
Measuring Impact of Philippine EITI

MARCH 16

UP Statistical Center Research Foundation

Authored by: John Eustaquio

Genelyn Ma. Sarte

Angela Nalica

Kevin Carl Santos

Martin Borlongan

Michael Van Supranes



Contents

Introduction 3

What is PH-EITI and Why Measure Impact 3

Objectives of the Project 3

Methodology 3

Scope of the Evaluation 3

Framework of the Impact Score 4

Questionnaire Design 5

Survey Operations 5

The Perceived Impact Scale 6

Data Analysis 8

Profile of the Respondents 8

Findings 20

PH-EITI Impact Score (Overall Rating) 40

Most Positive Result 41

Other Comments/Suggestions 42

Concluding Notes 43

Recommendations 44

Introduction

What is PH-EITI and Why Measure Impact

/*placeholder*/

Objectives of the Project

The main objective is to evaluate the effectiveness and impact of EITI implementation in the Philippines. To assess the opinions and trends that would be necessary for the improvements on the governance of the extractive industries. The specific objectives are as follows:

1. Develop a survey research design that can be used as a tool in assessing the effectiveness and impact of EITI implementation in the Philippines.
2. Implement an annual survey to assess the development and status of PH-EITI with regard to its relevance, impact, efficiency and sustainability.

Methodology

Scope of the Evaluation

The impact of PH-EITI will be measured based on the following objectives that were formulated during the institution of PH-EITI. These objectives are linked to EITI principles and reflective of national priorities for the extractive industries:

1. Show direct and indirect contribution of extractives to the economy
2. Improve public understanding of the management of natural resources and public availability of data
3. Strengthen national resource management / strengthen government systems

4. Create opportunities for dialogue and constructive engagement in natural resource management in order to build trust and reduce conflict among stakeholders
5. Pursue and strengthen the extractive sector's contribution to sustainable development


Framework of the Impact Score

(Fornell, et. al., 1996) introduced the American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI) model, a customer-based measurement system for evaluating and enhancing the performance of firms, industries, economic sectors, and national economies.

As shown in Figure 1, stakeholder's expectations may directly influence the formation of stakeholder's perception of EITI's impact or these expectations may first influence their perceived quality and their perceived value before these contribute in the development of their notion of satisfaction/overall impact.

To measure the stakeholder's satisfaction, ACSI uses a set of multiple indicators, and the stakeholder's satisfaction level is equated to a latent variable resulting from these indicators. The latent variable score or index is a composite of several items used to quantitatively measure customer satisfaction.

Scale items are constructed to represent different facets of stakeholder's expectations related to their engagement with services and their perceived quality of services. A minor modification of the ACSI was used to measure EITI's overall perceived impact among its stakeholders.



Questionnaire Design

The questionnaire was developed in coordination with PH-EITI. Several dimensions were considered in assessing the impact of EITI in the Philippines.

In order to get a better view of the stakeholder's who participated in the survey, several questions that would profile the respondents were asked. Some of these questions were also used in doing sub-analysis and stratification of the ratings.

The rating scale questions were identified to cover a) Areas of governance b) Impact Areas c) Key Initiatives of PH-EITI and d) Sector Specific Questions. The multiple indicators and the 1-10 scale are considered to abate the potentially critical stakeholders.

The last part of the questionnaire explores the qualitative aspect of the survey which aims to capture pertinent information that were not captured by the rating scales. The most positive and most negative result of EITI were asked along with the identification of other dimensions where EITI needs to be assessed. The last question covers the other suggestions of the stakeholders for the improvement of EITI.

Survey Operations

The study targeted for a complete enumeration (i.e., census) of the stakeholders identified by PH-EITI, with 2013 as reference period (i.e., stakeholders' basis in answering the questionnaire).

Self-administered surveys were given during PH-EITI's roadshows during 2018. This is done to ensure a high response rate among the stakeholders. Majority of those who refused to answer the survey were only invited for the first time by EITI so they deemed that they were not suited to evaluate EITI's impact.

The Perceived Impact Scale

A multiple-indicators scale rating scale (of 35 items) of 1-10 was created to assess the various dimensions that possibly determine the impact. The multiple indicators and the 1-10 scale are considered to abate the potentially critical stakeholders noted in the literature of stakeholder's satisfaction studies.

The scale items are divided into four sections namely: Areas of Governance, Impact Areas, Key Initiative of PH-EITI and Contribution specific to the stakeholders' designation (Civil Society Organization, Academe, Government, Private Company).

The specific items under each section are as follows:

- **Areas of Governance** - *Did management/governance of our natural resources improve or deteriorate/worsen in the last five years?*
 - Part1_1: Overall Governance.
 - Part1_2: Availability/accessibility of fiscal data and other information about the extract industries
 - Part1_3: Policy-making in the extractive industries
 - Part1_4: Public debate in relation to extractive industries.
 - Part1_5: Implementation of rules and policies.
 - Part1_6: Environmental monitoring of extractive operations.
 - Part1_7: Monitoring of revenues from the extractive industries.
 - Part1_8: Public understanding on extractive industries.
 - Part1_9: Government openness in the extractive industries.
 - Part1_10: Openness of extractive companies.
 - Part1_11: Willingness of civil society player (e.g., NGOs) to engage or be involved.
- **Impact Areas** - *Please rate to what extent has PH-EITI contributed to the following impact areas since 2013.*
 - Part2_1: Overall Governance.
 - Part2_2: Availability/accessibility of fiscal data and other information about the extract industries
 - Part2_3: Policy-making in the extractive industries
 - Part2_4: Public debate in relation to extractive industries.

-
- Part2_5: Implementation of rules and policies.
 - Part2_6: Environmental monitoring of extractive operations.
 - Part2_7: Monitoring of revenues from the extractive industries.
 - Part2_8: Public understanding on extractive industries.
 - Part2_9: Government openness in the extractive industries.
 - Part2_10: Openness of extractive companies.
 - Part2_11: Willingness of civil society player (e.g., NGOs) to engage or be involved.
 - **Key Initiatives of PH-EITI**
 - Part3_1: Publication of Annual Country Report.
 - Part3_2: Production/publication/distribution of Knowledge Materials (e.g., research studies, primers, brochures)
 - Part3_3: Local Outreach Activities (e.g., countrywide Roadshow, various local events where PH-EITI is resource person)
 - Part3_4: National Outreach Activities (e.g., National Conference, national events where PH-EITI is resource person) .
 - Part3_5: Capacity-Building Activities (e.g., workshops/trainings).
 - Part3_6: PH-EITI Official Website
 - Part3_7: PH-EITI Contracts Portal.
 - **CSO-specific Dimensions**
 - Part4_1: Increased CSO and community engagement in resource management/governance.
 - Part4_2: Improved community understanding of the extractive industries and resource management/governance.
 - **Industry-specific Dimension**
 - Part5_1: Improved ease of doing business in the extractive industries.
 - Part5_2: Improved public understanding and acceptability of extractive operations (companies' social license to operate).
 - **Government-specific Dimension**
 - Part6_1: Improved government regulatory systems (policies and programs) for the extractive industries.

-
- Part6_2: Increased industry compliance with government policies and participation in government programs

A sample questionnaire including the above scale items (including some additional items) is given in Appendix 1.

Data Analysis

The data encoding system in MS Access was developed for this survey. An electronic data quality check routine was integrated in the data encoding system.

Once all the questionnaires were encoded, descriptive statistics were generated to ensure that appropriate codes/data were captured in the database.

The perceived impact score was computed as a latent variable from the rating scale. The computed impact scores were then compared to the scores across the various sectors and location. These comparisons will establish whether there is any significant difference in the satisfaction rating of the stakeholders across all sectors and various location.

Profile of the Respondents

The roadshow database of EITI includes 899 stakeholders who attended the roadshow including those with sufficient contact details and those with no details at all. This list serves as the target population covered in the survey. A total of 630 stakeholders (70.1% of all EITI stakeholders in the list) are enumerated. Majority of the non-response were attendees who attended an EITI event for the first time during the survey day so they elected not to participate in the survey.

The range for the years of service with the company is from 3 months to 42 years, with an average 11.30 years (standard deviation of 10.10). The respondents are highly mixed, an adequate number of respondents have sufficient knowledge on the details of the engagement of their affiliation with EITI and hence, are eligible to respond to the scale items for the reference period stipulated in the questionnaire.

The responding stakeholders by sector and by area are summarized in Table 1 and 2 respectively. Majority of the responding firms are from local government agencies

(36.3%) and Industrial companies (31%) while there is still an ample representation for National Government Agency (16%), and the Civil Society Organization (16.7%).

Table 1. Distribution of Responding Stakeholders by Sector

		Count	Percentage
Sector	<i>National Government Agency</i>	101	16.0
	<i>Local Government Agency</i>	229	36.3
	<i>Civil Society Organization</i>	105	16.7
	<i>Industry</i>	195	31.0
	Total	630	100.0

Manila stakeholders comprise 14.6% of the respondents. Almost a quarter of the respondents came from Mindanao (35.5%) while only 6.8% are from Central Luzon and 4.4% in the Bicol Region.

Table 2. Distribution of Responding Stakeholders by Area

		Count	Percentage
Area	<i>BA – BAGUIO</i>	95	15.1
	<i>DA – DAVAO</i>	70	11.1
	<i>MA – MASBATE</i>	28	4.4
	<i>MN – MANILA</i>	92	14.6
	<i>OR - O.R.E.</i>	76	12.1
	<i>PA – PAMPANGA</i>	43	6.8
	<i>SU – SURIGAO</i>	154	24.4
	<i>VI – VISAYAS</i>	72	11.4
	Total	630	100.0

Most of the stakeholders have already heard of EITI (86.8%). The distribution is not that different across all areas and also across all sectors wherein the percentage who answered yes is always greater than 80%.

Table 3. Distribution of Stakeholders who have heard of EITI

	Response	Total		
		Count	Percentage	Percentage Valid
Have you ever heard about the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative or "EITI"?	Yes	539	85.6	86.8
	No	82	13.0	13.2
	No answer	9	1.4	0.0
	Total	630	100.0	100.0

Profile of the Respondents: Industry

There were 195 Industry representatives who participated in this survey, 88.2% of whom were from the mining industry. Most of the respondents from the Industry were from O. R. E. (33.9%) and Surigao (25.6%). Among the 176 of them who reported their years of service with their respective companies, the mean was computed at 6.5 years. The range of years of service extends from 0 to 30 years.

Table 4. Specific Industries of Respondents

Industry	Count	Percentage
<i>IT</i>	2	1.0
<i>Manufacturing</i>	4	2.1
<i>Media</i>	4	2.1
<i>Mining</i>	172	88.2
<i>Unspecified</i>	13	6.7
Total	195	100.0

Table 5. Number of Respondents by Survey Area

Area of Survey	Count	Percentage
<i>Baguio</i>	19	9.74%
<i>Davao</i>	7	3.59%
<i>Manila</i>	25	12.82%
<i>Masbate</i>	1	0.51%
<i>O.R.E.</i>	66	33.85%
<i>Pampanga</i>	10	5.13%
<i>Surigao</i>	50	25.64%
<i>Visayas</i>	17	8.72%
Total	195	100.00%

With respect to awareness of any extractive activity in his/her community, municipality, city, or province, 88.5% of 183 Industry representatives indicated awareness. Moreover, 91.6% of the 191 who answered said they have heard about EITI. The top source of awareness of EITI was seminars or conferences at 67.9%. Internet was the second largest source of awareness of EITI at 25%.

The LGU representatives who participated in the survey have known or have been involved with EITI as early as 2012.

Table 6. Source of Awareness of EITI

Source	Count	Percentage
<i>Radio</i>	5	3.0
<i>Television</i>	7	4.2
<i>Newspaper</i>	12	7.1
<i>Internet</i>	42	25.0
<i>Seminar/Conference</i>	114	67.9
<i>Word of Mouth</i>	34	20.2
<i>Others</i>	26	15.5
Total	168	100.0

Table 7. Year Representatives Have Known or Have Been Involved with EITI

Year	Count	Percentage
2012	8	4.6
2013	16	9.2
2014	12	6.9
2015	36	20.8
2016	28	16.2
2017	46	26.6
2018	27	15.6
Total	173	100.0

Table 8. Knowledge of EITI and what it does

Functions	Count	Percentage
<i>Promote transparency in the extractive industries</i>	189	96.9
<i>Fight corruption in the extractive industries</i>	93	47.7
<i>Disclose revenues from extractive industries</i>	139	71.3
<i>Raise public awareness and understanding on extractive industries</i>	154	79.0
<i>Disclose social and environmental information related to extractive industries</i>	140	71.8
<i>Provide venues for people to discuss issues about the extractive industries</i>	130	66.7
<i>Others</i>	5	2.6
Total	195	100.0

With pre-identified choices, the respondents were also asked what they think EITI is about or what does EITI do. Nearly all of the Industry representatives (96.9%) indicated “Promote transparency in the extractive industries”. This statement was followed by “Raise public awareness and understanding on extractive industries” (79%).

Other functions that the respondents think EITI does were “Bring closeness/camaraderie with other agencies/stakeholders”, “Information”, “Promote public awareness”, and “Understanding the coverage of the report”. A negative specific answer was given by one respondent who said, “It’s a dictatorship, not a dialogue”.

Profile of the Respondents: Local Government Units

The largest sector that participated in the survey was the Local Government Unit, with a total of 229 representatives. Most of the respondents from the LGUs were from Pampanga (33.2%), Davao (15.7%) and Baguio (15.3%). Among the 177 of them who reported their years of service with their respective companies, the mean was computed at 15 years. The range of years of service extends from 0 to 40 years.

Table 9. Number of Respondents by Survey Area

Area of Survey	Count	Percentage
<i>Baguio</i>	35	15.28%
<i>Davao</i>	36	15.72%
<i>Manila</i>	27	11.79%
<i>Masbate</i>	9	3.93%
<i>O.R.E.</i>	20	8.73%
<i>Pampanga</i>	76	33.19%
<i>Surigao</i>	26	11.35%
<i>Visayas</i>	229	100.00%
Total	35	15.28%

With respect to awareness of any extractive activity in his/her community, municipality, city, or province, 92.3% of LGU representatives indicated awareness. Moreover, 79.7% of the 227 who answered said they have heard about EITI. The top source of awareness of EITI was seminars or conferences at 81.4%. The LGU representatives who participated in the survey have known or have been involved with EITI as early as 2010, but nearly a third of them (32.3%) have come to know of EITI only in 2018.

Table 10. Source of Awareness of EITI

Source	Count	Percentage
Radio	2	1.2
Television	9	5.2
Newspaper	12	7.0
Internet	17	9.9
Seminar/Conference	140	81.4
Word of Mouth	14	8.1
Others	8	4.7
Total	172	100.0

Table 11. Year Representatives Have Known or Have Been Involved with EITI

Year	#	%
2010	1	.5
2012	4	2.1
2013	6	3.1
2014	14	7.3
2015	30	15.6
2016	38	19.8
2017	37	19.3
2018	62	32.3
Total	229	100.0

With pre-identified choices, the respondents were also asked what they think EITI is about or what does EITI do. Nearly all of the LGU representatives (95.4%) indicated “Promote transparency in the extractive industries”. This statement was followed by “Raise public awareness and understanding on extractive industries” (79.5%) and “Disclose revenues from extractive industries” (78.1%).

Other functions that the respondents think EITI does are “Develop/Enhance partnership among stakeholders”, “Exposure to community awareness/social and economic spending”, “Gain data/updates of other areas with mining”, “Help the LGU unit to collect or release the excise tax or royalty tax”. “It supports/provides ENR data

in planning”, “PH-EITI collects data from our LGU; I was once task to provide data but I was not informed why or for what”, “Protect and preserve the environment”, “Reconcile conflicting issues of different government partners and private sector”, and “Safeguard the utilization of our resources”. One respondent indicated that he has no idea.

Table 12. Knowledge of EITI and what it does

Functions	#	%
Promote transparency in the extractive industries	209	95.4
Fight corruption in the extractive industries	116	53.0
Disclose revenues from extractive industries	171	78.1
Raise public awareness and understanding on extractive industries	174	79.5
Disclose social and environmental information related to extractive industries	154	70.3
Provide venues for people to discuss issues about the extractive industries	149	68.0
Others	11	5.0
Total	219	100.0

Profile of the Respondents: National Government Agencies

A total of 101 representatives answered the survey questionnaire. Most of the representatives were surveyed in Manila (23.8%) and Baguio (20.8%). Among the 80 of them who indicated their years of service with their respective companies, the mean was computed at 14.7 years. The range of years of service reported, however, goes from 0 to 42 years.

Table 13. Number of Respondents by Survey Area

Area of Survey	Count	Percentage
Baguio	21	20.79%
Davao	14	13.86%
Manila	24	23.76%
Masbate	7	6.93%

O.R.E.	9	8.91%
Pampanga	4	3.96%
Surigao	12	11.88%
Visayas	10	9.90%
Total Valid	101	100.00%

Asked of their awareness of any extractive activity in his/her community, municipality, city, or province, 96% of NGA representatives indicated awareness. Moreover, 88.1% of them said they have heard about EITI. Asked where or how they have learned about EITI, the top source was seminars or conferences (76.2%). Some of the NGA representatives who participated in the survey have known or have been involved with EITI as early as 2012, but most of them indicated the years 2016 (23.9%), 2017 (21.7%) and 2018 (21.7%).

Table 14. Source of Awareness of EITI

Source	Count	Percentage
<i>Radio</i>	3	3.6
<i>Television</i>	3	3.6
<i>Newspaper</i>	8	9.5
<i>Internet</i>	17	20.2
<i>Seminar/Conference</i>	64	76.2
<i>Word of Mouth</i>	16	19.0
<i>Others</i>	10	11.9
Total	84	100.0

Table 15. Year Representatives Have Known or Have Been Involved with EITI

Year	Count	Percentage
2012	4	4.3
2013	6	6.5
2014	5	5.4
2015	15	16.3
2016	22	23.9
2017	20	21.7
2018	20	21.7
Total	101	100.0

With pre-identified choices, the respondents were also asked what they think EITI is about or what does EITI do. Nearly all of the NGA representatives (98%) indicated “Promote transparency in the extractive industries”. This statement was followed by “Disclose revenues from extractive industries” and “Raise public awareness and understanding on extractive industries”, each statement indicated by 84.2% of the NGA representatives.

Other functions that the respondents think EITI does are “Enable policy reviews/reforms addressing issues on the extractives”, “Give recommendations (venue)”, “Help NCIP to develop monitoring tools for MOA and royalties”, and “To be updated in the progress of the deliveries of the sharing of revenues to the LGUs as well as to maintain the natural environment resources of LGUs with mining industries”.

Table 16. Knowledge of EITI and what it does

Functions	Count	Percentage
<i>Promote transparency in the extractive industries</i>	99	98.0
<i>Fight corruption in the extractive industries</i>	58	57.4
<i>Disclose revenues from extractive industries</i>	85	84.2
<i>Raise public awareness and understanding on extractive industries</i>	85	84.2
<i>Disclose social and environmental information related to extractive industries</i>	73	72.3
<i>Provide venues for people to discuss issues about the extractive industries</i>	79	78.2
<i>Others</i>	4	4.0
Total	101	100.0

Profile of the Respondents: Civil Service Organizations

A total of 86 CSO/NGO representatives answered the survey questionnaire. Representatives were nearly equally distributed over the areas of Baguio (18.6%), Surigao (17.4%), Vsayas (15.1%), Davao (12.8%), Manila (12.8%) and Masbate (12.8%). Among the 50 of them who indicated their years of service with their respective companies, the mean was computed at 9.9 years. The range of years of service reported, however, goes from 0 to 32 years.

Table 17. Number of Respondents by Survey Area

Area of Survey	Count	Percentage
Baguio	16	18.60%
Davao	11	12.79%
Manila	11	12.79%
Masbate	11	12.79%
O.R.E.	1	1.16%
Pampanga	8	9.30%
Surigao	15	17.44%
Visayas	13	15.12%
Total Valid	86	100.00%

Asked of their awareness of any extractive activity in his/her community, municipality, city, or province, 96.3% of the 80 CSO/NGO representatives who responded indicated awareness. Moreover, a high awareness of EITI was reported, where 91.7% said they have heard about EITI. Asked where or how they have learned about EITI, the top source was seminars or conferences (74.3%), followed by word of mouth (21.6%). Some of the CSO/NGO representatives who participated in the survey have known or have been involved with EITI as early as 2010, but most of them indicated the years 2014 to 2018.

Table 18. Source of Awareness of EITI

Source	Count	Percentage
<i>Radio</i>	0	0.0
<i>Television</i>	3	4.1
<i>Newspaper</i>	2	2.7
<i>Internet</i>	10	13.5
<i>Seminar/Conference</i>	55	74.3
<i>Word of Mouth</i>	16	21.6
<i>Others</i>	7	9.5
Total	74	100.0

Table 19. Year Representatives Have Known or Have Been Involved with EITI

Year	Count	Percentage
2010	3	4.3
2011	1	1.4
2012	6	8.6
2013	3	4.3
2014	9	12.9
2015	8	11.4
2016	12	17.1
2017	10	14.3
2018	18	25.7
Total	86	100.0

Given some pre-identified choices, the respondents were also asked what they think EITI is about or what does EITI do. Nearly all of the CSO/NGO representatives (96.5%) indicated “Promote transparency in the extractive industries”. This statement was followed by “Raise public awareness and understanding on extractive industries” with 85.9%, “Fight corruption in the extractive industries” with 75.3% and “Disclose revenues from extractive industries” with 75.3%.

Other functions that the respondents think EITI does are (1) empowering CSO/PO to participate, (2) enlightening the IPs, (3) global standard for the good governance of

oil, gas and mineral resources, (4) Information, Education and Communication (IEC) to the community, (5) initiate and encourage subnational T&A endeavors, (6) injustice impact on economy, (7) platform for multi-stakeholder dialogue, (8) promotes accountability in extractive industry, and (9) protect national interest in mining industry, and (10) raise public awareness of illegal extractors of mineral resources involving political figures and influential personalities.

Table 20. Knowledge of EITI and what it does

Functions	Count	Percentage
<i>Promote transparency in the extractive industries</i>	82	96.5
<i>Fight corruption in the extractive industries</i>	64	75.3
<i>Disclose revenues from extractive industries</i>	64	75.3
<i>Raise public awareness and understanding on extractive industries</i>	73	85.9
<i>Disclose social and environmental information related to extractive industries</i>	61	71.8
<i>Provide venues for people to discuss issues about the extractive industries</i>	63	74.1
<i>Others</i>	11	12.9
Total	85	100.0

Findings

Areas of Governance

Part of the questionnaire were items to be rated with respect to whether improvement or deterioration in governance of natural resources is observed in the last five years. The scale used was from 1 to 10, with 1 indicating “resource governance deteriorated/worsened substantially” and 10 as “resource governance improved substantially”.

Industry representatives observed an improved Overall Governance, having mean rating of 7.4, with 77% of them giving ratings of at least 7.

Among other areas of governance, monitoring of revenues from the extractive industries has the highest mean score of 7.8 with 84.6% of representatives rating the item 7 or higher, followed by environmental monitoring of extractive operations with mean rating of 7.7 and 83.4% of representatives rating the item 7 or higher.

Improvement rating in all areas of governance are significantly positively correlated with overall impact of EITI, albeit of moderate size. The highest correlation coefficient was observed between overall impact of EITI and overall Governance.

Table 21. Ratings for Areas of Governance by the Industry Sector

Areas of Governance	Mean Rating
1. Overall Governance	7.4
2. Availability/accessibility of fiscal data and other information about the extract industries	7.4
3. Policy-making in the extractive industries	7.2
4. Public debate in relation to extractive industries	7.1
5. Implementation of rules and policies	7.3
6. Environmental monitoring of extractive operations	7.7
7. Monitoring of revenues from the extractive industries	7.8
8. Public understanding on extractive industries	6.9
9. Government openness in the extractive industries	7.1
10. Openness of extractive companies	7.6
11. Willingness of civil society player (e.g., NGOs) to engage or be involved	7.5

Part of the questionnaire were items to be rated with respect to whether improvement or deterioration in governance of natural resources is observed in the last five years. The scale used was from 1 to 10, with 1 indicating “resource governance deteriorated/worsened substantially” and 10 as “resource governance improved substantially”.

LGU representatives observed an improved Overall Governance, having mean rating of 7, with 66.7% of them giving ratings of at least 7.

Among other areas of governance, willingness of civil society player to engage or be involved has the highest mean score (7.4), followed by policy-making in the extractive industries (7), and monitoring of revenues from the extractive industries (7).

Table 22. Ratings for Areas of Governance by the LGUs

Areas of Governance	Mean Rating
1. Overall Governance	7.0
2. Availability/accessibility of fiscal data and other information about the extract industries	6.8
3. Policy-making in the extractive industries	7.0
4. Public debate in relation to extractive industries	6.6
5. Implementation of rules and policies	6.9
6. Environmental monitoring of extractive operations	6.9
7. Monitoring of revenues from the extractive industries	7.0
8. Public understanding on extractive industries	6.4
9. Government openness in the extractive industries	6.9
10. Openness of extractive companies	6.6
11. Willingness of civil society player (e.g., NGOs) to engage or be involved	7.4

The area with the lowest rating is public understanding on extractive industries (6.4). Only 53% of respondents provided ratings of 7 or higher for this statement, followed by openness of extractive companies with 57.7% of respondents providing ratings of 7 or higher. These are areas that EITI can possibly target for improvement in dealing with LGUs in the coming years.

All areas of governance were moderately positively correlated with the rating for the overall impact of EITI, with public understanding on extractive industries having the highest correlation coefficient of 0.686 with the overall impact. Government openness in the extractive industries followed with correlation coefficient of 0.654.

The questionnaire included items to be rated with respect to whether improvement or deterioration in governance of natural resources is observed in the last five years. The scale used was from 1 to 10, with 1 indicating “resource governance

deteriorated/worsened substantially” and 10 as “resource governance improved substantially”.

NGA representatives mostly observed an improved Overall Governance, having mean rating of 7.1, with 71.6% of them giving ratings of at least 7. Forty percent (40%) provided a rating of 8.

Among other areas of governance, willingness of civil society player to engage or be involved has the highest mean score (7.9), followed by government openness in the extractive industries (7.5), and monitoring of revenues from the extractive industries (7.5).

Table 23. Ratings for Areas of Governance by the NGAs

Areas of Governance	Mean Rating
1. Overall Governance	7.1
2. Availability/accessibility of fiscal data and other information about the extract industries	7.3
3. Policy-making in the extractive industries	7.3
4. Public debate in relation to extractive industries	7.4
5. Implementation of rules and policies	7.1
6. Environmental monitoring of extractive operations	7.3
7. Monitoring of revenues from the extractive industries	7.5
8. Public understanding on extractive industries	6.9
9. Government openness in the extractive industries	7.5
10. Openness of extractive companies	7.0
11. Willingness of civil society player (e.g., NGOs) to engage or be involved	7.9

The area with the lowest rating is public understanding on extractive industries (6.9). A total of 63.3% of respondents provided ratings of 7 or higher for this statement. This is an area that EITI can possibly target for improvement in the coming years.

All areas of governance were moderately positively correlated with the rating for the overall impact of EITI, with willingness of civil society player to engage or be involved having the highest correlation coefficient of 0.518 with the overall impact. Overall governance followed with correlation coefficient of 0.486.

The questionnaire included items to be rated with respect to whether improvement or deterioration in governance of natural resources is observed in the last five years. The scale used was from 1 to 10, with 1 indicating “resource governance deteriorated/worsened substantially” and 10 as “resource governance improved substantially”.

CSO/NGO representatives provided relatively low average ratings in all areas of governance except in willingness of civil society player to engage or be involved having mean rating of 7.8, with 73.7% of them giving ratings of at least 7 for this area. The area of openness of extractive companies has the lowest mean rating at 5.9; while all other areas have mean ratings of at least 6.

All areas of governance were moderately positively correlated with the rating for the overall impact of EITI, with monitoring of revenues from the extractive industries having the highest correlation coefficient of 0.536 with the overall impact of EITI. Willingness of civil society player to engage or be involved has the lowest correlation coefficient with the overall impact of EITI.

Table 24. Ratings for Areas of Governance by the CSOs

Areas of Governance	Mean Rating
1. Overall Governance	6.4
2. Availability/accessibility of fiscal data and other information about the extract industries	6.7
3. Policy-making in the extractive industries	6.3
4. Public debate in relation to extractive industries	6.2
5. Implementation of rules and policies	6.3
6. Environmental monitoring of extractive operations	6.1
7. Monitoring of revenues from the extractive industries	6.8

8. Public understanding on extractive industries	6.0
9. Government openness in the extractive industries	6.6
10. Openness of extractive companies	5.9
11. Willingness of civil society player (e.g., NGOs) to engage or be involved	7.8

PH-EITI Impact Indices

To further evaluate the effectiveness and impact of EITI implementation in the Philippines, a latent variable approach was employed to generate indices that will reflect the opinions of the stakeholders. For each aspect (i.e., subscale) in which EITI was assessed by the stakeholders, an index (i.e., latent variable score) was generated using principal components analysis. Three indices were calculated, namely, Areas of Governance index, Impact Areas index, and Key Initiative of PH-EITI index. Note that, unlike calculating simple averages that assign equal weights, these indices put varying weights to the different items in each subscale in the questionnaire.

Key Drivers of the PH-EITI Stakeholder Indices

Table 25 gives the magnitude of the correlation between the Areas of Governance index and each item. Among the 11 items in the Areas of Governance subscale, only item 11 (*willingness of civil society player to engage or be involved*) has the weakest relationship with the index. This implies that items 1-10 are the key drivers of the index, with item 5 (*implementation of rules and policies*) as the primary key driver.

Table 25. Correlation between the Areas of Governance Index and each Item

Areas of Governance	Correlation
1. Overall Governance	.849**
2. Availability/accessibility of fiscal data and other information about the extract industries	.861**
3. Policy-making in the extractive industries	.829**
4. Public debate in relation to extractive industries	.850**
5. Implementation of rules and policies	.892**
6. Environmental monitoring of extractive operations	.870**

7. Monitoring of revenues from the extractive industries	.874**
8. Public understanding on extractive industries	.868**
9. Government openness in the extractive industries	.819**
10. Openness of extractive companies	.869**
11. Willingness of civil society player (e.g., NGOs) to engage or be involved	.574**

**significant at 5% level

The strength of the relationship between the Impact Areas index and each item is given in Table 26. It can be noticed that similar with Areas of Governance index, the item with the least impact on the Impact Areas index is item 11 (*Willingness of civil society player to engage or be involved*). The rest of the items were strongly correlated with the overall index for Impact Areas. It can be noted that item 5 (*implementation of rules and policies*) was the major key driver of the index, having a correlation of 0.915.

Table 26. Correlation between the Impact Areas Index and each Item

Impact Areas	Correlation
1. Overall Governance	.879**
2. Availability/accessibility of fiscal data and other information about the extract industries	.862**
3. Policy-making in the extractive industries	.885**
4. Public debate in relation to extractive industries	.864**
5. Implementation of rules and policies	.915**
6. Environmental monitoring of extractive operations	.886**
7. Monitoring of revenues from the extractive industries	.886**
8. Public understanding on extractive industries	.873**
9. Government openness in the extractive industries	.859**
10. Openness of extractive companies	.849**
11. Willingness of civil society player (e.g., NGOs) to engage or be involved	.664**

**significant at 5% level

Table 27 presents the correlation between the Key Initiative index and each item. All seven items were strongly associated with the overall index of Key Initiatives. The primary key drivers of the index were items 4 (*national outreach activities*) with a correlation of 0.929, 3 (*local outreach activities*) with a correlation of 0.919, and 2 (*production/ publication/ distribution of knowledge materials*) with a correlation of 0.908.

Table 27. Correlation between the Key Initiative Index and each Item

Key Initiatives Index	Correlation
1. Publication of Annual Country Report	.865**
2. Production/publication/distribution of Knowledge Materials (e.g., research studies, primers, brochures)	.908**
3. Local Outreach Activities (e.g., countrywide Roadshow, various local events where PH-EITI is resource person)	.919**
4. National Outreach Activities (e.g., National Conference, national events where PH-EITI is resource person)	.929**
5. Capacity-Building Activities (e.g., workshops/trainings)	.896**
6. PH-EITI Official Website	.881**
7. PH-EITI Contracts Portal	.895**

****significant at 5% level**

PH-EITI Stakeholder Indices by Area and Sector

The overall Area of Governance index was 65.22%, indicating the stakeholders thought that the management or governance of our natural resources improve in the last five year. Furthermore, the overall Impact Areas index was 69.54%, suggesting that most of the stakeholders agreed that the PH-EITI contributed to the different impact areas since 2013. Among the three aspects, the stakeholders gave the highest level of agreement to the Key Initiatives of PH-EITI. The overall Key Initiative of PH-EITI index was 77%. This is a clear indication that the PH-EITI activities, projects, and programs contributed positively to overall extractives or resource governance upon consideration of their effects on the various impact areas.

Some of the percentile values of the three indices are presented in Table 28 to better understand their distribution for the stakeholders. Note that at least 50% of the stakeholders provided an index values of 68.66 for Areas of Government, 72.45% for

Impact Areas, and 78.98% for Key Initiatives. It can also be noted that there were only 10% of the respondents who produced index values lower than 40.64%, 46.55%, and 55.37%, respectively.

Table 28. Percentile Values for the PH-EITI Stakeholders Indices

	Areas of Governance Index	Impact Areas Index	Key Initiative of PH-EITI Index
99%	100.00	100.00	100.00
95%	91.53	93.35	100.00
90%	85.73	87.94	96.73
75% / Q3	77.11	80.44	88.71
50% / Median	68.66	72.45	78.98
25% / Q1	54.66	62.35	69.24
10%	40.64	46.55	55.37
5%	31.87	38.15	46.69
1%	9.77	19.43	9.64

Meanwhile, Table 29 reveals that Surigao obtained the highest Area of Governance index of 70.74%, around 5% higher than the overall index. This implies that the stakeholders in Surigao believed that the management and governance of our natural resources there had the most improvement in the last five years. Following Surigao is ORE with an index of 70.40%. Davao, on the other hand, obtained the lowest Area of Governance index of 58.04% only. Included in the bottom three were Baguio and Pampanga with 59.28% and 59.70%, respectively.

Table 29. Summary Statistics of PH-EITI Stakeholder Indices by Area

	Areas of Governance Index			Impact Areas Index			Key Initiative of PH-EITI Index		
	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max
Area BA - BAGUIO	59.28	4.99	100.00	67.27	27.61	100.00	75.77	.00	100.00
DA - DAVAO	58.04	15.68	90.97	60.60	3.48	95.44	71.64	.03	100.00
MA - MASBATE	65.83	29.33	94.80	73.27	32.05	100.00	79.52	9.64	100.00
MN – MANILA	66.27	22.65	100.00	70.70	32.87	95.87	78.43	43.53	100.00

OR - ORE	70.40	5.74	100.00	73.32	3.48	95.56	77.31	9.64	100.00
PA - PAMPANGA	59.70	.00	94.88	61.84	.00	92.08	74.04	26.49	100.00
SU - SURIGAO	70.74	31.68	100.00	73.04	26.15	100.00	78.83	36.85	100.00
VI - VISAYAS	64.25	14.38	100.00	69.65	35.70	100.00	77.93	43.53	100.00
Total	65.22	.00	100.00	69.54	.00	100.00	77.00	.00	100.00

By area, ORE got the highest Impact Areas index of 73.32% followed by Masbate and Surigao with 73.27% and 73.04%, respectively. These were the top three areas that viewed PH-EITI contributing to the different impact area since 2013. Pampanga and Davao were the bottom two area that garnered the lowest Impact Areas index of 61.84% and 60.60%, respectively.

As presented in Table 29, the Key Initiatives indices of the different areas were very close to the overall index, suggesting that the perception of the stakeholders as to whether the PH-EITI projects contributed positively to overall extractives or resource governance did not vary much across different areas. The two areas that obtained Key Initiatives indices below the overall index were Davao and Pampanga.

Table 30. Summary Statistics of PH-EITI Stakeholder Indices by Sector

Sector	Areas of Governance Index			Impact Areas Index			Key Initiative of PH-EITI Index		
	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max
National Government Agency	68.48	15.68	94.80	72.55	3.48	95.87	80.28	49.89	100.00
Local Government Agency	62.59	.00	100.00	68.03	19.43	100.00	75.62	.00	100.00
Civil Society Organization	59.10	9.10	95.57	65.00	.00	100.00	75.74	9.64	100.00
Academe	66.80	14.38	100.00	71.29	48.35	100.00	83.94	51.62	100.00
Industry	68.63	5.74	100.00	71.18	3.48	100.00	76.31	9.64	100.00
Total	65.22	.00	100.00	69.54	.00	100.00	77.00	.00	100.00

Table 30 gives the summary statistics of the PH-EITI Stakeholder indices by sector. For Areas of Governance index, National Government Agency and Industry obtained the highest values, 68.48% and 68.63%, respectively, whereas Civil Society Organization garnered the lowest value of 59.10%.

Generally, the Impact Areas Index values were higher across different sectors compared to Areas of Governance index. The National Government Agency, Academe, and Industry had the highest Impact Areas index of 72.55%, 71.29% and 71.18%, respectively. On the other hand, the Local Government Agency (68.03%) and Civil Society Organization (65.00%) were the two sectors whose Impact Areas indices were below the overall index. On the other hand, the Key Initiatives indices were fairly high across sectors compared to the other two indices. Academe got the highest index for Key Initiatives (83.94%) followed by National Government Agency (80.28%).

Correlation of Rating on Overall Impact of EITI with the Indices

Table 31 shows the correlation of the three PH-EITI Stakeholders indices with the rating on overall impact of EITI. It must be noted first that the three generated indices were only moderately correlated with each other. The Areas of Governance and Impact Areas indices had a correlation coefficient of 0.777, whereas the Impact Areas and Key Initiatives indices obtained a correlation coefficient of 0.719. The lowest degree of relationship was observed between Key Initiatives and Areas of Governance indices, with a correlation of 0.572. This suggests that the perceptions of the stakeholders in these three aspects were not necessarily the same. In other words, each generated index offers a unique information regarding the evaluation of the effectiveness and impact of EITI implementation in the Philippines.

It can be observed that even the rating of the stakeholders on the overall impact of EITI had moderate correlation with the three indices as well. Its correlation was highest with Impact Areas index (correlation = 0.742), followed by Key Initiatives index (correlation = 0.698) then by Areas of Governance index (correlation = 0.588). This is an indication that, when all three aspects were taken into consideration, the stakeholders put more weight to impact areas when evaluating the performance of EITI, followed by key initiatives followed and lastly by areas of governance.

Table 31. Correlation of the Indices with the Overall Rating

		Areas of Governance Index	Impact Areas Index	Key Initiative of PH-EITI Index	Overall Rating
Areas of Governance Index	Pearson Correlation	1	.777**	.572**	.588**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	521	477	449	450
Impact Areas Index	Pearson Correlation	.777**	1	.719**	.742**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	477	507	448	447
Key Initiative of PH-EITI Index	Pearson Correlation	.572**	.719**	1	.698**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	449	448	490	432
Overall Rating	Pearson Correlation	.588**	.742**	.698**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	450	447	432	517

**significant at 5% level

Impact Areas

Industry representatives were also asked to rate the extent to which EITI contributed to different impact areas mentioned in Section 2. The scale used was from 1 to 10, with 1 indicating “PH-EITI did not contribute at all” to 10 as “PH-EITI contributed substantially”.

The extent of contribution to Overall Governance was rated 7.6, on average, with 83.3% of respondents providing ratings of at least 7.

Among other areas of governance, the highest average rating of 7.9 was given to monitoring of revenues from the extractive industries with 87.1% of representatives rating the item at least 7. This was followed by availability or accessibility of fiscal data and other information about the extract industries and openness of extractive companies each with average rating of 7.8.

All areas are significantly correlated with the rating on overall impact of EITI, with moderate correlation. Of these areas, the highest of correlation coefficients were observed for policy-making in the extractive industries at 0.61, and implementation of rules and policies at 0.639.

Table 32. Ratings for Areas of Governance by the Industry Sector

Areas of Governance	Mean Rating
1. Overall Governance	7.6
2. Availability/accessibility of fiscal data and other information about the extract industries	7.8
3. Policy-making in the extractive industries	7.5
4. Public debate in relation to extractive industries	7.3
5. Implementation of rules and policies	7.5
6. Environmental monitoring of extractive operations	7.7
7. Monitoring of revenues from the extractive industries	7.9
8. Public understanding on extractive industries	7.4
9. Government openness in the extractive industries	7.4
10. Openness of extractive companies	7.8
11. Willingness of civil society player (e.g., NGOs) to engage or be involved	7.6

LGU representatives were also asked to rate the extent to which EITI contributed to different impact areas mentioned in Section 2. The scale used was from 1 to 10, with 1 indicating “PH-EITI did not contribute at all” to 10 as “PH-EITI contributed substantially”.

The extent of contribution to Overall Governance was rated 7.5, on average, with 77.2% of respondents providing ratings of at least 7.

Among other areas of governance, the highest average ratings of 7.5 were given to availability or accessibility of fiscal data and other information about the extract industries, monitoring of revenues from the extractive industries, and willingness of civil society player to engage or be involved. All other impact areas have mean ratings of at least 7. The area on willingness of civil society player to engage or be involved has 80.1% of representatives providing ratings of 7 or higher.

All areas are significantly correlated with the rating on overall impact of EITI, ranging from moderate to high correlation. Of these areas, the highest correlation coefficients were observed for environmental monitoring of extractive operations at 0.75, monitoring of revenues from the extractive industries at 0.718, and government openness in the extractive industries at 0.712.

Table 33. Ratings for Areas of Governance by LGUs

Impact Areas	Mean Rating
1. Overall Governance	7.5
2. Availability/accessibility of fiscal data and other information about the extract industries	7.5
3. Policy-making in the extractive industries	7.3
4. Public debate in relation to extractive industries	7.2
5. Implementation of rules and policies	7.2
6. Environmental monitoring of extractive operations	7.3
7. Monitoring of revenues from the extractive industries	7.5
8. Public understanding on extractive industries	7.0
9. Government openness in the extractive industries	7.3
10. Openness of extractive companies	7.2
11. Willingness of civil society player (e.g., NGOs) to engage or be involved	7.5

NGA representatives were also asked to rate the extent to which EITI contributed to different impact areas mentioned in Section 2. The scale used was from 1 to 10, with 1 indicating “PH-EITI did not contribute at all” to 10 as “PH-EITI contributed substantially”.

The extent of contribution to impact areas was generally rated higher by NGA representatives compared to governance of resources in the previous section. Overall Governance has a mean rating of 7.7, indicating a generally high contribution, with 88.2% of the respondents giving ratings of at least 7.

Among other areas of governance, the highest average ratings of 8 were given to availability or accessibility of fiscal data and other information about the extract industries, monitoring of revenues from the extractive industries, and willingness of civil society player to engage or be involved. All other impact areas have mean ratings of at

least 7.5. The area on availability or accessibility of fiscal data and other information about the extract industries has 90.6% of representatives providing ratings of 7 or higher.

Table 34. Ratings for Areas of Governance by NGAs

Impact Areas	Mean Rating
1. Overall Governance	7.7
2. Availability/accessibility of fiscal data and other information about the extract industries	8.0
3. Policy-making in the extractive industries	7.6
4. Public debate in relation to extractive industries	7.6
5. Implementation of rules and policies	7.5
6. Environmental monitoring of extractive operations	7.5
7. Monitoring of revenues from the extractive industries	8.0
8. Public understanding on extractive industries	7.5
9. Government openness in the extractive industries	7.9
10. Openness of extractive companies	7.5
11. Willingness of civil society player (e.g., NGOs) to engage or be involved	8.0

All areas are significantly correlated with the rating on overall impact of EITI, ranging from moderate to high correlation. Of these areas, the highest correlation coefficients were observed for overall governance at 0.718, policy-making in the extractive industries at 0.679, and availability or accessibility of fiscal data and other information about the extract industries at 0.615.

CSO representatives were also asked to rate the extent to which EITI contributed to different impact areas mentioned in Section 2. The scale used was from 1 to 10, with 1 indicating “PH-EITI did not contribute at all” to 10 as “PH-EITI contributed substantially”.

The extent of contribution to Overall Governance was rated 7.1, on average, with 64.8% of respondents providing ratings of at least 7.

Among other areas of governance, the highest average rating of 8.2 was given to willingness of civil society player to engage or be involved, with 86.8% of CSO/NGO representatives providing ratings of 7 or higher.

All areas are significantly correlated with the rating on overall impact of EITI, ranging from moderate to high correlation. Of these areas, the highest correlation coefficients were observed for environmental monitoring of extractive operations at 0.727, policy-making in the extractive industries at 0.692, and public understanding on extractive industries at 0.69. The lowest correlation coefficient was observed between the overall impact of EITI and willingness of civil society player to engage or be involved at 0.485.

Table 35. Ratings for Areas of Governance by CSOs

Impact Areas	Mean Rating
1. Overall Governance	7.1
2. Availability/accessibility of fiscal data and other information about the extract industries	7.1
3. Policy-making in the extractive industries	7.1
4. Public debate in relation to extractive industries	6.9
5. Implementation of rules and policies	6.8
6. Environmental monitoring of extractive operations	7.0
7. Monitoring of revenues from the extractive industries	7.3
8. Public understanding on extractive industries	6.8
9. Government openness in the extractive industries	7.2
10. Openness of extractive companies	6.5
11. Willingness of civil society player (e.g., NGOs) to engage or be involved	8.2

Key Initiatives of PH-EITI

Another set of statements was also rated by the respondents – the extent to which PH-EITI activities, project, or programs contributed positively to overall extractives or resource governance. The scale used was from 1 to 10, with 1 indicating “did not contribute at all” and 10 as “contributed substantially”.

Table 36. Ratings for Key Initiatives of PH-EITI by the Industry Sector

Key Initiative of PH-EITI	Mean Rating
1. Publication of Annual Country Report	8.1
2. Production/publication/distribution of Knowledge Materials (e.g., research studies, primers, brochures)	7.8
3. Local Outreach Activities (e.g., countrywide Roadshow, various local events where PH-EITI is resource person)	7.9
4. National Outreach Activities (e.g., National Conference, national events where PH-EITI is resource person)	7.9
5. Capacity-Building Activities (e.g., workshops/trainings)	7.8
6. PH-EITI Official Website	8.0
7. PH-EITI Contracts Portal	7.8
Additional Impact Areas	
1. Improved ease of doing business in the extractive industries	7.6
2. Improved public understanding and acceptability of extractive operations (companies' social license to operate)	7.7

The Industry representatives viewed EITI as contributing relatively well to the different key initiatives and additional impact areas, where the average ratings were at least 7.6. At least 80% of the representatives rated the item 7 or higher. The highest average ratings were given to publication of Annual Country Report (8.1) and PH-EITI Official Website (8).

The rating for overall impact of EITI is most highly correlated with capacity-building activities with correlation coefficient of 0.628, followed by PH-EITI Contracts Portal with correlation coefficient of 0.579.

Another set of statements was also rated by the respondents – the extent to which PH-EITI activities, project, or programs contributed positively to overall extractives or resource governance. The scale used was from 1 to 10, with 1 indicating “did not contribute at all” and 10 as “contributed substantially”.

Table 37. Ratings for Key Initiatives of PH-EITI by the LGUs

Key Initiative of PH-EITI	Mean Rating
1. Publication of Annual Country Report	8.0
2. Production/publication/distribution of Knowledge Materials (e.g., research studies, primers, brochures)	7.8
3. Local Outreach Activities (e.g., countrywide Roadshow, various local events where PH-EITI is resource person)	7.9
4. National Outreach Activities (e.g., National Conference, national events where PH-EITI is resource person)	7.9
5. Capacity-Building Activities (e.g., workshops/trainings)	7.7
6. PH-EITI Official Website	8.0
7. PH-EITI Contracts Portal	7.8
Additional Impact Areas	
1. Improved government regulatory systems (policies and programs) for the extractive industries	7.7
2. Increased industry compliance with government policies and participation in government programs	7.8

The LGU representatives viewed EITI as contributing relatively well to the different key initiatives and additional impact areas, where the average ratings were at least 7.7. The highest average ratings were given to publication of Annual Country Report (8) and PH-EITI Official Website (8).

The rating for overall impact of EITI is most highly correlated with capacity-building activities with correlation coefficient of 0.702, followed by PH-EITI Contracts Portal with correlation coefficient of 0.684.

For additional impact areas, both statements averaged at least 7.7 and at least 84% of the respondents provided ratings of at least 7. Both are also highly positively correlated with the overall impact of EITI.

A third set of statements was also rated by the respondents – the extent to which PH-EITI activities, project, or programs contributed positively to overall extractives or resource governance. The scale used was from 1 to 10, with 1 indicating “did not contribute at all” and 10 as “contributed substantially”.

The NGA representatives viewed EITI as contributing relatively well to the different key initiatives and additional impact areas, where the average ratings were at least 8. The highest average ratings were given to publication of Annual Country Report (8.5) and PH-EITI Official Website (8.4).

Although of moderate size, the rating for overall impact of EITI is most highly correlated with contribution to PH-EITI Contracts Portal, PH-EITI Official website and national outreach activities.

For additional impact areas, both statements averaged 8 and 88% of the respondents provided ratings of at least 7. Both are also moderately positively correlated with the overall impact of EITI.

Table 38. Ratings for Key Initiatives of PH-EITI by the NGAs

Key Initiative of PH-EITI	Mean Rating
1. Publication of Annual Country Report	8.5
2. Production/publication/distribution of Knowledge Materials (e.g., research studies, primers, brochures)	8.1
3. Local Outreach Activities (e.g., countrywide Roadshow, various local events where PH-EITI is resource person)	8.2
4. National Outreach Activities (e.g., National Conference, national events where PH-EITI is resource person)	8.1
5. Capacity-Building Activities (e.g., workshops/trainings)	8.0
6. PH-EITI Official Website	8.4
7. PH-EITI Contracts Portal	8.2
Additional Impact Areas	
1. Improved government regulatory systems (policies and programs) for the extractive industries	8.0
2. Increased industry compliance with government policies and participation in government programs	8.0

Another set of statements was also rated by the respondents – the extent to which PH-EITI activities, project, or programs contributed positively to overall extractives or resource governance. The scale used was from 1 to 10, with 1 indicating “did not contribute at all” and 10 as “contributed substantially”.

Table 39. Ratings for Key Initiatives of PH-EITI by the CSOs

Key Initiative of PH-EITI	Mean Rating
1. Publication of Annual Country Report	8.0
2. Production/publication/distribution of Knowledge Materials (e.g., research studies, primers, brochures)	8.0
3. Local Outreach Activities (e.g., countrywide Roadshow, various local events where PH-EITI is resource person)	7.9
4. National Outreach Activities (e.g., National Conference, national events where PH-EITI is resource person)	8.0
5. Capacity-Building Activities (e.g., workshops/trainings)	7.4
6. PH-EITI Official Website	8.1
7. PH-EITI Contracts Portal	7.8
Additional Impact Areas	
1. Increased CSO and community engagement in resource management/governance	7.7
2. Improved community understanding of the extractive industries and resource management/governance	7.6

The CSO/NGO representatives viewed EITI as contributing relatively well to the different key initiatives and additional impact areas, where the average ratings were at least 7.4. The highest average ratings were given to PH-EITI Official Website (8.1), publication of Annual County Report (8), production/publication/distribution of Knowledge Materials (8), and National Outreach Activities (8).

The rating for overall impact of EITI is most highly correlated with capacity-building activities with correlation coefficient of 0.574, followed by Local Outreach Activities with correlation coefficient of 0.557.

For additional impact areas, both statements averaged at least 7.6 and at least 64% of the respondents provided ratings of at least 7. Both are also highly positively correlated with the overall impact of EITI.

PH-EITI Impact Score (Overall Rating)

While a multiple-indicators scale was developed to compute for the latent variable score to be interpreted as the customer satisfaction index, an overall impact rating (top of the mind) was also included in the questionnaire to serve as a validation question.

A total of 517 of the 630 respondents indicated overall satisfaction ratings, producing an average rating of 7.8 (sd = 1.4). Majority of the responses are at the 7 to 9 range (77.9%), while 8.9% gave a perfect rating of 10. The lowest rating given for overall satisfaction is 1 which is given by a sole respondent.

The ratings for the 35 scale items, given in Appendix 2. Almost all of the items have average ratings above 7.0, with 6.6 and 6.8 being the lowest two (computed for the two dimensions in governance: a) Public debate in relation to extractive industries and b) Public understanding on extractive industries). All of the items are rated at least 7 by majority of the respondents.

Based on average ratings, EITI achieves higher ratings (at least 8) on the following aspects: Publication of Annual Country Report; Local Outreach Activities (e.g., countrywide Roadshow, various local events where PH-EITI is resource person); National Outreach Activities (e.g., National Conference, national events where PH-EITI is resource person); and PH-EITI Official Website.

The overall rating in areas of governance has an average rating of 7.3 and 7.72 for the impact areas while the key initiatives have the highest average rating at 8.2. The overall rating significantly correlates with each of the 35 scale items. The highest correlation is 0.507 (Environmental monitoring of extractive operations), followed by 0.506 (Environmental monitoring of extractive operations). The lowest correlation is 0.367 (with the item Publication of Annual Country Report), followed by 0.37 (with Implementation of rules and policies),

and 0.382 with willingness of civil society player (e.g., NGOs) to engage or be involved.

Overall Rating per Sector

The overall impact of EITI for the Industry Sector has mean rating of 7.8. It can be deduced that most of the Industry representatives recognize the high impact of EITI on all areas considered. A total of 89.6% of Industry representatives rated the overall impact at 7 or higher. However, there were few of them who provided ratings of as low as 2 and 4.

The overall impact of EITI has mean rating of 7.7. It can be deduced that most of the LGU representatives recognize the high impact of EITI on all areas considered. A total of 84.5% of LGU representatives rated the overall impact at 7 or higher. However, there were few of them who provided ratings of as low as 1 to 3.

For the NGAs, the overall impact of EITI has mean rating of 8. It can be deduced that most of the NGA representatives recognize the high impact of EITI on all areas considered. A total of 92.3% of NGA representatives rated the overall impact at 7 or higher. However, there were few of them who provided ratings of 4 and 5.

The overall impact of EITI for the CSOs has mean rating of 7.6. It can be deduced that most of the CSO/NGO representatives recognize the high impact of EITI on all areas considered. A total of 76.7% of CSO/NGO representatives rated the overall impact at 7 or higher. However, there were few of them who provided ratings of as low as 2.

Most Positive Result

Out of the 630 respondents, 340 of them gave answers on the most positive result of EITI. Almost 60% of them said that the most positive result is the promotion of transparency followed by showing the revenues from mining and extraction that could be used in the determination of taxes of the mining companies.

This is followed by the raising the public awareness and understanding on extractive industries and effective communication between stakeholders because EITI provides a venue for dialogue between its stakeholders.

Table 40. Distribution of the Responses About the Most Positive Result of PH-EITI

	Effective Communication among and between Stakeholders (Platform for Dialogue)	Showing the Revenues from Mining and Extraction	Promoting Transparency on various information	Improvement on Handling Natural Resources	Raise public awareness and understanding on extractive industries	None
BA – BAGUIO	22.45	20.41	61.22	2.04	30.61	48.42
DA – DAVAO	28.95	34.21	63.16	2.63	15.79	45.71
MA – MASBATE	25.00	18.75	68.75	12.50	18.75	42.86
MN – MANILA	23.33	30.00	46.67	3.33	8.33	34.78
OR - O.R.E.	17.95	10.26	76.92	2.56	15.38	48.68
PA – PAMPANGA	13.79	55.17	41.38	10.34	41.38	32.56
SU – SURIGAO	18.84	17.39	57.97	2.90	21.74	55.19
VI – VISAYAS	15.00	22.50	65.00	10.00	22.50	44.44
Grand Total	20.59	25.00	59.12	4.71	20.88	46.03

Other Comments/Suggestions

Some respondents outside of Manila area commented that they want to establish local and/or subnational PH-EITI office. These respondents are representing either Local Government Agency. An example of the comment is “must have regional and provincial offices on areas with active in all aspects of extractions”, “satellite office in provincial and region, auditing all LGUs gov't agencies and company”, “PH-EITI should mainstream to the provincial and city government”.

Other comments are about information dissemination. Wherein some stakeholders commented that the communications materials must be more accessible to marginalize groups/sectors. Some stated that the information dissemination must be given to people other than the stakeholders. They believe

that this will provide communities information that extractive industries are also helping in community growth & development.

Some stakeholders also mention that it would be better if EITI make promotional materials (videos, infographics) and should be shown to mainstream media and conduct roadshows to schools and churches.

The listing of the comments and the suggestion given by the respondents are listed in the appendix.

Concluding Notes

A multiple-indicators scale (35 items) was constructed with rating scale of 1-10. The multiple indicators and the 1-10 scale are considered to abate the potentially critical customers noted in the literature of customer satisfaction studies. From the items listed as important dimensions of impact, the scale items are divided into four sections namely: Areas of Governance, Impact Areas, Key Initiatives of EITI, and Sector-specific ratings.

The impact satisfaction score was computed as a latent variable from the perceived impact scale developed by the team following the American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI) model.

The attendees of the EITI roadshows includes 899 stakeholders. This serves as the target population covered in the survey. A total of 630 stakeholders (70.1% of all the attendees) are enumerated. The range for the years of service with the company is from 3 months to 42 years, with an average 11.3 years (standard deviation of 10.10). The respondents are highly mixed and came from different sectors and location. Most have sufficient knowledge on the details of the engagement of their firm with EITI and hence, are eligible to respond to the scale items for the reference period stipulated in the questionnaire.

The overall impact rating is 7.8 with a standard deviation of 1.4. By area, the overall ratings are: 7.7 for Northern Luzon/CAR stakeholders, 7.1 for Davao Region, 8.2 for the Bicol Region, 7.9 for Manila, 7.1 for Central Luzon, 8.0 for the CARAGA Region and Visayas, and 8.1 for the participants of the O.R.E roadshow.

The weak point of EITI are on the aspect of public debate in relation to extractive industries and public understanding on extractive industries. It is good to note, however,

that the overall rating is above 7.5 across all sectors (8 for NGA, 7.7 for LGA, 7.6 for CSOs, 8.5 for the Academe and 7.8 for the Industries).

Recommendations

Based on the results, PH-EITI got relatively high responses in almost all aspects that were covered by the study. This trend can be seen in all the sectors which means that PH-EITI really have a positive impact. The only problem that was seen by the investigators is the engagement of the LGUs with EITI. Since most people in the LGUs were being replaced whenever a new head of the LGU is elected, majority of the respondents from the LGUs only knew about PH-EITI when they were invited in the roadshow. Which means that prior the roadshow, there were almost no engagement with them from the time that they were appointed. So a suggested for PH-EITI is to intensify their engagement with the LGUs right after the local government elections especially in the areas where new personalities were elected so that they can immediately reestablish their connection with that LGU and assure the continuity of the projects and initiatives that they've started there.