1,



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

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 Secretary/ Head Executive Assistant Representative, Office of the Undersecretary for Legal,

Administration, Human Resources and Legislative Affairs

Representative, Office of the Undersecretary for Finance, Information Systems and Climate Change

Representative, Office of the Undersecretary Policy, Planning and International Affairs

Representative, Office of the Undersecretary for Field Operations (FO)
- Luzon, Visayas and Environment

Representative, Office of the Undersecretary for FO - Mindanao Representative, Office of the Undersecretary for Enforcement, Solid Waste Management, Local Government Units Concerns and Attached Agencies

Representative, Office of the Undersecretary for Special Concerns, Muslim Affairs and BARMM

Representative, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Policy, Planning and Foreign-Assisted and Special Projects

Representative, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement, Solid Waste Management and Local Government Units Concerns Representative, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Legal Affairs Representative, Office of the Assistant Secretary for FO - Luzon and Visavas

Representative, Office of the Assistant Secretary for FO - Eastern Mindanao

Representative, Office of the Assistant Secretary for FO - 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 Administration and Legislative Affairs

Representative, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Indigenous Peoples Affairs

Representative, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Special Concerns-Mindanao

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

FROM

1

The OIC Director

Policy and Planning Service

SUBJECT:

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE POLICY TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP (PTWG) MEETING NO. 2022-04 HELD ON MAY 11, 2022, 9:00 AM THROUGH IN-PERSON AND ZOOM

PLATFORM

DATE

1 9 MAY 2022

Furnished herewith is the Highlights of the Policy Technical Working Group (PTWG) Meeting No. 2022-04 held on May 11, 2022, 9:00 AM through in-person and Zoom platform, which tackled the following proposed policies:

- 1. Draft DENR Administrative Order (DAO) re Delegation of Authority to Approve Land Surveys to the Chief of Surveys and Mapping Division; and
- 2. Draft DENR Memorandum Order (DMO) re Guidelines on the Operationalization, Administration, and Proper Use of External DENR Web Portal (EDWP) and Regional External DENR Web Portal (REDWP)

For your information.

GLEAN TIARCELO C. NOBLE

4

7 8 9 10

11

14

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 Meeting No. 2022-04

May 11, 2022, 9:00 AM

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

12 13 Attendees

1.	Dir.	Glenn	Marcelo	C.	Noble,	PPS

- Asec. Hiro V. Masuda, OASHRSCSI 2.
- Asst. Dir. Mayumi Q. Natividad, ERDB 3.
- 4. Mr. Chito B. Reyes, OSEC/OHEA
- 5. For. Llarina S. Mojica, PSD
- 6. Ms. Maria Cristina Francisco, OUFOLVE
- 7. Engr. Roberto M. Aguda, OASPPFASP
- 8. Ms. Ma. Rainelda Ferraris, SCIS
- For. Adele Siapno, OASL 9.
- 10 Mr. Juan B. Ebora, ERDB
- 11. For. Flordelino Rey, OASPPFASP
- 12. Mr. Gino Sison, BMB
- 13. Atty. Jesse Bañas, LAS
- 14. Mr. Darwin R. Tejerero, BMB
- 15. Ms. Cheen Ann C. Aricheta, LMB
- 16. Ms. Olivia Remedillo, OUESWMLGCAA
- 17. Ms. Carmen Aquino, NCR
- 18. Ms. Kryshlaine T. Raquel, OASPPFASP
- 19. For. Rachell Abenir, BMB
- 20. Engr. Bienvenido F. Cruz, LMB
- 21. Ms. Heartleen R. Albajera, OUFOM
- 22. Ms. Mari Claire T. Miguel, SCIS
- 23. Ms. Yasmin Roselle Caparas, MEO-South
- 24. For. Maureen N. Reyes, OUFOM
- 25. Ms. Encarmila Panganiban, OULAHRLA
- 26. Ms. Carmen M. Aquino, NCR
- 27. Ms. Aira Valenzuela, OASFOEM
- 28. Mr. Daryl Dao, OASFOEM
- 29. Ms. Ma. Theresa V. Legaspi, CCS
- 30. Ms. Jean U. Ocampo, OASFOWM
- 31. Mr. Antonio S. Bautista, Jr., KISS
- 32. Mr. Dennis Segovia, KISS
- 33. Mr. Paul Brian Lachica, FMB

- 34. Ms. Ericka Marie Jabagat, OASFOWM
- 35. For. Dianne Lanugan, FMB
- 36. Ms. Alexandra M. Labore, LMB
- 37. For. Lovella Luzette Galindon, LMB
- 38. Engr. Teodorico A. Sandoval, MGB
- 39. For. Teodorico L. Marquez, Jr., MGB
- 40. Mr. Mark Carlo H. Cruz, MGB
- 41. Ms. Ma. Laila A. Taoingan, OASLA
- 42. Mr. Gaudencio Crisostomo, Jr., MGB
- 43. Mr. John P. Picio, Jr., BMB
- 44. For. Ma. Angela Tamoria, OUFOLVE
- 45. Engr. Manuel M. Binuya, MGB
- 46. Mr. Elias C. Susaya, Jr., OASFISMC
- 47. Ms. Catherine C. Pagkatipunan, LLO
- 48. Mr. Eugene Parañaque, ERDB
- 49. Ms. April Anne Casas, OASHRSCSI
- 50. Atty. Marivic Bunoan, LAS
- 51. Ms. Kris Jairah G. Mercado, ELEPS
- 52. Ms. Belly M. Cabeso, EMB
- 53. Engr. Myla C. Carungi. OUFOLVE
- 54. Ms. Ma. Anna Katrina Manapat, SCIS
- 55. Ms. Erlynne Carla Lucero, OASL
- 56. Mr. Dave Daguro, OASFOEM

Secretariat (PPS-PSD)

- 57. Mr. Nehemiah Leo Carlo B. Salvador
- 58. Ms. Anna Michelle I. Lim
- 59. For. Amisol B. Talania
- 60. Ms. Nim Hydee Eusebio
- 61. Ms. Mary Lou Retos
- 62. Ms. Maria Theresa Enriquez
- 63. For. Emma Liwliwa B. Medina
- 64. Ms. Zayrelle Ann Suello

II. Highlights of the Meeting

The meeting commenced at 9:30 AM and was presided over by Dir. Noble. He proceeded to read the agenda for the meeting.

1. Draft DENR Administrative Order (DAO) re Delegation of Authority to Approve Land Surveys to the Chief of Surveys and Mapping Division (SMD)

Presentation and Discussions:

- Dir. Noble informed that a meeting with the proponent was conducted on May 4, 2022 to further discuss the proposed policy. The essence of the same is the delegation of authority to approve land surveys to the Chief, SMD, which was previously vested with the Assistant Regional Director for Technical Services (ARD-TS). The objective is to streamline the process of approval.
- Engr. Cruz shared that the Geodetic Engineers of the Philippines, Inc. (GEP) made a courtesy call to the Secretary wherein they discussed topics on the streamlining of operation regarding approval of survey plans. Subsequently, an instruction was given to LMB Assistant Director Romeo Verzosa to draft a policy delegating the authority to the Chief, SMD of the Regional Office. According to Engr. Cruz, the pertinent legal policies such as Presidential Decree (PD) No. 1529, RA No. 8560, DAO No. 2007-2 and DMC No. 2010-13 were reviewed to ensure that there will be no violation regarding the delegation of authority to the Chief, SMD from the ARD-TS. Thereafter, it was agreed upon that a policy will be proposed. The LMB also considered the recommendation under the Quality Management System (QMS) to lessen the signatories in the documents of the Department.
- Engr. Cruz informed that the draft policy was consulted with the different DENR offices. Section 4 of thereof will not modify, but will lessen the steps/procedures. Similarly, it will not drastically change the present LAMS-IVAS operation. The LMB-Geodetic Survey-Division (GSD) proposed that the policy be considered by the Bureau's Policy Review Committee.
- On the title, Ms. Caparas suggested the possible inclusion of the Regional Office (RO) to emphasize that the policy only applies to the said offices. In reply, Engr. Cruz stated that while the RO may be added, the LMB has no such position as Chief of SMD. He stressed that all the SMDs are in the Regional Offices; the equivalent office in the LMB is the Geodetic Survey Division.
- On Section 2, For. Siapno asked for clarification whether survey plans are submitted only in the Regional Offices and not in the LMB. Engr. Cruz responded that the LMB does not approve survey plans considering that it is a staff bureau and the operations are delegated to the Regional Offices concerned which have jurisdiction over the area. As a follow-up, For. Siapno opined that the said delegation is limiting if focused on the ROs, as there may be submissions to other offices. In this case, the other offices will be constrained from acting on these submissions. Dir. Noble remarked that the statement is already acceptable.

• For. Lanugan noted the lack of a section on Basic Policy which is a part of the prescribed format for policies under the Enhanced DENR Policy Development System. Dir. Noble opined that the draft policy no longer necessitates a basic policy since it is not an Implementing Rules and Regulations, but just a mere delegation of authority or procedural guidelines. In addition, Section 1 already provides for the rationale which is the streamlining of procedures. He is of the opinion that such kinds of policies would no longer require a basic policy, unless the Legal Affairs Service has a different opinion. Atty. Bañas remarked that there is nothing wrong with the current format. Dir. Noble shared that the proposed delegation of authority was tackled in the draft Revised Manual of Authorities on Technical Matters.

- On the query regarding which policy was amended by the proposed policy, Dir. Noble explained that the same indirectly amended DAO No. 2007-29 and DMC No. 2010-13. Under DMC No. 2010-13, the signatory of survey plans is the Regional Technical Director (RTD) for Lands. With the new DENR Organizational Structure under EO 366, the authority to approve plans was vested with the ARD-TS, as reflected in DAO No. 2016-07 or the Manual of Authorities. However, the Manual of Authorities is subject of revision and the Revised Manual has been endorsed for approval of the Secretary.
- For. Siapno remarked on the policy with which the proposed policy will be anchored on. While awaiting its approval, she asked on the possible assigning of a control/policy number for the draft DAO on the Revised Manual of Authorities, which will then be cited in the proposed policy. In reply, Dir. Noble stated that this may only result in a chicken-and-egg situation. For. Siapno withdrew her comment given the reply of Dir. Noble.
- While he earlier acceded to the current draft, Atty. Bañas recommended the inclusion of a section on Basic Policy, for guidance of the ROs. Dir. Noble remarked that the Basic Policy and Objectives would be sometimes one and the same. Atty. Bañas agreed and noted that it would be a redundancy of statements. For. Lanugan also agreed with the point raised by Dir. Noble. With this, the suggestion to include a section on Basic Policy was not carried.
- On Section 3, Dir. Noble explained that the reason for the inclusion of a designated Assistant Division Chief is the lack of a plantilla position for the same. He stated that the purpose of the section is not only the delegation of authority to the Chief, SMD but to highlight that the Assistant Division Chief should be a licensed GE. He informed that per Engr. Henry Pacis of LMB, there is a section in the SMD that does not require the Chief to be a GE. Relatedly, For. Rey asked if there is a plantilla position for Assistant Division Chief under the DENR reorganization. In reply, Dir. Noble stated that there is none, hence, the inclusion of a designated Assistant Division Chief. On the query of For. Rey whether this is allowed under the organizational structure, Dir. Noble informed that during the discussion with the LMB, it was raised that there is a section where the Chief is not a licensed GE.
- For. Siapno raised the issue on the accountability of the recommendatory official should there be legal issues and concerns with regard to survey plans, given that said official is only designated.

• Engr. Aguda expressed agreement with the suggestion that one of the Section Chiefs may be designated in concurrent capacity as Assistant Division Chief. The said official should come from the Section involved in the processing of survey plans. According to him, there is a principal section that reviews survey plans. Dir. Noble concurred with the suggestion to indicate the Chief of the Section concerned. On the query whether all Section Chiefs under the SMD should be licensed GEs, Engr. Cruz responded that all the Section Chiefs of SMD are GEs, except for the Records Section. He informed that there are 3 or 4 sections under the SMD, i.e., Aggregate Section, Original Surveys Section and Cadastral Section. In addition, the Chief of the Field Network Party is also a GE, but this has been transferred to another Division.

- Mr. Manalili stressed that the focus of discussion should be on the delegation of authority to approve surveys, and not on the technicalities which will get the group to nowhere. Going back to the other policies will entail a lot of discussions. Dir. Noble remarked that only Section 3 of the draft policy needs to be addressed. Engr. Cruz commented that the Division Chief should be given the leeway to designate an Assistant Division Chief from a section that is not loaded with work. Accordingly, the section from which the Assistant Division Chief will come from should not be specified.
- Dir. Noble suggested doing away with the line "upon recommendation of the designated Assistant Chief" in Section 3 of the proposed policy, in order to have only one signatory in the survey plan. Atty. Bañas concurred with the suggestion as this is consistent with the purpose of streamlining the process. According to him, the inclusion of the the Assistant Chief as signatory will only be adding another layer considering that the survey plan goes through the review process of other sections. Engr. Cruz shared that under the current process, officials from some sections indicate their initials under the name of the Chief, SMD. With the proposed policy, the Assistant Chief will now be a signatory in the survey plan.
- For. Siapno opined that there is no need to designate an Assistant Division Chief who will act as recommending official for the approval of survey plans. Instead, the role may be assigned to the Section Chief of the unit directly involved with survey and mapping. With this, the Section Chief will not just be countersigning/putting their initials, but will become full signatory in the survey plan, thus, claiming accountability. Engr. Cruz agreed that this may be done, depending on the type of plan submitted. According to him, the matter will be consulted with the LMB management. With this, the survey plan template will be revised by indicating the Chief of the Section that will recommend approval. Relatedly, Dir. Noble suggested revising the line in Section 3 as "upon the recommendation of the Section chief concerned (Chief of Original Surveys Section, in the case of original surveys, Chief of the Aggregate Section, in the case of aggregate surveys, Chief of the Subdivision Section, in the case of subdivision surveys, etc.)." Atty. Bañas agreed with the suggestion of Dir. Noble.
- On the query of Atty. Bañas whether the law requires that all Section Chiefs should be GEs, Engr. Cruz affirmed that in the GEP law or RA No. 8560, these officials should be licensed GEs.

• For. Siapno reiterated her point that Section 3 should specify the recommending official, for accountability and to avoid grey areas. On the query of Dir. Noble whether there are other survey plans not included in the statement in the parenthesis stated above, Engr. Cruz replied that there are regions with Survey Control Section, where political boundary surveys are approved. Dir. Noble asked if such survey is contemplated under Section 2. Engr. Cruz replied in the affirmative, stating that Section 2 covers all kinds of survey plans.

- Atty. Bañas asked about the implication of the Revised Manual of Authorities being approved ahead of the proposed policy. In reply, Dir. Noble informed that the Revised Manual of Authorities already reflects this delegation of authority to the Chief, SMD. What is being clarified is the recommendation for approval of the survey plan.
- Dir. Noble explained that in the original/existing Manual of Authorities, the approving authority is the ARD-TS. However, this is now being devolved to the Chief, SMD under the proposed policy. He also mentioned that no layer was added, and that the only change is the Section Chief concerned becoming a signatory in the survey plan.
- On the query of Dir. Noble whether any of the three (3) Section Chiefs under the SMD may not be a GE, Engr. Cruz replied that these officials should all be GEs. This being the case, Dir. Noble opined that the line "The designated Assistant Chief of the SMD should be a licensed Geodetic Engineer in accordance with R.A. No. 8560" may be removed. Engr. Cruz concurred with the suggestion.
- Dir. Noble inquired if there are no other surveys approved in the ROs. Engr. Cruz
 responded that there are also correction surveys approved in the Aggregate Section.
 Dir. Noble expressed apprehension that an issue may arise in case there are other
 surveys necessitating approval but not cited in Section 3. Engr. Cruz agreed and
 stated the possibility of new classification of surveys that may come out in the future.
- Mr. Manalili commented that this was the issue he raised earlier. According to him, there may be many other surveys that will be missed by limiting those that will be indicated in Section 3, such as the surveys processed by the Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR) for issuance of Certificate of Land Ownership Awards (CLOAs). Engr. Cruz informed that such surveys fall under the Aggregate Section; foreshore land surveys fall under the Original Section, and that there are many other classifications of survey. He remarked that putting all the classifications of survey in the proposed policy will unnecessarily lengthen the same.
- Dir. Noble remarked that there is no harm in retaining the line which states that the Section Chief should be a licensed GE. The provision of RA 8560 is merely being highlighted.
- Dir. Noble clarified that the draft Revised Manual of Authorities only provides for the approving authority and not the recommending official. The delegation of authority to the Chief, SMD to approve survey plans has been reflected in the Manual. The proposed policy being reviewed clarifies the recommending authority.

• The members of the PTWG moved for and seconded the endorsement of the draft policy for approval of the Secretary.

Agreements:

- 1. On Section 3, delete "a designated Assistant Chief" and replace with "the Section Chief concerned;"
- 2. Revise the Annex to reflect the revision in Section 3;
- 3. The PTWG endorsed the approval of the draft policy.
- 2. Draft DENR Memorandum Order (DMO) re Guidelines on the Operationalization, Administration, and Proper Use of External DENR Web Portal (EDWP) and Regional External DENR Web Portals (REDWP)

Presentation and Discussions:

- Ms. Ferraris and Ms. Miguel presented a brief background of the proposed policy.
 Mr. Ebora requested that the body dispense with the discussion on the subject/title of the proposed policy.
- On the prefatory statement, Mr. Ebora requested the citation of more recent guiding policies from the Department of Information and Communications Technology (DICT), as the ones mentioned are old or may no longer be up-to-date. According to him, the said Department has more recent issuances that are fit for the prefatory statement. Ms. Miguel took note of the suggestion.
- On Section 1, For. Lanuagn proposed changing the heading to Basic Policy instead of Declaration of Policy, consistent with the Enhanced DENR Policy Development System. She also suggested the deletion of the line "The state recognizes the vital role of communication and information in nation-building" since this is already stated under Section 1.
- For. Rey remarked that the existing DENR web portal includes the regional web portals. He asked whether these regional external web portals are independent from the external DENR web portal. In reply, Ms. Ferraris informed that there used to be an internal website for DENR employees, which is no longer used. This was differentiated from the external web portal. Ms. Miguel added that with regard to the REDWPs, these have their respective URLs but are linked with the main server of the DENR. On the query of For. Rey whether the REDWPs are outside of the EDWP, Ms. Miguel replied that all these regional web portals are hosted in the main website of the DENR, although the regional offices are in charge of operating their respective websites. The REDWPs may be directly accessed as these have their own web addresses.
- Dir. Noble stated that to put it simply, the query of For. Rey is whether the Regional Offices' websites are separate, but whether a web portal can be accessed from the other is another question. The Regional Offices can access the website of the DENR, and in turn, the Central Office can also access the website of the Regional Offices. He added that the subject of discussion are websites and portals, and not the main

server, which is independently operated. The users can directly access the web, but can also do this through the main DENR website.

- On the suggestion of Mr. Lachica whether the term "external" may be changed to sub-website or any other appropriate term, Ms. Ferraris replied that the use of the said term is meant to differentiate it with the internal DENR web portal. This is where the online newsletters are posted, and which can be accessed by the DENR employees only. Ms. Aquino agreed with the remarks and reiterated that the DENR used to have two (2) websites- the internal which is for the employees only, and the external which is for the public. She concurred that since the internal website is no longer functional, the term "external" may be removed.
- On the query of For. Rey regarding the deletion of the internal website, Ms. Aquino replied that presently, it is not functional. Ms. Miguel added that per the Knowledge and Information Systems Service (KISS), the internal website is parked but that the KISS will be creating a new website, in line with the Information System Strategic Plan (ISSP) enhancement. Ms. Ferraris agreed with the suggestion to remove the term "external."
- For. Rey commented that the main DENR website may cover both the internal and external portals. In reply, Ms. Ferraris stated that there is a different management system for the internal portal. For. Rey suggested integrating the internal with the main web portal, the separate access of which will be dependent on the Web Administrator. Ms Aquino shared that in the internal website, there are information exclusive to internal users such as trainings. The HRDS will benefit greatly with the operation of the internal website, e.g., instead of issuing certificates of training to the participants, the HRDS need only to double-check whether said participants are included in the website. The Special Orders issued are also uploaded in the internal website. She also informed that the internal website contains the link to the external website. On the suggestion of For. Rey, Ms. Aquino replied that the KISS may be the one that can address the matter. With regard to the internal website, Ms. Miguel informed that only those with accounts in the active directory may access the same. Dir. Noble agreed with the point raised to have only one (1) website for the DENR.
- Mr. Lachica noted that the internal system was not tackled in other portions of the
 proposed policy. He also asked the reason for changing the term DENR website to
 portal when it contains the same functionality. Dir. Noble replied that the term
 "external" will be deleted. On the question regarding the more appropriate term to
 be used, i.e., whether "web portal" or "website," Ms. Miguel informed that the ISSP
 provides for the EDWP (web portal).
- Mr. Tejerero expressed agreement with the suggestion of For. Rey regarding the integration of the internal with the main DENR website. The internal website may just be only one page of the main DENR website. He suggested defining the scope of the draft policy, to possibly cover the internal website.
- For. Reyes commented that the DENR website may be maximized to cater not only
 to the stakeholders but also to the DENR employees. With regard to information
 exclusive to the DENR, a password or username may be provided to access the
 internal website. All these may be added in the functionality of the main website to

capture the particulars concerning the DENR employees. In reply, Ms. Miguel stated that the suggestion may be possibly done and workable. A link or page may be provided to access the internal website. On the suggestion to include the internal website, Dir. Noble remarked that the provision in Section 2 will be revised by adding the line "for its employees and stakeholders."

Ϊ,

- Ms. Miguel remarked that since the ISSP provides for the EDWP, it may be stated that the EDWP is also the DENR website. On the question raised by Dir. Noble whether the web portal also pertains to the website, or whether there are cases where the web portal is not a website, and the possible implication of using the term "website" instead of "web portal," Ms. Aquino replied that these may be answered by the KISS. Ms. Miguel informed that they will consult the matter with the said office.
- Dir. Noble asked the proponent to present the whole draft policy so that the PTWG members may have a grasp of the general provisions. Ms. Miguel proceeded to read the same.
- On Section 5.5., For Siapno suggested replacing the terms "He/she" with the exact designation of the personnel mentioned.
- On Section 2, Mr. Ebora noted the lack of specific objective/s with regard to the Central Office EDWP.
- Mr. Lachica also noted the lack of time element/timeline for the activities.
- Ms. Cabeso inquired if the EMB and other Bureaus are integrated in the web portal.
- For. Mojica informed that the RBCO has submitted comments on the draft policy.
- Ms. Caparas also pointed out that the clearance of data was not mentioned. She
 mentioned that all the contents to be uploaded in the web portal should undergo
 clearance from the offices concerned.
- Mr. Ebora reiterated his suggestion to expand the objectives to include the Central Office EDWP, and whether the Bureaus may be covered. Dir. Noble instructed the proponent to clarify the matter. In reply, Ms Miguel shared that the crafting of the proposed policy was a result of the system roll-out conducted in the Regional Offices in 2019 by the KISS, SCIS and the developer. Hence, the scope and coverage was limited only to the Central and Regional Offices websites.
- Dir. Noble inquired whether the Bureaus and Attached Agencies are not covered by the proposed guidelines. Mr. Ebora also asked on where to relegate the concerns/materials of the Bureaus. Dir. Noble mentioned that this will most likely be displayed through a link in the main website. He added that the draft policy may be able to cover the internal website.
- Mr. Ebora shared that while the ERDB website was developed in accordance with the DICT guidelines, the Bureau is also awaiting the issuance of a DENR guidelines on the matter. According to him, the ERDB website is operational but is independent

from the DENR main website. Ms. Miguel responded that the KISS may provide the answer being the office mandated with the hosting of DENR websites. She added that the Bureaus and Attached Agencies were not considered in the crafting of the proposed guidelines since they cannot adapt to the DENR main website as they have specific requirements. The server can only accommodate so much, hence, the focus on the Regional Offices. She mentioned that the LMB website is hosted by the DICT.

:.

- Mr. Bautista explained the difference between web portal and website. According to him, the graphics shown is what is indicated in the ISSP content management system which includes the website database and external portal and the website, incorporated in the web database. The KISS hosts the external web portal of the DENR as well as the internal web portal for employees. The separate websites (Regional Offices websites) are those that are hosted by the Department aside from the main website. He mentioned that the KISS is hosting the denr.gov.ph. and inside this portal is the linking with other offices that it is hosting.
- On the suggestion to have a DENR web portal that will include both the external and internal web portals, Mr. Segovia commented that technically, this is the system established to separate the public facing from the internal web portal. Such is the mechanism for the employees to access the internal web portal. The different identities are being separated by a log-in requirement but physically, only one system handles both. On the query of Dir. Noble if it is possible to only have one web portal, Mr. Segovia informed that the KISS is setting this up. Currently, the IDWP is suspended as the Joomla (content management system) platform is not compliant with the requirements of the DICT for website hosting. Nevertheless, the activity is already slated for implementation. He added that the web portal is just one; they are just separating the external from the internal. The website indicated in the diagram is the placeholder of other websites hosted by the Department. Mr. Bautista commented that they will consider the suggestion.
- Dir. Noble remarked that the discussion is focused on the issue regarding the deletion of the term "external." Relative to this, Ms. Miguel asked the KISS representatives if the EDWP is defined in the ISSP and the implication if the word "external" is removed. Mr. Segovia responded that they distinguished the external from the internal and this is reflected in the ISSP. Dir. Noble stated not to discuss the merits but the contents of the draft policy. Once the matter has been clarified, the definition of the DENR web portal will be polished. He suggested moving on with the other provisions of the proposed policy, and to set aside for the meantime anything that has reference to the term "external."
- For. Rey suggested that the SCIS and KISS discuss and settle the issue first, and to tackle the suggestion raised by Mr. Ebora regarding the inclusion of the Bureaus and Attached Agencies, as there may be external clients looking for these within the DENR website. Dir. Noble agreed. He remarked that the KISS only looked into the Central and Regional Offices web portals but failed to consider the Bureaus and Attached Agencies. The KISS should prepare the necessary requirements for the inclusion of these offices.
- For. Reyes echoed the comment of For. Rey that for the improvement of the web portal as a whole, the KISS should explore the possibility of including the other

offices. The Regional Offices have their own websites, but these are linked with the DENR main website. She asked if it is possible to also link the Bureaus and Attached Agencies' websites with that of the DENR's by clicking a link. Ms. Miguel replied that all the offices' websites are linked with the main website of the DENR.

i.

- Mr. Segovia stated that with regard to the suggestions of For. Reyes and For. Rey, all websites are linked to the main DENR website. It so happens that the template provided to the Regions came from the SCIS. There are Bureaus that were able to register their own domain with the DICT, thus, they have their own customized domain. However, the DICT is not allowing the Bureaus to have their own domain; the mother agency will be the main domain. He added that a web portal is a collection of the different websites of the Department. They can provide the template to all offices but the domain such as that of the BMB will be deleted once placed under the main DENR website. Dir. Noble commented that other offices already have their own domain and will only require a link to the main DENR web portal. Mr. Segovia informed that currently, the DENR hosts its own portal. However, the website will eventually be migrated to and hosted by the DICT. Dir. Noble expressed agreement with the hosting of the website by the DICT for added protection.
- Mr. Tejerero shared that the BMB already availed of the hosting of DICT in 2016. The Bureau was among the first to comply with AO 39; it submitted the website for evaluation. The hosting by the DICT provides various advantages as it covers vulnerability assessment of the website. He inquired on which guidelines (whether DICT or DENR) to follow in case of website migration. He also supported the suggestion to include a provision in the proposed policy regarding the clearinghouse mechanism so that the information to be uploaded are validated.
- Mr. Ebora remarked that if the Bureau's website is linked with the main DENR website, the general guiding principles will come from the DENR, but the trafficking of contents is solely the call of the ERDB Director.
- Ms. Cabeso commented in the chatbox that per the EMB's ICT, link or access may be provided.
- On Sub-section 2.1., Dir. Noble asked on the appropriateness of the objective. Mr.
 Lachica suggested defining instead the roles and responsibilities of offices and
 describing the procedures for operation, i.e., "Define the roles and responsibilities of
 each DENR office and key personnel in the operation of the DENR Central and
 Regional Office web portal."
- On Sub-section 2.2., Mr. Lachica suggested the following formulation: "Provide the procedures and protocols for the uniform operation and management of the DENR central and regional web portals, particularly on the following matters:"
- On Sub-section 2.2.1., Mr. Lachica suggested deleting "digital images" and adding "knowledge and information materials."
- For Sub-sections 2.2.3. and 2.2.4., Mr. Lachica noted that these provisions are just the same, hence, he suggested deleting said items. For Sub-section 2.2.2., he

proposed the addition of "functionality". The provision shall be read as: "Enhancement of EDWP/REDWP design and functionality."

١.

- On Section 3, Dir. Noble asked whether the term "operationalization" is aptly used. In reply, Mr. Lachica suggested replacing the term with "operation." On line 55 of the same section pertaining to the EDWP/REDWP, Ms. Miguel suggested removing the slash (/) and changing this with the word "and." Further on Section 3, Dir. Noble proposed the deletion of the line "which shall be for the use of RSCIGs and designated website administrators or web focal persons, and DENR service units with website modules or are module owners." There was also a suggestion to add the term "management." The provision shall now read as: "This Order shall cover the operation, administration, management, and proper use of the EDWP and REDWP."
- On Sub-section 4.2., Mr. Ebora asked on which other portions of the draft policy the term "End-user" was used. In reply, Dir. Noble mentioned that it was used in Subsection 5.6. (5.7.). Mr. Ebora noted the lack of an objective in Section 2 that is meant to engage the End-user. Relatedly, Dir. Noble asked the proponent whether the term still needs to be defined. Ms. Miguel responded that it may be removed. Mr. Ebora proposed that instead of removing the term, another objective related to the appreciation of End-users/clients may be added. If the end-user is not included, the proposed guidelines will be relegated to the DENR alone. In response, Dir. Noble suggested incorporating the word "End-users" at the end of Section 2.
- Still on Sub-section 4.2., Mr. Lachica noted the repetition of the statements pertaining to viewing, printing and downloading. Dir. Noble suggested the reformulation thereof as: "End-user refers to the general public (e.g., students, stakeholders, private/public organizations, etc.), DENR officials and personnel, or any person who has access to the EDWP/REDWP, for purposes of viewing, printing or downloading contents;"
- On Sub-section 4.4., Dir. Noble suggested copying the relevant contents of Sub-section 4.1.
- On Sub-section 4.5., Dir. Noble suggested correcting the IG of RSCIG as "Initiatives Group."
- On Sub-sections 4.6. and 4.7., Mr. Lachica noted the similarity of the definitions. Dir. Noble suggested indicating the specific roles of the personnel being defined. Ms. Miguel clarified that Sub-section 4.6 refers to office while Sub-section 4.7. pertains to the personnel.
- On Sub-section 4.2., For. Mojica mentioned that the comment of the RBCO concerns the limitations for End-users to access web materials. In reply, Ms. Miguel informed that the matter is provided in the responsibilities of the End-users under Section 5. With regard to the query of Dir. Noble as to who approves the contents, Ms. Miguel replied that this will be added as an annex.

• As to the query of Mr. Lachica regarding the provider of the article, Ms. Miguel replied that this is also defined in the proposed policy. When asked by Dir. Noble if the provider refers to the Module Owner, Ms. Miguel replied in the affirmative.

i.

- On Sub-section 4.6., For. Mojica asked if the office may be specified/identified.
- With regard to the provider of contents, Ms. Aquino informed that at the Regional Office level, it is the staff of the RICTU that is involved. On the other hand, the RSCIG does the lay-outing. Dir. Noble recognized that the proposed guidelines delineates/sets the roles of the different offices and personnel. Ms. Miguel concurred that it is being proposed for uniformity in implementation.
- On Sub-section 4.11., Dir. Noble suggested adding the word "functionality."
- For. Mojica inquired on the difference between the Web Content Administrator and the Web Technical Manager. Ms. Miguel responded that the Content Administrator pertains to the office, while the Technical Manager refers to the personnel.
- On Section 5, Dir. Noble suggested deleting the specific personnel and replacing this with "Key Personnel."
- On Sub-section 5.1., Dir. Noble asked if the KISS is also responsible for monitoring the REDWP. Ms. Miguel replied in the affirmative. She suggested deleting the slash (/) and adding the word "and" in EDWP/REDWP.
- Ms. Aquino inquired on who acts as Web Focal Person and Web Technical Manager.
- On Sub-section 5.1., Mr. Lachica commented that the responsibility of the KISS is on functionality and performance. On the other hand, it is the SCIS that is responsible for the design guide based on the identity of the Department. Hence, it was suggested that the term "appearance" be removed. He also informed that the KISS is responsible for ensuring the availability of the EDWP and REDWP. Thus, he suggested the following reformulation: "The Knowledge and Information Systems Service (KISS) of the DENR Central Office shall be responsible for the availability, functionality and performance of the EDWP and REDWP. It shall act as Web Technical Administrator."
- On Sub-section 5.2., Mr. Lachica requested clarification if it is the SCIS that is responsible for monitoring the contents of the REDWP. Ms. Miguel replied that when it comes to the Regional Offices, it is the RSCIG that monitors the content.
- Ms. Miguel explained that the SCIS does not monitor the banners posted in the DENR website, only the transparency seals and other pages as required under the PDP. Dir. Noble asked about the role of the SCIS with regard to web content management. He asked if the functions provided are the roles of the Web Content Administrator. He also sought the statement which indicates that the SCIS manages the web contents. Ms. Miguel replied that the materials which the offices request to be uploaded in the DENR website goes through the SCIS, such as the ERDB's request for the uploading of module on Sylvatrop.

• Mr. Segovia informed that the SCIS also manages the design appearance and color scheme under web content management. The KISS may customize the template according to the recommended design or color palette of the SCIS.

٠.

- Dir. Noble remarked that he cannot see the role of the SCIS with regard to web content management, hence, he suggested improving the statement by indicating its specific responsibility in this regard. Mr. Lachica suggested stating Sub-section 5.2. similarly with Sub-section 5.1. According to him, web content management by the SCIS is the sanitizing of contents posted in the website.
- Dir. Noble asked the meaning of web content administration. He opined that web content management is so broad. Ms. Miguel replied that the SCIS is responsible for the contents of the website. Dir. Noble commented that this may be about the development of content for the website. Ms. Caparas suggested changing the function under the first sentence of Sub-section 5.2. to: "The SCIS shall be responsible for coming up with policies and guidelines on the standard content and operations of the EDWP."
- For Sub-section 5.3., it was suggested that the formulation of Sub-section 5.2. be copied.
- On Sub-section 5.5., Dir. Noble asked if the web materials developed will only come from the SCIS-PID. In addition, he asked about where the Module Owners will come in and if they develop web materials. Ms. Miguel replied that the Module Owners are those who put contents in the website, while it is the SCIS-PID that uploads these contents. Ms. Ferraris added that administrators are assigned for the uploading of modules. The different offices develop their own modules, which are then uploaded in the website through the SCIS. The Administrative Service uploads laws and policies, while the HRDS uploads L&D materials. On the query of Dir. Noble whether the Module Owners will simply update the module contents, Ms. Ferraris replied on the affirmative.
- On Sub-section 5.5.1, Dir. Noble noted the lack of a statement indicating whether the Web Focal Person should come from the KISS or SCIS. Ms. Miguel responded that they will state that these personnel will come from these offices. Dir. Noble stressed that it should be clear that there are two (2) persons considered as Web Focal Person, and that their roles should be explicit. Their functions should also be distinct. Ms. Miguel replied that in the original draft, the Web Administrator and Web Focal Person are the same, but this was differentiated per the discussion on May 4, 2022. On the query of Dir. Noble as to who acts as Web Focal Person, Ms. Miguel replied that the Web Focal Person refers to the head of the SCIS. Dir. Noble noted the inconsistency in the statements of Ms. Miguel.
- Dir. Noble remarked that the proponent should define the functions so there is standardized personnel in the Region and Central Office. Ms Miguel replied that the Special Order was issued on this in 2019. In addition, the proposed guidelines was crafted in the same year.
- Dir. Noble instructed the conduct by the SCIS of a separate meeting on the proposed policy together with the KISS. On his query whether the KISS was involved in the

crafting of the proposed policy, Ms. Miguel replied that said office provided comments thereon. She shared that the guidelines was already formulated prior to the rollout. Dir. Noble commented that a lot could have changed from 2019 to the present. Ms. Miguel informed that the comments from the Regions are recent.

• Mr. Ebora echoed the statement of Dir. Noble to have a meeting between KISS and SCIS to delineate their functions, as well as to differentiate the functions of the Central Office and the Regional Offices.

• Dir. Noble stated that the proposed policy was not totally discussed; all the while he was under the impression that the same only involves the SCIS. He asked to suspend the discussion on the matter and requested the SCIS and KISS to review totally the draft policy. He stressed that the delineation of functions and roles should be clear. It should be considered that the reader of the proposed guidelines is not well-versed on IT. Moreover, the crafting should be improved. Thereafter, he stated that the PPS will have a face-to-face meeting with the KISS and SCIS.

• A suggestion was raised to also invite representatives from the RSCIG and RICTU in order to the have regional office perspective. Moreover, Mr. Lachica proposed the inclusion of the Bureaus in the scope and coverage of the draft policy.

• The other agenda was deferred to Wednesday next week, May 18, 2022. Dir. Noble stated that the PTWG Meeting will be held on the afternoon, while the meeting with the SCIS and KISS will be conducted in the morning of the same date.

Agreements:

1. On the prefatory statement:

 - Supplant the DICT policy mentioned with the recent applicable DICT policy/ies;

 - Delete the line "The State recognizes the vital role of communication and information in nation-building" as this is already mentioned in Section 1;

2. Change the heading of Section 1 to Basic Policy;

 3. Remove the term "External" in the various portions of the draft policy;4. On Section 2, add the line "other activities to End-Users;"

 5. On Section 2.1., the RSCIG, change the term "Information" to "Initiative;"6. Revise the sub-sections of Section 2 as:

"2.1. Define the roles and responsibilities of each DENR office and key personnel in the operation of the DENR Central and Regional Office web portal; and

2.2. Provide the procedures and protocols for the uniform operation and management of the DENR Central and Regional Office web portal, particularly on the following matters:

2.2.1. Uploading/posting of required documents including knowledge and information materials; and

2.2.2. Enhancement of EDWP/REDWP design and functionality."

7. On Section 2, expand the objectives by adding a provision related to the appreciation of the EDWP by the End-users;

- 8. Revise the statement in Section 3 as: "This Order shall cover the operation, administration, management, and proper use of the EDWP and REDWP;"
- 9. Reformulate the definition of the End-user under Sub-section 4.2. as: "End-User refers to the general public (e.g., students, stakeholders, private/public organizations, etc.), DENR officials and personnel, or any person who has access to the EDWP/REDWP, for purposes of viewing, printing or downloading contents;"
- 10. On Sub-section 4.4., copy the relevant statements under Sub-section 4.1.;
- 11. On Sub-section 4.5., correct the IG of RSCIG as "Initiatives Group;."
- 12. On Sub-section 4.11., add the word "functionality;"
- 13. On Section 5, revise the heading as: "Responsibilities of Offices and Key Personnel:"
- 14. Revise Sub-section 5.1. as: "The Knowledge and Information Systems Service (KISS) of the DENR Central Office shall be responsible for the availability, functionality and performance of the EDWP and REDWP. It shall act as Web Technical Administrator;"
- 15. On Sub-section 5.2., include a statement that the SCIS shall be responsible "for coming up with policies and guidelines on the standard content and operations of the EDWP;"
- 16. For Sub-section 5.3., copy the formulation of Sub-section 5.2.;
- 17. Consider the possible integration of the internal with the external DENR web portal;
- 18. Consider the inclusion of timeline for the activities;
- 19. Include the Bureaus and Attached Agencies in the scope of the proposed policy;
- 20. Include a provision on clearance mechanism for the uploading of contents; and
- 21. Conduct a meeting among the PPS, SCIS and KISS to further review the draft policy. The delineation of functions between the SCIS and KISS, as well as between the Central Office and the Regional Offices should be clarified. The meeting will be held in the morning of May 18, 2022. Representatives from the RSCIG, RICTU will be invited.

3. Draft DAO re Issuance of Provisional Agreement for Special Uses in Protected Areas

• Dir. Noble instructed the deferment of the proposed policy to the next PTWG Meeting, to be held in the afternoon of May 18, 2022.

There having no other matters to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 4:06 PM.

Prepared by the Secretariat

Noted by:

GLEŇŇ MARCELO C. NOBLE

OIQ Director, Policy and Planning Service