

QUESTION:

Good morning everybody and thanks a lot for doing this for us in London. We really appreciate it.

Look, you are progressing a project in the US called Resolution Copper and it does seem that the Apache, the Traditional Owners of the land, are against the development of the mine. I wonder if you could give some thoughts and just to your situation where ultimately you don't build the project if the Traditional Owners are dead set against it?

JAKOB STAUSHOLM (Chief Executive):

Thank you. Obviously the situation in the US is very different from some of the situations we have in Australia. You know we have been through a long 7-year consultation process with regards to Resolution. We don't have a final development plan for Resolution yet and we are very committed to continual engagement. We have had good engagements, particular with one group, the San Carlos group, has been an opponent and we would like to engage deeper with them. But I think it is difficult for any stakeholders actually to have a firm view at this point in time because we don't have a development plan. But we are very keen to continue striving for free prior informed consent for new development that meets all stakeholder needs, but it's far too early to conclude - there is a lot of work ahead of us. Thank you.

QUESTIONER:

Jakob, could I just follow up, if that's okay. I guess you jump to an interesting sort of question here where perhaps one group of Traditional Owners are in favour and another group aren't, so how do you deal with a situation like that where you don't necessarily have broad based engagement? How do you sort of get to that goal of broad based engagement and buy-in?

JAKOB STAUSHOLM:

Well, we certainly are trying to have a broad-based buy-in, but it is a complicated situation and I think we will have to look at case by case. What we are committing to is deeper engagement with all Apache groups in trying to find a solution. The reality is it is an important find and the choices will have to be made. We have not made any conclusions; we are just trying to focus on it and find a path that works for society at large and the communities.

QUESTIONER:

Okay. Thank you very much.

QUESTION:

Thank you and thank you for the call. The first question is just on ESG metrics. You mentioned at the outset that ESG was going to be linked to the STIP. Can you give us some colour on what specific metrics will be linked? Is it only safety statistics or will there be some other ESG statistics as well linked?

JAKOB STAUSHOLM:

Megan, would you like to talk about the measurements?

MEGAN CLARK (Non-Executive Director and Sustainability Chair):

Sure. One of the things that we have changed in our remuneration is including ESG metrics. We already have a safety metric, both a fatality metric which is binary and we have a safety maturity model which is very forward looking in terms of making sure that we have got all our safety systems and really excellence in that area, so if you like a leading metric.

We are also bringing into ESG our climate metrics as well, related to our recent announcements and commitments and they will go down through various levels from the CEO, and we also have diversity targets as well. So we are looking at a broad brush of ESG targets broader than we have in the past.

QUESTIONER:

That's pretty clear. Thank you. And just a last question from me, on the \$50 million investment in terms of increasing your indigenous managers within the business, what does success look like there? Have you set any numerical targets? Have you set a timeframe, etc?

JAKOB STAUSHOLM:

Thank you. I think I could hear about what does success look like for the investment we are doing into developing indigenous leaders there. Brad!

BRAD WELSH (Chief Advisor, Indigenous Affairs):

Thank you Jakob. It is a good question. When we think about the proportion of the indigenous population in Australia you are looking at about 3 per cent. If 3 per cent our managers - so as a straight numerical target you are looking at about 50 managers who are H band and above with another 100 that need to be ready in the pipeline in order to sort of keep growing the business.

I think that would be a minimal way to describe success in this programme. What we want to do is become the employer of choice. What we want to do is build a culture that the indigenous people want to enter Rio Tinto, grow the careers, be really successful, be successful for their communities, and really grow a skillset that these communities need all over the world.

So I think for us the \$50 million commitment is also about cultural competence , it is about the way we grow leaders, it is about how we embed values into the people who lead those leaders, and so success has tangible points around 50 and 100 professionals sitting behind them, but also really about becoming the employer of choice. Thank you.

QUESTIONER:

That's useful. Thank you.

QUESTION:

Thank you and thank you for all the work being done and you are well on the way to reclaiming your position of excellence in CSP, so thank you for that.

I have two quick questions. Firstly, certainly very interested in the work on the IAG. That is great news announced today. Perhaps somebody could confirm what disclosures or insights investors may be able to have in terms of the activities of IAG, and in particular their recommendation to the company, what form and frequency that may take?

The second one is a question for Megan. It is great to hear all the activity in terms of oversight of the actions on the back of the Parliamentary Inquiry and the Board review and beyond that the Sustainability Committee is going to do. But I am interested I guess a broader change in the way the committee will spend its time going forward, in particular give us an indication of risks related to sustainability across the Group, and if you could say more about that it would be much appreciated. Thank you.

MEGAN CLARK:

Kellie, do you want to take the IAG and I answer the second question on the timing and risks?

KELLIE PARKER (Chief Executive, Australia):

Thanks Megan. The Indigenous Advisory Group is really exciting step change for our business and one of the things that we are doing right now is ensuring that we have a charter for the Indigenous Advisory Group. What I want to make sure is that the Traditional Owners have the freedom and the authority to continue working locally with us and the Indigenous Advisory Group can take on much more national issues.

We need to be clear about how the group will work and how the group will make sure that they can coach and mentor the senior leaders that are based in Australia and as we build that Charter, then we will be able to approach a Chair and members of that group. As Megan has pointed out, she is able to have access to that group and to the Chair, sit on their meetings and she can also invite them to the sustainability committee.

So a really important component is that we are learning the views of senior indigenous leaders in Australia and we bring those views into our business so that we understand emerging issues and some of the complexity that we may not understand across the nation versus the local issues.

MEGAN CLARK:

And on the second question in terms of the Sustainability Committee and looking at broader risk, two things that we are doing. One, in particular with the communities and social performance, I mentioned that we are looking to extend the learnings that we have from Juukan globally and we have requested and are now receiving

updates of an audit of our global CSP risks, and we will continue to do that at each of our meetings.

This follows very much as well the process that we used several years ago after Vale's dam incident. We went through that same process reviewing all of our dams and water storage and doing a global audit, so we are doing something very similar here.

In a broader sense though, we did some reflection, as you can imagine, deep reflection right across the organisation, but also reflected on the time that we spent on the risk assessment but also who we were talking at a Sustainability Committee. We had quite a lot of time with our Functional leads looking at Group performance but we felt that we could really improve the direct conversations with the Products Group CEOs where basically the Committee could eyeball each one of the Product Group CEOs to talk about their non-financial risks, their ESG risks, in a much broader discussion, so we have dedicated a meeting to that. We will look at future trends, but we will really focus on having these direct conversations with the Product Group heads. We see that as a way of, one, understanding what they are focusing on, but also as a way of checking and verifying – perhaps there are areas which may need greater focus and we can use the expertise as well from the Committee. So they are just a couple of examples of changes that we have been making.

QUESTION:

Hi, good evening, and thanks for the update. I would like your comments if possible on how Rio Tinto is engaging on the legislative reforms in Australia around heritage legislations and particularly with attention to the potential mismatch between public statements of intentions and the reiterations on commitments that you have made today and then potentially lobbying on public policy that is inconsistent with those commitments and that locks, where there is a legislative framework that then allows for repetition. Perhaps some comment not only on just Rio's position, but perhaps on

the broader mining industry through industry associations as well which you are part of? Thank you.

JAKOB STAUSHOLM:

Kellie, would you elaborate on this?

KELLIE PARKER:

Thanks Jakob and thanks for the question. What we are trying to hold ourselves to is getting to best practice with cultural heritage management and best practice involves discretionary effort which is about the regulatory control. The legislation and any changes in legislation should be safeguarding and what we want to do is ensure that the best practice that we try and achieve and we establish best practice is above that. And that should then be able to go across all the different jurisdictions that we work in, in Australia, and then be applied globally into our global business.

So what we will be advocating for and talking to industry groups and the government is how we are trying to hold ourselves to best practice on cultural heritage management and teach people what that means, because we know already that people don't always understand what it means to work with Traditional Owners on cultural heritage management.

Maybe I will also invite Brad to provide some comment as he is heavily involved in these conversations.

BRAD WELSH:

Yes, thank you Kellie and thank you for the question. In relation to Heritage reforms, I guess the focal area at the moment is Western Australia and the proposed Heritage legislation in Western Australia.

We have made three public commitments in support of Cultural Heritage management plans, moving away from what is known as Section 18s, where there is an individual sort of approval for an impact area, whereas the Cultural Heritage management plan allows you to understand the whole Cultural Heritage Landscape and what if any impact there might be on that Cultural Heritage Landscape. It gives you more ability to understand the land the way the TOs see the land.

We have also supported a process for allowing new information. Under the current laws there is not a process of review or there is not a process of re-visiting something when new information is found, so we have expressed support for that. And we have also expressed support for a right of appeal in the West Australian legislation. So I guess it sits with the government of the day with the right to bring forward the legislation.

They are three public positions that we have made in relation to the West Australian legislation in particular. As Kellie described one of the biggest drivers of Cultural Heritage performance and trust is discretionary effort. So where we really want to get our partnerships with Traditional Owners too is a point where they understand that we do this because we want to understand and we want to do it well rather than that we are being forced to do it through regulatory means. Thank you.

QUESTION:

Thank you very much and thanks very much for the presentation. I have got two questions. The first one is just with regards to Board composition. You talk around the increase in the Traditional Owners playing a presence in management but is there a consideration on the Board composition perspective to increase that presence on the board?

JAKOB STAUSHOLM:

You said two questions?

QUESTIONER:

Oh yes. The second is just on the Panguna mine over in PNG. That's been something which you've increased disclosure on your website over the last year or so. But perhaps would you be able to provide an update on the latest on that one because I think there appeared to be some form of potential rehabilitation requirement there following the exit in the late 1980s.

JAKOB STAUSHOLM:

Megan, board composition, I think you are best placed for answering that question?

MEGAN CLARK:

We are going through a process of looking for additional board members as part of our ongoing, if you like, board succession. In particular, we are looking at the importance of Canadian and North American deep operational experience to replace David Constable's role on the board. David had very, very deep operational experience across multiple sectors, and we had significant operations in Quebec and British Columbia. And you have heard as well from Clayton, so that's the important one for us. And we are also looking at Australian representation on the Board as well and sector experience and connection with community will be important. So that process is underway and that's really as much as I can share at this point.

JAKOB STAUSHOLM:

Thank you. Kellie, will you give an update on the discussions, the engagement we have on the Panguna Mine?

KELLIE PARKER:

We are engaged in trying to understand how we can resolve the issues that are faced with that mine. We know that there is work to be done and we know that we want to do that safely, so we are engaged with the government process to ensure that we can find a solution, and as we have information we will be disclosing that.

JAKOB STAUSHOLM:

It is in the very early stages – Thank you Kellie.

QUESTION:

Thank you very much for taking the call. Your previous question actually was my question so no further question from me.

JAKOB STAUSHOLM:

Okay. Thank you. Next question?

OPERATOR:

There are no further questions.

MENNO SANDERSE (Head of Investor Relations):

Thank you everybody for taking the time to listen to us and for your questions. If you have any further discussions topics, also questions, please contact IR and we will follow up, and see you all later at our next event. Thank you very much and have a good day.

(End of Q&A Session)