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1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Operational Information

Name of Transportation Facility: Australian Gold Reagents – Ocean Freight Supply Chain
Name of Facility Owner: Not Applicable
Name of Facility Operator: Australian Gold Reagents Ltd
Name of Responsible Manager: Ed Beard, Export Technical Manager
Address: Australian Gold Reagents Ltd
PO Box 345
Kwinana 6167
State/Province: Western Australia
Country: Australia
Telephone: +61 8 9411 8155
Fax: +61 8 9411 8289
Email: ebeard@a-g-r.com.au

1.2 Description of Operation

1.2.1 CSBP Ltd and AGR Australia Limited – Production Facility

AGR is the management company of the unincorporated joint venture between CSBP Ltd (CSBP) and Coogee Chemicals Pty Ltd (Coogee Chemicals). CSBP, a subsidiary of Wesfarmers Ltd, is the major participant in the venture and acts as both plant operator and sales agent. Coogee Chemicals is a local manufacturer and distributor of industrial chemicals.

The AGR cyanide production facility is located within CSBP’s fertiliser and chemicals complex at Kwinana, some 40 km south of Perth within the state of Western Australia. AGR produces and transports two different forms of sodium cyanide from the Kwinana production facility, namely solution and solids. Sodium cyanide solution is produced as a 30% strength liquid and solid sodium cyanide as a >97% strength white briquette.

AGR, in its capacity as the sales agent, is the consignor and is responsible for the overall management of the sodium cyanide transportation activities.

The production facility was conditionally recertified against the Code on 18 September 2013 and a Corrective Action Plan developed on 18 September 2013. The Corrective Action Completion Report to close gaps identified during the Recertification Audit was completed on 19 June 2014 and AGR is now fully compliant with the ICMC.

The Ocean Freight Supply Chain from Fremantle Port, WA, to Destination Ports covers the transportation of solid sodium cyanide by ship from the Fremantle Port to various interstate and international ports.
The scope of this audit was limited to:

- Marine transportation of solid cyanide (intermediate bulk containers (IBCs) within shipping containers) from the Fremantle Port, WA, to various interstate and international ports by Mediterranean Shipping Company (Aust) Pty Ltd (MSC), Maersk Australia Pty Ltd (Maersk), Hapag-Lloyd and Kawasaki Kisen Kaisha Ltd (K Line). A description of the shipping lines’ role within AGR’s cyanide distribution network is provided in Section 1.3.

- The scope of the Ocean Freight Supply Chain from Fremantle Port, WA, to Destination Ports is illustrated in Figure 1.

![Figure 1: AGR Ocean Supply Chain](image-url)
1.3 Marine Transportation

1.3.1 Mediterranean Shipping Company (MSC)

MSC, headquartered in Geneva, Switzerland, is engaged in worldwide container transport. As of December 2013, MSC operates 443 container vessels with the capacity to handle the equivalent capacity of 2,228,200 twenty foot containers. MSC has set up dangerous goods cargo management centres that control the proper stowage of hazardous cargo worldwide through their MSC Link computer system headquartered in Antwerp. This hazardous cargo system is initiated when hazardous cargo is booked into the container booking MSC Link computer system.

All of MSC’s vessels are registered by the Lloyd’s Register Group, which provides classification and certification of ships, and inspects and approves important components and accessories. This registration is a requirement of the Australian Customs Act 1901.

MSC has provided shipping services to AGR since AGR commenced the export of solid sodium cyanide in 2002. Shipping destinations include ports in Africa, Asia, North America, the Middle East and Oceania.

1.3.2 Maersk Shipping (Maersk)

Maersk, headquartered in Copenhagen, Denmark, operates a fleet of containers vessels with worldwide shipping coverage. The fleet consists of more than 600 container vessels with the capacity to handle more than 2,225,000 twenty foot containers. Maersk operates a container booking and tracking system called the Global Customer Service System (GCSS). The system is also the management tool for handling the dangerous goods cargo for the proper control of the stowage of hazardous cargo.

All of Maersk’s vessels are registered by the Lloyd’s Register Group, which provides classification and certification of ships, and inspects and approves important components and accessories. This registration is a requirement of the Australian Customs Act 1901.

Maersk has provided shipping services to AGR since AGR commenced the export of solid sodium cyanide in 2002. Shipping destinations include various interstate and international ports.

1.3.3 Hapag-Lloyd

Hapag-Lloyd, headquartered in Hamburg, Germany, is engaged in worldwide container transport. The fleet consists of approximately 200 modern ships with the capacity to handle more than 1,000,000 twenty-foot containers. Hapag-Lloyd operates a fully integrated global network that supports all essential functions of container logistics.

All of the Hapag-Lloyd vessels are registered by the Lloyd’s Register Group, which provides classification and certification of ships, and inspects and approves important components and accessories. This registration is a requirement of the Australian Customs Act 1901.

Hapag-Lloyd has recently begun providing AGR with container shipping services. Shipping destinations include various international ports.
1.3.4 **Kawasaki Kisen Kaisha Ltd (‘K’ Line)**

Kawasaki Kisen Kaisha Ltd (‘K’ Line), headquartered in Tokyo, Japan, is engaged in worldwide container transport. Kawasaki Australia Pty Ltd a 100% owned subsidiary of Japan’s Kawasaki Kisen Kaisha (‘K’ Line) was established in 1970 to represent ‘K’ Line’s interest and business in Australia. The fleet consists of approximately 74 vessels with the capacity to handle more than 4,413,571 kt. ‘K’ Line operates a fully integrated global network that supports all essential functions of container logistics.

All of the ‘K’ Line vessels are registered by the Lloyd’s Register Group, which provides classification and certification of ships, and inspects and approves important components and accessories. This registration is a requirement of the *Australian Customs Act 1901*.

‘K’ Line plans to provide AGR with container shipping services in the near future. Shipping destinations include various international ports.

### 1.4 Road Transportation

No road transportation occurs as part of the AGR Ocean Supply Chain.

### 1.5 Transit Storage

Depending on weather, cargo types and other operational matters, shipping lines may tranship their cargo from one vessel to another. This involves unloading the cargo at a terminal facility, temporary set down and loading onto another vessel for the continuation of the delivery. Such trans-shipping does occur with AGR’s sodium cyanide. AGR has no control over when and where this happens, but through its due diligence investigations has satisfied itself that the shipping lines used (Maersk, MSC, Hapag-Lloyd and ‘K’ Line) undertake the shipping of the product in accordance with the *International Maritime Dangerous Goods Code* (IMO DG Code) and in a professional manner. This extends to the selection of terminals for trans-shipping.

Trans-shipping ports used include:

- **Maersk**:
  - Port of Tanjung Pelepas, Malaysia
  - Port of Tangier, Morocco
  - Algeciras Port, Spain.

- **MSC**:
  - Port of Singapore
  - Antwerp Port
  - Felixstowe Port, UK
  - Las Palmas Port, Canary Islands
  - Port of Busan, South Korea
  - Buenaventura Port, Colombia
  - Port of Sal Al Ah, Oman
  - Port Louis Harbour, Mauritius.
Hapag-Lloyd:
- Port of Singapore
- Port of Klang
- Le Havre
- Port of Antwerp
- Port of Hamburg
- Port of Hong Kong
- Port of Busan, South Korea

‘K’ Line:
- Port of Singapore
- Port of Tokyo
- Port of Busan, South Korea
- Port of Hong Kong
1.6 Auditors Findings and Attestation

☒ in full compliance with
☐ in substantial compliance with Cyanide Management Code
☐ not in compliance with

AGR is:

No significant cyanide exposures or releases were noted to have occurred during AGR’s Ocean Freight Supply Chain 2011-2014 audit cycle.

Audit Company: Golder Associates Pty Ltd
Audit Team Leader: Mike Woods, Exemplar Global (113792)
Email: mwoods@golder.com.au

1.7 Name and Signatures of Other Auditors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mike Woods</td>
<td>Lead Auditor and Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td>30 October 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical Specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.8 Dates of Audit

The Certification Transport Audit of AGR’s Ocean Freight Supply Chain was undertaken over a period of one (1) week concluding on 15 April 2015.

I attest that I meet the criteria for knowledge, experience and conflict of interest for Code Verification Audit Team Leader, established by the International Cyanide Management Institute and that all members of the audit team meet the applicable criteria established by the International Cyanide Management Institute for Code Verification Auditors.

I attest that this Summary Audit Report accurately describes the findings of the verification audit. I further attest that the verification audit was conducted in a professional manner in accordance with the Cyanide Transportation Verification Protocol for the International Cyanide Management Code and using standard and accepted practices for health, safety and environmental audits.
2.0 CONSIGNOR SUMMARY

2.1 Principle 1 – Transport
Transport Cyanide in a manner that minimises the potential for accidents and releases.

2.1.1 Transport Practice 1.1
Select cyanide transport routes to minimise the potential for accidents and releases.

☑ in full compliance with

☐ in substantial compliance with

☐ not in compliance with

Transport Practice 1.1

Summarise the basis for this Finding/Deficiencies Identified:
The AGR Ocean Freight Supply Chain is in FULL COMPLIANCE with Transport Practice 1.1 requiring the transport of cyanide in a manner that minimises the potential for accidents and releases.

AGR utilises Maersk, MSC, Hapag-Lloyd and ‘K’ Line for interstate and international shipping of solid sodium cyanide. Containers are placed and secured on their vessels at the loading port (Freemantle Port) by the port stevedoring company or service provider, and removed at the port of destination by the stevedoring company or service provider at that port. As such, Maersk, MSC, Hapag-Lloyd and ‘K’ Line provide a marine carrier service and all actual handling of containers (on and off vessels) is predominately undertaken by stevedoring companies at each port. The one exception is the self-geared Maersk vessels used to unload containers at the Port of Puerto Desedao, Brazil.

There are a number of instances where AGR’s sodium cyanide is transhipped at terminals or hubs en-route to its final destination port. AGR has no control over when and where this happens, but through its due diligence investigations has satisfied itself that the shipping lines used (Maersk, MSC, Hapag-Lloyd and ‘K’ Line) undertake the shipping of the product in accordance with the IMO DG Code and in a professional manner. This extends to the selection of terminals for trans-shipping.

AGR does not have control of the routes taken by the shipping lines, but has undertaken due diligence reviews of Maersk, MSC, Hapag-Lloyd and ‘K’ Line to verify that the shipments are in accordance with the IMO DG Code. AGR’s due diligence reviews have found that there were no issues of concern in regards to the management and shipping of sodium cyanide product by any of the shipping lines. In addition, through their dealings with the shipping lines, AGR has found Maersk, MSC, Hapag-Lloyd and ‘K’ Line to be professional organisations. The due diligence reviews state that:

“The report is not a final acceptance of [the shipping lines] for future work and as with all service providers to AGR, AGR will continue to review and monitor the performance.”

The routes taken are not ‘definitive’ routes as ships can take various routes to arrive at the same destination, taking into account tides, currents, wind and storms. This is also noted in the schedules with estimated travel times between ports.
2.1.2 Transport Practice 1.2

Ensure that personnel operating cyanide handling and transport equipment can perform their jobs with minimum risk to communities and the environment.

☐ in full compliance with
☐ in substantial compliance with
☐ not in compliance with

AGR is in FULL COMPLIANCE with Transport Practice 1.2 requiring personnel operating cyanide handling and transport equipment can perform their jobs with minimum risk to communities and the environment.

Summarise the basis for this Finding/Deficiencies Identified:

AGR utilise Maersk, MSC, Hapag-Lloyd and ‘K’ Line for the marine transport of sodium cyanide to various destination Ports. Containers are placed and secured on their vessels at the loading port by the Port stevedoring company or service provider, and removed at the Port of destination by the stevedoring company or service provider at that Port. The one exception is the self-geared Maersk vessels used to unload containers at the Port of Puerto Desedao, Brazil. These ports are not included in the scope of this audit and are assessed under due diligence as part of a separate supply chain.

All Maersk, MSC, Hapag-Lloyd and ‘K’ Line vessels are registered by the Lloyd’s Register Group, which provides classification and certification of ships, and inspects and approves important components and accessories. This registration is a requirement of the Australian Customs Act 1901.

Due diligence reviews of Maersk, MSC, Hapag-Lloyd and ‘K’ Line were undertaken by AGR to verify that the shipments are conducted in accordance with the IMO DG Code. AGR’s due diligence reviews have found that there were no issues of concern in regards to the management and shipping of sodium cyanide product by any of the shipping lines. In addition, through their dealings with the shipping lines, AGR has found Maersk, MSC, Hapag-Lloyd and ‘K’ Line to be professional organisations.

2.1.3 Transport Practice 1.3

Ensure that transport equipment is suitable for the cyanide shipment.

☐ in full compliance with
☐ in substantial compliance with
☐ not in compliance with

AGR is in FULL COMPLIANCE with Transport Practice 1.3 requiring that transport equipment is suitable for the cyanide shipment.

Summarise the basis for this Finding/Deficiencies Identified:

AGR utilise Maersk, MSC, Hapag-Lloyd and ‘K’ Line for the marine transport of sodium cyanide to various destination Ports. Containers are placed and secured on their vessels at the loading port by the Port stevedoring company or service provider, and removed at the Port of destination by the stevedoring company or service provider at that Port. The one exception is the self-geared Maersk vessels used to unload containers at the Port of Puerto Desedao, Brazil. These ports are not included in the scope of this audit and are assessed under due diligence as part of a separate supply chain.

All Maersk, MSC, Hapag-Lloyd and ‘K’ Line vessels are registered by the Lloyd’s Register Group, which provides classification and certification of ships, and inspects and approves important components and accessories. This registration is a requirement of the Australian Customs Act 1901.

Due diligence reviews of Maersk, MSC, Hapag-Lloyd and ‘K’ Line were undertaken by AGR to verify that the shipments are conducted in accordance with the IMO DG Code. AGR’s due diligence reviews have found that there were no issues of concern in regards to the management and shipping of sodium cyanide product by any of the shipping lines. In addition, through their dealings with the shipping lines, AGR has found Maersk, MSC, Hapag-Lloyd and ‘K’ Line to be professional organisations.
2.1.4 Transport Practice 1.4

Develop and implement a safety program for transport of cyanide.

- in full compliance with

AGR is
- in substantial compliance with
- not in compliance with

Summarise the basis for this Finding/Deficiencies Identified:

AGR is in FULL COMPLIANCE with Transport Practice 1.4 requiring the operation develop and implement a safety programme for transport of cyanide.

All Maersk, MSC, Hapag-Lloyd and ‘K’ Line vessels are registered by the Lloyd’s Register Group, which provides classification and certification of ships, and inspects and approves important components and accessories. This registration is a requirement of the Australian Customs Act 1901.

Maersk, MSC, Hapag-Lloyd and ‘K’ Line require from their clients (e.g. AGR) evidence that products booked for transport meet the packaging requirements of the IMO DG Code 2008. Both shipping liners reserve the right to refuse acceptance of cargo that does not meet packaging, container and documentation standards set out in the IMO DG Code.

Due diligence reviews of Maersk, MSC, Hapag-Lloyd and ‘K’ Line were undertaken by AGR to verify that the shipments are conducted in accordance with the IMO DG Code. AGR’s due diligence reviews have found that there were no issues of concern in regards to the management and shipping of sodium cyanide product by either shipping line. In addition, through their dealings with the two shipping lines, AGR has found MSC and Maersk to be professional organisations.

2.1.5 Transport Practice 1.5

Follow international standards for transportation of cyanide by sea and air.

- in full compliance with

AGR is
- in substantial compliance with
- not in compliance with

Summarise the basis for this Finding/Deficiencies Identified:

AGR is in FULL COMPLIANCE with Transport Practice 1.5 requiring the operation follow international standards for transportation of cyanide by sea and air.

All shipments of AGR sodium cyanide comply with the IMO DG Code. This includes packaging, labelling of IBCs, placarding of containers, damage inspections, supply of correct documentation and appropriate stowage and separation.

No consignments of cyanide are transported by air within the scope of this audit.
2.1.6 Transport Practice 1.6

Track cyanide shipments to prevent losses during transport.

☑ in full compliance with

☐ in substantial compliance with

☐ in compliance with

AGR is

Transport Practice 1.6

Summarise the basis for this Finding/Deficiencies Identified:

AGR is in FULL COMPLIANCE with Transport Practice 1.6 requiring the operation track cyanide shipments to prevent losses during transport.

AGR communicates with Maersk, MSC, Hapag-Lloyd and ‘K’ Line onshore representatives by phone, fax and email.

The due diligence for Maersk, MSC, Hapag-Lloyd and ‘K’ Line state that all vessels have continuous means of tracking and communication during their voyages.

Communication equipment is tested through continuous use.

All Maersk, MSC, Hapag-Lloyd and ‘K’ Line vessels are registered by the Lloyd’s Register Group, which provides classification and certification of ships, and inspects and approves important components and accessories. This registration is a requirement of the Australian Customs Act 1901.

Blackout areas have not been identified. However, all vessels have continuous means of tracking and communication during their voyages.

There are systems to track the progress of the cyanide shipments.

Maersk, MSC, Hapag-Lloyd and ‘K’ Line vessels have software that tracks containers from the time they are released by AGR, right through the shipping process and until they are received back at their container yards.

Chain of custody documentation is used by Maersk, MSC, Hapag-Lloyd and ‘K’ Line to prevent the loss of AGR sodium cyanide during shipment. This documentation includes the MO41 Document, which accompanies each container, and the ships manifest, which identifies the location and content of each container on the vessel. In addition, all shipping lines have computer tracking software to allow them to identify at which phase of shipment each container is in.

The amount of cyanide in transit and the Material Safety Data Sheets are contained within the ships manifest (including the MO41 Document), which accompanies the cargo throughout the journey.

AGR does not have control of the routes taken by the shipping lines, but has undertaken due diligence reviews of Maersk, MSC, Hapag-Lloyd and ‘K’ Line to verify that the shipments are in accordance with the IMO DG Code. AGR’s due diligence reviews have found that there were no issues of concern in regards to the management and shipping of sodium cyanide product by any of the shipping lines. In addition, through their dealings with the shipping lines, AGR has found Maersk, MSC, Hapag-Lloyd and ‘K’ Line to be professional organisations. The due diligence review states that:

The report is not a final acceptance of [the shipping lines] for future work and as with all service providers to AGR, AGR will continue to review and monitor the performance.
2.2 Principle 2 – Interim Storage

Design, construct and operate cyanide trans-shipping depots and interim storage sites to prevent release and exposures.

2.2.1 Transport Practice 2.1

Store cyanide in a manner that minimises the potential for accidental releases.

☐ in full compliance with
☐ in substantial compliance with
☐ not in compliance with

Transport Practice 2.1

Summarise the basis for this Finding/Deficiencies Identified:

AGR is in FULL COMPLIANCE with Transport Practice 2.1 that requires transporters design, construct and operate cyanide trans-shipping depots and interim storage sites to prevent release and exposures.

Depending on weather, cargo types and other operational matters, shipping lines may tranship their cargo from one vessel to another. This involves unloading the cargo at a terminal facility, temporary set down and loading onto another vessel for the continuation of the delivery. Such trans-shipping does occur with AGR’s sodium cyanide. AGR has no control over when and where this happens, but through its due diligence investigations has satisfied itself that the shipping lines used (Maersk, MSC, Hapag-Lloyd and ‘K’ Line) undertake the shipping of the product in a professional manner and in accordance with the IMO DG Code. This extends to the selection of terminals for trans-shipping.
2.3 Principle 3 – Emergency Response

Protect communities and the environment through the development of emergency response strategies and capabilities.

2.3.1 Transport Practice 3.1

Prepare detailed Emergency Response Plans for potential cyanide releases.

☑ in full compliance with

☐ in substantial compliance with

☐ not in compliance with

Transport Practice 3.1

Summarise the basis for this Finding/Deficiencies Identified:

AGR is in FULL COMPLIANCE with Transport Practice 3.1 requiring the operation prepare detailed Emergency Response Plans for potential cyanide releases.

Whilst AGR’s product is embarked on Maersk, MSC, Hapag-Lloyd and ‘K’ Line vessels, all emergency response is governed by the vessel’s captain. AGR conduct due diligence reviews of Maersk, MSC, Hapag-Lloyd and ‘K’ Line to ensure that the shipments occur in accordance with the IMO DG Code. AGR’s due diligence reviews have found that there were no issues of concern in regards to the management and shipping of sodium cyanide product by either shipping line. In addition, through their dealings with the shipping lines, AGR has found Maersk, MSC, Hapag-Lloyd and ‘K’ Line to be professional organisations.

All Maersk, MSC, Hapag-Lloyd and ‘K’ Line vessels are registered by the Lloyd’s Register Group, which provides classification and certification of ships, and inspects and approves important components and accessories. This registration is a requirement of the Australian Customs Act 1901.

2.3.2 Transport Practice 3.2

Designate appropriate response personnel and commit necessary resources for emergency response.

☑ in full compliance with

☐ in substantial compliance with

☐ not in compliance with

Transport Practice 3.2

Summarise the basis for this Finding/Deficiencies Identified:

AGR is in FULL COMPLIANCE with Transport Practice 3.2 requiring they designate appropriate response personnel and commit necessary resources for emergency response.

Whilst AGR’s product is embarked on Maersk, MSC, Hapag-Lloyd and ‘K’ Line vessels, all emergency response is governed by the vessel’s captain. AGR conduct due diligence reviews of Maersk, MSC, Hapag-Lloyd and ‘K’ Line to ensure that the shipments occur in accordance with the IMO DG Code. AGR’s due diligence reviews have found that there were no issues of concern in regards to the management and shipping of sodium cyanide product by any of the shipping lines. In addition, through their dealings with the shipping lines, AGR has found Maersk, MSC, Hapag-Lloyd and ‘K’ Line to be professional organisations.

All Maersk, MSC, Hapag-Lloyd and ‘K’ Line vessels are registered by the Lloyd’s Register Group, which provides classification and certification of ships, and inspects and approves important components and accessories. This registration is a requirement of the Australian Customs Act 1901.
2.3.3 Transport Practice 3.3
Develop procedures for internal and external emergency notification and reporting.

☑ in full compliance with

AGR is ☐ in substantial compliance with ☐ not in compliance with Transport Practice 3.3

Summarise the basis for this Finding/Deficiencies Identified:
AGR is in FULL COMPLIANCE with Transport Practice 3.3 requiring that they develop procedures for internal and external emergency notification and reporting.

All Maersk, MSC, Hapag-Lloyd and ‘K’ Line vessels carrying AGR sodium cyanide have ship manifests held by the captain, which contain emergency response information and contact details.

In addition, Maersk, MSC, Hapag-Lloyd and ‘K’ Line vessels are registered by the Lloyd's Register Group, which provides classification and certification of ships, and inspects and approves important components and accessories. This registration is a requirement of the Australian Customs Act 1901.

2.3.4 Transport Practice 3.4
Develop procedures for remediation of releases that recognise the additional hazards of cyanide treatment.

☑ in full compliance with

AGR is ☐ in substantial compliance with ☐ not in compliance with Transport Practice 3.4

Summarise the basis for this Finding/Deficiencies Identified:
AGR is in FULL COMPLIANCE with Transport Practice 3.4 requiring that they develop procedures for remediation of releases that recognise the additional hazards of cyanide treatment.

All Maersk, MSC, Hapag-Lloyd and ‘K’ Line vessels carrying AGR sodium cyanide have ship manifests held by the captain, which contain emergency response information and contact details.

In addition, Maersk, MSC, Hapag-Lloyd and ‘K’ Line vessels are registered by the Lloyd’s Register Group, which provides classification and certification of ships, and inspects and approves important components and accessories. This registration is a requirement of the Australian Customs Act 1901.
2.3.5 Transport Practice 3.5

Periodically evaluate response procedures and capabilities and revise them as needed.

☑ in full compliance with

☐ in substantial compliance with

☐ not in compliance with

Transport Practice 3.5

Summarise the basis for this Finding/Deficiencies Identified:

AGR is in FULL COMPLIANCE with Transport Practice 3.5 requiring the operation periodically evaluate response procedures and capabilities and revise them as needed.

All Maersk, MSC, Hapag-Lloyd and ‘K’ Line vessels carrying AGR sodium cyanide have ship manifests held by the captain, which contain emergency response information and contact details.

In addition, Maersk, MSC, Hapag-Lloyd and ‘K’ Line vessels are registered by the Lloyd’s Register Group, which provides classification and certification of ships, and inspects and approves important components and accessories. This registration is a requirement of the Australian Customs Act 1901.
3.0 DUE DILIGENCE

3.1 Mediterranean Shipping Company (MSC)

AGR’s Export Technical Manager conducted a due diligence review of MSC in January 2014. The due diligence assessment report was reviewed by Edward Clerk of Golder in February 2014. Edward is pre-certified by the ICMI as a Transport Technical Specialist.

The following items were addressed within the due diligence:

- Introduction
- Transport Practice 1.1
- Transport Practice 1.5 (1.5.1)
- Transport Practice 1.6.

3.1.1 Introduction

MSC’s head office is situated in Geneva, Switzerland and is engaged in worldwide container transport. As of December 2013, MSC were operating 443 container vessels with the capacity to handle and the equivalent capacity of 2,282,000 twenty foot containers.

MSC has provided container shipping services to AGR since AGR commenced the export of sodium cyanide solid in 2002. In developing the relationship:

- AGR had to prove to MSC that its product packaging was approved by the Australian regulators and tested in accordance with the IMO DG Code.
- MSC assisted in setting up of the Fremantle Port stevedoring operations to handle the export of the product.
- MSC assisted AGR in setting up its export documentation requirements.
- MSC have the right to refuse cargo if the packaging, container and/or documentation are not acceptable to IMO DG Code standards.
- AGR is aware that its day-to-day vessel booking and scheduling requirements are subject to the cargo being accepted and placed by the MSC dangerous cargo management system.

As mentioned in the Auditor guidance notes, AGR is not able to conduct inspections and checks on shipping vessels due to Port safety and security issues. The Australian Government, through Australian Maritime Safety Authority (AMSA) and State Governments through the Port State Control (PSC) do, however, inspect and monitor cargo vessels that frequent Australian Ports. These inspections verify vessels are seaworthy, do not pose a pollution risk, provide healthy and safe work environments and comply with relevant international regulations. These inspections are not only carried out at Australian Ports, but internationally and set the operating standards for the international shipping companies.

All of MSC’s Vessels are registered by the Lloyds Register Group. The Australian Customs Act 1901 requires all vessels bringing trade to and from Australia to be Lloyds registered, and the required import/export documentation has to show the name of the vessel and the Lloyds registration number.
3.1.2 Transport Practice 1.1

MSC is a carrier service providing international shipping of containers on a fleet of their container vessels. Containers containing sodium cyanide are placed and secured on their vessels at the loading port by the port stevedoring company or service provider, and removed at the port of destination by the stevedoring company or service provider at that port. Simply put MSC provides a carrier service handling of containers is done by the stevedoring companies at each port.

The international sales and exports of sodium cyanide take into consideration the shipping services available to service the intended target market. AGR only operates in export markets that are serviced by major international shipping companies with the ability to offer scheduled container services from Fremantle Port to the destination country or continent. AGR has mainly utilised MSC for its international shipping due to its selection of services available to various parts of the world and its weekly shipping schedule from Fremantle. AGR deals directly with MSC for its shipping requirements.

A simple explanation on how containers are moved around the world is explained as follows. The carrier’s larger vessels cover the main route. This main route is from Europe via the Mediterranean, Sub-Continent, and South East Asia, China and onto the West Coast of USA. The shipping lines have ownership positions at their main container hubs along the route. Feeder vessels servicing other destinations will link services through these hubs. For example, hubs in South East Asia operate shipping line feeder vessels which service Australian Ports. AGRs exports are shipped from the Fremantle Port to the South East Asian Hub then transhipped on a main line carrier to a Mediterranean or European Hub and again transhipped onto a feeder vessel servicing the African destination.

The route is not a ‘definitive’ route as ships can take various routes to arrive at the same destination as they take into account tides, currents, wind and storms. This is also noted in the schedules which provide estimated travel times between ports.

The table below shows the planned transhipment ports and final destination, depending on weather, ship availability and demand that MSC cargoes can be routed through.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depart</th>
<th>Hub</th>
<th>Hub</th>
<th>Destination Port</th>
<th>Transit Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fremantle</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Le Havre</td>
<td>Tema Ghana</td>
<td>52 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremantle</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Felix Stowe</td>
<td>Takoradi Ghana</td>
<td>52 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremantle</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Felix Stowe</td>
<td>Dakar Senegal</td>
<td>60 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremantle</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Sal Al Ah</td>
<td>Dar es Salaam Tanzania</td>
<td>25 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremantle</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Durban South Africa</td>
<td>14 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremantle</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Busan</td>
<td>Callao Peru</td>
<td>55 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremantle</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Port Louis</td>
<td>Walvis Bay Namibia</td>
<td>36 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremantle</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Buenos Aires</td>
<td>43 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremantle</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>19 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremantle</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Laem Chabang</td>
<td>16 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremantle</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Jeddah</td>
<td>24 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremantle</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Santos</td>
<td>37 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the purpose of this due diligence report, AGR does not consign any product on a vessel that is not a container vessel. No product is shipped by barge, ferry or other means. Any product if required to be shipped under these circumstances will require an individual route risk assessment and due diligence of the service provider.

3.1.3 Transport Practice 1.5 (1.5.1)
The due diligence describes the processes and systems in place to ensure that IMO DG Code is met during the shipment of cyanide by MSC. This is described in detail in the corresponding audit findings in section 2.0 of this audit report.

3.1.4 Transport Practice 1.6
The due diligence describes the processes and systems in place to ensure that cyanide shipments are tracked to prevent losses during transport. This is described in detail in the corresponding audit findings in section 2.0 of this audit report.

3.1.5 Conclusion
The due diligence concludes that:

AGR through its dealings with MSC has found them to be a professional organisation.

The ongoing review as a service provider and this due diligence report has found no issues of concern in regards to MSC management and shipping of the sodium cyanide product. The report is not a final acceptance of MSC for future work and as with all service providers to AGR, AGR will continue to review and monitor their performance.

Any changes in state, national or international regulations, standards or laws can result in a total review of the international shipping requirements.

3.2 Maersk Australia (Maersk)
AGR’s Export Technical Manager conducted a due diligence review of Maersk in January 2014. The due diligence assessment report was reviewed by Edward Clerk of Golder in February 2014. Edward is pre-certified by the ICMI as a Transport Technical Specialist.

The following items were addressed within the due diligence:

- Introduction
- Transport Practice 1.1
- Transport Practice 1.5 (1.5.1)
- Transport Practice 1.6

3.2.1 Introduction
Maersk is headquartered in Copenhagen, Denmark and operates a fleet of container vessels with worldwide shipping coverage. The fleet consists of more than 600 container vessels with the capacity to handle more than 2 225 000 twenty foot containers.

Maersk operates a container booking and tracking system called the GCSS. The system is also the management tool for handling the dangerous goods cargo for the proper control of the stowage of hazardous cargo.
Maersk has provided AGR with container shipping services since AGR commenced the export of sodium cyanide solid in 2002. At the commencement of the relationship, AGR had to prove to Maersk that its product packaging was approved by the Australian regulators and tested in accordance with IMO DG Code.

Maersk have the right to refuse cargo if the packaging, container and/or documentation are not acceptable to IMO DG Code standards. AGR is aware that its vessel booking and scheduling requirements are subject to the cargo being accepted and confirmed in the Maersk booking and tracking system before empty sea containers will be released to AGR for preparation and loading of consignments.

As mentioned in the Auditor guidance notes, AGR is not able to conduct inspections and checks on shipping vessels due to Port safety and security issues. The Australian Government, AMSA and State Governments through the PSC do, however, inspect and monitor cargo vessels that frequent Australian Ports. These inspections verify vessels are seaworthy, do not pose a pollution risk, provide healthy and safe work environments and comply with relevant international regulations. These inspections are not only carried out at Australian Ports, but internationally and set the operating standards for the international shipping companies.

All of Maersk’s vessels are registered with Lloyds Register Group. The Australian Customs Act 1901 requires all vessels bringing trade to and from Australia to be Lloyds registered, and the required import/export documentation has to show the name of the vessel and the Lloyds registration number.

3.2.2 Transport Practice 1.1

Maersk is a carrier service providing international shipping of containers on a fleet of their container vessels. Containers holding sodium cyanide are placed and secured on their vessels at the loading port by the port stevedoring company or service provider. At Fremantle this service is provided by Patricks. At the destination ports such as Puerto Deseado in Argentina, where the port does not have equipment to lift containers on and off the vessel, Maersk service these ports with a ‘self-geared’ vessel that has its own lifting devices.

The international sales and exports of sodium cyanide take into consideration the shipping services available to service the intended target market. AGR only operates in export markets that are serviced by major international shipping companies with the ability to offer scheduled container services from Fremantle Port to the destination country or continent. AGR has mainly utilised MSC for its international shipping due to its selection of services available to various parts of the world and its weekly shipping schedule from Fremantle. AGR deals directly with MSC for its shipping requirements.

A simple explanation on how containers are moved around the world is explained as follows. The carrier’s larger vessels cover the main route. This main route is from Europe via the Mediterranean, Sub-Continent, and South East Asia, China and onto the West Coast of USA. The shipping lines have ownership positions at their main container hubs along the route. Feeder vessels servicing other destinations will link services through these hubs. For example, hubs in South East Asia operate shipping line feeder vessels which service Australian Ports. AGRs exports are shipped from the Fremantle Port to the South East Asian Hub then transhipped on a main line carrier to a Mediterranean or European Hub and again transhipped onto a feeder vessel servicing the African.

The route is not a ‘definitive’ route as ships can take various routes to arrive at the same destination as they take into account tides, currents, wind and storms. This is also noted in the schedules which provide estimated travel times between ports.
The table below shows the planned transhipment ports and final destination, depending on weather, ship availability and demand that Maersk cargoes can be routed through. The consignment booking in the GCSS system will ensure any changes to the booking or scheduling are requested and confirmed from the vessel controllers or terminals. The booking carries all the requirements as regards to handling and stowage required for the sodium cyanide containers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depart</th>
<th>Hub</th>
<th>Hub</th>
<th>Destination Port</th>
<th>Transit Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fremantle</td>
<td>Tanjung Pelepas</td>
<td>Algeciras</td>
<td>Puerto Deseado</td>
<td>50 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the purpose of this due diligence report, AGR does not consign any product on a vessel that is not a container vessel. No product is shipped by barge, ferry or other means. Any product if required to be shipped under these circumstances will require an individual route risk assessment and due diligence of the service provider.

3.2.3 Transport Practice 1.5 (1.5.1)
The due diligence describes the processes and systems in place to ensure that IMO DG Code is met during the shipment of cyanide by Maersk. This is described in detail in the corresponding audit findings in section 2.0 of this audit report.

3.2.4 Transport Practice 1.6
The due diligence describes the processes and systems in place to ensure that cyanide shipments are tracked to prevent losses during transport. This is described in detail in the corresponding audit findings in section 2.0 of this audit report.

3.2.5 Conclusion
The due diligence concludes that:

*AGR through its dealings with Maersk has found them to be a professional organisation.*

The ongoing review as a service provider and this due diligence report has found no issues of concern in regards to Maersk management and shipping of the sodium cyanide product. The report is not a final acceptance of Maersk for future work and as with all service providers to AGR, AGR will continue to review and monitor their performance.

*Any changes in state, national or international regulations, standards or laws can result in a total review of the international shipping requirements.*

3.3 Hapag-Lloyd
AGR’s Export Technical Manager conducted a due diligence review of Hapag-Lloyd in February 2015. The due diligence assessment report was reviewed by Edward Clerk of Golder in March 2015. Edward is pre-certified by the ICMI as a Transport Technical Specialist.

The following items were addressed within the due diligence:

- Introduction
- Transport Practice 1.1
- Transport Practice 1.5 (1.5.1)
- Transport Practice 1.6.
3.3.1 Introduction

Hapag-Lloyd’s head office is situated in Hamburg, Germany and is engaged in worldwide container transport. The fleet consists of approximately 200 modern ships with the capacity to handle more than 1,000,000 twenty-foot containers. Hapag-Lloyd operates a fully integrated global network that supports all essential functions of container logistics.

Hapag-Lloyd has recently begun providing AGR with container shipping services. At the commencement of the relationship, AGR had to prove to Hapag-Lloyd that its product packaging was approved by the Australian regulators and tested in accordance with IMO DG Code.

Hapag-Lloyd have the right to refuse cargo if the packaging, container and/or documentation are not acceptable to IMO DG Code standards. AGR is aware that its vessel booking and scheduling requirements are subject to the cargo being accepted and confirmed in the Hapag-Lloyd booking and tracking system before empty sea containers will be released to AGR for preparation and loading of consignments.

As mentioned in the Auditor guidance notes, AGR is not able to conduct inspections and checks on shipping vessels due to port safety and security issues. The Australian Government, AMSA and State Governments through the PSC do, however, inspect and monitor cargo vessels that frequent Australian Ports. These inspections verify vessels are seaworthy, do not pose a pollution risk, provide healthy and safe work environments and comply with relevant international regulations. These inspections are not only carried out at Australian Ports, but internationally and set the operating standards for the international shipping companies.

All of Hapag-Lloyd’s vessels are registered with Lloyds Register Group. The Australian Customs Act 1901 requires all vessels bringing trade to and from Australia to be Lloyds registered, and the required import/export documentation has to show the name of the vessel and the Lloyds registration number.

3.3.2 Transport Practice 1.1

Hapag-Lloyd is a carrier service providing international shipping of containers on a fleet of their container vessels. Containers containing sodium cyanide are placed and secured on their vessels at the loading port by the port stevedoring company or service provider, and removed at the port of destination by the stevedoring company or service provider at that port. Simply put Hapag-Lloyd provides a carrier service handling of containers is done by the stevedoring companies at each port.

The international sales and exports of sodium cyanide take into consideration the shipping services available to service the intended target market. AGR only operates in export markets that are serviced by major international shipping companies with the ability to offer scheduled container services from Fremantle Port to the destination country or continent. AGR has mainly utilised MSC for its international shipping due to its selection of services available to various parts of the world and its weekly shipping schedule from Fremantle. AGR utilises Maersk, Hapag Lloyd and ‘K’ Line as an alternative shipping service provider. AGR deals directly with each shipping line for its shipping requirements.

A simple explanation on how containers are moved around the world is explained as follows. The carrier’s larger vessels cover the main route. This main route is from Europe via the Mediterranean, Sub-Continent, and South East Asia, China and onto the West Coast of USA. The shipping lines have ownership positions at their main container hubs along the route. Feeder vessels servicing other destinations will link services through these hubs. For example, hubs in South East Asia operate shipping line feeder vessels which service Australian Ports. AGRs exports are shipped from the Fremantle Port to the South East Asian Hub then transhipped on a main line carrier to a Mediterranean or European Hub and again transhipped onto a feeder vessel servicing the African destination.
The route is not a ‘definitive’ route as ships can take various routes to arrive at the same destination as they take into account tides, currents, wind and storms. This is also noted in the schedules which provide estimated travel times between ports.

The table below shows the planned transhipment ports and final destination, depending on weather, ship availability and demand that Hapag-Lloyd cargoes can be routed through. Additional routes may be added as required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depart</th>
<th>Hub</th>
<th>Hub</th>
<th>Destination Port</th>
<th>Transit Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fremantle</td>
<td>Port Klang</td>
<td>Santos</td>
<td>55 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremantle</td>
<td>Port Klang</td>
<td>Buenos Aires</td>
<td>60 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremantle</td>
<td>Port Klang</td>
<td>Cape Town</td>
<td>Walvis Bay</td>
<td>55 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremantle</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Tema</td>
<td>68 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremantle</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Le Havre</td>
<td>Abidjan</td>
<td>82 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremantle</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Le Havre</td>
<td>Dakar</td>
<td>77 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremantle</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Jeddah</td>
<td>39 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the purpose of this due diligence report, AGR does not consign any product on a vessel that is not a container vessel. No product is shipped by barge, ferry or other means. Any product if required to be shipped under these circumstances will require an individual route risk assessment and due diligence of the service provider.

3.3.3 Transport Practice 1.5 (1.5.1)

The due diligence describes the processes and systems in place to ensure that IMO DG Code is met during the shipment of cyanide by Hapag-Lloyd. This is described in detail in the corresponding audit findings in section 2.0 of this audit report.

3.3.4 Transport Practice 1.6

The due diligence describes the processes and systems in place to ensure that cyanide shipments are tracked to prevent losses during transport. This is described in detail in the corresponding audit findings in section 2.0 of this audit report.

3.3.5 Conclusion

The due diligence concludes that:

AGR through its dealings with Hapag-Lloyd has found them to be a professional organisation.

The ongoing review as a service provider and this due diligence report has found no issues of concern in regards to Hapag-Lloyd management and shipping of the sodium cyanide product. The report is not a final acceptance of Hapag-Lloyd for future work and as with all service providers to AGR, AGR will continue to review and monitor their performance.

Any changes in state, national or international regulations, standards or laws can result in a total review of the international shipping requirements.
3.4 Kawasaki Kisen Kaisha Ltd (‘K’ Line)

AGR’s Export Technical Manager conducted a due diligence review of ‘K’ Line in February 2015. The due diligence assessment report was reviewed by Edward Clerk of Golder in March 2015. Edward is pre-certified by the ICMI as a Transport Technical Specialist.

The following items were addressed within the due diligence:

- Introduction
- Transport Practice 1.1
- Transport Practice 1.5 (1.5.1)
- Transport Practice 1.6.

3.4.1 Introduction

‘K’ Line’s head office is situated in Tokyo, Japan and is engaged in worldwide container transport. Kawasaki Australia Pty Ltd a 100% owned subsidiary of Japan's Kawasaki Kisen Kaisha (‘K’ Line) was established in 1970 to represent ‘K’ Line's interest and business in Australia. The fleet consists of approximately 74 vessels with the capacity to handle more than 4 413 571 kt. ‘K’ Line operates a fully integrated global network that supports all essential functions of container logistics.

‘K’ Line plans to provide AGR with container shipping services in the near future. Prior to commencement of the relationship, AGR will have to prove to ‘K’ Line that its product packaging is approved by the Australian regulators and tested in accordance with IMO DG Code.

‘K’ Line will have the right to refuse cargo if the packaging, container and/or documentation are not acceptable to IMO DG Code standards. AGR is aware that its vessel booking and scheduling requirements will be subject to the cargo being accepted and confirmed in the ‘K’ Line booking and tracking system before empty sea containers will be released to AGR for preparation and loading of consignments.

As mentioned in the Auditor guidance notes, AGR is not able to conduct inspections and checks on shipping vessels due to port safety and security issues. The Australian Government, AMSA and State Governments through the PSC do, however, inspect and monitor cargo vessels that frequent Australian Ports. These inspections verify vessels are seaworthy, do not pose a pollution risk, provide healthy and safe work environments and comply with relevant international regulations. These inspections are not only carried out at Australian Ports, but internationally and set the operating standards for the international shipping companies.

All of ‘K’ Line’s vessels are registered with Lloyds Register Group. The Australian Customs Act 1901 requires all vessels bringing trade to and from Australia to be Lloyds registered, and the required import/export documentation has to show the name of the vessel and the Lloyds registration number.

3.4.2 Transport Practice 1.1

‘K’ Line is a carrier service providing international shipping of containers on a fleet of their container vessels. Containers containing sodium cyanide are placed and secured on their vessels at the loading port by the port stevedoring company or service provider, and removed at the port of destination by the stevedoring company or service provider at that port. Simply put ‘K’ Line provides a carrier service handling of containers is done by the stevedoring companies at each port.
The international sales and exports of sodium cyanide take into consideration the shipping services available to service the intended target market. AGR only operates in export markets that are serviced by major international shipping companies with the ability to offer scheduled container services from Fremantle Port to the destination country or continent. AGR has mainly utilised MSC for its international shipping due to its selection of services available to various parts of the world and its weekly shipping schedule from Fremantle. AGR utilises Maersk, Hapag Lloyd and ‘K’ Line as an alternative shipping service provider. AGR deals directly with each shipping line for its shipping requirements.

A simple explanation on how containers are moved around the world is explained as follows. The carrier’s larger vessels cover the main route. This main route is from Europe via the Mediterranean, Sub-Continent, and South East Asia, China and onto the West Coast of USA. The shipping lines have ownership positions at their main container hubs along the route. Feeder vessels servicing other destinations will link services through these hubs. For example, hubs in South East Asia operate shipping line feeder vessels which service Australian Ports. AGR’s exports are shipped from the Fremantle Port to the South East Asian Hub then transhipped on a main line carrier to a Mediterranean or European Hub and again transhipped onto a feeder vessel servicing the African destination.

The route is not a ‘definitive’ route as ships can take various routes to arrive at the same destination as they take into account tides, currents, wind and storms. This is also noted in the schedules which provide estimated travel times between ports.

The table below shows the planned transhipment ports and final destination, depending on weather, ship availability and demand that ‘K’ Line cargoes can be routed through.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depart</th>
<th>Hub</th>
<th>Hub</th>
<th>Destination Port</th>
<th>Transit Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fremantle</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Santos</td>
<td>38 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremantle</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Buenos Aires</td>
<td>42 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremantle</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Lam Chabang</td>
<td>14 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the purpose of this due diligence report, AGR does not consign any product on a vessel that is not a container vessel. No product is shipped by barge, ferry or other means. Any product if required to be shipped under these circumstances will require an individual route risk assessment and due diligence of the service provider.

3.4.3 Transport Practice 1.5 (1.5.1)

The due diligence describes the processes and systems in place to ensure that IMO DG Code is met during the shipment of cyanide by ‘K’ Line. This is described in detail in the corresponding audit findings in section 2.0 of this audit report.

3.4.4 Transport Practice 1.6

The due diligence describes the processes and systems in place to ensure that cyanide shipments are tracked to prevent losses during transport. This is described in detail in the corresponding audit findings in section 2.0 of this audit report.
3.4.5 Conclusion

The due diligence concludes that:

AGR through its dealings with ‘K’ Line has found them to be a professional organisation.

The ongoing review as a service provider and this due diligence report has found no issues of concern in regards to ‘K’ Line management and shipping of the sodium cyanide product. The report is not a final acceptance of ‘K’ Line for future work and as with all service providers to AGR, AGR will continue to review and monitor their performance.

Any changes in state, national or international regulations, standards or laws can result in a total review of the international shipping requirements.

3.5 Australian Shipping Regulatory Framework

All due diligence assessments reference the inspection and regulatory regime which governs the exporting of cyanide. More detail is provided below.

3.5.1 Australian Maritime Safety Authority (AMSA)

AMSA represents Australia at the International Maritime Organisation (IMO) and other international forums in the development, implementation and enforcement of international standards governing ship safety, navigation, marine environmental protection, ship operations, maritime security, crew competency, training and fatigue management.

Australia’s maritime regulatory framework is based on policies and guidelines relating to ship construction standards, ship survey and safety, crewing, seafarer’s qualifications and welfare, carriage and handling of cargoes, passengers, and marine pollution prevention.

AMSA is responsible for implementing IMO regulations for all safety related aspects of marine carriage of all types including bulk liquid and solid cargoes, dangerous goods, general cargoes, containers, as well as standards and operations concerning cargo lifting gear.

Under provisions of the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS) 1974 Ch I and Ch VII, ships are subject to port state control inspections during which compliance with cargo requirements including stowage, segregation, packaging and documentation is verified.

AMSA marine surveyors may board a ship at any time to inspect and detain un-seaworthy or substandard ships. These inspections include ensuring all dangerous goods cargoes are correctly documented on the manifest list, correctly stowed, segregated and especially for container vessels all containers are correctly lashed onto the vessel and all fixtures and lashings are in suitable and working condition.

3.5.2 Port State Control (PSC)

PSC is one of the government strategies in place to ensure the above objectives are achieved, however responsibility for the safety and operation of the vessel lies with the ship owners and flag states.

PSC inspections are conducted to ensure that foreign ships visiting Australian Ports are seaworthy, do not pose a pollution risk, provide healthy and safe work environment and comply with relevant international regulations.

Cargo ships become eligible for a PSC inspection every six months. Selection of a ship for inspection depends on a number of factors, including risk to the environment, specific complaints and an AMSA targeting scheme. Surveyors are guided by a set of ‘Instructions to Surveyors’ and ‘Ship Inspection Manual’, which is based on resolutions of the IMO.
As Australia is a party to the Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) on Port State Control in the Asia Pacific and Indian Ocean regions, information on detained ships is published on the Tokyo MOU website at www.tokyo-mou.org.

It is understood that the USA and European countries have similar inspection and control regimes, which ensures that shipping companies maintain their regulatory requirements and manage their license to operate.

### 3.5.3 Australian Department of Defence

The Australian Department of Defence manages on behalf of the Commonwealth Government Australia’s commitments to the United Nations Chemicals Weapons Convention. Through this AGR’s sodium cyanide production facilities are listed and licensed operations. All AGR’s export customers are required to complete a Permit Application and have its application approved before AGR is allowed to export any product. AGR assists with the collection of the Permit from its customers and then together with its own paperwork applies for the Permit. Each customers Permit reference number is required on the export documentation. AGR cannot export product without this approval.

### 3.6 Auditor Review of Due Diligence

The due diligence reviews were found by the Auditor to sufficiently evaluate the port operations, within the constraints of access and limited influence, and additional management measures by the consigner were not considered necessary.

### 4.0 IMPORTANT INFORMATION

Your attention is drawn to the document “Important Information Relating to This Report”, which is included as Appendix A to this report. This document is intended to assist you in ensuring that your expectations of this report are realistic, and that you understand the inherent limitations of a report of this nature. If you are uncertain as to whether this report is appropriate for any particular purpose please discuss this issue with us.
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APPENDIX A

Important Information
The document ("Report") to which this page is attached and which this page forms a part of, has been issued by Golder Associates Pty Ltd ("Golder") subject to the important limitations and other qualifications set out below.

This Report constitutes or is part of services ("Services") provided by Golder to its client ("Client") under and subject to a contract between Golder and its Client ("Contract"). The contents of this page are not intended to and do not alter Golder’s obligations (including any limits on those obligations) to its Client under the Contract.

This Report is provided for use solely by Golder’s Client and persons acting on the Client’s behalf, such as its professional advisers. Golder is responsible only to its Client for this Report. Golder has no responsibility to any other person who relies or makes decisions based upon this Report or who makes any other use of this Report. Golder accepts no responsibility for any loss or damage suffered by any person other than its Client as a result of any reliance upon any part of this Report, decisions made based upon this Report or any other use of it.

This Report has been prepared in the context of the circumstances and purposes referred to in, or derived from, the Contract and Golder accepts no responsibility for use of the Report, in whole or in part, in any other context or circumstance or for any other purpose.

The scope of Golder’s Services and the period of time they relate to are determined by the Contract and are subject to restrictions and limitations set out in the Contract. If a service or other work is not expressly referred to in this Report, do not assume that it has been provided or performed. If a matter is not addressed in this Report, do not assume that any determination has been made by Golder in regards to it.

At any location relevant to the Services conditions may exist which were not detected by Golder, in particular due to the specific scope of the investigation Golder has been engaged to undertake. Conditions can only be verified at the exact location of any tests undertaken. Variations in conditions may occur between tested locations and there may be conditions which have not been revealed by the investigation and which have not therefore been taken into account in this Report.

Golder accepts no responsibility for and makes no representation as to the accuracy or completeness of the information provided to it by or on behalf of the Client or sourced from any third party. Golder has assumed that such information is correct unless otherwise stated and no responsibility is accepted by Golder for incomplete or inaccurate data supplied by its Client or any other person for whom Golder is not responsible. Golder has not taken account of matters that may have existed when the Report was prepared but which were only later disclosed to Golder.

Having regard to the matters referred to in the previous paragraphs on this page in particular, carrying out the Services has allowed Golder to form no more than an opinion as to the actual conditions at any relevant location. That opinion is necessarily constrained by the extent of the information collected by Golder or otherwise made available to Golder. Further, the passage of time may affect the accuracy, applicability or usefulness of the opinions, assessments or other information in this Report. This Report is based upon the information and other circumstances that existed and were known to Golder when the Services were performed and this Report was prepared. Golder has not considered the effect of any possible future developments including physical changes to any relevant location or changes to any laws or regulations relevant to such location.

Where permitted by the Contract, Golder may have retained subconsultants affiliated with Golder to provide some or all of the Services. However, it is Golder which remains solely responsible for the Services and there is no legal recourse against any of Golder’s affiliated companies or the employees, officers or directors of any of them.

By date, or revision, the Report supersedes any prior report or other document issued by Golder dealing with any matter that is addressed in the Report.

Any uncertainty as to the extent to which this Report can be used or relied upon in any respect should be referred to Golder for clarification.
At Golder Associates we strive to be the most respected global company providing consulting, design, and construction services in earth, environment, and related areas of energy. Employee owned since our formation in 1960, our focus, unique culture and operating environment offer opportunities and the freedom to excel, which attracts the leading specialists in our fields. Golder professionals take the time to build an understanding of client needs and of the specific environments in which they operate. We continue to expand our technical capabilities and have experienced steady growth with employees who operate from offices located throughout Africa, Asia, Australasia, Europe, North America, and South America.