The mining state abroad: The Australian state's role in the Australian mining industry in the Philippines

The mining state abroad: The Australian state's role in the Australian mining industry in the Philippines

1. Introduction

Australia has one of the largest mining industries in the world, both in terms of the number of mining projects in Australia and the number of Australian companies with mining projects outside of Australia. It is no overstatement when Satchwell and Redden (2016: 1) refer to the Australian mining industry as a "formidable" global enterprise in terms of its global reach and dominance. This industry, both in Australia and outside of the borders of the state, is keenly supported by the Australian government, located as it is within Australian national developmentalist narratives. This support is evident in government policies but is perhaps best captured by the tenor of support for the industry recently. As an example, in 2017 the treasurer - defying parliamentary rules - brought a lump of coal into parliament and urged the opposition to "not be afraid of coal". A year later another government minister, Matt Canavan, stridently criticised students striking against climate change inaction, telling them that protesting only leads to unemployment, to the dole queue, and they should learn about the industry instead: "learn about how you build a mine, how you do geology, how you drill for oil and gas, which is one of the most remarkable scientific exploits of anywhere in the world that we do" (Australian Broadcasting Commission, 2018).

This article looks at the Australian government's role in supporting the Australian mining industry in the Philippines, where it comprises small and mid-sized mining companies and subcontracting firms. The geographic location of the Philippines is significant in that its location puts it in one of the regions where Australian mining companies are most heavily invested. In 2013 there were 47 Australian operated mines and 357 exploration projects in South-East Asia and the Pacific (Satchwell and Redden, 2016). The geographical proximity and geopolitical significance of this region to Australia, and the sometimes uneasy engagements Australia has with the region, form part of the context for these industrial connections. Australia has a close relationship with the Philippines and signed a 'Comprehensive Partnership' in 2015 (Commonwealth of Australia and Republic of the Philippines, 2015). These Australian mining companies are part of a global industry that is becoming increasingly interconnected through complex ownership structures, growth in the number of small to medium sized mining companies, and a greater reliance on subcontracting in their supply chains.

The 'home' states of companies are significantly involved in the global commodity chains of certain industries, including ones, such as the mining industry, which are highly inequitable. The role of the state in global commodity chains is often under-emphasised. Australia is neither a large economic nor political power, but it is one of the most important centres of the global mining industry. It is argued here that the Australian state is involved in supporting this industry at key points across its commodity chains. Many of these Australian based companies have mining projects in lower-income states, and by intervening in mining commodity chains the Australian state is reshaping inequitable relations between states. In part, such support is based on the greater economic resources available to state actors in wealthier states. It is also discursive, in that the dominant normative frameworks for how lower-income states 'ought' to integrate into global markets are shaped by many actors and institutions, including the external states. This points to the influence states can have in extraction or production outside of their borders, but further that the role of states in global commodity chains can not be understood without locating these states in the broader social contexts in which they are a part, in the case examined here, the inequitable relationships between states.

The principle sources used here, to examine the ways in which the Australian state is engaged with mining projects in the Philippines and the global commodity chains in which these projects exist, are government documents and reports from mining companies. Documents and statements from the Australian government and its departments, especially the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade were examined closely. In the first instance these documents were used to identify the Australian government's connections to the mining industry. Following this, the frameworks used to explain the purpose of Australian involvement were analysed. Finally, these activities were located within the broader policies of the Australian government and international agencies. The company reports and statements of Australian mining companies operating in the Philippines were analysed from the commencement of their projects to the current day. This was used to identify the activities of these companies but the specific focus of this was to examine, first, the direct engagement the company had with the Australian government and, second, the relevance of government activities in the profit making of these companies. Documents from the Republic of the Philippines, reports from non-governmental organisations and relevant newspaper articles and the policies of global agencies such the the World Bank were studied as context for the activities of the Australian government and Australian mining companies. A detailed examination of one mining company, OceanaGold, provides a case study.

2. Mining along complex and flexible commodity chains

2.1 The changing mining industry

Mining companies from Australia and elsewhere have increasingly complex ownership and financing structures. As is the case in other industries companies are connected through joint ventures, subsidiary arrangements and shareholdings in other companies. Ownership structures can make determination of the nationality of a company less than clear. However in the majority of cases the headquarter of a company and its primary stock exchange listing are consistent, and nationality can be ascribed on this basis. The exchange listing of a company, especially a secondary listing on an overseas exchange, is increasingly pragmatic, based on the opportunities for financing, market conditions and regulatory constraints (Baker & McKenzie, 2017: 1). For the junior and mid-tier Australian mining companies the second-tier exchanges such as the TSX Venture Exchange are particularly significant as they allow companies carrying more risk to list. But as market and investment conditions change the focus of secondary listings of small companies can change (Denina and Lewis, 2017). In 2007, for example, the Sydney Morning Herald reported that the TSX, "awash with capital, …has welcomed the new breed of Aussie juniors with open arms" (Sydney Morning Herald, 2007a). As de los Reyes (2017) argues, changes to the types of investors in a company, and with this the types of strategies and risks a company will take, are particularly important in the mining industry, given its reliance today on financing. Camba (2015) argues that financialisation has been significant in shaping mining in the Philippines. When companies were able to get low interest loans they began moving into new areas. The availability of financing for gold, the primary focus of Australian mining companies in the Philippines, is influenced by the metal's unique attributes. Gold has important industrial uses, but it also has key financial and monetary roles (Qian et al., 2019).

Alongside changes to ownership structures and financing, the industry is being reconfigured by a growth in the number of junior and mid-tier companies and a greater reliance on subcontracting firms. Accounting firm Grant Thornton (2009) estimated that juniors made up 80% of Australian Stock Exchange (ASX) listed resource companies. Even while the capitalisation of these companies is not remotely that of the large companies, their number is significant because of the quite different characteristics of these companies. Juniors and mid-tier companies are more risk prone, both at the mine site and in terms of access to capital. They lack significant capitalisation and are reliant on being able to raise capital externally. Because they usually focus on one or two mining projects they are more reliant on the fortunes of their exploratory sites (Holden and Jacobson, 2012). Risks to the projects at the mine site include the extent to which the area is mineralised, environmental risks, and the national and local mining policies. Bebbington et al. (2013: 6) suggest that these factors, and their limited community relations teams, mean that these companies are likely to be “less subtle, more rushed”, and with this more likely to cause conflict. The other significant change to the types of companies in the industry is the rapid growth in the use of subcontracting firms. Referred to as ‘Mining Equipment, Technology and Services’ (METS), this sector comprises a diverse set of firms providing services, equipment and specialised technology (Scott-Kemis, 2015). While there are many small companies, it also includes large global companies such as Deloitte. The Mining Council of Australia reports a five-fold increase in the value of this sector between 1998 and 2013 (Scott-Kemmis, 2015; see also Austmine, 2018). In part, the growth of the junior to mid-tier companies, as well as METS, has been brought about by large mining companies who have increasingly moved to subcontracting business models while also shedding research and development, and discovery activities. As a mining adviser from EY put it, the major mining companies “… don’t want to do leap-of-faith drilling” (Taylor and Nickel, 2017). In like vein Shabalala (2016), writing for Reuters, says “Tight budgets and nervous investors have convinced major miners that a cheap, timely way to ensure a strong pipeline of quality assets is to team up with junior, more nimble, exploration firms.”

2.2 Mining commodity chains

Given the globally networked nature of the mining industry and the complex ownership patterns which cross national borders, the global value chain (GVC) and related global production network (GPN) frameworks can be draw upon as a starting point to examine the industry. Both approaches argue that there has been an increase in global production and trade and alongside this transnational corporations have become vertically disintegrated (Gereffi and Fernandez-Stark, 2016; Gereffi et al., 2005). The governance of this network is primarily understood in terms of the the forms of the links between the companies in the network. In the GVC approach, for example, the governance of the commodity chain depends on three main forms of transaction: the complexity, the ability that they can be codified and the capabilities in the supply base (Gereffi et al., 2005). These approaches can be useful in moving the tendency in the literature to focus on the national scale towards an analysis of the multi-territorial dimensions of the industry and its commodity chains (Bridge, 2008). In focussing on the links between corporations, GPN and GVC frameworks can underplay the role of the state, and the ‘non-economic’ more broadly,within these commodity chain. Gereffi et al. (2005), for example, argue that state regulations such as import duties increase ‘geographic fragmentation’. As such the state is afforded an important role in this approach but it is an external contour the commodity chain navigates rather an internal dimension. But the state is central to any commodity chain. Mayer and Phillips (2017) argue that states have provided facilitative, regulative and distributive roles. States have facilitated global value chains through mechanisms such as supporting a fragmented production model through international trade agreements, extending the global market through pushing neoliberal models of development, and allowing for the greater concentration of market power. Further, they argue that states have allowed for a privatisation of regulatory governance within the GVC, and these private forms are necessarily backed by public mechanisms. Lastly, inequality is a necessary feature of GVCs, and states state policies can facilitate this (Mayer and Phillips, 2017).

There is an increasing body of literature that examines the extractive industries by drawing on commodity chain approaches, and in this the role of the state has been conceptualised in various ways (for examples, Bridge, 2008; Ciccantell and Smith, 2009; Katz and Pietrobelli, 2018; Parker et al., 2018; Pietrobelli et al., 2018). Katz and Pietrobelli (2018), for example, primarily understand the state as providing a regulatory context in their study of the Latin American mining sector at a time of increased demand for resources and of technological innovation. In this study of the interactions between the large mining companies and subcontractors, they locate these inta-corporation relations within the regulatory role of the public service and local communities. In other approaches the state is understood as in competition with an international corporation for the economic value that is derived from a commodity chain. Knierzinger, for example, argues that in the 2000s there was a 'crisis in chain governance' in the Bauxite industry due to a shortage of raw materials. The state, however, was not able to significantly improve its bargaining position vis-à-vis mining companies in large part because of the significant disrepepancy between the economic might of the mining majors in the country and the state. Alternatively, Bridge and Le Billion (2013) locate states as key players within oil's global production network, alongside firms and civil society. The global production network, they argue, is highly integrated, from the oil reserves to that of consumption and disposal or carbon sequestration. Significantly, in considering the role of the state, they argue the network is geopolitical. As oil moves across the geography of its global production network there is a contestation for control of the commodity in different territorial spaces. In this, power is derived from the control of these particular spaces.

This article studies the ways in which the Australian state provides support to Australian junior and mid-size mining companies in the Philippines. As such it contributes to the understanding of the role of the state in the commodity chains of the extractive industries. More specifically, to draw on Bridge and Le Billion (2013), it examines the role of the state in the contesting the 'control of particular spaces' in a commodity chain, in this case outside of its territorial spaces. It is argued here that the Australian state provides support to the Australian mining industry in the Philippines through engagements with the Philippines state, intervening both for the access to resources and the conditions in which these companies's activities are regulated. Alongside this, the state provides resources to the Australian mining industry directly. To do this, Australia draws on economic and political resources that are available to wealthier states. This includes global discourses about how lower income states 'should' participate in the global market. From this vantage, it is argued, the global commodity chains of the extractive industries can not be understood without understanding the multiple, active, engagements of states within these chains. This includes the states from which mining companies are headquartered. These states and involved in different ways partly because of the inequitable resources available to them, but also because of different political and ideological frameworks within these states.

The policies pusued by the states in which mineral resources are located are partly ideological, but are also shaped by state capacities. Today there are a range of mining regimes across the world, including 'resource nationalism' frameworks and others that focus more heavily on environmental protection (Broad and Fischer-Mackey, 2017). There are also a growing number of mining regimes that are neoliberal in that they increasingly open the industry to privatisation and allow greater access to foreign companies (Bridge, 2004; Hatcher, 2012). This includes those countries in which industry policy has been heavily influenced by the World Bank, as is the case for the Philippines (Hatcher, 2012). But states also have different capacities, and this impacts on their role in the industry. The Australian mining industry in the Asia-Pacific negotiate both the ideological framework and state capacities to mine and profit in the region. As one of the more striking examples, Rio Tinto negotiated an agreement for their highly contentious mine on the island of Bougainville in the period leading up to Papua New Guinea's independence from Australia in 1975. Their negotiating position was strongly influenced by the wide spread view that the country's economic independence from Australia depended on mining, and on this mine in particular (Denoon, 2012). More recently, Sing (2015) argues, that the PNG state has limited capacity to regulate the mining industry because of weak governance structures. Drawing on examples from four large mines which are part-owned by Australian companies he argues that these mines are primarily regulated by the actions of landowner communities rather than by the state (Sing 2015). In a different context, Spiegel (2014) draws attention to the role an ambiguous policy framework at the national level can play at the site of the mining project. Spiegel examines the issue of land shaing between mining companies and Artisinal and Small Scale Miners (ASM) at two mining projects in Cambodia, one Australian. He argues that because the legal status of ASM is unresolved the contestation over resource sharing is occurring between the mine and the community directly, with varying results (Spiegel, 2014).

The ideological frameworks and capacities of the state within which a company is headquartered is also important in understanding their practices. As example, Oskarsson and Lahiri-Dutt (2019) argue that Indian companies exporting coal to India have developed new commodity chains rather than rely on pre-existing chains. The corporate behaviour of these Indian companies does not always accord with global norms, but this is framed by Indian discourse of this in terms of this being required for the well-being of the poor. Further, Indian companies rely on internal resources, including expertise and funding and are are rooted in Indian models of resource nationalism which tie state and companies together closely, even while the Indian state has little influence over the companies' overseas operations (Oskarsson and Lahiri-Dutt, 2019). Unlike this example Australian companies are not mining in the Philippines for domestic requirements, but none the less the Australian state is engaged with these companies, and the sector more broadly. While there is an economic basis for this support, it is also ideological, contextualised by the significance of mining to a national developmentalist narrative in Australia. The state provides support through its relations with the Philippines state and directly to Australian companies in the Philippines. But support for the industry occurs at other places in the commodity chains of Australian mining companies as well, such as in the negotiation of international trade agreements, international governance frameworks and through overseas development aid programs. Section 3 below provides a broad overview of mining in the Philippines today. It locates the industry within colonial histories in the Philippines and in the neoliberal present.

3. Mining as a contentious and global practice in the Philippines

Mining looms large in the Philippines. Small scale mining outside of the formal sector ('artisanal mining') provides income for many households (Verbrugge, 2014). In the formal sector, there are about 50 mines – mostly small mines - and a far higher number of approved mining applications (Department of Environment and Natural Resources, 2018). Environmentally, socially and politically the impact of the mining industry on the country is immense and it remains extremely contentious. There have been both large scale disasters and endemic issues at mine sites. On the Island of Marinduque, for example, the ongoing consequences of the Macrcopper mine's practice of dumping tailings into a valuable fishing bay for years was eclipsed by the social and ecological disaster caused when a tailings dam burst in 1996 (Wurfel, 2006). Mining projects have been the sites of regular community displacement and violence. A report of the 2006 fact-finding mission led by Claire Doyle, former UK Secretary of for State for overseas aid, stated the mission was "shocked' by what it saw. The list of issues they raised included militarisation in the mining areas, mining within conflict zones, corruption, pressure being placed on the judiciary, environmental concerns, and lack of free, prior and informed consent from the indigenous peoples (Doyle et al., 2007). Many residents at mine sites, as well as provincial and national NGOs and church groups, have highlighted the ways in which these issues are continuing (Borde and Rasch, 2018; Camba, 2016; Holden and Jacobson, 2007; Holden et al., 2011; Lansang, 2011; Wetzlmaier, 2012). Their opposition to mining – or at least the conditions under which it is taking place – has meant that mining has remained an issue of political importance. Opposition to mining in several local provinces is demonstrated by the province banning large-scale mining (Chaloping-March, 2014; Goodland and Wicks, 2008; OceanGold Corporation, 2019c), but there are usually competing perspectives within communities (Lusterio-Rico, 2013; Rovillos and Tauli-Corpuz, 2012. At the national level, it remains a political issue. In the last election in the Philippines, Rodrigo Duterte said he would close mining projects that did not enforce stringent standards (Randa, 2016). On her first day in office Environment and National Resources Secretary, Regina Lopez, ordered an audit of all mines and within three months the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) had recommended twenty mines be suspended and 11 be monitored (Geronimo, 2016). President Duterte reiterated his support for Lopez's politically explosive action in his first State of the Nation Address, albeit stating "…there is a law allowing mining. Gina Lopez and I are just telling you, follow government standards" (Duterte, 2016). Lopez was, however, one of two appointments rejected by the Commission on Appointments and by August 2018 and following the audit processes DENR recommended the suspension remain on only four companies (Serapio and Dela Cruz, 2018; see also Department of the Environment and Natural Resources, 2017).

The policies and practices of mining in the Philippines have been shaped by changing global contexts. The industry was important to both the Spanish and the American colonisers. Lopez (1992), in his history of the mining industry in the Philippines, argues that in the early period of Spanish colonisation when there was an increasing interest in the mineral potential of colonised countries, the mineral deposits of the Philippines became an important part of Spanish trading routes. In the sixteenth century Spain issued instructions to look for colonial resources. By the second half of the eighteenth century the Spanish moved to a policy of *laissez-faire* management in the Philippines and the colony was opened to world commerce. It was decreed under Spanish Law that all minerals belonged to the state but that – with some exemptions - mining concessions were available to everyone (Lopez, 1992: 29). After the Philippine-American war (1899-1902) the country was colonised by America and these colonisers too were interested in the mineral wealth of the country. Lopez argues that during this period they saw one of the roles of the colony as supplying the requisite resources for American industry and the US sought to stimulate investment in the colony. The Philippine Bill of 1902, which became the framework for colonial rule, legislated that public land is open to exploration by the citizens of both the US and the Philippines and the American government undertook geological surveys to identify mineral resources. After independence in 1935 (interrupted by the Japanese occupation during World War II) the new constitution stated that all mineral resources belong to the state, and that only companies with at least 60% of their capital owned by citizens of the Philippines could exploit these resources (Lopez, 1992).

In recent decades, Philippine mining policy has moved away from the national developmentalist aspects evident in the constitution, as the industry has been opened to foreign owned companies. Key in opening access to overseas investors was the highly disputed 1995 Mining Act which allows for foreign ownership of mines and provides conditions to encourage mining companies to invest. As in the colonial eras, global actors and institutions are part of the explanation for these changes. The role of the World Bank is particularly significant. Hatcher (2012) suggests that the World Bank was in fact involved in drafting the 1995 Mining Act. Current policies to regulate and develop the mining sector draw heavily on the World Bank's Social Development Model (Hatcher, 2012). The premise of this model is that a country should encourage foreign investment and that this can occur within a pro-poor framework which will regulate social and environmental impacts and enhance local participatory development. Hatcher (2012) argues that this framework allows the state to "retreat" from regulation, monitoring and mediation of the industry as these tasks are increasing undertaken within private spheres and at the local level. It is, Hatcher suggests, a framework within which conflict over mining is depoliticised and conflict located within a technocratic framework. External states also shape the mining industry today.

4. The Australian mining industry in the Philippines

In the Philippines, the Australian mining industry is comprised of juniors, mid-tier companies and METS exclusively. There are about 30 Australian companies in the Philippines with investments in the mining sector, the 7th largest number of Australian mining companies in one country (Goodman, 2015). Yet only two of these, OceanaGold and Medusa, have operating mines, while another, Red5, recently halted its gold mining operations. OceanaGold, which is discussed in some detail in section 6, is a mid-tier mining company with headquarters in Melbourne. The company mines gold and copper at Didipio, which has one of the largest gold reserves in the Philippines. The Co-O gold mine of the Western Australian headquartered mining junior Medusa is located in East Mindanao and operated by its subsidiary Philsaga. Medusa also has some exploratory sites nearby (Medusa Mining Limited, 2018). While there are currently no large Australian mining companies in the Philippines, both Western Mining Corporation (WMC), now part of BHP Billiton, and Rio Tinto have previously had mining interests in the country. Rio Tinto part-owned the mining company Lepanto, which mines gold in Benguet Province, Luzon (Dela Peña, 2006) and conducted exploratory work at another site but pulled out after protests at the site (Doyle et al, 2007). WMC had a larger presence, having part owned two copper and gold exploration projects, one on Masapelid Island (Medusa Mining Limited, 2006) and the other at Tampakan (Go, 2002). It also signed an agreement – which never eventuated – with Penguin Mining to buy nickel from its mine at Romblon and to fund the company's exploratory work in that area (Sydney Morning Herald, 2007b). However the limited number of operating mines does not represent the full engagement of the Australian industry in the country as many Australian companies are involved in exploratory projects or work within the METS sector. West Australian headquartered company RTG, for example, has conducted extensive exploratory work at two gold and copper sites and one copper site while it has also carried out initial work elsewhere while an Australian company, Tribune, bought an exploratory gold project recently (The Asia Miner, 2018). There are numerous Australian METS involved in mine projects. At OceanaGold's mine, Leighton Contractor Philippines was contracted to undertake open-cut mining and tailing dam construction ($60 million) (Leighton Asia, 2008) while PYBAR undertakes boring operations. A number of Australian METS have opened offices in the Philippines, such as Perth based company OMC (Orway Mineral Consultants, n.d.), which has had contracts at the majority of mines in the country.

5. The Australian state's support for the Australian mining industry in the Philippines

The Australian state plays a significant role in supporting the Australian mining industry in the Philippines, and with this plays a role in shaping the mining industry in the country more broadly. Even for these small and risk prone mining juniors the state in which they are headquartered is important, for commodity chains might be global but they are not detached from the power or interests of states. Australia's interest is not for domestic requirements as Australia exports gold and copper (Buteyn, 2018) Part of the reason for this interest is that mining in the Philippines is considered a potential growth area for Australian companies. In the Philippines there is more Australian investment in mining that in any other industry and it is seen as leading the way for other investments. The Australian Minister for Foreign Affairs and Trade said in 2008 that Australian investment in the country has been "largely off the back of the growing interest of Australian mining companies…" (Crean, 2008b). Where large Australian companies are disinclined to mine in the country, the relatively low start up costs means that many juniors are willing. Bridge and Le Billion's (2013) argue, in reference to the hydrocarbon industry, that as this commodity moves geographically power and control involves the "control of particular spaces". Drawing on this, it is argued that in the 'particular space' the Australian state is contesting control of the mining industry with the Philippines state, both in terms of the access Australian companies have to resources, and the conditions under which the industry is regulated. Further, the Australian state provides resources to the Australian industry directly and in so strengthens their position in the industry. Practically and discursively Australia has been involved in framing how countries 'should' engage with global markets, with Australia's Overseas Development Aid (ODA) program being part of this. Global governance mechanisms such as the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative have been increasingly important in the industry and Australia has played a key role in these.

To begin, Australia has advocated to the Philippines state on behalf on specific mining companies, both for access to mineral resources, and for favourable regulatory conditions. This is particularly evident when companies have been in conflict with the Philippines state. In the lead up to the 2016 election in the Philippines, when the behaviour of mining companies was firmly an election issue, Trade Commissioner Anthony Weymouth spoke on a platform with the Country Director of the Australian mining company OceanaGold, Bradley Norman, to argue for the importance of mining as a developmental strategy, "uplifting" the standard of living in the Philippines (Alzona and Mocon-Ciriaco, 2016). Later, following the announcement of the moratorium on OceanaGold's activities (and that of many other companies) in the Philippines, Austrade, Australia's overseas trade and investment agency, supported the company's claim to be a responsible miner by announcing that its Philippines mining expo would include a site visit to OceanaGold's mine, and describing its credentials as a responsible miner "…In 2016 … [OceanaGold] received the Philippine Mine Safety Presidential Award, the Global CSR Summit Awards for "Best Workplace", second place for "Environmental Excellence" and third place for "Best Community Program." (Austrade, 2017). More blatantly, a decade before this, when a moratorium was placed on the Australian company Lafayette's Rapu Rapu mine following a massive mine spill the Australian Embassy issued a statement saying "The Australian Government reiterates its view that a blanket ban on mining in Rapu Rapu would deprive the country of thousands of jobs, significant economic growth, enormous local community development, large tax revenues and international investor confidence." The Australian Ambassador, Tony Heley, said that he believed the company had met all compliance requirements and should be allowed to start testing (Australian Embassy The Philippines, 2006). In 2012 Heley explained the role the Australian Embassy played in lobbying the Philippines government on behalf of a mining company. Following claims of human rights violations at an Australian company's Tampakan mining project he stated that the "future of the Tampakan Project" was an example of "where the Embassy – including me as Ambassador – has made strong representations to policy makers." (Tweddell, 2012).

At an industry-wide level, Australia has strengthened the commodity chains of Australian companies through state-to-state mechanisms, but it has also resourced the industry directly. In the Philippines Australia Ministerial Meetings (PAMM), through which bilateral relations are negotiated, mining appears to be a prominent topic, given it has been referred to in the statements released by the Australian Ministers after each meeting. After the third of these meetings, in 2011, the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Kevin Rudd and the Minister for Trade, Craig Emerson, said that they and their counterparts from the Philippines agreed on the economic and development benefits of mining, and their counterparts "…welcomed Australian investment in the mining sector" (Rudd, 2011). In addition, resources are provided to the industry directly, through Austrade programs, including expos in 2015 and 2017 for Australian companies considering entering the Philippines. These expos, *ExplORE Philippines,* ran alongside the Philippines mining industry's annual conference and offered "…on-the-ground assistance…" (Austrade, 2015b; Austrade, 2017b). As well as seeking access to markets, and encouraging Australian companies into these markets, the Australian government has also lobbyed for the conditions under which these companies are regulated. Speaking to reporters during the 2008 PAMM, Simon Crean, Minister for Trade, said that the mining industry has raised concerns about the approval processes and the royalty shares that went to local government and that these had been discussed with his counterparts with the result "...that there clearly is a realisation on the part of the Philippines Government that these are issues that need to be addressed and we have talked about mechanisms for addressing them…" (Crean, 2008a). Australian Ministers and Austrade have argued – in the context of the current debates about sustainable mining in the Philippines – that Australian industry is particularly well placed to play a positive role in the country because it has expertise in sustainable mining practices (Rudd, 2011).

In part this support draws on broader global framings of the ways lower income countries should engage with global markets, and Australia's capacities to encourage other countries to pursue such an approach. Specifically, the outcomes for the Philippines have been couched in terms of job creation and the economy, and more recently – perhaps given the failure of the industry to create jobs – in terms of sustainable communities and the economy. For example, Trade Commissioner Anthony Weymouth in a speech in 2016 said that the Philippines needs to increase mining to improve living conditions. He said there had been a disappointing lack of emphasis on mining from the current Aquino administration and that "there must be an emphasis on mining" from the next administration (Alzona and Mocon-Ciriaco, 2016). This is the agenda of the World Bank (Hatcher, 2012), but this shift is also evident in the mining frameworks of other relevant intra-governmental organisations such as Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC, 2018). One way in which the Australian government advocates for the way the Philippines should engage in the mining industry, and offers incentives for it to do this, is through Australia's Overseas Development Aid (ODA) program, which provides assistance to the mining industry. The Philippines is a priority country for Australia, and in terms of budget allocation it is the fifth largest of Australia's ODA recipients (Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 2018a) while Australia is the Philippines' third largest ODA donor (OECD, n.d.). Much of Australia's aid program is part of an Aid for Trade program, that is one that frames the needs of low income countries in terms of a lack of market integration and seeks to remedy this. It is stated in DFAT's Aid for Trade policy framework that it "…supports developing countries' efforts to better integrate into and benefit from the global rules-based trading system, implement domestic reform, and make a real economic impact on the lives of their citizens." (Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 2015a). The DFAT aid plan for the Philippines for 2016-2017 states that this program will "…support a more open, competitive and connected Philippine economy which can better engage with international partners" (Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 2015b). While Australia's ODA programs are not large ($67 million budgeted for in the 2018-19 budget), they can be important as part of broader international agendas, such as is the case here. There has been a move within the Australian ODA program from bilateral programs to those which are located within forms of global governance and regulation on the one hand, and international trade policies on the other, of which a key objective is the open integration of poorer countries into global markets.

Until recently the focus of the Aid for Trade program with the Philippines mining industry was on training for the mining industry delivered in Australia, but, while this is still part of the program, the current focus is on the global Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI). Between 2012 and 2015 Australia's signature mining development program was the International Mining for Development Centre (IM4DC), run by a university consortium in Australia. The Philippines was one of eight priority countries in this program (Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 2014). The centre closed in 2015 but training for the mining industry continues to be provided through scholarships to study in Australia and at the 'Philippines-Australia Resources Education Excellence Program' delivered at four universities in the Philippines. Managed through the Australian aid program it is funded by a number of mining companies, including Australia's Sagittarius Mines Inc. (Australian Embassy The Philippines, 2009). Today most of the expenditure on the mining industry in the Aid for Trade program is on a global initiative, the EITI. This initiative is designed to support transparency and accountability in the mining industry, particularly in the awarding of contracts and the payment of taxes and royalties. The initiative involves representation from states, companies and civil society organisations (Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative, n.d.; Brockmyer, 2016). Australia is the largest funder of this initiative (Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative, nd.), mainly through funding to the related Extractives Global Programmatic Support (EGPS), which is a multi-donor trust fund led by the World Bank to fund "programs ranging from transparency and governance, to legal and regulatory reform, local economic diversification, institutional strengthening and social and environmental sustainability" (World Bank, n.d.). Most EGPS funds go to the EITI. As well as general financial and practical support for the initiative, Australia has provided specific support to the Philippines. Australia has supported the Philippines application to become an EITI candidate. It has also helped to set up the multi-stakeholder group which will oversee the implementation of the EITI, and it has provided a small amount of funding for a community group to engage in community sector consultations.

Finally, the role the Australian state plays in the access, regulation and resourcing of the Australian mining industry in the Philippines is located alongside regional and international trade agreements which play an important role of the regulation of the mining industry in the Philippines and the commodity chains of the mining industry more broadly. In terms of the regulation of mining in both Australia and the Philippines, the ASEAN-Australia-New Zealand Free Trade Agreement is most significant. As well as reducing tariffs (in mining to none), it offers a "regime of investment protections, an investor-state dispute resolution mechanism, and a forward work program for market access commitments on investment" (Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 2009: 2). APEC too is significant to Australia and the Philippines and, as in the negotiations in the PAMM meetings or the aims of Australia's ODA program, the focus is on global market integration and the removal of barriers to international trade, which it suggests can be achieved in a framework of sustainable development and transparency. The most recent statement of the Ministers Responsible for Mining stated that they "recognise the importance of continued investment in exploration and mining as a foundation for sustenance and growth, and call on all economies, and industry to continue to seek options to promote further investment in the sector." (APEC Ministers Responsible for Mining Meeting, 2018). Australia is active within these meetings, while also providing a small APEC Mining Sub Fund for mining projects which "build cooperation between governments and the private sector" in developing countries (Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, n.d.).

6. OceanaGold actively draws on the Australian state

OceanaGold, one of only two Australian headquartered companies which currently have operating mines in the Philippines, provides an example of the state support to this industry and the significance of this support to the company. While headquartered in Melbourne the company re-domiciled to Canada in 2007 and has a holding company at the top of its corporate structure. The company's mine in the Philippines, at Didipio on the island of Luzon, is one of the largest gold mines in the country (Department of the Environment and Natural Resources, 2019). The company acquired the mine in 2006. While this is the company's main mine, it also has mines in New Zealand, which pre-date Didipio, and production has recently started at a mine in the U.S. (OceanaGold Corporation, 2017c). This mid-tier mining company re-domiciled to Canada while seeking funding for the Didipio mine, in order to enhance its prospects of gaining financing, but the company couldn't secure the necessary funding, and it placed the mine under 'care and maintenance' in 2008 (OceanaGold Corporation, 2008). Commercial production finally began in 2013 (OceanaGold Corporation, 2017a). OceanaGold is an early beneficiary of the reduction in restrictions on foreign ownership of mining projects in the Philippines and operates under a Financial or Technical Assistance Agreement (FTAA) (OceanaGold Corporation, 2008). In the case of OceanaGold the role of the state can not be understood - as the state is positioned in some of the global commodity chains approaches – as external, as providing the regulatory framework a commodity chain negotiates, or alternatively in contest with the commodity chains of a company for the a share the profits. While both of these dynamics form part of the context of OceanaGold's operations, for this company, whose license to mine has been contested, the close relationship it has with the Australian state is integral to its ability to operate.

Relations with the local community at the Didipio mine site have been extremely conflictual. While the community is not united in its opposition to the mine, there has been sustained opposition from local communities, NGOs and politicians who state that that there has been forced acquisition of land, lack of informed consent, military involvement, several environmental concerns and labour law violations (Broad et al., 2018; Martin et al., 2007; McKenzie, 2008; Waters, 2009). The Commission on Human Rights of the Philippines (CHRP) in a report in 2011 stated it was concerned about "the alarming human rights situation in Barangay Didipio…" centring on the mine, and that this situation appeared to be worsening (Commission on Human Rights of the Philippines, 2011). Commission chairperson, Loretta Ann P. Rosales, recommended that the Philippines administration consider withdrawing the company's license to operate. This did not occur, and opposition has continued. In 2016 Carlos M. Padilla, Representative for Lone District, Nueva Vizcaya in the Philippines House of Representatives in a Privilege Speech in Parliament called for the CHRP recommendations to be adopted because of human rights, environmental and taxation violations (Padilla, 2016). Not long after this, in 2017, OceanaGold's operations were suspended by Regina Lopez, Secretary of Environment and Natural Resources, and remained suspended following a mining audit in February (Department of Environment of Natural Resources, 2017; OceanaGold Corporation, 2017b). Ultimately the suspension did not take effect, but in July 2019 OceanaGold suspended mining (but not milling) for some time because a blockade of the mine, supported by the local government meant they did not have sufficient supplies (OceanaGold Corporation, 2019a).

The Australian state has provided significant support to OceanGold, and the company has actively pursued this, it has engaged with visiting Ministers, as well as with Austrade and the Embassy in Manila, and is a beneficiary of the Australian government's negotiation with the Philippine state for increased market access for Australian mining companies. This has included advocacy through the PAMM meetings where the OceanaGold CEO, Mike Wilkes, was in the government's business delegation accompanying the 2014 PAMM meeting (Robb, 2014). Following this PAMM, the Vice President of the Australia-New Zealand Chamber of Commerce (Philippines), Ian Porter, wrote to Australia's Foreign Minister Julie Bishop and Trade Minister Andrew Robb to thank them for their contribution to Australian business interests in the Philippines, particularly the mining interests, and in this letter cited OceanaGold as one of the large companies that is a member of the Chamber (Porter, 2014). As is the case for the Australian mining industry broadly, OceanaGold has benefitted from the resourcing the Australian state has provided for Australian companies, including through the *ExplORE Philippines* mining expo. But more specifically the company was a tour destination in this expo, and Austrade advertising stated that that OceanaGold demonstrates best practice in mining (Austrade, 2017; Austrade, 2017b).

In this the company draws on the Australian state's direct engagement with the Philippines state and the resources provided to the company, but also it actively draws on its broader developmentalist discourses. One element of this are the broad discourses the Australian government has promoted around mining as a form of economic development, job creation and community development in poorer countries. As already noted the Country Director of OceanaGold took the opportunity to speak on a platform with the Australian Trade Commissioner, Anthony Weymouth, both arguing for the importance of mining in "uplifting" the standard of living in the Philippines and pointing out the contribution the company could make to sustainable development (Alzona and Mocon-Ciriaco, 2016). Community development frameworks are also drawn upon consistently in both the media, where these include the development of small scale enterprises (Manila Times, 2016; Perante, 2016; Perante, 2017), and in company statements (OceanaGold Corporation, n.d.; OceanaGold Corporation, 2019a), as well as in sustainability reports. Through these the company asserts its community development credentials, which include the creation of small-scale income-generating enterprises. As part of this, it is draws on discourses within Aid for Trade and other frameworks which stress the value of integration of small scale community projects into global commodity chains. Today a particular focus of both the government and the company is in arguing that Australia's mining industry has the highest standards in sustainable mining. The government has pointed to the company's abilities in this area, and likewise the company has actively drawn on this discourse. In a press release following the Department of Environment and Natural Resources order to suspend the mine the company stated that it had always complied with Australian and Canadian mining standards and "…we strongly believe that the Didipio operation is the template for what President Duterte is seeking in his desire for a responsible mining sector …" (OceanaGold Corporation, 2017b). Statements such as this have been a feature of subsequent press releases (eg. OceanaGold Corporation, 2017b).

7. Conclusion

This article has examined on the role of the Australian state in the commodity chains of Australian mining companies in the Philippines, all of which are juniors or mid-size mining companies. It has argued that the Australian state has played an important role in the commodity chains of these companies, drawing on both state-to-state mechanisms and through industry mechanisms. Australia has advocated to, and negotiated with, the Philippines state for access to mineral resources, and the conditions in which companies are regulated. Alongside this it has provided resources to the industry directly. This has included support for the industry broadly but also support to specific companies. The example of OceanaGold showed the important role this has played in the operations of some mining companies in the Philippines. The roles discussed here are all at one specific place in a mining commodity chain. But the Australian state plays an important role in other locations and arenas that are part of the commodity chains of these companies. In Australia it regulates the Australian Stock Exchange, and with this is an element of the regulation of the industry. In state-to-state negotiations it takes part in several regional and global processes that shape the industry, including regional inter-governmental forums and agreements such as ASEAN, and through the international agreements to regulate industry, such as the EITI.

The roles the Australian state plays here needs to be located within a series of inequitable relations between states, but also different political and ideological frameworks of the states in which mining companies are headquartered. Like many other industries, mining is a global industry, but the social, political and environmental effects of the industry are amplified in lower-income countries. This is the case in the Philippines, where the industry has contributed to extraordinary social conflict, displacement and environmental degradation, as the example of OceanaGold attests. This company's mining project was controversial when it began, and it remains so. The evidence that points to the mine having a detrimental social and environmental impact is strong. In the engagement of the Australian state at various points in the commodity chains it draws on and shapes the inequitable relationships that are integral to global commodity chains. These interventions are economic, drawing on the resources available to wealthier states as well as the leverage they can have in a state in which the economic promise of mining is more significant. The interventions are also discursive, employing dominant discourses that lower-income states 'should' develop through defined forms of market integration.

By studying the role of the Australian state in the Australian mining industry in the Philippines this article add to the understanding of the state in the global commodity chains of the extractive industries. It supports the argument that the state plays an integral role in the global commodity chains of these industries, and that this includes state engagements at various points outside of their territorial boundaries. Industries, in local places, are shaped by these interactions between companies, states and others. While the relationships between states and companies are complex, companies are not 'nation-less' – as some approaches to the global might argue – and with this the state in which a company is headquartered matters, including by shaping the resourses available to them. This is not to attempt to underplay the role of the nation-state within which mining occurs. The Philippines has chosen to open its mining sector to overseas companies more now than it has historically and political decisions have been made about how the industry is to be regulated. Neither is it to underplay the extraordinary role inter-governmental organisations such as the World Bank have played in the mining industry. Australia's engagement with this industry is perhaps larger than is the case for other states because of the economic role mining plays in Australia and the significance the industry plays to national developmentalist models in Australia. However it is not unique.

References

Alzona, R., Mocon-Ciriaco, C., 2016. Australia wants next Philippine administration to prioritize mining. Business Mirror. Available at https://businessmirror.com.ph/2016/01/24/australia-wants-next-philippine-administration-to-prioritize-mining/ viewed 17 July 2019.

APEC Meeting of Ministers Responsible for Mining, 2018. Statement of the 6th Meeting of the APEC Ministers Responsible for Mining Meeting (MRM6). 23 August. Port Moresby. Available at https://www.apec.org/Meeting-Papers/Sectoral-Ministerial-Meetings/Mining/2018_mining viewed 12 July 2019.

The Asia Miner, 2018. Tribune resources braves Philippines mining industry. 14 December 2018. Available at http://www.asiaminer.com/news/latest-news/9591-tribune-resources-braves-philippines-mining-industry.html#.XMYk5qZS-cY viewed 17 July 2019.

Austmine, 2018. Austmine Annual Review 2018. Available at http://www.austmine.com.au/News/category/industry-insights-reports/austmine-annual-review-2018 Viewed 16 July 2019.

Austrade, 2015. Mining conference helps reshape views on Philippines. 21 October 2015. viewed 19 July 2016. [link no longer available]

Austrade, 2015b. Mining Mission: Expl*ORE* Philippines 2015. 24 June. https://www.austrade.gov.au/EventViewBookingDetails.aspx?Bck=Y&EventID=14196#/event viewed 12 July 2019.

Austrade, 2017. Mining Opportunities in the Philippines Likely as Policies Reviewed. 3 July. https://www.austrade.gov.au/news/latest-from-austrade/2017/mining-opportunities-in-the-philippines-likely-as-policies-are-reviewed. viewed 6 March 2019 [link no longer works]

Austrade, 2017b. Events: ExplORE Philippines 2017. https://www.austrade.gov.au/EventViewBookingDetails.aspx?Bck=Y&EventID=25031&m=0%7C0#/event viewed 10 September 2019.

Australian Broadcasting Commission, 2018. Students strike for climate change, defying calls to stay in school. 1 December 2018. Available at https://www.abc.net.au/news/2018-11-30/australian-students-climate-change-protest-scott-morrison/10571168 viewed 1 August 2019.

Australian Embassy The Philippines, 2006. Australian Government: Moratorium on Mining Will Deprive Philippines of Jobs and Growth. Manila. 22 May. https://philippines.embassy.gov.au/mnla/medrel2305.html viewed 9 July 2019.

Australian Embassy The Philippines, 2009. MR091609- Australia launches Philippine mining scholarships scheme. 16 September. Available at https://philippines.embassy.gov.au/mnla/medrel091609.html viewed 12 July 2019.

Baker & McKenzie, 2017. Cross-border Listings: A Guide for Mining Companies. Available at https://f.datasrvr.com/fr1/019/31632/FINAL_Mining_Guide_May_19.pdf?cbcachex=762164 viewed 17 July 2019.

Bebbington, A., Bornschlegl, T., Johnson, A., 2013. Political economies of extractive industries: from documenting complexity to informing current debates. Development and Change 00 (0), 1–16. DOI: 10.1111/dech.12057

Borde, R., Rasch, E. D., 2018. Internationalized framing and social movements against mining in India and the Philippines. Journal of Developing Societies 34 (2), 195-218. 10.1177/0169796x18767504

Bridge, G., 2004. Mapping the bonanza: geographies of mining investment in an era of neoliberal reform. The Professional Geographer 56 (3), 406-421. DOI: 10.1111/j.0033-0124.2004.05603009.x

Bridge, G., 2008. Global production networks and the extractive sector: governing resource-based development. Journal of Economic Geography 8 (3), 389-419. DOI: 10.1093/jeg/lbn009

Bridge, G., Le Billion, P., 2013. Oil. Polity Press, Cambridge and Malden.

Broad, R., Cavanagh, J., Coumans, C., La Vina, R., 2018. OceanaGold in the Philippines: Ten Violations That Should Prompt its Removal. Institute for Policy Studies and Mining Watch Canada. Washington D.C. and Ontario. Available at https://ips-dc.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/OceanaGold-Report.pdf viewed 15 July 2019.

Broad, R., Fischer-Mackey, J., 2017. From extractivism towards buen vivir: mining policy as indicator of a new development paradigm prioritizing the environment. Third World Quarterly 38 (6), 1327-1349. DOI: 10.1080/01436597.2016.1262741

Brockmyer, B. I., 2016. Global standards in national contexts: the role of transnational multi-stakeholder initiatives in public sector governance reform. Doctoral Dissertation, American University, Faculty of the School of International Service, American University. Washington D.C. Available at https://eiti.org/sites/default/files/documents/brockmyer_2016_global_standards_in_national_contexts.pdf viewed 15 July 2019.

Buteyn, S. 2018. The mineral industry of Australia. U.S. Geological Survey Minerals Yearbook – 2015. U.S. Department of the Interior.

Camba, A. A., 2015. From colonialism to neoliberalism: critical reflections on Philippine mining in the "long twentieth century". The Extractive Industries and Society 2 (2), 287-301. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2015.02.006

Camba, A. A., 2016. Philippine mining capitalism: the changing terrains of struggle in the neoliberal mining regime. ASEAS – Austrian Journal of South-East Asian Studies 9 (1), 69-86. DOI 10.14764/10.ASEAS-2016.1-5

Chaloping-March, M., 2014. The mining policy of the Philippines and "resource nationalism" towards nation building. Journal of la Société des Océanistes 138-139, 93-106. https://journals.openedition.org/jso/7067?lang=en

Ciccantell, P., Smith, D. A., 2009. Rethinking global commodity chains: integrating extraction, transport, and manufacturing. International Journal of Comparative Sociology 50, 361-384. DOI: 10.1177/0020715209105146

Commission on Human Rights of the Philippines (CHRP), 2011. Resolution on Displacement Complaint of Residents of Didipio, Kasibu, Nueza Vizcaya V. OceanaGold Philippines, Inc. (OGPI). Resolution CHR (IV) No. A2001-004. Quezon City.

Commonwealth of Australia and Republic of the Philippines, 2015. Joint Declaration on Australia – The Philippines Comprehensive Partnership. 18 November. Available at https://dfat.gov.au/about-us/publications/Documents/joint-declaration-on-australia-the-philippines-comprehensive-partnership.pdf viewed 8 August 2019.

Court of Tax Appeals, 2018. OceanaGold (Philippines CTA Case No. 8995 Versus Commissioner of Internal Affairs). Promulgated 22 March. Available at http://cta.judiciary.gov.ph viewed 8 August 2019.

Crean, S., 2008a. Interview with Marianne Go (The Philippine STAR), Estrella Torres (Business Mirror) and Felipe Salvosa (BusinessWorld). Transcript interview with Marianne Go (The Philippine STAR), Estrella Torres (Business Mirror) and Felipe Salvosa (BusinessWorld). Available at https://trademinister.gov.au/transcripts/2008/081009_star.htmlhttps://trademinister.gov.au/transcripts/2008/081009_star.html viewed 9 July 2019.

Crean, S., 2008b. Visit to the Philippines, Joint Media Release with Minister for Trade, The Hon Stephen Smith MP. 8 October. Available at https://trademinister.gov.au/releases/2008/sc_081008.html viewed 9 July 2019.

Dela Peña, Z. B., 2006. Rio Tinto eyes RP comeback. PhilStar. Available at https://www.philstar.com/business/2006/07/22/348697/rio-tinto-eyes-rp-comeback viewed 17 July 2019.

De los Reyes, J. A., 2017. Mining shareholder value: institutional shareholders, transnational corporations and the geography of gold mining. Geoforum 84, 251-261. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2016.12.004

Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, n.d. Extractive sector development assistance. Available at https://dfat.gov.au/aid/topics/investment-priorities/infrastructure-trade-facilitation-international-competitiveness/extractives-sector-development-assistance/Pages/extractives-sector-development-assistance-initiatives.aspx viewed 12 July 2019.

Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 2009. ASEAN–Australia–New Zealand Free Trade Agreement (AANZFTA) AANZFTA Fact Sheets (Consolidated). 24 February. Available at https://dfat.gov.au/trade/agreements/in-force/aanzfta/official-documents/Documents/fact_sheets.pdf viewed 8 August.

Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 2014. Mid-Term Review of IM4DC: Final Report. April. Available at https://dfat.gov.au/about-us/publications/Pages/mid-term-review-of-international-mining-for-development-centre-im4dc.aspx viewed 12 July 2019.

Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 2015a. Strategy for Australia's Aid for Trade Investments. Available at https://dfat.gov.au/about-us/publications/Documents/strategy-for-australias-aid-for-trade-investments.pdf viewed 12 July 2019.

Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 2015b. Aid Investment Plan 2015 to 2017/2018: The Philippines. https://dfat.gov.au/about-us/publications/Pages/aid-investment-plan-aip-the-philippines-2015-16-to-2017-18.aspx viewed 31 July 2019.

Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 2018a. Australian Aid Budget Summary 2018-19. 18 September. https://dfat.gov.au/about-us/corporate/portfolio-budget-statements/Documents/2018-19-australian-aid-budget-summary.pdf viewed 12 July 2019.

Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 2018b. Aid Program Performance Report 2017-18: Philippines. https://dfat.gov.au/about-us/publications/Documents/philippines-appr-2017-18.pdf viewed 15 July 2019.

Department of the Environment and Natural Resources, 2017. Final Mining Audit. 2 February. Available at http://edge.pse.com.ph/openDiscViewer.do?edge_no=56ea79deaa9211353318251c9257320d#sthash.MfdQjOxN.dpbs viewed 22 August 2019.

Department of the Environment and Natural Resources, 2018. Mining Industry Statistics. 14 August. Republic of the Philippines. Available at http://mgb.gov.ph/attachments/article/162/MIS%20August%202018 viewed 21 August 2019.

Department of the Environment and Natural Resources, 2019. Philippines Metallic Mineral Production Q1 2019 vs Q1 2019. Available at http://mgb.gov.ph/attachments/article/162/Q1%202019%20Metallic%20Mineral%20Production.pdf viewed 22 August 2019.

Denina, C., Lewis, B., 2017. Small mining companies shun London market after IPO flops. Reuters. 26 October 26. Available at https://www.reuters.com/article/us-mining-ipo/small-mining-companies-shun-london-market-after-ipo-flops-idUSKBN1CU26A viewed 22 August 2019.

Denoon, D. 2012. A Trial Separation: Australia and the Decolonisation of Papua New Guinea. ANU Press, Canberra.

Doyle, C., Wicks, C., Nally, F., 2007. Mining in the Philippines - Concerns and Conflicts: Report of a Fact Finding Mission to the Philippines July-August 2007. Society of St. Columban Fathers. Available at http://www.piplinks.org/system/files/Mining+in+the+Philippines+-+Concerns+and+Conflicts.pdf viewed 17 July 2019.

Duterte, R. R., 2016. The 2016 State of the Nation Address. 25 July. Available at: https://newsinfo.inquirer.net/799060/full-text-president-rodrigo-duterte-first-sona-state-nation-address-2016 viewed 10 September 2019.

Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative, n.d. Australia. Available at https://eiti.org/supporter/australia viewed 1 August 2019.

Gereffi, G., Fernandez-Stark, K., 2016. Global Value Chain Analysis: A Primer. July. Center on Globalization, Governance and Competitiveness at the Social Science Research Institute. Duke. Available at https://gvcc.duke.edu/wp-content/uploads/Duke_CGGC_Global_Value_Chain_GVC_Analysis_Primer_2nd_Ed_2016.pdf viewed 10 September 2019.

Gereffi, G., Humphrey, J., Sturgeon, T., 2005. The governance of global value chains. Review of International Political Economy 12 (1), 78-104. DOI: 10.1080/09692290500049805

Geronimo, J. Y., 2016. 20 mining firms recommended for suspension – DENR. Rappler. 27 September. Available at https://www.rappler.com/nation/147439-result-mining-firms-audit-denr viewed 9 July 2019.

Go, M., 2002. Australia's Western Mining leaves RP. Philstar. 5 October. Available at https://www.philstar.com/business/2002/10/05/178588/australia146s-western-mining-leaves-rp viewed 17 July 2019.

Goodman, C., 2015. Overseas Investments of Australian Companies: Trade and Investment Note. April. Austrade Economics, The Australian Government.

Goodland, R., Wicks, C., 2008. Philippines: Mining or Food? Case Study 5. Working Group on Mining in the Philippines. London. Available at http://www.piplinks.org/miningorfood.html viewed 1 August 2019.

Grant Thornton, 2009. Survey of Junior Mining and Exploration Companies. Available at https://www.grantthornton.com.au/globalassets/1.-member-firms/australian-website/publications/gtal_2009_er_jumex_survey.pdf viewed 10 July 2019.

Hatcher P., 2012. Taming risks in Asia: the World Bank Group and new mining regimes. Journal of Contemporary Asia 42(3), 427-446. DOI: 10.1080/00472336.2012.687630

Holden, W. N., Jacobson, R. D., 2007. Ecclesiastical opposition to nonferrous metals mining in the Philippines: neoliberalism encounters liberation theology. Asian Studies Review 31, 133-154. https://doi.org/10.1080/10357820701373291

Holden, W. N., Jacobson, R. D., 2012. Mining and Natural Hazard Vulnerability in the Philippines: Digging to Development or Digging to Disaster? Anthem Press London, New York and Delhi.

Holden, W., Nadeau, K., Jacobson, R. D., 2011. Exemplifying accumulations by dispossession: mining and indigenous people in the Philippines. Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography. 93(2), 141-161. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-0467.2011.00366.x .

Katz, J., Pietrobelli, C., 2018. Natural resource based growth, global value chains and domestic capabilities in the mining industry. Resources Policy 58, 11-20. DOI: 10.1016/j.resourpol.2018.02.001

Knierzinger, J., 2014. The socio-political implications of bauxite mining in Guinea: a commodity chain approach. The Extractive Industries and Society 1, 20-27.

Leighton Asia, 2008. Local experience brings mining contracts. Insite: The Leighton Asia Magazine. 2. Available at https://www.cimic.com.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0015/12507/LeightonAsiaMagazineApril08.pdf

Lansang, L. G. F., 2011. NGOs, coalition building and the campaign for a minerals management policy in the Philippines. Philippines Political Science Journal 32 (55): 127-166. DOI: 10.1080/01154451.2011.9723534.

Lusterio-Rico, R. R., 2013. Globalization and local communities: the mining experience in a Southern Luzon, Philippines province. Philippine Political Science Journal 34 (1), 48-61. DOI:10.1080/01154451.2013.789168

Lopez, S., 1992. Isles of Gold: A History of Mining in the Philippines. Oxford University Press, Singapore.

Manila Times, 2016. OceanaGold confident of passing mining audit. 25 July. Available at https://www.manilatimes.net/oceanagold-confident-of-passing-mining-audit/275962/ viewed 7 August 2019.

Martin, S., Vettori, L., McLeod, J., 2007. Mining Ombudsman Case Study Report: Didipio Gold and Copper Mine. Oxfam: Melbourne.

Mayer, F., Phillips, N., 2017. Outsourcing governance: states and the politics of a 'global value chain world'. New Political Economy 22 (2), 134-152. DOI: 10.1080/13563467.2016.1273341

Medusa Mining Limited, 2006. Annual Report. 22 September. Available at http://www.annualreports.com/Company/Medusa-Mining-Limited viewed 14 August 2019.

Medusa Mining Limited, 2018. Medusa Annual Report 2018. 27 September. Available at https://www.medusamining.com.au/investors/results-and-reports-2

McKenzie, N., 2008. Sydney Morning Herald. 28 March. https://www.smh.com.au/national/mine-guard-to-be-charged-over-village-shooting-20080514-2e13.html viewed 5 August 2019.

OceanaGold Corporation, 2008. OceanaGold Corporation Annual Report 2008. OceanaGold Corporation. 31 December 2008. https://www.oceanagold.com/investor-centre/corporate-reports/#1495763450543-c66eec58-e55e viewed 17 July 2019.

OceanaGold Corporation, 2017a. 2017 Fact Book. OceanaGold Corporation. 15 June. Available at https://www.oceanagold.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/OGC-FACT-BOOK-2017-WEB.pdf viewed 17 July 2019.

OceanaGold Corporation, 2017b. OceanaGold provides update on Philippines mining operations. 14 February. Available at https://www.oceanagold.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/170214-OceanaGold-DENR-Show-Cause-Order-News-Release-FINAL.pdf viewed 17 July 2019.

OceanaGold Corporation, 2017c. Management Discussion and Analysis for the third quarter ended September 30, 2017. 1 October. Available at https://www.oceanagold.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/171026-Q3-2017-MDA.pdf viewed 24 August 2019.

OceanaGold Corporation, 2019a. Company to appeal provincial ruling denying injunction at Didipio. Available at https://www.oceanagold.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/Company-files-application-for-injunction-to-ensure-continued-operations-at-Didipio.pdf viewed 7 August 2019.

OceanaGold Corporation, 2019b Company files application for injunction to ensure continued operation and Didipio. Available at https://www.oceanagold.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/Company-files-application-for-injunction-to-ensure-continued-operations-at-Didipio.pdf viewed 7 August 2019.

OceanaGold Corporation, 2019c. Management Discussion and Results First Quarter 2019. 29 April. Available at https://www.oceanagold.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/OceanaGold-Q1-2019-MDA.pdf viewed 8 August 2019.

OceanaGold, n.d. Small business development. Available at https://www.oceanagold.com/sustainability/communities/our-priorities/small-business-development/ viewed 7 August 2019.

OECD, n.d. Workbook: OECD DAC Aid at a Glance https://public.tableau.com/views/OECDDACAidataglancebyrecipient_new/Recipients?:embed=y&:display_count=yes&:showTabs=y&:toolbar=no?&:showVizHome=no viewed 2 August 2019.

Orway Mineral Consultants, n.d. Projects world map. Available at https://orway.com.au/projects-world-map/ https://orway.com.au/projects-world-map/). Viewed 9 July 2019.

Oskarsson, P., Lahiri-Dutt, K., 2019. India's resource (inter)nationalism: overseas mining investments shaped by domestic conditions. The Extractive Industries and Society 6, 747-755. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2018.11.006

Padilla, C., 2016. Privilege Speech of Rep. Padilla (PS049) to the House of Representatives, Republic of the Philippines. Available at http://www.congress.gov.ph/legisdocs/basic_16/PS049_Rep.%20Padilla.pdf viewed 15 July 2019.

Parker, R., Cox, S., Thompson, P., 2018. Financialization and value-based control: lessons from the Australian mining supply chain. Economic Geography 94 (1), 49-67. DOI: 10.1080/00130095.2017.1330118

Perante, L., 2016. OceanaGold shows how much 'We care'. BusinessMirror, 3 December. Available at https://businessmirror.com.ph/2016/12/03/oceanagold-shows-how-much-we-care/ viewed 7 August 2019.

Perante, L., 2017 OceanaGold back veggie production in Didipio. BusinessMirror, 26 February. Available at https://businessmirror.com.ph/2017/02/28/oceanagold-to-produce-veggies-near-mining-village/ viewed 7 August 2019.

Pietrobelli, C., Martin, A., Olivari, J., 2018. Innovation in mining value chains: new evidence from Latin America. Resources Policy 58, 1-10. Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resourpol.2018.05.010

Porter, I., 2014. Letter to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and Trade and Investment. Australian-New Zealand Chamber of Commerce Philippines. May. Available at http://anzcham.com/letter-to-minister-of-foreign-affairs-and-trade-and-investment/ viewed 15 July 2019.

Qian, Y., Ralescu, D.A., Zhang, D., 2019. Tha analysis of factors affecting global gold prices. Resources Policy 64, 1-9. Article 101478. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resourpol.2019.101478

Randa, P., 2016. If elected, Duterte to allow 'responsible' mining. Rappler, 4 February. Available at https://www.rappler.com/nation/politics/elections/2016/121343-rodrigo-duterte-responsible-mining viewed 9 July 2019.

Robb, A., 2014. Makati Business Club. Office of Andrew Robb, Minister for Trade and Investment. 21 February 2014. https://trademinister.gov.au/speeches/Pages/2014/ar_sp_140221.aspx?w=O%2F%2FeXE%2BIYc3HpsIRhVl0XA%3D%3D viewed 17 July 2019.

Rovillos, R.D., Tauli-Corpuz, V., 2012. Development, power, identity politics in the Philippines. In: Gomez, E. T., Sawyer, S. (Eds.) Politics of Resource Extraction. Palgrave Macmillian, Houndsmills and New York.

Rudd, K., 2011. Philippines-Australia Ministerial Meeting: Joint ministerial statement. Australian Government. Canberra https://foreignminister.gov.au/releases/Pages/2011/kr_mr_110616a.aspx?w=GYLX0mNSz4nLQKYuPOSgLQ%3D%3D viewed 12 July 2019.

Satchwell, I., Redden J., 2016. Redefining Australian Mining: Understanding the New Global Footprint. International Mining for Development Centre.

Scott-Kemmis, D., 2015. What About Those METS?: Leveraging Australia's Mining Equipment, Technology and Services Sector. Minerals Council of Australia

Serapio Jr, M., Dela Cruz, E., 2018. UPDATE 2-Philippines says 23 mines passed review, easing worry over nickel supply. Reuters, 31 June. Available at https://www.reuters.com/article/philippines-mining/update-2-philippines-says-23-mines-passed-review-easing-worry-over-nickel-supply-idUSL4N1TN296 viewed 9 June 2019.

Shabalala, Z., 2016. Cost-conscious major miners look to agility of junior explorers. Reuters. Available at https://www.reuters.com/article/us-mining-exploration-juniors/cost-conscious-major-miners-look-to-agility-of-junior-explorers-idUSKCN11Q17A viewed 17 July 2019 viewed 17 July 2019.

Sing, J., 2015. Regulating mining resource investments towards sustainable development: the case of Papua New Guinea. The Extractive Industries and Society 2, 124-131.

Spiegel, S.J., 2014. Rural place-making, globalization and the extractive sector: insights from gold mining areas in Kratie and Ratanakiri, Cambodia. Journal of Rural Studies 36, 300-310. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2014.09.007

Sydney Morning Herald 2007a. Aussie miners in mini stampede on TSX. 30 September 2007. https://www.smh.com.au/business/aussie-miners-in-mini-stampede-on-tsx-20070930-gdr8cj.html viewed 10 July.

Sydney Morning Herald 2007b. Pelican inks Romblon agreement with BHP. Sydney Morning Herald. 21 September. Available at https://www.smh.com.au/business/pelican-inks-romblon-agreement-with-bhp-20070921-104i.html viewed 16 July 2019.

Taylor, S., Nickel, R., 2017. With money in their pockets, prospects improve for small miners. Reuters. 4 March. Available at https://www.reuters.com/article/us-mining-conference/with-money-in-their-pockets-prospects-improve-for-small-miners-idUSKBN16A279 viewed 12 July 2019.

Tweddell, B., 2012. SP120227 - PANZ Business Forum - Opening Remarks by Ambassador Bill Tweddell. Australian Embassy The Philippines. Manila. 27 February. https://philippines.embassy.gov.au/mnla/Speech120227.html viewed 12 July 2019.

Verbrugge, B., 2014. Capital interests: a historical analysis of the transformation of small-scale gold mining in Compostela Valley province, Southern Philippines. The Extractive Industries and Society 1 (1), 86-95. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2014.01.004

Waters, J., 2009. Human rights probe into Australian miner. Australian Broadcasting Commission, 21 October. Available at https://www.abc.net.au/pm/content/2009/s2720488.htm viewed 6 August 2019.

Wetzlmaier, M., 2012. Cultural impacts of mining in Indigenous peoples' ancestral domains in the Philippines. ASEAS – Austrian Journal of South-East Asian Studies 5 (2), 335-344. DOI 10.4232/10.ASEAS-5.2-9

World Bank, n.d. Extractives Global Programmatic Support (EGPS) - Multi-Donor Trust Fund. https://www.worldbank.org/en/programs/egps viewed 2 August 2019.

Wurfel, D., 2006. Mining and the environment in the Philippines: the limits on civil society in a weak state. Philippine Studies 54 (1), 3-40. DOI: https://www.jstor.org/stable/42633861