PAX SILICA / NEW CLARK CITY / REVISED DOCUMENT REVIEW

Pax Silica in New Clark City

What the published agreements, original proposal, environmental certificate, and later records establish about the planned industrial hub.

- **A specific written exchange exists.**
  The April documents include a land proposal and conditional US acceptance. They leave the precise boundary and an appropriate lease agreement to be settled.
- **Data centers appear in the international documents.**
  Later officials exclude them from the planned local manufacturing hub. The distinction is between documents, dates, and geographic scope.
- **The environmental certificate has specific limits.**
  The published 2019 certificate covers land development and requires individual locator clearances. It does not clear every future industrial facility.

Evidence cutoff: October 27, 2026. Revised after reviewing the original BOI downloads, the environmental certificate and annexes, water procurement records, and additional official statements.

Prepared by MayonAI. The report assesses the evidence without recommending approval or rejection. Numbered references identify documents and reporting; citations link to the original publishers.

01 / THE PUBLIC RECORD

Three different things share one name

Much of the confusion begins when people use Pax Silica to mean the international initiative, the planned New Clark City hub, and any technology investment in the surrounding area.

INTERNATIONAL INITIATIVE

Pax Silica

Cooperation on technology supply chains, including critical minerals, semiconductors, advanced manufacturing, and computing infrastructure.

PROPOSED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT

The industrial hub

A planned development on roughly 1,620 hectares in New Clark City, Capas, Tarlac. Officials describe advanced manufacturing activities.

BOI publishes four relevant PDFs: the Pax Silica Declaration, BCDA's April 9 proposal, the US reply of April 16, and an AI partnership package signed on June 25. All four have now been downloaded and read. The file named Pax Silica is the US reply, rather than another copy of the declaration. [1]

The third category is the wider New Clark City estate. A project elsewhere in that estate does not automatically belong to the proposed hub. A statement about all Pax Silica partners does not establish what will be built on a particular parcel.

The location also matters. The proposed hub is in Tarlac. Clark Freeport, Pampanga, and New Clark City belong to a connected regional economy, but their names do not identify the same site.

The finding

A claim about Pax Silica needs a defined scope. Before accepting a statement about land, jobs, utilities, or data centers, identify the exact development and document it describes.

Sources: BOI document collection [1]; PNA account of the proposed local development [2].

02 / THE PUBLIC RECORD

What the April exchange actually says

The written record goes beyond an announcement of interest. It contains a specific Philippine offer and a US reply accepting that offer subject to further conditions.

BCDA's letter of April 9 proposes a coordination office on approximately 4,000 acres. It offers a two year grace period on rent as a Philippine contribution. Rent from the third year onward is left for another agreement. The proposal does not specify a total lease duration. [1b, PDF pages 2 to 3]

The US reply dated April 16 accepts the proposed two year arrangement subject to confirmation of the exact location and boundaries and conclusion of an appropriate lease agreement. It also calls for separate arrangements on funding, construction, and operations, subject to US requirements and available funds. [1c]

Point	What the documents establish
Free rent	Two proposed years, rather than a stated permanent exemption
Later rent	To be discussed and set separately
Total duration	Not specified in the published proposal
Boundary	To be confirmed and described in a supplemental agreement
End of lease	Proposed reversion of the property and fixed improvements to the Philippine government, absent renewal

The finding

A documented offer and conditional written acceptance exist. Describing the record as merely unsigned discussion would omit them. Describing this exchange as the completed operating lease would omit its conditions.

The proposal refers to a map as Annex A, but the four page BOI copy contains no map. This identifies a gap in that particular file; it does not establish that no map exists elsewhere.

Primary sources: BCDA proposal, April 9 [1b]; US reply, April 16 [1c].

03 / THE PUBLIC RECORD

Later agreements and plans are separate milestones

A declaration, a conditional offer, a local lease, a financing commitment, and a facility permit establish different things. They must be identified individually.

Date	Record examined	Status it establishes
April 16	Pax Silica Declaration and US reply	Broad cooperation and conditional acceptance of the land offer
June 25	Signed declaration accompanying the AI Opportunity Partnership	A further statement of international cooperation
July 23	Official BCDA and DICT briefing	Proposed industry mix, utility estimates, and phased timetable
September 4	BCDA community census release	Census validation and engagement for the proposed manufacturing park
October 13	Palace update reported by PNA	Local partnership details still under discussion
October 26	GMA report of House Bill 11758	A proposed legislative framework, not an enacted law

The June package is stored in a July upload directory. Its signed declaration gives June 25 as the date. The date inside the document takes precedence over the upload path. [1d, PDF page 2]

PNA's October 13 report says the local agreement was expected before the end of 2026. November also appears in reporting. Both describe targets rather than a confirmed signing event. [2]

On October 26, GMA reported that lawmakers had filed House Bill 11758 to establish an Advanced Industries Zone and authority. Its proposed incentives and obligations should not be presented as rights already enacted. [13]

The finding

The published April exchange and June partnership coexist with later local negotiations. The revised review did not locate an executed final operating lease or master development agreement that settles the remaining local terms.

Sources: BOI documents [1]; July briefing [9]; BCDA [12]; PNA [2]; GMA legislative report [13].

04 / THE PUBLIC RECORD

Data center references have a documented origin

Data centers appear in both the April Pax Silica Declaration and the June AI partnership statement. Their presence in the public debate cannot be dismissed as invented. [1a, PDF page 2; 1d, PDF page 1]

The April declaration discusses trusted networks, including data centers. The June statement encourages private industry investment in the next generation of data centers and access to AI computing. Both describe broader cooperation. Neither identifies an approved data center inside the proposed New Clark City parcel.

There is also an earlier local reference. During the official July 23 briefing, BCDA discussed inviting data centers and said one or two might form part of a development dominated by manufacturing. [9]

By September 21, DTI's stated local description excluded data centers and emphasized manufacturing for AI and semiconductor supply chains. [3]

The finding

The public descriptions changed, and their scopes differ. International support for data center investment is documented. Earlier local consideration is documented. Later official exclusion from the planned local hub is also documented.

Those facts do not establish an approved data center at the site. They do explain why an earlier report might use a description that conflicts with a later assurance.

For local readers, the next decisive record is a defined activity plan tied to the parcel and its approvals. An industrial factory, a computing campus, and a mineral processing facility have different utility, waste, employment, and transport requirements.

Correction standard. Check what a statement covered and when it was made before classifying it as misinformation.

Primary documents: BOI downloads [1a, 1d]; July briefing [9]. Later position: GMA report of DTI statements [3].

05 / THE PUBLIC RECORD

Jobs and investment figures are projections

A forecast describes a possible future. A commitment describes an obligation. An operating result describes something that has happened. Reports about the hub often contain the first category.

PNA reported BCDA estimates of USD40 billion to USD70 billion in investment and 130,000 to 190,000 jobs once the project is fully developed. These figures are attributed projections, rather than recorded investment receipts or existing employment. [2]

BCDA discussed these figures as full development potential, including a longer timetable, in the July briefing. The revised audit did not locate the underlying economic model needed to independently reproduce the ranges. [9]

How to read an employment claim

Question	Why it matters
Is this construction or continuing employment?	Temporary building work and operating jobs have different durations
Are jobs direct, supplier based, or estimated through wider spending?	Adding categories can inflate a headline or count activity twice
What year and level of occupancy are assumed?	Full development can differ greatly from the first operating phase
What skills, wages, and recruitment conditions apply?	A regional total does not establish access for nearby residents

The finding

The evidence supports an ambition to attract investment and employment. It does not yet establish the scale of delivered local benefits.

For a Pampanga business or a Tarlac job seeker, useful evidence would include named operating tenants, actual procurement opportunities, vacancies, qualification requirements, and training arrangements. Those details would show how a regional opportunity reaches a particular worker or supplier.

This is also why the hub cannot be counted as a direct replacement for BPO jobs. Industrial hiring depends on occupations and qualifications that must be matched separately.

Source for the headline projections: PNA, October 13 [2]. The comparison questions are MayonAI's analytical framework.

06 / THE PUBLIC RECORD

Utility estimates describe a future operating scale

The original July briefing gives the utility estimates a clearer context. BCDA described around 3 gigawatts at full development and an initial estimate of 65 million to 90 million liters of daily industrial water demand. [9]

These are planning statements, rather than measurements from operating facilities. Later reporting uses slightly different water ranges. The date and source should accompany any number.

What the units establish

Gigawatts measure power. Annual energy use depends on how much capacity operates and for how long. A full year at a constant 3 gigawatts would equal about 26.3 terawatt hours, but that calculation assumes continuous full use. It is not an observed consumption figure or an independently verified operating forecast.

Water withdrawal, consumption, treatment, reuse, and return flows also differ. A daily requirement cannot establish the effect on another user without identifying the source, season, and operating arrangements.

What BCDA proposed

The July briefing discussed surface water harvesting and proposed power projects and studies. These were intended supply measures. The statements do not establish that the final systems are financed, permitted, built, or operating.

CNA's October account includes local concerns about river availability in the dry season and BCDA's position that the development would avoid competition with community supplies. Those are attributed positions requiring a common source and demand assessment. [6]

The finding

The estimates establish the scale being discussed. **They do not independently prove either an unavoidable shortage or zero effect on existing users.** The necessary test is a phased water balance and power supply plan covering normal operation, dry periods, and failures.

Sources: July 23 official briefing [9]; CNA, October 16 [6]. Energy conversion is MayonAI arithmetic, with the full use assumption stated.

07 / THE PUBLIC RECORD

Water procurement has advanced beyond a verbal proposal

Public BCDA records show an actual procurement process for New Clark City's wider water and wastewater system. That is a more concrete development than a general statement that supply is being studied.

The comparative invitation records an unsolicited proposal received on January 29, 2026 from Korea Water Resources Corporation and Maynilad. It describes a twenty five year concession, subject to extension, and a competitive challenge process. [11a, PDF page 2]

The published challenger instructions contain an indicative schedule extending into 2027. They distinguish financing, construction, public utility assets, and operating arrangements. The document also says the schedule can change. [11b, Sections 1 and 1.3]

A number that can easily be misread

The instructions require bidders to demonstrate past experience with deep wells, underground dams, and treatment facilities of stated capacities. Those figures are qualification thresholds. Reading them as the amount of water promised to Pax Silica would be incorrect. [11b, Section 6.2]

The document defines comparable underground dam technology as subsurface storage or groundwater flow control, and distinguishes it from conventional surface dams. It therefore cannot be summarized simply as a finished rainwater reservoir design.

The finding

Documented procurement progress exists for the wider estate. It does not establish a completed or dedicated Pax Silica supply system. A final operating assessment still needs the chosen design, extraction permissions, allocations, demand assumptions, and contractual commitments.

This distinction matters to households, farms, and prospective industrial tenants. It recognizes work already underway while keeping the project boundary and delivery stage clear.

Primary sources: BCDA water invitation and challenger instructions [11]. This review examines their procurement scope and relevant requirements; it does not audit every procurement clause.

08 / THE PUBLIC RECORD

The environmental certificate sets explicit limits

The actual New Clark City environmental certificate is publicly obtainable. Its text provides a stronger answer than relying solely on reports about its existence.

Certificate ECC OL R03 2019 0304, issued on June 24, 2019, covers a 9,450 hectare land development project in Bamban and Capas, Tarlac. BCDA reproduces the certificate and annexes in its published bidding documents. [10, original PDF pages 86 to 95]

Its listed components include roads, housing, utilities, administrative and government facilities, and open spaces. It does not list a specific semiconductor factory, mineral processing plant, or data center as an approved component.

What the conditions say

1. **Restriction 25:** changes to approved components are subject to new environmental assessment requirements, and individual locators must secure individual certificates before project development.
2. **Restriction 26:** natural waterways must not be diverted and Water Code easements must be observed.
3. **Restriction 28:** a water management program must include rainwater harvesting, a retention pond, and upstream reforestation.
4. **Annex B:** recommendations include securing a certificate of non overlap through NCIP and implementing a resettlement action plan. These recommendations are not proof of completed compliance.

The covering letter also states that other necessary permits must be obtained before implementation.

The finding

The estate certificate exists and contains meaningful conditions. It is not a blanket clearance for every future industrial use. This review did not establish the current compliance status of each condition or locate a complete current register of locator approvals.

DENR's August 26 hearing remarks remain relevant as a dated account of project specific assessment status. They cannot alone establish the position on every later date. [4]

Primary source: 2019 certificate and annexes [10]. Hearing report: GMA [4].

09 / THE PUBLIC RECORD

Relocation is now part of the public record

BCDA's own September release and the October relocation accounts show that community impacts are part of project preparation. They support a more precise account than either a blanket denial of affected residents or an unverified final count.

On September 4, BCDA said it was updating a community census in Sitio Sapang Kawayan with NCIP. The release identifies validation and future assistance as purposes. It publishes no final household total or signed consent determination. [12]

GMA reported on October 19 that BCDA described a general understanding with communities and plans for about fifty homes elsewhere within New Clark City. The report cited an estimated housing cost of PHP25 million to PHP30 million. These are attributed plans and estimates. [8]

BusinessMirror's account that day described an agreement in principle, while reporting that household counts, budget, and eligibility rules remained unsettled. It also said the proposed housing would not necessarily transfer land ownership and that a request for alternative farmland remained under review. [5]

Where the reports need careful reading

One account presents the farmland offer more firmly than the other. This review did not obtain an executed relocation agreement that resolves the difference. It therefore does not describe farmland allocation, ownership, or full compensation as settled.

Mongabay reported Aeta land claims and BCDA's opposing position. Its linked mapping resource is a map image, which this revision inspected. It illustrates claimed spatial relationships; it supplies neither a household dataset nor a legal determination of the boundary. [7]

The finding

Relocation planning is documented. Its adequacy, coverage, legal terms, and acceptance by every affected household are not established by the material reviewed.

Moving within the same estate still involves a move. Accepting a housing design does not by itself demonstrate agreement to every term affecting land, livelihood, or compensation. These are separate matters requiring separate records.

Sources: BCDA census release [12]; GMA and BusinessMirror [8, 5]; Mongabay [7]. No household survey or land adjudication was conducted for this report.

10 / THE PUBLIC RECORD

Sovereignty claims need the final legal text

The April BCDA proposal explicitly refers to Philippine laws. It provides for reversion of the property and fixed improvements to the Philippine government when the lease ends without renewal. Its status and access provision calls for consultation consistent with Philippine laws; it does not expressly grant diplomatic immunity. [1b, PDF pages 3 to 4]

On September 21, DTI said the development would remain Philippine sovereign territory, with no diplomatic immunity, and that sovereignty language would appear in the governance framework. Rodolfo also said immunity had been discussed early and then removed from consideration. [3]

The April 16 US reply conditionally accepts the proposed arrangement and calls for an appropriate lease. Reading those documents establishes the exchange and its unresolved terms, rather than the legal contents of a later unexamined agreement. [1c]

Questions that should remain distinct

1. Who owns the land?
2. Who leases, develops, and operates it?
3. Which courts and regulators have authority?
4. What tax or investment incentives apply?
5. What remedies exist if a party breaches the agreement?

The answer to one question does not supply the answers to the others. A lease description alone cannot establish a transfer of national territory. Nor can a general assurance establish the content of every contractual clause.

The finding

The published exchange does not expressly transfer sovereignty or grant diplomatic immunity. The proposal invokes Philippine law and retains later agreements for key terms. The later DTI position rejects immunity. These findings do not constitute a legal opinion on the enforceability of the exchange or any subsequent instrument.

The next legal review should compare any final agreement with the actual April texts, identify changed terms, and examine the authority for those changes. Calling all criticism fabricated or describing the proposal as an established transfer of national territory both exceed the documents reviewed.

Sources: GMA, September 21 [3]; BOI document collection [1].

11 / THE PUBLIC RECORD

How to distinguish an error from an open question

A useful correction states exactly what a claim gets wrong. It also recognizes when the evidence supports a concern without establishing its predicted outcome.

Claim or inference	Finding from this review
Data centers were never mentioned in the official record	Contradicted by the April declaration, June statement, and July briefing [1a, 1d, 9]
Those references establish an approved data center on the local site	They do not identify such an approval; later officials exclude data centers locally [1, 3]
Nothing specific was offered or accepted	The April proposal and conditional US reply contain a specific exchange [1b, 1c]
The published offer fixes permanent free rent	It proposes two years; later rent and total duration are not fixed [1b, 1c]
The announced jobs already exist	Confuses a full development projection with an operating result [2]
Nobody could need to relocate	Inconsistent with October reporting of BCDA's own plans [5, 8]
Every affected person has accepted final terms	Not demonstrated by the reviewed records [5, 8]
The estate certificate clears every industrial facility	Restriction 25 requires additional assessment and individual locator clearances [10]
Water procurement proves a working dedicated supply	The records establish a procurement process, not completed delivery [11]

Read the date, attribution, and boundary together. A historical statement can be accurate yet unsuitable as a description of a later plan. An international statement can cover activities excluded from a particular local site.

The findings concern what claims the evidence supports. They do not determine anyone's intent or honesty.

12 / THE PUBLIC RECORD

The documents that would answer the next questions

The next useful update will come from records that make the proposal testable. Repeating investment targets or broad warnings cannot settle questions about implementation.

Question	Evidence that would answer it
What will actually be built?	Final site boundary, tenant list, phased plan, and facility descriptions
What changed after the April exchange?	Executed lease and development instruments, annexes, and comparison with the published offer and reply
What will residents receive?	Validated affected household records, agreements, tenure terms, and livelihood provisions
Will water remain available in the dry season?	Source specific demand and supply assessment, existing users, permits, and operating rules
What power supply will serve the facilities?	Generation and connection arrangements, schedules, and responsibility for costs
Which jobs are available locally?	Employers, occupations, wages, qualifications, hiring dates, and training access
Which environmental conditions have been met?	Compliance reports for the 2019 certificate and identified approvals for individual facilities

For local businesses, these records would distinguish a procurement opportunity from a promotional estimate. For residents, they would make assistance and safeguards concrete. For public agencies, they would provide a basis for explaining implementation and tracking results.

What the evidence supports today

The record establishes signed cooperation documents, a specific land offer, conditional US acceptance, an existing estate environmental certificate, water procurement activity, and community engagement. It also records continuing local implementation discussions and questions about effects on existing residents and resources.

It supports direct corrections to several public claims. It does not yet establish the full balance of delivered benefits and costs.

The document list is MayonAI's proposed framework for follow up. It is not an assertion that every listed record is legally required or unavailable elsewhere.

13 / THE PUBLIC RECORD

Primary documents and reading locations

The revision uses the actual text of the documents below. BOI's Download controls worked even when direct requests failed and the PDF viewer appeared blank. Scanned pages were read as images where text extraction failed.

[1] BOI public document collection. Open the document page and its Download controls. Four files were retrieved and read:

1. **[1a] Pax Silica Declaration.** Two pages. The BOI label identifies April 16, 2026. Data centers appear on PDF page 2. The published copy has signature redactions.
2. **[1b] BCDA proposal of April 9, 2026.** Four pages including the embassy cover note. Proposed terms appear on PDF pages 2 to 4. The map referenced as Annex A is absent from this downloaded file.
3. **[1c] US reply of April 16, 2026.** One page, published under the filename Pax Silica 1. It accepts the offer subject to further conditions.
4. **[1d] AI Opportunity Partnership package.** Two scanned pages. The signing declaration gives June 25, 2026. Its July upload path is not the signing date.

[9] PCO briefing, July 23, 2026. Official transcript and official briefing video. Relevant transcript passages were read through the web research service; direct browser access encountered security verification.

[10] New Clark City environmental certificate, June 24, 2019. BCDA bidding document Part 2, PDF pages 86 to 95. Includes the covering letter, certificate, conditions, and annexes. A ten page extract is preserved with this report.

[11] BCDA water procurement records. [11a] Comparative invitation and [11b] Challenger instructions. Read for scope, indicative schedule, and bidder qualifications; not a completed engineering or contract audit.

[12] BCDA community census release, September 4, 2026. BCDA and NCIP update community census in Capas. Official account of validation and engagement, without a final published household total.

Seven source PDFs were reviewed. Citations link to the original publishers. Publisher redactions are retained. An extracted certificate is identified as an extract rather than presented as a newly issued document.

14 / THE PUBLIC RECORD

Reporting, verification, and revision

The news accounts below are used for attributed statements, interviews, and later developments. They do not substitute for a permit, a signed household agreement, or an engineering study.

[2] PNA: Palace signing of Pax Silica framework eyed before year end. October 13, 2026. Agreement status and BCDA projections. The status statement was also checked against the official Palace transcript.

[3] GMA: Pax Silica agreement to include clause affirming Philippine sovereignty. September 21, 2026. Later DTI position on immunity and activity mix.

[4] GMA: DENR says no environmental impact assessment yet for Pax Silica hub in Tarlac. August 26, 2026. Dated hearing account.

[5] BusinessMirror: BCDA eyes 100 hectares for New Clark farmers. October 19, 2026. Relocation, tenure, and unresolved terms.

[6] CNA: Philippines eyes billions in investment from Pax Silica tech hub, but farmers fear for their livelihoods. October 16, 2026. Interviews and competing positions.

[7] Mongabay: Planned US tech hub in Philippines hit over environmental and Indigenous land concerns. September 23, 2026. Its linked community map was viewed separately; it is an illustration, not a household dataset or adjudication.

[8] GMA: BCDA estimates PHP30 million cost to relocate New Clark City settlers for Pax Silica. October 19, 2026. Housing and assistance proposals.

[13] GMA: Bill filed establishing ecozone for Pax Silica operations and other critical industries. October 26, 2026. The report identifies HB11758 as a proposal. The bill text was not located for clause review.

Verification date: October 27, 2026. Sources were read through the browser, downloaded documents, or the web research service as identified. Security challenges and blank viewers are access problems, not evidence that a document does not exist.

The review includes no fieldwork, household census, hydrological assessment, legal opinion, or confirmation of every current permit. Its remaining gaps concern specific records and compliance, rather than a general claim that the published documents cannot be read.