



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

The Assistant Director
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 and Chief of Staff
Representative, Office of the Undersecretary for Legal,
Administration, Human Resources, and Legislative Affairs
Representative, Office of the Undersecretary for Field Operations and
Environment
Representative, Office of the Undersecretary for Attached Agencies,
Mining and Muslim Affairs
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 Undersecretary for Solid Waste
Management & Local Government Units Concerns
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.-Luzon
Representative, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Field Ops.-
Visayas
Representative, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Field Ops.-
Mindanao and Legislative Affairs
Representative, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Finance,
Information Systems and Mining Concerns
Representative, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement
Representative, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration
and Human Resources

Representative, Legal Affairs Service
Representative, Strategic Communication and Initiatives Service
Representative, Foreign-Assisted and Special Projects Service

FROM : The OIC Director
Policy and Planning Service

SUBJECT : **HIGHLIGHTS OF THE POLICY TECHNICAL WORKING
GROUP (PTWG) MEETING NO. 2021-24 HELD ON
DECEMBER 6, 2021, 9:30 AM THROUGH IN-PERSON AND
VIRTUAL PLATFORM**

DATE : **15 DEC 2021**

Furnished herewith is the approved Highlights of the Policy Technical Working Group (PTWG) Meeting No. 2021-24 held on December 6, 2021, 9:30 AM through in-person and virtual platform, which tackled the following proposed policies:

1. Draft DENR Memorandum Order (DMO) re Prescribing an Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) System;
2. Draft DENR Administrative Order (DAO) re Guidelines for Public Participation under the Philippine Environmental Impact Statement System (PEISS) for Proposed Dredging Projects; and
3. Draft DENR Memorandum Circular (DMC) re Adopting the Environment and Natural Resource (ENR) Management Policy Digest

For information and reference.


MELINDA C. CAPISTRANO



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

DENR-POLICY TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP

Highlights of Meeting No. 2021-24

December 6, 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, PPS
 2. Dir. Norlito A. Eneran, LAS
 3. AD Edna Nuestro, FMB
 4. AD Mayumi Quintos-Natividad, ERDB
 5. Mr. Manuel D. Gerochi, PPS
 6. For. Roberto A. Oliveros, OUAAMMA
 7. For. Flordelino Rey, OASPPFASP
 8. Engr. Roberto Aguda, OASPPFASP
 9. Atty. Camilo D. Garcia, LAS
 10. For. Llarina S. Mojica, PSD
 11. Ms. Judith M. Redula, OUE
 12. Ms. Encarmila B. Panganiban, OULAHRLA
 13. Ms. Belly Cabeso, EMB
 14. Ms. Maria Cristina Francisco, OUFOE
 15. Mr. Gino Alejandro Sison, BMB
 16. Ms. Reina Frances Requieron, OASFISMIC
 17. For. Ivy Nicole G. Angeles, OCOS
 18. For. Adeluisa Siapno, OASL
 19. Ms. Winnievir Balilia, BMB
 20. Mr. Ted Sandoval, MGB
 21. Ms. Marivic Yao, EMB
 22. Ms. Ezra Luna, BMB
 23. Ms. Rita Flordeliz, PMED
 24. Mr. Gerold Allen Argonoso, MGB
 25. Mr. Richard Alamo, MGB
 26. Ms. Celeste Aquino
 27. Ms. Gina F. Pascua, LMB
 28. Ms. Blessed Joy P. Gibe
 29. Ms. Lorie Basilio, OUPPIA
 30. Mr. Buddy Punongbayan
 31. For. Jeruz Pahilanga, OASFOV
 32. Ms. Maureen N. Reyes, OASFOV
 33. For. Lovella Luzette Galindon, LMB
 34. For. Abigail Lovely Passion, FMB
 35. For. Kenneth Tabliga, FMB
 36. Mr. Eugene L. Parafaque, ERDB
 37. For. Rachell Abenir, BMB
 38. For. Claudett Endozo, FMB
 39. Mr. Jose Paolo Aragoncillo, EMB
 40. For. Maybele Umbrero, PMED
 41. For. Maricel Tadlip, PMED
 42. For. Edugives Gibas, PMED
 43. Mr. Sheen Michael King Tidadul, MGB
 44. Ms. Jemimah Torrefiel, MGB
 45. Ms. Angie Lou Alcantara, BMB
 46. Ms. Rowena Bolinas, BMB
 47. Engr. Marcial Mateo, MGB
 48. Ms. Ivy Kimberly Batecan, MGB
 49. Mr. Teodorico Marquez, Jr., MGB
 50. Engr. Henry P. Pacis, LMB
 51. Ms. Irish Mikee Wigwigan, BMB
 52. Ms. Celeste Aquino, MGB
 53. Ms. Christine Baladad, MGB
- Secretariat (PPS-PSD)
54. Mr. Nehemiah Leo Carlo B. Salvador
 55. For. Amisol B. Talania
 56. Ms. Mary Lou Retos
 57. Ms. Ana Michelle I. Lim
 58. Ms. Maria Theresa M. Enriquez
 59. For. Emma Liwliwa Baradi-Medina
 60. Ms. Cherry Winsom F. Holgado

16 **II. Highlights of the Meeting**

17
18 The meeting commenced at 9:36 AM and was presided over by Dir. Capistrano. She
19 proceeded to enumerate the agenda for the meeting. For. Rey moved for the approval of
20 the agenda, seconded by Ms. Panganiban.

21
22 **1. Draft DENR Memorandum Order (DMO) re Prescribing an Integrated**
23 **Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) System**

24
25 *Presentation and Discussions:*

26
27 The rationale of the draft policy was discussed by For. Tadlip. She informed that the
28 M&E design developed and implemented in the 1990s was not able to consider some of
29 the current operations and program/project management approaches that require strong
30 M&E. She also mentioned that some of the provisions in the latest revision to the standard
31 operating procedures or SOP are already antiquated and impractical for today's situation
32 wherein M&E-related communication is facilitated through online platforms. Moreover,
33 the M&E system is weak in the aspect of evaluation which brought about the holding of
34 numerous assessment conferences beyond what is rational, and that the interface of the
35 program/project status and performance monitoring is not well-defined.

36
37 For. Tadlip proceeded to discuss the background for the crafting of the proposed policy.
38 She enumerated the various M&E-related issuances such as the DENR Administrative
39 Order (DAO) No. 89-62 prescribing a "Standard Monitoring System for All DENR
40 Programs, Projects and Activities", DAO No. 92-33 providing for the Standard Operating
41 Procedures (SOP) Manual for Performance Monitoring of DENR Programs and Projects,
42 and DAO Nos. 99-38 and 2004-20 providing for revisions and further amendments to the
43 SOP Manual. According to her, the DENR engaged the Resources Environment and
44 Economics Center for Studies (REECS) in 2010 to update the DENR M&E System.
45 However, the output of the activity- DENR M&E System Operations Manual, was not
46 approved.

47
48 For. Tadlip presented the different activities conducted by PMED to update the M&E
49 System, such as the conduct of online survey and M&E Gaps Assessment, processing
50 and analysis of the online survey responses, consultation meetings with the different
51 M&E implementing units, drafting of the DENR Memorandum Order, consultation on
52 the draft policy with all the M&E implementing units and its annexes, enhancement of
53 the draft guidelines, and submission of the same to the Policy Technical Working Group
54 (PTWG) for review.

55
56 She also presented the salient features of the draft guidelines, the legal bases, and the
57 Implementation and Monitoring/Scope of Implementation.

58
59 Asst. Dir. Nuestro requested the proponent to discuss the roles of FASPS, Regional
60 Planning Offices and Bureaus in the M&E System before proceeding with the discussion
61 of the proposed policy. For. Tadlip and Mr. Gerochi replied that these roles/functions are
62 defined in the draft policy. However, Asst. Dir. Nuestro noted that while the draft policy
63 provides for the roles of these M&E implementing units, the current set-up was not
64 indicated.

65 For. Tadlip proceeded to discuss the draft policy. No questions were raised on the
66 prefatory statement and Section 1. Basic Policy.
67
68 On Section 2. Objective, Dir. Capistrano asked on the role/relationship of the Biodiversity
69 Corridor project vis-a-vis the M&E system. Mr. Gerochi replied that the project is
70 integrated in the M&E system, and will be considered in the project status report. Since
71 it is a special project, the same will fall under the FASPS reporting.
72
73 On the query of Dir. Capistrano if FASPS will have its own M&E system independent of
74 the Integrated M&E System, Mr. Gerochi informed that while the FASPS has its own
75 M&E system design, some elements of the report will fall under the DENR M&E. Those
76 that concern the donors are reported to the project donors. Dir. Capistrano mentioned that
77 the project status, as well as financial status will be reflected in the Integrated M&E
78 system.
79
80 On Section 3. Scope and Coverage, no question was raised.
81
82 On Section 4. Definition of Terms, Dir. Capistrano asked the proponent if the terms were
83 culled out from official sources. For. Tadlip responded that the definitions were taken
84 from the CAPB Manual and the DBM glossary of terms, including the word "target". On
85 the query of Dir. Capistrano regarding the reference for the UWM, For. Tadlip informed
86 that it was a formulation by Mr. Gerochi. Relatedly, Mr. Gerochi mentioned that there is
87 no official reference yet for the said term.
88
89 Engr. Pacis asked if the terms "monitoring" and "evaluation" may be defined separately
90 but may also have a similar meaning when combined. For. Tadlip replied that the term
91 "monitoring" refers to the progress of the project. Nevertheless, the M&E is considered
92 as an integrated process in terms of programs and projects. Dir. Capistrano surmised that
93 the definitions of monitoring and evaluation were combined. Mr. Gerochi replied that the
94 definition of M&E is composed of two components.
95
96 Engr. Pacis commented that the term "Target" may be defined for purposes of the draft
97 policy. Dir. Capistrano noted that it is based on the DBM definition. Mr. Gerochi
98 remarked that the target is the tangible goal. Engr. Pacis suggested distinguishing the
99 short-term and long-term or annual target. Mr. Gerochi mentioned about the overarching
100 goal in the logframes. The target is defined in the activities and the outcomes. When
101 applied in the draft policy, the group should decide whether the target will apply in the
102 medium-term, long-term or annual. Dir. Capistrano commented that there may be no need
103 to define the specifics, thus, maintaining the generic definition. Engr. Pacis agreed with
104 the points raised.
105
106 On Section 5. Adoption of the DENR M&E Framework, For. Tadlip informed the group
107 on the contents of the framework. For. Mojica requested that the graphical framework be
108 presented. Mr. Gerochi informed that it is a generic framework slightly adopted to the
109 DENR setting.
110
111 On the query of For. Oliveros whether the framework has passed consultation with the
112 different offices of the DENR, For. Tadlip replied in the affirmative.
113

114 For. Tadlip presented the DENR M&E Framework under Annex A. She informed that
115 the M&E System and processes involves Readiness Monitoring (RM) inputs in place,
116 followed by Progress Monitoring and Evaluation (PME) involving stakeholders response,
117 ENR program/project delivered. After 3 years, a Mid-Term Review will be conducted to
118 determine the initial gains, stakeholders responses to ENR policies, programs and
119 projects. Thereafter, PME will be conducted to gauge stakeholders response and the ENR
120 program/project delivered. After 6 years, Results Monitoring and Evaluation (RME) will
121 be undertaken to determine the impact to socio-economic objectives, outcomes-status of
122 ENR.

123
124 Mr. Gerochi emphasized that evaluation cannot be undertaken without the logical
125 framework. For. Tadlip shared that a relevant section is provided in the draft policy,
126 which will highlight the need for a logframe. She informed that the SOP and framework
127 for reports has already been disseminated by the PTWG Secretariat.

128
129 Asst. Dir. Nuestro stressed that the most important component is the process flow. She
130 again asked on the roles of the various units and offices of the Department in terms of
131 monitoring and evaluation. Mr. Gerochi remarked that what was presented was only the
132 framework. The process will be discussed later on in the draft policy. According to him,
133 the whole document should be reviewed first in order to have an understanding of the
134 overall process flow.

135
136 For. Mojica asked if the flowchart/process flow will be part of the draft policy. Mr.
137 Gerochi replied that it is part of the annexes. He also mentioned that this is specified in
138 the draft DMO, although not graphically presented. Dir. Capistrano remarked that process
139 flow may be discussed after tackling the roles and functions of the offices. Visualizing
140 the process may be discussed as the review proceeds.

141
142 On Section 6. Functions of the M&E Implementing Units and Focal Persons, Dir.
143 Capistrano suggested that the term "Functions" in the heading be replaced with the word
144 "Role." Mr. Gerochi agreed with the proposal.

145
146 On the query of Dir. Capistrano regarding the role of the Regional Planning Office, For.
147 Tadlip responded that this is provided for under Section 6.4. of the draft policy. Mr.
148 Gerochi mentioned that necessary corrections should be made for "program results and
149 outcome indicators" in the relevant provisions of the draft policy. He suggested that the
150 PMED review this. Dir. Capistrano inquired if the Administration and Finance pertains
151 only to the PENRO. For. Tadlip replied that this also applies to the Region.

152
153 Asst. Dir. Nuestro inquired on who will do the progress monitoring, results monitoring,
154 and outcome monitoring. Mr. Gerochi replied that these are provided for in the draft
155 policy. At the CENRO level, the office does not only submit but generates reports as well.
156 The planning/monitoring office will just consolidate but it is the technical divisions who
157 will monitor.

158
159 Asst. Dir. Nuestro asked on the role of the PENRO. Dir. Capistrano remarked that the
160 CENRO consolidates the progress report of the project, and the PENRO will again
161 consolidate these based on the progress report. She opined that the analysis of the project
162 should be done by the Regional Planning. As for the macro-level outcome analysis, it
163 should be PMED that should undertake the same. Nevertheless, the Bureau has a role in

164 analysing the overall progress/performance of the project such as the NGP. PMED and
165 the Bureaus will have their respective roles in the analysis of the program/project.

166

167 For. Oliveros asked on the role of the Implementing PENRO, and asked the inclusion
168 thereof in the Section, together with its role and responsibility. He added that the
169 Implementing PENRO will perform the tasks of both the CENRO and PENRO Planning.
170 Dir. Capistrano manifested her agreement with the suggestion and proposed that the
171 Implementing PENRO be added as Section 6.3. of the draft policy.

172

173 Engr. Pacis expressed support for the point raised by Asst. Dir. Nuestro regarding the role
174 of the Regional Office. Oftentimes, the M&E role of the Region is weak. Given the
175 framework, there is a need to emphasize the role of the Region. In their experience, the
176 Region does not do analysis so that the Staff Bureau has to go through the details. With
177 the proposed DMO, they hoped that the role and responsibility of the Region would be
178 defined. In addition, the workhorse are the CENROs and PENROs.

179

180 Mr. Gerochi remarked that the evaluated performance report is basically a form of
181 assessment/evaluation of performance. There is preliminary evaluation of the project at
182 the technical division of the Region. The function of the PMED is the same as that of the
183 Regional Monitoring Unit. The same function applies to the PENRO Monitoring Unit.

184

185 Dir. Capistrano noted that the word "evaluate" differs from "analysis." Engr. Pacis
186 suggested that PENRO, PMED and Regional Planning should consolidate, evaluate and
187 analyse physical and financial performance. Mr. Gerochi replied that analysis is a
188 foundation of evaluation. He suggested including both analysis and evaluation in the role
189 of the M&E implementing units. It may be that analysis could be included in the
190 evaluation, but it is emphasized that one cannot evaluate without analysis of what one is
191 trying to evaluate. According to Mr. Gerochi, evaluation is putting the analysis against a
192 set standard of performance. Analysis per se is deriving an issue out of what one is
193 observing, and these go in tandem. To emphasize the process, analysis and evaluation
194 may be used. Dir. Capistrano stated that the true essence of analysis is not being done.
195 Mr. Gerochi stated that the traditional tool of evaluating is used, which is a statistical
196 process, not analysis. Engr. Pacis shared that this was obvious during the EAGLE and the
197 OPCR Review. He asked on how the Region may be evaluated with regard to their M&E
198 Process, considering that the way they are evaluated right now, they are lumped together
199 with the field offices so that they are more focused on the operational aspect. Dir.
200 Capistrano commented that the Regional Planning is only looking at target vis-a-vis
201 accomplishment and this is something that is not preferred. A paradigm shift is needed to
202 incorporate analysis as the overall impact of our program.

203

204 Mr. Gerochi asked Engr. Pacis regarding his expectations from the analysis. In reply,
205 Engr. Pacis mentioned that in the CENRO, there should be analysis on
206 implementation/operational issues, policy issues, among others. Mr. Gerochi informed
207 that there is a narrative component in the reporting format which deals with the issues
208 encountered, performance, policy issues, issues encountered in operation which were not
209 previously required. Requiring the narrative portion in the report explaining the
210 operations and issues encountered results to analysis. These cannot be derived in the
211 statistical process. If the reports from CENROs and PENROs do not have this analysis,
212 the Region will have difficulty deriving this. To emphasize this analysis function, he

213 suggested adding this in the draft policy. Dir. Capistrano suggested that analysis be
214 incorporated in all levels of M&E.

215
216 Asst. Dir. Natividad asked on the deadlines for submission of reports. Mr. Gerochi
217 informed that the deadlines are indicated in the annexes. Dir. Capistrano suggested that
218 the deadlines/cut-offs be incorporated in a narrative format in the proposed policy. For.
219 Tadlip informed that previously, the matrix of deadline was part of the draft policy but
220 was annexed instead per recommendation of the PSD, considering that it is in landscape
221 format. Dir. Capistrano suggested that the deadline of submission be incorporated in the
222 provision on accountability or in another section. Mr. Gerochi stated that the provision
223 on deadline may be included in the accountability as there is also a punitive provision.
224 Ms. Pascua proposed the inclusion of deadlines for submission of MOVs.

225
226 For. Mojica suggested that corresponding output be also identified so the CENROs are
227 aware of the document that they will be submitting. Mr. Gerochi responded that this is
228 provided in the table. Dir. Capistrano commented that the deadline and output to be
229 submitted may be inserted in Section 7.1. in matrix form. Engr. Pacis remarked that if the
230 cut-off is subject to frequent changes, there is advantage in putting these information in
231 the annex for ease of revision.

232
233 Engr. Pacis asked on which level of physical accomplishment is being tackled in the semi-
234 annual validation. According to him, they hope that these are regional-level reports for
235 review, without going into details of physical accomplishment of the offices. Mr. Gerochi
236 replied that this pertains to physical accomplishments. He recalled that there is an annual
237 and semi-annual validation which was formerly done by PPS. Due however, to the
238 pandemic, field validation cannot be done. Hence, documentary review was resorted to.
239 The current set-up is that the sector validates and submits validation report to PMED, as
240 input to the total validation of performance. The physical examination of MOVs will be
241 done by the sector/bureau.

242
243 Engr. Pacis clarified their concern on the level of validation. He recalled that during the
244 meeting with PMED, the validation is on a per patent basis which is a bit much. He also
245 asked on the role of the Region in terms of validation of physical accomplishments.
246 According to him, the LMB may randomly check the MOVs; however, validation of
247 physical accomplishments of the field offices is clearly a function of the Region. Mr.
248 Gerochi commented that the current practice is adopted. The information is consolidated
249 in one report, to be checked and analysed individually. This is similarly done by PMED.
250 The random checking is applied if the Bureau has conducted actual field validation. Since
251 field validation is not feasible at the moment, table review/validation is done, which is on
252 a 100% basis.

253
254 According to Engr. Pacis, if the Region finds it difficult to do 100% validation of physical
255 accomplishments, this difficulty is compounded at the Bureau level. He suggested that
256 instead of the Bureaus looking into individual accomplishments for specific activities of
257 the field offices, the evaluation may be elevated at a higher level. He reiterated that the
258 Bureau may do random checking only. Mr. Gerochi commented that this is done by
259 PMED. Engr. Pacis shared that the Bureau (LMB) actually assisted PMED in validating
260 the accomplishments. Mr. Gerochi stressed that the most effective validation is by the
261 Staff Bureau as it has the manpower to perform the task. He stated that the whole Bureau
262 is structured to service management requirements and of these is monitoring. For that,

263 manpower can be basically expanded. Engr. Pacis remarked that the strategic direction is
264 to disengage with remedial functions. He mentioned that the Bureau has to monitor
265 division performance. In reply, Mr. Gerochi stated that it is not only the Planning Division
266 that is involved but the whole bureau. He mentioned that the one is to one paper validation
267 is doable and agreed that field validation may be randomly done.

268
269 Based on the discussions, Dir. Capistrano asked on whether it should be PMED or the
270 Bureau that should undertake the field validation. Mr. Gerochi replied that what is being
271 evaluated is the performance, and the skills and insight to analyse is with the Bureaus.
272 The PMED acts as the Secretary's eyes; in effect, it performs third party monitoring, and
273 independent from what the Bureau is doing. The PPS will have its own validation process
274 independent from the Bureau. According to him, the third party validation which is done
275 through contracting is in effect, being removed. He also pointed out that monitoring is
276 not the sole responsibility of PMED, and is done by all units. The Staff Bureaus were
277 created as staff of the Secretary, and thus, are integral part of the monitoring system. The
278 PMED acts as oversight of all these monitoring systems; it integrates and validates
279 everything. It sees how projects are harmonized, how the medium-term outcomes of the
280 Department are satisfied. It is also assessing based on the medium-term plan of the
281 Department. On the other hand, the Regions are assessing based on program medium-
282 term plan. Once a program M&E is developed, this is referred to the PMED for outcome
283 monitoring. The validation is principally a simple validation of whether the report is true
284 or not. However, the skill to discern what is acceptable or not is bestowed upon the
285 Bureaus. The output will be submitted to PMED and the latter will assess this against
286 what is being targeted to be achieved DENR-wide. He added that the activity is seasonal.

287
288 Dir. Capistrano noted that PMED will do random checking but the Staff Bureau should
289 totally evaluate everything. Engr. Pacis lamented that their issue is on the total validation
290 of all accomplishments. He argued that the general rule of thumb is that the closer to
291 operation, the better to validate the output. Thus, the Region should do the validation.
292 Dir. Capistrano agreed that validation should be done by the Region as they are in the
293 area. As such, evaluation will be done by the Bureau, but this should involve all regions,
294 not random regions, and with analysis. She asked on what then will be the role of PMED
295 with regard to evaluation.

296
297 Mr. Gerochi opined that validation should be distinguished from evaluation. Validation
298 of performance is just trying to see whether the performance is accurate or not. This will
299 be undertaken by the Regions, and will also be done at the Central Office level since the
300 Region basically validated on a 100% level. Dir. Capistrano asked on whether this will
301 be done by the Bureau or PMED. Mr. Gerochi responded that PMED will do random
302 checking but the Bureaus should evaluate documents at 100% basis. He stated that the
303 Bureau will only be doing table/documentary validation of submitted accomplishments.
304 All the Bureau needs to do is visually examine whether the submissions comply with the
305 reporting requirement. He stressed that there should be no problem with 100% percent
306 validation at the Bureau level. Presently, field validation cannot be done due to the
307 pandemic. Hence, documentary validation is being resorted to.

308
309 Dir. Capistrano remarked that for semi-annual and annual validation, the Bureau will
310 undertake 100% validation. On the other hand, PMED will only validate on a random
311 basis. She asked if the random validation to be undertaken by PMED will be based on the

312 report of the Bureau. In reply, Mr. Gerochi informed that this will be done using the
313 Regional Accomplishment Report.

314
315 On the query of Dir. Capistrano whether LMB does 100% table validation, Engr. Pacis
316 replied that this is being done with PMED, where they look at every activity. On her
317 query as to why validation is done with PMED, Ms. Pascua related that under the present
318 set-up, PMED provides the Bureau with copies of MOVs of Regions as for table
319 validation. On the submission of MOVs, Dir. Capistrano noted that based on the proposed
320 policy, these will now be forwarded directly to the Bureaus, copy furnished PMED.

321
322 Asst. Dir. Nuestro manifested her support to the position of Engr. Pacis. She opined that
323 the role of PMED should be reviewed based on EO 366. The role of the Bureau is on
324 technical monitoring, thus, they are assigned with Units of Work Measure (UWM) as
325 standards. She added that there should be some sort of levelling off. According to her,
326 most of the activities done by the Central Office are being passed to the Staff Bureaus,
327 including review of applications, etc. She stated that the draft policy captures the present
328 set-up which they do not agree with.

329
330 Mr. Gerochi stated that the physical accomplishment is a technical output. Asst. Dir.
331 Nuestro commented that the monitoring result of PMED will be an input to the Bureau's
332 policies. Mr. Gerochi countered that this is a wrong assumption and interpretation of their
333 functions. He stressed that performance monitoring of projects is technical monitoring.
334 Engr. Pacis observed that it is the role of the Regions that is missing, including their
335 capacity to provide monitoring, planning, etc. With the current role of the Staff Bureaus
336 in terms of monitoring operations, they are unable to gain technical expertise at the level
337 of the Region. Mr. Gerochi commented that the field offices can coordinate directly with
338 the Bureaus on technical matters. He added that the Region is now required to do 100%
339 validation. The Bureau will serve as a second tier validator, where they will check the
340 report of output.

341
342 Engr. Pacis stated that their issue is on the Bureau's individual review of each output. Mr.
343 Gerochi commented that they are checking report of outputs. Engr. Pacis proposed that
344 the Bureau will not look one by one at the reports but on the overall performance. Mr.
345 Gerochi replied that not looking into individual reports may affect the accuracy of the
346 validation report. However, as long as the Bureau can attest to the accuracy of the
347 validation report, then this may be acceptable. He cautioned that the validated report will
348 be used for the Performance-Based Bonus. Engr. Pacis mentioned that the Region will do
349 100% validation, and if they also check it 100%, they will duplicate this. Mr. Gerochi
350 commented that this may be so for as long as the integrity of the report is not
351 compromised.

352
353 Engr. Pacis mentioned at the end of the day, PMED will rely on the Bureau's expertise
354 for the report. According to him, there are multiple sectors where PMED may do random
355 validation. Mr. Gerochi commented that PMED's evaluation is focused on the sectors
356 where they see problems. The PMED has its own system of validation. For Staff Bureaus,
357 it is ideal for them to review and validate at 100% as it will affect the integrity of the
358 report.

359

360 Dir. Capistrano noted the refusal of the Staff Bureaus Planning to do validation at 100%
361 level. Engr. Pacis clarified this to mean as reviewing each and every output individually.
362 Dir. Capistrano also manifested her disagreement that MOVs be submitted to the Staff
363 Bureau because MOVs are actually supposed to be submitted to PMED in view of the
364 PBB. Mr. Gerochi replied that validation eats up a lot of work which could instead be
365 used for other higher value activities.

366
367 Dir. Capistrano observed that with the proposal, PMED will be left without work as all
368 the effort goes to the Bureaus. She reiterated that the 100% validation should be done by
369 the Region. She asked the reason for the transfer of direct submission of reports from
370 PMED to the Bureaus. Mr. Gerochi replied that the skill to determine is with the Bureau.
371 Dir. Capistrano compared the set-up of PMED to NEDA, where they consult the Bureaus.
372 She stressed that the accountability should rest with the PMED and not the Bureau. Mr.
373 Gerochi commented that what is validated are the outputs of the project. It is PMED that
374 is responsible for the overall validation/evaluation of projects, but technical evaluation is
375 the responsibility of the Staff Bureaus. Dir. Capistrano remarked that Bureaus have done
376 their role in terms of policy issuance. Mr. Gerochi stated that a project is just an activity
377 under the program.

378
379 Dir. Capistrano suggested that another discussion with the Staff Bureau be conducted,
380 given the violent reactions from the latter. The details should be defined and ironed out
381 during the consultation. She noted that these issues arise as the Bureaus did not raise
382 questions during the consultations. Mr. Gerochi commented that the problem is the lack
383 of common understanding of functions. He stressed that M&E is not the sole
384 responsibility of PMED.

385
386 Dr. Eneran moved that the policy be referred to the proponent for discussion with the
387 Staff bureaus. This was seconded by For. Mojica. Dir. Eneran stressed that the functions
388 of the respective offices in terms of the type of M&E to be done should be discussed. He
389 also suggested that the PTWG should be given information on the attendees to the
390 consultation, their commitments, as well as the agreements.

391
392 Dir. Capistrano terminated the discussion on the proposed policy, subject to consultation.
393 She stated that the principals from the Bureaus should be the ones to attend the
394 consultation.

395
396

Agreements:

397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408

1. On Section 6:
 - In the heading of Section 6, replace the word “Functions” with “Role”;
 - Revise the line “program/project indicators” as “program results and outcome indicators”;
 - Add as Section 6.3. the Implementing PENRO and its respective role/responsibility in terms of monitoring and evaluation, and generation of reports; and
 - Include “analyze (analysis)” among the roles of all the M&E implementing units. Analysis should be incorporated at all levels of M&E;
2. On Section 7.1., the deadline for submission of reports, the MOVs and the output/s should be written in a narrative format and incorporated in the draft policy.

- 409 3. PMED to conduct further consultation with the Staff Bureaus in order to settle the
410 issues raised during the meeting, particularly on the role of these Bureaus and
411 PMED in terms of validation of physical accomplishments. The principals from the
412 Bureaus should attend the consultation. PMED should provide the PTWG
413 information on the attendees during the consultation, their commitments, as well as
414 the agreements reached.
- 415 4. Further discussion on the proposed policy was deferred, subject to the consultation
416 with the Staff Bureaus.

417
418 **2. Draft DENR Administrative Order (DAO) re Guidelines for Public Participation**
419 **under the Philippine Environmental Impact Statement System (PEISS) for**
420 **Proposed Dredging Projects**

421
422 *Presentation and Discussions:*

423
424 Engr. Yao informed that the draft policy was already deliberated by the PTWG on July
425 6, 2021, but returned to EMB in view of the comments from Usec. Analiza R. Teh.

426
427 Dir. Capistrano asked on the procedure for draft policies that have been reviewed by the
428 PTWG. Based on her understanding, proposed policies that have already been deliberated
429 will no longer have to be reviewed again by the PTWG. For. Mojica informed that the
430 proposed policy is already on the process of vetting, but was returned to the proponent
431 for review based on the comments of Usec. Teh.

432
433 The PTWG secretariat presented the comments of Usec. Teh. On the title/subject, Engr.
434 Yao informed that the EMB adopted the proposal of Usec. Teh.

435
436 Dir. Eneran asked if the proposed additions to the title will, in effect, limit the guidelines
437 to Section 5.4. of MJC 2019-01. He suggested that the guidelines be reviewed to
438 determine if it is in accordance with the provision. He noted that proposed guidelines for
439 public participation is in accordance with the JMC of the different agencies. Engr. Yao
440 replied in the affirmative and explained that such really is the intention, which is to limit
441 the guidelines to Section 5.4. of the JMC. However, adopting the proposal of Usec. Teh
442 will result in a longer title/subject for the proposed policy. Dir. Eneran asked that the
443 particular provision of the JMC be presented. Engr. Yao informed that said section is
444 brief and confined only to the role of the DENR. The provision states that the DENR
445 restoration through dredging activities shall be covered by a separate order to be issued
446 by the Department.

447
448 On the query of Dir. Eneran whether JMC 2019-01 has passed through the PTWG before
449 signing by the Secretary, Engr. Yao replied that she is not aware if this passed through
450 the PTWG and if endorsed by the MGB to the PTWG, as it was originally drafted by the
451 DPWH and handled by the MGB.

452
453 Dir. Eneran mentioned that the draft policy is assailed in the ARTA as there are various
454 complaints thereon. Engr. Yao replied that she is not aware if there are such cases. Dir.
455 Eneran explained that the reason he commented on the draft policy is to know if there are
456 such cases. He suggested that the EMB or MGB check if there is an existing case on the
457 matter, so that the body can adjust accordingly.

459 Engr. Sandoval informed that the JMC was drafted by the DPWH, with participation of
460 the MGB. He added that it was the DENR that finalized it. From this JMC, succeeding
461 DAOs were issued. Before the issuance of DAO 2020-07, there were other DAOs were
462 issued applicable to some areas such Negros, Mindoro, and Zambales. The MGB has no
463 participation in the crafting of these DAOs, and that these involved the efforts of the
464 DENR. Issues emanated which were addressed by the policies/amendments such as those
465 concerning economic zones, highly urbanized cities, and component cities. The rationale
466 of the comment of Usec. Teh is to limit the focus on Section 5.4.- the reference for river
467 restoration, which is within the mandate of the DENR. The formation of the interagency
468 committee for dredging, where the Governor is the chairperson, was addressed in the
469 latest amendment of DAO No. 2020-07.

470
471 Dir. Eneran asked on the status of the pending cases questioning the validity of the JMC.
472 Engr. Sandoval replied that so far, MGB has not encountered any problems. The issue
473 could be in the gaps previously identified and these have been addressed by the
474 amendments. He mentioned that one such issue is the chairmanship of the Inter-Agency
475 Committee (IAC) within economic zones- whether the Governor or the Chairperson of
476 the economic zone, but this was already addressed by the DAO. To his knowledge, there
477 is no pending case at their level. Engr. Yao also stated that they have not heard of any
478 case on this. She related that during the RD's meeting, they raised that the requirements
479 of 2017-15 are stringent for restoration projects so the process for river restoration
480 projects was separated. They do not have issues with the JMC because it clarified the
481 roles and responsibilities among the agencies. The DAO however pertains to large-scale
482 dredging and public participation should be conducted. The process was devolved to the
483 Regional Offices to facilitate the issuance of the ECC.

484
485 Engr. Sandoval added that with respect to programmatic EIA, item 4, Section 2, of the
486 mother DAO requires programmatic EIA by the EMB RD. One of their concerns is if
487 there is only one contractor for the whole river system. In that case, a programmatic EIA
488 will not be needed but rather individual issuance. He suggested its inclusion in the draft
489 DAO. Engr. Yao replied that they cannot include such in the draft DAO considering that
490 subject only pertains to public participation. She informed that the EMB received a Memo
491 from DENR-MIMAROPA on this issue and their response is that a programmatic EIA
492 can still be done wherein they will consider the cumulative impact of dredging operation.
493 However, this is a bigger study compared to the Regular EIA.

494
495 Dir. Eneran asked whether river restoration should be treated as extractive and not
496 restoration. Engr. Yao replied that the process is not purely restorative as dredged
497 material will potentially have commercial value. The contractors are required to secure
498 ECC under Section 3 of the DAO, hence, public participation is necessary.

499
500 On the suggestion of Usec. Teh regarding the subject, Dir. Eneran proposed abbreviating
501 the same and to directly connect it with the JMC, i.e., Implementing Guidelines of Section
502 5.4 of JMC 2019-01.

503
504 Dir. Eneran asked on the amendments in the proposed policy. Engr. Yao replied that
505 series of meetings with concerned stakeholders will be conducted instead of a public
506 hearing. According to her, it is a lighter version of public participation. The matter was
507 brought up during the RDs meeting with the MGB. On the query of Dir. Eneran whether

508 this will not violate PD 1586, Engr. Yao replied that public participation was not
509 mentioned in the said law, but only in the DENR policies.

510
511 The PTWG Secretariat presented the other suggestions/reformulations of Usec. Teh such
512 as the rationale. Engr. Yao remarked that the reformulation is acceptable to the EMB.
513 Other suggestions are in the scope and coverage, definition of terms and heading of
514 Section 5.

515
516 Considering that all the proposals of Usec. Teh were adopted by the EMB and since there
517 are no other contentious issues, For. Oliveros moved for the approval of the proposed
518 policy. Dir. Eneran seconded the motion as long as the policy has passed consultation
519 with stakeholders.

520
521 ***Agreements:***

- 522
523 1. The subject should be abbreviated as "Guidelines for Public Participation under
524 Section 5.4. of JMC 2019-01"
525 2. The PTWG adopted the reformulation of Usec. Teh regarding the introductory
526 paragraph and rationale, scope and coverage, definition of terms and heading of
527 Section 5.

528
529 **3. Draft DENR Memorandum Circular (DMC) re Adopting the Environment and**
530 **Natural Resources (ENR) Management Policy Digest**

531
532 ***Presentation and Discussions:***

533
534 For. Mojica requested for deferment of the draft policy as there are policies that are yet
535 to be updated. A mini consultation will be conducted to review the proposed Policy
536 Digest.

537
538 For. Oliveros moved for the deferment of the discussion on the proposed policy,
539 considering the ongoing review of the one tenure instrument and the enforcement aspect.
540 This was seconded by Asst. Dir. Natividad.

541
542 There having no other matters to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 1:39 PM.

543
544

545
546

547
548

549
550

551
552

553
554

555
556












557

Prepared by the Secretariat *mm*

Noted by:

aml

Melinda C. Capistrano
MELINDA C. CAPISTRANO
Director, Policy and Planning Service
and Chairperson, PTWG
len

	DENR PSD - Missy Lim (Co-host, me)		
	DENR PSD Nehemiah Salvador (Host)		
	Maricel Tadlip (Co-host)		
	DENR PPS - Llarina Mojica		
	Cherry Winsom Holgado (Co-host)		
	DENR-PSD Mary Lou Retos (Co-host)		
	Emma Liwliwa Baradi-Medina (Co-host)		
	PSD-Amisol Talania (Co-host)		
	Chairperson - Melinda Capistrano		
	PPS - Manuel Gerochi		
	Assistant Secretary for Policy, Planning and...		
	BMB - Angie Lou Alcantara		
	BMB - Ezra Luna		
	BMB - Gino Alejandro Sison		
	BMB - Rachell Abenir		
	BMB - Winnievir Balilia		
	BMB Rowena Bolinas		
	BMB-CMD IRISH MIKEE WIGWIGAN		
	DENR PMED - eduviges gibas		
	DENR PMED - Maybele Umbrero		
	-----		

558
559
560
561
562
563

	DENR PMED - Rita Flordeliz		
	DENR PSD - tess enriquez		
	EMB Marivic Yao		
	EMB-EIAMD - Jose Paolo Aragoncillo		
	FMB - AD Edna Nuestro		
	FMB - Claudett Endozo		
	FMB Kenneth Tabliga		
	FMB_Abegail Lovely Pasion		
	LAS - Garcia, Camilo		
	LMB - Gina Pascua		
	LMB - Henry Pacis		
	LMB - Lovella Luzette Galindon		
	MGB - Celeste Aquino		
	MGB - Gerold Allen Argonoso		
	MGB - Gibe, Blessed Joy P.		
	MGB - Ivy Kimberly Batecan		
	MGB - Sheen Michael King Tidadul		
	MGB - Ted Sandoval		
	MGB PPIAD Jemimah Torrefiel		
	MGB richard alamo		

565
566
567
568
569

	LMB - Lovella Luzette Galindon	  
	MGB - Celeste Aquino	 
	MGB - Gerold Allen Argonoso	 
	MGB - Gibe, Blessed Joy P.	 
	MGB - Ivy Kimberly Batecan	 
	MGB - Sheen Michael King Tidadul	
	MGB - Ted Sandoval	 
	MGB PPIAD Jemimah Torrefiel	 
	MGB Richard Alamo	 
	OASECFOV_Jeruz Pahilanga_DMOI	 
	OASFISM - Reina Frances D. Requieron	
	OASFO-Visayas Maureen Reyes	 
	OASPPFASP-Flordelino Rey	 
	OCOS Ivy Nicole Galla-Angeles	 
	OUAAMMA - ROBERTO A. OLIVEROS	 
	OUE - JUDITH REDULA	 
	OUFOE Maria Cristina Francisco	
	OULAHRLA - Encarmila Panganiban	 
	TEODORICO, JR. MARQUEZ	 
	Vice Chair - Norlito Eneran	 

570
571
572
573
574
575

576
577

IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING PLAN/ SCOPE OF IMPLEMENTATION

1. All M&E Implementing units shall be the users of this Order.
2. It shall serve as a guide for DENR planning officers, M&E staff, budget officers in efficiently undertaking the M&E System.
3. It covers the implementation of all programs and projects, including foreign-assisted and special projects either to be implemented on an annual basis or multi-year
4. The proposed DENR M&E Framework will essentially guide the implementation and execution of the DENR Integrated M&E System.
5. The draft Order shall integrate and enhance all the existing M&E Systems DENR-wide. It establishes a new system, thus, all issuances relative to the monitoring, evaluation and reporting of performance of the Department shall be repealed or amended accordingly.

578
579
580
581
582
583

SUBJECT: PREScribing AN INTEGRATED MONITORING AND EVALUATION (M&E) SYSTEM

Pursuant to Executive Order (E.O.) No. 192, s. 1987 or the Reorganization Act of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources, E.O. No. 366 s. 2004 entitled "Directing a Strategic Review of the Operations and Organizations of the Executive Branch and Providing Options and Incentives for Government Employees who may be Affected by the Rationalization of the Functions and Agencies of the Executive Branch," DENR Administrative Order (DAO) No. 2014-01 entitled "Adopting the New DENR Organizational Structure Pursuant to E.O. 366 and the Rationalization Plan duly Approved by the Department of Budget and Management," and DAO No. 2018-18 entitled "Establishing a Centralized Management and Coordinative Mechanism at the Regional Offices of DENR, MGB, and EMB, and Designating the DENR Regional Director as the Regional Executive Director Providing Overall Command of Regional Operations," an Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) System is hereby prescribed. 1

SECTION 1. Basic Policy. It is the policy of the State to ensure the sustainable use, development, management, protection and conservation of the country's environment and natural resources, as well as to ensure equitable sharing of the benefits derived therefrom for the welfare of the present and future generations. In pursuance thereof, the DENR is

584
585
586
587

