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AT 9:45 A.M., ATTY. LUTGARDO BARBO, PRESIDING OFFICER, COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION (TWG), CALLED THE MEETING TO ORDER.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (ATTY. BARBO). Good morning.

Can we start? We would like to make of record that the resources persons who are here and who have been invited are the following: Architect Geronimo Manahan, Architect Ed Florentino, Architect Olonan, all of the United Architects of the Philippines. And who is the president of the United...

MR. OLONAN. The President is Architect Prosperidad Luis.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. And you are the Vice-President?

MR. OLONAN. So I am representing on his behalf.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Are you the Vice-President?

MR. OLONAN. Yes, National Executive Vice-President.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Thank you.

We also have Architect Gregorio Timbol, Architect Aqijiles Paredes, Architect Armando Alli, all of the Architecture Advocacy International Foundation Incorporated and the President and Chair is Architect Timbol; the Vice-President is Architect Paredes.

Again, good morning.

You must have by now copies of the two versions of the...
MR. MANAHAN. Mr. Chairman.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Before that, the Senate Bills 2081, this is introduced by Senator Magsaysay and the other one is Senate Bill 1290, introduced by Senator Osmeña. I hope you have copies of these two versions. But we are going to use the version of Senator Magsaysay as the working draft.

Now, I'd like to get your opening statements before we go direct to the provisions of the proposed bill of Senator Magsaysay, section by section not necessarily line by line. Who is raising his hand earlier? Architect Manahan, you have the floor.

MR. MANAHAN. Good morning, Mr. Chairman. I also represent the Council for Consulting Architects and Planners of the Philippines. It's the umbrella organization of Filipino Consulting Architects recognized by NEDA. I'm the President of CCAP.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Please proceed if you are ready with your idea on the bills, Architect Manahan.

MR. MANAHAN. It's good that we are making use of the Magsaysay bill as our working draft because it's an amendment to Republic Act 545, rather than an outright revision of the law.
There are only two important points that I'd like to mention which is critical to the amendment. It's the opening up the practice of the profession as a corporation.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. You are referring to what particular section?

MR. MANAHAN. In the last...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. And you deem this the more important provisions?

MR. MANAHAN. Yes, sir. It's in Section 38, the new Section 38.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Section 38. Okay.

MR. MANAHAN. And also, which is not included here is the expected opening of all professions in the country to the GATTS, to the General Agreement of the Tariffs and Trades.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. What particular section is that?

MR. MANAHAN. Wala ho dito, eh.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Wala? So you want it inserted?

MR. MANAHAN. Perhaps just the provision of that and implementing rules and regulations covering their procedure similarly for the corporation.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. Good. We will look into that. Are you through, Architect Florentino?

MR. FLORENTINO. Thank you, Atty. Barbo. 
I am the current Chairman of the Legislation Committee of the United Architects of the Philippines and have occupied that position off and on for the last 20 years, and kept in dealing with this particular law since then. At this point we are in the process of finalizing our own amendment, rather proposal to the whole law. We have been dealing with this and in dialogue with various organizations, voluntary organizations because the UAP is the accredited organization, of the United Architects. However, there are other organization voluntary and we have been in dialogue with them and have now tried to collate all of these, and is now in the process of finalizing it now so that as a whole, we can present it to the technical committee as of the position of the United Architects of the Philippines. And we have that version but I would rather not present it now until we get the approval of the whole association so that there will be no misunderstanding at all. However, in any discussion we will have, we can clarify our positions, we can point. We can always clarify our positions.

Thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. When you say Architect Florentino that the United Architects of the Philippines is the one accredited, may I know by whom accredited?

MR. FLORENTINO. Yes. Originally, Atty. Barbo, there were three organizations: the League of Philippine Architects, which at the time it was
negotiated, I was then President 25 years and the Philippine Institute of Architects and the Association of Government Architects, these associations agreed to integrate. And so, the result was the United Architects of the Philippines but it did not prevent other voluntary groups...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. I know. I know. But who accredited you?

MR. FLORENTINO. The PRC.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Ah! Okay.

MR. FLORENTINO. We have the number one accreditation certificates...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. Thank you. Thank you very much.

Architect Olonan.

MR. OLONAN. Well, actually, Mr. Chairman, we have the same view of our Chairman for Legislation. Well, actually, for the record, we respectfully appeal to this Committee to give us until mid-January to present our position. So we have the same view with our Chairman Architect Ed Florentino.

Thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. We will consider that so we give you up to mid-January of next year. Okay.
MR. TIMBOL. Atty. Barbo, I would like to say that we are well represented here as architects to protect our position. I would rather make further comments as we go on article after articles.

Thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Thank you.

Architect Paredes.

MR. PAREDES. Actually, we favor with the advocacy foundation that we have just formed, the former members of the National Committee on Legislation of the United Architects of the Philippines. What we want to protect is the profound the noble practice of the profession entirely and we would like to advocate to the proper practice as traditionally and profoundly experience throughout the years. As regards to the organic law of Republic Act 545 of Architecture and consolidated by a very profound and prudent as it's proven, it's existence for the past, more than three decades. And we believe, the version of Magsaysay is the one that we have favored. The only thing that we resent here is the participation of....../mhb
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MR. PAREDES. ... the participation of civil engineers in the practice of architecture.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. What particular section is that?

VOICE. Thirty-eight.

MR. PAREDES. Thirty-eight, I think. Thirty-eight.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-eight. So ...

MR. PAREDES. Thirty-eight.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-eight. Okay. We will have this marked.

Okay, please proceed.

MR. PAREDES. Because the amendment of Republic Act 545, which was promulgated in 1950, it was amended in 1956. Civil engineering law was previously enacted, that is, Republic Act 544. For that matter, Republic Act 545 just came after Republic Act 544 and it so happened after six years of its passage, the Republic Act 544, they inserted the civil engineering to have that prerogative to practise architecture, which is very much a violation of Republic Act 545, for the simple reason that the training of the civil engineers is more of a utilitarian nature and they deal with the exact sciences. But the architects are trained in the broad fields of science, architectural ... science, arts and technology. And with this as a multi-disciplined profession, we innovate in accordance to the needs of
the project or of the client or what the human demands is, which is entirely
different from them.

That’s why in 38, we should not allow the civil engineers to practise
architecture, as what was allowed before.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. Are you through? Okay?

MR. PAREDES. And on the other part of the bill of Sen. Magsaysay, and
we appreciate that, he is amenable in introducing corporate practice of
architecture, which was not allowed in Republic Act 545 before, although there is
a provision there in Republic Act 545, that there is a statement there that there is
no -- what you call this -- no prohibition rather when the architects themselves
had organized as a corporation to practise architecture. And that’s what we want
to insert here, that the corporate practice should be confined only to architects
and limited to architects, to be headed by the architects only. Because,
otherwise, we don’t want the, for example, a corporation to fall in the hands of a
developer to practise architecture or to fall in the hands of an engineer, who is not
an architect. And that’s our provisions that we want to be inserted there.
Otherwise, this bill should have been a perfect bill, sir.

Thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Thank you also.

May I call on Architect Dalli. Your opening statement.

MR. ALLI. Good morning, Atty. Barbo and Madam Lu Zulueta.
Basically, the filing of 2081 was a collaborative effort among some members of the United Architects of the Philippines but the intent basically at that time was to basically put forward the position that would be consistent with the ethical practice of the profession because we find ourselves in situations oftentimes wherein the original law – R.A. 545 and its amended version, R.A. 1581 of 1956 – have been often abused and we find the architects at the receiving end of many exploitative acts and that is basically what we intend to address when we were initially seeking the assistance of the offices of several senators to help us in the filing of an amended version for R.A. 545 and R.A. 1581.

Mr. Chairman, we just like to make some clarifications. All of the members of the architectural profession that you see here before you are members of the United Architects of the Philippines. While you see different organizations being represented here, all of us basically are UAP members because the United Architects of the Philippines is the accredited professional organization of the Professional Regulations Commission, which means that it’s the only or is the bonafide organization of architects duly licensed by the Philippines, ‘no?

Now, what was mentioned here, Your Honor, …

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Just a minute, just a minute. I hope you don’t mind.

MR. ALLI. Yes.
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it automatic for a licensed architect to become a member of the United Architects of the Philippines?

MR. ALLI. He must choose what organization, because there's another organization, but this other organization should have been part of the UAP since the '70s but they chose to break away. I don't know for some reason because I only became an architect 20 years ago, so that happened about 8 years before I got my license, 'no?  

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, anyway, that means that not every architect is a member of the United Architect of the Philippines.

MR. ALLI. That is correct.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Unlike the Integrated Bar of the Philippines ...

MR. ALLI. Yes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. If you are a lawyer, automatically you should be a member ...

MR. ALLI. Yes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Under, you know, some penalty by the Supreme Court, you should be a member.

MR. ALLI. Yes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. But, of course, while being a member of the Integrated Bar of the Philippines, you can also choose to...
MR. ALLI. Yes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. ... become a member of other lawyer organizations.

MR. ALLI. Yes, yes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Like myself, ...

MR. ALLI. Yes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. ... I am a member of other ...

MR. ALLI. Yes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Lawyer groups.

MR. ALLI. Yes.

MR. FLORENTINO. May I?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. So, that's a clarification.

MR. ALLI. If I may continue?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Please proceed.

MR. ALLI. The United Architects of the Philippines is an organization of individual practitioners. That means, if you get your license, you have the choice to become a member of the UAP.

Now, there are other organizations in which UAP members are also members and one of them is the Council for Consulting Architects and Planners of the Philippines, and we have the president here with us -- Architect Manahan -- and I am also the secretary general of CCAP but I'm representing AAIF today.
Now, the ...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So far, there is no conflict of interest ...

MR. ALLI. No conflict.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. ... at this point.

MR. ALLI. Because CCAP is an organization of firms and consultants. So that therein lies the distinction between UAP and CCAP. CCAP, actually, was originally formed, I think, in the late '80s, to address government projects but it has now expanded into other areas, as well, public and private sector projects, no?

The AAIF, on the other hand, is a new organization. We were able to register with the SEC only this year and basically AAIF stands for Architecture Advocacy International Foundation and basically it stands for good ethical practice of the profession. And we would like ...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Are you affiliated with other international organizations since you are using the word "international"?

MR. ALLI. We are in the process of completing these links with the other international organizations, 'no?

(Conferring with Mr. Paredes.)

Yes. Okay.
Now, in regard to Senate Bill 1290 of Senator Osmeña, we were able to file just this morning our position paper, the AAIF position paper, and it was received by the staff of Madam Lu Zulueta.

This is the position paper on Senate Bill 1290 and in regard to Senate Bill 2081, we would probably be filing a position paper concerning 2081 as well, probably at the same time that UAP would be filing its own version.

Before I conclude my opening statement, I would like to introduce another member of the AAIF. She is Architect Marietta Segovia.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it “Marietta” or “Nanette Segovia”?

Ah, your opening statement, please, architect.

MS. SEGOVIA. Good morning, sir.

Nanette is just my nickname being used in organization and my legal name is Marietta.

We are here ... (ceg)
MS. SEGOVIA. ...and my legal name is Marietta.

We are here as part of UAP also, but we would like to continue our purpose when we were members of the Legislation Committee two years. Since we would like to keep track of what we already endorsed or, I mean, submitted in the Office of Senator Magsaysay, and we are happy they are giving attention to our proposals. And with our new group as the AAI, we are here to follow up everything we want to finish which was our unfinished business before.

Thank you, sir.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. Thank you.

Is there any additional opening statement? Would you like to say something more, Architect Florentino?

MR. FLORENTINO. If I may, Attorney, I just want to have some comments on what has been said...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. Please proceed.

MR. FLORENTINO. ...not that I will contradict them but however... First, let me just mention the point of your question a while ago about, are all members of UAP automatically – is it mandatory, the words 'no'?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. No, no. My question was, is it always necessary that if you become an architect, you should be a member of – meaning, mandated by law to become a member of the United Architects of the Philippines?

MR. FLORENTINO. Attorney, the present law, in fact, even in previous versions, it is not mandatory, as you said. However, the consensus now in our groups...
that we will probably – we will present, as expressed by our executive vice president, reflect precisely that direction of which all licensed architects now should become members of the UAP. That is one of the main amendments that we would like to introduce. But as I said, this is all contained in one – that this will all be contained in one version. And let me just say that we have been going through all aspects of this law for years and in fact -- but the difficulty before, there were many associations who had different opinions. And therefore, the legislators will tell us, “Oh, magkasundo-sundo muna kayo.” It’s too ramified to listen to all sectors of architects, for example. And that is the reason why we went into dialogue with the Philippine Institute of Architects and all that. And that is the reason why...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Philippine Institute of Architects is not represented here. Nobody from the group?

MR. FLORENTINO. Because they agreed already in substance to the position of the United Architects of the Philippines and the version that will be submitted to you reflects precisely their position also, and that is the reason why. But we want to go through the formalities of having an official position of the United Architects of the Philippines, and that is why we are asking that time. We have a draft already, Attorney, but we want to formalize it so that when we present it to you, you will not say to us, “Eh, bakit hindi kayo magkasundo-sundo na mga arkitekto?” We don’t like sana that thing to happen again. Because that has been the one that delayed the amendment or the updating of our law for the past 25 years because architects do not agree, you know. But now we would like to present a united front, that now we are agreeable to these changes.
Thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. So before we go into the nitty-gritty of the bill, let’s have some backgrounder from our comsec, Committee Secretary Lu Zulueta, Lu.

MS. ZULUETA. Yes. Thank you, sir, for giving me the opportunity and welcome to the members of the architects. Thank you for coming over to participate in this technical working group.

As a backgrounder, we had a meeting, a preliminary meeting or a public hearing of this bill last September 4. And we took up Senate bills...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Just a minute, Lu. Who were present among you here during the public hearing?

MS. ZULUETA. It was only Architect Florentino during the meeting last September 4, with Senator Teresa Aquino-Oreta.

MR. FLORENTINO. Yes.

MS. ZULUETA. He was only... And also, yes, Architect Olanan. They were invited.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay.

MS. ZULUETA. And so, that was only a preliminary hearing, so you just introduced... Contrary to the letter which we received, complaining that we conducted a meeting on September and we had the agenda of the 11th Congress. That letter came from the AAIF. And so I would like to correct that statement that during that September 4 meeting, our agenda was Senate Bills 1290 and 2081, the 12th Congress bills. So I
would like to correct that view. So I'm hoping that this bill will be passed this 12th Congress.

MR. FLORENTINO. Thank you.

MS. ZULUETA. Okay. Thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Well, let's hope. Nothing is wrong with hoping.

Okay. Let's go to – we're using the Magsaysay version as the working draft.

Okay, let's proceed. Section – what about the title? Any questions on the title? “An Act Professionalizing Further the Practice of Architecture in the Philippines, Amending for the Purpose Republic Act Numbered Five Hundred and Forty-Five (Ra 545), as Amended, and for Other Purposes.” Any questions on this?

MR. PAREDES. None.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay.

Section 1, any question?

MR. PAREDES. None.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Section 2? Go over this and let us know.

MR. MANAHAN. Mr. Chair, are we still also correcting typo errors?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, of course, of course. Not only typo errors but even grammar.

MR. MANAHAN. Okay. Mr. Chairman, in Line 4.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Line 4 of Section?

MR. MANAHAN. Of Section 2.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Section 2, Line 4. Okay.
MR. MANAHAN. "Well-rounded" should appear.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. "Well-rounded", not "well-ronder". Okay.

MR. MANAHAN. And Line 5, "architects whose standards."

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay, yeah.

MR. MANAHAN. Thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. Thank you very much.

Okay. So Section 3, Definition of Terms. Any comment, questions, violent reactions?

MR. MANAHAN. Mr. Chair, another...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Architect Manahan.

MR. MANAHAN. Second line.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Second line of?

MR. MANAHAN. Of Section 3.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay.

MR. MANAHAN. "Following."

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yeah, "following." Right, right. When this was filed, they must have been in a hurry.

Section 4 – no, no, marami pala itong Section 3. Okay. Go over Section 3, Letter (A), Letter (B), Subparagraph (1), Subparagraph (2).

Yes.

MR. TIMBOL. I just want to hear the opinion of the architects here. That’s why...
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Your microphone, please. Okay.

MR. TIMBOL. I just want to know the opinion of my friends here, fellow architects, the difference between item one, "architect-on-record" and the other one is architect-in-charge." It seems like this architect-in-charge is covering a lot and it seems like the architect-on-record will be the one answering for any damages or liabilities. I just want to know about your opinions.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. I think that's a very good perception. It's a good idea to find out from among yourselves how we should define the two. So any idea?

MR. MANAHAN. Mr. Chairman.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Architect Manahan.

MR. MANAHAN. In Subsection 2, actually, there's a modifying statement, it's architect-in-charge of construction. It's not the overall person in charge, but he is responsible...
MR. MANAHAN.....but he is responsible for the operations in the field to the construction stage. While the architect on record is the one totally responsible for the design of the building.

MR. TIMBOL. Yes, for the design. The architect on record made the design, signed the plans, specifications and so forth, documents so forth and so on. Supposing the architects in charge of construction mess it up, made changes, could the architect on record be still responsible?

MR. MANAHAN. Mr. Chairman.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Architect Manahan, then I will call on Architect Paredes later on.

MR. MANAHAN. There's a document usually part of the construction documents called the general conditions of contract. And it's stated there that the one fully in charge of the project is the architect of record who signs and seals the documents. And sees to it that the documents are religiously followed in the job site. While the architect in charge of construction may be only part of the construction management group and seeing to it that all the architectural elements of the building are followed as per design and planned by the architect of record. If there are any changes as provided in the provisions of general conditions, he has to contact, get in touch with the architect of record to get the approvals.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. And if the architect in charge of the construction does not get the prior approval of the architect of record, the...
latter, meaning the architect in charge of construction shall have the liability, is that what you mean?

MR. MANAHAN. Not necessarily. If the architect of record releases his liability so be it. But often times, ethically he has to get the approval and permission of the architect of record. Because besides the architect of record there'll be other professionals signing the plans, the structural engineer, electrical engineer, sanitary and so forth and so on.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So after all, the signatory is the architect of record say after so many years, 10 years, the guaranty is still there, 15 years I mean, who is answerable is not the architect in charge of construction but the architect of record, 'yun ba?

Yes, Architect Paredes.

MR. PAREDES. May I explain that? Because under the Civil Code, Article 1723, paraphrasing the provision of that article, the one who design, the one who supervise the construction and the one who built are jointly and severally liable in case the building fails within 15 years after it has been erected. That's why, there should be a difference between the architect on record and the supervising architect and the builder himself. But there are cases when the architect of record is the one who administer the construction of the entered project. So he is the one that is all over responsible in the three instances there. That's why we have the separation of the one who supervise, the one who design and the one who built.
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Very clear, very clear. Okay.

Architect Alli.

MR. ALLI. Maybe the confusion stems from the incomplete sentence that we have under Item 2 because something should appear after the word "attendant on line 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. On line six, there's the word "the attendant" but it's hanging. Maybe the missing clause would be the attendant civil liability for constructions supervision. And then the word "architect in charge" is actually a part of another sentence.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Or it should be supervision...the attendant...

MR. ALLI. Responsibility...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Responsibility or liability...

MR. ALLI. Or liability for...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. And then period.

MR. ALLI. Yeah.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Architect in charge and...(reading)

Siguro, tama ano.

MR. ALLI. Or liability.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Responsibility or liability.

MR. ALLI. If I may continue, Mr. Chairman.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yeah. Please proceed.
MR. ALLI. The matter of Article 1723 which just touch on Architect Paredes, while it’s true that architects especially the ones who sign have 15 years mandatory liability under Article 1723. They still have another 10 years in which to get sued. So it’s actually 15 plus 10. For what happened during the 15 years, they can still get sued between year 16 and year 25. So it’s actually 15 plus 10. That’s why it’s very very important that the ones who signed are to be made aware of what they are signing for because this is an automatic life sentence of sorts eh. So you have 15 plus 10 palagi.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. That is ¼ of a century.

MR. TIMBOL. One generation.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. One generation. Yeah.

MR. TIMBOL. Atty. Barbo.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, sir.

MR. TIMBOL. You are more versed about legal matters ‘no.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay.

MR. TIMBOL. Sometimes I read in the papers that such a person of which the age of 70 cannot be imprisoned anymore. Could you please enlighten us?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. He can be imprisoned but I think the life sentence is much lessened and he cannot be put in the gas chamber or you know, hindi naman gas chamber ito. Ano ba ito? Lethal injection if you are 70
years old and more than that you are – you can be paroled. You are subject
to, you know, to leniency because of consideration of age. Hindi. Iba 'yun.
But that can happen also. House arrest, depende sa circumstances eh. So,
unless there are questions, we can proceed.

MR. MANAHAN. Another typo, Mr. Chairman.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

MR. MANAHAN. Line 3 of Section...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Maraming typo ano.

MR. MANAHAN. Marami.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Line?

MR. MANAHAN. Line 3 of Subsection 1, Responsible. May I add, Mr.
Chairman, one reason why the architect of record is being specified is that, it's
also the opportunity to extend the law when the GATS, General Agreement of
Trade Services is applied. Because sometimes, they might now allow
architects of records who are foreigners under GATTS.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. How shall it be worded?

MR. MANAHAN. Just the spelling, responsible

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yeah. Yeah. Responsible the spelling.

Ano ba ito maraming errors ah. First time akong – a bill formally filed na

Paragraph C, any questions?

MR. FLORENTINO. May I give my...
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Architect Florentino.

MR. FLORENTINO. Substantially, we are in agreement with Section C (a) as written except that the version of our association wanted to define also aside from the practice of architecture, it wanted also to define the scope of the practice of architecture. And that as I said, Attorney, that would be included in our position paper. The scope of architecture is quite low, it contains one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten; ten subsections to ask. In other words, it specifies the scope of practice, sort of elaborating on the practice of architecture just—we wanted to clarify what is the scope of practice of architecture. It includes there even programming, consultancy, planning, etcetera, etcetera, and that would be included in our position paper, Attorney.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Duly noted. Okay. Any other idea? Any questions? What about this.../mhb
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. ... What about this architectural firm'? Is it not the corporation composed of architects but only architects.

MR. MANAHAN. Mr. Chairman.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, please proceed.

MR. MANAHAN. In the definition of "architectural firm", there is an entity called a "foundation" and oftentimes the foundation is not necessarily a business corporation but is an avenue for some entities to come in. And in terms of tax liability, the foundation has some advantage to the detriment of a practising or a business firm that is practising in the Philippines.

I would recommend that we delete the term "or a foundation".

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. That is paragraph "D", after the word "corporation", delete the words "a foundation". So, it will read the corporation registered with the Board and with the Securities and Exchange Commission," without the words "a foundation"?

Okay. That is your recommendation. Any question on this? (Silence.)

That means a foundation is not embraced within the term "architectural firm." Is that what you mean?

MR. MANAHAN. Yes, sir.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. So ... (conferring with Ms. Zulueta)
MR. FLORENTINO. Attorney.

Will the Professional Regulation Commission accredit a firm or an architectural firm or a corporation or a foundation?

MR. MANAHAN. In the amendments.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Ah, okay. So, but what you are saying a few while ago, that the corporation must be composed of duly-licensed architects and not engineers?

Who said that?

Yeah, Architect Florentino.

MR. FLORENTINO. That point, Engineer, will be in another section. What we were defining here merely is the term "architectural firm" and the version of our UAP is "architectural firm" means "a sole proprietorship, a company or partnership or a corporation registered with the proper government agencies."

That is the version of our organization. With the proper ... registered with the proper government agencies. That, I think, is safer, you know.

VOICE. Yes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay.

VOICE. So, we may delete the "foundation".

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay.
MR. MANAHAN. Delete the "foundation".

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Oh, delete the "foundation".

Yes, Architect Timbol.

MR. TIMBOL. Further clarification, 'no? As of now, professionals, like architects, cannot incorporate as of now, and one of the articles of Senator Magsaysay is to allow them to incorporate.

Thank you.

MR. MANAHAN. Yeah, but ...

MR. FLORENTINO. That is why – Atty. ...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, you may proceed.

MR. FLORENTINO. That is why our term here is "proper government agencies" because there may be more than one government agency involved. There may be one more than ... Maybe the PRC can be an agency. Maybe the SEC can be an agency. That's why we do not specify SEC only as is written here in the bill. We are just putting in "registered with the proper government agencies."

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay? So, duly noted.

MR. ALLI. Mr. Chairman.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Architect Alli.
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Architect Florentino.

MR. FLORENTINO. As I understand it.

MR. FLORENTINO. Attorney, I am not an attorney but as I understand it, even a foundation, may be a corporation, I mean, should be, one way or the other. So, the …

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Correct, you can be registered with the SEC.

MR. FLORENTINO. … foundation, we don't have to mention specifically “foundation”. That is why the definition of the UAP on the firm, architectural firm, still stands. You don't have to mention foundation because even a foundation will be a corporation and should be registered with the proper agencies, 'no?'

So, we will … that is the reason why.

MR. MANAHAN. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman …

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Architect Manahan.

MR. MANAHAN. And besides, the law is about the practice of the profession …

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Uh-huh.

MR. MANAHAN. … and foundations are not obliged, cannot practise.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay.
MR. MANAHAN. So, anyway, foundations are registered, not only with the SEC but also with the NGO.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay, okay.

MR. FLORENTINO. That is right.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Anyway, you are engaged more in matters of advocacy?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay.

MR. PAREDES. ... direct government agencies, for example, bureaucracy to guide them in developing our country to the proper ... in a proper way.

In other words, we will introduce solutions that a bureaucratic body may not necessarily be conscious about the full development, the total development or comprehensive development.

For example, now, our country is developing but concentrating merely on the socioeconomic aspects, without the physical aspects. We have 7,100 islands that are underdeveloped, which actually should be part of the development as a comprehensive approach and that's what the advocacy is for, the Advocacy Foundation.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Understood.

MS. ZULUETA. Mr. Chairman.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Lu.
MS. ZULUETA. I think there’s something missing here under letter “C”,
General Practice of Architecture, under line No. 4, which says, “general
administration and responsible direction the erection …” I think something is
missing here.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Oo nga, ang daming mali ang kuwan nito.

MS. ZULUETA. Can we supply this?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Papaano? How should that be worded?

VOICE. In the erection.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Enlargement. Mukhang pornographic ito
ah. May enlargement pa, may erection. (Laughter.) Mabuti walang ejection.

MR. ALLI. Mr. Chairman, this was … this is …

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

MR. ALLI. … this is the original language of the original law, of R.A.
545. That’s why, since this was basically an amendment version, we chose not to
touch these terms because they are all encompassing.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. This can be improved eh.

MR. FLORENTINO. May I …?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. How do you improve that? Yes …

MR. FLORENTINO. May I read?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. … Father Florentino. I’m reminded of El

Filibusterismo, Father Florentino.
ARCHITECT FLORENTINO. Okay, please proceed.

MR. FLORENTINO. The general practice of architecture is hereby defined as the art of planning, architectural and structural designing, specifying, supervising and giving general supervision and responsible direction to the erection, enlargement or alterations of buildings and architectural design of engineering structures, etcetera, etcetera ... "

VOICE. Direction to the ...

MR. FLORENTINO. Direction to the erection, enlargement or alterations of buildings ...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Ito ba gagamitin natin o preposition na “in”? Responsible direction in the erection. In, not to. I think the correct preposition is “in”. In the erection, enlargement or ... buildings ... and building environments.

MR. FLORENTINO. But that’s an oversight of the old law.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Ano itong environments? Bakit naging plural.

MR. MANAHAN. Yes. Interior and exterior.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Ha, “And building environments” eh.

ARCHITECT MANAHAN?

MR. MANAHAN. The jargon is that you have interior environments and exterior environments. You have ... (ceg)
MR. MANAHAN. ...and exterior environments, you have built environments
and natural environment.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, that makes it plural. Ah, tama ito. Okay, sige.
I take your word for it.

Next.

Direction “in”, hindi “to” in the erection. Okay. You are sure na iyong erection,
kuwan iyon, parang kuwan iyan, iyong mga vertical na...

MR. FLORENTINO. Erection, enlargement.


MR. FLORENTINO. Immediately, after these provisions on the general practice
of architecture, now the version of the UAP chose to define also structural designing
because that word is mentioned in the general practice and that area has been the bone of
conflict with other professionals. What is structural designing? They thought, they
believe, rather, that we are overlapping with other profession, which is not. That is the
reason why we have defined it here so that it is...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Saan? What line is that?

MR. FLORENTINO. Wala po rito. Kaya I’m just putting it on record.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Wala.

MR. FLORENTINO. I’m just putting it on record, Attorney...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. I see.

MR. FLORENTINO. ...that the UAP has inserted – proposed to insert the word
“structural design” because it is mentioned in the practice of architecture.
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. I see. Good. Yeah. I think it should be clearly defined, structural design.

MR. FLORENTINO. Especially because this has been the source of conflict with other associations. That's why we have a definition here which we will submit later. I mean, we have a definition here which says, "Structural design is the act of conceiving, choosing and developing the type, disposition, arrangement and proportioning of the structural elements of an architectural work giving due consideration to safety, cost effectiveness, functionality and aesthetics." That we propose to put into our...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Well, I think -- after all, the senators in the plenary can decide among themselves. But I think there's no harm in setting a provision for that purpose. Anyway, what could be the possible objection of that, Architect Paredes?

MR. PAREDES. Structural designing is mentioned here, it's not necessarily the rigorous analysis of the structure in itself because that belongs to the expertise of structural designers who specialized on that. Actually, the concept of the building is in totality. When the architect designed a building, he is not merely concerned with the architectural planning and all that. Actually, he conceived of the structure as a whole, not only the functional requirements, the circulation and the interpolation of the spaces. He is concerned with the total design. So the concept of the structure belongs to the architect. And then the detailed, he makes his own calculations here which we call preliminary structural designing. And the final decision, the final execution of the contract documents for construction, the architect usually hires an expert structural designer, structural engineer, that he does the detail, rigorous analysis of the structure to
make it in accordance with the international accepted standards of design for safety and rigidity of the structure. Kaya structural designing is part of the architect’s concept here.

We don’t need to define it in detail because it should be in totality. The approach creates a totality of the design of the whole building. Or for that matter, he is concerned even with the air-conditioning design, electrical design. Actually, he is trained to work on those things. He has a working knowledge of that. That’s how strained. Kaya pagkuha natin ng architecture po, eh, civil engineer, I have to take it for four years or five years to finish architecture. But for an architect to take up civil engineering, it takes only two years, actually, now. And that has been ever since. Pagka ang arkitketo mag-e-engineer, dalawang taon lang. Pagka ang engineer ang mag-a-arkitekto, limang taon pa rin. Kasi total ang approach ho namin, eh. Kaya it doesn’t need o separate those...

Actually, even in the board exams, we are examined on structural designing and even electrical designing. And even mechanical, we are examined there to see if it that we have a working knowledge of the total design of the building. Hindi puwede po iyong ano, eh, halimbawa, ide-design ng arkitketo iyong plano lang, tapos ibibigay sa civil engineer, “I-structure mo nga ito.” Tapos ibibigay sa electrical engineer, “I-electrical mo nga ito.” Hindi, lahat iyon nandodoon na, naka-built ng lahat.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

MR. PAREDES. Iyon ang practice ngayon ng -- traditional practice. And that’s what the advocacy planners; the advocacy architects foundation is, we want to maintain such nobility of the practice of the profession. Nawawala na po iyon sa ngayon. Pati ang training ng arkitketo ngayon ma-ano – buhat nang na-introduce iyong ladder-type
architecture course, masyadong naging ano, very flimsy na ang study ng architecture.

Hindi kagaya noong traditional, based on Republic Act 545. Kasi mga Amerikano ho rin ang may gawa noon, eh.

Salamat po.


MR. FLORENTINO. Yeah. We just want to say that we are not in contradiction with Mr. Paredes, except that you will notice that he made an explanation, and that we want to...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. But your point is, we have to...

MR. FLORENTINO. Define.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. ...have a specific provision where we will have to define structural design.

MR. FLORENTINO. That's true.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. And Architect Paredes says there's no need for it.

Your reply.

MR. FLORENTINO. Yes. That is, we are... We will notice that there are — there has to be some clarifications like that. And that is the reason why there is need to our mind, especially in the eyes of civil engineers, there is need to define what it is because they may say that we are referring to something that is part of their profession. We want it clarified here that this is now a process by which architects — it is the domain of architects to do the conceptualization of the structures, not the computation. We agree...
with Architect Paredes. We agree with him. But we need still to define that precisely to prevent any conflict, misrepresentation or misunderstanding, right, misunderstanding.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Anyway, we would like to have it in a very specific definite provision of law. And Architect Paredes says it is a superfluous, therefore, no need. And that’s what we have to decide now.

MR. PAREDES. Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, your reply.

MR. PAREDES. Because I myself is doing structural designing, I’m only an architect. I design a church, for example, four-story buildings and all that. The computation is done by me because that’s not so intricate a structure. But when it comes to a multi-storey, let’s say, a thirty-storey building, I prefer it be done by a structural engineer. Concept cannot be beyond my expertise already. Because like residences, for example, structural design should not be required by the building official to submit a structural designer for residential building, for example. The architect could design that by himself as a structure. Kasi masyadong superfluous iyon, ipapagawa pa sa structural engineer when it’s only a small residence or a residence that is only two floors. That is within the capacity...
MR. PAREDES....that is within the capacity of an ordinary architect to
design that. Pagka ni-require pa ng structural engineering 'yun, masyado ng
komplikado.

Salamat po.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Architect Manahan, you are saying
something?

MR. MANAHAN. It's more of a clarification maybe this will help. The
bone of contention among architects not civil engineers but that's not the point
among civil engineers, structural engineers, is that the act of structural
designing covers several realms, while the realm of the architect would be in
terms of conceptualization. For easy projects like what Architect Paredes has
made, the expertise of the architect can support the computations. But if the
very complicated buildings especially these days, the expertise of the
structural engineers is required. And oftentimes, what happens is that the
definition of the realm of the practice of the architects, structural engineer and
the civil engineer encompasses the same realm but certain component of that
particular realm. And I think what Architect Florentino wants to explain in the
law, is that the realm of the architects is what is defined.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So what's your --- Do you resolve to have
it so provided in the law, meaning the definition?
MR. PAREDES. I would rather not.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. You would rather not?

MR. PAREDES. I would rather not...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. You would rather not.

MR. PAREDES. (Off-mike)

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. Can we have a consensus on this? If we cannot have any consensus then we will put it as part of the remarks.

MR. MANAHAN. Another explanation.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yeah, yeah.

MR. MANAHAN. This was discussed about 10 years ago between the Philippine Institute of Civil Engineers and the United Architects of the Philippines wherein the realms are defined like, for instance, it would be, I think three storeys.

In a span of seven meters both the civil engineer, the structural engineer and the architect can do their designing provided that they don't use the term that is not appropriate for their profession. So if the architects would be designing structural design for such buildings then he just uses the term "architect" similarly for the structural engineering. And in terms of education, often times the architect has sufficient education for designing such limitations...
but not the tall buildings. The tall buildings are specialization and further education of structural engineers both for the civil engineer and the architect.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Anyway, to resolve this issue, after all, you're still going to submit your position paper and we will have another meeting of this kind by come mid-January, then perhaps we can finally resolve that issue whether to put it here in the law or none at all because like Architect Paredes says, there's no need for that.

Yes, Architect Florentino.

MR. FLORENTINO. We are trying to avoid any objection to the law by other sectors. That is one reason why it is there that we are trying to avoid that one sector may say, "O bakit nakalagay 'yan, structural design 'yan, amin 'yan eh." Baka sabihin nila. So we would like to clarify that the designing component aspect of structural design we are talking about in our law, is not that it is not covered in the other professions like the computation that Architect Paredes is saying, the quantification and all that. No, we are not talking about that, we are talking about conceptualization that is the aspect of architect. I would like to clarify that. That is the reason for that.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. And so, that is now understood and I think we should not bogged down on that issue. So let's proceed. Yes.

MR. MANAHAN. Just to remove this confusion, in line six...
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Paragraph?

MR. MANAHAN. Of C.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Paragraph C, okay.

MR. MANAHAN. Here is the term engineering structures...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay.

MR. MANAHAN. I propose that we delete the term engineering, just call it structures.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Structural design, wala na't yung engineering structures? Engineering structures na ang nandiyan?

MR. MANAHAN. Architectural designs of structures.

MR. PAREDES. No, no. I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Just a minute, just a minute. And building environments and architectural design of engineering structures.

MR. PAREDES. Oo.

MR. MANAHAN. My proposal is to delete the word "engineering."

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Delete the word "engineering."

MR. PAREDES. No, I object to that. I object to that, Mr. Chairman...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

MR. PAREDES. ...because that would be confusing the whole sentence. That’s a traditional, what do you call this, a statement of the
Republic Act 545. Actually, the Quezon Bridge, for example, that is designed by an engineer in the Public Works. The copula, the entrance gate of that Quezon Boulevard, I think you are familiar with this, is designed by an architect, my father.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Really ha.

MR. PAREDES. Actually, the architectural aspect even the bar straits alone the bridge is designed by an architect. That's why there's the design, the architectural design of engineering structures because engineers are not capable to design architecturally. They are utilitarian designers. In other words, for functions of the structure but not for the aesthetic part. So it should not be deleted. That's a traditional part.


MR. MANAHAN. My point is, let's make the term more generic because when you say engineering structures that's purely engineering structures. But you might have other types of structures which are...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Which are not necessarily engineering, like what?

MR. MANAHAN. Buildings.

MR. PAREDES. Which one?
MR. MANAHAN. Buildings. Sculptural elements which needs architectural design components.

MR. PAREDES. Mali.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Are you comfortable with that?

MR. PAREDES. No, no. I'm not because it has been there. It's architectural design only a portion that he needs architectural, for example, a dam it's all engineering structure. But there are portions there that may require architectural design to make the appearance perhaps, to be more setting in attitudes. So why erase that, that's only architectural design of engineering structures. For example, a bridge could be, like Jones Bridge, it is an – Well, the old Jones Bridge I think you are familiar with that, Mr. Chairman...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Sa Sta. Cruz.

MR. PAREDES. ...where there is structural work. Actually, there's a work of architecture. It's a bridge, the former Jones Bridge. Actually, it has a sculpture there which was designed by my father and the bridge itself is actually all architectural aspect. To make it stand his is supposed to be an engineering structure. Masama 'yun eh. You'll be creating conflict. Pinag-aawayan eh.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Mayroon ba? Anyway...

MR. PAREDES. Hindi nila kasi nakita 'yung Jones Bridge eh.
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Mayroon bang architects role or part dito sa engineering work ng Diosdado Macapagal Avenue?

MR. PAREDES. 'Yung planning po, 'yung planning.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. 'Yung planning.

MR. PAREDES. 'Yung land pattern, 'yung the design of the space pattern, the roads and 'the wide areas, of course, of functional areas.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Assuming na ituloy 'yung ano, 'yung prosecution of the case, mayroong liability ba diyan ang architect na nag-design?

MR. PAREDES. Wala po. Wala.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Wala.

MR. MANAHAN. 'Yung contractor.

MR. PAREDES. 'Yung contractor at saka 'yung...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Matters of implementation.

Okay. So any consensus?

MR. TIMBOL. Before that.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Architect Timbol.

MR. TIMBOL. Ito off-the-record 'no.

(OFF-THE-RECORD)
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. So no consensus to remove or not to remove the word "engineering"?

MR. PAREDES. (Off-mike)

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Anyway, this is part of the old law. So are you going to forego with your...

MR. MANAHAN. I concede. Oo.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. So you agree that we do not touch the word "engineer" let it be there. Okay.

Let's proceed…/mhb
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. ... Let's proceed. So, leave the word "engineering," not delete. Do not delete the word "engineering." It's kasi in the law itself in the former law, the original law pala. Okay.

Okay, next paragraph. If not, let's go to Article II, after Section 3, paragraph "J", paragraph "K", paragraph "L", paragraph "M".

MR. MANAHAN. Dito lang. Just one question, Mr. Chairman, 'no?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

MR. MANAHAN. Does a law allow acronyms?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Acronyms?

MR. MANAHAN. Like there's one here in paragraph "K", second to the last sentence of the page – BOA, Board of Architecture. Although it was defined, I think ...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Paragraph, paragraph, which paragraph?

MR. MANAHAN. "K", second to the last sentence.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Ah, yeah. Yeah, it allows acronym but it should be spelled out.

MR. MANAHAN. Defined, oo.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. It should be spelled out and then in parentheses.

Ano ba itong BOA?

MR. MANAHAN. Board of Architecture.
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Ah Board, oo. Oo, Board of ... dapat spelled out.

MR. MANAHAN. Baka mayroon hong definition na Board eh.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Oo, oo, oo, tama. Board of Architecture.

MR. FLORENTINO. Eh, itong APOA?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay.

MR. MANAHAN. Another one.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. APOA, yes. How should this be spelled out?

MR. MANAHAN. Accredited Professional Organization of Architects.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Spelled out. Okay. Right, right, tama ano?

Okay. Okay. Service agreement means a written contract or equivalent public instrument stipulating ... Meaning, it should be in a formal document ha?

MR. MANAHAN. Notarized.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Verbal, hindi puwede, hindi i-co-consider 'yan as service agreement kung verbal. It should be written.

MR. MANAHAN. And notarized.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. And notarized, of course. Wala ritong "notarized" eh.

Ano, gusto ninyong ilagay?
MR. ALLI. Mr. Chairman.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Architect Alli.

MR. ALLI. To our understanding, public instrument means notarized document eh. Is there anything wrong with that?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Not necessarily. We have public documents. For example, this one are public documents but they are not notarized.

MR. ALLI. Okay, okay. In that case, we will insert the word “notarized”

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Notarized.

MR. ALLI. ... before “public”.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. And duly notarized ha? Means a written contract duly notarized.

So, kung nag-usap-usap lang na “Pakigawa mo naman, pare, ko ng kuwan nito. Alam mo naman gusto kong baguhin itong itsura ng bahay ko>”

Eh kung walang pinirmahan na ... that cannot be considered an agreement, ano? ‘Yan ang ibig sabihin niyan. And, therefore, in case of, you know, legal action, walang mahahabol diyan. Kasi walang written evidence.

So, is that what you mean?

Okay, if that is what you mean, please proceed.

Article II.
MR. FLORENTINO. Excuse me.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Architect Florentino.

MR. FLORENTINO. There is also ... just ... just a say, kuwan lang. In our proposal, we will also define the contract documents.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay.

MR. FLORENTINO. So that it will also clear ...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. How do you define the service agreement?

MR. FLORENTINO. The contract documents mean a final set of plans, specifications for a building or a complex that normally include architectural designs, structural, electrical, mechanical, plumbing design, specifications and related documents as appropriated in accordance with existing laws and other documents required to construct a building.

These are all to clarify ...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Written documents. Talagang nakasulat iyun talaga.

MR. FLORENTINO. Baka mamaya eh hindi nagkakaintindihan kung ano ang mga dokumentong iyon.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Tama. I think you should put that in your position paper and I think that is even a more comprehensive definition of the service agreement.

MR. MANAHAN. Although, Mr. Chairman, ...
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, please proceed.

MR. MANAHAN. ... the service agreement is between the architect and his client. While what Ed Florentino mentioned is the contract documents are the documents for the implementation of the project. And oftentimes, the agreement is between ... the documents are used by the contractor, the builder and the client in implementing the project.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Oh, okay.

MR. MANAHAN. So, it needs definition.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. That should be properly defined in your proposed position paper.

MR. FLORENTINO. Another one, Attorney. I must mention this because, especially this one I'm going to mention now because this is a very vital proposal, 'no, which I'd like to read it.

We'd like to define the APOA here the Accredited Professional Organization of Architects. It mentions APOA but there is no definition and we are clarifying this by stating. The APOA here, Attorney, it says here, dito sa "K", di ba mayroon APOA?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Mayroon BOA.

MR. FLORENTINO. APOA.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Kailangan may APOA.

MR. FLORENTINO. APOA, 'no?
MR. MANAHAN. Sa letter "F".

VOICE. Letter "F".

VOICE. Letter "F"

MR. FLORENTINO. Ah, ito, mayroon na.

VOICE. Mayroon na, letter "F".

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Mayroon nang letter "F". APOA.

MR. FLORENTINO. Okay. This is now the definition that the UAP proposes -- Accredited Professional Organization of Architects refers to the existing official national organization of architects of the Philippines, in which all registered Filipino architects shall be members, without prejudice to voluntary membership in other professional associations.

This is what I was mentioning a while ago.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, this is your ...

MR. FLORENTINO. Yes, this is our proposal. That what we will term as the APOA, the Accredited Professional Organization of Architects is the accredited ...

VOICES. Refers ...

MR. FLORENTINO. ... refers to the existing official national organization of all architects of the Philippines, in which all registered Filipino architects shall be members, without prejudice to voluntary membership in other
professional associations. Lahat na, ito ang sinasabi ni Attorney kanina, na parang bar association na.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Pero you do not have to put "without prejudice" to kuwan. Hindi na kailangan iyun "without prejudice".

Kasi under the Constitution, it is a legitimate right of any Filipino citizen to join any organization. That is not contrary to law or public policy. Not necessary na siguro.

MR. FLORENTINO. I think I agree with you, Attorney, but the reason why the other sectors insisted on having that ...

MR. PAREDES. No, the other sectors is not ...

MR. FLORENTINO. ... Ss to clarify na iyung kanilang mga association eh hindi mawawala. Ano ha? Iyung parang hindi mawawala.


Okay? So, letter "F", 'no? APOA means the official national organization of all registered and licensed architects in the Philippines.

MR. FLORENTINO. Yes, all registered.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Are you comfortable with this?

MR. PAREDES. Yes, comfortable.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay.

MR. PAREDES. Comfortable.
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, papaano ang kuwan? Iyung UAP wala rito?

MR. FLORENTINO. Alin?

MR. PARÉDES. Hindi.

MR. FLORENTINO. Precisely, this is the one ...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Ah, ito na. Ito na 'yun.

MR. FLORENTINO. By this definition, there will be no other organization but the UAP.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Ah ...

MR. FLORENTINO. Because it is now the existing accredited professional organization.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Ah, gusto mo iyung ...

MR. FLORENTINO. Kaya lang generic, hindi natin, hindi namin binanggit iyung word na “United Architects of the Philippines.”

MR. MANAHAN. Existing lang.

MR. FLORENTINO. Existing Accredited Professional Organization of the Philippines ... Architect and that is none other but the UAP.

MR. MANAHAN. Ganoon naman iyan.

MR. PAREDES. Oo, ganoon talaga. This is the only one officially accredited eh.
MR. FLORENTINO. You are now ... all registered architects will now be members of UAP.'Yan.

And then the last one that we are proposing to be defined is the continuing professional organization that will be mentioned by them, 'no? We wanted that clarified because, again, that has been a source of controversy.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Wala, wala rito iyun? Wala rito?

MR. FLORENTINO. Wala ho rito.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay.. Sige, duon sa position paper na i-sa-submit ninyo ...

MR. FLORENTINO. Kami mayroon.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay.

MR. FLORENTINO. Iyung “continuing professional organization” refers to a sustaining and progressive learning process that maintains, enhances or increases the knowledge and continuing ability of architects.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay.

MR. FLORENTINO. That will be contained in our position.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. Okay, let's proceed now to Article II.

VOICE. Article II.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Article II, any questions?

Section 4. Tingnan ninyo pati iyung spelling at saka grammar, ano?
Mukhang this is the first time that I come across with a bill ... (ceg)
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. ...This is the first time na I come across with a bill filed, formally filed already na maraming mistakes in typo.

Section 5, tingnan niyo.

MR. FLORENTINO. Just to note that in Section 4, we will have our own version.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay.

MR. FLORENTINO. Not very much different but...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yeah. Okay. Let’s proceed. Section 6. What do you mean by - Section 6, ano - hold the degree of B.S... This is Bachelor of Science in Architecture, ano.

VOICES. Yeah.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. What is meant by “or the equivalent thereof”? Ano’ng ibig sabihin niyan? Ano bang equivalent ng Bachelor of Science at saka Master of Science in Architecture? What can be the equivalent of that? And therefore, it can be conferred upon by an architectural college.

MR. PAREDES. Wala.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Walang equivalent, ano. Bakit ilalagay pa natin iyan? So i-delete na lang natin kung hindi kailangan.

MR. MANAHAN. Mr. Chairman.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

MR. MANAHAN. Yeah. I think this equivalent is somewhere related to degrees taken outside of the Philippines.
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Outside of the Philippines.

MR. MANAHAN. Like in Japan, it's called Bachelor of Architectural Engineering or a Masters in Architecture Engineering.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. "Legally chartered and of good standing." That is assuming na may reciprocity tayo sa Japan.

MR. MANAHAN. Yes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Pero tingnan natin kung ano bang mga requirements ng reciprocity. Baka iyong mga architectural graduates natin dito, hindi naman recognized sa Japan. Ano sila sinusuwerte, ire-recognize natin sila. Pero tayo hindi nire-recognize. The old provision is not necessarily a correct provision. What do you think?

MR. PAREDES. It's okay.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Ano’ng okay?

MR. PAREDES. As explained by Architect Manahan, iyong equivalent, I think it sounds off, correct me...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Or it sounds okay.

MR. PAREDES. ...he said architectural engineering. Although architects in the Philippines are considered architectural engineers. According to the former practitioner, a national artist, Pablo Antonio, said architects are engineers of buildings, specialty engineers of buildings. Kaya mayroong course sa Japan, Architectural Engineering. Kaya iyan ang equivalent nitong master or degrees and all that.
MR. MANAHAN. Kasi kamukha sa States, ano, it's not called Bachelor of Science. It's called Bachelor of Architecture only. Unlike here in the Philippines, it's a B.S. degree, Science, because of the larger science component of the degree.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So you would rather that we retain the words "equivalent thereof..."

MR. PAREDES. Equivalent, oho, tama iyan.


MR. PAREDES. Twenty years, tama. That's better for a board examiner.

VOICE. Yes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. May mga edad na iyan.

MR. PAREDES. Kasi po iyong practice architecture...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Kawawa naman iyong mga qualified.

MR. PAREDES. Kasi po dalawang ano, eh, maraming arkitekto ang nagpapractice all by their own, from the start. From the moment they pass the board, they practice by themselves. That will take time to really accumulate a proper experience in the design of building. Whereas those that took the benefit of being employed under a firm, they could tackle big buildings right away, that is sufficient. But for a board examiner who has not undergone that, I think it needs 20 years to amass enough knowledge about the design of building.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. May I ask Architects Segovia and Alli, your idea? Baka gusto ninyong - "Oh, sige kuwan, let's meet halfway, instead of 10 or 20, 15."

Yeah, your idea. Lady’s first, Architect Segovia.
MS. SEGOVIA. Okay. Actually, I agree with that na the more senior, the more experienced person is, especially if he is actively practicing the profession. I do believe that experience is the best qualification here as a member of the board. So I agree that, in fact, we agree that, the last time we discussed this, that it has to be raised to 20 years instead of 10 years.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. Pero di ba mahirap nang maghanap ng mga kuwan...

MS. SEGOVIA. No, I don’t think so. Because as far as I am concerned, the younger are much more inclined to have more experience first before going to another venue of being a member of the board. Sometimes there are some who are already established professionals who can leave their office or their firm and engage into another avenue of service of their profession, and then just let somebody in charge to run his office.


MR. ALLI. Mr. Chairman, the position of being -- well, being a chairman or a member of the board carries with it very, very great responsibilities. The Board of Architecture is a quasi-judicial body. That means, they could determine the fate of other architects. And we need to have mature people manning the board. We cannot have immature people manning the board. Besides 20 years is not such a long time to practice or to gain enough exposure in the practice. It really takes about 10 years for a new graduate or a new board passer to really get immersed in the practice. So 20 years, I think, is just about the right measure of experience required for the position.
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. So you are not that much assertive after all.

So it's okay, 20 years, ha. Okay.

So what about this "No former member of the faculty..."? Okay rin iyon, ano.

MR. PAREDES. That's okay.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay.

MR. PAREDES. That's okay.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Para walang conflict of interest, ano. Okay.

Terms of Office, Section 7.

MR. PAREDES. Okay.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay ito. Section 8, Executive Officer of the Board.

MR. FLORENTINO. Attorney.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Architect Florentino.

MR. FLORENTINO. In our version, we have inserted this – another section here, Powers and Functions of the Board.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Where is that?

MR. FLORENTINO. It's not in the proposed bill.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Oo nga, ano.

MR. FLORENTINO. Our version, our version will propose the powers and functions of the board.

MR. FLORENTINO. Basic iyon, eh.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. That should be very definite, very clear and very specific.

MR. FLORENTINO. We have 12 items here.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. You're right, okay. Okay. So you put that in your position paper.

MR. FLORENTINO. Yes, Attorney.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay.

MR. MANAHAN. Mr. Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Architect Manahan.

MR. MANAHAN. The heading of Section 8 lang, iyong board under parenthesis is right but the other one in the left side should be all in caps, capital; sa heading, Executive Officer of the Board, all in capital.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay.

MR. MANAHAN. Thank you.

MR. TIMBOL. Mr. Chairman.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

MR. TIMBOL. I was out for a while, can we please go back to Section 7?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay, Terms of Office.
MR. TIMBOL. Yes. This term of office was in the present Republic Act 545 but it's never implemented, Mr. Chairman. Yes. Eh, mayroong bagong ma-appoint, chairman na kaagad, eh. Yes. The reason why this is very good is, the three of them will become under studies for two years... /imjv
MR. TIMBOL…..for two years. By the time they reach the third year, kayang-kaya na niya. Alam na niya ang dapat niyang gawin, experienced na siya pero ngayon, naku po, tuloy-tuloy ‘yung mga German. My gosh! However, qualified they are, hindi tama ‘yun.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Siguro it is dependent upon your organization to voice out that kind of sentiment and perhaps influence the policymakers or the one who is running or even the president who is appointing the board members. I think that is – it behooves upon your organization to do that mga – Anyway, hindi na relevant sa kuwan natin ‘yan, dito sa pinag-uusapan natin. So nasa sa inyo na ‘yan. You should have a very active set of officers. Okay.

Anyway, I’d like to find out kung hanggang ngayon ba ang chairperson ng Board of Architect ay si Eugene Gan pa rin?

MR. TIMBOL. Yes, sir.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Siya pa rin. Ang members dalawa, si Miguel Galuza at saka Donato Dion(?)?

MR. FLORENTINO. Yes, Attorney.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Sila pa rin?

MR. OLONAN. Napatulan na si Donato Dion.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Sinong pumalit?

MR. OLONAN. ‘Si Santos.
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Kailan siya pinalitan?

MR. OLONAN. That was two years ago.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Bakit siya pinalitan, nag-resign, nag-end ang term niya?

MR. OLONAN. Tapos na ang kanyang term.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay.

MR. FLORENTINO. Let it be on record that in the version of the UAP, they had been contributing to it. They have been part of our meeting, the Board of Architecture.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. Section 9. (Pause)

Dito sa kuwan wala kayong share dito? Wala man lamang kayong recommendation, recommendatory power ng grupo ninyo?

MR. FLORENTINO. Mayroon po.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Doon sa vacancy mayroon ba kayo dito? Walang sinabi sa Section 9 eh. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the said board before expiration of term of office....(reading) Are you comfortable with that?

MR. FLORENTINO. Attorney, di nakalagay dito...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Architect Florentino.
MR. FLORENTINO. Sa Section 4, dito sa amin no…Sa version namin that creation and composition of the Professional Regulatory Board, nandidto ho ‘yung…

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Teka muna, pati pala ‘yung power ng board nandito na sa Section 5 eh. Powers and functions, Section 5, nandiyan na pala yan eh.

MR. FLORENTINO. Pero sa amin, the power vested…

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Sana binigyan niyo kaagad sa amin ‘yung position paper niyo para napag-aralan na natin kaagad.

MR. FLORENTINO. ‘Yun nga kung maaari two weeks.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. So, Section 10. (Pause)

Section 11?

MR. ALLI. Mr. Chairman.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Architect Alli.

MR. ALLI. Under Section 10, third line from the bottom, this office Bureau of Civil Service, does this still exist or should it be Civil Service Commission?


MR. TIMBOL. Yes, another question ho.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Architect Timbol.
MR. TIMBOL. It mention that the compensation will be the same as the member of the other board. There is no mention about traveling expenses and other expenses. (OFF-THE-RECORD) Junkets. Should it be here or…

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Siguro doon sa encompass na 'yan within the word “compensation” 'yung traveling expenses.

MR. FLORENTINO. (Inaudible)

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, what’s your idea on this?

MR. FLORENTINO. Mr. Chairman and members of the board shall receive compensation and allowances comparable to that being received by the chairman and members of existing regulatory boards under the commission as provided for in the new PRC Modernization Act. (Reading)

We do not control it. We are part of that. 'Yun ang aming ano…

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. You mentioned of allowances. So compensation and 'allowances.

MR. FLORENTINO. Ang examination ho puwede sa labas.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Would you be comfortable with that, Architect Timbol? So ilagay natin 'yung compensation and allowable allowances siguro, okay ba 'yun pero huwag 'yung junkets.

MR. TIMBOL. Nasa konsensiya na lang ho 'yun.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. So compensation and allowances.

(Pause)
MR. MANAHAN. Mr. Chairman.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

MR. MANAHAN. The last sentence in Section 10 is an open parenthesis pero hindi nagsasara 'yon. We don't know where it closes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. All fees shall be received...(Reading)

OO. Yeah. Baka typographical error 'yan. Dapat siguro wala 'yan.

MR. MANAHAN. Sir, the Bureau of Civil Service is no longer...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Oo. Baka 'yung open parenthesis before all fees baka wala 'yang kuwan...

MR. MANAHAN. Maybe the disbursing officer of the commission.


MR. ALLI. Mr. Chairman.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

MR. ALLI. It's defined under Section 1, Commission means, the Professional Regulation Commission. So we will use the word "Commission."
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. ... or baka hanggang Section 10 na lang tayo, I think the secretariat has not prepared a lunch for us.

So, we can come back next year, January? Ano?

Yes, ...

MR. MANAHAN. Siguro tapusin natin up to Section 13, since these are old provisions of the law.


MR. MANAHAN. Maybe, we can end after Section 13.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirteen. Okay.

MR. MANAHAN. And ...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Roster ... Okay. Agreed. Roster of Architects.

Roster of Architects. These are not cocks, ha? These are not rosters. So, Roster of Architects.

MR. TIMBOL. Itong No. 11, Section 11.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Section 11. Yeah.

MR. TIMBOL. Yeah. Itong second to the last line, ...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Second to the last line. Okay.

MR. TIMBOL. Baka akala nila 100 lang pesos ito, 'no? So i-capital natin iyung "one", capital "o n e." And then 'yung thousand capital din.
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Thousand pesos. Okay?

MR. TIMBOL. Oo.

MR. ALLI. Mr. Chairman.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, Architect Alli.

MR. TIMBOL. Salamat po.

MR. ALLI. The original text of the law was P1,000.00. So, siguro, going with what Architect Timbol was saying, baka i-bra-braket na lang natin iyung one thousand and then replace it with one hundred thousand, para hindi maano, magulo.

Kasi what we see here is that the word “HUNDRED” was inserted between “one” and “thousand”.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. One hundred thousand. pesos.

VOICE. Delete na iyun “one hundred”.

MR. ALLI. Ah, so, siguro, ...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Kailangan may kuwan nga, may figures at saka number.

MR. ALLI. Okay.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. So, ...

MR. ALLI. Ah, so, idadagdag natin iyung figure.

This is not ... I think this is a harmless provision. So, we can have this approved.

MR. MANAHAN. Mr. Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

MR. MANAHAN. Can we add the term after "Commission", that it be also made available to the Accredited Professional Organization of Architects?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Copy of which.

MR. MANAHAN. Yes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Board shall submit ... Okay.

Would that still be necessary considering that this is a public document and a citizen has the right to have access to a public document?

I think there is no need for that. The less wordy a law is, the better. Pag maraming mga words pang kuwan ...

Roster of Architects.

MR. MANAHAN. Regarding roster, 'no, ...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Ah, yeah, roster.

MR. MANAHAN. There is a provision here that all the members are ... the architects registered should be provided with the list. That has not been implemented.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Uh-huh.

MR. MANAHAN. Since my practice.
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Uh-huh.

MR. MANAHAN. Siguro, we can just remove that provision and put it that the roster is made available in the website of PRC.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The website. Ano ba ang ibig sabihin nito, iyung "provided to all members of the ..."

MR. MANAHAN. Individual architects ho.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Ah, individual architects should have a copy of the roster of their fellow architects.

MR. MANAHAN. Shall be mailed to each ...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay.

MR. MANAHAN. ... person so registered.

MR. TIMBOL. No, I thought in the website.

MR. MANAHAN. Hindi, iyun provision. My recommendation is to delete the phrase "copies of this roster shall be mailed to each person so registered."

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Uh-huh.

MR. MANAHAN. Instead of that, place "on file in the website of PRC."

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Shall be mailed.

MR. TIMBOL. In the website.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. To be mailed. Bakit hindi na lang "to be sent?"
MR. MANAHAN. Hindi ho, magastos ho iyan.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Ha?

MR. MANAHAN. O kaya …

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Or e-mail. Iyun ba ang ibig sabihin mo?

MR. MANAHAN. We have 10,000 architects and each would be receiving the whole roster.

MR. PAREDES. Hindi, mga probinsiyano baka walang computer eh.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. ‘Yung mga walang kuryente, walang computer necessarily.

MR. MANAHAN. Ah, hindi na ho nag-pra-practise iyun. Walang kuryente. (Laughter.)

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. So, ano ang proposal ninyo?

MR. MANAHAN. Place in the website. My proposal is to delete, to delete that, kasi hindi rin na-i-implement eh.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay.

MR. MANAHAN. Then, made it available and also in the website of PRC.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Bakit hindi na lang tayo mags-generalize to make it available na lang?

MR. MANAHAN. Oo. Ayan. Okay.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. … to make it available na lang.
MR. MANAHAN. Oo.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Kasi tama si Architect Paredes eh. Maraming mga ... sa probinsiya mga walang mga ...

MR. MANAHAN. Computer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. ... computer because non-functioning iyung electricity. Okay? To copies of this roster shall be made available.

MR. PAREDES. Shall be made available.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Ang ibig sabihin niyan, pupuwede iyung isang member pumunta duon at kumuha ...

MR. MANAHAN. Oo, puwede. Oo.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. ... because that is available to him. Ano? Shall be made available. Okay. Shall be made available, from the board 'yun. Shall be prepared by the board eh.

Meaning, it would form part of the function of the board to make the roster of architects available to each and every member. Okay.

MR. TIMBOL. That's part of their duty.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. That form part of the ... that will form part of their duty. Okay.

We acknowledge the ...

MR. FLORENTINO. Attorney.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. ... the ...
MR. FLORENTINO. Attorney.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. ... submission of the position paper by Cesar Canchela, architect.

MR. FLORENTINO. Attorney.


MR. FLORENTINO. May I make a suggestion?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Architect Florentino.

MR. FLORENTINO. The United Architects of the Philippines – Attorney, may I premise my statement by again recalling the fact that we had been trying to thresh out all the details of this for the past 20 years. But the main reason why we were unable to have a united position was that many sectors have tried to – of course, like this one, ‘no, we tried to give our everyone gives its own opinion, no? And that is the reason we tried to dialogue with as many sectors as we thought would be.

Now, as representative of the United Architects of the Philippines, I would like to invite all other institutions, who are interested in this law, to meet with us so that the position now that we will submit in January ...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. That’s your lookout. That’s your lookout, ‘no? That’s your concern ...

MR. FLORENTINO. Will be reflective of the...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Oo. That’s your ... Yeah, yeah, yeah.
MR. FLORENTINO. Napakahirap ...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. That is your own concern now. That is your ... internal among yourselves.

I think that is a good move.

MR. FLORENTINO. Dahil kung hindi ho ...

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Eh problema ninyo iyan, kung hindi kayo, you know, magkakaintindihan.

So, with that, we end at Section 13 and today is December 13, the lucky Friday, Friday the 13th, lucky day.

So, we will start, when we come back, Section 14, ha?

Okay. If there are no more ideas, no comments, no questions ...

MR. TIMBOL. Mayroon pa.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. ... I would like to thank you for ... Yeah, yeah.

MR. TIMBOL. Mayroon particular date in January, any particular date in January?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. No particular date yet, depende sa kuwan ...

MR. TIMBOL. I see.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. ... sa calendar.

MR. TIMBOL. Yes.
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. We will let you know.

MR. TIMBOL. Before I thank the Chair and Madam Zulueta, I would like to make a motion of mercy.

I would like to move that those who made the typos and other mistakes be forgiven (Laughter.) and I wish them a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay. Duly noted.

Thank you very much. This meeting is adjourned.

MR. OLONAN. Mr. Chairman.

MR. TIMBOL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. OLONAN. Mr. Chairman.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yeah.

MR. OLONAN. If ever that we have our hearing by next year, so can we propose that that will be after January 14 because our position will be submitted on January 14?

Okay. Thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Okay and good luck.

MR. MANAHAN. Thank you.

MR. TIMBOL. Salamat ho. Merry Christmas.

VOICE. Thank you.

MR. MANAHAN. Merry Christmas.
MR. PAREDES. Merry Christmas.

THE TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 11:25 A.M. ... (ceg)