



PMPI's Statement on issuance of Executive Order 130 amending the provision on moratorium for new mining contracts of Executive Order 79

This recent backtracking of President Rodrigo "Roa" Duterte and his administration on mining prove that indeed his past pronouncements and posturing as pro-environment is nothing but lip service.

The reasons for the amendment are unsubstantial and flawed. One, with regards to its claim that will add to the needed revenue and will generate jobs:

WE believe that mining is NOT a significant and sustainable job generating industry. One, with regards to its claim that it will add to the needed revenue and will generate jobs, this sector has been consistently employing below 1% percent of the Philippine's total employment from 2013 – 2018 (See Table 1. Data on Employment – Mining and Quarrying from the Mines and Geosciences Bureau 2013 – 2019).

Poverty in "Mining Provinces" is high. The DENR, along with the Department of Finance, the Chamber of Mines of the Philippines, and their apologetics have come to conclude that mining contributes to poverty alleviation. Looking into the poverty incidence among families for the year 2015 based on regional Annual Per Capita Poverty Threshold among prominent mining regions MIMAROPA, CARAGA, Region IX Zamboanga Peninsula (ZAMPEN), Region XII SOCCSKSARGEN, and Region V Bicol in relation to the national Annual Per Capita Poverty Threshold, we can deduce that mining operations within these regions does not necessarily help in alleviating poverty (See Table 2 below).

WE believe that the Philippine mining sector does not contribute to government revenue. A review of the Philippine government's revenue from mining from National Government Revenues - Tax Revenues (treasury.gov.ph) and that of the Mines and Geosciences Bureau, Mining Industry Data 2013 – 2018 show the Philippine Mining industry is, was, and forever shall be, an export-oriented industry geared towards serving foreign countries need for raw and semi-processed minerals which means, the argument that it can support the needs of this government's Build, Build, Build program is posited on a false idea that we manufacture our own steel and other metallic minerals into infrastructure components (see Table 3 below).

Worse, the share of the Philippine mining sector to the economy has yet to surpass the 2% share to the country's total revenue! (See Table 3. Percentage share of Philippine Mining Sector to Philippine Export, and Government Revenue from Taxes, Fees, and Royalties in millions of Php).



Moreover, the EO is deceitful. We doubt that the second amendment in the new Order requiring strict implementation of Mine Safety and Environmental Policies will be implemented and just an icing to the cake to douse off cold water to oppositions and challenges it will meet.

We do not believe that the current policies will safeguard the rights of communities, and the integrity of their environment against the onslaught of foreign-capitalized large-scale mining. Our communities are witness to this. Among those that were victimized by irresponsible large-scale mining corporations are communities of Marinduque, Rapu-rapu Island in Albay, and Manicani Island of Eastern Samar. These communities up to this moment bare witness to the scars and poison of open-pit mining - Marcopper Mining Tragedy of 1996 poisoned the Boac River and the communities living within the area; the un-rehabilitated mine site of Manicani Island despite Hinatuan Mining Corporations' expired mining contract; and worse, the Mines and Geosciences Bureau and the DENR has approved its mining contract in the past without Final Mine Rehabilitation and Decommissioning Plan per mandated by law.

We find the current government insensitive and oblivious to the current situation of the world confronted with environmental and ecological crisis.

WE are in the midst of a Climate Crisis. Based on the Global Climate Risk Index for 2018, the Philippines was ranked second among the world's most vulnerable in terms of the weather-related loss such as floods, storm, and heatwaves (Global Climate Risk Index, 2020). Opening-up new mines in rural areas puts them at greater risk on the impacts of climate change. This is a scientific fact, neglected by the DENR and Office of the President when it imprinted its imprimatur on Executive Order 130.

This insensible decision by this administration makes clearer the government's priorities and for whom is its promised development directed to. Mining industry has contributed greatly to the loss of biodiversity and this decreases natural and human resilience against impacts of climate changes such as drought, rising sea level and strong Typhoons such as Yolanda which devastated Eastern Samar back in 2013. The loss of forest covers leads to lessened ability for carbon sequestration and oxygen production, which are important to stabilize and balance climate changes. Wild animals being forced to move out due to habitat loss by mining bear the consequences that could reach catastrophic heights such as more zoonotic diseases like the COVID-19 pandemic. All these consequences will only have the poor, vulnerable, and disadvantaged sector of the Filipino people bear the brunt of this questionable economic development.



We deplore this new destructive measure disguising as move to favor development of people. This measure is short-sighted and fails to reflect on its longstanding impact to our ecosystem and people. There is a firm need for the government, especially environmental agencies, to properly recognize the intersectionality of social and environmental issues anchored in exploitation of nature.

Moreover, the notion that it is for the benefit of people is another lie. It favors the corporations and the so-called oligarchs that Duterte wants to supposedly disempower for the sake of people, which is evidently another lip service statement from this President. We view this as his way to appease his would-be supporters and to hold on to power come election 2022. This leaves-out the poor once again,

who he promised to serve on his assumption to power. The rights of people and nature will again be trampled upon with the lifting of the moratorium to new Mining Agreements.

The PMPI and our communities struggling against the destructive mining operations, will continue to be steadfast at engaging this administration to practice righteous and appropriate jurisdiction and eco-governance centered on holistic and sustainable development, and which it includes taking vigorous action to stop mining actively and entirely.

PMPI - Partnership Mission for People's Initiatives
16 April 2021

++++

For further details please contact:

Yolanda Rafol-Esguerra
National Coordinator
yre@pmpl.org.ph
+639177960637

Jay Martin Ablola
Advocacy and Information Management Officer
PMPI Anti-Mining Campaign Unit
jamartin.pmpi@gmail.com
+639176308149

STATISTICAL TABLES

1. The data from the Mines and Geosciences Bureau - Mining Industry Data 2013 – 2018 reveal the UNPLEASANT and DISMAL performance of the Philippine mining sector’s job generation from 2013 – 2019.

Table 1. Data on Employment – Mining and Quarrying from the Mines and Geosciences Bureau 2013 – 2019.

Employment	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019+
Actual Number of persons employed in Mining and Quarrying	250,000	235,000	236,000	219,000	203,000	207,000	190,000
Percentage to Total Philippine Employment	0.7%	0.6%	0.6%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%

+preliminary data

2. Table 2. Poverty Incidence in “Mining” Provinces of the Philippines.

	Annual Per Capita Poverty Threshold (in PhP)	Population (actual number)	Poverty Incidence among Families Estimates (%)	Calculated No. of Families living below the poverty threshold
REGION/PROVINCE	2015	2015	2015	2015
PHILIPPINES	22,747	100,981,437	18.0	18,176,659
MIMAROPA	20,369	2,963,360	18.0	533,404
Region V BICOL	22,503	1,441,000	31.0	446,710
Region IX ZAMPEN	22,557	3,629,783	29.7	1,078,045

Region SOCCSKSARGEN	XII	21,341	4,545,276	31.2	1,418,126,112
CARAGA		22,788	2,596,709	31.1	810,173

Source: Philippine Statistics Authority 2015-2018 Annual Per Capita Poverty Threshold, select region, unless indicated. The author did not use the 2018 data on poverty for consistency.

The Poverty Incidence in these select “mining region” is measured by comparing the Annual Per Capita Poverty Threshold adjusted per region divided by twelve (12 months) to calculate the minimum “monthly income” threshold for each person living in those selected regions. This monthly income threshold is the minimum income needed by a person to buy food and non-food items. In the Philippines, a family is estimated to have at least five members, thus, the calculated monthly income threshold for each person is multiplied by five (5).

For example, in 2015, the MIMAROPA region, the Annual Per Capita Threshold was set at Php20, 369.00 or Php 1697.42 per month for each person to buy their basic food and non-food needs. The findings of the study estimate that about 180 families per 1000 families were living below the poverty annual per capita poverty threshold of Php20, 369.00 or Php 1697.42 per month.

We note that MIMAROPA has an estimated population of about 2,963,360 in 2015 based on the 2015 Census of Population (POPCEN 2015). This means 18.0% of the population or 533,404 is living below the poverty threshold for that year.

To be fair, MIMAROPA was the only region that was better-off among the select “mining regions”, but not better than our national average.

This poverty scenario is prevalent in the other select “mining regions” - Region V Bicol, Region IX Zamboanga Peninsula (ZAMPEN), Region XII SOCCSKSARGEN, and CARAGA. By looking at the poverty incidence of these regions and comparing them with the national average, we can conclude that mining operations in these regions does not help alleviate poverty. To be fair, MIMAROPA was the only region that was better-off, but not better than our national average.

3. Table 3. Percentage share of Philippine Mining Sector to Philippine Export, and Government Revenue from Taxes, Fees, and Royalties in millions of Php

Yr.	Value of Total Exports of Mineral and Mineral Products (in Million USD)	% Share to Total Philippine Export	Php to USD Exchange Rate (BSP)	Value Total Exports of Mineral and Mineral Products (Actual value in Php)	Total Taxes, Fees, and Royalties From Mining (in Million Php)	National Government Revenues - Tax Revenues (in Million Php)	% Share of Mining Sector to Total Philippine Revenue
2013	3,412	6.3	42.44	144,805,280,000	24,445.7	1,535,698	1.6
2014	4,038	6.5	44.39	179,246,820,000	32,755.3	1,718,986	1.9
2015	2,853	4.8	45.50	129,811,500,000	30,123.4	1,815,475	1.7
2016	2,317	4.1	44.47	103,036,990,000	33,403.3	1,980,390	1.67
2017	4,285	6.24	50.40	215,964,000,000	25,926.8	2,250,678	1.15
2018	4,037	5.99	52.41	224,576,850,000	31,306.1	2,565,872	1.22

Source: National Government Revenues - Tax Revenues (treasury.gov.ph) access on April 28, 2020; MGB Mining Industry Data 2013 – 2018.

REFERENCES

- Mines and Geosciences Bureau. (2020, May 29). Mining Industry Statistics. Retrieved from : http://mgb.gov.ph/images/Mineral_Statistics/MIS_Q12020_May292020.pdf
- Bureau of Treasury. (No Date). National Government Revenues - Tax Revenues (2013-2018). Accessed on April 28, 2020 from: https://www.treasury.gov.ph/?page_id=4221
- Mines and Geosciences Bureau. (2020). Department of Environment & Natural Resources Mines and Geosciences Bureau Mining Industry Statistics (2013 – 2018) retrieved on April 28, 2020 from <https://mgb.gov.ph/>
- Philippine Statistics Authority. (04 June 2020). Annual Per Capita Poverty Threshold (2015-2018). Accessed on April 28, 2020 from <https://psa.gov.ph/poverty-press-releases/nid/162559>
- Eckstein, D., Kunzel, V., Schafer, L., Wings, M. (2019). Global Climate Risk Index 2020 Who Suffers Most from Extreme Weather Events? Weather-Related Loss Events in 2018 and 1999 to 2018. Accessed on April 16, 2021 from https://www.germanwatch.org/sites/default/files/20-2-01e%20Global%20Climate%20Risk%20Index%202020_14.pdf