AngloAmerican

AA TS 013 001
Version 1

GROUP TECHNICAL STANDARDS

Biodiversity Guideline

Owner	Area
Head of Nature & Land	Group Strategy & Sustainability

Approved by	Approval Date
Director of Strategy and Sustainability	January 2024

Purpose

This Biodiversity Guideline provides guidance on how the minimum requirements defined in Anglo American Biodiversity Standard can be achieved. The guidelines contained in this document are recommended approaches on how to meet the requirements of the Standard. They are not mandatory as there are likely to be other ways to meet the requirements of the Standard / Specifications that are acceptable.

This Guideline has been developed to provide more detail and clarification on how the requirements of the Standard can be implemented. This guideline is by no means exhaustive or the only acceptable approach and will be updated periodically and supported by good practice sharing. It is not intended as a template for achieving compliance.

Contents

SCOPE

This Guideline applies to:

1.1. All employees, contractors, and visitors involved with Anglo American managed businesses and operations, including:
- 1.1.1. Entire mining phases (e.g., exploration, design/projects, construction, operation, and closure).
- 1.1.2. All types of mining activities (e.g., open cut, underground, alluvial, and marine) and related infrastructure.
- 1.1.3. Processing activities (e.g., fixed plants, smelting and refining).
- 1.1.4. Support activities (e.g., offices, warehouses, logistics, ports).
- 1.1.5. Purchase, constructed, contracted, and hired equipment.
- 1.1.6. All equipment with the potential to cause movement and objects falling from or being projected by moving parts of plant or equipment.
- 1.1.7. All sources that under unexpected release can cause any injury or fatality (i.e. high-pressure hydraulics systems/houses, arc flash, etc.)

This Guideline does not apply to:

1.2. **Non-managed operations**, in which Anglo American or its businesses have a shareholding. Anglo American should seek to influence these operations to adopt the requirements of the related Standard and these guidelines and, at a minimum, to comply with local laws and requirements.

1.3. Operations out of scope for the Biodiversity Standard or where an operation has been exempted from complying with the Biodiversity Standard.

Legal compliance:

1.4. This Guideline must be applied in conjunction with all relevant national laws and/or specific national standards of countries, regions, and/or districts and its related Standard.

1.5. National laws and standards always take precedence. If the provisions of this Guideline conflict with applicable national laws and/or standards, the latter must be followed. However, the remaining provisions in this Guideline and associated Standard will continue to apply.

GUIDANCE

PLANNING AND DESIGN

2.1 Conduct high level screening/due diligence to delineate the study area based on the distribution of relevant biodiversity features and ecosystem services across the wider landscape/seascape. The extent of the study area will be informed by the following considerations:
- 2.1.1 The direct and indirect area of influence should be encompassed in the study area including cumulative impacts.
- 2.1.2 The distribution and ecology of species and habitats which may occur in the study area and the ecological processes, patterns and functions which support them including water bodies (including permanent and ephemeral surface and groundwater sources) which interact with a site's activities and infrastructure.
- 2.1.3 The ecosystem services supplied by potentially impacted ecosystems, including the area of supply of an ecosystem service and the extent representing the physical connection between the supply area and beneficiaries (where sufficient information is available).
- 2.1.4 Overlap with jurisdictional boundaries, legally protected and internationally recognised areas (including transition/buffer zones outlined in the relevant area management plans).

2.1.5 In the absence of adequate ecological information, a buffer of appropriate extent shall be applied at this initial phase using a biodiversity spatial analysis tool (e.g., Biodiversity Overlay Assessment Tool (BOAT))

2.2 Identify potential high-level biodiversity risk, liability and opportunities by completing a spatial analysis which identifies the following within the study area:

2.2.1 UNESCO World Heritage Sites, including their recognised buffer zone area, legally designated protected areas and internationally recognised areas, and IUCN red list threatened species with ranges overlapping the proposed area of influence.

2.2.2 Potential high-level risks, liabilities and opportunities for a site based on their proximity to biodiversity features including species, habitats and legally protected areas/ recognised areas

2.2.3 Complete an alternatives analysis during the early design phase for new sites and impacts/footprints. An alternatives' analysis will include an examination of technically and financially feasible alternatives to the source of impacts, and documentation of the rationale for selecting the course of action proposed.

2.2.4 Any new impacts (during new site selection, new study, new project, exploration, commissioning, new operation, closure and post-closure phase) from 1 January 2018 shall not be undertaken in or adversely affect areas of habitat which support SBFs (including natural habitats) (see Section 2.4), unless it is demonstrated there are no viable alternatives within the region for development on modified habitat or areas of lesser biodiversity value than the base case.

2.3 Desktop assessment to identify a preliminary list of Significant Biodiversity Features (SBF) and Potential Priority Ecosystem Service(s) (PES)

2.3.1 Identify the biodiversity features (e.g. species, habitats, regional ecosystems, vegetation communities), ecosystem services and legally protected or internationally recognised areas that occur or are likely to occur within the study area and wider landscape or seascape. This list will be refined after the completion of baseline surveys (see Section 2.4)

2.3.2 Determine the significance of biodiversity based on their global/national/regional conservation status, national legislation, representation in the conservation area network, and exposure to threats. The criteria for determining SBFs are shown in Section 2.4

2.3.3 Identify and assess potential impacts to legally protected and internationally recognised areas using a spatial analysis tool (and/or World Database of Protected Areas (WDPA) and relevant national databases) within a relevant radius determined by the site.

2.3.4 Identify biodiversity features, ecosystems, or ecological processes within the mine's proposed or actual area of influence that provide or support priority ecosystem services. Provide the information to the Social Performance Team to prioritise and maintain the potential PES. The process for determining potential PES is included in the Social Way Toolkit and led by the Social Performance Team, with collaboration from the Environment Team. The final list of potential PES shall be provided by the Social Performance Team to the Standard Champion to inform the field baseline data collection relating to PES supply.

2.3.5 Capture a list of potential SBFs, legally protected and internationally recognised areas, and potential ecosystem services by habitat/ecosystem in Isometrix through the Biodiversity Value Assessment (BVA).

2.3.6 Where possible, include upstream and downstream value chain(s), and areas of relevant biodiversity features within the landscape or seascape prior to any

significant change to physical footprint or apply this approach to any new impacts in already established operational areas.

2.4 Conduct a baseline to identify Significant Biodiversity Features (SBF) including species, habitats and legally protected and/or internationally recognised areas within a site's area of influence, to inform the site's biodiversity value assessment (new potential sites or expansion of existing). The baseline must adequately cover the area of influence and may need to be extended to a wider study area (i.e. upstream and downstream value chain(s). As a minimum, the following criteria will be used to determine SBFs:

- Highly threatened or unique ecosystems. These may be informed by the IUCN Red list of Ecosystem categories and criteria, or areas determined to be of high priority for conservation by regional or national systematic conservation planning.
- Natural habitat, of a pristine or degraded condition which supports biodiversity, ecological processes and/or ecosystem services.
- Threatened species listed as Critically Endangered or Endangered on the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (global) and/or through national assessments and supporting habitat.
- Endemic and/or range-restricted species and supporting habitat.
- Globally or regionally important populations of migratory and/or congregatory species and supporting habitat.
- Key evolutionary processes such as physical or spatial features which are known to act as catalysts for evolutionary and ecological processes, including species diversification.

2.4.1 Confirm the presence or likely presence of SBFs identified in the preliminary listing (as identified in the BVA). Biodiversity data may already have been acquired as part of the project's overall ESHIA. Existing data shall be used to address the Biodiversity Standard and additional surveys are required only where knowledge gaps have been identified.

2.4.2 Ensure that, for the ecosystems that supply PES, the baseline assessment identifies biodiversity and environmental features that support ecosystem services received by beneficiaries. This assessment additionally must provide the condition of those biodiversity features that provide and supply a PES and any environmental values that support the integrity of a PES. This baseline will be informed by and correlate with the biodiversity baseline outputs.

2.4.3 Identify the current condition or state of SBFs. A proxy[1] (or surrogate) can be selected to represent the state of the SBF, rather than each unique species, habitat and ecosystem service requiring its own baseline state and indicators (where appropriate). A competent professional should be involved in the selection of appropriate proxies.

2.4.4 Ensure the baseline survey captures seasonal variability. In some instances, the ecosystem is dynamic and the natural state of biodiversity and ecosystem services might be across a gradient or range of values. In such instances, the baseline state might be described as a range of values or compared against a control, which should be determined and designed with expert input.

2.4.5 Develop a habitat/ecosystem map using the most appropriate methods including existing land cover maps, field assessments, satellite imagery and ground truthing points from baseline surveys. The map will identify all habitat types by their condition state. This output is required to quantify the site's impacts on habitat which supports SBF and the supply of ecosystem services.

[1] A proxy or surrogate is a biodiversity feature such as a species or habitat or a set of indicators that represents the state of a broader group of biodiversity and ecosystem service supply.

2.4.6 Establish the time period (baseline year) that best represents the pre-impact state of SBFs in the study area. The baseline year will depend on the context and timeframe of a site. For existing operations this minimum baseline state will represent the start of 2018.

2.5 Identify and consider disclosure of potential high-level biodiversity and nature related dependencies, risks, impacts, liabilities, and opportunities in line with internationally accepted frameworks. This includes actions identified through regulatory and/or permitting requirements. Identify infrastructure and activities that are likely to generate direct, indirect and cumulative impacts during the project lifespan on SBF, legally protected and internationally recognised areas (prior to the application of the mitigation hierarchy). Summarise the following in the impact assessment:

2.5.1 Impact generating activities (e.g. vegetation clearing, light/noise pollution)

2.5.2 Which SBFs, legally protected and internationally recognised areas will be affected by the 'impact generating activity' and how these would be impacted

2.5.3 Expected intensity, extent of area, frequency and duration of impact.

2.6 Assess biodiversity impacts to SBFs through an Environment, Social & Health Impact Assessment (ESHIA) or similar assessment exercise. This must include conducting an assessment to determine full life of asset and post-closure impacts and consider mitigation options where relevant.

2.6.1 In cases where it is difficult to quantify the extent of direct and/or indirect impacts, the extent of the impacted area should be based upon a defendable disturbance buffer distance around the direct physical footprint informed by relevant local information and/or expert input.

2.6.2 Consult with stakeholders and experts to assist in identifying and assessing all actual and perceived impacts, proposed mitigation and establishing stakeholder views on the nature and extent of impacts to SBFs, habitat conversion and degradation, following the Social Way Toolkit.

2.7 Document the design and implementation of the mitigation hierarchy in the BMP for each impacted SBF. Documentation must clearly show the systematic application of avoidance, minimisation, restoration and mitigation actions. Where feasible, quantify the contribution of mitigation measures to reducing the residual impact.

2.7.1 Incorporate restoration and rehabilitation activities into a site's closure plan and be captured within specific closure objectives (see the Mine Closure Standard and Mine Closure Toolbox).

2.7.2 Allocate adequate time and resources to assessing the extent/condition of restoration/ rehabilitation activities. This action is required to determine the contribution of restoration activities to reducing the residual impact.

2.7.3 Success criteria for restoration and rehabilitation shall be developed as early as possible, but a minimum of ten years prior to planned closure, and be based on a proven rehabilitation prescription in line with the Mine Closure Standard, ecological requirements of impacted SBFs and compliance requirements. Closure plans shall be aligned with agreed end use that will achieve and maintain ecological integrity in the long-term.

2.7.4 Track and monitor restoration and rehabilitation indicators to demonstrate Net Gains for each impacted SBF. Results will be captured in Isometrix.

2.7.5 Review progress every 3 years as part of the BMP independent review. However, the restoration and rehabilitation targets may be yearly and should be identified by the appropriate disciplines and implemented across a longer time period, with updated objectives at the start of each review period.

2.7.6 Implement measures to avoid the potential for accidental or unintended introductions of new alien invasive species and the continued spread of existing

alien invasive species; these shall be assessed, planned for and managed through the Mine Closure Toolbox and Rehabilitation Guidelines.

2.7.7 Consult and coordinate across Biodiversity, Carbon, Social, Water, Land Management, Rehabilitation, Closure and other relevant disciplines to investigate if Nature-based Solutions (NbS) can be used throughout the full mining lifecycle to support mitigation measures and meet multiple Sustainable Mining Plan objectives. A brief summary of the conversation, the options, and the rationale for pursuing or not pursuing NbS should be clearly documented with reference co-benefits to society and the environment in the BMP.

For existing sites

2.7.8 Document, retrospectively in cases where impacts have occurred prior to 2018. Every effort must be made to comply with the above points in order to document the mitigation hierarchy. Noting that avoidance measures will likely be difficult to quantify when compared to a pre-mitigated impact due to many factors such as a lack of documentation or the project's life cycle.

2.7.9 Revisit and reapply the initial steps of the mitigation hierarchy to further reduce the residual impact before designing and implementing biodiversity offsets.

2.8 Record: Assess the outputs of the assessment to ensure data is updated, collected, managed, stored and shared.

2.9 Determine the residual impact on SBFs remaining after the application of avoidance, minimisation and restoration measures (and existing regulatory based offsets).

2.9.1 Compare the residual impact on each SBF to the threat status, extent and/or condition of that SBF prior to the impact occurring (referred to as the pre-impact baseline), OR at 1 January 2018 if impacts occurred prior to this date. Impacts must be forecasted from this date through to closure.

2.9.2 Demonstrate that impacts do not lead to a net reduction in the global and/or national/regional population of any Critically Endangered or Endangered species over a reasonable period of time.

2.9.3 Adopt a conservative approach to determining the extent and scale of project related impacts, contribution of mitigation measures and the loss-gain calculations for the residual impact assessment.

2.9.4 Outline NPI targets in the residual impact assessment for each impacted SBF based on the scale of the remaining residual impact. These NPI targets form the basis of the offset requirements. Residual impacts deemed to be catastrophically severe and/or of an unacceptable reputational risk to the company and/or cannot be adequately compensated through offsetting after the full application of the mitigation hierarchy may be deemed a 'no-go' situation and must be flagged with the Anglo American Head of Nature-based Solutions & Ecosystems as early as possible. Further consultation with experts should be pursued to consider additional avoidance and/or mitigation activities which may have been initially overlooked.

For existing sites

2.9.5 Consider the following sub-bullets when evaluating residual impacts:

2.9.6 Quantifying residual impacts prior to 2018 and documenting existing mitigation measures will still be required, yet will be acknowledged as historical unmitigated disturbances. These pre-2018 disturbances will not be quantified as part of the NPI commitment, however will be compensated through further enhancements to existing offsets/restoration or ACAs. Note that existing sites must still quantify all post-2018 impacts and addressed as part of the NPI commitment.

2.9.7 For sites with unmitigated historical disturbances prior to 1 January 2018, see section 2.10

2.9.8 Identify priority biodiversity insets (use of non-operated owned land) or offsets needed to achieve NPI if residual impacts remain to SBFs after mitigation measures have been considered and implemented. Implement biodiversity offsets to deliver on the ground and measurable gains which satisfy at a minimum the following criteria[2]

- Net Positive Impact/Net Gain. Offset activities will be designed and implemented to achieve in situ, measurable conservation outcomes that can reasonably be expected to result in a net gain for SBFs with remaining residual impacts.
- Equivalence. Offset activities will deliver gains to the same SBF affected by the site (like for like). Out-of-kind or trading-up may be considered where national assessments have been conducted to identify the permissible offset exchanges, or through engagement with relevant stakeholders, experts and regulating bodies. This approach cannot be utilised in lieu of quantifying a site's impacts, as the Biodiversity Standard requires an impact assessment to be conducted as compliance.
- Additionality. Offset activities will deliver gains to affected SBFs which are additional and demonstrably above and beyond what would have occurred if the offset action had not taken place including planned actions (business-as-usual scenario).
- Long term outcomes. Biodiversity outcomes from offset need to be achieved by the end of closure and secured for at least as long as the impacts occur and preferably in perpetuity to align with best practice.
- Stakeholder participation. The final offset option and activities must be based upon appropriate, extensive and transparent stakeholder consultation.

2.9.9 Identify and prioritise additional criteria for biodiversity offset options deemed most relevant to context and regional and/or national jurisdiction.

2.9.10 Identify potential biodiversity offset options in the region that have the potential to achieve the NPI outcomes required for each impacted SBF (i.e. develop a candidate list). Options which aggregate offsetting requirements and proposed activities with other actors in the landscape/ seascape should be included in the candidate list. Offset implementation may yield a more significant positive improvement to conservation if implemented in coordination and with pooled resources as opposed to a series of small and isolated projects within a landscape/ seascape.

2.9.11 Determine the applicable reference scenario against which losses and gains are compared. The reference scenario used in a particular jurisdiction (if applicable) will be identified during the gap analysis (see Section 3.1.1). Selecting the appropriate reference scenario will require a thorough understanding of the national legal requirements relating to offsets, biodiversity trends in the landscape/ seascape, and current best practice approaches. These factors and resultant decisions must be documented in the BMP document. Reference scenarios that will be considered are listed below:

- Static baseline (or fixed reference scenario) [3]

[2] These criteria and wording align with the BBOP principles

[3] The static baseline is where gains delivered through offset interventions are compared with the scenario of no change in biodiversity, relative to a specified fixed point in time. Therefore, no further loss of biodiversity compared to what currently exists (or exists at the chosen point in time).

- Counterfactual (or dynamic reference scenario)[4]
- Target-based ecological compensation approach [5]

2.9.12 Consider offset multipliers during offset design and loss-gain calculations as appropriate.

2.9.13 Outline final offset decisions in the BMP including planned offset activities. A site may summarise their approach in the BMP and cross reference a standalone Biodiversity Offset Management Plan (BOMP).

2.9.14 Track and monitor offset indicators to demonstrate Net Gains for each impacted SBF and results will be captured in Isometrix. Progress will be reviewed every 3 years as part of the BMP independent review.

2.9.15 Where an operation overlaps with a formally recognised conservation area or a biodiversity offset is declared a formally recognised conservation area, a Conservation Management Plan may be required under the relevant national legal and regulatory processes. An overview of this management plan should be included within the BMP.

2.10 Design and implement regional ecological restoration strategies, Additional Conservation Actions (ACAs) or other actions supported by stakeholders to ecologically compensate for unmitigated historical disturbance to SBF from Anglo American ownership to 1 January 2018. ACAs will be ongoing but initial ACAs shall be designed by the end of 2024 and implemented on the ground by 2030. ACAs are required regardless of whether SBFs are adversely impacted by Anglo American activities.

2.10.1 Several sites within a Business Unit or wider landscape/ seascape may choose to pool their resources and implement a combined ACA. This should be explored as part of the process of identification, selection and implementation of ACA.

2.10.2 Identify and select ACA options based on prioritisation criteria which the site deems are most relevant to the individual context. A justification for the decision shall be provided in the BMP. An example of the decision-making criteria that may be used to support the review of potential ACAs is provided in the table below.

2.10.3 Undertake stakeholder engagement, including mine management, Anglo American Group Technical and Sustainability, local beneficiaries, relevant governmental departments, partners and local experts to support and inform the final selection of ACA or suite of activities. This should be conducted in a formalised stakeholder engagement approach aligned with the Social Way requirements, with all decisions and outcomes included in a summary document (e.g., Stakeholder Engagement Plan)

2.10.4 Capture success indicators for ACAs and the results of monitoring and evaluation programme in Isometrix.

2.10.5 Review ACA progress every 3 years as part of the BMP independent review. The outcomes of each implemented ACA should be achieved within the review period; however, the individual or suite of ACA initiatives can be developed and implemented across a longer time period, with updated objectives at the start of each review period.

[4] The counterfactual occurs where gains delivered through offset interventions are compared against a scenario of predicted biodiversity change assuming neither the site impact nor the offset occurred. Estimated gains from offset implementation are compared to a 'background trajectory' (what would have happened to biodiversity in the absence of the site and the offset intervention).

[5] A target-based ecological compensation approach occurs where the required outcomes from compensation actions and the resultant gains to impacted biodiversity are determined at a jurisdictional level (e.g. national), based on the current state of biodiversity relative to an overarching outcomes-based target state (Simmonds et al., 2019).

Table 1. Decision-making criteria to support the review of potential ACA

		Higher priority	Lower priority
Is the biodiversity / ES a conservation priority?	Conservation threat status	Threatened at regional, national or global level or under-represented in protected area network	Not threatened or is well represented
	Range-restricted	Endemic or restricted extent	Not endemic or of restricted extent
	Migratory	Migratory or congregatory patterns	Not migratory or congregatory species
	Vulnerability	Vulnerable to threats	Not vulnerable to threats
	Historical losses	Suffered recent historical loss	Not having suffered threats or loss
	Sensitivity	Highly sensitive to threats or pressures	Resilient to threats or pressures
	Exploitation	Unsustainably utilised and exploited	Not utilised
	Ecosystem service(s) supply	Supplies PES locally and/ or can increase supply of ecosystem services that are regionally/ globally important	Limited ecosystem services supply
	Ecological contribution	Supports ecological processes or irreplaceable	Commonly occurring, widespread

Is the ACA a priority?	Targets contribution	Contributes to jurisdictional targets, objectives or priorities	Limited contribution
	Scaling-up	Contributes to wider landscape / seascape benefits	Site-specific or limited extent of benefits
	Other benefits	Delivers additional benefits to environment and natural processes (e.g. carbon capture, water quality/ quantity, soil health)	Limited additional benefits
		Delivers additional benefits to stakeholders and beneficiaries addressing societal challenges	Limited additional benefits
	Information	Site contributes to knowledge gaps	Limited contribution to knowledge gaps or significant knowledge already known
	Capacity	Technical capacity and support exist or can be developed	Limited or absent capacity to deliver project
	Partnerships	Partnerships and collaborative platforms exist or can be established	Limited potential for partnerships
Can the ACA satisfy following requirements?	Objectives are clearly defined and are measurable		
	ACA can be afforded in full, either as full funding or co-financing		
	ACA outcomes can be achieved within the specified time frame		
	Outcomes deliver an improvement		
	Outcomes are long-lasting and there is a sustainability plan to progress the ACA objectives beyond the initial project period		
	ACA builds upon/contributes to/supports other sites, BU and/or Group programmes within the SHE Way or Social Way		

This section is only relevant to existing sites with unmitigated historical disturbances to SBFs that have occurred from Anglo American ownership to 1 January 2018 and are not adequately addressed by past/existing offsetting activities, restoration and/or rehabilitation which reinstates habitat that supports SBFs.

- Existing sites with existing mitigation measures including offsets will complete a residual impact assessment evaluating impacts from Anglo American ownership to demonstrate how the existing actions/regulatory requirements align with the Biodiversity Standard/ Specification. Where gaps are identified, a site will need to upgrade existing offsets/restoration (see Section 2.9), design new offsets/restoration OR develop ACAs which target impacted SBF (see Section 2.10). ACAs in this context are only appropriate for sites that have previously implemented offsets which do not meet the NPI requirements outlined in the Biodiversity Standard/ Specification.
- Existing sites with unmitigated historical disturbances prior to 1 January 2018, will estimate the scale of residual impacts on SBF that has occurred from Anglo American ownership to 1 January 2018. Where historic information is inadequate to estimate the historic state of SBF, then the estimate of the loss of Natural Habitat/ remnant vegetation by the site shall be sufficient.
- Consult internal and external experts and/or relevant stakeholders to inform the appropriateness of the scale and nature of the activities to address unmitigated historical disturbances. Further guidance on engaging stakeholders related to (current and) historical disturbances is included in the Stakeholder Engagement Section of the Social Way.
- Provide a rationale for the approach used to addressing unmitigated biodiversity disturbance and include this in the BMP documentation.
- Incorporate requirements to address unmitigated historical biodiversity disturbances to SBFs through restoration/rehabilitation into a site's closure plan and captured within specific closure objectives by the end of 2024 (see the Mine Closure Standard and Mine Closure Toolbox).

IMPLEMENTATION AND MANAGEMENT

Each site should identify and allocate a site Standard Champion responsible for facilitating implementation of the Standard. All sites within scope must:

3.1. Develop, implement and maintain a BMP. The purpose of the BMP document is not to duplicate existing information that sits within other management programmes; rather, it is the framework for integrating the key information into one holistic and readily accessible source. Existing documents/plans should be cross referenced where appropriate. Sites shall refer to the BMP template which outlines the desired structure and content of the BMP.

3.2. Identify and develop partnerships with conservation organisations, academic institutions and/or businesses for collaboration and management of general biodiversity, SBFs, and/or legally protected and internationally recognised areas. Partnerships should be developed to support the implementation of offsite habitat restoration, biodiversity offsetting and/or ACAs.

3.3. Integrate the necessary controls and framework of the Biodiversity Standard into the ORM process so that future unforeseen impacts follow the requirements of the Standard and this Specification.

3.3.1. Integrate biodiversity data and/or management plans into the sites ORM SHE Way/ Social Way and or Management System and ensure alignment with the Anglo American Group Information Security Policy and related documents.

3.3.2. Integrate mitigation measures into the Site's Environmental Management System (EMS) or equivalent management system. For impacts to ecosystem services, further guidance on this is included in the Review and Planning Section of the Social Way Toolkit.

3.3.3. Ensure compatibility between environmental and social management. For biodiversity, this means implementing management that benefits biodiversity and ecosystem services and is compatible with a site's social and environmental (i.e. water, air, carbon, closure) objectives. Social and environmental objectives/management actions shall be implemented without inadvertently harming biodiversity.

3.4. Implement measures to avoid the potential for accidental or unintended introductions of invasive alien species and the continued spread of existing invasive alien species.

3.5. Establish and maintain systems for managing the information and data required to support the effectiveness of this Standard and ensure compliance obligations are met.

PERFORMANCE MONITORING

All sites within scope must:

4.1 Complete the specified self-assessment on renewal of this Standard in accordance with the **Technical Standards Governance Standard (AA TS 001).**

4.2 Record, report, investigate and implement corrective/remedial actions to address biodiversity-related environmental incidents in line with the AA mandated system for the reporting, investigating, closing-out and communication of SHE incidents as defined by the relevant systems and internal requirements.

4.3 Develop and implement an adaptive management and monitoring programme using site specific science based indicators for each impacted SBF or appropriate proxy to evaluate the effectiveness of mitigation actions (including offsets) on reducing impacts on biodiversity and track progress towards achieving NPI targets/outcomes. The monitoring approach and metrics should be consistent with the biodiversity baseline and residual impact assessment.

4.3.1 Guidance on how to monitor and evaluate impacts on ecosystems, which supply ecosystem services and its benefits, should be included in the next update of the Social Way . This should be managed by the Social Performance Teams; however, data on the quantity and quality of supply of PES (e.g. ecosystem change, water supply and hunted species) can also be collected by the Environmental Team. Data on the benefits and their use can be collected and used by the Social Performance Team.

4.3.2 Analyse and evaluate monitoring results to inform the need for corrective actions to be taken, including implementation of additional mitigation measures if needed.

4.3.3 Review the monitoring programme and update as necessary, based on monitoring results. The development, choice and use of indicators is an iterative and continual process – validation, review and revision are essential elements of fine-tuning the process moving forward.

4.3.4 Design indicators to follow the SMART philosophy (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Timely). Biodiversity indicators must also be sufficiently sensitive to provide a threshold value well before irreversible change occurs.

4.3.5 Define warning and critical thresholds for each indicator. These are intended to inform adaptive management and to avoid compromising achieving NPI. The thresholds should be developed based on the best available knowledge at the

time of development. Thresholds should be updated and revised as site monitoring data is collected and improves the site understanding.

4.3.6 Design a separate site-specific monitoring programme if offset measures are implemented to monitor and evaluate the success of offset programmes.

4.4 Report progress on BMP programme completion and against NPI pathways using internal systems like Isometrix, PowerBI aligned to the QHH approach on a quarterly basis, to make sure implementation of mitigation and management measures is dynamic.

4.5 Conduct biodiversity, restoration, rehabilitation and biodiversity-offsetting performance monitoring against defined end land use success criteria. Implement action plans and maintenance activities to achieve objectives using internal systems like Isometrix. These plans including the BMP will be reviewed internally as required and should be repeated if significant updates and changes are made to the BMP.

4.6 Ensure the BMP remains accurate and up to date, incorporating updates after any significant change to physical footprint and/or new impacts to site footprint or area of influence as they occur. These changes must be documents and the impacts of these changes shown on the respective biodiversity plans.

4.7 Report accurate and complete biodiversity data to Group in accordance with frequency requirements as set out by Group to align with internal, Board and external reporting frameworks. This should include BMP progress indicators on reporting systems (Isometrix and Objectives & Targets). Sharing of biodiversity data, where not sensitive, should be done using formats and conditions to enable such data to be accessed and re-used in future conservation decisions and research applications both internally as well as externally as necessary. Sharing of data shall be done in accordance with the AA Group Information Security Policy.

4.8 The BMP should be externally assured at least every three years by an independent, reputable conservation organisation, institution, or relevant certification body.

APPENDIX A: INTEGRATION WITH OTHER DOCUMENTS

For detailed information on specific document references, we encourage you to access the PowerBI Tool which contains the Standards Glossary and References. You can access it directly via this link.

APPENDIX B: RECORD OF AMENDMENTS

Version	Approved	Authors	Changes Made
Version 1	January 2024	W Mostert	New Document

APPENDIX C: GLOSSARY

For detailed information on specific terms or abbreviations, we encourage you to access the PowerBI Tool which contains the Standards Glossary and References. You can access it directly via this link.