**PHILIPPINE EXTRACTIVE INDUSTRIES TRANSPARENCY INITIATIVE**
Address: 5/F DOF Building, Roxas Boulevard corner Pablo Ocampo St., Manila 1004 Philippines
Telephone number: (02) 5317 6363 local 6655

pheiti@dof.gov.ph I pheiti.dof.gov.ph I facebook.com/PhilippineEITI I twitter.com/ph_eiti

**Philippine Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative**
**100TH MULTI-STAKEHOLDER GROUP (MSG) MEETING**
June 19, 2025, Thursday | 9:00 AM - 12:00 PM
Department of Finance, Manila

**MINUTES OF MEETING**

**Attendees:**

| NAME | AGENCY |
|---|---|
| **Government:** | |
| Usec. Bayani H. Agabin | Department of Finance (DOF) |
| Dir. Nenito C. Jariel, Jr. | Department of Energy (DOE) |
| Mr. Earl Jan Nera | Department Of Energy (DOE) |
| Engr. Romualdo D. Aguilos | Mines and Geosciences Bureau (MGB) |
| Ms. Maricor Anne D.G. Cauton | Union of Local Authorities of the Philippines (ULAP) |
| Mr. Ren Untalan | Union of Local Authorities of the Philippines (ULAP) |
| Mr. Reymark Tablanza | Department of the Interior and Local Government (DILG) |
| Ms. Samantha Tuppal | Department of the Interior and Local Government (DILG) |
| **Industry:** | |
| Atty. Ronald Rex S. Recidoro | Chamber of Mines of the Philippines(COMP) |
| Atty. Odette D. Adaci-Cattiling | Lepanto Consolidated Mining Co. |
| Atty. Jose Ma. Emmanuel A. Caral | Philippine Petroleum Association of the Upstream Industry (Oil & Gas) Inc. /Prime Energy Resources Development B.V. |
| **Civil Society Organizations:** | |
| Ms. Beverly F. Besmanos | Bantay Kita (BK) |
| Ms. Jeanira Godio-Okubo | PILIPINA, Baguio-Benguet Chapter |
| Ms. Arlene N. Sevilla | Tawi-Tawi Regional Agricultural College Assembly of Masses and Basic Sectors for Unity and Harmony—Initiatives for Normalization and Advancement for Human Security (AMBUH-INAH) |

|                              | Tawi-Tawi Alliance of Civil Society Organizations, Inc. (TACOS) |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mr. Rodne R. Galicha         | Living Laudato Si' Philippines                                 |
| Prof Maria Aurora Tabada     | Visayas State University (VSU)                                 |
| Ms. Joel Chester Pagulayan   | Oxfam Pilipinas                                               |
| Atty. Amy Faith T. Suson-Sitoy | Sectoral Transparency Alliance on Natural Resource Governance Cebu (STANCe) |

**PH-EITI Secretariat:**

| Ms. Mary Ann Dizon-Rodolfo | PH-EITI Secretariat |
|----------------------------|---------------------|
| Mr. Albert A. San Diego    | PH-EITI Secretariat |
| Ms. Rhea Mae B. Pamatmat   | PH-EITI Secretariat |
| Mr. Amiel De Guzman        | PH-EITI Secretariat |
| Ms. Malene A. Skensved     | PH-EITI Secretariat |

**PH-EITI Secretariat Documenters and Tech Support:**

| Ms. Rhoda H. Aranco        | PH-EITI Secretariat |
|----------------------------|---------------------|
| Mr. Job G. Besmonte        | PH-EITI Secretariat |
| Ms. Andrea Denise S. Ong   | PH-EITI Secretariat |
| Ms. Shaina Gem P. Cardenio | PH-EITI Secretariat |
| Mr. Lloyd Rainiel C. Bonsol | PH-EITI Secretariat |
| Ms. Aliyah Mae Gozon       | PH-EITI Secretariat |
| Ms. Jollie Anne M. Las Piñas | PH-EITI Secretariat |

## Agenda:

I. **Call to order**

II. **100 Meetings, One Vision: The PH-EITI MSG and the Pursuit of Transparency in the Extractives (Video Presentation)**

III. **Approval of the agenda of the 100th meeting**

IV. **Approval of the minutes of the 99th meeting**

V. **Matters arising from previous meetings**

VI. **Main Business**
   1. Update on the PH-EITI Report Production
   2. Refresher and Update on the Subnationalization Initiative
   3. Updates from the 2nd TWG Meeting with NCIP

**VII. Other Matters**
   1. Government Accounting Rules on Travel Reimbursement and Liquidation
   2. Upcoming PH-EITI Activities

**Proceedings:**

### I. Call to Order

The Chair, Usec. Bayani Agabin, called the meeting to order, noting that this was a momentous occasion, the 100th meeting of the Multi-Stakeholder Group (MSG) of the Philippine Extractive Industry Transparency Initiative (PH-EITI). The Chair expressed pride in seeing the group gathered and welcomed all members of the MSG, including partners from government, civil society, and industry. The Chair then took a few minutes to deliver opening remarks, reflecting on the milestone of the 100th MSG meeting and the journey of PH-EITI over the past 10 years. As he noted, "This 100th  MSG meeting is not just a number, it is a milestone. A reminder of what we've built together, a platform where diverse voices contribute to a single goal of transparency and accountability in the extractive sector"

### II. 100 Meetings, One Vision: The PH-EITI MSG and the Pursuit of Transparency in the Extractives (Video Presentation)

The meeting then proceeded to a video presentation highlighting the journey of the PH-EITI since its establishment in 2013 to date.

### III. Approval of the agenda of the 100th MSG meeting

A member of the Secretariat mentioned that the day's agenda was relatively brief. The Chair then suggested reviewing the list to see if any items, especially those marked "for information", could be streamlined or set aside. However, the MSG agreed that even these sections were relevant and should be tackled to ensure proper context and continuity.

The Chair asked for the agenda to be presented. The Chair noted that the group would cover as much as until noon and check their progress from there. With everyone agreeing, the Chair formally opened the meeting.

### IV. Approval of the Meeting Minutes

The Chair gave the MSG members one week to review the minutes of the 99th MSG meeting. If there are substantial comments, it will be brought to the attention of the body for review. In the absence of such revisions, the minutes would be considered officially approved.

## V. Matters Arising

The Chair asked if there were any outstanding matters that needed to be addressed from the previous meeting, to which the Secretariat responded that there were none. The Chair then proposed to move on to the main business of the current meeting.

| NO. | ITEM | ACTION | IN CHARGE | STATUS | REMARKS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **From the 99th MSG Meeting - May 22, 2025** | | | |
| 99.1 | **MSG GOVERNANCE** | The Chair granted MSG members an additional five (5) days to review the minutes of the 98th MSG meeting. Any substantial comments received within this period will be addressed in the next meeting. If no comments are submitted, the minutes will be considered approved. | MSG | **Completed** | As the Secretariat did not receive any comments within the set deadline, the minutes are considered approved. |
| 99.2 | **2025 Workplan** | MSG suggested that the budget per program must be included, as this information is crucial for evaluating whether our limited resources are sufficient to achieve the intended outcomes. MSG also agreed to give members an additional day to go over the Workplan once the budget details were incorporated. | Secretariat | **Completed** | Program per budget included in the workplan. |
| 99.3 | **2025 Workplan** | The MSG proposed that under item 1.7 Secretariat Management, the working hours of the | Secretariat | **Completed** | Included in the revised workplan. |

| NO. | ITEM | ACTION | IN CHARGE | STATUS | REMARKS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **From the 99th MSG Meeting - May 22, 2025** | | | | |
| | | secretariat staff should be reflected along with their corresponding hourly rates, to ensure a more accurate representation of personnel-related expenses | | | |
| 99.4 | **2025 Workplan** | The Chair and members recommended revising the budget to show a detailed breakdown of each item — including PS, MOOE, and other expense components — indicating the source of funds, listing all program activities. | Secretariat | **Completed** | Included in the revised workplan. |
| 99.5 | **2025 Workplan** | The Secretariat proposed circulating the revised version of the Work Plan for the MSG members to comment and approve by referendum, within the following week. | Secretariat | **Completed** | The final draft of the workplan was circulated for comments with a deadline set on May 30. As only one comment was received and no objections were raised by the deadline, the workplan was deemed approved by referendum on May 30. |
| 99.6 | **2025 Workplan** | The MSG suggested including the MGB Gender Impact Assessment (GIA) tool in the work plan | Secretariat | **Completed** | The Secretariat included the MGB GIA in the 2025 workplan and updated the list of gender tool activities to integrate it into the planning and monitoring system, thereby strengthening the capacity of the Secretariat and MSG to apply gender analysis in extractive governance. |

| NO. | ITEM | ACTION | IN CHARGE | STATUS | REMARKS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **From the 99th MSG Meeting - May 22, 2025** |
| | | | | | [Workplan Link](#) |
| 99.7 | **2025 Workplan** | The MSG recommended including the possible collaboration with the Philippine Statistics Authority (PSA) and the Regional Development Councils (RDC) to collect relevant data on IPs/ICCs, to supplement the information that the NCIP is currently unable to provide. | Secretariat | **Completed** | The activity has been incorporated within the IP engagement section of the workplan |
| 99.8 | **2025 Workplan** | The MSG recommended continuing coordination with MGB/COMP to seek their support in encouraging reporting companies to participate and further boost the participation rate before the end of the month. | Secretariat | **Completed** | The Secretariat has sent a new letter to the MGB requesting verification of the operational status of mining projects. In addition, it has also reached out to COMP to request assistance for their unresponsive member companies. |
| 99.9 | **MSG GOVERNANCE** | The MSG suggested that civil society representation in the NCIP TWG should include three members, one each from Luzon, Visayas, and Mindanao. | Secretariat | **Completed** | The MSG has designated three representatives from the Philippine island groups to participate in the NCIP TWG Meeting. |
| 99.10 | **MSG GOVERNANCE** | The Secretariat will circulate to the MSG for approval the potential representatives from each sector to serve in the NCIP TWG. | Secretariat | **Completed** | There are already representatives from the government, industry, and civil society organizations (CSOs) in the TWG with NCIP. |

| NO. | ITEM | ACTION | IN CHARGE | STATUS | REMARKS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **From the 99th MSG Meeting - May 22, 2025** |
| | | | | | 🔳 [Members] TWG wi… |
| 99.11 | **2025 Workplan** | The MSG suggested revisiting the gender research previously conducted by PH-EITI to explore how its framework can be adapted or improved for the MGB GIA Tool | Secretariat | **Ongoing** | This matter requires further consultation with the MGB, as the PH-EITI framework, which also focuses on gender equality and inclusivity, could potentially be adapted.<br><br>[PH-EITI Framework Matrix Link] |
| 99.12 | **MSG GOVERNANCE** | The MSG suggested clarifying the intended purpose of the GIA Tool, whether it is meant to gather baseline data or serve another specific function. | Secretariat | **Ongoing** | The tool is being refined to serve as a baseline data-gathering instrument aimed at assessing the gender dimensions of extractive industry operations and stakeholder participation. Further, we are exploring how the tool can also support<br>-Identifying gaps and barriers to gender inclusion<br>-Informing GAD planning and policy adjustments<br>- Monitoring the effectiveness of gender mainstreaming interventions over time<br><br>These functions are being reviewed to ensure alignment with both the EITI standard and national GAD mandates. Also, we plan to present a draft framework of the tool's |

| NO. | ITEM | ACTION | IN CHARGE | STATUS | REMARKS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **From the 99th MSG Meeting - May 22, 2025** | | | | |
| | | | | | objectives and scope for MSG input in the upcoming TWG meeting. |
| 99.13 | **MSG GOVERNANCE** | The MSG requested an orientation on the reimbursement process to guide CSO representatives accordingly. | Secretariat | **Ongoing** | The Secretariat will provide a brief orientation on the reimbursement process, particularly focusing on the government's guidelines under the "Other Matters" portion of the agenda. |

**V. Main Business**

1. **Update on the Production of the PH-EITI Country Reports FY 2023 and 2024**

The update focused on the participation of companies for fiscal years (FY) 2023 and 2024, emphasizing the status of legal document submissions, online reporting progress, and beneficial ownership disclosures.

For FY 2023, it was reported that industry participation has increased. Initially, **121 projects** across the mining, oil, and gas sectors were considered. However, based on agreements from previous MSG meetings, **20 projects** categorized under non-operational or care-and-maintenance status were excluded. This brought the **total number of targeted projects to 101.**

As of the meeting date:
- **75% of the 101 projects** had completed their Phase 1 submissions, including legal documents, taxpayer waivers, and sex-disaggregated data.
- **8% had submitted only advance or online copies**, with printed copies scheduled to follow.
- **17% have not submitted any requirement.** The Secretariat is actively coordinating with the relevant government agencies such as the MGB and continues to seek assistance from other stakeholders such as COMP, PNA, PPA, and mining companies to improve compliance.

Efforts to follow up with companies are ongoing. Weekly emails are sent every Tuesday to prompt submission of legal documents and report data through the Online Reporting in the Extractives (ORE) tool. Only five companies remain to be contacted to complete the 88% submission goal, while the remaining 12% were identified as consistently unresponsive.

For FY 2024, a similar process is being followed. From an initial 120 projects, 14 were excluded due to operational inactivity, bringing the target to 100 projects. Out of the stated figure,
- 72% have submitted complete legal documents,
- 7% have sent advance copies,
- 21% have not submitted any documentation.

The Phase 2 process, focused on data input via the ORE tool, runs concurrently with Phase 1. The reporting system was officially opened on May 15, 2025. This tool enables companies to report payments and data from various agencies, including the MGB, BIR, and DOE.

For FY 2023:
- 53 projects are currently in progress with their online submissions,
- 45 projects have yet to start,
- 2 projects have reached the validation stage where authorized representatives confirm the data inputted by compliance officers,
- Only 1 project has fully completed the reporting process, including validation.

For FY 2024, 80 projects have not begun their online submissions. The Secretariat noted that companies have different strategies; some complete FY 2023 reporting first before proceeding with FY 2024, while others do the report simultaneously. As of July 15, 2025, :
- 27 projects were in progress,
- 0 projects were validated,,
- 1 project had started submission.

The Secretariat reiterated that follow-up emails are being sent weekly to monitor and encourage reporting progress.

For Beneficial Ownership Disclosure, for FY 2023, out of 101 targeted projects:
- 56 projects submitted complete beneficial ownership documents,
- 21 projects submitted incomplete sets—only one to three out of the four required

documents.
- 24 projects have not submitted any documents.

For FY 2024, the statistics were slightly similar:
- 58 projects had complete submissions,
- 23 projects submitted incomplete documents
- 27 projects with No submissions

The Secretariat acknowledged that challenges persist in securing full compliance, with some companies expressing uncertainty over whether beneficial ownership transparency is mandatory. It was clarified that while submission is not compulsory, it is strongly encouraged as part of EITI's commitment to transparency.

To address submission gaps, a data sharing agreement (DSA) with the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) is currently in progress which is expected to significantly support information gathering moving forward..

The Secretariat confirmed that the proposed DSA with the SEC has already been presented to the SEC, and the comments from the Department of Finance Legal Affairs Office (LAO) has been addressed. The agreement was tentatively scheduled for presentation to the SEC Chair on July 17.

The Secretariat noted that the SEC's involvement would significantly streamline the collection of beneficial ownership information. Through this partnership, the SEC would provide all required beneficial ownership declarations directly to the PH-EITI, reducing the need for the Secretariat to request these documents from companies individually. The only remaining requirement from the companies would be the waiver or consent allowing the publication of the beneficial ownership information. This process is expected to ease the administrative burden on both sides and improve compliance rates.

The Chair then opened the floor to questions from the MSG. The Chair inquired whether the current reporting progress was on track compared to previous cycles. The Secretariat confirmed that the deadline for submission was July 11, 2025, with approximately 35 days remaining as of the meeting. In terms of comparative performance, the Secretariat reported improved participation rates: the current reporting cycle has already achieved 83% participation rate, compared to 73.55% during the same stage in the previous cycle for the FY 2022 report.

A government representative requested a breakdown by sub-sector, particularly to see whether a lower participation rate was more evident in the mining, oil and gas, or coal sectors. The Secretariat confirmed they could provide this disaggregated data. It was noted that mining companies constituted the majority of participating projects. The oil and gas sector, with only five targeted projects, had a smaller representation. For the coal sector, there was minimal engagement; one company (Semirara) was responsive, while others remained inactive.

Regarding the oil and gas projects, the Secretariat reported that of the five entities – Forum, NPG, PNOEC, Prime Energy, and Filodrill – only three had submitted their legal documents. Forum had not submitted, citing no commercial production, while Filodrill had been unresponsive despite follow-up efforts.

A government representative requested that the updated list of company submissions be sent to the DOE via email for further review.

The discussion then shifted to follow-up strategies. It was suggested that, aside from routine reminders, the MGB could be asked to assist in reminding mining companies.

The Chair emphasized the importance of mobilizing sectoral allies to increase submission rates with 33 days left before the deadline. It was proposed that a list of companies, who have incomplete or no submissions, be shared with the concerned agencies such as the MGB, COMP, DOE, and Philippine Nickel Industry Association (PNIA), requesting their support in issuing reminders to their members.

The Chair concluded the segment by noting that while progress was evident, a final push was still necessary. The support of partner agencies and industry associations would be crucial to improving compliance and meeting reporting targets.

### 2. Refresher and Update on the Subnationalization Initiative

The subnationalization initiative was described as a strategy to localize extractive governance. The goal is to create local bodies that can respond to area-specific concerns, recommend policies, and promote transparency at the grassroots level. While local reporting remains a future aspiration, the national EITI will continue as the primary reporting body for now.

The Secretariat emphasized the importance of local transparency, especially since communities

directly affected by extractive activities deserve access to accurate information, opportunities for dialogue, and formal accountability mechanisms. The initiative is also anchored in the Philippine EITI's commitment under the Philippine Open Government Partnership's Sixth National Action Plan.

In 2024, the l accomplishments included the regional roadshows  with the roundtable discussions in Benguet, Cebu, Butuan, Zambales, and Palawan. These consultations brought to light key issues such as delayed revenue sharing, unclear agency roles, and the lack of transparency in royalty management.

In parallel, the Secretariat had earlier collaborated on a subnational study through the USAID-INRM project. However, the project was terminated by the US government. Although the researchers expressed willingness to share their findings, they were unable to attend this MSG meeting or provide documentation. Based on prior engagements with them, it was noted that existing multi-stakeholder bodies such as the Palawan Council for Sustainable Development (PCSD) and Caraga's Representatives of Host and Neighboring Communities could potentially serve as templates for local EITI mechanisms.

A more recent stakeholder dialogue was held in Benguet in April, where LGUs, IP groups, civil society organizations, and mining representatives were consulted regarding the subnationalization plan. The dialogue revealed strong interest from certain LGUs, such as Itogon and Tuba, in developing local EITI ordinances. In fact, local officials even expressed openness to inviting the Secretariat team to present during their Sangguniang Bayan sessions.

Building on these engagements, three pilot LGUs were proposed for more intensive  subnational work. These include **Itogon in Benguet,** identified for its active small-scale mining, stakeholder interest, and local leadership; **Toledo City in Cebu**, chosen for its large-scale mining presence and strong LGU capacity; and **Claver in Surigao del Norte**, where high mining revenues and the existence of MRFC and MMT bodies offer a foundation for subnational EITI efforts.

Common issues raised during consultations in these areas were then summarized. In Benguet, concerns centered around complex NCIP processes, weak environmental safeguards, institutional limitations, data access problems, and the perceived lack of PH-EITI benefits. Cebu stakeholders pointed to delayed revenue sharing, minimal community engagement, weak enforcement, and the absence of energy transition planning. In Caraga, particularly in Butuan, the issues included non-transparent revenue flows, limited oversight, exclusion from project

planning, small-scale mining concerns, and broader capacity and governance gaps.

To address these, several next steps were outlined. First, the Secretariat plans to re-engage with Itogon and propose a local ordinance institutionalizing a local PH-EITI body aligned with existing structures. Second, engagements will begin with officials in Toledo and Claver, including administrators, planners, treasurers, and environmental officers, to identify priorities and determine appropriate local governance arrangements. Third, the team will produce simplified visual materials on topics such as wealth sharing, royalties, and contract transparency for use in community meetings. Fourth, localized assessments will be conducted to determine training needs like IP royalty handling, budgeting, and livelihood programming. Lastly, local stakeholders will be encouraged to determine governance models that best fit their context, whether through ordinances, MOUs, or by adapting existing multi-sectoral platforms.

The Secretariat concluded that no single model would suit all the LGUs. The governance structure for each locality should be contextualized based on local realities. Some may require forming new bodies, while others could strengthen existing mechanisms. Feedback and guidance from the MSG were requested to determine whether the proposed ways forward and pilot areas were acceptable.

A civil society representative requested to revisit the issues raised during the roadshow in Benguet, specifically pointing to a significant discussion brought up by the local government unit (LGU) regarding delayed and unclear revenue sharing. The CSO representative noted that several accountants had participated in the conversation and expressed concern too, but this particular issue was not reflected in the summary presented by the Secretariat.

In response, the Secretariat acknowledged that the indigenous peoples (IPs) in the area had raised concerns about royalty shares, particularly the lack of timely updates and the unavailability of data at the local level. It was suggested that a more detailed documentation of the issues raised during the roadshow could be shared with the group to address any gaps.

The same civil society representative emphasized the importance of including LGU-specific concerns in the documentation, especially given the expectations of local stakeholders. The Secretariat thanked the representative for the reminder.

A government representative shared observations regarding the approach taken in Cebu during the roadshows. They noted that the issue during earlier discussions was the question of which

governance body would be created or utilized at the local level. Specifically, they asked whether the initiative would tap into existing structures like the Regional Development Council (RDC). They observed that the current approach appeared too focused on the municipal level, which may limit the involvement of other relevant government agencies such as the NCIP. The representative recalled that a previous agreement within the MSG was to initially consider broader administrative levels. This, they argued, would cover more ground and potentially ensure stronger alignment and coordination across agencies. They recommended reassessing the scope of pilot areas like Cebu to see if a more strategic, province-wide approach might better serve the goals of the subnationalization initiative.

The Secretariat responded by noting that during the upcoming consultations, particularly in places like Itogon and Tuba, where no local EITI body currently exists, it may become evident that there are existing local structures that can be utilized instead of creating new ones. This contextual information would be better captured during further field engagements, as earlier roundtables did not fully surface this level of detail.

The Chair then emphasized the importance of establishing firmer plans and timelines for carrying out subnationalization activities.

Returning to the topic of site selection, another civil society representative asked how the pilot areas were chosen. The Secretariat explained that the intention was to select at least one pilot site per major island group, with the  initial idea to include Eastern Samar. However, logistical limitations, such as accessibility and transport considerations, had led the team to prioritize more feasible areas for now. Nonetheless, the Secretariat acknowledged that Eastern Samar remains on their radar, particularly because of an existing local body focused on just energy transition.

The civil society representative acknowledged the logistical considerations but suggested that the selection of pilot areas had so far been limited to small municipalities. They proposed that the initiative might benefit from a broader scope, possibly at the provincial level. A provincial approach, the representative argued, would allow for more scalable and replicable implementation. It would also help raise awareness about PH-EITI across multiple LGUs while building their capacity to manage extractive governance concerns collectively.

In response, the Chair offered a perspective that focused on direct impact. He suggested that targeting municipalities directly affected by mining activities makes practical sense, given their

proximity to and experience with extractive operations. The civil society representative affirmed this but added that providing models applicable across multiple levels like municipal, provincial, and eventually national, would allow for more meaningful policy development. While acknowledging the value of direct impact, they emphasized that the initiative must also contribute to broader institutional change.

A civil society representative recalled that the MSG had previously discussed subnationalization through concrete examples such as Bantay Kita's engagement with LGUs and mining affected communities. Lessons and criteria for assessing key areas for subnationalization were shared in those earlier meetings. In light of the limited time and complexity of the issue, the representative recommended holding a dedicated technical session to revisit the topic in greater detail. The representative emphasized that the subnationalization process is a lengthy and nuanced undertaking, further constrained by the absence of a dedicated budget. It was noted that decisions on where or whether to pilot subnational initiatives are not solely up to the national MSG or its members. A critical first step is assessing whether the concerned LGU is willing to participate. While formal agreements such as MOAs could be arranged, the fundamental question remains whether there is genuine demand for such engagement and whether all relevant stakeholders are prepared to take part.

The representative warned that launching a subnational process prematurely could surface numerous unresolved local issues, described metaphorically as "opening a Pandora's box."

Another challenge raised was the lack of clarity around which office or entity would serve as the local secretariat. To illustrate a working model, the representative pointed to the Provincial Mining Regulatory Board (PMRB), particularly in South Cotabato, which functions as a multi-stakeholder platform involving both small-scale and large-scale mining actors. The PMRB, backed by legislation and public funding, was cited as a functional local counterpart to PH-EITI. In that context, the representative recommended assessing whether a given PMRB would be willing and capable of adopting a localized PH-EITI role, including an evaluation of available financial resources.

It was reiterated that subnationalization must be approached as a multi-stakeholder process. External actors cannot impose it on local counterparts. Each pilot site must be tailored to the specific issues of a particular province or region. Local EITI platforms should focus on problems that are directly relevant to their context.

The representative further advised that the Secretariat, especially the technical leads, deepen their understanding of local dynamics, including how agencies like the MGB, MRFC (also a multi-stakeholder body), and NCIP operate, particularly when indigenous peoples are involved. All necessary preparations must be in place before attempting any pilot initiatives.

Given the challenges and resource constraints, it was proposed that the most practical step for the current year would be to strengthen the shared understanding of what subnationalization truly entails.

The Secretariat responded by citing Itogon as an example of a locality that had expressed its own interest in establishing a local PH-EITI body. In the case of Benguet, the Secretariat also consulted the Mines and Geosciences Bureau–Cordillera Administrative Region (MGB-CAR) to explore the possibility of having the Provincial Mining Regulatory Board (PMRB) serve as the local EITI mechanism. However, the regional MGB office clarified that the PMRB lacked the technical capacity to assume such a role. The Secretariat acknowledged that conditions vary significantly from one locality to another. This variability highlights the need for a clearer understanding of the local context before attempting to implement a subnational model. The point made was that a one-size-fits-all approach is not feasible.

A civil society representative emphasized the need to continue advocacy efforts to highlight the importance of transparency, especially at the local level. In Benguet Province, it was observed that the PMRB is functional and has already reached the Regional Development Council (RDC) to address transparency-related issues.

The representative pointed out that Benguet has numerous mining sites, both small-scale and large-scale, and one of the main challenges is fostering collaboration between these two sectors. The area was suggested as a potentially strong candidate for localized natural resource governance due to its active mining landscape.

However, it was underscored that local actors, including LGUs, industry, and communities, often have divergent interests. While LGUs may lack full transparency, the industry may withhold information, and communities may know what they want but lack the capacity to realize it. This dynamic complicates coordination and strategy-building, especially when each stakeholder defines and values transparency differently.

The representative acknowledged that Itogon, in particular, has historically been open to such efforts, even during previous projects. Nonetheless, issues between the municipalities of Itogon and Tuba, particularly in relation to large-scale operations like Philex Mines, were flagged as important contextual considerations. These tensions, while not openly discussed, have had a real impact on local communities.

It was noted that the MGB remains cautious, preferring not to be perceived as failing in its responsibilities, which contributes to the overall complexity of engagement. Given these challenges, the same representative recommended piloting at the provincial rather than the municipal level. This broader approach could encourage support from both small- and large-scale players and foster a clearer understanding of stakeholder roles.

The representative cautioned against rushing the process, advocating instead for a careful and measured approach. If the advocacy were to move forward, it was suggested that the RDC be utilized as the primary platform, with agencies such as NEDA, DILG, and PSA already initiating discussions on transparency and data use. However, it was noted that l local actors are not yet fully engaged, reinforcing the need to proceed slowly and thoughtfully.

A civil society representative reiterated their motion to convene a separate technical session involving the Secretariat and representatives from each stakeholder sector to further discuss the subnationalization program.

In response, the Chair acknowledged that subnationalization remains a lengthy and complex topic. However, there was consensus on the need to identify a pilot site. The Chair noted that the group could greatly benefit from the experiences of civil society initiatives such as Bantay Kita, particularly on how they engage communities. These community engagement strategies could serve as models for structuring subnationalization efforts.

The Chair emphasized that since the Secretariat has multiple responsibilities, support from stakeholders will be crucial. If replicable strategies can be drawn from previous experiences, the Secretariat may be able to integrate them into its own approach. It was agreed that a separate session focused solely on subnationalization would be scheduled, in part because this effort aligns with the country's commitments under the Open Government Partnership (OGP). Thus, pursuing it would fulfill multiple objectives simultaneously.

The Chair suggested that ideally, the group should outline a set of agreed-upon activities with corresponding timelines and committed dates. How this will unfold would depend on the direction agreed upon in the coming discussions. Referring again to Bantay Kita's work, the Chair stressed the importance of incorporating insights from community interactions and securing local stakeholder buy-in for any potential pilot. The Chair noted that success hinges on having a willing and capable site; otherwise, the initiative may not take off.

Palawan was mentioned as a potential pilot area due to the presence of the Palawan Council for Sustainable Development (PCSD), but it was agreed that this would require further evaluation.

To conclude, the Chair confirmed that a separate session, possibly held virtually, would be scheduled to continue discussions on the subnationalization program.

### 3. Updates from the 2nd TWG Meeting with NCIP

The Secretariat presented updates from the second Technical Working Group (TWG) meeting held on June 11, 2025, regarding the implementation of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP) and PH-EITI. The meeting was attended by representatives from NCIP's Office on Environmental and Human Rights (OEHR), the Ancestral Domains Office (ADO), the PH-EITI Secretariat, and members of the Multi-Stakeholder Group (MSG).

As a result of prior TWG discussions, sectoral representatives from the MSG were designated as TWG members. These include a representative from the Union of Local Authorities of the Philippines (ULAP) for the government sector, industry representatives, and civil society members from Luzon, Visayas, and Mindanao. The NCIP delegation included officials from OEHR, ADO, the Legal Affairs Office (LAO), and the Foreign-Assisted Programs and International Relations Office (FAPIRO).

At present, the TWG is still in the first phase of the MOU implementation, which is scheduled to run from May to July. This phase focuses on foundational actions, particularly the review and improvement of the existing NCIP monitoring tool, a tool that has been in use since 2016 but is now being re-evaluated for its effectiveness and relevance.

The OEHR shared a draft resolution during the meeting. This document laid out proposed reforms related to monitoring the Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC)-MOA process. It included new provisions on the formation of monitoring teams, transparency and accountability mechanisms, roles and responsibilities of involved parties, and guidance on funding. However,

OEHR clarified that the draft is still under development, and several provisions require further internal discussion within NCIP.

The group acknowledged that the FPIC process must be refined in terms of timing, methodology, and real-world implementation. A member of the TWG raised a concern regarding the tool's regional applicability, noting that it had not previously been used in Luzon, although it had been piloted in the Caraga Region. This was confirmed by other members, highlighting the need for a comprehensive review to ensure the tool can be effectively adapted across different IP contexts. This raised questions about consistency and applicability, prompting the chair to recommend a more deliberate review before the tool is rolled out.

Key recommendations and agreements from the meeting included:
- TWG members committed to sharing insights on past implementation experiences, particularly from Caraga, to help inform improvements to the tool.
- It was proposed that technical team members undergo capacity building to enhance their understanding of FPIC guidelines and the formulation process of Community Royalty Development Plans (CRDP).
- As reforms are drafted, members recommended integrating mechanisms to revisit and improve CRDPs to address existing gaps and ensure the tool's effectiveness once implemented.
- It was agreed that the draft guidance document from NCIP would be circulated among TWG members for feedback and refinement.

On the question of pilot testing the monitoring tool, a TWG member stressed the importance of identifying and preparing the appropriate consent procedures for engaging Indigenous Peoples (IPs). The MSG emphasized the need for:
- Proper coordination with the relevant NCIP regional offices before initiating formal engagement;
- Clear communication of safety assurances and accountability for personnel conducting the pilot test, including protective protocols for tribal leaders;
- Comprehensive planning, taking into account funding, implementation logistics, and contextual sensitivities.

In conclusion, the Chair underscored the need for a thorough review and enhancement of the monitoring tool before rollout. This process will help ensure that the tool serves as an effective, inclusive, and adaptable mechanism across different regions and Indigenous contexts.

A civil society representative expressed uncertainty about whether PH-EITI should continue to take on the full responsibility of working on the monitoring tool, pointing out that the tool was originally meant for the NCIP. They questioned the rationale behind the memorandum of agreement with NCIP. The Chair responded that the MOA was established primarily for monitoring of royalty payments.

The civil society representative recalled that back in 2016, PH-EITI had worked with Bantay Kita on this initiative intending to use the tool then. However, implementation became uncertain due to internal issues within NCIP. Moreover, some of the NCIP regional offices had shown interest, the central office had not given any formal instruction for its use.

They questioned why PH-EITI was once again taking on the task of improving a tool that had already been developed in 2016 and offered for its use nearly a decade ago. The representative suggested that the NCIP should first try implementing the tool, perhaps by instructing its regional offices to use it before the PH-EITI invests further effort. They added that, from what they understood, PH-EITI was the primary author of the tool, yet now, in 2025, it was back on the PH-EITI's plate without acknowledgement of its ownership or follow-through from the NCIP.

Another civil society representative confirmed that there was a memorandum order and that the monitoring tool was originally based on Bantay Kita's version. It was developed collaboratively with PH-EITI and later improved by NCIP to become the IP Royalty Monitoring Tool. The then NCIP Chair issued an administrative order directing all regional offices to use the tool.

However, the CSO representative shared that problems surfaced when the PH-EITI team coordinated with the NCIP and trained the regional directors and legal officers on the use of the tool. The major issue: there was no funding to implement the tool. Internal confusion within NCIP also posed unresolved challenges - questions like where to house the tool and which office should be responsible for monitoring. The same representative noted that the tool required several actors, which made it difficult for the NCIP to integrate it into their core mandate. The same CSO representative stated that the only real entry point for the monitoring tool seemed to be through NCIP's visitorial powers, but up to now, there was still no clear definition or scope for those powers. The same CSO representative explained that when the tool was piloted in NCIP Region 11, it became evident that the problem was much larger than the tool itself. The regional office proposed that, instead of focusing solely on royalties, the monitoring effort

should include all resources managed by the IP communities.

The same CSO representative recalled a national conference where NCIP Region 11 presented their proposed Community Resource Management and Development Plan (CRMDP), a broader approach that considered how royalties and other resources were being managed. This proposal, however, was forwarded to an NCIP office, possibly the Ancestral Domain Office ADO or Office of Southern Cultural Communities (OSCC), without proper follow-up or coordination.

As a way forward, the CSO representative suggested conducting another technical discussion to revisit and clarify what had already been accomplished. They also recommended reconnecting with Region 11 and relevant NCIP offices like OSCC to follow up on developments, especially any administrative reforms linked to royalty monitoring. The representative stressed that strengthening NCIP's mandate must be led by NCIP itself, while PH-EITI should maintain its support role. They also proposed assessing the current context within the NCIP, especially under the new Chairperson, to see whether there were new opportunities for meaningful engagement.

A government representative provided an additional update regarding the draft FPIC guidelines, clarifying that the document is still in its earliest stage – a "zero draft" — and far from final. It was also noted that the existing approved guidelines on FPIC have not yet been published, rendering them non-implementable at this time. Given this gap, the government representative seconded the suggestion to conduct another technical discussion in enhancing the monitoring tool.

In response, the Chair and the MSG members agreed that a separate session is necessary to further unpack the status of the guidelines and better align the ongoing engagement with NCIP. The Chair also shared a concern that while a former NCIP Chairperson had technically agreed to the MOU with PH-EITI, there were no concrete followup actions.  The Secretariat shared that there was a confirmed courtesy meeting with the new NCIP Chairperson scheduled June 27. The new NCIP Chair is aware of the initiative and open to discussion. The Secretariat encouraged the MSG members to join the upcoming meeting.

The Chair suggested that strengthening relationships and aligning work on the monitoring toolkit with NCIP's international direction could help move efforts forward more effectively. A CSO representative also suggested to continue the engagement with NCIP Region 11 and Regional Director Geroncio Aguio, especially given the region's active role in the previous pilot

activities.

## VII. Other Matters
### 1. Government Accounting Rules on Travel Reimbursement and Liquidation

The Secretariat provided a detailed orientation on the government-wide policies governing travel reimbursement and liquidation, specifically those based on Executive Order No. 77, which prescribes rates and policies for both local and foreign travel of all government employees. The EO also serves as the standard reference for reimbursable expenses incurred by civil society representatives participating in PH-EITI activities.

The Secretariat mentioned that under Section 2, paragraph C of the EO, the reimbursement covers actual transport expenses for authorized modes of travel by land, sea, or air – from official station or residence to the designated assignment and return. Acceptable proof for fare reimbursement includes only official receipts for taxi rides, or if unavailable, a picture of the taxi meter alongside the vehicle's plate number. In the absence of either, a certification of expenses may be issued, but only up to a maximum of PHP300.

It was further clarified that electronic ride-hailing receipts (e.g., from Grab or Joyride) are now accepted, provided they are email-based. Screenshots, however, are not valid. In cases where a digital receipt cannot be provided, only PHP 300 is reimbursable, regardless of the actual fare. Rental of vehicles and transport via informal modes like *habal-habal* or boats requires three price quotations—an ongoing challenge considering such services rarely issue receipts or formal quotes. All quotations must include fuel and related charges.

Under Section 5, allowable miscellaneous transportation expenses such as terminal fees, parking fees, and toll charges are also covered, but only when a government vehicle is used. If a private vehicle is used for official travel, fuel costs are not reimbursable. The Secretariat cited an example where a government-provided van was assigned for travel to Baguio, and thus separate expenses (like a Grab ride from home) became ineligible for reimbursement since official transport had already been provided.

The briefing also covered daily travel expense ceilings. For example, accommodations in Metro Manila are capped at PHP 2,200 per night, but only 50% of that is allotted for room lodging. Actual hotel costs often exceed the cap, especially in high-cost areas like the Metro-Manila, resulting in unreimbursed out-of-pocket expenses. The maximum allowable rate may also be prorated depending on the traveler's arrival and departure times. For instance, if a trip ends at lunchtime, only partial reimbursement may apply.

The Secretariat acknowledged the frustrations of many participants over delayed reimbursements and administrative hurdles. To conclude, the Secretariat presented a summary of post-activity documentation requirements – applicable not just for travel reimbursements but also for payments to  suppliers,. including  complete supporting documents and forms, which follow the same rigorous procedures  regardless of the amount involved.

During the post-event discussion, a member of the Secretariat reflected on the challenges related to personal cash advances or "*abono*" practices, where individuals cover expenses out of pocket in anticipation of later reimbursement. This was a common practice, especially in situations where participants were expected to travel or make purchases using their personal funds and not government funds.

The same Secretariat representative admitted to facilitate their work, they  previously engaged in this practice. However, she explained that this system was     discouraged due to recurring issues during liquidation. In some cases, the amounts reimbursed were significantly less than the actual costs that were advanced, causing discomfort and financial strain to the concerned parties despite having actual costs. The Secretariat cited specific examples, such as meals worth PHP 300 being reimbursed for only PHP 80 due to eligibility limits. These mismatches between actual and allowable expenses created discomfort and financial strain on those advancing funds.

They shared a personal example of how their own reimbursement claim from November 2024 had only been released recently, underscoring the slow but necessary pace of processing under formal procedures.

The Chair acknowledged the current challenges in the reimbursement process, particularly how they affect civil society representatives who often need to shoulder out-of-pocket expenses while waiting for their reimbursements.  The Chair emphasized the importance of finding a solution that ensures no one will have  to advance personal funds, pointing out that it's not fair to anyone, whether members of the Secretariat or CSO representatives, to carry this burden. The Chair noted that this situation partly explains why reimbursements are delayed and suggested that the group needs to work on a better system. The Chair then invited further comments from the MSG members.

A CSO representative, drawing from their previous experience in government, shared their view that a one-month turnaround time for processing reimbursement would generally be

considered reasonable. The same CSO representative noted that if a reimbursement request was filed in March and had not been received by June, the delay has clearly extended beyond what would be considered acceptable timeframe. While they acknowledged that immediate processing was not always possible, they emphasized the importance of providing updates.

A representative from the Secretariat explained the typical process flow for financial documents review and reimbursement. They noted that the accounting office often follows a first-in, first-out system. Once documents are submitted, they are reviewed within a few days. If any supporting documents are missing or require revisions, the papers are returned to the Secretariat. In some cases, resubmitted forms must be signed again, which restarts the process, going back and forth between concerned individuals and offices, contributing to overall delays.

The Chair, responding directly, clarified that all documents requiring his signature must be reviewed by his assistant. However, for the record, he pointed out that the delays do not occur at his office. The Secretariat affirmed this comment.

The Chair committed to reviewing the financial processes related to reimbursements by coordinating with the agency's accounting office. The goal, he stated, was to make the process more efficient, ideally reducing turnaround time to under one month. While acknowledging that the procedural steps were already clear, the Chair noted that delays often stem from changes in the required documents – an issue commonly encountered but one that still needs to be addressed. Improving efficiency, would not only benefit civil society partners but also the DOF, as a whole.

A civil society representative then brought up the relevance of the agency's ISO certification, noting that if the Department is ISO-certified, its processes should be consistent and standardized, not subject to frequent change.

The Chair agreed and clarified that the existing ISO standards apply to external clients but not to internal processes. They pointed out the irony in this distinction, suggesting that internal operations, such as financial workflows or leave applications, are equally deserving of standardized procedures. The Chair shared that they had previously raised this with the ISO team but encountered resistance, as the internal aspects were not included in the scope of ISO certification.

The Secretariat clarified that when processing travel documents or vouchers, there are instances when the paperwork must go through the Secretary's office for approval. However, if the Secretary is unavailable, alternate signatories such as Officers-in-Charge can sign the documents.

In response, the Chair explained that although Secretariat members are involved in the documentation, they are technically not considered part of the formal government plantilla. As a result, all financial transactions – including reimbursements – are credited under the Chair's name and account. They noted that even after funds are credited, the process still requires documents to be routed back, which can be burdensome and emotionally taxing.

A civil society representative expressed appreciation to the Secretariat members who had taken steps to clarify the reimbursement procedures. They acknowledged that the discussion was helpful and long overdue, especially to understand the process better. However, the representative raised a pressing concern about lingering communication gaps, particularly on financial coordination. They noted that poor communication has led to repeated misunderstandings, citing a past conflict over a boarding pass submission, where there was confusion about whether a screenshot or email confirmation was acceptable. The situation had caused unnecessary tension, as the representative was not informed of proper procedures despite the travel being arranged by the same contact.

The representative emphasized that such issues, though seemingly minor, accumulate and cause frustration. The core issue, they said, was not just the process, but the lack of timely and respectful communication, especially when delays stretched over several months without notice.

The same representative also raised logistical concerns about  flight bookings and check-ins that had been made on their behalf without the proper information being shared. In some cases, participants found out their flights were earlier than expected only upon arriving at the airport. They called for more proactive and accessible communication methods, mentioning that even a simple message through Facebook or messenger chat could have prevented confusion.

While acknowledging the Secretariat's limited resources, the representative reminded the group that the experience of long-time CSO partners should be handled with more care. They highlighted how civil society's participation has always been central to PH-EITI's mission of transparency and accountability. If long-standing CSO representatives face difficulties just to

participate, it raises questions about how much harder it must be for community-based organizations and local stakeholders.

The CSO representative pointed to the positive momentum brought about by the recent passage of the mining fiscal regime law, which embeds EITI participation more strongly as part of government commitments. This should, they argued, translate into institutional support for civil society engagement. They emphasized that the government has committed to involving CSOs as part of its transparency framework and that this must include real investment for meaningful participation.

The same CSO representative underscored that solutions do exist. It was a matter of preparedness and commitment to inclusion. They encouraged the Secretariat to anticipate challenges and create mechanisms that enable smoother participation, such as providing alternatives when official receipts are unavailable or establishing clearer systems for coordination.

The Chair asked whether it was feasible to issue advance funds to cover daily subsistence allowances (DSA) and other predictable expenses, especially for regional activities where fixed rates are already known. The Secretariat confirmed that cash advances are allowed under the same existing process, but emphasized that any resulting disallowances would still be addressed at the end of liquidation.

It was clarified that DSAs, such as the standard PHP 2,200 per day, do not require receipts, as long as the amount falls within EO 77 guidelines. However, this does not apply to procurement-related items, where formal documentation and competitive quotations are still required. Transportation, such as flights or land transfers, would still need receipts and boarding passes. The Secretariat noted that while receipts for taxi rides are mandatory, a photo of the taxi meter and plate number may be accepted if no receipt is issued, subject to agency-specific certification formats.

The Chair raised the point that, with planning, cash advances could be requested and released on time, ideally within two to three months before an event. This would eliminate the need for both Secretariat and MSG members to cover expenses from their own pockets. It was confirmed that with sufficient lead time, the DOF could process cash advances, although delays have historically occurred due to centralized processing constraints.

The discussion also addressed complications around travel bookings and reimbursements. Previously, booking through the Procurement Service was allowed, but this option was removed after the pandemic. The Secretariat explained that they have since been booking flights directly, with staff paying using their credit card and later seeking reimbursement. A proposal to engage a travel agency was explored but ultimately set aside due to higher costs. Instead, the current approach remains dependent on internal reimbursements, with continued efforts to minimize delays.

A civil society representative highlighted the importance of clear, timely communication when coordinating travel. They recounted past incidents where flight details or boarding passes were not properly shared, causing confusion at airports or missed connections. Concerns were also raised about mismatches between requested and booked flights, such as inconvenient terminals or times that didn't align with subsequent transport (e.g., ferry schedules). In some cases, preferences – especially for senior or mobility-impaired participants – were overlooked, which affected accessibility and comfort during travel.

Another civil society representative raised a clarification regarding the types of documentation accepted for travel-related reimbursements, particularly in cases where a certification is issued instead of official receipts. The question was whether a pro forma certification exists or if an acknowledgment receipt suffices, emphasizing that the completeness of these documents is crucial to avoid disallowances from the Commission on Audit (COA).

In response, it was clarified that while certifications, such as the PHP 300 transportation allowance without receipt, were previously acceptable, these are now increasingly being flagged by auditors. The rationale is that for modes of transport like taxis, which are mandated to issue receipts, claimants must now provide either an official receipt or, in the absence of one, a photo of the taxi meter along with the vehicle's plate number. The DOF has a specific format for such certifications, which must be strictly followed.

In response, the Chair acknowledged the concern and emphasized the need to meet with the finance team to determine which specific documents are required for different types of travel arrangements. The broader goal is to anticipate and plan travel logistics, allowing for proper documentation and minimizing the need for out-of-pocket spending by the Secretariat or MSG members.

A one-month target for processing reimbursements remains in place, though the Chair expressed hopes to shorten this further with improved internal coordination.

A civil society representative reminded the body of the importance of upholding professional conduct in accordance with EITI requirements. They emphasized that the national EITI Secretariat is expected to maintain professionalism when engaging with members of the Multi-Stakeholder Group (MSG), especially in the context of addressing issues or concerns.

They noted that communication should be proactive and respectful, something as simple as sending a message or checking in when needed can go a long way in resolving misunderstandings. It was further pointed out that many of the CSO representatives are senior citizens. While this should be seen as a strength and blessing, it also calls for more patience and tailored communication, particularly considering generational differences. The same representative underscored that fast-paced exchanges may not always be appropriate, and that a more deliberate and considerate approach is often necessary.

The Chair reiterated the importance of ensuring a smooth experience for MSG members when attending meetings, especially as many are stepping away from their regular responsibilities to contribute voluntarily to PH-EITI's objectives. The Chair acknowledged that difficulties such as out-of-pocket expenses, delayed reimbursements, and logistical challenges can discourage participation.

The Chair committed to working on improving the internal systems to address these issues. Members were encouraged to provide timely and constructive feedback so the Secretariat could identify areas for improvement. The Chair emphasized openness to such input, reaffirming a collaborative and supportive approach moving forward.

### X. Summary of Agreements

| Agreements | In charge | Timeline |
|---|---|---|
| The MSG agreed to give one week for the MSG members to review the 99th MSG meeting minutes, any substantial comments will be addressed in the next meeting, if none, it will be considered approved. | MSG and Secretariat | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| The MSG requested that the Secretariat submit the breakdown of the sub-sector data on the rate of participation of the companies, which the Secretariat agreed to provide and send via email. | Secretariat | |
| The MSG asked the Secretariat to send the list of companies that are unresponsive to the DOE and MGB and COMP and request for their assistance in reaching out to these companies. | MSG and Secretariat | |
| The MSG suggested setting clear target dates for the completion of the subnationalization activities. | Secretariat | |
| The MSG suggested adopting a provincial level approach for piloting subnationalization activities. | Secretariat | |
| The MSG agreed to defer the discussion on the subnationalization activities and schedule another technical meeting, considering the limited time available. | MSG and Secretariat | |
| The MSG has agreed to arrange another technical meeting to advance discussions on the NCIP monitoring tool. | MSG and Secretariat | |
| The MSG recommended engaging with NCIP Region 11 and RD Atty. Aguio, Dir. Arthur Herman, and the NCIP-OCC , to deliberate on the initiatives and challenges surrounding the implementation of the NCIP monitoring tool in relation to the MOU execution. | Secretariat | |
| The MSG suggested that the Secretariat meet with the DOF Accounting Office to address the challenges in the reimbursement process. | Secretariat | |

## XI. Adjournment

The Chair thanked all the MSG members for their active participation in the 100th MSG meeting and adjourned the session at 12:00 pm.