

Attachment 8.
Chronology of Important Events
Relative to the Regulated Profession of Architecture
in the Philippines
(June 1950 thru June 2007)

A. Date or Year	B. Event/ Milestone
1. June 1950	Passage of Republic Act (R.A.) No. 544 , the Civil Engineering (CE) law; the law does not mention that civil engineers (CEs) can prepare, sign and seal architectural plans and documents
2. June 1950	Passage of R.A. No. 545 , the organic Architecture law; the special law specifically mentions that only registered and licensed architects can prepare, sign and seal architectural plans and documents
3. June 1956	Passage of R.A. No. 1581 , the <u>amended</u> Architecture law; the amended portion specifically delineate the responsibility and liability of the architect in contrast to the CE; there is therefore no overlap in professional function
4. June 1956	Passage of R.A. No. 1582 , the <u>amended</u> CE law; the amended portion specifically delineate the responsibility and liability of the CE in contrast to the architect; there is therefore no overlap in professional function
5. Feb 1977	Promulgation of Presidential Decree (P.D.) No. 1096 , otherwise known as the National Building Code of the Philippines (NBCP)
6. 1979	Publication and dissemination of copies of the Implementing Rules and Regulations (IRR) of P.D. No. 1096
7. early 1990s	Initial amendments to IRR of P.D. No. 1096 ; R.A. No. 7160 (The Local Government Code of 1991) becomes law; its Article Seven Sec 477 allows the Municipal/ City engineer to act as the building official
8. late 1990s	The Architecture Code was issued by the DPWH to serve as one of the referral codes of P.D. No. 1096
9. 1997	R.A. No. 8293 (The Intellectual Property Code of the Philippines) becomes law; the architect's ownership and copyright over his/her work is upheld
10. 1998	R.A. No. 8534 (The Interior Design Act) becomes law; interior design thus became a separate regulated profession
11. 2000	R.A. No. 8981 (The PRC Modernization Act) becomes law
12. c. 2002	Commencement of work of the DPWH Board of Consultants (BoC) on the Revision of the IRR of P.D. No. 1096 ; the DPWH BoC limits the signing and sealing of architectural plans and documents only to registered/ licensed Philippine architects to conform to R.A. No. 1581
13. c. November 2002	Senator Aquilino Pimentel, Jr. , the acknowledged father of R.A. No. 7160 (The Local

	Government Code of 1991) <u>files Senate Bill 2426 (The Architecture Act of 2002)</u>
14.2003	Civil engineers (CEs) through their accredited professional organization (APO), the Philippine Institute of Civil Engineers (PICE) work out an agreement (<i>modus vivendi</i>) with the APO for architects, the United Architects of the Philippines (UAP) in which architects shall entirely <u>give up the structural design of buildings</u> in exchange for PICE support for the architecture bill pending in Congress; the architecture bills shall only state that architects will only undertake structural conceptualization instead; <u>in good faith</u> , the architects thus give up an important part of their professional practice, foregoing the many years of training in structural design of buildings
15.c. late 2003	Opposition by CE members of the BoC (who officially represent the PICE) to the draft of IRR which limits the signing and sealing of architectural plans and documents only to registered/ licensed Philippine architects; this act already constitute a violation of the 2003 <i>modus vivendi</i> between the PICE and the UAP ; thereafter, the CE/ PICE members of the BoC make representations with the DPWH for the department to seek a legal opinion from the DPWH ; the CE/ PICE members of the BoC guarantee to abide by the DoJ legal opinion; CEs representing the Philippine Institute of Civil Engineers (PICE) attend several congressional hearings on the crafting of the architecture bill
16.c.November 2003	Senator Aquilino Pimentel, Jr. , the acknowledged father of R.A. No. 7160 (The Local Government Code of 1991) <u>sponsors Senate Bill 2710</u> (The Architecture Act of 2003)
17. January 2004	The DoJ issues its legal opinion limiting the signing and sealing of architectural documents to registered/ licensed architects; the CE members of the BoC resist the DoJ legal opinion and seek other venues to air their complaints; PICE members attend bi-cameral conference committee hearings in Congress and make representations to extend the bill provision authorizing the appointment of architects to government positions requiring the expertise of architects from 3 months to 3 years;
18. February to early March 2004	Coordinated last ditch efforts by non-architects to derail the signing of the Congress-approved architecture bill into law
19. 17 March 2004	R.A. No. 9266 (The Architecture Act of 2004) was signed into law by Pres. GMA
20. 10 April 2004	R.A. No. 9266 takes effect, except for Sec. 35 (<i>Positions in Government Requiring the Services of Registered and Licensed Architects</i>) which is scheduled to take effect on 10 April 2007
21. April 2004	CE Members of the BoC appeal their case before the DPWH National Building Code Review Committee (NBCRC) but lost on their appeal

22. late 2004	DPWH Secretary Florante Soriquez promulgates the 2004 Revised IRR of P.D. No. 1096 containing the provisions under Sec. 302.3 that state that architectural documents signed/sealed by architects shall be submitted as part of list of documents to accompany a building permit application; the IRR of R.A. No. 9266 was approved by the Professional Regulation Commission (PRC) in September 2004 and published in the Official Gazette on 15 November 2004
23. 01 Dec 2004	the IRR of R.A. No. 9266 takes full effect
24. January 2005	Architects defeat 2 house bills that apparently sought to vest CEs with the right to undertake the work of architects
25. c. Feb to Mar 2005	Media campaigns by architects and CEs
26. 01, 08 and 15 April 2005	DPWH publication of the 2004 Revised IRR of P.D. No. 1096 in a national broadsheet
27. 01 May 2005	the 2004 Revised IRR of P.D. No. 1096 takes full effect
28. May 2005	CEs file 2 cases against the DPWH Secretary (at the Quezon City and Manila RTCs), arguing that they have the right to prepare, sign and seal architectural documents and sought TROs and writs of preliminary injunction against the 2004 Revised IRR of P.D. No. 1096 ; the Quezon City RTC rules in favor of the architects while the Manila RTC sides with the CEs and issues TROs against portions of Secs. 302.3 and 302.4 of the 2004 Revised IRR of P.D. No. 1096
29. late May 2005	Manila RTC Branch 22 issues the writ of preliminary injunction against Secs. 302.3 and 302.4 of the 2004 Revised IRR of P.D. No. 1096 ; the injunction visibly failed to address the matter of the regulatory law concerning the practice of the profession of architecture i.e. R.A. No. 9266 , its IRR and derivative regulations which were all in full effect at the time of the issuance of the injunction
30. late 2005	The architects, intervene in the Manila case through the United Architects of the Philippines (UAP), the integrated and accredited organization of architects (IAPOA) accredited by the PRC in compliance with R.A. No. 9266
31. December 2005	The UAP-IAPOA moves to have the Manila court lift the injunction
32. c. March 2006	Designated target date for the resolution of the Manila case
33. c. mid-2007	Due to the continuing, deliberate and apparently orchestrated violations of R.A. No. 9266 , many architects openly question their LGUS and local executives concerning the full implementation and enforcement of R.A. No. 9266
34. November 2006	Reconstitution of the Professional Regulatory Board of Architecture (PRBoA) in full compliance with R.A. No. 9266
35. December 2006	to clarify and counter the deliberate disinformation spread by non-architects that the May 2005 injunction also covers R.A. No.

	9266 , the UAP-IAPOA, after seeking official prior clearance from the PRBoA and the PRC , causes the publication of a full-page public announcement stating that there is no injunction on R.A. No. 9266 , as part of the observance of the annual Nationwide Architecture Week (NAW)
36. March 2007	Through the PRC , the reconstituted PRBoA start a campaign to inform the LGUs of its position concerning the signing and sealing of architectural documents by CEs and issue a call for the full implementation and enforcement of R.A. No. 9266
37. 27 March 2007	Through its position filed with the PRC , the PRBoA requests the PRC to officially rule on the preparation, signing and sealing of architectural documents by CEs in line with its efforts aimed at the full implementation and enforcement of R.A. No. 9266
38. 30 Mar 2007	The reconstitution of the PRBoA is completed with the appointment and oath-taking of the 3 rd Member; the mandate under R.A. No. 9266 is satisfied
39. c. early April 2007	The PICE files a contempt complaint against the UAP and its responsible officers and against the Building official of Naga City (a registered/ licensed architect who sought to enforce R.A. No. 9266) within his jurisdiction; the DPWH BoC , responsible for crafting the new building code, is reconstituted; the incumbent PRBoA Chairman is re-appointed by the DPWH OIC as Co-Vice Chair of the DPWH BoC
40. 10 April 2007	R.A. No. 9266 Sec. 35 (<i>Positions in Government Requiring the Services of Registered and Licensed Architects</i>) takes effect; Sec. 35 provides that all positions in government primarily requiring the services of an architect shall be filled only by registered and licensed architects;
41. 16 April 2007	The OIC of the DPWH (Sec. Manuel Bonoan) issues an order allowing CE signatures and seals on architectural plans and documents in direct violation of R.A. No. 9266
42. May 2007	After getting no feedback from informal channels, the PRBoA officially requests a PRC -mediated meeting with the Professional Regulatory Board of Civil Engineering (PRBoCE) to ascertain its official position on the matter, which the PRBoCE unexplicably turned down; the PRBoA writes the DPWH OIC seeking official clarification on the legal basis (or bases) of the 16 April 2007 DPWH order allowing CEs to sign and seal architectural plans and documents
43. June 2007	The PRBoA seeks a new legal opinion from the Department of Justice (DoJ) on the matter of the preparation, signing and sealing of architectural plans and documents and related matters.

Nothing follows.