

Government of Western Australia Department of Water and Environmental Regulation

Annual Audit Compliance Report Form

Environmental Protection Act 1986, Part V

Section A – Licenc	e Details			
Licence number:	L8194/2007/3	Licence file number:	2013/001082	
Licence holder:	Fortescue Metals	Fortescue Metals Group Ltd		
Trading as:	Fortescue Metals	Fortescue Metals Group Ltd		
ACN:	002 594 872			
Registered address:	Level 2, 87 Adelaide Terrace East Perth 6004 WA			
Reporting period:	01/01/2022 to	31/12/2022		

Section B – Statement of Compliance with Licence Conditions

Did you comply with all of your licence conditions during the reporting period? (please tick the appropriate box)

□Yes – please complete:

- section C;
- section D if required; and
- sign the declaration in Section F.

⊠No – please complete:

- section C;
- section D if required;
- section E; and
- sign the declaration at Section F.

Section C – Statement of Actual Production

Provide the actual production quantity for this reporting period. Supporting documentation is to be attached.

Actual Production Quantity	
192,811,414 tonnes of iron ore exported	
0 tonnes of rail ballast screened	

Section D - Statement of Actual Part 2 Waste Discharge Quantity

Provide the actual Part 2 waste discharge quantity for this reporting period. Supporting documentation is to be attached.

Prescribed Premises Category	Actual Part 2 Waste Discharge Quantity	
N/A – As per Environmental Protection Regulations 1987 5D(6)(e)	1,113,053 kL of wastewater was discharged from the desalination plant.	

Section E – Deta	ils of Non-Compliance w	vith Licence Conditi	on		
	Please use a separate page for each condition with which the licence holder was non-compliant at a time during the reporting period.				
Condition no:	Condition 1Date(s) of non- compliance:24/02/2022 - 24/08/2022				
Details of non-com	pliance:				
whenever ship load	Condition 1 requires Fortescue to undertake a manual dry sweep of the wharf at least daily whenever ship loading occurs, as per the requirements of Schedule 3, Table 13, Rows 11 and 19. Wharf sweeping was not undertaken at this frequency from 24 February 2022 to 25 August 2022.				
What was the actua	al (or suspected) environmen	tal impact of the non-c	ompliance?		
NOTE – please attac compliance took plac	h maps or diagrams to provide i e.	insight into the precise lo	cation of where the non-		
There is no known	actual or suspected environn	nental impact due to th	is non-compliance.		
There were no reportable boundary dust monitoring events during the reporting period (required under Condition 23), which indicates that any increase in dust from the Premise, as a result of the non-compliance, would have been minimal.					
Cause (or suspected cause) of non-compliance:					
Damage occurred to the road sweeper door in a storm. Due to delays in the delivery of replacement parts and repairs scheduled by third party, the road sweeper was not operational for an extended period.					
The road sweeper recommenced daily wharf sweeping on 25 August 2022.					
Action taken to mitigate any adverse effects of non-compliance and prevent recurrence of the non-compliance:					
An external contract was established for biweekly (limited due to vendor availability) cleanup of the wharf from 31 May 2022 until 25 August 2022.					
A backup road sweeper is being sourced to ensure compliance in case of future road sweeper unavailability.					
Was this non-compliance previously reported to DWER?					
Yes, and					
Reported to DWER verbally Date: / /					
Reported to	DWER Verbally				

Section E – Deta	ils of Non-Compliance w	vith Licence Conditi	on	
Please use a separate page for each condition with which the licence holder was non-compliant at a time during the reporting period.				
Condition no:	Condition 1	Date(s) of non- compliance:	25/08/2022	
Details of non-com	pliance:			
sufficient period to	s stormwater to be retained v allow the majority of suspend f Schedule 3, Table 13, Row	led particles to settle p	• •	
Basin (W1). Subsection into the adjacent Sol	pipeline caused the release of quently, the Sedimentation B outh West Creek. This poten rmwater and did not allow fo	asin overflowed, disch tially contravenes Con	arging dredge material dition 1 as the discharge	
What was the actua	al (or suspected) environmen	tal impact of the non-c	compliance?	
NOTE – please attac compliance took plac	h maps or diagrams to provide i e.	insight into the precise lo	cation of where the non-	
There was no know	n actual or suspected enviro	nmental impact due to	non-compliance.	
An independent specialist was engaged, confirming that there was no environmental impact due to the discharge being contained in an area comprised of tidal creeks and mud flats. These areas are subject to periodic inundation and water containing naturally high suspended particles.				
Drone footage show	wed no sedimentation occurr	ed within mangroves.		
Cause (or suspected cause) of non-compliance:				
The cause of rupture of the dredge pipeline was due to a foreign object in the pipe, which created a split while travelling through the pipeline.				
Action taken to mitigate any adverse effects of non-compliance and prevent recurrence of the non-compliance:				
Dredging immediately ceased once the leak was identified to reduce the volume of water discharged.				
Visual inspections of dredge pipelines and monitoring of pressure gauges are now conducted every 2 hours during dredge operations to ensure any damage to pipelines are identified as soon as possible.				
Was this non-compliance previously reported to DWER?				
Yes, and				

Department of Water and Environmental Regulation

Reported to DWER verbally	Date: / /
Reported to DWER in writing	Date: 26 /08 / 2022

Section E – Deta	ils of Non-Compliance w	ith Licence Conditi	on	
Please use a separate page for each condition with which the licence holder was non-compliant at a time during the reporting period.				
Condition no:	Condition 18	Date(s) of non- compliance:	01/01/2022 - 31/12/2022	
Details of non-comp	bliance:			
Premises has a mo	es Fortescue to ensure that a isture content at or above the I-loaded was at or above DE	e DEM level. During 20	022, less than 90% of	
	al (or suspected) environmen h maps or diagrams to provide i e.			
There is no known or suspected environmental impact due to this non-compliance. During the period, there has been no reportable boundary dust monitoring event (required under condition 23), which indicates that there was no increase in dust from the Premise, and therefore no environmental impact.				
Cause (or suspecte	d cause) of non-compliance:	:		
Mining from above water table and dry processing at multiple mining operations within Fortescue has resulted in some ore arriving at Anderson Point Material Handling Facility (MHF) below DEM. Due to varied geology at mine sites, Anderson Point MHF received a large number of different iron ore products at the train unloaders throughout 2022. Some of these products are produced infrequently, which represents challenges in getting representative composite samples for DEM testing.				
Action taken to mitigate any adverse effects of non-compliance and prevent recurrence of the non-compliance:				
		ges in getting represe	ntative composite samples	
non-compliance: Fortescue has unde compliance with in- Firetail to improve in	gate any adverse effects of n ertaken a study to assess a n loaded moisture, with ore con n-load product moisture for th	ges in getting represent non-compliance and pre- number of different option nditioning trials ongoin the driest products.	event recurrence of the ons to improve g at Eliwana Mine Site and	
non-compliance: Fortescue has unde compliance with in- Firetail to improve in	gate any adverse effects of n ertaken a study to assess a n loaded moisture, with ore co	ges in getting represent non-compliance and pre- number of different option nditioning trials ongoin the driest products.	event recurrence of the ons to improve g at Eliwana Mine Site and	
non-compliance: Fortescue has unde compliance with in- Firetail to improve in Further work is und	gate any adverse effects of n ertaken a study to assess a n loaded moisture, with ore con n-load product moisture for th	ges in getting represent non-compliance and pre- number of different option nditioning trials ongoin ne driest products.	event recurrence of the ons to improve g at Eliwana Mine Site and	
non-compliance: Fortescue has unde compliance with in- Firetail to improve in Further work is und	gate any adverse effects of n ertaken a study to assess a n loaded moisture, with ore con n-load product moisture for th erway to optimise these trials	ges in getting represent non-compliance and pre- number of different option nditioning trials ongoin ne driest products.	event recurrence of the ons to improve g at Eliwana Mine Site and	
non-compliance: Fortescue has under compliance with in- Firetail to improve in Further work is und Was this non-comp	gate any adverse effects of n ertaken a study to assess a n loaded moisture, with ore con n-load product moisture for th erway to optimise these trials	ges in getting represent non-compliance and pre- number of different option nditioning trials ongoin ne driest products.	event recurrence of the ons to improve g at Eliwana Mine Site and	

Section E – Deta	Section E – Details of Non-Compliance with Licence Condition			
Please use a separate page for each condition with which the licence holder was non-compliant at a time during the reporting period.				
Condition no:	Condition 20	Date(s) of non- compliance:	01/01/2022 - 31/12/2022	
Details of non-com	pliance:			
Premises has a mo	es Fortescue to ensure that a sisture content at or above DI or above DEM level.			
What was the actua	al (or suspected) environmen	tal impact of the non-c	compliance?	
NOTE – please attac compliance took plac	h maps or diagrams to provide i e.	insight into the precise lo	cation of where the non-	
There is no known	or suspected environmental	impact due to this non	-compliance.	
During the period, there has been no reportable boundary dust monitoring event (required under Condition 23), which indicates that any increase in dust from the premise, as a result of the non-compliance, would have been minimal.				
Cause (or suspecte	Cause (or suspected cause) of non-compliance:			
Mining from above water table and dry processing at multiple mining operations within Fortescue has resulted in some ore arriving at Anderson point MHF below DEM. Unblended ore products derived from dry processing also contributed to this non-compliance.				
Action taken to mitigate any adverse effects of non-compliance and prevent recurrence of the non-compliance:				
Fortescue is working to improve compliance with Condition 18 (inload moisture) with the trials of ore conditioning sprays at Eliwana and Firetail. This will result in improving the outload moisture percentage. Additionally, the installation of Bulk Ore Conditioning Sprays at the Port has been completed in accordance with Table 1, Condition 5 of the licence. This is likely to prevent a recurrence.				
Was this non-compliance previously reported to DWER?				
Yes, and				
Reported to	DWER verbally	Date: / /		
Reported to	DWER in writing	Date: / /		

Section E – Details of Non-Compliance with Licence Condition

Please use a separate page for each condition with which the licence holder was non-compliant at a time during the reporting period.

Condition no:	Condition 21	Date(s) of non- compliance:	01/01/2022 – 28/02/2022 & 31/08/2022 – 20/09/2022
---------------	--------------	--------------------------------	---

Details of non-compliance:

Condition 21 requires Fortescue to calibrate moisture analysers located at TUL001, TUL002 and TUL003 at least every six months, as per the requirements of Table 3, Column 5.

Calibration of the analysers was not undertaken for some hematite iron ore products and one moisture analyser was not calibrated at the minimum six-month frequency.

What was the actual (or suspected) environmental impact of the non-compliance?

NOTE – please attach maps or diagrams to provide insight into the precise location of where the noncompliance took place.

There is no known actual or suspected environmental impact due to this non-compliance.

There were no reportable boundary dust monitoring events during the reporting period (required under Condition 23), which indicates that any increase in dust from the premise, as a result of the non-compliance, would have been minimal.

Cause (or suspected cause) of non-compliance:

Due to the varied geology at the mine sites, Anderson Point MHF received a large number of different iron ore products at the train unloaders through 2022. Some of these products are produced infrequently which represents challenges in getting representative samples for testing.

Calibration for new products or products that are handled infrequently or in small amounts, has been challenging due to the complexity of the calibration and the number of different products and time taken to collect a representative composite sample to dispatch to the laboratory.

Action taken to mitigate any adverse effects of non-compliance and prevent recurrence of the non-compliance:

The internal planning tool allows for calibration to be undertaken every four months to allow for potential delays.

Moisture analyser stock levels have been increased from 2 to 3 units to ensure calibrations can be undertaken within the required timeframe and for all iron ore products.

A review of processes and procedures within the Integrated Planning team has been undertaken to allow for samples to be collected and dispatched to the laboratory for relevant calibrations to prevent a recurrence.

Additionally, moisture determination is also undertaken at the mine site train load out facilities to Australian Standards prior to arriving at the premises.

Department of Water and Environmental Regulation

Was this non-compliance previously reported to DWER?		
☐ Yes, and		
Reported to DWER verbally Date: / /		
Reported to DWER in writing Date: / /		

Section E – Det	ails of Non-Compliance w	vith Licence Condit	ion		
Please use a separate page for each condition with which the licence holder was non-compliant at a time during the reporting period.					
Condition no:	Condition 30	Date(s) of non- compliance:	31/10/2022		
Details of non-con	npliance:				
quarterly basis by	ires Fortescue to submit the d the last day of the following m D) analyses for the dust depo tober submission.	onth. The results of the	ne Crystalline and		
What was the actu	al (or suspected) environmen	tal impact of the non-	compliance?		
NOTE – please atta compliance took pla	ch maps or diagrams to provide ce.	insight into the precise lo	ocation of where the non-		
There is no known actual or suspected environmental impact due to this non-compliance.					
Cause (or suspect	ted cause) of non-compliance	:			
During analysis of (XRD analysis) for final ash content o not available to be	ted cause) of non-compliance the July samples, the laborate the samples. Due to an error of the samples was completely analysed for mineralogy. Due a set time frame re-sampling v	ory was unable to con in laboratory prepara digested for metals a to the nature of the s	tion of the samples, the malysis and an aliquot was		
During analysis of (XRD analysis) for final ash content of not available to be representative of a The laboratory had	the July samples, the laborate the samples. Due to an error of the samples was completely analysed for mineralogy. Due	ory was unable to con in laboratory prepara digested for metals a to the nature of the s vas not possible.	tion of the samples, the inalysis and an aliquot was samples being where the workflow did not		
During analysis of (XRD analysis) for final ash content of not available to be representative of a The laboratory had detail the addition	the July samples, the laborate the samples. Due to an error of the samples was completely analysed for mineralogy. Due a set time frame re-sampling v d recently transitioned to a ne	ory was unable to con in laboratory prepara digested for metals a to the nature of the s vas not possible. w reporting database requirements for XRD	tion of the samples, the inalysis and an aliquot was samples being where the workflow did not analysis.		
During analysis of (XRD analysis) for final ash content of not available to be representative of a The laboratory had detail the additiona Action taken to minon-compliance: The laboratory had workflow detailing	the July samples, the laborate the samples. Due to an error of the samples was completely analysed for mineralogy. Due a set time frame re-sampling v d recently transitioned to a ner al custom sample processing tigate any adverse effects of r	ory was unable to com in laboratory prepara digested for metals a to the nature of the s was not possible. w reporting database requirements for XRD non-compliance and p	tion of the samples, the inalysis and an aliquot was samples being where the workflow did not analysis. revent recurrence of the team, and the database		
During analysis of (XRD analysis) for final ash content of not available to be representative of a The laboratory had detail the additional Action taken to minon-compliance: The laboratory had workflow detailing have been correct	the July samples, the laborate the samples. Due to an error of the samples was completely analysed for mineralogy. Due a set time frame re-sampling v d recently transitioned to a ner al custom sample processing tigate any adverse effects of r	ory was unable to com in laboratory prepara digested for metals a to the nature of the s was not possible. w reporting database requirements for XRD non-compliance and p neet for the laboratory ients for the XRD anal	tion of the samples, the inalysis and an aliquot was samples being where the workflow did not analysis. revent recurrence of the team, and the database		
During analysis of (XRD analysis) for final ash content of not available to be representative of a The laboratory had detail the additional Action taken to minon-compliance: The laboratory had workflow detailing have been correct	the July samples, the laborate the samples. Due to an error of the samples was completely analysed for mineralogy. Due a set time frame re-sampling v d recently transitioned to a ner al custom sample processing tigate any adverse effects of r s updated the physical worksh the custom analysis requirem ly processed.	ory was unable to com in laboratory prepara digested for metals a to the nature of the s was not possible. w reporting database requirements for XRD non-compliance and p neet for the laboratory ients for the XRD anal	tion of the samples, the inalysis and an aliquot was samples being where the workflow did not analysis. revent recurrence of the team, and the database		
During analysis of (XRD analysis) for final ash content of not available to be representative of a The laboratory had detail the additional Action taken to minon-compliance: The laboratory had workflow detailing have been correct Was this non-com	the July samples, the laborate the samples. Due to an error of the samples was completely analysed for mineralogy. Due a set time frame re-sampling v d recently transitioned to a ner al custom sample processing tigate any adverse effects of r s updated the physical worksh the custom analysis requirem ly processed.	ory was unable to com in laboratory prepara digested for metals a to the nature of the s was not possible. w reporting database requirements for XRD non-compliance and p neet for the laboratory ients for the XRD anal	tion of the samples, the inalysis and an aliquot was samples being where the workflow did not analysis. revent recurrence of the team, and the database		

Section E – Deta	ils of Non-Compliance w	vith Licence Condit	ion	
Please use a separate page for each condition with which the licence holder was non-compliant at a time during the reporting period.				
Condition no:	Condition 32	Date(s) of non- compliance:	31/07/2022	
Details of non-com	pliance:			
Condition 32 requires Fortescue to ensure discharged wash water does not exceed the total recoverable hydrocarbons (TRH) limit of 15 mg/L as specified in Table 7, Column 4. A discharge of wash water occurred on 31 July 2022 at L2, where results indicate that TRH levels were 25.26 mg/L.				
What was the actua	al (or suspected) environmen	tal impact of the non-	compliance?	
NOTE – please attac compliance took plac	h maps or diagrams to provide i e.	insight into the precise lo	ocation of where the non-	
The potential impact to the environment due to this non-compliance is low given the lack of sensitive environmental receptors in the area.				
Visual inspections of the area found that there was no impact. Cause (or suspected cause) of non-compliance:				
Due to scheduled maintenance works within the vicinity a short-term loss of power to the oily water separator resulted in the water bypassing the oil water separator and discharging of untreated wash water via the stormwater pumps.				
Action taken to miti non-compliance:	gate any adverse effects of r	non-compliance and p	revent recurrence of the	
A bypass switch to the oily water separator (OWS) has been installed to allow for alternative power (i.e. backup generator) to be supplied to the OWS, which will prevent a future occurrence.				
Was this non-compliance previously reported to DWER?				
Yes, and				
Reported to	DWER verbally	Date: / /		
Reported to	DWER in writing	Date: / /		

Section F – Declaration

I/We declare that the information in this Annual Audit Compliance Report is true and correct and is not false or misleading in a material particular¹. I/We consent to the Annual Audit Compliance Report being published on the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation's (DWER) website.

Signature ² :		Signature:	
Name: (printed)		Name: (printed)	
Position:		Position:	
Date:	15/03/2023	Date:	
Seal (if signing under seal):			

² AACRs can only be signed by the licence holder or an authorised person with the legal authority to sign on behalf of the licence holder.

¹ It is an offence under section 112 of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986* for a person to give information on this form that to their knowledge is false or misleading in a material particular.