

IRON ORE (HAMERSLEY RANGE) AGREEMENT, SECONDARY PROCESSING OBLIGATIONS

1364. Mr L. Graham to the Minister for State Development

- (1) Are the secondary processing obligations contained in the Iron Ore (Hamersley Range) Agreement Act 1963 still current?
- (2) If the answer to (1) is yes -
 - (a) how far has the project proponent advanced with its obligations;
 - (b) what financial assistance has been granted by the State Government;
 - (c) what other financial assistance has been granted by the State Government;
 - (d) what action has the Government taken to ensure that the project proponent is fulfilling its obligations; and
 - (e) if any extensions to time have been granted -
 - (i) what was the reason for granting each extension;
 - (ii) on what date was each extension granted; and
 - (iii) for what period was each extension granted?
- (3) If the answer to (1) is no -
 - (a) why are the obligations not current;
 - (b) has any secondary processing been undertaken by the project proponent that has acquitted their obligation under the Act; and
 - (c) what action is the Government taking to ensure that the project proponent is fulfilling its obligations?

Mr C.M. BROWN replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) N/A.
- (3)
 - (a) The steel making obligations in the Hamersley Range Agreement were removed from the Agreement in 1987 with similar obligations being inserted, also in 1987, into the Iron Ore (Paraburdoo) Agreement Act 1968 and the Iron Ore (Mount Bruce) Agreement Act 1972 to allow for options other than steel to be accepted as meeting the processing obligation.
 - (b) Rio Tinto's involvement in the Hlsmelt project at Kwinana was accepted as fulfilling its secondary processing obligations under the Iron Ore (Paraburdoo) Agreement Act as an alternative to metallised agglomerates.
 - (c) The date for submission of proposals to meet steel making obligations in the Mount Bruce Agreement is 31 December 2009. This matter is being monitored by the Department of Industry and Resources.