



MEMORANDUM

TO : **LUZON REGIONAL OFFICES**
The Regional Executive Directors
The Environmental Management Bureau Regional Directors
The Mines and Geosciences Bureau Regional Directors

FROM : **THE OIC ASSISTANT SECRETARY**
Field Operations Luzon and Visayas

SUBJECT : **HIGHLIGHTS OF THE LUZON CLUSTER QUARTERLY MEETING HELD VIA ZOOM ON JUNE 23, 2022**

DATE : **30 JUN 2022**

This is to provide you a copy of the Highlights of the Luzon Cluster Quarterly Meeting held via Zoom on June 23, 2022. The 2nd Quarter Luzon Cluster meeting aimed to present the responses/comments of the concerned bureaus on the issues and concerns raised during the 4th Quarter Luzon Cluster meeting; and present and discuss the selected current and emerging issues submitted by the Regional Executive Directors.

The submitted issues and concerns of the Luzon Cluster had been consolidated. Please note that OASFLV staff compiled eleven (11) issues to be included in the agenda, but two (2) more issues were added during the discussion, thus ended with a total of 13 issues. The presented issues and concerns and the discussion of the agreements are shown in the table. If you have questions and clarifications, kindly email it to asecfosl.denr@yahoo.com.

| Agreements/discussions: | | |
|---|--|---------------------------------|
| Issues/Concerns/Agenda | Discussions/Agreements | Concerned Office |
| 1. R1, 4B - Delayed approval of the CY 2022 WFP particularly targets under NGP and Protected Area | This issue has been resolved as WFP was approved on June 3, 2022 | N/A |
| 2. CAR, NCR, R2, 4A - Absence of hauling truck and limited depository area for apprehended/seized forest products | CAR already purchased a hauling track as funds was released to them. Similarly, 4A was also given funds and already purchased a hauling track. However, they have problems on their depository areas. The regions are suggesting to have a standard design for depository areas. Thus, PENRO/CENRO can propose a design. For confiscated vehicles, CAR had coordinated with the LTO for the transfer of vehicles. The confiscated vehicle was utilized as additional service of the office. NCR clarified having no funds to | Regional Offices, PENROS/CENROs |

| | | |
|---|--|-----|
| | <p>purchase a hauling track neither construct depository area. But they have already identified site intended for their depository area. It was mentioned that they already made a request for the allocation of funds.</p> <p>OASFLV - This issue is also similar with the other regions. Thus, the regions, PENROs/CENROs can submit appropriate design to come up with a standard design for depository areas.</p> | |
| <p>3. CAR, 4A, R2, R5, 4B - LAWIN Application cannot be installed/incompatible in the latest geo-tagging devices/smart phones</p> | <p>R5 - LAWIN application is not compatible with the new devices. They mentioned that this issue has been raised to the FMB but, they have not received any response to date.</p> <p>4A – Reiterated experiencing similar issue as to the concerned of R5.</p> <p>OASFLV – The office will make the necessary representation with the FMB. Perhaps, necessary adjustment or equipment for the LAWIN application is required to resolve this issue.</p> | FMB |
| | <p>CAR – Also confirmed that LAWIN app is incompatible with other devices. Unfortunately, most of the old devices issued are no longer functioning.</p> | |
| <p>4. CAR - Online approval and issuance of CNC/ECC within PAs without proper validation on the ground</p> | <p>CAR – Explained that Certificate of non-coverage should not be issued in areas within NIPAS. However, there are CNCs granted online. It was suggested that necessary adjustments are required for online program. They added that for the meantime, the areas issued with CNCs have been validated to determine whether the area is outside or within ECA.</p> <p>OASFLV - Clarified that supposedly, ECC inside PA will not be issued unless approved by the PAMB. Thus, the office will make the necessary representation with the EMB as this was also observed in foreshore areas and forestlands where ECC was issued even without the proper tenurial instrument. As a rule of thumb, tenurial instrument must be approved prior to the application of ECC. This issue is similar in Boracay and this should be understood before any development should be undertaken. Possibly, will initiate a meeting to further discuss these processes.</p> | EMB |

| | | |
|---|---|-----|
| | <p>Atty. Sopsop mentioned the scheduled consultation within the 3rd week of July in Panglao, Bohol and could be an opportunity to discuss this issue with the EMB. The said scheduled consultation was noted to further discuss the issue.</p> <p>EMB CAR – Stressed that CNCs issued online are validated as they are required to submit the areas validated every month.</p> | |
| 5. NCR - There is no minimum lot area for RFPA especially in urban areas | <p>NCR – Explained that there are areas less than 10sqm having structures but not livable for habitation.</p> <p>OASFLV – Illuminated to have consideration on the use of the area, or have restriction on any development. For purposes of titling, it might not have restrictions but, the LGU would have requirements for the use of the area e.g for sanitation, building code and therefore, other clearances might be needed.</p> <p>NCR – Said that this will be relayed to RED Caancan.</p> <p>R1- Shared that they adapted the 22sqm socialized housing.</p> <p>OASFLV - The design could be for multi-level. Moreover, we will note on what the LMB could provide to enlighten everyone on this issue. In addition, Titling may not be a problem but there is a need to comply with the requirements of the other government agencies like LGU.</p> | LMB |
| 6. NCR - There is no specific guidelines in establishing the claim of an individual in the issuance of Survey Authority | <p>NCR – Although there are basic requirements for establishing the claim of an individual, there are also complex cases to be considered in establishing the claims of individual for example, the listed claimant is erroneous or does not exist/cannot be located. The conflict has not escalated to a formal complaint or multiple claimants. It could be the conduct of investigation for survey authority is subjective and the documents presented by the proponent varied. Currently, they are crafting a procedural manual for the conduct of investigation pursuant to ISO standard.</p> <p>CAR - There is a manual for survey and the requirements are included in the manual. So, there is already a specific guideline and everybody can check the procedure regarding land survey. The</p> | LMB |

| | | |
|--|--|-----|
| | <p>process which was highlighted is to first resolve the conflict for multiple claimants and then issue the survey authority for the winning party.</p> <p>OASFOLV - As it was explained, it can be checked to the manual for guidance. Moreover, this issue will then be forwarded to the LMB. Meanwhile, advice the SMD of NCR to visit the provision in the survey manual.</p> | |
| 7. CAR - No allotted funds for the conduct of FPIC for NGP areas | CAR - This issue was already discussed in the meeting with NCIP. | N/A |
| 8. CAR- Reclamation of river banks by private individuals | CAR – It was suggested to remove this issue as they have affirmed that this was not a reclamation, instead it is a stock file. Thus, it was agreed to discard this issue. | N/A |
| 9. R3 - Re-establishment of control points/ references and relocation of lots affected by Mt Pinatubo | <p>R3 - This was an issue particularly in towns of Bacolor, Florida Blanca and Porac. After Mt. Pinatubo has erupted, these areas were covered by lahar for a dept of about 30-40 meters. Thus, established control points are gone/missing. Now that it is under mining, the LMS is needing to re-establish the missing mojon. This activity was proposed in the 2022 WFP but unfortunately, it was not included in the approved WFP. Considering this activity is crucial in the identified areas, they will again propose the said activity for possible inclusion in the 2023 budget. It was emphasized that Dir. Talabis has a positive response on this issue and is willing to provide assistance to resolve the issue.</p> <p>OASFLV – This office will make a follow-up with LMB regarding the request of R3.</p> | LMB |
| 10. R2 - Expired/expiring CBFMAs within PAs covered with Certificate of Ancestral Domain Title (CADT) | This issue was already included in the discussion during the meeting with the NCIP | N/A |
| 11. 4A - Suspension on the issuance of survey authority, approval of plans, and issuance of patents over area covered by PP 1637 | <p>R4A - There is a recommendation for the lifting of suspension and it has forwarded to the bureau. However, we're not sure whether this has been forwarded to the Secretary.</p> <p>OASFLV - Considering this is a specific issue, the region can make a direct follow up. Nevertheless, this office will also make a follow up to determine the status of the suspension with Dir. Talabis.</p> | LMB |

| | | |
|--|--|---------------|
| 12. R5 – No guidelines on the renewal of Certificate of Stewardship Contract (CSC) | <p>R5 – Assessment of Certificate of Stewardship Contract (CSC) outside CBFM areas was conducted. It was added that follow up with the FMB regarding the guidelines on the renewal of CSC is needed.</p> <p>4B – They have conducted orientation on CSC evaluation but, it was discovered that the holders already changed their residency and their relatives are the one currently managing the CSC areas. It was recommended to have consideration on the transfer of CSC areas to their relatives and not only to the next of kin.</p> <p>R2 – It was observed that most of the CSC holders are hard to find/locate and during the course of interview with some CSC holders, it was found out that CSC holders already sold the area. Based on the assessment/evaluation, the CSCs were already sold and/or titled.</p> | FMB |
| 13. R5 - In the new manual of authority particularly DAO 2018-10, wherein the authority is given to the RED. | <p>R5 – In the WFP there are targets of appraisal of foreshore to be endorsed to the FMB, but in the new manual of authority the appraisal is now within the level of the RED. To harmonize the action, this issue could be discussed with the planning.</p> <p>OASFLV – It will be checked whether devolved functions are included in the revised manual. Moreover, this issue will be referred to the Planning, if necessary, adjustment is needed and to be taken up at the Central Office.</p> | LMB, Planning |

For information and appropriate action.


GILBERT C. GONZALES, CESO III