

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

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 <u>organic</u> Architecture law; this 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 <u>overlap</u> 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 no <u>overlap</u> in professional function
5. 1975	The United Architects of the Philippines (UAP) was formed out of the union of the Philippine Institute of Architects (PIA), the League of Philippine Architects (LPA) and the Association of Philippine Government Architects (APGA)
6. Feb 1977	Promulgation of Presidential Decree (P.D.) No. 1096 , otherwise known as the 1977 National Building Code of the Philippines (NBCP) by Philippine Pres. Ferdinand E. Marcos
7. 1979	Publication and dissemination of copies of the Implementing Rules and Regulations (IRR) of P.D. No. 1096 by the Department of Public Works and Highways (DPWH) and of part of the IRR of R.A. No. 1581 (the Amended architecture law of 1956) i.e. the Architects' National Code (otherwise known as the UAP Documents 200 through 208) were promulgated by the Professional Regulation Commission (PRC) in Sep 1979 as part of the IRR of R.A. No. 1581/545 (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 P.D. No. 1096 ; R.A. No. 7160 (The Local Government Code of 1991) becomes law; surprisingly, its Article Seven Sec. 477 allows the Municipal/ City Engineers (MCEs) of local government units (LGUs) who are in charge of horizontal works, to act simultaneously as the building official (BO) 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 BOs (who are MCEs) 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 DPWH to serve as one of the referral codes of P.D. No. 1096
11.1997	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
12.1998	R.A. No. 8534 (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	R.A. No. 8981 (The PRC Modernization Act) becomes law; the Board of Architecture (BoA) comes under greater administrative control and supervision of the PRC;
14.c. 2002	Commencement of work of the DPWH Board of Consultants (BoC) on the Revision of the IRR of P.D. No. 1096 (1977 NBCP); the DPWH BoC limits the signing and sealing of architectural plans and documents only to registered and licensed architects (RLAs) to conform to R.A. No. 1581
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 Philippine Institute of Architects (PIA) and the UAP), the nine (9)-member outgoing UAP National Committee on Legislation and Codes (NCLC , chaired by Arch. Greg Timbol II), which was then about to regroup as the Architecture Advocacy International Foundation (AAIF) , 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 UAP NCLC (later reconstituted as the AAIF)
16.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</u> (The Architecture Act of 2002) again substantially based on the draft bill supplied by the UAP NCLC (later AAIF)
17.2003	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 give up the structural design of

	<p><u>buildings</u> in exchange for PICE support for the architecture bill then pending in Congress; the architecture bills shall only state that registered and licensed Architects (RLAs) 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</p>
18.c. late 2003	<p>Continuing manifestation of the opposition by CE members of the BoC (who officially represent the PICE) to the draft of the Revised IRR of P.D. No. 1096 which limits the signing and sealing of architectural plans and documents only to registered/ licensed Philippine architects; this act already constituted 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 Department of Justice (DoJ); 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 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 Senator Aquilino Q. Pimentel, Jr., the acknowledged father of R.A. No. 7160 (The Local Government Code of 1991) the opportunity to <u>sponsor Senate Bill 2710</u> (The Architecture Act of 2003)</p>
20. November through December 2003	<p>Active lobby work at the Senate by the AAIF and the UAP; attendance at several meetings and Senate floor deliberations by both AAIF and UAP trustees/directors/officers/members; members of the Council of Consulting Architects and Planners of the Philippines (CCAPP, led by Dr. Roni Manahan) and of the University of the Philippines College of Architecture Alumni Foundation/ UPCAAFI (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 DoJ (through Sec. Merceditas Gutierrez) issues its <u>legal opinion</u> limiting the signing and sealing of architectural documents to <u>registered/ licensed architects (RLAs)</u>; contrary to what was agreed upon at the BoC, the CE members of the BoC apparently resisted the DoJ legal opinion and sought out 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 RLAs to local and national Philippine government positions requiring the expertise of architects i.e. from 3 months to 3 years (Sec. 35 of R.A. No. 9266, 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 CEs and other non-architects in league with said CEs to attempt to derail the signing into law of the Congress-approved architecture bill
23. 17 March 2004	R.A. No. 9266 (The Architecture Act of 2004) was finally signed into law by Philippine President Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo (PGMA)
24. 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 was scheduled to take effect on 10 April 2007, a last minute concession granted to the CEs by the Bi-cameral Conference Committee
25. c. April 2004	CE Members of the BoC appeal their case before the DPWH National Building Code Review Committee (NBCRC) but lost on their appeal
26. 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 <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 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 (taking effect 15 days later)
27. 01 Dec 2004	the IRR of R.A. No. 9266 takes full effect
28. January 2005	Architects from the AAIF and the UAP defeat two (2) Lower House bills that apparently sought to vest CEs with the privilege to undertake the work of registered and licensed architects (RLAs) 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/ RLAs (chiefly members of the AAIF) and some CEs against each other
30. 01, 08 and 15 April 2005	DPWH publication of the 2004 Revised IRR of P.D. No. 1096 in a national broadsheet (Manila Standard) copies of which were freely distributed at the UAP National Convention
31. 01 May 2005	the 2004 Revised IRR of P.D. No. 1096 takes full effect
32. late April through early May 2005	CEs file two (2) near simultaneous cases against the DPWH Secretary (at the Quezon City and Manila Regional Trial Courts/ RTCs), arguing that the CEs have the supposed right (??? <u>actually, the practice of a regulated profession is only a privilege that could be taken away by the state; the practice of a regulated profession was never a right</u>) to prepare, sign and seal architectural documents; the CEs then sought temporary restraining orders (TROs) and writs of preliminary

	<p>injunction (WPIs) against the 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 supposedly allowing CEs to sign and seal architectural documents; the two (2) cases filed by the CEs apparently/ completely fail to mention the existence of R.A. No. 9266 (a valid and subsisting special national law) and relied heavily on the said unofficial/incorrect/intercalated (with insertion) version of Sec. 302 of P.D. No. 1096 (purportedly allowing CEs to sign and seal architectural documents) i.e. the Vicente Foz version openly sold at National Bookstore branches nationwide); the Quezon City RTC rules in favor of the architects while the Manila RTC sides with the CEs and issues TROs <u>only</u> against portions of Secs. 302.3 and 302.4 of the 2004 Revised IRR of P.D. No. 1096 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 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 (valid and subsisting special national laws/regulations) at the time of the issuance of the injunction</p>
34. May through July 2005	<p>Registered and licensed Architect (RLA) members of the DPWH BoC saw through the PICE game plan and immediately sought help from architectural organizations such as the AAIF and the PIA to talk to the UAP-IAPOA about intervening in the case since RLAs/ Architects have no voice in the cases filed by the CEs;</p>
35. August through September 2005	<p>The RLA/ Architects represented by the UAP-IAPOA, the PIA, the AAIF, the CCAPP and the original Professional Regulatory Board of Architecture/ PRBoA (Architects Eugene Gan, Fernando Santos & Miguel Caluza) sign a memorandum designating the UAP-IAPOA to represent them in the planned intervention; 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 officially intervenes in the Manila case on behalf of all registered and licensed architects (RLAs);</p>
36. December 2005	<p>The UAP-IAPOA 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 PICE 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 R.A. No. 9266 , its IRR and derivative regulations, many RLAs/ Architects openly question their local government units (LGUs) and local executives concerning the full implementation and enforcement of R.A. No. 9266
40. November 2006	Start of the reconstitution of the Professional Regulatory Board of Architecture (PRBoA) with the appointment of its 1 st member (Arch. Angeline T. Chua Chiaco) and Chairman (Arch. Armando N. Alli), in full compliance with R.A. No. 9266 and its IRR
41. December 2006	to clarify and counter the deliberate disinformation spread by some non-architects that the May 2005 injunction also covers R.A. No. 9266 and its IRR, the UAP-IAPOA , <u>after seeking official prior clearance from the PRBoA and the PRC</u> , causes the publication of a full-page public announcement stating that there was no injunction on R.A. No. 9266 nor its IRR, as part of the observance of the annual Nationwide Architecture Week (NAW); this was later used as a basis for the filing of an indirect contempt complaint by the PICE against the UAP National officers led by PP Dinky Florentino
42. March 2007	Through the PRC , the partially reconstituted PRBoA start a campaign to fully inform the LGUs of its official 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 and its IRR
43. 27 March 2007	Through its official 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 and its IRR
44. 30 Mar 2007	The full reconstitution of the PRBoA is completed with the appointment and oath-taking of the 3 rd Member (Arch. Marietta B. Segovia); the mandate under R.A. No. 9266 is satisfied; the PRBoA embarks on a multi-media campaign targeted against fake architects and other non-architects (who may have secured other types of professional licenses from the state)
45. c. early April 2007	The PICE files an indirect contempt complaint against the UAP and its responsible officers and against the Building Official of Naga City (a registered and licensed architect or RLA who sought to enforce R.A. No. 9266 and its IRR) within his jurisdiction; the DPWH BoC , responsible for crafting the repeal version of the National Building Code, is also reconstituted by the DPWH Officer-in-charge (OIC); the incumbent PRBoA Chairman (Alli) is re-appointed by the DPWH OIC as Co-Vice Chair of the DPWH BoC
46. 10 April 2007	R.A. No. 9266 Sec. 35 (<i>Positions in Government Requiring the Services of Registered and Licensed Architects</i>) takes full effect ; Sec. 35

	provides that all positions in the local and national Philippine government primarily requiring the services of an Architect/ RLA shall be filled only by registered and licensed architects (RLAs) ;
47. 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
48. 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 inexplicably 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 in violation of R.A. No. 9266
49. 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.
50. July 2007	Architect Winstoney Ma. Salceda of UAP Camarines Sur Chapter files a complaint against CE Don Emmanuel Santy for his illegal practice of architecture, a violation of R.A. No. 9266 and its IRR
51. August 2007	PRBoA Chairman (Alli) goes on national broadsheet (the Philippine Daily Inquirer) to address the matter of illegal practices violative of R.A. No. 9266
52. September 2007	The PICE files another indirect contempt complaint against Architect Salceda and PRBoA Chairman Alli , mainly for the mailing by the PRC to various LGUs of the PRBoA's official position on the preparation, signing and sealing of architectural documents and for the PRBoA's call to LGUs to fully implement and enforce R.A. No. 9266 and its IRR
53. September through October 2007	The PRBoA and the PRBoCE exchange strongly-worded letters addressed to the PRC and various agencies of the national government; the DoJ issues two (2) legal opinions based on PRBoA requests; the last one suggested that the PRC resolve the issue of the signatory to architectural documents; the PRBoA campaigns openly against the CEs on various fora
54. November 2007	The PRC writes the PRBoA advising it to go to court to implement and enforce R.A. No. 9266 ; the PRBoA Chairman (Alli) goes on national TV (the Explainer on the ANC Channel) to address the matter of illegal practices violative of R.A. No. 9266 and its IRR ; the PRBoA prepares the legal kits for filing of charges against national and local government officials (specifically the CE -Building Officials) violating R.A. No. 9266 and its IRR and against fake architects (or other state-regulated

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

	<p>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</p>
<p>58. late February through early March 2008</p>	<p>The PRBoA fires off six (6) successive letters to DPWH Secretary Hermogenes B. Ebdane, Jr. i.e. initially sent via PRC priority mail and electronic mail, detailing PRBoA requests for action leading to the full implementation and enforcement of R.A. No. 9266 and its IRR in light of the promulgation of the long-awaited Decision of Manila RTC Branch 22; hardcopies of all the PRBoA letters are sent by courier and officially received by the Office of the DPWH Secretary on 04 March 2008; the Commission on Appointments (CA)-arranged 05 March 2008 meeting between the PRBoA and Sec. Ebdane does not take place as Sec. Ebdane begged off at the last minute; the PRBoA readies all the documents necessary for the filing of administrative and criminal complaints should Sec. Ebdane still fail to meet with the PRBoA by 13 March 2008 i.e. one full month after the release of the Decision of the Manila RTC Branch 22 which was effective immediately; the PICE files its Motion for Reconsideration (MR) against the Decision promulgated by the Manila RTC Branch 22; <u>the Court Order lifting/dissolving the injunction on Secs. 302.3 & 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 not be delayed by the filing of the MR by the PICE;</u> on 07 March 2008, the PICE 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 architectural plans/documents prepared, signed and sealed by civil engineers (CEs) in clear and deliberate violation of R.A. No. 9266, its IRR and derivative regulations, that are all in effect and not covered by any TRO, injunction nor pending question on the constitutionality of any of its provisions.</p>
<p>59. mid-March 2008</p>	<p>The PRBoA is again requested and assured by the Congressmen members of the Commission on Appointments (CA) that they shall ensure that Sec. Ebdane shall meet the PRBoA after Holy Week i.e. March 24 through 28; the PRBoA acquiesces noting that 27 March 2008 is the 15th 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 PRBoA under R.A. No. 6713 (The 1989 Code of Conduct and Ethical Standards for Public Officials and Employees) which prescribe a time limit to respond to correspondences;
60. late March 2008	PRBoA 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 UAP-IAPOA Task Force R.A. No. 9266 ; the PRBoA continues to defer the filing of its complaint against DPWH Secretary Hermogenes B. Ebdane, Jr. with the Office of the Ombudsman for his multiple culpable violations of standing laws and regulations such as R.A. No. 9266 (The Architecture Act of 2004) , P.D. No. 1096 (The 1977 National Building Code of the Philippines) , R.A. No. 8981 (The 1990 PRC Modernization Act) , R.A. No. 3019 (The 1960 Anti-Graft and Corrupt Practices Act) , R.A. 6713 (The 1989 Code of Conduct and Ethical Standards for Public Officials and Employees) , the Revised Penal Code, Executive Order/ E.O. 262 (The Administrative Code) , etc.; the PRBoA readies similar complaints against other national and local government unit (LGU) officials.
61. May 2008	The PRBoA and the PRC Standards and Inspection Division (SID) commence with the review of applications for registration of architectural firms under R.A. No. 9266 and its IRR;
62. June 2008	The PRBoA and the PRC International Affairs Division (IAD) commence with the review of an application for the issuance of a temporary/special permit (TSP) for a foreign architect (FA) under R.A. No. 9266 and its IRR ;
62. August 2008	The reconstituted PRBoA attends the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) Architect Registry Project 3rd Central Council meeting in Canada to help campaign for collaborative practice between a Philippine RLA and a foreign architect (FA) as an official mode of reciprocal recognition, in full conformity with R.A. No. 9266 and its IRR ;
62. September 2008	The PRC and the PRBoA reconstitute the Continuing Professional Education Council (CPEC) with the PRBoA Chair (Arch. Alli) as CPEC Chair , the UAP-IAPOA Secretary General (Arch. Gil Evasco) as the first CPEC member and the Vice President of the Council of Deans and Heads of Architectural Schools in the Philippines/ CODHASP (Arch. Ted Inocencio) as the second CPEC member , in full conformity with R.A. No. 9266 and its IRR;
62. 25 September 2008	The 2007 PICE case filed against the UAP-IAPOA is dismissed by a Court Decision dated 12 September 2008; this is the <u>2nd major court victory for the RLAs in 2008</u> and reaffirms the common position of the legislative, executive and judicial branches of the Philippine Government that <u>architectural</u> documents are only for RLAs to prepare, sign and seal.

Nothing follows.