The following table shows the exchange rates between the Philippine peso and the U.S. dollar, expressed in Philippine pesos per U.S. dollar, for the periods indicated, based on the volume-weighted average exchange rate for each business day in each of the periods presented:

	Year Ended December 31,			
	Period End	Average(1)	High(2)	Low(3)
2010	Php43.81	Php45.10	Php42.52	Php46.98
2011	43.92	43.28	41.96	44.59
2012	41.08	42.14	40.86	44.25
2013	44.40	42.66	40.57	44.66
2014	44.74	44.45	43.64	44.87
2015 (through March 25, 2015)	44.77	44.39	44.05	45.06

Source: Philippine Dealing System Reference Rate

(1) *Calculated by using the average of the exchange rates on the last day of each month during the period.*
(2) *Highest exchange rate for the period.*
(3) *Lowest exchange rate for the period.*

	Month			
	Period End	Average(1)	High(2)	Low(3)
2014				
September	Php44.88	Php44.15	Php43.56	Php44.97
October	44.88	44.80	44.62	44.97
November	44.91	44.95	44.87	45.12
December	44.74	44.67	44.51	44.92
2015				
January	44.08	44.57	44.08	45.06
February	44.08	44.22	44.05	44.40
March (through March 25, 2015)	44.77	44.41	44.08	44.83

Source: Philippine Dealing System Reference Rate

(1) *Calculated by using the average of the exchange rates during the month.*
(2) *Highest exchange rate for the month.*
(3) *Lowest exchange rate for the month.*

This report contains conversions of Philippine peso amounts into U.S. dollars for your convenience. Unless otherwise specified, these conversions were made at the Philippine Dealing System Reference Rate as at December 31, 2014 of Php44.74 to US$1.00. You should not assume that such Philippine peso amounts represent such U.S. dollar amounts or could have been or could be converted into U.S. dollars at the rate indicated, or at any particular rate. As at March 25, 2015, the exchange rate quoted through the Philippine Dealing System was Php44.77 to US$1.00. Unless otherwise specified, the weighted average exchange rate of the Philippine peso to the U.S. dollar for a given year used in the following discussions in this report was calculated using the average of the daily exchange rates quoted through the Philippine Dealing System during the year.

Capitalization and Indebtedness

Not applicable.

Reasons for the Offer and Use of Proceeds

Not applicable.

Risk Factors

You should carefully consider all of the information in this annual report, including the risks and uncertainties described below. If any of the following risks actually occurs, it could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition or results of operations and the trading price of our ADSs could decline and you could lose all or part of your investment.

Risks Relating to Us

We face competition from well-established telecommunications operators and may face competition from new entrants, which may have a material adverse effect on our business, results of operations, financial condition and prospects.

In 1993, the Philippine government liberalized the Philippine telecommunications industry and opened the Philippine telecommunications market to new entrants. At present, following the acquisition of the Digitel Group by PLDT, the number of major players in the industry has been reduced to three LECs, eight IGF providers and two cellular operators in the country. Many entrants into the Philippine telecommunications market have entered into strategic alliances with foreign telecommunications companies, which provide them access to technology and funding support, as well as service innovations and marketing strategies. We cannot assure you that the number of providers of telecommunications services will not increase in the future or that competition for customers will not cause our cellular and fixed line subscribers to switch to other operators, or otherwise cause us to increase our marketing expenditures or reduce our rates, resulting in a reduction in our profitability.

Competition in the cellular telecommunications industry is particularly intense, with network coverage, quality of service, product offerings, and price dictating subscriber preference. Recently, operators have grown more aggressive in maintaining and growing market share, especially in light of a maturing market. Our principal cellular competitor, Globe, has introduced aggressive marketing campaigns and promotions, such as unlimited voice and SMS offers. In the meantime, Smart and DMPI are also continually innovating their product and service offerings and conducting promotions, which may positively affect their cellular revenue growth. Due to competition from Globe, as well as over-the-top, or OTT, services, we cannot assure you that the additional marketing expenses incurred by us for these promotions, potential loss of customers, decrease in rates or the increase in capital expenditures required for our continued capacity expansion will not, in each case, have a material adverse effect on our business, results of operations, financial condition or prospects.

We are also facing growing competition from providers offering services using alternative wireless technologies and IP-based networks. Additionally, the Philippine Senate finance committee recommended an increase in the 2015 budget of Department of Science and Technology's Public *WiFi* Program with the aim of providing free public *WiFi* throughout the country starting 2015. We expect market saturation to continue to cause the wireless industry's customer growth rate to be moderate in comparison with historical growth rates, leading to increased competition for customers. We also expect that our customers' growing demand for data services will place constraints on our network capacity. This competition and our capacity issues will continue to put pressure on pricing and margins as companies compete for potential customers. Our ability to respond will depend, among other things, on continued improvement in network quality and customer service and effective marketing of attractive products and services. These efforts will involve significant expenses and require strategic management decisions on, and timely implementation of, equipment choices, network deployment and management, and service offerings.

The cellular telecommunications industry may not continue to grow.

The majority of our total revenues are currently derived from the provision of cellular services to customers in the Philippines. As a result, we depend on the continued development and growth of this industry in the Philippines. The cellular penetration rate in the country, however, has already reached an estimated 114% as at December 31, 2014, and thus the industry may well be considered mature, although the existence of subscribers owning multiple SIM cards results in this penetration rate being inflated to a certain extent. Further growth of the market depends on many factors beyond our control, including the continued introduction of new and enhanced cellular devices, the price levels of cellular handsets, consumer tastes and preferences, and the amount of disposable income of existing and potential subscribers. Any economic, technological or other developments resulting in a reduction in demand for cellular services or otherwise causing the Philippine cellular telecommunications industry to stop growing or reducing the rate of its growth, could materially harm our business, results of operations, financial condition and prospects.

Our results of operations have been, and may continue to be, adversely affected by competition in, and the introduction of new services which could put additional pressures on, the traditional international and national long distance services.

The international long distance business has historically been one of our major sources of revenue. However, due to competition, the reduction in international settlement rates that are paid to us by foreign telecommunications carriers for termination of international calls on our network, and the growing popularity of the so-called OTT service providers that offer social networking, instant messaging and VoIP services, revenues generated from our international long distance business have declined in recent years.

Revenues from international long distance services could further decline significantly in the future for a variety of reasons, such as:

- increases in competition from other domestic and international telecommunications providers;
- advances in technology;
- the continued popularity of alternative providers offering OTT services such as social networking, instant messaging, and internet telephony (also known as VoIP services); or
- other providers of broadband capacity.

The continued high cellular penetration rate in the Philippines and the prevalence of SMS have negatively impacted our national long distance business in recent years. Moreover, net settlement payments between PLDT and other foreign telecommunications carriers for origination and termination of international call traffic between the Philippines and other countries, which have been our predominant source of foreign currency revenues, have been declining in recent years. A continued decline in our foreign currency revenues could increase our exposure to risks from any possible future declines in the value of the Philippine peso against the U.S. dollar. As a result, we cannot assure you that we will be able to adequately increase our other revenues to make up for any adverse impact of a further decline in our net settlement payments. We cannot assure you that we can generate new revenue streams to fully offset the declines in our traditional fixed line long distance businesses, thus, our revenues and profitability could be materially reduced and our growth and prospects could suffer.

Failure to comply with the foreign ownership restrictions under the Philippine Constitution could result in monetary penalties or the revocation of our telecommunications license

Although we currently believe we are in compliance with the foreign ownership restrictions under the Philippine Constitution, if the Philippine SEC or the other relevant authorities in the Philippines determine otherwise, we could be subject to penalties.

Exceeding the foreign ownership restrictions imposed under the Philippine Constitution may subject the Company to (1) sanctions set out in Section 14 of the Philippine Foreign Investments Act of 1991, as amended, comprising a fine not exceeding (a) the lower of (x) 0.5% of the total paid in capital of the Company and (y) Php5 million, in the case of a corpornte entity, (b) Php200,000, in the case of the president of the Company or other responsible officers, and (c) Php100,000, in the case of other natural persons, which we refer to collectively as the Monetary Sanctions, and/or (2) the Philippine government commencing a *quo warranto* case in the name of the Republic of the Philippines against the Company to revoke the Company's franchise that permits the Company to engage in telecommunications activities.

While the law is still unsettled on this issue, we have been advised by our Philippine counsel that once a sufficient number of the Company's shares are issued or transferred to or are otherwise acquired by qualified Philippine nationals so as to result in the Company's foreign ownership percentage being in compliance with the foreign ownership restriction threshold, such a *quo warranto* case would not have merit, and if already initiated, would be subject to dismissal prior to the time that a judgment becomes final and executory. If an adverse decision becomes final and executory without the necessary transfer of shares having been made, the Company would have to secure a new franchise from the Philippine Congress (after the foreign ownership violation has been cured) if it still desires to engage in the telecommunications industry.

In the case of a violation of the foreign ownership restrictions, the Monetary Sanctions would continue to apply notwithstanding any curative issuance or transfer of shares to Philippine nationals.

Our business is significantly affected by governmental laws and regulations, including regulations in respect of our franchises, rates and taxes, and laws relating to anti-competitive practices and monopoly.

We operate our business under franchises, each of which is subject to amendment, termination or repeal by the Philippine Congress. Additionally, PLDT operates pursuant to various provisional authorities and CPCNs, which have been granted by the NTC and will expire between now and 2028. Some of PLDT's CPCNs and provisional authorities have already expired. However, PLDT filed applications for extension of these CPCNs and provisional authorities prior to their respective expiration dates and is therefore entitled to continue to conduct its business under its existing CPCNs and provisional authorities pending the NTC's decisions on these applications. Because PLDT filed the applications for extension on a timely basis, we expect that these applications will be granted. However, we cannot assure you that the NTC will grant these applications. Smart also operates its cellular, international long distance, national long distance and global mobile personal communications via satellite services as well as international private leased circuits pursuant to CPCNs, which will expire upon the expiration of its franchise. Smart's franchise is due to expire on March 27, 2017, 25 years after the date on which it was granted. DMPI's CPCN to operate and maintain a nationwide CMTS is for a period coterminous with the life of its existing franchise which is valid until December 11, 2027, 25 years after the date of its issuance.

The NTC also regulates the rates we are permitted to charge for services that have not yet been deregulated, such as local exchange services. We cannot assure you that the NTC will not impose additional obligations on us that could lead to the revocation of our licenses if not adhered to and/or to the reduction in our total revenues or profitability. In addition, the NTC could adopt changes to the regulations or implement additional guidelines governing our interconnection with other telecommunications companies or the rates and terms upon which we provide services to our customers. The occurrence of any of these changes could materially reduce our revenues and profitability.

The PLDT Group is also subject to a number of national and local taxes. We cannot assure you that the PLDT Group will not be subject to new, increased and/or additional taxes and that the PLDT Group would be able to impose or pass on additional charges or fees on its customers to compensate for the imposition of such taxes. HB No. 701 proposes to require all telecommunication companies to secure business permits and licenses from the local government where their respective cell sites are located. If this bill or any similar bills are enacted into law, such legislation could materially reduce our profitability and have a material adverse effect on our results of operations and financial condition. We cannot assure you that the PLDT Group will be able to impose additional charges or fees on its customers to compensate for the imposition of such taxes or charges, or for the loss of fees and/or charges.

Moreover, as one of the leading telecommunications service providers in the Philippines for fixed line, cellular and broadband services, we are subject to laws and regulations relating to anti-competitive practices and anti-monopoly. For example, Section 700 of NTC Memorandum Circular No. 8-9-95 requires us to seek the approval of the NTC with respect to rates of non-deregulated services in order to ensure that a healthy competitive environment is fostered within the industry. Also, Article II, Section 4 (g) of the Republic Act, or R.A., No. 7925 makes it the policy of the government to pursue a fair and reasonable interconnection of authorized public network operators and other providers of telecommunications services in order to achieve a viable, efficient, reliable and universal telecommunications services. The executive branch of the government has also exhibited strong interest in enforcing anti-competitive and anti-monopolistic measures with the signing by the President of the Philippines of Executive Order, or E.O., No. 45 on June 9, 2011. E.O. No. 45 designated the Department of Justice, or the DOJ, as the competition authority of the Philippines and established the Office for Competition under it to, among other things, investigate violations of competition laws and prosecute violators thereof. The DOJ’s Department Circular No. 11 implementing E.O. No. 45 took effect on March 1, 2013. While our business practices have not in the past been found to have violated any laws and regulations related to anti-competition and anti-monopoly, we cannot assure you that the relevant governmental regulators will not, in the future, find our business practices to have an anti-competitive effect on the Philippines telecommunications industry, nor can we assure you that we will not be found to have violated the relevant laws and regulations relating to anti-competition and anti-monopoly in the future. For example, prior to the acquisition of the Digitel Group, there were four major LECs (PLDT, Digitel, Innove Communications, Inc. and Bayan) and three cellular service providers (Smart, DMPI and Globe) in the Philippines. On October 26, 2011, we completed the acquisition of the Digitel Group, the operator of *Sun Cellular*, one of the two other major cellular service providers in the Philippines. As a result of the acquisition, the number of LECs and cellular service providers in the Philippines was reduced to three and two, respectively, leaving Globe as our sole major competitor in the cellular service market. In order to mitigate the apparent anti-competitive effect of the acquisition, we agreed, as part of the NTC’s decision to grant its consent for the acquisition, to divest ourselves of the frequency spectrum and associated licenses held by CURE, one of Smart’s subsidiaries. Any future expansion in our services, particularly in our cellular services, could subject us to additional conditions in the granting of our provisional authorities by the NTC and to increased regulatory scrutiny, which could harm our reputation and business, and which could have a material adverse effect on our growth and prospects. In addition, the occurrence of any such event could impose substantial costs or cause interruptions or considerable delays in the provision, development or expansion of our services. Delay or failure to receive any required franchises, licenses or regulatory approvals could result in the suspension of our services or abandonment of any planned expansions, thereby affecting our business, results of operations, financial condition and prospects.

The NTC may implement proposed changes in existing regulations and introduce new regulations, which may result in increased competition and/or changes in rates, each of which could have a material adverse effect on our revenues and profitability.

The NTC may regulate the rates and manner in which we operate and charge our customers.

On July 23, 2009 the NTC issued Memorandum Circular No. 05-07-2009 mandating cellular operators, including Smart and DMPI, to bill subscribers on a maximum six-second per pulse basis instead of the previous per minute basis. The NTC granted Smart and DMPI the provisional authority to charge new rates for the CMTS service and also directed Smart and DMPI to implement a six-second per pulse billing scheme on December 5, 2009. The implementation of this billing scheme is now pending with the Philippine Supreme Court after Smart and DMPI filed their petitions for review of the decision of the Court of Appeals on March 15, 2012 and March 12, 2012, respectively.

On October 24, 2011, the NTC issued Memorandum Circular No. 02-10-2011 directing the reduction of interconnection charges for SMS between two separate networks from Php0.35 to Php0.15 per SMS. The NTC has interpreted this circular to require a reduction in SMS rates charged to end users. Therefore, it initiated administrative cases against the mobile operators for the latter’s failure to implement reduced SMS charges. On November 20, 2012, the NTC rendered a decision directing Smart to reduce the retail price of users sending regular SMS to users on other networks from Php1.00 to Php0.80 or less; refund or reimburse its subscribers for the excess Php0.20 per off-network SMS; pay a fine of Php200 per day from December 1, 2011 until the date of compliance with the decision; and submit documents, records and reports pertaining to SMS sent to other networks. Smart filed a motion for reconsideration which was subsequently denied by the NTC in its resolution dated May 7, 2014. Smart then filed a petition for review at the Court of Appeals of the Philippines, or the Court of Appeals. On October 17, 2014, the 6th division of the Court of Appeals issued a resolution granting the temporary restraining order requested by Smart and directing the NTC not to enforce its decision and resolution. In a resolution promulgated on November 28, 2014, the Court of Appeals ordered the consolidation of Globe’s petition with Smarts’s and DMPI’s petitions. The application for preliminary injunction remains pending.

The NTC may call on carriers, other industry players and the public in general to attend public hearings with respect to certain proposed regulations affecting the industry in general or solicit comments from these groups with respect to consultative documents issued by the NTC on major industry issues, such as the August 2006 significant market power, or SMP, obligations, which were revived again during the pendency of PLDT’s acquisition of the Digitel Group in 2011. Under said consultative documents, for example, certain obligations are proposed to be imposed on carriers with SMP by using a roadmap which consists of the following critical processes: (1) defining markets to be used as basis for regulatory intervention; (2) determining if one or several operators in the defined markets have the degree of market power that merit regulatory intervention; (3) identifying appropriate SMP obligations to achieve policy objectives; and (4) determining conditions that justify withdrawal of regulation.

On July 15, 2011, the NTC issued Memorandum Circular No. 7-7-2011 which requires broadband service providers to specify the minimum broadband/internet connection speed and service reliability and the service rates in advertisements, flyers, brochures and service agreements and also sets the minimum service reliability of broadband service to 80%.

On December 19, 2011, the NTC issued a Decision in NTC ADM Case 2009-048 which lowered the interconnection charge between LEC and CMTS to Php2.50 per minute from Php4.00 per minute for LEC to CMTS and Php3.00 per minute from CMTS to LEC, PLDT and Smart individually filed on February 1, 2012 and January 20, 2012, respectively, separate motions for reconsideration arguing (among other things) that interconnection, including the rates thereof, should be, by law, a product of bilateral negotiations between the parties and that the decision to set lower rates was unconstitutional as an invalid exercise by the NTC of its quasi-legislative powers and violates the Philippine constitutional guarantee against impairment of contracts. The NTC denied the motion and PLDT and Smart appealed to the Court of Appeals, reiterating among other things, that the NTC erred in ruling that all LECs are automatically entitled to a cross-subsidy; that the NTC decision violates PLDT and Smart’s right to due process; and that the NTC decision violates the Philippine constitutional proscription against impairment of contracts. On December 12, 2014, the Court of Appeals granted Smart’s petition for review and set aside the NTC decision dated December 19, 2011.

A summary of the existing material regulations on our business is set forth in Item 1. “*Description of Business – Material Effects of Regulation on our Business*”. Due to the regulatory power of the NTC, as described above, we cannot assure you that the NTC will not impose changes to the current regulatory framework in the future, which could lead to increased competition or negatively affect the rates we can charge for our services. Any of these events could have a material adverse effect on our business, results of operations and prospects.

The franchise of Smart and DMPI may be revoked due to their failure to conduct a public offering of their shares.

In order to diversify the ownership base of public utilities, the Public Telecommunications Policy Act of the Philippines, or R.A. 7925, requires a telecommunications entity with regulated types of services to make a public offering through the stock exchanges of its shares representing at least 30% of its aggregate common shares within five years from: (a) the date the law became effective; or (b) the entity’s commencement of commercial operations, whichever date is later. As of the latest practicable date, Smart and DMPI have yet to conduct a public offering of their shares. Consequently, the Philippine Congress may revoke the franchise of Smart and DMPI for their failure to comply with the requirement under R.A. 7925 to conduct a public offering of their common shares. A *quo warranto* case may also be filed against Smart and DMPI by the Office of the Solicitor General of the Philippines for the revocation of the respective franchises of Smart and DMPI on the ground of the violation of R.A. 7925.

Although the position taken by Smart and DMPI is that these provisions of R.A. 7925 are merely directory and that the policy underlying the requirement for telecommunication entities to conduct a public offering should be deemed to have been achieved when PLDT acquired a 100% equity interest in Smart in 2000 and Digitel in 2011, which is now majority-owned by PLDT, and which in turn owns a 99.6% equity interest in DMPI, since PLDT was then and continues to be a publicly listed company, there can be no assurance that the Philippine Congress will agree with such position. In September 2004, Senate Bill No. 1675 was filed seeking to declare that a telecommunications entity shall be deemed to have complied with the requirement of making a public offering of its shares if two-thirds of its outstanding voting stock are owned and controlled directly or indirectly, by a listed company. However, we cannot assure you that such bill will be enacted or that the Philippine Congress will not revoke the franchise of Smart and DMPI or the Office of Solicitor General of the Philippines will not initiate a *quo warranto* proceeding against Smart and DMPI for the revocation of their respective franchises for failure to comply with the provisions of R.A. 7925 relating to the public offering of shares, the occurrence of any of which could have a material adverse effect on our business, results of operations, financial condition and prospects.

If we fail to effect the divestment of CURE in accordance with the terms of, or in a manner contemplated under the NTC's approval of our acquisition of the Digitel Group, the NTC may revoke its approval of any relevant franchises, licenses or permits held by Smart, any of which could significantly disrupt our operations and have a material adverse effect on our business, results of operations, financial condition and prospects.

As part of the NTC's decision to grant its consent to our acquisition of the Digitel Group, we agreed to divest ourselves of the frequency spectrum and associated franchises, licenses and permits held by CURE. Under the terms of the order issued by the NTC on October 26, 2011, (i) CURE is obligated to sell its *Red Mobile* business to Smart; and (ii) Smart is obligated to sell all of its rights and interests in CURE whose remaining assets will consist of its congressional franchise, certain frequency spectrum and related permits.

In compliance with the commitments in the divestment plan, CURE completed the sale and transfer of its *Red Mobile* business to Smart on June 30, 2012 for a total consideration of Php18 million through a series of transactions, such that, except for assets necessary to pay off obligations due after June 30, 2012 and certain tax assets, CURE's only remaining assets as at June 30, 2012 were its congressional franchise, 10 MHz of 3G frequency in the 2100 band and related permits.

In a letter dated September 10, 2012, Smart informed the NTC that the minimum Cost Recovery Amount, or CRA, to enable the PLDT Group to recover its investment in CURE, includes, among others, the total cost of equity investments in CURE, advances from Smart for operating requirements, advances from stockholders and associated funding costs. Smart also informed the NTC that the divestment will be undertaken through an auction sale of CURE's shares of stock to the winning bidder and submitted CURE's audited financial statements as at June 30, 2012 to the NTC. In a letter dated January 21, 2013, the NTC referred the computation of the CRA to the commissioners of the NTC. Smart sent a reply agreeing to the proposal and is awaiting advice from the NTC on the bidding and auction of the 3G license of CURE.

As at March 26, 2015, CURE is still waiting for NTC's advice on how to proceed with the planned divestment.

See *Note 2 – Summary of Significant Accounting Policies – Divestment of CURE* to the accompanying audited consolidated financial statements in Item 18. "Financial Statements" for further discussion.

We cannot assure you that we will be able to effect the divestment of CURE within the time or in a manner contemplated under the order issued by the NTC. If we fail to effect the divestment of CURE in accordance with the terms of, or in a manner contemplated under, the NTC's approval of our acquisition of the Digitel Group, the NTC may revoke its approval or any relevant franchises, licenses or permits held by Smart, any of which could significantly disrupt our operations and have a material adverse effect on our business, results of operations, financial condition and prospects.

Rapid changes and advancements in telecommunications technology may adversely affect the economics of our existing businesses and the value of our assets, increase our required capital expenditures and create new competition.

The global telecommunications industry has been characterized by rapid technological changes and advancements, and the Philippine market is not an exception. We cannot assure you that these developments will not result in competition from providers of new telecommunications services or the need to make substantial capital expenditures to transform our existing network infrastructure. Furthermore, the NTC has issued to Smart and our competitors licenses covering 3G cellular services, in respect of which we have made significant investments. We are also continuing to upgrade our fixed-line network to a next generation, all-IP network, expand our wireless broadband network in order to enhance our capability to provide broadband services, and upgrade and modernize our wireless cellular network in order to achieve greater operating and cost-efficiencies. However, these projects require and will continue to require, significant capital expenditures over the next few years.

Changes in available technology could increase competition and our capital costs, and if we are not able to adapt to changes in technology and address changing consumer demand on a timely basis, we may experience a decline in the demand for our services, be unable to implement our business strategy and experience reduced profits.

The rapid development of new technologies, new services and products, and new business models has begun to eliminate the distinctions between traditional, local, long distance, wireless, cable and internet communication services and bring new competitors into the telecommunications market. As a result, we are subject to increasing competition from providers offering telecommunications services using alternative technologies. These new competitors, which include ISPs, mobile device manufacturers and mobile software and application developers, compete against us in both voice and data businesses by offering mobile internet access, alternative voice and messaging services, OTT products, and other mobile services and are gaining an increasing share of the telecommunications industry value chain.

Our future success will depend on our ability to anticipate and adapt to these changes and to offer services that meet the demands of our customers on a competitive and timely basis. However, we may be unable to obtain new technologies on a timely basis or on satisfactory terms or implement them in an appropriate or effective manner. Future development of new technologies, services or standards could require significant changes to our business model, negatively impact our existing businesses or necessitate new acquisitions or investments. In addition, there could be legal or regulatory restraints on our introduction of new services. New products and services may also be expensive to develop and may result in increased competition. Such strategic initiatives and technological developments could require us to incur significant additional capital expenditures. As a result, we cannot assure you that we would be able to adopt or successfully implement new technologies, nor can we assure you that future technological changes will not adversely affect our operations or the competitiveness of our services.

In addition to introducing new technologies and offerings, we must phase out outdated and unprofitable technologies and services. If we are unable to do so on a cost-effective basis, we could experience reduced profits. There could also be legal or regulatory restraints on our ability to phase out current services.

We may not be successful in our acquisitions of, and investments in, other companies and businesses, and may therefore be unable to fully implement our business strategy.

As growth slows or reverses in our traditional fixed line and cellular businesses, and as part of our strategy to grow other business segments, we make acquisitions and investments in companies or businesses to enter new businesses or defend our existing markets. Since 2010, we have made a number of significant acquisitions and investments in businesses within and ancillary to the telecommunications sector, including an investment in shares of Meralco through PCEV in 2010, the acquisition of the Digitel Group in 2011, an investment in PDRs of MediaQuest (the ultimate parent company of Cignal TV, a direct-to-home pay-TV business) in 2012, and other smaller investments in various businesses. Most recently, we completed a €333 million, or Php19,577 million, investment in Rocket and entered into a joint venture agreement with Rocket to form MePay Global (see See Item 4. “Information on the Company – Development Activities (2012-2014)” for further information on our investment in Rocket and MePay Global). The success of our acquisitions and investments depends on a number of factors, such as:

- our ability to identify suitable opportunities for investment or acquisition;
- our ability to reach an acquisition or investment agreement on terms that are satisfactory to us or at all;
- the extent to which we are able to exercise control over the acquired company;
- the economic, business or other strategic objectives and goals of the acquired company compared to those of the PLDT Group, as well as the ability to execute the identified strategies in order to generate fair returns on the investment; and
- our ability to successfully integrate the acquired company or business with our existing businesses.

Any of our contemplated acquisitions and investments may not be consummated due to reasons or factors beyond our control. Even if any contemplated acquisitions and investments are consummated, we may not be able to realize any or all of the anticipated benefits of such acquisitions and investments and we cannot assure you that the consummation of such acquisitions and investments will not result in losses for us for a prolonged period of time. Moreover, if we are unsuccessful in our contemplated acquisitions and investments, we may not be able to fully implement our business strategy to maintain or grow certain of our businesses and our results of operations and financial position could be materially and adversely affected.

If we are unable to install and maintain telecommunications facilities and equipment in a timely manner, we may not be able to maintain our current market share and the quality of our services, which could have a material adverse effect on our results of operations and financial condition.

Our business requires the regular installation of new, and the maintenance of existing, telecommunications transmission and other facilities and equipment, which are being undertaken. The installation and maintenance of these facilities and equipment are subject to a number of risks and uncertainties, such as:

- shortages of equipment, materials and labor;
- work stoppages and labor disputes;
- interruptions resulting from inclement weather and other natural disasters;
- unforeseen engineering, environmental and geological problems; and
- unanticipated cost increases.

Any of these factors could give rise to delays or cost overruns in the installation of new facilities or equipment or could prevent us from properly maintaining the equipment used in our networks, and hence could affect our ability to maintain existing services and roll-out new services, for example, which could have a material adverse effect on our results of operations and financial condition.

Our businesses depend on the reliability of our network infrastructure which is subject to physical, technological and other risks.

We depend, to a significant degree, on an uninterrupted operation of our network to provide our services. We also depend on robust information technology systems to enable us to conduct our operations. The development and operation of telecommunications networks are subject to physical, technological and other risks, which may cause interruptions in service or reduced capacity for customers. These risks include but are not limited to:

- physical damage;
- power loss;
- capacity limitation;
- cable theft;
- software defects; and
- breaches of security by computer viruses, break-ins or otherwise.

The occurrence of any of the above events could have a material adverse effect on our ability to provide services to customers. While we are undertaking initiatives to prevent and/or mitigate the occurrence of these events, including the preparation of a disaster recovery plan that aims to allow restoration of service at the earliest possible time from occurrence of an incident, there can be no assurance that these events will not occur or that our initiatives will be effective should such events occur.

We are exposed to cyber security risks, which may include the gaining of unauthorized access to our networks by third parties; corruption of our data; and theft of intellectual property, stakeholder information or other sensitive data, the occurrence of any of which could significantly disrupt our business and have a material adverse effect on our results of operations and stakeholder confidence.

Over the years, our continued dependence on the latest digital technologies in conducting our operations exposes our business to risks associated with cyber incidents. These cyber incidents may range from unintentional events to deliberate attacks. These may be carried out by parties with the intention to bring about something as simple as plain disruption of our operations to something as destructive as breaching our network security and acquiring personal information on our subscribers. To date, we have not been subject to cyber attacks or other cyber incidents which, individually or in the aggregate, have had a material impact on our operations or financial condition. However, some network attacks can cause our telecommunications services or internal systems to be unavailable. Others, such as spam, could disrupt our business communication. Some network attacks, such as brute force attacks, could even cause the disclosure of confidential information.

In order to minimize our exposure to cyber security risks, we have deployed a multi-layered defense mechanism from the network to the host and up to the application level, so that if one defensive measure fails, there are other defensive measures which will continue to provide protection. However, we cannot assure you that any of such defenses will be effective against or neutralize the effects of any cyber incidents resulting from unintentional cyber security breaches or deliberate attacks on our network infrastructure or computer systems, nor can we assure you that our business will not be significantly disrupted in the event of such security breach or attack. If we fail to timely and effectively prevent the occurrence of any such cyber security incidents, or fail to promptly rectify any such incidents, our business could be significantly disrupted, our results of operations could be materially and adversely affected, and the confidence of our stakeholders could be lost.

Our businesses require substantial capital investment, which we may not be able to finance.

Our projects under development and the continued maintenance and improvement of our networks and services, including Smart’s projects, networks, platforms and services, require substantial ongoing capital investment. Our consolidated capital expenditures totaled Php34,759 million, Php28,838 million and Php36,396 million for the years ended December 31, 2014, 2013 and 2012, respectively. We currently estimate that our consolidated capital expenditures in 2015 will be approximately Php39 billion, of which approximately Php26 billion is estimated to be spent by our wireless segment and approximately Php13 billion is estimated to be spent by our fixed line segment. Our wireless segment’s capital spending is currently anticipated to focus on building out coverage, leveraging the capabilities of its newly modernized network and expanding 3G, fourth generation, or 4G, LTE including its backhaul and wireless broadband networks in order to enhance data transmission capabilities. We also contemplate enhancing network and platforms infrastructure and systems to support solutions deployment, campaign analytics and service delivery to enable customized and targeted services, as well as to further expand mainstream services and integration with the PLDT Group core and transmission network to increase penetration, mainly in provincial areas to achieve greater business benefits from a closely synergized environment. Our fixed line segment’s capital spending is currently intended principally to continue the build-out and upgrade of broadband data and IP infrastructures, fixed line data services, expanding transmission network, increasing international bandwidth capacity, and network maintenance.

Future strategic initiatives could require us to incur significant additional capital expenditures. We may be required to finance a portion of our future capital expenditures from external financing sources, some of which have not yet been fully arranged. There can be no assurance that financing for new projects will be available on terms acceptable to us, or at all. If we cannot complete our development programs or other capital projects on time due to our failure to obtain the required financing, our growth, results of operations, financial condition and prospects could be materially and adversely affected.

Our debt instruments contain restrictive covenants which require us to maintain certain financial tests and our indebtedness could impair our ability to fulfill our financial obligations and service our other debt.

As at December 31, 2014 and 2013, our consolidated long-term debt amounted to Php130,123 million and Php104,090 million, respectively, and accounted for 0.97x and 0.76x debt to equity ratio, respectively, calculated as long-term debt on a consolidated basis divided by total equity attributable to equity holders of PLDT. Our existing debt instruments contain covenants which, among other things, require PLDT to maintain certain financial ratios and other financial tests, calculated on the basis of PFRS at relevant measurement dates, principally at the end of each quarter period. For a description of some of these covenants, see *Note 21 – Interest-bearing Financial Liabilities* to the accompanying audited consolidated financial statements in Item 18. “Financial Statements”.

Our indebtedness and the requirements and limitations imposed by our debt covenants could have important consequences. For example, we may be required to dedicate a substantial portion of our cash flow to payments on our indebtedness, which could reduce the availability of our cash flow to fund working capital, capital expenditures and other general corporate requirements.

The principal factors that could negatively affect our ability to comply with the financial ratio covenants and other financial tests under our debt instruments are depreciation of the Philippine peso relative to the U.S. dollar, poor operating performance of PLDT and our consolidated subsidiaries, impairment or similar charges in respect of investments or other long-lived assets that may be recognized by PLDT and its consolidated subsidiaries, and increases in our interest expenses. Of our total consolidated debts, 47% and 57% were denominated in foreign currencies as at December 31, 2014 and 2013, respectively, principally in U.S. dollars, many of these financial ratios and other tests are expected to be negatively affected by any weakening of the Philippine peso.

We have maintained compliance with all of our financial ratios and covenants, as measured under PFRS, under our loan agreements and other debt instruments. However, if negative factors adversely affect our financial ratios, we may be unable to maintain compliance with these ratios and covenants. Inability to comply with the financial ratios and covenants could result in a declaration of default and acceleration of maturities of some or all of our indebtedness.

If we are unable to meet our debt service obligations or comply with our debt covenants, we could be forced to restructure or refinance our indebtedness, seek additional equity capital or sell assets. An inability to effect these measures successfully could result in a declaration of default and an acceleration of maturities of some or all of our indebtedness, which could have a material adverse effect on our business, results of operations and financial condition.

Our results of operations and our financial position could be materially and adversely affected if the Philippine peso significantly fluctuates against the U.S. dollar.

A substantial portion of our indebtedness, related interest expenses, our capital expenditures and a portion of our expenses are denominated in U.S. dollars and other foreign currencies, whereas most of our revenues are denominated in Philippine pesos. As at December 31, 2014, 47% of our total consolidated indebtedness was foreign currency-denominated, of which approximately 40% of our total consolidated indebtedness was unhedged. As at December 31, 2013, approximately 57% of our total consolidated indebtedness was foreign currency-denominated, of which approximately 48% of our total consolidated indebtedness was unhedged.

A depreciation of the Philippine peso against the U.S. dollar would increase the amount of our U.S. dollar-denominated debt obligations and operating and interest expenses in Philippine peso terms. In the event that the Philippine peso depreciates against the U.S. dollar, we may be unable to generate enough funds through operations and other means to offset the resulting increase in our obligations in Philippine peso terms. Moreover, a depreciation of the Philippine peso against the U.S. dollar may result in our recognition of significant foreign exchange losses, which could materially and adversely affect our results of operations. A depreciation of the Philippine peso could also cause us not to be in compliance with the financial covenants imposed on us by our lenders under certain loan agreements and other indebtedness. Further, fluctuations in the Philippine peso value and of interest rates impact the mark-to-market gains/losses of certain of our financial debt instruments, which were designated as non-hedged items.

Approximately, 20% of our consolidated service revenues were denominated in U.S. dollars and/or were linked to the U.S. dollar for the year ended December 31, 2014 as compared with approximately 21% in each of the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012. Approximately 10% of our consolidated expenses were denominated in U.S. dollars and/or linked to the U.S. dollar for the year ended December 31, 2014 as compared with approximately 11% and 12% for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012, respectively. In this respect, the depreciation of the weighted average exchange rate of the Philippine peso against the U.S. dollar increased our revenues and expenses, and consequently, affects our cash flow from operations in Philippine peso terms.

The Philippine peso has been subject to significant fluctuations in recent years. From 2009 to 2012, the Philippine peso appreciated from Php47.26 as at January 5, 2009 to Php41.08 as at December 31, 2012 and a high of Php40.86 on December 5, 2012, only to depreciate by approximately 8% to Php44.40 as at December 31, 2013 and further depreciated by 1% to Php44.74 as at December 31, 2014. We cannot assure you that the Philippine peso will not depreciate further and be subject to significant fluctuations going forward, due to a range of factors, including:

- political and economic developments affecting the Philippines, including the level of remittances from overseas Filipino workers;
- global economic and financial trends;
- the volatility of regional currencies, particularly the Japanese yen and Euro;
- any interest rate increases by the Federal Reserve Bank of the United States; and
- changes in the value of the U.S. dollar relative to Philippine peso, resulting from events such as higher demand for U.S. dollars by both banks and domestic businesses to service their maturing U.S. dollar obligations or foreign exchange traders including banks covering their short U.S. dollar positions, among others.

Our subsidiaries could be limited in their ability to pay dividends to us due to internal cash requirements and their creditors having superior claims over their assets and cash flows, which could materially and adversely affect our financial condition.

A majority of our total revenues and cash flow from operations is derived from our subsidiaries, particularly Smart. Smart has significant internal cash requirements for debt service, capital expenditures and operating expenses and as a result, may be financially unable to pay any dividends to PLDT. Although Smart has been making dividend payments to PLDT regularly since December 2002, there can be no assurance that PLDT will continue to receive these dividends or other distributions, or otherwise be able to derive liquidity from Smart or any other subsidiary or investee in the future.

Creditors of our subsidiaries generally have priority claims over our subsidiaries' assets and cash flows. We and our creditors will effectively be subordinated to the existing and future indebtedness and other liabilities, including trade payables, of our subsidiaries, except that we may be recognized as a creditor with respect to loans we have made to subsidiaries. If we are recognized as a creditor of a subsidiary, our claim will still be subordinated to any indebtedness secured by assets of the subsidiary and any indebtedness of the subsidiary otherwise deemed superior to the indebtedness we hold.

We may have difficulty meeting our debt payment obligations if we do not continue to receive cash dividends from our subsidiaries and our financial condition could be materially and adversely affected as a result.

A significant number of shares of PLDT's voting stocks (common and voting preferred stocks) are held by four shareholders, which may not act in the interests of other shareholders or stakeholders in PLDT.

The First Pacific Group and its Philippine affiliates had beneficial ownership of approximately 26% in PLDT's outstanding common stock (representing 15.1% of our overall voting stock) as at January 31, 2015, taking into account shares purchased from JGSHI pursuant to an option agreement in connection with the Digitel acquisition. This is the largest block of PLDT's common stock that is directly or indirectly under common ownership.

Pursuant to publicly available filings made with the PSE, as at January 31, 2015, NTT Communications and NTT DOCOMO together beneficially owned approximately 20% of PLDT's outstanding common stock (representing 12% of our overall voting stock), taking into account shares purchased from JGSHI pursuant to an option agreement in connection with the Digitel acquisition.

On October 26, 2011, PLDT completed the acquisition of a controlling interest in Digitel from JGSHI, and certain other seller-parties. As payment for the assets acquired from JGSHI, PLDT issued approximately 27.7 million common shares. In November 2011, JGSHI sold 5.81 million and 4.56 million PLDT shares to a Philippine affiliate of First Pacific and NTT DOCOMO, respectively, pursuant to separate option agreements that JGSHI had entered into with a Philippine affiliate of First Pacific and NTT DOCOMO, respectively. As at January 31, 2015, the JG Summit Group owned approximately 8% of PLDT's outstanding common shares (representing 4.7% of our overall voting stock).

The FP Parties, NTT Communications, NTT DOCOMO and PLDT entered into a Cooperation Agreement, dated January 31, 2006, pursuant to which, among other things, certain rights of NTT Communications under the Stock Purchase and Strategic Investment Agreement dated September 28, 1999, or the Strategic Agreement, and the Shareholders Agreement dated March 24, 2000, or the Shareholders Agreement, were extended to NTT DOCOMO. See Item 7. "Major Shareholders and Related Party Transactions" for further details regarding the shareholdings of NTT Communications and NTT DOCOMO in PLDT, and the rights granted pursuant to the Cooperation Agreement, Strategic Agreement and the Shareholders Agreement:

Additionally, PLDT's shares of voting preferred stock which represents approximately 41% of total outstanding shares of voting stocks are owned by a single stockholder, BTFHI.

As a result of their respective stockholdings, the FP Parties and/or NTT Communications and/or NTT DOCOMO and/or BTFHI are able to influence our actions and corporate governance, including:

- elections of PLDT's directors; and
- approval of major corporate actions, which require the vote of holders of common and voting preferred stocks.

The FP Parties and/or NTT Communications and/or NTT DOCOMO and/or BTFHI may exercise their respective voting rights over these decisions and transactions in a manner that could be contrary to the interests of other shareholders or stakeholders in PLDT.

Failure to maintain effective internal control over financial reporting in accordance with Section 404 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 could adversely impact investor confidence and the market price of our common shares and ADSs, and have a material adverse effect on our business, our reputation, financial condition and results of operations.

Effective internal control over financial reporting is necessary for us to provide reasonable assurance with respect to our financial reports and to effectively prevent fraud. If we are unable to provide reasonable assurance with respect to our financial reports and effectively prevent fraud, our reputation and results of operations could be harmed.

We are required to comply with various Philippine and U.S. laws and regulations on internal control. For example, pursuant to Section 404 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, beginning with the Annual Report on Form 20-F for the calendar year ended December 31, 2006, we have been required to include a report on our internal control over financial reporting in our Annual Reports on Form 20-F that contains an assessment by our management on the effectiveness of our internal control over financial reporting. In addition, an independent registered public accounting firm must express an opinion on our internal control over financial reporting based on its audits.

However, internal control over financial reporting may not prevent or detect misstatements because of its inherent limitations, including the possibility of human error, the circumvention or overriding of controls, or fraud. Therefore, even effective internal control over financial reporting can provide only reasonable assurance with respect to the preparation and fair presentation of financial statements. If we fail to maintain the adequacy of our internal control over financial reporting, including our failure to implement required new or improved controls, or if we experience difficulties in their implementation, our business and operating results could be harmed, we could fail to meet our reporting obligations and there could be a material adverse effect on our business, our reputation, financial condition and results of operations, and the market prices of our common shares and ADSs could decline significantly.

We are unionized and are vulnerable to work stoppages, slowdowns or increased labour costs.

As at December 31, 2014, PLDT has three employee unions, representing in the aggregate 5,877, or 34%, of the employees of the PLDT Group. This unionized workforce could result in demands that may increase our operating expenses and adversely affect our profitability. Each of our different employee groups may require separate collective bargaining agreements. If any group of our employees and PLDT are unable to reach agreement on the terms of their collective bargaining agreement or we were to experience widespread employee dissatisfaction, we could be subject to work slowdowns or stoppages. Any of these events would be disruptive to our operations and could harm our business.

Adverse results of any pending or future litigation and/or disputes may impact PLDT’s cash flows, results of operations and financial condition.

PLDT is involved in legal proceedings with various parties regarding the Philipine SEC Guidelines, which was issued in response to the decision in the Gamboa Case. On June 10, 2013, Jose M. Roy III filed a petition with the Supreme Court against the Chairperson of the Philippine SEC, Teresita Herbosa, the Philippine SEC and PLDT. The petition questions the constitutionality of the Philippine SEC Guidelines in determining the nationality of a Philippine company pursuant to the decision in the Gamboa Case and Section 11, Article XII of the Constitution. PLDT filed its challenge to the petition on September 5, 2013. On February 10, 2015 PLDT filed a consolidated memorandum setting forth its arguments against the petition. The resolution of the Jose M. Roy III Petition remains pending with the Supreme Court and is currently expected to occur before the end of 2015.

In January 2012, Smart and DMPI filed answers to a December 2011 show cause order by the NTC which required an explanation of why SMS retail rates were not lowered after the NTC issued Memorandum Circular No. 02-10-2011, which mandates that interconnection charge for SMS between two separate networks shall not be higher than Php0.15 per SMS. The outcome of the proceedings remains pending.

We are currently involved in various legal proceedings and tax assessments. Our estimate of the probable costs for the resolution of these claims have been developed in consultation with our counsel handling the defense in these matters and is based upon our analysis of potential results. Our future financial performance could be materially affected by changes in our estimates or effectiveness of our strategies relating to these proceedings and assessments.

For more information on PLDT's legal proceedings, see Item 8. "Financial Information – Legal Proceedings." While PLDT believes the positions it has taken in these cases are legally valid but the final results of these cases may prove to be different from its expectations. In addition, there is no assurance that PLDT will not be involved in future litigation or other disputes, the results of which may materially and adversely impact its business and financial conditions.

Risks Relating to the Philippines

PLDT's business may be adversely affected by political or social or economic instability in the Philippines.

The Philippines is subject to political, social and economic volatility that, directly or indirectly, could have a material adverse impact on our ability to sustain our business and growth.

In 2013, a major Philippine newspaper exposed a scam relating to the diversion and misuse of the Priority Development Assistance Fund, or PDAF, by some members of Congress through a pseudo-development organization headed by Janet Lim Napoles. As a result of this exposé, a number of investigations, including one in the Senate of the Philippines, have been launched to determine the extent of the diversion of the PDAF and the government officials and the private individuals responsible for the misappropriation of public funds. Cases of plunder and malversation of public funds are now pending against Janet Lim Napoles, three senators, a few members of the House of Representatives, and other private individuals.

We cannot assure you that the political environment in the Philippines will be stable or that the current or any future government will adopt economic policies that are conducive to sustained economic growth or which do not impact adversely on the current regulatory environment for the telecommunications and other companies.

If foreign exchange controls were to be imposed, our ability to meet our foreign currency payment obligations could be adversely affected.

The Philippine government has, in the past, instituted restrictions on the conversion of the Philippine peso into foreign currencies and the use of foreign exchange received by Philippine companies to pay foreign currency-denominated obligations. The Monetary Board of the BSP has statutory authority, with the approval of the President of the Philippines, during a foreign exchange crisis or in times of national emergency, to:

- suspend temporarily or restrict sales of foreign exchange;
- require licensing of foreign exchange transactions; or
- require the delivery of foreign exchange to the BSP or its designee banks.

We cannot assure you that foreign exchange controls will not be imposed in the future. If imposed, these restrictions could materially and adversely affect our ability to obtain foreign currency to service our foreign currency obligations.

The occurrence of natural catastrophes could materially disrupt our operations.

The Philippines has experienced a number of major natural catastrophes over the years, including floods, volcanic eruptions, earthquakes and typhoons, a recent example of which was Typhoon Yolanda (international name “Haiyan”) in November 2013. Typhoon Yolanda was the world’s strongest typhoon to date and caused massive destruction in the Visayan provinces. In 2014, a number of strong typhoons damaged many parts of the country, primarily the central Philippines and significant areas in Luzon. The frequency and severity of natural catastrophes and the challenges that arise from them may be further exacerbated as a result of global climate change. We cannot assure you that we are fully capable of addressing the impact of these occurrences or that the insurance coverage we maintain will fully compensate us for all the damages and economic losses resulting from these catastrophes, in which our business operations may be materially and adversely affected.

Continued terrorist activities in the Philippines could destabilize the country, adversely affecting our business environment.

Certain islands in the Philippines have been subject to a number of terrorist attacks and violent crimes in recent years. An increase in the number of terrorist attacks or violent crimes, or the occurrence of a large-scale terrorist attack, in the Philippines could negatively affect the Philippine economy and, therefore, our business, financial position and financial performance. In January of 2015, 44 members of the Philippines’ elite special action force, known as the SAF 44, were killed in combat while pursuing terrorists residing in the southern part of the country. This happened at a time when the Philippine government and the Moro Islamic Liberation Front, or the MILF, were rumored to be close to reaching agreement on the terms of the Bangsamoro Basic Law, the would-be governing law of the Bangsamoro political entity. While the MILF denied these attacks on the SAF 44, the Bangsamoro Islamic Freedom Fighters (a MILF breakaway group) is rumored to be responsible for them.

Additionally, the Philippine army has been in conflict with the Abu Sayyaf organization, which has ties to the al-Qaeda terrorist network and has been identified as being responsible for kidnapping and terrorist activities in the Philippines. There has also been a series of bombings in the Philippines, mainly in southern cities. Although no one has claimed responsibility for these attacks, Philippine military officials have stated that the attacks appeared to be the work of the Abu Sayyaf organization. There have also been a number of other violent crimes in the Philippines, including an additional series of bombings in the cities of Cagayan de Oro and Cotabato City, and in other areas in Maguindanao and North Cotabato provinces, all located in Mindanao.

There can be no assurance that the Philippines will not be subject to further, or an increased number of, acts of terrorism or violent crimes in the future. Terrorist attacks and violent crimes have had a material adverse effect on investment and confidence in, and the performance of, the Philippine economy in the past and in turn, our business, financial position and financial performance. Furthermore, there can be no assurance that the Philippines will not suffer a large-scale terrorist attack which could impact the Philippine economy for a significant period of time.

Territorial disputes with China and a number of Southeast Asian countries may disrupt the Philippine economy and business environment.

The Philippines, China and several Southeast Asian nations have been engaged in a series of long-standing territorial disputes over certain islands in the West Philippine Sea, also known as the South China Sea. The Philippines maintains that its claim over the disputed territories is supported by recognized principles of international law consistent with the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (“UNCLOS”). The Philippines made several efforts during the course of 2011 and 2012 to establish a framework for resolving these disputes, calling for multilateral talks to delineate territorial rights and establish a framework for resolving disputes.

Despite efforts to reach a compromise, a dispute arose between the Philippines and China over a group of small islands and reefs known as the Scarborough Shoal. In April and May 2012, the Philippines and China accused each other of deploying vessels to the shoal in an attempt to take control of the area, and both sides unilaterally imposed fishing bans at the shoal during later that year. These actions threatened to disrupt trade and other ties between the two countries, including a temporary ban by China on Philippine banana imports, as well as a temporary suspension of tours to the Philippines by Chinese travel agencies. Since July 2012, Chinese vessels have reportedly turned away Philippine fishing boats attempting to enter the shoal, and the Philippines has continued to protest China’s presence there. In January 2013, the Philippines instituted arbitration proceedings under UNCLOS and sent notice to the Chinese embassy in Manila. China has rejected and returned the notice sent by the Philippines to initiate arbitral proceedings. In May 2013, the Philippine Coast Guard shot and killed a Taiwanese fisherman in an area of the South China Sea claimed as an exclusive economic zone by both countries.

In September 2013, the Permanent Court of Arbitration in The Hague, Netherlands issued rules of procedure and initial timetable for the arbitration in which it will act as a registry of the proceedings. In January 2014, China imposed a “fishing permit” rule in the South China Sea, which has resulted in Philippine ships being expelled from the Ayungin Shoal in the Spratly group of islands by the Chinese Coast Guard. The Philippines has since filed a case against China with the International Court of Justice as a result of these actions.

In May 2014, Vietnamese ships collided with Chinese vessels in an area that both nations lay claim to, and where China is said to be setting up an oil rig. Also in May 2014, a Vietnamese fishing boat sank near the oil rig, and Vietnam released video footage showing a Chinese vessel gunning down the Vietnamese fishing boat. This incident has caused serious concerns for other Asian countries.

Should these territorial disputes continue or escalate further, the Philippines and its economy may be disrupted and our operations could be adversely affected as a result. In particular, further disputes between the Philippines and China may lead both countries to impose trade restrictions on the other's imports. Any such impact from these disputes could adversely affect the Philippine economy, and materially and adversely affect our business, financial position and financial performance.

As a foreign private issuer, we follow certain home country corporate governance practices which may afford less protection to holders of our ADSs.

As a foreign private issuer incorporated in the Philippines and listed on the PSE, we are permitted under applicable NYSE rules to follow certain home country corporate governance practices. The corporate governance practice and requirements in the Philippines do not require us to have a majority of the members of our board of directors to be independent, and do not require us to hold regular executive sessions where only independent directors are present. Further, the criteria for independence of directors and audit committee members applicable in the Philippines differ from those applicable under the NYSE rules. These Philippine home country corporate governance practices may afford less protection to holders of our ADSs.

The credit ratings of the Philippines may restrict the access to capital of Philippine companies, including PLDT.

Historically, the Philippines' sovereign debt has been rated non-investment grade by international credit rating agencies. Although during 2014, the Philippines' long-term foreign currency-denominated debt was affirmed by Fitch as investment-grade with a rating of BBB, and Standard and Poor's and Moody's upgraded the Philippines' long-term foreign currency-denominated debt to the investment-grade rating of BBB+ and Baa2, respectively, the continued relatively low sovereign ratings of the Philippine Government will directly and adversely affect companies domiciled in the Philippines as international credit rating agencies issue credit ratings by reference to that of the sovereign. No assurance can be given that Fitch, Moody's, Standard & Poor's or any other international credit rating agency will not downgrade the credit ratings of the Philippine Government in the future and, therefore, Philippine companies, including PLDT. Any such downgrade could have an adverse impact on the liquidity in the Philippine financial markets, the ability of the Philippine Government and Philippine companies, including PLDT, to raise additional financing, and the interest rates and other commercial terms at which such additional financing is available.

Risks Relating to Our Securities

PLDT is required to comply with foreign ownership restriction under the Philippine Constitution. At present, PLDT believes it has complied with such restrictions; however, there can be no assurance that further interpretations of the Philippine Constitution will not require PLDT to take further actions to be compliant with such foreign ownership restrictions.