



Application for Licence Amendment

Part V Division 3 of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986*

Licence Number	L9195/2019/1
Licence Holder	Kirkalocka Gold SPV Pty Ltd
ACN	626 160 816
File Number	APP-0029827
Premises	<p>Kirkalocka Gold Mine</p> <p>Part of Mining Lease M59/233 and Mining Lease M59/234. DAGGAR HILLS WA 6638</p> <p>As defined by the coordinates in Schedule 1 Figure 1 of the licence</p>
Date of Report	12 December 2025
Decision	Revised licence granted

Table of Contents

1. Decision summary	1
2. Scope of assessment	1
2.1 Regulatory framework	1
2.2 Amendment summary and background	1
3. Risk assessment	2
3.1 Source-pathways and receptors	2
3.1.1 Emissions and controls	2
3.1.2 Receptors	3
3.2 Risk ratings	5
3.3 Detailed risk assessment for the disposal of tailings derived from the processing of blended ore sources	7
3.3.1 Background and description of risk event	7
3.3.2 Description of potential adverse impact from emission	8
3.3.3 Applicant controls	8
3.3.4 Risk assessment	9
3.3.5 Regulatory controls	10
4. Consultation	10
5. Conclusion	12
5.1 Summary of amendments	12
References	15
Table 1: Licence holder controls	2
Table 2: Sensitive human, environmental and cultural receptors and distance from prescribed activity	3
Table 3. Risk assessment of potential emissions and discharges from the premises during operation	6
Table 4: Proposed seepage triggers and corrective actions	9
Table 5: Consultation	10
Table 6: Summary of licence amendments	12

1. Decision summary

Licence L9195/2019/1 is held by Kirkalocka Gold SPV Pty Ltd (licence holder) for the Kirkalocka Gold Mine (the premises), located at Part of Mining Lease M59/233 and Mining Lease M59/234, Daggar Hills.

This amendment report documents the assessment of potential risks to the environment and public health from proposed changes to the emissions and discharges during the operation of the premises. As a result of this assessment, revised licence L9195/2019/1 has been granted.

The revised licence issued as a result of this amendment consolidates and supersedes the existing licence previously granted in relation to the premises.

2. Scope of assessment

2.1 Regulatory framework

In completing the assessment documented in this amendment report, the department has considered and given due regard to its regulatory framework and relevant policy documents which are available at <https://dwer.wa.gov.au/regulatory-documents>.

2.2 Amendment summary and background

The premises is located approximately 70 km south of Mount Magnet and comprises of a gold mining and ore processing operation. On 22 December 2020 an amendment to licence L9195/2018/1 was granted to allow for the acceptance and processing of three additional external ore sources (EOS) at the premises, resulting in a total of six specified EOS sites approved by the licence (Cue sands, A-Zone mine site, Golden Grove Oxide (Crown), Mixy, Golden Grove Pyrite (Amity) and Geko Gold Project). The six specified EOS are blended with Kirkalocka oxide-ore during processing. On 29 September 2021, a further amendment was granted to allow for the self-assessment of EOS to allow for more EOS to be accepted and processed at the Kirkalocka Processing Plant without future licence amendments.

On 4 July 2025, the licence holder submitted an application to the department to amend licence L9195/2018/1 under section 59 and 59B of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986* (EP Act). The amendment being sought relates to the removal of conditions which limit EOS acceptance and throughputs on the premises. The specific limitations requesting to be removed are:

- Kirkalocka mill feed stockpiled on the ROM consisting of the following:
 - Kirkalocka oxide ore (premises mined or); and
 - Specified External Ore Sources (Cue sands, A-zone mine site, Golden Grove Oxide (crown), Mixy, Golden Grove Pyrite (Amity) and Geko Gold Project).
- Other External Ore Sources collected from locations within a maximum radius of 150km from the Premises; and
- External Ore sources must contribute a maximum 5% of the total annual throughput at the Kirkalocka mill and be blended at a maximum instantaneous rate of 15% of the mill feed.

This amendment is limited only to changes to EOS acceptance and processing requirements. No changes to any other aspect of the existing licence have been requested by licence holder.

Key findings:

The delegated officer notes that Tailings Storage Facility (TSF) 1 is currently at capacity. TSF1 is approved under L9195/2019/1 for an additional 4 embankment lifts. The licence holder has informed the department that plans for the next lift (Stage 3) are underway with the commencement of construction targeted for December 2025. EOS are planned to be accepted following the completion of the Stage 3 lift of TSF1.

3. Risk assessment

The department assesses the risks of emissions from prescribed premises and identifies the potential source, pathway and impact to receptors in accordance with the *Guideline: Risk assessments* (DWER 2020).

To establish a Risk Event there must be an emission, a receptor which may be exposed to that emission through an identified actual or likely pathway, and a potential adverse effect to the receptor from exposure to that emission.

3.1 Source-pathways and receptors

3.1.1 Emissions and controls

The key emissions and associated actual or likely pathways during premises operation which have been considered in this amendment report are detailed in Table 1 below. Table 1 also details the proposed control measures the licence holder has proposed to assist in controlling these emissions, where necessary.

Table 1: Licence holder controls

Emission	Sources	Potential pathways	Proposed controls
Dust	Storage of EOS on the Run of Mine (ROM) pad, movement of ore and processing of ore at the processing plant.	Air/windborne pathway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The use of dust suppression including water carts/water sprays on processing plant equipment and reticulation of surfaces such as the mined tailings which will sit on the ROM pad prior to processing; Ongoing monitoring of dust to ensure levels and quality are below the recommended environmental and health thresholds; Assess geochemical and other aspects of EOS in advance before bringing to site; Load and transport all external resources to Kirkalocka by road train with all loads covered; and Report the details of each source transported and processed in the Annual Environmental Report. <p><u>Existing conditions of the licence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Condition 4 - Dust suppression water sprays fitted to crushing and screening circuits, conveyor transfer

Emission	Sources	Potential pathways	Proposed controls
			points, tipping areas and stockpiles.
Contaminated stormwater / leachate	Storage of EOS on the ROM	Air/windborne pathway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incident rainfall within the mining area is contained; Surface water bunds are in place around the site to direct surface water from outside the mine site away from the processing areas; Surface water drains will be inspected periodically to ensure maintain functionality; A surface water assessment for the Project has been undertaken to understand the risks and mitigation measures. <p><u>Existing conditions of the licence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Condition 4 - Stockpiled External Ore Sources are contained within a bunded area which is designed to prevent stockpile stormwater run-off escaping the ROM pad area.
Seepage	Deposition of tailings into TSF1	Seepage to soils and groundwater	See Section 3.3.3

3.1.2 Receptors

In accordance with the *Guideline: Risk assessments* (DWER 2020), the delegated officer has excluded employees, visitors and contractors of the licence holder's from its assessment. Protection of these parties often involves different exposure risks and prevention strategies, and is provided for under other state legislation.

Table 2 below provides a summary of potential human and environmental receptors that may be impacted as a result of activities upon or emission and discharges from the prescribed premises (*Guideline: Environmental siting* (DWER 2020)).

Table 2: Sensitive human, environmental and cultural receptors and distance from prescribed activity

Human receptors	Distance from prescribed activity
Nil	Nil
Environmental receptors	Distance from prescribed activity
Native vegetation - Low woodland; mulga (<i>Acacia aneura</i>) Mulgas are shallow rooted (typically < 5m). Vegetation condition rated as excellent by Ecologica (2019).	Within and surrounding premises.

Mulga groves play an important role as water and nutrient sinks, creating fertile patches in generally water and nutrient poor landscapes (Ecologica, 2019).	
Ephemeral creek lines	An ephemeral creek-line (minor drainage line) is adjacent to TSF1 at the northern embankment.
<p>Underlying groundwater</p> <p>Water is used onsite for ore processing, dust suppression, construction activities and potable purposes.</p> <p>Groundwater in the regional area may be used for stock watering.</p> <p>Groundwater monitoring indicates the groundwater quality is considered fresh to brackish (total dissolved solids (TDS) range of 840 to 5,600 mg/L). The lower salinity levels were observed in groundwater monitoring bores upstream of the TSF1.</p> <p>Groundwater generally flows in a north-east west direction towards the mine pit.</p>	Approximately 4 to 7 meters below ground level (m bgl)
<i>Rights in Water and Irrigation Act 1914</i> (RIWI Act)	Premises located within the East Murchison Groundwater Area
Cultural receptors	Distance from prescribed activity
Nil	Nil

3.2 Risk ratings

Risk ratings have been assessed in accordance with the *Guideline: Risk Assessments* (DWER 2020) for those emission sources which are proposed to change and takes into account potential source-pathway and receptor linkages as identified in Section 3.1. Where linkages are incomplete they have not been considered further in the risk assessment.

Where the licence holder has proposed mitigation measures/controls (as detailed in Section 3.1), these have been considered when determining the final risk rating. Where the delegated officer considers the licence holder's proposed controls to be critical to maintaining an acceptable level of risk, these will be incorporated into the licence as regulatory controls.

Additional regulatory controls may be imposed where the licence holder's controls are not deemed sufficient. Where this is the case the need for additional controls will be documented and justified in Table 3.

The revised licence L9195/2019/1 that accompanies this amendment report authorises emissions associated with the operation of the premises.

The conditions in the revised licence have been determined in accordance with *Guidance Statement: Setting Conditions* (DER 2015).

Table 3. Risk assessment of potential emissions and discharges from the premises during operation

Risk Event					Risk rating ¹ C = consequence L = likelihood	Licence holder's controls sufficient?	Conditions ² of licence	Justification for additional regulatory controls/ DWER comments
Source/Activities	Potential emission	Potential pathways and impact	Receptors	Licence holder's controls				
Storage of EOS on the ROM pad, movement of ore and processing of ore at the processing plant.	Dust	Air/windborne pathway causing smothering and impacts to vegetation health	Native vegetation within and surrounding premises	Refer to Section 3.1	C = Minor L = Unlikely Medium Risk No change in risk rating	Y	Existing condition: Condition 4	N/A
Storage of EOS on the ROM pad.	Contaminated stormwater / leachate containing suspended solids (sediment laden), acid, dissolved solids, metals and metalloids	Overland runoff causing impacts to vegetation health and ecosystem function	Native vegetation within and surrounding premises Ephemeral creek lines adjacent to TSF1	Refer to Section 3.1	C = Minor L = Possible Medium Risk No change in risk rating	Y	Existing conditions: Condition 4, 5 and 25	N/A
Deposition of tailings into TSF1	Seepage from TSF containing acid, dissolved solids, metals and metalloids	Seepage through embankments resulting in overland runoff impacting vegetation health and ecosystem function Infiltration to groundwater causing degradation of groundwater quality, vegetation health and ecosystem function	Native vegetation within and surrounding premises Ephemeral creek lines adjacent to TSF1 Underlying groundwater 4 – 7 m bgl	Refer to Section 3.1	See detailed risk assessment in Section 3.3			

Note 1: Consequence ratings, likelihood ratings and risk descriptions are detailed in the *Guideline: Risk assessments* (DWER 2020).

Note 2: Proposed licence holder's controls are depicted by standard text. **bold and underline text** depicts additional regulatory controls imposed by department.

Licence: L9195/2019/1

3.3 Detailed risk assessment for the disposal of tailings derived from the processing of blended ore sources

3.3.1 Background and description of risk event

An amendment was granted on 21 September 2021 to allow for the self-assessment of EOS for the acceptance and processing of that ore at the premises. The key findings from the detailed risk assessment were:

- Processing of other EOS at the premises may increase the level of potentially harmful chemical constituents within seepage waters, which may impact an ephemeral creek line and native vegetation (mulga) bordering TSF1;
- During the lifecycle of TSF1, it is likely that the chemical composition of the seepage from TSF1 will change with the potential for metals and metalloids to be released, even if ore has been classified as non-acid forming (NAF);
- The most immediate environmental impacts caused by seepage are likely to be due to groundwater mounding and the effects of saline water on vegetation near the TSF; and
- The Seepage Plan which has been developed for the premises does not adequately address the issue of seepage at TSF1.

A combination of applicant proposed controls, and additional regulatory controls were applied to the licence. These controls related to limiting the throughput and source radius of EOS as well as requiring the licence holder to prepare and submit an updated Seepage Management Plan.

As part of this amendment, the licence holder has requested to remove the limits relating to the acceptance and processing of EOS. As the disposal of EOS derived tailings is intrinsically linked to seepage from TSF1, the delegated officer has also reviewed the updated Seepage Management Plan submitted to fulfill the requirements of Condition 22 of the licence. Key findings from the review of the Seepage Management Plan are outlined below.

Key findings:

The delegated officer has reviewed the Seepage Management Plan and found that:

- The geophysical assessment showed no visible structures or fractures which could create preferential pathways for seepage flow through the TSF.
- Additional shallow monitoring bores have been proposed, but have not yet been constructed.
- A program of works for the purpose of identifying the formation of a perched aquifer beneath the TSF1 has not been developed.
- KP17 has been equipped as a seepage recovery / production bore on the eastern side of TSF1.
- The supernatant pond is proposed to be maintained below a maximum 15% of the total surface area of the paddock when deposition is occurring. The paddock surface area will be determined by survey upon completion of each embankment raise.
- Decant pumping infrastructure was upgraded in 2021 to allow for a higher rate of recovery.
- A number of monitoring triggers for seepage and contingency actions have been proposed including constructing additional monitoring and recovery bores, review tailings deposition and TSF seepage management strategies and constructing

additional cutoff drains.

The delegated officer notes that since the mine has been in care and maintenance, groundwater mounding around TSF1 has remained below the 5 m bgl standing water level trigger, however, during operations between 2020 and 2021, the trigger was consistently exceeded in some bores. The delegated officer considers that when deposition of tailings into TSF1 recommences, there is a high likelihood that mounding will exceed the trigger value again. The delegated officer considers the contingencies specified in the Seepage Management Plan to be largely reactive and insufficiently detailed in terms of specific actions and timeframes to effectively address seepage issues.

3.3.2 Description of potential adverse impact from emission

The key risks associated with the blending of ore sourced from different mine sites include the potential to increase the acid generating capabilities of tailings resulting in Acid and Metalliferous Drainage (AMD), and the increased toxicity of tailings through geochemical variability. Impacts from AMD may last in perpetuity and increasing the toxicity of tailings may decrease the likelihood of successful rehabilitation and cause a degradation of groundwater quality.

The previous licence amendment identified groundwater mounding caused by seepage as the most immediate environmental risk during operations. To address uncertainties regarding the adequacy of the Seepage Management Plan, Condition 22 was included in the licence to require the licence holder to submit an updated Seepage Management Plan. The delegated officer reviewed the Seepage Management Plan as outlined above and found that the plan and proposed contingency actions will not adequately address the issues of seepage at TSF1.

3.3.3 Applicant controls

The existing controls in the licence for seepage are:

- Condition 5 (revised licence Condition 7) – inspection requirements for TSF1;
- Condition 15 (revised licence Condition 19) – monitoring requirements for the supernatant;
- Condition 16 (revised licence Condition 20) – monthly water balance requirements;
- Condition 20 (revised licence Condition 24) – ambient groundwater monitoring; and
- Condition 22 (condition removed as part of revised licence) – submission of an updated Seepage Management Plan.

The licence holder's proposed controls for seepage are:

- All EOS ores will be geochemically tested to determine their suitability for processing at Kirkalocka prior to being picked up and transported to site in accordance with the EOS Procedure;
- Maintain the size of the decant pond to 15% of the total surface area of the paddock;
- If the decant pond becomes greater than the target size, decant water from the TSF will be used as a priority for mineral processing instead of groundwater;
- The decant pumping infrastructure has been upgraded to allow for a higher rate of recovery if required;

Triggers and corrective actions are proposed as shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Proposed seepage triggers and corrective actions

Monitoring trigger	Corrective actions
20% increase in EC in groundwater monitoring bores.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Resample EC and ensure correct measurement; ▪ Review other analytes to determine if there are similar changes; ▪ Investigate potential causes; ▪ Increase sampling frequency in affected bores to monthly; and ▪ Implement selected contingency actions (if required).
No improvement or continued increase from initial EC trigger value over three consecutive measurements.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increase EC sampling frequency to monthly; ▪ Initiate installation of contingency, recovery bores; ▪ Utilise contingency bores to estimate distance/rate of potential seepage; ▪ Investigate potential causes; and ▪ Implement selected contingency actions.
Exceedance of livestock water quality guideline levels in analyte for two consecutive monitoring measurements.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review other analytes to determine if there are similar changes; ▪ Investigate potential causes; ▪ Increase sampling frequency in affected bores to (at least) monthly; and ▪ Implement selected contingency actions (if required).
Exceedance of the <5mbgl SWL reporting limit in any TSF monitoring bore.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Report through to DWER; ▪ Investigate potential causes; and ▪ Identify contingency actions and implementation timeframes within seven days.

- The following contingency actions will be applied:
 - Review decant pond volumes and increase recovery rates where practicable;
 - Initiate pump back from downstream recovery bores;
 - Construct additional monitoring or pump back bores in areas where trigger values are exceeded over three consecutive measurements;
 - Review tailings deposition and TSF seepage management strategies; and
 - Construct additional cutoff drains and pump back capability.
- Review of the TSF seepage management plan will be undertaken on annual basis.

3.3.4 Risk assessment

The delegated officer has:

- considered that the consequence to receptors inundated by mounding groundwater of a poor water quality from seepage from TSF1 could have moderate impacts to groundwater quality, native vegetation and ephemeral creek lines;
- considered that the likelihood of impacts to these receptors is possible based on previous mounding data from deposition of tailings into TSF1 and lack of proactive controls proposed in the Seepage Management Plan; and
- determined that the overall rating for the risk of impacts from seepage, based on a consequence of moderate and likelihood of possible, is **medium**.

3.3.5 Regulatory controls

The delegated officer has considered the licence holder’s request to remove conditions relating to limiting the throughput and source radius of EOS and has determined that the objective of these conditions was to ensure that EOS is suitable for processing at the premises primarily in regard to preventing AMD and reducing the toxicity potential of tailings.

The delegated officer has determined that by conditioning the geotechnical testing specified in the licence holder’s EOS Acceptance Procedure, the same objective can be achieved. Conditions relating to limiting the throughput and source radius have been removed from the licence and instead conditions 10 and 11 have been included to condition the requirement of the geochemical testing specified in the EOS Acceptance Procedure.

Condition 10 specifies the number of samples required based on the volume of material to be accepted. The sampling frequencies have been set in accordance with the licence holder’s EOS Acceptance Procedure, which has been verified as consistent with the approach recommended by Parbhakar-Fox and Dominy (2017).

Condition 11 specifies the testing and acceptance criteria for EOS, which have been adopted from the testing regime outlined in the licence holder’s EOS Acceptance Procedure. The delegated officer generally considers this regime sufficient to ensure compatibility with Kirkalocka ore and to prevent AMD impacts. In addition, the delegated officer has included pH and electrical conductivity in the testing requirements to identify ore that may have already undergone oxidation.

The delegated officer has reassessed the impacts of seepage and mounding in the context of the most recent Seepage Management Plan. The delegated officer notes that mounding will likely exceed the specified limit when operations recommence. Accordingly, specified actions for seepage have been included as conditions 2 and 3 and a trigger value for standing water level and corresponding trigger actions have been included at conditions 24 and 25 respectively.

The delegated officer notes that the premises is currently in care and maintenance and that TSF1 is at capacity, with additional lifts approved but not yet constructed. The delegated officer considers it necessary to be notified when the premises resumes operations to ensure the department has adequate oversight of the premises. Condition 34 has been added to require the licence holder to notify the department when operations resume. Furthermore, it is noted that the licence contains a number of historical conditions including provisions allowing for the discharge of dewatering water to land. The department notes that current dewatering water disposal practices at the premises may no longer be appropriate and may require a review of the adequacy of controls and the associated risk assessment when operations recommence.

4. Consultation

Table 5 provides a summary of the consultation undertaken by the department.

Table 5: Consultation

Consultation method	Comments received	Department response
Department of Mines, Petroleum and Exploration (DMPE) advised of proposal 11 September 2025	DMPE provided an email response on 24 September 2025 stating: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DMPE is of the understanding that since May 2022 the Kirkalocka Gold Mine has been under ‘Care and Maintenance’ as observed during a recent environmental inspection undertaken on 19 May 2025. • The TSF1 currently has no capacity to receive tailings unless lifted. 	The department notes DMPE’s comments.

- Approved Mining Proposal Reg ID 92241 (Rev 2.5) states Stage 3 lift on TSF1, to provide an additional 3.5Mt of tailings storage capacity, was planned for 2021. Since going into C&M in 2022 no such lift has been constructed, however this approval remains valid.
- In addition to the approved lift on TSF1, an additional TSF (TSF2) has also been approved under Reg ID 84320 in March 2020 and then redesigned under MP 92241 to be an Integrated Waste Landform (IWL). TSF2 is expected to provide an additional 8.6 Mt of capacity corresponding to approximately 3.9 years of production capacity based on the average design tonnage of 2.212 Mtpa and an adopted tailings dry density of 1.5t/m³. To date TSF2 was not built, however the footprint for the facility has been cleared and as above the approvals remains valid.
- The approved environmental outcome and performance criteria associated with the risk of treating external ore sources;

Risk pathway	Environmental outcome	Performance criteria	Monitoring
Adverse geochemical impacts arising from the treatment of ore from external ore sources (EOS); potential for seepage water from the TSF to reduce in quality.	EOS are managed to minimise impacts arising from the treatment of ore and potential for seepage water from the TSF to reduce in quality	All EOS are assessed and managed in accordance with the approved EOS environmental procedure (Appendix A).	Annual assessment of compliance with EOS environmental procedure.

- As the performance criteria refers to the EOS environmental procedure (attached), if the scope of that procedure was to change to support operations then a revised MDCP would be required. According to the licence amendment supporting document external ore sources are required to meet the conditions of ore acceptance (Threshold levels set out in Table 2) as per the EOS environmental procedure (Appendix A), and in this case a revised MDCP would not be required.
- If the design parameters of the approved TSFs needed to change then a revised MDCP would be required, however it is understood the licence amendment doesn't propose any physical change to infrastructure.
- Sufficient groundwater monitoring surrounding the TSF must be operational to understand changes in groundwater level or quality and determine any impacts from seepage.

Licence holder was provided with draft amendment on 28 November 2025	A response was received from the licence holder on 5 December 2025 stating that the licence holder had no comments and wished to waive the consultation period.	Noted.
--	---	--------

5. Conclusion

Based on the assessment in this amendment report, the delegated officer has determined that a revised licence will be granted, subject to conditions commensurate with the determined controls and necessary for administration and reporting requirements.

5.1 Summary of amendments

Table 6 provides a summary of the proposed amendments and will act as record of implemented changes. All proposed changes have been incorporated into the revised licence as part of the amendment process.

Table 6: Summary of licence amendments

Previous condition	Condition summary	Revised licence condition	Conversion/amendment notes
Front page	DWER file number	N/A	DWER file number updated
N/A	Seepage recovery specified works	2	Inclusion of specified actions for proactive seepage recovery
N/A	Seepage recovery specified works reporting	3	Inclusion of reporting requirements for seepage recovery works
2	Works compliance reporting	4	Updated numbering
3	Works compliance reporting	5	Updated numbering
4	Infrastructure and equipment requirements	6	Updated numbering, removal of EOS acceptance radius and specified ore sources. Removal of limitation on EOS throughput. Inclusion of EOS acceptance requirement.
5	Inspection requirements	7	Updated numbering
6	Inspection requirements	8	Updated numbering
7	Landfill acceptance	9	Updated numbering
N/A	EOS sampling frequency	10	Inclusion of EOS acceptance sampling frequencies
N/A	EOS testing requirements	11	Inclusion of EOS acceptance monitoring suite and limits
8	Process wastes authorised discharges	12	Updated numbering

Previous condition	Condition summary	Revised licence condition	Conversion/amendment notes
9	Process waste discharge limits	13	Updated numbering
10	Authorised discharges to land	14	Updated numbering
11	Treater wastewater discharge limits	15	Updated numbering
12	Monitoring scheduling requirements	16	Updated numbering
13	Manufacturer's specification requirements	17	Updated numbering
14	NATA accreditation requirements	18	Updated numbering
15	Process monitoring	19	Updated numbering
16	TSF water balance	20	Updated numbering
17	Monitoring of dewater and vegetation	21	Updated numbering
18	Vegetation trigger value exceedance actions	22	Updated numbering
19	WWTP monitoring	23	Updated numbering
20	Ambient groundwater monitoring	24	Updated numbering and inclusion of a SWL trigger
N/A	SWL trigger exceedance action	25	Inclusion of actions for SWL trigger exceedance
21	Specified actions – standing water level reporting	N/A	Removal of completed action
22	Specified actions – updated seepage management plan	N/A	Removal of completed action
23	Complaints record	26	Updated numbering
24	Annual Audit Compliance Report	27	Updated numbering, updated wording of condition for clarity
25	Annual Environment Report	28	Updated numbering, updated wording of condition for clarity, included condition reference for EOS laboratory results, updated groundwater monitoring reporting to include trigger exceedance actions.
26	Books	29	Updated numbering and inclusion of EOS monitoring
27	Books	30	Updated numbering

Previous condition	Condition summary	Revised licence condition	Conversion/amendment notes
28	Requirement to comply with request	31	Updated numbering
29	Non-compliance notification requirement	32	Updated numbering
30	Non-compliance notification requirement	33	Updated numbering and wording for clarity
N/A	Notification of recommencement of operations	34	Inclusion of requirement to notify the CEO of recommencement of operations
31	WWTP commissioning authorisation	35	Updated numbering
32	WWTP commissioning requirements	36	Updated numbering
33	WWTP commissioning monitoring requirements	37	Updated numbering
34	WWTP commissioning monitoring requirements	38	Updated numbering
35	WWTP commissioning reporting requirements	39	Updated numbering
36	WWTP commissioning reporting requirements	40	Updated numbering
37	WWTP commissioning notification requirements	41	Updated numbering
Figure 4	Vegetation monitoring locations	Figure 4	Updated to include all vegetation monitoring locations
Figure 6	Location of External Ore Sources	N/A	Removed as part of amendment

References

1. Department of Environment Regulation (DER) 2015, *Guidance Statement: Setting Conditions*, Perth, Western Australia.
2. Department of Water and Environmental Regulation (DWER) 2020, *Guideline: Environmental Siting*, Perth, Western Australia.
3. DWER 2020, *Guideline: Risk Assessments*, Perth, Western Australia.
4. Ecologica, December 2019, *Adaman Resources Kirkalocka Gold Mine Baseline Vegetation and Mulga Health Monitoring* (Revision 1), Osborne Park, Western Australia.
5. Kirkalocka Gold SPV October 2021, *Kirkalocka Gold Project Groundwater Monitoring Strategy and Seepage Management Plan*.
6. Parbhakar-Fox, A & Dominy SC 2017, *Sampling and blending in geoenvironmental campaigns – current practice and future opportunities*, Perth, Western Australia.
7. Talis Consultants July 2025, *External Ore Sources (EOS) Environmental Procedure: Version 4*, Leederville, Western Australia.