



Republic of the Philippines
Department of Environment and Natural Resources
Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City
Website: <http://www.denr.gov.ph> / E-mail: web@denrgov.ph

MEMORANDUM

FOR/TO : Assistant Director, BMB
Assistant Director, ERDB
Assistant Director, EMB
Assistant Director, FMB
Assistant Director, LMB
Assistant Director, MGB
Representative (OCOS)
Representative (Office of the Undersecretary for Legal, Admin., Human Resources, and Legislative Affairs)
Representative (Office of the Undersecretary for Field Operations and Environment)
Representative (Office of the Undersecretary for Mining and and Muslim Affairs)
Representative (Office of the Undersecretary Policy, Planning and Int'l. Affairs)
Representative (Office of the Undersecretary for Finance, Information Systems and Climate Change)
Representative (Office of the Undersecretary for Indigenous Peoples Affairs & Mindanao Environmental Priority Projects)
Representative (Office of the Undersecretary for Protected Areas and Special Concerns)
Representative (Office of the Undersecretary for Enforcement)
Representative (Office of the Assistant Secretary for Policy, Planning and Foreign-Assisted and Special Projects)
Representative (Office of the Assistant Secretary for Legal)
Representative (Office of the Assistant Secretary for Field Ops.- Visayas)
Representative (Office of the Assistant Secretary for Finance, Info. Systems and Mining Concerns)
Representative (Office of the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement)
Representative (Legal Affairs Service)

FROM : The Chairperson, and OIC Director Policy and Planning Service

SUBJECT : **HIGHLIGHTS OF PTWG MEETING NO. 2021-20 HELD ON 12 OCTOBER 2021 9:30 AM**

DATE : **15 OCT 2021**

We are furnishing herewith the highlights of the above-cited meeting regarding the following topics:

1. Draft DENR Memorandum Circular (DMC) re: Guidelines for the Naming of Watersheds in the Philippines;
2. Draft DMC re: Guidelines in the Creation of Watershed Management Councils;
3. Draft DENR Administrative Order (DAO) re: Guidelines in Granting Government Agencies a Gratuitous Permit for the Special Uses of Forest Lands; and
4. Draft DAO re: Guidelines on the Development of Payments for Ecosystem Services for Water Users to Finance Watershed Management in the Philippines

FOR INFORMATION.



DENR-POLICY TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP

Highlights of Meeting No. 2021-20

October 12, 2021, 9:30 AM

Combination of Virtual Meeting via Zoom and In-Person Hybrid Meeting
PPS-PSD, 3/F DENR Bldg., Visayas Ave., Diliman, Quezon City

I. Attendees

1. Dir. Melinda C. Capistrano, Chairperson
 2. Usec. Edilberto Leonardo, OUPASC
 3. Asec. Nonita S. Caguioa, OASFISMC
 4. For. Roberto A. Oliveros, OUMMA
 5. Ms. Merianne Kate Vargas, OUE
 6. For. Flordelino Rey, OASPPFASP
 7. For. Adeluisa Siapno, OASL
 8. Atty. Camilo D. Garcia, LAS
 9. Engr. Timothy John Dizon, ERDB
 10. For. Llarina S. Mojica, PSD
 11. Ms. Judith Redulla, OUE
 12. Ms. Ma. Carina Jarabe, OUPASC
 13. For. Belly C. Cabeso, EMB
 14. Ms. Aminah Blanco, OULAHRLA
 15. For. Angelito Bisquera, FMB
 16. For. Isabelita Austria, FMB
 17. Mr. Robert John Bandol, BMB
 18. For. Lemuelle Celis, FMB
 19. For. Roland Suzon, FMB
 20. Atty. Danilo Uykieng, MGB
 21. For. Ildefonso Quilloy, FMB
 22. Ms. Rowena Tercero, BMB
 23. Mr. Daryl Cao, OUIPAMEPP
 24. For. Yarah Garcia, FMB
 25. Ms. Reina Requieron, OASFISMC
 26. For. Angelo Marquez, FMB
 27. For. Ivy Nicole G. Angeles, OCOS
 28. Mr. Christian Kevin Latiza, MGB
 29. Ms. Ma. Cristina Francisco, OUFOE
 30. Mr. Jeruz Pahilanga, OASFOV
 31. Ms. Maureen Reyes, OASFOV
 32. For. Lovella Luzette Galindon, LMB
 33. Mr. Teodorico L. Marquez, Jr., MGB
 34. Ms. Marnette B. Puthenpurekal, MGB
 35. For. Claudett Endozo, FMB
 36. For. Alicia L. Castillo, FMB
 37. For. Ma. Teresa Aquino, FMB
 38. For. Kenneth Tabliga, FMB
 39. For. Dianne Lanugan, FMB
 40. Mr. Eugene Parafaque, ERDB
 41. For. Carmina Canua, FMB
 42. Mr. Carl del Rosario, OUIPAMEPP
 43. For. Rachell Abenir, BMB
 44. Representative, OUPPIA
 45. Mr. Edwin Concepcion, EMB
 46. For. Roland M. Suzon, FMB
 47. Mr. Alejandrino Sibucan, Jr., FMB
 48. Mr. Eugene Soyosa, FMB
- Secretariat (PPS-PSD)
49. Mr. Nehemiah Leo Carlo B. Salvador
 50. For. Amisol B. Talania (Forestry)
 51. Ms. Mary Lou Retos (Lands)
 52. Ms. Ana Michelle I. Lim (Biodiversity)
 53. Ms. Maria Theresa M. Enriquez (Mines)
 54. For. Emma Liwliwa Baradi-Medina (Mines)
 55. Ms. Marlyn C. Arzaga (Research)

II. Highlights of the Meeting

The meeting commenced at 9:33 AM and was presided over by Director Melinda C. Capistrano. She enumerated the agenda for the meeting, composed of FMB draft policies. For. Tabliga proposed the inclusion in the agenda as other matters of the draft DAO on the Payment of Ecosystem Services (EPS) for Water. Asec. Caguioa moved for the approval of the agenda and had been seconded by other members.

1. Draft DENR Memorandum Circular (DMC) re Guidelines for the Naming of Watersheds in the Philippines

Presentation and Discussions:

- The background on the draft policy was discussed by For. Aquino. She presented the rationale, timeline of activities, the process for the naming of watersheds, the ridge-to-

30 reef watershed boundaries, process of naming of sub-watersheds within the ridge-to-
31 reef watershed.

32

- 33 • Director Capistrano asked whether issues have been raised on the naming of
34 watersheds, prompting the crafting of the proposed policy.

35

36 In reply, For. Aquino informed that there are instances where in different names are
37 used to refer to the same watershed, creating confusion. She emphasized the
38 importance of coming up with names for easier compilation of data for the watersheds.

39

40 On the query of Director Capistrano whether there are adverse reactions from local
41 communities who are used to the old names of watersheds, For. Aquino replied that
42 while the local communities have been used to the old names, they may also embrace
43 the proposed name. But when it comes to data, there may be confusion especially in
44 the consolidation.

45

46 Director Capistrano informed that her main concern is on the confusion that may result
47 from the naming of the watersheds.

48

- 49 • For. Siapno stressed the importance of having the watersheds named. However, this
50 should be accompanied with IEC activities. She remarked that there will be full control
51 of data if there are definite names for watersheds. It should be emphasized that there is
52 a change in the name of the watershed in order to avoid confusion.

53

54 Director Capistrano commented that the naming is also important for the policy and
55 planning aspects.

56

- 57 • For. Rey asked if the proposed policy is strictly confined to the naming of unnamed
58 watersheds, considering that there are watersheds that have already been named.

59

60 In reply, For. Castillo informed that the watersheds that were named have not yet
61 undergone the ridge-to-reef delineation.

62

- 63 • For. Oliveros asked whether other terms for “naming” may be considered. For
64 For. Siapno, the said term may be retained as it is already sufficient and clearly reflects
65 the objective of the proposed policy.

66

67

68 *Preambular*

- 69 • For. Oliveros suggested indicating the title of EO No. 192, for consistency with how
70 the other legal bases were presented. He suggested deleting the phrase “defining the
71 mandates...including watersheds.”

72

- 73 • On line 18-20 under the prefatory statement, For. Siapno suggested the revision
74 thereof as: “the following guidelines for the naming of priority watersheds in support
75 to the National Irrigation System (NIS) and other watersheds development activities in
76 the Philippines is hereby promulgated.”

77

78 *Section 3. Scope and Coverage*

79

- 80 • For. Siapno asked whether the proposed policy covers only priority watersheds or all
81 watersheds.

82

83 For. Aquino replied that the policy covers all watersheds. As such, it was agreed that
84 the term “priority” be removed.

85

86 Relatedly, For. Oliveros suggested that the same term should be removed in the
87 prefatory statement.

88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146

- For. Rey commented that the ridge-to-reef term should also be removed as it was previously agreed that the said term will be deleted in the prefatory statement.

For. Aquino replied that the ridge to-reef term will be removed and will be replaced instead with “other watersheds.”

For. Castillo commented that removing the ridge-to-reef term may cause confusion in the field as it is the delineated ridge-to-reef watersheds that will need to be named. She added that there may be misconception that it is the 143 watersheds that will be named.

For. Cabeso opined that the ridge-to-reef may be retained in Section 3 regardless of whether it was removed in the prefatory statement.

- Based on the explanation of For. Castillo, For. Rey remarked that the focus for the naming should henceforth be on the ridge-to-reef watersheds, and that “other watersheds” proposed in Section 3 should be removed.

For. Aquino informed that the universe of watersheds has been defined; FMB has delineated all the 2,224 watersheds. In the naming of watersheds, it is these watersheds that will be prioritized. The protocol for naming is for the main tributary and the sub-watersheds within the ridge-to-reef watersheds identified. Those that are considered to be third order rivers/watersheds will not be covered by the protocol, thus, the name used by the local community will be respected.

For. Rey opined that naming sub-watersheds while not tackling other watersheds which also support sub-watersheds will be discriminatory.

For. Castillo responded that all watersheds are considered ridge-to-reef. Those that are considered third order are part of the ridge-to-reef watersheds and are called sub-watersheds. The remaining small watersheds are also part of the ridge-to-reef watersheds.

- Engr. Dizon commented that if all watersheds are covered, the phrase “supporting NIS watersheds” in Section 3 should be removed.

Director Capistrano also remarked that all watersheds are priority. Based on the discussions, For. Siapno proposed that Section 3 be revised as: “This Circular shall cover the naming of all watersheds and their respective sub-watersheds adopting the ridge-to-reef approach.”

Section 4. Definition of Terms

- Director Capistrano proposed doing away with the discussions thereof, since the terms were culled out from official sources.

Section 5. Naming of Ridge-to-Reef Watershed

- For. Oliveros suggested revising the heading as “Procedures on the Naming of Ridge-to-Reef Watersheds.”

For. Siapno agreed with the comment raised by For. Oliveros but the term ridge-to-reef should be removed.

For. Bisquera explained that the succeeding section pertain to the naming of sub-watersheds within the ridge-to-reef watershed, and that there is a different procedure for such.

147 For. Siapno responded that since the sub-watershed is part of the watershed, the former
148 should be incorporated in the section. Thus, Section 6 should be subsumed under
149 Section 5.

150 Director Capistrano commented that all watersheds should already be ridge-to-reef.

151 For. Aquino stated that they will revise Section 5 based on the suggestion.

- 152
- 153 • For. Castillo commented that while it is understood that the watersheds are ridge-to-
154 reef, the same is not clear in the regions. She shared that in the IWMP, the regions still
155 submit sub-watersheds.

156 For. Aquino informed that the issuance of the policy will be accompanied with IEC, in
157 order for the regions have a better understanding of the ridge-to-reef approach and its
158 importance. It is imperative that this be considered in the planning stage. She added
159 that there should be strict evaluation of proposals.

160 Director Capistrano informed that a Planning Workshop will be conducted next week
161 which may be a venue for the IEC.

162 For. Siapno suggested that the illustrations should be part of the annexes.

- 163
- 164 • Referring to Table 1 re Naming of watersheds with identical names of main tributaries
165 in one province under Section 5.2, For. Siapno commented that the line was not clearly
166 stated. She suggested that this be clearly translated into a statement.

167 Director Capistrano manifested her agreement with For. Siapno.

168

169 *Section 7. Process flow in the Naming of Watersheds*

- 170
- 171 • (to be renumbered as 6), For. Siapno commented that the process flow should come
172 first.
 - 173 • On item 7.1, For. Oliveros asked whether the PENROs and CENROs will not be
174 involved. In reply, for Aquino informed that since the Regional Office is already
175 encompassing, the field offices were no longer indicated.
 - 176 • For. Siapno asked whether main watersheds and sub-watersheds may be incorporated
177 in one framework, or if both may be translated into a single process flow.

178 For. Aquino informed that this may be done as the processes are the same. Responding
179 to For. Siapno's suggestion, For. Bisquera commented that there is an additional
180 process in the regional office which involves the delineation of sub-watershed. Hence,
181 he suggested that the process flow on sub-watersheds be retained.

182 Director Capistrano commented that notwithstanding the additional process for sub-
183 watershed, an additional box may be added in the process flow.

184

185 *Section 8. Development of Watershed Registry*

- 186
- 187 • For. Siapno suggested deleting the term "Development" in the heading. She asked if
188 there is already a list of the watersheds under Annex A.

189 For. Aquino replied in the affirmative. This being the case, For. Siapno commented
190 that Annex A should be incorporated in the beginning of the draft policy.

191 For. Oliveros manifested his agreement with For. Siapno and proposed that this be
192 incorporated in the Section on scope and coverage. He also opined that the registry
193

205 should not only be developed but should also be maintained. Hence, he proposed the
206 inclusion of the term “maintain.”

207
208 • For. Marquez asked on the possible inclusion of a transitory provision for approved
209 integrated watershed management plans.

210
211 For. Aquino agreed with the proposal and remarked that they will insert said section.

212
213 • For. Siapno moved for the approval of the draft policy subject to comments, and the
214 termination of the discussion. This was seconded by For. Oliveros.

215
216 • Director Capistrano instructed the PTWG Secretariat to provide the proponent with the
217 revised draft policy and the agreements/comments during the deliberation.

218
219 ***Agreements:***

220
221 • Preambular:
222 - indicate the short title of EO No. 192 for consistency with the other legal bases
223 - revise line 18-20 as “the following guidelines for the naming of priority watersheds
224 in support to the National Irrigation System (NIS) and other watersheds
225 development activities in the Philippines is hereby promulgated.”

226
227 • Section 3:
228 - revise the statement as: “This Circular shall cover the naming of all watersheds and
229 their respective watersheds adopting the ridge-to-reef approach.”
230 - incorporate herein Annex A mentioned in Section 8

231
232 • Section 5:
233 - revise the heading as “Procedures in the Naming of Watersheds”
234 - incorporate as sub-sections the procedures for naming the main watersheds and the
235 sub-watersheds under Section 6
236 - incorporate the illustrations and figures in the annexes
237 - translate Table 1 into a statement

238
239 • On Section 7, the process flow should come first

240
241 • Combine the main watershed and sub-watershed into a single framework or process
242 flow as the procedures are the same

243
244 • Section 8:
245 - delete the word “Development” in the heading
246 - add the line “and maintain” after the word “develop”
247 - incorporate Annex A in the Section on Scope and Coverage

248
249 • Include a Transitory Provision for approved integrated watersheds

250
251 • PTWG Secretariat to provide the proponent a copy of the revised drafted policy and
252 agreements/comments of the body.

253
254
255 **2. Draft DMC re Guidelines in the Creation of Watershed Management Councils**

256
257 ***Presentation and Discussions:***

258
259 • For. Aquino discussed the rationale, timeline of activities, and the policy outline.
260 According to her, various WMCs have been created but there is no standard process
261 for the creation of watershed bodies for management areas.

262

263 • For. Oliveros asked on the basis for the creation of WMCs.
264
265 For. Aquino replied that the process for creation is not standardized since there is no
266 existing policy on the matter.

267
268 For. Oliveros commented that the proposed policy should be in the form of a DENR
269 Administrative Order or DAO considering that there is no policy yet on the matter.

270
271 *Preambular*

272
273 • For. Oliveros suggested indicating the title of EO No. 192, for consistency with how
274 the other legal bases were presented.

275
276 *Section 2. Objectives*

- 277
- 278 • On item 2.1, For. Marquez suggested changing the period into a semi-colon.
 - 279
 - 280 • For. Mojica informed that the proposed policy was already tackled during the time of
281 former PPS Director Eriberto C. Argete. She informed that the concern then was the
282 harmonization of the WMC with other management councils such as PAMBs,
283 WQMAs, among others. It is only recently that the proposed policy was re-submitted
284 to PPS.
 - 285
 - 286 • For. Castillo informed that a meeting was conducted with all the bureaus regarding the
287 matter. The MGB and EMB expressed agreement with the creation of the WMC. A
288 proclaimed protected area (PA) is part of the ridge-to-reef approach. Also, the
289 Regional Executive Director (RED) already represents the MGB and EMB. According
290 to her, the harmonization was already considered in the revised draft guidelines.

291
292 *Section 4. Definition of Terms*

- 293
- 294 • Director Capistrano suggested doing away with the discussion on the definition of
295 terms since the terms were based from official sources.

296
297 *Section 5. Creation and Institutionalization of the Watershed Management Council*

- 298
- 299 • On A.Provincial Level, For. Oliveros noted that the Chair is the PENRO but the
300 members are on the level of Regional Directors. He opined that at the provincial level,
301 the members should be the provincial counterpart of the member agencies. He also
302 suggested adding a representative from the Office of the Provincial Governor. Further,
303 the Co-Chair should be from the Office of the Governor or from other government
304 agencies.

305
306 Director Capistrano suggested that the NIA manager should also be changed.

307
308 For. Castillo commented that the Regional Directors were indicated as members since
309 they have supervision over concerned personnel. It was also a recommendation from
310 NIA.

311
312 On the membership, For. Oliveros suggested indicating only the member-agencies and
313 it will be up to the agency to send their representative.

314
315 Director Capistrano expressed caution that by indicating only the member-agencies,
316 representative/s that may be sent may be lacking in authority.

- 317
- 318 • For. Rey commented that other member-agencies such as the DA, DWPH, DAR, etc.
319 have provincial offices. He also asked if the council is exclusive for NIA.

320

321 For. Aquino commented that the proposed policy is not for NIA purposes but
322 generally, for watersheds.

323

324 For. Rey asked on watersheds supporting hydro-electric.

325

326 In reply, For. Aquino informed that there is a law governing such areas.

327

328 Director Capistrano remarked that if the member-agency has no office at the provincial
329 level, the invitation should state that the representative to the MWC should be
330 someone knowledgeable or clothed with authority.

331

332 For. Castillo informed that even if there is a regional council, provinces still prefer the
333 creation of a provincial WMC.

334

335 Director Capistrano commented that this will only result to confusion.

336

- 337 • On the Regional Level, Director Capistrano commented that the NDC-RDC should
338 also be designated as Co-Chairperson.

339

340 *Section 6. Term of Office*

341

- 342 • Director Capistrano asked on the inclusion of duration of two (2) years for the term of
343 office of the Chairperson, when it should be the DENR that permanently holds the
344 chairmanship of the WMC.

345

346 For. Castillo explained that it was included as there is electoral process in the council.

347

348 Director Capistrano replied that election is only done when there is no Chairperson. As
349 such, it was suggested that the first sentence be deleted.

350

- 351 • For. Rey moved for the termination of the discussions on the proposed policy, subject
352 to the comments/suggestions. This was seconded by other members of the body.

353

- 354 • Director Capistrano instructed the PTWG Secretariat to provide the proponent with the
355 revised draft policy and the agreements/comments of the body.

356

357 *Agreements:*

358

- 359 • Convert the draft policy into a DENR Administrative Order (DAO)

360

- 361 • On the preambular, indicate the title of EO 192

362

- 363 • On Section 2.1, change the period into a semi-colon

364

- 365 • On Section 5:

366 - on the WMC Provincial Level, the members should come from the provincial office
367 of the member-agencies. If the member-agency has no office at the provincial level,
368 the invitation should state that the representative to the MWC should be someone
369 knowledgeable or clothed with authority.

370 - on the WMC Regional Level, include the NEDA-RDC as Co-Chairperson

371

- 372 • On Section 6, delete the statement regarding the two-year term of the Chairperson.

373

- 374 • PTWG Secretariat to provide the proponent a copy of the revised drafted policy and
375 agreements/comments of the body.

376

377 **RECESS: 12:00 Noon and resumed session at 1:18 PM**

378

379
380 **3. Draft DENR Administrative Order (DAO) re Guidelines in Granting Government**
381 **Agencies a Gratuitous Permit for the Special Uses of Forest Lands**
382

383 *Presentation and Discussions:*
384

- 385 • The background on the draft policy was presented by For. Quilloy. He informed that
386 the proposed policy has been deliberated by the PTWG on 07 February 2020.
387
- 388 • For. Quilloy presented the proposed revisions in the draft policy, in relation to the
389 comments of Usec. Analiza Rebuelta-Teh. The proposed revisions are as follows:
390 1) The GSUP shall only have a maximum non-renewable term of five (5) years;
391 2) Only the construction (except) operation of the roads and bridges will be covered
392 by the 5-year GSUP. On the other hand, both the construction and operation of the
393 infrastructures for public service and use of such as schools, hospitals, health
394 centers, flood control facilities, water reservoir or impounding dam and its related
395 facilities, air strip, landing site, harbour, public market, public plazas, and
396 evacuation site, will be covered by the 5-year GSUP;
397 3) The RED shall have the approving authority for the 5-year GSUP;
398 4) All national agencies and LGUs with approved GSUP for the construction and
399 operation of the infrastructure projects or facilities for public service and use other
400 than roads and bridges will be required to apply for Presidential Proclamation. In
401 case the government agencies failed to apply for Presidential Proclamation within
402 the allowable period for GSUP, they will be required to apply for FLAg pursuant
403 to DAO No. 2004-59 and other related policies of special uses of forest lands; and
404 5) All national government agencies and LGUs with existing SLUP and FLAgs
405 covering non-profit government-managed projects and infra projects for public
406 service and use as enumerated in Section 3.5 of the Order may opt to apply for
407 GSUP, provided that, only the SLUPs and FLAgs deemed necessary to be
408 transformed into GSUP may be considered.
409
- 410 • For. Oliveros commented that the item 3.5 mentioned in Section 12. Transitory
411 Provision may have to be changed or adjusted accordingly.
412

413 For. Quilloy informed that they will just make the necessary revision/adjustment as
414 pointed out.
415

- 416 • For. Oliveros suggested the inclusion of a process flow for the procedures.
417
- 418 • For. Siapno suggested revising the heading of Section 5, which should not be in the
419 form of a question.
420
- 421 • On Section 6-item b, For. Galindon asked if the documents indicated therein are
422 required to be submitted by the applicant. She shared that for similar policies of LMB,
423 requirements that are secured from the DENR are no longer asked from the applicant.
424 She asked if the intention of FMB is to require this from the applicant.
425

426 For Quilloy said yes, but they could include phrase “to be issued by DENR”.
427

- 428 • On line 138, item 7.7, For. Endozo informed that the proposals considered were: 1)
429 both REDs will issue the GSUP per region, 2) RED within majority area of the project
430 will issue the GSUP, and 3) GSUP will be issued by the Undersecretary for Field
431 Operations. According to her, the recommendation of the FMB is for the
432 Undersecretary for Field Operations to issue the GSUP for projects traversing two or
433 more regions.
434

435 FMB recommends the third option to be issued by the Usec for Field Operations.
436

437 • On item 7.7, For Siapno commented that this is a grey area, particularly on how to
438 define the majority area. She opined that since there is a joint review by the regional
439 offices concerned of the application, both REDs should be responsible for endorsing
440 the same.

441
442 For. Endozo clarified that all the REDs involved will endorse the application to the
443 Undersecretary for Field Operations.

444
445 However, Director Capistrano expressed caution that several process of endorsements
446 may be contrary to the Ease of Doing Business regulation.

447
448 For. Siapno remarked that it is easier to facilitate if there is a joint meeting among the
449 regional offices concerned.

450
451 For. Quilloy informed that applications traversing 2 regions is remote case. According
452 to him, there is no such application spanning two or more regions at the moment.

453
454 • Director Capistrano agreed with the proposal of the FMB as indicated in the revised
455 draft policy.

456
457 • For. Siapno moved for the termination of the discussions on the draft policy,
458 incorporating all the comments/suggestions of the body.

459

460 *Agreements:*

461

462 • The PTWG adopted option no. 3: The GSUP and its terms and conditions shall be
463 approved by the RED. In case the project traverses two or more regions, the GSUP
464 (Appendix C.2) and its terms and conditions shall be approved by the Undersecretary
465 for Field Operations.

466

467 The proponent shall submit the application requirements to the concerned Regional
468 Office with jurisdiction over the majority area of the project. A joint-review of the
469 application and its supporting documents shall be conducted to be chaired by the
470 concerned REDs. The REDs shall endorse the same for the approval/disapproval of
471 Undersecretary for Field Operations.

472

473 • Revise the heading of Section 5 to Qualification of Applicants.

474

475 • Revisit the requirements indicated in Section 6, e.g. item b. certification as to the land
476 classification of the area being applied for GSUP.

477

478 • On Section 12, cross-check whether the Section 3.5 mentioned therein pertains to the
479 provision stated.

480

481 • Include a process flow for the procedures as an Annex.

482

483 • PTWG Secretariat to provide the proponent a copy of the revised drafted policy and
484 agreements/comments of the body.

485

486

487

488

489

490

491

492

493

494

495 **4. Other Matters**
496
497 **4.1. Draft DAO re Guidelines on the Development of Payments for Ecosystem**
498 **Services for Water Users to Finance Watershed Management in the**
499 **Philippines**

500
501 *Presentation and Discussions:*
502

- 503 • The background on the draft policy was presented by For. Austria. According to her,
504 the proposed policy is focused on developing PES schemes for water users. The
505 Phases of PES mechanism development for water users were modelled on successful
506 PES pilot initiatives such as the Bago City Environmental Protection fee. The DENR-
507 FMB replicated the PES initiatives in Bagac and Mariveles, Bataan involving certain
508 activities such as willingness to pay study, among others.

509
510 She also informed that a PES toolkit entitled “Financing Watershed Management in
511 the Philippines: A Guide in Developing Payments for Ecosystem Services Mechanism
512 for Water Users” was developed. The PES toolkit is aimed to be used by key players
513 in a PES Scheme. She discussed the definition of PES and the PES principles:
514 voluntary transaction, well-defined ecosystem services, well-defined buyers and sellers
515 of the ES, conditionality of payment for continuous supply.
516

- 517 • For. Siapno commented that the guidelines are on the institutionalization of PES. All
518 the discussions are on the roles, functions of DENR and capacity building.
519
520 • For. Oliveros also asked for the formula on how to compute the PES.
521
522 • On the subject, For. Oliveros suggested removing “development” “of” and “to finance
523 watershed management in the Philippines.” For. Austria expressed agreement with the
524 suggestion.
525

526 Director Capistrano noted that the draft policy is lacking information on how to
527 operationalize the PES.
528

- 529 • For. Oliveros commented that if the processes are provided in the Manual, the same
530 should be adopted.
531
532 • Director Capistrano asked if the proposed policy has been discussed in the FMB and
533 with other bureaus.
534

535 For. Austria replied that it was only discussed at the PRC level of the FMB.
536

537 Director Capistrano commented that there should be a standard guidelines for PES.
538

539 For. Austria informed that the BMB has developed a PES for recreation, and FMB has
540 also drafted the CAVCS policy for carbon. She agreed that the first thing that should
541 be done is the adoption of the Manual.
542

543 For. Siapno proposed a revision in line 6-8, “Guidelines on the Institutionalization and
544 Operationalization of Payments for Ecosystem Services”.

545
546 Director Capistrano replied that the first thing to be undertaken is the adoption of the
547 Manual.
548

- 549 • Director Capistrano suggested that the proposed policy adopting the Manual should be
550 presented first to other bureaus and NWRB. According to her, she fully supports the
551 initiative in coming up with the PES for water users. She also assured that funding will

552 not be an issue as Usec.Teh is also supportive of the effort. She requested that the
553 consultation with other bureaus be fast-tracked.
554

555 • For. Siapno moved for the termination of the discussion on the proposed policy,
556 subject to the comments/recommendations of the body. This was seconded by For.
557 Oliveros.
558

559 • Director Capistrano commented that adoption of the Manual and operationalization
560 should be harmonized.
561

562 **Agreements:**

- 563 • Craft a policy adopting the Manual on PES for Water Users
- 564 • Conduct a consultation with all the Bureaus and NWRB

565
566
567 There having no other matters to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 2:12 PM.
568
569

570
571
572 Prepared by the Secretariat

573 Noted by:

574
575
576
577 **MELINDA C. CAPISTRANO**
578 Director, Policy and Planning Service
579 and Chairperson, PTWG
580

