

Appendix Table A1 The conclusion of Rapid Appraisal Process results of 12 pilot project in Chao Phraya river basin.(Continued)

| Primary indicator names | Sub-indicator names | Weighting Factor (FAO) | Old Indicator Label (FAO Water Reports /9) | Naraysuan dam | Plaichumpol | Dong Sethi | Tha Bua | Manorom | Chong Khae | Khok Krathiam | Roeng Rang | Phonlathep | Tha Bot | Samchuk | Pho Phraya |
|--|------------------------|------------------------|--|---------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| SERVICE and SOCIAL ORDER | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <u>Actual Water Delivery Service to Individual Ownership Units (e.g., field or farm)</u> | | | <i>I-1</i> | 1.8 | 0.7 | 1.2 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 1.5 | 0.9 | 1.3 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 1.6 | 1.8 |
| | Measurement of volumes | 1.0 | <i>I-1A</i> | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| | Flexibility | 2.0 | <i>I-1B</i> | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.5 |
| | Reliability | 4.0 | <i>I-1C</i> | 2.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.5 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| | Apparent equity. | 4.0 | <i>I-1D</i> | 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.5 | 1.0 | 1.5 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| <u>Stated Water Delivery Service to Individual Ownership Units (e.g., field or farm)</u> | | | <i>I-5</i> | 1.8 | 2.0 | 2.3 | 2.0 | 1.3 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.9 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 1.7 | 1.7 |
| | Measurement of volumes | 1.0 | <i>I-5A</i> | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| | Flexibility | 2.0 | <i>I-5B</i> | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.5 | 2.0 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| | Reliability | 4.0 | <i>I-5C</i> | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 2.5 |
| | Apparent equity. | 4.0 | <i>I-5D</i> | 2.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.5 | 2.0 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| <u>Actual Water Delivery Service at the most downstream point in the system operated by a paid employee</u> | | | <i>I-3</i> | 1.4 | 0.7 | 1.2 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 1.6 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 1.2 | 0.7 | 1.2 | 1.3 |

Appendix Table A1 The conclusion of Rapid Appraisal Process results of 12 pilot project in Chao Phraya river basin.(Continued)

| Primary indicator names | Sub-indicator names | Weighting Factor (FAO) | Old Indicator Label (FAO Water Reports /9) | Naraysuan dam | Plaichumpol | Dong Setthi | Tha Bua | Manorom | Chong Khae | Khok Krathiam | Roeng Rang | Phonlathep | Tha Bot | Samchuk | Pho Phraya |
|--|---|------------------------|--|---------------|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | Number of fields downstream of this point | 1.0 | <i>I-3A</i> | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| | Measurement of volumes | 4.0 | <i>I-3B</i> | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 |
| | Flexibility | 4.0 | <i>I-3C</i> | 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| | Reliability | 4.0 | <i>I-3D</i> | 2.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| | Apparent equity. | 4.0 | <i>I-3E</i> | 2.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| <u>Stated Water Delivery Service at the most downstream point in the system operated by a paid employee</u> | | | <i>I-7</i> | 1.2 | 1.8 | 1.6 | 1.8 | 1.2 | 2.1 | 2.6 | 1.8 | 1.4 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.4 |
| | Number of fields downstream of this point | 1.0 | <i>I-7A</i> | 1.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| | Measurement of volumes | 4.0 | <i>I-7B</i> | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| | Flexibility | 4.0 | <i>I-7C</i> | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.5 | 4.0 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 1.5 | 1.0 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| | Reliability | 4.0 | <i>I-7D</i> | 1.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| | Apparent equity. | 4.0 | <i>I-7E</i> | 2.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 1.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.0 | 1.5 | 2.5 |
| <u>Actual Water Delivery Service by the Main Canals to the Second Level Canals</u> | | | <i>I-4</i> | 2.2 | 2.4 | 1.8 | 2.4 | 1.8 | 2.0 | 2.6 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 1.2 | 2.2 | 1.4 |
| | Flexibility | 1.0 | <i>I-4A</i> | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.2 | 1.0 | 2.5 | 2.2 |
| | Reliability | 1.0 | <i>I-4B</i> | 2.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.2 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 2.2 |
| | Equity | 1.0 | <i>I-4C</i> | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |

Appendix Table A1 The conclusion of Rapid Appraisal Process results of 12 pilot project in Chao Phraya river basin.(Continued)

[illegible]

Appendix Table A1 The conclusion of Rapid Appraisal Process results of 12 pilot project in Chao Phraya river basin.(Continued)

[illegible]

Appendix Table A1 The conclusion of Rapid Appraisal Process results of 12 pilot project in Chao Phraya river basin.(Continued)

| Primary indicator names | Sub-indicator names | Weighting Factor (FAO) | Old Indicator Label (FAO Water Reports /19) | Naraysuan dam | Plaichumpol | Dong Sethi | Tha Bua | Manorom | Chong Khae | Khok Krathiam | Roeng Rang | Phonlathep | Tha Bot | Samchuk | Pho Phraya |
|---------------------------------------|---|------------------------|---|---------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | Suitability of the number of location(s) | 2.0 | <i>I-13A</i> | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| | Effectiveness of operation | 2.0 | <i>I-13B</i> | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| | Suitability of the storage/buffer capacities | 1.0 | <i>I-13C</i> | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| | Maintenance | 1.0 | <i>I-13D</i> | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Communications for the Main Canal | | | <i>I-14</i> | 2.0 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.2 | 2.5 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 2.7 | 3.4 | 2.4 | 3.4 | 3.6 |
| | Frequency of communications with the next higher level? (hr) | 2.0 | <i>I-14A</i> | 1.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| | Frequency of communications by operators or supervisors with their customers | 2.0 | <i>I-14B</i> | 2.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| | Dependability of voice communications by phone or radio. | 3.0 | <i>I-14C</i> | 3.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 |
| | Frequency of visits by upper level supervisors to the field. | 1.0 | <i>I-14D</i> | 2.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 1.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| | Existence and frequency of remote monitoring (either automatic or manual) at key spill points, including the end of the canal | 1.0 | <i>I-14E</i> | 1.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| | Availability of roads along the canal | 2.0 | <i>I-14F</i> | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 2.5 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| General Conditions for the Main Canal | | | <i>I-15</i> | 2.0 | 2.4 | 3.0 | 1.8 | 3.0 | 2.8 | 2.9 | 1.6 | 2.2 | 1.6 | 2.2 | 2.2 |
| | General level of maintenance of the canal floor and canal banks | 1.0 | <i>I-15A</i> | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 3.0 | 1.5 | 3.0 | 1.5 | 1.5 |

Appendix Table A1 The conclusion of Rapid Appraisal Process results of 12 pilot project in Chao Phraya river basin.(Continued)

| Primary indicator names | Sub-indicator names | Weighting Factor (FAO) | Old Indicator Label (FAO Water Reports /19) | Naraysuan dam | Plaichumpol | Dong Sethi | Tha Bua | Manorom | Chong Khae | Khok Krathiam | Roeng Rang | Phonlathep | Tha Bot | Samchuk | Pho Phraya |
|-----------------------------|---|------------------------|---|---------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | General lack of undesired seepage (note: if deliberate conjunctive use is practiced, some seepage may be desired). | 1.0 | <i>I-15B</i> | 0.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 1.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| | Availability of proper equipment and staff to adequately maintain this canal | 2.0 | <i>I-15C</i> | 2.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| | Travel time from the maintenance yard to the most distant point along this canal (for crews and maintenance equipment) | 1.0 | <i>I-15D</i> | 3.0 | 1.0 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Operation of the Main Canal | | | <i>I-16</i> | 2.3 | 2.5 | 2.3 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 2.2 | 2.5 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 1.9 | 2.8 | 2.8 |
| | How frequently does the headworks respond to realistic real time feedback from the operators/observers of this canal level? This question deals with a mismatch of orders, and problems associated with wedge storage variations and wave travel times. | 2.0 | <i>I-16A</i> | 3.0 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.7 |
| | Existence and effectiveness of water ordering/delivery procedures to match actual demands. This is different than the previous question, because the previous question dealt with problems | 1.0 | <i>I-16B</i> | 3.0 | 3.0 | 1.3 | 3.0 | 2.7 | 2.5 | 1.0 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 1.3 | 2.7 | 2.7 |
| | Clarity and correctness of instructions to operators. | 1.0 | <i>I-16C</i> | 1.3 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 2.7 | 3.0 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 3.0 | 1.3 | 2.7 | 2.7 |

Appendix Table A1 The conclusion of Rapid Appraisal Process results of 12 pilot project in Chao Phraya river basin.(Continued)

| Primary indicator names | Sub-indicator names | Weighting Factor (FAO) | Old Indicator Label (FAO Water Reports /9) | Naraysuan dam | Plaichumpol | Dong Sethi | Tha Bua | Manorom | Chong Khae | Khok Krathiam | Roeng Rang | Phonlathep | Tha Bot | Samchuk | Pho Phraya |
|--|---|------------------------|--|---------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | How frequently is the whole length of this canal checked for problems and reported to the office? This means one or more persons physically drive all the sections of the canal. | 1.0 | <i>I-16D</i> | 1.3 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 3.5 | 2.7 | 3.0 | 1.3 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Second Level Canals | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cross regulator hardware (Second level Canals) | | | <i>I-10</i> | 2.3 | 3.4 | 1.9 | 0.9 | 1.4 | 1.1 | 0.6 | 3.1 | 1.7 | 3.4 | 2.1 | 1.7 |
| | Ease of cross regulator operation under the current target operation. This does not mean that the current targets are being met; rather this rating indicates how easy or difficult it would be to move the cross regulators to meet the targets. | 1.0 | <i>I-10A</i> | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 1.5 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| | Level of maintenance of the cross regulators. | 1.0 | <i>I-10C</i> | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| | Lack of water level fluctuation | 3.0 | <i>I-10D</i> | 2.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
| | Travel time of a flow rate change throughout this canal level | 2.0 | <i>I-10E</i> | 3.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Turnouts from the Second Level Canals | | | <i>I-12</i> | 2.2 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.8 | 1.7 | 2.7 | 2.0 | 1.5 | 1.8 | 2.0 |

Appendix Table A1 The conclusion of Rapid Appraisal Process results of 12 pilot project in Chao Phraya river basin.(Continued)

| Primary indicator names | Sub-indicator names | Weighting Factor (FAO) | Old Indicator Label (FAO Water Reports /19) | Naraysuan dam | Plaichumpol | Dong Sethi | Tha Bua | Manorom | Chong Khae | Khok Krathiam | Roeng Rang | Phonlathep | Tha Bot | Samchuk | Pho Phraya |
|--|---|------------------------|---|---------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | Ease of turnout operation under the current target operation. This does not mean that the current targets are being met; rather this rating indicates how | 1.0 | <i>I-12A</i> | 2.5 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.5 | 2.0 |
| | Level of maintenance | 1.0 | <i>I-12C</i> | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| | Flow rate capacities | 1.0 | <i>I-12D</i> | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 0.5 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Regulating Reservoirs in the Second Level Canals | | | <i>I-13</i> | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| | Suitability of the number of location(s) | 2.0 | <i>I-13A</i> | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| | Effectiveness of operation | 2.0 | <i>I-13B</i> | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| | Suitability of the storage/buffer capacities | 1.0 | <i>I-13C</i> | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| | Maintenance | 1.0 | <i>I-13D</i> | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Communications for the Second Level Canals | | | <i>I-20</i> | 2.1 | 2.4 | 2.8 | 2.4 | 1.8 | 2.2 | 2.1 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| | Frequency of communications with the next higher level? (hr) | 2.0 | <i>I-20A</i> | 1.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| | Frequency of communications by operators or supervisors with their customers | 2.0 | <i>I-20B</i> | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| | Dependability of voice communications by phone or radio. | 3.0 | <i>I-20C</i> | 3.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 2.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| | Frequency of visits by upper level supervisors to the field. | 1.0 | <i>I-20D</i> | 1.0 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 |

Appendix Table A1 The conclusion of Rapid Appraisal Process results of 12 pilot project in Chao Phraya river basin.(Continued)

| Primary indicator names | Sub-indicator names | Weighting Factor (FAO) | Old Indicator Label (FAO Water Reports 19) | Naraysuan dam | Plaichumpol | Dong Sethi | Tha Bua | Manorom | Chong Khae | Khok Krathiam | Roeng Rang | Phonlathep | Tha Bot | Samchuk | Pho Phraya |
|--|---|------------------------|--|---------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | Existence and frequency of remote monitoring (either automatic or manual) at key spill points, including the end of the canal | 1.0 | <i>I-20E</i> | 1.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 1.5 |
| | Availability of roads along the canal | 2.0 | <i>I-21F</i> | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 2.5 | 3.0 | 2.5 |
| General Conditions for the Second Level Canals | | | <i>I-21</i> | 1.7 | 2.7 | 1.9 | 2.7 | 1.6 | 2.2 | 2.0 | 1.6 | 2.2 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 1.5 |
| | General level of maintenance of the canal floor and canal banks | 1.0 | <i>I-21B</i> | 2.0 | 2.7 | 2.5 | 2.7 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.5 |
| | General lack of undesired seepage (note: if deliberate conjunctive use is practiced, some seepage may be desired). | 1.0 | <i>I-21C</i> | 1.5 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.5 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 1.5 | 2.0 | 1.0 |
| | Availability of proper equipment and staff to adequately maintain this canal | 2.0 | <i>I-21D</i> | 1.0 | 2.8 | 2.0 | 2.8 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
| | Travel time from the maintenance yard to the most distant point along this canal (for crews and maintenance equipment) | 1.0 | <i>I-21E</i> | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 |
| Operation of the Second Level Canals | | | <i>I-22</i> | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 2.1 | 1.0 | 2.1 | 1.2 | 1.9 | 2.1 | 1.2 | 2.1 | 2.4 |

Appendix Table A1 The conclusion of Rapid Appraisal Process results of 12 pilot project in Chao Phraya river basin.(Continued)

| Primary indicator names | Sub-indicator names | Weighting Factor (FAO) | Old Indicator Label (FAO Water Reports /19) | Naraysuan dam | Plaichumpol | Dong Sethi | Tha Bua | Manorom | Chong Khae | Khok Krathiam | Roeng Rang | Phonlathep | Tha Bot | Samchuk | Pho Phraya |
|---|---|------------------------|---|---------------|-------------|------------|---------|---------|------------|---------------|------------|------------|---------|---------|------------|
| | How frequently does the headworks respond to realistic real time feedback from the operators/observers of this canal level? This question deals with a mismatch of orders, and problems associated with wedge storage variations and wave travel times. | 2.0 | I-22A | 2.0 | 2.7 | 1.3 | 2.7 | 1.5 | 2.7 | 1.3 | 2.7 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 2.7 | 2.7 |
| | Existence and effectiveness of water ordering/delivery procedures to match actual demands. This is different than the previous question, because the previous question dealt with problems that occur AFTER a change has been made. | 1.0 | I-22B | 2.0 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 |
| | Clarity and correctness of instructions to operators. | 1.0 | I-22C | 3.0 | 2.7 | 3.5 | 2.7 | 0.5 | 2.7 | 1.0 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 1.3 | 2.7 | 2.7 |
| | How frequently is the whole length of this canal checked for problems and reported to the office? This means one or more persons physically drive all the | 1.0 | I-22D | 1.3 | 1.3 | 4.0 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.0 | 1.3 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 1.3 | 2.7 |
| Third Level Canals | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cross regulator hardware (Third Level Canals) | | | | 2.1 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 2.0 | 0.5 | 1.4 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 1.7 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.9 |

Appendix Table A1 The conclusion of Rapid Appraisal Process results of 12 pilot project in Chao Phraya river basin.(Continued)

[illegible]

Appendix Table A1 The conclusion of Rapid Appraisal Process results of 12 pilot project in Chao Phraya river basin.(Continued)

| Primary indicator names | Sub-indicator names | Weighting Factor (FAO) | Old Indicator Label (FAO Water Reports /19) | Naraysuan dam | Plaichumpol | Dong Sethi | Tha Bua | Manorom | Chong Khae | Khok Krathiam | Roeng Rang | Phonlathep | Tha Bot | Samchuk | Pho Phraya |
|---|---|------------------------|---|---------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | Suitability of the number of location(s) | 2.0 | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| | Effectiveness of operation | 2.0 | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| | Suitability of the storage/buffer capacities | 1.0 | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| | Maintenance | 1.0 | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Communications for the Third Level Canals | | | | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.8 | 2.2 | 1.5 | 1.3 | 1.9 | 2.6 | 2.5 | 1.0 | 2.1 | 1.8 |
| | Frequency of communications with the next higher level? (hr) | 2.0 | | 1.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| | Frequency of communications by operators or supervisors with their customers | 2.0 | | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| | Dependability of voice communications by phone or radio. | 3.0 | | 3.0 | 1.0 | 3.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 |
| | Frequency of visits by upper level supervisors to the field. | 1.0 | | 2.0 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 |
| | Existence and frequency of remote monitoring (either automatic or manual) at key spill points, including the end of the canal | 1.0 | | 3.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
| | Availability of roads along the canal | 2.0 | | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| General Conditions for the Third Level Canals | | | | 2.1 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 1.1 | 2.1 | 1.4 | 2.4 | 1.9 | 1.2 | 2.3 | 2.0 |
| | General level of maintenance of the canal floor and canal banks | 1.0 | | 2.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |

Appendix Table A1 The conclusion of Rapid Appraisal Process results of 12 pilot project in Chao Phraya river basin.(Continued)

| Primary indicator names | Sub-indicator names | Weighting Factor (FAO) | Old Indicator Label (FAO Water Reports /19) | Naraysuan dam | Plaichumpol | Dong Sethi | Tha Bua | Manorom | Chong Khae | Khok Krathiam | Roeng Rang | Phonlathep | Tha Bot | Samchuk | Pho Phraya |
|-------------------------------------|---|------------------------|---|---------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | General lack of undesired seepage (note: if deliberate conjunctive use is practiced, some seepage may be desired). | 1.0 | | 1.5 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.5 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 2.5 | 2.0 |
| | Availability of proper equipment and staff to adequately maintain this canal | 2.0 | | 2.0 | 2.5 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 1.5 | 1.0 |
| | Travel time from the maintenance yard to the most distant point along this canal (for crews and maintenance equipment) | 1.0 | | 3.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Operation of the Third Level Canals | | | | 2.0 | 2.7 | 2.0 | 2.7 | 1.0 | 2.4 | 1.5 | 2.9 | 2.1 | 0.9 | 2.4 | 2.7 |
| | How frequently does the headworks respond to realistic real time feedback from the operators/observers of this canal level? This question deals with a mismatch of orders, and problems associated with wedge storage variations and wave travel times. | 2.0 | | 2.0 | 2.7 | 1.3 | 2.7 | 1.3 | 2.7 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 2.7 | 2.7 |
| | Existence and effectiveness of water ordering/delivery procedures to match actual demands. This is different than the previous question, because the previous question dealt with problems that occur AFTER a change has been made. | 1.0 | | 2.0 | 2.7 | 1.3 | 2.7 | 1.3 | 2.7 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 2.7 |

Appendix Table A1 The conclusion of Rapid Appraisal Process results of 12 pilot project in Chao Phraya river basin.(Continued)

Appendix Table A1 The conclusion of Rapid Appraisal Process results of 12 pilot project in Chao Phraya river basin.(Continued)

| Primary indicator names | Sub-indicator names | Weighting Factor (FAO) | Old Indicator Label (FAO Water Reports /19) | Naraysuan dam | Plaichumpol | Dong Sethi | Tha Bua | Manorom | Chong Khae | Khok Krathiam | Roeng Rang | Phonlathep | Tha Bot | Samchuk | Pho Phraya |
|-------------------------|---|------------------------|---|---------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | Adequacy of spending on modernization of the water delivery operation/structures (as contrasted to rehabilitation or regular operation) | 1.0 | <i>I-23C</i> | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Project Employees | | | <i>I-24</i> | 2.4 | 1.4 | 1.2 | 1.4 | 1.9 | 1.8 | 2.3 | 1.3 | 2.4 | 2.1 | 2.0 | 1.9 |
| | Frequency and adequacy of training of operators and middle managers (not secretaries and drivers). This should include employees at all levels of the distribution system, not only those who work in the office. | 1.0 | <i>I-24A</i> | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 |
| | Availability of written performance rules | 1.0 | <i>I-24B</i> | 3.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| | Power of employees to make decisions | 2.5 | <i>I-24C</i> | 2.0 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 3.5 | 1.5 | 2.5 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| | Ability of the project to dismiss employees with cause. | 2.0 | <i>I-24D</i> | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
| | Rewards for ememplary service | 1.0 | <i>I-24E</i> | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| | Relative salary of an operator compared to a day laborer | 2.0 | <i>I-24F</i> | 4.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Water User Associations | | | <i>I-25</i> | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 1.9 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 1.8 |
| | Percentage of all project users who have a functional, formal unit that participates in water distribution | 2.5 | <i>I-25A</i> | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 |
| | Actual ability of the strong Water User Associations to influence real-time water deliveries to the WUA. | 1.0 | <i>I-25B</i> | 2.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 2.5 |

Appendix Table A1 The conclusion of Rapid Appraisal Process results of 12 pilot project in Chao Phraya river basin.(Continued)

| Primary indicator names | Sub-indicator names | Weighting Factor (FAO) | Old Indicator Label (FAO Water Reports /19) | Naraysuan dam | Plaichumpol | Dong Setthi | Tha Bua | Manorom | Chong Khae | Khok Krathiam | Roeng Rang | Phonlathep | Tha Bot | Samchuk | Pho Phraya |
|---|---|------------------------|---|---------------|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | Ability of the WUA to rely on effective outside help for enforcement of its rules | 1.0 | <i>I-25C</i> | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
| | Legal basis for the WUAs | 1.0 | <i>I-25D</i> | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| | Financial strength of WUAS | 1.0 | <i>I-25E</i> | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
| Mobility and Size of Operations Staff | Operation staff mobility and efficiency, based on the ratio of operating staff to the number of turnouts. | | <i>I-28</i> | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Computers for billing and record management | The extent to which computers are used for billing and record management | | <i>I-30</i> | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Computers for canal control | The extent to which computers (either central or on-site) are used for canal control | | <i>I-31</i> | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 |