,887.34)	1,049,837.72	5,695,819.93	(1,703,725.06)		(1,703,725.06)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.70
6. NISO6	15,765,609.42	9,834,080.61	3,214,149.62	13,048,230.23	2,717,379.19	2,776,451.36	15,824,681.59	(59,072.17)	VS	(59,072.17)	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00
7. NISO7	220,395.50	451,810.21	188,093.37	639,903.58	(419,508.08)	127,559.36	767,462.94	(547,067.44)		(547,067.44)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.29
8. NISO8	16,758,607.04	7,805,801.14	5,242,535.55	13,048,336.69	3,710,270.35	2,203,808.17	15,252,144.86	1,506,462.18	O - 30%	1,158,817.06	347,645.12	312,880.61	34,764.51	1.10
9. NISO9	4,410,179.46	3,627,683.33	775,677.95	4,403,361.28	6,818.18	1,024,202.13	5,427,563.41	(1,017,383.95)	VS	(1,017,383.95)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.81
10. NISO10	21,921,589.98	11,508,015.06	5,272,103.17	16,780,118.23	5,141,571.75	3,249,052.49	20,029,170.72	1,892,519.26	VS - 25%	1,514,015.41	378,503.85	340,653.47	37,850.39	1.09
11. NISO11	6,390,392.80	2,621,929.70	1,687,128.93	4,309,058.63	2,081,334.17	740,248.18	5,049,306.81	1,341,085.99	VS - 25%	1,072,868.79	268,217.20	241,395.48	26,821.72	1.27
12. NISO12	2,066,636.60	2,400,000.00	99,429.49	2,499,429.49	(432,792.89)	677,590.87	3,177,020.36	(1,110,383.76)	S	(1,110,383.76)				0.65
SUB-TOTAL	109,932,706.14	57,531,251.76	29,428,857.17	86,960,108.93	22,972,596.21	16,242,771.30	103,202,880.23	6,729,824.91		4,412,218.42	2,317,606.49	2,085,845.84	231,760.65	1.07
PIOs:					0.00									
13. PIO 1	6,687,156.00	4,226,230.60	989,699.29	5,215,929.89	1,471,226.11	1,193,189.70	6,409,119.59	278,036.41	O - 30%	213,874.16	64,162.25	57,746.02	6,416.22	1.04
14. PIO 2	4,302,949.81	1,039,399.72	318,787.06	1,358,186.78	2,944,763.03	293,453.24	1,651,640.02	2,651,309.79	O - 30%	2,039,469.07	611,840.72	550,656.65	61,184.07	2.61
15. PIO3	7,809,032.14	3,852,393.58	867,798.42	4,720,192.00	3,088,840.14	1,087,644.47	5,807,836.47	2,001,195.67	O - 30%	1,539,381.28	461,814.39	415,632.95	46,181.44	1.34
16. PIO 4	4,239,549.73	3,283,493.70	600,834.94	3,884,328.64	355,221.09	927,027.24	4,811,355.88	(571,806.15)	VS	(571,806.15)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.88
17. PIO 5	945,033.81	3,402,563.35	568,633.66	3,971,197.01	(3,026,163.20)	960,644.11	4,931,841.12	(3,986,807.31)		(3,986,807.31)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.19
SUB-TOTAL	23,983,721.49	15,804,080.95	3,345,753.37	19,149,834.32	4,833,887.17	4,461,958.76	23,611,793.08	371,928.41	0.00	(765,888.94)	1,137,817.36	1,024,035.62	113,781.74	1.02
TOTAL NISO&PIO	133,916,426.63	73,335,332.71	32,774,610.54	106,109,943.25	27,806,483.38	20,704,730.06	126,814,673.31	7,101,753.32		3,646,329.48	3,455,423.84	3,109,881.46	345,542.38	1.06
GRAND TOTAL ---	134,579,454.12	92,567,047.94	34,910,852.86	127,477,700.80	7,101,753.32	20,704,730.06	127,477,700.80	7,101,753.32		3,646,329.48	3,455,423.84	3,109,881.46	345,542.38	1.06
											48.66%			
											94.76%			

ANNEX A

CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE PHYSICAL PERFORMANCE OF IRRIGATION SYSTEM OFFICES

The physical performance of Irrigation System Offices shall be evaluated as follows:

AREAS FOR EVALUATION	MAXIMUM POINT
1. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	35
1.1.Irrigated cropping intensity	15
1.2.Maintenance of canals and service roads	12
1.3.Measuring devices and control gates	8
2. EQUIPMENT MANAGEMENT	20
2.1.Operability	10
2.2.Utilization	10
3. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT	20
3.1.CA collection	15
3.2.BA collection	5
4. INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT	25
4.1.Organization of and contracting with IAs	7
4.2.O&M performance of IAs	9
4.3.Provision of assistance to IAs	9
T O T A L	100

The Regional Irrigation Managers shall evaluate the physical performance of ISOs under their jurisdiction. The results shall be reviewed by the Manager, Systems Management Department.

CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE PHYSICAL PERFORMANCE OF IRRIGATION SYSTEM OFFICES

The physical performance of Irrigation System Offices shall be evaluated as follows:

AREAS FOR EVALUATION	MAXIMUM	POINT
1. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE		35
1.1. Irrigated cropping intensity (ICI)		15
Attained 91-100% of the potential irrigated cropping intensity (PICI)	15	
Attained 75-90% of PICI	10	
Attained past 5-year average ICI (+/- 10% deviation)	5	
Attained 75-89% of average ICI	2	
Attained <75% of average ICI	0	
1.2. Maintenance of canal and service roads		12
a. Canal maintenance index		6
0.91-1.0	6	
0.81-0.90	4	
0.71-0.80	2	
below 0.71	1	
b. Service road maintenance index		6
0.91-1.0	6	
0.81-0.90	4	
0.71-0.80	2	
below 0.71	1	

CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE PHYSICAL PERFORMANCE OF IRRIGATION SYSTEM OFFICES

e physical performance of Irrigation System Offices shall be
luated as follows:

AREAS FOR EVALUATION	MAXIMUM	POINT
1.3.Measuring devices and control gates		8
a.Measuring device functionality index		2
0.96-1.0	2.0	
0.91-0.95	1.5	
0.86-0.90	1.0	
0.81-0.85	0.5	
below 0.81	0.0	
b.Measuring device utilization index		2
below 0.050	2.0	
0.051-0.100	1.5	
0.101-0.200	1.0	
0.201-0.300	0.5	
above 0.300	0.0	
c.Control gates functionality index		2
0.96-1.0	2.0	
0.91-0.95	1.5	
0.86-0.90	1.0	
0.81-0.85	0.5	
below 0.81	0.0	
d.Control gates utilization index		2
0.96-1.0	2.0	
0.91-0.95	1.5	
0.86-0.90	1.0	
0.81-0.85	0.5	
below 0.81	0.0	

CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE PHYSICAL PERFORMANCE OF IRRIGATION SYSTEM OFFICES

The physical performance of Irrigation System Offices shall be evaluated as follows:

AREAS FOR EVALUATION	MAXIMUM	POINT
2. EQUIPMENT MANAGEMENT		20
2.1.Equipment operability index		10
0.96-1.0	10	
0.91-0.95	8	
0.86-0.90	6	
0.81-0.85	4	
below 0.81	2	
2.2.Equipment utilization index		10
0.96-1.0	10	
0.91-0.95	8	
0.86-0.90	6	
0.81-0.85	4	
below 0.81	2	
3. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT		20
3.1.CA collection efficiency		15
above 90%	15	
80-89%	11	
70-79%	7	
60-69%	3	
below 60%	0	
3.2.BA collection efficiency		5
above 10%	5	
5-10%	3	
below 5%	1	
4. INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT		25
4.1.Organization of and contracting with IAs		7
a.Organization index	3	
b.Contracting index	4	

CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE PHYSICAL PERFORMANCE OF IRRIGATION SYSTEM OFFICES

The physical performance of Irrigation System Offices shall be evaluated as follows:

AREAS FOR EVALUATION	MAXIMUM	POINT
4.2.O&M performance of IAs		9
a.Irrigated cropping intensity	3	
91-100% of the system's average ICI	3	
86-90% of the system's average ICI	2	
76-85% of the system's average ICI	1	
below 75% of the system's average ICI	0	
b.Average production index	2	
above 105%	2	
100%-105%	1	
below 100%	0	
c.ISF collection	4	
1.Current accounts	3	
2.Back accounts	1	
10% and above	1	
below 10%	0	
4.3.Provision of assistance to IAs		9
a.Production loans index	2	
b.Marketing services index	3	
c.Other services index	2	
d.Cooperative involvement index	2	
T O T A L		100

The Regional Irrigation Manager shall evaluate the physical performance of ISOs under their jurisdiction. The results shall be reviewed by the Manager, Systems Management Department.

ANNEX A-2

DEFINITION OF TERMS AND SAMPLE COMPUTATIONS APPLYING THE CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE PHYSICAL PERFORMANCE OF IRRIGATION SYSTEM OFFICES

1. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

1.1 Irrigated Cropping Intensity

a. **Potential Irrigated Cropping Intensity (PICI)** is a measure of the maximum area that can be irrigated for the wet season and dry season cropping as a percentage of the service area. It is the sum of the maximum area that can be irrigated during the wet and dry seasons divided by the firmed up service area, the quotient multiplied by 100.

$$PICI = \frac{IAwsmax + IAdsmax}{SA} * 100$$

where,

SA = Firmed up service area
IAwsmax = Maximum area that can be irrigated in the wet season based on dependable water supply and available land and computed given the irrigation water requirements and using the system's design efficiency
IAdsmax = Maximum area that can be irrigated in the dry season based on dependable water supply and available land and computed given the irrigation water requirements and using the system's design efficiency

Example:

Firmed up service area = 3,000 ha
Maximum irrigable area, wet season = 2,800 ha
Maximum irrigable area, dry season = 2,400 ha

$$PICI = \frac{2,800 + 2,400}{3,000} * 100 = 173.3\%$$

b. **Irrigated Cropping Intensity (ICI)** is the indicator of the area actually irrigated in relation with the service area in percent. It is the sum of the area irrigated during the wet and dry seasons, any third crop and annual crop divided by the firmed up service area, the quotient multiplied by 100. (NOTE: Annual crop area is doubled as it is irrigated both in the wet and dry seasons.)

BA collectibles = cumulative unpaid bills since the signing of the O&M contracts

Example:

BA collection = P40,000
BA collectible = P70,000

$$BACE = \frac{40,000}{70,000} * 100 = 57\%$$

Referring to Annex A-1, item 4.2, the 57% BACE earns 1 point.

3. Provision of assistance to IAs

a. The assistance extended to IAs shall be measured in terms of production loans, marketing services and other services availed of.

1. Production Loan Index (PLI) is a measure of the number of IAs given production loans compared with the total number of IAs needing loans for two cropping seasons.

$$PLI = \frac{\text{No. of IAs Given Loans}}{\text{No. of IAs Needing Loans}} * 2$$

where,

Total no. of Ias needing loans = number of IAs that needed assistance in each of the cropping seasons

Total no. of IAs given loans = total number of IAs that actually availed of loans

Production loans = those obtained from government and non-government organizations with formal agreements with NIA such as Land Bank of the Philippines (LBP), Technology and Livelihood Resource Center (TLRC) and rural banks

Example:

No. of IAs given loans = 30
No. of IAs needing loans = 50

$$PLI = \frac{30}{50} * 2 = 1$$

The ISO gets 1 point for PLI.

2. Marketing Services Index (MSI) compares the number of IAs assisted in marketing services with the total number of IAs in the system for two cropping seasons.

$$MSI = \frac{\text{No. of IAs Assisted}}{\text{Total No. of IAs}} * 3$$

where,

No. of IAs assisted = number of IAs given marketing assistance in each of the cropping seasons

Marketing services = those provided by government and non-government organizations with formal agreements with NIA such as National Food Authority (NFA), TLRC or local marketing cooperatives

Example

No. of IAs assisted = 40
Total no. of IAs = 50

$$MSI = \frac{40}{50} * 3 = 2$$

The ISO earns 2 points for MSI.

c. Other Services Index (OSI) is an indicator of the number of IAs extended other services in relation with the total number of IAs for two cropping seasons.

$$OSI = \frac{\text{No. of IAs Served}}{\text{Total No. of IAs}} * 2$$

where,

No. of IAs served = number of IAs extended other services which include livelihood projects, other forms of agricultural loan, extension services and agricultural technology innovations in each of the cropping seasons

Other services = other support services provided by government and non-government organizations with formal agreements with NIA such as the Department of Agriculture-Livelihood Enhancement for Agricultural Development, TLRC, Philippine Crop Insurance Corporation, NFA and LGU or local institutions

Example:

No. of IAs served = 35
Total no. of IAs = 50

$$OSI = \frac{35}{50} * 2 = 1$$

The ISO earns 1 point for OSI.

Computation for the Total Points

II.	Operation and maintenance			
	1. Irrigated cropping intensity			24.5
	2. Maintenance of canals and service roads		15	
	a. CMI		6	
	b. SRMI		4	
	3. Measuring devices and control gates		2	
	a. MDFI			3.5
	b. MDUI		1.0	
	c. CGFI		1.5	
	d. CGUI		0.5	
			0.5	
III.	Equipment management			
	1. EQI			12
	2. EUI		6	
			6	
III.	Financial management			
	1. CACE			15
	2. BACE		11	
			5	
IV.	Institutional development			
	1. Organization and contracting			19
	a. OI		5	
	b. CI		2	
	2. O&M		3	
	a. IC			9
	b. API		3	
	c. Collection efficiency		2	
	1. CA		4	
	2. EA	3		
		1		
	3. Provision of assistance to IAs			
	a. PLI		5	
	b. MSI	1		
	c. OSI	2		
	d. CII	1		
		1		
	Total			71.5

With a total of 71.5 points, the ISO is rated SATISFACTORY in physical performance for the year.

ANNEX B

CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE PHYSICAL PERFORMANCE OF PROVINCIAL IRRIGATION OFFICES

The physical performance of Provincial Irrigation Offices shall be evaluated as follows:

AREAS FOR EVALUATION	MAXIMUM POINT
1. PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING	20
1.1.Feasibility reports	6
1.2.Detailed engineering	6
1.3.Program of Work	4
1.4.MOA signed	2
1.5.IA Organization	2
2. PROJECT CONSTRUCTION	25
2.1.Overall physical status	6
2.2.Overall fund utilization	4
2.3.Area generation/restoration	4
2.4.Equity generation	5
2.5.Turnover/acceptance of completed projects	6
3. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF CIS	15
3.1.Percentage of functioning CIS	7
3.2.Area actually irrigated vs. programmed	8
4. EQUIPMENT MANAGEMENT	20
4.1.Operability	10
4.2.Utilization	10
5. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT	20
5.1.CIS and PIS amortization collection (Current accounts + back accounts)	20
T O T A L	100

The Regional Irrigation Managers shall evaluate the physical performance of the PIOs under their jurisdiction. The results shall be reviewed by the Manager, CIDP-CIDIP.

CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE PHYSICAL PERFORMANCE OF PROVINCIAL IRRIGATION OFFICES

The physical performance of Provincial Irrigation Offices shall be evaluated as follows;

AREAS FOR EVALUATION	MAXIMUM PO
1 PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING	
1.1.Feasibility Study	
Target Outputs: Annual Program, xerox military map indicating project location, project profile and its estimation of area, topo map/layout F1-3.	
a.Quantity submitted vs. required	2.0
100%	2.0
91 - 99%	1.8
81 - 90%	1.5
70 - 80%	1.0
Below 70%	0.5
b.Quality & acceptability of reports	2.0
100%	2.0
91 - 99%	1.8
81 - 90%	1.5
70 - 80%	1.0
Below 70%	0.5
c.Timeliness of reports	2.0
100%	2.0
91 - 99%	1.8
81 - 90%	1.5
70 - 80%	1.0
Below 70%	0.5

...FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE PHYSICAL PERFORMANCE OF
...PROVINCIAL IRRIGATION OFFICES

The physical performance of Provincial Irrigation Offices shall be evaluated as follows:

AREAS FOR EVALUATION	MAXIMUM POINTS
1.1 Detailed engineering reports submitted vs. program: Target output per project: Construction plans namely, irrigation and drainage networks, plans & profile of irrigation canals/ diversion structures, irrigation and drainage structures.	6.0
a. Quantity submitted vs. required	2.0
100%	2.0
91 - 99%	1.8
81 - 90%	1.5
70 - 80%	1.0
Below 70%	0.5
b. Quality & acceptability of reports	2.0
100%	2.0
91 - 99%	1.8
81 - 90%	1.5
70 - 80%	1.0
Below 70%	0.5
c. Timeliness of reports	2.0
100%	2.0
91 - 99%	1.8
81 - 90%	1.5
70 - 80%	1.0
Below 70%	0.5
1.2 Programs of work submitted vs. program for the year: Target output: Flows for civil works	4.0
a. Quantity submitted vs. required	
100%	1.3
91 - 99%	1.0
81 - 90%	0.8
70 - 80%	0.5
Below 70%	

ITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE PHYSICAL PERFORMANCE OF PROVINCIAL IRRIGATION OFFICES

e physical performance of Provincial Irrigation Offices shall evaluated as follows:

AREAS FOR EVALUATION	MAXIMUM POINTS
b. Quality & acceptability of reports	1.5
100%	1.5
91 - 99%	1.3
81 - 90%	1.0
70 - 80%	0.8
Below 70%	0.5
c. Timeliness of reports	1.0
100%	1.0
91 - 99%	0.9
81 - 90%	0.8
70 - 80%	0.6
Below 70%	0.5
1.4 MOA signed vs. target	2.0
100%	2.0
91 - 99%	1.8
81 - 90%	1.5
70 - 80%	1.0
Below 70%	0.5
1.5 IA organization	2.0
100%	2.0
91 - 99%	1.8
70 - 90%	1.5
50 - 69%	1.0
below 50%	0.5
PROJECT CONSTRUCTION	25.0
2.1 Overall physical status	6.0
100%	6.0
90 - 99%	5.0
81 - 89%	4.0
70 - 80%	3.0
50 - 69%	2.0
below 50%	1.0

CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE PHYSICAL PERFORMANCE OF PROVINCIAL IRRIGATION OFFICES

The physical performance of Provincial Irrigation Offices shall be evaluated as follows:

AREAS FOR EVALUATION	MAXIMUM PO
2.2 Overall fund utilization	4.0
Projects within budget or underrun	4.0
Overrun 6% or below	3.0
Overrun 7 - 12%	2.0
Overrun above 12%	1.0
2.3 Area generation / exploration	6.0
100%	6.0
91 - 99%	5.5
81 - 90%	5.0
70 - 80%	4.0
61 - 69%	3.0
50 - 60%	2.0
below 50%	1.0
2.4 Equity generation	5.0
100%	5.0
91 - 99%	4.5
81 - 90%	4.0
70 - 80%	3.0
61 - 69%	2.0
below 60%	1.0
2.5 Turnover/acceptance of completed projects	6.0
100%	6.0
91 - 99%	5.5
81 - 90%	5.0
70 - 80%	4.0
61 - 69%	3.0
50 - 60%	2.0
below 50%	1.0

TERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE SYSTEM PERFORMANCE OF
PROVINCIAL IRRIGATION OFFICES

physical performance of Provincial Irrigation Offices shall
evaluated as follows:

AREAS FOR EVALUATION	MAXIMUM POINTS
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF SIS	
1. Percentage of functioning SIS	15.0
100%	7.0
90 - 99%	7.0
80 - 89%	6.0
70 - 79%	5.0
60 - 69%	4.0
50 - 59%	3.0
below 50%	2.0
	1.0
2. Actual irrigated area vs. program for the year	8.0
100%	8.0
90 - 99%	7.0
80 - 89%	6.0
70 - 79%	5.0
60 - 69%	4.0
50 - 59%	3.0
below 50%	2.0
	1.0
EQUIPMENT MANAGEMENT	20.0
1. Operability	10.0
100%	10.0
90 - 99%	9.0
80 - 89%	8.0
70 - 79%	6.0
60 - 69%	4.0
50 - 59%	2.0
below 50%	1.0
2. Utilization	10.0
100%	10.0
90 - 99%	9.0
80 - 89%	8.0
70 - 79%	6.0
60 - 69%	4.0
50 - 59%	2.0
below 50%	1.0

CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE PHYSICAL PERFORMANCE OF PROVINCIAL IRRIGATION OFFICES

The physical performance of Provincial Irrigation Offices shall be evaluated as follows:

AREAS FOR EVALUATION	MAXIMUM POINTS
5. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT	20.0
5.1 Collection efficiency based on Actual collection vs. Target collection	20.0
a. Pumps	6.0
100%	6.0
90 - 99%	5.0
80 - 89%	4.0
70 - 79%	3.0
60 - 69%	2.0
below 60%	1.0
b. C.I.S Amortization	14.0
100%	14.0
90 - 99%	12.0
80 - 89%	10.0
70 - 79%	8.0
60 - 69%	6.0
below 60%	5.0
T O T A L	100.0

Target outputs for each item should be firmed up at the start of the year. Any change in the original target should be justified.

The Regional Irrigation Managers shall evaluate the physical performance of the PIOs under their jurisdiction. The results shall be reviewed by the Manager, CIDP- CIDIP.

LE EVALUATION OF THE PHYSICAL PERFORMA

AREAS FOR EVALUATION		MAX. PTS.	OUTPUT/ TARGET	% ACCOMP	POINTS EARNED
PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING		20.0			20.0
1. Feasibility Study		6.0			6.0
Target Outputs:					
Annual Program, xerox military map indicating project location, project profile and F1-3 estimation of area, topo map/layout					
a. Quantity submitted vs. required	2.0		6/6	100	2.0
100%	2.0				
91 - 99%	1.8				
81 - 90%	1.5				
70 - 80%	1.0				
Below 70%	0.5				
b. Quality & acceptability of reports					2.0
100%	2.0				
91 - 99%	1.8				
81 - 90%	1.5				
70 - 80%	1.0				
Below 70%	0.5				
c. Timeliness of reports	2.0				2.0
100%	2.0				
91 - 99%	1.8				
81 - 90%	1.5				
70 - 80%	1.0				
Below 70%	0.5				

SAMPLE EVALUATION OF THE PHYSICAL PERFORMANCE OF SOUTHERN LEYTE PIO

AREAS FOR EVALUATION	MAX. PTS	OUTPUT/ TARGET	% ACCOMP	FCTN FARM
1.2. Detailed engineering reports submitted vs. program Target outputs per project: Construction plans namely; Irrigation and drainage networks, plans & profile of irrigation canals/diversion structures, irrigation and drainage structures.	6.0			6.
a. Quantity submitted vs. required		2/2	100	2.(
100%	2.0			
91 - 99%	1.8			
81 - 90%	1.5			
70 - 80%	1.0			
Below 70%	0.5			
b. Quality & acceptability of reports				2.(
100%	2.0			
91 - 99%	1.8			
81 - 90%	1.5			
70 - 80%	1.0			
Below 70%	0.5			
c. Timeliness of reports				2.(
100%	2.0			
91 - 99%	1.8			
81 - 90%	1.5			
70 - 80%	1.0			
Below 70%	0.5			

LE EVALUATION OF THE PHYSICAL PERFORMANCE OF SOUTHERN LEYTE PIO

AREAS FOR EVALUATION	MAX. PTS.	OUTPUT/ TARGET	% ACCOMP.	POINTS EARNED
3. Program of work submitted vs. program for the year; target output: POWs for civil work	4.0			4.0
a. Quantity submitted vs. required	1.5			1.5
100%	1.5			
91 - 99%	1.3			
81 - 90%	1.0			
70 - 80%	0.8			
Below 70%	0.5			
b. Quality & acceptability of reports				1.5
100%	1.5			
91 - 99%	1.3			
81 - 90%	1.0			
70 - 80%	0.8			
Below 70%	0.5			
c. Timeliness of reports				1.0
100%	1.0			
91 - 99%	0.9			
81 - 90%	0.8			
70 - 80%	0.6			
Below 70%	0.5			
). MOA signed vs. target	2.0	1/1	100	2.0
100%	2.0			
91 - 99%	1.8			
81 - 90%	1.5			
70 - 80%	1.0			
Below 70%	0.5			

SAMPLE EVALUATION OF THE PHYSICAL PERFORMANCE OF SOUTHERN LEYTE FID

AREAS FOR EVALUATION	MAX. PTS	OUTPUT/ TARGET	% ACCOMP	POINTS EARNED
1.5 IA organization	2.0	2/2	100	2.0
100%	2.0			
91 - 99%	1.8			
70 - 90%	1.5			
50 - 69%	1.0			
below 50%	0.5			
2. PROJECT CONSTRUCTION	25.0			24.0
2.1 Overall physical status	6.0		99	5.0
100%	6.0			
90 - 99%	5.0			
81 - 89%	4.0			
70 - 80%	3.0			
50 - 69%	2.0			
below 50%	1.0			
2.2 Overall fund utilization	4.0			4.0
Projects within budget or underrun	4.0			
Overrun 6% or below	3.0			
Overrun 7 - 12%	2.0			
Overrun above 12%	1.0			
2.3 Area generation/restoration	4.0			4.0
100%	4.0			
91 - 99%	3.5			
70 - 90%	3.0			
50 - 69%	2.0			
below 50%	1.0			

SAMPLE EVALUATION OF THE PHYSICAL PERFORMANCE OF SOUTHERN LEYTE FIO

AREAS FOR EVALUATION		MAX. PTS.	OUTPUT/ TARGET	% ACCOMP	POINTS EARNED
2.4 Equity generation		5.0	8484/22	385	5.0
100%	5.0				
91 - 99%	4.5				
81 - 90%	4.0				
70 - 80%	3.0				
61 - 69%	2.0				
below 60%	1.0				
2.5 Turnover/acceptance of completed projects		6.0	5/5	100	6.0
100%	6.0				
91 - 99%	5.0				
81 - 90%	4.0				
70 - 80%	3.0				
61 - 69%	2.0				
below 60%	1.0				
3. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF CIS		15.0			14.0
3.1 Percentage of functioning CIS		7.0	37/39	95	6.9
100%	7.0				
90 - 99%	6.0				
80 - 89%	5.0				
70 - 79%	4.0				
60 - 69%	3.0				
50 - 59%	2.0				
below 50%	1.0				
3.2 Actual irrigated vs. prog. for the year		8.0	1513/13	111	8.0
100%	8.0				
90 - 99%	7.0				
80 - 89%	6.0				
70 - 79%	5.0				
60 - 69%	4.0				
50 - 59%	2.0				
below 50%	1.0				

SAMPLE EVALUATION OF THE PHYSICAL PERFORMANCE OF SOUTHERN LEYTE FIO

AREAS FOR EVALUATION		MAX PTS	OUTPUT/ TARGET	% ACCOMP	POINTS EARNED
4. EQUIPMENT MANAGEMENT		20.0			19.0
4.1. Operability		10.0		93	9.0
100%	10.0				
90 - 99%	9.0				
80 - 89%	8.0				
70 - 79%	6.0				
60 - 69%	4.0				
50 - 59%	2.0				
below 50%	1.0				
4.2. Utilization		10.0		75	10.0
100%	10.0				
90 - 99%	9.0				
80 - 89%	8.0				
70 - 79%	6.0				
60 - 69%	4.0				
50 - 59%	2.0				
below 50%	1.0				
5. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT		20.0			18.0
5.1. Collection efficiency based Actual collection vs. Target collection					
a. Pumps		6.0	3/3	100	6.0
100%	6.0				
90 - 99%	5.0				
80 - 89%	4.0				
70 - 79%	3.0				
60 - 69%	2.0				
below 60%	1.0				
b. C.I.S. Amortization		14.0	209/230	91	12.0
100%	14.0				
90 - 99%	12.0				
80 - 89%	10.0				
70 - 79%	8.0				
60 - 69%	6.0				
below 60%	5.0				
T O T A L :		100.0			95.0

Determination of Viability Index, Class and Amount of VIG of Southern Leyte PIO

PIO's total income	=	₱10,446,728
total expenses	=	681,932
net income	=	9,764,796
viability index	=	15.32
class	=	A
physical performance	=	Outstanding

Referring to the Schedule of Incentives and Awards to Viable Units, the PIO falls under Schedule 1. It is entitled to VIG equivalent to 12% of net income or ₱1,171,776.

CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE PHYSICAL PERFORMANCE OF REGIONS

The physical performance of Regions shall be evaluated as follows:

	AREAS FOR EVALUATION	MAXIMUM POINTS
A.	IRRIGATION SYSTEMS OFFICES	40
1.	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	14
	1.1 Irrigated cropping intensity	6
	1.2 Maintenance of canals and service roads	6
	1.3 Measuring devices and control gates	2
2.	EQUIPMENT MANAGEMENT	8
	2.1 Operability	4
	2.2 Utilization	4
3.	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT	8
	3.1 CA collection efficiency	6
	3.2 BA collection efficiency	2
4.	INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT	10
	4.1 Organization of and contracting with IAs	2
	4.2 O&M performance of IAs	4
	4.3 Provision of assistance to IAs	4

ANNEX C

CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE PHYSICAL PERFORMANCE OF REGIONS

The physical performance of Regions shall be evaluated on the basis

AREAS FOR EVALUATION	CRITERIA	RATING
B. PROVINCIAL IRRIGATION OFFICES		40
1. PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING		10
1.1 Feasibility reports	2	
1.2 Detailed engineering	2	
1.3 Program of work	2	
1.4 MOA signed	1	
1.5 IA Organization	1	
2. PROJECT CONSTRUCTION		10
2.1 Overall physical status	2	
2.2 Overall fund utilization	2	
2.3 Area generation/restoration	2	
2.4 Equity generation	2	
2.5 Turnover/acceptance of completed projects	2	
3. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF CIS		6
3.1 Percentage of Functioning CIS	3	
3.2 Area actually irrigated vs. programmed	3	
4. EQUIPMENT MANAGEMENT		8
4.1 Operability	4	
4.2 Utilization	4	

CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE PHYSICAL PERFORMANCE OF REGIONS

The physical performance of Regions shall be evaluated as follows:

AREAS FOR EVALUATION		[illegible]
5. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT		
5.1 CIS and FIS amortization collection (Current accounts + back accounts)	[illegible]	
C. REGIONAL IRRIGATION OFFICE (as a unit)		20
1. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT		10
1.1 Income > Expenses	5	
1.2 Fund Utilization (Expenditures as % of Releases)	5	
91-100%	5	
81- 90%	3	
71- 80%	1	
below 71%	0	
2. EQUIPMENT MANAGEMENT		10
2.1 Operability	5	
2.2 Utilization	5	
T O T A L		100

The rating of the region on each area for evaluation shall be based on the weighted average performance of all ISOs/PIOs under its jurisdiction.

corplan/wigreg

CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE PHYSICAL PERFORMANCE OF INTEGRATED IRRIGATION SYSTEMS

The physical performance of Integrated Irrigation Systems shall be evaluated as follows:

AREAS FOR EVALUATION	MAXIMUM POINTS
A. DISTRICT OFFICES	**80**
1. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	**28**
1.1. Irrigated cropping intensity	12
1.2. Maintenance of canals and service roads	12
1.3. Measuring devices and control gates	4
2. EQUIPMENT MANAGEMENT	**16**
2.1. Operability	8
2.2. Utilization	8
3. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT	**16**
3.1. IA collection efficiency	12
3.2. BA collection efficiency	4
4. INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT	**20**
4.1. Organization of and contracting with IAs	6
4.2. O&M performance of IAs	7
4.3. Provision of assistance to IAs	7

CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE PHYSICAL PERFORMANCE OF INTEGRATED IRRIGATION SYSTEMS

The physical performance of Integrated Irrigation Systems shall be evaluated as follows:

AREAS FOR EVALUATION		MAXIMUM POINT
B. HEAD OFFICE INCLUDING THE DAM DIVISION		20
1. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT		10
1.1. Income > Expenses	5	
1.2. Fund Utilization (Expenditures as % of Releases)	5	
91-100%	5	
81- 90%	3	
71- 80%	1	
below 71%	0	
2. EQUIPMENT MANAGEMENT		10
2.1. Operability	5	
2.2. Utilization	5	
T O T A L -		100

The rating of the integrated irrigation system on each area for evaluation shall be based on the weighted average performance of all districts under its jurisdiction.

corplan/vigupma