



Anglo American 2025 Interim Results – Q&A

31 July 2025

Ian Rossouw (Barclays): Just a question on De Beers around the \$2 billion of inventory that you've previously mentioned John - today you said that of the inventory release of \$0.6 billion, a lot of that was from De Beers. Could you maybe give a bit of details where we stand now and what is normalized levels per your comments?

John Heasley: Yes, sure. No problem. Thanks, Ian and good morning.

So when we look at the total inventory in De Beers, at the end of 2024, that was about \$2.3 billion, something like that. And as you say, the majority of that working capital inflow for the group was in respect of De Beers inventory.

So, when you roll that through, then the sort of inventory that remains in De Beers is probably about \$1.8 billion, something like that. Not all of that, of course, is rough diamonds. There's various other things in there across the industrial businesses and retail stock, and so on. But when we look at the rough diamond inventory, then that's pretty much getting down to about the levels that we would consider normal for De Beers.

Ian Rossouw: And is that all carried on the balance sheet, or is the some of that off balance sheet?

John Heasley: All on balance sheet.

Ian Rossouw: Okay. And how does that impact the book value of the business?

John Heasley: Well, it's within the carrying value of the business. So relative to the \$4 billion that we had before, then there'll be a movement in that to reflect the reduction in the inventory in terms of what sits on the balance sheet - not necessarily a material difference in the overall valuation of the business in a willing buyer, willing seller scenario. But yes, what's on the balance sheet would be lowered by the reduction in inventory.

Ian Rossouw: Okay, all right. Thank you.

Liam Fitzpatrick (Deutsche Bank): Good morning. First question just on Met coal and the sale process there - just trying to gauge your level of confidence on completing with Peabody? And I think their position has been that they need to see a return to sustainable long-wall mining to complete. Is that a shared position? Do we need to see some sort of restart before completion can happen?

Duncan Wanblad: So look, fundamentally, under the contract, there's no real damage at all to the ore body. Obviously, the cash flows are delayed in terms of the restart. And what I am very confident on is the process that we followed to get it to restart and the progress that we're making within that process. So, on that basis, we believe that the contract should complete under the normal conditions. And we've been working quite hard with Peabody to make that a reality.

Liam Fitzpatrick: Then just a quick follow up on the costs. The \$500 million remaining, how much of that will flow through into the unit cost that we eventually see for 2026 versus kind of general overhead?

John Heasley: In terms of the \$0.5 billion, the majority of what's still to come through sits in corporate costs. So, I would say that less of that will be coming through in unit cost as more sits corporately. Just by nature of where we're at in the restructuring - of course, we're divesting these businesses, but we still have a corporate center that has to service all of them before they leave, do all the accounting, the legal, the treasury etc. while working through that process. And then once those businesses are divested, the corporate costs come down commensurately.

Matt Greene (Goldman Sachs): Good morning. Duncan, I have a question on Collahuasi. You touched briefly on the challenges around refractory material and the variability of the ore feed. I appreciate you've guided this year as a trough production year. But this is a world class tier one asset. So I'm quite surprised to see it end up in this position with such little operating flexibility. So, if we could take a step back, what have been the contributing factors that have led to this? And are you comfortable that the JV can deliver operational excellence over the medium term and, I guess, to go ahead with the fourth line expansion?

Duncan Wanblad: Yes. Sure, Matt. And it's a great question, of course. And the short answer to that is yes, I am confident that the JV management can deliver sustainable and good outcomes. But if we step back to specifically answer your question, Collahuasi fell behind in its stripping. I mean, we knew that from a while ago. So it wasn't immune from any of the issues that we were dealing with in Anglo generally at the time. So, it was hard yards to push to catch up. And generally, they've been making good progress on doing so. However, this year, they had planned to utilize low grade stockpiles.

Now, for many of us, of course, we say low grade stockpiles and we think it's really low grade at Collahuasi. However the stockpile there is running grades higher than some of the biggest copper mines that are sitting in the industry today. Unfortunately, when they got into that, stockpiles are notorious in terms of the homogenisation and your ability to effectively assay them and so on and so on.

The grade is clearly there, but the recoveries are not, so it's more oxidized than they expected it to be. And then they had the double whammy effect over the fact that they ran out of water. The solution there was to build our own desalination plant. You know, for years we've been struggling with water abstraction there. So the desalination plant was very well progressed, but it wasn't in time to cover off the deficit of water in the first half.

So as I say, a bit of a double whammy effect. That shouldn't exist in the second half of the year. What will continue to exist in some way, shape or form is the fact that our reliance in this bridge period on the stockpile means that we're likely to get lower recoveries from it going forward.

So what do we do now? We work really hard with the management and try and help them to find ways to accelerate that stripping so that we can just open up the back end of the mine again. To that extent, both Glencore and Anglo have found equipment that we've got at our existing operations that we're not utilizing that we're happy to send up to Collahuasi to help them get going with that. But that's the fundamental background to it.

Jason Fairclough (Bank of America): Duncan - two quick ones. First, in terms of the costs associated with the coal mine not being running? Can you frame that for us? I mean, you mentioned earlier \$250 million cost associated with the Valterra problems. I mean, is this hundreds of millions of dollars that it's costing you to not have this run?

Duncan Wanblad: Yes, Jason. So I think roughly the dimensions here are it's about \$45 million a month to keep Moranbah on hold and it's about \$10 million a month to keep Grosvenor on hold. So, that is the shape of it.

Still looking to hopefully get a restart later this year, early next year on Moranbah and, of course, making some quite good progress on Grosvenor, too. So, in the next couple of weeks, hopefully, we'll get the permission to go back underground and so on. But that's sort of the dimension of it.

Jason Fairclough: Okay. Just a small other one. Did you guys used to have a manganese business?

Duncan Wanblad: We still have a manganese business, doing really well – we've had the recovery of the Groote Eylandt resource and the port infrastructure and so on, so been doing good. So, we're hopefully looking forward to some really positive cash flows from that.

Jason Fairclough: Where does it all fit into this? Because I don't really see it being mentioned on any slides today?

Duncan Wanblad: Yes it's because it's not a fundamental main part of the business going forward. So, we hold a minority stake in that. It's not core as you know. At the right time, we'll decide what we need to do with it. But we've got a lot on our plate right now. And so, we're pretty much focused on dealing with the major elements of the portfolio change.

Jason Fairclough: Okay.

Ben Davis (RBC): Quick question on Valterra. Obviously, it's quite a sizable stake of 19.9%. Can you set out your preference, or tell us how you envisage you're going to dispose of that? Is it going to be a series of consecutive blocks? A strategic sale? Valterra buy-back of stock? Any ideas, I guess, would be interesting.

Duncan Wanblad: John, do you want to take that?

John Heasley: Yes. I mean, listen, as we said, the whole reason for holding the 19.9% was to manage the flow back. That's worked pretty well with a 90-day lockup period which, obviously, comes to an end round about the beginning of September. We're open-minded on various options, but our primary objective and priority on this has always been to ensure the successful trading of Valterra.

So, we'll look at our options. Clearly, we sold down previously through some accelerated bookbuilds. That's probably an option that would be the simplest going forward, but that's not to exclude any other options. And then we'll consider the conditions as we move through later this year and into next year for when exactly the right time to do that is.

Ben Davis: Thanks.

Alex Pearce (BMO): Duncan, could you provide us an update on the situation with Transnet and Kumba at the minute? Next year's a lower production year for the asset. And I see in the results

you got some penalties from a take-or-pay situation from Transnet, I believe, this half. And are you able to comment on the kind of levels at which that could be triggered going forward?

Duncan Wanblad: You mean the penalties to us or the penalties to Transnet?

Alex Pearce: The ones Transnet paid to you.

Duncan Wanblad: Yes, Transnet paid us. So no, Alex, I think really positive progress being made within Transnet on the restoration of those assets. Still slow, if I'm perfectly honest with you, but certainly much better availabilities this year than we've seen in previous years. So they went through a very big maintenance program at the end of last year, which was, by and large, successfully completed. And we're now seeing some of the benefits of that.

Of course, the next major step for this particular corridor is very likely going to be some form of concessioning. The government is in a process right now of running an RFI process, Request for Information process. So they're gathering a lot of inputs from various infrastructure players, industry players etc. as to what a concession line would look like.

And then depending on how that all rolls out in their analysis, either later this year or early next year, they'll issue a Request for Quotation, an RFQ, for people to bid on a concession. So I think that that's sort of the pathway of travel.

In the meantime, the mine, in amongst the other user group, so four or five main users on that line, is working really, really closely with Transnet to manage all the reliability and the safety issues on that line. And so far, so good. We'll have to see what happens when the RFQ comes out and what the interest is. But hopefully we get a very solid operator who knows what they're doing in terms of running infrastructure projects to take that over and run it.

As far as the penalties are concerned, I mean, it was a technical issue. So we will get the money back in terms of the tariffs on the way forward.

Alan Spence (BNP): Good morning. It's an election year in Chile and some candidates seem to have some very different views of what Codelco should look like. Any early thoughts on maybe some new options for you in the country?

Duncan Wanblad: Elections are every four years in Chile and the government does change every four years in Chile. I think the most important thing for us to do is just being a good company within Chile, and generally that's been the secret of success. We haven't heard anything specifically that would materially impact what we're doing there or what Codelco is doing, particularly on the Andina/Los Bronces assets. So hopefully still, as I say, looking forward to getting that deal fully inked before the end of this year.

Alan Spence: Thank you. And in Sakatti, what drove the downside – is it the kind of scale of the opportunity you see there, or does it have anything to do with the timeline?

Duncan Wanblad: I think timeline is good. So real material progress with Finland and the delegation for the permits, in particular, having had the project declared by Europe as a strategic project for Europe. I think that was a really material milestone forward. So probably a little bit

more optimistic now on timeline than we were the last time we spoke. The delta in the number is predominantly driven actually by the nickel price, because that's a copper equivalent number.

Alan Spence: Understood.

Richard Hatch (Berenberg): Good morning. Just a question on Collahuasi. You've talked about accelerating the mine development, which is noted in the costs. You mentioned this in your commentary that the costs have stepped up there - about \$480 million at the half now from \$420 million in H2. So, how long should we think about this kind of period of increased costs at Collahuasi?

And then second one is can you just remind us on the capital intensity of the fourth line, my mind isn't good enough anymore. Thanks.

Duncan Wanblad: Okay. John, can you do the capital intensity one? My mind's also not good enough for that.

Just as far as the Collahuasi costs are concerned, as I said, we're going to be working pretty much through to the end of next year. And if we're going to accelerate stripping, that's going to be more trucks. So I think probably through to the end of next year is what you should be assuming there.

Richard Hatch: Does it step up from this level or does it stay at this level?

Duncan Wanblad: No, we're going to work really hard not to let it step up from this level.

Richard Hatch: Okay.

John Heasley: And on capital intensity - I mean obviously we're not at Final Investment Decision or anything on the fourth line. But we know it as a sort of very straightforward brownfield expansion, so it's going to be at the lower end of the typical range.

So, I'm not putting a number out there right now, but I think the returns on that project will certainly be attractive from what we can see today.

Richard Hatch: Okay thanks.

Grant Sporre (Bloomberg Intelligence): It's actually just a follow up on Alex's question. The way you answered it on Transnet and the operator, it sounds like Anglo American wouldn't be interested in, or Kumba wouldn't really be interested in becoming an operator of that line.

Duncan Wanblad: Grant, I think our very, very strong preference is that an infrastructure operator gets that concession and runs it. Obviously, we don't want to be too far away from whatever's happening there because it is important - it's one of the most important lines in South Africa. But absolutely, our preference is that an infrastructure operator who knows about running train-sets and ports etc. is the successful better there.

Grant Sporre: Thank you.

Myles Allsop (UBS): A couple of questions, maybe firstly on the joint ventures. Could you give us a sense as to Serpentina - when will we see the benefit coming through, and what kind of impact on unit cost and realised pricing, in theory, could there be, just to help us model it out as we look out over the next kind of five years or so?

Also, I mean, with Andina and Los Bronces, how should we model that - just assume that volumes go up and unit cost go down? That was the first question around joint ventures.

Duncan Wanblad: Okay. On Serpentina, the critical part there is running through getting the permits, Myles, for opening up that ore body. And as you know, the first step there is just to displace the ore from the existing Minas-Rio mine with this. Why? Because this ore is definitely not as hard as the material that we're going to be moving into by the mid-thirties and certainly is of equivalent or potentially slightly higher grade than what we've got.

So that's a full on permitting process, and in Brazil, that takes four or five years to kind of get that done, but the team is on it. But what we are offsetting by that is potentially a couple of billion dollars of capex, which would be needed to adjust the front end of our current operations with additional crushing, additional milling etc. because we can just put this material, which is much more equivalent to what we're operating now, through the plants.

Again, really important date there is kind of middle of the next decade. So that's what you should be thinking of, and that should enable us to kind of keep the cost *pari passu* in terms of where they are today in real terms.

Myles Allsop: And with Los Bronces?

Duncan Wanblad: Yes, and at Los Bronces and how to think about this and steps going forward - we hopefully finalize the agreements with Codelco later on this year. We then go immediately into a set of processes around standard regulatory approvals and so on. Following which, we have to start permitting the combined mine.

In Chile, the conventional wisdom is that permitting of mines of this nature, just given the work that you need to do on them, is three years, plus or minus, for the EIA, and one year for the sectoral permits that happen after that. But of course, the fundamental logic of this is not only just the value associated with the deferral of significant components of capex on both sides, and access to ultimately that big blocked up wedge of copper that sits between the two mines, but also environmentally, it's a much friendlier solution too, because you're sharing a lot of infrastructure, and therefore you're managing more effectively the inputs such as water and so on.

So hopefully, we can do a bit better than that four years that I've just described. And Chile is one of the countries that is putting an enormous amount of effort into the acceleration of the administrative processes of permitting. So the big benefit there is massive deferrals of capital.

On Los Bronces underground - this is still a fantastic asset, don't forget that that resource there is 1.3% copper. There are not many ore bodies out there that are still at that level of copper. It would go to a bit further back in the queue in terms of its development, of course, unless copper prices went through the roof and we could substantiate its own plant, etc. And then you can just imagine the efficiencies that would be brought about from effectively running one pit rather than two pits.

So, I'm expecting a material cost benefit at a unit cost basis as a result of doing that, and we try and bring that on as quickly as possible. The rate limiting step will be the permit.

Myles Allsop: And will the old concentrator be restarted at broadly at the same time as the joint venture?

Duncan Wanblad: Yes we continue to run options on when and how to restart that concentrator. As I said, it was predicated on a number of things. The first thing is the right grade of ore going into it. The second thing is water. You know that we are now using some of that water that we've got there to remove Perez Caldera, which is a tailings dam that we want to relocate. And so, the combination of those two things and copper price ultimately determine when it's going to restart.

All things being equal in terms of where we are today, we were planning to start it closer to the back end of this decade unless, as I say, copper prices went through the roof *and* we've removed enough of Perez Caldera to satisfy ourselves that it was going to be compliant without any further hassle as far as GISTM considerations and so on are concerned.

Myles Allsop: And just maybe one quick one for John on the balance sheet. So 1x is kind of broadly where you look to be sort, which would be \$6 billion in net debt. Is that kind of the top end of the range, or how should we think about where you want new Anglo leverage to sit and when can we expect cash returns to step up even more aggressively?

John Heasley: Thanks, Myles. I mean, the reference to 1x was really the arithmetic of saying we're at 1.8x today, you take the assumed proceeds on steelmaking coal, on nickel, on Valterra, on De Beers, then very clearly you can see a strong pathway towards sort of, as you say, net debt of sort of \$6 billion and therefore, 1 times.

Where would I want to run the balance sheet? Clearly, our policy at the moment talks about not beyond 1.5x at bottom of cycle. Clearly, we're above that temporarily but that's fine - we'll take action to bring it back. That's clearly where we are just now. As we think about new Anglo, somewhere between 0.5 and 1x, I think, is a good place for the company to be running.

Of course, at certain points, it'd be right to be a little bit lower, and other times, right to be a little bit higher. But I think that that's the right place. Why is that? That's commensurate with a good investment grade credit rating, which I think is the right thing for a company such as ourselves to have, and just ensures that you've got access to liquidity at all points in the cycle, and allows you to be strategically consistent at top of cycle and bottom of cycle which, again, for a mining company in the markets, is really important.

Chris LaFemina (Jefferies): I just wanted to ask some follow ups on the coal sale. So you used the word 'flexible' in your ongoing discussions with Peabody. Is that flexibility around timing of the transaction? Is it about structure? Is it about price?

Maybe all the three? And maybe second to that, in the initial agreed deal, you have contingent deferred payments on Grosvenor for that mine potentially restarting. Is that the kind of structure you might consider on Moranbah North? Because it sounds like the timing of a restart on Moranbah North is far past the termination date of the transaction. So how does that work? I mean, the deal's got to close in September, right? And if you're not restarting the mine too early next year, it's not clear to me how this actually progresses from here?

Duncan Wanblad: Yes Chris, look, as I say - I don't want to get into too many details of the commercial discussions that we're having with Peabody today. Suffice it to say that I think that it's both of our preferences that this deal can complete. And so, we're going to work really hard to try and make that happen.

As I say, to the extent that it can't happen for whatever reasons, it won't be because we don't believe that this mine can restart and that there's real value in the mine going forward. So this will ultimately end up being a Peabody decision, not an Anglo American decision, as to whether they choose to complete or not.

Chris LaFemina: It may be too hypothetical to answer the question, but let's assume that it goes to arbitration. You indicated earlier that there's interest in these assets from other potential buyers. If you were to sell to another buyer at a large discount to what you've agreed with Peabody, doesn't that strengthen their argument that it was a MAC because it's kind of evidence potentially that the value of the assets is lower due to the incident, but even if it's a function of coal prices being lower, I would assume they could use it as an argument that this did indeed have a material impact on the value of the assets?

Duncan Wanblad: I'm sure they'll put forward many arguments --

Chris LaFemina: Yes.

Duncan Wanblad: If we end up in arbitration, Chris, and I definitely don't want to try and preempt what those arguments might be at this particular point in time.

Chris LaFemina: And just one last one on this. In terms of the timing, can you just walk us through what happens next? What is the timeline of getting us to the finish line? Thank you.

Duncan Wanblad: Yes, so as I said, we've now got all the way to the point where the regulators are really happy with the fact that we're back underground. We're doing some meaningful maintenance. We're doing the development work in terms of the future panels of the mine and so on.

We have also cleared the belt and we've done a whole lot of roof repairs etc. We've addressed the cracks in the face, which happens as a result of the mine standing for a really long period of time. We've spun the shearer. We've moved it out of where it was located so we can get access to a gearbox if we want to do some big maintenance on it. So you can see, by and large, all the steps of what it takes to operate the mine are in place and progressing. What happens next is that we do a number of risk assessments with the regulators that go through the operating processes and procedures of the mine going forward.

This is all in a document that's called the 'second workings' document. It is, by and large, the rules against which you run your mine by, and you do that in agreement with the authority. So that's the process that's under way with the authorities at the moment. But as I say, physically, we're in good shape.

Alain Gabriel (Morgan Stanley): Back to Matt's question on Collahuasi. You mentioned you're working with your JV partners on optimizing the mine plan into next year. Are you able to share

with us some of the key parameters that you expect for the mine, the latest parameters in terms of grades, throughputs, or production? What's your latest thinking there?

Duncan Wanblad: Well so look, as I say, fundamentally, no major changes at all. What we've got is this period now where, same as Los Bronces in a way, Donoso 2 had to open up so that we could get access to faces that would then provide the material into the plants. Collahuasi's got exactly that. The only difference is Collahuasi now has a really, really big stockpile that it can use as an offset, as we go through this. This is work that they've been doing for a couple of years now. Got caught short a little bit by the fact that the stockpiles are not going to perform as well as they thought that they were going to perform.

But that said, the work that's actually going on with the guys on the mine and Glencore and so on now, is saying there are other places in stockpiles we might be able to go to that could make a difference. What we really don't want to do is fundamentally change the shape of that mine because that mine is set up for very, very good high performance in the long run. So very important we don't make short-term decisions here that compromise the viability of the mine going forward. And so I think all of us are very focused on doing that. I reckon by 2026 is where all this development work needs to complete, and from 2027, we would be sort of be back on track exactly where we had planned to be.

Alain Gabriel: Okay, thank you. And the follow-up is Collahuasi again - your neighbors there appear now more keen on moving this adjacency forward. What are the remaining stumbling blocks in your view, and how realistic is it to expect a deal announcement in 2026?

Duncan Wanblad: Look, I think what's really good news is that everybody realizes that there's material value locked up there and it's definitely worth chasing down. Those discussions are ongoing and we need to find a way to do that. As I said to you before, when you think about this, what is the playbook? Step one is recognise that there's value. So, I think that's a check. Okay, everybody now recognizes there's an enormous amount of value here.

Step two is then a lot of work. You put a lot of effort into working out what this would look like, how it would look, and what the value deltas will be. I mean, you understand that it's big because the industrial synergies are huge, but it's about what these value deltas would be, and then how they distribute amongst the parties and so on.

So, I don't believe any fundamental stumbling blocks, but an enormous amount of work to do to make it happen.

Alain Gabriel: Thank you.

Maurizio Carulli (Quilter Cheviot Investment Management): We are shareholders. First of all, congratulations for the progress that you have done on the transformation of the company in the past 12 months, which has been really significant.

I have two questions about De Beers - one probably for Duncan and the other one probably for John. Because there has been a lot of news about the bidders, is it possible to get more color on the characteristics of some of the current bidders for De Beers? And also separately for John, how have you valued the inventory component in De Beers, roughly the \$2 billion?

Duncan Wanblad: Okay, thanks for those questions. Without giving anything away in the context of actually who the buyers are, as you can imagine, just as a bit of background history - when we made the announcement that we were planning on divesting our stake in De Beers, we had a number of inbound interests.

How do you sift through those interests - you look for people who genuinely understand the market, who are serious buyers, who absolutely have the wherewithal and the backing to be able to complete a transaction like that, and that then sort of sifts down into a much smaller group of people that you would take through into a formal process. So that's where we are now with this - the smaller group of people that we take through into a process.

All of the players that we have in our process at this particular point in time are absolutely credible in terms of: a) their understanding of the industry and b) their ability to be able to run and operate a business such as De Beers. So - they are associated with and aligned to and have experience of the industry and markets in this space. And that fills me with a huge amount of joy. So that's the type of buyer that we've got.

Of course, this is a very big business and therefore, probably we'll need multiple balance sheets to support the acquisition of it. And therefore, I think probably reasonable to assume that in the process, there will be consortia and consortia formations that ultimately, hopefully would prevail at the end of the day.

John Heasley: And in terms of the inventory - we're required to carry all of our inventories at the lower of the cost, i.e. what it cost us to get those inventories, or the realizable value, i.e. how much could we sell that inventory for. So, on the basis that the majority of our diamonds are mined by ourselves, then the cost is clearly relatively low compared to what we could sell those diamonds for. Of course, we buy some diamonds as well from Debswana our joint venture with a margin on them.

But at every period end, we look and see for those diamonds, as with any inventory, if the cost that we have those on our balance sheet at is more or less than what we could sell them for. And as long as it is less than what we can sell them for, then that's the carrying value. So, we're very comfortable with what the carrying value is.

Maurizio Carulli: Thank you.

Bob Brackett (Bernstein): Good morning. In the context of Woodsmith, you mentioned some great learnings involving the Sherwood Sandstone. In my personal life, great learnings have sometimes come with painful lessons. In that vein, can you give us an update on progress there?

Duncan Wanblad: Thanks for the question, Bob. Yes, so the Sherwood Sandstones were always recognized as a really tough part of the strata that we [would] have to navigate to get to the bottom.

Fundamentally here, this was for every meter a day that it took longer to get down there, you were kind of adding like a year to first production, right? So, we had a base case plan that said that we could navigate this at around about a meter a day. And if you could only do half a meter a day, well, you could add a year to the first production date of the project. If you were able to progress at two meters a day, of course, you make massive capital savings.

So, these are the learnings that we were hoping to get. And this is not just the rate at which you can penetrate that strata. It's the full cycle rate, i.e. you go down a certain number of meters, then you have to tub or line the shaft basically, and you have to dewater it, etcetera, and keep going. So these are the learnings that we've been getting today.

When we started off on this thing, we had a really difficult time with the picks on the head - so just like a head on a continuous miner. The rock was so hard, it was sort of beating the picks up, but then we did a lot of work with De Beers and ended up with lab-grown diamonds as one of the abrasives in the pick. I just can't think of a better use of lab-grown diamonds and the penetration rates improved phenomenally.

We've also now done a cycle or two of understanding what the tubbing rates, the dewatering rates, etcetera, are going to be and definitely some lessons in terms of the dewatering. But we're now at the point where I think we feel relatively confident that we are not going to be below our baseline one meter per day right through the mine.

Bob Brackett: Very clear, thanks for that.

Dominic O'Kane (JP Morgan): Hello, I have three questions. Firstly, on De Beers, could you give us an insight into what the net debt position is at De Beers currently?

My second question is on Moranbah, you mentioned that a restart would contemplate remote operations. Could you just give us an indication of what capacity utilisation you can run at using remote operations? Can you run at the full previous long-haul capacity utilization?

And then my third question relates to strategy. Over the last 12 months Anglo have done a remarkably good job in being a master of your own destiny. Arguably, the hard yards have now been completed. And so looking forward, do you think as a management team, you have the head space to consider other strategic future options, including potential M&A options that might be available to you?

John Heasley: Yes, on De Beers net debt, to be honest with you, that is sort of a function of how we internally finance. So, I'm not sure it's a really relevant sort of number. It's not as if they're a standalone finance business today. So if you're trying to work between an enterprise value and equity value, then it's not really a relevant measure to look at. It's really all intercompany financing and it's a small external revolving credit facility that sits at various levels within De Beers. But I wouldn't say that in the round, the debt number that sits in De Beers today is a tremendously important number.

Duncan Wanblad: Then, on Moranbah, in terms of the remote operations. So, the short answer to the question is no. They are not as productive as the combination of remote and manual operations, only simply because you need a part of a crew underground at all times to deal with maintenance and so on. And as we go through the restart here, we want to be appropriately cautious as we determine what the atmosphere is like in the goaf behind us.

Going forward, and on that basis, we prefer not to have anybody underground, including the maintenance crews while we take the first few runs at the face. But we don't expect that that will

be the end state. This will always end up as a combined automated and manual production facility.

It'll just be moderated in its ramp up by the fact that we'll run it on an automated basis. We'll have to stop the shearer, we'll have to then wait for our telemetry to tell us that we've got a stable atmosphere down there. Then we'll get the crews down, and they'll do the maintenance that they need to do. They'll do whatever else they need to do down there, and then they'll come back up again and we'll take the next cut. So that hopefully gives you a little bit of detail in what that means.

We've had some great success with this by the way. We created and developed the system. It's been implemented at Aquila for a number of years now and it's working extremely well. The productivity of this system when it's in automatic mode is just improving every day.

So, it'll be good on all fronts in terms of our ability to convert this into sort of a more stable operating method for the mine on a go-forward basis. So yes, a little bit slower from a productivity point of view to start, but the intention is that then gets back into normalized operations in the same way that we're running Aquila today.

And then on strategy, do we have the head space? Yes, we've got loads of head space. There's a lot going on, there has been a lot going on, but of course, we are always looking at what we can do in terms of improving value in this company. Absolutely, our number one priority was and remains operational excellence.

It doesn't matter what you have in your portfolio. You have to run all of these assets extremely well, all of the time and that remains a number one priority for us. The second, of course, is there is a lot of work to deal with these transitions and of course, while we have these businesses under management, we still have a key responsibility in terms of the proper management of these and so we absolutely remain focused on doing that. But very important for us to be sure that this transition concludes as successfully as possible.

And of course, with that came a massive reorganization of the company, both just in terms of the shape of the company as a result of the number of assets it was going to have, but also in terms of our own operating model. What makes us genuinely effective? How do we continue to underpin our operation excellence, our project performance excellence, our marketing excellence?

And so that also remains a very, very important part of management's mindset at the moment. And then of course, we have a number of wonderful endowments all of which have real organic growth options and possibilities. Many of them are now in relatively advanced stages of studies and permitting processes. And so that's tangible, in our control, deliverable and that's where we're putting an enormous amount of effort.

To the extent that there's anything else available there, we will of course look at that and understand whether we need to do that relative to the rest of our options at the time. And I can promise you that if we needed to make headspace for it, we absolutely would. But I think that there's a lot going on that's highly value accretive at the moment that we're very focused on doing.

END