



Anglo American 2025 Full Year Results – Q&A

20 February 2026

Liam Fitzpatrick (Deutsche Bank): Just had two or three questions on Collahuasi and QB around timing and process. So I think you originally said you wanted to begin construction from 2028. So can you walk us through when you would hope to reach an agreement with Glencore and the other partners, and when you would need to make the relevant permit license applications to meet that deadline? I think Glencore has said recently that they would like to be an equal owner with you in that future JV if that's where it heads. Is that a deal breaker? Is that on the table?

And final quick one - has your team visited QB since the due diligence in the summer? And are you happy in general with how the TMF work is progressing?

Duncan Wanblad: Okay. Thanks, Liam. Look, the baseline for growth at Collahuasi is the fourth line. And that has a very key milestone in and around the back end of 2027, where you have to commit to the development of the fourth line. Once you start deploying large amounts of capital into a new plant, that starts to materially impact the viability and the returns associated with the combination of Quebrada Blanca and Collahuasi. So around 2028 on current production rates at Collahuasi is when we would need to be sure that we are going down the combined mine path or we are taking a standalone fourth line pathway. I mean it is clear to me that based on all the economics that I've seen of both of those options that the combined Collahuasi/QB option is by far and away the most attractive, not least of all because of the lack of complexity, relatively speaking, in terms of building that plant and infrastructure, but also because of the capital intensity associated with it. And that's a very big driver of returns in the copper mining industry. So on that basis, we really do need to get a crack on and we need to get the ownership arrangements sorted out. We need to get the shareholder agreements in place and move on. I'm very well aware of Gary's wishes. We have had a conversation, Gary and I directly, and he's been very forthright in terms of what he would like at the end of the day. I have been similarly forthright as to what I would like at the end of the day, and now we are negotiating. I'm not sure what Gary will choose to do here, but I won't negotiate this in public. So we will just keep going until we've got a plan that makes sense for all shareholders and get it done as quickly as we can because the value at stake is pretty high here.

I don't believe we have actually visited en masse Quebrada Blanca since the diligence just before the announcement in September. But I do know that we have provided some assistance to Quebrada Blanca on the technical side in terms of them working through the most optimal way to manage the paddocks around the development of the tailings dam, and provided some advice and information to them on the cyclone modifications that they have just installed, and it seems to be operating okay.

Tyler Broda: We'll go to Ian. I'll go back and forth the row equally.

Ian Rossouw (Barclays): First question on Woodsmith. It would be great to get a bit of details around that and how the feasibility study is going in the shaft? And how should we think about this partnership? Obviously you mentioned a 25% equity stake. Is that a fixed number? Or can that swing around?

And then secondly, just on De Beers - obviously, it's been great to see the working capital release sort of help bring that cash flow to neutral. You won't have that card to play this year in a still challenging market. How can you sell a cash negative asset? Are you confident that you can do

that? And how should we think about the structure? Should we think about a sort of low upfront value and then a deferred sort of number contingent on the recovery in the diamond market?

Duncan Wanblad: Okay, on Woodsmith and the progress of the feasibility study - so I think last year this time, we were pretty clear on the three requirements that we needed to get to a point where we could ever even contemplate a full notice to proceed sanction for the project. One of those was the feasibility study, the second was a syndication and the third was having a balance sheet that was robust enough to carry the development of the project in its syndicated form forwards. Specifically to your question on the feasibility study - so in accordance with the slowdown plan, it's progressed really rather well during the course of last year. So they got to about 30 kilometers on the tunnel of 37 kilometers with a single tunnel boring machine, and we got pretty well into those sandstones. The outcome of that experience in the sandstones is that we can absolutely mine at more than a meter a day, which was the key determinant point in terms of whether it was going to swing one way or the other. There's more water than we would like in those sandstones for sure, but the drilling rate or the cutting rate is fine to support the current economics in the study.

And then as far as the syndication is concerned, of course, we're delighted that Mitsubishi has taken an option on this thing. They have invested quite a lot in this thing, both directly into the project, but also in their own understanding of the end markets themselves. So Mitsubishi have now got a reasonably well-developed trading desk in fertilizers. They've developed an understanding and knowledge of this, and I think that gave them enough confidence to acquire an option for a 25% stake in the project if and when it gets to feasibility study. So I think that that's very positive on a momentum basis, but still a long way to go given the timing to get to feasibility. I mean just on feasibility - the next hurdle now having understood sandstones and the impact of sandstones to the project is to get close enough to the ore body, so we can put some lateral long holes on top of the ore body with some deflections down into it, and so we can start to characterize and define the detail of the ore body to help us develop a mining plan that will ensure the payback period if we sanction the project. And I think as John said, given all of that stuff that's going on, it's running exactly as per the slowdown plan at the moment, but no chance of any of that happening before 2028.

On De Beers, regarding the working capital release - yes I think Al and the team did a really good job of that. And as John said, we now have inventories that are down more at sort of normal levels, the consequence of which is whilst there's probably still a little bit that we could do there, it won't have the same impact in 2026 as it did during 2025. The consequence of which is Al and the De Beers team are looking really hard at other mechanisms of cash flow preservation during the course of this year. And some of those are going to be potentially big changes in terms of overhead costs and other areas that De Beers have under management at the moment.

As far as the divestment process is concerned, I'm not really worried about that because the parties that we have in the divestment process all genuinely understand diamonds and diamond markets. All of them have deep experience in the type of cycles that are experienced in diamond businesses. And certainly, all of them recognize the deep value in De Beers and the quality of the assets that we have in De Beers, so not only the brand in the business, but also the quality of the underlying assets, particularly the Botswana assets. So I don't think that this has a material impact in terms of where we are in terms of the desire for a strategic buyer for the business.

Of course, that will play through into the structure of the proceeds that you get for the business because if the business is cash flow negative for a while, it will need to be funded for a while. And I suspect that we will see some form of structure in the consideration of the business. So some upfront payment perhaps, and then some contingent payments depending on the time it takes for the industry to recover.

Ephrem Ravi (Citi): Just a follow-up on De Beers - I get that the participants in the bidding process are industry veterans in the diamond industry. But at what point in time or at what parameters would you consider a spin-off or a spin-off to shareholders via a demerger versus a sale? I mean in terms of how much of that value deferral can you take versus a demerger? So I think just some criteria like the fertilizer three points that will guide your decision, like your North Star, would be helpful.

Secondly, on copper, and thematic in general, streaming has been a big sort of theme for all the diversifieds this result season. And you are one of the few people whose cost is actually going up year-on-year from a guidance perspective, presumably due to lack of precious metals credits. Is there some rabbit in the hat that you have which we are not aware of where you could kind of stream and surprise the market?

Duncan Wanblad: So let me deal with that one first. There aren't really any rabbits in the hat because the streaming of the minor metals is a function of what's actually in the ground, and the resources that we have aren't well endowed with silver and gold, unfortunately. The fundamental underpin to the costs going up, as John pointed out on his slide, are driven by two factors. The first of these is that we have strengthening producer currencies relative to the dollar. But at the same time, it also reflects the mix of products that we have during the course of 2026 relative to 2025. But that mix also changes back again in 2027. So we're producing from the lower grade, higher cost Los Bronces mine more proportionately than we would be from Collahuasi, just given that we're moving through that pushback phase, and still reliant quite heavily on some of the stockpile production during the course of the year. But as we move now in 2027 back into the fresh ore in Rosario, that cost profile changes again because we're in that better higher-grade ore. And at the same time in 2027, we will have moved more around the mine in Los Bronces and we'd be producing predominantly from the Donoso 2 phase which is a higher grade phase of the ore. And so the costs will adjust associated with that, too.

So those are the two primary drivers. And unfortunately, I don't have enough silver and gold in the ore bodies today. Quellaveco has some silver, by the way, and doing very well out of that.

John Heasley: Can I just add on the cost point - our cost guidance doesn't assume those prices are at current levels, so more consistent with a little bit more conservatism given volatility. So if we were to see silver prices stay up at sort of current levels, then there would be some upside to that cost guidance.

Duncan Wanblad: Your question on the spin-off of De Beers is a good one and slightly complicated in the context of if we were to spin De Beers today, it would be a real challenge in the context of where markets are and where comparables are for a company like De Beers, and therefore we've chosen to prioritize the strategic sale of the business.

This does not remove the option of being able to list De Beers at a time in the future, but it's unlikely to be in the current market environment. And therefore the sale is the priority that we are focusing on right now.

Tyler Broda: We'll go to Myles, and then we'll come back.

Myles Allsop (UBS): With the demerger, is there anything that could go wrong now? I mean how have your discussions with the Chinese regulators been progressing? Is there anything that we should be mindful of? And then thinking about the \$800 million - obviously you're doing more work. That was an audited number. How much upside do you see to the \$800 million? That's the first question.

Duncan Wanblad: Myles, so there is actually nothing to comment about in terms of the China regulatory process as it is at the moment. It's pretty much going as we expected it to do at this particular point in time. There have been no odd asks at all, and we're just in the process of providing the information that they've required under the usual process at this point in time. So as I said, we expected fully that this would take sort of 12 to 18 months. Nothing has changed our view on that at this point.

As far as the \$800 million goes, I don't have a new target that I'm putting out in the public at this particular point in time. Safe to say that cost management is a very key component of what we think makes a successful mining company going forward. And we are in the process of developing a really strong muscle on cost management throughout the business. And I think you should expect that to continue as we go forward. So whilst there isn't another target at this point in time, we are still absolutely working on bringing the overall operating costs in the business down. As John said, we are less focused on C1 type of costs because it's like a balloon, you squeeze it here, it pops out somewhere else. I care a lot about the total costs in the business, and that's what we manage on a day-to-day basis.

Myles Allsop: And then maybe just a bit like the streaming question - on infrastructure and other assets in the portfolio, things like water assets, obviously there's one in Collahuasi. Are you actively exploring other opportunities to optimise value through the portfolio? You have Samancor as well, I guess that's always one that kind of sits in the shadows and there's potentially a pathway to some restructuring there?

Duncan Wanblad: So I suppose the simplest answer to your question is we look through the portfolio all the time and look for these value-accretive opportunities. And to the extent that they are genuine and are long-lasting in their effect and not just a sugar hit, we will pursue them pretty rigorously. So that includes having a look at the infrastructure options that exist throughout the portfolio, too. But very often, you are kind of hooked up on the back of the fact that unless you have multiple offtakers on a particular set of infrastructure, it still all flows directly through to your balance sheet on a look-through basis. So it doesn't really change much, other than potentially add a margin that you're going to have to swallow somewhere along the line. But where there are opportunities where there are multiple offtakers and you can do something with the assets, and it doesn't compromise the viability of the current operations or the potential future viability of expansion or development of those businesses, we look at that very closely.

Samancor, I mean that's manganese. As I've said it before, that's a wonderful option that we've still got in the portfolio. It's producing really well. So now having come back after the cyclones in

Australia a year ago, it's a nice cash producer. I don't feel like I'm in a great rush to have to restructure anything on that at this particular point in time. I think it provides good optionality within the portfolio on a future basis.

Tyler Broda: All right. Let's geographically go with Dom.

Dominic O'Kane (JP Morgan): I just want to touch on Codelco. So you have a very strong and a very close working relationship with Codelco. So is there any update you can provide us with on your Andina conversations, but also how do you sense the engagement with Codelco is maybe changing for your organisation and the industry more broadly? Do you see more opportunities for your group and the industry more broadly to work more closely and pursue those types of opportunities that Codelco has at its disposal?

Duncan Wanblad: Yes. Thanks, Dom. Look, I mean you're right insofar as we've had a very long-standing relationship with Codelco given that they have been a partner of ours for many, many years now on Anglo Sur, which is Los Bronces, El Soldado and the Chagres smelter. And certainly, through many years of that sort of partnership, the operational relationships have been excellent. So even before we did the Los Bronces/Andina deal, we had to work very closely with them in terms of managing operational interfaces on the border of Andina and Los Bronces, and that was generally very effectively done by the two general managers and the people working for them.

What we were able to do with the synergy and liberating that wedge that exists between the two, dropping the huge expansion capex load on both sides of the fence, I think, is very much a function of how Codelco has been thinking for several years, certainly under the leadership of Maximo Pacheco. Given that these were hugely value-accretive opportunities for Codelco, they very commercial in the way that they approached it and thought about it. And certainly, given how I perceive it, it has been accepted nationally in Chile and within the various arms of government, and I can't really see why that should change in the future. Of course, we know we are going into a phase now where there's a new government in Chile and there could be some changes in the leadership of Codelco. But I think what fundamentally underpins what's happened today is a very hard core commercial rationale. And Chile is still very, very positive on foreign direct investment growth and copper growth, particularly.

Jason Fairclough (Bank of America): Two quick ones. First one is on BHP. So you had a brief follow-up with them in November. Some investors were surprised it was so brief. So I don't know if that's a question for you or for the Board?

Duncan Wanblad: Maybe for Mike. No. I mean there was a conversation that was had, and neither party felt it was worth pursuing after that conversation.

Tyler Broda: Jason, please.

Jason Fairclough: Okay. Second one, just to follow up on our favorite salt mine. How do you justify putting more capital into this when you're trying to capture a re-rating based on being seen as more of a copper pure play?

Duncan Wanblad: So it certainly is completely consistent with the strategy that we laid out and presented to the market in the middle of 2024. There's no new news in terms of this particular story, and it is the best value-accretive option that we've got for that asset.

So it just makes sense in terms of option preservation to get it to a point where we really do know whether we can or can't take it forward from an investment point of view. Otherwise, it would be a massive write-off and that wouldn't make any sense given the direction of travel and what we understand of that asset today.

Jason Fairclough: Can you just remind us the carrying value and the sunk capital in the asset, though?

Duncan Wanblad: John, can you?

John Heasley: Yes. The carrying value today is just around \$2 billion and total invested capital over the period is about \$5 billion.

Tyler Broda: Matt, please.

Matt Greene (Goldman Sachs): Probably just continuing Duncan with Woodsmith. You touched on the fact that you want to get through the sandstones to get to a technical point to underpin the feasibility study. You're now going and sinking \$0.5 billion to go that little step forward. So it sounds like with this agreement with Mitsubishi that you're still taking on a lot of the risk here. So do they need to see anything in particular here? And I guess just when it comes to bringing in further partners and syndicating here, what are you looking for in a partner? Because is this just a financial partner? Or are you looking at someone that's going to take perhaps disproportionate risk on the marketing side of this product?

Duncan Wanblad: No. So I think Mitsubishi are looking for exactly the same things that we're looking for in terms of a feasibility study. One is continued confidence in an ability to build the market for the product. And as I said earlier, they have developed an in-house capability to test that. So it's hugely validating from our perspective that it's not just us in an echo chamber about how we think this product is landing in the market and how effective it is in the market. We've got a genuine independent view of somebody else who's trying to look at it through the same sort of lenses that we are. And of course, they are absolutely going to need to understand what the capital cost for development of this project is on a go-forward basis, and what the risk inherent in the development of that project is, and that can only be determined by a quality feasibility study.

They do cost a lot these feasibility studies. I'm completely cognizant of that. But the reality is that this was true for Quellaveco too - slightly different scale, but we had to spend a lot of money upfront to fully characterize the risk that we had in that ore body and in the development of the infrastructure around that ore body to know for sure that we had a very high probability of meeting the capital costs within the contingency that we had specified for that project. And this is no different, right? I mean if you want a proper and a secure understanding of what these projects are going to cost and how much they are going to likely be and return to you, you need to do the homework upfront. And so it is this trade-off of how much you spend upfront versus how much of a risk or a gamble you're prepared to take on imperfect information and data to go forward on a project.

We elect to spend a little bit more upfront to get much better security of information and data that then defines not only the execution period of the project, but also the life of the project. And I think that, that was well underpinned by what we saw happen at Quellaveco, not only during the project development and execution phase which is one of the very few projects in the industry in recent times that was absolutely on time and on budget, but not only that, it did kind of what it said it was going to do on the tin and reduced an eight-year payback period to a four-year payback period. I mean that is real value going forward. And that's sort of what I believe Mitsubishi is looking at in the same way that we're looking at, very like-minded, right? Bear in mind, Mitsubishi is also our partner on Quellaveco.

In terms of do we have criteria for other types of investors - so Mitsubishi now have an option to go up to 25%. They're not limited to 25%. So if they chose to, they could go more than that if they would like to. And we are absolutely open to bringing on at least one more partner. The idea here is that it's not only financial. I mean financial risk mitigation is a very big important part of that. That's exactly why we brought on a partner for Quellaveco. But at the same time, to the extent that we can leverage a partner's capabilities, particularly in the mid and downstream of this, is where we'd like it to go.

And as I said, Mitsubishi is developing that capability. They have a very strong trading capability in that business anyway. So they have access to markets and are learning quite a lot about the product, too. So it's that type of partnership that we would see as very valuable going forward.

Matt Greene: That's great. Sorry, if I could just have a follow-on on Collahuasi on the fourth line. Just looking at the guidance next year - you had about, I think, \$600 million on copper growth. Los Bronces was in there. Obviously that's not happening anymore, and you had Collahuasi fourth line. There's no mention of that anymore. Should we read into that at all? This fourth line option has been floated around for 15 years or so. You presented your slides of how many options you have in the pro forma portfolio with Teck. If Glencore doesn't come play with QB, is there an option here that we could see the fourth line deferred again?

Duncan Wanblad: If Glencore doesn't?

Matthew Greene: Obviously you want to get a QB scenario here, but is there a point that you actually decide as Anglo, you do not want to pursue the fourth line because you have alternative options?

Duncan Wanblad: No. Look, I mean we'd never be churlish about this for sure. I mean what we're trying to do is mine the right resources in the right way and at the right time. The fourth line is an option, but it's certainly not the preferred option for Collahuasi. As I say, as I look at the pre-feasibility studies versus the concept studies and so on at this particular point in time, there is a much better option in terms of both risk and capital intensity by doing the combination of Quebrada Blanca and Collahuasi. I mean I would hope that all the partners would see it that way as we move forward. And certainly, I mean that has been fundamentally the driver of the thesis for Collahuasi on all sides of the fence for a long time.

It's now fundamentally how do we set up a new shareholders' agreement and how do we share the value of the synergies. And that's the negotiation.

Tyler Broda: We'll go to Chris.

Chris LaFemina (Jefferies): So first, Jonathan mentioned yesterday on the call that you received U.S. regulatory approvals. You mentioned it again today. Is that like full Hart-Scott-Rodino, DOJ, FTC, U.S. regulatory approvals are done, and which, in my opinion, would be a major step forward because of the fact that copper is a critical mineral now as per Congress, and Teck's biggest shareholders are Chinese? I thought that would be a hurdle to getting this across the finish line. So are you fully done with U.S. regulations? That's the first question.

Duncan Wanblad: Yes. So certainly, all the regulations that we needed to have applied for consent under, we have at this particular point in time. The only two outstanding are South Korea and China.

Christopher LaFemina: And then secondly, on Moranbah North - I think back in August, you said the run rate was costing you \$45 million a month or something, and that was six months ago.

Duncan Wanblad: That's right.

Christopher LaFemina: In the last couple of months, has it been similar to that level? And then with the phased restart of the longwall now, and I think you referred to it as a structured restart of the longwall, what exactly does that entail? And what are the cost run rates as you're ramping this thing back up?

Duncan Wanblad: Okay. John's probably got exactly the numbers, but of course, they will be lower for two reasons.

One is from November, Moranbah North got back into production in a limited fashion, but there is actually coal being cut and it is being sold. That's point one. Point two, it's being sold into a higher price environment at the moment, which is also pretty helpful. But specifically to your question about what is actually happening in terms of the ramp-up again at Moranbah North - first of all, the permission that we got to restart the mine at the end of October last year, so really a restart in November, was conditional on the fact that when we were actually cutting coal with the longwall, we didn't have anybody underground until such time as we got far enough away from what was believed to be the source of the incident. And during that period, therefore, we had to remotely operate the longwall which is a good thing, right, because that's generally a more productive way of doing it over time. But, because if you have a roof fall or anything, that sort of impacts the whole chain and the longwall and so on, and then you have to stop. We had a condition that said we had to see what happened to the atmosphere and the environment down there - it had to get to sort of stable levels in terms of carbon monoxide, and then we could send people down. And so the gap between a stop and a restart was anywhere between 6 and 12 hours. So it's pretty unproductive.

We are now, as of the beginning of February, in a position that we can run the mine completely unrestricted in that context. We have an agreement with our own workforce to be about 120 meters away from where that incident occurred before we actually start running it in an unrestricted sort of fashion.

We're at about 90 meters now. So another few weeks to a month is where we would now then be able to just start ramping up under normal conditions, with the natural variations which are attributable to that type of ore body.

Tyler Broda: Can we go to Alain quickly, if that's all right. And we keep it to one question from here on, as we've only got a few minutes left, if that's okay.

Alain Gabriel (Morgan Stanley): One question from my side, Duncan, is granted you've got your hands full with completing the Teck transaction, but you've also got a very capable project team at Quellaveco. Do you see opportunities to leverage their capabilities in exploiting inorganic options such as partnerships with other majors in Latin America where you can best utilise this team?

Duncan Wanblad: Alain, you are quite right. I have an absolutely capable team across all fronts. And certainly, Ali and the projects team are looking for every opportunity that they can, as well as Helena and the business development team. And to the extent that there are opportunities for us, we would, of course, engage in those. They would have to fit all the criteria that we have in terms of how we allocate capital and how we manage risk in the business going forward. We don't have any external options that are on the table that you don't know about today in that space, and particularly not in Peru at this point.

Tyler Broda: Tony?

Tony Robson (Global Mining Research): Possibly for John - carrying values for De Beers is \$2.3 billion. Could you remind us, please, I'm sure it's in the accounts - is that before or after any debt within De Beers, so is it net or gross?

And secondly, given that it's a discontinued asset and you're much closer now to realizing its value or knowing what its value is, are there any accounting IFRS rules that say you have to mark to market? So is that on future prices and cost discount rates and so on, your \$2.3 billion?

John Heasley: Yes. So the \$2.3 billion is on an enterprise value basis. So of course, there is some intercompany funding within De Beers, but from a valuation perspective, that sort of nets out, and that's sort of sunk capital from an Anglo American perspective. So the \$2.3 billion which is 100%, remember, and not the Anglo American share, is on an enterprise value basis.

In terms of the accounting - you have to sort of look at the fair market value and the value in use when you're doing your impairment assessment. So you have to take both of those things into account. So there is no absolute requirement to mark-to-market, but you, of course, have to take into account information that you have around what that market value could be as you are forming the impairment assessment.

Tyler Broda: We'll go to Ben and Alan quickly here.

Ben Davis (RBC): Just on De Beers - I was wondering if you could give us any color on the potential bidders. Has that settled down now? Has that been bedded down? It feels like we've had a lot of media reports of various government interest, consortium interest, but how well financed are those? And also, do those consortiums include governments etc.?

Duncan Wanblad: So they're all consortia that are involved. Some of them include governments and some of them don't. So there is a possibility that our share will be sold in three parts potentially or two parts potentially. That depends on where we get to in the negotiation in the next few weeks.

Patrick Mann (Investec): Can I just ask a little bit more on the timeline - so it looks that the optimal scenario here would be dispose of steelmaking coal, close nickel and De Beers before Anglo Teck closes at the end of the year and pay the special dividend. Are you confident in the timing of the De Beers thing? Or could we see a scenario where Anglo Teck closes and you're still trying to exit De Beers post that fact?

And then I understand that your best estimate is still 12 to 18 months, but given there's only two outstanding regulatory requirements, what is the soonest this could happen? I mean, could we wake up in a couple of months and it's done?

Duncan Wanblad: There is nothing in terms of the Anglo American portfolio restructure that is contingent on the completion of the deal with Teck. So the sequence that you described would be absolutely ideal if indeed we could make that happen. But there's no contingency of that to the completion.

So the consequence of that is that it is highly likely if the deal closes in that 12-month window, so around about September or so of this year, that De Beers will still be in the portfolio. I'm targeting, of course, to have it sold by that particular point in time, but it then will be running through its statutory and regulatory processes for completion. So it would be in Anglo Teck's portfolio until such time as it was gone.

In terms of the 12 to 18 months, I mean I think theoretically, that there's not much change in that 12-month time. And therefore that is the most likely period where we would expect it to be completed.

Tyler Broda: Very good. I think that's it - are there any other questions left in the audience?

There aren't. Okay. Well in that case, thank you very much for all of your questions at the end of a very long week. We really appreciate it. And I look forward to following up with you in due course. Thank you.

Duncan Wanblad: Thank you.