

**Chronology of Important Events Over the Past  
58 Years Relative to the Regulated Profession of  
Architecture in the Philippines  
(June 1950 thru September 2008)**

<b>A. Date or Year</b>	<b>B. Event/ Milestone</b>
1. June 1950	Passage of Republic Act (R.A.) No. 544, the Civil Engineering (CE) law; the law does <b>not</b> mention that civil engineers (CEs) can prepare, sign and seal <b>architectural</b> plans and documents
2. June 1950	Passage of R.A. No. 545, the <u>organic</u> Architecture law; this <b>special</b> law <b>specifically</b> mentions that <b>only</b> registered and licensed architects can prepare, sign and seal <b>architectural</b> 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 <b>no</b> overlap in professional function
4. June 1956	Passage of R.A. No. 1582, the <u>amended</u> CE law; the amended portion (Sec. 24) specifically <u>delineate</u> the responsibility and liability of the CE in contrast to the architect; there is therefore <b>no</b> overlap in professional function
5. 1975	The <b>United Architects of the Philippines (UAP)</b> was formed out of the union of the Philippine Institute of Architects ( <b>PIA</b> ), the League of Philippine Architects ( <b>LPA</b> ) and the Association of Philippine Government Architects ( <b>APGA</b> )
6. Feb 1977	Promulgation of Presidential Decree ( <b>P.D.</b> ) No. <b>1096</b> , otherwise known as the 1977 <b>National Building Code of the Philippines (NBCP)</b> by Philippine Pres. Ferdinand E. Marcos
7. 1979	Publication and dissemination of copies of the Implementing Rules and Regulations ( <b>IRR</b> ) of <b>P.D. No. 1096</b> by the Department of Public Works and Highways ( <b>DPWH</b> ) and of part of the <b>IRR</b> of R.A. No. 1581 (the Amended architecture law of 1956) i.e. the <b>Architects' National Code</b> (otherwise known as the <b>UAP Documents 200</b> through <b>208</b> ) were promulgated by the Professional Regulation Commission ( <b>PRC</b> ) in Sep 1979 as part of the IRR of <b>R.A. No. 1581/545</b> (the amended/ organic laws on architecture)
8. mid-1980s	Architects who are Members of the National Legislature i.e. <i>Batasan Pambansa</i> , led by Arch. Pentong Gaito and the leading lights of the United Architects of the Philippines (UAP), lobby for the passage of a new Architecture law
9. early 1990s	Initial amendments to IRR of <b>P.D. No. 1096</b> ; <b>R.A. No. 7160</b> (The Local Government Code of 1991) becomes law; surprisingly, its <b>Article Seven Sec. 477</b> allows the Municipal/ City Engineers ( <b>MCEs</b> ) of local government units (LGUs) who are in charge of horizontal works, to act simultaneously as the building official ( <b>BO</b> ) in charge of vertical works; this turn of events has forged an apparently unholy alliance

	between the MCEs and the LGUs, which has undoubtedly resulted in <u>multiple potentially willful violations</u> of P.D. No. 1096 and R.A. No. 1581 and their IRRs; the <b>BOs</b> (who are <b>MCEs</b> ) are supposedly the entities to fully implement and enforce P.D. No. 1096 & its IRR but they appear to be the very first ones to condone violations of the National Building Code;
10.late 1990s	The Architecture Code was issued by the <b>DPWH</b> to serve as one of the referral codes of <b>P.D. No. 1096</b>
11.1997	<b>R.A. No. 8293</b> (The Intellectual Property Code of the Philippines) becomes law; the Architect's ownership and copyright over his/her work is upheld
12.1998	<b>R.A. No. 8534</b> (The Interior Design Act) becomes law; interior design thus became a separate regulated profession; the law however does <u>not</u> allow registered and licensed interior designers (RLIDs) to practice <u>architectural interiors (AI)</u> , which still formed part of the state-regulated profession of architecture.
13.2000	<b>R.A. No. 8981</b> (The PRC Modernization Act) becomes law; the Board of Architecture ( <b>BoA</b> ) comes under greater administrative control and supervision of the PRC;
14.c. 2002	Commencement of work of the <b>DPWH</b> Board of Consultants ( <b>BoC</b> ) on the Revision of the <b>IRR</b> of <b>P.D. No. 1096</b> (1977 NBCP); the <b>DPWH BoC</b> limits the signing and sealing of <b>architectural</b> plans and documents only to registered and licensed architects ( <b>RLAs</b> ) to conform to <b>R.A. No. 1581</b>
15.c.March 2002	Realizing that the refilled/ rehashed architecture bill (by Sen. Serge Osmeña) was <u>not</u> progressing at the Senate (as fast as in the Lower House through the collaboration of the <b>Philippine Institute of Architects (PIA)</b> and the <b>UAP</b> ), the nine (9)-member outgoing <b>UAP</b> National Committee on Legislation and Codes ( <b>NCLC</b> , chaired by <b>Arch. Greg Timbol II</b> ), which was then about to regroup as the <b>Architecture Advocacy International Foundation (AAIF)</b> , sought the assistance of seven (7) incumbent Senators to file a new Senate Bill on architecture; Senator Magsaysay was the first to heed the call and filed the first <u>Senate Bill (S.B. No. 2081)</u> based on the draft of the <b>UAP NCLC</b> (later reconstituted as the <b>AAIF</b> )
16.c.November 2002	<b>Senator Aquilino Pimentel, Jr.</b> , the acknowledged father of <b>R.A. No. 7160</b> (The Local Government Code of 1991) <u>files Senate Bill 2426</u> (The Architecture Act of 2002) again substantially based on the draft bill supplied by the <b>UAP NCLC</b> (later <b>AAIF</b> )
17.2003	Civil engineers ( <b>CEs</b> ) through their accredited professional organization ( <b>APO</b> ), the Philippine Institute of Civil Engineers ( <b>PICE</b> ) work out an agreement ( <i>modus vivendi</i> ) with the APO for architects, the <b>United Architects of the Philippines (UAP)</b> in which architects shall entirely give up the <b>structural design</b> of

	<p><u>buildings</u> in exchange for <b>PICE</b> support for the architecture bill then pending in Congress; the architecture bills shall only state that registered and licensed Architects (<b>RLAs</b>) will only undertake <b>structural conceptualization</b> instead; <u>in good faith</u>, the Architects thus <b>give up</b> an important part of their professional practice, foregoing the many years of training in structural design of buildings</p>
18.c. late 2003	<p>Continuing manifestation of the opposition by <b>CE</b> members of the <b>BoC</b> (who officially represent the <b>PICE</b>) to the draft of the <b>Revised IRR</b> of <b>P.D. No. 1096</b> which limits the signing and sealing of <b>architectural</b> plans and documents only to registered/ licensed Philippine architects; this act already constituted a <b>violation</b> of the 2003 <i>modus vivendi</i> between the <b>PICE</b> and the <b>UAP</b>; thereafter, the <b>CE/ PICE</b> members of the <b>BoC</b> make representations with the <b>DPWH</b> for the department to seek a <b>legal opinion</b> from the Department of Justice (<b>DoJ</b>); the <b>CE/ PICE</b> members of the <b>BoC</b> guarantee to <b>abide by</b> the <b>DoJ</b> legal opinion; <b>CEs</b> representing the Philippine Institute of Civil Engineers (<b>PICE</b>) attend several congressional hearings on the crafting of the new architecture bill, particularly at the Philippine Senate;</p>
19.c. November 2003	<p>a golden window of opportunity emerged at the Philippine Senate when a two (2)-week delay occurred in the transmittal of the 2004 national budget bill from the Philippine House of Representatives; this gave <b>Senator Aquilino Q. Pimentel, Jr.</b>, the acknowledged father of <b>R.A. No. 7160</b> (The Local Government Code of 1991) the opportunity to <u>sponsor <b>Senate Bill 2710</b></u> (The Architecture Act of 2003)</p>
20. November through December 2003	<p>Active lobby work at the Senate by the <b>AAIF</b> and the <b>UAP</b>; attendance at several meetings and Senate floor deliberations by both <b>AAIF</b> and <b>UAP</b> trustees/directors/officers/members; members of the Council of Consulting Architects and Planners of the Philippines (<b>CCAPP</b>, led by Dr. Roni Manahan) and of the University of the Philippines College of Architecture Alumni Foundation/ <b>UPCAAFI</b> (Architects Joy Arcenas and John Pangilinan, brother of Sen. Francis Pangilinan) also help in the all-out lobby work to get the Senators' votes on the bill;</p>
21. 09 January 2004	<p>The <b>DoJ</b> (through <b>Sec. Merceditas Gutierrez</b>) issues its <u>legal opinion</u> limiting the signing and sealing of <b>architectural</b> documents to <u>registered/ licensed architects (<b>RLAs</b>)</u>; contrary to what was agreed upon at the <b>BoC</b>, the <b>CE</b> members of the <b>BoC</b> apparently resisted the <b>DoJ</b> legal opinion and sought out other venues to air their complaints; <b>PICE</b> members attend bi-cameral conference committee hearings in Congress and make representations to extend the bill provision authorizing the appointment of <b>RLAs</b> to local and national Philippine government positions requiring the expertise of architects i.e. from 3 months to 3 years (<b>Sec. 35 of R.A. No. 9266</b>, which took full effect on</p>

	10 April 2007); start of the Bi-cameral Conference Committee hearings to merge the approved House and Senate versions of the architecture bill
22. February to early March 2004	Apparently coordinated last-ditch efforts apparently mounted by some <b>CEs</b> and other <b>non-architects</b> in league with said <b>CEs</b> to attempt to derail the signing into law of the Congress-approved architecture bill
23. 17 March 2004	<b>R.A. No. 9266</b> (The <b>Architecture Act of 2004</b> ) was finally signed into law by Philippine President Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo (PGMA)
24. 10 April 2004	<b>R.A. No. 9266</b> takes effect, except for Sec. 35 ( <i>Positions in Government Requiring the Services of Registered and Licensed Architects</i> ) which was scheduled to take effect on 10 April 2007, a last minute concession granted to the <b>CEs</b> by the Bi-cameral Conference Committee
25. c. April 2004	<b>CE</b> Members of the <b>BoC</b> appeal their case before the <b>DPWH</b> National Building Code Review Committee ( <b>NBCRC</b> ) but lost on their appeal
26. late 2004	DPWH Secretary Florante Soriquez promulgates the <b>2004 Revised IRR of P.D. No. 1096</b> containing the provisions under <b>Sec. 302.3</b> that state that <u>architectural documents signed/sealed by registered and licensed architects (RLAs) shall be submitted as part of list of documents to accompany a building permit application;</u> the <b>IRR of R.A. No. 9266</b> was approved by the Professional Regulation Commission ( <b>PRC</b> ) in September 2004 and published in the Official Gazette on 15 November 2004 (taking effect 15 days later)
27. 01 Dec 2004	the <b>IRR of R.A. No. 9266</b> takes full effect
28. January 2005	Architects from the <b>AAIF</b> and the <b>UAP</b> defeat two (2) Lower House bills that apparently sought to vest <b>CEs</b> with the <b>privilege</b> to undertake the work of registered and licensed architects ( <b>RLAs</b> ) through the use of the apparently undeserved title of "prime professional" for buildings
29. c. Feb to Mar 2005	Media campaigns by registered and licensed architects/ <b>RLAs</b> (chiefly members of the <b>AAIF</b> ) and some <b>CEs</b> against each other
30. 01, 08 and 15 April 2005	<b>DPWH</b> publication of the <b>2004 Revised IRR of P.D. No. 1096</b> in a national broadsheet (Manila Standard) copies of which were freely distributed at the UAP National Convention
31. 01 May 2005	the <b>2004 Revised IRR of P.D. No. 1096</b> takes full effect
32. late April through early May 2005	<b>CEs</b> file two (2) near simultaneous cases against the <b>DPWH</b> Secretary (at the Quezon City and Manila Regional Trial Courts/ <b>RTCs</b> ), arguing that the <b>CEs</b> have the supposed right (??? <u>actually, the practice of a regulated profession is <b>only a privilege</b> that could be taken away by the state; the practice of a regulated profession was <b>never a right</b></u> ) to prepare, sign and seal <b>architectural</b> documents; the <b>CEs</b> then sought temporary restraining orders ( <b>TROs</b> ) and writs of preliminary

	<p>injunction (<b>WPIs</b>) against the <b>2004 Revised IRR of P.D. No. 1096 on the basis of an apparently intercalated version of Sec. 302 of P.D. No. 1096 (the 1977 NBCP) i.e. with an unofficial insertion</b> supposedly allowing CEs to sign and seal <b>architectural</b> documents; the two (2) cases filed by the <b>CEs</b> apparently/ completely fail to mention the existence of <b>R.A. No. 9266</b> (a valid and subsisting special national law) and relied heavily on the said unofficial/incorrect/<b>intercalated</b> (with insertion) version of Sec. 302 of <b>P.D. No. 1096</b> (purportedly allowing <b>CEs</b> to sign and seal <b>architectural</b> documents) i.e. the Vicente Foz version openly sold at National Bookstore branches nationwide); the Quezon City <b>RTC</b> rules in favor of the architects while the Manila <b>RTC</b> sides with the <b>CEs</b> and issues <b>TROs</b> <u>only</u> against portions of <b>Secs. 302.3 and 302.4</b> of the <b>2004 Revised IRR of P.D. No. 1096</b> i.e. <u>not</u> on the entire 2004 Revised IRR of P.D. No. 1096 and <u>not</u> on any provision of R.A. No. 9266 nor its IRR</p>
33. 24 May 2005	<p>Manila RTC Branch 22 issues the writ of preliminary <b>injunction</b> against <b>Secs. 302.3 and 302.4</b> of the <b>2004 Revised IRR of P.D. No. 1096</b>; the injunction visibly failed to address the matter of the regulatory law concerning the practice of the profession of architecture i.e. <b>R.A. No. 9266</b>, its IRR and derivative regulations which were all in <b>full effect</b> (valid and subsisting special national laws/regulations) at the time of the issuance of the <b>injunction</b></p>
34. May through July 2005	<p>Registered and licensed Architect (<b>RLA</b>) members of the <b>DPWH BoC</b> saw through the <b>PICE</b> game plan and immediately sought help from architectural organizations such as the <b>AAIF</b> and the <b>PIA</b> to talk to the <b>UAP-IAPOA</b> about <b>intervening</b> in the case since <b>RLAs/ Architects</b> have <b>no</b> voice in the cases filed by the <b>CEs</b>;</p>
35. August through September 2005	<p>The <b>RLA/ Architects</b> represented by the <b>UAP-IAPOA</b>, the <b>PIA</b>, the <b>AAIF</b>, the <b>CCAPP</b> and the original Professional Regulatory Board of Architecture/ <b>PRBoA</b> (Architects Eugene Gan, Fernando Santos &amp; Miguel Caluza) sign a <b>memorandum</b> designating the <b>UAP-IAPOA</b> to represent them in the planned intervention; the United Architects of the Philippines (<b>UAP</b>), the integrated and accredited organization of architects (<b>IAPOA</b>) accredited by the <b>PRC</b> in compliance with <b>R.A. No. 9266</b> officially <b>intervenes</b> in the Manila case on behalf of all registered and licensed architects (<b>RLAs</b>);</p>
36. December 2005	<p>The <b>UAP-IAPOA</b> moves to have the Manila court lift the injunction</p>
37. February 2006	<p>Parties submit memoranda to the Court (Manila RTC Branch 22) hearing the 2005 <b>PICE</b> Petition</p>
38. c. May 2006	<p>Designated target date for the resolution of the Manila case</p>
39. c. mid-2007	<p>Due to the apparently continuing, deliberate</p>

	and seemingly orchestrated violations of <b>R.A. No. 9266</b> , its IRR and derivative regulations, many <b>RLAs/ Architects</b> openly question their local government units ( <b>LGUs</b> ) and local executives concerning the full implementation and enforcement of <b>R.A. No. 9266</b>
40. November 2006	Start of the <b>reconstitution</b> of the Professional Regulatory Board of Architecture ( <b>PRBoA</b> ) with the appointment of its 1 <sup>st</sup> member ( <b>Arch. Angeline T. Chua Chiaco</b> ) and Chairman ( <b>Arch. Armando N. Alli</b> ), in full compliance with <b>R.A. No. 9266</b> and its IRR
41. December 2006	to clarify and counter the deliberate disinformation spread by some <b>non-architects</b> that the May 2005 <b>injunction</b> also covers <b>R.A. No. 9266</b> and its IRR, the <b>UAP-IAPOA</b> , <u>after seeking official prior clearance from the <b>PRBoA</b> and the <b>PRC</b></u> , causes the publication of a full-page public announcement stating that there was <b>no injunction on R.A. No. 9266</b> nor its IRR, as part of the observance of the annual Nationwide Architecture Week ( <b>NAW</b> ); this was later used as a basis for the filing of an <b>indirect contempt</b> complaint by the <b>PICE</b> against the UAP National officers led by <b>PP Dinky Florentino</b>
42. March 2007	Through the <b>PRC</b> , the partially <b>reconstituted PRBoA</b> start a campaign to fully inform the <b>LGUs</b> of its official <b>position</b> concerning the signing and sealing of <b>architectural</b> documents by <b>CEs</b> and issue a call for the full implementation and enforcement of <b>R.A. No. 9266</b> and its IRR
43. 27 March 2007	Through its official <b>position</b> filed with the <b>PRC</b> , the <b>PRBoA</b> requests the <b>PRC</b> to officially rule on the preparation, signing and sealing of <b>architectural</b> documents by <b>CEs</b> in line with its efforts aimed at the full implementation and enforcement of <b>R.A. No. 9266</b> and its IRR
44. 30 Mar 2007	The full <b>reconstitution</b> of the <b>PRBoA</b> is completed with the appointment and oath-taking of the 3 <sup>rd</sup> Member ( <b>Arch. Marietta B. Segovia</b> ); the mandate under <b>R.A. No. 9266</b> is satisfied; the <b>PRBoA</b> embarks on a multi-media campaign targeted against <b>fake</b> architects and other <b>non-architects</b> (who may have secured other types of professional licenses from the state)
45. c. early April 2007	The <b>PICE</b> files an <b>indirect contempt</b> complaint against the <b>UAP</b> and its responsible officers and against the Building Official of Naga City (a <b>registered and licensed architect</b> or <b>RLA</b> who sought to enforce <b>R.A. No. 9266</b> and its IRR) within his jurisdiction; the <b>DPWH BoC</b> , responsible for crafting the repeal version of the National Building Code, is also <b>reconstituted</b> by the <b>DPWH</b> Officer-in-charge ( <b>OIC</b> ); the incumbent <b>PRBoA</b> Chairman ( <b>Alli</b> ) is re-appointed by the <b>DPWH OIC</b> as Co-Vice Chair of the <b>DPWH BoC</b>
46. 10 April 2007	<b>R.A. No. 9266</b> Sec. 35 ( <i>Positions in Government Requiring the Services of Registered and Licensed Architects</i> ) <b>takes full effect</b> ; Sec. 35

	provides that <b>all</b> positions in the local and national Philippine government primarily requiring the services of an Architect/ <b>RLA</b> shall be filled only by <b>registered and licensed architects (RLAs)</b> ;
47. 16 April 2007	The <b>OIC</b> of the <b>DPWH</b> (Sec. Manuel Bonoan) issues an <b>order</b> allowing <b>CE</b> signatures and seals on <b>architectural</b> plans and documents in <b>direct</b> violation of <b>R.A. No. 9266</b>
48. May 2007	After getting no feedback from informal channels, the <b>PRBoA</b> officially requests a <b>PRC</b> -mediated meeting with the Professional Regulatory Board of Civil Engineering ( <b>PRBoCE</b> ) to ascertain its official position on the matter, which the <b>PRBoCE</b> inexplicably turned down; the <b>PRBoA</b> writes the <b>DPWH OIC</b> seeking official clarification on the legal basis (or bases) of the 16 April 2007 <b>DPWH</b> order allowing <b>CEs</b> to sign and seal <b>architectural</b> plans and documents in violation of <b>R.A. No. 9266</b>
49. June 2007	The <b>PRBoA</b> seeks a <b>new</b> legal opinion from the Department of Justice ( <b>DoJ</b> ) on the matter of the preparation, signing and sealing of <b>architectural</b> plans and documents and related matters.
50. July 2007	Architect <b>Winstoney Ma. Salceda</b> of UAP Camarines Sur Chapter files a complaint against <b>CE</b> Don Emmanuel Santy for his illegal practice of architecture, a violation of <b>R.A. No. 9266</b> and its <b>IRR</b>
51. August 2007	<b>PRBoA</b> Chairman ( <b>Alli</b> ) goes on national broadsheet (the Philippine Daily Inquirer) to address the matter of illegal practices violative of <b>R.A. No. 9266</b>
52. September 2007	The <b>PICE</b> files another <b>indirect contempt</b> complaint against Architect <b>Salceda</b> and <b>PRBoA</b> Chairman <b>Alli</b> , mainly for the mailing by the PRC to various LGUs of the <b>PRBoA's</b> official <b>position</b> on the preparation, signing and sealing of <b>architectural</b> documents and for the <b>PRBoA's</b> call to LGUs to fully implement and enforce <b>R.A. No. 9266</b> and its <b>IRR</b>
53. September through October 2007	The <b>PRBoA</b> and the <b>PRBoCE</b> exchange strongly-worded letters addressed to the <b>PRC</b> and various agencies of the national government; the <b>DoJ</b> issues two (2) legal opinions based on <b>PRBoA</b> requests; the last one suggested that the <b>PRC</b> resolve the issue of the signatory to <b>architectural</b> documents; the <b>PRBoA</b> campaigns openly against the <b>CEs</b> on various fora
54. November 2007	The <b>PRC</b> writes the <b>PRBoA</b> advising it to go to court to implement and enforce <b>R.A. No. 9266</b> ; the <b>PRBoA</b> Chairman ( <b>Alli</b> ) goes on national TV (the Explainer on the ANC Channel) to address the matter of illegal practices violative of <b>R.A. No. 9266</b> and its <b>IRR</b> ; the <b>PRBoA</b> prepares the legal kits for filing of charges against national and local government officials (specifically the <b>CE-Building Officials</b> ) violating <b>R.A. No. 9266</b> and its <b>IRR</b> and against fake architects (or other state-regulated

	professionals illegally practicing architecture); the <b>Mutual Recognition Agreement (MRA)</b> for the practice of architecture in the <b>Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN)</b> i.e. the <b>ASEAN Architect</b> , is signed for the Philippines by the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI) Secretary Peter Favila
55. December 2007	The <b>PRBoA</b> (with its <b>private</b> legal counsel, Atty. Dante S. David) drafts the <b>administrative and criminal</b> complaints against <b>DPWH Secretary Hermogenes B. Ebdane, Jr.</b> for his multiple culpable violations of various laws and regulations ( <b>R.A. No. 9266 &amp; IRR, P.D. No. 1096 &amp; IRR, R.A. No. 8981 &amp; IRR, R.A. No. 3019, R.A. No. 6713, Revised Penal Code, The Administrative Code, etc.</b> ); the <b>PRBoA</b> conducts the first ever overseas architecture licensure examinations ( <b>ALE</b> in Al-Khobar and Jeddah, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia/ <b>KSA</b> ) in full compliance with directives from the Office of the President (PGMA);
56. January 2008	The <b>PRBoA</b> officially hires its <b>private counsel</b> and refines the <b>administrative and criminal</b> complaints against <b>DPWH Secretary Hermogenes B. Ebdane, Jr.</b> for multiple culpable violations of <b>R.A. No. 9266, P.D. No. 1096, R.A. No. 3019, R.A. 6713, the Revised Penal Code, the Administrative Code, etc.</b> ; the <b>UAP-IAPOA</b> through National President <b>Medeliano Roldan</b> actively follows up the promulgation of the Decision of Manila RTC Branch 22 i.e. supposedly completed 29 January 2008; the <b>PRBoA</b> data website at <b><a href="http://www.architectureboard.ph">www.architectureboard.ph</a></b> finally goes online;
57. February 2008	The <b>PRBoA</b> unofficially interposes its strong objections against the confirmation of the appointment of <b>DPWH Secretary Hermogenes B. Ebdane, Jr.</b> due to <b>PRBoA</b> allegations of multiple culpable violations of <b>R.A. No. 9266, P.D. No. 1096, R.A. No. 8981, R.A. No. 3019, R.A. 6713, the Revised Penal Code, the Administrative Code, etc.</b> ; the Congressmen-members of the <b>Commission on Appointments (CA)</b> set an 05 March 2008 meeting between the <b>PRBoA</b> and Sec. Ebdane; in deference to the <b>CA</b> arrangements, the <b>PRBoA</b> momentarily defers the filing of its <b>administrative and criminal complaints</b> against Sec. Ebdane, originally scheduled for 11 February 2008; on the basis of the intercession of the Congressmen members of the Commission on Appointments ( <b>CA</b> ) i.e. <b>Congrs. Dimaporo, Zialcita, Gullas and Albano</b> , the <b>PRBoA</b> does not make official its complaints against Sec. Ebdane before the <b>CA</b> ; on 13 February 2008, Sec. Ebdane is confirmed as <b>DPWH Secretary</b> ; on the same day, the long-awaited <b>Decision</b> dated 29 January 2008 from the Manila RTC Branch 22 is finally released i.e. <b><u>dismissing the 2005 PICE Petition, together with the Order lifting/dissolving the 24 May 2005 injunction on Secs. 302.3 and 302.4 of the 2004 Revised IRR of the 1977 P.D. No. 1096 (NBCP) and declaring the said sections as valid and constitutional; the</u></b>

	<p><b>Decision also stated that the PICE used the unofficial and incorrect i.e. actually intercalated version of Sec. 302 of P.D. No. 1096 and committed forum shopping in filing its Petition; the PRBoA and the UAP-IAPOA disseminate the Decision to concerned parties including national government officials and the Congressmen members of the CA; the PRBoA data compact disc (CD) containing its website and 2007 annual report and general information is distributed for reproduction and use by various stakeholders</b></p>
<p>58. late February through early March 2008</p>	<p>The <b>PRBoA</b> fires off six (6) successive letters to <b>DPWH Secretary Hermogenes B. Ebdane, Jr.</b> i.e. initially sent via PRC priority mail and electronic mail, detailing <b>PRBoA</b> requests for action leading to the full implementation and enforcement of <b>R.A. No. 9266</b> and its <b>IRR</b> in light of the promulgation of the long-awaited Decision of Manila <b>RTC</b> Branch 22; hardcopies of all the <b>PRBoA</b> letters are sent by courier and officially received by the Office of the DPWH Secretary on 04 March 2008; the Commission on Appointments (<b>CA</b>)-arranged 05 March 2008 meeting between the <b>PRBoA</b> and Sec. Ebdane does <b>not</b> take place as Sec. Ebdane begged off at the last minute; the <b>PRBoA</b> readies all the documents necessary for the filing of <b>administrative and criminal</b> complaints should Sec. Ebdane still fail to meet with the <b>PRBoA</b> by 13 March 2008 i.e. one full month after the release of the Decision of the Manila <b>RTC</b> Branch 22 which was effective immediately; the <b>PICE</b> files its Motion for Reconsideration (<b>MR</b>) against the Decision promulgated by the Manila <b>RTC</b> Branch 22; <u>the Court Order <b>lifting/dissolving the injunction</b> on Secs. 302.3 &amp; 4 of the 2004 Revised IRR of P.D. No. 1096 (the 1977 NBCP) was supposed to have been implemented by the DPWH as the lifting/ dissolution order has an automatic effect i.e. should <b>not</b> be delayed by the filing of the <b>MR</b> by the <b>PICE</b>;</u> on 07 March 2008, the <b>PICE</b> Naga/CamSur Chapter publishes a memo supposedly emanating from the Office of the DPWH Secretary stating that the supposed <i>status quo</i> created by the DPWH shall be maintained i.e. that Building Officials nationwide shall continue to receive and process <b>architectural</b> plans/documents prepared, signed and sealed by civil engineers (<b>CEs</b>) in <b>clear and deliberate violation of R.A. No. 9266, its IRR and derivative regulations</b>, that are all in <b>effect</b> and <b>not</b> covered by any <b>TRO</b>, injunction nor pending question on the constitutionality of any of its provisions.</p>
<p>59. mid-March 2008</p>	<p>The <b>PRBoA</b> is again requested and assured by the Congressmen members of the Commission on Appointments (<b>CA</b>) that they shall ensure that Sec. Ebdane shall meet the <b>PRBoA</b> after Holy Week i.e. March 24 through 28; the <b>PRBoA</b> acquiesces noting that 27 March 2008 is the 15<sup>th</sup> and last working day for the DPWH Secretary to officially respond to its six (6) letters i.e. or else Sec. Ebdane can be additionally charged</p>

	by the <b>PRBoA</b> under <b>R.A. No. 6713 (The 1989 Code of Conduct and Ethical Standards for Public Officials and Employees)</b> which prescribe a time limit to respond to correspondences;
60. late March 2008	<b>PRBoA</b> resolutions concerning the mandatory registration of architectural firms and the issuance of temporary/special permits to foreign architects are published in a broadsheet through assistance from the <b>UAP-IAPOA Task Force R.A. No. 9266</b> ; the <b>PRBoA</b> continues to defer the filing of its complaint against <b>DPWH Secretary Hermogenes B. Ebdane, Jr.</b> with the <b>Office of the Ombudsman</b> for his multiple culpable violations of standing <b>laws and regulations</b> such as <b>R.A. No. 9266 (The Architecture Act of 2004)</b> , <b>P.D. No. 1096 (The 1977 National Building Code of the Philippines)</b> , <b>R.A. No. 8981 (The 1990 PRC Modernization Act)</b> , <b>R.A. No. 3019 (The 1960 Anti-Graft and Corrupt Practices Act)</b> , <b>R.A. 6713 (The 1989 Code of Conduct and Ethical Standards for Public Officials and Employees)</b> , the <b>Revised Penal Code, Executive Order/ E.O. 262 (The Administrative Code)</b> , etc.; the <b>PRBoA</b> readies similar complaints against other national and local government unit ( <b>LGU</b> ) officials.
61. May 2008	The <b>PRBoA</b> and the <b>PRC Standards and Inspection Division (SID)</b> commence with the review of applications for registration of architectural firms under <b>R.A. No. 9266</b> and its <b>IRR</b> ;
62. June 2008	The <b>PRBoA</b> and the <b>PRC International Affairs Division (IAD)</b> commence with the review of an application for the issuance of a temporary/special permit ( <b>TSP</b> ) for a foreign architect ( <b>FA</b> ) under <b>R.A. No. 9266</b> and its <b>IRR</b> ;
62. August 2008	The reconstituted <b>PRBoA</b> attends the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation ( <b>APEC</b> ) <b>Architect Registry Project 3<sup>rd</sup> Central Council</b> meeting in Canada to help campaign for collaborative practice between a Philippine <b>RLA</b> and a foreign architect ( <b>FA</b> ) as an official mode of reciprocal recognition, in full conformity with <b>R.A. No. 9266</b> and its <b>IRR</b> ;
62. September 2008	The <b>PRC</b> and the <b>PRBoA</b> reconstitute the Continuing Professional Education Council ( <b>CPEC</b> ) with the <b>PRBoA Chair (Arch. Alli)</b> as <b>CPEC Chair</b> , the <b>UAP-IAPOA Secretary General (Arch. Gil Evasco)</b> as the first <b>CPEC member</b> and the <b>Vice President of the Council of Deans and Heads of Architectural Schools in the Philippines/ CODHASP (Arch. Ted Inocencio)</b> as the second <b>CPEC member</b> , in full conformity with <b>R.A. No. 9266</b> and its <b>IRR</b> ;
62. 25 September 2008	The 2007 <b>PICE</b> case filed against the <b>UAP-IAPOA</b> is <b>dismissed</b> by a Court Decision dated 12 September 2008; this is the <b><u>2nd major court victory for the RLAs in 2008</u></b> and <b>reaffirms the common position of the legislative, executive and judicial branches of the Philippine Government</b> that <b><u>architectural</u></b> documents are only for <b>RLAs</b> to prepare, sign and seal.

Nothing follows.