



Republic of the Philippines
Department of Environment and Natural Resources
Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City
Tel Nos. (632) 929-66-26 to 29 · (632) 929-62-52
Website: <http://www.denr.gov.ph> / E-mail: web@denrgov.ph

MEMORANDUM

FOR / TO : The Director
Legal Affairs Service
Financial and Management Service

The Assistant Directors
Biodiversity Management Bureau
Ecosystems Research and Development Bureau
Environmental Management Bureau
Forest Management Bureau
Land Management Bureau
Mines and Geosciences Bureau

Representative, Office of the Head Executive Assistant
Representative, Office of the Undersecretary for Legal,
Administration, Human Resources, and Legislative Affairs
Representative, Office of the Undersecretary for Field Operations -
Luzon, Visayas and Environment
Representative, Office of the Undersecretary for Field Operations -
Mindanao
Representative, Office of the Undersecretary Policy, Planning and
International Affairs
Representative, Office of the Undersecretary for Finance, Information
Systems and Climate Change
Representative, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Policy, Planning
and Foreign-Assisted and Special Projects
Representative, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Legal Affairs
Representative, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Field Operations-
Luzon and Visayas
Representative, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Field Operations-
Eastern Mindanao
Representative, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Field Operations-
Western Mindanao
Representative, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Finance,
Information Systems and Mining Concerns
Representative, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Human
Resources, Strategic Communication and Sectoral Initiatives
Representative, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement,
Solid Waste Management and Local Government Units Concerns
Representative, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration
and Legislative Affairs
Representative, Legal Affairs Service
Representative, Climate Change Service

Representative, Strategic Communication and Initiatives Service
Representative, Foreign-Assisted and Special Projects Service
Representative, River Basin Control Office
Representative, Legislative Liaison Office

FROM : The OIC Director
Policy and Planning Service

SUBJECT : **HIGHLIGHTS OF THE POLICY TECHNICAL WORKING
GROUP (PTWG) MEETING NO. 2022-09 HELD ON AUGUST 09,
2022, 9:30 AM THROUGH COMBINATION IN-PERSON AND
ZOOM PLATFORM**

DATE : 12 AUG 2022

Furnished herewith is the approved Highlights of the Policy Technical Working Group (PTWG) Meeting No. 2022-09 held on August 09, 2022, 9:30 AM through combination in-person and Zoom platform, which tackled the following draft policies:

1. Draft DMO re: Guidelines for the Establishment of Mineral Reservations, and the Disestablishment of Certain Portion(s) or Modifications of an Established Mineral Reservation
2. Draft DAO re: Defining the Management Arrangements for the Operation of the Palawan Wildlife Rescue and Conservation Center (PWRCC)
3. Draft DPWH DILG DA DENR JAO re: Establishment, Maintenance and Management of Rainwater Harvesting Systems in the Country
4. Draft DAO re: Strengthening the Tamaraw Conservation Program and Providing its Implementation Mechanisms Thereof

For your information and/or appropriate action.


MELINDA C. CAPISTRANO



Republic of the Philippines
Department of Environment and Natural Resources

Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City

Tel. Nos. (02) 8920-0689 / 8925-8275 / 0917-885-3367 / 0917-868-3367

Website: <http://www.denr.gov.ph> / E-mail: web@denr.gov.ph

DENR-POLICY TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP

Minutes of the Meeting No. 2022-09

August 9, 2022, 9:30 AM

Combination of Virtual via Zoom and In-Person Meeting

PPS-PSD, 3/F DENR Bldg., Visayas Ave., Diliman, Quezon City

I. Attendees

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Dir. Melinda C. Capistrano, PPS | 33. Ms. Mylene Velasquez, RBCO |
| 2. Dir. Norlito A. Eneran, LAS | 34. Ms. Susan Ruth Nool, CCS |
| 3. For. Llarina S. Mojica, PSD | 35. Mr. Jello Ortega, CCS |
| 4. For. Mirasol Ocampo, BMB | 36. Engr. Snoofey Cabag-iran, NWRB |
| 5. Ms. Cecille Garcia, BMB | 37. Atty. Rosette Ferrer, LAS |
| 6. Ms. Winnievir Ballilia, BMB | 38. Ms. Andrea Palma, FASPS |
| 7. Ms. Katrina Erika Manalo, BMB | 39. Ms. Nimozenie Magleo, FASPS |
| 8. Mr. Eugene Paranaque, ERDB | 40. Cyrenaica Flaviano, LLO |
| 9. For. Claudett Endozo, FMB, | 41. Ms. Lora Mc-ren Abengoza, NRDC |
| 10. For. Lovella Luzette Galindon, LMB | 42. Mr. George Tanlimco, NRDC |
| 11. Engr. Liza Socorro Manzano, MGB | 43. Dr. Edwin M. Mojares, MGB |
| 12. Engr. Teodorico A. Sandoval, MGB | MIMAROPA |
| 13. Ms. Crezsyl Joy Arellano, MGB | 44. Ms. Maria Melissa Endang, MIMAROPA |
| 14. Mr. Brian Matthew Flores, MGB | 45. Ms. Michaela Rongavilla, DENR- |
| 15. Engr. Florian Servidad, MGB | MIMAROPA |
| 16. Ms. Bernadette Buladaco, MGB | 46. Ms. Rhodora Ubani, PENRO Palawan |
| 17. Mr. Henry Gervasio, HEA/OCOS | 47. Engr. Susan Abano, NWRB |
| 18. For. Ivy Nicole G. Angeles, HEA/OCOS | |
| 19. Ms. Encarmila Panganiban, OULAHRLA | Secretariat (PPS-PSD) |
| 20. Ms. Ma. Cristina Francisco, OUFOLVE | 48. Mr. Nehemiah Leo Carlo B. Salvador |
| 21. Mr. Jeruz Mari Y. Pahilanga, OUFOM | 49. Ms. Anna Michelle I. Lim |
| 22. For. Flordelino Rey, OASPPFASP | 50. For. Amisol B. Taliana |
| 23. For. Kryshlaine T. Raquel, OASPPFASP | 51. Ms. Nim Hyde Eusebio |
| 24. For. Adeluia G. Siapno, OASLA | 52. Ms. Mary Lou Retos |
| 25. For. Josefina M. Ocampo, OASFOLVE | 53. Ms. Maria Theresa Enriquez |
| 26. Ms. Jean U. Ocampo, OASFOWM | 54. For. Emma Liwliwa B. Medina |
| 27. Ms. Joan C. Timola, OASFOWM | 55. Ms. Zayrelle Ann Suello |
| 28. Ms. Fe Rosalie R. Bation, OASFOWM | 56. For. Hazel Jasmine Donato |
| 29. Ms. Shella Mae Toledo, OASFOWM | |
| 30. Mr. Ivan Bancoro, OASESWMLGUC | |
| 31. Engr. Reina D. Requieron, OASFISMC | |
| 32. Ms. Jobelle Munsod, OASALA | |

II. Highlights of the Meeting

The meeting commenced at 9:35 AM and was presided over by Director Capistrano. She proceeded to read the agenda for the meeting. Director Eneran moved for the approval of the agenda, seconded by Ms. Panganiban.

1. Draft DENR Memorandum Order (DMO) re Guidelines for the Establishment of Mineral Reservations, and the Disestablishment of Certain Portions/s or Modifications of an Established Mineral Reservation

Presentation and Discussions:

- Ms. Arellano informed that prior to the PTWG meeting, the draft policy was reviewed during a pre-PTWG meeting with former Dir. Glenn Marcelo c. Noble. She discussed the procedure for establishment of mineral reservation under DMO No. 2007-06 re Guidelines for Establishment of Mineral Reservations. Likewise, she presented the procedure provided under DAO NO. 2010-21 or the Implementing Rules and Regulation of Republic Act (RA) No. 7942 or the Philippine Mining Act.
- Ms. Arellano proceeded to discuss the salient features of the proposed guidelines, specifically the geological assessment, environmental resource mapping, conduct of public hearing, endorsement for establishment of mineral reservation, declaration of areas covered by mineral agreements into mineral reservation, and procedures for disestablishment or modification of a proclaimed mineral reservation.
- Atty. Ferrer inquired if the proponent considered the Office of the (OP) Memorandum Circular No. 2 regarding the Complete Staff Work (CSW) requirement, which contains the alternative uses, cost-benefit analysis (CBA), funding requirement and coordination with other agencies. Engr. Manzano responded that everything was considered in the evaluation and enhancement of the proposed policy. Moreover, other natural resources were taken into account through the mineral resources mapping. Basically, the MGB identified the aspects necessary for the declaration of a mineral reservation. She informed that there was a presentation to the OP, wherein an Assistant Secretary of said office has identified things that are necessary for the mineral reservation policies. Dir. Eneran suggested including a provision on CSW in Section 7. Submission of Progress Report, of the proposed policy. According to him, the submissions to OP should comply with the instructions of said office. It may be stated in Section 7 that the submission of report regarding the establishment or disestablishment is in compliance with the CSW requirement of the OP.
- Dir. Capistrano asked if a geological survey will again be conducted for the disestablishment of a mineral reservation. Engr. Manzano replied that with regard to the establishment, it is necessary to conduct the geological assessment. The geological assessment is not only about reconnaissance, but is a semi-detailed study. On the disestablishment, there is a requirement for a geological survey to check if there are other mineral resources in the area; such will be the basis for non-disestablishment. She cited a case in the Siruma area. The geological assessment will be the basis whether to disestablish a mineral reservation or to only limit/decrease the area covered.
- Dir. Capistrano asked if CBA is undertaken for the disestablishment of a mineral reservation. Engr. Manzano replied that a resource evaluation is conducted. She added that the CBA will also consider other resources. It will be used to consider which is more valuable- the development of natural resources or the protection thereof.
- For. Rey asked if the establishment or disestablishment is only exclusive to mineral lands, or whether this may cover other land classifications. He also asked if there will be a reclassification process for such lands. Ms. Arellano replied that one of the requirements submitted by the Regional Offices for such proposals is the clearance of the land use of the area, to determine whether the proposed area will overlap with other land classifications. She cited as one example the Biak-na-Bato mineral reservation, wherein initially, it was part of the national park. However, since it has been determined

that it is a rich source of marble, part of the park has been declared as a mineral reservation. For. Rey posed a question whether the land classification was not changed with its declaration as a mineral reservation. When the land classification is changed, the activities for the PA ceases. Ms. Arellano clarified that only a certain portion, and not the entire Biak-na-Bato was assigned as mineral reservation. She added that in some cases such as the Biak-na-Bato, areas can be reclassified. Dir. Capistrano stated that if declared as a PA, then the area cannot be utilized as a mineral reservation. She asked the MGB if they identify potential mineral reservations regardless of land classification. Ms. Arellano replied that lands are delineated in the maps, hence, they can easily determine which are overlapping areas. They take into account PAs, and other areas that might overlap with the proposed mineral reservation. On the query of Dir. Capistrano regarding the action of the MGB if the area has mineral resources within a land classified as forestland, Engr. Manzano replied that the MGB conducts cost-benefit analysis to determine the best use of the land. The current trend is the use of geospatial mapping. When overlaying the maps, the MGB is able to determine priority areas for commercial value and for protection of the environment. She agreed that the CBA should be done to determine what is more beneficial for the country, and that the final determination should be what will prevail.

- Dir. Eneran asked whether the format of the proposed policy should be a DMO or a DAO. Engr. Manzano asked Dir. Eneran which is the most appropriate format for the proposed policy. In reply, Dir. Eneran suggested that since there is a provision on publication, it may be best to reformat it as a DAO since there may be private interests that will be affected; a DMO is only internal to the DENR. Engr. Manzano agreed with the suggestion.
- Dir. Eneran suggested the insertion of a provision regarding the participation of other sectors of the Department, particularly on the disestablishment.
- Dir. Capistrano instructed the line-by-line review of the draft policy. She asked what is meant by the line "or Modification." Ms. Arellano replied that this pertains to the boundaries of the mineral lands which may be modified or changed. Engr. Manzano also informed that this refers to the decrease of the area, and disestablishment to another land use.
- On the subject, For. Josefina Ocampo suggested deleting the word "for" and changing this to "on". She also suggested removing the word "the," "of certain portion/s". In the prefatory statement, she suggested putting a semi-colon after the laws stated, deleting "and other pertinent laws, rules and regulation." Otherwise, these other regulations should be identified. She also suggested identifying those covered by the line "all concerned." Dir. Eneran commented that since it has been agreed that a DAO will be issued, the standard format for the prefatory statement should be adopted.
- On Section 1, For. Ocampo suggested changing the Basic Policy to Rationale. For. Mojica replied that based on the standard format, Basic Policy is the one that is applicable. Ms. Retos also added that the Rationale is included in the CSW and not in the draft policy. For. Ocampo also proposed rephrasing or revising some lines in the Basic Policy. Dir. Eneran asked if the Basic Policy was lifted *in toto* from the Mining Act, or whether there were revisions in the statement. Ms. Arellano replied that the provision was lifted from the Mining Act. It was agreed that the statement under the Mining Act should be adopted *in toto*.
- On Section 2, For. Ocampo suggested inserting the word "mineral" before lands. For. Mojica suggested retaining the previous statement regarding the coverage of "all areas." For. Galindon asked if it is possible to include the mineral agreement areas in the scope and coverage since this was mentioned in Sub-section 4.5. Engr. Manzano replied that the mineral agreement areas are already covered. She asked whether it is necessary to

put the details in Section 2. For. Rey clarified that these are areas covered by existing mining tenure for inclusion as mineral reservations. Engr. Manzano agreed with the statement of For. Rey. He suggested that the term “mineralized” be inserted before “highly prospective area.” Engr. Manzano replied that the latter is already understood to mean mineralized areas and to avoid redundancy they used the following terminology.

- On Sub-Section 3.1., For. Ocampo suggested changing the line “no longer sufficient” to “insufficient” or “inadequate.” For. Rey asked if the term was lifted from another law or policy, to which Engr. Manzano replied that the same was lifted from an existing policy. Ms. Arellano informed the body that the definition was improved from a previous definition as per agreement during the pre-PTWG conducted last May 18, 2022. Dir. Capistrano asked for the original definition of said term. As for the other terms defined, it was mentioned that these were lifted from other sources. On the definition of mineral lands, Engr. Manzano informed that there are certain additions to the definition since the original is very generic. On Sub-section 3.4. re Qualified Person, For. Ocampo asked for the number of persons or whether there is a limit. Engr. Manzano replied that the number is already established per province based on existing laws. She also informed the body that the definition was lifted from the existing law. Atty. Ferrer informed that mineral lands is a classification of land under the 1987 Constitution, and suggested referring to the constitutional use of the term that it is a land classification. She also noted that mineral lands were not mentioned in other parts of the draft policy. For. Mojica suggested revisiting DAO No. 2010-21 which is the reference for many of the terms defined. Dir. Capistrano mentioned about the draft policy having undergone review by the previous PPS Director. The PTWG Secretariat proceeded to show the definition of mineral lands under RA 7942. Dir. Capistrano suggested reviewing the Constitution and the definition under the Mining Act and harmonizing the same to come up with a proper definition for mineral lands. Atty. Ferrer noted that the term highly prospective area may be confusing to some, hence, she suggested defining the same under Section 3.
- On Sub-section 4.1., For. Ocampo asked if the activities under the geological assessment may be harmonized. Engr. Manzano replied that these are separate and phased activities. The establishment of mineral reservation is determined by the MGB. If there is no existing tenement, the area is opened for investment. There is no applicant yet for the area. She stressed that it is a process.
- On Sub-section 4.3., Dir. Capistrano asked whether the IPs will be included in the consultation process. Ms. Arellano informed that the provision was lifted from the previous policy as contained in DMO No. 2007-06, regarding the establishment of mineral reservations. Engr. Manzano stated that the provision already covers the IPs.
- For. Ocampo asked the threshold/acceptable number for the conduct of public hearings. Ms. Arellano responded that when MGB conducts public hearings, the original policy is consulted twice. She added that the Regional Offices conduct public hearings in batches, as long as these consultations do not go beyond the 30 days-notice. Moreover, the public hearing is conducted per barangay or for those that are covered by the proposal, or may be conducted at the municipal LGU level. Engr. Manzano stated that the public hearing is more than two (2). It is the MGB Regional Office that conducts the hearing, depending on the number of barangays and the sectors affected. Dir. Capistrano opined that there should be no definite number for the public hearings conducted. Ms. Arellano informed that the provision was lifted from the DMO No. 2007-06 and DAO No. 2010-21.
- For. Rey suggested that since there is a procedure, it is best to put the details in the draft policy. The FPIC certification process should also be incorporated. He recalled the issuance of an instruction that until the NCIP certification is not approved, the activity

may not proceed. If the NCIP certification process has started, all subsequent requests for NCIP certification will be expedient in case the area becomes a mineral reservation. The processes regarding coordination with other agencies should also be incorporated. Engr. Manzano asked whether it is appropriate to incorporate these processes since there are already established procedures. There is already coordination with other agencies and established processes regarding other requirements. Case in point, For. Rey asked whether there is coordination with MGB in case there is an application for IFMA over a mineral reservation. Dir. Capistrano replied that at the onset, this will not be allowed since the area is already established as a mineral reservation. Dir. Capistrano suggested adding NGAs in the public hearing. For. Siapno suggested adding an all-encompassing term of "other stakeholders." Similarly, Atty. Ferrer proposed the addition of the IPs in Sub-section 4.3.1. She also supported having a more detailed procedure, hence, it should be clarified at what point the consultation will end, e.g., issuance of Sangguniang Bayan resolution. For. Siapno commented that based on her experience in the field, explicitly stating this in the draft policy will tie the hands of/limit the sector. She suggested adding another provision regarding coordination with other agencies or stakeholders. Ms. Arellano clarified that in the MGB, there is an operating procedure for proposed mineral reservations establishment. With regard to opposing groups, the MGB requires the Regional Office to submit a certification that there is no opposition to the proposed mineral reservation. A Minutes of the Meeting is also required to support the certification that there is no opposition. For. Siapno suggested incorporating this in the draft policy. Engr. Manzano appreciated the inputs of For. Siapno and For. Rey based on their experience on the ground. She clarified that the provision was also lifted from the previous policy. She stated that the draft policy requires only one (1) publication, which is a departure from the existing policy which requires two (2) publications. For. Siapno opined that the suggestions regarding the procedure should be part of Sub-section 4.3.3.

- On Section 5, For. Siapno suggested revising the provision, i.e., stating as introductory paragraph and revise as: "The MGB upon its own initiative and determination that the area had reached the state of exhausted mineral resources and where the national interest so dictates and upon the request of concerned stakeholders through the DENR Secretary may recommend the dis-establishment of the mineral reservation and the reclassification to other land uses." She pointed out that the two introductory paragraphs in Section 5 should be in one sentence emphasizing the basis for the dis-establishment of mineral reservation. She added that there should be 5.1 which will state the criteria for the dis-establishment, 5.1.1 will cover the area that reach its state of exhausted mineral resources and provides emphasis why there is a dis-establishment or modification of an established mineral reservation area 5.1.2 to be the national interest which will include the basis for the dis-establishment or modification as listed in a,b,c and d. For. Siapno commented that Section 5 is in narrative form and different compared to Section 4 containing the procedures for establishment of mineral resources which clearly explain the procedures and protocols. She proposed a sub-heading/topic in Section 5 explaining the procedures and protocols for dis-establishment or modification of a proclaimed mineral resource as 5.2. Further, she added to insert 5.3 containing the endorsement of dis-establishment since there is the same provision contained in the previous Section. Dir. Capistrano instructed the Secretariat to get her suggested proposals for the section. On the modification, Atty. Ferrer asked if only those enumerated will be considered as grounds, and noted that the statement may be limiting. Relatedly, she suggested the possible insertion of the phrase "such as, but not limited to." On item d, she suggested changing "natural park" to "national park." For. Ocampo agreed with the suggestion of For. Siapno to have a criteria or sub-sections for disestablishment.
- Dir. Capistrano asked whether abandoned mining areas are not considered for disestablishment. Engr. Manzano replied that the criteria pertain to whether the mineral reserves in the mining area have been exhausted. For. Siapno replied that they do not identify the areas, but the purpose or use of the same. Engr. Manzano added that

abandoned mining areas may or may not be part of the established mineral reservations. She is of the opinion that these are not included in the scope of the draft policy. She also manifested her agreement with the comment of For. Siapno. On the abandoned mining areas, Engr. Manzano stated that the problem for rehabilitation of these areas is the lack of budget.

- On Section 6, For. Ocampo suggested deleting the line “any of”.
- On Section 7, For. Ocampo noted that disestablishment was not covered by the section, hence she suggested paraphrasing the provision.
- Dir. Capistrano suggested circulating proposed policies to PTWG members before the conduct of the PTWG deliberation, in order for them to provide comments on the form and substance of the proposed policy.
- On Section 8, For. Ocampo suggested revising the line “should the areas...” to “unless otherwise declared as a mineral reservation.”
- Atty. Ferrer asked for the possible inclusion of a provision on how the DENR may recommend in the disestablishment of mineral reservations established by law. Engr. Manzano informed that based on her knowledge, those established areas were realized through the issuance of the Office of the President. Ms. Arellano informed that regulations establishing mineral reservations are through Presidential Decrees, Proclamations, and Executive Orders. Atty. Ferrer stated that there are some that were established under PDs which have a force of law, e.g., PD 463, s. 1974. Hence, she suggested providing a process for such cases. Dir. Capistrano suggested the proponent to look into the law that Atty. Ferrer has been referring, she also commented that disestablishing mineral reserves submerged in waters would be costly. Engr. Manzano said that when they designed the draft policy, they have not considered the submerged lands and have only considered the mineral reservation on lands, nevertheless she agreed to the proposal.
- For. Siapno moved for the approval of the proposed policy, subject to the comments and recommendations of the PTWG members, seconded by For. Ocampo.

Agreements:

1. Insert in Section 7 a provision regarding the CSW requirement of the Office of the President;
2. Convert the proposed policy into a DAO;
3. Insert a provision regarding the participation of other sectors of the Department, particularly on the disestablishment;
4. On the title, delete the word “for” and change this to “on”. Also remove the words “the” and “of certain portion/s”;
5. On the prefatory statement, the standard format will be adopted;
6. On Section 1, adopt *in toto* the statement under the Mining Act;
7. Review the definition of “mineral lands” under the Constitution and come up with a proper definition;
8. Insert definition of highly prospective areas;
9. Add “other stakeholders” in sub-section 4.3.1.;
10. On Section 5:
 - Rephrase the section and insert the following subsection/topics:
 - 5.1 (criteria for the dis-establishment of mineral reservation or modification of an established mineral reservation area)
 - 5.1.1 (emphasis why there is a dis-establishment or modification of an established mineral reservation area)

- 5.1.2 (basis for the dis-establishment or modification)
 - a. Projected use of the area as government administrative center
 - b. As sites for major government infrastructure projects
 - c. As relocation or evacuation site/s for disaster affected populace
 - d. As National Parks (Geoparks, Geological Monuments, Unique Landscape)
- 5.2 (procedures and protocols for dis-establishment or modification of a proclaimed mineral resource)
- 5.3 (endorsement of dis-establishment)
 - On item d, change natural parks to national parks;
- 11. On Section 6, delete the line "any of";
- 12. Paraphrase Section 7 by considering therein the disestablishment of mineral reservations;
- 13. On Section 8, revise the line "should the areas..." to "unless otherwise declared as a mineral reservation;"
- 14. Circulate proposed policies to PTWG members prior to the PTWG meeting, for comment on the form and substance of the proposed policy; and
- 15. Provide a process for disestablishment of mineral reservations established through a Presidential Decree, which has a force of law.

2. Draft DENR Administrative Order (DAO) re Defining the Management Arrangements for the Operation of the Palawan Wildlife Rescue and Conservation Center (PWRCC)

Presentation and Discussions:

- For. Mirasol Ocampo presented a brief background of the proposed policy. The PWRCC was formerly known as the Crocodile Farm Institute (CFI), a national government project established in 1987 by the DENR through the technical and financial support from the Government of Japan. The Technical Cooperation Agreement between the two countries ended on August 19, 1994, and since then, the CFI has become solely a project of the Philippine Government through the DENR - BMB. She also discussed the supervision and management scheme for the PWRCC- from the BMB to the NRDC; transfer from the NRDC back to BMB, and then transferring again the operations from the BMB back to the NRDC. On March 2, 2022, the BMB was instructed by then Acting Secretary Jim O. Sampulna to facilitate the transfer of management of PWRCC from the NRDC back to BMB through PENRO Palawan.
- Dir. Capistrano asked the reason for returning the management of PWRCC back to BMB. For. Ocampo (BMB) replied that it was instructed by former Acting Secretary Jim Sampulna and based on assessment, there were inefficiencies in the management and operations, thereof. On the query of Dir. Capistrano asked why the center was not transferred under the management of the PCSDS, For. Ocampo (BMB) replied that it is a national wildlife rescue center, hence, should be under the management of a national government agency which is BMB that is mandated to look after the Implementation and monitoring of these rescue centers.
- Dir. Capistrano asked about the size of the PWRCC and whether it is exclusive to crocodiles. For. Ocampo (BMB) replied that the center is around 280 hectares in size, and also serves as a wildlife rescue center to other wildlife aside from crocodiles. Dir. Capistrano stated that in the past, the PWRCC was exclusive to crocodiles, and that wildlife that have been placed in the center for rehabilitation are freed and brought back to the wild. For. Ocampo (BMB) replied that there are other wildlife in the center that are not fit for release to the wild. Such as those that are physically impaired, they were the ones that showcased in display areas for educational purposes (e.g., field trip).

- Dir. Capistrano noted that the purpose for conserving the crocodiles is because they are threatened and endemic. She asked how these wildlife will be managed if their population increases. For. Ocampo (BMB) replied that the *Crocodylus porosus* is for commercial purposes for investment. Dir. Capistrano asked if the BMB has explored the possible co-management of the center with the LGU. Ms. Lim recalled that with regard to LGU management, there was a request from LGU Puerto Princesa for them to take over the center. However, the DENR did not grant such a request. Dir. Capistrano stressed that the center should be co-managed with the LGU, together with the PCSDS. With regard to the concern raised by Dir. Capistrano on the budget for maintenance, For. Ocampo (BMB) replied that this will be requested in the next year's budget. Still, Dir. Capistrano stressed that the proposal budget for wildlife is very minimal and PWRCC is not included in the proposal. For. Ocampo (BMB) informed that the budget was incorporated under Tier 2. Dir. Capistrano asked whether the LGU was asked regarding a co-management scheme. For. Ocampo (BMB) informed that there was a move before for co-management with the PCSDS but the same did not push through. Dir. Capistrano also touched on the revenue for the Local Government that will be generated by the center. Ms. Winnievir Ballilia (BMB) stated that prior to crafting of the proposed policy, there was a finding this year that there was no proper maintenance of the center by the NRDC. Also, the crocodiles were not taken care of properly and their cages are not conducive for living. With this, Ms. Ballilia said that they recommended first transferring the responsibility for management to the BMB with the help of DENR MIMAROPA Regional Office. She also pointed out the generation of revenues from the commercial sale of crocodiles is advantageous to the BMB. Dir. Capistrano asked if it was being sold, Ms. Ballilia replied that it is not yet sold but there's a stock for sale but due to lack of food, she also mentioned that more than a hundred crocodiles died under the watch of the NRDC. Dir. Capistrano opined that the BMB should have come up with options such as preparation of a business plan by a GOCC. Ms. Ballilia informed that the NRDC is still involved, but the management will be transferred to the BMB. According to her, the first order of business is for the transfer of management of the PWRCC due to the poor conditions of the crocodiles. Dir. Capistrano asked if a Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA) or comparative advantage was done prior to the crafting of the proposed policy to determine the benefits that will be derived with the transfer of management of the center. In reply, Ms. Ballilia stated that none of the plans of the NRDC was pushed through. Dir. Capistrano stressed the importance of having a CSW and using policy analysis tools for the crafting of the proposed policy. She reiterated that the BMB should have come up with options, and used proper tools or science-based research before coming up with the draft policy.
- For. Ocampo (BMB) manifested agreement with the concerns raised by Dir. Capistrano. According to her, there should be a back-up for the management scheme, the determination of incomes to be generated, and the innovations. The BMB should also compare the improvements and developments under the BMB management vis-à-vis NRDC management to improve the PWRCC. She stressed that there should be a deeper analysis for the draft policy. Dir. Capistrano emphasized that she is in support of the move to improve the management of the PWRCC, but a CSW and policy analysis should be undertaken for the proposed policy.
- For. Ocampo (BMB) moved for the deferment of the proposed policy subject, to a presentation of proposed management scheme, feasibility studies, and CSW. Ms. Ballilia objected to the motion. She lamented on how they can improve the management of the centre when it is still under the NRDC. Dir. Capistrano said that since they already have the assessment of the management of PWRCC under NRDC, she asked if a memorandum or letter to NRDC was sent regarding the PWRCC based on their observations. Ms. Ballilia informed the body that there had been a face-to-face meeting. Dir. Capistrano opined that it is the responsibility of the NRDC to improve the management of the center, as it is a source of revenue. The NRDC should also be aware that it is the one responsible for facilitating possible co-management with the LGU. Mr.

Geo Tanlimco informed that a Memo was received from the BMB regarding the PWRCC management, and that the Operations Officer was asked to explain regarding the concerns of BMB. The Operations Division has come up with a template for the monitoring of the center. They required the Project Manager to submit a monthly report on the management of the center. Since there is still no designated President for the NRDC, the staff are currently reporting to the Office of Usec. Analiza Rebuelta-Teh who is the Supervising Undersecretary for NRDC. Currently, the suggestions of the Operations Division is to come up with a fact-finding team for the issues and findings that were observed. On the query of Dir. Capistrano whether NRDC has come up with a solution in terms of the observations of the BMB, Mr. Tanlimco replied that the Operations Division is discussing the matter with Usec. Teh. Dir. Capistrano asked the BMB if they provided the NRDC with a deadline for them to recover and improve the management of PWRCC, Ms. Ballilia answered that unfortunately they did not include a deadline to their memo. Dir. Capistrano suggested changing the practice of coming up with a policy to address something that is not working. She reiterated that recommendations or proposals should be based on a CSW using policy analysis tools.

- It was agreed that the proposed policy be deferred pending the conduct of CSW using policy analysis tools and based on the recommendation of the PTWG Chairperson.

Agreements:

1. Defer the proposed policy pending the conduct of CSW using policy analysis tools and based on the recommendation of the PTWG Chairperson.

3. Draft DPWH-DILG-DA-DENR Joint Administrative Order (JAO) re Establishment, Maintenance and Management of Rainwater Harvesting Systems in the Country

Presentation and Discussions:

- Dir. Capistrano inquired about who is the proponent of the draft policy. Ms. Susan Nool (CCS) informed that the CCS drafted the JAO initially due to the Secretary's meeting with Atty. Tony Oposa and the Office of the Undersecretary for Policy, Planning and International Affairs (OUPPIA). Upon drafting the policy was routed to OUPPIA and PPS for comments. However, since water resources is under the NWRB, Dir. Elenida Basug of CCS requested the former to present the same. Ms. Nool informed that this was not subjected to a meeting with the NWRB. Dir. Capistrano said we do not accept policies unless there is Complete Staff Work. For. Talania explained that the proposed policy was instructed to be reviewed already, since this is being rushed.
- Ms. Nool said when the JAO was drafted it was routed to the concerned offices for comment. PPS commented as to format and content and the draft JAO was revised. Usec Teh then instructed for the JAO to be deliberated in DENR, after which, it will be consulted to external offices like DILG, DA, and DPWH.
- Dir. Capistrano stated that the proposed policy should have been consulted first with the other agencies before coming up with a full-blown policy. She added that the proposed policy should undergo a CSW. She also asked the CCS to facilitate the consultation of the JAO the other agencies, offices and stakeholders involved such as EMB, DPWH, DILG, NWRB and DA so that their inputs are incorporated.
- Ms. Abano moved for the deferment of the proposed policy, subject to the comments and recommendations.

Agreements:

1. Defer the proposed policy, subject to the conduct of CSW and consultation with other agencies involved.

2. CCS to facilitate consultation of the draft JAO with other concerned agencies, offices and stakeholders such as EMB, DPWH, DILG, NWRB, and DA.

4. Draft DAO re Strengthening the Tamaraw Conservation Program and Providing the Implementation Mechanism Thereof

Presentation and Discussions:

- For. Ocampo (BMB) presented a brief background on the proposed policy. The policy was already reviewed by the PTWG last March 9, 2022. An agreement was reached to circulate the DAO along with the Tamaraw Conservation and Management Action Plan (TCMAP) to all PTWG members, with a deadline for submission of comments on March 18, 2022. The PPS provided comments from the PTWG on March 25, 2022. The revised DAO and TCMAP were returned on June 1, 2022.
- For. Ocampo (BMB) also presented in matrix format the comments of the PTWG on the document. On the query of Dir. Capistrano if the comments have been incorporated, For. Ocampo replied in the affirmative. Dir. Capistrano also asked if the proposed policy has undergone a CSW. In reply, Ms. Lim informed that a CSW was submitted and that the draft DAO is a product of a Foreign Assisted Project, which includes population studies and projections as well as sociological studies of the Indigenous Peoples.
- Dir. Capistrano inquired if the tamaraw population has increased, based on the interventions, and the management scheme to be implemented in case the population increases drastically. For. Ocampo (BMB) replied that the distribution sites have increased and that this is considered in the TCMAP.
- Dir. Capistrano inquired why the title is **strengthening** and asked whether there is a previous policy on the matter. For. Ocampo (BMB) informed that the only policy pertaining to the tamaraw is DAO 2005-26 on Transferring the Tamaraw Conservation Program from the PAWB to DENR MIMAROPA. Dir. Capistrano also asked if the MIMAROPA has a conservation and management plan for tamaraws. In reply, For. Ocampo (BMB) replied that the Tamaraw Conservation Program is part of the regular activities of the Regional Office.
- On Sub-section 2.2., Ms. Josefina Ocampo suggested changing the word “coordinating” to “coordination.”
- Dir. Capistrano asked who approved the TCMAP. For. Ocampo (BMB) replied that this review process will also be the approval of the document. On the query of Dir. Capistrano asked if the TCMAP was subjected to consultation with the stakeholders, For. Ocampo (BMB) replied that this was consulted in 2018. Ms. Lim informed that the approval and adoption of the TCMAP is the reason why Director Glenn Noble instructed to circulate the TCMAP and the draft DAO for review of the PTWG members.
- For. Mojica informed the body that there is a draft bill on the matter proposed by then Congressman Josephine Sato of Mindoro. Ms. Ocampo commented that the TCMAP should have already been approved first before adoption. For. Ocampo (BMB) reiterated that the TCMAP has already been consulted various times with the stakeholders and has undergone review by the PTWG members. Ms. Ocampo said even if all the comments have been incorporated, it is still not considered as approved. She inquired whether approval should be done simultaneously with the adoption. For. Mojica asked the BMB if the TCMAP was already endorsed by their Bureau Director. In the previous presentation of the draft DAO, they showed the consultations undertaken and that the DAO is well-consulted on the part of the BMB.

- Dir. Capistrano asked for clarification who the BMB Director will endorse the TCMAP and the DAO to For. Mojica clarified that it is endorsement to the DENR CO and the Planning and Programming Division of the PPS. Dir. Capistrano mentioned that she is under the impression that the TCMAP has already been approved. For. Mojica said vital questions include whether the plan is already being used. Dir. Capistrano said we are strengthening something that should already be approved. Unfortunately, it has not been approved yet. For. Mojica said the adoption and team composition was combined because of the move of Cong. Sato in her Bill. Dir. Capistrano asked if there are precedents like this where the action plan is approved together with the DAO, or if we look for approved plan before making a DAO to strengthen and adopt. For. Mojica said that for the case of FMB, they presented the contents of the Master Plan and where they are using it, which like saying that the plan has already been approved. She asked if the TCMAP is already being used and they just need a one-pager adoption. For. Ocampo (BMB) said that per her understanding, this is the plan being followed. Ms. Retos opined that the draft DAO can adopt the TCMAP because there are provisions here that are not in the plan and it sets the principles so it would be better for this to also be the adoption of the plan. Dir. Capistrano asked if the title would still be "strengthen."
- Ms. Michaela Rongavilla of DENR-MIMAROPA informed that the subject of the draft policy is strengthening since there were already prior activities on tamaraw conservation. This DAO and that it sets other rules and management mechanisms such as the creation of a management body or the Tamaraw Conservation Coordinating Council (TC3), among others. Approval and adoption were combined because certain activities are already being implemented, especially for urgent items like relocation of ranchers. This also harmonizes the activities on tamaraw.
- Dir. Capistrano asked PSD regarding their opinion on combining the management mechanisms and adoption of the TCMAP and if there are already precedents. For. Mojica called on For. Rey.
- For. Rey stated that such was his observation previously that the TCMAP should be approved first before strengthening the same. He suggested to approve the plan first and strengthen afterwards. Dir. Capistrano said the problem is it is already being used but there is no official document that this is an approved plan. She asked if there will be an issue since we are combining this. For. Rey said in his experience, there is no precedent. Ms. Lim clarified that what is being strengthened is not the TCMAP but the Tamaraw Conservation Program, which is existing. She opined that the adoption of the TCMAP should go together with the issuance of the proposed policy because the activities in the TCMAP will be implemented by the bodies to be created by the DAO such as the TC3. Moreover, the policy itself serves as the instrument for approving the TCMAP. She suggested.
- Dir. Capistrano asked about the recommendation of the PSD. For. Mojica said they go for the approval. Concurrence has already been sought for both the DAO and the TCMAP from the PTWG Members. unfortunately, not all PTWG members replied. She requested BMB to show their Matrix of Comments.
- For. Rey asked if the DAO includes the strengthening of the TCMAP. For. Ocampo (BMB) clarified the strengthening pertains to the Tamaraw Conservation Program, which is an existing program of the DENR. The plan is the implementation. For. Rey asked if the implementation of the program is based on the plan. if we adopt the plan, will we adopt the old plan being used or the new plan. For. Ocampo (BMB) said we are adopting the new plan. In response, Ms. Rongavilla said we are strengthening the program, in existence since the 1970s. For this draft DAO, they are providing a structure. In 1996, an action plan was drafted but was never adopted by the DENR. In 2018, they drafted this second action plan during the Population and Habitat Viability Assessment

(PHVA) workshop and now they are requesting for its adoption. part of the draft DAO is the adoption of the plan, which is subject for review and updating every certain period of time as per the draft DAO. For. Rey asked about the precedent where the adoption and program strengthening were combined. The implementation of the program is based on the plan. He agreed with the suggestion that the adoption of the TCMAP will go together with the issuance of the policy. Dir. Capistrano asked if there are concurrences to the proposed policy. Since there was no motion, the policy will be deferred and the approved plan should first be submitted. For. Mojica asked if we are the rightful body to adopt the plan. Dir. Capistrano said we are the mechanism for our implementing offices to do the program and plan. For. Mojica asked if we issued it, we will approve the plan. Dir. Capistrano asked who should approve the TCMAP? For. Ocampo (BMB) replied that it is the Director of the BMB who will approve the document and that it is approved at the level of the BMB. This is why it has been endorsed to DENR CO for adoption. Dir. Capistrano asked if there is a document indicating that it has been approved by the BMB Director. Dir. Capistrano opined that the Plan should be approved first before adoption through a policy.

- For. Ocampo (BMB) asked for clarification on the process of approving plans and asked for specific guidelines. Dir. Capistrano said if there is a management plan, it should be approved prior to adoption. She asked if it should be approved by the Supervising Usec or endorsed by the Bureau director that it has undergone through consultation, meetings, and comments. We are also asking the Supervising Usec. to approve the plan. There should be an approved plan as it contains the strategies to be undertaken. When we see that the plan is lacking, that is when we make a DAO on strengthening and adoption.
- For. Mojica shared the case of the Philippine Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, which did not go through the PTWG but was signed nonetheless. That is one scenario. Dir. Capistrano asked who approved it. For. Mojica said that the DAO appeared suddenly and was already signed by the Secretary. The TCMAP took another route and went through the PTWG. For. Mojica suggested the issuance of a clarificatory guidance to Bureaus on the approval of management plans.
- Dir. Capistrano asked if there is an endorsement of the plan. Ms. Lim replied that both the DAO and the TCMAP were accompanied by a CSW signed by the BMB Director.
- For. Mojica asked which BMB Director endorsed the policy and TCMAP. For. Ocampo (BMB) answered it was endorsed by Asec. Ricardo Calderon. For. Mojica reiterated her suggestion to issue a clarificatory memorandum to Bureaus that plans should have endorsement of their principals and undergo review of PPS through PPD. Dir. Capistrano added that before coming up with the DAO, there should be a CSW and they should have used policy analysis tools such as Cost-Benefit Analysis.
- For. Mojica said that the PTWG should only review the draft DAO and that the attached TCMAP subject to review of the PPD. For. Ocampo (BMB) clarified that BMB will re-endorse the revised plan to the PTWG for second round of review. She also instructed the BMB to formally endorse the TCMAP to the Central Office which will be subject to another PTWG deliberation and to ensure that all attachments are taken into consideration. Ms. Ocampo informed that the draft policy was initially endorsed to the Central Office during the time of former Asec. Ricardo Calderon, and re-endorsed by Asst. Dir. Amelita DJ Ortiz.
- Ms. Ocampo moved for the deferment of the review of the proposed policy, subject to review of the TCMAP.
- Dir. Capistrano reminded the Bureaus and other policy proponents to ensure that their proposed policies have undergone CSW and policy analysis.

Agreements:

1. On Sub-section 2.2., change the word "coordinating" to "coordination.";
2. Clarificatory Memorandum shall be drafted by PSD for Bureaus' guidance on the approval of management/strategic plans. These should be endorsed/approved by their principals and should undergo review by the Planning and Programming Division. It should also emphasize that policies should have undergone CSW and policy analysis tools such as Cost-Benefit Analysis;
3. The BMB to formally re-endorse the revised DAO and approved TCMAP to DENR PPS. The TCMAP will undergo review by PPS-PPD. Afterwards, another PTWG deliberation for the DAO shall be scheduled; and
4. The discussion was deferred subject to the above agreements.

Having no other matters to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 3:30 PM.

Prepared by the Secretariat

Noted by:


MELINDA C. CAPISTRANO
OIC Director, Policy and Planning Service

DP	DENR PSD_... (Co-host, me)	Unmute	More >
	Llarina Mojica (Host)	/	/
DP	DENR PSD Observer Nehem... (Co-host)	/	/
DP	DENR PPS - Hazel Jasmine Donato (Co-host)	/	/
	DENR-PPS, Amisol Talania (Co-host)	/	/
DE	DENR-PSD Emma Liwiwa Baradi... (Co-host)	/	/
DM	DENR-PSD Mary Lou Retos (Co-host)	/	/
	PPS-PSD_MTE Enriquez (Co-host)	/	/
PH	PPS-PSD_Nim Hydee M. Eusebio (Co-host)	/	/
Z	PPS-PSD_Zayrelle Suello (Co-host)	/	/
PM	PPS MC Capistrano	/	/
AF	ASEC FO-WM FE ROSALIE R. BATION	/	/
AO	ASEC_FOWM_Jean Ocampo	/	/
AM	ASEC-WM_Shella Mae Toledo	/	/
B	BMB - Winnievir Balilia	/	/
	DENR MIMAROPA_Michaela Rongavilla	/	/
DP	DENR PENRO Palawan Rhodora Ubani	/	/
W	DENR-BMB Mirasol Ocampo	/	/
DC	DENR-LLO, CYRENAICA FLAVIANO	/	/
DM	DENRMIMAROPA_CDD_Maria Melissa L. E...	/	/
DE	DENR-Norlito Eneran	/	/

DT	DENR-OASPPFASP_Kryshlaine T. Raquel	/	/
J	DENR-OUSECFOM Jeruz Pahilanga	/	/
A	FASPS PMED Andrea Palma	/	/
FE	FMB_Claudett Endozo	/	/
	LAS Rosette Ferrer	/	/
	LMB_Lovella Luzette Galindon	/	/
M	MGB - Brian Flores	/	/
	MGB - Florian Servidad	/	/
ML	MGB Liza Manzano	/	/
MM	MGB MIMAROPA_Edwin M. Mojares	/	/
MS	MGB_PPIAD_Teodorico Sandoval	/	/
	MGB-LGSD_Cresyl Joy Arellano	/	/
	NRDC_LFA	/	/
OM	OASALA_Jobelle Munsod	/	/
OE	OASEC ESWMLGUC_Ivan Bancoro	/	/
OF	OASECFISMC_Reina Frances D. Requieron	/	/
	OASPPFASP- Flordelino Rey	/	/
OM	OUFLVE Maria Cristina Francisco	/	/
	OULAHRLA_Encarmila Panganiban	/	/
	RBCO Mylene Velasquez	/	/
W	DENR-BMB WRD	/	/

Participants (50)

Find a participant

M	MGB - Brian Flores	/	/
ML	MGB Liza Manzano	/	/
MM	MGB MIMAROPA_Edwin M. Mojares	/	/
MS	MGB_PPIAD_Teodorico Sandoval	/	/
	MGB-LGSD_Creszyl Joy Arellano	/	/
MT	MIMAROPA_TSD PENRO, Palawan	/	/
MM	MIMAROPA_CDD_Maria Melissa L. Endang...	/	/
	NRDC_LFA	/	/
OM	OASALA_Jobelle Munsod	/	/
OE	OASEC ESWMLGUC_Ivan Bancoro	/	
OF	OASECFISMCR_Reina Frances D. Requieron	/	
	OASFOLV_Josefina Ocampo	/	/
OT	OASPPFASP_Kryshlaine T. Raquel	/	/
	OCOS Ivy Nicole Gallia-Angeles	/	/
OO	Office of Asec LA-Adel Siapno	/	/
OM	OUFLVE Maria Cristina Francisco	/	/
	OULAHRLA_Encarmila Panganiban	/	/
	RBCO Mylene Velasquez	/	/
SC	SNOOFY CABAG-IRAN	/	/
W	DENR-BMB WRD	/	/

2

DP	DENR PSD_... (Co-host, me)	Unmute	More >
	PSD_Llarina Mojica (Host)	/	/
DP	DENR PPS - Hazel Jasmine Donato (Co-host)	/	
DP	DENR PSD Observer Nehemiah ... (Co-host)	/	/
	DENR-PPS_Amisol Talania (Co-host)	/	/
DE	DENR-PSD Emma Liwliwa Baradi... (Co-host)	/	/
DM	DENR-PSD Mary Lou Retos (Co-host)	/	/
	PPS-PSD_MTEnriquez (Co-host)	/	
Z	PPS-PSD_Zayrelle Suello (Co-host)	/	
PM	PPS MC Capistrano	/	/
AF	ASEC FO-WM FE ROSALIE R. BATION	/	/
AO	ASEC_FOWM_Jean Ocampo	/	/
AM	ASEC-WM_Shella Mae Toledo	/	/
	DENR MIMAROPA_Michaela Rongavilla	/	/
DP	DENR PENRO Palawan Rhodora Ubani	/	/
O	DENR_Orhee	/	/
W	DENR-BMB Mirasol Ocampo	/	/
DJ	DENR-CCS Jello Ortega	/	/
DE	DENR-Norlito Eneran	/	/
J	DENR-OUSECFOM Jeruz Pahilanga	/	/
EE	ERDB Eugene Paranaque	/	/

 FASPS PMED Andrea Palma	 	 RBCO Mylene Velasquez	 
 Geo Tanlimco	 	 DENR-BMB WRD	
 Henry Gervasio	 	 OCOS Ivy Nicole Galla-Angeles	
 LLO, Cyrenaica Flaviano			
 LMB_Lovella Luzette Galindon	 		
 MGB - Brian Flores	 		
 MGB Liza Manzano	 		
 MGB_PPIAD_Teodorico Sandoval	 		
 MIMAROPA, TSD PENRO Palawan	 		
 MIMAROPA_CDD_Maria Melissa L. Endang...	 		
 NRDC_LFA	 		
 NWRB-SNOOFY E. CABAG-IRAN	 		
 OASALA_Jobelle Munsod	 		
 OASEC ESWMLGUC_Ivan Bancoro			
 OASECFISM_CReina Frances D. Requieron			
 OASFOLV_Josefina Ocampo	 		
 OASPPFASP- Flordelino Rey	 		
 OASPPFASP_Kryshlaine T. Raquel	 		
 Office of Asec LA-Adel Siapno	 		
 OUFLVE Maria Cristina Francisco	 		
 OULAHRLA_Encarmila Panganiban	 		