

**Kellie Parker (Chief Executive – Australia):** Thanks Tom and everyone. I'd like to start the session today by acknowledging the Traditional Owners of Brisbane on both sides of the river where I'm presenting from and to acknowledge all Indigenous People who host our operations where we work and live, and I pay my respects to their elders past and present.

Last week, we released the second and final standalone Communities and Social Performance (CSP) commitments disclosure report, which reports the progress we've made to strengthen our approach to managing cultural heritage and rebuilding relationships with Traditional Owners and other stakeholders since the tragic destruction of Juukan Gorge rock shelters in 2020.

Following this report, further updates are going to be provided in our annual report. The key focus for my role is to listen to external voices as we seek to ensure our actions align with societies expectations and we continue to increase our dialogue with government, civil society organisations, Indigenous leaders, Traditional Owners and other stakeholders at all levels of our organisation and today I'm really pleased to share the progress with you and discuss the next steps. But to do that I'd like to now hand over to Chris Dark, General Manager of Heritage and Traditional Owner partnerships for Iron Ore.

**Chris Dark (General Manager Heritage and Traditional Owner partnerships, Iron Ore):** Thanks Kellie I suppose some feedback for this year. We're really pleased to have feedback from seven of the ten Pilbara Traditional Owner groups which was an improvement from last year where we had four, so we recognise continuing that this is a journey we're on and the feedbacks are a little bit variable, and we know we still have a long way to continue to build that trust and embed the changes we've committed to.

We've had general positive recognition from groups on our commitment to improving cultural heritage protection. And that's been through increased engagement and better ways of working and we've also had some positive feedback in work in terms of the way we increase cultural awareness within our workforce. But again, this feedback has been extremely valuable. We continue to listen learn and adapt and we're going to have to continue to build credibility and trust through extended time and actions and continue to meet with Traditional Owners and continue to prove that we're changing on that journey.

The second area I'd like to cover off today is really around the journey we're making with Traditional Owners to the model of co-management of country. And this is around enhancing the protection and preservation of cultural heritage. And so, when I say about that building trust is one of the key areas - we're going to build trust around how we co-design together. One of those examples I think you may have already seen in the press is around the way we co-design the Social, Cultural Heritage Management Plan with the Yinhawangka Aboriginal Corporation, where we collaborated in a genuine process of co-design and reflects a collaborative approach to ensure the protection of significant social and cultural heritage values as part of that proposed development of the Western Range iron ore project in the Pilbara. And we continue to work with the Traditional Owners on this co-design and how that is going to work in the future, and we continue to learn and adjust as we continue to evolve in that process. But again, this is about that co-design is a key step in terms of regaining the trust of the Traditional Owners in the right community, but now I'll hand over to Kellie now to talk through the next step.

**Kellie Parker:** Thanks Chris. Adam will eventually join us, he has just been delayed slightly so he will join us for Q&A. But I wanted to cover just how we're increasing the Indigenous voice and some of the barriers that we have for Indigenous people in our business. We know that having true diversity of perspectives will help our company move forward and it's a critical and important factor in business performance. So through the US\$50 million commitment we made in 2020 to attract, retain and grow Indigenous employment, we've been able to increase our leaders in Australia from 7 to 41. We are also - and I'm very proud - that we've recently appointed our first female Indigenous general manager in our global audit team. We know that there are barriers, which we saw in the release of the Everyday Respect Report earlier this year, with reports of racism. The creating an environment that is safe for Indigenous employees is a priority. Programs such as our Cultural Connection and two-way mentoring program are educating our leaders to genuinely consider Indigenous peoples views and perspectives. We have more than 200 indigenous employees across our Australian business enrolled in professional leadership programs as part of our commitment to developing Indigenous employees and elevating Indigenous voices. One of these I'd like to mention is the Emerging Indigenous Executive Leaders Program, which is a ground-breaking globally recognised program that focuses on developing executive ready Indigenous future leaders.

As we are listening to external perspectives, one of the things that we have put in place is the Australian Advisory Group, which was established in February 2022 to provide, particularly myself and other senior leaders, with guidance on current and emerging issues that are important to both the Australian community and our broader business. We've had our third meeting and are confident this group is going to advise and support myself and leaders to reach decisions that are more aligned with community expectations. And this is particularly important for the changing expectations that the Prime Minister has put forward in Australia. So now I'd like to hand over to Melinda as Head of Communities and Social Performance who will talk about how we're taking our learnings beyond Australia.

**Melinda Buckland (Head of Communities and Social Performance):** Thanks Kellie and good morning, and good afternoon everybody. Thanks for joining us. Since our last report, we have continued to strengthen our social performance governance capacity and capability across the business. We recently launched the revision of our global Communities and Performance Standard. This is our technical standard that applies to all our managed operations globally. It's intended to help us build strong relationships through respectful engagement, mitigate potential adverse impacts and of course, deliver positive social and economic outcomes to our host communities. The Standard reflects the evolution of our approach to working with communities and as Chris mentioned, it really is starting to move to a model of co-design and co-management. By way of providing an example outside Australia, which is often something we get asked, I'd like to share with you one partnership that was recently launched in Canada with the Cheslatta Carrier Nation - a First Nation in British Columbia, where our hydro facilities are located. The Cheslatta led project is surveying and excavating sites of cultural and historical significance near the Tatichek Lake and these were only revealed after wildfires spread through the area in 2018.

Through inter-generational stories such as the Cheslatta Carrier Nation believed these ancient villages and their people may have suffered from widespread disease that swept through the region and the team hopes that the dig will offer some evidence for when and how this may have happened to further the understanding of human occupation in the natural watershed. And some of the artifacts that they've uncovered so far are dating to more than 10,000 years. The second aspect I'd like to speak about is our independent cultural Heritage Management Audit. In 2020, we engaged the Environmental Resources

Management Group (ERM) to undertake the independent cultural heritage management audit across all our sites. We split it into two phases – Phase one of the audit was completed in 2022, sorry, phase one of the audit has just been completed, and focused on 20 audits across Australian assets. The audits found that changes introduced over the past couple of years have resulted in improvements in on the ground management. Just to give you an example of one of these improvements is, I think, shown on the screen, they are high tech guidance system that's being used on earth moving equipment and that's there to provide an added layer of protection for heritage sites. So ERM has really found that the use of technology has really supported the improvements across a number of our sites around managing heritage. In the report, ERM also highlighted the importance of organisational culture in effective management of cultural heritage. So they observed that where there was an embedded understanding, respect and appreciation of culture, and the value of cultural heritage, management practices were stronger. So to that end, and in alignment with Kellie's earlier comments, we really are continuing our focus on improving cultural intelligence in the company. One of the interesting ways, we're doing this - again using new technology - is through virtual reality as shown on the slide. This is proven to be really popular with our employees and actually is also equally effective. But everything's not perfect. The reports also identified four areas for improvement. They are water management, better management of artifacts, integrating heritage data, which is primarily systems across the business, and the need to continue to augment our team of experienced cultural heritage practitioners. Phase 2 will cover our assets outside Australia and that is currently underway and due to be completed at the end of this year. So I'd like to hand back to Kellie for next steps and to open the Q&A.

**Kellie Parker:** Thanks very much Melinda. In terms of next steps. We're committed to continue to rebuild trust and improve the engagement with Indigenous peoples, host communities and other stakeholders. We'll also continue to embed our revised Standards, procedures, systems and processes across our business. And we are focused on creating a more respectful diverse and inclusive company, which will help us become a better partner and enhance our social licence. So now we'd like to open up for your questions.

**Ian McIlwraith (ACSI):** Given that you're now going to start reporting this in the annual report, what will we see from next year and also, if you do it there, will we also see the Indigenous voice that we've been seeing in the last two reports?

**Kellie Parker:** Yeah, thanks very much Ian. We are in the process of understanding how we will actually build that annual report, and what it looks like versus what do we just keep publishing on our website. But it's really, really important that the Indigenous voices and particularly the Traditional Owners voices are heard. It's quite powerful, and it's quite powerful to hear them and share them verbatim. How we shape that going into the future is in development right now and particularly how do we actually ensure we hear the community voices. But we know just how important it is to share them transparently and that's why we're thinking about how that happens with an annual report versus what's on our website.

**Ian Mcilwrath:** Thanks for that.

**Kellie Parker:** Thanks Ian.

**Nick Spooner (Robeco):** Hi there, thanks for the presentation. Nick Spooner from Robeco. In your reporting you touched on – in the audit should I say - they touched on water management and water rights more strongly than some of the other points you mentioned. Just wondering about the next steps and reflections about how Rio Tinto is going to act based off that audit and those concerns raised?

**Kellie Parker:** Thanks Nick, I might get Melinda to talk to that one.

**Melinda Buckland:** So thanks Nick. I think the observation around water was really around us understanding the connection for Indigenous groups, the cultural connection of water. I think we traditionally have managed water from an environmental perspective, but not necessarily from a cultural perspective. So I think it's a learning for us and in the same way that we manage land and you know the cultural heritage around land is also to understand the cultural heritage associated with water. And I think Chris might be able to speak to this as well. But I know within the Western Range work that they have done the development project and the co-management of that that mine that that has been taken into consideration and that certain mine design aspects decisions have been taken to actually preserve the heritage quality of some of those water sources and water courses. So Chris – I don't know, do you want to add anymore to that?

**Chris Dark:** Yeah, I think that's a great example around the Western Range Project and the Social, Cultural Heritage Management Plan that we co-designed with the Yinhawangka Aboriginal Corporation and Noongar people. Water really is such a significant link to all of

their cultural heritage and identity and link to healthy country so going forward in that co-design piece, how you impact the waterways, how you mitigate the impact to those waterways and how you preserve cultural heritage around those waterways is a key source of working together and in those new co-design it's not just about the design of the mine it's also around what you monitor, manage and maintain ongoing throughout the life of the mine to make sure that those values are reserved and managed over time.

**Nick Spooner:** Right, thank you.

**Zoe de Spoelberch (Federated Hermes):** Hey, thank you very much. I was wondering to what extent are the Traditional Owners that responded to your survey's representative of all the Traditional Owners that Rio Tinto interacts with and if you provide an indication of the percentage of coverage that this would be? Thank you.

**Kellie Parker:** Yeah, thanks. I'll might hand to Adam – welcome Adam - just to talk about why we ended up surveying the Pilbara and what, why, where we're getting other voices coming in across Australia.

**Adam Lees (Chief Advisor – Indigenous Affairs):** Yeah, thanks for the question. So seven of the eleven Traditional Owner groups that we have agreements with in the Pilbara responded to the survey, which is a fairly positive development compared with last year's result. So we're really pleased with that. The focus initially has been on the feedback from Traditional Owners in the Pilbara because of that being in close proximity to the Juukan Gorge caves and those groups being the most impacted and affected by our activity, so it's been a priority for this team, and really important to me personally that we work really hard to receive that feedback so we're in a really great position this year. Obviously, we would want to strive and try and receive further feedback as we progress and as we look to incorporate those views and those voices and that feedback into whatever sort of reporting or disclosure mechanism that we have in future. Throughout the year, both Kellie and myself have led a number of different engagement across the country with Traditional Owner groups. We've been fairly busy in Gove. Kellie's had engagements with Traditional Owners in the Kimberley region relating to our Argyle closure. We've also had engagements in Weipa with Traditional Owners in relation to the Australian Advisory Group visit when we went there and Kellie participated in the signing of an agreement at Weipa. so we've been quite busy. We've also continued engagements and receiving feedback from

Traditional Owners in Aluminium and looking at how we can develop an agreement. We continue to collaborate with Traditional Owners in the Gladstone region, and Central Queensland. So, although we haven't formally captured the feedback of those groups. We have continued to engage and continue to have positive relationships with those stakeholders. Thank you.

**Zoe de Spoelberch:** Thank you, that's very helpful.

**Kirsten Callander (Victorian Funds Management Corporation):** Hi there, thank you. Kirsten Callander from Victorian Funds Management Corporation. Thank you for a great presentation. My question was on particularly how you're monitoring the effectiveness of the cultural awareness programs. It's fantastic to see how feasible and elevated the Traditional Owner perspectives were in the report but I was just wondering if you're complementing that with leading or lagging indicators internally to get that comprehensive perspective on something that's very difficult to measure?

**Kellie Parker:** Yeah, thanks very much Kirsten, it's a good question and certainly I might pass to Adam thinking about how we actually bring these cultural competency training together. It's been a huge piece of work in Adam's team and we're certainly seeing some impacts.

**Adam Lees:** Yeah, so thanks for that. So we actively measure and survey the participants who take part in the Cultural Connection course. It's a fairly comprehensive survey where we measure their sentiment, feelings and knowledge before doing the training and then compare that to a follow up survey afterwards and what we've seen is the quantum leap in sort of feelings expressed around the value of that program. The other sort of anecdotal evidence of the impact of that course is that seeing the change in the organisation. There was one course I really, you know, fondly remember, participated in the course with one of the senior leaders and they were so moved and so empowered by that course that they made the decision to go into their area to start to actively ramp up Indigenous recruitment and as a result of that one leader doing a cultural connection course we've appointed our very first female Indigenous general manager leader at Rio Tinto just because of one person, you know, taking that action and so it's quite transformative. We continue to then, I think the biggest impact of the course will be over time, as we begin to through our regular employee surveys and through additional surveying internally in relation to the

Everyday Respect task force is feel that sort of climate within the organisation shifting where we're seeing hopefully experiences of racism and bullying that Indigenous employees expressed reduce, and that we are able to sort of measure the impact of that awareness and that change sort of formally through our survey process.

**Kirsten Callander:** Thank you. Great to see how it evolves, in coming years and adapts to those secondary and tertiary outcomes. Thank you.

**Lara Blecher (PIRC):** Hi. Thanks for the presentation. You spoke about the cultural heritage impact assessments. I was wondering if there's also a plan to ramp up the environmental and social impact assessments and specifically independent ones such as the one you've committed to at Panguna?

**Kellie Parker:** Thanks Lara. The impact assessment that we're doing on Panguna has commenced but as part of the Standards that we've got in our business, we do our social impact assessments, but also every year, at every product group and asset, we actually do a review of their risks around their environmental impacts and how we assess that and how it's then governed through to the Sustainability Committee. The impact assessment at Panguna is going to be different to that. It is going to be so large on what we need to do and pleasingly the contractor has been announced to be able to commence that work, and that's going to take many months to actually understand the full impacts.

**Lara Blecher:** Thanks. So just to clarify that the Panguna one is sort of a one off?

**Kellie Parker:** It's so incredibly large, it will take at least 18 months and that is a process in itself, so our normal processes that we have in our product groups is ongoing we review them every year against our risk assessment or risk control libraries and risk registers. So the impact assessments like Panguna is a standalone assessment because it's monstrous. Pleasingly we've started it.

**Lara Blecher:** OK, sorry just to clarify one more thing. For the internal processes that are standard. Is there any element of independence? Or is there a discussion around how to introduce independence there?

**Kellie Parker:** So we have an auditing program in internal audit with our subject matter experts, and then we have a third line auditing program, which is run by our external auditors and environment does get picked up through that external audit and then we



have our ESG reporting, which is reviewed by externals, so there's several places where externals review what we're reporting on and external auditors coming in to review our environment progress.

**Lara Blecher:** OK thanks very much.

**Melinda Buckland:** And Kellie I might just add, as part of the revision of our social performance standard, we have also strengthened and not just within the Standard itself follows through with implementation that it is a requirement for all of our businesses to have social impact assessments and as you would realise they're typically quite big pieces of work and they're not something you can do internally so typically we would prepare the scope of work and contract out to an expert to run an impact assessment, so I mean, there's some level of independence there from the external expert doing that and typically and I think it is a written requirement in the Standard that there must be external engagement and participation as part of the impact assessment so it's certainly not us trying to assess the impacts ourselves. We of course, do our own risk assessment, which is a lesser piece of work but there are requirements for impact assessments and some of our assets have been going for a long time and they may have had them in the beginning, you know, when they started operations, but there is also a requirement to refresh those.

**Lara Blecher:** Thanks very much for that.

**Nigel Rossouw (Sustainalytics):** Thanks for the very succinct presentation and allowing a lot more time for questions. So thanks a lot for that. You mentioned you spoke about the independent cultural management audits by ERM. You highlighted the technological aspects and technological improvements that, you know, that they recommended but what about the gaps in Rio Tinto's qualitative approaches in an application of its CSP processes. So yeah, I'm thinking about you know things like community mapping, appreciative inquiry, Aboriginal sense of place, particularly sort of the social, cultural service provided by Aboriginal sense of place in rituals and traditional practices and their cultural identity and then storytelling. So certainly for me documenting storytelling is absolutely critical in CSP because indigenous knowledge about heritage is constructed in stories and encased in language and so, if you can just tell us a bit more about that and you know where have, you know, are their gaps in Rio Tinto's approach in those qualitative approaches and what

are you doing in this particular area? Are you strengthening and improving your qualitative approaches? Thank you.

**Kellie Parker:** Thanks very much Nigel. Melinda, I might get you to answer you know, there's two things there, one is just how the audit is going and what's being found through the audit but also how we're doing the work around the CSP Standard and the gap analysis, which picks up their co-design, co-management work.

**Melinda Buckland:** Yeah, thanks Nigel - I do agree with you. I think those qualitative components are very important. They're not things that ERM have picked up to be a significant gap at the moment, certainly hasn't come through. I've given you sort of the four areas I think that that's so far within Australia. So remembering at the moment they've only – this report - is sort of half of the story. It's the Australian part of the story, so the four points that I alluded to were gaps and also improvements and it's not there, but it's around, some of our complaints and grievance processes, I think they've found that they could be strengthened. Our incident management and tracking - sometimes things are reported as an environmental incident, not a heritage incident therefore, they sort of go down a different pathway, so there's a few other things, definitely in the way we manage those processes that can be improved. So it's great we're picking up those. So I think not the things that you've mentioned, but it's a great call out and I will go back and ask the question about, you know, how deeply they have investigated those areas. Within the CSP Standard, which I guess is more broadly, not just heritage but how we engage across the group. We're currently going through a gap assessment, so all of the businesses internally are taking the revised Standard and doing really section by section a self-assessment of where they think the gaps are supported by technical practitioners from my team, so we have a group of regional leads and technical leads who go out and support the assets to do this. They're coming up with their action plans to close out the actions by the end of the year and then the next 12 months, we expect they will close out these gaps - some of them are big pieces of work as Lara said, you know, some of our businesses don't have current impact assessments, so some of those businesses will be doing significant pieces of work like that, and then by 2024, we would expect that our businesses are consistently complying with our asset, with our CSP Standards. So definitely looking at broader engagement processes. The importance of storytelling, and

all the other ways that we engage with people to understand what's important to them and how we can support them.

**Stefan Hansen (Tyndall):** Hello everyone, just a question on the work Rio Tinto has been doing with the Traditional Owners on Western Range country. I think Chris touched on the Social and Cultural Heritage Management Plan from a water perspective. But I was just wondering if you could sort of maybe talk a little bit more on how that plan has evolved from previous practices, you know, maybe using the last major development at Gudai-Darri as an example of how the initial plans at that project differ from what you're doing now, you know, sort of what new practices you've put in place just to give us a sense on how that might impact the development of the Western Range.

**Kellie Parker:** Thanks very much Stefan I might hand to you Chris to talk through that one.

**Chris Dark:** Yeah, I'll tell you the difference - and Gudai-Darri going through that same stage as well - so what I would say the differences is now is our process from almost start of early stage of a project right through to execution of project we're bringing in the Traditional Owners at an earlier stage to help in terms of both the certainty of design and help in terms of speed design, but also use you get out early, where the cultural values are and how they need to be protected to allow us to help with that design and speed up that design so in the Western Range Project we had multiple iterations of design to ensure we could protect the significant sites that were identified and then you're working through transparently with the Traditional Owner on the decisions we can make and the impacts they have. And you're actually making some decisions together on some of that stuff, it's actually a much more collaborative, transparent and then you're holding each other accountable for the process right through the operation of the mine where you're there - they're involved in helping monitor some of those key sites and help manage those key sites as we go through the life of mine. So it's a lot more, basically, collaborative partnership approach and from what we've heard from Yinhawangka is, I think, that's just going to continue to evolve in their eyes and we for us I don't see any other way. It's the fastest way and the most efficient way for everyone involved to achieve a desired outcome where we do with a development but it actually gets to the least impact for the Traditional Owner and we get to protect the significance sites in a way that actually, they've helped

design and we've helped them be accountable for doing so. I think it's just a new way of operating and I don't think there's any other way going forward.

**Stefan Hansen:** Alright. Thanks very much.

**Kieran Murray (Baillie Gifford):** Hello guys, thanks very much for the call this morning. I suppose I wanted to ask a more high-level question. In the past year you've had a new Chairman of the Board appointed and I just wondered - it's obviously quite early in his tenure - but any early interactions with Dominic Barton and any specific changes in direction and how Dominic wants things done compared with Simon Thompson previously. Just trying to understand that connection between on the ground what you're doing, cause a lot of the information says been site specific or regional specific which has been fantastic, but I'm just trying to make that connection to the boardroom if you can just help me understand that please.

**Kellie Parker:** Yeah, sure. Dominic has definitely had an impact into the business. He has spent time on site with the PKKP people and understanding the tragic events that unfolded and the pain that we caused and the work that needs to happen to start to rebuild the relationship and also continue to do the remedy work, which we are doing with PKKP. He has also spent time at the assets. He spends a lot of time - thank goodness COVID travel restrictions have been lifted for him - because he has literally gotten himself around many of the assets to truly understand our business and the issues within the business and how the operations run and the differences that we have across our different geographies. And then we've just most recently presented strategy to him and the Board which was you know a continuation of what we have been doing and it was fully endorsed. He was very, very pleased with the work that we have done and presented around strategy and how we take that forward and so I think that there's a lot for him to learn. He's learning fast. It's very impactful how he wants to see the business grow and develop and then endorse that strategy, which we will be able to share much more at Capital Markets Day but, you know, certainly very engaging and we enjoy working with him.

**Tim Clark (Standard Bank):** Thank you very much, good morning. Just that my sense, reading or just flicking through the report and then listening to the presentation, is that this is very focused on Australia and very focused on Australian operations and perhaps that you're less focused or perhaps a little bit further back behind the curve or behind the

progress line at places like Jadar or Arizona or you know, Canada even in South Africa, where community issues are significant and have been significant. I just wonder if you could speak about where you think you are on the progression scale across different geographies, whether you think all geographies are moving at the same pace or like your executive management program sounded fantastic, but it also sounded pretty Australian right? I could be wrong, but that's what I'd like to get clarity on thanks.

**Kellie Parker:** Yeah, thanks very much Tim and look the disclosure is very much around you know the issue that we had, the tragic events happened at Juukan was in Australia and things had to change in Australia. Our you know US\$50 million commitment started in Australia but what's really important is that that all those lessons are learnt across the geographies and across our different assets. We have built much of the work into the CSP Standard that Melinda talked about and we're in a gap assessment at every asset to understand, you know, where they're at, and what do they need to close the gap. But I might hand to Adam. He most recently spent some time in North America and at Resolution with many of the tribes and certainly understanding you know how things have been reflected over there.

**Adam Lees:** Yeah, thanks Kellie and great question Tim. So a significant focus has been sort of looking at the lessons and the learnings from everything we've done in the Indigenous Affairs space in Australia and contemplating how we can roll those out. One of the early wins that we have had is - so we've had our second round, where our second intake of emerging leaders into the graduate program that Kellie mentioned earlier, and we've extended that to New Zealand. So for the first time we have Maori employees who are the Indigenous people from New Zealand we have I think three employees who are now part of that program we're seeking to replicate that for example, in North America and looking at our options there. We're also looking through the Canada strategy that is still under development that Melinda and her team have developed is looking at how we can do the same in Canada and North America and certainly the opportunity for me and members of my team to go and have a look at the project, the copper project at Resolution and meet first hand with tribal leaders and community members to understand - and employees as well, that was a really important part - to understand how we can support their aspirations and support that development and we've come back and given quite comprehensive feedback internally to the Copper team around our thoughts and

observations to strengthen that. So it's actually, it's a terrific opportunity for us to apply the lessons out of Australia to North America as well as potentially South America and elsewhere and I feel really confident and very positive around that.

**Tim Clark (Standard Bank):** My sense is just the community is going to become the sort of the tennis elbow over securing resources and developing mines and developing assets that are retaining assets and hence it's going to become a massive global focus and I just - but congratulations on the progress today. Thank you.

**David Whittaker (NSW T Corp):** Yeah, thanks Tom. Look thanks Kellie. For the discussion and the reporting – the report, it's a great level of disclosure around the survey results and the candid comments and feedback. How do you think investors should interpret that information and the scores there. We don't really know what the sample size is - some of them go up and down up a bit, some go - there's a lot. There's a lot of data points there. But what what's the - how do you think we should go about interpreting that information and that disclosure to get, you know, for us to really build our understanding of the progress that you're making on managing these risks and addressing those issues.

**Kellie Parker:** It's a good question David. I think that, you know, we've got two principles that we've been working on and certainly big core to me is that transparency builds trust, so if we start theming things or you know, collating things up people don't trust us. So full transparency actually helps build trust and we've got plenty of feedback at the beginning is that we were, you know, and in all honesty many people were telling us that we were spin doctors just after Juukan Gorge, so putting it all out there is part of the way that we believe that we build trust not only with our partners, but you know also with all of our other stakeholders. But there's a lot of jargon. There's a lot of stuff in there right, and there's a lot of stuff to you know work your way through. I think you can interpret it that we're making progress, that this is a very long journey on how we improve, and just as Tim said, you know, I'm a complete believer that you are with your community from the beginning of a project – even when you start to think about where the resource is - all the way to the end and it's that community that gives you your social licence to operate, so as we continue to progress, we continue to close the gap on how we work with communities, how we listen to communities, how we feedback, how we find, how we co-design, how we co-manage what we need to do. And societies changing and the more that we listen the more that we understand that of how - what's our role in that.

**David Whittaker:** OK, thanks very much.

**Maryna Arabei (Harding Loevner):** Hi. Thank you so much for the presentation. I'm curious in what capacity Indigenous people participate in the co-design and co-management that you are talking about and what's the highest level of participation?

**Kellie Parker:** Yeah, thanks for quite for the question. I might hand to Chris just to talk through some of those examples of how we're actually really doing that.

**Chris Dark:** So if you look at the way we do engagement, the way we, so we do surveys out on country with multiple surveys before family groups that are associated with that Traditional Owner group. I suppose the example I'm talking about here is the Western Range. So we first of all on country, making sure we have wide participation, we make sure there's clear scope of what we're there to see. Making sure we get all the information we can on country. We then bring it back to engagement to again make sure we have all family groups covered. We bring in independent consultants that we pay for, so we, we reimburse for and that provides independent advice to the Traditional Owners on the information that was presented whether it be an environmental whether it be the cultural heritage that was identified, what sort of landforms, which we're talking about putting in place, what sort of infrastructure we're talking about in place. We make sure that as part of that engagement there's certainly widespread knowledge across the full - as many people as we can get involved as we can through that survey through engagement through the decision making. And then it goes through the Traditional Owners governance committees - whether that be a heritage committee or whether that be a board committee - their decision-making process up to themselves. So we make sure we, we present the information transparently in a way that they can understand and we make sure they get independent advice to allow them to make informed decisions through their own governance framework, allows it to come up through and end up in a Social, Cultural Heritage Plan Management Plan and then our decision. So I'm not sure if that fully answered, but we certainly widely consulted over a period of time with as many people as possible of the Traditional Owner groups and making sure there's full representation.

**Maryna Arabei:** Thank you.

**Shane Chaplin (Swedbank):** Thanks just unmuting here. A couple of the areas of improvements you mentioned in the presentation, there was some recruiting of experts

within this area and I was just wondering how that's being approached and if you sort of have a plan for, you know, what people you need and what places and when you want to be able to fulfil that?

**Kellie Parker:** Thank Shane. I'm going to hand to Melinda because her team has done a fabulous job of really, you know, not only understanding our current capability but how do we develop it and where do we need capability for the future.

**Melinda Buckland:** Yeah, thanks Shane. I guess that report was specifically looking at heritage experts, but I'm going to respond more broadly because I think, you know, holistically we need to build or rebuild the technical capability across the group in all aspects of engagement with our communities, so within the central team that we established last year we have a specific work stream which is looking at competence. So we did an assessment last year and audit across the group of capability. We looked at 20 competencies and we identified where the strengths and where the gaps were. Not surprisingly, I guess, within the broader group of community and social performance professionals, cultural heritage is not something everybody is an expert in so it is something we draw on. We do have specific heritage experts in heritage roles and Chris has got quite a significant number of them in his team and we also of course, call on consultants and experts where we don't have the in-house requirements, but just more broadly, I guess on competence, either work that the teams doing as once we had done that assessment we've identified where the gaps are that we needed additional training. We've been developing training programs. We've got a foundations course, which we run with one of the universities, which is really for the entry level people. We have communities of practice for the rollout of the Standard this year. We've had monthly teach-ins so running three different time zones. We have on the average of 150 people or so join those or have been joining those each month and we pick out a section of the standard and run through that and most recently, we had the most fabulous communities and social performance conferences. We had two global conferences, one in Brisbane and one in Montreal, where we had people from all over our assets - about 130 people in both of those, and externals - some really highly qualified and eminent external practitioners - come to talk to us around good practices, I mean, we have a lot of that learning internally. So it was great to share that learning and I think that's another, perhaps sometimes we don't give it the due regard that that sort of internal sharing, but building that network



and strengthening the network so people internally can sort of call each other and lean on each other where they know they've got expertise across the group I think it's been really, really great and then obviously complementing that with the externals. So we've really got a broad program and we will run the gap or the sort of capacity or capability assessment again next year to check where we are to see where we've made progress. We obviously do monitoring against the competencies year on year. But it's really something that I've, to be honest, I've not seen in other companies, so it's been actually wonderful to be a part of and see that capability build across the group.

**Shane Chaplin (Swedbank):** Thanks very much. Can I be bold enough to ask another question? I was just wondering on sort of conflict resolution where it really gets the pointy end sort of, I mean, you know you develop a new project say their Western Range. I mean, how do things play out and what's the routine and, you know, if there's a really sort of you know high grade part of the ore body or something it's sitting on a site which local land owners say, no this is for us is no go, is there full consent on everything that gets done these days and how do you deal with, because this is a pointy end of the work isn't it, this is where all this kind of really starts to matter is what happens on the ground in these difficult situations.

**Kellie Parker:** So say we, we started that straight after Juukan where we actually reviewed all of the areas of cultural heritage and their significance and we went back to every group and checked and actually we took, you know, at that stage, 55 million off our mine plan. So it's an ongoing process as Chris talked about not only just start with the surveys, but then as every mine plans. are updated they go back into the group as part of the co-management and say, you know, what works? What are the options? What doesn't and if it doesn't work, and it's something needs to change, then it's changed and I certainly think, you know, certainly most recently you know, we've taken a quite a very strong position at ERA where, you know, the Traditional Owners do not want mining at the next mining lease of uranium, which is Jabiluka and we're backing them. So it's happening in relationships and understanding their culture, their decision processing and that's what we talk about is co-management.

**Shane Chaplin:** Thanks very much.

**Ed John (ACSI):** Thank you. I just had the question around next year's reporting. So there's obviously that shift to the annual report, which is pretty difficult to fit in terms of space and detail so just interested as to whether the same processes of consultation will happen and particularly with things like, you know, the phase two of the audit process and taking this work internationally, you know, what sort of detail will we say either within that in your annual report, or going to separate reporting from the company?

**Kellie Parker:** Yeah, that that is a good question, and it's absolutely work in progress right now about what we'll be formally including in the annual report. What would go up on our website and what will just be very transparent back into the community. So as Melinda talked about, you know, grievances processes should be quite public and transparent about what does the community think. What are actual stakeholders thinking of our mine plans and then, how do we actually embed that back into metrics back into our business and how do we then, you know, hold ourselves to account. So it's absolutely ongoing work. Can't quite answer it just yet because we're really deeply thinking about it, but we do know that transparency continues to build trust and we don't, we want to make sure that that is absolutely seen, so how we go about doing that is, there could be a bit of a mixture going forward but we'll be letting you know how it works.

**Ed John:** Thank you.

**Kellie Parker:** Thanks so much everyone for your attendance and your questions have been really good questions. I can see that there were more hands up so if there's follow up questions, please reach out to the Investor Relations Team. We'd love to continue to engage with you and continue to update you on where we're at but yeah, thanks very much and I'll now close the call. Thank you.

[ENDS]