

MAY 26 2021 GGG AGM TRANSCRIPT (55:58)

00:00 JOHN MAIR: So instead of, as Tony indicated, instead of giving a long-winded presentation, as to where we're at, we're in the process at the moment of, let's say, looking to engage what is a new government in Greenland that sort of comes about from the snap election. And that's a process that, you know, we are, I guess, working through in a way whereby we can engage them when they're ready to have a discussion about a path forward. So as I think everyone's aware, we had Impact Assessment signed off last year, as meeting Greenland's guidelines by various independent advisory groups.

At that point, the government initiated what is a statutory public consultation process in Greenland. Now, shortly on the back of that, we saw, let's call it political instability, developed within what was the lead party in the coalition, which led to ultimately a break in the coalition government and a snap election. And the Kvanefjeld project has always I guess been a political project, in some respects. And again, you know, but it was in the middle of a statutory public consultation, it was suddenly, you know, in the center between two sides of politics.

1.33 So that in itself was, let's say, unfortunate. And part of the reason is, as soon as an election is called, the government in Greenland goes into caretaker mode. And that creates a particularly challenging set of circumstances, when you're in statutory public consultation that's essentially managed by the government. So suddenly, a process which is meant to be managed is left open. And in this case, we saw a huge amount of noise that really comes from the angle of NGOs. With which the Greenland media has a strong alignment with. We see that in many parts of the world. And that's what tended to drown out what was otherwise the material that had been tabled and presented for public consultation.

2.20 So unfortunately, what we had is we had a set of circumstances, <?> a version of the project really put forward by the media that was not reflective of what had been tabled for public consultation after many, many years of a comprehensive review, revision process, by Greenland government and their advisors.

So we had an election, and we see what is the IA party come into power. It's a party that we have worked with previously - in the period 2009 to 2013. But in Greenland what we've seen is quite a turnover of politicians in the system, over the last, let's say, two to four years. Many of the leaders on both sides of politics in Greenland through the period 2008 through to 2018, or thereabouts, they've sort of moved on. And we have sort of a young, let's say, new group looking to make their mark on the Greenland political scene. So the project became a center point, particularly around the uranium component of the project. And that remains a point that we continue to review, based on advice from outside. And we look to be able to then have a dialogue with Greenland to understand what the specific issue points are from their perspective. And when I say specific issue points, it's important to understand that since - let's say over the last decade, there's been many steps done at a political level that have seen the - let's call it regulatory framework - advanced, such that, going back 10 years, there was a lot of question marks around how would a project like this essentially move forward. And when I say that, the uranium component was considered as part of a multi-element prospect, or opportunity, but at that point in time, let's say going back to circa 2011, Greenland had only been under self-rule government for two years. And this is an important consideration. So at that point, there was still a lot of uncertainty about the relationship between Greenland and Denmark with respect to foreign policy, and whose authority it was over various decisions.

So subsequent to that Greenland government launched what was a detailed review to explore that relationship, specifically to understand how that would work in the case of uranium, which does come under sort of foreign policy management. So that set out let's call it a framework. There was a government-driven sort of initiative. And then subsequent to that, we then saw a series of steps. First was removal of what was a notional sort of zero tolerance policy. We then saw work programs put in place jointly between Greenland and Denmark. But that was partly driven by the Danish side. <?> enabling legislation that was then passed in both Danish and Greenlandic Parliament. And that created legislation that provided a framework for say the production, in this case by-production of uranium and export in accordance with international best practice. And subsequent to that Greenland was signed up in its own right to the International Atomic Energy Agency.

5.46 So that was all, I guess, a series of steps that filled a void of unknowns that were present at the point of let's say, 10 years ago, in 2011. And in parallel to that, essentially our mandate was to evaluate the project and I guess part of the mandate was to look at the by-production of uranium within that framework, which we have effectively gone through and done. That's a process that went through extensive stakeholder engagement in Greenland to shape the project. That defined the project's scope. It was the first project to go through public consultation in Greenland at the terms of reference level. And then went through a very comprehensive, what we call guidance phase in Greenland. And that then draws upon the independent advisors to the Greenland government, to essentially shape the impact assessment for public consultation, and look at the level of detail of the content and the verification of all - of all of that.

6.48 So that was the precursor that really led up to where we found ourselves, you know, late in 2020. So we entered the consultation phase, which does have challenges, you know, in a sort of a COVID era. And that, you know, brought about what was initially sort of an extension to that process. But it also - we saw a series of, let's say, unforeseen events. We saw - this was a process, which is, again, a government managed process, it was going to be attended by senior leaders in Greenland, but on the basis of an event, which was outlined as being death threats, which turned out to be a hoax, you know, a very unfortunate one, those meetings were somewhat sort of compromised in that the leaders did not attend. We were able to conduct those meetings. Again, this is a statutory process. So we were able to conduct those meetings with in-country. We had Zoom participation from Perth but we also had representatives from the key advisors, in both the Greenland government and the Danish Center for Environment participating in those forums. But from that point on, we literally have been - the government went into caretaker mode, obviously election, early April, new coalition government formed and the government is essentially just settling in.

8.05 So we, we have been in touch with the mines department as such in Greenland for an initial dialogue. Greenland government has indicated that they will, they will look to continue and follow through on the public consultation process in Greenland. And the production of a white paper, which follows the public consultation process. And that's part of let's call it the - what is, I guess, the statutory public consultation process. So at the moment, we're just going through looking to try and organize a schedule around those meetings, look at who will be attending those meetings, and just sort of formalizing, you know, what will be, let's call it a second round of public meetings that will be attended by politicians, members of the administration, members of - representatives of the company and so forth. So that's where it's at. But in a broader looking sense we are just looking to be able to, I guess, engage the government, really understand from their side, what the issue points are and work through that conversation.

9.18 We're sort of, I guess, somewhat limited, obviously, in what we can say beyond that, because that conversation is yet to take place. But we'll be looking to, I guess, provide updates as we work through that process, in terms of forward-looking schedule.

9.36 I think what's important to understand is what we've presented as a development strategy was very heavily influenced or shaped by – by the public consultation process. This was something that involved extensive, let's call it meetings at a stakeholder community level in South Greenland, not just the townships, but going out by boat to small settlements, but then importantly workshops with the administration, with the various departments, the ministry for industry, the ministry for mineral resources, the environmental agency for mineral resource activity. And that dictated how much processing was to be done in Greenland, and so forth.

10.15 So essentially, we've done what, you know - we've presented the development strategy and the impacts around it for what had been agreed upon with extensive stakeholder input. Now, as I say, we see a significant change in the political landscape in terms of the politicians involved. And, you know, that sort of brings about circumstances where we need to readdress it. So when I say we're looking to, you know, engage the government, it's looking to understand, you know, if there are modifications to what has been presented, which essentially what was signed off by the terms of reference, we'd like to have that conversation. And that's what we're looking to do. And that's what we plan on updating the market on, once we've worked through that process.

11.00 So that's probably an overview of where we sit. Again, it's been a sort of fast-moving series of events over the last, let's say, four to five months. And, yeah, there's obviously some uncertainty in front of us. We've been in let's call it uncertain times before. But we'll look, as I say, to continue to try and mount the path forward.

11:27 QUESTIONER: Just as a quick question, John, I mean could you describe the new mine minister as an experienced politician?

11:36 JM: Ah, yeah, the new mines minister is a lady called Naaja Nathanielsen. Many, many years ago, I actually took her and a number of other politicians on a sort of a tour of the project. So she's been - she did step out of politics for a while, but there's been considerable experience in the Greenland government. Yeah, so she's been part of the political framework in Greenland for some time and is certainly one of the more experienced...

12:03 She was a part of a number of parliamentary committee groups on mining and all this sort of stuff. So from what I understand, from what I've read in the press anyway, she seems to have a good grasp of what mining is usually <?>.

12:19 JM: Yeah, look I think so. You know obviously the IA party has put forward an anti-uranium position. So we will, you know, that's a political situation, but the minister is, is experienced, as you say, but we are yet to sort of have a meeting at that level.

12:40 QUESTIONER John, there's a meeting at the beginning of June – they're having a big – the end of conclusion is coming in June?

12:50 JM: OK, so that's when - prior to the election being called, the public consultation period had been extended to the beginning of June. Now – then we had an election called, and then we've had basically - as I say, this is the government-managed process. The lead, that means now, since during that period, the government's been essentially in caretaker mode. So while the consultation has been notionally open, it hasn't really been, let's call it - it was just sort of left to, you know, this noise that really piled on top through various media,

through various media channels. So what we're anticipating is there will be an extension. And part of that reflects that the incoming government has highlighted –there will be another round of meetings, that the government obviously have to come in and settle, and then look at when these meetings can be scheduled. And then that will dictate where the extension of that consultation period is extended to. So we will update on that. That's why I say we're trying to work out now what the schedule will be. So we can effectively update on what that consultation period will look like. And what a conclusion date will be.

14:01 QUESTIONER: Probably can't ask you this officially but with this bad media, because <by one of our biggest opposition> is China on the rare earth.

14:11 JM: No, I don't think it's - I think it's - Greenland has been the focus of a lot of international activity. You know, there's a lot of NGOs, but most of them are external to Greenland that look at Greenland, and you know, there was an instance of a petition of sorts, which had, you know, something like 150 NGOs sign up to it. And that was essentially just opposing mining in Greenland, or any oil or gas, sort of full stop, and wanting to essentially turn the place into a giant national park. So look, you've got you've got these kind of forces, and they, they - it's - this is sort of something we see in many parts of the world at the moment. So it is really trying to understand this. And, you know, it's it's difficult again to - there really is a strong alignment between that agenda and those avenues and let's say the media, in many <?> places, particularly places that are not experienced mining jurisdictions. So look, I wouldn't, I wouldn't read anything, you know, beyond that into that particular scenario. But you know, again, that's for...

15:29 <ANTHONY HO>: Could I just add – before I take your question - could I just add to that part of I think - the observation from the media and everything, they all paint maybe China related. But the reality is that the Greenland government has been conducting Greenland Days in China over the years.

What was that - say it again, sorry?

The Greenland government has conducted Greenland day, which is like marketing Greenland as a jurisdiction for mining, in China. And even the bureaucrats have met up with Shenghe Resources and everything. So in terms of tacit acknowledgement that our Chinese partner is a listed public company on China's stock exchange, and that they are leading in terms of, in terms of rare earth technology, I mean, it's well regarded and respected. So there's no arguments about that. I think all this geopolitical focus of Greenland, all this takes place because Donald Trump decided he wanted to buy Greenland. That's how it all got started. And historically, like it or not, Greenland has a secret base up in the far north of Greenland, which is part of the old <Thule line>, which is the defense early warning system. So that's part of that. So other than that, I don't think we should worry too much about the geopolitical tensions. They all tend to ebb and wane. Sorry, there's a question from the lady.

17:09 LIAN: Thank you. Thank you for the overview as well. And good segue talking about NGOs. My name is Lian. I'm a board member of the Mineral Policy Institute here in Australia. We've been in conversation recently with colleagues at NOAH, at Friends of the Earth, Denmark, and at Urani Naamik in Greenland. And essentially what I'm interested in, in a bit more of the – [it's been] mentioned a couple of times this idea of quiet diplomacy. One of the things that - and I'd like to hear a bit more clarification about what exactly you mean by quiet diplomacy - because one of the things that we're interested in at the Mineral Policy Institute is how Australian companies operating overseas are acting transparently, ethically, so on and so forth, and responsibly, essentially. And I have a statement here from the new - the recently elected coalition from IA, who are not opposed to mining - they don't want to turn all of Greenland into a national park, I think that's an unfair characterization, but they are - I'll quote from their statement.

18.25 **The coalition sees extraction as an opportunity to develop the economy. The coalition agrees that uranium should not be extracted in Greenland. The mining project at Kvanefjeld must be stopped. In this election period, the coalition will work on legislation to ban exploitation of minerals that contain uranium. The coalition intends to amend the mineral resources act in order to increase public participation before projects are developed. The local population must have better conditions for starting up mining projects.**

So that's a statement from the new ruling coalition, which is slightly contradictory to the kind of optimistic overview that we've just heard. **So I'm wondering how - and my question then is, how can you in good faith, go ahead with this project, both in terms of transparency to shareholders and to the local communities, when the opposition has been so strong?** And I will just finally also note that in the French press last night is reporting that Irani has said that they will desist from uranium exploration for uranium in Greenland and respect the wishes of the recent democratic...

For four years.

For four years.

They're waiting for election change.

LIAN: They're waiting for another election, sure. So they're respecting the current democratic mandate that exists.

20:06 JM: So first point just with respect to the statement, when I mentioned, it wasn't the government I was referring to with respect to turning Greenland into a national park, it was just a lot of the NGOs that had signed up on this particular petition.

20:22 LIAN: There are many other NGOs that are opposed specifically to the uranium.

20:27 Yeah, yep. No, so when we say – look what we're looking to do is, what we've done is we've presented a project in a way that they've been endorsed by Greenland for us to present it. And that was a consistent position until a snap election was called. So we're in the middle of, you know, what had been a public consultation, and part of that is to transparently discuss the project. And we hope to be able to continue to do that. When we say what we want to be able to do is to be able to have a conversation with the government to understand their position, rather than that being a process, which is, you know, conducted via sort of stock market platforms or media platforms - to be able to have a conversation. And when we do it, it's not for that to be non-transparent but just to - you know, this has been a process that's been going on for a considerable amount of time. So that's really, you know, the approach we've, you know, we've taken, I think, going back, we've been through, you know, a lot of stakeholder engagement during the process to get here. So there's sort of like many considerations to this. If you were to look at this project in the context of other rare earth projects in different parts of the world many of them have also enrichment in radioactive materials. And, in numerous cases, those projects are fully permitted, and have strong government endorsement. Now, you could say that the <radioactive> components could be politicized and whatever it may be. So it comes down to, you know, in this particular case, the uranium is being looked at as it's easily extractable from the material during the processing to recover rare earths. So it's looked at as recovering a byproduct. It's not of particular economic significance to the project. But that's what it is. So it's just as I say, it's, you know, we just want to be able to have a conversation. And then we can update stakeholders and shareholders alike.

22.49 ANTHONY HO: Can I just add a statement to what, sorry, I didn't catch your name...

Lian. **The statement that you read out sounded as if it was made by the IA party during the election process.**

Correct.

AH: **Then you should go back and have a look at the statement issued by the Minister subsequently, when she was appointed, where she clearly stated that the Kvanefjeld project is a special case in that it included special conditions, and that the government will have to work through that process. So it contradicts - when you're election campaigning, and when you're in power. Now that they are in power they now have to deal with governing a country rather than rah, rah, rah campaigning – 'Vote for me, I'm going to make you all millionaires and you're all going to have beautiful sunshine and fresh air'. So all I'm saying is that what you're reading - what you have just read out, misrepresent the government's view, in that it was an electioneering slogan. You should go back and read the government's view at the moment.**

24:05 CROAKY QUESTIONER: I can't understand, John, why this mine would bring in such a vast amount of money through royalties and taxes into the government, <?> create employment, directly and indirectly, and it would also bring Greenland closer to independence. Everything is a win-win for Greenland. Why are a few politicians against it?

24:52 JM: What I would say is it's difficult to view the situation through our eyes. Greenland is a place that's, you know, been undergoing a pretty radical change over the last, say 15 years plus. From the point that it went to self-rule, in 2009, it brings about like a whole new – let's say, the political system was there. But it became managed essentially by Greenland. It used to be sort of a joint Greenland-Danish situation. And Greenland through this process has been finding its feet. And through that, it's sort of finding its identity in, you know, the international space. And that's seen the sort of, you know, the politics swing back and forth.

And, you know, we live in a world now, where there's a lot of, let's say, you know, noise, through media, internationally. You know Greenland's profile has risen extensively. Greenland gets discussed in geopolitical circles. And all of this I think affects Greenland internally. So there's a degree of caution as to, you know, which direction is the right direction, you know, and with a change of politics in Greenland, or a change in sentiment, it can sort of veer in another direction. You know, we've sort of been from 2009 through to say, recently, a lot of the leadership on both sides of politics was really quite forthright in wanting to engage the international community, really develop industry, really bring in foreign investment. Mining is seen as a key - natural resources as a key part of that agenda. And that was really tied to a push to independence. There's been a little bit of a step back from the conviction of that that sort of comes with – let's say from different, new, younger political minds entering the political landscape. But it's a difficult question to answer. The sort of the rationale we would apply to the situation, is not necessarily the rationale that Greenlanders apply to the situation. And that's – I probably can't say much more than that, but that's the only way I can really describe it.

27:12 CROAKY: Well at the moment there's not been a change - officially, there's not been a change in overall in as to uranium being legal or not legal at the moment?

27:29 No, they've indicated a desire to put in place legislation that would look to apply some kind of threshold level. And we don't know – and I don't think they know what that is at this point.

27:43 CROAKY: And just one more question – when you mine could you mine this <Kvanefjeld> without pulling out the uranium?

27:58 JM: Look, that's gonna depend on from a legislative path, which way Greenland goes. But in theory...

28.07 GREG BARNES: **Cut the crap, will you?**

JM: **What's that?**

GB: **Just cut the crap. We've been sitting here for a while and <?> crap.**

If you mine this ore, uranium <?>.

JM: **Yep.**

GB: **You have to smash apart the <seam> to get the uranium out. So you're <?>**

Now I've sat here for a while and listened to a lot of crap. You're just saying how popular you are in Greenland. Mate, you stink in Greenland. Your advertising campaign in the election probably did more to get IA elected than anybody else. Now, you may....

28.40 <?> **popular in Greenland...**

28.43 GB: **Hang on till I finish.**

<?> it would be less popular in Greenland than Hitler would be in Israel. Now that's your image.

28.55 **You're talking bullshit now, are you, Greg? <INAUDIBLE>**

29.10 **... the EIA I look at that in total disbelief and and poor standard.**

GML GUY: **!!!**

GB: **Wait til I finish. For example, the sample you took from the <?> had far higher fluoride in it. How on earth you can do a phosphate quotation when you go up to 1% phosphate in the ore is beyond me or anybody else. I don't have <?>. I don't <?>. You haven't taken <water> crystallization in the dump. Your dump is going to be much higher than your wall. That <seam> stinks and then you push this thing through. The amount of – if you look at the election in the town of Nasak, it was 50-50 for it. Now it's 99% against it. If you look in the town, in the whole country, 20% for the mine, 20 percent against the mine and 60% couldn't care less. The last survey was 84% against the mine. Now this is a good project. But the image you pushed in Greenland < the way> you pushed it has killed the project. There's other < things there>. You have actually ruined this project by inaction and pushing things through the politics. Sure, that's my opinion. This guy's gonna disagree.**

Okay.

GB: **The standard of your work is dreadful.**

SOMEONE: **Thanks, Greg!**

[MELEE OF OVERLAPPING COMMENTS, SOME LAUGHTER]

30:40 Greg, I appreciate what your position is. That's - you know, it's a consistent position. No surprises.

30:54 **Would you like an example - actinium. <?> he says actinium levels, which is a radioactive byproduct, the actinium levels – I'm being photographed, thank you, <?> The actinium levels were 8 to 12 times the acceptable level. <?> You haven't done the actinium assay.**

31:20 SOMEONE SHRILL: **Yes, we have Greg!**

When? <?> <Hubbub>

DOMINIC FURFARO: **What a load of shit! <Hubbub>**

JM: Any other questions from the floor?

I can respond but I just don't know whether that's really worth responding to.

32:06 It's all hearsay anyway. So the government has looked at our report and has given the green ticket to go into the public hearing. And that's more important than Greg Barnes spouting...

32:23 Question from the back.

32:24 QUESTIONER: Yeah. Just with regards to the statutory consultation, it appears somewhat to me that it was <?> after the war sort of thing. And she said you did a lot of public consultation earlier on, I understood that the government – Greenland and Denmark had approved all the environmental. So was there a caveat there that this public consultation actually had to proceed after, after after it was all done and approved?

JM: Yeah.

I guess that's where I don't understand that sort of linkage?

33:09 Well, what the way it works is you go through what's referred to as the guidance phase. And so you basically have a set of terms of reference, which shape impact assessments, you know, provide the scope. Then you produce what is let's call it a draft impact assessment. And then you work through a process with the independent advisors that really shape the structure of how that's presented, literally at almost a table of contents level. You've then got a lot of detailed technical studies, which underlie your main, what's called a document, they're all part of the impact assessment. And the balance of how much detail from those underlying studies that go in that document is really at the adjudication of <this goes> the Danish Center for the Environment. So this sort of reflects Greg on your point a little bit, it's not us that shapes when this is ready to go. We can't push the Danish Center for the Environment to sign off - on anything.

34:10 This has been a very rigorous five-year process. And as of 2019, the Danish Center for Environment and Greenland Institute for Natural Resources highlighted seven areas where they wanted additional information. We literally sat down with some of our advisors. We mapped out the scopes of work that would effectively address those issues. We chose the appropriate independent specialist consultants. That work was conducted. It went through a, you know, a final sort of review check. And then at that point, the overall document was given obviously a final check. And it was signed off by Greenland's environmental agency and the Danish Center for Environment as meeting the guidelines for Greenland public consultation.

35:07 **That was my point - that it was signed off.**

Yeah. Yeah. And look, even with the language and the tone in the EIA document, that was independent specialists that works with us, that advises, you know, major international companies, spoke directly with Greenland's environmental agency to understand specifically how they wanted things described, you know, the tone of language, and so forth. So that was all part of shaping what was, you know, how the Greenland government wanted it to be presented for public consultation. So that's the process of going through.

35:46 So just really, to come back in and answer what <?> is it goes, it goes through this rigorous process, and at the point that it is deemed by the government to be suitable for public consultation, then it goes to a consultation process. Now, in Australia, that would be different, those things tend to happen in parallel. But in Greenland, that's not the case.

36:09 OK, so there's not a situation that the government actually has approved it. And now, the new government has <gone and approved another> document that they've got to deal with carefully?

36:26 JM: Well, it's approved as meeting the guidelines for public consultation. And then initiated. That's why the government has highlighted that, you know, there is a commitment to ensure this process is carried out. So...

36:43 NEALE PRIOR: Neale Prior from the West. I'm just a bit confused. How hard is it to extract uranium? How hard is it to get the uranium out of the ore? Greg says it sounds really hard. You're sort of talking around it but how hard is it to actually mine and <flog> the stuff <?>.

37:01 JM: When you go through this process, like any mining process, you're got, you're digging up material that is enriched in most things in the periodic table, and variably enriched, and you've obviously got...

NP: I understand chemistry...

JM: You've obviously got the elements, which are the target elements, and you're looking to recover them in a manner that is, you know, from a cost point of view commercially viable. You may look to recover byproducts in that process if they're easily accessible and readily recovered in a cost effective manner. And then the rest of the material is looked to be stored in tailings.

37.40 So in the case of uranium, uranium goes with - most of it goes with the main rare earth mineral, which <? > That is leached in a chemical process, an acid process, whereby the uranium also goes into the solution. If you then consider part of the next process is impurity removal, where a series of elements are removed from that, let's call it leached <?liquor>, uranium then is one of a number of elements which can be effectively removed. In the case of uranium, it can be removed and recovered in a form that becomes saleable uranium oxide. Now, that's a relatively straightforward process in this particular case. Now, if you look at a number of rare earth operations in Australia, they also have enrichment in uranium and thorium. In those particular cases, they go through very similar steps in terms of a mineral recovery, or let's call it a, a flotation process or magnetic process. And then that mineral concentrate is treated, that mineral concentrate is invariably, in many cases, enriched in uranium and thorium, and that material just goes through to the tailings. **So it really depends simply how you class it. That's really what it comes down to. So, you know, yes, you are - you are digging up material, crushing minerals that do contain uranium. But that's quite commonplace in rare earth operations.**

NP: **Does it drastically affect the economies of your project?**

JM: **No.**

39:13 CROAKY: **So that uranium, once extracted and separated, could be put back into the mine?**

39:21 JM: **Well, you could do a number of things in theory with it.**

CROAKY: **Instead of selling it.**

JM: **You could.**

GML PERSON: **We don't need to fully extract it either.**

JM: But what it comes down to is, as I say, we will look to, you know, talk through this with Greenland authorities before you know we really work out what the next steps are.

39:41 There are uranium projects in Australia, which are accompanying rare earths, where the rare earths aren't recovered. That's the opposite of what I just said. Where they take out the uranium but they leave the rare earths. So we're doing the opposite.

40:02 Or mineral sand mining, where they don't extract the rare earths but they extract the titanium and the zirconium.

The tailings are now worth a few dollars.

Well, Iluka are setting up a rare earth processing plant here in Western Australia.

There's a question here.

Is the uranium issue the only issue that the new government seems to oppose?

40:24 JM: Again, until we - this is when I say we want to be able to have the conversation, is to really talk through and understand it. Until we have that, there's no point me trying to speculate on what, you know, what the concerns may be.

You must have a view though.

Look, I think the uranium is certainly – it's certainly what is repeated. And you know, whether there's sort of layers beneath that, second order issues, you know, I couldn't say at this point. I'm not aware of them, but certainly the uranium is the headline issue.

40:59 And do you - are you confident you could take the uranium issue out of the project without...

I couldn't comment on that at this point.

41:08 LIAN: **Impossible. The activist groups, Urani Naamik, will continue to oppose this, will continue to demonstrate opposition, and, and organize against the project because of the presence of uranium. That is... <?>**

GB: **I've got nothing wrong with the way you've handled uranium at all. My only question then is, if you are going to take the uranium out and effectively dump it, the existing EIA doesn't cover that, which means you will have to redo the EIA or add to the EIA to say where the uranium is going to go.**

That's my question then. And then that leads on to the other question.

In 2013, you signed a piece of paper saying that you agreed that if the government said you couldn't mine uranium, you wouldn't sue them. Perhaps you should comment about that too.

JM: **That comment relates to relates to not a 2013 but a 2011 addendum to the mining licence for the Kvanefjeld project that was put in place to provide a framework for the company to evaluate the project in a polymetallic sense, inclusive of uranium. Now the caveats in that addendum - and this is not part of the minerals act, which is government procedure in Greenland, it is addendum to a licence which is essentially a company to government agreement. Now there are a number of caveats in that for a number of reasons which go back to 2011. That is, as I mentioned before, Greenland had only been under self-rule since 2009, so 2 years at this point. So at this point there were still a lot of unknowns about how the relationship between Greenland and Denmark would play out. That's why as I mentioned previously in about 2012 I think maybe it was, Greenland initiated an extensive sort of report into understanding that relation in the context of how would you essentially manage the uranium by-production in this case, between the evolving relationship between Greenland and Denmark. And at this point there was still a zero tolerance policy [to uranium] in Greenland. So there were a lot of unknowns. Since that point there has been a lot of steps undertaken that have been government initiatives to remove those unknowns and replace them with what have become defined structures at a legislative level in both Greenland and Denmark.**

43.46 Now they were unknowns in 2011. And the way, as you know, Greg, the licensing works in Greenland, under an exploration licence, if you define a commercially viable deposit and you conduct impact assessments that meet the guidelines for public consultation, you are entitled to a mining licence for those materials. So, unless there were caveats in there, at that point of time, while there was still a zero-tolerance policy in place, they would have been giving us an automatic right to uranium exploitation essentially. So that's why there is a series of caveats in that – but it wasn't designed at that time to provide a mechanism just to turn that part of the project off. It was really put in place because there was a lot of uncertainties that needed to be addressed at that point in time.

GB: So I guess my question there is: does that line still apply <?>?

JM: That's something that we are working through at the moment. Until we work through that process, we can't answer that. We will update in due course.

GB: Why wasn't that sentence...

44.55 ANTHONY HO: <You don't have the call> Greg. Just coming back to the questioner from the back – I think it's fair to say that as a company we always comply with the laws of the land. And we've always worked with the government of the day. If the government changes policy, we evolve our process to try to accommodate them. And we are not there to, to push things through, as other people would suggest. <? 10, 11 years> and Greenlandic personnel in our drilling programs, etc. **The whole process is actually well, whilst we have to look after the <?shareholders> there is a little bit of altruism to help develop Greenland. Like it or not, it is a developing nation. And I grew up in Singapore. There's not too many Lee Kuan Yew around that can drive a country through and create something out of nothing. All you have in Singapore is human resources.**

In this instance, we are seeing democracy at work in Greenland, and we are trying to help them navigate some of the <?experimentation> of learning, of running the country. I mean, whilst we all appreciate the pristine nature of Greenland, we understand that. But even with climate change, there's a lot of Greenlandic people that's clapping their hands that every 1 degrees, they have another 1000 acres of arable land, that sort of situation. So it's a fine balance being a government. That's all I'm saying, with the IA government now coming to power. They are coming to grips with what's it like to govern a nation, if they intend to win the next election again. It's one thing to take an extreme view during an election year in campaign because it sells headlines and gets you elected. Now that you're elected, what are you going to do to get on the job? It's suddenly become a reality.

And so when I say we're working quietly and diligently with the government. We do not want to create a situation where we have all these debates out in the media and everything. It's not helpful. The government doesn't like that. You've got to work quietly with them to get things done, and understand where they're coming from, and help them to evolve their policies.

47.25 And, yes, they may have painted themselves into a corner during the election campaign, how are we going to assist them to achieve their aspirations of no uranium mining in Greenland without damaging shareholders' interests and shareholders' value in the company and our project? So that's all we're doing, that's what we're doing as a board of directors, and John as the managing director. We're not saying that the NGO is wrong. What we're saying is that the NGO sometimes can look at extreme views. And somewhere in the middle, there are common ground, that you can – as <Josh> keeps saying, create a win-win situation.

I mean, if you look at the situation in Australia, when Bob Hawke was elected Prime Minister, he said no uranium mining. But then the mines department said to him, You can't stop Jabiluka because it is already going on. So alright, he said, 'Yep, no uranium mining from now on, and Jabiluka can carry on'. So there's a lot of things that you need to work with government and help them achieve their goals and what they say during the election without damaging the country or damaging the shareholders interests.

48:44 QUESTIONER - So the bottom line is –we basically still have - do we have the ML?

AH: Yeah.

48:50 JM: Yeah, we've got an exploration license.

AH: I was just saying earlier before the meeting, and someone said to me, 'We have a big problem'. I said, 'I don't use the word problem. But we have a few challenges'. That's what management is all about - managing and mitigating risk, including managing the NGOs as well. I mean I'm not against the NGOs. I mean I used to be chairman of an NGO so... <?>, I mean, sometimes NGOs can take an extreme view to ensure the government listen and come up <to/wih> a middle ground. But that's the politics of, of the world that we live in with social media and everything.

49:34 The 24/7 media cycle where everything you read on the internet, they assume is correct and true, when in fact, it may not necessarily - to use the famous words of President Donald Trump, it may be fake (laughing).

49:51 LIAN: **I'm sorry, I can't help but - you mentioned Jabiluka and I just can't help but mention that as the perfect warning to shareholders of what can happen when you try to ignore the will of the local people. In that case, the Mirar people, local traditional owners of Jabiluka, managed to stop that mine going ahead, despite support from the Commonwealth Government, because of its content of uranium in a world heritage – in a national park. Sorry, I just couldn't leave that as an excellent warning to...**

50:28 JM: I think this, one of the things – I mean we're in a situation here, where to get to this point, you know, we always have done a lot of stakeholder engagement. But this is a, this is a point where, we acknowledge, we have to take a step back, and, you know, engage the cross section of stakeholders and understand that, and <they/that> will dictate the path forward. Because we only got to this point through that process with the landscape changes. And now we need to sort of reassess that and understand it. We've been through a similar kind of process before, you know, and it was, certainly, take a step back, understand, and then evaluate if there is a path forward. In that case, there was, you know, but we need to go through that process.

And the government is in a coalition, isn't it?

Yeah, the government's in a coalition.

51:25 **So things could change very, very quickly.**

Well, I mean, that's anyone's guess. (GENERAL LAUGHTER)

<It's not that everything's gonna change for evermore>. It could, it could change in a heartbeat.

51:40 JM: Yeah. I think what it comes down to there's a lot of other issues in Greenland. And this is, there's a lot of talk about uranium, uranium is a small economic component of a globally significant rare earth project in this case, you know. So we hardly seem to discuss that, because it's the small component that is, becomes, you know, the political football. And that's what it is. But, you know, there is a lot of other things and challenges that are part of the, you know, political discussion in Greenland, you know, debate around fisheries, fishing quotas.

You know, that's all part of, you know, as I say, Greenland's evolving, sort of, you know, the political situation, as they continue to, you know, deal with these core issues, that are all part of either their culture or common vocations or core to their economy.

52:33 AH: I think that part of it is quite interesting. I mean, the previous government coalition started to have cracks over an international airport. It wasn't over our project, when they start arguing about how many international airports they should have, and they ended up with two. And then the argument was, Should we have funding from the Danish government? And one of them said, No, we want independent funding from the Danish government. So that's how it progressed into a dissolution of the previous coalition company. But that is what I describe as democracy at work. That's what every country, every nation, every Parliament should have the right to go through that process. And we, as people currently working in that country, we have just got to work with the hands of cards that we have been dealt with.

Does that make sense?

Just one question, John. In the reading of the people – there's 56,000 altogether, is that right? So are they looking forward to becoming financially independent in their own lives instead of being on a welfare system?

53:52 JM: That sentiment sort of ebbs and flows. And, it certainly had more momentum, a number of years ago. And that that sort of, again, it sort of ebbs and flows with the different sides of politics to some extent. Yeah, I wouldn't say there's a clear answer to that. It certainly doesn't have the level of drive that it did.

54:18 Because I think somebody mentioned there was only what 60% didn't vote - quite a number didn't vote at the last election. Is that right?

54:26 I believe they had a low turnout.

Any other questions? I think this has been a very informative session, John. It provides robust discussion.

55:00 **I'm just thinking humorously when the mine does get going and they're earning good wages, they can pop down to Spain and get thawed out and come back for another <four/fortnight>.** (LAUGHTER)

55:10 AH: Well, I think if you look at some of the other issues that the Inuits, the local Inuits have with NGOs, it's also culturally the way of life. I mean, they're trying to - the NGOs are now trying to restrict the number of whales that they can kill and the number of seals that they can eat. So I'm not saying that the NGO is right or wrong, but some of the Inuits are saying our traditional way of life is just as important.

55:43 JM Maybe we can continue this over a coffee.

RECORDING ENDS