

FINANCIAL REVIEW

SE News - Opinion
HD **Iron ore is a giant game of chicken**
BY Angus Taylor
WC 840 words
PD 16 October 2014
SN The Australian Financial Review
SC AFNR
ED First
PG 70
LA English
CY Copyright 2014. Fairfax Media Management Pty Limited.
LP

Strategy The race is on to grab market share dropped by high-cost producers. Australian miners must move quickly to make sure Vale bails out first. Angus Taylor

The price of **iron ore** is on everyone's lips, and the obsession is warranted. For every drop of \$1 per tonne, Australia loses about \$600 **million** a year in revenue – and rising.

TD

Of that, \$200 **million** goes to governments and the balance goes to shareholders. These are seriously big numbers and big stakes.

Ivan Glasenberg, chief executive of Glencore, is telling Rio Tinto's shareholders that their **company** doesn't get it and that a merger will fix the issue.

West Australian Premier Colin Barnett is telling us that such rampant expansion is unhealthy. Rio Tinto's Andrew Harding is reminding everyone that Rio's margins are very attractive, so extra volume is good.

The **iron ore** majors are engaged in a game of chicken, the likes of which has not been seen before.

The parameters are clear. We can still expect some solid growth in global demand for **iron ore**, but this isn't the real prize. In the coming months and years the price will settle at unprofitable levels for high-cost mines. Costly production, particularly privately owned **Chinese** mines, will exit the market.

As these mines inevitably close – and it will be painful – the surrendered volumes are an extremely valuable catch to low-cost producers and their host country. Questions remain over who gets to produce those tonnes.

The players are also clear. Rio Tinto and BHP Billiton have the advantage of well-prepared expansions in the Pilbara close to market. Vale, the Brazilian **iron ore** monster, has the lowest cost of production, but much further to ship to **China**.

Meanwhile, Rio can choose between expansions in Australia or Guinea in West Africa. The costs of other producers are too high to be relevant, with the possible exception of Fortescue Metals Group. Plenty at **stake**

The value of these expansions is enormous to Australia. If we can grab an extra 100 **million** tonnes it is worth close to \$1 **billion** of recurring gross revenues, and at least \$200 **million** in annual tax revenue. The expansions will require as much as \$20 **billion** of investment – exactly what we need as other **mining** investment slows.

Game theory can shed light on such a game of chicken. First, the player with the lowest costs typically captures more of the market, as the French mathematician Antoine Cournot demonstrated in 1838.

All of the majors are pushing the envelope on costs, and telling us so. Vale is introducing supersized ships to address its distance from **China**.

Second, signalling your intention to "lock the steering wheel" will cause your competitors to "swerve" (in this context, halt or slow expansions). The economist Heinrich von Stackelberg worked this out in 1934. BHP has outlined plans to increase **iron ore** output by 65 **million** tonnes to 290 Mt by the end of 2017.

Rio Tinto, meanwhile, plans to ramp up output from its current 290 Mt to 330 Mt by 2015, not including its planned development in Guinea.

Third, the biggest producer, Vale – which has the most to lose – has blinked. No wonder Vale's director of planning has said "everyone is nervous about the **iron ore** price". None would be more nervous than Vale. Vale has the strongest incentive to slow global expansions, and despite extraordinary geological resources has been slow to expand, hindered by Brazil's complex licensing process.

Finally, secretly preparing to "swerve" (that is, to reduce production and expansions) at the last moment is typically smart for large players, so long as this really is a secret. But that requires flexibility far greater than Australia's current regulatory regime permits. Flexibility the way forward

So if Australia is to win this game, what do we need to do? We clearly need to stop jawboning Rio Tinto and BHP Billiton to halt their expansions. Doing so only gives our competitors a glimmer of hope.

We need to ensure that our producers are able to get their operational and expansion costs down. The government's focus on industrial relations in major development projects is important in this context. But more is needed.

Our miners need to be ready to move quickly and flexibly. This means reducing unnecessary regulatory constraints, as the government has done by streamlining environmental approvals. We must avoid any further risk of a cumbersome access regime coming into place, particularly given that our major producers are vertically integrated exporters.

And, of course, we have to avoid any risk of reintroducing the **mining** tax, with all the uncertainty that would create.

The Business Council of Australia has told us that we need an industry policy that builds on our competitive advantages. Policies supporting our biggest export industry to win do just that.

Angus Taylor is the federal member for Hume. He advised Australian and global organisations on strategy before entering politics.

CO	bkhlp : BHP Billiton Ltd bltpc : BHP Billiton PLC
IN	i211 : Metal Ore Mining i22 : Primary Metals i221 : Iron/Steel/Ferroalloys imet : Mining/Quarrying ibasicm : Basic Materials/Resources
NS	nedc : Commentaries/Opinions ccat : Corporate/Industrial News reqrrm : Suggested Reading Metals/Mining ncat : Content Types nfact : Factiva Filters nfcpx : C&E Executive News Filter redit : Selection of Top Stories/Trends/Analysis reqr : Suggested Reading Industry News
RE	austr : Australia apacz : Asia Pacific ausnz : Australia/Oceania
PUB	Fairfax Media Management Pty Limited
AN	Document AFNR000020141015eaag0002x