

1 2	62 nd PH-EITI Multi-stakeholder Group Meeting 29 May 2020 9:02 AM - 1:30 PM Google Meet					
3 4	Minutes of the Meeting					
5	-					
6 7	Attendees					
8	Government					
9	Asst. Secretary Ma. Teresa S. Habitan	Department of Finance (DOF)				
10	Ms. Febe J. Lim	DOF				
11	Dir. Anna Liza F. Bonagua	Department of the Interior and Local				
12	D: A I' O . O . I .	Government (DILG)				
13	Dir. Araceli S. Soluta	Department of Energy (DOE)				
14	Engr. Romualdo D. Aguilos	Department of Environment and				
15		Natural Resources-Mines and				
16 17	Ms. Maricor Anne D.G. Cauton	Geosciences Bureau (DENR-MGB) Union of Local Authorities of the				
18	Nis. Maricol Affile D.G. Cautoff	Philippines (ULAP)				
19		Timppines (OL/A)				
20	Industry					
21	Atty. Ronald Rex S. Recidoro	Chamber of Mines of the Philippines				
22	Atty. Joan D. Adaci-Cattiling	OceanaGold Philippines, Inc. (OGPI)				
23	Atty. Francis G. Ballesteros, Jr.	Philex Mining Corporation				
24	Engr. Rolando J. Paulino, Jr.	Petroleum Association of the				
25		Philippines				
26						
27	Civil Society Organization (CSO)					
28	Mr. Vincent T. Lazatin	Bantay Kita – Publish What You Pay				
29		Philippines (BK-PWYP)				
30	Ms. Angelica Dacanay	BK-PWYP				
31	Dr. Buenaventura M. Maata, Jr.	Philippine Grassroots Engagement in				
32	Dr. Nelson C. Cuaresma, Jr.	Rural Development Foundation, Inc. Concerned Advocates Saving				
33 34	Dr. Neison C. Guaresma, Jr.	Concerned Advocates Saving Terrestrial and Marine Ecosystems				
3 4		(COASTLINE), Inc.				
36	Dr. Glenn Pajares	Sectoral Transparency Alliance on				
37	Dr. Clorii i ajarco	Natural Resource Governance in				
38		Cebu, Inc.				
39	Prof. Ladylyn L. Mangada	Philippine Political Science				
40	,, ,	Association, University of the				
41		Philippines, Tacloban				

42	Consultants for the 6th Report				
43	Atty. Maria Karla L. Espinosa				
44	Ms. Linnet Madelane Chan, CPA				
45					
46	PH-EITI Secretariat				
47	Ms. Mary Ann Rodolfo				
48	Mr. Eastword Manlises				
49	Ms. Jane Baldago				
50	Ms. Roselyn Salagan				
51	Ms. Anna Leigh Anillo				
52	Ms. Katherine Denise Domingo				
53	Ms. Zoe Jimenez				
54					
55					
56	Agenda				
57					
58	Approval of the agenda				
59	 Confirmation of the approved minutes of the 61st MSG meeting 				
60	Matters arising from the previous meetings				
61	 Report on EITI Board meeting in February and consultation call in April 				
62	 Recap of activities than transpired since the 61st MSG meeting 				
63	Main Business				
64	 Highlights of the TWG Meeting on May 8 				
65	 Updates on budget and government guidelines on the new normal 				
66	■ Adjusted Work Plan 2020				
67	 Updates on the 6th Report (FY 2018) 				
68	■ Update on BO information publication				
69	Outreach activities				
70	■ MSG Online Learning Series				
71	■ Regional/Sectoral webinars in lieu of Roadshow 2020				
72	Other Matters				
73	Setting of the next MSG meeting				
74	o detailing of the flext wide friedling				
75					
76	1. Call to order				
70 77	i. Can to order				
78	Assistant Secretary Ma. Teresa Habitan chaired the 62 nd MSG meeting. There being				
79	a quorum, the meeting started at 9:02 a.m.				
80	a quorum, the meeting started at 3.02 a.m.				
81	The Chair noted that it is the MSG's first time to hold a virtual meeting.				
82	The Ohan hoted that it is the MOO's mist time to hold a virtual meeting.				
o2 83	The Chair, then, acknowledged Atty. Joan Adaci-Cattiling, president of OceanaGold				
os 84	Philippines, Inc., and now an industry representative to the MSG. She replaced Mr.				
85	Joey Leviste, who has just retired.				
00	oody Lovidie, who had just retired.				

The Chair also acknowledged Mr. Vincent Lazatin, the new National Coordinator of Bantay Kita, and new civil society representative to the MSG.

2. Approval of the agenda

The Chair asked the members for any additional item for inclusion in the agenda. With no other additional items for discussion, the agenda was approved.

3. Approval of the minutes of the 61st MSG meeting

The Chair noted that the minutes of the 61st MSG meeting was circulated to the MSG members in the last week of March. The secretariat reported that no comments were received from the MSG and that the minutes has been approved through the MSG Action Form.

4. Matters arising from previous MSG meetings

The Chair asked the members if there were any concerns from previous meetings that need to be discussed.

An industry representative recalled that the gender scoping study was one of the matters that got left behind from the last MSG meeting. He wondered if there was any plan to push through with a deep dive into the results of the scoping study.

The Chair reminded everyone that the matter of the gender scoping study is one of the items under Other Matters, and the discussion of the matter may be deferred until that part of the meeting.

The Chair, then, reported on what transpired during the recent meeting of the EITI International Board in Oslo, Norway in February 2020. It was the last physical meeting that the Board had before countries around the world imposed travel restrictions and lockdown measures due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Among the issues that were raised was the lack of political commitment in some EITI implementing countries. In addition, political transitions pose challenges to the continuous implementation of reforms.

The EITI Board wants EITI reporting to evolve from the collection and disclosure of EITI data to data analysis and formulation of policy reforms so as to deepen the relevance of EITI and enable better economic development among implementing countries.

In order for EITI to achieve its goal of fighting corruption in the extractives, EITI reporting must allow for timelier reporting instead of the customary reporting being done. The EITI Standard plays an important role in tackling graft and corruption issues and risks since transparency is at the heart of anti-corruption efforts.

133134135

136137

130

131

132

Systematic disclosure and energy transition were also discussed as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the extractives and on EITI implementation. Considering the situation, the EITI Board decided to give implementing countries more leeway for certain submissions, EITI reporting, and validation.

138139140

141

142143

The Chair advised the MSG members to think of whether or not to request for a postponement of the start of the validation process which will commence in October 2020. She added that it is something that the MSG should think of in the following weeks while keeping a close watch on how the situation in the country would develop amid the pandemic.

144145146

The Chair, then, gave the floor to the secretariat to give an overview of the activities that transpired since the 61st MSG meeting in December 2019.

147148

The following are the activities that transpired over the last five months:

149150151

 A TWG meeting was held on February 6 to discuss the 6th Report and beneficial ownership disclosure, among other matters.

152153154

 Assistant Secretary Habitan attended the 46th EITI Board meeting in Oslo, Norway on February 13-14, and the EITI Implementing Country Constituency Consultation Meeting on February 10-11.

156 157 158

159

155

• On March 4 to 6, the secretariat joined the Community/Stakeholder Orientations in CAR that the Bantay Kita arranged. The secretariat was able to engage at least three (3) stakeholder groups, including women representatives.

160161162

163164

165

166

On March 12, the 62nd MSG meeting was supposed to be held, but was cancelled due to the COVID-19 situation at the DOF building. A workshop on mainstreaming that was supposed to be facilitated by Mr. Sam Bartlett of the EITI International Secretariat was also cancelled. Despite this, the secretariat continued to meet with Mr. Bartlett. The highlights of the said meeting were circulated to the MSG.

167168169

 The latest draft of the Gender Scoping Study was circulated to the MSG on March 22 to April 10 for comments.

- Due to the limitations brought about by the pandemic, the MSG approved critical documents through the MSG Action Form (March 31-April 16). These included the TORs for the 7th Report.
- On April 24, the secretariat submitted a funding proposal to the World Bank.
- On April 29, the Chair had a consultation call with the EITI Board.
- On May 8, a second TWG meeting was held.
- Over the period, the secretariat did several revisions of the work plan, considering the developments in the COVID-19 situation. It also had at least three catch-up calls with the EITI International Secretariat. The most recent call was on May 26 where the EITI International Secretariat discussed alternative approaches in EITI reporting and beneficial ownership disclosure.

5. Main Business

a. Highlights of the TWG Meeting on May 8

The TWG meeting was attended by Engr. Aguilos, Dir. Soluta, Atty. Recidoro, Mr. Lazatin, and Dr. Maata. It tackled various matters such as the impact of the government's COVID-19 response on PH-EITI's budget and activities, updates on the production of the 6th Report, plans for stakeholder engagement activities including a webinar on the new version of the Online Reporting in the Extractives (ORE) Tool, an online learning series for the MSG, and the LGU Roadshow.

During the meeting, the secretariat also reported the summary of MSG actions on critical documents that were circulated for the MSG's review and approval. The following are the documents that were circulated and the corresponding MSG action.

TOR - 7th Report Contextual Information Consultant	Approved subject to comments
TOR - 7th Report Reconciliation Consultant	Approved subject to comments
TOR - Mainstreaming Feasibility Survey	Approved subject to comments
Company Waiver on Beneficial Ownership Disclosure	Approved subject to comments
Minutes of the 61st MSG Meeting	Approved
Conference Note for National Conference 2020	Approved subject to comments
Transparency Awards Mechanics	For further discussion

Respondents	4 government reps; 3 industry
	reps; 3 civil society reps

205 206

207

208

The comments of the MSG members were implemented and some of the documents were already released, specifically the TORs and the draft company waiver on BO disclosure.

209

210

b. Updates on Budget and Government Guidelines on the New Normal

211 212 213

214

The secretariat shared the salient provisions of the National Budget Circular No. 580 (NBC 580) issued by the DBM on April 22, which had an impact on EITI implementation. The NBC provided for the discontinuance of the following:

215 216 217

218 219

220 221

222

- Item 4.3.1.3. All foreign travels, except for ministerial meetings and scholarship/trainings that are grant-funded or undertaken at no cost to the government;
- Item 4.3.1.4. All local travels, unless urgently necessary and allowed by the Secretary or head of the SUCs, constitutional offices and GOCCs;
- Item 4.3.1.6. Hiring of job orders, except those considered as *frontliners* during this state of public health emergency.

223 224 225

226

The secretariat also reported that, in terms of the renewal of job orders (JOs), the DBM categorically confirmed in a letter that the PH-EITI may renew its JO personnel. All the members of the PH-EITI secretariat are under JO status.

227 228 229

Item 4.3.2 of NBC 580 also provides for the discontinuance by at least 10% in the cost of the following:

230 231 232

Item 4.3.2.1. Services of consultants and technical assistants;

Item 4.3.2.4. Cost of training, seminars and workshops.

233

234 235

236

In terms of budget, the NBC 580 reduced PH-EITI's budget to PHP 31.2 million from PHP 34.2 million. The amount taken away from PH-EITI's budget was originally allocated for local and foreign travels.

GAA 2020	PHP 13.2 million
NBC No. 580	(3 million)
2019 Continuing	21 million
Total remaining	PHP 31.2 million

242

243

239

The secretariat, then, shared the provisions of the Inter-agency Task Force for the Management of Infectious Diseases or IATF Resolution No. 38, which shall affect plans for outreach activities this year. The Resolutions provides for the following guidelines on mass gatherings:

Enhanced Community Quarantine	Modified Enhanced Community Quarantine	General Community Quarantine	Modified General Community Quarantine
Mass gatherings are prohibited.	Mass gatherings are prohibited.	Mass gatherings are prohibited.	Mass gatherings are allowed but shall be limited to
Gatherings that are	Gatherings that are	Gatherings that are	50% of the
essential for the	critical for the	critical for the	seating capacity
provision of	provision of	provision of	of the venue.
government	government services	government	
services are	are allowed.	services are	
allowed.		allowed.	

244245

c. Adjusted Work Plan 2020

246247248

The secretariat reported the following adjustments in the schedule and budget of activities mapped out in the work plan for 2020.

250 251

249

 The schedule of the Legislative Advocacy Training and Planning Workshop was moved to a later date.

252253254

The schedules of anticipated TWG and MSG meetings were also adjusted.

255256257

The National Conference was proposed to be held on October 28, and as a culminating activity for the LGU Roadshow.

258259

260

A training activity on the administration of the new version of the ORE Tool is being planned for the secretariat. There will also be webinars on ORE to familiarize reporting entities how to use the tool.

261262263

• The secretariat proposed to hold the Roadshow in two phases, which will run from the second week of July up to the last week of September.

264265

266

269

The Chair, then, asked the MSG for any questions they might have.

267268

An industry representative asked how the secretariat proposes to move forward with the rollout of the Roadshow given the COVID-19 situation.

The secretariat explained that, considering budgetary constraints and the prevailing community quarantine and social distancing measures, all stakeholder engagement activities will now have to be done online.

d. Updates on the 6th Report

Atty. Karla Espinosa, the consultant for the Contextual Information Chapter of the 6th Report, presented updates on the production of the 6th Report which covers extractives data from Fiscal Year 2018.

The consultant began with the presentation of the timeline of report production.

December 2020	Deadline for 6th Report publication
October 2020	Internal deadline for 6th Report publication (ahead of the Revalidation scheduled in October 2020*)
March 12, 2020	Cancelled 62nd MSG meeting
March 16, 2020 to present April 6-12, 2020	Community quarantine due to COVID-19 pandemic Holy Week
June 2020 August 2020	Target completion of 6th Report text without BO disclosure Target completion of 6th Report with BO disclosure
June/July 2020	Proposed online "report analysis workshop" / data dive / MSG meeting devoted to 6th Report discussion and approval

The consultant, then, presented the main features of the 6th Report.

Title	Synergizing Transparency for Sustainability
Covered sectors	Large-scale (1) metallic and (2) non-metallic mining, (3) oil and gas, (4) coal
Covered period	Fiscal year 2018
General content (based on EITI Standard and MSG comments)	Chapter 1 - Contextual Information (including economic, social & environmental dimensions; legal/policy updates; SSM; unilateral reporting on coal) Chapter 2 - Reconciliation report Chapter 3 - Beneficial ownership transparency (progress in roadmap; BO info)

- It is supposed to be a pilot mainstreamed report, but it is more like a *transitional report*. While IA had a modified role, data was not yet collected fully from routine public disclosures of agencies and companies. - *Mainstreaming or systematic disclosure* is embedded in the report as the thread running through the different chapters.

Highlights of the Reconciliation Report

Ms. Linnet Chan, the consultant for the Reconciliation Chapter of the 6th Report, presented the highlights, scope and methodology, and key findings of the reconciliation process.

The approach and methodology is divided into four (4) phases:

- Initial Scoping & Data Collection
- Materiality & Final Scoping
- Reconciliation
- Report Writing

The following is the summary of the scoped projects:

Sector	Target	Participating	Non-Participating
Metallic (producing)	30	26	4
Metallic (non-producing)			
Under Suspension	8	6	2
Under Care and Maintenance	9	5	4
Metallic - Subtotal	47	37	10
Non-Metallic	20	20	-
Oil and Gas	5	5	-
Coal	1	-	1
TOTAL	73	62	11

For the 6th Report, 73 projects were targeted - 47 metallic mines; the top 20 producing non-metallic mines, which is 84% of the total non-metallic mining industry; 5 oil and gas projects; and 1 coal project. A total of 62 projects participated for this cycle.

For the metallic mines, the percentage coverage of sale is at 99.99% for the participating metallic mining projects, whereas it is 0.01% for those who did not

participate. The percentage coverage of sale for both the non-metallic and oil & gas industries is at 100%. For coal, it is 0% since Semirara Mining and Power Corporation (SMPC) did not participate.

Scoped-in Revenue Streams for Metallic Mining. Scoping covers 97.80% of total payments (inclusive of out of scope revenue streams) from participating entities.

Revenue Streams	Government Agency	2018 Amount	% to Total Government Collections
Excise tax on minerals	BIR	3,779,024,865	35%
Corporate income tax	BIR	3,549,432,548	33%
Withholding tax - Foreign shareholder dividends	BIR	166,428,068	2%
Withholding tax - Royalties to claim owners	BIR	257,128,809	2%
Withholding tax - Final	BIR	215,366,174	2%
Customs duties	BOC	104,605,420	1%
VAT on imported materials and equipment	вос	662,456,191	6%
Royalty on mineral reservation	MGB	1,187,312,323	12%
Local business tax (paid either in mine site or head office)	LGU	452,676,597	4%
Real property tax - Basic	LGU	63,583,459	1%
Real property tax Special Education Fund (SEF)	LGU	97,079,273	1%
Royalty for IPs	NCIP	58,010,632	1%
		10,593,104,360	97.80%

Scoped-in Revenue Streams for Non-Metallic Mining. Scoping covers 98.66% of total payments (inclusive of out of scope revenue streams) from participating entities.

Revenue Streams	Government Agency	2018 Amount	% to Total Government Collections
Excise tax on minerals	BIR	313,036,242	3%
Corporate income tax	BIR	2,694,895,119	24%
Withholding tax - Foreign shareholder dividends	BIR	57,140,037	1%

Withholding tax - Profit remittance to principal	BIR	-	0%
Withholding tax - Royalties to claim owners	BIR	5,217,192	0%
Output VAT	BIR	6,164,638,699	55%
Customs duties	BOC	82,622,763	1%
VAT on imported materials and equipment	BOC	1,400,852,546	12%
Local business tax (paid either in mine site or head office)	LGU	80,913,436	1%
Real property tax - Basic	LGU	134,197,916	1%
Real property tax Special Education Fund (SEF)	LGU	134,186,189	1%
		11,080,730,074	98.66%

325326

327

Scoped-in Revenue Streams for Oil and Gas. Scoping covers 99.95% of total payments (inclusive of out of scope revenue streams) from participating entities.

328 329

Revenue Streams	Government Agency	2018 Amount	% to Total Government Collections
Government share from oil and gas production	DOE	25,982,899,862	73%
Corporate income tax	BIR	5,264,765,069	15%
Withholding tax - Profit remittance to principal	BIR	3,433,279,746	10%
Withholding tax - Final	BIR	854,743,894	2%
		35,535,688,572	99.95%

330331

Scoped-in Revenue Streams for Coal.

Revenue Streams	Government Agency	2018 Amount	% to Total Government Collections
Local business tax (paid either in mine site or head office)	LGU	806,728,389	2%
Real property tax - Basic	LGU	1,072,562	0%
Real property tax Special Education Fund (SEF)	LGU	1,072,562	0%

Government share from oil and gas production	DOE	3,569,015,012	98%
		3,651,832,972	100.00%

Payments made to LGU and DOE will be unilaterally reported.

The consultant presented the summary of the final reconciliation results. Overall, the total amount reconciled is at 112%, against the government reported figures. The reconciled amount is higher than what was reported by the government, mainly due to the figures from NCIP and LGU.

The consultant explained that for NCIP, since IP Royalty is technically not a revenue stream, the supporting documents from the participating projects were collected to arrive at the reconciled amount, considering that NCIP was not able to provide the complete set of data for 2018.

As discussed during the last TWG meeting, the LGU data has some issues wherein only one to two quarters were reported by the LGU, whereas the companies reported all quarterly payments.

Open Discussion

The Chair requested the consultant to highlight or make a footnote for the IP Royalty payments to explain that it is not a government collection, since it doesn't accrue to the government and is not a revenue source.

The consultant clarified that the said explanation is already stated in the report.

The Chair then suggested that the said set of data be removed from the table of revenue streams to prevent misinformation since some people just read the tables.

A government representative noted high discrepancies in the revenue stream for the LGUs. She said that the LGUs need to be clarified on the data needed from them. She explained that maybe only the data from the first two quarters were collected from the LGUs because they are in the middle of the reporting period. She suggested getting the data from the last two quarters of the previous year to complete the picture. The representative offered help in clarifying the matter at hand and in working on the Environment and Natural Resources Data Management Tool (ENRDMT) managed by the Bureau of Local Government Finance (BLGF) to lessen the discrepancy of the submission by LGUs.

374 The Chair asked the consultant how she computed the percentage of the reconciled amount against the government reported figures because the percentage for the NCIP 375 is 532%. 376

377

378 The consultant explained that it is the reconciled amount divided by the government 379 amount.

380 381

The Chair instructed the consultant to put a footnote on the percentage amount so that people will know how it was been computed.

382 383 384

385

386 387

388

389 390 The consultant for the contextual information added a response to an earlier inquiry on LGU data. The consultant explained that for the collection of LGU data, the secretariat relied almost entirely on the ENRDMT. However, it proved to be quite challenging because the system itself was encountering problems in 2019, during the time when the data was collected, which explains the big discrepancy. The secretariat coordinated with the BLGF regarding the matter. It was revealed that the larger system where ENRDMT is lodged is undergoing enhancements, affecting the collection of data through the ENRDMT.

391 392 393

An industry representative noted and questioned the large jump of the total reconciled amount from the 5th Report, especially for the metallic mining industry.

394 395 396

397

The contextual information consultant recalled that, in 2018, the Tax Reform for Acceleration and Inclusion (TRAIN) Act was implemented. The new law must have had an impact on the figures presented in the report.

398 399 400

401

The same industry representative clarified whether the report would explicitly attribute the increase to the TRAIN Act. He said it will be very important, not just to guide the government, but also them in the industry.

402 403 404

405 406

407

The Chair recalled that in 2017, there was a dip in metal prices, which was used to explain the reduction in the total reconciled amount. Such kind of explanations must be very clear in the contextual information. It is not just about reporting the numbers, but also the story behind the numbers.

408 409

410

The consultant for reconciliation, then, proceeded with her presentation.

411

412

413 414

415

416

Reconciliation Results - Metallic Mining.

National Commission on Indigenous Peoples.

Revenue Stream	Company Amount	Government Amount	Variance Pre-Recon	Reconciled Amount	Variance Post-Recon
Nickel					
Royalty for IPs	248,695,225	49,760,632	-198,934,593	254,053,390	17,201,349
Gold / Silver / Copper					
Royalty for IPs	56,811,653	8,250,000	-48,561,653	54,811,653	8,250,000
Total	305,506,878	58,010,632	-247,496,246	308,865,043	25,451,349

Total reconciled amount is PHP 308.9 million or 532% of total reported government collections.

The biggest amount still unreconciled from NCIP is attributed to two companies - SR Metals, Inc. and Apex Mining Co. Inc.

SR Metals, Inc. was able to support their reported amount, however, NCIP reported a higher amount, thus, the PHP 17 million is still unreconciled. Apex Mining Co. Inc. said that they did not pay anything for 2018 because they overpaid in the previous year and only continued payment in 2019. However, NCIP reported PHP 8 million for the payments of Apex Mining Co. Inc. Those are the source of the PHP 25 million variance.

Reconciliation Results - Non-Metallic Mining. Summary

Agency	Company Amount	Government Amount	Variance Pre- Recon	Reconciled Amount	Variance Post-Recon	%
BIR	5,713,968,374	8,493,749,083	2,779,780,710	8,220,415,309	14,642,605	97%
вос	1,485,825,747	1,482,102,511	-3,723,236	1,481,523,501	1,118,071	100%
LGU	507,406,736	308,469,288	-198,937,448	522,290,411	-1,934,734	169%
TOTAL	7,707,200,856	10,284,320,882	2,577,120,026	10,224,229,221	13,825,942	99%

The total reconciled amount is PHP 10.2 billion or 99% of total reported government collections. The highest variance is from BIR, attributed to Bohol Limestone Corp., which did not provide further supporting documents, that is why there is a PHP 14 million unreconciled variance.

Reconciliation Results - Oil and Gas.

Summary

Agency	Company Amount	Government Amount	Variance Pre- Recon	Reconciled Amount	Variance Post-Recon	%
BIR	16,162,347,357	9,552,788,710	-6,609,558,647	16,162,347,357	18,000	169%
DOE	25,982,899,862	25,982,899,862	-	25,982,899,862	-	100%
TOTAL	42,145,247,219	35,535,688,572	-6,609,558,647	42,145,247,219	18,000	119%

 The total reconciled amount is PHP 42 billion or 119% of total reported government collections. The remaining PHP 18,000 pertains to the withholding tax - final reported by BIR for Nido Production Galoc. There was no disclosure of the withholding tax - final in the Audited Financial Statements (AFS) of Nido Galoc Production.

Environmental and Social Expenditures.

The consultant presented the summary of the reconciliation results of the environmental and social expenditures for metallic mining. The percentage of the reconciled amount is 87.21% for PHP 3.2 billion. She said that the figures are better when compared to the previous report.

 The remaining unreconciled figures can be broken down into three reasons. First, the highest unreconciled figure amounting to PHP 330,423,929 would be the amount reported by MGB, but not by the project, in which no supporting documents were provided. Second, is the amount reported by the project, but not by MGB, which is PHP 129,281,653. Finally, the PHP 23,713,451 reported by both, with different amounts and no supporting documents provided.

The consultant also presented the breakdown of the reconciliation results for non-metallic mining. The reconciled amount is 99.83% of the reported amount of the government. She then presented the breakdown of the unreconciled amount. The PHP 35 million unreconciled amount is the one reported by the projects but not by MGB, in which no supporting documents were provided by the projects. The PHP 3 million is the amount reported by both, but no supporting documents were also provided.

The consultant further explained that the total amount reconciled presented during the last TWG meeting has already been improved since right after the said meeting, the MGB was able to provide more data for the social and environmental expenditures.

Open Discussion

A civil society representative asked for the meaning and explanation of the 87.21% from the table of the social and environmental reconciliation results for metallic mining.

The consultant explained that the 87.21% is the total reconciled amount against the government reported amount. When computed, it is PHP 3.158 billion divided by the amount for the government. It is the total percentage reconciled against the government amount.

The same civil society representative wanted to know how much of the total revenue of the mining companies was spent for the social and environmental payments. He suggested to include such an amount and percentage in the table or as an interpretation. He explained that the data only tells about the variance, but it doesn't show how much was spent for the social and environmental protection and enhancement.

In reference to the table presented, the consultant explained that the amount under the company amount, reported by the projects, tells the total amount spent for social and environmental payments, which is the actual expenditure for 2018.

To clarify question, the Chair asked whether the civil society representative was asking how much as a percentage of the revenues of the mining companies are the expenditures. The representative responded in the affirmative. The Chair said that it is a new way of looking at the numbers.

The civil society representative continued to explain that the information will be very beneficial for people who will be reading the report, especially for environmentalists and people who are concerned about the social impacts of mining projects. He said that the explanation can be written as a one-liner or a column.

The consultant for the contextual information clarified whether the civil society representative was requesting for a different or separate table that would place the social and environmental expenditures beside the revenues.

The civil society representative suggested that it can be an additional column, an explanation as part of the analysis, or another table.

The consultant asked if the data will be the social and environmental expenditures visa-vis the total revenue of the government and mining industry.

The Chair and the civil society representative said that it is the social and environmental expenditures in relation to the total revenue of the companies.

The consultant asked the civil society representative if he was thinking about reporting it on a per project basis. The representative said that it can just be the overall amount.

The Chair clarified that the revenue stream being discussed is the company revenues and not the government revenues. She also asked if the data being requested is presently available in the reporting.

The reconciliation consultant said that the revenue data was obtained from the financial statements (FS) provided by the SEC. The contextual information consultant mentioned that it is not part of the data being reconciled.

The Chair asked if the information can be part of the 6th Report. She said that it is good information since it adds depth to the analysis.

The contextual information consultant said that the secretariat would have to mine the FS which it only has in hard copy. She further explained that the data is not mined from the FS and that they only select data that are going to be reconciled or would figure in the report. Hence, it would require another round of data collection.

The reconciliation consultant clarified that the secretariat was able to get the revenue for the sales from the FS of the companies provided by SEC. She said that the concern is that not all the companies or projects have available AFS.

The Chair recommended adding an annotation on the matter. The contextual information consultant agreed with the Chair and said that the amount spent for the social and environmental expenditures based on legal provision will be annotated, so that there is an expectation that the amount constitutes a certain proportion and has a definite computation.

An industry representative agreed that it is important to know how much companies are spending for environmental protection and social development, in relation to revenues. He opined that that analysis should be in the contextual information chapter, not in the reconciliation report, so that the tables will be consistent across the board and it will be easier to compare. He concurred with the suggestion of contextual information consultant to do a report analysis workshop to understand the report at the granular level. He said that the independent administrator (IA) should be reporting on data and the analysis should be somewhere else.

The Chair concluded the open discussion by mentioning that there should be an analysis of the data collected, and that while it has been agreed that it is important for the reconciliation, she advised to include it in the contextual information chapter.

The reconciliation consultant, then, presented her recommendations for future reporting:

571 572 573

574

575 576

577

578

579 580

581

582

583

584

585

586 587

588

589

590 591

592

593

594

570

- Early engagement of the independent administrator
- Walkthrough procedures
 - Debrief and obtain updates
 - Emphasize accrual basis of reporting
 - Require detailed supporting schedules from participating projects
- Improve ORE reporting
 - The consultant proposed to have the option to extract the data collected in excel format for efficient reconciliation.
- Improvement on ENRDMT
 - The consultant recommended improving the main reporting tool for the LGU since there were issues encountered during the data collection.
 - Training of personnel of the different LGUs on how to properly use the ENRDMT
- Improve MGB reporting for environmental and social expenditures
 - Review and evaluate current procedures to identify root cause of late or incomplete data
- Prioritize NCIP Monitoring Tool
 - This tool has been developed in 2015 through the collaboration of NCIP and PH-EITI. However, it has yet to be fully rolled out. The NCIP is also asking for additional budget in order to effectively discharge its mandates and duties including the monitoring of payments of IP royalties. The agency also lacks manpower in the regional offices that is why they were not able to report on time.

595 596 597

Open Discussion

598 599 600

601

An industry representative inquired whether the data on SDMP only reflects the required expenditure and does not include the CSR or social commitments on top of the SDMP.

602 603 604

The reconciliation consultant said it does not include CSR. The secretariat asked if the CSR data is also covered in the report. The consultant answered in the affirmative.

605 606 607

608

609

610

611

The contextual information consultant proposed coming up with another table or an infographic that answers the question, "Where does the mining revenue go?" She said it could be a pie chart just to give a picture of where mining revenues go, including among others, social and environmental expenditures. Furthermore, she said that all comments were noted so as to be able to come up with a fair representation. She assured that it will be properly annotated in the contextual information chapter.

<u>Updates on beneficial ownership (BO) disclosure</u>

614615616

The contextual information consultant presented the updates on beneficial ownership disclosure. She shared that the Chapter 3 of the 6th Report is on BO disclosure, which will include the country's implementation of the BO disclosure roadmap.

618619620

617

Milestones

621

2016	MSG approved the PH-EITI BO disclosure roadmap (2017-2020) during the 38 th meeting. (Dec)
2017	 Scoping study Inclusion of BO in PH-OGP National Action Plan 2017-2019 Inclusion of BO in program of countrywide roadshow
2018	 First multi-sectoral BO workshop thru PH-OGP event (May) SEC issued MC No. 17, s. 2018 (Nov) BO declaration made part of ORE and pilot BO disclosure included in the 5th Report (Dec)
2019	 ADB – EITI regional workshop on BO in Asia & the Pacific (Mar) SEC issued MC No. 15, s. 2019 (Jul) PH-EITI – COMP – SEC workshop on BO disclosure (Oct) MSG agreed to align EITI BO disclosure with SEC policy on BO declaration (with a view to mainstreaming BO transparency*) and to publish BO information in the 6th Report. (Dec)
2020	 EITI deadline for public disclosure of BO information (Jan) Position of PH-EITI MSG on mainstreaming BO disclosure was communicated to the International Secretariat (IS), but PH still deemed unable to meet the deadline. In a TWG meeting, SEC gave updates on MC 15 implementation; publication was identified as an issue because MC 15 excludes it; SEC indicated openness to accept companies' waiver of non-publication in order to publish their BO information. (Feb) MSG approved a company waiver template which was then sent to SEC for comments. (Apr) PH-EITI received SEC's comments. (May 15)

622 623

624

625

BO was discussed as part of the agenda of all the MSG meetings since the approval of the BO Roadmap in December 2016.

The consultant explained the series of events that became problematic in publishing BO information. An agreement by the MSG was made during the 61st MSG meeting held in December 2019. The MSG resolved to align the BO disclosure under EITI with the SEC's requirement of BO declaration under the Memorandum Circular (MC) No. 15, originally issued in 2018 but was amended in 2019. This resolution is consistent with the EITI Board's decision, in February 2018, to make systematic disclosure the default expectation of implementing countries. Moreover, it has a basis in the EITI Standard and complies with Requirement 2.5 (a) which states that, "Where possible, beneficial ownership information should be incorporated in existing filings by companies to corporate regulators, stock exchanges or agencies regulating extractive industry licensing." The SEC falls under the corporate regulator classification. There was a clear rationale for opting to mainstream BO reporting and disclosure.

However, aligning with SEC's implementation of MC No. 15 entails waiting until the end of July 2020, the deadline for submitting the GIS, to get better and more complete BO information. Also, SEC's BO declaration form does not include PEP identification and will not be published by SEC.

 Another problem was the matter of publication. The 2019 EITI Standard requires that countries publicly disclose BO information. Under the 2016 EITI Standard, the language was that countries "disclose", so the adverb "publicly" from the 2019 EITI Standard made a lot of difference because under the 2016 EITI Standard, it could have just been argued that companies were already disclosing by virtue of MC No. 15, since it was already mandatory for all companies, not only extractive companies, to declare their beneficial owners as part of their GIS submission.

However, the 2019 EITI Standard clarified that what it requires is public disclosure, so given that quotation, come January 2020, PH-EITI was deemed unable to meet that deadline. But the secretariat communicated with the IS and clarified that it is also complying with the standard which says that as much as possible, it should be integrated in the processes of a corporate regulator, and that they are just waiting until the end of the period to get the BO information from the SEC, to be included in the 6th Report.

Another issue with the publication is that MC 15 excludes it. The circular specifically says that all the submissions on the BO declaration form shall not be uploaded to their publicly accessible electronic database which is the iView. Given that publication was an issue, the secretariat and the MSG sought to address it. First, by having the SEC during the TWG meeting held in February this year. Representatives from the Enforcement and Investor Protection Department (EIPD) made representations that it is possible for them to publish provided that the companies would execute a waiver, similar to the taxpayer's waiver companies execute for BIR. Hence, the secretariat proceeded with the positive feedback that publication is possible provided a waiver is given.

Second, a draft company waiver for BO disclosure was circulated to the MSG for comments and approval in February 2020. The MSG commented on and approved the draft waiver via Google Form in April 2020. It was then sent to the SEC for their comments. The SEC gave their comments in May and it was circulated to the MSG members for information and comment. PH-EITI and SEC met via Zoom on May 21, 2020 to discuss and clarify SEC's comments.

Where are we now?

- The first compliance period of MC 15 will end by August 2020.
- SEC cannot publish BO information, even with company waivers.

SEC's position is that:

 (1) It cannot publish BO information because MC 15 excludes publication and does not provide any exceptions. SEC would need to amend MC 15 to allow for exceptions.

(2) It can only share to PH-EITI the BO information disclosed by companies, provided

 (a) the data subjects give their consent (by themselves or by an authorized company representative through a Board resolution) and

 (b) PH-EITI executes a data sharing agreement with SEC under NPC Circular No. 16-02 in compliance with the Data Privacy Act of 2012 (DPA).

What can PH-EITI do?

There are at least three (3) options to be able to publish BO information:

A. Ask the companies to execute the waiver (as amended by SEC) and execute a data sharing agreement with SEC to obtain from SEC a copy of the companies' BO declaration forms (submitted to SEC as part of the GIS), and then publish the BO information in the 6th Report.

B. Directly ask the companies for a copy of the BO declaration forms they submitted to SEC and for their consent to the publication of their BO information in the 6th Report.

 C. Push for SEC to amend MC 15 to provide for exceptions to non-publication (as well as to add PEPs to the declaration form).

The contextual information consultant thinks that it is worthwhile to point out that the reason such issues on publication are present is because the PH-EITI is not dealing with the usual financial/quantitative data. The PH-EITI is already dealing with personal

information when it comes to BO. Hence, PH-EITI is constrained by the requirements of the DPA.

Whether the MSG goes for option A or B, it would entail a lot of responsibility on the part of the companies because they are the ones who will be executing a document, and this requires that they ensure that their data subjects consented to the data being disclosed and published.

 There will be a lot of paperwork for option A. Option B is simpler since PH-EITI just needs to ask for a copy of the companies' BO declaration forms. But PH-EITI also has to be careful in ensuring that before publication, the data subjects' consent was obtained.

 The consultant added that the SEC already received a complaint and there is an active case against the implementation of MC 15. The Office of the Solicitor General is representing the SEC in this case and the secretariat requested for a copy of the case documents to know what the complaint is about and the identified legal arguments.

The Chair asked what is in the legal case to know what the complaint was about. The consultant said that she has no idea about which company, but she asked for the general information about the case. However, SEC didn't give information, although they said they already prepared photocopies of the case documents for pickup.

The consultant then asked the members which option they would choose or if there is another option they think would be a better way to proceed.

Open Discussion

A civil society representative opined that option B would be easier and faster.

Another civil society representative concurred, with a comment that volunteers were asked before, but only OGPI complied.

Another civil society representative asked whether BO disclosure contradicts the DPA. He pointed out that they may be greater public interests to be considered in line with data privacy. He suggested considering getting a legal opinion, then possibly craft a legal argument showing how the BO disclosure is of greater public interest and therefore outweighs the harm that it may cause regarding privacy rights. He added that a legal opinion supporting this could help make the case for the SEC to amend MC No. 15.

The contextual information consultant said that the SEC agrees that there is public interest such as transparency and anti-corruption that override the interest in data

privacy. She said that the SEC agrees, on principle, that PH-EITI can disclose, and that MC 15 was issued for companies to disclose beneficial ownership. The SEC admits that they only look into the information they have when something triggers an investigation. The SEC agrees that there should be transparency on BO but it finds itself bound by regulation and legal requirements with regard to publication of the disclosed BO information.

The contextual information consultant noted that the PH-EITI could make a case for a long-term solution by pushing for the amendment of MC 15.

 The Chair said that the other options would also take time. She asked for the position of the members of the industry and their thoughts on the second option provided (option B.) She said that option C is the long-term solution if the SEC is willing to amend MC15, notwithstanding the fact that there is a pending lawsuit against them.

An industry representative believes that the second option can be done if the publication of the BO disclosure is properly explained to the companies. He said that the MSG could talk to the companies to explain what the PH-EITI needs. However, he pointed out that there could be a problem in securing the consent of the data subject or beneficial owner because without their consent, the company would not be able to disclose the BO information needed and allow its publication. The company, then, would also have to bear the consequences as they would not be able to comply with the EITI disclosure requirement. So long as the company waiver sticks closely to what the SEC wants to happen, the industry representative believes that the waiver can be pushed.

The contextual information consultant clarified that the data process that takes place before the information reaches EITI, given that BO information is personal information governed and protected by the DPA.

The SEC does not need to ask for consent of the beneficial owners because the SEC is already a public authority performing a public function. The issue is sharing the information with PH-EITI and publishing it. PH-EITI already satisfies one of the conditions, which is that it is performing a function and collecting data is part of it. The companies protect the controllers of the personal information data of their beneficial owners, but normally, these are just the directors and officers.

The contextual information consultant asked whether, without the legal complications discussed, the publication of BO data be considered as sensitive information as far as the industry is concerned. She said, the legal strictures become irrelevant if it is not sensitive information for the companies.

An industry representative agreed on earlier insights with respect to the legal requirement that the consent has to come from the data subject. She also agreed that

the beneficial owners, as is the case for a number of companies, could be the company directors and that this information is available in other parts of the GIS that are considered public information. She pointed out that the complication would be when the beneficial owners were different from the listed directors.

Another industry representative proposed exploring layering of the data that need to be published. He asked if the NPC could be asked for a clarification on the minimum information that can be readily be published without first securing consent from the data subject.

The contextual information consultant said that asking the NPC is hardly an assurance because if a data subject complains, then there would still be a case. The industry representative's suggestion could be applied, if the company will be the one to execute a waiver or a consent form. The burden would then be shifted to the companies to ensure that they have secured the necessary consent when they execute a waiver through their authorized company representative.

The industry representative clarified that he was suggesting a level of data that can be published without requiring consent.

The contextual information consultant opined that it might be helpful to enumerate the information requested for BO. These data are a combination of regular personal information and sensitive personal information. The EITI Standard requires the publication of the beneficial owners' name, nationality, country of residence, and PEP status. The national ID number, date of birth, specific residential address, and contact information are merely recommended by the EITI Standard. Under MC 15, the required information includes the complete name, address, nationality, date of birth, TIN, percentage of ownership or voting rights, and type of BO, since there are nine categories.

In comparison to what the DPA protects, the sensitive data would be date of birth, race, ethnic origin, marital status, religion, political affiliations, health, education, etc. In terms of the data required by both the EITI and SEC, the sensitive information would be the TIN, date of birth, and nationality.

The contextual information consultant asked one industry representative if what he was saying was that it is easier for companies to give the data if they are assured that some of the sensitive data would be redacted, given that it requires additional requirements for disclosure and publication.

The industry representative asked if it is possible to publish only the names at the moment, considering that these are already public information. He proposed to take option B wherein the names submitted to SEC will only be the data published.

The contextual information consultant clarified that if only the names were published, it would not meet the requirements of the EITI Standard. The Standard would require at least the name, nationality, and country of residence, including PEP, which were also disclosed in the GIS.

The Chair asked if such information can be used in time for submission of the 6th Report and if it is something that can be compiled substantively.

 The contextual information consultant made it clear that what is being done is an assessment of the receptiveness of the industry, should option B be decided upon, since it would require PH-EITI getting a copy of the declaration form directly from companies.

The Chair said she might directly ask the industry if they would be willing to allow PH-EITI to redact some information.

A civil society representative expressed concerns over having the PH-EITI secretariat and MSG to be in a position to hold custody of information that are not meant to be disclosed, and also have the power to redact such information. He further emphasized that it might be worth getting a legal opinion on what is actually covered by the DPA, and if there is any conflict between a request for BO information and DPA.

The same civil society representative concurred with one of the industry representatives on the option to publish just the names for the 6th report. If PH-EITI could legally circumscribe why this is in the public interest and that the public interest outweighs private interest then eventually, PH-EITI should be in a position where the beneficial owner's consent would not be needed. The information on the GIS could be insufficient in some cases where there are layers of ownership.

The Chair asked the civil society representative whom he wants to consult for legal opinion.

The civil society representative answered that it could be legal scholars, former justices of the Supreme Court, data privacy experts, or someone who could look at the issue from a legal standpoint.

The contextual information consultant said that the NPC can provide legal opinion.

The Chair asked the contextual information consultant about the implications of not meeting standards.

The contextual information consultant reiterated that the PH-EITI will undergo validation this year should it push through with the original schedule. She explained that the deadline was already January 2020 so there is more urgency to comply

because PH-EITI will be under the EITI International's scrutiny. If PH-EITI cannot publish BO disclosures, the legal obstacles will simply have to be described.

The Chair said that they should prioritize what can and cannot be done given the time and the environment in which PH-EITI are forced to work in right now. She said that she is willing to forgo, for the moment, PH-EITI's status as an EITI compliant country considering the difficulty to go around such legal obstacles. The Chair said that the IS must also be aware of such problems. She advised the members to ask the NPC for legal opinion to know exactly what PH-EITI will ask for, and the MSG has to agree on that. The MSG would also have to agree on other steps to be considered. In the meantime, the PH-EITI will submit the names which already appear on public documents - the GIS. Additional information will be submitted eventually.

 The contextual information consultant proposed that if the general inclination is to go for option B, the secretariat will draft a communication to companies to secure and request a copy of the BO declaration form, subject to an undertaking that the information will be, to a certain extent, kept confidential by PH-EITI. PH-EITI will be undertaking the responsibility to protect the privacy within legal bounds and identify which parts would be published. It would be up to the company to opt in or not, so it would be a voluntary disclosure and publication. If the members prefer it to be voluntary, then PH-EITI will simply have to document what will be gathered and explain the legal challenges/barriers to full disclosure.

The Chair expressed concerns over letting the PH-EITI Secretariat handle highly confidential information, especially considering the current work setup wherein the staff are mostly working from home.

A civil society representative concurred saying he does not think PH-EITI should be holding information that is not ready to be disclosed as it exposes PH-EITI to a risk of inadvertently disclosing information that should not be disclosed.

The secretariat noted the options enumerated and asked the members if they already wanted to decide on an option or if they wanted to defer the decision for another meeting or e-mail. The secretariat mentioned that several members prefer option B based on the messages sent through the meeting chatbox. The other option is to get the BO information available in the GIS and other platforms although it may not constitute compliance due to lack of other necessary information.

The Chair asked the members if they already wanted to decide on the matter or if they would rather discuss it via email or Viber group.

An industry representative said that the information required for EITI compliance mentioned by the contextual information consultant are already in the GIS. The secretariat may look into the GIS and confirm if the list of officers and directors already there would suffice, without the BO declaration form included.

The contextual information consultant explained that the secretariat would have to compare because owners that are published on the GIS, not the BO declaration form, are considered legal owners and are not, in the eyes of EITI, the beneficial owners. The beneficial owners are only the ones declared on the BO declaration form. The EITI International distinguishes between the legal owners and the beneficial owners.

The Chair proposed to do option B and wait for the companies to respond because in the end, the companies are the ones who will give their consent.

The members agreed to implement option B.

Proposal for Online Report Analysis Workshop

The consultants proposed to conduct a separate MSG meeting/seminar/workshop on the 6th Report. This would be conducted online for two to three hours in late June or early July. This would be moderated by the consultants.

The following are the proposed general objectives:

1. For the MSG to have more focused time to review, discuss, approve, learn, and appreciate the 6th Report

 2. To equip and prepare MSG members and the secretariat for activities that aim to disseminate or communicate the 6th Report

 3. To serve as a compressed report analysis-workshop and data dive that is normally conducted for each country report

e. Updates on the production of the 7th Report [FY 2019]

In the interest of time, the secretariat recommended that the discussion of the matter of the 7th Report production be deferred. The secretariat also proposed that all agenda items under Other Matters be communicated via email.

The MSG agreed with the recommendation, and the discussion of the said agenda items was deferred.

f. Update from EITI International: Alternative Reporting

The secretariat reported on the alternative EITI reporting that the EITI International Secretariat is encouraging implementing countries to produce especially amidst the COVID-19 pandemic.

The secretariat explained that more implementing countries are finding it difficult to produce a report under the current global health situation and that an alternative report will be more aligned with EITI mainstreaming.

The secretariat enumerated some alternatives to the conventional reporting. These include a thematic report on social and environmental payments, IP royalty data, or on Semirara Mining and Power Corporation, the lone material coal project.

The secretariat asked the members for their thoughts on how the alternative reporting could affect the data gathering.

A civil society representative said it might not be a mutually exclusive thing where PH-EITI needs to choose between the conventional and alternative reporting. He said it could be the conventional reporting supplemented with talks about some of the thematic issues. He also proposed to consider, in terms of thematic reporting, how extractives industry responded to the pandemic in terms of protecting the workers and adjusting amid different situations.

An industry representative concurred with the civil society representative. He agrees that PH-EITI should do a thematic report this year because like what the EITI International says, the findings have little variance ever since PH-EITI started reporting. He thinks everybody would be better served if there would be focus on various aspects of the extractives so there would be a deeper treatment. He proposed that PH-EITI look into the social and environmental payments since it has a direct impact on communities. Second, he proposed to review the efficacy of such payments to assess whether or not they are really working towards sustainability. Even if PH-EITI proceeded with a thematic reporting, he insisted that data should be gathered for two reasons: 1) data is needed every year; 2) all mining companies have already been trained to report every year, and if they do not do it for one year, they might forget it and PH-EITI will then have a harder time getting them to do it in subsequent years. He suggested retaining the reporting template aspect.

The Chair said that PH-EITI could expound on the percentage of the social and environmental payments vis-a-vis the mining revenues, as brought up in the discussion of the reconciliation results.

The contextual information consultant asked the members if there should still be reconciliation if data gathering would be done since that is the bulk of the work of an

independent administrator. She said that based on the recommendations that the reconciliation consultant gave earlier, the proposal would entail more work because the walkthroughs and systems would have to be improved. If the thematic reporting would be an analysis of an aspect of the traditional report, then the traditional reporting would still have to be done.

An industry representative offered an alternative, which is to gather data for 2019, and then do reconciliation in 2020, so the reconciliation will be for two years.

A government representative is particularly concerned about the TOR of the IA since it already includes reconciliation.

Another government representative concurred with the suggestion of the contextual information consultant.

The Chair said that the suggestion of one of the industry representatives could be explored in the 8th Report, considering the data that will be generated and the fact that there's no assurance yet if physical walkthroughs with projects and agencies can be done.

The secretariat said that there is not much choice since the TORs have already been released for the 7th Report although the TORs are not yet signed.

The Chair clarified that if an alternative report means that there is no reconciliation, but is stated on the TORs, then there would be no choice unless the TORs would be changed.

1048 A civil society representative said that any thematic report will require another TOR.

1050 With no other comments or insights from the members, the MSG resolved to do conventional reporting.

An industry representative asked that alternative reporting be flagged for the 8th Report.

The Chair said it might be relevant to do an alternative report for the 8th Report since it's reporting on 2020.

A government representative proposed to highlight the social expenditure diverted in response to COVID-19. He informed everyone that the MGB released and issued a memorandum that requires companies to allot a portion of their SDMP to COVID-19 response.

1065 Open Discussion

The Chair requested the secretariat to refresh the MSG on what the validation in October would entail.

The secretariat explained that the 6th Report will be the basis of the revalidation this year. The secretariat reported that there had been several meetings with the EITI IS and that the IS has been asking the PH-EITI to inform them if there were any challenges being encountered, considering the COVID-19 situation. If the report will be delayed, the PH-EITI may opt to request an extension.

 The contextual information consultant emphasized that the MSG would have to decide on the option to request for an extension in light of the current COVID-19 situation. There are no foreseen problems in producing the 6th Report which is the subject of the revalidation. However, there are aspects to validation and revalidation concerning stakeholder engagement that may be tricky to comply with within the EITI validation framework. This includes outreach activities of PH-EITI, as well as the level of commitment of each sector to the implementation.

The Chair advised the members to ask themselves whether the concerns for extension could be resolved within the extended timeframe. Otherwise, the Chair doesn't see any value added from seeking an extension. PH-EITI might need to be more specific on the concerns over stakeholder engagement that PH-EITI needs to address for validation.

A civil society representative asked how much time there is for an extension. The Chair answered that the usual extension is 6 months.

To give the new members an idea of what happened during the validation process in 2017, the contextual information consultant explained that it includes an appointed validator, appointed by the EITI Board, to assess compliance by a specific country with the EITI Standard. The validation entails desk research, wherein the IS gathers all data including documents of the implementing country. The main part is the report, which is one of the main outputs of the implementing country to assess if the report complies with or meets the requirements of the standard. The other part is assessing stakeholder engagement in each of the three sectors. A mission then arrives in the country where the validator gathers information through interviews with different stakeholder groups. This may be conducted either one-on-one or in groups. This is how they assess the level of engagement of the sectors, and how EITI in the country is impacting or getting results. The validator is going to assess how much stakeholder engagement has been done within the revalidation year and the PH-EITI does not have much to show for it in terms of outreach activities.

The Chair asked up to when an extension can be sought because the International Board would have its next meeting in June. The Chair is anticipating that this is one of the concerns that would be raised by implementing countries.

1111

The contextual information consultant answered that the only time period given under the standard is before the date of validation, which is enough time for the EITI Board to decide.

11151116

The Chair left the matter of the validation to the secretariat to think about for a while then instructed them to give an update.

1117 1118 1119

The Chair advised to move forward with the outreach activities since it is also critical for the validation.

112011211122

g. Outreach activities

1123 1124 1125

1126 1127 For the outreach activities, the secretariat asked for three decision points from the MSG. One is the MSG Online Learning Series, and in relation to that, the topic and sequence. The third decision requested from the MSG is on the approach for the roadshow.

1128 1129 1130

1131

1132

Consistent with the PH-EITI work plan for 2020, the secretariat proposed an MSG Online Learning Series, a capacity-building program for the MSG aimed at enabling the MSG members to effectively participate in natural resource governance. The online series is planned to run from June until August 2020.

113311341135

Among the suggested topics for the learning series are the following:

1136 1137

- Legislative Advocacy Training and Planning
- 1138
- o Discussant/Lecturer: Consultant
- 1139
- Suggested Date: 2nd week of June
- 1140
- Fundamentals of Mining (introducing the 4 states of mining)
- 1141
- The Economics of Mining
- 1142
- Principles of Governance applied in NRGGovernance Principles on Transparency
- 1143 1144
- Governance Principles on Accountability
- 1145
- NRG and poverty reduction
- 1146
- Laws on natural governance
- 1148

• Taxation in natural resource management

1149 1150

1151

The secretariat asked members if they agree on the topics listed. The secretariat also informed the members that they will also be requested to serve as facilitators or lecturers for some topics.

The Chair asked the period of implementation of] the learning series, if it would last through the end of the year or if it would spill over 2021.

The secretariat's proposed period for the learning series is from June until the last week of August, since preparation for other PH-EITI activities are scheduled in September and October.

Legislative Advocacy Training and Planning. This learning activity will serve as a venue for the MSG to establish strategies for the enactment of a law on transparency and accountability in the extractives. The activity will done online in four separate days, two hours per session.

An industry representative asked whether the activity would really take 8 hours for 4 days. In response to the question, the secretariat presented the proposed session outline and modules.

The Chair shared that based on her experience, the maximum number of hours for webinars is two.

An industry representative suggested conducting the learning series in two days for four hours each.

1175 The Chair suggested removing some of the modules.

The secretariat said it would revisit the duration of the session and would write it as part of the notice that would be circulated to the MSG, including the topic that the MSG members might want to facilitate themselves.

Roadshow 2020

The secretariat shared that the LGU Roadshow will now be done online and in two phases.

Under Phase 1, participants will be clustered by region, and regions with more than five projects will be divided into clusters by province. The estimated number of participants per cluster is 60. The secretariat proposes 11 clusters under Phase 1.

The Chair is worried about the quality of connectivity since it will be conducted online.

She asked if the secretariat has any idea on the kind of internet connection that the participants have.

The secretariat answered that if the MSG agrees with the schedule and approach, the secretariat could get in touch with the targeted participants and invite them. The secretariat is under the assumption that some of the participants have the capacity to go online but it is understood that not everyone has the same capacity or connectivity. Another option is to stream the whole program and the participants can just watch from their personal devices, but their participation might be limited to just listening in.

A government representative pointed out that even if the participants could simply stream, they would still need stable connection. She said that the purpose of the Roadshow would be defeated if the participants' engagement would be limited to just streaming. She shared that when they had a meeting with the DILG, they discovered that the LGUs do online virtual town hall meetings. Her only concern is the participants from the CSO.

 The Chair said that one of the suggestions done before was the hosting of a company, but the secretariat is limited to the guidelines of the community quarantine wherein there should be no mass gatherings. The Chair then asked for the schedule of the program.

The secretariat presented the program schedule and approach for Phases 1 and 2.

The secretariat acknowledged the limitations and the quarantine measures in place.

The Chair proposed to have a program that is heavy on visuals since it might be difficult for the participants to sit throughout the program.

The secretariat noted the comments of the MSG. It also encouraged the members to go through the MSG kit to review the other materials and items.

1223 The next MSG meeting was set on August 25, 2020.

1225 Without any further discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 1:30 pm.