

Explanatory Notes		
Question Number / Description	Disclosure Request Accompanying Notes	Comment for the disclosure
1. "Tailings Facility" Name/Identifier	Please identify every tailings storage facility and identify if there are multiple dams (saddle or secondary dams) within that facility. Please provide details of these within question 20.	Excluded tailings dams include TSF which are in pit (e.g. below ground surface) and very low risk dams which were either small or fully encapsulated with mine material.  In 2021 to align with the Global Industry Standard for Tailings Management Glencore consolidated the individual dam walls disclosed in 2019 into their parent TSF. Where a TSF contains secondary dam walls these are now provided in Q20.
2. Location	Please provide Long/Lat coordinates.	Coordinates are taken from Google Earth.
3. Ownership	Please specify: Owned and Operated, Subsidiary, JV, NOJV, as of March 2019	1. "Owned and Operated" -- Glencore plc is a holding company and the reporting company for purposes of this document. Glencore plc does not own or operate any assets or sites, but is instead a holding company; accordingly, no TSFs described in this document have been designated as "owned and operated";  2. Subsidiary – subsidiary refers to any subsidiary that is directly or indirectly wholly-owned by Glencore, or very nearly wholly-owned by Glencore excluding immaterial equity interests (e.g., 99.99% ownership); all other assets or sites which have partners are listed as a JV or NOJV as applicable; provided however that with respect to Glencore's ownership in Volcan Compania Minera S.A.A. ("Volcan"), Volcan is a publicly listed company in Peru and Glencore indirectly holds an ownership interest pursuant to which it exercises control through (a) approximately 55% of the outstanding voting rights in respect of Volcan on account of Glencore's indirect ownership of voting shares issued by Volcan, and (b) appointment of a majority of the board of directors of Volcan, accordingly, all TSFs for mines which are owned and operated by Volcan are included in this document and are each designated as a "Subsidiary"; however, any TSFs which may be owned and operated by any publicly listed company in which Glencore is a minority shareholder and does not exercise control over the management and affairs of such publicly listed company are not included in this document;  3. "JV" – JV refers to any incorporated legal entity or unincorporated joint venture in which a subsidiary of Glencore has an ownership interest and which it controls and operates; and  4. "NOJV" – NOJV refers to any non-publicly listed incorporated legal entity or unincorporated joint venture in which a subsidiary of Glencore has an ownership interest but does not exercise control; for any TSF that is operated and managed by an NOJV, such TSF is operated and managed by (a) independent management appointed on behalf of the shareholders or joint venture partners, or (b) another shareholder or joint venture partner in the NOJV.
4. Status	Please specify: Active, Inactive/Care and Maintenance, Closed etc. We take closed to mean: a closure plan was developed and approved by the relevant local government agency, and key stakeholders were involved in its development; a closed facility means the noted approved closure plan was fully implemented or the closure plan is in the process of being implemented. A facility that is inactive or under C&M is not considered closed until such time a closure plan has been implemented.	Active: operating TSFs In-active: TSFs that are in care and maintenance and have not progressed to closure. This includes sites that are under care and maintenance with a reasonable expectation of reopening and sites which are being used to attenuate water flows for the TSF. This does not include closed sites where water treatment is required. Also includes TSFs under construction but not yet operational. Closed: TSFs that are either closed or progressing to closure. This includes closed sites where water treatment is required.
5. Date of initial operation	(date or range)	Glencore has provided dates with respect to the initial design/commissioning. For TSFs where the date is uncertain, an estimated date has been provided. Where there are multiple secondary dams a range of start dates has been provided to show the evolution of the facility. In some cases, there also could be a discrepancy relating to reporting of the dates of: design, construction or commissioning, however, Glencore does not believe that this is a material discrepancy.
6. Is the Dam currently operated or closed as per currently approved design?	Yes/No. If 'No', more information can be provided in the answer to Q20	Two categories are being reported: Yes: TSFs that are operating within approved designs and design intent or dams that are under construction and not yet operational. No: TSF that are not operating within approved design or design intent and additional information is provided in Q20.
7. Raising method	Note: Upstream, Centerline, Modified Centreline, Downstream, Landform, Other.	The predominant raising method is reported although some TSFs may have occasional raises with different methods (e.g., downstream raises, centerline raises, upstream raises and hybrid – combinations of different methods). Where there are secondary dams present the various raising methods are also reported.
8. Current Maximum Height	Note: Please disclose in metres	The current maximum height of the Main Dam is reported.
9. Current Tailings Storage Impoundment Volume	Note: (m3 as of March 2019)	When available, the current volume of tailings deposited is reported within the facility including secondary dams. When not available, an estimated volume of tailings deposited has been calculated based on the area of the TSF and average height is reported.
10. Planned Tailings Storage Impoundment Volume in 5 years time	(m3 as planned for January 2024)	When available the planned volume is reported. When not available, an estimated volume based on the tailings production rate or other estimate has been made and reported.
11. Most Recent Independent Expert Review	(date) For this question we take 'Independent' to mean a suitably qualified individual or team, external to the Operation, that does not direct the design or construction work for that facility.	<b>No comment.</b>
12. Do you have full and complete relevant engineering records including design, construction, operation, maintenance, and/or closure	(Yes or No) We take the word "relevant" here to mean that you have all necessary documents to make an informed and substantiated decision on the safety of the dam, be it an old facility, or an acquisition, or legacy site. More information can be provided in your answer to Q20.	Yes means that there is sufficient information to be able to make an assessment of the safety of the dam. For responses with No, please refer to additional information provided in Question 20.

Explanatory Notes		
Question Number / Description	Disclosure Request Accompanying Notes	Comment for the disclosure
13. What is your hazard categorisation of this facility, based on the consequence of failure?		Hazard categorisation has been conducted according to the classification system provided in Q14. Where there are multiple dams within a TSF we have reported the highest consequence classification.
14. What guideline do you follow for the classification system?		As provided.
15. Has this facility, at any point in its history, failed to be confirmed or certified as stable, or experienced notable stability concerns, as identified by an independent engineer (even if later certified as stable by the same or a different firm).	<p>(Yes or No) We note that this will depend on factors including local legislation that are not necessarily tied to best practice. As such, and because remedial action may have been taken, a "Yes" answer may not indicate heightened risk.</p> <p>Stability concerns might include toe seepage, dam movement, overtopping, spillway failure, piping etc. If yes, have appropriately designed and reviewed mitigation actions been implemented?</p> <p>We also note that this question does not bear upon the appropriateness of the criteria, but rather the stewardship levels of the facility or the dam. Additional comments/information may be supplied in your answer to Q20.</p>	<p>Question 15 asks if any of our facilities have at any point in their history, failed to be confirmed or certified as stable, or experienced notable stability concerns, as identified by an independent engineer (even if later certified as stable by the same or a different firm). As this question can be open to interpretation we would like to clarify our approach and the context for our response.</p> <p>To fulfil our understanding of the spirit of the question (i.e. are there any potential life threatening safety concerns within an existing facility that have been previously flagged but remain unaddressed), the following interpretation was used:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not being certified/confirmed as stable is assumed to be where a noted deficiency is deemed sufficiently significant to trigger a catastrophic failure – the term deficiency is used in that context.</li> <li>• For operating facilities, this refers to any identified deficiency for the current life/stage. For a previous life/stage, any deficiency that was not addressed as vetted by an independent review.</li> <li>• For closed/legacy facilities, this refers to any deficiency identified that reflects the current state of the facility versus a previous issue that has been addressed through confirmed changed condition via the closure process.</li> </ul> <p>The above was used on the basis that we believe the disclosure effort is aimed at identifying tailings facilities that could potentially lead to life-safety concerns, while avoiding falsely identifying issues for facilities that are decades old and no longer resemble the facility referred to in a former noted deficiency (i.e. the formerly noted deficiency is for a facility of nature that materially no longer exists). The approach was agreed with other members of the ICMM, who have also communicated this interpretation to the Investor Initiative.</p> <p>As a result of continued effort in this area, we have reduced the number of TSFs that have previously answered yes to this question to 8 TSFs. In doing so, we have applied leading CDA Guidelines aligned with the Global Industry Standard for Tailings Management, that reflect the most current understanding of risks associated with TSF management. By applying these leading practices we have identified those facilities where there may be a deficiency in the design (hence sometimes exceeding requirements of local regulations). Since our previous disclosure in 2021, we have substantially completed construction of the New Narrows dam at Strathcona/Onaping and continued buttressing activities at Tolovsky and Zyranovsky where 2Mt and 4.5Mt have been placed respectively to date. Detailed engineering for buttresses and unloading at Rhovan, Chashinsky, Rosaura and Mahr Tunnel was delayed by the Covid-19 Pandemic and are now being finalised with construction also planned (subject to permitting) to commence at these locations in 2022. At Ocroyoc an assessment of dam deformation during an extreme earthquake is being undertaken to validate whether any buttressing will be required.</p>
16. Do you have internal/in house engineering specialist oversight of this facility? Or do you have external engineering support for this purpose?	Note: Answers may be "Both".	The answer to the question is typically "both". The in-house engineering specialist is a person responsible for TSF oversight and external engineering support is most often carried out for the design. External engineering support is also provided through the Glencore Corporate auditing process.
17. Has a formal analysis of the downstream impact on communities, ecosystems and critical infrastructure in the event of catastrophic failure been undertaken and to reflect final conditions? If so, when did this assessment take place?	Note: Please answer 'yes' or 'no', and if 'yes', provide a date.	Where the answer is "Yes" the assessment of the analysis of the downstream impacts has been carried out for the existing conditions based upon a semi-quantitative dam break analysis that considers both "sunny day" and "rainy day" dam failure modes and consideration of water/tailings flows and "mud flow" from potential tailings liquefaction flow. In some cases numerical dam break analyses have been carried out by the assets consultants.
18. Is there a) a closure plan in place for this dam, and b) does it include long term monitoring?	Please answer both parts of this question (e.g. Yes and Yes)	In line with Glencore's Environmental Policy and supporting standards we require our assets to have closure plans which range from conceptual to detailed level. All closed facilities will include appropriate long term monitoring.
19. Have you, or do you plan to assess your tailings facilities against the impact of more regular extreme weather events as a result of climate change, e.g. over the next two years?	(Yes or No)	Climate change, results in both higher or lower precipitation and more variability. As part of ongoing Dam Safety Assessments (DSA) and review of meteorological data, the potential impact on the design basis for the tailings facilities will be reviewed on an on-going basis.
20. Any other relevant information and supporting documentation. Please state if you have omitted any other exposure to tailings facilities through any joint ventures you may have.	Note: this may include links to annual report disclosures, further information in the public domain, guidelines or reports etc.	Additional information.