## **ENERGY REGULATIONS 1-94**

IMPLEMENTATION FEEDBACK

## A. EPIRA IMPLEMENTING RULES AND REGULATIONS

CONCERNS		RECOMMENDATIONS
Fund allocation among EF, DLF, and RWMHEEF	Our host communities expressed that a bigger share of the remittances must be allocated for DLF/RWMHEEF projects because their areas need more development and lively hood and environmental protection. The objective of the ER Fund can be best accomplished if meaningful and	Allocation of the fund be removed and maintained consolidated to allow more meaningful projects as the community sees fit. The generating company can offer recommendations on the type of project that can be implemented.
	adequately funded projects will be implemented. Moreover, electric cooperatives have other sources of funds for electrification projects, i.e. National Electrification Administration.	
Funding scope and project type of EF	Electric cooperatives expressed that their target beneficiaries in far flung areas cannot afford to pay for the cost of the drop-wire connections from the transmission poles to their residences.	In addition to missionary projects, the fund should also consider upgrading (including upgrading of streetlights) and full scale electrification projects in areas that have high potential for development provided that projects are sustainable.
	Host communities prefer that funds for street lighting projects should come from EF. This will make available a larger portion of the ER Funds for DLF and RWMHEEF.	<i>(Example: Some water system projects require a three-phase connection to operate water pumps.</i>
	Electrification expansion projects and some DLF and RWMHEEF projects cannot be implemented because substations and upgrading of the existing power infrastructure are not allowed.	Also, some equipment for livelihood projects to be used to process raw materials require three-phase connections.)
Geographical Limitations of the Beneficiaries	Some regions have inadequate EF for electrification projects compared to other regions, i.e. Region IV-A and Region 5.	The generators can assist the DOE in identifying the host communities as beneficiaries within the region. DOE can realign the ER Funds so less developed regions can benefit from the unused funds from other regions.
Full utilization of available funds	Currently, LGUs with released project funds cannot utilize their available balance for other ER 1-94 projects.	Host communities prefer that the project funds be made always available in order to continuously implement new projects. This however does not remove accountabilities of LGU officers for improperly used funds.

Generator	For projects to be implemented by an	The generators are the fund source of ER 1-
requirement in	NGO, the Commission on Audit (COA)	94. The COA Order should be reviewed to
project	requires a counterpart fund from the	determine the true definition of NGOs.
implementation	implementing generator amounting to	The generator should be allowed to
	20% of the project cost and 30%	implement projects in behalf of the host
	performance bond.	community without the 20% counterpart and
		the 30% performance bond. The
		management cost of the project shall serve as
		the counterpart of the generator.

## B. ENERGY REGULATIONS 1-94 PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

C	ONCERNS	RECOMMENDATIONS
Delays in proposal	Our host communities	DOE can streamline the process flow of the
review and approval	expressed the need to fast	approval of proposals.
	track the approval of projects	
Release of Project	and release project funds for	DOE can adopt a matrix of signatories for fund
Funds	the proponents and	releases to avoid delays in the documentation.
	beneficiaries.	
Templates	There are multiple versions of	To facilitate and avoid confusion in the
	the Memorandum of	implementation of the projects, DOE, host
	Agreement (MOA) and Notice	communities and generators can adopt a single
	to Proceed (NTP) for DLF and	and standard template of the MOA and NTP.
	RWMHEEF projects. Please	
	refer to Annexes B and C.	